Summaries

Vered Noam

Mishnaic Hebrew in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Identification of a Halakhic Term in 4QMMT

The article reexamines a rule in 4QMMT. Josephus's account demonstrates that, regarding this case, the stringent Qumran legislation reflects an early tradition practiced at the start of the second century BCE, whereas the lenient Pharisaic-rabbinic position must have been a novelty. The author suggests that this sectarian law presents a hitherto unidentified example of shared halakhic terminology used both in the Dead Sea Scrolls and rabbinic literature, providing further attestation to an ancient system of halakhah that preceded the sectarian schism.

Moshe Florentin

Is the Root שב״ח Attested in the Samaritan Pentateuch?

This article examines the suggestion that, in the Samaritan Pentateuch, the root שב״ח underlies the numeral שבע 'sevenfold' in verses such as ויספתי ליסרה אתכם שבע על חטאתיכם "I will punish you sevenfold for your sins" (Lev 26:18) and the word השבעה, in the locution שנת השבעה (parallel to MT שְׁנַת הַשֶּׁבַע, 'the seventh year' [Deut 15:9]). Considerations related to the orthography of שבע in the SP, its phonetics, its distribution, its translations into Aramaic and Arabic, and the meaning and distribution of the root שב״ח, led the author to conclude that this assumption faces several insurmountable difficulties.

Stefan Schorch, Alina Tarshin, and Frank Weigelt

The Use of the Aramaic and Arabic Translations of the Samaritan Pentateuch in Samaritan Hebrew Lexicography

The lexicographical analysis of the vocabulary of the Samaritan Pentateuch relies mainly on three criteria: the etymology of a given lexeme, its uses in context, and its renderings in the Aramaic and Arabic translations of the SP. The importance of the latter is enhanced by the fact that both the Aramaic and the Arabic versions present rather literal translations of the SP, in terms of lexical and syntactical equivalence. Due to this characteristic, the versions generally enable the reconstruction of their Hebrew *Vorlagen* and unambiguous determination of how a given Hebrew lexeme was understood by the Samaritan Aramaic and Arabic translators. The role of the Samaritan versions in Samaritan Hebrew lexicography is therefore mainly twofold: first, the Samaritan Aramaic and Arabic translations are an indispensable tool for reconstruction of the Samaritan Hebrew vocabulary, with regard to the written and the oral transmission of the SP between the first century CE and the medieval period. Second, the Samaritan Aramaic and Arabic translations are the main source for determining the meaning of each lexeme from the Samaritan Hebrew vocabulary.

Yehudit Henshke

MS Cambridge of the Mishnah: Tradition and Transmission

MS Cambridge of the Mishnah (Add. 470.1), a Byzantine manuscript that belongs to the western type of the Palestinian branch of the Mishnah, shares many stable features with MS Kaufmann (A 50). Selected examples of these strong affinities, drawn from different linguistic spheres, are presented here. Nonetheless, as opposed to other western manuscripts of the Mishnah, MS Cambridge possesses unique, independent traditions that display greater closeness to the epigraphic evidence from Genizah fragments of the Mishnah and to Amoraic Hebrew. These include erosion of the distinction between the consonants *heh* and *ḥet* and the emphatic consonants *tsadi-samekh* and *qof–kaf;* unique traditions for personal names:

ליעזר, לעזר יודה, יושע, and יוסי; and the prominence of defective spelling as opposed to the definitively plene spelling characteristic of MS Kaufmann.

The linguistic picture represented by MS Cambridge attests to the varied, stratified nature of Rabbinic Hebrew and suggests that the accepted, clear-cut distinction often made between Tannaitic and Amoraic Hebrew does not accurately reflect the linguistic reality in Palestine. It seems more apposite to consider the varieties of Rabbinic Hebrew in Palestine on a time-place continuum.

