

## פתח דבר

אנו שמחים להניח לפני הקוראים את כרך יט של "מחקרים בלשון". עשרת המאמרים הכלולים בו מתפרסים על פני כל תקופות הלשון וחוקרים אותה מזוויות רבות. רוב המאמרים נוגעים בלשון המקרא, בנוסחו, בתרגומו, בפרשנותו ובתורת הדקדוק הנשענת עליו. עמנואל מסטיי הן בשימוש הנוסחה "ביד פלוני" מצד התחביר והסמנטיקה ומראה מה נשתנה בה בספרים המאוחרים של המקרא. מיתקה גולוברצהבי סוקרת את השמות הפרטיים המכילים את הרכיב "בעל" בחצי הראשון של האלף הראשון לפני הספירה, משווה בין תפוצתם במקרא ובין תפוצתם בממצא האפיגרפי, ומסיקה מכאן מסקנות על היקף פולחן הבעל ועל ההבדל שבין מסורת המקרא ובין המציאות העולה מן האפיגרפיה. נוסח המקרא נידון במאמרו של יונתן הווארד, שהוא תגובה על מאמרו של אפרים בצלאל הלבני שנתפרסם במחקרים בלשון טז (תשע"ה): הלבני תהה איזה נוסח מקרא עומד ביסוד דקדוקו של גזניוס, שכן ניכר שנוסח זה איננו מתאים לעדי הנוסח המעולים שבידינו, והוארד מאתר את הדפוס המדויק. מאמרה של מרים (לאור) כהנא מוקדש לתרגומי המקרא, ובמקרה הזה תרגום יונתן לנביאים, ובו תוארו הגורמים הפעילים בחריגה הידועה מן התרגום המילולי כשמדובר בשם ה', גורמים שלדבריה הם לא רק תאולוגיים אלא גם תחביריים, לקסיקליים וסגנוניים. נוסח של מקרא הנוגע בפרשנותו מואר במאמרו של משה פלורנטין על הפסוק "תהיינה לראש יוסף ולקדקד נזיר אחיו" לפי מסורת שומרון, שבה המילים "ראש" ו"קדקד" מיודעות, ומכאן ש"ראש" אינו נסמך ליוסף אלא תואר לו. קריאה זו ופרשנות זו קשורות לדעתו במגמה מרכזית באמונת השומרונים. מסורת שומרון בפירוש המקרא מתעשרת גם ממאמרו של עלי ותד, שבו הוא מפרסם עוד קטע - המצטרף אל קטעים שפורסמו במקומות אחרים - של מילון מן העברית של נוסח התורה השומרוני אל הערבית. גם מאמרו של חנוך גמליאל נוגע בפרשנות המקרא ומשווה בין שיטתו של רש"י לשיטתו של אבן-עזרא בכיאורי מילים, ובעיקר בשאלה אם הפרשן חש עצמו מחויב להגדיר כל מילה. דקדוק חכמי ימי הביניים נחקר במאמרו של יהונתן וורמסר, שנסקרו בו גלגולי שימושו של אחד המונחים הנפוצים בדקדוק העברי, "פיאור" (שממנו נשתלשל גם ההסבר הנפוץ "לתפארת הקריאה" לדגשים מסוימים), משימושו הראשוני לציון הרחבת מילה אל שאר שימושו.

שני מאמרים חוקרים תקופות מאוחרות יותר. מאמרה של מירב (טובול) כהנא הוא המשך למחקריה על הטטרלמה בספרות חז"ל, וכאן היא מתארת את המבנה

של הטטרלמה מסוג הצירופים הזהים, שאין בהם ערכיות (חיובית או שלילית) אלא תכונות מקבילות. ובמאמר שמטרתו העיקרית היא העברית החדשה, רותי ברדנשטיין ונועם פריי מתארים את תהליך החילון, שבמסגרתו עבר הביטוי "סליחה" מבקשת מחילה מן האל למילת התנצלות שבין אדם לחברו וכך היה לסמן שיח בעברית של ימינו.

