

EDUARD YEchezkel KUTSCHER

A HISTORY OF THE HEBREW  
LANGUAGE

*Edited by*

RAPHAEL KUTSCHER

1982

THE MAGNES PRESS, THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY, JERUSALEM  
E.J. BRILL, LEIDEN

Published with the assistance of the  
Louis and Minna Epstein Fund of the  
American Academy for Jewish Research

Distributed by

N.V. Boekhandel en Drukkerij V/H  
E.J. Brill, Oude Rijn 33a, Leiden  
Holland

©

*The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University*  
*Jerusalem 1982*  
ISBN 965-223-397-8  
Printed in Israel  
at "Ahva" Co. Press, Jerusalem

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxv
EDITOR'S FOREWORD	xxix
CHAPTER ONE: THE BACKGROUND. §1	1
CHAPTER TWO: THE SEMITIC LANGUAGES. §2	3
CHAPTER THREE: HEBREW AS A SEMITIC LANGUAGE	5
A. What Is a Semitic Language? §3	5
I. <i>Consonant-Vowel Relationship.</i> §4	5
II. <i>Roots.</i> §5	6
<i>a. Patterns of the Semitic Root.</i> §6	6
B. Guttural (Laryngal and Pharyngal) and Emphatic Consonants. §7	7
I. <i>The Laryngals</i> ך, ך׃ (/ʾ, h/). §8	7
II. <i>The Pharyngals</i> ע, פ (/h/'/). §9	8
III. <i>The Emphatics</i> ק, צ, ט (/t, s, q/). §10	8
C. Vowels. §11	8
D. Morphology	8
I. <i>Pronouns and Particles.</i> §12	8
II. <i>The Verb.</i> §13	9
III. <i>The Noun.</i> §14	10
IV. <i>Attributes of the Noun.</i> §15	10
E. Syntax. §16	10
CHAPTER FOUR: BIBLICAL HEBREW	12
A. Tripartite Division of Biblical Hebrew. §17	12
B. Methods of Presentation. §18	12
C. Phonology	12
I. <i>Consonants.</i> §19	12
<i>a. Sibilants.</i> §20	13
1. <i>The Merger of</i> שׁ (/š/) <i>and</i> שׁ (/s/). §21	14
2. <i>The Šibbolet-Sibbolet Incident.</i> §22	14
3. <i>The Pronunciation of the Sibilants by                 Diaspora Jews as a Reflection of Their                 Respective Languages.</i> §23	15

<i>b. Gutturals.</i> §24	17
1. ן (/h/ and ף (/ʕ/) in Greek Transliterations. §25	17
2. <i>The Merger of /x/ with /h/ and /g/ with /ʕ/.</i> §26	18
3. <i>The Weak Pronunciation of the Gutturals.</i> §27	18
4. <i>Refutation of Kahle's Theory of Gutturals.</i> §28	19
<i>c. The ן ,פ ,כ ,ד ,ג ,ז (/b, g, d, k, p, t/).</i> §29	21
1. <i>Refutation of Kahle's Theory of the /b, g, d, k, p, t/.</i> §30	21
II. <i>Vowels</i>	22
<i>a. The Proto-Semitic Long Vowels in BH.</i> §31	22
1. <i>Proto-Semitic /a:/ in BH.</i> §32	23
<i>a. Bauer's "Mixed Language" Theory.</i> §33	23
<i>β. The /a:/&gt;/o:/ Shift in Cuneiform Transliteration.</i> §34	24
<i>b. The Proto-Semitic Short Vowels in BH.</i> §35	25
1. <i>Stress as a Distinctive Feature.</i> §36	26
2. <i>A Sound-Change Attested During Three Thousand Years in Syria-Palestine.</i> §37	26
3. <i>Proto-Semitic Short /i, u/ in BH.</i> §38	29
4. <i>Vowel Length as a Distinctive Feature in BH.</i> §39	29
D. <i>Morphology</i>	30
I. <i>Independent Pronouns</i>	30
<i>a. First Person Singular.</i> §40	30
<i>b. Second Person Feminine Singular.</i> §41	30
<i>c. First Person Plural.</i> §42	31
<i>d. Second and Third Persons Plural (Masc. and Fem.).</i> §43	31
II. <i>Demonstrative Pronouns.</i> §44	31
III. <i>Relative Pronouns.</i> §45	32
IV. <i>The Possessive Suffix of the Second Person Masculine Singular.</i> §46	32
V. <i>The Verb</i>	35
<i>a. Stems.</i> §47	35
1. <i>Passive Qal.</i> §48	36
2. <i>Nif'al.</i> §49	36

3. <i>Iste'al</i> . §50	37
b. <i>Tenses</i> . §51	37
1. <i>Suffixes of the Perfect</i>	37
α. <i>Second Person Singular Masculine</i> . § 52	37
β. <i>Second Person Singular Feminine</i> . §53	37
β <sup>1</sup> . " <i>Mirage</i> " <i>Forms</i> . §54	38
γ. <i>Third Person Singular Feminine</i> . §55	39
δ. <i>Third Person Plural Feminine</i> . §56	39
2. <i>Prefixes and Suffixes of the Imperfect</i> . §57	40
α. <i>Second Person Singular Feminine and Second and Third Persons Plural Masculine</i> . §58	40
β. <i>Third Person Plural Feminine</i> . §59	41
c. <i>Active and Neutral Bases in the Qal</i>	42
1. <i>Perfect</i> . §60	42
2. <i>Imperfect</i> . §61	42
3. <i>Participle</i> . §62	42
d. <i>The Weak Verbs</i>	42
1. <i>ל"א and ל"י (ל"ה) Verbs</i> . §63	42
2. <i>ל"י and ע"י Verbs</i> . §64	43
IV. <i>The Noun</i> . §65	43
E. <i>Syntax</i>	44
I. <i>Syntax of the Verb in SBH</i> . §66	44
II. <i>Syntax of the Verb in LBH</i> . §67	45
III. <i>Infinitives and Participles</i> . §68	45
F. <i>Vocabulary</i>	46
I. <i>Foreign Loanwords</i> . §69	46
a. <i>How Is a Foreign Loanword Recognized?</i> §70	46
b. <i>Wanderwörter (Travelling Words)</i> . §71	47
c. <i>Akkadian and Sumerian Loanwords</i>	48
1. <i>Akkadian</i> . §72	48
2. <i>Sumerian</i> . §73	50
d. <i>Egyptian Loanwords</i> . §74	51
e. <i>Persian Loanwords</i> . §75	52
f. <i>Loanwords from Other Languages</i> . §76	52

<i>g. Aramaic Loanwords</i> . . . . .	53
II. <i>The Native Vocabulary</i> . . . . .	53
<i>a. The Vocabulary as a Reflection of Jewish Life. §77</i> . . . . .	53
<i>b. Topographical Terms. §78</i> . . . . .	54
1. <i>Dialectal Differences? §79</i> . . . . .	54
<i>c. Thorns and Thistles. §80</i> . . . . .	55
<i>d. "All the Fountains of the Great Deep and the Flood         Gates of the Sky". §81</i> . . . . .	55
<i>e. The Desert. §82</i> . . . . .	56
<i>f. Translation and Transculturation. §83</i> . . . . .	56
<i>g. Diachronic Investigation. §84</i> . . . . .	57
<i>h. The Evidence from Place Names. §85</i> . . . . .	57
1. <i>Sound Changes in Places Names. §86</i> . . . . .	59
2. <i>Canaanite Deities in Places Names. §87</i> . . . . .	59
3. <i>Place Names in Word Plays. §88</i> . . . . .	60
<i>i. Personal Names. §89</i> . . . . .	60
1. <i>Personal Names Preserving Old Grammatical             Forms. §90</i> . . . . .	62
2. <i>Special Vocabulary in Personal Names. § 91</i> . . . . .	63
G. <i>Inscriptions. §92</i> . . . . .	64
I. <i>Spelling. §93</i> . . . . .	65
II. <i>Phonology. §94</i> . . . . .	66
III. <i>Morphology. §95</i> . . . . .	66
IV. <i>Vocabulary. §96</i> . . . . .	67
H. <i>Hebrew Words in Akkadian Transliteration. §97</i> . . . . .	68
I. <i>Hebrew Loanwords in Foreign Languages. §98</i> . . . . .	68
J. <i>Dialects of Biblical Hebrew. §99</i> . . . . .	70
K. <i>The Aramaic Influence. §100</i> . . . . .	71
I. <i>In Phonology. §101</i> . . . . .	73
II. <i>In Morphology</i> . . . . .	74
III. <i>In Syntax. §104</i> . . . . .	75
<i>a. In the Verb. §102</i> . . . . .	74
<i>b. In the Noun. §103</i> . . . . .	74
IV. <i>In the Vocabulary. §105</i> . . . . .	75
<i>a. Aramaic Calques. §106</i> . . . . .	76

L. Stratification of Biblical Hebrew (and El-Amarna). §107	77
I. <i>The El-Amarna Glosses</i> . §108	77
a. <i>Phonology</i> . §109	78
b. <i>Morphology</i> . §110	78
II. <i>Archaic Biblical Hebrew</i> . §111	79
a. <i>Morphology</i> . §112	79
1. <i>The Verb</i> . §113	79
2. <i>The Noun</i> . §114	79
b. <i>Syntax</i> . §115	80
c. <i>Vocabulary</i> . §116	80
III. <i>Late Biblical Hebrew</i> . §117	81
a. <i>Spelling</i> . §118	81
b. <i>Pronouns</i> . §119	81
c. <i>The Verb</i> . §120	81
d. <i>The Noun</i> . §121	81
e. <i>Syntax of the Verb and Noun</i> . §122	82
f. <i>Vocabulary</i> . §123	82
g. <i>LBH Features not Found in Mishnaic Hebrew</i> . §124	84
1. <i>A Canaanite Construction</i> . §125	85
M. <i>Conclusions</i> . §126	85

## CHAPTER FIVE: THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND CONTEMPORARY SOURCES

A. <i>The Book of Ben Sira</i> . §127	87
I. <i>The Cairo Geniza Fragments</i> . §128	88
a. <i>Grammar</i> . §129	88
b. <i>Vocabulary</i>	88
1. <i>LBH Material</i>	88
a. <i>Verbs</i> . §130	88
β. <i>Nouns</i> , §131	88
2. <i>MH Material</i> . §132	89
a. <i>Verbs</i> . §133	89
β. <i>Nouns</i> . §134	89
3. <i>Aramaic Material</i>	89
a. <i>Verbs</i> . §135	89

β. <i>Nouns.</i> §136	89
γ. <i>An Aramaic Calque.</i> §137	89
4. <i>A Word from an Unknown Source.</i> §138	90
II. <i>The Masada Fragments.</i> §139	90
a. <i>Spelling.</i> §140	90
b. <i>Morphology.</i> §141	91
c. <i>Vocabulary.</i> §142	91
1. <i>ABH Material.</i> §143	91
2. <i>SBH Material.</i> §144	91
3. <i>LBH Material.</i> §145	91
4. <i>MH Material.</i> §146	91
5. <i>Aramaic Material.</i> §147	91
6. <i>Material from Unknown Sources.</i> §148	91
d. <i>Biblical and Non-Biblical Transmissions in the Masada Fragments.</i> §149	92
e. <i>Ben Sira and the Dead Sea Scrolls.</i> §150	92
B. <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls.</i> §151	93
I. <i>The Isaiah Scroll.</i> §152	93
II. <i>The Language of the DSS as Reflected in the Isaiah Scroll</i>	94
a. <i>Proper Names.</i> §153	94
b. <i>The Linguistic Background.</i> §154	94
c. <i>Spelling.</i> §155	95
d. <i>Phonology.</i> §156	96
e. <i>Morphology</i>	96
1. <i>Pronouns.</i> §157	96
2. <i>The Verb.</i> §158	97
3. <i>The Noun.</i> §159	98
4. <i>Particles.</i> §160	99
f. <i>Syntax.</i> §161	99
g. <i>Vocabulary</i>	100
1. <i>On the Absence of Greek and Latin Loans in the DSS.</i> §162	100
a. <i>A Loan Translation from Latin?</i> §163	100
2. <i>A Persian Loanword.</i> §164	101



3. <i>The Hebrew Vocabulary</i> . . . . .	102
α. <i>Biblical Hebrew Vocabulary</i> . §165 . . . . .	102
β. <i>Mishnaic Hebrew Vocabulary</i> . §166 . . . . .	103
γ. <i>Vocabulary from Unknown Sources</i> . §167 . . . . .	104
h. <i>The Aramaic Influence</i> . §168 . . . . .	104
1. <i>In Morphology</i> . . . . .	104
α. <i>Pronouns</i> . §169 . . . . .	104
β. <i>Noun Formation</i> . §170 . . . . .	104
γ. <i>The Verb</i> . §171 . . . . .	105
2. <i>In the Vocabulary</i> . §172 . . . . .	105
α. <i>Aramaic Calques</i> . §173 . . . . .	105
C. <i>Other Contemporary Sources</i> . . . . .	106
I. <i>The Transliterations of the Septuagint</i> . §174 . . . . .	106
a. <i>Phonology</i> . §175 . . . . .	106
b. <i>Morphology</i> . §176 . . . . .	107
II. <i>The Samaritan Pentateuch</i> . §177 . . . . .	108
a. <i>Spelling</i> . §178 . . . . .	108
b. <i>Phonology</i> . §179 . . . . .	109
c. <i>Morphology</i> . . . . .	109
1. <i>Pronouns</i> . §180 . . . . .	109
2. <i>The Verb</i> . §181 . . . . .	109
3. <i>The Noun</i> . §182 . . . . .	110
d. <i>Vocabulary</i> . §183 . . . . .	110
e. <i>The Aramaic Influence</i> . §184 . . . . .	111
III. <i>Inscriptions</i> . §185 . . . . .	111
IV. <i>Transliterations of the Gospels and of Greek and Latin Inscriptions</i> . §186 . . . . .	112
V. <i>Hebrew Loanwords and Calques in Other Languages</i> . . . . .	112
a. <i>Loanwords</i> . §187 . . . . .	112
b. <i>Calques</i> . §188 . . . . .	113
D. <i>Desiderata</i> . §189 . . . . .	114

**CHAPTER SIX: MISHNAIC HEBREW** . . . . . 115

**A. Spoken and Literary Mishnaic Hebrew** . . . . . 115

**I. *The Beginning of Mishnaic Hebrew as a Literary***

<i>Language.</i> §190	115
II. <i>The End of Mishnaic Hebrew as a Spoken</i>	
<i>Language.</i> §191	115
III. <i>Mishnaic Hebrew as a Literary Language.</i> §192	116
B. <i>The Problem of Mishnaic Hebrew</i>	117
I. <i>Geiger's "Artificial Language" Theory and the</i>	
<i>Bar Koseba Letters.</i> §193	117
II. <i>Segal's Refutation of Geiger's Theory.</i> §194	118
III. <i>A Critique of Segal's Methods</i>	118
<i>a. On the Reliability of the Printed Editions.</i> §195	118
<i>b. On the Impact of Aramaic.</i> §196	119
C. <i>Grammatical and Lexical Survey</i>	120
I. <i>Phonology</i>	120
<i>a. Consonants</i>	120
1. <i>Gutturals.</i> §197	120
2. <i>The /b, g, d, k, p, t/. </i> §198	121
3. <i>Final [m]. </i> §199	121
<i>b. Vowels.</i> §200	122
II. <i>Morphology</i>	123
<i>a. Pronouns</i>	123
1. <i>Independent Pronouns.</i> §201	123
2. <i>Pronominal Suffixes.</i> §202	123
3. <i>Demonstrative Pronouns.</i> §203	124
4. <i>Independent Possessive Pronoun.</i> §204	124
5. <i>Reflexive Pronouns.</i> §205	124
6. <i>Relative Pronoun.</i> §206	125
<i>b. The Verb</i>	125
1. <i>Perfect.</i> §207	125
2. <i>Imperfect.</i> §208	125
3. <i>Participle.</i> §209	126
4. <i>Infinitive.</i> §210	126
5. <i>Stems.</i> §211	127
6. <i>The Weak Verbs.</i> §212	127
<i>c. The Noun</i>	128
1. <i>Noun Pattern.</i> §213	128
2. <i>The Plural.</i> §214	129

III. <i>Syntax</i> . . . . .	129
<i>a. Syntax of the Pronoun.</i> §215 . . . . .	129
<i>b. Syntax of the Noun</i> . . . . .	130
1. <i>The Construct State.</i> §216 . . . . .	130
2. <i>Determination.</i> §217 . . . . .	130
<i>c. Syntax of the Verb.</i> §218 . . . . .	131
IV. <i>Vocabulary.</i> §219 . . . . .	132
<i>a. Biblical Hebrew Vocabulary.</i> §220 . . . . .	132
1. <i>Numerals.</i> §221 . . . . .	132
2. <i>Parts of the Body.</i> §222 . . . . .	133
3. <i>Kinship.</i> §223 . . . . .	133
4. <i>Notions of Time.</i> §224 . . . . .	133
5. <i>Clothing.</i> §225 . . . . .	133
6. <i>Foodstuff.</i> §226 . . . . .	133
7. <i>Basic Human Actions.</i> §227 . . . . .	133
8. <i>Other Semantic Fields.</i> §228 . . . . .	134
9. <i>ABH Words in MH.</i> §229 . . . . .	134
10. <i>LBH Words in MH.</i> §230 . . . . .	135
<i>b. Non-Biblical Hebrew Vocabulary.</i> §231 . . . . .	135
1. <i>Semantic Innovations.</i> §232 . . . . .	135
2. <i>Morphological Innovations.</i> §233 . . . . .	135
3. <i>New Hebrew Elements.</i> §234 . . . . .	135
<i>c. Foreign Loanwords</i> . . . . .	136
1. <i>Akkadian.</i> §235 . . . . .	136
2. <i>Persian.</i> §236 . . . . .	137
3. <i>Greek.</i> §237 . . . . .	137
4. <i>Latin.</i> §238 . . . . .	138
5. <i>Greek and Latin Loanwords in Everday</i> <i>Life.</i> §239 . . . . .	138
6. <i>Aramaic.</i> §240 . . . . .	140
<i>a. Verbs.</i> §241 . . . . .	140
<i>β. Nouns.</i> §242 . . . . .	140
<i>γ. Calques and Inverted Calques.</i> §243 . . . . .	140
D. <i>Dialects of Mishnaic Hebrew.</i> §244 . . . . .	141
E. <i>The Transliterations of the Hexapla and Jerome</i> . . . . .	142

1. <i>The Second Column of the Hexapla.</i> §245	142
<i>a. Phonology</i>	143
1. <i>Vowels.</i> §246	143
2. <i>Consonants: Gutturals.</i> §247	144
<i>b. Morphology</i>	144
1. <i>Possessive Pronouns.</i> §248	144
2. <i>The Verb.</i> §249	144
3. <i>The Noun.</i> §250	144
II. <i>The Transliterations of Jerome.</i> §251	145
F. <i>Mishnaic Hebrew in Palestinian Aramaic Dialects.</i> §252	145
G. <i>Critique of Lexicographical Reference Works.</i> §253	146
CHAPTER SEVEN: MEDIEVAL HEBREW. §254	148
A. <i>Medieval Hebrew as a Spoken and Literary Language</i>	149
I. <i>Occasional Use as a Spoken Language.</i> §255	149
II. <i>Medieval Hebrew as a Literary Language.</i> §256	150
B. <i>Developments in Hebrew Linguistics.</i> §257	151
I. <i>The Invention of Vowel Signs (Vocalization)</i>	151
<i>a. The Need for Vowel Signs.</i> §258	151
<i>b. The Three Vocalization Systems.</i> §259	152
II. <i>Pronunciation of Hebrew in Christian and Arab Countries.</i> §260	152
<i>a. Consonants</i>	153
1. <i>Emphatics and Gutturals.</i> §261	153
2. <i>Sibilants.</i> §262	154
<i>b. Vowels.</i> §263	154
1. <i>Old Pronunciation Sometimes Preserved in Yiddish.</i> §264	155
C. <i>The Piyyuṭim</i> §265	155
I. <i>Linguistic Techniques of the Payṭanim.</i> §266	156
II. <i>Opposition to the Piyyuṭim.</i> §267	157
D. <i>Linguistics and Poetry in Spain and Elsewhere</i>	158
I. <i>The Rise of Hebrew Linguistics in Spain.</i> §268	158
II. <i>The Hebrew Poetry of Spain and Italy.</i> §269	159
<i>a. The Language.</i> §270	160

1. <i>Mishnaic Hebrew Elements.</i> §271	161
2. <i>Arabic (and Other) Influence.</i> §272	161
III. <i>The Language of the Medieval Translations from Arabic.</i> §273	162
E. <i>The Hebrew of the Literary Works from the Middle Ages to the Revival (End of the Eighteenth Century)</i>	165
I. <i>Maimonides.</i> §274	165
II. <i>Other Medieval Sources.</i> §275	166
III. <i>Rashi.</i> §276	167
IV. <i>Later Sources.</i> §277	168
F. <i>Specialized Vocabulary.</i> §278	168
I. <i>Chess.</i> §279	168
II. <i>Writing and Translating.</i> §280	169
III. <i>Music.</i> §281	169
IV. <i>Printing.</i> §282	170
V. <i>Mysticism.</i> §283	170
VI. <i>Home, School, Synagogue and Community Government, Relationships with Gentiles.</i> §284	171
G. <i>Hebrew Loanwords in Foreign Languages</i>	172
I. <i>Sabbath and Holidays.</i> §285	172
II. <i>In Medieval Latin</i>	173
a. <i>Medicine.</i> §286	173
b. <i>Linguistics.</i> §287	174
c. <i>Mysticism.</i> §288	175
III. <i>In Arabic.</i> §289	175
IV. <i>In German.</i> §290	176
H. <i>Hebrew in the Jewish Languages of the Diaspora.</i> §291	177
I. <i>Judeo-Arabic.</i> §292	177
a. <i>Phonetics and Orthography.</i> §293	177
b. <i>Grammatical Structure.</i> §294	177
c. <i>Vocabulary.</i> §295	178
II. <i>Judeo-Persian.</i> §296	178
III. <i>Hebrew in Romance Languages?</i> §297	179
IV. <i>Judeo-French.</i> §298	179
V. <i>Judeo-Italian.</i> §299	180

VI. <i>Judeo-Spanish</i> . §300	180
VII. <i>Yiddish</i> . §301	181
<i>a. Phonetics</i> . §302	181
<i>b. Morphology</i> . §303	182
VIII. <i>Judeo-Slavic</i> . §304	182

## CHAPTER EIGHT: MODERN HEBREW AND ISRAELI

HEBREW	183
A. The Revival of Hebrew	183
1. <i>The Strange Birth of Modern Hebrew</i> . §306	183
<i>a. Biblical Hebrew as a Vehicle of the Haskalah</i> . §307	184
<i>b. Adaptations of BH and New Creations of the Maskilim and Rabbis</i> . §308	186
<i>c. Mendele Mokher Sefarim — Creator of Modern Hebrew</i> . §309	190
1. <i>The Elements of His Language: BH, MH, Aramaic, Medieval Hebrew and Yiddish</i> . §310	190
2. <i>Mendele's Language — Only a Vehicle of Literature</i> . §311	192
II. <i>Hebrew Revived in Palestine</i> . §312	193
<i>a. Eliezer Ben Yehuda</i> . §313	193
<i>b. Va'ad Halashon Ha'ivrit (The Hebrew Language Committee)</i> . §314	194
1. <i>A Change of Policy in Va'ad Halashon</i> . §315	195
B. The Sources of Israeli Hebrew. §316	196
1. <i>Biblical Hebrew</i>	196
<i>a. Syntax Rejected</i> . §317	196
<i>b. Morphology</i> . §318	197
<i>c. Vocabulary</i> . §319	197
1. <i>Clash between BH and MH Avoided</i> . §320	198
2. <i>Why Was the Use of BH Vocabulary Opposed</i> . §321	199
II. <i>Biblical Hebrew Inscriptions</i> . §322	201
III. <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Bar Koseba Letters</i> . §323	201

IV. <i>The Septuagint.</i> §324	201
V. <i>Mishnaic Hebrew.</i> §325	202
<i>a. Noun Patterns.</i> §326	202
<i>b. Syntax.</i> §327	202
<i>c. Vocabulary.</i> §328	203
<i>d. Secondary Sources as a Channel between MH and IH.</i> §329	203
VI. <i>Medieval Hebrew</i>	204
<i>a. Piyyuṭim.</i> §330	204
<i>b. Kabbala.</i> §331	205
<i>c. The Scientific Translations.</i> §332	205
<i>d. Arabic via Medieval Hebrew.</i> §333	205
1. <i>Calques.</i> §334	205
<i>e. The Poetry of Spain.</i> §335	206
<i>f. Other Medieval Hebrew Sources.</i> §336	206
VII. <i>Aramaic.</i> §337	207
<i>a. New Creations from Aramaic Roots.</i> §338	208
<i>b. Aramaic as Elevated Style.</i> §339	208
<i>c. Aramaic Variant Forms for Semantic Differentiation.</i> §340	209
VIII. <i>Arabic</i>	209
<i>a. Introduced by Ben Yehuda.</i> §341	209
<i>b. Introduced by the Palmach.</i> §342	210
<i>c. Other Vocabulary Sources.</i> §343	210
1. <i>Climate and Milieu.</i> §344	211
2. <i>Expressive and Onomatopoeic Words.</i> §345	211
3. <i>Borrowed Nouns Treated as Foreign.</i> §346	212
IX. <i>Yiddish.</i> §347	212
<i>a. Phonology.</i> §348	213
<i>b. Morphology.</i> §349	214
<i>c. Syntax.</i> §350	214
<i>d. Prepositions.</i> §351	215
<i>e. Use of the Stems.</i> §352	215
<i>f. Vocabulary.</i> §353	217
1. <i>Words of Yiddish Origin.</i> §354	217

2. <i>Classical Hebrew Words Absorbed in IH via Yiddish.</i> §355	217
3. <i>Hebrew Words in Yiddish Form.</i> §356	217
4. <i>Hebrew-Yiddish Compounds.</i> §357	218
5. <i>Yiddish Words of Slavic Origin.</i> §358	218
6. <i>Loan Translations and Replica Formations.</i> §359	218
g. <i>Yiddish as a Channel for Classical Hebrew and Aramaic Words.</i> §360	218
X. <i>Judeo-Spanish.</i> §361	219
XI. <i>Other European Languages</i>	219
a. <i>Vocabulary.</i> § 362	219
b. <i>Noun and Adjective Formations.</i> §363	220
c. <i>Syntax.</i> §364	221
d. <i>English.</i> §365	223
e. <i>German.</i> §366	223
f. <i>French.</i> §367	224
g. <i>Russian.</i> §368	224
h. <i>Onomatopoetic Words.</i> §369	224
XII. <i>Akkadilan.</i> §370	225
C. <i>Trends and Methods</i>	225
I. <i>Acceptance and Rejection</i>	225
a. <i>Secularization.</i> §371	225
b. <i>Rejection.</i> §372	226
c. <i>The Sephardic Pronunciation Adopted.</i> §373	226
II. <i>Forging the Israeli Hebrew Vocabulary.</i> §374	228
a. <i>Midrashic Tale as a Source of an IH Phrase.</i> § 375	228
b. <i>From Loanword to Hebrew.</i> §376	229
c. <i>From Compound to a Single Word.</i> §377	229
d. <i>Narrowing of Meaning.</i> §378	229
e. <i>Widening of Meaning.</i> §379	230
f. <i>Differentiation.</i> §380	230
g. <i>Avoidance of Homonyms.</i> §381	231
h. <i>Transfer of Meaning.</i> §382	231
i. <i>Mistakes</i>	231



1. <i>Accepted.</i> §383	231
2. <i>Rejected.</i> §384	233
<i>j. Change of Meaning as a Result of Change in Interpretation.</i> §385	233
<i>k. Words from Proper Names.</i> §386	234
<i>l. Popular Etymology.</i> §387	235
<i>m. "Spelling Pronunciation".</i> §388	235
<i>n. Dialectal Differences.</i> §389	235
<i>o. Hebrew and Aramaic Grammatical Differences.</i> §390	236
<i>p. Words and Roots Created from Abbreviations and Blends.</i> §391	236
<i>q. Contagion.</i> §392	237
<i>r. New Terms Changing the Meaning of Old Ones.</i> §393	237
<i>s. Analogy.</i> §394	237
<i>t. Back Formation.</i> §395	238
<i>u. Elevated Words.</i> §396	238
<i>v. Degraded Words (Pejorative Change of Meaning).</i> §397	238
<i>w. Change of Meaning Caused by Social Change.</i> §398	239
<i>x. Euphemisms.</i> §399	239
<i>y. Struggle between New Terms.</i> §400	239
<i>z. Suppletion.</i> §401	240
<i>aa. New Creations That are Identical with BH or MH by Mere Chance.</i> §402	240
<i>bb. New Words in Vogue.</i> §403	241
<i>cc. New Words</i>	241
1. <i>Who Created What?</i> §404	241
2. <i>How New Terms Are Publicized.</i> §405	242
III. <i>The Changing Face of Israeli Hebrew.</i> §406	243
Israeli Hebrew as a New Entity. §407	243
An Outline of Israeli Hebrew. §408	247
1. <i>Phonology and Phonetics.</i> §409	247
a. <i>Consonants: Phonemics, Phonetics and Lost</i>	

<i>Phonemes.</i> §410	248
<i>b. Vowels.</i> §411	249
<i>c. Further Observations on IH Phonemes.</i> §412	250
<i>d. Stress.</i> §413	251
<i>f. Non-Assimilation of Nun.</i> §415	251
11. <i>Morphology</i>	252
<i>a. Pronouns</i>	252
1. <i>Independent Pronouns.</i> §416	252
2. <i>Possessive Suffixes and the Independent Possessive Pronoun.</i> §417	252
<i>α. Uses of the Independent Possessive Pronoun.</i> §418	252
3. <i>Demonstrative Pronouns.</i> §419	253
4. <i>Relative Pronouns.</i> §420	254
<i>b. The Verb</i>	254
1. <i>Prefixes and Suffixes.</i> §421	254
2. <i>Participle of the Feminine Singular.</i> §422	254
3. <i>Infinitives.</i> §423	254
4. <i>The Weak Verbs.</i> §424	254
5. <i>Stems.</i> §425	254
<i>α. Qal.</i> §426	255
<i>β. Nif'al.</i> §427	255
<i>γ. Pi'el.</i> §428	255
<i>δ. Pi'lel.</i> §429	256
<i>ε. Pu'al.</i> §430	256
<i>ζ. Hif'il and Hof'al.</i> §431	256
<i>η. Hitpa'el.</i> §432	256
<i>θ. Nitpa'el.</i> §433	256
III. <i>The Verbal System (Tenses, Moods and Aspects)</i>	257
<i>a. Tenses.</i> §434	257
1. <i>The Participle Plus Auxiliary.</i> §435	257
2. <i>The Active Participle.</i> §436	257
3. <i>The Imperfect.</i> §437	257
4. <i>Negation.</i> §438	258
5. <i>Imperative.</i> §439	258

6. <i>Infinitive.</i> §440	259
7. <i>The Passive Participle.</i> §441	259
IV. <i>Word Formation</i>	260
a. <i>The Noun.</i> §442	260
1. <i>The Construct State and the של Construction.</i> §443	260
2. <i>Apposition.</i> §444	261
b. <i>Adjectival Forms.</i> §445	261
c. <i>Adverbs.</i> §446	262
d. <i>Prepositions.</i> §447	262
V. <i>Special Languages in Israeli Hebrew.</i> §448	263
a. <i>Children's Language.</i> §449	263
b. <i>Slang.</i> §450	263
c. <i>Argot.</i> §451	264
d. <i>The Hebrew of the Synagogue.</i> §452	264
F. <i>Israeli Hebrew from the Revival to the Present</i>	265
I. <i>The Expansion of Spoken Israeli Hebrew.</i> §453	265
II. <i>Contributions by Individuals and Organizations.</i>	267
a. <i>Writers.</i> §454	267
b. <i>Translators.</i> §455	267
c. <i>Other Contributors.</i> §456	267
d. <i>Newspapers.</i> §457	268
e. <i>The Army.</i> §458	268
III. <i>The Academy of the Hebrew Language.</i> §459	268
a. <i>The Problem of IH Spelling.</i> §460	269
G. <i>Hebrew in Contemporary Jewish and Non-Jewish Languages.</i> §461	270
I. <i>Hebrew in Yiddish</i>	270
a. <i>Dialects of Yiddish.</i> §462	270
b. <i>The Role of Hebrew: "Whole Hebrew" and "Merged Hebrew"</i> §463	271
c. <i>Grammatical and Lexical Survey</i>	272
1. <i>Phonology</i>	272
a. <i>Consonants.</i> §464	272
b. <i>Vowels.</i> §465	272

γ. <i>Stress.</i> §466	273
2. <i>Morphology</i>	273
α. <i>The Verb.</i> §467	273
β. <i>The Noun.</i> §468	273
β <sup>1</sup> . <i>Construct State.</i> §469	275
β <sup>2</sup> . <i>The Plural.</i> §470	275
3. <i>"Yiddish Syntax Has a Hebrew Soul" —</i>	
<i>Unproven.</i> §471	275
4. <i>Vocabulary.</i> §472	276
d. <i>Hebrew in the Yiddish of Holland.</i> §473	278
1. <i>Phonology.</i> §474	278
2. <i>Vocabulary.</i> §475	279
11. <i>Hebrew in Judeo-Spanish.</i> §476	279
a. <i>Phonology</i>	280
1. <i>Consonants.</i> §477	280
2. <i>Vowels.</i> §478	280
b. <i>Morphology</i>	280
1. <i>The Verb.</i> §479	280
2. <i>The Noun.</i> §480	280
c. <i>Syntax.</i> §481	280
d. <i>Vocabulary.</i> §482	280
III. <i>Hebrew in Judeo-Italian.</i> §483	281
IV. <i>Hebrew in Judeo-French.</i> §484	282
V. <i>Hebrew in the Turkic Dialect of the Karaites of Lithuania.</i> §485	282
a. <i>Phonology</i>	282
1. <i>Consonants.</i> §486	282
2. <i>Vowels.</i> §487	283
b. <i>Morphology</i>	283
1. <i>The Verb.</i> §488	283
2. <i>The Noun.</i> §489	283
c. <i>Syntax.</i> §490	283
d. <i>Vocabulary.</i> §491	284
VI. <i>Hebrew in the Judeo-Arabic of Yemen.</i> §492	284
a. <i>Phonology.</i> §493	285

<i>b. Morphology</i> . . . . .	285
1. <i>The Verb</i> . §494 . . . . .	285
2. <i>The Noun</i> . §495 . . . . .	286
<i>a. Noun Patterns</i> . §496 . . . . .	286
<i>c. Vocabulary</i> . §497 . . . . .	286
VII. <i>Hebrew in the Judeo-Arabic Dialect of Fez, Morocco</i> . . . . .	287
<i>a. Phonology</i> . . . . .	287
1. <i>Consonants</i> . §498 . . . . .	287
2. <i>Vowels</i> . §499 . . . . .	288
3. <i>Stress</i> . §500 . . . . .	288
<i>b. Morphology</i> . . . . .	288
1. <i>The Verb</i> . §501 . . . . .	288
2. <i>The Noun</i> . §502 . . . . .	288
<i>c. Vocabulary</i> . §503 . . . . .	288
VIII. <i>Hebrew in the Judeo-Arabic Dialect of Algiers</i> . . . . .	289
<i>a. Phonology</i> . . . . .	289
1. <i>Consonants</i> . §504 . . . . .	289
2. <i>Vowels</i> . §505 . . . . .	289
<i>b. Morphology</i> . . . . .	290
1. <i>The Verb</i> . §506 . . . . .	290
2. <i>The Noun</i> . §507 . . . . .	290
<i>c. Vocabulary</i> . §508 . . . . .	290
IX. <i>Hebrew in Non-Jewish European Languages</i> . . . . .	291
<i>a. German</i> . §509 . . . . .	291
<i>b. English</i> . §510 . . . . .	291
<i>c. Dutch</i> . §511 . . . . .	293
<i>d. Hungarian</i> . §512 . . . . .	293
H. Epilogue	
<i>Hebrew — the only language revived and remodelled.</i>	
<i>Is Israeli Hebrew still Hebrew? Parallel cases of</i>	
<i>language modernization: the Hungarian example.</i>	
<i>Hebrew as a uniting force in Israel and in the</i>	
<i>Diaspora</i> . §513 . . . . .	293
APPENDIX by Raphael Kutscher . . . . .	301
A. Addenda . . . . .	301

B. Tables	303
Table 1. The Hebrew consonants in relation to Proto-Semitic, Aramaic and Arabic	303
Table 2. The independent personal pronouns in Biblical Hebrew, Mishnaic Hebrew (and the Dead Sea Scrolls)	304
Table 3. The imperfect in Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew	304
C. Selective Indexes	305
I. <i>Hebrew Forms, Lexemes and Roots</i>	305
II. <i>General Index and Transliterations</i>	306

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

### Bibliographical

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <i>AHw</i>                                    | W. von Soden, <i>Akkadisches Handwörterbuch</i> , Wiesbaden 1965–.  |
| <i>Archive</i>                                | E.Y. Kutscher, ed., <i>Archive of the New Dictionary of Rabbinical Literature</i> , vol. I, Ramat-Gan 1972.   |
| Baron, <i>History</i> VII                     | S.W. Baron, <i>A Social and Religious History of the Jews</i> <sup>2</sup> , vol. VII, Hebrew Language and Letters (High Middle Ages), New York 1958. |
| <i>BASOR</i>                                  | <i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i> .  |
| Bauer–Leander, <i>Hist. Gramm.</i>            | H. Bauer–P. Leander, <i>Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache</i> , Halle 1922.   |
| Ben Yehuda, <i>Dictionary</i>                 | E. Ben Yehuda, <i>A Complete Dictionary of Ancient and Modern Hebrew</i> , 1910–1959.   |
| Bergsträsser,<br><i>Einführung</i>            | G. Bergsträsser, <i>Einführung in die semitischen Sprachen</i> , München 1928.  |
| Bergsträsser, <i>HG</i>                       | G. Bergsträsser, <i>Hebräische Grammatik</i> , Leipzig 1918.  |
| <i>CAD</i>                                    | <i>The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago</i> , Chicago and Glückstadt, 1956–.                                |
| Diringer, <i>Inscrizioni</i>                  | D. Diringer, <i>Le iscrizioni antico-ebraice palestinesi</i> , Firenze 1934.  |
| <i>EJ</i>                                     | <i>Encyclopaedia Judaica</i> , Jerusalem 1971.  |
| Finkelstein, <i>The Jews</i> <sup>3</sup>     | L. Finkelstein, ed., <i>The Jews: Their History, Culture and Religion</i> <sup>3</sup> , New York 1960.   |
| Garbell,<br><i>Fremdsprachliche Einflüsse</i> | I. Chanoch geb. Garbell, <i>Fremdsprachliche Einflüsse im modernen Hebräisch</i> , Berlin 1930.   |
| Harris, <i>Development</i>                    | Z.S. Harris, <i>Development of the Canaanite Dialects</i> , New Haven 1939.   |
| <i>HUCA</i>                                   | <i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i> .  |
| <i>IEJ</i>                                    | <i>Israel Exploration Journal</i> .   |
| <i>JAOS</i>                                   | <i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i> .   |
| <i>JBL</i>                                    | <i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i> .   |
| <i>JNES</i>                                   | <i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i> .  |

JSS	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies.</i>
Koehler–Baumgartner <sup>3</sup>	L. Koehler und W. Baumgartner, <i>Hebraisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum alten Testament</i> , dritte Auflage neu bearbeitet von W. Baumgartner unter Mitarbeit von B. Hartmann und E.Y. Kutscher, Leiden 1967–
Kutscher, <i>Isaiah Scroll</i>	E.Y. Kutscher, <i>The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1 Q Isa<sup>a</sup>)</i> , Leiden 1974 (translation of the Hebrew original, 1959).
Löw, <i>Flora</i>	I. Löw, <i>Die Flora der Juden</i> , Wien und Leipzig 1928–1934.
Rosén, <i>Contemporary Hebrew</i>	H.B. Rosén, <i>Contemporary Hebrew</i> , The Hague and Paris 1977.
Segal, <i>Mišnaic Hebrew</i>	M.H. Segal, <i>Mišnaic Hebrew and Its Relation to Biblical Hebrew and to Aramaic</i> , Oxford 1909 (reprinted from the <i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i> 20 [1908]).
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.</i>
ZDMG	<i>Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.</i>

י. אבינרי, כבושי העברית בדורנו, מרחביה 1946.	אבינרי, כבושי העברית בדורנו
י.ג. אפשטיין, מבוא לנוסח המשנה, ירושלים תש"ח.	אפשטיין, מבוא
י. בלאו, תחיית העברית ותחיית הערבית הספרותית, ירושלים תשל"ו.	בלאו, תחיית העברית
י. קוטשר, מחקרים בעברית ובארמית, ירושלים תשל"ז.	מחקרים
י. קוטשר, לשון חז"ל, ספר חנוך ילק, ירושלים תשכ"ג, עמ' 246–280 (= מחקרים, עמ' עג-קז).	קוטשר, לשון חז"ל
י. קוטשר, מלים ותולדותיהן, ירושלים תשכ"א.	קוטשר, מלים ותולדותיהן,
ח. רבין, "מלים זרות", אנציקלופדיה מקראית ד, טורים 1070–1080.	רבין, "מלים זרות"
ח. רחן, העברית שלנו, תל-אביב תשט"ז.	רחן, העברית שלנו
ח. רחן, עברית טובה <sup>3</sup> , ירושלים תשל"ז.	רחן, עברית טובה <sup>3</sup>



## Other

A	Aramaic
ABH	Archaic Biblical Hebrew
BH	Biblical Hebrew
Chron.	Chronicles
Dan.	Daniel
Deut.	Deuteronomy
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls
Eccles.	Ecclesiastes
Ex.	Exodus
Ez.	Ezra
Ezek.	Ezekiel
H	Hebrew
IE	Indo-European
IH	Israeli Hebrew
Isa.	Isaiah
JA	Judeo-Arabic
JF	Judeo-French
Josh.	Joshua
JP	Judeo-Persian
JSp	Judeo-Spanish
Jud.	Judges
LBH	Late Biblical Hebrew
Lev.	Leviticus
MD	Manual of Discipline
MH	Mishnaic Hebrew
MS, MSS	manuscript, manuscripts
MT	Masoretic Text
Neh.	Nehemiah
Nu.	Numbers
PS	Proto-Semitic
Sam.	Samuel
SBH	Standard Biblical Hebrew
SL	Semitic languages
SP	Samaritan Pentateuch
Y	Yiddish



## EDITOR'S FOREWORD

When my father, Professor Eduard Yechezkel Kutscher passed away in December 1971, the manuscript of the present book was far from complete. It had been written between the years 1964 and 1968, and many notes, corrections, and bibliographical references were written later by hand on the typescript. The manuscript concluded with the author's handwritten words *הסוף חסר*. The missing end included a section titled "Israeli Hebrew as a Means for Preserving Judaism."

Most of the cross references had not been supplied, and many of the bibliographical references gave only the author's name and the page number (occasionally without the latter), but no title; in one case, the Hungarian book quoted in §513, both the author's name and the title were missing. I filled in the cross references (and added many more), and provided the bibliographical details whenever possible; in only a few cases was I unable to identify the reference.

### *The Reference Literature*

Generally, the literature cited refers to the paragraph to which it is appended, but in some cases it refers to a whole topic. It must be stressed that the author had no intention of supplying an exhaustive bibliography for each subject.

Prof. G. Sarfatti changed all references to the Hebrew original of the author's *Isaiah Scroll* into the appropriate citations from the posthumous English translation (1974).

I did likewise with *Studies in Galilean Aramaic* (1976) and updated references to the third edition of Rosén's *'Ivrit Tovah* (1977).

### *Division into Paragraphs*

The author divided and titled most of the paragraphs. However, where necessary I changed the division or location of several paragraphs, further divided others into the smallest possible sections (thereby eliminating the necessity for a detailed index), and added consecutive paragraph numbers (§) to facilitate cross references.

### *Contributions by Other Scholars*

At the suggestion of Prof. H.B. Rosén, I asked several colleagues to read individual chapters of the book in order to update the reference literature. Their additions and notes are placed in square brackets and marked by their initials; those which are not so marked are mine. Except for Chapter Four, which I myself read, the following colleagues read these chapters: Professor Gideon Goldenberg—Chapters One, Two and Three, Professor Gad Sarfatti and Dr. Elisha Qimron—Chapters Five and Six, Mrs. Esther Goldenberg—Chapter Seven, Dr. Ora R. Schwarzwald—Chapter Eight.

Dr. Schwarzwald also helped fill in the cross references in Chapter Eight and made many helpful suggestions. I am thoroughly indebted to these colleagues.

### *The Tables*

The manuscript contained references to Tables 1–3 which were missing. I provided them (pp. 302–303) on the basis of the views expressed by the author in this book and in previous publications.

### *Acknowledgements*

My work in this book benefited from the help of several people. First and foremost is my wife Dr. Carol Bosworth Kutscher, who copy-edited large sections of the manuscript and was otherwise of great help to me in matters of editorial policy. The mistakes and inconsistencies left in the book are in the sections which she did not read or else the result of my tampering with it after she had finished her work.

To the following people my thanks are also due: Dr. Moshe Bar-Asher, Miss Alisa Bloch, Prof. Avi Hurvitz, Miss Hadassa Stein (secretarial help and bibliography), and Dr. Baruch Yaron. Special thanks are due to Miss Adèle Zarmatti for her careful proof-reading and editorial help. The Faculty of Humanities of the Hebrew University provided a grant which helped pay for secretarial assistance and the American Academy for Jewish Research supported the publication of this book. I am obliged to all.

*Department of Archaeology  
and Ancient Near Eastern Studies  
Tel Aviv University  
April 1981*

RAPHAEL KUTSCHER

## CHAPTER ONE

## THE BACKGROUND

§1. Some time during the second half of the second millennium B.C.E., Israelite tribes conquered Palestine. As they settled down they integrated themselves into the patchwork of peoples inhabiting the Near East. The Canaanites, who spoke a North-Semitic language were the dominant people in the conquered country. From both the Canaanite (Phoenician) inscriptions and from the glosses of El-Amarna (see below §108) we know that this language was very close to Hebrew. We may assume that the language of the inhabitants was very close to that of the Israelite tribes when they penetrated Canaan. The hypothesis that Hebrew arose through a mixture of this language and the language spoken by the Israelites has not been proven (see §33). This assumption is the more plausible since, according to the tradition of the Israelites, which most Jewish scholars do not doubt, their forefathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob roamed Canaan already several hundred years previously.

During the time of the settlement and the centuries that followed, the Israelites came in contact with the Hittites — of whom the Jebusites and Hivites were apparently sub-groups — who were peoples of non-Semitic origin speaking non-Semitic languages. The closely related neighbors of the Israelites, namely the Amonites, Moabites and Edomites, probably spoke languages closely related to Hebrew, but next to nothing is known about them except for Moabite, thanks to the stele erected by King Mesha (ninth century B.C.E.). We also know nothing about the language of the Philistines, a non-Semitic people who occupied mainly the southern part of the coastal plain, after whom the Romans named the whole country Palestine in the second century C.E.

The Hurrians were another non-Semitic people mentioned by the Bible among other inhabitants of Canaan, whose language became known during the last decades. We may safely assume that the languages and dialects spoken by these people had some effect upon Hebrew, but for the time being we lack the means for tracing this effect.

The Assyrians and Babylonians spoke Akkadian, another Semitic language which left its imprint on Hebrew. Their language was the *lingua franca* of the Near East during the El-Amarna period (fifteenth–fourteenth centuries B.C.E. and see below, §§72, 108). Egypt ruled Palestine before the Israelite conquest. Later, during the period of the First Temple, the Egyptian army conducted several raids into Palestine, clashed with the Assyrian army there or passed through Palestine on its way to Syria. Thanks to these facts and because of the special way in which the fate of the Israelite tribes and the Patriarchs was bound up with that of Egypt, interference with Hebrew on the part of the Akkadian and Egyptian languages was unavoidable.

Some time before 1100 B.C.E. the Arameans, another Semitic people, established themselves in Syria. During the centuries that followed, their language, Aramaic, became dominant throughout the Near East as the language of diplomacy and commerce, and was indeed the *lingua franca* of the entire area. No language in this region could escape its impact, and Hebrew's entire make-up was profoundly altered during the succeeding millennium.

In 539 B.C.E., the Persian King Cyrus defeated Babylonia and for two centuries the Near East was under Persian domination.

The situation in the Near East took a totally new turn with the triumphant march of Alexander the Great from Greece to India. Wherever his soldiers set foot, Greek culture and the Greek language inaugurated an entirely new era. Persian and Greek loanwords in Hebrew and in the other languages of the area bear witness to the imprint the Greeks left on the peoples with whom they came in contact throughout the Near East.

## CHAPTER TWO

## THE SEMITIC LANGUAGES

§2. The term Semitic (see Gen. 10, 21–31; 11, 10–26) is used to denote a group of languages that share common features of phonology, morphology, syntax and vocabulary. The most reasonable assumption is that these languages are related to each other through descent from a parent language, Proto-Semitic, (as for example, the Romance languages are descended from Latin). However, unlike Latin, Proto-Semitic did not survive, although certain of its characteristics can be reconstructed with the aid of the older Semitic languages.

Semitic languages were employed by people living in ancient times in Mesopotamia (modern Iraq), Syria, Palestine and Arabia, as well as by the Ethiopians. Through the conquests of the Arabs, a Semitic language — Arabic — came to be spoken in North Africa, and temporarily in Spain and other parts of Southern Europe, while an Arabic dialect is today the vernacular of Malta.

The Semitic languages are usually divided according to their geographical distribution into (North-)East Semitic, North-West Semitic, and South-West Semitic.

(North-)East Semitic i.e. Akkadian comprises two dialects, Assyrian and Babylonian, and was employed in the past mainly in Mesopotamia. North-West Semitic, was spoken in ancient times in Syria–Palestine. To this branch belong Amorite (known mainly from proper nouns), Ugaritic which was discovered in 1929, Canaanite which is known from inscriptions, Moabite (known almost exclusively from the Mesha stele), Hebrew and Aramaic. One branch of Canaanite is Punic which Canaanite settlers brought to North Africa while Aramaic dislodged Canaanite as the spoken language of Syria and Akkadian as the spoken language of Mesopotamia (from around the middle of the first millennium B.C.E. until the Arab conquest; and see below, §100). Dialects of Aramaic survived in three villages in Syria as well as in the territory where Turkey, Persia and Iraq meet (Kurdistan). South-West Semitic includes Classical Arabic (the language of the

Qur'an), Southern Arabic which is known from inscriptions, as well as Ethiopic (Ge'ez). Of these languages a large number of spoken dialects survive today.

The earliest Semitic language attested in writing is Akkadian — from the third millennium B.C.E.

The Semitic languages are related to three other groups: Egyptian, Lybico-Berber, Cushitic (and also the Chad group) generally referred to as Hamitic.

*Literature:*

S. Moscati, *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages*, Wiesbaden 1964, pp. 3–16.

[The linguistic affiliation of the Eblaite dialect, discovered in 1974–75 has not yet been determined.

A preliminary analysis led I.J. Gelb to conclude that the closest languages are Amorite and Old Akkadian. In my opinion the syntax of the few texts published thus far (after Gelb's article) and Gelb's conclusions indicate close proximity to Old Akkadian. See I.J. Gelb, "Thoughts about Ibla: A Preliminary Evaluation, March 1977", *Syro-Mesopotamian Studies* 1/1 (1977), 3–30.]



## CHAPTER THREE

## HEBREW AS A SEMITIC LANGUAGE

## A. What Is a Semitic Language?

§3. In an article published in 1958 E. Ullendorff underlines the difficulties in defining what a Semitic language is. However the older Semitic languages (SL) do possess several characteristics more or less common to them all. In the following they will be set out as they are reflected in Hebrew.

*Literature:*

E. Ullendorff, "What is a Semitic Language?", *Orientalia* NS 27 (1958), pp. 66-75.

I. *Consonant-Vowel Relationship*

§4. The most outstanding trait which the Semitic languages share with the languages mentioned above is in the special relationship between consonants of the root and vowels. The consonants are carriers of the primary semantic distinctions, at least in the verb and in nouns derived from the verb. The vowels play the role of modifiers indicating grammatical and secondary semantic meanings. Any verbal or nominal form of the root שמר, no matter how it is vocalized and regardless of any consonantal affixes, will always have its basic meaning 'guard, watch'; e.g., שְׁמוֹר 'guarded', מִשְׁמָר 'watch', שׂוֹמֵר 'watchman', אֶשְׁמֹר 'I shall watch', and so on. This characteristic immediately sets the Semitic languages apart from the Indo-European languages, for example. To be sure, in forms such as English *sing, sang, song*, the vowels play the same role in Indo-European as they do in the Semitic languages. But while in the Semitic languages this role is the *only* function of the vowels, German *lieben, loben, laben, leben*,

or English *live, leave, love* point up the fact that in Indo-European a change of vowels can effect a change of basic meaning, while in SL it cannot.

## II. *Roots*

§5. The second characteristic, closely related to the first is that the Semitic root (except for pronouns and particles) generally consists of three (rarely of four or five) consonants. To be sure, there is reason to believe that this stage developed from an earlier one in the Semitic languages where the roots contained two consonants only. There are several reasons for this assumption: a) the survival of a number of biradical nouns belonging to the basic vocabulary of human life such as parts of the body, kinship, notions of time, primitive utensils etc. such as יָד 'hand', שֵׁפָה 'lip', דָּם 'blood', שֶׁד 'breast', נֶדֶד 'nipple', שֵׁשׁ 'buttocks', בֶּן 'son', אָמָה 'maidservant', שָׁנָה 'year', יוֹם 'day' (plural יָמִים!), עֵץ 'wood, tree' etc. The word פֶּה 'mouth' has only one radical. b) Certain categories of the verb (hollow, geminate and possibly others) preserved forms that apparently go back to this earlier stage. c) Traces of this earlier stage can sometimes be discerned in triradical roots. Consider several verbs whose first two radicals are פֶּר e.g., פָּרַד 'divide', פָּרַט 'change (money)', פָּרַךְ, פָּרַר 'crumble', פָּרַם 'tear (a garment)', פָּרַס 'divide in two, break (especially bread)', פָּרַק 'tear apart', פָּרַץ 'break through' and a few others. It seems obvious that the underlying notion of 'divide' is bound up with the consonants פֶּר while the third radical acts as a semantic modifier. Admittedly, it would not be easy to detect many other such convincing series, and scholarly efforts in this direction have generally been none too successful. But taking into account the factor of time which we must allow for the completion of this process (namely turning original biradicals into triradicals), this failure was only to be expected. Though triradicals are also met with in Indo-European (IE), it cannot be denied that in SL this type is truly pervasive. Even the biradicals that had not added a third radical to the root had to adapt themselves more or less to the triradical pattern. The same applies to some of the biradical nouns (above (a)), in several SL and dialects, as pointed out by Th. Nöldeke.

### a. *Patterns of the Semitic Root*

§6. A student of mine, reflecting on the series of פֶּר-verbs (above) asked

how could פּרַף mean 'to button' in modern Hebrew, when it is obviously diametrically opposed to the basic meaning 'divide'. The answer was simple: the root of the modern Hebrew verb comes from Greek via Mishnaic Hebrew (MH).

This case brings us to another important point, namely the patterning of the Semitic root (Greenberg). The root פּרַף betrays its foreign origin by its patterning ABA. Semitic roots patterned this way are extremely rare, e.g., נָתַן 'give', and a few nouns, e.g., שֶׁרֶשׁ 'root'. The instances found in MH, e.g., כָּרַךְ 'encircle, twine around', are apparently secondary. It is also instructive that in the first two positions, not only are identical consonants excluded (the patterning AAB being non-existent except in Akkadian) but even homorganic consonants (produced by the same organ) do not occur in this position. (There are exceptions however e.g., the noun אֶחָד 'one'.) On the other hand, while the patterning ABB (the geminate verb) is very much in evidence, e.g., סָבַב 'surround', homorganic consonants, e.g., the root סָבַף, both [b] and [p] being labials (produced by the lips) are excluded in positions two and three.

#### *Literature:*

Ullendorff, *op. cit.* (above §3);

G. Bergsträsser, *Einführung in die semitischen Sprachen*, München 1928, pp. 6-7;

Bergstrasser, *HG* II, pp. 1-4;

Th. Nöldeke, *Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*, Strassburg 1910, pp. 109-178 (especially p. 111);

J.H. Greenberg, *Word* 6 (1950), pp. 162ff.

### B. Guttural (Laryngal and Pharyngal) and Emphatic Consonants

§7. There are two consonantal series in Hebrew which have no counterpart in IE (except for /h/, see §8): the gutturals (pharyngals and laryngals) and emphatics.

#### I. *The Laryngals* ה ,א (/ʔ, h/)

§8. While the phoneme /h/ is to be found in several IE languages, they

lack the phoneme /ʔ/. To be sure, English, for example, does have this consonant, but employs it as a word marker only, cf. *ʔan ice man* as against *a nice man*. In the Semitic languages this additional sound produced in the first phrase after *an* in the English example counts as a full-fledged phoneme, though it is very much liable to weakening.

## II. The Pharyngals ע ,א (/ħ, ʕ/)

§9. It is nearly impossible to describe these sounds to a European who has never heard them pronounced by Oriental Jews or by Arabic-speakers.

## III. The Emphatics ק ,צ ,ט (/t, s, q/)

§10. The emphatics /t, s, q/ are a variety of /t, s, k/ pronounced with a special emphasis. Describing these sounds is difficult for the reasons mentioned above.

## C. Vowels

§11. Proto-Semitic apparently had three vocalic phonemes /a, i, u/ both long and short. In Hebrew two new long phonemes arose through the contracting of original diphthongs [aw], [ay] which turned into /o:/ and /e:/ respectively.

The proto-Semitic short vowels developed in Biblical Hebrew (BH) various vocalic variants of quality as well as quantity.

### *Literature:*

Bergsträsser, *Einführung*, pp. 3-5;

Idem, *HG I*, pp. 34-42.

## D. Morphology

### I. Pronouns and Particles

§12. The triradicality of the root does not include the pronouns and particles, cf. Hebrew אני 'I', הם 'they', etc.

II. *The Verb*

§13. Hebrew has two tenses, the perfect and the imperfect. The perfect is built by the addition of suffixes to the base which consists of the root plus the vowels. While the root is generally the same in all derivatives, the choice of vowels depends on the stem, tense, gender and number used, e.g., לָמַד 'he learned', לִמַּד 'he taught'.

The imperfect adds prefixes (and in certain persons, suffixes) to the base. The prefixes indicate the person, the suffixes indicate the gender and number, e.g., תִּלְמְדִי 'you (fem.) will learn', תִּלְמְדֶנָּה 'they (fem.) will learn'.

Ethiopic has three tenses, while Akkadian has four. It is commonly assumed that, as in early Indo-European, these tenses were employed primarily to indicate notions of aspect (completed and uncompleted action), regardless of the time involved, and only secondarily came to express notions of time. Therefore יִכְתֹּב may mean 'he used to write', 'he is writing', 'he will write'. The imperative, which is employed only in positive sentences, together with the long imperfect (found only in the first person), and the short imperfect (employed mainly in the third person) belongs to a separate framework expressing modal notions (wish, command, etc). Its form reveals that it is closely related to the imperfect since both are built on the same pattern (the imperative lacks the prefix), e.g., אֶכְתֹּב 'I would like to write', כָּתֹב 'write' (imperative), יַעַל 'let him go up'. The participle indicating the present is not as conspicuous in BH as it is in MH. The absolute infinitive, used for stress and command, e.g. שָׁמַר אֶשְׁמַר 'I will indeed watch', and the construct infinitive e.g., לְשָׁמַר 'to watch', בְּשָׁמַר 'while watching', are very much in evidence.

All these forms are organized in three types of stems: active, passive, and reflexive-reciprocal (which tends to replace the passive). There are three active stems. The first one denotes simple action or happening, e.g., שָׁבַר 'to break'. The second one denotes intensive actions, e.g., שָׁבַר 'to break' but שָׁבַר 'to shatter'; קָבַר 'to bury' but קָבַר 'to bury many corpses'. It also denotes causative-factitive action, e.g., לָמַד 'to learn' but לִמַּד 'to make someone learn', i.e. 'to teach'. Lastly, it serves as a denominative stem, that is, for verbs derived from nouns or adjectives, e.g., עָשַׂר 'to tithe' from עָשָׂר 'ten'. A third active conjugation, used mainly as a causative and denominative, is built by prefix and base patterning, e.g., זָכַר 'to remember', but הִזְכִּיר 'to remind'. The intensive conjugation is built by the doubling of

the second consonant and by prefixes respectively, plus changes in vocalizations of the base. The passives are distinguished from their respective active stems by the patternings [u] — [a] of the base e.g., שָׁבַר 'he shattered', שָׁבַר 'it was shattered', the reflexive-reciprocal by prefixes and vowel patterning, e.g., הִתְהַלַּל 'to boast' (praise oneself).

### III. *The Noun*

§14. Nouns are created by means of different vowel patternings of the root, e.g., נָעַר 'boy', נְעָר 'youth', and by prefixes mainly [m+vowel], e.g., מִדְבָּר 'wilderness', and suffixes, mainly [vowel+n], e.g. קִרְבָּן 'sacrifice'.

Possession is expressed by pronominal suffixes, as Biblical Hebrew has no independent possessive suffix.

There are two grammatical genders, masculine and feminine, the masculine unmarked, the feminine noun mostly marked by the ending [-a:t], which in Hebrew generally survives only in the construct state. Feminine adjectives are always marked with the feminine ending. In the numerals it is the masculine that is marked with the feminine ending.

There are three numbers: singular, plural and dual (the latter being of limited use). There are two types of plural endings, one [-i:m] mainly serving the masculine, the other [-a:t] (in Hebrew [-o:t]) mainly the feminine noun. The ending [-i:m] is always employed for the masculine adjective and [-a:t] ([-o:t]) always for the feminine.

### IV. *Attributes of the Noun*

§15. Adjectives follow the noun, e.g., הַבַּיִת הַגָּדוֹל, 'the big house' as does the apposition, e.g. יִשְׁעְיָהוּ הַנָּבִיא 'the prophet Isaiah'. Two nouns can also be combined in a construction where the first noun in the construct state is the nucleus and the second delimits the range of the first one and indicates possession or another relationship, e.g., בַּיִת הַמֶּלֶךְ 'the house of the king', שֻׁלְחָן עֵץ 'a table of wood' etc.

### E. Syntax

§16. It is generally assumed that at least in West-Semitic in the verbal

sentence the verb preceded the subject and that the object followed the subject, e.g., וַיִּשְׁלַח יַעֲקֹב מַלְאָכִים 'and Jacob sent messengers' (Gen. 32,4). The nominal sentence generally lacks the copula, e.g., וַהֲיָה בְּאֵר בַּשָּׂדֶה 'there... was a well in the open' (Gen. 29, 2).

Those Semitic languages that do occasionally employ a pronoun as a quasi-copula put it after the (indeterminate) predicate, e.g., שֶׁבַע פָּרֹת הַטֹּבֹת שֶׁבַע שָׁנִים הֵנָּה 'the seven healthy cows are seven years' (Gen. 41, 26).

The relative clause is constructed like a main clause except that in Hebrew it is (generally) preceded by the relative pronoun אֲשֶׁר. However, sentences are mainly coordinated rather than subordinated.

*Literature:*

G. Bergsträsser, *Einführung*, pp. 3–20.

## CHAPTER FOUR

## BIBLICAL HEBREW

## A. Tripartite Division of Biblical Hebrew

§17. It is scarcely possible to date the different books of BH on a linguistic basis, but by and large, scholars have accepted the following tripartite division:

1) Archaic Biblical Hebrew (ABH) is represented mainly by the poetry of the Pentateuch and the Early Prophets. This hardly seems surprising because poetic language generally tends to be archaic (see §§111ff.).

2) Standard Biblical Hebrew (SBH) representing Biblical prose.

3) Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH) as it appears in the Chronicles and other Books (see §§118ff.).

## B. Method of Presentation

§18. The following survey is based on SBH; the facts are traced vertically up to ABH and down to LBH and beyond, where deemed necessary. The other periods will subsequently be summed up under separate headings (§§108–125). With all its shortcomings, of which there are many, this seems to be the best method for tracing the history of Hebrew within our framework.

## C. Phonology

I. *Consonants*

§19. According to the generally accepted assumption Proto-Semitic had 29 consonantal phonemes. In Hebrew the number was reduced to 23 after



the merger of several phonemes (cf. Table 1). Since the Hebrew alphabet has 22 signs, one of them, װ, must do service for two sounds the װ (/š/) and ױ (/ś/). The Masorettes, who invented the vowel signs during the second half of the first millenium C.E., introduced the diacritical point to distinguish between these two. As pointed out above (§§8–10), Hebrew possesses two groups of consonantal phonemes which set it apart in this respect from the IE languages: the gutturals (pharyngals and laryngals) and the emphatics. The first group underwent far-reaching transformations during the history of the Hebrew language, and these we shall deal with in detail. Another group, the phonemes /b, g, d, k, p, t/ also merit special discussion as does a fourth group, the sibilants ם ,װ ,ױ (/š, ś, s/). Let us start with this group.

### a. Sibilants

§20. BH had at its inception three sibilants, װ /š/, ױ /ś/, and ם /s/. We do not know for sure how the second phoneme was originally pronounced (today it is pronounced like ם = s). A few generations ago, scholars believed that /ś/ was only a kind of offshoot of the /š/ which had developed within Hebrew (and Aramaic). This view has been discarded for three reasons:

1) Hebrew /ś/ is always paralleled in Arabic by one consonant, while the equivalent of Hebrew /š/ is another consonant (see Table 1).

2) South Arabic, both that of the inscriptions and of the modern dialects, has indeed preserved three different phonemes exactly paralleling the three Hebrew phonemes dealt with here.

3) Hebrew /š/ and /ś/ are never interchanged except in foreign loans שריון – שריון 'armor'. Therefore there is no reason to doubt that in Hebrew as in South Arabic there existed three different phonemes /š, ś, s/, represented by ם ,װ ,ױ. But if this be so, how are we to account for the fact that for these three phonemes there are only two signs available? It is impossible to clear up this problem within the framework of our study; we can only hint at the solution. The alphabet was apparently invented by a people whose language possessed only two of these three phonemes. When it was adopted by other peoples such as the Jews and Arameans, whose language had all three phonemes, they simply employed one sign for two phonemes instead of adding a new sign. Apparently they chose the װ sign because the pronunciation of the /š/ was close to that of the /ś/.

*Literature:*

E.Y. Kutscher, *JSS* 10 (1965), pp. 39–41.

1. *The Merger of ש (/ś/) and ס (/s/)*. §21. But the pronunciation of the /ś/ did not remain stable even during Biblical times. In the course of several centuries it came close to that of the /s/ and finally merged with it. We know when this process came to an end because especially in the later books of the Bible there appear several roots containing an original /ś/ spelled with a /s/ e.g., סְכָרִים ‘they hire’ (Ezra 4, 5; = שְׁכָרִים). In MH most of the roots containing an original /ś/ are already spelled with *samekh*, e.g., the root ספק (= שפק in BH). This tendency is especially marked in the manuscripts where even שים ‘to put’, בְּשׂוֹרָה ‘tidings’, etc. are spelled with *samekh*. In the printed editions, the copyists and printers very often “corrected” the spelling in accordance with Biblical Hebrew (cf. §195).

*Literature:*

Bergsträsser, *HG* 1, p. 42.

2. *The Šibbolet–Sibbolet Incident*. §22. The /ś/ too, seems to have undergone a change during Biblical times, at least in one Hebrew dialect, but the facts are by no means clear. It is alluded to in the famous incident in Judges 12, 1ff. The Ephraimites who challenged Jephthah tried to escape from Transjordan to their own territory. However the Gileadites had occupied the fords of the Jordan River and were able to trap the disguised Ephraimites who were trying to cross the river by demanding from them, “Say שְׁבִלֶת and he said סְבִלֶת”. At first glance this story seems to provide a clear-cut proof that the Ephraimites pronounced /ś/ as [s] as in several Semitic languages, e.g., Amharic. But this interpretation of the story is by no means generally accepted. E.A. Speiser raised a very plausible objection to it by pointing out that no North-West Semitic language known to us lacks the phoneme /ś/. Therefore it is difficult to believe that the Ephraimites were unable to produce this sound. Speiser then put forward the very ingenious theory that the /ś/ of שְׁבִלֶת goes back to a proto-Semitic /t/ (cf. Table 1). In the language of the Gileadites the original phoneme still survived, whereas in that of the Ephraimites, as in Hebrew and Canaanite in general, it had already turned into /ś/. For lack of a proper sign for this /t/ phoneme (pronounced something like the *th* of *thing* in English), the Biblical narrator had to use the grapheme (sign) of the phoneme closest to

it, namely the /š/. Indeed, the early Aramaic inscriptions chose exactly the same grapheme, that of /š/, for the notation of the phoneme /t/. Since this phoneme did not exist in the language of the Ephraimites, they substituted the /s/ (*samekh*) for it, exactly as certain immigrants to the U.S. sometimes substitute /s/ for English /th/ which is alien to their native language, and pronounce [sing] instead of [thing].

This ingenious solution seems plausible, but as R. Marcus pointed out, the assumption that the /š/ of *תְּשִׁבָּה* goes back to a proto-Semitic /t/ rests on a very shaky foundation. Indeed it was recently shown [by E.Y. Kutscher] that this foundation did not exist at all since the alleged attestation of the Proto-Semitic root *tbl* turned out to be the product of medieval scribes. The riddle remains, therefore, unresolved,

#### Literature:

J.J. Finkelstein and M. Greenberg, eds., *Oriental and Biblical Studies: Collected Writings of E.A. Speiser*, Philadelphia 1967, pp. 143–150 (= *BASOR* 85 [1942], pp. 10–13);

E.Y. Kutscher in *Hebräische Wortforschung: Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag Walter Baumgartner*, Leiden 1967, pp. 173–174.

3. *The Pronunciation of the Sibilants by Diaspora Jews As a Reflection of Their Respective Languages.* §23. The pronunciation of /š/ remained constant throughout the periods of the Bible, Dead Sea Scrolls, Mishna and the Talmud. As Gumpertz has shown, except for parts of Spain which were under Arab domination, it was lost in Western and Central Europe, where it was apparently pronounced like the /s/. The reason for this change is to be found in a basic rule that applies to the pronunciation of Hebrew outside Palestine, and to some extent also to the Hebrew spoken within the boundaries of Palestine while it was under Greek and Roman rule. The pronunciation of Hebrew outside Palestine was conditioned to a very great extent by the vernacular of the country in which the Hebrew speakers resided. M. Weinreich was right in pointing out that although in the past the speech of Jews contained sounds that were not shared with the co-territorial language, the efforts of the Jews to preserve them were doomed to fail. The very fact that none of the Jewish communities of today except for the Yemenite has succeeded in preserving them is eloquent proof of this rule (see §§373, 492–3).

Proofs of this rule abound.<sup>1</sup> European Jews can pronounce neither the

gutturals nor the emphatics because these phonemes (or most of them) do not exist in the European languages (cf. §261). On the other hand, some Oriental Jews have difficulty in producing the [v] (*bet* without *dagesh*) since this sound is alien to Arabic. A more recent case in point: the second generation of Jewish immigrants in America are often unable to pronounce a Hebrew /o:/ as in שָׁלוֹם 'peace' and substitute the diphthong [ou]: [shaloum]. This is obviously because there is no (long) [o:] in English. One more instance that will clinch the matter is that of the American-born Jews who are sometimes apt to mispronounce the Hebrew [x] (*kaf* without *dagesh*). Instead of [barxu] you will sometimes hear [barhu] or [barku]. In view of the absence of [x] in American English the reason for this substitution is obvious.

The very same rule applies to Jews who emigrated into countries inhabited by Greek-, Latin- (later Romance)-, or German-speaking populations. The /š/ phoneme was originally lacking in all these languages, arising in the Romance and Germanic languages only about 1000 years ago. Thus in the course of time, the Jews living in these countries lost the ability to pronounce the /š/ and substituted the [s] (or a similar sound) for it. Only after the emergence of the phoneme /š/ in the above languages was the /š/ re-introduced into Hebrew as well. Traces of the [s] pronunciation still survive, especially among Jews of European Sephardic origin. Sephardic Jews in Amsterdam recite the [Kadis] (Kadish) and Jews originally from Greece greet each other with [Sabat salom] (Shabat shalom).

It is possible that the confusion of the hushing series of phonemes /š, ž, č/ with the hissing phonemes /s, z, c/ in one dialect of Yiddish is a distant offshoot of the situation that prevailed in the countries mentioned above. "This dialect feature has come to be known as *sabésdiker losn* 'solemn speech' (literally 'Sabbath language'), a phrase which in Yiddish is *šabésdiker lošn* with two [š]'s and an [s]. The mispronunciation of it immediately identifies those who are afflicted with the trait, to them the term *litvak* is commonly applied." According to the explanation given by Weinreich, one of the main reasons for this confusion seems to have been the fact that the early Jewish immigrants from Germany to Poland arrived with only a weak distinction between /s/ and /š/ and even this weak distinction disappeared, perhaps under local influence in Poland (the so-called *mazurzenie*). When these early immigrants later moved to Lithuania and its vicinity, a new wave of immigrants arriving from Germany — where the /š/ phoneme had meanwhile fully developed — migrated into Poland and

were able to keep the distinction between /s/ and /š/ (Uriel Weinreich; cf. also below §262).

### Literature:

י.ג. גומפרץ, מבטאי שפתנו, ירושלים תשי"ג, עמ' 33-41.

מאקס וויינרייך, לשוננו כז-כח (תשכ"ג-כ"ד), עמ' 137.

Uriel Weinreich, *Slavic World* 8 (1952), pp. 360ff.

### b. Gutturals

§24. The pharyngals /ʕ, ħ/: Each of these pharyngals represents a merger of two PS phonemes. The phonemes that disappeared are /x/ (pronounced as in Bach, Scottish *loch* or Yiddish *ich*) and /ǰ/ (pronounced like a fricative [g]). When did these phonemes disappear? At first glance it would seem that they disappeared before Hebrew was committed to writing, or else we should have expected to find in the Hebrew alphabet a special grapheme for their notation.

But in the light of our discussion of the notation of /ś/ and /š/ by the same grapheme (see above §20), this conclusion would be hasty because there is reason to believe that these phonemes did in fact exist during Biblical times, and that, as in the case of /ś/, it was only for lack of a grapheme of their own that the graphemes ן, ף respectively were used for them. In other words, we can assume that ן was used during Biblical times to indicate both the pharyngal /ħ/ and the velar /x/ while the sign ף did service for both the pharyngal /ʕ/ and the velar /ǰ/. It should be mentioned that Arabic, which possesses all four of these sounds does indeed use the graphemes ح, خ for the two other sounds and distinguishes between the two pairs by means of a diacritical point (compare Hebrew ש, שׁ).

1. ן (/ħ/) and ף (/ʕ/) in Greek Transliterations. §25. This assumption is borne out by the transliterations of the Septuagint from the third-second centuries B.C.E. (see §174). Here we find that while some *hets* do not seem to appear in certain names, e.g., *Isaak*=יִצְחָק, others are transliterated by the Greek χ (*chi*, henceforth written *ch*) the pronunciation of which corresponds to the above mentioned German, Yiddish and Scottish /x/, e.g., *Rachel*=רַחֵל, *Achiezer*=אַחִיעֶזֶר. The same holds true for the 'ayin. While some 'ayins do not appear in the Greek transliteration, e.g., in the name *Iakob*=יַעֲקֹב others do, e.g., *Gaza*=גָּזָה, (the Greeks, for lack of an adequate letter, use the Greek letter γ = /g/ to denote the sound). Although

more detailed research is required to clarify the picture, it can safely be stated on the basis of comparison with Arabic that the [x] is employed mainly where the parallel Arabic root has a /x/, while in words in which Hebrew *het* parallels Arabic /h/, Greek, for lack of an adequate grapheme, has no consonantal notation. The same applies to the *ghayin* as in the case of the name of the city of גָּזָה which is transliterated in the Septuagint with a [g] — *Gaza* since the 'ayin in this word, exactly as in its modern Arabic form, was pronounced as a velar [g̊]. As is well known, the Arabic form, transliterated by Europeans as *Gaza*, is in use outside of Israel.

These instances go a long way towards proving that during the third and second centuries B.C.E. each of the two signs ח ,ע was pronounced in either of two ways in different words, and each pronunciation represented the PS pronunciation of the two different phonemes that survived in Arabic until today.

2. *The Merger of /x/ with /h/ and /g/ with /'/. §26.* However, during the course of the next few centuries, one of the pronunciations of the two signs disappeared. This is proved by the fact that the transliterations of the Hexapla from the second to third centuries C.E. never employ the letter *chi* for the *het* and *gamma* for the 'ayin (cf. §§245, 247). The Masoretes who vocalized the Hebrew text during the second half of the first millennium C.E. no longer distinguished between two kinds of *het* and two kinds of 'ayin. This is not surprising since their vocalization of the Hebrew text aimed at transmitting the last stage of spoken Hebrew which, as we said, already lacked the above mentioned distinctions.

*Literature:*

Bergsträsser, *HG* I, p. 36 d;

G. Lisowsky, *Die Transkription der hebräischen Eigennamen des Pentateuch in der Septuaginta*, Basel 1940, p. 123.

3. *The Weak Pronunciation of the Gutturals. §27.* The vocalization of the Masoretes indicates that the pronunciation of the *alef*, *he*, *het* and 'ayin was weaker than that of the other consonants. This is readily deduced from the facts that 1) they are not doubled, cf. דָּבַר but פָּאָר (in this respect they are joined by the /r/); 2) they cannot be vocalized with the semi-vowel, i.e. *shva mobile* (or *shva na'*) and require an auxiliary vowel (the so-called *ḥataf*) e.g., דְּבַרְוּ but פְּאָרוּ.

Sometimes they are vocalized by a *ḥataf* even where there was originally no vowel at all i.e. *shva quiescense* (or *shva nah*), (cf. אָבְנָה but אֶפְשָׁה). Here we should point out that the consonantal (unvocalized) text of the Bible already bears witness to the fact that these consonants were weaker than the others, and hence this weakening cannot be attributed to the Masoretic pronunciation. The phoneme /n/, when not followed by a vowel in the middle of the word, is assimilated to the following consonant, e.g., יַפֵּל instead of \*יַנְפֵּל, 'he will fall'. But this assimilation very rarely takes place when the following consonant is a guttural, e.g., יַנְחֵל 'he will inherit'.

4. *Refutation of Kahle's Theory of Gutturals.* §28. The problem of the gutturals played a large part in the theory of P.E. Kahle. In a lecture before the Congress of Orientalists in Leipzig in 1921, he propounded the following theory: The Masoretes who vocalized the Biblical text during the second half of the first millennium C.E. were, in effect, language reformers. They did not try to preserve BH as they inherited it from their predecessors. On the contrary, they introduced changes that amounted, in fact, to a language reform. Kahle adduced two proofs for this revolutionary theory. The first was the pronunciation of the gutturals, the second, that of the /b, g, d, k, p, t/ (cf. §30). Kahle maintained that in the Hebrew of the Masoretes the gutturals were not pronounced at all. How did he know? Going back to the transliterations of the Hexapla (cf. §§244ff.) and other Greek and Latin sources, he pointed out that these transliterations have no notation for the gutturals, e.g., *batathi* = בַּתְּתִי. Since the Masoretes lived several centuries after the above mentioned sources, they could not have heard the pronunciation of the gutturals if they had not already existed several centuries before. What prompted the Masoretes to attempt linguistic reform and what pattern did they follow in order to re-introduce the earlier "correct" pronunciation? When the Arabic language became dominant in Palestine after the Arab conquest (635 C.E.) the Masoretes, according to Kahle, realized that the "correct" pronunciation of the gutturals was preserved in the Arabic language, and it was this realization that prompted them to re-introduce the "correct" pronunciation into Hebrew.

This theory, namely that the Masoretes changed the traditional pronunciation of the Holy Scriptures under the influence of a language which they had only recently come to know, seemed utterly fantastic, as was immediately pointed out by the most important contemporary Hebraist, G. Bergsträsser. He also stressed the fact that if the Masoretes did indeed

bring about changes attributed to them by Kahle, they must have been trained as modern Semitic scholars! Today Kahle's theories scarcely hold water (cf. §30). As to the gutturals, on the one hand we can prove that the Greek transliterations of Arabic words proceed along the same lines i.e. they do not indicate the gutturals. But after all, as even Kahle admits that the gutturals did exist in Arabic, obviously they were omitted because the Greek language, lacking these phonemes, also lacked graphemes denoting them. The same, of course, holds true for the transliterations of the Hebrew gutturals.

On the other hand, Kahle was laboring under the impression that the gutturals were not pronounced anywhere in Palestine. While this is apparently true for certain areas, mainly the big Hellenized cities, it is by no means true for the whole territory. On the contrary, we are able to show that in most places in Palestine the inhabitants did pronounce the gutturals. Place names constitute the best proof of this contention. Biblical place names that survived in the Arabic of Palestine nearly always preserved the original gutturals, e.g., **עַכּא** 'Acre'. This, of course, was possible only if we assume that the Arab conquerors heard these sounds.

But we can adduce the clear-cut evidence of the statement by the Church Father Jerome (fourth–fifth centuries C.E.; see below §251), who says that “the Jews laughed at the Christians for their inaccurate pronunciations, especially of their aspirates and of certain letters which should be pronounced with a guttural roughness.” (Sutcliffe). The situation seems to be plain enough; the Jews were able to pronounce the gutturals (the instances adduced are the place names **הַכּרְוֹן** and **צַעַר**), but the Greek or Hellenized Christians were unable to do so for the obvious reason that Greek lacked these phonemes.

It goes without saying that Jews who emigrated to Europe (except as mentioned, those living in Arabic Spain) also lost the ability to pronounce *'ayin* and *het*. The pronunciation of the *'ayin* did not differ from that of *alef* (but the latter also was not pronounced like a Semitic *alef* and was practically only a vowel carrier), while for the pharyngal *het* they substituted the [x] pronunciation (compare §25 above). In western Germany this [x] seems to have been affected by the same process which turned German [x] in several dialects into an [h] which eventually disappeared entirely. However, this [x] remained in eastern parts of German-speaking territories so that the Jews living in this area were known as **בְּנֵי חֵית** — “those who knew how to pronounce the *het*” (an allusion to Genesis 23, 3ff), while



those living in the western part were known during the Middle Ages as בְּנֵי הַיֵּת — meaning “those who pronounced the *het* as *he*”. Traces of the latter pronunciation survived in the Yiddish of Poland, as, for example, in the two proper names סִימָה going back to שְׂמָחָה and רְלָה coming from רְחֵל, beside רחליה (Rochele) (M. Weinreich; and see below §261).

*Literature:*

P.E. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*<sup>2</sup>, Oxford 1959, pp. 164–171;

E.Y. Kutscher, *JSS* 10 (1965), pp. 41–49;

F. Sutcliffe, *Biblica* 29 (1948), p. 120;

מ. וויינרײך, לשוננו כג (חשי"ט), עמ' 85–101.

c. *The* ת, פ, כ, ג, ד, ב (/b, g, d, k, p, t/)

§29. These phonemes have, according to the Masoretic vocalization, a two-fold pronunciation (realization): 1) as the parallel plosives in English, marked in the Hebrew text by a dot in the letter (*dagesh*), 2) but after a vowel or half-vowel they are pronounced (realized) as fricatives, e.g., [b] ~ [v] in בַּיִת [bayit], but בְּבַיִת [bɛvayit]. The same applies to the others, e.g., [p] turns into [f] after a vowel, etc. — a trait Hebrew shares with Aramaic. To be sure, the Yemenite is the only Jewish community today which has preserved this distinction in all these phonemes nearly intact, precisely according to the Masoretic vocalization (cf. §373). In other Jewish communities several of these phonemes are always pronounced according to the first pronunciation as plosives, even if they come after the vowel, despite the Masoretic indication that they should be pronounced as fricatives.

It is impossible to establish the earliest date for this common characteristic of Hebrew and Aramaic. According to Speiser it should be quite early, about 1000 B.C.E. While this is not easy to prove, it seems to be more or less generally accepted that at least during the second half of the first millenium B.C.E. it must already have been in existence.

*Literature:*

F. Rosenthal, *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*, Wiesbaden 1961, pp. 13, 15;

E.A. Speiser, *BASOR* no. 74 (1939), p. 5 n. 10.

1. *Refutation of Kahle's Theory of the /b, g, d, k, p, t/*. §30. P. Kahle cast

doubt upon the very existence of the above-mentioned characteristic in H. He believed that at least during the Mishnaic period these phonemes were pronounced only as fricatives (that is, in all positions, even those not following a vowel, they were pronounced as the Masoretes indicated they were to be pronounced only after vowels). There was no [b], [p], [k], etc., but only [v], [f], [x]. Again, Kahle's mainstay was the Greek transliterations. According to him, the double realization described above was introduced by the Masoretes under the influence of Aramaic.

The erroneous nature of this theory can be demonstrated in the same way that Kahle's theory about the gutturals was disproved (cf. §28). After all, the method of transcription of these Aramaic sounds does not differ in the Greek sources from the one used for the transliteration of the parallel Hebrew sounds. In spite of this, no one assumes that this trait was absent from Aramaic. The only explanation can be, as above, that the Greek alphabet was not adequate to reflect this trait. Thus, these sources prove nothing.

On the other hand, Kahle did not notice that this hypothesis contradicts his earlier one concerning the gutturals. If the Masoretes were eager to imitate Arabic, why did they not do it also in the case of the /b, g, d, k, p, t/?

#### *Literature:*

P.E. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*<sup>2</sup>, Oxford 1959, p. 179;

E.Y. Kutscher, *JSS* 10 (1965), pp. 24–35.

## II. Vowels

### *a. The Proto-Semitic Long Vowels in BH*

§31. While the PS long vowels /i:, u:/ did not change their quality in BH (cf. יָמִין 'right', שוֹר 'wall'), /a:/ appears in BH both as /a:/ (e.g., צֹדֵד 'hunter') and as /o:/ (e.g., שְׁלוֹמִים 'peace, well-being') (see in detail below §32). These vowels apparently also retained their quantity as long vowels. There also arose a long /e:/, as, e.g., in בֵּצֵדָה 'egg', and a long /o:/, as, e.g., in צוֹם 'fast', from the contraction of PS diphthongs [ay] and [aw] respectively. Thus BH apparently has five long vowel phonemes /a:, e:, i:, o:, u:/, all of which are stable and generally do not change under the influence of the stress (see below). Also, they do not undergo shortening (reduction) to a semi-vowel (*shva na'*) as is very often the case with the PS short vowels

(see below §35). Therefore, /e:/, for example, remains unchanged throughout the entire declension pattern, e.g., בְּיַצִּיחֶם, -בְּיַצִּי, בְּיַצִּים.

Quite often, though not always, these long vowels when in medial position (except for /a:/) are written plene, i.e. they are spelled with a *waw* or *yod* respectively (see instances above). Vowels at the end of a word are practically always spelled plene, including *he* for [a]–and [e]–type vowels, e.g., אַתָּה ‘you’, יִבְנֶה ‘he will build’, as well as *alef* for [a]–and [e]–type vowels (very rarely in the middle of the word), e.g., קָרָא ‘he called’, כִּסֵּא ‘chair’. However, in practically all the cases the *alef* was originally one of the radicals (i.e. the third consonant of the root), and only at a later stage became silent and turned into a vowel sign.

#### *Literature:*

Bergsträsser, *Einführung*, pp. 38f.;

Idem., *HG I*, §7.

