

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF HEBREW LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

Volume 3 P–Z

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

- Hacohen, Gonen and Emanuel A. Schegloff. 2006. "On the preference for minimization in referring to persons: Evidence from Hebrew conversations". *Journal of Pragmatics* 38:1305–1312.
- Henkin, Rony. 2003. "More on the task dependent redundancy in the Hebrew interlanguage of speakers of Arabic" (in Hebrew). *Research papers in Hebrew linguistics, Hebrew literature and Jewish languages*, ed. by Daniel Sivan and Pablo-Isaac Halevy-Kirtchuk, 151–175. Beer-Sheva: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press.
- Joüon, Paul and Takamitsu Muraoka. 2006. *A grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Revised English edition. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- Kutscher, Eduard Yechezkel. 1982. *A history of the Hebrew language*, ed. by Raphael Kutscher. Jerusalem: Magnes and Leiden: Brill.
- Meir, Irit. 2005. "The vulnerability of gender marking in Modern Hebrew numerals". *Hebrew Linguistics* 55:31–42.
- Muchnik, Malka. 2004. "Tel-Aviv 'Southerner' Hebrew dialect in *The Moon Goes Green in the Wadi*". *Helkat Lashon* 35:5–19. English abstract on p. i.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. 2005. "Linguistic notes on Moabite and Ancient Hebrew inscriptions". *Samaritan, Hebrew and Aramaic studies presented to Professor Abraham Tal*, ed. by Moshe Bar-Asher and Moshe Florentin, *31–*44. Jerusalem: Bialik.
- Richard, Jack, et al. 1985. *The Longman dictionary of applied linguistics*. Essex: Longman.
- Rosén, Haiim B. 1977. *Contemporary Hebrew*. The Hague / Paris: Mouton.
- Sagi, Hana. 1999. "Redundant use of the negator 'lo'". *Helkat Lashon* 28:7–21. English abstract p. i.
- Sarfattii, Gad Ben-Ami. 1977. "Erev pesaxim". *Lěšoněnu* 41:21–28, 158. English version in *Studies in Mishnaic Hebrew*, ed. by Moshe Bar-Asher, 323–335. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1998.
- Talshir, David. 1987. "The status of Late Biblical Hebrew between Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew". *Language Studies* 2–3, ed. by Moshe Bar-Asher, 161–172. Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

YISHAI NEUMAN

(State University of New York, Geneseo)

Reduplication

Reduplicated words exhibit one or more identical segments in a designated position. Hebrew reduplication involves only consonants (e.g., *משורר* *mešorer* 'poet', *דפדף* *difdef* 'to turn pages, leaf through a book'), though reduplication in other languages may involve both vowels and consonants (e.g., CVC in Agta: *puspusa* 'cats', *kalkaldin* 'goats'). Not every pair of identical consonants in a word is due to reduplication, since the process of reduplication is restricted by position. In Hebrew, a pair (or pairs) of identical consonants that constitutes reduplication appears at the right periphery of the word, without an intervening consonant. Thus, *גרר* *garar* 'to drag', *שחרר* *šixrer* 'to release, liberate', and *בקבוק* *baqbuq* 'bottle' are reduplicated but *מימן* *mimen* 'to finance', *ספסל* *safsal* 'bench', and *שורש* *šoreš* 'root' are not (see Schwarzwald 2004 for a general discussion on words with identical consonants).

1. STRUCTURAL RELATIONS

Many reduplicated words have a non-reduplicated counterpart (1a), which may be considered the base. A few reduplicated words have another morphologically related reduplicated form (1b), in which case it is not clear which is the base. Moreover, there are orphan reduplicated words, which do not have a synchronically related form (1c). These latter are considered reduplicated since they obey the constraints determining the structure of reduplicated forms (see below, §4).

1. STRUCTURAL RELATIONS

2. THE PURPOSE OF REDUPLICATION

Reduplication is a word-formation process and, as such, it is not obligatory. This process is not obligatory for the derivation of a new word (the notion in question could be expressed just as well by a phrase). And even when a new word is derived, it is possible to employ word-formation processes other than reduplication. That is, reduplication is just one among a variety of strategies of word formation (others include affixation and ablaut) which can be optionally selected (see Gafos 1998 for a different view).