Michael Ryzhik

Direct Speech in Mishnaic Hebrew

The text of the Mishnah greatly resembles the register of direct speech for several reasons: it is defined as "Oral Law", i.e., text designated for oral transmission; it is for the most part organized and presented as dialogues between the rabbis; and even anonymity is often expressed by use of the second-person form of the verb. But these dialogic structures are more in the way of rhetorical devices (very common in the classical world) than real dialogues. In order to find the vestiges of actual direct speech we must search for presumed attempts to imitate real dialogues. For this aim I consulted the following contexts: (1) short tales with dialogues in which the participants are simple people, not rabbis; (2) descriptions of conditional circumstances, such as "if one enters the town"; (3) and sentences that are to be said aloud, such as "it has been written in my presence" referring to a *get* (bill of divorce). These contexts revealed specific traits that may be characteristic of the living language of the period. These traits belong mainly to two strata: a lower register than standard Mishnaic Hebrew; e.g., dialectical forms, such as נעיים instead of standard מעיין, or a higher register, such as the verb פחז. Specifically, the 2sg.m. personal pronoun את – instead of אתה – is found in the described types of imitated direct speech.

Shimon Sharvit

The Use of Feminine Forms in Impersonal Constructions in Rabbinic Hebrew

This paper treats the use of feminine forms to express an impersonal subject in Rabbinic Hebrew as compared to Biblical Hebrew. The main types are: (1) verbs in the third-person feminine: פעלה, תפעל. The most attested phrases include: איכפת, עלתה לו, עלתה על דעת, עלתה על לב, תיוודע, חשכה/תחשך; (2) the feminine demonstrative pronoun [זו, זאת] in several structures, such as: ועוד זאת/זו, את זו דרש, ולא זו בלבד, זאת אומרת; and (3) the feminine personal pronoun [היא]: ולא היא, היא הנותנת. In addition, I comment on the use of the biblical form זאת in tannaitic literature alongside the regular mishnaic form זו.

Alexey (Eliyahu) Yuditsky

On שיויו and שיואו

In MS Vienna of the Tosefta (Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. Hebr. 20) one finds the form שיואו alongside the expected form שיויו. Moshe Bar-Asher has suggested that שיואו exhibits a peculiar spelling of שיויו, where the *aleph* reflects a glide, as occurs widely in postbiblical sources, e.g., קניה – קְנָאָה, הניה – הנאה. However, as Yochanan Breuer has shown, such an interchange is found in postbiblical sources only when the glide is preceded by the /a/ vowel, expressed by a *pataḥ* or a *qameṣ*. In the case of שיויו the glide is apparently preceded by the consonant /w/; therefore, its spelling with *aleph* is unusual.

It is argued here that in the manuscripts of postbiblical sources there are additional cases of the *aleph*/*yod* interchange preceded by /u/ and /o/ vowels, e.g. בערבוביאה, שרואים. And, in some manuscripts, the scribes used *aleph* to express the glide in particular phonetic and graphemic environments. It should, therefore, be assumed that the *aleph* in the word שיואו indeed represents a glide, as suggested by Bar-Asher.

Elitzur A. Bar-Asher Siegal

Kol-še-hu in Rabbinic and Modern Hebrew

This paper follows the history of the sequence *kol-še-hu* ('all-that-he') from Rabbinic Hebrew until its uses in Modern Hebrew. It identifies changes already in the rabbinic corpus: at first these forms functioned in a compositional manner in free relative clauses; they then underwent a process of morphological univerbation in which they became a single linguistic unit that functions as an indefinite pronoun/determiner.

Furthermore, the paper points to a semantic change that took place in Modern Hebrew in which *kolšehu* denotes a universal quantification of kind instead of quantity (which was the case until the early stages of Modern Hebrew). It thus demonstrates the continuity between Modern Hebrew and earlier stages of Hebrew and the pertinence of the tools of historical linguistics for the study of diachronic phenomena in the emergence of Modern Hebrew.

Rivka Shemesh-Raiskin

A Fortiori Arguments in Halakhic Give-and-Take in the Mishnah and Tosefta: A Study of Discourse and Syntax

In halakhic give-and-take in the Mishnah and Tosefta, the sages-interlocutors often use *a fortiori* (*qal-vaxomer*) arguments. Following a previous description of such arguments in halakhic give-and-take conversations in the Mishnah (Shemesh-Raiskin 2021), this article describes *a fortiori* arguments in the Tosefta and compares the two compilations. Most of the *qal-vaxomer* arguments found in the conversations in the Tosefta lack corresponding conversations in the Mishnah, and the arguments in the Tosefta that do have corresponding ones in the Mishnah are longer and more complex.

