



PROJECT MUSE®

The *Kitsur shulḥan 'arukh* , Hasidic Tale, and Maskilic
Literature as Exemplars of Ashkenazic Hebrew

Lily Okalani Kahn

Jewish Quarterly Review, Volume 108, Number 2, Spring 2018, pp.
159-193 (Article)

Published by University of Pennsylvania Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/jqr.2018.0012>



➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/696499>

The *Kitsur shulḥan ‘arukh*, Hasidic Tale, and Maskilic Literature as Exemplars of Ashkenazic Hebrew

LILY OKALANI KAHN

INTRODUCTION

THE DIVERSE FORMS of Hebrew literature composed in Eastern Europe in the nineteenth century are of great linguistic significance for two chief reasons. First, they can shed important light on the nature and development of written Hebrew in the Ashkenazic diaspora. Second, they are the immediate forerunners of revernacularized Hebrew as it emerged in late-nineteenth and early twentieth-century Palestine, and as such they can offer an unparalleled insight into the early development of the modern (Israeli) form of the language. Despite their importance for our understanding of the diachronic evolution of Hebrew, the nineteenth-century Eastern European forms of the language have traditionally suffered from scholarly neglect and until recently have not been subjected to detailed linguistic analysis, falling prey instead to generalizations.¹ This is particularly true of two major forms of narrative Hebrew composed in nineteenth-century Eastern Europe, maskilic literature and the hasidic tale.

Maskilic Hebrew fiction, which flourished in Eastern Europe (primarily in czarist Russia) in the second half of the nineteenth century, was the product of an ideological movement that prized the study of Hebrew grammar with an expressed preference for a purist style based on the

1. Book-length grammatical analyses of Eastern European Hebrew include Tzvi Betzer, *History of the Hebrew Language: The Medieval Division, Unit 7: Rabbinic Hebrew* (Tel Aviv, 2001); Lily Kahn, *The Verbal System in Late Enlightenment Hebrew* (Leiden, 2009); Lily Kahn, *A Grammar of the Eastern European Hasidic Hebrew Tale* (Leiden, 2015); and Chen Buchbut, “The Language of Rabbi Nathan Sternhartz’s Writings (aka Reb Noson of Breslov): A Diachronic Examination” (Ph.D. diss., University of Haifa, 2016).

biblical standard.² This attitude was an innovation of the maskilic movement,³ as formal study of Hebrew grammar and adherence to a particular form of the language had not played a role in the traditional Eastern European Jewish educational establishment.⁴ These maskilic authors viewed their novels, short stories, and plays as part of an educational project geared toward the enlightenment of Eastern European Jewry and regarded language as an important element of this endeavor.⁵

Like maskilic fiction, the Eastern European hasidic hagiographic tale rose to prominence in the second half of the nineteenth century (though production continued into the early twentieth century). The authors were adherents of the hasidic spiritual movement from parts of present-day Poland, Ukraine, Belarus, and Russia. In contrast to their maskilic counterparts, they did not express ideological views regarding the formal study of Hebrew grammar or the superiority of any particular linguistic standard. The maskilim generally espoused a strongly antihasidic ideology⁶ and regarded the Hebrew employed by hasidic writers as corrupt,

2. See, e.g., Eduard Y. Kutscher, *A History of the Hebrew Language* (Jerusalem, 1982), 183–89; Yaacov Shavit, “A Duty Too Heavy to Bear: Hebrew in the 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; Angel Sáenz-Badillos, *A History of the Hebrew Language*, trans. J. Elwolde (Cambridge, 1993), 267–68; Maya Agmon-Fruchtman and Immanuel Allon, *History of the Hebrew Language: The Modern Division, Unit 8: The Revival of Hebrew* (Tel Aviv, 1994), 17; Ilan Eldar, *From Mendelssohn to Mendele: The Emergence of Modern Literary Hebrew* (Jerusalem, 2014), esp. 10, 54.

3. See Moshe Pelli, *Haskalah and Beyond: The Reception of the Hebrew Enlightenment and the Emergence of Haskalah Judaism* (Lanham, Md., 2010).

4. David Patterson, *A Phoenix in Fetters: Studies in Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century Hebrew Fiction* (Savage, Md., 1988), 4; Andrea Schatz, *Sprache in der Zerstreuung: Die Säkularisierung des Hebräischen im 18. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen, 2009), esp. 17–18, 75–97.

5. See Abraham Mapu, preface to *Hoze bezyonot* (Warsaw, 1869; repr. in *Kol kitve Avraham Mapu*, Tel Aviv, 1940) for a mid-nineteenth-century maskilic perspective on the role of Hebrew in literature. See also Y. Yitzhaki, “The Hebrew Authors of the Haskala: Their Views on the Hebrew Language” (Hebrew), *Leishonenu* 34.4 (1970): 287–305, 35.1 (1970): 39–59, 35.2 (1971): 140–54; Moshe Pelli, *The Age of Haskalah: Studies in Hebrew Literature of the Enlightenment* (Leiden, 1979), 73–90; Patterson, *A Phoenix in Fetters*, 5–6.

6. This is strongly evident in nineteenth-century maskilic literature; some prominent examples include Isaac Erter, *Ha-tsofe le-vet Yisra’el* (Vienna, 1858); Sholem Jacob Abramowitz, *Ha’avot ve-ha-banim* (Odessa, 1868); and Peretz Smolenskin, *Ha-to’e be-darkhe ha-hayim* (Vienna, 1876). See Patterson, *A Phoenix in Fetters*, 66–92, and Shmuel Werses, *Trends and Forms in Haskalah Literature* (Hebrew; Jerusalem, 1990), 91–109.

ignorant, and ungrammatical, with the authors categorized as ignorant and poorly educated.⁷ The maskilic author Joseph Perl's satirical epistolary novels *Megale temirin*⁸ and *Boḥen tsadik*,⁹ which were composed in a style replete with intentional grammatical errors designed as a parody of the Hasidic Hebrew idiom, exemplify this perception.¹⁰

A third significant type of nineteenth-century Eastern European Hebrew writing is nonhasidic Orthodox halakhic literature. This body of writing is the product of the same cultural and linguistic background as contemporaneous hasidic and maskilic narrative, but its authors were not affiliated with either of these two movements and as such were rooted in a different ideological perspective. The most well-known and widely read representative of nineteenth-century Eastern European halakhic writing is the *Kitsur Shulḥan 'arukh*, or *Kitsur*, as it is commonly known. Compiled by Solomon Ganzfried, a Hungarian Orthodox rabbi, the *Kitsur* is a handbook of practical Ashkenazic halakhah first published in 1864. It contains detailed guidelines for everyday Jewish life and has been hugely influential among Ashkenazic Jewry; after its first publication it quickly became their most popular and authoritative legal guide,¹¹ was published in fourteen editions in Ganzfried's lifetime, and has been reissued in countless editions since then, remaining the essential compendium of Orthodox halakhah to this day. In contrast to the hasidic authors, whom the maskilim regarded as badly educated, Ganzfried had impressive traditional Jewish educational credentials and would have been extremely well versed in the canonical Hebrew sources: he was raised by a guardian considered to be one of the outstanding scholars of the period, served as the head of the *bet din* of his hometown of Ungvar, and was an extremely well-respected legal authority.¹² Ganzfried's seminal work is thus an ideal

7. See Lewis Glinert, "The Hasidic Tale and the Sociolinguistic Modernization of the Jews of Eastern Europe," in *Studies in Jewish Narrative Presented to Yoav Elstein*, ed. A. Lipsker and R. Kushelevsky (Hebrew; Ramat Gan, 2006), 1:vii–xxxvi.

8. Joseph Perl, *Megale temirin* (Vienna, 1819).

9. Joseph Perl, *Boḥen tsadik* (Prague, 1838).

10. See Shmuel Werses, *Story and Source: Studies in the Development of Hebrew Prose* (Hebrew; Ramat Gan, 1971), 9–45; Dov Taylor, trans., *Joseph Perl's Revealer of Secrets: The First Hebrew Novel* (Boulder, Colo., 1997); Ken Frieden, "Joseph Perl's Escape from Biblical Epigonism through Parody of Hasidic Writing," *AJS Review* 29.2 (2005): 265–82; and Jonatan Meir, *Imagined Hasidism: The Anti-Hasidic Writings of Joseph Perl* (Jerusalem, 2013), for discussion of Perl's works.

11. *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 2nd ed., s.v. "Ganzfried, Solomon ben Joseph."

12. *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 2nd ed., s.v. "Ganzfried, Solomon ben Joseph."

subject of linguistic examination alongside hasidic and maskilic narrative literature because it is arguably one of the most influential and familiar nonhasidic and nonmaskilic Hebrew texts from mid-nineteenth-century Eastern Europe. The fact that Ganzfried was neither hasidic nor maskilic means that his writing can be regarded as a sort of control text whose language can fruitfully be examined against that composed by adherents of these two ideologically, and allegedly linguistically, opposed movements. Hence, these three prominent yet understudied textual corpora can together serve to paint a relatively comprehensive and representative picture of Hebrew in nineteenth-century Eastern Europe.

The maskilic characterization of Hasidic Hebrew as a grammatically flawed and corrupt form of the language having little in common with their own grammatically standardized and purist compositions has led to a widespread scholarly consensus that these two forms of nineteenth-century Eastern European Hebrew are linguistically distinct due to the authors' different educational, ideological, and religio-cultural orientations. As such, the existence of nonstandard grammatical features in hasidic texts has been noted and dismissed as evidence of the authors' grammatical ignorance, whereas maskilic literature is not typically associated with such nonstandard elements. Ganzfried's *Kitsur*, which stands in isolation from the perceived hasidic/maskilic linguistic dichotomy, has not been the subject of this type of linguistic preconception and has never been singled out as grammatically flawed.

As such, it is perhaps startling to discover that linguistic analysis of these three corpora reveals the same nonstandard features attested in the hasidic tale to be extremely common elements of not only the *Kitsur*, which was never subjected to the accusations of grammatical inferiority leveled at hasidic narrative, but also of the writing of the very maskilic authors who condemned the hasidic tale for its corrupt language. However, when one considers that despite their very different ideological and religio-cultural orientations, the authors of each corpus are all the product of the same Eastern European Ashkenazic environment and basic education, and that all have Yiddish as their native vernacular (as well as that Maskilic and Hasidic Hebrew have been shown to resemble each other closely in other aspects of morphology and syntax¹³), the fact that they all employ the same nonstandard elements in their writing is perhaps less surprising. Indeed, the relatively systematic employment of these nonstandard features in all three corpora suggests that, rather than being

13. Lily Kahn, "Grammatical Similarities between Nineteenth-Century Hasidic and Maskilic Hebrew Narratives," *Hebrew Studies* 53 (2012): 179–201.

haphazard mistakes deriving from hasidic grammatical ignorance, they are actually elements of a shared Ashkenazic linguistic heritage. This proposal is reinforced by the existence of many similar features in medieval and early modern responsa literature from Central and Eastern Europe, suggesting that such an Ashkenazic form of Hebrew may be a much more widespread variety stretching back many centuries prior to the time of Ganzfried and his hasidic and maskilic counterparts.

