



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to all those who engage in its study; the *Sources* will indeed long occupy a place in literature as an authority on the subject.

M. KAYSERLING.

THE BEGINNINGS OF HEBREW GRAMMAR.

Die Anfänge der hebräischen Grammatik, von Dr. W. BACHER, Professor an der Landes-Rabbinerschule zu Budapest. Separat-Abdruck aus dem 49 Bände *der Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*. (Leipzig, Brockhaus, 1895, 120 pp.)

PROF. W. BACHER, whose energies seem unlimited, describes in this essay the origin and development of Hebrew grammatical science during the centuries preceding Hajjug. The scientific study of that language was inaugurated with the advent of this writer, so that Abraham Ibn Ezra in the *Sefath Jether*, No. 74, rightly remarks: "Hebrew grammar did not exist till Jehuda ben David arose, chief of the grammarians." Before Hajjug, however, we may already discover germs and traces of Hebrew grammar, which ought not to be passed over by the historians. These Dr. Bacher has grouped in nine chapters, and collated systematically.

The first chapter (pp. 3-7) notices grammatical elements in traditional literature. The author correctly points out that current conceptions of the existence of grammatical elements in Talmud and Midrash are exaggerated; it is not proper to speak of a grammar of the Hebrew language in the period that produced the Talmud. Only an exiguous number of merest traces of linguistic categories of a very general character exist, and these afterwards became constituent elements of grammatical terminology. The contributions of traditional literature to later Hebrew grammar, Dr. Bacher exhaustively collects and enumerates.

The second chapter (pp. 7-12) indicates the extent to which the Massorah, by its isolated rules and technical terms, prepared the way for Hebrew grammar. The author justly styles the Massorah the cradle of Hebrew grammar; because, for the sake of preserving the true text, the Massorites carefully distinguished the various forms and grouped together those that were similar. On the other hand, these Massorite lists lack grammatical character. The Massorites, only concerned with the correct reading of the text, for instance, jumbled together Hebrew with Biblical Aramaic. Their interest centred not in Hebrew as a language, but in the text of the Hebrew scriptures.

Chapter III (pp. 13-20) treats of the vowel points. The author favours Graetz's hypothesis that the first vowel characters were written over as well as under the words. Of the two systems of punctuation—the Tiberian and the Babylonian—the author proves that the latter was the original and simpler, and accordingly the more ancient.

In Chapter IV (pp. 20-23), the elements of Hebrew grammar, gathered from the *Sepher Jezirah*, are discussed. This original work was the first to give the classification of Hebrew consonants which was afterwards adopted by the grammarians. We also learn from it that the *Resh* was pronounced in two ways.

Aaron b. Moses b. Asher, discussed in Chapter V (pp. 23-28), represents the transition from the Massorites to the grammarians. His Massorite rules (collected in דקדוקי הטעמים) are permeated with grammatical conceptions. Ben Asher is the first who discusses the seven vowels which he names "kings" (שבעה מלכים). Both nomenclature and number were accepted by all grammarians till Joseph Qimhi. Ben Asher's chapter on the parts of speech (דקדוקי הטעמים § 71) shows that he really had some idea of exact grammar. This chapter is headed סדר כל משמע אומן המקרא in which משמע does not perhaps signify elements of audible speech (see Bacher, p. 32), but, as among the Karaites, is identical with כתוב (see *Eshkol Hakkofer*, No. 168, letter ב). The expression מצרירות, a Hebraic form of the Arabic מצرد, is remarkable as denoting the Infinitive. Ibn Parchon, as well as his contemporary, the Karaite Jehuda Hadassi, calls the Infinitive simply מצרד (*Eshkol*, No. 33, letter ע; No. 163, letter י; compare *Monatsschrift*, XL, 120). I here take the opportunity of remarking that the composer (or translator, see Steinschneider, *Die hebr. Uebersetz.*, p. 939) of a small grammatical essay ספר הבנין (MS. Bodl., Catal. Neubauer, No. 1467) uses מצרד as a term for the Infinitive. The reason is given as follows: שנופל לכל צד לזכר ולריבוי ולעתיד וזולתם: (f. 58 c).

