**Hebrew Tense and Modus through German Glasses:**

**A Glance at Judah Leib Ben-Ze’ev’s Maskilic Linguistic Methodology**

Abstract

As is well-known, many Jews during the Jewish Enlightenment era were influenced by the scientific and cultural activity of the surrounding societies, and in many cases the writings authored for the Jewish public were inspired by it. This paper examines the realization of this inspiration in the field of Hebrew linguistics. Judah Leib Ben-Ze’ev, a prominent figure at the beginnings of the Jewish enlightenment and its greatest grammarian, based his linguistic work, to a large extent, on adaptation and adjustment of the grammar of German, as presented in German grammar guides of the time, to Hebrew. The description of the tense-modus system in Ben-Ze’ev’s work, accurately reflecting the German categorization and terminology, is a distinctive example of this process.

1. Introduction.

Many important cultural and social developments that took place during the Jewish Enlightenment, the *Haskalah*, were realized thanks to its scholars’ openness to foreign scientific and cultural sources. Besides honoring the traditional Jewish writings from ancient and medieval times, they studied and adopted various writings from their contemporary European neighbors.[[1]](#footnote-2) Consequently, they were able to develop and enrich their own cultural and scientific work in the Jewish context.

A central position in this trend was occupied by German literature and culture, which constituted one of the foremost models for the contemporary Jewish intelligentsia, especially during its early period (late 18th century – early 19th century).[[2]](#footnote-3) German influence is probably reflected in Jewish works in every cultural and scientific field,[[3]](#footnote-4) and Hebrew linguistics is no exception in this respect.

One author whose writings clearly reflect such an influence is Judah Leib Ben-Ze’ev (1764–1811), who was a prominent figure at the beginning of the *Haskalah*.[[4]](#footnote-5) He played a central role in the efforts of the *maskilim* to cultivate the Hebrew language and expand its use in various fields, beyond the customary uses in traditional study of sacred Jewish sources.[[5]](#footnote-6) His work on Biblical Hebrew grammar, *Talmud Lashon Ivri* (*TLI*; first publication: Breslau, 1796) was the most extensive work of this kind written in Hebrew up to his time. It was republished around 20 times and gained considerable popularity among Jews throughout Europe, making him the greatest Jewish linguist of his period.

*TLI*’s theoretical infrastructure is based on German linguistics to a large extent. Ben-Ze’ev made use of the existing material in earlier Jewish and Christian Hebrew grammars, but most of his extended descriptions and newly-introduced linguistic notions were formulated thanks to his acquaintance with German linguistics.[[6]](#footnote-7) His use of German linguistic sources is clearly evident in the Latin and German glosses (in Hebrew characters), usually representing the common standard terms in German linguistics, that he attached to almost every technical term mentioned in *TLI*. Apparently, Ben-Ze’ev’s main sources were the writings of the well-known German linguist Johann Christoph Adelung (1732-1806).[[7]](#footnote-8)

This article examines the manner in which German linguistic infrastructure was adapted to Hebrew in the time-modus system of Biblical Hebrew and introduced into the literature by Ben-Ze’ev. His treatment of this issue demonstrates his attempt to adapt the German linguistic system to create a description of Biblical Hebrew. There is no doubt that this attempt enriched the study of Hebrew grammar with new concepts and broader observations. However, one might question the necessity and adequacy of some of these borrowed distinctions for describing Biblical Hebrew. These ambivalent aspects are well reflected in Ben-Ze’ev’s time-modus system.

Let us begin with an examination of Hebrew tenses as described by Ben-Ze’ev.

