STYLISTIC CHANGE IN A MODERN HEBREW NOVEL

1931 - 1965

a comparison of Batyah Kahana's first and
second editions of ____בתוך__ אל__ המחני___

LEIGH DAVID LERNER

Thesis submitted in partial
fulfillment of the require-
ments for the Degree of
Master of Arts in Hebrew Letters
and Ordination.

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion

1972

Referee, Prof. Werner Weinberg

STYLISTIC CHANGE IN A MODERN HEBREW NOVEL

1931 - 1965

a comparison of Batyah Kahana's two editions of הבנין אל מבוא

SUMMARY

מבוא אל הבנין has two editions. The author apparently
intended to update her text, since the second version
carries no previous copyright, and has innumerable changes
within it. This thesis studies the changes to determine
what direction Modern Hebrew is taking, both in the text
and outside it. The thesis uses source materials in
linguistics and literary criticism to verify results.
It is divided into several parts, according to topic:
lexical, morphological, semantic, syntactic, idiomatic,
stylistic change; and a brief appendix on ketiv.

Changes go in two directions. Some few move toward
melitzah, and the bulk toward popular style.

Lexical change tended to a more common vocabulary,
a plainer, less adorned language. Some journalistic style
rubs off on the newer edition. The results were tested
against two word frequency lists from approximately the
same dates as the novels in question.

Morphological change showed some progress to contrac-
tions, the Nitpa'el, and the new form of the imperative verb.
The data are limited, but source texts confirm many of the
conclusions.

Semantic change is a limited section. The meanings
of a few words have shifted over the years, and a trade-
mark has become a household word. In sum, little can be

learned or generalized from the research in semantics.

Syntactical changes, a large section, give a fine indication of Modern Hebrew's direction. Verbs often go without subject pronouns, the sign of the definite direct object diminishes in frequency, and the present tense increases in frequency. Question words find less currency, and numerous other syntactical items undergo change.

In idiomatic change, a resource person rated each change on the basis of improved, indifferent, or worse usage. Samples appear of various changes, and we learn that the author has updated the idioms of her book.

The study of stylistic change uses some standard texts as a guide in drawing conclusions. Modern Hebrew style as reflected in the novel has become considerably more terse, emphasizing color and action. Refinement, correction, editing, and the elimination of older forms takes place.

On the whole, the novel and the research offer good evidence of typical changes which have occurred in the Hebrew language. Description of the changes may generate models for additional study.

<div style="text-align: right;">
Leigh David Lerner
1972
</div>

To my parents, who put me on the right road; Sally Baron, who set the path clear before me; Werner Weinberg, whose guidance mapped the route; and above all, to my wife Roxy, whose love and encouragement saw me to my destination.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

0. Introduction

0.0.1. This thesis began with an interesting, perhaps
unique discovery. In late autumn of 1970, Mr. Leon Alex of
The Hebrew Union College Library, Cincinnati, Ohio, received
the 1965 edition of Batyah Kahana's   בְּבֵית אֱלֹ מוֹרַי   through
the program provided by PL480 and The Library of Congress.
As a matter of course, he checked the College catalogue to
see if it was not already in the library's possession. There
he discovered the same title, the same author, but a copy-
right dated 1931. He looked again at the newly-acquired
volume, and nowhere on it could he find a mention of an
earlier edition. His curiosity sparked, Mr. Alex proceeded
to pull the older book from the stacks and to compare the
two. He found numerous small changes on every page, yet the
story remained substantially unchanged. Without a doubt,
the 1965 copy, with its gaily decorated cover, illustrations,
and larger print, was meant to appear as a new novel before a
different generation of Hebrew readers. He felt that even a
mention of the old copyright might discourage the younger
reader, who would have visions of a Hebrew style long since
passe', and therefore would not buy the book.

0.0.2. Neither edition of   בְּבֵית אֱלֹ מוֹרַי   is a major
literary contribution, yet the two together formed the
possibility of an interesting linguistic and stylistic ana-
lysis. Recognizing this fact, Mr. Alex promptly brought
the books to the attention of Dr. Werner Weinberg, Professor
of Hebrew Language and Literature at the College. Dr.Weinberg

reviewed the material, saw also the potential for close analysis which the books offered, and recommended such a study to this writer, who eagerly accepted the challenge.

0.1.1. After a preliminary study, a procedure was chosen. The two texts would be analyzed line by line, with each change categorized by morphology, syntax, style, semantics, lexicon, and ketiv. Within each unit lie further subdivisions. It was hoped that the entire novel could be scrutinized, but this task proved to be too difficult. A preliminary word count showed that half the book equalled 20,000 words,so that this study encompasses all of the material through the tenth chapter. The final word count shows approximately 17,000 words in the 1931 edition and 15,000 words in the 1965 copy. While the total words accomplished does not reach the intended goal, it is still a large sample, a conservative estimate, and a good 50% of the whole corpus. It would seem to offer sufficient material on which to draw conclusions.

0.1.2. The goal of the study derives from the obvious difference in eras between the two works. There is over a generation of time, thirty-four years, from the publication of the first novel to that of the second. Since Batyah Kahana made literally thousands of small revisions in her second edition, and since the 1965 volume bears no reference to its predecessor, one could assume that she wanted to update her style, renew her Hebrew in the current literary idiom. The question has to be asked: "What are the

differences between the first and second copies of בכורי

הרים *ℱ* , and do they reflect the trend of change in the
Hebrew language from 1931 to 1965? Indeed, can we generate
some description of the changes from this study?"

0.2. Since the thesis hinges on the work of one author
and a little known one at that, it is necessary to ask whether
her prose is at least of some merit. Born in Ukrainia in
1901, Batyah Kahana "studied at a gymnasium and university
. . .in Vienna. She made <u>aliyah</u> in 1921. . .and now lives
in Ramat Gan."[1] Her first story appeared in print in 1922, and
numerous pieces followed. *"המרד" , "גליון" , "דואר" ,*
"הבוקר" , "דבר" , and *"הארץ"* have printed her
work. She is the author of five volumes, בכורים (1927),
בכורי הרים *ℱ* (novel, 1931), נתיבות (1936),
עקבות ועוד (1959), מחנה שלושה (novel, 1960), and
juvenile literature.[2] Literary critic Chaim Weiner wrote of
her first set of stories, בכורים , in 1927, "Batyah Kahana
seeks, and in her way she finds, the irrational strength latent
in the life and burdens of the young <u>Yishuv</u>."[3] While not now
accepted as one of Israel's foremost writers, her credentials
are in good order. Well educated, frequently published, and
critically noted, Batyah Kahana cannot be ignored as an ex-
ception or outlander in Israeli literary circles. A linguis-
tic study of Modern Hebrew which uses her writing stands on
firm ground.

0.3. This paper rests on a corpus of sufficient length
and of sound Modern Hebrew style. The research proceeded by

a satisfactory and traditional scientific method of linguistic study. The results ought to give reasonable and verifiable insights into some basic changes in Modern Hebrew over a generation of time, 1931-1965.

1. LEXICAL CHANGES

1.0.1. Lexical changes, or changes in the selection for use of a single word from one edition to the other, appear frequently. Herein we attempt to determine whether the changes are, on the whole, toward simplification or <u>melitzah</u>. The guides necessary to distinguish such alterations must, perforce, be word frequency lists. Fortunately, two lists are available, each representing approximately the same time period as the different editions of Miss Kahana's novel. They are אוצר המלים, by Dr. Eliezer Rieger, Jerusalem, 1935, and The Basic Word List for Elementary Schools, Dr. Raphael Balgur, Ramat Gan, 1968. The dates of publication compare favorably with the source text.

1.0.2. Certain problems occur in the employment of both word frequency lists. Rieger's work does not use the depth of examples found in Balgur's research. In fact, Balgur's final count rests on over one million words, while Rieger's is based on only 200,000. Moreover, Rieger's list ends at word number 2017. Balgur's carries to 4224. These differences mean that a number of words found on the modern list will not be in the older version, and there is, of course, no way of making a comparison when such is the case, except to say that a word not found on Rieger's list must be less frequent than his last single example. Because of the somewhat limited extent of Rieger's survey, certain variants occur. In addition, Balgur has the fruit of thirty-three more years of research in the field to aid him in his work.

Nonetheless, these remain the only two works from which to draw conclusions.

1.1.0. Lexical change among verbs occurred 135 times in the sample. Even though they could be categorized as stylistic modifications, that area has been reserved for other nuances. The words throughout the category of lexical change retain a similarity in the meaning, do not qualify as idioms, and are generally distinguished by the fact that either word would easily fit in the other's place with no loss in meaning.

1.1.1. Sixty verbs, or 44% of the group, had been changed to a word more common in Balgur's 1968 frequency list. Here are prime examples.

	p. in A (1st ed.)	word	1935 frequency rank	p. in B (2nd ed.)	word	1968 rank
(a)	9	הסים׳	496	10	רק׳	19
(b)	99	להסתכל	1415	65	לראות	19
(c)	102	שע	225	67	הביא	38
(d)	33	שוב	225	26	הלך	110
(e)	112	דרגה	131	74	היקשת	108
(f)	27	הבאה	874	22	דגיל	96
(g)	110	הקדיש	518	72	שבת	130
(h)	17	הקפיאה	1504	16	שמרת	68
(i)	47	הזהיר	NA*	34	הניג	202
(j)	27	הסברת	NA	22	החזר	477

*NA-Not Available

Some of the above occur once, but others, such as (f), more often. Only (e) suffers from the differences between the two lists. Note that נ3י presently ranks 96, and in 1935 ranked 131. גקע presently occupies the number 108 slot, and 1935 ranked 49. ᴵn effect, the author chose a less frequent word, but the method employed herein inadequately demonstrates that concept. Among the verbs, however, this remains the only instance of the problem. Rieger's list did not show a rank for כי , which Balgur placed as number 803. Such a discrepancy can only reflect on Rieger's methods, but changes nothing here, since אבהל is a still more common verb.

1.1.2. Fifty verbs, or 37%, were changed lexically to a less common word.

	p. in A/	word/	1935 rank/	p.in B/	word/	1968 rank
(a)	21	לחצ'ב	221	18	שאר	3638 (8)
(b)	115	שאתב	62	76	הקצ'בת	900
(c)	130	שאנע	213	85	הנתש	1095
(d)	102	אודב	89	67	שוזק	696
(e)	114	לבבסי	231	75	לבענה	761
(f)	27	ידחלי	1458	22	ןההב	2385
(g)	23	הסובסד	1415	19	ד"ר	3732
(h)	10	תכרב	285	11	השאו	1245

Most of these verbs are straightforward examples, but (a) stands out as an exception. Balgur ranks both the infinitive

and the verb of דאלכ, giving it two listings instead of the usual single heading. To be honest, the verbs in (a) ought to have comparisons made on the same basis. We therefore show the true parallel in the parentheses. Technically, then, (a) belongs in the first grouping, 1.1.1. Allowing +5%leeway in our statistics, however, means that such a discrepancy makes little difference in the overall view.

1.1.3. Some verbs simply could not be found on either list. 7% of the sample, or ten pairs of words, were not available (NA).

			1935			1968
	p. in A/	word/	rank/	p. in B/	word/	rank
(a)	21	קֹנֵף	NA	26	כ3ני3	NA
(b)	92	נגלכה	NA	61	נ'יה	NA

1.1.4. An additional 15 verbs, 11%, could be located in Balgur, but not in Rieger. Of these words, two types may be discerned: those changed from an expression more current in 1968 to one less so, and vice versa. Note here we deal only with statisitics from 1968. Melitzah appeared in 60% of the cases. The rest showed the opposite tendency.

			1968			1968
	p. in A/	word/	rank/	p. in B/	word/	rank
(a)	35	ויאשנ	2237	27	טקיי	3388
(b)	20	ניאכשנ	NA	18	הסניק	2736

Out of one million instances, the words in (a) occurred 12 vs. 7 times. This fact, combined with.the very limited

number of sets with which to work, makes drawing a conclusion
difficult to justify.

1.1.5. Lexical change among verbs shows no large and
significant trends when the group is viewed as a whole.
Dropping the 18% on which no data can be found, we are left
with 110 sets of changes. Here, 60% moved toward more common
expressions, a substantial drift. Throughout this chapter,
then, we will follow whether such a trend recurs.

1.2.0. The approach taken to lexical change among nouns
and pronouns will be substantially the same as for verbs,
with one exception. Certain changes in this section are re-
current and outstanding. They deserve special mention.

1.2.1. The total number of alterations found among nouns
and pronouns amounts to 92. Of these, some 35, or 38% of the
whole, were to more common words.

	p. in A/	word/	1935 rank/	p. in B/	word/	1968 rank
(a)	100	כּﬦוּ	1312	67	אﬞﬦ/	246
(b)	96	כּﬦﬡ	724	64	כֿﬢ	184
(c)	60	כﬥﬦﬡ -	NA	41	אﬥﬦﬤﬧ	448
(d)	40	ﬡﬦﬠ	NA	29	כﬡﬦﬧ	1750
(e)	27	'כﬥﬦﬡ	252	22	כﬥ	18
(f)	33	אﬥﬦﬡﬧ	1348	24	כﬤﬦﬡ	316
(g)	46	כﬥﬦﬡﬧ	NA	33	כﬥﬦﬡﬧ	539

In (a) we observe a change from philosophical Hebrew to more current discourse. (b) and (e) represent a move away from decorous, elegant language to straightforward speech. (c) demonstrates the growth in popularity of a purely Hebrew term for an invention of western civilization which, in mary languages, entered as a loan word. Everyday speech prefers the use of פיצו to אינמה, as illustrated by (f), and this change appeared numerous times throughout the novel. In (g), we note a modification that updates the style considerably, since "wheel" and "tire" have come to hold different meanings during the last fifty years. While the 38% figure shows no large growth in favor of simpler phraseology, nonetheless, the examples draw a picture of judicious and selective changes which modernize the prose.

1.2.2. Among nouns and pronouns, Kahana keeps a balance between simplification and ornamentation in her style. Of the sample, 34% became a word less common in 1968. Listed below are some useful examples.

	P. in A/	word/	1935 rank/	p. in B/	word/	1968 rank
(a)	84	אזינבי	22	56	אינקני	268
(b)	32	אנאנד	379	24	אינד	NA
(c)	9	גלרני	850	10	גע	NA
(d)	111	אנמון	118	74	אקן	131
(e)	110	אנבכני	842	72	הכוב	2243
(f)	108	גבק	90	71	אוסדאן	3663
(g)	126	אוכיונד	823	83	מיבנון	2270

The two most frequently seen changes are (a) and (g), but
(c) also recurred. An obvious effort to bring some measure
of chic presents itself in (b). In every case, the change
brings variety to a well-worn phrase, bringing not a little
relief to the author's style. Verbs tend, on the whole, to
have peculiar, unique meanings. A change in a verb may alter
the sense of the sentence to a small degree, but nouns, with
their multitude of synonyms, interchange themselves quite
readily, adding spice to prosaic syntax. We might predict,
then, very little movement to simpler words on this basis.
In 1.2.5. we will note it in greater degree.

