INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES AND PRIZE ESSAYS

AUTHOR___David H. Aaron_____

TITLE___"A Critical Survey of Major Trends in the Modern_____

___Linguistic Scholarship of Middle Hebrew 1"_____

TYPE OF THESIS: Ph.D. [ ]   D.H.L. [ ]   Rabbinic [x]

Master's [ ]   Prize Essay [ ]

1. May circulate [ ]   ) Not necessary
) for Ph.D.
2. Is restricted [✗] for _10_ years.   ) thesis

   Note: The Library shall respect restrictions placed on theses
          or prize essays for a period of no more than ten years.

   I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of my thesis
   for security purposes.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis. _____ ✗_____
                                                      yes   no

March 1, 1983   _____
Date   Signature of Author

_____

A Critical Survey of Major Trends

in the Modern Linguistic Scholarship of Middle Hebrew 1

David H. Aaron

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for Ordination

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion

1983

Referee:
Professor Matitiahu Tsevat

Contents

Acknowledgements

DIGEST

Middle Hebrew is the language of the Oral Tradition. Since the 1930's, scholars have differentiated various strata within the general category of Middle Hebrew. The distinctions have been based on linguistic criteria. This essay will deal with Middle Hebrew 1, which is best identified as the postbiblical Hebrew used by the Tannaim.

This investigation will attempt to provide an understanding of the primary contributions in the field of linguistics (made over the past 45 years) concerning Middle Hebrew 1. It is not my goal--nore would it be possible in this type of essay--to present a comprehensive consideration of every study pertaining to MH-1. Our discussion will touch mainly upon the work of six scholars and a few others in passing.

The reader can expect a brief discussion of early works in the field. In addition, there will be an introduction to some of the manuscript traditions of Middle Hebrew. We will then consider M.H. Segal's works and some of his critics. Y. Kutscher's ideas will be reviewed as well as the contribution of A. Bendavid. There will be a brief summary of H. Yalon's writings and Z. Ben-Hayyim's discussion on MH and other literary sources. Before the final summary, we will touch upon the most recent work of note, M. Moreshet's verb lexicon.

INTRODUCTION

Middle Hebrew is the language in which the תורה
שבעל פה (the Oral Tradition) was composed and transmitted.[1]
It has been preserved by the Jews for two thousand years
in parts of their liturgy and hermeneutic literatures.

Since the Oral Tradition was composed over more than
half a millennium, its language was not stagnant. Numerous
terms have been used to name and describe the various stages
of its development. The three most common terms demand
clarification: Mishnaic Hebrew (MsH), Rabbinic Hebrew (RH),
and Middle Hebrew (MH).

Rabbinic Hebrew refers to content rather than linguistic
form. RH is generally the language of the halachic and aggadic
compositions of the rabbis from the first century until the
present day. Amazingly, the entire gamut does exhibit certain
common charactersitics. Even so, it should not be viewed as
a formal linguistic unit.

Mishnaic Hebrew refers specifically to the language of
the Mishnah, the earliest known rabbinic source. Since other
rabbinic and non-rabbinic works fit into the same linguistic
track, a more comprehensive term was established in order
to eliminate confusion.

Middle Hebrew is the most general and recent term in
use. It refers to the postbiblical Hebrew of the Second
Temple Period and beyond, which was spoken and used in the
Oral Tradition. It is currently recognized that Middle Hebrew

must be divided into periods. While scholars vary in their setting of MH's *terminus a quo*, it is generally held (in the broadest sense) that we can distinguish between MH-1 and MH-2. The *terminus ad quem* for MH-1 is usually placed in the mid-3rd century C.E., or, shortly after the death of Judah Hanasi. With these guidelines, MH-1 came to maturity at some point after the establishment of the Great ASsembly (4th century B.C.E.) and faded away during the 3rd century C.E. Those who maintain this outline are porponents of yet a further distinction: viz., that MH-1 was the spoken language of the Jews of Palestine while MH-2 was used by the rabbis after Hebrew had ceased to serve as a colloquial language.

This investigation will attempt to provide an understanding of the primary contributions in the field of linguistics (made over the past 45 years) concerning MH-1. It is not my goal--nor would it be possible in this type of essay--to present a comprehensive consideration of every study pertaining to MH-1. A thorough investigation of this field would involve a scrutiny of the work of close to thirty scholars. Our discussion will touch mainly upon the work of six scholars and a few others in passing.

Because of the limitations implicit in the Rabbinic Thesis (i.e., time and training), I shall attempt to offer a synthesis and scrutiny of the major works of scholarship to have made an impact on the direction of MH-1 studies.

The reader can expect a brief discussion of early works in the field. In addition, there will be an introduction to some of the manuscript traditions of MH. We will then consider M.H. Segal's works and some of his critics. Y. Kutscher's ideas will be reviewed as well as the contribution of A. Bendavid. There will be a brief summary of H. Yalon's writings and Z. Ben-Hayyim's discussion on MH and other literary sources. Before the final summary, we will touch upon the most recent work of note, M. Moreshet's verb lexicon.

Few of the articles and books concerning MH-1 deal with the linguistic facets of the language in an integrated manner. The articles are usually specialized and are best considered components of a greater whole. They report particular textual variants or variations in vocalizations as they are suggested by remnant oral and written traditions. Theoretical studies of MH-1's development are sparce.

When the numerous articles of the past 45 years are juxtaposed, a woven tapestry slowly emerges. But a complete synthetic work on the field has yet to be done. No grammar has replaced M. H. Segal's two mishnaic grammars (1927 and 1935) even though there has been widespread criticism of this work.

In addition, nothing has been written in English. The student who is unable to immerse himself in the numerous scattered articles written almost exclusively in Modern

Hebrew, cannot possibly survey the field. Thus, even the most basic type of introduction is wanting.

I hope that this essay, though clearly of very modest proportions, can serve as a basic survey for the beginning student.

The Literature and Manuscripts of MH-1

At the turn of the century, the appellation "Mishnaic Hebrew" referred to "...the idiom in which was composed the Halakic and Haggadic literature of the Jews from c. 200 B.C. to 200 A.C., i.e., from Simon the Just down to the first generation of the Amoraim."[2] At that time, the works thought to comprise the literature of the period were: *Mishnah, Tosefta, Aboth d'Rabbi Natan, Masektot Ketanot, Mekilta, Sifra, Sifre, Seder 'Olam,* and *Baraitot of the Gemara.*[3]

It is debatable whether the aforementioned dates are the parameters of the tannaitic period. Without entering into a discussion of chronology, we shall presently review the current list of Rabbinic sources[4] ascribed to the MH-1 period. Since manuscripts have been a major factor in the research since the discovery of the Cairo Geniza, it will also be helpful to provide a brief commentary on the oldest and most significant manuscripts of each text.[5]

MISHNAH

The *Mishnah* is the primary souce of MH-1. The most significant ms is the Kaufmann Manuscript (Kms) of Italian origin, dating from the mid-13th century.[6] It is complete and fully vocalized. The pointing was added after the consonantal text was completed and surely by a different person.

The Parma 138 Manuscript is complete but only 40% vocalized (i.e., through *Gittin*). It is of Italian origin from the mid-13th century. The pointing was done by someone other than the scribe.

Cambridge (Add. 470) ms dates to c. 1350. It is not vocalized and is written for the most part without *matres lectionis*.

Paris, Mishnah (328-329) dates from the end of the 14th
century. There are also numerous early printed editions
in Paris.

In addition to the complete mss there are numerous Geniza
fragments pertaining to *Mishnah*; to date, approximately
150 fragments. Some consist of a complete Tractate.

TOSEFTA

Berlin 159 Erfurt is composed of four complete orders
and sections of a fifth. It is of German origin, dating
to the mid-12th century.

Vienna (46) ms is complete and dates to the mid-13th
century.

The British Museum of London has a partial ms from c. 1450.
In addition, there are numerous Geniza fragments.

MEKILTA D'RABBI YISHMAEL

The earliest ms is Oxford 2.151 dated 1291. Two other mss
of importance are Vatican 6.299 from c. 1350 and Jerusalem
1.117 dated 1435. There are also numerous Geniza fragments.

SIFRA

There are many complete mss in addition to numerous fragments.
The main ones are: Vatican 66, Babylonian pointing, but is thought
to be of Palestinian origin, from c. 950; Vatican 1,31 is not
pointed and it is perhaps also from Palestine, dated, 1073; London 2,
341 , dating 1150; Parman ms c. 1350.

SIFRE

Vatican 32,3 date s to the 10th century. In London there
is a 12 century ms and at Oxford a ms of 1291.

SIFRE ZUTA

This text survives only in Geniza fragments.

MEKILTA D'RABBI SIMON B. YOHAI / MEKILTA TO DEUTERONOMY

Both survive only in fragments. Of the former, substantial
mss exist; of the later, texts are scarce.

BARAITA TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE SANCTUARY

This work claims three mss: Munich 95 from 1343; Austria
11.31 dates from 1509; Parma 5,353, mid-16th century.

SEDER 'OLAM (RABA)
Twelve datable mss exist, the earliest being Parma
10,541 from c. 1300 and Oxford 8,692 from 1315.

BARAITA OF THE 32 MIDOT

Sometimes called *Mishnat d'Rabbi Eliezer* has two main
incomplete mss from c. 15th-16th centuries. (Cf. Enelow,
1933 translation and introduction to the work.

BARAITA OF REDEMPTION

There are only fragments.

EARLY REFERENCE WORKS

In 1845 Abraham Geiger published his *Lehr-und Lesebuch
zur Sprache der Mischnah* (Breslau). He was the first to
present a grammatical overview of Rabbinic Hebrew in the
scientific manner established during the 19th century. He is
also generally regarded as the first to identify MH as an
entity independent from BH. Geiger regarded the Hebrew of the
Mishnah as the artificial and mechanical invention of "school-
men" and compared it to the Latin of the Middle Ages.[7] This
point of view dominated 19th century scholarship. The *Lehrbuch
der neuhebräischen Sprache* of C. Siegfried and H. L. Strack was in
agreement with Geiger's premises.[8] While their work was more
methodical and complete (as a grammar) than that of Geiger's,
it was vitiated by their failure to differentiate between
"...MH. and Aramaic or semi-Aramaic forms and phrases, and
by a number of other inaccuracies."[9] Numerous smaller and
more specialized works were composed near the end of the
century[10] but most adopted the point of view expressed by
Geiger.