1. *Proto-Semitic /a:/ in BH.* §32. As stated above, the PS long vowels survive in Hebrew, but PS /a:/ appears mostly as /o:/ in Hebrew and Canaanite, e.g., PS [\*sala:m] (thus in Arabic) Hebrew שָׁלוֹם ‘peace’. Two problems connected with this sound change require further clarification. Under what condition did this sound change take place? If the change was unconditioned, how are we to account for the fact that there exist in Hebrew several verbal and nominal patterns in which the PS /a:/ does not conform to this rule?

The participle Qal of the hollow verbs, such as קָם is a case in point. On the basis of our knowledge of the Semitic languages we should have expected the form קָם, since the [a] is supposedly long, and indeed this form does occur once — קוֹמִים (plural; II Kings 16, 7). Or consider the noun pattern *qatṭa:l* as in צַיֵּד ‘hunter’. On the basis of what we know from Hebrew and other Semitic languages the second [a] is long. Why, then, did it not turn into /o:/? Here, too, we occasionally find the expected form, e.g., קָנוֹא (Josh. 24, 19) alongside קָנָא ‘impassioned’.

*a. Bauer's “Mixed Language” Theory.* §33. Now, to be sure, in the case of some noun patterns with /a:/ instead of /o:/ such as יָקָר ‘honor’, for example, we do know why they did not change. Practically all the occurrences of this pattern appear in later BH upon which Aramaic influence was already

well under way (cf. §103). Thus there is reason to believe that the nouns belonging to this pattern are loans from Aramaic. However, although this explanation is quite plausible for some noun patterns, it does not apply to patterns such as  $\text{מָקַר}$  and  $\text{מָצִיחַ}$  discussed above, which are part and parcel of the earliest strata of BH.

It was mainly this problem which led the famous scholar Hans Bauer to put forth the theory of Hebrew as a mixed language. PS /a:/ had turned into /o:/ in the “Hebrew” spoken in Canaan. But the Israelite tribes invading Canaan spoke a dialect that at least in this respect was identical with Proto-Semitic (and for that matter with Aramaic and Arabic). The situation prevailing in BH, then, is the outcome of the mixture of these two languages, with sometimes the Canaanite stratum gaining the upper hand, and at other times the dialect of the invaders.

This theory got a very mixed reception. For the time being the means at our disposal do not permit us to prove or disprove it. Other scholars proposed the theory that the change was conditioned by stress yet this solution, too, can hardly be said to do justice to all the relevant material.

$\beta$ . *The /a:/ > /o:/ Shift in Cuneiform Transliterations.* §34. As stated above, the sound change /a:/ > /o:/ is a characteristic which Hebrew shares with Canaanite. In this case, thanks to the El-Amarna letters (fourteenth–fifteenth centuries B.C.E.; see in detail §108) we are able to establish at least the earliest date at which this change is attested. Written in the Akkadian language and employing the cuneiform script, these letters often explain Akkadian words by means of their Canaanite counterparts. For this reason the letters contain Canaanite-Hebrew forms like *anūki* — אֲנֻכִי ‘I’ (Since Akkadian does not possess a special sign for [o] it had to use [u] for the Canaanite [o]).

It should be pointed out that while in the Canaanite glosses PS long /a:/ is always reflected by /o:/, there are indications that the change /a:/ > /o:/ had not yet been accomplished over the whole territory of Palestine and Syria, as some place names prove. The name of  $\text{עַכּוֹ}$  (Acre) is still spelled *Akka* and that of  $\text{מִגִּדּוֹ}$  (Megiddo) is spelled *Magidda* — both with [a]! Apparently in Acre, at least, the /a:/ was still pronounced as [a]. But in the Assyrian inscriptions from the late eighth and seventh centuries B.C.E. the name of Acre is spelled *Akku!*

This is one of the few cases in which cuneiform transliterations enable us to put our finger on the process of historical sound changes.

*Literature:*

Bergsträsser, *HG* I, §25;

Bauer-Leander, *Hist. Gramm.*, pp. 15ff.;

Harris, *Development*, pp. 42f.;

H. Bauer, *ZAW* 59 (1930), p. 75;

ח. רבין, תרביץ ל (תשכ"א), עמ' 99 ואילך.

*b. The Proto-Semitic Short Vowels in BH*

§35. The PS short vowel phonemes /a, i, u/ survived as such in BH, e.g., בַּד 'jug', שְׂמֹלָה 'dress', שֻׁלְחָן 'table', but four more vowels (in the Tiberian vocalization, see §259) developed from them, differing from the first three in quality and (see below) apparently sometimes also in quantity: [e] as in שֵׁן 'tooth', [ɛ] as in מֶלֶךְ 'king', [o] as in בֹּקֵר 'morning', [ɔ] as in דְּבָר 'word', חֵכְמָה 'wisdom'. There is no doubt that the *qameṣ* in these words in the Tiberian vocalization is to be pronounced [ɔ], according to the pronunciation of the Ashkenazic and Yemenite Jews of today rather than according to the Sephardic pronunciation (see below §§37, 373). While nearly all the vowel signs are identical with those employed for the PS long vowels, we can rather readily distinguish between them even without resorting to comparative Semitic grammar, for two reasons: 1) While most of the PS long vowels (and original diphthongs) tend to be spelled plene (see above §31) this is rarely true of the PS short vowels.

2) More important is their behavior pattern. In contrast to the long vowels (and diphthongs), the distribution of PS short vowels is more limited and they are liable to shortening.

The PS short vowels in Hebrew fall, by and large, into two categories. The first category, reflected by most instances of the *qameṣ gadol* e.g., דְּבָר 'word'; by the *ṣere*, e.g., שֵׁן 'tooth' and by the *holem* e.g., בֹּקֵר 'morning', is characterised by the fact that its members cannot appear in a closed unstressed syllable, e.g., דְּבָר, but שֵׁן, דְּבַרְכֶם, שְׂנִי but כְּתוּלָה, כְּתוּלָנוּ. It seems probable that these vowels became lengthened under the influence of stress (see below §37).

The second category that comprises the *pataḥ*, *segol*, short *hiriq*, short *qameṣ*, and *qibbuṣ*, as e.g., in the words מַלְכָּה 'queen', עֵגְלָה 'heifer', שְׂמֹלָה 'dress', קָרְבָּן 'sacrifice', שֻׁלְחָן 'table', generally appears only in closed unstressed syllables, except for the first two which can appear also in a stressed syllable, open or closed.

Vowels of neither category appear in originally open unstressed

syllables, except for /a/ (and usually also /e/) of the first category which can stand in cases where the stress falls on the next syllable, e.g., מָטָר 'rain' PS [maṭar] (thus still in Arabic). In open unstressed syllables, except for the case mentioned above, PS short vowels appear as semi-vowels (*shva na'*), e.g., דְּבַר-דְּבָרִי 'word, my word' שָׁנָה-שָׁנָתִי 'year, my year' מֶלֶךְ-מְלָכִים 'king, kings'. When these short vowels follow a guttural they appear as the so-called *ḥataf*, e.g., חֵבֶר-חֲבֵרִים 'friend, friends'.

1. *Stress As a Distinctive Feature.* §36. As we see from the above-mentioned instances, stress plays quite an important part in shaping the quality and apparently also the quantity of the PS short vowels in Hebrew. But stress is also important because it is distinctive (compare the English *cónvict* (noun) to *convíct* (verb), e.g., רָחֵל בָּאָה 'Rachel is coming', but רָחֵל בָּאָה 'Rachel came' (Genesis 29, 6, 9 and see Rashi ad loc.).

*Literature:*

Bergsträsser, *HG* I, pp. 117-119;

Sh. Morag, *The Vocalization Systems of Arabic, Hebrew and Aramaic*, s'-Gravenhage 1962, pp. 22ff.;

S. Moscati, *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages*, Wiesbaden 1964, pp. 49-51.

2. *A Sound Change Attested During Three Thousand Years in Syria-Palestine.* §37. The history of one short PS vowel in Hebrew is worth describing. As mentioned above (§35), under the influence of stress the short PS /a/ may appear in BH as [ɔ] according to the Tiberian vocalization. In Hebrew, the stress may even affect the preceding syllable, and thus PS [maṭar] 'rain' turned in Hebrew into מָטָר. Obviously the stress effected a certain lengthening of the short vowels. The change in quantity (lengthening) also caused a change in quality (the color of the vowel). Here we should add that what we have said about quality applies to the PS long /a:/ that did not turn into /o:/ (see above §32). It is, incidentally, the same development that we observed in the PS long /a:/ with the difference that while the PS long /a:/ turned into a clear-cut long [o:] the PS short /a/ that was apparently lengthened owing to stress, was stuck half way according to the Tiberian vocalization, and was pronounced [ɔ] (something like the English vowel in *wall*). As we pointed out, although the Ashkenazic and Yemenite communities do pronounce it more or less this way, the Sephar-

dic (and Israeli) Hebrew-speaking Jews pronounce these cases of *qameṣ* as [a] despite the unmistakable Tiberian vocalization.

To be sure, among the Ashkenazic Jews this might well have been a secondary development that took place in Europe only towards the end of the Middle Ages. (There is reason to believe that in the Ashkenazic communities of Central Europe the Sephardic pronunciation of *qameṣ* was also prevalent prior to the sound change indicated above.) However, there is little doubt that the Yemenite pronunciation of the *qameṣ* as [ɔ] goes back to the tradition of the Tiberian (and in this respect perhaps also Babylonian) vocalization.

How are we to account for this change? Going back to the transliterations in El-Amarna and other Akkadian sources, we find that this vowel is reflected by an [a]. The same applies to the Greek transliterations of the Septuagint (§174) and the Hexapla (§245). Only in Jerome's writings (fourth-fifth centuries C.E.; §251) do we find a few cases of transliterations with [o], e.g., *bosor* i.e.  $\text{בֹּשׁוֹר}$ , but these cases are very doubtful as are instances adduced from the Dead Sea Scrolls. Since the transliterations do not yet reflect this change we might think that it developed during the second half of the first millennium C.E. as reflected by the vocalization of the Tiberian Masoretes who lived during this time. However, a second solution based on geographical linguistics seems preferable. It can be shown that in the Canaanite languages short PS /a/ when stressed also turned into [ɔ] (or maybe even into a full [o]). Assyrian transliterations of Canaanite names in the eighth-seventh centuries B.C.E. render such an /a/ by [u]. (Lacking a sign for [o], Akkadian [= Assyrian-Babylonian] uses the [u] vowel instead.) For example, a name which would parallel Hebrew  $\text{בַּעַל־מַלְכָּה}$  'Baal-Has-Reigned (or -Reigns)' and vocalized in Hebrew pausal form  $\text{בַּעַל־מַלְכָּה}$  is rendered as *Ba-'a-al-ma-lu-ku*. What is more, there is reason to believe that this change is already reflected in the Phoenician name of the letter *iota* = Hebrew  $\text{י}$ . Since the alphabet was transmitted to the Greeks around the year 1000 B.C.E., this Phoenician name would attest to an earlier date for this change. However, the matter is not sufficiently decisive since the form of *iota* can be interpreted differently. Moreover, Greek and Latin transliterations of Canaanite and Punic (Canaanite of North Africa) also reflect the change of short PS /a/ into [ɔ] (or [o]).

In that case the most logical assumption would be the following: The Galilee borders on former Canaanite territory. We may assume, therefore,

that this sound change that originated in the Canaanite area (modern Lebanon) spread in the course of time to the Galilee but did not continue south into Samaria and Judea (including Jerusalem). This assumption is supported by the fact that the Hebrew of the Samaritans (see below §177), who lived south of the Galilee, namely in central Palestine around Shechem (present day Nablus) does not show a trace of this change.

When did this sound change reach Galilee? This is hard to establish. The fact that it is not reflected by the Greek transliterations mentioned above cannot be adduced as a proof in dating it since the Septuagint obviously reflects the Jerusalemite pronunciation, in which this change may never have taken place. The Hexapla probably represents the pronunciation in Caesarea which is also south of the territory in question. Jerome lived mainly in Bethlehem in Judea so, again, his language could scarcely serve as a *testis linguae* of Galilean Hebrew. Thus in this respect we are entirely in the dark.

Still, the particulars of this sound change in Palestine and the Diaspora have not yet been established with certainty. Nonetheless, this change survived for millennia until our own day and affected both the Syriac of the territory and its Aramaic (spoken even today near Damascus), as well as spoken Arabic dialects in adjacent territories.

This fact is remarkable especially since it seems to be the only instance of the attestation of a sound change operative in a certain territory for more than 3000 years.

This hypothesis could only be tested with the help of transliterations of Greek and Latin inscriptions from the Galilee which for the time being are very scarce.

But if this hypothesis is true, we may assume that the Sephardic Jewish pronunciation represents the pronunciation prevalent in Jerusalem and Judea in general before the destruction of the Temple.

But what about the Ashkenazic Jews? Must we then assume that they are descendants of Galilean Jews? By no means! H. Yalon has shown that the so-called Sephardic pronunciation was that of medieval Jewry in Western and Central Europe, as we can see from the fact that prayer books that were vocalized in Germany, such as the famous Maḥzor of de Magenza (thirteenth century C.E.) continually mix up the *qameṣ* and the *pataḥ* just as Sephardic Jews do.

How then did the *qameṣ* come to be pronounced in Europe in the Ashkenazic way? Two solutions are possible:



(1) When the [a] of the German element in Yiddish underwent the same change, it might have brought about the corresponding change in Hebrew.

(2) M. Weinreich believes that it was artificially reintroduced by Jews coming from Babylonia. But it must be pointed out that it is by no means sure that the Babylonian *qameṣ* was indeed pronounced the Ashkenazic way. The problem needs further clarification. The question of the pronunciation of the Babylonian *qameṣ* (see §373) is bound up with the question of the pronunciation of Hebrew by the Yemenites whose *qameṣ* is of the Ashkenazic type.

*Literature:*

Harris, *Development*, pp. 61 (§37), 79 (§64c);

J. Friedrich-W. Röllig, *Phönizisch-Punische Grammatik*, Rome 1970, §78;

A. Sperber, *HUCA* 12–13 (1938), p. 214 (offprint p. 112);

. ח. ילון, קונטרסים א ירושלים תרצ"ז-תרצ"ח עמ' 62 ואילך;

. ח. ילון, עניני לשון, ירושלים תש"ב, עמ' 16 ואילך;

. מ. וויינרייך, לשוננו כז-כח (תשכ"ג-תשכ"ד), עמ' 230, 325;

. י. קוטשר, לשוננו לג (תשכ"ט), עמ' 83-110, 240 (with English summary).

3. *Proto-Semitic Short /i, u/ in BH.* §38. We mentioned that the PS /i, u/ survived in BH, but during the time of the Second Temple it was apparently lost in colloquial Hebrew (and Aramaic). This is proved by the fact that in the Greek and Latin transliterations of the Septuagint, the Hexapla and Jerome, the short /i/ and /u/ are not transliterated by Greek [i] and [u], but by [ε] and [ο] (§§175, 246 and 251 respectively). Since Aramaic texts discovered several decades ago also employ the vowels [ε] and [ο] instead of [i] and [u], there is reason to believe that this was also the case with spoken MH and that the scribes changed it entirely (see below §195) but this issue requires further clarification.

*Literature:*

. י. קוטשר, מחקרים בעברית ובארמית, ירושלים תשל"ז, עמ' קלה-קסח\*\*\*.]

4. *Vowel Length As a Distinctive Feature in BH.* §39. It is a moot question whether or not, and to what extent, length is distinctive in BH, and how many phonemes are represented by the vowels enumerated above. According to various scholars their number ranges from five to eleven.

*Literature:*

מ. וויינרייך, לשוננו כז-כח (תשכ"ג-תשכ"ד), עמ' 230

S. Morag, *The Vocalization Systems of Arabic, Hebrew and Aramaic*, s'-Gravenhage 1962, pp. 22ff.

## D. Morphology

I. *Independent Pronouns*a. *First Person Singular*

§40. One of the most striking features of BH is the use of two forms for the first person sing.: אָנִי and אֲנִי. They are not used side by side in all the strata of BH. The early and poetical sections of BH prefer אֲנִי, while in later BH אָנִי has displaced אֲנִי almost entirely. The trend is especially conspicuous in Chronicles which includes a large amount of material that parallels the Second Book of Samuel and both Books of Kings which were apparently among its sources. Wherever the writer of Chronicles finds אֲנִי in these sources, he substitutes אָנִי; compare, for example, I Chron. 21, 10, 17 with II Sam. 24, 12, 17.

This is a clear indication that during that period, (about the fifth century B.C.E.) אֲנִי was on the way out of colloquial Hebrew and being replaced by אָנִי. Indeed, not a trace of it survived in MH (see §201).

*Literature:*

Bauer-Leander, *Hist. Gramm.*, p. 248;

Segal, *Mišnaic Hebrew*, p. 9.

b. *Second Person Feminine Singular*

§41. Besides הָאָתָּי there are a few cases in the Books of Judges and Kings of אַתִּי (*ketib*) which is doubtless the earlier form. Since this rare form occurs in stories coming from the Israelite dialect (as opposed to the dialect of Judah, see §99), it may indicate that אַתִּי was used in that dialect. (אַתִּי in Jer. 4, 30 and Ezek. 36, 13 is to be attributed to Aramaic influence; see in detail §53.)

The Samaritan Pentateuch, too, quite often employs אַתִּי instead of אַתְּ. Now if we assume that the Samaritan Pentateuch is an Israelite variant of the Pentateuch (the Samaritans living within the confines of the former

Israelite kingdom, see in detail §177), then the occurrence of אַתִּי in that source would seem to support the above mentioned theory. On the other hand, in view of the general character of the language of the Samaritan Pentateuch, the appearance of this form might be due instead to Aramaic influence (cf. §180).

*Literature:*

Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, pp. 208f.;

Bauer-Leander, *Hist. Gramm.*, p. 248.

*c. First Person Plural*

§42. The first person plural appears both as אֲנַחְנִי and אֲנַחְנִי, the latter being the later form which, incidentally, also occurs in the Lachish letters. Both forms were to disappear in MH which substituted אֲנִי for them. This latter form is heralded in BH in one place, but only as a *ketib* (= 'spelled'), while the *qere* (= 'to be read') is אֲנַחְנִי (Jeremiah 42, 6). This may serve to indicate that the new form was already in existence in the popular language of that time but was not yet considered standard, and therefore the *qere* there is still the BH אֲנַחְנִי.

*d. Second and Third Persons Plural (Masc. and Fem.)*

§43. These pronouns underwent certain changes in the Dead Sea Scrolls (see §157) and especially in Mishnaic Hebrew (see §201).

## II. Demonstrative Pronouns

§44. The form of the fem. sg. אַתִּי is noteworthy. It occurs without the /-t/ once in Hosea 7, 16 spelled אַתִּי and once in the cycle of (Northern) Israelite stories in II Kings 6, 19, where it is spelled אַתִּי. The latter spelling occurs several times in LBH, e.g., Ezek. 40, 45. Both of these spellings exhibit dialectal peculiarities (cf. above §41). In MH only this form, spelled אַתִּי, survives.

In view of these facts, it is probable that the form אַתִּי-אַתִּי existed from early times as a dialectal form mainly in the Northern speech from which it gradually spread to the South (Judah) and in the course of time supplanted the longer form אַתִּי.

*Literature:*

Bauer-Leander, *Hist. Gramm.* p. 261;

Segal, *Mišnaic Hebrew*, pp. 10f.

### III. Relative Pronouns

§45. In BH the principal relative pronoun is אֲשֶׁר. The form -שֶׁ which is apparently not related to it, occurs in the Song of Deborah, three times in the story of Gideon, and once in Israelite (northern) section of the Book of Kings. Therefore there is reason to believe that its use was common in the vernacular of Northern Palestine. On the other hand, it occurs in those books of the Bible that are supposed to reflect LBH, e.g., Ecclesiastes. In MH -שֶׁ has replaced אֲשֶׁר altogether. Here too, as above (§44) we seem to find the same sequence: Israelite Hebrew, LBH, MH.

### IV. The Possessive Suffix of the Second Person Masculine Singular

§46. The vocalization of the second person sing. masc. played a large part in Kahle's theory (§§28, 30). This suffix appears in BH according to the Masoretic vocalization, mainly as ךָּ, e.g., דְּבַרְךָ, 'your word'. Kahle maintained that the proper form should have been ךָּ : דְּבַרְךָ. Again, Kahle rests his case on the transliterations of the Hexapla and Jerome with the addition of a new source: the vocalization of Piyyuṭim (religious hymns) found in the Cairo Geniza (cf. below §§127, 265). According to Kahle, the Masoretic, as mentioned above, changed the proper Hebrew ending ךָּ to ךָּ under the impact of Arabic.

The discovery of the DSS (see Chapter Five) sounded the death knell of this theory. In the DSS this suffix is very often spelled plene with *he*, e.g., לִבְבְּכָה 'your heart', a clear indication that it was pronounced ךָּ.

How, then, are we to account for the form that appears in the transliterations and in the Piyyuṭim? The solution was already outlined by Bergsträsser who pointed out that whenever a language is employed as the language of sacred scriptures, a colloquial variety is also likely to appear. It is safe to assume, he said, that while BH survived in the synagogue as the language of the Holy Scriptures, there arose in the course of time a later variety of Hebrew which served as the colloquial language. Bergsträsser's

assumption is now the common property of scholars of BH and MH. We now know that this colloquial is MH which did, indeed, differ from BH in many aspects of grammar and vocabulary. One of the points of departure from BH is the vocalization of the suffixes of the second person sing. masc. and fem. (see §201). Therefore it is not surprising that the Piyuṭim which were not written in BH, were vocalized according to MH.

But what about the transliterations of the Hexapla and Jerome where the material is BH and not MH? The answer is that in this case and elsewhere the transliterations reflect MH and not BH. As we noted above, during the period under discussion, vocalization had not yet been invented and this permitted of a certain latitude in reading the consonantal text. In fact, Jerome expressly states that in reading this consonantal text "according to the discretion of readers and the different regions, the same words are pronounced with different sounds and accents." (Sutcliffe). It therefore comes as no surprise that the readers of the text did not keep to the proper pronunciation of BH but substituted the sounds of their own colloquial Hebrew or Aramaic (Ben-Hayyim).

Nor is this the only instance of this process. The situation in modern-day Israel could serve as another illustration. Today everyone who knows Hebrew is able to read BH with few mistakes. But place the unvocalized scroll of the Torah used for reading in the synagogue before him, and have him read the weekly portion for the Sabbath service without benefit of proper preparation, and even a scholar will be unable to avoid mistakes. The reason is obvious: The spoken Hebrew of today is different from BH and the reader will *volens volens* superimpose his spoken language on the Biblical text. The proper reading of BH was apparently preserved mainly among the families of the Sopherim (and later Masoretes) who were taught the proper reading of the Biblical text from childhood as is the custom among the priestly Samaritan families until this very day. It is doubtful whether the average reader of BH was any more conversant with the proper reading of the unvocalized BH text than, say, the cultured Englishman is with the proper pronunciation of Chaucerian English in the original spelling.

Scholars should bear this important fact in mind when employing the transliterations to write the history of the pronunciation of BH. For certain traits of the transliterations which have been termed characteristic of pre-Masoretic Hebrew may well turn out to be alien to BH and to belong rather



It is also illuminating that in certain nooks and crannies of the language the original form managed to escape the “correcting” tendencies of the grammarians even within the Ashkenazic community. Certain Piyyuṭim (see §265), e.g., לְמַעַן אֲמַתְךָ (recited on Hoshana Rabba — the seventh day of the Festival of Succoth) are still vocalized with הֵךְ, and it is this suffix which is reflected in MH expressions used in Yiddish, as for instance בְּעַל קְרַתְךָ ‘nolens volens’ instead of בְּעַל קְרַתְךָ\* and מִמָּה נִפְשָׁךְ instead of מִמָּה\* נִפְשָׁךְ ‘whichever way you look at it’ (in which form it passed into IH). The long arm of the grammarians was not able to interfere with everyday speech.

#### Literature:

P.E. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*<sup>2</sup>, Oxford 1959, pp. 95ff.;

F. Sutcliffe, *Biblica* 29 (1948), p. 200;

G. Bergsträsser, *OLZ* 27 (1924), cols. 582–586;

Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, *Studies in the Traditions of the Hebrew Language*, Madrid-Barcelona 1954, pp. 13ff.;

Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, pp. 45–49, 441f.;

ח. ילון, מבוא לניקוד המשנה, ירושלים תשכ”ד, עמ’ 13–15.

## V. The Verb

### a. Stems

§47. Generally speaking, only seven stems of BH are known. They fall into three groups. The first group consisting of two stems, denotes simple action or happening, and comprises the Qal and Nif‘al, the former active, the latter mainly passive (cf. below §49). The second group includes three stems whose characteristic trait is the doubling of the second consonant. These are the so-called intensive stems, although their function is still a matter of debate. These stems are the Pi‘el, denoting active action, the Pu‘al, which is an internal passive, i.e., it differs from its active stem only in its differing vowels without having recourse to affixes. The third intensive stem, the Hitpa‘el, yields a reflexive meaning (also for the Qal) with the aid of a prefix. The last group is formed with the prefix *he* (which is syncopated in the imperfect and participle) and includes two stems, the Hif‘il and the Hof‘al, an internal passive. It functions mainly as a causative-factitive and also as a denominative.

*Literature:*

Bergsträsser, *Einführung*, pp. 41–43.

1. *Passive Qal*. §48. A comparison of these three groups raises the following questions: why should the first group, in contrast to the second group, consist only of the active and passive stems? (For obvious reasons, this question is hardly relevant to the third group). Why is the reflexive stem lacking so that the Hitpa'el, which properly belongs to the second group on the basis of the doubling of its second root consonant, must be pressed into service of the first group? The second question is, why are the passives of the second and third group internal passives? Why should the passive of the Qal be built with the aid of the prefix [ni-] (Nif'al) and other morphemes?

As a matter of fact, scholars have discovered that the first group, too, originally consisted of three stems, the Qal, an internal passive of the Qal, and a reflexive, the Nif'al. How was this internal passive discovered? It was pointed out that strangely enough, certain roots that were employed in the active voice only in the Qal, but never in the Pi'el or Hif'il, when used in the passive voice in the perfect, appear in the Pu'al, and in the imperfect in the Hof'al. לָקַח 'to take', for example in the passive is לִקַּח (= Pu'al) in the perfect, and יִקַּח (=Hof'al) in the imperfect. With the help of Arabic it was established that these quasi-Pu'al and Hof'al forms are nothing more than the perfect and imperfect of the original passive of the Qal.

The passive Qal, for reasons that cannot be dealt with here, was on its way out during the time of BH and being replaced by the Nif'al. That is why in the Book of Esther (LBH) we find אֶתְּקַח אֶתְּחַרְתִּי 'Esther was taken' (Esther 2, 8, 16) instead of אֶתְּקַחְתִּי (Gen. 12, 15). That is, the original passive Qal was displaced here by the Nif'al. This is not to say that we do not find the Nif'al also in early books, but the tendency to replace it is much more pronounced in LBH and also in DSS Isaiah and the Samaritan Pentateuch (see §§158, 181 respectively and cf. below §49).

*Literature:*

Bergsträsser, *HG* II, §15;

Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, 344, 4); 364, 2).

2. *Nif'al*. §49. First, it originally functioned as the reflexive of the Qal. This is easily established by the fact that in some roots it still retains this mean-



ing, e.g., הִשָּׁמֵר 'to guard oneself'. Second, it has an imperative which is absent in the proper passives Pu'al and Hof'al. Third, it is formed by means of a prefix. Fourth, in all the SL the reflexive in general and the Nif'al in particular tend to turn into passives. In this way it came about that the Nif'al replaced the passive of the Qal so that in MH there is not a trace of it (with one possible exception, see §211).

*Literature:*

Bergsträsser, *HG* II, 16.

3. *Ifte'al*. §50. There are also a few traces of other stems, e.g., that of the Ifte'al with the infix [t(a)] after the first radical. It is possible that the place name אֲשֶׁתְּחֵמֶץ meaning 'hearing place' goes back to this stem, which also occurs in Early Canaanite as well as in Moabite. In the latter it occurs in the stele of King Mesha in the form וְאִלְתַּחַם 'I fought'; the corresponding Hebrew form would be וְאִלְתַּחַם (cf. also below §85).

*Literature:*

Bergsträsser, *HG* II, §18.

*b. Tenses*

§51. As mentioned above (§13), BH has two tenses, the perfect and the imperfect.

1. *Suffixes of the Perfect.*

*a. Second Person Singular Masculine.* §52. Of this suffix, too, Kahle maintained that its vowel was non-existent in pre-Masoretic Hebrew, but was introduced by the Masoretes in imitation of Arabic (see §46). However, since the DSS spell this suffix quite often with *he*, e.g., אִמְרַתָּה 'you said', Kahle's assumption is clearly without foundation.

*β. Second Person Singular Feminine.* §53. Mainly in Jeremiah and Ezekiel the *ketib* with תִּי appears, e.g., לְמַדְתִּי 'you taught' (Jer. 2, 33) but with the *qere* לְמַדְתְּ.

A comparison with the SL indicates that the suffix of the second person feminine is indeed [-ti] (the [-i] being long or short). The assumption which immediately comes to mind is that the PS [-ti] lost its vowel in Hebrew but

survived as an archaism in the two books mentioned where the *ketib* reflects the archaic form — as it often does — and the *qere* represents the form that became prevalent in BH.

However, a very serious objection to this assumption could be raised: If it is indeed correct, why did this supposedly archaic form with [-ti] not survive in the earlier books of the Bible, such as the Pentateuch, and the Former Prophets? Why did it turn up only in later books of the Bible where it is nearly impossible to discover archaic forms?

On the basis of this objection Brockelmann and Bergsträsser are inclined to believe that the spelling with [-ti] in these books is to be ascribed to the influence of Aramaic in which it survived until the first centuries of the first millennium C.E. We should also bear in mind that these late books were written in a time when Aramaic influence permeated the Hebrew language (see §100 and cf. above §41).

#### *Literature:*

Bergsträsser, *HG* II, §4a;

Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, pp. 25, 188-190.

β<sup>1</sup>. “*Mirage*” *Forms*. §54. Scholars believe that עַד שֶׁקָמְתִי דְבוֹרָה שֶׁקָמְתִי (Ju. 5, 7) is to be translated ‘until *you* arose, Deborah, *you* arose as a mother in Israel’ (and not ‘until I arose, Deborah...’). If they are right, this would be a clear instance of the above form in ABH. Since the Song of Deborah belongs to early Biblical poetry (cf. §§111-116), and therefore certainly reflects an archaic stage of Hebrew, Aramaic influence would seem to be ruled out (but see §100). Are we then, to assume that when the same form reappears in the later books of the Bible it is an Aramaism (i.e. an Aramaic form)?

Indeed we may, for this is apparently the only solution to the problem. Let us give a parallel from English. In Anglo-Saxon [sk] became [sh], giving rise to such forms as *ship*, *shirt* etc. But after the Scandinavian invasion in the 10th century C.E., quite a few Scandinavian parallels of the same English words entered the English language. However, since in Scandinavian the above mentioned sound change had not taken place at that time, these words entered English in a form that looked like Anglo-Saxon, namely, *skip*, *skirt* and others such as *sky*, etc. Had we not known that these forms entered English at a relatively late date, we might have assumed that they are archaic English forms that had somehow managed

to defy the sound change [sk] > [sh] and to survive in their ancient form.

We shall assume that the same process was operative in Hebrew. The suffix [-ti:] was still in existence in Archaic Hebrew but became [-t] in SBH. When Aramaic influence started transforming SBH, this was one of the forms which it brought back, which had survived in Standard Aramaic. Thus it creates the “mirage” of the reappearance of an archaic form. It is therefore not surprising that the form is also met with in the Dead Sea Scrolls where Aramaic influence is especially conspicuous (see §171). This, incidentally, is not the only instance of such a “mirage” form (cf. §59).

*Literature:*

O. Jespersen, *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, Oxford 1943, §62;

E. Björkman, *Scandinavian Loan Words in Middle English*, Halle 1900, pp. 10, 119ff.

γ. *Third Person Singular Feminine.* §55. In the Semitic languages the suffix is [-at], but it turned into [a:] in Hebrew for phonological reasons and is spelled with a *he* as a *mater lectionis* (vowel letter). In BH there are three instances of the ending [-at]. The first, אָזַלְתָּ ‘is gone’ occurs in Deut. 32, 36 in a poetic passage. The survival of this archaic form in the early poetry is, of course, not surprising. The survival of אָשַׁבְתָּ (Isaiah 23,15) could also be explained in the same way. But אָשַׁבְתָּ instead of אָשַׁבְתָּ ‘she returned’ in Ezekiel 46, 17 could not be interpreted in this late book as an archaic survival for such survivals in the later books of the Bible are, as explained above, extremely unlikely. So here again the only explanation seems to be that the earlier form which managed to survive in the early text disappeared from SBH to be reintroduced from Aramaic into LBH, albeit sporadically. We should note, however, that this early suffix was reinstated in the verbs in Mishnaic Hebrew (see §212).

δ. *Third Person Plural Feminine.* §56. When we look at the paradigm of the perfect we immediately notice a certain discrepancy. Except in the first person (as in the imperfect) the paradigm contains no common form for the masculine and the feminine, while the form for the third person plural is shared by both genders. This sameness in form seems strange. Indeed, a glance at the older Semitic languages confirms that all of them, as far as could be ascertained, employ a different form for each gender.

But close scrutiny of BH does reveal a separate form for the third person plural feminine. Sometimes it appears only as the *ketib*, e.g., יָרִינוּ לָא שִׁפְכָה אֶת הַדָּם הַזֶּה 'Our hands did not shed this blood' (Deut. 21, 7), where the *qere* is שִׁפְכוּ. The reason for the difference between the *qere* and the *ketib* apparently lies in the fact that since שִׁפְכָה was felt to be an archaic form the SBH form שִׁפְכוּ was read instead. This is quite often the case with the *qere* and *ketib*, when the *ketib* reflects the old form while the *qere* follows "modern" usage. (The same is true in English where the spelling represents the older form while the pronunciation follows the spoken language, e.g., *knight*). Sometimes, though, the archaic form also appears as the *qere*, e.g., וְעֵינָיו קָמָה 'and his eyes were set' (I Sam. 4, 15). The question then arises, why did this form disappear and thereby create a disturbance in the structure of Hebrew? The answer presents itself immediately. Since this archaic form, which is paralleled by Aramaic and Akkadian, became identical with the third person feminine singular (which in turn is the product of a phonological process), there was, for obvious reasons, no alternative but to use the masculine form for the feminine as well. It is possible to prove that this change brought about the neutralization of the masculine and feminine plural in the Hebrew imperfect (see §59). Incidentally, there is reason to believe that the original form returned sporadically to BH via Aramaic.

### Literature:

Bergsträsser, *HG* II, §4b.

2. *Prefixes and Suffixes of the Imperfect.* §57. The imperfect is created by means of prefixes and suffixes, the latter indicating mainly gender and number (see §13 and Table 3).

a. *Second Person Singular Feminine and Second and Third Persons Plural Masculine.* §58. The suffixes of these forms in SBH are [-i:] and [-i:n] for the former and [-u:] and [-u:n] for the latter. In other Semitic languages (Arabic, Aramaic) the presence and absence of the [-n] serve two different functions while in BH their use seems to be facultative. It should be noted that in Chronicles the [-u:] ending sometimes appears where the parallel text in Kings has [-u:n], e.g., יִדְעוּן in I Kings 8, 38, but יִדְעוּ in II Chr. 6, 29. This would seem to indicate that in LBH the longer ending had already disappeared. Indeed, in MH only the shorter form sur-

vives (see §208). It is noteworthy that in spite of the strong Aramaic influence upon LBH, in this case LBH and MH chose the form diametrically opposed to the Aramaic in which the longer form became the normal one in most of the later dialects.

*Literature:*

Bergsträsser, *HG* II, §5a, b.

β. *Third Person Plural Feminine.* §59. The SBH form of this person is identical with the form of the second person plural feminine. In this respect Hebrew stands nearly isolated among the Semitic languages since they all employ the same prefix [y+vowel] in this case. Again, there are three cases in Hebrew in which this prefix does appear: וַיִּחַמְּנָה 'their mating occurred' (Gen. 30, 38), וַיִּשְׁרָנָה '(the cows) went straight' (I Sam. 6, 12) and יַעֲמֹדְנָה 'shall arise' (Dan 8, 22). The first two instances can be regarded as survivals of the archaic form, but this is, of course, ruled out in the case of the late Book of Daniel. Here too, as in §54 we must assume that this is a "mirage" form for which Aramaic influence was responsible. But while in the forms discussed above the "mirage" form is more or less identical with the Hebrew form, here, due to the Aramaic influence, a mixed form arose, since the suffix [-na:] is Hebrew. (In Aramaic the form should have been וַיַּעֲמֹדְנָה\*). We find another type of mixed form in וְאַלְמָנוֹתַיָּךְ עָלֶי תִבְטְחוּ וְאַלְמָנוֹתַיָּךְ (=) 'and let your widows trust in me' (Jer. 49, 11). Here, while the prefix remained that of the feminine, the suffix was taken over from the parallel masculine form. This case itself could be taken as an indication of the weakening of the feminine form. Eventually the masculine form was to displace the feminine form altogether. It is no coincidence that in the late Book of Esther we find וְכָל הַנְּשִׂים יִתְּנוּ יָקָר לְבָעֲלֵיהֶן 'and all women will give honor to their husbands' (1, 20). In MH the standard BH feminine form has completely disappeared (as did that of the second person plural feminine), and its function was taken over by the parallel masculine form.

With this particular form we have the rare opportunity to observe the vicissitudes in BH of one specific case as represented by five different forms easily placed within a time sequence. This is not to say that all representatives of all five forms do fit this picture. Nevertheless, the trend seems to be clear: (1) the archaic form יִקְטְלֶנָּה (2) the BH standard form תִּקְטְלֶנָּה (3) a pseudo-archaic "mirage" form (actually a mixed form) יִקְטְלֶנָּה (4) a new

form תִּקְטְלוּ representing a Hebrew mixed form, and finally (5) the masculine taking over completely: יִקְטְלוּ.

*Literature:*

Bergsträsser, *HG* II, §5a.

*c. Active and Neutral Bases in the Qal*

1. *Perfect.* §60. The base of the perfect Qal in nearly all the SL can be vocalized in three different ways which fall into two categories: with /a/ in the second syllable for the active verbs and with /i/ or /u/ for the others. In Hebrew the second category is losing ground; only five verbs have survived from the /u/ type (e.g., יָכַל 'he could'), and the /i/ type (e.g., יָשָׁן 'he slept') is not as strong as it is in Arabic, for example. Quite a few cases of the latter type will, at times, switch over to the /a/ type, e.g., אָשָׁם 'he was guilty' (Lev. 5, 19) as against אָשְׂמוּ 'they were guilty' (ibid. 4, 13; in pausa). In MH יָכַל is the only verb of the /u/ type which survived.

2. *Imperfect.* §61. The above mentioned types of the perfect are paralleled in Arabic by three different vocalizations of the second syllable of the imperfect. In Hebrew the /i/ imperfect disappeared almost entirely; only the /u/ imperfect, e.g., יִשָּׁמַר (perfect שָׁמַר) and the /a/ imperfect, e.g., יִישָׁן 'he will sleep' (perfect יָשָׁן) are fully developed. The imperative follows the imperfect, e.g., שָׁמַר, יִישָׁן.

3. *Participle.* §62. The three types of verbs in the Qal stem have their counterparts in the participle as well. The active verbs require the *qo:tel* type. The two others are mainly the in forms identical with the third person singular perfect, e.g., יֹשֵׁן, יֹכֵל.

*Literature:*

Bergsträsser, *HG* II, §14b, c, d, f, h, r.

*d. The Weak Verbs*

1. *ל"א and (ל"ה) ל"י Verbs.* §63. These two types, e.g., קָלָא 'to be full' and קָנָה 'to buy' respectively are generally kept apart in BH. But some ל"א forms already appear which are construed according to the (ל"ה) ל"י verbs,

pointing toward the situation in MH, where the א"ל verbs turned into ל"י (see §212).

*Literature:*

Bergsträsser, *HG* II, §29d, f, h.

2. ל"י and ע"י Verbs. §64. One of the characteristics of these verbs, such as קום 'to stand up' is that in the Pi'el, Pu'al and Hitpa'el stems they do not double the second radical (*waw* or *yod*) but the third radical instead, e.g., אָקוּמָא 'I shall rebuild' (Isa. 44, 26). There are also cases where the normal pattern is adhered to but with the gemination of the second radical. Excepting those which are also ל"י (e.g., צָנָה) these are to a great extent late roots coming mainly from Aramaic, e.g., וְחִיבְתֶם 'you would endanger' (Dan. 1,10). This form becomes dominant in MH.

*Literature:*

Bergsträsser, *HG* II, §§20d, 28r, u.

## VI. *The Noun*

§65. The different nominal types are built upon the root with different vocalization patterns, gemination of the second or third radical, addition of derivational prefixes (mainly [m + vowel]) or derivational suffixes (mainly [-a:n, -o:n] or [-u:t]). Scholars have not yet drawn a clear historical picture of the development of the different nominal types, but the history of the nominal type built with the derivational suffix [-u:t], e.g., מְלָכּוּת 'kingdom', seems to be clear enough. It is rare in ABH and SBH, but becomes more common in LBH (Chronicles. Daniel etc.). Several nominal types of Aramaic origin will be discussed later (see §103).

*Literature:*

Koehler-Baumgartner<sup>3</sup>, s.v. מְלָכּוּת.

## E. Syntax

I. *Syntax of the Verb in SBH*

§66. The dominating factor of BH syntax is the framework of the tenses. A sentence may open with the verb in the imperfect, but the following verbs will appear in the so-called consecutive perfect, e.g., וְהָיָה אִם שָׁמַעַתְּ תִשְׁמָעוּ 'If, then you obey... I will grant thee rain for your land in season... you shall gather... I will provide... you shall eat...', (Deut. 11, 13–15). The form of the consecutive perfect is, except for the stress in certain cases, identical with that of the normal perfect.

This consecutive tense must be prefixed by the *waw* conversive. On the other hand, a sentence starting with the perfect is followed by verbs in the imperfect and, wherever possible, in the short imperfect. e.g., וַיַּעֲקֹב נָתַן לְעֵשָׂו, וַיֵּאָכֵל וַיִּשְׂתֶּה וַיֵּלֶךְ 'Jacob then gave Esau bread... and he ate, drank, rose, and went his way' (Gen. 25, 34). These too, must be prefixed by *waw* conversive, but its vocalization is different from that of the perfect. With the help of these four tense forms, BH has built a complex system capable of subtle indications of both time and aspect. The past perfect, for example, is indicated in the following way by the subject preceding the predicate, e.g., וְרָחֵל לָקְחָהּ 'and Rachel meanwhile had taken' (Gen. 31, 34). It is mainly the imperfect and the perfect conversive which serve to indicate the imperfect aspect of action, e.g., כֹּכָה יַעֲשֶׂה אִיּוֹב כָּל הַיָּמִים 'thus Job did continually' (Job 1, 5). The imperfect is employed here despite the fact that the action takes place in the past, in order to indicate the habitative aspect. Scholars assume that the Semitic tenses, including those of Hebrew, were originally aspectual expressions denoting perfective or imperfective action, regardless of the time the action took place. The system of simple and conversive tenses which Hebrew developed, whose origin still remains unexplained, is peculiar only to BH and Moabite as it appears in the Mesha stele (see above §2; Segert believes that it is written in the Israelite dialect of Hebrew).

*Literature:*

Bergsträsser, *HG* II, §§6–8; §9n;

S. Segert, *Archiv Orientalní* 29 (1961), 197–267.



II. *Syntax of the Verb in LBH*

§67. This system began to disintegrate in LBH. For example, where the Book of Chronicles parallels the Books of Samuel and Kings we find that the conversive tense is replaced by a simple tense, and instead of the imperfect indicating habitative action we find the perfect. Apparently the reason is that the imperfect was becoming an indicator only of the temporal concept to the exclusion of notions of aspect. Later, in MH, the imperfect underwent another change in this respect (see §218). The following is a good instance of the replacement of the imperfect by the perfect plus *waw*: וַיְהִי כִּי יָבֹאוּ הַרְצִיִּים וַיִּשְׂאוּם הַרְצִיִּים וַיְשִׁיבוּם אֶל תֵּא הַרְצִיִּים 'And as often as the King went into the house of the Lord, the guards bore them and brought them back to the guard room' (I Kings 14, 28). The parallel text reads ... וַיְשִׁיבוּם וַיִּשְׂאוּם וַיְהִי כִּי יָבֹאוּ הַרְצִיִּים וַיִּשְׂאוּם וַיְשִׁיבוּם (II Chron. 12, 11).

It should be mentioned here that the system of the four tenses is built on the fact that the verb precedes all other elements of the sentence except in the past perfect. After some particles, e.g., לֹא the verb does not appear with the *waw* conversive.

For further discussion see below §122.

*Literature:*

A. Kropat, *Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik*, Giessen 1909, §6 III; Bergsträsser, loc. cit. (above §66).

III. *Infinitives and Participles*

§68. Rounding up the picture are the two infinitives and one participle which each stem possesses, except the Qal which has both an active and a passive participle. The infinitive construct, to which the prepositions (מִן) מ (מִן) can be prefixed, functions with the ל- mainly as the object of a finite verb (like *to* + infinitive in English), e.g., מֵאֵן לְשַׁלַּח הָעָם 'he refuses to let the people go' (Ex. 7, 14), and with other prepositions mainly as a gerund (like the English [-ing] construction), e.g., וַיְהִי כִּי קָרָא מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת הַסֵּפֶר 'Upon reading the letter, the King of Israel rent his clothes' (II Kings 5, 7).

The infinitive absolute, which is characteristic of Hebrew, is mainly used as a kind of imperative, e.g. זָכוֹר אֶת יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת לְקַדְּשׁוֹ 'Remember the sab-

bath day to keep it holy' (Ex. 20, 8), as well as for emphasis, e.g., in מוֹת תָּמוּת 'thou shalt surely die' (Gen. 2, 17), and instead of a finite verb, e.g., וְנִתְּוֹן תְּמַרְקִיָּהֶן ... וְנִקְבְּצוּ אֹתָם כָּל נְעָרָהּ... 'they should gather all the young virgins... and let their ointments be given them' (Esther 2, 3). The participles remain nouns, the active employed mainly in the sphere of the present-future, the passive indicating mainly the outcome of past actions.

## F. Vocabulary

### I. Foreign Loanwords

§69. The horizon of the average Jew during Biblical times was relatively wide, extending to India in the East, to Southern Arabia in the south, to Asia Minor in the north, and westward as far as the Greek Isles, probably even farther. In the southeast it was bounded by Nubia, the southern neighbor of Egypt. It was one world in which people, artifacts, food products and even ideas were apt to travel widely. Through commerce, the peoples of this area absorbed words of other languages especially the names of institutions (mainly political and military), of artifacts and products, as well as technical processes. BH has quite a few foreign loans from nearly all the major languages dominant in this area.

#### a. How Is a Foreign Loanword Recognized?

§70. Loans from non-Semitic languages are generally quite easy to detect since their "root" is alien to the Semitic languages (cf. above §5). For this reason it is more difficult but nonetheless possible to identify words borrowed from a Semitic language. There are ways by which we can achieve quite satisfactory results in this respect.

1) The differences in sound changes in the various Semitic languages enable us to identify as non-Hebrew those roots that exhibit sound changes alien to Hebrew. 2) Very often the type of a certain noun is alien, or at least uncommon to Hebrew. 3) The root is absent from Hebrew except for the word in question. 4) The word turns up only in a certain layer of BH, mainly in LBH which is a priori suspected of having been exposed to the influence of a foreign language namely, Aramaic. 5) The cultural background

of the word in question indicates its foreign origin. (Instances will be given below §73). Of course, there are times when there is no clear-cut solution, and quite often the origin of a particular word remains in doubt.

*Literature:*

1080-1070 טורים, "מלים זרות", רבין, (with extensive lists and literature).

*b. Wanderwörter (Travelling Words)*

§71. Not all the foreign words indicate direct contact between Hebrew and their country of origin. There are words that travel from language to language so that very often it is impossible to tell from which language a word comes. A case in point is שק 'sack' which is to be found in Egyptian and in nearly all the Semitic languages. It is attested in Greek and was widely diffused throughout the European languages. While it looks Semitic, its Semitic origin cannot be taken for granted. Another instance is ברזל 'iron' (with [p] instead of [b] in some other Semitic languages). It cannot be native to Hebrew for several reasons. 1) The quadriliteral root in itself could not as yet be used as an argument against the assumption that it is of Hebrew, or for that matter, of Semitic stock (cf. above §5). 2) More serious is the fact that this noun pattern is rare in Hebrew. 3) The Bible indicates that iron was found in Palestine (Deut. 8, 9), but apparently our forefathers preferred to import it from abroad. The following verse 'Now there was no smith to be found throughout all the Land of Israel for the Philistines said: "Lest the Hebrews make themselves swords or spears"' (I Sam. 13, 19) seems to indicate that the Israelites were not well versed in blacksmithery and were dependent on the work of foreigners. 4) There is little doubt that the word is found also in Europe. Scholars assume that Latin *ferrum* (<\*fersom) is related to our word. It was recently pointed out that *Fursil*, the name of an iron mine in northern Italy, is obviously identical with our word. The country of origin of the word has not yet been established. Another noun whose parallels turn up in quite a few Indo-European languages is פילגש 'concubine'. One glance at the pattern of this noun reveals that it cannot be Hebrew or even Semitic. It also seems to be a "travelling word" in Greek, Latin (*paelex*), Old Persian, Armenian, etc. In the Semitic languages parallel nouns are to be found in Aramaic and perhaps Arabic. While there is no doubt that פילגש is not Semitic, Indo-European scholars cannot agree as to its origin.

*Literature:*

Koehler-Baumgartner<sup>3</sup>, s.v. בְּרֹזַל; שָׁק;

;1071 רבין, "מלים זרות", טור 8-9;

קוטשר, מלים ותולדותיהן, עמ' 8-9;

F. Altheim, *Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache*, Frankfurt a/M 1951, pp. 52-53.

A. Walde-J.B. Hofmann, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*<sup>3</sup>, Heidelberg 1938-1940, s.v. *ferrum, paelex*;

[P. Artzi, *JNES* 28 (1969), 268ff.]

*c. Akkadian and Sumerian Loanwords*

1. *Akkadian*. §72. This language of the Babylonians and Assyrians looms large as one of the most important sources of foreign loans in Hebrew. Mesopotamian (i.e. Sumerian-Babylonian-Assyrian) civilization exercised tremendous cultural influence over the neighboring countries. By the El-Amarna period (fifteenth-fourteenth centuries B.C.E.) Akkadian had become the *lingua franca* of the entire Near East (see above §1 and below §108). In the first millennium B.C.E. contacts between the Babylonians and Assyrians and Palestine were very intensive. Therefore it seems obvious that technical terms should have been borrowed extensively not only in the domains of government and warfare, but also in the fields of handicrafts, merchandise, utensils, law etc. This borrowing was done not only by the Israelites, but also by the Canaanites, Arameans and others. During the Arab domination of Spain, several of these loans from Akkadian reached European countries via Aramaic which transmitted them to Arabic (see below).

Loans from Akkadian include words like מְחֹזוּ, originally 'port', today 'district', סִפְרָ, 'letter' today 'book', סִגְנָ, 'a high official', today 'vice-, deputy'. The case of מְסַבֵּן 'a man belonging to a certain social class', today 'poor' is especially interesting. From Akkadian the word also penetrated Aramaic, which transmitted it to Arabic. Via Arabic it eventually reached French (*mesquin*), Italian (*meschino*) and other languages. Other Akkadian loanwords include פְּחָה 'governor', סְרִיס 'eunuch', שֶׁגַל 'queen, concubine', מְדָה 'taxes', מְחִיר 'price'. The word טַעַם is another interesting case. While elsewhere in BH it means 'taste', in Jonah 3,7 it is used to mean 'decree' (of the Assyrian king). Since this is the only place in BH where טַעַם has this meaning, there is reason to believe that the Akkadian *ṭēmu* (= 'decree')

brought about this change (calque; see §106). There may be other hidden traces of Akkadian influences of this type, but they are obviously difficult to detect.

As is well known, both *chief* and *chef* entered the English language from French. The difference in their pronunciation is accounted for by their history; *chief* was borrowed by the English language several hundred years ago, while *chef* is a latecomer (the last century.) It exhibits a sound change that had taken place meanwhile in the French language.

Sometimes Hebrew borrowed words from Akkadian which go back to Semitic roots that do exist in Hebrew. A case in point are Akkadian parallels of the Hebrew root שִׁכַן 'to dwell', from which is derived e.g., שָׁכֵן 'neighbor'. This root apparently entered Hebrew at quite an early date as סוֹכֵן 'a high official'. It must have been quite common in Canaanite too and therefore in the El-Amarna glosses (see §108) it already serves to explain another Akkadian word! During the time of the First Temple it again entered Hebrew in the form סֹנֵן meaning 'a high official', Assyrian /k/ quite often being transliterated at that time by [g]. So it happened that a certain PS root is represented in Hebrew by three different forms, as happened, for example, to Latin *caput* in English, (cf. *chief*-*chef* mentioned above).

The names of the months found in MH and still in use today (כְּסֵלוֹ, אָדָר, נִיסָן, etc.), are of Sumerian-Akkadian origin. Indeed the Rabbis knew that the names of the months came from Babylonia. A few of these names already turn up in LBH, e.g., אֱלֹל, נִיסָן, etc. In SBH the names are still in Canaanite-Hebrew, e.g. חֹדֶשׁ הָאָבִיב (Ex 13,4) for the later נִיסָן and זו (I Kings 6,1) for the later אָבִיב. While scholars sometimes tend to exaggerate the importance of Akkadian influence on Hebrew by including in their list of loans words whose Akkadian origin is by no means established, e.g., מְכוֹר 'to sell', דִּין 'law' the share of Akkadian remains substantial nonetheless.

#### Literature:

;1074-1072 רבין, "מלים זרות", טורים

H. Zimmern, *Akkadische Fremdwörter als Beweis für babylonischen Kultureinfluss*, Leipzig 1917, passim (see Index);

O. Jespersen, *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, Oxford 1943, §112.

י. קוטשר, לשוננו לד (חש"ל), עמ' 5-18 [=מחקרים, עמ' שעז-שצ] (מחוז).

[Akkadian texts contemporary with the El-Amarna tablets were also found in various places in Israel. Their time span, however, is more extensive than the El-Amarna period as they are dated between ca. the seventeenth and thirteenth centuries B.C.E. See A.F. Rainey, *Tel Aviv* 2 (1975), 125-129, and 3 (1976), 137-140 (a Sumerian-Akkadian-Canaanite lexicon; both articles reprinted in M. Kochavi et al., *Aphék-Antipatris 1974-1977: The Inscriptions*, Tel Aviv 1978) (from Aphék); A. Shaffer, apud W.G. Dever et al. *Gezer I* (Jerusalem 1970), 111ff. (Gezer); W.W. Hallo and H. Tadmor, *IEJ* 27 (1977) 1ff. with nn. 1-3 (Hazor); A. Goetze and S. Levy, *'Atiqot* vol. 2 (1959), 121ff. (Megiddo); *Encyclopaedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land* vol. IV, 1147 (Taanach).]

2. *Sumerian.* §73. Akkadian was also the medium of transmission of Sumerian loanwords, since Sumerian, a non-Semitic language, was employed by the Babylonians and Assyrians even after it had died out in Mesopotamia as a spoken language. Instances of Sumerian loanwords in BH are: אָמָן 'craftsman', אָכָר 'farmer', כִּסֵּא 'chair', טַפְסָר 'scribe', שׁוֹפָר 'shofar, ram's horn(?)' and others. One of the most important Sumerian loanwords is הֵיכָל 'temple'. There is no root in Hebrew to explain this noun, but Sumerian é-gal 'big house' seems to do so admirably. To be sure, the origin of the *he* presents a problem. Since Sumerian presumably did not have any gutturals, the same problem presents itself with regard to עֵדֶן 'Eden' (Sum. edin) and הַדְּבָר 'Tigris River' (Sum. Idigna).

Another Sumerian loanword, מֵלָח 'sailor', could serve as an excellent example of how a loan can be tracked down. At first sight it looks perfectly Semitic. The root could be that of מָלַח 'salt', and the noun pattern is the Semitic pattern which serves to denote professions, e.g., צַיֵּד 'hunter'. Why, then, should we resort to the assumption of a foreign origin? There are several reasons. 1) The word appears only in LBH originating in Babylonia (Ezek. 27, 9, 29) or reflecting an Assyrian milieu (Jonah 1, 5), which leads us to suspect a foreign origin (see above §70 under 6). 2) Elsewhere in an earlier source אֲנָשֵׁי אֲנִיּוֹת יוֹדְעֵי הַיָּם 'seaman who were familiar with the sea' is used (I Kings 9, 27), and cf. also יוֹרְדֵי הַיָּם בְּאֲנִיּוֹת 'those who go down to the sea in ships' (Psalms 107, 23). 3) In the kingdom of Judah at least, seamanship was apparently not highly developed. (Cf. I Kings 9, 27, where Solomon was compelled to ask Phoenicians to lend him a hand in equipping and dispatching a naval expedition. Cf. also *ibid.* 22, 49.) This is understandable since the Kingdom of Judah had very few outlets to the sea,

the maritime coast in the west being occupied by the Philistines. The Judeans, therefore, might not have felt the need for a technical term for 'sailor'. 4) The word is found in Akkadian, and since the Akkadian influence is especially strong in Ezekiel, there is no difficulty in assuming that this word should be added to the long list of Akkadian loans in this book. 5) To clinch the matter, the word is of Sumerian origin, where *má* = 'ship' and *lah<sub>4</sub>* = 'to drive, lead, move'. Thus, there was no need after all, to an etymology of מִלַּח 'salt'. In Hebrew the noun pattern adapted itself to that of צִיד.

The case of מִלַּח shows that even a word that looks completely Hebraic may be proved to be of foreign origin. Of course, this is an exception; in other instances we are not that fortunate. Take the following instance: The English word *cumin* is assumed to be of Sumerian origin. It is to be found in Akkadian, from which it penetrated into Hebrew (כַּמּוֹן) and apparently also into Canaanite. From Canaanite it reached Greek/Latin (*cuminum*) and nearly all of the European languages.

This word (and others) came to Europe also by another way. It wandered from Akkadian through Aramaic, via Arabic which transmitted it to Spanish and Portuguese. (Both countries were under Arab domination for centuries.) These forms still indicate the route they travelled by keeping the Arabic definite article, e.g., Spanish *alcamonias* (with a change in meaning). The word does not seem to be Sumerian, and is probably Semitic.

#### Literature:

;1074-1071 "מלים זרות" רבין,

Zimmern, op. cit. (above §72);

;59-58 קוטשר, מלים ותולדותיהן, עמ' 59-58

Löw, *Flora* vol. III, p. 436;

AHw, s.v. *kamūnu*.

[CAD vol. K, s.v. *kamūnu* A.]

#### d. Egyptian Loanwords

§74. There are also several loanwords from Egyptian in BH. They belong mainly to the domain of material culture, e.g., אָח 'brazier', אֶבְנֵי אֶבְנֵי 'girdle', אֵיפָה (measure unit) and צִי 'ship' (today 'fleet'). אֶטוֹן 'a kind of linen' is expressly attributed to Egypt in Proverbs 7, 16. חוֹתָם 'seal, signet ring', gave rise to a verb חָתַם 'to sign, seal' (e.g., Esther 8, 10). It goes without saying that words like גִּמָּא 'papyrus', סוּף 'reed', יָאֵר 'Nile' that are

indicative of Egyptian background, are of Egyptian origin, as is, of course, פַּרְעֹה 'Pharaoh' ('the Big House').

*Literature:*

;1077-1076 טורים, "מלים זרות", רבין,

Th. O. Lambdin, *JAOS* 73 (1953), 145ff.

*e. Persian Loanwords*

§75. Since the Persian rule over Palestine was relatively short (from the middle of the sixth until the middle of the fourth century B.C.E.) Persian loanwords, which naturally occur only in LBH, are not too numerous. They all belong to the field of government, e.g., גִּזְבָּר 'treasurer', אֶחָשְׁדָּרְפָּן 'governor', also פַּרְדֵּס 'park'. The last word, which originally denoted the parks of the Persian rulers where they hunted, was also borrowed by the Greeks, and via the Septuagint translation of גֶּן (עֵדֶן) in Gen. 2, 8 it eventually came to denote 'paradise' in various European languages.

*Literature:*

Dictionaries;

;1079 טור, "מלים זרות", רבין,

.23-21 קוטשר, מלים ותולדותיהן, עמ' 21-23.

*f. Loanwords from Other Languages*

§76. A few words seem to have come into Hebrew from Asia Minor, e.g., יַיִן 'wine'. The origin of the Hebrew and English words is identical.

In Hebrew, /w/ in initial position turned into /y/ but the original form, with /w/, survives both in Arabic and in Ethiopic (Ge'ez). It also reached Greek and Latin and from Latin it was borrowed by nearly all the European languages, since it was the Romans who taught viniculture to the inhabitants of Europe. The word קַוְבַּע 'helmet' is probably of Hittite origin. The Hittite word is supposedly related to Latin *caput* 'head', from which various English words like *chapter*, *chief*, *chef*, *capital*, etc. are derived.

At least one word that Hebrew borrowed from Philistean is known also from Greek, namely סָרְגָן\* which in Israeli Hebrew means 'captain' (as a military rank). In the Bible the princes of the Philistines are called סָרְגֵי פְּלִשְׁתִּים (I Sam. 6, 4 etc.). Scholars believe that the word is identical with the Greek word *tyrannos* 'tyrant', originally 'ruler'. The word apparently



originated somewhere in Asia Minor and was brought to Palestine by the non-Semitic Philistines.

While סָרֶן\* is not originally Greek, some scholars believe that another word אַפְרִינֹן 'litter' is of Greek origin although others assume Persian origin; שְׂרִינֹן 'mail' is supposed to be Hurrian.

If J. Friedrich is right, כִּיּוֹר 'laver' was borrowed from Urartean. He pointed out that the word occurs in an Akkadian text that enumerates booty taken from Urartu (=אֲרָרְטָ, Armenia). Incidentally, it is listed there together with another word, *kannu*, which occurs in Hebrew alongside כִּיּוֹר, e.g., וְאֶת הַכִּיּוֹר וְאֶת הַמַּדְבַּח 'and its laver and its stand' (Ex 31, 9). Friedrich's solution appears acceptable since he has found a parallel Urartean word while no Hebrew or other probable etymology has as yet been proposed. Of course, it is impossible to tell which language or languages played the role of the transmitters.

Many more words are attributed to these four languages but most of the cases are extremely doubtful, as are several nouns assumed to be of Sanskrit origin. Perhaps names of precious stones such as בְּרֻקֶּת and סַפִּיר did come from Sanskrit.

### Literature:

Dictionaries;

;1078 רבין, "מלים זרות", טור

Löw, *Flora* I, 48ff.;

S. Ernout and A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*<sup>3</sup>, Paris 1951, s.v. *vinum*;

Ch. Rabin, *Orientalia* NS 32 (1963), 124-5;

;72-71 קוטשר, מלים ותולדותיהן, עמ'

É. Boisacq, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*<sup>2</sup>, Heidelberg-Paris 1938, s.v. *tyrannos*;

J. Friedrich, *Archiv Orientalní* 4 (1932), 66ff.

### g. Aramaic Loanwords

Regarding Aramaic loanwords see §105.

## II. The Native Vocabulary

### a. The Vocabulary as a Reflection of Jewish Life

§77. The native vocabulary of BH is a true reflection of the life,

geographical background, means of livelihood, manners and customs, religion and beliefs of the Jewish people during Biblical times. One does not need a thorough knowledge of the Bible to realize that the Jews of Biblical times were a nation of farmers and shepherds, rather than of merchants or craftsmen. This can be easily ascertained from BH. Not only is the word כְּנַעֲנִי 'Canaanite' employed for 'merchant' (e.g., Prov, 31, 24), but the very vocabulary of commerce (which is as yet not very rich) can be used as a proof in this respect. Moreover, the few technical commercial terms both in BH and MH are, to a large extent, loans from Akkadian or Aramaic (see above §72; the word מְחִיר 'price' is an instance of an Akkadian loan in this field).

We find an entirely different picture in the above-mentioned fields. Foreign loanwords are practically non-existent (אָרֶר 'farmer', above §73, is an exception), and the vocabulary is rich to the extent that very often we have the impression of *embarras de richesse*. Of course, words that now appear to us mere synonyms probably had each its own well defined meaning. As pointed out by Löw in the case of the names of thorns and thistles (below §80), it is only because we are unable to establish the exact meaning of the different words employed in the same field, that we tend to consider them synonyms.

### b. Topographical Terms

§78. BH knows more than ten expressions of hills and mountains — הַר, גְּבֻעָה, גִּבְעָה, צוּר, רֶמָה, עֶפְלָה, בָּמָה, מְשָׁבֵה, גֵּב, גְּבוּנוֹן, חֵל, רֶכְסִים, מְצָדָה because apparently Hebrew speakers could distinguish between different kinds of mountains, hills, hillocks, crags, etc. On the other hand, we do not even know whether, or in what respect, גְּבֻעָה was different from הַר. To be sure, הַר is commonly translated 'mountain' and גְּבֻעָה 'hill' (e.g., Isa. 40, 4), but this seems to be a merely conventional translation resorted to by the embarrassed translators. For the fact that we find גְּבֻעָה גְּבוּהָ 'high hill' e.g., in I Kings 14, 23 obviously contradicts the assumption that גְּבֻעָה means 'hill' (cf. הַר גְּבוּהָ 'a high mountain', Isa. 40, 9).

1. *Dialectal differences?* §79. However, it is also possible that the richness of the vocabulary sometimes derives from dialectal differences. Take, for instance, the words הַר, רֶמָה, גְּבֻעָה, גִּבְעָה and גִּבְעָה do not occur in place names in Transjordan (with one exception) while רֶמָה and הַר do. Unless

this is due to mere chance, the attestation of the place names indicates that the use of the root גבע was restricted to central Palestine.

### c. *Thorns and Thistles*

§80. Since the Jews were mainly an agricultural people, it is not surprising that we find 117 names of plants in BH. The difficulties of the Jewish farmer are also revealed, *inter alia*, by the fact that there are eighteen different names of thorns and thistles. In identifying these plants we are on much firmer ground than in other fields of BH lexicography, thanks to the admirable works of E. Löw and G. Dalman. Both were greatly assisted by the fact that quite a few of these words survived in the spoken Arabic of Palestine.

#### *Literature:*

Löw, *Flora* IV, pp. 75, 85–86;

G. Dalman, *Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina* II, Gütersloh 1932, pp. 242–323.

### d. *“All the Fountains of the Great Deep and the Flood-Gates of the Sky”*

§81. Agriculture was less dependent on irrigation than on seasonal rains. It is therefore not surprising that there are about ten words for different cloud formations: עָנָן, עֲנָנָה, עָב, \*חֲזִיז, \*עֲרִיף, עֲרֶפֶל, \*נָשִׂיא, עֲרָבוֹת, and several words for rain: גֶּשֶׁם, מָטָר, וַרְזִיף, רִבִּיבִים, יוֹרֶה, מוֹרֶה, מְלֻקָּשׁ, דֶּלֶף. The cisterns which were used to preserve the water during the spring and summer when no rain fell in Palestine, were of prime importance. Several names bear witness to this fact: בּוֹר, גָּבֵא, \*גֵּב, בְּרֵכָה, \*מִיכָל (?).

Springs and wells also played an important role in agriculture, as did rivers, rivulets, etc. This can easily be established by the numerous names which denote them: מַעְיָן, עֵינ, מְקוֹר, מוֹצָא (מַיִם), גֵּלְה, מְבוּעַ, בְּאֵר, שְׁלַח, נְהַר, מַעְיָן, עֵינ, מְקוֹר, מוֹצָא (מַיִם), גֵּלְה, מְבוּעַ, בְּאֵר, שְׁלַח, נְהַר, נַחַל (אֵיתָן, אֶכְבֹּב), פְּלֵג, יוֹבֵל, יִבְל, אָפִיק, \*אָשֵׁד.

Here, too, the possibility that several dialects contributed towards this richness cannot be excluded. It is perhaps no mere chance that מוֹצָא can be pinpointed only in the region of Jerusalem; we are told in II Chron. 32, 30: והוא יחזקיהו סתם את מוצא מימי גיחון העליון ונישרם למטה מערבה לעיר דויד 'This same Hezekiah also stopped the upper spring of the waters of Gihon, and brought them straight down on the west side of the city of David'. It could of course be assumed that in this verse מוֹצָא reflects the language of the author, as in II Kings 2, 21, where מוֹצָא הַמַּיִם is employed concerning a spring in Jericho. But מוֹצָא also occurs in the Siloam inscription which

records the very feat which is mentioned in Chronicles. Finally מוֹצָא as a place name is found only once in Palestine — in the neighborhood of Jerusalem (while עֵיִן, for example, is found over the whole area).

We may assume, therefore, that מוֹצָא was employed mainly in the dialect of Jerusalem.

*Literature:*

ר. פטאי, המים, תל-אביב תרצ"ו, עמ' 167-165, 177-176, 180-177.

*e. The Desert*

§82. Probably the history of the Jewish people as well as the geographical setting of Palestine are reflected in the fact that more than ten expressions turn up in BH to denote the deserts: מְדָבָר, צִיָּה, שְׂמָמָה, יְשִׁימוֹן, עֲרָבָה, בְּתָהּ, דְּבָר, חֲרָרִים, אֶרֶץ תְּלָאבוֹת, אֶרֶץ גּוֹרָה, אֶרֶץ מְלָחָה, תְּהוֹ.

*Literature:*

Dictionaries.

*f. Translation and Transculturation*

§83. The material mentioned above would in itself be sufficient to prove the importance of the soil and agriculture in the life of our forefathers during Biblical times.

Nevertheless, it is another aspect of Jewish life during Biblical times that made the Jewish people what it is, and which is the *raison d'être* of the Bible. No doubt poetical portions describing, for example, the beauty of the Palestinian landscape deeply impress the reader. But the Bible came to occupy its unique position not because of its literary value but because of its religious and social message. Thus, while we feel sure of the basic meanings of such important terms as רַחֲמִים, חֶסֶד, מְשֻׁפֵּט, צָדֵק, yet as J. Barr has pointed out, whenever we attempt to translate these terms into a European language, we must contend with the problems of translation as well as transculturation. He successfully demolished the very widely held belief that "the Semitic languages are as perfect expressions of Semitic thinking as European languages are of European thinking". Others would replace the word 'Semitic' by 'Hebrew', but all would maintain that somehow the Hebrew terms have revealed their contents by their very roots and forms. While it can not be denied that there may be some truth to that contention,

Barr points out that the scholars who held this view based it on methods that do not hold water linguistically. A proper investigation of this semantic field conducted along the lines of up-to-date semantic research, especially of the field theory, may yield more positive results.

*Literature:*

J. Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language*, Oxford 1961, pp. 107ff.

*g. Diachronic Investigation*

§84. Alongside this synchronic investigation, another investigation, conducted along diachronic lines, mainly comparing the state of affairs in MH with that of BH could provide us with some fresh insights. For example, it is interesting to note that the MH technical term אָסוּר 'it is forbidden', מְתָר 'it is permitted' are not to be found in BH. Thus, 'it is forbidden to eat' is expressed by וְלֹא יֵאָכֵל (חֲמֵץ) 'no leavened bread shall be eaten' (Ex. 13, 3), while the opposite, 'may be eaten' is expressed by יֵאָכֵל (e.g., Lev. 17, 13).

Even without a thorough investigation, differences between the various strata of BH (ABH, SBH, and LBH) are easily discernible and will be discussed later (§§111–125).

*h. The Evidence from Place Names*

§85. An additional source of BH lexicography is the place names in the Bible. While some of them are doubtless of non-Semitic origin, e.g., צִקְלָג, the overwhelming majority are Canaanite and Hebrew. Some place names provide us with very welcome information concerning problems of Hebrew vocabulary, while a few may help us to clear up some points in the history of the language, especially in the field of phonology. The noun קֶרֶקַע 'soil, ground' goes back to קֶרֶקַר\* (the *resh* turned into *'ayin* through dissimilation). The original form has not survived in BH except perhaps in the speech of Balaam (Nu. 24, 17), where the word קֶרֶקַר may have this meaning. The original form is to be found in Arabic (and Akkadian). The place name קֶרֶקַר (Ju. 8, 10) shows that it also existed in Transjordan.

The root of the word שׁוּעַל 'fox' has an added /b/ in Akkadian and Arabic. The place name שְׁעֵלִיָּם (Ju. 1, 35 etc.) indicates that this form, too, must have been known at least in certain regions of Palestine. If we remember that somewhere in the same region we find אֶרֶץ שׁוּעַל 'the Land of the Fox' (I Sam 13, 17), and that it was in this region that 'Samson went and

caught three hundred foxes' (Ju. 15, 4), it becomes quite clear that שַׁעֲלָבִים should be considered an alloform of the SBH שוּעַל.

Incidentally, the ancient שַׁעֲלָבִים has survived in the Arabic of Palestine as *Selbit*. This form intrigued me, since the disappearance of the 'ayin seemed strange. (The pronunciation change of /š/ to [s] in Palestinian Arabic poses no problem.) The riddle was solved when the ruins of a Samaritan synagogue were discovered at this site. Since the Samaritans do not pronounce 'ayin (see §179), it did not survive in the speech of the Arabs who settled there after they took over the village from the Samaritans (or after the Samaritans became Arabic-speaking Moslems).

In his work *Flora der Juden* E. Löw pointed out that it is mere chance that certain nouns and verbs from the domain of agriculture which are known to us from MH do not happen to occur in BH. The word for carob, for example, is non-existent in BH although there is little doubt that it was known in Biblical times. Another instance: The place name גַּמְזוֹ (II Chr. 28, 18) seems to indicate that the fruit of the sycamore was known under this name during BH times despite the fact that it does not occur except in MH (גַּמְזוֹת). This place name is also known in MH thanks to גַּמְזוֹ אִישׁ נַחום. According to a Midrashic explanation, he was called גַּמְזוֹ אִישׁ because he used to say that no matter what happened to him לוֹ לְטוֹבָה גַּם 'it is for the best'. This is one of the instances of Midrashic explanations of place names (and proper nouns in general) on popular etymology.

The place name אֶלְתָּקָא (Josh. 19, 44 etc.) goes a long way towards proving that the Ifte'al stem (see above §50) existed not only in Akkadian, Arabic, Moabite, Ugaritic, and Early Phoenician, but also in Palestinian Canaanite (= Hebrew). The name is commonly explained deriving from the root לָקַי \* 'meet', which survives in Arabic; the place name would thus mean 'meeting place.' For another instance see above §50.

#### Literature:

W. Borée, *Die alten Ortsnamen Palästinas*, Leipzig 1930, p. 116.

י. קוטשר, יבנה ב, ירושלים ת"ש, עמ' לח-מב; [=מחקרים, שלא-שלג]

H. Bauer, *ZAW* 48 (1930), pp. 77-78;

Löw, *Flora* II, p. 393; I, p. 277;

Talmudic dictionaries s.v. גַּמְזוֹ;

H. Bauer, *ZAW* 48 (1930), pp. 77f.

Koehler-Baumgartner<sup>3</sup>, s.v. אֶלְתָּקָא.

[A.F. Rainey, "The Toponymics of Eretz Israel", *BASOR* no. 231 (1978),

pp. 1–17; D. Barag, *Encyclopaedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land IV*, s.v. *Shaalbim*.]

1. *Sound Changes in Place Names.* §86. Akkadian transliterations are helpful in establishing the diffusion of a certain sound change. While in the El-Amarna, glosses PS /a:/ had already changed to /o:/, place names indicate that this sound change had not yet taken place throughout the whole area (see in detail above §34).

But by the end of the eighth century B.C.E. the /a:/ > /o:/ Canaanite shift seems to have occurred throughout Palestine, as we see from place names in the third campaign of the annals of Sennacherib, King of Assyria, which took place in 701 B.C.E. Names in that campaign include *Šidunnu*, *Akkū*, *Yapū*, *Isqalūna* (אֶשְׁקָלוֹן, יָפוֹ, עָכוֹ, צִידוֹן) etc. The only name which does not show this shift is *Bīt-Daganna*, apparently named after the (Philistine-) Canaanite god *Dagōn* (*Bīt-\*Dagūna* or the like would be expected). However this does not prove that the shift did not occur there, for another possibility is that the Assyrian scribe, familiar with the worship of this god in Assyria, simply replaced the Canaanite with the Assyrian form of the name.

The place name מְגֵרֹן appears in LBH in the form מְגֵרֹן (Zach. 12, 11). This tendency of adding [-n] to the final /-o:/ of place names seems to have been prevalent in LBH, MH, and in the spoken Arabic of Palestine. The place name שִׁילֹה, שִׁילוֹ, too, bears witness to this tendency. Already in the Septuagint it appears as *Sēlōn* and in the spoken Arabic of Palestine as *Sēlūn*.

2. *Canaanite Deities in Place Names.* §87. Place names are also interesting for cultural reasons. Names like בְּעֵל גָּד (Josh. 11, 17) and other compound names where בְּעֵל is one of the constituents indicate that these places may have served as cultic centers for the Canaanite god Ba'al in one of his manifestations. Other names like בֵּית עֵנַת or עֵנַתוֹחַ are indicative of the goddess עֵנַת. The same holds true for בֵּית שֶׁמֶשׁ (שֶׁמֶשׁ = the Sun-God) and עֵשְׁתָּרֹת-קַרְנַיִם (עֵשְׁתָּרֹת = the goddess Astarte). Even לְחָם of the place name לְחָם בֵּית לְחָם was explained by O. Schroeder as the name of a god.

#### Literature:

W. Borée, *Die alten Orstnamen Palästinas*, Leipzig 1930, pp. 105f.

[A.F. Rainey, *BASOR* no 231 (1978), p. 6.

Schroeder's view on the name בֵּית לָחֶם was decisively refuted by H. Tadmor and Z. Kallai, *Eretz Israel* 9 (1969), 138ff. (Hebrew).]

3. *Place Names in Word Plays.* §88. Sometimes the Prophets made plays on the words of place names, הַשְּׂמִיחִים לְלֹא דְבַר הָאֹמְרִים הֲלֹא בְחֹזְקֵנוּ לָקַחְנוּ קַרְנֵינִי לְנוֹ קַרְנֵינִי which is translated '(You) who rejoice in a thing of naught who say, "Have we not by our strength taken horns for ourselves?"' (Amos 6, 13). H. Graetz remarked that לֹא דְבַר and קַרְנֵינִי (עֲשֶׂתְרוֹת־קַרְנֵינִי) were place names, and indeed the RSV, too, adopted this interpretation (see e.g., II Sam. 17, 27; Gen. 14, 5). Jeroboam II apparently conquered these two Transjordanian cities, which must have caused much rejoicing in Israel. Therefore the prophet sounded the note of warning, hinting that the rejoicing would come to naught.

Another instance of such a play on words is found in נִשְׁמְדוּ בְּעֵין־דָּאָר הָיוּ (Ps 83, 11) which is translated 'which perished at Ein Dor, they became as dung for the earth'. The allusion here is to Gideon's defeat of the Midianites (see the preceding verse). The Midianites fleeing to Transjordan obviously crossed the river Jordan at the ford of Adamah (today Damiyye) where they suffered another crushing defeat (cf. Jud. 7, 24; 8, 1-3), and this is what the writer hints at. (This place is mentioned in the Bible as אֲדָמָה, e.g., Jos. 3, 16, I Kings 7, 46).

#### *Literature:*

י. קוטשר, ידיעות החברה העברית לחקירת ארץ-ישראל

ועתיקותיה ב (תרצ"ה), עמ' 40-42 [=מחקרים שיט-שכא]:

קוטשר, מלים ותולדותיהן, עמ' 88-89;

לו דְבַר, אֲדָמָה II, אֲדָם V, Koehler-Baumgartner<sup>3</sup>, s.v.

#### *i. Personal Names*

§89. Personal names, too, are important sources of linguistic information. They can be helpful in dating Biblical books. Take the case of the names built on the pattern lexeme (noun or verb) plus the apocopated Tetragrammaton. In the earlier books of the Bible, e.g., Kings, we find names like עֲזַרְיָהוּ, יִשְׁעִיָהוּ, עֲזַרְיָהוּ, while in LBH the tendency is to drop the final *waw* (עֲזַיָּה etc.). While for reasons that cannot be discussed here the Book of Chronicles must be accorded a special position in this respect, the



books of Ezra and Nehemiah present a clear picture, for here the shorter form predominates.

This historical picture is also confirmed by Hebrew and Aramaic inscriptions, as well as by Akkadian transliterations of proper names. In the Lachish letters from the sixth century B.C.E. (see §92) only the earlier forms with *waw* appear, while in the Aramaic documents of Elephantine in Egypt (fifth century B.C.E.) the reverse situation prevails. In these documents there appear quite a few Hebrew names of Jewish soldiers who were on garrison duty on the southern border of Egypt. The names built according to the pattern discussed above nearly always lack the *waw*, e.g., אושעיה, אוריה, יאזניה. This fact played a role in dating the Isaiah Scroll from Qumran Cave I, among the first DSS discovered, for in that Scroll these names are always spelled without the final *waw*. Mainly for linguistic reasons it is quite obvious that this Scroll was written sometime during the last centuries of the first millennium B.C.E. and reflects a popular version of the Book of Isaiah known to us. These theophoric names contributed greatly toward making this assumption plausible (see §153).

The transliteration of the name of King Hezekiah in the annals of Sennacherib (see above §86) indicates that while the longer form was dominant, the process of shortening had already started. As a rule, the name is transliterated *Hazaqiau*, but the form *Hazaqia* occurs in one copy of the annals. The process of shortening was apparently accelerated during the exile after the destruction of the First Temple. Therefore, the longer form is extinct in the sources from that period, as mentioned above, and also in the Hebrew and Aramaic inscriptions from Jerusalem dated to the beginning of the Common Era (see §185). It is interesting to note that the Septuagint and other translations use the short form even when transliterating the longer forms of the Hebrew text. This is why in the European languages only the shorter forms are used, e.g., Isaiah, despite the fact that in the Book of Isaiah the name of the prophet is always spelled with a *waw*. It goes without saying that in MH the shorter form is employed.

One more point should be mentioned. How are we to account for the shorter form *Uriah* the Hittite, so conspicuous in the Book of Samuel? The answer is simple: the name is not of Hebrew origin and its bearer was a Hittite! The resemblance to a Hebrew name is purely coincidental.

*Literature:*

Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, pp. 4, 104ff.;

Koehler-Baumgartner<sup>3</sup>, s.v. אוריה.

[The evidence of the form *Hazaqia* should be regarded with caution. It occurs only once, in one of the numerous copies of the third campaign from Sennacherib's annals, whereas in all the other copies the form is *Hazaqiau*. In a seal impression of a high official of Hezekiah, the king's name is spelled חזקיהו. However, two other seals, contemporary with or slightly later than Hezekiah (who reigned from 727 to 698 B.C.E.) bear the names הודיה and מעשיה respectively, which support the author's view on the dating of the appearance of theophoric personal names without the final *waw*. See R. Hestrin and M. Dayagi-Mendels, *Inscribed Seals*, Jerusalem 1978, pp. 42, 93 and 101 respectively.]

1. *Personal Names Preserving Old Grammatical Forms.* §90. Personal names sometimes preserve old grammatical forms or usages that were abandoned in ordinary speech, e.g., יִשְׁעָיָהוּ. As F. Delitzsch pointed out, the first constituent of this name is a verb in the third person masculine perfect in the Qal stem (cf., e.g., צִוְרִיָּהוּ). This verb is no longer employed in BH in the Qal but only in the Hif'il stem. Indeed, the original name of Joshua son of Nun, namely הוֹשֵׁעַ and likewise the name of the Israelite King Hoshea (probably a shortened form of הוֹשַׁעִיהוּ) exhibit the root in the Hif'il stem, albeit in a strange form since we would have expected the form הוֹשִׁיעַ. *Ausi'*, the Assyrian transliteration of the name of the Israelite King in the annals of Tiglatpileser III King of Assyria (eighth century B.C.E.), creates two problems. Although none of the consonants of this transliteration is identical with that of BH, the differences are readily explained. Having no signs for Hebrew *he* and *'ayin*, the Assyrian scribe had no choice but to render those sounds as he did. Since the Assyrians pronounced the /š/ as [s] there is no difficulty in explaining the consonantal form. What is surprising is the fact that the Hebrew /o:/ is transliterated by [au]. To be sure, there is no doubt that this Hebrew /o:/, like many others, goes back to an original diphthong. But as will be shown (§94), there is reason to believe that in the Israelite Kingdom the diphthongs were always contracted (as in Canaanite). The other puzzling question is: Does the [i] reflect the (long) /i:/ that would appear in the standard Hebrew form of this name, הוֹשִׁיעַ, or does it reflect the original (short) /i/ from which the /i:/ of the Hebrew

Hif'il had developed? Since the Hebrew material in Akkadian transliterations is very meager, it is impossible for the time being to answer these questions.

*Literature:*

M. Noth, *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung*, Stuttgart 1928, p. 36.

2. *Special Vocabulary in Personal Names.* §91. Personal names also help us prove that the vocabulary of BH must have been much richer than what is reflected by the vocabulary of the Bible. There are quite a few names that cannot be explained from the vocabulary of BH as it is known to us. In such cases the other Semitic languages especially Arabic and Akkadian, prove helpful. This is not surprising since every language contains proper names built from roots that did not survive in everyday speech (cf. for example, English *Herbert*). Quite often we must go to the early sources of the language in question or to a cognate language for the explanation. The same applies to BH where, to be sure, a few of the proper names are of foreign origin, e.g., פְּנִיָּהּ which comes from Egyptian ('the Negro'). But in most cases, the root is Hebrew although it does not appear in BH either because there was no occasion to use it (cf. §85), or because it had already died out during BH times but managed to survive in the other Semitic languages. Among those names are לְאָה (the parallel Akkadian word means 'cow', cf. רְחֵל 'ewe'). The name בַּעַז has no root in Hebrew, but with the aid of Arabic it could be explained to mean 'sharp of mind'. The name בְּנָהּ poses a problem. In I Sam. 25, 25 Abigail tries to appease David by saying of her husband, "For as his name is, so is he. בְּנָהּ is his name and folly is with him." But this can hardly be more than a play on words, since it is impossible to believe that parents would give their child such a name. It seems that Arabic provides the answer, as was pointed out by Montgomery. In Arabic the parallel root means 'to be clever, noble'. (It is purely coincidental that the word sounds like the English *noble* which comes from Latin). Therefore we may assume that in southern Judea, the dwelling place of בְּנָהּ, the root was employed with the meaning found in Arabic ('noble'), while in other parts of the country the meaning was the direct opposite. (There are a few other instances of roots having two diametrically opposed meanings in two kindred languages, and sometimes, as in Arabic, in the same language).

*Literature:*

Noth, op. cit. (above §90) p. 229;

Montgomery, *JQR* NS 25 (1934–35), p. 261.

## G. Inscriptions

§92. The few Hebrew inscriptions found in Palestine are generally very short. Nevertheless, they provide us with very welcome information about spelling, grammar, vocabulary, and the problem of early Hebrew dialects (cf. §§79, 101).

The most important inscriptions are the Gezer calendar (time of Solomon, tenth century B.C.E.), the Samaria ostraca (time of Joash or Jeroboam II, first half of the eighth century), the famous Siloam inscription of Hezekiah (end of the eighth century), a letter from Meşad Hashavyahu (time of Josiah, end of the seventh century), the Lachish letters and the Arad ostraca (both groups from shortly before the end of the Kingdom of Judah, beginning of the sixth century).

The others are very short inscriptions on small potsherds, seals, weights, various types of vessels and other objects.

