

## Summaries

**Tania Notarius**

### **Passive Voice in Ugaritic in Historical Perspective**

This paper treats the various expressions of the passive voice in Ugaritic from a diachronic perspective. The most common way of expressing the passive voice in Ugaritic ground (G) stem verbs is the internal passive (Gpass) stem, which is equally attested in prose and poetry. Although there is no expression of the agent-phrase in the Gpass sentences, the agent is an indispensable part of the semantic structure of the event. The Gpass verbs have impersonal usage and are not derived from stative verbs. For its part, the N-stem is an expression of middle voice but can be used as the passive in the language of prose; the N-stem verbs are commonly derived from stative verbs and do not feature impersonal usage, regularly promoting the patient as the syntactic subject. The Gt-stem verbs do not have passive usage, whereas the newly derived passive participle of the G-stem is sporadically attested in the predicative position. The data are examined in the context of the expression of the passive in other Northwest Semitic languages.

**Yaron Lisha**

### **The Nominal Form מִקְטָלִים in Ancient Sources and Various Dictionaries**

Examination of manuscripts of various works often reveals differences between the manuscript and the printed versions. Such comparisons of reliable biblical manuscripts and the various printed editions of the Bible disclose many, also linguistic, differences. For example, biblical manuscripts vocalize the letter *qof* in the word מִלְקָחִים with *pataḥ*, as opposed to the

*qamets* found in printed editions of the Bible as well as in the dictionaries. This study treats the vocalization of *qof* with *pataḥ* in the word מִלְקָחַיִם, as opposed to *shəwa* as in the nominal form מִקְטָלִים, concluding that the vocalization with *pataḥ* seems to reflect phonetic transcription. In addition, the article examines the various traditions in mishnaic manuscripts of the nominal form מִקְטָלִים, including its vocalization in the Babylonian tradition. It seems that, unlike other traditions, the Babylonian as well as the Yemenite tradition here preserved *shəwa* in the second radical.

**Ariel Gabbay**

### **The Verb with Object Suffixes in Mishnaic Hebrew according to Medieval Manuscripts and First Editions**

This article treats systematic reading differences in verbs with object suffixes attested in vocalized witnesses of Mishnaic Hebrew: the medieval vocalized manuscripts of the Mishnah, on the one hand, and the first two printed editions of the Mishnah with full vocalization – the Constantinople (1644) and the Amsterdam (1646) editions – on the other hand. Fundamental differences were discovered in three categories, of which the most prominent is the category of the 3<sup>rd</sup> fem. sing. verb with 3<sup>rd</sup> masc. sing. object suffixes. The manuscripts reflect equalization of the present and past forms. The printed editions, however, reflect a more complex process: the present forms of the verb were equalized with those of the past, but all the forms with object suffixes, past and present, were influenced by the nominal forms with possessive suffixes, thus *dagesh forte* was omitted from *taw*, and *shureq* was replaced by *holem*. Examination of the recorded documentation of the oral traditions shows that the Sephardic reading tradition corresponds precisely with the vocalization in the Constantinople and Amsterdam editions. Since in all forms, past and present, Sephardic stress is clearly penultimate, it is conceivable that the stress in the reading tradition of the vocalizers was also penultimate.

A prevailing assumption in the study of MH is that the language in the printed editions was deeply influenced by Biblical Hebrew grammar. This article shows that in the Constantinople and Amsterdam printed editions,

all 3<sup>rd</sup> fem. sing. past forms with 3<sup>rd</sup> masc. sing. object suffixes are vocalized in contradiction to the Tiberian vocalization, whereas the manuscripts follow BH vocalization exactly. This is also the case for the other categories discussed in the article: the vocalization in the manuscripts corresponds with BH, whereas the printed editions depart from it. It turns out that the vocalizers from Constantinople and Amsterdam did not feel bound by BH. Despite their expertise in biblical grammar, they vocalized in accordance with the accepted reading tradition of MH in their time and place. This tradition of MH deviates from BH in key grammatical issues, of which one is the verb with object suffixes.

**Ivri J. Bunis**

### **The Orthography ׀הש as Hypercorrection: A Reexamination in Light of Guttural Weakening**

In Biblical and Postbiblical Hebrew, one orthographic subform of the subordinating particle ׀ש is irregular. Alongside its usual spelling ׀ש, it is sporadically written ׀הש, and both forms are attached to the following word. In all vocalized occurrences of ׀הש, the letter *heh* is silent, even though word-internal *heh* not indicating the consonant /h/ is very unusual in Hebrew orthography. This has prompted a number of scholarly explanations for the orthography ׀הש, but as the present article shows, previous explanations must be ruled out because they contradict well-established Hebrew orthographic norms. The present article reexamines the orthography ׀הש and offers a new explanation, which links it to other phenomena typical of Late and Postbiblical Hebrew. In order to explain the orthography ׀הש, the article argues that one must take into account linguistic phenomena that were much more common in spoken Hebrew than in the literary registers documented by the surviving vocalized texts and reading traditions. Unlike previous explanations, the present article proposes that the silent *heh* is a hypercorrection in a linguistic reality where guttural consonants weakened in spoken Hebrew and the consonant /h/ tended to be elided after subordinating ׀ש.

Dikla Abravanel and Nora Boneh

**This Comes as a Surprise?  
The Pseudo-Coordination Construction with *ba* ‘come’**

This paper focuses on the interpretative and distributional properties of the pseudo-coordination construction featuring the verb *ba* ‘come’ in Modern Hebrew (MH). It claims that the central invariable meaning underlying all inferences in the various contexts is one in which the underlying proposition contradicts contextually salient normative beliefs held by the speaker. In so doing, we discard the attribution of mirativity to this construction, a prevalent view regarding similar constructions cross-linguistically. To substantiate this claim, we show that the central meaning component relevant for the counter-to-norm inference is due to MH ‘come’ being a deictic verb associated with a doxastic modal component. We show that this meaning component is available both for locative ‘come’ and for the pseudo-coordination construction. The difference in the choice of the syntactic complement, prepositional phrase vs. propositional complement, is the only substantial difference between the two instances of ‘come’, and we conjecture that this is the crux of the metaphorical shift often attributed to ‘come’. To further substantiate our central claim, we engage in a brief comparative discussion of the inferences yielded by the pseudo-coordination constructions featuring ‘go’ and ‘sit’. Finally, we consider and discard examples that can undermine the current analysis.

*English summaries edited by Dena Ordan*