the

Phonetician

Journal
of
ISPhS

International
Society of
Phonetic
Sciences

Number 115 2018

Book review

AHARON MAMAN FESTSCHRIFT. LANGUAGE STUDIES XVII-XVIII EDITED BY: YOCHANAN BREUER, STEVEN E. FASSBERG AND OFRA TIROSH-BECKER (2017)

Jerusalem: The Faculty of Humanities, Department of Hebrew Language, The Jack, Joseph and Morton Mandel Institute of Jewish Studies. Magnes Press. 636 pages in Hebrew. Contents list in Hebrew 3 pp., Preface 1 p., Professor Maman's picture 1 p., The Editors' "Aharon Maman" 4 pp., List of his publications pp. 15-29.
The English side: Contents list in English 3 pp., Abstracts of papers pp. XI-XXXV. (ISSN 0334-6110 Paper Print and E-Book. Price: $46.00 (138.- NIS) Site price: $ 41.40 (124.20 NIS) eBook: $ 34.50 (103.50 NIS).

Reviewed by:
Judith Rosenhouse
SWANTECH Ltd. Haifa, Israel
judith@swantech.co.il

1 General introduction

This book is a linguistic festschrift for Prof. Aharon Maman, a member of the Department of Hebrew Language at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, on his retirement. The volume (No. 17-18 of the journal, Language Studies, published by the Department of Hebrew Languages, of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem) holds 34 papers written by his friends, colleagues and students. The authors of these studies are all well-known scholars, whose works demonstrate some of their scholarship. After the editors' laudatory preface, we find a paper by Maman himself, entitled "The school of life" (pp. 5-14), briefly describing his journey in life and his academic area at the Hebrew University since immigrating to Israel from Morocco as a child. Professor Maman's publications list, edited by Elnatan Hen, reveals his numerous contributions to the study of the various linguistic and cultural aspects of the Hebrew language and its development. These include medieval linguistics, Hebrew in the medieval era, language traditions of Jewish communities and their contacts with other languages – i.e., North African Judeo-Arabic, Aramaic and its dialects (Samaritan-, Babylonian, and neo-Aramaic), Ladino and Modern Hebrew.

The papers in the book are in line with Maman's interests: they deal with linguistic aspects of the history and development of the Hebrew language since the Biblical era,

through the medieval centuries and later up to Modern Hebrew. Major themes in these papers are the written traditions of Hebrew in rabbinical texts of the Talmud[1], Mishnah[2] and other texts, including Karaite[3] and Samaritan[4] texts and the development of Hebrew grammar literature (e.g., Menahem Ben Saruql Al-Fa:si). This book is not on phonetics per se, but the papers contain phonetic and phonological discussions of various aspects of the Hebrew language. Some chapters deal with Aramaic in different environments and text types, and with Classical Arabic and Judeo-Arabic. About a third of the papers in this collection could be more interesting for our readers than others, e.g., those by Blau & Yahalom; Ben-Arié; M. Bar-Asher; Breuer; Dotan; Henschke; Yaakov; Khan; Laufer; Sabar; Rhyzhik; Schwarzwald; and Tirosh-Becker. The other papers complement the scope of the linguistic aspects of Hebrew language and its development. Summaries of the papers appear below in two groups: (i) papers that discuss phonetic/ phonological issues, and (ii) all the rest.

2 Phonetic/ phonological issues

Joshua Blau and Joseph Yahalom (pp. 95-116) study "The typology of Palestinian vocalization systems preserved in manuscripts from the last quarter of the first millennium". Written Hebrew uses consonantal letters, as well as vowel signs, added to the consonants. In time, both the consonant letters and the vowels changed, yielding a Palestinian system, and other systems developed outside of Palestine. This paper focuses on vowels in Palestinian manuscripts. The existing writing systems attest to the existence of different dialects of Hebrew at the time. In some Palestinian manuscripts, there were two vocalization signs for /a/ and two for /e/, implying that there were users who used these signs to distinguish the vowels, while in other texts (dialects) the vowels were unified. The paper discusses these systems.

