Introduction

Edit Doron

What is the relation between *Hebrew* in the pre-modern period and its contemporary form *Modern Hebrew*? Hebrew ceased to be spoken by native speakers at the beginning of the 3rd century CE but has been used as a liturgical, scholarly, legal, and cultural language of Jewish communities world-wide. Modern Hebrew (MH), since the early 20th century, has been the native language of the Jewish community in Palestine and later Israel. Given these historical facts, the question is often asked whether Modern Hebrew could possibly be, from a linguistic perspective, a stage in the development of Hebrew, transmitted from earlier stages. In the view of its speakers and traditional scholars, it undoubtedly is.[1] According to one radical linguistic hypothesis, however, it is not; rather it is a creole[2] based on a substrate of contact languages (particularly Yiddish, the native language of many of the Jewish immigrants to Palestine), and a Hebrew superstrate, serving solely as a lexifier.[3]

The present collection is a first attempt to present detailed analysis of the syntax of Modern Hebrew (MH), which goes beyond the controversy between the traditional and the radical views. More specifically, it aims at laying the grounds for a theoretically sound approach to the genesis of MH. Before introducing these studies, a brief historical overview might be necessary.[4]

* The project presented in this volume started out with the work and findings of the members of the 2013–2016 Research Group on the emergence of Modern Hebrew at the Mandel Scholion Interdisciplinary Research Center in the Humanities and Jewish Studies at The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, who have all contributed chapters to this volume. I would like to thank the Mandel Scholion center for providing generous support to our group, and the *JJL* editors, Sarah Bunin Benor and Ofra Tirosh-Becker, for hosting a special thematic volume and for the immense editorial work they have invested in its publication. I am grateful to Chanan Ariel, Miri Bar-Ziv Levy, Malka Rappaport Hovav, and Yael Reshef for their help with writing this introduction.

1 Reshef, forthcoming.

2 Wexler 1990, following Holm 1988; Izre'el 2001.

3 For the relexification view of the nature of creoles see Lefebvre 1998.

4 For more detailed information about the various stages of Hebrew, I refer the reader to Harshav 1999 and to the relevant articles in the *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics* (Khan et al. 2013).

 | DOI 10.1163/9789004310896_002

Historical Overview

Hebrew ceased to be a spoken language at the end of the 2nd century CE. Between this period and the time of the establishment of MH as a spoken language in Palestine, Hebrew consisted of a large body of writings containing a core of scripture, liturgical and traditional legal works, and an extensive range of scholarly and literary works. The central religious works were read and studied and used in worship over the centuries in Jewish communities in Europe, the Middle East, and North Africa, but also as far as Central Asia, India, and China. The language of all the writings contained elements of the earliest stages of written Hebrew that emerged when Hebrew was still a language with native speakers, and also elements of the written language from subsequent periods when it was no longer spoken.[5]

The written texts of Hebrew that emerged when it was still a spoken language are classified into two main corpora. These are the Old Testament, composed before the Common Era (**Biblical Hebrew**) and the Mishnah and related texts (**Mishnaic Hebrew**). Mishnaic texts, although composed in a period when Hebrew was a language with native speakers, are traditionally classified as part of **Rabbinic Hebrew**, together with the Talmud and other texts which were composed after Hebrew ceased to be spoken. This joint classification is due to both corpora together forming the legal (*halakhic*) basis of orthodox Jewish life and to their close linguistic affinity, clearly distinguished from Biblical Hebrew. Both corpora were committed to writing in Hebrew in Palestine and Babylon, by people whose native language was Aramaic, a language that greatly influenced the Rabbinic stage of Hebrew.

The following period, **Medieval Hebrew**, starts around the 7th century with the Arab conquest, when Arabic replaced Aramaic as the native language in many Jewish communities. Vast religious, philosophical, and scientific corpora, and a lot of poetry and liturgical hymns were written during this period in lands under Islamic rule in the Middle East, North Africa, and Europe, and in adjacent lands under Christian rule. The corpus created from the 15th century onward is sometimes called **Late Rabbinic Hebrew**. It consists of halakhic writings, but also administrative documents relating to the life of communities in Europe and some literary work. In the 18th century in Eastern Europe scholars identify **Hasidic Hebrew** as a distinct corpus, which was rich in hagiography and homiletics typical of the Hasidic branch of Judaism.

5 There is, however, evidence of very rare circumstances where Hebrew was sometimes spoken, e.g., Tirosh-Becker 2015.

Modern publications in Hebrew start appearing in the middle of the 18th century in Central and Eastern Europe, the manifestation of a new cultural movement expressing Jewish secular aspirations for emancipation and integration into the surrounding culture. The language of these publications is known as the Hebrew of the Haskalah (Enlightenment), also called **Maskilic Hebrew**. Under the influence of the neo-classical trend of the times, some of the notable literary oeuvres were written in Biblical Hebrew. However, most writings (political, scientific, newspaper articles),[6] and even some literary work, kept up the tradition of utilizing a mixture of all the historical stages of Hebrew. This conscious linguistic mixture of different historical periods turned into the mainstream style of written Hebrew during the second half of the 19th century. At the end of the century, in the aftermath of widespread pogroms (massacres of Jews in the Russian empire), Jewish refugees and others who supported the ideas of Jewish nationalism emigrated to Palestine, bringing along their Hebrew (sometimes called **Revival Hebrew**) as part of the foundation for a projected autonomous political entity.

Palestine at the end of the 19th century was a province of the Ottoman Empire, with a population of about 500,000 Muslims, 5,000 Christians (mostly German), and 40,000 Jews.[7] The Jewish inhabitants, who formed what is known as the *Old Yishuv*, were the descendants of Jews who had immigrated over the previous millennium for religious reasons. They lived in Jerusalem, Safed, and Tiberias, where they constituted the majority of the population, and in other ancient towns such as Hebron, Peqiʿin, and Shefarʿam. The oldest communities of the Old Yishuv spoke Arabic, and others were divided into communities speaking different languages according to their land of origin: Judeo-Spanish in the case of Sephardic communities, and Yiddish (also Hungarian, Rumanian, etc.) in the case of Ashkenazi communities. Members of the Old Yishuv used Hebrew as a lingua-franca when they interacted among themselves. They spoke it according to the traditional phonology in which the Sephardic communities, which were the majority, conducted their traditional readings of the Bible and other religious rituals.[8] The newcomers from Europe adapted this pronunciation in some ways to Ashkenazi phonology[9] and became the first community of **Modern Hebrew** speakers. The subsequent large waves of Jewish immigration eventually adopted this language.