This essay thus aims to provide the first analysis of the nonstandard grammatical features attested in the *Kitsur*, the hasidic tale, and maskilic fiction and to situate them within the context of a shared Ashkenazic form of Hebrew.¹⁴ The features to be examined consist of prepositions in conjunction with the definite article; nonstandard noun gender; definite construct nouns; doubly definite construct chains; split construct chains; avoidance of the dual form with time words and numbers; superlative adjective constructions with יוֹתֵר *yoter*; and masculine numerals in conjunction with feminine nouns. I will present and analyze each of these phenomena in turn with examples drawn from Ganzfried's *Kitsur*; a representative corpus of thirty-seven Hasidic Hebrew tale collections published between 1864 and 1914; and a representative corpus of twenty-one Maskilic Hebrew short stories, novels, and plays published between 1857 and 1878.

In the body of the essay each phenomenon is illustrated with one example from the *Kitsur*, hasidic tale, and maskilic literature in turn; further examples from each of the three corpora are provided for reference in an appendix at the end of the essay. In order to lend a sense of proportion, slightly fewer examples are provided in the appendix for constructions that are less ubiquitous than others. The phenomena will be analyzed in light of the possible sources that contributed to their development. These consist of influence from the authors' native Yiddish on the one hand, and of earlier Hebrew (Ashkenazic and non-Ashkenazic) literary models on the other. While it can sometimes be difficult to ascertain the precise role played by an older non-Ashkenazic Hebrew literary source in the development of a given nineteenth-century Eastern European Hebrew phenomenon, the existence of an identical feature in a well-known medieval or early modern text such as the biblical commentaries of Abarbanel or Alshekh is worth noting because Ganzfried and the hasidic and

14. Due to space limitations, the selection of nonstandard features examined in this essay, while representative and relatively comprehensive, is not exhaustive. See Kahn, "Grammatical Similarities," for discussion of several other non-standard features in Hasidic and Maskilic Hebrew.

maskilic authors would all have been intimately familiar with these writings and are thus likely to have drawn on them (probably subconsciously) in their own Hebrew compositions.

1. PREPOSITIONS IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE DEFINITE ARTICLE

The first nonstandard feature to be examined here concerns the Eastern European Hebrew authors' treatment of the definite article when appearing in conjunction with one of the inseparable prepositions ב- (*b-* "in, at, by, with"), ל- (*l-* "to, for"), and כ- (*k-* "as, like"). In biblical Hebrew the definite article is regularly elided when prefixed by one of these prepositions, e.g., אִישׁ (*ba-'ish* "the man" [Gen 24.22]) vs. אִישׁ (*la-'ish* "to the man" [Gen 43.6]); exceptions to this convention are relatively marginal and generally restricted to books considered to be late.¹⁵ Elision of the definite article following an inseparable preposition is likewise standard in Mishnaic Hebrew and subsequent forms of the language. By contrast, in Ganzfried's *Kitsur*, the hasidic tale, and maskilic literature, the definite article is typically retained following inseparable prepositions. This trend, which has relatively few exceptions in all three corpora, is striking in its divergence from the canonical norm. The fact that the maskilic authors employ the construction so regularly despite their expressed preference for classical norms is particularly noteworthy, suggesting that, despite any conscious attempts to differentiate their own written language from that of their more traditional contemporaries, this convention was so familiar to them that they employed it instinctively without recognizing its nonstandard nature.

The following three examples illustrate this phenomenon as attested in the *Kitsur*, Hasidic and Maskilic Hebrew respectively. (See section 1 of the appendix at the end of this essay for further examples from each of the three corpora.)

Kitsur: לְהָאִישׁ *le-ha-'ish* "for the husband";¹⁶ cf. standard equivalent לְאִישׁ *la-ish*

15. Paul Joüon and Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (2nd ed., 2006; repr. with corrections, Rome, 2009), 104.

16. Solomon ben Joseph Ganzfried, *Kitsur shulḥan 'arukh* (Ungvar, 1864), 75.5. Note that some of the section divisions appearing in the first edition, which are cited in this essay, may differ from those appearing in more recent editions of the *Kitsur*. Note also that many of the nonstandard features cited here have been excised from modern editions of the *Kitsur*.

Hasidic: להסוכה *le-ba-suka* “to the sukkah”;¹⁷ cf. standard equivalent
לסוכה *la-suka*

Maskilic: בהארון *be-ba-'aron* “on the ark”;¹⁸ cf. standard equivalent
בארון *ba-'aron*

The fact that the authors of all three corpora quite consistently adhere to this convention, which is so at odds with the standard attested in the classical Hebrew texts, suggests that they were all drawing on a shared model. This possibility is supported by the fact that the same phenomenon is a characteristic feature of medieval and early modern Ashkenazic responsa literature,¹⁹ hinting at an unbroken chain of largely undocumented Ashkenazic Hebrew that can perhaps be traced back to the medieval period. Moreover, although these earlier written Hebrew sources are likely to have been the authors' primary influence, their impact may have been compounded by the fact that in the authors' Yiddish vernacular the definite article is a separate word rather than a prefix and as such is not elided when appearing in conjunction with a preposition.

2. NONSTANDARD NOUN GENDER

2.1. *Masculine singular nouns*

Another prominent area in which the three corpora exhibit marked differences from the canonical forms of Hebrew concerns the grammatical gender of nouns. The standard biblical and postbiblical convention is that masculine singular nouns end in any consonant except *tav*, and in any vowel except *kamets be*. Ganzfried and his hasidic and maskilic contemporaries employ a system that differs from this in several regards.

2.1.1. *Nouns ending in tav*

The first difference is that the authors commonly treat nouns ending in any consonant, including *tav*, as masculine; this contrasts with other forms of the language, in which nouns ending in *tav* are typically feminine. The phenomenon is more commonly attested in the *Kitsur* and hasidic tale than in maskilic fiction. This difference is most likely a product of the maskilic drive toward standardization based on canonical norms. However, the fact that despite their expressed aims they some-

17. Reuben Zak, *Bet Yisra'el* (Piotrkow, 1912; repr. in *Holy Books from the Students of the Holy Ba'al Shem Tov of Eternal Memory*, vol. 5, New York, 1983), 7.

18. Peretz Smolenskin, *Ha-gemul* (Odessa, 1867; repr. Warsaw, 1910), 5.

19. Betzer, *Rabbinic Hebrew*, 85–86.

times deviate from these norms and treat nouns ending in *tav* as masculine, just as their nonmaskilic counterparts do, indicates that they were heirs to the same Eastern European Hebrew grammatical tradition more widely exhibited in the *Kitzur* and hasidic tales. That is to say, because the authors were so steeped in these noncanonical structures they sometimes failed to recognize them as such, despite their conscious attempts to adhere to the biblical standard in their writing.²⁰

This phenomenon is illustrated in the following three examples from the *Kitzur*, Hasidic Hebrew, and Maskilic Hebrew in turn. Further examples can be found in section 2.1.1 of the appendix.

- Kitzur*: קדחת חזק *kadaḥat ḥazak* “a high fever”;²¹ cf. standard equivalent קדחת חזקה *kadaḥat ḥazakah*
- Hasidic: אחדות גדול *aḥdut gadol* “great unity”;²² cf. standard equivalent אחדות גדולה *aḥdut gedolah*
- Maskilic: האות הראשון *ba-’ot ba-rishon* “the first letter”;²³ cf. standard equivalent האות הראשונה *ba-’ot ba-rishonah*

The association of word-final *tav* with masculine gender is not unique to the three corpora under examination here but rather features more widely in medieval and early modern Ashkenazic Hebrew responsa literature²⁴ as well as in Arabic-influenced medieval Spanish Hebrew.²⁵ As in the case of the definite article in conjunction with inseparable prepositions, the most direct literary source of the phenomenon attested in the *Kitzur*, hasidic tale, and maskilic literature is most likely the earlier Ashkenazic responsa, as they stem from the same geographical and cultural milieu. However, the responsa authors may themselves have been influenced by the existence of the same practice in earlier Spanish Hebrew. Again as in

20. This tendency can be equated with another phenomenon widely exhibited in Maskilic Hebrew prose fiction whereby the authors often employed rabbinic structures and vocabulary because of their subconscious familiarity with this form of the language, despite an expressed desire to eschew it in favor of the biblical model. See Lily Kahn, “Rabbinic Elements in the Verbal System of Maskilic Hebrew Fiction, 1857–81,” *Hebrew Studies* 49 (2008): 317–34, and Kahn, *Verbal System*.

21. Ganzfried, *Kitzur*, 89.5.

22. Dov Baer Ehrmann, *Devarim ‘arevim*, part 1 (Munkacs, 1903), 21a.

23. Isaac Edward Salkinson, *Ram ve-Ya’el* (Vienna, 1878), 69.

24. *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 2nd ed., s.v. “Hebrew Language, Medieval,” 670.

25. Chaim Rabin, *The Development of the Syntax of Post-Biblical Hebrew* (Leiden, 2000), 89–90; *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics*, s.v. “Medieval Hebrew,” 663.

the case of the definite article, the impact of these earlier Hebrew literary corpora is likely to have been compounded by the fact that in the nineteenth-century authors' native Yiddish *tav* is not a feminine marker.²⁶ A parallel phenomenon is attested in the Hebrew compositions of Judeo-Spanish speakers from the Ottoman Empire and North Africa in the early modern and modern periods, due to similar influence from the phonologically based noun gender rules of the authors' vernacular.²⁷ This correspondence points to a more widespread tendency for diaspora Hebrew grammar to be shaped by the authors' spoken language.

2.1.2. *Endingless nouns*

The Eastern European Hebrew authors' tendency to treat nouns not ending in *kamets be* as masculine extends to their approach to nouns that are feminine in the canonical forms of Hebrew despite lacking a traditional feminine ending (e.g., פעם *pa'am* "occasion, time"; יד *yaḏ* "hand"; עיר *ir* "city"). In Maskilic Hebrew this phenomenon, like that of masculine nouns ending in *tav*, is somewhat more restricted. Again, this is most likely due to the authors' conscious desire to adhere to canonical grammatical norms. However, it is still occasionally attested, typically with the noun פעם *pa'am*, as in the maskilic example shown below. This indicates that, as above, the authors often failed to recognize this collocation as a noncanonical form.

The following examples illustrate the treatment of this type of noun in each of the three corpora in turn. See section 2.1.2 of the appendix for further examples.

- Kitsur*: בפעם הראשון *be-/ba-pa'am ba-rishon* "the first time";²⁸ cf. standard equivalent בפעם הראשונה *ba-pa'am ba-rishonah*
- Hasidic: אבן טוב *even tov* "a precious stone";²⁹ cf. standard equivalent אבן טובה *even tovah*
- Maskilic: בפעם הראשון *be-/ba-pa'am ba-rishon* "the first time";³⁰ cf. standard equivalent בפעם הראשונה *ba-pa'am ba-rishonah*

In this case, the direct source of the phenomenon is most likely influence from the authors' Yiddish vernacular, in which nouns ending in conso-

26. *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 2nd ed., s.v. "Hebrew Language, Medieval," 670.

27. David M. Bunis, "'Whole Hebrew': A Revised Definition," in *A Touch of Grace: Studies in Ashkenazic Culture, Women's History, and the Languages of the Jews Presented to Chava Turniansky*, ed. I. Bartal et al. (Jerusalem, 2013), 50*–51*.

28. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 59.11.