הגב' תם פרחי ערכה את הלשון בטוב טעם ודעת והגב' אירית נחום התקינה את הסדר בידיים אמונות. אנו מודים למכון למדעי היהדות על תמיכתו בהוצאת הכרך ולהוצאת מאגנס על ההפקה מהחל ועד כלה.

## תוכן העניינים

ה	פתח דבר
1	רותי ברדנשטיין ונועם פריי חילונה של הסליחה
35	מיתקה גלובל־רצהבי תפוצת שמות פרטיים עם המרכיב 'בעל' בממצאים מחפירות ארכאולוגיות בארץ ישראל בתקופת הברזל II ובמקרא
51	חנוך גמליאל תפיסה לקסיקוגרפית מצמצמת מול תפיסה מרחיבה: סיכום ביניים לעיון משווה בין אבן עזרא לרש"י
67	יונתן האורד נוסח המקרא בגזניוס-קאוטש: תוספת למאמרו של הלבני
71	יהונתן וורמסר פיאור, תפארת ודגש לתפארת הקריאה: על גלגוליו של מונח בספרות הדקדוק העברי
89	עלי ותד מילון דו־לשוני: עברי (שומרוני)-ערבי, עלום שם <sup>2</sup>
133	מירב (טובול) כהנא טטרלמה וטרילמה מסוג הצירופים הזהים במשנה ובתוספתא
151	מרים (לאור) כהנא היבטים תחביריים וסגנוניים המשתקפים ביחס לה' בתרגום יונתן לנביאים
169	עמנואל מסטיי הנוסחה 'פִּיֶד פלוני' בהקשר הנבואי: דיאכרוניה תחבירית
191	משה פלורנטין לראש יוסף ולקרקד נזיר אחיו
IX	תקצירים באנגלית

## Contents

Preface		ה
Ruti Bardenstein and Noam Frey	The Secularization of Hebrew <i>slixa</i> ('Sorry', 'Excuse Me', 'Pardon')	1
Mitka R. Golub	The Element בעל in Personal Names from Archaeological Excavations in the Land of Israel during the Iron Age II Period and from the Bible	35
Chanoch Gamiel	Two Different Lexical Approaches: Rashi vs. Ibn Ezra	51
Jonathan Howard	The Biblical Text of Gesenius–Kautzsch: An Addendum to Halivni's Paper	67
Yehonatan Wormser	From פִּאֹרִי to לְתַפְאֶרֶת הַקְּרִיָּאָה: Change and Development in the Use of a Hebrew Grammatical Term	71
Ali Watad	An Anonymous Bilingual Dictionary <sub>2</sub> : (Samaritan) Hebrew and Arabic	89
Merav (Tubul) Kahana	Same-Phrase Tetralemma and Trilemma in the Mishna and Tosefta	133
Miriam (Laor) Kahana	Syntactic and Stylistic Elements Reflecting the Attitude toward God in Targum Jonathan to the Prophets	151
Emmanuel Mastey	The Formula בִּיד פְּלוֹנִי 'By the Hand of Someone' in Prophetic Context: Syntactic Diachrony	169
Moshe Florentin	וּלְקִרְקַד <i>wlaqqādqād</i> : and לַרְעָשׁ <i>larrēʔoš</i> : A Study of Two Words with Gemination in the Samaritan Pentateuch	191
English Abstracts		IX