    1.2.3. Out of 92 pairs, 19 were unavailable in either text,
representing fully 21% of the total.

	p. in A/	word/	1935 rank/	p. in B/	word/	1935 rank
(a)	63	נֵלו	NA	42	הֵלוֹ	NA
(b)	17	אוֹנ	NA	16	קוֹאי	NA
(c)	111	קוֹי	NA	74	קוֹיוֹת	NA
(d)	6	גיוֹנ	NA	7	רֵאֹוֹת	NA

Even though no statistics are available, this short list
merits comment. A clear example of melitzah appears in
(a), and the newer words of (c) and (d) show a trend in
favor of a particular mishkal. Still, conclusions of a
scientific character are not warranted.

    1.2.4. A meager 7 pairs of words, or 8%, appear in
Balgur's list under rankings higher in number than Rieger's

last entry. These same terms cannot be found in Rieger. Of
the seven sets, one change recurs three times.

	p. in A/	word/	1935 rank/	p. in B/	word/	1968 rank
(a)	66	$\mathcal{y}\mathcal{el}$	4183	45	$\mathcal{3} \mathcal{y}$	3254

Clearly the newer edition chooses the word more common to our
times, and perhaps this instance ought to be recorded in
section 1.2.1. According to this method, all the other pairs
in the section also qualify in the same manner, Therefore,
45% of the sample drift toward more generally applied terms.
Unfortunately, we remain without a comparative standard from
1935, and it seems best to ignore the words in this category.

1.2.5. We rate lexical change among nouns and pronouns on
three levels.

	% of whole	% of (whole less N.A. both resources)	%of(whole less N.A. Rieger)
change to more common	38	53	58
change to less common	34	47	41

Through this comparative method, it is possible to see some
small trend on the part of the author toward more frequently
listed words. If we care to take into account the facts
gleaned from 1.2.4., the percentage drift in this direction
is heavy, indeed.

1.3.0. We will deal with lexical changes among adjectives
briefly, treating each sub-group separately and arriving at a

summary table.

1.3.1. Only a few descriptive adjectives underwent altera-
tion from one edition to the next. No great conclusion can
come from the limited sample, but a movement toward <u>melitzah</u>
can be detected. Of the twenty word pairs, nine went this
way, seven moved to more frequent terms, and four were not
available, giving us 45% of the whole and 56% the useful
total which tended toward elevated style. Examples of both
types appear below.

	p. in A/	word/	1935 rank/	p. in B/	word/	1968 rank
(a)	55	כח'ג	NA	38	ג/ב	53
(b)	47	אשונבע	NA	33	כ/יוד'	2078
(c)	70	יקר	103	47	סבל'	414
(d)	43	רהב,	54	31	יגרה'	540
(e)	123	שמאו	NA	80	כהנ3	NA

1.2.3. Demonstratives, even though scheduled under adjec-
tives, include among them a number of pronouns. This was done
purposefully to bring the same words, no matter how they
function, into the same class. In this group, a problem ap-
peared. The form אלה with its suffix did not find a
listing in Balgur, but Rieger counted it. Balgur must have
filed the form under אל , which is the most common word
in the language. Furthermore, use of אלה , as in אלה
כ'כב , actually ought to be considered an idiom, yet it must
be contrasted against a single word. The dilemma can only be

solved to the extent that it is pointedly brought out.
Excluding the five cases representative of the problem
leaves only a nine pair sample, of which 55% are changes to
the less common instance.

	p. in A/	word/	1935 rank/	p. in B/	word/	1968 rank
(a)	114	‏כנ‎	6	75	‏כק‎	49
(b)	94	‏יוכן‎	1115	62	‏יככן‎	724

In sum, too small a sample and too many discrepancies make
results too variable for our use.

1.3.3. With only small basic data and complications
galore, a guess can be made as to the percentage change in
adjectives. Overall, 34% became more popular words, and 41%
words of less frequent usage. These results are fractions of
the useful sample only. Essentially, not much can be learned
from the data, and it may only serve to make the final con-
clusions somewhat hazy.

1.4. Adverbs ever remain few in number within the Hebrew
language. Lexical change among them is predictably insig-
nificant. Only one observable modification constantly re-
appeared, and that was from ‏ל313‎ to ‏ל311‎ , ranked 473
in 1935 and 280 in 1968, respectively. This one change
accounted for all eight pairs noted under the category.

1.5.0. Conjunctions as a class showed distinct and in-
teresting trends toward certain usages. Most compelling in
this category is the fact that not a single case of change

to a less common word occurs, although a small few cannot
be determined.

1.5.1. Use of   פלא   occurs with increasing frequency.
Twenty-two such instances occurred, most involving a move
away from   פדילא ,(10X),   דאלא ,(3X), and   הרפ   (3X).

	p. in A/	word/	1935 rank/	p. in B/	word/	1968 rank
(a)	115	פדיקל	260	76	פך	33
(b)	28	דאלא	95	22	פלא	33
(c)	22	הרפ	NA	19	פלא	33
(d)	26	פינלא	481	21	פלא	33

1.5.2. Out of eight pairs which changed to   פל , seven
originated as   דלא , a word with a lower frequency rating.
One could not be determined.

	p. in A/	word/	1935 rank/	p. in B/	word/	1968 rank
(a)	77	דלא ילא אבר	352	51	אבר ילא פל	16
(b)	22	דלא כיו ה3י	352	19	ה3י כיו פל	16

1.5.3. In a miscellaneous set of conjunctions, consisting
of a dozen pairs, one group cannot be determined, but all the
others tended toward more common usage. Most typical examples
follow.

	p. in A/	word/	1935 rank/	p. in B/	word/	1968 rank
(a)	26	פדיקל	159	21	דאלא	71
(b)	26	דלא	852	21	ודאלא	238
(c)	29	הרפ	NA	22	דאלא	114

The above-cited examples make up 83% of the total group, giving a small, but still significant trend. Combined with the information gleaned in 1.5.1-2., an obvious direction away from *פֿik* , *ﬠ/ﬞ* , and *הרﬠ* is apparent.

1.5.4. The conjunctive prefixed letter "*l*„ did not find itself listed in the frequency charts. Above all others, it is the cause of the most unusable data in this area. Indeed, two pairs changed from idiomatic expressions to simply "and." No method of comparison is, however, available.

1.5.5. In sum, with conjunctions we observe 91% of the whole and 100% of the usable sample becoming words more commonly found in the Hebrew language of today. The over-all number of pairs is forty-four. We can speak, then, of a heavy trend toward simplification among what we might loosely call "grammar words," as opposed to "meaning words."

1.6.0. Subordinate conjunctions are a breed apart. The bulk of them cannot be located in the lists available to us for the simple reason that the compilers deal with words, while these conjunctions are prefixes. Of twenty-three sets, only nine qualify for comparison. Of these latter, five moved to more frequent words.

1.6.1. Below are instances of both types of change.

	p. in A/	word/	1935 rank/	p. in B/	word/	1968 rank
(a)	114	*lﬞlﬞ*	470	75	*lﬞﬠk*	290
(b)	86	...*ı ﬡﬞkıﬨ*	NA	58	...*ﬠ ﬑ıﬞﬢ*	510
(c)	25	...*ﬠ ıﬡﬞﬤ*	334	21	...*ﬠ ﬞﬡﬤ*	788

1.6.2. Even though no information in the form of ratings is available, in one set of changes we observe an outstanding similarity. Virtually every *ɛn* has been transformed to *ɛɔ* . Discussion with several native Israelis has yet to explain this change. The only real reason appears to be the shifting trends of style. *ɛn* is simply not used in daily speech.

	p. in A/	word/	1935 rank/	p. in B/	word/	1968 rank
(a)	89	*p'ɾʐɪjɛn*	NA	60	*p'ɾʐɪjɛɔ*	NA
(b)	125	*ɪjk³ɛn*	NA	81	*ɪjk³ɛɔ*	NA
(c)	10	*ɪɔɔɪɛn*	NA	11	*ɪɔɔɪɛɔ*	NA

Five more examples are extant, all of which adds up to a strong case against the use of *ɛn* in present day Hebrew.

1.6.3. The overview of subordinate conjunctions gives little information. Of the useful nine pieces of data, 55% changed to more common words, but this represents a mere 22% of the whole. If, however, we include the problem treated in 1.6.2. as part of the movement toward simplification, then we arrive at 57% of the whole and 76% of the useful drifting in that direction. It would seem that *ɛn* > *ɛɔ* stands alone as the only true and substantial trend gleaned from all the subordinate conjunctions.

1.7.0. The statistics on interjections shape up in this way: total, 24; 17 change to more common expression; 1 to less common; 6 not available. Expressed as percentages of the

whole, 74% became words of higher frequency, 4% went the other direction. Omitting the unavailable entries, 94% moved to words found more often on the lists.

1.7.1. In essence, only three strong and constant changes appear in the category of interjections.

    (a)   הוי   >   הו

    (b)   כן   >   הין

    (c)   הלא   >   הנה

1.8.0. Only eight changes appear in the interrogative words used to introduce sentences. Statistics cannot be used because of one of the major flaws in the word lists. In Rieger and Balgur, we find an effort to distinguish meanings among the words to some small extent. Often, however, no specific use is explicated, and a single word may stand for many different meanings. The same problem crops up here, in the case of /מי/ . As an interrogative, no way to rate it is proper, for the frequency lists do not make distinctions of fine enough character with this word. We will therefore point out the most compelling trend, leaving off further analysis.

1.8.1. Repeated change to /מי/ occurs in the novel.

	p. in A/	word/	1935 rank/	p. in B/	word/	1968 rank
(a)	37	מכיר לא וכבר	30	28	מי לא וכבר	11?
(b)	58	אלה...מכל	762	40	מי ... אלה	11?

1.9.1. The following chart summarizes the findings contained in the chapter. It attempts to show the results by section, accounting for certain problems previously noted. Then it offers a grand total from which to draw conclusions.

1.8.2. Statistics reveal an interesting, yet almost expected movement toward simplification of language. When viewed out of perspective, 50% of the whole, and 64% of the usable sets went to words found more frequently in Balgur's list. This would seem to indicate a desire, if not within the language as a whole, at least within Kahana's mind, to reduce flowery prose and bring in a little more journalistic sort of writing. The popularity of magazine and newspaper style in America, added to the influence of advertising prose, has developed what might be termed "a language of the first thousand words." No doubt these same forces universally found in Western culture have had some influence on the Israeli vocabulary. too. We offer some evidence of the fact, but not of the reason, herein.

1.8.3. It is interesting to note, however, that descriptive adjectives became, for the most part, of less common nature. Verbs and nouns tended slightly in the opposite direction. What we might look for in Modern Hebrew, then, is a continued growth in the stock of adjectives, while specificity in nouns and verbs wears away. Since adverbs are commonly nouns, or adjectives-turned-noun, with a preposition attached, we could expect a similar train of events

1. LEXICAL CHANGE

	TOTAL	# CHNG. TO MORE COMMON	# CHNG. TO LESS COMMON	# NOT AVAILABLE	% OF WHOLE CHNG. TO MORE COM.	% OF WHOLE CHNG. TO LESS COM.	% OF USE-FUL WHOLE > MORE COM.	% OF USE-FUL WHOLE > LESS COM.	% NOT AVAILABLE
VERBS	135	60	50	25	44	37	60	-40	18
NOUNS	92	35	31	26	38	34	53	47	29
DESCRIPTIVE ADJ.	20	7	9	4	35	45	44	56	20
DEMONSTRATIVES	14	4	5	5	29	36	44	55	36
RELATIVE ADJS.	NA				NA				
ADVERBS	8	8	00	00	100	00	100	00	
CONJUNCTIONS	44	40	00	4	91	06	100	00	9
SUBORDINATE CONJ.	23	5 (13)*	4	14 (6)**	22 (57)*	17	55 (76)*	44 (25)*	61 (26)**
INTERJECTIONS	24	17	1	6	74	4	94	6	22
INTERROGATIVES	NA				NA				
GRAND TOTAL ***	360	176 (184)*	100	84 (76)**	50	28	64	36	22

* Includes eight changes from ꞓN to ꞓↃ.

** Excludes eight changes from ꞓN to ꞓↃ, which have been placed under "Number Changed to More Common."

*** Based on a figure including four changes from ꞓN to ꞓↃ, taken as an average.

in adverbs, but the evidence here does not lead to that conclusion.

1.8.4.   Perspective must, nonetheless, be maintained. The 360 changes observed amount to only about 2.5% of the total word count.   Given the facts that many other types of changes occur and lexical shifts make up only a part of the whole, 2.5% may well be a significant figure.   Still, it is wise to see the extent of the forest before judging the density of a copse.

2. MORPHOLOGY

2.0. Morphological changes occur in reasonable, albeit
not overwhelming numbers. In this section we will examine
the various changes that take place, with an eye toward
major trends and developments. Since no frequency list
applies to this type of study, let us see the different
transformations on their own merit, making one assumption.
For the sake of argument, we can assume that extensive and
repetitive differences between the first and second editions
of משנה *for* בכתב indicate a need for a new style, a new choice
of morpheme. It will remain for others to test this
hypothesis in similar endeavors, for we must operate under
the belief that editing is not done for the sake of bad
taste.

2.1.0. <u>Binyanim</u>. Changes in <u>binyanim</u> which have little
or nothing to do with true syntactical change are many and
in various directions. Herein are reported the most im-
portant findings with some evaluations.

2.1.1. Within the area covered by research, seven in-
stances of a surprising change occurred. <u>Hitpa'el</u> became
<u>Nitpa'el</u> in these cases. No difference in context, no
nuance of meaning distinguishes each pair. The switch
is reasonably constant and without apparent reason. Nothing
in the opposite direction was found, either, to offset the
trend.

p.in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 52	והתחלקה, שלו יהגיהה	37	יהגיהה, שלו והתחלקה
(b) 41	3r שישעררה, שוב בחנתו	30	3r שישעררה שוב בחנתו

The difference amazes much less in the light of modern literary style. Barkali notes in his Complete Verb Table, "In recent literature, the use of the form Nitpa'el in the past tense increases."[4] This, then, simply updates the style.