1. The Hebrew Tenses According to *Talmud Lashon Ivri*.

Ben-Ze'ev essentially follows the standard system of three tenses—past, present and future (*TLI*, §219)—as they appear in all Hebrew grammars since the late Middle Ages.[[8]](#footnote-9) In this framework, he presents a new distinction between absolute tenses and relative tenses.[[9]](#footnote-10) That is, he differentiates between verbs marking an action in a certain time and verbs that express actions whose timing is defined in relation to another action. Accordingly, he divides the past forms into two types: *‘abhar boded* and *‘abhar miṣṭareph* (lit. “separate past” and “joining past”),[[10]](#footnote-11) (*TLI*, §340).[[11]](#footnote-12) The term *boded* (“separate”) relates to absolute tense, and *miṣṭareph* (“joining”) denotes relative tense, because the verb “joins” another verb and its time is defined in relation to it.

In his description of the past tense, Ben-Ze’ev takes this division a step further and presents a complicated system, which contains two “manners” (*ophanim*) and three “levels”(*madregot*)*.* The two “manners” are the above-mentioned types *‘abhar boded* and *‘abhar miṣṭareph*. In *‘abhar boded*, which relates to past verbs which express a simple action that happened in the past without any temporal relation to another action, there is one “level”—past perfect (*abhar nišlam*). The second “manner”,*‘abhar miṣṭareph* , which relates to relative past verbs, contains two “levels,” which mark different points on the time sequence—imperfect *‘abhar bilti nišlam* (an action that began in the past and had not been finished once another action occurred) and pluperfect (*‘abhar še-kevar nišlam*).[[12]](#footnote-13) The term *ophen*, “manner,” therefore, marks the absoluteness or relativity of the verb’s tense, and *madrega*, “level,” refers to its location on a relative timeline.

Ben-Ze’ev emphasizes that this system matches “other languages,” which mark these distinctions with grammatical devices. But in Hebrew, by contrast, there are no grammatical devices designated to express these types, with all these distinctions to be understood only through context. All three types, therefore, are expressed by the same forms—*qaṭal* or *wa-yiqṭol*. Past perfect is usually expressed, according to Ben-Ze’ev, by *wa-yiqṭol* forms, e.g. וַיֹּאמֶר (“he said”), וַיְדַבֵּר (“he spoke”); while the common imperfect is usually expressed by the infinitive construct form, which is followed by a *wa-yiqṭol* form:[[13]](#footnote-14) e.g., **כִּשְׁמֹעַ** עֵשָׂו אֶת דִּבְרֵי אָבִיו **וַיִּצְעַק** (“While Esau was hearing the words of his father, he cried out […]”; Gen. 27:34);[[14]](#footnote-15) the pluperfect is expressed by two following past verbs, e.g. כִּי **שָׁמְעָה** בִּשְׂדֵה מוֹאָב כִּי **פָקַד** יְקֹוָק אֶת עַמּוֹ לָתֵת לָהֶם לָחֶם (“for she had heard in the fields of Moab that the LORD had visited his people and given them food”—the LORD had visited and given before she [Naomi] heard; Ruth 1:6).

These distinctions are not completely new in Hebrew grammar. The distinction between three “types” of past tense (clearly following the Latin grammar) has been well established in Hebrew grammars since the 16th century.[[15]](#footnote-16) But the combination of these “types” with the criterion of relativity, which forms the complicated system of *ophanim* and *madregot*, was introduced here with regard to Hebrew for the first time. Ben-Ze’ev followed step-by-step the system which already existed in contemporary German linguistics, which included exactly the same hierarchy: as Adelung puts is, there are two “Stufen” of “Präteritum”: “ohne / in Beziehung auf eine andere Handlung” (with or without relation to another action); the second “Stufe” is divided into two “Fälle”: “wenn die eine Handlung noch nicht völlig vorüber ist” (when an action is still not totally completed), “wenn die eine Handlung schon völlig vorüber ist” (when an action is already totally completed).[[16]](#footnote-17) Ben-Ze’ev’s *ophanim* (“manners”) parallel Adelung’s “Stufen,” and the term *madregot* (“levels”) stands in for Adelung’s “Fälle.”