## **The Secularization of Hebrew *slixa* (‘Sorry’, ‘Excuse Me’, ‘Pardon’)**

This research presents the grammaticalization path of Hebrew *slixa* (‘sorry’, ‘excuse me’, ‘pardon’) into a multi-functional discourse marker. While biblical *slixa* was expressed solely towards God as a sinner’s search for redemption and reflected God’s superiority over man, we claim that the secularization of *slixa* as a common interpersonal speech act of apology motivated its grammaticalization as a multi-functional discourse marker. On the one hand, *slixa* functions as a speech act which reflects the positioning of interlocutors as a product of the social force between them. On the other hand, *slixa* is also used to mark the upcoming misdeed-related utterance. We claim that due to *slixa*’s use as an expression of the speakers’ intention to mitigate face threats toward the listener, as in *slixa gveret, at to ‘a* (‘sorry/excuse me miss, you are wrong’), *slixa* is also used in Modern Hebrew to convey a misdeed carried out by the addressee rather than the speaker, as in *slixa?!? ata lo tagid li ma la ‘asot* (‘Excuse me?!? You can’t tell me what to do!’). This kind of *slixa* will be dubbed ‘mutual *slixa*’. In addition, we claim that the persistence (Hopper, 1991) of the different uses of *slixa* is the injustice that is involved in it. However, unlike *slixa*’s original exclusive use as a sinner’s way to ask God for forgiveness, it is also used in Modern Hebrew by the person to whom the injustice was committed.

For our analysis of contemporary Hebrew, we used a political corpus, the Knesset committees’ transcripts from the years 1995-2016. We found that *slixa* is most often used as a ‘mutual *slixa*,’ while it is least often used as an apology. We also looked at a non-political contemporary Hebrew corpus (heTenTen, a collection of text corpora created from the Web), where we found that *slixa* is most often used as an apology and much less as a ‘mutual *slixa*’. The historical data was taken from the Ma’agarim corpus (comprised of Hebrew texts from the Historical Dictionary Project of the Academy of the Hebrew Language), and 20<sup>th</sup> century data was taken from Tel-Aviv University’s Jpress corpus (featuring the Historical Jewish Press).

Mitka R. Golub

## **The Element בעל in Personal Names from Archaeological Excavations in the Land of Israel during the Iron Age II Period and from the Bible**

Stimulated by the discovery of the 'Išba'al inscription from the tenth century BCE at Khirbet Qeiyafa, I investigated all personal names with the element בעל from the Iron Age II period: 10<sup>th</sup>/9<sup>th</sup> century to 586 BCE. The names were collected from artifacts found in excavations in the Land of Israel and Transjordan in the context of the Iron Age II period, and from the Hebrew Bible. I analyze and compare the distribution of these names according to geography and chronology. The results show that the use of the element בעל is very limited in both archaeology and the Hebrew Bible, probably indicating that the worship of Baal was not widespread during this period. In archaeology, the element בעל occurs in Israel in the 8<sup>th</sup> century but is absent from Judah from the 9<sup>th</sup> century onward. In the Bible, the element בעל appears before and during David's time, but disappears from both Israel and Judah from the 9<sup>th</sup> century onward. Thus, while בעל appears in archaeological Israelite names, it is absent from biblical Israelite names, as from Judean names from archaeology. These results may be interpreted to indicate that the Bible reflects Judean and not Israelite onomastic traditions.

Chanoch Gamliel

## **Two Different Lexical Approaches: Rashi vs. Ibn Ezra**

An important aspect of Biblical exegesis is providing the meaning of words, especially difficult and rare ones. A fundamental question related to this is which words ought to be explained and in what way. We have conducted a preliminary study of the commentaries of Rashi and Ibn Ezra to Isaiah and examined 200 difficult words, half of them hapax legomena, in order to see whether they receive a lexical definition and which one. Rashi defines nearly every word lexically and he takes pains so as to give a wider semantic account of the semantic development of the specific meaning in

the context. Ibn Ezra refrains from explaining 25% of these words, although he mentions quite frequently that they are hapax legomena, and when he does give a definition it is short and minimal in semantic scope. He prefers to cite other verses without supplying any explanation. This is quite surprising since Ibn Ezra had access to the elaborate commentary of Saadia Gaon and to the dictionary of Ibn Janah. It seems that he and Rashi viewed differently the lexical work of the commentator: it should be exhaustive and detailed (Rashi) or contain only minimal and partial information (Ibn Ezra). This conclusion has to be verified by a more comprehensive survey of their commentaries, which I hope to complete in the near future.