There were some contrary opinions. The Jewish historian
H. Graetz wrote in *Litteraturblatt d. Orients* (1844) that
MH was a living language spoken by Jews during the Hasmonean
period. It developed, he held, as a natural offshoot of BH.
Segal notes a few other examples of those who were not in
agreement with Geiger[11] but for the most part, the trend set
in 1845 remained dominant until Segal's *Jewish Quarterly Review*
article of 1908.[12]

At the end of the 19th century, the first lexical aids
appeared in Germany. Jakob Levy's monumental dictionary of
rabbinic sources is still a valuble tool for the student of
this literature.[13] In the field of lexicology we might make
mention of H. L. Fleischer and H. Y. Kohut (a contemporary
of Levy). [14]

The first volume of S. Kraus' *Griechische und lateinische
Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch und Targum* (Berlin 1898-99)
was severely criticized by S. Fraenkel.[15] The second volume
received the attention of I. Löw whose notations are considered
worthwhile. Löw was to be best known for his invaluble *Die Flora
der Juden* (Vienna, 1926-34) which is a tool for the student of
BH as well as MH. Löw's expansive knowledge of semitic languages
makes this work more comprehensive than previous works in
Hebrew philology.

M. Jastrow's two-volume dictionary which covers virtually
all of the Rabbinic Literature known in his day including the
Targumim, is the only work to have appeared in English.[16]
For the most part, this work is more complete than earlier

dictionaries. Jastrow, however, had a tendency to strain to assign Hebrew origins for words which can best be identified as loan words.

G. H. Dalman's dictionary which appeared approximately twenty years later,[17] covers the same literature and is significant in that Dalman was the first to be cognizant of Yemenite manuscripts for Targums Onkelos and Jonathan. However, Dalman's system of vocalization is considered unscientific.[18]

THE CONTROVERSY
CONCERNING M. H. SEGAL'S WORK

The modern conception of MH was first championed by
M.H. Segal. Ironically, his work, though indisputably
significant, has suffered severe criticism over the years.
While his general conclusions were recognized by virtually
everyone, his grammatical writings have been virtually
ridiculed. This is because many have judged the evidence
on which he bases his grammars to be distorted. Subsequently,
Segal's work is rarely mentioned without disparagement, even
after many years of scholars making the same points over and
over again.

Segal was the first to firmly posit the notion--in
opposition to Geiger's thesis decades earlier--that MH was
a spoken language which developled naturally from BH. In his
Jewish Quarterly Review article of July 1908[1] Segal laid the
theoretical and basic structural foundations for his grammar
of Mishnaic Hebrew.[2] He noted four salient characteristics
of MH which struck him as linguistic curiosities.

1) There are words in MH known in BH which are
   also known in Aramaic (A).

2) There are words [roots] in BH and Aramaic
   which have the same meaning. Some of those very
   words also appear in MH but with different
   meanings.

3) There are technical phrases in MH which do not
   appear in either BH or A.

4) There are aspects of BH rarely found in Tanach
   which appear regularly in MH.[3]

In his attempt to reconcile these four aspects, Segal

presented what he held to be self evident about the nature
of language. These assumptions, in turn, lie at the base of
his understanding of MH's development.

Segal was convinced, for instance, that grammatical
forms and rules are not as easily altered or exchanged as is
vocabulary. Some of the far reaching implications of this
premise are unveiled in the following passage:

> For grammar is, as it were, the soul of the language, and by
> violently surrendering its grammar, the language would at the
> same time be giving up its very life and committing its own
> destruction. Change in grammar is usually a very slow and
> laborious process. The germ of the new form must have existed
> in the language long before the new form made its appearance.
> When it does appear, it remains for a time quiet and unobstrusive,
> and slowly and gradually works its way until it acquires a permanent
> place in the government of the language, existing for a long time
> side by side with the old form which it is eventually to supplant.
> And when the latter is compelled at last to acknowledge itself
> conquered, it does not yet yield up its position entirely, but
> continues to exercise some kind of power, however, feeble and
> subordinate, until it is finally exterminated by its rival and
> disappears entirely.[4]

While Segal recognized that Aramaic had an influence on
the development of MH, he tended to minimize its significance.
It suited Segal's cause to view Aramaic as an external catalyst
of secondary import rather than as an integral force equal in
significance to the other components which have played a role
in the development of Hebrew. This was due to his conviction
as quoted above, that the major grammatical changes must stem
from aspects internal to the language.

Also at issue was the need to emphasize the naturalness
of MH as a language which evolved from BH. Segal concluded
that the anomalies of MH did not simply appear out of a

vacuum, nor were they the specious concoctions of scholastics in an academic setting. Rather, they were the authentic results of evolution: phenomena only mutually explainable when viewed as elements of a speech-community. Thus, when presented with the problem of how the net vocabulary of MH surpassed BH without considerable influence from outside sources, Segal stressed that "...it cannot be repeated too often that the vocabulary of the Old Testament contains but a part, and possibly only a small part, of the stock of words possessed by the Hebrew language. It is, therefore, unreasonable to assign to Aramaic all those words [5] in MH. which are not found in BH."[6]

In the introduction to the 1936 Grammar, Segal expounds on the theoretical and pragmatic considerations which governed the formulation of his work. For the structuring and organization of his 1936 Grammar, he borrowed the system of categorization and terminology found in Gesenius-Kautsch's biblical grammar, adopting some modifications.[7]

Continuing with the introduction to the 1936 Grammar, Segal comments at length, once again, on theoretical considerations. He explains that, while on the one hand it is necessary to clarify the function of a word which is derived from nothing other than the word's particular form, and that the form and function create a single linguistic unit such that it is difficult to distinguish [or, separate] between the two (i.e., the form and the meaning); the truth is, that any order that

12

that might be chosen for delineating the grammatic materials (excluding the phonetic ones) will present major difficulties. According to Segal, there is no system which would be completely suitable for all the demands of absolute logic. Thus the result is the mixture of areas in the categories of the grammar.

Segal believes it best not to become entangled in abstract theories (such as phonemic reconstruction), but rather, that one should concentrate on the pragmatic aspect of linguistic analysis. Thus, when there is confusion concerning a word's morphology, one should be inclined to chose the form which best accomodates the needs of the reader.

Concerning the versions presented in the examples Segal used in his 1936 Grammar, Segal states that he only brought variants to the attention of the reader when they were pertinent to a grammatical form.[8] Using examples primarily relating to the Mishnah, he did not feel obligated to sight variants either in manuscripts or early printed editions. Segal thereby admits that those forms of the words he brings to light may not be the original (i.e., the ones used in mishnaic times). Further, he acknowledges that those who investigate manuscript versions may criticize and correct certain conclusions based on possible imperfect representations cited in his book.

Although, Segal adds that he is "...certain that the basic grammatical forms of the Mishnah, as I have indicated them in my book, will not at all be altered by means of a critique of

the forms [versions] in my examples."[9]

In summation, Segal thought it satisfactory to write a grammar of the language of the Mishnah based on the most commonly used printed texts of the Mishnah. The aim was to facilitate comprehension, acknowledging the discoveries brought to light by the study of manuscripts only when they would aid one's understanding of the grammatical forms--an occurance which, Segal ascertained, would tend to be rather isolated.

There has been assiduous criticism of Segal's grammatical studies. Even M. Moreshet, instead of simply presenting his finds in his recent lexicon on MH verbs (1980) spends a considerable amount of time indicating the flaws of Segal's 1936 Grammar. The criticisms assail Segal's choice of versions and vocalization, the scope of literature he employed as evidence, and perhaps most trenchant, his consideration of Aramaic.

P. Kahle wrote in an *Hebrew Union College Annual* article (1935) that he felt it to be "...quite unpardonable that in a Mishna Grammar compiled in Oxford and published there in 1927 it should be considered sufficient to quote the Mishna forms throughout with an artificial punctuation built up according to the biblical Tiberian vocalization."[10]

Segal addresses Kahl's remarks directly in his introduction to the 193 rammar, and cites Kahle's main complaints: First, according to Kahle, the writer of a grammar should take it

14

upon himself to collect and arrange the various scattered
materials from the Geniza and other sources which pertain
to MH; and secondly, the mss should form the foundations
for a scientific approach to pointing. Kahle holds that
Segal failed on both accounts. Further, Kahle specifically
emphasizes "Oxford" to indicate that for Segal, many of the
mss of the Mishnah were easily accessible, (Oxford being
Segal's teaching post at the time), and that the author
evidently did not make an effort to consult them.

Segal responds with a ideological refutation that
actually pertains to all the critiques levied against his
works. No one, however, seems to acknowledge these arguments.
Because of their significance with respect to some of our
ensuing discussion, it is fitting to consider here a para-
phrase of a long segment of Segal's rebuttal.

Segal holds that Kahle makes a fundamental error by
exaggerating the significance of the superlinear pointing
with respect to grammar, and by assigning inordinate importance
to the conclusions he derives from a comparison of the super-
linear and Tiberian point traditions. According to Kahle, the
Tiberian system of pointing was never a living dialect. Instead,
it developed as an inauthentic system of vocalization[11] which
the בעלי מסורה of Tiberius created for themselves in order to
teach the Jews how (according to their beliefs) the Hebrew of
the Tanach should be pronounced.[12]

Segal reminds us of a similar debate concerning the relative
merits of the ashkenazic and sephardic pronounciations: Which

15

of the two is correct? This question is asked as if there
were a language in the world that had one correct system of
pronounciation, and as if the multiplicity of pronounciations
and dialects in all living and natural language were not a
necessary universal characteristic of speech societies.

The variations among the three Hebrew vocalization
systems, according to Segal, are merely the natural con-
trasts among the three Hebrew dialects of Judea, Babylonia,
and Galilee; similar to the Aramaic variants among the Jews
of Jerusalem, Babylonia and Galilee. The significance of
these diviations and their developments should be discussed
in a forum devoted to the study of phonetics and is not, holds
Segal, particularly relevant to the writing of a grammar.[13]

Even as Segal clearly outlines these ideological premises
in his 1936 Grammar, critics after Kahle continue to cite the
same shortcomings without addressing Segal's defense.