2. THE PURPOSE OF REDUPLICATION

In some cases, reduplication can be attributed to prosodic restrictions. Reduplicated verbs like *חִימֵם* *ximem* 'to heat' and *קִינֵן* *qinen* 'to nest' are derived from their non-reduplicated counterparts *חָם* *xam* 'hot' and *קָן* *qen* 'nest', respectively. In such cases, reduplication is due to the disyllabic structure enforced by the verbal patterns (*binyanim*), which is satisfied by the addition of a copied consonant. However, epenthesis, as in *שֵׁם* *šem* 'name' > *שִׁיֵּם* *šiyem* 'to name', is also a possible strategy of satisfying such prosodic requirements (→ Denominal Verbs).

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

(1) Reduplicated words and their non-reduplicated counterparts

(1a) Reduplicated—Non-reduplicated

חִימֵם	<i>ximem</i>	‘to heat’	חֵם	<i>ḡam</i>	‘hot’
מְשׁוֹרֵר	<i>mešorer</i>	‘poet’	שִׁיר	<i>šir</i>	‘song’
כִּדְרֵר	<i>kidrer</i>	‘to dribble’	כְּדֹר	<i>kadur</i>	‘ball’
שִׁמְנָמָן	<i>šmanman</i>	‘chubby’	שָׁמֵן	<i>šamen</i>	‘fat’

(1b) Reduplicated—reduplicated

צִלְצֵל	<i>šilšel</i>	‘to ring’	צִלִּיל	<i>šlil</i>	‘sound’
בִּלְבֵּל	<i>bilbel</i>	‘to confuse’	בִּלָּל	<i>balal</i>	‘to mix’
צִמְרִמֹּרֶת	<i>šmarmóret</i>	‘shiver’	מִצְמִרֵר	<i>mešamrer</i>	‘shivering’

(1c) Orphan reduplicated

קִלֵּל	<i>qilel</i>	‘to curse’
זָקִיק	<i>zaqiq</i>	‘follicle’
שִׂרְפָּרָף	<i>šrafraf</i>	‘footstool’

In other cases, reduplication conveys semantic properties, like diminutive in *קֵמֶט* *qémeṭ* ‘wrinkle’ > *קִמְטוּט* *qamṭuṭ* ‘little wrinkle’ or durative/repetitive in *כְּדֹר* *kadur* ‘ball’ > *כִּדְרֵר* *kidrer* ‘to dribble’ (Ussishkin 1999; 2000; Tobin 2001). However, it is not the case that every instance of reduplication conveys these semantic properties (e.g., *דּוֹבֵר* *dover* ‘spokesman’ > *דִּבְרֵר* *divrer* ‘acting as a spokesman’ is not durative/repetitive). Moreover, these semantic properties are found in other morphological structures (e.g., diminutive in *דֵּגֶל* *dégel* ‘flag’ > *דִּגְלוֹן* *diglon* ‘little flag’).

3. CONFIGURATIONS OF HEBREW REDUPLICATION

There are four structural configurations of reduplication in Hebrew, each distinguished by the number of identical pairs of consonants (one or two) and the number of different consonants (two or three) (see Tobin 2001 for a sign-oriented classification). While the configurations in (2a–c) are found in all major lexical categories, that in (2d) is restricted to nouns and adjectives.

The limited configurations in (2) are due to two types of restrictions, one general to all native Hebrew words and another specific to reduplication.

Reduplicated words, like non-reduplicated native ones, fit into verbal and nominal configurations (*binyanim* and *mishqalim*, respectively; → Binyanim; *Mishqal*), which limit the phonological shape of the word in terms of prosodic structure (number of syllables and syllable structures) and vocalic pattern. Some configurations have affixes. As shown in (3) below, reduplicated words fit into the same configurations as non-reduplicated words.

A restriction specific to reduplication is that the identical pairs of consonants must be at the right periphery of the word (e.g., *חָגַג* *ḡagag* ‘to celebrate’, *וִרְדָּד* *vradrad* ‘pinkish’) and not at the left (**חָחַג* **ḡaḡag*, **וִרְרַד* **vraṡrad*). It should be noted that this restriction is not based on the existing lexicon of Hebrew alone, but also on the preference manifested in experimental studies on nonce-words (Berent and Shimron 1997).

4. THE GRAMMAR OF REDUPLICATION

Speakers of Hebrew can form a reduplicated word from a non-reduplicated one, as well as identify a word as reduplicated without a given base. These capacities can be accounted for in terms of constraints on the patterns of reduplication (Bat-El 2006).