2.1.2. A second major trend in the area of binyanim appears as a movement toward the Kal. Out of twenty-one pairs involving the Kal, fifteen sets went from another binyan to Kal, while only six worked in the opposite direction.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 104	לפנו פשרד ונהיה	68	והיה לפנו פשרד
(b) 115	הקמ'ים הריה אך הנה	76	הקיום הריה אך הגנ
(c) 50	ארטסק אל אך	36	ארסקת אל אין
(d) 46	313 הגקרהם אליי	33	313 קרה אליי
(e) 45 והבכי אנו והבריה לפנת		32	והבכי אנו כרה לפנת

A number of the changes from Kal were to Hitpa'el forms.

(f) 10	רחב והחלב בעיק	11	הגרחה, החלב בעיק

Dealing with so small a number of sets as we are, it would seem wisest not to draw earth-shaking conclusions. Yet, if the examples in question are fairly representative of changes in Hebrew, then we should look forward to the development

of a greater frequency in the Kal forms.

2.1.3. The remaining few cases offer no evidence large enough to predict a direction of flow, but two instances of change from passive forms using ‏היה‎ as an auxiliary verb to straight hof'al forms do stand out. With European languages influencing Hebrew today, we might expect more changes in exactly the opposite route, toward use of auxiliary verbs. No such thing occurred, however. Much more data will be necessary before anyone can speak meaningfully about this region where morphology and syntax touch in Modern Hebrew.

2.2. Diminutives. Within the novel, one of the characters, a young girl, is named Ruth. Kahana constantly changes her first edition "Ruth" to the diminutive form, "Ruthy". In Israel today, diminutive nicknames are commonplace. The second edition of ‏בכות‎ ‏תיני‎ therefore reflects in this one respect the culture of the modern-day Jewish homeland.

2.3. Contractions. Excluding prepositions such as the attachable mem (from), a small group of true contractions was collected. Foremost among these, the change from ‏כאלו‎ to ‏כ‎ reoccurred four times, composing two-thirds of the total. An almost expected change, it represents well the spoken Hebrew of our time.

2.4. Locative ‏ה‎. Locative ‏ה‎ met with disfavor four times, while being reinserted in two different places. From this dearth of examples, we establish for ourselves the barest thread of a progression away from the use of this morpheme.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 28	לחדר נכנסה הקהל	22	התבגרה ונכסה הקהל
(b) 104	ועוקף שאר	68	וישב של

In modern times, an effort to do away with אא altogether has begun.[5] The research discussed here brought to life two occurrances of exactly the same approach to the word, seeming to verify this recent thrust in the language.

2.5. Command forms. A decisive change in command forms finds good illustration within our text. Throughout the first edition, the second person, future tense forms suffice for command. In the re-write, all of these morphemes became the true command, in the Biblical style. עקימו פעיעו הפעול gives example of various correct types acceptable as proper commands. All of these fall into the same category, except, of course, those words preceded by של.[6]

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 45	דיני, ספחו ל	32	דיני, ספח ל
(b) 96	אני 133 אולך ד	63	אני 33 אולך ד
(c) 113	ולחמה של	75	ולחמה של

Fourteen pairs performed precisely as noted above, giving us a straightforward trend confirmed by recent criticism.

2.6. Suffix vs. article indicating possession. When explaining something in English, we have the option of saying, "Then it is placed on the head," or, "Then it is placed on your head." Technically, the former sentence does not

necessarily refer to any specific head, "your" head, yet
as an instruction, little doubt can be cast on who is re-
ceiving directions. The selfsame problem shows itself in
the data at hand within Hebrew. Sometimes a suffix, some-
times an article can denote possession, and changes occur
four times in each direction.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 81	רישבו כא כאה ראשו	54	כאה הכלה ראשיו
(b) 118	כי אך הקליט פויין נחלט	77	כולא הקליט אותיר הנחלט

No preference is expressed by the author, nor does there seem
a compelling reason to make the changes. Apparently we have
a nuance which needs more data to be properly developed.

2.7. Suffixes. Within the five pairs which underwent
a change in suffix of an internal nature, three dropped the
letter <u>nun</u>. One added it.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 111	אך, דורה,	74	אריו, דורה,
(b) 18	אילי, שובריט	16	אליה שוברט

Conclusions are not justified.

2.8.0. Several types of variations in <u>mishkalim</u> occurred.
No massive group of data capable of yielding important results
shows itself, however.

2.8.1. Verb <u>mishkalim</u>. In the present tense, singular,
feminine forms, changes in two opposite directions throw

off our ability to cite a trend. Nonetheless, one direc-
tion happens more frequently than the other. The ending
־ַאֲ appears to replace ־ָה in most cases. When the reverse
takes place, we can only note it as inconsistency on the part
of the author.

	p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a)	51	וכל האמנות מוקפסת	37	וכל האמניה מוקפסת
(b)	18	וקל קבת אהווזות	16	וקל קבת אהוזרת
(c)	110	אמושבות	72	אמושבות

As a rule, the Barkali tables prefer the ending with <u>taf</u>,
so that out of eight instances, 75% proceed according to
the best style book. [27]

2.8.2. A very few other changes illustrate possible al-
ternative transformations which words in Modern Hebrew can
undergo, but they do not lead to solid insights.

	p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a)	31	הסוניבציאות	24	הסוניבצקין
(b)	26	הַאבב	21	בבן

Above examplesshed light on some of the noun and adjective
<u>mishkalim</u> which found change. Only four of these are extant
in the material surveyed.

2.9.0. Gender changes. Let us examine each pair,
attempting o discover whether the newer work offers a
better choice in gender.

2.9.1.   *ענינה דבר שלו* (A42) >   *ענינה דבר שלו*
(B30). *שלו* is feminine, while *שלו·דבר* from the new edition
is masculine. Clearly, then, an error has been made which
the proofreader should have caught.

2.9.2.   *אנכי, קלוניות* (A82) >   *גיא קלוניות*
(B54). The ending ought to make reference to *קלוניות* , a
feminine form. Therefore, the second edition stands correct.

2.9.3.   *הדבורים רבות* (A79) >   *הדבורים רבה*
(B52). "Bees," a feminine word in Hebrew, deserves the
feminine plural ending, which it does not receive in the
new book. Again, the mistake should have been perceived,
and the editors should have left well enough alone.

2.9.4. P_L *הבא כל* (A92) > P_L *הבא זה אלכס*
(B62). Both words refer to an idea, an entire sentence
preceding them, so that no specific referent is detectable.
What we may notice is a seeming inclination toward *אלכס*
in such general usages, as in *אותה אלכס*. The later edition
may, under this condition, be considered correct.

2.9.5.   *פלגי* (A100) >   *פלגות*   (B67) [wadi].
Alcalay's dictionary gives preference to the masculine form
of the noun,[7] making the 1931 spelling unimprovable.

2.9.6. With three out of five cases in error, the new
edition can hardly face the world as a paradigm of morpho-
logical purity in the area of gender. A good editor avoids
mistakes like these, yet we can profit from them. Is it

possible that אֵי , because of the plural פִּיע , feels
stress in the spoken language? On the example of its
plural, a speaker might choose a masculine adjective.
Could "bee" slowly become דְּבוֹר over a period of time,
with the queen bee known as דְּבוֹרָה ? And isn't it possible
that a loan word like "wadi" is Hebraized into whatever
plural seems appropriate to the speaker? All of these
processes take place in language, and our text may allow
some insight into the organism of a language's develop-
ment.

2.10. Conclusion. Limited data withholds large-scale
conclusions, but a modest progression to recent forms makes
itself visible in the two texts under comparison. Each
region of exploration has yielded information which we
could expect to find borne out in other Hebrew sources;
the use of Nitpa'el, contractions, the difference in command
forms, and other findings point to certain demonstrable
developments in the language of Israel.

3. SEMANTIC CHANGE

3.0. Semantics deals with meanings, and by "semantic change" we aim our discussion at those words which are changed because their meaning is no longer the same. In this category, an irrepressible desire for modernization manifests itself. Without new words which update the language, the entire context of the story may suffer from nonsensical prose. Our purpose, then, is not to predict possible behavior to look for in Modern Hebrew, but here we will examine the actual cases representative of semantic change in the language. The approach covers all the pairs noted, set by set.

3.1. סיגרה (A70, 118) ⟩ סיגריה (B47,77). In the story, no real clue of meaning for the word in the first edition is given. Does it mean cigar or cigarette? At first glance, cigar looks appropriate, since the smoker is a male, but the change to cigarette throws a new light on the situation. Perhaps, a hazy perhaps, Kahana meant cigarette by סיגרה. If this be the truth, then the change is justified.

3.2. היא רדה וזון הפזור-לבי ⟩ (A109) היא רדה וזון הבזור שאול (601A) וזון הבזור שאול (B72). By no stretch of the imagination could פזור alone be construed as "absent-minded," while the idiom presented in the second edition does, indeed, hold that nuance of meaning. [8] Nevertheless, בזור has the potential translation of "scattering,"so that some sense of the idea could flow from the sentence. The 1965 choice is superior.

3.3. נ_ערא_N אל ... אלבא1S(A110) ⟩ נ_ארא_N אל ∂ו_אהS ...
(B72). Even though the first choice is adequate, a
tremendous semantic difference makes the second choice
stand out. The new edition employs a verb directly re-
lated to the wearing of hats, but the 1931 edition uses a
less selective, far more general term.

3.4. בבהור _ח'ו (A111)) נ_תחיל∫ הבה'ירה
(B74). The correct noun for "gallop" or "galloping" occurs
in the second edition.[9] The word noted first above must be
either a neologism or an obscure form not found in modern
dictionaries.

3.5. ו6ו1כב בו1ב33 ורא∂ (A115)) א1ו∂ו3 ∫_וו_דנ_ו1∫ (B76).
The use of ∱1_3∂3 , whistle, the sound of a car horn,
must be viewed today as semantically anomalous. The proper
term appears in the later revision, and it is this word
which completely fulfills the meaning intended by the author.

3.6. נ_ו1ב∫_ (A60) ⟩ נ_ו1ב∫_ (B41).
The intended meaning here is undoubtedly "automobile." Perhaps
(A60) refers in slang to a car, much as aficionados today
refer to their "machines," whether they be motorcycles or
autos. The sentence does not come in quotation and makes
up a part of the continuing narrative. On that basis, we
rule out slang and opt for an old usage now replaced by a
slightly different form.

3.7. XIV ‎*צ'רצ'‎* (A65) ⟩ XIV ‎*שרר*‎ (B44).

How ought foreign names be Hebraized? Kahana offers two
options in this instance, one drawing on her background
in Vienna, and the other on a straight transliteration of
the French name into Hebrew. The new edition makes, it .
would seem, a more sensible choice, for it is readily
recognizable of whom she speaks.

3.8. "‎*פרימוס*‎" (A9) ⟩ ‎*פרימוס*‎ (B10).

Trademarks fill a peculiar function in our society. The
popularity of a given label may soon come to represent an
entire genre. Facial tissue becomes Kleenex, and refrigerator
in many homes is called "the Frigidaire," regardless of who
manufactured the unit. Just so, Modern Hebrew has acquired
similar idioms, represented by the present case. From
brand name only, the word has come to mean the thing itself,
and in today's slang, even a third person living in a
couple's room.[10] The evidence for this effect lies in·
the quotation marks of the first edition. By 1965, no
quotation marks are necessary, indicating Primus's
acceptance into the Hebrew language as a full-fledged
member.

3.9. ‎*נשאלג*‎ (A124) ⟩ ‎*פרישלג*‎ (B81) .

The former version of the word is not an acceptable one by
today's standards, and it calls for revision. The two
alternatives are ‎*פרישל*‎ and ‎*נישל*‎ .[11] The new choice
matches one of the two possibilities, indeed picking the one

most West European in sound.

3.10 Conclusion. Very few real instances of semantic
change take place between the two novels. Even some of
the listings found here may be classified in this category
tenuously, at best. This is not to say that numerous
semantic changes have not transpired over the thirty years
the research covers, but it does indicate certain facts
about good prose. Logically, the most likely place for
such change should occur in slang and in everyday speech.
הכהן *to* מבכים, with its long narrative sections and
often romantic, high-flown language has little room for
slang. Even normal speech is not always commonly found
in the dialogue. The vocabulary remains reasonable stable
throughout, and lexical, not semantic, differences are the
crucial factors in word changes.

4. SYNTACTICAL CHANGE

4.0. Syntax refers to the construction of sentences, and in this chapter we deal primarily with the very same area. We will look for general trends and movements observable in the comparison of syntax between the two novels, seeking to relate the information to the course of Modern Hebrew.

4.1.0. Changes in word position. Sentence order in Hebrew is often a function of style, but it also can represent the shape of the language at any given moment in its history. Not only the influences of Hebrew style, but all of modern literature brings itself to bear in determining the future of Hebrew, for Israel lives in the Western world, and its most influential immigrants also come from the West. Syntax may well be changed in numerous ways, and alternate word positions might develop over thirty years, not only out of contact with the Indo-European group, but out of the fact that Modern Hebrew is such a young language and has a need for synthetic constructions.

4.1.1. Interrupted quotations. A quotation offers an opportunity to build style on an elemental level. Far from requiring the ability to form countless variations in syntax, a quotation within a narrative, a snatch of speech in the body of a novel uses four basic mechanisms: 1) quotation alone ("How are you, Tom?"), 2) narrative plus quotation (Tom asked, "How are you?"), 3) quotation plus narrative ("How are you?" Tom asked.) Clearly noticeable in the second edition of the novel is the move away from options two and three above towards option four: interrupted quotations, or quote-narrative-quote ("How," asked Tom, "are you?").

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 94	בּאמרת בּ3חוּק: כּרב...	63	"כּרב"אמרת מ3תחוּק, "ה'שׁ...
(b) 92	רנה 3חקה ואמרת:הגּיוֹ לן	61	הגּיוֹ לן—3חקה רינה—איּk...
(c) 90	ו:הכן,חבר...הגּ 3. חחק	60...פּחוּגּוּ—פּה3. הגּם—הבּר—ו:הכן,חבר

Since we find this same direction in the text over twenty times, it seems reasonable to posit that it is a conscious improvement in the syntax of the older edition and an effort to reinvigorate the style. Surely, the interrupted quotations add a variety missing from the earlier work.