Meirav (Tubul) Kahana

### **Same-Phrase Tetralemma and Trilemma in the Mishna and Tosefta**

A tetralemma is a logical pattern made of four sentences containing two characteristics each (A, B) and their opposites: (A, B), (-A, B), (A, -B), (-A, -B). I have discussed the pattern in previous research. A trilemma is a tetralemma that omits one of the four sentences. In identical combination tetralemma, the two characteristics without their opposites create four combinations, such that in two of the sentences one characteristic appears twice: (A,A), (A,B), (B,A), (B,B). In identical combination trilemma, only three of the aforementioned combinations appear. This article examines identical combination tetralemma and identical combination trilemma. These two patterns share characteristics with the tetralemma, yet some of their characteristics are unique. Given the differences between the classic / prototypical tetralemma, on the one hand, and the identical combination tetralemma and the identical combination trilemma, on the other hand, the latter two patterns should be classified in a single, separate type of pattern. In addition, the article compares the Mishna and the Tosefta in terms of the number of tetrallemmas of both types—the classic tetralemma and the two patterns with identical combinations—that are documented in these two compilations of Tannaitic language.

Miriam (Laor) Kahana

## **Syntactic and Stylistic Elements Reflecting the Attitude toward God in Targum Jonathan to the Prophets**

In this article I attempt to point to the syntactic function associated with the mention of the name of God in the Targum and to the syntactic circumstances in which the Targum translates literally, without changes or additions. I argue that, in addition to theological and hermeneutic considerations, one can also isolate syntactic and stylistic aspects that shed light on the Targum's conception of God.

When the divine name appears in a verse in a predicative position, the Targum does not ascribe the statement to God himself, but rather to something other than God, such as what happens before (קדם) God, God's word (מימרא), his presence (שכינתא), his worship (פולחנא), or his glory (יקרא). In those few verses in which verses are translated literally, it seems that the Targum wishes to preserve unique syntactic structures. When the divine name appears as the grammatical agent, the Targum generally preserves the verse unchanged. Even when the verb is understood as ascribing to God an unacceptable anthropomorphism, the Targum generally prefers to alter the verb and to preserve the syntactic structure unchanged. We also identify a stylistic-theological preference: the Targum does not see it as obligatory to add or to change the verb if it already did so in the parallel section of the verse. This is especially true if the change was adopted in relation to the name *YHWH*, while in the parallel stich the name *Elohim* appears.

Jonathan Howard

## **The Biblical Text of Gesenius–Kautzsch: An Addendum to Halivni's Paper**

In *Language Studies* 16, Dr. E. B. Halivni compared the text of the Bible as quoted in the Gesenius–Kautzsch–Cowley grammar with today's authoritative versions (Aleppo, Leningrad and the Venice 1525 edition). A number of differences were noted and the grammar of the different



readings analyzed. In this paper I demonstrate that the vast majority of these differences can be traced to the 19th-century Bible edition published by Seligman Baer.

Yehonatan Wormser

### **From פֵּאוּר to דְּגִשׁ לְתַפְאֵרֶת הַקְּרִיאָה: Change and Development in the Use of a Hebrew Grammatical Term**

The Arabic term *تخميم* ('glory'; פֵּאוּר in Hebrew) was used by Sa'adia Gaon and other early Arabic-speaking grammarians to describe augmentation of words. Jonah ibn Janah used the same word in a completely different meaning, when explaining certain vowel changes. The Qimḥis, Joseph and especially his son, David, adopted another form of this term – תַּפְאֵרֶת – and in addition to its use in marking specific vowel changes, they used it in the phrase דְּגִשׁ לְתַפְאֵרֶת הַקְּרִיאָה, referring to cases of exceptional occurrences of *dagesh* (as in מִקְרָשׁ [Exod 15:17], חֲדָלוּ [Judg 5:7]), which did not match one of the regular known functions of *dagesh*. This term continued to serve more or less in this sense in later Hebrew grammars. In some modern Hebrew grammars, however, it is used in a narrower sense, referring only to a certain type of *dagesh*, which appears in a few particles like לְמָה, אֵלֶּה, etc. This is the last development in the use of the term and is essentially different from its original meaning.