(2) Configurations of reduplication

	Configurations	No. of identical pairs	No. of different Cs			
(2a)	CVC _i VC _i	1	2	חביב	<i>xaviv</i>	'charming'
(2b)	CVCC _i VC _i	1	3	שחרר	<i>šixrer</i>	'to release'
(2c)	C _i VC _j C _i VC _j	2	2	גלגל	<i>galgal</i>	'wheel'
(2d)	CC _i VC _j C _i VC _j	2	3	שרברב	<i>šravrav</i>	'plumber'

(3) Configurations shared by reduplicated and non-reduplicated words

Configuration		Reduplicated			Non-reduplicated	
CaCaC	גרר	<i>garar</i>	'to drag'	גדל	<i>gadal</i>	'to grow'
CiCeC	חימם	<i>ximem</i>	'to heat'	חיבק	<i>xibeq</i>	'to hug'
CiCCeC	קלקל	<i>qilqel</i>	'to spoil'	דקלם	<i>diglem</i>	'to cite'
hiCCiC	הפליל	<i>hiflil</i>	'to incriminate'	הכניס	<i>hixnis</i>	'to put in'
hitCaCeC	התקרר	<i>hitqarar</i>	'to get a cold'	התלבש	<i>hitlabeš</i>	'to dress'
CaCiC	קריר	<i>qarir</i>	'chilly'	שביר	<i>šavir</i>	'fragile'
CoCeC	שודד	<i>šoded</i>	'robber'	שומר	<i>šomer</i>	'guard'
CaCCuC	שבלול	<i>šablul</i>	'snail'	ילקוט	<i>yalquṭ</i>	'school bag'
CaCCéCet	דפדפת	<i>dafdéfet</i>	'paper pad'	כרטסת	<i>karṭéset</i>	'card index'
miCCaCa	מכללה	<i>mixlala</i>	'college'	משטרה	<i>mišṭara</i>	'police'

The first structural constraint on the patterns of reduplication states that *the stem is positioned at the left periphery of the word* (prefixes excluded). As psycholinguistic studies suggest, the left periphery (the beginning) of the word facilitates processing and word recognition, such that, the sooner the stem is identified, the quicker the recognition of the word (Bat-El 2002).

At the other end, the right periphery is perceptually salient, in particular when stress is final, as is usually the case in native Hebrew words (note that all reduplicated forms conform to native configurations). This is the motivation for another constraint, which states that *the final consonant of the word corresponds to the final consonant of the stem*. Note that reduplicated forms may undergo spirantization, resulting in non-identical corresponding consonants (e.g., שררב *širbev* 'to prolong, insert in the wrong place'). Although spirantization is opaque in Modern Hebrew, speakers identify the correspondence between the two consonants (→ *bgdktpt* Consonants: Modern Hebrew).

These two constraints impose the structure $\{[...C_i]_{\text{Stem}}...C_i\}_{\text{Word}}$ on reduplicated forms, where the stem is word-initial and the final consonant of the word corresponds (i.e., is identical) to the final consonant of the stem. The

prosodic structure of the word is determined by the configurations (see (3) above), which limit the size of the word to two syllables (excluding affixes) and the syllable structure to CV, CVC, and initial CCVC. Note that syllables with initial CC are possible only in word-initial position in nouns and adjectives (e.g., צמיחה *šmixa* 'growth', קטנה *qtana* 'small [fs.]'); verbs do not allow such syllables with the exception of denominal verbs derived from bases with initial cluster (e.g., טרינספר *trinsfer* 'to transfer').

Given the above constraints, the prosodic structures CVCVC and CVCCVC provided by the configurations, can host only the existing pattern of reduplication: C_iVC₂VC₂, C_iVC₂C₃VC₃, and C_iVC₂C_iVC₂. Patterns such as $\{[C_iVC_2]VC_i\}$ are excluded (thus שורש *šóreš* 'root' is not reduplicated), since the consonant at the right edge of the word (C_i) does not correspond to the consonant at the right edge of the stem. Similarly, patterns such as $\{C_iV[C_iVC_2]\}$ are excluded (thus מימן *mimen* 'to finance' is not reduplicated) since the stem ([C_iVC₂]) is not at the left edge of the word.

A constraint requiring *contiguity in the string of consonants* must also be assumed, in order to exclude patterns such as $\{[C_iVC_3]C_2VC_3\}$ (thus ספסל *safsəl* 'bench' is not reduplicated). This constraint is also relevant for the pattern

$C_1C_2VC_3C_2VC_3$, explaining the absence of the pattern $*[C_1C_2VC_3]C_1VC_3$, where the copied material (C_1VC_3) is not contiguous.