4.1.2. Subject before vs. after verb. A remarkable number of sentences had changes of a nature which caused the subject to come after the verb. Out of sixty-one such pairs, forty-eight followed this direction. Why? Research has not offered a solution, but a sense of style seems to be the best reason. Sentences which begin with the verb represent a more classical style, reminiscent of earlier Jewish literature and seemingly unaffected by simple conversational patterns. These sentences have a feel of the timeless to them.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 37	וכּפּוֹהּ 3רּיק היה	28	וכּה,3רּק הבּה
(b) 22	אלּ הוּא רה3,	19	רה3, pّ הוּא
(c) 81	הּקּרנּ, שׁאמנ, הבּהّה8,	54	הבּהّהה, שׁאמנ הّקّרנّה
(d) 86	הّהּ kהّ אלּ י'רّ31	58	הّהּ kהّ יّרّ31 אלّ

and their opposite

| (e) 81 | יّאבּוּר כּה אלّ רהّ8ekp | 54 | כּה8ah הّרuשׁ יّהּ8וּר |

4.1.3. Adverbial prepositional phrase or adverb before vs. after what it modifies. In approximately sixty cases, the adverb or adverbial prepositional phrase moved from after to before that which it modifies ,66% of the instances. Particularly responsible for this shift is the single word " כבר ," which constantly changed in such a way. But all in all, we might look in Modern Hebrew literature for more introductory phrases in sentences, as well as for continued positioning of the adverb first.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 52	ואלי כלאבר אולי	37	אולי כלאבר
(b) 90	חנה הצגה כבר	60	וכבר היקשה חנה
(c) 10	רני היו אני בקלות	11	בקלות היו אני רני
and their opposite			
(d) 49	העברית סגות 313	34	והוא סגח העברית

4.1.4. Order of indirect object. The indirect object tended to change from one edition of the novel to the next, in that it was placed after the verb or direct object rather than before one of the two. There exist no examples of change in the opposite direction among the ten cases, yet we do not have sufficient number to make broad predictions.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 101	הרכבה בלים שים פותחק את המשבר	67	ברכה בלים את המשבר שים פותחק
(b) 94	רכלו בנטלו אונת כאול	63	מקרב בו אונת כאול

4.1.5. Noun of direct address. The noun of direct address possesses a certain flexibility often not observed elsewhere. In the nine pairs available, a bare majority show a progression away from the opening word of the sentence: i.e. "Hello, honored guest," instead of "Honored guest, hello." Nonetheless, virtually any sensible position within the sentence lies open to a noun of direct address.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 102	אבסח. לּ ,רנ	68	רּ ,רנתי. ל
(b) 50	313, הדי פּ עיֹלוֹ	36	הדי פּ עלּוֹ ,313

4.1.6. Auxiliary verbs. With only ten changes among the auxiliary verbs, little can be said. The movement is toward placement of the auxiliary after the main verb, but this seems to be little more than a stylistic device to break the monotony of sentence structure.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 110	והיא נתלּאבנ	72	נאבלּאב היתה
(b) 17	היֹ דּואה פּלּאב פה	16	דּואה היֹת פּלּאב פה

4.1.7. Questions. Changes in the order of question sentences went helter-skelter. Twice the הישאלה was dropped and the order rearranged, twice הלּא found a different place in the sentence. Other changes were contradictory.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 80	?אלא הזומה	52	אל הזולא?
(b) 39	?רצוי כלום הן, אלא	29	הלום יוצר אתה?

Both the above examples provide instances of improved
conversational characteristics. As Sivan points out, the

הן המלך   is today used primarily in quotations from
previous literature and is not a truly living part of daily
speech.[12]

4.2. Verb with or without subject pronoun. In the over-
whelming number of instances, approximately eighty altogether,
the verb which appeared in older edition with its accompany-
ing subject pronoun lost that pronoun in the subsequent work,
with the verbcarrying the subject within it. This occurred
in 85% of the sets, estimating conservatively. Terse prose
demands streamlining, and since verbs in Hebrew do, for the
most part, carry their subjects embedded within them, the
loss of the pronoun is a boon to style. Below are examples
which illustrate the change.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 82	קרן 313 בריתי	54	קרן ברנ'חה
(b) 83	הם שרקו	55	וכך שרקו
(c) 67	היא כנראה כל הכנה	46	כנראה כל הכנה
(d) 68	היא הבטיחה להראות ל'	46	הבטיחה להראות ל'
(e) 73	אתה אליק אותה אלו'	48	אליק אותה אלו'

Example (e) actually supplies a subject with the suffix, so that the pronoun cannot be termed necessary. Even in the sets which added a pronoun, good reasons are available, such as emphasis, or a complete change in style which requires a pronoun in place of a pronominal suffix. It is safe to say that our novel shows a prominent tendency in this case, a tendency toward terseness which makes for smoother reading and better effectiveness.

4.3.0. Sentence types. A good re-write will always include any number of adjustments in sentence structures, creating new simple, compound, or complex, even compound-complex arrangements. Editing requires the reshaping of sentences toward a flowing style, a style often puncutated by sentence variety.

4.3.1. Simple > compound sentence. The greatest number of changes involved adding "and" to a sentence, thus connecting it to the next thought, creating a compound sentence.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 32	תרגש היתה מרגע *3hpₐₜ ... היה *3rₑkₐₐ אל ₐₐₓ יₑₓ	24	היתה תעלב *3hₐf *3hₐ ₐₜ ... והₐ kₐₐₐ אאₐₓ ...
(b) 82	הוה koₚ הלₓ לₓ ₜ baₙₐₐ ... הₐ koₚ השₐₐₜ ₐₗ bₐₐₓ ₗₐₓחₚₜ	55	הₐ koₚ baₘₐ ... וₑₜ השₐₜ ₐₗ bₐₐ ₗₐₓחₚₜ

Because compound sentences are easily manufactured without time-consuming sentence reconstruction, and because they imitate spoken narrative in many ways, particularly the stringing of sentences not altogether related to one another except by their conjunction, such sentences might be expected to come

to the fore in the new edition. Whether these changes repre-
sent art or not remains a different question.

4.3.2. Complex ⟩ compound sentence. Precisely half as many
complex sentences as simple sentences went to the compound
variety (12 vs. 24). On the basis of the theoretical pro-
jections in 4.3.1., we might not expect the changes noted here
at all. Why should Kahana choose compound forms when she has
already gone to the trouble of writing a complex one? The
answer lies in the type of change usually found here. It
does not illustrate massive editing at all, but rather typifies
selected few changes, generally causing an attached preposi-
tion or article/become vav, the conjunction.
(to)

	p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a)	57	אחר זאת ביאו בישלה הכל	39	אחר זאת ישבו הכל
(b)	51	מאריב פרס פורת פל, הלך	37	מאריב פרס הפורת לפי הפסוק
		המלץ רוד גאו'.		ומלץ רוד גאו'.

Obviously minor, these changes are similar to the bulk of
the examples applicable in the section. We learn, then,
that in re-writing the novel, the author did not care to
begin from scratch, tearing apart structures and rebuilding.
Instead, her choice was to make selective and simple changes
which she found, for whatever reason, necessary. Further
evidence will bear this out.

4.3.3. X ⟩ complex sentence. The research turned up only
seven instances of simple or compound sentences becoming complex
ones. Some of these required reshuffling of structures; a few
did not. Again we notice the tendency to avoid making great

restructuring, for the number of pairs moving to complex
forms is quite small.

4.3.4. X⟩ simple sentence. Five complex sentences were
discovered which became, literally, simplified.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 10	ושבחר 'אמׂ אלה'ו	11 גהרגסוॆאל/ ע'נמ' הכ 'לה אׂ3'ו	
	גׂהסוׁה		

4.3.5. X⟩ fragment. Only five cases became "fragments,"
sentences seemingly without verb or even ellipsis. Fragments
are not uncommon at all in modern literature. In English,
Dos Passos and Hemingway helped popularize them, and no
doubt Hebrew has been influenced by this modern trend, for
literati the world over keep abreast of all developments.
In fact, it is surprising that more such quasi-sentences do
not appear. Perhaps the romantic nature of the novel re-
stricts the use of fragments as a breach of style, or perhaps
the author is not completely in favor of them. Yet, they
do appear, and to a greater extent than in the first edition.

4.3.6. Conclusion. Changes in sentence forms follow the
path of least resistance. The bulk of changes came to com-
pound forms, with a smattering of other types being repre-
sented. Most of the changes can be made easily by inter-
changing a conjunction with another word, or even letter.
Reuben Sivan's injunction against the formation of long
sentences,[13] then, is well-regarded. Simple sentences strung
together to make a compound unit still usually have the

appearance of two short ideas. Many complex constructions
which were lengthy become broken down into two simple
sentences connected by a conjunction, and a few other units
go to fragments. We find here an improvement in style with-
out an exceptionally great effort to accomplish the goal.

4.4.0. Conjunctions and punctuation. Related to types
of sentence structures in a direct way, the problem of con-
junctions and conjunctive punctuation deserves some dis-
cussion. Specifically, we refer in this section to sentences
which stand wholly, entirely on their own merit, yet one part
of the set has added to it a conjunction, e.g. "He went home."〉
"And he went home." With regard to punctuation, here we refer
to sentences which may replace a conjunction with a punctuation
mark, or replace punctuation with a connective word, e.g. "He
stood on his hands, and everyone looked."〉 "He stood on his
hands; everyone looked." The arrangement can be vice versa.

4.4.1. Co-ordinate conjunctions. No logical reason exists
to justify the excessive beginning of sentences with co-
ordinate conjunctions. In English, teachers have inveighed
against the practice for years. Indeed, by definition, open-
ing a sentence with "and" is precluded. Warriner writes of
conjunctions in his English Grammar and Composition, "A
conjunction is a word which joins words and groups of words.
There are three kinds of conjunctions: Co-ordinating. . .,
correlative. . ., and subordinating. . . Co-ordinating con-
junctions: and, but, or, nor, for."[14] While we might expect

to see subordinating conjunctions at the head of a sentence, since they lead subordinate clauses, we would not expect a co-ordinate conjunction, because it is a connector for two independent clauses. Nevertheless, we do note in the English language many sentences beginning with co-ordinate con-junctions. While Warriner's may not approve of the style, he cannot rule it out of existence. In Hebrew, we might justify co-ordinate conjunctions as sentence openers if the sentence or the narrative is in a Biblical style. Even a philosophical or medieval style uses vav a great deal, whether because of Arabic or other influences. The novel in question, however, makes no claims to any of these styles, and we might look for a format of which even Warriner would approve. Instead, we find thirty-four additions of the co-ordinate conjunction at the beginning of a new sentence, and only sixteen removals of that part of speech. Out of personal prejudice and years of English language indoctrination, we might look with dis-favor on the style Kahana chooses. Some may wish to vindicate her by referring to the increased naturalness of the style which her addition of co-ordinate conjunctions brings. Yet, could it be possible to hold up the standard, "vigorous writ-ing is concise,"[15]and thereby condemn the author for not "avoiding the 'stringy' style which results from the overuse of and. . ."?[16]

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 9	...סוף לדור הוא הדור	10	...סוף לדור הדור והוא
(b) 89	...לו חמאה	60	לה וכאשר
(c) 105	חסר הנשיק הנלכדו	69	מהכורא הנשיק והיו
(d) 109	אואל ונשמ ליה כי	72	ונשמא הראבה יגה

and their opposite

| (e) 16 | ? סגורה אל ונתה | 14 | ? דרך מה |

4.4.2. Punctuation. No tendency in any special direction
revealed itself through the research. Co-ordinate conjunc-
tions were dropped and replaced by commas alone, and the
opposite occurred, too. Out of forty-eight cases, twenty-
five added a conjunction, twenty-three left it out. We must
conclude that the option lies open to employ the comma as
the sign of the co-ordinate conjunction, with no expressed
word necessary.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 78	ולא אמר, נסכה שירולא אמר	51	אמר, ונסכה פלו
(b) 72	נקנית כי, ונים אל נשקו	48	נכנסת והיא יביה את נשקו

and their opposite

| (c) 11 | ? ונשוֹל אמרק כושא מ | 12 | ? פלוֹ מה, אמרק כושא מ |
| (d) 111 | .3 גר לפ הגידו | 74 | .3 גר אל הגידו |

Most noticeable in the evidence was the case of (c) repeating
itself time and again in lists of nouns, while the connection
of clauses by comma alone did not occur as often.

4.5. Use of את. Reuben Sivan carefully points out that the sign of the determined direct object has a definite place in the grammar of Modern Hebrew.[17] If in far distant future ages, the two editions of ‌____ מכבי ‌‌‌‌ and ‌‌‌ בכרם ‌‌‌ were the last remains of Modern Hebrew, linguistics experts would surely guess that good Hebrew style was slowly diminishing the use of את. In fact, because Sivan speaks so vehemently about those who would end the use of this particle, we begin to suspect it truly is in jeopardy. In our novel, thirty-one times the author removed the את before a determined direct object, while adding את only nine times. Projecting to the language as a whole, we need to investigate the particle את, attempting to learn whether it is losing ground in frequency. The research here leads to the hypothesis that it is.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 31	נ3' את find אצ	23	אצ find נ3'
(b) 47	ljleד את אברה	33	שרבה בjleד
(c) 49	נ'3' את רחל3 'ו	34	הי3 רחל3 'ו'נ3

and their opposite

(e) 110 וקי3ן 3n9ן אה את...אנאk1   72   כ>אנא...את אה 3n9ן אלd קי3ן

In virtually every case, את is omitted before an object determined by a suffix or by the construct state with a suffixed word. Kahana added את to sentences which required parallelism (as above), which had a direct object determined by the article, or occasionally in a sentence where, if she

had been consistent, she would have omitted את to be in con-
sonance with (a), (b), or (c) above. With these results,
we could narrow our hypothesis, predicting that את is common-
ly forgotten, may even be on the verge of impropriety before an
object which is determined by a suffix. While we would not
ordinarily expect to find this in high literary style, the
language of daily life might bear out the hypothesis. At any
rate, such is the direction to which the findings point.

4.6.0. Tenses. A relatively small number of changes occurred
among the tenses of the various sentences, but they are
changes which, in a few cases, are worth noting for the move-
ment of the language they show. The basis of comparison
shall be to pick up the changes by what they became, i.e. X
tense goes to future tense, and the listing will therefore
be "future."