*Literature:*

H. Donner–W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften*, vols. I–III, Wiesbaden [third edition, 1969–1973];

D. Diringer, *Le Inscrizioni Antico-Ebraice Palestinesi*, Firenze 1934;

[Y. Aharoni, *Arad Inscriptions*, Jerusalem 1975 (Hebrew)].

[Many of the inscriptions mentioned above were translated into English by W.F. Albright in J. Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*<sup>3</sup>, Princeton 1969, pp. 320ff., 568f.

For a recent find of inscriptions dated to the ninth–eighth century B.C.E. see provisionally Z. Meshel, *Kuntillet 'Ajrud: A Religious Centre from the Time of the Judaeon Monarchy on the Border of Sinai*, Israel Museum Catalogue no. 175, Jerusalem 1978.

For the earliest Hebrew inscription, an abecedarium from the twelfth century B.C.E., see M. Kochavi, *Tel Aviv* 4 (1977), 1ff. and A. Demsky, *ibid.* 14ff. Both articles are reprinted in Kochavi et al., *Aphek-Antipatris* etc. (see §72).

For collections of inscriptions see *Inscriptions Reveal*, Israel Museum Catalogue no. 100, Jerusalem 1973, and R. Hestrin-M. Dayagi-Mendels, *Inscribed Seals*, Jerusalem 1978.]

### I. Spelling

§93. The spelling of the inscriptions is much more defective than that of the Bible, e.g., החצבם 'the hewers' (Siloam inscription) which is spelled חֲצַבִּים in the Bible. To be sure, several words do appear which are spelled plene, as עוד 'more' מוצא 'source', but since the Hebrew /o:/ in these words goes back to an original diphthong, scholars used to believe that these diphthongs were still uncontracted in this period in Judea and therefore in these words the *waw* was still pronounced as a consonant. On the basis of this assumption, they maintained that in the inscriptions no cases of plene writing are found.

This assumption was found to be faulty. On the one hand, in the Siloam inscription we find the word ים 'day' spelled defectively. Since the /o:/ in the word goes back to an original diphthong, this seems to show that the diphthongs were already contracted, and if they were contracted in ים, then in all probability they were also contracted in עוד, מוצא. Thus the *waw* is to be considered a plene spelling of /o:/. Incidentally, in the Bible too, the long /o:/ which goes back to an original diphthong is usually spelled with a *waw*.

But even if we admit to some doubt concerning ים, there is other irrefutable evidence regarding plene spelling in the eighth century B.C.E. The word ארור 'cursed' appears in a short Jerusalemite epitaph of the same period. There are also a few cases of plene writing in the Lachish letters which would be difficult to explain, such as the personal name יאוש and איש 'man', תשעית 'ninth'. But there is no doubt that the tendency in these inscriptions towards defective spelling is dominant in the medial position (i.e. in the middle of the word).

#### Literature:

Diringer, *Inscrizioni*, pp. 21-95;

F.M. Cross-D.N. Freedman, *Early Hebrew Orthography*, New Haven 1952, pp. 45-57;

On the epitaph: N. Avigad, *Israel Exploration Journal* 3 (1953), pp. 141ff.

[Fresh evidence from the Arad ostraca lends support to the author's thesis on the contraction of diphthongs and on plene pelling. See A.F. Rainey, *Leshonenu* 36 (1972), 186-189 (Hebrew with English summary).]

## II. Phonology

§94. In the ostraca discovered in the excavations of Samaria there are several occurrences of the word יין equalling SBH יַיִן 'wine'. This is a clear-cut proof that the original diphthong in this word was contracted even in the absolute (and not only in the construct as in SBH יַיִן). Therefore, the Hebrew of Samaria seems in this respect to have been identical with Canaanite in which the original PS diphthongs were contracted in any position, e.g., בית = SBH בַּיִת 'house'. (Concerning the transliteration of the name of King Hosea see above §90). This is an important isogloss establishing the Israelite dialect as opposed to the Judean on which our Biblical text is based (and see below §99). There is another word in these ostraca which seems strange, תש(ב) '(in the) year of' which looks suspiciously Aramaic.

## III. Morphology

§95. It should be noted that the possessive suffix of the third person singular is spelled with *he* as sometimes in the Bible, e.g., עִירָה 'his foal, ass' (Gen 49,11). As is well known, the standard spelling in the Bible is with *waw*. While we know that PS had an /h/ in this suffix, which also appears in the early Phoenician inscriptions of Byblos, this /h/ disappeared from Canaanite dialects at a very early date and does not appear in the El-Amarna glosses or in the early Phoenician inscriptions outside Byblos. In later inscriptions from Byblos this suffix is spelled as in the Bible, namely with *waw*, e.g., אֲדָתוּ 'his lady' (tenth century B.C.E.). Therefore the occurrence of this suffix *he* in the Lachish letters (early sixth century B.C.E.) is worthy of study, the more so because רֵעו 'his fellow' in the Siloam inscription does seem to have the spelling with *waw* (but this could be a different form, as some scholars assume).

An interesting case is that of the form הִית equalling BH הִיְתָה 'was (fem.)'. This form occurs in the Bible once as a *ketib*, (II Kings 9, 37) and represents the earlier form from which the SBH form הִיְתָה later developed. Therefore we are inclined to believe that הִית of the Siloam inscription is identical with the earlier form, discarded in SBH. But it could also be the other way round, since in MH this form staged a "comeback" (see §212). (This "comeback" affected all the ל"י verbs). Thus one could well argue that this הִית of the inscription heralds the re-mergence of the form rather than its survival.

There is one inscription, the Gezer calendar, that has grammatical peculiarities not found in BH. It is questionable whether it should even be considered as belonging to Hebrew. (Gezer, situated in the Philistine plain, did not always belong to the Judean kingdom).

#### *Literature:*

F.M. Cross and D.N. Freedman, *Early Hebrew Orthography*, New Haven 1952, pp. 46–56;

Diringer, *Inscrizioni*, pp. 28–95;

J. Friedrich–W. Röllig, *Phönizisch–Punische Grammatik*<sup>2</sup>, Roma 1970, §§234, 237.

### IV. Vocabulary

§96. The vocabulary of the inscriptions is practically identical with that of BH, and only a few new roots turn up. While זרה of the Siloam inscription is as yet unexplained, נצף found on weights does not present a problem. The parallel root in Arabic means 'half', therefore נצף obviously denotes half of a certain weight. Another legend on weights, פים was able to solve a riddle in I Sam. 13, 21 למחרשות פים etc. which the King James version translates 'Yet they had a file for the mattocks', but the Revised Standard Version already renders 'and the charge was pim for the ploughshares', thanks to the discovery of the פים weight.

#### *Literature:*

Diringer, *Inscrizioni*, pp. 264ff. 273ff.

[The average weight of the נצף is 9.84 grams, but two *nṣf*'s do not

render a known weight unit. The average weight of the פים is 7.808 grams. See E. Stern, "Measures and Weights", *Enzyklopedia Miqra'it* vol. IV, cols. 869-871 (Hebrew).]

## H. Hebrew Words in Akkadian Transliteration

§97. We have pointed out several times the importance of transliterations for the study of the history of the Hebrew language. We are here concerned mainly with the Akkadian transliterations, and to a lesser degree, with the Egyptian ones. As we have remarked (§§34, 86), they are helpful, for example, in establishing the geographical diffusion of the sound change /a:/>/o:/ (cf. §32). Let us adduce one more instance. תַּנּ 'wine press' is assumed to go back to a root תננ. The *taw* does not appear in Hebrew in this form (compare תנש 'sleep'; root תש), while the *nun* is assimilated to the *taw* exactly like the *nun* of תַּנּ, feminine of תַּנּ. Akkadian transliterations indicate that in a certain dialect at least, the *nun* was still unassimilated during the El-Amarna period as shown by place names containing the element *Ginti*. The spelling *Gitti*, also in El-Amarna, shows that the second form (which appears in BH), was also current at that time. Incidentally, both forms exhibit the vowel [i] while in BH, according to the vocalization, the vowel is [a]. As mentioned, the form תַּנּ exactly parallels that of תַּנּ. The [a] of תַּנּ goes back to an original /i/ as can easily be established with the aid of the masculine and of the parallel form in Arabic—*bint* 'daughter'. In SBH, according to the Masoretic vocalization, this /i/ turned into [a], because of the so-called Law of Philippi which stipulates that PS short /i/ turns into [a] in stressed closed syllables. The form *Gitti* then shows that this law was not operative in the Canaanite of El-Amarna (cf also §109).

### *Literature:*

Bauer-Leander, *Hist. Gramm.*, pp. 194f., 450.

## I. Hebrew Loanwords in Foreign Languages

§98. Hebrew loanwords in foreign languages are also important for our purposes. To be sure, we can hardly assume that Canaanite loanwords



found in Egyptian and Greek came from Hebrew proper, but they are relevant to Hebrew as well. Mainly Canaanite loans in Greek should concern us here, of which we shall give two instances.

It is commonly assumed that the Greeks received their alphabet from the Canaanites. With the alphabet they took over most of the Semitic names of the different signs, among them *iota*. The name of this sign is apparently derived from the word for 'hand' יָד in Canaanite. (Incidentally, the next sign in the alphabetic order is *kappa*, Hebrew כַּף 'palm [of the hand]'). However, if the Greeks took over the Canaanite name of this letter, why is there an [o] instead of an [a] in *iota*? The reason is as follows: In Canaanite the original short Semitic /a/, which was lengthened by stress (= Hebrew *qameṣ gadol*) was pronounced something like [ɔ] (as it is pronounced today by the Ashkenazic Jews). In other words, in early Canaanite during El-Amarna times, long proto-Semitic /a:/ changed into /o:/ (above §32) while in later Canaanite the short Semitic /a/ which through stress became lengthened, turned into an [ɔ] (see in detail §37). The name of the *iota* must have been borrowed by Greek after the completion of this Canaanite process.

The other instance of a Canaanite loanword in Greek is the word *chitón* that was borrowed by the Romans and turned into *tunica* (English *tunic*). The origin is the Canaanite כַּתָּן = Hebrew כִּתְּוֹן. While the problem of the difference between the Hebrew and Greek consonants cannot be discussed here, let us explain the difference between the vowels of the Hebrew and Canaanite forms.

Hebrew and Canaanite dislike the sequence of two consecutive [u, o] type vowels. Therefore, wherever they would occur, the first of the two vowels turns into [i] (dissimilation). That is why the derivatives of ראש 'head' and חוץ 'outside', namely ראשון and חיצון have an [i] vowel in the first syllable. The same applies to the Hebrew צפור 'bird' which apparently goes back to \*šuppur. It is this early form that turns up as the Canaanite place name *Šupur* in an Akkadian transliteration. While this last instance proves that the earlier form could occasionally survive (as in Hebrew כִּתְּוֹן), the above mentioned dissimilation must have been operative at least as early as El-Amarna times. This is proven by the place name (*Gitti*) *Rimūnīma*, a form which goes back to \*[Rummo:ni:ma].

The form of the Greek loan *chitón*, then, shows that dissimilation also affected this word in Canaanite, while in Hebrew כִּתְּוֹן it did not. However, there might have been at least one Hebrew dialect in which this word

behaved as it did in Canaanite, since the Samaritan Pentateuch (§177) spells this word with a *yod*—כִּיתַנַּת. (To be sure, another explanation for the form in the Samaritan Pentateuch may be proposed).

*Literature:*

Harris, *Development*, pp. 61f., 79f.;

J. Friedrich–W. Röllig, *Phönizisch-Punische Grammatik*, Rome 1970, §78;

Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, pp. 453f.

## J. Dialects of Biblical Hebrew

§99. In previous paragraphs the problem of dialects in Biblical times was mentioned several times. It is mainly the possibility of the existence of an Israelite (northern) dialect, as distinct from the Judean (southern) dialect which intrigues scholars. The first indication of dialectal differences between the tribes is the famous שְׁבִלֹת-טְבִלֹת story (above §22). The Samaria ostraca provide an additional trait, namely, the contraction of the diphthong [ay] into [e:] as represented in the word יָן (= יַיָן) 'wine' (above §94). We also mentioned the possibility that in the earlier strata of BH the relative pronoun ׀־שׁ represents northern usage as opposed to אֲשֶׁר in the southern dialect (§45). The same holds true for the spelling אַתִּי of the second person singular feminine (see §41).

However, the latter instance points up the problematic character of this dialectal division, for it may simply reflect archaic features common to BH which by pure chance happened to occur in sources that can be ascribed to the northern sphere. More work is required before a clearer picture can be established.

Scholars maintain that the language of the Book of Hosea, which is different from that of the other prophets of his time, possibly reflects a northern idiom. Here too, some skepticism is in order.

Finally, as we remarked above it is possible that מוֹצֵא 'mountain' and גְּבֻעָה 'spring' and נָבֵל 'noble' were regionally restricted (see §§79, 81, 91 respectively).

*Literature:*

W. Baumgartner, *Anthropos* 35–36 (1940–41), p. 608 note 1 (= Baumgartner, *Zum alten Testament und seiner Umwelt*, Leiden 1959, p. 226 n. 4).

## K. The Aramaic Influence

**§100.** It is impossible to survey ABH and LBH before dealing with the Aramaic influence. From the time Aramaic first entered the domain of Hebrew until today it gradually acquired the status of a kind of second sacred Jewish language. Because of the symbiosis of the two languages during the nearly one thousand years before Hebrew died out as a spoken language (end of the second century C.E.), Aramaic became the main factor shaping Hebrew. Its influence persisted and even gained momentum during the time Hebrew was employed only as a written language and right down to the threshold of Israeli Hebrew. Even the latter did not close its doors to a new influx of Aramaic vocabulary (cf. §§337–340).

Aramaic entered Syria as the language of the Aramean tribes some time before 1100 B.C.E. and quickly spread throughout the Near East. In the eighth century B.C.E. it was not yet understood by the ordinary Judean. That is why King Hezekiah's envoys requested of General Rabshaqe of the Assyrian King Sennacherib, "Speak, I pray thee, to thy servants in the Aramean language, for we understand it; and speak not with us in the Jews' [Judean] language in the ears of the people that are on the wall." (II Kings 18, 26; Isa. 35, 11).

Incidentally, the language of the Jerusalemites is here called יהודית by its speakers (also Neh. 13, 24). This may indicate that it was felt to be an independent dialect which did not include the language of the other part of Israelite (Northern) Palestine (which by that time had ceased to exist as a national entity). The Book of Isaiah mentions שִׁפְתֵי כְּנָעַן 'the language of Canaan' (19, 18), which apparently denotes all the Hebrew and Canaanite dialects spoken in Palestine and Syria. The incident of the Assyrian Rabshaqe also reflects the great importance of Aramaic which already in the days of the Assyrian and (later) Babylonian empires had become a sort of *lingua franca*, the language of diplomacy and international trade of the Near East as is also proved by the Aramaic inscriptions found throughout the area. This Official Aramaic was an official language of the vast Persian empire which was heir to the Assyrian and Babylonian empires. It was employed from India to Ethiopia and from the Caucasus to Northern Arabia. In view of its importance, it is not surprising that Hezekiah's envoys wanted to speak Aramaic, and not Assyrian, with the Assyrian general.

In Syria and Palestine, however, not only civil servants, merchants, and scholars adopted Aramaic, but thanks to the large Aramean population of

Syria, the language also spread among the Canaanite- and Hebrew-speaking peoples living in these lands.

The Aramaic influence is discernible in every field of the language: phonology, morphology, syntax, and vocabulary. But before dealing with it we should establish what linguistic traits of BH often considered to be Aramaic are not in fact Aramaic. In ABH, especially in the early poetry and sometimes in SBH, there appear forms and roots that at first sight seem Aramaic. Since the root אַתַּח is not SBH and occurs only in poetry (where sometimes it might have been used, as in Isaiah 21, 12, to imitate the language of a foreigner, see below), we might have been inclined to consider its occurrence as a sign of Aramaic influence, since it is standard Aramaic. The same applies to the form אָזְלַח (Deut. 32, 36), third person singular feminine perfect which is Standard Aramaic but not SBH. Yet this interpretation would be incorrect, for these roots and forms belong to the common stock of Hebrew and Aramaic as well as most of the Semitic languages. They died out in SBH but survived in Aramaic, and sometimes staged a "comeback" in Hebrew via Aramaic (cf. §54). Concerning the ending [-ti] and the third person plural feminine, see above §§53, 56 respectively.

We should also exclude those Biblical passages in which the speech of foreigners appears, for in order to characterize them as such, the Bible puts in their mouth roots and forms which were either rare or non-existent in BH, but which were supposed to be identical or at least close to the roots and forms employed in the language of the people alluded to. See, e.g., in II Kings 6, 8–13 words and forms like אֵיכָה מְשַׁלְנוּ, נַחְתִּים, מְשַׁלְנוּ, אֵיכָה (where the speakers are Arameans) or roots and forms like אֲתִי, הֲתִי, תִּבְעִי, בְּעִי in Isaiah 21, 11–14 (where the speakers are Edomite-Arabs). The same applies to the Aramaisms of the Wisdom Literature, as, for example, Proverbs 31, 2 where the word בַּר (=Hebrew בֵּן) occurs three times. It is hardly plausible that Hebrew should have borrowed this extremely common word from Aramaic, and indeed it does not appear elsewhere in Hebrew contexts. It is much more plausible to assume that the Aramaic coloring was part and parcel of the Wisdom Literature, and that the occurrence of Aramaic elements in it should be attributed to this coloring, as N.H. Tur-Sinai pointed out. This fact is not surprising since the Wisdom Literature was considered to be of Eastern origin. This might, of course, also apply to the language of other books akin to Proverbs, in which books the so-called Aramaic element might be much earlier than the date when real Aramaic influence

made itself felt. The fact that Jacob is called אַרְמֵי אֶבְרָא 'a fugitive Aramean' (Deut 26, 5) probably indicates not only a consciousness of a common ancestry, but also the consciousness of a common linguistic stock with the Arameans.

Real Aramaic influence is conspicuous especially in the late books and those whose language is considered late, mainly Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, some chapters in Psalms, Ezekiel, Ecclesiastes, Esther, etc.

On the other hand, it might be possible to assume that from the very beginning of Hebrew, Aramaic was used as a poetical element. The Song of Deborah which is generally assumed to be very early, is a case in point. To be sure, a form like שְׁקַמְתִּי 'you (fem. sing.) arose' (Jud. 5, 7) could be explained as an archaic survival (see §54), but how are we to account for the root מחק 'to smite' (ibid. 26) which, as Albright pointed out, appears here in the (presumably) Old Aramaic form (= Hebrew מחץ)? The same applies to the root תני 'to tell, relate' (= Hebrew שני, ibid. 11). This leads us to suppose that the learned embellished their Hebrew style with Aramaic.

It must, then, be admitted, that it is not easy to draw the line between early Biblical Hebrew and quasi-Aramaic traits on the one hand, and genuine elements of late Aramaic influence on the other. Sometimes it is hard to avoid the pitfalls that make this linguistic territory dangerous. We should bear in mind the famous dictum of Th. Nöldeke, the foremost Aramaist of his time and one of the most outstanding Semitic scholars, "You have to be careful of the vicious circle: 'The passage is late because it contains one or more Aramaisms' and 'The word or words are Aramaic because the passage is late'". Still, I hope that in the following lines we will not tread on too slippery ground.

#### Literature:

- E.Y. Kutscher, "Aramaic", *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 3, cols. 257–287;  
 W. Baumgartner, *Anthropos* 35–36 (1940–41), p. 608 n. 9 (= *Zum altem Testament und seiner Umwelt*, Leiden 1959, p. 228 n. 3);  
 Th. Nöldeke, *ZDMG* 57 (1903), pp. 412–420;  
 י. קוטשר, הדואר 47 (תשכ"ח), עמ' 507 [= מחקרים, עמ' שה-שו];  
 נ.ה. טור-סיני, אנציקלופדיה מקראית א, טורים 593–594.

### I. In Phonology

§101. The most outstanding trait in this field is that diachronically (i.e.

historically) some of the Aramaic phonemes differ from the Hebrew ones (see Table 1). But synchronically (that is, limited to the recording of Aramaic during a certain stage, in our case about the middle of the first millennium B.C.E.), a most amazing fact is that Aramaic possesses exactly the same phonemes that we find in Hebrew and Canaanite. This is the more surprising since, thanks to the early Aramaic inscriptions, we know that Aramaic had previously possessed *more* phonemes than Hebrew, while in later Aramaic all the phonemes alien to Hebrew and Canaanite disappeared. We must stress the uniqueness of this phenomenon for there are no other two languages, no matter how closely related, whose stock of phonemes is identical (cf. English-Dutch-German, French-Italian). Even two dialects of the same language nearly always differ by at least one sound which does not exist in one of them, cf. Scotch [ch] as in *loch*. The symbiosis of the two languages is not sufficient to cause this unique fact. Hebrew and Aramaic also share, at least in Biblical Aramaic (BA), the same vowels. To be sure, some of them are historically different; Aramaic *qameṣ gadol* is generally paralleled by Hebrew *holem* (see above §32). The phenomenon of /b, g, d, k, p, t/ (above §29) is also common to both languages.

## II. In Morphology

### a. In the Verb

§102. We have already discussed several traits of LBH that betray Aramaic influence: the second pers. sg. fem. perfect ending [-ti] (§53), the third pers. sg. fem. perfect ending [-at] (§55) and the form *קִטְלָנָה* of the third pers. pl. fem. imperfect (§59). At this point it should be remarked that a few cases of the special form of the third pers. pl. fem. perfect may also belong to this category (§56), but none of these traits survived in MH.

### b. In the Noun

§103 Several new noun patterns are undoubtedly of Aramaic origin. First among them is the verbal noun of the Hif'il, namely *הַקְטָלָה*, but it is remarkable that the first instance of this noun pattern (which is very common in MH) already turn up in the Book of Isaiah. They are *הַפְּרָתָה* (פְּגִיחָהּ) 'partiality' (lit. 'the recognition of their faces', 3, 9), where *הַפְּרָתָה* is used as a verbal noun, and *לְהַנְפֶּה* 'to sift' (30, 28). The vocalization of these forms

betrays their Aramaic origin, as in Hebrew *הכורה\** and *הנופה\** would be expected (see §32). These nouns are employed as infinitives and verbal nouns in Aramaic dialects.

The same applies to the *q<sup>e</sup>ta:l* noun pattern, e.g., *כְּתָב* 'writing', *קָרָב* 'war' etc. Again, nearly all the instances turn up only in LBH and represent the form which parallels Hebrew *כְּתוּב* etc. Yet, it is remarkable that one noun of this pattern, namely *שְׁאָר* 'remnant', figures prominently in Isaiah. Perhaps despite the fact that the common Judean did not yet understand Aramaic (above §100), we may posit that these two noun patterns reached Hebrew via the Judean intelligentsia.

### III. *In Syntax*

§104. Aramaic may have had its most revolutionary effect in the area of syntax, but this is by no means proven. The *waw* conversive started losing ground in LBH until it disappeared entirely from MH (see §67). Since the tense system of MH exactly parallels that of Aramaic, it would be easy to assume that the latter had a hand in the transformation of Hebrew. But although linguistic interference in the area of syntax is a very common phenomenon, it is something quite difficult to prove. In this case a parallel development might have occurred in both languages. This possibility — which at first sight seems far-fetched — seems reasonable in light of the fact that in this respect Aramaic itself had undergone far-reaching changes (cf. also §218). Mutual interferences between Canaanite, Hebrew and Aramaic can not be excluded. After all, we do not know what other linguistic forces were shaping the languages of this territory at the time.

### IV. *In The Vocabulary*

§105. It is in the field of vocabulary that we are on the firmest ground when establishing Aramaic influence upon Hebrew. Certain Aramaic consonants are historically identical with other consonants in Hebrew (see Table 1). Therefore, if we find, for example, the root *טלל* 'to roof' (Neh. 3, 15) we immediately recognize it as an Aramaic loan, since in Hebrew it should have been *צלל*.

Of course, the matter becomes more complicated when we encounter a

root whose origin cannot be detected with the help of sound changes, e.g., עָרַק 'to flee' (Job 30, 3). Still there is reason to believe that it is a loan from Aramaic. First, because there is a very common Hebrew verb, פָּרוּחַ meaning 'to flee'. Secondly, עָרַק is very prominent in the Aramaic dialects. Thirdly, and most decisively, the fact that it turns up only in Job (which contains many Aramaic loans), clinches the matter. Therefore, very little doubt remains as to its Aramaic origin. Other Aramaic loans in LBH are, e.g., חָזַק 'be strong'; הִטְעָה 'to lead astray'; נֶחֱל 'rock'; סוּף 'end'; שָׁגוּא/שָׁגוּה 'to grow, be great'. Instead of SBH פָּקַד 'to appoint', etc., LBH, under Aramaic influence, employs the verb מָנָה e.g., נִמְן 'he assigned' (Jonah 2, 1).

### a. Aramaic Calques

§106. There are more subtle cases of influence in the field of both grammar and vocabulary than those discussed thus far. A word or phrase which may look perfectly Hebrew may, under closer scrutiny, turn out to have been modeled after Aramaic. These cases are referred to as *calques*. An example of this is the English expression *hobby-horse* which served as the model for the German *Steckenpferd* as well as for kindred expressions in other languages.

As to Aramaic calques in Hebrew: In the latter אָחַז means 'to hold' but in Neh. 7, 3 it means 'to bar, lock'. The only explanation for this semantic extension seems to be the following: The parallel Aramaic root אָחַד means both 'to hold' and 'to bar, lock'. Bilingual speakers who readily identified these two roots transferred the meaning 'to bar, lock' from Aramaic to Hebrew. Another instance is Hebrew זָכָר meaning 'male'; its Aramaic counterpart דִּכְר is also used for 'ram'. If, therefore, in the late Book of Malachi (1, 14; and in MH) זָכָר is employed for 'ram' instead of the standard Hebrew אֵיל, it most probably is an Aramaic calque. There is reason to believe that חָזַל 'to fear' (Job 32, 6) is Aramaic חָחַל in Hebrew guise. (As to LBH עָמוּד meaning both 'to stand' and 'to get up' but in SBH only 'to stand' see §123).

The problem of the Aramaic influence on Hebrew, and especially the problem of calque requires a thoroughgoing investigation.

### Literature:

E.Y. Kutscher, "Aramaic", *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 3, cols. 266f., 282;  
E. Kautzsch, *Die Aramaismen in Alten Testament* I, Halle 1902;



Review of Kautzsch by Th. Nöldeke, *ZDMG* 57 (1903), pp. 412–420; F. Rosenthal, *Die aramaistische Forschung* etc, Leiden 1939, pp. 41–43; י. קוטשר, בבואה של הארמית בעברית, תרביץ לג (חשכ"ד) עמ' 118–125 [= מחקרים, עמ' שצד-תא].

## L. Stratification of Biblical Hebrew (and El-Amarna)

§107. In the preceding paragraphs we have attempted to describe the history of BH on the basis of SBH with many references to the glosses of El-Amarna, ABH, and LBH. Only now, especially after having reviewed the Aramaic influence, can the characteristics of these three strata, each as an entity, be summed up.

### I. *The El-Amarna Glosses*

§108. The El-Amarna period is named after the site in Egypt where the international correspondence of the Egyptian kings Amenhotep III and Amenhotep IV was found. It includes letters in Akkadian sent by their vassal kings of various city-states in Palestine and Syria, and by kings of other Near Eastern powers. The scribes who wrote these letters were apparently not too well versed in Akkadian and therefore sometimes provided Akkadian words with a Canaanite gloss (explaining word), and even the Akkadian they employed was mixed with Canaanite forms of speech. The letters date from the fifteenth–fourteenth centuries B.C.E. and are, therefore, the earliest source for the Canaanite of Palestine. This was apparently the language spoken on the eve of the invasion by the Israelite tribes. Even if it is not assumed that the language of the invaders was identical with that of the inhabitants (and cf. Bauer's "mixed language" theory, above §33), nevertheless, these glosses provide us with very valuable information on the history of the Hebrew language.

#### *Literature:*

Text and translation of the letters: J.A. Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln* I-II, Leipzig 1915.  
[A.F. Rainey, *El Amarna Tablets 359–379: Supplement to J.A. Knudtzon, Die El-Amarna-Tafeln*, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1978.

For a general survey see W.L. Moran, *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 15, cols. 933–935.]

### a. Phonology

§109. We have already mentioned what these glosses can teach us about the /a:/>/o:/ sound change (§34).

Forms like *ma-aḥ-ṣu-ú* (Hebrew מָתְצוּהוּ) ‘they killed him’ and others, indicate that as in BH, a full short vowel might be shortened to a semi-vowel, or even disappear entirely; otherwise we should have expected \**ma-ḥa-ṣu-ú* (although in BH the vocalization is according to another pattern, this fact is irrelevant to the point dealt with here). The diphthongs appear contracted as in Canaanite and the Hebrew of Samaria (see above §94), e.g., *qi-e-zi* = BH קִיִּזִּי ‘summer fruits’. Philippi’s Law (cf. §97) is not operative.

### b. Morphology

§110. *Anūki* ‘I’ parallels the BH form אֲנֹכִי (as against the Akkadian form *anāku* (for lack of cuneiform signs with an [o] vowel, the Canaanite scribes used signs with a [u] vowel instead). The form *ḥi-na-ya*, BH חֵינִי ‘my eyes’, exhibits the possessive suffix [-ya] which occurs in this form in Akkadian, Arabic, etc, but not in BH. The third person feminine singular perfect ends with [-at]: *abadat* (= BH אָבָדָה) ‘perished’ as in ABH (cf. חָלְלָה §55). Barth’s Law seems to be fully operative in these texts. This law postulates that if the basis of the Qal imperfect is vocalized with [o], BH originally had an /a/ in the prefix, e.g., יִחַלֵּשׁ, ‘he will weaken’. But if it is vocalized with an [a], the /i/ phoneme appears in the prefix, e.g., יִחַלֵּשׁ, ‘he will be weak’. This applies also to Ugaritic. There is some indication that the first vowel of the Hif’il perfect is identical with that of BH (contrary to common Semitic). The so-called emphatic *mem*, seemingly otiose when it occasionally occurs in BH, e.g., מִתְּנִים קָמָיו (= מִתְּנִי קָמָיו) ‘loins of his foes’ (Deut. 33, 11) is found in El-Amarna (and Ugaritic). It is very revealing that the Samaritan Pentateuch which is a popular version of the Jewish Pentateuch, omits this “superfluous” *mem* (see §182). The passive Qal stem (cf. §48) is employed very frequently in the El-Amarna letters which contain more traits of seemingly Canaanite origin.

### Literature:

Bauer-Leander, *Hist. Gramm.*, pp. 22f.;

F.M. Th. Böhl, *Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe*, Leipzig 1909, pp. 80–89;

- E. Ebeling, “Das Verbum der El-Amarna-Briefe”, *Beiträge zur Assyriologie* VIII (1910), pp. 39–79;
- Bergsträsser, *HG* II, p. 78 (on Barth’s Law);
- H. Hummel, “Enclitic *Mem* in Early Northwest Semitic, Especially Hebrew”, *JBL* 76 (1957), pp. 85–107 (especially p. 93).
- [A.F. Rainey, “Reflections on the Suffix Conjugation in West Semitized Amarna Tablets”, *Ugarit-Forschungen* 5 (1973), pp. 235–262, with references to earlier linguistic discussions.]

## II. Archaic Biblical Hebrew

§111. ABH is reflected mainly in early Biblical poetry. Its main features are:

### a. Morphology

§112. Archaic suffixes abound, e.g., the spelling with *he* instead of SBH *waw*, e.g., עִירָה ‘his ass’, סוּתָה ‘his garment’ (Gen. 49, 11); the suffix מו- in בָּקְמוּ ‘(the sea) covered them’ (Ex. 15, 10), אֱלֹהֵימָו ‘their gods’ (Deut. 32, 37) etc. On the other hand the fem. suffix כִּי־ = SBH ך־, e.g., רָעַתְכִי ‘your wickedness’ (Jer. 11, 15) in most cases seems not an archaism but a “mirage” form (see §54) since it occurs mainly in late poetry, and it is apparently an Aramaism.

1. *The Verb.* §113. Several archaic forms of the perfect tense, like the endings [-ti], [-at] and [-a:] have already been discussed (see §§53, 55, 56 respectively).

2. *The Noun.* §114. שָׁרִי instead of SBH שָׂרָה is typical of the poetic language. The same holds true for the ending [-i:] in the construct state, e.g., בְּנֵי אֶתוֹנוּ ‘his ass, foal’ (Gen 49, 11; SBH בְּנֵי אֶתוֹנוּ), and the ending *waw* in the same case, e.g., חֵיתוֹ אֶרֶץ ‘wild beasts’ (ibid. 1, 24; SBH חֵיתוֹ אֶרֶץ). Again, it is interesting to observe that the Samaritan Pentateuch omits this “superfluous” *waw*. Some scholars assume these endings to be survivals of the old Semitic case endings employed in Akkadian, Ugaritic, and Arabic. These forms (and others to be discussed later) probably became stereotyped in poetry and appear in the late poetry as well. The employment of the definite article [ha-] is rare in poetry, especially in the earlier

poetry. The verb is often negated by בַּל (as in Canaanite) e.g., בַּל יָקוּמוּ וַיִּרְשׁוּ אֶרֶץ 'lest they rise and possess the earth' (Isa. 14, 21).

### b. Syntax

§115. The imperfect is used freely for all "tenses" even without the *waw* conversive. Relative clauses often appear without the relative pronoun, especially when the antecedent is undetermined, e.g., הַחֲדָשִׁים מִקָּרִב בָּאוּ 'new ones, who came but lately' (Deut. 32, 17).

The relative pronoun ׀ has been discussed above (§45). Sometimes הָ or וּ appear as a relative pronoun, e.g., עַם זֶה קָנִיתִי 'the people... whom You have ransomed' (Ex 15, 16). It enjoyed a revival in later poetry, perhaps as an Aramaism.

### c. Vocabulary

§116. The difference between prose and poetry is especially marked in this field. Many verbs and nouns are restricted to poetry, e.g., (SBH equivalents in parentheses) הִאָזֵן (שְׁמוֹעַ) 'to listen'; חֶמֶר (יַיִן) 'wine'; חָרוֹץ (חָרֶץ) 'gold'; כָּבִיר (גְּדוֹל) 'big'; מָחוּץ (הִכָּה) 'smite'; נָגוּהַ (הָאָר) 'shine'; פָּעוּל (עָשָׂה) 'do'; שָׂעַר (יָדוּעַ) 'know' (Deut. 32, 17); רוֹזֵן (only plural; שָׂר) 'prince'.

An interesting case is סוּתָה 'his robe' (Gen. 49, 11), a *hapax legomenon*, or a word which does not occur anywhere else in BH. It is therefore not surprising that the Samaritan Pentateuch, following its tendency, replaces it with the more common כִּסוּת which occurs several times in the Pentateuch (see §183). There can be no doubt in the reading of סוּתָה in the Hebrew Pentateuch because the same word has also shown up in Phoenician inscriptions.

The fact that the verbs and nouns mentioned above no longer appear in MH does indeed confirm the assumption that they were absent from everyday SBH speech.

BH poetry shares quite a few of these roots with Canaanite and Ugaritic, e.g., סוּתָה, חָרוֹץ, מָחוּץ, פָּעוּל, a fact which M. Cassuto believed to be an indication that these languages share a common literary background, and that Canaanite poetry influenced early Hebrew poetry.

### Literature:

Dictionaries;

Bergsträsser, *HG* I, p. 12;

מ.ד. קאסוטו, תרביץ יג (תש"ב), עמ' 197-212;

יד (תש"ג), עמ' 1-10.

III. *Late Biblical Hebrew*

§117. LBH was shaped to a very great extent by Aramaic influence (see §§100-106). But it is not easy to distinguish those characteristics that might have been the product of inner Hebrew development rather than of Aramaic influence. Therefore, on the one hand the reader should always consult the paragraph concerning Aramaic influence, and on the other hand bear in mind that we are by no means sure that the traits discussed below should not be attributed to Aramaic.

*Literature:*

[A. Hurvitz, *The Transition Period in Biblical Hebrew*, Jerusalem 1972 (in Hebrew).]

*a. Spelling*

§118. Spelling in the later books of the Bible tends to be more plene than in SBH. A case in point is the name of the city of Jerusalem and the name of David. The former is spelled ירושלם, without a *yod*, (but is vocalized יְרוּשָׁלַם) more than 600 times, but only five times with a *yod*, three of them occurring in Chronicles, e.g., I 3, 5 and one in Esther 2, 6. The name of King David, too, is always spelled defectively (without a *yod*) except in Chronicles (and also in those Minor Prophets which were edited after the exile), where it is spelled plene — דָּוִיד.

*b. Pronouns*

§119. The prevalence of אָנִי over אֲנִי has been discussed above (§40).

*c. The Verb*

§120. In Ezra and Nehemiah but not in Chronicles, the long imperfect is often used instead of the simple imperfect, e.g., וָאֲתַאֲבֵל=וָאֲתַאֲבֵל 'I mourned' (Neh. 1, 4).

*d. The Noun*

§121. The archaic form שָׁדַי, in Ps. 96, 12 appears in a parallel text in I Chr. 16, 32 as שָׁדָה. Instead of the SBH מַמְלָכָה 'kingdom' LBH books tend to employ מְלָכוּת. The Books of Chronicles replace three times מַמְלָכָה of parallel texts with מְלָכוּת e.g., I 17, 11 (= II Sam. 7, 12).

### e. *Syntax of the Verb and Noun*

§122. The Books of Chronicles tend to employ the double plural, e.g., אַנְשֵׁי הַשָּׁם 'men of renown' (I 5, 24) instead of אַנְשֵׁי הַשָּׁם (Gen. 6, 4). Active constructions are preferred to passive ones; compare, e.g., וַיִּזְלְדוּ וּבָנוּת 'and more sons and daughters were born to David' (II Sam. 5, 13) which Chronicles renders וַיִּזְלַד דָּוִד עוֹד בָּנִים וּבָנוּת 'and David begot more sons and daughters' (I 14, 3). The passive Qal is replaced by the Nif'al, for example in נִזְלַד 'was born' (I 20, 6) where the parallel text has יָלַד (II Sam. 21, 20). The same kind of replacement is also attested in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Samaritan Pentateuch (see §§158 and 181 respectively).

Very interesting is the use of אָז. In the earlier books of the Bible, אָז 'then' (referring to the past) is followed by the short imperfect, e.g., אָז יִקְהַל שְׁלֹמֹה 'then Solomon assembled' (I Kings 8, 1) or more generally by the normal imperfect, e.g., אָז יָשָׁר מֹשֶׁה 'then Moses sang' (Ex. 15, 1). Only rarely is it followed by the perfect. But in Chronicles the perfect is always employed, e.g., אָז אָמַר דָּוִד 'then David said' (I 15, 2).

The use of the infinitive absolute as an imperative is avoided; cf. הֲלוֹךְ וְדַבֵּר 'go and say' (II Sam. 24, 12) as against לֵךְ וְדַבֵּר (I Chron. 21, 10). Chronicles sometimes employ ל־ instead of אָתָּה to indicate the direct object, e.g., וַיִּבְדֵּל דָּוִד ... לְבָנֵי אָסָף 'David set apart... the sons of Asaf' (I 25, 1). This is apparently another case of Aramaic influence.

About the tenses and moods of LBH see above §67.

### *Literature:*

Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, pp. 3ff., 99, 326ff., 384f.;

Bergsträsser, *HG II*, p. 23;

A. Sperber, "Hebrew in Parallel Transmissions", *HUCA* 14 (1939), p. 247;

A. Kropat, *Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik*, Giessen 1909, pp. 8f., 14f., 23-25, 72-75.

### f. *Vocabulary*

§123. It is very interesting to see how Chronicles substitutes words that are common in BH for words that had become antiquated or which had meanwhile changed their meanings. We already have mentioned the case of אָנְכִי-אָנִי. The following verses are quite instructive in this case. I Sam 31, 12-13 tells how the inhabitants of Jabesh Gilead brought the body of Saul for burial. The same story is also told in I Chr. 10, 12. The Chronicler

changes three words in this short account. Samuel reads *וַיִּקְחוּ אֶת גְּוִיַּת שָׁאוּל וְאֶת גְּוִיַּת בָּנָיו... וַיִּקְבְּרוּ תַּחַת הָאֶשְׁלָח* 'They took the body of Saul and the bodies of his sons... and buried them under the tamarisk tree', while Chronicles reads *וַיִּשְׂאוּ אֶת גּוֹפַת שָׁאוּל וְאֶת גּוֹפַת בָּנָיו... וַיִּקְבְּרוּ... תַּחַת הָאֵלֶּה* 'They took away the body of Saul and the body of his sons... and they buried... under the oak.' The reason for the change is the following: *לָקוּחַ* tended to be used for 'to buy', while for 'to take', *נָשׂוּא* was sometimes used. (The latter verb appears with this meaning in MH, but there *נָטוּל* is employed in most cases). Instead of *גְּוִיָּה* (very rare in MH), a new word *גּוֹפָה* appears (from *גוּף* 'body'), apparently an Aramaic loan which is very frequent in MH. And instead of *אֶשְׁלָח* which appears only three times in SBH, the more common *אֵלֶּה* is substituted.

Quite a few Hebrew roots which are very common in MH first appear in LBH, e.g., the root of MH *צָרִיךְ* 'to need', in *צָרְכְּךָ* 'your need' (II Chron. 2, 15). The root *כָּשַׁר* which plays such an important role in Jewish life appears only in Esther and Ecclesiastes. But we must temper this observation with a note of caution. In the past, scholars assumed that these two roots *צָרַךְ* and *כָּשַׁר* were Aramaic. Today this seems much less probable since their form in Aramaic should have been *\*עֲרַךְ* and *\*כַּתַּר*. The first root appears as *צַרַךְ* in Ugaritic (and the second as *כַּתַּר*?). Therefore, these roots might have belonged to a Hebrew or Canaanite dialect. (Concerning Ecclesiastes, see also below §124).<sup>115</sup>

Some SBH verbs underwent a change in meaning. In SBH *רָצוּהוּ* means 'to be content', while *תְּפֹנֵץ* means 'to wish'. In LBH *רָצוּהוּ* is already approaching the meaning of *תְּפֹנֵץ* 'to wish'. That is why in Esther 1, 8 we find *לַעֲשׂוֹת כְּרָצוֹן כֹּל אִישׁ וְאִישׁ* 'to do as every man desired'. In MH *רָצוּהוּ* is practically the only verb which survives with this meaning. Another interesting change occurs in the verb for 'to marry': in SBH it is expressed by the phrase *לָקוּחַ אִשָּׁה*, while in LBH this phrase is always replaced by *נָשׂוּא אִשָּׁה*, e.g., Ezra 10, 44. How are we to account for this change? The only explanation seems to be in the fact that, as mentioned above, *לָקוּחַ* in SBH is mainly used with the meaning 'to take', but in MH it is used mainly with the meaning 'to buy'. This semantic change was well under way in LBH (see above, and also Prov. 31, 16 where we find *וַתִּקְחֶהּ* 'and she buys it'). Therefore, to avoid misunderstanding, the verb *נָשׂוּא* which means 'to carry' but also 'to take', was employed, as in the instance mentioned above in Chronicles. There is another development that in all probability owes its existence to the change in meaning of *לָקוּחַ*. In SBH 'to receive' is *לָקוּחַ*, e.g.,

נָתַחֵי כֶסֶף הַשָּׂדֶה קַח מִמֶּנִּי 'let me pay the price of the land, accept it from me' (Gen. 23, 13). In LBH the Aramaic loan קָבַל is used instead, e.g., וַיִּקְבְּלוּ דָוִד 'David received them' (I Chron. 12, 19). Here, too, the reason for the change is obvious. Because of the semantic change of לָקוּחַ mentioned above, ... לָקוּחַ מִן could have been interpreted to mean 'to buy from'. Indeed, this meaning is extremely common in MH, e.g., מִן הַנֶּחֱתוּם 'If a man bought... from the baker' (Demai 5, 1, 3). A new verb was urgently needed, so Aramaic קָבַל was 'accepted' by Hebrew and became very common in MH.

Instead of SBH מַמְלָכָה or מְלוּכָה 'kingdom', LBH prefers מְלָכוֹת which is used about 30 times in Chronicles and also in Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther and Daniel. As mentioned above (§121), the noun pattern with the derivational suffix יוֹת became more and more prevalent in the course of the history of BH and MH. In SBH עָמוּד means 'to stand' and קוּם 'to get up'. In LBH עָמוּד extended its use by also coming to mean 'to get up', e.g., רָוַח וְהִצֵּלָה 'relief and deliverance will rise for the Jews from another quarter' (Esther 4, 14). In MH virtually only עָמוּד is used. (Incidentally, this case might have been a so-called "inverted calque" from Aramaic, where קוּם also has both meanings).

### Literature:

Dictionaries;

S.R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, New York 1956, pp. 535ff. (Chronicles).

קוטשר, מלים ותולדותיהן, עמ' 56-55

. קוטשר, תרביץ לג (תשכ"ג), עמ' 124 [=מחקרים, עמ' ת-תא].

### *g. LBH Features not Found in Mishnaic Hebrew*

§124. All the cases mentioned in this paragraph indicate that, as might have been expected, LBH represents the transitional stage between SBH and MH. Therefore, most of the new verbs and forms that turn up in LBH are common in MH. Besides those dealt with above, we should also mention חָתוּךְ 'to cut' (Dan. 9, 24) or מְקַצֵּץ 'some of', מִנָּה 'to appoint' (instead of SBH פָּקוּד), גִּיל 'age', etc.

But this is by no means the case with all the new material to be found in LBH. One example is מַפְשָׁעָה (I Chr. 19, 4) 'posterior'. While the verb פָּסוּעַ (=פָּשׁוּעַ) 'to step' is common in MH, this noun does not occur. So we must



assume that during the centuries that passed between LBH and the rise of MH some new arrivals were eventually ejected from the language.

This assumption may also apply to syntax. Some of the characteristics of LBH in morphology and syntax discussed above are absent from MH.

1. *A Canaanite Construction.* §125. Here we should like to add one instance which is important for another reason. Scholars formerly believed that all new characteristics of LBH were to be considered late, whether or not they were Aramaisms. But in recent years it has been pointed out that Ecclesiastes, whose language is commonly considered to be late, shares some traits with Canaanite and even Ugaritic which are absent from Aramaic and LBH in general. The most conspicuous instance is in 4, 2 וְשַׁבַּח אֲנִי. This form, namely the infinitive with the independent pronoun, is impossible in Hebrew. Therefore, the text was emended by scholars to וְשַׁבַּחְתִּי 'I praised'. But in a Canaanite inscription of Azitawada (9th century B.C.E.) this construction was found several times and was subsequently discovered in other Canaanite texts, making "emendation" unacceptable. Hence, this construction is now considered an indication of Canaanite influence on Ecclesiastes. Yet this construction did not survive in MH. Incidentally, this case should serve to qualify the assumption that everything in BH prose that differs from SBH should be considered late.

#### *Literature:*

כ.ה. גורדון, השפעה צפון-ישראלית על העברית שלאחר גלות בבל, ארץ ישראל ג (תשי"ד), עמ' 104-105;

M. Dahood, *Biblica* 33 (1952), 221ff.

### M. Conclusions

§126. The study of various aspects of Biblical Hebrew is badly in need of new approaches.

*Grammar.* There is no up-to-date grammar of BH at present. The work of Bergsträsser is excellent, but it covers only phonology and the verb and, especially in the domain of phonology, it is outdated. The work of Bauer-Leander is also very good but it does not treat the syntax and it needs revision. Brockelmann's syntax does not do full justice to BH syntax. The new languages discovered (Ugaritic!), new material in many fields, e.g., inscrip-

tions, transliterations, and new linguistic approaches during the last two generations make revisions an urgent requirement. Nothing less than a new descriptive and historical grammar of Biblical Hebrew must be written.

*Special Fields.* While the work of Noth on personal names and Borée's on place names are still quite useful, the same cannot be said of works in other fields dealt with in this chapter. A new collection of Hebrew inscriptions from Palestine is an urgent desideratum and the works of Diringer and Moscati require at least a supplement. A work dealing with the Akkadian transliterations of Hebrew personal names and place names would be of the first importance for writing the history of Hebrew. The situation is also very bad concerning the Aramaic influence on BH. Kautzsch's book is entirely outdated by the wealth of material in the field of early Aramaic inscriptions which would shed an entirely new light on the problem, as we have seen. There is also no comprehensive treatment of LBH or ABH except for the material to be found in the introductions to the Bible and to its individual books.

*Lexicography.* The situation in this respect is also unsatisfactory. The Biblical dictionaries of Brown-Driver-Briggs and of Gesenius-Buhl while very useful, have been outdated by the tremendous growth of the material in the field of Semitics and the discovery of a new Semitic language namely, Ugaritic. Moreover, these dictionaries are mainly concerned with etymology, but the history of the words in BH itself is nearly entirely overlooked. The reasons to this are quite clear: Very few BH words have really been investigated in this respect. Furthermore, as J. Barr has shown, the subject of BH semantics has labored too much under the influence of etymology and theology. Synchronic and diachronic investigations of different semantic fields in BH are needed before a clear picture of the history of the vocabulary will emerge. The dictionaries mentioned above also fail to fully exploit the material found in MH. In this respect the work has to be done on the basis of the achievements of the last two generations in the field of MH lexicography (see below §253). The dictionary of Ben-Yehudah, edited by Ben-Yehudah-Segal-Tur Sinai (Hebrew), is extremely useful in this respect, but being a thesaurus of the Hebrew of all periods, it cannot do full justice to BH. There is hope that the new edition of the Koehler-Baumgartner Hebrew and Aramaic lexicon, now in the process of publication, as well as other dictionaries planned by various scholars will improve this picture.

## CHAPTER FIVE

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS  
AND CONTEMPORARY SOURCES

## A. The Book of Ben Sira

§127. Until recently there was a linguistic vacuum between the period of BH (assumed to have ended more or less in the fifth century B.C.E.), and the period of MH (about 200 C.E.).

At the end of the last century Hebrew fragments of the Book of Ben Sira were found in the Cairo Geniza. (A geniza is a room where worn out sacred books, or books and writings considered sacred, were deposited prior to their interment). The discovery revolutionized Jewish scholarship, since in this geniza books were found that had been completely lost, such as earlier and better texts of the Targumim, Talmudic and Midrashic manuscripts of MH, as well as Biblical texts vocalized with the Babylonian and Palestinian vocalization. Thanks to the letters and documents found there, an entirely new world of medieval Jewish history has unfolded. S. Schechter, their discoverer, realized the importance of the Cairo Geniza thanks to a leaf of paper that came from there which he immediately recognized to be the Hebrew text of Ben Sira.

This book, written in the second century B.C.E., had survived only in Greek, Latin and Syriac translations; the Hebrew original was presumed lost. When the Hebrew fragments were found, the problem arose of whether they represent the original Hebrew, going back to the second century B.C.E., or a retranslation into Hebrew made during the Middle Ages. As long as this controversy remained unsettled, the language of these fragments — whose correct text was difficult to establish, owing to the differences between several copies — could not be considered to represent the language of the period.

However, since Y. Yadin discovered in Masada fragments dating, at the very latest, from the first century C.E., whose text is quite close to that of a certain fragment found in the Geniza (see below §128), we may, with all

due reservation, present the linguistic picture that emerges from these texts. However, it must be admitted that only the Masada text is linguistically reliable (see below §139).

(The partial vocalization in the following discussion is tentative as the texts are not vocalized. For Masada fragments other than Ben Sira see below §149.)

*Literature:*

P.E. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*<sup>2</sup>, Oxford 1959.

### 1. *The Cairo Geniza Fragments*

§128. Scholars have pointed out that quite a high proportion of the vocabulary reflects LBH, MH and Aramaic material. This in itself can be considered proof that the text did not originate during the Middle Ages (as some scholars assumed), since in this case we might have expected SBH or even ABH to play a much greater role, as is the case with Hebrew texts originating in the Middle Ages.

#### a. *Grammar*

§129. Along with the SBH relative pronoun אֲשֶׁר, the late ׀ֿ is quite conspicuous. The perfect appears with *waw* conjunctive. There are cases of plural ending [-i:n] instead of [-i:m].

#### b. *Vocabulary*

##### 1. *LBH Material.*

α. *Verbs.* §130. Here, too, עָמַד is used with the meaning 'to get up', e.g., 47, 1 (see §123). וָנַע 'tremble' (48, 12) also belongs to this category (cf. Esther 5, 9).

β. *Nouns.* §131. The Persian loanword פִּתְגָּם 'word' (5, 11) is not surprising. More significant is the case of הַדוֹת 'thanksgiving' (47, 8), an infinitive employed as a noun only in LBH, e.g., Neh. 12, 46.

2. *MH Material*. §132. The material to be included in this paragraph (as in the above paragraphs), will also comprise words that came into MH from Aramaic.

*a. Verbs*. §133. סָרַב (4, 25) 'to refuse' is characteristic of this kind. צָרוּךְ 'to be in need of' (13, 6) is a clear-cut verb (to be found in MH only in MSS, generally ... לְצָרוּךְ לְ). הִסְפִּיק (הַשְׁפִּיק in the Masada text) 'to be enough, to be able to' (42, 17) is also conspicuous in MH. The case of הִתְנַהֵּן 'to praise oneself' is interesting. This root probably originated from the Nif'al of the Biblical root אָוָה (cf. נָאוּ לְחַיִּיךָ 'your cheeks are comely', Song of Songs 1, 10) and generally appears in MH already as נָאָה (in MSS still נִאוּה) 'to be pretty, nice'. נָאָה is also found in Ben Sira 51, 16. Instead of יְדִלִיק (43, 4) we find in the margin יְסִיק 'to kindle'. The verb נָטוּל 'to take', common especially in MH, also turns up here (42, 8).

*β. Nouns*. §134. The *בית מדרש* 'academy' (51, 23) is characteristic of the MH period. Other nouns include: שׁוֹתֵף 'partner' (41, 18) which replaces חֵבֵר in the margin, בְּרִיּוֹת 'creatures' (16, 16), and עוֹלָם 'world' (3, 18). Let us mention two more nouns: נְכֻסִים 'property' (5, 8) and כְּהוֹנָה גְדוֹלָה 'high priesthood' (45, 24). The noun pattern *qeti:la*: (see §1212) occurs e.g., in גְּרִיעָה 'dying'; the pattern *qittu:l* (see *ibid*), in e.g., יְסוּר 'suffering' (4, 29); the pattern *haqta:la* (see §103) e.g., in הוֹדָא 'thanks' (51, 17).

### 3. *Aramaic material*

*a. Verbs*. §135. The root סַפַּק 'to suffice' is employed in the Qal, 'to be enough' (above §133). It is interesting to note that in I Kings 20, 10, where it appears in the Qal (spelled שַׁפַּק), it is an Aramean king who is speaking.

*β. Nouns*. §136. The word סִימָה e.g., 40, 18, in the margin for אוֹצֵר, (and spelled שִׁימָה in the Masada text 41, 14) is Aramaic (though from a root that is found also in Hebrew). The Verbal noun of the Hitpa'el e.g., הִשְׁתַּנּוּת 'the change' (43, 8) is probably also Aramaic but there may be one case in BH הִתְחַבְּרוּת (Dan. 11, 23).

*γ. An Aramaic Calque*. §137. צוּנֹעַ 'to be clever' (42, 8) is perhaps an Aramaic calque.

4. *A Word from an Unknown Source.* §138. אשוח 'pool' (50, 3) is interesting since it does not appear in this form either in Hebrew or in Aramaic, but it does appear in the stele of Mesha, King of Moab (ninth century B.C.E.). It has now emerged also in the form אשיח in the Copper Scroll.

*Literature:*

D. Strauss, *Sprachliche Studien zu den hebräischen Sirachfragmenten*, Zurich 1900;

[*The Book of Ben Sira: Text, Concordance and an Analysis of the Vocabulary*, Jerusalem 1973 (Hebrew). — G.S.]

## II. *The Masada Fragments*

§139. The above description of the language of Ben Sira, based on fragments discovered in the Cairo Geniza dating back to the Middle Ages has now to be qualified by the picture that emerges from the fragments discovered by Y. Yadin in the excavation at Masada. These fragments date from 125–100 B.C.E.

The Masada fragments prove beyond a doubt that the Geniza fragments represent the Hebrew original (see above §127). On the other hand, the new fragments prove decisively that the Geniza fragments have not preserved the original text faithfully. Therefore, I believe, a short description of this text too, is in order here. [References are to the definitive edition of the Academy of the Hebrew Language, above §138.]

### *a. Spelling*

§140. Ben Sira apparently tried to imitate BH, so the spelling is practically identical with that of BH (as against DSS; see below §155). But the spelling of מזונים 'scales' (42, 4) parallels that of DSS (cf. below §150), rather than BH מאזנים.

For the same reason, Ben Sira prefers the grapheme ש (=ש) where DSS [rarely — E.Q.] and especially MH might use *samekh*, e.g., שימה 'treasure' (41, 14). The margin of one Geniza fragment has already the "normal" spelling of MH סימה, while the text itself substitutes the BH אוצר for the MH word — a good illustration of how the text was altered in the Middle Ages.

*b. Morphology*

§141. The form בויש (42, 1; 41, 32 in Yadin's edition) seems to have been built on the pattern of the strong verb. The Geniza fragment corrects it to the "normal" form בוש.

*c. Vocabulary*

§142. For the reason stated above (§140), the language of Ben Sira draws upon all strata of BH. However, it could not escape the impact of the contemporary dialects, namely MH and Aramaic, as the following instances show.

1. *ABH Material.* §143. פָּחוּ 'wantonness' (41, 16; preserved on the margin of one of the fragments); פִּעַל 'act' (42, 15).

2. *SBH Material.* §144. נִין 'child' (?) (41, 5); כֹּאשֶׁר 'as' (44, 9).

3. *LBH Material.* §145. קִבַּל 'to receive' (41, 1).

4. *MH Material.* §146. גִּפּוֹת 'banks (of a river)' (40, 16); שׁוֹתֵף 'partner' (41, 18); צָרָה 'need' (42, 23). Lieberman showed that דָּרַךְ (42, 3) has to be translated 'plenipotentiary' on the basis of MH. תִּמְחִי 'polishing' (42, 4) is not found in MH, but the verbal root does occur.

*Literature:*

ש. ליברמן, לשוננו לב (תשכ"ח), עמ' 92-90

י. קוטשר, ibid, עמ' 345-346 [=מחקרים, עמ' שנו-שנח].

5. *Aramaic Material.* §147. שִׁימָה 'treasure' (41, 14; see above §140); קִרְמִיָּה 'branch' (?) (40, 16) seems to occur only in the Aramaic of the Babylonian Talmud. שָׁנָה 'to tell' (42, 1; 44, 15) is apparently an Aramaic calque. (Yadin translates 'to repeat'.) The parallel Aramaic root תָּנִי which occurs as an Aramaism in ABH (see above §100) also means 'to tell'.

6. *Material from Unknown Sources.* §148. Since we know very little about the language spoken at this period (the last centuries before the Common Era) it is not surprising that we come across roots unknown both in BH and MH. One of these roots appears in מְשַׁרְיָק 'sparkles' 43, 9. Incidentally the fact that this root also survived in the Geniza fragments (מְשַׁרְיָקָה 50, 7;

thus vocalized on the basis of its Arabic cognate) is the best proof that those fragments go back to the Hebrew original, for it would have been otherwise impossible to account for its occurrence in the text. Another unknown root, apparently close to the meaning of BH ארח 'wander' is to be found in (עתות) יאריח 'prescribeth (seasons)' 43, 6 which also can apparently only be explained with the help of its Arabic cognate. This word was changed in the Geniza texts.

*d. Biblical and Non-Biblical Transmissions in the Masada Fragments*

§149. In the excavations at Masada Y. Yadin found a fragment of Psalms. It is interesting to realize that the text of Ben Sira underwent many changes resulting from the "corrections" of medieval (and earlier) scribes. Owing to these corrections not only the spelling was changed (e.g., שימה-סימה, see above §140), but words unknown to the scribes were "corrected" out of existence (e.g., תמחי above §146). But Psalms fared differently. Except for a few cases of defective spellings, that are also common in our MSS of the Bible, there is practically no difference between the text discovered at Masada and our Masoretic text. How are we to account for this difference between the transmission of Psalms and of Ben Sira? The answer is simply that Psalms represented a sacred text and therefore the scribes made every effort to copy it faithfully, while Ben Sira was not canonised, and so it was treated less carefully. This is a clear proof of how particular the scribes were not to change anything when copying a Biblical text.

*Literature:*

Y. Yadin, *The Ben-Sira Scroll from Masada*, Jerusalem 1965 (= *Eretz-Israel* 8 (1967), pp. 1–45);

idem, *IEJ* 15 (1965) pp. 103–104.

*e. Ben Sira and the Dead Sea Scrolls*

§150. Is there any connections between the language of the DSS and that of Ben Sira? The special grammatical and lexical features characteristic of the DSS have yet to be studied. The following case is interesting. The root זוב is not found in Hebrew in Hif'il, but it does occur in the Geniza fragment with the meaning 'to cause to flow' (38, 16), and the Isaiah Scroll reads הזיב instead of הזיל in 48, 21. The word נהיה 'which hap-



pens', important in the DSS, occurs in the Geniza fragments (42, 19; plural). For the spelling מונים see above §140.

*Literature:*

Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, p. 233;

P. Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual of Discipline*, Leiden 1957, p. 68 n. 48.

## B. The Dead Sea Scrolls

§151. The story of the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls has been told many times. Therefore, we shall restrict ourselves to relating the essentials needed for linguistic analysis. Since 1947, when the first discoveries were made, scholars have been publishing scrolls and fragments of scrolls found in caves around the Dead Sea. The bulk of these findings originally belonged to the library of a Jewish sect (probably the Essenes) that dwelled in what is today Khirbet Qumran near the northern edge of the Dead Sea. The material coming from this library consists mainly of 1) portions and even whole books of the Jewish Bible and Apocrypha and Pseudographa and 2) Secrearian writings, hymns, manuals, commentaries on Biblical books etc.

### I. *The Isaiah Scroll*

§152. For our purposes not only the second kind is of great importance but also some Biblical books and fragments, especially the Isaiah Scroll found in cave 1 (1Q Isa<sup>a</sup>). The text of this Scroll is by and large identical with the Masoretic Isaiah, but differs from it mainly in its language, e.g., the spelling, the phonetics underlying the spelling, morphology, and to a certain extent, vocabulary, as well as syntax. Today it can be stated that linguistically the Scroll is generally considered to be a popular version of Isaiah, reflecting the linguistic situation prevailing in Palestine during the last centuries before the Common Era. As yet, no comprehensive, detailed linguistic study has been made of any of this material except for the Isaiah Scroll. Therefore the following account is based mainly on the language of this Scroll.

*Literature:*

- [E.Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isdiah Scroll (1 Q Isa<sup>a</sup>)*, Jerusalem 1959 (Hebrew), Leiden 1974 (English); E. Qimron, *A Grammar of the Hebrew Language of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Ph.D. dissertation, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1976 (in Hebrew).]

## II. *The Language of the DSS as Reflected in the Isaiah Scroll*

### a. *Proper Names*

§153. The forms of proper names constitute the best proof of the late provenience of the Scroll. The name of the city of Damascus is a case in point. The Masoretic text of Isaiah reads דַּמָּשֶׁק, whereas the Scroll has דרמשק seven times. The early sources of this name, viz. the Egyptian, Akkadian, and Aramaic inscriptions show only a form without [r] that parallels the Masoretic form. This is true also of BH where the form of דרמשק occurs only in the Book of Chronicles. It then appears in MH and Syriac.

The same picture emerges from the form of the theophoric names in the pattern of יִשְׁעִיָּהּ, הַזְּקִיָּהּ etc. In the Scroll these names are nearly always found in the shorter form as יִשְׁעִיָּהּ, הַזְּקִיָּהּ which, as pointed out above (§89) are the later ones. Also the spelling of the names יְרוּשָׁלַיִם (mostly with *yod*) as against the spelling without *yod* in SBH (see above §118), and דוֹיֵד (always plene) point toward a late origin. These proper names alone are a convincing proof that the Scroll reflects a “modernized” version of Isaiah. What was the aim of this “modernization” of the language? The linguistic background provides the answer.

### b. *The Linguistic Background*

§154. “During the last centuries before the Common Era, Classical Biblical Hebrew ceased to exist as a spoken language. Hebrew, as far as it was spoken, was no longer Biblical Hebrew but Mishnaic Hebrew which differed greatly from it in morphology, vocabulary and syntax. Generally, Aramaic, which during the previous centuries had become the *lingua franca* of the Near East, served as the vernacular in Palestine, apparently in several dialects. (From a later period we know of three spoken dialects, viz.

Galilean Aramaic, Samaritan Aramaic and Christian Aramaic of Palestine.)

As a result of this situation, the common people's understanding of the Bible was very limited. It may be safely assumed that only those words, forms and phrases had a chance to be understood which still survived in Mishnaic Hebrew, or had cognates in Aramaic or occurred relatively frequently in the Bible. In other words, the common people knew only a kind of Basic Biblical Hebrew. *Hapax legomena* and even rare words and constructions from the Hebrew Bible were no longer understood.

Furthermore, the common people were not even able to read the ancient text properly, as vocalization had not yet been invented. Doubtless there was a strong tendency to substitute the Aramaic pronunciation for the Hebrew in the cases of homographic words in both languages, e.g., ראש, לא (=לא, ראש in Hebrew, ראש, לא in Aramaic).

In light of all these factors, I believe that along with the official text of the Bible, a certain type of vulgar text also emerged."

Therefore we may assume that many of those points in which the Scroll differs linguistically from the Masoretic Isaiah represent characteristics of the literary Hebrew of the last centuries of the first millennium B.C.E.

#### *Literature:*

Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, pp. 3–5; 96–125.

[The section in quotation marks is a quote (with slight changes and omissions) from the English summary of the Hebrew original of the author's *Isaiah Scroll*.]

#### *c. Spelling.*

§155. The spelling tends to be plene not only for long vowels, but also for originally PS short vowels (including those that remained short in Hebrew), and also for *hatafs*, e.g., לאמור=לאמר, אוניה=אנניה, כולם=כלם, מיחיים=מחיים, יטול=יטל. In addition, the DSS developed a type of spelling very rarely met with in BH, e.g., לוא=לא, מיא=מי, כיא=כי, רואש=ראש.

#### *Literature:*

Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, pp. 5–8, 126–186.

[Unlike the other short PS vowels, short PS /i/ is spelled defectively, namely, without a *yod*; see Qimron, *Grammar* (above §152), p. 53. — E.Q.]

*d. Phonology*

§156. The pharyngals ע, ח, and the laryngals ה, א, apparently weakened, at least in the speech of the members of the sect. This caused them to be very often confused in the Isaiah Scroll and sometimes in the other Scrolls. Examples of this are: נרהב=נרְחָב, יהיה=יְחִיָּה, אנה=הִנֵּה, יבור=יְעֻבֵר. This is one of the many characteristics which the Scrolls share with the Samaritan Pentateuch (see §179). Cf. also the discussion above §28.

*Literature:*

Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, pp. 57, 505-511.

*e. Morphology*

1. *Pronouns.* §157. The most striking trait of the language of the DSS is represented by the forms of some of the personal pronouns as well as the parallel pronominal suffixes (cf. Table 2). Instead of אַתָּם the form אַתְמָה sometimes occurs, which, as H.L. Ginsberg immediately remarked, is identical with that of the Samaritan oral tradition. It may be assumed that both אַתְמָה and other pronominal forms characteristic of the Scrolls do not represent early forms but are the result of the process of internal Hebrew analogy, (paralleling a similar process in modern Arabic dialects). On the other hand, suffixes of the type חִי of the perfect (second pers. sing. fem.) כִּי of the noun (second pers. sing. fem. poss. pron.), which at first glance seem to be archaisms, are "mirage" forms since they are actually Aramaisms (see above §54). There is still no clear-cut answer to the problem of the forms הוּא-הוּא, הוּא-הוּא. They, too, may be the product of the analogical process mentioned above, but the possibility of the survival of early forms cannot be excluded.

It should be pointed out that the spelling of the כִּי type (poss. pron. second pers. sing. masc.) instead of the Biblical חִי effectively demolishes the contention of Kahle discussed above (§46). This spelling clearly demonstrates that the ending was indeed חִי and not חִי as he maintained.

*Literature:*

Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, pp. 45-52; 433-451;

H.L. Ginsberg, *BASOR* no. 112 (1948), p. 20 n. 3.

2. *The Verb.* §158. Many forms that look like BH pausal forms (i.e. forms that, according to the Tiberian vocalization, occur at the end of clauses and sentences), occur in context in the DSS e.g., תחפורו 'you shall blush' (Isa. 1, 29). There is reason to believe that these forms represent a pronunciation which, at least in the verb, stressed not the ultima (the last syllable), prevalent in BH according to the Tiberian Masoretic vocalization, but the penultima (the next to the last syllable). This trait in the Scrolls seems to reflect the later pronunciation that became prevalent in substandard Hebrew at this period, and which is therefore also prominent in MH, the spoken language of the period and even in an Aramaic dialect spoken in Palestine (cf. below §252). Another characteristic of the DSS is the use of the long imperfect, e.g., ואכרותה 'I felled (trees)' (Isa. 37, 24). The Scrolls share this characteristic with some later books of the Bible such as Ezra and Nehemiah (but not Chronicles); cf. above §120. Archaic forms tend to disappear; תבִּעוֹן בעו (Isa. 21, 12), for example, becomes תבעוֹן בעו. (See also our discussion above §100.)

Participles of the neutral verbs, such as שֹׁכֵן (cf. §62) sometimes appear as in the "regular" (active) form, e.g., שוכן 'dweller' (Isa. 33, 24). Verbs that are vocalized with [a] in the imperfect Qal in BH appear in the Scroll with a *waw*, e.g., יִחַרְבּ=יחרוב (Isa. 19, 5). This tendency is also conspicuous in MH as well as in later Aramaic dialects.

Sometimes verbs are used in a stem different from that in BH. In most such cases it can be shown that this change goes back to the tendency to adapt to later usage, e.g., יִקַּח (the passive of the Qal is replaced six times in the Isaiah Scroll by the later Nif'al יִלְקַח; and cf. above §48). Instead of יִקְדִּישׁוּ שְׁמִי 'they will sanctify My name' (29, 23) the Isaiah Scroll reads יִקְדִּישׁוּ שְׁמִי apparently because in MH it is the Pi'el which is employed in this meaning.

Two instances are remarkable: The word משור 'twisted' is vocalized in BH as a Hof'al participle, e.g., Ex. 26, 1, while in the Milḥamah Scroll it appears as משזור, i.e. as a participle of the Pu'al. This form may reflect a tradition different from ours, as in the following case: In BH the root כשל 'stumble' is employed in the perfect and in the participle in the Qal, while in the imperfect it is nearly always vocalized as Nif'al. It is therefore remarkable that in DSS it is spelled as the imperfect Qal, e.g., יכשולו (Isa. 40, 30). It has been pointed out that the Masoretic tendency is to vocalize forms according to their usage in the latest layer of spoken BH. In the root כשל this tendency is already clearly evident in a few cases in BH, e.g.,

נִכְשָׁלִים (I Sam. 2, 4) and the infinitive Nif'al הִכְשַׁל (Dan 11, 34). Therefore it is possible that the writer of the DSS clung to the earlier form which was apparently the use of Qal in all the tenses. As this form is also employed in the Christian Aramaic of Palestine, it is therefore possible that it was the Aramaic dialect of the writers which prompted them to prefer the Qal.

Another instance is clearly the result of the late development of the merging of the ל"א and ל"י roots (see §63). In MH, for example, instead of BH לְקָרָא 'to read' לְקָרוּת (the ל"י form) is used. Thus the writers of DSS who tried to imitate BH, apparently sometimes erroneously used a genuine ל"י verb as if it were a ל"א verb (hyper-correction). This is apparently why they use לְכַלָּה (often spelled with *he* instead of *alef* in the DSS) as if the root were BH כָּלָא. The Aramaic forms in this field will be discussed later (§171).

*Literature:*

Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, pp. 39–44; 315–365

[On מְשׁוּר which occurs also in the Samaritan tradition see Qimron, *Grammar*, (above §152) p. 179. — E.Q.]

3. *The Noun.* §159. Here, too, archaic forms tend to disappear from the Scrolls, e.g., חֵית יַעַר instead of חֵיתוֹ יַעַר 'beasts of the forest' (Isa. 56, 9 twice; cf. above §114). The same also applies to the archaic form שְׁנִי (see *ibid.*) which appears in a modernized form as שֹׁדָה. The spelling אוּהוּר 'tent' and כּוּבוּר = כְּבֹד 'hardness' (MD IV 11) indicate that the noun pattern *quṭl*, which in BH is vocalized as קֻטַּל could occur in the DSS as קוּטוּל (also as קטול, as in Aramaic). In this respect, the DSS parallel the Septuagint e.g., *Moloch*=Hebrew מֹלֶךְ (cf. below §176) and Christian Aramaic of Palestine. The form חוּזִיר as against BH חֲזִיר 'swine' is identical with that of the Babylonian vocalization and of Christian Aramaic of Palestine. Therefore, this form indicates, like many others, that the dialect spoken or written by the members of the sect was not identical with the Hebrew preserved by the Masoretes of Tiberias. Forms like נְגִיעִים (plural of נִגַע 'plague') which in BH is נִגְעִים, are paralleled by פְּסָל-פְּסִילִים 'image' in BH, but they are much more common in MH (cf. plural of נָזַק 'damage' as in the name of the Mishnaic tractate נְזִיקִין). Therefore, this tendency perhaps betrays the influence of the spoken Hebrew of that period, i.e. MH.

Another instance which clearly goes back to the influence of LBH is the

plural form of the type פְּלִשְׁתִּים. In SBH the plural is פְּלִשְׁתִּים, while in LBH פְּלִשְׁתִּים emerges. The same form is to be met with in DSS, e.g., Isa. 11, 4.

*Literature:*

Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, pp. 55, 502–504; 374; 511–515;  
 . י. ליכט, מגילת ההודיות, ירושלים תשי"ז, עמ' 9.

4. *Particles.* §160. The form מַאדָּה (also spelled מוֹדָה, מוֹאדָה) as against BH מָאָד 'very', e.g., Isa. 47, 6, may also reflect an earlier usage that was later abandoned. The picture is entirely different in the case of אוֹי. In the Isaiah Scroll, instead of אוֹי לִי 'woe is me', we read אִילִי (6, 5). This is not a scribal error, because this form is found twice in Ecclesiastes. What is more, Mishnaic MSS established the fact that in MH only אִילִי is used. Hence it was the printers and copyists who corrected this form to אוֹי לִי under the influence of BH (see §§46, 195). Thus, this change in the Isaiah Scroll is due to the influence of the later usage.

*Literature:*

Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, 390; 413–414;  
 . י. קוטשר, לשון חז"ל, ספר חנוך ילון, ירושלים תשכ"ג  
 עמ' 266–267 [= מחקרים, עמ' צג-צד].

*f. Syntax*

§161. The writers of the sectarian scrolls tried to imitate SBH, but lapses in the use of the *waw* conversive (cf. §66) indicate that they were not completely at ease with this usage. Some characteristics indicate that their language should be in some respect considered as an offshoot of LBH, especially Chronicles (as alluded to above, see §159 פְּלִשְׁתִּים). A case in point is the employment of the infinitive construct plus לֹא for the prohibitive, e.g., לֹא לִצְעוּד 'they must not walk' (MD I 13). This construction, which is practically absent from SBH, is all the more interesting since it crops up in the languages spoken in Jerusalem at the time, as we see from Aramaic and Greek inscriptions of Jerusalem (and also in Punic, i.e. late Canaanite of North Africa). We mentioned above (§115) that BH sometimes employs relative clauses without the relative pronoun. Since this construction does not appear in LBH and MH, the writer of the Isaiah Scroll tries to rid the text of it in different ways, e.g., instead of בְּדַרְךָ תֵּלֵךְ 'in the way you should go' (48, 17), he simply adds the relative pronoun אֲשֶׁר:

בדרך אשר תלך. The same applies to the phrase צום אֶבְחַרְהוּ 'the fast that I choose' to which he adds both the article and the relative pronoun הַצּוּם אֲשֶׁר הוּא, while in וְהוֹלֵכְתִי עִוְרִים בְּדֶרֶךְ לֹא יָדְעוּ 'and I will lead the blind in a way they know not' (42, 16), the writer of the Scroll apparently misunderstood the construction and changed לֹא יָדְעוּ into יָדְעוּ וְלֹא.

### g. Vocabulary

1. *On the Absence of Greek and Latin Loans in the DSS.* §162. At first sight it is astonishing that the DSS should contain so few new foreign loans except for Aramaic and those that are already part and parcel of BH. The Greek loans especially are conspicuous by their absence, a most astounding fact since the sectarian scrolls are generally dated from the first century B.C.E. to the first century C.E., that is to say, about 200-300 years after the conquest by Alexander (see above §152), and in MH Greek loans abound. The lack of Latin loans is less surprising because Roman rule had been extended over Palestine only shortly before this time. How, then, are we to explain this strange paucity of foreign loans in the DSS?

As mentioned above (§161), the goal of the writers was to employ BH and this may have led them to avoid newcomers from other languages, and Greek and Latin loans are easily identifiable as such. Moreover, apparently before the influx of a foreign vocabulary becomes possible, a kind of language resistance must be overcome and this takes time. The table drawn up by Jespersen shows how rare French words were in English during the first 150 years after the Norman conquest in 1066. Only later was there a massive invasion of French words into the English vocabulary. In our case, when we consider this fact and bear in mind that these were religious writings, this resistance was probably much stronger than in the case of English.

#### Literature:

O. Jespersen, *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, Oxford 1943, §§94, 95.

α. *A Loan Translation from Latin?* §163. While loans from Greek and Latin seem to be practically nonexistent, the problem of *loan translations* should be investigated. Y. Yadin, in *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* deals extensively with terminology of



weapons, tactics and organization employed in that Scroll. He points out that some of these terms parallel Latin terms, and bear “an astonishing resemblance to the list of names of battle formations employed by the Roman army”. Some of the terms appearing in both lists correspond literally, especially *alae* ‘wings’, *turres* ‘towers’ which are כנפים and מגדלות in the Scroll.

We therefore could assume that the writer, or those who coined these terms, while eschewing direct loans from Latin, coined new Hebrew terms as loan translations, modeled after the Latin terms. This is, for example, the way in which Old English often proceeded when, after the English had embraced Christianity, instead of taking over the Greek or Latin terms, they translated them into their own language. The Greek *euaggélion* was turned into *god-spell*, hence *gospel* today. If the English chose this course, we are certainly entitled to assume that the Jews did likewise when they had to employ technical terms used by their enemy — the Romans.

But here we are treading on dangerous ground, for the Latin *turris* might well be a loan translation of Greek *púrgos* which has the same meaning, and already occurs in Homer. But can a Semitic origin be excluded? As to *alae* — BH אגף which also seems to have both meanings, would caution us against a hasty conclusion.

#### Literature:

- Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*, Oxford 1962, p. 184;  
O. Jespersen, *op. cit.* (above §162) §41.

2. *A Persian Loanword.* §164. A new Persian loan, נחשיר, makes its appearance in the Scrolls. As pointed out by Asmussen, in Persian the word probably means ‘hunting for pleasure’ (rather than for a livelihood). Therefore it was eminently suited for the purposes of the sect for describing the terrible punishment to be meted out to the evil-doers at the end of days. The inhabitants of Palestine were no doubt familiar with the battue, organized by the Persian satraps and the entourage in the wide hunting grounds of the פרדסים where the animals were slaughtered en masse at will, simply to satisfy the hunters’ lust for blood.

#### Literature:

- קוטשר, מלים ותולדותיהן, עמ' 22–23.

### 3. *The Hebrew Vocabulary*

a. *Biblical Hebrew Vocabulary*. §165. As mentioned, the DSS' attempt to imitate BH is very conspicuous in their vocabulary. The Hodayot Scroll makes especially indiscriminate use of all the layers of Hebrew i.e. SBH e.g., גבול 'boundary', ABH e.g., הופיע 'to appear', LBH e.g., קץ 'time, period'.

But in these writings, there already appears a new BH element which was destined to become an important feature to this very day. Quite often (in the manner of IH, see §385) the DSS employ rare roots and words whose proper meaning was no longer known. In such a case, the Scrolls would assign them a meaning not based on living usage or oral tradition, but upon the authors' interpretations of the verse in the Bible where that rare word occurs. Sometimes this interpretation would be correct, but other times, of course, it could be wrong. Let us give a few instances. In Jonah 4, 8 in the expression רוח קדים חרישית '... east wind', the word חרישית, translated 'sultry', is unclear but this did not prevent the author of the Hodayot from using it in the phrase כאוניה בועף חרישית 'like a ship...' where חרישית should apparently be rendered as 'storm' (ועף=rage). As recognized by scholars, this use originated in a certain interpretation of the verse quoted above. (The word does not appear elsewhere). This also accounts for the feminine חרישית which goes well with רוח (feminine) in Jonah but not with ועף. Another instance is in Peshar Habakkuk 6, 11 where we read נערים אשישים וזקנים ונשים וטף 'boys... old men, women, and children'. According to the context, אשישים can only have the meaning of 'old', 'young', or in between. Indeed the word ישיש which seems to be very close to our אשיש appears in Job several times with the meaning of 'aged'. But if that be so, we should expect ישישים and not אשישים. Where, then, did the writer get the form אשישים from? It apparently arose through the interpretation of the verse לְאֲשִׁישֵׁי קִיר חֲרָשֶׁת (Isa. 16, 7). Here the meaning of אשישי is by no means clear. Some translate it 'raisin cakes', others prefer to explain it as 'walls'. The writer of the Hodayot apparently interpreted it under the influence of ישיש 'old man' in the way of the Greek interpreter Aquila (third century C.E.). This interpretation might have been facilitated by the fact that in a parallel verse, Jer 48, 36, we find אַנְשֵׁי קִיר חֲרָשׁ 'men of Kir-heres'.

Another interesting case is the word תְּעוּדָה. In BH it occurs three times and it seems to mean 'attesting', as in Ruth 4, 7 where it is formed from the

root עוּד 'to witness'. Somehow, though, the writer of the DSS seems to have interpreted the word as if it were derived from the root יַעַד and seems to employ it with the meaning מוֹעֵד 'time'.

There are many more such cases, but there is no doubt that the overwhelming majority of the BH words are in accordance with BH usage.

Sometimes the DSS highlight overlooked meanings of BH. One of these cases is the word קָץ e.g., MD IV 16, 17. In the DSS, MH and Aramaic dialects it means 'time'. This led E.L. Sukenik to realize that the same meaning is extant also in BH, but was misinterpreted to mean 'end' until the discovery of the DSS. The correct meaning is especially conspicuous in LBH, e.g., קָץ קָץ, בָּא, בָּא הֶקֶץ (Ezek. 7, 6); the synonymous expression בָּא הַיָּעַת (ibid. 7 and 12) proves that קָץ means 'time'. It also replaces the earlier קָצָה in the Isaiah Scroll (2, 7 twice).

Yadin believes that BH כִּידוֹן (spelled כִּידוֹן in the Milḥama Scroll) does not mean 'lance' but 'sword' and שָׁלֵט does not mean 'shield' but several types of weapons. The use of these words in the Milḥama Scroll led Yadin to reexamine these nouns in BH.

#### Literature:

א.ל. סוקניק, מגילות גנוזות, ירושלים 1948, עמ' 22;

Ch. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents*, Oxford 1954, p. 2;

Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, p. 283;

Yadin, *The Scroll of the War* etc. (above §163), pp. 129–131; 133–134;

M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, vol. I, New Haven 1950, (Peshar Habakkuk);

י. ליכט, מגילת ההודיות, ירושלים תשי"ז, עמ' 121 (חרישית).

β. *Mishnaic Hebrew Vocabulary*. §166. There are already a few elements in DSS that are otherwise found only in MH: גודל (Milḥamah V 13) = MH גודל, 'thumb', מועט (= BH מְעַט = MH מוֹעַט 'small' (MD IV 16). An interesting case is that of זעטוט 'young man'. The Mishnaic sources tell us that one manuscript that was found in the Temple read זעטוטי instead of נַעְרִי in Ex. 24, 5. Until a few years ago the word was problematic and scholars even thought that it might be Greek. The word זעטוט in the DSS settled the problem once and for all. (Incidentally, the root has also turned up in Arabic and Aramaic).

*Literature:*

Ch. Rabin, "The Historical Background of Qumran Hebrew", *Scripta Hierosolymitana*, IV, 1958 pp. 144ff., 148 (מועט);  
Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, p. 81 n. 2.

γ. *Vocabulary from Unknown Sources.* §167. We cannot determine whether the new roots and words which have thus far been found only in the Scrolls are survivals from BH which only by mere chance do not appear there or are loans from some language or dialect unknown to us, like the words בִּדְן, אֲבִדְן, (Milḥamah V 6, 9; meaning unclear), and ממוזים (ibid. V 8; also not entirely clear).

*h. The Aramaic Influence*

§168. The Aramaic influence is all pervasive. The Isaiah Scroll especially is permeated by Aramaic elements, but they are to be found in the other Scrolls as well.

*1. In Morphology.*

α *Pronouns.* §169. The fem. second pers. sing. אחי in the Isaiah Scroll 51, 10, 12 does not represent the old form (cf. §53) but is a "mirage" form under the influence of Aramaic (see §54; thus also in the Samaritan Pentateuch, below §180). The same holds true for the possessive suffix of the sing. and plural fem. e.g., לכי (=לך) (Isa. 40, 9). It can be shown that the Aramaic forms replace the Hebrew ones also in MH, as in the case of the Aramaic possessive suffix of the third pers. sing. in עלוהי (=H עליו) 'upon him' (Isa. 2, 2), רגלוהי (=H רגליו) 'his feet' (MD VI 13).

β. *Noun Formation.* §170. Several nouns appear in Aramaic form, e.g., בסור (=בסר; Isa. 18, 5). As mentioned above (§159), the Semitic *quṭl* noun-pattern appears in Hebrew as קטל, in Aramaic as קטל, but in the DSS as קוטול (and קטול) as these and other instances prove. (See also about the Septuagint, below §176). Instead of Hebrew חשכה 'darkness' (Isa. 8, 22) we find the Aramaic חשוכה. It is worth mentioning that instead of BH לֶהָב 'blade' in Milḥamah we find לוהב, e.g., VI 2. A change from the *qaṭl* pattern to the *quṭl* pattern which in itself is possible also in Hebrew, but in Hodayoth II 26 we find להוב, a clear-cut Aramaic form.

γ. *The Verb.* §171. The second pers. sing. fem. perfect very often appears with the ending תי־ e.g., שכחתי 'you have forgotten' (Isa. 17, 10). As pointed out above (§53) this is also probably due to the Aramaic influence. The same applies to this form in the Samaritan Pentateuch (see §181). The Qal imperative has forms like דרושו 'seek' (= דרשו; Isa. 1, 17) This may be either the Aramaic form, or the BH pausal form employed in context. Instead of מִסִּיר 'is taking away', (Isa. 3, 1) we find מהסיר, a clear-cut Aramaic form. The Isaiah scroll reading of הכרות פניהם instead of הפַּרְתָּ פְּנֵיהֶם 'partiality', (3, 9) seems to be another result of the influence of Aramaic which requires the ending ת־ in the construct in this infinitive pattern (which is here employed as a verbal noun). As to the noun pattern itself, see above §103. ואין להשנות 'nothing to be changed' MD III 16, i.e. the Hif'il instead of the Pi'el לשנות, ואין להשנות, is a change which is due to Aramaic, since in Biblical Aramaic the root is employed in the Haf'el (=Hebrew Hif'il; and cf. below §173).

*Literature:*

Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, pp. 23–29; 187–215.

