

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF HEBREW LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

Volume 1
A–F

General Editor
Geoffrey Khan

Associate Editors
Shmuel Bolokzy
Steven E. Fassberg
Gary A. Rendsburg
Aaron D. Rubin
Ora R. Schwarzwald
Tamar Zewi



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2013

© 2013 Koninklijke Brill NV ISBN 978-90-04-17642-3

Table of Contents

VOLUME ONE

Introduction	vii
List of Contributors	ix
Transcription Tables	xiii
Articles A-F	I

VOLUME TWO

Transcription Tables	vii
Articles G-O	I

VOLUME THREE

Transcription Tables	vii
Articles P-Z	I

VOLUME FOUR

Transcription Tables	vii
Index	I

versus *pu'al* would be worthy of investigation (cf. Glinert 1989:142). IH clearly has devices other than the passive construction to mark absence of first actant (Glinert 1989:139–140; → Binyanim: Biblical Hebrew; Binyanim: Rabbinic Hebrew; Binyanim: Modern Hebrew and the references there). A characteristic feature in IH is the frequent employment of passive constructions with agent extension. The increased use of this device is documented already in Medieval Hebrew (Rabin 2000:113–114) and is standardized in IH, usually by the particles בִּידִי *bi-yde* or עַל יְדֵי *'al-yede*. The older use of לֵ- *le-* is preserved with certain kinds of verbs, e.g., זֶה יוֹבֵן לָךְ *ze yuvan lax* ‘this is understood by you (fs)'; consider also יַעֲקֹב זֹעֵזֵעַ ... מִ-יָדָאָב *ya'qov zu'aza' mi-...* ‘Jacob was shocked by...’ (Glinert 1989:145–146). Also, the subjectless sentence is alive and well in IH: דוֹבֵר עַל הַפּוּגָה *dubar 'al hafuga* ‘there was talk of a truce’, הוּחַל בְּהַקְמַת כּוֹר *huxal be-haqamat kur* ‘The building of a reactor was begun’ (Glinert 1989:146–147).

REFERENCES

- Ben-Hayyim, Ze'ev. 2000. *A grammar of Samaritan Hebrew based on the recitation of the law in comparison with the Tiberian and other Jewish traditions*. Jerusalem: Magnes and Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- Doron, Edit. 2003. “Agency and voice: The semantics of the Semitic templates”. *Natural Language Semantics* 11:1–67.
- GKC = Kautzsch, Emil (ed.). 1910. *Gesenius' Hebrew grammar*. Trans. by Arthur E. Cowley. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Glinert, Lewis. 1989. *The grammar of Modern Hebrew*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kropat, Arno. 1909. *Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik verglichen mit der seiner Quellen*. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann.
- Qimron, Elisha. 1986. *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Rabin, Chaim. 2000. *The development of the syntax of post-biblical Hebrew*. Leiden: Brill.
- Retsö, Jan. 1989. *Diathesis in the Semitic languages: A comparative morphological study*. Leiden: Brill.
- Schwarzwald (Rodrigue), Ora. 2008. “The special status of *nif'al* in Hebrew”. *Current issues in generative Hebrew linguistics*, ed. by Sharon Armon-Lotem, Gabi Danon, and Susan Rothstein, 61–75. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Segal, Moses Hirsch. 1927. *A grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yeivin, Israel. 1985. *Masoret halašon ha-'Ivrit ha-mištaqefet ba-niqud ha-Bavli*, Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language.

JAN RETSÖ

(University of Gothenburg)

Diglossia: Biblical Hebrew

Diglossia refers to the use of two registers, one written or classical and the other spoken or colloquial, in a particular language (Ferguson 1959; 1991; some scholars have expanded the meaning of ‘diglossia’, on which see below, “Diglossia: Rabbinic Hebrew”; in the first section of the present entry we retain the original, more restricted connotation of the term). The prototypical example of diglossia, not only within Semitic, but in general, is Arabic, with its classical and colloquial varieties—the former (now in the guise of Modern Standard Arabic) used for writing and formal discourse (e.g., sermons), with the latter used in ordinary conversation (e.g., at home, in the marketplace, etc.).

A situation of diglossia has been reconstructed for ancient Hebrew. According to this reconstruction, the grammatical norms in the Bible, which are relatively constant in the corpus, represent the ancient written variety of Hebrew, while departures from the grammatical norm, which are legion in the Bible, frequently represent the spoken variety of Hebrew in ancient Israel. These divergent forms and usages often parallel spoken Arabic forms and usages, and/or they emerge as the grammatical norms of later Mishnaic Hebrew, which represents a spoken dialect of the Roman period, albeit one used for written texts (see below). Illustrative examples include the following:

- (1) Gender neutralization, with no distinction made in 2pl and 3pl verbs and pronouns. In such cases, the masculine forms typically come to be used for the feminine as well, as in: (a) אַתֶּם *'attem* ‘you (typically 2mpl)’ (Ezek. 13.20), with the antecedent בָּנוֹת עַמֶּיךָ *bənoṯt 'ammakā* ‘daughters of your people’ (ibid. v. 17) (though note the ‘correct’ form אַתְּנָה *'attēnā* ‘you [2fpl]’ earlier in the verse); (b) הַמַּלְכּוֹת שִׁשְׁשִׁים *həmaləkōt šiššim* ‘they (typically 3mpl) are sixty queens’ (Song 6.8); (c) הַמְלַבְּשֶׁךָ *ham-malbiškem* ‘who clothed you (typically 2mpl)’ (2 Sam. 1.24), with the antecedent בָּנוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל *bənoṯt yiśrā'ēl* ‘daughters of Israel’; (d) צֹאֲנָם *sōnām* ‘their (typically 3mpl) flock’ (Exod. 2.17), with the antecedent בָּנוֹת רְעוּל *bānoṯt 'reuel* ‘daughters (of Reuel)’ in the previous verse; (e) אִם-יָצְאוּ בָנוֹתֵי שִׁלּוֹ *'im-yəṣū'ū bənoṯt-šilō* ‘if the daughters

of Shiloh come out' (Judg. 21.21), using the typical 3mpl prefix-conjugation verb; (f) שְׁמַעוּ הַדְּבָר הַזֶּה פְּרוֹת הַבָּשָׁן *šim'ū had-dābār haz-ze pārōt hab-bāšān* 'hear this word, O cows of Bashan' (Amos 4.1), using the typically 2mpl imperative.