Dror Ben Arié (pp. 117-136) "Miqneh Abram of Abraham de Balmes: A new reading of a sixteenth century Hebrew grammar in the light of Hebrew and Latin treatises." The Hebrew grammar book (from 1523) entitled "Miqneh Abram" 'Abraham's asset', i.e., the holy language, is in both Hebrew and Latin. Ben Arié argues that the book is an original synthesis of Latin and Hebrew grammatical traditions and de Balmes' innovations, and that it is impossible to understand the terms without considering both origins. The book has a phonological part, considered the simple or basic elements of language, as well as morphological and syntactic chapters. Ben Arié focuses on the terms "compositio" (Hebrew [harkava]), and "regimen" (Hebrew [ʃimmuʃ]) which include phonological speech elements (pronunciation) as the basis of words. De Balmes was innovative in adding the third level, of what is beyond the word, which had not been previously discussed in Hebrew grammar.

Moshe Bar-Asher "The limitations of orthography, script and morphology: A problem of Mishanic Hebrew grammar" (pp. 161-178). Hebrew is usually written without vocalization (i.e., just consonants, no vowels). This may yield misinterpretations of the written word(s). Even when the words are vowelized, and the texts are reliable, different transmission versions of the same text may reveal a different spelling of the same word. Minimal differences between certain Hebrew

letters may also yield mistaken copying of texts. This is an important issue when dealing with sacred texts such as the Bible or its translations. These problems are analyzed here and demonstrated by nouns and nominalized present participle patterns based on a systematic study of several manuscripts. Following this analysis, Bar-Asher concludes that most of such differences are not due to errors but to the existence of parallel forms.

Yochanan Breuer, "Rabba and Rava, ʔabba and ʔava – spelling, pronunciation and meaning" (pp. 205-220). The paper analyzes the question of whether these lexemes, apparently meaning father/the father/my father, differ only in spelling or also in meaning, and which meaning is to be attributed to which spelling. These Hebrew, Western and Eastern Aramaic words share the same root but their spelling and pronunciation differ. The words occur in Jewish scholarly rabbinical books (e.g., the Talmud), where both these languages occur, and therefore need to be used accurately. The author analyzes this issue based on the contexts and finds differences between the Hebrew and the Aramaic texts, which suggest their historical developmental dating.

Aron Dotan authored "The double pronunciation of the ancient 'resh'" (pp. 251-300). "Resh" (the Hebrew name for /r/) has developed over time in Hebrew (as in other languages). It is difficult to study phonetics from silent written literature, but Dotan focuses on this aspect. For Hebrew as spoken in medieval times, there are scholarly studies of the /r/. A known problem is that there are two /r/ forms in various manuscripts (of the Bible) – with and without a gemination mark (Hebrew /dageʃ/). The question is how these allophones were pronounced about 1500-2000 or more years ago. Were there differences between its pronunciation by Jews in the Land of Israel (also called Tiberias, since that was the main Jewish center in the country at some period) and by Jews in the diaspora of Babylon? Were there conditioning differences (e.g., in the environment of a phoneme) in the two transmitted articulations of /r/? The paper attempts to answer these questions based on earlier studies. The /r/ question deals with its articulation locus (front /r/ or uvular /ɣ/) or its articulation manner (/rʳ/ (many taps) or simple /r/ (one tap). Modern Jewish Iraqi dialects are known to use two manners of articulation (/r/ and /ɣ/) – could this reflect the manner of pronunciation of /r/ also 1500-2000 years ago? The difference between the Tiberian and the Babylonian Hebrew dialects is presented in the paper, using data going back to the 8th century CE. However, the author stresses that these considerations still need more tangible proof.

