

Summaries

Moshe Bar-Asher

Is צָרְעָה an Insect?

This article returns to my suggestion that the meaning of the noun צָרְעָה differs in Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew. In Mishnaic Hebrew, the noun refers to some kind of ‘poisonous wild bee’, ‘wasp’. Concerning its meaning in Biblical Hebrew, the known Targums (Onkelos, Jonathan on the Prophets, the Palestinian Targum in the Neofiti manuscript, and Pseudo-Jonathan, as well as the Peshitta, the Septuagint, and the Vulgate) supply the same meaning as found in Mishnaic Hebrew. This is also Rashi’s opinion. On the other hand, all of the manuscripts of the Samaritan Targums translate צָרְעָה as ‘distress, trouble’. Some medieval authorities (Saadiah Gaon, Ibn Janah, Ibn Ezra, and Alfasi) adopt a similar approach, explaining צָרְעָה as ‘a serious blow’, ‘plague’, ‘serious illness’, or ‘fear’.

I conjecture that צָרְעָה refers to a predatory wild animal: the ‘lion’. In Arabic this noun has four radicals: *ضرمغام*. In Hebrew, the consonant [m] was apocopated > צָרְעָה (a triradical noun). A similar development is attested for the noun *ثعلب*. Found in Hebrew as שַׁעֲלָב (preserved in the place name שַׁעֲלָבִים), this eventually became שׁוּעַל and תַּעַל in Aramaic after the loss of the consonant [b]. Similarly, the Arabic noun *عصفور* became צַפּוֹר in Hebrew, צַפּוֹר in Aramaic after the loss of the consonant [ʿ].

I underpin my suggestion from the Bible itself: (a) the צָרְעָה is said to consume all, which fits a predatory wild animal; (b) the nouns אָרִי, אַרְיָה and their synonyms occur frequently in the Bible; (c) biblical stories recount encounters with lions; (d) historical research has proven the existence of lions in the biblical period; and (e) 2 Kings 17 relates that God sent lions throughout the land. Notwithstanding, this proposal must remain conjectural.

Asher Laufer

The Furtive *Patah* in Tiberian and Colloquial Hebrew

Acoustic and physiological studies have determined that both the lower vowels and the guttural consonants (עיצורי הגרון – האח"ע) are articulated in the same area. The difference between these sounds is basically in the degree of tilting of the epiglottis. In contrast to low vowels, in high vowels the epiglottis remains erect behind the root of the tongue.

These discoveries clarify the physiological and acoustic reasons for the furtive *patah* law in Hebrew: phonetic assimilation to the articulation of the final guttural consonants. In order to produce a pharyngeal consonant at the end of a word, the epiglottis must reach a state of considerable pharyngeal stricture; if a high vowel precedes the final guttural, the epiglottis must move from an erect position to one of considerable constriction with the back wall of the pharynx. To produce the gutturals the epiglottis moves backwards towards the back wall of the pharynx, and on its way it in any case articulates the vowel [a] – an intermediate position between an upright epiglottis and the epiglottal pharyngeal consonants. This physiological explanation also clarifies the fact that the furtive *patah*, which is an auxiliary vowel similar to pharyngeals, “sneaks in” only after high vowels, because after low vowels the epiglottis is already tilted back and does not require an auxiliary vowel.

These findings clarify other phenomena of lowered vowels adjacent to the pharyngeal consonants; for example, in the pattern of בָּקֵר, we find צֶעֶר, צָחַר, צָהַר, תָּאֵר. For a similar reason, mobile *shewas* in gutturals are always converted into *hataphs*, which are actually composed of the three low vowels in Tiberian Hebrew: [◌◌◌].

“Sneaking in” an auxiliary vowel creates a hiatus (gliding vowels that belong to different syllables), which is an unusual situation for syllabic structures in Hebrew. The article presents solutions that Hebrew has reached in the past and present to address this difficulty.

Rivka Shemesh-Raiskin

The Verb Class of Expression of Emotions in the Mishnah and Tosefta

The verb class of expression of emotions in the Mishnah and Tosefta comprises four subclasses, including nine verbs, most of which have few occurrences: verbs of appeasing (אמר, דיבר, פייס, ריצה); consoling (ניחם); greeting (השיב שלום, שאל (ב)שלום); and reproaching (אמר, מיהה). The scope of the class is narrow in both the Mishnah and Tosefta (as well as in halakhic midrash), and the verbs of this class express a narrow range of emotions. Notwithstanding, there are quite a number of differences between this class and the parallel verb class in Biblical Hebrew.

In the Mishnah and Tosefta the verbs of this class appear in discourse units of a halakhic nature, in contexts that describe the expression of feelings in halakhic circumstances. These verbs do not usually appear in narrative discourse units, nor do they express ordinary actions involving the expression of emotions in ordinary circumstances.

In most of their occurrences, the syntactic framework of the verbs includes NP1 as the subject and NP2 as the complement, and they serve the experiencer and the recipient of the emotion (respectively) in the semantic framework; on rare occasions, we find an asyndetic clause that serves the message uttered by the addressor.

