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Introduction

The Eastern European Hasidic Hebrew tale corpus is a large collection of hagiographic stories composed during the second half of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century by followers of the Hasidic spiritual movement in a region spread chiefly over parts of present-day Poland, Ukraine, Belarus, and Russia. The tales, which focus on the lives and works of the rebbes, or Hasidic spiritual leaders, provide an unparalleled linguistic insight into the Hebrew language from both synchronic and diachronic standpoints. Firstly, they offer a unique perspective on the nature of Hebrew in traditional Eastern European Jewish society in the pre-modern period because they constitute the sole extensive record of narrative and discursive language use from this setting. The tales are the product of a fascinating multilingual environment: the authors spoke Yiddish as their native vernacular, had been schooled from a very early age in the reading, writing, and recitation of a range of Biblical and post-Biblical Hebrew texts, were familiar with various Aramaic writings, and were surrounded by speakers of Slavic languages (typically Russian, Ukrainian, and Polish). Thus, examination of their work sheds light on the remarkable product of this unusual case of language contact. Secondly, the idiom of the tales plays a pivotal role in the historical development of Hebrew: it is one of the two chief narrative forms of the language, along with that employed by the Maskilim (adherents of the Jewish Enlightenment), which flourished immediately prior to and were in many ways the direct forerunners of the vernacularization project in Palestine beginning in the 1880s. Therefore, a thorough understanding of Hasidic Hebrew can help pinpoint ways in which this hitherto unexamined linguistic variety relates to and perhaps influenced contemporaneous and subsequent forms of Hebrew.

1.1 The Hasidic Hebrew Tale

Hasidic literature has come down to us in a variety of genres, of which the two dominant ones are a) homiletical (transcriptions of sermons delivered by the Hasidic masters) and b) narrative (tales by and about the Hasidic masters) (Gries 1992: 17–46). The narrative literature can be divided into three distinct categories. The first consists of the parables embedded within the homiletical writings. The earliest example of this is the 1780 volume Tole-
dot Yaʿaqov Yosef, with other such works appearing during the final decades of the eighteenth century and the early nineteenth century (Wineman 2001: xiii, xix). Such parables can be considered the nuclei of later, more expansive, Hasidic tales (Nigal 1999a: 312–314; 1999b: 356). The second, and most common, type of narrative literature consists of the hagiographic tales celebrating the lives of the Hasidic masters. The first collection of such tales is Shivḥe haBesht, a compilation of legends relating to the founder of Hasidism and his circle of associates first published at the end of 1814. The third category consists of tales composed by the Hasidic masters themselves. The earliest example of such a work is Sippure Maʿašiyot by Nahman of Braslav (1815). Some of these early tale collections exist in both Hebrew and Yiddish, and there is uncertainty regarding the initial language of composition. For example, Yaʿari (1963–1964: 261) argues that the original version of Shivḥe haBesht was Yiddish, while Mondshine (1982: 25, 40) contends that the Yiddish text was a translation of a Hebrew version that may have predated the published edition of 1814. Nahman of Braslav’s Sippure Maʿašiyot is noteworthy as it appears to be the only collection of Hasidic tales to be originally published in a bilingual Hebrew-Yiddish edition (see Werses 2005 and Glinert 2006: xvii–xviii for details).

After the appearance of Shivḥe haBesht and Sippure Maʿašiyot, there is a gap of fifty years before the publication of any further Hasidic Hebrew narrative literature. The reasons for this hiatus are unclear and have given rise to a number of scholarly speculations (Dan 1975: 189–195; Rapoport-Albert 1988: 498, 515). This interval ended in 1864 with the publication of Michael Levi Rodkinsohn’s Shivḥe haRav, which included tales about the Habad-Lubavitch spiritual leader Shneur Zalman of Liady and became a prominent model for other tale compilers (see Meir 2008 for details of Rodkinsohn’s life and work). In subsequent years this Hasidic narrative tale genre, particularly hagiographic literature, flourished and grew into a substantial corpus. The tales commonly focus on the lives and works of the rebbes and their followers; see Nigal (1981; 2008) and Dvir-Goldberg (2003) for detailed discussions of the topics and themes appearing in the collections. The bulk of Hasidic narrative literature most likely derives from tales that were passed down orally in Yiddish and translated into Hebrew only when committed to writing (Dvir-Goldberg 2003: 19). In many cases the origins and authors of the tale collections are unclear, as compilers often collected stories from a variety of unacknowledged oral and written sources and then presented them in their collections as if they were all the authentic utterances of venerable Hasidic elders (Gellman 2012: 92–93). While it is uncertain how many Hasidic followers read these published Hebrew tales in addition to hearing the oral Yiddish versions, the genre grew extremely popular dur-
ing the last few decades of the nineteenth century (see Rabin 1985: 14) and continued to proliferate into the twentieth century. However, with the mass Jewish emigration from Eastern Europe after the First World War the production centres of Hasidic narrative literature shifted to Palestine, North America, and beyond, becoming increasingly integrated with vernacularized Modern Hebrew. Therefore Eastern European Hasidic Hebrew narrative literature as a linguistic corpus is best defined as the texts published between 1864 and 1914, when the genre was contained within its formative geographical and historical setting.

1.2 Previous Scholarship on Hasidic Hebrew

Despite its great significance for Hebrew linguistic research, no thorough study of the grammar of the tales has ever been conducted. This neglect is rooted in the genre’s historical and sociolinguistic background. The Maskilic movement, which spread throughout Central and Eastern Europe during the nineteenth century, espoused a strongly anti-Hasidic ideology (see Patterson 1988: 66–78) and regarded the Hebrew employed by Hasidic writers as corrupt, ignorant, and ungrammatical. This attitude is exemplified in the Maskilic author Joseph Perl’s satirical epistolatory novels *Megalle Ṭemirin* (1819) and *Bohen Ṣaddiq* (1838), which were composed in an error-ridden style designed as a parody of the Hasidic Hebrew idiom (see Werses 1971: 9–45; Taylor 1997; and Frieden 2005 for discussion of Perl’s works). The Maskilic dislike of Hasidic Hebrew is rooted in their perception that the language was based primarily on Rabbinic Hebrew with admixtures of Aramaic, that it exhibited strong influence from the Yiddish vernacular, and that it was replete with deviations from biblical grammatical norms. The Maskilim viewed Aramaic-influenced post-Biblical Hebrew with disdain because they regarded it to be linguistically impure (Sáenz-Badillos 1993: 267) and because they associated it with Yiddish (Even-Zohar 1990: 112), which they felt to be a sign of ignorance and an impediment to the Jews’ enlightenment (Agmon-Fruchtman and Allon 1994: 17). By contrast, the Maskilim expressly attempted to base their own style on Biblical Hebrew, the form of the language that they perceived as the most pure and elevated (Agmon-Fruchtman and Allon 1994: 17).

The Maskilic perception of the language of the Hasidic Hebrew tale as a debased conglomeration of Aramaicized Rabbinic Hebrew and Yiddish undeserving of serious study was later adopted in academic circles and has remained largely unchallenged. Thus, over the years linguists and literary scholars have made references to the unlettered and corrupt nature of Hasidic Hebrew. For
example, Klausner (1952–1958: 2:309) expresses the view that the authors were ignorant of basic Hebrew grammar, while Rabin (2000: 80) describes the language as ‘utter lawlessness’, states that ‘distinctions of gender, conjugation, [and] sentence construction were completely obliterated’, and designates the tales as ‘sometimes nothing but Yiddish idioms with Hebrew words’. These (often very subjective) claims have never been substantiated by means of detailed linguistic analysis, and therefore the actual composition of Hasidic Hebrew has thus far remained unknown. Glinert (1987, 1996: 100, 2006) has been the only linguist to challenge these widespread scholarly generalizations, arguing that Eastern European Hasidic Hebrew should not be dismissed as unworthy of examination but rather should be acknowledged and studied as an important predecessor of vernacularized Israeli Hebrew. In keeping with this position, the present volume seeks to fill the lacuna in the literature by providing a thorough corpus-based grammatical analysis of narrative Hasidic Hebrew.

1.3 The Language of the Hasidic Hebrew Tales

Despite the impression given by the Maskilic and scholarly assumptions discussed above, the Hasidic Hebrew tale reflects a rich fusion of linguistic influences that combine to form a system which, though differing from the canonical forms of the language, constitute a cohesive and fully functional idiom.

Firstly, in contrast to the widespread belief that Hasidic Hebrew is primarily rabbinic-based, a substantial component of the tales’ morphosyntax is actually based on the biblical model. Characteristic biblical features in Hasidic Hebrew include (among others) the 3fp yiqṭol form, the wayyiqṭol and weqaṭal, the use of the unprefixed infinitive construct, and the particle הנה. This use of biblical forms is unsurprising given the central role of the Hebrew Bible in Jewish culture in general, including in Hasidism (albeit through the filter of rabbinic literature). Despite the Maskilic assertion that the Hasidic authors were ignorant of biblical grammar, they were clearly familiar with elements of the Hebrew Bible and its linguistic presence is very much in evidence throughout their work. As will be discussed in this volume, the selection of characteristically biblical forms and features may have been a technique designed (perhaps subconsciously) to lend an aura of gravitas to the tales by situating them linguistically within the venerable tradition of biblical historical narrative.

Secondly, in keeping with the Maskilic and scholarly perception, the rabbinic stratum of the language is also very much in evidence in Hasidic Hebrew.
Typically rabbinic features employed in the tales include periphrastic conjugations consisting of the root ה.י.ה 'be' + qoṭel; the plural suffix -ן, the reflexive pronoun -ני 'self'; and subordinators such as -ש and -שכ. However, these rabbinic forms often appear alongside, and are employed in free variation with, their biblical counterparts; moreover, in some cases the authors utilize forms based on a fusion of biblical and rabbinic precedent (e.g. the wayyiqṭol with post-biblical roots).

The authors' use of earlier Hebrew sources is not limited to the two canonical varieties of the language but rather encompasses medieval halakhic works and biblical commentaries such as those of Rashi and Abarbanel, early modern commentaries such as that of Moses Alshich, and responsa literature. In many cases, phenomena lacking clear precedent in biblical or rabbinic literature can be traced to these writings. Abarbanel and Alshich are particularly common sources of seemingly non-standard Hasidic Hebrew grammatical features, e.g. superlative constructions with רתוי meaning 'most', the use of the negatorבלא, and the compound subordinator -ש יני 'because'.

Similarly, Hasidic Hebrew grammar exhibits numerous elements that cannot be traced definitively to a widespread earlier form of the language but rather have identical counterparts in contemporaneous Maskilic Hebrew literature, e.g. the retention of the definite article following inseparable prepositions, the use of suffixed forms of הנה in conjunction with the infinitive construct, certain neologisms, and the technique of shibbuṣ (see Kahn 2012b for further details). Such resemblances are much more common than might be expected because, notwithstanding the Maskilic authors' overt antipathy towards the Hasidic movement, the two groups of authors actually had a great deal in common: they were all the products of traditional Eastern European Jewish society, spoke Yiddish as their native language, and had been trained in the same educational establishments, the cheder and yeshivah. Moreover, many Maskilim came from Hasidic backgrounds themselves. (See Werses 1990: 91–109 for details of the relationship between Hasidim and Maskilim in the mid-nineteenth century.) In addition, despite their aversion to Hasidism the Maskilim were often intimately versed in Hasidic literature. For example, as Rabin (1985: 20) points out, the popularity of Joseph Perl's mock-Hasidic satires is predicated upon his readers' familiarity with the subject of his parody. The existence of numerous shared Hasidic and Maskilic grammatical elements, and the attestation of similar features in other Ashkenazi Hebrew compositions such as responsa literature, hint at the existence of a much broader and as yet unexamined Eastern European Hebrew idiom.

Again in keeping with the Maskilic and scholarly assumption, the morphosyntax of the tales displays significant areas of influence from the authors'
Yiddish vernacular. This influence includes issues such as noun and pronoun gender, the use of the second person plural pronoun בֵּיתא ‘you’ as a polite singular form, and the prefixing of the definite article to construct nouns. In addition, certain aspects of Hasidic Hebrew grammar, e.g. the merging of the third person singular pronouns הוא and איה, are shaped by phonological factors rooted in the authors’ Yiddish and Ashkenazi Hebrew pronunciation. Moreover, Yiddish contributed a substantial lexical component to Hasidic Hebrew. The selection of Yiddish vocabulary is not haphazard but rather is typically restricted to terms denoting concrete, everyday objects, usually those lacking established Hebrew equivalents at the time of writing. Nevertheless, despite the prominence of Yiddish influence in the tales, they are not simply ‘Yiddish idioms with Hebrew words’ as Rabin suggested; rather, Yiddish comprises one of many elements in the complex linguistic mix that contributed to the tales.

Another Maskilic and scholarly assumption is that Aramaic occupies an important position in the tales’ linguistic makeup (see Rabin 1985: 20). Indeed, the authors’ familiarity with a range of Aramaic sources, particularly the Babylonian Talmud, is occasionally evident in the tales; however, contrary to expectations, traces of Aramaic are very minor, being restricted almost exclusively to the possessive prefix ד. The Aramaic lexical component is more prominent, but even there its scope is relatively narrow, being employed primarily with reference to abstract concepts from the theological, legal, and mystical domains. Interestingly, the tales reveal almost no direct grammatical or lexical influence from the Slavic languages in whose territory their authors lived (as opposed to Slavic features introduced into Hasidic Hebrew via Yiddish). This suggests a lack of linguistic contact between the Hasidic Hebrew authors and their Ukrainian-, Polish-, and Russian-speaking neighbours.

Although its legacy is sometimes more difficult to assess than its formative influences, some characteristic elements of Hasidic Hebrew resemble and thus may have contributed to aspects of revernacularized Israeli Hebrew. Such features include the use of הוּא with plural nouns meaning ‘some’, various issues concerning numeral syntax, and the use of the qaṭal as an aspect-neutral past tense. As Glinert (2006: xxviii) argues, the popularity of the Hasidic tales may have played a greater role than is traditionally recognized in paving the way for the revernacularization project by demonstrating that Hebrew was capable of rendering a wide variety of linguistic content in a manner accessible to the general population (in contrast to Maskilic Hebrew, which had a relatively restricted readership). Moreover, many Maskilim and former Hasidim were drawn to Zionism in the 1880s and 1890s and pioneered the revernacularization of Hebrew in Palestine (Klausner 1952–1958, 4:256–261, 6:74–99;
Mandel 1993). Perhaps even more significantly, the style of the tales is acknowledged to have influenced S.Y. Agnon and subsequent Israeli writers (Rabin 1985: 20). It is hence unsurprising that Hasidic Hebrew grammatical elements should have contributed to the development of the language of present-day Israel.

Examination of Hasidic Hebrew thus reveals that it is inadequate to describe the language simply as an erratic and ungrammatical melange of Rabbinic Hebrew, Aramaic, and Yiddish. Rather, it should more appropriately be acknowledged as a fascinating and important Eastern European variety of Hebrew that draws on a diverse range of biblical, rabbinic, medieval, and early modern forms of the language as well as on Yiddish and occasionally Aramaic, combining them in a cohesive and characteristic way. As such, it deserves consideration as a linguistic system in its own right. Proper comprehension of this idiom enriches not only our perspective on Hebrew in Eastern Europe immediately prior to the revernacularization period but also our understanding of the diachronic development of the language as a whole.

1.4 About This Grammar

1.4.1 Scope and Content
This volume is intended to serve as a reference grammar describing the characteristic phonological, orthographic, morphological, syntactic, and lexical features of Hasidic Hebrew narrative literature based on a corpus comprised of the major tale collections that appeared in print between 1864 and 1914. The works composed between 1780 and 1815 have been excluded because, although they served as a literary and linguistic model for the later texts, the fifty-year gap between them and the bulk of the literature is too great for them to be considered a cohesive unit. (Unsurprisingly, however, there are many resemblances between the two corpora, which will be examined in this volume when relevant; see also Glinert 2006 and Kahn 2011 for details of the grammar of the early Hasidic Hebrew tales.)

The grammar provides a description of the forms, structures, and usages that are widely distributed throughout the Hasidic Hebrew tale corpus and can be considered standard features of the language as a whole. Although there is some variation between authors, the majority of linguistic features addressed in this volume are common to most or all authors and therefore can be regarded as representative. Marginal elements appearing only in the works of a single author are not usually included, but certain important yet exceptional phenomena are examined and designated as such.
In addition, the grammar investigates the diverse linguistic influences that contributed to the development of these standard Hasidic Hebrew features. First and foremost, comparisons are drawn with earlier forms of Hebrew, including the language of the Hebrew Bible, the Mishnah, the Tosefta, and rabbinic midrashim, as well as a range of medieval and early modern varieties. Similarly, resemblances to contemporaneous Maskilic Hebrew literature and other non-Hasidic nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Hebrew writings from Eastern Europe are investigated. Parallels with Israeli Hebrew are likewise drawn in cases where Hasidic Hebrew phenomena may have contributed (sometimes in conjunction with their Maskilic Hebrew counterparts) to the development of the modern language. Non-Hebrew linguistic influences are also considered: chief among these is Yiddish, which, as discussed above, contributed in numerous ways to the tales’ morphosyntax and lexis; conversely, Aramaic features in the tales are minimal, but cases of Aramaic influence are examined where relevant and a section is devoted to the Aramaic lexical component. Likewise, grammatical and lexical elements stemming directly from Slavic languages are very rare, but occasionally the possibility of Slavic influence is addressed.

1.4.2 Presentation of Examples
The grammatical points presented in this grammar are drawn from a corpus of first editions or facsimilies thereof of 77 tale collections composed by 45 different Hasidic Hebrew authors. The texts range in size from several pages to more than two hundred. Many collections contain a mix of hagiographic tales and homiletic or legal material. In such cases the examples in this book are generally drawn from the hagiographic sections of the collections. Typically each example is attributed to only a single author; in the case of examples consisting of individual words and constructions these attributions are for illustrative purposes only, as most such examples are actually attested in the work of multiple additional authors which have not been cited due to space constraints. As a general rule copious examples are provided for characteristic Hasidic Hebrew phenomena that are unknown or rare in other forms of the language, whereas fewer examples are given for forms and constructions that are standard in other historical varieties of Hebrew as well.

A selection of sample texts from Rodkinsohn (1864b), Bodek (1865c), Shenkel (1883), Munk (1898), Bromberg (1899), Ehrmann (1903), and Sofer (1904) can be found at the end of the volume.

Glossaries of potentially unfamiliar names and vocabulary (i.e. terms deriving from Hebrew, Aramaic, and Yiddish; Eastern European place names; Ashkenazi personal names; and historical figures) appearing in the English transla-
tions of the examples are provided at the end of the volume after the selection of sample texts.

The spelling and punctuation of examples drawn from the Hasidic Hebrew tales has been retained, except that Rashi script has been converted into block script. Likewise, the spelling of Yiddish words is presented as it occurs in the text cited; when this deviates from Standard Yiddish orthography to an extent that may make identification difficult, the Standard Yiddish spelling has been provided as well. Where relevant to the discussion, transliteration is given for Yiddish vocabulary according to the standard YIVO convention.

Pagination conventions in the Hasidic Hebrew tales vary by text, as follows:

a) Some texts, e.g. Laufbahn (1914), are numbered by page in Arabic numerals (e.g. 1, 2, 3, 4, etc.).

b) A few, e.g. Moses of Kobrin (1910), Brandwein (1912), Duner (1912), Gemen (1914), Chikernik (1908) are numbered by page in Hebrew alphabetic numeral values.

c) Others, e.g. A. Walden (1860?), Kaidaner (1875), HaLevi (1907), Moses Leib of Sasov (1903), Ehrmann (1911) are numbered by folio with Hebrew alphabetic numerical values, with only the right side of each folio labelled (e.g. 8, 2, 1, 7, representing e.g. 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, etc.).

d) Still others employ a combination of Arabic numerals and Hebrew alphabetic symbols. These display further variation: in some such cases, e.g. Rodkinsohn (1864b), Singer (1900a), Shenkel (1903a, 1903b), Sofer (1904), Heilmann (1902) the right-hand pages are labelled with even Arabic numerals, e.g. 2, 4, 6, 8, etc. and the left-hand pages indicate the folio using the Hebrew alphabetic values (e.g. 8, 2, 1, 7).

e) In others, e.g. Bromberg (1899), Teomim Fraenkel (1911), Sobelman (1909/10), Michelsohn (1910b, 1910c, 1911), Berger (1906, 1910c), Hirsch (1900), Singer (1900b), Brill (1909), Jacob Isaac ben Asher of Przysucha (1908), Menahem Mendel of Rimanov (1908), Rosenthal (1909), Rapaport (1909), Rakats (1912) every page is labelled consecutively with Arabic numerals (e.g. 1, 2, 3, 4, etc.), while the left-hand pages additionally indicate the folio using the Hebrew alphabet (e.g. 1, 2, 3, 4, etc.).

f) Finally, some texts, e.g. Bodek (1865a), Ehrmann (1905), lack pagination altogether.

In this volume, the page references to works containing pagination are cited in the same format in which they appear in the original. However, texts labelled by folio with Hebrew alphabetic symbols have been converted to standard folio notation using Arabic numerals, e.g. 8 is represented as 1a or 1b. In the case of
texts employing both Arabic numerals and Hebrew folio notation, the Arabic numerals have been used (even if only every other page actually bears a number in the original).

In the case of texts lacking pagination, for citation purposes the pages have been numbered consecutively starting with the first page of the tales (excluding title pages, introductions, and other front matter).
CHAPTER 2

Phonology

The following is an outline of the Hasidic Hebrew tale authors' phonological system as reflected in their orthography. This system is consistent with the Ukrainian and Polish varieties of Ashkenazi Hebrew phonology as discussed in detail in U. Weinreich (1965) and Katz (1993). More specifically, it corresponds most closely to 'popular Ashkenazic' Hebrew, i.e. casual Yiddish-influenced Hebrew pronunciation, in contrast to 'formal Ashkenazic', the pronunciation used for Torah recitation and in other ritualized settings (see Katz 1993: 76–78 for details). While this volume does not provide an in-depth discussion of Hasidic Hebrew phonology, in subsequent sections it will address those aspects that have a direct relationship with the tales' orthography and morphosyntax.

2.1 Consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dental/ Palato-</th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>Labiodental</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Uvular</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stops</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiceless</td>
<td>ב פ</td>
<td>ג ק ה</td>
<td>ד ר ש צ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced</td>
<td>ב ד</td>
<td>ג כ ק</td>
<td>ד ר ש צ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fricatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiceless</td>
<td>פ ס ש צ</td>
<td>ה ר ש צ</td>
<td>ד ר ש צ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced</td>
<td>ב ו וי</td>
<td>ג ו ג ו ג ו</td>
<td>ד ר ש צ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affricates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiceless</td>
<td>צ צ צ צ</td>
<td>ג ג ג ג ג ג</td>
<td>ד ר ש צ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced</td>
<td>צ צ צ צ</td>
<td>ג ג ג ג ג ג</td>
<td>ד ר ש צ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nasals</strong></td>
<td>מ נ</td>
<td>נ נ נ נ נ נ</td>
<td>ד ר ש צ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approximants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ל י ע י ב</td>
<td>י י י י ב</td>
<td>ד ר ש צ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes:

– The voiced palato-alveolar fricative [ʒ] and the voiceless alveolar and palato-alveolar affricates [ts] and [tʃ] are found only in Yiddish loanwords and proper nouns (see 3.5.1 for details).
– ר may be realized as an alveolar trill [r] or tap [ɾ] or a uvular trill [ʀ] in addition to a voiced uvular fricative [ʁ] depending on each individual author's variety of spoken Yiddish (and by extension Hebrew).

2.2 Vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monophthongs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diphthongs

| ej | ě, ě, ě, ě, ě |
| aj | ě, ě |
| əj | ě, ě |

Notes:

– Stress is typically on the penult.
– Unstressed ı, ě, ą, and ě are all realized as [ø].
– ŏ and ą are pronounced as [œj] in Southeastern (Ukrainian/Bessarabian/Romanian) and Mideastern (Polish) Yiddish and Ashkenazi Hebrew and Yiddish, but [ej] in Northeastern (Lithuanian/Latvian/Belarussian) Yiddish and Ashkenazi Hebrew (see Katz 1993: 51 for details).

Vocalization markers are only rarely indicated in the Hasidic Hebrew tales, but when attested are pronounced as follows:
### Phonology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long (stressed)</th>
<th>Short (stressed)</th>
<th>Reduced (stressed)</th>
<th>With mater lectionis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נ - א, ע</td>
<td>נ - או</td>
<td>נ - או</td>
<td>נ - או</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נ - א</td>
<td>נ - א</td>
<td>נ - א</td>
<td>נ - א</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נ - א</td>
<td>נ - א</td>
<td>נ - א</td>
<td>נ - א</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נ - או, או, או</td>
<td>נ - או</td>
<td>נ - או</td>
<td>נ - או</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נ - או, או, או</td>
<td>נ - או, או, או</td>
<td>נ - או, או, או</td>
<td>נ - או, או, או</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

- The pronunciation of נ, נ, נ, נ, נ, נ varies according to region; see U. Weinreich (1965), Altbauer (1968), and Katz (1993) for details.
- Vocalization markers in unstressed syllables typically indicate a pronunciation of [ə].

See sections 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5.2 for further details of the orthographic conventions relating to Hasidic Hebrew vowels and diphthongs.
Orthography

The Hasidic Hebrew tale does not deviate markedly from the orthographic norms of other widespread written forms of the language; however, it does display a number of characteristic or non-standard conventions, to be discussed below.

3.1 Script

The Hasidic Hebrew tales exhibit a mixture of block and Rashi script. The main typographical conventions are as follows:

a) Some tale collections, e.g. Bodek (1865a), Bromberg (1899), Shenkel (1903), Zak (1912), Ehrmann (1903), Laufbahn (1914), Singer (1900a), M. Walden (1914) are printed wholly in block script.

b) Some collections, e.g. Kaidaner (1875), Munk (1898), Duner (1899), Sofer (1904), Sobelman (1909/10), Berger (1906, 1907, 1910), Shenkel (1896) are printed almost completely in Rashi script, with only titles, major section headings, and the initial word of new sections appearing in block script. Bodek (1866), Lieberson (1913), HaLevi (1909), N. Duner (1899), Rosenthal (1909), Rapaport (1909), Rakats (1912) are printed according to similar conventions, except that sometimes proper names and occasionally dates within the body of the text are also set in block script. Rashi script is never used for titles or section headings in any tale collection. In most collections that are wholly in block script headings and sometimes proper names are printed in bigger font, e.g. Zak (1912), Ehrmann (1903).

c) Some collections, e.g. Rodkinsohn (1864, 1865), Bodek (1865), Yellin (1913) are printed in a mix of Rashi and block script, with the two alternating in an apparently arbitrary manner (e.g. some tales or parts of tales may appear in block script while others appear in block script, with no clear stylistic motivation for the difference).
3.2 Omission of Final Letter(s)

The Hasidic Hebrew authors frequently drop the final letter of words and indicate the omission by a single apostrophe. ה is the letter most commonly omitted in this way, e.g.:

– ‘it was’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911b: 14)
– ‘a great war’ (A. Walden 1860?: 2a)
– ‘he will’ (Munk 1898: 52)
– ‘eating and drinking’ (Brandwein 1912: 31)
– ‘the ship’ (Michelsohn 1912: 63)
– ‘proof’ (Zak 1912: 29)

However, other letters may be omitted as well. This usually affects ש and (less frequently) ת, usually as the last consonant of plural suffixes, as below:

Omitted ש

– ‘occasions’ (Bodek 1865c: 12)
– ‘robbers’ (Ehrmann 1903: 6a)
– ‘big’ (Laufbahn 1914: 45)
– ‘the trustworthy witnesses’ (N. Duner 1899: 83)
– ‘they say’ (Stamm 1905: 5)
– ‘in the eyes’ (Brandwein 1912: 36)
– ‘holy ones’ (Michelsohn 1912: 29)

Omitted ת

– ‘redemptions’ (Sofer 1904: 20)
– ‘thoughts’ (Brandwein 1912: 10)
– ‘at a Purim feast’ (Lieberson 1913: 53)
– ‘to do’ (Shenkel 1903b: 11)

It is only rarely attested with other consonants, e.g.:

– ‘near’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 12)
– ‘his fingers’ (Zak 1912: 39)

There is a similar practice whereby an entire word is abbreviated to the first, or sometimes first few, consonants. This is particularly common with the words
‘rabbī’, ‘rebbe’, ‘Mr’; קדוש ‘holy’; and חדא/תחא ‘one’, ‘a’, as in the first four examples below. This convention is not limited to the Hasidic tales but is found in many earlier types of Hebrew texts with which the authors would have been familiar, e.g. responsa literature.

– רб תוקדוש רבא = (רב) ‘the holy Rabbi R. Asher’ (Gemen 1914: 77)
– שודק רב = (רב) ‘that holy Rebbe’ (Lieberson 1913: 7)
– ‘אריבג = (דחא) ‘a rich man’ (Kaidaner 1875: 11b)
– אנליוומגא = (ןואגה) ‘the Vilna Gaon’ (Sofer 1904: 6)
– ‘פ = (השרפ) ‘weekly Torah portion’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 36–37)
– ‘יחב = (הניחב) ‘regard’ (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 1)

The motivation for this practice varies from case to case. The frequent omission of final י following ב may be due to a reluctance to avoid the resulting combination הכנ as this comprises a form of the Divine Name (see Suriano 2013 for discussion of this issue in Jewish tradition); however, the omission is very inconsistent, which means that this was not a universal concern if it indeed played any role. Likewise, the practice does not seem to be attributable to the need to conserve printing space, as the omitted letters appear in various locations within the texts and not necessarily at the end of a line where space considerations would be most likely to prompt such a technique. However, it may be due to other typesetting issues such as a shortage of certain letters (e.g. the frequently used ב and י) on a single typeset page.

3.3 Plene and Defective Spelling

3.3.1 Plene Spelling

The Hasidic Hebrew tales typically employ plene spelling with both matres lectionis ּ and י, e.g.:

With ּ

– אמא ‘them’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 17)
– מולבש ‘clothed’ (Hirsch 1900: 48)

1 ל"נה literally means ‘aforementioned’; see 5.5.2.1.4 for discussion.
3.3.2 Defective Spelling

Orthography

With ־:

– ‘him’ (Munk 1898: 82)
– ‘the table’ (Stamm 1905: 18)
– ‘standing’ (Brandwein 1912: 18)
– ‘in their power’ (Lieberson 1913: 48)

– ‘fifth’ (HaLevi 1909: 53)
– ‘kiddush’ (Gemen 1914: 67)
– ‘and he blessed’ (Brandwein 1912: 17)
– ‘the dirt’ (Lieberson 1913: 61)
– ‘the reincarnated soul’ (Sofer 1904: 5)
– ‘arranged match’ (Michelsohn 1912: 25)

The preference for plene spelling typically extends to the use of ־ to represent [i] in closed syllables, e.g.:

– ‘he refused’ (N. Duner 1912: 2)
– ‘to forgive’ (Breitstein 1914: 16)
– ‘to lie down’ (Shenkel 1883, pt. 1: 10)
– ‘your end’ (Michelsohn 1912: 86)
– ‘to approach’ (Rosenthal 1909: 45)
– ‘it was given’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 42)
– ‘he commanded’ (Bodek 1865a: 11)

This tendency often includes the practice of using ־ to represent qames ِ ِhaṭuf, e.g.:

– ‘when he heard’ (Bodek 1865c: 19)
– ‘to endure him/it’ (Singer 1900a, pt. 1: 8)
– ‘to bother him’ (Breitstein 1914: 7)
– ‘to sell it’ (Yellin 1913: 5)
– ‘to block him’ (Munk 1898: 35)

3.3.2 Defective Spelling

Although plene spelling is the norm in the Hasidic Hebrew tale, defective spelling is also attested. In most cases the selection of a defective variant is sporadic and does not seem to be subject to rules or patterns, as in the following cases, which may be spelt plene elsewhere in the tales:
The interchangeable nature of the plene and defective spelling is illustrated in the following examples, in which both variants appear on the same page of a single text:

- לע הלע(ו)ת 'on the table' (Laufbahn 1914: 48); cf. על הלע(ו)ת 'on the table' (Laufbahn 1914: 48)
- הליגמה 'the Scroll of Esther' (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 24); cf. הלגמה 'the Scroll of Esther' (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 24)

Although sometimes spelt plene, as shown above, suffixed qal infinitives construct comparatively often appear in their defective form, as below. The two alternatives are employed in free variation.

- בנסע 'when they travelled' (Sofer 1904: 6)
- בנסעה 'while they were standing' (Rodkinsohn 1865: 12)
- בא鼩 'when he heard' (Rosenthal 1909: 14)
- בא鼩ת 'when he opened' (Michelsohn 1910b: 36–37)
- בא遒 'when he was travelling' (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 1412)

Only the following two words are relatively consistently spelt defectively:

- אנכי 'I' (Zak 1912: 19)
- אש 'a woman' (Stamm 1905: 5)

---

2 Two consecutive pages in this text are both numbered 14.
In the case of the defective spelling is likely due to the fact that this is a characteristically biblical word and is spelt defectively in the Bible. Nevertheless, even this is spelt plene on rare occasions, e.g.:

- אנכי (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 39)

3.3.3 **Representation of** [v]

Double י is commonly employed to represent [v], e.g.:

- לוז ‘to accompany’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 25)
- י’e they will be saved’ (Bodek 1865c: 5)
- יוחנן ‘senior’ (Berger 1910a: 67)
- ייחור ‘with arguments’ (Hirsch 1900: 17)
- יבואר ‘of course’ (Sofer 1904: 41)
- י Euros ‘confession’ (Stamm 1905: 29)
- יים ‘precisely’ (Lieberson 1913: 46)
- ילחו ‘the loan’ (Michelsohn 1912: 26)

The single variant is not as frequently attested but is not rare, e.g.:

- יב ‘certainly’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 4)
- ייח ‘they became pale’ (Zak 1912: 159)
- ייח ‘to the ritual bath’ (Gemen 1914: 90)
- יחל ‘and [they] earn’ (Sofer 1904: 29)
- ילחו ‘to the ritual bath’ (Lieberson 1913: 46)
- ייח ‘he meant’ (Breitstein 1914: 11)

The authors treat the plene and defective variants as interchangeable, as evidenced by the fact that they sometimes employ both of them in close proximity to each other, e.g.:

- ייח ‘and ritual baths’ (J. Duner 1899: 69); cf. ייח ‘the ritual baths’ (J. Duner 1899: 69)
- ייח ‘of course’ (Sofer 1904: 41); cf. ייח ‘of course’ (Sofer 1904: 1)

3.3.4 **Representation of** [j]

Double י is frequently used to represent [j] within a word, e.g.:

- ייח ‘that they should appease’ (Gemen 1914: 55)
- ייח ‘from villages’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 4)
Much more rarely, a single י is attested, e.g.:

- הבכיה 'with weeping' (Gemen 1914: 84)
- מהיה 'merit' (Jacob Isaac ben Asher of Przysucha 1908: 60)
- לייחד 'to unite' (Sofer 1904: 2)

3.4 Non-Standard Use of matres lectionis

The Hasidic Hebrew tales exhibit some non-standard and unprecedented use of matres lectionis, particularly relating to ה and י, as detailed below.

3.4.1 Non-Standard Use of י

The mater lectionis י is very frequently used to represent şere in stressed syllables in cases where canonical varieties of Hebrew would not typically exhibit such a spelling. The motivation for this practice is likely rooted in phonological considerations: as the vowel şere and the combination şere plus mater lectionis י in stressed open syllables are both pronounced identically in Ashkenazi Hebrew (typically as the diphthong [ej] or [aj]), the authors most likely made no distinction between these two spellings and inserted the י in the case of singular nouns on analogy with other Hebrew words in which şere is conventionally followed by י, e.g. the masculine plural construct form. This phenomenon extends to nouns, adjectives, possessive and object suffixes, and verbs.

In some cases, particularly in nouns, there is precedent for these forms in rabbinic literature (chiefly the Tosefta, midrashim, and the two Talmuds), as shown below. Nevertheless, even in these instances in the rabbinic texts the plene forms are much less common than the defective ones, whereas in the Hasidic Hebrew tales the variants with י are the norm. For example, in the Mishnah, Tosefta, Talmuds, and midrashim the form ינקזה 'old woman' appears more than five times more frequently than the variant יניקזה, while conversely in Hasidic Hebrew יניקזה is relatively standard, as shown in the first example below.

- ינקזה 'the old woman' (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 8)
- ירדשת 'slumber' (Ehrmann 1903: 3b)
- יברוד 'your companion' (Bodek 1865c: 12)
The use of non-standard \( \text{-י} \) is particularly common before possessive and object suffixes. It is almost universal on singular nouns and prepositions with a 1cp suffix, as in the first four examples below. It is also frequently attested on verbs with 1cp and 3ms object suffixes, as in the last two examples. In this respect the authors' phonological motivation is likely to have been reinforced by the fact that plural nouns with a possessive suffix contain a \( \text{-י} \) in the canonical forms of the language.

In some instances this Hasidic Hebrew use of extra *matres lectionis* seems to reflect the authors' non-standard pronunciation of the words in question. The plural form \( \text{םיציפח} \) ‘things’ (shown in the first example below), which is commonly attested in Hasidic Hebrew instead of the canonical variant \( \text{םיצפח} \), is a case in point. The presence of the non-standard \( \text{-י} \) in the second syllable suggests that the authors pronounced the word as if the defective form were pointed \( \text{םיִצֵפֲח} \), with a *ṣere* pointing the second syllable (perhaps on analogy with other plural nouns such as \( \text{םירבח} \)) instead of \( \text{םיִצָפֲח} \), with a *qames*. Significantly, this Hasidic Hebrew variant corresponds precisely to and therefore is most likely based directly on Yiddish, in which the same word is pronounced *khfeysim*.

Similarly, the second example reflects a non-standard pronunciation [jəʃenə], possibly formed on analogy with the much more common form לְנֵקְז, which itself reflects the Ashkenazi Hebrew pronunciation of the standard vocalization הָנֵקְז. A related phenomenon is illustrated in the third example: the form מִניָקְז ‘from your elder’ seems to reflect paradigm levelling, whereby the standard
reduction of sere to patah in the second syllable of suffixed forms of the noun Viện seen in many other forms of the language does not take place in Hasidic Hebrew.

- תפיטים ‘things’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 8)
- שעינה ‘old (fs)’ (N. Duner 1912: 18)
- מכינים ‘from your elder’ (Ehrmann 1903: 19b)

While this tendency is widely visible throughout the Hasidic Hebrew tale corpus, it is not universal. The authors seem to have regarded the two variants as interchangeable, as evidenced by the fact that they may employ both of them in close proximity to each other, e.g.:

- אנשי שולמה ‘our benefactors’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 14); cf. ונימולשישנא (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 14)

Although non-standard use of י is most typically restricted to nouns, adjectives, and possessive or object suffixes, in some cases the same phenomenon is exhibited in verbal forms as well. As in the case of nouns and suffixes, the use of the non-standard mater lectionis in verbs serves to represent the vowel sere. This is illustrated in the following verbal forms:

- ווהיתו ‘and it buzzed’ (Kaidaner 1875: 10b); cf. ותות (Ruth 1:19)
- ויצי ‘they will protect’ (Ehrmann 1903: 16b)
- ומקסריס ‘prosecutors’ (Lieberson 1913: 50)
- ויקרט ‘they persecute’ (J. Duner 1899: 31)

By contrast, י is not used to represent sere in closed, unstressed syllables as the authors would have pronounced this as [ə] rather than as [ej] or [aj]; for example, the unsuffixed singular form of e.g. הביצהיר ‘in my courtyard’ is יברצו ‘in a courtyard’ (Kaidaner 1875: 46a).

These non-standard uses of י constitute one of many aspects of the orthography, morphology, syntax, and lexis of the Hasidic Hebrew tales in which the authors’ understanding and use of written Hebrew was mediated to a considerable extent through their vernacular rather than solely through other Hebrew texts. This principle will be discussed further throughout this volume.

3.4.2 Interchangeability of י and ו

Sometimes the Hasidic Hebrew authors employ the mater lectionis ו in unstressed final syllables wherein one would expect to find י, and vice-versa,
as illustrated below. This interchangeability of א and י is rooted in phonological considerations: in the authors' Polish and Ukrainian ‘popular Ashkenazi’ Hebrew pronunciation (as discussed in Katz 1993: 76–78), the unstressed shureq and hireq would both have been pronounced as [ə] (U. Weinreich 1965: 43). Similarly, stressed shureq was typically fronted to [i] (Katz 1993: 65, 68; see also M. Weinreich 1973, 2: 370–371). This phenomenon is most likely traceable to pre-standardized Yiddish orthographic practice, in which fluctuation between א and י in unstressed final syllables is likewise attested (Kerler 1999: 150).

א instead of י

– אליהו הנבואה (הנביא) ‘the prophet Elijah’ (Munk 1898: 31)
– תלמידו המובח (התلمוד), ‘an outstanding student’ (Bodek 1865a: 66; Laufbahn 1914: 48)
– טומא את תלמידו ()”the students of the Rebbe’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 37)
– יליד = יליד (’to the fair’ (Zak 1912: 9)

י instead of א

– הרופה (הרופה) ‘medicine’ (Ehrmann 1903: 6b)
– מליח (מליח) ‘salted fish’; ‘herring’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 39)
– מנעה (מנעה) ‘they stole the merchandise from his shop’ (M. Walden 1914: 59)
– זק ונתני פנים (’elderly and distinguished’ (HaLevi 1907: 22a)

The same phenomenon is seen in the spelling of Eastern European place names (see 3.5.2.5) and also has an influence on certain Hasidic Hebrew grammatical issues such as noun gender (see 4.1).

3.4.3 **Non-Standard Use of א to Represent qameṣ**

The influence of Ashkenazi Hebrew and Yiddish on the authors' use of vowels extends to the use of א to represent qameṣ. This occurs in penultimate syllables that would have been stressed in their pronunciation, reflecting the underlying realization of qameṣ as [כ or כ]. The phenomenon is illustrated below:

–ו אובנהוהילא = איבנה (’the prophet Elijah’ (Munk 1898: 31)
– והבומדומלת = דימלת (’an outstanding student’ (Bodek 1865a: 66; Laufbahn 1914: 48)
– ודומלתולרמאו = ודימלת (’and his student said to him’ (Moses Leib of Sasov 1903: 34a)
– יבראידומלת = יידימלת (’the students of the Rebbe’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 37)
– דיריל = דיריל (’to the fair’ (Zak 1912: 9)

– יפרת = הפורת ‘medicine’ (Ehrmann 1903: 6b)
– חילםגד = חילם ‘salted fish’; ‘herring’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 39)
– והינחמהרוחסוהובנג = והונחמ ‘they stole the merchandise from his shop’ (M. Walden 1914: 59)
– אושנ = אושנ ‘elderly and distinguished’ (HaLevi 1907: 22a)
3.5 Spelling of Eastern European Proper Nouns and Loanwords

Hasidic Hebrew orthographic conventions relating to the representation of proper nouns rooted in the authors' Eastern European surroundings (i.e. geographical locations and personal names deriving from them) as well as of Yiddish loanwords are not completely standardized, but generally conform to a number of common patterns. Most of these orthographic tendencies reflect direct influence from contemporaneous Yiddish spelling, which is logical given that the names in question are embedded in a Yiddish-speaking context.

3.5.1 Consonants

3.5.1.1 [f]
The voiceless labio-dental fricative [f] appearing at the beginning of words is represented by פ, as in Yiddish. This is illustrated below. In most cases no orthographic distinction is made between פ representing [p] and [f], but in certain texts (primarily Ehrmann's) [f] in word-initial position is indicated by the diacritical mark רafe, as in the final example.

– Freydke' (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 41)
– מפרדנקו (Hirsch 1900: 42)
– ‘Fishl' (Sofer 1904: 41)
– פּייבל 'Faivel' (Ehrmann 1903: 8a)

3.5.1.2 [v]
The voiced labio-dental fricative [v] is typically represented by the combination ו, as in Yiddish, e.g.:

– ‘Vitebsk' (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 5)
– 'from Piotrkow' (Bromberg 1899: 43)
– ‘from Dubrovno' (Kaidaner 1875: 25a)
– 'from Kishinev' (Lieberson 1913: 48)
– ‘in Vienna' (Sofer 1904: 39)
– ‘in Warsaw' (Teomim Fraenkel 1911b: 19)
– ‘Vizhnitz' (Michelsohn 1912: 145)
– ‘in Vilna' (Sofer 1904: 5)
Rarely only one \( v \) is used, e.g.:

- ‘Vilna’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 6)
- ‘Koidanov’ (Shalom of Koidanov 1882: 14)

Moreover, in word-final position \( b \) is often used instead of \( v \), e.g.:

- מתפרקב \( ‘Piotrkow’ \) (Bromberg 1899: 35)
- ‘to Zolochiv’ \( \) (Brandwein 1912: 4)
- בבאראנדשון \( ‘in Barditchev’ \) (Lieberson 1913: 39)
- ‘from Ziditchov’ \( \) (Munk 1898: 3)
- ברארדשון \( ‘Barditchev’ \) (Ehrmann 1911: 8b)
- מברצלזון \( ‘of Blendow’ \) (Breitstein 1914: 15)
- ‘to Rimanov’ \( \) (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 141³)

Only very rarely is \([v]\) represented by \( b \) in word-medial position, e.g.:

- ‘Lvov’ \( \) (Shenkel 1903b: 3)

3.5.1.3 \([t]\)

The voiceless alveolar stop \([t]\) is invariably represented by \( t \), e.g.:

- ובטאראנימאל \( ‘and in Tarnipol’ \) (Sofer 1904: 38)
- ‘Vitebsk’ \( \) (Kaidaner 1875: 34b)
- טוטיש \( ‘Tuchyn’ \) (Hirsch 1900: 32)
- טתרטנ쁜 \( ‘Stratyn’ \) (Brandwein 1912: 8)
- מטמטנבן \( ‘from Satanov’ \) (Lieberson 1913: 41)

3.5.1.4 \([k]\)

The voiceless velar stop \([k]\) is invariably represented by \( k \), e.g.:

- ווטאטס \( ‘Vitebsk’ \) (Kaidaner 1875: 34b)
- ‘from Kishinev’ \( \) (Lieberson 1913: 48)
- מוקומק \( ‘from Munkacs’ \) (Michelsohn 1912: 71)
- ‘to Kamianets’ \( \) (Munk 1898: 21)
- ‘of Kotzk’ \( \) (M. Walden 1914: 14)

³ Two consecutive pages in this text are both numbered 14.
3.5.1.5 [s]
The voiceless alveolar sibilant [s] is almost invariably represented by ש in the spelling of proper names, but on rare occasions ת (the unpointed equivalent of ש as opposed to ת) is used instead, as below. This convention has precedent in Yiddish orthography prior to the YIVO standardization (see Kerler 1999: 66, 118).

– ’R. Shlomo Rafaels’ (Kaidaner 1875: 40a)
– ‘to Nikolsburg’ (Munk 1898: 34)
– ‘in Pressburg’ (Michelsohn 1910b: 133)

3.5.1.6 [ʃ]
A similarly marginal converse phenomenon is attested whereby ש is used to represent [ʃ], as below. The origins of this practice are unclear, though it could theoretically be a reflection of German orthography whereby [ʃ] preceding a consonant is routinely spelled with s.

– ’Shpoler’ (Bodek 1866: 39)

In rare cases the representation of [ʃ] may be influenced by Polish orthography. Thus, while the name Zusha (Meshullam Zusha of Hanipoli) is often spelt צושה (e.g. Kaidaner 1875: 48b) or צוש (e.g. Sofer 1904: 12), it may sometimes be spelt צוש (e.g. Munk 1898: 2; Lieberson 1913: 64; Ehrmann 1903: 15a; N. Duner 1912: 4; Menahem Mendel of Rimanov 1908: 22) with the consonant combination ש indicating [ʃ] instead of the expected ת. This spelling mirrors the Polish spelling of the name, which conforms to a Polish orthographic convention whereby [ʃ] can be indicated by the combination ш.

3.5.1.7 [ʒ]
Hasidic Hebrew lacks an unambiguous way of representing [ʒ], which is common in place names of Slavic origin. Instead, the consonant ז is employed to denote this sound, e.g.:

– ‘from Ruzhin’ (Bromberg 1899: 41)
– ‘Medzhbyizh’ (Baruch of Medzhbyizh 1880: 26)
– ‘Volozhin’ (Heilman 1902: 79)
– ‘Lizhensk’ (Kaidaner 1875: 47a)

4 I.e. from Shpola.
In such cases familiarity with the place name is the only factor enabling the reader to determine whether the т should be pronounced as [z] or as [ʒ]. Only on very rare occasions is the combination שש used to designate [ʒ] (as is common in Yiddish), e.g.:

- 'משנהדרא' 'policeman' (Sofer 1904: 35)
- 'למע[SerializeField] בושטכאסמ' 'from Sochaczew' (Michelsohn 1912: 38)

However this is used inconsistently even within the work of the same author; thus, the word 'משנהדרא appearing in Sofer (1904) appears on the same page as רדנאז.

3.5.1.8 [x]
The voiceless velar fricative [x] is most commonly represented by ח, e.g.:

- 'לזיווחעל' 'Lechovich' (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 19)
- 'בואניחאקב' 'in Kokhanovo' (Stamm 1905: 5)
- 'וברחיינצאבק' 'from Želechów' (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 19)

However, it may alternatively be represented by כ, as below. The authors regarded ח and כ as interchangeable in this regard and sometimes employed them in free variation in the spelling of the same place name, as comparison of the extract from Stamm (1905) above with the one below illustrates. This fluctuation is understandable considering that the Hasidic Hebrew authors would have pronounced both ח and כ identically as [x] (Katz 1993: 70).

- 'בוכעשט' 'Chekhov' (Bromberg 1899: 34)
- 'בושטכאסמ' 'from Sochaczew' (Michelsohn 1912: 38)
- 'בכאמביאה' 'in Kokhanovo' (Stamm 1905: 33)
- 'מלע DISCLAIMS: of Lechovich' (Shalom of Koidanov 1882: 13)

3.5.1.9 [ts] in Word-Final Position
The authors sometimes represent the voiceless alveolar sibilant affricate [ts] in word-final position in proper names and Yiddish loanwords with the tautologous combination טס instead of simply ט, as below. Rarely this practice extends
to Hebrew words commonly employed in Yiddish, as in the final example. This convention is traceable to pre-standardized Yiddish orthography (see Kerler 1999: 205).

– צֶטאש 'Schatz' (Munk 1898: 62)
– פֶלפַּאָטִין 'place' (Sofer 1904: 25)
– צֶטֶרָנוֹויץ' 'Czernowitz' (Seuss 1890: 62)
– יֵּלֶאָטֻט 'the palace' (Greenwald 1899: 56a)
– בֶבֶלְצֶאָט 'from Bełżec' (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 54)
– יֵאָרָוָויץ 'Horowitz' (Munk 1898: 75)
– יֵפֶרְרֶא 'the landowner' (Ehrmann 1903: 19b)

3.5.1.10 [ʧ]
The voiceless palato-alveolar affricate [ʧ] is represented by the combination טש, as in Yiddish (see Kerler 1999: 151, 205), e.g.:

– בַּוּשְטִידָרָאָב 'Barditchev' (Ehrmann 1911: 8b)
– לְמֵעַשְׁטְּפֵרְיָש 'to Mezeritch' (Kaidaner 1875: 34b)
– בַּוּשְטִידְזֶיָמ 'from Ziditchov' (Munk 1898: 3)
– לְפֶסֶטְרַנְוָוָבָר 'from Chernobyl' (Chikernik 1908: 9)
– בַּזְוָטַכְס 'Munkacs' (Berger 1906: 48)
– לְפֶסֶטְרַנְוָוָוִי 'from Czernowitz' (Laufbahn 1914: 48)

3.5.1.11 Double Consonants
Sometimes place names and Yiddish loanwords appear with a double consonant, e.g.:

– אֵסָסְיָטְס 'Odessa' (Heilmann 1902: 224) (cf. German Odessa and Russian Одесса)
– רַעְמַמֲעַא 'shopkeeper' (Sofer 1904: 29)
– רַעְמַמֲע 'bucket' (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 3)
– עששאַק 'porridge' (Ehrmann 1911: 32b)

This practice is relatively sporadic. It is not a standard feature of Yiddish orthography, but is found in certain types of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century written Yiddish under German influence (see Mark 1978: 35 and Jacobs 2005: 52). The Hasidic Hebrew convention is thus also likely to derive via Yiddish from this German orthographic convention. This is particularly clearly visible
in the first three examples above, which have precise counterparts with a double consonant in German. In addition, the third example has a parallel in Russian, which may have exerted some simultaneous influence. However, the phenomenon extends to certain words that have no direct counterparts in German or Russian, as in the last three examples.

3.5.2  **Vowels**

3.5.2.1  [a]

The vowel [a] is relatively consistently represented orthographically in Hasidic Hebrew proper names and loanwords in word-medial position by א, as below. As in the case of consonants discussed above, this convention derives from Yiddish orthographic practice whereby word-medial [a] is typically represented in the same way (Mark 198: 34).

- בְּרַדִיתְכֶב (Barditchev) (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 3)
- מָאוֹרְשָא (from Warsaw) (Zak 1912: 34)
- לָלוֹבָאָטְש (to Lubavitch) (Kaidaner 1875: 28a)
- פָּרָג (Prague) (J. Duner 1899: 105)
- הָאנִיפַּלְיֶא (Hanipoli) (Ehrmann 1903: 15a)

3.5.2.2  [e]

Like medial [a], initial and medial [e] is relatively often represented orthographically in Hasidic Hebrew. It is designated by ע, which directly mirrors Yiddish orthographic practice (see Mark 1978: 34; Schaechter 1999: 1). Examples of this tendency are shown below:

- פָּסְטַרְסְבַּרְט (St. Petersburg) (Kaidaner 1875: 42a)
- פּוּטְרָקְפֶּב (Piotrkow) (Bromberg 1899: 35)
- פֶּסְט (Pest) (Munk 1898: 29)
- בְּכִישְׁנֶנְוַש (‘in Kishinev) (Ehrmann 1905: 139a)
- בְּבֶלְצ (to Belz) (Bodek 1865b: 40)
- לָמעְרָטש (‘to Mezeritch) (Zak 1912: 148)

However, the use of ע in these contexts is not universal or consistent: thus, the same word may appear with ע in some cases and without it in others, e.g.:

- בְּבָרְלְיו (in Berlin) vs. בָּבְרַלְיו (Rodkinsohn 1865: 8)
Word-final \[ə\] is often represented by ָא, as in the following:

- ינלי 'Vilna' (Rodkinsohn 1864a: 35)
- ינקיה 'Venice' (Bodek 1865c: 15)
- מירונה 'from Riga' (Kaidaner 1875: 29a)
- פוזנה 'Poznań' (J. Duner 1899: 18)
- חניפא 'Hanipoli' (Ehrmann 1903: 15a)
- מחארה 'from Warsaw' (Michelsohn 1912: 33)

Somewhat less frequently, it can be represented by י, as below. Aside from the fact that ָא is more commonly attested, both letters are treated interchangeably and inconsistently in these positions: the same proper noun may be spelt with ָא on one occasion and י on another. The last two examples below illustrate this fluctuation.

- יוקסאמל 'to Moscow' (Heilmann 1902: 99)
- יקים iphone 'Yekele' (Lieberson 1913: 40)
- יוקסאמ 'Moscow' (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 37); cf. יוקסאמ 'Moscow' (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 38)
- יושה 'Zusha' (Kaidaner 1875: 48a); cf. יושה (Kaidaner 1875: 48b)

In addition, י is sometimes used instead of ָא or י in medial and final positions to denote \[ə\], e.g.:

- יבריל 'Berele' (Bromberg 1899: 39)
- ימכסומ 'from Moscow' (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 34)
- יוסיל 'Yosele' (Bromberg 1899: 40)
- ימלט 'Motele' (Lieberson 1913: 51)
- יר 'R. Shmelke' (Hirsch 1900: 23)

In contrast to earlier forms of Hebrew, as well as to Modern (Israeli) Hebrew, ה is hardly ever used to represent \[ə\] in final position in proper names. Some rare examples are shown below:

- יאיטליה 'Italy' (Bodek 1865c: 15)
- יאיטליה 'Italy' (J. Duner 1899: 18)
3.5.2.4 [ɔ]
[ɔ] in medial and final positions is typically represented by א, as below. This is likewise based on Yiddish precedent (U. Weinreich 2007: 333).

– דוברזנא ‘Dubrovna’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 37)
– לוסקוק ‘to Moscow’ (Heilmann 1902: 99)
– אדס ‘Odessa’ (Kaidaner 1875: 44a)
– גני ‘Hanipoli’ (Ehrmann 1903: 15a)
– ממסק ‘from Moscow’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 34)

Much less frequently, it may be represented by ו, e.g.:

– פון ‘Poznań’ (J. Duner 1899: 18)
– בארדיטשט ‘Barditchev’ (Ehrmann 1911: 8b)
– פיטרנוק ‘Piotrkow’ (Jacob Isaac ben Asher of Przysucha 1908: 109)

3.5.2.5 [i] and [u]
[i] is typically represented by י and [u] is typically represented by ו in the spelling of Eastern European place names. However, ي and ו are sometimes used interchangeably, as in the case of Hebrew words (discussed in 3.4.2).

י instead of י

– תולטעוס for תולטעוס ‘Tulchyn’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 34)
– גס for גס ‘Russia’ (Kaidaner 1875: 44a)
– הולנדר for הולנדר ‘the Lubliner [Rebbe]’ (Laufbahn 1914: 48)
– מלתנערפ for מלתנערפ ‘from Lizhensk’ (Bodek 1865a: 50)

י instead of ו

– קפנס for קפנס ‘from Ruzhin’ (Munk 1898: 17)
– קאפוס for קאפוס ‘Kapust’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 46)

3.5.2.6 Diphthongs [ej] and [ɔj]
The diphthongs [ej] and [ɔj] are often represented by ו in Yiddish loanwords (with the precise pronunciation depending on the Ashkenazi Hebrew/Yiddish dialect of the author, or perhaps typesetter). This convention is most likely an extension of the principle whereby holom in open syllables is pronounced as [ej] in Northeastern (Lithuanian/Latvian/Belarussian) Ashkenazi Hebrew and as [ɔj] in Mideastern (Polish/Hungarian) and Southeastern (Ukrainian/Bessa-
rabian/Romanian) Ashkenazi Hebrew (Katz 1993: 51). The following examples illustrate this practice:

– ספופ ‘pope’ (Kaidaner 1875: 12a) (pronounced as [pɔjps] or [pejps]; cf. Standard Yiddish ויפופ)

3.6 Spelling of Divine Labels

There is a tendency among the Hasidic Hebrew authors to spell the word for ‘God’ as אלקִי, with a ק replacing the expected ה in order to avoid the potential for a printed divine name to be defaced in the event that the publication containing it should ever be destroyed. This is a frequent convention in Jewish non-liturgical writings. In some collections the word is invariably spelt with a ק (e.g. Rodkinsohn 1864b; Landau 1892; Hirsch 1900; Ehrmann 1903; Sofer 1904; Sobelman 1909/10; Zak 1912).

However, in many collections (e.g. Bodek 1865c; Bodek? 1866; Kaidaner 1875; Munk 1898; N. Duner 1899; Moses Leib of Sasov 1903; Michelsohn 1905; Stamm 1905; Teomim Fraenkel 1911b; Rakats 1912; Lieberson 1913) the convention is inconsistent, as shown below. It is unclear why the practice is followed consistently in some of the tale collections while others employ it only sporadically.

– ונייהלא ‘our God’ (Bodek 1865c: 3); cf. עםיקלא ‘your God’ (Bodek 1865c: 8)
– אלקִי (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 7); cf. אלקֶים ‘God’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 6)
– אלקִי (Stamm 1905: 12); cf. אלקִים ‘God’ (Stamm 1905: 21)
– אלћי יאלו נובי ‘my God and God of my ancestors’ (Lieberson 1913: 11); cf. אלקִי ‘your God’ (Lieberson 1913: 23)
– אלכִי ‘our God’ (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 24); cf. אלכַּים ‘God’ (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 24)

3.7 Vocalization

Vocalization is not usually employed in the Hasidic Hebrew tales except as a pronunciation aid in the transcription of loanwords from Slavic languages, as in the Russian and Ukrainian borrowings shown below:

– ויופארסיט ‘interrogation (Russian)’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 7)
– פאסעט ‘boot (Ukrainian)’ (Bodek? 1866: 14a)
Certain authors, most commonly Zak and Landau, also sometimes use partial vocalization in Yiddish loanwords. This usually consists of *qameṣ* and *pataḥ* pointing š, in accordance with the common Yiddish convention which subsequently became standardized in the official *yivo* orthography established in 1936. However, sometimes other symbols are employed, such as the *šere* shown in the penultimate example. Only very rarely is more extensive vocalization used for Yiddish loanwords, as in the final example.

– [*םעָר=טפל*] ‘pre-wedding dance party’ (Zak 1912: 136)
– [*מותגרמטאפע*] ‘photograph(y)’ (Michelsohn 1910b: 185)
– [*שְפִיא*] ‘spy’ (Ehrmann 1905: 50a)
– [*רֶיריידיל*] ‘dreidel’ (Landau 1892: 35)
– [*טָאָלטִע*] ‘monkey’ (Bodek? 1866: 5b)

Moreover, some limited vocalization is sporadically attested on Hebrew words. In some cases, such vocalization may serve to clarify potentially ambiguous words. For example, in the following cases the pointing presumably serves to avoid confusion with the otherwise identically spelt words shown beside them. However, this phenomenon of disambiguation is extremely marginal, appearing only on a handful of occasions. Moreover, even in these cases the vocalization is strikingly undermotivated: in all of the sentences below the immediate context makes the other possible reading of the consonants highly unlikely or even (as in the first example) grammatically impossible, and thus the potential for confusion in an unvocalized text would be very low.

– [*ינֶדוע*] ‘lest it be made known’ (Sofer 1904: 16); cf. [*ינֶדֶע*] ‘knowing’
– [*שֶּׁעְלָל יָד לָי אֶז*] ‘I had wits then’ (Michelsohn 1912: 20); cf. [*שֶּׁעְל*] ‘that everything’
– [*ואָאָוֶר הָזֶה נָתֶהוּ בַּעַרְמַר רַחְיֵל*] ‘And after this plague broke out in their city, may God protect us’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 30); cf. [*רָבָד*] ‘thing’; ‘matter’

Vocalization is also sometimes attested in cases where even the tenuous practical motivation discussed above does not seem to apply. Thus, some authors occasionally employ the pointed consonant š instead of the more common unpointed variant š, as illustrated below. This phenomenon is not employed consistently or for any particular reason; for example, the pointed variants shown below do not appear on words that would otherwise have a potentially ambiguous meaning.

– [*לָבֵשׁ*] ‘dressed’ (Zak 1912: 136)
– [*וּבַדָיָה נָסִים*] ‘eighteen years old’ (Sofer 1904: 1)
3.8 **Gershayim**

*Gershayim*, the symbol “”, is used in the following ways in Hasidic Hebrew:

a) It is placed before the last letter in acronyms (see 16.1.2 for further examples), e.g.:

- ‘Habadniks’ (Bodek 1866: 53)
- ‘anniversary of a death’ (Bromberg 1899: 5)
- ‘nevertheless’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 3)
- ‘the synagogue’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 45)
- ‘afterwards’ (Munk 1898: 65)

b) It is placed between two Hebrew alphabetic symbols representing a numeral (see 3.10 for details), e.g.:

- ‘eleven years’ (Bromberg 1899: 8)
- ‘twelve men’ (Ehrmann 1903: 39a)
- ‘seventeen times’ (Stamm 1905: 22)
- ‘eighteen reinisch’ (Munk 1898: 64)

c) Very rarely, it is placed before the last letter of an unabbreviated Yiddish loanword, as below. This practice may stem from the convention found in Medieval Hebrew texts (e.g. Rashi’s biblical commentary) of placing *gershayim* before the last letter of a foreign word. However, this usage is extremely marginal in Hasidic Hebrew.

- ‘Latin’ (Bodek 1865c: 16)
- ‘doorknob’ (Bromberg 1899: 42)

3.9 **Punctuation**

The Hasidic Hebrew tale collections exhibit a range of different punctuation conventions, detailed below.

3.9.1 **Minimal Punctuation**

In some collections, e.g. Rodkinsohn (1864b, 1865), Bodek (1866), Shalom of Koidanov (1882), Landau (1892), Sobelman (1909/10), and Zak (1912), punctuation consists of the following symbols:
ORTHOGRAPHY

- a single mid-level dot (·)
- a full stop (.)
- sof pasuq (:)

Both · or . and : can be used to indicate the end of a sentence, but · and . are used to separate sentences within a narrative unit, while : serves to mark the end of a section. These punctuation conventions are illustrated below. The sentence dividers · or . are often used relatively sparingly so that there is no clear division between sentences, with sequences of coordinated and subordinated clauses continuing for several lines.

- נבא להפלנ אביו של מרב. ‘And he came before the (lit: his) father of our Rebbe.’ (Landau 1892: 7)
- והכסף מגדל בלול יימהפר ‘And the matter went into his heart, and he became bitter’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 32)
- ופי יא בעשה מאוד. ‘Therefore I am in great sorrow.’ (Zak 1912: 37)

3.9.2 Extended Punctuation
In other collections, e.g. Ehrmann (1903), Sofer (1904), Sobelman (1909/10), Berger (1906, 1907, 1910a–c), Michelsohn (1905, 1910a–c, 1911, 1912), commas, full stops, exclamation marks, question marks, and other European-style punctuation symbols are employed. These punctuation symbols are often used in ways differing from standard convention in e.g. European languages and Modern (Israeli) Hebrew, as detailed below.

3.9.2.1 Full Stops
Many authors employ full stops in a much wider range of syntactic contexts than usual in European languages, frequently using them to divide parts of single sentences. This is illustrated in the following examples, in which full stops appear directly preceding a relative clause and in the middle of a possessive construction respectively:

- ומי חסרי פראברишיטש לי שמה חסידי אהד מונעלי התשדיד. שהסחנופ תמיד התה לצלא ‘And among the Hasidim of Probisht there was one of the great Hasidim, who always found shelter with the righteous Rebbe Shalom’ (Zak 1912: 7)
- ומשלושי לי מבריתינ. של חוסה ומקים ניתהש ‘And they were dressed in copper armour and copper hats’ (Sofer 1904: 1)
This use of mid-sentence full stops is particularly common following temporal clauses, e.g.:

- When that Torah scholar arrived there, the Ba’al Shem Tov went to a special room with the Torah scholar’ (Michelsohn 1910b: 141)
- ‘And when the man went out of his house, the non-Jew immediately died.’ (Brandwein 1912: 46)
- ‘And when he arrived at the house of his son, that Maggid, he said to him ...’ (Chikernik 1903a: 27)
- ‘When they came home, the house was well heated.’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 4)

Similarly, full stops often stand in for other symbols. For example, even though question marks are occasionally attested in Sobelman (1909/10), a full stop appears at the end of the question shown below:

- ‘What is the meaning of your knocking?’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 33)

3.9.2.2 Question Marks

Question marks are relatively rarely used, but when they do appear they are confined to question contexts, as expected, e.g.:

- ‘Let him please tell me why he said precisely this song?’ (Berger 1907: 53)
- ‘And how can I stay for the Sabbath?’ (1894: 5)

3.9.2.3 Exclamation Marks

In contrast to the general convention in e.g. European languages and Modern (Israeli) Hebrew, the Hasidic Hebrew authors often use exclamation marks in contexts lacking any element of heightened importance or emotion, where one might instead expect to find some other punctuation symbol such as a colon or full stop, e.g.:

- ‘And she told him as follows! And he said to her ...’ (Berger 1910b: 72)
Like full stops, exclamation marks may sometimes appear mid-sentence, as in the following examples:

- הלילהעצמאב׳יהו!raham שומעיוי לדרת שלהם על פthane השער! And in the middle of the night! The Ba’al Shem Tov told his servant to knock on the gate’ (Ehrmann 1903: 5b)

3.9.2.4 In Conjunction with Mid-Level Dot and sof pasuq
The authors who employ European-style punctuation symbols typically make use of the mid-level dot and sof pasuq as well. As in the case of the texts discussed above in 3.9.1, these authors often use sof pasuq to signal the end of a tale or narrative episode. In some cases it is the only marker of such divisions, while in others it appears as an additional indicator immediately following a full stop, exclamation mark, etc., e.g.:

- המורת והארמנדר הלוח! ‘the servant of this tenant farmer!’ (Ehrmann 1903: 2b)

3.9.2.5 Quotation Marks
In many tale collections direct speech is not explicitly indicated. However, in others quotation marks are employed, as follows:

- "איך זה אוניק שמעתי מה סדרתי ילן לדורש בפאררבוריה. Therefore, pay attention (lit: incline your ear) and listen to what I have planned for my sermon in Pressburg’ (Michelsohn 1910: 133)
- "כשחייתי ילן בשבת שמעתי עליה שלום הזרוע מתבעות. ‘When I was a boy of seven years I took it upon myself not to harm any creature in the world’ (Berger 1907: 147)
- "הנשא דל דידי איזא קרישא. ‘Do you still have any questions?’ (N. Duner 1912: 27)

Similarly, on occasion quotation marks are used to single out individual words as labels, e.g.:

- "אבל קאואר דה החוה כה ישונא דה חזר הגר. ‘But when the “crazy man” was there, the “rich man” was missing’ (Rosenthal 1909: 77)
3.10 Numerals and Dates

Numerals may be designated in several different ways in the Hasidic Hebrew tales.

In some cases they are spelt out as words, as below:

- ‘two men’ (J. Duner 1899: 99)
- ‘nineteen’ (Kaidaner 1875: 17b)
- ‘eighteen’ (Sofer 1904: 9)
- ‘thirteen consecutive years’ (Moses Leib of Sasov 1903: 21a)
- ‘twenty-two consecutive years’ (Michelsohn 1910c: 33)
- ‘a hundred and forty streets’ (Seuss 1890: 7)

Numerals up to twenty are also very frequently represented by their standard Hebrew alphabetic symbols, as below:

- ‘two hours’ (A. Walden 1860?: 13b)
- ‘three hundred’ (Zak 1912: 18)
- ‘three questions’ (Sofer 1904: 10)
- ‘eleven years’ (Bromberg 1899: 8)
- ‘twelve men’ (Ehrmann 1903: 39a)
- ‘twelve years old’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 33)
- ‘about twelve seconds’ (Berger 1907: 148)
- ‘about fifteen years old’ (Sofer 1904: 42)
- ‘twenty years’ (Kaidaner 1875: 25b)

More rarely, a larger number is attested in this form, e.g.:

- ‘a hundred ducats’ (N. Duner 1899: 89)

Occasionally a numeral that has an iconic value in gematria, the Jewish numerological system, is represented as such. For example, eighteen is sometimes represented by the word יא ‘life’, its equivalent in gematria, e.g.:

- ‘eighteen years old’ (Sofer 1904: 1)
- ‘eighteen years’ (Berger 1910a: 58)
Very rarely, the name of the alphabetic symbol is spelt out in full, e.g.:

- יד דורות ‘ten (lit: yod) generations’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 18)

Arabic numerals are hardly attested within the tales. The following are rare examples:

- לְכַפְרִים יָדְסָלֵעַ דַּרְשֵׁי 50 מְכוֹת בֵּמְכוֹל ‘to strike the sermon giver fifty times (lit: strikes) with a stick’ (Sofer 1904: 32)
- רֶיצִי 300 ‘three hundred roubles’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 6)
- 25 ‘twenty-five złoty (or: guilders)’ (Ehrmann 1905: 158b)
- ¼ ‘half past four’ (Leichter 1901: 8b)

Dates are usually given according to the Hebrew calendar, e.g.:

- גְּנוֹרַת תְּנֶשֶׁף רוּחַ ‘in the winter of the year 5653 (1893)’ (Yellin 1913: 38)
- בֵּשֵׁנַת תְּרֵכִים ‘in the year 5628 (1868)’ (Lieberson 1913: 53)
- בֵּשֵׁנַת תְּרֵשִׁים ‘in the year 5602 (1842)’ (M. Walden 1914: 83)
- יָעֲקֹב ‘the year 5552 (1792)’ (Shalom of Koidanov 1882: 13)
- וַיִּלְבֶשׁ בַּן בֵּשֵׁנַת תַּקָּשִׁים ‘and a son was born to them in the year 5507 (1747)’ (Heilmann 1902: 1)

Gregorian dates are cited only very rarely, and in such cases Arabic numerals are used, e.g.:

- 1843 ‘in the year 1843’ (Heilmann 1902: 229)
- 1831 ‘in the year 1831 by their reckoning’ (Zak 1912: 36)
CHAPTER 4

Nouns

4.1 Gender

The Hasidic Hebrew system of noun gender differs from that of canonical varieties of the language. On initial inspection the authors’ approach to noun gender appears to be inconsistent, with traditionally feminine nouns often treated as masculine and vice versa. This apparent confusion seems to lend support to the Maskilic argument that the Hasidic Hebrew authors had a shaky grasp of Hebrew grammar (see Perl 1819, 1838 for an example of this view). However, this apparently chaotic approach actually reflects a relatively regular system in which a noun’s gender is dictated by the pronunciation of its ending, as detailed below.