6 Newspapers in Hebrew were published from the mid-1800s in various cities, e.g., Berlin, Warsaw, Cracow, St. Petersburg.

7 Lewis 1954, Ben-Aryeh & Bartal 1983.

8 Fellman 1973.

9 Ofer 2007.

They called it Hebrew and consciously aspired to be faithful to its historical legacy.[10] A full educational system was instituted, run entirely in Hebrew, from kindergarten[11] all the way to university.[12] In 1922, Hebrew was granted the status of official language, alongside English and Arabic, of the British Mandate for Palestine. In 1948, Hebrew was proclaimed the official language of the state of Israel together with Arabic.

Overview of Contributions

The chapters in the present volume document syntactic structures novel to Modern Hebrew (MH) and investigate the origins of the innovation, looking for parallel structures in the contact languages and also for possible internal precursors of these structures. The results of the study have direct bearing on the controversy regarding the nature of MH. If the genesis of MH followed a creolization process, where Hebrew was but a lexifier, the novel syntactic structures of MH should not be developments of previous Hebrew structures, but should be accounted for solely on the basis of the syntax of the contact languages. The converse does not hold if the genesis of MH was based on transmission from previous stages of Hebrew. That is, assuming that MH results from transmission, there is still room for the influence of contact languages. Even if MH was transmitted from previous stages of Hebrew, this could not be the familiar transmission by native speakers in a normal historical development. The first generation of MH speakers spoke it as a second language (L2). This is clearly atypical. Language is typically transmitted by native speakers for whom the transmitted language is a first language (L1). In the case of Hebrew, transmission was mediated by L2 speakers, who were the original speakers of MH. The linguistic knowledge of L2 speakers is imperfect and may contain

10 Tutored by the Committee of the Hebrew Language (predecessor of the present-day Academy of the Hebrew Language) founded in Jerusalem in 1889 by the lexicographer Eliezer Ben-Yehuda, who had been the pioneer ideologue of the transformation of Hebrew into a spoken language.

11 The first kindergarten in Palestine run in Hebrew was established in 1898 by Esther Shapira in the town of Rishon LeZion, founded in 1882 and considered the first town of the *New Yishuv*.

12 The Technion (Institute of Technology) was founded in Haifa in 1912. In 1914 it committed to a curriculum taught in Hebrew, after a year-long struggle known as the "War of Languages" fought against the prior decision of its board of trustees to conduct classes in German. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem was founded in 1918 and has taught in Hebrew ever since it opened its gates in 1925.

inconsistencies and disruptions which inhibit linguistic transmission of the language. This imperfect transmission characterizes the process of language shift, when a group of speakers shifts to a target language by acquiring it as an L2, thus failing to learn it perfectly.[13] L2-mediated transmission is bound to give rise to change due to the influence of the L2 speakers' native languages. Moreover, the next generation, which is the first generation of L1 speakers of MH, undergoes a process of deficient learning based solely on L2 speakers. Normally, when language is transmitted from L1 speakers to L1 speakers, there are language-specific innate principles which guide learning and secure smooth transmission.

The transmission-based hypothesis—that MH was indeed transmitted from previous stages of Hebrew (though deficiently through L2 speakers)—can be supported by comparing the patterns of changes found in MH with those found in other known examples of deficient transmission. The studies in this volume support the transmission-based hypothesis by describing changes which are indeed similar to what is known about deficient transmission via L2 speakers in other documented cases of language contact, such as Kroch 2001 and Meisel 2011.

There have been in the past arguments adduced against the creole-based genesis, notably Goldenberg 1996, Blau 2002, Zeldes 2013. These scholars have argued that MH includes many constructions already found in historical stages of Hebrew. The present studies show something more dramatic: that many novel constructions of MH, including those triggered by contact, are actually based in one way or another on original Hebrew structures. In other words, in many cases the novel constructions seem to encode change applied to the previous stages of Hebrew, whether internally motivated or contact-induced.

The transmission-based hypothesis is best discussed in the framework of the view found in the generative literature since Chomsky (1981), where language variation is conceived as following from parametric differences. Grammars are taken to differ from each other along the lines of different parametric choices. In other words, grammars make different choices in selecting the values of underspecified formal features found in the characterization of particular parameters. For example, Rizzi (1982) has suggested that a grammar which allows question formation from within structures otherwise thought to be syntactic islands differs from one which doesn't in selecting CP (Complementizer

13 As known in general about L2 acquisition, Gass & Selinker (2008:89–155).

Phrase) rather than IP (Inflection Phrase) as the value of the bounding node parameter, at least for constructing questions.[14]

Since Lightfoot (1991, 1999), Roberts (1993, 1999), Roberts & Roussou (2003), syntactic change has been conceived as diachronic modification in the values of parameters. In particular, two types of parameter modification have been described in previous studies of contact: (a) *value transfer*, where there is direct transfer into the language of the L2 speakers of the value settings of the parameters in their native language (the contact language), and (b) *value reset*, where L1 speakers change the value of parameters that originates in a previous generation. L1 speakers acquire the language at an early stage, when they still have access to the mental mechanism which enables them to reset the values of parameters. They do so in the face of the ambiguous and conflicting triggers they are exposed to in the speech of the preceding generation of L2 speakers.

The present studies are not formulated in terms of universal parameters but rather language-specific constructions. What these studies show is that novel MH constructions follow the two modification types formulated above: value transfer from the contact language, and value reset. Novel constructions are shown in the present studies to be related to particular constructions within previous stages of Hebrew. The difference between the novel and original versions of a construction are shown to result from value change (either value transfer or value reset) of a property of the original construction. When inspecting a particular novel construction, one can tell whether it is the outcome of value transfer or value reset. Value transfer results in properties of the construction not originally found in Hebrew but identical to the ones found in the parallel construction within the contact language. Value reset results in properties of the construction which are neither originally apparent in Hebrew nor identical to properties of parallel constructions in the contact languages. Value reset is different from Rosén's 1995 account of the change within the language of L1 speakers, whereby native speakers are consciously taught the historical values of the Hebrew parameters at school, or make use of general cognitive mechanisms such as analogy and back-formation which lead them to simplify and neutralize the grammar of the previous generation of L2 speakers.