Hanoch Yalon, one of the most prodigious scholars of
MH, reviewed both the 1927 and 1936 Grammars.[14] His comments
are basically the same in both reviews.[15] Yalon submits that
Segal should not have included material from outside of the
Mishnah for his examples in the manner he did. He failed to
be exhaustive in his selection of examples. In addition, he
neglected to consult scientific editions.[16] Yalon argues
(as did Kahle) that manuscripts and early printed editions
should have been consulted not only for forms and pointing,
but as the basic texts from which the grammar should have been

written. Further, he states, Segal failed to recognize the contributions of other scholars whose works were completed before his grammar.[17]

The remainder of Yalon's article meticulously combs through Segal's erroneous judgments with respect to determining verb stems [בנין] or the pointing of nouns.[18] The "misvocalization" of other appellations constitute the balance of the articles.[19]

Menachem Moreshet, a student of Kutscher, primarily focuses on Segal's lexicological errors. Segal had set out to stress the organic reliationship between MH and BH. A significant part of this task involved the analysis of MH vocalbulary. We have already commented on how Segal minimized the influence of Aramaic in order to emphasize MH's link to BH. In the same vein, Segal hoped to show that the number of words derived from sources other than BH (or the spoken language of the period) was less than the number of words which developed naturally in the Hebrew speaking environment. Segal identified 300 new words (more precisely, verb roots).[20] This estimation (which took into consideration more than just the Mishnah) fell short of Albeck's figures which only considered Mishnah.[21] Moreshet will identify almost twice the total of Segal's computation.[22]

There are numerous problems in the determination of just what is to be counted as a "new verb."[23] Regardless of the outcome of these discussions, it is clear that Segal's figures

are inaccurate. Moreshet asserts that one of the reasons for this inaccuracy is that Segal failed to take into consideration manuscripts which expose roots that were lost in printed editions.

Moreshet also demonstrates that Segal mistakenly minimized the effect of Aramaic on the development of MH. Two-thirds of all new verbs in MH are found in one or another Aramaic dialect. This would seem to suggest that the relationship between Aramaic and MH might be best defined as symbiotic.[24]

Clearly, Segal was considerably mistaken concerning his judgments about the interrelationship of Aramaic and MH; and his point of view cannot be overlooked. But the other criticisms which are literally heaped against Segal's grammars may not share the same degree of legitimacy.

For, instead of confronting Segal directly with those theoretical factors which must be taken into consideration when writing a grammar, his adversaries condemn him for elements which have a logical sequence in what Segal clearly identified as his method.[25] Segal's conviction was that a grammar could be successfully written with the utilization of printed editions as the basis for the study. This is dismissed without proper rebuttal and ultimately, without justification.[26]

Certainly it is not the responsibility of the grammarian to present a survey of all extant manuscripts when composing a grammar. Most of the evidence extracted from the manuscripts concerns phonology. While there is information concerning problems with morphology, surprisingly little has radically

18

altered the traditional understanding of the text.[27] To state that Segal "completely distorts" MH by ignoring the fact that variants x, y, and z are known to occur for a particular word is in itself, a distorted criticism.

Despite the fact that Segal made countless errors, it remains to be proven that a grammar of MH must be written taking into consideration manuscript variants and non-Tiberian vocalization systems. Now that manuscript studies have been done in great depth, a list of variants may be of interest to the philologist. But it is questionable as to whether they should be the basis for the grammar itself.

Y. Kutscher on Middle Hebrew

Y. Kutscher devised the system of language reconstruction based on the establishment of an אב טקסט (av text), best rendered, "source text" (AvT). Kutscher held that the discovery of early manuscripts has caused scholars to drastically alter their understanding of MH. By comparing manuscripts with later printed editions, we are able to witness how distortions crept into MH texts. The changes were not the result of copying errors, but rather, conscious efforts on the part of scribes (and later editors) to fashion MH after BH forms.

These efforts were part of the attempt to rectify what the scribes viewed as the corruption of BH in rabbinic sources. Kutscher was of the opinion that MH was treated as an illegitimate form of BH from the Amoraic period on. It consequently underwent considerable alterations over the generations in order to make it compatible with BH forms.

Kutscher asserted that we have been able to uncover words and forms which completely disappeared from the printed renditions because of the modern investigation of manuscripts and the establishment of the "source texts." In addition to distortions which resulted from תקונים ("corrections"), erasures have been detected. Often, corrections were inconsistent throughout a given manuscript. Thus two stages of scribal distortions are preserved and in some cases, the תקונים (which came later) may be truer to earlier sources.

Considering all these variables, Kutscher maintains that

we must establish one text as the best and most authentic
source. This superior text (i.e., AvT) will provide the basis
for all grammatical and lexical studies. In addition, compar-
ative work should utilize this manuscript rather than others.[1]

In conjunction with the need to establish and AvT comes
·the problem of determining that text "X" is in fact superior
to text "Y". Kutscher devised a series of controls and criteria
in order to differentiate corrupt texts from the more authentic
ones. The criteria fall into four general categories.

1) Geniza fragments, on the whole, are thought to provide
excellent sources, particularly because they did not suffer the
influence of European copyists. They were also copied at a
time that was closer to the actual period of MH than was any
other extant group of manuscripts.

2) Sources in Aramaic and other Palestinian Hebrew
dialects serve as correctives enabling us to detect syntacti-
cal and morphological influences. Without bringing Aramaic
dialects into the study of MH, certain Hebrew words (or
sentences) must be judged enigmatic, since no Hebrew prece-
dent can be determined. By this measure, our perspective
is improved.[2]

Some archeological finds, such as synagogue inscriptions
and tombstone epitaphs, can be helpful. Unfortunately, there
are too few of such artifacts to serve as a significant control.

In general, there are few non-rabbinic attestations in
MH. One immediately cites the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS), but

Kutscher holds that the fact that they are not vocalized

renders them a limited resource as far as correctives are

concerned.[3]

The Hebrew of the Samaritans does provide considerable

illumination; we shall mention this briefly below.

3) Within all of these various sources and the Rabbinic

Literature itself, there are internal correctives which are

of significance. Proper names, for example, can provide much

insight since appellations are not likely to be changed very

much. Many will exhibit vocalizations true to early periods.

Jewish names in non-semitic sources will also contain clues

as to early pointing tendencies, since a foreign source is

not likely to make alterations. (It is inclined to either

preserve it intact or provide a completely non-semitic

substitute.)

4) Remnant oral traditions such as that of the Yemenites

and Samaritans, are thought to contain archaic forms; and to

reflect early readings in their liturgical traditions, in

addition to their written texts. Kutscher, however, is less

confident of these sources (as "authentic evidence") than

others. He writes that he cannot draw conclusions from them

with a "sound scientific conscience."[4]

Contrary to this stand is Hanoch Yalon, who on several

occasions opted for a Yemenite (or Samaritan) vocalization

over a pointing found in the texts Kutscher considered

source texts (AvT).[5] Part of the debate is based on the

relative value ascribed to one's efforts in the "reconstruction" of thelanguage; whether or not this is viewed as bringing one closer to the actual MH or simply making one text consistent throughout, in terms of its style and linguistic character. We shall return to this issue later.

Presuming that the distortions in the texts are the results of conscious acts rather than scribal errors, Kutscher poses an answer to the theoretical question concerning the proclivity of the scribes toward BH, (i.e., why BH forms and not another more recent dialect?). He purports that during the Second Temple Period, BH took root as the "standard" language, since it was continually heard in the synagogues during the Torah readings. Middle Hebrew, on the other hand, was not passed down in vocalized form as was BH. Therefore, a wide range of variations infiltrated the language. Inconsistency within MH was the norm, especially after it ceased to function as a spoken tongue, and as the attitude prevailed that MH was merely a distorted BH.

Kutscher's thesis is rather questionable. It is true that BH was always heard in synagogues during Torah Readings, but we should add that MH was also "heard" regularly. Indeed, the liturgy which was recited by every synagogue worshipper seems to have its origin in MH. Moreover, the Passover liturgy and other home prayers would have been composed in MH and an "authentic" vocalization would have been just as likely to be maintained there.[6] The language of the Torah, on the other

hand, was unknown to the average Hebrew speaker. Already

in the early years of the Amoraim (if not before) the task

of reading Torah was assigned solely to experts.[7]

We may respectfully assert that the explanation which

identifies the Torah readings as having wielded influence

as the standard language is an unsatisfactory explanation

as to the reason why תקונים took place with a proclivity

toward BH.

Kutscher is the first to outline in detail a four

layered stratification of MH. The four categories are as

follows:

Tannaitic Palestinian   (MH-1P ע1א)
Tannaitic Babylonian   (MH-1B ע1ב)

Amoraic Palestinian   (MH-1P ע2א)
Amoraic Babylonian   (MH-1B ע2ב)[8]

EAch stratum denotes a different stage in the development of

the language. The obvious implication is that even MH-1 can-

not be considered homogeneous.

Kutscher does not clarify just what is the difference

between MH-1B and MH-2B. He does comment that we should only

be able to distinguish between a few dialectical differences

when considering MH-1P and MH-1B. Thus, MH-1B will be very

similar to MH-1P and probably rather close to MH-2B. But

none of this is fully delineated in Kutscher's exposition.

Many aspects of Kutscher's system of stratification

24

prompt questions. We have affirmed that MH-1P was a spoken language which developed naturally from BH. Further, it functioned as a living language for several centuries. From it sprang the literature written by the Tannaim. If these criteria set MH-1P apart, what can be said of the appellation "MH-1B" which, according to its parts, identifies a Hebrew which was simultaneous with MH-1P, but used in a different locale? Since it is MH-1,should we not assume that it too was a living language?

Clearly not. According to Kutscher's divisions, it was not a natural language, but rather the adaptation of the Hebrew imported from Palestine with salient influences provided by local (Babylonian-Aramaic) dialects. Most of the spelling and lexical variations found in Kutscher's MH-1B were indubitably the result of influences other than those found in a community which used MH as the colloquial tongue.

Ultimately the question sees to be whether one should not categorize MH-1 of Palestine separately, since MH was a natural language only in Palestine.[9] One could then choose to differentiate three strata within the non-spoken Middle Hebrews of Palestine (Amoraim) and Babylonia (early and late).

The labels are significant for two types of studies. (We need to clarify this to demonstrate the gravity of Kutscher's misleading terminology.) First, when defining a word,it is important to ascertain that the reading of a particular root is in accord with its appropriate meaning at the time of its

application. We do not wish to confuse the different meanings
of a root that happens to be common to several literary periods.

