

FOLIA ORIENTALIA
VOL. 47 2010

Rivka Shemesh

Bar Ilan University
Ramat Gan

THE USE OF THE CO-AGENTIC DATIVE PRONOUN
IN THE MISHNA AND TOSEFTA

1. Introduction

1.1 The definition of the co-agentive dative and its features in the research

“The co-agentive dative pronoun” (a term coined by Halevy 2004¹) is a suffixed pronoun appearing in the structure ‘verb + -ל + pronoun’ as in the following sentence:

הילד קם לו מוקדם בבוקר. – ‘The child got himself up early in the morning.’

This pronoun refers to the subject of the sentence² (that is, it is reflexive or co-referential), and the subject realizes the agent of the event. This pronoun cannot be replaced with another pronoun while maintaining the meaning of the sentence; for example, in the sentence above, the pronoun לו cannot be replaced with another pronoun and achieve the same meaning: *הילד קם להם/לי מוקדם בבוקר – ‘The child got them/me up early in the morning’. The co-agentive dative pronoun is also called “the redundant pronoun”,³ because it is semantically redundant, in that it does not inject an additional participant into the event.

The co-agentive dative is often identified in the research with the terms “ethical dative”⁴ and the “dativus commodi” (for example Azar 1995:148–9), but it is distinguished from

¹ In her paper in English – Halevy 2007 – the term “subject co-referential dative” (SCD) is used. Berman (1982:51–6) uses the term “reflexive” or “co-referential dative” and characterizes the status of this pronoun. For the features of this pronoun, see the following sources: Berman 1982:51–6; Ullendorff 1992:8; Cohen 1994:179–81; Halevy 2004:113–22 and note 4.

² In Rodrigue-Schwarzwald and Sokoloff 1992:74, the term “ethical dative” is translated as דאטיב נושא (“subject dative”).

³ This pronoun appears in Sharvit 2006:151. For an explanation of its redundancy, see Berman 1982:51–6.

⁴ See for example Cohen 1994:179–81; Halevy 2004:113–22 and note 4; Sharvit 2006:151. Blau 2005 explains that although the term is unsatisfactory and vague, he uses it for reasons of convenience. Halevy (2004:113–22) considers the co-agentive dative to be a subclass of the ethical dative or an interim category between the ethical dative and the dative known as the “possessive dative”.

these terms in this paper, following Halevy 2004:113–22 and note 4.⁵ The pronoun that serves as the ethical dative (“*dativus ethicus*” in Latin as well as dative of emotion/feeling⁶) is also a suffixed pronoun to -ל, for example in the sentence הילד קם לנו – ‘The child woke up early for us’, but it does not realize a participant in the event, but is rather an entity that is close to the agent or to the recipient of the event (for example in this sentence, there is closeness between the child and the addressers of the utterance). Also the “*dativus commodi*” (Jouon 1991:488; Azar 1995:148–9) can appear as a suffixed pronoun to -ל, as in the sentence הילד קנה לו ספר – ‘The child bought himself a book’; It denotes the benefactive, that is, the one that gains benefit, or the one that is harmed by the action (“*dativus incommodi*”), and unlike the co-agentive dative pronoun, it can be replaced by another pronoun (for example: הילד קנה לי/לך ספר – ‘The child bought me/you a book’).

The research notes a number of approaches to explain the meaning of the element termed here “the co-agentive dative pronoun”. One approach is that the pronoun denotes the benefactive, the one that benefits from the action, as we find, for example, in the definition provided (in Hebrew) by Rodrigue-Schwarzwald and Sokoloff 1992:74 (“[...] to note that the person or object under discussion is considered by the actor and the action is carried out for his benefit or enjoyment”) [my emphasis – R.S.] and in Segal (1936:167) (“...to show that the action touches on the heart of the subject, that he has an interest in it, that it is to his benefit, and so on”).

⁵ See also Jouon 1991:488 note 2. Naudé 1997 distinguishes between four dative structures: ethical dative, possessive dative, *dativus commodi*, and the indirect object, and compares their features in the table that appears on page 161 in his paper.

⁶ For the characterization of the ethical dative, see Berman 1982:38–9. Muraoka 1978 maintains that this term, which was borrowed from Latin grammar to Semitic philology, is a magic notion used unsuccessfully by scholars, because it is inappropriate for Semitic languages, in which the ethical dative pronoun is identical to the subject of the sentence, unlike the situation in Indo-European languages. See also Ullendorff (1992:1–3). On this term, see also Shatil (2004:55), who prefers the term “sympathetic dative”.

Also, Azar (1995:148–9) offers this meaning (“It expresses [...] the *dativus commodi* [...], that is the idea of the action being carried out at the free will of and for the benefit of the one carrying out the action”), and further clarifies that it emanates from a combination of the preposition לְ (which means ‘for, for the benefit of’) and the element of reflexiveness. This approach does not actually distinguish between the co-agentive dative and the “*dativus commodi*”. A second approach, which may be called an aspectual approach, maintains that the pronoun expresses an aspect of the action which is noted by means of the previous verb – an aspect of a ‘reflexive action’ according to Bendavid (1967:146–7), or an ingressive aspect (involving the entering into or emerging from a situation) according to Sokoloff (1969:270–2).⁷ A third approach is a functional one: According to Muraoka 1978,⁸ the pronoun has a centripetal meaning of focusing on the subject, which creates its individual identity by separating it from everything around it; and according to Noss 1995, it denotes (in the Bible and in African languages described in his paper) a contrastive focus – to explicitly contrast the subject with another figure, which has a thematic function in the development of discourse when shifts in focus are identified in the discourse. In addition to the approaches that explain the denotative meaning of the pronoun, in the research one can find treatment of the connotative aspects of its meaning: Ullendorff (1992:1–3, 8) believes that the pronoun has a universal connotation of ironic informality, even frivolity, and that its expression is indicative of a popular and informal style. As proof of this, he compares the verse עַתָּה הִנֵּה בַטַּחַת לָךְ עַל מִשְׁעֶנֶת הַקֶּהֶץ הַזֶּה עַל מִצְרַיִם – ‘You rely, of all things, on Egypt, that splintered reed of a staff’ (2 Kings 18, 21),⁹ which implies, in his view, the utter futility of trusting in Egypt, with the parallel verse in Isaiah 36, 6, in which the word לָךְ is absent, and which expresses a more serious approach.

⁷ It is notable that there is a general discussion of the pronoun as denoting emphasis: Sokoloff (2002:611–3) defines the use of this pronoun in Babylonian Aramaic as ethical dative and notes its role “for emphasis”, and Ben-Yehuda (1948, Vol. 5:2568–9, 2572–3) defines the use of the pronoun “to emphasize the verb”.

⁸ On his research, see also Cohen 1994:179–80. Ullendorff (1992:1–7) does not accept Muraoka’s explanation.

⁹ The translation in this paper of the Biblical verses into English is based on JPS Hebrew-English Tanakh (2000).

Associated with the explanation of the meaning of the pronoun is yet another issue that is the subject of research – the characterization of the type of the verbs that accompany it. These verbs are generally characterized as intransitive verbs, in particular verbs of motion¹⁰ such as הלך ('went'), but also verbs that express emotion, such as in the verse אל דברי השקר תבטחו לכם – 'Don't put your trust in illusion' (Jeremiah 7, 4) (Waltke and O'Connor 1990:208–9) as well as statal verbs, such as ישן ('sleep') (Halevy 2004:113–22 and note 4).

1.2 Research of the co-agentive dative pronoun in the stages of Hebrew

The phenomenon of the use of the co-agentive dative pronoun is being studied in many languages,¹¹ and in particular in Hebrew.

In the study of Biblical Hebrew, the features of the phenomenon have been presented, for example the great frequency of verbs in the second person imperative form (such as לך לך

¹⁰ Regarding the characterization of the verbs as verbs of motion, see for example the following sources: Muraoka 1978; Berman 1982:51–6; Waltke and O'Connor 1990:208–9; Ullendorff 1992:8; Azar 1995:148–9.

¹¹ Ullendorff (1992:1–7) describes the phenomenon in Indo-European languages (Latin, Greek, German, and French) in order to enable a somewhat clearer focus on the position in Semitics. Blau (2005) presents five examples of this phenomenon from medieval Judaeo-Arabic, and thinks that they are indicative of the spread of this feature in Arabic in the first half of the second millennium. Halevy (2007:301–4) notes that the phenomenon is not common in modern spoken Arabic.

– ‘Go forth’ [Genesis 12, 1]), עברו לכם – ‘Cross over’ [Joshua 22, 19]].¹² In describing the pronoun, various scholars have used terms such as “ethical dative”, “dativus commodi”, and “dativus incommodi” (the latter, for example, in the verse יבשו עצמותינו – ‘Our bones are dried up and our hope is gone; we are doomed’ [Ezekiel 37, 11]); for instance, in the BDB dictionary (1906:515), it is defined as “dative of feeling [...], throwing the action back upon the subject, and expressing with some pathos the interest, or satisfaction, or completeness with which it is (or is to be) accomplished [...]”.¹³ A number of researchers discuss how the pronoun is rendered in various translations of the Bible: Ullendorff (1992:7–9) mentions that lack of attention in the translations to the shades of meaning of the pronoun in the verses לו – ‘straying about on its own’ (Hosea 8, 9) and רבת שכנה לה נפשי עם שונא שלום – ‘dwelt somehow’ (Psalms 120, 6), and Halevy (2007:301–4) finds that in various translations of the Bible into English, French and German, the rendering of the pronoun is not consistent – While French translators frequently translate the pronoun (usually according to the pattern s’en aller or va t’en in the case of imperative clauses with the verb הלך), English translators sometimes simply omit it (eventhough לו, הלך לו, יצא לו, הסתלק לו, and עמד לו can be translated in English to complex verbal constructions such as ‘go off’, ‘go away’, ‘be off’ and ‘stand about’ respectively or by thematizing expressions like ‘as for X’). Noss

¹² On the various persons in imperative and other verb forms, as well as on the variety in using this structure in various sentences and texts in the Bible, see Noss 1995:327–8, 334–5. On the phenomenon in the Bible, see, for example, the following sources: Jouon 1991:488; Berman 1982:51–6; Halevy 2004:115; Halevy 2007:301–4. Naudé 1997 uses the theoretical linguistic framework (such as full interpretation and binding theory) in his discussion of the ethical dative in the Biblical Hebrew. Based on principles of linguistic theories, he concludes that the ethical dative in the Bible is an anaphoric (reflexive) clitic (supported) element: He bases its clitic character on its features which resemble clitic elements (it is dependent on a verb and it cannot be questioned or replaced by a full noun phrase), and he bases the idea that it is co-referential with the subject of the verb that accompanies it on the fact that the verb can be both transitive and intransitive, but not ergative and passive verbs that do not select a subject.

