# Hebrew Grammar in Contact with German Grammar during the Jewish Enlightenment: Pronouns as Case Study

Dr. Yehonatan Wormser

University of Amsterdam and Efrata College, Jerusalem

Yefe Nof 43 St., Nahariya, Israel 22208

[yowormser@gmail.com](mailto:yowormser@gmail.com)

Abstract

This paper introduces an initial examination of the influence of German grammatical theory on Jewish Hebrew grammatical works during the beginning of the Jewish Enlightenment (end of 18th century). The examination is based on the terminology and description of one issue – the Hebrew pronouns, as presented in two main works – Moses Mendelssohn's (1729 –1786) booklet ʾ*Or Lintivah* (Berlin, 1783) and the comprehensive grammar of Judah Leib Ben-Zeʾev (1764 – 1811) – *Talmud Lashon* ʿ*I*vri (Breslau, 1796). The German sources of those two scholars and the manner they used them are being revealed and analyzed. This analysis paints a picture of a careful and selective adaptation of the German model on the one hand, and perceiving Hebrew grammatical elements through German features on the other hand, which left its imprints on the Hebrew grammar until nowadays.

1. Introduction[[1]](#footnote-2)

One of the best-known Maskilic endeavors during the early stage of their activity focused on the linguistic qualification of the Jewish community. On the explicit level,[[2]](#footnote-3) the aim was to expand and cultivate the Hebrew language as a suitable medium for any cultural, scientific, or artistic purpose. This was presented as a religious and cultural ideal, crucial for the preservation of Jewish heritage and development of the Jewish people as a modern, civilized nation.[[3]](#footnote-4) To this end, in addition to a large volume of new Hebrew writing in a variety of cultural and scientific fields, new Hebrew grammars and handbooks were published.

No less important in this respect is the position of the German language. Speaking or writing high-level German was not widely regarded as an explicit idealistic aim, but rather, like any other vernacular language, as a practical need for financial and social connections.[[4]](#footnote-5) However, the special attitude of the Maskilim toward German is strongly evident.[[5]](#footnote-6) The creation of German translations of the Pentateuch and other Hebrew writings, as well as the deep Maskilic reliance on German literary, cultural, scientific, and philosophic sources in the early period of the Jewish Enlightenment, are prominent expressions of this attitude.[[6]](#footnote-7)

The Hebrew grammar in this period is no exception. Maskilic grammatical writings include frequent and numerous comparisons to German and translations of German terms, some of them written in German or in a bilingual Hebrew-German format.[[7]](#footnote-8) The connections with German linguistics enabled a substantial extension and development of Hebrew grammatical descriptions, particularly in the domain of syntax, which had been relatively neglected in earlier Hebrew grammars. The strong influence of German linguistics on Hebrew linguistics is therefore quite obvious.[[8]](#footnote-9) Nevertheless, it has never previously been systematically described, nor its German sources precisely revealed.[[9]](#footnote-10)

The first Jewish work of this period in which those foreign theories were applied to offer considerable innovations in grammatical descriptions is the pamphlet ʾ*Or lintivah* (Berlin, 1783), authored by the famous Jewish philosopher Moses Mendelssohn (1729 –1786). This work was intended to serve as a Hebrew introduction to the *Targum* – his German translation of the Pentateuch. In the third part, Mendelssohn presented an organized, compendious introduction for the main principles and key-terms of the Hebrew syntax.[[10]](#footnote-11) In all probability, the aim of this section was to note some fundamental differences between Hebrew and German syntax, in order to provide the reader with an explanation for perceived discrepancies between the German translation and the original text. Although not intended as a grammatical description *per se*, it represents a considerable innovation in Jewish Hebrew linguistic tradition.[[11]](#footnote-12)

The next significant step was taken a few years later by Judah Leib Ben-Zeʾev (1764 –1811).[[12]](#footnote-13) In his comprehensive Hebrew grammar *Talmud lashon ʿivri* (Breslau, 1796), he devotes the fourth section (out of five in the work) to a detailed presentation of Hebrew syntax. In this section, he expands upon Mendelssohn’s initial work, introducing an exhaustive biblical Hebrew syntactic analysis. The other sections of his book also include numerous valuable innovations. Ben-Zeʾev's work offers a solid methodological and theoretical basis for the grammatical descriptions in subsequent works.