Ben Asher is greatly surpassed by his contemporary, the Gaon Saadiah, of whom the sixth chapter treats (pp. 38-62). Saadiah was the first to write a book exclusively devoted to Hebrew grammar. This was composed in Arabic, under the influence of the Arabic language, and consists of twelve chapters. According to Dr. Harkavy (*Studien u. Mittheilungen*, V, 34) it was intended as an appendix to the second recension of Saadiah's *Agron* (or *Egron*). Dr. Bacher, however, with some plausibility, argues that it formed an independent work¹,

¹ The grounds for Dr. Bacher's views were communicated to the *Revue des*

with the title כתב אללגה, and endeavours, principally from Saadiah's citations, in his *Commentary on the Sepher Jezirah*, and from the quotations in Dunash ben Labrat's critique, to reconstruct the contents of the twelve chapters. The subjects of this work were, Dr. Bacher thinks:—(1) The Letters; (2) The Gutturals; (3) Peculiarities of other letters; (4) Changes of Letters; (5) Changes of Vowels; (6) Dagesh and Raphé; (7) Assimilation of Consonants of the same class; (8) Radical and Servile Letters; (9) Conjugation of Verbs; (10) Declension of Nouns¹; (11) Anomalies; (12) Syntax.

Jehuda Ibn Qoreish, discussed in Chapter VII (pp. 63-70), probably made use of Saadiah's writings; but nevertheless represents an earlier and less advanced stage in grammatical science. The importance of his work mainly consists in the fact that he was the first to institute a comparison between the Semitic tongues. Apart from this, he only plays a secondary part in the history of the beginnings of Hebrew grammar. He has, withal, a number of grammatical peculiarities which deserve notice.

The last two chapters, the eighth (pp. 70-95) and the ninth (pp. 95-114), treat of the efforts of the first representatives of Hebrew linguistic science in Spain, Menahem b. Saruq and Dunash b. Labrat. Menahem composed a complete dictionary of the Hebrew language, which he probably edited in two recensions. The first, according to Dr. Kaufmann (*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, XL, 370), forms the basis of a Berne MS. The Bodleian Library possesses a recently-acquired fragment of Menahem's Lexicon, which gives a portion of the Introduction and of the Letter Alef, and is more condensed than the printed edition, from which it differs in the arrangements of the radicals. I was unfortunately only able to examine it cursorily, and could therefore not determine whether it corresponds with the Berne MS.

As Menahem wrote his Lexicon in Hebrew, he had to construct a terminology and invent technical terms. Thus, for example, he was probably the first to introduce the word גזירה (p. 94). It would be highly desirable, if Dr. Bacher were to compile a list of Menahem's

Études Juives, XXIV, 310, 313. Dr. Harkavy, however, still maintains his own theory, and promises to adduce proofs. (See his *חידושים גם ישנים*, No. 5, in *דוידק*, p. 44.)

¹ The citation from Dunash's *Criticism*, No. 89 (p. 56), should undoubtedly be corrected thus, ואמר תהלה כמו תהלתו אף תהלה נדלתי לפי דרך התרגום. Saadiah always treats these forms as nouns with the first person singular pronominal suffix. Cp. my essay, *Mose b. Samuel Hakkohen Ibn Chiquitilla*, &c., p. 130.

terms, marking those of which he is the originator. (Most of them are to be found scattered in Dr. Bacher's essay, *Die grammatische Terminologie des Jehuda b. David Hajjuḡ*, Vienna, 1882.) But, although Menahem avoided Arabic terminology (p. 71), he was, nevertheless, consciously or unconsciously, influenced by it. Apart from the examples given by Dr. Bacher (pp. 71-72), the division of the nouns into *שמות* and *מפעלים* (p. 85) is an imitation of the Arabic *אסם נאמד* and *אסם משתק* (see my *Beiträge z. Gesch. d. hebr. Sprachwissensch.*, i. 14-15, and Dr. Bacher, *Monatsschrift*, XL, 119). Thus, too, Menahem's expression (p. 48) *ראשוני המלה ותיכוניה ואחרוניה* is a literal translation of the Arabic *אויל אחרוף ואוסאמה ואואכרהא* (see *Grammatische Terminologie des Hajjuḡ*, p. 22, no. 2). The opening paragraphs of the Introduction are modelled on an Arabic pattern. How remote Menahem still is from a scientific conception of the Hebrew language is proved by the circumstance that, like the Massorah, he does not accurately distinguish the Hebrew from the Aramaic element in the Bible (p. 72, no. 3). Both in Menahem and the Massorah, the subject of interest is not Hebrew, but the language of the Bible. Even the Karaite author of the *Mushtamil* (see below), who lived at the beginning of the eleventh century, gives, in the seventh part of his work, examples from the Aramaic in illustration of the variation in meaning produced by transposition of consonants¹. Of Saadiah's writings, Menahem, according to Dr. Bacher, only knew the *Agron*. This can have reference only to the Gaon's *Grammatical Writings*; for Saadiah's exegetical writings were probably known and used by Menahem. Thus, Menahem's refutation of the derivation of *זרית* (Ps. cxxxix. 3) from *זרת* (p. 86, note), is probably derived from Saadiah (see Pinsker, *Likkute Kadmonioth*, p. 174). So also, Menahem, in disproving (fol. 83 b) the identification of *מזרות* (Job xxxviii. 32) with *מולות* (p. 82, note 5), does not aim at Ibn Qoreish, but rather attacks Saadiah, who translated *מזרות* with *אללנום*. Cp. my Essay on *Ibn Chiquitilla*, p. 183, and the passage there cited from Dunash's *Critique on Saadiah*, no. 84, *מזרות כמו מולות (ר"ל רב סעדיה)*.