Secondly, a root which only enters MH at a later period
(or, conversely, was only used in an early period) can provide
clues as to the date of composition. Kutscher's categories
are not helpful for either study. This becomes clear with
just a few examples.

Kutscher notes many instances of word variations rendered
by different periods. However, in the majority of cases, he
presents, the variations are so numerous that nothing valuble
can be discerned except to state that there were, infact, many
variables.

For example, in Kutscher's treatment of the word רִבִּי [11]
he notes four common variables: רַבִּי, רִבִּי, רִיבִּי, רֶבִּי. The
last,   is, according to Kutscher, the most original form,
even though it is also only found in Babylonian sources. This
is a rather curious argument, since one would normally consider
Palestine the preserver of the original forms. Kutscher argues
that the form רַבִּי must have existed in Palestine since the
Gospels[12] contain the Greek word ῥαββι . This form is said to
reflect Palestinian sources. Kutscher further explains that
the original form underwent transformations in MH-1P since it
was there that Hebrew was spoken. In Babylonia, on the other
hand, Hebrew forms were frozen. The "dead langauge" (i.e.,
MH-1B) would have had less of a predisposition to change.

The problems are basically threefold.

1) Throughout the entire discussion of רבי, Kutscher never differentiates between MH-1 and MH-2. He does contrast Babylonian sources with Palestinian sources.

2) On the basis of the Gospels, Kutscher argues that the form רבי must have existed in Palestine. Further, it represents the most ancient knowable vocalization.

While the Gospels may indeed represent a valid source for comparison, we should add a strong word of caution. Greek is a non-semitic language with a phonology of its own. While transcriptions can maintain a high degree of accuracy, a touch of skepticism is not inappropriate when it comes to New Testament writings. Whereas lexical borrowing is a common phenomenon among languages of close proximity, "...sounds, or groups of sounds, do not ordinarily travel from one language to another."[13] On this topic, Arlotto continues:

> A borrowed word, fully integrated into its new language, loses whatever phonetic properties it had originally that would make it sound foreign. The sounds (or sound patterns) of a language at any given point in time, we generally consider to be exclusively the product of internal history, of phonemes in some sense evolving from precious phonemes in the same language.[13a]

While this note of doubt should be interjected, one should not overstate the issue. All of the phonemes in the word רבי are in Greek--or at least seem to be. We have no way of knowing whether or not the pronunciations were the same.[14] However, since we cannot ascribe to any of the Gospel writers a significant acquiantance with Hebrew, it is not advisable to view them as providing convincing evidence.[15]

3) Kutscher explains that the Babylonian dialect froze the original form because it inherited the form as part of a dead language. This explanation supports my contention that MH-1B is a misleading category (as will be further discussed).

Nevertheless, it is conceivable that a word could be preserved in this manner; but should one not be somewhat skeptical when the word is one as commonly used as "Rabbi"-- nomenclature which was certainly employed in the Babylonian Jewish community with respect to its sages, as regularly as in Palestine? And such an appellation would have been equally active in Babylonia as in Palestine--just as it is today in America or Italy, among the Jews of those countries. The "feeze/dead language" argument employed by Kutscher concerning the pronounciation of רבי is not convincing.

It is more viable to conclude that each of the various sources contains valid dialectical variants which are equally "original." There is no reason to doubt that more than one pronounciation existed simultaneously. The same should be concluded concerning other roots.

In summary, then, what was the ultimate purpose of Kutscher's categories? what did they achieve? and what are the problems with his presentation?

The term "tannaitic" refers to the period of the Sages who were active before the redaction of the Mishnah. In addition, there is the establishment of a linguistic division of pre-Mishnah and post-Mishnah, which is subsequently subdivided by Kutscher

28

according to locations--Palestine and Babylonia. On a different level, there is also a distincition drawn between the (natural) spoken MH and the "dead languages" of MH. Yet MH-1P alone fits into the first category.

The problem, as implied above, concerns the divisions "1" and "2". In MH-1P, the "1" connotes the category of Palestinian Jews who used MH as a splien language (i.e., the Tannaim). When the same "1" occurs in the appellation "MH-1B", confusion results. Middle Hebrew was never a spoken language in Babylonia (according to Kutscher himself). Furthermore, Tannaim did not exist in Babylonia.

This entire system of categorization is counterproductive. Note that this is determined without any linguistic analysis of sources. Different divisions must be established if a diachronic analysis of MH is to be of any value.

A. BENDAVID'S APPROACH

Especially noteworthy is Bendavid's two volume work

לשון מקרא ולשון חכמים (*Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew*).[1]
Bendavid has formulated a comprehensive theory about the devel-
opment of MH and its relationship to the numerous variables
affecting its growth. By analyzing style, syntax, word
choice, morphology, internal and external influences as well
as social and ideological factors, Bendavid creates for the
reader a presentation one might best call "organic"; the
life of a language is brought to view and the author places
the reader's hand on its pulse.

The far reaching implications of Bendavid's theoretical
work have not been adequately discussed in print.[2] However,
their significance for the student of Hebrew is in many ways
greater than that of the vast majority of articles published
to date on MH. Despite its flaws, no one else has presented
in a single work such an integrated study of MH.

Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew is based on an earlier
work by Bendavid, which did not present as elaborate a
collection of exemplary texts.[3] The first volume establishes
the theoretical groundwork, while the second methodically
compares aspects of BH and MH. The author addresses theoretical
questions which concern the development of Hebrew through the
Middle Ages to modern times. Indeed, a goal of his study is
to provide a context for the understanding (and development)
of Modern Hebrew. We shall confine our consideration to those

chapters which discuss MH.

In consonance with the major trends since Segal, Bendavid holds that MH was a spoken dialect. In contrast to most other linguists, however, Bendavid detects the earliest evidence of its existence in the Tanach. He writes: It is surely a fact that even in the earliest books of the Bible you find the foundations of another daughter language which surreptitiously slips in and undermines the stability of the vocabulary."[4] This represents the predecessor to the mature Middle Hebrew.

The Hebrew of the Tanach reflects an official court (or, literary) langauge which periodically admitted collo-quial phrases to emphasize a character's personality, or, to influence the reader's point of view in relation to a dialog's content. In addition, there were also aesthetic factors which prompted the incorporation of non-official BH language in traditional sources. Most salient among the artistic considerations in composition would be biblical poetic parallelism.

Bendavid explains that the vast assortment of synonyms found in BH were maintained as part of a system of poetic parallelism which preferred the presence of two synonymous terms in the expression of a single idea over an economy of expression more typical of later (post-biblical) Hebrew. To nurture this artistic preference, BH would utilize contemporary dialects in its search for synonymous word pairs to fulfill the poetic form.

It is not usually possible to detect the word most natural to the dominant dialect or to establish the particular sources of a rare synonym. The simple presence of so many variants, however, bears witness to the existence of other sources of vocabulary.[5]

Parallelism did not enjoy the same popularity during the MH period, even though there are still visible remnants. One finds the following case to be true of the Mishnah and Tosefta: Once a word had acquired a new (or clearly limited mishnaic) meaning in juxtaposition to BH, or, once a grammatical form had been adopted into mainstream MH usage (regardless of its origin), the original BH meaning/counterform was no longer able to find application in MH texts.

This can be viewed in as common a root as ספר . In BH, ספר . In BH, לספור ספרים; למנות מנין] were identical in meaning. [למנות מנין ; לספור ספרים]. Once they had acquired separate functions in MH, they were no longer interchangeable.[6] This phenomenon might strike us as rather curious, as Bendavid hastens to point out. The Sages were expert in Tanach and easily could have employed BH forms in MH literature. The fact that they did not only supports the premise that MH served as a natural spoken language which was not subject to artificial constructs.

The court language of the Bible was transmitted by a school of scribes established and maintained by the religious/ political authorities. In regulating the school, the hegemonic establishment was able to call for the abrogation of personal styles in favor of an official literary motif. This process,

in turn, assured the preservation of the literary motif which had been passed down for generations in those very works which gave legitimacy to the religious and political sovereigns.

In the later books of Tanach, one can sense the emergence of styles and structures not ordinarily observed in the earlier formal BH. In short, Bendavid attributes these inovations to the waning of the scribal school. With the weakening of the Temple authority during the Hellenistic period until the destruction of the Second Temple, there evolved a perceivable stylistic liberation. Thus it is quite probable, according to Bendavid, that the changing styles resulted from inconsistent control by the official literary authority.

Interacting in the emergence of the "new" motifs were three environmental variables: traditional sources, foreign influences, and colloquial or internal elements. Bendavid holds that these variables are present at any given point in a language's history. Also, in each era, an equilibrium is established (naturally or artificially) among them, which is responsible for regulating their respective influences over the spoken and written languages.

In the later books of Tanach, one can identify the three variables as follows:

1) Traditional sources: BH style, which struggles for survival.

2) Foreign influences: Aramaic, which penetrates from outside.

3) Internal elements: Folk Hebrew ("Mishnaic") sprouting

33

from within.[7]

Jonah and Esther are discussed as having preserved the greatest degree of BH. Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles, are the most strongly influenced by Aramaic. Song of Songs and Koheleth were shaped most significantly by spoken (folk) Hebrew. Bendavid's analysis of these books brings him to conclude that weakened authority allowed for a shift in the precarious balance among the three environmental variables. The weaker the authority, the more influential the variable which bears the closest relation to the people.

Bendavid's emphasis on the simultaneity of dialects ultimately forces him to reject the theories of Higher Textual Criticism. Since Wellhausen, there have been numerous schools of textual criticism which generally assert the same theory: The various styles in BH are to be attributed to different generations of authors. The composite nature of Tanach is best viewed diachronically, such that J, E, P, D, (for instance) represent different sources which stem from different periods. The last, canonizing period, would serve as editor to what was inherited.

This theory of authorship, charges Bendavid, "...comes only to solve literary and historical problems in the history of the Bible whereas problems concerning language, it fails to solve."[8] Bendavid proposes a synchronic consideration of the text. The different literary sources which comprise the composite texture of Tanach are merely a number of dialects that have been woven together: the mixture established on

34

artistic and ideological grounds.

To illustrate his point at a practical level, one might take the example of two synonyms which share two of three root letters: שׁחק and צחק. Some would hold that the presence of these two roots reflects scribal errors (understood to have occured during transmission from one generation to another). Others might say that there was a shift in the first radical because of the peculiar development of the phonemes שׁ and צ (i.e., an allophonic variation). Bendavid holds that the two roots represent two dialects which may/may not have been contemporaneous.