5. CONCLUSION

Hebrew reduplicated words, which conform to the structural restrictions imposed by the language's verbal and nominal configuration, have one or two pairs of identical consonants. The position of the identical consonants is restricted to the right periphery of the word, allowing the base stem to be aligned with the left edge. Words with identical consonants that do not obey the constraints on reduplication are not reduplicated, though they might have been reduplicated in earlier stages of the language. Speakers may resist words with identical consonants that do not obey the constraints on reduplication. This is evident by the word שפופרת *šfoferet* 'tube', which speakers often produce (and also spell) as שפורפרת *šforferet*. Interestingly, a search in the Bar-Ilan *Responsa Project* database (2010) reveals that the wrong form in the current stage of the language (i.e., *šforferet*) is documented (though rarely) in texts from the 11th century on, and might have originally been correct, if שפופרת *šfoferet* 'tube' is historically a reduplicated form of שופר *šofar* 'ram's horn' (i.e., *šofar* > *šforferet* > *šfoferet*). A similar historical development is found in Chaha (Banksira 2000), where $C_1VC_1VC_2$ forms are derived from $C_1VC_2C_1VC_2$ via deletion of a non-final coda consonant.

REFERENCES

- Banksira, Degif Petros. 2000. *Sound mutations: The morphophonology of Chaha*. Philadelphia / Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bat-El, Outi. 2002. "Semitic verb structure within a universal perspective". *Language processing and acquisition in languages of Semitic, root-based, morphology*, ed. by Joseph Shimron, 29–59. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- . 2006. "Consonant copying and consonant identity: The segmental and prosodic structure of Hebrew reduplication". *Linguistic Inquiry* 37:179–210.
- Berent, Iris and Joseph Shimron. 1997. "The representation of Hebrew words: Evidence from the Obligatory Contour Principle". *Cognition* 64:39–72.
- Gafos, Diamandis. 1998. "Eliminating long-distance consonantal spreading". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16:223–278.
- Schwarzwald (Rodrigue), Ora. 2004. "Some notes on consonant reduplication in Hebrew" (in Hebrew). *Morashtenu Studies* 2–3:251–265.

Tobin, Yishai. 2001. "Trying to 'make sense' out of phonological reduplication in Hebrew", *Proceedings of LP'2000*, ed. by Bohumil Palek and Osamu Fujimura, 227–260. Prague: Karolinum.

Ussishkin, Adam. 1999. "The inadequacy of the consonantal root: Modern Hebrew denominal verbs and output-output correspondence". *Phonology* 16:401–442.

—. 2000. "The emergence of fixed prosody". PhD dissertation, University of California Santa Clara.

OUTI BAT-EL
(Tel-Aviv University)

Reflexive

1. DEFINITIONS AND SCOPE

A reflexive verb denotes a verb or construction where the subject and the object refer to the same entity or set of entities. These two roles are often referred to as 'agent' and 'patient', but unlike in prototypical agent-patient relationships a reflexive verb does not necessarily involve a change of state (\rightarrow Agent; Patient), and thus manifests an intermediate degree of transitivity. A reflexive pronoun, likewise, typically denotes a referent that is identical to that of the Actor (the subject noun phrase), but generally has the syntactic function of an object. A reflexive verb, like a passive verb, can only be used to refer to a situation in which there is an agent, while a verb in the middle-voice is unmarked with respect to the presence of an agent, and thus may often be used in Hebrew to refer to the same situation as the passive or reflexive. There are, however, also reflexive-patient-subject constructions, i.e., constructions in which a transitive verb has a patient as its subject and a reflexive pronoun as its object, e.g., זו השקעה שמצדיקה את עצמה, *zo hašq'a še-mašdiqa 'et 'ašmah* 'It is an investment that justifies itself'.

Reflexivization of the sort found in Semitic languages, as opposed to that found in Romance languages, is generally viewed as clause-bound and sensitive to the semantics of the verb. As opposed to the situation in Romance languages, it can be the input to nominalization, e.g., תיהיה התרחצות בים *tihye hitraḥašut ba-yam* 'There will be bathing.REF in the sea'. In generative studies (Reinhart and Siloni 2005; Siloni 2008), there is a view that takes reflexivization