2. *In the Vocabulary.* §172. Here we find quite a few Aramaic loan-words. The prominence of the root סרך in the DSS is apparently due to Aramaic. It means 'order', and is very much like Greek *táksis* 'battle array, ordinance', etc. The root סדר, which occurs very frequently in Milḥamah e.g., VII 8 with the meaning 'battle order', is also apparently Aramaic. While these two roots also occur in BH (with not exactly the same meanings) the root גבל 'knead' e.g., Hodayot III 24 is Aramaic and is also loaned to MH.

*Literature:*

P. Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual of Discipline*, Leiden 1957, p. 46; י. ליכט, מגילת ההודיות, ירושלים תשי"ז, עמ' 61.

α. *Aramaic Calques.* §173. A good instance of an Aramaic calque is the expression אוחזי אבות MD II 9. As Wernberg-Møller has shown, this is a calque from Aramaic where אחד אבות means 'to intercede'. The calque was made possible by the correct identification on the part of the bilingual Hebrew Aramaic speakers of אחד אבות with אחד אבות. The Aramaic phrase, in turn, is a calque from Akkadian.

BH כוס 'glass' is feminine, but in the Isaiah Scroll (51, 22f.) it appears as

masculine apparently because of the Aramaic influence (as happened in MH, see §243). For a calque in verbal stem usage see above §171. Further research will doubtless reveal many more instances of Aramaic calques.

*Literature:*

Wernberg-Møller, *op. cit.* (§172) p. 53;

י. קוטשר, תרביץ לג (תשכ"ד), עמ' 125, 128 [=מחקרים, ע'מ חא-חב, תד];

Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, pp. 43f., 394.

### C. Other Contemporary Sources

#### I. *The Transliterations of the Septuagint*

§174. The transliterations of the Septuagint are from the same period as the Book of Ben Sira and the DSS (third–second centuries B.C.E.). The material is restricted to the proper names which appear in Greek transliterations. Nonetheless, they are quite instructive with regard to many linguistic points.

##### a. *Phonology*

§175 The transliteration of the consonants /h, ' / has been dealt with in §25 and we shall restrict our discussion here to the vowels. BH short [i] is nearly always transliterated by Greek ε, e.g., הֵלֵל *Hellel*. We have reason to believe that in the spoken Aramaic of the period short [i] did not exist and was replaced by [ε] as shown by vocalized text of the Jerusalem Targum edited by Kahle. The same apparently holds good for the short [u], which was replaced by [o]. That is why the name יִפְנָה (Nu 13, 6) for example, appears in the Septuagint as *Iephonnē*. It is possible that the same state of affairs prevailed in MH (see §200).

The place name עֲדֻלַם is transliterated in the Septuagint as *Odollam*, e.g., Josh 12, 15. The first [o] points up the tendency of the Septuagint to color the half vowel (*shva* or *ḥataf*) by the quality of the following vowel. This rule may also account for the first vowel to be found in the names *Sodoma* and *Gomorra*, as against the Masoretic vocalization עֲמֹרָה, סְדוֹם. In both the first vowel is apparently a semi-vowel that was pronounced [o] because of the following full vowel.

Another characteristic of the transliterations is that in a closed unaccent-

ed syllable the Septuagint very often has the vowel [a] where the Masoretic vocalization shows [i] e.g., *Balaam* בַּלְעָם (Nu. 22, 5) etc., *Magdól* = מַגְדֹּל (e.g., Ex. 14, 2).

*Literature:*

G. Lisowsky, *Die Transkription der hebräischen Eigennamen des Pentateuch in der Septuaginta*, Ph.D. dissertation, Basel 1940, pp.124–127;

Bergsträsser, *HG I*, pp. 61, 120;

Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, pp. 500–501.

[קוטשר, מחקרים, עמ' קלו-קלז].

*b. Morphology*

§176. Since the transliterations consist only of proper nouns, we can learn very little about the morphology. One of the few examples is the following: As is known, the so-called segolates, as, e.g., סֵפֶר 'book' were originally monosyllabic and the second vowel is secondary. For this reason these nouns are stressed penultimately (on the original vowel). In the Masoretic vocalization the second vowel is mostly a *segol* (hence the name segolates), and sometimes, under the influence of *he*, *het* and '*ayin*, a *pataḥ* (e.g., נָעַר 'youth'), but never [o]. The Septuagint does have an [o] as a secondary vowel in certain cases of the *quṭl* pattern, e.g., Hebrew מֹלֶךְ which is transliterated *Moloch* (e.g., II Kings 23, 10). The same apparently applies to the DSS (see above §159).

It is interesting to note that a form peculiar to the Septuagint but absent from the Masoretic text managed to survive within the Jewish community until today. The father of David is called, according to the Masoretic vocalization, יֵשַׁי. The Septuagint transliterated it *Iessai*, that is to say, with the doubling of the /s/. (There is no /š/ in Greek.) It was pointed out by Yalon that this form still exists in certain prayer books of the Sephardic community in the form יֵשַׁי.

*Literature:*

Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, pp. 502–504;

ח. ילון, קרית ספר לב (תשי"ז), 99–98.

## II. *The Samaritan Pentateuch*

§177. After the severance of the Samaritan community's ties with the Temple of Jerusalem and with the Jewish communities some time during the fifth century B.C.E. (cf. Neh 3, 19-20), the Samaritan community was centered mainly around its temple in Shechem (Nablus). From the Jewish Bible they possess only the Pentateuch, written in old Hebrew characters. When this version became known in Europe during the seventeenth century, non-Jewish scholars believed that they now had what they considered a more "original" text than the Jewish Pentateuch. But about 150 years ago, the famous Semitist Wilhelm Gesenius established that the SP is merely a popular version of the Jewish Pentateuch. This assumption was proved correct by the discovery of the DSS, since, as already pointed out above (§156), the Scrolls share quite a few characteristics with the SP which are absent from the Jewish Bible. It may be said that the relationship between the language of the SP and the Hebrew Pentateuch parallels that of Chronicles and Samuel and Kings on the one hand, and especially the relationship between the Dead Sea Isaiah to the Masoretic Isaiah on the other. Incidentally, among the DSS there were found fragments of MSS of the SP type. That is why in the SP the spelling is more plene, archaic forms tend to disappear, and rare words and roots are replaced by their common parallels. Though a modern investigation of the peculiarities of the SP has yet to be made, there seems to be sufficient evidence for bearing out this assumption as the following instances will prove.

### *Literature:*

E. Würthwein, *The Texts of the Old Testament*, Oxford 1957, pp. 31-32;  
F.M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*,  
Garden City 1961, pp. 192-193.

### *a. Spelling*

§178. The spelling of the SP tends to be more plene than that of BH, e.g., מאורות 'lights' (Gen. 1, 14, 16) = MT מארת, אותות 'signs' (ibid 14) = MT אהת. To a certain extent it also parallels the type of spelling found in the DSS, e.g., ראישון 'first' (ibid 25, 25) = MT ראשון, מית, ראשון 'dead' (ibid 23, 3) = MT מית. Naturally, the archaic spelling of the possessive suffix of the third pers. sing. masc. (that is, *he* instead of *waw*, cf. above §112) is eliminated;



אָהֶלָה 'his tent' (Gen. 9, 21; 12, 8; 13, 3) and עִירָה 'his foal' (ibid 49, 11) are spelled אהלו, עירו respectively in the SP.

*Literature:*

Würthwein, (§177), p. 31.

Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, pp. 21, 175.

*b. Phonology*

§179. The most striking characteristic of the Samaritan Pentateuch is the confusion of the gutturals (laryngals and pharyngals) which we find also in the DSS, e.g., הַבְּדֵלָה (Gen 2, 12) instead of הַבְּדִלָּח in several MSS, שָׁחַם instead of שָׁחַם. Instead of הַשִּׁיאָנִי (Gen. 3, 13) some MSS read אֲשִׁינִי others הַשִּׁינִי and still others הַשִּׁיעֲנִי. As for the vowels, it is worthwhile noting that according to the oral transmission — differing in many respects in the pronunciation of consonants and vowels from that of the Jews — short [u] has disappeared altogether from Samaritan Hebrew e.g., אַחַק = 'law'. The /b, g, d, k, p, t/ survive with one pronunciation each, although according to Samaritan grammarians of the Middle Ages four of them still had two realizations. שׁ is pronounced =שׁ. About כִּתְנָה (= כְּתָנָה) see above §98.

*Literature:*

ז. בְּ-חִיִּים, לְשׁוֹנְנוּ יֵב (תש"ג) עמ' 55-58.

ז. בְּ-חִיִּים, עֵבְרִית וְאַרְמִית נּוֹסַח שׁוֹמְרוֹן, כִּרְךְ הַ, יְרוּשָׁלַיִם]

.37-20 עמ' 1977 — G.S.]

*c. Morphology*

1. *Pronouns.* §180. Instead of the form אַתְּ (second pers. sg. fem.) we mainly find אַחִי e.g., Gen 12, 11. Again this is scarcely a survival of an earlier form, but rather a revival made via Aramaic, that is to say, a "mirage" form (see above §54), as pointed out by Ben-Hayyim and others.

*Literature:*

ז. בְּ-חִיִּים, לְשׁוֹנְנוּ יֵב (תש"ג), עמ' 115;

ז. בְּ-חִיִּים, עֵבְרִית וְאַרְמִית

— G.S., E.Q.] עמ' 74-75, 167-168.

2. *The Verb.* § 181. Instead of the second pers. sg. fem. perfect קָטַלְתְּ we find

אתי e.g., יצחקתי 'you (f.) laughed' = MT צַחֲקֶתָּהּ (Gen 18, 15). Like אחי (§180), this too, seems to be a "mirage" form. There seems to have been a tendency to employ the normal forms instead of the short forms of the imperfect, e.g., ירבה 'let... increase' = MT יִרְבֶּה (Gen. 1, 22). It is not surprising that the passive Qal also tends to disappear as in LBH and DSS (see above §§122, 158 respectively) and instead of גָּנַב גִּנְבֹתִי 'I was kidnapped' (Gen 40, 15), we find in SP גנוב וגנבתי the "normal" Nif'al.

*Literature:*

ז. בן-חיים, לשוננו יב (תש"ג), עמ' 119, 125.

Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, 188, 328.

— ז. בן-חיים, עברית וארמית נוסח שומרון, כך ה, עמ' 78, 129, 130-132. — G.S.]

3. *The Noun.* §182. Instead of the archaic תַּחֲתוֹ 'wild beasts' (Gen. 1, 25) the SP employs the normal חית as do the DSS (above §159). Archaic *mem* of קָמְיוֹ מְתַנִּים (above §110) disappears from the Samaritan text, and instead we find the "normal" מתני קמיו 'the loins of his foes' (Deut. 33, 11). Hebrew חֲמִשׁ = 'one-fifth' (Gen. 47, 26) is replaced by the Aramaic form חמוש. Instead of the ABH יָמוֹת 'days' (Deut. 32, 7), which survived in MH, יומת is employed.

*Literature:*

ז. בן-חיים, עברית וארמית נוסח שומרון, כך ג ספר ראשון, ירושלים תשכ"א, עמ' 158.

*d. Vocabulary.*

§183. In the vocabulary, too, the tendency of replacing unknown roots and forms is clearly discernible, e.g., לו 'oh that' (Gen. 17, 18) where the SP reads לוי which means the same in MH and Aramaic dialects. In other places in the Pentateuch the SP reads this word either לו or corrects it to לא 'no' or to לי 'to me'. Another instance is to be found in Gen. 24, 20 וַתְּעַר כַּדָּה 'emptying her jar' where the SP reads ותורד כדה. A look into the Bible Concordance will immediately reveal the reason for this change. The word is a *hapax legomenon* (a word mentioned only once) in the Pentateuch, although it is found more often in the rest of Bible. For this reason the Samaritans apparently did not know its meaning and replaced it, with

the help of the context, with the well-known root ירד 'to go down', here in the Hif'il, meaning 'to lower'.

An interesting case is the replacement of the *hapax legomenon* סוּתָה 'his robe' (Gen. 49, 11) by כְּסוּתוֹ. The latter word occurs several times in the Pentateuch (see above §116).

### e. The Aramaic Influence

§184. Aramaisms have been noted in the previous paragraphs (§§180–181). One more instance is illuminating. אִישׁ וְאִשָּׁה אֶל אֶחָתָהּ and אֶל אֶחָיו (Ex. 25, 20; 26, 3, 5, 6, 17; 37, 9) e.g., וּפְנֵיהֶם אִישׁ אֶל אֶחָיו 'They (the cherubim) shall face each other' (Ex. 25, 20) is replaced in the SP by the phrases אַחַת אֶל אַחַת and אֶחָד אֶל אֶחָד respectively. The reason is obvious: this phrase is Aramaic and it also penetrated LBH.

### Literature:

*Abraham Geiger's Nachgelassene Schriften*, Herausgegeben von Ludwig Geiger, vol. 4, Berlin 1876, p. 57;  
י. קוטשר, תרביץ לג (חשכ"ד), עמ' 124 [=מחקרים, עמ' ת].

## III. Inscriptions

§185. The Hebrew and Aramaic inscriptions of Jerusalem are very short and consist mostly of names on ossuaries. Still, some interesting linguistic information can be gleaned from them.

There are indications in these inscriptions that the laryngals and pharyngals were not strictly distinguished from one another and tended sometimes to disappear as the name יְשׁוּעַ = יִשׁוּ proves. This tendency is apparently the outcome of the Greek influence in Jerusalem (cf. §156) which also is discernible in some place names in and around Jerusalem, e.g., Hebrew גְּבֵעוֹן to the north of the city, which survived in Arabic without an /' / (=el-Jib). For reasons unknown, the name רִבְקָה appears in the Septuagint as *Rebekka*. We would have expected *Rebka* (for [i] > [ε] in the Septuagint see §175). Indeed, this very form turns up in a Greek inscription from Jaffa. For the form לעזר see below §186.

### Literature:

י. קוטשר, (מ. אבי יונה, עורך), ספר ירושלים, כרך א', ירושלים;  
תשט"ו, עמ' 356–357 [=מחקרים, עמ' לה];

Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, pp. 93f.;

S. Klein, *Jüdisch-palästinisches Corpus Inscriptionum*, Wien-Berlin 1920, p. 50.

[J. Naveh, *On Stone and Mosaic: The Aramaic and Hebrew Inscriptions from Ancient Synagogues*, Jerusalem 1978, (in Hebrew). — G.S.

For a corpus of Hebrew, Aramaic and other inscriptions see *Inscriptions Reveal: Documents from the Time of the Bible, the Mishna and the Talmud*, Israel Museum Catalogue no. 100, Jerusalem 1973.]

#### IV. Transliterations of the Gospels and of Greek and Latin Inscriptions

§186. The Gospels are the earliest source for the vocalization of the word רבי. There it is transliterated *rabbi*. While this form survived until modern times, in various Jewish communities other forms were used such a *ribbi* of the Sepharadim, *rebbi* of the Ashkenazim, and *rubbi* in Italy and elsewhere. These forms are not later "corruptions", but came into existence quite early. The form *rebbi* and *ribbi* are attested to by Greek and Latin transliterations from the third century C.E. and on, as well as by the spelling ריבי and the vocalizations of Mishnaic manuscripts. Another case in point is the name *Lazar*, found in the gospels and in Greek and Hebrew inscriptions in Palestine. This is the earliest source for a trend found in MH and Aramaic of Palestine, namely, the dropping of the initial *alef* plus vowel. That is why this name, which in BH is אֶלְעָזָר, appears in MH manuscripts as לעזר, and has survived until our own day in Yiddish as לוזר (Lozer) and ליזר (Lezer). The same applies to אֶלְיָעָזָר.

##### Literature:

W. Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments*<sup>4</sup>, Berlin 1952, s. vv. *rabbi*, *Lazaros*;

Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, pp. 65f.;

.קוטשר, לשון חז"ל, עמ' 255-256 [=מחקרים, עמ' פב-פג].

#### V. Hebrew Loanwords and Calques in Other Languages

##### a. Loanwords

§187. The Hebrew of this period is the first which can be shown to have

influenced other languages. If we find Hebrew loans in Aramaic e.g., *māzōnā* = Hebrew מִזוֹן, 'provisions', we cannot be sure whether it is a loan from Hebrew or from Canaanite. However, a few Hebrew (and Aramaic) words which occur in the Gospels started on their way throughout Europe at this time, e.g., רַבִּי 'rabbi', אָבִא 'father' (cf., e.g., English *abbot*), *amen*, which is Hebrew אָמֵן etc. An interesting case is that of the world *jubilee* (although this particular case belongs to a later period). This is a blend of the Hebrew יוֹבֵל 'the fiftieth year' and the Latin *jubilare*, 'to emit cries of joy' (cf. below §383).

#### Literature:

K. Lokotsch, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der europäischen Wörter orientalischen Ursprungs*, Heidelberg 1927, s.vv. *rabbi*, *amen*;

S. Ernout-A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*<sup>3</sup>, Paris 1951, s.v. *jubilo*;

.29, 2-1 קוֹטְשֶׁר, מַלִּים וְחוֹלְדוּתִיהֶן, עַמ' 1-2, 29.

#### b. Calques

§188. Several nouns connected with the Christian ecclesiastical hierarchy are apparently calques (loan translations) from the Hebrew of the DSS. The bishop (Greek *epískopos* 'overseer') is, as has been established, a loan translation of מְבַקֵּר which occurs with the same meaning in the DSS. The same applies to *klerus* which is employed in several European languages to denote a clergyman, which equals the Greek *klêros*, 'lot'. It was shown that it goes back to לוֹט 'lot', with the meaning employed in the DSS. The famous Gospel phrase "the poor in spirit" (Matt. 3, 5,) apparently also goes back to a Hebrew phrase in the MD.

Much has been written about traces of Semitic syntax in the Septuagint and the Gospels. Hebrew נוֹשָׂא פָּנִים 'to favor' is translated exactly by the parallel Greek words *prósōpon lambánein*. Hebrew וַיְהִי 'and it happened' is mostly translated by the Septuagint as *kai egeneto*, to be found also in the Gospels. These two instances are clear-cut cases of H phrases in Greek garb.

#### Literature:

F. Blass-A. Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*<sup>8</sup>, Göttingen 1949, p. 5, n. 5;

K. Beyer, *Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament*, I/1 Göttingen 1962, p. 31.

[On *episcopos*: 116 עמ"ה, תשכ"ה, ירושלים, מגילת הסרכים, י. ליכט, — G.S.]

#### D. Desiderata

§189. We need a thorough investigation of the transliterations of the Septuagint. The work of Lisowsky (above §175) is the only relatively satisfactory treatment of a small part of the material, while the work of Sperber (above §37) is disappointing. There is no comprehensive treatment, as yet, of the Greek transcriptions from Palestine and Syria. The DSS (except for one) also await a thorough linguistic analysis, as does the SP. A new investigation of Greek and Latin terms connected with the Early Church in the light of the new DSS material, as well as other Jewish sources, might also yield interesting results.

*Postscript.* There is no doubt that thorough and comprehensive treatment of the sources which is so urgently needed might modify the picture presented above, but is not likely to change it drastically.

## CHAPTER SIX

### MISHNAIC HEBREW

#### A. Spoken and Literary Mishnaic Hebrew

##### I. *The Beginning of Mishnaic Hebrew as a Literary Language*

§190. At the end of the first century B.C.E. the Roman Empire conquered Judea. The two full-scale Jewish revolts failed. The first Revolt (67–73 C.E.) led to the destruction of the Jewish state, its capital Jerusalem and the Temple within, depriving the Jews of their political, social, and religious center.

The destruction of Jerusalem must have had far-reaching linguistic repercussions. It was apparently this destruction which at last ended the unbroken tradition of Biblical Hebrew as a vehicle of literary expression, whose last offshoot was the Dead Sea Scrolls. After the loss of its literary center and arbiter, the spoken language of Judea, Mishnaic Hebrew, was able to move into the vacuum that had been created. (If Biblical Hebrew was employed after this period, it was not another link in the unbroken chain, but a chain that had to be forged anew by acquiring a thorough knowledge of Biblical Hebrew sources.)

##### II. *The End of Mishnaic Hebrew as a Spoken Language*

§191. The above assumption seems born out not only by the language of the Mishna but also by the letters of Bar-Koseba (= Bar-Kokhba) and his contemporaries which are written in MH (see below §193). The Second Revolt, that of Bar-Koseba (132–135 C.E.), had even more far reaching consequences for the history of the Hebrew language. The Romans seem to have uprooted and slaughtered the majority of the inhabitants of Judea

proper (the southern part of Palestine). It stands to reason that it was in Judea, the heart of the Jewish state of the Hasmoneans, that MH had existed as the spoken language for centuries, side by side with Aramaic. Other parts of the country, e.g., the Galilee which were brought under Jewish domination only later, were probably monolingual, speaking only Aramaic. Therefore, the Hebrew speaking stock having been killed off or sold into slavery, there was little hope left for the survival of MH.

### III. *Mishnaic Hebrew as a Literary Language*

§192. Indeed, it is assumed that at the time when Rabbi (= Rabbi Yehuda Hannasi) and his students collected the oral traditions in the Mishna, Tosefta and Halachic Midrashim (ca. 200 C.E.), their language was already dead, or moribund. This was all the more so since the process of collecting and editing the old tradition was undertaken in the Galilee, the refuge of Jewish scholars after the suppression of the Bar-Koseba revolt, and there in the midst of the Aramaic speaking population, Hebrew could not hope to survive as a spoken language. That is why even the students of Rabbi did not understand the meaning of certain Hebrew words found in the Mishna and had to consult Rabbi's maidservant (perhaps herself an aged refugee from Judea). Rabbi's exhortation as related in the Talmud Babli, Bava Qamma 82b-83a — אמר ר' (=רבי), בארץ ישראל לשון סורסי למה — או לשון הקודש או לשון יונית. 'Rabbi said: "Why do we need Syriac (i.e. Aramaic) in Eretz Israel? — (use) either the Sacred Tongue or Greek"' came too late. The very fact that he wanted Aramaic to be replaced by Hebrew *or by Greek*, speaks volumes in this respect. Mishnaic Hebrew was dead; in the Talmud it was already employed by the rabbis as a dead language, but was apparently no longer spoken by the people. It is essential that scholars distinguish between these two layers of MH as MH1, the language of the Mishna, Tosefta and the Baraytot in the Talmudim, which represent a spoken language of the Tannaim, and the dead MH2 of the Amoraim in the Talmudim. The following survey is based mainly on the living Mishnaic Hebrew (MH1).

#### *Literature:*

[E.Y. Kutscher, "Some Problems of the Lexicography of Mishnaic Hebrew and its Comparison with Biblical Hebrew", in E.Y. Kutscher, ed., *Archive*



of the *New Dictionary of Rabbinical Literature*, vol. I, Ramat-Gan 1972, pp. 29–82 (Hebrew with English summary). In this article Kutscher offers a more detailed stratification of MH. — G.S.]

## B. The Problem of Mishnaic Hebrew

### I. Geiger's "Artificial Language" Theory and the Bar-Koseba Letters

§193. Abraham Geiger was the first to publish a scholarly grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew. In his work he sets forth the astounding theory that MH was an artificial language which was never spoken at all. The Jewish historian H. Graetz fiercely attacked Geiger's contention and was joined by other scholars such as S.D. Luzatto. One gets the impression that this theory is in accordance with Geiger's Jewish attitude, for he was the chief architect of the Jewish religious Reform movement then closely bound up with assimilationist tendencies. The language and content of the Mishna and of the related literature should be considered artificial and unnatural.

On the other hand, scholars who fiercely attacked Geiger belonged religiously and nationally to the non-Reform wing of Judaism. However, neither group could marshal any important array of facts to prove its point decisively and in a scholarly manner. The controversy continued until 1908. In that year M.H. Segal solved the problem. Today, thanks to the letters of Bar-Koseba and his contemporaries not the slightest doubt remains that Graetz, Segal, Ben Yehuda, Klausner and others were right in assuming that MH was a living language, and that Geiger was wrong. These letters (first half of the second century C.E.), which were found in caves near the Dead Sea did not originate in scholarly circles but dealt with mundane matters that had to do with their military and administrative background. Therefore, if these letters employ MH (alongside Aramaic and Greek), there can be only one explanation — it was the spoken language, and not an artificial language created by and for the scholars of the *בית המדרש* (the academies). As Milik was quick to point out, the letters establish beyond any shred of doubt that MH was a spoken language.

#### *Literature:*

T. J. Milik, *Les grottes de Murabba'ât*, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert II, Oxford 1961, p. 70;

י. קוטשר, לשוננו כו (תשכ"ב) עמ' 7-23 [On the Bar-Koseba letters: 23-7 עמ' 7-23].  
 — מחקרים, עמ' נד-ע. G.S.]

## II. Segal's Refutation of Geiger's Theory

§194. We should briefly describe how Segal was able to prove his thesis. He was the first to assemble all the facts pertaining to the problem, viz., all the grammatical points in which MH differs from BH. He isolated those points that are, or may be, of Aramaic origin. While he certainly tended to minimize the effect of the Aramaic influence (see below §196), nevertheless, a certain residue of traits characteristic of MH in contrast to BH, remains which can not be accounted for by Aramaic influence. A few instances: אָנוּ 'we', instead of אָנַחְנוּ (See §201); לִיקַח 'to take' (infinitive), instead of לְקַחַח; אֵלֵינוּ 'these', instead of אֵלֶיהָ (see §203); a new conjugation, Nitpa'al replacing in part the perfect of the Hitpa'el.

He also pointed out that MH is only the last stage of a development that started during BH times, as the language of the Book of Chronicles proved decisively. Consider e.g., אָנִי-אָנִי 'I'. In BH both are used; in MH only אָנִי is left. Chronicles generally substitutes אָנִי for אֲנִי (see above §40). It is no coincidence that there is no trace of אָנִי in MH. This is what we should expect if MH is the natural offshoot of LBH. But this lack would be more difficult to explain if we assumed that MH were an artificial product. Therefore, Segal is certainly correct in stating: "In this MH has merely developed... a tendency already strong in BH." The result of Segal's research is that Mishnaic Hebrew is a legitimate offspring of Biblical Hebrew, albeit with great changes.

### *Literature:*

Segal, *Mishnaic Hebrew*, pp. 9ff.

## III. A Critique of Segal's Methods

### *a. On the Reliability of the Printed Editions.*

§195. Segal definitely proved his point; nonetheless, the whole field needs an entirely new approach for two reasons: First, both in his article and in his grammars of MH published later, Segal based his research on the prin-

ted versions of MH. Meanwhile, during the last two generations, more and more early manuscripts and fragments of manuscripts of MH (including vocalized texts) were discovered. With the help of these new texts, scholars established that the printed versions are utterly unreliable material for linguistic study. The medieval copyists and printers of Europe displayed a marked tendency to “correct” the Mishnaic text, in order to bring it more into line with BH (cf. above §46). Therefore, it is these recently discovered manuscripts that should serve as the basis for research, as pointed out mainly by S. Lieberman and the late J.N. Epstein, H. Yalon [and E.Y. Kutscher]. Systematic studies based on this new material established that an entirely new picture of MH is bound to emerge from these manuscripts.

This new picture may also have far-reaching consequences for the evaluation of the Hebrew reflected in the Greek transliterations, in the DSS, and for Aramaic dialects spoken in Palestine. Greek and Latin transliterations of the Bible do not always reflect BH as it was preserved until the days of the Masoretes by a strict oral tradition, but are often more in line with the linguistic facts as reflected by MH. (See, e.g., above §175, concerning the vowels /i/ and /u/ in all the sources). Therefore, these sources should not be termed as pre-Masoretic, but rather extra-Masoretic, following A. Murtonen.

*Literature:*

A. Murtonen, *Materials for a Non-Masoretic Hebrew Grammar I*, Helsinki 1958.

[E.Y. Kutscher, *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 16, cols. 1593f.]

*b. On the Impact of Aramaic*

§196. Second, Segal tried to minimize the extent of the Aramaic influence. Now, on the strength of this more recent picture, we might even be tempted to say that MH was a mixed Aramaic-Hebrew language. Of course, it is a known fact that many languages change under the impact of a foreign language. In some cases these influences are far-reaching, but it is a moot point what stage of external influence must be reached before the language can be considered mixed. This is because there are language areas that seem to be more open to foreign influences than others, e.g., syntax (word order, etc.). But there does seem to be general agreement concerning the so-called *système fermé* (Meillet), namely in declensions and conjugations. This area resists more strongly than others the onslaught of a foreign

language. If, therefore, we find that a foreign language has succeeded in penetrating this domain, we might be justified in stating that the language in question is well on its way toward becoming a *langue mixte*. In MH there are two outstanding forms which prove our point, namely, the suffixes of the second person singular masc. and fem. (see below §202) and the verb. In some cases in Pirke Avoth (The Sayings of the Fathers) we find the form הוי 'be you, (imp. sing. masc.) instead of the form הנה (e.g., 1, 4). This form is Aramaic. The same applies to the form הוה 'be ye' (imp. pl. masc.), instead of הוה that managed to survive even in the Maḥzor (Prayer Book) of the Italian Rite, e.g., *ibid.* 1, 1. Therefore, the following survey will be based mainly on the material of the MSS.

### C. Grammatical and Lexical Survey

#### I. Phonology

##### a. Consonants

*1. Gutturals. §197.* We may state (pace Kahle) that these consonants remained more or less stable during the period concerned. The Talmud, commenting on the Mishna, mentions a few words containing gutturals, whose pronunciation was in doubt. A Barayta expressly states (Talmud Bavli, Megilla 27b; Yerushalmi, Berakhot 4d) that only three cities, Haifa, Beth-Shean and Tivon, were unreliable for the pronunciation of the gutturals. Concerning Beth-Shean we happen to know that the Greek influence was dominant there, and this explains why they were unable to pronounce the gutturals properly (and cf. above §§156, 179). To be sure, we may assume that the Barayta had mainly Galilean cities in mind. It is possible that the same development took place also in other cities that were under the sway of Greek culture. In the Talmudic sources just quoted it is also noted that in the Academy of the Tanna R. Eliezer ben Yaacov they did not distinguish between *alef* and *'ayin*. These statements prove that this state of affairs was exceptional and not the rule.

Moreover, the Church Father Jerome (§251) expressly states that the Jews mocked the Christians because of their inability to pronounce the gutturals. This then is a clear-cut statement to the effect that even in the

fourth–fifth centuries Jews did pronounce the gutturals, while the non-Jews (apparently Greek-speaking) were unable to do so. To be sure, a story in the Babylonian Talmud is meant to show that the Galileans could not pronounce the gutturals. But, since the contents of the story exactly fit the linguistic state of Babylonia (where the gutturals were not pronounced), it is clear that it has to be taken *cum grano salis*, and certainly does not apply to the Galilee as a whole (and see above).

*Literature:*

E.Y. Kutscher, *Studies in Galilean Aramaic*, Ramat-Gan 1976, pp. 67ff., 89f.;  
idem, *JSS* 10 (1965), pp. 45ff.

2. *The /b, g, d, k, p, t/*. §198. (See above §29.) The spirant *bet* (i.e. without a *dagesh*) was apparently pronounced like *waw*, and therefore we find, for example, that instead of the spelling יבנה ('Yavneh') the spelling יווי is sometimes used. (The double *waw* is employed where the *waw* is a consonant and not a *mater lectionis*.) But it is impossible to say which of these two, i.e. the labial [w] = ו or the labio-dental [v] = ב changed its original realization.

*Literature:*

.1226-1223 אפשטיין, מבוא, עמ' 1226

3. *Final /m/*. §199. Thanks to the MSS it can be shown that in MH, under certain conditions, final [m] turned into [n]. Instead of אדם 'person' we often find אדן.

Incidentally, this word shows how antiquated our dictionaries of MH (and Talmudic Aramaic) are, for none of them lists this form. During the last two generations hundreds of instances of this spelling have turned up in the MSS of MH. Why, then, was it unknown to the compilers of the dictionaries? Again, the tendency of the medieval copyists and printers to "correct" the text of MH in accordance with BH (see above §§46, 195) was responsible for the disappearance of the form אדן from the printed editions. Sometimes this word is found in the MSS spelled with ן that was corrected to ם by a later hand (e.g., MS Kaufmann, Berakhot 1, 8).

This [-m] > [-n] sound change appears already in the Bible in the Book of Nehemiah where the name שלום is spelled שלון (3, 15). Hebrew and

Greek inscriptions of the first century from Jerusalem spell the name שלום with an [n]. This sound change must have been operative throughout the whole territory of Palestine and Syria, as proved by a first century C.E. inscription from Palmyra, in the Syrian Desert. It also explains why the place name מְרוֹם in the Galilee is spelled מְרוֹן in MH. Via Aramaic, several forms managed to survive even in the spoken Arabic of this territory. In the Arabic of Kfar 'Abida in Lebanon, Aramaic loans display this sound change, e.g., in the names *Brāhīn* (= Abraham) *Mariēn* (= Miriam, Mary). On the other hand, the name of the Shiloah Spring near Jerusalem is transliterated *Siloam* in the Septuagint and in the Gospels. Today, however, the nearby Arab village which derives its name from this Greek form is called *Silwan*.

This sound change probably also left its imprint on the transliterations of the Septuagint. Quite a few Hebrew names that have in Hebrew a final [n], appear in the Septuagint with an [m], e.g., *Madiam* (= Midian). The only plausible explanation for this seems to be the following: The translators of the Septuagint, who knew that they pronounced a final [m] as an [n] were prone to transliterate even a genuine [n] in the final position as [m] (hyper-correction). It is instructive that wherever the [n] was not final, e.g., the form *Madianites* 'the Midianite', it was of course, spelled with an [n].

#### *Literature:*

E.Y. Kutscher, *Studies in Galilean Aramaic*, Ramat-Gan 1976, pp. 58–67, 101–103;

קוטשר, לשון חז"ל, עמ' 258 [=מחקרים, עמ' פה].

#### *b. Vowels.*

§200. Little can be said concerning the vowels of MH, except that the short /i/ was probably realized something like an [e] and short /u/ like [o] exactly as it is reflected in the transliterations of the Septuagint and in Galilean Aramaic (above §175).

#### *Literature:*

[קוטשר, מחקרים, עמ' קני־קסח\*\*\*].

## II. Morphology

## a. Pronouns

1. *Independent Pronouns.* §201. The changes in the pronouns are quite far-reaching. אָנְכִי which was on its way out in LBH disappeared entirely. For אַתָּה, the Aramaic form אַתְּ is quite frequent in MSS. In the printed editions it has survived in the Passover Haggada, in the phrase אַתְּ פִּתַּח לוֹ 'you shall begin (speaking) to him'. Instead of אַנְחִנוּ and נַחֲנוּ, אָנוּ is employed, a form which apparently arose within Hebrew by analogy with forms like שָׁמְרָנוּ 'he guarded us'. For the second person plural we should expect אַתֶּן according to the sound change of final [m] > [n]. But the form was detected only recently in the Bar-Koseba letters, and a little later in MSS. Biblical הֵם, הֵנָּה (masc.) and הֵנָּה (fem.) merged into one form הֵן, הֵן for both. With the loss of the final unstressed vowel, the [m] was bound to turn into [n] (see above §199). Because of all these changes in the plural, masculine and feminine forms were neutralized (i.e. their differences disappeared). This tendency also applies to the pronominal suffixes (see §202) and to the perfect and imperfect verb forms. The situation with regard to MH pronouns is the following (see Table 2):

- (1) disappearance of some BH elements (i.e., נַחֲנוּ, אַנְחִנוּ);
- (2) survival of BH elements (all sg. forms except אַנְכִי, and אַתָּם);
- (3) survival of certain BH elements in modified form (second and third pers. masc. and fem.);
- (4) emergence of genuine Hebrew LBH–MH element (first pers. pl.);
- (5) an Aramaic element (אַתְּ [masc.]).

It is difficult to determine whether we should assume that the development went from BH → DSS → MH, or from BH directly to MH, with DSS representing a purely literary development.

*Literature:*

קוטשר, לשון חז"ל עמ' 259–261 [= מחקרים, עמ' פו-פח].

2. *Pronominal Suffixes.* §202. As mentioned above, the pronominal suffixes of the second person singular masculine and feminine were taken over from Aramaic (cf. §196); cf. masc. אִשְׁתְּךָ 'your wife', fem. בְּעֵלְיֶךָ 'your husband'. The few exceptions, such as בְּנֶךָ, בְּתֻךָ prove the rule since they concern words whose Aramaic form (בְּרַת, בְּרַת) is different from the Hebrew

one, and thus Aramaic did not affect Hebrew in such cases. Of course, in the printed editions, this form was “corrected” according to BH, but it has managed to survive in some Sephardic prayer books in the Blessing of the New Moon e.g., בְּרוּךְ יוֹצְרֵיךָ ‘Blessed be your (fem.) Creator’.

As indicated above, because of the change of final [-m] > [-n], masculine and feminine plurals were neutralized.

*Literature:*

Above §201.

3. *Demonstrative Pronouns.* §203. The masc. sing. הַזֶּה is identical with the BH form; the fem. sing. is הַזֹּאת. In SBH the form is הַזֹּאת fem. sing. but a few cases of the MH form occur with the spellings הַזֶּה, הַזֹּה. הַזֹּה can not be explained as a shortened form of הַזֹּאת because of the difficulty of accounting for the dropping or the /t/. On the other hand, the SBH הַזֹּאת is nothing more than [zo:] (spelled הַזֶּה, הַזֹּה) plus /t/ as shown by parallels in other Semitic languages. How then did the old form manage to enjoy a revival? Should we attribute it to the influence of a Canaanite dialect? This would also account for the frequency of the form הַזֶּה in Ecclesiastes (About a Canaanite construction in that book see above §125.) There are also other cases where a linear development from SBH seems to be out of the question, and indeed dialect borrowing seems to hold promise of a solution (see below §206). BH הַזֶּה ‘these’ seems strange because elsewhere no הַזֶּה ending serves as plural morpheme. In MH it is replaced by הַזֶּה by analogy with the plural morpheme of the verb in the perf. and imp. The demonstrative הַזֶּה and הַזֹּה were shortened to הַזֶּה. The accusative particle אֵת with suffixes of the 3rd pers. is employed as a demonstrative adjective, e.g., אֵת הַיּוֹם ‘that day’ and also ‘the same day’. It is not yet clear under what circumstances the pronoun and the noun are prefixed by the article.

4. *Independent Possessive Pronoun.* §204. MH developed this pronoun with the base -שָׁל (geminated lamed) plus the possessive suffix, e.g., שָׁלִי, שָׁלְךָ ‘mine, yours (masc.)’ etc. See in detail below §215.

5. *Reflexive Pronoun.* §205. MH makes extensive use of the noun עֲצָם ‘bone’ as a reflexive pronoun, e.g., סִכַּנְתִּי בְּעֲצָמִי ‘I endangered myself’ (Berakhot 1, 3). (In BH נַפְשׁ is sometimes used in this capacity). Another



reflexive pronoun is על 'upon oneself', e.g., הַבְּנָאִי שֶׁקִּבֵּל עָלָיו לְסַתּוֹר אֶת הַכֶּתֶל, 'the builder who took it upon himself to tear down a wall' (Bava Qamma 9, 3).

6. *Relative Pronoun.* §206. The relative pronoun is ׀ as in LBH (see above §45), while BH אֲשֶׁר has disappeared. Since it is hard to believe that ׀ is the short form of אֲשֶׁר the question of dialect mixture again arises. To be sure, the Canaanite form is אש, but the Punic (late North African Canaanite) is ׀. Milik has already pointed out the possibility of a Hebrew-Canaanite koiné (common literary language). In this context, let us mention that ׀ appears in ABH as well, in the Song of Deborah, אֲשֶׁרָהּ 'you (fem.) arose' (Ju. 5, 7, twice, and see above §45). As to ׀ (= ל + ׀) see below §215.

*Literature:*

Segal, *Mišnaic Hebrew*, pp. 10–14;

J.T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discoveries in the Wilderness of Judaea*, London 1959, pp. 130–133.

b. *The Verb*

1. *Perfect.* §207. The Archaic forms have disappeared, and only SBH ones survived. One change occurs in the second person plural masculine because of the sound change of final [m] > [n] (אֲמַרְתֶּן). As mentioned, masculine and feminine plurals are neutralized, but forms with [m] also occur, possibly only as antiquated spellings, or as products of scribal correction.

2. *Imperfect.* §208. Here, too, archaic forms have disappeared, while those of SBH survived. In view of the strong Aramaic influence on MH (above §196), it is all the more important to stress the fact that the forms ending in [n], viz., the second person singular feminine, second and third persons plural masculine, such as אֲמַרְתֶּן (above §58), did not survive, despite their identity with the Aramaic forms. Another change that goes counter to the Aramaic tendency is the elimination of special forms for second and third persons plural feminine (see Table 3). This change, as pointed out above, started already in LBH.

A linguist who lacked the benefit of knowing all the pertinent facts, when comparing the affixes of the perfect and the imperfect of BH and MH,

might conclude that in MH the tendency was to neutralize the genders in the plural, and therefore the plural forms for masculine and feminine are identical. Such a conclusion would be misleading. In the perfect the third person plural feminine (קָטְלוּהָ) was eliminated nearly entirely already in BH, apparently because these two forms became identical through a sound change in the third person singular feminine, namely, קָטְלוּ > קָטְלוּהָ (see above §56). But the second person plural masculine and feminine did not change throughout the life of BH. On the other hand, the elimination of the special forms for the second and third persons plural feminine of the imperfect already began in BH. Therefore, we shall have to assume that while in both the perfect and the imperfect the two genders were neutralized, (i.e.: only one form was used for both), the motive force behind this change was of a much more complex nature than is at first apparent.

On the other hand, the fact that the elimination of the perfect third person plural feminine took place very early in BH might well have influenced the parallel form of the imperfect, which was identical with the second person plural feminine. The second person might then have followed suit. Thus these parallel developments might have had, at least to some extent, a common cause.

3. *Participle*. §209. MH prefers the feminine participle ending [-et] (and not [a:]), e.g., שׁוֹמְרָה 'watches' יוֹשֶׁבֶת 'sits', always thus except for the ע"ו verbs and, to a certain extent, the ל"א-ל"י verbs. This form is preferred even in the Hif'il e.g., מִפְּלֹת 'one who drops (i.e. is having a miscarriage)' (Niddah 3, 3). The masculine plural very often employs the Aramaic plural morpheme יִן instead of the Hebrew יִם e.g., קוֹרְאִין 'they read'. (See also the plural of the noun, below §214.)

4. *Infinitive*. §210. The infinitive absolute has disappeared entirely; the construct survives only with the preposition ל. This form can not be further analyzed in MH, and, therefore, if the verb requires the preposition מן it is added to the infinitive plus ל, e.g., אָסוּר מִלְקַחוֹן (MS Kaufmann) 'is forbidden to wash' (Berakhot 2, 6). Instead of the infinitive plus ב and פ in BH, e.g., בְּצִאָתוֹ, בְּצִאָתוֹ, relative clauses are employed, e.g., בְּשִׁיבָא.

#### *Literature:*

Segal, *Mišnaic Hebrew*, pp. 38–40, 42;

.1264 אפשטיין, מבוא, עמ' 1264.

5. *Stems*. §211. The Pu'al disappeared nearly entirely (except for the participle), and its function has been taken over by the Hitpa'el-Nitpa'al which was employed not only as a reflexive, but also as a passive, as is the case in Aramaic, e.g., נְתַגֵּיר 'was converted'. In the perfect the Hitpa'el was replaced by the Nitpa'al, a new form which is apparently a cross between Hitpa'el and Nif'al. As H. Yalon pointed out, according to good manuscripts, the vocalization is Nitpa'al and not Nitpa'el; the latter is a "creation" of the printers. There are a few cases of Šaf'el, e.g., לְשַׁחֵרַר 'to release'. A Nif'al or passive Qal which looks like a Pu'al occurs mainly in the פ"נ verbs. It survived also in the Prayer Book in the Musaf Prayer of the Sabbath of the New Moon: וְנִטַּל כְּבוֹד מִבֵּית חַיֵּינוּ, 'and glory was taken from the house of our life' (instead of נִטַּל).

*Literature:*

Segal, *Mišnaic Hebrew*, pp. 25–33;

חנוך ילון, מבוא לניקוד המשנה, ירושלים תשכ"ד, עמ' 15 ואילך,  
136 ואילך, 152 ואילך;

E.Y. Kutscher, *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 16, cols. 1597f.

[For a different opinion on נִטַּל etc. see M. Moreshet, "On the NUF'AL Stem in Post-Biblical Hebrew", in G. Sarfatti et al., eds., *Studies in Hebrew and Semitic Languages Dedicated to the Memory of Prof. Eduard Yechezkel Kutscher*, Ramat-Gan 1980 (Hebrew with English summary), pp. 126–139.]

6. *The Weak Verbs*. §212. As mentioned above (§211), there is a form in the פ"נ verbs which appears to be a Pu'al but is probably originally a Nif'al or a passive Qal (cf. §48). The Qal infinitive of נָתַן 'to give' is לָתֵן (= BH לָתַת), on the analogy of the imperfect.

The same applies to the Qal infinitives of the פ"י verbs, e.g., לִישֵׁב 'to sit', לִירֵד 'to descend' (= BH לְרַדַּת, לְשָׁבַת, לְרַדַּת לִירֵד).

The ע"ו verbs in the Pi'el, Pu'al and Hitpa'el are employed in forms paralleling the strong verbs, e.g., לִכְוֹן 'to have the intention' (= BH לְכוּן). In the Nif'al perfect they often changed from נִדּוֹן 'was judged, discussed' in BH to נִדּוֹן in MH, apparently under the influence of the imperfect (e.g., יִדּוֹן) and the perfect of the strong verb (compare נִכְנַס).

The א"ל verbs usually became ל"י. We therefore find לְקַרֵּא 'to read' (= BH לְקַרָּא); MSS vocalize יִקְרָא 'he shall read', e.g., Berakhot 3, 5 (MS Kaufmann).

The ל"י and ל"א verbs share a very important trait, namely, the ending of the third person singular feminine perfect is [-at], and not [-ta:] as in BH, e.g., קָנְתָּ 'she acquired' (= BH קָנְתָּהּ, originally קָנְתָּ\*). Thus we witness once again a case of the re-emergence of an older form at the expense of a new form: קָנְתָּ\* > קָנְתָּהּ > קָנְתָּ (cf. §§95, 100). Since in BH the earlier form is extremely rare, it would be very difficult to explain it as a survival in MH. It would also be difficult to assume Aramaic influence here since we can not explain why it should have affected only the ל"י verbs. Perhaps we shall have to fall back again upon dialect mixture as the explanation, and to assume that in some Hebrew dialect a form of the type קָנְתָּ survived for phonological reasons that can not be set forth here, and from that dialect it was taken over by MH.

#### Literature:

Segal, *Mišnaic Hebrew*, pp. 40, 54–58;

E.Y. Kutscher, *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 16, cols. 1599f;

[G. Haneman, *Morphology of Mishnaic Hebrew According to the Tradition of the Parma Manuscript (de Rossi 138)*, Tel-Aviv 1980 (in Hebrew). — G.S.]

#### c. The Noun

1. *Noun Pattern.* §213. *Qeṭi:la:* is employed as a verbal substantive for any root of the Qal, e.g., אָכַלְתָּ 'eating'; the form מִיתָה 'death' usually replaces BH מָוֹת. (In BH the pattern *qeṭi:la:* is very rare as a verbal substantive.) The verbal substantive of Pi'el is *qitṭu:l*, e.g., כָּבַדְתָּ 'honoring, acting respectfully' (rare in BH). Less conspicuous is the form *qaṭṭa:la:*, e.g., פָּנְנָה 'devotion' (from פָּנָה 'to direct'), which is of Aramaic origin. The Aramaic noun pattern *haqṭa:la:* (cf. §103) is regularly employed as a verbal substantive of the Hif'il, e.g., הִדְלַקְתָּ 'lighting' (from הִדְלִיק 'to light'). The form *heqṭel* also occurs, e.g., הִקְטַרְתָּ 'burning (of sacrificial fat pieces)', which in BH is vocalized *haqṭel*.

Other important nominal patterns in MH are *qa:to:l* as *nomen agentis*, e.g., לָקוּחַ 'purchaser, buyer' (rare in BH; of Aramaic origin?), and nominal patterns with the derivational suffix [-a:n]. But MH of Palestine differs here from MH of Babylonia. In the former we find, e.g., רֹצֵחַן 'murderer', while in the latter we find רֹצֵחַן. The origin of this noun pattern as well as its exact form is not entirely clear.

*Literature:*

Segal, *Mišnaic Hebrew*, pp. 58–63;

אפשטיין, מבוא, עמ' 1256–1255;

י. קוטשר, ספר בר-אילן למדעי הרוח והחברה, קובץ העשור, רמת-גן תשכ"ט, עמ' 53–77 [=מחקרים, עמ' קי-קלד].

2. *The Plural*. §214. Instead of the masc. pl. morpheme [-i:m], the form [-i:n] appears (cf. §209). This might again be a case of direct Aramaic influence, but cf. above §199 concerning אָדָם, אָדָן.

Peculiar to MH is the ending אָאוֹת (or אָאוֹת) mainly in foreign loans, but also with Hebrew nouns, e.g., מִרְחָצוֹת (מִרְחָצוֹת) 'baths', בְּיָרוֹת (בְּיָרוֹת) 'wells', possibly a reflection of an Aramaic form. The former form (with *alef*) is mainly Babylonian, the latter Palestinian.

The plural of nouns ending in [-u:t] is [-uyyo:t] in BH, and there are only two such examples: מְלָכוֹת 'kingdoms' (Dan. 8, 22) and חֲנוּטוֹת 'shops' (Jer. 37, 16). In MH there are quite a few plurals of nouns of this pattern, and the ending is [-iyyo:t], e.g., מְלָכוֹת 'kingdoms', חֲרִיטוֹת 'palm branches' etc. In MS Kaufmann the only noun which kept the BH ending is חֲנוּטוֹת apparently as a result of the "corrections" of earlier copyists, but the correct MH form חֲנוּטוֹת occurs in another MS. Although מְלָכוֹת occurs in BH (see above), the correct MH plural form מְלָכוֹת did survive the "corrections" of the copyists, apparently because it figures prominently in good editions of the Rosh Hashana Prayer Book in connection with the blowing of the shofar (ram's horn) — שׁוֹפָרוֹת, זְכוּרוֹת, מְלָכוֹת.

The double plural which already appears in LBH (see §122) is common in MH, e.g., רְאשֵׁי שָׁנִים (for רְאשֵׁי שָׁנָה) 'New Years', בְּתֵי מְדַרְשׁוֹת (for בְּתֵי מְדַרְשׁ) 'academies'.

*Literature:*

Segal, *Mišnaic Hebrew*, pp. 67–69.

י. קוטשר, ספר בר אילן למדעי הרוח והחברה,

רמת-גן תשכ"ט, עמ' 51–53 [=מחקרים, עמ' קח-קי].

## III. Syntax

*a. Syntax of the Pronoun*

§215. As mentioned above (§204) MH has created an independent

possessive pronoun with the base של. Its attributive use is still quite restricted, e.g., הַהָר שֶׁלָּהּ 'her mountain' (Ševi'it 9, 2). It is often employed with loanwords that are not yet adapted to Hebrew, e.g., מוֹכָנִי שֶׁלָּהּ 'her device' (Kelim 18, 2), a loan from Greek (= English *machine*).

It is not yet clear under which conditions the noun is determined (i.e. prefixed by the article). Of course, to a certain extent של parallels BH ...ל and אֲשֶׁר (§45), e.g., מְעַרְבַת הַמַּכְפֵּלָה אֲשֶׁר לוֹ 'the cave of Machpela which he owns' (Gen. 23, 9). In BH this phrase is still a relative clause (lit. 'which is to him'), while in MH של is already a possessive pronoun, and therefore can also be employed predicatively, e.g., שְׁלִישׁ מִמָּה שֶׁאַתָּה קוֹצֵר שֶׁלְּךָ 'one third of what you shall reap will be yours' (Pe'ah 5, 5).

## b. The Noun

1. *The Construct State.* §216. Instead of the construct state like בֵּית הַמֶּלֶךְ 'the king's house', very often there appears הַבַּיִת שֶׁלְּמֶלֶךְ (thus correctly in the MSS). Another construction with a proleptic suffix is frequent in MH, viz. בֵּיתוֹ שֶׁלְּמֶלֶךְ. This construction, found once in BH (מִטַּתוֹ שֶׁלְּשֹׁלֹמֹה) 'Solomon's bed', Song of Songs 3, 7) is apparently also a product of Aramaic influence. In the printed editions of the Mishna של appears as an independent morpheme, with the following noun undetermined: הַבַּיִת שֶׁל מֶלֶךְ.

It was H. Yalon who first pointed out that in manuscripts we find the proper vocalization שֶׁלְּהַמֶּלֶךְ < שֶׁלְּמֶלֶךְ. When של became separated during the Middle Ages for unknown reasons, the definite article was lost: בֵּיתוֹ שֶׁל מֶלֶךְ. The Yemenite community, though, still reads it the original way, in spite of the fact that in the printed editions the של is separated from the noun.

Strangely enough, however, in the Bar-Koseba letters there is one case in which של occurs with, but separated from, a determined noun: שֶׁל הַגּוֹאֲיִן 'of (or belonging to) the Gentiles'.

## Literature:

Segal, *Mišnaic Hebrew*, pp. 70ff., 75ff., 80–82;

י. קוטשר, לשוננו כו (תשכ"ב), 11–10 [= מחקרים, נז–נח].

2. *Determination.* §217. It is difficult to establish clear-cut rules, but it seems that when an adjective follows, the noun is generally undetermined,

e.g., אנשי הכנסת הגדולה: Pirke Avoth 1, 1 (instead of הגדולה) 'The Men of the Great Synagogue'.

*Literature:*

Segal, *Mišnaic Hebrew*, p. 21.

*c. Syntax of the Verb.*

§218. The most revolutionary change between BH and MH occurred in the area of the tenses and moods (cf. LBH, above §67). Here the verb was entirely reorganized. The short imperfect, the long imperfect, and consecutive tenses are gone. What is more, the imperfect lost its aspectual function, now denoting future action (but see below). The perfect now denotes only past action; the participle is employed to denote present or future action, e.g., גִּזְרֵנִי אָנִי, 'I order'. (BH could have used the perfect [e.g., נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי 'I swear' (Jer. 44, 26)].) Another innovation is the use of the passive participle to denote the situation in the present that is the outcome of a past action (English present perfect), e.g., מְקַבֵּל אָנִי 'I have received' (Pe'ah 2, 6), (literally, 'I am received'); זָכוֹר אָנִי, 'I remember' (Ketubot 2, 10); cf. כָּל־מִי שֶׁעִיֵּר אֶת־חַרְבֵּי הַיָּדָיִם בְּיָמָיו 'all girt with swords' (Song of Songs 3, 8). Probably bound up with this change is the encroachment of the participle on the domain of the future, e.g., וְתִחְיֶה הַמֵּתִים בָּא עִי אֱלֵיהֶוּ זָכוֹר לְטוֹב 'and the resurrection of the dead shall come through Elijah of blessed memory' (Soṭah 9, 15). The imperfect denoting the future tense is mainly restricted to the subordinate clause; in the main clause it is chiefly used to indicate desire or command, e.g., אִם יָבֵא בְנֵי מִן הַמִּלְחָמָה בְּשָׁלוֹם 'if my son returns safely from the war' (Nazir 3, 6); כֹּל מִי שִׂידַע לוֹ זָכוֹת יָבֵא 'if any man know anything in his favor, let him come' (Sanhedrin 6, 1). Sometimes, in order to indicate the clear-cut future, an analytic form עֲתִיד plus ...ל is employed, e.g., מָה שֶׁאֲנִי עֲתִיד לְהַפְרִישׁ, 'what I shall have to set apart' (Demai 7, 1).

Another innovation is the emergence of synthetic tenses and moods with the auxiliary verb היה to indicate repeated action, e.g., נוֹהֲגִין הָיוּ בֵּית אֲבָא 'in my father's house they used to...' (Pe'ah 2, 4). Verbs that require another verb as a direct object can take on the second verb not only in the infinitive plus ל-, but also in the participle, e.g., הִתְחִילוּ לְבַרֵּךְ שׁוֹרְפֵי־ן 'all the people began to burn (the ḥametz)' (Pesahim 1, 5). Only few cases of this construction already appear in BH.

All these changes in MH almost exactly parallel Aramaic. Therefore, the simplest assumption would be that this too should be ascribed to Aramaic

influence. But since Aramaic itself underwent far-reaching changes in this respect, as can be seen by comparing the language of the Aramaic inscriptions and of Biblical Aramaic with late Aramaic, we had best refrain from drawing conclusions.

*Literature:*

Segal, *Mišnaic Hebrew*, pp. 34–35.

[Sh. Sharvit, “The ‘Tense’ System of Mishnaic Hebrew”, in G. Sarfatti et al., eds., *Studies in Hebrew and Semitic Languages Dedicated to the Memory of Prof. Eduard Yechezkel Kutscher*, Ramat-Gan 1980 (Hebrew with English summary), pp. 110–125. — G.S.]

#### IV. Vocabulary

§219. The vocabulary of MH also underwent extensive changes. Nonetheless, apparently up to fifty per cent of the material occurring in our texts is identical in every respect with BH. The vocabulary is composed of (1) BH material; (2) Biblical material that underwent either semantic or morphological changes (changes of noun pattern, verbal stem, etc.); (3) Hebrew material that apparently goes back to the BH times, but for one reason or another is absent from the vocabulary of BH (As mentioned above §85, BH vocabulary represents only a part of the Hebrew spoken in Biblical times); (4) foreign loans, from Akkadian, Persian, Greek, Latin, and of course, Aramaic (abbreviated A in the following sections).

*Literature:*

For §§220–243: מלים ותולדותיהן, קוטשר, passim (consult the Indexes).

##### a. Biblical Hebrew Vocabulary

§220. It would be interesting to establish in what semantic fields no (or only a few) changes occurred and on the other hand what are the fields that are inundated by newcomers, either Hebrew or foreign. Due to the lack of special investigations in this respect, the following survey, of course, cannot be considered final.

1. *Numerals.* §221. There was no change whatsoever in the domain of the numerals (ordinal and cardinal) except for the replacement of BH עֲנִית



‘second’ (adj. fem. and adv.) by שְׁנֵיָהּ. This is not surprising, since in general linguistics numerals are well known for their resistance to the absorption of newcomers. This fact played quite a conspicuous part in establishing the relationship among the Indo-European languages.

2. *Parts of the Body.* §222. As was to be expected, the majority of the names survived, but אָף ‘nose’ gave way to חֶטֶם (of unknown origin), perhaps because אָף had another dominant meaning, ‘anger’ (but this too, disappeared in MH). Another instance בָּרֶם (= BH בֶּטֶן) ‘belly’ already appears once in BH (spelled with ש).

3. *Kinship.* §223. Most of the terms survived, but for ‘my father, mother’ the Aramaic אָמָא, אָבָא were taken over. While חוֹתֵן ‘father-in-law (of the husband)’ disappeared, חָם ‘father-in-law (of the wife)’ extended its use. In גִּיס ‘husband of the sister-in-law’ we have an addition. There are some doubts concerning the use of דוֹד ‘uncle’, which may be on its way out, and instead of which אָחִי הָאֵב, אָחִי הָאָב are used. Neither נִין nor נֶכֶד (apparently = ‘offspring’) survived.

4. *Notions of Time.* §224. Basic notions like ‘day’, ‘night’, ‘month’, ‘year’ survived, but in the construct, instead of לַיְלִי, לַיְלִי (possibly A) is used, e.g., לַיְלִי יוֹם טוֹב הָרֵאשׁוֹן ‘the night of the first holiday’. For ‘morning’ and ‘evening’ we have two nominal forms, שַׁחֲרִית, עֶרְבִית created from BH nouns, but בֵּין הָעֶרְבִים ‘dusk’ and יוֹמָם ‘day’ (adverb) disappeared. An important newcomer from Aramaic is שָׁעָה ‘hour’.

5. *Clothing.* §225. Contrary to those fields, so intimately bound up with everyday life, another semantic field of this type, namely, clothing has preserved only one root coming from BH: מְנַעֵל ‘footwear’. Considering the fast-changing styles, this is perhaps not surprising.

6. *Foodstuff.* §226. Here too, the basic elements, בָּשָׂר ‘meat’, לֶחֶם ‘bread’, מַיִם ‘water’, יַיִן ‘wine’ etc. did not change, but many new elements did appear, e.g., different kinds of ‘wine’, some of them bearing Greek names e.g., אֲנוֹמְלִין (with various spellings) ‘honey wine’ (cf. below §239).

7. *Basic Human Actions.* §227. Verbs denoting basic human actions, reflexes etc. survived for the most part: שָׁמוֹעַ ‘to hear’, דַּבֵּר speak, דְּרוֹעַ

'know', הָלַךְ 'go', יָצָא 'leave', רָאָה 'see', לָקַח 'take', נָתַן 'give' etc. But there are a few significant changes in this field also. Biblical Hebrew בָּא 'come, enter' was restricted to 'come' only, while for 'enter' the root כָּנַס appears strangely enough in the Nif'al; the verb שָׁב is employed in the Hif'il instead of BH עָנָה 'answer', while in the meaning 'to return', it was replaced by a newcomer חָזַר (see below §234). BH עָנָה 'to answer' is restricted to the meaning 'to chant'. The old יָכַל 'to be able' survived, but for 'must', which lacked a verb of its own in BH, there is the new root צָרַח (once in BH) which appears mainly in the form צָרַחַךְ (ibid). חָפֵץ 'to wish' is already on its way out in BH, and רָצוּה takes its place. The former practically disappeared from MH. לָקַח, already alluded to above (§123), also underwent an important change. Very often it was employed with the meaning 'to buy' and was replaced by נָטַל for 'to take'.

8. *Other Semantic Fields.* §228. Both limited space and lack of previous research make it difficult to discuss other semantic fields. But it should be stressed that the largest percentage of survivals seems to have been in the domain of agriculture, and was the smallest in the domains of commerce and handicrafts.

The reason for this is clear. As pointed out above §77, the Jews were mainly an agricultural people during and after BH times and this field was a very conservative one in every respect.

Another interesting fact concerns the basic furniture of the Hebrew room of BH times: מִטָּה 'bed', כִּסֵּא 'chair', שֻׁלְחָן 'table', מְנוֹרָה 'lamp' (cf. II Kings 4, 10). כִּסֵּא, which is in itself of Sumerian origin (see §73) was replaced by the Greek קַתְדֵרָה (which eventually appeared as *chair* in English).

9. *ABH Words in MH.* §229. The BH element of MH does not, of course, reflect evenly the three layers of BH, namely, ABH, SBH, and LBH. As indicated above, ABH was restricted to poetry and thus stood very little chance of survival in MH. One of the few cases is יָנַק 'jump, fall upon, leap forth' (Deut. 34, 22) but 'to squirt' in MH.

Generally, when archaic roots and forms turn up in MH we have to look for the reason. If יָמוּת, the archaic plural of יָוֵם (e.g., Deut. 32, 7) is to be found in MH, its survival (or comeback) is to be accounted for by its A counterpart יוֹמָתָא. The same applies to the noun עֲנָה 'conjugal right' (from the root meaning 'time', Ex. 21, 10) = MH עוֹנָה 'time, season' (it appears

also in the Aramaic of Palestine). For this reason, the case of פועל 'worker' is strange, since in BH the verb is restricted to poetry. Is it possible that here, too, we should look for its origins in Canaanite where it is employed as a standard root (= BH עָשָׂה) (above §116)?

10. *LBH Words in MH.* §230. Unlike the vocabulary of ABH, that of LBH was nearly fully preserved in MH, e.g., חָתַךְ 'to cut', קָבַל 'to receive', תָּעַנִיתִי 'fast', בָּרַס 'belly', etc. (cf. §222).

### *b. Non-Biblical Hebrew Vocabulary*

§231. In this section we include not only foreign loans and Hebrew newcomers, but also BH elements that exhibit either a change in form or a change of meaning.

1. *Semantic Innovations.* §232. עוֹלָם 'eternity' in BH, has an added meaning 'world' which parallels that of A. BH מַעֲשֵׂה 'work, deed' now means 'a happening' (again an A calque). BH מָצָה 'grain' = MH 'money'. רָאוּהָ 'to see' also came to denote 'insight, understanding'.

2. *Morphological Innovations.* §233. מִשְׁאָח 'fire signal' in BH turns into מְשׂוּאָח in MH. בָּחַשׁ 'to deny' (Pi'el) became הִכְחִישׁ 'to contradict' (Hif'il). The verb קָשַׁל, employed in BH in Hif'il to mean 'to cause to stumble', appears in MH in the Pi'el according to MSS. From the BH verb סָעַד there appears the noun סְעוּדָה 'meal'.

### *Literature:*

[Kutscher, *Archive of the New Dictionary*, p. 72 (כשל).]

3. *New Hebrew Elements.* §234. Here belong those elements which most probably existed in the original stock of Hebrew, but by chance do not appear in BH. Undoubtedly, quite a few roots of this sort occur in MH, especially in the domain of agriculture, e.g., מָסוּק 'to harvest olives', עָצוּד 'to uproot' etc. טָחוּל 'spleen' is a good example of a "new" Hebrew element. The Arabic cognate is *ṭuhāl* and the Hebrew form shows the /a:/>/o:/ change (see §32), which did not occur in Aramaic. But some newcomers of this type apparently present a problem. We can understand that the root עָכַב 'hinder' is lacking in BH by mere chance. But it would be hard to explain in this way the verb חָזַר 'to return' that replaced BH שָׁב. It can scar-

cely be Aramaic (despite the fact that it is found in Palestinian A dialects), since in some A dialects the form is הדר. Therefore, the root חזר must be Hebrew-Canaanite. The only plausible explanation is that the Arameans themselves borrowed it somewhere in a Canaanite speaking area, and subsequently diffused it throughout the entire territory, both via Aramaic and in MH. The same might apply to the very common root צרך which already appears in Ugaritic, a language very close to Canaanite. It appears only once in LBH (II Chronicles 2, 15). Possibly פָּשׁוּר had the same fate, for it appears only in LBH (but it is possible that it is a loan from Akkadian; see above §123).

At first glance some of this material looks like BH, e.g. פָּסוּל 'to tarnish' = BH 'to hew'. But these are apparently homonyms, so we must postulate two different PS roots.

### C. Foreign Loanwords

*1. Akkadian.* §235. The influx of Akkadian into Hebrew continued mainly via Aramaic even after the Persians conquered the Babylonian Empire, but some of the loans apparently found their way directly into Hebrew, perhaps during the time of the Exile. Among these loans (as in BH) are words that Akkadian itself borrowed from Sumerian, e.g., תְּרַנְגוּל 'rooster'. Other Akkadian loans are: אָרִיס 'tenant' (which comes from a root that parallels Hebrew חָרַשׁ 'to plow'); צָבֶת 'pliers', מְשִׁיחָה 'cord.' Akkadian loans are conspicuous in the field of commerce, e.g., גָּט (Sumerian) '(legal) document' (for divorce etc.).

תַּגְּר 'merchant' goes back to Akkadian *tamkāru*. Some scholars assume that it is a native Akkadian word whose root is a cognate of Hebrew מָכַר 'to sell'. B. Landsberger took a different view. According to him there are "Proto-Indo-Germanic" roots in Sumerian, among them *dam-gār*, from which Akkadian *tamkāru* was borrowed. Therefore Landsberger assumed that this Akkadian word is a cognate of Latin *merx*, from which, among others, the English *merchant* derives.

Other instances of Akkadian words in MH are אָמַד 'evaluate, appraise', פָּתוּק 'to open irrigation channels' (which is identical to BH פָּתוּק and פִּתְק which, in turn might also be of Akkadian origin), and תְּרַגוּם 'translation'. The verb וָזַז 'to move' also comes from Akkadian, although strangely enough, BH קַזוּזָה 'doorpost' also derives from this root.

שֶׁלֶד 'skeleton' is Akkadian *šalamtu* (and is not identical with the English

*skeleton* which is of Latin origin). The word is employed as feminine, as in Akkadian, in spite of the fact that the feminine ending is no longer recognizable in Hebrew.

Calques from Akkadian are also to be found in MH as e.g., דִּין וְדָרָרִים, אֵין לִי 'I will have neither right nor claim' (Ketubot 9, 1). This phrase is a loan translation of the Akkadian *dīnī ū dabābi*.

*Literature:*

B. Landsberger, in *Hebräische Wortforschung: Festschrift... Walter Baumgartner*, Leiden 1967, 176–178.

2. *Persian*. §236. It is not surprising that Persian loans entered MH, since the Persians ruled over Palestine for two centuries (537–333 B.C.E.). These loans belong mainly to the domain of administration, e.g., אֲמַרְכָּל 'title of (Temple) official'. Neither is it surprising to find the word נֶרְד 'rose' (the Persian and the English words are related), in view of the fact that the Persians were famous horticulturalists. The very fact that the first consonant is a *waw* is bound to betray its non-Hebrew origin, since there are very few original Hebrew words whose first consonant is a *waw*. The word גֹּוֹן 'color' was also lent from Persian.

*Literature:*

[J.C. Greenfield, in M. Boyce and I Gershevitch, eds., *W.B. Henning Memorial Volume*, London 1970, pp. 180–185;

Kutscher, *Archive of the New Dictionary*, pp. 90–94 (Hebrew with English summary p. XXIX);

Sh. Shaked, *ibid.*, p. 112 (Hebrew with English summary p. XXXIV). All three references are to אֲמַרְכָּל.]

3. *Greek*. §237. Alexander the Great's conquest and the reign of Hellenism that came in its wake, exposed the Near East to Greek culture whose impact left indelible marks upon the languages of this area. MH bears witness to this influence by the hundreds of Greek loans and calques it contains. These loans encompass every fields of material culture.

In the field of administration we have the בִּוְלֵי 'city council'. Even the סְנֵהֲדָרִין 'judicial-religious assembly' — a major institution of the Jewish authorities — derived its name from Greek. The element *archi-* e.g., in the hybrid Hebrew-Greek compound אֲרַכְיָדִין 'chief justice' is very con-

spicuous in MH (= *arch-* in English as in *archbishop*, which goes back to the same source).

Of course this element also turns up in pure Greek compounds such as אַרְכִּי־לִי־סָטִיט 'chief robber'. Close to these are words denoting administrative entities and the like, for instance מְטְרוֹפּוֹלִיץ 'metropolis'. The word for 'port' occurs in Palestine in the Greek form לָמֵן (thus MSS) *limēn*, but in Mishnaic texts coming from Babylonia, the metathesised form נָמִיל is used.

The word for the fortified part of the city is חֶקֶרֶה (The initial *het*, instead of an expected *alef*, presents a problem [cf. Greek *akrópolis*].

NOTE: In the following sections, vocalizations attested in manuscripts are marked by a small circle°. Most of the words adduced do not occur in vocalized manuscripts and the vocalization provided in such cases is reconstructed on the basis of linguistic considerations. Normally only one form is quoted in cases where the loanword appears in the sources in two or more forms.

The shopkeeper's פְּנִיקֶס 'notebook' (or 'writing board') comes from Greek, as does his לִי־טָרָה° 'one pound weight'. He paid for his merchandise with the Greek אֶיֶסָר 'a coin'. Greek names appear even for foods and vegetables, e.g. קָרוֹב° 'cabbage'. אֶסְטָלֶת° 'garment' (cf. English *stole*) and other items of clothing are Greek. What is more astonishing is that even words like אַיִר° 'air' and זוּג° 'pair' were borrowed from Greek. From the latter a verbal root זָגַג 'to couple' was formed. Another such verbal root is בָּסַס 'to base'; the Greek *básis* is the origin of both the Hebrew and the English words.

Greek calques (loan translations) also seem to occur, e.g. יָפָה 'beautiful(?)' with the adverbial meaning 'well' (יָפָה אָמַרְתָּ 'you have spoken well') from *kalôs*. S. Lieberman believes that הִשְׁלַם 'to die' (lit. 'to complete') reflects Greek *telentein*, which has the same meaning.

#### Literature:

[Kutscher, *Archive of the New Dictionary*, pp. 96f. (למֵן-נמל)]

4. *Latin*. §238. Latin loans reached MH mostly via Greek and are derived mainly from the domain of the military, e.g., לִגְיוֹן° 'legion', דּוּקֶס 'duke' (in both cases the Latin and MH words are identical). Some administrative terms are אָנוּנָה (also אַרְנוּנָה) 'annual tax', and לִיבְלָר 'scribe'.

5. *Greek and Latin Loanwords in Everyday Life*. §239. The following lines will illustrate the abundance of Greek and Latin loanwords in everyday life

in MH. To round out the picture, loanwords that occur in MH after it ceased to be a spoken language also have to be taken into account. (These were generally not included in the above examples.) The picture which we give is certainly overdrawn, but it is nonetheless indicative of the situation.

The judge יודיקי (Latin) or the chief judge אַרְכִיבִידִיקי (Greek-Latin, see above §237), sitting on the podium בַּימָה (Greek), questioned the defendant who was standing on a small platform גַּרְדּוֹן (Latin). Having heard the prosecutor קְטִיגוֹר (Greek) and the defense attorney פְּרִקְלִיט (Greek), they either discharged the defendant by giving דִּימוּס (Latin) or convicted him by giving אַפּוֹפְסִיס (Greek) and turned him over to the executioner סְפִקְלוֹטוֹר (Latin).

A stranger אַכְסֵנִי (Greek) who travels the ocean אוֹקֵינוֹס (Greek) in a ship לִיבּוֹרְנִי (Latin) trusted that his skipper קֶבֶרְנִיט would be able to avoid the pirates' פִּירָאטִין ships and arrive safely in port לָמֵן (Greek, see above). From there he travelled sitting in the קָרוֹן (Gaelic via Latin; = English *car*) of the highway אַסְטֶרְטָה (Latin; = English *street*) which was guarded by the watchtowers בּוֹרְגִינִין (German? via Latin; = English *borough, Edinburgh* etc., also *purgos* (Greek?)). When he arrived at the metropolis מֶטְרוֹפּוֹלִין (Greek) he had to enter it through the city gates פִּילִי (Greek). If the stranger was an important personality, e.g., the Caesar קֵיסַר (Latin), the inhabitants would greet him with shouts of קְלוֹס (Greek; cf. §237). He might arrive at the city square פֶּלְטָה (Greek; = German *Platz*) and enter a building through the פְּרוֹזֶדוֹר (Greek; correctly פְּרוֹזֶדוֹר) and sit down in the inner room טֶרִיקְלִין (Latin) on a bench סֶסְפֶּס (Latin) or he might prefer the chair קְהֶדְרָה (Greek; English *chair*). Then he would wash his hands perhaps with some soap צֶפּוֹן (German? via Latin and Greek; = English *soap*) and have a hearty meal אַרִיסטוֹן (Greek). He would start out with a hors d'oeuvre תְּרִגִּימָה (Greek) honey wine יִינוֹמִילִין (Greek; the parallel of Hebrew יין is the first constituent, see above §226). This list could be continued ad infinitum, or more properly, until the wayfarer's death, since eventually, his bones would be deposited in an ossuary גְּלוֹסְקֵמָה (Greek). The reader will have noticed that only one verb from Greek was employed in this description, and indeed verbs of Greek or Latin origin are rare in MH. Yet, despite the abundance of the loans, they did not affect the structure of the language at all.

[For additional material on Greek and Latin loanwords see D. Sperber, *Bar-Ilan* vol. XIV–XV (1977), pp. 9–60 of the English section. — G.S.]

6. *Aramaic*. §240. The case is quite different with Aramaic. As pointed out several times, the effect of A was far reaching in morphology and syntax. The same might have been the case in phonology, but for the time being, nothing concrete can be said in this respect (but see above §196). It is not surprising that the impact of A is also felt, to a very large extent, in the basic vocabulary of MH.

α. *Verbs*. §241. There are quite a few A verbal roots in MH, e.g., ארע 'to happen' (in Hebrew the form should have been ערץ\*). Others are טיע 'to help' ושוש 'to fear'. The history of the root מחה 'to protest' is remarkable. It comes from A and parallels Hebrew מחוץ 'to crush'. Its form in early A מחא, was borrowed by BH, with the meaning 'to clap hands'. Since in later A as in MH the א"ל verbs generally turned into ל"י (ל"ה), it appears as מחה and entered MH with the meaning 'to protest' (originally 'to hit on the hands').

Here, then, we have an original Semitic root in triplet form in Hebrew. Nor is this an isolated case.

β. *Nouns*. §242. The influx of nouns and particles was also quite extensive. MH אלא 'but, only' is A. In H it should have been אא לא cf. אא לא אלא ביה. תלתן 'but you shall go into my father's house' (Gen. 24, 38). תלתן 'clover' also betrays its A origin by its consonants for in H it should have been שלשן\*. The noun קלל 'rule' turns out to be A (its vocalization in H should have been קלול\*). The wife's sister's husband has an A name גיס. It is interesting that the words for teacher and student, רב, תלמיד, come from A, from roots that are also found in H.

γ. *Calques and Inverted Calques*. §243. An interesting case is the Aramaic word for 'tree', namely, אילן. This case brings us to the problem of A calques in MH (cf. §106 on BH). In BH עץ has a double meaning, 'wood' and 'tree'. A, however, employs two different roots for the two meanings and MH followed suit by limiting the meaning of עץ to 'wood' (its etymological counterpart is employed with the same meaning in A), and borrowing the A אילן for 'tree'. That is why the fifteenth day of the month of Shevat is called ראש השנה לאילנות (Rosh Hashanah 1,1) and not לעצים... The very need for two semantemes in MH as against only one in BH is the outcome of the A influence.

A calque also effected changes in grammatical gender. כוס 'cup' is



feminine in BH but becomes masculine in MH. For this reason in the Haggadah of Passover we drink כּוֹס רִאשׁוֹן — שְׁנִי — שְׁלִישִׁי — רְבִיעִי 'first, second, third, fourth cup' all in masculine (though one certainly also hears כּוֹס רִאשׁוֹנָה etc. as feminine, under BH influence). On the other hand, שָׂדֶה 'field', masculine in BH becomes feminine in MH, e.g., נִסְתַּחֲפָה שְׂדֶהוּ 'his field was laid waste' (Ketubot 7, 8). Since there seems to be no reason behind these changes in gender, we should apparently credit אֶסֶם 'cup' masculine and חֶקֶל 'field' feminine for these changes.

In spite of the strong A influence described above, there seems to have been a resistance to wholesale Aramaization. Consider the following: In BH there are two words for 'also' גַּם and אַף. In MH only אַף survives. It would be easy to assume that גַּם was dropped because it does not occur in A while אַף does. But how, then, are we to explain the opposite cases? For 'rain' two nouns are mainly employed in BH גֶּשֶׁם and מָטָר. In MH מָטָר disappears in spite of the fact that it is to be found in all the A dialects, while the typically H גֶּשֶׁם survives.

#### Literature:

מ. מורשת, לקסיקון הפועל שנתחדש בלשון התנאים,]

רמת-גן תשמ"א;

ש. שרביט, נוסחאותיה ולשונה של מסכת אבות,

Ph.D. dissertation, Bar-Ilan University 1976 (in press). — G.S.]

### D. Dialects of Mishnaic Hebrew

§244. There are clear-cut indications that there were several varieties (if not dialects) of spoken MH (see above §192). In the Mishnaic literature itself, different Tannaim used different nouns for the same object, e.g. קְרִיצָה 'pick' (Sheqalim 8, 2) was called צִיפּוּרִין by Abba Shaul [Talmud Bavli, Sheqalim 29b — G.S.]. Sometimes the Talmud points out that different Tannaim use different expressions according to their respective places of origin. While the gutturals were generally pronounced correctly, in some cities and in the Academy of a certain Tanna, their pronunciation was weakened (see above §197). Still, it would be difficult to detect distinct layers in the Mishna as can be done in BH. The only exception seems to be

the tractate Sayings of the Fathers whose language is colored to a certain extent by BH.

We have noted that the language of MH as transmitted in Babylonia differs to a certain extent from that transmitted in Palestine. It also seems that MH of the Amoraim, already a dead language, was not exactly identical with the living MH, e.g., [וְהִמָּה — G.S.] ‘stench’ (Terumot 10, 1 in MSS) in MH, but [זוהמא — G.S.] in the Babylonian Talmud. Since research in this respect has not yet started, and the facts are largely unknown, nothing substantial can be said in this respect.

But clear-cut proofs of at least slight differences in MH are provided by the letters and documents, written in MH, of Bar-Koseba and his contemporaries. The most outstanding characteristic is the spelling of the *nota accusativi* as ן instead of ןא. This fact caused Milik to assume a Hebrew-Canaanite koiné since this is also the case in Punic (Canaanite of North Africa of about the same period). Another interesting case is that של of the genitive construction is written separately from the following noun while the noun is determined, e.g., של הגואיין ‘of the foreigners’ (this spelling, with *alef*, is attested in the DSS). A very interesting note by Jerome (§251) throws light on the situation during the fourth to fifth centuries C.E. He refers to BH, but this also holds good for MH. He says, “It is of no consequence whether (the word Shalem) is pronounced Salem or Salim, as H very rarely uses vowel letters in the course of words, and according to the discretion of readers and the different regions the same words is pronounced with different sounds and accents”.

#### *Literature:*

[Milik, above §206;

Kutscher, above §§192, 216.]

## E. The Transliterations of the Hexapla and Jerome

### I. *The Second Column of the Hexapla*

§245. The Church Father Origenes who lived in the city of Caesarea in Palestine in the third century C.E. edited the Hexapla, a six-column edition of the Bible.

This edition contained the Hebrew text in its first column, four different Greek translations in its third to sixth columns, and a transliteration of the Hebrew text in Greek characters in the second column. Only a few fragments and quotations of this transliteration survived. But even this meager material is highly instructive for the history of Hebrew. This is the earliest document which provides a full and continuous Hebrew text i.e., indicating consonants as well as the quality and sometimes even the quantity of all the vowels. It must be kept in mind that the vocalization signs had not yet been invented.

*Literature:*

[E. Brönno, *Studien über hebräische Morphologie und Syntax*, Leipzig 1943. — G.S.]

*a. Phonology*

1. *Vowels.* §246. As in the Septuagint, the short /i/ and /u/ of the Masoretic vocalization are transliterated by [e] and [o]. As pointed out above (§§175, 200), this apparently also parallels the situation in MH. Therefore, it seems highly probable that this pronunciation represents the substandard, that is to say, the pronunciation that prevailed in the spoken H and A of Palestine at that time. But the original /i/ and /u/, as preserved for us by the Masoretes, survived in the standard pronunciation, i.e. in the reading of the Bible text in the synagogue. Although the vocalization of the Masoretes is known to us only from a period about 600 years later than that of the transliterations, it faithfully preserved older forms. This is proved by the fact that nearly all the short [u]'s and a large number of the [i]'s in the Masoretic texts represent PS /u/'s and /i/'s. Therefore, of course they must reflect an earlier stage of the language (see §38). As shown above §175, the Septuagint also sometimes reflects the substandard pronunciation rather than the standard. There is a clear-cut distinction between PS long /u:/ and /i:/ which are transliterated by Greek *ou* (= [u]) and *i*, and between PS short /u/ and /i/ which are transliterated by *o* and *e*. For long /e:/ and /o:/ the parallel Greek long vowels *eta* and *omega* are employed not only in the case where these vowels represent contracted diphthongs but even when these sounds represent PS short vowels that became long due to stress, including pretonic syllables, e.g., *ēlau* = אֱלָיו, 'to him', *ōzēr* = עֹזֵר, 'helper' *iesmōrou* = יִשְׁמְרוּ, 'they will guard'.

2. *Consonants: Gutturals.* §247. There is no trace of the annotation of 'ayin by Greek *gamma* and *het* by *chi* as in *Gaza* and *Rachel* (see above §25). There is no sign at all to indicate the pharyngals /ħ/ and /ʕ/. Since, as shown above (*ibid.*), these sounds were pronounced by the Jews of the period, we can only conclude that the two different pronunciations of π and of υ respectively have merged and were pronounced like the [ħ] and [ʕ] of the Sepharadim of today. As Greek has no signs for these phonemes, there was no possibility of notating them.

### b. Morphology

1. *Possessive Pronouns.* §248. The possessive pronouns of the second person singular and plural masculine are the same as those employed in A (and MH) but are different from the older forms employed by the Masoretes. An added proof that the language underlying these transliterations was permeated by the substandard is the fact that clear-cut Aramaic forms appear in them, e.g., *alau* which is Aramaic עֲלוּהִי and not Hebrew עָלִיוּ.

2. *The Verb.* §249. There are quite a few pausal forms in context e.g. *iephpholou* = יפלו 'they will fall' in the Masoretic vocalization. The same is true in the DSS (where substandard traits abound, see §158) and in MH.

3. *The Noun.* 250. The most intriguing aspect in the noun is the form of the segolates. As demonstrated above, already in the Septuagint the segolates always have an anaptyctic vowel e.g., *Moloch* (= מֹלֶךְ) but in the Hexapla the second vowel never appears, and the first one keeps its original quality, e.g., *abd* = עֲבָד. How are we to account for this strange fact? After all, once these anaptyctic vowels have arisen it is very unlikely that they should have been dropped. Should we assume, then, that with regard to this phenomenon these transliterations reflect another dialect of H that at least in this respect was more archaic than the H of the Masoretes and that of the Septuagint? This solution seems preferable to the assumption of fluctuations between the Septuagint, the Hexapla, Jerome (see below), and the Masoretes. As in the Septuagint, noun patterns with prefix [m-] tend to keep the original vowel quality [a], e.g. *mabsar* = מִבְצָר 'fortress'. It is interesting to note that H קֶרְסֵל 'ankle' appears as *korsel* which is the form that we find in the MSS of MH. This is further proof that the language of the Hexapla tends to graft MH and A on BH texts.

Of course, this is not the case wherever this transliteration diverges from the BH of the Masoretes. The noun patterns mentioned above are apparently more archaic than the H transmitted by the Masoretes. There is also reason to believe that the so-called Law of Philippi (cf. §97) was not active in this text.

## II. *The Transliterations of Jerome*

§251. The Church Father Jerome (Hieronymus) who lived in Palestine at the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century C.E. is an important source for the history of Hebrew. Jerome came to Palestine from abroad and learned Hebrew from Jewish teachers in order to produce his Vulgate with the help of the original text, and not only with the help of the Greek versions. In his extensive Latin commentaries to the Bible he quite often discusses H words. Thanks to the several hundred H words that appear in his commentaries, we are able to form an idea of H as he knew it. To be sure, what has been shown concerning the transliterations of the Septuagint, and especially concerning the Hexapla, also applies to his transliterations, i.e. grafting of MH and A forms on BH. The most obvious indication of this is again the form of the possessive pronoun of the second person singular, e.g., *dodach* = דדך 'your uncle'. The same applies to the pausal forms in context (see above §§158, 249) The segolates exhibit the forms known from the Septuagint, i.e. with the anaptyctic vowel, e.g., *sedec* = סדעק 'righteousness'. But the anaptyctic vowel in the *qu!* forms is no longer [o] but [e] e.g., *codes* = שדעק. In other words, the behavior of this noun pattern is now practically identical with that of Masoretic H. Nouns with prefix [m] are generally vocalized with [a] in the first syllable as in the Septuagint and the Hexapla, e.g., *mabsar* = מבסר. About *bosor* = בוסר see above §37.

The writings of Jerome are still a gold mine of information and a more thorough study of his works might well yield many more items as surprising as these.

## F. Mishnaic Hebrew in Palestinian Aramaic Dialects

§252. Both BH and MH, influenced the A dialects spoken in Palestine,

viz. Galilean A, Christian A of Palestine, and Samaritan A, with the strongest influence upon the Christian A of Palestine (which was apparently spoken by converted Jews). Not only words of H origin like  $\text{אצו}$  = H  $\text{אצו}$  'council', are found, but H grammatical forms, too, succeeded in penetrating it, e.g., the pausal forms of the verb (see above §158). (Pausal forms are entirely alien to A). It is regrettable that also in the field of H influence on A, proper research has not as yet begun.

[For MH influence on the Christian Aramaic of Palestine see M. Bar-Asher, *Palestinian Syriac Studies*, Ph.D dissertation, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem 1976 (in Hebrew), references quoted in his index, p. 581 under IX.]