Judith Henschke, "On the language of the Mustaʕarabi Jews of Peqiʕin: Between Jewish Arabic and local Arabic – a look at the names of the holidays" (pp. 317-336). The village called Peqiʕin is considered the last place of continuous agricultural Jewish life in the country since at least the Roman period. This view is based on archeological excavations as well as written texts and the tradition of the last family who lived there. Recorded songs attest to the musical influences of local Arabic, Spanish and Moroccan music types, and a music type which differs from all the above. The author's field research is based on conversations with some of the living people

of the village and older recordings of their speech in the 20th century. Linguistically, the Jews' Arabic dialect in Peqiʕin is similar to near-by Galilean Arabic dialects. Still, Henschke finds not only lexical differences from the local Arabic dialect in Jewish elements derived from Hebrew, but also features similar to Judeo-Arabic elements in other diasporas. She demonstrates them by the names for Sabbath ([ʃabːat]), the first day of the month (as in Arabic [ras əs-ʃahər]), the first day of the year (as in Arabic [ras əs-sane/sene]), Sukkoth 'the holiday of Tabernacles' (as in Arabic [ʕid l-ʕorʃ]), Hanouka ([ʕid ən-nur] 'holiday of lights' and [ʕid iz-zlabe] 'holiday of doughnuts'). For some holidays, both Hebrew and Arabic names are used ([jom kippur/ʕid el-ɣufraːn] 'Atonement day', [ʕid el-fasaħ/[ʕid el-fisəħ][5] 'Easter', [ʃaboʕot/[ʕid el-ʕansˁara] 'Pentecost'.

Doron Yaakov, the paper "Remarks on a verbal form in the Yemenite tradition of Mishnaic Hebrew" (pp. 337-346) discusses variations of the verb forms hitpaʕel/ nitpaʕel: the former occurs in Biblical Hebrew texts, the latter in the later Mishnaic Hebrew. In addition to the difference between the prefixes (/h/ vs. /n/), the vowel following the 2nd root consonant is mainly /tsere/ ([e]) in the Bible reading tradition, 'pataħ' ([a]) in the Mishna, and /kamasˁ/ ([ɔ]) in a single southern-Yemeni reading tradition. The author investigates the sources of the rare Yemeni (/kamasˁ/) and Mishnaic (/h/) forms and finds such forms in old Babylonian texts. According to Yaakov, these forms attest to the great effect of oral traditions in preserving ancient language elements.

Geoffrey Khan, "The pronunciation of Dageʃ in the Tiberian tradition of Biblical Hebrew" (pp. 347-360). Dageʃ is the Hebrew term for a geminated ("stressed") consonant. There were two types of dageʃ in the Hebrew writing system: a strong (forte) dageʃ, which indicates gemination in almost all letters of the alphabet, including the six stops [bː, dː, gː, kː, pː, tː]. In Modern Hebrew, the weak (lene) dageʃ changes the pronunciation of these six phonemes to the parallel "unstressed, weak" stops [b, d, g, k, p, t]. Without any Dageʃ, these letters are pronounced as fricatives [v, ɣ, ð, x, f, θ][6]. Khan finds evidence in the material of traditional Masoretic treatises of the Tiberian school and the Karaite Bible translations into Arabic, that those six letters vocalized by the weak (lene) dageʃ were pronounced as stops and not fricatives. He suggests that the fricative reading manner developed in the later Masoretic period, i.e., the 10th-11th centuries CE. In the Arabic orthography, however (of the Karaites), there are no different terms for two dageʃ types. A special case is the letter <t> (/tav/ in Hebrew) and its gemination mark, which Khan mentions but leaves for a later study.

Asher Laufer, "Contemporary realizations of Qamesˁ: The pronunciation of qamesˁ before a ħatˁef-qamesˁ[7] (pp 361-386). Laufer first describes the liturgical vocalization systems of three Hebrew dialects that have been preserved in oral Bible reading and prayers: the Tiberian (northern) system with seven phonemic vowels /i, e, ɛ, a, ɔ, o, u/; the Babylonian system with six vowels /i, ɛ, e/a, ɔ, o, u/; and the South-Israeli (Jerusalem) system with five vowels /i, e/ ɛ, a, o, u/. These systems have survived in oral traditions, but the writing system of all these dialects follows the Tiberian