4.6.1. Future. The changes to future tense represent a
crumb of the total picture. Three appeared, one of which went
from present to future, but which, in the process was altered
in actual meaning. The other two involved the word " היה ,"
which is discussed in ____31____ . Our two examples seem to ex-
press a need for the future tense with this word, yet in ___31___
it appears in the past.[18] It must, then, be the sense of the
author that such a tense change is required.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 96	שבוע ילה קנה שובע יום לך	64	שבוע ילה שור כן על
(b) 125	ובגלל קהלת אז הייתן אז ראשה	81	ובגלל לאת אז ראשה

4.6.2. Past. Kahana makes scattered and unpredictable changes from various tenses into the past. They do, however, fall into certain categories. Perhaps for the sake of style, some pure past tenses become forms involving vav conversive. Continuing past action finds expression in past progressive constructions, thus enhancing the motion of the narrative. In spots where past progressive had been employed, the true past is used. Attention to this ironic state of affairs shows a good reason for the differences. In the latter case, the past progressive was employed either in ill-suited ways or in terms that have since been replaced by idioms or the general use of the past tense among the public. The same holds true of present tense verbs in their conversion to the past. In the original version of the novel, many of the present tense verbs attach themselves to quotations, forming the author's narrative after a character speaks, e.g. "Hello," says Rina. Clearly, past tense fits more easily to the English language speaker, and, no doubt, even to Hebrew speakers, else why the change? In sum, differences from one edition to the next in respect to the past tense rely largely on common sense and nuances of style, and not on some egregious errors or radical transitions in Modern Hebrew.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 104	וֹסֵיִן לְסֹׁא הַנָּ בִּנְצָ׳וֹ אַבֶּק	69	וֹסֵיִן אֲבֶק פּוֹנֶל הַנָּ בִּנְצָ׳וֹ
(b) 110	חִיּוּק שָׁל אַ בַּעֵיִן	72	הַחִיּוק הָיָה חֹוֵר שָׁל פֵּיִן
(c) 19	וְכֹל סַעֲרַת הַיָּין ...	17	כֹל הֶחֹסַנ ...
(d) 7	— כֹּ׳ — דָנָה הַיָּשׁ,	8	— כֹּ׳ — אָנָה הַפֵּס

Only about thirty changes to the past tense took place, so that to look for trends is self-defeating. We have, however, noted the main points.

4.6.3. Present. The course of change most manifest among the alterations in tenses is towards the present tense. The direction is particularly noticeable in the case of the past tense, which most often shifts to the present. Approximately forty such changes reveal themselves in the research, the highest total of all movements in tense. Kahana adheres to the dictum of Reuben Sivan, who states in Better Hebrew Usage, "Use the present tense instead of the past whenever possible."[19] The future tense finds few changes to present, except in sentences which ask, "Do you know. . .?"

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 82	לּד יּ3ר	55	אוּל וּ3ר
(b) 32	שׁ האמרכת פלוּ וּ3ק	24	שׁ האמרכה, ארוּ פּ3וּ קּ
(c) 34	שׁבּר זהבּ אוּ	26	אשׁבּר אמסוּ
(d) 34	אוּ נּסׁ וּפּ3רּ וּוּקראּ	26	אוּ נּסׁ וּפּ3רּ אוּ קּרוּ
(e) 49	?רּדּאּ	34	?אוּלּ 3רּ

Similar to the example of (e), (a) appears as a type throughout the text. The change seems to be from Biblical style to use of the present tense as a matter of course. All in all, it is the present tense which dominates the changes discovered in the books, and the evidence from Sivan, cited above, makes this expected. We should be able to verify the trend through research in other such controlled texts to illustrate the rise

of the present tense in Modern Hebrew.

4.6.4. Conclusion, tenses. While but a handful of data
is available, some honest judgments can be made, as they have
been above. Still, more material would give better results
for study.

4.7.0. Suffixes. In sufficient data exists for con-
clusions in this area, but herein are reported some of the
changes noticeable through the study. No generalizations
are intended.

4.7.1. With vs. without suffix and v.v. Twenty-six
sets of sentences dropped or added suffixes. Of the seventeen
which added a suffix, the reasons which could be offered for
their performance are many: unclear antecedent, repetitive
antecedent noun replaced by pronoun, nuance of style, etc.
Those which lose a suffix often have pronouns or nouns instead,
or suffer no lowering of style by their loss.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 40	והנה גורת שׁל דניה	30	והנה גווה שׁלה
(b) 75	kd הברי ואה השׁר׳קׁני	50	kd הברי גור אה שׁרׁיקׁ׳נׁ
(c) 129	אוּלי גׁני 5ׁ/רׁ	84	kd ׁהׁכׁ בׁ5ׁ/5 יׁkׁ
(d) 39	בהרׁיק 3ׁ׳ׁ/ וׁ 3ׁx kׁ/נ	29	בהרׁית 3ׁ׳ׁ/ וׁ 3ׁx kׁ/נׁ

4.7.2. אك vs. object suffix on verb and v.v. Only nine
cases exist altogether, five of which have suffixes instead
of אك plus an object in the second edition. The construction
appears to/ be interchangeable, acceptable in either form.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 89	מסא אלא רוני אסכה	59	סיראוט דיני
(b) 97	הכקהג היקלוג	64	אלא וודהנוע הקוה אלף קלא הכוראה

4.7.3. Possession by suffix alone vs. de plus suffix, and v.v. With only four sets, three became constructions with de.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 28	הבעסיכ	22	הבעסיק אלקם
(b) 113	עהר3 de	75	ר3עו

This is a subset of 4.7.1.

4.8. Mishnaic possessives. The viability of the Mishnaic possessive as a part of modern literary style continues. Perhaps because of the romantic nature of the novel, perhaps because of personal choice, Kahana makes use of the Mishnaic possessive form, changing to it nine times and away from it six times.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 8	פע והבאן אלה יועיר	8	שאוע de הבאן אלה העגר
(b) 42	באראוג 133ע גריא de ירו	30	באראוג 133ע הא גייע ירוק

4.9. Construct vs. de and v.v. Is it better for a writer to use the language of the people, or should there be a certain style reserved for literature, much as spoken and literary Arabic differ radically, or even as Hemingway's seemingly good imitation of spoken English differs markedly

from real speech patterns? Such is the problem in this
section, for Kahana chooses to convert many examples of the
construct state into forms bound together by $\check{s}e$. Why
is it a problem? Simply because those who would refine the
language, such as Sivan, strive to maintain the construct
state in Hebrew. Yet, by their very writing about the sub-
ject and by their admonition to use the construct[20] they admit
that it has fallen into dis- or misuse among Hebrew speakers.
Since Kahana has dropped a number of construct forms from her
work, we can say that she has modernized, but we cannot say
she has refined, unless we use the daily speech as/yardstick.
We could, however, safely posit the existence of a trend
away from the construct, if not from Sivan's own concern, at
least from הדבר שׁל בבניה .

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 54	ושׁיקות הבריאת	38	ושׁיקות שׁל בריאת
(b) 94	לאסור עֵרְן	63	לאסור שׁל ערכאי
(c) 119	שׁמע שׁליים	78	שׁמע שׁל שׁליים

4.10 Repetition of subject by pronoun. It is possible in
Hebrew to repeat the subject in pronoun form within a sentence.
With a small number of pairs available, the research reveals
a trend away from the double subject. Such a movement ought
to take place as language grows, for it begins to use avail-
able shortcuts.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 114	כולן הן קלונות	75	כולן קלונות
(b) 74	לא אהבה היו, יג רינו	49	לא אהבה היו, יג רינו

4.11. Ellipsis. A slight increase in the use of ellipsis occurs over the course of the two novels. Generally speaking, ellipsis manifests itself as an understood verb, "to be," but it also appears in other ways. In certain contexts, responses within conversations are readily predictable, and they often revert to ellipsis. Since ellipsis works best as response to a question or a previous fully stated antecedent, we should expect to find its highest utilization in conversation.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 47	לא, בהם שלא גאולה שמעון	33	לא, בהם גאולה שמעון
(b) 80	ושמעה היה ריק	52	ושמעה ריק
(c) 91	הוא ראל יצ, הביא ספר	61	צריל הביא ספר

So little data exists in this area that far more research and a greater volume of control text is necessary.

4.12. Interjections. Under this category of interjections, we refer most specifically to הרי and הנה . In effect, then, Kahana is not diminishing interjections, but in fact diminishes her use of these two expressions, just as their use in Modern Hebrew has indeed become less.[21] While we are required to note the effect under Syntax, it really pertains most specifically to Style, where we will take it up again.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 55	יُ קָנ הֵ‏313 !	38	אَلـ הַ‏3
(b) 87	נָכוֹן יَעِי	60	אַנَ נָכוֹן
(c) 82	וَהָדِيرَ اَقِשׁَילَرَ	54	וَاَنَ اَقِשׁَילَرَ
(d) 55	כָנֵה אَلـ קַקִמִיّאَنَ	38	אَلـ קַקِيמِيَّהَ

4.13 Question words, particles. "Use of the question
words. . .is not essential, and in current speech, there
is indicated more and more the inclination to ask without
question words. With intonation of the words, the question
is made clear."[22] Sivan succinctly summarizes the case as it
is found in בַּחֲרוֹת עַל הַהֶגֶן . Throughout the novel,
question words drop from sight, replaced with what can only
be the pitch level of the sentence, were it to be read
aloud.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 49	אَلـ הَ זוֹכֵר אَلـ אֵוَاكِ?	34	אَلـ הَ זוֹכֵר אَلـنَ
(b) 49	וَהَ‏תَ‏3ר	34	יَוَائَ אَלـ הَ
(c) 37	וَכِي אَת הَיִת ?	78	וَאֵמَ הָיָה הَדَ‏3לֵם
(d) 28	דَרَ פַ‏אَلَ, כַلِ כَלَא נَ פَ‏וֹסَنَ	22	אَلَ‏פَ, כَלَ נَ פَ‏וֹסَنَ

The loss of the question word seldom has an effect on the word
order, except in the case of הَ הَ‏אَلَ‏כَ‏نَ , which usually causes
the verb to be first in the question. Without the particle,
the pronoun often precedes the verb.

4.14 While adequate data remains missing in some areas, it is possible to say confidently from the evidence taken as a whole, that Kahana has shifted her style to accomodate the times. Moreover, since so many changes are verifiably in tune with Modern Hebrew, we might be able to use other unverified observations as yardsticks or some measure of the language today.

5. IDIOMATIC CHANGE

5.0. Idioms are classified generally by their most pro-
minent word, whether noun, verb, etc. We deal in this section
with the following problem: is the new idiom an improvement,
a bootless change, or the forfeiture of an already tasteful
choice? To ascertain the information, a resource person was
employed who could offer the necessary judgmental data. Dalia
Vlodaver, wife of Dr. Zeev Vlodaver, volunteered to help out,
and to her many thanks are due. She resides in the United
States as of this writing, at 2040 Montreal, St. Paul,
Minn., 55116. She attended Tel Aviv University, majoring in
biology, and the Teacher's Institute in Tel Aviv, majoring in
Hebrew literature and Hebrew grammar. She matriculated
simultaneously at both schools in 1959, continuing on for
another three years. She remains one laboratory course short
of her degree. The opinions contained in each section, save
the conclusion, belong to her.

5.1. Adverbs

5.1.1. כן vs. כך. A score of changes from כן to
כך occur from one edition to the next. While כן retains
its usefulness, it is an older form, and כך is considered
better. Kahana has modernized her language with regard to
these terms.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 31	כן ליעז סו ליים אكלכל	23	כלך ליעז אكלכל
(b) 114	כה אכליג וنכרי'ס	75	כל כך אכלג וنכרי'ס
(c) 54	כה ריחز/	38	כל כך ריחز/
(d) 19	פעם היתג כה ידאת	10	יעא עיא מרוקת כל כך

5.1.2. Miscellaneous. Among adverbs, most terms trend
to more modern forms. Exceptions appear in the case of (a)
through (c) below, which the resource person believes not to
be improvements. These represent half of the unacceptable
changes. Example (d) illustrates those changes which neither
work to improve nor detract. Only a few instances of this
type occur. From (e) to the end of the list, changes are
deemed fortuitous.

P. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 6	וכי שהוא את הן דומות	7	ורה קסת דומות שלהן
(b) 108	היה דומה... שוב כל מתשהת	71	היה דומה... ההיסח-הדרך
(c) 69	לא גרא בקום פקעו	47	לא פרא את גאב בקעו
(d) 18	ותופס המקלא	16	ותופס אמן
(e) 26	מה מקום מעריק?	21	ותפוס שאת ער...?
(f) 108	היתה רואה אהד	71	היתה רואה החיפול
(g) 68	מקראית בכל יות	46	ניקראית יות יום
(h) 75	לתוחר בן גד הבירו	50	מכול ותוליף לא הבור
(j) 85	313 קד בגלמהות הרויה יל	56	313 קד בגלמהות כדכל
(k) 86	היקו לתוי והשראת התחירות	58	כיוון שבבחירות
(l) 93	אלה פרם לא שת לו ראו	62	מתופס לא שראה
(m) 68	ארן הכריה שהראת שי	46	באהו הכירו...
(n) 60	נכתאג שיף ובן	41	נרתאג הוובל...
(o) 56	גין השאו	39	בתאוני ערב
(p) 128	אלך בו הרש	84	אלך ערב של
(q) 110	ותגבבת בריקנו	72	היו היתה שוקה שלאת לשבם
(r) 5	אדה והפשל	7	שלה אדה

We describe the problems in the first three examples as
follows: the ‏גובה קימה‎ of (a) is not merely a "while", but
almost an hour, which is too long a time to indicate within
the context. The first edition's choice of ‏כל כך מאוחר‎
in (b) stands out for its clarity. The expression, ‏לא כזה‎
‏את הבית‎ , found in (c) gives a good example of over-
burdened usage, which the original novel avoids in this
case. Sentence (d)'s idioms carry equal weight, although
we might possibly prefer ‏בקומה‎ for literary endeavors.
The spoken language would employ the second word. The rest
of the idioms cited above have been improved to some extent.
Any reasonably educated Hebrew speaker would say ‏לומר?‎
in the setting of (e). In letter (f), the second term ‏מהביט‎ ,
shows off a finer style, one which a cultured person would
surely use when writing. The idiomatic use of ‏רע רע‎ in
(g) toes the modern mark, just as ‏נאוה הדלת‎ does in sentence
(h). From these examples and others, we note Kahana's
progress toward a Modern Hebrew style which today's speakers
might employ and would surely look for in the literature they
read. Sentence (j) needs correction because of its im-
precision. ‏הראויה לו‎ has the nuance of "suitable, fitting
for him," but ‏כדרכו‎ , substituted in the new novel,
plainly says, "as he was accustomed." Since David was bow-
ing to a peasant woman, his gesture was not "suitable,"
but rather something he usually did. Tightening of the prose
appears in (k), where ‏הפליא‎ becomes merely ‏גם‎ . In
(1), ‏אלה כמו‎ finds acceptability, but ‏ממנו‎ stands above

it for its literary style. The two phrases in sentence (m)
delineate another case of the need for accuracy. The first
idiom, ـرﻝ , gives the sense of " when we were close to
leaving," but the second and improved choice, ـرﻝﻭ ,
states simply and unquestionably, "when," matching the context
of the sentence beautifully, and so fulfilling its function.
ﺃﻟ ﻧﺑﺭ , the original idiom of (n), harks back to an
earlier Modern Hebrew and gives a nuance of "a good probability."
ﻟﻛﺑﺭ , on the other hand, illustrates a contemporary
term and lends the meaning, "for sure." The meaning of the
two expressions in (o) remains the same even today. Why,
then, should the choice of the 1965 edition find preference?
Only because it is "nicer," a cut above its fellow in style.
The very same criticism can be levelled at ﻣﻭ ﺑﺭﻭ ,
which our resource person described as "kids' talk."