¹ I content myself with one example from the Article *זבר* (Brit. Mus. MS. Or. 2592, f. 39 b): *עגו אדא אנתשמת הוא אלאחרף פי לפגזה עלי הוא אלהך כן*: *אלנשאם כן להא מעאני . . . ואדא חגירת . . . בדהא אלצורה ערב כן להא מעאני אחרדא אלצמאן כן ערב עברך לשוב . . . (Ps. cxix. 122) וכאמסהא מן אלאכתלאש כן ויתעברו בגדים . . . (ib. cvi. 35) מהעבינן להן (Dan. ii. 43) אלך*.

² I would like to add to Dr. Bacher's chapter on Menahem, that the expression *לשון ערומים* (p. 90, n. 1) probably refers to the well-known passage in T. B. Pesachim, 3 a.

Menahem's Lexicon was notoriously the occasion of a severe personal attack on its author by Dunash b. Labrat. Dunash does not attack Menahem's system; his criticism is directed only against single passages. Dunash states that he discussed 200 passages; in fact only 160 are examined by him. Dr. Bacher (p. 96) believes that, voluntarily or involuntarily, Dunash gave up his task. I incline to the alternative hypothesis, mentioned by Dr. Bacher, that Dunash's critique has not come down to us in a complete form. It is not to be supposed that in this, his first work, dedicated to the statesman Hasdai ibn Shaprut, Dunash would have promised more than he was able or willing to perform. A missing fragment in Dunash's critique on תשוקתך (Gen. iii. 16) I restored in my Essay on *Ibn Chiquitilla*, p. 126. Besides the critique on Menahem, Dunash also composed a criticism of Saadiah, which apparently was never completed. It is remarkable that Dunash, in his first work, speaks of Saadiah with great respect, styling him זקני. This expression has frequently given rise to the error that Saadiah was Dunash's grandfather. זקני, however, is the Hebrew equivalent of the Arabic שיכי (p. 97, note 1. Cp. Harkavy, *Studien u. Mittheilungen*, V, 89). I do not see the necessity of assuming that זקני, any more than the Arabic שיכי, means "teacher"; the Arabic term for "teacher" is אסתאדי. The words of Menahem's disciples (ed. Stern, p. 27), וקיתה בעת קהוא צעיר, אחרי שומך אותו זקנך (ib. p. 48) תלמידיו בכל שכל ובלשון הערב וכו' ורבך, do not imply that Dunash was personally a pupil of Saadiah.

"Dunash awoke," Ibn Ezra remarks (*Safa Berurah*, 25 b), "from the slumber of folly," i. e. in grammatical science he took a higher rank than his predecessors. This is especially exhibited in his *Critique on Saadiah*, in which, according to Dr. Bacher (p. 98), "The great event in Hebrew grammar, the discovery of the weak radicals and their laws is foreshadowed." But that does not prevent him from occasionally diverging from the lines correctly marked out by the predecessors whom he criticizes. Still, I think אדרם (Ps. xlii. 5) should be excluded from the examples given by Dr. Bacher (p. 103). (See my notice in the *Revue des Études Juives*, XXXI, 118.)

The dispute between Menahem and Dunash was notoriously continued by their disciples. Bacher, however, does not discuss the controversial writings of the latter; as they did not travel beyond the sphere of grammatical knowledge covered by their teachers. The author here, too, accepts the identification of Jehudah b. David, Menahem's pupil and collaborator, with Hajjug. The latter's efforts, however, no longer belong to the beginnings of Hebrew grammar. The manner in which Hajjug, in the introduction to his *Essay on the*

Weak Radicals, cites Menahem, makes it improbable that he was the latter's pupil (see also my *Beiträge*, &c., p. 28). In my opinion, an argument for the same view is the circumstance that the term 'קני mentioned above was not, as I have already explained, used by Dunash in the sense of "teacher."