### G. Critique of Lexicographical Reference Works

**§253.** The research into MH is very unsatisfactory. The situation concerning the grammar has been alluded to. Regarding lexicography, there is no lexicon devoted exclusively to MH. MH material is included in dictionaries that cover the material of the Rabbinic writings — including all the A dialects — such as those of Levy, Jastrow, and Kohut. These dictionaries have many shortcomings. They are badly organized and do not distinguish between the two layers of MH, namely spoken MH (the language of the Tannaim) and that of the Amoraim (see above §192). Scientifically, they are out of date, both in etymology and semantics. Krauss's *Additamenta* to Kohut's work only slightly changes the situation. Ben Yehuda's *Thesaurus* includes the MH material and is in many respects more reliable than the dictionaries mentioned above, but it does not answer the need for a special dictionary of MH. A new dictionary of MH is an urgent desideratum.

In the field of MH lexicography, it is especially the works of S. Lieberman and the late H. Yalon, J.N. Epstein [and E.Y. Kutscher] that will have to be utilized. What was said about MH lexicography in general also applies to foreign loans in MH in particular. Krauss's volume has gained in importance by the additions of Löw, but it is outdated. The works of S. Lieberman have improved the situation also in this field. While the Akkadian loans also need reviewing, the Aramaic influence has to be treated *de novo*. To date, the only field treated satisfactorily is the flora, by Löw.

Among the transliterations only Brönno's treatment of the Hexapla is more or less up to date.

*Literature:*

[Major contributions to the study of MH dialects, grammar and especially vocabulary are to be found in four of the author's posthumous articles, namely, "The Present State of Research into Mishnaic Hebrew Especially Lexicography and Its Tasks", "Some Problems of the Lexicography of Mishnaic Hebrew and Its Comparison with Biblical Hebrew", "Addenda to the Lexicographical Section" and "Trivia" all in E.Y. Kutscher, ed., *Archive of the New Dictionary of Rabbinical Literature* vol. I, Ramat-Gan 1972, pp. 3-105, in Hebrew, with English summaries pp. III-XXXII.

[Bibliographical references to the works of Jastrow, Kohut, Krauss, Levy and Löw can be found in the footnotes, *ibid*, pp. 4-8.]

## CHAPTER SEVEN

## MEDIÉVAL HEBREW\*

§254. It is generally assumed that MH died out as a spoken language at the end of the second century C.E. as was certainly the case in the Galilee, though possibly it lived on for some time in Judea. However, there is little doubt that around the fifth century C.E. H was not used anywhere as a spoken language, although it was still extensively employed in writing until it was revived three generations ago as a spoken language. Though technically dead for centuries, H continued to change. The original Palestinian phonetics, even of the sacred text of BH, not to mention that of MH could not be preserved throughout the various parts of the Diaspora in which each region created its own system of pronunciation.

Generally, H consonants and vowels were very much influenced by the local language. Only the Yemenite community was able to keep quite close to H as known to the Masoretes (see §373).

We are able to discuss some of the well-defined linguistic characteristics of several quasi-dialects of H which arose after the Mishnaic-Talmudic period. All the H "languages" which arose have one feature in common. While BH and MH were natural autonomic languages, each representing a stage of spoken H (with the possible exception of the H of the DSS, see above), all of the later strata of H represent a mixture of BH, MH, and other elements. Even the H of the Spanish poetry which strove to base itself linguistically on BH did not refrain entirely from using MH. Conversely, even though Maimonides states explicitly that his *Mishneh Torah* was written in MH, it nonetheless contains biblical and other elements.

This process of intermingling the two strata of H apparently began immediately after MH died out in the Galilee. When the Amora R. Yochanan

\*According to I. Abrahams, *Jewish Life in the Middle Ages*, reprint New York 1969, p. 1, the Jewish Middle Ages lasted until the close of the eighteenth century.



(third century C.E.) heard other Amoraim intentionally substitute a BH form for MH (רחלים 'ewes' instead of רחלות; מסך instead of מוג 'to mix wine with water'; Talmud Bavli Hullin 137b, Avoda Zara 58b) he upbraided them, declaring that these two languages were different (לשון חורה לעצמה) (לשון חורר) (לחורר) ולשון חכמים לעצמן (לחורר). However, since MH was dead and BH had greater authority, his opposition was futile.

*Literature:*

אפשטיין, מבוא, עמ' 282–283 (רחלים).

## A. Medieval Hebrew as Spoken and Literary Language

### I. Occasional Use as a Spoken Language

§255. To some extent H was employed as a spoken language even during the long period of the Exile. Jews traveling from East to West or migrating from country to country would converse with their fellow Jews in H. As Parḥon (twelfth century) puts it: "When travellers arrive in the Christian lands they do not understand the native Jews. That is why the latter are forced to converse in the Holy Tongue." When a German rabbi, Isaiah Hurwitz, journeyed to Palestine by way of Syria he tells us that in Aleppo, "Their speech is the Holy Tongue; and, whenever I lectured there, I did so in the Holy Tongue likewise." There is reason to believe that at the beginning of the present millennium H was employed to a certain extent as the language of instruction in Jewish schools in the Moslem countries. We hear about schools in Amsterdam in which certain classes were taught in H (1680). In Frankfurt and in other cities in Germany parents are admonished to see to it that the children speak H (1711). In tenth-century Palestine we hear about H being spoken in Tiberias; in Jerusalem in the fifteenth century, even non-Jewish travellers report this fact. The British Consul in Jerusalem, J. Finn mentions H as a vehicle of everyday speech (1854). Moses Montefiore (nineteenth century) also alludes to this fact.

In Yemen until very recently the Rabbi's sermon was delivered in H. Talmud and Mishnah were taught in H and scholars sometimes conversed with one another in H.

*Literature:*

C. Roth, *Personalities and Events in Jewish History*, Philadelphia 1953, pp. 136ff.;

מ. איש-שלום, לתולדות הדבור העברי, קובץ ארשת,

ירושלים תש"ד, עמ' שפז;

ש.ד. גויטין, סדרי חינוך בימי הגאונים ובית הרמב"ם,

ירושלים תשכ"ב, עמ' קסג;

ש. מורג, העברית שבפי יהודי תימן, ירושלים 1963, עמ' ל.

II. *Medieval Hebrew as a Literary Language*

§256. Of course these were exceptional cases.

“During the Middle Ages Jews used as their vernacular the language of the territory they lived in. But there was a significant divergence between those Jews living under Islam and those in Christian countries. In Christian lands where Latin was employed as a literary medium, H was the only literary language which the Jews could use. In the Arabic-speaking countries, on the other hand, where the vernacular was quite close to the literary language, Jews were inclined to write in Arabic. Even authors who spoke with grief and chagrin of the neglect of their own tongue, did not as a rule hesitate to resort to Arabic in their literary productions.” (Halkin).

Poetry, however, was generally composed in H even in these countries, since as Halkin rightly points out: “Poetry among the Arabs served the purpose of displaying the beauties of their language... The finest example of style was believed by them... to exist in the Qur`ān... Their [the Jews'] pride... impelled them to do for H as their neighbors did for their tongue.”

But in Christian countries literary production was in H whether its topic was connected with the Bible, Mishnah or Talmud, or with secular subjects. Even contracts with Gentiles were at times drawn up in H as were the famous *Starrs* in England (eleventh–thirteenth centuries).

*Literature:*

A.S. Halkin, “The Medieval Attitude toward Hebrew”, in A. Altman, ed., *Biblical and Other Studies*, Cambridge, Mass. 1963.

F. A. Lincoln, *The Starra*, Oxford 1939, pp. 1–7.

## B. Developments in Hebrew Linguistics

§257. But before we proceed to describe the different H “dialects” of the Middle Ages, we should mention two very important developments which played a part in the transmission of H: 1) the invention of the vowel signs and 2) the rise and development of H linguistics.

I. *The Invention of Vowel Signs (Vocalization)*a. *The Need for Vowel Signs*

§258. The Phoenician alphabet, like nearly all the Semitic alphabets derived from it, was originally devised to indicate consonants only. Symbols employed to indicate vowels (namely *waw* and *yod*) occur very rarely, e.g., in Phoenician inscriptions, but are already widely used in the Bible. Yet in themselves they could not solve the problem of how to indicate the correct pronunciation for those who did not speak BH as a natural language. *Waw* served not only as a consonant (e.g., מָוֹת ‘death’), but could also indicate both long /o:/ and /u:/ e.g., שׁוֹר ‘ox’ and שׁוֹר ‘wall’, vs. שְׁלחַן ‘table’ and בֶּקֶר ‘morning’, while it was very rarely employed to indicate short vowels. The same holds true for *yod*, cf. עִיר ‘ass’ and עִיר ‘city’; הַיִּכַּל ‘palace’, but שֵׁן ‘tooth’. There is practically no *mater lectionis* for [a] vowels. The problem became acute during the Second Temple period when on the one hand Aramaic was becoming dominant, and on the other, MH was replacing BH. To be sure, the writers of the DSS tried to solve the problem by extending the use of the *matres lectionis* to indicate short vowels, by adding *alef* (not extensively) in the middle of words, and by introducing new *matres lectionis*, and the authors of the Mishnah and the Talmud followed in their footsteps to a certain extent. Nonetheless, the existing symbols could not indicate all of the timbres, e.g., the difference between /u/-/o/, /i/-/e/. There is reason to believe that only a small number of professional readers were able to recite the Bible in the synagogue without interference from the colloquial languages, i.e., MH and Aramaic.

At the time of the Arab conquest in the eighth century, the Jews had to know three dead languages (BH, MH, and Aramaic) for religious purposes so that the use of vowel signs to indicate the timbres became imperative, and indeed this seems to be the reason for the invention of the vowel signs.

*Literature:*

For a similar account see S.W. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*<sup>2</sup>, vol. VII, Hebrew Language and Letters (High Middle Ages), New York, 1958, p. 4ff.

*b. The Three Vocalization Systems*

§259. The invention of the vocalization systems was apparently the work of the Masoretes of the second half of the first millennium C.E. Until the last century only the Tiberian or “oui” vocalization system was known, but during the last hundred years two additional systems were discovered, 1) the Babylonian, both simple and complex (originating in Mesopotamia), which was still in use in the Yemenite Jewish community until a few generations ago; 2) the Palestinian system, differing from the Tiberian and apparently abandoned very early. These two systems differ in the symbols used for the vowels, in the *dagesh*, etc. (the latter two systems employing supralinear signs), and also reflect different linguistic traditions. For example, the Babylonian system possesses only one symbol for both *pataḥ* and *segol*, as is reflected to this day in the Yemenite pronunciation.

Thanks to the invention of the vowel signs, every Jew was able to read the Biblical text whose reading was thereby stabilized. Although Mishnaic texts and Piyuṭim (see below) were very often vocalized, their vocalization was never standardized, and practically every manuscript followed its own rules.

*Literature:*

Bauer-Leander, *Hist. Gramm.*, p. 81–114;

Sh. Morag, *The Vocalization Systems of Arabic, Hebrew and Aramaic*, 's-Gravenhage 1962, pp. 17–45;

מ. וויינרײך, ראשית ההברה האשכנזית וכו', לשוננו כז-כח (תשכ״ג-כ״ד) עמ' .231-230, 147-142

[A. Dotan, *EJ* 16, cols. 1404–61, esp. 1447–49. — E.G.]

II. *Pronunciation of Hebrew in Christian and Arab Countries*

§260. A discussion of the system of vocalization should be approached through a preliminary treatment of the pronunciation of Hebrew in the Diaspora from the beginning of the Middle Ages to the revival of the

Hebrew language. The geographical and historical aspects of this difficult subject still await systematic treatment. Until now only Medieval Spain has been studied, by the late I. Garbell. She concluded that in Moorish Spain the entire Hebrew sound system was adapted to that of (Moorish) Arabic. *Mutatis mutandis* this also holds true in the Christian countries where those H consonants which had no counterpart in the vernacular generally did not survive in H either. (Christian Spain, though, might have been something of an exception owing to its Moorish-Arabic neighbors, former domination, etc.) To be sure, there was certainly a tendency, as M. Weinreich points out, to preserve consonants in one form or another at least in the so-called "whole-Hebrew" (the reading in the synagogue, etc.), but doubtless this picture is generally correct.

*Literature:*

I. Garbell, "The Pronunciation of Hebrew in Medieval Spain", *Homenaje A.*

*Millas Vallicrosa*, Barcelona 1954, p. 646;

M. Weinreich, *op. cit.* (§259), p. 136.

*a. Consonants*

1. *Emphatics and Gutturals.* §261. It follows therefore, that the pronunciation of the emphatics /q, t/ in Christian countries merged with their non-emphatic counterparts /k, t/, while in the Moslem countries they survived thanks to their existence in Arabic. The same applies to /s/ which in Christian countries turned into /ts/, a phoneme absent in the Semitic languages except for Ethiopic. By the same token, the laryngals /ʕ, h/ survived in the Moslem countries but disappeared in Christian lands despite apparent efforts to preserve the /ʕ/. In Europe towards the end of the Middle Ages we hear about the B<sup>e</sup>nē Xeth (an allusion to Gen. 23, 3) who pronounced the pharyngal /ħ/ as a velar [x], and the B<sup>e</sup>nē Heth who pronounced /ħ/ as [h]. According to Max Weinreich, the B<sup>e</sup>nē Xeth were Jews living in Slavic countries who, because of the Babylonian Renaissance (see below), tried to reintroduce the "original" pronunciation as /ħ/. Instead, they succeeded in introducing [x]. B<sup>e</sup>nē Heth were Jews who came from France and had to replace the pharyngal /ħ/ with the laryngal [h]. Survivals are found in Yiddish, e.g., the names Sime, Simhe and Simxe all of which =  $\text{הֵמָּשׁ}$ ; the former reflecting the earlier Western pronunciation (and cf. above §28).

*Literature:*

Garbell, op. cit. (§260) passim;

M. Weinreich, op. cit. (§259), pp. 328ff.;

מ. וויינרייך, לשוננו כג (חשי"ט), עמ' 85-101;

M. Güdemann, *Geschichte des Erziehungswesens und der Cultur der Juden in Deutschland*, Wien 1888, p. 75-77.

2. *Sibilants*. §262. But perhaps the most interesting development was that of the *shin*. In Europe during the first millennium C.E., the /š/ was lacking in the Germanic and Romance languages and in Greek. Therefore in the H pronunciation of the Jews who spoke these languages /š/ was replaced by [s] (cf. Sabbath = שַׁבָּת). At the beginning of the second millennium C.E., /š/ arose in these languages thus enabling the Jews to revert to the original pronunciation (apparently also with the help of Jews from regions which had preserved the /š/).

Even later, French and German Jews kept the [s] pronunciation in many instances, and cf. the cases of [kaddis], [sabbat salom] and [sabesdiker losn] discussed above §23.

*Literature:*

See above §23.

*b. Vowels*

§263. Here, too, there are differences among various regions. For example, the Sephardim do not distinguish between *qameš gadol* and *pataḥ* (both = [a]), and between *šere* and *segol* (both = [e]). The /o:/ of the Ashkenazic communities mostly turned into a diphthong: [oi, au, ei] e.g., שׁוּמַר 'guard' [šoimer], [šauer], [šeimer]. The short /u/ in certain regions of Eastern Europe turned into [ü]; cf. שׁוּקָה [süke] or [i] — [sike] in Yiddish.

The most important development concerns the fate of the *qameš gadol*. As set forth above (§37) there is no doubt that this vowel was pronounced as a type of [o] by the Masoretes of Tiberias, and until a generation ago it was commonly thought that the parallel Ashkenazic pronunciation reflects the Masoretic one. But H. Yalon has shown that in Europe at the beginning of the second millennium C.E., the Ashkenazic communities pronounced the *qameš gadol* like the *pataḥ*, and that the change to the so-called Ashkenazic pronunciation began in the thirteenth, and came to an end in the fifteenth century. (Cf. also below §§465, 474.)

1. *Old Pronunciation Sometimes Preserved in Yiddish.* §264. A few words with the older pronunciation survived until today in Yiddish e.g., קלל — [klal] ‘rule’, משניות — [mišnayot] ‘soul’s’, נפשות — [nefašot] ‘souls’. How are we to account for this change? H. Yalon believed that it was the outcome of a parallel process in the German dialects so that it was mere coincidence that the *qamaṣ gadol* came to be identical with that of the Masoretes and Yemenites. M. Weinreich is inclined to believe that it is the outcome of the “Babylonian Renaissance” during which scholars who came to Europe after the destruction of the Babylonian academies brought with them the Babylonian pronunciation of the *qameṣ*. However, it is not entirely clear how the *qameṣ* was pronounced in Babylonia.

*Literature:*

M. Weinreich, op. cit. (§259), pp. 140, 237–239, 244;

ח. ילון, קונטרסים לעניני הלשון העברית, א, ירושלים

תרצ"ז-תרצ"ח, עמ' 62-78;

[Sh. Morag, “Pronunciations of Hebrew”, *EJ* 13, cols. 1120–1143;

א. אדלר, מסורת הקריאה הקדם-אשכנזית, מהותה

והיסודות המשותפים לה ולמסורות ספרד,

— E.G.] עדה ולשון ד, ירושלים, תשל"ט.

### C. Piyyuṭim and Poetry

§265. In Palestine around the middle of the first millennium C.E. a new genre of religious poetry arose — the Piyyuṭ (from the Greek *poiētēs*). The Piyyuṭ is a hymn added to the older liturgy. “This designation (Piyyuṭ) was not quite as descriptive of the peculiar nature of this poetry as its... synonym, *ḥazzanut*; that is compositions of synagogue readers” (Baron). The composition of Piyyuṭim spread from Palestine to the diaspora, reaching its peak during the end of the first half of the present millennium and continuing sporadically for several centuries. Although the recitation of Piyyuṭim played an important role in synagogue services, it also met with opposition, and was one of the targets of the nineteenth century reformers in Germany.

*Literature:*

S. Spiegel, “On Hebrew Medieval Poetry”, in L. Finkelstein, ed., *The Jews*<sup>3</sup>

- I, Philadelphia 1960, pp. 169ff.;  
 Baron, *History* VII, pp. 89ff.;  
 L. Zunz, *Die Ritus des synagogalen Gottesdienstes*<sup>2</sup>, Berlin 1919,  
 pp. 169ff.;  
 [Y. Yahalom, *The Syntax of the Ancient Piyyut (including Yannai) as a  
 Basis for Its Style*, Ph.D. dissertation, The Hebrew University of  
 Jerusalem 1974 (Hebrew). — E.G.]

### I. Linguistic Techniques of the Payṭanim

§266. The authors of the Piyyuṭim adopted a revolutionary approach to the H language. Not even Israeli Hebrew has approached the language in so daring a fashion. There are differences among the linguistic usages of the various Payṭanim, the most important of whom were Yosé ben Yosé, Yannai, Elazar Ha-Kalir and R. Sa'adyah Gaon. While the language of the first writer is easily understood, Sa'adyah Gaon excelled in the use of rare and difficult forms and roots of BH by means of which according to Zulay, Sa'adyah intended to bring about a general renaissance of BH. He was thus the forerunner of the later Spanish poetic tendency to restore BH to its proper place in poetry. All of the Payṭanim made extensive use of the device of surprise by means of allusions to obscure Aggadic Midrashim.

The Payṭanim brought about a revolution especially in the morphology of H. They also made use of BH, MH, and Aramaic, although the extent of the use of different sources depends upon the particular Payṭan. The main characteristics of their language are emblematic use of words, e.g., אַדְמוֹן = the Roman Empire (cf Gen. 25, 25, identifying Edom — Rome); פ"נ, פ"י verbs and geminates are employed as if they were ע"ו verbs, e.g., גַּשׁ (= גַּשׁוּ) 'he approached'; the prepositions כ, ב and ל are employed as conjunctions, e.g., כִּי יֵצְאוּ (= כַּאֲשֶׁר יֵצְאוּ) 'when they went out'; nouns were created from verbal roots, e.g., מִלַּל 'talk', and verbs from nouns, e.g., אָרַשׁ 'to talk' (from BH אָרַשׁ 'talk'); masculine nouns were changed to feminine, and *vice versa* (only by Sa'adyah) e.g., אָרַשׁ (אַרְשַׁת); nouns of ל"ה roots may appear in shortened forms, מַעַשׂ 'doing, work' (< מַעֲשֵׂה); verbs are apt to be employed in stems which do not occur in the sources, e.g., הַתְּנִצָּה 'to guard, fight' (instead of Nif'al). The Payṭanim were also fond of word plays. There is certainly some basis for M. Zulay's assumption that to a certain extent these innovations represent a spoken dialect. For instance,



Ibn Ezra criticizes Kalir for rhyming [m] with [n], e.g., יום with עלין. But as Yalon has shown [m] at the end of a word became [n] under certain circumstances. However, there is no doubt that the bulk of the linguistic changes are the innovations of the Payṭanim themselves.

Sa'adyah Gaon frequently used *hapax legomena* and irregular grammatical forms for certain reasons connected with his attitude towards BH and MH and his fight against the Karaites, a Jewish sect which rejected all of post-Biblical literature and tradition.

### Literature:

Baron, *History* VII, p. 89;

L. Zunz, *Die synagogale Poesie des Mittelalters*<sup>2</sup>, Frankfurt a/M 1920, pp. 372, 477, 453, 380, 384, 388, 421, 387, 417, 427;

H. Yalon, *MGJW* 77 (1933), p. 430;

M. Zulay, "Researches in Yannai's Liturgical Poems", *Studies of the Research Institute for Hebrew Poetry in Jerusalem* VI (1946) (in Hebrew), pp. 161-249;

idem, "The Language of the Payyetanim", *Melilah* I (Manchester 1944) (in Hebrew), pp. 69ff.;

מ. זולאי, האסכולה הפייטנית של רב סעדיה גאון, ירושלים תשכ"ד, עמ' יח, יז-חי, יט ואילך, לא ואילך, לו;

ד.מ. רבינוביץ, הלכה ואגדה בפיוטי יניי, נוי יורק-תל אביב תשכ"ד, עמ' לב-מט;

[E. Goldenberg, *Lešonenu* 37 (1972-73), pp. 117-163; 38 (1973-74), pp. 85-87 (Hebrew with English summary);

idem, *EJ* 16, cols. 1609-1616. — E.G.]

## II. Opposition to the Piyyuṭim

§267. The linguistic revolution created by the Payṭanim did not go uncontested. R. Abraham Ibn Ezra (twelfth century) came out very strongly against Kalir (commentary on Eccles. 5, 1). Ibn Ezra even finds fault with the fact that the Payṭanim used BH and MH indiscriminately since "it is known that these are different languages (expressions) that are not of the Holy Tongue. And also they (the Rabbis of the Talmud) said: לשון מקרא לשון חור (BH and MH are different "languages") (cf. above

§254). Therefore it is not surprising that Ibn Ezra opposed Persian, Greek and other loanwords in MH.

Rabbi David Qimḥi (Radaq; end of the twelfth century) also criticized the Payṭanim. Although he conceded that a certain freedom in the use of BH was permissible, he scored the Payṭanim for going too far.

The opposition to the Piyyuṭim for linguistic reasons among others is even to be found in the Prayer Book of R. Jacob Emden (Javetz, eighteenth century) who calls their language “a mixture of languages”.

#### *Literature:*

A. A. Wolff, עזרת שלום ואמת, *Stimmen der ältesten glaubwürdigsten Rabinen über die Piyyuṭim*, Leipzig 1857, pp. 9ff., 15, 24.

### D. Linguistics and Poetry in Spain and Elsewhere

#### I. *The Rise of Hebrew Linguistics in Spain*

§268. The beginnings of H linguistics can be traced to the East, to the work of the Masoretes. “Hand in hand with the deepened and diversified interest in the Bible went the newly awakened scientific curiosity about the Hebrew language, its vocabulary and forms... (a) distinguished Karaite grammarian and exegete... wrote... ‘No one can arrive at this [true understanding of the Bible] whilst being ignorant of the language’” (Baron). The fight against the Karaites also played a part in this newly awakened interest in BH. Moreover, as Baron puts it: “Perhaps in no period of human history did preoccupation with the correctness and purity of the spoken and written language become such a deep concern of educated classes as during the Islamic Renaissance.” Already in the ninth–tenth century Sa‘adyah Gaon composed several treatises on linguistics. Yehudah Ibn Qoreish, a native of tenth-century North Africa, pointed out the kinship of H, Aramaic and Arabic, while other scholars (including Karaite authors) are to be considered among the founders of H linguistics. Yet it was the Jews of Spain during the tenth–thirteenth centuries who really brought about the golden age of H linguistics. The influence of the Arabic grammarians which made itself felt thanks to the Judeo-Arabic symbiosis in Spain, enabled H linguistics to flourish.

During this period the foundations of comparative Semitic linguistics were laid thanks to scholarly knowledge of BH, MH, Aramaic and Arabic.

The main architects of this entirely new field in Jewish scholarship were Menahem ben Saruq, Dunash ben Labrat, Judah ben Hayyūj (who established the principle of the tri-radical root in H) and especially Yonah Ibn Janah. Joseph Qimḥi and his son David Qimḥi (Radaq) already signify the end of this period (tenth-thirteenth centuries). These authors composed grammatical treatises and dictionaries of BH, mainly in Arabic. Their attitude to MH varied. Since they had no conception of the development of language, they did not know what to make of MH which differs so substantially from BH. The Spanish poets had an analogous attitude to MH (see below §269); therefore, we find e.g., that Moshe Ibn Ezra in his treatise *The Poetry of Israel* says: "If we sometimes have recourse to MH this is quite all right, in spite of the fact that sometimes we find there expressions which contradict linguistic laws." For the attitudes of R. Abraham Ibn Ezra toward MH, see above §267.

These statements show quite clearly that despite Sa'adyah's efforts, MH was not considered to be on a par with BH, and so, even though most of the grammarians mentioned above did make use of it, their attitude towards it remained somewhat ambivalent. It is therefore not surprising that neither the Talmudic dictionary of R. Nathan of Rome (eleventh century), nor the dictionary of Tanḥum of Jerusalem to the *Mishneh Torah* of Maimonides was composed in Spain.

#### *Literature:*

Baron, *History* VII, pp. 3, 4ff.;

H. Hirschfeld, *Literary History of Hebrew Grammarians and Lexicographers*, Oxford and London 1926;

[D. Tené, *EJ* 16, cols. 1352-1390. — E.G.]

## II. *The Hebrew Poetry of Spain and Italy*

§269. Closely connected with Hebrew linguistics in Spain was the emergence of H poetry not devoted solely to religious themes, but also to secular subjects. Here too, the influence of Arabic is undeniable. A certain meter imitating that of the Arabic was introduced. In addition, in their choice of BH, the poets followed in the footsteps of the Arabic poets who

imitated the language of the Qur'ān. (But see above concerning Sa'adyah, §266). This whole treatment of H was diametrically opposed to that of the Payṭanim whose goal was to use BH only. Thus Moshe Ibn Ezra's admonition that the poets not change the stem of a root immediately reveals his opposition to the Payṭanim, and to the Spanish poets the most famous of whom, besides those mentioned above as grammarians, are Shmuel Ha-Nagid, Shlomo Ibn Gabirol, Judah Ha-Levi, and the two Ibn Ezra's mentioned above (tenth-twelfth century)

*a. The Language*

§270. As mentioned above, the Payṭanim aspired to produce a poetic language in pure BH in order to extol the beauty of the Bible as the Arabs did the Qur'ān. This aim was quite fully realized. However, their language was not genuine BH; sometimes they would use a phrase or word from the Bible and intentionally give it a meaning different from its Biblical context. This device called *šibbuṣ* was considered a great achievement. An example is found in the line by Ibn Gabirol: אָכַן מִיָּדַעִי וְנִחַתְנִי לְאֵד עַד פִּי קָרָא תִיךְ אָבִי- 'Oh my friend thou hast greatly forsaken me, and therefore I have called thee arch-forsaker.' אָבִי-וְנִחַתְנִי (I Chr. 4, 18) is a personal name employed here with the entirely different meaning of 'arch-forsaker'. Or again, speaking of hypocrites who try to show a pure soul, he says: וְחִתְּתִיהָ תַעֲמֹד הַבְּהָרָה. The meaning of this phrase in the Bible (Lev. 13, 23) is '... the discoloration remains stationary', while here חִתְּתִיהָ means '(the discoloration stays) underneath.' The poets, and before them the Payṭanim would sometimes attribute a meaning to a Biblical word different from the meaning commonly attributed to it in the Biblical text. The grammarian Yonah Ibn Janaḥ already remarked on this point; for example, he mentions that the Payṭanim employ the word תִּין (Job 41, 4 a *hapax legomenon*) not with the proper meaning 'prayer' (according to Ibn Janaḥ), but with the meaning 'speech'. In another case he castigates the poet who employs the H root צדה 'to lie in wait' as if its meaning were צור 'to capture'. On the other hand, he defends another poet's use of עָבוּר instead of בָּעָבוּר. Moshe Ibn Ezra uses the root שוה in the meaning 'to disappoint' which, according to our dictionaries, does not occur with this meaning in the Bible. But Ibn Janaḥ explains Hos. 10, 1 פָּרִי יִשָּׂוּה לֹו from the root שוה meaning 'to disappoint, lie'.

The noun אור 'light' is sometimes employed with the meaning 'rain' on the basis of the interpretation of certain Biblical passages (e.g., Job 36, 30).

Although the authors of this poetry intended to keep their language grammatically close to BH (e.g., the poet was not supposed to change even the stem of a Biblical verb; see above §269), nevertheless we find even denomintive verbs such as *מְיוֹשֵׁפָה* from *יָשֵׁפָה* ‘jasper’ (Ibn Gabirol). Shmuel Ha-Nagid (eleventh century) did not hesitate to create new nouns such as *הִלְשָׁה* ‘weakness’ and to employ new stems as the Payṭanim did, for example, *אָזַן* (= *הִאָּזַן*) ‘to listen’. In addition to this modified BH we shall consider two more elements.

1. *Mishnaic Hebrew Elements.* §271. Shmuel Ha-Nagid drew upon MH quite extensively, e.g., MH *קָרַיַת*, ‘reading of’ instead of *קָרְיָאָה*, and such words as *קוֹשְׁפָה* ‘question’, *טְעוּת* ‘mistake’, *זָג* (Greek loan) ‘pair’ and others occur in his poetry. Judah Al-Ḥarizi (twelfth–thirteenth century) in his translation of the *maqamah*’s (“a picturesque genre in rhymed prose intersected by verse”, Spiegel) also uses MH words, e.g., *בֵּית־דִּין* ‘court’, *טַעֲנָה* ‘argument’, *בְּצֵל בְּרָחִי* ‘nolens volens’, etc.

Yiṣhak Ibn Khalfun, a contemporary of Shmuel Ha-Nagid, also employed MH and even usages of the Payṭanim in his poems, e.g., *מַעֲשֵׂ* (= *מַעֲשָׂה*), or the preposition *כ* with the finilte verb e.g., *כְּשֵׁם* (*כְּאִשָּׁר*) ‘when he put’ (see above §266). According to Mirsky it was only the later poets of Spain (Judah Ha-Levy, Moses Ibn Ezra) who were more particular in the use of BH in their works.

2. *Arabic (and Other) Influence.* §272. Arabic influence, though contested by scholars and obviously very weak, does exist. To be sure, when Judah Ha-Levi says, *דְּרַשְׁתִּיךָ וְאַם מְלִכְךָ אֵין בְּךָ* “I sought you (Eretz Israel) even if your king (God) does not dwell in you”, *אם* is not necessarily a reflex of the Arabic *in* ‘even if’, since as Mirsky has shown, *אם* occurs in the Bible with the same meaning, e.g., Num. 36, 4; cf. Rashi ad loc. On the other hand, this quite rare meaning of *אם* in the Bible came to be commonly employed only under the impact of Arabic. Even more striking is Judah Ha-Levi’s *לְרִכּוּב אֲנִיּוֹת* ‘to journey in ships’, for BH *רָכַב* ‘to ride’ is never employed in connection with ships. *בֵּין יְדָיו* meaning ‘before, in front of’ is a reflex of the parallel Arabic phrase. Al-Ḥarizi employs loan translations from Arabic created by the Translators (see below §273) e.g., *מְצִיאוּת* ‘existence’. *טַעַם* means ‘food’ like the parallel Arabic word. He even takes over a clear-cut Arabic root: *ḏabb* ‘lizard’.

In the poetry of Immanuel of Rome (thirteenth–fourteenth century) the

influence of his native tongue is discernible in loan translations like חובל 'cordelier, Franciscan monk'.

*Literature:*

Sh. Spiegel, "On Medieval Hebrew Poetry", in L. Finkelstein, ed., *The Jews*<sup>3</sup> I, Philadelphia 1960, pp. 854ff. (Payṭanim); pp. 875ff.;

א. מירסקי, לשוננו יח (חשי"ג), עמ' 98-99.

[E. Goldenberg, *EJ* 16, cols. 1616–1622; bibliography col. 1660. — E.G.]

III. *The Languages of the Medieval Translations from Arabic*

§273. While Europe was still immersed in the Dark Ages "the Islamic world developed its great intellectual system (eighth–thirteenth centuries)... Greek writings and Greek ideas gradually found their way into Arabic... philosophy, ... mathematics, astronomy, astrology, geography and medicine... [and] were rapidly diffused throughout the Muslim world... It was the Wandering Jew who bore westward the magic draught" (Singer).

These new sciences were transmitted from East to West in the areas of contact in southern Italy, Sicily and Spain. Here, translators who were sometimes Jews or were aided by Jews, brought the old-new science from the Moslems to the Christians, occasionally through the medium of Hebrew.

This movement was preceded by the translation into Hebrew of important works composed in Arabic by famous Jewish scholars (Sa'adyah Gaon, Maimonides, and others) for the benefit of Jews living in Christian countries, especially in Provence. Still their activity can be considered a reflex of the general movement to transmit knowledge from East to West and from Antiquity to the emerging new world (Sarfatti).

But except for a few instances, neither BH nor MH possessed the technical terms needed in the field of science. In addition, the translators had to overcome syntactical problems as described by Judah Ibn Tibbon (twelfth century) whose family played an important role in the translation movement.

Most of the translators solved the problem by translating "literally from Arabic" in conformity with the ideal standard as defined by Ibn Tibbon. In this way there arose a new H idiom, "translation Hebrew" (Baron).

Ch. Rabin has given a good description of how a translation language is

used: "After a certain length of translation contact, language B acquires a stock of words with perfect translation fit, forming a semantic field of their own, which henceforth considerably eases the task of the translator. It similarly acquires a stock of grammatical constructions which by experience are known to be convenient equivalents of typical constructions of language A." To be sure, the thirteenth-century poet and translator Judah Al-Ḥarizi fought for a purer H, but the Tibbonic system was to prevail, using the following means to solve the various problems inherent in the translations. 1) The translator could simply take over the technical terms which he found in Arabic. Since the scholars were well aware of relationship between Arabic and H (see above §268), they did not hesitate to employ this means. According to B. Klar, only 2.5% of the newly created words (about 80 in number) were Arabic. They included such words as אֶפְק 'horizon', מְרָכּוֹ 'center', קֶטֶב 'pole', some of which are themselves loan words in Arabic, e.g., אֶקְלִים 'region' (today 'climate', from Greek), הַגֵּוֹמֶטְרָה 'geometry' (from Persian, found already in the Talmud). 2) But the translators resorted mostly to loan translations (calques) which at first sight appear to be original H words, but on closer inspection turn out to be exact renderings from a foreign language, e.g., English *youth movement* is an exact translation of *Jugendbewegung*, or modern H גַּן יְלָדִים 'kindergarten' reflects German *Kindergarten*. The translators made extensive use of the method of creating words with a H "body" and an Arabic "soul". This method can be subdivided into three categories: a) choosing a word independently of any similarity between the H and Arabic word, e.g., עָרַוּךְ in BH = 'estimate' acquired the meaning 'magnitude' (= Ar. *miqdār*); b) borrowing as a result of similarity of meaning, e.g., מַעְלָה BH 'step', now also 'degree', since Ar. *daraj* means both 'step' and 'degree'; c) borrowing because of similarity of names e.g., גֵּרֶר 'fence', now also 'square root' because of Ar. *jidr*. Very often the roots in H and Ar. were cognates as קִשְׁיָהָה 'area' and Ar. *misāḥa* (Sarfatti).

The number of words created by this process during the Middle Ages runs to the thousands. A few more instances are מְצִיאוֹת 'existence', יְחָס 'relationship', שֹׁשֶׁרֶט 'root', שְׁלִילָה 'negation' (Ar *salb*, which itself is a loan-translation from Greek *stērēsis*), רֵאשׁ מְמוֹן 'capital' (which in turn is an early loan-translation from Greek, which borrowed this meaning from H-Canaanite רֵאשׁ, and this from Akkadian *qaqqadu*).

But the activity of the translators did not stop with the coining of technical terms. Their idion "similarly acquired a stock of grammatical

constructions" entirely alien to H, owing to the tendency to translate literally. The syntax is permeated by Arabisms in the domain of the verb, the noun, the particles, word-order, etc. New tenses were created, e.g. of the type הָיָה יַעֲשֶׂה 'he would do' (MH עוֹשֶׂה הָיָה, BH יַעֲשֶׂה); existing verbal forms acquired new meanings, e.g., יִתְרַצְחוּ 'they will kill each other'. The use of prepositions is patterned after the use of the parallel Arabic root, e.g., אָמַר ב־ 'he ordered' etc.

These innovations are especially notable, (in order of importance according to M. (Goshen-) Gottstein) in the fields of philosophy and science but also in grammar, exegesis and Halacha (Jewish law), and thanks to the influence of the translations, are also to be found in works composed in Hebrew.

These innovations occasionally restored archaic BH constructions which had been lost in H. For example, the asyndetic relative clause mainly after an undertermined noun (see §115) was reintroduced following the pattern of Arabic e.g., צָרִיכָה נִסְיוֹן, הֵיא מְלָאכָה צָרִיכָה אֲשֶׁר (שֶׁ) before צָרִיכָה 'it is a work (*that*) needs experience'. On the other hand, as (Goshen-)Gottstein has pointed out, certain images which arose in IH are also found in this style, e.g., two nouns in the construct state before a third noun (the *regens*), e.g., בִּידִיעַת וּבְהִסְבָּמַת הַקְּהָל 'with the knowledge and assent of the public' (=BH וּבְהִסְבָּמַתוֹ וּבְהִסְבָּמַתוֹ הַקְּהָל, or MH שֶׁל הַקְּהָל) or לְמַּה שֶׁ = 'because of'.

The construction הָיָה יַעֲשֶׂה even found its way into the excellent native H prose of Al-Ḥarizi (thirteenth century) e.g., וְהֵייתִי אֶתְחַבֵּר (instead of correct H מְתַחַבֵּר).

The introduction into H of new words or new meanings for older words, and constructions alien to BH and MH had an influence which is still felt today (see §332).

#### Literature:

Ch. and D.W. Singer, "The Jewish Factor in Medieval Thought", in G.R. Bevan and Ch. Singer, eds., *The Legacy of Israel*, Oxford 1953, pp. 180-183, 205 ff.;

G.B. Sarfatti, *Mathematical Terminology in Hebrew Scientific Literature of the Middle Ages*, Jerusalem 1968 (Hebrew), pp. 63f., 169f., 198ff., and English Summary pp. X-XI, XIII;

Baron, *History* VII, p. 7;



Ch. Rabin, "The Linguistics of Translation" in A.H. Smith, ed., *Aspects of Translation*, London 1958, pp. 123ff., 137, 140, 144;

;40, 33, 31 'עמ' תל-אביב תשי"ד, עמ' 103-102 (ראש ממון);

קוטשר, מלים ותולדותיהן, עמ' 103-102 (ראש ממון);

מ. גוטשטיין, תחבירה ומלונה של הלשון העברית שבתחום השפעתה של הערבית

Ph.D. dissertation, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem 1951, pp. 1

(§2), 6 (§22), 30 (§81), 92 (§202 א b), 117 (§255);

A. Percikowitsch (י. פרץ), *Al-Harizi als Übersetzer der Makamen Al-Hariris*, München 1932, p. 32.

[E. Goldenberg, *EJ* 16, cols. 1622–1633; bibliography col. 1661. — E.G.]

## E. The Hebrew of Literary Works from the Middle Ages to the Revival (End of the Eighteenth Century)

### I. *Maimonides*

§274. While the literary-linguistic categories dealt with above are clearly defined, the same can not be said of other writings of the period which certainly constitute 95 per cent of the literary output.

The language of these writings has scarcely been studied except for the Mishneh Torah of Maimonides and the commentaries of Rashi (see below §276). Maimonides expressly states that he wrote this work — which codifies all the Halachic material of the Mishna and the Talmud — in the language of the Mishna. Indeed he succeeded marvellously in this though he did not avoid an admixture of some BH words, e.g. הַתְּמַהֲמָה 'to tarry' (= MH הַשְּׁתַּהוּת), נֶכַח 'opposite' (= MH פִּנְנָד). Arabic influence, too, is noticeable in his writings. But apparently he never appropriated any Arabic root which did not exist in Hebrew, so the Arabic influence is restricted to the various types of loan translations (cf. above §272). He also succeeded in avoiding the influence of Arabic in the domain of syntax.

The Talmudic Aramaic element usually appears in Hebrew garb, e.g., עבר 'bar, bolt', נָפוץ 'to shake off'. Only very few Aramaic legal terms were taken over without change, e.g., אֶסְמִכְתָּא 'reliance'; other words were translated into Hebrew, e.g., קֶתָא 'hilt' and פְּרִזְלָא 'blade' by נֶצֶב and לְהָב respectively (both BH). The BH הֶעֱתִיק is employed to mean 'to transmit' (an Arabism). Maimonides sometimes used words coined by the translators

and others, e.g., מִחֶצֶב 'mineral' and תְּשֻׁבֶרֶת 'geometry'. Moreover, he did not hesitate to expand or change the meanings of BH and MH words to suit his purposes, e.g., גֵּיּוֹמֶטְרִיָּה 'geometry' (Greek loan in MH where it is employed with another meaning; he thus reverted to the principal meaning of the Greek word), תְּתוּךְ 'to pronounce distinctly' from MH תְּתוּךְ 'to cut'.

Like the translators, he coined new verbs such as נִגְלַל 'to be caused' from BH נִגְלַל 'because', changed verbal stems, e.g., לָהֵטְיִיל 'to take a walk' (Hitpa'el) = MH טִיֵּיל (Pi'el), created new nouns and adjectives, e.g., זָהוֹב 'golden', changed the forms of nouns, e.g., שֵׁדֶר 'spinal column' from MH שֵׁדֶרֶשׁ. Sometimes his great antagonist R. Abraham Ibn David does indeed upbraid him on this score saying, קִלְקַל עָלֵינוּ אֶת הַלְּשׁוֹן 'he corrupted the language' מְשַׁנֵּה לְשׁוֹן חֲכָמֵינוּ 'he changes the language of our Sages' (=MH). But according to Twersky, "what he really objected to was the confusion and distortion which he believed was generated by this stylistic change..."

*Literature:*

- W. Bacher, "Der sprachliche Charakter des Mischne Tora", *Jahresbericht der Landesrabbinerschule in Budapest*, Budapest 1903, pp. 117, 128 (חתך), 129, 283, 290 (טיל), 131f., 144 (התמהמה), 133f. (נצב);  
 Sarfatti, op. cit. (§273), p. 146 n. 37 (חתוך), 164f. (גיומטריה), 207 n. 7 and passim (see his Index, תשבורת);  
 W. Bacher, "Zum sprachlichen Charakter des Mischne Tora" in *Moses ben Maimon II*, Leipzig 1914, pp. 281, 282 (נגלל), 286 (אסמכתא);  
 ד.צ. בנעט, תרביץ ו (תרצ"ה) עמ' 40 (מחצב);  
 I. Twersky, *Rabad of Posquières*, Cambridge, Mass. 1962, p. 171.

II. Other Medieval Sources

§275. Influences in the sphere of syntax are even more interesting. I believe that the construction הַבַּיִת הוּא גָדוֹל as against the original construction הוּא הַבַּיִת גָדוֹל 'the house is big' is a reflection of the European construction (German, English, French, etc.) where the copula follows the subject.

A similar construction used by a thirteenth-century Judeo-French writer is נִיֵּשׁ כָּתוּב בְּאַסְקוּפָה meaning 'it is written on the lintel', a clear reflection of the German *Es ist geschrieben*, French *Il est écrit* etc.

There is no doubt that other writers were influenced by their native

tongues, e.g., Ladino and Arabic, but no systematic research has yet been carried out. We know that, e.g., in the *responsa* 'smoking' is called לְשָׁתוֹת (טבק) 'to drink tobacco', under the influence of the Arabic *shariba* 'to drink' (tobacco). This use spread even to non-Moslem Europe. (Incidentally, עשן, the root employed today, also occurs.) In the Acts of the Jewish Parliament (וְעַד אֲרֵבַע הָאָרְצוֹת, 1580-1764), we find loans from Polish, e.g., אָדוֹן (= Pol. *pan* 'landowner'); German, e.g., חִילּוּף (פְּתָב) *Wechsel (Brief)*, (a type of promissory note), while ממר"ן, a kind of promissory note, is from Latin *membrana*. The H word בורח 'fugitive' appears with the meaning 'bankrupt'. One word which I used to hear in my youth in Slovakia, מְשׁוּעָבָד, pl. מְשׁוּעָבָדִים meaning 'congregational officials', literally 'enslaved', is apparently to be found in the sixteenth century.

The rabbinic *responsa* in Halachic matters often had to find terms for new inventions, e.g., 'watch' שעה (= hour), מורה שעות etc.

#### Literature:

- ש. נובל, תרגומי שאילה מידיש בעברית  
 הרבנית, לשוננו כג (תשי"ט) עמ' 173, 175;  
 א. יערי, אגרות ארץ ישראל, תל-אביב תש"ג, עמ' 81 (יש כתוב);  
 י.ז. כהנא, השפעה חיצונית באוצר המלים של ספרות התשובות,  
 לשוננו טו (תש"ז), עמ' 202.

### III. Rashi

§276. The language of Rashi (R. Shelomo Yitzḥaḳi) the great commentator on the Bible and the Babylonian Talmud was greatly praised for its popular style which served as a model for generations. But it is only thanks to the work of I. Avinery that we are able to establish certain surprising linguistic facts. First, Rashi coined hundreds of new words, among them some which are very widely used today, e.g., יְהוּדִיּוּת 'Jewishness', מְאָסָר 'imprisonment', אֵירוֹעַ 'happening', פְּרָשָׁן 'commentator', etc. But Rashi's syntax, blending H and Aramaic elements, and the influence of the French language (if any) still await clarification.

#### Literature:

- י. אבינרי, היכל רש"י ג', תל-אביב תש"ב, עמ' שלג.

IV. *Later Sources*

§277. The rest of the literature has received only scant scholarly attention. Clearly writers who lived in Germany could not escape the influence of their own language (Middle Yiddish-German), for German words such as *Klar* 'clear' turn up in their H. If a certain writer uses *שמונה מאות* to mean 'about 800' he is using a loan translation of German *gegen* which means not only 'against' (as *כנגד*), but also 'about'. Loan translations abound especially in the works of R. Judah the Pious (twelfth-thirteenth century). *הרי אתה תופס עצמך (צדיק)* is an exact translation of present-day German *Du hältst dich für...* *תפוס* in H means 'to get hold of' like *halten*, which also means 'to consider'. It goes without saying that this influence did not escape the notice of the grammarians. The famous R. Elia Levita (fifteenth century) remarks that the Ashkenazic Jews call a 'gift' *מזינה* since they are misled by the German word. In German *schchenken* = 'to give a present' and *einschenken* = 'to pour out wine' = H *מזוג* and thus the two words were wrongly identified.

*Literature:*

I. Halperin, *Acta Congressus Generalis Judaeorum Regni Poloniae*, Jerusalem 1945 (Hebrew), pp. 536, 541, 545;

י. היילפרין, "לקט מלים מתחום התרבות של היהדות האשכנזית", לשוננו טו (חש"ז), עמ' 193, 195;

י.ז. כהנא, "ללקסיקוגרפיה בספרות התשובות", לשוננו יג (חש"ז-חש"ח), עמ' 48.

F. Specialized Vocabulary

§278. We need adduce only a few illuminating examples to show how readily Medieval Hebrew met challenges old and new.

I. *Chess*

§279. During the Middle Ages the Arabs introduced chess into Europe from Asia via Persia. H as well as the European languages, had to find technical terms for the chess pieces. It proceeded very much the way the

translators did. Rashi's assumption that the game is mentioned in the Talmud does not seem to be borne out by the facts. But already in the twelfth century, in what may be the earliest description of the game in Europe, a poem ascribed to Abraham Ibn Ezra supplies us with the technical terms. The game is called *שהמת*. While it was common knowledge that *ש* (= Shah) is the title of the Persian king, *מת* was mistakenly identified with Hebrew (or Arabic) *מת* 'dead'. As a matter of fact, both constituents are Persian, and the second element = 'beat, lost, defeated'. But we also find the name *אישקקיש* (from the Romance languages); 'Queen' is *מלכה*, *שיגל*, (BH) and also *ferz* (Persian); Rook = *רוך* (Persian), but also *מִרְכָבָה* 'chariot' (loan-translation) and *מִגְדָּל* 'castle'.

*Literature:*

H.J.R. Murray, *A History of Chess*, Oxford 1962, pp. 159, 446–447;  
 M. Steinschneider, *Schach bei den Juden* (reprint from A.V.D. Linde, *Geschichte und Bibliographie, des Schachspiels* Berlin 1873, p. 4 (156)–7 (159), 12 (164), 15 (168), 43 (195) 45 (197).

## II. Writing and Translating

§280. Strangely enough, we possess many words for the writing and translation of books. BH *כתוב*, *תקון*, and *עשוה* are employed for writing, but later also *יסוד*, *ערוך*, and *סדור* (all BH). But against all of these originally H words, *חבר* (a loan translation from Arabic) gained the upper hand. The same occurred in the case of the term for translation. Besides the BH *תרגם* we have *הליץ*, *הלעיו*, etc.; also *פתור*, *פרש* (mainly MH), and *הפוך*, a loan translation from Latin *vertere*, French *tourner*, etc. Again a loan translation from Arabic, *העתק* became dominant.

*Literature:*

Zunz, *Gesammelte Schriften* III, Berlin 1876, pp. 50–67;  
 Ben Yehuda, *Dictionary* III, s.v. *חבר*, (p. 1431) note (a).

## III. Music

§281. As with chess we find a few loans, but mostly loan translations or

original H terms. 'Melody' appears as לַחַן (a loan from Arabic), זָמַר, נָגוּן (MH). בְּלִתֵּי מַסָּכִים 'consonant' is a loan translation while מַסָּכִים = 'dissonant'. נְעִימָה (MH) is employed to mean 'tone'.

*Literature:*

.ח. לוונשטיין, לשוננו יג (תש"ד-תש"ה) עמ' 141.

IV. *Printing*

§282. The first H book was printed in 1475, thirty-five years after the invention of the process. The book itself contained no word for the new art; it was simply called קָחוּב. But only two years later דְּפוּס appears as the word for 'printing' (from MH, loan from Greek, also reflected in English 'typography'). קָחוּב and חָקוּק 'incise', continued to be used for a short time, but in 1491 דְּפוּס was verbalized into הִדְפִּיט and הִדְפָּס. Thanks to the new art itself these same words are employed until this very day.

*Literature:*

A. Berliner, *Über den Einfluss des ersten hebräischen Buchdrucks auf den Cultus und die Cultur der Juden*, Frankfurt a/M 1896, p. 1-3.

V. *Mysticism*

§283. Although its roots are of course much older, the Jewish mysticism which flourished during the last millennium also enriched the H vocabulary. In part, additions from this field are still integrated into IH, though not with the original meaning. Thanks to G. Meyrink's novel *The Golem*, even non-Jews may know about the גּוֹלֵם, 'a magically created robot, a man created (from clay) by magical art'. כְּוִנָּה, 'mystical intention or concentration' is also a creation of Jewish mysticism. The word סְפִירוֹת from the H root סָפַר 'to count' is "a term for which the approximate translation would be 'spheres' or 'regions', although the H word *sefirah* has nothing to do with the Greek *sphaira*" (Scholem). שְׁעוֹר קוֹמָה 'Measure of the Body' (of God), a term which "aroused bitterest antagonism" in other section of Jewry, because of its anthropomorphizing connotation, also survived until today with the changed meaning 'stature'. But דְּבִקוּת 'adhesion',

*nuio mysticis* with God = 'ecstasy' is still used with much the same meaning as the original. אַחֲרָא אֶחָרָא, 'other side', = 'evil powers', תְּקוּן 'restoration of learning' or 'meaning', as well as הַתְּלֵהבוּת 'enthusiasm' are all known today even outside the Hassidic circles where they originated.

Let us close with two very interesting cases. The רֵבּוּק 'ghost possessing the body of a living person' became famous throughout the world thanks to Ansky's play of this name which has been performed hundreds of times by the Habima Theater. The word first appeared in the eighteenth century. On the other hand, the term גְּלָגוּל 'transmigration of souls' is not only early (first appearing in the book בַּהִיר), but might even be a loan translation of a Manichean term known in Latin as *revolutiones*.

#### Literature:

G.G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, Jerusalem 1941, pp. 33 (כוונה), 75, 203 (ספירות), 62 (שיעור קומה), 121, 175, 28, 337 (דבקות); etc.); Idem, *On the Kabbalah and its Symbolism*, New York 1965, p. 158, p. 174 n. 1 (גולם);

ג. שלום, לשוננו ו (תרצ"ד-תרצ"ה), 41-40 (גולם, דיבוק);

י. השבי, לשוננו יג (תש"ד-תש"ה), 51-50 (גולם);

R.J.Z. Werblowsky, *Joseph Caro Lawyer and Mystic*, Oxford 1962, p. 235 (גלגול).

### VI. Home, School, Synagogue and Community Government, Relationships with Gentiles

§284. New words arose and the meaning of old ones were continuously modified in keeping with ever-changing Jewish life and custom.

"The Barmitzvah rites, which accompanied the completion of a boy's thirteenth year" and the compound בֶּר מִצְוָה 'son of the mitzvah' (with the Aramaic בֶּר instead of H בֵּן) can be traced back to the fourteenth century. The חֲדָר 'Jewish elementary school' turns up only in the seventeenth century. The קוּנְטָרס 'note-book', applied to Rashi's Commentary, was taken over from the Latin *quaternus, quinternus*. The title שְׂדֵכָן 'match-maker' emerges during the twelfth century. The use of the word חוּן (MH) for 'cantor' also belongs to the Middle Ages, as does the רַבֵּנִית 'the wife of the

Rabbi', with its Yiddish counterpart *Rebbetzin*. Both the קְלִי זָמֵר (= Yiddish *Klezmer*) and בְּדִחָן testify to the *joie de vivre* of the Jews even during this period. The euphemism בֵּית חַיִּים 'house of the living' (= cemetery), also belongs to the Middle Ages (fourteenth century). גָּלַח, an ungrammatical noun was coined for 'priest'. It literally means 'barber, shaver' and גְּלִיחַ 'shaven' should have been a more appropriate term. נְזִיר 'monk' is already found in Spanish-Jewish poetry

It was characteristic of the status of the Jews in the Middle Ages that they were obliged to coin a special term for the community intercessor, שְׂתַדְלָן. Incidentally, this form shows, on the one hand, the lively use made of the ל- suffix for creating *nomina actoris* (cf. also בַּדְחָן, שְׂדַכָּן), while on the other hand, the form שְׂתַדְלָן instead of מְשַׂתְדֵּלָן (from the participle of the Hitpa'el) is strange indeed.

*Literature:*

I. Abrahams, *Jewish Life in the Middle Ages*, New York 1969, pp. 32

(בר מצוה), 45 n. 2 (חזן), 77 n.2 (ביית חיים), 170 n. 2 (שדכן);

ש. אסף, מקורות לתולדות החנוך בישראל, כרך ראשון, תל-

אביב תרפ"ח, עמ' עח;

M. Güdemann, *Geschichte des Erziehungswesens und der Cultur der Juden in Frankreich und Deutschland*, Wien 1880, pp. 47 n. 1 (גלח), 193, 297 (Index s.v. קוונטרס);

Ben Yehuda, *Dictionary I* (s.v. בַּדְחָן), XIII (s.v. רבניח) XV (s.v. שְׂתַדְלָן).

## G. Hebrew Loanwords in Foreign Languages

### I. Sabbath and Holidays

§285. We have already discussed words of Hebrew origin that reached Europe via Greek and Latin (see above §§98, 187–188).

Here we should mention several words which also probably go back to early Latin but which emerge in the European languages only during the Middle Ages, namely designations of the Jewish Sabbath and holidays. *Dies bonus, bonus dies*, a calque of H יוֹם טוֹב 'holy day' (lit. 'good day') occurs in the *Vetus Latina* (the earliest Latin translation of the Bible) and survives only sporadically in the European languages. The same applies to



*dies magnus*, a calque of the Talmudic Aramaic יומא רבא 'the Day of Atonement' (lit. 'big day') which in its Greek rendering was known to the Jews of Corfu.

The name Saturday penetrated into many European languages where it appears in a form which goes back to H שבת, e.g. *samedi* (< *sambedi*) in French, *Samstag* in German (< *sambaztag* in Old High German), *szombat* in Hungarian which is itself a loan from Slavic, *sobota* in Slovak and other Slavic languages. Incidentally, Persian, too, has a kindred form apparently loaned from Hebrew via Aramaic. Early Greek words for Friday *prosábbaton* and *paraskeuē* 'preparing' also betray Jewish influence.

It is also possible that the Sardinian name of the month of September, *Raputanni* = 'head of the year', is a calque of H ראש השנה 'New Year' (which falls in September).

#### Literature:

D.S. Blondheim, *Les parlers judéo-romans et la Vetus Latina*, Paris 1925, pp. XL n.2, LIX, LXI–LXIII;

E.Y. Kutscher, *JSS* 10 (1965), p. 38;

A. Thumb, *Zeitschrift für deutsche Wortforschung* 1 (1901), p. 166–7;

G. Bonfante, *Word* 5 (1949), p. 171ff, 174 n. 11.

## II. In Medieval Latin

### a. Medicine

§286. Here we will deal with a specific channel which was essential for the impact of H on the Latin of the Middle Ages, viz. the medieval translation literature (see above §273). It is mainly in the field of medicine that the impact of Arabic, but also H, made itself felt. This is not surprising in light of the fact that Jewish physicians played a very important role during the Middle Ages. King Manuel of Portugal (1497) even gave permission to Jewish physicians and surgeons to study H medical books, saying "that such physicians and surgeons as have been and as shall be converted and do not know Latin may keep H books relating to their profession". In an address delivered in Leipzig in 1518 the German scholar Petrus Mosellanus stressed the fact that "there lies hidden in the libraries of the Jews a treasure of medical lore so great that it seems incapable of being surpassed

by the books of any other language.” Therefore he urges “our Christian youths” to learn this language.

Indeed, S. Muntner claims to have gathered about 90,000 occurrences of medical terms from H MSS. In his works the sixteenth-century physician Vesalius “gives Hebrew names... for some of the anatomical structures.”

What is even more surprising, though disputed, is the fact that the Medical School of Montpellier (France) “was partly a Jewish creation (twelfth century), and it is said that the earliest teaching was in Arabic and Hebrew.”

Did any of this H medical terminology survive? J. Hyrtl probably erroneously believes that *pomum Adami* ‘Adam’s apple’ may be a survival from this age, but more likely a translator misinterpreted H *adam* ‘man’ as ‘Adam’. However, according to Singer–Rabin two terms did survive, one of them “with a very long history... *canna*, the modern ‘cane’, for one of the long bones of forearm or leg” from H קַנָּה.

#### *Literature:*

- I. Munz, *Die jüdischen Ärzte im Mittelalter*, Frankfurt a/M 1922;  
 H. Friedenwald, *The Jews and Medicine*, Baltimore 1944, I 146ff. (use of the Hebrew language in medical literature), 162 (Vesalius), 181 (King Manuel of Portugal), 183f. (Mosellanus);  
 S. Muntner, *Contribution to the History of the Hebrew Language in Medical Instruction* (Hebrew), Jerusalem 1940, English foreword p. VI;  
 G. Sarton, *Introduction to the History of Science II*, Baltimore 1934, p. 352 (Montpellier);  
 J. Hyrtl, *Das Arabische und Hebräische in der Anatomie*, Wien 1879, p. 164 (*pomum Adami*);  
 I. Löw, *Flora III*, p. 232 (Adam’s apple);  
 Ch. Singer and Ch. Rabin, *A Prelude to Modern Science*, Cambridge 1946, p. LXXVII.

#### *b. Linguistics*

§287. The impact of H was felt in other fields too. “The revival of H studies which is so striking a feature of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and the influence of which has remained as an important element in sacred learning and, to a certain extent, in the humanities ever since, was one of the results of... the Renaissance... a *trilinguis homo* was one who knew Latin, Greek and Hebrew.” Luther and Calvin studied Hebrew and one of

the most outstanding humanists, J. Reuchlin, published the first (?) Hebrew grammar to be written by a Christian. Thanks to this revived interest in Hebrew, the term שורש (itself a loan translation from Arabic which received it from Sanskrit) was accepted by linguists as Latin *radix*, English 'root', German *Wurzel* etc. The term *affixum*, first employed by Reuchlin also seems to go back to H תוספת.

*Literature:*

- G.H. Box, in E.R. Bevan and Ch. Singer, eds., *The Legacy of Israel*, Oxford 1927, pp. 315ff.;
- B. Delbrück, *Einleitung in das Studium der indogermanischen Sprachen*, Leipzig 1919, p. 26–28;
- W. Bacher, *Die Anfänge der hebräischen Grammatik*, Leipzig 1845, p. 73; 69–68 ח. רוון, העברית שלנו, תל-אביב, חשט"ז, עמ' 69–68;
- L. Prys, *Die grammatikalische Terminologie des Abrahām ibn Esra*, Basel 1950, pp. 105, 145.

*c. In Mysticism*

§288. This was another field of Jewish endeavor which became known during the Renaissance. Pico della Mirandola (fifteenth century), another outstanding figure among the humanists, was the first Christian student of the Kabbala in which he "discovered in the Cabala all the doctrines of Christianity." Therefore, it is not surprising that the "Cabala exercised a profound influence on Christian thinking during the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries" (Box), and the word itself was absorbed by several European languages such as German, French and English in different forms (*Kabale, cabale, cabal*), although strangely it took on the pejorative meaning 'plot', etc.

*Literature:*

- Box, op. cit. (§287), pp. 319, 330, 324;
- Etymological dictionaries of German, French and English.

### III. In Arabic

§289. Jews had been living in the Arabian Peninsula since early times and were prominent in the pre-Islamic community of Medina. There is

“sufficient evidence of the importance of Jews as a religious body in the community to which Muhammad addressed his message” as the Jewish elements of the Qur’an testify. Therefore, it is to be expected that the various Hebrew loan words in the Qur’an are primarily Aramaic in form. The word *aḥbār* is the (Arabic) of *ḥabr* (or *ḥibr* = Jewish scholar, which is the Hebrew תַּבַּר ‘friend’ etc., but ‘scholar’ in MH). Both ‘Adn = אֲדֵן ‘Paradise’ and *Jahannam* = גֵּיהֵנָם ‘Gehenna’ are found in the Qur’an, the latter in MH (and Aramaic) form. There are many other H (Aramaic) loans as well.

*Literature:*

H. Jeffery, *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur’ān*, Baroda 1938, pp. 23, 24, 49, 212-3, 105-106.

IV. *In German*

§290. While individual Hebrew words were sporadically absorbed by various European languages (e.g. *starrs* in English, see §255), it is in Medieval German that we find the greatest number of H elements. Jews were very prominent in long-distance trade in medieval Germany. They had only to interlard their German with Hebrew words to make it at once incomprehensible to Gentiles. The advantages of such a jargon were not lost on other wayfaring elements and so the compound of H and Yiddish became a main source of *Rotwelsch* “the cant of peddlers, thieves, vagabonds and the like” (Lockwood), e.g., *Schöchellbosj* (H שְׂכַר ‘beer’ + בֵּית ‘house’ via the Yiddish pronunciation of *Schocher-Bos*) meaning ‘inn’. In Luther’s day it was known that this ‘argot contained H words.

*Literature:*

W.B. Lockwood, *An Informal History of the German Language*, Cambridge 1965, p. 262-3;

M. Güdemann, *Geschichte des Erziehungswesens und der Cultur der Juden in Deutschland* etc., Wien 1888, p. 172-3.

## H. Hebrew in the Jewish Languages of the Diaspora

§291. The Jews in the Diaspora created several new languages of their own, each of them containing Hebrew elements.

I. *Judeo-Arabic*

§292. Judeo-Arabic (JA) seems to be the earliest Jewish language of the Diaspora preserved in writing (ninth century). It was employed throughout Spain, and in the African and Asian territories where Arabic was the dominant literary and spoken language. In those places in Christian Europe where the local language did not prevail, Arabic was widely used in literature connected with religious matters. The reason for its vigor in displacing Aramaic (and Hebrew) in these fields is not entirely clear. Every linguistic aspect of Judeo-Arabic exhibits quite a few Hebrew traits.

a. *Phonetics and Orthography*

§293. There is reason to believe “that the H elements of JA were generally adapted to the phonetic system of Arabic”, but the loanword גייר ‘to make a proselyte’ kept its hard g (= Arabic *dj*). Incidentally, the double *yod* in this word and elsewhere instead of the consonantal *yod* reflects MH (Aramaic) orthography. The same holds true for the double *waw*.

b. *Grammatical Structure*

§294. “It is quite remarkable to what extent the Hebrew elements are adapted to the syntactic patterns of Arabic” (Blau). (As we shall see later, this is not always the case with other Jewish languages [see §301]). For example, in the clause *וְלֹא יִפְטֹר אוֹתָהּ מִשְׁבוּעָה* ‘and he did not exempt her from oath’ only *לֹא* is Arabic, but since it requires the imperfect in Arabic, the Hebrew *פִּטַּר* follows suit.

In JA morphology, Hebrew loans are often adapted to the parallel Arabic category. For example, *תֵּאָבֵל* = H *התאבל* ‘to mourn’; *שִׁטְרוֹת* ‘writs’ appears with the Arabic plural ending *שִׁטְרָת*. Even more often H loans are used in the so-called Arabic ‘broken plural’, e.g. *סְדוּר* ‘prayer-book’, plural *סְדוּרִים*.

The opposite tendency, namely, the impact of H on Arabic is much less in evidence. We find the use of *שַׁבָּת* ‘Saturday’ as a feminine noun ap-

parently due to H שֶׁבַת. Also, the fact that the Arabic definite article is prefixed only once in constructions like אֵלְאִשָּׁה חֲכָמָה 'the wise woman' (H הָאִשָּׁה הַחֲכָמָה) seems to indicate "that Hebrew elements might have been felt as heterogeneous features in the Arabic sentence."

### c. Vocabulary

§295. In the sphere of JA, of course, Hebrew loans abound. The text quoted by Blau (p. 145) shows clearly how in Halachic discussions, about 50% of the vocabulary is H (and Aramaic) but "occur also in other literary genres which were not exclusively destined for scholars."

Nor were H loans restricted to the domain of religion as e.g. חַזָּן, סוֹבֵה 'cantor', but also in commerce (cf. above §290) as apparently רוּחַ 'profit', צָעַר 'distress' etc. Generally, loan words are transferred to Arabic without phonetic change, although Hebrew allophones may be rendered by the phonetically parallel Arabic phonemes, e.g. תלמוד 'Talmud' (pronounced in Hebrew *Talmud*) by תלמוד (/dz/=ج in Arabic is a separate phoneme from /d/). Hebrew /sh/ is mostly transferred as /s/ since in the main this is its etymological counterpart (cf. above סבת — שבח). But, e.g. H פְּרָשָׁה 'the weekly Scripture lesson' is rendered both as פראסה and פראשה (written plene with א, as in Arabic, and א̄ to indicate ā at the end of the word as in Ar).

### Literature:

J. Blau, *The Emergence and Linguistic Background of Judaeo-Arabic*, Oxford 1965, pp. 21f., 133ff.

## II. Judeo-Persian

§296 The oldest document in Judeo-Persian (eighth century) does not yet show any trace of H, although H elements are quite conspicuous in an eleventh-century document which contains a considerable number of H words such as קִינָן 'property'. H elements make themselves felt, for example, in a commentary on the Book of Saruud, "and the specific form of H-Persian word combination", like that in Yiddish, e.g. בְּגָלוּחַ רִפְתָן 'to go into exile' occurs in it. "There is also noticeable an influence of Persian syntax on the H element... Bible translations... follow" (mostly) "the syntactic

structure of the H original” (Fischel), e.g. the rendering of the H infinitive absolute of the type *יִפְקֹד יִפְקֹד* ‘he indeed will remember’.

*Literature:*

W. Bacher *JRAS* 1903, 760

Asmussen, *Acta Orientalia* 29 (1965), p. 58;

W. Fischel, *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia* VI, p. 256;

W. Bacher, *ZDMG* 51 (1887), pp. 397, 408.

### III. Hebrew in Romance Languages?

§297. D. Blondheim maintained that the Jews in Romance countries (France, Spain etc.) spoke a language of their own which went back to a peculiar Latin *koine* (common language) spoken by the Jews in the first centuries C.E. Among the material gathered by him, we find the *dies bonus* discussed above.

His conclusions are not accepted by scholars who now believe that, at least during the first centuries of the present millennium, the Romance Jewish languages were much less definite linguistic entities than Yiddish.

*Literature:*

D.S. Blondheim, *op. cit.* (§285), p. IX;

M. Banit, *Revue de linguistique romane* XXVII (1963), 245ff.

### IV. Judeo-French

§298. Although his contention is now contested, Blondheim maintained that “the Jews... used quite a considerable number of H words.” For example, they translated the H *יָמִין, תֵּימָן* ‘south’ by another H word *יָרֵוּם*, and *יָם* ‘west’ by *מַעְרָב*. There also seem to be French words which changed their meaning under the impact of H, e.g. *plain* ‘simple’ (commentary on the Bible) = *פֶּשֶׁט*.

*Literature:*

M. Weinreich, *Romance Philology* IX (1956), p. 418.

V. *Judeo-Italian*

§299. In the earliest Judeo-Italian documents the H elements are scarce or non-existent. In an elegy from the thirteenth century there are no traces of H at all. While Cassuto believes that the author avoided them intentionally, it must be pointed out that Berenblut–Banit’s study of translations of Isaiah (sixteenth century and later) found few cases of clear-cut Hebraisms, e.g. *homicidiaturi* ‘murderers’ with the derivational suffix *-tore* for the agent formed from noun-roots. In fewer than ten cases the translators use another H word for that of the text, e.g. *Gehinam* ‘hell’ (the MH form!) for תַּפְתָּה. A few H words appear, e.g. in the preface to a hymn from the sixteenth century.

*Literature:*

- U. Cassuto, *Archivio glottologico italiano* XXII–XXIII (1929), p. 382;  
 M. Berenblut, *A Comparative Study of Judaeo-Italian Translations of Isaiah*, Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, New York 1949, pp. 235ff., 241, 145;  
 C. Roth, *REJ* 80 (1925), 182.  
 E.Y. Kutscher, *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 27 (1964) p. 47 (Gehinam);  
 :. קוטשר, מלים ותולדותיהן, עמ' 66–67 (גהינם).  
 [E.Y. Kutscher, *Archive of the New Dictionary* etc. (above §253), pp. 70f. (גהינם).]

VI. *Judeo-Spanish*

§300. Judeo-Spanish, called *Dzudesmo* (*Ladino* is the name used for the Bible translations), is the language of Jews hailing from Spain and Portugal. At the end of the fifteenth century they were forced to leave these countries and build new lives in North Africa, France, the Netherlands, Italy, and within the Ottoman Empire (the Balkans, Asia Minor and Palestine). It is believed that JS, like parallel Jewish languages, represents an archaic Spanish dialect.

Already in Spain *Dzudesmo* contained H elements as can be shown by the use of special H phrases and forms both in North Africa and the East, e.g. מְעֵלָה מְטָה ‘more or less, about’, and from documents written in Spain. H nouns such as מְלוֹה ‘creditor’, לוֹוֵה ‘debtor’, the verb *enheremen* (חָרַם = ‘excommunication’) ‘to excommunicate’ and the *samaies* שָׁמַשׁ ‘beadle’.



Constructions such as שׁוֹמוֹשׁ מִתְקַנִּים ‘we institute’ crop up where the auxiliary verb *ser* ‘to be’ is employed (very much as in Yiddish) as do other constructions with other H elements (מְקַבְּלִים ‘receive’). In an early translation of the Bible, MH words תְּשׁוּבָה ‘repentance’, and אֶפֶילוּ ‘even’, as well as BH words are employed.

*Literature:*

S. Marcus, *Sefarad* 22 (1962), pp. 129ff.;

ש. מרכוס, השפה הספרדית-יהודית, ירושלים חשכ"ה, עמ' לג ואילך.

## VII. Yiddish

§301. Yiddish came into being around the year 1000 on the Middle Rhine. It is a “fusion language” whose components are Hebrew, (Old) French (whose speakers apparently came from France), German (and Old-Italian?). After the Jews moved eastward, the Slavic component was added (though it appears sporadically in France even in very early times).

Hebrew elements, namely מחזור ‘prayer book for the holidays’ and בית הכנסת ‘synagogue’, already appear in the earliest text of Yiddish (a verse discovered by M. Beit-Arié in a MS of a prayer-book for the holidays written in Worms in 1272). The widespread use of H in Yiddish is shown by the fact that translations of the Bible into Yiddish sometimes use as the equivalent of a certain H word not only the same word, e.g. קוּל ‘voice’, but also a different H word, e.g. פְּלִי זָמֵר ‘instrument of song’ for נְגִינֹת ‘music’. In the case of a seventeenth-century letter from Bohemia, it is difficult to determine whether it is written in Y interspersed with H or vice versa.

### a. Phonetics

§302. H phonetic elements became integrated into Y. As mentioned above (§37) there is reason to believe that during the earlier period of Y it was the so-called “Sephardic” pronunciation that prevailed in European H. M. Weinreich also stressed the fact that, as in the Y of today, it is sometimes not the “whole H” form which is used, but “merged H”: cf. בַּעַל הַבַּיִת pronounced *ba'al habayis* in the prayer, but *balebos* in Y by the same person. Therefore, we must also reckon with the possibility of this phenomenon in the past.

*b. Morphology*

§303. The word *rebbetzin* 'the wife of the rabbi' (< *rabbissa*) which has a H base and Romance suffix shows the fusion of these two elements. The periphrastic verb e.g. *mxabed zayn*, where the base is H and the auxiliary verb Y is known already from the sixteenth century.

*Literature:*

M. Weinreich, *Romance Philology* IX (1956) p. 403;

מ. וויינרייך, אלגעמיינא ענציקלאפעדיע, יידן ב.

50 (רבצין), 58 (מכבד זיין):

מ. וויינרייך, יידישע שפראך, XXIII (1963), 7ff. (מחזור):

S. Birnbaum, in *For Max Weinreich on his Seventieth Birthday*, The Hague 1964 (in Yiddish), pp. 503 (קול), 523 (פֿלזמר);

S. Nobel, *ibid.* (in Yiddish), p. 406 (letter from Bohemia).

VIII. *Judeo-Slavic*

§304. Slavic glosses are found even in the commentaries of Rashi who resided in Franco-German territory, and especially in the works of writers from Bohemia. These glosses are attributed by the writers to the לשון קנען 'language of Canaan' (cf. Gen. 9, 25 and 'slave'). But as yet we know next to nothing about this special Slavic dialect and its H elements. From the seventeenth century we have the sentence *jer tebi...* מְקַדֵּשׁ *byl* 'I have hallowed thee' (= you are my wife) which reminds us of the parallel Yiddish constructions (see above §303).

*Literature:*

M. Weinreich, in *For Roman Jakobson*, The Hague 1956, p. 622ff.;

R. Jakobson–M. Halle, in *For Max Weinreich* etc. (above §303), p. 147ff. (Canaan).

## CHAPTER EIGHT

## MODERN HEBREW AND ISRAELI HEBREW

## A. The Revival of Hebrew

I. *The Strange Birth of Modern Hebrew*

§306. The Haskalah (Enlightenment) movement, originating in Germany at the close of the eighteenth century, aimed at the secularization of the Jewish people and motivated the revival of Hebrew writing. This new Hebrew spread from Germany to Hungary, Bohemia, and Moravia. In all these places it thrived for a short time, only to die once more. Why? The truth seems to be that Hebrew was revived much less for its own sake than to serve the purposes of the Maskilim (the adherents of the Haskalah) who aspired to spread their ideas among their fellow Jews. But what language were they to use to accomplish this? German? Jews on the whole did not know German (even N.H. Wessely, one of the foremost Maskilim did not know German well). Yiddish? This language was an aspect of Jewish life that the Maskilim hated wholeheartedly. They had no choice but to use Hebrew to which they had sentimental ties and which, after all, was taught even at German universities, had served as a vehicle of secular literature in medieval Spain, and was, in short, fashionable. Incidentally, this fact is clearly recognized by Max Wiener who says, "By the way, [the Hebrew of the Enlighteners] was an expression of their antipathy towards... Yiddish". I find myself in full agreement with S. Spiegel's opinion that

"The fathers of the Berlin *Haskalah*... wanted to bring their people closer to the nations of Europe by means of Hebrew; ... to spread through Hebrew, the gospel of the rationalism that discarded nationality... and finally to pave the way, through Hebrew, for assimilation and absorption. Hebrew for them was not an end in it-

self, but a means to an end, an implement that, when it had served the purpose, could be thrown away. At least, this was their mental attitude, though the heart clung to the old language despite the objection of the head. [They] had no other medium through which to reach their people. Yiddish they despised. The Gentile languages were not understood by the people. Therefore they used Hebrew to decoy the Jews into the foreign world and the foreign languages.”

*Literature:*

Sh. Spiegel, *Hebrew Reborn*, Cleveland, New York, Philadelphia 1962, pp. 20 f.;

M. Wiener, *Jüdische Religion im Zeitalter der Emanzipation*, Berlin 1933, p. 43.

*a. Biblical Hebrew as a Vehicle of the Haskalah*

§307. The language which the Enlighteners employed was the language of the Bible. They purposely avoided the use of other sources such as MH, the Piyyuṭ, and, of course, the Rabbinical language of the Middle Ages. This was the beginning of the *melitzah*, the stereotyped Biblical style. As Spiegel puts it,

“Hebrew used to be a series of quotations... Anger was expressed in wrathful words from Amos. Distress in the terms of the Psalms. Doubt via Ecclesiastes... Hebrew... consisted of scattered fragments from the Bible in varying mechanical combinations. Bible verses were simply dismembered and joined together again in new unions.”

It goes without saying that according to this tendency to revive BH only, the creation of new terms and phrases was out of the question. But of course, this proved to be impossible in practice. So while the Enlighteners did not coin new terms, they did superimpose new meanings on old terms, mainly as loan translations from German, e.g., ‘high schools’ are called *בִּינְיִים סֵפֶר* (German *Mittelschule*). Instead of *תְּלֻי גָּ* ‘dependent (on)’, they use the active participle because German employs the active participle (*abhängig*). Even more astonishing is the use of *לְבַד* meaning ‘however.’ This too is a loan translation of the German *allein* which means both ‘alone’ and ‘however’ (the latter meaning being practically forgotten today). Only very rarely was non-BH employed.

To be sure, there were exceptions. The grammarian J.L. Ben Ze'eb did include post-BH material in his dictionary for 'vulgar' use, while M. Lefin (Levin) employed MH in his writings. It is certainly no coincidence that, like Mendele Mokher Sefarim (see below §309), Lefin wrote in Yiddish as well. But the overwhelming majority did not want to have anything to do with post-BH.

This language was used in Germany in the circles of the Maskilim, in Bohemia, Moravia, and in parts of Hungary for about two generations. But as soon as the second generation grew up knowing German, Hebrew was cast into limbo. The situation came to such a pass that in the middle of the century radical reformers wanted to get rid of Hebrew at least to a certain extent, even as the sacred language of the synagogue.

Meanwhile, the Haskalah movement, and Hebrew with it, had reached Eastern Europe where it was destined to play a much more significant role than in Central Europe. The chief reason was that the Jewish masses were hostile to the Haskalah and thus Hebrew long remained the instrument of those forces which strove to bring "enlightenment" to the people. On the other hand, the low cultural level of the non-Jewish environment, coupled with its hostile attitude towards assimilation, kept the Jews very much to themselves. Even under these circumstances, Hebrew did not cease to be used as an instrument of enlightenment, which is to say, assimilation. To quote Speigel "...the same forces that made for national dissolution were at work here also, which is obvious from the baptism of the sons of prominent Maskilim."

Perhaps one of the most astounding instances of a kind of unconscious wish for self-destruction is Judah Leib Gordon's poem *הקיץ עמי* ('Awake, my People'). Here he urges his fellow Jews to assimilate to the Russian people. Unequivocally he tells them to speak the language of their "native" country instead of Yiddish. I doubt whether there is an historical parallel to this case of a poet writing in one language (Hebrew) urging his readers to adopt another one (Russian)!

This trend noted in Germany also prevailed in Eastern Europe. Only the first generation labored for Jewish enlightenment with the instrument of revived Hebrew. The second generation not only ceased the work of their fathers, but also left their own people and adopted Polish, Russian, and other languages and cultures, and some even embraced the Christian religion. Quite a large number of them later associated themselves with the European Socialist movements. How then, did Hebrew live on? In place of

the second generation, new Maskilim arose, very often sons of the very men who themselves fought against the Maskilim. It would be fascinating to follow this process in detail, but the outlines are already clear enough.

This aspect of the Haskalah is somewhat embarrassing and hence, more often than not, is conveniently overlooked by most students of modern Jewish history. Kabak, a Hebrew writer of the last generation, emphasized this in a striking incident in one of his works, בחלל הריק. Here the hero meets the author Avraham Mapu who wrote the novel אהבת ציון (*The Love of Zion*) that might well be called the crown of this kind of language and literature — a novel about Biblical times written in BH prose, a work that has still not lost its charm. The hero of Kabak's novel meets Mapu and asks a question which greatly upsets him: "But your son Leon... what does he know of our language? Nearly nothing." The tragedy of children being unable to read the Hebrew writings of their own father must have been all too common at that time.

*Literature:*

E.Y. Kutscher, *Conservative Judaism* X/3 (1956) pp. 28ff.;

M. Wiener, op. cit. (§306);

Spiegel, *Hebrew Reborn* (§306), pp. 12f., 96 (Lefn), 173;

י. כרמיאל, ממילון ההשכלה, לשוננו לא (חשכ"ו), עמ' 317-311;

י. בלאו תחיית העברית ותחיית הערבית הספרותית; ירושלים

תשל"ו, עמ' 10-16;

J. Fellman, *The Revival of a Classical Tongue*, The Hague and Paris 1973, pp. 14f.;

A. Bar-Adon, *Agnon and the Revival of Hebrew*, Jerusalem 1977 (in Hebrew), pp. 23-52;

Y. Karmiel, *Lešonenu* 34 (1969-70), pp. 306ff. (Hebrew with English summary; on Mapu). — O.S.]

*b. Adaptations of BH and New Creations of the Maskilim and Rabbis*

§308. Still, whatever might be said against the Maskilim, the fact remains that it was they who kept BH alive, as a vehicle for poems and short articles. Mapu himself described the limitations of BH as a modern language of literary composition. He said that while BH was entirely sufficient for his purposes in *The Love of Zion* which is set in Biblical times, it was not feasible to use BH in writing novels describing contemporary life. Authors would have to have recourse to MH as Mapu himself had already

done. Still, Maskilim after Mapu continued to attempt the impossible by writing novels in BH. Even a Semitic scholar of the stature of J. Halevy fought for the preservation of BH as a literary idiom (e.g., the use of the *waw* conversive!), and opposed the use of MH. But he did admit that there was room for limited change within the confines of BH.

We encounter the same literary picture in the periodicals published during these times. The outcome was, in the words of D. Patterson:

“The attempt to convey the concepts of the modern world and the problems of contemporary society while adhering almost exclusively to biblical vocabulary and idiom, inevitably gave rise to violent stresses and strains. The situation was further aggravated by the absence of both a suitable literary tradition and the generally accepted conventions necessary for the expressions of a wide range of ideas in clear, precise and economical terms. The introduction of concepts previously alien to Hebrew moulds time and again compelled the novelists to stretch and distort the language in the attempt to adapt it to new purposes... The enforced resort to clumsy circumlocutions and crude approximations even for the expression of common objects and ideas frequently resulted in cumbersome terminology which sometimes borders on the grotesque.

No less importantly, for want of a spoken colloquial idiom, the dialogue is largely composed of stiff and stilted phrases in place of the terse, pithy, colourful idioms of living speech. Here, again, the novelists were forced to resort to all sorts of circumlocutions and halting approximations in the attempt to create a sustained and comprehensible dialogue.”

Patterson's description holds good despite the lack of thorough investigation of that period.

As mentioned, new creations were out of the question, but BH words and phrases were given new meanings in order to fill the lack. B. Karu gleaned a surprisingly large amount of material from a simple perusal of sixteen issues of the weekly *Hatzfira* from 1881. There we already find the expressions *בֵּית מִסְתָּר* ‘store’, *דְּעַת קְהָל* ‘public opinion’, *חֶשְׂמַל* ‘electricity’, *יּוֹבֵל* ‘jubilee’, *מִוֶּקֶשׁ* ‘mine’, *מִשְׁבָּר* ‘crisis’, *מִשְׁפָּט קָדוֹם* ‘prejudice’, *סוֹכֵן* ‘agent’, *סוֹפֵר* ‘writer’, *תּוֹתַח* ‘field gun, cannon’ (cf. below), *תְּרַבּוּת* ‘culture’. The word for ‘oranges’ was also created at this time: *תְּפוּחֵי זָהָב* ‘golden apples’. This

term is a translation, via Yiddish *pomerantsen*, of Latin *poma aurantia*. תפוחי זָהָב is pure BH (Prov. 25, 11) which in IH became תפוז (see below §391). All these words are BH, but with new meanings.

Some of the Maskilim were so particular that they would reject BH words if their current meanings were not exactly those of BH. They would, for example reject the MH meaning of 'line' for שוֹרָה (whose meaning in BH is not securely established). To be sure, Karu also found words from MH and Medieval Hebrew. Thus we find MH: מוֹדָעָה 'ad' (actually Aramaic), הַחֲפֵתָחוֹת 'front', פְּרָךְ 'volume', and from the Middle Ages: הַחֲפֵתָחוֹת 'development', הַצָּעָה 'suggestion', סְפָרוֹת 'literature'. On the basis of Karu's work, it seems likely that quite a few new creations like those now current in Israeli Hebrew, might after all turn up in the much maligned language of the Maskilim.

To be sure, quite a few words of this type did not enter Modern Hebrew, e.g., יוֹדֵעַ דָּת וְדִין (תַּחֲנוּנַת רַבְּבָת), 'railway station' (today נְחִיבוֹת), 'lawyer' (today עוֹרֵךְ דִּין). The new terms are generally shorter than the old and therefore the reason for rejecting the former terms is clear, as in the case of הַנּוֹתֵן זְמִירוֹת בְּלֵילָה 'nightingale'. Instead of מוֹרָה הַשָּׁעוֹת 'watch', the shorter שָׁעוֹן is used (see below).