The following elements can be added to the arguments: (1) elements prefatory to the argument; (2) additions; (3) responses; and (4) post-argument additions. These elements are more frequently found in the Tosefta than in the Mishnah.

Nine syntactic patterns of the *qal-vaxomer* arguments are presented, of which three are described in greater detail: (1) ‏(ו)מה אם + מ1 + אינו דין + ש־מ2‏ (=*[and] what if + S1 + is it not logical + that-S2*) – the most frequent pattern from the patterns of Azar (1991) in both compilations; (2) ‏(מה) אם‏ + ‏מ1 (חיובי) + מ2 (שלילי: לא + יפעל)‏ (=*[what] if + S1 (positive) + S2 (negative: no + Yifʿal*) – which is frequent only in the Mishnah; and (3) ‏לא, אם אמרת/‏ ‏אמרתם ב־ + צ״ש1 + ש־מ1 + תאמר/תאמרו ב־ + צ״ש2 + ש־מ2?‏ (=*No, if you [sing./pl.] have said in + NP1 + that-S1 + will you [sing./pl.] say in + NP2 + that-S2*) – the most frequent pattern in both compilations.

Doron Ya'akov

The Interchange of ‏בתוך‏ and ‏לתוך‏ in Mishnaic Hebrew

Interchanges of prepositions in Biblical Hebrew are well known, but each preposition usually has a fixed semantic role. The preposition ‏ב־‏ has a locative and stative function, and the preposition ‏ל־‏ marks direction. Accordingly, the prepositional phrases ‏בתוך‏ and ‏אל־תוך‏ function with this semantic contrast. But in Mishnaic Hebrew we find many examples where ‏בתוך‏ follows motion verbs, and ‏לתוך‏ stative verbs. The article treats the distribution of these interchanges in rabbinic literature and examines possible explanations for this prominent phenomenon, among them external influence of a foreign language, or an internal process of semantic bleaching.

Nurit Shoval-Dudai

The Status of Greek and Latin in Palestine as Attested by Loanwords in Rabbinic Literature

The past three decades have seen a shift in the scholarly evaluation of the status of Greek and Latin in ancient Palestine, with the growing advocacy of the view of a broader and deeper influence of these languages on the local population. Nevertheless, the traditional view, which maintains that Greek loanwords penetrated Hebrew through Aramaic mediation and that Latin words were borrowed through double mediation – via Greek

into Aramaic and from Aramaic, in their Greek form, into Hebrew – is still generally accepted.

In the framework of the Academy of the Hebrew Language's Historical Dictionary Project, Greek and Latin loanwords were collected and studied. Since the full texts of these ancient treatises were encoded, we now have a complete, updated corpus of these loanwords in rabbinic literature, based on select manuscripts.

A renewed lexical and morphological examination and comparison to contemporary loanwords in Syriac may temper the proposition of exclusive Aramaic and Greek mediation and acknowledge the possible existence of parallel routes of direct borrowing. Such an appraisal is more consistent with the changing conception of the status of Greek and Latin in ancient Palestine.

Simcha Gershon Bohrer

The Scribe's Corrections in MS Kaufmann of the Mishnah: A Study of Four Corrected Haplographic Errors

MS Kaufmann contains numerous scribal errors. Most of these errors went unnoticed by the scribe and were left to the proofreaders. This article examines an until recently overlooked phenomenon – ascribable to the poor quality of the photocopies at scholars' disposal – namely that, in several places, the scribe himself corrected his errors. The key to understanding the scribe's corrections is identification of haplographic errors of omission or repetition. The article focuses on four examples of such errors corrected by the scribe, in each case proposing a reconstruction of the erroneous text based on context, spacing, and remnants of letters.

The first example, from the end of Tractate Pe'ah (8:9), is the longest, most prominent example of the scribe's correction of a haplographic error of omission. This example also impacts the research of the scribe's textual tradition. The second example, from Tractate Ohalot (18:7), is the longest, most prominent example of the scribe's correction of an error of repetition. Interestingly, the scribe did not examine his error carefully and failed to notice that a large part of the correction was unnecessary. The third example, from Tractate Avodah Zarah (3:13), is a correction of a

repetition which is difficult to decipher. Only by assuming that the scribe was correcting a haplographic error can the erroneous text be reconstructed. In addition, it is possible that the proposed reconstruction reveals an error in the manuscript from which MS Kaufmann was copied, transferred to MS Kaufmann as is. The fourth example, from Tractate Parah (3:4–5), shows an error of repetition that temporarily affected the position of the Mishnah's number. This example shows that even the appearance of a single word twice in one section could lead to scribal error.