The description of the future tense in *TLI*, although based on a similar principle, is simpler. It is divided into two types: *‘atid boded* (lit. "“separate future”") is the regular future tense; Ben-Ze’ev did not demonstrate its expression, but there is no doubt that he refers here to the common *yiqṭol* forms. The other type is*‘atid murkabh* (lit. “complex future”). It is defined by Ben-Ze’ev as a verb that marks a future action which will end before another action—namely, future perfect: e.g., וּמוֹלַדְתְּךָ אֲשֶׁר הוֹלַדְתָּ אַחֲרֵיהֶם לְךָ יִהְיוּ עַל שֵׁם אֲחֵיהֶם יִקָּרְאוּ (“And the children that you will have[[17]](#footnote-18) fathered after them shall be yours. They shall be called by the name of their brothers”; Gen. 48:6)—the verb הוֹלַדְתָּ denotes, according to Ben-Ze’ev, a future action which ended before the second action—יִקָּרְאוּ. This classification also reflects the parallel system in German grammars of the time.[[18]](#footnote-19)

As to the present, Ben-Ze’ev takes the approach that has been common in Hebrew linguistics since the Middle Ages, according to which it is expressed with the participle (*TLI*, §219): e.g., רוֹאֶה (“see”), מְצַוֶּה (“order, command”). As German grammar exhibits no complexity in this category, Ben-Ze’ev presents an independent description, in which he points to a few additional manners of the participle’s use, which in modern terminology we would call aspectual (durative, habitual, and imperfective actions [*TLI*, §219, §341]).[[19]](#footnote-20)

Most of Ben-Ze’ev’s description of Hebrew tense is, therefore, heavily modeled after German linguistics. On the one hand, this influence has definitely had a positive outcome, while on the other hand, the necessity of some components might be doubted. While recognition of the future perfect does indeed illuminate a new aspect of the Qatal form’s usage[[20]](#footnote-21) (one which probably had not been recognized before), the distinctions concerning past tense in Hebrew have essentially no expression in the formation of the Hebrew verb itself. As mentioned above, Ben-Ze’ev himself points out that in “other languages” there are “indications” (*simanim*) in verbal morphology for all kinds of past tenses, while in Hebrew they can be recognized only through context. In other words, the Hebrew verb does not reflect any sense of past relative tenses, marking only (as Ben-Ze’ev perceives it) a simple tense, namely occurrence of an action in the past.

One would question, therefore, the necessity of including relative tenses in a Hebrew grammar book. The complicated past system would serve only speakers of German or other languages that possess similar systems, in order to facilitate an active usage of Hebrew tenses. But this is not the purpose of a descriptive grammar such as *TLI*, and for the sake of knowing and understanding Hebrew, the system is liable to confuse the reader and burden him with unnecessary information.

1. The Hebrew Moods According to *Talmud Lashon Ivri*

The concept of verbal moods, which has been an integral part of Western linguistics since antiquity, was initially introduced in Christian Hebrew grammars in the early modern period,[[21]](#footnote-22) and its presentation in *TLI* is its first description in a grammar of the language written in Hebrew. Following the German linguistic tradition,[[22]](#footnote-23) Ben-Ze’ev recognizes four moods (*derakhim* in his terminology): indicative, imperative, infinitive and conjunctive (*TLI*, §219,343). Note that this set of moods differs from the lists of moods common in modern linguistics, which do not include the infinitive. This difference indicates a different sense of the term “mood”: while in modern linguistics, mood is a “grammatical category of verbs which expresses the subjective attitude of the speaker towards the state of affairs described by the utterance,”[[23]](#footnote-24) the Hebrew infinitive has no such function. The “mood” in *TLI* thus relates to the modes of the verb in a more general sense; it defines the types or manners of the verbal forms that differ from one another in their function, not necessarily the manners in which the subjective attitude of the speaker is expressed. Accordingly, the infinitive, which is a verbal mode that expresses the general semantic content of the verb, is a *modus*—namely, a verbal mood. This sense of the term *modus* is by no means an innovation by Ben-Ze’ev, but rather its regular meaning in Western linguistics since the early stages of the Greek and Latin grammars.[[24]](#footnote-25)