ﻣﻭ ﺭﺑﻭ "elegantly" states the identical idea,
carrying with it a touch of the literary language, as
opposed to the Hebrew of the streets. Both of the phrases
in (q) are used today, yet ـﺑﺭﺑ occurs more often in the
spoken language and has yet to wear itself out as an
acceptable idiom. The last example, (r), boasts two good
idioms for the written language, and they are close to each
other in style. Nonetheless, ﺑﺭﻭ ﺑﻛﺭﻭ , the newer set,
should be preferred for its modern touch.

5.2. Interrogatives. A few changes in interrogative
pronouns and their idioms were noticed. They are, for the
most part, advantageous.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 82	? אם הענין יב	55	אי כי האם יב המאם ?
(b) 14	כלמי אא אג ענוני ?	13	ןו אאת אג ענוני ?
(c) 94	ומי פא אם על לא עיני?	63	אם לל על עיני ?
(d) 111	על פיע אם הוא אברתם?	74	לאם הוא אברתם?

Mrs. Vlodaver prefers the second sentence of (a) as a better construction, perhaps because of the כי , which gives the subject a point of reference. The next three examples involve לאם , אודע , and two other variations appearing in the earlier novel. בילן explains the difference between the two words: לאם means "for what reason, for what purpose, for the sake of what," and אודע asks the question, "why, for what cause."[23] Clearly, translation does not render the full sense of the difference, so we might add the additional translation for לאם , "to what end." Either of the two words are better choices than those set forth in the original text. (b) affords an excellent paradigm for the use of לאם ; (c) provides a perfect referent for the employment of אודע ; and (d) probably ought to have אודע , too.

5.3. Adjectives. The pattern continues. One change was rejected by the resource person as unsuitable, two were deemed equally acceptable, and most were held to have made improvements.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 130	בתוך היו תורית באלו	85	בתוך היו תיורית שרא
(b) 41	כאהור רצ'ד אסר	30	בתוח כאה ורצ'ע
(c) 111	אורילא לא היה שאו רצון	74	אורילא לא היה שרצה
(d) 127	בחסת דבר את	83	אמתו בחסת
(e) 32	רואר...ה קלן והיסר	24	רואר... בה הקלן...ובה הגאה
(f) 69	אמתא וואלו אן הכלל	47	אמתא אולף
(g) 70	ואחר שריקה גם רצד	47	ואחר רצי שריקה
(h) 40	שגרקה חל רצו	30	שגרקה רצו קלן
(j) 77	לקנוא א ואלא ל דהרית	51	לקנוא באה דהרית
(k) 52	ויאל את לא פרח נאה	37	איון בה אילו כרה אלא בשנת
(l) 122	הגולה ביותר	80	הגבוהת אכול
(m) 116	חדון תאנמל	76	בהרך אולת תאנות
(n) 22	אובן	19	כאובן
(o) 27	פ' גה כאילו אלא בריקא שנץ	21	שרת גה כאילו אלא בריקא
(p) 6	הולשריח הפלאי ורצד	7	הולשריח הולנת
(q) 14	הכאלן?	13	בכאאת?

Our respondent found (a) unacceptable, since שרא is less literary than Kahan's original choice of באלו. Sentence (b) and (c) above hold changes which need not have been made, but which are equally acceptable, i.e. רצ'ד אסר = בתוח כאה , רצ'ע ואה כאה , שאו רצון = אורילא. Letter (d) through (q) are considered improvements in idiom. While the meaning of בסת דבר and אמתו in (d) are equivalent, the latter can be found more often in speech and is generally recognized as the best selection. Many examples of this

change crop up throughout the novel in a consistent fashion.
The stronger adjective of the pair in (e) appears in the
second edition of the novel, שּׂכִינָה נּוֹ . Sentence (f)
possesses two expressions of equal power, but the first
novel's selection best belongs to speech, and the second
volume's choice gives a finer literary touch. (g)'s term,

 אֶת כִּרְּי , is nothing less than old fashioned, making
the new edition's substitution winner, as it were, by
default. Within (h), our resource person believes מַ לְּצַ to
belong outdated, the 1965 edition's   כַּצִ וֹקִי   somewhat
better, yet she would propose כַּצִ וֹקִ replace both of
them. Sentences (j) and (n) seem to change because of the
general popularity of the substituted words in common speech.
Emphasis and specificity appear to cause   כֵל to move to
כַּצֵל ... לֵכָה in (k), adding a finer touch to the style.
Instance (l) shows the author's choice of a comparative for the
first edition, a superlative for the second. The latter
is held best for the context. Not only does (m) possess
an interesting change of idiom, but even a change in spelling
for "Teheran." The idiomatic choice for the later volume,

כַּטְתֵל שְׁתַלְיָן , represents a finer style, a more literary
touch. In (o), the first expression, בְּאֵילַ נַּאֵ , means
"temporary," but   לֵ וֹעֵל indicates "momentary." The
resource person preferred the latter phrase for its style and
its nuance, the fact that לֵ וֹעֵל is probably a short time,
yet could easily be longer, while the earlier edition's

idiom is lackluster. The idiom of the 1931 novel found
in (p) has been replaced by a single word encompassing the
idea and beautifying the language. Sentence (q) offers an
interesting contrast. Even though ‏האמנם?‏ can be con-
sidered more polite, a little more polished, ‏באמת?‏ , "truly?",
finds greater acceptance in the spoken realm. Since the con-
text of the sentence is speech, the second edition there-
fore makes the best selection for its idiom.

5.4. Verbs. As in the other sections, the foremost
drift of the idioms involving verbs is toward modernization.
Below listed are nineteen examples, nearly half the useful
samples of such change. The first four, (a) through (d),
are considered by the resource person not to have been im-
provements. The fifth sample (e), need not have been changed,
but loses nothing with its subsequent transformation. From
(f) on, the new novel contains the best example of Modern
Hebrew's idiomatic style.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 81	‏היגה דורשת‏	54	‏ועניין דורח ל...‏
(b) 58	‏קורות אותו נאים לופס‏	40	‏פוכה הו אל ראשו‏
(c) 100	‏העירוני רגע נבא שחוק‏	65	‏נשמחה רגיל‏
(d) 103	‏הגלף פגע רגיל‏	68	‏ועם עיני המיני.‏
(e) 126	‏אדרני פה גלו פוע לא‏	83	‏אדרני פה ולא נעו צארון‏
(f) 92	‏יא ג. ורו לף אלק‏	61	‏עניין ל. ולק‏
(g) 19	‏סגורה הייג‏	17	‏מאשן‏
(h) 88	‏חייק הגלף נשפן פיחו‏	59	‏שחוק חיק פ בקש ספיחה‏

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(j) 74	בראת שוג רוני	49	השיכה
(k) 91	בהק שאות	61	נבחק שמה
(l) 92	אין הר3וני הכם	62	מסימה
(m) 54	ט לכל· לכל· לכלי	62	אל הסבר
(n) 82	הוכיח של כל דרך שהנק	54	להוכיח של כל דרך ואל
(o) 58	אין כיכוא להגוונכת	40	אן אולך להגוונכת
(p) 115	הלכלר3· . . חרק אל חריקן	76	הלכלר מלל3· . . . אל לרבון
(q) 21	הא ולך אלנר	18	נלך כל
(r) 26	אנא לו ר. מארל מאל "בקובור"	21	וואל היינו לרבקובור·
(s) 20	הגיכ בכןני·	17	קלך הה מגל
(t) 5	אנפן ג3· 131 לר31ק	7	מנפל ג131 וקראו הקלר

The distinction between the older and newer sentences of
(a) is that difference between "required" and "forced."
The former expression makes the best sense in context.
The verb קטר of (b) stands as the most commonly used
and best choice of th two. In (c), החקה simply does not
fund currency in the language. Both idioms of (d) are
acceptable, but the one employed by the 1965 edition is more
usual and accepted. A similar situation exists in (e),
where the early edition uses a spoken idiom, and the new
selection belongs to the literary world. Here, however,
our resource person judged the two to be equal in strength.
The second idiom of (f), עיר , also has the style a
writer ought to apply. Example (g) recurs several times

through the novel, replacing an old idiom with a single verb
of high popularity. The nitpa'el form illustrated in (h) is
a more modern form, displacing its pi'el partner. We have
noticed the movement to nitpa'el before and might posit it as
a "polite" form coming into Hebrew. Sentence (j) gives another
instance of an idiom becoming a single word found commonly
in the contemporary language of Israel. Again the nitpa'el
appears, within (k). The term found in the early novel
has become most inelegant, rather like "belch" in English.
Therefore, the rewritten version employs the refined ex-
pression as it is accepted today. The single word אסיוראנ
comes in place of a longer idiom which, though nice, runs on.
We note here, in (l), and throughout the new volume, a
tendency toward terseness. On reading (m), the cry,
" /×/'ζ ," was heard from Mrs. Vlodaver's mouth. She
found the second edition's emendation a necessary one, if
only to end the awkward style originally set forth. In (n),
two interesting idioms occur. In the first instance, Kahana
changes אכ to ה×כ א, a most common expression for
"everything." She also moves to the simpler קלev' , which
fits neatly into the conversational prose of the context.
The replacement idiom of (o) manifests a less convoluted style,
and the new form found in (p) accurately pinpoints the proper
combination of words to say, "the cricket chirps." The
first word set seems to talk of the cricket's creaking or
scraping. Sentence (q) also lends two items for comment.

בא נגל , an idiom of classical texts, goes to a single
word, נגל ; גלה , which has the meaning of a back-
yard garden, is replaced by גל , the general term more
usually discovered in daily speech. Since (q) is conversation,
the changes make sense. One "becomes a doctor" with the
idiom of the newer text, in (r) above. The first idiom can
be called "supermelitzah." Also a case of melitzah, פה פרק
מאן in (s), holds a certain amount of refinement which the
example of (r) lacks. A look at (t) reveals a lexical or
semantic problem, in that צרק ought to refer to a cry
which one would make after an injury, while the idiom קורא בקול
means "calling loudly." We thereforeprefer the latter for
this sentence.

5.5. Nouns. Idioms whose foremost words are nouns
demonstrated the same progression to contemporary forms.
A sampling can be found below.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 106	הפרנסו אולד לר 3י הפני	70	יודעים מאלד אולד לד 3י רפואה
(b) 110	קלין-פנאס	72	קרניים
(c) 28	תושב הירי	22	בני ברק
(d) 17	סוככת על צליית אסל הפנאס	16	הארינו,
(e) 78	חייב הבג צחוק אחלון	51	חייבת חיק אחלון
(f) 79	מהסכלו	52	אנשיסלד
(g) 22	מיו הבגל ר	19	הקלינו

64

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(h) 53	פ'ירש יההעונ'	37	אמר בקול
(j) 125	הפוא כן	81	פישר דוור
(k) 71	ישמא הגיוrr	48	ישמע הקן נוירו
(l) 76	ענה מגוק ונעימ כשל	50	ענה מגוק עין ודן עין
(m) 53	אמרה, כ'ה הסא בחוק של נתר רוח	37	אמרת ענה והליבישת אל קניה הא בחוק של קירא רוח
(n) 123	שונית הסיגרה	80	גדן הסיגריה
(o) 110	הפוא הניא	72	עקרא הביא
(p) 99	של השביע	65	יקקוט הנה
(q) 25 ...	יקישת לגשת ...	20	לקחת כוס גו

Our resource person sees (a) through (c) as not acceptable
changes. The rest improve in the second edition. The Ob-
jection to (a)'s new version comes from the choice of מירה,
which ought to refer to a thing, and even if it does not,
the original phrasing remains a cleaner style. She likes

קוד מאשר because of its specificity. In (c), a dis-
tinction must be drawn between עיר and כרך.
A כרך is a huge city, even larger than Tel Aviv, which rules
out all Israelis as בני-כרך. Nonetheless, the phrase is still
too fancy, and the first idiom, גושה עיר, ought to be pre-
ferred. We begin now the changes for the better. Sentences
(d) and (g) illustrate new words replacing older forms. In
(e), a more complicated state of affairs crops up: A person
with חיוך הנכון, has "a ready smile." Such a smile cannot be
forced, and thus the change to חיוך comes about. Both
ותסכל and הגיב occur in Modern Hebrew with
frequency, but the latter retains greater popularity. The
same is true of (h), where אמר בקול is the preferred term today for

"honeymoon." In (j), we find an idiom whose meaning stands
vaguely as "bird," צפור כזו , changed to a specific type of
bird found in Israel as commonly as the sparrow is found in
America. The improvement in (k) involves nuances of mean-
ing. זוית lends the idea of the angle of the corner,
while קרן זוית is the corner, per se. The idiom,
עד כאן עד , in (l) passes as pure refinement of style.
Even though the two phrases in question under (m) have the
same meaning, קורת רוח is preferable today to נחת רוח , whidh
intimates its Yiddish immigrant origin in "nachas." Earlier
in this thesis, the problem of סיגריה occurred, and its
solution lies here. Our resource person recalls this word
in its meaning of "cigarette" in years gone by, but the
newer word, סיגריה , is on everyone's lips today. Further
proof exists in גבב , instead of בדל , for "cigarette
butt," because the common understanding of the idiom is in
relation to cigarettes, not cigars. In sentence (o), a
shift in meaning has taken place. בעל הבית now refers to the
owner of the house, and עקרת בית to the lady of the house.
In (p) we observe theprogression of the language. School
children once carried a ילקוט , later תיק גב ,
and today it goes by the name of תרמיל גב . Even since
1965, then, developments have brought about newer idioms
for every-day items. Two items come to our attention
in (q). The use of ליטרת 3rd works fairly well, but usually
one takes a cup of tea for himself, and does not say he

serves himself tea. In the second place, in English as well as in Hebrew, people speak of "a cup of tea, " not "the cup of tea." We find, then, that the rewritten novel makes changes which adjust to the current tongue.

