

פתח דבר

כרך כפול זה של "מחקרים בלשון" מוגש בהערכה רבה לחבר יקר, עמית נאמן, מורה אהוב וחוקר דגול לרגל פרישתו מן ההוראה באוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים. חברו יחד שלושים וחמישה מחברים מהארץ ומחוץ-לארץ כדי להודות לפרופ' יוחנן ברויאר על התורה הרבה שלמדנו מפיו. יותר משלושה עשורים יוחנן חוקר ומלמד בחוג ללשון העברית באוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים. תרומותיו לחקר העברית בכלל ולחקר לשון חז"ל והארמית הבבלית בפרט היו לנכסי צאן ברזל ותמשכנה לעצב את המחקר גם בדורות הבאים.

אישיותו של יוחנן מתאפיינת ביושר וביושרה, הן בין כותלי האוניברסיטה הן מחוצה להם. האמת נר לרגליו. יוחנן גם ניחן בעין חדה ובוחנת, וכפי שהעיר קולגה, "יוחנן רואה בחשכת הליל את מה שאנחנו לא מצליחים לזהות באור היום". עיניו מבחינות בכל עץ ביער ומקיפות את היער כולו. כל מי ששוחח פעם עם יוחנן גם יודע שהוא אדם חושב המגבש לעצמו משנה סדורה ורהוטה במגוון נושאים בין שמדובר במחקר (ולא רק באותם נושאים שהוא חוקר) בין שמדובר בענייני דיומא. אין אכסניה מתאימה יותר לספר יובל ליוחנן ברויאר מאשר מחקרים בלשון, שיוחנן נמנה עם עורכיו. "מחקרים בלשון" כא-כב מוקדש לו בתודה, בהערכה ובאהבה.

אנו מודים למכון למדעי היהדות ע"ש ג'ק, ג'וזף ומורטון מנדל, לקרן ע"ש דוד ופולה בן-גוריון למדעי היהדות מיסודה של משפחת פדרמן, לקרן ע"ש דורה ויוסף שוורץ ולקרן ע"ש צ'רלס וולפסון על תמיכתם הנדיבה בפרסומו של כרך זה. תודתנו נתונה לגברת תם פרחי על עריכתה המוקפדת והנקייה, לגברת אירית נחום שהתקינה את הסדר בזריזות וביעילות, ולהוצאת מאגנס שהוציאה מתחת ידה מלאכה מתוקנת.

ירושלים, פורים תשפ"ה

שמאל פסברג עברי י' בונים

תוכן העניינים

ה	פתח דבר
	עברי י' בונים
1	יוחנן ברויאר
5	רשימת הפרסומים של יוחנן ברויאר
	אוהד אבודרהם
11	התחילית "קא" במנדאית הקלסית
	אילן אלדר ז"ל
33	כללי הטעמים המפסיקים בשלושת ספרי אמ"ת מתוך ספר "עדת דבורים"
	יואל אליצור
47	תולדות "איגר" בארמית והשתקפותן במשנה
	חנן אריאל
55	בגדי השרד: עיוני לשון ונוסח בבבלי יומא עב ע"ב
	ירחמיאל ברודי
77	למה תתראו?
	רוני גולדשטיין ושלמה נאה
81	עיונים לקסיקליים בשדה הסמנטי של חגירת המותניים
	חנוך גמליאל
139	דרכי תרגום שונות בימי הביניים: עיון בתרגומי איגרת תימן
	יונתן האורד
155	גלגולי נוסח ולשון בפסקה מתפילת מוסף לראש חודש
	יהודית הנשקה
185	מימוש חי"ת בעברית בת זמננו: בחינה חברתית ובלשנית
	יונתן וורמסר
217	טיבו של הדגש החזק בעיני המדקדקים בימי הביניים

239	אברהם טל ומשה פלורנטיין תרגום חדש לתורת השומרונים
249	ג'פרי כאן הבחנות מורפולוגיות מחודשות בצורות פועליות במסורות הקריאה השומרונית והטברנית של עברית מקראית
261	חיים א' כהן גוון: לתולדות צורתה וניקודה של מילה אחת
269	חזי מוצפי עיונים לקסיקליים בארמית החדשה של טיאהרה
287	אורי מור בחזרה לסוגיה נדושה: חילופי ם-ן
303	משה מורגנשטרן ואוהד אבורהם עוד קערות מנדאיות מאוסף שלמה מוסיוף
327	עדינה מושבי הבעת הסידוריות בספר מלכים והתאריך הסינכרוניסטי
353	חננאל מירסקי סתירות והיעדר עקיבות במחברת מנחם
379	מרדכי מישור "עלה" (תה' מז 6) לשון מלכות
389	אהרן ממן בין דוד בן אברהם אלפסי למנחם בן סרוק
413	עמנואל מסטיי על הניסים ועל הת'שים: שני ערכים חדשים בלשון האמוראים
431	דינה סנדר אחת בפה ואחת בלב: עברית כלשון דיבור ויידיש כלשון רגש בקרב חרדים בישראל

	יוסף עופר
447	חריגות מחוקי טעמי המקרא
	איתן פינסקי
469	הצירוף הוה + בינוני בארמית הבבלית
	שמואל פסברג
499	צורות הפסק בעברית ובארמית: תופעה עקב מגע?
	שמא יהודה פרידמן
511	"כסעודת שלמה בשעתו/בשעתה" (בבא מציעא ז, א) – חילוף גרסה מאתגר
	שין-ג' פרנג
517	הלשון הארמית בפיוטי רבי שמואל השלישי מירושלים
	תמר צבי
539	"הן" במשמעות 'אם' בעברית המקראית המאוחרת
	אהרן קולר
551	ארמית רבנית קדומה: דיאלקטים וכתבי יד
	מיכאל ריז'יק
	הערות למערכת הבניינים במסורות מאוחרות של לשון המשנה:
575	המעבר פיעל < קל
	יעל רשף
597	שני נסמכים לסומך אחד בתקופת ההתהוות של העברית החדשה
	אריאל שוה
617	סטיות דקדוקיות בלשונו של רש"י
	כריסטיאן שטאדל
	על לשונה העברית של כתובת קבר מארגיס, ארמניה: כלום חלה בה
639	השפעה פרסית?
	ראובן שמחה שטיינר
	"חסדו"/"חזדו" בהלל לעומת "תזכרו"/"תסכרו" בקריית שמע:
647	הדיוק בהגייה (ובאיות) בעיני חז"ל

רות שטרן

669 איגרות הגאונים כמקור לנוסחות כתיבה המשמשות בעברית החדשה

עפרה תירוש-בקר

689 מונחי לשון במילון תלת-לשוני מאלג'יריה

XI

תקצירים באנגלית

Ruth Stern

The Letters of the Geonim as a Source of Epistolary Linguistic Forms in Modern Hebrew

The writing formulas in official letters in Modern Hebrew are often identical or similar to the formulas found in Geonic letters. This article presents the similar formulas with two purposes in mind: 1) to illustrate the significance of the Interim Period for the formation of Modern Hebrew; 2) to show that the continuity of the use of the Hebrew language throughout history was a major factor that allowed the revival of Modern Hebrew.