Let us now introduce the Hebrew moods according to Ben-Ze’ev. In *TLI* (§219) the indicative mood is called *derekh haḥlaṭa*, which is a Hebrew equivalent of the German gloss provided by Ben-Ze’ev—“die bestimmte Art”[[25]](#footnote-26)—“the definite, decided manner.” Ben-Ze’ev defines it as a verb which is expressed in “a final and definite certainty” (*berur gamur u-muḥlaṭ*), in a certain time, and mostly indicates person, gender, and number (of its subject)—namely, the regular finite verb (e.g.אֵלֵךְ ,הָלַכְתִּי —“I walked, I will walk”).

The second mood in *TLI* is *derekh ha-maqor*, or “Modus Infinitiv, die unbestimmte Art”—the infinitive.[[26]](#footnote-27) Ben-Ze’ev deems it the pure expression of the essence of the action, without the other features of the finite verb—time, person, gender, and number. Essentially, according to Ben-Ze’ev, it is the “name of the action” (š*em ha-pe‘ula*), which is an abstract noun (*šem miqre*).[[27]](#footnote-28) He illustrates a few syntactical functions in which this mood is used in Biblical Hebrew (*TLI*, §344).[[28]](#footnote-29)

The third mood is *derekh ha-ṣiwwuy* or “modus Imperativ, die gebietende Art” (*TLI*, §219). In addition to expressing commands (such as דַבֵּר“speak!”, לֵךְ “go!”) it is also used for requests, advice, or hopes (*TLI*, §347).

These three moods are introduced in *TLI* as an integral part of Hebrew verbs’ description. But the fourth —*derekh ha-qiššur* or “*Modus Konjunktiv*”— is different. It is mentioned only in the section on syntax, as incidental additional information added to the chapter dealing with the “use of verbal moods” (*TLI*, §343). The reason is made clear in Ben-Ze’ev’s explanation: this mood is used when the speaker does not determine whether the claim meets the test of reality or truth, to expresses doubt, hope, request, conditionality, etc. In Hebrew, in contrast to other languages, there is no specific verbal form expressing this kind of meaning, so it is expressed only by a conjunction which appears in the preceding context: e.g., לוּ— וְלוּ הוֹאַלְנוּ וַנֵּשֶׁב בְּעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן (“Would that we had been content to dwell beyond the Jordan!”; Josh. 7:7), מִי יִתֵּן—מִי יִתֵּן וְהָיָה לְבָבָם זֶה לָהֶם לְיִרְאָה אֹתִי וְלִשְׁמֹר אֶת כָּל מִצְוֹתַי כָּל הַיָּמִים (“Oh that they had such a mind as this always, to fear me and to keep all my commandments”; Deut. 5:26), אִם—וְעַתָּה אִם נָא מָצָאתִי חֵן בְּעֵינֶיךָ הוֹדִעֵנִי נָא אֶת דְּרָכֶךָ (“Now therefore, if I have found favor in your sight, please show me now your ways”; Ex. 33:13), etc. Simply put, Ben-Ze’ev understands that there is no conjunctive mood in Hebrew. Nevertheless, since it is an integral component of German grammar, he could not just ignore it, and he found it necessary to explain it and demonstrate how this idea could be expressed in Hebrew.