The clearest element in which the German background is reflected in these works is technical Hebrew terminology. Almost every grammatical term is accompanied by a German translation, transliterated into Hebrew letters and placed in parentheses. This is the first time that Hebrew alternatives are introduced for many of these German terms (which, in turn, are often originally taken from the Latin). These Hebrew terms by no means reflect an automatic adoption of German terminology. A substantial effort is made to present a careful and selective adaptation, in which the Hebrew alternatives are employed only when they were considered appropriate terms, suitable for the Hebrew grammatical features. In other cases, the German term is rejected. Even when it is accepted, the selection of the Hebrew alternative is not a simple loan translation, but rather an attempt to find the best representative for the Hebrew linguistic element. The terminology employed in those works is, therefore, a good reflection for the essential attitude towards many linguistic issues and their underlying significance. However, at least in some cases, it seems that the German-modeled terminology does not represent the nature of Hebrew grammar in the most desirable or appropriate manner, even according to the writer’s linguistic theory, instead creating a Hebrew grammatical perception shaped by German principles.

In this paper, I examine one representative issue: the treatment and terminology of the Hebrew pronouns in Mendelssohn's and Ben-Ze'ev's works. This issue appears to offer a striking and distinctive example of the treatment and adaptation of German grammatical sources by Maskilic scholars, as well as German influence on the Hebrew grammatical conceptions and its subsequent traces in Hebrew grammar to the present day. Our subject will enable us to reveal the primary German sources that lay behind these two works[[13]](#footnote-14) and to trace the way German ideas were embraced by Jewish Hebrew grammars and the consequences of this adoption.

This paper is divided into two parts: the first outlines in general the description of the pronouns as presented by these two scholars; the second discusses a specific category in Ben-Ze'ev's work – the relative pronoun, from which much can be learned about his sources and linguistic attitude.

1. The pronouns in ʾ*Or lintivah* and *Talmud lashon ʿivri*.

In his description of the Hebrew pronouns, Mendelssohn[[14]](#footnote-15) describes only personal (independent and suffixed) pronouns. As for other categories that grammarians of other languages include under the term *pronomina*, he claims (without explanation) that for the purposes of describing Hebrew, it is not necessary to "mention them in particular and to study them in detail." However, he lists those categories and explains them briefly for the benefit of those who compare his German translation to the original Hebrew text, and would like to understand why the translator provided different German translations for the same Hebrew word in different instances.[[15]](#footnote-16) His list contains six categories: כנויי גוף (personal pronouns, in which he includes independent and suffixed pronouns, as well as כנויים חוזרים - reciprocal pronouns), כנויי הקנין (possessive pronouns), כנויים רומזים (demonstrative pronouns), כנויי השאלה (interrogative pronouns), כנויים מצרפים (relative pronouns) and כנויים בלתי מיוחדים (indefinite pronouns). [[16]](#footnote-17)Although not intended to serve as a Hebrew grammatical description, the mere presentation of the pronouns in Hebrew marks a considerable innovation. Except for the personal pronoun, which is traditionally described in Hebrew grammars, the other terms are introduced in Hebrew by a Jewish[[17]](#footnote-18) author for the first time.[[18]](#footnote-19) Even though Mendelssohn maintains that these categories are not necessary for Hebrew description, four of them (reciprocal, possessive, demonstrative and relative pronouns) have remained an integral part of Hebrew grammar, and three of them are still referred to by the terms Mendelssohn coins (כנויים חוזרים, כנויי קניין, כנויים רומזים).[[19]](#footnote-20)