4.1.1 Masculine Singular Nouns

In Hasidic Hebrew singular nouns not ending in [ə] are almost invariably masculine. In many cases this practice overlaps with that of earlier forms of Hebrew dating back to the biblical stratum, in which masculine nouns are unmarked (see e.g. Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 244) and often end in a consonant. Thus, the noun shown below is masculine not only in Hasidic Hebrew but also in the canonical literature.

- בוטシア ‘a good man’ (Munk 1898: 22)

However, in many cases the Hasidic Hebrew authors’ understanding of masculine noun gender diverges from that found in the classical texts. Firstly, according to their interpretation nouns ending in ר- are masculine, as shown below; this contrasts sharply with Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew, in which final ר- is almost invariably a feminine marker (see e.g. Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 245 and Pérez Fernández 1999: 63).

- הדרתיהלמה ‘and the door was closed’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pt. 3: 12)
- ‘‘great unity’’ (Ehrmann 1903: 21a)
- ‘with awesome and fearful devotion’ (Zak 1912: 159)
- ‘with great speed’ (Brill 1909: 81)
- הדרתיהלמה ‘the first door’ (Sofer 1904: 26)
- ‘a big dispute’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 47)
This association of נ- with masculine gender is not unique to Hasidic Hebrew but rather features in a wide range of medieval and early modern Ashkenazi Hebrew writings (Goldenberg 2007: 670) as well as in medieval Spanish-Provençal Hebrew prose (Rabin 2000: 89–90), the latter under the influence of Arabic (Sáenz-Badillos 2013). The Hasidic Hebrew practice is most likely rooted to some extent in this more general Ashkenazi Hebrew convention, which may in turn be the result of combined influence from the earlier Spanish-Provençal Hebrew phenomenon and the fact that in the authors’ native Yiddish נ- is not a feminine marker (Goldenberg 2007: 670).

Similarly, the Hasidic Hebrew authors typically regard traditionally ‘endingless feminine nouns’ as masculine, e.g.:

- ‘to the adjacent city’ (Landau 1892: 18)
- ‘the first time’ (Heilmann 1902: 139)
- ‘a precious stone’ (A. Walden 1860?: 25a)
- ‘a stone placed for a long time in one place’ (Moses of Kobrin 1910: 37)
- ‘the precious stone’ (Sofer 1904: 20)

As in the case of nouns ending in נ- Rabin (2000: 89–90) notes a similar tendency to treat endingless feminine nouns as masculine in medieval Spanish-Provençal Hebrew prose, and Sarfatti (2003: 86) identifies it as a feature of medieval Hebrew translations of Arabic works. Like that of nouns ending in נ-, this Hasidic Hebrew practice may be partially attributable to influence from these earlier writings, as well as to the fact that in Yiddish nouns ending in consonants are not typically associated with feminine gender (Mark 1978: 123; Katz 1987: 50). However, the relatively thorough and systematic nature of both Hasidic Hebrew phenomena, combined with the equally methodical converse assignation of feminine gender to be discussed below, suggest that the authors’ perception of masculine noun gender is not solely a reflection of these
various influences but also constitutes a somewhat independent phonologically driven trend towards regularization.

There are some exceptions to the above patterns: thus, individual authors occasionally follow historical precedent by treating a particular noun ending in \[ə\] as masculine when their Hasidic contemporaries interpret it as feminine, as below.

– לודגהאנתה ‘the great mishnaic sage’ (Bodek 1866: 30)
– מתיישה נורה ‘an awesome story’ (Seuss 1890: 4); cf. מתיישה נפלאה ‘a wondrous story’ (Seuss 1890: 40)
– ארונהשעמ ‘a small moment’ (Zak 1912: 16)
– בוטעפש ‘great bounty’ (Munk 1898: 70)

In the case of animate nouns this is due to logical gender overriding grammatical gender; such an instance is shown in the first example. However, in the case of inanimate nouns the practice is comparatively erratic, varying from author to author and even within the same text, as illustrated in the second example. The existence of such exceptions indicates that the above-described Hasidic Hebrew interpretation of masculine gender may be a trend in the process of crystallization rather than a completely fixed system.

4.1.2 Feminine Singular Nouns

In Hasidic Hebrew the only consistently recognized nominal feminine marker is word-final \[ə\]. According to the authors’ ‘popular Ashkenazic’ Hebrew phonological system (Katz 1993: 76–78), this vowel may be represented in a variety of ways in writing, namely by \[ת, ח, ר, ס, י\] (see also 2.2). This understanding of feminine noun gender marks a significant divergence from earlier forms of Hebrew, in which nouns ending in \[ת, ח, ר, ס, י\] are typically masculine. The Hasidic Hebrew approach highlights the significant point that the authors’ understanding of grammatical noun gender was rooted primarily in the nouns’ contemporary pronunciation rather than in historical orthographic convention. As in the case of the non-canonical masculine nouns discussed above, this system seems to reflect Yiddish influence; indeed, it is most likely traceable primarily to that language, wherein word-final \[ə\] (which may likewise be represented by \[ת, ח, ר, ס, י\]) is the chief morphological feminine marker in nouns (Mark 1978: 123; Katz 1987: 50; Jacobs 2005: 154, 167). Again as in the case of the masculine nouns, this paradigm can be regarded as a phonologically conditioned Hasidic Hebrew grammatical development in its own right.

With respect to nouns ending in \[ת\] (represented in the typically unvocalized Hasidic Hebrew tales as \[ת\]) Hasidic Hebrew usually overlaps with biblical
and rabbinic literature, as י- is the most frequently employed nominal feminine marker in those forms of the language (Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 245; Pérez Fernández 1999: 63), e.g.:

- "סעודת נרות" ‘a big feast’ (Shenkel 1903b: 19)

However, this correspondence is only partial because Hasidic Hebrew treats nouns ending in -ה as feminine even if they are masculine in the canonical texts. The most common example of this is the noun לילה ‘night’, shown below. The same practice is attested in medieval Spanish-Provençal Hebrew (Rabin 2000: 91), and, as in the case of masculine nouns ending in -ת, this precedent may have contributed to some degree to the Hasidic usage, though the latter is more likely to be part of the larger Yiddish-based phonological phenomenon described above.

- "לילה קרירה דוד מואד" ‘a very cold night’ (Lieberson 1913: 44)
- "ليلתון השלישית" ‘and on the third night’ (M. Walden 1912: 10)
- "הלילה החבשה עליהם" ‘the night grew dark on them’ (Ehremann 1903: 6a)
- "ליל כללון הודשנה" ‘on the first night’ (Landau 1892: 35)
- " ddlתון השניה" ‘and on the second night’ (Hirsch 1900: 20)
- "הלילה אחרונה" ‘and on the last night’ (Rapaport 1909: 19)

Conversely, in the case of Hasidic Hebrew feminine nouns ending in י- there is very little gender overlap with earlier forms of Hebrew. The authors’ association of such nouns with feminine gender may have been reinforced by the fact that some of them, e.g. "משה ‘tale’ in the first example, are employed independently as feminine nouns in Yiddish.

- "משה גוזלת נוראת" ‘a great and awesome tale’ (Shenkel 1903b: 7)
- "מעטשת הרשעה ‘the first story’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 20)
- "מעטשה הממשתה רבה" ‘and from that story’ (Bodek 1865a: 71)
- "מעטשה יוקרה חנה術ה בפר’ ‘an expensive gold watch’ (Berger 1907: 149)
- "מעטשה יוקרה חנה術ה בפר’ ‘a precious story written in a book’ (Rodkinsohn 1864a: 41)
- "ممראות הנראה הזהת ‘this awesome sight’ (Hirsch 1900: 66)
- "מעטשה גוזלת נוראת ‘a big camp’ (Gemen 1911: 62)
- "מעטשה קטנה ‘a small story’ (Singer 1900b: 8)
- "ممראות יוקרה הזהת ‘this precious sight’ (Rosenthal 1909: 9)
- "ممראות הנראה הזהת ‘this terrible event’ (Breitstein 1914: 23)
- "מעטשה גוזלת ‘a big banquet’ (Berger 1910b: 74)"
Similarly, Hasidic Hebrew feminine nouns ending in -ע, such as those shown below, typically clash with canonical Hebrew gender assignment. Some of these are loanwords lacking clear precedent in earlier Hebrew literature (typically deriving from Yiddish, in which they are also feminine).

- שבעת שילמה ‘a whole week’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 13)
- חקיקת אשר אנכי היה קומד עליה ‘the ground on which I was standing’ (Bromberg 1899: 27)
-𝘼昤RefreshingShゃl yüks ‘his old skullcap’ (Munk 1898: 65)
- ‘until they came to another inn’ (Ehrmann 1903: 33b)
- ‘another coin’ (Landau 1892: 51)
- ‘the last moment’ (Zak 1912: 16)
- ‘one small coin’ (Michelsohn 1910c: 49)
- ‘for a small moment’ (Bodek 1865a: 24)

Likewise, Hasidic Hebrew feminine nouns ending in -א are typically masculine in Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew. Again, this trend has partial precedent in medieval Spanish-Provençal Hebrew; however, as in the cases discussed above the Hasidic Hebrew phenomenon is more extensive than that of its medieval antecedent because the latter is restricted to Talmudic Aramaic loanwords (Rabin 2000: 91), while the former includes any word ending in -א. The following examples illustrate this:

- כסא המונית ‘a chair which had been prepared’ (Michelsohn 1912: 99)
- כסא המורשת ‘from his holy seat’ (Berger 1906: 76)
- כסא הכבדה ‘a heavy burden’ (Ehrmann 1903: 14a)
- כסא הקש̀ה ‘a small note’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 6)
- פלאו נשלーム ‘a great wonder’ (Kaidaner 1875: 37b)
- והמשהד CAREFULLYgetSource יsaid ‘and he approached the big, heavy chair that stood there and lifted it’ (Zak 1912: 39)

Finally, Hasidic Hebrew nouns ending in -י and pronounced with final [ə] receive this same feminine treatment. Many of these nouns, such as the first two examples below, are loanwords from Yiddish (in which they are likewise feminine).

- קריתשטימי ישנה ‘an old inn’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 43)
- בהזודו לוב נפלד וראמצליקי מעלי ראש ‘And in his hurry to flee the skullcap fell off his head’ (Bodek 1865b: 10)
As in the case of masculine nouns discussed above, nouns with logical feminine reference are treated as feminine, e.g.:

- תדמולמוהלודגתקידצ ‘a great and learned righteous woman’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 68)
- התאבלוגנרתהו ‘and the chicken came’ (Ehrmann 1903: 20b)

While the Hasidic Hebrew authors are relatively consistent regarding this approach to feminine noun gender, in some cases historically feminine nouns not ending in [ə] are treated as feminine in the tales as well, e.g.:

- הנושארםעפ ‘first time’ (Landau 1892: 54); cf. נושארםעפ (Landau 1892: 54)
- הלודגשא ‘a big fire’ (Zak 1912: 146)
- הלודגתובהלתהב ‘with great enthusiasm’ (Sofer 1904: 20)
- הלודגתוקיבדבו ‘and with great devotion’ (Brandwein 1912: 16)
- הלודגתקולחמ ‘a big dispute’ (Heilmann 1902: 2)
- התאוויהתעופה ‘with great and intense enthusiasm’ (Breitstein 1914: 8)
- התאוויהתעופה ‘from the adjacent town’ (Landau 1892: 5)

This sometimes occurs when the noun in question is part of a noun-adjective phrase that appears in a well-known classical text and therefore seems to have been regarded by the authors as a set phrase. Such a case is shown in the first example above, which contains an endingless noun in conjunction with a

---

1 Two consecutive pages in this text are both numbered 14.
feminine adjective in a phrase that would have been familiar to the authors from its appearance in Exodus 2:22. As in the case of historically masculine nouns ending in [ə] discussed in 4.1.1, this inconsistency may suggest that the Hasidic Hebrew gender system was still undergoing a process of paradigm levelling at the time of the tales’ composition. This is supported by the fact that the same author may sometimes treat a given noun as masculine and other times as feminine, as illustrated in several of the above examples. The noun עִיר ‘city’ seems to be the one most vulnerable to alternation in gender assignment, sometimes attested as masculine, as shown previously, and sometimes as feminine, as in the last two examples above.

A special case involves the noun בית 'house': this is typically masculine, but is often treated as feminine in the collocation בית הכנסת ‘synagogue’ and when modified by attributive adjectives whose feminine singular form ends in -ת, as below. Similar collocations are attested in the contemporaneous writings of the Maskilic author M.L. Lilienblum and of the Jerusalem community leader Yosef Rivlin (Wertheimer 1975: 158–159), suggesting that this may be an element of a more widespread Ashkenazi form of Hebrew.

– הבית הגדול ‘in the big synagogue’ (Michelson 1910b: 191)
– בית הכנסת הידוע ‘the well-known synagogue’ (Berger 1910c: 49)
– בית הכנסת העתיק ‘the old synagogue’ (Chikernik 1903b: 13)
– בית הכנסת החפשי ‘the free house’ (Bodek 1865b: 4)
– בית מיחודה ‘a special residence’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 54)
– בית הכנסת הגדול ‘in the big synagogue’ (Shenkel 1903b: 3)

4.1.3 Common Singular Nouns
Three endingless nouns (ךָרְד ‘way’, חוּר ‘wind’; ‘spirit’, and ןוּשֵׁל ‘language’) that traditionally have common gender in earlier forms of Hebrew are frequently attested as both masculine and feminine in the Hasidic tales. This can be seen in the following two sets of examples respectively.

Masculine

– דֹּרָך ישר ‘a straight way’ (Zak 1912: 20)
– דָּרְך גָּדוֹל ‘a great way’ (Bodek 1865a: 10)
– דָּרְך בָּרוֹח ‘on a distant way’ (Singer 1900b: 26)
– דֹּרָך אחר ‘another way’ (Moses Leib of Sasov 1903: 25b)
– רוח חדש ‘a new spirit’ (Rapaport 1909: 12)
– רוח הלשון הרומ ‘the hinted language’ (Zak 1912: 155)
– בָּלֶשׁון צָע ‘in clear language’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 33)
The flexible gender of these nouns is highlighted by the fact that they sometimes appear in conjunction with both a masculine and feminine adjective in a single phrase, e.g.:

- רוח יתק גוולה 'a great strong wind' (Berger 1907: 25)

The gender of this small category of nouns diverges from the general trend in Hasidic Hebrew whereby nouns ending in [ǝ] are usually feminine and nouns ending in anything else masculine. However, these common nouns are somewhat more frequently treated as masculine, as the examples illustrate. Moreover, the trend in Hasidic Hebrew seems to be to reduce the number of common nouns by assigning masculine gender to most endingless nouns, as evidenced by the fact that only three such traditionally common nouns appear regularly in the tales, in contrast to e.g. Biblical Hebrew, which contains more than ten such nouns (see Levi 1987: 13–15 for details).

**4.1.4 Masculine Plural Nouns**

As in the singular, the gender of Hasidic Hebrew plural nouns is determined according to their suffix. Thus, nouns whose plural form ends in -םי are almost invariably treated as masculine. In many cases this overlaps with other forms of Hebrew because most nouns whose plural is formed with -םי are masculine in the canonical strata of the language as well (Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 248; Pérez Fernández 1999: 63). The following is an example of this:

- דיריים גולים 'great tzaddikim' (M. Walden 1914: 20)

However, as expected this correspondence breaks down with respect to the plural of nouns such as מז 'occasion' and עב 'stone' that are traditionally feminine but are masculine in Hasidic Hebrew, such as the following:

- פר למחים רוחקים 'except on rare occasions' (Bromberg 1899: 29)
- אחיו הנרימ הרוחקים 'one of the distant cities' (Ehrmann 1903: 19a)
In addition, and perhaps more surprisingly, the Hasidic Hebrew authors’ correlation between the מ- suffix and masculine gender applies even to nouns whose singular forms are feminine in their own writings, e.g.:

- מם-ישעמ ‘good deeds’ (Shenkel 1903b: 18)
- מים-יגולימ ‘large stones’ (Munk 1898: 76)
- מים-יהורוקים ‘rarely’ (Landau 1892: 16, 35; Berger 1910b: 11)
- מים-טורוב ’precious stones’ (Sofer 1904: 29; Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 8)
- מים-פקמעום ה Kaepernick ’on the previous occasions’ (Hirsch 1900: 44)
- מים-ままעיס ‘bad deeds’ (N. Duner 1912: 19)
- מים-בשיניים ה Kaepernick ‘with grinding teeth’ (Shenkel 1883, pt. 2: 26)
- מים-ỵינישב ’their hind legs’ (Chikernik 1902: 11)

This is especially striking in the case of logically feminine plural nouns such asadies, as in the following examples:

- מים-ינש ‘the first years’ (Berger 1906: 62)
- מים-ינש ‘and precious pearls’ (Brandwein 1912: 22)
- מים-ינש ‘the last three years’ (Michelsohn 1912: 39)
- מים-ינש ‘sixty consecutive years’ (Yellin 1913: 9)

This phenomenon is noteworthy because it suggests that the Hasidic Hebrew understanding of plural noun gender is based primarily on attraction rather than on a need to maintain continuity with the gender of the singular noun or indeed on the logical gender of the plural noun (this can be contrasted with the treatment of logically masculine singular nouns such asאני ‘mishnaic sage’ discussed in 4.1.1 and logically feminine singular nouns such asתקידא discussed in 4.1.2). This predilection for attraction does not seem to have been unique to Hasidic Hebrew, but rather is evident in medieval and early modern responsa literature (Betzer 2001: 75–76) as well as in medieval translations of Arabic works (Sarfatti 2003: 86). However, as in the case of the singular nouns, this Hasidic Hebrew convention is so extensive that it is unlikely to be attributable solely to influence from earlier literature, but rather seems to
comprise part of a wider synchronic realignment of noun gender and a drive towards attraction-based gender concord.

As in the case of masculine singular nouns, there are some exceptions to this general tendency, whereby traditionally feminine plurals noun ending in -םי are likewise treated as feminine in Hasidic Hebrew. Such instances are shown below.

- 'bright eyes' (Landau 1892: 6)
- 'many times' (Zak 1912: 161)
- [...] 'precious stones' (Sofer 1904: 30)
- ‘seven consecutive years’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 47)
- ‘with empty hands’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pt. 3: 19)
- ‘two consecutive years’ (Yellin 1913: 5)
- ‘with a pleasant welcome’ (Berger 1910b: 72; Hirsch 1900: 18)
- ‘precious stones’ (Michelsohn 1912: 110); cf. אבנים יקרים ‘precious stones’ (Michelsohn 1912: 110)

This phenomenon is most common with well-known collocations attested in earlier literature, such as ‘pleasantly’ in the penultimate example. As in the case of masculine and feminine singular nouns, these deviations from the trend towards attraction-based plural gender agreement may indicate that the Hasidic Hebrew noun gender structure was still in the process of development. This possibility is supported by the fact that individual authors may treat the same plural noun as masculine on some occasions and feminine on others, as illustrated in the last example.

4.1.5 Feminine Plural Nouns

Just as Hasidic Hebrew almost invariably regards plural nouns ending in -םי as masculine, so it nearly always treats plural nouns ending in -תו as feminine. Again, this convention often corresponds to that of earlier types of Hebrew, in which -תו is likewise typically a feminine plural marker (see Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 248; Pérez Fernández 1999: 64). This overlap is illustrated below:

- [...] ‘bad qualities’ (J. Duner 1899: 34)

However, here too Hasidic Hebrew deviates from the canonical norms in that it generally treats plural nouns ending in -תו as feminine despite the fact that they are masculine in other forms of the language. Unsurprisingly, this affects nouns such as לילה ‘night’ whose singular form is regarded as
feminine in Hasidic Hebrew but masculine in other varieties of the language, as in the following examples:

- דנקומחאורות כמו 'on the first nights' (Landau 1892: 23)
- תגלומתלולימ 'consecutive nights' (Bodek 1865b: 10)
- ת獴ותריה 'many fields' (Sofer 1904: 34)

However, as in the case of masculine plural nouns, this tendency applies even to plural nouns whose singular counterparts are regarded as masculine in Hasidic Hebrew, e.g.:

- תולודגתונולח 'big windows' (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 5)
- תקולותנאריה 'with awesome sounds' (Kaidaner 1875: 20a)
- תיאלהבגדת 'tall trees' (Ehmann 1903: 33b)
- תלםוקきちורן שחרורקית 'to places that are very far away' (Landau 1892: 56)
- תערונהירעתומרת 'evil and bitter ideas' (Bodek 1865a: 74)
- תשיחוטשנישтан 'elevated secrets' (Berger 1906: 18)
- תפקומהתדרות 'the big places' (Hirsch 1900: 64)
- תפקומתחקראות והזרוקות 'the near and far places' (Michelsohn 1911: 25)
- דונורעיןשלוהיולהקית 'candles, except that they weren't burning' (N. Duner 1912: 10)
- תוקלודתורנינשו 'and two burning candles' (Seuss 1890: 5)
- תושכנתככית 'holy feelings' (Michelsohn 1910c: 62)
- תושכנתככית 'holy ideas' (Shenkel 1903a: 20)

As in the case of masculine plural nouns, this phenomenon is found more generally in Ashkenazi Hebrew writings (Wertheimer 1975: 157; Betzer 2001: 75–76; Goldenberg 2007: 670) as well as in medieval Spanish-Provençal Hebrew literature (Rabin 2000: 91) and medieval Hebrew translations of Arabic texts (Sarfatti 2003: 86). Again, the Hasidic Hebrew usage is likely to be a direct product of this more widespread Ashkenazi Hebrew practice, which may itself derive from the medieval Spanish Hebrew phenomenon (Goldenberg 2007: 670). Moreover, the tendency was probably reinforced by the fact that the authors would have pronounced the suffix -ית as ōs, which corresponds phonetically to the most common Yiddish feminine plural marker (see Mark 1978: 123, 161–162; Katz 1987: 59, 54–55). Additionally, as in the case of the singular and masculine plural nouns it seems to comprise part of a wider Hasidic Hebrew tendency towards regularization and attraction-based gender concord. See Betzer 2001: 75 and Sarfatti 2003: 86 for a similar analysis of the corresponding phenomenon in responsa literature and in medieval Hebrew
translations respectively; by contrast, see Goldenberg 2007: 670 and Rabin 2000: 92 for the more prescriptive argument that this trend (in Ashkenazi Hebrew and medieval Spanish Hebrew prose respectively) is a function of grammatical ignorance.

As above, there are some exceptions to this convention whereby a plural noun ending in -ת- is treated as masculine, e.g.:

- ‘the holy Patriarchs’ (Landau 1892: 66)
- ‘closed windows’ (Ehrmann 1903: 36b)
- ‘the holy names’ (Zak 1912: 159)
- ‘good fruits’ (Sofer 1904: 6)
- ‘and various strange ideas’ (Rodkinsohn 1864a: 6)
- ‘from other places’ (Gemen 1914: 91)
- ‘burning candles’ (Bodek 1865a: 14; cf. Norah רובוי ‘many candles’ (Bodek 1865b: 9)

Some of these exceptions consist of logically masculine plural nouns, as in the first example. The trend to treat such nouns as masculine can be contrasted with logically feminine plural nouns, in which logical gender is overridden by the tendency towards attraction-based concord. In other cases, this phenomenon may indicate that the Hasidic Hebrew noun gender system was in the process of development at the time of the tales’ composition; this is illustrated by fluctuating plural noun gender within the work of a single author, as in the last example.

4.2 Number

4.2.1 Dual

Hasidic Hebrew differs from biblical and most post-biblical forms of Hebrew, in which a small group of nouns consisting chiefly of paired body parts, time words and certain numerals typically appear with a dual suffix to indicate that the noun in question is appearing in a quantity of two, e.g. ‘hands’, שתיות (two hours), ha�ישירה (two weeks), שבעה (two months), יתאפ (two years), מיווש (two hundred) (Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 250–253; Ariel 2013; Schwarzwald 2013).

Conversely, in the Hasidic Hebrew tale corpus this dual form is almost invariably avoided in conjunction with numerals and nouns referring to time. Instead, the authors typically designate the concepts ‘two hours/weeks/hundred’, etc., with the numeral שתיות/שני ‘two’ followed by a plural noun. This
practice is most likely due to influence from the authors’ native Yiddish: in Yiddish 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 have been the most obvious form for the authors to use as it is likely that they were subconsciously translating the concepts directly from Yiddish plural phrases, e.g. נאָווייווצ ‘two weeks’, etc. This applies to the nouns שעוע ‘hours’, שעוע ‘days’, שבועות ‘weeks’, and the more rarely attested ירח ‘months’, שנה ‘years’, פעמים ‘times’, מאה ‘hundreds’, and אלפים ‘thousands’, as below:

שועו

– בר ‘two hours’ (Kaidaner 1875: 9a)
– שעוע ‘two hours’ (N. Duner 1899: 36)
– שעוע ‘two hours’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 6)

יום

– שני ימים ‘two days’ (Shenkel 1883, pt. 2: 9)

שבועות

– שני שבועות ‘two weeks’ (Hirsch 1900: 73)
– בר ‘two weeks’ (Heilmann 1902: 79)

ירוח, חודשים

– ‘in two months’ (Bodek 1865b: 4)
– ובשנים חודשים ‘and in two months’ (Berger 1910b: 27)
– ‘in two months’ (A. Walden 1860?: 32a)

שנים

– שני ימים ‘two years’ (A. Walden 1860?: 2a)
– ‘in two months’ (Landau 1892: 35)
– בר ‘two years’ (Singer 1900b: 5)
–نشر ‘two years’ (Yellin 1913: 22)
However, on rare occasions a dual noun with temporal or numeral reference is attested, as shown below. These forms are an extremely marginal feature of Hasidic Hebrew, but their appearance most likely reflects the fact that despite the very strong influence of their vernacular in this regard, the authors were not writing in complete isolation from the earlier Hebrew textual tradition.

Conversely, in the case of nouns referring to naturally paired body parts the Hasidic Hebrew authors use the dual form more frequently. The discrepancy in use of the dual between temporal words and body parts is probably due to the fact that, in contrast to time words and numerals, the plural forms of body parts naturally occurring in pairs are extremely rare or non-existent in earlier Hebrew literature. In such cases the dual forms the main or sole way of expressing more than one body part and therefore these forms would most likely have sprung immediately to the authors' minds, possibly to the extent that they regarded them simply as plural forms and did not actually perceive them as duals.
This phenomenon is comparable to an earlier development in Hebrew whereby
the occasional plural noun has a pseudo-dual suffix even though the dual
meaning has been lost or never existed, e.g. מים ‘water’, שמים ‘heavens’,
‘Egypt’, רחキャン ‘millstones’, etc. Such nouns retain their fixed pseudo-dual suffix
in Hasidic Hebrew, as illustrated below. In the case of noun דלת ‘door’, the dual
form is sometimes used instead of the plural דלתות with no apparent difference
in meaning, as shown in the final example.

– מזגמים ‘scales’ (Landau 1892: 57)
– יוחנן ‘more than double’ (Kaidaner 1875: 29a)
– אליהים ‘borders’ (Munk 1898: 58)
–zech ‘a water mill’ (Bromberg 1899: 22)
– והדלתים ‘and the doors’ (Ehrmann 1903: 2b)

4.2.2 Plural
The morphology and use of Hasidic Hebrew plural nouns typically mirrors that
of earlier canonical forms of the language. However, occasionally plural forms
deviate somewhat from historical precedent, as detailed below.

4.2.2.1 Masculine Plural Suffix י-
Most masculine Hasidic Hebrew nouns take the plural suffix י-. However, occa-
sionally a noun is attested with the suffix י-. This suffix is infrequent in Biblical
Hebrew but common in Rabbinic Hebrew. The authors’ use of the י- suffix is not
restricted to nouns, but rather extends to adjectives and the qoṭel (see 5.1 and
8.5.1.2 for these issues respectively). The Hasidic Hebrew use of the י- suffix on
nouns is sporadic and not extremely consistent, but a few patterns are evident.

Certain plural nouns appear relatively consistently with the י- suffix. The
words in question can all be traced directly to rabbinic literature, in which they
are commonly attested with the י- suffix. The following examples illustrate this
phenomenon:

– אורות ‘engagement’ (Kaidaner 1875: 37b)
– קדושי ‘marriage ceremony’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 58)
– יוחסין ‘divorce’ (Shenkel 1903b: 20)
– ידו ‘marriage match’ (Heilmann 1902: 246)
– ולשון ‘marriage’ (Landau 1892: 16)
Similarly, sometimes the authors may select the י- variant when the word in question is not a common feature of earlier literature, but tends to take the י- suffix on the occasions when it does appear in rabbinic sources. For example, the noun shown below appears in the plural on only 84 occasions in rabbinic and medieval sources, but out of these the 60 exhibit the י- suffix while only 24 exhibit the ש- variant.

- קִשׁוֹטִים ‘ornaments’ (Bromberg 1899: 14)

By contrast, in many cases the two suffixes are employed in free variation. This tendency is so pronounced that both of them may appear attached to the same noun in close proximity to each other within a single text, as in the last two examples below. There are no clear patterns governing the authors' selection of one variant over the other on any given occasion, but the reason that they employed both variants interchangeably may be that the words in question appear with both the י- and ש- suffixes in earlier texts and that while in some cases one form may be more common than the other, neither is extremely rare.

- נִירִי ‘the dancing’ (Bodek 1865a: 39); cf. בהרונעיה ‘in the dancing’ (Rodkinsohn 1864a: 29)
- נֵמָס ‘the diners/reclining ones’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 50); cf. שֵׁדֶוק ‘the guests’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 40)
- נִיוֹק ‘arranged marriages’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 40); cf. שֵׁדוֹר ‘the guests’ (Landau 1892: 36)
- נִיחֵרֲא ‘the guests’ (Landau 1892: 36)

In contrast to the gender of plural nouns, attraction does not seem to play a role in the authors' selection of the י- suffix; nouns with this variant may be modified by attributive adjectives ending in ש- or accompanied by nouns ending in ש-, as below.

- נִירֵּא ‘hidden secrets’ (Kaidaner 1875: 43a)
- נִירִי ‘with much jewellery’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 37)
- נִירֵּא ‘and with great afflictions’ (N. Duner 1912: 30)
- נִירֵּא ‘with different curses’ (Ehrmann 1903: 30b)
- נִירֵּא ‘books and clothes and jewellery’ (Moses of Kobrin 1910: 35)
- נִירֵּא ‘the foods and the dishes’ (Bodek 1866: 1)
4.3 Construct

The construct chain is a common element of the Hasidic tales. In terms of morphology, Hasidic Hebrew construct chains almost invariably resemble those of other forms of the language, but syntactically they exhibit many non-standard and innovative characteristics.

4.3.1 Morphology

4.3.1.1 Standard Construct Forms

In most cases Hasidic Hebrew construct nouns resemble those found in other forms of Hebrew.

4.3.1.1.1 Masculine Singular

In the case of masculine singular nouns there are no consonant changes in the construct. Because the Hasidic Hebrew tale texts are unvocalized, these forms are thus orthographically identical to their absolute counterparts, as in the following examples. It is therefore often difficult to ascertain whether the authors would have indeed pronounced these construct forms in the same way as those of e.g. Biblical Hebrew. It is thus possible that the Hasidic Hebrew authors did not distinguish between the absolute and construct forms of nouns such as e.g. חדר ‘room’ and בית ‘house’, but the consonantal text does not give us any clues on this issue.

– אור היום ‘the light of day’ (Bromberg 1899: 8)

Conversely, a few masculine singular nouns undergo consonant changes in the construct, as below. These patterns follow historical precedent dating back to Biblical Hebrew (with the occasional exception of Rabbinic Hebrew, in which these nouns are sometimes the same in the absolute and construct).

– אב הילד ‘the father of the child’ (Shenkel 1903b: 21)
– אחיה המארת ‘the brother of the betrothed girl’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 38)
– לאבי החתן ‘for the father of the bridegroom’ (Bodek? 1866: 22b)
– אחיו אחיו ‘the brother of his father’ (N. Duner 1912: 3)

4.3.1.1.2 Feminine Singular

The construct form of feminine singular nouns ending in -ה is formed as expected, by replacing the -ה with -ת, as below.

– בשעת אוכל ‘at the time of eating’ (J. Duner 1899: 16)
– ששת חיות ‘conversation of fowl’ (Shalom of Koidanov 1882: 13)
nouns

- ‘at the Sabbath meal’ (Moses of Kobrin 1910: 48)
- ‘in the saying of Psalms’ (N. Duner 1912: 2)
- ‘a meal of bread’ (Ehrmann 1903: 1)

4.3.1.1.3 Masculine Plural
The construct of plural nouns ending in ם-ןי-/ןי- is formed as in other varieties of Hebrew by replacing ם-ןי-/ןי- with the plural construct suffix י-, as below.

- ‘in the students’ eyes’ (N. Duner 1912: 23)
- ‘wine merchants’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1910: 65)
- ‘and wine cellars’ (Bodek 1865b: 43)
- ‘a native (lit: one of the children) of Satanow’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 36)
- ‘the words of that tailor’ (Ehrmann 1903: 2a)

4.3.1.1.4 Feminine Plural
As in other forms of Hebrew, the construct form of nouns taking the plural suffix ר- does not differ from the absolute as regards consonants. As in the case of the masculine singular, the construct forms of such nouns thus appear identical to their absolute counterparts, e.g.:

- ‘in all the lands of Volhynia and Poland’ (Heilmann 1902: 35)
- ‘in the laws of Passover’ (Landau 1892: 14)
- ‘parting greetings’ (Michelson 1910c: 32)

4.3.1.2 Non-Standard Construct Forms
As mentioned above, the formation of Hasidic Hebrew construct forms is extremely regular. Just a few non-standard plural construct nouns are attested in the Hasidic Hebrew tales, and the authors who employ them select them on only rare occasions. All of these forms have precedent in, and therefore most likely derive from, rabbinic and/or medieval sources. Thus, the non-standard form in the first example appears in e.g. the Tosefta (Beṣa 1:4), and the second appears in a variety of medieval texts such as Eliyahu Mizrahi’s Bible commentary. Interestingly, the third example does not seem to have been a common feature of Biblical or Mishnaic Hebrew but is attested in an Aramaic passage in the Mishnah (Ketubbot 4:12), as well as a number of times in the Aramaic of the Babylonian Talmud and medieval Aramaic writings. This extremely marginal phenomenon seems to be one of the only cases of Aramaic morphological influence on the Hasidic Hebrew
tales, though it may alternatively, or additionally, be based on an unconscious analogy with the singular form יום ‘day’.

– בֵּיתֵי תבֶּטֶלִיל – ‘on Tevet nights’ (Bodek 1865a: 35)
– חֵוֹת הָרְכוּק – ‘the windows of heaven’ (Ehrmann 1903: 7b)
–-complete with ‘and all the market days’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 37)

A somewhat more common phenomenon involves the construct plural of the word ימי ‘days’. In Rabbinic Hebrew this plural noun has two construct forms, ימי and ימי, each with a different semantic force: the former means ‘days of’, while the latter means ‘eras of’ or ‘epochs of’ (Pérez Fernández 1999: 65). In Hasidic Hebrew, by contrast, ימי is simply an alternative variant of יום. Comparison of the meaning of ימי the first example below with ימי in the second and third examples illustrates this. This particular collocation has some precedent in medieval sources, e.g. Joseph Karo’s Kesef Mishne (1574–1575), but appears only a handful of times so it is uncertain whether the authors were influenced by these earlier attestations.

– בֵּיתֵי הֲבָנִישׁי – ‘in the days of the Ba’al Shem Tov’ (Ehrmann 1903: 1b)
– בֵּיתֵי הָרוֹקָה – ‘on cold/winter days (lit: on the days of cold)’ (Landau 1892: 24)
– לְכֵל הֲבָנִיכָע – [...] ‘all the days of the week’ (HaLevi 1909: 53)

4.3.2 Syntax
4.3.2.1 Length of Construct Chains

Hasidic Hebrew construct chains most commonly consist of two members (one construct and one absolute), e.g.:

– ראשו העיר – ‘the town leaders’ (Moses of Kobrin 1910: 38)
– תֵּקִין שפֵּר – ‘shofar blowing’ (Shalom of Koidanov 1882: 20)
– לְמִשְׁרֵי הַטִּמֵּן – ‘burning of leaven’ (Baruch of Medzhvybzh 1880: 24)
– כְּרַאת הַהוֹדֶד – ‘the Torah recitation’ (Shenkel 1903b: 4)
– אור היום – ‘the light of day’ (Bromberg 1899: 9)

They may additionally be composed of three members (two construct and one absolute), as below:

– מְשָׁה הַנְּכָת אָרוֹדֵי – ‘the commandment of hospitality’ (Munk 1898: 11)
– הַטְּלוּדֵי בֵּית הָכֹדֶשׁ – ‘the students of the study-house’ (Shenkel 1903b: 19)
– כְּפֶרֶה חֵיוֹדוֹשׁ הָרוֹדֵי הַלַּל – ‘the books of these Torah insights of his’ (Landau 1892: 46)
More rarely, they may consist of four members (three construct and one absolute), e.g.:

- הרותהתבהאשאיפשרו 'and the sparks of fire of the love of the Torah' (Kaidaner 1875: 25b)
- הסכמות נול ידיק הזר 'the approval of the greatest of the righteous of the generation' (Zak 1912: 7)
- המסבה ישובת שיתית משקה 'a party of sitting of drinking wine' (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 19)

In longer (three- and four-member) chains the last two members usually compose a set phrase, such as הסכמות נול ידיק הזר 'hospitality', התbahאשאיפשרו 'the study-house', and הבת השקה 'the righteous of the generation', as above. However, they do not invariably do so; for example, there are no set phrases in the three-member construct chain הרותישהודיחרפס 'the book of his Torah insights' shown above (although even here הרותישהודיח 'his Torah insights' is based on the set phrase הרותישהודיח 'Torah insights').

4.3.2.2 Definiteness of Construct Chains

4.3.2.2.1 Definite Article Prefixed to Absolute Noun

In Biblical Hebrew the standard way of making construct chains definite is by prefixing the definite article to the absolute noun, with the construct noun remaining unprefixed (see e.g. Williams 2007: 8), and this practice remained standard in subsequent forms of the language. The Hasidic Hebrew authors sometimes follow this convention, as in the following examples.

- תיבהיןב 'the members of our household' (Kaidaner 1875: 12b)
- יבגמלל 'the king’s son' (Sofer 1904: 36)
- הבהשלבת 'the daughter of the owner of the house' (Bodek 1865a: 35)
- אגרלהספרים 'the chest of books' (Berger 1910b: 95)
- עיגלהרב 'the Rebbe’s wagon' (Moses Leib of Sasov 1903: 21a)
- בעיתאשפתנהלת 'in the eyes of the householder’s wife' (Bodek? 1866: 4a)
- אגודתמדיריךזר 'one of the righteous of the generation' (Baruch of Medzhybzh 1880: 26)
- בשעלעגולה 'the wagon driver' (N. Duner 1912: 19)
- הבהשלבת 'the immersion house' (Kamelhar 1909: 25)
- עלבריתמוללה 'at the circumcision ceremony' (Breitstein 1914: 52)
4.3.2.2.2 Definite Article Prefixed to Construct Noun

Although the Hasidic Hebrew authors sometimes follow historical precedent by making construct chains definite through prefixation of the definite article to the absolute noun, as above, this is not their sole or even most frequently utilized technique. Rather, on many occasions they make construct chains definite by prefixing the definite article to the construct noun instead of the absolute one.

This practice lacks clear precedent in Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew. By contrast, it is attested in medieval and early modern responsa literature (Betz 2001: 91), as well as in the two formative early nineteenth-century Hasidic Hebrew tale collections Shivhe haBesht and Sippure ma’asiyot (Kahn 2011: 338–340), and the use of the construction in the Hasidic Hebrew corpus under examination is doubtless traceable in some measure to its appearance in these earlier writings.

However, it is most likely that the phenomenon in all of these types of literature is ultimately attributable to influence from Yiddish, which was the native language of all of the Hasidic Hebrew authors as well as many of the composers of Ashkenazi responsa. Many Hebrew construct chains, such as those shown below, exist independently in Yiddish as compound nouns; in Yiddish such nouns are made definite by placing the definite article before the first noun in the construction, i.e. דער יראות שימש ‘the fear of heaven’, דער נורא שדוק ‘the ark’, דער ביעל-מלחה ‘the soldier’. The fact that the Hasidic Hebrew authors precisely replicate the Yiddish construction indicates that they (most likely subconsciously) understood these construct chains as single compound nouns, as in their native Yiddish. This is supported by cases such as that shown in the last example, 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.

- דער יראות שימש ‘the fear of heaven’ (Bromberg 1899: 35)
- דער נורא שדוק ‘the ark’ (Kaidaner 1875: 19b)
- דער ביעל-מלחה ‘the soldier’ (Bodek 1865a: 36)
- דער הקצער פה ‘the agreement’ (Ehrmann 1903: 10a)
- דער ביעל-מלחה ‘the cemetery’ (Sofer 1904: 16)
- דער כל-הנשלימאכל-מלומאכ ‘all of the artisans’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 81)
- דער ראש ישיב ‘the head of the yeshivah’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 3)
- דער הביל-עגל ‘the wagon driver’ (Berger 1907: 88)
- דער הביל-אסמע ‘the innkeeper’ (Brandwein 1912: 4)
- דער הביל-רכיל ‘the gossip’ (Rosenthal 1909: 16)
The authors' instinctive proclivity for this approach is highlighted by the fact that it is not restricted to construct chains appearing independently in Yiddish, but rather was generalized to include construct chains not typically employed in that language, such as those shown below. Conversely, the fact that the authors do not use this Yiddish-based construction in all cases but rather alternate it with the standard Hebrew convention discussed above supports the proposal that the Yiddish influence was subconscious and therefore not completely systematic; as in the case of non-standard noun gender discussed above, this fluctuation most likely reflects a system in the process of development.

- הובות יי 'the wine barrels' (Shenkel 1903b: 16)
- השתייה יי 'the drinking of wine' (Bromberg 1899: 20)
- الحديثות 'the iron bonds' (Ehrmann 1903: 33a)
- השנייה 'the silken clothes' (Landau 1892: 59)
- השפר והסיס 'the family tree' (Zak 1912: 18)
- השפ STREET 'the false prophets' (Lieberson 1913: 7)
- הדיבור נ الوصول 'the words of prophecy' (Chikernik 1903b: 6)
- השקורות שער 'the fur coat' (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 34)
- הבוקס יי 'the bottle of wine' (Gemen 1914: 66)
- הנשה מים 'the water carrier' (Sofer 1904: 1)
- הצלחת מים 'the bottle of water' (M. Walden 1914: 39)
- יהושיה מולדת 'the ministers of the land' (A. Walden 1860?: 2b)

As in the case of non-standard noun gender, it has been traditional in scholarly circles to interpret this type of usage as evidence of the Hasidic Hebrew authors' grammatical ignorance. However, it is important to consider that these authors had an intimate knowledge of written and recited Hebrew instilled in them since early childhood, and moreover, that some of them had considerable education and experience with written Hebrew; for example, Rodkinsohn had a background in publishing (see Meir 2008: 240–241). This consideration, combined with the extremely widespread appearance of this construction, means that it need not be dismissed as a series of errors committed by writers with a shaky grasp of Hebrew but rather acknowledged as an organic development in a thriving written Eastern European idiom.
4.3.2.2.3  **Doubly Definite Construct Chains**

In addition to prefixing the definite article to construct nouns, the Hasidic Hebrew authors frequently make construct chains doubly definite by prefixing the definite article to both the absolute noun and the construct noun. Again, this convention does not seem to be rooted in the canonical texts: while a similar phenomenon is attested in Biblical Hebrew, it is very marginal in that stratum of the language (Williams 2007: 8) and therefore is unlikely to be the immediate source for its extremely pervasive Hasidic Hebrew counterpart. Similarly, doubly definite construct chains are occasionally attested in rabbinic literature, and such forms may have contributed to some of the Hasidic Hebrew forms; for example, the phrase הבщу ליבת ‘the owner/landlord’ appears once in Midrash Zuṭa (Ruth). However, again, these relatively isolated forms are not likely to be the source of the very common Hasidic Hebrew construction. Conversely, the same practice is visible in Rashi’s commentaries (Betzer 2001: 108) and in medieval and early modern responsa literature (Betzer 2001: 91–92), and, as in the case of the definite construct nouns, the Hasidic Hebrew usage is most likely informed by this wider phenomenon. Similarly, it is attested in the non-Hasidic nineteenth-century Ashkenazi writings of Jerusalem community leader Yosef Rivlin (Wertheimer 1975: 159–160). It is likely that the convention in all of these types of literature can be attributed to the same convergence of two unrelated factors, to be discussed in turn below.

The first factor is influence from Yiddish, which accounts for a number of doubly defined construct chains such as those shown in the following examples:

- יבשל hızב ‘the owner’ (A. Walden 1860?: 51a)
- ידיקשקז ‘the righteous man of the generation’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 55)
- יקריא מוהלה ‘the Torah reading’ (Lieberson 1913: 44)
- יבשת חיס ‘the cemetery’ (Berger 1910c: 12)
- יהושע קוה ‘the head of the community’ (Ehrmann 1903: 35a)
- חוסמHDR ‘the redemption of the firstborn’ (Sofer 1904: 23)
- ילובית הבת ‘to the synagogue’ (Gemen 1914: 58)
- יבריליקה ‘the great ones of the generation’ (Singer 1900b: 10)
- מחנה תעלה ‘the custom of the world’ (Stamm 1905: 7)

In these cases, the authors seem to have regarded the chains (i.e. הבщу ליבת ‘innkeeper’ and ידיקשקז ‘righteous men of the generation’) as fixed, indefinite compound nouns despite the fact that they contain a definite article; that is, they do not seem to have recognized the articles as definiteness markers but rather simply as intrinsic lexicalized components of the nouns. As such,
in order to make the nouns definite they prefixed the article to the construct noun, resulting in a doubly definite chain. As in the case of definite construct nouns, this practice seems clearly to stem directly from the authors’ Yiddish vernacular, in which many of these construct chains function independently as compound nouns with the Hebrew definite article serving as a meaningless lexicalized component; such Yiddish compound nouns are made definite by inserting the (Yiddish) definite article before them. For example, the indefinite Yiddish nouns תיבהלעב ‘innkeeper’ and צרי קיז ‘righteous man of the generation’ can be contrasted with their definite equivalents תיבהלעברעד ‘the innkeeper’ and צרי קיזערעד ‘the righteous man of the generation’. (See Wertheimer 1975: 160 for a similar analysis of this phenomenon in the writing of Yosef Rivlin.)

This phenomenon is highlighted by the existence in Hasidic Hebrew of clearly indefinite construct chains including a definite article, as in the following examples, which are also employed independently in Yiddish:

- ונהנ שיב התכשת חזר ‘and they built a new synagogue there’ (Hirsch 1900: 91)
- כלכש מהאיה בעל הבית ‘to request from some innkeeper’ (N. Duner 1912: 4)
- ביבת המורשת אחד דקיק לוב ‘in a study-house of the holy community of Lvov’ (Shenkel 1903b: 3)

Occasionally this practice even extends to nouns that are not used in Yiddish, as in the following extracts, in which the construct chains בית הוותת תיב ‘brothel’ and סוחר חי ‘wine merchant’ appear in contexts indicating clearly that they are indefinite:

- ווהר איו חיימ אדר פודר מוקים בוכל בה 처 הוותת ‘And there was at that time a tailor who used to keep a brothel in his house’ (Moses of Kobrin 1910: 38)
- בא איה שפה סוחר חי ‘A wine merchant arrived there’ (Shenkel 1903b: 16)

Although Yiddish influence explains the existence of many doubly definite Hasidic Hebrew construct chains, it does not account for such chains that were not typically used either in Yiddish or in earlier forms of Hebrew as set phrases containing a definite article prefixed to the absolute noun. Thus, the chains shown below exist in Yiddish as compound nouns but are invariably employed in that language without a definite article: for example, the noun הגעהלעבה ‘carriage driver’, is commonly used in Yiddish as a compound noun not containing the definite article, i.e. לגעהלעבה ‘carriage driver’.
Similarly, many doubly definite Hasidic Hebrew construct chains are not employed in Yiddish at all, but rather are either attested in earlier Hebrew texts without any definite articles. Such cases are shown below. For example, 

� זהבשכductionיה


de ‘the lord of the town’ has precedent in the indefinite chain ריעןודא ‘lord of a town’ in Nahmanides’ commentary on Numbers (Masse 35), while the definite chain דבעםיקלא ‘worshipper of God’ can be traced to the indefinite ושםיקלא ‘worshipper of God’ appearing in the Babylonian Talmud (Ḥagiga 9b) and the definite chain תומיכהשם ‘the pieces of fish’ appears as the indefinite והתובית ‘pieces of fish’ in the Babylonian Talmud (Bava Meši’a 23b).

Alternatively, as the collocations shown above are not particularly widespread features of rabbinic literature, it is possible that the Hasidic Hebrew authors were not actually familiar with them in their indefinite form and created their doubly definite chains completely spontaneously. This seems more clearly to be the case in the examples shown below, wherein the construct chains in question are completely lacking from, or appear only rarely, in earlier Hebrew texts (in either indefinite or definite form).

� זהבשכductionיה


de ‘the cup of alcohol’ (Ehrmann 1903: 2b)

de ‘to the capital city’ (Sofer 1904: 29)

de ‘the inner courtyard of the king’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 86)

de ‘the gossipier’ (Rosenthal 1909: 16)

Therefore, unlike the Yiddish-derived doubly definite construct chains, in these instances the Hasidic Hebrew authors did not adopt well-known phrases already containing one definite article and add another; rather, they prefixed both definite articles themselves. This suggests that the authors regarded these construct chains not as compound nouns to be made definite by the addition of a second ה prefix, but as noun-adjective phrases in which both noun and adjective must be made definite in order to make the whole phrase definite. This
process is most clearly visible in the following examples, in which the authors could easily have confused the absolute noun כרדש ‘holiness’ with the very similar adjective קדוש ‘holy’.

- הארון הקדוש ‘the ark’ (Ehrmann 1903: 31b)
- יום השבת הקדוש ‘on the holy Sabbath day’ (Munk 1898: 72)

As discussed above, these non-standard constructions are so prevalent that they should not be disregarded simply as unsystematic mistakes but rather can be interpreted as a natural development in an evolving and uniquely Eastern European form of Hebrew.

4.3.2.3 Circumlocutions Instead of Split Construct Chains
According to standard Biblical and post-Biblical Hebrew convention, two construct nouns are never linked by the conjunction waw; instead, one of them is placed after the following absolute noun, prefixed by waw and bearing a possessive pronominal suffix (for details of this practice in Biblical Hebrew see Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 434–435; in Rabbinic Hebrew see Segal 1927: 187–188; in the language of Palestinian pīyyuṭim see Rand 2006: 250–252; and in medieval Spanish-Provençal Hebrew see Rabin 2000: 93). The Hasidic Hebrew authors only rarely follow this precedent, as the following examples:

- Owen ‘the power and might of the LORD’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 11)
- דרכי העינים יכדרה ‘the great and honoured ones of the town’ (M. Walden 1912: 11)

4.3.2.4 Split Construct Chains
Although the Hasidic Hebrew authors often follow historical precedent by employing circumlocutions instead of splitting construct chains (as illustrated in the previous section), they frequently deviate from the standard construction by inserting the conjunction waw between two or more construct nouns. This type of split construct chain can be seen in the following examples:

- והברת אלפים קדוש ‘the holiness and wonder of our Rebbe’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 6)
- ישרים והשמרים ‘the stupid and ignorant ones’ (J. Duner 1899: 35)
- הלוחות וה/english ‘to warn against eating and drinking anything spicy’ (Landau 1892: 58)
- כל הלהמות והחלונות ‘all the doors and windows of the city’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 48)
This non-standard usage is occasionally attested in the Hebrew Bible, but is an extremely marginal phenomenon (Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 435; Williams 2007: 8–9). It is found in certain medieval Karaite piyyuṭim (Rabin 2000: 93), but it is doubtful whether this literature exerted any direct influence on the authors of the Hasidic Hebrew corpus. By contrast, precisely the same construction is attested in Moses Alshich's late sixteenth-century commentary on Psalms 87 in the phrase 'ץראהתביחותשודק' 'the holiness and love of the land'. This text is more likely to have had some influence on the Hasidic Hebrew authors, as they were clearly familiar with it given that its traces are visible in other aspects of the grammar of the tale corpus (see e.g. comparative adjective constructions discussed in the beginning of 5.2; infinitives construct of i- and i-1 roots in 8.10.5.2; and the compound causal conjunction -ןש in 13.1.3). Moreover, any such influence was probably compounded by the existence of a similar construction in the authors' vernacular. The construct chain is not a feature of the Yiddish language, which instead frequently expresses the possessive relationship between nouns by means of the preposition 'ןופֿ' 'of' placed before the possessor (Mark 1978: 178–179). In such constructions it is not uncommon for the possessed nouns to be linked by the conjunction 'ןוא' 'and'. The existence of such a mechanism in the authors’ native language is likely to have informed their Hebrew writing and overridden any sense that they may have had of the construction being ungrammatical. As in the case of non-standard construct chain definite-
ness, although this usage differs from the canonical Hebrew norms it need not be interpreted prescriptively as an error, but rather more neutrally as an internal linguistic development. Interestingly, the same phenomenon appears in the writings of S.Y. Agnon (Breuer 2009: 105), composed several decades after the initial revernacularization of Hebrew in Palestine.

4.3.2.5 Noun-Adjective Construct Chains
While most Hasidic Hebrew construct chains are composed solely of nouns, some contain an adjective instead of one of the nouns.

In some cases the adjective appears in the construct position, as in the following example. This type of construction has parallels in earlier forms of the language dating back to the Hebrew Bible (Gibson 1994: 30; Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 438–439; Van Hecke 2013).

– ‘the greatest of the students in the yeshivah’ (Shenkel 1903b: 19)

However, not infrequently an adjective is attested in the absolute position, as in the following examples. In such cases the adjectives serve to modify the associated construct nouns just as attributive adjectives modify their associated nouns in noun-adjective phrases. These adjectives typically match the construct nouns in gender and number, as below. This type of construction is very rarely attested in Biblical Hebrew (Williams 2007: 10), but it is so marginal that it is unlikely to have directly inspired the Hasidic Hebrew phenomenon, particularly since the collocations are not the same.

– ‘Days of Awe’ (Berger 1906: 48)
– ‘the Days of Awe’ (Hirsch 1900: 13)
– ‘the holy words of my Rebbe of blessed memory’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 2: 20)
– ‘and true stories’ (Shenkel 1903a: 1)

Number discord between the noun and adjective is extremely rare; the following example is the only clear such case in the corpus. In this collocation, which is very commonly attested in the tales, the construct noun is plural but the adjective is singular. This particular phrase is attested in, and therefore most likely directly stems from, the Mishnah (e.g. Yoma 3:6) and Babylonian Talmud (e.g. Yoma 60b).

– ‘white clothes’ (A. Walden 1860?: 26a)
Only slightly more frequently does one find gender discord between the elements; the two phrases below are rare examples. In the first one, the construct noun is masculine while the adjective is feminine, while in the second one the noun is feminine and the adjective masculine. This phenomenon reflects the occasional tendency towards gender discord visible throughout the tale corpus (see e.g. 5.4.3 for discussion of gender discord in noun-adjective phrases).

– תורוחשילותח ‘black cats’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 43)
– لمדרינת הרוחות ‘to a distant land’ (Ehrmann 1903: 19a)

As mentioned above, the collocation בגדים לבנים ‘white clothes’ appears in the Mishnah and Talmud, while ימי נוראים ‘Days of Awe’ appears in Jacob Levi Moelin’s fifteenth-century compendium of German-Jewish customs Minhage Maharil. The other Hasidic Hebrew phrases do not have clear precedent in earlier texts. It is possible that the authors were inspired by the few expressions known to them from rabbinic and medieval texts, and then applied it subconsciously in unprecedented constructions. However, because the phenomenon is not very widespread in these earlier writings, such influence is unlikely to have been the sole factor in the development of the Hasidic Hebrew usage: rather, it probably developed spontaneously by analogy with noun-adjective phrases, most likely reinforced by the tendency to confuse construct chains with noun-adjective phrases (as discussed in 4.3.2.2.3).

4.3.2.6 Abstract Plural Absolute Nouns
When Hasidic Hebrew construct chains are composed of a plural construct noun, the following absolute noun is typically plural as well. This applies even if the noun refers to an abstract concept that outside of construct chain settings appears only in the singular, e.g.:

– מכתיבים מדרשים ‘from study houses’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 3)
– כמתフィרורי תורה ‘several Torah scrolls’ (Kaidaner 1875: 19b)
– בכל בתי כנסיות ‘in all synagogues’ (Shenkel 1903b: 17)
– ובצעלקראים ‘and artisans’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 38)
– בתי מדרשים ‘study houses’ (Shalom of Koidanov 1882: 17)
– בבתי תפלה ‘the prayer leaders’ (M. Walden 1914: 59)
– דבורי הבילם [... ‘words of meaninglessness’ (Michelsohn 1910a: 142)

This Hasidic Hebrew convention seems to be ultimately traceable to Late Biblical Hebrew, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and Rabbinic Hebrew, in which the absolute noun following a plural construct noun is frequently plural as well even if it
refers to an abstract concept; this contrasts with Standard Biblical Hebrew, in which the absolute noun in such chains typically remains in the singular (Pérez Fernández 1999: 70). The Hasidic Hebrew preference for this post-biblical convention over its biblical counterpart appears on first inspection to constitute evidence that, as commonly believed, the language of the tales is predominantly rabbinic-based (see e.g. Frieden 2005: 267 for an example of this view); as such, it does not seem to warrant special examination. However, such an explanation is belied by the fact that the tales are actually replete with biblical grammatical elements and that rabbinic elements are not necessarily chosen by default (as discussed elsewhere in this volume; see also Kahn 2012a); therefore, the authors’ consistent adoption of this particular rabbinic feature should not be dismissed as a motiveless norm. Rather, in this case the authors’ selection of the rabbinic construction may be due to their penchant for attraction (as in the case of noun gender discussed in 4.1; see also Kahn 2013a), given that it features two plural nouns in succession. Moreover, the same phenomenon is attested in medieval and early modern responsa literature (Betzer 2001: 92); as this literature is extremely widespread and would have been familiar at least in part to the Hasidic Hebrew authors, it may have served to reinforce their inclination to follow this model rather than the biblical one.

4.3.2.7 Construct Form Used as Absolute
In rare cases the Hasidic Hebrew authors employ the construct form of a noun outside of the confines of a construct chain, in a setting wherein one would expect to find the absolute form, e.g.:

– מ comunità לשדר עזר
  ‘because of the outward feeling’ (Kaidaner 1875: 18b)
– פייסא של מסף
  ‘and with a lamp of silver’ (Lieberson 1913: 22)
– אהבה המקשת בלנה
  ‘And love took root in his heart’ (Ehrmann 1903: 25a)
– סעודה זוהי
  ‘a big meal’ (Sofer 1904: 2)

The unexpected construct form may appear in a variety of syntactic contexts: in the first example above, it is found in a noun-adjective phrase, in which the definite feminine singular noun has the construct suffix (see 4.3.2.2.2 for discussion of definite construct nouns) but is immediately followed by a definite adjective. It may additionally be found in a possessive construction with the particle ‘of’, as in the second example, or before a verb, as in the third.

This phenomenon, like the converse practice whereby an absolute form is found serving as a construct noun (see 4.3.2.8), is an occasional aberration rather than a systematic convention. The forms in question do not appear to have direct precedent in the canonical forms of Hebrew. Interestingly, however,
a similar phenomenon is attested in Biblical Hebrew, whereby certain con-
struct forms appear on occasion serving as absolute nouns (Rand 2006: 100).
Nevertheless, it is unclear whether this somewhat marginal biblical practice
inspired the equally marginal Hasidic Hebrew phenomenon. Instead, it is more
likely simply to be a typesetting error, whereby the intended ד was inadvert-
tently substituted by the very similar looking ד on certain occasions.

4.3.2.8 Absolute Form Used as Construct
While the Hasidic Hebrew authors typically follow historical precedent in the
formation of construct nouns (as discussed in 4.3.1), there are some deviations
from the standard in the feminine singular and masculine plural. Thus, while
the construct form of feminine singular nouns ending in ד- typically takes a ד- suffix (see 4.3.1.1.2), occasionally such a feminine singular noun appears
immediately before another noun in a position that appears to be construct,
but without the characteristic ד-. Such cases are shown below. This practice is
not systematic but rather most likely constitutes either an occasional oversight
on the part of the authors or a typesetting error. The latter is particularly
probable because the consonants ד and ד are easily confused, especially in
Rashi script (though the phenomenon is not restricted to texts printed in Rashi
script).

– תונמה י‘a piece of bread’ (Munk 1898: 51)
– תנור ‘He hired a wooden wagon’ (Lieberson 1913: 40)
– תבט ה‘this piece of fish’ (Ehrmann 1903: 37b)
– תנור ‘and by kneading bread’ (Sofer 1904: 6)
– תנור ‘a piece of sugar’ (Berger 1910b: 89)
– תנור ‘in the theft suffered by (lit: of) the lady’ (Bodek? 1866: 20a)
– תנור ‘a piece of fish’ (Shenkel 1883, pt. 1: 12)
– תנור ‘a wagon of wood’ (Breitstein 1914: 9)

Likewise, sometimes an absolute masculine plural form is used instead of an
expected construct one, as in the following examples. Like the corresponding
non-standard use of the feminine singular absolute form in construct position,
this seems to be an occasional aberration rather than a widespread trend. In
some cases, it is possible that the authors used the absolute form because they
did not perceive the noun in question to be plural but rather regarded it as
a fixed singular form. This may be the case in the last example, as the noun
שהלמה ‘payment’ is plural in form but has a singular sense.

3 Sic; דבוש.
This practice is most commonly seen with numerals in conjunction with definite nouns, as below; the construct form of numerals is almost never used in Hasidic Hebrew narrative. See 7.4 for further discussion and examples.

This phenomenon is restricted primarily to a single collocation, shown in the following examples, in which the construct noun יושב ‘lacking’ is plural even when it refers to a singular head noun.

The phrase in question appears several times in rabbinic, medieval, and early modern literature with reference to plural head nouns (e.g. Babylonian Talmud Eruvin 28a; Alshich on Proverbs 30), and it is therefore possible that the Hasidic Hebrew authors perceived it as a set expression and did not see the need to alter the structure when used in conjunction with a singular noun. This tendency is likely to have been reinforced by the authors’ proclivity for attraction, which would have made them less inclined to recognize and avoid such discord.

Only in one case does this phenomenon extend to another collocation, shown below. In this case the absolute noun is plural despite having a singular sense. Again, this instance is most likely ascribable to attraction.
4.3.2.10 Attributive Adjectives in Construct Chains

Although the Hasidic Hebrew authors employ the construct chain frequently and with apparent ease, they tend to avoid it in conjunction with attributive adjectives in favour of the possessive particle ל (see section 12.1.1 for further discussion of this particle). When construct chains do appear with attributive adjectives, typically either the construct chain or the noun and attributive adjective constitute a set phrase. The examples below illustrate this point, with the set phrases underlined.

- הלודגהֲסנכהתיבב ‘in the large synagogue’ (Shenkel 1903b: 3)
- הבשעתהלשנתוקס ‘at the meal of the previous Sabbath eve’ (Bromberg 1899: 18)
- ההנהלתהUILDERתקדשה ‘upon the revelation of the holy righteous one’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 1)
- מפרירתהיהודיהתק ‘the death of the Holy Jew’4 (Jacob Isaac ben Asher of Przysucha 1908: 68)
- האשראלהעלייהתקדשה ‘this holy man of God’ (Rosenthal 1909: 7)
- לודגהריבעלעב ‘a big sinner’ (M. Walden 1912: 91)

There are some cases of adjectives modifying construct chains that do not conform to this pattern; for example, the phrases below do not contain commonly employed set phrases. However, such exceptions are relatively rare.

- מפרירתהיהודיהתק ‘the Rebbe’s first answer’ (Michelsohn 1910a: 110)
- מספרםחספיכרצ ‘the many Passover necessities’ (Bromberg 1899: 28)

The fact that the authors tend to avoid modifying nouns in construct chains with attributive adjectives suggests that they found such constructions difficult or awkward. This may be linked in part to their tendency to employ adjectives as one of the members of a construct chain (discussed in 4.3.2.5), in that they may subconsciously have perceived construct chains with attributive adjectives simply as unwieldy or confusing variations on those non-standard formations. The fact that attributive adjectives typically appear in Hasidic Hebrew construct chain settings only as part of, or in association with, set phrases may support this interpretation, because it suggests that the authors understood such constructions to be individual compound nouns rather than

4 Jacob Isaac Rabinowicz (1766–1813), the founder of Przysucha Hasidism.
construct chains as such (as in the case of the Yiddish-influenced definite construct nouns discussed in 4.3.2.2.2 and the doubly definite construct chains discussed in 4.3.2.2.3).

4.4 Articles

4.4.1 Indefinite Article

Like other forms of Hebrew, the language of the Hasidic tale lacks a true indefinite article. However, the numeral דחא/תחא ‘one’ very often serves a function similar to that of an indefinite article, conveying the notion of ‘a certain’, as in the following examples. This phenomenon is occasionally attested in earlier varieties of the language dating back to Biblical Hebrew (Rubin 2013b), but the Hasidic Hebrew authors use it much more frequently; this tendency is likely to have been reinforced by the existence of a true indefinite article in Yiddish (Mark 1978: 119; Jacobs 2005: 174).

– דחא פי עפש אתח זוח הקר מפשעה נויא בבר אאת ‘And one time a terrible thing happened in a certain village’ (Seuss 1890: 14)
– דחא פי עפש באכד אאת שעד סף אאת ‘A story of a hunter who hunted a bird’ (Shenkel 1883, pt. 1: 20)
– דחא פי עפש באכד אאת ‘And the woman cried in floods of tears that she had given a sum of eight hundred reinish to a certain man’ (Bodek 1865b: 3)
– דחא פי עפש באכד אאת ‘And he called to a man who was leading his beast to pasture’ (Chikernik 1902: 13)
– דחא פי עפש באכד אאת ‘A story of a certain town (I’ve forgotten its name)’ (A. Walden 1860?: 38a)
– דחא פי עפש באכד אאת ‘And he heard the cry of a pauper who was standing with his wagon’ (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 26)
– דחא פי עפש באכד אאת ‘Once when he was talking of the first tzaddikim and the first Hasidim, a Hasid said to him …’ (Moses of Kobrin 1910: 75)
– דחא פי עפש באכד אאת ‘And he told further […] that when he was travelling once with his holy Rebbe […] he came to a certain town’ (M. Walden 1914: 7)
– דחא פי עפש באכד אאת ‘Once a rich man came to him’ (Ehrmann 1911: 12b)
– דחא פי עפש באכד אאת ‘Once a woman came to the Rebbe’ (Menahem Mendel of Rimanov 1908: 22)
– דחא פי עפש באכד אאת ‘And they went to a big tavern’ (Kaidaner 1875: 48b)
4.4.2 **Definite Article**

4.4.2.1 Definite Article with Prepositions

The definite article is typically retained following inseparable prepositions, e.g.:

- ‘לֵחַיְמְךָ’ ‘to the righteous man’ (Bodek 1865c: 14)
- ‘לִהְיוֹתָהּ שְׁפָם’ ‘to the fear of heaven’ (J. Duner 1899: 17)
- ‘בָּאָבְּרֶפֶךְ מִלָּה’ ‘in my village’ (HaLevi 1909: 53)
- ‘כִּי חָרֹעֶת בּוֹ’ ‘like the good inclination’ (Lieberson 1913: 19)
- ‘לֶחֶזֶק הָעָלָה’ ‘to the sukkah’ (Zak 1912: 7)
- ‘לַהֲבָר’ ‘to the Rebbe’ (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 28)
- ‘בְּרָבֶּהֶב בַּדֶּנֶת’ ‘in the big house’ (Berger 1907: 91)
- ‘בְּרָבֶּהֶב בַּדֶּנֶת’ ‘in the book’ (Rodkinsohn 1864a: 41)
- ‘לָמַסְבָּה’ ‘to the party’ (Hirsch 1900: 17)
- ‘לִיהוֹקך’ ‘to the old man’ (Ehrmann 1911: 19b)
- ‘לִיַּחְוֵל’ ‘to the sick man’ (Michelsohn 1911: 15)
- ‘בְּהַרְדָּד’ ‘and on the road’ (Brandwein 1912: 18)
- ‘בְּהַרְדָּד’ ‘in the room’ (Shalom of Koidanov 1882: 20)
- ‘לִיְזָרָק’ ‘to the silversmith’ (Singer 1900b: 5)
- ‘לִיַּהְוָהָנָה’ ‘to the wedding’ (Bodek? 1866: 5a)
- ‘לִיַּשָּר’ ‘to the minister’ (N. Duner 1912: 2)
- ‘לִיַּאֲדוֹן’ ‘to the gentleman’ (Ehrmann 1905: 85b)
- ‘בְּהַרְבֶּעַת הָה’ ‘in this house’ (Jacob Isaac ben Asher of Przysucha 1908: 45)
- ‘לִיַּשְׁחָטֵח הָוָא’ ‘to that ritual slaughterer’ (? 1894: 14)
- ‘לִיַּדְר’ ‘to the room’ (Rosenthal 1909: 44)
- ‘לִיַּבִּאָר’ ‘to the well’ (Seuss 1890: 27)
- ‘לִיַּדְז’ ‘to the fish’ (Breitstein 1914: 21)
- ‘בְּהַרְנָה’ ‘in the river’ (Shenkel 1903a: 10)
- ‘בְּכָפְרָם’ ‘in the village’ (Bodek 1865b: 42)
- ‘לִיַּהוֹסָפָה’ ‘to the wedding canopy’ (Chikernik 1903b: 31)
- ‘לִיַּשְׁאָרִים’ ‘to the matchmakers’ (M. Walden 1912: 31)

This convention contrasts sharply with earlier canonical strata of the language. In Biblical Hebrew the definite article is regularly elided when prefixed by one of these prepositions; while exceptions to this are attested, they are relatively rare and typically confined to biblical books commonly considered to be late (Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 104). This type of elision is likewise the norm in rabbinic and other post-biblical forms of Hebrew; as in Biblical Hebrew, exceptions are comparatively uncommon. The fact that the authors of both corpora quite consistently adhered to this convention, which is so at odds with the standard practice in classical Hebrew texts, is striking. Conversely, the same phenomenon is
a characteristic feature of medieval and early modern responsa literature (Betzer 2001: 85–86), and this may be the source of the Hasidic Hebrew practice. Moreover, the same feature is widely attested in contemporaneous Maskilic Hebrew literature as well; thus, this issue constitutes one of many points of correspondence between nineteenth-century Hasidic and Maskilic Hebrew (see Kahn 2012: 271–273 for details).

While this tendency is extremely widespread, it is not completely consistently employed; thus, the definite article is omitted in rare cases. However, such omissions are relatively marginal. They are restricted almost exclusively to collocations consisting of a noun followed by an adjective, as below. Because the article is so regularly attested on nouns prefixed by prepositions without associated adjectives, its omission in these cases may not constitute a true exception to the above trend but rather is likely actually attributable to another phenomenon commonly exhibited in Hasidic Hebrew tales, whereby the definite article is absent from the noun in noun-adjective phrases (see 5.4.1.2.1).

Cases in which a noun without an associated adjective exhibits an elided definite article following a preposition are even more negligible; some rare examples are shown below:

– לְלִיסָבְשָהְ בַּחֲמוֹרָה ‘to the famous yeshivahs’ (Kamelhar 1909: 24)
– בְּדַרְכָּ דַהֲרוֹת נוֹל ‘on the greater way’ (Rapaport 1909: 42)
– בְּדַרְכָּ הָטָמו ‘on the good path’ (Bromberg 1899: 35)
– בְּדַרְכָּ חִיָּר ‘on the straight path’ (Moses of Kobrin 1910: 47)

4.4.2.2 Definite Article Prefixed to Noun with Possessive Suffix

On rare instances the Hasidic Hebrew authors prefix the definite article to a noun bearing a possessive suffix, as illustrated below. This phenomenon diverges from the norms of other forms of Hebrew, in which a noun may take either a possessive suffix or a definite article but not both simultaneously (Rubin 2013a). Conversely, it may be traceable to Yiddish, which possesses a similar (though comparatively uncommon) construction consisting of definite article + noun + possessive adjective (Jacobs, Prince, and van der Auwera 1994: 408). This construction is quite marginal in the tale corpus and as such cannot be considered a typical productive element of Hasidic Hebrew morphosyntax.
‘His mother (lit: the his mother) came to [see] him’ (Munk 1898: 17)

‘the livelihood (lit: the his livelihood) of a Jewish man’ (Breitstein 1914: 51)

‘Our Rabbi (lit: the our Rabbi) Gershon came’ (Zak 1912: 22)

4.4.2.3 Definite Article Prefixed to Verb

In Hasidic Hebrew, as in other forms of the language, the definite article is typically prefixed only to common nouns and qoṭel forms, as well as to the adjectives modifying such forms. However, very rarely the definite article is found prefixed to a finite verb. This convention is restricted to the verb רבע ‘passed’, as below.

