

## REAL AND IMAGINARY RESIDUAL INFLUENCES OF BIBLICAL HEBREW ON MODERN HEBREW GRAMMAR

Стаття присвячена проблемі взаємовідношень між сучасним івритом і біблійною гебрайською мовою. Конкретніше, у ній розглядається питання про реальні та позірні залишкові сліди впливу мови Біблії на граматику сучасного івриту.

Ключові слова: Біблія, сучасний іврит, гебрайська мова, грамика.

### Introductory Remarks

1. It is well known that Hebrew writers in the generation of the revival of Hebrew, as well as other revivalists (teachers, writers and authors of grammar books), based Modern Hebrew on Biblical Hebrew grammar. However, they did not entirely disregard the grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew. Modern Hebrew's special affinity to Biblical Hebrew is apparent in its morphology. For example, Modern Hebrew uses the *Hitpa'el* / הִתְפַּעֵל stem as the reflexive of the *Pf'el* / פִּעַל stem, as in Biblical Hebrew, but not the Mishnaic Hebrew variant *Nitpa'al* / נִתְפַּעֵל. Here too, in Modern Hebrew the second radical is vocalized primarily by the vowel [e] in the last syllable: *hitpa'el* / הִתְפַּעֵל and not *hitpa'al* / הִתְפַּעֵל with [a], even though both variants are used in Biblical Hebrew.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, when *Nitpa'al* / נִתְפַּעֵל forms were introduced into the language, whether in literature, speech or school textbooks, the second radical was vocalized with [e]; for example the verb *Nitbakeš* / נִתְבַּקֵּשׁ ('he was asked'). This appears already in the orthography and the vocalization of the printed editions of the Mishnah.<sup>2</sup>

2. Another example of this phenomenon is the plural morpheme. Modern Hebrew uses the masculine plural suffix *-im* for the participle of all verbal stems and for nouns. This form, which is characteristic of Biblical Hebrew<sup>3</sup>, was preferred over the suffix *-in* that was very common in Mishnaic Hebrew<sup>4</sup>. Almost no one today uses the Mishnaic Hebrew forms *mon-in* / מוֹנִין ('they count'), *ṣarab-in* / עֶרְבִין ('evenings'). Instead the plural forms *mon-im* / מוֹנִים, *ṣarab-im* / עֶרְבִים are used with the Biblical Hebrew suffix. This is interesting because the participle *mon-im* does not appear in the Bible. Nor does the plural of the noun *ṣereb* / עֶרֶב ('evening'): *ṣarab-im* appear in the Bible. Nonetheless, the suffix *-in* does occur in Modern Hebrew in a few words. It occurs, for example, in the nouns *nissu'-in* / נִשְׂוִין ('marriage') and *geruṣ-in* / גְּרוּשִׁין ('divorce'). This suffix also occurs in the adverbs *b<sup>e</sup>-mešar-in* / בְּמִישָׁרִין ('directly') and *ba-ṣarab-in* / בְּעִקְרִין ('indirectly'). In this case, the suffix is not perceived to be

<sup>1</sup> This paper was delivered as the opening address to the Scholion Research Group conference on the Emergence of Modern Hebrew that took place on July 4, 2016 in Hebrew University, Jerusalem. For example *ve-hithallek* / וְהִתְהַלַּךְ (Exodus 21, 19) and *hithazzaq* / הִתְהַזְקָה (Chronicles II 13, 7). School textbooks played an important role in establishing the preference of *Hitpa'el* over *Hitpa'al*.

<sup>2</sup> See Yalon 1964. pp. 16-17.

<sup>3</sup> The morpheme *-in* appears in the Bible in a few nouns, mostly in biblical books influenced by Aramaic. For example *mill-in* / מִלִּין ('words', Job 12, 11; 15, 13 etc.). See Bar-Asher 2009 Vol. I pp. 115-116, footnotes 49-51.

<sup>4</sup> Of course, the morpheme *-im* was also common in Mishnaic Hebrew. However, the morpheme *-in* is perceived, justifiably or no, to be a distinguishing feature of Mishnaic Hebrew as opposed to Biblical Hebrew.

the plural morpheme. This suffix also occurs in the word *modi<sup>s</sup>-in* / מודיעין where it is used not only as a toponym but also as an office name or to indicate the information booth at the entrance of an institution. Hebrew speakers perceive this word to be in the singular such as this example that appeared in a newspaper article: *ha-modi<sup>s</sup>-in bi-sde ha-t<sup>s</sup>uḇa šel Tel-Aviv hu ya<sup>s</sup>il* ('the information [service] at Tel-Aviv airport is efficient').

3. It is interesting to note that much of the legacy of Biblical Hebrew morphology rejected by Mishnaic Hebrew is also absent from Modern Hebrew. For example, the modal forms of the verb have entirely vanished from standard Modern Hebrew. These are the cohortative form, for example *niḇ<sup>s</sup>la* / נִבְעָלָה, and the jussive form, for example *taqem* / תִּקַּם, *ya'al* / יַעַל. Similarly, the inverted forms are not used in Modern Hebrew — *wa-yiḇ<sup>s</sup>al* / וַיִּבְעַל, *u-ḇa<sup>s</sup>alti* / וַבְּעַלְתִּי. There are many additional examples of Biblical Hebrew grammatical forms absent from both Mishnaic Hebrew and from Modern Hebrew.

4. Certain elements of Biblical Hebrew morphology that are generally absent from Modern Hebrew were nevertheless used in poetry and songs, especially during the first half of the twentieth century. These include the inverted verbal forms, the modal forms of the verb and the locative *He: ha-hara(h)* / הַהָרָה ('to the mountain'), *ha-negba(h)* / הַנֶּגְבָה ('to the south'). These genres also made use of the pausal forms of the nominal pattern *pe<sup>s</sup>el* / פְּעֵל. Nouns of this pattern, such as *'ereḥ* / עֶרֶב, etc. were vocalized in syntactic pause positions as *'ereḥ* / עֶרֶב, etc. Even so, this linguistic feature has become rarer in the past two generations. One reason for this is that poets and songwriters of the past two generations seem to lack affinity to the literary language. They prefer to adapt dominant speech patterns from the spoken language in their compositions.

#### Remains, Traces and Imitations of Biblical Hebrew Grammar

5. Nevertheless, an examination of written and spoken Hebrew shows that there remain in the margins of the language a number of Biblical Hebrew features that are absent from Mishnaic Hebrew and from standard Modern Hebrew. These features are remains or splinters of Biblical Hebrew that remained from the *Haskalah* (enlightenment) period, from the period of the revival of spoken Hebrew and from poetry and songs. Some of these features are only apparent traces of Biblical Hebrew. However, some of these features are deliberate imitations of Biblical Hebrew grammar. At times, this was done either in order to impart a higher, more literary air to the expression while at other times it was done in jest or to ridicule<sup>5</sup>.