In keeping with their principles, the Maskilim were completely against loan words, but sometimes they could not avoid them, e.g., תֵּלֵגְרָמָה 'telegram'. They took more kindly to the translation of foreign terms by Hebrew words which were phonetically close to them and had some kind of semantic connection, however tenuous. Thus, e.g., 'telegraph' was רַב דְּלוּג רַב ('big leap'), 'cannon' אֹן קֵנָה ('pipe of strength'). (Incidentally, 'cannon' and קֵנָה do go back to the same root). Other such terms were אֵד קֵלוֹן 'eau de cologne' (literally 'mist of Cologne'); חוֹלֵי רַע 'cholera' ('bad illness'); פְּרֻטֵי כָל 'protocol' ('details of everything'; of Greek origin). Such creations disappear entirely except for the last two which have managed to survive, as has סֹפָה 'sofa', in spite of the fact that in II Sam. 17, 28 it denotes a kind of vessel.

Even worse are clumsy and unwieldy phrases for technical terms, e.g., בְּתֵי הָאֶסָף לְדַבְרֵים עֲתִיקִים 'museum' (literally 'the storehouses for old things'; today מוֹזֵיאֹן). Such monstrosities, of course, had no chance of survival.

Some of the terminology for new inventions fluctuated greatly, e.g., 'trains' מְרַבּוֹת הַבְּרוֹזֵל, מְרַבּוֹת הַקִּיטוֹר עֲגֵלַת קִיטוֹר, מְרַבּוֹת אֵשׁ. As D. Patterson puts it, "Even elementary turns of phrase as 'quite right' or 'you are right' produce such stilted and artificial forms as: הֵי כְדָבְרֶיךָ, צָנְקָתְךָ בְּדָבְרֶיךָ



”הלא דָּבָר הוא, כְּדָבָרָךְ בֵּן הוא, טוב הַדָּבָר, מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל דְּבָרֵי שְׂפָתֶיךָ.” On the other hand, certain idioms kept occurring in the writings of many of the Maskilim, apparently owing to the influence of Mapu, and a few of them managed to survive until today, e.g., מְצָא חֵן בְּעֵינַי ‘I like it’ (‘it found grace in my eyes’); כְּלִיזֵן עֵינַיִם ‘yearning’, שָׂאֵט נַפֶּשׁ ‘contempt’ מְחֹז חֲפָצוֹ ‘his destination’.

Mapu seems to have mastered BH completely (although, to be sure, no research has been done on this subject). But his successors were not as proficient and we find מְלִים מְעֻטִים (instead of מְעֻטוֹת) and other such lapses. The definite article remains after the prepositions ב and ל, e.g., בְּהַמְּכַתְּבִים ‘in the letters’ (instead of בְּמַכְתָּבִים).

The Haskala writers were not the only ones to grapple with the problems of finding equivalent expressions for the phenomena of modern life. The rabbis who continued to employ the often ungrammatical Hebrew-Aramaic mixture that was in use in the Middle Ages faced the same problem. But because they were not interested in the language but rather in the religious problems created by the new technological age, their solutions were generally unsatisfactory. We find מְגִיד הַחֲדָשׁוֹת (‘teller of the news’) for ‘newspaper’, חֲצִים (‘arrows’) for ‘rifle’, and for ‘watch’ we find שְׂעָה (‘hour’) or מַה שְּׂמֹרֶה עַל הַשְּׂעוֹת (‘that which shows the hour’, a translation from Latin *horologium*).

#### Literature:

D. Patterson, “Some Linguistic Aspects of the Nineteenth-Century Hebrew Novel”, *JSS* 7 (1962), pp. 310, 314ff.;

E.M. Lipschütz, *Vom lebendigen Hebräisch*, Berlin 1920, p. 12 n. 1;  
י. כנעני, לשוננו ה (תרצ"ג), עמ' 16-64 (הלוי);

א. פורת, דרכי הלכסיקוגרפיה לספרות ההשכלה, לשוננו ז (תרצ"ו), עמ' 537;  
ב. קרוא, תרומת עיתונות ההשכלה להרחבת הלשון, ספר השנה של העיתונאים.

חל אביב תשכ"ב, עמ' 219-220;

ד. סדן, לשוננו לעם ו (תשט"ו), עמ' 33-34, 42;

ג. שפירא, הלשון הטכנית בספרות הרבנית, לשוננו כו (תשכ"ב), עמ' 215-216;  
[Y. Yitzhaki, “The Hebrew Authors of the Haskalah” etc., *Lešonenu* 34 (1969-70), pp. 287-305; 35 (1970-71), pp. 39-59, 140-154 (Hebrew with English summary);

ה. סיוון, לשוננו לעם כא (תשל"ל), עמ' 277: כג (תשל"ב) 221-222 (שעון);

יז (תשכ"ו), עמ' 151-153: כה (תשל"ד) עמ' 136 (רכבת);

ו. מירקין, בלשנות עברית חפ"שית 13 (תשל"ח), עמ' 86-91. — O.S.]

c. *Mendele Mokher Sefarim* — *Creator of Modern Hebrew*

§309. The process of assimilation that followed in the wake of the Haskalah was halved to some extent towards the end of the century when the important new force of Zionism appeared in the arena of Jewish history. With its arrival, H literature abandoned the tendency to try to induce the Jews to assimilate. Now, on the contrary, Hebrew literature became nationalistic. But this change in the literature was preceded by a very important change in the H language itself, which served to create modern H.

Jews in Central Europe had ample opportunity to learn the languages of their neighbors and in this way to satisfy their cultural needs. But in Eastern Europe, non-Jewish culture was not made available, and hence H had to be the vehicle of secular learning for the Jews. The Maskilim used BH because of their contempt for the Jewish life of their generation. But for many reasons, BH turned out to be rather ill suited to meeting these cultural needs. Thus a new H had to come into being; it was created by Mendele Mokher Sefarim (the pen name of A.S. Abramowitz). Mendele is also considered the "father" of modern Yiddish literature and style. He is apparently the only writer who created two literary languages — Hebrew and Yiddish. While other Hebrew writers, owing to the deficiency of their BH language, often wrote not what they *intended* to write but what they were *able* to write, Mendele did not fool himself. Once he decided to translate his Yiddish into Hebrew, he felt compelled to create a Hebrew language of his own which would reflect his Yiddish precisely.

1. *The Elements of His Language: BH, MH, Aramaic, Medieval Hebrew and Yiddish.* §310. In contrast to BH, the language Mendele created has many components. He and his followers made extensive use of the BH vocabulary, but MH plays a large part in it, too. And once and for all, they almost entirely abandoned the BH tense system with its "hazy" notions of time which made it so difficult to use. Instead, a clear-cut system of three tenses, past, present participle and future was adopted, apparently under the (mistaken) notion that this was MH usage (cf. above §218). The cohortative and the jussive were eliminated, and as to the infinitive, there is a sort of compromise so that its use is quite fluid. On the other hand, the Biblical stems are used almost in their entirety, and the MH Nitpa'al (see §211) is not neglected.

In Mendele's Hebrew there is a good deal of Aramaic, a source which he

dropped in his later writings. Mendele also drew heavily upon the Prayer Book, Medieval Hebrew and other popular literature. Naturally, the more familiar a text was from the Prayer Book, such as the Grace after Meals or from the Passover Haggadah, the greater were the chances that its vocabulary would be accepted. Thus the Bible, the commentary of Rashi (cf. §276), certain Midrashim and the like, were more readily accepted. Moreover, there was a kind of oral Hebrew element that had developed in the Diaspora which was not necessarily in literature (see below). Finally, Yiddish, as spoken by Jews in Eastern Europe also influenced the new language.

We have selected a passage from Mendel which we shall analyse below.

כל ימי — כך מספר בנימין השלישי בעצמו — כל ימי נתגדלתי בק"ק בטלון; בה היתה הורתי ולדתי, בה למדתי ודעה קנייתי, ובה נשאתי, למזל טוב, את זוגתי הצנועה, מרת ולדה תחיה. בטלון היא עיר קטנה באחד המקומות הנשכחים מרגל אדם ודבר אין לה כמעט עם הישוב. וכשיזדמן לשם פעמים אחד מעוברי דרך, משגיחים ומשתאים: מי הוא זה ומאין זה, מה לו פה ומי לו פה, ולמה נתכוון בביאתו? מפני שביאה בעלמא בלא כלום אי אפשר, וכי לחנם נושא אדם את רגליו, והולך ובא על לא דבר? מסתמא יש דברים בגו ואין המקרה הזה אומר אלא דרשני. הבה נתחכמה לו!...

בני העיר בטלון רובם ככולם אביונים גדולים וקבצנים נוראים, לא עליכם, אבל הכל מודים שהם אביונים שמוזים, קבצנים טובי לב, ובעלי בטחון...

(from the beginning of *The Travels of Benjamin the Third*).

In the passage above, certain phrases immediately remind us of Biblical expressions; for אדם מרגל אדם cf. Job 28, 4, for מה לו פה ומי לו פה cf. Isa. 22, 16 and הבה נתחכמה לו is a verbatim quote from Ex. 1, 10. בטלון are of Aramaic origin. משגיחים and משתאים are MH and נתגדלתי, בלא כלום, וכשיזדמן אין originated in Rashi's phrase אין אביונים גדולים וקבצנים נוראים 'This (difficult) verse cries for a (homiletic) explanation'. 'verse' was turned here into מקרה 'case', a change not to be found in the classical sources but originating in the everyday speech of scholars. אביונים גדולים can not be anything but the (Hebrew-) Yiddish אביון, since the proper meaning of the Hebrew phrase would be 'an important poor man', which Mendele certainly did not intend!

The Hebrew style developed by Mendele and his school has remained more or less unchanged until today, but we must not forget that in Eastern Europe Hebrew was a written, not a spoken language — Yiddish was the everyday tongue of the people.

Moreover, even before Mendele developed his new style (in his first period), he revived and coined several names of animals while translating a zoological composition, and also created several words, e.g., גָּפְרוֹר 'match'.

*Literature:*

Mendele's language has not been properly investigated except for א. אברונין, למקורות לשונו של מנדלי, לשונו (תרצ"ט), עמ' 159 ואילך which deals with certain components of his language, e.g., the Prayer Book, pp. 162-166.

The essays on his style are disappointing, see for example

ח.ג. ביאליק, מנדלי ושלוש הכרכים, כל כתבי ביאליק, הדפסה

כג, תל-אביב תשכ"ד, עמ' רמח-רנא;

י. פיכמן, שלום יעקב אברמוביץ, כל כתבי מנדלי מוכר ספרים, הדפסה יב,

תל-אביב תשכ"ו, עמ' VII ואילך;

י.ח. רבניצקי, העומר א-ב (חרס"ז-חרס"ט) עמ' 23-31.

Rawnitzky denies the influence of Yiddish on Mendele's Hebrew. But cf.

ד. סדן, מנדלי בין שתי הלשונות, מאזנים

(תשכ"ו) p. 111. Also see E.M. Lipschütz, op. cit. (§308), p. 21.

For terms coined by Mendele see

י.א. זיידמן, לשונו ז (תרצ"ו), עמ' 205-219, 336-348.

2. *Mendele's Language — Only a Vehicle of Literature.* §311. The language created by Mendele was intended to be a literary medium only. Mendele neither believed in nor was interested in the revival of Hebrew. In this respect he was a Maskil; the language which he created was to serve only as a tool of the Haskalah, in other words, to further assimilation. In one of his short stories, בימי הרעש he mocks at those who try to speak Hebrew. It is said that H.N. Bialik wanted him to be elected an honorary member as the creator of a Hebrew literary idiom, but M. Ussishkin prevented it because the goal of the association was the revival of Hebrew as a spoken language.

*Literature:*

כל כתבי מנדלי מוכר ספרים, עמ' תיז-תיח;

מ. איש-שלום, מעריב 19.5.1967, עמ' 15.

II. *Hebrew Revived in Palestine*

§312. Meanwhile, however, at the end of the nineteenth century, societies for the revival of Hebrew as a spoken language sprang up in Eastern Europe and Russia. Later on, during the period between the World Wars schools were established in Poland, Lithuania and elsewhere, in which Hebrew was employed at least partly as the language of instruction. Nonetheless, Hebrew did not stand any real chance of becoming a spoken language in Europe.

It was only in Palestine that this goal could be realized because of the special conditions that obtained there. Jerusalem and other cities were inhabited by Jews from all corners of the world. They spoke Yiddish, Judeo-Spanish, Arabic and other languages. Hebrew was the only medium in which all these Jews could communicate with each other. In addition, the immigrants who began to come to Palestine at the end of the nineteenth century to live in the agricultural settlements had to determine the language of instruction for their children. There was the temptation to use French, and later German or English because of the cultural activities of the French Alliance Israélite and German Ezra organizations. But Zionism decided in favor of Hebrew. In 1913-1914 Hebrew had to fight for dominance in the schools. It was mainly the Jewish teachers who opposed the German Jewish organization Ezra which intended to use German at the Technion which was about to be built in Haifa. The ensuing struggle decided the fate of the Hebrew language; since its victory, the status of Hebrew has never again been in doubt in the Jewish State. Hebrew was established as the language of instruction in every official institution of learning from kindergarten to the universities.

*Literature:*

[Bar-Adon, op. cit. (§307), pp. 58-92, 128-164;

Fellman, *The Revival* (§307), pp. 27-55, 94-111. — O.S.]

*a. Eliezer Ben Yehuda*

§313. Yet all these achievements would not have been possible without the efforts of E. Ben Yehuda and his circle consisting principally of J.M. Pines, Z. Yavetz, D. Yellin, and others. Ben Yehuda moved to Jerusalem and made his own family the first whose children grew up without knowing any other language but Hebrew. From here, the habit of speaking Hebrew

spread to other families and by a cooperative effort with the kindergartens and schools, a Hebrew-speaking community gradually grew up in Jaffa (later Tel Aviv), Haifa, and the agricultural settlements. The spread of spoken Hebrew was given added impetus by immigrants of the so-called Second Aliyah (1905), which numbered among its distinguished members David Ben Gurion and David Kimchi.

*Literature:*

ד. סיוון, לשוננו לעם כד (תשל"ג), עמ' 67-116;

פ. נאמן, לשוננו לעם כה (תשל"ד), עמ' 83-127;

Fellman, *The Revival* (above §307), pp. 27-93. — O.S.

R. Sivan, "Ben-Yehuda and the Revival of Hebrew Speech", *Ariel* no. 25 (1969), pp. 35-39.]

*b. Va'ad Halashon Ha'ivrit (The Hebrew Language Committee)*

§314. It was soon discovered that the revival of a language created solely by Mendele Mokher Sefarim would not suffice, and so the Va'ad Halashon Ha'ivrit, the Hebrew Language Committee, was created in 1889. When the State of Israel was established, the Committee became the Academy of the Hebrew Language (see below §459). The members of Va'ad Halashon, the colleagues of Ben Yehuda, were mainly educators who realized that the process of revival must be accompanied by the enlargement of Hebrew by new creations. As mentioned above, even the most basic words used in the kitchen, the school, and in public life, science and the humanities were lacking. Therefore Va'ad Halashon decided;

1) to search diligently among the Hebrew sources — BH, MH, Piyyuṭim and Medieval scientific and translation Hebrew;

2) to fill the void by creating new words;

3) to have recourse also to Aramaic and where necessary, to other Semitic languages, especially Arabic.

Originally, the Va'ad strongly opposed loanwords from Indo-European languages, even if they were "internationally accepted."

A precursor of Va'ad Halashon during the preceding generation was the grammarian M. Schulbaum, a native of Galicia (then part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire). Schulbaum had already begun to create new words very much along the lines that were followed later by Ben Yehuda. Apparently Schulbaum did not find the response he had expected among

his contemporaries, but it would be interesting to know whether he influenced Ben Yehuda.

How did Hebrew writers outside Palestine react to all these events? Predictably, some were incredulous. Even two decades later, when the revival was already an established fact, S. Bernfeld insisted that "To make Hebrew a spoken language... is entirely impossible. This (the revival of a dead language) never happened to any language."

Others vehemently opposed the activities of Va'ad Halashon which some called a "word-factory." Even Aḥad Ha'am, who held "progressive" views about language development and criticized those narrow-minded grammarians who looked for "mistakes" in the works of Hebrew writers disliked the mass creation of words by linguists. He felt that new terms should be coined by writers and only as the occasion and the need arose. J. Klausner, on the other hand, went all out in defense of the new trend and was himself active in the creation of new words.

*Literature:*

ש. איזנשטדט, שפחנו העברית תחיה, תל-אביב 1967, עמ' 27, 110;

מ. בלשן, השלוח א (תרנ"ז), עמ' 286

Klausner's answer, *ibid.* pp. 533ff.;

(= י. קלוזנר, העברית החדשה ובעיותיה, תל-אביב 1957, עמ' 13);

קלוזנר, העברית החדשה וכו', עמ' 188

כל כתבי אחד העם, תל-אביב וירושלים תש"ז, עמ' 13

O.S. — ר. ויס, לשוננו לעם כה (תשל"ד), עמ' 167-174];

M. Medan, "The Academy of the Hebrew Language", *Ariel* no. 25 (1969), pp. 40-47.]

1. *A. Change of Policy in Va'ad Halashon.* §315. We have pointed out that in the course of the revival, IH did not strictly follow the lines laid down above. The use of Arabic and other Semitic languages was now practically out of the question as sources for enriching IH. For whereas the early members of the Va'ad Halashon, especially those of Sephardic stock like Yellin, knew Arabic perfectly, the intelligentsia coming from Europe possessed a rich knowledge of classical Jewish writings and were disinclined to absorb Semitic roots unknown to them. Also loanwords, especially those that were internationally accepted, and loan translations from Yiddish, especially if they were found in medieval Rabbinic literature,

could no longer be excluded. These points have to be considered before we deal with the sources of Israeli Hebrew.

## B. The Sources of Israeli Hebrew

§316. In the following chapters we shall be concerned with the material that went into the making of IH including material that was rejected or rejected after having first been accepted. The main stress will be on the components making IH a fusion language.

### *Literature:*

Unless a special source is indicated, consult the dictionaries listed below for the sources of the material in the following pages. The sources of those discussions which are the product of my own observations are not, of course, given. The dictionaries are:

אליעזר בן יהודה, מלון הלשון העברית הישנה והחדשה

(English title: Eliezer Ben Yehuda of Jerusalem, *A Complete Dictionary of Ancient and Modern Hebrew*, I–XVI [with Prolegomena in a separate volume], 1910–1959);

א. אבן-שושן, מלון חדש, ירושלים תשי"א-תשי"ב;

א. אבן-שושן, המלון החדש, ירושלים תשכ"ו-תש"ל;

מ. מדן, מאלף עד ת"י, ירושלים תשכ"ד;

[6th edition, 1973;

.1969 O.S.] — ר. אלקלעי, מלון עברי שלם, רמת-גן 1969.

### I. *Biblical Hebrew*

#### a. *Syntax Rejected*

§317. BH is the most important constituent of IH vocabulary, phraseology (to some extent), and morphology of the verb and noun (conjugation and declension). But except for the Hebrew in children's books, BH syntax was almost entirely rejected and with it all the morphosyntactic aspects of the verb that are the main features of BH. In this respect IH closely follows the MH pattern. (See above §218).



*b. Morphology*

§318. Therefore, not only were all the archaic forms of BH rejected (see above §§207, 208), but also the consecutive tenses, the cohortative, the infinitive absolute more or less, and the infinitive construct (except for the plus ל and plus כ infinitives forms, e.g., לְשֹׁמֵר). On the other hand, those elements of the verb which were retained were generally in their BH and not their MH forms. The remaining perfect, imperfect, and infinitive construct mostly conform to the BH pattern. This also applies to the weak verbs and stems. To be sure, there are differences in these respects among Hebrew writers. Those who are more inclined to use MH, among them Agnon, prefer such forms as לְיָרֵד, לְיִשֵּׁב, לְתַן to their BH equivalents לַחַח, לַרְדָּה, לַרְדָּה (cf. above §212). But the differences here are minimal. The declensions of the noun are those of BH. (To be sure, MH forms were practically unknown since they were discovered only in the last generation, see above §212). A few cases such as בְּעַל כְּרִיזָה ‘against your will’ exhibit the MH form, since these forms are not directly derived from MH but came into IH via Yiddish. Here we see that the long arm of the purists was not able to reach into every nook and corner of the spoken idiom during the period of the Diaspora.

The personal pronouns are also more or less those of BH (but see §416), but the BH conjunctions, e.g., כִּי, אֲשֶׁר have practically disappeared. A certain Jerusalem professor who continues to use כִּי ‘since’ immediately betrays his former membership in the Jerusalem circle (Ben Yehuda, Yellin, etc.) which followed BH in this area more strictly than did the writers who came from Eastern Europe (Bialik, etc.) (see in detail §453).

*c. Vocabulary*

§319. Practically all the SBH vocabulary was taken over by IH. Problems arose only when this vocabulary clashed morphologically and semantically with that of MH (see later §§320, 328). The same applies to LBH. Wherever the synonym of a certain root could not be found in SBH or MH, IH did not hesitate to employ the archaic root; for example, יָנַק ‘to lead forth’ (Deut. 33, 22) is used both with this meaning and the MH sense of ‘to spurt’. But what about the ABH-SBH synonyms עָשׂוּה—פָּעוּל ‘do’, and שָׁמוֹעַ—הִאָּזַן ‘hear’? Very often ABH roots provided IH with the raw material so necessary for coining the many verbs and nouns required by a modern language, material unavailable in the early Hebrew sources. For example, הִאָּזַן was assigned the specific meaning ‘listen to the radio’, פָּעוּל

'to be active' with the adjective פָּעִיל 'active', derived from it and פְּעִילוֹת 'activity'.

1. *Clash between BH and MH Avoided.* §320. Occasionally SBH was discarded when it clashed with LBH and MH. A very good case in point is the use of חָפוץ 'to want'. It was discarded except by American Hebrew-speaking Jews, and was replaced by LBH and MH רָצוּה. On the other hand, MH נָטוּל 'to take' could not dislodge BH לָקוּחַ. The use of לָקוּחַ 'to buy' (mainly MH) did not impinge on קָנוּה in IH (as it did in MH). The MH form and meaning prevail only in the noun לָקוּחַ 'buyer, customer' obviously because in MH the verb לָקוּחַ is very often employed with the meaning 'to take' (see above §227). On the other hand, לָקוּחַ was a welcome addition to the vocabulary since its MH form provided the lexeme for the noun, whereas קָנוּה is needed for the verbal expression in the present tense קוֹנֵה הוּא meaning mainly 'he buys'.

Still, it is quite difficult to ascertain why in certain cases the MH lexeme was preferred or rejected. H. Rosén and A. Bendavid seem to be right in assuming that one of the main reasons was the tendency to avoid homonymic and polynymic clashes. IH prefers שֶׁמֶשׁ 'sun' to חֶמֶה (mainly MH), since the latter is also the feminine of the adjective חָם 'hot'. The same applies to יָרַח 'moon', rather than the mainly MH לְבָנָה. Instead of MH מִיָּתָה 'death', BH מָוֶת is employed in IH since the former is homonymous with מִטָּה 'bed'. MH עַכְשָׁיו 'now' is preferred to BH עַתָּה because of אַתָּה 'you'. Another reason advanced by Rosén is that of association. 'Freedom' is חֵפְזַי (BH) or חֲרוּת (MH) but not דְּרוֹר (BH), since there are several other common IH adjectives, nouns and verbs derived from these roots: חֵפְזִי 'free', חֵפְשָׁה 'vacation', בְּן־חֹרֵין 'free man', שִׁחָרַר 'to liberate, free', but none from דְּרוֹר.

To be sure, in many of the cases which Rosén and Bendavid discuss, other reasons could be advanced, for example, frequency in MH, but both tendencies which these scholars refer to seem well established.

Bendavid, I think, rightly assumes that preference was very often given to a Hebrew lexeme that was in use in Yiddish, e.g., טָעוּה (mainly MH) 'to err', rather than שָׁגוּה, שָׁגוּג, שָׁגוּגָה mainly BH, see below.

A triradical normal root also seems to have been preferred. Thus MH הִתְחַל 'to begin' is dominant rather than BH הִחַל.

Sometimes the clash was resolved by assigning the two terms to different

domains, e.g., BH שופט is 'judge', but the mainly MH דין is 'judge of a rabbinical court'.

In many cases the problem of BH and MH synonymy is still unresolved, e.g., between BH פה and כאן 'here'. Of course, certain writers such as Agnon, prefer MH in these and other cases.

BH words which were not needed in IH because other words had replaced them (and sometimes even such that were needed) received new meanings, e.g., אקדח = BH 'beryl', IH 'revolver'; מוקש = BH 'snare, trap', IH 'mine'; חשמל = BH 'electrum', IH 'electricity' (and cf. below §§321, 324).

*Literature:*

ת. רוזן, העברית שלנו, תל-אביב תשט"ז, עמ' 92 (דרור

חפש, חרות); 98 (אקדח, חשמל);

א. בנדויד, לשון מקרא ולשון חכמים<sup>2</sup>, תל-אביב תשכ"ז, עמ' 2-3;

ר. ויס, לשוננו לעם יב (תשכ"א), עמ' 200.

2. *Why Was the Use of BH Vocabulary Opposed §321.* The tendency to avoid BH in coining new terms in IH still prevails to a certain extent. This tendency is the result of two opposing attitudes. The first, while not opposed to BH as such, maintains that all the BH material that did not survive in MH is dead matter and should, therefore be ignored for the purposes of IH, a view maintained by the late J. Klausner. Therefore, instead of, e.g., BH נחוץ 'it is necessary', he employs MH נצרך; instead of אניתה 'ship' he uses ספינה. In the *Encyclopaedia Hebraica*, of which he was an editor, all the participles of the Hif'il fem. sing. had to appear in the MH form (with the ending *-et*) rather than the BH form, e.g., מומנת 'invites' (and not מומינה). This attitude was rejected. As Avineri points out, IH has revived the majority of the more than 800 words that did not survive in MH. Some of them are used with their original meaning, e.g., אניתה 'ship', and some were assigned new meanings, e.g., מנזר 'monastery', נזיר 'monk'. Even a word like משק (from Gen. 15, 2 בן משק ביתי), as yet unexplained, is employed (on the basis of the context in which it appears) with the meaning of 'household management, farm'. With equal lack of success, Klausner opposed the use of this and other *hapax legomena* (words that appear only once in BH).

The second attitude was much more reasonable. It insisted that the exploitation of BH for coining IH words must be restricted lest the new mean-

ing assigned to biblical roots eventually mar our understanding of the Bible. Two instances may illustrate the correctness of this view. The BH מוקש 'snare, trap' means 'mine' in IH, so that Israeli youngsters reading Deut. 7, 16, for example, might understand that when one stepped on a Canaanite, he exploded under one's feet! Other examples tested in classes from elementary schools to the university yielded the same picture. Young Israelis were asked, "What is the translation of the verse כִּי בְאֵפֶם הִרְגוּ שׂוֹר (Gen. 49:6)?" Almost no one was able to explain the second part of the verse because in IH רְצוֹן means 'wish'. How can one maim oxen without wishing to? Some even attempted to explain its meaning as 'evil wish'. But in SBH רְצוֹן does not mean 'wish' but 'pleasure', and therefore, the Jewish Publication Society translation correctly renders the verse, "For when angry they slay man and when pleased they main oxen", meaning they are dangerous in whatever wood they happen to be. As is well known, this difficulty arises in translating early texts in any language. Since words sometimes change their meaning only imperceptively, everyday usage may lead the reader and even the scholar to misunderstand the early text. This danger is present also in translating Middle High German into Modern German, as put by Saran and Nagel:

"A translation from Middle High German is seemingly very easy, but as a matter of fact very difficult... [because] in nearly every word we have to distinguish between the 'Sprachgefühl' of Middle High German and Modern German... Many words appear in Modern German with quite different or entirely new meanings."

So for this reason it may have been a blessing for the Jews that Hebrew died out 1800 years ago before it had the chance to develop too far from BH and MH, as was the case, for example, with modern Syriac dialects with relation to Old Syriac (see below §§364, 513).

#### Literature:

F. Saran-B. Nagel, *Das Übersetzen aus dem Mittelhochdeutschen*<sup>3</sup>, Tübingen 1957, pp. 1-3;

י. קלוונר, לשוננו יא (חש"א), עמ' 101;

[H.B. Rosén, *Contemporary Hebrew*, The Hague and Paris 1977, pp. 30-37. — O.S.]

II. *Biblical Hebrew Inscriptions*

§322. One word, found only in the Siloam inscription (cf. §92), namely נִקְבָּה 'tunnel' is utilized in IH, vocalized נִקְבָּה.

III. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Bar Koseba Letters*

§323. Since the Dead Sea Scrolls were discovered only recently (1947), they have, of course, had no hand in shaping IH. But strangely enough, the phrase החזק מעמד 'to hold fast' which seems to be a calque from German, was found there with the same (or similar) meaning.

I was also surprised to discover in the Bar Koseba letters (see above §193) the verb דאוג with the exact meanings as in Israeli Hebrew, i.e. not only 'to be troubled' but also 'to care for', a use which at first sight seems to be a calque from German *sorgen*. To be sure, it does seem to be employed in this sense in Ben Sira (cf. above §127). הוי שלום 'good bye' in the Bar Koseba letters is identical with IH usage, but so far, no other early source for this expression has turned up.

These and many other instances (see, e.g., §§366, 368) indicate that IH usage, even when seemingly prompted by foreign influence, was sometimes shaped unwittingly in the spirit of the classical sources.

*Literature:*

ד. ירדן, ביטויים "מודרניים" במקורות קדומים, לשוננו לעם

ו (חשט"ו) עמ' 10;

י. קוטשר, לשוננו כו (חשכ"ב) עמ' 123-124; כז (חשכ"ג) עמ' 9 [=מחקרים,

עמ' מב-מג, נו].

IV. *The Septuagint*

§324. One BH word received its meaning in IH because of its translation in the Septuagint. J.L. Gordon employed the BH חֶשֶׁמֶלְ(ה) with the meaning 'electricity' because the Septuagint translated it by the Greek *elektron*. Its original meaning is still uncertain.

*Literature:*

B. Landsberger, in *Hebräische Wortforschung: Festschrift... Walter Baumgartner* (above §22), pp. 190ff.;

W. von Soden, *ibid.* p. 298;

ר. סיוון, לשוננו לעם יז (תשכ"ו), עמ' 200-201.

V. *Mishnaic Hebrew*

§325. MH had very little effect on IH morphology (see above §307). As pointed out by A. Bendavid, the reason is obvious; until very recently Hebrew grammar was BH and not MH whose morphology was scarcely known (see above §§212, 318).

a. *Noun Patterns.*

§326. IH copied mainly from MH the noun patterns of the verbal substantive of the Qal, e.g. שְׁמִירָה 'watching', Pi'el e.g., דְּבוּר 'speech', and Hif'il e.g., הַיְקָמָה 'invitation' (see above §213).

The Babylonian form of the *nomen agentis*, e.g., גְּזֹלָן is also very widespread, while the Palestinian form גּוֹזֵל is not, and small wonder, since the latter form was discovered in manuscripts only during the last few decades, (*ibid.*). But both types are utilized with the root סבל; סְבֵלָן 'patient', סוֹבֵלָן 'tolerant'. The nominal type לְקוֹחַ (*ibid.*) is not widespread in IH, apparently because it is identical with the infinitive absolute which was also dropped.

However, it is in IH syntax that MH is all but dominant. The tenses of IH are identical with those which until very recently were supposed to have been the tenses of MH (see above §218).

The same is more or less true of the infinitives: the infinitive absolute was dropped altogether, while the construct is mainly employed with לְשָׂמֵר ('to guard'), less often with בְּצֵאתוֹ ('while leaving') where a relative clause is more often employed (בְּשִׁיעָא 'when he left'). As the relative pronoun MH שֶׁ (and not BH אֲשֶׁר) is preferred.

b. *Syntax*

§327. The genitive construction is very much alive, although the construction with שֶׁל is also widespread, both in the form שֶׁל הַמֶּלֶךְ and בֵּיתוֹ שֶׁל הַמֶּלֶךְ 'the king's house'. The MH independent possessive pronoun, e.g.

שְׁלִי הַבַּיִת ‘my house’, plays an important role in IH (see below §443). As mentioned above (§216) originally שְׁלִ was not separated from the following noun.

Since the IH tense system is modelled after MH, the whole make-up of the syntax, inasmuch as it is Hebrew, resembles MH and not BH (see also §§434–441).

### c. Vocabulary

**§328.** MH is a rich source of IH vocabulary and continues to provide IH with an uninterrupted flow of new roots. As happened to BH itself (see above §123), here, too, the synonymic clash was sometimes resolved by differentiation, i.e., assigning different meanings, consciously or sub-consciously, to the BH–MH synonyms, e.g., ‘to love’ is אָהַב in BH, חָבַב in MH. Today חָבַב has come to mean ‘to like’. קָרוֹן ‘wagon’ (from Latin; English *car*) is now used only with the meaning ‘(railway) coach’. פּוֹלְמוֹס ‘war’ (from Greek) is employed with the meaning of ‘polemics’; קָנוּי ‘counted, entered for a share in the sacrifice’ became a ‘subscriber (to a newspaper)’. סְנִיף ‘attachment’ is now ‘branch (of a bank, etc.)’. (See at length above §§319, 320).

### Literature:

א. בנדויד, לשון המקרא ולשון חכמים<sup>2</sup> (לעיל §320), עמ' 7;  
 ר. ויס, לשוננו לעם יב (תשכ"א), עמ' 59, 202.

### d. Secondary Sources as a Channel between MH and IH

**§329.** There seems, however, to be one important difference between the use of BH and MH. The Maskilim who revived Hebrew were thoroughly acquainted with BH, and the average Jew was also quite familiar with certain parts of it (the Pentateuch, Psalms, and other books). Therefore, both parties could supply the revived language with BH vocabulary directly.

The situation with regard to MH was different, for the material from this source often came indirectly, via various secondary sources such as Rashi's commentaries on the Pentateuch, the Prayer Book, and the Maḥzor (prayer book) of the High Holidays. Words and expressions that occur frequently in these sources or figure prominently in certain important prayers had a better chance of entering IH even if they were rare in the MH primary sources.

We can safely assume that the expression חָסַל ‘finished’ (of Aramaic

origin) entered IH from the Passover Haggadah with the phrase *הסל מה נשתנה* 'the order of Passover is ended' as did the expression *מה נשתנה* (literally), 'what has changed' with the phrase *מה נשתנה הלילה הזה* 'why is this night different?'. A good instance of how the above-mentioned rule might also apply to BH to a certain extent is the history of the word *הקנה*, originally 'sigh, uttering'. For reasons not entirely clear, this word which appears in Psalms: *בלינו שגינו כמו הקנה* 'our years come to an end like a sigh' (90, 9) is explained as 'helm' by the Midrash. It is scarcely credible that the revivers should have noticed this passage in an obscure Midrash. But one of the Payṭanim in the course of his diligent search for rare words in the Hebrew and Aramaic Rabbinic sources (cf. §266) did seize upon it and so it came to appear in the famous Piyuṭ whose first line is *לחמר ביד היוצר* which figures very prominently in the prayer of the Eve of the Day of Atonement, in the stanza which begins *כי הגה ההגה ביד המלח* 'like a rudder in the hand of the sailor'. For this reason the word was well known to the average Jew and hence its way into IH was facilitated. It is employed to mean both 'rudder' and 'steering wheel'.

*Literature:*

W. Bacher, *Monatsschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*, 41 (1887), pp. 403–404.

## VI. Medieval Hebrew

### a. Piyuṭim

§330. Few of the words and roots which the Payṭanim created entered IH. As pointed out above (§267), the Payṭanim's revolutionary methods of creating new roots and forms met with stiff opposition in medieval Spain during the Hebrew renaissance there. As this renaissance was a model for the revivers, they shared its dislike of the Payṭanic language to such an extent that they described this debased style by using the first words of a certain Piyuṭ *אץ קוצץ בן קוצץ*. One of the few words which IH did accept, however, is *אהל* 'to wish', and one of the few nouns is *מָרָץ* 'energy', although the meaning 'energy' is not identical with its meaning as employed by the Payṭanim. Another noun, *מעש*, an ungrammatical coinage of the Payṭanim (cf. above §266) figures prominently in the Prayer Book and that explains why it entered IH in elevated prose (= 'activity').



b. *Kabbala*

§331. Several words and phrases of IH can be traced back to the Kabbalistic literature, e.g., עֲרֵטִילָאִי ‘naked’ or תְּקוּן in the phrases עַל עַל קָא תְּקוּנוֹ, מְצָא אֶת תְּקוּנוֹ ‘was corrected’.

*Literature:*

מ.צ. קדרי, לשווננו לעם יב (תשכ"א), עמ' 177 ואילך, 183 ואילך, 215 ואילך; [M.Z. Kaddari, *The Medieval Heritage of Modern Hebrew Usage*, Tel Aviv 1970 (Hebrew with English summary), pp. 91–106. — O.S.]

c. *The Scientific Translations*

§332. Since some of this literature continued to be studied and read throughout the ages, it is not surprising that even today it is a source of scientific and philosophical terminology.

The words אֶקְלִים ‘climate’ and קֶטֶר ‘diameter’ of Greek origin, came from Arabic via the medieval Hebrew translations. Another new Hebrew verb רָכַז ‘to concentrate’, was added to IH from מְרָכַז (<Arabic *markaz*) ‘center’. הִנְדָּסָה ‘geometry, engineering’ in IH was originally Persian and is found as a loanword in the Talmud. It came into Hebrew by translation from Arabic (cf. above §273).

d. *Arabic via Medieval Hebrew*

§333. Apparently in the early Rabbinic literature the root נִסַּח (BH and MH) also acquired the Arabic meaning ‘to copy’. The nouns נִסְחָה ‘text’ and נִסְחָה ‘prescription, formula’ etc. are much in evidence mainly in the scientific language of IH.

1. *Calques.* §334. Arabic calques abound, e.g., שָׁלוּל ‘to loot’ > ‘to negate’, since the parallel Arabic root (*sll*) has both meanings (which is itself a loan translation from Greek *stérēsis*), and hence the IH adjective שְׁלִילִי ‘negative’; חֲבוּר ‘composition’ (book, etc.); מְצִיאוֹת ‘reality’. The medical translators also coined many adjectives from nouns simply by adding the suffix [-i], e.g., מְלֻאכּוּתִי ‘artificial’. In BH and MH this pattern is still restricted almost entirely to gentiles, e.g., יְהוּדִי ‘Jew’. Thanks to the influence of Arabic on Medieval Hebrew, IH now possesses a welcome derivational suffix for the creation of nouns as well as adjectives.

*Literature:*

[On the [-i] ending:

ר. מירקין, לשוננו לעם כד (תשל"ג), עמ' 297-301.

.244-233 עמ' א. בן-סירא, ibid., O.S.]

*e. The Poetry of Spain*

§335. Since in principle the poets of Spain were opposed to the influx of new roots and forms, and though they did create several (see above §270), very little material in IH seems to be derived from that source. קרונו 'rhyme' may be one although the verb קרוז, a calque from Arabic, appears already in earlier times. Another one is אסיר ציון 'prisoner of Zion' denoting Jews imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain because of Zionist activities. This phrase originated in a famous poem of Yehuda Halevi that begins with the line ציון הלא תשאלי לשלום אסיריך "Zion, do you not ask about the welfare of your prisoners?"

*f. Other Medieval Hebrew Sources*

§336. (Cf. §284.) IH contains a few words that were coined from Hebrew roots during the Middle Ages or entered written Hebrew from the vernacular. Among them are רבנית 'a Rabbi's wife' and קנטרס 'booklet'. On the other hand, גלח 'priest' was rejected because of its pejorative overtones (lit. 'shaven, tonsured'), and today פֶּמֶר is used.

Sometimes in the spoken language of the Jews, Hebrew words that underwent a change of meaning came to possess diametrically opposed meanings. A good case in point is תָּסִיד. In BH it means 'pious man' and was used in this sense in the Hasmonean period. During the second half of the eighteenth century, there arose in Eastern Europe a "sect" which called itself Hasidim meaning 'the pious ones'. But since in the course of time every Hasid came to belong to the circle of one rabbi or another, such as the Rabbi of Gur or Bobov, the expression ...תָּסִיד שָׁל 'the Hasid of' acquired the connotation 'the adherent of...' This meaning became so strong that the word began to be used even in non-Hasidic circles with the meaning of 'adherent'. Even Zinberg, the literary historian of Yiddish could, so I am told, speak about "the Hasidim of the Mitnagdim" despite the fact that the Mitnagdim (Opponents) were the bitter opponents of the Hasidim! Today one is no longer surprised to encounter the phrase תָּסִידֵי הַקוֹמוּניסְטִים 'the adherents of the Communists'!

VII. *Aramaic*

§337. Aramaic is the most important non-Hebrew source for IH vocabulary. We are not referring to the Aramaic loans in BH and MH, for these were considered integral parts of Hebrew at all times. Such a word is עָרוּק 'deserter' which was coined a generation ago from the verb עָרוּק 'to flee' which appears only once in BH and did not survive in later Hebrew sources. Rather, we mean here those Aramaic elements (mainly the Aramaic parts of the Babylonian Talmud) that were not absorbed into the earlier strata of Hebrew.

Aramaic, which was something of a sacred language to the Jews for over two millennia, was much better suited to the task of enlarging IH than was Arabic because the majority of the immigrants to Palestine during the 'twenties, 'thirties, and 'forties hailed from non-Arabic-speaking countries where they had received a good Aramaic background thanks to their education in the heder (Jewish elementary school) and yeshiva (Jewish Talmudic college) in Eastern Europe.

Quite a few Aramaic expressions were employed in Yiddish, the vernacular of most of the immigrants during that period, and Aramaic roots and forms very often entered IH directly from Yiddish, among them בְּלֹאוּ 'anyway', תְּרִיִסר 'a dozen', תְּרִיִסרִי 'contradictory'. Some semi-Aramaic expressions are בְּלִית בְּרִירָה 'having no choice', אֲלֵבָא 'in fact'.

At least one expression, בְּדַחֲלוֹ וּרְחִימוֹ 'in awe', entered IH from a short prayer in the Prayer Book which is recited by the Hasidim on many occasions.

Moreover, a large portion of IH vocabulary was taken from Talmudic sources, among them such words as אָבָא 'father', אִמָּא 'mother', סָבָא (pronounced סָבָא) 'grandfather', סָבָאָא 'grandmother'.

Very common are מָה אֶכְפֹּת לִי 'I don't care' as well as כְּדִלְקָמָן 'as follows, below', מֵאֵידֶךָ גִּיטָא 'on the other hand' (often shortened to מֵאֵידֶךָ), and of course, מִשְׁכַּנְתָּא 'mortgage' which plays such a large part in the economic life of Israel. These and other words were taken over in their Aramaic form without any change of meaning. Sometimes an effort was made to turn the Aramaic forms into Hebrew, but this rarely succeeded, as in מִן הֶסְתָּם 'probably' (Mendele still uses the Aramaic form מִסְתָּמָא; see above §310 in the Hebrew text), while אֶמְתְּלָא for אֶמְתְּלָא 'pretext' did not gain a

foothold. A colleague of mine uses Hebrew *בְּעוֹלָם* instead of Aramaic *בְּעֵלְמָא* in phrases like *מְקַרְהָ בְּעֵלְמָא* 'coincidence'.

*Literature:*

[Kaddari, *The Medieval Heritage* (above §331), pp. 76-79 (ברחילו ורחימו).]

*a. New Creations from Aramaic Roots*

§338. Probably even more important is the role of Aramaic in providing material for the creation of words with new meanings not found in the sources. *אָתַר* meaning 'to localize' was formed from the Aramaic noun *אָתַר* (which was itself revived in the meaning 'archeological site', and even with the possessive suffix *בְּאָתְרוֹ* 'in situ'). From the same root the Mishna coined the expression *לְאֵלְתַר* 'immediately' which was turned in IH into the verb *אֵלְתַר* 'to improvise'. 'To broadcast' is translated by the Aramaic *שְׁדַר*, 'to send' which gave rise to the nouns *שְׁדוּר* 'broadcasting', *מְשַׁדֵּר* 'transmitter'. In games of sport a tie score is expressed by *תִּיקוּ*.

The root *גוּב* was adopted from the Palestinian Talmud (the only instance of its kind, as far as I know), thence *הִגִּב* 'to react' and *תְּגוּבָה* 'reaction'. Aramaic also provided Hebrew with the prefix *תַּחַ* ('under', H = תַּחַת) for creating prepositional compounds like *תַּחַת־תּוֹדָעָה* 'sub-consciousness', *תַּחַת־מְקַלֵּעַ* 'submachine gun'. This type of compound is still quite rare in IH, but cf. the Hebrew compound *עַל־אָנוּשִׁי* 'superhuman' (and cf. below §363).

The grammatical influence of Aramaic on IH is negligible. It can hardly be possible, as Avineri maintains, that forms like *אָדִישׁ* 'indifferent', *גְּמִישׁ* 'flexible', and *שְׁבִיר* 'breakable' were patterned after Aramaic. Other forms which Avineri believes to be of Aramaic origin are already found in BH and MH and therefore can not belong to this category.

*Literature:*

.75-72 עמ' *אבינרי, כבושי העברית בדורנו,*

[Rosén, *Contemporary Hebrew*, p. 148 (on תַּחַת)]

*b. Aramaic as Elevated Style*

§339. As Rosén has rightly stressed, Aramaic also affected IH stylistically. In English one can say:

*He came too soon, = He arrived prematurely.*

*now* = *at present*  
*It's too bad.* = *It is regrettable.*

The first column represents the colloquial forms, while the second column contains the “learned, elegant” ones. The “learned” material is generally of non-English (French, Latin) origin. So too, Aramaic words and forms in IH are sometimes employed as learned, higher forms, e.g., Hebrew אִישׁ אֵינוּ אֵילֵק = Aramaic לִית מֵאן דְּפִלִיג ‘nobody contests’; Hebrew טוֹב = Aramaic נִיחָא ‘O.K.’ Rosén therefore opposes Klausner’s proposal to drop the Aramaic elements.

*Literature:*

רוזן, העברית שלנו, עמ' 84-88.

*c. Aramaic Variant Forms for Semantic Differentiation*

§340. Rosén is certainly right in pointing out the differences between the noun patterns of *haqṭa:la:-aqṭa:la:* e.g., הַזְעָקָה-אֲזַעֲקָה. Both are of Aramaic origin — the former being the earlier form (already found in BH, see above §103); the latter, its younger variant, occurs in MH. IH put this difference to good use, employing *aqṭa:la:* mostly as a verbal noun, e.g., הַזְעָקָת תְּזַלִּים is the verbal noun of הַזְעֵק תְּזַלִּים ‘to call up soldiers’, while אֲזַעֲקָה = ‘air raid warning’.

*Literature:*

רוזן, העברית שלנו, עמ' 85.

## VIII. Arabic

*a. Introduced by Ben Yehuda*

§341. Ben Yehuda believed that Arabic should provide all the roots missing in Hebrew. Though his efforts in this area did not produce many concrete results, he did find several roots which were absorbed into IH. Some of them are very widely used, e.g. נָדִיר ‘rare’, תְּאָרִיךְ ‘date’, אָדִיב ‘polite’, רְצִינִי ‘earnest’. הִגֵּר ‘to migrate’ (today ‘emigrate’) was also borrowed from Arabic, but Ben Yehuda considered the root to be Hebrew because of the personal name הִגֵּר, Abraham’s maidservant. The same applies to אֶהְדָּה

'sympathy' which he created from an Arabic root that he thought was identical with the root of the BH personal name אהוד.

*Literature:*

I. Chanoch-Garbell, *Fremdsprachliche Einflüsse im modernen Hebräisch*, Berlin 1930, pp. 32-34;  
 מ. פיאמנטה, לשוננו לעם יב (תשכ"א), עמ' 152 (אדיב).

*b. Introduced by the Palmach*

§342. Another layer of Arabic loanwords goes back to the 'forties and originated mainly in the milieu of the Jewish underground movement. The פלוגות מ"ח (acronym of פלוגות מחץ 'strike units'), an arm of the Hagana held frequent meetings with the Beduins. It became fashionable for the Palmach members to imitate the Arabs in some respects and thus several Arabic words entered their language, e.g. צ'ןפאת 'tall tale' and פנג'אן 'coffee pot', both of which made the rounds during nightly meetings with Beduins. Another version maintains that these words gained currency in the Palmach units trained during World War II to operate disguised as Beduins behind the German lines in North Africa.

*Literature:*

ח. בלנק, ליסוד הערבי שבדיבור הישראלי, לשוננו לעם ו (תשט"ו),  
 קונטרס נג, עמ' 11-12.

For the other version about the origin of these two words see S. Keshet, *Ha'aretz*, Oct. 25, 1967, p. 3 (Hebrew).

*c. Other Vocabulary Sources*

§343. 'postage stamp' was taken over from Arabic, but is of non-Arabic origin. Some of the Arabic loans were adapted to their parallel Hebrew roots, e.g. רשמי 'official', Arabic *rasmī*, which is still sometimes employed by the older generation. מחסן 'store house' and תעריף 'tariff' were absorbed easily since these two Arabic words had been borrowed by many European languages and were therefore known to the European Jews (cf. English *magazine*, from Arabic via French *magazine*). Apparently the noun קטר 'locomotive' which appears to be perfect Hebrew (cf. קטרת 'incense', understood as 'smoke'), was coined under the influence of the Arabic *qitār* 'train' even though the origin of the two roots is probably different.

It is obvious that Arabic did not affect the structure of IH, but in the 'twenties we find new noun formations with the derivational suffix [-iyya] very much in vogue, e.g., עִירִיָּה 'city hall', נְגָרִיָּה 'carpenter's workshop', etc. This can be explained by Arabic where we find the same suffix, e.g., *baladiyye* 'city hall'. This noun pattern with similar meanings was so strenuously opposed that only a few nouns survived, though the pattern does exist in BH with a different meaning.

Through the daily contact between Jews and Arabs, various everyday expressions found their way, mainly into substandard Hebrew, e.g., סִבְרָה 'prickly fruit of a species of cactus' (Hebrew צִבְרָה), and מִשְׁמִישׁ 'apricot' employed in the Hebrew plural מִשְׁמִישִׁים. The plural of פְּלֶאפֶּל 'spicy fried balls prepared from chick peas', is פְּלֶאפֶּלִים but the word itself kept its Arabic form, as is immediately apparent from the fact that it begins with an [f], which does not exist in Hebrew in initial position. The main ingredient of the falafel is חֲמוּס 'chick peas' (also Arabic).

Practically all of these and the following Arabic loans are penultimately stressed (see below §346).

#### Literature:

- קוטשר, מלים ותולדותיהן, עמ' 46 (מחסן);  
 Blanc, op. cit. (§342), pp. 8–9 (סברה etc.);  
 Chanoch-Garbelle, loc. cit. (§341);  
 [בלאו, תחיית העברית, עמ' 27–29 (קטר, עיריה).] — O.S.]

1. *Climate and Milieu.* §344. Even in standard Hebrew תְּקִסִין is used to denote 'a period of hot, dry weather'. In the official weather report, however, שָׂרָב is the word used. מְכַתָּר 'Arab village head' superficially sounds and looks like Hebrew מְכַתֵּר 'crowned' (except for its spelling!), but the plural betrays its Arabic origin. The word is stressed on the penultima מְכַתָּרִים while Hebrew מְכַתֵּרִים is stressed on the ultima.

גְּרוּשׁ, plural גְּרוּשִׁים, a loan from Italian *grosso*, is also very often used instead of standard Hebrew אֶגְלוּרָה (a small monetary unit). [Now, in 1980. גְּרוּשׁ has practically been phased out.]

#### Literature:

- Blanc, op. cit. (§342), pp. 10, 11, 13.

2. *Expressive and Onomatopoeic Words.* §345. Expressions like תְּבִיבִי 'my

friend' also 'oh boy' (which also betrays its Arabic origin by the [b] instead of [v]) is almost standard, while דְּחִילָכְךָ 'now then' is still very much substandard as are זָפֵף 'lousy', טֶמְבָּל 'idiot' (of Turkish origin), מְבֹסוּט 'happy, satisfied' and פִּיף 'fun' (with the derived verb פִּיף 'to have a good time').

It had been assumed that the substandard חֲתִיכָה 'a shapely girl' reflects Yiddish, but A. Bar-Adon has shown that Arabic is the more likely origin (similar expressions occur elsewhere). Through back-formation the masculine חֲתִיךָ was formed, as well as the verb הִתְחַתֵּךְ 'to behave or dress up like a חֲתִיכָה / חֲתִיךָ'.

זִמְזִם 'to hum' comes from Arabic, but German *summen* may have played a part in its acceptance. On the other hand, S. Lieberman showed that this root occurs with a similar meaning ('to mumble') in MH.

### Literature:

ת. בלנק, לשוננו לעם ו (חשט"ו), קונטרס נד-נה, עמ' 30-31

(דחילכ, חביבי): קונטרס נו, עמ' 20-21 (זפת,

טמבל, מבסוט, כיף);

א. בר-אדון, לשוננו לעם יד (חשכ"ג), עמ' 250-264;

ש. ליברמן, תרביץ ה (תרצ"ד), עמ' 99.

3. *Borrowed Nouns Treated as Foreign.* §346. Substandard Arabic loans are recognizable by their accent which remains on the original syllable (see above §344), and by the phonemes /b, k, p/ which retain their Arabic pronunciation [b, k, f] and do not follow the rules of Hebrew (cf. above §§343, 345). Thus such nouns are treated as foreign and cannot be employed with possessive suffixes (e.g., הַמְּכַתָּאֵר שְׁלָהֶם 'their headman' but not \*הַמְּכַתָּאֵרֵם), as are Latin and Greek loans in MH (see above §204).

## IX. Yiddish

§347. At first sight, it would seem that Yiddish influence on Hebrew must be ruled out, for as Max Weinreich puts it:

"From the inception of Yiddish and until the eighteenth century, the influence of spoken Yiddish upon the Ashkenazic version of written rabbinical Hebrew was very strong. It was as a reaction against this "corrupt" language that Modern Hebrew was born: its emphasis on



the return to the “sources”, notably the Bible, resulted in the diminution of Yiddish influence. In spoken IH, the Yiddish “substrate” makes itself felt so definitely again, that even consistent purists have to acquiesce in some of these influences on phonemics, morphology, syntax and vocabulary.”

Indeed an analysis of the language of Mendele Mokher Sefarim (above §310) bears out this contention.

### *Literature:*

M. Weinreich, in U. Weinreich, ed., *The Field of Yiddish*, New York 1954, p. 81 n. 19.

### *a. Phonology*

§348. Besides the pronunciation of certain phonemes and initial clusters (see §§409–412, 439), the Ashkenazic influence is felt in the penultimate stress of proper nouns; in Sephardic Hebrew the stress is generally on the ultimate syllable. When most of the Ashkenazic Jews in Palestine adopted the Sephardic pronunciation, the stress of course followed suit. But a few words with emotional overtones did not submit, for example, *רַיָּקָא*, which is nearly impossible to translate, but means approximately ‘just for spite’. It came into Hebrew from Aramaic via Yiddish and is still stressed mostly on the first syllable. But it was the personal names which most stoutly resisted this change of stress. Even today, one can hear the clear-cut Yiddish pronunciation *Móishe* instead of *Moshé*, especially in informal speech. In most cases, the realization of the consonants and vowels of the proper nouns conforms with the Sephardic pronunciation, though the stress does not, e.g., *שְׂרָה*, *יִצְחָק*, *יוֹסֵף* while names like *דָּוִד* conform entirely.

Place names in Israel confirm the hypothesis that Yiddish has influenced the stress upon many proper nouns, for the names of sites known or established before the revival of Hebrew retain the penultimate stress: *יָפוֹ*, *תֵּל־אֵבֶר*, *תֵּל־אֵשׁוֹן*, *רְחֹבֹת*, *חֵיפָה*, *זְכֵרֹן* (for *זְכָרֹן*), *זְכֵרֹן* (for *זְכָרֹן*), *תֵּל־יֹסֵף*, *אֶבְיָב* etc.; place names of the pattern *תֵּל־נֵנְיָה*, *תֵּל־נֵנְיָה* are a special case (*עֶפְרָתָה* is Arabic). It can be said that this trend gained such momentum that it affected even personal names not used in Ashkenazic Hebrew, e.g., *יָפָה*, *אֶהוּד* and the like. This process has made stress distinctive in IH, e.g., *יָפָה יָפָה* (Yaffa is beautiful). Jabotinsky suggested that

this situation be left as it was, but this met with heavy opposition in official circles. Concerning the consonants, see below §§409–412.

### *Literature:*

E.Y. Kutscher, "Modern Hebrew and 'Israeli' Hebrew", *Conservative Judaism* X/3 (1956), p. 38.

### *b. Morphology*

§349. The Slavic derivational suffix [-nik] as in מוֹשָׁבְנִיק 'member of a moshav' (a type of agricultural settlement) entered IH via Yiddish, as did the suffixes [-tshik], e.g. קְטַנְצ'יק 'small' and [-le], e.g. אָבאָלֶה 'daddy' (children's talk). These suffixes did not alter the original position of the stress.

### *c. Syntax*

§350. Unlike the calques described below (§359), Yiddish (and European) interference are most strongly felt in the domain of syntax. Even the word order of outstanding writers came under its influence. Two instances will illustrate this point.

Years ago, I showed several friends a commentary on Isaiah written by a Jewish scholar and asked them to tell me what was wrong with the title, הַנְּבִיאִי יִשְׁעִיָּהוּ. None of them realized that this word order is nearly non-existent in BH and MH, for in BH it is always הַנְּבִיאִי יִשְׁעִיָּהוּ; the names of the other prophets (with one exception) also occur in this order as do most nouns in apposition with proper nouns. The exceptions are words like אִישׁ 'man' or מֶלֶךְ 'king' which in IH always come before personal names as in the instances quoted above. The reason is readily apparent from English 'the Prophet Isaiah'. The same is true of nouns like רופֵּא 'doctor', מְנַהֵל 'director', סוֹפֵר 'author' which come before the name, contrary to what we would expect on the basis of BH and MH usage. To the best of my knowledge, even purists have never taken exception to this usage.

If an Israeli is asked to translate the English sentence 'the house is big', he will give הַבַּיִת גָּדוֹל or use the copula הַבַּיִת הוּא גָּדוֹל. Only rarely, if pressed, might he offer a third construction הַבַּיִת גָּדוֹל הוּא. Yet the second construction, so widely used in IH, exists neither in BH nor in MH (except for the "identity clause" as is הַשְּׁלִיט יוֹסֵף 'Joseph was the vizier', Gen. 42, 6 where both subject and predicate are determined). In BH and MH we find either the first construction without the copula, or the third construc-

tion with the copula after the predicate. (The copula also follows the predicate in the גדול הוא הבית 'big is the house' type of construction, where the sentence begins with the predicate). Incidentally, this is the case with all Semitic languages possessing a copula. The second construction, of course, reflects the influence of Yiddish, French, German, and English where the copula comes between the subject and predicate.

The most astonishing fact is that not only did this replica formation in IH pass uncontested, but it was not even recognized as an intruder by writers and eminent Hebrew scholars. Surely an outstanding sign of the depth of the influence of the foreign substrata upon IH is the fact that it is found even in the works of such classical Hebrew writers as Bialik. But while writers of the last generation scarcely use the classical word order, we do find it occasionally in the works of authors who keep close to classical Hebrew. Yet as far as I know, this is the case mainly in quotations or quasi-quotations from the classical sources. Only future research will reveal whether this is merely an isolated case of extreme deviation from the pattern of classical Hebrew syntax.

#### *Literature:*

[On the influence of European languages in the use of the copula in literary Arabic and Hebrew see בלאו, תחייח העברית, p. 85f. — O.S.]

#### *d. Prepositions*

§351. Hebrew writers were sometimes unconsciously influenced in their use of prepositions by their Yiddish or other substrata. A famous Hebrew writer once told me: "If I say תלוי תמונו 'it depends on him' (instead of בו תלוי) ipso facto it proves that this is correct Hebrew." But as a matter of fact, he employed the preposition מן instead of ב because of his Yiddish (or German) substratum. Moreover, since Yiddish *mit* 'with' parallels Hebrew עם, even authors like Bialik wrote הרוצח עם קרדמו (instead of בקרדמו) 'the murderer with his axe', although he did change it in later editions. הקתקל על 'to look at' instead of ...הקתקל is another instance of Yiddish (or German) interference, and אצל is very often employed with the meaning of 'among', e.g., השירה אצל היהודים 'poetry among the Jews', because of Yiddish (German) *bei* (=French *chez*).

#### *e. Use of the Stems*

§352. It is believed that ש + imperfect denoting the jussive, e.g., שילך 'let him go' is a Yiddish calque, but this requires clear-cut proof.

One very important trait of the IH verb originating in Yiddish has been noted by H. Blanc. Under Slavic influence, the Yiddish verb developed “aspectoid” distinctions wherein plain action is contrasted with “instantaneous or abrupt variety of the same action”, e.g., *ix šrayb* ‘I write’ vs. *ix gib a šrayb* ‘I am writing for a moment’ (*gib* from *gebn* ‘to give’). In cases of the “plain verb vs. prefixedated verb... the contrast is between a plain verb with imperfective lexical meaning and a prefixedated verb with perfective lexical meaning”, e.g., *šlofn* ‘to sleep’ vs. *aynšlofn* ‘to fall asleep’ where the second verb “denotes transition from some other state or action to the state or action denoted” by the first member.

The first trait is to be found in IH in expressions construed of a noun plus the verb *נתון* ‘give’ (= Yiddish *gebn*), e.g., *נתון קפיצה* (= *gebn a šprung*) ‘to jump’, *נתון צלצול* (*gebn a klung*) ‘to ring, phone’.

More important than these substandard phrases is the fact that “there are a number of Hebrew verb pairs... *qaṭal* vs. *niqṭal* or *qaṭal* vs. *hitqaṭtel*” which “are functionally equivalent to some Yiddish pairs of the second type”, e.g., *ישב* (*zicn*) ‘to be sitting’, *התישב* (*avek/ zecn zex*) ‘to sit down’; *שכב* (*lign*) ‘to be lying down’, *השכב* (*avek/ leygn zix*), ‘to lie down’; *עמד* (*šteyn*) ‘to stand’, *העמד* (*avek/ šteln zix, opšteln zix*) ‘to stand up, to come to a halt’; *זכור* (*gedenken*) ‘to remember’, *הזכר* (*dermanen zix*) ‘to recall to mind’.

Blanc’s basic assumption is certainly correct, with several restrictions, most of which he himself pointed out. Some of the pairs listed in his article, e.g., *פחד* ‘to be afraid’, *הבהל* ‘to become frightened’ are attested already in BH. The pairs *qaṭal-niqṭal*, *qaṭal-hitqaṭtel* already appear in BH but especially in MH with the same function. In BH, for example, *זכור* means both ‘to remember’ and ‘to recall to mind’, while MH employed *אני זכור* (see §218) ‘I remember’, *אני נזכר* ‘it occurs to me, I recall’. The very fact that the Nif’al is used rather than the Qal as in the last two cases, would indicate that Yiddish alone could not be the sole motivating force behind this development. IH has practically ceased to employ the Nif’al as a reflexive, whereas in the parallel Yiddish the reflexive form is used (see above).

Therefore, in my opinion, this trend is the product of polygenesis, i.e., it was brought about by several factors: Yiddish, elements from BH and MH (e.g., *הזכר* — *זכור*), and analogy. Since in BH *עמד* = ‘to stand’, *העצר* = ‘to come to a halt,’ there arose *העמד*, and later *השכב*, as well as other instances listed by Blanc.

*Literature:*

H. Blanc, "Some Yiddish Influences in Israeli Hebrew", in U. Weinreich, ed., *The Field of Yiddish*, Second Collection, The Hague 1965, pp. 185–201; esp. 190–196.

*f. Vocabulary*

§353. IH vocabulary contains quite a few Yiddishisms, but except for calques, they are mostly substandard. They are of the following types:

1. *Words of Yiddish Origin.* §354. לַעֲשׂוֹת קוֹנֵץ 'to play a trick' (= German *Kunst*) is entirely substandard, while קוֹמְיוֹץ 'a campfire party' (Yiddish 'come, sit down!') is now practically standard. The noun שְׁוִיץ 'showing-off' and the verb derived from it — הַשְׁוִץ 'to show off', from German *schwitzen* 'to sweat', are rather more substandard than standard.

2. *Classical Hebrew Words Absorbed in IH via Yiddish.* §355. בַּעַל גּוֹף 'bully, parvenue' employed by Bialik(!), is a good instance of this type. Another is תְּרוּץ 'excuse' which was widely employed in the Middle Ages in Talmudic discussions with the meaning 'answer, solution' to a problem. In this way it came to mean in Yiddish 'a feeble answer, excuse' and is used with this meaning in IH (cf. also below §392).

*Literature:*

מ. קאסאווער, *יידישע שפראך* XVIII (1958), 72 (בעל גוף).

3. *Hebrew Words in Yiddish Form.* §356. In the case of הַרְבֵּי 'the rabbi' employed even by Bialik, the addition of the definite article הַ to a noun plus a possessive suffix is only possible because רַבֵּי, as in Yiddish, is treated as an uninflected noun (and cf. BH הָעֶרְבֵךְ 'the equivalent', Lev. 27, 23).

But mostly, such words are not standard, e.g., *rebbe*, a form of address to an Eastern European rabbi; חֲבֵרָה 'the gang, the boys' (originally 'society, group'); *berye* (Hebrew בְּרִיָּה) 'creature'; and *bitúxn* (Hebrew בְּטָחוֹן). A speaker at a Zionist Congress once told his audience that the Jews need not only בְּטָחוֹן 'safety, security' but also *bitúxn* 'trust (in God)'. One may say to a teacher אַתָּה מְלַמֵּד 'you teach', but if he is told, "you are a *melámed*" (the Old World *heder* teacher — pronounced with the penultimate stress, as in Yiddish), he will be quite offended.

Only rarely does IH take over bodily a Yiddish compound both of

whose members are Hebrew but which is formed according to a Yiddish pattern. This does not apply to Yiddish *yeshive boxer* ('student of a rabbinical academy'), since in IH it appears correctly as בְּחֹר יְשִׁיבָה. But שוֹשָׁן (the Purim festival of Susa) was taken over exactly in this form, whereas in Hebrew it should be שָׁל שׁוֹשָׁן.

The story behind the loanword עֶכְבְּרוֹשׁ 'rat' is interesting. It goes back to a Yiddish compound whose members are Hebrew ראש + עֶכְבָּר ('mouse' + 'head'), a pejorative nickname apparently meaning 'thief', derived from German *Mauskopf* 'thief' which still appears in Grimm's dictionary. This word came into IH in its Yiddish form with a changed meaning, closer to the original.

#### Literature:

י. עזלעט, יידישע שפראך XVII (1957), 55–52 (עבכרוש);  
 O.S. — נ. ברגרין, לשוננו לעם כא (חש"ל), עמ' 55–52 (עבכרוש).

4. *Hebrew-Yiddish Compounds.* §357. The most common example is חֶבְרָה־מָן 'a regular guy, one of the boys, resourceful' (lit. 'man of the חֶבְרָה, Yiddish *xevre*).

5. *Yiddish Words of Slavic Origin.* §358. *Nudnik* 'nuisance' has even yielded a quasi-Hebrew root נִדְנָד 'to pester'. Hebrew-speakers are no longer aware of this origin and are convinced that it is from Hebrew 'to swing', especially since על הַנְּשָׂמָה 'to pester' is also employed.

6. *Loan Translations and Replica Formations.* §359. These are quite numerous, e.g., אָחוֹז in the phrase אַיִפֶּה אָנְחֵנוּ אוֹחֲזִים, Yiddish *vu halten mir?* 'where do we stand?' (e.g., in readings in class). *Halten* originally meant 'to stand', but because it also means 'to hold' it was interpreted as meaning 'to hold' and is translated by אָחוֹז 'to stand'. Further examples are עוֹשֶׂה חַיִּים, *s' gayt nisht* 'it is not going well'; דוֹפֶק, *s' klappt* 'it works'; עוֹשֶׂה מַאֲדָּה, *er hot mir maxt e lebn* 'he is having a good time'; and חוֹר בְּרֵאשׁ, *er hot mir gmaxt a lox in kop* 'he pestered me'. The Hebrew verb חָשׂוּק is employed in the Hitpa'el חִתְּחַשֵּׁק meaning 'yearn to' since in Yiddish the reflexive is used *es hot six im fargluzt*. (Cf. above §352.)

#### g. *Yiddish as a Channel for Classical Hebrew and Aramaic Words*

§360. It is quite probable that many Hebrew and Aramaic words, es-

pecially from MH, were absorbed into IH via Yiddish. As mentioned above, some of these words are immediately identifiable owing to their penultimate stress, e.g., *דַּוְקָא* or by the special formation of the possessive pronoun, e.g., *בְּעֵל כְּרִתְךָ, מְמָה נִפְשָׁךְ* (cf. §§318, 348, 355, 356, 463). Very prominent among these are particles with emotional overtones, e.g., *אָדְרִיבָּה* (stressed pre-penultimately) ‘on the contrary’; *אָפֵלוּ* (here the penultimate stress is legitimate) ‘even’; *בְּקִצּוֹר* ‘in short’; *בְּעֵקֶר* ‘mainly’; *פֶּשׁוּט* ‘simply’; *הֵלְנֹאִי* ‘if only’; *לְהִכְעִיס, לְהִכְעִיט* ‘to spite’. Since BH lacked counterparts of these words, IH had to accept them nolens volens. But *אָפֶשֶׁר* ‘maybe’, also of MH origin, meaning ‘possible’, was replaced by BH *אוֹלֵי*. Most likely there are many more Hebrew words which Yiddish served to channel into IH, although this would be hard to prove beyond a doubt. But it is certainly no coincidence that of the approximately one hundred adverbs, adverbial phrases, and conjunctions in Yiddish, about ninety percent are also employed in IH.

#### Literature:

.42, (1960) XX ש. קאודאן, יידישע שפראך

### X. Judeo-Spanish

§361. Judeo-Spanish is the vernacular of the non-Ashkenazic inhabitants of Israel who came originally from Spain. As yet, only a few interferences of this language with IH have been established. The Hebrew title for a Sephardic rabbi is *הַחֵם* which apparently came to IH via Judeo-Spanish (although the word is also employed by the non-Judeo-Spanish speaking Oriental Jews). A few substandard expressions are often employed even by Hebrew-speaking housewives, e.g., *לְעֵשׂוֹת סְפוֹנְגָה* ‘to mop the floor.’ The rag is a *spondzador*, while the laundry is washed in the *payla* (but in Judeo-Spanish — ‘cooking pot’). *Pupites* ‘sunflower seeds’ is also in common usage in Ashkenazic houses.

### XI. Other European Languages

#### a. Vocabulary

§362. It is often impossible to determine whether a certain trait in IH is

due to the interference of Yiddish or other European languages (as e.g., the place of the copula, above §350). It is equally impossible to establish the relationship between the different European languages. Owing to the contact between these languages, they often contain the same phrase, making it impossible to identify the language of origin. For example, 'order of the day' is *ordre du jour* in French, *Tagesordnung* in German and סֵדֶר הַיּוֹם in Hebrew; 'middle ages' is *medium aevum* in Latin, *moyen âge* in French *Mittelalter* in German and יְמֵי הַבְּיָנִים in Hebrew.

In IH, besides the instances just adduced, we have פּוֹלֵמוֹס 'polemics' (but MH 'war'), German *Polemik* (a Greek loan in all three languages); תְּנוּעָה '(ideological) movement', German *Bewegung*; מַפָּה 'map' (also 'tablecloth', MH 'napkin'), German *Mappe*, Polish *mapka* (a loan from Latin in these and other languages); מַסְכָּה 'mask' (BH 'molten image', from the root נִסַּךְ), German *Maske* (מַסְכָּה was adopted with the new meaning in IH because of its phonetic and semantic similarity to the European words, which are a loan from Arabic *masxara*); נִקְרָת רְאוּת 'point of view', German *Gesichtspunkt*; הַצֵּעַד הָרִאשׁוֹן 'the first step', German *der erste Schritt*; בּוֹלֵעַ אֲשׁוּרוּלוֹגְיָה devours books' *verschlingt Bücher* in German. The hybrid אֲשׁוּרוּלוֹגְיָה 'Assyriology' is German *Assyriologie*. The infinitive + ל used as an imperative — לְכַתֵּב 'write' could be either German or Russian. The prepositions הוֹדוֹת 'thanks to' German *dank* and לְמִרְוֹת 'in spite of', German *trotz* also fall into this category. There are many more instances of this kind. To be sure, we may safely assume that German (which was apparently known by all the Jewish writers of Eastern Europe) was the prime factor behind these creations.

#### Literature:

A. Bach, *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*<sup>9</sup>, Heidelberg 1970, §163; Garbell, *Fremdsprachliche Einflüsse*, passim, e.g., pp. 40, 41, 50, 69.

#### b. Noun and Adjective Formations

§363. A very important phenomenon, betraying European influence, has been pointed out by H. Blanc:

"...the necessity of translating terms from Standard Average European (SAE), have resulted in the introduction of prefixes, a type of morpheme virtually unknown to Semitic languages and for which



there is but the barest precedent in earlier Hebrew; these have been adapted from, or invented on the base of, existing Hebrew and Aramaic particles or words, or lifted bodily from SAE, and today form an extremely important and productive part of the language. Most prefixes are so productive that they can be added, as the need arises, to almost any noun or adjective. Thus we have-אִי 'un-'or 'dis-' for nouns, בְּלִתִּי for adjectives (אִי־סֹדֵר, 'disorder', בְּלִתִּי מְסֻדָּר, 'disorderly'); בִּי-, די-, 'bi-, di-', as in דִּי־שִׁיחַ, 'dialogue'; תְּלִי-, 'tri-', as in תְּלֵת רַגְלִים 'tripod'; תַּתְּ-, 'sub-, under-', as in תַּת־מַיִם, 'underwater'; בֵּין-, 'inter' as in בֵּין־לְאֻמִּים, 'international' etc. Of those borrowed outright from SAE we may list pro-and anti-: פְּרו־עֲרָבִי, 'pro-Arab', אֲנִטִּי 'anti-Egyptian.' One of the reasons of the wholesale introduction of prefixes was structurally feasible and easy, even though quite novel, is the partial resemblance such constructions bear to the way Hebrew, as other Semitic languages, uses phrases of closely bound words (the so-called "construct phrases") to form complexes of noun-plus-noun or adjective-plus-noun: רַב־צַדִּיִּים, 'many-sided,' literally 'many of sides,' is such a construct phrase, but רַב־צַדִּי (same meaning) is formed with a prefix רַב meaning 'multi- or poly.'

### Literature:

H. Blanc, "Hebrew in Israel: Trends and Problems", *The Middle East Journal* XI (1957), pp. 401f.;

ח. רבין, לחקר העברית הספרותית החדשה, לשוננו כב (תשי"ח), עמ' 250 ואילך; ר. מירקין, לשוננו כו (תשכ"ב), עמ' 217.

### c. Syntax

§364. H. Rosén has noted a far more important phenomenon which has changed the whole make-up of IH — its syntax.

The development of the "period" with its many subordinate clauses has made IH flexible enough to be employed like any other modern language. To be sure, while BH is to a large extent paratactic, i.e. it prefers to coordinate sentences, MH is much more syntactic, making use of the subordinating ׀ in all kinds of subjunctions. MH has by far still not achieved the flexibility of modern languages in this respect.

Rosén is also right in pointing out the fact that this development went practically unnoticed by the purists.

As a matter of fact it already was alluded to by M. Plessner and formulated by the famous Semitic scholar G. Bergsträsser in the following sentence: "(IH) in fact (is) a European language in a translucent Hebrew garment with common European characteristics... being Hebrew but on the surface." There is more than a grain of truth in this statement, though it is greatly exaggerated. Let us only remember that the morphology, the very core of the language (as pointed out by A. Meillet), the conjugations, the declension, the stems, and the noun patterns have scarcely changed. Also, as far as changes have occurred they are well within the confines of Semitic (see Blanc's remarks above). In this respect IH is very much like Akkadian, whose syntax became 'un-Semitic' owing to the influence of Sumerian.

Even more revealing is the state of affairs in Amharic (the official language of Ethiopia) which (in the words of H.J. Polotsky) is a Semitic language in respect to morphology, but an African one in its syntax. Both Amharic and, for example, Neo-Syriac, have become much more 'un-Semitic' in this respect than IH.

U. Weinreich has pointed out that "the transfer of morphemes which are as strongly bound as inflectional endings... seem to be extremely rare" but "interference in the domain of grammatical relation is extremely common in the speech of bilinguals." To the best of my knowledge, there is no living Semitic language whose word order has not changed from that of its parent language. I also doubt whether there is a Semitic language, except for classical Arabic, where these changes cannot be traced even in earlier times. Therefore, syntactic change as a yardstick to measure whether and how far a language has kept (or lost) its Semitic (or European) structure plays a very modest role. Indeed it is possible to establish the relationship between, say, a modern Arabic dialect and an Ethiopic dialect by comparing their morphology. Incidentally, in Neo-Syriac nearly the whole tense system was changed under Persian (and Turkish) influence (cf. below §513).

#### *Literature:*

M. Plessner, *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 28 (1925), p. 684; 34 (1931), p. 803;

ח. רוזן, *העברית שלנו*, עמ' 125-132;

G. Bergsträsser, *Einführung*, p. 47;

A. Meillet, *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale* I, Paris 1948, p. 82;

For Akkadian and Amharic see for example, Bergsträsser *Einführung*;

U. Weinreich, *Languages in Contact*<sup>4</sup>, The Hague 1966, pp. 31, 37;

[Rosén, *Contemporary Hebrew*, pp. 27-29;

.91-87 עמ' בלאו, תחיית העברית, — O.S.]

#### d. English

§365. Words like 'boss' and 'job' are widely employed colloquially. English *tramp* in the phrase תָּפּוּס טְרָמֵפּ פְּלִירֵט means 'to hitchhike'; from English *flirt*, IH created a quintiliteral verb פְּלִירֵטֵט, a very unusual case. English 'puncture' has extended its meaning, and today פּוֹצֵץ means anything that goes wrong. Of course, calques abound, e.g., גִּיל מְתַקָּדָם 'advanced age'. The superfluous מִי in the phrase מִי שֶׁהָיָה שֶׁגְּרִיר מֵר גּוֹלָן, 'Mr. Golan who was ambassador' goes back to translation of the English 'who' by the interrogative pronoun, and at the same time it is also translated as a relative pronoun by שֶׁ.

In addition, certain syntactical features which appear mainly in the news papers, apparently go back to English, e.g., putting 'therefore' after the first word of the sentence (when it should properly be in the first position). Or consider the following phrase: מְנַהֵל מְשָׂרְדוֹ בְּפָרִיז שֶׁל הַשְּׂבֻעוֹן 'the chief of the office in Paris of the weekly.' Properly the attribute בְּפָרִיז should come after שְׂבֻעוֹן.

#### Literature:

צ. שארפשטיין, לשוננו לעם יב (תשכ"א), עמ' 173;

מ. אלטבאור, לשוננו לעם ו (תשט"ו), עמ' 15;

א. בנדויד, לשוננו לעם טז (תשכ"ה), עמ' 231-233.

#### e. German

§366. From German *Bürste* Ben Yehuda created מְבִרֶשֶׁת 'brush', and he was apparently influenced by German *Puppe* in creating בִּבָּה 'doll', although he maintained that it was (spoken) Arabic that served as the basis for these creations. The special use of פְּרִטִי 'private' is apparently influenced by the German *privat* (פְּרִיט means 'individual'), while כַּבֵּל 'cable' goes back to German *Kabel* (which may or may not be of Arabic origin; BH כַּבְּלִים = 'fetters'). עֵתוֹן 'newspaper' (from עֵת 'time') reflects German 'Zeitung'; גָּתוֹן תְּשׁוּבָה 'I take the liberty' = *ich erlaube mir*;

'to answer' = *Antwort geben*; הוא שולט באנגלית 'he is perfect in English' = *er beherrsche Englisch* and apparently אֲנִי מְצַפְצֵף עָלָיו 'I don't give a damn about him' = *ich pfeife auf ihm*, which also entered Polish, Hungarian and Italian.

*Prepositions*. ... אין להם מושג מן 'they have no idea of' = *Sie haben keine Ahnung von*. Incidentally, the use of מן to introduce the *agens* in passive sentences מובא מהילינגר 'quoted by Dilinger' *zitiert von Dilinger*, which is not used any more in IH, is the original BH and MH use.

#### Literature:

קוטשר, מלים ותולדותיהן, עמ' 70

ד. סדן, לשוננו לעם ו (תשט"ו), קונטרס

נד-נה, עמ' 40-41

I. Biró, *Magyar Nyelv* 56 (1960), pp. 327, 332.

#### f. French

§367. French influence is negligible. אַוִּירוֹן 'airplane' is apparently patterned after *avoin*; אֶפְנָה 'fashion' was created from אָפֶן 'mode' according to the French relationship *la mode — le mode*.

#### Literature:

Garbell, *Fremdsprachliche Einflüsse*, p. 43;

#### g. Russian

§368. בְּלָגָן 'confusion, disorganization' comes from Russian (a loan word from Persian); יִפִּי 'how wonderful' seems to be a replica formation from Russian. But it is interesting to note that it also occurs in MH with a very similar meaning. Perhaps מַה פֶּתָאם, an emphatic 'how come' also goes back to Russian. Other calques occur, e.g., חָתוּם עַל 'to subscribe' *podpisatsa* (which exactly parallels the English verb!) and הִקְדַּשׁ 'to devote'.

#### Literature:

Garbell, *Fremdsprachliche Einflüsse*, p. 36;

אבינרי, כבושי העברית בדורנו, עמ' 151.

#### h. Onomatopoeic Words

§369. Bialik created the verb נִרְשַׁשׁ 'to rustle' simply by imitating the sound. One is reminded of the German 'rascheln' with the same meaning.

XII. *Akkadian*

§370. אָרֶךְ ‘bronze’, borrowed by Ben Yehuda from Akkadian *urudû* seems to be the only direct loan from this language in IH. [Ben Yehuda, however, was misled by Muss-Arnolt’s Assyrian dictionary (published in 1905), as this “Akkadian” word was artificially coined by Sennacherib’s scribes (and used only by them) from Sumerian *urudu* (= Akkadian *werû*) ‘copper’, not ‘bronze’. The Akkadian word for ‘bronze’ is *siparru*.]

*Literature:*

קוטשר, מלים ותולדותיהן, עמ' 8;

[*AHW*, s.v. *siparru* (Lieferung 11, 1972), *urudû* (Lieferung 14, 1979); *CAD* vol. E, s.v. *erû* A.]

## C. Trends and Methods

I. *Acceptance and rejection*a. *Secularization*

§371. We mentioned above the objection to the full use of BH for the purposes of IH (see §321). It should be added here, that certain ultra-religious circles do not employ, e.g., the word ‘electricity’ since according to Rabbinical exegesis, this word which occurs in the Book of Ezekiel is the name of an “angel.” Indeed the problem of secularization of traditional Hebrew in IH looms large.

The revivers, writers and journalists very often did not mind using words from the domain of religion and related areas with a new secularized meaning; e.g., מְנַחָה ‘afternoon prayer’ is now used in the expression סְעוּדַת מְנַחָה ‘five o’clock tea’; מוֹסָף ‘additional prayer’ (e.g., on the Sabbath) is now employed as ‘(weekly) newspaper supplement’. מְחֻזָּר ‘prayerbook for the holidays’ now ‘cycle, series’ (of lectures, etc.). The instances are quite numerous. This tendency which is not without significance for the cultural background of IH is sometimes the source of misunderstanding. While teaching Hebrew in the U.S., I read an article with my students in which occurred the phrase מִצְוַת הַיְשׁוּרוֹת לְעָם ‘the mitzvah of service to the people’. A student asked “What kind of mitzvah (religious command) is

this? I have never heard of it.” This instance shows what may happen if an expression used until recently only in the domain of religion, suddenly emerges in another area. In IH אגדה is the word for ‘legend, fairy tale’, but originally it meant ‘non-Halachic portions of the Rabbinic literature’. A child who studies the Aggadic portions of the Talmud may ask, “Is this just a legend?”

*Literature:*

.25-22 אבינרי, כבושי העברית בדורנו, עמ' 22-25

[In recent years the words משכן (BH ‘the Tabernacle’) and היכל (BH ‘the Temple’) have been used for naming public buildings, e.g., משכן הקנסט ‘the Knesset building’, היכל הספורט — a stadium in Tel Aviv.]

*b. Rejection*

§372. On the other hand, Hebrew words that were employed in the Diaspora and acquired connotations reflecting Jewish life there, were sometimes rejected. פּרָנָס ‘head of community’ who apparently was not very much liked, disappeared. The מְשַׁלָּח who was sent by yeshivot (Talmudic academies) to raise funds, is not used in IH. The גַּבַּאי ‘an officer’ (of various institutions) lives on in the synagogue only. It goes without saying that שְׂתַּדְּלָן ‘a person trying to influence the non-Jewish authorities on behalf of his Jewish brethren’ (cf. §284) is far from the mentality of IH speakers and thus the world does not exist in IH. The שְׂמַשׁ, Yiddish *shames*, ‘janitor (of the synagogue, school etc.)’ was recently replaced by שָׂרָח (cf. §398). On the other hand another word of the same root מְשַׁרָּח ‘servant’, מְשַׁרְתָּה ‘maidservant’ never stood a chance of acceptance by IH. However the verb שָׂרַח ‘to serve’, unencumbered by pejorative connotations, is widely used. The participle מְשַׁרָּח used verbally also exists.

*c. The Sephardic Pronunciation Adopted*

§373. Closely akin to this type of rejection is the rejection of the Ashkenazic pronunciation. As Sh. Morag puts it:

“For a period of nearly 1700 years, Hebrew existed orally not as a spoken language but as a liturgical language, the language in which prayer was conducted and sacred texts read and studied. At the time when the revival of spoken Hebrew began, the various Jewish communities differed, as they still do today, with regard to their traditional Hebrew pronunciations, that is the pronunciations which

were preserved in the reading of sacred texts. Roughly speaking, these pronunciations may be divided into three major groups: the Ashkenazi [main features: distinction between *qāmēš* and *pathaḥ*, as well as between *šērī* and *s<sup>e</sup>ghōl*; realization of the *qāmēš* as [o] or [u]; no regular realization of the *š<sup>e</sup>wā mobile*; realization of the hard t as [t] and of the soft t as [s]; no pharyngeals and no emphatics; no gemination; stress usually non-ultimate], the Sephardi [main features; pronunciation of *qāmēš* as *pathaḥ*, i.e., as an [a], and of *šērī* as *s<sup>e</sup>ghōl*, i.e., as an [e]; realization of the *š<sup>e</sup>wā mobile* as a short [e]; realization of the hard t as [t], and the soft t either as [θ] or as [t]; preservation of the pharyngeals and of some emphatics; gemination; stress either ultimate or penultimate], and the Yemenite [main features: distinction between *qāmēš* [ɔ] and *pathaḥ* as well as between *šērī* and *s<sup>e</sup>ghōl*; no distinction between *pathaḥ* and *s<sup>e</sup>ghōl*, which are both pronounced [æ]; realization of the *ḥōlam* as [ö], or, in some regions of Yemen, as the *šērī* ([e]); realization of the *š<sup>e</sup>wā mobile* as a short [a]; differentiation between hard and soft *bgd kpt*, as well as between pharyngeals and non-pharyngeals, emphatics and non-emphatics; gemination; stress usually non-ultimate]. It should be noted that each of these pronunciations, and particularly the Ashkenazi and Sephardi, exists in several varieties.

The problem that the leaders of the linguistic revival faced at the first stages of the transformation was: What pronunciation should be made the standard pronunciation of Hebrew? The Yemenite pronunciation, being employed by only one community (and, besides, hardly known in Palestine and Europe at that time), could not have been taken into account; the decision, therefore, had to be made between the Ashkenazi and Sephardi pronunciations.

The decision was made in favor of the Sephardi pronunciation, on which Modern Spoken Hebrew is fundamentally based. The reasons for this decision, which was strongly backed by the vehement activity of Eliezer Ben-Yehuda (1858–1922), “the Reviver of the Hebrew Language”, were manifold... Some circles considered the Sephardi pronunciation to be more “aesthetic” or more correct from a historical point of view than the Ashkenazi.”