Beyond the similarities between the transmission of Hebrew in its earliest stages and other cases of L2 transmission, the present studies show changes that are particular to the transmission of Hebrew.

14 The example cannot be further elaborated in this short introduction. I refer the reader to Rizzi 1982:49–76 and Lightfoot 2006:142–144 where such an analysis has been suggested.

1) In the case of Hebrew, the L2-stage differs from more familiar examples of L2 acquisition, as it took place when there was no community of native speakers of the L2. It may be akin to language acquisition in a scenario of *heritage language*, where there is reduced access to primary linguistic data, and the data available to the learners is inconclusive. Such a scenario has been studied cross-linguistically (Montrul 2004, Polinsky & Kagan 2007) and has been shown to result in incomplete acquisition and grammatical reanalysis heavily influenced by the first language of the learners, leading to language change.
2) In Hebrew, there was some value resetting at the stage of L2 speakers, maybe because they often acquired L2 at the same age as L1. Since it is early acquisition which allows resetting, young L2 learners might have overcome conflicting triggers they were exposed to in their two languages by resetting relevant values of MH constructions. An example is discussed in the chapter by Taube.
3) In cases where the original Hebrew value of a given parameter/construction remains in MH alongside the value transferred from the contact language, the two values serve to distinguish registers. As is to be expected, the original Hebrew value tends to be used in prescriptive MH, whereas the value transferred from the native language of the L2 speakers is reserved for colloquial MH. This is amply illustrated in the chapters by Kagan, Ziv, Schwarzwald & Shlomo, Francez, Bar-Asher Siegal, Neuman, and Doron & Meir.
4) The contact languages which seem to have influenced MH most were the languages spoken by the Jewish communities whose members were the first L2 speakers of MH. Some are Jewish languages which have evolved over centuries remote from their non-Jewish correlates (Yiddish and Judeo-Spanish). Others are Jewish dialects of the surrounding languages (Judeo-Arabic, Jewish Neo-Aramaic). In addition, there was influence of the languages surrounding the communities, both in Eastern Europe and in Palestine (Slavic, Arabic). The present studies also demonstrate that language contact is not unique to MH, but has been pervasive in the development of Hebrew over the ages. There is repeated mention of the influence of Aramaic during the period of antiquity and the influence of Arabic and Romance languages on Medieval Hebrew.

Another fact brought to light by the present studies is that contrary to claims that Yiddish might be a Slavic language (Wexler 1990), there are actually crucial differences between Yiddish and Slavic, and it is possible to demonstrate in

many cases whether value transfer originated from Yiddish or Slavic. This is demonstrated in the chapters by Kagan, Keren, Tsirkin-Sadan, and Ariel.

The volume is organized along two dimensions. One dimension is concerned with the type of transmission, and separates constructions with properties clearly affected by language contact resulting in language shift (first four sections) from those with properties which might be the result of internal development or borrowing (last two sections respectively). Another factor plays a role within this dimension, and distinguishes two types of value-change in the properties of constructions whose transmission was mediated by language contact: L2 transfer (the vast majority of the cases) vs. L1 reset (which can be detected in the chapters by Widgerson, Bleaman, and Ariel). The second dimension separates constituents according to their structural complexity: phrasal vs. lexical, and their grammatical role: clause central vs. clause peripheral.

Clausal Predicates

The phenomenon described in the first chapter, by **Taube**, seems to involve L2 value reset (rather than mere transfer). The chapter accounts for the possessive/existential construction, a thetic construction that goes back to Biblical Hebrew. The same construction is found in MH, but unlike previous stages of Hebrew, MH extensively marks the possessum as accusative—a novel marking that has never been properly understood (the possessum is originally nominative in Hebrew). Taube makes the discovery that in Slavic, the marking is genitive and crucially only occurs in negative clauses. This means that originally, the special marking is not at all a characteristic of the possessive/existential construction, but of negation—the realization of the well-known Slavic case value known as the *genitive of negation*. Taube shows how the Slavic value was first transferred by speakers of Yiddish to their own negative existential construction, utilizing accusative morphology (Yiddish does not have special forms for the genitive case). Later, learners of Hebrew reset the case value within their L2 Hebrew. The change must have taken place at the L2-stage, in view of evidence that it was already in effect among speakers prior to 1911, when there were practically no L1-speakers of MH. It appears that L2 speakers, faced with the case conflict between positive and negative existential constructions, and between the possessive and existential constructions, reset the MH case value to the accusative in all possessive/existential constructions, irrespective of negation.

The next chapters contain examples where at the L2 stage, only value transfer is attested, as expected, not reset. **Kagan** discusses another MH construction which originates in Biblical Hebrew, one in which a pronoun functions as copula. In Biblical Hebrew, only personal pronouns can be copulas, and

this has been analyzed as a case of grammaticalization which took place in Biblical Hebrew.[15] In MH, a different process is attested, whereby demonstrative pronouns start to function as copulas directly under contact with Slavic (here there is no Yiddish mediation). The novelty of this second grammaticalization is documented by the vast difference between the properties of personal vs. demonstrative copulas. The former are grammaticalized as syntactic heads (Doron 1983, 1986), while the latter, both in Slavic (Van Gelderen 2011) and MH (Spector Shirz 2014) are specifiers. The latter process can be viewed as the result of value-transfer by L2 speakers of the Slavic value, and is considered colloquial. It seems that there was never subsequent value reset by L1 speakers to unify personal and demonstrative pronouns.[16]

Gamliel & Mar'i also describe a construction of MH that originates in Biblical Hebrew. This is an example whereby lexical verbs are grammaticalized as aspectual auxiliaries conjoined to the main verb.[17] This grammaticalization is attested in Biblical Hebrew for the auxiliary *hālaḵ* 'go,' which denotes imperfectivity, and *šāḇ* 'return' which denotes repetitivity (*ḥāzar* in Mishnaic Hebrew). In MH, the process expands. The relevant contact language this time is Arabic. Under the influence of Arabic dialects, the grammaticalization is extended in MH to additional verbs in the same conjunctive construction: *ba* 'come' (ingressive aspect) and *yašav* 'sit' (durative aspect); Lucas 2015:528 shows the same grammaticalization of the latter verb in Maltese English, also under contact with Arabic. This transfer is facilitated by the fact that *go* is a grammaticalized auxiliary also in Arabic.