6. This study is based on the collection of data over the course of decades. This includes many hundreds of statements from the written and spoken language. I did not base this study on statements from very learned people who are familiar with Classical Hebrew nor from speakers unfamiliar with this level of Hebrew, even though I documented their language also. The data for this study comes from the writing of educated journalists and from academic writing in journals and books. The data also includes examples from the spoken language of high school and university graduates. Many of the informants are teachers, physicians, engineers and attorneys. Some of the informants are public figures who know Hebrew very well. Some of these latter informants use ridiculous language. It is possible to learn from them about deviations

5 Ze'ev Ben-Hayyim wrote on this over sixty years ago in his famous paper *an Ancient Language in a New Reality*. «Take for example pausal forms. These forms are not in use in our living language; when one occasionally encounters them in poetry they are outdated; [...]; the use of these forms in Modern Hebrew is infuriating and is used only to ridicule or in imitation» (Ben-Hayyim, 1992, p. 42).

from the norm and not only errors. Naturally, I will only present a small portion of the data collected over the past decades.

7. My main intention in this study is to deal with a number of morphological categories characteristic of Biblical Hebrew grammar that are attested in the margins of Modern Hebrew. Some of these categories are indeed Biblical Hebrew forms while others are imagined or only apparent forms reminiscent of actual Biblical Hebrew forms. I have identified more than ten such categories but I will only deal here with six categories that have a great deal of data from which it is possible to make well-founded deductions. Perhaps it will be possible in the future to add additional categories of real and apparent forms of Biblical Hebrew grammar that come to light in the written and spoken Hebrew of recent decades.

#### The *Pa'ol* / פִּעֵל Pattern of the Verb

8. When referring to traces of biblical Hebrew grammar I mean grammatical categories that have completely disappeared from the language, save for one or two surviving forms. Such an example would be the widely used form *qaṭonti* / קִטַּנְתִּי. The root *q.t.n* / קִט is not used in the Qal stem in Modern Hebrew. In addition, the inflectional pattern of *pa'ol* / פִּעֵל in the past tense of the Qal stem has almost completely disappeared. Indeed, the complete paradigm of the root *pa'ol* in the Qal stem is not used in Modern Hebrew. Only the past tense first person singular form *qaṭonti* is in use. Its source is the biblical verse *qaṭonti mikkol ha-ḥasad-im u-mikkol ha-<sup>a</sup>met <sup>a</sup>šer ṣasita ṣim ṣabde-ka* ('I am not worthy of the least of all the mercies, and of all the truth, that thou hast shewed unto thy servant', Genesis 32, 11). Learned speakers introduced this usage into Modern Hebrew in the early period of the revival of spoken Hebrew. This verb acts like any other idiom, retaining its form. Moreover, in Modern Hebrew this form at times expresses genuine humility, but sometimes expresses insincere humility. It should be noted that in Modern Hebrew periphrastic expressions with the root *q.t.n* are more common than the verb *qaṭon*. For example, *na<sup>a</sup>sa qaṭan* / נִעְשָׂה קָטָן ('to become small') expresses becoming physically small and *hiqṭin 'et ṣatmo* / הִקְטִינוּ אֶת עֲצָמוֹ ('to make oneself small') expresses real or insincere humility.

9. Verbal forms in this pattern exist only in the standard language only in the verb - *yaḳol*: *yaḳolti*, *yaḳolta* / יִכְלֹתִי, יִכְלֹתְךָ etc., 'I could, you could' etc.). While educated speakers well versed in Hebrew do use them, these forms, compete, with a limited degree of success, with the more common pattern *yaḳalti*, *yaḳalta* etc with the vowel [a] in the second syllable. The past tense third person is used mainly as a compound verb *haya yaḳol* / הָיָה יָכוֹל ('he could') instead of the form *yaḳol* / יָכַל, which is identical in pronunciation with the participle *yaḳol* / יָכוֹל. Similarly, many speakers use the expression *<sup>a</sup>šer yaḡorti* / וְאֲשֶׁר יִגְרַתִּי based on the biblical verse *va-<sup>a</sup>šer yaḡorti yaḡo(ʿ) l-i* / וְאֲשֶׁר יִגְרַתִּי יָבֵא לִי ('and that which I was afraid of is come unto me', Job 3, 25). The expression *<sup>a</sup>šer yaḡorti* is often used in a more extended form, closer to the wording of the verse from Job.

10. In summation, a complete and systematic paradigm of the inflectional pattern *pa'ol* exists only for the verb *yaḳol*, and then only in the standard language. However, learned speakers in previous generations borrowed the form *qaṭonti* and the expression *<sup>a</sup>šer yaḡorti ḥa(ʿ) l-i* from the Bible. Contemporary speakers of Modern Hebrew use these expressions as idioms that belong to their linguistic heritage, even when they are not aware of their origins. The verbs do not exist in other grammatical persons. Hence, forms such as *qaṭonta*, *q<sup>e</sup>ṭontem* or *yaḡorta*, *yaḡornu* do not exist in Modern Hebrew.

#### *Pa'el* / פִּעֵל Pausal Forms

11. A characteristic feature of Biblical Hebrew grammar is the existence of *Pa'el* /

לְעַלְּ forms in pause that alternate with *Pe'el* / פֻּעַל contextual forms. I have shown elsewhere that while this feature had already disappeared from Mishnaic Hebrew, there are occasional examples of pausal forms in the vocalized manuscripts of the Mishnah, not necessarily in syntactic pause positions <sup>6</sup>. a tradition exists of feminine participial forms with *qamats*/ קָמֶץ such as *to'amet* / טוֹעֵמָה, *maspeqet* / מַסְפֵּקֶת, *mab'etet* / מַבְעֵטֶת as Ariel Gabbay has recently shown in an interesting study <sup>7</sup>. I wish to deal now with the *Pa'el* form.

12. I have already mentioned that Modern Hebrew follows Mishnaic Hebrew in this category. I indeed know some speakers, some who speak very flowery Hebrew or some eccentric speakers, who use *Pa'el* pausal forms in their speech. For example, I documented one speaker who said *matay ba(')ta min ha-darek?* / מַתֵּי בָאתָ מִן הַדֶּרֶךְ? ('When did you come from the way?'). One speaker mockingly said of someone *hu pašat 'et ha-ragel* ('He went bankrupt.'). However, my intention is not to point out the usage of flowery or eccentric speakers but rather to describe *Pa'el* pausal forms in spoken Hebrew <sup>8</sup>. Modern Hebrew includes at least two traces of this kind, one real and one apparent.

13. A real trace of the use of *Pa'el* pausal forms is the pronunciation of the *nomen rectum* in the expression *'abodat parek* / עֲבוּדַת פְּרֶק ('oppressive work'). I have documented this pronunciation over one hundred times in the past few years. Only four informants gave the pronunciation *'abodat pereḵ* / עֲבוּדַת פֶּרֶךְ. The expression *'abodat pareḵ* does not occur in the Bible but the expression is based on the verbs *he'ebid* / הִעֲבִיד ('to make someone work') and *'abad* / עָבַד ('to work') in two verses that came together with the noun *'aboda(h)* / עֲבוּדָה ('work'). These verses are *va-ya'ebidu Mitsrayim 'et b'ney Isra'el b'e-ḡarek* ('And the Egyptians made the children of Israel to serve with rigour' Exodus 1, 13) and *'ašer 'abdu ba-hem b'e-ḡarek* (they made them serve, was with rigour') <sup>9</sup>.