Uri Holtzman

The Edition of the Mishnah according to MS Kaufmann: Editorial Considerations for Textual Insertions

The publication by the Academy of the Hebrew Language of an edition of the Mishnah according to MS Kaufmann (A 50) will soon reach completion. One problem confronting the editors was that of omitted words or passages in the text. Should textual omissions be reconstructed, or should the base text be that of the manuscript, with its errors and lacunae, and corrections indicated in footnotes?

As set by Professor Moshe Bar-Asher, the President of the Academy of the Hebrew Language, the guidelines determined that this edition was to be a complete edition of the Mishnah, one from which the Mishnah could be studied. This meant that, at times, the text had to be completed using other manuscripts of the Mishnah.

However, not every lacuna in the manuscript justifies editorial intervention. We therefore defined three types of scribal omissions: (1) apparent scribal omissions that were the product of scribal error. Such omissions must be filled in; (2) uncertain omissions for which the reader does not necessarily sense the missing word or words. It is quite possible that this was the scribe's text. Such omissions should not be reconstructed; and (3) omissions that are not clear-cut, but in which the missing word or words disrupt the understanding of the text. The extant text could not have been written thus and such omissions must be reconstructed. In this paper I present examples of the three above-mentioned types and explain the considerations underlying the editorial decisions.

Shamma Friedman

Remarks on the Language of the Tosefta

This study has four parts. Part one examines whether traces of Babylonian Aramaic can be found in the Tosefta. The Babylonian influence on the Tosefta has been subjected to scholarly attention. I present an extreme case, in which we find Babylonian Aramaic in some of the textual witnesses: at the beginning of t. Berakhot (1:3): ר׳ נתן או׳ שלש משמרות **הוי** הלילה; and in t. Gittin 5:5–6: שהאומ׳ על מנת כאומ׳ מעכשיו **דמי**. The word הוי, meaning 'constitute, comprise', was introduced by a tradent familiar with the BT parallel, as was דמי, an enhancement of the particle of comparison.

   Part two addresses variance in the use of technical terms. The meanings of אשבורן 'where liquids pool', and קטפרס 'where they flow', are transposed in t. Pisḥa 3:6.

   Part three looks at phraseology unique to the Tosefta. In the phrase יש כאן, the Tosefta uses כאן pleonastically, commonly found in occurrences of tetralemma.

   Finally, part four examines occurrences of authentic tannaitic language. Alongside its unique features, the Tosefta regularly presents authentic tannaitic language, such as אף על פי without -ש, and the demonstrative pronoun without the definite article, following a definite noun.

Uri Mor

Distinctive Morphological Features in Sifre Zuta on Numbers

A common assumption among scholars of rabbinic literature is that the halakhic midrash Sifre Zuta on Numbers is stylistically and halakhically distinct from other tannaitic midrashim, but to date this supposition has not been supported by comprehensive structural (grammatical) analysis. This paper, part of a larger project on the language of Sifre Zuta on Numbers, offers an initial step in this direction by examining the formation of six distinctive nominal forms found in Genizah copies of Sifre Zuta on Numbers: גומים 'hollows' (rather than גומות); מכתישה 'mortar' (rather than

מכתשת); יוריות 'cauldrons' (rather than יורות); דוליות 'buckets' (rather than דליים, etc.); פונדקין 'inns' (rather than פונדקאות, etc.); and יצורה 'pottery work' (rather than יצירה or צורה).

This group of six nouns demonstrates that the Genizah documents preserve ancient, authentic traditions of Mishnaic Hebrew, including features which deviate from so-called standard Mishnaic Hebrew. However, it appears that the nonstandard phenomena do not add up to a significant typological, i.e., dialectal, distinction.