Bleaman discusses another MH construction that originates in Biblical Hebrew, one where an infinitival form of the verb within a clausal predicate is used to reduplicate its finite form. In MH, a construction involving reduplication is found as well. Unlike previous views, which conclude that this is the same construction (Goldenberg 1971), Bleaman carefully traces vast differences between the two: morphological, syntactic and pragmatic. In particular, the MH construction is phrasal, unlike the lexical reduplication in Biblical Hebrew. The MH phrase always appears to the left of the entire clause, unlike the Biblical infinitive which immediately precedes or even follows the verb. Again, we have here a case where the basic construction is due to a Biblical Hebrew parameter (the separation of the lexical verb from the inflection). But the construction in MH is different in many ways from the basic Biblical

15 This is part of the "Copula Cycle" discussed by Van Gelderen 2011:Ch. 4.

16 Data discussed in Spector Shirtz 2014:Ch. 2 fn 4 perhaps show that at a certain point there might have been beginnings of such reset.

17 This falls under the "Aspect Cycle" discussed by Van Gelderen 2011:Ch. 7.6.

construction. Rather it has the properties of a parallel Yiddish construction and is thus probably due to value-transfer by L2 MH speakers whose native language was Yiddish. There seems to have been subsequent reset by L1 speakers which allowed the new value to be adopted in contemporary MH, and the Biblical value was relegated to frozen examples within archaic stylized writing.

Dubnov too discusses a predicational construction that originates in Biblical Hebrew, the secondary predicate. She shows that in the Old Testament, only depictive secondary predicates are used. These are secondary predicates which are typically adjectives, sometimes participles, they are participant related, they follow and form a prosodic unit with the main predicate, and they are obligatorily within the scope of sentential negation. Dubnov shows that in early MH literature a new type of secondary predicate enters the language—the circumstantial secondary predicate. As in the construction discussed by Bleaman, here too the new version has very different properties from the Biblical version. Circumstantial secondary predicates are typically participles rather than adjectives, they further describe the event rather than one of its participants, they can precede the main predicate and form a separate constituent, and finally they can escape the scope of sentential negation. Dubnov argues that this cluster of properties characterizes a special part of speech found in Slavic and Yiddish, the **adverbial participle,** whose only function is expressing a circumstantial secondary predicate. It thus seems that the value determining the choice of secondary predicates in these languages was transferred by the speakers to their L2 MH, allowing the inclusion of ordinary participles as secondary predicates in MH.

Clausal Periphery

Schwarzwald & Shlomo describe a construction which consists of a clause introduced by the complementizer 'that' (*še* in Hebrew). Originally in Hebrew, as is typically the case cross-linguistically, the complementizer is only found in embedded clauses. In the future tense, such clauses have a modal interpretation, and in MH are found in a construction consisting of main clauses expressing modality, e.g., requests and wishes. The authors argue that the novel construction evolved in MH under the influence of Judeo-Spanish, where the same construction is attested for parallel modal clauses with a complementizer (*ke* in Judeo-Spanish). This raises an interesting puzzle, since Judeo-Spanish is a minor contact language restricted to a very small subcommunity of the early MH L2 speakers. How did the new value *main-clause* for the distribution of this construction catch up with the entire community of MH speakers?

The answer is, as argued by the authors, that the new value *main-clause* had actually previously been introduced into Hebrew through medieval contact with Spanish and other Romance languages (with the same complementizer *que*). It made its way into Late Rabbinic texts, and was adopted by early users of MH, independently of transfer from Judeo-Spanish. Thus, this value became generally available.

A particular variant of the same construction is described by **Francez**, which he argues likewise originates in Judeo-Spanish. Here the future-tense main-clause introduced by *še* 'that' is embedded under the question word *lama* 'why.' This particular variant has very special semantics-pragmatics, identical to those of the parallel construction in Judeo-Spanish, which substantiates a common origin. In particular, when the construction includes negation, it is interpreted both in MH and in Judeo-Spanish as a suggestion with a positive polarity (Francez calls the construction under such an interpretation "suggesterogative"). The converse is also true in both languages: when the construction does not include negation, it cannot be interpreted as suggesterogative. Francez explains the special contribution of negation in both languages as follows: the suggesterogative interpretation depends on negation taking scope outside both the *that*-clause and the modal *that* operator, i.e., it is a high negation operative at the level of the speech-act; this explanation is substantiated by the ungrammaticality of negative polarity items within suggesterogatives in both languages, which is due to the fact that such items are not licensed within clauses not including the negation. The complex composition of the suggesterogative is probably not independent in the two languages, suggesting that this might be a case of L2 transfer.

Another construction unique to the clause periphery, also embedded under *lama* 'why,' is described by **Khalaily & Doron**, interestingly originating in other contact languages. The construction entered MH through contact with Arabic dialects and Neo-Aramaic dialects, probably through L2 transfer, but is attested as a general Semitic construction also found in Rabbinic Hebrew. The ancient origin may have facilitated its entering MH. In this construction the clause embedded under *why* is not a *that*-clause but a question. This double question has its own special semantics-pragmatics, and is constructed as a rhetorical question which rejects a presupposition present in the discourse. The same double question with the same rejection function is also found in the construction within the contact languages, which argues for a common origin.

The chapter by **Ziv** is concerned with the non-canonical word order found in colloquial Hebrew, typically in the spoken modality, where certain elements are placed in the right periphery of the clause (i.e., clause final). Examples

include parentheticals, tags and discourse markers, focus markers, certain conjunctions, and dislocated constituents. Ziv shows that these elements were found in Biblical Hebrew, but their function was limited, and they were typically clause initial rather than clause final. It is only in MH that these elements start to appear in the right periphery, particularly in the spoken modality, and acquire special functions determined by information structure considerations. Both the placement of these elements in a position which follows the constituents over which they scope, and the special functions they acquire in this position, were probably introduced by L2 MH learners by transferring the relevant value from Slavic and Yiddish, where the same word order with the same functions is attested as well.