Ofra Tirosh-Becker

Linguistics Terms in a Tri-Lingual Dictionary of Algerian Jews

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries Algerian Jews lived in a diverse linguistic environment that included Arabic, Judeo-Arabic, French, Hebrew, Berber, and more. Judeo-Arabic served as the communities' main language, but under French colonial rule, which began in 1830, Judeo-Arabic was gradually replaced by French. One of the challenges faced by the Jewish community leaders was to ensure that their students and community members maintain their knowledge of Hebrew and Judeo-Arabic languages and their heritage. Furthermore, French modernity led to the introduction of many new terms, thus creating a need for expanding the Hebrew and Judeo-Arabic lexicons. In this paper I discuss a tri-lingual French–Hebrew–Judeo-Arabic dictionary published c.1930 by Rabbi Yosef Renassia, one of the pillars of the Jewish community of Constantine in eastern Algeria. This extensive dictionary, which includes more than eleven thousand entries, is a treasure trove for the study of Hebrew and Judeo-Arabic at that time. Specifically, in this paper I focus on a single semantic field, that of linguistic terms. Hebrew and Judeo-Arabic linguistic terms are grouped according to their sub-fields: general linguistic terms, parts of speech, morphology, syntax, morphosyntax, semantics and more, and are further discussed in a linguistic and historical context.

more common in *Galilean* Hebrew due to the influence of Phoenician, a neighboring language in which a new root, *s-k-r*, had supplanted the original *z-k-r*.

Immediately after warning about *tizkĕrû*, the Yerushalmi adds a warning against pronouncing *hasdô* ‘His grace, kindness’ in *Hallel* with a [z] instead of an [s]. Here too the rejected pronunciation is a product of voicing assimilation (of /s/ to the following /d/), and here too there is a non-Jewish sociolinguistic context to consider (see below). At first glance, this added warning is surprising, in part because the Yerushalmi, in commenting on the section of *m. Berakhot* 2:3 dealing with precision in pronouncing the *Shema*, does not quote the *bāraytā* stating ‘so too in *Hallel* and the *Megillah*’—a *bāraytā* that it *does* quote in commenting both on a different section of that mishnah and on an earlier mishnah.

The warning about *hasdô* in *Hallel* becomes less surprising once we notice that it comes from Rav Ḥisda, whose name is derived from Aramaic *ḥisd-* and, indirectly, Hebrew *hasd-*. Ancient, medieval and modern sources provide abundant evidence that *ḥVsd-* (= *hasd-*, *hesd-*, *ḥisd-*) in Hebrew and Aramaic nouns—including the personal names Ḥisda and Ḥasdai—was often pronounced with a [z]. In Late Aramaic texts written by non-Jews in Eretz-Israel and Babylonia, *ḥVsd-* was frequently even *spelled* with a *zayin*.

R. Ḥisda appears to have been proud of his name, perhaps because his teacher alluded to it in praising him. His own utterances also contain allusions to his name. The existence of Rabbinic utterances containing such allusions has been recognized since the time of Rashi. This phenomenon—in at least some of its manifestations—is increasingly viewed today as a form of “onomastic (or nominative) determinism” or, in Aramaic, *šmā gārim* = Hebrew *hašem gorem* ‘the name is to blame.’

It is possible that R. Ḥisda’s pride in his name led him to protest against its pronunciation with [z] and its spelling with *zayin*—and to do the same with other cases of *ḥVsd-*. His decision to use the letter *samekh* as his abbreviated signature may be viewed, with Shamma Friedman, as an attempt to call attention to the standard pronunciation and spelling of his name.

contemporary common perception (עוטה instead of עט), or by simple and human distraction from preventing the influence of various factors, internal and exterior, on the language forms required in the context (צורה instead of צד; תן; נמוסו as a feminine imperative). All these forms demonstrate the various circumstances that might lead to grammatical deviations in general in other compositions and by other authors.

Christian Stadel

Gleanings from the Language of the Jews of Medieval Eghegis, Armenia: Persian Substrate in a Hebrew Tombstone Inscription?

64 medieval tombstones excavated in Eghegis (Vayots Dzor region) in southern Armenia testify to a Jewish presence in the area in the 13th and 14th centuries. Based on onomastic and paleographic evidence, it has been suggested that the Jews who used the cemetery were ultimately of Persian origin. Linguistic peculiarities in the Hebrew of the inscriptions found on some of the tombstones point in the same direction. Three ungrammatical or unidiomatic Hebrew expressions conform to typical features of Persian, thus suggesting that the Jews from Eghegis spoke a Neo-Persian dialect.

Richard C. Steiner

Ḥasdô/Ḥazdô in Hallel vs. Tizkêrû/Tiskêrû in the Šema': Precision in Pronunciation (and Spelling) according to the Sages

In *Berakhot* 2:3, the mishnah records a controversy concerning the degree of phonetic precision required in reciting the *Shema'* prayer. In commenting on that mishnah, the Talmud Yerushalmi warns against pronouncing *tizkêrû* '(that) you may remember' with an [s] instead of a [z]. In all likelihood, the pronunciation with [s] arose in Hebrew as a natural product of voicing assimilation (of /z/ to the following /k/), but it may have become

based on an analysis of language use in the Hebrew press between the early 1870s and the early 1930s. It is shown that following repeated prescriptive objection to non-classical constructions such as **חכמי ירושלים** ‘the sages and rabbis of Jerusalem’ throughout the second half of the 19th century, by the early 20th century the employment of such constructions had turned from a common feature of written Hebrew into a marker of traditional, outdated linguistic style. As a result, when Hebrew speech started to take root in the emergent speech community, the overall distribution of the non-classical construction had already sharply declined, and in addition, the formerly common employment of two consecutive synonymous nouns in such constructions was particularly affected and practically disappeared. Despite the relative success of the early prescriptive efforts to eradicate this non-classical usage, its discussion continued to occupy a central place in prescriptive discourse down to our day, regardless of the marked change in the linguistic reality reflected in actual linguistic practice.