Emmanuel Mastey

How Dialectal Differences Affected the Interpretation of Tannaitic Sources by the Babylonian Talmud: Two Case Studies

The Babylonian Hebrew dialect is not identical with the dialect reflected in tannaitic works composed in the land of Israel. They differ in various respects, including syntax, morphology, phonetics, vocabulary, and semantics. The latter aspect has major ramifications for the way in which Babylonian sages perceived and interpreted tannaitic sources. The paper examines two cases (Rosh Hashanah 30b; Temurah 12a–b) in which a tannaitic text seems to have had a different intent, as compared to its interpretation in the Babylonian Talmud. Both cases are shown to be rooted in an unnoticed dialectal difference between Babylonia and the land of Israel. In one of these instances, the Babylonian interpretation of the tannaitic text led to a series of changes in that text as cited in the Talmud.

Ariel Shaveh

"To Understand a Proverb and a Figure": Two Obscure Midrashic Phrases and Their Linguistic History

This article sheds light on two midrashic phrases used by Rashi, which seem to have originally had a different form. The first is the proverb הידבק לשחוור וישתחוו לך (Gen 15:18; Deut 1:7), apparently excerpted from Sifre

Deuteronomy and Genesis Rabbah. Rashi clearly explains שחוור as a high-ranking official, assigning to the sentence the meaning "attach yourself to an official and people will bow down to you". This etymology indeed has a solid basis in Targum Onqelos and the Babylonian Talmud. The authoritative witnesses of the Midrash, however, share an Aramaic proverb instead: אידבק לשחין וישתחן לך, which probably means "attach yourself to the heat and you will heat up".

The second phrase (Exod 19:18 and elsewhere), originating in the Mekhilta, is well known and even used in Modern Hebrew due to the popularity of Rashi's commentary. Its common form nowadays is לסבר את האוזן, but previous scholars have already pointed out that this phrase rather opened with another verb, suggesting לשבר or לשכך. Consequently, they tended to ignore the difficult and surprising version לשכר את האוזן found in some important, early witnesses to both the Midrash and Rashi's commentary. Espousing the probable assumption that this was Rashi's version of the Midrash, I show its affinity to the French phraseology of that era.

Shulamit Elizur

From the Lexicon of Early Palestinian *Payyetanim*: Two Roots and Their Semantic Extensions

The early Palestinian *payyetanim* added new meanings to various roots. The present article clarifies the meanings associated in *piyyut* with two roots: דפק and רבך.

The root דפק, whose basic meaning is 'to strike', is employed in *piyyut* with a number of semantic extensions: with reference to redemption (in the wake of the verse "The sound of my Beloved knocking [*dofeq*]"); with reference to prayer (as part of the metaphor of the worshiper knocking [*dofeq*] on the gates of heaven); and as denoting urging (in wake of Gen 33:13). Two additional meanings of the root דפק proposed by scholars – 'to flow', and as a variant of דבק – are also reviewed, with the conclusion that it is impossible to prove that they are part of the semantics of the root in early Palestinian *piyyut*.

The root רבך, whose basic meaning is 'to fry', undergoes semantic expansion and comes to refer to suffering. It is also attested with the meaning 'to mix', perhaps as an outgrowth of the act of mixing that accompanies frying, as well as with reference to prayer.

Aharon Maman

Menaḥem Ben Saruq and Rabbinic Hebrew

The first Hebrew-Hebrew dictionary of the Bible, known as *Maḥberet,* was authored by Menaḥem ben Saruq, a tenth-century Cordoban poet and lexicographer. From its publication by Zvi Filipowski in 1854 scholars have noticed that, unlike Saadiah Gaon and others, Ben Saruq rarely compares biblical entries to their Rabbinic Hebrew counterparts. Some scholars regard this in a derogatory light. They also enumerate, usually following Filipowski's edition, some ten cases only of comparison to Rabbinic Hebrew in *Maḥberet*. This article carefully examines all these cases individually and attempts to prove, based on close readings of the manuscripts, study of Menaḥem's literary style, and other principles, that these comparisons did not originate with Menaḥem, but were added by copyists. The question thus is no longer why the *Maḥberet* makes few comparisons to Rabbinic Hebrew, but rather why it completely refrains from any recourse to RH.

It seems that, in principle, Menaḥem took the concept of "The Torah uses its own language and the Sages their own" to an extreme, i.e., not only were they different registers, but also far removed from one another. This expands on an argument made in a previous article, which showed that, for Menaḥem, a first-generation poet of the Spanish Golden Age, only Biblical Hebrew was appropriate for poetry. He therefore confined his dictionary entries to the Bible only and made every effort to extract his definitions from within Biblical Hebrew.