Mendelssohn’s list accurately parallels similar lists in contemporary German grammars.[[20]](#footnote-21) Mendelssohn's main source is the most famous German grammar of his time, and one of the most successful grammars ever – Johann Christoph Gottsched's (1700-1766) German grammar, in which exactly the same list of pronouns is presented.[[21]](#footnote-22) There is only one significant difference: the terms Mendelssohn mentions for the indefinite pronoun are the German *unbestimmte Fürwörter* and the Latin equivalent *indefinita*. These terms had not been used by Gottsched, suggesting that Mendelssohn was familiar with other German grammars, possibly that authored by Christian Friedrich Hempel[[22]](#footnote-23) (died in 1757), who employed these terms.As mentioned, According to Mendelssohn's view, the detailing of all kinds of pronouns is necessary for comparison between Hebrew and German, not for learning or describing Hebrew *per se*. For his immediate successors who authored grammatical works on Hebrew, however, this aspect had already become an integral part of Hebrew grammar. Thus, Yoel Bril (1760-1802) in his textbook *ʿAmudei ha-lashon* (Berlin, 1794) describes five pronouns by employing the same terms, excluding only the indefinite pronoun.[[23]](#footnote-24)

Ben-Zeʾev, whose book was published two years later, introduces a similar list of the Hebrew pronouns: מלות הגוף ('words of person'), כנוי הקניין, כנוי הרומז, כינוי המיחד והמצרף, כנוי השאלה and כנוי סתמי (§156-163). Several significant differences can be noted relative to Mendelssohn. Due to the limited scope of this paper, we will not be able to discuss all of them, and we will focus on one - כינוי המיחד והמצרף, since this term clearly reveals Ben-Zeʾev's German source and provides an illuminating demonstration of the way Hebrew grammar was sometimes modeled by German grammar.

1. The relative pronoun in *Talmud lashon ʿivri*

The expanded term כנוי המיחד והמצרף (literally: the specifying and joining pronoun) form one class in *Talmud lashon ʿivri* (§160). However, it immediately turns out to be a designation for two different particles that function jointly as a correlative conjunction. Ben-Zeʾev explains that these two pronouns function together to join two sentences (i.e. a main clause and a dependent clause in a complex sentence) that have one noun in common. The first pronoun – כנוי המיחד – indicates or emphasizes one noun in the first sentence (the main clause), while כינוי המצרף ("אֲשֶׁר" or ("שֶׁ-" attaches a second sentence (the dependent clause), which serves as a modifier of this noun. He demonstrates this with one biblical verse: "הוּא אַהֲרֹן וּמֹשֶׁה אֲשֶׁר אָמַר יהוה לָהֶם" ('These are that Aaron and Moses, to whom the LORD said […]', Exod. 6:26). The word"הוּא" , according to Ben-Zeʾev, is כנוי המיחד, thus "specifies"[[24]](#footnote-25) the names of Moses and Aaron. The word "אֲשֶר" (כנוי המצרף) joins the second sentence ("אֲשֶׁר אָמַר יהוה לָהֶם") to these names, modifying them more specifically. Thus, when presenting the function of this pronoun, Ben-Zeʾev prefers to introduce a term related to a specific, relatively rare syntactic construction. He actually ignores, at this stage, the common use of the relative word אשר without any parallel "specifying" component in the sentence.

This unprecedented approach by Ben-Zeʾev, as well as the Latin and German translations he attaches to the Hebrew terms (*determinativa und relativa*, *bestimmendes und beziehendes Fürwort*), reveal his source very clearly. Ben-Zeʾev reflects here the innovative description presented by the well-known German grammarian Johann Christoph Adelung. Adelung[[25]](#footnote-26) argues that there was another kind of pronoun that had not been distinguished by his predecessors, which he calls *Determinativa*. This class of pronouns comprises words such as *derjenige, derselbe, solcher* etc. Those words are used, as Adelung puts it, with the relative pronouns (*Relativa*, such as *welcher, der, was*), to connect two sentences, while the *Determinativa* specifies or marks ("bestimmen") the subject of the first sentence, and the *Relativa* relates the second sentence to this subject (of the first sentence).[[26]](#footnote-27) In order to emphasize the connection between these two categories, he even suggests a combined term for the former – *Demonstrativorelativa*.

