Most of the papers in this volume originated as presentations at the conference Biblical Hebrew and Rabbinic Hebrew: New Perspectives in Philology and Linguistics, which was held at the University of Cambridge, 8–10th July, 2019. The aim of the conference was to build bridges between various strands of research in the field of Hebrew language studies that rarely meet, namely philologists working on Biblical Hebrew, philologists working on Rabbinic Hebrew and theoretical linguists.

The volume is the published outcome of this initiative. It contains peer-reviewed papers in the fields of Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew that advance the field by the philological investigation of primary sources and the application of cutting-edge linguistic theory. These include contributions by established scholars and by students and early career researchers.

This is the author-approved edition of this Open Access title. As with all Open Book publications, this entire book is available to read for free on the publisher’s website. Printed and digital editions, together with supplementary digital material, can also be found here: www.openbookpublishers.com

Cover image: Genizah fragment of the Hebrew Bible with Babylonian vocalisation (Num. 18.27-28, Cambridge University Library T-S A38.12; courtesy of the Syndics of Cambridge University Library). Genizah fragment of the Mishnah (Ḥ allah 1, Cambridge University Library MS Add.470.1; courtesy of the Syndics of Cambridge University Library). Linguistic analysis of Ps. 1.1 (Elizabeth Robar). Images selected by Estara Arrant.
ON THE MORPHOLOGY OF THE GUTTURAL VERBS IN SEPHARDIC TRADITIONS IN THE EARLY MODERN PERIOD

Ariel Gabbay

1.0. Introduction

This article deals with the morphology of the guttural verbs in the Sephardic reading tradition for the Mishna. It is based on findings common to the world’s first two Mishna editions printed with full vocalisation: the Constantinople Mishna edition (1643–1645, hence CM)\(^1\) and the Amsterdam Mishna edition (1646–, hence AM),\(^2\) both of which probably represent the living reading tradition for Mishnaic Hebrew among Sephardic Jews in the 17th century. The findings presented below contradict not only the grammar of the Bible, but also the grammar of the Mishna, as represented in the medieval vocalised manuscripts, first and foremost MS Kaufmann.

It is commonly assumed that Mishnaic Hebrew, especially as represented in the printed editions of the Mishna, has been

---

\(^1\) See CM’s title page in Appendix 1.
\(^2\) See AM’s title page in Appendix 2.
deeply influenced by Biblical Hebrew. Printers and grammarians, who idolised the biblical language, aspired to bring Mishnaic Hebrew closer to the Tiberian biblical standard (Kutscher 1963, 247–48; Yalon 1964, 12; Mishor 1989, 90; Bar-Asher 2009a, 318; 2009b, 50–51). As a result, one might expect that the grammar reflected in a printed Mishna is in fact identical to biblical grammar. Thus, for example, in the matter of the widespread verb נעשה ‘to become, to be done’ G. Birnbaum determined that “In the printed editions the vocalisation is, of course, according to the Tiberian Bible (that is נעשה, נעשוי, נעשון, נעשים).” However, this study presents a different picture: both CM and AM, though vocalised by grammar experts, stray from BH grammatical standards. They not only contain dozens of forms with segol instead of pataḥ—e.g., נעשה, נעשוי, נעשון, נעשים—but they also reveal fundamental deviations from the biblical norm in quite a few grammatical categories. As mentioned above, I shall limit the discussion to anomalies relating to the morphology of the guttural verbs.

3 See Birnbaum (2008, 129).

4 In the introduction of CM, the publishers praise the vocaliser’s work, performed “according to grammar by an expert in grammar.” Similar things are said in the introduction of AM.

5 For an overall examination of the deviations from Biblical Hebrew in CM, see Gabbay (2017). For another side of the question discussed in this paper, see also Gabbay (2019).
2.0. Findings

Below are the categories in which the tradition reflected in AM and CM fits neither biblical grammar nor the medieval vocalised manuscripts of the Mishna.