Ofra Tirosh-Becker

The Plural Morpheme in Rabbinic Hebrew
According to Karaite Manuscripts

This paper discusses a specific linguistic phenomenon in Rabbinic Hebrew according to its manifestation in rabbinic quotations embedded in Karaite writings. The reliability of these rabbinic quotations is established through a multitude of linguistic phenomena, spanning phonology, morphology, morphosyntax and syntax, that match the evidence found in reliable rabbinic sources. The discussion herein focuses on the distribution of the plural suffix ‏ים-‏/‏ין-‏ of nouns and participles in Rabbinic Hebrew based on a large corpus of rabbinic citations in Karaite writings, in comparison to the distribution of this morpheme in reliable rabbinic manuscripts. The analysis yields new insights into this well-trodden subject.

Chaim E. Cohen

Jacob Emden's *Leḥem Niqqudim* on Tractate Abot

This article discusses Rabbi Jacob Emden's *Leḥem Niqqudim,* which is an appendix to his commentary on Tractate Abot, *Leḥem Shamayim*. The purpose of this composition, which is composed of short comments arranged in the order of the tractate, is to establish the grammatically correct reading. In his introduction, Emden explains what motivated him to compose this work: first, the vocalized Amsterdam printing of the Mishnah was riddled with errors; second, the errors in the extensive commentary of Rabbi Yom-Tov Lipmann Heller, *Tosfot Yom-Tov*, and especially the grammatical rules of Rabbi Zalman Hanau, to which Emden objected vociferously.

  The article presents examples of these comments in order to explain their rationale, generally and specifically. Extensive treatment is given to the second-person pronominal suffix ‏ךָ-‏. Emden adheres to the position that the form should be ‏ךְ-‏, which is consistent with biblical grammar. This approach seems to contradict his position regarding Mishnaic Hebrew and

the undesirability of correcting it to conform with biblical usage. From this apparent contradiction, we can discern how Emden understood the talmudic dictum לשון תורה לעצמה ולשון חכמים לעצמן ("The Torah uses its own language and the Sages their own") and its application.

Yehonatan Wormser

The Vocalization in the Kehati Editions of the Mishnah

This paper describes the nature of the vocalization of the Mishnah in the popular, widely distributed editions with Pinḥas Kehati's commentary. Initially edited by the commentator, Pinḥas Kehati, his vocalization is grounded mainly in the rules of biblical vocalization and the vocalization standards of Modern Hebrew. In addition to this principle, he sometimes consulted the vocalization of the Mishnah by Ḥanoch Yalon and, in some cases, was influenced by the Ashkenazi tradition of Mishnah reading. Years later, in the new editions of the Mishnah with Kehati's commentary many forms were changed according to their vocalization in ancient manuscripts of the Mishnah. Nevertheless, the editors of these editions made efforts to maintain their fundamental characteristic as popular editions accessible to all students of the Mishnah.

Mor Shemesh

Biblical Hebrew in Ashkenazi Attire:
The Language of Biblical Citations in the
Ashkenazi Reading Tradition of the Mishnah

This paper studies the biblical citations in Ashkenazi printed editions of the Mishnah and discusses the numerous differences attested between their vocalization and the traditional Tiberian vocalization of the Bible. These differences spark interest for two main reasons. First, most of them exhibit phonological and morphological phenomena also known from the Ashkenazi reading tradition of the Mishnah itself, and their presence in the biblical citations in the Mishnah reinforces their nature as

characteristic of the Ashkenazi tradition. Second, the displacement of the biblical reading tradition by the reading tradition of rabbinic literature, as evidenced by these differences, reinforces the inferior status of the Bible in the Ashkenazi world of learning. In the known distinction between the reading traditions of the Bible and those of rabbinic literature, a new intermediate arena is revealed here: the reading of the biblical citations found in rabbinic literature.