orthographic system. Contemporary liturgical Hebrew thus distinguishes Yemenite, Ashkenazi and Sephardi pronunciations, following the three old traditions. However, certain prayer books reveal differences in the pronunciation of a qames֯ which precedes a glottal/laryngeal consonant with a small qames֯. This leads to Laufer's analysis of the pronunciation of the "small" and "big" qames֯ in various phonetic environments. Laufer presents evidence of the pronunciation of the un-accented qames֯ as /a/ (not /ɔ/) in Sephardi texts and oral tradition. The final question is how to pronounce qames֯ in contemporary spoken Hebrew. Which rule should prevail: that of the liturgical tradition or that of the "Ashkenazi" pronunciation? This question is relevant also for non-liturgical utterances, because many words are common to both (e.g., [t͡sohorajim ~ t͡saharajim] 'noontime', [noʕomi ~ naʕami] 'Naomi, female name' [moħoratajim ~ maħaratajim] 'after tomorrow'). Laufer prefers the traditional manner (with /a/) in such cases, although a large proportion of the native speakers of Modern Hebrew now use a form that never existed in the history of the Hebrew language due to a grammarians' error.

Yosef Ofer, "Two Masoretic notes about words vocalized with a qames֯ and their metamorphosis" (pp. 427-446). This paper analyzes two notes from Masoretic (tradition) texts that deal with the reading pronunciation of words in the Hebrew Bible. The notes discuss whether their pronunciation should be with qames֯ (/ɔ/) or with pataħ (/a/). However, the texts of both these notes has become corrupted by time and consequently their correct meanings (and reading manners) have been forgotten. Still, since oral traditions have preserved Bible reading, most of the discussed forms are correctly pronounced. The author suggests correcting the reading manner of the notes according to these considerations.

Yona Sabar, "Hebrew in the shadow of New Aramaic: Miszrahi Hebrew as reflected in the report of a Kurdish Hakham traveling in Kurdistan in 1932" (pp. 455-500). This paper focuses on a Hebrew text written (apparently in the 1930's) by a Kurdish-Jew who travelled in the Middle East and its Jewish communities: Jaffa, Haifa, Acre, Beirut, and Georgia (Tiflis), Azerbaijan (Baku), Kurdistan, and even Iraq (Baghdad) and Russia (Yekaterinburg). He writes in Hebrew with features developed in Palestine at the beginning of the 20th century, but uses the Arabic numerals (e.g., ٢ =2, ٣ = 3, ٧ = 7), and features that reflect his Kurdish (Jewish Zacho) dialect. It has many spelling mistakes and other errors showing mixed knowledge of Hebrew and its literary register. These features include using, even when not necessary, /j, w, ʔ/ to mark long or stressed vowels (the so called "matres lectionis"), affricates or emphatic consonants (e.g., [s֯]), for non-affricates (e.g., /s/) deriving from his spoken Kurdish dialect. The author also notes morphological, syntactic, and other features. The author then presents the whole text (26 pp. in this book) in Hebrew with annotations.

Michael Ryzhik, "Orthographic differences between orders of the Mishnah in MS Kaufmann" (pp. 517-536). The author examines different parts of the Mishnah manuscript as edited by Kaufmann (apparently in the 11th-12th century CE). He notes that several of the orders (parts) use the "matres lectionis" more than others, e.g.,

/keʔilu/ vs. /kilu/ 'as if', /yehuda/ vs. /yuda/ 'Judas', /kullam/ vs. /kllam/ 'all of them', /nixnas/ vs. /nxnas/ '(he) entered', etc. Other duplicate cases (e.g., full vocalization or not) also exist. Obviously, the manuscript is not uniform. Ryzhik concludes that the Kaufmann manuscript had different origins, which developed in different manners over the long period from the 3rd century to the 11th-12th century, when Kaufmann edited the manuscript in Italy.