2.1. Feminine Participle with Third Radical Guttural

The first matter is feminine participle forms whose third radical is guttural. As is well known, in Biblical Hebrew these forms appear with modification of segol to patah (e.g., פִּקֵּחַ, פִּקֶּחֶּת). This is also the case in the Mishna manuscripts, except for one unusual and rare form: מַגְבֶּהֶּת ‘lifts up (fs)’ (Halla 3.1), found in some of the manuscripts (Zurawel 2004, 107). CM and AM also vocalise patah (or qames6) in most cases. Yet, we find eight verbs with segol: נִפְרֶּעֶּת ‘collects (a debt) (fs)’ (CM, Ketubbot 10.5; Shevu‘ot 7.7, compared to נִפְרֶּעֶּת in Ketubbot 9.8; Giṭṭin 4.3), מְקֻפֶּחֶת ‘ruined (fs)’ (CM, Ohalot 16.1), מְנַחַת ‘set, lying (fs)’ (CM, Terumot 8.8 [2x], compared to מְנַחַת in Ketubbot 8.8 [2x]), מַגְלֶחֶת ‘shave (fs)’ (AM, Soṭa 3.8; Nazir 4.7), מְשַׁבַחֶּת ‘increases in value (fs)’ (AM, ‘Arachin 6.5 [2x], compared to מְשַׁבַחֶּת in Soṭa 3.5), מַשְׂבַחַת ‘the one sent forth (fs)’ (AM, Nega‘im 14.5 [2x], listed without dagesh), מְגַבֶּחֶת ‘lifts up (fs)’ (AM, Halla 3.1), and two pausal forms: מְשַׁבַחַת ‘increases in value (fs)’ (AM, Baba Qama 5.4), מַצָעֶּת ‘make the bed (fs)’ (CM, Ketubbot 5.5 [2x], šade without dagesh). It should also be noted that the feminine form of פִּקֵּחַ ‘a person who is not deaf’ in both editions is always פִּקֶּחֶּת/פִּקֶּחֶּת.

6 In both editions, patah and qames may be interchangeable due to the Sephardic accent of the vocalisers, which does not distinguish between the two signs.
It should be emphasised that the interchange of *pataḥ* and *segol* does not reflect a Yemenite pronunciation. The accent of the two vocalisers was Sephardic, as evidenced by many interchanges between *pataḥ* and *qamesḥ* on the one hand and *segol* and šere on the other hand. In contrast, *pataḥ* and *segol* are not parallel: *segol* may appear instead of *pataḥ* only in some of the third-guttural feminine forms, but *pataḥ* never appears instead of *segol*.

Reading such guttural feminine forms with *segol* instead of *pataḥ*, known from various Sephardic oral traditions of recent generations, is interpreted as an analogy to the non-guttural forms (Morag 2003, 47). This study, however, first reveals these forms in vocalised editions of the Mishna from the 17th century. It turns out that the picture reflected in CM and AM is quite similar to that of the reading traditions of Baghdad and Aleppo, but different from that of Djerba. As in the Baghdad and Aleppo traditions, this phenomenon is relatively limited: the forms with *segol* are a minority compared to the forms with *pataḥ/qamesḥ* and are not found in the *qal* stem<sup>7</sup> nor in biblical words, whereas in the tradition of Djerba the forms with *segol* are the vast majority and appear in all circumstances (Katz 1977, 195–96).

### 2.2. Lack of Compensatory Lengthening in *Piʿel* and *Puʿal*

The second issue relates to the vowel of the first radical before a middle guttural in the *piʿel* and *puʿal* stems. While in the Tiberian system we usually find the vowel modifications *i* > *e* (often

---

<sup>7</sup> Except for one form, actually a noun: פֶּתֶּחַת ‘key’ (AM, *Kelim* 13.6; *Baba Batra* 6.5, compared to פֶּתֶּחַת in *Beṣa* 4.2).
before א and always before ר, such as שֵּרֵה ‘to serve’, מָטֵה ‘to refuse’ and always before ר, such as שֵּרֵּת ‘to serve’, מֵאֵּן ‘to refuse’, מְגֹאָׂל ‘detestable’, מְטֹהָּׂרָׂה ‘purified [fs]’, מְבֹעָּרֶת ‘removed [fs]’, מְגוּרֶשֶת ‘divorcée’, מְמֹשַּׂר ‘expelled’), in both Mishna editions, in most cases, there is no vowel change. This feature is revealed not only before ר (examples include מְגוּרֶשֶת ‘divorcée’, מְמֹשַׂר ‘leftover’), but also before other guttural consonants. The number of relevant examples from the entire Mishna is not large, yet almost all of them are vocalised as opposed to biblical grammar: מְאִיתָה/מְאִיתָה ‘she refused’ (CM, AM, Yevamot 1.2; 2.10; 13.4 [2x]; 13.5 [2x], 7 [2x]), מַיָה ‘they refused’ (AM, Yevamot 1.1 [2x], but in CM מַיָה), מַשְוָר ‘leftover’ (CM, AM, Pe’a 3.3 [2x]; Zevahim 8.12 [2x]), מַמְשָׂבָות ‘unclean (fpl)’ (CM, AM, Ḥalla 2.2; Ḥagiga 3.3, compared to מַמְשָׂבָות, only in CM in Hullin 2.5; Toharot 2.1; Tevul Yom 4.1; while in AM shureq appears in all cases), מַשְׂחָה ‘stinking’ (CM, AM, Bekhorot 6.12), מַבְּעוֹר ‘removed’ (CM, AM, Ma‘aser Sheni 5.6; Pesahim 2.3), מַמְזוֹעֵת ‘small (fs)’ (CM, AM, Qinnim 1.2 [2x]). In both editions, the form מָבָּאָר ‘made clear’ comes with holam (Yadayim 3.1). In the manuscripts of the Mishna, the past forms