¹³ This feature in BDB (1906) is accepted by Muraoka 1978 and by Halevy 2007:301–4.

1995 is opposed to this disregard on the part of translators due to the difficulty in finding an appropriate translation for the pronoun. Mention of an explanation for the pronoun in Biblical exegesis can be found in Cohen (1994:179–81 and note 3), which comments on Rashi's commentary to the words לך לך – “for your own good and benefit”¹⁴ – and on the interpretation by Nachmanides, who disagrees with Rashi, claiming that this is an idiomatic phrase.

In the research of Mishnaic Hebrew, examples of the phenomenon have been presented (for example in Azar [1995:148–9]): נפל לו עליה: [‘If] he fell down upon it’ [Peah 4, 3]; ובא לו וישב לו בצידו [...] והלך לו – ‘and sat beside him [...] and went along’ [Shabbath 13, 7]; בא לו – ‘a member of this party comes to the other party’ [Pesahim 9, 10]; and see also Ben-Yehuda 1948, vol. 5:2572–3), and the pronoun has been defined either as noting the benefactive,¹⁵ or – by Sokoloff 1969:270–2 – as noting an ingressive aspect (of entering into or emerging from a situation) alongside verbs of motion,¹⁶ for example הלך לו denotes emerging from a situation and its meaning is ‘he went off, departed’, whereas הלך alone without the pronoun denotes a static situation meaning ‘went along’ (according to Muraoka 1978). Sokoloff enumerates the occurrences of the pronoun in Genesis Rabba together with the verbs accompany it (the number in parenthesis following the verb denotes the number of occurrences of the pronoun with each verb): בא (4), הלך (10), יצא (8), ירד (1), ישב (3), ישן (2), נכנס (1), עמד (7), and פירש (1). Muraoka 1978 maintains that some of the examples that Sokoloff presents do not fit in with his approach, for example: עמד לו יעקב אחר הדלת עד שנכנס עשו (in which עמד לו means ‘stood’ rather than ‘stood

¹⁴ Shatil (2004:56) hypothesizes that Rashi's interpretation of this phrase appears – in his view – to be mistaken, and is influenced by the European languages – French and German – that Rashi spoke.

¹⁵ On this phenomenon in Mishnaic Hebrew in general and specifically on the perception of the pronoun as benefactive, see the following sources: Segal 1936:167; Azar 1995:148–9; Sharvit 2006:151; Cohen 1994:179–80; Halevy 2004:115; Halevy 2007:301–4.

¹⁶ Sokoloff (1990:274) notes the ingressive use among the uses of the preposition לו in Jewish Aramaic, and enumerates in the entry of this preposition in his dictionary the following nine verbs, most of which are verbs of motion: קום, סלק, נפק, נחת, מטי, יתב, דמך, יתב, אזל, אתי, דמך, יתב, מטי, נחת, נפק, סלק, קום.

up'), and *מה אתה סבור שאני מייתה ואתה יושב לך* (in which *יושב לך* means 'sit around' rather than 'sit down').

Bendavid (1967:186–7) defines the phenomenon of the use of the pronoun as typical of the Mishna of Eretz Israel, and provides examples of forms having a pronoun that were replaced in the Babylonian Talmud with forms without the pronoun (such as: *מי שהלך לו* compared to *מי שהלך למדינת הים*). Sokoloff (1969:270–2), on the other hand, maintains that the phenomenon is limited in the Bible and in Tannaitic Hebrew but is common in Amoraic Hebrew.

As for the source of the phenomenon in Mishnaic Hebrew,¹⁷ Bendavid (1967:146–7 and a note on page 147) explains that the extensive phenomenon in the Mishna is not the continuation of the phenomenon in Biblical Hebrew, because the pronoun does not have the same meaning that it had in the Bible (for example *בא לו* in Mishnaic Hebrew means, in his view, 'turned to leave there' as in Greek, and not 'has already reached a certain place' as in Biblical Hebrew¹⁸), and consequently Bendavid maintains that the phenomenon in Mishnaic Hebrew is influenced by Greek. As opposed to him, Sokoloff (1969:270–2) is convinced that this phenomenon is influenced by Aramaic.¹⁹ Bendavid (1967:146–7 and a note on 147) argues that because there is a difference between the verbs in the two languages, Aramaic should not be viewed as the source of the phenomenon before carefully examining the appearing of the pronoun alongside each and every one of the verbs in Mishnaic Hebrew. Shatil 2004 offers another explanation regarding the source of the phenomenon in Mishnaic Hebrew: "The reflexive dative in Mishnaic Hebrew, which occurs in verbs of motion to denote ingressiveness, is the continuation of the Biblical and generally Semitic use, except that its use is expanded in verbs of motion as a result of the increase of this use in contemporary Aramaic" (p. 56, originally in Hebrew).

¹⁷ On the source of the phenomenon in Mishnaic Hebrew, see also Ullendorff 1992:7–9; Cohen 1994:179–80; Halevy 2004:115.

¹⁸ From examining the verb *בא*, which will be presented in section 2.3.2, it emerges that the meaning of the verb that he denotes is far from certain.

¹⁹ On the phenomenon in Aramaic and in Syriac, see the following sources and the literature noted in them: Bendavid 1967:147 note; Ullendorff 1992:2, 5–7; Halevy 2004:115; Halevy 2007:301–4.

The phenomenon of the use of the co-agentive dative pronoun was studied in the research of the later stages of Hebrew too.²⁰ Considerable discussion of it can be found in the study of Modern Hebrew, especially in papers by Berman 1982 and Halevy (2004 and 2007). In her 1982 study, Berman describes the increase of the phenomenon in Modern Hebrew compared to earlier stages of the language, as well as the manner of presentation of the role of the affected part in each of the various syntactical structures in which *־ו* appears with a pronoun (ethical dative, dative with one-place or two-place predicate, “extended” dative in three-place predicates and reflexive or coreferential dative). In the study by Halevy 2004, the structure which includes the pronoun in Modern Hebrew is presented as a means to express the aspect of the action (observing the action from within) and the mode of the action (subject-oriented) in a particular discourse structure (in order to place emphasis on the significant affectedness of the subject-entity participant). The study by Cohen (1994:181–3) points to yet another function of this structure: to denote prolonged actions that are suddenly cut short by a new, short action.²¹ The expansion of the phenomenon in Modern Hebrew is usually attributed to the influence of Slavic languages (Berman 1982 following Even-Zohar; and Halevy 2007:113–22 and note 4). Halevy (2007:318) explicates the difference in distribution and usage between the pronoun in Modern Hebrew and the pronouns from earlier stages of Hebrew, and suggests that the dative pronoun in Modern Hebrew is not directly related to any of the earlier pronouns but is a reinvention by contemporary Hebrew which developed in light of the increasingly “dative orientation” of the language.

²⁰ For example, Muraoka 1978 explored forms in Agnon’s “Levav Hayamim”, and Ullendorff 1992 examined forms from the Middle Ages, Agnon, and Bialik.

²¹ Shatil (2004:60–1) offers an amendment to Cohen. He argues that the role of the dative pronoun that Cohen describes can be found in the literary genre, whereas in the genre of the living dialogue, the dative indicates the interest of the person marked in the dative, and the verb indicates the specific action. And see also in Shatil 2004:60–2 a presentation of the functions of the dative pronoun in Modern Hebrew, conditional – in his view – on the register, the genre, and lexical factors.

2. Description of the co-agentive dative pronoun in the Mishna and Tosefta

A survey of the research of the co-agentive dative pronoun in Mishnaic Hebrew (in section 1.2 above) shows that the pronoun was not described completely in the stage of Tannaitic Hebrew. Consequently, this chapter will describe the pronoun in Tannaitic Hebrew, including an examination of all the occurrences in two compositions – the Mishna and the Tosefta. The study of the pronoun will include a survey of the verbs with which the pronoun occurs and of the contexts of its occurrences, with a distinction made between the two writings. The goal is to assess the extent of the frequency of the pronoun in the Mishna and Tosefta, to try to precisely define its meaning and clarify the circumstances of its use.

The three sections of this chapter present the findings of the examination of the occurrences of the pronoun in Mishna and Tosefta.

2.1 The inventory of forms of the co-agentive dative pronoun

The examination found that the co-agentive dative pronoun has 100 occurrences in the Mishna and 71 in the Tosefta.²² It should be noted that the disparity between the two compositions regarding the number of occurrences of the pronoun is unexpected in light of the difference in the size of the two compositions: According to “Ma’agarim”, there are 188,483 words in the Mishna and 304,079 in the Tosefta; namely, the ratio between

²² The search for the occurrences of the pronoun in the Mishna and Tosefta was carried out in the “Ma’agarim” program of the Hebrew Language Historical Dictionary Project, the Academy of the Hebrew Language, in particular the version located on the Academy’s website, with a limited use of the CD-ROM version. To facilitate the smooth reading of the quotes, punctuation marks have occasionally been added, and certain textual marks used by the Hebrew Historical Dictionary Project may have been omitted. The translation of Mishna excerpts into English is based on Blackman 1963, Neusner 1988, and Danby 1933, and the translation of the Tosefta is based on Neusner 1981. The original language of the translations from these published versions was frequently altered in order to introduce the translated passages in language consistent with modern English.

the two compositions in terms of the number of words is 1:1.6 in favor of the Tosefta.

The pronoun is prevalent in the two compositions in two forms – לוֹ, which has 70 occurrences in the Mishna (that is, 70 percent of the occurrences of the pronoun in the Mishna) and 42 occurrences in the Tosefta (that is, 59 percent of the occurrences of the pronoun in the Tosefta), and להּ, which has 19 occurrences in the Mishna (= 19 percent) and 20 in the Tosefta (= 28 percent). Also found are the forms להם (seven in the Mishna and four in the Tosefta), and להן (four in the Mishna and five in the Tosefta). As opposed to that, in the two compositions, no occurrences of the other forms of the pronoun (לִי, לָךְ, לָנוּ, לָכֶם, לָהֶם) were found used as the co-agentive dative pronoun. From this, we can see that the pronoun is found in the Mishna and Tosefta only in the third person, and in this, is distinct from the pronoun in the Bible, which is prevalent in the second person after imperative verb and is found in various other persons (as stated in section 1.2 above).