Ariel Shaveh

Morphological Deviations in the Hebrew of Rashi

Appearing in a literary composition, deviations from the grammatical standard provide important details on the grammatical views of its author, and especially reveal where he allowed himself to abandon his views or which forces influenced him to do so. Few medieval compositions survived as autographs, which can directly testify to such forms. Copyists and printers tended to eliminate substandard forms while adding others unintentionally. Thus, reconstructing the original version requires a patient examination of the manuscripts and a careful consideration of the findings.

This article focuses on Rashi’s commentary to the Pentateuch, which exists in early and reliable manuscripts and contains a large variety of morphological deviations. Some deviations are deliberate, such as **אאפאיהם** and other artificial forms that Rashi constructed for pedagogical needs, and **אחוריהם** which was apparently used to stress the accurate meaning of the phrase. In other cases, the deviation is not intentional, but rather caused by the difference between the author’s grammatical perception and the

from Mishnah Avot 1 and 2. This limited but valuable corpus shows isoglosses with Onqelos that set ERA and Onqelos apart from later JPA, but also other syntactic features that are not known from Onqelos or Targum Jonathan. The detailed study of these lines also has implications for the textual history of the Mishnah, as it allows us to discover if the manuscripts known to preserve authentic MH forms (Kaufmann, Parma De Rossi 138, Paris, and Cambridge) are also reliable when it comes to Aramaic.

Michael Ryzhik

Some Notes on *Binyanim* in the Late Tradition of Mishnaic Hebrew: The Shift from *Pi^{se}el* to *Qal*

As is well known, some verbs that occur in Biblical Hebrew in *qal* shift to *pi^{se}el* in Tannaitic Hebrew. In late traditions of the Mishnaic language, however, as represented by late medieval manuscripts and in early printed editions, the opposite phenomenon is attested, i.e., there is a shift from *pi^{se}el* to *qal*. It happens also in Mishnaic verbs that are attested already in Biblical Hebrew (e.g., גר"ר, פר"ץ, רב"ק). This process is especially found in western traditions, specifically the Italian tradition, and more specifically in the Livorno editions, but evidence of it shows up also in other traditions. In later printed editions these verbs returned to *pi^{se}el*. It is important to stress that in each period of the development of Mishnaic Hebrew in the Middle Ages and in modern times, internal synchronic developments are responsible and these examples are not to be understood as corrupted forms. These processes are apparent when comparing different manuscripts and printed editions written and printed in Ashkenaz and in Italy.

Yael Reshef

The Split Construct Chain in Emergent Modern Hebrew

This article discusses changes in the distribution and usage patterns of the split construct chain in the early phases of the evolution of Modern Hebrew,

data from this study shed important light on the linguistic situation in Palestine towards the end of the Geonic period, and have implications also for determining the date and provenance of the late Aramaic targums. The study shows furthermore that late Palestinian works were not necessarily written in pure Palestinian Aramaic, and Palestinian linguistic features have no bearing on the provenance of late compositions.

Tamar Zewi

הן Meaning ‘If’ in Late Biblical Hebrew

The paper examines the scholarly dispute concerning the role of הן as a conditional particle in Classical and Late Biblical Hebrew. Based on the linguistic evidence and its analysis, it supports the interpretation of the role of הן in certain examples, as well as that of its cognates הנה and והנה, as introducing conditional clauses already in Classical Hebrew, in addition to their primary presentative or affirmative role. This role significantly expands in Late Biblical Hebrew due to contact with Aramaic. As this interpretation pertains to questions of language contact and to the meaning and use of a function word rather than a content word, it is more obscure and less easily discerned.

Aaron J. Koller

Early Rabbinic Aramaic: Dialects and Manuscripts

The Aramaic in Tannaitic literature has been understudied, despite pioneering efforts by Dalman and recent work by Stadel. The corpus, such as it is, is bewilderingly diverse, including legal contracts, aphorisms, dream reports, and editorial comments. Still, a number of observations can be made about this collection of texts, here called ‘Early Rabbinic Aramaic’ (ERA), which allow us to situate this dialect within the Palestinian dialects of the second and third centuries of the Common Era on the basis of morphological details.

The second part of the paper is a detailed study of four Aramaic sayings

after he was crowned, one as king and one as commoner. This understanding is based upon a homiletical reading of Ecclesiastes 1:12 where Solomon appears to be referring to his kingship in the past tense, as expanded in the Ashmedai legend at bGittin 68a-b. Therefore בשעתו is taken as “during the period he was king”. Scholarship has largely followed Rashi’s explanation, despite its extremely forced character. In bEruvin 41a Rashi demonstrates again his disturbance with בשעתו, as he comments שהיתה שעתו עומדת בשעתו – שהיתה שעתו עומדת, דמלך והדיוט הוא, reaching out to another non-related idiomatic usage.

Clearly the superior reading בשעתה was not available to Rashi. It refers to the feast itself, famous for its sumptuousness (I Kings 5:2–3), and obviates a forced explanation.

Reviewing all the occurrences and readings of the idiomatic בשעתו/בשעתה, we can determine that it was used for people regarding their generation, or objects regarding their fame (mPea 7:1–2 כְּזֵית הַנְּטוּפָה בְּשַׁעְתּוֹ). The phrase כסעורת שלמה בשעתו/בשעתה is the only occurrence with two possible referents. The correct one is the famous feast, and therefore בשעתה. However, linguistic attraction to the adjacent “Solomon” created the reading בשעתו.

Hsin-Chih Perng

The Aramaic Language of the Liturgical Poems of Rabbi Shemuel ben Hoshana from Jerusalem

Rabbi Shemuel ben Hoshana was a great scholar and poet and a leading figure of the academy in Jerusalem in the second half of the tenth century and the beginning of the eleventh century. Hundreds of his Hebrew poems have been discovered in the Cairo Geniza, as well as a few Aramaic poems which were recited in synagogues on holidays before the reading of Targum Jonathan to the *Haphtaroth*. The language of these Aramaic poems is vastly different from the language of earlier Aramaic poems from Palestine. In this article I analyze in detail the different elements in Rabbi Shemuel’s Aramaic language, with special emphasis placed on the Syriac component, and also compare his language with the language of the late Aramaic targums. The

could be possible to make chronological and geographical evaluations of other manuscripts based on this criterion which, being morphosyntactic, is significantly less susceptible to conscious changes and does not lend itself as easily to interpretation as do phonetical or morphological ones.