Accordingly, there can be no doubt that Ben-Zeʾev relies on Adelung on this issue. His terms are obviously translated from Adelung's, and his analysis of their function is almost identical. He makes only a slight change in categorization – presenting those two pronouns under one category.[[27]](#footnote-28) This is also fully understandable in light of Adelung's approach, which emphasizes the mutual connection between them.[[28]](#footnote-29)

The next discussion presented by Ben-Zeʾev (§161) focuses on the Hebrew relative pronoun. This pronoun, according to Ben-Zeʾev, joins two sentences by one joint noun that serves in both. He explains that the syntactic function of this noun may differ in each of the two joined sentences. He quotes the example, "וְיָשַב בָּהּ עַד מוֹת הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל אֲשֶׁר מָשַׁח אוֹתוֹ בְּשֶׁמֶן הַקֹּדֶשׁ" ('[…] and he shall live in it until the death of the high priest, who was anointed with the holy oil;' Num. 35:25). The "joint" noun (or, to be precise, noun phrase) is "הכהן הגדול" ("the high priest,"). In the first sentence – "מות הכהן הגדול" – is the subject (as Ben-Zeʾev analyses it). In the second sentence – "משח אותו בשמן הקדש" – it is represented by the word "אותו" – a construction of the accusative marker ('אֶת') and a suffixed personal pronoun.

For Ben-Zeʾev, in this common situation, in which the antecedent noun is represented in the main clause differently than the way it is represented in the relative clause, it is desirable that the relative pronoun, unlike the Hebrew usage, would reflect this difference. He makes thus a surprising statement, atypical for him. He asserts that it would also have been appropriate for the Hebrew relative pronoun אשר, as it is in other languages, to mark the case of the antecedent noun in the relative clause. It would have been also appropriate for אשר to be "changed," i.e. inflected, by number and gender. But the Hebrew language "diverted" in this matter from "all other languages," as "אשר" denotes only joining two sentences.[[29]](#footnote-30)

The obvious model for Ben-Zeʾev's view of the relative clause, which serves for translating all his Hebrew examples, is the German *welche*. He not only views Hebrew here through the prism of German grammar, but actually expects Hebrew to act as German. Such an explicit expectation is uncommon in Ben-Zeʾev's grammatical writing. It thus represents a rare and extreme instance, but one that demonstrates one aspect of Ben-Zeʾev's basic attitude; he admires the German language and regards it as an ultimate linguistic model. It is probable to assume that this normative comment made by Ben-Zeʾevwas inspired by theintensive normative activity in German-speaking areas at the time, and the wide discussions on the shape of High German and its relations to local dialects.[[30]](#footnote-31)

Ben-Zeʾev therefore makes the distinction that the Hebrew relative word אשר (as well as ש and other Hebrew relative markers) is inflexible, marking only conjoining two clauses. Following this, the conclusion is inevitable: the word אשר and the other Hebrew relative markers, according to Ben-Zeʾev, actually do not function as pronouns at all, thus serving only as conjunctive relative marker. The term "pronoun" denotes a word or grammatical component that is used instead of a specific noun (or noun phrase), usually explicitly mentioned before. This term is used in this sense due to its basic meaning of substituting one word with another word. But this is not, as Ben-Zeʾev describes it, the situation with אשר. Given that it is only a "joining word," or a conjunction, without any mark of its antecedent noun, it should not be classified in the category of pronouns, nor should the term כינוי (literally "appellation," which represents the concept of substituting a noun) be used to denote it. Classifying the Hebrew relative markers as pronouns in *Talmud lashon ʾivri* is, therefore, not an expression of Ben-Zeʾev's perception of their grammatical nature, but rather a result of his adhesion to the German model.

1. Conclusion

The contact between German linguistics and Hebrew grammar, led by scholars at the beginning of the Jewish Enlightenment, yielded a substantial development of Jewish Hebrew grammar.[[31]](#footnote-32) The descriptions of the pronouns are a good example of this development, in which the Hebrew possessive, demonstrative, relative and interrogative pronouns were distinguished, classified and described in Hebrew for the first time.

In adapting the foreign model of this subject and adjusting it to Hebrew, Moses Mendelssohn and Judah Leib Ben-Zeʾev both made an effort to be loyal to the nature of the Hebrew language.[[32]](#footnote-33) However, in Ben-Zeʾev's treatment of the relative pronoun, the German influence was stronger..