2.2 Verbs that appear with the co-agentive dative pronoun

The following table presents the occurrences of the four forms of the pronoun found in the Mishna and Tosefta – לו, לה, להם, להן – with a breakdown of the verbs with which the pronoun appears:

	Mishna					Tosefta				
	לו	לה	להם	להן	Total	לו	לה	להם	להן	Total
הלך	25	17	4	4	50	16	13	4	4	37
בא	33	–	2	–	35	20	–	–	–	20
ישב	6	2	–	–	8	3	5	–	–	8
ישן	4	–	–	–	4					–
נפל	2	–	–	–	2					–
עמד					–	1	–	–	–	1
נכנס					–	1	–	–	–	1
נמשך	–	–	1	–	1	–	–	–	1	1
בדה					–	1	–	–	–	1
גבלע					–	–	1	–	–	1
סירג					–	–	1	–	–	1
Total	70	19	7	4	100	42	20	4	5	71

The verbs with which the co-agentive dative pronoun appears in the Mishna and Tosefta will be described from a number of perspectives: the frequency of the verbs and their distribution in the two compositions, the types of verbs and their Biblical heritage.

From the perspective of **the frequency of the verbs and their distribution**, of the eleven verbs with which the co-agentive dative pronoun appears, four can be found in both compositions – הלך, בא, ישב, נמשך; the most frequent verbs are הלך (50 occurrences in the Mishna [50 percent of the pronoun's occurrences in the Mishna], and 37 occurrences in the Tosefta [51 percent of the pronoun's occurrences in the Tosefta]), and בא (35 occurrences in the Mishna [= 35 percent] and 20 occurrences in the Tosefta [= 28 percent]), the verb ישב has eight occurrences in the Mishna and Tosefta each, and the verb נמשך has one occurrence in each of the compositions. The rest of the verbs are not frequent and can be found only in one of the two compositions: In the Mishna, there can

be found *ישן* and *נפל*, and in the Tosefta, there are five verbs, each of which has one occurrence with the pronoun: *סירג*, *נבלע*, *בדה*, *נכנס*, *עמד*. When we compare these findings regarding the verbs that appear with the pronoun in the Mishna and Tosefta with the findings of Sokoloff 1969 regarding the verbs in Genesis Rabba (presented in section 1.2 above), we can see that in Genesis Rabba too, *הלך* is the most frequent verb (ten occurrences), and also that the verbs *בא* and *ישב* appear in it (four and three occurrences respectively); of the eight verbs that do not occur frequently in the Mishna and Tosefta, three verbs are also found in Genesis Rabba: *ישן* (two occurrences), *עמד* (frequent in Genesis Rabba – seven occurrences), and *נכנס* (one occurrence), and five verbs that are not found in Genesis Rabba: *סירג*, *נבלע*, *בדה*, *נמשך*, *נפל*. Three verbs that Sokoloff 1969 found in Genesis Rabba were not found in the Mishna and Tosefta: *יצא* (frequent in Genesis Rabba – eight occurrences), *ירד* (one occurrence), and *פירש* (one occurrence).

From the perspective of **the types of verbs**, of the eleven verbs with which the co-agentive dative pronoun appears in the Mishna and Tosefta, most of the verbs belong to the types of verbs known from the research literature (presented in section 1.1 above). The most outstanding type of verbs is that of the verbs of motion – seven verbs belong to this category: *הלך*, *בא*, *ישב*, *נפל*, *עמד*, *נכנס*, *נמשך*; this type of verb is outstanding not only in relation to the number of verbs that belong to this category, but also in relation to the status of these verbs – four of them are the only verbs found in both compositions (*הלך*, *נמשך*, *ישב*, *בא*) and two of them are the only verbs that are frequent in both compositions (*הלך*, *בא*). In addition to the verbs of motion, two verbs are stative verbs: *ישן*, *נבלע*; and two verbs, *בדה* and *סירג*, each of which has one occurrence in the Tosefta, are not included in the known types, but are activity verbs that have no common denominator. The meanings of the verbs will be discussed in section 2.3.2 below.

From the perspective of **the verbs' Biblical heritage**, of the eleven verbs with which the co-agentive dative pronoun appears in the Mishna and Tosefta, two verbs appear with the pronoun in the Bible too: *הלך* and *ישב*; Although only two verbs are involved, it should be noted that both of them can be found in both the Mishna and the Tosefta, and one of them – *הלך* – is the most frequent of all the verbs. Six other verbs have their source in the Bible, but only in Mishnaic Hebrew they appear with the pronoun: Of them, only the verb

בא is a frequent verb that appears in both compositions, גמשך is also found in both compositions, and the rest are rare and appear only in one of the compositions – ישן, נפל, עמד, נבלע. Three of the other verbs are new verbs in Mishnaic Hebrew and are not found in the Bible at all: סירג, בדה, נכנס. As stated in the introductory section (section 1.2 above), in the research it has been claimed that the phenomenon in Mishnaic Hebrew is not of a Biblical source, but is borrowed – from either Greek or Aramaic. It should be noted that more than half of the verbs with which the pronoun appears in the Mishna and Tosefta have a parallel in Aramaic, especially the verbs of motion: הלך (אזל), בא (אתי), יושב (יתב), נפל (נחת), עמד (קום) and also the statal verb ישן (דמך).²³ Although the exploration of the Biblical heritage of the verbs in the Mishna and Tosefta cannot determine the source of the phenomenon, it indicates that the claim that the source of the phenomenon lies in the Bible cannot be completely ruled out, even if the Aramaic also contributed to the existence of the phenomenon in Mishnaic Hebrew.

A description of the various verbs will be presented at length in section 2.3.2 below as part of the discussion of the meaning and circumstances of its use.

2.3 The use of the co-agentive dative pronoun

2.3.1 Types of contexts in which the pronoun appears

In order to examine the circumstances of the use of the co-agentive dative pronoun, the contexts in which the pronoun occurs in the Mishna and Tosefta were examined. Three main types of contexts for the appearance of the pronoun were found. The type of context that is most prevalent is the formulation of law – 69 percent of the occurrences of the

²³ The verbs in parenthesis are six of the nine verbs mentioned in Sokoloff 1990:274 when noting the use of ל- in Jewish Aramaic (the three others that are noted are סלק, נפק, משי). When describing the meanings of the nine verbs in Sokoloff's dictionary, he distinguishes this use, which he calls ingressive and in some of the entries he notes a different meaning use for this use: אזל (pp. 43–5) – 'go away' (as compared to the usual meaning: 'go, go forth, perish, die'), דמך (p. 152) – 'fall asleep' (as compared to 'sleep, lie down, die'), קום (pp. 479–81) – 'stand up' (as compared to 'rise, stand, exist, prevail, fulfill, preserve, place').

pronoun in the Mishna and Tosefta (118 out of 171 occurrences)²⁴ are found in contexts that involve the presentation of a halacha (for example occurrences: 5–7, 9–17, 19–24, 28–29 below).

A fairly prevalent context for the appearance of the pronoun is a description of a ceremony – 21 percent of the occurrences of the pronoun in the Mishna and Tosefta (36 out of 171 occurrences)²⁵ appear in descriptions of ceremonies, for example the *egla arufa* (the decapitated heifer) ceremony (occurrence 1), the ritual in the temple on Yom Kippur (2), the ordeal of the *isha sotah* (a woman accused of being unfaithful) (3) and the ritual of worship in the temple (occurrences 18 and 26 below):

(1) לָהֶם נִפְטְרוּ זִיקְנֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם וְהָלְכוּ

‘The elders of Jerusalem took leave and went away’ (Sotah 9, 5)

(2) בָּא לֹן אֶצֶל פֶּרוֹ

‘He came to his bullock’ (Yoma 3, 8)

(3) בָּא לֹן לְכַתּוֹב אֶת הַמְּגִילָה

‘He came to write the scroll’ (Sotah 2, 3)

The narrative context is not a prevalent one for the appearance of the pronoun: Only 7 percent of the occurrences of the pronoun in the Mishna and Tosefta (12 out of 171 occurrences) appear in stories about events that occurred in the past, for example (as well as occurrences 8 and 25 below):

(4) בָּא לֹן אֶצֶל ר' דּוּסָא בֶן אֲרִיכִינָס

‘He came to R. Dosa B. Harkinas’ (Rosh Hashanah 2, 9)

From the examination of the types of contexts in which the occurrences of the pronoun

²⁴ The extent of the halachic context is very evident in the Tosefta – in this context 77 percent of the occurrences of the pronoun were found (55 out of 71 occurrences), with fewer found in the Mishna – 63 percent of the occurrences of the pronoun (63 out of 100 occurrences) appear in halachic context.

²⁵ The extent of the ceremonial context is more evident in the Mishna than in the Tosefta – in this context, 27 percent of the occurrences of the pronoun in the Mishna were found (27 out of 100 occurrences), compared to 13 percent of the occurrences of the pronoun in the Tosefta (nine out of 71 occurrences).

appear²⁶ the halachic nature of the contexts is clearly evident: If we add to the first context – that of the formulation of law – the description of a ceremony, which, although formulated as a story about the details of a ceremony that was practiced in the past, enables to infer from it the laws regarding the proper way to hold the ceremony, we will find that 90 percent of the occurrences of the co-agentive dative pronoun in the Mishna and Tosefta appear in halachic contexts. These contexts are formulated in a legal language, and do not reflect the vernacular as it was spoken. In other words, they do not express popular and informal style, which is the style typical of the pronoun, according to Ullendorff 1992 (as noted in the introduction, section 1.1 above). In these contexts, there are no occurrences of the pronoun within direct speech which presents the saying of the addresser in first person or the imperative to the addressee in second person, as opposed to Biblical Hebrew, in which the second person imperative form is frequent (as noted in the introduction, section 1.2 above) and in which the structure appears both in direct and indirect speech (according to Noss 1995:335). The absence of such occurrences of the pronoun explains the finding presented in section 2.1 above regarding the presence of the pronoun in the Mishna and Tosefta in third person forms only, and not in the first and second person forms.