14. In addition to these two verses, another factor contributed to the coining of the phrase *'abodat pareḵ*. That is the fact that the noun *pareḵ* appears six times in the Bible but only once in the context form: *lo yirdennu b'ḡarek l'-eneka* ('and the other shall not rule with rigour over him in thy sight' Leviticus 25, 53). The other five occurrences are in pause. In addition to the two aforementioned occurrences from Exodus, this word occurs two more times in the Pentateuch: *lo tirde bo b'e-ḡarek* ('you shall not rule over him with rigour' Leviticus ibid. 43, 46); and once more in the Prophets: *r'ditem 'otam b'e-ḡarek* ('with cruelty have ye ruled them' Ezekiel 34, 4) <sup>10</sup>. It is also quite possible that the abundant distribution of the form *ḡarek* contributed to the preference of the biblical vocalization in the phrase *'abodat pareḵ* <sup>11</sup>.

15. Throughout the generations, the context form was used even in pause. Here are some examples: *ts'raru-m b'e-ḡarek* / צָרְרִים בְּפֶרֶךְ (Yose ben Yose, *Eshad b'e-ma'as-*

<sup>6</sup> See Bar-Asher 2015, p. 403 §0.2, p. 452 §0.1.

<sup>7</sup> See Gabbay 2015, p. 96.

<sup>8</sup> One of my friends from Yeshiva high school, the late Yosef Yohai (Yohimak), was in the habit of using pausal forms as part of his normal speech. Unfortunately, he fell in the Battle for the Liberation of Jerusalem in the Six Day War two days before his intended wedding. When I invoke his memory, I mention this speech pattern of his. My dear friend Yosef Yohai was neither a speaker of flowery Hebrew nor an eccentric. His speech included other biblical features, which included the use of pausal forms.

<sup>9</sup> It should be noted that the noun *'aboda* occurs three times in this verse. The one who coined this phrase surely took notice of that.

<sup>10</sup> Four of these five occurrences are verse-final and one occurrence is in mid-verse (Leviticus 25, 43) but is accentuated with an *etnahta*.

<sup>11</sup> Ben-Hayyim 1992, p. 42, made a similar comment concerning the form *'abodat pareḵ*. See above note 5.



ay, vocalization according to MS Oxford 1035 and the Worms Maḥzor) <sup>12</sup>, and also *u-mi-perek el perek* אֶל פֶּרֶק וּמִפֶּרֶק / (from the dirge נִפְשׁ יְדִידוֹת וְנֶפֶשׁ for the morning service on the ninth day of Ab in the Sephardic rite) <sup>13</sup>. The form *perek* was also used when this noun occurred in the same context with the noun *‘aboda*, for example *‘abodat-i b’e-morek, ha-yom kemo b’e-perek* / יוֹם כְּמוֹ בְּפֶרֶק, הַיּוֹם כְּמוֹ בְּפֶרֶק (Yotser for the Sabbath preceding the ninth day of Ab in the Italian Maḥzor of S. D. Luzzatto, Vol. I page 164b) <sup>15</sup>.

16. The expression *‘abodat perek* already appears in the liturgical poetry of Yannai: *b-imey Moshe ba’ela ‘abodat perek* / בְּיַמֵּי מֹשֶׁה בְּטִלְהָ עֲבוֹדַת פֶּרֶק (Ezkerā yamim ‘im yamim) <sup>16</sup> although without witness to its vocalization. However, this phrase appears in an early textual witness (probably from the late eighth century or the early ninth century at the latest) with an alternate version of the *nomen regens* and the *nomen rectum* vocalized, but not in the pausal form <sup>17</sup>: *‘abdut perek* / עֲבֻדוֹת פֶּרֶק (MS Oxford D55 p. 6) <sup>18</sup>.

17. The Ben-Yehuda dictionary gives *perek* as the first vocalized form and *parek* as the secondary form. The lexical section brings the phrase *‘aboda b’e-perek* / בְּפֶרֶק בְּעֹבֹדָה but does not list the phrase *‘abodat parek*. However, most new dictionaries do list this phrase, vocalized as *‘abodat perek*. This vocalization appears in Gur’s dictionary, Medan’s dictionary *Me’alef ‘ad Tav*, the dictionaries of Kena’ani and Even-Shoshan, as well as in the more recent *Millon ha-Hove* and *Rav-Milim*. These dictionaries intentionally disregard the contemporary pronunciation. Clearly, the lexicographers who compiled these dictionaries acted in this way because pausal forms such as *parek* do not exist in Modern Hebrew. It should be noted that the pronunciation *‘abodat perek* is used in the Hebrew component of the Yiddish language <sup>19</sup>. It is quite possible that the Yiddish form influenced the lexicographers who were familiar with the phrase from their mother tongue. On the other hand, Sappir dictionary gives two alternative forms of this phrase: *‘abodat perek (parek)*. It is not known when the pronunciation *‘abodat parek* came into general use but it is the more common usage in Modern Hebrew.

18. The other phrase whose affinity to the Bible is more imaginary than real is *‘En Karem* / עֵין כָּרֶם — the name of both the neighborhood and the hospital. The official Hebrew name that was coined for the Arab village east of Jerusalem from whence a spring flowed was *‘En Kerem* / עֵין כְּרֶם. This is also the name of the adjoining hospital — *Hadaska ‘En Kerem* / הַדָּסָה עֵין כְּרֶם. Over the past five years, I documented the pronunciation of this name. Of the more than one hundred times that I heard this name, the speakers used the form *‘En Kerem* fewer than ten times. The overwhelming majority said *‘En Karem*.

<sup>12</sup> I wish to thank Ya’akov Etzion for these references.

<sup>13</sup> This vocalization appears in the books of dirges for the ninth day of Ab both in the Western and Oriental rites. I have also heard this reading from reliable informants from the Levant and from the Maghreb.

<sup>14</sup> The word *perek* is vocalized thus even though it occurs at the end of the line in a primary pause position.

<sup>15</sup> These three final examples appear in Ben-Yehuda’s Dictionary, p. 5185.

<sup>16</sup> This example was taken from the Online Database of the Historical Dictionary Project of the Hebrew Language, The Academy of the Hebrew Language.

<sup>17</sup> The manuscript is vocalized with Palestinian vocalization. I changed the Palestinian vowel marks to Tiberian vowel marks.

<sup>18</sup> I wish to thank Ya’akov Etzion for this reference as well.

<sup>19</sup> Weinreich’s dictionary gives this transcription: *AVOYDES PE’REKH*. Niborski’s dictionary gives the transcription in Hebrew letters: אַװײַדספּע־רעך. Stutchkoff dictionary, p. 433 vocalizes the word *perek* / פֶּרֶק with segol.