Ben-Zeʾev thus expects the Hebrew relative marker to behave like its German counterpart, expressing a normative comment regarding the Biblical Hebrew features. This stance reflects a sharp observation, shared by Mendelssohn, on the nature of the Hebrew relative word, which serves as a conjunction and not as a pronoun. As we pointed out, the conclusion one should draw on the basis of this observation is that the Hebrew relative markers should not be considered as pronouns at all. Accordingly the term כנוי is unsuitable for this category, and its use by Ben-Zeʾev is due to his adhesion to the German model. This case is exceptional in terms of the explicit nature of Ben-Zeʾev's statement, but it represents many other cases in which his adherence to the German model is evident.

This observation should also be taken into account in light of modern studies. Biblical Hebrew researchers have not reached agreement on the question of whether and to what extent אשר should be considered as a pronoun.[[33]](#footnote-34) They do all agree, however, that it is used differently than the European relative pronouns, and that there are cases in Biblical Hebrew in which it serves as a conjunction rather than a pronoun.[[34]](#footnote-35) The term "כינוי", therefore, is an inadequate term, according to some scholars, and all would agree that it does not reflect the whole variety of its use in Hebrew.

Nevertheless, the term כינוי for the Hebrew relative markers remains in use to this day. Although the old construction phrase had changed, when the nomen regens מצרף or מייחד ומצרף was replaced by the modern term זיקה – the nomen rectum remained unchanged, forming the phrase כינוי זיקה. The latter was set as the standard term by the Academy for Hebrew Language.[[35]](#footnote-36) Despite its problematic adequacy for Hebrew, the tendency of reflecting the foreign terminology,[[36]](#footnote-37) introduced with respect to this subject in Mendelssohn and Ben-Zeʾev's works, proved stronger.