2.3.2 The meaning of the pronoun and the circumstances of its use

This section will describe eleven verbs with which the co-agentive dative pronoun appears in the Mishna and Tosefta, as presented in section 2.2 above, with an examination of the meanings of the verbs²⁷ within the contexts in which they appear with the pronoun. The description will enable to explore the meaning of the pronoun and its role in relation to the verbs.

²⁶ In addition to the three main contexts presented with examples, a number of occurrences of the pronoun were found in two additional contexts: halachic give-and-take (three occurrences in the Mishna [Bekhoroth 4, 4; Baba Metzia 2, 10; Horayoth 1, 2] and one occurrence in the Tosefta (occurrence 27 below]) and wise sayings (one occurrence in the Mishna [occurrence 31 below]).

²⁷ To examine the various verbs, I used the dictionaries of Jastrow 1950 and Ben-Yehuda 1948, Kasovsky's concordance (1967) as well as the translations noted in this section below.

הלך, as noted, is the most frequent from the eleven verbs (50 occurrences with the pronoun in the Mishna and 37 in the Tosefta). It is a verb of motion that denotes a movement from one place to another, especially of a human being (e.g. occurrences 7, 8, and 10), but also of an animal (e.g., a dog, such as in occurrence 5) and of an inanimate object²⁸ (e.g., a stone, as in 9, and water, as in 6):

(5) **כלב שנטל את החררה והלך לו לגדיש**, אכל את החררה והדליק את הגדיש – על החררה נזק משלם נזק שלם, ועל הגדיש משלם חצי נזק

‘A dog which took a cake [to which a cinder adhered] and went to a standing grain, ate the cake and set the stack on fire – [its owner] must pay full damages for the cake, but only half-damages for the standing grain’ (Baba Kamma 2, 3)

(6) **ולא עוד אלא שנוטל את הפקק כדי שיצאו מים וילכו להם**

‘And not only so, but he takes the stopper out so that the water will flow out and go its way’ (Tos. Erubin 8, 8)

(7) **מי שהלך לו למדינת הים ועמד אחר ופירנס את אשתו [...]**

‘He who went overseas, and another arose and supported his wife [...]’ (Ketuboth 13, 2)

(8) **כך היו מוכי שחין שבירושלם עושין: הולך לו ערב פסחים אצל הרופא וחותרו עד שהוא מניח בו כסעורה [...]**

‘So did the people afflicted with boils do in Jerusalem: He goes on the eve of Passover to the physician, and he would cut [the boil] until he leaves on it but a hair’s breadth [...]’ (Kerithoth 3, 8)

(9) **היה יודע שיש אדם בבור וזרק את האבן בבור והלכה לה על האדם והרגתו – הרי זה אינו גולה**

²⁸ According to Halevy (2004:113–22 and note 4), the co-agentive dative pronoun denotes in a prototypical fashion the experiencer, who is usually a human being, but could also refer to an inanimate object, flora, or abstract concept (for example: **הלך שם חוט דק כזה** – ‘A thin thread is twisting there’), and the construction there expresses personification, says Halevy. For more on this situation in the Bible, see Noss 1995:328. And see below the second meaning of **הלך** – a physical disappearance of an inanimate, as shown in examples 11–14.

‘[If] he knew that there was a man in the pit and he tossed in a rock into the pit and it hit the man and killed him – this one does not go into exile’ (Tos. Makkoth 2, 6)

אירע קרי באחד מהן, יוצא והולך לו במסיבה ההולכת תחת הבירה (10)

‘[If] one of them should have a nocturnal emission of semen, he would go out and walk along the passage that leads below the Temple building’ (Tamid 1, 1)

In more than a third of its occurrences (37 percent, i.e. 32 out of 87 occurrences in the Mishna and Tosefta), הלך appears with prepositions of place, which generally focus on the destination of the movement:²⁹ ל- (15 occurrences [as in occurrence 5], ten of them in the phrase הלך למדינת הים [as in 7]), אצל (three occurrences [as in 8]), על (ten occurrences [as in 9]), and ב- (three occurrences [as in 10]).

In addition to the physical movement of a person, animal, or inanimate object, הלך also denotes a physical disappearance of an inanimate object – for example hair (three occurrences [such as occurrence 11], and in particular various types of lesions and signs of impurity (such as 12–14):

הלך לו שער שחור והניח שער צהוב במקומו (11)

‘[If] black hair went away and left golden hair’ (Tos. Negaim 4, 7)

בהרת כגריס ובה מחיה כעדשה – פרחא בכלו ואחר כך הלכה לה מחייה או שהלכה לה מחיה (12)
ואחר כך פרחא בכלו

‘A bright spot the size of a split bean, and in it is quick flesh the size of a lentil – it spread all over his entire [body] and afterwards the quick flesh disappeared or the quick flesh disappeared and afterwards it [the spot] spread over his entire [body]’ (Negaim 8, 2)

נסמך השחין לשתייהן או לאחת מהן, הקיף השחין לשתייהן או את אחת מהן, או חלקן; השחין (13)
ומחית השחין והמכווה ומחית המכווה והבוהק; והלכו להן [...] השחין ומחית השחין והמכווה
ומחית המכווה והבוהק חולקין בין האום לפיסיון והלכו להן

‘The boil joined both of them or one of them, the boil surrounded both of them or one or them or there divided them; The boil, and the raw flesh of the boil, and the burning

²⁹ Only the preposition מן, which appears in one occurrence, focuses on the starting point of the movement, but in this context there is no expression of physical movement.

and the raw flesh of the burning, and the tetter; and they went away [...] the boil, and the raw flesh of the boil, and the burning, and the raw flesh of the burning, and the tetter divide between the primary sign and the spreading, and then go away' (Negaim 1, 6)

בהרת ובה סימני טומאה החליטו והלכו להן סימני טומאה (14)

'A bright spot and in it are tokens of uncleanness and one certified him and the tokens of uncleanness went away' (Tos. Negaim 1, 3)

A search for the meaning of the pronoun alongside the verb הלך shows that two of the meanings attributed in the research to this pronoun (presented in section 1.1 above) do not suit the pronoun that appears with הלך: The pronoun does not reflect the benefactive of the activity of going or walking,³⁰ and there does not appear to be any particular focus on the doer of the action (centripetal meaning). The ingressive meaning of emerging from a situation (see there as well as section 1.2 above) may emanate from the meaning of the verb הלך and not necessarily from the pronoun itself. Although in some of the contexts of the occurrences the action previous to the walking is described, which may emphasize the perception of walking as a transition into a new situation, for example נפטר (in the sense of 'separated', such as in occurrence 1), יצא (such as 6 and 10), and עמד, for example:

אעפ' שעמד כהן והלך לו אין מחייבין אותו לכבותו עד שיתכבה מאיליו (15)

'Even though the priest got up and left, they do not obligate him to put out the lamp until it goes out by itself' (Tos. Terumoth 10, 9)

Nevertheless, it is not clear that the co-agentive dative pronoun is what provides the ingressive meaning; it rather appears that this meaning is expressed in the verb הלך on its own. This meaning of the verb הלך can be expressed also when it appears without the pronoun, for example in the following occurrences of the verb, which are similar to its occurrences with the pronoun:

³⁰ Ben-Yehuda 1948 notes this meaning of הלך accompanied by לו: "Partially in the meaning 'went by his will, intent, purpose'" (originally in Hebrew), but in the examples that he offers (Genesis 22, 2; 12, 1; Jeremiah 5, 5; Song of Songs 2, 12; Sifrei Beha'alothcha 86; Numbers Rabbah 8; Ecclesiastes Rabbah 1, 1), occurrences from the Mishna and Tosefta are not included.

The going of a person: [...] 'הולך אצל החנווני ואומ' 'He who is forbidden by vow from deriving benefit from his fellow and has nothing to eat, he may go to a storekeeper and say [...]' (Nedarim 4, 7), as compared to occurrence 8: הולך לו ערב פסחים אצל הרופא [...];

A person going overseas: [...] 'מי שהלכה אשתו למדינת הים' 'He whose wife went overseas [...] (Yebamoth 10, 4) as compared to occurrence 7: [...] 'מי שהלך לו למדינת הים [...];

The going of water: 'והלכו המים לשם' 'and the water rose to that spot' (Parah 5, 7), as compared to occurrence 6: הלכו מים וילכו להם;

The disappearance of hair: 'הלך שער שחור והניח שער צהב מקומו' 'Black hair went away and left behind golden hair in its place' (Tos. Negaim 4, 4), as compared to occurrence 11, which appears three Mishna verses later: הלך לו שער שחור והניח שער צהב במקומו;

– בהרת ובה מחייה ופיסיון; הלכה המחייה [...] 'הלך הפיסיון' 'A bright spot and with it are quick flesh and spreading; the quick flesh disappeared [...] the spreading disappeared' (Negaim 4, 7), as compared to occurrence 12, for example: הלכה לה מחייה.

An examination of the occurrences of the co-agentive dative pronoun alongside the verb הלך in three translations into English – of Danby (1933) and Neusner (1988) of the Mishna and of Avery-Peck et al. (1977–1986) of the Tosefta – showed that in the translations the verb הלך together with the pronoun are translated together as the verb “go” in less than a quarter of the occurrences in an average of the three translations (Danby 1993 tends to do so more than the other two translations – in 32 percent of the occurrences in the Mishna he translates it as the verb “go”, compared to Neusner 1988 [in 22 percent of the occurrences in the Mishna] and Avery-Peck et al. 1977–1986 [in 17 percent of the occurrences in the Tosefta]). In the translations, the form “is gone” (only in Danby 1933) and phrases with the verb “go” such as “go away”, “go (on) his way”, “go along” could also be found;³¹ as well as additional verbs, such as: “disappear”, “leave”,

³¹ It should be noted that according to Muraoka 1978 (in the introduction, section 1.2 above) הלך לו has an ingressive meaning – ‘he went off, departed’, as compared to הלך which has a static meaning, ‘he went along’, but as presented here, ‘go along’ is found as a translation of הלך with the pronoun alongside it in

“come to”, which are compatible with the shades of meaning of the verb described here.