19. The pausal form *karem* appears in the Bible in all seven occurrences of the word *kerem* in primary pause position (accentuated with *'etnahta* or at the end of a verse). Here are examples of the word *Karem* in pause: *va-yitta' karem* / כָּרֶם וַיִּטֵּעַ (‘and he planted a vineyard’, Genesis 9, 20)<sup>20</sup>. Even so, it is clear to me that the pronunciation *'En Karem* does not originate with the Bible. Many of Jerusalem’s neighborhoods had Arabic names. Whether these neighborhoods had been part of the city in the past, or had been adjacent villages, the Arabic names remained, even when the authorities gave them Hebrew names. The *Bet Safafa* neighborhood retains the name of the previous Arab village. The *Malha* neighborhood, previously an Arab village, retains its name despite having had its name changed officially by the authorities to *Manahat*. The name *Manahat* was given to the neighborhood in order to restore the biblical name to its former glory<sup>21</sup>. However, this name appears only on professional maps, and then beside the name *Malha* (with one of the names in parentheses). The neighborhood lying on the boundary between East and West Jerusalem is still known as *Musrara*. Few use the Hebrew name *Morasha*. The Hebrew name is used for the most part by the current or former residents who equate the Arabic name with a neighborhood having a concentration of problematic families.

20. The village of *'En Karem* was fortunate that the Hebrew name of the Jerusalem neighborhood is almost identical to the original Arabic name — *'En Karm*. The two elements of its name both have Hebrew equivalents of almost similar pronunciation. Hebraized toponyms do not lose their affinity to the original Arabic name. Hebrew speakers pronounced the Arabic noun *'En* like its Hebrew equivalent — *'En*. The noun *Karm* has the vowel [a] after the initial consonant. Hebrew speakers also pronounced the Hebrew equivalent with the vowel [a] after the initial consonant *kaf*. This produced the pronunciation *Karem* that is in most respects similar to its Arabic equivalent. This Hebraized form successfully supplanted the Arabic toponym. However, the pronunciation of the form *Karem*, which can seemingly be attributed to the influence of Biblical Hebrew, does not bear any real affinity to the Bible. Few speakers have trained themselves to say *'En Kerem* instead of the pausal form *'En Karem*.

### Locative *He*

21. One of the ancient remnants of case endings in the Bible is the suffix [a] that indicates direction. Examples of this form, called locative *He* or *He* of direction in some grammar books, are *ha-šamayma(h)* / הַשָּׁמַיְמָה (‘to heaven’, Genesis 28, 12), *yamma(h) va-qedma(h) ve-tsaḥona(h) va-negba(h)* / יָמָה וְקִדְמָה וְצָפוֹנָה וְנִגְבָּה (‘to the west and to the east and to the north and to the south’, *ibid.* 14). When this form is added to a noun in a construct phrase, the suffix [a] is added to the *nomen regens*, as in *artsa(h) Kēna'an* / אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן (‘into the land of Canaan’, Genesis 12, 5), *b'e'era(h) šab'a'* / בְּאֶרֶץ שְׁבַע (‘to Beersheba’, Genesis 46, 1).

22. However, already in the Biblical books of the First Temple period the locative *He* was weakened. I will point out some examples of this phenomenon. (A) At times the locative *He* did not express direction. Of course, in many cases the word *šamma(h)* / שָׁמָּה meant ‘thither’ and thus did express direction. For example *la-nus šamma(h)* / לָנוּס שָׁמָּה (‘to escape thither’, Genesis 19, 20), *min ha-šamm-im 'ašer nafotsu šamma(h)* / מִן הָעַמִּים אֲשֶׁר נִפְצְוּ שָׁמָּה (‘from the people whither they were scattered’, Ezekiel 29, 13). However, there are examples of *šamma(h)* meaning only ‘there’, where the suffixed locative *He* has no function. For example *va-yebk šamma(h)* / וַיִּבְךְּ

<sup>20</sup> The noun כָּרֶם occurs at the end of the verse.

<sup>21</sup> *Va-yaglum 'el Manahat* / וַיִּגְלוּם אֶל מְנַחַת (‘and they removed them to Manahath’, I Chronicles 8, 6).

וַיִּשְׁכְּבוּ שָׁמָּה (‘and he wept there’, Genesis 43, 30), *va-yiškəbu šamma(h)* / וַיִּשְׁכְּבוּ שָׁמָּה (‘and they lodged there’ Joshua 2, 1). Similarly, the word *tsāḇona* / צָפוֹנָה means ‘north’ and not ‘to the north’, as in the verse *‘el ha-tsaḇona(h)* / אֶל-הַצְּפוֹנָה (‘toward the north’ Ezekiel 8, 14). In other cases the particle *l/ל* (‘to’) was added to a word with locative *He*, as in the verse *la-tsaḇona(h)*, *la-negba(h)* / לַצְּפוֹנָה, לַנִּגְבָּה (‘northward, southward’, I Chronicles 26, 17)<sup>22</sup>. (B) In other cases particles are prefixed to nouns with locative *He* which did not indicate direction. For example, *ba-negba(h)* / בַּנִּגְבָּה means ‘in the south’ (Joshua 15, 21) and *mi-tsaḇona(h)* / מִצְּפוֹנָה means ‘from the north’ (*ibid.* verse 10). In short, many of the examples cited here show that words with locative *He* were often perceived as alternative forms to the basic forms without this suffix.

23. The process of the disappearance of locative *He* is apparent in Mishnaic Hebrew. In the nouns where locative *He* survived it is a redundant morpheme. For example, in the words *l<sup>e</sup>-ma<sup>l</sup>lan* / לַמַּעֲלָן (<*l<sup>e</sup>-ma<sup>l</sup>la(h)* / לַמַּעֲלָה ‘upward’) and *l<sup>e</sup>-maṭṭan* / לַמַּטָּן (<*l<sup>e</sup>-maṭṭa(h)* / לַמַּטָּה ‘downward’). Some textual witnesses of the Mishnah read the word *ḥutsa(h)* / הוֹצָא, especially in the phrase *ḥutsa(h) la-‘arets* / הוֹצָא לְאֶרֶץ (‘outside the Land [of Israel]’ Terumot 1, 5), *l<sup>e</sup>-ḥutsa(h) la-‘arets* / לְהוֹצָא לְאֶרֶץ (‘out of the Land [of Israel]’ Shevi‘it 6, 5 - 2x)<sup>23</sup>. Indeed, even in modern Hebrew the locative *He* is almost never used. We say *hem nos<sup>e</sup>im l-Irushalayim* not *Yrušalayima(h)*.

24. Even so, there are still regular and irregular uses of locative *He* in Modern Hebrew. I will first mention the regular use. We still might hear *hu ‘ala ‘artsa(h)* / הוּא עָלָה אֶרֶץ (‘He immigrated to Israel’). (When someone says that he is going home, whether young or old, he says *‘ani holek ha-bayta(h)* / אָנִי הוֹלֵךְ הַבַּיְתָה (‘I am going home’). Similarly, many residents of Jerusalem neighborhoods of the previous generation would say *‘ani holek ha-‘ira(h)* / אָנִי הוֹלֵךְ הָעִירָה (‘I am going to [the center of] town.’) instead of *‘ani holek la-‘ir* / אָנִי הוֹלֵךְ לְעִיר. Locative *He* is also regularly used when indicating direction of movement: *yamina(h)*, *s<sup>e</sup>mola(h)*, *qadima(h)*, *‘aḥora(h)* / יְמִינָה, שְׂמֹאלָה, קְדִימָה, אַחֲוָרָה (‘right, left, forth, back’). These words are in common use in written and spoken Hebrew, not only in military drills or in youth movements. Folk dancers in the first half of the twentieth century commonly sang these words as the chorus of songs while dancing — *y<sup>e</sup>mina(h)* *y<sup>e</sup>mina(h)*, *s<sup>e</sup>mola(h)* *s<sup>e</sup>mol*, *l<sup>e</sup>-ḥan-im ‘aḥora(h)* / יְמִינָה. קְדִימָה אַחֲוָרָה. In this chorus, the adverb *l<sup>e</sup>-ḥan-im* took the place of *qadima(h)*. These two variants are common, not only in the spoken language. One hears the statement *yatsati ha-ḥutsa(h)* / יָצְאתִי הַחוּצָה (‘I went outside’). The use of the opposite expression, *p<sup>e</sup>nima(h)* / פְּנִימָה (‘inside’), is also quite common.