8 In the Babylonian biblical vocalisation tradition šere may appear before any of the gutturals, even in cases where the Tiberian vocalisation indicates hireq. See Yeivin (1985, 516–18).

9 In Yemenite and Sephardic oral traditions, middle-radical ר forms may be similar to those of ordinary verbs, with gemination of ר (see Morag 1998, 46–47). However, in CM and AM there is no dagesh. In AM dagesh is indicated in neither ר nor א, ה, ו, and in CM it is not indicated in any consonant. And yet, the vocalisation of the first radical is clear and different from that in Biblical Hebrew.
of מָאַן ‘to refuse’ are vocalised with sere in the first radical,¹⁰ and the guttural pu’al forms appear with holam in most cases.¹¹

It should be noted that CM and AM reflect a completely different picture in the nifal category. The prefix of the future forms of nifal appears as in the Bible and in the Mishna as represented in the manuscripts, depending on the nature of the next consonant. That is to say, before a non-guttural consonant the prefix is vocalised with hireq (such as יִכְרֶר ‘they will be sold’, יִכָּנֶס ‘he will enter’), but before a guttural consonant it is constantly vocalised with šere: יָאָכֵל ‘it will be eaten’ (Pesaḥim 7.11), יֵּעָׂשֶה ‘let this one be declared’ (Makkot 1.1), יֵּיָּרְקָּב ‘let them rot’ (CM, Terumot 5.1, but AM indicates a qal form: וּיִרְקָּב), יֵּהָׂרְג ‘they are put to death’ (Makkot 1.5), יֵּעָׂבֵּד ‘[after] it has been worshipped’ (‘Avoda Zara 4.4), יֵּרָׂאֶה ‘it will appear’ (Negaʿim 4.7), יֵּרָׂא ‘let them be seen’ (Negaʿim 11.1).¹²

---

¹⁰ In MS Kaufmann this is always the case, and the same is true of MS Parma, except for one appearance with hireq (Haneman 1980, 159).

¹¹ However, the verb עָטַת ממוּ is vocalised with shureq (Haneman 1980, 191).

¹² Two exceptions with hireq were found in CM, both with the third-person prefix יִ ‘is put to death (3ms)’ (Soṭa 9.7), יִ ‘they are eaten (m)’ (Bekhorot 2.9). It is possible that the realisation of šere approached that of hireq under the influence of yod.
2.3. *Shewa Mobile* with Guttural Consonants in Quadriliteral Verbs

The third issue is *shewa mobile* (vocal *shewa*, שעוה נג) with guttural consonants. The rule in Tiberian Biblical Hebrew is that when the guttural stands at the beginning of a syllable with *shewa*, it necessarily takes a *ḥataf*, and almost always *ḥataf-pataḥ*.¹³ Accordingly, in CM and AM *ḥataf-pataḥ* is the permanent replacement of *shewa mobile*, and appears in all forms, such as: ‘to specify (3mpl)’ (Baba Metzia 3.9), ‘one purifies it’ (Negaʿim 13.1), ‘(it) diminishes it’ (Kelim 5.7; 28.1), ‘that commit sacrilege’ (Zevahim 7.4 [2x]), and ‘wash (3mpl)’ (Yoma 8.1). However, this is not the case for quadriliteral verbs whose third radical is a guttural consonant, which is expected to appear with *ḥataf-pataḥ*. These verbs are regularly vocalised with *shewa mobile* or with another diacritic that may be parallel to *shewa mobile* in the Sephardic accent: ‘(a wind) that hurled’ (CM, AM, Kilʿaim 7.7), ‘(they) compel (her)’ (CM, Soṭa 3.3, in AM: מְעַרְעְרִים, מְעַרְעֵּרִים), ‘it (ms) singed it (fs)’ (CM, Shabbat 2.3, but in AM: מְהַבְהֵּב, מְהַבְהֵּב), ‘(they) parch’ (AM, Menahot 10.4, in CM:

¹³ There are, however, some exceptions (see GKC 1910, §64h).