בא, as noted, is the second most common verb among the eleven verbs with which the pronoun appears in the Mishna and Tosefta (35 occurrences in the Mishna and 20 in the Tosefta). It is a verb of motion that denotes the arrival of a person at a particular place.³² In 73 percent of its occurrences (= 40 out of 55 occurrences in the Mishna and Tosefta), the place is noted with a preposition that focuses on the destination, especially ל- (23 occurrences, such as 16) and אצל (16 occurrences, such as 2 and 4):

עולת העוף כיצד היתה נעשת? עלה בכבש ופנה לסבב, בא לו לקרן דרומית מזרחית [...] בא (16)
לו לגוף

‘The burnt offering of fowl – how was it prepared? [The priest] went up on the ramp and went around the circuit, he came to the southeastern corner [...] He came to the body’ (Zebahim 6, 5)

In three of the translations into English that were examined, the verb בא and the accompanying pronoun were translated together by the verb “come” in most of the occurrences – in 65 percent of the occurrences on the average (with a similar proportion in Danby 1933 and Neusner 1988 [in 71 percent and 68 percent of the occurrences in the Mishna respectively], compared to a lower proportion in Avery-Peck et al. 1977–1986 [57 percent of the occurrences in the Tosefta]). In the translations, phrasal verbs could also be found, such as “come along”, as well as other verbs, especially “go” (also in phrases such as “go along”, “go out”).

An examination of the occurrences of the co-agentive dative pronoun together with the verb בא did not reveal that the pronoun adds further meaning to the verb that was not present without the pronoun. Thus, for example, when occurrences of the verb without the pronoun were compared with similar occurrences of the verb with the pronoun, such

some of the occurrences (in four occurrences in Neusner’s translation [1988] of the Mishna and in six occurrences in the translation by Avery-Peck et al. 1977–1986 of the Tosefta).

³² An examination of the occurrences of the verb undermines Bendavid’s claim, as presented in section 1.2 above, that לו בא in Mishnaic Hebrew means ‘turned to leave there’, as in Greek, whereas in Biblical Hebrew it means ‘has already reached in a certain place’, and see note 18 there.

as: [...] 'and when he came to his father [the father] said to him
[...]' (Baba Metzia 7, 1) compared to occurrence 4: בא לשער, בא לו אצל ר' דוסא בן ארכינס:
[...] – 'They came to the gate which opens out from the court of the
women' (Tos. Parah 3, 4) compared to occurrence 16: ובא ליטול, בא לו לקרן דרומית מזרחית:
– 'and he came to buy from him produce at the threshing floor' (Tos.
Baba Metzia 4, 23), compared to occurrence 3: בא לו לכתוב את המגילה:

The verb **ישב**, like the verbs **הלך** and **בא**, appears with the co-agentive dative pronoun in the two compositions, but unlike them, as noted, it is not frequent in this use (eight occurrences in each of the compositions). This verb denotes a static position of a person³³ in a particular place, which is noted in 69 percent of its occurrences (11 out of 16 occurrences in the Mishna and Tosefta) with a preposition, mainly **ב**- (five occurrences, such as 17), as well as other prepositions, like **אצל** (such as 18) and **על גבי** (such as 19):

ישב אחד על הפתח ולא מילאו, ישב השני ומילאו – השני חייב. ישב הראשון על הפתח (17) ומילאו ובא השני וישב לו בצידו, אף-על-פי שעמד הראשון והלך לו, הראשון חייב והשני פטור

[If] one sat down at the doorway and did not completely fill it, and a second person sat down and finished filling it – the second person is liable. [If] the first sat down at the doorway and filled it up and a second one came along and sat beside him, even though the first one got up and went away, the first remains liable and the second is exempt' (Shabbath 13, 7)

בא וישב לו אצל אחיו הכהנים עד שהשערים נפתחים (18)

'He came and sat down beside his brethren the priests until the gates were opened'
(Tamid 1, 1)

ישיבה לה על גבי מטה ועל גבי כסא ועל גבי ספסל ונתעסקה בטהרות ושימשה את ביתה (19)
 '[If] she sat down on a bed and on a chair and on a bench and was engaged in preparing things requiring cleanness and had intercourse' (Tos. Niddah 1, 4)

³³ The following occurrence is the only one in which the motion described is of an inanimate object: הזורק – 'He who tossed [an object] against a wall above ten handbreadths and it went and landed in a hole four by four handbreadths, this person is liable' (Shabbath 10, 9).

In the translations, ישב and the accompanying pronoun are translated as the verb “sit” only in the translation by Danby 1933 (in 25 percent of the occurrences in the Mishna), and a prevalent translation is the phrase “sit (him/himself) down”, along with other verbs that can also be found, such as “remain”, “take (up) seats”.

Examination of the occurrences of the co-agentive dative pronoun occurring with the verb ישב did not reveal that the pronoun adds any additional meaning to the verb that is not present in it without the pronoun. Thus, for example, when comparing the occurrences of the verb without the pronoun to similar occurrences with the pronoun, such as: היתה יושבת במיטה ועסוקה בטהרות – ‘[If] she was sitting on the bed and engaged in things requiring cleanness’ (Niddah 1, 2) compared to occurrence 19: ישבה לה על גבי מטה [...]. ונתעסקה בטהרות ושימשה את ביתה. In addition, there are contexts in which the verb appears both with and without the pronoun – in occurrence 17 the pronoun appears after the fourth occurrence of the verb ישב, when in the three occurrences previous to this one (ישב אחד [...], ישב השני [...], ישב הראשון [...]), there is no pronoun accompanying it; and one may ask: Is the meaning of the verb in the fourth occurrence different from the meaning in the three earlier ones, and if so – is that what causes the appearance of the pronoun? And additionally, does the appearance of the pronoun alongside the verb הלך in the following clause in this context (הלך לו) affect the use of the pronoun with the verb ישב? Like the three verbs presented so far, the four verbs נפל (occurrences 20 and 21), עמד (22), נכנס (23), and נמשך (24) are verbs of motion accompanied by the co-agentive dative pronoun, but they occur infrequently and most appear either in the Mishna or the Tosefta (נמשך has one occurrence in each of the two compositions and they correspond to one another, נפל has two occurrences in the Mishna, and each of the other two verbs has one occurrence in the Tosefta):

נטל מקצת הפיאה וזרק על השאר [...] נפל לו עליה, פרס טליתו עליה – מעבירים אותו ממנו (20)
‘[If] one [of the poor] took part of the *peah* and threw it over the rest [...] [If] he fell down upon it or spread his cloak over it – they remove it from him’ (Peah 4, 3)

ראה את המציאה ונפל לו עליה ובא אחר והחזיק בה – זה שהחזיק בה זכה בה (21)
‘[If] one saw a lost object and fell on it, and another came along and grabbed it – the one who grabbed it has acquired possession of it’ (Baba Metzia 1, 4)

היה אוכל בסוכה וירדו עליו גשמים והלך ועמד לו (22)

'[If] one was eating in a *Sukkah* and it rained and he went and stood somewhere else' (Tos. Sukkah 2, 4)

היה נוטל את מגלתה ונכנס לו לאולם (23)

'He would take her scroll and bring it into the *ulam*' (Tos. Sotah 2, 1)

נמשכין להן אחד מכל חבורה וחבורה ומפרישין פסח אחד וא' [...] (24)

'One member of each party withdraws, and they designate another animal as a Passover-offering and say [...]' (Tos. Pesahim 9, 1), and in the corresponding occurrence in the Mishna: עשרה עשרה נמשכים להם – 'And similarly five parties, each with five or ten members, they draw to themselves one member from every party and so do they declare [...]' (Pesahim 9, 10)

The four verbs denote various types of motion: נפל denotes movement of dropping downward, appearing with the preposition על. In the translations, נפל and the accompanying pronoun are translated by the verb "fall" (in one occurrence in Danby 1993 and in two occurrences in Neusner 1988) or by the phrasal verb "fall down" (in one occurrence in Danby 1933). The verb עמד denotes movement of standing in a single place ('stand somewhere else' in the translation of Avery-Peck et al. 1977–1986 for occurrence 22). The verb נכנס denotes movement of arrival at a certain place, which appears with the preposition ל-. The verb נמשך denotes movement of emergence, withdrawal from a place ('withdraw' in the translation of Avery-Peck et al. 1977–1986 for occurrence 24).

As in the case of the three previous verbs, also in the case of these four verbs, the co-agentive dative pronoun does not appear to add anything to the meaning of the verb. This conclusion arises also from a comparison of occurrences of the verbs without the pronoun to similar occurrences of the same verbs with the pronoun, for example: the verb עמד – [...] 'And Moses went and stood on the Nile River and said [...]' (Tos. Sotah 4, 7) compared to occurrence 22: והלך ועמד לו; and the verb נכנס – [...] 'A Levite does not enter the Temple courtyard to perform his service unless he has studied for five years' (Tos. Shekalim 3, 26) compared to occurrence 23: ונכנס לו לאולם. Additionally, in the context of occurrence

22, the verb appears in two adjacent clauses twice, once with the pronoun and once without it, with the pronoun appearing after the verb הלך that follows it.³⁴ היה אוכל בסוכה – [If] one was eating in a *Sukkah* and it rained and he went and stood somewhere else [...] [If] he was sleeping in a *Sukkah* and it rained and he got up and went away' (Tos. Sukkah 2, 4), and there does not appear to be any difference in meaning between the two occurrences of the verb, and the contribution of the dative pronoun to the meaning is unclear.

In addition to the seven verbs of motion that are accompanied by the co-agentive dative pronoun described here, the pronoun also appears with two statal verbs – ישן and נבלע.