Ora (Rodrigue) Schwarzwald, "The common denominator principle in the formation of Israeli Hebrew (pp. 557-572) Linguistic common denominators, in contrast with mathematiccal ones, take the smallest elements that are common to various groups. The Hebrew language regained its full use, in both speech and writing, after being used for centuries primarily for liturgical and ritual purposes. This process involved many Jewish communal linguistic traditions emanating from Europe, North Africa and the Middle East. These tradetions converged to the smallest common denominator in all the domains of Hebrew structures. Schwarzwald presents examples and explanations of the changes that have shaped Modern Hebrew. The examples refer mainly to phonetic/phonological elements (e.g., unification of [k/q], reducing the vowel system to five phonemes, word accent rules which differ between original (old) Hebrew words and innovated or foreign ones, differentiation between verb forms with assimilated and non-assimilated /n/ (e.g., /hibit/ 'he looked' vs. /hinbit/ 'he germinated a plant'). Thus, Modern Hebrew now has old (ancient) structures and new ones. The latter use new rules that may contradict older rules.

Ofra Tirosh-Becker, "Hebrew and Judeo Arabic of Bar Mitzva homilies from Ghardaïa. (pp. 611- 636). The paper begins with a survey of the town Ghardaïa in the Mzab region of Algeria, and the development of the Jewish community there. The paper focuses on Jewish customs there, mainly the speech given by a boy celebrating his coming of age (at age 13). In this celebration, boys also get a prayer shawl to pray with and begin using the ritual phylacteries in the prayers. The paper analyzes the Hebrew and Judeo-Arabic elements from a book on Jewish customs in Ghardaïa (published in1926). On the phonetic level, the author notes the mixture of /u - o/, the use of the fricative consonants (/s, ʃ, ts, tʃ, z, ʒ/) and the emphatization (laryngealization) trend of non-emphatic consonants in adjacent emphatic environments. These are typical features of colloquial Arabic dialects in North Africa. She also presents many morphological and syntactic features.

3 Other papers

Yitzhak Avishur writes about "Names of Jewish holidays in Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic" (pp. 31-46). The author discusses two Jewish holiday names, [purim] and [hoʃaʕna rabːa], as they appear in Arabic, Aramaic and Hebrew. The examples, which illustrate pronunciation aspects, appear also in the Arabic alphabet.

Ilan Eldar's paper "The Hebrew of Dutch Sepharadim[8] in seventeenth century Amsterdam" (p. 47-64) deals with texts by Spanish and Portuguese Jews who fled from the Iberian Peninsula to Amsterdam, and by their children who were already born there. In that time, Amsterdam was an important Jewish center. The texts

demonstrate that in writing, these people went on using the Spanish and Portuguese languages, in addition to treatises and poetry in Hebrew.

David M. Bunis' paper deals with "The Iberian Judeo-Arabic roots of the Ladino Bible translation tradition" (p. 65-88). This paper suggests that the Bible translation in Ladino has its roots in Judeo-Arabic, which they used first in North Africa and Spain during the Moslem conquest. Bunis does not study parallel Hebrew-Judeo-Arabic-Ladino syntactic structures by comparing texts, but by (cognate) lexical items. In his study, he uses material from Rabi Seʕadya Gaʔon's[9] Bible translation from the 10th century.

Joshua Blau's paper (pp. 89-94) "Remarks on the Biblical dictionary of David Alfa:si" raises questions about items in that dictionary. Alfa:si's (10th century) dictionary reveals, according to Blau, features of a special "translationese" style. Blau notes that Alfa:si may innovate a translated meaning, and then add an explanation in a more conventional phrasing. Blau thinks that this procedure shows that Alfa:si sometimes widened the semantic use of that item in his Bible translation. Another issue is Alfa:si's translation of *bjnwt* 'between, among' as limited to the present and future tenses (not for the past) which Blau considers strange. Blau concludes that where it appears, that word seems to be redundant, as implied in its deletion in Rabi Seʕadya Gaʔon's Bible translation.