¹⁴ AM’s version is different from the conventional one. It is possible that the vocaliser of AM was used to reading this verb in the same way the vocaliser of CM had read, but could not express his reading in the version that he found. Perhaps for this reason he indicated מְעַרְעְרִים to express מְעַרְעְרִים ‘(they) compel (her)’. At the same time, it is possible that he interpreted this form as a regular triliteral verb and vocalised accordingly.
In this category, the fundamental difference from biblical grammar is prominent, especially as manifest in CM. The number of relevant examples from the entire Mishna is only five, and in all of them, without exception, CM has shewa mobile or ṣere, expressing the vowel e, rather than hataf-patah, indicating the vowel a.\(^{15}\) It should be emphasised that in this category as well, the vocalised manuscripts of the Mishna reflect a reading tradition that is clearly similar to that of Biblical Hebrew, which prefers the semivowel a: all these quadriliteral verbs appear in the Mishna manuscripts with an a vowel beneath the third radical.\(^{16}\)

\(^{15}\) Obviously, AM also confirms the reading tradition that emerges from CM. Most examples clearly indicate the vowel e. Only one form appears with the vowel a in the third radical (.listFiles(0)), but one cannot ignore the special place in which it occurs: in the second chapter of tractate Shabbat, which is usually read in synagogues on Friday night and is actually part of the prayer. It is quite possible that this chapter was subject to greater influence of Biblical Hebrew.

\(^{16}\) In MS Kaufmann hataf-patah is found in three of the five forms:.listFiles(0). In another form, qames comes:.listFiles(0) (probably equivalent to.listFiles(0)). The latter form appears with hireq:.listFiles(0). Presumably, the spelling of the third syllable with yod in the listFiles(0) indicates that the scribe of MS Kaufmann read this verb just as the vocalisers of CM and AM read it, but the vocaliser of MS Kaufmann, who was not used to such reading, assumed that the spelling requires hireq. In MS Parma (De Rossi 138) we find:.listFiles(0). The other forms appear in the non-vocalised part of the manuscript. MS Parma Order Toharot (De Rossi 497) includes only one of the five forms, and it comes with
3.0. Discussion

We have seen above that the vocalisation of the two editions does not match biblical grammar rules. How can this fact be explained? It cannot be argued that the vocalisers were unfamiliar with biblical grammar. The introductions of the books reveal that the vocalisers were learned scholars who were well acquainted with biblical grammar and that it was for this reason they were chosen for their task.\(^\text{17}\) It is therefore logical to assume that these findings reflect an authentic Sephardic reading tradition for Mishnaic Hebrew different from Biblical Hebrew in some basic matters. An instructive example is the vocalisation of the verb מָאנָא ‘to refuse’, whose past forms are prevalent in the Bible, always with ṣere in the first radical: מַאֲנָא, מַאֲנָה, מַאֲנָה, מַאֲנָת, מַאֲנָת. When this verb appears in the two Mishna editions as a direct quotation from the Bible, it appears in accordance with the Biblical vocalisation: ...מַאֲנָא יִבְּמִי לְהָׂקִי (Deut. 25.7 in Yevamot 12.6). Yet, in the regular halachic language of the Mishna, the first radical comes in most cases with hireq: מַאְנָא, מַאְנַת (see above). These forms are of great significance: they prove that the vocalisers knew the Tiberian vocalisation for this verb, and yet chose another vocalisation. It is important to note that the verb מָאנָא is the only verb in the Mishna in the pi’el category with a middle radical ṣalef. It may therefore represent a broader rule in CM and AM’s tradition

\(^{17}\) See above, fn. 4.
for post-biblical Hebrew: the first radical of past piʿʿel forms was pronounced with hireq regardless of the identity of the next radical. Similarly, the first radical of the puʿʿal forms was pronounced with shureq regardless of the identity of the next radical. The reason for this was presumably the desire to simplify the language and avoid grammatical complexity.¹⁸

It seems that many of the deviations from biblical grammar are the result of simplification and harmonisation of verbal paradigms. In this way we are able to explain the findings in the other two categories as well: נִׂפְרֶעֶת according to the vocalic pattern of נִׂכְנֶסֶת and מְעַרְעְרִׂין according to the pattern of מְגַלְגְלִׂין.