Dr. Bacher has excluded the Karaites, as well as Menahem's disciples, because their grammatical outlook was not wider than that of their non-Karaite contemporaries, and because they exercised no influence on the development of Hebrew grammar. It would, however, be eminently desirable that the little which the Karaites actually did accomplish in the field of Hebrew linguistics were put together, so as to help us to form some clear notions of their work and influence. We trust that the author, who has recently turned his attention to the Karaites, will undertake this task, which, we are sure, he would accomplish in his usual masterly manner.

In a concluding note (pp. 115-117) the author tells us that, of the earliest "Masters of Hebrew" whom Abraham ibn Ezra enumerates in the Introduction to the *Moznaim*, he would leave out two; the "Anonymous" from Jerusalem and Dunash b. Tamim. On the first, the author has shed sufficient light in the *Revue des Études Juives*, XXX, 232-256, where he has put to good use the material supplied by Kokowtsoff. We now know that this "Anonymous" is identical with Abulfarag Harun, that his essay, the full title of which is כחאב אלמשתמל עלי אלפצול ואלפצול פי אללנה אלעבראניה, consisted of eight parts, and it was completed in the year 1026 C.E. It does not belong to the beginnings of Hebrew grammar¹. The second, Dunash b. Tamim, lived before Hajjug; but the accounts that have come down to us concerning him are very meagre. He composed work which Abraham Ibn Ezra characterizes as ספר מעורב מלשון עבר וערב. Its object is the examination of the mutual relation of Arabic and Hebrew, but only from a lexicographical standpoint, as appears from Moses Ibn Ezra's Poetry (ed. Kokowtsoff, *Wostochnifa Zamjetki*, p. 215, ll. 16-18). It would accordingly be incorrect to take Abraham Ibn Ezra's words to mean that Dunash's work is partly in Hebrew and partly in Arabic. (See Harkavy, *הרשימים גם ישנים*, No. 2, p. 6, n. 3; also Geiger, *Jud. Zeitschrift*, X, 231.) To the authors mentioned by Dr. Bacher (p. 117) who have quoted from Dunash's book should be added the

¹ Of the Mushtamil, I found, in the British Museum, besides the MS. Or. 2592, mentioned above, p. 5, note 1, another portion of the second part in MS. Or. 2561, and a fragment of a Compendium of the Mushtamil in the Bodleian. I hope shortly to give some further information about these manuscripts.

name of Ibn Bal'am, who cites Dunash in his Commentary on Deuteronomy xxviii. 27 (Fuchs, *Studien über Ibn Bal'am*, p. xx). Ibn Bal'am, again, is drawn upon by Tanhum Jerushalmi, in his annotations on I Sam. v. 6 (see Fuchs, *ib.*, p. xli, and Munk, *Notice sur About-walid*, p. 59, n. 1). Among the few quotations in Abraham Ibn Ezra, one has remained unnoticed. It occurs in the first Commentary on Genesis i. 31, ed. Friedländer, p. 33: ור' אדונים בן תמים אמר כי ביום הראשון היה אור וחשך כדמות הלבנה וההבדלה ביום השני כי בן דרך כוכב והדשאים בשלישי כי ננה לאות על כל מאכל וכו'. Still this passage may not come from Dunash's philological work; but, as is more probable, from his Commentary on the *Sepher Jezirah*. This citation may help to clear up the obscurity in which this commentary is wrapped up (see Steinschneider, *Die hebr. Uebers.*, pp. 394-401)¹.

Appendices and Corrections (pp. 117-118) and a list of the quoted and elucidated Hebrew and Arabic grammatical termini (pp. 118-120) close Dr. Bacher's in many ways instructive and stimulating essay, which has again earned the author the sincere thanks of all friends of Hebrew linguistic science.

SAMUEL POZNAŃSKI.

BERLIN, December 29, 1895.

A NEW GRAMMATICAL TEXT BOOK,

BY PROF. STRACK.

Abriss des biblischen Aramäisch. Grammatik, nach Handschriften berichtiger Text, Wörterbuch. Von Prof. Dr. HERMANN L. STRACK. (Leipzig, T. C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, 1896. 32 and 47 pages, 8vo.)

PROF. STRACK has published a grammatical compilation on the Aramaic used in the biblical books Ezra and Daniel, as a sequel to his Hebrew grammar published in 1893 (fifth edition). He had announced this *Abriss* as early as 1885 in the series which he has edited entitled "Porta linguarum orientalicum." In the introduction to this work, Prof. Strack gives his reasons for the delay and for its

¹ Of the manuscripts enumerated by Dr. Steinschneider, I have examined two, the Berlin MS. 78, and MS. Bodl. Reggio 51 (of Steinschneider's copy), but have not found in either the words cited by Ibn Ezra.