Henshke's chapter is unique in that it shows the mechanism of value transfer at work in real time. Henshke studies Israeli Periphery Hebrew (IPH), spoken in Israeli communities that mostly consist of descendants of native speakers of North African Judeo-Arabic dialects. She argues that in IPH, the variety of values for the dislocation construction is strikingly richer than in colloquial MH in general and is the result of transfer from Judeo-Arabic. She shows many very subtle and detailed differences between IPH and general colloquial MH and argues that in all these cases the IPH values conform to Judeo-Arabic, demonstrating that contact language influence does not consist in diffuse language similarity but in a very precise transfer of particular values. For example, dislocated constructions in IPH serve a richer array of functions than in MH, such as the presentation of deictic relations, including social or locative relations anchored to the speaker, similarly to Judeo-Arabic. Moreover, the variety of elements which can appear dislocated in the (right or left) periphery of the clause is richer in IPH than in MH, and so is the type of clause-internal pronominals which resume the dislocated element. In MH, referential noun phrases can be dislocated and related to resumptive personal pronouns (including the pronominal clitics attached to prepositions). IPH freely allows, in addition, the dislocation of personal pronouns, which may be resumed not only by personal pronouns but also by verbal subject inflection. Moreover, IPH allows the dislocation of demonstrative pronouns. In such cases, the resumptive pronoun is demonstrative. Neither subject inflection nor demonstrative pronouns can function as resumptive pronouns in colloquial MH in general. IPH often makes use of the *echo* construction, where the resumptive pronoun is exactly of the same type as the dislocated element (both are personal pronouns, or both are demonstrative pronouns) and also the striking *complex echo* construction with simultaneous left and right dislocation of the same pronominal. Studies like Henshke's real-time documentation are extremely valuable. For example, the documentation of the echo construction in IPH will prove crucial in a scenario

where the echo construction spreads to general MH, as it will demonstrate that it originates from contact with Judeo-Arabic (since the spread started in IPH) rather than Yiddish, which also has the same construction.

Negation

Rubinstein, Sichel, & Tsirkin-Sadan discuss superfluous negation (Super Neg)—negation which does not reverse the truth conditions of the clause. Constructions with such negation include free relatives, exclamative rhetorical questions, clausal complements of 'until,' 'without,' and 'before,' clausal complements of 'fear'-type verbs, complements of negated 'surprise,' and the complement of 'almost.' These values have been transferred from Slavic and Yiddish. Haspelmath & König (1998) establish the areal nature of the phenomenon among certain eastern European languages. They speculate that Yiddish borrowed the construction from Russian, Polish, or Ukrainian. Yet Super Neg with slightly different values is attested in previous periods of Hebrew. Complements of 'fear' and other verbs of this class were introduced by both 'lest' and *še-lo* 'that-NEG.' Super Neg uses of *še-lo* in this construction are attested in early Rabbinic texts. Super Neg in the complement of *kimʕat* 'almost' is attested in small numbers in Medieval Hebrew and later. Constructions with Super Neg in MH thus do not all share the same path of development. Several constructions disappeared (*kimʕat še-lo* 'almost that-NEG') while others lived on to become part of MH grammar. Language contact may have reinforced existing patterns of Hebrew ('fear' verbs), led to reanalysis of others (*ʕad še-lo* 'until that-NEG'), and introduced altogether new forms into the language (such as in free relatives).

Keren's chapter is concerned with the change in interpretation and distribution of particular negative items. She shows that in Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew, the negative items *meʔuma*, *klum*, and *šum davar*, best translated to English as *anything*, have the distribution of Negative Polarity Items (NPIs). These are lexical items which cannot freely appear in clauses of the language, but are restricted to clauses with the semantic property of being *downward entailing* (first formulated by Ladusaw 1979). Clauses which have this property include negative and interrogative clauses, protases of conditionals, clauses with particular quantifiers, and others. When examining Revival Hebrew texts, Keren finds a change in the distribution of *meʔuma*, *klum*, and *šum davar*. Their distribution is now more restricted, they only appear in negative clauses but not in other types of downward entailing clauses. Keren suggests that they are now better translated to English as *nothing*. Negative elements restricted to negative clauses have been called Negative Concord Items (Ladusaw 1992). Why would the NPIs *meʔuma*, *klum*, and *šum davar* turn into NCIs? Keren

examines their counterparts in Polish, Russian, and Yiddish, and shows that in Polish and Russian these items are strictly NCIs, but that is less clear for Yiddish. Thus the change is probably due to value transfer from Slavic.

Keren's chapter is unique in that it presents a case of language change which simply cannot be detected by comparative textual work. Without the theoretical distinction between NPIs and NCIs, it would be natural, in view of their Biblical and Rabbinic distribution, to consider insignificant the fact that *meʔuma, klum*, and *šum davar* are missing from Revival interrogatives, conditional protases, etc., especially if textual work is not buttressed by asking for speakers' judgments. Without querying speakers, one would not know that MH speakers consider ungrammatical interrogatives and protases containing these items, unless negation is present as well. On the other hand, researchers who are native speakers might unconsciously rely on their own native-speaker judgments. They would thus be biased in favor of the modern distribution and conclude from the texts that *meʔuma, klum*, and *šum davar* are restricted to negative clauses throughout the history of Hebrew, and that the Biblical and Rabbinic interrogatives and protases are an unexplained quirk. Whichever distribution the researchers assume, the change would not be detected.

Lexical Choices

The chapter by **Wigderson** is concerned with L1 reset. In the L2 generation, speakers favored a verbal system with two different exponents of the middle intensive template, the Biblical form *hitpaʕel* and the Rabbinic *nitpaʕel*, which served to distinguish nuances of agentivity vs. passivity. Wigderson suggests that the distinction is due to an L2 transfer from Yiddish. What is surprising is the almost complete loss of the distinction in the speech of the succeeding L1 generation. Wigderson attributes it to the subset principle (Berwick 1985): children always make the most conservative hypothesis when engaged in value resetting. In the present example, children do not get enough evidence for using *nitpaʕel*, and they conclude that their language permits one exponent only, *hitpaʕel*. Only if children systematically heard adults using *nitpaʕel* would they conclude that their language permits it too. Assuming that the L2 speakers used *nitpaʕel* mostly in writing, but not much in their spoken language, especially with children, this may explain the value reset by the L1 generation.