‘last Sabbath eve’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 2)

‘last year’ (Chikernik 1902: 5)

‘last week’ (Michelsohn 1912: 18)

The same phenomenon is occasionally attested in Biblical Hebrew (Williams 2007: 38), e.g. in 1 Chronicles 26:28. However, the marginality of the biblical construction and the fact that the Hasidic Hebrew collocations are not the same as the biblical ones suggests that the Hasidic usage is not based directly on the biblical one. Conversely, one of the phrases (בשנה העברת ‘last year’) is attested in Alshich’s Bible commentary, and this is more likely to have exerted an immediate influence on the tale authors, as many elements of Hasidic Hebrew grammar discussed elsewhere in this volume seem to derive in part from this commentary (see e.g. split construct chains discussed in 4.3.2.4; comparative adjective constructions discussed in the beginning of 5.2; infinitives construct of י- and נ- roots in 8.10.5.2; and the compound causal conjunction ש- in 13.1.3). However, any such influence was most likely compounded by the fact that the corresponding Yiddish construction begins with the definite article, e.g. תבשן ענעגנאַגראַפֿםעד ‘last Sabbath’. The same phrases appear in certain other nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Eastern European Hebrew halakhic compendiums and responsa such as Abraham Danzig’s Hayye Adam and Israel Meir Kagan’s Mishnah Berura, suggesting that this is one of a number of more widespread features of Ashkenazi Hebrew of the period.

4.4.2.4 Uses of Definite Article

The most typical use of the definite article in Hasidic Hebrew is as an indicator of anaphoric reference. This can be seen in the following example, in which
the common noun ‘rich man’ is indefinite when initially introduced, but prefixed by the definite article when mentioned a second time.

– ‘ריבג’ ‘rich man’ is indefinite when initially introduced, but prefixed by the definite article when mentioned a second time.

The definite article is additionally used in the case of unique referents such as the Ba’al Shem Tov and the LORD, as below; however, this usage is rooted in the fact that the labels in question are simply definite noun phrases.

– ‘Only the LORD knows’ (Kaidaner 1875: 12b)
– ‘the Arizal’ (Shalom of Koidanov 1882: 20)
– ‘the Ba’al Shem Tov’ (Shenkel 1903b: 15)
– ‘great men of the LORD’ (Brill 1909: 80)

The definite article is employed only rarely in conjunction with singular generic referents, as below.

– ‘And when we came into the house we (lit: and we) found the whole household sitting and wailing as over a (lit: the) dead person’ (Kaidaner 1875: 12a)

It may also serve as a relative marker when prefixed to a qoṭel, as in the following example (see 13.11.2 for further discussion of this issue).

– ‘the man who was sitting in the wagon’ (Kaidaner 1875: 13b)

The definite article is not used as a vocative in Hasidic Hebrew.

The Hasidic Hebrew uses of the definite article do not correspond precisely to either Biblical or Rabbinic Hebrew. In Biblical Hebrew the definite article is used in a wide range of roles, and is frequently found in conjunction with unique referents and generic referents, as a vocative, and for anaphoric determination (see Barr 1989; Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 242–250; Schorch 2003 for details). Rabbinic Hebrew has retained these uses (Segal 1927: 180–181); however, it employs the definite article less frequently than its biblical predecessor (Pérez Fernández 1999: 26). Conversely, the Hasidic Hebrew usage seems to overlap somewhat more closely with that of Yiddish, in which the definite...
article is most frequently employed anaphorically, does not serve as a vocative, and is sometimes used (in addition to the indefinite article) with generic referents or with substantivized adjectives denoting general qualities (Jacobs 2005: 173–174). This suggests that the Hasidic Hebrew authors’ use of the definite article was influenced to some degree by that of their vernacular. However, it is important to note that discrepancies between Hasidic Hebrew and its biblical and rabbinic predecessors are relatively minor, with most instances of definite article use (i.e. anaphoric reference) corresponding in all forms of the language as well as in Yiddish.

4.5 Apposition

Nominal apposition is not a frequent feature of Hasidic Hebrew, but occasionally two nouns are found juxtaposed in an appositional relationship, as below. Nouns in apposition correspond in gender, number, and definiteness.

- יוהושע דריך מה粳 글ף אמש היה נמס עליזך חכ ממלך אהובות גנות ‘And he thought on his way [about] what he was doing; for here he was, going to such a righteous man and bringing lovers, prostitutes’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 45)
- וייח יאחור השבת קמש בר אמש חייארחים ‘And it was after the Sabbath when his men, the guests, came’ (Bromberg 1899: 24)
-־תונוזתובוהאךילומוהזכקידצלעסונאוההנההשועאוההמוכרדבושחיו ‘Then his righteous mother understood’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1910: 44)
-םיחרואהוישנאואברשאכתבשהרחאיהיו ‘And non-Jewish merchants came there’ (Sofer 1904: 31)

There are also two even less common variant appositional constructions. The first consists of an independent personal pronoun followed by a corresponding noun, as in the first two examples below, and the second consists of a noun with possessive suffix followed by a construct chain, as in the third example.

- יתשגרהטוידההיכנאםגרשאלודגיונישוניאר׳בםוידתירחשתדועסבו ‘And at the morning meal of the second day we saw a big change that even I, the simpleton, felt’ (Bromberg 1899: 37–38)
-הזהשיאהתאריכמבתוכהינאו ‘And I, the writer, know this man’ (Rosenthal 1909: 64)
-זלהחצורהדיודימםתואליצהוימחרבםשהלבא ‘But the LORD in His mercy saved them from his hand, the hand of this murderer’ (Ehrmann 1903: 3b)
The cognate accusative is attested relatively frequently in the tales. Many Hasidic Hebrew cognate accusative collocations are commonly attested in Biblical and sometimes post-Biblical Hebrew texts, as illustrated in the following examples.

- **הלודגהחמשםלעהחמשםיאנתהתעבו** 'And at the time of the engagement the lad rejoiced greatly (lit: rejoiced a great rejoicing)' (Bodek 1865c: 10); cf. **חַ֥מְשִׂיַּו הָֽלוֹדְגהָ֥חְמִשׂןוֹ֖יָקיִֽקַּה־לַעהָ֛נוֹי** 'And Jonah rejoiced greatly over the plant’ (Jonah 4:6)

- **הוֹמְבֹּצּוּ הָֽלָּדֶנֶֽם שְׁמַהְוּ שְׁמַהְוּ הָֽדְרָלֶֽה** 'And it seemed to them that they were corpses who stood up from their graves to fight the fight of Israel, and they feared (lit: feared a fear) and trembling seized them’ (Shenkel 1903b: 24); cf. **םָ֑ביִר־תֶאביִ֖רָיביִ֥ר** 'He will indeed plead their cause’ (Jer. 50:34) and **שָ֣פּוּ וֹ פָּדָ֑יו מָתְתָּא הָֽלָּדֶֽה** 'There they are in great fear’ (Psalms 145); cf. also **לודגַּה דָרְחָ֣פּ׀םָ֤שׁ** 'And because of this they feared greatly’ (Ibn Ezra on Exod. 9)

- **תאזההדרחהתאילאתדרחיכ** 'Because you worried about me (lit: worried this worry)' (Michelsohn 1912: 84); cf. **הָ֣לֹדְגּ֮הָדָרֲחקָ֣חְצִידַ֨רֱחֶיַּו** 'And Isaac trembled greatly’ (Gen. 27:33)

- **הלודגהקעצקעציו** 'And he screamed a great scream' (Bodek? 1866: 10); cf. **קַ֣עְצִיַּו דֹ֑אְמ־דַעהָ֖רָמוּהָ֥לֹדְגּהָ֔קָעְצ** 'And he screamed a very great and bitter scream’ (Gen. 27:34)

- **ל״נהשיאוחַבֶ֙טַחֹ֤בְטןַעַ֨מְל** 'to carry out a slaughter' (Ezek. 21:15)

However, the Hasidic Hebrew authors also employed the construction productively: for example, the collocations shown below appear rarely or not at all in earlier forms of the language.

- **והואפָּסּוּ דָֽרְחָו מָפְשַׁיִ֥תָי הָֽלָּדֶֽה** 'And he took (lit: stepped) a step outside straight away’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 46)

- **כָּלָה הָֽדְדֵוּי הָֽרָה אָשְׂרָאָֽלֶֽה וְדָֽלֶֽה** 'All of the Torah insights that my teacher made’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 8)
– And he took the stick and struck the child time after time (lit: strike after strike)’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 75)
– In his heart he was extremely envious (lit: he envied a great envy)’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 34)
– ‘Because of this you made (lit: journeyed) the big journey’ (A. Walden 1860?: 19b)
– ‘until in a short time he grew very rich (lit: was enriched a great richness)’ (Rosenthal 1909: 52)
– ‘And also their leader punished them in a way (lit: a punishment) that they deserved’ (Kaidaner 1875: 48b)
– ‘And he became very rich (lit: was enriched a great richness)’ (N. Duner 1912: 2)
– We have to take (lit: look) a little look’ (Heilmann 1902: 52)
Adjectives

5.1 Plural Suffix ∫-

Like nouns, masculine plural adjectives are typically formed with the suffix ∫-, but are occasionally attested with the variant suffix ∫- instead. As in the case of the nouns (discussed in 4.2.2.1), such adjectives are relatively rare and their appearance is not governed by systematic considerations.

Occasionally, attraction may play a role: for example, in the phrases shown below, the authors may have selected the ∫- suffix for the adjectives in order to match the associated nouns.

- נזוחי הקדושין ‘the holy sparks’ (Moses Leib of Sasov 1903: 29b)
- חפיפי פוסולין ‘with invalid phylacteries’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 2: 19)

However, such phrases are infrequent and attraction does not account for the phenomenon in general. Thus, in the following examples there is no correspondence between the nouns and their attributive adjectives; in each case a noun with the ∫- suffix is modified by an adjective with ∫-.

- במם חמים ‘in hot water’ (Chikernik 1908: 2)
- ימים ר循环经济 ‘consecutive days’ (J. Duner 1899: 21)

5.2 Comparative Adjectives

Comparative adjectival constructions in the Hasidic Hebrew tales may be formed in several different ways. A relatively common construction consists of the adverb ירי ‘more’ followed by the adjective, as in the following examples.

- ממראות ירי גבורה ‘on higher [spiritual] levels’ (Landau 1892: 26)
- האורזים של עבשימ 테 ירי גזויים ‘The tzaddikim of today are greater’ (Moses of Kobrin 1910: 75)
- ייתי בא תלמידה ירי נリスク ‘I would have reached a higher level than you’ (Michelsohn 1910c: 52)
- כי ירי פה לולוות ישיב יחדר ‘because it was more pleasing for him to sit in his room’ (Bromberg 1899: 29)
If the second term of the comparison is mentioned, it follows the comparative adjective phrase and is introduced by the preposition -מ/-מ ‘than’, as below.

– בובית הזז הרעש י gör גדר מח:_ן ‘And in this house the noise is greater than outside’ (Kaidaner 1875: 8a)
– אתה יצאה ליזה י gör חסם מ الشركات של_ן ‘You want to be wiser than our Later Authorities’ (J. Duner 1899: 47)
– ‘other places better than this place’ (Brandwein 1912: 46)
– ‘I was more well-known than you’ (Breitstein 1914: 13)

Somewhat less frequently, the comparative adverb may follow the adjective:

– ‘It’s better to be like a fool’ (Chikernik 1903a: 7)
– ‘even greater suffering’ (Bodek 1866: 45)
– ‘because pigs’ milk is even better than cows’ milk’ (Ehrmann 1911: 5b)

Rarely the comparative particle appears without an associated adjective. For example, in the following extract it is found in conjunction with a noun phrase:

– ‘more energetic (lit: more an owner of power)’ (Landau 1892: 5)

Interestingly, these ways of forming comparative adjectives do not all have exact counterparts in either Biblical or Rabbinic Hebrew. In both of these forms of the language comparative constructions are usually composed of the adjective followed by -מ/-מ ‘than’ and the second term of the comparison (Williams 2007: 33; Segal 1927: 193; Pérez Fernández 1999: 81). The modifier י gör exists in Tannaitic and Amoraic Hebrew (though not in the Mishnah), but it is employed following the adjective (Breuer 1998: 136), so does not precisely mirror the most common Hasidic Hebrew comparative construction (with the adjective in
second position). Conversely, both the constructions ותרוי + adjective and adjective + ותרוי are attested occasionally in aggadic midrashim and become more widespread in the medieval and early modern period, appearing in the writings of Abarbanel and Ibn Ezra, as well as in Alshich’s sixteenth-century Bible commentary. As in many other cases discussed throughout this grammar, it is likely that the Hasidic Hebrew method of forming comparatives is rooted primarily in the appearance of similar constructions in these medieval and early modern texts.

5.3 Superlative Adjectives

Hasidic Hebrew superlative adjective phrases can be formed in several different ways. The most common construction consists of the adverb ותרוי preceding the adjective. This usage is noteworthy because ותרוי additionally serves as a comparative marker in Hasidic Hebrew (discussed above in 5.2). However, the context generally makes clear whether a comparative or superlative sense is intended, as illustrated in the following examples.

– אספת ‘a meeting of the three greatest doctors’ (N. Duner 1912: 28)
– בכם ‘as one of the most outstanding geniuses of his generation’ (Michelsohn 1912: 115)
– היסרים ‘The biggest sufferings are …’ (Gemen 1914: 54)
– עד שעשה ‘until he reached the highest level’ (HaLevi 1907: 25a)
– מהמה ‘a great soul from the highest world’ (Bodek 1865a: 3)
– והרי ‘And he was one of the greatest and most famous Hasidim’ (Heilmann 1902: 144)
– הצדק ‘the greatest righteous man in that generation’ (Rosenthal 1909: 18)
– ההוזיא ‘the greatest description with which he described someone’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 12)
– הרופא ‘The biggest expert doctor in the town’ (Shenkel 1883, pt. 2: 9)
– הוואו ‘And he was the most influential man in the city’ (Zak 1912: 164)
– והשלמה ‘And the biggest wonder is the servant’s forgetting everything’ (Kaidaner 1875: 13a)
This construction most likely derives from medieval and early modern literature such as the writings of Abarbanel and Alshich, in which it is widely attested, having been introduced into the language via Arabic-influenced Hebrew translations beginning in the twelfth century (Sáenz-Badillos 2013). It is not clearly traceable to earlier canonical forms of the language: in Biblical Hebrew there is no superlative marker, with the superlative sense conveyed by syntactic means such as placing the positive adjective in construct, prefixing it with the definite article, attaching a pronominal suffix, etc. (Williams 2007: 33–34); conversely, in Rabbinic Hebrew the superlative may be conveyed by the postpositive marker 'the most' (Even-Shoshan 2003: 689) but not by prepositive "there.

More rarely, superlatives may be formed with a definite adjective followed by the adverb 'most', as in the following examples. In contrast to the more common construction discussed above, this has precedent in Rabbinic Hebrew (Even-Shoshan 2003: 689).

– והי ילבשuem מאנטש המפונטים יבואר
  'And he was dressed like one of the simplest people' (Berger 1910b: 21)
– ואפי במקומונות הקרבם יבואר
  'and even in the coldest places' (Yellin 1913: 31)

Similarly, on occasion the superlative may be composed of an adjective followed by -شبه 'in' and then the same adjective in masculine plural form. The initial adjective is usually indefinite, as in the first three examples below, but it may be definite, as in the final example. This construction is also ultimately traceable to Rabbinic Hebrew (Pérez Fernández 1999: 82).

– החממה טובים שבכלל
  'the best tastes in the world' (Hirsch 1900: 18)
– אףל ייה הגרי שגבוליים
  'even [if] he is the greatest of the great' (Teomim Fraenkel 1911b: 68)
– וייס איה השבר יראה
  'a tailor who was the most insignificant of all'
  (Lieberson 1913: 65)
– הקפראדימל הצרי יבשל
  'the youngest cardinal of them all' (Singer 1900a, pt. 3: 2)

Very rarely, the superlative may be conveyed by a definite adjective followed by -מן/מן 'from/of' or ים 'among', as in the following two examples respectively. The precise origin of these extremely marginal constructions is unclear as they...
seem to lack direct precedent in earlier forms of Hebrew, but they are most likely best regarded as variations on the preceding construction.

– יהודר הנגדלת-balot ויהו ‘And this is the biggest matter of them all’ (Kaidaner 1875: 28a)
– אוגר הצעיר ביהול ‘I am the youngest of all’ (Bodek 1865c: 3)

5.4 Noun-Adjective Concord

5.4.1 Definiteness

5.4.1.1 Definiteness Concord
Definite nouns in Hasidic Hebrew narrative are typically modified by definite adjectives. This concord is most frequently seen in noun-adjective phrases that are definite because they are prefixed by the definite article, e.g.:

– ליננההנטקהריעה ‘that small town’ (Kaidaner 1875: 20b)
– הלודגההפיסאה ‘the big meeting’ (Michelsohn 1910b: 172)
– תובוטהתודמה ‘the good qualities’ (Berger 1906: 73)
– ברהןומההלכו ‘and the whole great crowd’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 35)

The same applies to nouns with possessive suffixes, e.g.:

– בוהאהוכלמ ‘his beloved king’ (N. Duner 1912: 5)
– בותכתהחיווקדיש ‘in his holy thoughts’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 42)
– בותכתהחיווקדיש ‘his pure table’ (Kamelhar 1909: 29)
– בותכתהחיווקדיש ‘his pleasant son’ (Heilmann 1902: 21)
– לילמרדעתלהמה ‘to his high level’ (J. Duner 1899: 49)
– ברודרתקודע ‘your torn clothes’ (Munk 1898: 37)
– ברודרתקודע ‘my big brother’ (Shalom of Koidanov 1882: 20)

5.4.1.2 Definiteness Discord

5.4.1.2.1 Indefinite Noun with Definite Adjective
There are frequent exceptions to the trend towards definiteness concord in Hasidic Hebrew noun-adjective phrases. The most common of these is a phenomenon whereby the definite article in the phrase is prefixed only to the adjective(s), as below. This tendency is a feature of earlier forms of Hebrew, being attested occasionally in the Bible (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 260; Williams 2007: 31), more frequently in rabbinic literature (Sarfatti 1989: 161–165; Pérez-Fernández 1999: 26–27; Pat-El 2009: 35–36; Rubin 2013a), and in responsa
literature (Betzer 2001: 90), but seems to be more prevalent in Hasidic Hebrew than in the canonical forms of the language.

- 'the [first act of] wisdom' (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 22)
- 'the infamous libels' (Bodek 1865c: 13)
- 'from the old people' (Lieberson 1913: 92)
- 'that rich man' (Bromberg 1899: 31)
- 'all the bodily activities of man' (J. Duner 1899: 15)
- 'the upper palace' (Ehrmann 1903: 4b)
- 'the second house' (Sofer 1904: 38)
- 'the upper worlds' (Bodek 1865a: 20)
- 'the second Sabbath' (Hirsch 1900: 46)
- 'the last time' (Shalom of Koidanov 1882: 22)
- 'the last days' (N. Duner 1912: 33)
- 'the well-known book' (Heilmann 1902: 43)
- 'the first night' (? 1894: 9)
- 'the last street' (Singer 1900a, pt. 3: 6)
- 'his white silk garment' (Michelsohn 1905: 64)
- 'the two back legs' (Shenkel 1904: 14)

This phenomenon is attested with demonstrative as well as standard adjectives, as below. It is particularly common with the proximal singular forms ויה and ויה but is also found with the proximal plural form וה and with the distal singular forms ויה and ויה.

- 'and this non-Jew' (Lieberson 1913: 9)
- 'this man' (Zak 1912: 162)
- 'this letter' (Hirsch 1900: 14)
- 'this milk' (Ehrmann 1911: 5b)
- 'these things' (Bromberg 1899: 28)

This tendency to make only the demonstrative adjective definite within a noun phrase is so strong that sometimes if there is another adjective in such a phrase, it remains indefinite as well. For example, in the phrases shown below both the noun and associated adjective are indefinite, with only the final demonstrative adjective taking the definite article. This may suggest that the authors saw the definite article prefixed to the demonstrative adjective as an inseparable lexicalized component of the demonstrative.
– עֶנִי גְדוֹל הָלוֹךְ ‘this great matter’ (Ehrmann 1911: 5b)
– קֹדֶשׁ אֲלֵוִיק הָלוֹךְ ‘this Godly holy man’ (Bodek 1865c: 13)
– בֵּשָׁוָה טַוְּבָה הָלוֹךְ ‘this good news’ (Kaidaner 1875: 48a)

However, in other cases both the standard and demonstrative adjectives are
definite, with only the noun remaining indefinite, e.g.:

– אתְּ הָמוֹנָה הֹוָה ‘and this big stone’ (J. Duner 1899: 105)
– הָמוֹנָה הָמוֹנָה ‘this small cushion’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 30)

5.4.1.2.2 Definite Noun with Indefinite Adjective
Although the most common type of noun-adjective definiteness discord in
Hasidic Hebrew involves an indefinite noun in conjunction with a definite
adjective, a converse phenomenon is also attested whereby the definite arti-
cle is prefixed to the noun but not to its associated attributive adjective, as
below.

– לְהָעַזְדְוָהָ רַעָשִׁי ‘to the wicked men’ (Sofer 1904: 8)
– הָמַשְׁמִישׁ סָאָמַיְסְ שֵׁלְמֶה ‘their faithful servants’ (J. Duner 1899: 109)
– הָמָּנֵו הָרֹות ‘the evil decrees’ (M. Walden 1914: 53)
– הָמְנַשְׁסִי סָוֵיְס ‘the precious stones’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 8)
– הָמָּאָרְשׁ נַעְשֶׁנְ ‘the faithful/reliable man’ (Michelsohn 1910b: 156)
– הָמַחְשָׁשׁ בֵּרְוֹי ‘the alien thoughts’ (Bodek 1865a: 32)
– הָמָּמֵו קֻפָּנְ ‘the small sukkah’ (Berger 1906: 19)
– הָמָּמֵו הָרֹודָל ‘the big worry’ (Singer 1900b: 7)
– הָמָּמָו הָעוּרְוָה קְטָנִי ‘the small villages’ (Leichter 1901: 8b)
– הָמַשְׁשׁ הָמָּאָדְדָד ‘a story of the holy Maggid’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 5)
– הָמַשְׁשׁ הָמָּאָדְדָד ‘and of the hidden tzaddik’ (Seuss 1890: 41)
– הָמָּמַדְו הָרֹות ‘the bad qualities’ (Singer 1900a, pt. 2: 5)

Although the indefinite element in this type of construction is usually a stan-
dard adjective, in some cases a demonstrative may appear, e.g.:

– הָמַשְׁשִׁמְא הָמַדְדָד ‘this inn’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911b: 91)
– הָמַדְדָד הָמַדְדָד ‘this lord’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 8)
– הָמַדְדָד הָדוּרְבָּר ‘these matters’ (Ehrmann 1903: 2a)
– הָמַדְדָד הָמַדְדָד ‘this big pause’ (Stamm 1905: 16)

Occasionally the definite noun appears in conjunction with an indefinite adject-
ive but a definite demonstrative adjective, as below. In some of these cases
the authors seem to have regarded the noun and adjective as a set expression because of its independent existence in Yiddish as a compound noun, as in the first example.

- זֶלֶה הַרְעָה הַלְהַוָה ‘this evil decree’ (Ehrmann 1903: 35a)
- הָרְמָלִיתֵז הַגָּוְלָה הָאוָזֵה ‘these great words of wisdom’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911b: 85)
- הָלֶמֶסְסִית הַנֶּלֶז הָלוֹה ‘to this big party’ (Hirsch 1900: 17)
- הָעוֹרָה קִטְנָה תַּנְלִי ‘that small town’ (Kaidaner 1875: 20b)

A rare variant of this phenomenon occurs in noun phrases containing two adjectives, wherein the first adjective is definite but the second one is indefinite, e.g.:

- הבסָּת הַגָּוְלָה בָּבָה ‘the big, heavy chair’ (Zak 1912: 39)

This type of discord is very occasionally attested in Rabbinic Hebrew, but it is extremely marginal (Sarfatti 1989: 158–160) and is therefore unlikely to have inspired these Hasidic constructions. They may instead may be attributable at least in part to influence from Yiddish, in which the definite article in a noun-adjective phrase appears only once, at the beginning of the phrase (Jacobs 2005: 239–240). However, in many cases this phenomenon may alternatively simply be an element of the wider Hasidic Hebrew tendency towards noun-verb discord (see 8.13) and noun-adjective discord (see elsewhere in 5.4) and not necessarily specifically attributable to influence from Yiddish. This definiteness discord does not seem to be governed by systematic patterns, with definite and indefinite adjectives used interchangeably in similar syntactic and semantic contexts. This is illustrated by comparing the following two phrases: both consist of the same noun-adjective phrase within the same text by a single author, with one adjective being indefinite while the other is prefixed by the definite article.

- מְהָסֵס יָד הַפְרוּטָה ‘from the famous Hasid’ (Bromberg 1899: 20)

5.4.2 Number

In Hasidic Hebrew number discord between nouns and their associated adjectives is less common than gender and definiteness discord. However, it is not unusual for a singular noun to appear in conjunction with a plural adjective or vice versa, as detailed below.
5.4.2.1 Singular Noun with Plural Adjective
A singular noun may be modified by a plural attributive adjective, as below. This type of discord is quite rare and does not seem to be traceable to any particular historical form of the language; due to its marginality it is best considered an anomaly.

– אֵינוֹת הַמָּזוֹלָה הַנָּדוּלָה ‘Then there was the big dispute’ (Ehrmann 1911: 12b)
– הָדָאָסֶה שָׁוָה גְדוֹלִים שֶׁבַּמּוֹדֶה ‘the greatest doctor in the land’ (Bromberg 1899: 33)
– הַתּוֹרִי הַדָּם ‘that oven’ (Munk 1898: 49)

5.4.2.2 Plural Noun with Singular Adjective
Just as a singular noun may appear in conjunction with a plural adjective, so the converse phenomenon is attested whereby a plural noun is modified by a singular attributive adjective. Again, this type of construction lacks clear historical precedent and is very marginal within the tales; both types of number discord are almost entirely restricted to two authors, Ehrmann and Munk.

– וּמֶשֶׁבֶת נַדְלַה אֲרוֹבָה ‘and a big, long crossing path’ (Sofer 1904: 23)
– הַרְבֵּה מְשִׁישָׁת מָות ‘many such cases’ (Munk 1898: 33)
– הַנְּאָוֶּים הלוֹל ‘these geniuses’ (Ehrmann 1903: 32a)

5.4.3 Gender
Although the Hasidic Hebrew authors’ system of noun gender is relatively systematic, in some cases noun-adjective phrases exhibit gender discord that cannot be accounted for by the classification discussed in 4.1. Thus, occasionally a singular noun that is masculine according to both Hasidic and other Hebrew classification systems appears in conjunction with a feminine adjective, e.g.:

– מַמְתָּה שֶלֶוֶּה ‘a letter that was sent’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 5)
– הָמָּקִים רַחֲמוֹ ‘the place is far away’ (A. Walden 1860?: 13a)

Similarly, masculine plural nouns are occasionally modified by feminine plural adjectives, e.g.:

– סְפַרְיָם שָׁון ‘various books’ (Ehrmann 1903: 48a)
– בְּחֵלֶלָיו שָׁחוֹר ‘with black curls’ (Zak 1912: 15)
Even more rarely, a feminine singular noun ending in ח may appear in conjunction with a masculine adjective.

– בשנה חק ‘in a deep (lit: strong) sleep’ (Munk 1898: 28)

Conversely, the phenomenon is comparatively frequent with feminine plural nouns modified by masculine adjectives:

– במרדנויות רוחקים ‘in distant countries’ (Ehrmann 1903: 48b)
– הקניות והכרים ‘the aforementioned purchases’ (Landau 1892: 35)
– ב ‘two fixed hours’ (Zak 1912: 13)
– ‘good souls’ (Sofer 1904: 10)
– שש שנים רוזיס ‘six consecutive hours’ (Berger 1906: 15)
– בכמות האחים ‘in other goods’ (Rodkinsohn 1864a: 16)
– אמרים טהורים הקדושים ‘pure and holy sayings’ (Stamm 1905: 11)
– ‘high walls’ (Seuss 1890: 27)
– [...] ‘in the nearby towns’ (M. Walden 1914: 6)
– ‘and all of the blessings that are recited’ (Shenkel 1903b: 3)

Feminine plural nouns bearing a possessive suffix are particularly often modified by masculine plural adjectives, as in the following. The possessive suffix is usually 3ms, though very rarely a 1cs suffix (referring to a masculine character) is attested, as in the last example. This phenomenon seems to reflect a type of attraction whereby the masculine possessive suffix prompted the authors to attach the masculine suffix to the associated adjective as well.

– במרדנויות רוחקים ‘his holy thoughts’ (Bodek 1865a: 71)
– ‘of his awesome levels’ (Berger 1907: 64)
– משחתותיו הקדשים ‘his holy maidservants’ (Ehrmann 1905: 75b)
– ‘his holy lips’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 78)
– ‘my thoughts there are purer’ (Zak 1912: 28)

Aside from the above issue of possessive suffixes the gender discord does not seem to conform to any clear patterns. Rabin (2000: 91–92) notes a similar occurrence of seemingly arbitrary discord in medieval Spanish-Provençal Hebrew and suggests that it may be due to copyists’ mistakes. Conversely, Betzer (2001: 108) observes the same type of discord in Rashi’s commentaries and in medieval and early modern responsa literature (2001: 89), but regards these as phenomena intrinsic to these types of literature rather than as errors. While an explanation of hasty composition or printing inaccuracies could
theoretically be used to account for these Hasidic Hebrew anomalies, they seem more likely to indicate that the generally systematic patterns discussed above were sometimes overridden by a somewhat casual attitude to gender concord, most likely reinforced by the existence of such irregularities in these earlier writings familiar to the authors.

5.5 Demonstrative Adjectives

Hasidic Hebrew possesses a diverse array of demonstrative adjectives. As in other forms of the language there are two chief sets, proximal and distal. These will be discussed in turn.

5.5.1 Proximal

The Hasidic Hebrew proximal adjectives are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proximal</th>
<th>Proximal</th>
<th>Proximal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הלאה</td>
<td>התאזה</td>
<td>הזלה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הלא</td>
<td>התאזה</td>
<td>הזלה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הולא</td>
<td>התאזה</td>
<td>הזלה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וללה</td>
<td>התאזה</td>
<td>הזלה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ולאה</td>
<td>התאזה</td>
<td>הזלה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cp</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>fs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the above table shows, the Hasidic Hebrew authors employ a wide range of proximal demonstrative adjectives. These variants are for the most part regarded as interchangeable, but some are more commonly employed than others. Each variant will be discussed in turn below.

5.5.1.1 Singular

וה, והאזה, והה and והאזה are the most frequently employed proximal demonstrative adjectives in Hasidic Hebrew. As in other forms of the language, they are postpositive and appear in conjunction with a definite noun. However, in Hasidic Hebrew, unlike in the canonical forms of the language, they are unmarked for gender and appear in free variation. Thus, וה (and the prefixed variant וה, ‘such a’) which is masculine in other forms of Hebrew, may be used with both masculine and feminine nouns, as below:

– מהרוה ‘this holy man’ (Bodek 1865c: 13)
– המעשה והוה ‘this story’ (Sofer 1904: 26)
Similarly, התו (and the prefixed variant התו ‘such a’), which is feminine in other varieties of the language, is used with both masculine and feminine nouns, e.g.:

- המבהבתו ‘from this village’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 38)
- המבלבה התו ‘such a’ (Munk 1898: 41)
- המעשהתו ‘this story’ (Sofer 1904: 40)
- המיקשהתו ‘this place’ (Bodek 1865a: 52)
- הלילה התו ‘this night’ (A. Walden 1860?: 7b)
- לבר התו ‘in this village’ (Bodek? 1866: 3a)
- לבר התו ‘such a thing’ (Rosenthal 1909: 50)
- לבר התו ‘and at this time’ (Breitstein 1914: 9)

The interchangeability of the two demonstratives is highlighted in the following example, in which the same phrase appears twice on the same page of a single text with each variant:

- התו ‘this letter’ (Bromberg 1899: 14); cf. התו ‘this letter’ (Bromberg 1899: 14)

This phenomenon is a logical function of the Hasidic Hebrew authors’ system of noun gender. The singular proximal demonstrative adjectives התו and התו would most likely have been pronounced by the authors as [zə] and [zə]/[zə] respectively (Katz 1993: 68). As such, they do not clearly fit into the paradigm discussed in 4.1 whereby masculine forms end in anything except [ə] while feminine forms end in [ə], and this may have led to the authors perceiving both variants as interchangeable. Again, this indicates that synchronic phonological factors seem to have played a more important role in the development of Hasidic Hebrew grammatical categories than adherence to previous written norms. Moreover, the fact that the authors appear to have subconsciously applied the principles of their noun gender paradigm to demonstrative adjectives underscores the importance of this paradigm’s place in Hasidic Hebrew grammar.

The variant form התו is occasionally attested instead of התו, as below. This form is typically employed in Rabbinic Hebrew to the almost complete exclusion of התו (Pérez-Fernández 1999: 22). It is noteworthy that in this regard
the Hasidic Hebrew authors had a marked preference for the biblical variant. Moreover, in contrast to התאזה והוזה, והוזה is used in Hasidic Hebrew only in conjunction with feminine nouns.1

- והוזה ‘all this week’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911b: 25)

5.5.1.1.2 והוזה (Postpositive)
Somewhat less frequently one finds והוזה, והוזה, or והוזה following an indefinite noun, as shown below. Again, והוזה and והוזה are both unmarked for gender, while והוזה is less common and is reserved for feminine nouns.

והוזה

- והוזה ‘this manner’ (Bodek 1865c: 8)
- והוזה ‘in this place’ (Lieberson 1913: 68)
- והוזה ‘and from this kugel’ (Rapaport 1909: 29)

והוזה

- והוזה ‘and with this payment’ (Ehrmann 1911: 42b)
- והוזה ‘in this wisdom’ (Bodek 1865c: 15)
- והוזה ‘and in this year’ (Chikernik 1908: 8)

והוזה

- והוזה ‘on this night’ (Heilmann 1902: 9)
- והוזה ‘in this milk’ (Hirsch 1900: 18)
- והוזה ‘this commandment’ (Michelsohn 1912: 117)

5.5.1.1.3 והוזה (Prepositive)
Another frequently attested demonstrative construction consists of והוזה or והוזה followed by a definite noun. It may be based on an identical biblical construction, which is itself actually relatively uncommon but appears in e.g. והוזה ‘the land of the Chaldeans, this people’ (Isa. 23:13) (see Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 309 for details). This construction is not attested in Rabbinic Hebrew, in which a demonstrative adjective may precede the noun but

1 I.e. with nouns that are treated as feminine in Hasidic Hebrew, but possibly not in other forms of the language.
the noun is not prefixed by the definite article (see Segal 1927: 201; Pérez Fernández 1999: 23). However, it is a feature of Arabicized medieval forms of Hebrew (Hopkins 2013), which may have exerted an additional influence. In addition, Aramaic prepositive demonstrative constructions may have served to reinforce the usage (see 16.2.2 for discussion of this type of Aramaic construction in the tales).

- ה ז

- ‘in this room’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 13)
- ‘and at this time’ (Kaidaner 1875: 13a)
- ‘with this child’ (Bodek 1866: 39)
- ‘this tailor’ (Lieberson 1913: 65)
- ‘in this version’ (Ehrmann 1903: 10b)
- I heard this story’ (Sofer 1904: 18)
- ‘This child is not hers’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 75)

- ה ז

- ‘this chair’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 13)
- ‘this story’ (Hirsch 1900: 54)
- ‘with this advice’ (Heilmann 1902: 49)
- ‘this level’ (Michelsohn 1910c: 22)

As in the preceding constructions, the variant ז is also attested, again only in conjunction with feminine nouns:

- ז ה ז

- ‘that night’ (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 1)
- ‘at that moment’ (Seuss 1890: 4)
- ‘in this inn’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1910: 59)

5.5.1.4 These variants, which are also attested relatively frequently, are postpositive and appear in conjunction with a definite head noun. They have biblical precedent (Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 105; Garr 2008) and, with the exception of ז ה ז, are also used in Rabbinic Hebrew, particularly in the Amoraic period (Pérez Fernández 1999: 22). Garr (2008) argues that the biblical forms have a medial rather than proximal or distal sense; as such, the Hasidic Hebrew forms differ slightly in meaning from their biblical antecedents in that they have either a proximal meaning, as below, or a distal one (discussed in 5.5.2.1.3). Moreover,
as in the case of the other demonstrative variants discussed above, the gender assignment of these forms does not correspond precisely to that of other varieties of Hebrew. Thus, זלוה and its variant form זלילה are masculine in other forms of Hebrew, but may be employed in conjunction with either masculine or feminine Hasidic Hebrew nouns, as below.

- זלוה ‘this man’ (Bodek 1865b: 3)
- זלוה ‘this letter’ (Munk 1898: 70)
- זלוה ‘this story’ (Hirsch 1900: 13)
- זלוה ‘this woman’ (Ehrmann 1903: 1b)
- זלוה ‘this non-Jewish woman’ (Michelsohn 1910b: 141)
- זלוה ‘this terrible mistake’ (Berger 1906: 60)

By contrast, זלוה is typically employed in conjunction with feminine head nouns, e.g.:

- זלוה ‘and this terrible edict’ (Kaidaner 1875: 47b)
- זלוה ‘this woman’ (M. Walden 1912: 23)
- זלוה ‘this faith’ (Berger 1907: 149)
- זלוה ‘this inn’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911b: 91)

Nevertheless, it too is rarely found with masculine head nouns, as follows:

- זלוה ‘this couple’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pt. 3: 18)

The authors’ perception of זלוה (as an equivalent of זלוה) can be seen by comparing the following two examples, in which a single author employs both demonstratives with the same feminine noun.

- זלוה ‘this pipe’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 17); cf. זלוה ‘this pipe’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 17)

5.5.1.2 Plural

As in the singular, there are several variants of the plural proximal demonstrative adjectives.

5.5.1.2.1 זלילה

This common plural demonstrative is postpositive and typically appears in conjunction with definite nouns, as in the first three examples below. It also occasionally appears in conjunction with indefinite nouns, as in the final
example. Interestingly, it is not particularly frequently attested, in contrast to e.g. Biblical Hebrew, in which it is standard (Hasselbach 2013); it appears most typically in conjunction with the noun 'things', as in the first example.

– השם הםירבדה 'these things' (N. Duner 1912: 7)
– השם הםירבדים 'these Hasidim' (Bodek 1865c: 1)
– השם הםירבדים ממעניין 'from these paupers' (Rodkinsohn 1865: 14)
– השם הםירבדים 'these rings' (Singer 1900a: 4)

5.5.1.2.2 הלא
This variant is likewise common in gender and appears in conjunction with definite nouns, but can be either pre- or postpositive, as below. The use of these constructions is most likely traceable to rabbinic literature such as the Tosefta and Babylonian Talmud, in which similar phrases are sometimes attested.

Prepositive

– המahoים הםירבדה 'these things' (Berger 1910a: 38)
– המahoים הםירבדים 'these judgements' (Jacob Isaac ben Asher of Przysucha 1908: 86)
– המahoים הםירבדים 'all these souls' (Michelsohn 1910c: 25)
– המahoים הםירבדים 'these clothes' (Laufbahn 1914: 28)

Postpositive

– המahoים הםירבדים 'these letters' (Bodek 1865c: 8)
– המahoים הםירבדים 'and these words of his' (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 51)
– המahoים הםירבדים 'from these notes of petition' (Breitstein 1914: 22)
– המahoים הםירבדים 'these rings' (Singer 1900a: 5)

5.5.1.2.3 הלא
This variant is prepositive and common in gender. It appears in conjunction with definite nouns or noun phrases, as in the following examples. Like the previous construction, this is traceable to rabbinic literature, appearing on a number of occasions in e.g. Exodus and Deuteronomy Rabba. It is also widely attested in medieval sources such as Abarbanel.

– אלא שיבתכמה 'in these two things' (J. Duner 1899: 15)
– אלא שיבתכמה 'in these two things' (Brandwein 1912: 22)
This demonstrative is postpositive and common in gender. It may appear in conjunction with an indefinite noun, as in the first set of examples below, or a definite noun, as in the second set. These constructions are based on rabbinic precedent (Pérez Fernández 1999: 22–23).

With Indefinite Head Noun

- והלהםישוריפ ‘these interpretations’ (J. Duner 1899: 17)
- והלהםירבד ‘these countries’ (Bodek 1865c: 15)
- והלהםירוביד ‘these arks’ (Landau 1892: 37)
- והלהםירשב ‘these words’ (Berger 1910a: 75)
- והלהםירבד ‘these things’ (Rosenthal 1909: 72)

With Definite Head Noun

- והלהםירבדה ‘these things’ (Michelsohn 1910c: 5)
- והלהםירובידה ‘these words’ (Munk 1898: 31)
- והלהםיינע ‘these lords’ (Rosenthal 1909: 7)
- והלהםינודא ‘these paupers’ (Seuss 1890: 19)
- והלהםישודקהםירבקהו ‘and these holy graves’ (Shenkel 1883, pt. 2: 3)

This variant, which is postpositive and usually appears in conjunction with definite nouns, is likewise traceable to Rabbinic Hebrew (Pérez Fernández 1999: 22).

- והלאם ‘these people’ (Leichter 1901: 9b)
- והלאם ‘these bad things’ (Michelsohn 1910c: 15)
- והלאם ‘these two men’ (Munk 1898: 32)
- והלאם ‘these words’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911b: 65)

Occasionally this postpositive demonstrative appears without the definite article and in conjunction with an indefinite noun, as below. The Hasidic Hebrew authors’ use of this form may derive (either directly or indirectly) from medieval Hebrew sources such as the writings of the fourteenth-century Spanish halakhist Yom Tov Ishbili (Ritba).
5.5.2 Distal
The distal demonstrative adjectives are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distal</th>
<th>cs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הוהא, יהייה, אוחה, אוחהتاح, אוחהتاح, הוהא</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>התוהא, התוהא, התוהא, התוהא</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>התוהא, התוהא, התוהא, התוהא</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like their proximal counterparts, the Hasidic Hebrew distal demonstrative adjectives have a number of variants, discussed below.

5.5.2.1 Singular

5.5.2.1.1 הוהא, יהייה
The most common Hasidic Hebrew distal demonstrative adjective is postpositive יהייה, followed in frequency by postpositive יהייה. Like their proximal counterparts יהייה and יהייה, these two forms both have common gender. Thus, while יהייה may appear in conjunction with masculine nouns, it is used with equal frequency to modify feminine nouns; likewise, although יהייה may modify feminine nouns, it is often employed with reference to masculine nouns. This phenomenon is most likely ascribable to a single phonological consideration: as discussed in 3.4.2, in the authors’ Polish and Ukrainian Ashkenazic Hebrew, *shureq* was fronted to [i] (Katz 1993: 65, 68), rendering the 3ms variant יהייה identical in sound to the 3fs יהייה, with both pronounced as [hi]. As such, the authors seem to have regarded them as two interchangeable variants despite their slightly different spelling. The predominance of the variant יהייה over יהייה may be due to the somewhat more frequent attestation of the former in well-known Hebrew literature such as the Bible and Mishnah, rendering it more instinctively familiar to the authors. The same phenomenon affects the 3cs personal pronouns יהייה and יהייה; see 6.1.1.5 for details.
As in the case of the proximal demonstratives discussed above, אהה and איהה are used interchangeably. This is illustrated in the following example, in which both variants appear in conjunction with the same noun on the same page of the work of a single author.

- אהה ‘that letter’ (Singer 1900b: 2); cf. איהה ‘at that time’ (Berger 1906: 40)
With Indefinite Noun

- ‘that story’ (J. Duner 1899: 90)
- ‘and at that time (lit: hour)’ (HaLevi 1909: 54)
- ‘in that year’ (Lieberson 1913: 64)

With Definite Noun

- ‘and on that day’ (J. Duner 1899: 96)
- ‘to that man’ (Lieberson 1913: 62)
- ‘and that man went’ (Breitstein 1914: 6)

Less frequently, the particleותוא (the 3fs suffixed form of the accusative particle) can be used as a common singular distal demonstrative. It is most typically found with feminine nouns but does occur with masculine nouns as well, as in the final example of the first set below. As in the case ofוהואוהוא andוהואוהוא discussed above, this interchangeability is most likely ascribable to phonological considerations, given that the authors would have pronounced both variants as[ɔjsə] or[ejsə]. In contrast toוהואוהוא,ותוא is almost always found in conjunction with indefinite nouns; however, it does very occasionally appear with a definite noun, as in the final example.

With Indefinite Noun

- ‘in that inn’ (Chikernik 1908: 7)
- ‘at that time’ (lit: hour) (Seuss 1890: 46)
- ‘to the same trunk’ (Shenkel 1904: 26)

With Definite Noun

- ‘that hand’ (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 18)

Note thatוהואוהוא andוהואוהוא can also be used to mean ‘the same’, with only context distinguishing the two usages, e.g.:

- ‘And he was in the same condition in which he had been previously’ (HaLevi 1909: 54)
The common singular proximal demonstrative (זֶה) is also employed as a common singular distal demonstrative. This usage does not have clear historical precedent in Hebrew: while it is theoretically possible that the authors subconsciously registered the medial sense of the Biblical Hebrew forms (discussed in Garr 2008) as an ambiguous fusion of proximal and distal senses and therefore used them in both contexts, the relative rarity of the biblical construction renders this somewhat unlikely. Instead, the Hasidic Hebrew usage may be attributable to influence from Yiddish, in which a distinction between proximal and distal demonstratives is not always made (Katz 1987: 112–114).

– ‘And the time (lit: day) came when he had to travel in that week to a place [with] a fair’ (Ehrmann 1903: 8a)
– ‘In that year, God protect us, there was a bad decree’ (Michelsohn 1910c: 29)
– ‘And three days went by, and there was no trace of that man’ (Bodek 1865b: 3)

The variant (וזֶה) is also occasionally attested in this capacity, e.g.:

– ‘in that year’ (Ehrmann 1903: 28b)
– ‘that great and awesome commandment’ (Brill 1909: 7)
– ‘that hundred ducats’ (N. Duner 1899: 89)

Finally, the abbreviation (ל״נה) ‘the aforementioned’ is used extremely frequently in Hasidic Hebrew as a common singular distal demonstrative (as well as common plural; see 5.5.2.2.1). This usage is noteworthy because it is not clearly traceable to a recognized convention in earlier forms of Hebrew. It is likely to be rooted in the frequent appearance of the abbreviation in medieval and early modern texts such as Alshich’s commentary; in the narrative contexts of the tales the meaning seems to evolved from the technical ‘aforementioned’ into a much more general demonstrative sense. This phenomenon is illustrated in the following examples:

– ‘that rich man’ (Bromberg 1899: 31)
– ‘in that small town’ (Kaidaner 1875: 20b)
– ‘that Reb Motele’ (Rapaport 1909: 43)
In addition to its use with singular nouns, the abbreviation ל׳נה ‘the aforementioned’ is the most commonly used plural distal demonstrative adjective in Hasidic Hebrew. This is illustrated below. As discussed in 5.5.2.1.4 above, this practice does not have precedent in canonical forms of Hebrew; it is most likely an extension of the original meaning of the abbreviation as used in earlier texts.

- ל׳נהםידליינשהרדעה ‘the absence of those two children’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1910: 23)
- ל׳נהםיקידצהשלשה ‘those three righteous men’ (Hirsch 1900: 33)
- ל׳נהםינקזהםישנאה ‘those old men’ (Bromberg 1899: 5)
- ל׳נהתולגעילעבה ‘those wagon-drivers’ (M. Walden 1912: 18)

Like their singular counterparts, the plural proximal demonstratives presented in 5.5.1.2 are often used with a distal sense, as below. This is again likely to be the result of influence from Yiddish.

- וללהםימיה ‘those days’ (Berger 1906: 87)
- וללהםירובדינשה ‘those two bees’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 69)
- ולאהםיתפומינשה ‘those two wonders’ (Singer 1900a, pt. 1: 3)
- ولאהרנתוכיתחינשהו ‘and those two pieces of candle’ (Hirsch 1900: 32)

Perhaps unexpectedly, the accusative particle with 3mp suffix ב- or its variant י is employed only rarely as a plural distal demonstrative adjective in Hasidic Hebrew, as below, in contrast to post-biblical varieties of the language in which it is commonly used in this capacity (Segal 1936: 52; Pérez Fernández 1999: 23; Rabin 2000: 101).

- מואות, אולא ‘from [among] those anusim’ (HaLevi 1909: 54)
- ואימות המצות ‘those commandments’ (N. Duner 1899: 76)
- ליאותם עדימ ‘for those paupers’ (Landau 1892: 49)
Likewise, the plural distal demonstratives "המהו" and "שם" are attested only relatively rarely. Of the two, "שם" is much more commonly employed than "המהו", which is extremely marginal, as shown below. This distribution contrasts with that of the 3mp independent personal pronouns, of which "שם" is more common (see 6.1.1).

5.6 Indefinite Adjective

The word "אויה" is frequently used in Hasidic Hebrew as an indefinite adjective of common gender with the sense of 'some kind of', or 'a certain', e.g.:

- 'a certain crazy man' (Ehrmann 1903: 8b)
- 'in some yeshivah' (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 3)
- 'Give me some advice' (Breitstein 1914: 28)
- 'a certain tzaddik' (Shenkel 1903b: 8)
- 'and in some regard he believed' (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 1)
- 'a certain thing' (J. Duner 1899: 32)
The form בַּזָּא can be traced to Rabbinic Hebrew; however, the Hasidic Hebrew use of the word diverges somewhat from that of its rabbinic antecedent. In Rabbinic Hebrew it typically serves as a masculine singular interrogative pronoun or adjective meaning ‘which’ (Pérez Fernández 1999: 35). While it can appear in rabbinic literature in statements before a singular noun with the meaning of ‘whichever’ (see Azar 1995: 213 for examples), it means ‘any one out of a [known] number of options’ rather than ‘some unknown sort of’. Moreover, the Hasidic Hebrew form has common gender (as can be seen by comparing the first and second examples above, in which it modifies a masculine and feminine noun respectively). By contrast, its rabbinic counterpart is solely masculine. (While it is theoretically possible that the Hasidic Hebrew בַּזָּא with feminine nouns actually represents the feminine variant בַּזָּא, which is sometimes found in rabbinic literature, the authors’ strong tendency towards regularized use of matres lectionis combined with their interchangeable treatment of the underlying pronouns בַּזָּא and בַּזָּא [see 6.3] renders this unlikely.) Rather, it is more probable that the Hasidic Hebrew authors inherited this usage from an identical medieval/early modern pattern that is attested in responsa literature (see Kaddari 1991: 172–174).

Similarly, בַּזָּא may be used in conjunction with both masculine and feminine plural nouns as an adjective with the sense of ‘some’ or ‘several’, as below.

– בַּזָּא שְׁנֵים ‘several years’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 15)
– בַּזָּא עַשְׁה ‘several hours’ (Berger 1910b: 108)
– בַּזָּא אֲנָשִׁים חֲסָדִים ‘some Hasidic men’ (Brandwein 1912: 4)
– בַּזָּא מִכְסֵי ‘a few minutes’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 13)
– בַּזָּא הָזוּכִים ‘a few złoty (or: guilders)’ (Breitstein 1914: 17)

This usage appears to be totally without precedent in Rabbinic Hebrew. Conversely, like many other seemingly non-standard Hasidic Hebrew grammatical features, it has an exact counterpart in, and therefore may derive from, medieval and early modern responsa literature (Betzer 2001: 98–99). Moreover, the use of בַּזָּא with plural nouns was incorporated into vernacularized Hebrew in Palestine and has become a feature of Israeli Hebrew (see Even-Shoshan 2003: 55 for examples).

Much less frequently, the variant בַּזָּא is used in an identical way before a plural noun, e.g.:

– בַּזָּא שְּבֵעָה ‘several weeks’ (HaLevi 1909: 53)
– בַּזָּא דְּבֻּרֵים ‘certain words’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911b: 65)
Again, this usage differs from that of Rabbinic Hebrew, in which בְּאֵה is a feminine singular interrogative pronoun (Segal 1927: 44; Pérez Fernández 1999: 35), but rather has precedent in medieval/early modern responsa (Kaddari 1991: 174–176).
CHAPTER 6

Pronouns

6.1 Independent Personal Pronouns

6.1.1 Morphology

The Hasidic Hebrew personal pronouns are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Singular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נִנָּא, אֶנָּא</td>
<td>אֶנָּא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָנָא, בֵּית</td>
<td>יָנָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַלֶּה, אוָה</td>
<td>וַלֶּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַלֶּה, אָה</td>
<td>וַלֶּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַלֶּה, אָה</td>
<td>וַלֶּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַלֶּה, אָה</td>
<td>וַלֶּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַלֶּה, אָה</td>
<td>וַלֶּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַלֶּה, אָה</td>
<td>וַלֶּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וַלֶּה, אָה</td>
<td>וַלֶּה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issues relating to the individual pronouns are discussed below.

6.1.1.1 1cs Pronouns

The 1cs pronouns נִנָּא and יָנָא are both attested in the Hasidic Hebrew tale, and each is used with approximately equal frequency, as illustrated below. The authors do not seem to perceive a syntactic or semantic difference between the two variants, sometimes employing both within close proximity in the speech of a single character (as exemplified in the two extracts from Zak below). This is noteworthy because outside of Hasidic Hebrew נִנָּא, אֶנָּא is typically associated with the biblical stratum of the language; in Rabbinic Hebrew it has been almost completely replaced by יָנָא with the sole exception of liturgy and biblical citations (Pérez Fernández 1999: 18). The frequent appearance of both נִנָּא, אֶנָּא and יָנָא in the tales is one of many examples of a wider trend whereby the authors employ a fusion of characteristically biblical and post-biblical forms and structures. יָנָא is usually spelt defectively but is occasionally attested in the plene version (see 3.3).

אנכי

– ‘Did I not pray with you?’ (Laufbahn 1914: 50)
– ‘I am an old man’ (Michelsohn 1910c: 30)
6.1.1.2 2cs Pronoun

The second person singular pronoun איה, which in canonical forms of Hebrew is strictly masculine, may be used in Hasidic Hebrew with reference not only to male but also to female addressees. This is illustrated in the examples below, in which the interlocutors are women. In many cases this is highlighted by the presence of a feminine verbal form or adjective in conjunction with the pronoun. (By contrast, note that in some of the examples not only the pronoun but also the accompanying verb is masculine; this phenomenon is discussed in 8.13.2.1).

- 'I am very hungry' (Berger 1907: 38)
- 'And how will I also be worthy?' (Zak 1912: 12–13)

- 'I am afraid' (Stamm 1905: 33)
- 'I didn't do anything' (Singer 1900b: 1)
- 'I am very thirsty' (Hirsch 1900: 13)
- 'I can do that' (Zak 1912: 13)

- 'I am very hungry' (Berger 1907: 38)
- 'And how will I also be worthy?' (Zak 1912: 12–13)

- 'I am afraid' (Stamm 1905: 33)
- 'I didn't do anything' (Singer 1900b: 1)
- 'I am very thirsty' (Hirsch 1900: 13)
- 'I can do that' (Zak 1912: 13)
Unlike certain other instances of non-standard gender in Hasidic Hebrew (e.g. noun gender discussed in 4.1, the distal demonstratives איהו and איה discussed in 5.5.2.1, and the 3cs pronouns discussed below in this section), this phenomenon is not due to phonological considerations but rather seems to constitute a case of paradigm levelling. This process is likely to stem from a certain lack of awareness on the part of the authors regarding the distinction between Hebrew second person masculine and feminine pronouns because their native Yiddish is gender-neutral in this respect. Such influence may have been compounded by the fact that the authors were in the habit of employing the masculine variants because the overwhelming majority of characters in the Hasidic Hebrew tales are male; hence, they would have had to make a special point of remembering to use the feminine forms on the relatively rare occasions involving female addressees. These points are underscored by the fact that, in contrast to the third person singular pronoun איה, the rarely attested 2fs pronouns תא and היא are almost never used with male referents.

6.1.1.3 2cs Pronoun

In addition to serving as a second person plural pronoun, תא is used in Hasidic Hebrew as a polite/formal second person singular marker in cases when the speaker is addressing a stranger or superior (e.g. a wealthy man, rabbi, or Rebbe) to whom he wishes to show politeness and/or deference. This usage is extremely noteworthy because such a convention is not a standard feature of other earlier or later forms of Hebrew. However, it corresponds precisely to Yiddish as well as Slavic languages such as Russian and Ukrainian, wherein the 2p pronouns are additionally used as formal or polite 2s markers (see Katz 1987: 103 for Yiddish; Wade 2000: 134 for Russian; Pugh and Press 1999: 174 for Ukrainian).

– And he asked him, “Are you Reb Leib from the town of Suwalki?” (Rodkinsohn 1865: 38)
– And he went to Reb Heschel and said to him, “[...] And you are sitting here in such comfort” (Shenkel 1903b: 5)
– And the holy Rebbe greeted him and asked him, “Where are you from?” (Munk 1898: 22)
– And the messenger asked the old man, “Tell me why you are crying” (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 38)
– And the Rebbe asked him, “Can you learn?” (Singer 1900b: 28)
– And he said to me, “You are the Rebbe of Brod” (N. Duner 1912: 23)
The concept of polite vs. informal second person pronouns is consciously acknowledged on one occasion in the tale corpus, shown below:

And he also started to speak to the Ba’al Shem Tov in polite language, and he spoke (lit: said) to him using the polite “you” [...]. And the Ba’al Shem Tov started to speak (lit: say) to him using the informal “you”’ (Chikernik 1902: 14)

Similarly, לאַ may be used as a polite singular pronoun for female addressees, as in the following example:

And they asked her, “What are you doing here?” And she answered [that] they had taken her husband and she had gone with him’ (Munk 1898: 39)

Interestingly, the polite form is not used by the authors when addressing the reader; in such cases the plain 2ms form לאַ is chosen instead.

6.1.1.4 2cs Pronoun לאַ
The pronoun לאַ is attested only very sporadically. When it does occur, it usually indicates a female addressee; rare examples of this usage are as follows:

At my place you’re not a rabbi’s wife’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 35)

And now you are also crying’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 25)

Moreover, on very exceptional occasions לאַ is used with reference to a masculine subject, as below. This usage is most likely rooted in Rabbinic Hebrew, in which לאַ is a 2cs form (Pérez Fernández 1999: 18). However, unlike in Rabbinic Hebrew, this usage is so marginal as to be almost non-existent in Hasidic Hebrew.

Elijah said, “You know that I am zealous for Your holy name”’ (J. Duner 1899: 23)

And she answered him, “Because of the grass that is in the dry hay on which you are lying I can’t approach you”’ (Landau 1892: 19)
6.1.1.5 3cs Pronouns

The pronouns איה and איה, which in other forms of Hebrew are 3ms and 3fs respectively, are employed interchangeably as 3cs pronouns in Hasidic Hebrew. Thus, איה can be used not only in conjunction with masculine subjects but also with feminine ones (whether logical or grammatical), as below.

- האשה הנברה בתית הוה איה הניה  ‘The woman, the mistress of this house, is a whore’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 29)
- ‘The bride is my sister’ (Kaidaner 1875: 18a)
- הניה אוחית עשרה לימים והנה גורשה יה שמה רディ  ‘Look, my sister is young and she is divorced, and she has a hundred roubles’ (Munk 1898: 25)
- ‘In my opinion it is enough for the bride as she is dressed’ (Sofer 1904: 42)
- ‘The Jewish mistress of the house, she did this’ (Ehrmann 1911: 16b)
- ‘One mezuzah which is invalid’ (N. Duner 1912: 21)
- ‘And the woman said, “I am she”’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 38)

Likewise, איה may be used in contexts clearly indicating that it refers to a masculine singular subject (again whether human or inanimate), as below. This phenomenon is somewhat less common than the converse, but is not unusual.

- ‘The man with the hat—he is the thief of the złoty (or: guilders)!’ (Kaidaner 1875: 34a)
- ‘It is not a meaningless matter’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 38)
- ‘And then the Rebbe announced that he was the Ba’al Shem Tov’ (Seuss 1890: 33)
- ‘And one time Rebbe Faivel travelled [...] and got lost on the way [...] and his driver did not know where he was travelling’ (Munk 1898: 49)

As in the case of the singular distal demonstratives והיא and והיא (discussed in 5.5.2.1.1), this phenomenon is attributable to the fact that in the authors’ Polish and Ukrainian Ashkenazic Hebrew, shureq was fronted to [i] (Katz 1993: 65, 68; see also 3.4.2 for further details), which means that they would have pronounced both forms as [hi]. Again as in the case of והיא and והיא, the predominance of the variant איה over איה may be due to the fact that איה is much more frequently attested in earlier Hebrew literature familiar to the authors.
This tendency may have been reinforced by the occasional ketiv spelling of the 3fs pronoun היא in the Pentateuch (see Fassberg 2012 for discussion of this biblical phenomenon). As in the case of feminine singular nouns (discussed in 4.1.2), this phenomenon indicates that the authors’ contemporary pronunciation was often more important than orthographic precedent in the construction of Hasidic Hebrew grammar.

6.1.1.6 1cp Pronouns

The 1cp pronouns והנה and והן are both attested in relatively equal distribution. As in the case of the 1cs pronouns, the Hasidic tales here reflect both biblical and post-biblical influences: והנה is typical of Biblical Hebrew, while והן is characteristic of Rabbinic Hebrew (Pérez Fernández 1999: 18). Again as in the case of the 1cs forms, both variants may be employed within close proximity to each other, as illustrated by the examples from Zak (1912) and Gemen (1914) below. However, והן tends to be used more frequently in conjunction with other clearly post-biblical forms such as the subordinator -ש ‘that’ and qoṭel with -ן suffix, as well as with the negator değil, as illustrated in the example from Berger (1906) below.

והנה

- והנה ‘We have been staying in this village for a few years now’ (HaLevi 1907: 22b)
- והנה ‘But we are guilty’ (Sofer 1904: 14)
- והנה ‘We are obliged’ (Munk 1898: 21)
- והנה ‘Therefore we need to pray’ (Zak 1912: 25)
- והנה ‘As for us, we are flesh and blood’ (Gemen 1914: 49)

והן

- והן ‘We don’t yet know the purpose of the trip’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 7)
- והן ‘While we are alive, we’re not afraid’ (Berger 1906: 29)
- והן ‘We are going to the beadle’ (Leichter 1901: 8b)
- והן ‘We don’t want to pray for them’ (Zak 1912: 25)
- והן ‘As for us, we are flesh and blood’ (Gemen 1914: 49)
6.1.1.7 2fp Pronoun

The 2fp pronoun is almost unattested; an extremely rare example is as follows:

– הנאנת העםconnector מישום ייחוס בדיבור
  ‘And you yourselves are obligated regarding the matter’ (Breitstein 1914: 38)

6.1.1.8 3cp Pronouns

Hasidic Hebrew possesses three third person plural pronoun variants, המה, וֹ, and וּ. In contrast to the 1cs and 1cp, these three forms are not employed with similar frequency: the variant המה is the most common, while וּ is very rare. These trends are illustrated below. This pattern of distribution is noteworthy because, like הו and הוּ (Pérez Fernández 1999: 18). The authors’ tendency to avoid וּ may constitute a subconscious attempt to avoid confusion with the homophonous interjection ו, which is very commonly employed in the tales with the meaning of ‘yes’ (see 12.9).

המה
– ‘They are enslaved to his will’ (Zak 1912: 35)
– ‘until they had left the city’ (Laufbahn 1914: 45)
– ‘And they also argued intensely with him’ (Sofer 1904: 18)
– ‘for they are above him’ (Lieberon 1913: 12)

וֹ
– ‘And maybe they will copy [it]’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 13)
– ‘And they didn’t want to reveal [it]’ (Ehrmann 1903: 14b)
– ‘And they were travelling’ (N. Duner 1912: 19)

וּ
– ‘Israel is holy’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 2)
– ‘a few matters, and they are ...’ (Landau 1892: 3)

Again, these pronouns are all common in gender, though the dearth of feminine plural third person subjects in the Hasidic Hebrew corpus makes generalizations difficult. Rare examples of וּ in conjunction with a feminine plural subject are shown below.
6.1.2 Syntax
6.1.2.1 Use of Subject Pronouns
Hasidic Hebrew corresponds to many other forms of the language in that the personal subject pronouns are most frequently attested in non-verbal sentences, as below:

- נחנאםילודגח״ת ‘We are great Torah scholars’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911b: 10)
- עשפמיכנאףחשיתיאר ‘I saw that I am innocent of transgression’ (Breitstein 1914: 39)
- ייםילריעצינא ‘I am young’ (Gemen 1914: 74)
- דארבמברהםתא ‘You are the Rebbe of Brod’ (N. Duner 1912: 23)

In verbal sentences the pronouns are not rare, but are not attested as often as in non-verbal sentences because the person is encoded within the verb. The authors' motivation for selecting a pronoun in any given verbal sentence is only partially transparent. In some cases they employ it in order to highlight a shift in subject within a sentence, as in the following examples:

- הנבםעהשענהלכירומלרפסתואבתו ‘And she came and told our teacher everything that was happening with her son. And I also told him that he was a dear lad’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 32)
- הפימעדליהתאראשהולדגאינאו ‘Leave the child with me here, and I will raise him’ (Breitstein 1914: 39)

However, on many occasions a pronoun is used in conjunction with a verb in contexts wherein the above explanation does not seem to apply, i.e. there is no change in subject and the pronoun does not clearly convey extra emphasis. Such cases are shown below. It is possible that in this type of instance the use of the pronoun is instead attributable to influence from Yiddish, in which personal pronouns are commonly used with verbs.

- והם לקח חכם ירי ורכב עלון ‘And he took a horse and rode on it’ (Shenkel 1903a: 22)
- אמר אלו ומדתי ליטש כ איני יא מה ‘And he said, “I was forced to travel, because I am afraid of them”’ (M. Walden 1912: 29)
6.1.2.2 Subject Pro-Drop

Because independent subject pronouns are optional in Hasidic Hebrew verbal clauses, subject pro-drop is widely attested, as illustrated below. This tendency is not surprising given that the same phenomenon is attested in earlier varieties of Hebrew (Holmstedt 2013a) as well as in Yiddish (Jacobs 2005: 261–262).

– הוחלמה שם אלי לחיי במקום לקותרו These Hasidim drank to his health and they took him [...] with them again’ (Bodek 1865c: 1)
– ‘אך אנכי נשארא על קומתי כי אביני אל ידעתי אל הגרת את ברת מדיה’ (Seuss 1890: 10)
– ‘They went with the trail that was in the snow’ (HaLevi 1909: 53)

6.1.2.3 Object Pro-Drop

Like subject pro-drop (discussed in 6.1.2.2), object pro-drop is sometimes exhibited in the tales, as shown below. As in the case of subject pro-drop, this phenomenon has precedent in Biblical Hebrew and is also found in the present-day form of the language (Holmstedt 2013a). It is likewise attested in Yiddish (Jacobs 2005: 261–262).

– ‘These Hasidim drank to his health and they took him [...] with them again’ (Bodek 1865c: 1)
– ‘But I stayed in my (lit: his) place because I didn’t know and wasn’t familiar with the Maggid’ (Seuss 1890: 10)
– ‘They went with the trail that was in the snow’ (HaLevi 1909: 53)

6.1.2.2 Subject Pro-Drop

Because independent subject pronouns are optional in Hasidic Hebrew verbal clauses, subject pro-drop is widely attested, as illustrated below. This tendency is not surprising given that the same phenomenon is attested in earlier varieties of Hebrew (Holmstedt 2013a) as well as in Yiddish (Jacobs 2005: 261–262).

– ‘These Hasidim drank to his health and they took him [...] with them again’ (Bodek 1865c: 1)
– ‘But I stayed in my (lit: his) place because I didn’t know and wasn’t familiar with the Maggid’ (Seuss 1890: 10)
– ‘They went with the trail that was in the snow’ (HaLevi 1909: 53)

6.1.2.3 Object Pro-Drop

Like subject pro-drop (discussed in 6.1.2.2), object pro-drop is sometimes exhibited in the tales, as shown below. As in the case of subject pro-drop, this phenomenon has precedent in Biblical Hebrew and is also found in the present-day form of the language (Holmstedt 2013a). It is likewise attested in Yiddish (Jacobs 2005: 261–262).

– ‘These Hasidim drank to his health and they took him [...] with them again’ (Bodek 1865c: 1)
– ‘But I stayed in my (lit: his) place because I didn’t know and wasn’t familiar with the Maggid’ (Seuss 1890: 10)
– ‘They went with the trail that was in the snow’ (HaLevi 1909: 53)
6.2 Pronominal Suffixes

6.2.1 Possessive Suffixes

6.2.1.1 Suffixes on Singular Nouns

The forms of possessive suffixes appearing in conjunction with singular nouns in Hasidic Hebrew are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Singular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>וּנַ-</td>
<td>יַ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כּ-</td>
<td>ד-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כּ-</td>
<td>ד-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מּוּ-</td>
<td>נ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מּוּ-</td>
<td>נ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מּוּ-</td>
<td>נ-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noteworthy features of individual suffixes are discussed below.

6.2.1.1.1 2ms/2fs Suffix

The 2ms and 2fs suffixes are listed separately under the assumption that the authors would have pronounced them differently, but due to lack of vocalization in the tales this cannot be confirmed. It is possible that the authors instead treated the two vocalizations of ד- (כ[א] and כ[א]) as interchangeable 2cs variants, or indeed that they employed only the traditionally 2ms form [כא] as a 2cs form to the exclusion of the traditionally feminine [כא]. Such possibilities are supported by the authors’ use of common gender in the second person independent pronouns (discussed in 6.1.1.2, 6.1.1.3, and 6.1.1.4).
6.2.1.1.2 3ms Suffixes
The form of the 3ms possessive suffix is typically ה, but nouns ending in ה sometimes take the variant וה instead. In such cases the selection of one suffix over the other may sometimes be due to historical precedent. Thus, the form with ה shown in the first example below appears with the same suffix in medieval texts such as the Talmudic commentaries of Rashi and Nahmanides. Conversely, the form with וה shown in the second example is commonly attested in this form in biblical and post-biblical sources. However, this type of pattern is not always visible; indeed, the same noun may appear with both suffixes even within a single work, as in the final example.

– רומר 'his teacher' (Bromberg 1899: 13)
– רעזה 'his companion' (M. Walden 1914: 55)
– יפה 'his mouth' (Bodek 1865c: 4); cf. פי 'his mouth' (Bodek 1865c: 7)

6.2.1.1.3 3fs Suffix
The 3fs suffix is only rarely attested, e.g.:

– נשמה 'her soul' (Kaidaner 1875: 28a)
– קוסמה 'according to her size' (Moses of Kobrin 1910: 43)
– ידיעות 'and its intention' (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 8)

6.2.1.1.4 1cp Suffix
The 1cp suffix is sometimes attested as י, as standard in earlier forms of Hebrew, but much more frequently appears as י. The latter variant appears to be an orthographic convention reflecting the authors’ pronunciation of the šere beginning the suffix as the diphthong [ej] (see 3.4.1 for details).

6.2.1.1.5 2fp Suffix
The 2fp is almost unattested (due at least in part to the dearth of multiple female addressees in the tales). The following is a rare example:

– לאתנוגה 'and you yourselves' (Breitstein 1914: 38)

6.2.1.1.6 3cp Suffixes
As in the case of the independent personal pronouns, the Hasidic Hebrew authors do not generally distinguish between third person plural masculine and feminine suffixes. Rather, they utilize two 3cp variants, ו- and י-. These two forms are employed in free variation. Each is illustrated below in turn
with both masculine and feminine referents. This usage contrasts with the biblical standard, according to which מ is masculine and נ feminine (van der Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze 1999: 204). It is partly rooted in Rabbinic Hebrew, in which both מ and נ may be used with masculine reference (Pérez Fernández 1999: 30). However, the use of מ with feminine reference does not derive from the canonical literature; rather, it comprises part of the wider Hasidic Hebrew tendency towards common gender in demonstrative adjectives (discussed in 5.5) and in personal pronouns (discussed in 6.1.1).