29. Aaron Walden, *Kebal ḥasidim* (n.p., 1860?), 25a.

30. Kalman Schulman, *Mistere Pariz*, 4 vols. (Vilnius, 1857–60), 1:15.

nants are not typically feminine.³¹ This Yiddish influence may have been compounded by the existence of a similar tendency in medieval Spanish Provençal Hebrew prose³² and medieval Hebrew translations of Arabic works,³³ with which the nineteenth-century Hebrew authors are likely to have been familiar to some extent. However, the degree of such influence is difficult to establish with certainty because it is much less direct than that of the vernacular. With respect to the particular proclivity in maskilic literature to treat precisely פֶּא'ם *pa'am* as masculine, this noun is commonly regarded as masculine in well-known medieval Hebrew texts such as the commentaries of Rashi and Ibn Ezra, as well as occasionally in the Talmud and midrashim; this suggests that in the present case the maskilic authors, despite a commonly expressed desire to emulate biblical standards, were more strongly influenced by these later sources.

2.2. Feminine singular nouns

Just as the authors under consideration tend to treat all nouns ending in a consonant as masculine, so they have a proclivity to treat all nouns ending in the sound /ə/ as feminine. The sound /ə/ can be represented in various ways in Hebrew orthography, the most common of which is *kamets be*. Given that *kamets be* is the most widespread feminine noun marker in Biblical Hebrew³⁴ as well as in subsequent forms of the language, there is a large degree of overlap between the Eastern European corpora and their historical predecessors. However, in some cases the Eastern European convention diverges from the canonical standard. One of the most prominent examples of this is the noun לַיְלָה (*laylah* “night”), which ends in *kamets be* but is treated as masculine in standard forms of Hebrew; conversely, it is commonly regarded as feminine in the nineteenth-century corpora (as in the first example below). The phenomenon extends to nouns ending in *segol be*, *‘ayin*, and vocalic *yod*, all of which would have been pronounced as /ə/ in the popular Ashkenazic Hebrew phonology shared by Ganzfried and his hasidic and maskilic counterparts.³⁵ In most cases this clashes with the canonical norms, in which such nouns are regarded as masculine. Interestingly, in contrast to

31. Yudel Mark, *A Grammar of Standard Yiddish* (Yiddish; New York, 1978), 123; Dovid Katz, *Grammar of the Yiddish Language* (London, 1987), 50.

32. Rabin, *Post-Biblical Hebrew*, 89–90.

33. Gad Ben-Ammi Sarfatti, *History of the Hebrew Language: The Medieval Division, Unit 5: The Language of the Translators from Arabic* (Tel Aviv, 2003), 86.

34. Joüon and Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 245.

35. Dovid Katz, “The Phonology of Ashkenazic,” in *Hebrew in Ashkenaz: A Language in Exile*, ed. L. Glinert (New York, 1993), 76–78.

the masculine nouns ending in *tav* and endingless traditionally feminine nouns discussed above, the maskilic authors treat canonically masculine nouns ending in /ə/ as feminine at a similar rate to Ganzfried and the hasidic authors. This suggests that their intimate familiarity with the Eastern European Hebrew model made it difficult for them to recognize the feminine treatment of such nouns as being at odds with the classical model.

The following examples illustrate this phenomenon in each of the three corpora. See section 2.2 of the appendix for further examples.

- Kitsur*: בלילה הראשונה *be/ba-laylah ba-rishonah* “on the first night”;³⁶ cf. standard equivalent בלילה הראשון *ba-laylah ba-rishon*
- Hasidic: משתה גדולה *mishteh gedolah* “a big banquet”;³⁷ cf. standard equivalent משתה גדול *mishteh gadol*
- Maskilic: וכובעו הגדולה *ve-khova’o ba-gedolah* “and his big hat”;³⁸ cf. standard equivalent וכובעו הגדול *ve-khova’o ba-gadol*

The Eastern European authors’ treatment of these nouns as feminine is most likely rooted in influence from their native Yiddish, in which word-final /ə/ is the chief morphological feminine marker in nouns³⁹; in contrast to some of the other nominal patterns discussed above, it seems to lack direct precedent in medieval or early modern Hebrew literature. However, a parallel phenomenon has been observed in the Hebrew compositions of Judeo-Spanish speakers whereby canonically masculine nouns ending in the sound /a/, such as מורא (*mora* “fear”), are treated as feminine because /a/ is the chief morphological marker of feminine gender in Judeo-Spanish.⁴⁰ As in the case of masculine nouns ending in *tav*, this similarity points to a wider trend whereby diaspora Hebrew morphosyntax has been shaped by its authors’ vernacular.

2.5 Masculine plural nouns

The *Kitsur*, hasidic tale, and maskilic fiction exhibit similar differences from the canonical standard with respect to the gender of plural nouns.

36. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 132.3.

37. Israel Berger, *Eser tsafot* (Piotrkow, 1910; repr. in *Holy Books*, vol. 97, New York, 1996), 74.

38. Baruch Brand, “Sha’are dema’ot,” *Ha-boker Or* 2.2–3 (1877): 79.

39. Mark, *A Grammar of Standard Yiddish*, 123; Katz, *Grammar of the Yiddish Language*, 50; Neil G. Jacobs, *Yiddish: A Linguistic Introduction* (Cambridge, 2005), 154, 167.

40. Bunis, “Whole Hebrew,” 51*.

In both biblical and later forms of the language, the ending ־im typically serves as a masculine plural marker. However, there are many exceptions to this trend in the canonical strata whereby the suffix may be attached to a feminine noun; these may be the plurals of endingless feminine singular nouns (e.g., פְּעָמִים *pe'amim* “times, occasions” and אֲבָנִים *avanim* “stones”), derived from the endingless feminine singular forms פַּעַם *pa'am*; and אֶבֶן *even* respectively), or nouns whose singular forms have a typically feminine ending (e.g., נָשִׁים *nashim* “women”; and שָׁנִים *shanim* “years,” derived from the feminine singular forms אִשָּׁה *isha* “woman” and שָׁנָה *shanah* “year”). Ganzfried and his hasidic and maskilic contemporaries deviate from this precedent in that they tend to treat all plural nouns ending in ־im as masculine, even if they are feminine in other forms of the language.

This is illustrated in the following examples. See section 2.3 of the appendix for further examples.

- Kitsur*: $\text{לְעֵתִים רְחוֹקִים}$ *le-'itim reḥokim* “rarely”;⁴¹ cf. standard equivalent $\text{לְעֵתִים רְחוֹקוֹת}$ *le-'itim reḥokot*
- Hasidic: $\text{אֲבָנִים גְּדוֹלִים}$ *avanim gedolim* “large stones”;⁴² cf. standard equivalent $\text{אֲבָנִים גְּדוֹלוֹת}$ *avanim gedolot*
- Maskilic: $\text{בִּיצִים גְּדוֹלִים}$ *betsim gedolim* “big eggs”;⁴³ cf. standard equivalent $\text{בִּיצִים גְּדוֹלוֹת}$ *betsim gedolot*

Significantly, this includes not only endingless feminine nouns whose singular forms they treat as masculine (such as אֲבָנִים *avanim* “stones,” from אֶבֶן *even* “stone”) but also nouns whose singular form they themselves regard as feminine, such as נָשִׁים *nashim* “women” and שָׁנִים *shanim* “years,” as in the following examples from the *Kitsur* and hasidic tale respectively.

- Kitsur*: $\text{וְהַנָּשִׁים שְׂצָרִיכִין לְהַדְלִיק נֵרוֹת}$ *ve-ha-nashim she-tserikbin le-hadlik nerot* “and the women who have to light candles”;⁴⁴ cf. standard equivalent $\text{וְהַנָּשִׁים שְׂצָרִיכוֹת לְהַדְלִיק נֵרוֹת}$ *ve-ha-nashim she-tserikbot le-hadlik nerot*
- Hasidic: $\text{שָׁנִים הָרִשּׁוֹנִים}$ *shanim ha-rishonim* “the first years”;⁴⁵ cf. standard equivalent $\text{הַשָּׁנִים הָרִשּׁוֹנוֹת}$ *ha-shanim ha-rishonot*

41. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 80.59.

42. Faivel Munk, *Siḥot tsadikim* (Warsaw, 1898), 76.

43. Mordechai David Brandstädter, “Doktor Yosef Alfasi,” *Ha-Shaḥar* 6.11 (1875): 664.

44. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 93.5.

45. Israel Berger, *‘Eser kedusbot* (Piotrkow, 1906; repr. in *Holy Books*, vol. 97, New York, 1996), 62.

The trend extends to the dual, which ends in עֵינִים- *-ayim* in the case of both masculine and feminine nouns, as illustrated in the following Maskilic Hebrew example.

Maskilic: בעיניכם הלועגים *be-'enkbem ba-lo'agim* "with your mocking eyes";⁴⁶ cf. standard equivalent בעיניכם הלועגות *be-'enkbem ba-lo'agot*

As in the case of some of the singular noun categories discussed above, this nonstandard gender assignment has direct precedent in medieval and early modern Central and Eastern European responsa literature⁴⁷ and as such is likely to have constituted a broader feature of Ashkenazic Hebrew. It is also attested in medieval translations of Arabic works,⁴⁸ which may have informed the Ashkenazic phenomenon. This literary precedent is likely to have been compounded by a synchronic predilection on the part of Ganzfried and his hasidic and maskilic counterparts for regularization of noun gender based on attraction, that is, phonological suffix concord between nouns and their associated adjectives. As in the case of masculine nouns ending in *tav* and feminine nouns ending in /*ə*/ discussed above, the same phenomenon is sometimes attested in the Hebrew writing of Ottoman and North African Judeo-Spanish speakers,⁴⁹ suggesting that attraction-based noun-adjective suffix concord may have been a significant force in diaspora Hebrew morphosyntax more widely.

2.4 Feminine plural nouns

Just as the Eastern European Hebrew authors have a proclivity for treating any plural noun ending in עֵינִים- *-im* as masculine, so they tend to regard any plural noun ending in הֵן- *-ot* as feminine. In other historical forms of Hebrew, הֵן- *-ot* likewise typically serves as a plural feminine marker but is not infrequently attached to masculine nouns (e.g., מקומות *mekomot* "places" and סודות *sodot* "secrets," derived from the masculine מקום *makom* "place" and סוד *sod* "secret" respectively). Thus, the Eastern European Hebrew usage often differs from that found in the canonical strata in that it tends to treat such nouns as feminine, despite the fact that it regards the singular forms of the same nouns as masculine.

46. Isaac Meir Dick, "Ha-behalah," *Ha-melits* 7.41–43 (1867): 305–6; 312–13; 322–23, at 312.

47. Betzer, *History of the Hebrew Language*, 75–76.

48. Sarfatti, *Translators from Arabic*, 86.

49. Bunis, "Whole Hebrew," 52*.

The following examples illustrate this phenomenon. See section 2.4 of the appendix for further examples from all three corpora.

- Kitsur*: מקודשות מקומות *mekomot mekudashot* “sanctified places”;⁵⁰ cf. standard equivalent מקודשים מקומות *mekomot mekudashim*
- Hasidic: שדות רבות *sadot rabot* “many fields”;⁵¹ cf. standard equivalent שדות רבים *sadot rabim*
- Maskilic: היו דלות ורעות [...] המשתות *ba-mishtot* [...] *hayu dalot ve-ra’ot* “the banquets [...] were meagre and poor”;⁵² cf. standard equivalent היו דלים ורעים [...] המשתים־משתיות *ba-mishtim/mishtayot hayu dalim ve-ra’im*

As in the case of masculine plural nouns, this phenomenon is found more generally in Ashkenazic Hebrew writings, including nineteenth-century compositions from Palestine⁵³ as well as earlier responsa literature.⁵⁴ It is likewise found in medieval Spanish Provençal Hebrew literature⁵⁵ and medieval Hebrew translations of Arabic texts.⁵⁶ As in the case of the plural nouns ending in ם- *-im*, the nineteenth-century phenomenon is likely to be a direct product of this more widespread Ashkenazic Hebrew practice, which may itself derive from the medieval Spanish Hebrew phenomenon.⁵⁷ This literary legacy was probably reinforced by the fact that Ganzfried and the hasidic and maskilic authors would have pronounced the suffix ות- *-ot* as /əs/, which corresponds in pronunciation to the most common Yiddish feminine plural marker.⁵⁸ Additionally, as in the case of some of the nonstandard singular nouns and the plural nouns ending in ם- *-im*, similar constructions are attested in the Hebrew writing of Ottoman and North African Judeo-Spanish speakers,⁵⁹ which again points to

50. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 12.5.