25. I wish to comment on most of the above examples. The sense of the word *ha-‘ira(h)* / הָעִירָה in the expressions *‘ani holek ha-‘ira(h)* has changed. Those who used this expression meant “going to the center of town”, not to the town itself. Similarly, Asher Reich’s poem *Bridge over the Yarkon* appeared in the “Gallery” supplement of the Haaretz newspaper (3 March 2016, p. 16). The opening lines of the poem are *mid-dei yom gešer ha-Yarqon ma<sup>a</sup>ḥbir ‘oti ha-‘ira(h)* (‘Every day the bridge over the Yarkon/ brings me to town’). We see that Modern Hebrew poetry still makes use of locative *He* to express direction. I asked the poet Asher Reich what he meant by the word *ha-‘ira(h)*. He answered that the bridge brings him to the center of the city<sup>24</sup>. This usage by residents of Jerusalem and by the poet from Tel Aviv differs from the biblical usage of *ha-‘ira(h)*. When *ha-‘ira(h)* occurs in the Bible, such as in *va-yašubu ha-*

<sup>22</sup> Compare the wording of the other two directions nearby in the text: *la-mizrah* / לַמִּזְרָה (in the same verse) and *la-ma<sup>a</sup>raḥ* / לַמַּעְרָב (in verse 18).

<sup>23</sup> See Bar-Asher 2015 p. 215.

<sup>24</sup> I spoke with Asher Reich on the day the poem appeared in Gallery. He said that it was an old poem and then said what I wrote here.

*ira(h)* (‘and they went back to the city’ Genesis 44, 13) *va-yabo’u ha-ira(h)* (‘and they came to the city’ I Chronicles 19, 15), it means going toward or coming into a city. It does not mean to the city center. However, even this usage is rare in the speech of young speakers. A child whose father says *‘ani nosea’ ha-ira(h)* will himself say *‘ani nosea’ l’merkaz ha-ir* (I am going to the center of town’).

26. The above-mentioned use of *yamina(h)*, *s<sup>e</sup>mola(h)*, *qadima(h)*, *aḥora(h)* is not part of the linguistic heritage of the Bible. Three of these words do not occur in the Bible, and the one that does occur in the Bible has a different meaning. The Bible states *v<sup>e</sup>-tah<sup>a</sup>loḳot la-yamin m<sup>e</sup>al la-ḥoma(h)* / לַיְמִין מֵעַל לְחֹמָה וְתֵהְלֶכְתָּ (‘and companies... on the right upon the wall’, Nehemiah 12, 31) — *la-yamin*, not *yamina(h)*. Similarly, the verses state *ha-yarden issob l<sup>e</sup>-aḥor* / הַיַּרְדֵּן יָסֹב לְאַחֹר (‘Jordan was driven back’ Psalms 114, 3); here too, *l<sup>e</sup>-aḥor* not *aḥora(h)*. Neither the word *s<sup>e</sup>mola(h)* nor its alternative forms *li-smol* occur in the Bible. Only the word *qadima(h)* appears in the Bible but means ‘towards the east’, as in the verse *mi-p<sup>e</sup>’at qadima(h)* / מִפְּאַת קְדִמָּה (‘from the east side’, Ezekiel 48, 8), not ‘going forward’. The triangular model for expressing the three directions by means of the words *yamina(h)*, *s<sup>e</sup>mola(h)*, *aḥora(h)* conforms to biblical Hebrew grammar and the meaning of each word is clear: *yamina(h)*, ‘to the right’, *s<sup>e</sup>mola(h)* ‘to the left’, *aḥora(h)* ‘backwards’. To complete the fourth direction, ‘going forward’, Modern Hebrew adopted the word *qadima(h)* also ending in the vowel [a], so that movement in all four directions could be expressed by words with the same ending. This caused *qadima(h)* to undergo a change in meaning.

27. I have to note that the noun *yamin* and the form *yamina(h)* with the locative *He* suffix are pronounced in spoken Hebrew with a reduced vowel — *y<sup>e</sup>min*, *y<sup>e</sup>mina(h)*. The standard forms *yamin*, *yamina(h)* are become more and more rare. However, I wish to note the success of Ruth Almagor-Ramon, Israel Radio’s linguistic editor, for instilling the use of the biblical forms *daroma(h)* and *tsaḥona(h)* with locative *He* in traffic updates. For example, *Ayyalon tsaḥona(h)* and *Ayyalon daroma(h)* meaning the ‘northbound Ayyalon Highway’ and the ‘southbound Ayyalon Highway’<sup>25</sup>. Even in this case, *tsaḥona(h)* (‘northbound’) was inherited from the Bible while *daroma(h)* (‘southbound’) is a successful imitation of the biblical form. Nevertheless, more than once I have heard traffic updates on Israel Army Radio refer to *Ayyalon tsaḥon* and *Ayyalon darom* ‘north Ayalon Highway’ and the ‘south Ayalon Highway’.

28. Another development of *tsaḥona(h)* and *daroma(h)* is linked to the indication of directions on maps. Maps usually indicate the north at the top, the south at the bottom and east and west at the right and left. From this “north” developed the meaning ‘upward’ and “south” ‘downward’. From this meaning, these words developed the sense of ‘increase in number’ and ‘decrease in number’. Here are examples of this usage: *kol ha-yladim mi-gil šaloš tsaḥona(h)* / כָּל הַיְלָדִים מִגִּיל שְׁלוֹשׁ צְפוּנָה / ‘all children three years old and up’<sup>26</sup>, *hora’a(h) zo ḥala’al kitta(h) 8 ve-daroma(h)* / בְּתָהּ הַ יְרֻמָּה הַ יְרֻמָּה עַל הַרְצָה זוֹ הַרְצָה זוֹ הַרְצָה עַל (‘this directive applies to eighth grade and down’)<sup>27</sup>.

29. At times locative *He* is employed by some Modern Hebrew speakers in jest or in order to express ridicule. Dozens of times I have heard people say that they went *Tel-Aviva* / תֵּל-אָבִיבָה, not *l<sup>e</sup>-Tel-Aviv* / לְתֵל-אָבִיב; *Ramat-Ganna* / רַמַת גַּנָּה, not *l<sup>e</sup>-Ra-*

<sup>25</sup> R. Almagor-Ramon wrote to me in a letter dated 26 Adar I 5776 (6 March 2016) that the initiative for this change came from listeners. She acceded to their requests and worked to change the policy. Other radio stations adopted this policy, except for the Army Radio, as stated below. This prevented serious misunderstandings by drivers.