The fall of the court scribes instituted a new literary era. The language spoken by the people was the dialect naturally adapted by the rabbis in transmitting the Oral Tradition. According to Bendavid, all learning during the first century and a half of the first millennium was based on memorization. The sages never intended their teachings to be formally recorded.[9] The Tannaim bore the same relationship to the Oral Tradition as had the scribes to the Scriptures in their generations. Scribal learning was replaced by the process of rote-learning.

The destruction of the Temple set the stage for a period of rapid change. This shift in the learning process was just one feature in a general cultural and social revolution. The

maturation and ultimate domination of MH evolved in response
to the growing number of sectarian groups that were vying for
ideological supremacy. This is best illustrated, according
to Bendavid, by considering the import of the passage in
Kohelet Raba (30-12:12 ויתר מהמה) which reads: "Whoever brings
into his home [a book] other than the twenty-four [books of
the Tanach], brings trouble into his home."[10] He interpretes
this statement as being indicative of the type of safeguards
the rabbis established for Rabbinic Judaism.

Numerous sectarian alternatives to Pharisaic Judaism
appeared during the early centuries of the millenium, most
often presenting their views in the form of written literatures.
In perceiving the ideological vulnerability of the Jews, a
vulnerability initiated by the destruction of the Temple
and compounded by heavily oppressive Roman policies, the rabbis
found it necessary to aggressively combat imposing ideologies.

Their system of learning was the primary method of
defense. It denegrated any written text except Tanach, and
legitimatized only the Oral Tradition, which required no
text.[11] As a result of the increasing necessity to learn by
rote, the language developed stylistic and structural elements
to facilitate memorization.

The rabbinic system required that one repeat exactly
what one learned, including the attribution of authorship.
This was devised to veer young students away from the

36

"detrimental" sectarian writings.

The language of the rabbis was an adaptation of a colloquial dialect to the needs of an academic/religious setting. A literary style *per se,* did not develop separately from the colloquial speech, because of the nature of the Oral Tradition. Even though the recitation would vary in word or phrase from one generation to another, the style remained constant.[12] The language was elevated to the level of the content it expressed.

After an analysis of the growth of MH, Bendavid discusses the evidence provided by names and foreign languages. There follows a detailed examination of the Hebrew of the Palestinian Sages in contrast to the Babylonian Rabbis. Particularly note-worthy is his consideration of Aramaic and Greek.

Throughout, Bendavid is ever so sensitive to style and syntax. That is to say, his analysis goes beyond the "scientific" descriptions found in most linguistic treatises. Nonetheless, there are technical surveys which bring to light manuscript evidence and questions of phonology.

The first two-hundred and fifty pages of volume one are concerned almost soley with biblical and mishnaic dialects and their relationships to other languages and literary sources. In the remaining sections of the first volume, Bendavid discusses later MH, medieval developments and ultimately, some contemporary linguistic concerns in Modern Hebrew.

The second volume (and the very end of the first volume) provides unique tables for the student of Hebrew. Bendavid places, sometimes in parallel columns, and other times mixed within a paragraph, dialogs, narratives, poetry and other literary genres, from both biblical and mishnaic Hebrew. At times, he provides actual texts from traditional sources; at other times he reconstructs or provides anew, texts for the sake of comparison in different motifs and dialects. The comparative commentary guides the reader through lessons which concern everything from lexical contrasts to the usage of particular prepositions. These chapters are an invaluble tool for the student of the Hebrew language.

Reactions to Bendavid's books have always been mixed. Virtually everyone expresses admiration for Bendavid's sensitivity to the Hebrew language. One cannot help but admire the extraordinary internal comparative studies of Hebrew lexicology and syntax, not to mention Bendavid's treatment of style and literary drift. Yet even with these positive assets, there is considerable (often vituperative) criticism of Bendavid's work.

J. Blau is generally dissatisfied with Bendavid's theoretical suppositions.[13] He calls his general conclusions concerning early Hebrew dialects nothing less than fickle.[14] Nonetheless, Blau praises the thoroughness of Bendavid's comparative studies and his sense of style.[15]

Blau notes that in the earliest of the three works,

(לשון מקרא או לשון חכמים), Bendavid contradicts himself by

permitting the following three assertions:

1. Biblical Hebrew was not a spoken language.
2. Middle Hebrew was a splien language (dialect).
3. Middle Hebrew replaces Biblical Hebrew.

Although Blau does not cite it *per se*, the same contradiction

appears in לשון מקרא ולשון חכמים , when Bendavid calls the

foundations of MH the "daughter language" of BH.[16]

We have discussed how Bendavid attempts to demonstrate

that MH was the colloquial language used in all walks of

life.[17] He comes to this conclusion by considering the

stylistic aspects of BH and MH and those elements which

appear in MH as a permanent characteristic; elements which

are always in flux in BH (e.g., verb forms, vocabulary,

tense, and syntax). Blau holds that Bendavid is in error

when he equates the language of the Oral Tradition with the

colloquial tongue.[18] Blau infers that both BH and MH were

literary languages: neither identical with spoken tongues.

MH and BH were mixtures of (literary) sources.

Moreshet makes the same criticism, rather emphatically:[19]

the language of the sages was not a folk dialect and cannot

be legitimately identified as the "substandard" language

evident in the First Temple Period (writings). Rather, the

evidence suggests that MH is the natural outcome of influences

which were not yet pervasive during the First Temple days;

influences which only gained in strength during the last two

centuries before the turn of the millennium. Aramaic is
the strongest influence (according to Moreshet) while only
one third of the verbs in MH are derived from BH. Thus,
Moreshet strongly asserts that Bendavid's conviction that
MH influenced BH sources is false.

Moreshet also comments on Bendavid's failure to distin-
guish between MH-1 and MH-2.[20] Bendavid does differentiate
between Palestinian and Babylonian sources, however, finding
most of the significant variations attributable to the dialects
of particular regions.[21] Blau asserts on the same issue: "How
could it happen that the author, with as keen as sense of
style as he has, was not cognizant enough to distinguish be-
tween the various strata of the language?"[22] Kutscher reit-
erates the same and adds that Bendavid often drew on the works
of predecessors (and contemporaries alike) without always
indicating his sources.[23]

As to the criticims concerning stratification, one needs
only to recall the previous discussion to note the weaknesses
inherent in the system that is used as the measuring rod.
Bendavid's "system" of categorization is superior to that of
Kutscher's in that it more accurately reflects the nature of
language.

Tzarfati's review in לשוננו לעם [24] is of particular
interest. First he notes the obvious: everyone, regardless
of his attitude toward the entire book, comments on the

author's special sense for the Hebrew language. Tzarfati
holds that in addition to the unifying factor of the central
theme, the sections of the book are bonded by two charac-
teristics of the author: his unique expertise and his refined
linguistic and literary sensitivity. He adds that the phrase,
"a sense for language" (or the like), is a dangerous term
today. Linguists are supposed to think of themselves as
scientists who investigate language objectively, like modern
physicists or physicians. A "sense for language" is often
thought of as a phenomenon of the past. It is an anachronism;
that trait found in scholars of the pre-scientific world.

Nonetheless, this tainted expression is often uttered
intentionally in words of praise--and often by the "scientists"
themselves. Tzarfati maintains that while other sciences may
be able to abandon the investigative technique known as
"intuition," linguistics cannot.

Intuition, however, not in a mystical sense, but that
intellection which comes into play only after a scholar--who
has carefully read and studied his material, thoroughly
scrutinizing the evidence (printed and mss)--begins to do
comparative work. At that point, his ability to arrive at
conclusions about linguistic issues must be led by a "sense
for the language"; an intuition which is partially innate
and partly acquired through developed practice and skill.[25]

Nonrabbinic Sources

Nonrabbinic texts of the Second Temple Period and the early part of the first millennium hav e proven to be valuble sources in MH-1 studies. This corpus consists of the nonbiblical Dead Sea Scroll materials, the Bar Kokhba letters, Samaritan Hebrew (and Aramaic), and some inscriptions unearthed by archeologists. The research spurred by these sources cannot be discussed at length in this essay. It is a subject unto itself. We should, however, briefly touch upon a few topics in order to indicate some of the aspects of MH-1 studies affected by the consideration of nonrabbinic sources.

This is best done by alluding to the works of H. Yalon and Z. Ben-Hayyim. Both have already been mentioned in passing. Yalon, a prolific writer of articles on virtually all facets of MH studies, is perhaps best known for his book, *Introduction to the Pointing of the Mishnah*.[1] There Yalon provides a detailed commentary on the vocalization of the Albeck edition of the Mishnah, which was his doing.

Yalon's collected articles fill more than three thick volumes. Each deals with a specific aspect of lexicology, morphology, phonology, and, with much innovation, dialectology in oral and written traditions. Because of the detailed and diverse nature of Yalon's writings, we cannot here provide a satisfactory summary of his significant contribution.

Yalon submits that the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS)
reflect three different systems of vocalization. Some
of the variants imply pronounciation diversity, while
others represent grammatical divergencies. He cautions
that the unvolcalized texts do not reflect phonological
practices consistently. This one might already know from
dealing with the Masoretic text which is vocalized, but
nonetheless preserves inconsistencies in the consonantal
text. (E.G., גבלת Deut. 32:8, גבולת Isa. 10:13, גבלות
Job 24:2, are all pronounced [g'vulot].)

The DSS have altered our stand on numerous issues.
For instance, it had been thought by many that the masculine
possessive ending [ך] was the innovation of post-Talmudic
grammarians, under the influence of Arabic. Yalon demon-
strates with the DSS materials that the ending was, indeed,
an earlier development.[2]

The DSS have also clarified our understanding of
some enigmatic MH verb forms. One of the examples cited
by Yalon concerns the Qal imperfect forms which in the
DSS often have a matres lectionis immediately after the
second radical (to make it identical with what we find
in Tiberian pointing as a pausal form): e.g., תערוכו,
יחלוצו , אתמוכה et. al.[3]

The same infixed *vav* is found in Palestinian and Baby-
lonian pointed texts of MH. Whereas it was thought to
reflect the tendency of scribes to alter MH so that it

43

might conform to BH, we can now assume that it was a
natural part of earlier MH.[4]

Also of significance to the study of MH are the various
dialects which have been preserved in written and oral forms.
These include the Samaritan grammars of the Middle Ages and
modern day informants; Yemenite traditions, and North
African traditions and manuscripts (just to mention the
major sources). Yalon and Ben-Hayyim have championed the
application of the information they provide to the process
of reconstructing older sources.