Neuman presents a case with L2 transfer of the values of lexical exponents from contact languages, eventually partly overruled by the original Hebrew values. He shows that the comitative reversible preposition *with* is syncretic in

many languages with the non-reversible instrumental preposition. This is the case in Yiddish and Arabic, and the syncretic value of the parameter was transferred to the speech of L2 learners of MH. But in writing, L2 users preserved the original Hebrew value, where the preposition is reversible only, giving rise to the prescriptive use where *ʕim* 'with' is comitative only and is distinct from the non-reversible *be-* 'by means of.' In the next generation, both values are used by L1 speakers, depending on the context of use. Even educated speakers start allowing non-reversible uses of *ʕim* 'with' (this might be partly due to borrowing from non-reversible, possessive, uses of the English *with*).

An example of L2 transfer from Slavic (rather than Yiddish) is discussed by **Tsirkin-Sadan**. It involves two related but separate Rabbinic collocations which are eventually reinterpreted as a single adverb in the speech of the first L2 learners of MH in accordance with Slavic. One Rabbinic collocation is the combination of the preposition *be-* 'in' and the noun *klal* 'totality,' grammaticalized in Medieval Hebrew as the adverb *biḵlal* 'in general.'[18] The other is the Rabbinic negative polarity item *klal* 'at all.' In Slavic, but not in Yiddish, a single adverb carries both meanings, and it contains the locative preposition 'in.' The transfer of this complex meaning to MH promoted the creation of the single adverb *bixlal* with a blanket use of the locative preposition. The new adverb further acquires in MH the additional function of discourse marker that it has in Slavic.

An additional example of the crucial role of Slavic is provided in the chapter by **Ariel**. The chapter follows the changes within the early stages of MH in the choice of the preposition which heads phrases expressing the material constitution of entities, e.g. 'of glass.' Ariel shows that historically, two options are found in the Hebrew sources: mostly the Rabbinic genitive preposition *šel* 'of,' but also the locative (source) preposition *min* 'from,' a vestige from Biblical Hebrew also used in Medieval Hebrew. Ariel shows that in the earliest phases of Revival Hebrew, writers originally favored the Rabbinic *šel* 'of,' gradually switching over the years to *min* 'from' as MH started to be spoken. This probably represents value transfer not from Yiddish, which uses the preposition *fun*, which has both possessive and locative interpretations, but from Russian, which uses the locative *iz*, which does not have a possessive meaning. L2 learners transferred the Slavic value and used the preposition *min* 'from.' For L1 speakers this becomes the only value, similarly to the process described in the chapters by Wigderson and Bleaman.

18 This is part of the "Case Cycle" discussed by Van Gelderen 2011:Ch 5.1.3.

Noun-phrase Structure

Bar-Asher Siegal discusses two reciprocal constructions, the demonstrative construction originating in Mishnaic Hebrew, and the numeral construction calqued from a European construction, which came to be favored in (colloquial) MH probably because of L2 transfer from the contact languages. Similarly to other cases discussed in the volume, the original Hebrew construction was relegated to formal writing. Despite the semantic and syntactic resemblance between the new and the old constructions, they remain side by side as two independent constructions with different grammatical properties and semantic nuances. First, only a component of the numeral construction may be floated from complement to specifier position; this is impossible in the demonstrative construction, probably since a floated demonstrative is interpreted as referring to a different argument than a separate demonstrative in complement position. Second, only the components of the demonstrative construction can encode the singular/plural contrast and therefore distinguish between cases where reciprocity is held between individuals or between groups; plurality encoding is not attested in the numeral construction.

Bar-Ziv Levy & Agranovsky show that the complementizer introducing free relatives had the Biblical value in the original stages of MH. The Mishnaic value was present as well, but it gained popularity once the use of MH became heavily influenced by the original languages of the users, and the Mishnaic value was favored since it matched the value transferred by speakers of the Yiddish/Slavic value. In addition, the authors show that an innovative binary distinction in definiteness originates in transfer from the same contact languages (in particular Yiddish and Polish); this distinction is adopted and extensively made use of in the subsequent L1 generation.

Reshef discusses a periphrastic superlative construction that was used in early Modern Hebrew texts and argues that it originates in Medieval contact with Arabic and Latin. This superlative consists of the definite determiner appended to a periphrastic comparative adjective of the form *more + Adj*. Reshef attributes the adoption of this definite periphrastic superlative to its affinity to the Hebrew definite form of the adjective which originally served as superlative but was less useful since it required explicit mention of the comparison class. In later texts of Modern Hebrew, the medieval periphrastic superlative is gradually lost and replaced by the original Hebrew periphrastic elative construction *Adj + to-a-high-degree*. Reshef attributes the loss of the previous construction *more + Adj* to its problematic word order, whereby the modifier *more* precedes the head *Adj*, which is problematic since Hebrew requires the opposite word order. This nevertheless does not determine the choice of the elative to replace the ungrammatically ordered comparative. Reshef therefore

concludes that the value-transfer from contact languages is merely functional rather than structural. But it is also possible to entertain a different hypothesis. In Slavic, the elative *to a high extent/degree* is used for the superlative. It is therefore possible that the adoption of the elative structure took place under the influence of the Slavic construction. Since Slavic was indeed a contact language in the period when the change took place, the 1920s, the change might after all be a case of structural L2 value-transfer.

Doron & Meir discuss value changes of the Hebrew determiner (D). In Biblical Hebrew, as in Semitic in general, D is an inflectional feature of the category *state* (distinguishing the absolute/construct/emphatic states). Doron & Meir show a change in the morphosyntax of D in Medieval Hebrew, first internally within Rabbinic Hebrew texts, and later strengthened by contact first with Arabic and then with other European languages. The change in morphosyntax brought about a change in the values available to D and its reinterpretation as marking definiteness. In MH as spoken today D expresses values of definiteness, whereas Revival Hebrew preferred to stick to the state values of the category (still reflected in prescriptive Hebrew today). Under L2 transfer, the former value for D won in colloquial MH, due to the influence of Yiddish, the native language of many of the first L2 speakers of MH.