<sup>26</sup> I heard this statement from a schoolteacher who accompanied a guided tour in March 2016 and I have documented many more examples of this phenomenon.

<sup>27</sup> I documented this example in the year 2013, but I have only few examples of this usage.



*mat-Gan* / לְרַמַּת גֵּן. This usage belies a false sense of scholarly knowledge of Biblical Hebrew. Clearly, these imitations are not in line with Biblical Hebrew grammar. In construct phrases in the language of the Bible, locative *He* is affixed to the *nomen regens*, as in 'Artsa K<sup>e</sup>na'an / אֶרֶץ כְּנַעַן not 'Erets K<sup>e</sup>na'na / אֶרֶץ כְּנַעֲנָה.

30. Many place names end with a real or apparent dual morpheme, for example the biblical toponym *Ramatayim* / רַמְתַּיִם. Whoever goes to or returns from *Ramatayim* also goes to or returns to *Ramata* or *ha-Ramata*. The biblical text says that the Prophet Samuel's father Elkanah was *min ha-Ramatayim Tsoḥim* / מִן הַרְמַתַּיִם צוֹפִים ('from Ramataim Zophim' I Samuel 1, 1). The Bible states that when Elkanah went to his home with his family *va-yab'u 'el betam ha-Ramata* / וַיָּבֹאוּ אֶל-בֵּיתָם הַרְמַתָּה ('and they came to their house to Ramah' I Samuel 1, 19). Similarly, of the Prophet Samuel the text states *u-tshubato ha-Ramata* / וַתְּשׁוּבָתוֹ הַרְמַתָּה ('and his return was to Ramah' *ibid.* 7, 17). Clearly, the final dual morpheme is apocopated in order to attach the locative *He*. In recent years, I have documented people travelling to *Ramatayim* or *Givatayim* use the forms *Ramatayma* / רַמְתַּיְמָה and *Giv'atayma* / גִּבְעַתַּיְמָה. While it is not clear whether forms like these will be accepted in Modern Hebrew, we cannot object to them. *Ramataym* and *Giv'ataym* are not called today *Rama(h)* and *Giv'a(h)*. This usage reflects a kind of morphological innovation in Modern Hebrew<sup>28</sup>.

### Interrogative *He*

31. Another linguistic feature of Biblical Hebrew which is rare or has almost entirely disappeared from Modern Hebrew is the use of interrogative *He*. Here too, Modern Hebrew is quite similar to Mishnaic Hebrew. However, like other characteristic features of Biblical Hebrew, some well-educated Modern Hebrew speakers do employ interrogative *He* at times. I recently heard someone ask: *ha-salahta l-i 'et ha-seḥer še-biqqashti?* / הַסֵּפֶר שֶׁבִּקַּשְׁתָּי? הֲשַׁלַּחְתָּ לִּי אֵת ('Did you send me the book that I requested?'). a journalist wrote in a recent newspaper column: *ha-'emet ha-dabar še-li-tšpon Korea yeš pitstsat meman?* / הָאֵמֶת הַדָּבָר שֶׁלְצִפּוֹן קוֹרֵיאה יֵשׁ פִּצְצַת מִימֶן? ('Does North Korea indeed have a hydrogen bomb?'). However, this feature is certainly not common in written or spoken Modern Hebrew. Interrogative *He*, which appeared in poetry and songs throughout the twentieth century, is nearly entirely absent from this genre today. Avraham Shlonsky wrote in the first half of the twentieth century the popular song: *h<sup>a</sup>-sama'ta 'ek ba-negeb 'erets mul šamayim?* / הֲשָׁמַעְתָּ אִיךָ בְּנֶגֶב אֶרֶץ מוֹל שָׁמַיִם? ('Did you hear how in the Negev the earth is opposite heaven?'). Today, few know this poet, fewer still his poems and songs, including this formerly popular one. Nonetheless, interrogative *He* is used with some words on a regular basis, although of unequal distribution in the language. These are mainly the words *ha-'im* / הָאֵם ('Is it'), *ha-'umnam* / הָאִמְנָם ('Is that so?'), *ha-k<sup>e</sup>tsa<sup>sa</sup>qata-h* / הַכֶּצֶּעֲקוֹתָהּ ('Is it so terrible?').

32. The interrogative particle *ha-'im* is very common in both written and spoken Modern Hebrew and opens many questions, such as *ha-'im 'atta maskim 'itt-o?* / הָאֵם אַתָּה מַסְכִּים אִתּוֹ ('Do you agree with him?'). I heard a secondary school pupil ask this question; the latter question. However, the truth is that many speakers will ask question without *ha-'im*, for example *'atta maskim 'itt-o?*. Even writers of texts, who cannot express questions by means of intonation, will simply place a question mark at the end of statements. Others, wishing to impart a more literary air to their language, will employ the word *k<sup>e</sup>lum* / כְּלוּם as an interrogative particle as in Mishnaic Hebrew saying: *k<sup>e</sup>lum 'atta maskim 'itt-o?*

33. It is interesting that the particle *ha-'im*, which is quite rare in Biblical Hebrew,

<sup>28</sup> Note well, this seems to be «a kind of morphological innovation», not an actual morphological innovation. The place name pronounced Y<sup>e</sup>rušalayim, which resembles nouns with the dual ending and its form with locative *He* is (written IRWŠLMH) Y<sup>e</sup>rušalayma(h) (I Kings 10, 2 etc.).

has nevertheless become so widely used in Modern Hebrew. *ha-'im* occurs only in two verses: *ha-'im tamnu li-gvov*? /? הָאִם תִּמְנוּ לִגְוֹעַ? ('Have we been consigned to die?'), Numbers 17, 28), *ha-'im 'en 'ezrati bi*? / בִּי הָאִם אֵין עֲזָרָתִי בִּי? ('Is not my help in me?'), Job 6, 13). This particle is also absent from Mishnaic Hebrew. While the orthographic form הָאִם is attested in some textual witnesses of the Mishnah, this is not the particle *ha-'im*. For example, *ha:-'im hiqdim ma'aser sheni le-ma'aser ri'son* / הָאִם הִקְדִּים הָאִם הַקְדָּים ('Here is, if the Second Tithe is taken from it before the First Tithe'), Demai 1, 4; Ma'aser Sheni 5, 11). This is the text in the Parma a manuscript in these occurrences of the word<sup>29</sup>, and according to Rabbi Y. Ashkenazi's version in Tractate Demai (as mentioned in *Melekheth Shelomo*)<sup>30</sup>. Most other textual witnesses bring the correct version: *H"m* / הָאִם הָאִם. This is the presentative particle *ha/* הָאִם followed by the conditional particle *'im/* אִם, which coalesced into one orthographic word because they are pronounced as one word<sup>31</sup>. This word should be vocalized הָאִם, the *He* vocalized with *qamats*, as Epstein correctly pointed out. The Mishnaic word הָאִם (אִם) has no connection with the biblical interrogative particle הָאִם<sup>32</sup>. The *He* in that case takes *patah*, like the vocalization of interrogative *He* before a guttural consonant.