Ben-Hayyim has argued that the Samaritan Hebrew and
Aramaic did not develop isolated from the rest of Palestinian
culture. If his hypothesis is correct, Samaritan Hebrew
becomes a valuble source for linguistic comparisons.

Ben-Hayyim's argument runs as follows: The linguistic
tradition emerging from the DSS is on the whole, the same
as the Samaritan tradition. Since there is no basis to
attribute to the DS sect, memebership to the Samaritans,
we should conclude that both linguistic traditions are
typical of the language used in *Eretz* Israel.

Ben-Hayyim does recognized that the Hebrew of the
DSS and Samaritan Hebrew are not identical in every detail.
The language of the DSS seems to be an older prototype of
what we find in Samaritan Hebrew. The latter, on the other
hand, is closer to MH-1 than to the Tiberian pointing system.
The commonalities can only lead one to the conclusion, argues

44

Ben-Hayyim, that there was one language which naturally developed throughout Palestine. This position is strengthened when one considers that the Samaritans rejected the non-Pentateuchal parts of Hebrew Scriptures and the rabbinic/pharisaic Oral Tradition, thereby discontinuing any direct cultural/literary link to Rabbinic Judaism.

Ben-Hayyim and Yalon both provide detailed illustrations of the commonalities among dialects and how they illuminate our understanding of MH. Essentially, these studies contribute to two main aspects of MH scholarship; they substantiate that MH does contain many authentic elements which were hereto thought of as distortions; or, they enable us to make choices between "authentic" and "inauthentic" sources.

One example should suffice to demonstrate the type of implications of which we are speaking. Yemenite traditions of MH contain a פָּעֵל form which maintains the long vowel of the first radical (as in the Qal regular perfects and statives of BH). Meanwhile, in the participle, (e.g., מְזָמְּנִין, מְנַבֵּב) we find what Samaritan grammarians called, "בנין כבד חסר דגשות העי"ן." This non-Tiberian form in MH-1 gains credence through the testimony provided by the Samaritan and other dialect traditions.[5]

45

The most recent contribution of note to the study

of MH-1 is M. Moreshet's *Lexicon of the New Verb in the Language*

of the Tannaim. The lexicon is not organized like an ordinary

dictionary. Below is a sample of an average page.[1]

נחז — קל: דם ה נ ו ח ז יז ושעל הסכין חייב לכסות (ספרא אחרי יא,ט—כי"ד וכן
שסה)12/)[72] = כמו ניחז (פ"ע—ר' נפעל).

השט על פני המים ה נ ו ת ז י ן . . העושה ציפור במים ה נ ו ת ז י ן (מכשי' ה,ב, שם ה)[73].

פיעל: והיין מ נ ח ז על גבי ענבים (ת' ע"ז ז(ח),ה — 22/471) = נזרקו ממנו טיפות.
שהיו צרורות מ נ ת ז י ם מתחת רגלה (ב"ק ב,א) = דילגו וקיפצו ממקום למקום
(שד"ל)[43*].

נ פ ע ל: ו נ י ח ז הימנו חרס (ת' ב"ק א,ה — 23/346). דם חטאת ש נ י ת ז על הבגד
(זבח' יא,א—פ,לו)[74], נ י ח ז על מקצתו של בגד (ספרא צו ו,ג—לב). ו נ ח ז ה צינירה
מפיו (טהר' י,ו—השוה ת' כיפו' ד(ג),כ—14/189). נ י ת ז ה בקעה מן העץ (ת' מכות
ב,א—20/439). ו נ ח ז ו צרורות מתחת רגליו ונפלו (ת' שבת ט(י),יד—24/122, והשוה
22/346). מקול הרעם שלמעלן נ י ת ז ו צנורות מלמטן (מכ דויהי ה—20/108, מ), נ ת ז ו
משקין מתחת רגליו וטמא את המטפחות (ס"ז פרה יט,יא—2/306 — תרביץ א 7/61). במים
ה נ י ת ז י ן (מכש' ה,ב—פ) = נזרק בטיפות.

נ ו פ ע ל(?):על פני המים ה נ ו ת ז י ן . . . × 2 (מכש' ה,ב)[44*] — ראה למעלן בקל.

ה פ ע י ל: ו ה ת י ז את הצרעה בקנה (ע"ז ד,י) = ניתק אותו מן המקום.
היו מ ת י ז י ם את ראשו בסייף (סנה' ז,ג), או עד ש י ת י ז את ראשה (טהר' א,ד) = כרת
הראש בכוח, בתנופה (גרם שיקפוץ ממקומו).
ואם נתכוון ל ה ת י ז על חבירו (מכש' ה,ב) = זרק טיפות מים.

---

72   וט (עמ' 156) וכן רייס פר 4: דם הניחז. ובקג"נ Heb. d 54: הנוחז, שמא רומז לכניין נופעל.

73   הניקד כנ"ל כקל גם ככ"י פר/ב × 3. ואף בקג"נ בבליים (ראה ייבין, קג"נ 52). ובלא ניקד כנ"ל גם לו וגנ"ם סה.
פ: הניחזין × 1, הנוחזין × 1. ושמא רומז זה והכתיב ככי"ק ואחרים לצורת בניין נופעל. והייתה מסורת שונה בידי
הסופר והנקרן.

74   ק: שנחן... ושמא ט"ס היא. ומצויים חילופי ז/ן.

43*   עיין בפירושו לישע' יח,ה. וראה בהערה 45* בהמשך.

44*   הניקדים הם ברובם כבניין קל (ראה למעלן הערה 73), אך שמא הייתה בידי הסופר מסורת של נופעל. ילון
אמנם הניח כך בקריח ספר ד 136 (בביקורתו על ספרו של סגל, המהדורה האנגלית), אך לא הזכיר זאת בדונו
בהרחבה בבניין נופעל במבוא, עמ' 152 ואילך. וראה הנמן 255 על־פי מסורת כ"י פרמה, ושם × 11 כנפעל
רגיל. חיזוק נוסף לקיום הנופעל כאן יש מקג"נ של הספרא: ה נ ו ח ז (בח"ג למעלן). אך בכי"ר: הנוחיז.
וראה מאמרי, ספר קוטשר, עמ' 137.

הוא našāru של ל"ח, כבעברית השוה במילון פון סודן 759 AHw = abteilen (הוראה קרובה).
אף במנדאית מזדמן 'נשר'. ראה מילון 308-307 (NSR), כצורת משנה של NTR, to fall down,
drip.

ספק אם נמצא בניבי ארמית אחרים. דלמן במילונו 279 b מציינו באפעל, אך לא מצאתי לכך
תיעוד. יאסטרוב מציין מקום אחד מחר"כ דה"א ה,כג: אשיר, אך איננו לפי שפ/8, אלא: 'מישר
חרמון' × 2. על המובא מבבלי ברכ' ח,א: "דלאחורא נשרא' ראה במילון לוי ערך 'נשרא' כשם,
וראה גם בעה"ש ה ערך 'נשוור'.

Each *binyan* receives an independent paragraph.
Immediately following the stem identification, Moreshet
provides texts which contain examples of common usages.
Detailed footnotes elucidate information pertaining to the
root's morphological variants. Often comments relate to
aspects pertinent to comparative semitics (though these are
not exhaustive). At the conclusion of each collection of
sources, there appears an "equals" sign [=], after which there
is a definition of the root. Synonyms, or an explanatory
sentence may provide the meaning; or both. Finally, at the
end of each entry, in small script, Morsehet indicates the
word's linguistic source (be it Aramaic, BH, Akkadian, etc.).

Moreshet sets out to identify the verbs in MH-1
which are not found in earlier Hebrew. Along the way, he
investigates the influences of Aramaic on the development
of MH, as well as the enrichments to Hebrew vocabulary
provided by Greek and other foreign sources. Like many
of his predecessors, Moreshet elucidates on the erroneous
elements of Segal's Grammars and emphasizes the role of
Aramaic in contrast to Segal's minimization of Aramaic's
influence.

A discussion of research methods is presented early
in the ninety-two page introduction to the lexicon. Moreshet
provides a detailed assessment of the literature significant

for the identification of MH-1 roots and the extant manu-
scripts. The only noteworthy break with earlier classifica-
tions of Rabbinic Literature in Moreshet's survey, is one
argued by him in an earlier article; i.e., the baraitot,
while undoubtedly tannaitic material, should not be viewed
as relating MH-1.[2] Moreshet holds that those who repeated
the baraitot in Babylonia, modified the Palestinian style
to accord with the one which was colloquial to their era and
locale. This involved adding or deleting sentences and/or
words. Since they studied orally, the transformations occured
naturally. Words borrowed from BH--especially verbs--that
were not used in MH-1 surface in the baraitot.

In the past, errors in judgment concerning the
classification of roots have been caused by the inability to
provide guidelines as to how an appropriate list of MH-1 and
MH-2 roots can be accurately drawn up. We commented above,
that Y. Kutscher was the first to insist on the various
strata of MH. He relied on the prin ciple of the "source
text" to identify the authentic MH-1 roots. The value of
this system was challenged by Ben-Hayyim (among others).[3]
Ben-Hayyim writes that the manuscripts established as the
AvT will provide evidence no purer than the conception of
MH held during the era when the scribe put his pen to the
parchment.

Moreshet synthesizes the two approaches. He views
the AvT as a מָסוֹרֶת יְסוֹד. It is to be used methodically to

construct the basis for comparing roots of BH, MH and
Aramaic Texts. Other manuscripts (i.e., those judged to
be inferior according to Kutscher's system of classification)
are kept for reference purposes. Variants from those texts
not viewed as AvT will nonetheless be considered מסורת יסוד [4]
containing authentic forms. The difference is that they will
not provide the methodological basis for comparison. Thus,
while Moreshet accepts in principle the notion of an AvT,
discrepancies among manuscripts will not be judged in favor
of the AvT.

Rather than view variants as scribal errors based on
the status of a text, Moreshet postpones decisions until
other parameters can be discerned. The principle is: Two
variants may be equally valid representatives of MH-1 just
as one root may have two diverse meanings in any given
period.