The verb ישן has four occurrences with the pronoun in the Mishna, and it denotes falling asleep and resting, for example:

הישן תחת המיטה לא יצא ידי חובתו. אמ' ר' יהודה: נוהגין היינו ישינים תחת המיטות לפני (25) הזקנים. אמ' ר' שמעון: מעשה בטבי עבדו של רבן גמליא' שהיה ישן תחת המיטה, אמ' רבן גמליא' לזקינים: ראייתם טבי עבדי שהוא תלמיד חכם' ויודיע שעבדים פטורים מן הסוכה וישן לו תחת המטה. לפי דרכנו למדנו שהישן תחת המיטה לא יצא ידי חובתו

'If one sleeps under a bed [in a *Sukkah*] he has not fulfilled his obligation. R. Judah said: We had the practice of sleeping under the bed before the Elders. R. Simeon said: It happened that Tabi, Rabban Gamaliel's slave, slept under the bed, and Rabban Gamaliel said to the Elders: Do you see Tabi my slave, that he is a disciple of sages and he knows that slaves are exempt from the *Sukkah*, therefore he sleeps under the bed. Thus we learned that the one who sleeps under the bed has not fulfilled his obligation' (Sukkah 2, 1)

ונעל הכהן מבפנים ובן לוי ישן לו מבחוץ [...] ונתן כסותו עליה וישן לו (26)

'And the priest locked [the gates] from inside and the Levite slept outside [...] He put his cloak upon it and went to sleep' (Middoth 1, 9)

In the translations, ישן and the accompanying pronoun are translated as the verb "sleep" (in two occurrences in Danby 1933 and in one in Neusner 1988) or as the phrasal verb "go to sleep" (in two occurrences in Danby 1933 and in three in Neusner 1988).

An examination of the occurrences of the co-agentive dative pronoun alongside the verb

³⁴ This occurrence will be discussed among the occurrences of הלך – occurrence 32 below.

ישן did not show that it adds meaning to the verb that was not present without the pronoun. In the context of occurrence 25, the verb has four additional occurrences without the accompanying pronoun, three before its occurrence with the pronoun and one after it, and it is difficult to discern any additional meaning contributed by the pronoun that is not present in the nearby occurrences of the verb ישן without the pronoun.

The verb **נבלע** has one occurrence with the pronoun in the Tosefta and it denotes the absorption of a liquid ('is absorbed' in the translation of Avery-Peck et al. 1977–1986):

אמרו לו: אתה אומ' אם נמצאת שכבת זרע טמא אם לאו טהור, ואנו אומ' יצאת הימנו טיפה (27)
כל שהוא ונבלעה לה בכיס

'They said to him: You say 'If semen is found [in the bag] he is unclean, if not, he is clean', and we say 'A drop in any amount exuded from him and was absorbed by the bag' (Tos. Niddah 2, 9)

In addition to the seven verbs of motion and two statal verbs, the co-agentive dative pronoun appears with two activity verbs – בדה (28) and סירג (29), each of which has one occurrence with the pronoun in the Tosefta:

ר' שמעון אומ': אף כשאמרו של נחתומין בכרכים עד שלשה תנורים אסורין עד שלשה ימים, (28)
שמשחרית היה בודה לו שאר כל אותו היום

'R. Simeon says: Also when they stated the rule concerning that belonging to bakers in large towns once they had made use of their ovens three times, nonetheless it is prohibited for three days, for at dawn he would get the leaven for the whole rest of that day' (Tos. Pesahim 2, 2)

היתה למודת להיות רואה עשרים ואחד עשרים ושנים עשרים ושלשה הרי זו וסת. סירגה לה (29)
ארבעה ימי' אינה וסת

'[If] she habitually saw [blood] on the twenty one day or on the twenty two day or on the twenty third day, it is menstruation. If it skipped four days, it is not menstruation' (Tos. Niddah 9, 4)

These two verbs are rare regarding their roots or their pattern, and their meaning is not entirely clear.

The verb **בדה** apparently means 'arranged'.³⁵ According to Lieberman 1992b, vol. 4:485,

³⁵ But in the translation of Avery-Peck et al. 1977–1986: 'get the leaven', that is 'leavened, ferment'.

its meaning is 'creation and arrangement'. In "Ma'agarim", it is included in the root ב"י with the meaning of 'separation, "leaven set apart"'.³⁶ Lieberman (ibid) determines that in this occurrence the correct version is בודה, which appears in MS Vienna, MS Erfurt, and Cairo Genizah fragments, compared to other versions: בודק (from first printing), בורה (from MS London), בורה, and בורה (from the Yerushalmi).

The verb סירג apparently means 'skip'. This is what emerges from the "Hassdei David" commentary on the Tosefta (Pardo 1994). Jastro 1950 explains: "to do a thing in a manner in which straps are drawn in bedsteads etc., i.e. in zig-zag; skip", and Ben-Yehuda 1948 defines: "skipped and passed over, did something intermittently, not in order – to skip over" (originally in Hebrew; the excerpt is not found in the translation of Avery-Peck et al. 1977–1986). This is a unique meaning of the root in the pi'el pattern,³⁷ and because the verb does not denote physical skipping, it is not included among the verbs of motion.

3. Differences between manuscripts and between manuscripts and printed

³⁶ For this root in the qal pattern, "Ma'agarim" has in addition to the occurrence from the Tosefta (which has a parallel in the Yerushalmi Orlah 2, 11 <62, 2>, where the mistaken version בורה appears), one occurrence in the Mishna: שאור כזיית בודה להם מתוך ומחמצן – 'The leaven for them is set apart from their (dough) and [with this] they are lee' (Menahoth 5, 1), which is also quoted in Sifra Emor 10, 3 <101, 2>. In the Yerushalmi Megillah 1, 8 <71, 3> appears the only occurrence of the root in the pi'el pattern: בורגני – 'A resident of a station house made up for them false Aramaic translation from the Greek'. Lieberman (1984:13–4 and notes 14 and 16 in page 14) (there is a reference to it in "Ma'agarim"), states that the correct version of the verb here is בידה, noting that the meaning is: 'chose, removed, created'. Ben-Yehuda 1948 presents only the occurrence of the root in the Mishna, and defines the meaning of the verb: 'took something out of something'; in a note he presents the interpretation of the Arukh and of Rashi and others – expression of 'removal'.

³⁷ In Tannaitic Hebrew there are ten additional occurrences of the root in the pi'el pattern, with the meaning of the verb being 'wove, knotted', as in: הדבל שהוא מסריג את המטה – 'The rope with which one knots the bed' (Tos. Kelim Baba Metzia 9, 4).

editions regarding the use of the co-agentive dative pronoun

An examination of the 100 occurrences of the co-agentive dative pronoun in the Mishna found in MS Kaufmann, collected from “Ma’agarim”, in the three manuscripts, Parma Manuscript, Lowe manuscript, and Paris manuscript, it was found that in five of the 100 occurrences, one or more of the three manuscripts uses the form of the verb without the pronoun:

In occurrence 7 – in MS Paris and Lowe it says: מי שהלך למדינת הים (in MS Lowe the form *בעלה is added after the verb, with an asterisk before it, indicating that it is mistaken), compared to מי שהלך לְּ למדינת הים in MS Kaufmann and Paris; in occurrence 21 – it says in MS Lowe: ונפל עליה compared to ונפל לְּ עליה in the three other manuscripts; in occurrence 26 – in the first occurrence of the verb ישן in MS Parma, it says: ישן מבחוץ compared to וישן לְּ מבחוץ in the three other manuscripts; and in the two following occurrences:

אמ' לו: כשם שהתפללתה עליהם שירדו כך היתפלל שילכו להם (30)

‘They said to him: Just as you prayed for it to rain so pray now that it may go away’ (Taanith 3, 8) – In MS Lowe and Paris, it says: שילכו as compared to להם in the other two manuscripts

ר' דוסתאי בר' ינאי אומ' משם ר' מאיר: כל השכח דבר אחד ממשנתו מעלין עליו כאילו (31)
מתחייב בנפשו [...] הא אינו מתחייב עד שישב לְּ ויסירם מלבו

‘R. Dosetai b. R. Yannai in the name of R. Meir says: Whoever forgets a single thing from his study, the Scripture reckons it to him as if he had forfeited his life [...] Thus he becomes liable for his life unless he sits and removes them from his heart’ (Aboth 3, 8) – In MS Lowe, it says: עד שישב as compared to לְּ עד שישב in the three other manuscripts

Although these five occurrences of the pronoun, in which there are differences between the manuscripts, are only a minority of the occurrences of the pronouns in the Mishna – only 5 percent of the 100 occurrences of the co-agentive dative pronoun in the Mishna according to MS Kaufmann, nevertheless they indicate that there is some disagreement among the manuscripts regarding the use of the pronoun, as may be expected from a

phenomenon at the center of which is a linguistic component that may be considered to be superfluous. In addition, these occurrences may indicate a certain tendency on the part of the manuscripts regarding the use of the pronoun: Of the five occurrences, MS Lowe omits the pronoun in four occurrences (7, 21, 30, 31), that is in most of the occurrences (80 percent); MS Parma omits it in two cases (7, 26); and MS Paris omits it only in one occurrence (30), in other words it is most similar to MS Kaufmann from this respect. It should be noted that these occurrences are not indicative of MS Kaufmann's tendency regarding the use of the pronoun, because the occurrences of the pronoun were collected, as noted, from "Ma'agarim", and they are based on this manuscript.

When examining 41 of the 71 occurrences of the co-agentive dative pronoun in the Tosefta – the occurrences that could be examined with the alternative versions apparatus in Lieberman 1929a³⁸ – it was found that in six of the 41 occurrences (i.e. 15 percent), there was a difference between the traditions of the Tosefta regarding the use of the pronoun. In all of the six occurrences, the pronoun is found together with the verb *והלך*, and in some of the traditions of the Tosefta, the form of the verb without the pronoun is found:

(32) *היה ישן בסוכה וירדו עליו גשמים ועמד והלך לו*

'[If] he was sleeping in a *Sukkah* and it rained and he got up and went away' (Tos. Sukkah 2, 4) – in the first printing: *והלך*

בא על אשת איש ופסלה מתחת ידי בעלה, נטרד והלך לו מן העולם; ועל זה נאמ' מעות לא

³⁸ These 41 occurrences that were examined are found in the orders Zeraim, Moed, Nashim, and Nezikin (only the tractates Baba Kamma, Baba Metzia, and Baba Bathra), which were published in the Lieberman 1992a edition. The remaining occurrences, which are found in the other tractates in Order Nezikin, as well as in the orders Kodashim and Tohoroth, which are not included in the Lieberman 1992a edition, were not examined in regard to the differences between the manuscripts, because in the Zuckermann 1970 edition in which they are included, the alternative version apparatus does not note any differences regarding the use of the dative pronoun, and consequently this edition does not indicate anything regarding the differences between the traditions of the Tosefta in this area. The examination thus includes 41 of a total of the 71 occurrences of the co-agentive dative pronoun in the Tosefta (collected from the "Ma'agarim", based on MS Vienna), i.e. only 58 percent of the occurrences.