An additional contribution of this study is the complementary distribution found among the various 3f.s. perfect forms of the verb הוּה, namely הוּאִי, הוּיָא and הוּת.

Steven E. Fassberg

Pausal Forms in Hebrew and Aramaic: A Phenomenon of Language Contact?

Pausal forms are attested to varying degrees in ancient as well as modern Semitic languages. There are pausal forms in Biblical and Tannaitic Hebrew in both the Tiberian and Babylonian traditions. Pre-Modern Aramaic exhibits pausal forms only in Jewish Aramaic texts, viz., Biblical Aramaic (Tiberian and Babylonian), Targums Onqelos, Jonathan, and the Hagiographa. Neo-Aramaic has a few pausal forms in both Jewish and Christian dialects. The shift of contextual *pataḥ* to pausal *qamaṣ* is found in both ancient Hebrew and Aramaic and the phenomenon in Aramaic, which is not as widespread as it is in Hebrew, may be the result of living contact with Hebrew or due to later Jewish scribes. Other pausal pointings in Jewish Aramaic sources are sporadic and differ from their Hebrew counterparts, and thus cannot be attributed to Hebrew influence.

Shamma Friedman

כסעורת שלמה בשעתו/בשעתה (בבא מציעא ז, א) A Challenging Textual Variant

The idiomatic בשעתו/בשעתה occurs several times in the Talmudic corpus. Especially challenging vis-à-vis textual reading and meaning is the occurrence presented in mBM 7:1. Rashi, who had the reading בשעתו, comments: בעת מלכותו, דמלך והדיוט הוה. Solomon lived through two periods

The *hwa* + Participle Syntagm in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic

Contrary to the classical four-way Semitic participle (m.s., f.s., m.pl., f.pl.), the Jewish Babylonian Aramaic participle developed a full verbal conjugation. This development influenced the syntagm *hwa* + participle where the inflected auxiliary, originally revealing person but now superfluous, was often (but not always) replaced by the ground form הוה (historically, the 3m.s. perfect form). In this paper I provide an exhaustive account of both the ground form and inflected *hwa* + participle syntagms found in two corpora. The main corpus includes the entire Babylonian Talmud existing in the first-tier manuscripts used by the Historical Dictionary of the Academy of the Hebrew Language. This corpus exhibits both the ground form and inflected structures, with the Yemenite manuscripts therein exhibiting a somewhat different distribution from the rest. The secondary corpus is comprised of four manuscripts dubbed by M. Morgenstern as ‘Early Eastern manuscripts’ (EEMss) and which he claims preserve the language in its most pristine form. These include both Talmudic and Geonic works and interestingly exhibit a different picture—only the ground form is found here.

Auxiliary verbs are grammaticalized units and inflection loss may accompany the grammaticalization process. In an attempt to explain the difference between the corpora, I suggest that the different distributions of the conjugated auxiliary reveal three lines of transition. The Yemenite manuscripts, although not ancient themselves, represent/preserve the original Babylonian language at a time when this syntagm had been affected only partially by grammaticalization and where the third person structures still resisted change to various extents (for reasons explained in the paper). The EEMss depict an original Babylonian language as well, but one at least a hundred years younger in which the process of grammaticalization had come to an end leaving (almost) no trace of the conjugated helping verb. The manuscripts in the third group (main corpus excluding Yemenite manuscripts) originated from the same historical stage as the language seen in the Yemenite manuscripts but were copied and changed in Europe, resulting in some unnatural developments such as reverse grammaticalization. It

Hebrew-speaking ultra-Orthodox in Israel. Analyzing the occurrences of Yiddish in the ultra-Orthodox public sphere on the one hand (e.g., store names and advertisements), and in elementary schools on the other, I demonstrate how Yiddish serves a pragmatic need of adding an emotional layer and group affiliation sense to ultra-Orthodox Hebrew, rather than fulfilling its semantic need. Furthermore, I consider how Yiddish functions as a kind of ethnic borderline in Hebrew-speaking ultra-Orthodox educational institutions, enriching the discussion through interviews with mothers of students attending such institutions. This examination enhances our sociolinguistic understanding of Yiddish among Hebrew-speaking ultra-Orthodox in Israel, revealing the underlying links between linguistic choices and group membership.

Yosef Ofer

Deviations from Biblical Accentuation Rules and Their Explanations

The article discusses 18 verses which deviate from the technical rules of biblical accentuation that determine under what circumstances each of the disjunctive accents appears, which conjunctive accents are appropriate for each disjunctive accent, in which circumstances a disjunctive accent replaces a conjunctive one, etc. Three types of explanations are offered for these exceptional verses: (1) the cantillation is influenced by the accents of another verse; (2) the accents of the verse were created on the basis of a different literal wording of the verse, which existed in the past and was rejected; (3) the accents of the verse are a combination or compromise between two ancient traditions of reading, each of which is logical and conforms to the accentuation rules. For the purpose of these explanations, reconstruction of early stages of reading and cantillation of the verses are proposed: The ancient reconstructed text corresponded to the accentuation rules, but different processes of development and influence led to the unusual cantillation.

Our findings indicate that Alfāsi responded more often to the opinions reflected in the *Maḥberet* than did Menaḥem to the *Jāmi*⁶. This conclusion is supported by a recently discovered finding by Nasir Basal that Alfāsi was active in the last quarter of the tenth century. Since we know that the *Maḥberet* was published between 950 and 960, the question of influence now seems to be resolved.

