English Abstracts

David Téné

The State of the Art in Hebrew Linguistic Literature

This article stems from the late Professor D. Téné's opening lecture in
the Research Group on Hebrew Linguistic Literature, which he headed
and directed during the 1994-1995 academic year at the Institute for
Advanced Studies at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. The article
deals with the state of the art in the field, focusing on the achievements of
the last quarter of the twentieth century compared with those of the
former century, beginning with W. Bacher. Téné describes Bacher's work
in this field as a four-floor pyramid, whose first floor consists of critical
editions of medieval works in the field; the second of bibliographical
monographs on Hebrew scholars and their works; the third of surveys on
the development of Hebrew linguistic literature; and the fourth essay on
Hebrew linguistics. Téné claims that this model was used not only by
Bacher but by his contemporaries and followers during the subsequent
generations as well. Nevertheless, Téné claims that while during the 19th
century critical editions dealt with comprehensive works, in the 20th
century researchers mainly focused on the Geniza material with the result
that they only edited as much material as accidentally discovered in one
Geniza collection or another. Editing also consisted sometimes of only
one leaf. Téné's opinion is that one should return to Bacher's model, i.e.
one should collect all of a work that survived in the Geniza together with
materials outside the Geniza before editing it. He also urges researchers to
follow the other fields of study set by Bacher. Therefore, Téné suggests
that encyclopaedic catalogues for the manuscripts of Hebrew linguistic
literature should be compiled for the sake of research and critical editions.
He also makes few suggestions for future research in the field and
improvements to Bacher's model.

David Téné

How Should Older Works in Hebrew Linguistics be Edited

The late D. Téné read this paper as an introduction to a symposium on the question of how older works on Hebrew linguistics should be edited. Téné based his views on his own experience in preparing the second edition of R. Yonah b. Janaḥ's Sefer ha–Riqmah (Jerusalem 1964), edited originally by M. Wilensky (Berlin 1929–1931), which he regarded as a model, and on his own edition of Ibn Janaḥ's Sefer Ha–Hasagah (in press).

Téné held that no edition might be considered critical unless it is based upon more than a single manuscript. The editor shoud use not only all the surviving copies made from the autograph or from its later copies but of its translations as well, when such translations exist. In setting up the text, the editor should analyze all the philological material and study the linguistic theory of that work, its language and its terminology.

Aharon Dotan

The Editing of Ancient Linguistic Texts

Compard to the development of textual criticism in classical philology, the methods of editing medieval Hebrew linguistic texts and Hebrew textual criticism as a whole are still in their infancy and problematic.

The editing of the Hebrew biblical text has been revolutionized in the twentieth century from eclectic Bible editions to diplomatic editions, based mostly on master codices of the Ben–Asher masoretic school.

Similarly, there has been a debate about the methods of editing mishnaic texts, whether eclectic or diplomatic.

Turning to medieval linguistic texts, leaving aside the technicalities of editorial display, the editor must choose between a text based on a single preferred manuscript versus a text resulting from learned emendations. The conflict between the written 'diploma' and human subjective reasoning here is the main issue.

The solution should take into consideration the intention of users. Linguistic texts are by nature intended for scholars, themselves well trained in linguistics and even in textual criticism. They might prefer a first–hand impression of the original text rather than be presented with the outcome of the editor's personal considerations.

A basic handbook for the use of the critic and the editor of medieval Hebrew texts, similar to handbooks and companions existing in classic and in arabic philology, is an urgent desideratum.

Yosef Ofer

Masoretic Comments on Grammar in MS לﬞﬞ
(A Manuscript from St. Petersburg Containing
the *Tafsīr* of Saadia Gaon)

Samuel ben Jacob, the 11th century Masorete, who copied the famous biblical manuscript Firkovitch B19a now housed in St. Petersburg (Leningrad), also copied many additional biblical manuscripts. One of the most interesting is ms. לﬞﬞ (Firkovitch Ebr II C1 paper), which contains the Arabic translation *(tafsīr)* of Saadia Gaon. The Masoretic material found in the manuscript is unique and contains some grammatical comments. These comments are discussed in this article along with an analysis of their language, terminology, and contents.

This Masoretic material teaches us that Samuel ben Jacob was influenced by the first Hebrew grammarians and by the first grammatical works they wrote. These sources led him to reinvestigate the Masoretic material he worked on. He experimented to a limited extent with explaining the different linguistic forms appearing in the Bible and the relationships between the forms.

Two Masoretic comments from ms. לﬞﬞ dealing with the Masoretic system and principles of counting are also discussed in this article. Both comments constitute the first step in investigating the Masora and in defining its methods. Additional Masoretic comments containing homilies based on letters or exceptional words in the Bible are also taken up in this paper.