34. *ha-'umnam* is used much less than *ha-'im*. While it appears mostly in the written language, educated speakers use it in speech as well. I have read sentences such as *ha-'umnam Ben Yehuda tamak b'e-toknit Uganda shel Herzl*? / אִם בֶּן יְהוּדָה תָּמַק בְּעֵת הַקְּנִית / אִם בֶּן יְהוּדָה תָּמַק בְּעֵת הַקְּנִית ('Did the Ben-Yehudah indeed support Herzl's Uganda plan?'). Certainly, I have heard famous public figures frequently open questions with the word *ha-'umnam*. However, less educated speakers also say *ha-'umnam*.

35. One often-used example of interrogative *He* in Modern Hebrew, not only in the written language but also in speech, is the biblical word *ha-k'etsa'qata-h* / הֲכִצְעָקְתָּהּ. This word entered today's language from the biblical account of Sodom and Gomorrah (Genesis 18, 21). This word is used idiomatically and was introduced into Modern Hebrew by learned speakers of previous generations who were well versed in the Bible and in other Jewish literary sources. Those who use this idiom do not mean raising of the voice (*ts'e'qa(h)* / צִעָקָה = 'cry') nor prayer which is sometimes expressed by the verb *tsa'aq* / צָעַק (= 'cry out'). The person who uses this idiom means to express amazement at his how interlocutor, or a group of people, exaggerated about the difficulty of a situation: *k'etsa'qata-h* ('Is it so terrible?').

#### An Imaginary Trace of *Vav* Consecutive

36. *Vav* Consecutive occurs in Hebrew literature in the period of the Haskalah and the in the period of the revival of spoken Hebrew in the latter part of the nineteenth century and the turn of the twentieth century. It also occurs in Modern Hebrew literature of the twentieth century when the use of spoken Hebrew became more widespread. Nevertheless, there is no trace of *vav* consecutive in written or spoken Hebrew today. However, one trace of this *vav* was discernible in the language of politicians. Even this usage has changed and has become an imaginary trace of *vav* Consecutive.

37. I will explain. Here are some quotes in my files from the 1970s and 1980s: *ve-haya 'im titt'nu la-nu et ha-koah* / וְהָיָה אִם תִּתְּנוּ לָנוּ אֶת הַכֹּחַ / ('In the event that you

<sup>29</sup> The vocalizer of Parma a freely exchanges *patah* and *qamats*. These occurrences of הָאִם show that the letter he vocalized with *patah* (הָאִם).

<sup>30</sup> This data already appears in Sacks 1971 - 1075, in the portions of the Mishnah mentioned.

<sup>31</sup> The phrases *ha-'en* / הָאִם אֵין (<הָאִם), *ha-ketsad* / הֲכִצְעָד (>הָאִם צִד), etc. are also to be explained in this fashion. See Epstein 1948, p. 1219. Even so, there is evidence to suggest that some speakers, and writers, of Modern Hebrew today use the word הֲכִצְעָד as an interrogative particle. They even vocalize it as *ha-ketsad* / הֲכִצְעָד or *ha-ketsad* / הֲכִצְעָד (with interrogative *He* vocalized with *patah* followed by *dagesh*, like in *ha-ketsa'qata-h* / הֲכִצְעָקְתָּהּ).

<sup>32</sup> See Epstein *ibid*.

will give us the power'). This type of sentences, while occasionally still in use, have become quite rare.

38. Sentences opening with the verb *ve-haya* / וְהָיָה have disappeared from the speech of many speakers because they perceive the letter *vav* to be the conjunction "and", which does not generally occur at the beginning of sentences in Modern Hebrew. For this reason, this usage has changed and the verb is now used without the conjunction *vav*. For example, a well-known journalist recently wrote *haya im yamšiku li-bnot ba-hitnah' luyot* / הָיָה אִם יִמְשִׁיכוּ לְבָנוֹת בְּהַתְנַחְלוּיּוֹת ('In the event that settlement building will continue'). The verb *haya* remains as a kind of inverted form, but without its characteristic feature — the *vav* consecutive. This is the only trace of this *vav* in spoken Hebrew today, and even then only an imaginary one.

#### *Pa'ol pa'alti* / פְּעוּל פְּעַלְתִּי

39. The infinitive absolute, a grammatical category characteristic of Biblical Hebrew, has entirely disappeared from Mishnaic Hebrew. One of its uses was the tautological pattern of infinitive absolute + finite verb, for example *sos 'asis* / שׁוֹשׁ אֲשִׁישׁ ('I will greatly rejoice' Isaiah 61, 10), *šalleah 'šallah* / שְׁלַחְהָ תְּשַׁלְּחָ ('You shall send away' Deuteronomy 22, 7), *hugged huggad* / הִגִּיד הִגִּיד ('It has been told' Ruth 2, 11). This usage has disappeared from Mishnaic Hebrew, together with other uses of the infinitive absolute. Likewise, the infinitive absolute is not used in Modern Hebrew, hence neither is the tautological pattern used.

40. I wish to clarify the last statement. It would be more accurate to say that Modern Hebrew almost entirely lacks the tautological use of the infinitive absolute. I have documented dozens of examples of the infinitive absolute in the speech of learned Hebrew speakers who used this form as an emphatic structure. Furthermore, I have even heard this usage with verbs that are Modern Hebrew neologisms. I will mention three examples. Here are two sentences from a conversation between two learned speakers. Speaker 1: «Promise to update me regarding the results of the test». Speaker 2: *talpen 'atalpen 'eleka k'-še-'eda* / תַּלְפֵן אֲטַלְפֵן אֵלֶיךָ כְּשֶׁאֲדַע ('I will surely telephone as soon as I know.'). Here is an excerpt from a conversation that I recently heard. Speaker 1: «Please text me the time of the meeting»; Speaker 2: *sammes 'sammes l'-ka* / סַמְמֵס אֲסַמְמֵס לְךָ ('I will surely text you'). I said: *sammes 'sammes 'atta 'omer?* / סַמְמֵס אֲסַמְמֵס אַתָּה? ('Do you say *sammes 'sammes*?'). He answered: *b'-vadday kak 'aso 'e'se* / בְּדַי אֶעֱשֶׂה, כְּדַי אֶעֱשֶׂה ('Of course, I will certainly do it.'). I wish to point out that I documented these utterances from the speech of ordinary speakers of Modern Hebrew, not from the speech of Bible teachers or those well versed in the Bible.

#### Concluding Remarks

41. It turns out that the affinity of Modern Hebrew to Biblical Hebrew is quite strong. This affinity is apparent even in the case of some grammatical categories that have for the most part disappeared from Hebrew as a living language long ago. At times, these true remains or splinters entered Modern Hebrew from the writings of the Haskalah period or from the period of the revival of spoken Hebrew. Other examples are only imaginary traces of biblical usage. Modern Hebrew style also includes imitations of Biblical Hebrew grammar by learned speakers, such as the *Pa'ol pa'alti* forms in new verbs<sup>33</sup>.

42. Some of these phenomena described here are in common use, such as the particle *ha-'im* with interrogative *He*<sup>34</sup>; others occur only in the speech or writing of few

<sup>33</sup> See above §40.