Emmanuel Mastey

On Miracles and Worn-Out Animals: Two New Entries to the Lexicon of Amoraic Hebrew

The paper discusses two new entries to the lexicon of Amoraic Hebrew in the Land of Israel. The first is the hitherto unknown noun תֵּשׁ (*tēš*), from the root ת-ש-ש ('be exhausted'), recorded in two manuscripts of Amoraic sources, namely, the Jerusalem Talmud and Genesis Rabbah. It means 'worn-out (animal)'. The other is the collocation עשה ניסין in Hebrew and עבר ניסין in Jewish Palestinian Aramaic, both of which mean literally 'make miracles' and that is its sense in most cases; however, in a few places they have a different meaning, 'release, ransom, deliver from death'. It is argued that this latter signification evolved through a semantic development from the basic meaning of the collocation עבר ניסין, which, in Targumic Aramaic, is associated with the deliverance of Israel from Egypt. It is further suggested that another possible factor in the semantic-lexical process was the similarity, both phonetically and contextually, between the Hebrew/Aramaic word ניסין ('miracles') and the Greek νόσις (a by-form of λύσις), 'loosing, releasing, deliverance from death'.

Dina Sender

Hebrew as a Language of Speech and Yiddish as a Language of Emotion among the Ultra-Orthodox in Israel

This article seeks to describe the manifold functions of Yiddish among the

manuscripts and Genizah fragments can further resolve some of the issues.

This article reviews ten contradictions and inconsistencies and offers solutions to most of them.

Mordechay Mishor

הָלַךְ (Ps 47:6) — ‘Reigned’

The ambiguity of the verb הָלַךְ in Ps 47:6 has led to different interpretations. Here an attempt has been made to justify the meaning ‘reigned’ in the light of biblical parallels, rabbinic exegesis and the Akkadian verb *elû* (as suggested to me by Professor S.E. Loewenstamm).

Aharon Maman

Between David ben Abraham Alfāsi and Menaḥem ben Saruq

In the second half of the tenth century, two eminent linguists, Menaḥem ben Saruq of Córdoba (Spain) and David ben Abraham Alfāsi of Jerusalem, composed the first dictionaries for the Bible, *Maḥberet* and *Jāmiʿ al-Alfāz* (hence - *Jāmiʿ*), respectively. Both covered the entire Bible including its two languages, Hebrew and Aramaic, and both intertwined the Aramaic entries with the Hebrew ones as if they were a single language. Their underlying root theory is quite similar. Both recognized monoliteral and biliteral roots; both were concerned about the aesthetics of their dictionaries and share many other aspects both in details and general feature. Yet, they also differ in many aspects, e.g., the *Maḥberet* is Hebrew-Hebrew whereas the *Jāmiʿ* is Hebrew-Arabic. Alfāsi made explicit and implicit comparisons to Arabic whereas Menaḥem avoided that.

Though there is neither a direct reference to, nor a quote of the other, Simcha Pinsker assumed in 1860 that Alfāsi’s *Jāmiʿ* influenced the *Maḥberet* and since then, many have followed in his footsteps. This article revisits the subject and presents a systematic comparison of the two dictionaries.

many scholars view Kings as the literary product of the classical period (aside from its final chapters), others argue that the book is the product of an editor in the transitional or late period, who composed a synchronistic skeleton into which classical sources from the separate chronicles of the kingdoms of Judah and Israel were incorporated.

In this paper I argue that the syntax of cardinal constructions with ordinal meaning in Kings has potential significance for the resolution of this debate. The cardinal constructions expressing ordinality in Kings have a unique distributional pattern which differs from those found in other biblical texts. The differences, however, are limited to a special type of expression: the synchronistic date, which specifies the year of an event in the history of the kingdom of Judah by means of the regnal year of the king of Israel, or vice versa. The uniqueness of the synchronistic dates can be explained by adopting the widely-accepted hypothesis that these dates were not present in the original textual sources of the narratives, but rather were added by the editor. The data presented in this paper provide linguistic evidence for this hypothesis, which until now was supported only by literary evidence. I further argue that a comparison of the synchronistic dates with cardinal constructions in other biblical and extra-biblical texts supports the dating of the composition of the synchronistic dates, along with the synchronistic skeleton of the book, to the classical period.

Hananel Mirsky

Contradictions and Inconsistencies in *Maḥberet Menaḥem*

Scholars have pointed out that there are contradictions and inconsistencies in *Maḥberet Menaḥem*. For example, they have noted that sometimes Menaḥem opposed the permutation of ש"י (ś) and סמ"ך (s), yet at other times accepted it. They also have commented on words with a missing אל"ף: They are placed under roots with אל"ף, roots without אל"ף and sometimes under two roots.

The source of such pronouncements has been Philipowsky's edition (1854), which is based on unreliable manuscripts. Some of the inconsistencies are resolved in Badillos's eclectic edition (1986). However,

Matthew Morgenstern and Ohad Abudraham

Additional Mandaic Bowls from the Shlomo Moussaieff Collection

This article presents an edition of four previously unpublished Mandaic magic texts inscribed on earthenware bowls in late antiquity. The first text describes an appeal from the client to Nabu, requesting his intercession so that his consort, Nanay, will desist from taking infants to replace her own. Nabu instructs the client to make an offering in place of the infants. The second text provides a previously unedited witness to a known formula. Our text exhibits several unique grammatical features. The third text is a historiola and contributes significant new textual evidence to a formula that was previously published in an unsatisfactory manner. Our text allows for substantial improvements in its readings. The fourth text contains an enigmatic incantation in which blessings of the clients are interwoven with repetitive magical worlds.

Adina Moshavi

The Expression of Ordinal Meaning in the Book of Kings and the Synchronistic Date

Although Biblical Hebrew has separate morphological paradigms of cardinal and ordinal numerals, ordinal numerals are frequently expressed in the Bible by means of special syntactic constructions featuring cardinal numbers, used almost exclusively for temporal expressions featuring years, months or days. Some of these expressions are calendrical, relating to an established system of dividing time (e.g., the day of the week or the year of a king's reign), while others relate to a locally-determined time-line. Previous studies have shown that cardinal constructions with ordinal meaning undergo diachronic changes in the Bible, with certain constructions from classical Biblical Hebrew progressively declining in the transitional and late periods and others increasing in frequency and distribution. The present study examines the expression of ordinality in the book of Kings. While

The present article discusses ten Ṭyare lexical items: Four are related to Ṭyare's lexical antiquity and hark back to older Aramaic *dlh* 'to be blurry', *mārē d-šmayyā* 'Lord of Heaven, God', *mss* 'to measure' and *tātā* 'ewe'; four descend from hitherto unattested Aramaic lexemes: **ʕtn* 'to emit smoke', **nhy* 'to lead', **maggādā* (*√ngd*) 'road', and **tubbālē* 'spices'; and two shed light on Syriac parallels with unknown or uncertain meanings: Ṭyare *parəmʔa* '*Quercus brantii*, a species of oak' and *pediḏwe* 'propolis' in connection to the Syriac enigmatic nouns *pʕermā* and *peddāḏwē*.