- (2) Merger of א"ל (final *alef*) and ל"י (final *yod*) verbs, with the former inflected like the latter. Sometimes the *alef* is still written, even though the Masoretic vocalization demonstrates that the verb was inflected according to the ל"י (final *yod*) pattern. Examples from across the verbal paradigm include: (a) כָּלוּ *kālū* 'they restrained' (1 Sam. 6.10) (3mpl suffix-conjugation of כ"ל *k-l-*); (b) יִכְלֶה *yikle* 'would restrain' (Gen. 23.6) (3ms prefix-conjugation of כ"ל *k-l-*); (c) יִרְאוּ *yarū* 'fear' (Josh. 24.14; see also 1 Sam. 12.24; Ps. 34.10) (2mpl imperative of י"ר *y-r-*); (d) חָטְיִים *hōtīm* 'sinning' (1 Sam. 14.33) (mpl active participle of ח"ט *h-t-*); (e) קֹרְאִים *qōrīm* 'calling' (Ps. 99.6) (mpl active participle of ק"ר *q-r-*); (f) קְרָאוֹת *qarōt* 'to call' (Judg. 8.1) (infinitive construct of ק"ר *q-r-*); (g) בְּקִנְאוֹתָו *bə-qannōtō* 'in his zeal' (2 Sam. 21.2) (infinitive construct of ק"נ *q-n-*).
- (3) The deletion of the definite article from the noun in an adjectival clause (→ Definite Article). That is to say, instead of DEF. ART.-NOUN + DEF. ART.-ADJ., which represents the grammatical norm, e.g., הַדְּבָר הַטּוֹב *had-dābār haṭ-ṭōb* 'the good thing' (Josh. 21.45), one encounters NOUN + DEF. ART.-ADJ.; examples include: הַרְעָה רְיֹחַ הָרָעָה *rūah hā-rā'ā* 'the evil spirit' (1 Sam. 12.23); הַגְּדוֹל בּוֹר *bōr hag-gādōl* 'the large cistern' (1 Sam. 19.22); שֶׁמֶן הַטּוֹב *šemen haṭ-ṭōb* 'the good oil' (2 Kgs 20.13).
- (4) The anticipatory pronominal suffix, whereby an object (direct or indirect) is expressed both through a pronoun and a following noun. Illustrations follow (with the pronoun object placed within parentheses in the glosses): (a) וַתִּרְאֶהוּ אֶת־הַיָּלֵד *wat-tir'ehū 'et-hay-yeled* 'and she saw (him) the child' (Exod. 2.6); (b) יְבִיאָה אֶת תְּרוּמַת יְהוָה *yəbī'ehā 'et torūmat YHWH* 'he shall bring (it) the offering of YHWH' (Exod. 35.5); (c) אֲנֹכִי נֹתֵן לָהֶם לֶבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל *'ānōkī nōtēn lāhem li-bnē yisrā'el* 'I give (to them) to the children of Israel' (Josh. 1.2).

It is important to note that these colloquial usages appear in third-person narration as frequently as they do in quoted direct speech (examples from the above illustrations include Exod. 2.6, 17; 1 Sam. 6.10; 12.23; 19.22; 2 Sam. 21.2; 2 Kgs 20.13), which is to say, these departures from the grammatical standard do not reflect an attempt at representing the spoken register of ancient Hebrew. Quite the contrary, quoted speech in the Bible is often couched in the literary idiom, a situation which also obtains in the Qur'ān, in which quoted speech appears in classical, not colloquial Arabic. One should conclude then, that, in general, these colloquialisms penetrated the biblical text rather randomly and subconsciously.

REFERENCES

- Ferguson, Charles A. 1959. "Diglossia". *Word* 15: 325-340.
 —. 1991. "Diglossia revisited". *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 10:214-234.
 Ólafsson, Sverrir. 1991. "On diglossia in ancient Hebrew and its graphic representation". *Folia Orientalia* 28:193-205.
 Rendsburg, Gary A. 1990. *Diglossia in ancient Hebrew*. New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society.
 —. 1991. "Parallel developments in Mishnaic Hebrew, colloquial Arabic, and other varieties of spoken Semitic". *Semitic Studies in Honor of Wolf Leslau*, ed. by Alan S. Kaye, vol. 2, 1265-1277. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
 Ullendorff, Edward. 1977. *Is Biblical Hebrew a language?* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

GARY A. RENDSBURG
(Rutgers University)

Diglossia: Rabbinic Hebrew

1. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Jewish communities of the Hellenistic, Roman, and early Byzantine periods consisted of people who spoke Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek to such an extent that many were probably bilingual and perhaps even trilingual (for surveys, see Barr 1989; Watt 2000). While it is clear that some of the Diaspora communities no longer knew Hebrew (as demonstrated by the need for translations of the Bible into Greek and Aramaic, and as explicitly attested by some rabbinic sources (cf., e.g., Tosefta Megilla 3.13), Hebrew remained a living language in