---

- בְּמַעְסֶנֶסֶנָא לְפַנֵי הַרְיָרִי אֶלֶימֶלךְ ‘in their condition before the Rebbe Elimelech’ (Breitstein 1914: 13)
- בְּשֵׁנַת 1831 ‘in the year 1831 according to their reckoning’ (Zak 1912: 36)
- יְשַׁעִית מַשֶּׁש לְדָרָם ‘And they travelled from there on their way’ (Singer 1900b: 5)
- סְדַרְדָּלְמֶשׁוּוֹתַי ‘two little Jewish girls whose father owed him a lot of money’ (Berger 1906: 12)

---

- דְרֶחֶנֶשׁ הַחָסִידִים ‘the way of the Hasidim’ (Michelsohn 1905: 67)
- הָלוֹדֵדְתֵיהּ תַּנְיָק ‘the genealogies of righteous men’ (Ehrmann 1903: 26b)
- לְשֵׁתֵק בָּטֶרֶךְ וְשָׁלְמְדָו הַחָכְמַי ‘to empathize with the woe of scholars’ (Bodek 1865a: 4)
- בְּהוֹלוֹת אָשֶׁר נַעֲשֶׂה נְבֵיעָה ‘three virgin [daughters] who have come of age’ (Sofer 1904: 8)

### 6.2.1.1.7 Rare 3mp Suffix

There is a rare 3mp variant מ- which sometimes appears attached to ל(ו)ב ‘all’, as below. This suffix is attested in the Hebrew Bible in poetic texts typically regarded as belonging to an archaic linguistic stratum, e.g. Exodus 15, Deuteronomy 32, Judges 5 (see Young and Rezetko 2008: 312–340 for discussion). However, the noun ל(ו)ב is not attested with the suffix מ- in the Hebrew Bible, and therefore its appearance in the Hasidic tales does not constitute a direct borrowing from the biblical text. Moreover, it appears to lack attestation in rabbinic or medieval texts; it first appears in nineteenth-century Eastern European Hebrew writings roughly contemporaneous with the Hasidic tales such as Meir Loeb ben Yechiel Michael Weiss (Malbim) and the responsa of
Moses Judah Leib Zilberberg. This form may thus constitute one of a number of characteristic features of a broader Eastern European type of Hebrew.

– כללם ‘all of them’ (Singer 1900a, pt. 3: 6)

6.2.1.8 Rare 3fp Suffix
Likewise, there is a rare specifically 3fp suffix, הנ, appearing in conjunction with הכ ‘all’ and the (noun-based) adverb ונ ‘alone’, as below. This variant is restricted to forms appearing in the Hebrew Bible (cf. הנ ‘all of them’ in Prov. 31:29; וה ‘by themselves’ in Gen. 21:29). The relative infrequency of this suffix in the Hasidic Hebrew corpus is therefore most likely rooted in the rareness of the same suffix in the Hebrew Bible (see Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 266).

– כללם ‘all of them’ (Kaidaner 1875: 12b)
– לעדם ‘on their own’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 50)

6.2.1.2 Suffixes on Plural Nouns
The attested forms of suffixes on plural nouns are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Singular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יני</td>
<td>י(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יכוס</td>
<td>י(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יכ</td>
<td>י(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יני</td>
<td>י(-)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks on individual suffixes are given below.

6.2.1.2.1 2ms/2fs Suffix
As in the case of the 2ms/2fs suffix on singular nouns, the lack of vocalization on the י- suffix makes it impossible to tell whether the authors would have maintained the traditional difference in pronunciation between these two forms, as well as whether they would have employed both variants interchangeably.
6.2.1.2.2 3cp Suffix

As in the case of the third person plural suffixes on singular nouns discussed in 6.2.1.1.6, the Hasidic Hebrew authors do not routinely distinguish between 3mp and 3fs possessive suffixes on plural nouns. Instead, they employ three 3cp variants, -םהי-, -ם-, and -ןהי-. The forms are more or less equally common and can be used with masculine and feminine referents, as shown below. Nouns whose plurals end in -תו may take any of the three suffixes, but those ending in -םי may not take the -ם- suffix. Otherwise, the variants are employed interchangeably; comparison of the two extracts from Hirsch (1900) below illustrate this, as both contain the same plural noun (שְׁמוֹת, ‘names’), once with the -ם- suffix and once with the -םהי- one.

ם-

– וַויוֹ הַבָּנָא הַבָּטָת הַבָּטָה אַמּוֹת ‘And when they came home, their mothers came’ (Bodek 1865c: 21)
– וַנַּתְּ לָהֶם אָמְרָה לָהֶם שְׁמוֹת ‘And he gave [some] to them and he told them their names’ (Hirsch 1900: 60)

הָיָם

– וַרְאוּ יֵכִּה בִּנְבֵה שְׁמוֹתָה ‘And they saw [...] that their names were written’ (Hirsch 1900: 8)
– וַנַּבְּרוּ לְאַבְרֶם רִלְיָה ‘And when he came close [...] all of the animals raised their legs’ (Chikernik 1902: 11)

יִהְיָן

– וְנַגְּנֵו מַמֵּלָאָם עַרְבֵּס לְשׁוֹמֵעָה ‘Wonderful melodies pleasing to their hearers’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911b: 11)
– וַחֲסַפְּרָה לִשְׁכּוּנֵתיהָ לִשְׁכּוּנֵתיהָ לְעַלְיָה ‘And she told her neighbour-women, and her neighbour-women told their husbands’ (Shenkel 1883, pt. 1: 7)

---

1 Sic; = שְׁכּוּנֵתיה.
6.2.1.3 Suffixes on Prepositions

The forms of suffixes on prepositions are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Singular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1cp</td>
<td>-וני</td>
<td>-י</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2cp</td>
<td>-םכ, -כם</td>
<td>-ך, -כם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3cp</td>
<td>-ם(ה), -ום(ה)</td>
<td>-ו, -ום(ה)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3mp</td>
<td>-ומ</td>
<td>-יה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks on individual suffixes are given below.

6.2.1.3.1 2cp as Polite 2cs

Prepositions with 2cp pronominal suffixes are sometimes used in direct speech portions of the tales to refer politely to a 2cs addressee, as below. This phenomenon is part of a widespread convention in Hasidic Hebrew tales whereby 2cp forms serve as polite 2cs markers; it extends to subject pronouns (see 6.1.1) and verbs (see 8.13.1.3). As discussed above, this convention is noteworthy because it does not seem to be a recognized feature of earlier types of Hebrew, but rather resembles the authors' Yiddish vernacular.

– ‘אמר ול יד ניחא אוק יל פאני ילמר עמכס’ And he said to him, “I don’t have time to talk to you now either”’ (Munk 1898: 54)

6.2.1.3.2 3cp Suffixes

As in the case of noun suffixes, third person plural suffixes attached to prepositions are common in gender. Feminine plural antecedents are relatively rare, but are attested with both -ם- and -ן- suffixes, as below.

– ‘והשאנה שתי ונשים אשאר עדין יל למד הלם’ And two women whom he had not yet told remained’ (Sofer 1904: 3)
– ‘כשהלך הפרהמעשוןעל המזרחי שלפתי בחנה עלולים מבן’ when the professor went on the steps before his house to go up them’ (Landau 1892: 11)

6.2.1.3.3 Rare 3mp Suffix

The archaic Biblical Hebrew 3mp suffix -ומ is attested on the preposition ל, as below. In contrast to discussed in 6.2.1.1.7, this form does appear in the Hebrew Bible as well as in numerous rabbinic midrashim and medieval
sources such as Abarbanel with which the Hasidic Hebrew authors are likely to have been familiar.

– הלמה ‘to them’ (Bodek? 1866: 21b)

6.2.2 Subject Suffixes
Subject suffixes are frequently employed in the Hasidic Hebrew tales attached to infinitives construct in temporal clauses. The attested subject suffixes are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Singular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1cp_PARAMETERS</td>
<td>1cs_PARAMETERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2mp</td>
<td>2cs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2fp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3mp</td>
<td>3ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3fp</td>
<td>3fs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following extracts illustrate the use of these subject suffixes; see 8.8.2.2.4 and 13.14.2 for further examples.

– ‘When he heard this he became very excited’ (Rosenthal 1909: 14)
– ‘And joy gripped him as he found a thousand ducats’ (Bodek 1865b: 9)
– ‘And in all the time that we were standing he didn’t speak’ (Hirsch 1900: 8)

In addition, infinitives construct prefixed by ל are occasionally found with these same subject suffixes. These are restricted to the root ה.ו.י ‘be’, as below. See 8.8.2.2.6 for further discussion of this construction.

– ‘משמעה זה תוריית ליהודי מונלול ‘And your sentence is the reason for your being reincarnated’ (Bodek 1865c: 19)
– ‘ונכמתה ליהודי משחרת ‘And she was accepted to be a servant’ (Sofer 1904: 14)
– ‘ליהודי משחרתמשערת ‘for them to be forgotten from the world’ (Munk 1898: 1)
– ‘ליהודי משמדיס ‘for them to be ordained as rabbis’ (J. Duner 1899: 79)
6.2.3 **Object Suffixes**

6.2.3.1 **Standard Suffixes**

Verbal object suffixes are a common feature of Hasidic Hebrew, though they appear perhaps slightly less frequently than independent object suffixes. The forms of the object suffixes are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Singular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ינ(ך)</td>
<td>ינ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ינ(ך)</td>
<td>ינ(ך)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ינ(ך)</td>
<td>ינ(ך)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ינ(ך)</td>
<td>ינ(ך)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ינ(ך)</td>
<td>ינ(ך)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ינ(ך)</td>
<td>ינ(ך)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issues relating to the individual object suffixes are discussed below.

6.2.3.1.1 **1cs Suffix**

The 1cs object suffix may be attached to various verbal forms. This is illustrated in the examples below, in which it appears with a *qatal* and *yiqtol* respectively.

- ינלאש ‘he asked me’ (J. Duner 1899: 71)
- יינוחיניש ‘that they should leave me’ (Bromberg 1899: 17)

However, it appears most frequently with the infinitive construct prefixed by *ל*, e.g.:

- יינארקל ‘to call me’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 18)
- יינחיטבא ‘I called you’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 41)
- יינרתו ‘to permit you’ (Ehrmann 1903: 15b)
- יינכמתל ‘to support me’ (Ehrmann 1903: 40a)
- יינקיזחהל ‘to hold me’ (Michelsohn 1910c: 45)

6.2.3.1.2 **2ms Suffix**

The 2ms object suffix י is attested on verbs of various conjugations, e.g.:

- יינארק ‘I called you’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 41)
- יינחיטבא ‘I will guarantee you’ (Bodek 1865c: 8)
- יינרתו ‘to permit you’ (Ehrmann 1903: 15b)
6.2.3.1.3 2fs Suffix
The 2fs object suffix -ך is attested only rarely, as below. As in the case of the 2ms/2fs possessive suffix on singular and plural nouns (discussed in 6.2.1.1 and 6.2.1.2.1), due to lack of pointing it is impossible to be certain whether the authors would have distinguished this in pronunciation from the 2ms suffix.

– אַחֲמוֹל בֵּילְלָה בּכָּה לֹא שָׁלוֹתךְ ‘Last night you were crying and I didn’t ask you’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 25)

6.2.3.1.4 3ms Suffixes
The 3ms object suffix -ו is relatively frequently attested on qaṭal verbs, e.g.:

– וָבָה ‘he was fond of him’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 22)
– וָראָו ‘I saw him’ (Bromberg 1899: 20)
– וָה אָוָו ‘It (f) seized him’ (Ehrmann 1903: 9a)
– וָדָי לֹא הָאָמָנָה ‘She didn’t believe him’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 4)

It is attested on yiḥṭol and wayyiqṭol forms only relatively rarely, e.g.:

– וָאָשְׁוַתָה לֹא תְבוֹר ‘And his wife doesn’t recognize him’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 22)

Like the 1cs suffix it is most typically found on infinitives construct, e.g.:

– וָה כָּלָו ‘to lead him’ (Bodek 1865c: 7)
– וָה לָסִבָל ‘to endure him’ (Bromberg ‘1899: 20)
– וָה לָהְבוֹת לָהָר ‘to strike him and kill him’ (J. Duner 1899: 96)
– וָה לָעֵבָר ‘to bury him’ (Lieberson 1913: 41)

It is not usually attested on the qoṭel, but a rare example is shown below:

– הָלאָשָו יָשָו לָא עָשָו יָשָו ‘to the guest who was asking him a question’ (Landau 1892: 54)

This form is consistently used with III-ו roots, e.g.:

– וָה ‘and he struck him’ (Bromberg 1899: 23)
– וָו ‘and he answered him’ (Singer 1900b: 7)
– וָו ‘and he accompanied him’ (Sofer 1904: 1)
The variant וה- is more commonly used than י- in conjunction with the yiqtol and wayyiqtol, e.g.:

- והנתת 'you (ms) will let him' (Bodek 1865c: 6)
- והשאלתה 'and she asked him' (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 11)
- והיאלוה 'he will feed him' (Rosenthal 1909: 71)

It is particularly common with verbal forms ending in a vowel, e.g.:

- והעגפיןפ 'lest he meet him' (Ehrmann 1903: 20b)
- והארקה 'I will read it' (Landau 1892: 57)
- והלאו 'and [that] he not bring him' (Teomim Fraenkel 1911b: 17)

Moreover, it is commonly attested on qatal forms ending in a vowel, e.g.:

- והיאובאו 'and they brought him' (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 5)
- וההליכו 'and they dressed him' (Landau 1892: 66)
- והכראו 'they called him' (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 42)
- והלקחוה 'they took him' (Bodek 1865c: 1)

It is only rarely attested on qatal forms ending in a consonant, e.g.:

- והלאשת 'then he asked him' (Sofer 1904: 5)

It is also occasionally found on infinitives construct ending in both consonants and vowels (though י- is more common), e.g.:

- והלגבלו 'to receive him' (Bodek 1865c: 11)
- והלבנשו 'to bring him in' (Zak 1912: 20)
- והלאדותיו 'and to inform him' (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 78)

6.2.3.1.5 3fs Suffix

The 3fs suffix וה- is attested in the tales but is somewhat rare, e.g.:

- והייתה 'and he gave it (f)' (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 23)
- והsomeone to provide for her' (Sobelman 1909/10, pt. 3: 13)

6.2.3.1.6 1cp Suffix

The 1cp suffix is not extremely common but is occasionally attested, typically on infinitives construct, e.g.:
– ‘to destroy us’ (Sofer 1904: 3)
– ‘to show us’ (Kaidaner 1875: 19b)

6.2.3.1.7 2mp Suffix
The 2mp suffix is very uncommon; the following is a rare example:
– ‘Come, and I will teach you the ways of Hasidism’
  (M. Walden 1914: 29)

6.2.3.1.8 2fp Suffix
The 2fp suffix is almost unattested; a rare example is shown below:
– ‘I will also be unable to save you’ (Breitstein 1914: 38)

6.2.3.1.9 3cp Suffixes
As in the case of the personal pronouns, there is no distinction between 3mp
and 3fp object suffixes in Hasidic Hebrew. Instead, there are two 3cp variants,
consisting of the standard biblical form -ם and its more typically rabbinic
counterpart -ן. Examples of -ם in conjunction with masculine and feminine
objects are shown below:

Masculine
– ‘to remove them from their cages’ (Kaidaner 1875: 22a)
– ‘to slaughter them’ (Singer 1900a, pt. 2: 3)
– ‘to bring them to Danzig’ (Zak 1912: 28)

Feminine
– ‘simple medicines that do not need to be
  bought’ (Landau 1892: 11)
– ‘And the man took his two daughters from him [...]
  and he redeemed them for a large sum and
  took them to his house’ (Berger 1906: 12)
– ‘Before his death he called his two daughters in order to bless them’
  (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 60)

The -ן variant in conjunction with masculine and feminine nouns is shown in
the following examples respectively:

– ‘לַחֲמָו מַעֲשֵׂה שְׁאֵל מְאֹד לֶקְנֹתָם
  ‘simple medicines that do not need to be
  bought’ (Landau 1892: 11)
– ‘וַיִּקְרָא בֵּית לָוּבְּרָה וֶהֱוָה בְּנְוָה
  וַיְנַשֶּׁה וַיִּקְרָא בֵּית לָוְּבָר בְּנְוָה אֲבָה
  ‘Before his death he called his two
  daughters in order to bless them’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 60)
The 3cp suffixes are most commonly attested with infinitives construct, as above, but are occasionally found with a finite verb such as the following qatal forms:

– ברלםהלתויהל ] ... to teach them grammar’ (Bodek 1865c: 19)
– ב’ two [or] three daughters to marry off’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 21)

6.2.3.2 Energic Suffixes
The 3ms and 3fs object suffixes sometimes appear with energetic נ, as shown below. The energetic suffixes can be attached to the yiqṭol or wayyiqṭol.

The authors’ motivation for employing the energetic forms varies. Often their selection may be attributable to the existence of the same suffixed verbal form in a well-known earlier Hebrew text (possibly with a slightly different meaning). In some cases these forms appear in the Hebrew Bible, as illustrated in the following examples.

– וּנֶּֽאָצְמִיִ֥מ Who might find it (m)’ (Zak 1912: 16); cf. וּנֶּֽאָצְמַּיִ֥מ (Eccl. 7:24)
– הָנֶּֽאָשִּׂי He would marry her’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pt. 3: 14); cf. הָנֶּֽאָשִׂיא ‘Who can bear it (f)?’ (Prov. 18:14)
– הָנֶ֥נְתִּי Let him give it (f)’ (Bodek? 1866: 6b); cf. הָנֶ֥נְתִּי (Gen. 23:9)
In other cases the Hasidic Hebrew verbs with energetic suffix lack a biblical model but instead appear in identical form (which, again, may have a slightly different meaning) in the Mishnah, Talmud, and other rabbinic literature, or in well-known medieval and early modern texts. Examples of such cases are shown below.

- נָהֲנָה ‘He would leave him in peace’ (Ehrmann 1903: 31a); cf. נָהֲנָה ‘He must leave it (m)’ (Mishnah Pesahim 1:3)
- לָבֵכֶשׁ שָׁלֹם ‘to ask him to teach him’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911b: 15); cf. אל לָבֵכֶשׁ ‘He must not teach him’ (Mishnah Nedarim 4:3)
- שְׁחִיתָהוֹ ‘that he might allow her’ (Landau 1892: 54); cf. שְׁחִיתָהוֹ ‘Let him leave it (f)’ (Mishnah Terumot 8:8)
- ונְכֹלַשׁ אָבוּדָה ‘until I teach it (f)’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 26); cf. אל ונְכֹלַשׁ ‘I will study it (f)’ (Babylonian Talmud Bekhorot 29a)
- אֲפִיָּהוּ ‘I shall take him’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 40); cf. אֲפִיָּהוּ ‘I shall take him’ (Lamentations Rabba 4; Ibn Ezra on Hosea 13; Alshich on Proverbs 21)
- לא תעֲבֹג ‘Do not delay him’ (M. Walden 1914: 12); cf. לא תעֲבֹג ‘It delays him’ (Alshich on Proverbs 26)
- יְבֹאָה ‘And he should bring her’ (Shenkel 1903b: 11); cf. יְבֹאָה ‘And he would bring her’ (Alshich on Esther 2)

By contrast, in some cases the form is not widely attested in earlier literature and therefore the authors’ choice to employ the energetic suffix cannot readily be attributed to familiarity from a source text. In these instances the Hasidic Hebrew authors appear to have employed the energetic suffixes productively. They do not seem to have had a specific semantic motivation for doing so on any given instance; rather, it is likely that they regarded the standard and energetic suffixes as interchangeable much like e.g. the 3mp variants ס and ט.

For example, the following form seems to be attested only once in a familiar pre-Hasidic Hebrew composition, in Bahya ben Asher’s commentary on the Pentateuch (composed 1291), and it is doubtful whether this made such an impression on Bromberg that it prompted him to include it in his own writing.

- וְנַחֵיק הָעָה ‘And he rebuked him’ (Bromberg 1899: 45)

Likewise, the following example appears only once in earlier literature, in Abraham Seba’s sixteenth-century kabbalistic commentary on the Pentateuch:

- וְנֵּכַּה ‘And he will rebuke him’ (Shenkel 1903b: 11)
Similarly, some energetic suffixes appear to be completely without precedent in earlier Hebrew literature; the following example illustrates such a case:

– מותב שמאמרים ‘better that I damage him’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 17)

6.2.3.3 Non-Standard Use of Direct Object Suffixes

The Hasidic Hebrew authors occasionally employ a direct object suffix or a suffixed form of the accusative marker in contexts wherein one would typically find an indirect object composed of the preposition -ל with a pronominal suffix. This phenomenon is illustrated below:

– ילרמאור״ומדאיתואארקזא 'Then the Rebbe called me and said to me …' (Bodek 1866: 43)
– תוריכשהימדותואםלשלםילשהאליכןולמהמותואשורגלהצוררשהו 'And the official wanted to throw him out of the inn because he had not finished paying him the rent' (Kaidaner 1875: 45a)
– ילתמדוריהיתנשיהיהםמהמלתשלוםיאווריהיתנשיהיהםמריהיתנשיההםישועבלימכחםישנאךוליבוירשאיאברהמחלש 'Send [a message] quickly on the island that they should bring you wise hearted men who do work, and they should build storehouses for you' (Shenkel 1903b: 31)

Some of these non-standard constructions derive from Yiddish; for example, the verb phrase in the first example is a direct translation of the Yiddish רע ענפפּוּעָה he called me, which contains an accusative pronoun. Similarly, in cases involving a 3ms suffix (such as the middle two examples) the authors’ use of the direct object form may be attributable to a perceived interchangeability between the direct and indirect object resulting from the fact that Yiddish has a syncretic accusative and dative 3ms pronoun, אָס ‘him’. In some cases, such as the last example, the authors’ motivation is less clear but the rarity of the phenomenon in general means that such cases are extremely marginal.
6.3 Demonstrative Pronouns

6.3.1 Proximal
The Hasidic Hebrew proximal demonstrative pronouns are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cp</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>fs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הלא</td>
<td>את</td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>את</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast to the proximal demonstrative adjectives, the proximal demonstrative pronouns more frequently maintain a distinction between masculine and feminine singular forms. Examples of the masculine pronoun are as follows:

- 'And this is the wording' (Gemen 1914: 91)
- 'This is not Emperor Pawel' (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 16)
- 'who this is' (Michelsohn 1912: 49)
- 'And this one said it in a different manner' (HaLevi 1907: 24b)

The feminine singular pronoun is תאז. It is almost unattested in the tales in conjunction with feminine predicates; the following is a rare example:

- 'And she (lit: this one) knew with certainty that this was not her husband' (Brandwein 1914: 1)

Although the gender distinction between הלא and תאז is typically upheld, התאז does sometimes appear in conjunction with masculine predicates, e.g.:

- 'And they asked, “What place is this?”' (Teomim Fraenkel 1911b: 57)
- 'This is the praise of the Ba’al Shem Tov' (Brandwein 1912: 9)

In addition to its use as a subject pronoun, התאז serves as an anaphoric pronoun referring to abstract concepts, as shown below. The same applies to the prefixed variant התא ‘such a’, illustrated in the last example. The authors most likely
adopted this convention because it is common in earlier Hebrew texts; for example, in the Hebrew Bible the feminine singular demonstrative pronoun is the form most commonly used as a *neutrum* pronoun (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 312).

- They spoke all of this’ (Munk 1898: 49)
- ‘And so it was. And after this when the holy Tzaddik went away ...’ (Sofer 1904: 20)
- ‘The king was alarmed when he saw this’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 12)
- ‘Because he himself did not want to tell him this’ (Berger 1907: 46)
- ‘And they wanted to ask him about this’ (Hirsch 1900: 24)
- ‘I learned this from the Rebbe of Lublin’ (Jacob Isaac ben Asher of Przysucha 1908: 47)
- ‘and the Hasidim who saw and heard this’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 57)
- ‘And when they told this to the Ba’al Shem Tov he said, “It’s not enough that he is not coming to [see] me”’ (Chikernik 1903b: 6)
- ‘A man who has done such a thing’ (N. Duner 1912: 21)

6.3.2 Distal

In contrast to the distal demonstrative adjectives, the distal pronouns are not a common feature of Hasidic Hebrew. The following is a rare example:

- ‘And that is a greater level’ (Bromberg 1899: 8)

However, the 3cp object pronoun ואתו (discussed further in 12.3.1.1.4) is often employed as a plural distal demonstrative pronoun in relative clauses, as below. This usage has precedent in Rabbinic Hebrew (Pérez Fernández 1999: 23).

- ‘He was one of those upon whom death has been decreed’ (J. Duner 1899: 75)
- ‘He said of those who wear Sabbath clothes ...’ (Greenwald 1897: 92)
- ‘about those which had been printed previously’ (Heilmann 1902: 164)
6.4 Interrogative Pronouns

The Hasidic Hebrew interrogative pronouns are listed below. They do not differ from those used in the canonical forms of the language.

- **מיה** (‘what’), e.g. "What could I do?" (M. Walden 1914: 53)
- **מי** (‘who’), e.g. "Who is he" (Jacob Isaac ben Asher of Przysucha 1908: 43)

6.5 Indefinite Pronouns

The commonly used Hasidic Hebrew indefinite pronouns are shown below. They typically derive from Rabbinic Hebrew (see Pérez Fernández 1999: 40–42).

Depending on context, כל and everyone can mean either ‘everyone’ or ‘anything’ respectively.

Likewise, כל can mean ‘everyone’ or ‘everything’.

The characteristically rabbinic indefinite pronoun והשל מי is very rare in Hasidic Hebrew. When attested, it appears as two words,وحשל מי, as below. It always has a relative sense rather than a strictly indefinite one, being translatable as ‘one who’, ‘a person who’, or ‘someone who’ who rather than simply as ‘someone’.

Every

- כלolah משלמה הקהלת נאמה, ‘Each one from the two communities had a claim’ (Shenkel 1883, pt. 1: 9)
- כלolah משלמה הקהלת נאמה, ‘We see that not everyone merits it’ (M. Walden 1913, pt. 2: 6)
- הכלolah משלמה הקהלת נאמה, ‘And everyone recognized in him that he was not a simple poor man’ (Heilmann 1902: 107)
- הכלolah משלמה הקהלת נאמה, ‘I will offer everything’ (Rapaport 1909: 26)
- הכלolah משלמה הקהלת נאמה, ‘the physicality that is in everything’ (Zak 1912: 67)
Any

– ‘anyone’, e.g. And that woman recovered immediately, like anyone’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1910: 64)
– ‘anything’, e.g. There is no more mercy for such a man than for anything in the world’ (Yellin 1913: 64)

Some

– ‘such-and-such’, e.g. a tenant farmer whose name is such-and-such’ (Munk 1898: 30)
– ‘something’, e.g. Please give me something’ (Rosenthal 1909: 74)
– ‘someone who’; ‘one who’, e.g. lying like someone who is sleeping’ (Greenwald 1899: 10a)
– ‘something’, e.g. something like this’ (Breitstein 1914: 60)

No, Any (negative)

– ‘no-one’, ‘anyone’, e.g. And the Gaon didn’t tell anyone’ (Seuss 1890: 60)
– ‘nothing’, ‘anything’, e.g. I don’t know anything’ (? 1894: 16)

6.6 Reflexive Pronouns

The Hasidic Hebrew authors often employ the characteristically post-biblical construction מְצַע ‘self’ in conjunction with a possessive suffix as a reflexive pronoun. The construction frequently appears in abbreviated form as עָז, as in the third example below. The reflexive pronoun may be used as a direct or indirect object, as in the first set of examples below, or, when prefixed by ב, as an adverbial intensifier, as in the second set. It is also rarely employed as an adnominal intensifier, as in the final set. A noteworthy Hasidic Hebrew use of the reflexive pronoun is in conjunction with hitpael/nitpael verbs (see 8.9.5.4.3).
Direct or Indirect Object

- ‘He prevented himself from eating sugar’ (Yellin 1913: 5)
- ‘And he laid himself down to sleep’ (Hirsch 1900: 11)
- ‘And that non-Jewish child also used to shake himself (in prayer)’ (Brandwein 1912: 5)
- ‘But you must prepare yourself for his arrival’ (Rodkinsohn 1864a: 30)
- ‘And he said to himself, “Sit down, Reb Shemelke”’ (Bodek 1865c: 11)

Adverbial

- ‘Then I understood by myself that I had not started anything in the worship of the LORD blessed be He’ (Moses of Kobrin 1910: 34)
- ‘This man Moses feared for his life to travel by himself’ (Ehrmann 1903: 20b)
- ‘I, who myself see him every day putting on phylacteries and praying’ (Berger 1910b: 13)
- ‘If I had the ability to go I would certainly go by myself’ (M. Walden 1914: 93)

Adnominal

- ‘Because he himself was from the western lands’ (M. Walden 1914: 14)
- ‘It is that very same soul itself that was given to him when he was still in his mother’s belly’ (Rosenthal 1909: 39)

6.7 Reciprocal Pronouns

The Hasidic Hebrew reciprocal pronoun is a construction consisting of the singular proximal demonstrative זה ‘this one’, followed by the accusative marker תאם or preposition, followed by another singular proximal demonstrative זה. The accusative marker is used when the pronoun functions as a direct object, while the prepositions serve to denote various types of indirect object. These
reciprocal constructions are very commonly written in abbreviated form as ז״אז, ז״לז, etc., as in the first example below. This construction derives from Rabbinic Hebrew (Segal 1927: 208).

– ‘And when the rabbi came they started to debate each other’ (Sofer 1904: 5)
– ‘And without the conversion to Judaism they would not have met each other’ (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 4)
– ‘At that moment, he heard two ravens, a mother and her son, saying to each other, “Is this man dead or not?”’ (Shenkel 1883, pt. 1: 6)
– ‘and also drinking alcohol and toasting each other’s health’ (Bodek 1866: 24)

6.8 Relative Pronouns

Hasidic Hebrew possesses three variants of the relative pronoun, the typically biblicalרשא, the typically post-biblical-ש, and the Aramaic-ד, as illustrated below in turn. See 13.11.1 for details regarding the distribution of these three variants.

– ‘And his wonders that the Ba’al Shem Tov of blessed memory performed’ (Bodek 1865c: 1)
– ‘the laugh that our Rebbe laughed last night’ (Roddinsohn 1865: 1)
– ‘a baraita that helps (i.e. supports) you[r argument]’ (Bromberg 1899: 11)
Numerals

7.1 Paradigm

The Hasidic Hebrew cardinal numerals 1–19 are as follows. Note that the authors do not typically employ construct forms (with the exception of the numeral 2 and in rare cases before the word אלפים ‘thousands’, discussed in 7.5 below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Common</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אוד</td>
<td>אוד, אוד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שתי</td>
<td>שנ, שנ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שלוש</td>
<td>שלוש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ארבעה</td>
<td>ארבע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חמישה</td>
<td>חמישה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שש</td>
<td>שש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سابע</td>
<td>سابע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שמונה</td>
<td>שמונה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>תשע</td>
<td>תשע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עשר</td>
<td>עשר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עשרים</td>
<td>עשר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עשרים</td>
<td>עשרים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שלוש עשרים</td>
<td>שלוש עשרים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ארבע עשרים</td>
<td>ארבע עשרים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חמישה עשרים</td>
<td>חמישה עשרים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שש עשרים</td>
<td>שש עשרים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سابע עשרים</td>
<td>سابע עשרים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שמונה עשרים</td>
<td>שמונה עשרים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>תשע עשרים</td>
<td>תשע עשרים</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2 Gender

As in earlier forms of Hebrew, the numerals 1–19 exhibit two variants. However, as shown in the above table, the distribution of these variants in Hasidic Hebrew is different than in other forms of the language, in which one variant is employed in conjunction with masculine nouns and the other with feminine nouns. These differences will be discussed in detail below.

7.2.1 Numerals 1–2

In Hasidic Hebrew the variants for 1 and 2 are all interchangeable, used with both masculine and feminine nouns. The following examples illustrate each pair of numerals, דחא/תחא and ינש/יתש, modifying masculine and feminine nouns. Note that only the construct forms of ‘two’ are used in conjunction with nouns; the absolute forms ינש and ייתש are avoided in such contexts. This will be discussed further in 7.5 below.

אני

- דחא ‘a pauper’ (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 26)
- דחאםעפ ‘one time’ (Shalom of Koidanov 1882: 22)
- דחאלו ‘one foot’ (Berger 1910b: 123)
- דחאשת ‘one silliness’ (Gemen 1914: 54)
- דחאשבת ‘one Sabbath’ (Breitstein 1914: 19)
- דחאמט ‘one step’ (Ehrmann 1905: 48b)
- דחאמע ‘One mezuzah’ (N. Duner 1912: 21)

אתוה

- תחא ‘in one village’ (Rodkinsohn 1864a: 24)
- תחאלספ ‘one bench’ (Shenkel 1903b: 27)
- תחאםעפ ‘one time’ (Moses Leib of Sasov 1903: 34b)
- תחאשא ‘one woman’ (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 18)

שנים

- ינש ‘two emissaries’ (A. Walden 1860?: 29a)
- ינשעבדים ‘two slaves’ (Hirsch 1900: 73)
- ינשתור ‘two Torahs’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pt. 3: 13)
- ינשתלד ‘two small girls’ (Berger 1906: 12)
- ינששת ‘two pieces’ (Hirsch 1900: 32)
The interchangeability of שנים and שנות is clearly illustrated by comparison of the following two examples, in which the same author employs both variants in conjunction with the same noun.

- תועשיתשמרתוי ‘more than two hours’ (Munk 1898: 19); cf. תועשינשב ‘in two hours’ (Munk 1898: 50)

This phenomenon is comparable to that of the proximal demonstrative adjectives (5.5.1) and the personal pronouns (6.1.1), in which any gender distinction has been levelled. As in the case of the proximal demonstrative adjectives, this usage seems to be rooted at least partly in the fact that the numerals in question do not fit neatly into the authors’ conception of grammatical gender: neither דאך nor תחא ends in [ə], which means that the authors did not recognize either form as clearly feminine, and instead treated them as interchangeable. This phonological levelling is likely to have been reinforced by the existence of a similar tendency in rabbinic literature to employ דאך/תחא and שנות/שנה with both masculine and feminine nouns (which was itself motivated by similar factors such as a realignment in the gender of certain nouns and a weakening of the phonological distinction between the masculine and feminine forms of some of the numerals; see Sharvit 2008: 228–234 for details).

### 7.2.2 Numerals 3–19

Similarly, in the case of the numerals 3–19 the variants that are traditionally masculine are employed interchangeably with nouns of both gender; by contrast, the traditionally feminine variants 3–19 are employed relatively rarely, and almost always in conjunction with שנות ‘years’ or a small assortment of feminine nouns.
Thus, the traditionally masculine numerals are often found in conjunction with nouns that are regarded as masculine in Hasidic Hebrew (though not necessarily in other forms of the language), as in the following examples:

- יומת ושתן ‘five or six men’ (Chikernik 1903b: 25)
- יומת ושתן ‘ten months’ (Berger 1906: 56)
- יומת ושתן ‘ten years’ (Sofer 1904: 13)
- יומת ושתן ‘fifteen years’ (Bodek 1865a: 24)
- יומת ושתן ‘three years’ (Rosenthal 1909: 18)
- יומת ושתן ‘three times’ (Gemen 1914: 91)
- יומת ושתן ‘three women’ (Michelsohn 1905: 79)

They also frequently appear in conjunction with nouns treated as feminine by the Hasidic Hebrew authors as well as in other forms of the language:

- יומת ושתן ‘five or six questions’ (Chikernik 1903b: 24)
- יומת ושתן ‘and three daughters’ (Berger 1906a: 63)
- יומת ושתן ‘five hundred’ (Shenkel 1903b: 16)
- יומת ושתן ‘seven plagues’ (Stamm 1905: 6)
- יומת ושתן ‘in five hours’ (Singer 190a, pt. 2: 12)
- יומת ושתן ‘four hours’ (Shalom of Koidanov 1882: 15)
- יומת ושתן ‘ten parshahs’ (Bromberg 1899: 57)
- יומת ושתן ‘three commandments of the Torah’ (Shenkel 1903b: 11)
- יומת ושתן ‘nineteen years old’ (Kaidaner 1875: 17b)

Conversely, the feminine variants of these numerals are not often utilized; when attested, they appear almost exclusively in conjunction with feminine nouns or with the noun יומת ‘years’ (which is typically regarded as masculine in Hasidic Hebrew but is feminine in other forms of the language).

- יומת ושתן ‘in all the seven wisdoms’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 53)
- יומת ושתן ‘fifteen hours’ (Kaidaner 1875: 25a)
- יומת ושתן ‘seven years’ (Bodek 1865c: 19)
- יומת ושתן ‘twelve years’ (Singer 1900a, pt. 3: 2)
- יומת ושתן ‘seven years’ (Michelsohn 1910c: 55)
- יומת ושתן ‘nineteen years’ (Gemen 1914: 56)

The feminine form is also more common in set phrases, e.g.:

- יומת ושתן ‘at the third Sabbath meal’ (Ehrmann 1905: 144b)
These tendencies suggest that the numeral system in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Hasidic Hebrew was undergoing a process of simplification whereby the feminine variants were being abandoned in favour of their masculine counterparts. Similar patterns are attested in non-Hasidic nineteenth-century Ashkenazi Hebrew writings from Eastern Europe and Palestine (Wertheimer 1975: 157), suggesting that the levelling process exhibited in the tales is part of a much more widespread phenomenon. This streamlining of numeral gender was most likely influenced at least in part by the fact that the authors’ native Yiddish has only one set of numerals, which is used to modify nouns of any gender (Katz 1987: 201–203). As in the case of the numerals 1 and 2, this process is likely to have been reinforced by the existence in rabbinic literature of a blurring of the boundary between masculine and feminine numerals due to shifting noun gender and lack of phonological distinctiveness (Sharvit 2008: 228–234). Note that the Hasidic Hebrew phenomenon is comparable to the converse development in present-day colloquial Hebrew whereby the feminine numerals are commonly employed in conjunction with both masculine and feminine nouns (see Glinert 1989: 80–81).

7.3 Number

Nouns are invariably plural in conjunction with numerals 1–10, e.g.:

- תועשינש ‘two hours’ (Berger 1906: 74)
- סינשהשלש ‘three years’ (Rodkinsohn 1864a: 9)
- חמש ‘five years’ (Ehrmann 1903: 23b)
- רביע ‘seven plagues’ (Stamm 1905: 6)
- שמונה ‘eight days’ (Bromberg 1899: 26)

Nouns appearing in conjunction with numerals higher than 10 are most commonly in the plural, as in the first set of examples below. More rarely they may be in the singular, as in the second set. This preference for plural nouns is not based strictly on either a biblical or a rabbinic model: in Biblical Hebrew nouns appearing in conjunction with the decimals may be either singular or plural (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 280–281; Shivtiel 2013), while in Rabbinic Hebrew nouns in conjunction with the decimals are typically singular (Pérez Fernández 1999: 87). The authors’ tendency to employ the plural form of nouns in such cases is likely to have been reinforced by Yiddish, in which nouns appear in the plural in conjunction with numerals except in a few set circumstances (Mark 1978: 234–235; Jacobs 2005: 191–192).
Plural Noun

- ‘ten minutes’ (Ehrmann 1911: 11a)
- ‘fifty years’ (Sofer 1904: 23)
- ‘sixty great men’ (Berger 1910c: 13)
- ‘eighty years’ (Landau 1892: 65)
- ‘a hundred years’ (Zak 1912: 12)

Singular Noun

- ‘twenty years’ (Zak 1912: 12)
- ‘eighty years’ (Chikernik 1903b: 10)
- ‘thirty consecutive years’ (Yellin 1913: 9)
- ‘ninety years old’ (J. Duner 1899: 16)

The two variants were used interchangeably, as comparison of the following pair of examples from the work of a single author illustrates: the first contains a singular noun and the second a plural one.

- ‘twenty years’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 45); cf. ‘more than twenty years’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 43)

7.4 Definiteness

Numerals modifying definite nouns typically appear prefixed by the definite article, while the following nouns remain unprefixed, as below. This convention differs from the standard Hebrew convention dating back to the biblical stratum, whereby numerals associated with definite nouns appear in construct, with the definite article prefixed to the following noun (see Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 277).

- ‘the eight days’ (Sofer 1904: 38)
- ‘those two bees’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 69)
- ‘the seven men’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 8)
- ‘the two hours’ (Rodkinsohn 1864a: 34)
- ‘those three righteous men’ (Hirsch 1900: 33)

1 See 16.3.4.4 for details of this Yiddish plural suffix.
Less frequently both the numeral and noun are definite, as below. This type of construction is comparable to the common phenomenon of doubly definite construct chains discussed in 4.3.2.2.3 except that it is much rarer with numerals.

- `the two brothers` (Michelsohn 1905: 63)
- `the two men` (Berger 1907: 42)

Finally, sometimes the construction that is standard in the canonical forms of Hebrew is attested, though less often than the non-standard constructions shown above.

- `those two righteous men` (Singer 1900b: 23)

### 7.5 Word Order and State

#### 7.5.1 Numeral 1

The numeral `one` always follows its associated noun, as below. This corresponds to both Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew (see Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 492 and Pérez Fernández 1999: 86 respectively).

- `one man` (Ehrmann 1905: 55a)
- `one time` (Munk 1898: 18)
- `one wall` (Zak 1912: 7)
- `on one day` (Bromberg 1899: 23)

#### 7.5.2 Numeral 2

The numerals `two` always appear in construct before their associated noun, as below. This convention differs from that of Biblical Hebrew, in which `two` may appear in construct before the noun, in absolute form.
before the noun, or in absolute form following the noun (see Waltke and O'Connor 1990: 276). Conversely, it more closely resembles that of Rabbinic Hebrew, in which שֵׁשַׁם/שֵׁשִּׁים usually appear in construct form preceding the noun (Pérez Fernández 1999: 86). Moreover, the Hasidic Hebrew usage has an identical parallel in Israeli Hebrew, in which only the construct variant is used (see Coffin and Bolozky 2005: 184).

– שְׁשִי ‘two years’ (Munk 1898: 18)
– שְׁשֵׁה ‘two students’ (Laufbahn 1914: 45)
– שְׁשִי ‘two women’ (Sofer 1904: 3)
– שְׁשַי ‘two hours’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 6)

7.5.3 *Numerals 3 and Above*
Numerals 3 and above almost invariably appear in absolute form preceding the associated noun, as illustrated below. This practice differs somewhat from Biblical Hebrew, in which numerals may either precede or follow their nouns (see Waltke and O'Connor 1990: 276–277, Weitzman 1996, and Williams 2007: 41 for details)—though they more commonly precede them (Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 492–493). It more closely resembles Rabbinic Hebrew, in which numerals most commonly appear in absolute form preceding their associated nouns (see Pérez Fernández 1999: 86). Moreover, the Hasidic Hebrew usage identically mirrors the authors’ native Yiddish, in which numerals invariably precede their associated nouns (see Mark 1978: 234 for details); in addition, it corresponds precisely to Israeli Hebrew (see Coffin and Bolozky 2005: 183–184). Despite the latter resemblance, it is unclear whether the Hasidic Hebrew usage played a role in the establishment of the Israeli Hebrew convention, as the identical Yiddish construction may have exerted a stronger direct influence.

– שלש תלות ‘three challahs’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 14ii²)
– שבעה מחות ‘seven plagues’ (Stamm 1905: 6)
– חמישה عشر שעות ‘fifteen hours’ (Kaidaner 1875: 25a)
– שבע מאות פרוסים ‘five hundred Russians’ (Berger 1910b: 87)
– חמש מאות וחמש זלוטי ‘fifteen hundred and six złoty (or: guilders)’
(Breitstein 1914: 22)

---
² Two consecutive pages in this text are both numbered 14.
Only very rarely is such a numeral attested following the noun, as in the following example. This may be a calque of the Russian construction whereby the numeral following the noun denotes imprecision, similar to the English ‘or so’ (Wade 2000: 208); however, given the rarity of this construction and the Hasidic Hebrew authors’ general unfamiliarity with the Russian language, it is more likely to derive from the biblical usage.

– ועבהר תמיים שלשה ונא נודע ערבון החול והולח ‘And three days (or possibly: about three days or so) went by, and there was no trace of that man’ (Bodek 1865b: 3)

7.5.4 Numeral 1,000
ףלא ‘thousand’ appears only rarely modified by another numeral. When such constructions do occur, the numerals modifying פלא ‘thousand’ are placed prepositively, with פלא pluralized asalmמ ‘thousands’. They may appear in construct, as in the first two examples below; this corresponds to the standard order in Biblical Hebrew (Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 300). Alternatively, they may appear in their absolute form, as in the last example. This construction differs from the canonical norm but corresponds to the above-discussed Hasidic Hebrew tendency to avoid the construct form of numerals.

– שנ אלפים ‘two thousand’ (Bodek? 1866: 7a)
– שש אלפים ‘six thousand years’ (Moses Leib of Sasov 1903: 26b)
– ובשבע אלפים ‘and in six thousand’ (Moses Leib of Sasov 1903: 26b)

7.5.5 Compound Numerals
Compound numerals greater than 20 are not usually written out in full, but rather are typically represented alphanumerically (as discussed in 3.10). On the occasions when they are written out, they may be formed with the tens first, as in the first set of examples below, or with the units first, as in the second set. Both patterns are attested in Biblical Hebrew (Walke and O’Connor 1990: 280–281), while tens + units seems to be the norm in Rabbinic Hebrew (Segal 1936: 101). The Hasidic Hebrew use of the units + tens construction may be reinforced by the fact that this order is standard in Yiddish (Jacobs 2005: 191), e.g. הקיזנאוווצ ‘twenty-two (lit: two and twenty)’. However, the relative paucity of cases in which compound numerals are written out in words makes it difficult to ascertain which of these two patterns would have been the dominant one in the authors’ Hebrew idiom when the numerals were read aloud.
Tens + Units

- ‘twenty-two versts’ (Chikernik 1903b: 12)
- ‘forty-eight years’ (Breitstein 1914: 9)
- ‘twenty-two consecutive years’ (Michelsohn 1910c: 33)
- ‘a hundred and ninety-two years’ (Gemen 1914: 83)

Units + Tens

- ‘fifty-three (lit: three and fifty) years’ (Hirsch 1900: 69)
- ‘twenty-two (lit: two and twenty) years’ (Sofer 1904: 22)
- ‘seventy-five (lit: five and seventy) kopecks’ (Chikernik 1903a: 25)
- ‘ninety-nine (lit: nine and ninety) parts’ (Breitstein 1914: 13)
CHAPTER 8

Verbs

In the following section the morphology and uses of each verbal form are discussed in turn. The morphology of Hasidic Hebrew verbs corresponds in many respects to the standard forms in other types of the language; as such, only non-standard or variant forms and other noteworthy morphological issues are presented here.

8.1 Qaṭal

8.1.1 Morphology
The morphology of the qaṭal in Hasidic Hebrew corresponds to that of other types of Hebrew, with the exception of certain phenomena relating to weak roots discussed in 8.10.

8.1.2 Uses
The qaṭal in the Hasidic Hebrew tales serves almost exclusively as a past tense marker. In this respect it differs from Biblical Hebrew, in which the qaṭal is found in present and future settings as well as punctive past ones (see Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 478–495 and Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 330–337 for details); rather, it more closely resembles Rabbinic Hebrew, in which the qaṭal serves primarily as a past tense (Pérez Fernández 1999: 115–116). However, Hasidic Hebrew usage diverges from the rabbinic model in that it employs the qaṭal in iterative past contexts in addition to punctive ones. This treatment of the qaṭal as an aspect-neutral past tense form does not seem to be rooted in earlier canonical forms of Hebrew, but rather mirrors contemporaneous Maskilic Hebrew literature and the authors’ native Yiddish. Conversely, the Hasidic Hebrew authors regularly employ the qaṭal form of certain stative roots to convey present states; this usage differs strikingly from that of rabbinic and rabbinic-based forms of the language and from Yiddish, and is instead directly rooted in Biblical Hebrew. These various uses of the Hasidic Hebrew qaṭal are discussed below.
8.1.2.1 Preterite

The most common use of the Hasidic Hebrew qaṭal is as a preterite, as in the following examples. In this respect the language of the tales corresponds to earlier varieties of Hebrew, in which a preterite meaning is generally regarded to be a central function of this conjugation (see e.g. Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 486 and Joosten 2012: 193, 215–218 for Biblical Hebrew; Pérez Fernández 1999: 115–116 for Rabbinic Hebrew; Rand 2006: 324–325 for *piyyuṭim* from Byzantine Palestine; Kahn 2009: 87–89 for nineteenth-century Maskilic Hebrew).

- וּמְצוּעַ בְּרַיְבֶּהוּרגֶסְתָּלָּהוּ ‘And (as for) the door, the rich man closed (it) himself’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 13)
- וְיָכַּ֥ב אָדוֹן הַנְּשָׁאִּים הַעַטְנָ֖ים לַהלֹֽהְרַֽמְוַתָּהוּ ‘And straight after the wedding he set up the special room for him’ (Brandwein 1912: 1)
- 'וַהֲחֵלָ֥ת בֶּכְם ‘And she started to cry’ (Singer 1900b: 5)
- 'וְקָפְתֵּךְ מַחֲזֵקְתָּךְ ‘And I jumped from under the clothes’ (Ehrmann 1905: 52a)
- 'וַהלַֽבְּתָךְ נֶגֶף הָחֹזֶה לָרָאָֽתָה יְֽשָׁנָֽה רַחְאֶֽפָּי ‘I also went outside in order to see if it was time to travel from here’ (Seuss 1890: 23)

Chains of qaṭal are often used to convey sequences of past action, as in the following examples; such chains are used in free variation with wayyiqṭol to convey past action sequences (see 8.3.2 for further discussion of this issue).

- וּכְסָהוּ וַאֲלָ֥ן תִּילִילָ֖ר מֵאָמַ֑יו וַתִּהְמַֽה ‘He went and searched and found me and told me to give him that sum’ (M. Walden 1914: 6)
- 'וַאֲחָכָּ֣ת וְרָעְשָׂ֣ה וַתַּהֳלְךָ בַּתָּהֲמָּה ‘And fear and trembling gripped me, and I opened the door and fled’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1910: 4)
- 'וַהֲחֵלָת הַדְּלֵי וַאֲחָכָ֣ת וַתִּהֲמַֽה ‘He said this in a loud (lit: big) voice and afterwards drank coffee and put on gloves’ (Gemen 1914: 91)
- 'וַהלַֽבְּתָךְ לְשַׁבָּסְנֶֽהָם וַתִּהֲמַֽה לְשַׁבָּס נַעְשָׂאִים נַעְשָׂא ‘She went to the neighbours and asked for six groschen for herself, and she bought flour for two, eggs for two, and butter for two groschen, and she prepared this kind of meal’ (Michelsohn 1910a: 46)

Qaṭal forms with preterite value often appear prefixed by the conjunction waw following a temporal clause consisting of an infinitive construct, e.g.:
And when I came I gave him the paper’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 22)

‘When he came to the house of the holy Rebbe, he wanted to enter’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 10)

‘And when she came before the holy Rebbe she gave him the note’ (N. Duner 1912: 28)

‘And when they were travelling, they strayed from the right road’ (Brandwein 1912: 21)

‘And when she came before the holy Rebbe she gave him the note with his name’ (Michelsohn 1910a: 11)

‘And when he arrived in Premishlan he was greeted by the Rebbe’ (Breitstein 1914: 43)

‘And when they were in Kobrin they went in to [see] the Admor of Kobrin’ (Moses of Kobrin 1910: 45)

This phenomenon lacks clear precedent in earlier forms of Hebrew. It partially resembles a rare biblical construction whereby a qaṭal with preterite value may appear in narrative prefixed by the conjunction waw (see Joosten 2012: 223–225 for details); however, the biblical construction is quite marginal and not linked to temporal clauses, whereas the Hasidic Hebrew construction is relatively common and found only following temporal clauses. These factors suggest that the Hasidic construction does not derive directly from the biblical one. Rather, it seems to constitute a fusion of the typical biblical construction composed of a temporal clause with infinitive construct followed by a wayyiqṭol combined with the post-biblical use of qaṭal rather than wayyiqṭol in preterite settings. As such, it fits in with the wider Hasidic Hebrew tendency to fuse biblical and post-biblical forms and constructions in innovative and productive ways.

8.1.2.2 Present Perfect

The qaṭal may also be used to convey the equivalent of English present perfect actions, i.e. actions that took place in the past but are seen to have an effect in the present. Present perfect contexts are often difficult to distinguish from preterite ones, but typically refer to an experience that the subject has had at some unspecified point prior to the present moment and possibly on more than one occasion, as in the examples below. This usage is particularly common in negative sentences, often in conjunction with the adverb דְּעַי ‘yet’, as in the final example.
8.1.2.3 Pluperfect

The qatal can be used in pluperfect contexts, conveying that an action was already in a state of completion by the time that the mainline narrative action took place, as in the following example. Again, this corresponds to the canonical forms of Hebrew (see e.g. Joosten 2012: 219–220 for Biblical Hebrew and Pérez Fernández 1999: 116 for Rabbinic Hebrew).

\[ \text{Because the emperor knew from the rabbi, R. Asher from Stolin, that Avigdor had turned him in} \] (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 16)

\[ \text{And when they were travelling, they strayed from the correct road and travelled through mountains and hills that no man had passed through} \] (Brandwein 1912: 21)

\[ \text{Afterwards a telegraph came [saying] that that R. Motele had won the court case} \] (Rapaport 1909: 43)

\[ \text{At first the bishop thought that he had fainted, and he called the doctor to check his condition} \] (HaLevi 1909: 54)

\[ \text{When the alcohol had worn off the guards, they awoke from their sleep and saw that the Jew had escaped} \] (Kaidaner 1875: 17a)
They may also appear in causal clauses, introduced by a particle such as ‘because’, as in the examples below.

- הבשל הבית לא היה והיא. ‘The innkeeper wasn’t in his house, because he had travelled to the city with his wife’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 4)
- והשם עריע הלוע. ‘And when he arrived at his house he said ‘Congratulations’ to the man, the messenger, because the woman had already given birth to a son’ (Bodek 1865a: 71)
- הנוה החולדות הינו לא היה מצדו ואהבר כי לא ראוה עוד יד. ‘That holy Rebbe, the Toledot, didn’t know the Ba’al Shem Tov from previously, because he hadn’t seen him yet, only heard of him’ (Chikernik 1902: 13)
- כי אשתה קנתה ואהבת מתא הירים קדש. ‘because his wife had bought them from the fishermen before’ (A. Walden 1860?: 56a)

8.1.2.4 Past Progressive

Qaṭal forms in Hasidic Hebrew are not used solely to indicate punctive past actions; rather, they may also be used in durative past contexts. Thus, they are relatively frequently used to denote past progressive actions. Such qaṭal forms are typically found in subordinate clauses, as in the following examples:

- והנאוה הנודר חبثך היה. ‘And when he opened the door, Reb Baruch was walking back and forth in his room’ (Zak 1912: 153)
- והיהו והבפש מרוחק יכ עמד הרוח עצים עתונה. ‘And the Ba’al Shem Tov saw from afar that the old man was standing next to the wagon’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 12)
- וישים על הרבח חוריך י //= תאה ייר. ‘And many merchants who were travelling to some fair were lodging there’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 15)
- והנה קאוש התשון מדריך Мосרש הרשו וDateString רוח ובקשת אשר לא עבר תאה. ‘And when they were travelling, they strayed from the correct road and travelled through mountains and hills that no man had passed through’ (Brandwein 1912: 21)
- והם נשאוה לקהל שלום ישב אב הנהי עת 얼마. ‘And when they came to receive a greeting the Maggid was then sitting with his son’ (Chikernik 1902: 7)
- וישמש קול עשון עני א追い שישמו עב עתונה של במקום רמות עט. ‘And he heard the cry of a pauper who was standing with his wagon in a place of mud and muck’ (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 26)
However, they may additionally appear in main clauses, e.g.:

– ‘Once he was travelling on Friday afternoon and he heard the cry of a pauper’ (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 26)
– ‘And he ran and came to the Ba’al Shem Tov, and he was already praying the afternoon prayers, so the Ba’al Shem Tov did not greet him’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 21)
– ‘And many merchants who were travelling to some fair were lodging there’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 15)

The Hasidic Hebrew use of the *qaṭal* in past progressive contexts differs from both Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew, in which the *qaṭal* is typically used only for punctive rather than durative past actions. In Biblical Hebrew, the *qoṭel* would most likely be used to convey past progressive actions (Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 383), while in Rabbinic Hebrew a periphrastic construction would commonly be used in such contexts (Pérez Fernández 1999: 137). The Hasidic Hebrew treatment of the *qaṭal* as an aspect-neutral past tense that can be used in progressive as well as habitual settings (see 8.1.2.5) does not seem to have clear precedent in the earlier canonical forms of Hebrew; rather, it resembles the *qaṭal* in contemporaneous Maskilic Hebrew and the past tense in the authors’ native Yiddish, as these forms are used to convey punctive, progressive, and iterative past actions (see Kahn 2009: 77–83 and 2012b: 194–197 for Maskilic Hebrew; see U. Weinreich 1971: 328 and Estraikh 1996: 88 for Yiddish). Moreover, this use of the *qaṭal* became a standard feature of Israeli Hebrew (see e.g. Glinert 1989: 125; Coffin and Bolozky 2005: 40; Boneh 2013).

### 8.1.2.5 Past Habitual

In addition to its use in past progressive contexts, the *qaṭal* frequently serves to denote past habitual actions. In such cases it is often accompanied by temporal adverbs like *דימת* ‘always’ and *םוילכב* ‘every day’. The following examples illustrate this usage:

– ‘And so they always called him by the name Alter’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 42)
– ‘And at kiddush and havdalah he always came into the house’ (Ehrmann 1903: 19b)
– ‘And this is the wording that he would always say every day before sleep’ (Gemen 1914: 91)
– ‘The way of the Maggid of...’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 42)
blessed memory was that every day he prayed before the pulpit by himself’ (Greenwald 1899: 52b)

— וְנַשְׁחַתְּיוֹ הֶרְצִית לָלְכָּה בְּיוֹם הָחוֹרִית לְשָׁבָל אֲנִי בְּגִלְנָה בָּדְרֵם בַּכּוֹדָש הַלַּחֵם לְשָׁמַר. And when he had to go to at the winter days to immerse himself in the river, as was his way in holiness, his wife would go with him to guard him’ (Chikernik 1903a: 7–8)

— בַּכּל הַפְּעִם שָׁמִישׁ לְלוֹבִיל wines. ‘And every time that he travelled to Lublin, they would give him (lit: into his hand) notes of petition’ (M. Walden 1912: 123)

— בַּכּל הַאֲרוּרִיִּים הַרְוִילִים היה נָשָׁשׁ הָבוֹדֶר הַנָּשָׁשׁ שָׁמִישׁ שָׁמִישׁ כָל. ‘At all of the big fairs, he would travel [there] and rent a shop, and he would stand there for all the days of the fair’ (Rodkinsohn 1864a: 7)

As in the case of the past progressive qaṭal this usage is noteworthy in that it differs from both Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew, in which the qaṭal is used only to convey punctive past actions, with past habitual actions indicated by other means. However, in this respect as in that of the past progressive discussed above, the Hasidic Hebrew qaṭal corresponds to that of contemporaneous Maskilic Hebrew literature as well as to the aspect-neutral past tense of the authors’ Yiddish vernacular. Furthermore, this usage became standard in Israeli Hebrew, in which the qaṭal is regularly employed in past habitual contexts (Glinert 1989: 126; Boneh 2013).

8.1.2.6 Present States

Although in general the qaṭal does not appear in present tense contexts in Hasidic Hebrew, there is one frequent exception whereby the qal root ידוע ‘know’ is employed in the qaṭal conjugation with present meaning. This convention is illustrated below:

— יָפוּר אֲלֵי עַתָּה יְדֻעַתְּ יְבַר שְׁלָלָם הָוָה בְּשָׁמְשׁוֹן אֵית בַּאֲרִים. ‘And he said to him, “Now I know that your Rebbe is in the heavens, and I am on the earth”’ (Bromberg 1899: 30)

— וְאַפְרֵי הָשִׂירְרָה לְמַשָּׁמְשׁוֹן הָדוּרָה מִי הָוָה הָּרָע. ‘Then the Ruzhiner Rebbe said to his attendant, “Do you know who this minister is?”’ (Zak 1912: 15)

— עַתָּה יְדֻעַתְּ יְבַר אֲלָקָס בִּישְׁרָאֵל. ‘Now I know that there is a God in Israel’ (Rodkinsohn 1864a: 12)

— יָהָדְתְּ אֵית דָּעִים אָאוּרִי. ‘You know me’ (Bodek? 1866: 23a)

— שָׁלָלָה הָדוּרָה אֵית מְסֻנָּדִיל. ‘They asked, “Do you know Mendl?”’ (Michelsohn 1910c: 70)

— הָנָּה יְדֻעַתְּ יְבַר אֵית הָלוֹשׁ אָאוּר. ‘I know that you are a weak man’ (Seuss 1890: 5)
And the Baʾal Shem Tov answered, “I know, my son, I know”’ (Chikernik 1903b: 10)
‘I know that you are a righteous man’ (A. Walden 1860?: 14b)

Although this phenomenon is typically restricted to the root ידעי ‘know’, it is rarely attested with the root אהבת ‘love’, e.g.:

And when his heart was merry with wine, he said to his companion, “Do you love me or not?” And he answered him, “I love you very much”’ (Moses Leib of Sasov 1903: 21a)

The Hasidic Hebrew use of the stative qal qaṭal to convey present conditions directly mirrors that of its biblical predecessor (see Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 364–373). This Hasidic and biblical usage can be contrasted with Rabbinic Hebrew, in which the qoṭel is typically employed in similar cases (Pérez Fernández 1999: 133). However, the Hasidic Hebrew convention is smaller in scope than that of Biblical Hebrew, as the former is almost completely restricted to the root ידעי ‘know’ while the latter extends to a range of stative roots. This may constitute a case in which the Hasidic Hebrew authors (perhaps subconsciously) partially adopted a characteristically biblical construction (but failed to replicate it in full) in order to give their writing a feeling of historical authenticity by grounding it within the linguistic tradition of biblical historical narrative.¹ This phenomenon of harnessing typically biblical features for stylistic effect is evident in various other aspects of the tales’ grammar; see e.g. 8.2.1.4 and 8.3.3.1 for a fuller discussion of the issue in relation to 3fp yiqtol forms and wayyiqtol sequences respectively.

8.2 Yiqtol

8.2.1 Morphology
8.2.1.1 Paragogic

Occasionally yiqtol forms appear in the tales with a paragogic נ suffix. In many cases the Hasidic Hebrew form has a precise biblical parallel by which the authors were most likely inspired. This is illustrated in the examples below,

¹ I am very grateful to Ada Rapoport-Albert for initially proposing this motivation.
each of which is based on an identical biblical form. These forms are not frequently attested in the Hebrew Bible (e.g. נוּבֲאָשִׁי is found only in Ruth 2:9), but they all appear in well-studied parts of the corpus (i.e. the Pentateuch, Psalms, Ruth) that would have been familiar to the authors. Moreover, the familiarity of these forms was probably reinforced by the citation of the verses in question in Rabbinic, Medieval, and Early Modern Hebrew writings.

– יָמְהַהַרְבֶּהוֹתָשְּׁלָשׁוּ: ‘And they will multiply my wounds and blows’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 28); cf. אִפּוֹטָנוֹפָצִיוּרֵהוֹתָשְּׁלָשׁוּ: ‘Were I to count them, they would outnumber [grains of] sand’ (Psalms 139:18)
– כִּלָּהּ: ‘But they all draw from the well of their Torah’ (Bodek 1865c: 1); cf. יָנָהַהַרְבֶּהוֹתָשְּׁלָשׁוּ: ‘And you shall drink from [the water] that the lads draw’ (Ruth 2:9)
– יָאִיתָהָשָׁלָשׁוּ: ‘and the deed that they would do according to the holy way’ (Heilmann 1902: 24); cf. יָאתָהָשָׁלָשׁוּ: ‘and the deed[s] that they must do’ (Exod. 18:20)

In other cases, the Hasidic Hebrew forms lack biblical precedent but appear in medieval and early modern writings. For example, each yiqṭol shown below appears in identical form in Moses Alshich's biblical commentary. This is in keeping with the widespread tendency of the Hasidic Hebrew authors discussed elsewhere in this volume to avail themselves of structures and phrases appearing in Hebrew texts from the medieval and early modern periods, with Alshich’s commentary a particularly common source.

– יָאִיתָהָשָׁלָשׁוּ: ‘as many, and indeed fine (lit: complete), ones will testify and say’ (Kaidaner 1875: 30a)
– יָאִיתָהָשָׁלָשׁוּ: ‘And from then on he agreed with his opinion that they should always write [their sermons down]’ (Ehrmann 1903: 17a)
– יָאִיתָהָשָׁלָשׁוּ: ‘to understand what they were hinting to him’ (Bodek 1865a: 50)

However, other Hasidic Hebrew paragogic forms lack attestation in either the Hebrew Bible or post-biblical literature. The verb נוּטָשָׁלָשׁוּ ‘you are sending’ below constitutes such a case. The only precedent for this form in earlier Jewish sources appears to be five appearances in Targum Onqelos. Since the Hasidic Hebrew authors are likely to have regularly studied and therefore been intimately familiar with Targum Onqelos, it is possible that their use of the form נוּטָשָׁלָשׁוּ was inspired by its appearance in this text, despite the fact that the latter is in Aramaic. This phenomenon is part of a broader, though sporadic, tendency
on the part of the authors to incorporate certain Aramaic elements into their Hebrew writing (see 16.2 for details).

– ‘Do you not know to whom you are sending me’
  (Rodkinsohn 1865: 28)

Rarely, a *yiqṭol* with paragogic 1 seems to lack precedent altogether in earlier sources, suggesting that on these instances it was used productively by the Hasidic Hebrew authors. Such a case is illustrated below. This phenomenon is not common and therefore cannot be said to constitute an integral feature of Hasidic Hebrew grammar, but it nevertheless demonstrates that the authors were capable of adapting this variant independently rather than simply incorporating well-known biblical and rabbinic forms into their compositions.

– ‘And from the heavens they will aid him’
  (Bodek 1865a: 49)

8.2.1.2 Shortened (Jussive) Forms

On very rare occasions in the tales a second or third person *hifil yiqṭol* with clearly indicative or modal force appears in shortened form, identical to a jussive, as in the following examples:

– ‘So that you should come and tell me the reason for the matter’
  (Rodkinsohn 1865: 59)

– ‘Maybe he will agree to give me a cake with the coffee’
  (Michelsohn 1910c: 6)

– ‘And the non-Jew asked him to add more for him’
  (M. Walden 1914: 52)

This use of shortened forms in indicative contexts is noteworthy both because it stands in striking contrast to the almost complete avoidance in Hasidic Hebrew of the jussive in third person command settings (see 8.7.3) and because its historical origins are uncertain. While there is some biblical precedent for shortened *yiqṭol* forms in indicative contexts, particularly in poetic and late texts (Qimron 1986–1987; 148, 158), it is doubtful whether this rather marginal phenomenon had any direct bearing on the (likewise marginal) Hasidic Hebrew usage. Similarly, shortened forms are found in the language of Palestinian *piyyutim* (Rand 2006: 140–141); however, the degree to which the tale authors would have been influenced by such forms is again uncertain.
Rather, the development is perhaps more likely to have been synchronic: the authors may have employed these forms based on analogy with the hifil wayyiqtol, which is frequently shortened in Hasidic Hebrew (see 8.3.1.1.2). This is particularly likely in cases wherein the shortened form is prefixed by the conjunction waw, which could easily have been confused with the waw-consecutive. The first example above constitutes such a case. Alternatively, it is possible that the authors did not make a clear distinction between shortened and unshortened forms and used them interchangeably in these cases, as they seem to have done in the case of the wayyiqtol (see 8.3.1.1). This trend may be linked to the identical phenomenon which is more commonly found in Maskilic Hebrew (see Kahn 2009: 18–20), and as such constitutes one of many features of a more widespread Eastern European form of Hebrew. However, only a few such forms are attested in the tales, and as such the practice is better regarded as an occasional aberration rather than an entrenched feature of Hasidic Hebrew grammar.

8.2.1.3 2/3mp with holem

The standard form of the 2mp and 3mp yiqtol in Hasidic Hebrew, as in other forms of the language, contains a shewa in the second syllable. However, occasionally a Hasidic Hebrew 2mp or 3mp yiqtol is found with a holem (represented by ) in this position instead of the expected shewa. Such forms are not particularly commonly attested, but are distributed throughout the tale corpus.

Some of these forms have precise counterparts in the Hebrew Bible or rabbinic literature, and as such it is likely that the Hasidic Hebrew authors selected them on occasion because they were familiar with them from their appearance in these earlier texts. For example, the form in following example was selected because the whole clause is an adaptation of Genesis 8:22, which contains an identical yiqtol with holem.

Other forms seem to derive from rabbinic or medieval literature; for example, the following extract contains a form with a precise counterpart in Moses Alshich’s commentary on 1 Samuel 16.

– כל על השגריר ר. יושי פַּעַמְּי מְרִית refer to Rebbe Zusha did so many times [...]—cold and heat shall not cease—until the rabbi from Ostroh felt it’ (Ehrmann 1903: 15a); cf. רָעִיע מְקָשָא; וּתְבוֹשַׁיאֹלְלוַיַ֖לָוםוֹ הַֽיָּקָֽוֹמ הָוָֽיֵּרֹחָצִיַ֧קֹ֣ו ‘Seed and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, day and night, shall not cease’ (Gen. 8:22)

Other forms seem to derive from rabbinic or medieval literature; for example, the following extract contains a form with a precise counterpart in Moses Alshich’s commentary on 1 Samuel 16.

– כל על השגריר ר. יושי פַּעַמְּי מְרִית refer to ‘everything that they might want’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 28)
However, other Hasidic Hebrew forms seem to be completely without precedent in earlier forms of Hebrew, including not only Biblical or Rabbinic but also medieval varieties of the language. The following example constitutes such a case. These unprecedented forms comprise part of a trend visible throughout the tales whereby the authors employed biblical and rabbinic morphological features productively, rather than limiting themselves to forms actually attested in the canonical literature.

And you will bury me' (Rodkinsohn 1864a: 40)

Moreover, the syntactic use of the Hasidic Hebrew form only partially resembles that of Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew. In Biblical Hebrew *yiqṭol* with *ḥolem* is restricted to pausal positions, i.e. marked by a disjunctive accent at the end of a clause or verse (König 1881–1897, 1:161; Lambert 1946: 280; Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 125); similarly, in Rabbinic Hebrew, such forms are almost always found in pausal positions (Segal 1927: 71–72; Haneman 1980: 41; Bar-Asher 1990: 69; Sharvit 2004: 54). By contrast, in Hasidic Hebrew they may appear in any syntactic position. Thus, while they are sometimes found at the end of a clause or sentence, as in the first example below, they often appear within a syntactic unit, as in the remaining examples. This discrepancy suggests that the Hasidic Hebrew authors were familiar with the long form and incorporated it into their writing without necessarily taking into account all of the syntactic properties of the biblical and rabbinic forms. In this respect the Hasidic Hebrew use corresponds to that of contemporaneous Maskilic Hebrew, in which 3mp *yiqṭol* with *ḥolem* is likewise employed in both the middle and end of clauses and sentences (see Kahn 2009: 22–24).

‘And the officer appointed guards next to them so that they wouldn’t escape’ (Kaidaner 1875: 16b)

‘Certainly the non-Jews will steal some of the wine’ (Bodek? 1866: 24b)

‘lest they steal him’ (Sofer 1904: 6)

‘so that people wouldn’t think they had hidden it there’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 28)

8.2.1.4 3fp Form
Verbs associated with feminine plural subjects in the Hasidic Hebrew tales almost invariably appear in the 3fp form. This phenomenon applies equally to logically and grammatically feminine subjects, as in the following examples:
This practice clearly follows the model of Biblical Hebrew, in which the feminine plural *yiqṭol* forms are typically used in conjunction with feminine plural subjects, in contrast to Rabbinic Hebrew, in which the feminine plural *yiqṭol* forms have with few exceptions been replaced by their masculine equivalents (see Schwarzwald 1981: 15; Pérez Fernández 1999: 106).

The Hasidic Hebrew authors’ relatively consistent use of the 3fp form is striking and possibly surprising: given that references to plural female subjects are rare in the tales and that the authors often employ a masculine singular verb or adjective in conjunction with a feminine singular subject (see 8.13.2), one might expect them to use the extremely common 3mp instead of the 3fp on the relatively few occasions warranting this form. As in the case of the stative *qal* with present meaning discussed in 8.1.2.6, it is possible that the Hasidic Hebrew authors selected this form precisely because it had strong biblical associations for them: when composing historical narrative they are likely to have turned to the classic model of historical Hebrew narrative provided by the Hebrew Bible, and as such sometimes availed themselves of characteristically biblical features such as the 3fp *yiqṭol* in order to lend a biblical, and thereby historical, feel to their writing. The same tendency can be seen in other aspects of Hasidic Hebrew grammar, for example the *wayyiqtol* (see 8.3.3.1). Conversely, or additionally, the 2/3fp *yiqṭol* is a prominent feature of Rashi’s biblical and Talmudic commentaries (Betzer 2001: 108), and it is likely that the presence of the form in these writings, with which the Hasidic Hebrew authors would have been familiar, reinforced their tendency to employ it.