1. I would like to express my deep thanks to Prof. Irene E. Zwiep for her pleasant and inspiring collaboration in this study and for her valuable comments on an earlier draft of this paper. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. For a discussion of the implicit and subtle motives of this activity, see: Edward Y. Kutsher, *A History of the Hebrew Language*, ed. R. Kutsher (Jerusalem, 1982), 183-84; Yaakov Shavit, "A Duty Too Heavy to Bear: Hebrew in Berlin Haskalah, 1783-1819: Between Classic, Modern and Romantic," in *Hebrew in Ashkenaz: A Language in Exile*, ed. L. Glinert (New-York, 1993), 111-28; Israel Bartal, "From Traditional Biligualism to National Monoligualism," in *Hebrew in Ashkenaz: A Language in Exile*, ed. L. Glinert (New-York, 1993), 144-5. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Shlomo Haramati, "Dibur ʿivri bi-tkufat ha-Haskalah," *Leshonenu la-ʿam* 39.5-6 (1988): 99-104; Chaim Shoham, *Ispired by German Enlightenment* (Hebrew; Tel Aviv, 1996), 25-29; Shmuel Feiner, *The Jewish Enlightenment* (Hebrew; Jerusalem, 2002), 222-23; Andrea Schatz, *Sprache in der Zerstreuung : die Säkularisierung des Hebräischen im 18. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen, 2009), 191-94; Ilan Eldar, *From Mendelssohn to Mendele: The Emergence of Modern Literary Hebrew* (Hebrew; Jerusalem, 2014), 53-57. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Yosef Yiz@haki, "Deʿotehen shel sofre ha-Haskalah ʿal ha-lashon ha-ʿivrit ve-darkhehem be-har@havatah ve-@hidushah," *Lešonenu* 35 (1971): 146-47; Edward Breuer, *The Limits of Enlightenment: Jews, Germans and the Eighteenth-Century Study of Scripture* (Massachussets, 1996), 77-78. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. See, for example: Shmuel Werses, "Inter-lingual Tensions in the Maskilic Periodecal 'Hameʾasef' and its Time in Germany" (Hebrew), *Dappim: Research in Literature* 11 (1997-1998): 33-48; Eldar, *Mendelssohn to Mendele,* 99-102. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Shoham, *German Enlightenment*, 30-40; Breuer, *Limits of Enlightenment*, 20-26. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. For a comprehensive survey of some of those writings, see Irene E. Zwiep, "Imagined speech communities: Western Ashkenazi multiligualism as reflected in eighteenth-century grammars of Hebrew", in *Speaking Jewish – Jewish Speak: Multiligualism in Western Ashkenazic Culture*, ed. S. Berger (Louvain, 2003), 94-117. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. See Zwiep, "Ashkenazi multiligualism," 80. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. See Zwiep, "Ashkenazi multiligualism," 101-11, for initial remarks on the German sources of several Hebrew grammar textbooks. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. Mendelssohn also discussed syntactical issues, mainly from a philosophical angle, in *Beʾur milot ha-higayon* (Frankfurt, 1762), his commentary to Maimonides' philosophic treatise. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. Perets Sandler, *Ha-beʾur la-Torah shel Moshe Mendelssohn we-siʿato* (Jerusalem, 1941), 41-42. Before Mendelssohn, only one Jewish Hebrew grammarian devoted a separate chapter providing a systematic description of the Hebrew syntax – the 16th century Italian scholar Rabbi Abraham de Balmes, in his grammar *Mikneh Avram* (Venice, 1523). This Latin-influenced chapter was very difficult to understand and had no impact on later grammatical works. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. For some biographical details about Ben-Zeʾev see Edward Breuer, "(Re)Creating Traditions of Language and Texts: The Haskalah and Cultural Continuity" *Modern Juadism* 16 (1996): 161-64 and references. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. This initial study of the Maskilic grammars somewhat resembles to the studies presented by Prof. Dan Becker on some medieval grammarians, in which he revealed their Arabic linguistic sources (Cf. Dan Becker, "Linguistic Rules and Definitions in Ibn Janā@h's 'Kitab Al-Lumaʿ' (Sefer Ha-Riqmah) Copied from the Arab Grammarians", *JQR* 86.3-4 (1996): 275-98; idem, *Arabic Sources of R. Jonah ibn Jana@h's Grammar* (Hebrew; Tel Aviv, 1998); idem, *Arabic Sources of Isaac ibn Barun's Book of Comparison between the Hebrew and the Arabic Languages* (Hebrew; Tel Aviv, 2005). [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. Page numbers are not given for references to ʾ*Or lintivah*, since this work is unpaged. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. For an example of such an ambiguity, see ibid. in ʾ*Or lintivah.* [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. According to Mendelssohn, the word "איש" (lit. 'man') may serve in this function in Biblical Hebrew. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. As for Christian scholars, all the pronouns had been already introduced before Mendelssohn by Christian Hebraists, except for indefinite pronouns (see, for example, David Michaelis, *Hebräische Grammatik.*, 2nd ed. (Halle, 1768), 266-92). However, the order and sub-categorization of Mendelssohn's list suggest that it was not these works but rather contemporary German grammars that served as his main source (see below). [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
18. Earlier Jewish grammars described only independent personal pronouns and suffixed pronouns, which function as object pronouns or possessive pronouns (See, for example, Rabbi Shmuʾel Archevolti, *Sefer arugat ha-bosem* [Amsterdam, 1730], 66b-70a). [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
19. Cf. Ora Rorigue-Schwarzwald and Michael Sokoloff, *A Hebrew Dictionary of Linguistics and Philology* (Hebrew; Even-Yehuda, 1992), 263-64. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