Internal Change

In some cases, the role of contact languages in influencing a construction is less clear. **Shatil** describes a Hebrew possessive structure of the form N_1 *of* N_2 which, as in other languages, came to have a particular evaluative interpretation—the *quality pseudopartivite* (also known as a *binominal noun phrase*). Shatil discusses the syntactic, semantic, prosodic and sociolinguistic features of the MH quality pseudopartitive. The structure is basically possessive, e.g., *reax šel ʔorez*, 'smell of rice,' but like in many languages the possessive structure also has *pseudopartitive* uses for particular types of N_1, e.g., the quantity pseudopartitive *kos šel ʔorez*, 'a cup of rice,' including quality pseudopartitive uses where N_1 is an evaluative noun, either positively or negatively, sometimes the nominalization of an adjective, such as *yófi šel ʔorez*, 'good rice,' literally 'a beauty of rice.' Pseudopartitives are special in that they are right-headed, unlike the original possessive which is left-headed. Shatil recognizes that the quality pseudopartivite construction might have originated in an inner process, but contact may still have played a role in the construction's wide distribution, since it can be found in most of the languages of contact.

The chapter by **Bar-Asher Siegal & Boneh** discusses a parameter which has remained stable and resisted change. Such parameters have been shown (by Roberts & Biberauer 2014) to be the *macro-parameters* (so-called by Baker

1996). They are unlike the *micro-parameters*, including language-specific constructions illustrated so far, which are sensitive to change as they are characterized by the value of a single property. Macro-parameters are clusters of properties and, as such, resist change. They often consist of particular categories like nouns, verbs, etc. Bar-Asher Siegal & Boneh discuss prepositions, in particular dative prepositions. They argue that the functions of dative prepositions are stable throughout Hebrew history, including MH. They point to what might be a counterexample, a MH use which is novel, the so-called *discursive dative*. Yet they argue that this use has probably existed all along, but has not been previously documented in Hebrew since it is restricted to the spoken modality. As such, it could not have been transmitted from previous stages of Hebrew to the L2 speakers of MH. Rather, it must have been transferred from their native languages, many of which included this use.

Borrowing

The chapter by **Rappaport Hovav** presents the one example in the volume of construction borrowing, which is a different type of contact-induced change from the shift discussed in all the other studies (the two types were distinguished by Thomason & Kaufman 1988). Borrowing happens in the converse direction: it happens when speakers reset a value within their language, not as part of the process of acquiring L2, but as part of L2 influence. There is no shift to L2, but rather an effect on L1 due to a relatively long period of contact with a prestige L2 (English in the present example), which is not adopted by the community but affects its L1.

Recent changes within MH tend to be of the borrowing type, and the construction documented by Rappaport Hovav is very recent in MH. The construction involves the single collocation *ʔibed ʔet ʕacmo l-a-daʕat* 'obliterate oneself consciously.' Originally this construction was compositionally interpreted as 'commit suicide,' where the adverb *consciously* transparently contributed the conscious dimension of the act. This collocation froze in MH, together with the archaic prefixal form *l-* within the adverb *consciously.* In MH the transparency was lost, since adverbial prefixes were reinterpreted as prepositions. The preposition *l-* 'to' is systematically interpreted as goal in MH, including in resultative adjuncts. In order to preserve transparency, it made sense to reinterpret *l-* as a goal preposition introducing the result. This required reversing the sense of *consciousness* to denote the result of suicide, i.e., something akin to *lack of consciousness*, metaphorically *death* (reversal of the literal meaning of items in fixed collocations is often attested in Hebrew). This freed the verb within the collocation from carrying the resultative meaning of *death* and allowed its interpretation as a manner verb. Other manner verbs started being used as

well. The next step described by Rappaport Hovav involved the reinterpretation of the reflexive element as a functional element rather than necessarily as an argument, maybe akin to the prefixal reflexive morphology in the lexical version of *obliterate oneself*, i.e., *hit?abed*. What was borrowed from English is the use of such a functional reflexive element to allow the application of resultatives to intransitive verbs. As a result, the range of possible verbs in the construction was extended to intransitives, and eventually to transitives with unspecified objects, very similarly to English, giving rise to a new productive construction of MH, a collocation with a variable verbal slot.

When MH started being spoken in Palestine, lexical borrowing from Arabic was highly regarded, as it symbolized the metamorphosis of the Jewish new immigrants into authentic local inhabitants. Some of the borrowed items were later replaced, e.g., *buǧaras* 'headache,' *čílba* 'enemy,' *čizbat* 'story,' *finǧan* 'coffeepot,' *ǧábal* 'mountain,' *ǧamá?a* 'friends,' *ǧára* 'jar,' *ǧóra* 'sewage,' *sáxbak* 'friend,' *rásmi* 'formal,' but many others remain integrated within MH, such as the adjective *?áħla* 'more beautiful/most beautiful,' borrowed as *áxla*. This lexical item is carefully studied in the article by **Gafter & Horesh**, and it allows them to unveil interesting characteristics of lexical borrowing. In Arabic, *?áħla* is clearly an adjective, as it exhibits the two morphosyntactic characteristics typical of comparative/superlative adjectives in Arabic. It is derived in the special template *?aCCaC*, and it can precede the head noun N in the attributive construction, unlike all other adjectives, which must follow N. *áxla* is borrowed together with its morphosyntactic characteristics. Yet these morphosyntactic characteristics do not characterize adjectives of any sort in Hebrew. The *?aCCaC* template is used to derive nouns rather than adjectives, and preceding the head N is only allowed for evaluative nouns in the attributive construction, never adjectives. Accordingly, *áxla* seems to have the form and distribution of a noun in MH, though it definitely has an evaluative interpretation, something like 'a good thing.' Indeed, like other evaluative nouns, it is found together with the possessive preposition *šel* 'of' e.g., *áxla* (*šel*) *órez* 'good rice' within the Hebrew quality pseudopartitive construction discussed in Shatil's article. Lexical borrowing thus seems to preserve morphosyntax and part of the semantics but surprisingly not necessarily the lexical category.

In sum, the genesis of MH as studied in the present volume provides examples of various types of language change: reset, transfer, internal change, and borrowing. The various types of change illustrated in the volume collectively disprove the hypothesis that MH has a creole character and is based on a specifically Yiddish substrate with a Hebrew superstrate that serves solely as a lexifier. In particular, the examples of change as a result of contact appear to support the transmission hypothesis for MH. Though they involve constructions

influenced by contact with a range of languages, in many of the cases these constructions are modifications of constructions that existed in some form in earlier stages of Hebrew.