Only on very rare occasions is the 3mp form employed in conjunction with a feminine plural subject, as below. In some of these cases, such as the first two examples below, it is possible that the plural suffix *םי*, which is regarded as masculine in Hasidic Hebrew even when the noun in question is feminine in the singular, may have triggered use of the masculine plural verb.
8.2.2 Uses

The *yiqtol* in Hasidic Hebrew functions primarily as a marker of future tense, non-past modalities, and volitional senses, but it is also sometimes used in past and present contexts. In this regard Hasidic Hebrew follows the biblical model to some extent, as the *yiqtol* can be used in all of these settings in that form of the language (Waltke and O'Connor 1990: 502–514; Joosten 2012: 266–287), in contrast to rabbinic-based forms of Hebrew, in which it is not used in past or present indicative contexts (Pérez Fernández 1999: 108; Geiger 2013c). However, the Hasidic Hebrew *yiqtol* differs from its biblical equivalent in that it is not used as frequently in past and present contexts; this is most likely rooted in influence from the post-biblical forms of the language. Indeed, the use of the *yiqtol* in past and present contexts at all may reflect another (conscious or subconscious) attempt on the part of the authors to link their writings linguistically to the revered historical narratives of the Hebrew Bible and thereby highlight their status as serious documents worthy of attention and study. In this respect Hasidic Hebrew resembles contemporaneous Maskilic Hebrew prose fiction, in which the *yiqtol* is found in past, present, future, modal, and volitional settings (see Kahn 2009: 104–154). Likewise, the motivation for this similarity may have the same ideological basis in both Hasidic and Maskilic Hebrew, as each set of authors had the biblical model in mind to some extent. However, the Maskilic Hebrew authors were explicit in their goal to follow biblical usage as closely as possible, while the Hasidic Hebrew authors had no such expressed aim. Moreover, the two forms of Hebrew differ in that the Hasidic Hebrew authors’ use of the *yiqtol* in past habitual contexts is much less frequent than that of their Maskilic counterparts.

8.2.2.1 Past

The *yiqtol* does not typically serve as a past tense marker in Hasidic Hebrew. However, very rarely it appears in past tense contexts, where it may indicate past habitual, preterite, or pluperfect actions, as below.
8.2.2.1.1 Past Habitual
On very rare occasions the Hasidic Hebrew *yiqtol* is found in a context indicating that it refers to an iterative past action. Such a case is shown below. It is possible that this infrequent phenomenon is based on the very common biblical use of the *yiqtol* as an iterative past marker (see Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 502–503), though the fact that the Hasidic Hebrew usage appears so rarely suggests that the biblical influence was marginal in this case.

– נֵן בֵּכֶל הַשָּׁבָת בֵּכֶל פַּעְמֵשׁ שֶׁאֵל יְהֹוָה לֶא רָבָּת מְזִמֶּרְךָ. יִתְבּוֹטַשׁ בֵּא דֵל פַּרְחַ יהו
  ‘And so it was for the whole Sabbath, and every time the Rebbe would ask him, “What does the LORD say?” And on Saturday night they came before the Rebbe’ (Bodek 1866: 56)

8.2.2.1.2 Preterite
There are only two clear instances in the tales in which the *yiqtol* serves to denote a preterite action, both in the writings of a single author (Bodek), as follows:

– כִּי עֵת בָּרוֹחַ הַבָּרוֹחַ גְּדוֹלָהּ גִּמֹלֻ לְמַחְוָא אַמּוֹת לַהַנֶּשׁ מַאֲכָלִים [... לִא אָמְרֵי הַלֵּידִים לֵאָבוּל
  ‘And when they came home, their mothers came to serve food [...] but the children did not want to eat’ (Bodek 1865c: 21)

– נִיטָלַשׁ (קִנָּา) גְּדוֹלָהּ גִּמֹלֻ לְמַחְוָא אַמּוֹת לַהַנֶּשׁ מַאֲכָלִים
  ‘And all of a sudden his ears heard the ringing of a bell (a sleigh) behind him’ (Bodek 1865b: 10)

This scarcity is in keeping with earlier forms of Hebrew, in which the *yiqtol* does not typically convey preterite actions. Nevertheless, there is historical precedent for this anomalous use: *yiqtol* with preterite value is occasionally attested in Biblical Hebrew (Joosten 2012: 287). Similarly, *yiqtol* sometimes has preterite value in nineteenth-century Maskilic Hebrew (Kahn 2009: 109–111). However, the marginal nature of this usage in all of these forms of Hebrew makes it difficult to make any definite associations between the Hasidic phenomenon and its biblical or Maskilic counterparts.

8.2.2.1.3 Pluperfect
Extremely rarely the *yiqtol* is attested in a seemingly pluperfect context, as below. This usage is hardly less marginal in earlier canonical forms of the language than it is in Hasidic Hebrew; as such, the few cases appearing in the tales are best regarded as anomalies.
‘Once he stayed in the holy community of Rashkov in the winter. And he had not blessed the [new] moon yet’ (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 1)

8.2.2.2 Present
8.2.2.2.1 General Present

The *yiqṭol* is most commonly employed in future, modal, and volitional contexts. However, very occasionally it appears in present settings. In such cases it most commonly denotes general present states, as in the following examples.

– הבהאיוהערתאשיאותושרדמיתבבותויסנכיתבבתודחאתebbוקיזחיומלוכ 'Everyone keeps united in the synagogues and study houses, and everyone loves his fellow' (Bodek 1865c: 13)
– ירחאבילםכלשברהחלשרשאםויהרוכזתה 'Do you remember the day on which your Rebbe sent Leib after me?' (Rodkinsohn 1864a: 12)
–ךריעבדמלמהתאריכתה 'Do you know the melamed in your town?' (Seuss 1890: 15)
–הזהשיאהמוצרתהמ 'What do you want from this man?' (M. Walden 1913, pt. 3: 5)

The use of the *yiqṭol* in general present contexts is occasionally attested with the stative root ידּ. ‘know’, as below. As discussed in 8.1.2.6, this root more commonly appears in the *qaṭal* with present meaning; aside from the difference in frequency the two conjugations are employed in free variation in such contexts. In this respect the Hasidic Hebrew authors follow biblical precedent, as this root is sometimes attested in the *yiqṭol* with present force in that form of the language (e.g. in 1 Kings 3:7).

– תאזעדתןינמותואהלאשו 'And she asked him, “How do you know this?”' (Michelsohn 1910a: 39)
–שדוקתבשןמזבורקשעדתאלהיבוהאולרמאו 'And he said to him, “My beloved, don’t you know that the holy Sabbath is approaching?”' (Zak 1912: 12)

Similarly, the root יכ. ‘be able’ is often used with present tense meaning. In this case, the tendency may be linked to the modal sense of the root, as the *yiqṭol* is commonly employed in modal contexts in Hasidic Hebrew (see 8.2.2.4).

– ?תותשלדחאשיאלכויהמכ ‘How much can one man drink?’ (Ehrmann 1905: 55a)
– ?ונמהעשתהוהנוכללהב ‘And from this story we can understand’ (1894: 19)
'I am old and weak; I can’t take part in quarrels any more’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 28)

8.2.2.2.2 Present Progressive

In addition, on rare occasions the *yiqṭol* is used to denote present progressive actions, as below. This usage has a parallel in Biblical Hebrew, in which it is equally marginal and is restricted primarily to questions (see Joosten 2012: 61–62, 278–280). In some of these cases the Hasidic Hebrew form is based directly on a biblical model; for example, the *yiqṭol* in the first example below derives from a very similar phrase in Genesis 37:15.

- ‘Another wretched man, a destitute and impoverished tailor, LORD have mercy, met him and asked him, “What are you looking for?”’ (Ehmann 1903: 2a); cf. מָצָא וְהוַֽעֲלֵיהֶם וּמָאָבָ֣ו וּמָאְלָּכֹ֔ן וְלָאָבָֽו יָהֲעֲרֶ֥שׁ לוֹזָאֵ֑ל יָאָלָכ֔וּ צִֽוָּה לָאָבָֽו מְיָדָּב֏וּקַשׁ ‘And the man asked him, “What are you looking for?”’ (Genesis 37:15)

8.2.2.2.3 Present Habitual

Likewise, the *yiqṭol* very rarely serves to convey present habitual actions, as in the following examples. This usage most likely stems from Biblical Hebrew, in which it is a regular feature (Joosten 2012: 276–277); however, in this case the frequency of the Hasidic Hebrew usage does not correspond to that of the biblical model, as the former is quite marginal while the latter is widespread.

- ‘What is this, that you always go after me’ (Gemen 1914: 54)
- ‘Why do you hit me more than the other boys’ (Sofer 1904: 22)
- ‘It is told in his name that once he came in Hungary to a butcher who did not know him’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 24)
8.2.2.3 Future

8.2.2.3.4 Absolute Future (Plans and Predictions)

The *yiqṭol* is commonly used to indicate various types of future actions. Thus, it frequently denotes future plans, as below:

- We shall tell of this below, please God’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 17)
- ‘And they said, “The Tzaddik of Apta is going to come here’” (Hirsch 1900: 41)
- ‘I will tell you a wonderful story’ (Rosenthal 1909: 17)
- ‘And the man said, “I will do so”’ (Seuss 1890: 5)
- ‘What use is it to me going to the Ba’al Shem Tov? I’ll rest here’ (A. Walden 1860?: 15a)
- ‘Another five hundred Russians will fall’ (Berger 1910b: 87)
- ‘On Wednesday night around midnight your husband will come to your house’ (Rodkinsohn 1864a: 30)
- ‘Maybe we will learn the way of the LORD from him’ (Michelsohn 1905: 85)
- ‘Maybe he will heal our son’ (Chikernik 1902: 12)
- ‘After all, in two months you will be able to collect around thirty roubles’ (A. Walden 1860?: 32b)

Similarly, it is used to convey predictions, e.g.:

- ‘We shall tell of this below, please God’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 17)
- ‘And they said, “The Tzaddik of Apta is going to come here”’ (Hirsch 1900: 41)
- ‘I will tell you a wonderful story’ (Rosenthal 1909: 17)
- ‘And the man said, “I will do so”’ (Seuss 1890: 5)
- ‘What use is it to me going to the Ba’al Shem Tov? I’ll rest here’ (A. Walden 1860?: 15a)
- ‘Another five hundred Russians will fall’ (Berger 1910b: 87)
- ‘On Wednesday night around midnight your husband will come to your house’ (Rodkinsohn 1864a: 30)
- ‘Maybe we will learn the way of the LORD from him’ (Michelsohn 1905: 85)
- ‘Maybe he will heal our son’ (Chikernik 1902: 12)
- ‘After all, in two months you will be able to collect around thirty roubles’ (A. Walden 1860?: 32b)

These uses of the *yiqṭol* in the Hasidic Hebrew tales are unremarkable given that they are found in the Hebrew Bible (see e.g. Gibson 1994: 76–78; Joosten 2012: 266–268) as well as in Rabbinic Hebrew (though mostly in subordinate clauses; see Pérez Fernández 1999: 108, 124) and later literature (see e.g. Rand 2006: 335–336; Gryczan 2013).

8.2.2.3.5 Relative Future

Sometimes the *yiqṭol* is used to denote the relative future in past contexts, as below. Such *yiqṭol* forms usually appear in subordinate clauses introduced by subordinators such as התחלה ב thanhala ‘that’ or谶ה ‘when’, as in all except the last example. However, they are occasionally found in independent clauses, as in the last example. This usage has clear precedent in Biblical Hebrew (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 513; Williams 2007: 70), which may have influenced the
Hasidic Hebrew authors to some degree. Any such influence may have been compounded by the fact that the future tense is used in relative settings in Yiddish (Schaechter 2003: 56). The possibility of Yiddish influence may be supported by the fact that an identical use is found in nineteenth-century Maskilic Hebrew (Kahn 2009: 121–122), which was composed by native Yiddish speakers, and subsequently became a standard feature of Israeli Hebrew (Tzivoni 1991: 84; Boneh 2013).

– ‘And they sat the whole night, and the man described in detail to him his whole journey, through which towns he would have to travel’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 15)
– ‘And he said to them that afterwards he would enquire about that wagon, and force them to return the money to him’ (Bromberg 1899: 24)
– ‘And the intention was that in the drunkenness they would rise up over him to strike him a fatal blow’ (J. Duner 1899: 96)
– ‘And the youth determined that early in the morning when they unlocked his room he would escape from there’ (Berger 1907: 25)
– ‘And that night, before the Maggid lay down on his bed he said, “Master of the Universe”’ (Hirsch 1900: 65)
– ‘And he put on gloves because he knew that the doctor was going to come, and he didn’t want to touch him with his holy hands’ (Gemen 1914: 91)
– ‘And he promised her that he himself would come after his death’ (Brandwein 1912: 2)
– ‘And they watched after him in order to know the place where he was going to lodge’ (N. Duner 1912: 19)
– ‘And he said to them that they would dine at the Ba’al Shem Tov’s house on the holy Sabbath day’ (Munk 1898: 72)
– ‘The hours passed and went by, and soon another would arrive in his place’ (Bodek 1865c: 14)

8.2.2.4 Modal

The *yiqtol* can be used to convey a range of deontic and epistemic modalities, most typically capability, obligation, desirability, and possibility, as in the examples below respectively. In this regard Hasidic Hebrew resembles both its
biblical and rabbinic antecedents, as the *yiqṭol* can be used in similar modal contexts in both of these strata of the language (see Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 506–509 for Biblical Hebrew; see Mishor 2013 for Rabbinic Hebrew). However, Hasidic Hebrew is more closely aligned with post-biblical conventions in that it uses the *yiqṭol* only in non-past modal contexts, in contrast to Biblical Hebrew, in which it may be used with reference to past modalities as well.

**Capability**

- ‘וְשָׁמָּם רָאִים נָרָאָהוּ נְפְלָאָהוּ יְשָׁרֵל לַא יִשְׁעֵר בְּמוֹמָה נְשָׁמָה’ ‘And there they saw from him marvels and wonders that cannot be comprehended by the physical brain’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 38)
- ‘וַהֲיוֹתָה יְפְרָה לְבָבוּ יָאָמָר אָיֵיס תַּעֲבֹר אֶת מָה אֶתְשַׁע’ ‘And they all started to cry, and they said, “How can you leave us?” And he said, “What can I do”’ (Bromberg 1899: 25)
- ‘וּנְתַּא בִּזְעָת קָאָו אֵוָר מַה כַּגִּבְלוּ לְדַעְלָה נְפִּלָאָהוּ אָמָּה כִּי יַאֲל’ ‘I know that there are tzaddikim in Poland who can work wonders and miracles, but how can I go?’ (Singer 1900b: 2)

**Obligation**

- ‘וְלַבּעֵל לָא חָנִי דָר’ ‘And you must not tell your husband anything’ (Sofer 1904: 16)
- ‘וּהֵוְא נִינָא לָל אַט אָשָר תַּעֲשֶׂה’ ‘And he will tell you what you must do’ (Rodkinsohn 1864a: 19)
- ‘וְנִוְּדֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ יִוָא שֵׁאָל מִשָּׁו מֵהַסְדִּיו הַחֵרְבִּים עַלְּוֹי נָוְּאָרִים’ ‘The edict of the king was that the Hasidim must not travel to the Rebbes for the Days of Awe’ (Seuss 1890: 10)

**Desirability**

- ‘וְלַיְבָבּ בֵּבַּע שֵׁשֶׁת בָּרְדָק’ ‘It is better that you should sit in your house’ (Zak 1912: 29)
- ‘וְשָׁמָּא אֵשָּׁי בֶּלַעַד שֵׁשְּׁלָהוּ וְלִבָּא וֹאָמָא’ ‘What should I do with the child with whom I study?’ (Landau 1892: 29)
- ‘וּהֲשָׁב רַבִּין מַיְשָׁרִי אֶל הַבְּלָעַד שְּלָהוּ אֶל מִכְהָרִים יִנְּשָׁמ אָלִים חָדִים’ ‘And our Rebbe replied that they should break all of their dishes or sell them to non-Jews, and buy new dishes’ (Michelsohn 1912: 106)
- ‘וְלִמָּה יַשָּׁמֵא אֵוָא קִנֹּא עַי’ ‘So why should I hate him for that?’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 5)
Possibility

- ‘And he wanted to give him anything that he might request’ (Ehrmann 1903: 1b)
- ‘Give me advice [about] what to do [...] how may I also merit [it]?’ (Zak 1912: 12)

8.2.2.5 Volitional

8.2.2.5.1 1cp Mutual Encouragement

1cp yiqṭol is occasionally used to convey mutual encouragement, equivalent to English ‘let’s’, as in the following examples:

- ‘Now let’s leave off telling the story of the man in Vilna’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 7)
- ‘Now let’s stay here a few weeks’ (N. Duner 1912: 10)
- ‘Come with me and let’s go together’ (M. Walden 1914: 124)
- ‘And they said to each other, “Come what may, let’s stop here”’ (Laufbahn 1914: 49)

In this type of setting the yiqṭol may be used interchangeably with the cohortative (see 8.7.1). This use of the yiqṭol has precedent in biblical and post-biblical forms of Hebrew. In Biblical Hebrew the yiqṭol can serve to convey mutual encouragement alongside the cohortative, though each form is employed in slightly different circumstances, with the cohortative thought to be used in more urgent and personal contexts than the yiqṭol (see Shulman 1996: 196–197). In Rabbinic Hebrew, by contrast, the yiqṭol is the only form used in such settings as the cohortative is not a productive feature (Bar-Asher 1999: 9; Pérez Fernández 1999: 105; Fassberg 2013). The Hasidic Hebrew authors follow biblical precedent in that they employ both the yiqṭol and the cohortative to denote mutual encouragement (and indeed exhibit something of a preference for the markedly biblical cohortative over the yiqṭol); however, unlike their biblical model they do not seem to use the two forms in distinct semantic settings.

8.2.2.5.2 Second Person Commands

The yiqṭol often serves to convey positive second person commands, as below. In such contexts the yiqṭol is used interchangeably with the imperative (see 8.7.2.2). This phenomenon has precedent in both Biblical and post-Biblical Hebrew. In Biblical Hebrew the yiqṭol and imperative are both employed in similar though not identical contexts; the yiqṭol is used in less personal and
urgent circumstances than the imperative (Shulman 2001). Similarly, in Rabbinic Hebrew the *yiqtol* is very frequently used with second person command reference, in contrast to the imperative, which is relatively rare (Pérez Fernández 1999: 124).

- האמת ולכ יאני ראה כל הנשים believe him that I don’t see anything except the Godly power’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 39)
- *yiqtol* ‘Take this coin and buy a citron’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 25)
- ‘Know that this is not the holy spirit’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 2: 19)
- You learn with him as well some time’ (Berger 1910c: 54)
- ‘Eat and drink a lot so that you will be healthy’ (Chikernik 1903b: 20)

The *yiqtol* can also be employed in conjunction with the negator לא with all stems and root types to denote negative second person commands, as in the first example below, or alternatively with the negator אל in otherwise identical settings, as in the second. The Hasidic Hebrew convention of using the *yiqtol* following לא to convey negative commands differs from Biblical Hebrew in that it extends to stems and root types such as the *hifil* and hollow roots (as in the last example) which in Biblical Hebrew have a distinct shortened jussive form that would be used in such contexts. Conversely, the Hasidic usage mirrors Rabbinic Hebrew, in which negative commands are routinely conveyed by לא followed by the *yiqtol* (Pérez Fernández 1999: 124).

- אמרلبתה [...] ‘He said to his daughter, “[...] Don’t stand still”’ (Bodek? 1866: 14a)
- אמר ולברך קדושה מעלה התשובה הרשע לא תדאו כלל אועשל ויהי אלהים במעד ‘And His Holy Honour said to him regarding the matter of getting the permit, “Don’t worry at all; I will advise you, and God will assist you”’ (Kaidaner 1875: 41a)
- אשאל מעלהמה לא תאטעמי ‘I will ask your honour one small question; please do not deny me’ (Rodkinsohn 1864a: 5)
- לא תשוב ליבך ‘Don’t return to your house’ (Bodek 1865b: 1)

Occasionally a 3ms *yiqtol* is used as an oblique way of issuing a polite request or suggestion to an interlocutor. The practice, illustrated below, serves as a way of conveying deference towards the interlocutor, who is invariably a Rebbe or
other highly esteemed figure. The verbs in question always have third person command force and are usually followed by the politeness marker אָנָּ. This usage most likely stems from Biblical Hebrew, in which third person singular יִקְרָא and jussive forms followed by אָנָּ may be used with polite second person reference (Shulman 1999: 61–62).

–  ‚And one man said to him, “Let his Honour say to him that he should eat something (lit: take something into his mouth)”’ (Bromberg 1899: 32)
–  ‚And the man said to him, “Let our Rebbe please tell us what you see”’ (Singer 1900b: 4)

8.2.2.5.3 Third Person Commands

The יִקְרָא is the only form used in Hasidic Hebrew to convey third person commands, as shown below.

–  ‘Let he who has immersed in the ritual bath enter’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 38)
–  ‘And the Ba’al Shem Tov answered, saying, “Let him eat with me”’ (Sofer 1904: 9)
–  ‘Let him come here’ (Laufbahn 1914: 49)
–  ‘Let him not lay blame on us’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 40); cf.  ‘Let not the king lay any [blame] on his servant’ (1 Sam. 22:15)

In this respect Hasidic Hebrew differs from its biblical antecedent in that it never employs the jussive form to convey third person commands, even in the case of III-ה, hollow, and היפיל roots from which a jussive could be formed on the basis of those attested in Biblical Hebrew. For example, in the final example above the יִקְרָא is used to convey a negative third person command even though there is a shortened jussive form attested for the root in question in the Hebrew Bible. Instead, the language of the tales resembles Rabbinic Hebrew, in which the jussive is not a productive feature (Segal 1927: 72; Pérez Fernández 1999: 105). In this respect it also overlaps with nineteenth-century Maskilic Hebrew, in which the jussive is likewise unproductive (see Kahn 2009: 150–152).
8.3  *Wayyiqṭol*

The *wayyiqṭol* is a common feature of Hasidic Hebrew narrative. The centrality of this form to the verbal system exhibited in the tales is striking considering that the *wayyiqṭol* is a prominent characteristic of Biblical Hebrew as opposed to rabbinic or rabbinic-based varieties of the language. While the Hasidic Hebrew *wayyiqṭol* generally resembles its biblical predecessor, it has some idiosyncrasies of morphology and usage which will be discussed below.

8.3.1  *Morphology*

8.3.1.1  Shortening

Although the Hasidic Hebrew *wayyiqṭol* is modelled on that of its biblical antecedent, the authors’ treatment of *wayyiqṭol* forms of *qal* iii-ו, *qal* hollow, and *hifil* roots differs to a certain degree from their biblical counterparts in that the biblical *wayyiqṭol* forms typically undergo vowel shortening while in Hasidic Hebrew this convention is followed only sporadically.

8.3.1.1.1  Unshortened *wayyiqṭol*

In the Hasidic tales the *wayyiqṭol* forms of all root types in the *hifil*, of iii-ו verbs of all stems, and of hollow roots in the *qal* most commonly appear in unshortened form. This contrasts with Biblical Hebrew, in which these types of *wayyiqṭol* are usually shortened (Gesenius-Kautzsch 1910: 147; Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 128, 191, 196).

The following are some of the unshortened *qal* forms appearing in the tales:

- יביהו ‘and he built’ (Rodkinsohn 1864a: 33)
- יועדו ‘and he answered’ (Breitstein 1914: 18)
- יעשה ‘and he did’ (Singer 1900b: 19)
- יוסרו ‘and he turned aside’ (Bodek 1865c: 3)

Unshortened *hifil* *wayyiqṭol* forms are particularly numerous in Hasidic Hebrew, e.g.:

- ישבר ‘and he passed’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 28)
- ישב ‘and he showed’ (Berger 1907: 115)
- ישב ‘and he struck’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 75)
- יסרו ‘and he continued’ (Bodek 1865c: 3)
- יושי ‘and he testified’ (Sofer 1904: 32)
- יהב ‘and he brought’ (Laufbahn 1914: 48)
- יהשת ‘and she stretched out’ (Michelsohn 1912: 21)
- יבשו ‘and he promised’ (Chikernik 1903b: 7)
Unapocopated יי piel is less common but is also occasionally attested, e.g.:

- והכסה ‘and he covered’ (Zak 1912: 32)
- והנסיכו ‘and he tried’ (Bodek 1865a: 20)
- והgetResource(‘and he commanded’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 16)

Most of these unshortened wayyiqtol forms are 3ms, but occasionally a 3fs form is attested, e.g.:

- והיהתיו ‘and there was’ (Kaidaner 1875: 47a)
- והממתה ‘and she waited’ (A. Walden 1860?: 48a)
- וה DataGridView(‘and she told’ (Laufbahn 1914: 46)

Some of these unshortened Hasidic Hebrew wayyiqtol forms lack biblical parallels. A striking example is the form shown below:

- והתחתיו ‘and he started’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 33)

This is a wayyiqtol from a post-biblical root ה.ח.ט (a secondary root derived from ה.ל.ח), and thus completely unattested in the Hebrew Bible. In this case the lack of shortening is attributable to the absence of a model in the Hebrew Bible: as the Hasidic Hebrew authors had no shortened biblical wayyiqtol from this root in mind, when composing their form their most immediately familiar model would have been the frequently attested post-biblical yiqtol ליחתי, and it is easy to see how when adapting this form into a wayyiqtol they left it unshortened. This phenomenon of taking a post-biblical root and using it to form a characteristically biblical wayyiqtol, with a resulting divergence from the biblical tendency towards shortening, is an example of the widespread Hasidic Hebrew tendency to create original forms representing a fusion of biblical and post-biblical convention.

Similarly, in other cases the Hasidic Hebrew authors employ a wayyiqtol based on a root that is attested in Biblical Hebrew, but does not appear as a wayyiqtol in that form of the language. In such cases, as in those discussed above, the Hasidic Hebrew authors would have had no clear biblical model on which to base their wayyiqtol, which may explain the forms’ lack of shortening. The following two examples illustrate such wayyiqtol forms: the first is attested in the Hebrew Bible as a qatal and infinitive construct but not as a wayyiqtol, and the second appears as a yiqtol but not as a wayyiqtol.
However, in many other cases Hasidic Hebrew unshortened wayyiqṭol forms do have shortened biblical equivalents. For example, each wayyiqṭol shown below appears relatively frequently in the Hebrew Bible in shortened form. In these cases the reason for the lack of shortening is less clear than in those lacking biblical precedent. It is noteworthy that the Hasidic Hebrew use of unshortened wayyiqṭol is closely mirrored in contemporaneous Maskilic Hebrew narrative literature (see Kahn 2009: 38–41). This similarity is one element of a much more large-scale correspondence between nineteenth-century Hasidic and Maskilic Hebrew reflected in morphological and syntactic issues discussed throughout this volume.

– ‘and he answered’ (Landau 1892: 101); cf. נַעַ֥יַּו (Gen. 18:27)
– ‘and he did’ (Singer 1900b: 19); cf. יַעַ֥יַּו (Exod. 9:6)
– ‘and he commanded’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 16); cf. יַעַ֥יַּו (Num. 32:28)
– ‘and he showed’ (Breitstein 1914: 25); cf. יַעַ֥יַּו (2 Kings 11:4)
– ‘and he wept’ (Rosenthal 1909: 8); cf. יַעַ֥יַּו (Gen. 27:38)
– ‘and he turned aside’ (Bodek 1865c: 3); cf. יַעַ֥יַּו (Judges 14:8)

8.3.1.1.2 Shortened wayyiqṭol

Although unshortened wayyiqṭol is extremely common in Hasidic Hebrew, some shortened forms are attested. Qal III-ו/י roots sometimes appear in apocopated form, usually in the 3ms, as below. In most cases the apocopated and unapocopated variants are used in free variation; it is possible that the authors regarded them as interchangeable variants like, for example, the 3cp pronouns הָה, הָנָה, and הָי discussed in 6.1.1.8.

– ‘and he cried’ (Michelsohn 1912: 50)
– ‘and he answered’ (? 1894: 15)
– ‘and he did’ (Bromberg 1899: 26)
– ‘and he drank’ (Hirsch 1900: 48)

Interestingly, qal hollow wayyiqṭol is more frequently shortened than not, as in the following examples. This may be due to the fact that the authors would have pronounced the final syllable of such forms as [ə] whether they were shortened or not (in accordance with the typical pronunciation of unstressed final syllables in Ashkenazi Hebrew as [ə]; see U. Weinreich 1965: 43), which corresponds to the spelling of the shortened biblical form rather than to the unshortened version.
verbs

– רשם ‘and he placed’ (Bodek 1865a: 39)
– ייפס ‘and it sank/faded’ (Kaidaner 1875: 9b)
– יירר ‘and he ran’ (Chikernik 1903b: 10)
– ייפר ‘and he turned aside’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 33)
– ייפס ‘and he fled’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 4)
– ייר ‘and he arose’ (Bodek 1865a: 36)
– יימת ‘and he died’ (A. Walden 1860?: 2a)

Apocopated piel 3mp forms are only rarely attested, e.g.:

– ויש ‘and he commanded’ (J. Duner 1899: 19)

However, shortened hifil appears more frequently, e.g.:

– וחלוש אתה ‘and he put [it] on her’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 42)
– וישכם ‘and he rose early’ (Kaidaner 1875: 19b)
– יידר ‘and he told’ (Chikernik 1903b: 10)
– יבש ‘and he looked’ (Laufbahn 1914: 48)

Although most shortened wayyiqtol forms are 3ms, some 3fs forms are attested, e.g.:

– וחוס ‘and she continued’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 38)
– וחובר ‘and she wept’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 4)
– חות ‘and she turned’ (Kamelhar 1909: 26)

Apocopated 1cs wayyiqtol is attested only very rarely, e.g.:

– אני ‘and I answered’ (Kaidaner 1875: 25b)

8.3.1.2 3mp with holem

The 3mp wayyiqtol of qal roots is occasionally attested with holem (represented by ו instead of the expected shewa. This phenomenon is identical to that of qal 2mp and 3mp yiqtol with holem discussed in 8.2.1.3, though it is much less frequent. Some of these forms are most likely based on identical biblical models, as in the following example:

– וחוס ‘And they stood there’ (Seuss 1890: 28); cf. יותך ‘And they stood still’ (2 Sam. 2:23)
By contrast, some of these forms appear to constitute original Hasidic Hebrew creations lacking precise biblical or post-biblical counterparts but drawing on and fusing elements of earlier strata of the language. For example, the construction ייחשו shown in the example below is not attested in the Hebrew Bible; however, the corresponding yiqṭol form ייחשו with ḥolem in the second syllable is attested once, in Psalms 107:30, and this yiqṭol is repeated several times in texts by medieval and early modern writers including Ibn Ezra and Alshich. It is possible that the existence of this particular yiqṭol form in these texts, all of which would have been extremely familiar to Rodkinsohn, subconsciously prompted him to use this variant rather than its equivalent with shewa when creating his new wayyiqṭol.

– 'And afterwards the living and the dead argued further and fell silent' (Rodkinsohn 1865: 35)

8.3.1.3 3fp Forms
As discussed above, feminine plural subjects are relatively uncommon in the Hasidic Hebrew tales. However, when such subjects are attested, any associated wayyiqṭol typically appears in the 3fp form, as below (like their yiqṭol counterparts; see 8.2.1.4).

– 'And two women remained' (Sofer 1904: 3)

8.3.1.4 Wayyiqṭol with ה Suffix
The wayyiqṭol with suffixed ה, which is sometimes found in Biblical Hebrew (Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 129–130), is almost unattested in the Hasidic Hebrew tales. The only clear example is shown below. Interestingly, this form does not have a biblical counterpart, but because the phenomenon is so marginal it cannot be considered a productive feature of Hasidic Hebrew.

– 'And the woman told the story' (Seuss 1890: 32)

8.3.2 Uses
The Hasidic Hebrew wayyiqṭol functions exclusively as a past tense marker. It appears in two different past tense contexts, as detailed below.

8.3.2.1 Preterite
The Hasidic Hebrew wayyiqṭol most commonly serves to convey preterite actions in narrative, as below. As discussed in 8.1.2.1, qatal forms are also very frequently employed in preterite contexts in Hasidic Hebrew. In contrast to
Biblical Hebrew, in which there are syntactic and semantic differences governing the use of the *qaṭal* vs. *wayyiqṭol* in preterite settings, in Hasidic Hebrew the two conjugations are employed in free variation. This treatment of the *qaṭal* and *wayyiqṭol* as two interchangeable preterite forms closely resembles that of Maskilic literature (see Kahn 2009: 241–243).

– ויתלבו הראשונים לא ראו את הדבר ‘So the friends went to see the man’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 46)
– ולכבר מלך מסר את החכמים על החכם לאברה וטו את עבד לחרות את החכם ‘The king became very angry and became cruel to the Hasid, and ordered his servant to kill the Hasid’ (J. Duner 1899: 19)
– והם אמרו לו על חכם על הנעלם מבית מנהר בשמת חור ‘And the honourable Rebbe made an improvement with a vault in that synagogue in the year 1860. And he also made a cover for the burial monument’ (Landau 1892: 49)
– והנהבהלה והוהו בהיות ותים ותני להשלל ‘And she became agitated, and she returned to her house and she came and told her husband’ (Laufbahn 1914: 46)
– ויסנור את הדה תוקד בקול ואソסכו וכל עדות ואסרו אתו במקמי ‘And he closed the door and called out (lit: with a voice) and gathered all his servants and they bound him with restraints’ (Bodek? 1866: 20a)
– ו.junit את הדה שלוה יחד לא ‘And he left the challah and went home’ (Sofer 1904: 1)
– וישכמי בכם ישן על שלום הרמה הנשים והימים ‘And they got up early in the morning and they travelled with many other men, merchants’ (Kamelhar 1909: 29)
– והשמיש האשה לאישתה תולד ‘And the woman listened to her husband, and she went then, in the days of rain and snow, to the ritual bath’ (Seuss 1890: 31)
– ויתערור ולמד וההתחלת לאכלה ‘And my heart was greatly stirred, and I started to cry’ (Breitstein 1914: 20)
– ויתקרך הירדרא ממרא ושולם אחריו עבדו וירבדו על פיים לימי אחריו ‘And the tenant farmer grew very angry, and he sent his non-Jewish servant after him, and he rode on a horse to run after him’ (Michelsohn 1910a: 45)
– והשמיש הקפנה את ההלילה חוה ותורוכו נוח חברה והכסף מקטיף סופים וтопית ‘And the old woman kept guard that night and lit many candles, and cooked good dishes and waited the whole night’ (A. Walden 1860?: 48a)
8.3.2.2 Past Progressive

Although in the vast majority of cases the Hasidic Hebrew wayyiqtol denotes preterite actions, on rare instances it has past progressive force, as below. In such cases the wayyiqtol takes its tense/aspect value from a closely preceding qatal.

– ירוואא יבנשעיש מראקוכ יכ שעמ הוק אצל הצעה ודרבר עפ הרות ‘And the Ba’al Shem Tov saw from afar that the old man was standing next to the wagon and was talking with the guest’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 12)

8.3.3 Syntax

While the syntax of the Hasidic Hebrew wayyiqtol partially overlaps with that of its biblical counterpart, it has several noteworthy properties, to be discussed below.

8.3.3.1 Sequences with qatal and wayyiqtol

Wayyiqtol may appear at the end of a verbal sequence preceded by multiple qatal forms, as in the first two examples below, or conversely at the beginning of a sequence that is continued by qatal forms, as in the third example.

– הרתיא רכק ברצל תשיכנינו תעטעק בעל מרד ‘The lame man stamped his foot and ground his teeth and cried out in a bitter voice’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 46)
– אמר הז היה בן יהודי MacOS מברק ידור לקומת אונס ו协调发展 ‘And he said, “This is his son, and he is one of his students,” and the holy Rebbe was very happy and he brought them very close’ (M. Walden 1914: 55)
– וישלח האיש עניל את לי ויכשת הדלתות והותק יד לקראות התו הקלח ואחרי יברעש ‘And that man stretched out his hand and opened the door, and the Rebbe ran towards him and took Rabbi Berish’ (Singer 1900b: 13)

These usages differ from Biblical Hebrew, in which past narrative sequences are typically conveyed by a series of wayyiqtol forms rather than by a combination of qatal and wayyiqtol. Thus, in contrast to its biblical counterpart, the Hasidic Hebrew wayyiqtol is not an obligatory component of the verbal system but rather an optional element that can be selected as desired, possibly as a stylistic device serving to situate the tales as the linguistic heirs to the venerable tradition of biblical narrative. Significantly, this same approach to the wayyiqtol is found in nineteenth-century Maskilic Hebrew literature, which often contains chains of qatal with a single wayyiqtol at the end (see Kahn 2009: 188–189).
8.3.3.2 Temporal Clause + wayyiqṭol without יהי
Occasionally the Hasidic Hebrew authors employ a wayyiqṭol as the first finite verb of a narrative unit following a temporal clause that lacks an introductory יהי, as below; this diverges from biblical convention, according to which a sequence containing a wayyiqṭol following a temporal clause would typically be introduced by יהי, with only rare exceptions (van der Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze 1999: 166–167).

– ‘Once when he was talking of the first Tzaddikim and the first Hasidim, a Hasid said to him …’ (Moses of Kobrin 1910: 75)
– ‘And when they heard the man's words, they said to each other, “Come what may, let's stop here”’ (Laufbahn 1914: 49)
– ‘When the head of the yeshivah heard this, he knew in his soul that he was not on such a [spiritual] level’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 3)
– ‘And the next day when the matter became known in the whole town, the whole town was abuzz’ (N. Duner 1899: 42)

8.3.3.3 Adverb + wayyiqṭol
Sometimes a wayyiqṭol beginning a narrative sequence is immediately preceded by an adverb, as shown below. This practice is not standard in Biblical Hebrew, Maskilic Hebrew, or the Hasidic tale corpus itself. It is sometimes the result of shibbus, i.e. the insertion of a biblical phrase into the narrative, without concern for syntactic compatibility with its immediate setting. The last example constitutes such a case. (See section 15 for further discussion of shibbus in Hasidic Hebrew.)

– ‘And suddenly the doctor was astonished’ (Seuss 1890: 4)
– ‘And the LORD immediately took notice of her’ (Brandwein 1912: 40)
– ‘Immediately (and) the whole town was astir’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 6); cf. ‘And when they arrived in Bethlehem the whole town was abuzz over them’ (Ruth 1:19)
8.3.3.4 Extended wayyiqṭol Sequences

In contrast to Biblical Hebrew, in which wayyiqṭol sequences can continue for extended stretches of narrative, in Hasidic Hebrew it is rare to find more than three or four in close proximity. However, longer wayyiqṭol sequences do occasionally occur, as below.

And many artists who were coming to see the great worth of this palace gathered together. And among them came a villager, from among the poor of the people. And he entered into the halls of the palace and raised his eyes and saw that on one wall was painted a villager just like him (lit: like his resemblance and his image), holding a cup of wine in his hand and drinking until he was drunk. And that villager answered and said ...’ (Zak 1912: 7)

8.3.4 וייר

Closely linked to the Hasidic Hebrew use of the wayyiqṭol is its employment of the related construction וייר. Wayne is commonly used to introduce temporal phrases and clauses in past settings. This usage is a feature of Biblical Hebrew (see Gibson 1994: 157) but does not occur in rabbinic literature (Bendavid 1971: 577). In some cases, such as that shown in the following example, the temporal phrase or clause introduced by וייר is followed by a wayyiqṭol. This type of construction precisely mirrors biblical usage.

However, more frequently Hasidic temporal phrases or clauses with וייר are immediately followed by a qatal, as below. This is true even when the subsequent narrative is continued by wayyiqṭol forms, as in the final example. This usage contrasts with that of Standard Biblical Hebrew, in which temporal clauses introduced by וייר are typically followed by a wayyiqṭol (Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 608). By contrast, it is attested in Late Biblical Hebrew (Cohen 2013: 70–71), and this may have contributed in some measure to the development of the Hasidic construction. Any such influence was probably compounded by the authors’ lack of familiarity with the syntactic properties of the Standard Bib-
lical construction; they are likely to have employed simply because they perceived it (like the wayyiqtol) as a salient element of narrative Hebrew due to its frequent appearance in the Bible.

– ‘And as he was walking he encountered a village at evening time’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 4)
– ‘And when they were all standing in the village, the non-Jews also came to the village’ (Bromberg 1899: 24)
– ‘And on Friday evening the boy stood up at Kiddush time’ (? 1894: 3)
– ‘And after these things they set the table in a manner fit for a king’ (Seuss 1890: 34)
– ‘And on the way they came to an inn’ (Michelsohn 1910a: 48)
– ‘And the king saw him, he found favour in his eyes, and he ran towards him and hugged and kissed the Hasid’ (Bodek 1865c: 15–16)

8.4 Weqatal

Just as the Hasidic Hebrew authors employ the wayyiqtol construction in past narrative contexts, so they use the weqatal in consecutive future settings. However, in contrast to the wayyiqtol, the weqatal is only a marginal feature in the tales. It usually occurs in instances of shibbus, phrases directly taken or very closely adapted from biblical verses (see section 15 for a discussion of shibbus in Hasidic Hebrew). This is illustrated in the following examples, which are close adaptations of biblical verses.

– ‘And if you are willing and obey, you will eat of the good of the land. However, if you refuse and rebel, the sword of Mohammed’s hatred will burn you up, for his mouth has spoken’ (Bodek 1865c: 9); cf. אֶת־הָאֲשֶׁרָם הָעָלָם אֲשֶׁר הָעָלָם אֲשֶׁר הָעָלָם אֲשֶׁר הָעָלָם אֲשֶׁר הָעָלָם אֲשֶׁר הָעָלָם אֲשֶׁר הָעָלָם אֲשֶׁר הָעָלָם אֲשֶׁרָם הָעָלָם אֲשֶׁר הָעָלָם אֲשֶׁר הָעָלָם אֲשֶׁר הָעָלָם אֲשֶׁר הָעָלָם אֲשֶׁר הָעָלָם אֲשֶׁר הָעָלָם אֲשֶׁר הָעָלָם אֲשֶׁר הָעָלָם אֲשֶׁר הָעָלָם אֲשֶׁר הָעָלָם אֲשֶׁר הָעָלָם אֲשֶׁר הָעָלָם אֲשֶׁר הָעָלָם אֲשֶׁר הָעָלָם אֲשֶׁר הָעָלָם אֲשֶׁר הָעָלָם אֲשֶׁר הָעָלָם אֲשֶׁר הָעָלָם אֲשֶׁר הָעָלָם אֲשֶׁר הָעָl

– ‘This time next year you will bear a son and call him Israel’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 3); cf. יַעֲלֵה בֶּשָּׁה יָדֶֽת בֵּית יָדֶֽת בֵּית יָדֶֽת בֵּית יָדֶֽת בֵּית יָדֶֽת בֵּית יָדֶֽת בֵּית יָדֶֽת בֵּית יָדֶֽת בֵּית יָדֶֽת בֵּית יָדֶֽת בֵּית יָדֶֽת בֵּית יָדֶֽת בֵּית יָדֶֽת בֵּית יָדֶֽת בֵּית יָדֶֽת בֵּית יָדֶֽת בֵּית יָדֶֽת בֵּית יָדֶֽת בֵּית יָדֶֽת בֵּית יָd
Indeed, your wife Sarah will bear you a son and you will call him Isaac' (Gen. 17:19)

The Hasidic Hebrew *weqaṭal* does not commonly appear outside of this type of *shibbus* setting and therefore does not appear to be a very productive feature of the language. However, it is rarely attested in original constructions, e.g.:

- ‘Send [a message] quickly on the island that they should bring you wise hearted men who do work, and they should build storehouses for you’ (Shenkel 1903b: 31)
- ‘And afterwards he said to him, “With the LORD’s help she will be cured and she will have sons, and you will circumcize sons”’ (Singer 1900b: 12)

Another aspect of the restricted nature of the Hasidic Hebrew *weqaṭal* is the fact that it is limited to future settings, in contrast to its biblical predecessor, which can be found in past habitual, present, and command contexts as well (see Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 367–375 for details). This discrepancy seems to indicate that the Hasidic Hebrew authors regarded the *weqaṭal* as the future tense equivalent of the preterite *wayyiqṭol* and therefore did not incorporate, or perhaps even recognize, the numerous other biblical uses of the form.

The same phenomenon discussed in 8.3.3.3 regarding the *wayyiqṭol* is attested with the *weqaṭal*, whereby it may appear in a syntactically unexpected environment, immediately preceded by an adverb or prepositional phrase. This is illustrated below. Because the *weqaṭal* is in general a much less common feature of Hasidic Hebrew narrative than the *wayyiqṭol*, this type of construction is quite marginal.

- ‘Afterwards (and) you will bring the matters before God to advocate’ (Zak 1912: 30)

### 8.5 Qoṭel

#### 8.5.1 Morphology

**Feminine Singular**

The feminine singular *qoṭel* has two variant forms in Hasidic Hebrew. The first, and most common by far, ends in -ת. This applies to *qoṭel* forms of a range of stems, as illustrated in the following examples.
Much less frequently, feminine singular qoṭel forms of various stems are attested with the ending -ת. Examples of this variant include the following:

- "take care’ (Bodek 1865c: 17)
- ‘seek’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 33)
- ‘take’ (Zak 1912: 161)
- ‘ask’ (Sofer 1904: 10)
- ‘seem’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 36)
- ‘write’ (Bodek 1865a: 58)
- ‘give’ (Berger 1906: 61)
- ‘can’ (Seuss 1890: 12)
The authors’ occasional selection of the ב- suffix does not reflect any particular syntactic or semantic patterns; rather, it is likely that they viewed this variant as interchangeable with the more typicalbih- suffix. It is possible that their preference for thebih- suffix is, like other aspects of their writing such as the 3fp yiqṭol form (see 8.2.1.4) due to their tendency to select forms and patterns that they associated (perhaps subconsciously) with the Hebrew Bible. Examples of thebih- suffix are distributed throughout the tale corpus but are in the minority among all writers.

Conversely, in some cases thebih- suffix may have been chosen because the form in question is part of a quote or paraphrase from an earlier source which itself contains the same form. For example, the selection of thebih- suffix on the qoṭelันילוכי ‘can’ shown below is likely due to the fact that it is based on an almost identical phrase in Maimonides’ Mishne Tora (which is itself a paraphrase of a very similar phrase appearing in the Babylonian Talmud Berakhot 34b). However, despite their close resemblance, in the Hasidic Hebrew phrase only the second of the two plural qoṭel forms has thebih- suffix, whereas in Mishne Tora both do. The fact that the quote is reproduced precisely with the sole exception of the plural suffix supports the likelihood that the Hasidic Hebrew authors regarded thebih- andbih- variants as interchangeable.

8.5.1.3 Suffixed qoṭel and qaṭul
The Hasidic Hebrew authors occasionally employ a 1cs subject suffix in conjunction with a qoṭel. This practice is restricted to the few qaṭl forms shown below. The convention of attaching a 1cs subject suffix to a qoṭel derives from Rabbinic Hebrew; however, in the Hasidic tales it is restricted and infrequent, whereas it is relatively commonplace in rabbinic literature (Pérez Fernández 1999: 130).
Similarly, qatul forms occasionally appear with a ics subject suffix. These forms always have an active sense despite their passive form. They are restricted to the root זכ, remember' in the qal, as in the first example below, and the roots בטח 'be assured'; 'promise' and כר 'be obliged' in the hofal, as in the remainder.

- וזכינרוכזו 'And I remember that once there were three madmen on one day' (Bromberg 1899: 23)
- וזכינרוכזו 'I promise in the name of my Rebbe that it is certainly kosher!' (Ehrmann 1903: 35b)
- וזכינרוכזו 'And he said to him, “I am sure that by necessity [and] not by your will you will become a rabbi”’ (J. Duner 1899: 90)
- וזכינרוכזו 'And I am obliged to go from here' (Berger 1910c: 14)

The Hasidic Hebrew authors’ use of this type of construction appears to stem from rabbinic and medieval literature, as the forms in question are all attested in e.g. the Babylonian Talmud and Alshich’s commentaries. (These constructions seem in turn to stem from the mishnaic convention of using the qal qatul of the root זכ in an active sense; see Pérez Fernández 1999: 140.) The fact that this construction is limited to a very small number of roots indicates that it is an isolated lexicalized phenomenon rather than a productive grammatical feature.

### 8.5.2 Uses

The Hasidic Hebrew qotel is most commonly a tensed form that serves to mark present progressive and planned future actions. This usage differs from Biblical Hebrew, in which the qotel is a verbal adjective used to convey progressive or iterative action in any tense (Williams 2007: 88). Instead, it more closely resembles Rabbinic Hebrew, in which the qotel has been fully incorporated into the tense system and serves as a present/future marker (Pérez Fernández 1999: 108). However, the Hasidic Hebrew authors’ treatment of the qotel is not identical to that of Rabbinic Hebrew; rather, they sometimes follow the biblical model, employing the form as an untensed marker of progressive
actions and states that may appear in past tense contexts. This fusion of biblical and post-biblical uses, to be discussed below, is part of a much more widespread trend visible throughout the morphology and syntax of the Hasidic Hebrew tale corpus.

8.5.2.1 Present Progressive
The qoṭel is used to convey actions in progress at the present moment (most typically in direct speech), e.g.:

- מצה יודי עומדotron ימער בעדו עלשת אחרמלכתו ‘A Jew is standing here, who cannot be prevented from going in to see the queen’ (Bodek 1865c: 6)
- והכאת נכי אתהובמה ‘And now you are crying too’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 25)
- ואעט הבייל מAdvice why are you crying?’ (Greenwald 1899: 53b)

This usage, which is illustrated in the following examples, overlaps with both biblical and post-biblical varieties of Hebrew (see Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 626 and Geiger 2013a for Biblical Hebrew; see Mishor 1983: 251; Azar 1995: 17; Geiger 2013b for Rabbinic Hebrew; Rand 2006: 240–241 for Hebrew poetry from Byzantine Palestine; Rabin 1968: 114–115 for medieval Ashkenazi Hebrew).

8.5.2.2 Present Habitual
The qoṭel serves as the main way of conveying present habitual actions in Hasidic Hebrew, as illustrated below. This usage is rooted in Rabbinic Hebrew, in which the qoṭel is primarily a present/future tense marker and is used for all types of present actions including habitual ones (Mishor 1983: 251, 263; Geiger 2013c). It differs from Biblical Hebrew, in which the yiqṭol is the chief form used to indicate present habitual actions (Joosten 2012: 276–277). As discussed in 8.2.2.2.3, the Hasidic Hebrew authors may also use the yiqṭol in this type of context and as such there is a degree of overlap between the two verbal forms; however, the use of the qoṭel to denote present habitual actions is much more common than that of the yiqṭol, which is quite rare.

- ותקועים רבים כל אנשי ארץ ייישים ‘And all of the people of eastern Galicia do so today’ (Rokinksohn 1864b: 11)
- והכובתא עודמלנהיברהולךאו ‘And that Rebbe said to him, “Why are you crying?”’ (Greenwald 1899: 53b)

And there the custom until this day is that every day in the morning the beadle of the city strikes with a (lit: the) hammer on all of the doors and windows of the city’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 48)
In addition to its frequent use in present contexts, the qotel is often attested in direct speech contexts indicating planned actions scheduled to take place in the near future. This usage is illustrated below. Qotel in this type of context is sometimes preceded by the particle הנה, as in the last two examples.

- 'And you will not see me again, for I am leaving here straight away' (Rodkinsohn 1865: 38)
- 'And afterwards I will give you [something] to eat' (Greenwald 1897: 94)
- 'And as a sign I’m sending you your ring' (Breitstein 1914: 29–30)
- 'Tomorrow at this time I am going to travel to my Rebbe' (Kaidaner 1875: 17a)
- 'And from now on I will sell you the wood, as much as you like' (Ehrmann 1911: 11a)

The use of the qotel to convey imminent future plans has widespread precedent in previous forms of the language, being found in Biblical Hebrew (Williams 2007: 88) as well as tannaitic literature (Pérez Fernández 1999: 138) and in later writings including e.g. piyyutim from Byzantine Palestine (Rand 2006: 341). The use of the particle הנה in such contexts also has historical precedent, as it is common in Biblical Hebrew (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 627–628), though not a feature of Rabbinic Hebrew (Segal 1927: 149). Given its common appearance in earlier types of Hebrew, this Hasidic use of the qotel is not surprising; moreover, as in the case of other usages discussed in the present study, this tendency may have been strengthened by the fact that Yiddish also employs the present tense (which generally corresponds to the Hasidic Hebrew qotel in other ways) with reference to planned future actions (Mark 1978: 276).

8.5.2.4 Present Perfect Progressive

The qotel is also used with reference to present perfect progressive actions, i.e. actions that started at some point in the past and have continued uninterrupted until the present moment. This usage is typically found in direct
speech, with the present moment corresponding to the time of utterance, as below.

- ‘And since then I have been working at my trade with faith’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 16)
- ‘And so for the past eight days I have always been seeing him walking behind me’ (Bromberg 1899: 26)
- ‘For fourteen years now you’ve been travelling to [see] me’ (Berger 1910a: 40)
- ‘And from that moment I have been doing good things for the Jews’ (Ehrmann 1903: 5b)
- ‘We have been staying in this village for a few years now’ (HaLevi 1907: 22b)

The use of the qotel in present perfect progressive contexts can be traced back to Rabbinic Hebrew (Mishor 1983: 258), but it does not seem to be a particularly common usage in that stratum of the language. It is likely that the Hasidic Hebrew authors’ use of this construction is based not solely on rabbinic and rabbinic-based literature, but also reflects influence from Yiddish, in which the present tense (which frequently overlaps with the Hasidic Hebrew qotel in other respects, as mentioned in the previous section) is used to convey present perfect progressive actions (U. Weinreich 1971: 328).

8.5.2.5 Narrative Present

The qotel does not usually function as a narrative present in Hasidic Hebrew but is rarely attested in such settings, e.g.:

- ‘I caught the thief, and I brought him to the jailhouse. And he asked me to let him beg for a few alms’ (Sofer 1904: 35)
- ‘And the doctor was astonished [...] and in a few moments the child suddenly started to cry’ (Seuss 1890: 4)
- ‘And suddenly the carriage stopped, and a respectable old man got out of it’ (Seuss 1890: 31)

As in the case of the qotel used in present perfect progressive contexts, this usage is likely the result of multiple influences: it is a feature of Rabbinic Hebrew (Mishor 1983: 255; Pérez Fernández 1999: 134) as well as the authors’ native Yiddish (Mark 1978: 276). However, it is noteworthy that this is an ex-
tremely marginal feature of Hasidic Hebrew compared to Rabbinic Hebrew and Yiddish. This discrepancy is particularly striking considering that the Hasidic Hebrew tales have a high proportion of direct speech retelling past events, which one might expect to be the quintessential setting for the narrative present. Seuss (1890) uses it more often than any other author in the corpus, as evident from the examples above, though even he does not employ it very frequently.

8.5.2.6 Past Progressive
Although the qoṭel is not usually employed in past contexts in Hasidic Hebrew, it is sometimes found in past progressive settings. In such cases it most commonly appears following the particle והנה, as in the examples below.

– ‘And the tax-collector ran to see what was going on there, and there she was, lying like a dead person’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 8)
– ‘And at that moment they entered the village, and there the horse was, going on its way through the village and not stopping at any house’ (Kaidaner 1875: 9a)
– ‘And when the Rebbe awoke from his sleep, he saw that they were travelling on the road that goes up to the town of Bar’ (N. Duner 1912: 19)

This usage is most likely inspired by the frequent biblical use of והנה followed by a qoṭel with past progressive sense. However, the two forms of Hebrew differ in that the Hasidic use of the qoṭel in past progressive settings is largely restricted to this specific construction starting with והנה, while the biblical qoṭel is primarily an untensed form that is often used in a wide variety of past progressive contexts and need not be introduced by והנה (see Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 381–382 for details of the biblical uses of the qoṭel in past contexts).

Similarly, the qoṭel is sometimes used to convey past progressive actions in subordinate clauses introduced by a complementizer instead of והנה, e.g.:

– ‘When they saw that a Jewish man was going along the road without shoes [...] they marvelled greatly at this’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 4)
– ‘When I wanted to enter the prayer house I saw that my father of eternal memory was coming out’ (Zak 1912: 37)
In addition, the *qotel* may be employed in past progressive contexts without an introductory *הנהו* or temporal conjunction, as below. In this type of instance, only the wider context indicates that the *qotel* refers to a past action or state. This usage is very rare and is most commonly seen in the work of Kaidaner (1875), as below.

– ‘וַיָּלֵךְ לָמָרְדֵּק וּבָא מֵהָמָרְדֵּק בְּכָשׁ מָשַׁר נִמְצָא שְׁמֵר לִפְנֵי הָמָרְדֵּק אֵין וּמַרְדֵּק’ ‘And he went to the baths and came [back] from the baths, and he asked him to tell him what [it was], and the servant didn’t remember at all’ (Kaidaner 1875: 11b)

Like the other past progressive uses of the *qotel*, this one most likely derives from Biblical Hebrew, in which the *qotel* is an untensed form that can likewise be used in independent past tense contexts to convey progressive action or states (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 624–625; Williams 2007: 88). This Hasidic Hebrew usage is noteworthy because it contrasts with the more common trend evident throughout the tales whereby the *qotel* serves primarily as a tensed form conveying present and future action, as it does in Rabbinic and many other post-biblical forms of Hebrew (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 624–625; Pérez Fernández 1999: 108). This treatment of the *qotel* as both a tensed and untensed form constitutes one of many cases discussed throughout this volume whereby the Hasidic Hebrew authors fuse elements of biblical and post-biblical convention. However, the use of the *qotel* in independent clauses with past progressive sense is very restricted in scope and as such cannot be considered a typical feature of Hasidic Hebrew.

8.5.2.7 Concurrent Action

The Hasidic Hebrew *qotel* may be used to denote an action in progress at the same time as that of the main verb in the clause. Such actions usually have past tense reference, as they are typically found in narrative or in direct speech recounting past events. In such cases the subject of the *qotel* is usually different from that of the main verb, as in the following examples:

– ‘וּמְסֶלֶל נְכַס רַאֲוַה שֶׁהַרְבָּה יְהוֹדֵיס שְׁמוֹדָא שֶׁש’ ‘The carriage driver came in and saw many Jews standing there’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 10)
– ‘פָּאָא בַּזֶּה מָדְרֵשׁ מִזְמָא אַאָה הָסְדִּיָמ שֵׁישָמ שָׁשַׁת יִי’ ‘One time he came to his study house and found the Hasidim sitting and drinking wine’ (Zak 1912: 30)
– ‘וּמְסֶלֶל הַלָּמְדֵּי נְדֶרְמָא וֹשֶׁמֶנ כָּלִי קָוָא אָאוּת בֶּשָּׁמָא’ ‘And during the studies he fell asleep, and heard a voice calling him by name’ (Kaidaner 1875: 28a)
Occasionally both the main verb and the concurrent qotel may have the same subject, as in the following examples; such constructions usually contain a form of the root ד.מ.ע 'stand' in the qal as either the main verb or the qotel.

This usage has parallels in earlier forms of the language including Biblical Hebrew (König 1881–1897, pt. 3: 601; Davidson 1994: 168–169) and Rabbinic Hebrew (Segal 1908: 696). However, the canonical forms of the language often convey concurrent actions in other ways, e.g. conjunction waw + qotel in Biblical Hebrew and ·כש + qotel in Rabbinic Hebrew (Gordon 1982: 135, 159), whereas the Hasidic Hebrew authors employ only the unaccompanied qotel. An identical practice is found in contemporaneous Maskilic Hebrew prose (Kahn 2009: 175–178), suggesting that it may comprise a feature of a wider Eastern European variety of Hebrew.

This usage bears a partial resemblance to the employment of the qotel to convey past progressive actions (discussed in 8.5.2.6 above) in that in both cases the qotel refers to a past action ongoing at the same time as the main action(s) of the surrounding narrative; however, the two usages differ in that qotel forms
conveying concurrent action take their tense value from the preceding finite verb, while those in past progressive contexts do not necessarily do so.

8.5.2.8 Complement of Finite Verb ליחתה ‘Began’
Very occasionally the qoṭel serves as the complement of the qaṭal ליחתה ‘began’. This construction is extremely marginal in Hasidic Hebrew; rare examples are shown below. It is identical in meaning to the much more common construction composed of a finite verb followed by an infinitive construct (discussed in 8.8.2.2.1). It is most likely ultimately traceable to Rabbinic Hebrew, which possesses the same construction (Sharvit 1998: 337; Pérez Fernández 1999: 136).

– רעשהלעקפודליחתה ‘He started pounding on the gate’ (Bodek 1865a: 70)
– השפרמבםיכובוליחתה ‘They started crying with bitter spirit’ (Munk 1898: 36)

8.6 Periphrastic Constructions

Periphrastic constructions constitute a major component of the Hasidic Hebrew verbal system. These constructions are composed of an auxiliary consisting of a form of the root ה.י.ה ‘be’ in conjunction with a main verb which can be a qoṭel, a qaṭal, or an infinitive construct. Hasidic Hebrew periphrastic forms serve to indicate a broad range of tense and aspect values, most of which can alternatively be conveyed using other verbal forms.

8.6.1 Qaṭal + qoṭel
By far the most common type of periphrastic construction in Hasidic Hebrew is composed of a qaṭal of the root ה.י.ה ‘be’ followed by a qoṭel. This type of construction is used in a wide variety of past tense and irreal conditional settings, as detailed below. These periphrastic constructions overlap with the qaṭal, which is often used to convey exactly the same kinds of values; indeed, there seems to be no semantic difference in Hasidic Hebrew between the periphrastic construction on the one hand and the qaṭal on the other. This employment of two different constructions in free variation to designate the same tense and aspectual meanings comprises part of the broader tendency visible throughout Hasidic Hebrew grammar to incorporate a wide range of morphological and syntactic alternatives drawn from various earlier strata of the language rather than relying exclusively on one variant or another. However, the periphrastic forms are employed somewhat more commonly than the qaṭal, which may suggest that the Hasidic Hebrew verbal system was in the process of developing a formal distinction between punctive and progressive aspect.
8.6.1.1 Past Habitual

Periphrastic constructions consisting of the *qatal* of the root **ה.י.ה** ‘be’ followed by a *qotel* are frequently used to convey a past habitual sense. Such actions are often accompanied by a temporal adverb indicating frequency. These periphrastic constructions may refer to both actions and states, as illustrated below. This usage has precedent in Rabbinic Hebrew (Pérez Fernández 1999: 108–109; Mishor 2013) as well as in medieval forms of the language such as the *piyyutim* (Sáenz-Badillos 1993: 210). The same sense may additionally be expressed by the *qatal*, as discussed in 8.1.2.5, but the periphrastic construction is more common.

- ‘And R. Yehuda always used to recite Psalms’ (Sofer 1904: 1)
- ‘And a certain [man] from Lvov used to drink in his house every day until he became drunk’ (J. Duner 1899: 14)
- ‘He ordered [them] to lift him from his bed and seat him on the chair that he always used to sit on’ (Landau 1892: 66)
- ‘Indeed King Napoleon never used to sleep during the day’ (Stamm 1905: 10)
- ‘And each and every day the gentleman would enjoy the milk very much’ (Hirsch 1900: 18)
- ‘In the first generations, the robber used to live in the forest’ (Greenwald 1897: 100)
- ‘The Rebbe of Lublin of eternal memory used to say every day before study, “Master of the Universe!”’ (Rapaport 1909: 10)
- ‘And once in three years all of the dukes used to travel to Warsaw’ (Shenkel 1903a: 17)
- ‘In previous years they used to study a lot in our country’ (Chikernik 1908: 4)
- ‘I will tell you how he used to come to me evening and morning’ (A. Walden 1860?: 31b)

Very occasionally the word order is reversed, with the *qotel* preceding the *qatal*, as in the following example. This convention is not very common; the fronting of the *qotel* is perhaps intended to draw attention to that element of the construction, but it may simply be a rare stylistic variant.
8.6.1.2 Past Progressive

The periphrastic construction consisting of the *qatal* of the root ה.י.ו. ‘be’ followed by a *qotel* is additionally used to convey past actions that were in progress at a point simultaneous with that of the main verb of the sentence (which is itself usually a *qatal*). Only context distinguishes this usage from its past habitual counterpart discussed in the previous section. This usage, which is illustrated below, has precedent in various forms of post-Biblical Hebrew ranging from mishnaic literature (see Pérez Fernández 1999: 108–109; Sharvit 2004: 50; Mishor 2013) to several types of medieval writings (Rabin 1968: 115; Sarfatti 2003: 87; Rand 2006: 341–342). Again, this usage may alternatively be conveyed by the *qatal*, as discussed in 8.1.2.4, though the periphrastic construction is more common.

- ‘One time I was walking on the road with my teacher (the Ari), may his memory live on in the World to Come, and a Torah scholar came and walked in front of him’ (J. Duner 1899: 57)
- ‘When he was sleeping a messenger came’ (Bodek 1865a: 70)
- ‘Rabbi Joseph the Maggid of Polonnoye was having an afternoon nap once when he saw (in his dream) a great sight’ (N. Duner 1912: 35)
- ‘And when I came to the inn the holy Rebbe, the [Holy] Jew of everlasting memory was eating breakfast’ (Breitstein 1914: 5)
- ‘When he came before the Rebbe he was crying very much’ (Greenwald 1899: 53b)
- ‘And at that time that holy Rebbe was sleeping’ (Chikernik 1902: 26)

8.6.1.3 Preterite

This type of periphrastic construction can also be used to convey punctive past actions, as below. The punctive force of such constructions is particularly

---

2 Sic; יתיהי
unmistakable in cases such as the first example, in which it clearly refers to a single incident and is immediately followed by a sequence of qatal forms with a similar preterite value, or the second example, in which the action in question (breaking) is explicitly telic. As in the case of the other uses discussed above, this meaning can alternatively be conveyed by the qatal, as discussed in 8.1.2.1. However, unlike for the other uses, the qatal is actually the default conjugation for preterite actions while the periphrastic construction is comparatively uncommon.

‘Once our Teacher of blessed memory was very ill, and the famous Holy One of Warka of blessed memory came to visit him, and he came out of his room’ (Bromberg 1899: 32)

‘And once at his feast he gave him a lot of wine’ (Michelsohn 1910a: 62)

This usage does not have clear precedent in Rabbinic Hebrew, in which the periphrastic construction is typically reserved for progressive and habitual action. However, there may be some precedent in the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Hebrew kabbalistic texts of Moses Cordovero, Isaac Luria, and Chaim Vital, who employ the periphrastic construction simply as a past marker (Betzer 2001: 120).

More frequently, the periphrastic construction is used to convey past states with stative roots; this is particularly common with the roots כ.ו.י ‘know’ and כ.ל.י ‘be able’.

‘And he didn’t want to believe them’ (Brandwein 1912: 21)

‘The Maggid wanted to go pray’ (Rapaport 1909: 34)

‘A story of a hunter who hunted a bird that knew the language of humans’ (Shenkel 1883, pt. 1: 20)

‘And in that town they didn’t know him yet’ (A. Walden 1860?: 30a)

‘At the time of this child’s circumcision I did not know what his name was that would be called in Israel’ (Bromberg 1899: 40)

‘And no one from the Rebbe’s household recognized him’ (Zak 1912: 12)
8.6.1.4 Pluperfect

Rarely, periphrastic constructions serve to denote pluperfect actions, as below. This usage is limited to the writings of a single author, Bromberg, and so is not representative of the Hasidic Hebrew corpus as a whole.

- And it was his way in holiness even when he had not completely recovered yet’ (Bromberg 1899: 21)
- ‘And he told afterwards how he had been angry at the Sabbath meal’ (Bromberg 1899: 41)

This usage is noteworthy because it is not clearly based on Rabbinic Hebrew precedent: in that form of the language, periphrastic forms are used to convey past habitual, past progressive, and irreal conditional actions (Sharvit 2004: 50), but not pluperfect ones. Moreover, it does not seem to be rooted in the qatal + qotel constructions used in Medieval Hebrew literature, which likewise tend to convey past habitual, progressive, and/or irreal conditional actions (see e.g. Rand 2006: 341–342 and Sarfatti 2003: 87). The origins of this innovation are thus unclear. It is possible that the construction is indirectly modelled on analogy with the Yiddish pluperfect, which is a periphrastic construction composed of the past tense of the verb קָבָה 'to have' or קָיָה 'to be' followed by the past participle (Jacobs 2005: 218), e.g. עַכְּבִּיָה הָאִם הָאוֹכָלָה מִיָּהוָה 'he had said'. However, the relationship between the Hebrew and Yiddish constructions is uncertain because, while somewhat similar, they do not mirror each other precisely, and because the Yiddish pluperfect is chiefly a literary form that does not feature frequently in everyday language (Mark 1978: 281; Jacobs 2005: 218).

8.6.1.5 Irreal Conditions

Periphrastic constructions with היה + qotel are frequently employed in the protasis and apodosis of irreal conditions, as below.

- ‘If I studied, I would remember’ (Zak 1912: 14)
- ‘If you had seen the great joy that there was in Paradise when your holy infant son arrived, you wouldn’t cry’ (Bromberg 1899: 4)
- ‘And if hadn’t been for those who opened for him, he would have died of the cold’ (Gemen 1914: 66)
The Hasidic Hebrew authors’ use of this construction in irreal conditional settings is unsurprising given that it is a feature of Rabbinic Hebrew (Mishor 2013), as well as of certain medieval writings (Sarfatti 2003: 87). In contrast to the other uses of this construction discussed above, in this case הָיָה + qoṭel is the main form employed in such settings, in contrast to the qaṭal, which appears in such clauses only infrequently by comparison (see 13.6.2 for examples).

8.6.2 Qaṭal + qaṭal

Although the most frequently attested periphrastic construction in Hasidic Hebrew consists of a qaṭal followed by a qoṭel, there is also a rarer construction composed of a qaṭal of the root הָיָה, יִהוּדָה, be’ followed by another qaṭal of a different root. Such constructions are typically used to convey preterite actions, as in the following examples:

– וַיָּקָםוּ הָאָדָם שְׁחִיתוֹ וַיָּעַל וְהָלָךְ לֶכֶךָ לָיָּבָד לְהַלְּכָה לָיָּבָדוּ לְכָל בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְלָיָּבָד (Ex 14:6) ‘And after two years […] that woman decided in her heart to travel with the child to the Ba’al Sham Tov of blessed memory’ (Munk 1898: 18)
– וַיִּעַרְרָבָּם עָלָיו מֵעַל הָעֹלָה וַיִּשְׁלֹקֶהוּ וַיִּעַרְרָבָּם עָלָיו מֵעַל הָעֹלָה וַיִּשְׁלֹקֶהוּ וַיִּעַרְרָבָּם עָלָיו מֵעַל הָעֹלָה וַיִּשְׁלֹקֶהוּ וַיִּעַרְרָבָּם עָלָיו מֵעַל הָעֹלָה וַיִּשְׁלֹקֶהוּ וַיִּעַרְרָבָּם עָלָיו מֵעַל הָעֹלָה וַיִּשְׁלֹקֶהוּ וַיִּעַרְרָבָּם עָלָיו מֵעַל הָעֹלָה וַיִּשְׁלֹקֶהוּ V (Ehrmann 1903: 16b)
– וַיִּפְנֵהוּ וַיִּפְנֵהוּ וַיִּפְנֵהוּ וַיִּפְנֵהוּ וַיִּפְנֵהוּ V (Bodek? 1866: 24a)
– וַיִּפְנֵהוּ וַיִּפְנֵהוּ וַיִּפְנֵהוּ V (Bodek? 1866: 24a)

They are also very rarely found in irreal conditional contexts:

– וַיִּפְנֵהוּ וַיִּפְנֵהוּ V (Bodek? 1866: 24a)

May the Lord grant that I be in any case in the Land of Israel one
Sabbath and pray before the Western Wall; then I would surely accomplish a lot’ (Breitstein 1914: 19)

This type of construction is used in similar contexts to those in which qatal or qatal + qotel constructions are found, and there is no clear reason motivating the authors’ selection of this relatively rare alternative on any given occasion. It may derive from medieval Hebrew translations of Arabic works, in which the same construction exists (Sarfatti 2003: 87); however, the Hasidic Hebrew version seems to have a different function than that of its medieval counterpart, as the latter is typically reserved for conveying pluperfects (G. Khan, personal communication).

8.6.3 Yiqṭol + qotel
The Hasidic Hebrew authors very rarely employ periphrastic constructions consisting of a yiqṭol of the root הַיְּ.י.ה followed by a qotel. These constructions indicate absolute or relative future actions, which may be progressive, as in the first example below, or punctive, as in the second example.

– ámb התודים באס פול זב בחק השכאי פוק י [. . .] והשק [ [...] ויזיר אא התבשש אס ‘But he warned them that if something were to fall in the bag, then they should immediately close the bag [...] and wake up the Ba’al Shem Tov if he were sleeping’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 10)
– ámb מי מאר י [. . .] יהוה העשו ‘If our teacher gives him wine, what will he do?’ (Bromberg 1899: 28)

This usage has precedent in Rabbinic Hebrew (Pérez Fernández 1999: 108–109), but the Hasidic Hebrew usage differs from its rabbinic antecedent in that the latter serves only to indicate progressive and habitual future actions. The construction also appears in medieval and early modern sources such as Abarbanel and Alshich’s commentaries, which are likely to have exerted an influence on the emergence of the Hasidic Hebrew form (though the aspectual properties of these forms has not been examined in the secondary literature). Interestingly, it differs from medieval Ashkenazi Hebrew, in which periphrastic forms with the yiqṭol as their first member are not attested (Rosén 1995: 72–73). It is possible that the Hasidic Hebrew authors’ blurring of aspectual boundaries may be attributable to some degree to influence from Yiddish, in which there is no morphological distinction between punctive and progressive aspect in the past or future (see Jacobs 2005: 217–220 for a description of the Yiddish tense system).
8.6.4 Yiqtol + yiqtol
A periphrastic form comprised of a *yiqṭol* of the root ה.י.ה ‘be’ followed by a *yiqṭol* of another root is very rarely attested in the tales, as below. The construction indicates future tense in the same way as the simple *yiqṭol* more commonly does.