Uri Mor

An Old Issue Revisited: Fluctuation of -m/-n

Fluctuation of *mem* and *nun* in final position are well-known in Classical Rabbinic literature and other ancient Hebrew and Aramaic corpora. This feature and its implications have been discussed extensively in research literature, from Ginsberg's seminal 1933 paper to the present. The prevailing view holds that the data betray two distinguishable phenomena: (a) final vowel nasalization, reflected in plural personal pronouns, nasal-final words, and vowel-final words; (b) scribal differentiation between nominal and verbal forms, reflected in the masculine plural morpheme.

The paper offers a re-examination of the data, including texts which have not yet been taken into consideration, from a cross-dialectal perspective. It concludes that (a) the nasalization phenomenon was prevalent in Palestine not only in various dialects of Hebrew and Aramaic, but also in Punic and Koine Greek, and most probably in the masculine plural morpheme as well; (b) the scribal differentiation practice developed in Babylonia (as Mishor has already suggested in a 1990/91 paper) as early as the Amoraic period, and therefore its manifestation in Rabbinic manuscripts should not be attributed to lateness but rather to Babylonian tradition.

Chaim E. Cohen

גִּוּן – A Chronology of the Form

The normative form of the word גִּוּן is גִּוּן. This is the form that is employed in contemporary dictionaries, including those of the Academy of the Hebrew Language. This form has no basis in ancient Hebrew sources and is the result of a theoretical grammatical investigation whose purpose was to create a form that would be consistent with the familiar construct form כְּגִוּן and the common plural form גִּוּנִים. This paper presents an account of this investigation, which occurred over the course of a century, and the various forms that have been proposed: גִּוּן, גִּוּן, גִּוּן and others.

As noted, the deliberations regarding the form of this word are the result of there being no vocalized precedent in Hebrew sources. This article presents a precedent in a *piyyut* in the Ashkenazic *maḥzor*, which is documented with vocalization, beginning with the fourteenth century. Unsurprisingly, the form in the *piyyut* does not support the form established in modern Hebrew as the standard, which is artificial.

Hezy Mutzafi

Some Lexical Observations on the Neo-Aramaic Dialect Cluster of Ṭyare

Ṭyare Neo-Aramaic is a NENA (North-Eastern Neo-Aramaic) dialect cluster originally spoken by tribal Assyrian Christians in the district of Ṭyare in the Ottoman province of Hakkâri (presently in south-eastern Turkey). Being one of the most archaizing NENA varieties, its conservative nature manifests itself mainly in the spheres of morphology and lexicon. The Ṭyare dialects exhibit an astonishingly rich repository of inherited Aramaic lexical items. Some of these are unique to Ṭyare amongst the Neo-Aramaic languages, and some are not even attested in literary Aramaic, but are clearly of ancient Aramaic and Semitic pedigree. In addition, unclear meanings of some literary Aramaic words could likely be elucidated by virtue of their modern reflexes in Ṭyare.

Abraham Tal and Moshe Florentin

A New Translation of the Samaritan Pentateuch

In this article we briefly present the principles of our recently published English translation of the Samaritan Pentateuch. We address several issues: (a) the Samaritan manuscript that served as the basis for our translation; (b) the nature of the English translation; (c) the necessity of presenting the Hebrew source of the Samaritan text and comparing it with the Masoretic text; (d) the types of differences presented in the edition; (e) the methods adopted in presenting both the text and the accompanying notes; (f) the difficulties in determining the version and interpreting the text.

Geoffrey Khan

Innovative Morphological Distinctions in Verbal Forms in the Samaritan and Tiberian Reading Traditions of Biblical Hebrew

The Samaritan oral tradition of the Pentateuch reflects a wider range of morphological forms of the *qal* active participle than the Tiberian tradition. Several of these are innovations borrowed from Aramaic. In some cases the Samaritan tradition exploits its larger pool of morphological patterns of the participle to express semantic distinctions that are not expressed in the morphology of the Tiberian tradition. The central semantic distinction that is expressed is between participles of a nominal character that express time-stable properties and those of a verbal character that express contingent properties. This same process can be identified in several places in the Tiberian tradition. This casts light on the interpretation tradition of the forms in question in the Tiberian tradition.

factors play a significant role in the realization of either the pharyngeal or uvular /ħ/. Phonology: It was found that the pharyngeal [ħ] tends to appear in the environment of a *furtive pataḥ*. Syntax: Nouns are at the top of the hierarchy in the pronunciation of the pharyngeal [ħ]. The study also explores the diverse repertoire of Mizrahi Hebrew and speakers' choices across various conversational contexts.

Yehonatan Wormser

The Nature of *Dagesh Forte* as Perceived by Medieval Hebrew Grammarians

The purpose of the *dagesh forte*, which in modern times is thought to mark gemination, was not always viewed as such during the Middle Ages. Even though the two fathers of Hebrew grammatical theory in medieval Europe — R. Judah Ḥayyuj and R. Jonah ibn Janāḥ — did recognize the *dagesh forte* as representing two identical letters, i.e., gemination, later prominent grammarians such as R. Abraham ibn Ezra and R. David Kimḥi (Radak) did not. Instead, Ibn Ezra and Radak believed the *dagesh forte* signaled grammatical information about the form in which it occurred, e.g., it represented the ellipsis of a radical consonant or marked the *binyan*; they did not relate to the phonetic nature of the *dagesh*.

The term הבלעה 'absorption' was frequently used to describe the phonetic nature of the *dagesh*. A close examination of its use by different grammarians reveals that it had at least three distinct meanings in medieval Hebrew grammars.

In contrast to most late medieval Jewish grammarians, Christian Hebrew grammarians recognized the *dagesh forte* as a sign of gemination. Even though the first grammatical works written by Christian Hebraists drew heavily on Jewish sources, they, nonetheless, recognized the geminating nature of the *dagesh*, probably due to their acquaintance with the parallel phenomenon in Latin.