Yet, it is clear that the tendency to unify paradigms was not unlimited. We have seen categories in which the vocalisation of guttural verbs is quite similar to that in the Bible and in Mishna manuscripts. Thus, for example, in future nifʿal forms the prefix before a guttural consonant is consistently vocalised with šere rather than hireq. What made this category different? It is reasonable to assume that since in Biblical Hebrew there is a clear and stable rule, and the vowel preceding each one of the guttural consonants is always šere,¹⁹ this rule also continued to exist in post-biblical Hebrew traditions. In contrast, in the intensive conjugation...

¹⁸ It cannot be argued that the lack of compensatory lengthening in piʿʿel and puʿʿal was the result of the fact that the reading traditions of Constantinople and Amsterdam lacked gemination (dagesh forte). If that were the reason, we would expect a lack of compensatory lengthening in nifʿal as well. However, this is clearly not the case (see §2.2 above).

¹⁹ GKC (1910, §51b).
tions, there is no absolute rule in Biblical Hebrew. In fact, lengthening of the preceding vowel occurs consistently only before resh, whereas with other gutturals the preceding vowel may be similar to that of the non-guttural verbs (GKC 1910, §64d–e). This complexity may have led in late traditions of Mishnaic Hebrew to unification of the vowels of the first radical in all piʿel and puʿal verbs, including those with gutturals.

The same is true for the nifʿal forms נעשׂה, נעשׂו. The Tiberian vocalisation offers two alternatives for reading the prefix -נ before an initial guttural, with either segol or pataḥ, e.g., נעשה ‘was done (3fs)’ as compared to נעשׂה ‘was done (3ms)’, נ Walls ‘was hidden (3ms)’ as compared to נעתי ‘is feared (ms)’, נ희תי ‘I was regarded’ as compared to נבהים ‘you hid (ms)’. Since the Tiberian tradition here is not homogeneous, a simpler inflection evolved. Thus, in CM and AM the prefix of all guttural verbs regularly has segol, including forms in which the Tiberian vocalisation indicates pataḥ.

It turns out that small categories with few examples were also subject to the effect of unification, for example, the category of quadriliteral verbs with guttural third radical. It is interesting that, while these verbs are read similarly to non-guttural quadriliteral verbs (מְעַרְעְרִין like מְגַלְגְלִין, triliteral verbs with a guttural

---

20 And there is also a third option, if we consider that the prefix of the verb ניחיה ‘to become’ appears with hireq.

21 The only exception is the verb ניחיה.

22 It is worth noting that, as opposed to the biblical form נצללים ‘hypocrites’ (Ps. 26.4), we find in CM נצלים (Shevuʿot 2.1). However, the version in AM is נצלים.
middle radical are consistently distinguished from their non-guttural counterparts, as *hataf-patah* regularly replaces *shewa mobile* in the guttural forms.  

23 Why were the quadrilateral gutturals, and not the triliteral gutturals, influenced by non-guttural forms? Presumably, this is because Biblical Hebrew has plenty of triliteral middle guttural verbs with *hataf-patah*. The prominent presence of these forms in the Bible helped them to be preserved in post-biblical Hebrew traditions. By contrast, the number of biblical cases of quadriliterals with guttural third radical is extremely small.  

24 Therefore, the forms of these verbs were more likely to resemble those of non-guttural verbs.

In short, analogy to non-guttural forms is to be expected in categories where Biblical Hebrew reveals complex inflection, as well as in small categories with few examples. However, this does not mean that in other categories analogy is not possible. In reality, some of the guttural feminine participle forms in CM and AM were found to have vocalisations that correspond to those of non-guttural forms, e.g., מִזְכָּלֵת נְמָרֶשֶת, even though the Tiberian Bible reveals a clear paradigm with numerous examples in which the gutturals always appear with *patah* rather than *segol*. And yet, it should not be forgotten that in the two Mishna editions studied,

---

23 As mentioned in §2.3, there is a clear difference in the vocalisation of the middle radical between triliteral guttural and non-guttural forms: יִכְתְבּ ‘they will write’, נְתַן ‘give (mpl)’, מְלַמְד ‘teaches (ms) him’ vs. יִרְצְח ‘they will wash’, נָהָג ‘be accustomed (mpl)’, מְמַעֲט ‘diminishes (ms) it’.