– ‘The Rebbe will be able to help you’ (Munk 1898: 52)

The origin of this extremely marginal construction is uncertain. It lacks exact precedent in Rabbinic Hebrew but is attested in medieval Hebrew translations of Arabic works (Sarfatti 2003: 87; Goshen-Gottstein 2006: 60–61); it is possible that the Hasidic Hebrew usage stems from this medieval phenomenon, though it is so rare that it is most likely better regarded simply as an anomaly.

8.6.5 Infinitive Construct + qoṭel
While Hasidic Hebrew periphrastic verbal constructions most frequently consist of a *qatal* followed by a *qoṭel*, they may be composed of an infinitive construct followed by a *qoṭel*. In such constructions the infinitive construct is often prefixed by -ל, as in the following examples:

– ‘And he never sat down to dine until he had brought a pauper in with him to dine with him’ (Bodek 1865c: 18)
– ‘because it was more pleasing for him to sit in his room and study with dedication’ (Bromberg 1899: 29)

Alternatively, it frequently appears in temporal clauses prefixed by -ב, e.g.:

– ‘Once when the holy Rebbe Shmelke was travelling on the road, he passed through a certain village’ (M. Walden 1912: 109)
– ‘Once, when he was studying Torah in the study house he saw how one of the youths cleaned his (lit: the) pipe’ (J. Duner 1899: 81)
– ‘while I was living in my father-in-law’s house’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pt. 3: 3)
– ‘And while he was lodging in a village not far away [...] robbers came’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911b: 29)
Finally, it sometimes appears in unprefixed form, e.g.:

– נעשוורת מתדירמת אולת ויתמשלם בהבנתון אל풋יא {[זטב] הוה
have awoken from the stupor of stupidity to be engaged in pondering God-
liness and love of the Creator’ (Kaidaner 1875: 18b)

Like most of the other periphrastic constructions discussed above, this form is ultimately traceable to Rabbinic Hebrew (Pérez Fernández 1999: 108–109). However, in that stratum of the language it is used specifically for progressive actions, whereas in Hasidic Hebrew the aspectual force is often unclear (as it is in some of the other periphrastic constructions examined previously). For example, the constructions above that appear within temporal clauses clearly denote ongoing activities, as illustrated in the English translations. By contrast, in cases such as לִהְיוּתָ עַשֵּׂדּ ‘to dine’ in the first example there is no unambiguously progressive element in the activities, and indeed a punctive sense seems to be more natural than a progressive one, as shown in the translation. It is possible that in even such instances the authors selected the periphrastic construction intentionally in order to convey an ongoing event, and that the ongoing nature of these events simply cannot be readily translated into English with a progressive verbal form. Alternatively, however, the selection of the periphrastic construction in such cases may be a stylistic or even arbitrary choice with no aspectual significance.

8.6.6 Periphrastic Constructions with nifal

The use of the periphrastic constructions consisting of a form of the root הָיָה and a qoṭel is particularly common with nifal qoṭel. The construction most commonly consists of a qaṭal + qoṭel, but may also be comprised of a yiqṭol + qoṭel or an infinitive construct + qoṭel. These possibilities are illustrated below.

Qaṭal + qoṭel

– והרוב פָּתָח הָקִימַע וּזְיוּר נֶעֲבַת הַתֵּחָן? שָאָה יִשְׁא אתוֹת ‘And the rabbi opened the amulet and inside it was written, “Is it possible that a brother should marry his sister?”’ (Ehrmann 1903: 19b)
– אֲחֵי של בְּראָדֶה רַעְבָּה נֵקַנַּא הָרְבֵּ בַּמַּאֲלָא ‘The brother of the honourable rabbi, who was called the Rebbe of Kovel’ (Landau 1892: 29)
– וַיְחָסַף בּוֹדֵהַר יְרֵעָדוֹמָּא לַשֶּׁהָ בַּיִּישֶּׁ ‘And the letter was addressed “to Moses son of Hayim”’ (Michelsohn 1912: 105)
– ובָּעָלֶה כּבֵּר הָיָה נַפְּסָא אֲי ‘And her husband had already died then’ (Bodek? 1866: 5a)
And while he was in Poland it was made known that Elijah of blessed memory had revealed himself to him' (N. Duner 1899: 62)  
The holy genius, the head of the holy court of Lublin, who was called Ironhead’ (Jacob Isaac ben Asher of Przysucha 1908: 44)  
The leader of the Mitnagdim was called R. Solomon Hasid’ (Breitstein 1914: 17)  
They were chased very much from their homes’ (M. Walden 1914: 10)  
as if his legs and ribs were broken’ (Shenkel 1903a: 6)  
‘And I was almost repelled in horror’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1910: 6)  
‘until his flesh could almost be seen there’ (Chikernik 1903a: 8)  

Yiqṭol + qoṭel

And I will hope to God that she will immediately be blessed (lit: attended to in peace) with her child’ (Lieberson 1913: 92)  
But from today onwards he must take care not to do such things’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 5)  
‘I bless you [with the intention] that you should be careful about these two things’ (J. Duner 1899: 15)  

Infinitive Construct + qoṭel

Know that you are fated (lit: your end is) to be killed by a pagan robber’ (Lieberson 1913: 92)  
‘to surrender in the world’ (Bodek 1865a: 34)  
‘to surrender before him’ (HaLevi 1907: 20b)  
‘and it was his custom to hide in hiding places’ (Singer 1900a, pt. 1: 6)  
‘to be careful of the tzaddikim’ (M. Walden 1914: 20)  
‘to be buried near his rebbe’ (Michelsohn 1905: 83)  
‘His way was always to be careful’ (Yellin 1913: 31)  
‘And his time came to enter the wedding canopy’ (J. Duner 1899: 15)
This type of periphrastic construction has some precedent in earlier Hebrew sources such as Rashi’s commentaries, which may have contributed to its appearance in the tales. However, the Hasidic Hebrew authors’ use of the form is noteworthy in that they employ it to the almost total exclusion of simple nifal qatal, yiqtol, and infinitives construct with passive meaning. Moreover, although nifal forms with active force may appear in the tales in their simple form (e.g. לָכַּת ‘you hid’ [HaLevi 1909: 54]; רַבֵּד ‘to be careful’ [Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 3]; לִיבָּנָס ‘to enter’ [Landau 1892: 22]), they often appear in periphrastic form, as above. This suggests that the authors selected the periphrastic forms because they found it difficult to produce the full range of nifal conjugations.

However, the fact that the use of periphrastic constructions is particularly common in the case of nifal roots with passive meaning indicates that their popularity is not ascribable purely to such considerations. Rather, it is possible that the authors did not perceive the passive nifal as a true verbal form but instead understood it as an adjectival form. This may be due to influence from Yiddish, in which the passive is a periphrastic construction formed by means of the auxiliary נְעָר ‘become’ (which correlates to the Hebrew root ה.י.ה when serving as an auxiliary) followed by a past participle (Jacobs 2005: 220). Moreover, this tendency may reflect an ongoing process in Hasidic Hebrew whereby the nifal (and to some extent the other two passive stems) are losing much of their verbal function and becoming reanalyzed as adjectival forms. This parallels the process that took place between Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew whereby the pual was reanalyzed as an adjective rather than a verbal form (Pérez Fernández 1999: 95; Hilman 2013).

8.7 Volitives

8.7.1 Cohortative

The cohortative appears relatively frequently in the direct speech in the tales in both the singular and plural. This aspect of the Hasidic Hebrew verbal system is directly traceable to Biblical Hebrew, in which the cohortative is a central element (and perhaps to biblically-inspired medieval poetry, which likewise employs it; see Fassberg 2013), in contrast to Rabbinic Hebrew, in which it is not a productive feature (Bar-Asher 1999: 9; Pérez Fernández 1999: 105; Fassberg 2013).
8.7.1.1 Singular Cohortative

In Hasidic Hebrew the cohortative is somewhat more frequently attested in the singular than in the plural. Singular cohortatives may appear with a variety of roots, but the most commonly attested one is the form אספדה ‘I shall tell’, as in the first two examples below. The singular cohortative almost always indicates a planned future action; as such, it overlaps with the *yiqṭol* when used with reference to future plans (as discussed in 8.2.2.3.4).

– אספדה ילס ספת המבר ‘I will tell you the reason for the matter’ (Berger 1910b: 23)
– אספדה ילס איזי מששה ‘And I will tell you a certain story’ (Chikernik 1902: 14)
– לפס אתה מיית או הייבאאלעי ‘Please wait a bit more and I shall return to you’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 19)
– ‘לפי אציגה ילס ספר ברור מכלת נקך ‘Therefore I shall present to you a story as clear as pure flour’ (Kaidaner 1875: 6b)
– אני אספר ואשפש ‘I will remember and I will pour’ (Bodek 1865a: 27)
– אפשר אספרה מה טמא תשוב ‘Maybe I will atone for your sin’ (Michelsohn 1910a: 41)

This usage corresponds to that of Biblical Hebrew, as in that stratum of the language the singular cohortative is sometimes used in planned future contexts (van der Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze 1999: 152). However, the Biblical Hebrew singular cohortative differs from its Hasidic Hebrew counterpart in that it may appear in a wider variety of present and future contexts. Moreover, there is widespread agreement that despite its seeming interchangeability with the *yiqṭol*, the Biblical Hebrew singular cohortative is a volitive form indicating a heightened element of desire or personal involvement in the action on the part of the speaker (see e.g. Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 573–574; Shulman 1996: 196–197; Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 345–346); by contrast, it is not certain that the Hasidic authors were conscious of or sought to emulate this volitive force. It is instead likely that, as in the case of other prominent biblical forms employed in the tales (such as e.g. the pronouns אני ‘I’ and הם ‘they’ discussed in 6.1.1 and the feminine plural *yiqṭol* discussed in 8.2.1.4), they associated the singular cohortative with biblical style, and selected it on occasion as a variant of the *yiqṭol* with future meaning in order to strengthen the linguistic similarity between their writing and biblical narrative.

Only very rarely is a singular cohortative found in purpose clauses, as in the following example. Such cases seem to be directly adapted from biblical sources (as below) rather than constituting a productive Hasidic Hebrew construction.
8.7.1.2 Plural Cohortative
The plural cohortative is likewise attested relatively commonly, but is somewhat less productive than its singular equivalent because it is typically restricted to two roots, הַלְכָאְו וַיְאָהוֹל "go" and (less frequently) בְּךָו וַיְאָהוֹל "return", as illustrated below. It is used to indicate mutual encouragement, equivalent to the English 'let's'. As in the case of the singular cohortative, this has precedent in the Hebrew Bible (Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 346), but the Hasidic Hebrew authors utilize the form less frequently and with a much smaller range of roots than their biblical model.

– נָלֵ֑כֹאְו לֶֽשֶׁר הָעִיר 'Let's go to the minister of the city' (Kaidaner 1875: 33b)
– לֶֽשֶׁנַּא נָֽלָכוֹו 'Let's go to him' (Michelsonh 1910b: 144)
– לֶֽשֶׁנַּא נָֽלָכוֹו אֱלֹהֵי הָחֵד 'Come, let's go to the holy Rebbe' (N. Duner 1912: 28)
– נָֽלָכוֹו נֶלַת וְלַי הַבְּרֶנֶחָה 'Let's go together to the banquet house' (Breitstein 1914: 52)
– בָּאָו נָלֵ֑כֹאְו לַסְרוּ עַד רָפֵעָה 'Come, let's go hear the sermon' (Brandwein 1912: 3)
– מְשֻׂכָּה וַתְּהַלָּה לֶבְרֶנֶךְ בְּיוֹתֵר הָהַלּוֹט 'And now we shall return to speaking about the young groom' (Bodek 1865b: 13)

8.7.2 Imperative
8.7.2.1 Morphology
8.7.2.1.1 Masculine Singular Imperatives
Masculine singular imperatives are widely distributed throughout the Hasidic Hebrew tales, but are most commonly restricted to the qal, e.g.:

– דוֹל 'Go' (N. Duner 1912: 2)
– לָכָה 'Look' (Gemen 1914: 69)
– שִׁמֵּש 'Listen' (Berger 1910b: 24)
– יִד 'Know' (Breitstein 1914: 49)
– נָז 'Give' (Ehrmann 1903: 49a)
– בָּר 'Say' (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 22)
– קָח 'Take' (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 26)
– שָׁש 'Lift' (J. Duner 1899: 33)
– שָׁם 'Look after' (Kaidaner 1875: 16a)
– מַעֲרֶה 'Have mercy' (Hirsch 1900: 43)
– וָיִן 'Run' (A. Walden 1860?: 23a)
– [...] 'Chop' (Greenwald 1897: 94)
By contrast, masculine singular imperatives in the nifal and hitpael are relatively uncommon. Examples include the following:

**Nifal**

- נוכו 'And prepare yourself' (Rodkinsohn 1865: 36)
- חש 'Be careful' (Sofer 1904: 7)
- והוה 'Be careful' (Singer 1900b: 12)

**Hitpael**

- מנהק 'Become stronger' (Rodkinsohn 1865: 14)
- יח載 'Look' (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 25)

Masculine singular piel imperatives are somewhat more frequently attested, though still much rarer than the qal. Common forms include the following:

**Piel**

- שקב 'Look for' (Rodkinsohn 1865: 10)
- ספר 'Tell' (Kaidaner 1875: 15a)
- הקבל 'And receive' (Michelsohn 1912: 77)
-דא ו북 'Go out and look for' (Ehrmann 1905: 56a)

In contrast to the other derived stems, hifil imperatives are quite commonly attested in the tales. Such forms are almost always shortened, following biblical precedent (see Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 149), as below. (See 8.9.6.1 for exceptions to this trend.)

- טב 'Look' (Kaidaner 1875: 23a)
- ב 'Turn' ((Michelsohn 1910b: 133)
- ובק 'And bring' (M. Walden 1914: 39)
- ובק 'And understand' (Bromberg 1899: 14)
- ובק 'And put' (Rodkinsohn 1865: 54)
- שכס 'Get up early' (Bodek 1865a: 15)
- ב 'Tell' (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 12)
8.7.2.1.2 Masculine Singular Imperative with ה Suffix

The Hasidic Hebrew masculine singular imperative is sometimes attested with a ה suffix, e.g.:

- הַנְּגֵדָה לַמֶּה מַבְּכָשָׁךְ ‘Tell me what you want’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 12)
- הַנְּגֵדָה לָהֶם ‘Come here’ (Bodek 1865c: 14)
- הַנְּגֵדָה לְךָ ‘Please give [it] to me’ (Michelsohn 1911: 24)
- הַנְּגֵדָה לְךָ הָעָלָה ‘Give your son to me’ (Seuss 1890: 54)
- הַנְּגֵדָה לְךָ אֵלָה עָצָם ‘Therefore give me some advice’ (Breitstein 1914: 28)
- הַנְּגֵדָה לְךָ אֵלָה עָצָם ‘And they said to him, “Come with us” ’ (Laufbahn 1914: 49)

These Hasidic Hebrew forms all have precise equivalents in the Hebrew Bible and are therefore most likely inspired by their biblical antecedents. (While the suffixed imperative is not completely unknown in Rabbinic Hebrew, in that form of the language it is a very marginal phenomenon restricted to a few forms appearing in liturgical and intentionally biblicizing contexts [Pérez Fernández 1999: 151]; most of the Hasidic suffixed imperatives are not attested in Rabbinic Hebrew and cannot have been inspired by that form of the language.)

The function of the suffixed imperative in the Hasidic Hebrew tales is uncertain, as is the precise relationship between the Hasidic and biblical understanding of the form. This uncertainty is in part attributable to the fact that the role of the suffix in Biblical Hebrew is itself disputed. For example, van der Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze (1999: 150) state that its role is unclear, while Waltke and O’Connor (1990: 571) argue that it is most likely no different in meaning from its unsuffixed counterpart, as both occur in similar settings. By contrast, Fassberg (1994: 33; 1999: 13) and Shulman (1996: 250) propose that the suffixed variant is usually employed when the command is directed towards or for the benefit of the speaker, whereas the unsuffixed form indicates action directed towards others. Interestingly, the use of the Hasidic Hebrew suffixed form seems to support Fassberg’s and Shulman’s analysis of the biblical form, as it is used in contexts indicating that the command will somehow affect the speaker. However, it is unlikely that the Hasidic authors consciously interpreted the biblical suffixed form in this way and that, as in the case of certain other elements of Hasidic Hebrew grammar discussed in this volume, they did not employ it in order to convey this type of semantic content but rather selected it simply because it was familiar to them and perhaps in order to lend a biblical flavour to their writing.
8.7.2.1.3 **Feminine Singular Imperatives**

Feminine singular imperatives are attested only sporadically in Hasidic Hebrew. Various stems are attested among those that do appear. This dearth of feminine singular imperatives is attributable to the relative paucity of female characters in the tales, compounded by the authors’ tendency to employ masculine singular imperatives in conjunction with feminine subjects (see 8.13.2.1). Rare examples include the following:

- ידע ‘Know’ (Berger 1910b: 72)
- ידיבדב ‘Be informed’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 3)
- יתן ‘Give’ (Kaidaner 1875: 23b)
- ידבר ‘Tell’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 25)
- ילב ‘Go’ (? 1894: 11)

8.7.2.1.4 **Masculine Plural Imperatives**

Masculine plural imperatives are a relatively common feature of the tales. Like their masculine singular counterparts, they are most frequently attested in the *qal*, e.g.:

- או ‘Look’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 12)
- טע ‘Do’ (Landau 1892: 18)
- טע ‘Travel’ (Munk 1898: 22)
- ידע ‘Know’ (Chikernik 1902: 17)
- ילב ‘Go’ (Michelsohn 1910a: 37)
- עבד ‘Serve’ (Laufbahn 1914: 51)
- תקיח ‘Investigate’ (Kaidaner 1875: 19b)
- ישמע ‘Listen’ (Hirsch 1900: 32)

Masculine plural imperatives from the derived stems are only rarely attested. As in the case of the masculine singular, the *hifil* is more commonly employed than the other derived stems. Examples include the following:

**Nifal**

- משמחת ‘Look after yourselves’ (Breitstein 1914: 38)
- יאספת ‘Gather yourselves’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 31)
Piel

– ‘Hurry’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 19)
– ‘And look for him’ (Laufbahn 1914: 49)

Hitpael

– ‘Please do all that you can’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 5)
– ‘Go and make a living’ (Shenkel 1903b: 10)

Hifil

– ‘Please look outside’ (Jacob Isaac ben Asher of Przysucha 1908: 47)
– ‘Go and bring’ (Michelsohn 1910a: 37)
– ‘Tell’ (Rodkinsohn 1864a: 21)

8.7.2.2 Uses

The Hasidic Hebrew imperative may be used to convey a range of volitive senses, including urgent or immediate commands, polite requests, and durative commands and injunctions. These various uses are illustrated below. The yiqṭol may alternatively be employed in all of these cases with the same meaning (see 8.2.2.5.2).

– ‘Suddenly the Ba’al Shem Tov called me, “Jacob, go and summon the bishop for me”’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 19)
– ‘Please take the thousand ducats from me’ (Bodek 1865c: 4)
– ‘You, House of Israel, lend me your ears and hear my innocent tales’ (Kaidaner 1875: 19a)
– ‘Know that that man is one of the hidden righteous ones’ (Chikernik 1902: 17)
– ‘Take this coin and buy a citron’ (Sobelman 1909/10 pts. 1–2: 25)

The Hasidic Hebrew uses of the imperative and the interchangeability of the form with the yiqṭol echo the canonical strata of the language, though there are some differences. In Biblical Hebrew the imperative can serve to convey immediate commands, polite requests, and wishes, but is not typically used in durative contexts, in which the yiqṭol is employed instead (see van der Merwe,
Naudé, and Kroeze 1999: 149, 151). Conversely, in Rabbinic Hebrew the imperative is used in similar settings to those in which its Hasidic Hebrew counterparts are found, but the imperative form is itself much rarer than the yiqtol (Pérez Fernandez 1999: 152), unlike Hasidic Hebrew in which the imperative and yiqtol are both employed in volitive contexts with similar frequency. However, the Hasidic Hebrew usage corresponds precisely to nineteenth-century Maskilic Hebrew, in which the imperative and yiqtol may be employed in free variation in the same range of settings (Kahn 2009: 145–147, 208–210). This is one of many areas in which both Hasidic and Maskilic Hebrew can perhaps be regarded as two components of a broader Eastern European form of Hebrew.

### 8.7.3 Jussive

The jussive is almost entirely unknown in Hasidic Hebrew, in which third person command force is nearly invariably conveyed by the yiqtol (see 8.2.2.5.3). The only jussives attested in the tales are the 3ms and 3fs forms of the roots י ה and י ח ‘be’ and י ח ‘live’, as below. These often serve as fossilized components in a few set phrases such as י ח ‘long live’, as in the last two examples. This convention has a close parallel in Maskilic Hebrew, wherein the jussive is avoided except for the roots י ה and י ח (see Kahn 2009: 211). The avoidance of the jussive in both Hasidic and Maskilic Hebrew is most likely rooted in the fact that the form is largely unattested in rabbinic literature (Pérez Fernández 1999: 122). Interestingly, in this case the Hasidic Hebrew authors did not follow the tendency discussed elsewhere in this volume to adopt characteristically biblical forms in order to root their compositions within the biblical narrative tradition.

- י ח ‘Be so good (lit: may it be of your goodness) as to tell me whether you are Leib of Suwalki’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 39)
- י ח ‘Give ear and listen, and may your ear be attentive to these words’ (Bodek 1865c: 3)
- י ח ‘Long live the king, long live the king!’ (Shenkel 1903b: 29)
- י ח ‘Long live our holy and righteous Rebbe’ (Sofer 1904: 10)
8.8  Infinitives

Hasidic Hebrew possesses both an infinitive absolute and an infinitive construct, discussed below in turn.

8.8.1  Infinitive Absolute

The Hasidic Hebrew authors’ use of the infinitive absolute is most likely inspired by Biblical rather than Rabbinic Hebrew, given that an analogous construction is relatively common in the former but extremely marginal in the latter (see Zohori 1990: 132–133 for details of the few attestations of the form in Rabbinic Hebrew). The Hasidic Hebrew infinitive absolute is used in a variety of different ways, as examined in the following sections.

8.8.1.1  Paranomastic Infinitive Absolute

The most common use of the infinitive absolute in Hasidic Hebrew is in paranomastic constructions consisting of a prepositive infinitive followed by a finite verb of the same root. The frequency of this construction is most likely due to the fact that it is the most common type of infinitive absolute in Biblical Hebrew (Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 391). Paranomastic infinitives absolute are most typically qal, but nifal, piel, and hifil forms are attested as well. In the qal the construction is most commonly attested with the root ידוע ‘know’. The following examples illustrate these points:

Qal

– ‘וכראו אחורית מגלה ח糧. נאמעלע ידוע’ ‘And he called after him, “You will fall! Napoleon, you will fall!”’ (Berger 1910b: 87)
– ‘ידעתי ידוע תדהת הגר נאמע?’ ‘I know that you will be ashamed’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 30)
– ‘ ['./meh ידוע תדהת המ נאמע' ‘From this you will surely know how awesome his deeds are’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pt. 3: 12)
– ‘薁ווא נראת אשר בобыти זחר אор גבאל’ ‘And we have indeed seen that in your house there shines a great light’ (Brandwein 1912: 2)
– ‘ידעתי תדהת ידוע תדהת נאמעה מרמת乐园ך’ ‘Know that a great danger is hovering over you’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1910: 58)
– ‘ידעתי תדהת ידוע תדהת נאמעה יהוה אלי’ ‘Know that you are the man’ (A. Walden 1860?: 7a)
**Nifal**

- ‘He yearned to hear’ (Michelsohn 1911: 25)

**Piel**

- ‘And if you promise me that you will indeed bless, I will promise’ (Bodek 1865c: 3)
- ‘I will not have a place by my father-in-law, for he will surely expel me from my house’ (Kaidaner 1875: 26a)
- ‘He said to him, “My son, divorce her”’ (Ehrmann 1905: 58b)

**Hifil**

- ‘I have determined my life’ (Singer 1900a, pt. 3: 8)

Although the infinitive absolute usually appears in the same stem as the associated finite verb, sometimes a qal infinitive absolute is attested in conjunction with a finite verb of a derived stem, as below:

- ‘Now while I am talking I shall make mention of a living man of many [amazing] deeds’ (Kaidaner 1875: 7a)

More rarely, a paranomastic infinitive absolute may follow the associated finite verb, with no apparent difference in meaning. Such a case is shown below:

- ‘And he went until he approached the rich man’ (Bodek 1865a: 38)

The function of the Hasidic Hebrew paranomastic infinitive absolute is somewhat unclear. It sometimes appears in contexts suggesting that it may serve to draw added attention to the finite verb. However, this reading is not at all certain, and it is equally possible that the infinitive absolute in these constructions is devoid of clear semantic content and is instead best left untranslated. The examples above illustrate this uncertainty: all of the infinitives in question could theoretically be interpreted as an emphatic marker drawing attention to the urgency or seriousness of the action conveyed by the root and could be given a translation value of ‘indeed’, while alternatively, each of these forms may be understood as stylistic devices and omitted from the English translations.
This lack of clarity is in part attributable to a similar uncertainty as to the function of the corresponding form in Biblical Hebrew, which has been interpreted as a topicalization marker, an emphatic form, and a modal marker (see Callaham 2010 for details). It is likely that the Hasidic Hebrew authors did not perceive the construction as a meaningful semantic device but rather occasionally employed it because (like various other grammatical phenomena discussed elsewhere in this volume) it was immediately familiar to them from its appearance in the Hebrew Bible and lent a biblical flavour to their compositions, without giving deeper thought to its significance in that form of the language. This is supported by the fact that the infinitive absolute is relatively infrequent and is typically limited to a few roots, e.g. י.ר.ב ‘bless’, י.ד.מ ‘die’, י.ד.ר ‘know’, which are commonly attested in the Hebrew Bible.

However, the Hasidic Hebrew infinitive absolute is not merely a fossilized form but can rather be used productively: for example, the phrase 'you will indeed be ashamed' (Rodkinsohn 1865: 30) shown above is found only twice in the Hebrew Bible, as וּשָׁוָעָבָז in Jeremiah 6:15 and Jeremiah 8:12, and these differ from the Hasidic Hebrew phrase in that they contain a negator and 3mp verb instead of a 2ms verb with no negator; similarly, the phrase יֵרֵיכָזָאָרָכָז 'I shall make mention' (Kaidaner 1875: 7a) does not have a biblical parallel at all.

8.8.1.2 Postpositive Infinitive Absolute Expressing Concurrent Action

Although Hasidic Hebrew infinitives absolute consist predominantly of the prepositive paranomastic type, sometimes two infinitives absolute appear following a finite verb to convey continuous or iterative action. This construction is not productive, but rather is restricted to a set of fossilized phrases with verbs of motion known to the authors from the Hebrew Bible, as illustrated below.

- וּשָׁוָעָבָז ‘And he went from there, travelling on to Breslau’ (Michelsohn 1910b: 6); cf. וּמַשְׁעָבָצָא וְלֹא חָלֹז וּמַשְׁעָבָצָא ‘And Abraham went on, travelling to the Negev’ (Gen. 12:9)
- יֵרֵיכָזָאָרָכָז ‘And he kept getting bigger until he was very big’ (Laufbahn 1914: 45); cf. יֵרֵיכָזָאָרָכָז יֶנֶּלֶל תַּעַלַּו ‘And he continued to grow in wealth until he was very wealthy’ (Gen. 26:13)
- וּשָׁוָעָבָז ‘And he came closer and closer’ (Bodek? 1866: 9a); cf. וּשָׁוָעָבָז ‘And he came closer and closer’ (2 Sam. 18:25)
- וּשָׁוָעָבָז ‘And his strength kept fading’ (Kamelhar 1909: 64); cf. וּשָׁוָעָבָז ‘And the waters kept receding’ (Gen. 8:5)
- וּשָׁוָעָבָז ‘And she went along weeping’ (Seuss 1890: 31); cf. וּשָׁוָעָבָז ‘And her husband went after her, weeping as he went’ (2 Sam. 3:16)
8.8.1.3 As Imperative
The Hasidic Hebrew authors typically employ the infinitive absolute only in paranomastic constructions and to indicate concurrent action; they do not generally use it to denote imperatives or other finite verbs, in contrast to Biblical Hebrew, in which it can sometimes serve these functions (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 593–597; Morrison 2013). However, on very rare occasions the Hasidic Hebrew infinitive absolute is attested with the sense of an imperative. This usage is not a productive feature of Hasidic Hebrew but rather is limited to a very small number of fossilized forms based directly on biblical precedent, as shown below.

– חכשת לאורוכזן כל תща ‘Therefore remember, and do not forget’ (Seuss 1890: 67);
     cf. תָ֖בַּשַּׁהםוֹי־תֶא֩רוֹ֛כָז ‘Remember the Sabbath day’ (Exod. 20:8)

8.8.2 Infinitive Construct
8.8.2.1 Morphology
The Hasidic Hebrew infinitive construct possesses a variety of forms; it may be unprefixed and unsuffixed or appear with a range of prefixes and suffixes. Each of these possibilities is discussed below.

8.8.2.1.5 Unprefixed
The infinitive construct frequently appears in the tales in unprefixed form, e.g.:

– תָ֖אצ ‘to go out’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 9)
– תָ֖ל ‘to go’ (Bodek 1865c: 22)
– תָ֖ת ‘to give’ (Laufbahn 1914: 48)
– תָ֖ושע ‘to do’ (Ehrmann 1903: 3b)

In this respect Hasidic Hebrew follows the model of the Hebrew Bible, in which the unprefixed infinitive construct is a common element (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 600–603; van der Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze 1999: 72). This can be contrasted with rabbinic literature, in which the unprefixed infinitive construct is not a productive feature (Sharvit 1998: 336; Pérez Fernández 1999: 144). As in many other aspects of its morphosyntax, in this regard Hasidic Hebrew mirrors contemporaneous Maskilic Hebrew literature, in which the unprefixed infinitive construct is commonly attested (see Kahn 2009: 60–61).

8.8.2.1.6 Prefixed by -ב, -כ, and -מ
The Hasidic Hebrew infinitive construct frequently appears prefixed by the prepositions -ב, -כ, and -מ. These forms of infinitive construct are modelled
on Biblical Hebrew, which frequently employs identical constructions (see Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 604), in contrast to Rabbinic Hebrew, in which the infinitive construct with these prefixes and without ל is unknown except in rare biblicizing liturgical instances (Pérez Fernández 1999: 144). However, it is also widespread in medieval and early modern Hebrew texts such as responsa literature and Rashi’s biblical and Talmudic commentaries (Betzer 2001: 55, 108), and these sources may have contributed to the Hasidic Hebrew usage. Moreover, as in the case of the unprefixed infinitive construct, these prefixed forms are also attested in contemporaneous Maskilic writings (see Kahn 2009: 60–61), suggesting that they comprise an element of a broader Eastern European form of Hebrew.

Examples of the infinitive construct prefixed by ב-, כ-, and מ- are shown below. Infinitives construct prefixed by ב- and כ- invariably serve as part of a temporal clause (see 13.14.2), while those prefixed by מ- are typically employed in separative clauses (see 8.8.2.2.5).

**With ב**

- ‘while I was standing before a king of flesh and blood’ (J. Duner 1899: 19)
- ‘when he was sitting in his house’ (Zak 1912: 28)
- ‘while they were travelling’ (Sofer 1904: 6)
- [בִּהוֹדוּת יִדְּלֵה] ‘when he was a child’ (Gemen 1914: 59)

**With כ**

- ‘as they were speaking’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 14)
- מְשַׁמָּע יְהוּדָיְיָהוּ ‘and when “the rich man” heard’ (Ehramm 1903: 2a)
- בִּכְלַחַת לִבָּה ‘and when I finished speaking’ (HaLevi 1909: 52)
- בִּכְלַחַת לִבָּה ‘when they arrived in Lublin’ (Berger 1910b: 108)

**With מ**

- מְחַל ‘from containing/to contain’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 15)
- מְדַבֵּר ‘from speaking’ (Kaidaner 1875: 16a)
- מְלַכֹּת ‘from going’ (Michelsohn 1910b: 9)

8.8.2.1.7 **Prefixed by ל**

In addition to the prefixes ב-, כ-, and מ-, Hasidic Hebrew infinitives construct may be prefixed by ל-, e.g.:
The infinitive construct prefixed by -ל most typically functions as the complement of finite verbs (see 8.8.2.2.1) and in purpose clauses (see 8.8.2.2.3); in such cases it is generally employed in free variation with its unprefixed counterpart. The infinitive construct prefixed by -ל is attested in all previous types of Hebrew. However, the Hasidic Hebrew use of this variant most closely resembles that of biblical and Maskilic literature, in which the variant with -ל is only one of several infinitive construct forms, in contrast to Rabbinic, Israeli, and certain other post-biblical varieties of Hebrew, in which it is the only infinitive construct form in productive use.

8.8.2.1.8 With Subject Suffixes
Unprefixed infinitives construct and those prefixed by -ב, -כ, or -מ are frequently attested with a subject suffix, as shown below. Infinitives construct prefixed by -ל do not typically appear with subject suffixes (see 8.8.2.2.6 for the sole exception to this).

- ושתוע ‘his doing’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 9)
- ובשעון ‘when he heard’ (Bodek 1865c: 19)
- ובשובה ‘and when she returned’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 49)
- ובראות ‘when we saw’ (Laufbahn 1914: 48)

8.8.2.1.9 With Object Suffixes
All types of infinitive construct may take object suffixes in Hasidic Hebrew. However, object suffixes are most commonly found attached to infinitives construct prefixed by -ל, in contrast to those that are unprefixed or prefixed by -ב, -כ, and -מ, which much more frequently appear in conjunction with subject suffixes. These trends are illustrated below.

Prefixed by -ל

- לעتصل ‘to endure him/it’ (Singer 1900a, pt. 1: 8)
- לעטר ‘to bother him’ (Breitstein 1914: 7)
- לעמרה ‘to sell it’ (Yellin 1913: 5)
- לעמות ‘to block him’ (Munk 1898: 35)
Unprefixed

– ‘in order to draw him to himself’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 25)

Note that when an object suffix is attached to a qal infinitive construct, the stem vowel of the infinitive becomes qames haṭuf (represented by ְי), as above. This convention is traceable to Biblical Hebrew (see Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 165–166), but the orthography differs in that qames haṭuf is never represented by ְי in the Hebrew Bible. The Hasidic Hebrew spelling convention is part of a widespread tendency to employ ְי to indicate qames haṭuf (see 3.3.1).

8.8.2.2 Uses
The Hasidic Hebrew infinitive construct has a variety of uses, which, like its morphology, reflect a fusion of influence from biblical and post-biblical forms of the language.

8.8.2.2.1 Complement of Finite Verb
One of the most frequent uses of the Hasidic Hebrew infinitive construct is as the complement of a finite verb. In such cases both the unprefixed infinitive construct and the variant prefixed by ל may be employed. These two possibilities are illustrated below in turn. The variant with ל is slightly more commonly attested than its unprefixed counterpart, but both forms appear frequently and are used in free variation with no clear preference for one as opposed to the other with specific roots or collocations.

Unprefixed

– ‘And the boy took the violin, because he knew how to play the violin’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 32)
– ‘The Ba’al Shem Tov of eternal memory did not let him do so’ (Ehrmann 1903: 3b)
– ‘I did not want to travel to him’ (Laufbahn 1914: 47)

Prefix by ל

– ‘But the rich man didn’t want to give more than half the desired amount’ (Ehrmann 1905: 137b)
‘Our Rebbe wanted to know’ (Heilmann 1902: 57)
‘And he didn’t want to give [it] to him’ (Rosenthal 1909: 47)
‘But I could not ask this of him’ (Michelsohn 1910a: 112)
‘I could not go on’ (Berger 1910a: 15)

This usage partially resembles Biblical Hebrew, in which both the prefixed and unprefixed infinitive construct can serve as the complement of a finite verb; however, in Biblical Hebrew certain finite verbs tend to be found in conjunction with infinitives prefixed by ל while others can be found with either variant (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 606), whereas in Hasidic Hebrew no such distinction is made.

8.8.2.2.2 Nominal
The Hasidic Hebrew infinitive construct only rarely serves as a verbal noun, as this function is typically conveyed by gerunds (see 8.12). An unusual example of an infinitive construct in a nominal role is shown below.

‘Here at the place on which we are standing (lit: on the place of our standing)’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 28)

In this respect Hasidic Hebrew more closely resembles Rabbinic Hebrew, in which the gerund is used to convey nominal meanings (Pérez Fernández 1999: 57–58), rather than Biblical Hebrew, in which the infinitive construct is regularly found in such settings (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 600–601; Morrison 2013); however, as in many aspects of Hasidic Hebrew grammar this usage represents something of a fusion between the biblical and rabbinic models given that nominal infinitives construct are sometimes attested.

8.8.2.2.3 Purpose Clauses
The Hasidic Hebrew infinitive construct is frequently used in the construction of purpose clauses. Such infinitives construct are most commonly prefixed by ל, as in the first set of examples below. Alternatively, they may be formed with an unprefixed infinitive following the particle והלע in order to, as in the second set. Both of these constructions have precedent in Biblical Hebrew (Williams 2007: 83), but only the second one is a feature of Rabbinic Hebrew, in which the unprefixed infinitive construct is not attested (Pérez Fernández 1999: 144).
Prefixed by -ל

- ‘And he took him outside and he stood in order to sanctify the New Moon’ (Bodek 1865c: 14)
- ‘and to gather funds in order to buy meat’ (Berger 1910a: 45)
- ‘What can I do in order to save you?’ (Ehrmann 1905: 44b)
- ‘That man went from town to town in order to collect alms’ (Seuss 1890: 26)

Unprefixed

- ‘in order to justify’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 2)
- ‘in order to take profit’ (M. Walden 1914: 13)
- ‘in order to scare people’ (Breitstein 1914: 26)
- ‘in order for the merchants to have pleasure’ (Shenkel 1903b: 23)

8.8.2.2.4 Temporal

One of the most common uses of the Hasidic Hebrew infinitive construct is in the construction of temporal clauses. Infinitives construct in temporal clauses are typically preceded by the inseparable preposition -ב meaning ‘when’, ‘while’, or ‘just after’. More rarely, they may be prefixed by -כ meaning ‘when/just after’, or preceded by an independent temporal preposition. Infinitives construct in temporal clauses usually have subject suffixes, though they may be followed by an independent subject. These possibilities are illustrated in the following examples.

Prefixed by -ב

- ‘the deed that was done to me when I was standing before a flesh-and-blood king’ (J. Duner 1899: 19)
- ‘And when the righteous Rabbi Abraham had finished these words, he put his hand on the table and laid his head on it’ (Zak 1912: 8)
- ‘And as he looked at it he remembered everything that he had done thus far’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 40)
- ‘I got to know him while we were travelling to the wedding between the
Barditchever and Lubavitcher [Rebbes’ families] (Landau 1892: 6)
– ש”רגההנעתלדהוחתפבו ‘And as he opened the door Rebbe Shmelke answered’ (Michelsohn 1910b: 36–37)
– נוראותו נוחת תפעל 모습 ‘And when he saw them he was greatly amazed’ (Berger 1907: 37)

Prefixed by -כ
– וייח כברה כ…”антשמע מעין אתה ואתם ואתו המודר המשר פונט ‘And as they were speaking to each other as people do, [asking] where are you from, the man said to the merchant, “From such-and-such a town’” (Rodkinsohn 1865: 14)
– גבלתיה לבר טעם משם מדים ‘And when I finished speaking, he immediately travelled away from there’ (HaLevi 1909: 52)
– נ概念股 תפלדר אולמר חפירות ‘When they arrived in Lublin, they separated from each other’ (Berger 1910b: 108)
– ונראותו התוסמ אמור חננ יל השלם ‘And when the wise man saw him, he greeted him’ (Singer 1900b: 26)

Preceded by Independent Preposition
– וייחל על הברה על ההزواה הדוך משפסיך על הزواה עד יבוא שמחה ‘And the rabbi gave him [money] for the expenses of the road that would be sufficient for the expenses until his arrival there’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 12)
– בכת שישיב בפשעם ‘while I was sitting at the feast’ (M. Walden 1912: 29)
– לאחר שהמאטרה חפשמה ‘after he got out of prison’ (Zak 1912: 16)

This use of the infinitive construct closely resembles Biblical Hebrew (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 604–605), in contrast to Rabbinic Hebrew, in which the infinitive is invariably prefixed by -ל and is not employed in temporal clauses (Pérez Fernández 1999: 109–110, 144). However, the Hasidic Hebrew usage differs from that of Biblical Hebrew in that the authors use both -כ and -ל in the sense of either ‘while’ or ‘just after’, whereas in Biblical Hebrew -ל typically means only ‘while’, with the sense of ‘just after’ reserved for -כ (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 604; Williams 2007: 179; see also Gropp 1995 for a detailed comparison of these two constructions). Moreover, the Hasidic Hebrew authors’ use of temporal infinitives construct is not restricted to forms attested in the biblical corpus; rather, they employ the construction productively. In this respect Hasidic Hebrew resembles contemporaneous Maskilic Hebrew, in which such constructions are also a typical feature (Kahn 2009: 235–240).
8.8.2.2.5 Separative

The Hasidic Hebrew authors employ the infinitive construct prefixed by -מ in separative clauses, with reference to an action that the subject has been prevented from or ceased performing. The infinitive may be preceded by an adjective or adverb, with the construction indicating that the action of the infinitive cannot be carried out because of the excessive quality of the adjective. Alternatively, it may be preceded by a finite verb with a sense of delay or cessation. Infinitives construct prefixed by -מ in separative contexts are most commonly prefixed by -ל, as in the first set of examples below. However, they also appear on occasion without -ל, as in the second set.

**Prefixed by -ל**

- יאמר יד ממלנו אצל יהודים 'And he said, “Enough stealing from Jews”' (Sofer 1904: 7)
- [...] ומרפלת מלת חוד השות 'Once [...] he neglected to give another bribe' (Ehmann 1903: 6b)
- והזכיר פסקملابוה 'And afterwards he stopped coming again' (Bromberg 1899: 20)
- עד שבאורהנה פסק לגבר מלאני ומאמות 'until in the end he entirely stopped eating anything' (Landau 1892: 66)
- ופגר פסקמלדער בוש 'The rich man stopped talking about it' (Sobelman 1909/10, pt. 3: 16)
- וה휴ד מלך מלך ליגאל 'And he stopped going to the silversmith any more' (Singer 1900b: 5)
- לא טוב עשוה שנה אי הריב מלאני מלאני והמטוס אנתל 'He did not do well when he denied the Rebbe of Lublin from lodging with him' (Jacob Isaac ben Asher of Przysucha 1908: 93)
- והטללה הוריב אי בנטע ופסק פגעיסמפלד 'And the Rebbe Bunem prayed that the rain would stop falling' (Berger 1910c: 59)

**Without -ל**

- לא אשקוט מדור מוחישה מחודש 'I shall not refrain (lit: be silent) from speaking of the holy man' (Kaidaner 1875: 16a)
- אשר הרטה שער יקר מלכת 'But the wind stopped me from going' (Michelsohn 1910b: 9)
- ואו לא מנע אוחי המלאכים מלתך שלמור התפלת الشريف 'And then the angels did not stop me from going to hear the morning prayer' (Breitstein 1914: 41)
This Hasidic Hebrew usage constitutes a fusion of biblical and rabbinic conventions: in Biblical Hebrew, separative constructions with the infinitive construct typically appear without -ל (Waltke and O'Connor 1990: 603–605), while in Rabbinic Hebrew, infinitives construct are invariably prefixed by -ל (Pérez Fernández 1999: 106) and may be attested with -מ in separative contexts (Sharvit 1998: 336). This phenomenon is part of a widespread tendency in Hasidic Hebrew to combine biblical and post-biblical forms and constructions.

8.8.2.2.6 Epexegetical

The infinitive construct is sometimes used in contexts indicating the conditions under which the action of an associated finite verb took place. Such infinitives construct are most commonly preceded by -ל, as below.

– יתרו אֶתִי יִבָּרֵךְ הַצָּעִיר בְּכָלִים יְדַעֵת (Bodek 1865c: 4)
– חַוֹּל כַּאֲשֶׁר נָשִּׂיאֵת לַעֲבֹרָה לְעִידֹתָה (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 13)
– יִפְגֻּשׁ שִׁירֵי חַסֵּד בַּעֲרֵב מְחַלֶּה הֵמָּה מָכְשׁוֹת (Kaidaner 1875: 19b)

The use of the -ל prefix in conjunction with an infinitive construct in epexegetical settings is rooted in Biblical Hebrew (Waltke and O'Connor 1990: 608–609; Williams 2007: 82). However, the Hasidic authors sometimes employ a subject suffix in these cases, which is unknown in the biblical corpus. Similarly, it does not seem to stem from Rabbinic Hebrew, in which infinitives construct do not appear with subject suffixes (Sharvit 1998: 336). Like many other Hasidic Hebrew features, this seems to be traceable to Medieval Hebrew literature, in which identical forms are attested. For example, the construction ‘my being’ shown in the first example appears in Ibn Ezra’s commentary on Psalms 38:17.

A related construction consists of an infinitive construct with prefixed inseparable preposition -ב and a subject suffix serving to convey an action that is concurrent with, and provides the motivation for, the action of a nearby finite verb. This usage does not have clear precedent in Biblical Hebrew; rather, it may
be a calque of one of the functions of the Yiddish present participle, which can be used to indicate simultaneous action (U. Weinreich 1971: 329).

– אבל העריך לא רצה בה鞍ור, כי הוא רצה לפני רגלו ‘But the pauper didn’t want to, saying that he wanted to go on foot’ (N. Duner 1912: 2)
– שוטטים הסתיימו לו להביחים לא רעת עד התשדים ‘Adversaries incited him to this by proving to him the evil of the community of Hasidim’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 19)

8.9 Stems

The stems in use in Hasidic Hebrew are shown in the following table. Note-worthy morphological, syntactic, and semantic aspects of each stem will be discussed in turn below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Passive</th>
<th>Reflexive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qal</td>
<td>Nifal</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piel</td>
<td>Pual</td>
<td>Hitpael/Nitpael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitpael/Nitpael (intransitive)</td>
<td>Hitpael/Nitpael</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polel, pilpel</td>
<td>Polal, polpal</td>
<td>Hitpolel, Hitpalpel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hifil</td>
<td>Hofal</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.9.1 Qal

The morphology and syntax of the qal typically conforms to earlier varieties of Hebrew. Exceptions and other noteworthy phenomena are discussed below.

8.9.1.1 Qal Passive

The qal passive is attested in the Hasidic Hebrew tale corpus but is rare. It is restricted to a small number of yiqṭol and wayyiqṭol forms, shown below. Theoretically such cases may stem directly from the biblical corpus; however, the forms ייiltr ‘it will be given’ and חייל ‘he/it will be born’ appear relatively frequently in the works of medieval writers including Ibn Ezra and Abarbanel, and since the Hasidic authors often drew on this type of medieval literature, their occasional use of qal passives is more likely to constitute one such case.
It will be given’ (Bodek 1865c: 8)
– דָּלַי ‘He/it will be born’ (J. Duner 1899: 36)
– נוֹחֵל לָהֵם בּ ‘And a son was born to them’ (Heilmann 1902: 1)

8.9.1.2 Stative qal

Qal verbs formed according to the stative pattern are sometimes attested in Hasidic Hebrew, most typically of the following roots. (Some of these qal forms have active rather than stative meaning, as in Biblical Hebrew; see Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 118–120 for details.)

– ג.ב.ר.’grow strong’
– מ.ב.ח.’be wise’
– ש.ב.ל.’wear’
– ד.מ.ל.’learn’
– צ.פ.ק.’be small’
– ר.צ.ק.’be short’
– ב.ב.ש.’lie (down)’

As in many other aspects of Hasidic Hebrew grammar, the use of qal stative forms seems to reflect a mixture of conventions from different earlier strata of the language. Some of the stative roots in the tales, e.g. ב.ב.ש.’lie (down), are common features of many historical types of Hebrew, while others, e.g. ג.ב.ר.’grow strong’, צ.פ.ק.’be small’, ר.צ.ק.’be short’, and מ.ב.ח.’be wise’ are attested in the biblical corpus but uncommon in Rabbinic Hebrew, having been replaced by adjectival constructions (Segal 1927: 55; Pérez Fernández 1999: 98). However, these types of stative qal forms are sometimes found in the writings of Abarbanel and Alshich; this suggests that, as in many other cases discussed in this study, the Hasidic Hebrew authors’ use of seemingly biblical elements may actually be partially attributable to the forms’ appearance in these post-biblical texts.

Stative qal verbs can be attested as 3ms or 3fs yiqṭol and wayyiqṭol forms, as in the following sets of examples respectively.

Yiqṭol

– תַּקֵּשֶׁר הַיְּרֵשָׁה הַמַּכְּבָל ‘The page is too short to contain [them]’ (Shalom of Koidanov 1882: 13)
– יְבִּא אָם אֲנָה לְכִי חָוָלָם נַעֲשֶׂן לְמִלְבֹּם ‘Because if I reveal [it] the whole world will become small before you’ (Zak 1912: 19)
The stative roots most commonly attested in the qatal are לכבשׁה ‘lie (down)’ and נבשׁה ‘grow strong’, as below.

- והרוהה ההנהור ילמד/The youth Shneur Zalman excelled greatly in studies, more so than all of his generation, and he was wiser than any man in his generation’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 1)

In the yiqtol, wayyiqtol, and infinitive construct statives typically have patah (represented by lack of mater lectionis) instead of holm as their stem vowel, as in Biblical Hebrew (see Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 117, 125; Pat-El 2013). However, forms that would have patah in Biblical Hebrew are sometimes attested with holm, represented by the.

- וַתְּרַעְּנָהּ ‘The page would be [too] short’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 47)
- וַתְּרַעְּנָהּ ‘that he should wear the card’ (Kaidaner 1875: 17b)
- וַתְּרַעְּנָהּ ‘when he studies’ (Bodek 1865a: 5)
- וַתְּרַעְּנָהּ ‘And he rode’ (Michelsohn 1912: 49)
- וַתְּרַעְּנָהּ ‘to lie down’ (M. Walden 1914: 8)
The above pattern has occasional precedent in the Mishnah (Haneman 1980:107) and also appears in other rabbinic sources such as the Talmud and midrashim. This overlaps with a related phenomenon in Hasidic Hebrew whereby qal yiqṭol, wayyiqṭol, and infinitives construct of 11-guttural roots appear with holem as their stem vowel (see 8.10.1.2).

8.9.1.3 Non-Standard Transitive qal
The Hasidic Hebrew authors often employ qal forms with transitive or causative force, in contrast to other forms of the language in which they would be intransitive. In most such cases one would expect to find a verb of the same root in the hifil instead of a qal. This phenomenon is illustrated in the following examples:

– יזא יאמטנעה הדרך באיה מפער העמוד גביש עמוסים לטרע עותך ‘And in the middle of the journey, in some village, the wagon-driver stopped the horses in order to graze them’ (Bromberg 1899:29)
– יזא יכיב ינסק יאוה ואו אומת שונות הל הדר ‘And he hugged and kissed him, and he told [them] to return the child to her’ (Munk 1898:18)
– יזא יתכה לקח אתו אבנרי עםו אומת הבוח חספנוק שלחר ‘And his aforementioned father immediately took him and stood him in the Rebbe’s boat’ (Bodek 1866:18)
– יזא ידרדר אתו לוהתי ‘And I brought him down to this world’ (Lieberson 1913:22)
– יזא יאנלַי עErrorMessage אניוה בּמנ ‘I will be able to stand her before you’ (Ehrmann 1903:8b)
– יזא יואמר לו שאתי מזאת שיחזור למכ הרדור ‘And tell him that I command that he repeat the sermon for you’ (Kaidaner 1875:36a)
– יזא יטשיב אדמרלו ליליא ע ErrorMessage יאמרו מפורק יעלוק ‘And the Rebbe of blessed memory said, “Let them put cups and leeches on him”’ (Zak 1912:21)
– יזא ימש ברי הייד בתו דמכ והזראה ‘The LORD, blessed be He, will remove that woe from you’ (Singer 1900b:25)
– יזא ימש [סי ישרור ולי ומכ] ‘he who returns the ring to him’ (Breitstein 1914:29)
– יזא יועני בולחץ להNullPointerException ויווורה מיס ‘And his eyes were sticking out and dripping water’ (A. Walden 1860?:5a)
– יזא ירה האדמיר ידוק אוץ בחרבי איוו אומת ‘Look, the gentleman will stab me with his sword or kill me’ (Seuss 1890:15)

In a significant minority of these cases the object of the qal is a form of the reflexive pronoun - ‘self’ (discussed in 6.6), e.g.
The origins of this non-standard causative use of the qal are not completely clear. In some cases it may be attributable to phonological considerations. The final unstressed \( \text{ו} \) in qal forms such as \( \text{לוזחי} \) and \( \text{דומעי} \) would have been pronounced as \([\text{ǝ}]\) according to the conventions of the authors' Ashkenazi Hebrew (see U. Weinreich 1965: 43); the qal forms would thus have been aurally identical to their hifil counterparts, which may have caused the authors to perceive the two stems as identical. This confusion may have been extended by analogy to other qal forms that did not correspond in sound to their hifil equivalents. More generally, this widespread extension of causative function from the hifil to the qal suggests that the Hasidic Hebrew may have been in a process of development whereby a causative function was evolving as part of the qal stem. This may in turn point to a certain erosion of the stem system in favour of one in which the same verb may be used in both a transitive and intransitive sense, as in e.g. English.

Note that this unexpected use of qal instead of hifil is not universal; in some cases the authors do follow historical Hebrew precedent in the case of these roots, as below; however, this is less common than the non-standard usage.

A separate but related phenomenon is commonly attested whereby the qal appears instead of its expected piel counterpart. This is confined to the root ל,\( \text{מ},\)\( \text{ד}, \)which in other forms of Hebrew is typically used in the qal to mean ‘learn’ and in the piel to mean ‘teach’ (Even-Shoshan 2003: 843), but which in the Hasidic tales is used in the qal to mean ‘teach’, as below. In contrast to the more widespread causative use of the qal instead of the hifil discussed above,
this phenomenon is most likely a calque from Yiddish, in which the verb can mean either 'learn' or 'teach'.

- And she asked him not to teach him that craft' (Singer 1900b: 5)
- And every night they would teach me a different skill' (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 44)
- The students of the Baʾal Shem Tov asked him once to teach them the attribute of [spiritual] levels' (Ehrmann 1903: 3b)

8.9.2 Nifal

As in the case of the qal, the morphology and syntax of the Hasidic Hebrew nifal typically follow historical standards. The only noteworthy issue relating to this stem concerns the form of the infinitive construct prefixed by -ל: it has two variants, both of which are more or less equally common and are employed interchangeably. The variants reflect a fusion of biblical and rabbinic precedent. The first one has -ל preceding the first radical, i.e. it is spelt defectively, with the standard ה prefix of the nifal following the -ל. This convention resembles those typically found in the biblical corpus (van der Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze 1999: 77–78).

- to remain' (1894: 5)
- to be separated, take leave' (Sobelman 1909/10, pt. 3: 18)
- ‘to give in’ (Heilmann 1902: 88)
- ‘and to enter’ (Sofer 1904: 13)
- ‘to be careful' (Kaidaner 1875: 18b)

The second variant has -ל preceding the first radical, i.e. it is spelt plene and there is no ה prefix. This form resembles Rabbinic Hebrew and later rabbinic-based varieties of the language (see Pérez Fernández 1999: 96 for a discussion of this phenomenon in Rabbinic Hebrew; see Betzer 2001: 58 for examples of the same feature in medieval and early modern responsa literature).

- to be annulled’ (Zak 1912: 142)
- ‘to pass away’, ‘to part’ (Michelsohn 1905: 85)
- ‘to enter’ (Sofer 1904: 28)
- ‘to be careful’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 3)
- ‘to swear’ (Bodek 1865b: 30)
- ‘to get rid of’ (J. Duner 1899: 14)
Very rarely a nifal infinitive construct appears with both י and ה, representing a fusion of the two other variants:

– לָהֶרֶד ‘to separate’ (Rosenthal 1909: 45)

Below are unusual examples of a converse phenomenon whereby both י and ה are omitted:

– לָפֶס הַלְּבָן יִתֵּן ‘to enter Paradise’ (Gemen 1914: 63)
– לָפֶס הַלְּבָן יִתֵּן ‘to enter in to [see] the Rebbe’ (Munk 1898: 28)
– מִתְבַּרְבוּת הָיוֹת לַשָּׁאך בְּנֵית ‘I was forced to stay in my house’ (Ehrmann 1903: 17b)

8.9.3 Piel
The Hasidic Hebrew piel in Hasidic Hebrew corresponds in form and usage to that of other varieties of the language.

8.9.4 Pual
The pual serves as a full verbal form in Hasidic Hebrew, appearing as a qaṭal, yiqṭol, and wayyiqṭol as well as a qoṭel, as illustrated below.

In the qaṭal Hasidic Hebrew pual forms are most commonly 3ms, e.g.:

– שָׁקֵב ‘He was sought’ (Kaidaner 1875: 46a)
– שָׁרָג ‘He was banished’ (Berger 1906: 16)
– לָדֹג ‘He was raised’ (Kamelhar 1909: 24)
– הָסָר ‘She got engaged’ (Bodek 1865c: 10)

The pual appears in the yiqṭol quite frequently. As in the qaṭal, such forms are usually 3ms, e.g.:

– יָקִב ‘It will be explained’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 26)
– יָרוּש ‘And [someone] will be searched for’ (Bodek 1865c: 4)
– יָנוּנִב ‘It (here: they) will be stolen’ (Kaidaner 1875: 16b)
– יָבְשָׁל ‘It will be cancelled out’ (Lieberson 1913: 42)
– יָדְר ‘It will be spoken’ (Ehrmann 1903: 3a)
– יָכֹל ‘It is/will be accepted’ (Sofer 1904: 28)
– יָסִפ ‘It is told’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 54)
– בָּאָשׁ כְּפֶר עֹזֶן ‘With this your sin will be atoned for’ (Berger 1910c: 12)
– הָדֹר ‘The matter will be clarified’ (A. Walden 1860?: 21a)

In addition, it occasionally appears as a 3mp, e.g.:

– בָּאָשׁ כְּפֶר עֹזֶן ‘With this your sin will be atoned for’ (Berger 1910c: 12)
verbs

– יזורתי ‘They will be explained’ (Kaidaner 1875: 13b)

3fs is also rarely attested, e.g.:

– בובשל ‘It will be cooked’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 23)
– אשים ‘Our guilt will be atoned’ (Ehrmann 1903: 9b)

_Pual_ wayyiqṭol is also sometimes attested, again typically in the 3ms, e.g.:

– ישול ‘And it was repaid’ (Bodek 1866: 33)
– יסר ‘And it was told’ (Berger 1910b: 87)

Finally, as in other types of Hebrew the _pual_ is commonly attested in the _qoṭel_, e.g.:

– מקור ‘closely linked’ (HaLevi 1907: 22a)
– מקול ‘able’ (Michelsohn 1910c: 22)
– משודת ‘matched (in marriage)’ (Sofer 1904: 11)
– משעבים ‘enslaved’ (Zak 1912: 35)

The Hasidic Hebrew use of the _pual_ mirrors Biblical Hebrew, in which the stem appears in the same conjugations (see van der Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze 1999: 81–82). By contrast, it differs from Rabbinic Hebrew, in which the _pual_ is almost entirely restricted to adjectival _qoṭel_ forms (Bar-Asher 1999: 66; Pérez Fernández 1999: 95). Interestingly, it also contrasts with Eastern European Hebrew responsa literature, in which non-participial _pual_ forms are rarely attested (Betzer 2001: 60). However, the fact that the Hasidic Hebrew verbal _pual_ is restricted to the third person suggests a somewhat more limited role than verbs in other stems which are more widely represented in all persons. While this resembles Biblical Hebrew to some degree, as the _pual_ is relatively rare in that form of the language as well (Joūon-Muraoka 2006: 153), the Hasidic usage is more restricted than that of its biblical predecessor, in which the _pual_ is sometimes attested in the first and second person.

8.9.5 Hitpael/Nitpael

The Hasidic Hebrew _hitpael_ and _nitpael_ exhibit a somewhat higher number of divergences from other forms of the language and other noteworthy morphological and syntactic characteristics than the other stems. These will be examined below.
Metathesis and Assimilation of Sibilants and Dentals

Hasidic Hebrew hitpael and nitpael forms whose first radical is a sibilant or dental usually exhibit metathesis and assimilation in accordance with standard historical Hebrew precedent. This is illustrated below.

- ‘And we looked’ (Landau 1892: 37)
- ‘He hurries’ (Zak 1912: 9)
- ‘to justify himself’ (Sofer 1904: 3)
- ‘to amuse oneself’ (Laufbahn 1914: 46)

However, in certain cases Hasidic Hebrew hitpael/nitpael forms do not undergo the expected assimilation. This phenomenon is most commonly seen in the case of the root בּ. This non-assimilation occurs in the qatal, infinitive construct, and qotiel. The following examples illustrate these points. As in the case of many other non-canonical elements of Hasidic Hebrew grammar, this variant is attested in, and may therefore have been inspired by, the writings of medieval commentators such as Abarbanel and Ibn Ezra.

- ‘until they became extremely connected’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 51)
- ‘to stay close to the wise ones’ (J. Duner 1899: 95)
- ‘to stay close and connecting himself to the Holy One blessed be He’ (Landau 1892: 43)
- ‘a contagious sick person’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 12)
- ‘one who cleaves to them’ (Bodek 1865a: 10)
- ‘one who clove to him’ (Hirsch 1900: 46)
- ‘to stay close to him’ (Brandwein 1912: 8)
- ‘to cleave to the King of Kings’ (N. Duner 1912: 12)
- ‘to cleave to a/the man’ (? 1894: 24)

Although this phenomenon is most commonly restricted to the root בּ, it also appears rarely with other roots, as below. In the case of the final example, a 3ms nitpael of the same root appears without assimilation in a Hebrew sentence in the Zohar (Megillat Shir haShirim), though it is unclear whether Shenkel was influenced by this sole earlier attestation of the form. It is alternatively possible that the Hasidic Hebrew forms are independent developments based on analogy with the standard nitpael.
8.9.5.2 Hitpael versus nitpael

The tale authors make frequent use of both the characteristically biblical hitpael and its typically post-biblical equivalent nitpael. Their motivations for selecting one form instead of the other on any given occasion are varied.

In some cases, they may have chosen one of the variants because the verb in question was familiar to them in that particular form from a well-known earlier source. Thus, in some cases the selection of a hitpael may be due to the fact that the form in question is particularly well-attested in familiar portions of the Hebrew Bible, while conversely it does not appear frequently as a nitpael in rabbinic and medieval literature. The following example may constitute such a case:

וְיַחֲלְתָּהְתָּ הַקָּדֶשׁ 'I walked before him' (M. Walden 1914: 27); cf. יִתְּכַ֣לַּהְתִּי נָעָוִ֑נֶ֑י מֵעְלֵֽיהֶֽם 'And I have walked before you' (1 Sam. 12:2)

Similarly, in some cases the authors’ selection of the nitpael may have been modelled on rabbinic or rabbinic-based literature. This explanation is likely when the root in question is rare or unattested in the biblical corpus as a hitpael but conversely is well-attested in post-biblical literature as a nitpael. The following example illustrates such a case:

וַיָּכַלֵּלֶֽהַל גְּלֶֽלִים 'it was revealed' (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 22); cf. e.g. Bereshit Rabba Miqqes; Abarbanel on Gen. 31

However, in most cases no such motivations are apparent, and instead the authors seem to regard these two variants as synonymous and interchangeable, employing them in free variation in the same way as e.g. the variants of certain personal pronouns (as discussed in 6.1.1). Thus, they may select a hitpael even when the corresponding nitpael is frequently attested in post-biblical literature, and conversely a nitpael despite the existence of a biblical hitpael. There do not usually seem to be semantic factors such as difference in register motivating the selection of one form instead of the other on any given occasion. This is illustrated in the following examples, which contain hitpael forms on the left and their nitpael counterparts on the right, often within close proximity to each other in the work of a single author. In this respect Hasidic Hebrew resembles...
the language of contemporaneous Maskilic prose fiction, which employs both hitpael and nitpael forms in similar contexts (Kahn 2009: 13–17).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hitpael</th>
<th>Nitpael</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>קזחתה 'He became more resolute' (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 37)</td>
<td>קזחתנ 'He became more resolute' (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קזחתנה 'They gathered together' (Bodek 1865a: 61)</td>
<td>תנקובנ 'They gathered together' (Bodek 1865a: 39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ותצבקתה 'And he prayed' (Hirsch 1900: 55)</td>
<td>ותצבקתנ 'He prayed the evening prayer' (Jacob Isaac ben Asher of Przysucha 1908: 49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והתחפשת 'And he lodged' (M. Walden 1914: 38)</td>
<td>ננסכתנ 'He lodged' (Kaidaner 1875: 13a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.9.5.3 Nitpael in qoṭel

In Hasidic Hebrew the difference between the nitpael and hitpael is typically visible only in the qatal, given that in the yiqtol the -ן prefix is replaced by preformative suffixes, while in the imperative and infinitives it is replaced by a ה prefix and in the qoṭel it is replaced by the standard -ן prefix characteristic of the derived stems. This division is identical to that of the standard rabbinic nitpael (Segal 1927: 64; Pérez Fernández 1999: 95). However, the -ן prefix of the nitpael sometimes appears in the qoṭel. This phenomenon is quite rare but appears in various different qoṭel forms, e.g.:

- וילאהתפתניתייהאלו 'But I was not tempted by him' (Bromberg 1899: 26)
- קידצהמןירפסמשתעבתררועתנהמישרהתאז 'This description comes to life (lit: is awoken) when one tells of the Tzaddik' (Munk 1898: 1)
-ךלשתוקיפדבתנווכתנהנווכהזיא 'What is the meaning of your knocking?' (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 33)
-םלועבםיווהתנשןיקיטנאלשׁןינעה 'the matter of ancient things that manifest themselves in the world' (Zak 1912: 138)

This practice is noteworthy because it is not commonly recognized as a standard feature of Rabbinic Hebrew, though certain mishnaic manuscripts exhibit an identical practice (see Bar-Asher 1977: 88–95; Qimron 1977); these may constitute a vernacular variant of the standard version (Bar-Asher 1999: 56). It seems unlikely that the Hasidic Hebrew phenomenon is based directly on these
forms, since it is doubtful that the printed Mishnahs available to the authors would have reproduced them. However, the phenomenon is attested in Rashi’s biblical and Talmudic commentaries (Betzer 2001: 106), as well as in Ashkenazi responsa literature (Kaddari 1991: 358–382) and these writings are conversely very likely to have influenced the Hasidic Hebrew authors. Nevertheless, the precise nitpael qoṭel forms with -נ prefix appearing in the Hasidic Hebrew corpus seem to be somewhat productive (though rare), as they do not always have much precedent in earlier writings that are likely to have informed the tales directly. Qimron (1977: 145–146) notes a widespread presence of nitpael qoṭel forms in the non-narrative early nineteenth-century Hasidic writings Liqqute Moharan and Degel Maḥane Efrayim. Interestingly, the tale authors do not follow this precedent, employing such forms only very infrequently; this lack of correspondence may be due to the difference in genre.

8.9.5.4 Uses of the hitpael/nitpael
The Hasidic Hebrew hitpael/nitpael most typically conveys intransitive, inchoative, and passive actions, but may also convey reflexive and reciprocal ones. The meaning of each given hitpael/nitpael is lexically conditioned, and in this respect the Hasidic Hebrew authors do not generally display innovation in their use of the stem but rather follow established biblical and/or post-biblical precedent in their use of any given hitpael/nitpael form. A notable exception to this trend concerns their employment of the hitpael/nitpael in conjunction with a reflexive pronoun as direct object, to be discussed below.

8.9.5.4.1 Passive
The Hasidic Hebrew hitpael/nitpael sometimes functions as a passive stem. The passive function of this stem is traceable to Rabbinic Hebrew (Halevy 2013), in contrast to Biblical Hebrew wherein it is typically reflexive or reciprocal (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 429; Williams 2007: 63; Blau 2010: 232). Some hitpael/nitpael forms with a passive sense are shown below:

– ‘Indeed the debt will not be paid for you with this’ (Ehrmann 1903: 21b)
– ‘when he saw that he had been healed from his illness’ (Breitstein 1914: 61)
– ‘Unpleasant things were discovered about that cantor’ (Kaidaner 1875: 20b)
– ‘Their prayer was (lit: were) accepted’ (Bodek 1865c: 19)
8.9.5.4.2 **Intransitive and Inchoative**
The *hitpael/nitpael* frequently conveys intransitive and inchoative actions, as below. Like other Hasidic Hebrew uses of the *hitpael/nitpael*, this usage is lexically conditioned and the roots in question are typically found with similar meaning in earlier forms of the language.

- ‘I walked before him’ (M. Walden 1914: 27)
- ‘Didn’t I pray with you?’ (Laufbahn 1914: 50)
- ‘A great consuming fire started’ (Ehrmann 1903: 1b)
- ‘And then his mind calmed down (lit: cooled)’ (Bromberg 1899: 35)

8.9.5.4.3 **Reflexive**
The Hasidic Hebrew *hitpael/nitpael* can also be used to denote reflexive or reciprocal actions, as below. This usage is unsurprising given that the expression of reflexivity is the chief function of the stem in Biblical Hebrew (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 429; Williams 2007: 63; Blau 2010: 232) and is also one of its uses in Rabbinic Hebrew (Pérez Fernández 1999: 100).

- ‘to afflict themselves and recite Psalms’ (Munk 1898: 18)
- ‘What is this, that the whole city has gathered together?’ (Sofer 1904: 1)

However, the Hasidic Hebrew treatment of the *hitpael/nitpael* in reflexive contexts often differs strikingly from that of earlier (and later) forms of the language in that it is relatively commonly found in conjunction with direct objects conveyed explicitly by the reflexive pronoun -מצע ‘-self’ (discussed in 6.6), e.g.:

- ‘Is it not so that when they gather together in love they join themselves together amongst themselves’ (J. Duner 1899: 41)
- ‘and one who merits staying close and connecting himself to the Holy One blessed be He’ (Landau 1892: 43)
- ‘And it was told that the Emperor Napoleon disguised himself as a private citizen’ (Berger 1910b: 87)
- ‘And he made himself strong’ (Rosenthal 1909: 24)
- ‘He said to me that he glorified himself’ (M. Walden 1914: 9)
- ‘He behaves extravagantly’ (Chikernik 1903a: 27)
And he dressed himself up as a neighbour woman’ (Brandwein 1912: 2)

This usage deviates from the standard in other forms of Hebrew whereby the hitpael/nitpael is strictly intransitive and does not appear in conjunction with a direct object, whether reflexive or not. Instead, it closely resembles the authors’ native Yiddish, in which transitive verbs can be made reflexive by the addition of the pronoun יד‎ ‘oneself’ following the verb. Thus, יאָטעגנאָהרע means ‘he put on (an item of clothing)’, while its reflexive counterpart יאָטעגנאָהרע יד‎ means ‘he dressed himself’. It is possible that in the cases in question, the authors instinctively made recourse to this Yiddish model because there were no prominent earlier Hebrew constructions of which they could avail themselves in order to convey their desired meaning. For example, in the final example above the root הִלֵּבַשׁ is not attested in the hitpael in the Hebrew Bible at all and is not a common feature of rabbinic literature (though it does appear occasionally in the Talmud and in medieval and early modern works by e.g. Moses Alshich, which may explain their selection of this stem in the first place). The lack of a well-known Hebrew equivalent for the concept of ‘dressing oneself’, which would have been familiar to the authors from their native language, may have prompted them to adopt that mode of expression in their Hebrew writing. This phenomenon is attested in Eastern European responsa, likewise under Yiddish influence (Betzer 1997: 26–29), and indeed appears much earlier in the twelfth/thirteenth-century Ashkenazi Hebrew work Sefer Ḥasidim, where it is again traceable to Yiddish (Nobel 1958: 172).

8.9.6 Hifil
Like the qal and the nifal, the Hasidic Hebrew hifil corresponds to that of earlier varieties of the language. Exceptions are discussed below.

8.9.6.1 Unshortened Imperatives
Hasidic Hebrew hifil masculine singular imperatives typically appear in shortened form, as is standard in other varieties of the language. However, occasionally a hifil is attested in unshortened form, with י in the second syllable, e.g.:

– הרבי נא אָוִּה לֵפִי ‘Please bring him before me’ (Bodek 1865a: 70)
– חָק מְתַלעָבָה הָוָּשׁ מָחַמְרֵי אָוִּה וַאֲסֶפְּנָיָא שִׁלַּך ‘Take the wagon and the horses, and station them at your inn’ (N. Duner 1912: 24)

This convention deviates from historical standard, according to which hifil masculine singular imperatives typically appear without hireq-yod following the
second radical (Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 149). However, like many other aspects of Hasidic Hebrew grammar it corresponds to nineteenth-century Maskilic Hebrew (see Kahn 2009: 49–52). Interestingly, it is more marginal in Hasidic than in Maskilic Hebrew, which goes against the common perception first propagated by Maskilic authors that Hasidic Hebrew grammar is much less in keeping with historical standards than their own writing.