Jonathan Howard

The *Musaf* Prayer for the New Moon: Textual Criticism and Historical Linguistics

The article offers a fresh, two-pronged text-critical and diachronic-linguistic analysis of a difficult passage in the opening unit of the weekday *Musaf* prayer for the new moon (beginning *ראשי חודשים לעמך נתתה*). Variant readings of the passage are collated from nine medieval and early-modern liturgical rites (in almost 50 copies), marking four substantial differences. Two of these suggest a repeated process of textual emendations. The original form of these is reconstructed and historical linguistics is used to trace the morphological and syntactical reason which likely motivated these emendations.

The other two variants are explained as ways of “smoothing” out poetical syntax to a more straightforward style. It is argued that the entire opening unit (like others of its sort) betrays an original preclassical poetical form, but it had been incorporated into regular, prosaic liturgy, and was subsequently susceptible to stylistic emendations. It is also suggested that the preclassical form of the unit does not imply an early Palestinian dating, but that the unit may well be of Babylonian origin, where preclassical forms had persisted long after they were replaced by newer (classical and postclassical) forms in Palestine.

Yehudit Henshke

The Realization of /ħ/ in Contemporary Hebrew: A Social and Linguistic Analysis

This article examines the realization of /ħ/ in the spoken Hebrew of Israelis of distant Mizrahi origin (Mizrahi Hebrew), comparing it to its realization as [χ] in General Hebrew. Based on the *Other Hebrew* corpus, the study focuses on several aspects. Phonetics: Findings indicate that speakers of Mizrahi Hebrew produce both uvular [χ] and pharyngeal [ħ] realizations of /ħ/. Sociolinguistics: The results suggest that demographic and social

Ronnie Goldstein and Shlomo Naeh

Some Lexical Studies in the Semantic Field of Girding the Waist

The semantic field of girding the waist includes several different words. Apart from their basic meaning, the words are used in the sense of readiness, professionalism, determination, diligence, strength, swiftness and the like. Based on the semantic spectrum of meanings of the words related to girding, the article offers new readings and new interpretations for several difficult phrases. (1) **אז תחרץ** (2 Sam. 5:24) is interpreted as ‘then you should gird your weapon’. (2) The rare root **מס"ר** (Num. 31:5,16) is also interpreted in the same way, viz., ‘girding one’s weapon or belt’. (3) Similarly, we propose to interpret in this sense the verb **יזה** in Ex. 28:28. (4) In light of some ancient sources the verb **חזק** in Isa. 28:22 is found to mean ‘binding’ or ‘tightening’. (5) A new explanation is proposed for the phrase **זרזיר מתנים** in Prov. 30:31 and subsequently for the entire, obscure parable (vv. 29–31).

Chanoch Gamliel

Different Styles in Medieval Translation

Maimonides’ famous Epistle to Yemen was translated into Hebrew by R. Samuel ibn Tibbon, the well-known translator of the *Guide of the Perplexed*, and later on by R. Nahum, a less known translator from the Magreb. The latter’s translation became the accepted translation.

Here we examine the method of both translators, especially with regard to Arabic influence and choice of Biblical Hebrew vs. Mishnaic Hebrew. Tibbon’s translation reveals much Arabic influence and a preference for Biblical Hebrew, whereas Nahum’s translation avoids the latter and makes more use of Mishnaic Hebrew. It seems that Nahum’s style gained more acceptance since it was less complicated and was congruent with the Rabbinic Hebrew which developed in the Middle Ages.

medieval commentaries on the Talmud, and in more than twenty manuscripts of *Midrash HaGadol*. One of these interpretations displays many difficulties in content and language, and its wording differs considerably among the textual witnesses.

The introduction of this paper reviews the interpretations proposed for the obscure term **בגרי השרר** by ancient translations and commentaries as well as modern scholars. The Talmudic textual variants and the difficulties associated with each one of them are then presented, with special attention paid to lexicon, syntax, and semantics. A solution to these difficulties emerges from the emendation of one letter in the text, first proposed by Samuel Krauss and E.Y. Kutscher. The paper also offers a possible reconstruction of the original Talmudic text and the development of its variations.

Robert Brody

למה תתראו?

In Genesis 42:2 Jacob orders his sons to go to Egypt and buy provisions to relieve their famine. This clear instruction is preceded by the enigmatic rhetorical question *lāmmāh titrā'u*. The key word in this question is normally understood as a *hitpa^{ss}el* form of the verb *r'y*, but elsewhere this *hitpa^{ss}el* form means 'face off in battle'; furthermore, commentators struggle to suggest a plausible semantic connection between being seen and the sense required by the context, of refraining from action. The author suggests that *titrā'u* is better understood as a *qal* form of a verb *tr'* related to Rabbinic Hebrew *hatrā'āh*, a warning issued by witnesses in order to dissuade someone from performing a prohibited action. If the meaning of this verb in the *qal* is 'to hang back, to refrain from action', which would perfectly suit the biblical context, the expected meaning of the *hiph^{il}* would be 'to cause another to refrain from action, to dissuade', as demonstrated by Rabbinic Hebrew.

of both, though he mainly drew on the abridgement.

This article presents the chapter from *ʿAdat Devorim* on the rules of the disjunctive accents in the three poetic books. The author did not translate word for word, but rather here and there modified slightly what was written in the abridgement. I have noted when the translation diverges from the Arabic original. Explanatory notes have been added when necessary.

Yoel Elitzur

The History of Aramaic *ʿigar* and its Reflection in the Mishna

ʿigar/ʿigara is the usual Aramaic word for ‘roof’. The origin of the word in Sumerian, e_2 -gar, is a combination of ‘house’ and ‘brick’. The word passed into Akkadian and from there into Aramaic. In Sumerian and Akkadian and even in Official Aramaic the meaning of the word was ‘wall’, but in the middle of the Second Temple period the word came to be used with the meaning ‘roof’ and so it continued throughout the Aramaic dialects. In that context, עיר שגגותיה חומתה in *m. ʿArakhin* 9:6 is puzzling, because it is not the roofs of the houses that form the city wall, but the walls of the houses. This phrase seems to originate in an ancient paragraph in a *barayta* quoted twice in the Babylonian Talmud: חומה ולא שור איגר. The ancient *halakha* uttered in Aramaic still used the word איגר in the sense of ‘wall’, but the Tanna of the Mishna no longer understood this and transferred the expression to Hebrew according to the Aramaic of his time.