A second (though by no means secondary) goal of
Moreshet's work is to finally establish exactly what was
the influence of Aramaic on the development of MH-1. The
major Aramaic sources to be considered influential and
whose traditions must be investigated are as follows:
Classical/Biblical Aramaic, Qumran Letters, Bar Kokhba
Letters, Job Targum from DSS, Scrolls of Antiochus, Syriac
and the Targumim.[5] Close attention must be paid to the
numerous dialects encountered in Jewish Aramaic, and what
each might suggest about colloquial usage of MH.

49

In addition to the basic principles of method, there are several theoretical issues considered in the introduction. When providing classifications for old and new roots, how is a quadra-consonantal root to be viewed? If it shares radicals with a tri-consonantal root of BH and MH, should it be looked upon as a "new" root or a grammatical variant? How about changes which appear to be the result of spelling errors? e.g., [גלף]:[קלף]. Finally, how is one to classify roots which were inherited from BH but which acquired new meanings in MH?

Instead of setting up an umbrella principle, Moreshet concludes that each case must be judged separately. Only the most general guidelines are established. Each root requires cross-reference research in comparative semitics. This is especially the case when a particular root receives a meaning in MH totally alien to the "original" BH connotation, or when homonyms appear.

These last two categories of words involve unique problems. Moreshet asserts that, if popularly found BH words vacate their positions in MH for other words (roots) of the same meaning, it is assumed that the influences causing the shift are external.[6] Such would obviously be the case with homonyms.

It is generally recognized that a "new root" in MH may not be a new Hebrew root at all, but may simply never have appeared in the corpus of BH. To determine whether or not a word is truely an old Hebrew root, there must be a thorough

scan of the other semitic languages. If the root being sought
does not appear elsewhere, then it may be safely concluded
that it did not come into MH by means of foreign sources and
must have been inherently present in old Hebrew.

But also if a root appears in ancient sources though
not in BH, it is unsafe to conclude that it must have been
derived from external influences. There are old semitic
roots shared by all the semitic languages.[7]

There are yet other clues as to the origin and subsequent
classification of a root. For instance, the form [a-b-a] is
not common in the old semitic languages.[8] In this case,
morphology can suggest the relative age of a word.

In general, the ancient sources proved to be of little
help in the process of categorization. Moreshet remarks
that comparative work with the Ugaritic dictionary--an exer-
cise from which one might have hoped to glean considerable
insight concerning old semitic roots in Hebrew--provides
virtually no finds.[9]

This would suggest that relatively few MH words not
found in BH were extant during biblical times. Moreshet
holds taking this evidence into account, that the emergence
in MH of BH terms that are not found in Tanach, is an insig-
nificant factor in the vocabulary of MH.[10] He flatly asserts,
that it is more realistic to attribute the appearance of most
new roots to the influence of an Aramaic cognate.

In short, Moreshet minimizes the influence of non-BH

old Hebrew to the extent that Segal minimized the prominence of Aramaic.

Moreshet concludes that there are 604 roots in MH which are not found in earlier Hebrew. Therefore, MH is not to be viewed as a direct continuation of BH.[11] Aramaic is more responsible for MH's verbal vocabulary and morphological developments than any other foreign factor.

Moreshet is very careful to write that he is speaking about verbs and not MH in general. The detecting of influences, however, may not be as scientific a process as his introduction would have us believe. Common sense dictates that the presence of a certain vocabulary does not fully expose its source. Thus, statistics alone, in Moreshets's study of the verb, may be misleading.

Moreshet treats verbs in a vacuum. Consider that only 19% of the words in Tanach are verbs.[12] When we think of the thousands of daily activities which are not described in Tanach, we can assume that a large portion of the natural BH verb vocabulary is missing.

No statistical breakdown of linguistic categories of the vast literature of MH is available. Thus we cannot determine the percentage of verbs, etc., in Rabbinic Literature. Arguments by analogy to other language and literatures are not satisfactory.

By raising the issue, however, I mean to insert a word of caution. An investigation of MH vocabulary in general is

the only way to be secure in determining just what the influences were on (MH's word inventory in general and) MH's verbs in particular. The singling out of verbs might be too atomistic an approach to permit meaningful conclusions.

The following is the statistical breakdown Moreshet provides. [13]

I. NEW VERBS WITH SOME LINK TO TANACH

1. Denominatives (from biblical nouns)	63	
2. Roots found in Tanach as derivatives	81	
3. Related to Tanach (the test being morphological or phonological)		
a) root related structurally	22	
b) missing consonants	42	
c) by means of metathesis	4	
d) quadra-consonantal (from biblical root)	29	
TOTAL	241	(39.90%)

II. BORROWED FROM OR INFLUENCED BY ARAMAIC (by verbs with no link to Tanach) FROM THOSE FOUND IN ARAMAIC DIALECTS.

1. From eastern and western [Aramaic]	128	
2. Western	35	
3. Eastern	38	
4. Derivatives from ARamaic nouns	7	
5. Secondary roots (from Aramaic)	2	
TOTAL	210	(34.76%)

III. PENETRATION OF VERBS FROM A FOREIGN SOURCE (other than Aramaic).

1. Akkadian	23	
2. Persian	4	
3. Greek (or Roman)	30	
TOTAL	57	(9.43%)

IV. UNKNOWN SOURCES (or, not in Aramaic).

1. Belonging to ancient Hebrew	42	
2. Mishnaic nouns [derivatives]	21	
3. Secondary roots	2	
4. Onomatopoeic	5	
TOTAL	70	(11.58%)

Forms which were unclassifiable in any of the above sections.

TOTAL	26	(4.30%)

Concluding Comments

The contoversies and different types of research we have discussed all focus on one thing: How should one interprete the data which in this case are the texts of Middle Hebrew?

Surely the interpretation of data is the issue in every "scientific" endeavor. The difference between the "hard" sciences and historical linguistics, is that the conclusions reached in the former can ultimately be verified or disclaimed by reality (in time) while the conclusions of the latter are forever obscured by time.

At the beginning of the century, the controversy in MH studies was largely centered on the question of whether or not MH was a spoken or artificial language. The answer had far reaching implications because it affected the attitudes which governed the writing of grammars and the establishment of lexical sources.

While the exact issues are somewhat different, the question about MH's role in Tannatic times and the nature of the language found in MH-1 texts, remains open to debate. This is made clear by the fact that Moreshet closes his introduction to the *Lexicon* with a caustic attack on Bendavid's concept of "fold" Hebrew; just as Kutscher vitriolicly criticized Segal's uncategorized Mishnaic Hebrew as naive; just as Blau finds the texts of MH to be a poor reflection of the actual spoken language, et. al.

Without doubt, the research in the DSS Hebrew and dialectology support the idea that the texts of MH have not been handed down to us totally bereft of forms natural to the community which spoke it. Meanwhile, we are continually reminded by the study of manuscripts just how many forms have been lost due to corruptions indigenous to the process of scribal transmission. The inconsistencies still outweigh the certainties.

The issue of determining just how much Aramaic is in MH forms (and vocabulary) maintains its two extreme camps with Kutscher's school still a dominant force. Moreshet's *Lexicon* does not constitute the "last word" on the question.

The articles become more and more detailed and narrow in scope. Segal's warning about atomism should still be heeded.

Is historical linguistics a scientific study? The attitudes with which one approaches this question will govern the way one approaches the type of research being done in Middle Hebrew studies. Somewhere there is a middle ground between the statistics of Moreshet and those who produce studies like him, and Bendavid's "sense for the Hebrew language." A truely comprehensive, synthetic work remains to be done which might put all of the varieties in perspective.

NOTES

INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE & MANUSCRIPTS   [PP. 1-10]

[1]Middle Hebrew is usually referred to in Hebrew as: לשון חכמים

[2]Segal, Oxford 1909, p.1.

[3]Segal, Oxford 1909, p.1.

[4]We are only listing Rabbinic Sources here. Nonrabbinic sources will be discussed later; see pp.42-45

[5]The *terminus ad quem* for this list is c.300 C.E. The list is based on the Hebrew Academy's *Book of Sources* (ספר מקורות) pp.50-55. Also, see, Moreshet, *Lexicon*, pp. 19-29.

[6]For a more detailed description of this very significant manuscript, see Y. Kutscher's description in *Encyclopedia Judaica 16*, cols. 1599-1603.

[7]Segal, Oxford 1909, p.3.

[8]Hermann L. Strach and Carl Siegfried, *Lehrbuch der neuhebräischen Sprache und Literatur* (Karlsruhe & Leipzig: H. Reuther, 1884). They were more extreme than Geiger in insisting that MH was artificial.

[9]Segal, Oxford 1909, pp.2-3.

[10]S. Stein, *Das Verbum in der Mischnasprache* (Berlin 1888); F. Hillel, *Nominalbildung in der Mischna* (Berlin 1891), et. al. See Segal, Oxford 1909, p.3.

[11]Segal, Oxford 1909, p.4f. Segal mentions Barth, Nöldeke, Weiss, M.I. Levi, and W. Bacher as some of those who had inclinations in opposition to Geiger (and Strack for that matter).

[12]Kutscher, *Research*, pp.4-5 reports on late 19th century works and exposes their obsolescence.

[13]J. Levy, *Worterbuch uber Talmudim und Midraschim* (Leipzig 1876-89).

[14]Kutscher provides a critical perspective in   p.6. H. Y. Kohut, ספר הערוך השלם (Wien 1878-92).

[15]S. Fraenkel's review appears in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländische Geselleschaft* 52 (1898), pp.290-300; and subsequently on the other volume, *ZDMG* 55 (1901). See Kutscher, *Research* p.8.

[16]M. Jastrow, A *Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (New York: Pardes Publ., 1903).

[17]G. H. Dalman, *Aramäisch Neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch* (Frankfort a/Main 1922).

[18]Kutscher, *Research*, p. 8.

NOTES

[1]As noted above, all paginations refer to Oxford 1909.

[2]1927 Grammar and 1936 Grammar. For full bibliography, see Bibliography below.

[3]Segal, Oxford 1909, p. 5; and conclusions, p. 88.

[4]Segal, Oxford 1909, pp.7-8.

[5]Segal, Oxford 1909, elsewhere in place of "words" we read "forms" or the like; e.g., p. 88.

[6]Segal, Oxford 1909, p.90.

[7]Gesenius' *Hebrew Grammar,* edited and enlarged by E. Kautsch (1908 in the 28th edition) translated by A. E. Cowley (Clarendon: Oxford Univ. Press), 13 printings of translation.