Geoffrey Khan

The Theory of Morphology in the *Diqduq*
of the Karaite Joseph ben Noaḥ

Joseph ben Noaḥ was a Karaite scholar who was active in Jerusalem towards the end of the tenth century. Around the year 1,000 he founded a college of Karaite scholars in Jerusalem. His surviving works include a grammatical text known as the *Diqduq* and a commentary on the Bible. The *Diqduq* itself is a grammatical commentary on the Bible rather than a systematically arranged grammar book. A study of the text, however, allows us to reconstruct his grammatical theory. Some of this grammatical thought is attributed by Joseph ben Noaḥ to earlier Karaite grammarians, who appear to have belonged to Karaite circles of scholars in Iraq, where Joseph ben Noaḥ received his training.

This paper studies the theory of Hebrew morphology that is found in the *Diqduq*. The main focus of this is the derivation of verbs and nouns. Various levels of analysis can be distinguished. Verbs and nouns have morphological bases. These are not abstract roots but rather real linguistic forms, consisting of consonants and vowels. The normal base of a verbal form is the masc. sing. imperative and that of a noun is the sing. absolute form. In addition to the morphological base, Joseph ben Noaḥ refers to the abstract substance (Arabic: *jawhar*) of linguistic forms. This is not necessarily equivalent to the concept of abstract root that we have today, but rather was the abstract substance in each individual word. The *jawhar* of words may contain vowel letters and geminated consonants. Finally, all words belong to a lexical class which is referred to by the term *lughah* (the Arabic translation of the Hebrew term *lashon*).

There are some parallels in this system of morphology with the one that is found in the grammatical writings of Saadya Gaon. The concept of vowel letters and of the Hebrew root developed by Ḥayyūj and the Spanish grammarians. As far as we can tell, Joseph ben Noaḥ had no contact with the Spanish grammarians.

XII

Aharon Maman

The Hebrew Alphabet as a Grammatical Mnemotechnic Framework: Introduction to Al–Kitāb al–Mushtamil, Part III

Part III of Abū–l–Faraj Harun's Al–Kitāb al–Mushtamil is long and comprehensive. It includes every item in Biblical Hebrew grammar that is related to one of the Hebrew letters. The several paragraphs in this part are therefore classified according to the order of the Hebrew alphabet and not according to their logical one. The Hebrew alphabet itself is divided into two major halves: one which includes eleven letters that might serve both as radicals and serviles, and one which includes the other eleven that can only be radicals. The latter half is quite short and only deals with interchanges of radicals such as ג/כ in סגר/סכר, while the first half constitutes the body of Part III.

Abū–l–Faraj classifies the grammatical material in every letter according to the position of that letter in the word: initial, medial or final. For example, under the letter ו he first lists its different usages while initial (such as when used as a conjunctive waw), then while final (such as when used as the 3ms possessive pronoun or as the 3mpl. subject pronoun). The classification is systematic. Many topics and details are listed here along with numerous of excurses, making it difficult for the reader to follow Abū-l-Faraj's intention. For this reason, our study article serves first of all as a guide to this section of al-Mushtamil. The article also describes other characteristics of this section, includng its didactic, comparative (with Arabic), philological (along with being linguistic) and hermeneutic nature. Some of Abū–l–Faraj's grammatical concepts are also described here, such as the relationship between the *ḥaqiqah* and the *majāz,* the derivation of a noun from of a name, the general and the rare, etc.

Ilan Eldar

The Arabic Original of the Additional Chapters of Ḥayyūj's 'Sefer ha–Niqqūd'

The famous grammarian Rabbi Yehuda b. David (Abū Zakariyyā Yaḥyā ibn Dāwud) Ḥayyūj (ca. 945 – ca. 1000) established the theory of triradicalism of the Hebrew verbs.

Beside his two grammatical works on defective verbs ('book of the verbs with weak letters' and 'book of the geminate verbs'), Ḥayyūj composed a small treatise entitled 'Kitāb al-Tanqiṭ' (Book of vocalization), in which he described the behavior of the vowels in various phonological environments and morphological patterns and their relation to the quiescent weak letters. These Judeo–Arabic works were translated into Hebrew by R. Abraham ibn Ezra.

Compared with the original Arabic text of 'Kitāb al–Tanqīṭ', the manuscripts of Ibn Ezra's translation contain three additional chapters. (Kitāb al–Tanqīṭ was edited together with Ibn Ezra's Hebrew translation entitled 'Sefer ha–Niqqūd' by J. W. Nutt in his Two Treatises by Jehuda Ḥayyūj, London and Berlin 1870). These chapters were not composed by Ḥayyūj, but by an anonymous author.