51. Jacob Sofer, *Sipure Ya’akov* (Husyatín, 1904), 34.

52. Dick, *Ha-behala*, 322.

53. Yehudit Wertheimer, “On the Study of 19th-Century Hebrew: Based on an Analysis of the Language of Yosef Rivlin and M. L. Lilienblum,” in *Vatikin: Studies on the History of the Yishuv*, ed. H. Z. Hirschberg (Hebrew; Ramat Gan, 1975), 149–61.

54. Betzer, *History of the Hebrew Language*, 75–76; *Encyclopædia Judaica*, 2nd ed., s.v. “Hebrew Language, Medieval,” 670.

55. Rabin, *Post-Biblical Hebrew*, 91.

56. Sarfatti, *Translators from Arabic*, 86.

57. *Encyclopædia Judaica*, 2nd ed., s.v. “Hebrew Language, Medieval,” 670.

58. Mark, *A Grammar of Standard Yiddish*, 123, 161–62; Katz, *Grammar of the Yiddish Language*, 50, 54–55.

59. Bunis, “Whole Hebrew,” 52*.

a wider inclination toward attraction-based gender concord in diaspora Hebrew.

3. DEFINITE CONSTRUCT NOUNS

Another prominent area in which the *Kitsur*, hasidic tale, and maskilic literature diverge from the canonical norms concerns the treatment of definite construct chains. The standard method of making construct chains definite in Biblical Hebrew is to prefix the definite article to the absolute noun, while leaving the construct noun unprefixes⁶⁰ (e.g., the indefinite מִלְחָמָה אֲנָשִׁים *anshe milḥama* “men of war” [2 Chr 8.9] vs. its definite counterpart הַמִּלְחָמָה אֲנָשִׁים *anshe ha-milḥama* “the men of war” [Num 31.28]), and this convention has remained standard in later forms of the language. Ganzfried and his hasidic and maskilic contemporaries sometimes follow this canonical precedent, but in many cases they deviate from the standard by placing the definite article on the construct noun instead of the absolute one. As in the cases discussed above, the fact that maskilic authors frequently employ this construction suggests that their subconscious familiarity with the Ashkenazic Hebrew linguistic model was so dominant that it made it difficult for them to identify this feature as nonstandard, despite any conscious purist tendencies which they may have had.

The following examples illustrate this phenomenon. See section 3 of the appendix for further examples from each corpus.

- Kitsur*: מִבְּתֵי הַבְּעָלִי בָּתִּים *mi-bate ba-ba'ale batim* “from the houses of the hosts”;⁶¹ cf. standard equivalent מִבְּתֵי בְּעָלִי הַבֵּית *mi-bate ba'ale ba-bayit*
- Hasidic: הָרֹאשׁ הַיְּשִׁיבָה *ba-rosh yeshivah* “the head of the yeshivah”;⁶² cf. standard equivalent רֹאשׁ הַיְּשִׁיבָה *rosh ha-yeshivah*
- Maskilic: הַמְּנַשֵּׁב רוּחַ *ba-menashev ruah* “the fan”;⁶³ cf. standard equivalent מְנַשֵּׁב הַרוּחַ *menashev ha-ruah*

Like nonstandard noun gender, this phenomenon is attested in medieval and early modern Ashkenazic responsa literature,⁶⁴ and its appearance in

60. Ronald J. Williams, *Williams' Hebrew Syntax*, rev. J. C. Beckman (3rd ed.; Toronto, 2007), 8.

61. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 91.13.

62. Abraham Isaac Sobelman, *Sipure tsadikim ba-ḥadashim*, parts 1/2 (Piotrkow, 1909/10; repr. in *Holy Books of Eternal Memory*, vol. 4, New York, 1982), 3.

63. Salkinson, *Ram ve-Ya'el*, 64.

64. Betzer, *History of the Hebrew Language*, 91.

the nineteenth-century corpora is doubtless traceable in some measure to this earlier literary precedent. However, any such influence is most likely compounded by synchronic impact from the authors' native Yiddish. A large number of Hebrew construct chains, including many of those shown in the examples above, exist independently in Yiddish as compound nouns, and in that language such nouns are made definite by placing the definite article before the first noun in the construction, as in *דאס יראת-שמים* *dos yires shomayim* "the fear of heaven," *דער ארון-קודש* *der orn koydesh* "the ark." The fact that Ganzfried and his hasidic and maskilic counterparts replicate the Yiddish construction suggests that they (most likely subconsciously) perceived these construct chains as single compound nouns, as in their vernacular. This is supported by cases such as that shown in the example from the *Kitzur* above, in which a three-member construct chain is made definite by prefixing the definite article to the second member, which is itself the first word in a construct chain existing independently in Yiddish as a compound noun. Note that, as in the case of certain nonstandard noun gender patterns discussed above, the same phenomenon is attested in the Hebrew compositions of Judeo-Spanish speakers,⁶⁵ indicating another parallel development informed by constructions in the authors' vernacular.

4. DOUBLY DEFINITE CONSTRUCT CHAINS

There is a variation of this phenomenon attested in all three corpora whereby the construct chain is made definite by prefixing the definite article to both the absolute and construct nouns. This type of construction is somewhat less commonly attested in Maskilic Hebrew than in the *Kitzur* and the hasidic tale. However, the fact that it does nevertheless sometimes appear suggests that, as in the case of the nonstandard noun gender discussed above, the maskilic authors consciously intended to avoid the construction, which they perhaps recognized as clashing with the canonical norm, but their ingrained familiarity with this Ashkenazic Hebrew convention resulted in their occasional, most likely unintentional, use of it. Interestingly, they seem to have been more aware of the nonstandard nature of this construction than of the variant discussed above whereby only the construct noun takes the definite article.

The following examples illustrate this phenomenon. See section 4 of the appendix for further examples from all three corpora.

65. Bunis, "Whole Hebrew," 59*.

- Kitsur*: הבית הקברות *ba-bet ha-kevarot* “the cemetery”;⁶⁶ cf. standard equivalent בית הקברות *bet ha-kevarot*
- Hasidic: הבעל הבית *ba-ba’al ha-bayit* “the owner”;⁶⁷ cf. standard equivalent בעל הבית *ba’al ha-bayit*
- Maskilic: השר הצבא *ba-sar ha-tsava* “the army commander”;⁶⁸ cf. standard equivalent שר הצבא *sar ha-tsava*

Like most of the nonstandard features discussed above, this practice is attested in medieval and early modern responsa literature⁶⁹ as well as in Rashi’s eleventh-century biblical commentaries,⁷⁰ suggesting that it is another component of a more extensive Ashkenazic form of Hebrew. Synchronically, it is also attested in the nineteenth-century Ashkenazic writings of Jerusalem community leader Yosef Rivlin,⁷¹ which again hints at a much broader shared system at odds with the canonical norms. As in several of the cases discussed above, any literary precedent has almost certainly been reinforced by synchronic influence from the authors’ native Yiddish: many of the construct chains in question are employed independently in Yiddish as compound nouns in which the Hebrew definite article constitutes a meaningless lexicalized component, e.g., בעל הבית *balebos* “owner, landlord,” בית הקברות *beyesakvoret* “cemetery,” and the Yiddish definite article is placed at the beginning of the compound to make it definite, e.g., דער בעל הבית *der balebos* “the owner, landlord,” בית הקברות *der/dos beyesakvoret* “the cemetery.” This suggestion is supported by the fact that the Eastern European Hebrew authors under discussion sometimes employ this type of construct chain with a lexicalized definite article in an indefinite context, as it would be used in their vernacular; this is illustrated in the following Maskilic Hebrew example:

- Maskilic: יש גם מקוה קרה ומקוה חמה, בית הקברות ישן ובית הקברות חדש והמון “מנינים” *yesh gam mikva kara u-mikva hama, bet ha-kevarot yashan u-vet ha-kevarot hadash ve-hamon “mınyanim”* “there is also a cold mikvah and a hot mikvah, an old cemetery and a new ceme-

66. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 198.2.

67. Walden, *Kebal hasidim*, 51a.

68. Samuel Joseph Fuenn, “Ha-kadish li-fne Kol Nidre,” *Ha-karmel*, 2nd ser., 3.4–6 (1875–76): 217–24; 273–80; 334.

69. Betzer, *History of the Hebrew Language*, 91–92.

70. Betzer, *History of the Hebrew Language*, 108.

71. Wertheimer, “19th-Century Hebrew,” 159–60.

tery, and many ‘minyans’”;⁷² cf. standard equivalent ש גם מקוה קרה ומקוה חמת, בית קברות ישן ובית קברות חדש והמון “מנינים”
yesh gam mikva kara u-mikva ḥama, bet kevarot yashan u-vet kevarot ḥadash ve-hamon “minyanim”

5. SPLIT CONSTRUCT CHAINS

The nonstandard treatment of the construct chain exhibited in the three Eastern European corpora extends beyond their approach to definiteness. The standard Biblical and post-Biblical Hebrew convention is that two construct nouns cannot be linked by the conjunction *waw*; instead, one of them is placed after the subsequent absolute noun, which is prefixed by *waw* and bears a possessive pronominal suffix.⁷³ While Ganzfried and the hasidic and maskilic authors sometimes follow this tradition, they also have a tendency to deviate from it by inserting the conjunction *waw* between two or more construct nouns. The maskilic authors employ this nonstandard construction as frequently as Ganzfried and the hasidic authors, suggesting that they did not consciously regard it as grammatically flawed.

The following examples illustrate split construct chains in the *Kitour*, hasidic tale, and maskilic literature respectively. See section 5 of the appendix for further examples from each corpus.

- Kitour*: וראשי המזמורים וסופי המזמורים *ve-rashe ve-sofe ha-mizmorim* “the first and last of the psalms”;⁷⁴ cf. standard equivalent וראשי המזמורים וסופיהם *ve-rashe ha-mizmorim ve-sofehem*
- Hasidic: גדולי העיר וחשובי העיר *gedole va-ḥashuve ha-ir* “the big and important men of the town”;⁷⁵ cf. standard equivalent גדולי העיר וחשוביה *gedole ha-ir va-ḥashuveha*
- Maskilic: בעלי ובעלות קתי המרזח *ba‘ale u-va‘alot bate ha-marzeah* “the landlords and landladies of the taverns”;⁷⁶ cf. standard equivalent בעלי בתי המרזח ובעלותיהם *ba‘ale bate ha-marzeah u-va‘alotehem*

72. Brandstädter, “Doktor Yosef Alfasi,” 651.

73. For details of this convention in Biblical Hebrew, see Joüon and Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 434–35; for Rabbinic Hebrew, see Moses Hirsch Segal, *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew* (Oxford, 1927), 187–88; for the language of Palestinian piyyutim, see Michael Rand, *Introduction to the Grammar of Hebrew Poetry in Byzantine Palestine* (Piscataway, N.J., 2006), 250–52; and for medieval Spanish Provençal Hebrew, see Rabin, *Post-Biblical Hebrew*, 93.