The influence of German is evident not only in the methodology and terms of *TLI*, but also in Ben-Ze’ev’s grammatical patterns of thinking in this matter. This recognition arises in the wake of one detail that Ben-Ze’ev incorporates in this subject. Among the Hebrew conjunctions mentioned as expressing the “conjunctive mood,” Ben-Ze’ev includes the particle כִּי when it serves as quotative (for example, וַיֹּאמֶר הִנֵּה שָׁמַעְתִּי **כִּי** יֶשׁ שֶׁבֶר בְּמִצְרָיִם “And he (Jacob) said: ‘Behold, I have heard that there is grain for sale in Egypt’”; Gen. 42:2). The clear equivalent is the German *konjuktiv I*.[[29]](#footnote-30) But, as Ben-Ze’ev explains, in languages which have this mood, it expresses a sense of uncertainty, “when the speaker tells a matter as he heard it, and he does not guarantee if it is true or false” (*TLI*, §343). This explanation does not seem to fit the function of the biblical .כִּי There is no evidence that it contains any modal sense besides its function as quotative. It is even unclear whether Ben-Ze'ev himself really attributed this modal sense to כִּי. It seems more likely that it is only his desire to present Hebrew grammar in maximal accordance with German grammar that brought about the inclusion of כִּי here, without any intention to suggest a new sense of this particle.

An apparently similar case, albeit with the opposite result, is Ben-Ze’ev’s treatment of the Hebrew cohortative. These are verbal future forms, enhanced with the suffix –ָה (e.g., אֵלְכָה “may I go” instead of the regular form אֵלֵךְ, or אָרוּצָה “may I run” in place of אָרוּץ), which are considered in modern scholarship as volitive moods.[[30]](#footnote-31) Ben-Ze’ev is probably the first to recognize the unique meaning of these forms, pointing out their volitive sense (*TLI*, §347).[[31]](#footnote-32) But he does not regard this form as a kind of verbal mood, considering it instead a verbal variant of a completely different type. He employs here the medieval idea of “additional letters in order to lessen the meaning” (התוספת בא להקטין הענין),[[32]](#footnote-33) essentially regarding the additional letter, *he* in this case, as a diminutive suffix. This suffix, according to Ben-Ze’ev, diminishes the future form’s regular meaning of decided future, to only “requesting permission.”[[33]](#footnote-34)

One might expect that once a consistent verb formation, distinct from the regular indicative form, is identified as carrying a different sense, it would be recognized as another mood. So why did Ben-Ze’ev fail to do so? The limited appearance of this formation in Biblical Hebrew, usually only in imperfect first person and imperative forms,[[34]](#footnote-35) makes this identification a somewhat difficult task. But it appears that the main reason is the absence of a parallel mood in German grammar. Ben-Ze’ev learned about the notion of mood from German grammar and adapted it to Hebrew. For this reason, the set of Hebrew verbal moods was restricted to the scope of the German moods, and defining a new mood would have exceeded Ben-Ze’ev’s framework.

1. **Conclusion**

The linguistic work of Ben-Ze’ev, especially in its syntactic parts, is based to a large extent on an adaptation of the contemporary German model. The time-modus system as sketched in *TLI* is a distinctive example of this, as the terminological infrastructure of this subject in *TLI* closely parallels its German counterpart, with only slight changes entailed in the basic differences between the languages. On the one hand, the new categories directed Ben-Ze’ev’s attention to innovative distinctions relevant to Hebrew grammar (such as the use of Qatal forms to express future perfect), in addition to other new observations based on his own linguistic investigations (such as the volitive sense of the cohortative forms). On the other hand, Ben-Ze’ev presents a partially superfluous categorization that has no real expression in Hebrew grammar and might cause difficulties and confusion for his readers.

It seems that the fact Ben-Ze’ev so closely followed the German model is primarily a result of the nature of his linguistic education, which was probably attained through the study of German grammar. His linguistic work aimed, to a large extent, at elaborating the description of Hebrew grammar according to the most advanced linguistics of his time, and adopting the framework and terminology of German linguistics was the way that he was able to fulfill this aspiration. However, it is reasonable to assume that the constraint of his linguistic training was not the only reason behind this decision. The Maskilic cultural approach typically regarded German culture as an ultimate model, such that imitating many of its features could advance Jewish society in many areas. It is likely that the scholarly work of Ben-Ze’ev, who undoubtedly held such a view of German culture, reflects this attitude as well, and that this is another reason for his following its linguistic system.
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