The findings of this paper about the verb class of expression of emotion may serve in the future as the basis for a comparison with other verb classes in Mishnaic Hebrew, especially the verb class of emotion investigated in Etel Bochenek's doctoral dissertation.

Michael Schneider (deceased)

חס וחלילה על ההיסטוריה

The article discusses the origins and reception of the expression חס וחלילה and its reversed twin חלילה וחס. My findings show that the formula was coined or at least appeared in written form in the context of eleventh-

century Arabic to Hebrew translation projects undertaken by both Karaites and Rabbanites.

The influence of Arabic, specifically the expression *حاشا وكلا*, gave rise to the demand for a formula expressing double negation which the formula *חס ושלום* did not meet. That is why the expression *חלילה וחס* emerged – either to augment biblical *חלילה* or as a straightforward translation of *حاشا وكلا*. An example of the second possibility is found in Samuel ibn Tibbon's translation of *Guide of the Perplexed*, which contributed significantly to the spread of this expression.

Dina Sender

[le'avdil 'elef 'alfej av'doles]: Ashkenazi Pronunciation in Haredi Hebrew – Grammar and Pragmatics

This article focuses on a linguistic phenomenon, Ashkenazi pronunciation, that characterizes Haredi Hebrew: a word or word-sequence which, although embedded in a generally fluent Israeli Hebrew, features a unique phonological quality that is foreign to most Hebrew speakers. I aim to examine Ashkenazi pronunciation from multiple angles: to map the lexical sources of the linguistic forms with Ashkenazi pronunciation, analyze its phonological characteristics, trace grammatical changes that occur in forms with Ashkenazi pronunciation, and to discuss the pragmatic functions this pronunciation serves. The examination draws on a corpus of about six-and-a-half hours of internal interviews among men belonging to the Jerusalem Faction (Peleg Yerushalmi), a subgroup of the Lithuanian (Lita'i, i.e., non-Hasidic) Haredi sector.

The article reveals a significant influence of general Israeli Hebrew on Ashkenazi pronunciation: it affects the articulation of various linguistic forms with Ashkenazi pronunciation and enables lexical and grammatical manipulation. Notwithstanding the dominance of general Israeli Hebrew, a pragmatic examination of Ashkenazi pronunciation among members of the Peleg Yerushalmi suggests that its main function is the group's self-determination and social differentiation from other Haredi sectors as well as from general Israeli society.

Vera Agranovsky

The Development of Quadrilateral Reduplicated Roots as Aspect Markers in Modern Hebrew

This article deals with a group of verbs with a quadrilateral root pattern that consists of the repetition of the two-consonant element – $C_1C_2C_1C_2$: e.g., *šlšl* ‘ring’, *brbr* ‘blabber’. Previous research proposed such semantic characteristics for this group as iteration, repetition, and event-internal pluractionality and pointed out that there is no shared common denominator for all members of this group. All these studies examined the $C_1C_2C_1C_2$ verb group either synchronically or more generally diachronically, by analyzing verbs from all periods of Hebrew.

Conducted from the diachronic productivity view, the present study classified these verbs according to the respective periods of Hebrew in which they were coined. Their semantic characteristics were also analyzed separately. From this perspective, I found that throughout the development of Hebrew, more and more verbs created in this pattern share the same semantics: the multiplicative-semelfactive aspect. These verbs express a series of instantaneous events with a natural atomic structure; for example, *gimgem* ‘stutter’, *hinhen* ‘nod’, *rišreš* ‘rustle’, *kixkeax* ‘cough’. They can refer to atomic events of the series (*Mary coughed again and again*) – the multiplicative aspect, but also usually to a single event of the series (*Mary coughed once*) – the semelfactive aspect.

This article presents the process by which the $C_1C_2C_1C_2$ verb pattern gradually turned into an aspect marker until becoming the single productive form of multiplicative-semelfactive verbs in Modern Hebrew. Also, it includes analysis of the possible factors influencing this process, which are universal and unique, internal and external.

Eliezer (Lewis) Glinert

Shmuel Bolozky, *Dictionary of Hebrew Nouns*,
Jerusalem: Rubin Mass, 2020, 828 pp.

Described as “a dictionary of 14,000 Hebrew nouns and adjectives, classified into 998 patterns, with grammatical information”, this is in fact a reference

book by a leading scholar of Modern Hebrew morphology, aimed at both scholars and students. Basing itself on a Morfix Modern Hebrew frequency count, it profiles each pattern with full inflexions, concise morphological and (where appropriate) semantic characterization in English, with copious lexical and contextual examples. For ease of study, the numerous morphophonological variants have separate entries, and two indexes, by alphabetical order and by pattern, are provided. An online edition is planned. The book tacitly reflects formal, not prescriptive, norms, with just occasional reference to colloquial usage, frequencies, or productivity. Scholars will find many intriguing observations scattered throughout the book. This review underscores some broad linguistic assumptions and issues embedded in the entries, such as the three-way distinction between stem + affix, discontinuous root + vowels, and bare stems (the latter not distinguished by the author); differences between N, ADJ and V derivations; the use of imported stems in nativized derivations; and the semantic indeterminacy of many patterns.

English summaries edited by Dena Ordan