Chanan Ariel

בגדי השרד: Linguistic and Philological Observations on Babylonian Talmud Yoma 72b

The Babylonian Talmud Yoma 72b presents midrashic interpretations regarding בגדי השרד, textiles related to the priesthood mentioned in the book of Exodus. The text is preserved in six manuscripts, in quotations within

The Prefix *qa-* in Classical Mandaic

While the prefix *qa-* has a prominent role in the language of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic, it is rarely attested in Classical Mandaic, the contemporary dialect of the Mandaean, whose close affinity with the Jewish Babylonian dialect has long been noted. In light of the widespread use of the prefix *qa-* in the subsequent layers of Mandaic—Early Neo-Mandaic (the Leiden Glossary and colophons) and Neo-Mandaic—one wonders whether the roots of this feature are not much earlier. The article presents for the first time a complete, annotated catalogue of all the examples of the prefix *qa-* in Classical Mandaic sources. Its dual function is described in comparison to the cognate particle in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic as demonstrated by Y. Breuer: (1) to denote a continuous action; (2) to express actions still relevant in the present. The present study also investigates the distribution of *qa-* among the literary compositions in Mandaic, its alternative spellings in the main manuscripts (*qa-*, *qi-* and *q-*), its assumed pronunciation (*qa-*), and its likely origin (vernacular influence).

Ilan Eldar

‘*Adat Devorim* (‘Swarm of Bees’)

The Karaite composition ‘*Adat Devorim* (‘Swarm of Bees’) is a compilation in Hebrew of grammatical pericopes, chapters, and *Masorah*, which were collected by the Karaite sage Yosef Qostandini around 1100 CE. The work was copied in 1207 by Judah b. Jacob in Gagra, a town on the northeast coast of the Black Sea. The only complete manuscript is found in the Second Firkovich Collection (#161) of the Russian National Library in St. Petersburg. ‘*Adat Devorim* contains discussions concerning the rules of the accent signs of the twenty-one prose books of the Hebrew Bible as well as of the three poetic books (Job, Proverbs, and Psalms). It was translated into Karaite Hebrew from the abridgement of *Hidāyat al-Qāriʿ* (‘The Guide for the Reader’). Qostandini had before him the two versions of *Hidāyat al-Qāriʿ*, i.e., the complete version and the abridged one. He clearly made use

Aaron Koller	Early Rabbinic Aramaic: Dialects and Manuscripts	551
Michael Rhyzik	Some Notes on <i>Binyanim</i> in the Late Tradition of Mishnaic Hebrew: The Shift from <i>Pi^{ve}el</i> to <i>Qal</i>	575
Yael Reshef	The Split Construct Chain in Emergent Modern Hebrew	597
Ariel Shaveh	Morphological Deviations in the Hebrew of Rashi	617
Christian Stadel	Gleanings from the Language of the Jews of Medieval Eghegis, Armenia: Persian Substrate in a Hebrew Tombstone Inscription?	639
Richard C. Steiner	<i>Ḥasdô/Ḥazdô</i> in <i>Hallel</i> vs. <i>Tizkêrû/Tiskêrû</i> in the <i>Šema</i> ‘: Precision in Pronunciation (and Spelling) according to the Sages	647
Ruth Stern	The Letters of the Geonim as a Source of Epistolary Linguistic Forms in Modern Hebrew	669
Ofra Tirosh-Becker	Linguistic Terms in a Tri-Lingual Dictionary of Algerian Jews	689
English Abstracts		XI

Hezy Mutzafi	Some Lexical Observations on the Neo-Aramaic Dialect Cluster of Ṭyare	269
Uri Mor	An Old Issue Revisited: Fluctuation of <i>-m/-n</i>	287
Matthew Morgenstern and Ohad Abudraham	Additional Mandaic Bowls from the Shlomo Moussaieff Collection	303
Adina Moshavi	The Expression of Ordinal Meaning in the Book of Kings and the Synchronistic Date	327
Hananel Mirsky	Contradictions and Inconsistencies in <i>Maḥberet Menaḥem</i>	353
Mordechay Mishor	עָלָה (Ps 47:6) — ‘to Reign’	379
Aharon Maman	Between David ben Abraham Alfāsi and Menaḥem ben Saruq	389
Emmanuel Mastey	On Miracles and Worn-Out Animals: Two New Entries to the Lexicon of Amoraic Hebrew	413
Dina Sender	Hebrew as a Language of Speech and Yiddish as a Language of Emotion among the Ultra-Orthodox in Israel	431
Yosef Ofer	Deviations from Biblical Accentuation Rules and Their Explanations	447
Etan Pinsky	The <i>hwa</i> + Participle Syntagm in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic	469
Steven E. Fassberg	Pausal Forms in Hebrew and Aramaic: A Phenomenon of Language Contact?	499
Shamma Friedman	כסעודת שלמה בשעתו/בשעתה (בבא מציעא ז, א) A Challenging Textual Variant	511
Hsin-Chih Perng	The Aramaic Language of the Liturgical Poems of Rabbi Shemuel ben Hoshana from Jerusalem	517
Tamar Zewi	הן Meaning ‘If’ in Late Biblical Hebrew	539

Contents

Preface		ה
Ivri J. Bunis	Yochanan Breuer	1
Yochanan Breuer	List of Publications	5
Ohad Abudraham	The Prefix <i>qa-</i> in Classical Mandaic	11
Ilan Eldar ז"ל	<i>ʿAdat Devorim</i> ('Swarm of Bees')	33
Yoel Elitzur	The History of Aramaic <i>ʿigar</i> and Its Reflection in the Mishna	47
Chanan Ariel	בגדי השרד: Linguistic and Philological Observations on Babylonian Talmud Yoma 72b	55
Robert Brody	למה תתראו?	77
Ronnie Goldstein and Shlomo Nach	Some Lexical Studies in the Semantic Field of Girding the Waist	81
Chanoch Gamliel	Different Styles in Medieval Translation	139
Jonathan Howard	The <i>Musaf</i> Prayer for the New Moon: Textual Criticism and Historical Linguistics	155
Yehudit Henshke	The Realization of /h/ in Contemporary Hebrew: A Social and Linguistic Consideration	185
Yehonatan Wormser	The Nature of <i>Dagesh Forte</i> as Perceived by Medieval Hebrew Grammarians	217
Abraham Tal and Moshe Florentin	A New Translation of the Samaritan Pentateuch	239
Geoffrey Khan	Innovative Morphological Distinctions in Verbal Forms in the Samaritan and Tiberian Reading Traditions of Biblical Hebrew	249
Chaim E. Cohen	גורן — A Chronology of the Form	261