[8]See the introduction to the 1936 Grammar.

[9]Segal, 1936 Grammar, p. VII.

[10]P. Kahle and T. Weinberg, "The Mishna Text in Babylonia, Fragments from the Geniza," *Hebrew Union College Annual,* 1935 p. 187.

[11]Segal uses two words interchangeably:

[12]Kahle discusses this in his article in *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft,* 30, p. 230f.

[13]Segal, 1936 Grammar, pp. VII-IX.

[14]Review of 1927 Grammar:קרית ספר 4, 1927, p.136. Critique of 1936 Grammar:קרית ספר 13, 1936, pp.299-308. Reprint of the latter is in פרקי לשון pp.104-112. The pagination I use is from the reprint.)

[15]The 1936 review is much more detailed and considers a greater portion of the book in depth.

[16]Yalon, 1936 Review, p.108, section 9.

[21] H. Albeck,   מבוא למשנה, ירושלים—ת"א תשי"ט.   134-173

[22] Moreshet, *Lexicon*, p.86-87. Summary below, p.53.

[23] Moreshet; see our discussion below, p.51f.

[24] Moreshet, *Lexicon*, p. 91.

[25] As quoted in part above, p.11-14. See 1936 Grammar, Introduction.

[26] Kutscher, *Research*, p.10, state most emphatically "...that it is wrong to base the grammar of MH on printed editions [as Segal did]... because they forge a completely distorted picture..."

[27] Kutscher discusses phonology at length in *Research*, sections 74, 78 etc. Also in *Archives* see pp.83-105 and 106-116. It is difficult to see how any of Kutscher's conclusions concerning phonology demonstrate that Segal's sources provided a "completely distorted picture" of Middle Hebrew.

KUTSCHER ON MIDDLE HEBREW [PP.20-29]

[1] Kutscher, *Research*, p.15.

[2] Primarily early targumim. See Kutscher on Galilean Aramaic. *Tarbitz 21-23*, Jerusalem   . Moreshet supplies a complete bibliography of Kutscher on Aramaic, *Lexicon*, p.420.

[3] Many hold contrary opinions. For a brief summary, see the conclusions in Kutscher, *Language*, p.5.

[4] Kutscher, *Research*, p.76.

[5] Yalon, *Introduction*, p.95 end of section 10, for an example of Yalon prefering an oral tradition over mss evidence.

[6] This is not to assert that uniformity would have been present throughout the Diaspora. But certainly uniformity would have been the rule throughout Palestine for the early Tannaitic period.

[7] See on this subject, J. Heinemann and A. Shinan,
(Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 1976)pp.112-113.

[8] Kutscher, *Research*, section 32f.

[9] Later we will discuss Moreshet on this issue; see p.48. I believe that the same can be determined without a linguistic consideration. The terminology is not sensical given the definition of the components.

[10] Virtually every article noted in our bibliograph concerning Kutscher.

[11] Kutscher, *Research* p. 34f.

[12] Kutscher, *Research*. Consider sections 34-35, though our discussion is concerned specifically with 35. Are we not to assume that everything pertains to MH-1? It is also worth noting that in section 32, Kutscher criticizes Segal for not having distinguished between MH of the Tannaim and the Amoraim. Kutscher does not do any better here.

[13]Anthony Arlotto, *Introduction to Historical Linguistics*, (Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1972) p.190.

[13a]Arlotto, *Introduction*, p. 190.

[14]The borrowing of phonemes can take place regularly when the source language is being called upon by bilinguals.

[15]In general, the New Testament is not considered a good source for deriving information about early Hebrew.

NOTES

A. Bendavid's Approach [pp.30-41]

[1]A. Bendavid; for full bibliography, see Bibliography.

[2]Some of the reviews:29–44 עמ" מס"44 קרית ספר, יהושע בלאו,
424 – עמ" מס"46 קרית ספר: כ' כרך על 1969,35,כרך א'.
קונטרס ד (קפ"ו), שבט מחזור יט, ג. צרפתי, לשוננו לעם, וגם 1970 ,428

[3]See Bibliography.

[4]Bendavid, *Language 1967*,p.13.

[5]Bendavid, *Language 1967*, p.45.

[6]For numerous examples, see, *Language 1967*, p.44f.

[7]Bendavid, *Language 1967*, p. 60 שלשה מאוחרים בספרים "הקורא
על הנאבק תנכ"י סגנון של ריח (1 כהם: מריח הוא ריחות
של ריח (3 מבחוץ. החדרת ארמית של ריח (2 קיומו.
מבפנים." ועולה המכצבצת ("משנתיח") עממית עברית

Bendavid compares this same breakdown to Modern Hebrew: As BH was to
MH, all of the Rabbinic Sources and BH is to Modern Hebrew. As Aramaic
was to MH, Indo-European languages, Yiddish and Arabic are to Modern
Hebrew. Fold elements are common to both.

[8]Bendavid, *Language 1967*, p.58.

[9]Bendavid, *Language 1967*, pp.96-97.

[10]Bendavid, *Language 1967*, p.103. יותר ביתו בתוך המכניס כל
בביתו. מכניס הוא מהומה ספרים מכ"ד

[11]Bendavid, *Language 1967*, p.101. רשאי אתה אי שבכתב דברים
לאומרם רשאי אתה אי פה שבעל ודברים פה על לאומרם
(:ס גיטין) בכתב

NOTES

Nonrabbinic Sources [pp. 42-45]

[1]H. Yalon, *Introduction to the Pointing of the Mishnah*, in
Hebrew:מבוא לניקוד המשנה

[2]Yalon, *DSS*,pp. 16-17.

[3]Yalon, *DSS*, p. 23.

[4]Yalon, *DSS*, p. 25: e.g.,   תשמורו, ישפוטו, תעבורי, also see
א. פורת, לשון חכמים. ירושלים-תרצ"ח. עמ" 39

[5]Ben-Hayyim, *Tradition*, p. 45f. Also, Yalon,
p. 10; Morag,*Tarbiz*,20 p. 349 provides evidence with Babylonian
pointing and from Targum.

MORESHET'S LEXICON OF THE NEW VERBS IN MH-1 [PP.46-53]

[1]Moreshet, *Lexicon*, p.236

[2]Moreshet, "הבדידהזה העבריות בכללי אינן לשון חכמים א'"
בספר זיכרון לחנוך ילון, בר-אילן, 1974, עמ"275-314.

[3]Ben-Hayyim, *L'shonanu* 28   , p. 286.

[4]Moreshet, *Lexicon*, p. 19.

[5]Moreshet, *Lexicon*, p. 16 and p. 30.

[6]Moreshet, *Lexicon*, p. 63.

[7]This is often the case with agricultural terms, cf., L. Löw,
Die Flora der Juden,

[8]See Kutscher's discussion on the clues in morphology, *Archives I*
p. 66.

[9]Moreshet, *Lexicon*, p. 64.

[10]Moreshet, *Lexicon*, pp. 66-67.

[11]Moreshet, *Lexicon*, p. 91.

[12]Ernest Jenni and Claus Westermann, *Theologisches Hand-
wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1976),p.542.

[13]Moreshet, *Lexicon*, pp. 87f.

A Brief Bibliography for
the References Relating to Notes

Bibliography	Reference Key

ח. אלבק, <u>מבוא למשנה</u>. ירושלים-ת"א תשי"ט.

ח. אלבק, <u>ששה סדרי משנה</u>. ירושלים-ת"א תשי"ט.

א. בנדויד, <u>לשון מקרא ולשון חכמים</u> (א-ב).   Bendavid, *Language 1967*
תל-אביב-תשכ"ז-תשל"א.

ז. בן-חיים, "מסורת השומרונים וזיקתה למסורת   Ben-Hayyim, *Tradition*
הלשון של מגילות ים המלח ולשון
חז"ל," <u>לשוננו</u> כב (תשי"ח)
עמ' 223-245.
<u>קובץ מאמרים בלשון חז"ל</u>. מ. בר-
אשר, עורך, ירושלים-תשל"ב, עמ'
36-58.

ז. בן-חיים, "המסורת השומרונים והשימוש בה
לחקר העברית והארמית," <u>לשוננו</u>
יז (תשי"א) עמ' 133-138.

ז. בן-חיים, "מן העבודה במילון ההיסטורי,"   Ben-Hayyim, *L'shonanu*
<u>לשוננו</u> 27-28 (תשכ"ד) עמ' 277-289.
(רק חלקים על ידיו.)

ח. ילון, <u>מבוא לניקוד המשנה</u>. ירושלים-תשכ"ד.

ח. ילון, <u>מגילות מדבר יהודה</u>.(דברי לשון)   Yalon, *DSS*
ירושלים-תשכ"ז.

ח. ילון, <u>קונטרסים לעניני לשון</u>. ירושלים-
תשכ"ד.

ח. ילון, <u>פרקי לשון</u>. ירושלים-תשל"א.   Yalon, 1936 Review

ש. מורג, "כנין פָּעל וכנין נִתְפָּעל (לבירורן   Morag, *Tarbiz*
של צורות במסורת לשון חכמים)"
<u>תרביץ</u> כ"ו (תשי"ז) עמ' 349-356.

מ. מורשת, "הכריתחות העבריות בכבלי אינן   Moreshet, *Lexicon*
לשון חכמים א', "<u>כספר זיכרון</u>
<u>לחנוך ילון</u>. רמת-גן-חשל"ד.

מ. מורשת, <u>לקסיקון הפועל</u> (שנתחדש בלשון
החנאים). רמת-גן-חשמ"א.

מ. סגל, <u>דקדוק לשון המשנה</u>. תל-אביב-חרצ"ו.   Segal, 1935 Grammar

י. קוטשר, "לשון חז"ל, "<u>כספר חנוך ילון</u>.
ירושלים-חשס"ג, עמ' 246-280.
וגם:<u>בקובץ מאמרים בלשון חז"ל</u> א.
ירושלים-חשל"ב.

י. קוטשר, "מצב המחקר של לשון חז"ל (בעיקר   Kutscher, *Research*
במילונות) וחפקידיר," <u>בערכי</u>
<u>המילון החדש לספרות חז"ל</u> א'.
רמת-גן-חשל"ב, עמ' 3-28.

י. קוטשר, "מבעירות המילונות של חז"ל וכ"ו"
<u>ערכי א'</u>. רמת-גן-חשל"ב עמ' 29-105.