20. See Max Hermann Jellinek, *Gecshichte der Neuhochdeutschen Grammatik: von den Anfängen bis auf Adelung (*Heidelberg, 1914), 2:273-74; Ernst Leser, "Fachwörter zur Deutschen Grammatik von Schottel bis Gottsched", *Zeitschrift für Deutsche Wortforschung* 15 (1914): 46-48. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
21. See Johann Christoph Gottsched, *Vollständigere und Neuerläuterte Deutsche Sprachkunst* (Leipzig, 1776), 277-93 (first publication: Leipzig, 1748). Cf. Schatz, *Sprache*, 204-14. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
22. Christian Friedrich Hempel, *Erleichterte Hoch-Teutsche Sprach-Lehre* (Leipzig, 1754), 399-401. I would like to thank the reader for his valuable comment at this point. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
23. Bril, ʿ*Amudei*, 28-32, 68-70. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
24. This term מיחד 'specifies' is a calque from the German "bestimmend." See below. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
25. Johann Christoph Adelung, *Versuch eine Vollständigen grammatisch-kritischen Wörterbuch* (Leipzig, 1774), 1322; idem, *Deutche Sprachlehre für* *Schulen* (Berlin, 1781), §384; idem, *Umständliches Lehrgebäude der Deutchen Sprache zur Erläuterung der Deutchen Sprachlehre für Schulen* (Leipzig, 1782)*,* 1:703-705. cf. Jellinek, *Grammatik*, 274-75. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
26. Here is one example provided by Adelung: "Ich verzeihe es denjenigen, welche schuld daran sind." [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
27. This categorization might be fallible. While reading this passage, in which Ben-Zeʾev had not presented the relative pronoun as an independent category, one might conclude that the Hebrew relative pronouns appear only in such a correlative system with the *Determinativa*. But it is clear that Ben-Zeʾev didn’t mean that, as proven by the following discussion (see below) in which he deals only with the relative pronoun and in his examples no *Determinativa* appears. The only reason for him to join these two pronouns into one category is his effort to maintain the pattern of pronouns categorization of his German sources. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
28. Joining these two categories is probably a result of his desire to maintain the framework of six pronouns (cf. Jellinek, Grammatik, 275). [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
29. "והיה ראוי אם כן שיסומן במלת אשר סמן יחס השם במשפט המצורף, וכן היה ראוי שישתנה לפי המין והמספר, כאשר הוא בשאר לשונות, אך הלשון נטתה בענין הזה משאר לשונות, כי אין במלה ההוא כי אם הוראת הצרוף לבד." (Ben-Zeʿev, *Talmud*, §161). This difference between Hebrew and other languages was already pointed out by Mendelssohn, but without taking a normative stance (however, it should be noticed that such a stance is not expected in light of the aims of the grammatical section in ʾ*Or Lintivah* ; cf. above). [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
30. To mention just two of the many studies that describe this issue: Peter von Polenz, *Deutsche Sprachgeschichte vom Spätmittelalter bis zum Gegenwart* (Berlin and New York 1994), 2:144-93; Jörg Kilian, "Enwicklungen in Deutchland im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert ausserhalb der Sprachgesellschaften," in *History of Language Sciences: an International Handbook of the Study of Language from the Beginnings to the Present*, ed. S. Auroux and K. Versteech (Berlin, 2000), 841-51 . [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
31. The practice of adapting an existing foreign linguistic framework for the sake of describing Hebrew and other languages is in itself well-known and has been common since ancient times. See, for example, Aharon Maman, "The Adoption of Foreign Theories by Medieval and Renaissance Hebrew Grammarians" (Hebrew), Lešonenu 76 (2014): 309-17. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
32. Mendelssohn, as stated above, claimed that most of the pronominal categories are not necessary for Hebrew. Similarly, Ben-Zeʾev also noted differences between Hebrew and other languages while emphasizing that the indefinite pronoun has no unique words designated for it and is referred to in different ways according to context (§163,§332) [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
33. See Emil Kautzsch and Arthur Ernest Cowley, eds., *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* (Oxford, 1910), §138; Paul Joüon, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, Trans. and ed. T. Muraoka (Roma, 1996), §145; Robert D. Holmstedt, *The Relative Clause in Biblical Hebrew* (Winona Lake, 2016), 63. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
34. As for scholars who describe later Hebrew layers, it seems that at least some of them share the opinion that אשר and ש are not pronouns. See, for example, Yitzhak Peretz, *The Relative Clause* (Hebrew; Tel Aviv, 1967), 86-87; 127-33; Lewis Glinert, *The Grammar of Modern Hebrew* (Cambridge, 2004), 359. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
35. This term appears in the formal list of linguistic terms presented in the Academy's official website ("מונחי האקדמיה", accessed August 26, 2018, https://terms.hebrew-academy.org.il/munnah/54125\_2/relative%20pronoun). The same is with another much authoritative source – Rodrigue-Schwarzwald and Sokoloff, *Dictionary*, 192. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
36. The connection of the modern term to European terminology is probably intentional, in order to facilitate its use in general linguistic studies relating to various languages. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)