Ariel Gabbay

Contextual and Pausal Forms in the First Vocalized Mishnah Editions: Between the Manuscripts and Sephardic Reading Traditions

This article deals with contextual and pausal forms in the Mishnaic Hebrew verb system, according to the first printed editions of the Mishnah with full vocalization: the Constantinople (1644) and the Amsterdam (1646) editions. The article reveals a crucial, prominent systemic difference between these two editions and the medieval vocalized manuscripts of the Mishnah. In the manuscripts, as a rule, contextual forms appear in contextual status, and pausal forms appear in pausal status, similar to Biblical Hebrew. However, in both printed editions, the Biblical Hebrew rules of contextual and pausal forms are not applied. In certain verb categories pausal forms are regularly used, the most prominent of which are the third-person feminine singular and the third-person masculine plural in the *nifʿal* and *hufʿal* stems, whereas in other major categories only contextual forms are used, regardless of the syntactic environment.

The reading that emerges from these two seventeenth-century European editions closely resembles the Mishnaic reading tradition of Sephardic communities in North Africa and the Levant, as documented in recent generations. It therefore seems that the reading tradition represented in the two printed editions reflects the popular reading tradition for Mishnaic Hebrew. It is likely that the informal, free reading by the general public was in plain language, which avoided grammatical duplication and used a single verb form in each category, ignoring syntactic status.

Adam Bin-Nun

The Yemenite Tradition of Mishnaic Hebrew in the Past Generation: From Oral Law to Written Law

The study of the Mishnah in Yemen, always prominent, underwent many changes. In early periods, the Yemenites made use of handwritten copies of the Mishnah, to which Maimonides's commentary had been appended. From the late sixteenth century onwards, printed editions of the Mishnah with Rabbi Obadiah of Bertinoro's commentary found their way to Yemen. These editions became so prevalent that by the early twentieth century there remained not a single complete Yemenite manuscript of Maimonides's Mishnah commentary.

Known for their expertise in preservation of accurate readings, the present study examines the uniqueness of the Yemenite tradition sustained by the previous generation as opposed to earlier ones. It also briefly surveys the tradition of Rabbi Joseph Amar as compared to that of the previous generation.

A considerable part of the study is devoted to the presentation of a new edition of the six orders of the Mishnah, vocalized according to the Yemenite tradition. This synchronic edition is based mainly on the versions found in the printed books studied in Yemen and vocalized according to the reading tradition used in Yemen's central highlands in the generation prior to the community's *aliyah* to Israel. It also includes an apparatus of variant readings that had become commonplace in central Yemen among members of the prior generation.

Joseph Tedghi

Archaic Linguistic Forms of Mishnaic Hebrew Preserved in Moroccan Judeo-Arabic

Whereas the Hebrew terms and expressions integrated into Jewish languages have, for the most part, retained their traditional pronunciation, some have undergone phonological and morphological modification. Research carried out over the past few years has established that these differences in

fact reflect old Hebrew reading traditions which have fallen into disuse, but which are documented in ancient manuscripts of the Mishnah.

In the present article, I propose to demonstrate the preservation of some ancient, original linguistic forms of Mishnaic Hebrew (*leshon ḥakhamim*) in spoken Moroccan Judeo-Arabic, on the basis of specimens collected during various field surveys carried out in Morocco, France, and Israel. To illustrate, I note several examples of some of the structures discussed: archaic forms of pronunciation of certain terms; construct-state forms identical with the absolute form; contextual structures identical with pausal forms; occasional use of the second-person masculine singular pronominal suffix ךָ and not ךְ; use of the נִתְפַּעֵל verbal pattern and not נִתְפְּעֵל; gemination of *resh* like other consonants in verbs conjugated in the פִּעֵל form or its derivatives in the nominal פִּעוּל pattern. Obviously, these vestiges of Mishnaic Hebrew linguistic forms, which confirm those supplied by the manuscripts, are of great importance. On the one hand, they bear witness to the fidelity of the transmission of Hebrew in the Diaspora Jewish communities and, on the other hand, constitute an essential source for a better understanding of the history of the Hebrew language.

Ishay Rosen-Zvi

Shamma Friedman (ed.), *Talmud Ha-Igud: BT Gittin Chapter IX*,
Jerusalem: The Society for the Interpretation of the Talmud,
2020, xxxix + 640 pp.

This review of Professor Shamma Friedman's new commentary on the last chapter of b. Gittin (*Hamegaresh*) examines its method, style, and intended audience and compares it to other scholarly talmudic commentaries. My goal is to consider the various approaches to composing a running academic commentary on the Babylonian Talmud, and the advantages and limitations of each.

English summaries edited by Dena Ordan