One reason certainly was that put forward by Lipschütz: “There had existed for a long time in Palestine a colloquial Hebrew among certain circles

between the different communities in the discussion between the Sephardic Hacham and the Ashkenazic Rabbi... Sometimes Hebrew was even employed when a Sephardi studied Talmud together with an Ashkenazi... Characteristic of this colloquial was the Sephardic pronunciation... The new movement chose this existing colloquial... It seems that this colloquial was especially instrumental in the selection of the pronunciation... also the already existing schools tht taught in Hebrew had apparently played a part in the decision... These were mainly attended by children of Oriental jews (who employed the Sephardic pronunciation)." (translation mine — E.Y.K.) But the main reason apparently was that "The Sephardi pronunciation symbolized to its adherents, the spirit of cultural renaissance, whereas the Ashkenazi highly reminiscent of Yiddish, represented the Diaspora, the direct continuation of the immediate past which they rejected" (Morag). To be sure, what Ben Yehuda intended (according to one of his sons) was the introduction of the Sephardic pronunciation in its entirety, including the pronunciation of ן as [h], ץ as [ʕ], ק, צ, ט as emphatics, and also the gemination (see below). What was accepted was the pronunciation of *qāmēṣ* as [a] and the ן (without *dagesh*) as [t].

#### *Literature:*

Sh. Morag, "Planned and Unplanned Development in Modern Hebrew",

*Lingua* VIII (1959), pp. 249f.;

E.M. Lipschütz, *Vom lebendigen Hebräisch*, Berlin 1920 pp. 23-26;

.146-143 עמ' 15 ואילך, עמ' 37 (חשי"ח), מלאכי, בצרון

[Fellman, *The Revival* (above §307), pp. 84-87. — O.S.]

## II. Forging the Israeli Hebrew Vocabulary

§374. In creating new forms, assigning new meanings to old forms and roots, taking over forms and roots from foreign languages, and in general all the well-known ways employed in any modern language were brought into play. A few instances may be adduced here:

### *a. Midrashic Tale as a Source of an IH Phrase*

§375. A story told in the Midrash (Bamidbar Rabbah 13, 4) gave rise to a phrase containing a proper name. It is told, that when the prince of the tribe of Judah saw the hesitation of the Israelites to enter the Red Sea, he



was the first to rush forward and leap into it. The others then followed suit. His name was נַחֲשׁוֹן; hence a feat of this type is called קְפִיצַת נַחֲשׁוֹן 'a leap of Nahshon'.

For other words derived from proper names see below §386.

### b. From Loanword to Hebrew

§376. During the course of the last generation the tendency to eliminate foreign words, even international ones, has gained momentum, as shown by the lists of Avineri and Sivan, e.g., מוֹשְׁבָה instead of קוֹלוֹנְיָה 'colony' and many more. But מְכֻלְלָה could not push out אוּנִיבֶרְסִיטָה 'university'. Today מְכֻלְלָה is occasionally used in Israel for 'college'. Even the Academy (אֶקָדֶמְיָה) of the Hebrew Language was unable to find a Hebrew name for itself. But no word can illustrate this process better than the טְלָפוֹן from which the verb טָלַפַּן was coined.

#### Literature:

אבינרי, כבושי העברית בדורנו, עמ' 55-61;  
ר. סיוון, לשוננו לעם יז (תשכ"ו), עמ' 216-220.

### c. From Compound to a Single Word

§377. One of the chief aims of the revivers was to create single-word terms instead of compounds that encumbered the language of the Maskilim (see above §308). J.M. Pines (and J. Klausner) explained the problem by using the question: "How do you say 'my watch' or 'my golden watch'?" 'The watchmaker of my golden watch' would be something like: מְתַקֵּן "מְתַקֵּן מוֹרֵה הַשָּׁעוֹת שֶׁל מוֹרֵה הַשָּׁעוֹת זֶה־בִּשְׁלִי." By creating שָׁעוֹן 'watch' and שָׁעָן, 'watchmaker' we can manage better with שָׁעוֹן הַזֶּה־בִּשְׁלִי.

#### Literature:

י. קלוזנר, לשוננו י (תרצ"ט), עמ' 280;  
ר. ויס, לשוננו לעם יב (תשכ"א), עמ' 232.

### d. Narrowing of Meaning

§378. ABH הֶאָזֵן 'to listen' was narrowed in IH to mean 'to listen to the radio', and the participle of the verb is used with the meaning '(radio) listener' (cf. above §319). כְּבוֹד 'honoring' turned into 'refreshments (offered to guests)'.

מִשְׁקָה 'drink' becomes 'alcoholic drink' when accented מִשְׁקָה; the

penultimate stress immediately betrays the Yiddish origin (see §§348, 356). This is also well illustrated by a story told about the first meeting between Y. Sadeh, the founder of the Palmach (see §342) and Y. Allon, one of his commanders. Sadeh asked for a מַשְׁקָה to celebrate the successful completion of some military exercises. Allon, being a *sabra* (see §341), ran to the barn and brought milk fresh from the cow. Sadeh, coming from Poland, burst out laughing as he, of course, meant to celebrate with an alcoholic drink!

*Literature:*

S. Keshet, *Ha'aretz* October 25, 1967, p. 3, col. 8.

*e. Widening of Meaning*

§379. The instances of secularization mentioned above (§371) also represent a widening of meaning, e.g., מוֹסָף 'the additional prayer' now also '(weekly) supplement (of a newspaper)'; שְׂרוּת 'service' now also 'taxis running along regular bus-lines', but in pl. שְׂרוּתִים 'bathroom'; סִפְרָיָה 'library' now (substandard) also 'book-case'.]

*f. Differentiation*

§380. We mentioned the clash between BH and MH as well as between the different layers of BH (see §§319–320). Here we can go more thoroughly into the matter, following H. Rosén, who shows how IH was often able to exploit the grammatical and lexical differences between BH and MH, SBH and LBH. The BH passive participle Qal form נָשׂוּא means 'predicate', whereas the parallel MH form נָשׂוּי means 'married'. The SBH and (mainly) MH forms of the verbal noun of the Pi'el yield two different meanings for a single root; compare בִּקְרוּר 'visit' vs. בִּקְרָה 'control', קְבוּל 'capacity' vs. קְבֻלָּה 'receipt; reception' (cf. above §213). Similarly, the use of certain constituents in the construct state may mean something quite different when the same constituents are used in the quasi-MH שָׁל-*construction* (cf. §216); compare בֵּית כְּנֻסַת 'synagogue', בֵּית דָּוִד 'the House (=Dynasty) of David', כָּרְטִיס חֲבֵר 'membership card' vs. הַבֵּית שֶׁל הַכְּנֻסַת 'the Knesset (= Israeli Parliament) building', הַבֵּית שֶׁל דָּוִד 'David's house', כָּרְטִיס שֶׁל חֲבֵר 'a friend's ticket'.

The synonyms שָׂדֵה — שְׂדֵמָה 'field' (the latter mainly ABH) are exploited in a different way, שְׂדֵמָה being employed only in poetry. The same division

between prose and poetry applies to MH *הַשׁוּבָה* (in BH ‘return’) and BH *מַעֲנָה* ‘answer’, *שָׁקַר* and *קָזַב* (both BH).

The BH *עֲגָלָה* ‘wagon’ and its MH synonym *קָרוֹן* (cf. §238) are now differentiated as the latter was given the meaning ‘railroad car’. Sometimes, as Rosén has shown, we can account for the reasons which caused the differentiation but there is no overall explanation as yet. It is very possible that several factors were at work and thus each case has to be examined separately (cf. also §340).

*Literature:*

רוזן, העברית שלנו, עמ' 93–88, 97

*g. Avoidance of Homonyms*

§381. For the perfect IH uses *הִיָּה זָכוֹל* ‘he could’ (instead of *יָשָׁן*, *הִיָּה יָשָׁן* ‘he slept’ (instead of *יָשָׁן*) to differentiate it from the participle of these two verbs, which in BH and MH are identical (see above §§60, 62). Some פ"נ verbs e.g., *נָשַׁךְ* ‘to bite’, *נָטַשׁ* ‘to abandon’ are used in the active voice in the Qal, but in the passive voice (at least in the perfect) in the Pu'al (and not in the Nif'al): *נִשְׁךְ* ‘he was bitten’, *נִטַּשׁ* ‘he was abandoned’. The reason is clear: The Nif'al forms are nearly identical with the Pi'el and are therefore avoided (see also below §402).

*Literature:*

[Another way of distinguishing between the perfect and the participle of verbs like *יָשָׁן*, *יָכַל* is the use of *יָשָׁן*, *יָכַל* for the perfect. — O.S.]

*h. Transfer of Meaning*

§382. *שָׁדַר* means ‘to send’ in Aramaic but ‘to broadcast’ in IH (cf. above §338).

*i. Mistakes*

1. *Accepted.* §383. Some forms and meanings go back to misreadings of the Biblical text, scribal mistakes in MH or misinterpretations, but they are accepted nonetheless. *אָזְלַת יָד* ‘(their) might is gone’ (Deut. 32, 36) is an archaic form (see above §55). The IH speaker understood the *qameṣ gadol* as *qameṣ qatan*, which is pronounced [o] in the Sephardic pronunciation too, and therefore interpreted *אָזְלַת* as a noun (on the pattern of *חֶזְקָמָה*) in the construct state and so a new compound *אָזְלַת יָד* came into being. There is

no need to "correct" this compound, since it could have been created consciously and therefore it is perfectly acceptable. The phrase קול קורא במדבר is employed with the meaning 'a voice crying in the wilderness'. It goes back to קול קורא במדבר פנו דרך 'a voice cries: In the wilderness prepare a way' (Isa. 40, 3). At first sight, the IH usage seems to be a simple calque from the European languages. However in these languages it goes back to the Gospels, where this meaning rests on a misinterpretation of the verse in Isaiah. Just as no one would discard the above mentioned English expression because of its "dubious" ancestry, no one would attempt this in IH.

A similar case is the BH word יובל 'the fiftieth year' (cf. Lev. 25, 10). It changed its meaning through a non-Hebrew source and returned to IH with its secondary meaning. Via the Vulgate (the Latin translation of the Bible), and through the interference of a Latin verb, *jubilare*, it acquired the connotation of 'joy' and thus became 'jubilee', which is no longer connected with the concept of the fiftieth year. With this meaning, היובל העשרים נחמשה 'the twenty-fifth anniversary', should be, on the basis of BH, a contradiction in terms.

Words that came into being in the texts of MH due to scribal errors (by confusing ר and ד, ס and final ם) were accepted uncorrected in IH, e.g., פרוודור instead of פרודור 'corridor' (Greek), אולר instead of אולד 'knife' (Latin), ליסטים instead of ליסטים 'robber' (Greek).

Instead of MH חרות 'pit', IH employs דות. Here, however, the process of corruption was a different one. The original form is חרות. The Mishna was studied in Europe mainly in conjunction with the Babylonian Talmud. In Babylonia, ח was pronounced ה which the scribes interpreted as the ה of the definite article. Thus, the form דות came into being.

Since these types of mistakes are common when taking over a foreign word, no one expects them to be corrected. English *venture* should serve as an interesting example. It arose through metanalysis of (French) *aventure*, where the *a* was interpreted as the indefinite article. It therefore nearly exactly parallels the case of דות. Naturally, there is even less inclination to reintroduce the "correct" form in foreign loanwords once the "corrupted" form has adapted itself to a correct Hebrew pattern, e.g., נמל 'port' instead of the correct לימן (or נמיל; see above §237), or לבקר 'scribe' instead of ליבלר (Latin *libellarius*).

*Literature*

קוטשר, מלים ותולדותיהן, עמ' 29-31 (יובל, קול קורא במדבר), 45 (נמל);  
O. Jespersen, *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, Oxford  
1943, §116.

2. *Rejected*: §384. Sometimes though, such mistakes are rejected. Several decades ago IH employed הַי טוֹב 'the best', הַי רַע 'the worst', based on only one instance in BH (II Sam. 23, 19). The reason for the rejection is clear. The expression that replaced it, בְּיֹתֵר, is very much in evidence in MH and therefore הַטוֹב בְּיֹתֵר and הַרַע בְּיֹתֵר are in common IH usage.

מִשָּׁב '(while) sitting', מְעַמָּד '(while) standing' go back to the text of a certain prayer (composed in MH) as read by the Ashkenazim. The Yemenites read מִיֹּשֵׁב, מְעוֹמֵד, which, as H. Yalon has shown, is the correct reading. Here too, no change in IH is demanded, since the syntactic construction rejected by the Yemenite reading is not known in IH.

[הַי is now restricted to colloquial speech. — O.S.]

*Literature:*

ח. ילון, קונטרסים לעניני הלשון העברית א (תרצ"ז-צ"ח), עמ' 79-80.

*j. Change of Meaning as Result of Change in Interpretation*

§385. Most of the material from primary sources such as BH and MH was absorbed with its primary meaning. There was no need to change the meaning of בַּיִת 'house', שֻׁלְחָן 'table', or כִּסֵּא 'chair'. However, this does not mean that what IH considered to be the original meaning was identical with the meaning intended in the sources. Our house or table or chair do not look exactly like the objects denoted by the words in BH and MH. For this reason, the meaning attributed to certain BH and MH words are sometimes based on a certain interpretation of a text rather than on the living oral tradition, as in other languages. This of course, applies mainly to rare words, whose meaning did not survive in the oral and written tradition.

Early medieval scholars sometimes interpreted a certain word according to their understanding and on the basis of that interpretation writers of Hebrew during later medieval and modern times might have used the word with that same meaning. However, modern scholarship has sometimes dissociated itself from that interpretation thanks to comparative Semitics, new linguistic interpretations, archaeological finds, e In these cases it is

generally the earlier meaning that prevails in IH. The following is a case in point: As has been recently established, the word *מָחוּז* occurring in BH (Ps. 107, 30) had the meaning 'haven, port'. But during the Middle Ages a new interpretation arose, namely, 'district'. It is with this meaning that the word is currently being employed in IH. Once a meaning has gained currency over several centuries, it acquires *eo ipso* legitimacy of its own and will not be abandoned for reasons of scholarly accuracy. The same process gave rise to the noun *הֵגָה* 'steering wheel' (cf. §330).

*Literature:*

י. קוטשר, לשוננו ח (תרצ"ז), עמ' 136-145; לד (תש"ל) עמ' 5-18.  
[with English summary = מחקרים, עמ' שסו-שצ].

k. *Words From Proper Names*

§386. IH is also inclined to employ verbs and nouns whose meaning was not established by the normal procedure of Biblical exegesis, but were the products of Midrashic exegesis, which did not aim at discovering the simple Scriptural meaning, but tried to discover hints for a hidden meaning. The following is a good illustration: Pharaoh called Joseph *פַּעְנִחַ* which is, of course, an Egyptian name. The Midrash, however, attempted to discover the Hebrew meaning of this Egyptian name, and explained it as 'The Revealer of Hidden Things'. Because *הַצְפִּין* in Hebrew means indeed 'to hide', *פַּעְנִחַ* must mean 'to reveal'. Thus the Payṭanim (see above §§265–267) began using *פַּעְנִחַ* with the meaning 'to reveal', and in IH it means 'to decipher'.

In Ezra 2, 2 we find the name *מְרֹדַכִּי בִלְשָׁן* which is the Akkadian name *Marduk-belšunu* ('Marduk-Is-Their-Lord'). Midrashic exegesis identified the first component with the famous *מְרֹדַכִּי* of the Book of Esther and explained *בִלְשָׁן* as 'he knew (seventy) languages' (*לְשׁוֹן* = 'tongue, language'). IH therefore uses the word *בִלְשָׁן* (with the vocalization adapted to the noun-pattern *qatla:n*, as e.g., *גֹּזֵלָן* 'robber') with the meaning 'linguist' (already in Yiddish).

For another case see above §375.

*Literature:*

נ.ה. טור-סיני, לשוננו ח (תרצ"ז), עמ' 107

N.H. Tur-Sinai, *The Revival of the Hebrew Language*, Jerusalem 1960, pp. 8, 18;

[O.S.] — ר. מירקין, לשוננו לעם כד (תשל"ג), עמ' 297-298.]

### l. Popular Etymology

§387. Popular etymology resembles Midrashic exegesis. In IH כַּר means 'pillow' and כְּסֵת 'blanket'. But in both BH and MH the meanings of the two words are very close. The change in meaning came about because of the association of כְּסֵת with the root כסה 'to cover'.

#### Literature:

E.M. Lipschütz, *Vom lebendigen Hebräisch*, Berlin 1920, p. 36 note 1.

[G. Sarfatti, *Lešonenu* 39 (1974–75), pp. 236–262; 40 (1975–76), pp. 117–141. — O.S.]

### m. "Spelling Pronunciation"

§388. Since *š* is used mainly for [š] and only occasionally for [ś] — which is generally spelled with ס — שְׁדֶרֶה 'boulevard' is usually pronounced with [š] — [šdera:]. While this could only occur because newspapers and books are generally unvocalized, spelling pronunciations may also occur in vocalized texts. The ם (*qames*) sign when "long" is [a] but when "short" (in closed unaccented syllables) is a kind of [o]. As a result צַרְפַּת 'France' is often pronounced [corfat] instead of [car<sup>e</sup>fat]. (Cf. also יֶד אֶזְלָת יֶד, above §383).

#### Literature:

ש. מרקין (מורג), *החנוך תש"ז*, עמ' 5.

### n. Dialectal Differences

§389. It has been pointed out several times that IH uses synonyms occurring in different sources, by assigning them different meanings e.g., הַאָּזֶן — שְׂמוֹעַ (above §§319, 378, 380). IH also exploited grammatical synonyms representing different dialectal transmissions. In Palestinian MH we find the noun type *qo:ʔla:n*, e.g., גֹּזֵל 'robber', while the Babylonian transmission has גֹּזֵל. IH takes advantage of this situation by using both types with different meanings. Alongside the adjective טְבִילָן 'patient' (created during the Middle Ages) the form טוֹבִילָן 'tolerant' came into being. But it is possible that the latter form was created directly from the participle of the Qal. The same applies to Palestinian MH הוֹדִיעָה whose Babylonian counterpart is הוֹדָעָה. The first is used for 'thanksgiving', while the

second for 'admission'. But in the two traditions both forms could have both meanings.

### *o. Hebrew and Aramaic Grammatical Differences*

§390. Grammatical differences between Hebrew and Aramaic were sometimes exploited for the creation of words with different meanings (cf. above §340). The Aramaic determined form of the word אַיִר 'air' (Greek *aēr*) is אַיִרָא. In the Talmudic saying אַיִרָא דְאֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל מְחַכֵּים 'The air of Eretz Israel makes one wise' (Bava Batra 158b), the word was interpreted as meaning 'milieu', and so a new word was coined which adapted itself to Hebrew by the spelling with final ה — אַיִרָה as a feminine of אַיִר.

An Aramaic grammatical form whose Hebrew semantic parallel is morphologically different was reinterpreted in IH as representing its Hebrew parallel in the following case: גְּמָרָא in Aramaic is the noun גְּמָר plus the definite article אַרְ (which, to be sure, lost its determinative force in certain Aramaic dialects). The word means both 'Talmud' as well as the 'tome of the Talmud'. Since in Hebrew words ending in [a] are generally feminine, the plural is גְּמָרוֹת (as if the singular were spelled גְּמָרָה) and is employed as feminine, e.g., by Bialik אַרְכּוֹת גְּמָרוֹת 'long Gemaras'.

### *p. Words and Roots Created from Abbreviations and Blends*

§391. The word תְּפוּיָה in BH and MH means 'apple'. In the nineteenth century the compound אֶדְמָה תְּפוּיָה 'potato' was coined as a calque from German (Yiddish?). When a Hebrew expression was needed for 'orange', the compound תְּפוּיָה זָהָב, pl. תְּפוּיָהי זָהָב was first used (see above §308). This was later turned by Avineri into the blend תְּפוּיָה, which was accepted also in the standard language (and cf. below §393).

But standard language does not easily accept roots created from abbreviations. For example, from the compound דִּין וְהַשְׁבוֹן 'report' the abbreviation דו"ח was created. This abbreviation — as well as others — was sanctioned by the Academy as a noun דו"ח (the ungrammatical *dox* is still widely used). Afterwards, when this new noun was turned into a verbal root דוּחַ 'to give a report', the Academy refused to recognize it. The sanctioning of abbreviations as independent words was not considered to be too revolutionary a step, since this has been the accepted procedure for hundreds of years, especially regarding proper names. רַבִּי מִשֵּׁה בֶן מִימון (Maimonides), for example, is never mentioned by his full name, but only as רַמְבַּ"ם, from the initials of his full name (cf. above §274). [The same ap-



plies to רש"י (Rashi, above §276) and to other medieval Jewish scholars. — O.S.]

*Literature:*

אבינרי, כבושי העברית בדורנו, עמ' 129–130 (תפוז).

[Many more abbreviations are considered standard today, e.g., ראש המטה — הפל"י 'chief of staff of the Israeli (or foreign) army', מנהל — קל"י 'director general' etc.]

*q. Contagion*

§392. "Latin *persona* has become a negative particle in French... the contiguity with the negative particle *ne* has "infected" this word" (also *pas*, *rien*, *point* in French; Ullman). The same applies to the IH קלום which in certain circumstances can be used without a negative particle to mean 'nothing'. From מומן (בסוף), apparently 'ready money', מומנים came to mean 'cash' already in the Middle Ages, but entered IH via Yiddish (and cf. also §355).

*Literature:*

S. Ullman, *The Principles of Semantics*, Glasgow-Oxford 1959, pp. 184f.

*r. New Terms Change the Meaning of Old Ones*

§393. The case of תפוח 'apple' is interesting. Until recently they were very rare in Israel, whereas תפוחי אדמה 'potatoes' and תפוחי זקב (or תפוחי נהב) 'oranges' were common. Therefore, when at last the original תפוח 'apple' appeared, it was not simply called תפוח, but rather תפוח עץ 'tree apple', to contrast it with the other תפוחים (and cf. above §§308, 391).

*Literature:*

[On the identification of תפוח with the apple see J. Feliks, *Plant World of the Bible*, Ramat-Gan 1968, pp. 60–63 (Hebrew).]

*s. Analogy*

§394. Analogy is a very strong factor in the creation of new forms in IH. Instead of the BH declined infinitive forms of the פ"י roots such as שבת, e.g., בשבתי 'while I am sitting', even scholars sometimes use a new form

בְּיָשָׁרִי, and others like בְּיָדָעִי ‘while knowing’, בְּיָרֵדִי ‘while going down’, בְּהֶלְכִי ‘while walking’, created by analogy with the strong verb.

Since נְעָלִים ‘shoes’ are feminine, גַּרְבָּיִם ‘socks’, מְכַנְסִים ‘pants’ and מְשַׁקְפִים ‘eyeglasses’ are employed in the substandard as feminine nouns in IH.

### t. Back Formation

§395. From the form לוּט (Qal passive participle of לוּטַ) ‘enclosed’, a masculine לוּטָה was formed by analogy to the ל"ה verbs. From the plural בְּנִים ‘honest people’ (root כּוּן) the singular בְּנָה was formed by analogy to nouns like גָּאָה, pl. גָּאִים ‘proud’. Here the need for differentiation was felt since the correct form כֵּן is the word for ‘yes’ (also meaning ‘so’).

### u. Elevated Words

§396. The word מְזֹל (from Akkadian) originally ‘constellation, planet’ came to mean ‘fate’; thus מְזֹל טוֹב means ‘good luck’ (still employed as a wish) while מְזֹל רַע means ‘bad luck’. Today מְזֹל alone means ‘good luck’ (as in Yiddish) while, e.g., מְזֹל בִּישׁ is ‘unlucky’. This type of elevation occurred also in other languages, e.g., Hungarian *szerecsse* = ‘luck’.

### Literature:

Klaniczay, *Magyar Nyelv* 43 (1947), pp. 38ff.;

For other cases of elevation see 21–18 ‘עמ’ אבינרי, כבושי העברית בדורנו, עמ’ 18–21 [G. Sarfatti, *Hebrew Semantics*, Jerusalem 1978, p. 163 (Hebrew).]

### v. Degraded Words (Pejorative Change of Meaning)

§397. נְעֵרָה ‘girl’ is sometimes employed to mean not only ‘girlfriend’ but somewhat euphemistically also for ‘young street-walker’. The word צִיּוֹנוּת ‘Zionism’ is occasionally employed by writers of the younger generation with the meaning ‘idle smooth talk about Zionistic ideals not backed up by deeds’. Sometimes this meaning is indicated by quotation marks. I still remember חִקְיָה ‘research’, but today מְחַקֵּר is used, perhaps because the former was associated with the activity of the חִקְרָן, the ‘quasi-scholar of the ghetto’ as portrayed in the Haskalah literature. חִקְיָה is used now for ‘investigation’.

### Literature:

י. כנעני, אוצר הלשון העברית כרך ה, ירושלים-תל-אביב תשכ"ד, עמ' 1457 (חקרן).

w. *Change of Meaning Caused by Social Change*

§398. The social changes that took place during recent generations made themselves felt in the vocabulary of IH. Because the status of women has changed it was felt that both BH לָקַח and LBH-MH נָשׂוּא 'to marry' (man—subject, woman—object) (cf. §§123, 227) was no longer adequate the reflexive-reciprocal הִתְחַתֵּן was introduced. Purists were not pleased with this since הִתְחַתֵּן in BH means 'to marry into a family'. Obviously a verb was needed that would express the reciprocal relationship of the two parties which were now supposed to be equal. The appropriate conjunction seemed to be Hitpa'el, but neither הִתְלַקַּח which means 'to flare up' nor הִתְנַשֵּׂא which means 'to exalt oneself, to be overbearing' could be employed. For want of anything better, the reciprocal Nif'al (as in BH) was resorted to and today הִנָּשׂא is used.

The same applies to 'divorce'. The verb is no longer the active גָּרַשׁ (subject—male, object—female) literally 'to drive out' but the reciprocal הִתְגַּרְשׁ (literally 'to drive each other out') is used. To be sure, the 'divorcée' is the participle passive גְּרוּשָׁה, but since already in MH the 'divorcer' was גָּרוֹשׁ by analogy, this "injustice" is redressed.

שָׂמֵשׁ used to denote both 'school janitor' and 'beadle (of the synagogue)'. Now the former is called שָׂרְתָא whereas the beadle is still a שָׂמֵשׁ (cf. above §372).

[מִשְׁרַד הַיְּרֵאָר the Ministry of Post in Israel (which also includes the telephone system and the technical operation of the radio and television stations), was renamed a few years ago מִשְׁרַד הַתְּקֻשָׁרָת 'Ministry of Communications', to give it a more "modern" image.]

x. *Euphemisms*

§399. Needless to say, euphemisms are as much in evidence in IH as in other languages where words must be found to apply to indelicate entities. What started out as בֵּית הַכֶּסֶּא 'toilet' (MH) was changed to בֵּית הַשְּׂמוּשׁ and finally became (for the time being) שְׂרוּתִים (cf. §379) or נוֹחִיּוֹת. (The same happened to the English equivalent.)

y. *Struggle between New Terms*

§400. As in the Haskalah period (above §306), the age of the revival saw new terms in conflict over supermacy. Seven words struggled for 'pencil' until Klausner's עֶפְרוֹן (from עֶפְרָת, 'lead') won out. Amusingly, Rawnitzky, who apparently misread Klausner's suggestion as עֶפְרוֹן, mocked at his

proposal by saying, “A broken pencil, then, will be *עָפְרוֹן הִחְתִּי*” — Ephron the Hittite (Gen. 23, 10; *חחח* in BH = ‘to break’). More than twenty words vied with each other for the meaning ‘match’ until Mendele’s *גְּפִיר* prevailed.

*Literature:*

נ. שפירא, לשוננו כו-כח (תשכ"ג-כ"ד), עמ' 252

ואילך, עמ' 340 ואילך;

ד. סיוון, לשוננו לעם יז (תשכ"ו) עמ' 211;

אבינרי, כבושי העברית בדורנו, עמ' 211.

*z. Suppletion*

§401. An interesting case of suppletion (supplementary distribution) is mentioned by H. Blanc, “... one says *לֹא אֶגִּיד לּוֹ* ‘I’ll tell him’, using the verb *הִגִּיד* (root נגד) for the future, but *אֶגִּיד אֹמֵר לּוֹ* ‘I’m telling him’ and *אֶמְרָתִי לּוֹ* ‘I told him’, using the verb *אמר* for the present and the past.” I know of no reason why and how this usage came about.

*Literature:*

H. Blanc, “The Growth of Israeli Hebrew”, *Middle Eastern Affairs* 5 (1954), p. 389.

*aa. New Creations That Are Identical with BH or MH by Mere Chance*

§402. Sometimes new formations that no doubt arose spontaneously in IH (including calques), are by pure chance identical with the original forms that occur in BH or MH. The expression *יֹפִי* ‘how nice’ is supposed to be a calque from Russian, but occurs in MH (see above §368). Certain purists tried to eliminate expressions like *דְּרָךְ הַחִלּוֹן* ‘through the window’ and at first sight, with good reason. This *דְּרָךְ* was thought to reflect German (and Yiddish) *durch*. But then it was pointed out that it is MH (and perhaps even BH, cf. Ex. 13, 17). For another important case see above §323.

The *פ"נ* verbs *נָשַׁךְ* ‘to bite’ and *נָטַשׁ* ‘to abandon’ are employed in the active voice in the Qal stem, but in the passive perfect in the Pu‘al, and not in the Nif‘al, namely, *נִטְשָׁה*, *נִשְׁכָּה*. The cause seems to be the tendency to avoid homonyms (see above §381). There is no reason to oppose this new created Pu‘al usage, for in BH, too, forms that are identical with the perfect of the Pu‘al may serve as passive of the Qal (see above §48). Therefore, strangely enough, IH seems to have recreated on its own a linguistic usage

that was already on its way out in BH, without having been influenced directly or indirectly by that usage.

This brings to mind another problem. In MH parallel forms are found which could have been interpreted as survivals of the passive Qal from BH (cf. above §211). But since, as in IH, most of these cases involve פ"נ verbs it could be maintained that, exactly as in IH, these are not survivals but recreations that arose because of the tendency of differentiation.

### *bb. New Words in Vogue*

§403. Once a new word gains acceptance, it is apt to dislodge words with meanings close to itself, thus sometimes defeating its own purpose. To the best of my knowledge יָדַע 'know-how' was created during the last years; now it has nearly ousted יְדִיעָה 'knowledge'.

A very amusing article by H. Zemer (originally published in the daily *Davar*) listed quite a number of such words very much in vogue in Israel, among them עָרַן 'age' (e.g., עָרַן הָאָטוֹם 'Atomic age'), הַגָּם 'pattern', תַּת־הַכֵּיָרָה 'subconscious', תוֹדָעָה 'consciousness', הַשְּׁלֵכוֹת 'repercussion', מִינְכֵי 'maximum', קְטוּב 'polarization' and many more.

### *Literature:*

- ח. זמר, לשוננו לעם יח (תשכ"ז), עמ' 244-247.  
 ח. סופר, לשוננו לעם כו (תשל"ה) 84-89: כז (תשל"ו) 105-112.  
 For another humorous approach to new words in vogue see  
 .א. קישון, הכל בו של אפרים קישון, תל-אביב תשל"ב, עמ' 52-54.]

### *cc. New Words*

1. *Who Created What?* §404. It is very difficult to establish who created the various new words. Very few articles dealing with this problem — among them R. Sivan, R. Weiss, N. Shapira and also Avineri's dictionary of Bialik's new creations — give exact references. The work of the Academy is anonymous and only the origin of words discussed by the plenum can be traced with the help of minutes.

It is sometimes quite interesting to follow the controversy about the creators of certain terms. One writer tried to add some words to Avineri's dictionary. Avineri replied that some of the words mentioned preceded Bialik while others were already listed.

Even more amusing is the story of the verb צָלַם 'to photograph'. Sivan

mentioned that it was created by D. Yellin. Another young scholar pointed to Pines (Yellin's father-in-law), but later retracted. Sivan then retold the whole story that he heard from Yellin himself (below §405). Another note by a third writer mentioned a still earlier origin. Sivan then answered by quoting Yellin where he asserts *in writing* that he created this technical term. Therefore we have to assume that two (or perhaps three) people created it independently.

I was firmly convinced that M. Sharett, the first Foreign Minister of Israel, invented נְרֵפוֹן 'passport' and אֶשְׁרָה 'visa'. Since the Arabic equivalent of the latter is *išārā* (a different root from that of אֶשְׁרָה, and of a quite complicated origin), and Sharett knew Arabic well, I thought that he might have been influenced by the Arabic word. But Sharett told me that he "ordered" both words from someone else (and cf. also below §456).

### *Literature:*

The articles of Sivan, Weiss and Shapira were mentioned in the preceding paragraphs, above §§377, 400;

י. אבינרי, מלון חדושי ח.ג. ביאליק, תל-אביב תרצ"ה;

ר. מירקין, לשוננו לעם יח (תשכ"ז) and subsequent volumes. — O.S.]

2. *How New Terms Are Publicized.* §405. The Hebrew Language Committee and the Academy of the Hebrew Language have published over the years lists of terms as well as technical dictionaries. Schulbaum included them in his German-Hebrew dictionary. The same was done by (Lasar-) Torczyner (Tur-Sinai). When German Jews began to arrive in Palestine (1933–1939) it sometimes played havoc with their Hebrew, since most of Torczyner's new creations were not known there. The Haskalah writers sometimes translated words on the spot or added word lists to their writings. But most of the writers and journalists simply included them in their writings, and Bialik stated expressly that he preferred to slip his new creations into writings of other writers which he edited, e.g., נְשָׁרַשׁ (above §369).

This procedure was generally successful, but sometimes mishaps were unavoidable. D. Yellin wanted to popularize in this way the verb צָלַם 'to photograph' (see above §404). Describing in an article a Christian religious he wrote וְהַצֵּלֵם קִצְצֵלֵם 'and the photographer takes pictures'. He sent his article from Palestine to a Hebrew weekly in Europe. The editor who failed to recognize the meaning intended by Yellin, changed it because of the context

into **וְהַצְלֵב מְצֵלֵב** 'the cross crosses', in spite of the fact that this does not make any sense.

*Literature:*

D. Patterson, *JSS* 7 (1962), pp. 313ff.;

י.א. זיידמן, לחקר לשונו של ביאליק, לשונו ז (תרצ"ז), עמ' 76-77;

ר. סיוון, לשונו לעם יג (תשכ"ב), עמ' 19 (צלם).

### III. *The Changing Face of IH*

§406. H. Rosén has pointed out that we can follow changes taking place in the Hebrew component of IH thanks to the daily *Ha'aretz*. It used to have a column entitled Fifty Years Ago and one entitled Thirty Years Ago, where news of those times would be reprinted without change. Here, says Rosén, we have an ideal opportunity to see linguistic processes that take many generations to occur in other languages, taking place before our eyes, compressed in a few decades. R. Sivan supplies a list of changes e.g., **דְּרִבּוֹן** < **מַעַת לַעַת** '24 hours'. Incidentally, in this case the (Aramaic) **יְמָמָה** is employed contrary to its original meaning 'day' (as opposed to night)!

*Literature:*

רוזן, העברית שלנו, עמ' 108-109;

ר. סיוון, לשונו לעם יז (תשכ"ו), עמ' 220-223.

### D. Israeli Hebrew as a New Entity

§407. In the previous paragraphs we have tried to point out the sources that went into the making of IH. The revivers, of course, were convinced that they were reviving a kind of combination of BH and MH, with a few additions that did not affect the structure of Hebrew. As mentioned by E.M. Lipschütz, while employing the new language, they were always conscious — or at least believed they were — of the origin of each word and phrase. It should be pointed out that linguistically too, they had a point; linguistic research at that time meant the history of the language. Once they could marshal all the linguistic facts from the sources with the help of

historical research of the language, they believed that by simply combining all these facts they would create (or re-create) Israeli Hebrew.

During the last generation the picture has changed entirely. A new generation of Hebrew speakers has arisen. They employed Hebrew naturally as their native language just as English, French and German speakers do. They did not care about the sources of the language, exactly as the average American is not interested in finding out the sources of his native speech.

Something else also happened. Linguistics during the nineteenth century was historical and comparative; however, scholarship has taken a new turn during the last decades. A new school of thought came into being that stressed the synchronic aspect of linguistic research. This school is mainly interested in discovering how a certain language functions as an entity at a given time. In this context it disregards the history of the different parts of the language. It stresses the inter-relationship of the different elements that make up the language. This new linguistic viewpoint reached Israel in the late forties. A new generation of general linguists arose who maintained that all the different sources of IH had fused into a new identity, which did not consist simply of its components. Rather, functioning as an identity it willy-nilly created a new *entity* through the interplay of the various old elements. This new entity, namely, Israeli Hebrew, contains some new traits unknown in its sources. These new traits are not to be regarded as mistakes according to this new school of thought — after all, every new trait in every language starts out as a “mistake” — but rather as a legitimate and necessary offspring of the old elements that went into the creation of the new language. According to the maxim that at any given moment in every language *chaque se tient* (A. Meillet), these new traits cannot be eliminated from IH without endangering its whole structure.

This new language was named Israeli Hebrew by its discoverer, Haiim B. Rosén. In a series of radio talks and in articles and books, he tried to prove that in IH there are innovations which can by no means be attributed (as was maintained by others) to the interference of foreign languages, and therefore should not be considered as mistakes. A few clear-cut cases for this contention follow.

In certain verbal forms the masc. sing. participle is identical with the third person sing. perfect, e.g., יָכַל ‘is/was able’, דָּוָר ‘dwells/dwelled’ and especially in the Nif‘al (according to the Sephardic pronunciation), e.g., נִכָּר/נִכָּר (both pronounced [nikar]) ‘is/was recognizable’. In such cases IH



tends to employ the auxiliary verb הָיָה to indicate past tense. A certain writer wrote הוּא לֹא הָיָה יָכוֹל וְהוּא לֹא יָכוֹל 'he could not and he still cannot'; "correctly" it would be הוּא לֹא יָכוֹל וְהוּא לֹא יָכוֹל. As a matter of fact, he could have written הוּא לֹא יָכוֹל וְהוּא אֵינּוּ יָכוֹל, but since in IH לֹא has eliminated אֵין before the participle (thus already in MH), this alternative does not make sense to the IH speaker. In the Nif'al this usage tends to involve even other roots, e.g., הָיָה נִדְמָה לִי instead of נִדְמָה לִי 'it seemed to me'. Here, the reason is apparently a different one (see below §435).

Since מִמֶּנּוּ (according to the Tiberian vocalization) means both 'from us' and 'from him', even writers who are particular about their language prefer מִמֶּנּוּ for 'from us'. Another possibility is to pronounce 'from him' as מִמֶּנּוּ. Here the speaker has unwittingly created the form used during the Middle Ages. מִמֶּנּוּ literally means 'from with us' but מִמֶּנּוּ is not employed at all, except in names of firms, such as בְּרֵגֶר אֶת גִּנּוּל. In this case it reflects the impact of the Austro-German *et* which is the French *et* 'and' pronounced [et] (spelling pronunciation).

New compounds were created, such as מִגְדָּלוֹר 'lighthouse', נְמוֹז 'traffic light' where the morpheme of the plural is added to the second constituent, מִגְדָּלוֹרִים (and not מִגְדָּלֵי אֹר, as required by grammar). This occurs already in MH: in Midrash Bereshit Rabbah the form בְּנוֹנוֹת (pl. of בְּנוֹנָה) occurs! Interesting, also, is the case of בֶּן דּוֹד denoting a 'male cousin' (even on the mother's side), but a 'female cousin' is generally בַּת דּוֹדָה even if she is a daughter of an uncle.

This very phenomenon also occurs in Yiddish. While 'prince' is בֶּן מַלְכָּה, 'princess' is בַּת מַלְכָּה. This is why these two forms are found in Mendel's *The Travels of Benjamin the Third* (cf. §309). We might well assume that it goes back to the Hebrew component of Yiddish (cf. §§462-472).

I. Blanc points out that "In recent years [IH] has been producing dozens of adjectives indicating something like English adjectives *-able*: שֶׁבִיר 'breakable', קָרִיא 'readable' etc..." He adds that no one knows precisely on what basis the pattern was launched. (Could it be גַּמִּיש 'flexible' which is MH? and cf. above §338).

Even if we do not take into account several other instances adduced as internal innovations (some are very much substandard, and others occur in MH), the instances mentioned above establish, to my mind, beyond doubt the identity of IH as a special entity, functioning more or less as any normal modern language.

Admittedly, there used to be a trend that maintained that everything new

in Modern Hebrew which is not found in the sources should be considered incorrect. There was also a second school of thought not so narrow-minded which allowed mistakes if they were the outgrowth of linguistic forces working in the older sources as well. Thus *לֹא יֵאֱמָן כִּי יִסְפָּר* 'unbelievable!' (lit. 'not believed if told', cf. Habakkuk 1, 5) (also Yiddish) instead of *יֵאֱמָן* would be considered correct. The same holds true for *מַעֲשֵׂה* 'story' as a back formation of *מַעֲשֵׂוֹת* which is properly the plural of *מַעֲשֶׂה*. But the new approach was different for two reasons: 1. While formerly linguistics were inclined to see the trees rather than the forest, they now saw only the forest. 2. In its consequent application, their approach amounted to a severance of Hebrew from the sources. These, in their opinion, should cease to play a part in deciding which way the language should develop.

This approach has not gone uncontested. Z. Ben Ḥayyim has pointed out that it may still be too early to investigate IH as an independent entity.

Still, the identity of IH having been established, all the other traits, including those that go back to the interference of foreign languages will have to be taken into account as normal in any descriptive grammar. Of course, this does not commit anyone as regards the *normative* grammar of IH.

H. Blanc has succinctly described the exact components that went into the making of IH:

"The essential components of the Hebrew spoken in Israel today... (are) three... The first is the basic grammar and vocabulary of the Hebrew classics (the Old Testament and post-Biblical literature)... the second is the largely unconscious linguistic activity of the speakers, and the creation of new forms without reference to the classics or to the guidance of official bodies; the third is the all-pervasive non-Hebrew influence stemming from the linguistic background of veteran settlers and new immigrants alike."

(We may add: and of the Hebrew writers beginning with the Haskalah!)

I cannot refrain from quoting the excellent illustration given by Blanc:

"A native Israeli is commonly referred to as a *sabre*, a word meaning 'prickly pear', supposedly because of the natives' rough exterior and manners. The word is a borrowing from Palestinian Arabic *sabra*, but its present final vowel and its plural form, *sabres*, show that it came into Hebrew through Yiddish, the language of the very first

East European settlers, who learned the term from the local Arabs. Further, while the Israelis pronounce the word very much as Yiddish speakers would, the tutored ear can easily distinguish a clearly non-Yiddish tinge in their pronunciation, which is thus specifically Israeli. To complicate matters, this word is today in process of being replaced by a neo-Hebrew word obtained by Hebraizing the Arabic term; the word thus officially introduced was to be pronounced *tsavar*, in the plural *tsavarim*, both with stress on the last syllable, but for reasons which need not detain us here, the form now in use and in competition with *sabre* is *tsabar*, in the plural *tsabarim*, both stressed on the first syllable; *tsavar* is relegated to the dictionary. Thus we have an Arabic word with a Yiddish form and an Israeli pronunciation being replaced by a semi-Hebraized word spoken in a manner peculiar to the natives and entirely out of joint with the demands of classical grammar."

*Literature:*

H. Blanc, "The Growth of Israeli Hebrew", *Middle Eastern Affairs* 5 (1954), pp. 385f.

ז. בן-חיים, לשון עתיקה במציאות חדשה, לשוננו לעם ד (תשי"ג), עמ' 3-85. [Rosén, *Contemporary Hebrew*, pp. 40-54 (includes recent bibliography). — O.S.]

## E. An Outline of Israeli Hebrew

**§408.** As mentioned above (§407), IH became the object of linguistic research only during the last years, and there is still no agreement among scholars on many points, including the basic facts. Therefore the following outline should be considered as tentative only. We shall try to describe standard IH, roughly that of high school and university graduates who try to speak correct Hebrew as they know it and to avoid slang mainly in formal speech, and to a certain extent in informal speech as well. This is not to say that every aspect of the language thus described is considered acceptable by scholars of puristic tendencies.

### I. Phonology and Phonetics

**§409.** The speakers of Hebrew whose native or only language is IH can

be divided into two groups. One is composed of those who came from Europe and the Western Hemisphere and their offspring (the so-called Ashkenazim) as well as those who became assimilated to them. The other group consists of persons who hail from Arabic-speaking (and other Near Eastern) countries (the so-called Sephardim). The difference between the language of the two groups is mainly in their stock of consonantal phonemes and their realization. While our description will be concerned with the language of the Western group, we shall occasionally point out the divergencies between it and the Eastern group. This procedure is preferable since the Western group is considered the prestigious group, despite the efforts of a few linguists and the Israeli radio to introduce the pronunciation of the Easterners which is closer to the original.

*Literature:*

[M. Chayën, *The Phonetics of Modern Hebrew*, The Hague and Paris 1973;

idem, "The Pronunciation of Israeli Hebrew", *Lešonenu* 36 (1971–72), pp. 212–219, 287–300 (Hebrew with English summary);

Rosën, *Contemporary Hebrew*, pp. 55–81;

O. Schwarzwald, "Concrete and Abstract Theoretical Methods and the Analysis of BGDKPT-BKP in Hebrew", *Lešonenu* 40 (1975–76), pp. 211–232 (in Hebrew). — O.S.]

*a. Consonants: Phonemics, Phonetics and Lost Phoneme*

§410. *Phonemics.* IH, like BH, has twenty-three phonemes but only a few survive unchanged, while the majority consist of

- 1) phonemes which represent two original phonemes merged into one;
- 2) former allophones which turned into phonemes;
- 3) phonemes of foreign origin. Except for the last category, the spelling remained unchanged.

1) As in Yiddish (see §373): 'ayin = alef, /'/: עָבַד 'he worked' = (is realized) אָבַד 'he perished'; kaf (without *dagesh*) = het /x/: רָכַשׁ 'he acquired' = רָחַשׁ 'he felt'; qof = kaf (with *dagesh*) /k/: בִּקֵּר 'he visited' = בִּכֵּר 'he preferred'; tet = taw (with or without *dagesh*) /t/: טָבַע 'he drowned' = תָּבַע 'he demanded' (*taw* without *dagesh* is the only consonant which did not keep its Yiddish pronunciation but rather the Sephardic one, see §373).

2) The fricative allophones (i.e. those without *dagesh*) of the phonemes /b, k, p/ are phonemicized: *bet* = /v/, (and this /v/ = *waw* /v/, see below).

Therefore, since there is no gemination in IH, *hitxaver* (a substandard form, derived from חָבֵר 'friend') 'to become a friend of' is opposed to *hitxaber* 'to associate with'; (and *kaf* without *dagesh*=/x/), סִיכָה 'lubrication' is opposed to סִכָּה 'pin'; *pe* = /f/, and שֶׁפָּה 'lip' is opposed to סֹפָה 'sofa'.

3) The phonemes /ž/ (spelled 'ו'), /č/ (spelled 'צ'), /ǵ/ (spelled 'ג') occur as such only in foreign loans, e.g., חֲבָצֵט 'jacket', פּוֹנְצָר 'puncture, flat tire', גֵּנְטְלֵמָן 'gentleman'.

*Phonetics.* *šade* is pronounced [c] (see above §373), *waw* = [v] (= *bet* without *dagesh*), *resh* mainly as [R] = uvular trill (French /r/). *Gimel*, *dalet* and *taw*, both with and without *dagesh*, are realized [g, d, t]. /h/ is lost in several positions, e.g., at word final; therefore כַּלְבָּה [kalba:] 'her dog' = כַּלְבָּה [kalba:] 'bitch'. The same applies to /ʔ/ in some positions, e.g., לֹא לִי אֶכְפֹּת [loxpət li] 'I could not care less'. Some IH phonemes have positional variants, e.g., חֶשְׁבוֹן [xežbon] 'calculation; invoice', where the unvoiced [š] became voiced [ž] because of the voiced [b]; אֶשְׁכַּח [eškə] 'I shall remember', where the voiced [z] became unvoiced [s] because of the unvoiced [k].

*Lost Phonemes.* IH lost the typically Semitic consonantal laryngals /ʕ, h/ and emphatics /t̤, s̤, q/ (cf. §§9, 10, 24) as well as /w/. These phonemes are realized [ʔ, x, t, c, k, v] respectively (and cf. above §410). [Oriental native speakers (of Arabicized Hebrew, in Blanc's terminology) do preserve the /ʕ/ and /h/. — O.S.]

### b. Vowels

§411. IH is supposed to have six vowel phonemes of which five, /a, e, i, o, u/ are attested in every position, but the sixth, /ə/ (representing an original *šva na'*) only after certain initial consonants. Its phonemic character is established, for example, by the minimal pair שֶׁרֵאשׁ [bəroš] 'at the head of' (construct state) as against שֶׁרֵאשׁ [broš] 'cypress'.

The latter instance indicates that initial clusters do occur in IH, in varying combinations contrary to the case in BH and in other classical Semitic languages.

Vowel length is not supposed to be distinctive. A case like נָטַעְתִּי [nata:ti] 'I planted' (as against נָטַעְתִּי [natati] 'I gave'), is more properly analyzed as [nataati].

Cases of [ey] which have variants of [e:] are analyzed as representing the diphthong /ey/. Other diphthongs are said to be /ia, ua, ea, oa/, e.g., בָּחַ

[koax] 'force'. They occur only before /x/ (< *het*) /' / (< 'ayin) [and [θ] < *he*, e.g., גָּבוֹהַ [gavoah] 'tall'. — O.S.]

Vowels in accented syllables are longer than in unaccented ones. The vowels *šere*, *segol*, *ḥaṭaf segol* and sometimes *ḥiriq* (when representing an original *shva na'*) merged into /e/, and *qameš gadol*, *pataḥ* and *ḥaṭaf pataḥ* merged into /a/.

In contradistinction to the consonants, where the Yiddish substrate is dominant, here it is the Sephardic pronunciation which prevails.

### c. Further Observations on IH Phonemes

§412. This picture of the phonemes of IH, especially the consonantal phonemes, is not entirely satisfactory. In the case of the consonantal phonemes in categories 1) and 2) (above §410) it does not reveal in phonemic terms that the classical Hebrew system, which has partially broken down in IH, does nonetheless exist to a large extent in IH. For example, while [x] < *kaf* without *dagesh* may have a phonemic character, it may also function as an allophone of *kaf* with *dagesh* as in BH, e.g., כָּתָב [ktav] 'writing' but בְּכָתָב [bixtav] 'in writing'. This is not the case, however, with [x] < *het*! The same applies to [k] < *kaf* with *dagesh*, which, as mentioned, has an allophone [x], but not to [k] < *qof* which always remains [k], e.g., קָרָב [krav] 'battle' but בִּקְרָב [bikrav] 'in battle'.

Compare also the problem of the perfect רָחַב [raxav] 'it was wide' = רָכַב [raxav] 'he rode' as against the imperfect יִרְחַב [yirxav] 'it will be wide' but יִרְכַּב [yirkav] 'he will ride'. Also, in my opinion, it remains unexplained that the same phenomenon exists in the perfect קָרָא [kara] 'he read' = קָרַע [kara] 'he tore' as against the passive participle קָרוּא [karu] 'read' but קָרוּעַ [karua] 'torn', and in similar cases.

It should also be pointed out that the phonemic load of some new phonemes, e.g., /f/ seems to be extremely light, and it would be very difficult to find even a small number of minimal pairs /p/:/f/. In other words, /f/ nearly always functions as an allophone and not as a phoneme. To be sure, while the average IH speaker may pronounce כָּתָב [ktav], בְּכָתָב [bixtav], he would say כִּתָּה [kita] 'classroom', בְּכִתָּה [bɛkita] 'in a classroom' (instead of [bɛxita]). But even purists would not apply the /b, g, d, k, p, t/-rule to foreign lexemes like פּוֹלִין 'Poland'; they would pronounce [bɔpolin] and not [bɔfolin].

This very complicated state of affairs has not yet been stated clearly in

phonemic terms. No doubt the phonological description of IH needs further refinement.

[See now the literature quoted for §409.]

#### d. Stress

§413. As in BH, stress falls on the ultimate, penultimate, or sometimes even on the ante-penultimate syllable, e.g., יְרוּשָׁלַמִיּוֹת 'Jerusalemites' (fem.). In one case, i.e. forms like קְבוּצַת־יְרוּשָׁלַיִם, 'women of the kibbutz' the stress falls even farther away (?). There are cases where the stress is penultimate where in BH it is ultimate, e.g., יְרוּשָׁלַמִי 'Jerusalemite'. This holds true especially in personal and place names (see above §348).

#### e. Gemination.

§414. Gemination (doubling of a consonant) has been lost in IH.

#### f. Assimilation of Nun

§415. BH and MH assimilate [n] to the following consonant, e.g., יִפְּלוּ 'they will fall' (root נפל). Since this rule has lost its force, the assimilation that occurs is retained in paradigms that go back to BH and MH, but is disregarded in new creations, e.g., הַנְּצַח 'to perpetuate', הַנְּפִק 'to issue' instead of the "correct" forms \*הַנְּפִק, \*הַנְּצַח. Even purists do not seem to object anymore. (Incidentally, this may already appear in MH where we find הַנְּמַד 'to lower'). Sometimes the rule of assimilation is disregarded even in forms that do appear in BH and MH, but are relatively rare, e.g., יִנְשֶׁךְ 'he will bite', as against BH יִשֶׁךְ (e.g., Eccl. 10, 11).

#### Literature:

D. Tené, *L'hébreu Contemporain* (unpublished);

R.W. Weiman, *Native and Foreign Elements in a Language: A Study in General Linguistics Applied to Modern Hebrew*, Philadelphia 1950;

H. Blanc, *Word* 9 (1953), pp. 87-90 (review of Weiman);

;186-138 ריון, העברית שלנו, עמ' 186-138

H. Blanc, *Language* 32 (1956), pp. 795-802 (review of Rosén);

H.B. Rosén, *A Textbook of Israeli Hebrew*<sup>2</sup>, Chicago & London 1966;

G. Fraenkel, "A Structural Approach to Israeli Hebrew", *JAO* 86 (1966), pp. 32-38.

## II. Morphology

## a. Pronouns

1. *Independent Pronouns.* §416. Nearly all the personal pronouns are SBH. Only אָנוּ 'we' comes from MH. הֵן 'they' (fem.) is MH but there it serves for both masc. and fem. It apparently owes its existence in IH to the (mistaken) assumption that BH לְהֵן, בְּהֵן (properly the prepositions ל+suffix) are to be analyzed ב + הֵן, ל + הֵן in which הֵן is an independent pronoun.

אָנוּ and אָנֹכִי are widely used whereas אָנֹכִי and אָנוּ are used mainly in elevated language. The BH forms with a final /a/ namely, הִמָּה, הִנָּה, אֲתָנָה are lost, as is הִנָּהוּ. The vocalization of אָתָּן is somewhat problematic.

2. *Possessive Suffixes and the Independent Possessive Pronoun.* §417. IH uses the BH possessive suffixes, but the MH independent possessive pronoun is equally common (שְׁלִי, שְׁלֶךָ etc.; see above §204).

In IH, substandard forms of the possessive suffixes are sometimes used with prepositions, e.g., אִתְּךָ (for אִתְּךָ) 'with you' (fem.) under the influence of the parallel noun suffix, or the sing. suffix in בְּלִעְדֵי 'without me' instead of the plural בְּלִעְדֵי (the underlying preposition is בְּלִעְדֵי\*) under the influence of forms like אִתִּי 'with me'.

a. *Uses of the Independent Possessive Pronoun.* §418. As in MH, there are no hard and fast rules that determine whether the independent possessive pronouns or the possessive suffixes are to be used (cf. §216). The following picture seems to be more or less accurate.

1) Foreign loans are seldom used with the suffix, e.g., הַקוּרְסִים שֶׁלָנוּ 'our courses' (and cf. §346).

2) It seems to me that often, at least in spoken IH, the suffixes would not be used even with Hebrew nouns if they would perceptibly change the basic form of the noun, e.g., הַקְלָלָה שֶׁלוּ (for קְלָלָתוֹ) 'his curse'.

3) The independent possessive pronoun often replaces the possessive suffix in informal speech, e.g., אָבִיא שְׁלִי (instead of אָבִי) 'my father'.

4) In many cases, as pointed out by Rosén, the use of the suffix seems to be conditioned at the same level of speech but the exact nature of the conditioning has not yet been established, e.g., בְּשָׂרִי 'my flesh', but הַבָּשָׂר שְׁלִי 'my meat'; בְּנוֹתַי 'my daughters', but הַבָּנוֹת שְׁלִי 'my girls' (used by their teacher), the first denoting "inalienable property", while the second "alienable property". U. Ornan maintains that the difference in usage goes back to the difference between primary and secondary meaning.



5) The reason for the replacement of the possessive suffix is obvious, as pointed out by Rosén, in such cases as *תְּעוּדַת הַחֵבֶר שְׁלִי* 'my membership card' as against *תְּעוּדַת חֵבְרִי* 'the document of my friend'. In the first case the immediate constituents are *תְּעוּדַת-חֵבֶר* + possessive pronoun (cf. English translation), and here the possessive pronoun refers to the compound in its entirety, whereas in *תְּעוּדַת חֵבְרִי* the immediate constituents are *חֵבְרִי* + *תְּעוּדַת*, and the possessive suffix only refers to *חֵבֶר*. Incidentally, already in BH we find such cases, e.g., *מִרְכָּבַת הַמִּשְׁנָה אֲשֶׁר לוֹ* (Gen. 41, 43) where the translation of the Revised Standard Version 'in his second chariot' is preferable to that of the Jewish Publication Society 'chariot of his second-in-command' (cf. also above §380).

#### Literature:

U. Ornan, "The Use of Attached and Independent Possessive Pronouns in Modern Hebrew", *Fourth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, Jerusalem 1968, pp. 117-122 (Hebrew with English summary p. 188);  
 ;188-177 ,160-149 עמ' עברית טובה<sup>3</sup>, רוזן,  
 [Rosén, *Contemporary Hebrew*, pp. 144-152. — O.S.]

3. *Demonstrative Pronouns.* §419. BH and MH forms are used indiscriminately: *זֹאת*, *זוּ*, 'this' (fem.), *אֵלֶּה*, *אֵלֶּוּ*, 'these'; they always follow the noun. It is still a problem whether the MH forms require the article, e.g., *זוּ אִשָּׁה* or *הָאִשָּׁה הַזֹּאת* 'this woman'. Also widely used is the MH *אֵת* + third persons suffixes, which precedes the noun, yet here too, the question of the determination of the noun remains unsolved: *אֹתוֹ הַיּוֹם* (as in MH) or *יּוֹם אֹתוֹ* 'that day' (cf. above §203). It is also employed with the meaning 'the same', as in MH, e.g., *אָנֹחְנוּ עֲדֵינָן גָּרִים בְּאוֹתוֹ (הַ)בַּיִת*, 'we still live in that (or the same) house'.

*זֶה* functions in substandard IH quite often like English *it*, German *es*, i.e. as an "empty" subject, e.g., *זֶה קָשֶׁה לְלַמַּד עִבְרִית*, 'it is difficult to learn Hebrew'; standard IH omits *זֶה*.

As Rosén has shown, with the preposition *כ* these demonstratives agree in gender and number with the noun they follow and not with the noun they refer to, e.g., *יֵשׁ לִי עֲשָׂרָה פּוֹעֲלִים גְּרוּעִים; עוֹד פּוֹעֵל כְּזֶה אֵינִי רוֹצֶה*, 'I have already got ten bad workers; one more like *this* (instead of *בְּאֵלֶּה* 'these') I do not want'.

*Literature:*

רוזן, עברית טובה<sup>3</sup>, עמ' 51–53.

[For וְ as a copula in nominal sentences see *ibid.* pp. 245–247. — O.S.]

4. *Relative Pronouns.* §420. The (mainly) MH ךְּ is more often used than BH אֲשֶׁר.

*b. The Verb*

1. *Prefixes and Suffixes.* §421. Prefixes and suffixes of the perfect and imperfect are SBH, except the second and third pers. pl. fem. of the imperfect, where the (mainly) MH forms יִשְׁמְרוּ, תִּשְׁמְרוּ can also be employed.

2. *Participle of the Feminine Singular.* §422. This form is created by the ending [-et] in all stems including the Hof'al, e.g., מְפַעֵלֶת 'is operated', but excluding the Hif'il, where the ending is [-a:], e.g., מְפַעֵלָה 'operates'. [In the weak verbs the forms are identical with those of BH.]

3. *Infinitives.* §423. It is mainly the infinitive construct + ל which survives, but it also occurs with ב or מ with the ל (as in MH, see §210) or, rarely, without it. The infinitive absolute may be used in elevated speech.

4. *The Weak Verbs.* §424. Verbs are generally used in their BH forms; therefore, for example, ל"א verbs are used as such (and do not turn into ל"ה verbs, as in MH). To be sure, ל"ה forms do occasionally turn up, e.g., נָשׂוּי 'married' (instead of נָשׂוּא). In the Nif'al perfect of ע"ו verbs BH and MH forms may be employed side by side with specialized meanings; MH form נִדוּן = 'was discussed' while BH form נִדוֹן = 'was sentenced'. In the infinitive construct of פ"י verbs mainly BH forms are used: לְשֹׁבֵת 'to sit' (some writers, like Agnon, prefer MH לִישֵׁב). With the preposition ב, IH created, by analogy, forms like בְּיֹשֵׁבִי 'while I was sitting' (instead of BH בְּשֹׁבֵתִי, see above §326).

*Literature:*

[O. Schwarzwald, *Studies... Kutscher* (above §211), pp. 181–188 (Hebrew with English summary). — O.S.]

5. *Stems.* §425. The stems are also those of SBH, in addition to the Nit-

pa'el of MH (which should actually have been Nitpa'al as pointed out by Yalon, see §211) but the use differs somewhat from that of SBH.

IH has a tremendous number of verbs that appear not only in their original stems but also in stems other than those in which they occur in the classical sources. Also there is a large amount of denominative verbs (verbs created from nouns).

*α. Qal. §426.* Around a hundred years ago, the Qal was widely used (according to Sivan, more than 30% of all verbs), but it has acquired only a small number of newcomers, e.g., אָגַף 'to outflank' (denominative from אָגַף 'flank').

Some substandard forms are common in the Qal. Instead of הוּא יָשָׁן 'he is asleep', children say יוֹשֵׁן, on the pattern of כּוֹתֵב, etc. The second person plural perfect is pronounced שָׁמַרְתָּם instead of שָׁמַרְתֶּם (the first vowel remains and is not shortened), because of the other forms of the paradigm.

*β. Nif'al. §427.* This stem is employed to indicate perfective action (here IH has unwittingly reproduced the usage found in MH). e.g., שָׁכַב 'he was lying', נָשַׁבַּב 'he lay down' (see above §352). Besides, the Nif'al serves mainly as the passive of the Qal.

*γ. Pi'el. §428.* The Pi'el has made tremendous headway, and in its wake also the Pu'al and Hitpa'el. This stem has attracted the highest percentage of new material (according to Sivan more than 30%). The reason is that the Pi'el (and also the Pu'al and Hitpa'el) can easily be formed not only from tri-literal, but also from quadri- and exceptionally from quinque-literal roots. Therefore, we find, e.g., כָּבַד 'to stamp' (from כּוּל 'stamp') and even מָקַשׁ 'to mine' (from מוֹקֵשׁ 'mine'; root יקש) where the original derivational prefix is treated as if it were part and parcel of the root. This occasionally happens also in MH, e.g., תָּרוּם 'to separate the priestly gift' (today 'to contribute') from תְּרוּמָה 'the priestly gift', from the Hif'il of רוּם 'to lift'. Examples of quadri-literal roots are: אֶרְגַּן 'to organize' from אֶרְגוּן (a loan from English *organization*); תְּדַרְךָ 'to brief' from תְּדַרְךָ 'briefing' (<תְּדַרְךָ 'to instruct'), where the *taw* became part of the root. A derivational suffix is treated as a root consonant in cases like הִנְחִינֵנוּ 'to present' (as by a model) from הַנְּחָנִית '(girl) model' (<the MH Greek loan הַנְּחָנִית). The quinque-literal verb טֵלְגַרַּף (from *telegraph*) is a special case.

ד. *Pi'el*. §429. (with the reduplication of the third root consonant) deserves special attention. It is employed in cases where the simple Pi'el would be awkward, e.g., אָוַר 'to air' as אָוַר\* would be homophonous with עָוַר 'to blind'. Sometimes it is employed in order to modify the meaning of the simple root, e.g., צַחֵק 'to giggle' (צַחֵק = 'to laugh, jest' etc.). 'to flirt' — a quinque-literal root (from English *flirt!*) is, like טַלְגֵּרֶה, a special case (cf. above §§365, 428).

ה. *Pu'al*. §430. This stem serves mainly as the passive of the Pi'el but in the פ"נ verbs it is occasionally employed as the passive of the Qal, e.g., נָטַשׁ 'he was abandoned' (see at length above §§381, 402).

ז. *Hif'il and Hof'al*. §431. Hif'il and its passive Hof'al have also attracted a host of new roots. As mentioned above (§415) in verbs whose first root consonant is [n], the [n] is not assimilated in new formations or new meanings. Therefore from the root נגד, for example, we find both the old form הִגִּד (from BH) 'to say' and the new formation הִנְגִּד 'to contrast', from נִגְד 'opposite'.

Here, too as in the Pi'el, the root employed might contain a consonant which was originally a derivational prefix, although this is possible only in cases where the root so created is tri-literal, e.g., הִתְחַנֵּץ 'to start (a car)' from תְּחַנֵּץ 'movement' (root נוּע).

ח. *Hitpa'el*. §432. This stem, too, has attracted quite a few newcomers. Besides indicating reflexive and sometimes passive action, it is employed, like the Nif'al, to indicate perfective action, e.g., יָשׁוּב 'to be sitting' but הִתְיָשַׁב 'to sit down' (cf. above §352) although it is sometimes difficult to pinpoint the difference between the Hitpa'el and the active stems; cf. הִזְדַּחַל 'to crawl, to go very slowly'.

ט. *Nitpa'el*. §433. The Nitpa'el has a passive meaning, and it occurs in the perfect only (the imperfect being created from the *Hitpa'el*), e.g., נִתְבַּקֵּשׁ 'was asked'.

In IH much more than in BH and MH, it would be difficult to discover the original meanings ascribed to the stems in BH, for the usage is already lexicalized to a large extent.

III. *The Verbal Systems (Tenses, Moods, and Aspects)*a. *Tenses*

§434. IH has four tenses, three simple tenses and one compound tense. They are the perfect, the imperfect, the participle, and the active participle + the auxiliary verb הָיָה. The perfect is used to denote the past, paralleling the English past (preterit), perfect, and past perfect, and (as in English) after כְּאִלּוּ 'as if', לוֹ, אִלּוּ, 'if', לוֹלָא 'if not' (contrary to the facts), הִלְנָאִי 'I wish'.

*Literature:*

[For §§434-441: Rosén, *Contemporary Hebrew*, pp. 179-205. — O.S.]

1. *The Participle Plus Auxiliary.* §435. The participle + auxiliary הָיָה is used as an indication of time referring to the past, to indicate habitualness, e.g., בְּשָׁנָה שֶׁעָבְרָה הָיָה בָּא לְעֵתִים, 'last year he used to come occasionally'. Often to stress habitualness, the verb נָהוּג in the participle is added, the main verb appearing as infinitive + ל הָיָה נוֹהֵג לְבוֹא: לְהֵיבֹא. Certain imperfect verbs whose masc. sing. active participle of the Qal is identical with the perfect, employ this tense instead of the perfect, e.g., הָיָה גָּר 'he lived', הָיָה לָכַל 'he could' (cf. §381). The same applies to certain imperfect verbs in the Nif'al for the same reason, e.g., הָיָה נִחְשָׁב 'was considered' (instead of נִחְשָׁב), but cf. הָיָה נִרְאָה 'it seemed' vs. נִרְאָה 'was seen' (see also above §407). It is also employed to indicate an imagined event whose occurrence is precluded, e.g., בְּמִקּוֹמְךָ לֹא הָיִיתִי אוֹמֵר כֵּן 'in your place, I would not say so'. It is also used in sentences starting with לוֹ, אִלּוּ to express non-actuality in the last part of the sentence: אִלּוּ בָּאתִי אֵלֶיךָ מָה הָיִיתָ עוֹשֶׂה? 'if I came to you, what would you have done?'.

2. *The Active Participle.* §436. The active participle is employed to indicate the present. It parallels the English simple present ('the sun shines'), present progressive ('the sun is shining'), present perfect progressive: אֲנִי גֹר 'I have been living in Jerusalem for ten years', and also as a future tense when it is indicated: אֲנִי בָּא מָחָר 'I am coming tomorrow'. The active participle is also used as a noun.

3. *The Imperfect.* §437. The imperfect is employed to describe events, as well as in conditional sentences after אִם 'if' (but not after לוֹ, אִלּוּ which

take the perfect), after אולי (indicating hesitation) = English ‘may’, and in relative clauses after ׀־שׁ and ׀־י. It is also used to express desire, command etc. (= cohortative, imperative and jussive of BH), e.g., נְחַכְּהָ ‘let us wait’, תִּרְאֶה ‘see’ and in the third pers. sing. masc. יֵלֶךְ ‘he shall go’, (but instead of it also שְׁיֵלֶךְ ‘he shall go, let him go’). Note: שָׁאַשְׁלֵם? ‘should I pay?’

Occasionally the imperfect is used to indicate habitual action as in BH, e.g., יבִּגְּס לְאוֹלָם ... יִגִּיעַ לְמָקוֹם... מוֹנִית תָּבוֹא בְּשָׂמוֹנָה... ‘a taxi would come at eight... (he) would arrive at the place... (he) would enter the hall...’ (S. Keshet, *Ha'arezt* Supplement, May 26, 1967, p. 10). It seems to me that this usage does not go back to BH but has invaded journalese from English (e.g., *he would sit for hours without saying a word*).

#### 4. Negation. §438. Negation is indicated by לא except

1) when the participle with אין is used, e.g., אֲנִי לֹא רוֹצֶה / אֲיַנְנִי רוֹצֶה ‘I don’t want’;

2) with the first pers. pl. of the imperfect used to express desire, e.g., נְחַכְּהָ אֲלֹ ‘let us not wait’ (while לֹא נְחַכְּהָ = ‘we shall not wait’; נְחַכְּהָ is ambiguous!);

3) with the negated imperative and jussive (second and third pers. imperfect), where אֲלֹ is also used: אֲלֹ תֵלֶךְ ‘don’t go’, אֲלֹ יֵלֶךְ ‘let him not go’.

This tense system, especially the use of the imperfect, does not seem to correspond to anything found in BH and MH (see §§66, 67, 218). Those who introduced it seem to have acted under the (mistaken) impression that it is MH. Is it possible that its foundations were laid during the Middle Ages?

The tense system of BH, especially the waw conversive, is used in children’s literature.

5. *The Imperative.* §439. It is not clear when the imperative is employed to express positive command and when the imperfect. According to Rosén, the imperfect is used if the imperative contains an inadmissible initial cluster, e.g., תִּרְשֵׁם ‘write down!’ instead of רִשְׁם [rəšom], but סָגַר [sgor] (admissible initial cluster) ‘shut!’.

#### *Literature:*

;219-216, 112-111 עמ' רוזן, העברית שלנו,

[Rosén, *Contemporary Hebrew*, pp. 198–200.]

6. *The Infinitive.* §440 The infinitive + ל is employed as the complement of a finite verb, e.g., אָנִי רוֹצֵה לְיָצֵאת 'I want to leave'; after נָא (in writing) or בְּבִקְשָׁה (in speech), e.g., נָא לְצַלֵּץ בְּפִעְמוֹן 'Please ring the bell', בְּבִקְשָׁה לְשַׁלֵּם 'please pay'; after certain adjectives, e.g., קָל לְשָׁמֵעַ 'it is easy to hear'; and after צָרִיךְ, e.g., אַתָּה צָרִיךְ לַעֲבֹד 'you have to work'. In all these cases the object can be expressed by adding a pronominal suffix or a preposition + suffix, e.g., אַתָּה צָרִיךְ לְשָׁמֵר/לְשָׁמְרוֹ עָלָיו 'you have to watch him'. The infinitive + ל is also used as a command, generally one addressed to more than one person (e.g., by the teacher to the class): לְשֵׁתֵק 'keep quiet'. This is scarcely standard.

The infinitive is negated by לֹא; in general prohibition it is negated also by אֵין or אָסוּר, e.g., אָסוּר לְהִדְבִיק מוֹדָעוֹת 'Post no bills'.

The infinitive + ב is employed as a gerund (= English *-ing*), always with (subject) suffix, e.g., בְּצֵאתוֹ 'when leaving'. Occasionally it is used with other prepositions (and a noun instead of suffix), e.g., נִמְכַר סְחוּרָה מִהַפְתָּח הַחֲנוּת עַד הַסְגָּרָה 'we shall sell merchandise from the store's opening until its closing'.

7. *The Passive Participles.* §441. The passive participles of the Qal, Pu'al and Hof'al are employed mainly as stative passives, while the participles of the Nif'al and Hitpa'el denote action passive, e.g., הַבַּיִת סָגוּר 'the house is closed', הַבַּיִת נִסְגָּר 'the house is being closed', הָעִנְיָן מְסֻדָּר 'the matter is fixed', הָעִנְיָן מְסֻדָּר 'the matter is being fixed'. For lack of a special form, the Hof'al participle seems to be used also as an action passive, generally with הוֹלָךְ: הוֹלָכִים (וּ) מְעֻבְרִים 'the men are being transferred'.

Like any adjective, the stative passive can be related to past and future with the help of הָיָה. The Pu'al participle is employed with the meaning 'provided with, heaving' etc., e.g., מְצֻלָּם 'illustrated with photographs' and even where there is no active, e.g., מְמַשְׁקָף 'bespectacled' מִשְׁקָפִים from 'spectacles'.

The passive participle is sometimes used to indicate the state of the subject, which is the result of a past action: מְפֹסֵד 'loser', מְרִנָּח 'gainer'. This is the case with MH (and LBH) מְקַבֵּל אָנִי 'I have received' etc., above §218.

IV. *Word Formation*a. *The Noun*

§442. IH needed a large number of new nouns and all BH and MH noun types were utilized in this respect. Sivan may be right that there is a tendency to avoid noun patterns without a derivational prefix or suffix, since the spelling does not clearly indicate which pattern is intended (cf. above §388). This difficulty sometimes created double forms, e.g., the noun דגם 'model' which is sometimes pronounced דָּגַם and sometimes דִּגְמָ. Of course, this occasionally obtains in patterns with prefixes and suffixes as shown by nouns like מְסַפֵּר/מְסַפֶּרָה 'barbershop', מְדַרְבֵּר/מְדַרְבֶּרָה 'sidewalk'. IH is not adverse to using the same pattern in two dialectical forms, e.g., סְבִלָן 'patient' (adj.), סוֹבֵלָן 'tolerant' (see above §§213, 326) or הוֹדָאָה 'confession' and הוֹדִיָּה 'thanksgiving' (cf. §389).

There are about seventy noun patterns in BH and MH which are employed by IH. In addition there are a few new ones of foreign origin. A few other words of cognate meaning were patterned after תִּיאָטְרוֹן 'theater', בִּבְטָרוֹן 'puppet theater' etc., while the derivational suffix of קְבוּצָנִיק 'member of a kibbutz' is, as in American English *beatnik*, of Slavic origin (cf. above §349). The derivational suffix ית־ is widely used to create diminutives, e.g., כַּף 'spoon', כַּפִּית 'teaspoon'.

1. *The Construct State and the של-Construction.* §443. As in MH, both the construct state and the שֶׁל-construction are employed. Therefore, there are three ways to translate the phrase 'the (a) house of the teacher':

- 1) בֵּית (ה)מֹרֶה
- 2) בֵּית שֶׁל (ה)מֹרֶה and
- 3) בֵּיתוֹ שֶׁל הַמֹּרֶה.

It was again Rosén who pointed out that these three constructions are not exactly identical (cf. above §418). To be sure, the construct still dominates and occurs ten times more often than the של forms.

In compounds like בֵּית סֵפֶר 'school', בֵּית קְבָרוֹת 'cemetery' the construct is obligatory and cannot be replaced by the שֶׁל-construction. The same applies to compounds with בְּעֵל, בְּעֵלָה when it means 'one who has, (one) with, (one) of' (see above §355), e.g., עֲצָה זוֹ הִיא בְּעֵלֶת מִשְׁקָל רֵב 'this advice is of great weight'. It also holds good concerning compounds with חֵסֵר 'less', generally the opposite of the בְּעֵל-construction, e.g., חֵסֵר תְּקוּנָה 'hopeless'.

In the following two examples the choice of either construction is used



for differentiation: בְּקַבּוּק יַיִן = ‘a bottle of wine’ while בְּקַבּוּק שֶׁל יַיִן ‘a wine bottle’, בֵּית הָאִישׁ ‘the man’s house’ i.e. which he built, while שֶׁל הָאִישׁ ‘the house that belongs to the man’. Especially interesting is Rosén’s discovery that IH makes use of both constructions to avoid inherent ambiguity of the construct in cases like אִם אֶהְבֶּת אִם i.e. where the first noun is a verbal substantive. This phrase could mean ‘mother’s love’ (the mother being the lover) or ‘love of’ (mother being the beloved). Therefore it seems to me that in the construct (at least in many cases), the following way was found to circumvent the ambiguity, e.g., בְּחִירַת הַכְּנֶסֶת means ‘the election of the Knesset’ (Israeli Parliament), the Knesset being the elected, while הַבְּחִירָה שֶׁל הַכְּנֶסֶת – ‘the election (say, of a chairman) by the Knesset’. As in MH, foreign loans are generally used with the שֶׁל–construction, e.g., הַקּוּרְסָה שֶׁל הַמּוֹרֶה ‘the teacher’s course’.

The שֶׁל–constructions are also preferred when an adjective follows. This is especially so in cases where both nouns agree in gender and number, e.g. בֶּן הַשָּׂכֵן הַטוֹב where it is impossible to establish what the immediate constituents are, i.e. whether טוֹב ‘good’ refers to בֶּן ‘son’ or to שָׂכֵן ‘neighbor’. The שֶׁל–constructions הַבֶּן/בָּנוּ שֶׁל הַשָּׂכֵן and הַשָּׂכֵן שֶׁל הַבֶּן/בָּנוּ solve this problem.

### Literature:

רוזן, עברית טובה<sup>3</sup>, עמ' 125–193.

2. *Apposition*. §444. The apposition precedes the proper noun, e.g., אִשְׁתּוֹ הַנְּבִיאָה יִשְׁעִיָּהוּ ‘his wife Bath-sheva’ as against אִשְׁתּוֹ בַּת-שֶׁבַע in BH; הַנְּבִיאָה יִשְׁעִיָּהוּ ‘the Prophet Isaiah’ as against הַנְּבִיאָה יִשְׁעִיָּהוּ in BH, see above §350.

### b. Adjectival Forms

§445. *qatī:l* pattern is widely employed to create adjectives that parallel English adjectives with the ending *-able*, e.g., שֶׁבִיר ‘breakable’ (cf. above §338).

IH very widely employs adjectives with the derivational suffix יִ not only from nouns, e.g., חֶלְקִי ‘partial’ (חֶלֶק = ‘part’) but also from adverbs and adverbial phrases, e.g., מִמָּשִׁי ‘tangible, factual’ (מִמָּשׁ = ‘really, reality’) עַדְכֵּנִי ‘up to date’ (עַד כֵּן = ‘up until now’). Most of the adjectives can be negated by the prefix בְּלִתי (see above §363) which can take the article הַ (הַ) בְּלִתי ‘(the) impossible’, הַ (הַ) בְּלִתי מְתָאִים ‘(the) unsuitable’.

A true creation of IH is adjectives derived from compound expressions.

The first member of the compound is mainly of non-Hebrew origin (Aramaic, Greek or Latin), while the second member is an adjective with the ך suffix (see above §334). They are mainly of three types:

1) The first member is a quantative expression: חד 'one' (A), e.g., חד־צדדי 'one-sided'; בי 'bi-' (a Greek loan in MH), e.g., די־לשוני 'bilingual'; תלת 'tri-' (A), e.g., תלת־שנתי 'triennial'; כלל 'pan-' (A>MH), e.g., כלל־אירופי 'Pan-European'; רב 'multi-' (H), e.g., רב־חלקי 'manyfold'.

2) The first member is a preposition: פרו 'pro' (Latin), e.g., פרו־אנגלי 'pro-English'; אנטי 'anti-' (Latin), e.g., אנטי־שמי 'antisemite'; על 'super-' (H), e.g., על־טבעי 'supernatural'; תת 'sub-' (A), e.g., תת־הכרתי 'subconscious'; בין 'inter-' (H), e.g., בין־לאומי 'international'; טרום 'pre-' (H, new creation), e.g., טרום־מלחמתי 'prewar', קדם 'pre-' (A) = טרום; בחר; post-' (A) e.g., בחר־מקראי 'post-Biblical'.

3) The first member is the name of a cardinal point, as מרכז 'center', דרום 'south', e.g., דרום־אמריקאי 'South American'. (Cf. also §363).

### c. Adverbs

§446. Since both BH and MH lack adverbs which in English are easily created from adjectives (e.g., *easy* — *easily*), IH resorted to various means to fill the void. Very often nouns with prepositions are used, e.g., בקלות 'easily' (= 'with ease') as in BH and MH. Sometimes, strangely enough, this is done even in cases where Hebrew does have an adverb; instead of פתאום 'suddenly', בפתאומיות might be employed (by suffixing ית which turns it into an adjective and adding ות to it which turns it into a noun, and again, by prefixing ב), e.g., מת בפתאומיות 'he died suddenly'. The feminine adjective with the ending ית often functions as an adverb, e.g., רשמית 'officially' as does the feminine plural adjective e.g., ארככות 'at length'.

The employment of אפן 'manner' + ב before an adjective in adverbial usage is very common; instead of חפשיית 'freely' one may say באפן חפשי.

### d. Prepositions

§447. Prepositions are both BH and MH. According to Rosén, "when ל is not a governed case prefix, it is replaced... by the corresponding form of א" e.g., טלפנתי אל הדוד 'I telephoned the uncle' but טלפנתי אליו 'I telephoned him', as against את הספור לילד/לו 'I tell the child/him the story'. About מאתנו replacing ממנו see above §407.

### Literature:

רוזן, עברית טובה<sup>3</sup>, עמ' 116-119.

V. *Special Languages in Israeli Hebrew*

§448. There are no geographical dialects in IH but there exist special languages such as children's languages, slang and argot.

*Literature:*

[For dialectal forms of the Galilee at the beginning of the century see A. Bar-Adon, *The Rise and Decline of a Dialect*, The Hague and Paris 1975. — O.S.]

a. *Children's Language*

§449. פיל [fill], a back formation from English *film* which was interpreted by children as a noun with a plural ending ים—belongs to this category. *Concert* was pronounced = קונצֶרֶת, in accordance with the ת־ pattern of the fem. participle (e.g., בוגֶרֶת 'graduate') and so the plural קונצרות came into being.

*Literature:*

[A. Bar-Adon, *Children's Hebrew in Israel*, Ph.D. dissertation, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1959 (Hebrew);

.א. בר-אדון, לשוננו לעם יד (תשכ"ג), עמ' 21-28; יח (תשכ"ז), עמ' 35-63, 96. — O.S.]

b. *Slang*

§450. The reasons for the development of slang in IH are the same as in other languages: the simple pleasure of new creations. These are the results of various processes, such as abbreviations: נֶמֶר ('leopard') which stands for נודניק ממדרגה ראשונה 'a nuisance of the first class', וּבֶשׁ which stands for זו הבֶּעִיָּה שֶׁלוֹ 'that's his problem' (which occurs also with the possessive suffix, e.g., וּבֶשְׁךָ 'that's your problem'); emphasis: עֲצוּם, עוֹלָמִי, פְּנִטְסָטִי and the German-Yiddish אֵיזֶן (*Eisen* = 'iron'), all expressing enthusiastic approval, 'excellent' etc.; euphemisms: הֵלֵךְ 'he went' = 'he died', עֲזָרָה שְׁלִישִׁית 'third aid' = 'toilet paper'; loan translations: סִדְרָתִי אוֹתוֹ 'I fixed him', עַל הַלְבָּה 'in true form' (= German *auf der Hohe*).

Many slang words and expressions are of foreign origin, such as Arabic (see §345, where all words adduced, except וּמְיוֹם are slang), Yiddish (נֶדְנֵד see §§352, 354, 358, 359), English (פְּלֶרְטֵט etc., §365), Russian (בְּלֶגֶן §368) and others.

*Literature:*

ר. ספן, דרכי הסלנג, ירושלים 1963, עמ' 15-16;

י. שלו, לשוננו לעם כה (תשל"ד), עמ' 61-79. — O.S.

D. Ben-Amotz and N. Ben-Yehuda, *The World Dictionary of Hebrew Slang*, Jerusalem 1972 (Hebrew);

ר. ספן, מילון הסלנג הישראלי, ירושלים 1965.]

*c. Argot*

§451. Little research has been done in the field of professional languages. The language of fisherman and sailors has been found to contain words from all the languages employed in the Mediterranean. Besides Hebrew (incidentally, this is the case concerning all the languages of this territory) standard and substandard, there are words from Arabic, Turkish, Italian, French, German, Greek, English and even of Maltese origin.

*Literature:*

ש. מורג, ר. ספן, לשוננו לא (תשכ"ז), עמ' 289-298; לב (תשכ"ח), עמ' 308-325. — O.S.]

*d. The Hebrew of the Synagogue*

§452. IH serves all Hebrew speaking Jews (and Arabs) of Israel both as their spoken and written language. But this does not apply to the language of the synagogue. Especially in the case of the older generation all the different pronunciations from countries of Europe, Asia and Africa are still heard. Ashkenazic Jews, especially those who are close to the old *yishuv*, but also others of the older generation still pray with Ashkenazic pronunciation. The Ashkenazic pronunciation itself is not uniform, the main difference being in the Hebrew of the Jews of German, Hungarian, Polish and Lithuanian origin. As a common denominator we could mention the pronunciation of the ח, ע, as ['] and [x], of the ה without *dagesh* as [s] and the *qameš* as [o] or [u]. (see §373). But as for the other vowels, /o:/ is pronounced as a diphthong of various kinds, e.g., [oi, au, ei] (cf. §263).

There is also the so-called Sephardic pronunciation. But here again, that of the Sephardim coming from Europe (e.g., Netherlands, the Balkans) differs from that of the Sephardim coming from Arabic speaking countries. Among the Europeans, the Italians lost their /h/; the pharyngals are not pronounced (or at least not according to the original pronunciation). /š/ might be pronounced [s], e.g., [kadis] = Kadish 'mourner's prayer'

(see above §§23, 263). Jews coming from Arabic speaking countries have preserved the pharyngals but often have difficulties in pronouncing /p/ since this phoneme is lacking in Arabic. Only the Yemenites have kept the pronunciation of BH phonemes distinct and they are the only ones who preserved the double pronunciation of /b, g, d, k, p, t/. (Other Jewish communities have preserved only some of these phonemes, for example the Sephardic pronunciation of /b, k, p/.)

This does not mean, however, that the Yemenites preserved the old pronunciation in every respect; for example, ג ( *gimel* with *dagesh* ) is pronounced [ğ]. But the Yemenites have preserved the original MH much better than other communities. One interesting instance is, that contrary to other communities, they did not separate של from the following noun as in MH (see above §216).

Persian Jews have a pronunciation of their own which consists of four different types. Except for the Hebrew of the Yemenites, much research remains to be done in this field.

