Summaries

David Sabato

העלאת תרומה: The Relationship between Linguistic Development and Halakhic Innovation

One of the innovations in the active lexicon of Mishnaic Hebrew relates to the meaning of the root *ayin-lamed-yod*. Used primarily in the sense of upward physical movement in Biblical Hebrew, in Mishnaic Hebrew this root acquired the added meaning of 'suspension, cancellation, neutralization'. A similar use of the root *ayin-lamed-yod* in the sense of 'disappearance, removal' is already found in the Bible, but the prominent and systematic use of the root *ayin-lamed-yod* in the halakhic-legal sense of neutralization appears for the first time in tannaitic sources dealing with the laws governing mixtures of *terumah* and ordinary produce. In addition to the semantic development of the root *ayin-lamed-yod*, there took place in Mishnaic Hebrew a morphological development connected to this halakhic realm: the creation of the tannaitic verb *tav-resh-mem* in place of the biblical verb *resh-vav-mem*. The article examines the halakhic discussions of these issues in the disputes between Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel in m. Terumot, and in a passage in the tannaitic midrash halakhah Sifre Bemidbar, while focusing on the changing meanings of the roots *ayin-lamed-yod* and *resh-vam-mem/tav-resh-mem*. Its main argument is that linguistic changes in Mishnaic Hebrew accompanied the halakhic innovations in the laws governing mixtures.

Ohad Abudraham

Features of the Hebrew Language
on Babylonian Jewish Incantation Bowls

This article presents an updated survey of the Hebrew language found in the Babylonian Jewish epigraphic material. Since Mishor's pioneering study (2007) hundreds of new incantation bowls have come to light (e.g., the Hilprecht, British Museum, Moussaieff, and Schøyen collections). The new bowls enrich our knowledge of the earlier history of the Babylonian Jewish tradition. The current study focuses on three main features of the Hebrew strata in the epigraphic corpus: (1) its close affinity with the Babylonian Jewish vocalization tradition; (2) its informal character as compared to medieval vocalized manuscripts; and (3) Aramaic influence.

Neta Dan

Neologisms in Uri Zvi Greenberg's
Book of Indictment and Faith

This article examines neologisms invented by Uri Zvi Greenberg in his *Book of Indictment and Faith* (1937). In this book, which includes fiery political poems, Greenberg coined about forty-five words, using diverse modes of word formation. Samples of these neologisms are grammatically described and analyzed.

   This analysis reveals that Greenberg's neologisms can be divided into two main groups: (1) words that regulate the rhyme and rhythm, and (2) words that augment the rhetorical effects of the poems and kindle strong emotions. Thus, although he in theory resisted word renewal, Greenberg in fact engaged in the revival of Hebrew, even if for local poetic purposes only.

Ruti Bardenstein

The Grammaticalization Path of Rhetorical Questions

Questions are used for multiple discourse purposes, beyond just seeking for information-bearing answers. Questions of a specific kind that are associated with a specific discourse pattern (Ariel 2008) might serve as a fertile ground for rhetoric interpretations via contextual deduction (questions cannot serve as a discourse pattern on their own right) and even for various grammaticalization processes (e.g. Herring 1991 for rhetorical questions in Tamil; Koshik 2005 for rhetorical questions in English). Like any other linguistic phrase that is consistently associated with a certain discourse pattern, questions might gradually lose their original function (in this case: questioning) and turn into linguistic constructions that bear an altogether different meaning than the compositional meaning of their parts. This type of grammaticalization process is the focus of this paper. It is a two-stage process whereby questions lose their original questioning function. Initially, they are recruited to convey the strong and emotional speaker's stance (usually his/her resentment) towards a salient discourse assumption or claim. Then, this interpretation becomes a salient discourse profile of the specific questions; it fixates so that these questions become Goldbergian constructions (Goldberg 1995), which are called Constructional Rhetorical Questions (CRQ, Bardenstein 2018). These constructions pair a certain form with a certain meaning un-compositionally (their meaning is not composed of the meanings of their parts). In other words, the relevant questions: (a) are never interpreted as 'real' (information-seeking) questions and (b) there is no way of predicting their meanings based on the meaning of their parts or based on other related constructions. Thus, we witness a linguistic, historical-change process of question forms whose linguistic recruitment and pragmatic usage eventually becomes semantic (to the point where the question is no longer perceived as a question). This paper demonstrates the two-stage process by examining the grammaticalization path of four types of Hebrew CRQs, based on several corpora.

Yerahmiel (Robert) Brody

Yochanan Breuer, *From Aramaic into Hebrew: The Method
of Translation in the Book* Hilkhot Reʾu (Sources and Studies, 17 NS),
Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language, 2020, xxx + 601 pp.

Yochanan Breuer's book is an intensive study of a unique case: the translation, known as *Hilkhot Reʾu*, of the earliest post-talmudic halakhic code, known as *Halakhot Pesuqot*. Breuer agrees with the scholarly consensus that this translation was produced in Eretz Israel in the late geonic period; among his interesting suggestions is that it may have been a group effort and not the work of a single translator. The primary focus of his study, as indicated by the book's subtitle, is the technique of translation, and in particular the linguistic choices (conscious or subconscious) of the translator or translators. The book includes a unique dictionary, showing all the ways in which a given Aramaic lexeme was translated (or not) in *Hilkhot Reʾu*. Breuer demonstrates, with great erudition and linguistic sensitivity, that whoever produced this translation was thoroughly imbued with the spirit of Rabbinic Hebrew and generally faithful to the style of this linguistic stratum. In some cases, though, the situation is more complex; for instance, a Biblical Hebrew word may be chosen, or the syntax may be affected by the source language, Babylonian Aramaic.

In my opinion, Breuer is overly generous in his assessment of the translator's or translators' knowledge of Babylonian Aramaic and at times his attempts to defend a given translation, while ingenious, are unconvincing. The limitations of the translation are particularly noticeable with regard to loanwords of Iranian or Akkadian origin in Babylonian Aramaic. These words are often left untranslated; in other cases the translation seems to reflect conjectures – sometimes successful, sometimes not – based on context. Breuer's perhaps excessive generosity in no way detracts from his signal contribution to the history of the Hebrew language and to a deeper understanding of the historical interaction between Hebrew and Aramaic.

English summaries edited by Dena Ordan