8.9.6.2 Shortened Infinitive Construct

The form of the Hasidic Hebrew hifil infinitive construct usually corresponds to that of other historical varieties of the language. However, occasionally a hifil infinitive construct prefixed by ל- appears in shortened form, without the י before the final radical, as shown below.

– ארסומךלהלוכרדהיהיכ for it was his way to bring a chair with him’ (Munk 1898: 24)
– לאされていた לכל חולם על שבת ‘She didn't have anything to prepare for the Sabbath’ (HaLevi 1909: 53)
– ולחסמר멀יםאתהחובותעם ‘and to remove the pieces of wood from on top of them’ (M. Walden 1914: 124)

This phenomenon lacks clear precedent in the canonical forms of Hebrew. Similar forms are attested in the language of Palestinian piyyutim (Rand 2006: 101–102), but the precise forms do not seem to overlap and are unlikely to have exerted a strong influence on the Hasidic Hebrew authors, who may not have been familiar with these forms at all. It is instead more likely that the authors formed their anomalous hifil infinitives construct on analogy with hifil infinitive absolute, which has sere in the final syllable. Interestingly, the same phenomenon is attested in contemporaneous Maskilic Hebrew literature (Kahn 2009: 53–55); this seems to be one of many unprecedented and non-standard features shared by nineteenth-century Hasidic and Maskilic Hebrew authors (see Kahn 2012b for a detailed discussion of such correspondences) and may constitute a feature of a more widespread Eastern European form of Hebrew, as noted throughout this volume.

8.9.6.3 Hifil with Two Direct Objects

Some Hasidic Hebrew hifil verbs may govern two direct objects despite the fact that logically one of the objects is direct and the other is indirect. This type of construction is limited to a few roots such as ר.א.ר ‘show’ and ב.ב. ‘dress’ that can theoretically take both a direct and indirect object in the hifil, as illustrated below. The practice has precedent in earlier forms of Hebrew (see...
Waltke and O'Connor 1990: 441–442 for details of this type of construction in Biblical Hebrew).

- ‘And he said, “Why did they show him this”’
  (Bromberg 1899: 16)
- ‘And he dressed him [in] his clothes’
  (Ehrmann 1903: 8b)
- ‘And he showed him the letter’
  (Singer 1900b: 3)
- ‘And he wanted to promise him either wealth or good sons’
  (M. Walden 1914: 59)
- ‘And the Ba’al Shem Tov asked him to show him the chicken’
  (Sofer 1904: 5)

8.9.6.4 Non-Standard Intransitive hifil

Just as the Hasidic Hebrew authors often use the qal in a sense that would traditionally be conveyed by a hifil of the same root (discussed in 8.9.1.3), so they conversely often utilize a hifil where one might expect to find a qal, or sometimes a hitpael/nitpael or nifal, of the same root.

Most frequently, a traditionally causative hifil appears in Hasidic Hebrew with an intransitive sense instead of an expected qal. This is most common with the root ש.ו.ב, which may be used in the tales with the meaning ‘go back’ rather than the expected ‘bring back’, e.g.:

- ‘Don’t return to your house’
  (Bodek 1865c: 1)
- ‘We can’t repent, because we have no power’
  (Lieberson 1913: 53)

Less commonly, a hifil with a traditionally transitive sense may be used intransitively instead of an expected hitpael/nitpael. For example, in the following extract the hifil הרכתה is used in the intransitive/reflexive sense of ‘prepare oneself’ that one would expect to be conveyed by its hitpolel equivalent הרכתהו.

- ‘Until they all prepared to travel [to] the city’
  (Kaidaner 1875: 32b)

Likewise, a traditionally causative or transitive hifil may be used with the intransitive sense of a nifal of the same root. Thus, in the following example the hifil הבכעה is used with the intransitive force of ‘I entered’ instead of the expected nifal הבכעה.

- ‘Until they all prepared to travel [to] the city’
  (Kaidaner 1875: 32b)
His daughter said to him, “I entered the wedding canopy with him” (Munk 1898: 25)

In other cases, the hifil may have a completely different meaning than the qal, and the former is employed with the sense of the latter. This phenomenon (shown below) is restricted to the hifil, which is sometimes used in the sense of ‘pull’ like its qal counterpart, instead of in the more usual sense of ‘continue’. This particular case is almost certainly a calque from Yiddish, in which the verb can mean both ‘pull’ and ‘continue’ (Beinfeld and Bochner 2013: 577). This is clearly illustrated in the last example, which is a direct translation of the Yiddish idiom ‘עט נעיצ עט נעיצ יפרעלעך’ (Beinfeld and Bochner 2013: 626).

And he was afraid to enter them because there was no one who would pull him back from there' (Bromberg 1899: 35)

And by his striking with the whip he pulled him out of the water!' (Ehrmann 1903: 35b)

And in some years he had the habit of drawing lots on one of the nights of Hanukkah’ (Landau 1892: 35)

With the exception of the Yiddish-inspired use of the hifil of מְשִׁים in the sense of ‘pull’, this non-standard usage (like the converse phenomenon affecting the qal) does not have clear historical precedent. Again, in some cases it may be rooted in phonological considerations: hifil forms containing ‘ in their final syllable such as הִמָּת ‘he will kill’ and יִשָּׁב ‘he will return’ would have been realized as [ǝ] in the authors’ Ashkenazi Hebrew pronunciation (U. Weinreich 1965: 43), rendering them aurally identical to their qal counterparts מָת ‘he will die’ and יִשָּׁב ‘he will return’. This resemblance may have led the authors to regard the two stems as interchangeable in such cases. This phenomenon, like many others discussed in this volume, indicates the key role of oral as opposed to written forms in the shaping of Hasidic Hebrew grammar. In cases wherein no such factor is present, the development may likewise have been based on analogy with the phonologically triggered overlap. Again as in the case of the non-standard transitive qal forms, this may suggest that the system of stems was in the process of levelling in Hasidic Hebrew whereby the boundary between the hifil and the qal was merging with regard to causative function.
8.9.7 Hofal
Like the *pual*, the Hasidic Hebrew *hofal* is a verbal form rather than solely an adjectival *qoṭel*. In contrast to the *pual*, the verbal nature of the *hofal* has remained relatively constant in post-biblical forms of Hebrew and so its use in Hasidic Hebrew does not demand special comment; however, the use of the stem in the tales exhibits several noteworthy characteristics, as detailed below.

Verbal *hofal* forms are most commonly found in the *qaṭal* and may appear in a variety of persons, though they are predominantly limited to a few roots, e.g.:

- החרכה 'He was forced' (Rodkinsohn 1865: 20)
- הוחלט 'And it was decided' (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 16)
- הובאה 'It was brought' (M. Walden 1914: 123)
- הובארו 'They were forced' (Laufbahn 1914: 50)
- והכברתי [...] 'I was forced' (Bromberg 1899: 26)
- ותרבייתי 'I needed' (Sofer 1904: 3)
- והכרוננו 'We were made to be accustomed' (Bodek 1866: 7)
- וה удалось 'You (p) needed' (Munk 1898: 25)

In contrast to the *pual*, the *hofal* is only relatively rarely attested in the *yiqṭol* compared to the *qaṭal*. In such cases it is usually a 3ms or 3mp, e.g.:

- יבוי 'It should be understood' (Kaidaner 1875: 21b)
- ביטצת 'He is promised' (Sofer 1904: 4)
- ויירה 'And they will be recognized' (Rodkinsohn 1865: 24)

Like its *pual* counterpart, the Hasidic Hebrew *hofal* most commonly appears as an adjectival *qoṭel* (as in other forms of Hebrew).

- מובשת לъ 'It is promised to him' (Laufbahn 1914: 46)
- השעה המונהלת 'the designated hour' (Bodek 1866: 43)
- מוכתרים 'obligated' (Landau 1892: 8)

8.9.8 Minor Stems
Minor stems such as the *polel*, *hitpolel*, and *pilpel* appear relatively often in the Hasidic Hebrew tales and are attested in a range of persons and conjugations, as illustrated below.
8.9.8.1 **Hitpolel**
The *hitpolel* is the most common of the minor stems, e.g.:

- העצוה[...] ‘He found shelter’ (Zak 1912: 7)
- ונהיזמה ‘And I was astonished’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 22)
- לתרוב ‘to understand’ (J. Duner 1899: 18)
- לחשחק ‘to yearn’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 2: 16)
- נהדר ‘He became poor’ (Gemen 1914: 71)

8.9.8.2 **Polel**
The *polel* is also attested, e.g.:

- ענה ‘It (f) stirred’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 41)
- לעור ‘to awaken’ (Michelsohn 1910b: 41)
- ויורה ‘And he woke them up’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 14ii3)
- והשת_font ‘And they wandered’ (Laufbahn 1914: 51)

8.9.8.3 **Pilpel**
The *pilpel* is likewise attested, e.g.:

- לאמש ‘to polish’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 32)
- יעשה ‘And he checked’ (Laufbahn 1914: 48)
- בכבר ‘to turn (something) around’ (Landau 1892: 17)
- ללק ‘They ruined’ (Sofer 1904: 17)

8.9.8.4 **Others**
Other minor stems are occasionally attested, such as the *polpal* and the *hit-palpel* in the following examples:

- מקהל ‘ruined’ (M. Walden 1914: 52)
- ושעשוע ‘and amuse himself’ (Gemen 1914: 60)

8.10 **Root Classes**

The Hasidic Hebrew tales exhibit some noteworthy and unprecedented morphological features relating to the various root classes, as detailed below.

---

3 Two consecutive pages in this text are both numbered 14.
8.10.1 **11-Guttural**

Qal *yiqtol* and *wayyiqtol* of 11-guttural roots may follow one of two different patterns in Hasidic Hebrew, reflecting conflicting influences from various historical forms of the language.

8.10.1.1 With *pataḥ*

The first pattern consists of *pataḥ* (represented by lack of *mater lectionis*) as the stem vowel. This practice resembles the standard precedent set by Biblical Hebrew (Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 169–170; Weingreen 1959: 255, 263, 265). The following sets of examples illustrate this convention with the *yiqtol* and *wayyiqtol* respectively.

**Yiqṭol**

- מיאשה אוחדד ‘I ask you’ (Ehrmann 1903: 15b)
- גאדתאלש ‘for her not to worry’ (Brandwein 1912: 1)
- איייזה שבירר ‘which one he would choose’ (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 26)
- יישמה ‘And he was happy’ (Sofer 1904: 5)
- שינמלולה ‘for him to forgive her’ (M. Walden 1914: 117)

**Wayyiqtol**

- וריבחםולשללאשיו ‘He greeted his companion’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 55)
- וברעגיו ‘And he rebuked him’ (Breitstein 1914: 7)
- יברקעציו ‘And he cried, “Rebbe!”’ (Chikernik 1902: 23)

8.10.1.2 With *ḥolem*

Conversely, the second pattern is modelled on that of strong roots, with *ḥolem* (represented by ‘ו) as the stem vowel. This pattern is illustrated in the following sets of examples with the *yiqtol*, *wayyiqtol*, and infinitive construct in turn.

**Yiqṭol**

- טוחשא ‘I will slaughter’ (Munk 1898: 42)
- דועסי ‘He dines’ (Ehrmann 1903: 26a)
- קוחדא ‘I will push’ (Zak 1912: 163)
- לועפי ‘He will act’ (Singer 1900b: 12)
- ולרוחביש ‘that he should choose for himself’ (Sofer 1904: 2)
- וייוווט ‘that he forgive you’ (? 1894: 5)
- טוטס ‘He tastes’ (Rapaport 1909: 29)
This practice differs from that of Biblical Hebrew, in which the second syllable of this type of qal root in the yiqṭol and wayyiqṭol is almost invariably pointed with pataḥ (see König 1881–1897, 1:261 and Gesenius-Kautzsch 1910: 169–170 for details and for the very few exceptions to this convention). In the case of the yiqṭol it has some basis in Rabbinic Hebrew, in which qal yiqṭol forms of ii-guttural roots often have holem instead of pataḥ as their stem vowel (see Haneman 1980: 104–105 for details). The extension of this type of form to the wayyiqṭol seems to constitute a fusion of biblical and post-biblical features, as seen in many other aspects of Hasidic Hebrew grammar. Moreover, any rabbinic influence was most likely reinforced by medieval sources by authors such as Ibn Ezra and Abarbanel, in which some of the same yiqṭol forms are attested. Finally, similar yiqṭol and wayyiqṭol forms appear frequently in contemporaneous Maskilic texts, and this phenomenon can therefore be regarded as one of many illustrations of the close linguistic relationship between these two types of nineteenth-century Hebrew (see Kahn 2009: 26–29 for details of this convention in Maskilic literature).

8.10.2  ִו

8.10.2.1 Feminine Singular qoṭel

The feminine singular qoṭel of ִו roots in Hasidic Hebrew typically ends in ה in all stems, as below. This follows the standard pattern of Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew (Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 190; Pérez Fernández 1999: 130–131).

- הָכָבָתָא הָכָבָתָא ְחַגָּתָא, 'And now you are crying too' (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 25)
- הַזֶּה הַזֶּה, 'She saw' (Gemen 1914: 63)
However, in the *nifal* the feminine singular *qotel* typically ends in י- as shown below. The Hasidic Hebrew use of this variant is most likely derived from Rabbinic Hebrew, in which it is the usual form in the *nifal* (Pérez Fernández 1999: 131).

- והאישה אשת אשת נהמה הגרה ‘and the man at whose house the theft was done’ (M. Walden 1914: 63)
- הב møוסק נחילת מואד ‘The tax collector's daughter is very ill’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 5)

The י- is additionally found in the *qal*, in which it is typically attested with the form רזית ‘wants’ but is sometimes attested with other roots as well, e.g.:

- ולו שליחו רצייה ‘And she did not want’ (Brandwein 1912: 1)
- ויהיahun אהת רצייה ‘Even now she doesn't want to’ (Michelsohn 1912: 29)
- והאשה קשת אאת רצייה ‘how his wife doesn't want to’ (Jacob Isaac ben Asher of Przysucha 1908: 99)
- [אשת נשיא[ר] רצייה בפל] ‘a good wife, doing the will of her husband’ (Shenkel 1903b: 25)
- והקול אשת בינה ‘the sound of a woman crying’ (Ehrmann 1911: 20b)

In the *qal* the י- variant is not a standard element of Biblical or Rabbinic Hebrew. Nevertheless, the form רזית ‘wants’ does appear occasionally in certain rabbinic texts, e.g. *Midrash Zuṭa* on Ruth. The appearance of this variant in Hasidic Hebrew may be at least partly inspired by these rabbinic forms. This is likely to have been reinforced by analogy with the corresponding *nifal* forms and possibly with the feminine singular *qotel* form of iii-א roots, i.e. -תא, with which it is identical in pronunciation. This possibility is supported by the fact that the authors sometimes confuse the infinitive construct forms of these two root classes (see 8.10.2.3). Moreover, it is noteworthy that the forms רזית ‘wanting’, עשת ‘doing’, and ביכה ‘crying’ appear in contemporaneous non-narrative Ashkenazi writings, namely the responsa of Shalom Mordechai Schwadron (Maharsham) and the Talmudic commentary *Ḥiddushe haRim* by the first Rebbe of the Ger Hasidic dynasty, Isaac Meir Alter. This suggests that the י- variant is one of many shared features distributed throughout various genres of Eastern European Hebrew compositions from the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.
8.10.2.2 *Yiqṭol* of Root ה̣י̣На

The *yiqṭol* of the root ה̣י̣Na ‘be’ may be formed according to two variant patterns in Hasidic Hebrew, based on the biblical and rabbinic models respectively. These variants are employed in free variation and are both attested relatively frequently. *Yiqṭol* forms based on the first pattern are unapocopated, ending in ה̣Na, as standard in Biblical Hebrew, e.g.:

- ‘It would be a big mitzvah for him’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 13)
- ‘an agreement that the wedding would be in the place of the bride’ (Breitstein 1914: 40)
- ‘My son, be [there] every day during my prayer’ (Bromberg 1899: 8)
- ‘You will become a rabbi’ (J. Duner 1899: 90)
- ‘I accept upon myself that I will be good’ (Rapaport 1909: 10)

*Yiqṭol* forms based on the second pattern are apocopated with final 8 or י, as is common in Rabbinic Hebrew (Pérez Fernández 1999: 122–123), e.g.:

- ‘You will not have sons’ (Munk 1898: 18)
- ‘what would be the week after it’ (HaLevi 1909: 53)
- ‘so that you will be healthy’ (Chikernik 1903b: 20)
- ‘We will be the first’ (Bodek? 1866: 20a)

8.10.2.3 Infinitive Construct

While infinitive constructs prefixed by ל of ה̣I/י̣N roots in Hasidic Hebrew are typically formed with the suffix רא̣Na, when such infinitives appear in conjunction with an object suffix, they are occasionally attested without רא̣Na and instead with a י linking the stem of the infinitive to the suffix, e.g.:

- ‘to show us’ (Kaidaner 1875: 19b)
- ‘and to test him’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 19)

This phenomenon does not seem to have clear precedent in earlier canonical forms of Hebrew. It is attested in the language of *piyyutim* from Palestine (Yeivin 1996: 112), though it is unclear whether such forms can be considered solely responsible for the emergence of the Hasidic Hebrew phenomenon. Interestingly, precisely the same form as that shown in the first example above appears in the 1798 Hasidic biblical commentary *Or haMeʾir* by Zeʾev Wolf of Zhitomir (Leviticus, *Beḥuqqotay*), which suggests that either a) the tale authors
had this form in mind or b) this phenomenon was an element shared by writers of various types of Eastern European Hebrew. In any case, this type of form is quite marginal in Hasidic Hebrew.

8.10.2.4 Qatal Formed on Analogy with III-א

Very rarely a III-ל/א qatal form is formed on analogy with III-א roots, e.g.:

– עשה ‘They did/made’ (Munk 1898: 20)
– קאנה ‘She bought’ (Bodek 1866: 39)

This is the converse of the more common practice whereby the qatal of III-א roots is formed on analogy with that of III-ל/י roots (see 8.10.3.1). Both phenomena may indicate that the authors perceived the two root classes as somewhat interchangeable due to fact that א and ל would have been pronounced identically in many forms of such verbs.

8.10.3 III-א

8.10.3.1 Qatal and qotel Formed on Analogy with III-ל/י

Certain qal qatal and qotel verbs of the III-א roots ק, ר, א ‘read’; ‘call’ and מ, צ, א ‘find’ are sometimes formed on analogy with III-ל/י roots, e.g.:

Qatal
– הושמה נשבעلة ‘She found her husband there’ (Kaidaner 1875: 46a)
– מצינו ‘We found’ (Greenwald 1897: 92)
– שלשנינו ‘that we found’ (Shalom of Koidanov 1882: 21)
– וקרתי ‘And I read’ (Heilmann 1902: 79)
– וראוה בשחר אמר לה ‘when he saw that he had been healed from his illness’ (Breitstein 1914: 61)
– וזרה כרתי ‘Today we read’ (Berger 1910c: 35)

Qotel
– הורכשת קוראה אוח ‘The duchess was calling him’ (Shenkel 1903a: 17)

This practice is traceable to Rabbinic Hebrew, in which similar forms are attested (Pérez Fernández 1999: 114–115). Moreover, it may have been influenced by the existence of an identical phenomenon in the language of the Palestinian piyyut (Yeivin 1996: 107–108), as it is possible that the Hasidic Hebrew authors were familiar with at least some of these writings. In addition, these
historical influences are likely to have been compounded by synchronic issues of phonology and frequency: in many forms the authors would have pronounced 111-יו/roots identically to their 111-ב counterparts, and since verbs of the former root class are much more numerous than those of the latter, the authors are likely to have been more instinctively familiar with their conjugation and therefore sometimes unintentionally constructed 111-ב forms on analogy with their 111-יו equivalents. Finally, note that in the case of the 3fs, this resembles the converse phenomenon whereby the 3fs qatal form of 111-יו qal roots is formed on analogy with 111-ב roots (8.10.2.4).

This tendency extends to infinitives construct, which sometimes appear with a ד- suffix like 111-יו roots. This is most commonly seen with the roots ה.ח.ר. ‘heal’ and ה.ל.ו. ‘fill’, as in the first three examples below.

- תואפר ‘to heal’ (Chikernik 1902: 12)
- תוארפר ‘to recover’ (Landau 1892: 52)
- תואר ‘to fill’ (Kamelhar 1909: 63)
- תואר ‘to create’ (Munk 1898: 23)

In some cases involving the root ב.א.ר. ‘read’, ‘call’, the ב is elided as well:

- תור ‘to read’ (Shenkel 1903b: 3)

The variant with ב- is considered standard in Biblical Hebrew, though the variant with ד- is sometimes attested (see Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 186–187 for details); by contrast, the variant with ד- is extremely common in Rabbinic Hebrew (see Segal 1936: 150 for details), and this widespread rabbinic tendency is likely to be the primary inspiration for the Hasidic Hebrew convention.

8.10.3.2 Feminine Singular qotel
The feminine singular qotel of 111-ב roots usually ends in ד- but is very rarely attested ending in ד-, as below.

- תונא ‘one group associated with bad company’ (Zak 1912: 23)

This tendency to select the ד- ending is in keeping with the more general Hasidic Hebrew preference for ד- over ד- as a feminine singular qotel marker. It also corresponds to Biblical Hebrew, which typically employs the ד- suffix (Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 187), in contrast to Rabbinic Hebrew, in which both variants may be employed with 111-ב roots (Pérez Fernández 1999: 131).
verbs

8.10.4  

\textit{I-א}

\textbf{8.10.4.1 1cs yiqṭol}

1cs \textit{yiqṭol} forms of \textit{I-א} roots are not very commonly attested in Hasidic Hebrew, but those that occur are typically spelt with two א symbols, e.g.:

- אאמנול 'And I will eat' (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 6)
- אאור 'I will gird' (Shenkel 1903b: 31)

\textbf{8.10.4.2 Qal Infinitive Construct}

The \textit{I-א} root \textit{א.מ.ר} 'say' has two variants in Hasidic Hebrew, based on the biblical and rabbinic models respectively, as illustrated below. Like many other Hasidic Hebrew grammatical elements with two variants, these forms are both used frequently and are employed interchangeably.

\textbf{Biblical Model}

- לאמר ולנהח את אדון המפשס 'to say to him, “Our lord the Pope is dead”' (Bodek 1865c: 4)
- לאמר הבアニメ 'to say, “This is the man”' (Rodkinsohn 1865: 9)

\textbf{Rabbinic Model}

- ואיאו הע יול ליבקית 'And he could not say [it] with devotion' (Hirsch 1900: 15)
- להשתבג ולאמר תרילם 'to afflict themselves and recite Psalms' (Munk 1898: 18)

8.10.5  

\textit{I-י and I-נ}

\textbf{8.10.5.1 Qal Infinitives Construct}

Hasidic Hebrew \textit{qal} infinitives construct prefixed by יל of \textit{I-י} and \textit{I-נ} roots have two variant forms, one based on the biblical model and the other on the rabbinic one. The first variant lacks the initial radical and has a final ר, as in Biblical Hebrew (van der Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze 1999: 115). The second pattern has an initial מ and no final ר, in keeping with the rabbinic model according to which such forms are based on the 3ms \textit{yiqṭol} form (Pérez Fernández 1999: 145). The two variants, which are illustrated below, are employed in free variation; this is highlighted by the fact that both forms may appear in the work of a single author.
### Biblical model | Rabbinic model
---|---
‘to approach’ (Brandwein 1912: 43) | ‘to know’ (Zak 1912: 137)
‘to know’ (N. Duner 1912: 19) | ‘to plant’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 26)
‘to go’ (Zak 1912: 21) | ‘to go’ (Singer 1900b: 4)
‘to go’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 32) | ‘to travel’ (Yellin 1913: 26)
‘to take’ (HaLevi 1909: 52) | ‘to take’ (Sofer 1904: 1)
‘to go down’ (Sofer 1904: 20) | ‘to go down’ (Bromberg 1899: 23)
‘to carry’ (Bodek 1865c: 2) | ‘to marry’ (Zak 1912: 22)
‘to dwell’; ‘to sit’ (Zak 1912: 154) | ‘to sit’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 33)
‘to sleep’ (Brandwein 1912: 1) | ‘to sleep’ (Lieberson 1913: 91)
‘to give’ (Michelsohn 1900c: 6) | ‘to give’ (Berger 1906: 87)

In addition, the root נ.ש.א. ‘lift’; ‘carry’; ‘marry’ is sometimes attested with the infinitive construct form נ.ש.א, as below. This form is not characteristic of either biblical or rabbinic literature but rather most likely derives from Medieval Hebrew writings by Ibn Ezra and Abarbanel, in which it is attested (see e.g. Ibn Ezra on Deuteronomy 34 and Abarbanel on Genesis 18).

- ‘to carry him to Brod’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 5)
- ‘to carry and endure’ (M. Walden 1914: 125)

The alternative tannaitic infinitive construct of the root ל.נ.ז. ‘walk’; ‘go’ is hardly attested in the Hasidic Hebrew corpus; a rare example is shown below:

- ‘He couldn’t go any further’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 4)

Like many other Hasidic Hebrew grammatical features with biblical and rabbinic variants, both of these forms are widely distributed (though the rabbinic variant is perhaps slightly more common) and are usually employed in free variation. However, in some cases there are certain patterns relating to the use of the two variants. Firstly, the authors have a marked preference for the rabbinic-based infinitive construct of the root נ.ש.א. ‘sleep’, with the biblical variant נ.ש.א ‘to sleep’ attested only very rarely; some of the few examples are shown
below. The reason for this partiality is uncertain, though the authors may have selected the rabbinic form simply because it is shorter, given that they would have pronounced both variants identically as [lišǝn].

– ‘which house she went to sleep in’ (Brandwein 1912: 1)
– ‘And he went to sleep’ (N. Duner 1912: 23)
– ‘to sleep there’ (M. Walden 1914: 121)

Secondly, when infinitives construct without -ל of i-ו and i-י roots are used in temporal clauses, the biblical variant is consistently selected instead of the rabbinic one, as shown below. This stands to reason given that such constructions are themselves based on biblical rather than rabbinic models. The only exception to this involves a variant construction lacking canonical precedent typically seen with the roots י.ש.ו, ‘know’ and ב.ש.י, ‘sit’; see 8.10.5.2 for details.

– ‘until he approached the rich man’ (Bodek 1865a: 38)
– ‘while he was sitting at the meal’ (Berger 1907: 128)
– ‘And as he was walking he encountered a village’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 4)
– ‘Once when he was living in prison he stood wearing his prayer-shawl and phylacteries the whole day’ (Zak 1912: 15)

Thirdly, in the case of the root י.ש.א, ‘lift’; ‘carry’; ‘marry’ the authors sometimes employ each variant in different semantic contexts. Thus, when used in the sense of ‘lift’ or ‘carry’ the infinitive construct can appear as either ל.א or ל.א, as it has this meaning in both biblical and post-biblical literature. Conversely, when used in the sense of ‘marry’ it appears only as ל.א, as this meaning is very commonly found in this form in rabbinic literature.

8.10.5.2 Qal Infinitive Construct with Subject Suffixes
The Hasidic Hebrew authors commonly employ a construction consisting of an infinitive construct of i-ו and i-י roots without -ל in conjunction with a subject suffix and with the first radical intact. The phenomenon is most typically attested with the roots ב.ש.י, ‘sit’ and י.ש.ו, ‘know’, as in the first seven examples below, but is also sometimes found with other roots such as ג.ל.ר, ‘go’ and ל.ק.ח, ‘take’, as in the last two examples.

– ‘while he was sitting at the table’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 29–30)
Like many other aspects of Hasidic Hebrew morphosyntax, such forms represent a fusion of biblical and rabbinic constructions. They resemble biblical infinitives construct in that the latter commonly appear unprefixed and with a subject suffix, but they differ from them in that biblical infinitives construct of i-ו and i-נ roots appear without the first radical and with final -ת (as discussed in 8.10.5.1), as e.g. סָתְּבִשְׁבּ ‘when they live’ (Ezek. 39:26). Conversely, they resemble Rabbinic Hebrew infinitives construct in their retention of the initial radical and lack of final -ת, but in that stratum of the language the infinitive construct is invariably prefixed by -ל and does not take subject suffixes.

Significantly, the same construction is occasionally attested in certain medieval and early modern Hebrew texts including the commentaries of Rashi, Abarbanel, and Moses Alshich. These medieval forms may have been the source of the Hasidic Hebrew ones. However, in the earlier texts the phenomenon is relatively marginal, whereas in the Hasidic tales it is comparatively widespread and productive; this suggests that the Hasidic authors were initially inspired by the somewhat rare medieval form and then transformed it into a more central feature of their own writing.

An identical phenomenon is widely attested in contemporaneous Maskilic literature (see Kahn 2009: 71–76 and 2012b: 270–271 for details); this feature is thus one of many points of linguistic overlap between nineteenth-century Hasidic and Maskilic Hebrew narrative literatures suggesting the existence of a more widespread Eastern European form of Hebrew.
8.10.6  Hollow and Geminate

8.10.6.1  3fs qal qatal

Sometimes the 3fs qatal form of qal hollow roots is formed on analogy with
111-ו/roots, ending in הוה, instead of the expected form ending in ר. This
phenomenon is usually restricted to the root_areas
come’, as illustrated below,
and is occasionally attested with other roots, as in the last example.

– באהו עם הוה בהוה(a) הפנים ‘When the day was at an end she came again’
  (HaLevi 1909: 53)
– come אתה בהוה(א) הלילה ‘Once she came to him’ (Munk 1898: 18)
– come אתה לפני התוועד ‘And she came before the Gaon, the holy head of
  the rabbinical court’ (Michelsohn 1910b: 27)
– פי בהוה(א) אדם וה ‘Once a woman came to his chamber’ (Berger 1910a: 32)
– אדם פא בהוה(א) וה ‘Afterwards a woman came’ (Singer 1900a, pt. 1: 3)
– תכל אלה לוה הלוח(א) ‘And never did [even] a penny rested with me’
  (Rodkinsohn 1865: 13)

There is also a less common defective variant of this pattern ending in ר:

– לוהם בהוה(ר) וה ‘And she had not come back’ (Brandwein 1912: 27)
– come בהוה(ר) דג ‘Once an agunah came to his Holy Honour’ (Kaidaner
  1875: 46a)
– come בהוה(ר) וה ‘And one time a woman from among his followers
  came’ (Ehrmann 1903: 14a)

In some cases the forms in question may be inspired by an occasional attest-
ation in earlier varieties of Hebrew. For example, the form בהוה
appears in
the Mishnah (e.g. Avoda Zara 3:4) and in medieval and early modern literature
such as Rashi’s commentary and Moses Sofer’s eighteenth/nineteenth-
century work Haṭam Sofer. By contrast, some of these forms lack precedent
in earlier canonical forms of Hebrew but appear in contemporaneous Eastern
European Hebrew writings. For example, the form לוה ‘she lodged’ does
not seem to be a feature of Biblical, Rabbinic, or Medieval Hebrew literature,
but is found on 14 occasions in contemporaneous halakhic and responsa liter-
ature in Hebrew, e.g. Sha’are Teshuva, a commentary on the Shulhan Arukh by
Chaim Mordechai Margaliot, Avne Ezer, responsa by Avraham Bornstein, and
Bet She’arim, responsa by Amram Blum. Thus the form in question appears to
have been a recognized variant employed in the nineteenth century, though it
is not clear exactly when and in which circles it first came into use.
8.10.6.2  

**Hifil qaṭal**

The 1cs, 2ms, and 2fs qaṭal hifil forms of hollow and geminate roots have two variants in Hasidic Hebrew. Firstly, they are often attested with a linking vowel *ḥolem* (represented by ı) before the affirmative, as in the following examples. This variant is associated with Biblical Hebrew as it is usually (though not always) present in that form of the language (see van der Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze 1999: 121–122; Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 199).

- יאואתְּהָקְצַיתֵי 'And then I awoke' (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 46)
- רבְּהָהנַּהוֹתְּהָקְצַיתֵי 'Now I have begun' (Kaidaner 1875: 18a)
- רבְּהָהנַּהוֹתְּהָקְצַיתֵי 'all of the clothes that I had prepared' (Sofer 1904: 11)
- רבְּהָהנַּהוֹתְּהָקְצַיתֵי 'for I have done evil [with] my deeds' (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 26)
- רבְּהָהנַּהוֹתְּהָקְצַיתֵי 'I turned all of this around' (Laufbahn 1914: 50)
- רבְּהָהנַּהוֹתְּהָקְצַיתֵי 'I prepared all of this feast' (Bodek? 1866: 21a)
- רבְּהָהנַּהוֹתְּהָקְצַיתֵי 'the tree which I prepared for him' (Seuss 1890: 36)
- רבְּהָהנַּהוֹתְּהָקְצַיתֵי 'You have started to see visions' (Singer 1900a, pt. 1: 3)
- רבְּהָהנַּהוֹתְּהָקְצַיתֵי 'when I started to rest' (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 15)
- רבְּהָהנַּהוֹתְּהָקְצַיתֵי 'and when I raised my voice' (Breitstein 1914: 54)
- רבְּהָהנַּהוֹתְּהָקְצַיתֵי 'I removed the head phylacteries' (A. Walden 1860?: 23b)

Conversely, and slightly less frequently, they may be found without the linking vowel, as below. This variant is regarded as typical of Rabbinic Hebrew (Segal 1936: 146; Haneman 1980: 290).

- רבְּהָהנַּהוֹתְּהָקְצַיתֵי 'Did you bring this?' (Bodek 1865c: 7)
- רבְּהָהנַּהוֹתְּהָקְצַיתֵי 'if you had understood' (Rodkinsohn 1865: 26)
- רבְּהָהנַּהוֹתְּהָקְצַיתֵי 'How did you dare' (Kaidaner 1875: 18a)
- רבְּהָהנַּהוֹתְּהָקְצַיתֵי 'You did not know him' (Breitstein 1914: 13)
- רבְּהָהנַּהוֹתְּהָקְצַיתֵי 'And I replied' (Zak 1912: 37)
- רבְּהָהנַּהוֹתְּהָקְצַיתֵי 'from the sum that I had left' (Sofer 1904: 7)
- רבְּהָהנַּהוֹתְּהָקְצַיתֵי 'I have brought you a sealed letter from the Ba’al Shem Tov’ (Ehrmann 1903: 4a)
- רבְּהָהנַּהוֹתְּהָקְצַיתֵי 'Therefore I understood' (Laufbahn 1914: 48)
- רבְּהָהנַּהוֹתְּהָקְצַיתֵי 'And I answered him' (Moses Leib of Sasov 1903: 30a)

In contrast to many other Hasidic Hebrew grammatical features possessing biblical and rabbinic variants, in this case the authors did not usually employ both of these forms in free variation. Rather, in many cases their selection of a
particular variant may be based on its appearance in a familiar biblical text. The above examples illustrate this: the form יקחתי has a precise counterpart in Psalms 3:6; similarly, יתליה is attested in Deuteronomy 2:31 and 1 Samuel 22:15, while יברת is attested in e.g. Exodus 32:21. Conversely, some of the forms without a linking vowel are unattested in the biblical corpus and instead seem to be rooted in rabbinic or medieval literature. For example, the form מנהנש lacks precedent in both Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew but appears frequently in the medieval commentary of Abarbanel and the sixteenth-century commentary of Moses Alshich; similarly, the form מצת is attested in the Babylonian Talmud and the commentary of Moses Alshich.

8.11 Suffixed Verbs

Hasidic Hebrew verbs typically undergo the same types of consonant and vowel changes when object suffixes are attached as other forms of the language. Noteworthy features are discussed below.

8.11.1 3fs qatal

The final ה of the 3fs qatal form is replaced by ת when object suffixes are attached. This convention resembles earlier forms of Hebrew. Such forms are quite rare due to the relative dearth of feminine verbal forms in the tales, but examples include the following:

– יתריהזה ‘She warned him’ (Bromberg 1899: 55)
– יתחא ‘It (f) seized him’ (Ehrmann 1903: 9a)
– יתילא ‘She didn’t believe him’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 4)
– יתעنة ‘The merit of the Torah stopped him’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 22)

8.12 Gerunds

Gerunds are a common feature of Hasidic Hebrew and are formed in the same way as in rabbinic literature (see Pérez Fernández 1999: 57–58 and Sharvit 2008: 117 for details of gerund formation in Rabbinic Hebrew). Note that in Hasidic Hebrew gerunds coexist alongside infinitives construct (though the latter are employed much more rarely in nominal capacities; see 8.8.2.2.2). This contrasts with Rabbinic Hebrew, in which the gerund is employed to the exclusion of the infinitive construct (Pérez Fernández 1999: 57–58). Qal and piel gerunds are more commonly attested than those of the other stems.
Qal gerunds follow the pattern *qetila*, e.g.:

-Դõלõšõ ‘walking’ (Bodek? 1866: 24a)
-מפמיõ ‘footstep’ (Ehrmann 1905: 48b)
-טכטכõ ‘this purchase’ (Rosenthal 1909: 7)
-ווחוõõ ‘and his return’ (M. Walden 1914: 24)
-בטבידõ ‘standing’ (Kaidaner 1875: 20a)
-פליõõ ‘wonder’ (Landau 1892: 30)
-באמõ ‘baking’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 7)
-בכביõ ‘with weeping’ (Bodek 1865a: 31)
-זעבזõ ‘the transgression’ (HaLevi 1907: 23b)
-אכלו ושתה ושהõ ‘eating and drinking and sleeping’ (Gemen 1914: 83)

There is a slight tendency towards regularization of irregular *qal* gerunds, with forms such as לתריזחבו ‘and upon her return’ (Berger 1907: 78), in contrast to the standard but irregular form in other types of Hebrew תורוה.

*Piel* gerunds follow the pattern *qiṭṭul*, e.g.:

-שתוûל ופוהõk ‘coughing and yawning’ (Jacob Isaac ben Asher of Przysucha 1908: 52)
-הילוõ ‘his walking’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 45)
-שויõ ‘change’ (Kaidaner 1875: 20a)
-שתוû ‘marriage match’ (Ehrmann 1903: 40a)
-בושûl[... ‘cooking’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 7)

*Hitpael* gerunds follow the pattern *hitqaṭṭelut*, e.g.:

-בהתעלוõת ‘with amazement’ (Kaidaner 1875: 20a)
-естественнות ‘justification’ (Sofer 1904: 3)
-הנהוõת ‘manifestation’ (Laufbahn 1914: 51)
-הטלקות ‘his disappearance’ (Landau 1892: 15)

*Hifil* gerunds follow the pattern *haqṭala*, e.g.:

-בבהטוה ‘in my promise’ (Bodek 1865c: 9)
-מרוהוãת ìסקמי ‘from business earnings’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 13)
-활동ה ìזר ‘the candle lighting’ (Laufbahn 1914: 49)
-בנהõ ‘understanding’ (Landau 1892: 9)
8.13 Subject-Verb Concord

8.13.1 Number

8.13.1.1 Number Discord

Hasidic Hebrew verbal clauses often exhibit number discord. This phenomenon is generally restricted to third person subjects and verbs. It is most frequent with the verb הָיְתָה, but is relatively widely attested with other verbs as well, particularly others of iii-/י- roots. The high concentration of iii-/י- roots in such instances suggests that in most cases the discord is likely due to phonological considerations: because the ending of iii-/י- singular verbs and their plural counterparts were both pronounced identically as [ə], as typical of unstressed final syllables in Ashkenazi Hebrew and Yiddish (U. Weinreich 1965: 43), the authors could easily have confused the written singular and plural forms. This tendency can be seen in the examples below.

The most common type of number discord consists of a singular verb used in conjunction with a plural subject. This is most frequently found in clauses wherein the verb precedes the subject, e.g.:

- וַיֵּרְדֶּשֶׁהוּ הָאָרֶץ מָלְאָכֵי יְהוָה 'There were learned sages there' (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 10)
- וְאֵלָה הַיָּד וְעָשֶׁה יִשָּׁר 'What can the demons do to me?' (Kaidaner 1875: 44a)
- וַיֵּשֶׁב לָא לֶאָדָר שֶׁיֹּדֶעַ 'a parable of someone who had a lot of money' (Greenwald 1899: 56a)
- הַנָּגְלֶל עַל חֵשֶׁם נְעַיֵּי דְבַרְדוֹת מֶשֶׁר 'Unpleasant things were discovered about that cantor' (Kaidaner 1875: 20b)

Similarly, a singular verb may be used preceding a series of multiple singular subjects, e.g.:

- וַיְחַלֹּק נֵס הָאָדָר שֶׁיֹּדֶעַ שָׁבְעָה לִרְאָדָשׁ 'And therefore he and his wife travelled again afterwards to Radoszyce' (Bromberg 1899: 26)

Conversely, it may occur when the verb follows the subject, e.g.:

- וַיְרָדֶה וַיְכַבֵּשׁ הָאָרֶץ וְהַעֲבַר וְקָרָדשׁ 'The horses will be torn away and the wagon will break' (Bromberg 1899: 27)
- וַיְרָדֶה וַיְקַבֵּשׁ לְאָדָר שֶׁיֹּדֶעַ 'And he had no children' (Shenkel 1903b: 19)
- וַיָּדַע וְהָאָדָר שֶׁיֹּדֶעַ לְאָדָר שֶׁיֹּדֶעַ 'The thoughts that fall upon a person suddenly—it is not for nothing' (Kaidaner 1875: 27a)
- וַיְרָדֶה וַיְכַבֵּשׁ הָאָדָר שֶׁיֹּדֶעַ 'And the chambers of this rich man were elegant' (Breitstein 1914: 36)
More rarely, a plural verb may be used in conjunction with a following singular noun, as below.

– ‘Their prayer was (lit: were) accepted’ (Bodek 1865c: 19)

– ‘And he had a very big, strong brain’ (Munk 1898: 19)

– ‘Now this thought troubled him greatly’ (Shenkel 1903b: 30)

Again, on rare occasions the order may be reversed, with a singular noun followed by a plural verb, e.g.:

– ‘The cold arrived’ (Ehrmann 1903: 15a)

Sometimes this type of discord seems to be triggered by attraction, as in the following case where the plural verb appears in close proximity to a plural suffixed preposition:

– ‘And you will not have a loss’ (Munk 1898: 26)

Similarly, periphrastic verbs sometimes exhibit number discord between the two members. The first member is typically singular while the second is plural, with the entire construction referring to a plural subject, as in the following examples, in which the qaṭal is 3ms while the qoṭel and subject are masculine plural.

– ‘And likewise, when they needed to get a bishop they could not get one without the permission of the city’s rabbi’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 51)

– ‘And all of the sages used to give in to him’ (J. Duner 1899: 55)

Number discord in equational sentences is also occasionally attested, as follows. In this case the discord is likely based on the fact that the authors would have pronounced both the singular feminine singular construct form נ- and its plural counterpart נ- identically, as [nə].

– ‘This is the railroads’ (Zak 1912: 137)
8.13.1.2 Logical vs. Grammatical Number Concord

In general the Hasidic Hebrew authors employ plural verbs in conjunction with grammatically singular nouns referring to collectives. This proclivity for logical rather than grammatical number concord has precedent in Biblical Hebrew, in which *ad sensum* plural verbs are often attested (Williams 2007: 92–93). However, in Biblical Hebrew this is only a tendency whereas in Hasidic Hebrew it is almost invariable.

- 'because the audience do not take care with them' (J. Duner 1899: 19)
- 'What is this, that the whole city has gathered together?' (Sofer 1904: 1)
- 'The Heavenly Court asked my father' (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 24)
- 'And the whole city marvelled greatly' (Hirsch 1900: 33)
- 'Everyone says that the alcohol porter is bitter' (Michelsohn 1912: 22)
- 'And the Baʾal Shem Tov ordered all of the group that was sitting with him' (Rodkinsohn 1865: 1)
- 'And the new couple went on their way' (Michelsohn 1912: 49)
- 'It is as everyone says' (Berger 1910c: 60)
- 'Once the crowd was jostling in order to hear Torah from the mouth of the Rebbe' (Yellin 1913: 31)
- 'Indeed everyone is travelling to the Baʾal Shem Tov' (Chikernik 1902: 12)
- 'when the whole city came' (A. Walden 1860?: 8a)

Grammatical number concord is attested only very infrequently in Hasidic Hebrew; a rare case is shown below. This extract is an example of *shibbus* from a biblical text, which underscores the unproductiveness of this type of concord in the tales.

- 'And the whole people rushed towards him' (Singer 1900a, pt. 3: 7); cf. 'And all of the people in the camp trembled' (Exod. 19:16)

8.13.1.3 2cp Verb as Polite 2cs Marker

The Hasidic Hebrew authors frequently employ 2cp verbs as polite or formal 2cs markers, as shown below.
This convention resembles the phenomenon whereby 2cp subject pronouns are used as polite 2cs forms (see 6.1.1.3). As in the case of the pronoun, the use of a plural verb in conjunction with a singular subject usually signals politeness; however in some cases it is used simply as a marker of formality when the interlocutor is a stranger of inferior status. As in the case of the polite 2cs pronoun, the use of 2cp verbs referring to 2cs subjects is most likely directly traceable to the authors’ native Yiddish, in which the polite second person singular verbal form is identical to the second person plural form (Katz 1987: 103).

8.13.2 Gender
There is a high incidence of gender discord between Hasidic Hebrew verbs and their subjects. The phenomenon is attested with third, second, and first person singular subjects of both genders, but is most common with feminine subjects. The discord is ascribable to a variety of considerations, discussed below.

8.13.2.1 Masculine Singular Verbs with Feminine Referents
Hasidic Hebrew feminine singular subjects frequently appear in conjunction with masculine verbs. This phenomenon is attested with a range of conjugations including qaṭal, yiqṭol, and qoṭel, and occurs with logically and grammatically feminine subjects. It is commonly found with 3ms qaṭal and yiqṭol and masculine singular qoṭel forms, as in the following:

3ms qaṭal

– ‘Ataḥ veyiqṭol et ha’aretz eḥad. Amarei shel ha’aretz bo’avotav me’ot ha’aretz
– ‘And afterwards, when the girl was healed, I said that that this must have been in the merit of the righteous man’ (Kaidaner 1875: 31b)
– ‘And a daughter was born to him’ (Zak 1912: 147)
verbs

– ‘And afterwards the woman confessed all her sins’ (Ehrmann 1903: 15a)
– ‘And he knew that his wife had conceived adulterously’ (Shenkel 1903b: 18)
– ‘The rumour arrived’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 40)
– ‘He had one daughter’ (Bodek 1865a: 2)
– ‘And he had an only daughter’ (A. Walden 1860?: 4b)

3ms *yiqṭol*

– ‘And they showed him that it would be a big mitzvah’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 13)
– ‘The decree will be annulled’ (Munk 1898: 63)

**Masculine Singular qoṭel**

– ‘Many agunahs are saved by the prayer of our Rebbe’ (Hirsch 1900: 49)
– ‘And afterwards she asked her again whether the potion-making women could cook well’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 15)
– ‘And his wife the rebbetzin was also travelling with him then’ (Bromberg 1899: 44)
– ‘The agunah travelled to her house, and she believed and did not believe’ (Munk 1898: 33)

This type of discord is also very frequently found with 2ms *qaṭal* and *yiqṭol* and masculine singular imperatives in conjunction with female addressees, and with masculine singular *qoṭel* in conjunction with female speakers, as illustrated below.

**2ms *yiqṭol***

– ‘And he said to her, “What do you want? Do you want to live the rest of your days in wealth?”’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 3)
– ‘And he told her, “Know that my teacher and Rebbe came”’ (Bromberg 1899: 5)
– ‘My daughter! [...] Who do you want for a husband?’ (Ehrmann 1911: 1b)
Masculine Singular Imperatives

- 'The Rebbe said to her, “Listen!”’ (Munk 1898: 41)
- 'The Rebbe said to the woman, “Please look at the heavens,” and the woman did so’ (Kaidaner 1875: 23a)
- ‘Know that you will regret [it]’ (Bodek? 1866: 2a)
- ‘And he said to her [...] “Come to me with him”’ (Kamelhar 1909: 31)
- ‘The wagon-driver said to the innkeeper’s wife, “Sell me alcohol”’ (Chikernik 1902: 10)

Masculine Singular qoṭel

- ‘And the woman continued speaking to him, and said “[...] And you will not see me again, for I am going away from here right away”’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 38)
- ‘And afterwards, it occurred to the woman, “Why do I need his permission for this? I can do the thing by myself too!”’ (Kaidaner 1875: 31b)
- ‘And she said to him, “I am going the way of all flesh!”’ (Sofer 1904: 14)
- ‘And the fiancée said to him, “I worry [that] maybe with the passage of time you will forget me”’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 41)

In general, this phenomenon suggests a tendency towards paradigm levelling with respect to gender, most likely triggered by the fact that Yiddish does not...
possess distinct masculine and feminine verb forms. The fact that the drive is towards replacement of feminine verbal forms with their masculine counterparts may indicate that the authors were more familiar with the masculine forms due to the relative paucity of female characters in the tales.

Moreover, in some cases the trend towards paradigm levelling is likely to have been compounded by phonological factors. Thus, in the case of 3ms qatal forms whose final radical is א or ע, such as נתרמא he (here: she) was healed’ and潔 ע ‘he (here: she) arrived’, the discord may be attributable to the fact that in the authors’ pronunciation 3ms qatal forms ending in א- or ע- would have been pronounced similarly to their 3fs counterparts, as [ǝ] (U. Weinreich 1965: 43). Conversely, in the case of 3ms qatal forms of iii-ה/י roots such as הדוה ‘he (here: she) confessed’ and ההרה ‘she had conceived’ in the first set of examples above, the discord may be due to the fact that the ending is an iconic feminine singular marker in other areas of the language, which may have reinforced the authors’ subconscious tendency to avoid 3fs forms (ending in the less frequently attested הת-) in favour of their more common and familiar 3ms counterparts. These phenomena, like many other aspects of Hasidic Hebrew grammar, underscore the important role that aural and oral factors played relative to orthographic ones in the shaping of Hasidic Hebrew morphosyntax.

8.13.2.2 Feminine Singular Verbs with Masculine Referents
In contrast to their feminine counterparts, masculine subjects typically correspond in gender to their associated verbs. However, in rare cases a masculine singular subject appears in conjunction with a 3fs verb. This is ascribable to various factors depending on the form in question. When the verb is a qatal whose final radical is א or ע, the discord is most likely due to the fact that the authors would have pronounced the masculine and feminine variants identically (as in the case of the converse phenomenon discussed above in 8.13.2.1). The following example illustrates this point:

–ramsא יל冶炼 ‘The house was filled’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 44)

In other cases, there is no such phonological motivation and instead the discord may indicate that the authors had the 3fs verbal form in mind because the associated agent or indirect object is feminine. This resembles the tendency to employ third person singular verbs in conjunction with plural subjects comprised of multiple singular entities (see 8.13.1.1). With respect to gender, this tendency is not systematic but rather is a relatively haphazard phenomenon stemming from a spontaneous association that the authors made between the
verb and a constituent other than the grammatical subject in the particular instance in question. Such cases are shown below:

– זוחאת בקול בוכם כי אנהלה לה כי עוף שלשה מעות ריב
  ‘And she cried out in a weeping voice that she had lost a purse (lit: pocket) with three hundred roubles’ (Sofer 1904: 17)
– הרביםה לolsonה ונשון חולשת לה באמות לה זנר
  ‘And the Ba’al Shem Tov of blessed memory promised her that she would have a son in that year’ (Munk 1898: 18)

Finally, sometimes this type of gender discord lacks a phonological or other motivation. This phenomenon, exemplified below, is relatively marginal, but may reflect a degree of fluctuation and confusion stemming from the ongoing paradigm levelling process whereby feminine singular verbal forms were being replaced by their masculine equivalents (discussed in the preceding section).

– תוכזן בךלוותרחמםויברשאךחיטבמינאיכ
  ‘For I promise you that tomorrow a male child will be born to you’ (Bromberg 1899: 5)
– בראהיפמרבדהקראזנדואפראו
  ‘And suddenly a word was uttered by (lit: thrown from the mouth of) the Rebbe’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 36)
– והילכמהלזאםחליה
  ‘The bread was gone from his plate’ (Bodek 1866: 16)
– ירמגלרוקהונמהרבעשדע
  ‘until the cold left him completely’ (N. Duner 1912: 18)

Similarly, 2ms subjects are sometimes found in conjunction with 2fs yiqṭol or with feminine singular imperative forms, e.g.:

– אמרה ולא חמר נפשך שאחת מהותש
  ‘They said to him, “Do not imagine that you are of good pedigree”’ (Kaidaner 1875: 17a)
–אמרה ולא חרב יאל חרב אלי הנהו
  ‘The Rebbe, of blessed memory, said to him, “Do not fear and do not cry”’ (Munk 1898: 69)

In contrast to the phenomenon involving 3fs verbal forms, this type of discord seems to be due purely to phonological factors. (Given the aforementioned scarcity of 2fs subjects and verbs in the tales and the fact that such forms are often substituted by their masculine counterparts, it is very unlikely that the authors actually intended to select the 2fs verbs.) The forms in question are all of 111-7/3 roots, and in standard forms of Hebrew the 2ms yiqṭol of such forms ends in ǝ, which the Hasidic Hebrew authors would have pronounced as [ǝ]. Given that they sometimes employed ǝ to represent this vowel in word-final
position (e.g. in the Yiddish loanword קְרַטְשֶׁם ‘inn’), it is likely that they viewed ו and ה as somewhat interchangeable and occasionally substituted the former for the latter. Again, this type of phenomenon highlights the importance of aural and oral factors in the development of Hasidic Hebrew grammar.

8.14 Sequence of Tense

Hasidic Hebrew does not have sequence of tense. As such, verbs in subordinate clauses following the particles וב, ו, אם or ש ‘that’ or אם/whether’ do not shift their tense; rather, the same tense is used as it would be in independent clauses. This contrasts with e.g. English, in which sequence of tense is a standard feature (see e.g. Comrie 1985: 104–112). The lack of sequence of tense in Hasidic Hebrew is most visible with qoṭel with present reference and yiqṭol with future reference, as shown below in turn. Comparison of the verbs in the Hasidic Hebrew examples with their counterparts in their English translations illustrates the difference between the two languages in this respect.

Qoṭel

– וַיָּרָאָה שְׁאוֹמֵה בָּדָרֶשׁ שְׁלֵשַׁי מַהֲאָשׁ בָּבוֹתְלָּו מָעְמְלַתִּי יִהְמָר ‘And he saw that he was crying floods of tears and hitting his head against the wall and praying to the LORD, blessed be He’ (Kaidaner 1875: 20b)
– וַיָּמֵר לְרַבָּה יֶשֶׁב יחֵשֶׁנְתָּ שְׁאוֹמֵה יִדֵּר לְעֹד יִהְמָר יִדִּיר ‘And then his mind calmed down (lit: cooled), and he knew that he was going on the right way’ (Bromberg 1899: 35)
– וַיָּמֵר לְרַבָּה יֶשֶׁב יֵתָּה שְׁאוֹמֵה יִדֵּר לְעֹד יִהְמָר יִדִּיר ‘And he said to his rabbi, the head of the yeshivah, that he didn’t want to marry the bride’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 3)
– וַיָּמֵר לְרַבָּה יֶשֶׁב יֵתָּה שְׁאוֹמֵה יִדֵּר לְעֹד יִהְמָר יִדִּיר ‘And the student went in and saw that she was sitting on her own’ (Shenkel 1883, pt. 1: 19)

Yiqṭol

– וַיָּמֵר לְרַבָּה יֶשֶׁב יֵתָּה שְׁאוֹמֵה יִדֵּר לְעֹד יִהְמָר יִדִּיר ‘And he also asked the rabbi whether he could know who they were’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 17)
– וַיָּמֵר לְרַבָּה יֶשֶׁב יֵתָּה שְׁאוֹמֵה יִדֵּר לְעֹד יִהְמָר יִדִּיר ‘And in the middle of that the servant came in to ask him what he would eat that day (lit: today)’ (M. Walden 1912: 90)
It is unclear whether this Hasidic Hebrew convention is rooted to any extent in earlier forms of Hebrew, and comparison is made difficult due to two interlinked factors: firstly, the Hasidic Hebrew use of the verbal conjugations does not precisely overlap with those of Biblical or post-Biblical Hebrew, and secondly, the phenomenon of sequence of tenses in these forms of the language remains largely unaddressed in the secondary literature. By contrast, Yiddish functions in precisely the same way (Jacobs, Prince, and van der Auwera 1994: 409), and this resemblance suggests that the authors’ Hebrew usage was reinforced by influence from their vernacular. Note that the same construction is standard in present-day Israeli Hebrew (Coffin and Bolozky 2005: 374; Sharvit 2008).
Prepositions

9.1 Commonly Attested Prepositions

Hasidic Hebrew prepositions, like other aspects of its grammar, reflect a mix of typically biblical forms, e.g. בְּשֵׁלָל ‘for’, post-biblical forms, e.g. לְיָבָשֵׁב ‘for’, and shared forms. Commonly attested prepositions are shown below.

- (ⴱ) ‘after’, e.g. חוֹרָה ‘after the feast’ (Sofer 1904: 1)
- (ⴱ) ‘to’; ‘towards’, e.g. לְאָבְכָם ‘to your father’ (Landau 1892: 17)
- (ⴱ) ‘in’; ‘with’, e.g. בְּהַכַּסֶּר ‘in my village’ (HaLevi 1909: 53)
- (ⴱ) ‘without’, e.g. מֵנֶל ‘and without clothes’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 4)
- (ⴱ) ‘for’, e.g. יָרְדִי יָבָשֵׁל ‘beautiful apartments for the king’ (Jacob Isaac ben Asher of Przysucha 1908: 44)
- ‘before’, e.g. גָּרָה ‘before the holiday’ (Bodek 1865c: 1)
- (ⴱ) ‘to’; ‘for’, e.g. הָלָמינַרי ‘to his students’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 5)
- (ⴱ) ‘after’, e.g. לְאָבְכָה ‘and after this’ (Sofer 1904: 20)
- (ⴱ) ‘for’, e.g. לְמַמְּשָׁר ‘for his servant David’ (Shenkel 1903b: 11)
- (ⴱ) ‘towards’; ‘in preparation for’, e.g. לְקָרָאת ‘in preparation for your arrival’ (Laufbahn 1914: 49)
- (ⴱ) ‘from’; ‘than’, e.g. מַה מֵהָדָר ‘from the road’ (M. Walden 1914: 41)
- (ⴱ) ‘from’; e.g. מְאוֹז ‘from me’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 30)
- (ⴱ) ‘because of’, e.g. מַהַמָּת ‘because of grass’ (Landau 1892: 19)
- (ⴱ) ‘until’, e.g. דּוֹז הָיָה ‘until that night’ (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 1)
- (ⴱ) ‘on’; ‘about’; ‘for’; (ⴱ) ‘at’, e.g. על מְשָׁבָב ‘on his bed’ (Hirsch 1900: 65)
- (ⴱ) ‘on’ (variant of (ⴱ), e.g. מְרַס עֲלֵיה ‘he strummed on a violin’ (Zak 1912: 32)
- (ⴱ) ‘with’, e.g. מִיָּבָשֵׁל ‘with the wagon’ (Moses Leib of Sasov 1903: 21a)
- ‘before’, e.g. כּוֹדֵם ‘before the wedding’ (Ehrmann 1903: 19b)
- ‘under’, e.g. מִזְרָע ‘under the table’ (Munk 1898: 36)

1 This usage lacks precedent in Biblical or Rabbinic Hebrew, in which (ⴱ) is an adverb meaning ‘not yet’; however, it is sometimes found in Medieval Hebrew literature (Even-Shoshan 2003: 667).
2 The Hasidic Hebrew use of this form is heavily influenced by Yiddish; see 16.3.7.
Adverbs

Hasidic Hebrew resembles other varieties of the language in that it does not possess a single method of forming adverbs and that it does not have an established productive way of creating derived adverbs. As in other aspects of Hasidic Hebrew grammar, its adverbs reflect a mix of typically biblical forms such as איה ‘where’, post-biblical forms such as היש ‘now’, and shared forms. The various types of Hasidic Hebrew adverbs are discussed below.

10.1 Interrogative Adverbs

Commonly attested Hasidic Hebrew interrogative adverbs are as follows:

– מאי ‘where’, e.g. מאי איך אתה יודע מה אתה מתרסה ‘Where is the poor man?’ (Hirsch 1900: 44)
– מאי ‘which’, e.g. מאי איך אתה יודע מה אתה מתרסה ‘From which business is your livelihood?’ (Bromberg 1899: 25)
– מאי ‘how’, e.g. מאי איך אתה יכול走出 ‘How can you leave us?’ (Bromberg 1899: 25)
– מאי ‘where to’, e.g. מאי איך אתה יכול走出 ‘Where will you go from here?’ (Laufbahn 1914: 49)
– מאי ‘where’, e.g. מאי איך אתה יודעłę הת ‘And I don’t see where to go’ (Chikernik 1903a: 16)
– מאי ‘how much/many’, e.g. מאי איך אתה יודע מה אתה יכול走出 ‘How much can one man drink?’ (Ehman 1905: 55a)
– מאי ‘why’, e.g. מאי איך אתה יודע מה אתה יכול走出 ‘Why did he strike you?’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 38)
– מאי ‘why’, e.g. מאי איך אתה יודע מה אתה יכול走出 ‘Why are you crying?’ (Singer 1900b: 6)
– מאי ‘from where’, e.g. מאי איך אתה יכול走出 ‘From where do you know this?’ (Landau 1892: 13)
– מאי ‘when’, e.g. מאי איך אתה יכול走出 ‘When did you leave your house?’ (Bodek 1865c: 1)

1 איה also frequently serves as an indefinite adjective; see 5.6.
10.2 Adverbs of Place

Typical Hasidic Hebrew adverbs of place are listed below:

- שָּנָאכָן ‘here’ e.g. ‘Isn’t there a young woman here?’ (Bromberg 1899: 25–26)
- שָּנָאכָן ‘there’ e.g. ‘And a very great celebration was made there’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 8)
- שְׁנַאכ ‘here’ e.g. ‘I heard that he was going here and there’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1910: 4)
- שִׁמְש ‘there’ e.g. ‘And take there’ (Sofer 1904: 7)
- שִׁמְש ‘there’ e.g. ‘And I am staying here’ (Landau 1892: 17)
- שִׁמְש ‘there’ e.g. ‘And take there’ (Sofer 1904: 7)

10.3 Adverbs of Time

Commonly employed Hasidic Hebrew adverbs of time include the following:

- זָא ‘then’ e.g. ‘And then he spoke to the spirit’ (Bromberg 1899: 22)
- אחרְכ ‘afterwards’ e.g. ‘And afterwards he drank coffee’ (Gemen 1914: 91)
- אַתָמְל ‘yesterday’ e.g. ‘Last night you were crying’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 25)
- לֶוֶת ‘already’ e.g. ‘The woman had already given birth’ (Bodek 1865a: 71)
- לְפַעַט ‘sometimes’ e.g. ‘and sometimes the clarinet’ (Gemen 1914: 86)
- לְפַעַט ‘still’ e.g. ‘Do you still have any questions?’ (N. Duner 1912: 27)
- [...] לְפַעַט ‘now’ e.g. ‘And now they are simply slaves to desire’ (Munk 1898: 17)
- לְפַעַט ‘now’ e.g. ‘Even now she doesn’t want to’ (Michelsohn 1912: 29)
- לְפַעַט ‘beforehand’ ‘previously’ e.g. ‘even though they may pass through several towns beforehand’ (M. Walden 1914: 25)
10.4 Adverbs of Manner

Typical Hasidic Hebrew adverbs of manner are as follows:

– ‘nevertheless’, e.g.

  ‘And nevertheless our Rebbe didn’t eat the sauce or the meat’ (Gemen 1914: 83)

– ‘maybe’, e.g.

  ‘And maybe he would repent’ (Bodek 1866: 56)

– ‘surely’, e.g.

  ‘I would surely accomplish a lot’ (Breitstein 1914: 19)

– ‘well’, e.g.

  ‘dressed well’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 4)

– ‘You don’t have anything more to tell’ (Munk 1898: 21)

– ‘almost’, e.g.

  ‘almost the whole year’ (Seuss 1890: 10)

– ‘thus’, e.g.

  ‘And thus you shall do’ (Zak 1912: 136)

– ‘slowly’, e.g.

  ‘And he went slowly’ (M. Walden 1914: 54)

– ‘completely’, e.g.

  ‘completely dark’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 50)

– ‘quickly’, e.g.

  ‘Send quickly’ (Shenkel 1903b: 31)

– ‘simply’, e.g.

  ‘They are simply slaves to desire’ (Munk 1898: 17)

– ‘suddenly’, e.g.

  ‘And suddenly he saw’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 32)

– ‘empty-handed’, e.g.

  ‘He went home empty-handed’ (Sofer 1904: 21)

– ‘only’, e.g.

  ‘only eight’ (Kaidaner 1875: 10a)

– ‘immediately’, e.g.

  ‘The non-Jew immediately died’ (Brandwein 1912: 46)
Hasidic Hebrew possesses a range of coordinating and subordinating conjunctions. Like adverbs, the conjunctions reflect a mix of biblical and post-biblical forms, as well as certain Yiddish-influenced and unprecedented elements.

### 11.1 Coordinating Conjunctions

Coordinating conjunctions typical of Hasidic Hebrew are as follows.

- ‘but’, e.g. באל ‘But what should I do’ (Zak 1912: 14)
- ‘but’, e.g. ואתה תביש ענסמ ליזא ‘And you must prepare yourself for his arrival’ (Rodkinsohn 1864a: 30)
- ‘or’, e.g. תלבוש וא תעשה ‘clothes or money’ (M. Walden 1914: 122)
- ‘and’, e.g. והנבהתי התוכ ‘And I raised the cup’ (Shalom of Koidanov 1882: 20)

### 11.2 Subordinating Conjunctions

Subordinating conjunctions typical of Hasidic Hebrew are as follows. See 13 for details and examples of the various types of subordinate clauses that these conjunctions introduce.

**Causal Conjunctions (all translatable as 'because'; see 13.1 for examples)**

- עני
- כי
- המהמה של
- המפר של
- עלי אושר

---

1 See 13.7 for examples of contrast clauses introduced by this conjunction.
2 See 13.7 for examples of contrast clauses introduced by this conjunction.
3 Unlike in Biblical Hebrew, in Hasidic Hebrew this conjunction is not typically used to indicate contrasts.
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Complementizers (all translatable as ‘that'; see 13.4 for examples)

- אֶשֶר
- ד.
- כ.
- ש.

Concessive Conjunctions (all translatable as ‘even though'; see 13.5 for examples)

- אוּי
- אוּש
- והם ש.

Conditional Conjunctions (all translatable as ‘if'; see 13.6 for examples)

- אוּל
- או
- ל.

Purpose Conjunctions (see 13.10 for examples)

- בּוֹדֶר ‘so that'; ‘in order to'
- בְּשֵבָר ‘so that'; ‘in order to'
- דוּ ‘so that'; ‘in order to'
- לִבְלָ ‘lest'
- לָמֶשׁ ‘so that'; ‘in order to'
- מַן ‘lest'
- שׁ ‘so that'; ‘in order to'
- שָׁמָא ‘lest'

Relative Conjunctions (all translatable as ‘who', ‘which', or ‘that'; see 13.11 for examples)

- אֶשֶר
- ד. (Aramaic)
- ש.
Result Conjunctions (all translatable as ‘therefore’; see 13.12 for examples)

- לאה
- לפי בך
- על בז

Temporal Conjunctions (see 13.14 for examples)

- תעשע ‘when’; ‘while’4
- יהושע ‘when’
- נש ‘when’
- למש ‘when’
- מא ‘while’

---

4 This usage most likely derives from Yiddish, in which תעשע likewise serves as a temporal conjunction meaning ‘while’ (Beinfeld and Bochner 2013: 190).
Chapter 12

Particles, Prefixes, and Suffixes

12.1 Possessive Particles

In addition to the construct chain (discussed in 4.3), Hasidic Hebrew has two particles, the characteristically post-biblical ילש ‘of’ and its Aramaic counterpart ד-י, that serve to designate possessive and adjectival relationships between nouns. In contrast to many other elements of Hasidic Hebrew grammar in which biblical and post-biblical variants are employed interchangeably, these possessive particles are often restricted to specific semantic and syntactic contexts, discussed below.

12.1.1 ילש

The typically rabbinic possessive particle ילש ‘of’ is sometimes employed in Hasidic Hebrew instead of the construct chain. In some cases ילש is used interchangeably with the construct chain, but often its appearance is restricted to certain settings such as set expressions and noun phrases containing attributive adjectives or proleptic suffixes. Moreover, in general ילש is used somewhat less frequently and productively in Hasidic Hebrew than the construct chain. This is noteworthy for two main reasons. Firstly, as ילש is a characteristic marker of Rabbinic Hebrew (Pérez Fernández 1999: 32; Bendavid 1971: 462, 469), the fact that it is not the most prominent way of expressing possession in Hasidic Hebrew indicates that (in contrast to the Maskilic-based scholarly assumption) in this respect, as in many others, the language of the tales is not solely or primarily rooted in the rabbinic model. Secondly, the authors’ preference for the construct chain indicates that in this regard they were not overly influenced by their native Yiddish, considering that the Yiddish possessive particle נופ ‘of’ bears a much closer syntactic resemblance to ילש than to the construct chain.

The various patterns surrounding the use of ילש are examined below.

12.1.1.1 Interchangeable with Construct Chain

In some cases ילש is employed in identical syntactic contexts to the construct chain, i.e. indicating a possessive or adjectival relationship between two nouns, which may be either definite or indefinite, as below. This interchangeable use of the construct chain and ילש is underscored by the fact that a single author may employ the same two nouns in both constructions within the same paragraph, as the final example illustrates.
This phenomenon has a parallel in Rabbinic Hebrew, in which the construct chain and particle "shall often overlap in usage (Pérez Fernández 1999: 32). However, as mentioned above Hasidic Hebrew makes much more sparing use of than its rabbinic antecedent. There is some variation in this respect between individual authors; for example, Bromberg and Shenkel employ more frequently than Kaidaner, who avoids it almost entirely; nevertheless, the tales are relatively uniform in that no author uses more often than the construct chain.

12.1.1.2 In Set Phrases
Although "shall is sometimes employed productively in contexts indistinguishable from those in which the construct chain is found, it often appears as part of a set phrase that is well known from rabbinic literature. Examples of this are the phrases shown in the following examples, all of which are attested in rabbinic and medieval texts such as the Babylonian Talmud, midrashim, Rashi's commentaries, etc. The relative frequency of cases in which "shall appears in set phrases constitutes further evidence of the Hasidic Hebrew authors' overall preference for the construct chain as a productive method of expressing nominal possession.

- 'the Heavenly Court' (Shenkel 1903b: 8)
- 'the last night of Passover' (Bromberg 1899: 38)
- 'the seventh day of Passover' (Sofer 1904: 1)
- 'heavenly academy' (Brill 1909: 81)
- 'in the heavenly host' (Singer 1900b: 26)
- 'king of mercy' (A. Walden 1860?: 40b)
12.1.1.3 With Proleptic Suffix

In at least half of the cases in which לֵשׁ appears in the Hasidic Hebrew tales, it is employed in conjunction with a third person proleptic possessive suffix. The suffix is typically 3ms, but may occasionally be 3fs or 3mp. The construction is typically employed in phrases where the possessor is definite, as in the following examples.

With 3ms Suffix

- ‘the grandson of the Ba’al Shem Tov’ (Zak 1912: 153)
- ‘the daughter of this taxman’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 4)
- ‘the worth of the honey’ (Sofer 1904: 38)
- ‘from the pocket of the garment’ (Berger 1907: 115)
- ‘the tail of the fish’ (Brandwein 1912: 20)
- ‘the Jew’s roof’ (Bodek? 1866: 5b)
- ‘to the resting place of that Hasid’ (Brill 1909: 81)
- ‘and his father’s mother’ (N. Duner 1912: 27)
- ‘the power of the Rebbe’ (Ehrmann 1905: 85b)
- ‘to the house of the informer’ (Heilmann 1902: 199)
- ‘the father of the Maharal of Prague’ (Jacob Isaac ben Asher of Przysucha 1908: 111)
- ‘his father’s brother-in-law’ (Michelsohn 1910c: 47)
- ‘the student of the Maggid of Mezeritch’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 14ii)

With 3fs Suffix

- ‘the heart of the orphan girl’ (Bodek 1866: 1)
- ‘your daughter’s match’ (Bodek? 1866: 3a)

With 3cp Suffix

- ‘the sins of Israel’ (Munk 1898: 16)
- ‘the Christians’ holiday Easter’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 18)

This construction most likely derives directly from Rabbinic Hebrew, in which it is a prominent feature (Pérez Fernández 1999: 32). However, the Hasidic...
Hebrew authors deviate somewhat from rabbinic precedent in that this proleptic construction is for them the most common vehicle for לֵשׁ, while in rabbinic literature the particle is widely attested in many other settings as well.

