

Summaries

Emmanuel Mastey

The Term **lwl* (לול) and Its Transformation: From Biblical to Rabbinic Hebrew

This article explores an enigmatic architectural term that has long engaged the interest of scholars of Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew: *lullim* – לולִים. Found in the biblical description of Solomon's Temple (1 Kgs 6:8), it refers to a feature facilitating movement between the Temple tiers. Although examined from the morphological and semantic perspectives in previous studies, its precise meaning remains uncertain. Unique to Hebrew, the term later became a loanword in talmudic Aramaic. It appears in Rabbinic Hebrew texts, including the Mishnah, Tosefta, and the Jerusalem and Babylonian Talmuds, albeit in different contexts.

Whereas the traditional interpretation of לול as a 'skylight' or 'trapdoor' (e.g., an opening allowing access to the upper story of a building) fits the context in some sources, it fails to account for others. This study proposes a new interpretation: a 'niche' designed for storage. This interpretation not only aligns with the rabbinic sources but also finds support in archeological and ethnographic evidence. The article further examines the distinction between לול and the mishnaic term מִסְכָּה, a facility in the Herodian Temple that filled a role analogous to that of the לולִים in the Solomonic Temple.

Moshe Bar-Asher

The Vowel Systems Reflected in Manuscripts of Tannaitic Hebrew

Examination of reliable vocalized manuscripts of tannaitic literature reveals that they transmit three vowel systems: (a) a seven-vowel system like the Tiberian tradition of biblical vocalization, e.g. MS Parma B (De Rossi 497);

(b) a six-vowel system, e.g. MS Vatican 66 of Sifra and fragments of mishnaic manuscripts attesting to Babylonian vocalization; and (c) a five-vowel system, e.g. MS Parma A (De Rossi 138). One manuscript of the Mishnah, MS Kaufmann A 50, transmits an admixture of two traditions: its primary tradition is a seven-vowel system like that of MS Parma B; its secondary tradition is a five-vowel system like that of MS Parma A that reflects the Spanish-Italian tradition.

Ariel Gabbay

The Inflection of לִקְ"ח as an Initial Radical *Nun* Verb (פִּנ') **in Mishnaic Hebrew: A Reconsideration**

As is well known, in all periods of the Hebrew language, the inflection of the verb לִקְ"ח in the *qal* conjugation is similar to that of verbs with a first radical *nun*: לִקְחָ > לִקְחָ. The accepted explanation for the assimilation of the *lamed* is analogy of לִקְ"ח to its antonym נָתַן, in which the *nun* is assimilated to the proceeding radical: נָתַן > נָתַן.

However, various vocalized sources of Mishnaic Hebrew – manuscripts and early editions, recordings of the reading of the Mishnah by scholars from different communities, as well as unvocalized texts from the responsa literature – provide clear evidence of the preservation of the *lamed* in *qal* future tense, that is, לִקְחָ, לִקְחָ. It seems that, in various Jewish diasporas, both in the East and the West, the forms with *lamed*, which contradict not only Biblical Hebrew but also Mishnaic Hebrew as represented in the Kaufmann manuscript, indicate that the verb לִקְ"ח was, for many generations, treated like other triliteral regular verbs, rather than as a first radical *nun* verb.

It is possible that the identification of לִקְ"ח with the regular verbs occurred at a relatively late stage in the transmission of Mishnaic Hebrew, and that, over time, the reading preserving *lamed* with quiescent *shewa* was integrated into the early text of the Mishnah, as long as the consonantal structure allowed it. Nevertheless, it cannot be ruled out that the reading as a regular triliteral verb, which is already documented in the eleventh-century Parma manuscript of the Mishnah (De Rossi 138), derives from an ancient spoken dialect of Mishnaic Hebrew.

Omri Livnat

The *Ma'amad* for the Day of Atonement in Hebrew Liturgical Poetry from Al-Andalus: A Reassessment

For over a century, it has been widely accepted in scholarly research that five prominent Andalusí poets – Joseph ibn Abitur, Solomon ibn Gabirol, Isaac ibn Giyyat, Moses ibn Ezra, and Abraham ibn Ezra – composed *ma'amadim* for the Day of Atonement. Scholars of Andalusí liturgical poetry define a *ma'amad* as a large collection created by a single poet, containing all the liturgical poems intended for recitation on the Day of Atonement: *yosrot*, *qedushta'ot*, and *seliḥot*.

After critically reviewing the arguments offered in favor of the longstanding consensus noted above, this article takes issue with this conclusion. The author maintains that, although these poets did produce collections of *piyyuṭim* for the Day of Atonement (such as *qedushta'ot*), there is no unequivocal evidence that they composed mega-collections of *ma'amadim* for this holy day. Perhaps in planning their *piyyuṭim* for the Day of Atonement, some of these poets intended that they be recited consecutively as part of a broader collection, but this requires further individual investigation of each poet and his corpus.

Carmit Miller Shapiro

The Grammaticization of *nir'e* ('seem') in Casual Spoken Discourse

The verb נראה 'seem' indicates sensory or mental perception. Hebrew possesses several constructions using this verb: the impersonal uninflected predicative נראה (לי) ש- '[it] seems [to me] that'; the fixed lexical construction לי נראה '[it] seems to me', which can appear in different positions with regard to the proposition; the impersonal uninflected predicative נראה לך ש-? 'no way', lit. 'Does it seem to you that?'; and the discourse markers נראה לך? (no way', '[does it] seem [this way] to you?') and מה נראה לך (no way', lit. 'what does it seem to you'), which appear as a response to the interlocutor's utterance.

This study explores the usages of **נראה** and its constructions in casual Hebrew conversations. On their basis, I suggest the paths of these utterances. Sometimes **נראה** simply carries a literal meaning, but at times it also expresses an epistemic stance. The constructions **נראה (לי) ש-** and **נראה לי** express an epistemic stance and mitigate the speaker's utterance; the other constructions are used to tease the interlocutor. Based on the morphological, pragmatic, syntactical and prosodic aspects of **נראה** and its constructions and on diachronic evidence, I argue that the constructions were grammaticized from the present form of **נראה**.

English summaries edited by Dena Ordan