24 And they also do not appear in a position in which *hataf-patah* is expected, such as נִשְׂרֵן נְתֵס ‘will be utterly broken (fs)’ (Jer. 51.58), וַתִּחַלֶל ‘and (the queen) was grieved’ (Est. 4.4).
the forms that deviate from the norms of Tiberian vocalisation are a minority compared to other forms in the category. In addition, all the anomalous forms are found in the derived stems only, with none appearing in the Bible.

4.0. The Historical Development of this Reading Tradition

The reading tradition presented above arises from two distant places and different witnesses, which certainly did not exert mutual influence. Therefore, we can assume that this reading tradition is ancient, although we cannot determine for certain how ancient it is. It may have developed in the Middle Ages, but later than the vocalised manuscripts of the 12th and 13th centuries. However, it is possible that this reading tradition evolved in an even earlier period and reflects another type of Mishnaic Hebrew, though we do not have its ancient documentation. What is certain is that the vocalic realisation emerging from CM and AM

25 Even if we assume that CM, the earlier edition, arrived in Amsterdam and the publishers of AM saw it, it is certain that the vocalisation in AM was not copied from CM. First, the vocaliser of AM writes in his introduction that he had to rely on his understanding of grammar. Second, if the vocalisation was copied from CM, it should have been the same. As a matter of fact, there are many differences in vocalisation between the two editions (most of the differences are related to the marking of pataḥ and qames, on the one hand, and of segol and šere, on the other), and in this article, too, some of the findings (see §2) are not the same.

26 It is possible, however, that in the work of the MS Kaufmann’s scribe we find a hint of gutturals with shewa mobile instead of ḥataf-pataḥ (see
continued to exist in various Sephardic communities until our time. Forms like נִׂזְרֶעֶת, מְבוּעָׂר, מְגוּרֶשֶת, and עִׂלְעְלָׂה are documented in the Sephardic reading traditions of recent generations. It is interesting to note one verse from the Selihot, the prayers delivered in the period leading up to the High Holidays. In the 12th century Piyyutין, the vocalisation that appears in almost all contemporary Sephardic prayer books is as follows:

בָּמְצוֹותַּךְ שְׁנֵיָה נְזָהֲרִים וַאֲחַרְךָ לָא מְבֹעָרֶּהָ שְׁוֵי הָלָּכִים וְנָמִּרֶהָ עַל אָחָד

‘At your command the two of them take care / and after you they do not criticise / they hurried and went hastily / up one of the mountains.’

The form מְבֹעָרֶּה (‘criticise (mpl)’) is not only opposed to biblical grammar, but is also unsuitable for the rhyme. Apparently, such a pronunciation of quadriliteral verbs has been accepted for centuries, since at least the 17th century.

above, fn. 16). But it is difficult to determine this with certainty based on a single example.

27 On guttural feminine participle forms with segol (instead of patah), see above, §2.1. On guttural quadrilaterals with shewa mobile (instead of hataf-patah), see Morag (1977, 83); Katz (1981, 68). On the vowel preceding a middle radical in piʿʿel and puʿʿal, see above, fn. 9. The form מְבֹעָרֶּה (with shureq instead of olam, as expected according to the biblical form מְבֹעָרֶּה ‘was burning [fs]’ [Jer. 36.22]) is documented in the reading tradition of the Baghdadi community (Morag 1977, 120).

28 It is worth noting, by the way, that this is the accepted pronunciation for quadriliteral verbs in Israel today. Forms such as הבּהָב ‘it flashed, blinked (fs)’, יָהַדְדֵי ‘they will echo’, מְעַרְעֵּרִים ‘appeal, object; undermine
5.0. Conclusions

CM and AM reflect an authentic Sephardic reading tradition of Mishnaic Hebrew that systematically differs from Biblical Hebrew. For this reason, one should disagree with the common opinion that Biblical Hebrew dominates the language of printed editions of the Mishna.

It seems that one of the most important features of Mishnaic Hebrew, as represented in the two editions examined, is the effect of the tendency to simplify the halachic language and avoid grammatical duplications.

(mpl)’, and יהלעךנהו ‘was shocked, went pale (3fs)’—with gutturals realised with an e vowel—are common pronunciations, even among educated people.
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