A few years ago I was fortunate to locate and identify a number of Geniza fragments containing the unknown Arabic text of these three chapters.

In this paper the text is published in a critical edition, with explanatory notes and introduction.

Dan Becker

The Arabic Sources of Isḥāq Ben Barūn's Grammatical Comparisons between Hebrew and Arabic

The sole comprehensive medieval Jewish work devoted to a linguistic comparison of Hebrew and Arabic – treating both grammatical and lexical matters – is Isḥāq ben Barūn's *Kitāb al–Muwāzana bayna al–luġa al–ᶜIbrāniyya wal-ᶜArabiyya* (Book of comparison between the Hebrew and the Arabic languages). Written in the late eleventh century in Spain, this work is extant in fragmentary form only.

Careful comparison of the grammatical part of ben Barūn's work with works of Arab grammarians who had preceded him revealed extensive use of *al-Jumal*, which is an Arabic grammar written by al-Zajjājī (d. circa 950). Although in the extant fragments of ben Barūn's work this Arab grammarian is not mentioned by name at all, the findings show undoubtedly that *al-Jumal* was the main source for ben Barūn's grammatical comparison, and in fact, in many instances he copied from *al-Jumal* whole sentences and passages verbatim.

This article presents eight examples of the Arabic source (there are many more examples) in three paragraphs: (a) Five examples of passages copied almost verbatim from *al-Jumal*. (b) One example of a long paragraph dealing with the feminine gender, copied almost verbatim from ibn al-Anbārī's *Kitāb al-Muḏakkar wal-Muʔannaṯ*. In this passage ben Barūn mentions ibn al-Anbārī (d. 939) by name. (c) The sources of two notes given by ben Barūn, in which he mentions by name the Arab grammarians al-Mubarrad (d. 898) and al-Zubaydi (d. 989), without naming the titles of their works.

Reuben S. Steiner

Vowel Length in Hebrew: Description and Theories from Jerome to Judah Halevy in the Light of Religious Polemics

In Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages, religious polemics often had a linguistic component. This is particulary obvious in Rabbanite–Karaite polemics, but it is also true of Jewish–Christian and Jewish–Muslim polemics.

One of the more curious by-products of the religious differences with Christians and Muslims was a heightened awareness of length differences in the Hebrew vowel system. In the fourth/fifth century C.E., Jerome's Jewish neighbors ridiculed his mispronunciations of Hebrew, specifically his lengthening of short vowels and his shortening of long ones. Jerome characterizes these mispronunciations as mistakes in the accent. Thus, he seems to have learned the hard way that vowel length was largely determined by the accent in post-Hexaplaric Hebrew.

The shortening of long vowels became entangled with religious polemics once again in the tenth century, when Dunash introduced the use of Arabic meter into Hebrew poetry. Menaḥem's disciples viewed Dunash's metrical poetry both as a tacit concession to Muslim claims that Arabic was superior to Hebrew and as a procrustean bed with no room for long vowels in closed syllables. In their polemical essay on Arabic meter (which may have been written by R. Judah Ḥayyūj), we find the first theory of Hebrew vowel length. It is based on the idea that every long vowel is composed of a short vowel plus a *sākin layyin* (quiescent ?, w, or y), an idea which was later to assume great importance in the thought of Ḥayyūj.

In the twelfth century, the same polemic led R. Judah Halevy to focus on phonotactics and prosody, areas in which he believed he could show that Hebrew was superior to Arabic. However, the phonological theory developed by his predecessors was not adequate to this task. His solution was to add the philosophical theory of impositions (functioning as levels) to the linguistic theory of quiescents. The result was the most sophisticated (and least understood) phonological theory in the history of Hebrew linguistics, a theory which stands midway between the thought of the Stoics and recent models of generative phonology.

Angel Sáenz–Badillos

Some Grammatical Attitudes of Abraham Ibn Ezra

This article intends to draw attention to some aspects in Abraham ibn Ezra's study of basic linguistic concepts, which are, in fact, both more original and consequent than usually thought to be. In continuing the attempt to define Ibn Ezra's linguistic system we will point out some aspects, which although seemingly unconnected, when taken as a whole, help to perceive their internal coherence and to characterize Ibn Ezra's linguistic posture.

First we analyze the attitude of Ibn Ezra with respect to the Andalusian grammarians of the 10th and 11th Centuries, Menahem, Dunash, Ḥayyūj, Ibn Janaḥ, Samuel ha–Nagid and Moshé Ibn Chiquitilla, underlining his particular feeling of closeness to the theories of Ḥayyūj, ha–Nagid and Ibn Chiquitilla.