Nasir Basal (pp.137-160) "On the comparison between languages in Tafsi:r alʔalfa:ðˁ by ʔAbu al-Faraj Ha:ru:n: Comparisons to Rabbinic Hebrew and Aramaic." The book "Tafsi:r alʔalfa:ðˁ" ('Explanation of Expressions') is a Bible-based bilingual Hebrew-Arabic glossary by the Karaite ʔAbu al-Faraj Ha:ru:n (10th-11th CE). Basal describes ʔAbu al-Faraj's method of language comparison, while discussing mainly unique (singularly occurring, hapax legomenae) Biblical Hebrew lexical items. Many examples are compared with Rabbinical Hebrew, Biblical Aramaic and translation Aramaic, including works by Seʕadya Gaʔon and certain Karaite authors.

Elitzur Bar-Asher Sigal's paper "Rhetorical questions in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic" (179-204) focuses on the use of the Babylonian Aramaic /mi/ and /ʔatu/ rhetorical interrogative particles, in order to find their function and meaning. This work reveals that /mi/ is an ordinary interrogative particle, while /ʔatu/ is used (i) in non-rhetorical contexts suggesting a causal link, and (ii) in rhetorical contexts, implying a reference to a previous utterance. (iii) It also raises doubts about the possible truth-value of a rhetorical question. /ʔatu/ also appears at the head of the rhetorical question and not directly before the main predicate. In the context of negative rhetorical questions /ʔatu mi/ may occur together, in limited complementary distribution.

Chanoch Gamliel's paper, "Lexical definitions in Menahem's[10] Mahberet and Rashi's commentary" (pp. 221-236) The "Mahberet" is the first Hebrew Bible dictionary written in Hebrew. This paper examines the definition methods of the "Mahberet" and Rashi's commentary of the Hebrew Bible (in Hebrew) which contains explanations of many Hebrew lexemes. Gamliel finds many differences between these

two scholars' methods. While Menahem Ben Sarouk's book presents occasional synonyms and more Biblical quotations as examples than real definitions, Rashi's work really tries to define lexical meanings, and is innovative in his independent method.

Santiago Garcia-Jalon, "Manuscripts that preceded the *Introductiones* of Alfonso de Zamora" (pp. 237-250). Alfosno de Zamora was the son of a rabbi in Zamora, Spain, and was converted to Christianity when he returned to Zamora in 1506 after the expulsion of Jews in 1492. He was later appointed professor at the University of Salamanca and then head of the faculty of Hebrew at the University of Alcala. He wrote the book entitled "Introductiones artis Grammaticae Hebraicae" in 1515 and the second edition in 1526. This paper discusses manuscripts of Hebrew grammar books that appeared in the 16th century and spread the "general linguistics" method which Alfonso de Zamora knew (and used) in his 2nd edition. Many signs attest to the long years that it took for him to write the 2nd edition.

Jonathan Howard's paper "Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek: The list of languages in Meʔor ʕayin and the transmission of Diqduqe Ha-Miqra" (pp. 301-316) "Meʔor ʕayin" is an 11th century grammar of Hebrew, adapted and based on earlier grammar books. Howard suggests that the detailed list of languages (in chapter 11) is an adaptation of an earlier list, which appears in the book "Diqduqe Ha-Miqra" ('Bible minutiae') some three centuries earlier. The adaptation seems to formalize the ideas presented in the earlier book. In addition, this study finds in "Meʔor ʕayin" a different sub-archetype of "Diqduqe Ha-Miqra". The author notes that the three mentioned languages do not include Arabic, though it was an important scholarly language at the time. The origin of the book is not known, though its author is assumed to have been Karaite, and such scholars usually knew Arabic. Maman himself found some elements hinting at the Arabic origin of the book. The two language lists differ in some respects from one another, but Howard assessed that the later one was an adaptation of the earlier one, by omitting elements from the earlier list (e.g., Aramaic for 'Leshon Kasdim', both meaning Aramaic), and adding "the Ismaelite language" (i.e., Arabic). This fact also demonstrates that the comparative linguistics of Biblical Hebrew and Arabic existed as early as the 8th century CE. The author finally describes the various origins of "Meʔor ʕayin" in a figure.