74. Ganzfried, *Kitour*, 129.5.

75. Hayim Meir Heilmann, *Bet rebe* (Berdichev, 1902), 107.

76. Schulman, *Mistere Pariz*, 7.

Although this type of construction is occasionally attested in the Hebrew Bible, it is a very marginal phenomenon⁷⁷ and as such is unlikely to have exerted any meaningful influence on Ashkenazic Hebrew. Likewise, though it is attested in certain medieval Karaite piyyutim,⁷⁸ this literature most probably did not exert enough impact on Eastern European Hebrew literature to have shaped the phenomenon in the latter. A more likely source of influence is Moses Alshekh's seventeenth-century commentary to Psalms 87, a text with which Ganzfried as well as the hasidic and maskilic authors would have been familiar, and which contains a split construct chain, קְדוּשַׁת וְחִיבַת הָאָרֶץ *kedushbat ve-hibat ha'arets* "the holiness and love of the land." However, any such influence is likely to have been a minor factor in comparison with the existence of a similar construction in the authors' Yiddish vernacular, in which the construct chain is not a feature and which instead frequently expresses nominal possession by means of the preposition פֿון *fun* "of" placed before the possessor,⁷⁹ with multiple possessums commonly linked by the conjunction און *un* "and." As in many of the cases discussed above, this highlights the important role that Yiddish played in the formation of Eastern European Hebrew morphosyntax.

6. AVOIDANCE OF THE DUAL WITH TIME WORDS AND NUMERALS

The Eastern European corpora under examination differ from the canonical forms of Hebrew with respect to their treatment of the dual form. In Biblical Hebrew, as well as subsequent forms of the language, a restricted collection of nouns (denoting time words, certain numerals, and paired body parts) commonly appears with a dual suffix, ׁ(י)- *-ayim*, in order to indicate a precise quantity of two,⁸⁰ as in שְׁעֵי(י) *sha'atayim* "two hours"; שְׁבוּעֵי(י) *shevu'ayim* "two weeks"; חֳדָשֵׁי(י) *hodashayim* "two months"; שְׁנֵי(י) *shenatayim* "two years"; מֵאוֹתַי(י) *matayim* "two hundred"; יָדַי(י) *yadayim* "hands." In the *Kitsur* as well as in hasidic and maskilic literature this dual form is almost completely avoided in the case of time words and numerals. Instead, the authors typically designate the concepts "two

77. Joüon and Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 435; Williams, *Williams' Hebrew Syntax*, 8–9.

78. Rabin, *Post-Biblical Hebrew*, 93.

79. Mark, *A Grammar of Standard Yiddish*, 178–79.

80. Joüon and Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 250–53; *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics*, s.v. "Dual: Pre-Modern Hebrew" and "Dual: Modern Hebrew."

hours/weeks,” and the like, with the numeral שנים/שנים *shenayim/sbtayim* “two” followed by a plural noun.

The following examples illustrate this tendency. See section 6 of the appendix for further examples from all three corpora.

- Kitsur*: שנים פעמים *shene pe'amim* “two times”;⁸¹ cf. standard equivalent
 פעמים (י) *pa'amayim*
Hasidic: שני שעות *shene sha'ot* “two hours”;⁸² cf. standard equivalent
 שעות (י) *sha'atayim*
Maskilic: שני ימים *shene yamim* “two days”;⁸³ cf. standard equivalent
 יומי (י) *yomayim*

This practice is most likely due to influence from the authors' native Yiddish, in which there is no dual form, only a singular and plural. Therefore, when searching for a way to denote the concept of “two” temporal nouns or numerals, the plural form of such nouns would immediately have come to the authors' minds, as it is likely that they were subconsciously translating the concepts directly from Yiddish plural phrases, e.g. צוויי טעג *tvey teg* “two days”; צוויי וואכן *tvey vokhn* “two weeks.” Note that in the case of paired body parts the authors do employ the dual forms, most likely because the corresponding plural forms are rare or have a different meaning; as such, the dual forms would have been the most familiar to them.⁸⁴ Although this phenomenon has not been documented in the grammatical studies of earlier Central and Eastern European Hebrew texts such as responsa literature, it is possible that, like many of the other constructions discussed above, it is likewise a feature of these older works and as such comprises an element of a broader Ashkenazic Hebrew.

7. SUPERLATIVE ADJECTIVE CONSTRUCTIONS WITH יוֹתֵר *YOTER*

The *Kitsur*, hasidic tales, and maskilic fiction all exhibit the same noteworthy way of conveying superlative adjective constructions, namely, by means of the adverb יוֹתֵר *yoter* followed by an adjective prefixed by the definite article. This construction lacks clear precedent in Biblical or Rabbinic Hebrew: the former has no specific superlative marker, instead conveying the superlative sense by means of a range of syntactic methods including prefixing the positive adjective with the definite article, putting

81. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 32.9.

82. Nathan Neta Duner, *Sha'are ha-'emuna* (Warsaw, 1899), 36.

83. Dick, *Ha-behala*, 305.

84. See Lily Kahn, *A Grammar of the Eastern European Hasidic Hebrew Tale* (Leiden, 2015), 53–54, for further details of this tendency in Hasidic Hebrew.

it in construct, attaching a pronominal suffix to it, and others⁸⁵; likewise, while in Mishnaic Hebrew the superlative can be indicated by the post-positive marker ביותר *be-yoter* “the most,”⁸⁶ the prepositive יותר *yoter* does not serve in this capacity.

The following examples illustrate this phenomenon in the *Kitsur*, Hasidic Hebrew, and Maskilic Hebrew respectively.⁸⁷ See section 7 of the appendix for further examples from each corpus.

- Kitsur*: באופן היותר טוב לשמור את הפקדון *ḥayav li-shmor et ha-pikadon be-/ba-’ofen ba-yoter tov* “one must safeguard the deposit in the best manner”⁸⁸
- Hasidic: גדולים יותר רופאים *avifat 3 rof’im ba-yoter gedolim* “a meeting of the three greatest doctors”⁸⁹
- Maskilic: המשכרת היותר גדולה אשר ביד בני אנוש למצוא *ba-maskoret ha-yoter gedola asher bide ben enosh li-mtso* “the greatest wage that is in human power to find”⁹⁰

This construction is attested in Hebrew texts from the twelfth century onward, having been introduced under influence from Arabic⁹¹ and Latin;⁹² it is widely attested in medieval and early modern (non-Ashkenazic) biblical commentaries such as those of Abarbanel and Alshekh. These commentaries may have been the most direct literary source of the nineteenth-century Eastern European usage, given that the authors would all have been extremely familiar with them. However, it is possible that, like many of the other phenomena analyzed in this essay, the same construction is more widely attested in other Ashkenazic Hebrew texts which might have served as the more immediate forerunners of the corpora under examination here; this point requires further investigation. In

85. Williams, *Williams’ Hebrew Syntax*, 33–34.

86. Abraham Even-Shoshan, *The Even-Shoshan Dictionary: Revised and Updated for the 21st Century*, ed. M. Azar, I. Shamir, and Y. Yannai (Israel, 2003), 2:689.

87. Note that standard equivalents are not provided in this section due to the range of possibilities for expressing superlatives in Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew.

88. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 183.3.

89. Nathan Neta Duner, *Butsina kadisha* (Piotrkow, 1912), 28.

90. Peretz Smolenskin, preface to *Iti’el ba-kushi mi-Vinetya* by I. E. Salkinson (Vienna, 1874), xii.

91. *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics*, s.v. “Medieval Hebrew.”

92. Yael Reshef, “The Impact of Contact Languages on the Grammaticalization of the Modern Hebrew Superlative,” *Journal of Jewish Languages* 3.1–2 (2015): 272.

contrast to many of the topics discussed above, Yiddish does not appear to have played a role in the development of this phenomenon: superlatives in that language are formed by means of a suffix and are syntactically very different from the Hebrew construction under examination. Note that this way of constructing superlatives survived into the early twentieth century in revernacularized Hebrew in Palestine.⁹³

8. MASCULINE NUMERALS IN CONJUNCTION WITH FEMININE NOUNS

The final nonstandard Eastern European Hebrew feature to be examined here is the use of masculine numerals in conjunction with feminine nouns. In the canonical forms of Hebrew masculine numerals (אחד *ehad* “one”; שנים *shenayim* “two”; שלוש *shelosh*, and subsequent numerals ending in a *kamets be* suffix) are employed in conjunction with masculine nouns, while their feminine variants (אחת *ahat* “one”; שתי *shtayim* “two”; שלוש *shalosh* “three,” and subsequent numerals without the *kamets be* suffix) are used in conjunction with feminine nouns. While Ganzfried and his hasidic and maskilic contemporaries sometimes follow this precedent, in many cases they use the masculine numerals to modify not only masculine nouns but also feminine ones.

The following examples illustrate this phenomenon in the *Kitsur*, hasidic tale, and maskilic fiction respectively. See section 8 of the appendix for further examples from each corpus.

- Kitsur*: שלשה מלאכות *sheloshah melakhot* “three tasks”;⁹⁴ cf. standard equivalent שלוש מלאכות *shalosh melakhot*
- Hasidic: חמשה מאות *hamisha me’ot* “five hundred”;⁹⁵ cf. standard equivalent חמש מאות *hamesh me’ot*
- Maskilic: ליפני ששה ועשרים שנה *li-fne shisha ve-‘esrim shana* “twenty-six years ago”;⁹⁶ cf. standard equivalent לפני שש ועשרים [= לפני ששה ועשרים *li-fne shesh ve-‘esrim* [= ‘esrim ve-shesh] shana

This phenomenon does not have clear precedent in earlier Hebrew literary sources. It may have been informed in a certain measure by the fact that in Mishnaic Hebrew the boundary between masculine and feminine numerals is somewhat obscured, due in part to shifts in noun gender from

93. Reshef, “Modern Hebrew Superlative,” 273.

94. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 65.16.

95. Eliezer Shenkel, *Sipure anshe shem* (Podgorze, 1903), 16.

96. Brandstädter, “Doktor Yosef Alfasi,” 657.

the biblical period,⁹⁷ but the Mishnaic Hebrew phenomenon does not closely resemble the Eastern European one, in which there is a marked preference to employ the masculine numerals with feminine nouns as well as masculine ones. As in the case of the nonstandard noun gender discussed above, this phenomenon may be rooted in phonological considerations: since the masculine numerals end in *kamets be*, the authors may have subconsciously associated them with feminine gender. Similarly, the fact that the masculine construct numerals end in *ן-* *-t* may have collocated naturally in the authors' minds with the feminine plural ending *ן-* *-ot* due to the phonological resemblance between the two. This tendency to employ masculine numerals in conjunction with both masculine and feminine nouns suggests that the numeral system in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Eastern European Hebrew was undergoing a process of simplification whereby the feminine variants were being abandoned in favor of their masculine counterparts. This drive toward streamlining of numeral gender is likely to have been informed at least partially by the fact that the authors' Yiddish vernacular has only one set of numerals, which is used to modify nouns of any gender.⁹⁸ Similar patterns have been noted in Joseph Rivlin's nineteenth-century Ashkenazic Hebrew writings from Jerusalem,⁹⁹ which, like many of the other nonstandard grammatical features discussed above, points to a broader Ashkenazic Hebrew phenomenon.