References

Baker, Mark. 1996. *The Polysynthesis Parameter*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ben-Aryeh, Yehoshua & Israel Bartal, eds. 1983. *The History of Eretz Israel: The Last Phase of Ottoman Rule (1799–1917)*. Jerusalem: Keter (in Hebrew).

Berwick, Robert. 1985. *The Acquisition of Syntactic Knowledge*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Biberauer, Theresa & Ian Roberts. Forthcoming. "Parameter Setting." In *The Cambridge Handbook of Historical Syntax*, eds. A. Ledgeway & I. Roberts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blau, Yehoshua. 2002. "Reflections on the Revival of Hebrew." *Leshonenu* 65: 315–324 (in Hebrew).

Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Doron, Edit. 1983. *Verbless Predicates in Hebrew*. Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin.

———. "The Pronominal Copula as Agreement Clitic." In *Syntax and Semantics* 19: *The Syntax of Pronominal Clitics*, ed. H. Borer. New York: Academic Press, 313–332.

Fellman, Jack. 1973. *The Revival of a Classical Tongue: Eliezer Ben Yehuda and the Modern Hebrew Language*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Gass, Susan M. & Larry Selinker. 2008. *Second Language Acquisition: An Introductory Course.* 3rd edition. New York: Routledge.

Goldenberg, Gideon. 1971. "Tautological Infinitive." *Israel Oriental Studies* 1: 36–85.

———. 1996. "Hebrew as a Living Semitic Language." In *Evolution and Renewal—Trends in the Development of the Hebrew Language: Lectures Commemorating the 100th Anniversary of the Establishment of the Hebrew Language Council.* Jerusalem: Publications of the Israel Academy of the Sciences and Humanities, 148–190 (in Hebrew).

Harshav, Benjamin. 1999. *Language in Time of Revolution.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Haspelmath, Martin & Ekkehard König. 1998. "Concessive Conditionals in the Languages of Europe." In *Adverbial Constructions in the Languages of Europe*, ed. Johan van der Auwera. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 563–640.

Holm, John A. 1988. *Pidgins and Creoles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Izre'el, Shlomo. 2001. "On Processes in the Formation of the Hebrew Spoken in Israel." In *Speaking Hebrew: Research of Spoken Language and Linguistic Variation in Israel, Te'uda 18*, ed. S. Izre'el. Tel Aviv: TAU Press, 217–238 (in Hebrew).

Khan, Geoffrey et al., eds. 2013. *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics*. Leiden: Brill.

Kroch, Anthony S. 2001. "Syntactic Change." In *The Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory*, eds. Mark. Baltin & Christopher Collins. Oxford: Blackwell, 699–729.

Ladusaw, William A. 1979. *Polarity Sensitivity as Inherent Scope Relations*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Texas, Austin. Also published, New York: Garland Press, 1980.

———. 1992. "Expressing Negation." In *Semantics and Linguistic Theory* (*SALT*) *II*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Lefebvre, Claire. 1998. *Creole Genesis and the Acquisition of Grammar: The Case of Haitian Creole.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lightfoot, David. 1991. *How to Set Parameters. Arguments from Language Change*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

———. 1999. *The Development of Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.

———. 2006. *How New Languages Emerge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lewis, Bernard. 1954. "Studies in the Ottoman Archives—I." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 16.3: 469–501.

Lucas, Christopher. 2015. "Contact-induced Language Change." In *The Routledge Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, eds. Claire Bowern & Bethwyn Evans. New York: Routledge.

Meisel, Jürgen M. 2011. "Bilingual Language Acquisition and Theories of Diachronic Change: Bilingualism as Cause and Effect of Grammatical Change." *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 14.2: 121–145.

Montrul, Silvina. 2004. "Subject and Object Expression in Spanish Heritage Speakers: A Case of Morphosyntactic Convergence." *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 7.2: 125–142.

Ofer, Yosef. 2007. "The Origin of Israeli Pronunciation." In *Sha'arei Lashon: Studies in Hebrew, Aramaic and Jewish Languages Presented to Moshe Bar-Asher, vol. III*, eds. A. Maman, S.E. Fassberg, & Y. Breuer. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 166–172 (in Hebrew).

Polinsky, Maria & Olga Kagan. 2007. "Heritage Languages: In the 'Wild' and in the Classroom." *Language and Linguistics Compass* 1.5: 368–395.

Pintzuk, Susan. 2008. "Variationist Approaches to Syntactic Change." In *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, eds. Brian D. Joseph & Richard D. Janda. New York: Wiley. 509–528.

Reshef, Yael. 2013. "Revival of Hebrew: Sociolinguistic Dimension." In *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics*, vol. 3, eds. G. Khan et al. Leiden: Brill, 408–415.

———. Forthcoming. *Hebrew in the Mandate Period*. Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language (in Hebrew).

Rizzi, Luigi. 1982. *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Roberts, Ian. 1993. *Verbs and Diachronic Syntax. A Comparative History of English and French*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

———. 1999. "Verb Movement and Markedness." In *Language Creation and Language Change: Creolization, Diachrony, and Development*, ed. M. DeGraff. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 287–327.

——— & Anna Roussou. 2003. *Syntactic Change: A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosén, Haiim B. 1995. *Hebrew at the Crossroad of Cultures.* Leuven and Paris: Peeters.

Spector Shirtz, Ilona. 2014. *The Syntax of Non-verbal Predication in Modern Hebrew: Predicate Nominals, Pseudoclefts and Clefts*. Ph.D. Dissertation, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Thomason, Sarah G. & Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics.* Berkeley, CA: UC Press.

Tirosh-Becker, Ofra. 2015. "Eli'ezer Ben-Yehuda and Algerian Jews: Relationship and Language." In *Arabic and Semitic Linguistics Contextualized. A Festschrift for Jan Retsö*, ed. L. Edzard. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 432–433.

Van Gelderen, Elly. 2011. *The Linguistic Cycle: Language Change and the Language Faculty.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wexler, Paul. 1990. *The Schizoid Nature of Modern Hebrew: A Slavic Language in Search of a Semitic Past*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Zeldes, Amir. 2013. "Is Modern Hebrew Standard Average European? The View from European." *Linguistic Typology* 17: 439–470.