Secondly, this attitude is analyzed according to the two–fold way Ibn Ezra relates to grammatical knowledge: the tradition, and the reasoning or reflection. In a similar manner, we deal with his opinion on anomalous forms and the "compound" words found in the Bible.

This is reflected in the symmetry which Ibn Ezra establishes between language and nature and in his fundamental return to tradition. One also finds that in his extensive employment of analogy and the principle of "correction" as well as in his explanation of the "anomalous forms", he is not so distant from the controversies of the Arabic grammarians of Basra.

Carlos Del Valle

Identifying the Hebrew Grammars of
Abraham Ibn Ezra

Of the four Hebrew grammars that Abraham Ibn 'Ezra mentions in his *Safah Berurah (Sefer ha–Moznayim, Sefer ha–Yesod, Sefat Yeter, Sefer Ṣaḥot)*, scholars have had difficulty in identifying two of these works among extant manuscript collections, namely: *Sefer ha–Yesod* and *Sefer Yeter*.

Now, with the publication of the grammar discovered by Pinsker and edited posthumously by N. Allony, the problem of the identity of the last named work has been definitively resolved. I refer to the book *Sefat Yeter*, composed by Abraham Ibn 'Ezra in Lucca between 1140–1145. The phrase "Yesod Diqduq" does not belong to the title of the work. In his edition of the *Sefat Yeter*, Allony could not use the Mss. Ebr. I A 97 (the most important manuscript) and Ebr II A 158–8 of the Firkovitch collection of Saint Petersburg and Ms. 150.2 of Warsaw.

As for *Sefer ha–Yesod*, also written in Lucca at the same period, the work is thought to be lost. For while the work on grammar contained in Ms. 1239 of the Bibliothèque National of Paris was identified by its copyist as the *Sefer ha–Yesod* of Abraham Ibn 'Ezra, this attribution has been judged wrong, and the work has been considered spurious. In my opinion, even if the work is not part of *Sefer ha–Yesod*, it deserves new treatment in the future. For such an investigation will demonstrate the great antiquity of the work, dating at least to the beginning of the 13th century, and will show that it was taken by R. Moses, the nephew of R. Menaḥem ben Simeon of Posquières, as the basis of his grammatical work *Sekel Toḇ*. At least two other manuscripts (Vat 460 and Or 1425 of the British Library) are copies of this same work, with the difference that the Vatican manuscript reproduced it with greater fullness and also identified it, it seems, with Abraham Ibn 'Ezra's *Sefat Yeter*. These bits of information compel us to take more seriously the attribution of the work to Abraham Ibn 'Ezra, as some ancient manuscripts do.

Nevertheless, an analysis of the work indicates that it simply cannot be identified with the *Sefer ha–Yesod* of Abraham Ibn 'Ezra. The character of the work in those manuscripts and that of the work of Abraham Ibn

'Ezra known from his writings is totally different. An analysis of the work's terminology, grammatical content and style does not provide definitive proof that it should be attributed to Abraham Ibn 'Ezra. However, the analysis does not disprove it either. To solve the problem we must await other manuscript evidence.

Meir N. Zislin

A Karaite Version of the Introduction of R. Abraham Ibn Ezra to his *Sefer Moznayim* (Firk II ebr, 456/1)

In this paper I am publishing the text of a Karaite version of the Introduction of R. A. Ibn Ezra to his *Sefer Moznayim*, dealing with the history of early Hebrew philologists up to his time. The author of this version, dating to the sixteenth century C.A., assigns the foundation of Hebrew philology to the sect of the Karaites rather than to Rav Saadia Gaon or other Rabbanites who followed him.

Sara Japhet

Multi–lingualism Theory and Practice in Rashbam's Biblical Commentaries

Multi–lingualism has been a constant feature of Jewish culture along the ages, expressed on two–levels. Not only did the Jews keep their own language(s) in their religious and cultural life while adopting the local vernacular for their quotidian transactions, but the Jewish cultural heritage itself was from the outset multilingual. the Bible, the Talmud and the Midrash are all bi–lingual, and while the Bible could be read – at least in certain communities and at certain periods – in translation, the translation, the talmudic and midrashic literature could be studied only in their original languages.

Did this multi–lingual phenomenon find expression in biblical exegesis? Were the commentators aware of it and did they refer to it in their work? Were they influenced by the multi–lingual reality of their time and place?

Our paper will discuss the views and practice of one of the greatest biblical commentators: R. Samuel ben Meir (Rashbam), who lived and worked in northern France during the 12th century.