#### *Literature:*

ש. מורג, העברית שבפי יהודי תימן, ירושלים תשכ"ג;

[Sh. Morag, "Pronunciations of Hebrew", *EJ* 13, cols. 1120–1145. — O.S.]

## F. Israeli Hebrew from the Revival to the Present

### I. *The Expansion of Spoken Israeli Hebrew*

§453. While Hebrew was already widely used in writing, no real attempt was made to turn it into a spoken language in Europe. This possibility was ruled out expressly even by some Hebrew writers (cf. §§307, 311). The turning point came with the immigration of Eliezer Ben Yehuda to Palestine in 1881. Prompted by nationalistic impulses, he demanded that Hebrew be introduced as a spoken language. His children were brought up speaking Hebrew, and little by little he and his circle of friends, J.M. Pines, David Yellin and others, were able to enlarge the number of families that followed Ben Yehuda, both in Jerusalem and the Jewish agricultural "colonies" that had existed then for several years. In Jerusalem itself, the

inhabitants of the old communities (Old *Yishuv*) consisting of religious Jews, especially those of Ashkenazic origin who were opposed to all change in the field of education, continued to employ Yiddish in their *heder's* (elementary schools of the old type) and *yeshivot* (Talmudical academies), and were strongly opposed to Ben Yehuda who was non-observant.

Spoken Hebrew gained a new lease on life thanks to the so-called Second Aliyah (1905) that brought young *halutzim* ('pioneers') from Russia eager for social, nationalistic, and linguistic reform.

Ben Yehuda founded the Hebrew Language Committee whose chief aim was to supply the budding language with badly needed terms in all areas of modern life. The members of the committee were writers living in Palestine. The new terms created by this committee were employed in teaching in the kindergartens, elementary schools, high schools and teachers' seminaries that had been established over the years, sometimes in the face of strong opposition on the part of the European Jewish organizations which supported these schools. In 1914, a strike against the schools of Ezra, a German organization, marked the turning point at which spoken Hebrew gained a much surer foothold in education.

According to a writer now living in Israel, in 1914 at the outbreak of World War I, there were three to four hundred Jewish families who spoke Hebrew. But statistics show a different story. As Bacchi has shown, among the 85,000 Jews living in Palestine at that time, 25,000 spoke Hebrew. It is significant that in the agricultural settlements and towns, where the new immigrant element was strong, 75% were Hebrew speaking. In the cities of Jerusalem, Hebron, etc. with predominately Old *Yishuv* inhabitants, only 5% were Hebrew speaking. It is also interesting to note that 60% of the inhabitants of Ashkenazic origin, and more than 60% of the Yemenites spoke Hebrew, but the percentage was much lower in other Sephardic communities speaking Ladino and Arabic. Herbert Samuel, the then (Jewish) High Commissioner of Palestine under the British Mandate, put Hebrew on an equal footing with English and Arabic as the official languages of the country. It took several years — nearly until the very end of the Mandate in 1948 — to put this law into practice through the government bureaucracy, but the outcome was never in doubt. New tides of immigration during the twenties and thirties, and since the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948, brought masses of non-Hebrew-speaking Jews. While the older generation very often persisted in employing the native

language, the younger generation was brought up on Hebrew, and it has become the language of the Jews of Israel as much as English is the language of Americans. As in America, the pockets of the older generation still employing other languages as colloquial are shrinking.

*Literature:*

- [R.A. Bachi, "A Statistical Analysis of the Revival of Hebrew in Israel", *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 3 (1955), pp. 179–247;  
U.O. Schmelz and R. Bachi, *Lešonenu* 37 (1972–73), pp. 50–68, 187–201 (Hebrew with English summary). — O.S.]

## II. Contributions by Individuals and Organizations

### a. Writers

§454. Hebrew writers contributed heavily to the process of reviving and enlarging the vocabulary of IH. H.N. Bialik was perhaps the most outstanding example among them. It is still too early to assess the contribution of the younger generation of writers

### b. Translators

§455. Translators were often in the forefront of revivers, since they could not afford to evade the problems of vocabulary. The translations of Abraham Shlonsky (Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, de Coster's *Tyl Ulenspiegel* etc.) are a model of ingenious solutions.

But it is the journalist who bears the brunt of the onslaught of new foreign terms. When translating telegrams for the morning edition, there is little time for consulting either the Academy of the Hebrew Language (below §459) or a scholar. The number of new words and terms coined this way, on the spur of the moment, is considerable and of course, this channel of enlarging Hebrew is still very active. To mention a few, the verbs נָחַת 'to land' and פָּלַשׁ 'to invade' came into use with these meanings a few decades ago, with D. Pines.

### c. Other Contributors

§456. Some political personalities showed a great interest in creating new terms. Against the background of occasional border clashes, M. Sharett, the first Foreign Minister of Israel, coined the term תְּקֵרִית (גְּבוּל) 'border clash'.

'(border) incident'. D. Remez, the first Minister of Transportation, coined the word מוֹנִיחַ 'taxi' (cf. also above §404).

In various departments of the Israeli Government, and in other organizations which produce a great amount of publications, quite a few people find the creation of new words and phrases an exciting pastime.

#### d. Newspapers

§457. Some newspapers run a regular column devoted to the Hebrew language. The editors of these columns deal mainly with the normative aspect of the language. That is, they try to eliminate what they consider to be mistakes. But, since the various editors represent different schools of thought, their decisions sometimes clash, and may also be opposed to the decisions of the Va'ad Halashon (above §314) or, later, of the Academy of the Hebrew Language (below §459).

#### c. The Army

§458. The Hagana (and to a lesser degree, the other two underground organizations, Etzel and Lehi), and since 1948 the Israel Defense Forces, have been very active in creating technical terms in the military sphere. They, too, could not wait for the sometimes longwinded deliberations of the Va'ad Halashon (and later the Academy). Thus, military terms were coined that sometimes look a bit strange. One such term is סָמָל 'non-commissioned officer', an acronym of סָגֵן מַחוּרָג לַמַּנִּיחַ which is a replica (in bad Hebrew) of the English expression.

#### Literature:

.קוטשר, מלים ותולדותיהן, עמ' 72, 116.

### III. The Academy of the Hebrew Language

§459. The Va'ad Halashon, founded by Ben Yehuda in 1890 (above §314), became under Israeli law the Academy of the Hebrew Language in 1953. Its purpose, as laid down by the Act which created it, is "to guide the development of the Hebrew language, on the basis of research into its different periods and branches." The Act also provides that "decisions of the Academy in matters of grammar, spelling, terminology and transliteration, duly published in *Reshumot* [the official Israel Government gazette], shall



be binding on educational and scientific bodies, on the Government, its departments and institutions and on local authorities." This provision, however, is not strictly applied. This is why the editors of Language columns in daily newspapers (above §457) sometimes disregard the decisions of the Academy.

There are a maximum of twenty-three full members and twenty-three associate members. The Academy's main function is the creation of technical terms. Two to three members of the different subcommittees sit down together with specialists in such fields as geography, mathematics, economics etc., and create new words or decide to accept terms that were already in use. The work of the Committee for *Grammār*, composed only or mainly of members of the Academy, is closer to the aims of the Academy as set forth above. This committee is divided into two subcommittees, one of which deals systematically with fundamental problems of Hebrew grammar, while the other subcommittee answers questions directed to it by individuals in government offices, the radio, etc. Another committee is trying to solve the problem of the orthography.

#### *Literature:*

[The Act of the Academy of the Hebrew Language was published in *Lešonenu* 19 (1954–55), pp. 5 to 10. — O.S.]

For a brief history of the Academy, its activities and publications see M. Medan, "The Academy of the Hebrew Language", *Ariel* no. 25, pp. 40–47.]

*a. The Problem of IH Spelling.* §460. While BH spelling is plene mostly for long vowels, MH spelling tends to be plene even for short vowels. IH is close in this respect to MH, but even this plene spelling is very far from a complete solution to the spelling problem. The same sign must be employed for several vowels, *waw* for /u/ and /o/, and *yod* for /i/, /e/ and /ε/. In addition, these two signs have to do service as consonants. There is no special sign to indicate the vowel /a/.

Some time ago one of the committees of the Academy suggested the revolutionary solution of introducing new signs for various vowels. The proposal was overwhelmingly rejected in accordance with the Academy's belief that no new rules can be set which are opposed to those employed by the primary sources, BH and MH. Since any change of spelling in these sources is out of the question, and since these sources represent a

vital part of the syllabus of the primary and secondary schools and the universities, any revolutionary change in IH would only complicate matters by adding a new system of spelling to the old one that cannot be abolished.

The Academy has yet to approach the problem of IH as such (see above §407), for the Academy is composed mainly of conservative purists who are decidedly unenthusiastic about the new entity of IH. The moderates of the Academy are willing to acknowledge as genuine those traits of IH that can somehow be traced back to the original layers of IH, but they are intolerant of innovations of IH that go back to foreign influences which are bound to strengthen the non-Semitic character of IH.

### G. Hebrew in Contemporary Jewish and Non-Jewish Languages

[In contrast with section G of Chapter Seven (§§285-304), the subject of section G of Chapter Eight (§§462-508) is the Hebrew material documented in post-medieval sources, up to the present, and as the reader will see, parts of the discussion are based on the analysis of live Jewish dialects. It is possible, of course, that the origin of some of this material is medieval. — R.K.]

**§461.** Although the most important Jewish language is Yiddish, there are scarcely any Jewish languages that do not contain Hebrew elements. Yiddish also served as a channel through which Hebrew words entered non-Jewish European languages.

#### I. Hebrew in Yiddish

##### a. Dialects of Yiddish

**§462.** Spoken Yiddish can be roughly divided into two main dialects — Western Yiddish, prevailing west of the German-Polish frontier of 1939, and Eastern Yiddish, east of that line. The latter comprises three sub-dialects — Lithuanian (northeastern), Ukrainian (southeastern) and Polish (central) Yiddish. These dialects differ from each other mainly in the realization of the vowels and to a certain extent in morphology and vocabulary.

The Hebrew component in Yiddish differs between these dialects in all three linguistic fields mentioned. A word may appear in different forms, e.g., *nəḏán*, *nádn*, *nódn*, *nadínya*, all from the Hebrew (-Aramaic) נְדוּנָה 'dowry'. Different Hebrew words may be employed for the same thing, e.g., סְדוּר or תְּפִלָּה 'a prayer book'.

*Literature:*

Uriel Weinreich, *College Yiddish*<sup>4</sup>, New York 1965, p. 43;

.63, 58 אוריאל וויינרײך, לשוננו כה (חשכ"א), עמ' 58, 63

*b. The Role of Hebrew; "Whole Hebrew" and "Merged Hebrew"*

§463. Hebrew plays a very important role in Yiddish, especially in phonology, morphology and vocabulary.

Yiddish has drawn its Hebrew elements from practically all strata of Hebrew—BH, MH, Medieval Hebrew, and from Aramaic. Especially remarkable is the fact that Hebrew elements in Yiddish lead a life of their own and so have given rise to quite a few new Hebrew words and phrases, some of which even found their way back into IH although they do not occur in any written Hebrew documents. Even those elements which Yiddish took over from Hebrew directly were not accepted in their "proper" Hebrew form (or "whole" Hebrew, as M. Weinreich terms it), but in a more popular form which Weinreich calls "merged" Hebrew. For example: A person reciting the Grace after Meals will say "May the Allmerciful bless *bal ha-bayis*" (בְּעַל הַבַּיִת) 'the head of the household', but he will say something like *balbus* in his spoken Yiddish. It sometimes happens that certain sound changes that took place in Yiddish and Hebrew elements did not effect the "whole Hebrew", e.g., in Bessarabia שָׁבַח is pronounced *šobəs*, but in the prayer the old *šabəs* survived. And lastly, there is a reason to believe that forms which disappeared from MH during the last thousand years, survived in Yiddish, e.g., מִמָּה וּנְפִשָּׁךְ 'either way' (cf. above §360).

The Hebrew component of Yiddish started losing ground in Soviet Russia, where the spelling of Hebrew elements was de-Hebraized, e.g., אֱמֶת 'truth' > עמעס. The Yiddish scholar N. Shtif considered this a positive development. After breaking down the Hebrew component in Yiddish into 3820 words from 930 roots, Shtif classified them according to semantic fields (religion, work, etc.) and concluded that fully one third of the Hebrew words belong to the religio-social domain. (A similar study was made by C.S. Kazdan.) Shtif claimed that because the Hebrew words in this

category had been originated by the socio-economically dominant classes, these words were being rejected by the working class. Of course, this inimical attitude to the Hebrew component of Yiddish did not go uncontested even in Russia, as shown by Spivak's article. The opposing view is that, as M. Weinreich points out, without the Hebrew-Aramaic element Yiddish would not have existed.

### Literature:

- ג. שטיף, די סאציאלע דיפערענציאציע אין יידיש, יידישע שפראך (קיעוו) 3 (1929), עמ' 1 ואילך;  
 ח.ש. קאזדאן, וועגן פארשידענע גרופעס העברעיזמען, יידישע שפראך (ניו יארק) XX (1960), עמ' 33 ואילך;  
 ע. ספיוואק, אפן שפראכפראנט (קיעוו) זאמלונג 2 (1935), עמ' 3 ואילך;  
 מ. ווינרייך, די צוקונפט XXXVI (1931);  
 ג. שטיף, אפן שפראכפראנט 1931, עמ' 33 (contra Weinreich); 1932, עמ' 11.

### c. Grammatical and Lexical Survey

#### 1. Phonology

α. *Consonants*. §464 It can be stated, in general, that only those consonantal phonemes that exist in the non-Hebrew component of Yiddish exist in Yiddish itself. Therefore, all others have disappeared (cf. above §261): א, ע = zero; ח = כ (without *dagesh*); ק = כ; ט = ת; ו = ב (without *dagesh*); צ = [c] (a consonant close to [ts]); ת (without *dagesh*) = ס [s]. Locally a few other differences occur, such as the hesitation in pronunciation of ט and ש of Lithuanian Jews as in *sabesdiker losn* = *šabəsdiker lošn* (cf. above §§23, 262).

β. *Vowels*. §465. The dialects differ from each other mainly in the vowels. *Qames* (*gadol*) is pronounced [o] or [u] in different dialects. *Holem* (1) is pronounced as a diphthong [au] in Western Yiddish (*šaumer* = שוּמֶר), as [ei] in Northeastern Yiddish (*šeimer*), and as [oy] in Southeastern Yiddish (*šoymer*). In the latter dialect short /u/ is pronounced [i] (cf. §474). *Šere* and *segol* are kept apart (closed [e] and open [ɛ] respectively) and in some places in Poland *šere* was pronounced as a diphthong [ay], e.g., *sayfər* = סִפֶּר 'book'.

It should be noted that under certain conditions *holem* remained [o] as in

*os* = אָו 'letter (of the alphabet)', or became [u] as in *zu* = זױ (< זױ) 'this (fcm.)'. Apparently quite a few cases of *qameṣ* survived with the pronunciation [a], as in *yam* = יָם 'sea', *klal* = כָּלָל 'rule' (see above §264). On the other hand, sometimes even an original *pataḥ* or *ḥataf-pataḥ* turned into [o] or [u] as if it were a *qameṣ*, e.g., *xuləm* = חֻלָּם 'dream'. *Pataḥ* and *ḥataf-pataḥ* (with *alef* or 'ayin) were sometimes nasalized, as in *Yankev* = יַעֲקֹב 'Jacob'.

### Literature:

[Sh. Morag, *EJ* 13, cols. 1126–1130. — O.S.]

γ. *Stress*. §466. The stress falls on the penultima (cf. above § 348). It is possible that this goes back to MH, but this requires further clarification. Sometimes it falls even on the ante-penultima, e.g., *múmanəs* = מְמוֹנָנוֹת 'finances'. The unstressed syllables are slurred over and may disappear in compounds, e.g., *škojəx* = יִשְׂרָאֵל, an Aramaic expression meaning 'be strong', today 'thanks', and *šalšudəs* = שְׁלוֹשׁ סְעוּדוֹת lit. 'three meals' referring to the third meal of the Sabbath.

## 2. Morphology

α. *The Verb*. §467. Sometimes a Yiddish verb is created from a Hebrew base with a German derivational suffix, e.g., *patern* from פִּטַּר 'to get rid of'. But the Hebrew element is also employed by creating periphrastic verbs:

1) In active and transitive meanings with the help of the Germanic auxiliary verbs *hobn* and *zayn* plus the Hebrew participle: *mxabed zayn* (from בָּבֵד) 'to honor'. In the past: *er hot mxabed geven* 'he has honored'.

2) In a medio-passive meaning, plus Germanic *vern* and participle: *nical vern* 'to be saved' (Hebrew הִנָּצַל). The two main dialects of Yiddish sometimes differ in this respect. For example, in Western Yiddish *xamec batln* 'search for the *ḥāmeṣ* (leavened bread) on the eve of Passover', is in Eastern Yiddish *bodek xamec zayn*. Besides the difference in verbs — בָּטַל 'to nullify' vs. בְּדוּק 'to search' — two different ways are employed to verbalize them in Yiddish.

β. *The Noun*. §468. It is in the domain of the noun that Yiddish has shown its creativity within the Hebrew component. A good example are creations with the noun בְּעָל 'owner' which in Yiddish has turned into a derivational

prefix indicating any connection with the following noun. To be sure, **בַּעַל** in BH and MH already indicates not only 'owner' but someone connected with the idea expressed by the following noun; the brothers of Joseph call him **בַּעַל הַחֲלוֹמוֹת** 'the dreamer' (Gen. 37, 18). But in Yiddish a host of nouns of the same pattern were created, e.g., **בַּעַל בְּטָחוֹן** (pronounced *bal bituxn*) 'a man of faith', **בַּעַל גְּאֹוָה** 'haughty man', **בַּעַל מוֹסָף** 'the man who leads the Musaf prayer'; **בַּעַל עֲגֵלָה** is not 'the owner of the wagon' but the 'teamster'. These creations sometimes managed to gain acceptance in IH, e.g., **בַּעַל גּוֹף** of Bialik (see above §355). Some creations of this type were not acceptable because **בַּעַל** seems practically superfluous, e.g., **בַּעַל מְחַבֵּר** 'author', **בַּעַל קוֹרָא** 'reader (of the weekly portion of the Torah)', and therefore IH prefers **קְרִיאָה** **בַּעַל** (also from Yiddish). Incidentally, sometimes **קוֹרָא** and **קְרִיאָה** merge to produce a new form *bal koreya*.

Similar to the case just discussed but much less developed are compounds with **מַעֲשֵׂה** 'story, occurrence' where it parallels the English derivational suffix *-like*, e.g., **מַעֲשֵׂה־רַב** 'rabbi-like' (as the behavior of a rabbi), **מַעֲשֵׂה־סוֹחֵר** 'merchant-like'. This reminds one of the IH **מַעֲשֵׂה־שָׂטָן** 'devil's work, as (bad) luck would have it'.

A second noun pattern that was extensively used in new creations is that of **וֵית** (pronounced [-es]), some of which were accepted by IH, e.g., **בוֹרְרוֹת** 'arbitration' from **בוֹרֵר** 'arbitrator' or **פְּשֻׁטוֹת** 'simplicity'.

A third, very active pattern is that with the ending **־ן** (pronounced [-en], e.g., **לְמַדָּן** 'knowledgeable, learned', **בְּדַחָן** 'jester'). Nouns were also created by adding the **וֵית** ending to this pattern, e.g., **בְּדַחְנוֹת** 'jesting'. Both patterns were accepted by IH.

A fourth pattern, the Hebrew fem. ending **־הַ** (pronounced [-e]) made headway into Yiddish: from **חַסִּיד** 'pious man', **חַסִּידָה** 'pious woman' (= 'stork' in BH), and from **פּוֹלִין** 'Polish nobleman', **פּוֹלִינָה** 'noblewoman' were formed. There are a few cases where the Aramaic fem. ending **־תָּא** (pronounced [-tæ]) is used, as in **כְּלַפְתֵּי** 'bitch' (derogatory), the fem. of Aramaic **כְּלָבָא** 'dog'.

Very interesting are back formations: from **שְׂמוֹת** (pl. of **שֵׁם**) 'names', but in Yiddish 'worn out pages (of sacred books)', a new singular **שְׂמַע** (*šeyme*) was created. Moreover, even from **מַחְלָקָה** 'quarrel' which was understood by speakers as a plural (since the unstressed syllable was slurred over) a new singular was created **מַחְלוּקָה**. Other noun patterns comprising a Hebrew base and a non-Hebrew derivational suffix are, e.g., **סִדְרֵי** 'prayer book' (= **סִדְרוֹר** + *-l*) **יִישְׁדִּיג** (**יִאֹוֶשׁ** 'despair' + Germanic *-dig*) 'desperate',

*balbatiš* (from *בַּיִת בַּעַל* ‘householder’) an adjective meaning ‘patrician’ or the like.

There are compounds composed of an Hebrew and non-Hebrew element, e.g., *dirgelt* ‘rent’ from Hebrew *דִּירָה* plus Germanic *gelt* ‘money’. In others both elements are Hebrew, but the compound itself is Yiddish, e.g., *Ester tonic* ‘fast of Esther’ (Hebrew *תַּעֲנִית אֶסְתֵּר*); cf. also above §356.

β<sup>1</sup>. *Construct State*. §469. The Hebrew construct remains only in compounds e.g., *בֵּית דִּין* ‘court of justice’. But elsewhere instead of the construct, the absolute form is employed, e.g., *מָקוֹם מְנוּחָה* (instead of *מְקוֹם־*) ‘place of rest’, *לְשׁוֹן קֹדֶשׁ* (instead of *לְשׁוֹן־*) ‘the holy language’.

β<sup>2</sup>. *The Plural*. §470. As in Hebrew, the plural suffixes are generally *ים* and *ות*. The former suffix has even penetrated non-Hebrew components, e.g., *poyerim* (=German *Bauer*) ‘farmers’ and even *narunəm* (German plural *Narren!*) ‘stupid’, where the Hebrew pl. suffix was added to the Germanic plural suffix. *רַבֵּי* ‘Hassidic rabbi’ has as its plural *rabonim*, *rabeyim* (Hebrew) and *rebes* (Yiddish). The mainly feminine plural ending *ות* (pronounced [-əs]) apparently merged with the European ending *-s*. Sometimes the *ים* ending is employed instead of *ות* as in *šabusim* ‘Sabbaths’ (Hebrew *שַׁבָּתוֹת*), and even in *tə’usim* ‘mistakes’, which preserved the Hebrew fem. ending *ות* of the singular (*טְעוּת*), although this ending is eliminated in the Hebrew plural *טְעוּיוֹת*, *טְעוּיוֹת* (and cf. above §214).

3. “*Yiddish Syntax Has a Hebrew Soul*” — *Unproven*. §471. Did Hebrew have any influence on Yiddish syntax? Could a dead language exercise influence on a living one? Y. Mark who devoted a special study to this problem believes it did. It may be remarked that the situation in the Turkic dialect of Karaite Jews would lend support to this theory (see below §490). Still, the points discussed by Mark seem to require further study, as he himself admits.

He believes that the inclination of Yiddish to coordinate sentences (unlike IH, which tends to subordinate them, as shown by Rosén) betrays classical Hebrew influence. This is also true of the word order *di kale daynə* ‘your bride’ (lit. ‘the bride yours’, instead of *daynə kale*) = Hebrew *הַכֵּלָה שְׁלֶךְ*. But, as Mark himself points out, this phenomenon is also found in Slavic. As to the fact that Lithuanian Yiddish possesses only masculine and feminine genders (but not the neutral), Mark later assumes

that Hebrew might have been only a minor factor in bringing about this situation, since it is found in neighboring languages (Lithuanian and White Russian).

The best illustration for Hebrew influence, according to Mark, is the relative clause of the type *der manš vos ix hob im gatrofn*, 'the man I met' = Hebrew (הָאָדָם אֲשֶׁר פָּגַשְׁתִּיו (פְּגִישְׁתִּי אוֹתוֹ). This is indeed a remarkable case. But I am very much in doubt whether he is right concerning the construction *lernən lern ix nixt*, 'as to learning — I do not' which he (and others!) trace back to the Hebrew construction of the type *אֶשְׂמֹר אֶשְׂמֹר* 'I shall indeed guard'. For one, in the Yiddish construction the infinitive is the logical subject, but not in Hebrew, where the infinitive is employed as an adverb. Secondly, this construction crops up very often in the same conditions in other languages, e.g. German, Italian and in the Aramaic of the Babylonian Talmud! Therefore his statement that "Yiddish syntax has a Hebrew soul" needs further proof.

#### Literature:

רוזן, העברית שלנו, עמ' 128-132;

[G. Goldenberg, "Tautological Infinitive", *Israel Oriental Studies* I (1971), pp. 36-85, — O.S.]

4. *Vocabulary*. §472. There are thousands of Hebrew words in Yiddish (see above §463). Y. Mark believes "that the total number of Hebraisms in Yiddish must be at least ten thousand and perhaps even twelve thousand." According to him the frequency of the Hebrew element in the Yiddish press ranges between 5.28% (Poland 1939) and 2.96% (Russia 1937-39). He also lists the 100 most frequent words, the first being *אָפּלוי* 'even' which apparently crops up in other Jewish languages (see below §§482, 503).

While there is no doubt that the Hebrew element is mainly to be found in the domain of religion and culture in general, as well as of occupations that often called for interference of the Jewish legal authorities, there is practically no sphere of life free from it (see above Shtif and Kazdan, §463).

Why did certain Hebrew elements gain entrance into Yiddish while others did not? Sometimes the reasons are clear: *לְכָנָה* 'moon' was accepted because the monthly *קדוּשׁ לְכָנָה* 'Blessing of the New Moon' is connected with it, but not with *שֶׁמֶשׁ* or *חַמָּה* 'sun'. *אָרוֹן* is the 'Holy Ark' or 'coffin' but not a simple 'cupboard'; *גַּן עֵדֶן* 'Paradise' but not *גַּן* 'garden'. The root *בטח* in different forms was used very much in legal contexts, but how did the nearly synonymous verb *הָאָמַן* gain acceptance? The same question can be



asked about many other verbs, nouns, adverbs and conjunctions. No doubt the widespread learning among Ashkenazic Jewry played an important role in “easing in” the Hebrew element.

It is beyond the scope of the present work to give a detailed evaluation of this extensive material according to semantic categories. A few instances which aim mainly at the Hebrew material that came into being in Yiddish itself (see above §468) or changed its meaning, will suffice.

*Euphemism*: בית החיים ‘cemetery’ (lit. ‘house of the living’) (also in Sephardic); *widening of meaning*: ערב ‘eve’, originally only of Sabbath and Holidays > ‘eve’ in general; *narrowing of meaning*: משקה, מבורד, see above §378, מתנגד originally ‘opponent’, later the opponents of Hassidism; *specification*: מכלה ‘finished’ > ‘bankrupt’; *contagion*: מומן, מומנים ‘ready (money)’ > ‘cash’ (cf. above §392); *from abstract to concrete*: מלכות not only ‘kingdom’ but also ‘king’.

The following case of *popular etymology* is interesting: Was it the name of Haman’s son (Esther 9, 7) which made נלפון ‘poor’ popular? It is explained as a Hebrew-German compound, namely, נל ‘poor’ + von added to aristocratic names such as *von Humboldt*. In German we find Baron von Habenichts (‘Baron of I-Have-Nothing’) of which נלפון could be a Yiddish rendering.

How difficult it is to disentangle the various Hebrew-Yiddish skeins that have turned into a perfect blend is shown by Sadan in the phrase *alter Terakh* = IH תרח וקן ‘old fool’. Is תרח Abraham’s father (Gen. 11, 26)? Or should the word be spelled with a *tet* as though coming from Hebrew טרח ‘burden’? Having shown that both explanations must have been at the back of the mind of those who used this Yiddish phrase, Sadan came to the conclusion that it goes back to the German component of Yiddish — *töricht* ‘foolish’ of Modern German, and is an allusion to Ecclesiastes 4,13 “Better is a poor and a wise child than an old and foolish king.”

A more interesting case is that of the name of the rabbi’s wife *rebecen*. Beranek has collected other forms found in western West-Yiddish, e.g. *rebbin*, *rebbeten*, *rebbecinte*, *rebeten*, *rabbucinderin* and even *rebbenen*, and a few more. Nearly all of these forms contain a Hebrew element (*rebbe*) a Germanic element *-in*, *-en* (which is the feminine morpheme, as in *Lehrerin* ‘woman-teacher’), some an Aramaic element *-te* (cf. above §468). But what kind of element is that containing [c]? J. Joffe thinks it is Slavic; M. Weinreich, Romance (also Y. Mark), while Beranek believes it to be a Hebrew feminine form \**rebbit*, though he has no source for this form. In-

terestingly enough, as David Cohen told me, in the Neo-Aramaic-speaking community of Kurdish Jews the Aramaic form *rubbisa* exists. The [s] > [c] change is attested in Romance Jewish. So we have a choice between four possibilities. To this feminine ending was added the Germanic feminine ending, and sometimes the same Aramaic ending in a different form (-*te*). It is believed that this ending influenced Zamenhof, the creator of Esperanto, to choose the suffix *-edzin* to denote a 'married woman'.

*Literature:*

ד. סדן, תרח זקן, לשוננו לעם קונטרס מג (תשי"ד), עמ' 12-16;

י. מ[ארק], יידישע שפראך XVIII (1958), 80-82;

מ. וויינרייך, אלגעמיינע ענציקלאפעדיע, יידן ב, 50-51.

*d. Hebrew in the Yiddish of Holland*

§473. The Hebrew component of the Yiddish of Holland deserves our special attention for several reasons. This dialect "occupied a position of unique importance... for in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries... (Holland)... functioned as the publishing center of translations into Yiddish... (and its)... vestiges are a goldmine of words and phrases which... have retained archaic forms." (Beem). This fact is apparently also traceable in its Hebrew component. Besides, its Hebrew component seems to be the best known among the Western Yiddish dialects, to which it belongs.

1. *Phonology*. §474. In this dialect, too, M. Weinreich's theory concerning "whole Hebrew" and "merged Hebrew" (see above §463) is confirmed. As De Vries notes, "the pronunciation of the Italian 'ayin as a kind of velar [n], (cf. *Yankev*, above §465) which became dominant in the Sephardic community and in the nineteenth century also in the Ashkenazic community (of Holland) did not exert any influence on the 'ayin in the Hebrew component of Yiddish."

On the other hand one peculiarity might strike us at first sight as being archaic. In MH *qibbuş* in a closed unaccented syllable was apparently pronounced as a variety of [o], e.g., חוּצָפָה 'cheekiness' (see above §§175, 200; [this example is adduced in the author's מחקרים p. 105]). The same form is found in this dialect, e.g., *xocpe*, but it is expressly stated that this [u] > [o] (only short?) is the outcome of Dutch influence. Therefore this trait, like the pronunciation of the Ashkenazic *gameş gadol* (see above §§37, 263) should not be considered as a survival, but as an innovation.

Among other remarkable traits of this dialect should be mentioned the [u] > [i] shift (e.g., in ספּוּת) as in the Western Yiddish dialect of Endingen and Lengnau (Switzerland). This trait is at home in Southeastern Yiddish (cf. above §465), and possibly was brought to the West as were some other traits, by rabbis and teachers who very often came from the East.

2. *Vocabulary.* §475. Worthy of mentioning are the following: *berye* < בְּרִיָּה 'a man who considers himself to be a hero', while the other form of the same noun, *briyye* means 'creature'. (This doublet is also found elsewhere in Yiddish). *Šaskənən* (which I happen to know from Slovakian Yiddish) 'to drink copiously' seems to be a blend of שָׁתָה 'drink' הִשְׁקָה 'to give to drink'. Notice also הַקְדוּשׁ בְּרוּךְ הוּא instead of הַקְדוּשׁ in the phrase 'the Holy One, be He praised'. The same form occurs in the dialect of Algiers (below §508).

*Literature (for §§473–475):*

H. Beem, "Yiddish in Holland", in U. Weinreich, ed., *The Field of Yiddish*, New York 1954, p. 122;

H. Beem, *Jerösche*, Assen 1959, pp. 18 (no. 12), 121f. (nos. 472–474);

F. Guggenheim-Grünberg, *Die Sprache der schweizer Juden von Endingen und Lengnau*, Zürich 1950, p. 8; concerning this dialect, see her article in *The Field of Yiddish*, pp. 48ff.;

Jac. van Ginneken, *Handboek der Nederlandsche Taal* II, Nijmegen 1914, deals there with the Yiddish of Holland including a glossary of Yiddish (pp. 67–99) which contains words of Hebrew origin; but see Beem in *The Field of Yiddish*, p. 122;

ב. דה־פּריס, חלקה של העברית בידיש ההולנדי, לשוננו כו

;52, עמ' 50, (חשכ"ב),

קוטשר, לשון חז"ל, עמ' 272 [=מחקרים עמ' צט] (בריה).

## II. Hebrew in Judeo-Spanish

§476. It goes without saying that like Yiddish, Judeo-Spanish (Džudezmo) was colored by the respective languages of the countries of its speakers (today termed Sephardim) namely Arabic, Greek, Turkish, etc. On the background and distribution of Judeo-Spanish (JSp) see above §300.

Hebrew influence in JSp is said to be much less than in Yiddish.

### a. Phonology

1. *Consonants.* §477. Generally the same situations are obtained as in Yiddish, i.e. phonemes unknown in non-Hebrew components disappeared. Therefore e.g., *he* and *'ayin* are generally absent, e.g., in Bulgaria *amares* = עֵם הָאָרֶץ 'ignorant person'. In Salonica *'ayin* may be pronounced [x]: *šemax* = עֵמֶשׁ apparently attempting to preserve the original pronunciation. *Šade* = [s], e.g., *assafon* = הַצֶּפֶן 'the north'. As mentioned above (§§23, 262), *šin* may be pronounced [s]: *rosasana* = שֶׁשׁ הַשָּׁנָה 'New Year'. *Taw* = [t] and in the Balkans [d]: *avod* = אָבוֹת 'forefathers'. In some places the final consonant is sometimes dropped, e.g., in Salonica *Iako* = יַעֲקֹב 'Jacob' (also in the Spanish component).

2. *Vowels.* §478. It is known that *holem* remained [o]; *qameš gadol* is pronounced [a], like the *pataḥ*. In all the dialects (?) *šere* and *segol* seemed to have merged, realized [ɛ].

### b. Morphology.

1. *The Verb.* §479. As in Yiddish (cf. §467), verbs can be created from a Hebrew base with Romance derivational suffix, e.g., *lamdar* from לָמַד 'to learn'.

2. *The Noun.* §480. Romance derivational suffixes can be grafted on Hebrew bases, e.g., *-zo* in *henozo* (from חַן 'grace') 'gracious'; *-li* in *sekanali* (from סִכָּנָה 'danger') 'dangerous'; *-ado* in *mazalado* (from מְזָל 'luck') 'lucky'.

The Hebrew plural suffix יִם can be attached to Romance bases, e.g., *ladronim* 'thieves' (cf. Yiddish *poyerim*, above §470) and we find even *reb-bisim*, plural of *rebbe*, apparently + *isa*, a Romance element (cf. below §483).

### c. Syntax

§481. It is maintained that the syntax was also influenced by Hebrew.

### d. Vocabulary

§482. There are quite a few Hebrew words in JSp e.g., אֶפֶס 'even' (see above §300), חֲרָפָה 'disgrace', שֶׁקֶר 'lie' and also אֶכְלֵן (a new creation as in Yiddish) 'glutton'. Some of the Hebrew elements change their meaning,

e.g., יְחִיד 'member of the community' (Hebrew 'individual'). Also the non-Hebrew phraseology is said to be influenced by Hebrew, e.g., *elpatron del mundo* = רִבּוֹנוֹ שֶׁל עוֹלָם 'Lord of the World'. As in Yiddish, JSp words sometimes appear in changed form, e.g., *bala baya* = בַּעַל הַבַּיִת 'head of a household' (Yiddish *balbus*, above §463); *salisudo* = שְׁלֵשׁ סַעֲוֹדוֹת 'third meal (of the Sabbath)' (lit. 'three meals'; Yiddish *šalsudəs*, above §466).

It is interesting to note that here too, some words seem to have survived in the original "uncorrected" MH form, e.g., *geinan* 'purgatory' (final [m] occasionally > [n] in JSp) which reflects the form גְּיֵהָנָם used in the MH manuscripts and still used by Sephardic and Yemenite Jews instead of the "corrected" form (i.e. BH גֵּיא הָנָם).

*Literature (for §§476-482):*

ש. מרכוס, השפה הספרדית-יהודית, ירושלים תשכ"ה, עמ' קכ-קלב, קנב-קפ with extensive bibliography;

on גהינם see E.Y. Kutscher, literature quoted in §299;

[J. Nehama (avec la collaboration de J. Cantera), *Dictionnaire du judéo-espagnol*, Madrid 1977.]

### III. Hebrew in Judeo-Italian

§483. Without going here into the matter of phonology (pronunciation of consonants and vowels) which would mainly repeat the above mentioned statement about the consonants in general (§261) few words about vocabulary may be in order. גוּף 'glutton' reminds one of בַּעַל גוּף in Yiddish and תְּבַרְתָּא (with Aramaic feminine ending, but meaning 'maid servant'; also used in Yiddish) reminds us of תְּבַרְתָּא of Yiddish (see above §468). The same applies to תְּמֹרֶתא, תְּמֹרֶתא feminine of תְּמֹר 'pig', תְּמֹר 'ass'. There are some words that are entirely absent from Yiddish. I do not have in mind words like מוֹשֵׁב 'toilet' which is a loan translation from Italian *loco* 'place, toilet' in Rome, but especially two other names: רַבֵּי 'the teacher' is found also elsewhere in Sephardic communities. The plural is *rubbisim* and Cassuto reminds us of the form *rebbites* found in an early Jewish-Latin inscription; cf. also JSp *ribbissim*. This might be an early form coming from Palestine. Instead of עֶרֶב 'eve' the (Palestinian) Aramaic (?) עֶרְבָּה, e.g., עֶרְבָּה שֶׁל שַׁבָּת 'Sabbath eve' is used. In view of special relations between early Italy and Palestine, this is not surprising.

*Literature:*

ש. הרטום, ארץ ישראל ג (תשי"ד), עמ' 261-265;  
 מ.ד. קאסוטו, היסוד העברי בלשון דיבורם של יהודי איטליה,  
 לשוננו טז (תש"ח), עמ' 188-190;  
 ש. מלאכי, לשוננו לעם יח (תשכ"ז), עמ' 15 (רובי);  
 Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, pp. 65-67 (רבי).

IV. *Hebrew in Judeo-French*

§484. *Chuadit* may have been the name of "a new Jewish language (that) had been in the process of development" in the four Jewish communities in Comtat Venaissin (Provence, Southern France) during the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century. Its components were French, Provençal and Hebrew.

The phonology of this language shows some peculiar traits, especially that of [s] > [f] e.g., *fuf* = סוס 'horse'. This trait is the more interesting since it only occurs in the Hebrew component, and it seems to be nearly entirely lacking in Provençal (and French). Another change is [y] > [š] e.g., *chuadit* = יהודית 'Jewish'. Hebrew elements here can take a Provençal suffix, e.g., *ensicorege* (< שפור 'drunkard') 'to get drunk'.

*Literature:*

Z. Szajkowski, *The Language of the Jews in the Four Communities of Comtat Venaissin* (Yiddish with English summary, and with a preface by M. Weinreich), New York 1948, pp. V, 4, 17ff., 49ff.

V. *Hebrew in the Turkic Dialect of the Karaites of Lithuania*

§485. Tatar-speaking Karaites from the Crimea were brought to Lithuania as prisoners at the end of the fourteenth century. They continued to use their original language, Tatar, which is a Turkic dialect.

a. *Phonology*

1. *Consonants*. §486. Without going into details it may be stated that the consonantal phonemes correspond to those found among European Jews;

note especially the disappearance of the pharyngals. Instead of *he* a variant of 'ayin (a kind of soft [g]) appears, but this applies only to the "merged Hebrew" component (see above §463) while in "whole Hebrew" *he* does appear. Before and after the so-called front vowels, e.g., [e], consonants appear in a kind of soft pronunciation, as in the Slavonic languages.

There are two pronunciations of [l]; instead of [ll] (geminated [l]) we find [nl], e.g., *kaNla* = כַּלָּה 'bride'.

2. *Vowels.* §487 The vowels reflects the Sephardic pronunciation i.e. *qameṣ gadol* is pronounced [a], *ḥolem* [o], and *shva na'* [e].

### b. Morphology

1. *The Verb.* §488. As in Yiddish, verbs are periphrastic, e.g., *mazzal iz'lam'a* 'to guess' (< Hebrew מְנַחֵם).

2. *The Noun* §489. Hebrew bases can be combined with Turkic derivational suffixes, e.g., *noeflik* 'adultery' (< נוֹאֵף = 'adulterer'), with the abstract suffix *-lik*. They can receive the plural suffix *-lar*, e.g., *otiiotlar* 'letters' (אוֹתוֹת + *lar*) and also case endings, e.g., *şuralarda* 'in the lines' (שׁוֹרָה + *lar* + locative *da*). In *Moše r'ib'b'imiz* = מוֹשֶׁה רִיבְבֵנוּ 'our teacher Moses' we have the Hebrew מוֹשֶׁה רִבִּי (my teacher Moses) + the Turkic first pers. pl. possessive suffix *-miz*. (On *ribbi* see above §483, especially the references in *Isaiah Scroll*).

### c. Syntax

§490. According to scholars, the interference of Hebrew with the spoken dialect seems to be greater than in any of the other languages spoken by Jews. Because of this influence, owing to the literal word-for-word translation of the Bible, the word order has taken on a Hebrew color, e.g., *şער ראשו* 'hair of his head' is *čačy bašynyn*, lit. 'his hair of his head' contrary to Turkic usage (which would be 'of his head, his hair'). As in Hebrew, the Turkic conjunction *da* is placed before and not after the word as in Turkic. Turkic languages use postpositions (and not prepositions), but in this element they are apt to turn into prepositions as in Hebrew. [For example, 'before the Lord' is *atnyndan adonainyn* in the Turkic dialect of the Karaites, but *Rabbin önünden* in Turkish.] I must admit that I am not fully convinced that all these changes took place just in the spoken language and

not only in the literature where it is more understandable. But even with this reservation the influence of Hebrew is indeed remarkable. Other typical Hebrew terms or phrases are reflected literally in the dialects e.g., the construction like *שמור שמרת* 'I indeed watched' etc.

#### d. Vocabulary

§491. The Karaites broke away from the mainstream of Judaism in the eighth century C.E. They acknowledge the authority of the Bible only, but not of the Mishna or Talmud. Therefore, we would expect only BH material in their speech. Indeed, this is mostly the case. But we must stress that some non-Biblical Hebrew words survived in their speech from the period before the eighth century.

It is not surprising to find BH words like *בחור* 'young man', *חתן* 'bridegroom', *צפון* 'north', *דרום* 'south'; but it is much more interesting to point out that they have preserved words such as *פשט* (H 'plain meaning') with the meaning 'translation', *שמש* 'beadle', *סדור* 'prayer book' and other words not found in BH. What is especially interesting is the word *defus* *דפוס* 'printing' (stressed on the penultima). Since the word was introduced by Jews only about half a millenium ago, after the invention of the printing press (see §282), the only explanation, in my opinion, is that the Karaites received it from the Jews. Some Hebrew words changed their meanings, e.g., *מפלה* 'defeat' > 'old witch'. Calques apparently also occur; thus the word *kiplik* 'strength', in a wish paralleling Hebrew *כח* (= strength) 'thank you' (lit. 'may your strength be strong', cf. §466). Especially interesting is the fact that *k'ok* 'heaven' also appears with the plural suffix *lar* (*k'oklar*; and cf. also above §489), because of Hebrew *שמים*.

#### Literature (for §§485-491):

מ. אלטבאואר, על העברית שבפי קראי ליטא ועל היסודות העבריים שבלשונם, לשוננו כא (תשי"ז), עמ' 116-126, כב (תשי"ח), עמ' 258-265.

### VI. Hebrew in the Judeo-Arabic of Yemen

§492. Besides the Ashkenazic and Sephardic, the most important community in every respect is the Yemenite. This also applies to its Hebrew heritage, including the pronunciation, which came to the attention of scholars about a hundred years ago, at the time of the "discovery" of this community.



This community, living until very recently in southern Arabia and cut off from the rest of Jewry, had in the past strong ties with Babylonia, and until several hundred years ago had employed the Babylonian (not the Tiberian) vocalization (cf. §259). It is not surprising, therefore, that their pronunciation should preserve, until this very day, the imprint of this vocalization. It is worth pointing out that unlike the Ashkenazic and Sephardic communities (cf. §§23, 260-263), the Yemenites were able to preserve the Hebrew sounds which do not exist in the vernacular of their Arab neighbors, e.g., [v] and [p]. (See also below §498.)

### a. Phonology

§493. Before dealing with the Hebrew elements in the Arabic of the Yemenites, it is imperative that we give an account of their pronunciation. The main features of this pronunciation are:

“distinction between *qāmēṣ* [ɔ] and *pathaḥ* as well as between *ṣērī* and *seghōl*; no distinction between *pathaḥ* and *seghōl* which are both pronounced [ae]; realization of the *hōlam* as [ö], or, in some regions of Yemen, as the *ṣērī* ([e]); realization of the *šewā mobile* as a short [a]; differentiation between hard and soft *bgd kpt*, as well as between pharyngeals and non-pharyngeals, emphatics and non-emphatics; gemination; stress usually non-ultimate.” (Morag)

Let us add a few points. In one district (Habban) *qameṣ* (*gadol*) is practically [a]. As to the /b, g, d, k, p, t/ phonemes, it should be stressed that the Yemenites are the only community that has preserved the two-fold pronunciation (i.e. with and without *dagesh*; cf. above §29). Details: *Gimel* with *dagesh* is pronounced [dž], but without it [ɣ] (a kind of soft [g]); *dalet* without *dagesh* is pronounced like English *th* in *the*, and without it as in *think*. *Qof* is generally pronounced as a kind of [g].

It should be pointed out that the rules governing the /b, g, d, k, p, t/ phonemes are not always operative in the Hebrew words employed in Arabic vernacular; example:  $\text{קַדְדָּן}$  (for  $\text{קַדְדָּן}$ ) ‘bridegroom’. M. Weinreich’s thesis concerning “whole Hebrew” and “merged Hebrew” (above §§302, 463, below §507) again stands confirmed.

### b. Morphology.

1. *The Verb.* §494. Sometimes the root appears in Hebrew form in an

Arabic sentence, but mostly it is employed with Arabic prefixes and suffixes, e.g., שָׁבַתְנוּא *šobatne* = Hebrew שָׁבַתְנוּ 'we spent the Sabbath'. A verb may appear in the Qal, even if it occurs in another stem in Hebrew. In all these cases the root of the verb remains Hebrew. Sometimes the Hebrew verb is conjugated entirely in Arabic, especially by women.

There are Arabic verbs created from Hebrew nouns, mostly along the pattern *qauḥal*: יִשְׁחָדוּךָ *šauḥadu* (from שָׁחַד) 'they will bribe'. In contrast with Yiddish (cf. §352), there are very few periphrastic verbal creations; example: מְכַנְּוּהָ שְׁחִיטָה 'they killed her' (lit. 'they prepared her killing').

2. *The Noun.* §495. Feminine endings are those of Hebrew, but sometimes they are added without changing the base, e.g., שׁוֹטֵה 'fool', fem. *šoti'ā*. The plural endings are Hebrew, but Arabic plural forms are occasionally employed, e.g., סְדוּר 'prayer book', plural *sadadīr*. The definite article is the Arabic *al* (cf. Yiddish) and therefore אֵלְמִנָּה 'widow' became מְנָה (taking אֵל as the definite article).

α. *Noun Patterns.* §496. As in Yiddish (cf. §468), the noun pattern with the *-a:n* ending is very much in evidence, e.g., כַּפְרָן 'unbeliever', פְּתָחָן 'one who likes to talk' (unknown in the literature); also known are *qetā:l* forms such as כַּפְשָׁף 'witchcraft'. As in Yiddish (ibid.), a new noun can be created from a Hebrew base according to an Arabic pattern, e.g., *marwaye* 'the position of the מְאָרֵי' (see below §497).

Adjectives are compared as in Arabic, e.g., עָשִׂיר 'rich', but אַעְשָׂר 'richer'.

### c. *Vocabulary*

§497. In contrast with Yiddish, a greater number of Arabic words are employed in the sphere of religion even for the Prayer Book (*tiklāl*) and for Jewish holidays.

There are also Hebrew-Aramaic elements, e.g., מְאָרֵי (pronounced close to מוֹרֵי) 'rabbi-teacher', חָתָן (sic!) 'bridegroom' (see above §493). עֶרֶב is Arabic, but used only by the Jews for Hebrew עֶרֶב with the specific meaning 'eve of a holiday', i.e. the day before the holiday (MH יוֹם טוֹב 'ערב').

Some nouns appear in a form different from IH, e.g., סְעוּדָה 'meal' (thus in MH manuscripts).

Worth mentioning are חֲמִים 'hot food' (cf. Yiddish *tshulent*, from Latin *calidus* 'hot'; IH חֲמִין). אוֹרְחָ ('guest') = 'beggars' as in Yiddish, while סְמִנִּים

(‘signs’) are the ‘sideburns’ (Yiddish *pejes* = פּאַות). קַעָרָה ‘grave’ (lit. ‘cave’) is a survival from Mishnaic Hebrew, as is כּוֹרֶה ‘sepulchral chamber’.

Some words changed their meanings: חוץ (‘outside’) = ‘shoes’; אָרִי (‘lion’) = ‘hero’ is a calque from Arabic *qahm*. Conjunctions and adverbs are rare, but אַפְּלוּ ‘even’ is employed (cf. above §472) in what appears to be a Hebrew-Arabic form.

In comparison with Yiddish the Hebrew component in this (and other) Arabic dialects is not very significant. Goitein may be right when he explains that Arabic as a Semitic language was better adapted to express the special needs of the Jews than German. Besides, Saadya’s venerated Arabic translation of the Bible, used in the synagogue, as well as the religious and philosophical literature of the Middle Ages written in Arabic, gave it a kind of quasi-religious halo.

#### *Literature (for §§492-497):*

Sh. Morag, *Lingua* VIII (1959), p. 250;

ש. מורג, העברית שבפי יהודי תימן, ירושלים תשכ"ג;

ש.ד. גויטיין, היסודות העבריים בשפת הדבור של יהודי תימן.

לשונונו ג (חר"ץ), עמ' 380-356;

E.Y. Kutscher, “Yemenite Hebrew and Ancient Pronunciation”, *JSS* 11 (1966), pp. 217-225 (review of Morag);

see also the word list of Jewish-Arabic words in

י. קאפח, הליכות תימן, ירושלים תשכ"א, עמ' 305 ואילך;

י. רצהבי, לשונונו לעם כא (חש"ל), עמ' 232-227, 265-252;

.46-43 עמ' (חשל"א), O.S.]

## VII. *Hebrew in the Judeo-Arabic Dialect of Fez, Morocco*

### a. *Phonology*

1. *Consonants*. §498. Like the Yemenite (cf. §492), this dialect too, preserved Hebrew phonemes which are absent from Arabic, i.e. *pe* and *gimel* with *dagesh* = [p], [g]; *waw* = [v] (and [f]). *Qof* turned into [ʔ] and *taw* with and without *dagesh* turned into an affricate [ts](ʔ), since the original phones are missing in Arabic. *Shin* = [s], and *bet* and *dalet* without *dagesh* are pronounced like those with *dagesh*.

יְיָ ‘God’ is pronounced *yabbwi* (γ is a velar) probably to differentiate it

from *rebbe* 'teacher' (cf. *ribbi* of the Karaites, above §489, and note especially the reference to §483).

2. *Vowels*. §499. The *qameṣ gadol* is of the [a] type, i.e. Sephardic (cf. §373); its quality depends on whether the syllable is stressed or unstressed. *Pataḥ* and *hiriq* are not pronounced (or pronounced ultra short) in a closed unstressed syllable, e.g., *skkána* = סְכָנָה 'danger', *mšna* = מִשְׁנָה 'Mishna'. The *šuruq* and *qibbuṣ* are of the [o] type, e.g., *borox* = בְּרוּךְ 'blessed', *mix-obbadim* = מִיְבָרְכִים 'honored'.

3. *Stress*. §500. The place of the stress in some cases is different from that of standard Hebrew: *ndâba* = נְדָבָה 'alms' penultimate, under Arabic influence, *pisâḥ* = פִּסְחָ ultimate.

### b. Morphology

1. *The Verb*. §501. Some denominative verbs occur in Arabic form, e.g., *tgiyir* 'to be converted to Judaism', from גָּר 'proselyte' (for the same phenomenon see Yemenite dialect, above §494, Algiers, below §506). The conjugation of the verb can be Hebrew or Arabic (cf. §494), while participles seem to preserve the Hebrew form, e.g., *gamôr* = גָּמַר 'perfect'.

2. *The Noun*. §502. Some nouns form a diminutive (according to the Arabic pattern), e.g., *skika* 'a small סִכָּה (tabernacle)'. Sometimes the Arabic plural ending *-in* is employed (instead of יים), e.g., *rebbiyin* 'teachers' (cf. Yiddish *rebbes*, above §470), or *-at* as in *məṇorât* 'candles'. לְוָלְב has an Arabic broken plural: *lwalb* (cf. broken plural in Yemenite, above §495). Generally the Arabic article is used: *la'sirim* = ל + עֲשִׂירִים 'the rich'; the Hebrew article is rare. In the words הַפְטָרָה 'chapter from the Prophets read in the synagogue', הַבְדָּלָה 'ceremony at the conclusion of the Sabbath', the *he* was taken to be the Hebrew article and so פְּטָרָה (*fiṭāra*), בְּדָלָה (*bdäla*) came into being.

### c. Vocabulary

§503. According to Leslau there are "innumerable Hebrew words" in this dialect, but there is no indication as to the actual number (cf. Yiddish §463). The majority of the Hebrew words belong to the religious domain, and they seem to be very much identical with those to be found in Yiddish,

e.g., קהל 'community' ספר 'book', מנורה 'lamp', חזן 'cantor'; others are unlike Yiddish e.g., מַעְרָה ('cave') 'cemetery' (cf. Yemenite, above §497). The names of the holidays are Hebrew (in contrast to the Yemenites, see *ibid.*). Religious formulas include שַׁבַּת שְׁלוֹם 'Sabbath of Peace' (greeting used on the Sabbath; thus also IH). Social life knows some Hebrew expressions absent from Yiddish e.g., פְּרָס 'assistance'. Family life: *ktebba* 'marriage contract' = MH and Yiddish כְּתֻבָּה, but כתיבין is found in an Aramaic text. Some insults, e.g., מְמֹר 'bastard' are to be found in Yiddish as well, but not קְצֻרוֹת שָׁנִים 'may your life be shortened'. מְעֻלָּה מְטָה 'approximately' also occurs elsewhere in Sephardic communities. כֹּחַ 'force' also turns up in Arabicized form: *mkówoh* 'strong'.

אֶפְלוֹ 'even' and אֲדַרְבָּה 'on the contrary' are also at home here, as in Yiddish (above §472; the former also in JSp, §482). Some words changed their form or meaning: פִּיַּט *piyaṭ* is not only 'to sing a religious song' (cf. *piyyuṭ*, above §265), but 'to sing' in general, *xalab* 'dog' is supposed to be Hebrew כְּלָב (?); *sxolbrâxa* is (abbreviated) זְכָרוֹנוֹ לְבָרְכָה 'of blessed memory'.

#### *Literature (for §§498–503):*

W. Leslau, "Hebrew Elements in the Judeo-Arabic Dialect of Fez", *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, N.S. 36 (1945–46), pp. 61ff.;  
 ב.מ. לוין, אוצר הגאונים, כרך ט, קידושין, ירושלים ה"ש עמ' 172 (כתיבין).

### VIII. *Hebrew in the Judeo-Arabic Dialect of Algiers*

#### *a. Phonology*

1. *Consonants.* §504. As in the dialect of Fez, *gimel* and *pe* with *dagesh* are [g], [p], and *qof* turned into ['] (see §498). *He* disappeared and *waw* is pronounced [b].

2. *Vowels.* §505. The distinction between the different vowels is usually clear-cut, but sometimes it is difficult to recognize whether a certain Hebrew word contains [u] or [o]. *Šuruq* and *ħiriq* (with *yod*) are preserved, and, as in the Sephardic pronunciation in general, the distinction between *šere* and *segol* is lost. *Qameṣ gadol* and *pataḥ* are not entirely identical, the former being sometimes pronounced as a variety of open [o] (compare the Ashkenazic pronunciations, above §§37, 373).

The stress, in contrast with Arabic, is always on the final syllable.

### b. Morphology

1. *The Verb.* §506. The Hebrew verbs are inflected as in Arabic (cf. Yemenite, §494, Fez, §501), e.g., *tmālšən* (< מְלַשֵּׁן 'informer') 'to inform', but from מוֹמָר 'apostate' *itmumar*.

2. *The Noun.* §507. Here, too, we have to differentiate between "whole Hebrew" and "merged Hebrew" (above §§302, 463, 493). For example, only words that are exclusively Jewish use the Hebrew *-i:m* and *-o:t* plural endings (cf. Yiddish, §470), but occasionally Arabic words occur with the Hebrew plural ending, e.g., *glalim* 'the poor', on the analogy of עֲשִׁירִים 'the rich' (cf. Yiddish, *ibid.*). On the other hand, Hebrew words used by Arabs as well may receive the Arabic plural ending, e.g., *rebiin* 'rabbis', while מְדִרְשָׁה 'rabbinic school' has acquired an Arabic broken plural form *mdāreš*. In *nšāmti* = נִשְׁמַתִּי 'my soul' only the root remains Hebrew, while the pattern becomes Arabic.

The Arabic article is occasionally used instead of the Hebrew one.

### c. Vocabulary

§508. Here, too, Hebrew words are to be found in many fields. שָׂמֵשׁ 'beadle' is pronounced *səmmaš* (Yiddish *šaməs!*). The חָכֵם 'foreign rabbi' was originally pronounced *xaxam* (instead of *ħaxam*) which seems to indicate that it was borrowed from another dialect. רֵאשׁ הַשָּׁנָה is *rāš šāna* (the same as in MH manuscripts?). Very interesting is the fact that הַקְדוֹשׁ בְּרוּךְ הוּא 'the Holy one, be He praised' appears here as הַקְדוֹשׁ בְּרוּךְ הוּא a form recently discovered in MSS of MH, and is used also in Dutch Yiddish (§475).

We also find calques: 'menstruation' is called הַדֶּרֶךְ הַנְּשִׁים 'the way of women' (cf. Gen. 31, 35) but also *trèq*, the Arabic translation of הַדֶּרֶךְ.

It is interesting that in a word that is known in the Arabic of Algiers, *thaspila* (< הַשְׁפִּיל) 'to degrade', the [h] survives! (see above §504). This is one of the rare Hebrew words borrowed by the Arabs.

There is also a kind of secret language (*argot*) which the merchants used among themselves in order not to be understood (cf. §451), e.g. *bla dabar* = Arabic *bla* 'without' + Hebrew דַּבַּר 'speaking', i.e. 'silence' (and cf. לֹא מְדַבֵּר in Slovakian Yiddish).

### Literature (for §§504–508):

M. Cohen, *Le parler arabe des juifs d'Alger*, Paris 1912, pp. 386–408.

IX. *Hebrew in Non-Jewish European Languages*a. *German*

§509. Hebrew words that entered German via Yiddish persisted even under the Nazi regime. Not only did one top official, Göbbels, have a Hebrew name (Joseph), but he would rant about the *Miessmacher* 'a man who tries to present everything in a negative light'. This compound contains a Hebrew element מְאִוֵּס 'repulsive' (or מְאִוֵּס) + *macher* 'maker'. All those within Germany who criticized the Nazis fell under this category.

A friend of mine when taken into "protective custody" in Germany in 1938 tried to explain something to his captors. The answer he received was *Jude genug gedibbert* 'Jew, stop talking' (lit. 'enough said'); *gedibbert* comes from דִּבֵּר 'to talk'.

*Schmuser* 'idle talker', *Schmuss* 'idle talk' come from שְׂמוּעוֹת 'hear-say'.

Very interesting is the *Pleitegeier*, 'person who went bankrupt', from a Yiddish compound meaning 'fugitive'. *Pleite* = Hebrew פְּלִיטָה 'escape' (according to the pronunciation mentioned above §465), *geier* = 'he who goes' (Yiddish *gayn* 'to go'). The Germans reinterpreted *geier* as *Geier* 'vulture' so the *Pleitegeier* became those who gather when there is a bankruptcy, as vultures swarm over a carcass. This, incidentally, is not the only case of such a reinterpretation.

*Literature:*

E. Littmann, *Morgenländische Wörter im Deutschen*<sup>2</sup>, Tübingen 1924, pp. 26–52.

[For Hebrew words in the "secret language" of Schopfloch, Germany, see K. Philipp, *Lachoudisch, Geheimsprache Schopflochs*, Dinkelsbühl 1969 (reference courtesy A. Raviv). Examples: *acheln* = אָכַל 'to eat', *Bajes* = בַּיִת 'house', *Bauker* = בֹּקֶר 'morning', *Behemes* = בְּהֵמֹת 'cattle'. For the vocalic and morphological patterns cf. above §§467, 464, 465 and 470, respectively.]

b. *English*

§510. All the European languages are permeated in the field of vocabulary by Hebrew words in European garb. Consider the word *angel*: originally 'messenger' in Greek, it came to mean 'angel' because it reflected BH מַלְאָךְ which also originally meant 'messenger' (and also turned into

'angel'). This is only one example of Hebrew influence on English via the Bible translations. Thanks to the role which Jewish life has been playing on the American scene especially during the last decades, Hebrew words came to be known also via Yiddish. As the *Times Literary Supplement* put it (Nov. 6, 1959) "Also to have Jewish friends... to read *Marjorie Morningstar* or the *Magic Barrel* or *I and Thou*, are currently signs of urbanity at the different cultural levels rather than of oddity, much like having a Yiddish phrase or two to season one's speech." Of course, Israel has also had its contribution to make. One can hardly open an issue of the *Times Literary Supplement* without coming across a book title or a book review with an allusion to a Biblical phrase. W. Chomsky lists modern novels whose titles go back to the Bible e.g., *The Good Earth* (Deut. 6, 18), *The Way of all Flesh* (Gen. 6, 12) and quite a few others. He could also have mentioned *The Skin of Our Teeth* (Job 19, 20). Incidentally, describing the strange character of this play, the London correspondent of the daily *Ha'arets* in the late forties said that even its name is hardly translatable into Hebrew! And indeed, it sometimes happens that Hebrew speakers do not know that a certain English phrase comes from Hebrew, and try to translate it back into Hebrew!

How far the "Yiddish seasoning" goes can be ascertained from *Time Magazine*, September 1, 1967, p. 60 col. ii "Arnold even has the chutzpah" which does not even bother to explain this Hebrew word (which to be sure is certainly loaned from Yiddish). Another, more interesting, instance reads: "Her father, a pious (Jewish) jeweler... Sat *shiva* for her" (*Sunday Times Weekly Review*, June 11, 1967 p. 45, col. iii). *Shiva* is Hebrew for the period of mourning (שבועה 'seven (days)'); the paper found it superfluous to explain the word. It goes without saying that words dealing with Israel passed directly from IH into English, such as *kibbutz*, *Haggana* and several others.

A more interesting question is whether the influence of the English Bible, mentioned above, was restricted to words or Biblical allusions or whether it also succeeded in invading the structure of English. According to Jespersen, "The scriptural 'holy of holies' which contains a Hebrew manner of expressing the superlative, has given rise to a great many similar phrases in English, such as 'in my heart of hearts' (Shakespeare, *Hamlet* III, 2, 78; 'mystery of mysteries'... (or) 'I am sorrowful to my tail's tail' (Kipling, *Second Jungle Book*, 160)."



*Literature:*

O. Jespersen, *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, Oxford 1943, §252;

[W. Chomsky, *Hebrew the Eternal Language*, Philadelphia 1957, pp. 245–269.—O.S.]

*c. Dutch*

§511. Hebrew elements entered Dutch via Yiddish (cf. §§473–475). Some examples are *choochem* (=חָכָם) ‘wise, clever man’, *dalles* (=דָּלוּת) ‘poverty’, *kapôres* (=כַּפָּרוֹת) ‘atonement’) ‘finished’ (cf. Yiddish *toygt oyf kapores* ‘good-for-nothing’), *gannew* (=גַּנָּב) ‘thief’, *kalle* (=כַּלָּה) ‘bride’, *mâsel* (=מָזָל) ‘luck’, *stiekum* (=שְׁתִּיקָה) ‘silence’) ‘secret’.

*Literature:*

H. Beem, *Jerösche*, Assen 1959, *pasim* (see the Register, pp. 235ff.);

.50 דה-פריס, לשוננו כו (תשכ"ב) עמ' 50.

*d. Hungarian*

§512. There are a few Hebrew words in Hungarian, mainly in the sub-standard speech of Budapest, e.g., *ponem* (=פָּנִים) ‘face’) ‘character’ (derogatory), *hohem* (=חָכָם) ‘wise’) ‘wise guy’, *yatt* (=יָד) ‘hand’) ‘handshake (over an agreement etc.)’, *zof* (=זָהָב) ‘gold’) ‘valuable’.

## H. Epilogue

*Hebrew—the only language revived and remodelled. Is Israeli Hebrew still Hebrew? Parallel cases of language modernization: the Hungarian example. Hebrew as a uniting force in Israel and in the Diaspora.*

§513. It is impossible to finish the history of the Hebrew language without asking several questions.

The first question is: How does the achievement of the revival of Hebrew compare with the achievements of other nations in this respect? To quote C. Rabin:

“Language revivals were an integral feature of the national movements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. They consisted either in achieving literary and administrative status for a purely spoken vernacular or in extending the spoken and written use of a former national language which had been abandoned by a part of the nation, but was in every instance still used by some of the people. Hebrew is the only case of a language which had completely ceased to be spoken and had no administrative status, and yet was successfully revived.”

He is certainly right. More or less, each language passed through this stage, but it is especially true for the Eastern European languages. In Hungarian, modernization of the language began mainly at the end of the eighteenth century and, exactly as in Hebrew, it was due to the influence of the Enlightenment. But there is one essential difference, namely, that Hungarian never ceased to be spoken. To be sure, the Hungarians had to coin new terms, but they did not have to revive their language. (Incidentally, their way of solving their problems was close to that of the Hebrew Language Committee). They, of course, could also draw heavily on the spoken dialects. Like Hebrew, Hungarian and other languages which had to be modernized contain a great many loan translations, much more than they care to acknowledge. The same holds true for other languages, such as Slavic and Germanic (Danish is said to be full of German loan translations). Turkish could also serve as a parallel for language rejuvenation, but again not for revival, since it never ceased to be spoken.

In this respect, then, IH stands alone in the world. Indeed the words of the famous Semitic scholar Theodor Nöldeke, written at the end of the last century, put this achievement in its proper relief:

“The dream of some Zionists, that Hebrew—a would-be Hebrew, that is to say—will again become a living, popular language in Palestine, has still less prospect of realization than their vision of a restored Jewish empire in the Holy Land.”

Nöldeke was entitled to his doubts. Stranger is the utterance of the German scholar W. Porzig, who in 1950 (!) said, “There will be people in the foreseeable future who will actually have Hebrew as their mother tongue.” Porzig’s statement is characteristic of modern linguists who very often, still

do not take notice of IH and its strange and unparalleled birth. The reason seems to be clear. It is as difficult for some people to digest the fact of a revived and recreated language as it is to accept the fact of the Jewish State. But the facts cannot be overlooked.

The second question which we must ask ourselves is whether the strange story of the revival (above §§306–311) is as unparalleled as the fact of the revival of Hebrew?

There are two instances which can be compared only to a certain extent since the languages concerned had not been revived like Hebrew, but had only to be streamlined to serve as the vehicle of a literary language.

First is Yiddish. It seems that Yiddish, too, was “revived” as a literary language only as a tool for spreading the Haskalah (above §306) i.e. assimilation. Let us quote H. Szmeruk about M. Lefin (Levin), “one of the founders of Yiddish Literature” who also wrote in Hebrew (above §307): “It is pretty sure that M. Lefin, like the other Maskilim of his generation, thought that Jews should adopt the language of the country they were living in and give up Yiddish!” Here, too, as in Modern Hebrew, the will for survival came only much later. Alas, the prospects of this survival seem very slight. The process noted concerning Modern Hebrew, until the emergence of Zionism, was the same in Yiddish. As pointed out in an article in the *Jewish Forward*:

“The Jew who was influenced by Yiddish literature and Yiddish newspapers to send his children to non-Jewish schools did not succeed anymore in having his children speak Yiddish... 99% of the Yiddish writers are children of religious Jews who did not know anything about ‘isms’... it was very rarely that a Yiddish writer had a son who followed in his footsteps.”

Therefore, the future of Yiddish today is indeed very bleak, for, as the writer adds, “It is no coincidence that the children of Mendele [who was a Yiddish writer] and Peretz left Judaism altogether.” Here it is indeed expressly stated that there was no physical continuation of Yiddish speakers but only of Yiddish.

Another example is Slovak. The man who created what was to become literary Slovak was also influenced by the general enlightened movement emanating from France and later from Germany. He stated explicitly that he intended this language to be used only until Slovaks should master Hungarian. Needless to say, this statement caused consternation ever since

Slovaks became conscious of their own nationality in the middle of the last century. There seems to have been something about the era of the enlightenment before the birth of the nationalistic movements that was favorable to this process of the revival of a spoken dialect into a literary one, only to commit suicide later.

Returning to the subject of reviving and enlarging the Hebrew language, the reader might well pose the third question: Is this still Hebrew? Are the ways and means employed to revive and enlarge it appropriate to a natural language, or should Modern Hebrew be considered entirely unnatural and artificial, like Esperanto?

However, before attempting a detailed answer, I would like to point out that some scholars pose a similar question with regard to English, viz. whether English can still be considered an Indo-European language, since it has become so far removed from that language group. Or consider the much closer case of Modern Syriac which stems from the Syriac dialect spoken in the first millennium C.E. Modern Syriac has gotten so far away from its parent that a scholar conversant only with Syriac would not be able to understand one sentence. The entire verbal system has been completely transformed under the impact of Persian and Turkish, and very little is left from the Syriac tenses.

Now, IH is much closer to MH and BH than Modern Syriac is to Syriac. In this respect it was, as we said (§321), a blessing for Hebrew that it was dead for eighteen hundred years.

It would be going too far to adduce parallels to prove that these same ways and means were also employed in such languages as English and German. Instead, I would prefer to compare a language where these methods were employed, apparently very much in the same proportion as in Hebrew.

Let me quote from Géza Bárczi's *A Biography of the Hungarian Language*. In the chapter describing the renewal of the Hungarian language, which began at the same time as the revival of Hebrew, at the end of the eighteenth century, Bárczi says (pp. 291–293):

“As we saw, the conscious enriching of the vocabulary by creating new words was not new. Every civilized language passed more or less through this stage... There was need for new words so that our writers could express exactly the ideas of modern life and of the developing scholarship... They [the Hungarians] studied the French

and German examples... It is hard to believe that in the Hungarian vocabulary it was possible to incorporate thousands of new words... Several camps fought with each other—extreme renewers, who inundated the language with terrible, incomprehensible new words, and the old guard who opposed each new creation. Little by little the necessity and possibility of creating new words was accepted by the main part of the opponents.”

This picture parallels nearly exactly what happened in this respect in Modern Hebrew, especially since the end of the last century. The methods used in renewing Hungarian were almost completely identical with those used in reviving Hebrew. Bárczi continues (pp. 296–300):

“A fortunate means was the revival of antiquated words [cf. above §321]... Sometimes their revival was accompanied by misinterpretation [cf. §385], by mistakes [cf. §383] or simply by changing the meaning [cf., e.g., §§385, 393]... Sometimes it happens that a new word is born through a misreading of an old one [cf. §§239, 383] and this is coupled by misinterpretation... [The renewers used words] which were until then only dialectic... and not only ones with a new and different meaning [cf. Aramaic, above §§337–340]... Rarely it happened that a foreign word was accepted as it looked like Hungarian... It is interesting that they did not take many new words from the kindred languages as was often done by language reformers of other languages (for example in this way many Italian and French words came into Rumanian, and words from other Slavic languages into Bulgarian etc.) [cf. Arabic and Aramaic, above §§314, 337–346]... But the bulk of the new words was created by the use of derivational suffixes [cf., e.g., §§334, 343, 442, 445, 446].” [Translation by E.Y.K.]

Many expressions were created as loan translations from German which cannot be understood from Hungarian (cf. §359). “Concerning compounds, I would like to point out the compound which is created by fusing two maimed words” (p. 306; cf. §391). The writer again notes the German influence which besides the loan translations mentioned above, added quite a few German elements to Hungarian (pp. 316–318). On p. 355 he describes the fight against the German spirit in the Hungarian language.

I think that Hungarian may serve as a fairly close parallel to what was done in Modern Hebrew and proves, by the way, that Modern Hebrew chose a reasonable course of development. There is no reason to be ashamed of our new creations.

The fourth question is: Did IH conquer its former opponents? The answer is yes, nearly one hundred per cent. In the nineteen twenties it was still strongly opposed on the one hand by the extreme religious element in Jerusalem which is today represented by the Neturei Karta, and on the other hand by the communists. The communists have given in completely and no longer regard Modern Hebrew as the language of the reactionary bourgeoisie. The reasons are clear; they had no choice but to use IH if they wanted to recruit new members among the younger generation of Israel. The Neturei Karta still oppose Modern Hebrew for religious reasons, but new words keep slipping into their style, even though in their school system they do not teach in Modern Hebrew but in Yiddish.

The fifth question is: What is the role of Modern Hebrew in shaping the destiny of Israel and the Jews?

We can safely say that there would have been no Israel and no consciousness of Jewish-Israeli nationality without Modern Hebrew. For the Israeli, Hebrew is the language of the Bible, of the Mishna and other classical sources. It is this consciousness that creates the feeling of continuity between our generation and the previous generations, especially those who had lived in Eretz Israel and spoke Hebrew.

The Bible is a fundamental element of the consciousness of all Israeli Jews, believers and non-believers alike. The exceptions are the communists and others on the extreme left, and a small secularist group, who deny the continuity of the Jewish people, rejecting all ties with the Jews outside Israel, and believing instead in the existence of an Israeli people, a fusion of Jews and Arabs.

The very fact that an Israeli can go back to the Bible without having recourse to a translation creates a feeling of immediacy. Every reader can be his own interpreter and believe that his interpretation of the Bible is the right one. This is possible only if we ensure that the linguistic chasm between BH and IH does not become unbridgeable. The day the Bible will have to be translated into IH will mark the end of the special attitude of the Israeli toward the Bible.

To be sure, modern linguistics has adopted a *laissez faire* policy regarding language (Leave Your Language Alone which is also a title of a

book by R.A. Hall). But while we agree that in every language there are forces at work which keep it changing, IH is very different from other languages in this respect. A native speaker of IH has practically no difficulty in reading the Bible, the Mishna and other creations thousands of years old, which is impossible in any other language. And it is this capability which creates the vital historical consciousness in the Israeli. The vast majority of Israeli Jews feels that it is essentially a member of the people which created this language, both within Israel as outside it, and which employed it as a sacred language especially during the past two thousand years.

Therefore, the aim of the Academy of the Hebrew Language should be to guard Israeli Hebrew and to ensure that its development continue to foster this historical-linguistic bond of the Israeli with his long Jewish past. The Leave Your Language Alone policy should not apply to Israeli Hebrew. Had we followed it, Israeli Hebrew would not have existed at all and Jews would have continued to speak their former languages.

*Literature:*

Th. Nöldeke, "Semitic Languages", *Encyclopaedia Britannica*<sup>11</sup> vol. 24, p. 622b;

W. Porzig, *Das Wunder der Sprache*<sup>2</sup>, Bern 1950, p. 258;

ח. שמרוק, "יידישע שפראך XXIV (1964), עמ' 34

G. Bárczi, *A magyar nyelv életrajza*, Budapest 1963, pp. 291-355.





## APPENDIX

by Raphael Kutscher

### A. Addenda

- §33. Add: H. Bauer, *Zur Frage der Sprachmischung im Hebräischen*, Halle 1924;
- J. Blau, "Problems in the History of the Hebrew Language", in M. Dorman et al., eds., *In Memory of Gedaliahu Alon*, [Tel Aviv] 1970, pp. 9–14 (Hebrew).
- §73. It is possible that some gutturals existed in early Sumerian; see R. Kutscher, *Qadmoniot* XIII (1980), p. 127 (Hebrew).
- §100. Add: A. Hurvitz, "The Chronological Significance of 'Aramaisms' in Biblical Hebrew", *IEJ* 18 (1968), pp. 234–240.
- §138. The author referred to Segal's edition of Ben Sira, ספר בן סגל, מ.צ. ספר בן סגל, ספר בן סגל, ספר בן סגל; I changed the references according to the definitive edition of the Academy of the Hebrew Language (1973).
- §195. On Mishnaic manuscripts see now מ. בר-אשר, משנה כתב יד פארמה מ. בר-אשר, עורך. קובץ מאמרים בלשון חז"ל [א], ירושלים "ב" לסדר טהרות, (מ. בר-אשר, עורך). קובץ מאמרים בלשון חז"ל [א], ירושלים תשל"ב, עמ' 185–166;
- מ. בית-אריה, כתב-יד קאופמן של המשנה—מוצאו וזמנו, (מ. בר-אשר, עורך). קובץ מאמרים בלשון חז"ל ב, ירושלים תש"ם, עמ' 84–99.
- §197. In 1970 an Aramaic inscription was excavated in a synagogue from the Roman or Byzantine period in Beth-Shean. In this inscription the words for 'this work' are spelled חדה אבידתא (instead of עבדתא), which the author considered a welcome illustration to the confusion of the gutturals in Beth-Shean, Haifa and Tivon, mentioned in the Barayta (but he did not have a chance to include it in the manuscript of this book); see J. Naveh, *On Stone and Mosaic* (above §185), pp. 78f.
- §199. Concerning the name *Marien* it is interesting to note that an amulet bearing the name מרין (or ברת?) was recently found in Khirbet Kanef in the Golan (reported in *Ha'aretz*, September 30, 1980, p. 4). The

date of the amulet is not given, but it may be associated with the late Roman or Byzantine synagogue in the site.

§253. Numerous studies in Mishnaic Hebrew were published in the two collections mentioned in the addendum to §195 and in M.Z Kaddari, ed., *Archive of the New Dictionary of Rabbinic Literature II*, Ramat-Gan 1974 (Hebrew with English summaries). (References courtesy M. Bar-Asher.)

§415. Complete: D. Tené, *L'hébreu contemporain*, Ph. D. dissertation, Université de Paris, 1961.

## B. Tables

### Table 1

The Hebrew consonants in relation to Proto-Semitic, Aramaic and Arabic

Proto Semitic	Hebrew		Aramaic	Arabic
'	א	<i>alef</i>	'	'
b	ב	<i>bet</i>	b	b
g	ג	<i>gimel</i>	g	g
d	ד	<i>dalet</i>	d	d
h	ה	<i>he</i>	h	h
w	ו	<i>waw</i>	w	w
z	ז	<i>zayin</i>	z	z
ḏ	ז	<i>zayin</i>	ḏ	ḏ
ḥ	ח	<i>ḥet</i>	ḥ	ḥ
x	ח	<i>ḥet</i>	ḥ	x
t	ט	<i>ṭet</i>	ṭ	ṭ
y	י	<i>yod</i>	y	y
k	כ	<i>kaf</i>	k	k
l	ל	<i>lamed</i>	l	l
m	מ	<i>mem</i>	m	m
n	נ	<i>nun</i>	n	n
s	ס	<i>samekh</i>	s	s
'	ע	<i>'ayin</i>	'	'
ġ	ע	<i>'ayin</i>	'	ġ
p	פ	<i>pe</i>	p	f
ʃ	צ	<i>ʃade</i>	ʃ	ʃ
ṭ	צ	<i>ʃade</i>	ṭ	ṭ
ḏ	צ	<i>ʃade</i>	q, 'ḏ	ḏ
q	ק	<i>qof</i>	q	q
r	ר	<i>resh</i>	r	r
š	ש	<i>šin</i>	š	š
š	ש	<i>šin</i>	š	š
ṭ	ש	<i>šin</i>	ṭ	ṭ
t	ת	<i>taw</i>	t	t

For a different view on the origins of the *ʃade* see J. Blau, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, Wiesbaden 1976, p. 6 with note a.

Table 2  
The independent personal pronouns

אָנִי, אַלְכִי		אָנִי	
אָתָּה, אַתִּי הִיא	אַתָּה הוּא	אַתָּה הִיא (DSS היאה)	אַתָּה, אַתָּה הוּא (DSS הוואה)
אַנְחֵנוּ, בְּחֵנוּ, אֲנוּ		אָנוּ	
אַתָּנָה, אַתָּן הִנֵּה	אַתָּם הֵם, הֵמָּה	אַתָּם אַתָּן(?) , אַתָּם הֵם, הֵן	אַתָּם, אַתָּן (DSS אַתְמָה) הֵם, הֵן
Biblical Hebrew <i>The unvocalized forms occur as ketib only</i>		Mishnaic Hebrew (and Dead Sea Scrolls)	

Table 3  
The imperfect

אַכְתֹּב, אֲכַתְּבָה		אַכְתֹּב	
תְּכַתְּבֵי, תְּכַתְּבִין תְּכַתֵּב	תְּכַתֵּב, יְכַתֵּב	תְּכַתְּבֵי תְּכַתֵּב	תְּכַתֵּב יְכַתֵּב
נְכַתְּבֵי, נְכַתְּבָה		נְכַתֵּב	
תְּכַתְּבֵי יְכַתְּבֵי, תְּכַתְּבֵי תְּכַתְּבוּ, יְכַתְּבוּ	תְּכַתְּבוּ, תְּכַתְּבוּן יְכַתְּבוּ, יְכַתְּבוּן	תְּכַתְּבוּ יְכַתְּבוּ	
Biblical Hebrew		Mishnaic Hebrew	

## C. Selective Indexes

*References are to paragraphs*

### I. Hebrew Forms, Lexemes and Roots

אָזַלַח (Deut. 32, 36), 55, 100, 110, 383  
(cf. also אָזַלַח)

בָּעַל בְּרִחָךְ, 46, 318, 348, 355, 356, 360  
בְּרִיזָל, 71

גַּת, 97

גִּבַּע, 79, 99

גִּיהֶנָם, 289 (cf. also *Gehinam, Geinan, Jahannam*)

דַּמְשֶׁק, דַּמְשֶׁק, 153

הָאָזֶן, 116, 319, 378, 380, 389

הוֹדִיָּא, הוֹדִיָּא, 134, 389, 442

הוֹשִׁיעַ 90

היה as auxiliary verb, 218, 273, 381, 407, 435

הַקְטִילָה, 103, 134, 213, 326, 340

יֹת ending, 65, 121, 123, 171, 214, 446, 468

חֹזֵר, 227, 234

חִיָּתוֹ (אָרְיָן, יַעֲרִי), 14, 159, 182

טַעַם, 72

יָ, (adjectival suffix) 334, 445

יַגֵּן, 97

יֵהוּ, יֵהוּ, in personal names, 89, 90, 153

יוֹנֵי ('Yavneh'), 198

יַעֲמָדָן, 59

יַקְטִילָנָה, 59, 100

יָתְנוּ (Esther 1, 20), 59

כִּיחַתָּה, 98

כִּשֶׁר, 123, 234

כְּחִנָּת, 98

לִקַּח, 123, 227, 320, 398

לִקִּי, 85

מ + participle, 384

מוֹצֵא, 81, 93, 99

מִחָא, 241

מִחָץ, 100, 241

מִחָק, 100

מִלְחָה, 73

מִמָּה גִּפְשָׁךְ, 46, 318, 348, 355, 356, 360, 463

מִרוֹן, 199

צֶרֶךְ, 123, 234

מְחִינִים קָמְיוֹ (Deut. 33, 11), 110, 182

נִשְׂאָה, 123, 227, 398

סָפָן, 72

סוֹכֵן, 72

צָבָר, see סָבָרָה

עַמַּד, 123, 130

verbs, passive perfect, 211, 381, 402

verbs, פֿר־

צָבָר (various forms), 343, 407

צָפוּר, 98

קוּטוּל (qutl), 159, 170

קוּטְלָן, 213, 326, 389, 442

קוּמִים (II Kings 16, 7), 32

קוּטוּל (qutl), 159, 182

קוּטוּל, 134, 213, 326

קוּטִיל, 338, 407, 445

קוּטִילָה, 134, 213, 326

קוּטִילִין, 159

קוּטִל, 103

קוּטִל, 159, 176, 251

קוּטִל, 31, 32, 33, 73

קוּטִילָה, 213

קוּטִילָה (fem. pl.), 56, 102, 113, 208

קוּטִילוּיּוֹת, קוּטִילוּיּוֹת, 214

קוּטִילָן, 213, 284, 326, 389, 442, 468, 496

קוּטִילָה (third pers. fem. sing.), 102, 110,

113, 208, 212 (cf. also אָזַלַח (יד))

קוּטִילָה (second pers. fem. sing.), 53, 102,

113, 171, 181 (cf. also אֲשַׁמְתִּי)

קָמָה (I Sam. 4, 15), 56

קִרְקַר, קִרְקַר, 85

רָבִי, 186, 483, 489 498

רַבְצוֹן (Gen. 49, 6), 321

רַבְצוֹן (שְׁבַת אָנִי), (Eccles. 4, 2), 125

שְׁכָן, 72

שָׁל + noun, 216, 244, 327, 380

שָׁל- + possessive suffix, 204, 215, 216,

327, 417, 418, 443

שְׁעָלְבִים, 85

שְׁקֵמָתַי (Judges 5, 7), 54, 100, 206 (cf. also קִטְלָתַי)  
שָׁפָרָה (Deut. 21, 7), 56  
תְּבַטְחוּ (Jer. 49, 11), 59  
תִּלְקַח (Esther 2, 8, 16) 48  
תָּנִי, 100  
תִּלְקַח (Gen. 12, 15), 48  
תְּפִיחַ (זֶהָב), 308, 391  
תִּרְבַּח זֶקֶן, 472

## II. General Index and Transliterations

*Ausi'* (הַשֵּׁעַ; Assyrian), 90  
Barth's law, 110  
*bosor* (בָּשָׂר; Greek) 37, 251  
*chitón* (Greek), 98  
dialect mixture in BH and MH, 203, 206, 212, 244  
dialectal differences in BH, 44, 79, 81, 90, 91, 94, 99, 100, 109  
El-Amarna, 1, 34, 37, 71, 86, 95, 97, 98, 108–110  
*Gehinam* (גִּיהֶנָם; Judeo-Italian), 299  
*Geinam* (גִּיְהֶנָם; JSp), 482

*iota*, 37  
*Jahannam* (جَهَنَّمَ; Arabic), 289  
*ketib*, see *qere* and *ketib*  
"merged" Hebrew, see "whole" Hebrew and "merged" Hebrew  
*Moloch* (מֹלֶךְ; Greek), 159, 176, 250  
pausal forms in the verb, 37, 60, 158, 171, 249, 251, 252  
personal names, 89–91, 153, 348  
Philippi's law, 97, 109, 250  
place names, 28, 50, 52, 79, 85–88, 97, 98, 348  
pronouns, third person used as copula, 16, 350  
*qere* and *ketib*, 41, 42, 52, 53, 56, 95  
*rebbein*, *rebbetzin*, etc., 284, 303, 472, 480  
Samaritans and Samaritan Pentateuch, 41, 46, 48, 85, 98, 110, 114, 116, 122, 154, 156, 157, 158, 171, 177–184  
Septuagint, 25, 37, 38, 75, 89, 159, 174–176, 324  
"whole" Hebrew and "merged" Hebrew, 260, 302, 360, 463, 474, 486, 493, 507