Ali Watad

### **An Anonymous Bilingual Dictionary<sub>2</sub>: (Samaritan) Hebrew and Arabic**

Beginning in the 11th century, the Arabic language became the spoken language of the Samaritan community, as was true for other communities in Palestine such as the Jews and the Karaites. The Samaritan scholars composed works in Arabic in many fields, e.g., *halacha*, grammar, exegesis, and translation. One of these fields was lexicography, in which they

composed Hebrew-Arabic-Aramaic trilingual dictionaries and Hebrew-Arabic bilingual dictionaries.

In this article, I examine the surviving pages of an anonymous bilingual dictionary of Samaritan Hebrew and Arabic. I refer to this dictionary as ‘Anonymous<sub>2</sub>’ since I am publishing another anonymous dictionary, which I have designated ‘Anonymous<sub>1</sub>’. In the current study I describe the manuscript, the nature of the dictionary, its structure, the sources of the Hebrew column, the language reflected in this Hebrew column, and the sources of the Arabic column. I then present a scientific edition of the surviving pages of the dictionary.

Emmanuel Mastey

### **The Formula בִּיד פְּלוּנִי ‘By the hand of Someone’ in Prophetic Context: Syntactic Diachrony**

The Bible sometimes indicates that a certain event is the execution of a prophetic revelation, or that certain deeds fulfill, or alternatively disobey, God’s commandments. In many of the cases, the prophet who revealed God’s will is then mentioned using a formula containing the compound בִּיד (literally, ‘by the hand of’), e.g., כְּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר ה’ בְּיַד מֹשֶׁה ‘when God spoke through Moses’ (Num. 27:23). In this paper, an attempt is made to unfold the semantic and syntactic evolution of this formula. Among other uses, it seems to have developed a function that is best described as *intermediary*, a special type of instrumentality or agency, according to which the prophet serves as the *proxy* of God, i.e., the prophet is merely the mouth of God.

This usage continues to be applied in Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH); however, a by-form has developed in the late stratum, in which the prophet no longer functions as the intermediary, but rather as the recipient of God’s words. I tend to see this linguistic by-form as part of the conceptual adjustment in the Second Temple period regarding prophets and prophecies: the word of God is now a fixed text and the prophet is not merely the announcer of God’s dictum but the bearer of God’s (written?) message.

## **לראש *larrēʔoš* and ולקדקדו *wlaqqādqād*: A Study of Two Words with Gemination in the Samaritan Pentateuch**

The gemination of the consonants *r* and *q* attested in לראש *larrēʔoš* and ולקדקדו *wlaqqādqād* in the biblical verse תהיינה לראש יוסף ולקדקדו נזיר אחיו (Gen 49:26) is not secondary but rather indicates that both nouns are definite. Accordingly, they ought to be translated ‘the head’ and ‘the leader’. Thus the Samaritan reading tradition understands the verse as ‘May they [the blessings] be on *the head*, Joseph, and on *the leader*, the consecrated among his brothers’. The early stratum of the Samaritan Targum, however, translates them by the indefinite לריש, similar to the Masoretic לראש: ‘May they (the blessings) be on the head *of* Joseph, and on the brow *of* him who was separate from his brothers’. By contrast, the late stratum of the Samaritan Targum renders the word לרישה, i.e., ‘the head’. The same is true for the (late) Arabic translation, where one reads للرايس ‘to the head’. This late evidence lines up with the contemporary Samaritan pronunciation *larrēʔoš* and *wlaqqādqād*. One must conclude that the glorification of the traditional reading of this verse is a relatively late interpretation by the Samaritans and reflects a late stage in the development of the Samaritan version.