José Martinez Delgado, "The making of accumulative lists in the Maḥberet of Menaḥem Ben Saruq" (pp. 387-407). Delgado's paper is another study of Menahem's grammatical activity in his "Maḥberet", the first dictionary based on the Hebrew Bible. The lists deal with phonetic/phonological, morphological and lexical aspects. They rely on the traditional analysis of Hebrew grammar (Masora) before its Arabicization in Andalus (i.e., the Iberian Peninsula), but are influenced by Al-Khalil's Arabic "Kit:ab al-ʕajn" 'the book of ʕajn', and the first alphabetic Arabic dictionary (8th century CE). This is evident in the articulation locus identification (e.g., the laryngeal ʕain), the arrangement into biconsonantal and tri-consonantal roots, and with a list of biconsonantal root pairs which do not have any semantic meaning in

Hebrew. The examples for the lists are from Biblical verses. Following tradition, the consonants are arranged in the Hebrew order of 22 consonants, while the letters are arranged into serving (affixed) and base (root) consonants. The lists also include words that differ by vocalization and word accents, as well as homonyms ("same form and different meanings").

Hananel Mirsky, "The Maḥberet Menaḥem according to the critical edition of Saenz-Badillos" (pp.408-426) Since the Bible is a sacred text, writers who copied it along the centuries tried to keep their work as accurate possible, but copiers' errors did occur in them. Linguists and philologists tried to clarify such errors by comparing different versions (editions) of the Bible. This paper analyzes Badillos' edition of Menaḥem's Maḥberet using 13 cases (examples) of Badillos' version, which followed phonetic/phonological reasoning, illustrating various written forms of words and roots from the Bible. Mirsky's conclusion is that Badillos' philological analysis is not sufficient, explaining semantic (content) reasoning should also be taken into consideration.

Steven E. Fassberg "Perfect third masculine singular ending in –w and related forms in Samarian Aramaic" (pp. 447-454). The problem raised here is that several 3rd person masculine singular past tense verbs (of some root type) written in Samaritan Aramaic in the translated Biblical text, are written with a final "waw" (/w/), which normally denotes 3rd person masculine plural in verbs. After examining several researchers' discussions of this point, Fassberg suggests that when a noun indicates a group, it is referred to as a plural person. This structure is found in the Hebrew Bible, mainly in its later parts, and in various Aramaic texts other than the Aramaic Bible translation.

Moshe Kahan, "The transformation of ellipsis from an exegetical rule to a logical theorem in Kaspi's work" (pp. 401-516) This paper deals with the linguistics and logic taken from the contributions of Joseph Ibn Kaspi (13th-14th century) from Provence. Kaspi analyzed ellipsis in the Bible (a syntactic structure, today studied also within discourse analysis). He was not the first to note elliptic utterances in the Bible, but he initiated the study of this feature within the linguistic-philosophical (Aristotelian) rules, considering ellipsis as a deliberate omission of unnecessary "details" compared to the "general" features.

Yael Reshef, "Distinctive lexical features in the written Hebrew of the Revival period" (pp. 537-556). The 60 years' revival period of Hebrew[11] in *Eretz Yisraʔel* (the Land of Israel) led to the development of Modern Hebrew, in the prolific use of Hebrew in books, newspapers etc. and speech. Some of the vocabulary used in this period continued traditional expressions (Biblical, Mishnaic, Rabbinic, etc.). Not all of the meanings of such lexemes were integrated in later Modern Hebrew, however, and were discarded from everyday usage. Reshef gives examples of this process from newspapers of that period, and argues that it should be considered a distinct period in the history of Hebrew.

Joseph Chetrit, "Representation of the Jewish community and communal ethos: A socio-pragmatic and linguistic analysis of a Hebrew elegy by R. Shemuel Haliwa (Meknes, 1790)", (pp. 573-594) Chetrit presents a lament by the Meknes (Morocco) rabbi, Shemuel Haliwa about the 1790 pogrom against the Jews of Meknes. The lament is written in Hebrew, in a rhymed poetic framework. Chetrit analyzes the lament from its socio-pragmatic and linguistic aspects. These elements are based on well-known Hebrew prayers and liturgical texts.