CONCLUSION

This essay has highlighted a range of distinct grammatical features that are typically regarded as nonstandard with respect to both biblical and postbiblical forms of Hebrew but which are widely attested in three major varieties of nineteenth-century Eastern European Hebrew as exemplified by Solomon Ganzfried's *Kitsur shulḥan 'arukh*, the Hasidic Hebrew hagiographic tale, and Maskilic Hebrew literary fiction. The fact that the same nonstandard features are attested in these three very distinct literary corpora composed by authors operating within widely diverging religious, literary, and ideological milieus suggests that their shared geographical and cultural origin as Yiddish-speaking Eastern European Jews with a traditional Ashkenazic education may have had a greater bearing on their Hebrew composition than their different perspectives would suggest. Perhaps the most striking evidence for this is the fact that the maskilic

97. Shimon Sharvit, *Studies in Mishnaic Hebrew* (Jerusalem, 2008), 228–34.

98. Dovid Katz, *Grammar of the Yiddish Language*, 201–3.

99. Wertheimer, "19th Century Hebrew," 157.

authors employ most of these nonstandard features in equal measure with their hasidic counterparts and Ganzfried, despite widespread attempts to follow a normative standard in their language; only in rare cases (such as singular nouns ending in *tav* and doubly definite construct chains), do they seem to employ the nonstandard forms less frequently than Ganzfried and the hasidic authors, but even in these cases they do occasionally make use of them. These tendencies indicate that Eastern European Hebrew was a firmly ingrained component of their writing and suggests that they were often unable to identify nonstandard features despite their consciously expressed disdain for them. The similarities between these three corpora may point to a widespread cohesive variety of Hebrew that developed in Central and Eastern Europe. This is supported by the fact that in many cases (as with the definite article in conjunction with inseparable prepositions, some of the nonstandard noun gender patterns, definite construct nouns, and doubly definite construct chains) the same phenomena have been observed in medieval and early modern Ashkenazic responsa literature. This precedent points to the existence of a much more widespread Ashkenazic form of Hebrew dating back to the medieval period. Further investigation is required to establish the parameters and precise nature of this broader Ashkenazic variety of the language. Finally, occasional parallels with other partially documented forms of Hebrew, such as certain medieval Spanish varieties, and the writings of Ottoman and North African Judeo-Spanish speakers, suggest that some of these so-called nonstandard features may actually constitute much more widespread tendencies common to distinct varieties of Hebrew literature produced in diverse diaspora locations.

APPENDIX

This appendix contains further examples from the *Kitsur*, Hasidic Hebrew tale, and Maskilic Hebrew prose fiction of each morphosyntactic phenomenon discussed in the article.

1. PREPOSITIONS IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE DEFINITE ARTICLE

Kitsur

1. בקצה *be-ba-katzeb* “at the edge”;¹⁰⁰ cf. standard equivalent בקצה *ba-katzeb*
2. גם להסוס *gam le-ba-sus* “to the horse as well”;¹⁰¹ cf. standard equivalent לסוס *gam la-sus*
3. אם נשתמש תחלה בהכלי *im nisbtamesh tehilab be-ba-keli* “if he first used the

100. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 10.17.

101. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 87.3.

vessel”;¹⁰² cf. standard equivalent *im nishtamesh/ biishtamesh tehilah ba-keli*

4. *ve-shayakh le-ba-’ir* “and it belongs to the city”;¹⁰³ cf. standard equivalent *ve-shayakh la-’ir*

Hasidic Hebrew

1. *be-bayit ha-gadol* “in the big house”;¹⁰⁴ cf. standard equivalent *ba-bayit ha-gadol*
2. *u-ve-ba-derekh* “and on the road”;¹⁰⁵ cf. standard equivalent *u-va-derekh*
3. *be-ba-ḥeder* “in the room”;¹⁰⁶ cf. standard equivalent *ba-ḥeder*
4. *le-ba-tsoref* “to the silversmith”;¹⁰⁷ cf. standard equivalent *la-tsoref*

Maskilic Hebrew

1. *le-ba-batim* “to the houses”;¹⁰⁸ cf. standard equivalent *la-batim*
2. *rak tsiva le-ba-mesharet* “he just ordered the servant”;¹⁰⁹ cf. standard equivalent *rak tsiva la-mesharet*
3. *be-ba-shuk ha-gadol* “in the big marketplace”;¹¹⁰ cf. standard equivalent *ba-shuk ha-gadol*
4. *me-’ever le-ba-nabar* “on the other side of the river”¹¹¹; cf. standard equivalent *me-’ever la-nabar*

2. NONSTANDARD NOUN GENDER

2.1 Masculine singular nouns

2.1.1 Nouns ending in tav

Kitsur

1. *kutonet lavan* “a white garment”;¹¹² cf. standard equivalent *kutonet levana*

102. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 113.5.

103. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 92.1.

104. Israel Berger, *’Ezer orot* (Piotrkow, 1907; repr. in *Holy Books*, vol. 97, New York, 1996), 91.

105. Eliezer Brandwein, *Degel maḥane Yehuda* (Lemberg, 1912; repr. in *Holy Books*, vol. 31, New York, 1985), 18.

106. Shalom of Koidanov, *Divre shalom* (Vilna, 1882; repr. in *Holy Books*, vol. 34, New York, 1985), 20.

107. Isaac Singer, *Seve ratson* (Podgorze, 1900; repr. in *Holy Books from the Students of the Holy Ba’al Shem Tov of Eternal Memory*, vol. 31, New York, 1985), 5.

108. Schulman, *Mistere Pariz*, 3.

109. Sholem Jacob Abramowitz, *Limeḏu betev* (Warsaw, 1862; repr. with introd. by D. Miron, New York, 1969), 11.

110. Brandstädter, “Doktor Yosef Alfasi,” 663.

111. Abraham Ber Gottlob, “Orot me-’ofel,” *Ha-boker Or* 1.1–6 (1876): 17–31, 90–99, 158–73, 243–56, 302–9, 378–86, at 20.

112. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 155.4.

2. הדלת נפתחה *ba-ḏelet niṭṭaḥ* “the door opens”;¹¹³ cf. standard equivalent *ba-ḏelet niṭṭaḥat*
3. אם הפת גדול *im ba-pat gadol* “if the piece of bread is big”;¹¹⁴ cf. standard equivalent *im ba-pat gedolah*
4. מקום שהתחיל התולעת להתרקם *makom she-biṭḥil ba-tola‘at le-biṭrakem* “a place where the worm started to grow”;¹¹⁵ cf. standard equivalent *makom she-biṭḥilab ba-tola‘at le-biṭrakem*

Hasidic Hebrew

1. וצנצנת קטן *ve-tzintzenet katan* “and a small jar”;¹¹⁶ cf. standard equivalent *ve-tzintzenet ketanab*
2. הדלת הראשון *ba-ḏelet ba-rishon* “the first door”;¹¹⁷ cf. standard equivalent *ba-ḏelet ba-rishonab*
3. מחלוקת גדול *maḥloket gadol* “a big dispute”;¹¹⁸ cf. standard equivalent *maḥloket gedolah*
4. השבת הראשון *ba-shabat ba-rishon* “the first Sabbath”;¹¹⁹ cf. standard equivalent *ba-shabat ba-rishonab*

Maskilic Hebrew

1. בשבת הראשון *be-shabat/ba-shabat ba-rishon* “on the first Sabbath”;¹²⁰ cf. standard equivalent *ba-shabat ba-rishonab*
2. תועלת חומרית ומוסרית *to‘elet ḥomri u-musari* “a material and moral benefit”;¹²¹ cf. standard equivalent *to‘elet ḥomrit u-musarit*

2.1.2 Endless nouns

Kitsur

1. האש הטבעי *ba-‘esh ba-tiv‘iy* [sic] “the natural fire”;¹²² cf. standard equivalent *ba-‘esh ba-tiv‘it*

113. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 11.4.

114. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 40.1.

115. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 46.30.

116. Abraham Hayim Simhah Bunem Michelsohn, *Mekor ḥayim* (Bilgoray, 1912; repr. in *Holy Books*, vol. 30, New York, 1985), 53.

117. Sofer, *Sipure Ya‘akov*, 26.

118. Judah Aryeh Teomim Fraenkel, *Ohale shem* (Bilgoray, 1911; repr. in *Holy Books*, vol. 17, New York, 1984), 47.

119. Abraham Hayim Simhah Bunem Michelsohn, *Dover shalom* (Przemysl, 1910; repr. in *Holy Books*, vol. 30, New York, 1985), 153.

120. A. Y. Nisselowitz, “Ha-temura,” *Ha-karmel*, 2nd ser., 3.2–3 (1875): 82–91, 146–55, at 86.

121. Grigorii Bogrov, “Anashim shovavim,” *Ha-melits* 14.25–26 (1878): 507–12, 531–36, at 534.

122. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 32.2.

2. היד השני *ba-yaḏ ba-sbeni* “the second hand”;¹²³ cf. standard equivalent היד השני(ה) *ba-yaḏ ba-sbeniyah*

Hasidic Hebrew

1. בפעם הראשון *be-/ba-pa'am ba-rishon* “the first time”;¹²⁴ cf. standard equivalent בפעם הראשונה *ba-pa'am ba-rishonah*
 2. לעיר הסמוך *le-/la-'ir ba-samukh* “to the adjacent city”;¹²⁵ cf. standard equivalent לעיר הסמוכה *la-'ir ba-semukhab*

Maskilic Hebrew

1. בפעם האחרון *be-/ba-pa'am ba-'aḥaron* “the last time”;¹²⁶ cf. standard equivalent בפעם האחרונה *ba-pa'am ba-'aḥaronah*
 2. ובפעם השני *u-ve-/va-pa'am ba-sbeni* “and the second time”;¹²⁷ cf. standard equivalent ובפעם השני(ה) *u-va-pa'am ba-sbeniyah*

2.2 Feminine singular nouns

Kitsur

1. מראה אדמומית *mar'e admumit* “a reddish appearance”;¹²⁸ cf. standard equivalent מראה אדמומי *mar'e admumi*
 2. ואפילו השדה שייכה לעכו"ם *ve-'afilu ba-sadeh shayakhab le-'aku"m* “and even if the field belongs to an idolater”;¹²⁹ cf. standard equivalent ואפילו השדה שייכה לעכו"ם *ve-'afilu ba-sadeh shayakb le-'aku"m*
 3. צבע שחור [...] *tseva sheḥorah* “black colour”;¹³⁰ cf. standard equivalent צבע שחור *tseva shahor*
 4. שבוע הראשונה *shavua' ba-rishonah* “the first week”;¹³¹ cf. standard equivalent השבוע הראשון *ba-shavua' ba-rishon*
 5. אם אין בה חולי אחרת *im en ba ḥoli aḥeret* “if she has no other illness”;¹³² cf. standard equivalent אם אין בה חולי אחר *im en ba ḥoli aḥer*

Hasidic Hebrew

1. מחנה גדול *maḥane gedolab* “a big camp”;¹³³ cf. standard equivalent מחנה גדול *maḥane gadol*

123. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 40.10.

124. Heilmann, *Bet rebe*, 139.

125. Isaac Landau, *Zikaron tov* (Piotrkow, 1892; repr. in *Holy Books*, vol. 3, New York, 1984), 18.

126. Judah Isaac Leinwand, *'Ose mezimot*, part 1 (Lemberg, 1875), 42.

127. Schulman, *Mistere Pariz*, 41.

128. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 155.6.

129. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 167.3.

130. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 3.2.

131. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 197.2.

132. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 90.3.

133. Eliezer Dov Gemen, *Sifran shel tsadikim* (Warsaw, 1914; repr. in *Holy Books*, vol. 68, New York, 1988), 62.

2. לילה קרה עד מאוד *layla karab* 'ad me'od "a very cold night";¹³⁴ cf. standard equivalent לילה קר עד מאוד *layla kar* 'ad me'od
3. מעשה קטנה *ma'aseh ketanah* "a small story";¹³⁵ cf. standard equivalent מעשה קטן *ma'aseh katan*
4. הרגע האחרונה *ba-rega' ba-'aḥaronah* "the last moment";¹³⁶ cf. standard equivalent הרגע האחרון *ba-rega' ba-'aḥaron*
5. ויבך בכי רבה *va-yevk bekhi rabah* "and he wept greatly";¹³⁷ cf. standard equivalent ויבך בכי רב *va-yevk bekhi rav*

Maskilic Hebrew

1. כי מסוה הרחיצה מצלת על כלם *ki masveh ba-reḥitsab matselet 'al kulam* "for the veil of bathing covers them all in shadow";¹³⁸ cf. standard equivalent כי מסוה הרחיצה מצל על כלם *ki masveh ba-reḥitsab metsel 'al kulam*
2. כי גדלה שם מעשה הגנבה *ki gadlah sham ma'aseh ba-genevab* "for the act[s] of theft had increased there";¹³⁹ cf. standard equivalent כי גדל שם מעשה הגנבה *ki gadal sham ma'aseh ba-genevab*
3. וחצי הלילה השני *ve-ḥetsi ba-laylab ba-sheniyab* "and the second half of the night";¹⁴⁰ cf. standard equivalent וחצי הלילה השני *ve-ḥetsi ba-laylab ba-sheni*
4. במכסה עתיק לימים *be-mikhsab 'atikab le-yamim* "in an ancient cover";¹⁴¹ cf. standard equivalent במכסה עתיק לימים *be-mikhsab 'atik le-yamim*
5. ולא עליה שפכה הטבע רוח-ששון *ve-lo 'alehab shafkhab ba-teva' ruah-sason* "but nature did not pour its spirit of joy upon it";¹⁴² cf. standard equivalent ולא עליה שפך הטבע רוח-ששון *ve-lo 'alehab shafakh ba-teva' ruah-sason*
6. הטבע הנדיב *ba-teva' ba-neḏivab* "generous nature";¹⁴³ cf. standard equivalent הטבע הנדיב *ba-teva' ba-nadiv*

2.5 Masculine plural nouns

Kitsur

1. שלשה פעמים רצופים *sheloshab pe'amim retsufim* "three consecutive times";¹⁴⁴ cf. standard equivalent שלש פעמים רצופות *shalosh pe'amim retsufot*
2. מאבנים אחרים *me'avanim aḥerim* "from other stones";¹⁴⁵ cf. standard equivalent מאבנים אחרות *me'avanim aḥerot*

134. Hayim Lieberman, *Tseror ba-ḥayim* (Bilgoray, 1913; repr. in *Holy Books*, vol. 7, New York, 1983), 44.

135. Singer, *Seve ratson*, 8.

136. Zak, *Bet Yisra'el*, 16.

137. Solomon Zalman Breistein, *Siḥot ḥayim* (Piotrkow, 1914), 44.

138. Dick, "Ha-behala," 305.

139. Dick, "Ha-behala," 305.

140. Nahum Meir Sheikewitz, "Gemul akhzarim," *Ha-melits* 12.8–15 (1872): 59–60, 66–67, 73–74, 82–83, 98–99, 107, 115, at 74.

141. Sheikewitz, "Gemul akhzarim," 60.

142. Smolenskin, *Ha-gemul*, 7.

143. Mordechai David Brandstädter, "Me-ḥayil el ḥayil," *Ha-shaḥar* 9.7–12 (1878): 374–84, 431–39, 477–86, 548–58, 592–604, 643–55.

144. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 150.1.

145. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 11.10.

Hasidic Hebrew

1. רק לעתים רחוקים *rak le-’itim reḥokim* “except rarely”;¹⁴⁶ cf. standard equivalent רק לעתים רחוקות *rak le-’itim reḥokot*
2. אחת הערים הרחוקות *aḥat be-’arim ba-reḥokim* “one of the distant cities”;¹⁴⁷ cf. standard equivalent אחת הערים הרחוקות *aḥat be-’arim ba-reḥokot*

Maskilic Hebrew

1. המלים המעטים האלה *ba-milim ba-me’atim ba-’eleh* “these few words”;¹⁴⁸ cf. standard equivalent המלים המעטות האלה *ba-milim ba-me’atot ba-’eleh*
2. בעיניכם הלועגים *be-’enekhem ba-lo’agin* “with your mocking eyes”;¹⁴⁹ cf. standard equivalent בעיניכם הלועגות *be-’enekhem ba-lo’agot*
3. ביצים גדולים *betsim gedolim* “big eggs”;¹⁵⁰ cf. standard equivalent ביצים גדולות *betsim gedolot*
4. ברגליו האחוריים *be-raglav ba-’aḥaronim* “by its hind legs”;¹⁵¹ cf. standard equivalent ברגליו האחוריות *be-raglav ba-’aḥoriot*

2.4 Feminine plural nouns

Kitsur

1. סודות גדולים *sodot gedolot* “big secrets”;¹⁵² cf. standard equivalent סודות גדולות *sodot gedolim*
2. אפילו נרות דולקות *afilu nerot doleket* “even burning candles”;¹⁵³ cf. standard equivalent אפילו נרות דולקים *afilu nerot dolekim*
3. שמות קדושות *shemot kedushot* “holy names”;¹⁵⁴ cf. standard equivalent שמות קדושים *shemot kedushim*
4. קולות גדולות *kolot gedolot* “loud (lit: big) voices”;¹⁵⁵ cf. standard equivalent קולות גדולים *kolot gedolim*

Hasidic Hebrew

1. סודות נשגבות *sodot niṣgavot* “elevated secrets”;¹⁵⁶ cf. standard equivalent סודות נשגבים *sodot niṣgavim*
2. חלונות גדולות *ḥalonot gedolot* “big windows”;¹⁵⁷ cf. standard equivalent חלונות גדולים *ḥalonot gedolim*

146. Israel Moses Bromberg, *Toledot ha-nifla’ot* (Warsaw, 1899), 29.

147. Ehrmann, *Devarim ’arevim*, 19a.

148. Abramowitz, *Limedū betev*, 9.

149. Dick, *Ha-behala*, 312.

150. Brandstädter, “Doktor Yosef Alfasi,” 664.

151. Judah Leib Gordon, “Kave le-h’ ve-hu yoshi’a lekha,” *Ha-karmel*, 1st ser., 1.37 (1861): 298.

152. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 18.4.

153. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 85.12.

154. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 191.7.

155. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 15.4.

156. Berger, *’Ezer kedushot*, 18.

157. Michael Levi Frumkin Rodkinsohn, *Shivḥe ba-rav* (Lemberg, 1864), 5.

3. *u-shne nerot dolekot* “and two burning candles”;¹⁵⁸ cf. standard equivalent *u-shne nerot dolekim*
4. *regashot kedushot* “holy feelings”¹⁵⁹; cf. standard equivalent *regashot kedushim*

Maskilic Hebrew

1. *kol ba-zikbronot ba-atuvot* “all the sad memories”;¹⁶⁰ cf. standard equivalent *kol ba-zikbronot ba-atuvim*
2. *eshtonot ma'ativot* “saddening thoughts”;¹⁶¹ cf. standard equivalent *eshtonot ma'ativim*
3. *shene motot tsilinderiot* “two cylindrical rods”;¹⁶² cf. standard equivalent *shene motot tsilinderiyim*
4. *shte regashot mitnagedot isbab el re'utab* “two opposing feelings”;¹⁶³ cf. standard equivalent *shene regashot mitnagedim isb el re'ehu*

3. DEFINITE CONSTRUCT NOUNS

Kitsur

1. *ve-'asur lishmoa' ba-kele shir* “and it is forbidden to listen to the instruments”;¹⁶⁴ cf. standard equivalent *ve-'asur lishmoa' et kele ba-shir*
2. *ba-ba'ale dinim borerim labem anashim* “the litigants choose men for themselves”;¹⁶⁵ cf. standard equivalent *ba'ale din borerim labem anashim*
3. *ba-ba'al berit* “the father of a baby being circumcised (at a circumcision ceremony)”;¹⁶⁶ cf. standard equivalent *ba'al ba-berit*

Hasidic Hebrew

1. *ba-ba'al 'agalab* “the wagon driver”;¹⁶⁷ cf. standard equivalent *ba'al ba-'agalab*
2. *ba-yir'at shamayim* “the fear of heaven”¹⁶⁸; cf. standard equivalent *yir'at ba-shamayim*

158. Israel David Seuss, *Ma'asot me-ba-gedolim ve-ba-tsadikim* (Warsaw, 1890), 5.

159. Abraham Hayim Simhah Bunem Michelsohn, *Ateret Menahem* (Bilgoray, 1910; repr. in *Holy Books*, vol. 75, New York, 1989), 62.

160. Fuenn, “Ha-kadish li-fne Kol Nidre,” 224.

161. Bogrov, “*Anashim shovavim*,” 510.

162. Samuel Elijah Eisenstadt. “Neshikat melekch,” *Ha-melits* 10.33–34 (1870): 247–49, 255–56, at 247.

163. Abraham Jacob Brock, “*Hatan damim, o ketem ba-dam*,” *Ha-boker Or* 2.1–6 (1877): 41–48, 113–28, 221–36, 301–8, at 229.

164. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 64.7.

165. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 176.7.

166. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 22.6.