יוכל לתקון'

'[If] he had sexual relations with a married woman and invalidated her from continuing marriage with her husband, he is tormented and driven from the world; and concerning such a person it is written "That which is crooked cannot be made straight"' (Tos. Hagigah 1, 7) – in the first printing and in MS London: והלך

כהן שנמצא בו פסול לובש שחורין ומתעטף שחורין, יוצא והולך לו (34)

'A priest in whom is found a point of invalidation dresses himself in black garments and cloaks himself in a black cloak, leaves, and goes on his way' (Tos. Hagigah 2, 9) – in MS London: והולך

האשה שהלכה היא ובעלה למדינת הים [...] והלכה לה למדינת הים [...] והלכה לה למדינת הים

'A woman who went overseas with her husband [...] and again she went overseas [...] and again went overseas' (Tos. Yebamoth 11, 5) – in MS Erfurt והלך בעלה [...] והלך בעלה and in the Cairo Geniza fragments: והלכה לה

יכול לא היו טעונין לינה? תל' ביום עשרים ושלושה לחדש השביעי שלח את העם וילכו (36) לאהליהם'. הא כיצד? נפטרו מבעוד יום, השכימו והלכו להם

'Is it possible that they did not require being kept overnight? Scripture says: "On the twenty-third day of the seventh month he sent the people away to their homes". How so? They took their leaves while it was still day, then they went to sleep and they went along' (Tos. Sukkah 4, 18) – in MS Erfurt: והלכו

The differences between the various traditions of the Tosefta that were found regarding the use of the co-agentive dative pronoun (in 15 percent of the 41 occurrences that were examined) accordingly join the differences found between the manuscripts of the Mishna (in 5 percent of the 100 occurrences), pointing to a linguistic phenomenon that exhibits variance among the different original texts.

In addition to the attempt to assess the extent of the differences between the various manuscripts of the Mishna regarding the use of the co-agentive dative pronoun and the tendency of the various manuscripts in this matter, an attempt was made to assess the extent of the differences between the manuscripts and the printed editions of the Mishna as well. A comparison of the occurrences of the pronoun in MS Kaufmann (according to

“Ma’agarim”) and those in the printed editions (according to the “Responsa Project”) included occurrences of the pronoun in the form לו together with two verbs – הלך and בא; the form לו is the prevalent form of the pronoun, and these two verbs are the most prevalent in the occurrences of the pronoun; in other words, out of 100 occurrences of all the forms of the pronoun together with all the verbs in the Mishna found in MS Kaufmann, 58 occurrences (25 with הלך and 33 with בא), i.e. 58 percent of the occurrences were examined. The 58 occurrences from MS Kaufmann were examined in the printed editions, and it was found that for these occurrences, the printed editions used fewer forms of the pronoun than the manuscripts – in seven of the 25 occurrences of הלך לו in the manuscripts (i.e. 28 percent) the printed editions omitted the pronoun, and this was the case for two of the 33 occurrences of בא לו (6 percent). Similarly, no additional occurrences of לו were found in the printed editions with these two verbs that were not found in the manuscripts. That is to say, this examination, although incomplete, can show the tendency of the manuscripts of the Mishna to use the co-agentive dative pronoun more than the printed editions.

4. Appendix: Interpretive approaches regarding the appearance of the co-agentive dative pronoun in the Bible

In order to examine the interpretative approaches to the appearance of the co-agentive dative pronoun in the Bible, 42 occurrences of the pronoun in verses that are mentioned in the books of Biblical grammar in the presentation of this phenomenon were examined (Gesenius 1910:381 section 119s; Waltke and O’Connor 1990:208–9 section 11.2.10d; Jouon 1991:488 section 133d);³⁹ the commentaries on these verses have been collected

³⁹ And these are the 42 occurrences: Genesis 12, 1; 21, 16; 22, 2; 5; 24, 6; 27, 43; Exodus 18, 27; Numbers 11, 16; 22, 6; 34; 23, 1; Deuteronomy 1, 7; 13; 40; 2, 13; 5, 27; Jehoshua 18, 4; 22, 4; Judges 20, 7; 1 Samuel 22, 5; 2 Samuel 2, 21; 16, 20; 1 Kings 17, 3; 2 Kings 4, 3; Isaiah 36, 9; 40, 9; Jeremiah 4, 19; 7, 4; Ezekiel 37, 11; Hosea 8, 9; Amos 7, 12; Psalms 66, 7; 120, 6; 123, 4; Job 6, 19; 15, 28; Song of Songs 2, 10 – x2; 13; 17; 8, 14; 2 Chronicles 35, 21.

from the databases of the “Responsa Project” and “Torah Treasures”.

In fewer than a quarter of the verses that were examined (nine verses), commentary could be found that related to the appearance of the dative pronoun. From among these verses, the most well known is: וַיֹּאמֶר ה' אֶל אַבְרָם: לֵךְ לְךָ מֵאֶרֶץ וּמִמּוֹלֶתְךָ וּמִבֵּית אָבִיךָ אֶל הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר – אֲרֹאךְ – ‘The Lord said to Abram: Go forth from your native land and from your father’s house to the land that I will show you’ (Genesis 12, 1), and Rashi’s commentary on this verse is also well known: “Go forth – for your benefit and for your good, and there I will make you into a great nation, but here you will not merit to have children; Moreover, I will make your nature known in the world” [emphasis in this citation and in the following citations is mine and do not appear in the original; all the citations are originally in Hebrew]; this commentary relates to לְךָ as a purpose adverbial noting the benefactive of the action. Nachmanides cites the words of Rashi and rejects them (“There is no need”); unlike Rashi, he views this verse as an example of a general phenomenon of the redundant pronoun, which he illustrates by means of additional verses: “Because this is the rule of the language, הַגֶּשֶׁם חָלַף הֵלֵךְ לוֹ, (‘The rains are over and gone’ [Song of Songs 2, 11]), קוֹמוּ, אֲלֵכֶה לִי אֶל הַגְּדוֹלִים, (‘So I will go to the wealthy’ [Jeremiah 5, 5]), וְעַבְרוּ לָכֶם אֶת נַחַל זֶרֶד (‘Up now! Cross the wadi Zered!’ [Deuteronomy 2, 13]), and most are similar”. Nachmanides is referring to the homily of the sages on verses in which the pronoun appears: “But our sages (Yoma 3, 2; 72, 2) interpreted what the Scriptures say וַעֲשֵׂה לָךְ שְׁתֵּי חֲצוֹצְרוֹת, (‘and make an ark of wood’ [Deuteronomy 10, 1]), וְעָשִׂי כֶסֶף, (‘Have two silver trumpets made’ [Numbers 10, 2]), because it is not his work, and it should have been worded as it is regarding the Tabernacle: וְאֵת הַמִּשְׁכָּן תַּעֲשֶׂה, (‘As for the Tabernacle, make it cloth’ [Exodus 26, 1])”. R. Eliyahu Mizrahi (1435–1526), a commentator on Rashi, does not agree with Nachmanides’ interpretation (“And these things are puzzling to me in the extreme”) that for these verses the homilies of the sages seek to explain the appearance of לְךָ next to עָשָׂה, when “it is not his work”, because as he says, “We have already found in the Talmud in a number of places where they expounded these pronouns, even in a place that the work was his”, and offers examples such as: וְעָשׂוּ לָהֶם צִיצִית. Unlike Nachmanides, R. Eliyahu Mizrahi believes that even if the phenomenon is a general one, it can be interpreted and

commented on (‘Even if this is figure of speech, in those places where it can be interpreted, we interpret’).

The commentaries by Rashi and Nachmanides on the phrase לך לך in fact represent two opposed exegetic approaches regarding the status of the co-agentive dative pronoun in the Bible: One approach interprets the appearance of the pronoun and tries to explain its meaning, and the other approach views its appearance as a linguistic phenomenon that needs no further explanation. The first approach is also expressed in Rashi’s commentary on the verse הבו לכם אנשים חכמים ונבִיִּים ויִדְעִים לשבטיכם (‘Pick from each of your tribes men who are wise, discerning, and experienced’ [Deuteronomy 1, 13]) – הבו לכם – Prepare yourselves for this matter”, as well as on the verse פרא בודד לו (‘[Like] a lonely wild ass’ [Hosea 8, 9]) – פרא בודד לו – They became like a wild ass that goes alone to itself, sniffing air from place to place to wander”; and also the words of other commentaries express this approach:

In the words of R. Naftali Zvi Yehuda Berlin in his commentary “Ha’amek Davar”, on the verse: ועתה בני שמע בקלי וקום ברח לך אל לבן אחי חרנה (‘Now, my son, listen to me, flee at once to Haran to my brother Laban’ [Genesis 27, 43]) – ברח לך – [Keep it] to yourself, so that your flight does not become known, rather, for yourself flee”;

In the words of Judah Loew in his commentary “Gur Aryeh” on the verse ויאמר ה' אל משה: אִסְפָּה לִי שִׁבְעִים מִזִּקְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (‘The Lord said to Moses: Gather for Me seventy of Israel’s elders’ [Numbers 11, 16]) – “[...] And why was it necessary to write לי, because Moses protested to the Almighty, saying לא אוכל’ etc., and the Almighty had to amend, thus he said אספה לי that is ‘for me’, to remove a complaint that you have against Me”;

And also in the words of R. Haim Moshe Ben Attar in his commentary “Or Ha-Haim”, on the verse ויאמר בלעם אל מלאך ה': [...] ועתה אם רע בעיניך אשובה לך (‘Balaam said to the angel of the Lord: [...] If you still disapprove I will turn back’ [Numbers 22, 34]) – “And he said לי, because he had a prophetic vision that it would be advantageous to him to go back”.

In these various commentaries, the dative pronoun is interpreted as a reflexive pronoun (“to itself” and “to yourself”) or as a pronoun that denotes the benefactive of the action

(“for me”, “that it would be advantageous to him”). These two meanings are clearly denoted by the author of “Haamek Davar” in his commentary on the verse וישלח משה את חתנו וילך לו אל ארצו (‘Then Moses bade his father-in-law farewell, and he went his way to his own land’ [Exodus 18, 27]): “And this can be understood in two ways as we wrote for לך לך. 1. for his own benefit; 2. on his own”; This commentator shows how it is possible to understand both meanings in the phrase וילך לו in this verse: “And here if the meaning is ‘for his own benefit’, that is to address his needs to sell his assets, as it says in Numbers 10, 30; and if the meaning is ‘on his own’, that is he left his sons and servants there, and went on his own to his land”.