Although the material in our prossession is rather limited, Rashbam's views are clear: linguistic phenomena are universal, but individual languages grant them different realizations. These views are appropriate expression of the time: the intellectual renaissance of the 12th century.

Cyril Aslanoff

Between Latin Grammarians and the Qimḥis, Efodi and De Balmes on Phonetics

This study tries to reassess the question of a possible Western influence on medieval Hebrew grammar, especially in the field of phonetics. Abba Bendavid's assumption as to the autonomy of Joseph Qimḥi's classification of the Hebrew vowels (viewed as a natural extrapolation of both Massoretic and Arabic theories) is confirmed on the basis of the demonstration of the essential difference between the description of vowels in the Latin grammatical tradition (represented by the two treatises of Aelius Donatus and Priscianus' *Institutiones grammaticae)* and its Hebrew counterpart. While the Latin grammatical treatises of the Late Antiquity consider the length of the vowel as a characteristic added to the vowel (something today's phoneticians would call "suprasegmental"), Joseph Qimḥi's classification views the length of the vowel as an essential feature of the vowel.

As for the later developments of Hebrew grammar represented by the names of Profiat Duran (Efodi) and Abraham de Balmes, they may be more open to foreign influences, but not as far as the phonetics is concerned. Their descriptions of the Hebrew vowels and consonants seem more like personal innovations than reflect any Western tradition. This

latter has not developed the branch of phonetics as it did with other branches like semantics or syntax. Efodi tries to reconsider the phonetics of the Hebrew language in a syllabic way, which may reflect the application of Western philosophic influence rather then an influence of linguistic thought. Moreover, he tries to reduce the number of the letters on the basis of their effective pronunciation in Catalunya of his days.

As for De Balmes, his analysis of the Hebrew phonetic system is based on a confusion of phonetics and graphematics, which shows that he intended his *Peculium Abrae* (at least in its Latin version) for beginners in the study of the Hebrew language.

Sophie Kessler–Mesguich

The Qimḥi's Legacy in the Grammatical Work of Pagninus

In the first decades of the 16th century, many Hebrew grammar books were composed by Christian Hebraists. This paper deals with one of them, the *Hebraicarum Institutionum Libri Quatuor*, written in 1526 by the Italian Hebraist Sanctes Pagninus. After demonstrating the unity of works by Pagninus, i.e. his Hebrew grammar, dictionary, and his new translation of the Bible, we give a general survey of Pagninus' grammatical work. In our conclusion, we point out the difference between the works of Reuchlin and Pagninus: the former uses mostly the *Mahalakh Shviley haDa'at* by Moshe Qimḥi, and his grammar remains quite elementary, while the latter, who strongly relies on David Qimḥi's *Mikhlol*, provided Christian Hebraists with a pattern of grammatical description which played a prominent role till the end of the century.

אחרי שפורסמו חיבוריו של אליהו בחור בתרגומו של מינסטר[21] וחיבוריו של פגנינוס, כלומר אחרי 1520.

רויכלין היה אמנם חלוץ החלוצים, אך ספרו הוא ספר בסיסי, ספר המכוון למתחילים. הדֶגֶם המשתלשל ועובר מספר לימוד לספר לימוד אחרי 1550 הוא דגם ה־*Institutiones hebraicae*; ועל כן מדקדקים נוצרים, גם אלה שלא היו מסוגלים להתמודד עם "המכלול", מרבים להזכיר את Rabbi David, princeps grammaticorum (ר' דוד, ראש המדקדקים).

נספח: רשימת ספרי הדקדוק של פגנינוס

Enchiridion ad capessendam linguam graecam, Avignon [1521?]

Isagoga ad linguam graecam, Avignon 1525

[*Institutiones hebraicae*], Lyon 1526

Institutionum hebraicarum abbreviatio, Lyon 1528

Institutionum abbreviatio, Lutetiae 1546

Hebraicarum Institutionum Libri IIII, Sancte Pagnino authore, ex R. David Kimhi priore parte מכלול, *quam* הדקדוק חלק *inscripsit, fere transcripti*, Lutetiae 1549

קצר הדקדוק *Institutionum hebraicarum abbreviatio*, Parisiis 1556

---

21. למשל: ספר הדקדוק *Grammatica hebraica absolutissima Eliae Levitae Germani,"* שפורסם *nuper per Sebastianum Munsterum iuxta hebraismum Latinitate donata'* בבאזל בשנת 1525. על החיבורים של אליהו בחור והשפעתו ראה G. E. Weil, *Elie Lévita, humaniste et massorète (1469-1549)*, Leiden 1963