Joseph Tedghi, "Neologism and Rare forms in the spiritual words of Moroccan sages" (pp. 595-610). The paper is based on literature written by Moroccan sages who used Hebrew as a living language of written communication. They also coined new terms that were lacking in their writing. Tedghi gives examples that appear in various documents since the 16th century, and suggests that these innovations imply that the Moroccan sages used Hebrew freely, innovating new words or expanding meanings, as also found in Modern Israeli Hebrew.

4 Summary

To sum up this review, this book is interesting for linguists, phoneticians and grammarians in general as well as scholars of Hebrew, Arabic, and Aramaic. These three important living Semitic languages are not usually represented in our journal, which makes this review perhaps more interesting for non-Semitics readers. The studies reflect many aspects of linguistic issues in their written and oral media. They deal with ancient (Biblical) or just "old" texts (i.e., since the medieval era) and try to uncover and reveal the living forms of the language and their development. A few papers discuss Modern Hebrew, focusing on phonetic features and their changes, whereas others examine old and new lexical items and other grammatical structures. They use various methods of modern linguistics, including field study. This nice gift for Professor Maman widens our horizons in many ways and is a worthy contribution to the learning of Hebrew and the languages discussed in it.

Endnotes

[1] The Talmud (/talmud/) is the collected Rabbinic material assembled after the Bible in ca. the 3rd century CE. It has two versions: the earlier one was written in Jerusalem (current Israel) while the other, later one was the Babylonian Talmud (current Iraq). The Babylonian one is now considered the more important for the Jewish religious learning of earlier rabbinic traditions.

[2] Mishnah is the first part of the oral tradition of the Jewish ritual laws. It was finally edited in writing, apparently in the beginning of the 3rd century CE.

[3] Karaite is a still existing Jewish sect, which began apparently in the 8th century CE. Today less than 1% of Jews belong to this sect. They live by the Bible rules and rituals, not accepting those of the later Rabbinical exegesis and rules

[4] The Samaritans are an ethnic group of Jews who claim to have continued living in the country without ever leaving it. They speak a special Hebrew dialect and live by the Bible rules and rituals, not accepting those of the later Rabbinical exegesis and rules.

[5] in Modern Hebrew it is pronounced as [pesax]

[6] In Modern Hebrew /ɣ,ð,θ/ have become /g, d, t/, respectively.

[7] qames^{ʕ} is the name of the vowel /ɔ/, which in some Hebrew dialects is pronounced as /a/. qames^{ʕ} may be "big" and pronounced as /ɔ/, or "small" when it is "shortened" due to

morpho-phonological pattern rules. ħatʿef-qamesʿ is an ultra-short vowel. It becomes an epenthetic vowel, preventing consonant clusters when followed by a laryngeal/glottal consonant.

[8] Sepharadim – derived from [sefarad] 'Spain' in Hebrew, referring to Jews originating in Spain. Nowadays, the term is still used to refer to Jews originating in the Mediterranean basin, from Spain and Portugal via North Africa to Greece and Turkey.

[9] Seʕadya Gaʔon (882-941 CE) was born in Egypt, but became head of the Jewish community in Sura (/Su:ra/), Iraq. He was an original thinker and wrote many books and studies of the Hebrew language, rabbinical laws, and philosophy. He wrote in Judeo Arabic, translated the Bible into Arabic, authored Hebrew grammar books and a Hebrew dictionary, etc.

[10] Menahem- is Menahem Ben Sarouk (920-970 CE) from Spain. Rashi is the abbreviation of his name Rabi Shelomo Yitshaqi (1040-1105 CE), who was born and lived in France and won fame for his Bible and Talmud exegesis and many other studies.

[11] The period between the end of the Enlightenment period and the end of the British mandate rule in Palestine (from 1881 and 1947) is the period of revival of Hebrew literature and the crystallization of Modern Hebrew native oral speech.