167. Berger, *Eser orot*, 88.

168. Bromberg, *Toledot ha-nifla'ot*, 35.

3. ארון הקודש *ba'aron kodesh* “the ark”;¹⁶⁹ cf. standard equivalent ארון הקודש *aron ba-kodesh*
4. בעל הבית *ba-ba'al bayit* “the house owner”;¹⁷⁰ cf. standard equivalent בעל הבית *ba'al ba-bayit*

Maskilic Hebrew

1. עצמות בעלי החיים *'atsmot ba-ba'ale hayim* “the animals’ bones”;¹⁷¹ cf. standard equivalent עצמות בעלי החיים *'atsmot ba'ale ba-hayim*
2. אחד הבעלי בתים *ahad ba-ba'ale batim* “one of the house owners”;¹⁷² cf. standard equivalent מבעלי הבית *ahad mi-ba'ale ba-bayit*
3. היין-שרף *ba-yayin saraf* “the intoxicating drink”;¹⁷³ cf. standard equivalent היין-שרף *yayin ba-saraf*
4. מכתבי עורך-דין *mikhteve ba-'orekh-din* “the lawyer’s letters”;¹⁷⁴ cf. standard equivalent מכתבי עורך הדין *mikhteve 'orekh ba-din*

4. DOUBLY DEFINITE CONSTRUCT CHAINS

Kitsur

1. הבית הכנסת *ba-bet ba-keneset* “the synagogue”;¹⁷⁵ cf. standard equivalent בית הכנסת *bet ba-keneset*
2. ירחיק את עצמו מן הארון הקודש *yarhik et 'atomo min ba-'aron ba-kodesh* “he must distance himself from the Torah ark”;¹⁷⁶ cf. standard equivalent ירחיק את עצמו מן ארון הקודש *yarhik et 'atomo min aron ba-kodesh*
3. [...] *ba-ba'al ba-bayit* “the owner of the house”;¹⁷⁷ cf. standard equivalent בעל הבית *ba'al ba-bayit*

Hasidic Hebrew

1. הצדיק הדור *ba-tzadik ba-dor* “the righteous man of the generation”;¹⁷⁸ cf. standard equivalent צדיק הדור *tzadik ba-dor*
2. הקריאת התורה *ba-keri'at ba-torah* “the Torah reading”;¹⁷⁹ cf. standard equivalent קריאת התורה *keri'at ba-torah*
3. להבית הכנסת *le-ba-bet ba-keneset* “to the synagogue”;¹⁸⁰ cf. standard equivalent לבית הכנסת *le-vet ba-keneset*

169. Jacob Kaidaner, *Sipure nora'im* (Lemberg, 1875; repr. in *Holy Books*, vol. 3, New York, 1981), 19b.

170. Menahem Mendel Bodek, *Seder ba-dorot mi-talmide ba-Besh"t za"l* (Lemberg, 1865), 36.

171. Nisselowitz, “Ha-temura,” 87.

172. Brandstädter, “Doktor Yosef Alfasi,” 665.

173. Gottlober, “Orot me-'ofel,” 20.

174. Leinwand, *Ose mezimot*, 19.

175. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 12.7.

176. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 97.7.

177. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 42.17.

178. Yo'ets Kim Kadish Rakats, *Tif'eret ba-yebudi*, 2 parts (Piotrkow, 1912; repr. in *Holy Books*, vol. 3, New York, 1984), 1:55.

179. Lieberman, *Tseror ba-hayim*, 44.

180. Gemen, *Sifran shel tzadikim*, 58.

Maskilic Hebrew

1. *ba-‘ir ba-birab* “the capital city”;¹⁸¹ cf. standard equivalent עיר הבירה *‘ir ba-birab*

5. SPLIT CONSTRUCT CHAINS

Kitsur

1. *be-‘asiyat ve-‘afiyat ba-matsot sbelo* “in the preparing and baking of his matzahs”;¹⁸² cf. standard equivalent בעשיית המצות שלו ובאפייתן *be-‘asiyat ba-matsot sbelo u-ve-‘afiyatan*

Hasidic Hebrew

1. *kedusbat ve-bafla’at rabenu* “the holiness and wonder of our Rebbe”;¹⁸³ cf. standard equivalent קדושת רבנו והפלאותו *kedusbat rabenu ve-bafla’ato*
2. *kaftore u-firbe kesef* “buttons and flowers of silver”;¹⁸⁴ cf. standard equivalent כסף ופרחי כסף *kaftore kesef u-firbe kesef*

Maskilic Hebrew

1. *tif’eret ve-badar ba-kiryab ba-‘alizab ba-zot* “the glory and splendour of this merry city”;¹⁸⁵ cf. standard equivalent תפארת הקריה העליונה הזאת *tif’eret ba-kiryab ba-‘alizab ba-zot ve-badarab*
2. *atsile ve-rozene erets* “the noblemen and rulers of the land”;¹⁸⁶ cf. standard equivalent אצילי ורוזניה הארץ *atsile ba-‘arets ve-rozenebab*

6. AVOIDANCE OF THE DUAL WITH
TIME WORDS AND NUMERALS*Kitsur*

1. *shte sha’ot* “two hours”;¹⁸⁷ cf. standard equivalent שתי שעות *sha’atayim*
2. *shene yamim* “two days”;¹⁸⁸ cf. standard equivalent יומי *yomayim*
3. *shte shanim* “two years”;¹⁸⁹ cf. standard equivalent שנתי *shenatayim*
4. *shene alafim* “two thousand”;¹⁹⁰ cf. standard equivalent אלפי *alpayim*

Hasidic Hebrew

1. *shene yamim* “two days”;¹⁹¹ cf. standard equivalent יומי *yomayim*
2. *shene me’ot* “two hundred”;¹⁹² cf. standard equivalent מאתי *matayim*

181. Nisselowitz, “Ha-temura,” 82.

182. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 107.14.

183. Michael Levi Frumkin Rodkinsohn, *‘Adat tsadikim* (Lemberg, 1865), 6.

184. Walden, *Kabal hasidim*, 16a.

185. Nisselowitz, “Ha-temura,” 86.

186. Brock, “Hatan damim,” 234.

187. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 69.2.

188. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 167.1.

189. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 168.1.

190. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 92.1.

191. Eliezer Shenkel, *Ma’asiyot peli’ot nora’im ve-nifla’im*, part 2 (Lemberg, 1883), 9.

192. Rakats, *Tif’eret ba-yebudi*, 2:17.

3. שבעה שבועות *shene shavu'ot* "two weeks";¹⁹³ cf. standard equivalent שבועי(ים) *shevu'ayim*
4. בשני חדשים *bi-shne ḥodashim* "in two months";¹⁹⁴ cf. standard equivalent בחדשי(ים) *be-ḥodshayim*

Maskilic Hebrew

1. שתי שעות *shte sha'ot* "two hours";¹⁹⁵ cf. standard equivalent שתי(ים) *sha'atayim*
2. ביותר משתי מאות וחמשים שנים *be-yoter mi-shte me'ot va-ḥamishim shanim* "more than two hundred and fifty years";¹⁹⁶ cf. standard equivalent ביותר ממאתים וחמשים שנים *be-yoter mi-ma'atayim va-ḥamishim shanim*
3. כשתי שנים *ki-shte shanim* "approximately two years";¹⁹⁷ cf. standard equivalent כשנתי(ים) *ki-shnatayim*
4. שתי פעמים *shte pe'amim* "two times";¹⁹⁸ cf. standard equivalent פעמי(ים) *pa'amayim*

7. SUPERLATIVE ADJECTIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

WITH יותר *YOTER**Kitsur*

1. בעת היותר סמוך לבין השמשות *be/ba-'et ba-yoter samukh le-ven ba-shemashot* "at the time closest to twilight"¹⁹⁹
2. מוהל וסנדק היותר טוב וצדיק *mohel ve-sandak ba-yoter tov ve-tzadik* "the best and most righteous mohel and godfather"²⁰⁰
3. כדי לעשות על צד היותר טוב *kede la'asot 'al tsad ba-yoter tov* "in order to err on the side of caution (lit: to do [something] on the best side)"²⁰¹

Hasidic Hebrew

1. נשמה גדולה מעולם היותר עליון *neshamah gedolah me'olam ba-yoter 'elyon* "a great soul from the highest world"²⁰²
2. הצדיק היותר גדול שבדור ההוא *ba-tzadik ba-yoter gadol she-ba-dor ba-hu* "the greatest righteous man in that generation"²⁰³
3. בעל דעה היותר גדול בעיר *ve-hu bay[ah] ba'al de'ab ba-yoter gadol ba-'ir* "and he was the most influential man in the city"²⁰⁴

193. Isaac Dov Hirsch, *Emunat tzadikim* (Warsaw, 1900; repr. in *Holy Books*, vol. 42, New York, 1985), 73.

194. Menahem Mendel Bodek, *Pe'er mi-kedoshim* (Lemberg, 1865), 4.

195. Smolenskin, preface, v–xxxii, xxix; Brandstädter, "Doktor Yosef Alfasi," 662.

196. Fuenn, "Ha-kadish li-fne Kol Nidre," 334.

197. Reuben Asher Braudes, "Ish ḥasid," *Ha-boker Or* 2.4–5 (1877): 189.

198. Gottlober, "Orot me-'ofel," 23.

199. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 155.2.

200. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 159.1.

201. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 48.6.

202. Bodek, *Seder ha-dorot*, 3.

203. Solomon Gabriel Rosenthal, *Tiferet ba-tzadikim* (Warsaw, 1909), 18.

204. Zak, *Bet Yisra'el*, 164.

Maskilic Hebrew

1. *az bayiti yoshev safun be/ba-bet marzeah ba-yoter nikbbad ba-'ir* "in that case I would sit in the most respectable inn in the town"²⁰⁵
2. *lamedu et yedekhem la'asok be/ba-misḥarim ba-yoter betuḥim me'eleh* "teach yourselves to engage in the most secure businesses of these"²⁰⁶
3. *ki baḥar be/ba'orah ba-yoter tov ve-yasbar* "for he had chosen the best and most honest path"²⁰⁷

8. MASCULINE NUMERALS IN CONJUNCTION WITH FEMININE NOUNS

Kitsur

1. שש ברכות *shishsh berakhot* "six blessings";²⁰⁸ cf. standard equivalent שש ברכות *shesh berakhot*
2. שנים עשר שעות *shenem 'asar sha'ot* "twelve hours";²⁰⁹ cf. standard equivalent שתיים עשרה שעות *shtem 'esreh sha'ot*
3. שלשה מצות *shelosh matzot* "three pieces of matzah";²¹⁰ cf. standard equivalent שלוש מצות *shalosh matzot*

Hasidic Hebrew

1. ושלושה בנות *u-shloshah banot* "and three daughters";²¹¹ cf. standard equivalent ושלוש בנות *ve-shalosh banot*
2. שבע מכות *shiv'ah makot* "seven plagues";²¹² cf. standard equivalent שבע מכות *sheva' makot*
3. בחמשה שעות *ba-ḥamishah sha'ot* "in five hours";²¹³ cf. standard equivalent בחמש שעות *be-ḥamesh sha'ot*

Maskilic Hebrew

1. שני עטרות כסף *shene 'atarot kesev* "two silver crowns";²¹⁴ cf. standard equivalent שתי עטרות כסף *shte 'atarot kesev*

205. Judah Leib Gordon, "Shene yamim ve-layla eḥad be-vet malon orḥim," in *'Olam ke-minhago* (Warsaw, 1874; repr. in *The Works of Judah Leib Gordon: Prose* [Hebrew; Tel Aviv, 1960]), 3.

206. Eisenstadt, "Neshikat melekh," 248.

207. Bogrov, "Anashim shovavim," 532.

208. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 145.1.

209. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 106.1.

210. Ganzfried, *Kitsur*, 115.8.

211. Israel Berger, *'Eser 'atarot* (Piotrkow, 1910; repr. in *Holy Books*, vol. 97, New York, 1996), 63.

212. Shalom Elijah Stamm, *Zekher tsadik* (Vilna, 1905; repr. in *Holy Books*, vol. 35, New York, 1986), 6.

213. Isaac Singer, *Pe'ulat ba-tsadikim*, 3 parts (Podgorze, 1900), 2:12.

214. L. Shapiro, "Ha-mistater," *Ha-karmel*, 2nd ser., 2.12 (1874): 572.

2. ארבעת השבתות האלה *arba'at ha-shabatot ha'eleh* "these four Sabbaths";²¹⁵ cf. standard equivalent ארבע השבתות האלה *arba' ha-shabatot ha'eleh*
3. שלש הנפשות האהובות *sheloshet ha-nefashot ha-abuvot* "the three beloved souls"²¹⁶; cf. standard equivalent שלש הנפשות האהובות *shelosb ha-nefashot ha-abuvot*

215. Leinwand, *Ose mezimot*, 42.

216. Fuenn, "Ha-kadish li-fne Kol Nidre," 279.