<sup>34</sup> See above §§32-33.

speakers, such as the particle *ha-’umnam*<sup>35</sup>. In this case, we have seen that there are features characteristic of the language of the pre-State generation who left their mark on the Hebrew language in the years following the establishment of the State of Israel, but have disappeared from the language of the generation born towards the close of the twentieth century<sup>36</sup>.

43. It is interesting to note the various changes in the semantics and grammar of biblical words and forms that have survived in written and spoken Modern Hebrew. Changes in semantics are apparent in the use of words with the locative *He* ending, such as *ha-’ira(h)* (‘to [the center of] town’)<sup>37</sup>, *qadima(h)* (‘forward’)<sup>38</sup>, and also *tsa’bona(h)* (‘northward’) and *daroma(h)* (‘southward’) to indicate ‘up’ and ‘down’ in respect of age<sup>39</sup>. The shift of the form *ve-haya* in conditional sentences with *vav* consecutive, to *haya* without *vav*, is indicative of grammatical change in the speech of speakers whose awareness of the Hebrew language throughout the ages is weak<sup>40</sup>.

44. Some grammatical items should not be understood grammatically but rather idiomatically. I believe the forms *qaṭonti* and *ha-k<sup>e</sup>tsa<sup>sa</sup>qata-h* are examples of idioms<sup>41</sup>. It is important to point out the contrast between the word *qaṭonti*, and the root *y.k.l.* This root exists in Modern Hebrew in the Qal stem as a complete paradigm in the standard language and some still use the forms *yaḳolti*, *yaḳolta* etc. However, the verb *qaṭonti* is the only form of the paradigm in use. Even then, speakers use it lexically<sup>42</sup>. Similarly, unlike the particle *ha-’im* and word *ha-’umnam* which reflected the use of interrogative *He* — in the former word interrogative *He* is used regularly but in the latter word only by well-educated speakers — *ha-k<sup>e</sup>tsa<sup>sa</sup>qata-h* is a kind of idiom. The two words *qaṭonti* and *ha-k<sup>e</sup>tsa<sup>sa</sup>qata-h*, and also the form *tsumet* / תְּשׁוּמַת — and not *tsumat*/ תְּשׁוּמַת according to the standard vocalization — used in the expression *tsumet lev* / לֵב תְּשׁוּמַת לְב (‘attention’) based on the verse *b<sup>e</sup>-tsumet yad* / בְּתְשׁוּמַת יָד (‘given in hand’ Leviticus 5, 21), are not part of paradigms but are used idiomatically. They are no different than the proverb *he-haḳam ‘enav be-ro sh-o* / הִהָקֵם הָעֵינַי בְּרֹאשׁוֹ (‘The wise man’s eyes are in his head’ Ecclesiastes 2, 14) or the words of rebuke used as a proverb *h<sup>a</sup>-ratsahta v<sup>e</sup>-gam yarašta* / הֲרַצְחָתָּךְ רַשָׁתָּךְ וְגַם יָרַצְתָּ (‘Hast thou killed and also taken possession?’ I Kings 21, 19).

45. Indeed, both real and imaginary traces of Biblical Hebrew morphology exist in Modern Hebrew. Some of these imaginary forms are amusing; others have taken root in the written and even spoken language. Some use imitations of Biblical Hebrew grammar in order to impart a literary air to their language; others use them to ridicule, to jest. All of these forms of expression testify to the presence of irregular phenomena in our Hebrew, which echoes with the Bible’s language throughout.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Dictionaries

Ben-Yehuda = E. Ben-Yehuda, *a Complete Dictionary of Ancient and Modern Hebrew*, Vol. I–XVI, Jerusalem and Tel Aviv 1948–1958

<sup>35</sup> See above §34.

<sup>36</sup> See above §25 concerning the use of the word *ha-’ira(h)* which has been replaced by *merkaz ha-’ir*.

<sup>37</sup> See *ibid.* for details of this phenomenon.

<sup>38</sup> See above §26.

<sup>39</sup> See above §28. I wish to note that while I mentioned this usage in respect of age, there are some examples of this usage to indicate any numerical increase or decrease.

<sup>40</sup> See above §38.

<sup>41</sup> See above §§8, 35.

<sup>42</sup> See above §§9–10.



- Rav-Milim = Y. Choueka, *Rav-Milim — a Comprehensive Dictionary of Modern Hebrew*, Editor in Chief Uzi Freidkin, [Bnei Brak] 1997
- Even-Shoshan = A. Even-Shoshan, *Milon Even-Shoshan*, Vol. I–VI, Tel Aviv 2003
- Gur = Y. Gur (Grozovski), *Milon 'ivri*, Tel Aviv 1947
- Kena'ani = Y. Kena'ani, *Otsar Halashon Ha 'ivrit*, Vol. I–XVIII, Jerusalem & Tel Aviv 1960–1989
- Medan = M. Medan, *Me'alef 'ad Tav — Milon 'ivri Shimushi*, Jerusalem 1954
- Millon ha-Hove = S. Bahat & M. Mishor, *Dictionary of Contemporary Hebrew*, Jerusalem 1995
- Niborski = Y. Niborski & S. Neuberg, *Dictionnaire des mots d'origine hébraïque et araméenne en usage dans la langue Yiddish*, Paris 1999
- Sappir = E. Avneyon (Editor in Chief), *The Encyclopedic Sappir Dictionary*, Vol. I–VII, Israel 1998
- Stutchkoff = N. Stutchkoff, *Thesaurus of the Yiddish Language*, Ed. Max Weinreich, New York 1950
- Weinreich = U. Weinreich, *Modern English-Yiddish Yiddish-English Dictionary*, New York 1968

### Studies

- Bar-Asher 2009 = M. Bar-Asher, *Studies in Mishnaic Hebrew, Vol. I: Introductions and Linguistic Investigations Vol II: Grammatical Topics*, Jerusalem 2009
- Bar-Asher 2015 = M. Bar-Asher, *a Morphology of Mishnaic Hebrew — Introductions and Noun Morphology*, Vol. I–II, Jerusalem 2015
- Ben-Hayyim, 1992 = Z. Ben-Hayyim, *The Struggle for a Language*, Jerusalem 1992
- Epstein 1948 = J.N. Epstein, *Introduction to the Mishnaic Text*, Jerusalem 1948 (3rd edition 2000)
- Gabbay 2015 = A. Gabby, «*Po'elet or Po'alet?* — Feminine Participle Forms in Pausal Inflection in the 1644 Constantinople Edition of the Mishna», *Language Studies* XVI (2015) 89–99
- Parma a Ms = *Mishna Codex Parma (De Rossi 138): an Early Vowelized M Sacks, 1971–1975 = The Mishnah with Variant Readings Collected from Manuscripts, Fragments of the «Genizah» and Early Printed Editions and Collated with Quotations from the Mishnah in early Rabbinic Literature*, Ed. Nissan Sacks, Vol. 1–2, Jerusalem 1971–1975. *manuscript of the Complete Mishna Text. Facsimile Edition*. Jerusalem, 1970.
- Yalon 1964 = H. Yalon, *Introduction to the Vocalization of the Mishnah*, Jerusalem, 1964.

(Hebrew University, Jerusalem)