5.6. Prepositional phrases. Prepositions represent the most sensitive area of any language, and a native speaker is a virtual "must" as a guide through their maze. Below can be seen many of the most interesting changes which occurred among idioms built around prepositions. Only the first example cited failed to improve the style of the novel.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 112	הארכ לתוך יותר	74	פה כניסת
(b) 97	הסירה ל... דבר אחר?	64	וסירה לא ... לא אחר?
(c) 95	מה שאני לתאר רק	63	מה שאני לתאר מכן
(d) 41	רק כמסור רגיל	30	רק לתאר כמו רגיל
(e) 70	וההר הסולימ יף.ב.לואר כתב	47	זאת תחת וזר פוליסיקה יסוד לומד
(f) 112	לא אבל ... רוח צרוף	76	לא אבל זיף הנפשת אדם
(g) 44	כך אני אמל לאמ!	32	כך אמל אלי ואפס!
(h) 37	אמא שקנו את הגבול	28	מיד שקנו את הגבולים
(j) 24	ויאה לזרא הקונה	20	ויאה הקונה לא...
(k) 17	הורה שרג פתאום לאתן רב זה	16	הורה שרג פתאום זה ראון
(l) 91	שזי ההל מקומ פלגם בלבל שיר	61	לאלי מקומ בלבל שיר

In (a), the newer idiom fits best for a thief, not for someone who is merely coming into a room. In sentence (b), הכבד refers best to things, not people. The preposition

ᚷ   has a more modern touch, anyway, and so is
preferred. For the same reason, (c)'s אנלד is more
acceptable. Also considered a better construction, אנלד
ברא כדיר of (d) finds favor over its older counterpart.
In every-day speech, one might employ the first idiom of
(e), גהו... ונאי , but as a literary idiom which also has much
popularity among Hebrew speakers, אני...לרי gains a greater
following in contemporary times. The problem presented by
(f) represents the difference between   נוי and   ראל .
The latter term is the stronger, and, in fact, אל האופי
lives as a full-fledged idiom in Modern Hebrew. (g) presents
a similar situation. In speech today, people say   אלי הופיע
because it is the idiom. The older version would come
strangely to the ears of a native. In the context of (h),
 אני'ל remains the best choice, since it states "from this
special day." Usage for אמל refers to some general time.
The preposition אל in (j) has more currency than לבוני .
Sentence (k) causes the teacher of Hebrew to ask, "the
finish of what?" The second novel, in saying, " רר לאוני , "
offers no possibility of asking the question, for it speaks
of "its end," thus pointing to some antecedent. We find an
interesting situation in (l) with regard to הדלא . The
1965 version is superior because it is sensitive to הלא 's
slipping usage. In fact, up to 1968, a letter grade of "D"
in Israeli schools was indicated by, " הלא אנסוד ." Now we
find, " ול אנסוד ," illustrating the decline of הדלא . This
word now has the meaning of "it is not," when combined with לה .

5.7. Miscellaneous expressions. Among the few idioms which were not easily classified, the same movement occurs. Forms sought to modernize themselves whenever possible.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 24	אולהל זאוגה ·ליכוג	20 ·אלהו זאוֹבנק ובן ·ליכלא
(b) 11	לאל נזמ	12	הריק הש פאס
(c) 100	סֿאו 'וב ולֿ	65	ב. לֿ . לֿ ,קٖ
(d) 115	הגיֿבק	76	לכארֿלc
(e) 111	הפֿפֿה, ואפֿקٖא	74	אלו נֿבֿה אٖוֿk
(f) 68	כٖלٖכٖ אٖۥٖ סٖۥٖ אٖۥٖ	46	אֿۥٖא סٖۥٖא אٖۥٖ
(g) 90	אٖۥٖ לٖۥٖ ?	60	אٖۥٖ אٖۥٖ לٖۥٖ ?
(h) 88 …ולٖۥٖ ולٖۥٖ ,… ולٖۥٖ אٖۥٖ	59	אٖۥٖ אٖۥٖ … ,ولٖۥٖ אٖۥٖ …
(j) 75	לٖۥٖ ۥٖ,ۥٖ	50	נٖزٖ לٖۥٖ

Sentence (a) presents some difficulties. Our respondent did not like either form, for each one is more cumbersome than the next. Alcalay points to two idioms, לٖۥٖ ٖۥٖٖ and נٖۥٖ ٖۥٖٖ , both meaning, "be so good as to."[24] The newer version certainly seems awkward in this light. In (b), either statement finds acceptance, but the early one relates best to Ashkenazim and the later one to Sephardim. The following phrases go to finer style in the 1965 edition. Even though the first idiom presents a beautiful image expressed in Jeremiah 8:18, an image of great literary strength, the second idiom of (c) retains the most popularity today. Item (d) expresses the same idea, but the first term is less literary and certainly less polite than the replacement

Kahana makes for it. Since (e) comes out of a spoken context, the newer constuction is probably better, though not as high a style as ‬בהקפס אמן‬ . In (f), the idiom of the first novel is incomplete without the **vav** which the author does not fail to add in her rewritten version. Again, a more refined literary touch comes through in the choice of ‬אה נג לסף‬ , over against the original selection of (g). In the case of (h), the first idiom actually makes the most sense, "the one. . .and the other. . ." Similarly, within (j) can be found two good posibilities for expressing the same idea, the early one polite, genteel, and the later one rather ordinary, but used often.

5.8. Conclusion. In illustrating idiomatic change, only the most basic trends have been attempted. We have learned that Kahana generally tries to update her choice of idioms, and we have examined numerous instances of idiomatic change in order to discover that fact. Clearly, we have not tried to look over every single case, but instead have viewed enough data to arrive at how the judgments were determined and why the conclusion rests as it does. Without constant repetition of changes, it is doubtful that a more precise method could be applied. Also noted implicity in the discussion of these idiom, the tension between refinement of style and popular currency plagues the mind of anyone who would judge the efficacy of two sets of phrases. The respondent who co-operated on this chapter had to balance her sense of style and her consciousness of the spoken

tongue, arriving at conclusions which have practically
no mathematical yardstick available for proper testing.
We have, therefore, relied primarily on personal, educated
opinion, and we can only hope that it demonstrates a
correct view of Modern Hebrew.

6. STYLISTIC CHANGE

6.0. If we were to examine fully every instance of
stylistic change in the novel, over one thousand sets would
fall under our scrutiny. Unlike idiomatic change, which at
least has a controllable number of phrase-pairs to deal with,
style presents an overwhelming problem. The approach we
will employ herein will involve taking a few of the main-
streams of change which run through the differences in style
of the two novels. Out of these streams, we can hopefully
learn some of the important directions Modern Hebrew's
literary works are tending towards.

6.1. Colorful prose. A good writer strives for vivid
prose. "In general, . . .it is nouns and verbs. . .that
give to good writing its toughness and color."[25] Truly,
Kahana heeds this critique of the effective writer. She
attempts to make her verbs and nouns work harder for her in
the second edition of מבוא/ת של הספר. Let us take for
example the verb which explains who speaks a given sentence,
as in, "Hello," <u>said</u> Rina. Below lie only a few of the
revisions brought about by the author in her 1965 publication.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 103	עיר דוד	68	נענר דוד
(b) 44	גקר לו	32	הביתה הכניס
(c) 57	אמרה רינה	39	קראה רינה
(d) 86	אמרה רינה	58	נגבהתה ... רינה
(e) 89	שאלה רינה	59	שטרה רינה

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(f) 89	אורת ורֵי	60	סיֵיֵש
(g) 102	אֵת 313	68	גֵעֵנ 313

The sets speak for themselves. Kahana's effort maintains
its consistency as it seeks to add a depth of texture to
formerly bland prose. The verbs she substitutes give strength
and feeling to her writing, deepen the emotion, lend color.
Similarly, the instances shown below appear to offer the
same vivacity.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 62	... זֵי על אֵת זֵרֵי...	42	... זֵי אֵת זֵי...
(b) 82	הֵו הֵפֵיז אֵיֵ בֵאֵ	55	הֵו לֵי הֵ אֵ פֵי לֵו
(c) 95	הֵו גֵהֵרֵ אֵהֵכֵבֵי	63	הֵו קֵרֵ אֵכֵבֵי

Sentence (a) gains a sense of mystery from the reformulation
of the idiom. "Fix, rivet" contains a sharpness, a power
which "look" can never hope to achieve in sentence (b). In
(c), the new word, "riddled," possesses a slightly move
pictorial effect than "torn," which has become a bit worn.
All in all, while some few stylistic changes detract from
the color of the work, most add heavily to it and increase
the efficacy of the prose.

6.2. Refinement. Certain small changes in style bring
about an improvement that good literary taste dictates.
Though other sections cover various modes of refinement, they
fall into general categories. Moreover, nothing dictates that

these changes must be a refining or improving in the style, despite their overall trend in such a direction. Therefore, we shall look now for conscious changes which bring about at least a small measure of elegance into the novel.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 105	*[Hebrew handwriting]*	69	*[Hebrew handwriting]*
(b) 6	*[Hebrew handwriting]*	7	*[Hebrew handwriting]*
(c) 119	*[Hebrew handwriting]*	78	*[Hebrew handwriting]*
(d) 67	*[Hebrew handwriting]*	46	*[Hebrew handwriting]*
(e) 32	*[Hebrew handwriting]*	24	*[Hebrew handwriting]*
(f) 32	*[Hebrew handwriting]*	24	*[Hebrew handwriting]*
(g) 55	*[Hebrew handwriting]*	38	*[Hebrew handwriting]*
(h) 41	*[Hebrew handwriting]*	30	*[Hebrew handwriting]*

Sentences (a) through (c) typify an extensive group of sentences whose parallelism fairs poorly in the original work, but comes to improvement in the later edition. Strunk and White correctly emphasize the importance of parallelism.

> Express co-ordinate ideas in similar form.
> This principle, that of parallel construction, requires that expressions similar in content and function be outwardly similar. The likeness of form enables the reader to recognize more readily the likeness of content and function.
>
> By this principle, an article or a preposition applying to all the members of a series must either be used only before the first term or else be repeated before each term. [26]

Sample (d) represents a logical refinement in the progression

of ideas, for the newer volume puts the Talmud and Bible into their historical order. Sentence (e) fails to take advantage of a hint toward the title of the novel, a failure that the 1965 work corrects. We have touched upon the sort of change in (f) before, but it may also be considered refinement in style, for <u>Barkali's</u> <u>Verb</u> <u>Table</u> prefers the substitute form, אקוֹרה .[27] In (g) above we find improvement in the strength of the statement. Again, from Strunk and White:

> <u>Put statements in positive form</u>. Make <u>definite assertions</u>. Avoid tame, color-less, hesitating, noncommital language. Use the word <u>not</u> as a means of denial or in antithesis, never as a means of evasion. [28]

Finally, sentence (h) stands as true poetic refinement. Recall the verse from Poe's "The Raven": "Came a tapping gently rapping, rapping on my chamber door." Note how the rhythm of the translation best imitates the original in the second edition by the alteration of ג' to כ·ּג' .

In sum, refinements pervade the rewritten novel, but we have noted the bulk of them in other headings than style.

6.3. Bad vs. good style. Everyone makes mistakes, but in literature, a good editor catches them. Those errors which the editor or author failed to delete from the first edition were expunged from the second. Below are cited several anomalies from 1931 with their 1965 improvements.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 60	אחר שוֹלה	41	שוֹלה

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(b) 31	היתור אלין שוא?	23	י.תסור אלין שוא?
(c) 20	היאת אייק דעני יורד?	17	האותק איני צור דעני?
(d) 27	הד הכדרין הההיר	22	אור הכדרין הההיק
(e) 52	הזק השעה הנק נשעו	37	והידק האחא הנק נשעו
(f) 120	ריסיה...., sp…… היו	78	ריסיה...., sp……ת מורד.פ
(g) 130	אל התמחוא כהנה עשן	85	אלא התמחוא כהנה עשן
(h) 82	אלק קסלונניוא	54	אלק הקלונניוא

The verb of (a) contains the idea of חזור, rendering it more than redundant. In sentence (b), a second person context exists, yet the early edition employs the third person. The use of יעור arouses curiosity in (c), and, as explained in Chapter Five, the replacement for it, צור, works best. Some may accept the metaphor הד הכדרין, יהיר, but a prim and proper editor would surely call it mixed and demand a correction, as in the new version. An "echo" cannot "illumine." In (e), no mention of a first hand appears in the original novel, but it does begin speaking about a second hand. This incongruity disappears in the rewrite. Since ריו is masculine, the first sentence of (f) must be wrong to bring in the feminine מורדת. The error is later erased. The same type of mistake occurs in (g), where אל is feminine yet possesses a masculine verb in the first place. Again we find needed change. Sentence (h) merely repeats the process, taking אלק to its feminine form in agreement with הקלונניוא. We can, in sum, observe a process of editing and correction, a concerted effort to weed out errors left in print thirty

years before.

6.4. Active vs. passive voice and v.v. "Active voice
is better than passive."[29] So enjoins Reuben Sivan, and
so agrees Batyah Kahana. Of the changes, about 63% became
active, the remainder going the opposite direction.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 108	ול הכון אל הוא	71	אוה ראה לכל
(b) 115	ושאו צבוי הואל	76	הכונות צורות

and their opposite

(c) 87	קרא אלי השם	59	ושאר קרן של השם

"The active voice is usually more direct and vigorous than
the passive. . .The habitual use of the active voice. . .
makes for forcible writing."[30] Kahana has attempted to make
the necessary changes, but only about twenty-five such word
sets exist. We cannot make broad generalizations from such
a limited sample.

6.5. Elimination of הא and יהא . Mrs. Vlodaver,
resource person on idiomatic change, pointed out that these
words do not find a large following in Modern Hebrew of the
present day. The author of הבית על הגבו has eliminated
them from her novel in over a score of sentences, thus putting
this observation to a successful test.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 54	הי פו אנכי ל	38	כי אנכי ל
(b) 22	היו שהתה הנתלק?	19	ולא שהתה הנתלק?

As a consequence of the disappearance of ‫מין‬ , sentences
like (b) above take on the shape they do. Pronominal suf-
fixes become subject pronouns quite often in the new ver-
sion of the novel, only because of the shift noted here.

6.6. Emphasis. The author restructured certain sentences
to bring about more effective emphasis. In addition, she
added some words which have the same influence on the meaning
of the phrase.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 59	‫אין בידך לעשות י.‬	40	‫אין המצב יף‬
(b) 82	‫מי עירוני הינו ים‬	55	‫מי עג הינוני מ בעלת‬
(c) 85	‫העוד י.‬	56	‫וכאן העוד י.‬
(d) 115	‫עיד רין כאן ההורגות‬	76	‫ואין ים כאלה ההורות‬

The rephrasing of (a) gives it impetus, while the addition
of ‫עג‬ and ‫בעלת‬ in (b) puts immediacy, impatience into
the thought. The ‫וכאן‬ of (c) makes the question more
probing, and the new idiom of (d) accentuates the last word
of the sentence. The research uncovered about forty changes
in emphasis, and only one or two did not strengthen the sentence
because they overworked qualifiers like ‫מאד‬ . Though Hebrew
speakers may accept qualifiers readily, English speakers ought
not to overuse them.[31] It would seem a good rule for any
language because of the diminishing returns overworked quali-
fiers give. At any rate, the bulk of changes in emphasis
moved the sentence involved to new heights.