The second exegetic approach, which, as noted earlier, is represented in the commentary of Nachmanides on the phrase לך לך, is also expressed in the commentary of R. Abraham Ibn Ezra on the verse פנו וסעו לכם וב'או הר האמרי ואל כל שכניו (‘Start out and make your way to the hill country of the Amorites and to all their neighbors’ [Deuteronomy 1, 7]) – “And make your way – a figure of speech, like לך לך (Genesis 12, 1)”.⁴⁰

The translations into Aramaic of these 42 occurrences of the dative pronoun mostly rendered it as the Aramaic equivalent of ל-, but in three verses another approach is found: the reflexive pronoun was added (in the translation by Yonatan Ben Uziel of the verse וכדון ברי קביל מיני קום ערוק לך: – ‘Now, my son, listen to me, flee thee at once to Haran to my brother Laban’ [Genesis 27, 43]; or the replacement of ל- with another preposition having a clear meaning: קדם- (In the Onkelos translation of the verse ויאמר ה' אל משה: אספה לי – ‘The Lord said to Moses: Gather for Me seventy of Israel’s elders’ [Numbers 11, 16]; and בגין- (in the Yonatan Ben Uziel translation of the verse ועתה לכה נא ארה לי את העם הזה – ‘Come then out a curse upon this people to me’ [Numbers 22, 6]; (וכדון איתא בבעו לוט בגיני ית עמא הדין).

⁴⁰ It should be noted that Ibn Ezra relates in a similar fashion to occurrences of the dative pronoun in other verses too, which were not included in the examination: ואתה קח לך בשמים ראש (‘Take choice spices’ [Exodus 30, 23]), and פסל לך שני לוחות אבנים כראשונים (‘Carve two tablets of stone like the first’ [Exodus 34, 1]).

5. Summary

Noss (1995:327–8, 334–5) describes the structure of ‘verb + -ל + pronoun’ with the co-agentive dative pronoun in Biblical Hebrew as a productive structure: It can appear with all persons, with a variety of verb forms, with a variety of verbs, both in positive and negative sentences and a variety of texts – both narrative and lyrical, in both direct and indirect speech.

In Section 2 of this paper, the co-agentive dative pronoun is described in two compositions of the Tannaitic Hebrew – the Mishna and the Tosefta – in order to complete the description of its use in Mishnaic Hebrew, with a perspective on different aspects: the forms of the pronoun, the contexts in which the occurrences appear, and the verbs with which the pronoun appears.

The co-agentive dative pronoun has 100 occurrences in the Mishna and 71 occurrences in the Tosefta. Unlike the Bible, it appears with a limited variety of persons: It is found in the two compositions only in the four forms of the third person, especially לָהּ and לוֹ (in 88 percent of the occurrences). As for the contexts in which the pronoun appears, it was found that the majority are of a halachic nature, especially the formulation of law and the description of a ceremony (89 percent). In addition, the verbs with which the pronoun appears in the Mishna and Tosefta are quite limited: Eleven verbs are involved, of which only four are found in both compositions; of them the pronoun is frequent only with two verbs – הָלַךְ and בָּא (83 percent), and with five verbs it appears only once. The Biblical heritage of the verbs is expressed indeed in only two verbs with which the pronoun already appears in the Bible – הָלַךְ and יָשַׁב, but these are two verbs that appear in both compositions, and the first is the most frequent of the verbs; consequently, it is difficult to reject the attribution of the phenomenon to Biblical Hebrew, although it appears that Aramaic may have contributed to this phenomenon, because in more than half of the verbs that were found, Aramaic has a corresponding verb that also appears with the pronoun. Of the eleven verbs, the category of verbs of motion is strikingly evident. When the occurrences of the pronoun were examined together with the various verbs within the contexts, it was difficult to attribute to the pronoun any of the meanings attributed to it in the research (the benefactive, ingressive aspect, or centripetal meaning), and to explicate

what its role is in regard to the verbs, especially when a comparison was made between the occurrences of the verbs with the pronoun and similar occurrences of the verbs without the pronoun that appear in similar contexts, as well as a comparison of nearby occurrences of the verbs with and without the pronoun that appear in the same contexts.

In Section 3, the differences between several manuscripts of the Mishna and between several traditions of the Tosefta were presented in regard to the pronoun: Such differences were found in a minority of the occurrences of the pronoun in the Mishna (5 percent of the occurrences of the pronoun) and in the Tosefta (15 percent out of the 41 occurrences that were examined), and they indicate a certain lack of uniformity regarding this phenomenon, which expresses a redundancy of the language.

Section 4 appended to this paper presents two opposed exegetic approaches regarding the status of the co-agentive dative pronoun in the Bible, which emerge from an examination of the exegetic approaches to the appearance of the pronoun in a sample of verses from the Bible.

References

- Avery-Peck, Alan J. et al. (trans.) (1977–1986). The Tosefta translated from the Hebrew, ed. by Jacob Neusner and Richard S. Sarason. Hoboken: Ktav.
- Azar, Moshe. 1995. The syntax of Mishnaic Hebrew. Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language and University of Haifa.
- BDB. 1906. A Hebrew and English lexicon of the Old Testament, ed. By Francis Brown, Samuel Rolles Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, based on the lexicon of William Gesenius as translated by Edward Robinson. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bendavid, Abba. 1967. Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew. Tel-Aviv: Dvir, vol. 1.
- Ben-Yehuda, Eliezer. 1948. A complete dictionary of ancient and modern Hebrew. Jerusalem: Ben-Yehuda Hozaa-La'Or.
- Berman Aronson, Ruth. 1982. Dative marking of the affectee role: Data from modern Hebrew. Hebrew Annual Review 6.35–59.
- Blackman, Philip (trans.) 1963. Mishnayoth: Pointed Hebrew text, English translation, introductions, notes, supplement, appendix, indexes, addenda, corrigenda. New York: The Judaica Press.
- Blau, Joshua. 2005. The *dativus ethicus* in Medieval Judaeo-Arabic. Semitic studies in honour of Edward Ullendorff, ed. By Geoffrey Khan, 109–14. Leiden–Boston: Brill.
- Cohen, Dalia. 1994. The so-called *dativus ethivud* as a syntactic gap-filler in the daily Israeli press. Proceedings of the Congress of Jewish Studies 11 D I.179–84.
- Danby, Herbert. 1933. The Mishnah translated from the Hebrew with introduction and brief explanatory notes. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gesenius, Wilhelm. 1910. Gesenius' Hebrew grammar, edited and enl. by E. Kautzsch, English edition by A. E. Cowley. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Halevy, Rivka. 2004. The function of the construction 'verb + *l-* + personal reflexive pronoun' in contemporary Hebrew. Leshonenu 66.113–43.
- Halevy, Rivka. 2007. The subject co-referential *l-* pronoun in Hebrew. Studies in Semitic and general linguistics in honor of Gideon Goldenberg, ed. By Tali Bar and Eran Cohen, 299–321. Munster: Ugarit-Verlag.

- Jastrow, Marcus. 1950. A dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic literature. New York: Pardes.
- Jouon, Paul. 1991. A grammar of Biblical Hebrew, trans. and rev. by Takamitsu Muraoka. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto biblico.
- JPS Hebrew-English Tanakh. 2000. JPS Hebrew-English Tanakh: The traditional Hebrew text and the new JPS translation. second edition. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.
- Kasovsky, Chaim Yehoshua. 1967. Thesaurus Mishnae. Tel Aviv: Massadah.
- Lieberman, Saul. 1984. Greek and Hellenism in Jewish Palestine. Jerusalem: Bialik and Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi.
- Lieberman, Saul. 1992a. The Tosefta according to Codex Vienna, with variants from Codex Erfurt, Genisah Mss. And Editio Princeps (Venice 1521). second edition. Jerusalem: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America.
- Lieberman, Saul. 1992b. Tosefta Ki-Fshutah: A comprehensive commentary on the Tosefta. second edition. Jerusalem: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. 1978. On the so-called *dativus ethicus* in Hebrew. The Journal of Theological Studies 29.495–8.
- Naudé, J. A. 1997. The syntactic status of the ethical dative in Biblical Hebrew. Journal for Semitics 9 1–2.129–65.
- Neusner, Jacob. 1981. The Tosefta, translated from the Hebrew. New York: Ktav.
- Neusner, Jacob. 1988. The Mishnah: A new translation. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Noss, Philip A. 1995. The Hebrew post-verbal *Lamed* preposition plus pronoun: Discourse features in the light of some African languages. The Bible Translator 46 3.326–35.
- Pardo, David. 1994. *Hasdei David*. Jerusalem: H. Vagshal.
- Rodrigue-Schwarzwald, Ora and Sokoloff, Michael. 1992. A Hebrew dictionary of linguistic and philology. Even Yehuda: Reches.
- Segal, Moses Hirsch. 1936. A grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew. Tel Aviv: Dvir.
- Sharvit, Shimon. 2004. History of the Hebrew language: The classical division, Unit 3: Talmudic Hebrew. Tel Aviv: The Open university of Israel.

- Sharvit, Shimon. 2006. Language and style of tractate Avoth through the ages. Beer Sheva: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press.
- Shatil, Nimrod. 2004. The ethical dative through structural, functional and typological perspectives. *Societatis Linguisticae Europaeae Sodalitium Israelense* – Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual Meeting 15. 55–68.
- Sokoloff, Michael. 1969. The Hebrew of *Bereshit Rabba* according to Ms. Vat. Ebr. 30 (concl.). *Leshonenu* 33.270–9.
(= 1972. *Qoves Ma'amarim bi-Lshon Hazal*, vol. 1, ed. by Moshe Bar-Asher, 290–9. Jerusalem.)
- Sokoloff, Michael. 1990. A dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine period. Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press.
- Sokoloff, Michael. 2002. A dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic periods. Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press.
- Ullendorff, Edward. 1992. Some observations on the *dativus ethicus* in Semitics and elsewhere. *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 15.1–9.
- Waltke, Bruce K. and O'Connor, M. 1990. An introduction to Biblical Hebrew syntax. Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake.
- Zuckerman, Moses Samuel. 1970. Tosefta based on the Erfurt and Vienna Codices with parallels and variants. Jerusalem.