6.7. Redundancy. One important element in any revision
of prose will always be the elimination of redundant words
and phrases. Combined with a tendency to shorten and abbre-
viate throughout the novel, ending redundancy helped bring
a refreshing pace to many sentences.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 110	שהוא כוללת רוצה / דרין ביום האיר	72	שמאה רוחם שינוי / דרין ביום האיר
(b) 37	היא רַרַת היחוד/ ומי בֿשי אתחזקירי	28	אולם הישר הירם אתחזקירי
(c) 68	כה השואנו כאלו בכלה	46	הטוענה

Sentence (a) fairs well without פהים . יחוקיר and
אתחזקיר together only restate a similar idea. The com-
plaining done in (c) could not have been done in any other
ears but the speaker's. The context of the conversation
tells us this fact, which obviates the need for בכלה .
These examples only serve to highlight a real trend toward
shorter prose, a progression made clearer in 6.8.

6.8. Terseness. The second edition of הנער ﬤ בנות contains
several thousand fewer words than its predecessor. As a
result, we can expect one of two possibilities: whole sections
are deleted from the text or sentences become significantly
shortened many times over. In truth, a few paragraphs do
disappear from the rewrite, but, for the most part, shortening
takes place on every page, in almost every sentence. Aside
from cuts which are a part of other changes noted herein, two
hundred sentences in the first half of the book lost words in
the effort to bring terseness. A few instances lie below.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(a) 61	מה הבהר ואהר אעכי, ירע	42	מה ועכי, ירע
(b) 54	כן ,וכי יהר של 14 רבוה	38	כן,יך של 14 רבוה
(c) 33	ונאצא כיפה ראא הרוע, אער כי ,וכי. הקין.	26	ורוא רבץ ראה וכי. ירבה הקין
(d) 9	והאיא ורכי!	10	הביא!
(e) 61	אוף, סקרן הסקרוע וחוחא הוור, כוד אר הקא אער היאא כוד רוך וכליד, פואריון.	42	אוף, סקרן הויוחא אוחא וכוד, רבא יבה אין 15...

Cases (a) through (d) offer an idea of the editing and
snipping done across the board in the entire work. Letter
(e) shows a certain process taking place. The author assumes
her reader knows something of the history of Israel, its
struggles and trial, and therefore deletes as she has. The
consummate example of wholesale deletion occurs below.

p. in A/	sentence	/p. in B/	sentence
(f) 62-3	הריאוע אל הצירה... . . .(3 lines of description) . . . מפאר אל הצירה פארק הול וכא של והואכבירה הרבה.	42	הריאוע אל הצירה פארק הול של, והואבירה אל הרבה.

Here the editor's pen rips like a surgeon's knife in slashing
sentences down to their leanest. The process yields the same
sense, yet stands as a terse unit: "vigorous writing is
concise."[32]

6.9. Conclusion. Taken as a whole, the style of גבורת ___
ההר ___ improved from the first edition to the second.
Changes brought terseness, color, elimination of errors, and

a more active, emphatic style. The new novel, while telling the same story in virtually the same words, reads briskly and seems to be a product of this age. That was Kahana's goal in rewriting, and she achieved it. At the same time, however, we learn that style books and manuals approve of the new format, and we should expect to find it as a general mode of approach throughout all of the ordinary Modern Hebrew literature in our time.

7. CONCLUSION

7.1. The novel _הוכל_ _על_ _בסוד_ exhibits many of
the qualities and nuances considered "good style" by experts
in Modern Hebrew. Moreover, it reveals virtually innumerable
changes which have taken place over the thirty years between
editions of the book. The study includes sufficient material
to obtain results and has been carefully connected to im-
portant source books in lexicon and style.

7.2. No writer should be expected to have a perfect grasp
of language nor to pen a novel in the style of the angels.
How much more gratifying are our results, then, when the fact
that the author in question, Batyah Kahana, stands as a minor
light in the galaxy of Modern Hebrew writers. If she has made
the changes in style, syntax, lexicon, etc., then they are
probably quite representative and not especially unique in
any respect.

7.3. Along with modernization and improvement, the novel
also exemplifies contemporary idioms and popular lexicon. The
book rides a thin line between refined, literary language and
the language of the streets. Often, Kahana chooses to wipe
out melitzah in favor of a plain, unadorned term. Sometimes
she will reach for an above average, polished word or ex-
pression. We are therefore able to learn about all types of
style from her work.

7.4. In general, however, lexical change moved toward a
more common word set, a plainer, less adorned language. A
bit of the journalistic style rubs off on the newer edition.

Such a movement has been observed in English, too, where public consumption of literary materials has its control in several mass media. Newspapers, for example, seldom write with greater than a high school vocabulary, and usually at the junior high level.[33] People become accustomed to a simpler style and enjoy it. Perhaps the same has happened in Hebrew.

7.5. Morphological change showed some movement to contractions, the Nitpa'el, and a new form of the imperative verb. The data is limited, but other source texts serve to verify many of the conclusions.

7.6. The area least fruitful in results, semantic change, offers a number of examples, but little opportunity for generalization. Highlighted by the movement of a trademark into the popular domain, the section gives only a smattering of specific words which have shifted in their meaning and have been replaced.

7.7. Syntactical changes, rich in data, give a fine indication of Modern Hebrew's direction. Verbs often go without subject pronouns, the sign of the definite direct object diminishes in frequency, and the present tense looms larger in the scheme of things. Moreover, the question words find less currency, and several other syntactical items from the first edition undergo alteration for their 1965 counterpart. In sum, outside sources seem to vindicate the changes we found, and in describing them, we have also set up a modest paradigm useful in further investigations of this type.

7.8. No abundance of duplication existed in idiomatic changes, except for the trend of נ֘ו > ק֘ > כ֘. The paper seeks to quantify the variations through the use of a resource person who categorized idioms of the 1965 novel as improved, indifferent, or worse. Samples and explanations of each type of idiom were illustrated, and we conclude that the author has updated her style, employing new expressions and bringing old ones into line with current language patterns.

7.9. In considering stylistic change, usage books stood as the guide through the maze. We learn that good Modern Hebrew style has become considerably more terse, emphasizing color and action. Refinement, correction, editing, and the elimination of older forms takes place. Many of the changes could go into a casebook for students learning how to write.

7.10 Taken as a whole, the novel and the research offer good evidence of typical changes which have occurred in the Hebrew language. The description of these changes generates models for additional study in other texts and builds a framework of reference from which to compare more literature. They give an inkling of linguistic trends and stresses currently operating on Hebrew, together with a small basis for predicting the future of the tongue. If the paper has accomplished just this much, it has been more than successful.

APPENDIX - <u>KETIV</u>

A.0. Spelling does not remain constant in either of
the two books. Therefore, the observations below
can only follow as generalizations observed through-
out the material. We do, however, receive a
fairly accurate picture of trends.

A.1. <u>Kamats katan</u>. <u>Kamats katan</u> is represented by a
<u>cholem</u> in the new edition.

אגנות) אגונות   חכמ׳פ) חכמ׳פ

A.2. <u>Cholem</u>.

A.2.1. <u>Cholem</u> chaser. A word whose vowel is a <u>cholem</u>,
but which was originally printed without that
sign, receives it in the new edition.

כתב) כתוב   לרכה) לרכותה   בקר) ביקר

A.2.2. <u>Cholem</u> and <u>vav</u>. When the vowel and the consonant
appear together, the vowel is fully pointed
in the new edition.   לרחוב) לרחווב

A.3. <u>Kibuts</u>. A word whose vowel is a <u>kibuts</u>, but which
was originally printed without that sign, receives
it in the new edition as a <u>shurek</u>.

המשגה) המשוגה   מאחר) מאוחר

A.4. <u>Shurek</u>.

A.4.1. Possible confusion. Possible confusion between
<u>shurek</u> and <u>cholem</u> finds rectification through
<u>male'</u> print.   קלנוניא) קלנוניא

A.4.2. _Shurek_ and _vav_. When the letter _vav_ appears twice,
once as _shurek_ and once as a consonant, the vowel is
fully pointed in the new edition.

אבויג׳ > אבויג׳   ל׳יו > ל׳יו

A.5. Consonantal _vav_. Consonantal _vav_ usually appears
in the new edition doubled, except before or after
a _cholem_ or _shurek_, as in A.4.2.

חוור׳ל > חור׳ל   הגווזת > הגוזת

A.6. _Yod._

A.6.1. Duals. All dual endings are formed with two of
the letter _yod_. · רגל׳׳ם > רגל׳ם   כנב׳׳ם > כנב׳ם

A.6.2. Consonantal _yod_. _Yod_ the consonant, when it is in
the midst of a word, is doubled.

והג׳הם > הג׳הם   סב׳׳ר > סב׳ר   אב׳׳ן > אב׳ן

A.6.3. _Yod_ as a _mater lectionis_. _Yod_ is usually used as
a _mater lectionis_ for _chirek_ and sometimes for _tsere_.

פריעל > פריעל   והע׳ל > הע׳ל   לניכם > לנכם   כפל׳ > כפל׳

A.7. Conclusion. Though not all-inclusive by any means, the
above listed changes represent the major direction
ketiv travelled between the two editions of הברכ/ות
המבכ. Since irregularities are present,
we must be satisfied with only limited results.

FOOTNOTES

1. pp. 133-4. ‏קורס, י׳ סבוקין הסורו הטבריג בטורג המחרון.‏

2. <u>ibid</u>. p. 134

3. ‏ע"ו, ח"י. פרקי ת"ג וספרות. p. 153‏

4. ‏ריקן, 'קקי. לות הברן פ׳ הכלמ.‏ pp. 32

5. ‏סיון, ריאון. לסיקון פסרי ולדעון.‏ p. 312

6. <u>ibid</u>., p. 285

7. Alcalay, Reuben. <u>The Complete Hebrew-English Dictionary</u>.
   p. 635.

8. <u>ibid</u>., p. 2019

9. <u>ibid</u>., p. 410

10. <u>ibid</u>., p. 2109

11. ‏אבן-שושן, אלמן החדש.‏ p. 703

12. ‏ס"ון‏ , <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 68-9

13. <u>ibid</u>., p. 198

14. Warriner, John E. and Griffith, Francis. <u>English</u>
    <u>Grammar and Composition</u>. pp. 15-16

15. Strunk, William, Jr. and White, E.B. <u>The Elements of</u>
    <u>Style</u>. p. ix

16. Warriner, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 257

footnotes, continued.

17.　　　/''·ο　　　, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., pp. 39-40

18.　　　ן31　　　· 'ι∂3ιא,ן∩ ן הηρ', Ćηη , p. 179

19.　　　/''ο　　　, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 73

20. <u>ibid</u>., p. 235

21. Vlodaver, Mrs. Zeev.　Interview.

22.　　　/''ο　　, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 69.

23.　　ן∩ ן Ćηη , <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 82

24. Alcalay, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 897

25. Strunk, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., pp. 57-8

26. <u>ibid</u>., pp. 20-1

27.　　　'√ןηη , <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 29

28. Strunk, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 14

29.　　/''ο , <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 228

30. Strunk, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 13

31. <u>ibid</u>., p. 59

footnotes, continued

32. _ibid._, p. 17

33. Chucker, Harold. Interview.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS - English or Hebrew with English title appended

1. Alcalay, Reuben. The Complete Hebrew-English Dictionary.
    Hartford, Prayer Book Press, 1965.

2. Balgur, Raphael. The Basic Word List for Elementary
    Schools. Ramat Gan, Otsar Hamoreh, 1968.

3. Pei, Mario. Glossary of Linguistic Terminology.
    Garden City, Doubleday Anchor, 1966.

4. Sivan, Reuben. Better Hebrew Usage.(‏לשון טובה ספר‏ ‏לקסיקון‏)
    Tel Aviv, Karni, 1969.

5. Strunk, William Jr. and White, E.B. The Elements of
    Style. New York, MacMillan, 1970.

6. Warriner, John E. and Griffith, Francis. English
    Grammar and Composition. New York; Harcourt,
    Brace, and World; 1957.

BOOKS - Hebrew

7.   ‏אלכ-בונדי, אברהם. אלפי מלון חדש. ירושלים, קרית ספר, 1951‏

8.   ‏בסה, יעקב ‏†‏ רון ,מורי. 31 קן על אלכ-אביה, הקיבות ‏†‏ המאוחדת,1960‏

9.   ‏ברקי, חייך. תות הספר הדסית. ירושלים, דוין ומ‏ ‏ כן, 1966‏

10.   ‏כהנמן, נתיה. עברות הדבור על אלכביה, הרל ‏†‏ בן, 1931‏

11.   ‏פנקל, נתיה. עברות הדבר על אלכביה, מוסד, 1965‏

12.   ‏קרופ, ‏ ‏ לכסיקון הספות העברית הדרוא והחדונות, ‏ ‏ כרך א‏
      ‏רחמים, הוצאת הקיבות הלכם! ומאוד לצר, 1967‏

13.   ‏רוזין, חיים. התחדות לשון. על אלכביה, ‏ ‏ עד אואר, 1956‏

14.   ‏ר‏ ‏בין,אביך. אלכ ‏ ‏ לשון המדברת. ירושלים, דכיר חברת דיון
      ‏יותבן, 1835‏

15.   ‏חיים ויזל (WEINER) פרא, תורה ‏ ‏ חכמה ומוסר. ירושלים, קרית ספר,
      ‏1960‏

Bibliography, continued.

ARTICLES

16.   אירקין, ל'פאר. "סיביה". מאמר הלשון וערכיו ובני זקוקרת. (תחנון) כרך קלון, עמ' 20,
        תל אביב, 1946-7, pp. 325-84)

17. Weinberg, Werner.   מאמר מאיר - איון" ב"ק אגבד אבני הלשון.
        Cincinnati, in unpublished form, 1971.

INTERVIEWS

18. Chucker, Harold. Editorial Editor of Minneapolis Star.
        Minneapolis, July 28, 1970.

19. Vlodaver, Mrs. Zeev. College-educated (Tel Aviv Uni-
        versity and Tel Aviv Teacher's College) resource
        person. 2040 Montreal Av., St. Paul, Mn., 1972.