In addition, this construction is sometimes found in conjunction with a possessor that is a common noun and lacks a definite article, as in the following examples. Many of the phrases in question appear in rabbinic and medieval literature, and the authors may therefore simply have borrowed them as set phrases from these sources, but not all such forms are clearly ascribable to this influence (e.g. the phrase in the last example seems to lack precedent).

– לֵשׁ תַּל שְׁלָלְמָר לֵשׁ תְּלֵמְדוּדָה שְׁלָלְמָר נֶבֶם ‘to sympathize with the woes of Torah scholars’ (Bodek 1865a: 4)
– לֵשׁ הָעָפֹר שֶל אֶשְׁוָי הוֹדְרִי ‘the livelihood of a Jewish man’ (Breitstein 1914: 51)
– לֵשׁ רְוֹנֵא שֶל אַדָּם ‘the memory of a man’ (Singer 1900b: 28)
– לֵשׁ חָוָה שֶל אָשָׁא נֶעֶה ‘the power of a modest woman’ (Ehrmann 1911: 20a)
– לֵשׁ קִבּוֹר שֶל אָשָׁי אַוָּר ‘the grave of another man’ (Berger 1910c: 12)

In some such cases the meaning of the possessor is definite even though it is not marked as such, e.g.:

– לֵשׁ כְּלָל תִּוָּר ‘the yoke of Torah’ (Bodek 1865a: 29)

12.1.1.4 With Attributive Adjectives
Another relatively common Hasidic Hebrew use of לֵשׁ is in possessive constructions containing attributive adjectives. Indeed in such contexts the authors prefer the particle to the construct chain, which appears only rarely with attributive adjectives (see 4.3.2.10). The adjectives in these possessive constructions usually modify the first noun rather than the second, but occasionally they may modify the second noun as well. These possibilities are illustrated below. The authors’ preference for לֵשׁ instead of the construct chain in phrases containing attributive adjectives suggests that, uncharacteristically, in such cases they were more at ease with the particle. This may be due to confusion caused by their tendency to use adjectives as members of construct chains.

– לֵשׁ מִשְׁכַּה נוֹרָה לֵשׁ הַרְבָּא אָוָר הָעָלֶם ‘a great and awesome story of the Rebbe, light of the world’ (Shenkel 1903b: 7)
– לֵשׁ הָרֶםְמִי נוֹת בֹּז לֵשׁ הָאִמְרוֹת לֵשׁ הָטָוְלָר ‘Maimonides meant by this the real secret of the incense’ (Bromberg 1899: 48)
12.1.1.5 With Pronominal Suffixes

Just as Hasidic Hebrew may express the possessive or modifying relationship between two nouns by either the construct chain or a possessive particle, so it may express the possessive relationship between a noun and a personal pronoun either by means of a possessive suffix attached to the noun (see 6.2.1) or by the particle לְ with a pronominal suffix following the noun. The two constructions are used with similar frequency. The authors’ motivations for selecting לְ with a pronominal suffix instead of a suffixed noun on any given occasion are not always clear. In many cases לְ with a pronominal suffix often seems to be used in conjunction with post-biblical nouns and Yiddish loanwords that the authors might have perceived as awkward with a possessive suffix. This trend is illustrated in the following examples, which contain nouns denoting characteristically rabbinic and medieval or early modern concepts.

–ךלשיברה ‘your Rebbe’ (Ehrmann 1905: 85b)
–המכות ‘my writings’ (Hirsch 1900: 32)
–הלעטה ‘to my carriage-driver’ (Kaidaner 1875: 27b)
–הבר מות ‘his bar mitzvah’ (Heilmann 1902: 2)
–הפתלי ‘our phylacteries’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 5)

Nevertheless, לְ with pronominal suffixes is additionally found in conjunction with words that are not specifically post-biblical, e.g.:

–ךלשלם ‘my wagon’ (Jacob Isaac ben Asher of Przysucha 1908: 51)
–ךלשית ‘my hands’ (Chikernik 1903b: 6)
–ווכנס ‘And he entered his room’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 13)

In some such cases it is nevertheless possible that the nouns in question struck the authors as non-biblical because of their frequent use in post-biblical sources and in Yiddish, and therefore they did not naturally combine them
with a more characteristically biblical possessive suffix. However, this may not be applicable in all cases: for example, in the phrase shown in the final example below it does not seem particularly likely that the authors would have perceived the word הָדֶר ‘room’ as post-biblical, given that it is used with an identical sense in the Hebrew Bible (Even-Shoshan 2003: 525).

Usually the possessive particle is used in conjunction with definite nouns. However, rarely it is found with an indefinite head noun, as below.

– יָהלֵם יָדֶבֶעינָשׁ ‘two slaves of hers’ (Hirsch 1900: 73)
– יָהלֵם יְדוֹלָה תַּבִּישֵׁית שָׁלָל ‘And he took jewels of hers’ (Ehrmann 1905: 57a)
– יָהלֵם יָדוֹתא אָנָיָה יָגְדוֹל שָׁלָל ‘to remove the pauper and his wagon’ (Breitstein 1914: 26)
– יָהלֵם יָנָה לָנָה שָׁלָל ‘Give me your wagon’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 8)

This practice has precedent in Rabbinic Hebrew (see e.g. Sharvit 2004: 74 for examples). It may be reinforced by the fact that in Yiddish nouns in the standard possessive adjective construction do not take the definite article (Jacobs 2005: 183).

12.1.2

In addition to the post-Biblical Hebrew possessive particle לֵשׁ, the Hasidic Hebrew authors make use of its Aramaic equivalent, לט. However, they do not seem to have regarded this Aramaic particle as interchangeable with the construct chain or לֵשׁ: instead of employing it to indicate possessive relationships, they typically use it to convey geographic or, somewhat less frequently, temporal ones. Interestingly, in these settings לט is used extremely systematically, to the almost complete exclusion of the construct chain and לֵשׁ.

12.1.2.1 Geographic Sense

The particle לט is most commonly used to indicate geographic relationships. In such contexts it usually links a common noun with a following proper one; the common noun generally denotes an individual, event, or institution originating from or based in a particular geographic location while the proper noun denotes the location in question. In some cases the particle is instead prefixed to a common noun with geographic reference such as יִשָּׁר ‘city’ or קִו ‘community’; this itself may be unaccompanied, followed by the place name, or bear a possessive suffix. Occasionally, the second constituent may be an adverb of place rather than a noun. These possibilities are all illustrated below. The origins of this construction are not completely clear, though it may be based
on analogy with the well-known Hebrew and Yiddish designation for Vilnius, ‘Jerusalem of Lithuania’.

– ‘the market day of Balta’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 37)
– ‘the new rabbi of Pinsk’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 10)
– ‘in the library of the capital city Vienna’ (Bodek 1866: 5)
– ‘to the house of the community leader of [the] town’ (Bodek 1866: 7)
– ‘and also the rabbi of our community’ (Kaidaner 1875: 26b)
– ‘in the local synagogue (lit: the synagogue of there)’ (Shenkel 1903b: 24)
– ‘the local rabbi (lit: rabbi of there)’ (Ehrmann 1903: 15a; Singer 1900b: 3)
– ‘And the local river (lit: the river of here) rose’ (Landau 1892: 18)
– ‘to the doctors of that place (lit: there)’ (Moses Leib of Sasov 1903: 21a)
– ‘the rabbi of this place (lit: here)’ (Michelsohn 1912: 6)
– ‘from the rabbi of our community’ (A. Walden 1860?: 12a)
– ‘one of the opponents [of Hasidism] of Vitebsk’ (Heilmann 1902: 197)
– ‘fear of the local gentiles (lit: gentiles of there)’ (Rosenthal 1909: 44)
– ‘on both sides of [the] local river (lit: river of there)’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 9)

12.1.2.2 Temporal Sense
The particle -ד can also be used in a temporal sense. This usage is less frequent than the geographic sense discussed above but is still not uncommon. In such cases -ד generally appears between two common nouns, with the first noun indicating an event that takes place at a set time, e.g. ‘morning meal’ or קידוש ‘kiddush’, and the second noun denoting a specific time, e.g. יומ׳ ב ‘the second day’ or לילה ‘Friday evening’. More rarely this pattern may be reversed, with the first noun designating the time and the second noun referring to the event. These patterns can be seen in the following examples.

– ‘Friday night Kiddush’ (Bromberg 1899: 34)
– ‘The third day of the intermediate days of Passover’ (Gemen 1914: 54)
The precise derivation of this temporal usage is more obscure than that of
the geographic one, save that in a general sense it is most likely traceable to
the frequent appearance of -ד in the Babylonian Talmud and later Aramaic
writings. Moreover, the fact that the Hasidic Hebrew authors systematically
employ -ד in these two specific contexts while avoiding it almost completely
in others is striking and cannot clearly be ascribed to any particular motivation
or linguistic influence. This phenomenon lends further support to the proposal
that many Hasidic Hebrew non-standard usages are not indiscriminate but
rather can be considered systematic internal developments.

12.1.2.3 Exceptions

There are rare exceptions to the above patterns whereby -ד is found in contexts
that appear interchangeable with those in which the construct chain and
都能够 are more commonly employed. The following is an example of this very marginal
phenomenon.

– ומכנש בורשש עי אוח 'and like the story of the adversary with Job' (Ehrmann
1903: 7a)

The authors' motivation for the occasional selection of -ד in such settings
when they typically reserve it for geographical and temporal contexts is not
clear, though it may suggest that the particle's role as a marker of geographical
and temporal relationships, though largely regular, had not yet been entirely
crystallized during the period of the tales' composition.

12.2

The particle ןיא 'not'; 'there isn't'; 'there aren't' is commonly used in Hasidic
Hebrew both as a negative existential particle and as a negator in verbless and
participial clauses. The particle may take pronominal suffixes, as shown in the
following table. Where multiple variants of a single form are listed (e.g. the 1cs
ואין), they are used interchangeably unless otherwise indicated in the
discussion below.
Plural | Singular
--- | ---
1cp | אני, אinite, ואת
2mp | אנחנו,คfinite, ואת
2fp | –
3mp | אנחנו,אfinite
3fp | –

The suffixed forms of ניא generally conform to biblical and/or rabbinic precedent regarding morphology but exhibit a few noteworthy differences from the canonical forms of Hebrew regarding person and number.

Firstly, as in the case of the personal pronouns, the 2p form can also serve as a polite 2s form. (No examples of feminine addressees with ניא appear in the tale corpus.)

– זמר ל reminding לאמר איסוס אינכאמדיך לאמר אינכאמדיך
  ‘And Reb Faivel said to him, “Don’t you know them?”’ (Munk 1898: 50)

Secondly, the role of the forms וניא andםניא, which are 3ms and 3mp in other forms of Hebrew, has been extended so that וניא also serves as a 2ms and 1cs form, whileםניא also serves as a 1cp form, e.g.:

1cs and 2cs Pronouns with וניא

– אני ‘I don’t take [anything] except one gold [piece] from a shop’ (Kaidaner 1875: 33b)
– Stopwatch ‘And he claimed that I don’t need the kaddish so much’ (Zak 1912: 9)
– אני ‘I can’t be of benefit to you’ (J. Duner 1899: 16)
– אתה ‘You see, you are also certainly not far away from his nature’ (Kaidaner 1875: 46a)
– אתה ‘Of course, you’re not a fool’ (Munk 1898: 65)

1cp Pronouns with אנחנו

– אנחנו ‘We don’t know’ (Rosenthal 1909: 14)
– אנחנו ‘And we aren’t afraid’ (Chikernik 1902: 32)
Conversely, the traditionally 1cs form ניא can also serve as a 3ms form:

– ‘And that bird does not bode well, as is known’ (Ehrmann 1903: 49b)

A similar, though not identical, phenomenon is found in medieval and early modern responsa literature, in which gender and/or number discord is attested in negative constructions with suffixed forms of ניא (Betzer 2001: 91), and, as in many other instances, it is likely that the Hasidic Hebrew convention was inspired or reinforced to some degree by the existences of this related practice. Moreover, like many other non-standard aspects of Hasidic Hebrew morphosyntax, this phenomenon is most likely directly attributable at least in part to phonological factors: the forms ניא and וניא would most likely have been pronounced identically as [ejne] or [ajne] in the authors’ Ashkenazi Hebrew, which could have led to confusion between the written forms.

12.3

The accusative marker ניא is a relatively common feature of Hasidic Hebrew, though its forms and uses do not always correspond precisely to other forms of the language. Noteworthy morphological and syntactic aspects of the particle are discussed below.

12.3.1  Morphology

12.3.1.1 With Pronominal Suffixes

The accusative marker ניא is frequently attested with pronominal suffixes in the tales. The suffixed forms of the particle are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Singular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1cp ניא</td>
<td>1cs ניא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2cp ניא</td>
<td>2ms ניא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3cp ניא</td>
<td>3ms ניא</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks on noteworthy aspects of individual forms are given below.
12.3.1.1  Spelling
The 1cs, 3ms, and 1cp forms are consistently spelt plene. The fact that the 1 present in the other forms is missing in the 2cp indicates that the Hasidic authors followed the standard Hebrew convention whereby the holem of the other forms is replaced by segol (although due to the lack of pointing, it is difficult to be completely certain that lack of 1 should definitely be interpreted as indication of a segol).

12.3.1.2  2fs Form
The 2fs form is only very infrequently attested; a rare example is shown below. Because the texts are unvocalized it is not clear whether the authors systematically distinguished between the 2ms and 2fs variants (particularly given their propensity to use traditionally 2m subject pronouns with 2f reference; see 6.1.1.2 and 6.1.1.3).

– ותֹּפָסִים אֶמְאָה לֶחָטְלִפְנַי מַאֲסָכֵלִים [אמר] [אגר פַּרְצָה עָוָּות] מְפֹּתָה And his mother wanted to give him food [...] and he said [...] “I will support you from now on”’ (Sofer 1904: 7)

12.3.1.3  2cp/2ms Form
The form אתה is common in gender; an example with a feminine plural subject is shown below:

– וְהָנָה [אמר] [אגר פַּרְצָה] אתה הדְּפֶּאִי נָא [And there were two women [...] and he said “[...] I will free you”’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 14)

Moreover, it can serve as a polite 2ms form, e.g.:

– ויָאִמְר הָרוֹב הַכֹּרֶשׁ הַדְּרֵעַ אוֹרִי יַאֲמֵר אֶל יוֹדָּא אתה לָבְרָי The holy Rebbe said, “Do you know me?” And he said, “I know that you are a Rebbe”’ (Sofer 1904: 35)

12.3.1.4  3cp Forms
As in the case of the independent personal pronouns (discussed in 6.1.1.8), Hasidic Hebrew does not distinguish masculine and feminine gender in the third person plural object pronouns. Instead, it has two interchangeable 3cp variants. However, אתה is more frequently attested than והם, as illustrated below.
12.3.2 Use

12.3.2.1 Distribution

In many cases definite nouns in Hasidic Hebrew are preceded by the accusative particle התאם. This applies to nouns prefixed by the definite article and nouns with a possessive suffix. (There are no examples of proper nouns preceded by התאם in the tales.) These possibilities are illustrated below. In this respect Hasidic Hebrew follows the standard convention in Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew (see Rabin 2000: 117).

With Definite Article

- לעבלש המדהות התאם "To rent this inn of mine’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911b: 92)
- לעבלשה התאם "She went and milked the pig’ (Ehrmann 1911: 5b)
- ולשימחה התאם "And the rabbi ordered his non-Jewish servant to bridle the horses’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 1)
- הלשימחה התאם "And he brought in the place where the roof was leaking into the house’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 36)
- הלשימחה התאם "And he sent him back the strap’ (Brandwein 1912: 10)
- הלשימחה התאם "I was forced to leave my meal’ (Hirsch 1900: 29)
- הלשימחה התאם "And he took his bag’ (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 28)
- הלשימחה התאם "And the Rebbe took the wheel’ (N. Duner 1912: 18)
- הלשימחה התאם "to take this great wealth’ (Rosenthal 1909: 19)
‘And the Rebbe took the goblet’ (Seuss 1890: 5)
‘And he saw the silver’ (Shenkel 1883, pt. 1: 7)
‘He went and hid the money’ (Greenwald 1899: 56a)
‘And he took the box’ (Chikernik 1903b: 22)

With Possessive Suffix

‘The holy child immediately opened his mouth’ (Zak 1912: 9)
‘to leave his Rebbe’ (Singer 1900b: 24)
‘to open his mouth’ (Bodek? 1866: 7b)
‘to hear their speech’ (Jacob Isaac ben Asher of Przysucha 1908: 52)

However, the Hasidic Hebrew authors do not always employ התא in conjunction with definite direct objects; indeed, they omit it somewhat more often than they insert it. Examples of this strong tendency to avoid התא before objects preceded by the definite article and with possessive suffixes are shown below.

With Definite Article

‘to eat the meat’ (Gemen 1914: 48)
‘And I raised the cup’ (Shalom of Koidanov 1882: 20)
‘Again he put down the note from his hand’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911b: 70)
‘And he could not endure the great fear’ (Bodek 1865a: 24)
‘And he took the chair in his hand’ (Singer 1900b: 14)
‘They sold all the bread’ (Bodek? 1866: 23b)
‘And he put on the clothes’ (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 2)
‘And he told him the truth’ (Jacob Isaac ben Asher of Przysucha 1908: 99)
‘And he took the key from him’ (Rosenthal 1909: 23)
‘to extinguish the candles’ (Seuss 1890: 4)
‘And you will merit seeing the Divine Presence’ (Shenkel 1883, pt. 2: 29)
‘For whom are they building this big palace?’ (Greenwald 1899: 56a)
‘You didn’t close the door’ (M. Walden 1913, pt. 3: 13)
‘Did you bring the package?’ (HaLevi 1909: 53)
With Possessive Suffix

- ‘לחתות ראשה’ (Brandwein 1912: 18) ‘to cut off its head’
- ‘לдать לך בתה’ (Heilmann 1902: 120) ‘to give you his daughter’
- ‘ולאד働きנהרמשייפרשבנותו’ (Berger 1910a: 38) ‘And when he heard her words, he opened his mouth in a great laugh’
- ‘לעזוב לימודו’ (Singer 1900a, pt. 2: 15) ‘to leave his learning’
- ‘וישב עלจองואםלשמהבמחודהרבה’ (Kaidaner 1875: 28a) ‘And he sat at the table and ate his meal with great happiness’
- ‘והשתי יחלקברחתפירדה’ (Zak 1912: 12) ‘And he stretched out his hand to receive the parting blessing’

Direct object phrases lacking תא are not restricted to specific semantic or syntactic settings; rather, the particle seems to be an optional element that can be inserted or omitted at random. The following two examples below illustrate this, as each one contains similar collocations appearing within the work of a single author both with and without תא.

- ‘א_non-Jew had carried the carrots’ (Michelsohn 1912: 84); cf. ‘לזאותלשמיםשלאכל’ (Michelsohn 1912: 84–85) ‘to eat the carrots’
- ‘לאותלקהלשלשתהסדכתעשלאשת’ (Ehrmann 1905: 44b); cf. ‘והיהמתאהב״הוהלקהלשלשתהסכתעלאשת’ (Ehrmann 1905: 153a) ‘And the holy Rebbe redeemed the headscarf’

The authors' frequent omission of תא likely stems at least in part from the fact that their native Yiddish does not possess such a particle, and that as such it was not natural for them to insert it. This may have been compounded by the widespread existence of a similar trend in a range of well-known Hebrew texts from the medieval period, including Rashi's commentaries, the Sefer Hasidim, Spanish-Provençal Hebrew prose (see Rosén 1995: 64–66 and Rabin 2000: 117) and translations from Arabic (Goshen-Gottstein 2006: 111). Rabin (2000: 117) proposes that this medieval convention is rooted in Paytanic Hebrew (which often omits תא, as discussed in Rand 2006: 258–259), and that this in turn is based on Biblical Hebrew poetry, in which תא is much less common than in biblical prose; alternatively, it is possible that the medieval authors tended to omit the particle for the same reason as their Hasidic descendants, precisely because it was lacking in their own native languages.

Finally, note that when there are two direct objects in a row, the first may be preceded by תא while the second lacks it, e.g.
12.3.2.2 Preceding Indefinite Noun

The particle תָּא sometimes appears before an indefinite noun. This usage deviates from historical precedent, as in earlier forms of Hebrew תָּא is typically restricted to definite direct object phrases. There are a few rare instances of this phenomenon in Biblical Hebrew, e.g. Num. 21:9 and 1 Kings 12:31 (see Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 180–181 and Williams 2007: 168 for discussion). The construction seems to be slightly more common in Rabbinic Hebrew, particularly when the noun in question begins with a guttural consonant (Azar 1995: 62–63). The biblical phenomenon is extremely marginal and is therefore unlikely to have inspired the Hasidic Hebrew construction. The rabbinic construction is perhaps more likely to have exerted some influence, though this is uncertain as it is not an extremely widespread feature of rabbinic literature and therefore it is unclear how much of an impression it would have made on the Hasidic Hebrew authors.

In some of these non-standard cases the authors may have selected תָּא because they perceived the constructions in question to be definite. For example, a few such nouns follow the noun ולל ‘every’, which though grammatically indefinite may have been perceived by the authors as definite due to its meaning. This phenomenon is likewise attested in the Mishnah (Azar 1995: 63). Examples include the following:

- ‘אנכי אל תראה כל על מקום התמידת תָּא ‘I don’t see anything but the Godly power that keeps every physical thing alive’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 39)
- ‘והבישתאלאברךותָאכלאשרוה ‘And the Ba’al Shem Tov of blessed memory blessed each and every man’ (Ehrmann 1903: 3a)

Similarly, it is sometimes found preceding an indefinite noun that is followed by a suffixed possessive particle, which would likewise typically be understood as definite, e.g.:

- ‘הראהלאמשהבדוהשקשורהתָאעגלהשהלעגלהשהרחיישין ‘And he indicated to Reb Moshe with his hand that he should tie his wagon to the wagon of the Maskil’ (Sofer 1904: 23)
- ‘אנירמהאתמעלםאתנאםעך ‘I don’t want you or your money’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 12)
Conversely, in many cases the indefinite noun appears in syntactic contexts lacking any definite elements, wherein the authors’ motivation for selecting the accusative particle is less clear, e.g.:

- ‘And we will heal others’ (Gemen 1914: 59)
- ‘to call one pauper’ (Michelsohn 1912: 36)
- ‘Who it was [that] stole a precious stone’ (Bodek? 1866: 16a)
- ‘And he asked one man’ (N. Duner 1912: 2)
- ‘to bless a non-Jew’ (Singer 1900a, pt. 1: 3)
- ‘to carry phylacteries on the Sabbath day’ (Breitstein 1914: 60)
- ‘The baker had taken a man for [his] son-in-law’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 56)
- ‘[...] He could not stand people any more’ (Bromberg 1899: 41)

The particle הנה is an extremely common element of the tales. In this respect Hasidic Hebrew resembles its biblical antecedent, in which הנה plays a key role, in contrast to rabbinic literature, in which it does not feature (Segal 1927: 149). Its morphological, syntactic, and semantic properties are presented below.

12.4.1 Morphology

12.4.1.1 With Pronominal Suffixes

In Hasidic Hebrew הנה does not appear very frequently with pronominal suffixes. The attested suffixed forms are shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Singular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הנהו 1cp</td>
<td>הנהי 1cs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נהנו 2mp</td>
<td>נהני 2ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נהנה 2fp</td>
<td>נהנה 2fs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נהו 3mp</td>
<td>נהוה 3ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נה 3fp</td>
<td>נה 3fs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 3ms form והנה, shown below, lacks precedent in the earlier canonical forms of Hebrew: in Biblical Hebrew the only 3ms form is וֹנִּה (van der Merwe, Naudé, and Kroee 1999: 329), while in Mishnaic Hebrew the particle ירה is used instead of והנה (Pérez Fernández 1999: 173). However, the variant והנה is attested in the sixteenth- and eighteenth-century biblical commentaries of Moses Alshich and Chaim ibn Attar, which may be the direct source of the Hasidic Hebrew use of this form. The popularity of the form may have been reinforced by analogy with the identically spelt Aramaic term והנה ‘those', which is widespread in sources such as the Babylonian Talmud.

– והנה The stain is clean (Sofer 1904: 4)
– והנהו And he looked, and he was exactly according to his resemblance (J. Duner 1899: 112)
– והנהו And he has never been here (Ehrmann 1903: 12a)

12.4.2 Use
The particle והנה is found in several syntactic and semantic contexts, detailed below.

12.4.2.1 והנה in Direct Speech
והנה frequently appears at the very beginning of an utterance followed by a finite verb, as shown below. In these contexts it serves to draw attention to the following statement, with a translation value of ‘you see' or ‘it so happens that'. This usage corresponds to that of Biblical Hebrew, in which והנה is often found at the beginning of a direct utterance followed by a finite verb (see Zewi 1996 for details).

– והנה ‘Afterwards the Ba’al Shem Tov said to him, “You see, I know [what] your request [is]”’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 6)
– והנה ‘And the holy Maggid said to them, “I will make a compromise between you”’ (Gemen 1914: 64)
– והנה ‘You see, I have begun’ (Kaidaner 1875: 18a)
– והנה ‘I know that you are a weak man' (Seuss 1890: 5)

In some cases והנה appears at or near the beginning of an utterance with a pronominal suffix and directly followed by a qoṭel or non-verbal predicate. In such instances it usually marks the qoṭel as conveying present progressive or planned future action. Again, these usages all have precise counterparts in Biblical Hebrew (as discussed in Zewi 1996).
‘I see that it is so’ (Michelsohn 1910a: 44)

‘I hereby promise you that I will copy it properly’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 13)

‘And you see with your own eyes that I am wearing Sabbath clothes’ (N. Duner 1899: 77)

‘And they asked him, “When did you leave your house for Lublin?” And he answered them, “[Actually], I am travelling from Lublin to my house”’ (Bodek 1865c: 1)

‘Thus I fulfil [the commandment of] honouring one’s father’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 14i2)

Very rarely it serves as a nominal clause, e.g.:

‘And he told them the matters as they are’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 14ii3)

The suffixed particle is occasionally employed in conjunction with an independent pronoun. The use of the independent pronoun in addition to the suffix may be intended to draw attention to the subject through topicalization, though alternatively the authors may simply have used this particular construction because it was familiar to them from well-known biblical passages (such as Gen. 6:17, cited below), without any particular semantic considerations.

‘I know’ (Ehrmann 1911: 43b)

‘I suggest for myself’ (Landau 1892: 12)

‘And I am a very weak man’ (Jacob Isaac ben Asher of Przysucha 1908: 51)

‘And I will give my life in exchange for his life’ (M. Walden 1912: 60)

Cf. ‘And I am going to bring a flood, water upon the land’ (Gen. 6:17)

12.4.2.2 וְ(n) in Past Tense Settings

In addition to its attestation in present and future direct speech contexts, וְ very commonly appears in past tense settings (usually in narrative but occa-
sionally in direct speech) prefixed by the conjunction waw. In such cases it typically serves to introduce an element of vividness or immediacy, with a possible translation value of ‘and it so happened,’ ‘and there was’ or ‘when suddenly’. It may be followed by a variety of verbal forms with past tense force, including qotel and qaṭal with a past progressive sense and qaṭal with a preterite sense.

In such contexts ונה often follows the verb ה.ר.ר. ‘see’, e.g.:

– ‘ויירא ונה ילד בתוך היד’ (Seuss 1890: 27)
– ‘ויירא ונהﲆיעי לים Surface עד צליכה ונה’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 32)
– ‘ויירא ונה צרי חוכמי נחום הימים כそれでも חיות יใด ממולך מבו ישע’ (M. Walden 1913, pt. 3: 26)
– ‘ויירא בראographics חוכמי מזון ירה ונה למכל מExcellent מיעזלח הריצי באה’ (N. Duner 1912: 19)

It also frequently appears at the beginning of an independent sentence or clause:

– ‘וירא המוכם לאריא מה היה שות ונה היא שובכת חמת’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 8)
– ‘ויירא המוסים נשו גיד’ (Hirsch 1900: 59)
– ‘ויירא למנים ונהיתו ידויים מייסו כל מה ניעה’ (Moses Leib of Sasov 1903: 21a)
– ‘ויירא ונברר נינלי היה שות’ (Michelsohn 1910c: 54)

It occasionally appears directly following a temporal clause, e.g.:

– ‘וייתנה אלי. ויירא המוכם הנה יבסי שבוית’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 49)
– ‘וייתנה בewise היו ליירא והנה מאריס ונה מעשי ונה ענו נה نها
– ‘וייתנה בewise היו ליירא והנה מאריס ונה מעשי ונה ענו נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה והנה
– ‘וייתנה בewise היו ליירא והנה מאריס ונה מעשי ונה ענו נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה נה הנה

As mentioned above, it sometimes appears in direct speech with past tense reference, e.g.:
And I got up in the morning and saw that the whole leg had swollen up’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1910: 58)

Rarely, הנה appears in a past tense narrative setting without the conjunction waw, e.g.:

And he thought on his way [about] what he was doing; for here he was, going to such a righteous man and bringing lovers, prostitutes’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 45)

This Hasidic Hebrew usage mirrors to a considerable extent that of the biblical particle הנה, which has been interpreted to convey vividness or immediacy (see e.g. van der Merwe 2007) and can be followed by a qoṭel or qaṭal as well as other verbal and non-verbal forms (Zewi 1996: 34). However, there seems to be a difference between the biblical and Hasidic uses of the particle. The biblical הנה typically appears following verbs of sight, descriptions of dreams and visions, or other sight- or motion-related contexts (Zewi 1996: 27–28). By contrast, while the particle in Hasidic Hebrew often follows the verb ראו ‘see’, it does not necessarily follow explicit or implied verbs of sight or motion; indeed, as illustrated above, it frequently appears at the beginning of new sentences and narrative portions that are not directly connected to the preceding passage. Moreover, הנה immediately following a temporal clause without an introductory particle יהיו and הנה without the prefixed conjunction waw in narrative are not typical features of Biblical Hebrew.

It is likely that the partial resemblance in usage between Biblical and Hasidic Hebrew in this respect is attributable to the fact that the authors were intimately familiar with the biblical text and so incorporated the particle into their own writing in contexts that they perceived to resemble those of their biblical model. As in many other aspects of Hasidic Hebrew grammar, this tendency may be rooted in a desire to situate the tales linguistically within the venerable tradition of biblical narrative. However, the fact that הנה was not used in post-Biblical Hebrew and lacks an equivalent in their vernacular most likely meant that they did not fully understand the range of syntactic and semantic nuances of the biblical particle (which is not remarkable, given that it remains a subject of debate among present-day grammarians), and consequently employed it in somewhat different positions than those of the Hebrew Bible.
12.4.3 **Preceding Infinitive Construct**

The particle **הנה** with pronominal suffixes can be placed before an infinitive construct in order to convey the sense that the subject is about to perform the action indicated by the infinitive construct. In many cases there seems to be an element of willingness on the part of the subject to carry out the action conveyed by the infinitive. This usage is illustrated in the following examples:

- **הנה לְחַזַּק הָאָדָם** יָשָׁרְתוּ דַּעְתָּהוּ 'And I am about to copy down that which is relevant to our matter here' (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 38)
- **עַד יִשָּׂרֵי הָעָם,** אַחַר יִשָּׂרֵי הָעָם הָיָהוּ 'Therefore I am going to inform you what the priests have advised against you' (Shenkel 1903b: 24)
- **הנה לְעָשֶׂה לָכֶם שָׁלוֹם שְׁלוֹם,** בֵּית לָכֶם 'I am going to set a table before you laid with meat to eat' (Ehrmann 1903: 14b)
- **מַעְשָׂה הָנָּה לְחַזַּק בֵּית אָשָׂר,** אָשָׂר שָׁתִּי יְשָׁרֵי 'From now on I am going to carry out everything that you impose on me' (Bodek 1865c: 4)
- **הנה לְעָשֶׂה רְשֵׁי הָוָה,** אָשָׂר 'I am going to do the will of the Creator' (Singer 1900b: 22)
- **הנה לְחַזַּק,** בֵּית נֶהָד 'I am going to copy down a pleasant matter' (Chikernik 1903b: 32)

This usage is noteworthy because it seems to lack precedent in earlier forms of Hebrew. In Biblical Hebrew the particle **הנה** is often found preceding a *qotel* with imminent future force (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 627), but is never attested in conjunction with an infinitive construct. Similarly, the infinitive construct prefixed by **ל-** can itself serve to denote an imminent action (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 610), but this use does not occur following **הנה.** Conversely, in Rabbinic Hebrew the particle **הנה** is not a productive feature, having been replaced by **יהי** (Pérez Fernández 1999: 20, 173), and the latter is not used in conjunction with an infinitive construct to indicate imminent action. Moreover, this construction does not seem to appear in Medieval Hebrew literature. However, the same phenomenon is widely attested in Maskilic Hebrew literature (see Kahn 2009: 277–279 for details of this convention). This is one of many examples of the high degree of linguistic similarity between Hasidic and Maskilic Hebrew narrative. In addition, the construction appears in some eighteenth- to early twentieth-century Ashkenazi responsa, e.g. Moses Sofer’s eighteenth/nineteenth-century *Haṭam Sofer* and Moses Nahum Yerushalmiski’s *Be’er Moshe* (1901). This suggests that the construction can be regarded as a more widespread Eastern European Hebrew phenomenon.
The particle יִשׁ is widely attested in Hasidic Hebrew and typically functions as an existential particle with an indefinite noun with a translation value of ‘there is/there are’, as below. This mirrors the standard function of the particle in Biblical and post-Biblical Hebrew (see e.g. Gibson 1994: 56–57; Azar 1995: 85; Rabin 2000: 109–110; Rand 2006: 398).

– יִשׁ לִי יִדְיעָה בֵּיהַרְוָה אָשֶׁר הָוָרָדָה עַמָּדָה בּוֹדָה ‘I have clear knowledge that the matter is in a good condition’ (Bromberg 1899: 30)
– יִשׁ אָנוֹשׁי שםָאָלֵי עלָבְּהָא אֶזְּזָר וְעַשְׂרָר יָד ‘There are people who ask me in what way I am a Hasidic rebbe’ (J. Duner 1899: 39)
– יִשׁ חָלִיךְ בִּי רֶאֶס ‘There is a God in Israel’ (Rodkinsohn 1864a: 12)

In conjunction with a suffixed form of the preposition -ל, it serves to indicate possession in a manner equivalent to the English verb ‘have’, e.g.:

– יִשׁ לָכֶם כְּפֶסַךְ אֲשֶׁר לָךְ ‘all your money that you have’ (A. Walden 1860?: 31a)
– יִשׁ אָמְרָה הָחוֹתָן לַחוֹתָן שֶׁהָכָלָה יִשָׁה לַחַם כָּפָר יָד ‘The groom said to his friends that the bride had a face like a non-Jewish girl’ (Michelsohn 1905: 65)
– יִשׁ אֶשָּׁא אָמְחָד יִשֶׁר דוֹרְבֵי עָפָא ‘There is a man who has an issue with you’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911b: 5)

The particle אָנָה is a common feature of the Hasidic Hebrew tales. The authors’ employment of אָנָה is most likely modelled on its appearance in the Hebrew Bible, wherein it is a common and characteristic feature, in contrast to Rabbinic Hebrew, in which it is relatively marginal and restricted to biblicizing liturgical and poetic settings (Segal 1927: 148).

12.6.1 Syntactic Properties
In Hasidic Hebrew אָנָה appears frequently in direct speech in conjunction with a variety of verbal forms. It most commonly appears directly following an imperative, e.g.:

– קֵם נָא וְאֵאוֹת אֶל הָרָב יִכּוֹר אָלִיל ‘Please get up and follow me to the rabbi, because he is calling for you’ (Bodek 1865b: 28)
– שֶׁמֶנָּה נָא מִהֵמָּשְׁמֵלָד אָאיָר עַלְּךָ ‘Please listen to what the teacher is saying about you’ (Zak 1912: 8)
It may also follow third person *yiqṭol* forms with command force, as below:

- ‘Let him now go to rest’ (Bodek 1865a: 48)
- ‘Let our rabbi please tell us’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 1)
- ‘Please be so kind (lit: let it please be of your goodness) to reveal the truth to me’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 13)
- ‘May the life of your servant be valued in your eyes, my lord’ (Kaidaner 1875: 10b)
- ‘Here, let them get to know me’ (Landau 1892: 62)

Although the syntactic properties of the Hasidic Hebrew *אנ* resemble those of its biblical counterpart, there is a slight difference between the biblical and Hasidic employment of the particle in conjunction with third person commands of *hifil*, *iii-/י*, and hollow roots: in such cases Biblical Hebrew employs a distinct shortened jussive form, while Hasidic Hebrew, in which the jussive is not a productive feature (see 8.7.3), uses the *yiqṭol* instead.

More rarely, *אנ* may follow first person *yiqṭol*, e.g.:

- ‘Please let me put on my clothes’ (Rodkinsohn 1864a: 10)
- ‘Let us have (lit: speak) a debate about Torah interpretations’ (J. Duner 1899: 41)
- ‘Let me come before his honour with a request’ (Michelsohn 1912: 93)
- ‘Maybe I will also try to travel to him’ (Yellin 1913: 26)

Usually nothing separates the verb from the following *אנ*. The example below is a rare exception, whereby a suffixed preposition intercedes between the verb and the particle. This usage does not seem to have biblical precedent, which may point to a somewhat different understanding of the particle's syntactic properties on the part of the Hasidic Hebrew authors, possibly influenced by their native Yiddish (see directly below for details).

- ‘Let him tell me’ (Berger 1907: 53)

*אנ* also appears relatively frequently preceding its associated verb, e.g.:
This position is noteworthy as it seems to be without precedent in earlier forms of Hebrew. In Biblical Hebrew אֶ is invariably placed after the associated verb (Gesenius-Kautzsch 1910: 308), and the infrequent attestations of the particle in rabbinic literature reflect this convention, as do other post-biblical forms of the Hebrew such as the language of Palestinian piyyutim (Rand 2006: 399). The Hasidic Hebrew fronting of the particle may be due to influence from Yiddish: if, as is likely, the authors interpreted אֶ as a politeness particle (see following section), they may have equated it with the Yiddish politeness marker ביטש ‘please’, which commonly precedes its associated verb, leading them to treat it similarly.

12.6.2 Semantic Function
The semantic significance of the Hasidic Hebrew אֶ is not completely certain. The contexts in which it appears generally suggest that it is a politeness marker with a translation value of ‘please’, as illustrated in the English translations of the examples below. However, it is not entirely clear that the authors employed it with such a meaning in mind.

– הללו בעיון נא ‘Let him dine’ (Ehrmann 1911: 23b)
– נא יספר ‘Let him tell them’ (Rosenthal 1909: 17)
– נא אל תנהדר ‘Please do not deny’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 15)
– יחור ואי לבט khảפרא נא רעיית חסניית וأسلحة ‘You don’t have anything more to tell. Please go away in good health (lit: to life and to peace)’ (Munk 1898: 21)
– ויאמר לך Aydın נאציע ואת רדף תאר ‘And he said to the guest, “Please describe her with your words”’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 40)

This uncertainty is rooted to an extent in the fact that the function of אֶ in the Hebrew Bible is somewhat unclear and grammarians have interpreted it in various ways, e.g. as a marker of logical consequence (see Lambdin 1971: 170–171; Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 578–579; Fassberg 1994: 70–71), as a particle of entreaty (Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 322–323), and as lacking any semantic significance (Arnold and Choi 2003: 65), in addition to as a politeness marker (Kaufman 1991; Shulman 1999). However, the rabbis of the Talmud understood the biblical particle to be a politeness marker (see Kaufman 1991: 195), and as
the Hasidic authors would most likely have been familiar with this rabbinic explanation it is plausible that they interpreted and used אֱ as a politeness marker themselves. Alternatively, however, it is possible that they used it without attaching any particular semantic significance to it, simply because it was familiar to them from its frequent appearance in the Hebrew Bible.

12.7 Directive ה-

The directive suffix ה- is a common and widespread feature of Hasidic Hebrew. It is frequently attested on a range of nouns deriving from Biblical Hebrew, as shown below. Most of these forms occur frequently in the biblical corpus, but some of them are relatively rare; for example, חָתֵפה ‘to the door’ appears only once (in Genesis 19:6). These rarer biblical forms nevertheless appear in well-known narratives and were therefore most likely very familiar to the authors.

– הָנה ‘here and there’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 38)
– הָרָצָה ‘to the ground’ (Laufbahn 1914: 47)
– הָהָרָה ‘homewards’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 53)
– הָרָה ‘into the room’ (Kamelhar 1909: 31)
– הָזָה ‘towards outside’ (Jacob Isaac ben Asher of Przysucha 1908: 47)
– הָזָה ‘to the city’ (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 27)
– הָזָה ‘to the door’ (Singer 1900a, pt. 3: 5)
– הָשְׁמָה ‘heavenwards’ (Shalom of Koidanov 1882: 21)
– הָזָה ‘towards outside’ (Ehrmann 1903: 4a)
– הָלָה ‘to Luz’⁴ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 37)
– הָרֵפָה ‘(towards) inside’ (Michelsohn 1910a: 118)
– הָרֶפֶת ‘forwards’ (Zak 1912: 14)
– הָרֶפֶת ‘to Sheol’ (Bodek 1865c: 8)
– הָרֶפֶת ‘(to) there’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911b: 10)

Strikingly, the directive suffix in Hasidic Hebrew is not restricted to these forms with biblical precedent. Rather, it is frequently used innovatively with Eastern European place names, as below. These forms seem to lack clear precedent in earlier Hebrew texts. The most popular of these forms is הָלָה ‘to Lublin’, shown in the first example below, which is attested many times in the work of

---

⁴ Earlier name for the biblical city of Bethel, mentioned in Gen. 28:9 and 35:6.
seven different authors. Michelsohn's use of the directive suffix in such cases is particularly productive, as illustrated in the following examples.

- המדרטשמא 'to Amsterdam' (Michelsohn 1912: 91)
- הוב 'to Lvov' (Michelsohn 1912: 92)
- הובלינה 'to Lublin' (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 35)
- הלייכס 'to Lzhensk' (N. Duner 1912: 25)
- פסטהובנה 'to St. Petersburg' (Breitstein 1914: 26)
- רומנה 'to Romanov' (Michelsohn 1910c: 13)

This appears exceptionally with a tautologous prefixed preposition as well, as follows:

- הולינה 'to Lublin' (Ehrmann 1911: 27b)

The adverb שמה (‘to) there’ is often used with a locative rather than directive force, as shown below. This usage has precedent in Biblical Hebrew (Even-Shoshan 2003: 1912).

- לאשאוה[…]ץינזאקלהמשמועסוишינאבותכיםא 'He asked […] if he would write to the members of his house so that they would travel from there to Kozienice' (Bromberg 1899: 18)
- הזואמן ישב שמה כמות כל שנה 'And the loyal man stayed there almost the whole year' (Seuss 1890: 10)

The same locative sense is also once found with another noun, shown below. This latter usage does not seem to have clear precedent in Biblical Hebrew, in which the locative ק is attested only with place names prefixed by the inseparable preposition ב ‘in’ or preceded by the independent preposition על ‘near’; ‘next to’ (Williams 2007: 26).

- נוהה אש מחלקה תורלוה חכתיוהיר 'a great consuming fire started inside the city' (Ehrmann 1903: 1b)

The directive suffix can sometimes be used without the definite article and a following place name, as below. This usage does not seem to be attested in earlier canonical Hebrew writings.

- ריעיה ממעה 'to the town of Medzhybizh' (Bodek 1865b: 3)
- ריעיה מים 'to the city of Vienna' (M. Walden 1912: 109)
12.8 Interrogative -ה

The prefix -ה, which serves to form polar questions, is a relatively common feature of Hasidic Hebrew, as shown below. Interrogative -ה is attested in both Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew. However, it is a common element of Biblical Hebrew (Williams 2007: 192) but is relatively rare in rabbinic literature (Segal 1927: 220); therefore, its somewhat more frequent attestation in Hasidic Hebrew may indicate that in this case the authors were drawing primarily on their familiarity with the form from biblical texts. As in many other cases discussed throughout this volume, it is possible that the authors employed this form because they associated it with biblical literature and wanted (perhaps subconsciously) to root their own writing within the linguistic and literary tradition of biblical historical narrative.

– ‘המער הסה את הורב משטיאל ‘Do you know the rabbi from Stolin?’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 16)
– ‘הידעות את הדוא ‘Do you know what day it is?’ (Landau 1892: 14)
– ותיהול烦躁 לובות אומת הלحرم את האמרי ‘And the ghost started to cry; he said, “Do you seek to kill me?”’ (Kaidaner 1875: 24a)
– ‘הwerp את הערע תע שערני שעון זכר ‘Do you remember the time when we two were friends?’ (Gemen 1914: 69)
– ‘המשך ול удעי אולק קרשא ‘Do you still have any questions?’ (N. Duner 1912: 27)
– ‘האת ג’לדמעת מכם ‘Did you learn this from me?’ (Jacob Isaac ben Asher of Przysucha 1908: 50)
– ‘שעל העדעת את מעדלי ‘They asked, “Do you know Mendl?”’ (Michelsohn 1910c: 70)
– ‘הabras את המלמד בשור ‘Do you know the melamed in your town?’ (Seuss 1890: 15)
– ‘האכלת המ שיש ‘Have you eaten anything today?’ (Breitstein 1914: 33)
– ‘יהולכל הלוחת והלודה אתו עיד שנייה בעל עבדה ‘Can it be that the Rebbe of everlasting memory doesn’t know that he is a sinner?’ (M. Walden 1913, pt. 3: 8)

In addition, the particle frequently appears in the construction ההלא ‘is it not the case’, introducing a question for which a positive reply is expected, e.g.:

– ‘הלא יש תוכן את הורב געש ‘Isn’t there a young woman here?’ (Bromberg 1899: 25–26)
– ‘הלא אתה أيון שוטה ‘Of course, you’re not a fool’ (Munk 1898: 65)
Similarly, it is used in the formation of the independent interrogative האה, which, like the prefix, serves to introduce polar questions, e.g.:

- האה חורת ואליamanho ‘Did you return the wheel to him?’ (Bromberg 1899: 32)
- האה לימד? ‘Did he study?’ (Ehrmann 1911: 10b)
- האה בהאת את זה ‘Did you bring this?’ (Bodek 1865c: 7)
- האה אחוה חביתהל ‘Did you bring the package?’ (HaLevi 1909: 53)

12.9 Interjections

The Hasidic Hebrew authors express the interjection ‘yes’ by means of וה, as below. This usage is likely to derive primarily from Rabbinic Hebrew, in which the particle may be employed in the same sense (Jastrow 1903: 356; Pérez Fernández 1999: 172). וה is likewise attested in Biblical Hebrew, but differs from its Hasidic counterpart in that it is not an interjection but rather a clitic serving to introduce another constituent (Garr 2004: 324); moreover, it does not simply convey assent but instead is used to present facts or shared knowledge and to signal a range of epistemic values including speaker conviction, commitment, and certainty (see Garr 2004 for details). Nevertheless, the fact that the various biblical uses all have an affirmative sense may have reinforced the Hasidic Hebrew usage despite any syntactic and semantic differences.

- והולבישהו וולבישהיהיההמברהעמשאלשבHashSet אנד the Lithuanian Jew thought that the Rebbe had not heard what he had answered him, and he answered him, “Yes’’ (Munk 1898: 23)
- והורמאו צילמילתויהלהתאהצורםאולרמאו ‘And he said to him, “Do you want to be my attendant?” And he said, “Yes”’ (Shenkel 1903b: 12)
- והורמאו זיאמר וואם רצה אתוה חיבתלו מפרל גאמר וה ‘And he said to him, “Do you want to be my attendant?” And he said, “Yes”’ (Shenkel 1903b: 12)
- והורמאו ונתולה וולרמי ברשוש, וה, וייד, אפי ‘And the holy Rebbe answered him with his head, “Yes, I know’’’ (Breitstein 1914: 12)
Chapter 13

Clauses

13.1 Causal

Hasidic Hebrew causal clauses may be introduced by a variety of conjunctions, reflecting a typical fusion of biblical and post-biblical conventions. The different possibilities are shown below.

13.1.1 Introduced by כי

The most common Hasidic Hebrew causal subordinator is the characteristically biblical כי 'because', as below.

- וואם הנהל חנסתי לו כי הוא בטוח בו: 'And that man apologized to him because he trusted in the LORD' (Rodkinsohn 1865: 12)
- והדקדוקבר רצה לגלל מוש כי ראיה כי הלך מת: 'And the doctor wanted to go away from there, because he saw that the child was dead' (Seuss 1890: 4)
- אלא היה יוכל ليستוחו כי מרום הפיה: 'And he couldn't drink it because it was (lit: they were) bitter' (Ehrmann 1911: 9a)
- והיש רצה להלך אוסר מהמלוך כי לא השל את עשים: 'And the official wanted to throw him out of the inn because he had not finished paying' (Kaidaner 1875: 45a)

13.1.2 Introduced by -ש

Less frequently, the authors may employ the characteristically post-biblical causal conjunction -ש, as below. The use of this conjunction in Hasidic Hebrew is identical to that of its rabbinic predecessor (see Pérez Fernández 1999: 222–223 for details).

- רק מעשה Sheridan משון ורותלי כי מעשי: 'Only my deeds, for I have done evil [with] my deeds' (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 26)
- וראה ראת אלה בירוח ורות אלה גורל שלך חל והיי נישיא: 'And we have indeed seen that in your house there shines a great light, because your son, the child, will be the leader of the Jewish people' (Brandwein 1912: 2)
- אם לא נידע מה אמת אני אנתה בראש שמע מרדנה: 'And we don't know what that is, because we don't see any level[s]' (Laufbahn 1914: 51)
The Grodzisker Rebbe ordered that the rain stop because he had to travel to Radom’ (Gemen 1914: 94)

13.1.3 **Introduced by a Compound Conjunction**

The authors employ a variety of compound causal conjunctions. Most of these derive from post-Biblical Hebrew, e.g. - הממחת ש, - יהוּ, -شبهל ש, as in the following examples.

- 'Because you have taken it upon yourself to obey my words, I promise you that you will not have to travel all the way there’ (Bromberg 1899: 25)
- 'Because she ate cakes with his sister the righteous woman Reyzele, the dybbuk left her’ (Gemen 1914: 69)
- 'And many times he would ask a question because he was in doubt’ (Landau 1892: 57)
- 'Because the holy Rebbe of Stratyn saw him and he was still in a dispute with him, he turned his face away’ (HaLevi 1909: 54)
- 'And he had not blessed the [new] moon yet, because the moon had not shone until that night’ (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 1)
- ‘Because as for Hasidim, they don’t have any connection with Hell’ (Brill 1909: 27)

The compound biblical conjunction כן עי ‘because’ is also employed. It is not as common as the conjunctions discussed above but is not rare. Examples include the following:

- 'And because since then he was used to good meals, therefore a new spirit entered him’ (Ehrmann 1903: 29b)
- ‘Because the doctor had instructed him not to drink’ (Michelsohn 1912: 18)
- 'Because the man had fallen into transgression […] therefore he did not greet him’ (Sofer 1904: 10)
- ‘because his soul was impure’ (HaLevi 1907: 22a)
Sometimes the authors employ a compound based on a fusion of biblical and rabbinic components, as below. This construction is most likely based on its appearance in Alshich's commentary.

- ‘Because he had a rabbinic authorization from seventy cities’ (Zak 1912: 22)
- ‘Because he himself was from the western lands’ (M. Walden 1914: 14)

13.2 Circumstantial

Concomitant circumstantial clauses are typically attested with introductory waw, as in the following examples. This usage is most likely based on Biblical Hebrew, which has the same construction (Williams 2007: 176).

- ‘אַן הָאֱלֹהִים גַּזְזָא הַחָוָה נַפְלָל עַל רְאוּפִּי ‘Where can I go at this time, being naked?’ (Shenkel 1903b: 22)
- ‘וְשַׂעֲרֵי הַלְּתָן הֵמָּה יַתְנִיעִית עֶלְיוֹן ‘And he sat before an open window with the skullcap on his head’ (Landau 1892: 18)
- ‘בַּעַזְא אַשָּׁה אָחָה וַיִּלָּד עַל הָדוֹר מַעְשֵׁי ‘A woman came with a child in her arms’ (M. Walden 1914: 8)

Much more rarely, the qoṭel in a concomitant circumstantial clause is introduced by the post-biblical subordinator -ש, as below. This latter practice is noteworthy as it does not seem to derive from either Biblical Hebrew, in which neither -ש nor the more common equivalent ראו serves to introduce circumstantial clauses (see Williams 2007: 163–168 for a discussion of the uses of these particles in Biblical Hebrew), or from Rabbinic Hebrew, in which the compound subordinator -כַּש may be employed (Gordon 1982: 159), but not its simple counterpart.

- ‘מֵתָאשׁ אָתָא שֶׁקִּידָה הָפָרָה בַּדוֹר מַעְשֵׁי ‘And I found him reading the week’s Torah portion in floods of tears’ (Kaidaner 1875: 15a)
- ‘מֵתָאשׁ בַּאֲשָׁר רֹא אָתָא שֶׁקִּידָה הָפָרָה לָפְּנֵי הָעָמָדָה כַּמָּלְאָה הֲ, תֵּבֵאת ‘And when they arrived there, they saw him sitting before the Talmud like an angel of the LORD of Hosts’ (M. Walden 1914: 54)

Antecedent circumstantial clauses containing qaṭal may more frequently be introduced by -ש, e.g.:
13.3 Comparative

Comparative clauses are typically formed by means of the characteristically biblical conjunction יְשַׁרְשָׁאכ ‘as’, as below. This construction has a precise counterpart in Biblical Hebrew (Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 604).

- וינודאםעבלכהחמשירשאכיתארקלםלוכוצרוםיבלכהםוקמדעיתכלהו ‘And I went to the place of the dogs, and they all ran towards me as a dog rejoices with its master’ (Kaidaner 1875: 15a)
- ‘I must seek a restful home (lit: rest) for you, just as I seek for myself’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 7)

In counterfactual settings comparative clauses are typically formed by means of the post-biblical conjunction יְשַׁרְשַׁאכ ‘as if’, as in Rabbinic Hebrew (Pérez Fernández 1999: 217), e.g.:

- וינודאםעבלכהחמשירשאכיתארקלםלוכוצרוםיבלכהםוקמדעיתכלהו ‘And he was considered as one who studies the Torah without doubt, and as if he had fulfilled the entire Torah’ (Bodek 1865a: 6)
- וינודאםעבלכהחמשירשאכיתארקלםלוכוצרוםיבלכהםוקמד thaimassage ‘And he pretended (lit: made himself) as if he didn't know anything’ (Laufbahn 1914: 45)
- והשתה המיס יְשַׁרְשַׁאכ ‘And he drank the water as if it were soup’ (M. Walden 1914: 11)

13.4 Complement

13.4.1 Standard

Most of the complement clauses appearing in Hasidic Hebrew are object clauses. Object clauses in narrative are usually introduced by either the biblical complementizer יְשַׁרְשַׁאכ ‘that’ or its post-biblical counterpart -ש ‘that’, as in the two sets of examples below respectively. -ש is used somewhat more frequently than יְשַׁרְשַׁאכ, though יְשַׁרְשַׁאכ is not at all rare. The two particles are used in free distribution.
This practice thus constitutes another example of the widespread Hasidic Hebrew tendency to use biblical and post-biblical features interchangeably.

With יכ

- 'The woman cried in floods of tears that she had given a sum of eight hundred reinisch to a certain man' (Bodek 1865b: 3)
- 'And he said that he couldn’t go' (Berger 1910b: 142)
- 'And he declared aloud that the Rebbe had said that the Sabbath had not begun yet' (Chikernik 1903b: 13)
- 'And she cried out in a weeping voice that she had lost a purse (lit: pocket) with three hundred roubles' (Sofer 1904: 17)

With -ש

- 'And he said that he and his workers were only eight [men]' (Kaidaner 1875: 10a)
- 'But I know with certainty that the beast was kosher' (M. Walden 1913, pt. 3: 9)
- 'You know they say about you that you have many silver vessels and golden vessels and clocks' (Chikernik 1903a: 27)
- 'After all, didn’t you say that you were going to Lvov' (Berger 1910a: 38)
- 'And once an edict came out that a Jew was not permitted to own a pharmacy' (Berger 1910c: 115)

Somewhat more rarely the biblical particle רשא ‘that’ is used, as below. In Hasidic Hebrew, as in its biblical predecessor, רשא is more frequently employed as a relativizer (see 13.11 for details).

- 'I have clear knowledge that the matter is in a good condition' (Bromberg 1899: 30)
- 'Know that our emperor took the nation of Poland with such force' (Lieberson 1913: 27)
- 'And he told the Jew that the duchess was calling him to her house' (Shenkel 1903a: 17)
Finally, occasionally complement clauses may be introduced by the Aramaic complementizer -ד, as below. This usage is extremely rare; the prefix -ד in Hasidic Hebrew most typically serves as a possessive marker indicating geographical and temporal relationships (see 12.1.2).

- ותניבה מהויאדובזא ונייברה ‘And he thought with certainty that when he sat in weekday clothes [...] our Rebbe would undoubtedly wonder’ (Rosenthal 1909: 51)
- ידרע הארائه יבי ישראל אינל נמטיר על משברו ‘except that the bitter herb is also the beginning of the redemption’ (Berger 1910c: 51)
- ‘It is known that we the children of Israel do not have numbers in accounts’ (M. Walden 1912: 40)
- והפירושים והחכמה היתה דעתה קא chạy על פesityה העם ‘and the interpretation of that holy Rebbe that your people stand upon the simple people’ (Shenkel 1903b: 10)
- ואמר להם מה דאראת בנב ברוח דק ‘And he said to them what is mentioned in the Gemara, Berakhot 7, that a completely righteous man is permitted to be incited by wicked men’ (Bromberg 1899: 31)

13.4.2 **Following Verbs of Desire and Command**

A common subcategory of object clause consists of constructions in which one subject wants another subject to perform a given action. In such cases the Hasidic Hebrew authors employ a syntagm composed of the first subject followed by the associated verb of desire or command and then one of the subordinating particles (usually כ or -ש but sometimes אשת) followed by a *yiqtol*, as illustrated below. This type of construction corresponds to English infinitive constructions, as shown in the translations of the examples below. The usage may be partially rooted in post-Biblical Hebrew, in which -ש followed by a *yiqtol* is sometimes used in a similar way (Segal 1927: 242). The Hasidic Hebrew employment of כ and אשת as well as -ש in this type of setting is one of many examples seen throughout the grammar of the tales whereby biblical and post-biblical features are combined.
With יכ

– ‘And he wanted the name of Hasidim not to be mentioned again’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 3)
– ‘And he asked him to give a recommendation’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911b: 28)
– ‘I order you to stay here’ (? 1894: 5)

With ש

– ‘And then he spoke to the spirit and warned it to leave this woman’ (Bromberg 1899: 22)
– ‘And the holy Rebbe ordered him to buy a lottery ticket’ (Yellin 1913: 50)
– ‘And he asked him to dine with him’ (Seuss 1890: 33)
– ‘And he asked him to give him a charm’ (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 22)
– ‘And he wanted him to stay with him’ (Rosenthal 1909: 23)
– ‘And he ordered the warden to bring a second cup’ (Rapaport 1909: 33)

With ראש

– ‘And the king wanted his only son to learn wisdom’ (Seuss 1890: 35)

13.4.3  Introducing Direct Speech

The direct speech portions of the Hasidic Hebrew tales are not usually introduced by a specific marker. However, sometimes an utterance is preceded by the biblical complementizer יכ or, more commonly, its post-biblical counterpart -ש, e.g.:

With יכ

– ‘And my teacher of blessed memory told me that “Once I was in Kozienice”’ (Bromberg 1899: 7)
– ‘And they told him that “We are travelling to the place which the LORD has said”’ (Ehrmann 1903: 9b)
– ‘She answered and said that “You don’t know”’ (Michelsohn 1910c: 68)
With -ש

His daughter said to him that “I went into the wedding canopy with him” (Munk 1898: 25)

And my father of blessed memory said that “The deceased father of that orphan came to me in complaint” (Zak 1912: 9)

And my father of blessed memory said that “I went into the wedding canopy with him” (Munk 1898: 25)

And the rabbi of Barditchev answered him that “If I were sitting in peace here like the rabbi of Petersburg [...], I would also be able to study” (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 18)

And he said to him that “If you really had faith, you wouldn't need anything except the paper that I gave you” (Brandwein 1912: 17)

His holy honour our teacher of everlasting memory said (lit: said that) “When I was in Lublin for the first time, I heard that the Holy Jew, the Rebbe of everlasting memory, was coming” (Breitstein 1914: 5)

And he said to him that “Everything that belonged to me was burnt, and I was left with nothing” (Kaidaner 1875: 22a)

The use of -כ has precedent in Biblical Hebrew, in which the particle can likewise be employed to introduce direct speech (Williams 2007: 159). Hasidic Hebrew usage may stem from this biblical -כ recitativum, as it is not a feature of Rabbinic Hebrew (Segal 1927: 146) and does not seem to be a common element of the various medieval literatures with which the authors would have been familiar. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that the authors selected this particle instead of -ש, which is much more frequently employed in the biblical text introducing direct speech. Whatever the origins of the Hasidic Hebrew use of -כ to introduce direct speech, it is likely that their use of -ש is based on analogy with that of -כ, as they regarded the two particles as identical in other respects.

This type of construction is also attested once with the Aramaic complementizer -ד, as follows:

And he wondered, and said that “What is the puzzle?” (Bromberg 1899: 48)
13.5 Concessive

Hasidic Hebrew concessive clauses are most commonly introduced by any of the compound conjunctions ר”ש או ר”ש א”ש, ש”א או ש”א ש”א, as in the following examples respectively.

– ‘As they say that one is going to Leipzig even though they may pass through several towns beforehand’ (M. Walden 1914: 25)
– ‘The reading of the megillah, even if it was three miles away, nevertheless his voice was heard’ (Bodek 1866: 5)
– ‘The cistern was dry, even though previously it had been full of water’ (Sofer 1904: 9)

Interestingly, none of these conjunctions has precise precedent in the canonical forms of Hebrew; rather, they all constitute a fusion of various similar biblical and post-biblical particles. Concessive clauses in Rabbinic Hebrew are introduced by a variety of compound conjunctions beginning with ר”ש, א”ש, etc., and ש”א (see Segal 1927: 232, Pérez Fernández 1999: 241–242, and Azar 2013a for details), but ש”א or ש”א ש”א ש”א are not typically found in such settings. Similarly, in Biblical Hebrew concessive clauses may be introduced by a variety of particles including יִכּ (Williams 2007: 188), but the combination יִכּ ר”ש is not employed in this way.

In some cases concessive clauses are doubly marked, with ש”א or ש”א ש”א (or more rarely ש”א ש”א ש”א ש”א) introducing the first term and א”ל א”ל א”ל א”ל or א”ל א”ל א”ל א”ל how ever introducing the second term, e.g.:

– ‘Even though we really are big opponents of the way of the Hasidim, we (lit: but we) what our eyes saw, and not [those of] a stranger, it is impossible to deny’ (Kaidaner 1875: 15b)
– ‘And his acquaintances said to him, "Although you don’t hold the Ba’al Shem Tov in high regard, nevertheless we have heard people tell wondrous things about him”’ (Munk 1898: 17)
– ‘Even if the matter did not actually take place, it was in the power of the Ba’al Shem Tov to accomplish anything’ (Landau 1892: 18)
This construction is noteworthy because it does not seem precisely to mirror any earlier canonical form of Hebrew. In part it is rooted in Rabbinic Hebrew, in that the conjunction לבא in the contrastive sense and -שא both derive from this stratum. However, the compound -שא seems to be relatively rare in Rabbinic Hebrew: while it is attested, e.g. in Tosefta Tohorot 6:16, it is used much less frequently than the other rabbinic concessive compounds based on -שא, namely -שףא and -שפףא. Likewise, the particle מנהג is not a feature of Rabbinic Hebrew, but rather a medieval development (Even-Shoshan 2003: 358). Moreover, the construction as a whole is not a standard feature of Rabbinic Hebrew, wherein the second term of a concessive clause does not typically have an introductory particle (see Segal 1927: 231–232 and Pérez Fernández 1999: 242 for discussion of Rabbinic Hebrew concessive clauses). Likewise, no parallel construction employing two concessive conjunctions is found in Biblical Hebrew (see Williams 2007: 187–189 for details).

13.6 Conditional

13.6.1 Real Conditions
Real conditions are an extremely common feature of Hasidic Hebrew. They are typically composed of a protasis followed by an apodosis. The protasis is invariably introduced by אם ‘if’ or, more rarely, its medieval variant באם. By contrast, the apodosis does not usually have an introductory particle; however, in some cases it is introduced by the particle ע”ש ‘then’. Most commonly, both the protasis and apodosis have a future tense setting denoted by yiqṭol or imperative forms. These points are illustrated in the following examples.

- ‘אם תרצה, תן נא לעכה ונקרך נלך ‘If you want, give us the letter and we will read it for you’ (Ehrmann 1903: 4a)
- ‘האיש אמר כי הוא רוצהราม עコミ אם וילע ד׳ עコミ איתך וילך The man answered that he thought that if he asked him for one more week, he would give [it] to him’ (HaLevi 1909: 53)
- ‘אם תשלם לי אנא אנכי ואתא אתא אשר 베וני, ויאר ‘And if you pay me, then I will steal him and his wife and his children’ (Kaidaner 1875: 16b)
- ‘אם תתן לי א’hמרין רשת א_FRIEND טומ הזך אלה חיניק ‘If the Rebbe gives me permission, I will also answer my part’ (Moses Leib of Sasov 1903: 34a)
- ‘באם תבוא لنا ולה’ץ חלך עם בהדרה יזרם ‘And if you come here, go back with me on this way’ (Brandwein 1912: 17)
- ‘אם תודיע אדל אדול על כל מה שנעשה בהכבה עד כי לא אוכל עוד לחקל איש והך ‘If you do thus once more, know that I will not be able to save your son again’ (Bodek? 1866: 2b)
The use of asm to introduce real protases has precedent in both Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew (Williams 2007: 182; Pérez Fernández 1999: 215). The use of zar to introduce the protasis is ultimately traceable to Biblical Hebrew (Williams 2007: 181); it is not a feature of rabbinic literature (see Azar 1998 for details of Rabbinic Hebrew conditional clauses).

Occasionally the protasis and/or the apodosis has a present setting indicated by a qotel or a past setting indicated by a qatal, as below:

**Qatal**

- ‘And if a pauper came and didn’t have anything to give, he cut off a button and gave it to him to sell’ (Yellin 1913: 5)
- ‘And if I have sinned, may my lord answer me for this’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 2)
- ‘If they gave him clothes or money, he would give everything to other paupers’ (M. Walden 1914: 122)

**Qotel**

- ‘If the Tzaddik of Belz has ruled that I should reveal myself, I am obliged to do as he says’ (? 1894: 14)
- ‘And if I don’t feel that it is tasty, all of my work has been in vain’ (Gemen 1914: 63–64)
- ‘For man must be like a shofar; if one blows on it a sound comes from it’ (Munk 1898: 24)
Rarely, the apodosis may precede the protasis, e.g.:

- ‘Don’t get angry at me if I tell you the words of the Rebbe’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 29)
- ‘He’ll be able to help you if he wants to’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 5)
- ‘I’ll shoot this at you if you don’t listen to me’ (Shenkel 1903b: 5)
- ‘What will you do if, God forbid, there is a fire in the town on the holy Sabbath?’ (Hirsch 1900: 11)

Fronting the apodosis likely serves to highlight the salience of the information contained therein relative to that of the protasis; thus, in the first example above the fronting indicates that the speaker views the negative request ‘don’t get angry’ as more important than the condition ‘if I tell you’. Similarly, in the second example the fronting may function as a way of drawing attention to the outcome ‘he will be able to help you’, while in the third one it may serve to emphasize the outcome of ‘shooting’. This type of construction has some precedent in Rabbinic Hebrew (Azar 2013b), in which it is likewise marginal. It is also sometimes attested in questions, as in the final example.

### 13.6.2 Irreal Conditions

Positive and negative irreal conditions appear frequently in Hasidic Hebrew in a variety of different forms.

The protasis of positive irreal conditions is typically introduced by the particle **אם** or its medieval variant **באם**, as below.

- ‘If you had the place where my father of blessed memory is, you would also be very happy’ (Zak 1912: 8)
- ‘If I had the ability to go I would certainly go by myself’ (M. Walden 1914: 93)
- ‘If you knew where my place was above, you would certainly judge me favourably’ (Michelsohn 1910a: 39)
- ‘If you had seen the great joy that there was in Paradise when your holy infant son arrived, you wouldn’t cry’ (Bromberg 1899: 4)
- ‘And he said to him, ‘If you really had faith, you wouldn’t need anything except the paper that I gave you”’ (Brandwein 1912: 17)
This construction has some precedent in Biblical Hebrew, in which the use of סא in irreal conditions is rarely attested (Williams 2007: 184). It also overlaps with a construction found in Rabbinic Hebrew, wherein סא can be used to introduce irreal conditions with pluperfect tense value (Pérez Fernández 1999: 216); however, it is doubtful whether the Hasidic Hebrew usage is directly or solely attributable to these biblical and rabbinic constructions, as irreal conditions are more typically introduced by ול in Biblical Hebrew (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 637–638) and ו(א) in Rabbinic Hebrew (Azar 1995: 152; Pérez Fernández 1999: 216–217). By contrast, it may be at least partially traceable to various medieval sources such as Rashi and Spanish-Provençal Hebrew prose, in which סא is frequently used to introduce irreal conditions (Rabin 2000: 179–180). Any such influence was likely compounded by the fact that in Yiddish real and irreal conditions alike are introduced by the same conjunctions, ול, וה, or זא (Schaechter 2003: 307–308).

Irreal protases may alternatively begin with the rabbinic particle ו(א) or, more rarely, its biblical counterpart ול, e.g.:

– ‘If you had understood by yourselves and had asked him who he was, I would have revealed him to you’ (Rodkinson 1865: 26)
– ו(א)י ‘And if I knew where she was (lit: her place), I would place her as the crown on my head’ (Sofer 1904: 15)
– ‘If I were the grandson of R. Jacob Koppel on the father’s side, I would look different’ (M. Walden 1913, pt. 3: 33)

The protasis of negative irreal conditions is often introduced by the biblical particle ול/ולא, e.g.:

– ‘And if he had not been forgotten, the sin[s] of this world would have led to his abandon and that of them all, and he would not have gone to rescue them’ (Munk 1898: 46)
– ‘If not for me and you, the whole world would be almost about to fall’ (Michelsohn 1910b: 37)
– ‘And if hadn’t been for those who opened [the door] for him, he would have died of the cold’ (Gemen 1914: 66)

1 Sic.
And if it were not so, he would have brought the redemption' (Shenkel 1883, pt. 2: 30)

Alternatively, negative irreal protases are sometimes introduced by אלםא א, as below.

– ‘If you (lit: I) had not bought it from me, I would have repented’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 35)
– ‘that if the attribute of forgetfulness did not exist in the world, the world would not be able to exist’ (Singer 1900b: 28)

This construction does not have clear precedent in biblical, rabbinic, or medieval forms of the language, in which the biblical הָלָל/יָלָל or the post-biblical אֵלָל/יֵלָל are typically employed in negative irreal protases (see e.g. Waltke and O'Connor 1990: 637–638; Pérez Fernández 1999: 217–218; Rabin 2000: 180–181; Goshen-Gottstein 2006: 245–246). However, the authors’ utilization of this construction is unsurprising given that it is a logical way of negating the positive particle אלם; moreover, as in the case of the positive irreal conditions discussed above it resembles the Yiddish construction used to introduce negative irreal conditions, יינביהו י to ‘if not’ (see Mark 1978: 290 for examples).

The apodosis does not usually have an introductory particle, though rarely the predominantly post-biblical יא is used, e.g.:

– Our sage of everlasting memory said that if he could pray in the morning, then all would be well with the whole world’ (Landau 1892: 22)

The verbs in both the protasis and apodosis of irreal conditions are typically periphrastic constructions composed of the qatāl of the root הָיָה, e.g.:

– ‘if I had wandered in exile as many years as you, I would have reached a higher level than you’ (Michelsohn 1910c: 52)

Landau (1892) uses the post-biblical particle יאלד to introduce the protasis of positive irreal conditions. This usage deviates markedly from that of the other Hasidic Hebrew authors, who employ it only in the protasis of negative irreal conditions. Landau's usage is traceable to Amoraic Hebrew (see Breuer 1998: 132–134 for details of the Amoraic construction).
More rarely, a qatal or yiqtol may appear in the protasis, as in the following two examples respectively:

– If you had understood by yourselves and had asked who he was, I would have revealed him to you’ (A. Walden 1860?: 14a)

– For if I looked at the bad part [of the person], I would not let the man come into my house’ (Landau 1892: 19)

As in the case of real conditions, the order of the clauses is very rarely reversed so that the apodosis precedes the protasis, e.g.:

– And what would you have done if the emperor had raised the curtain?’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 9)

13.7 Contrast

Contrast clauses in the tales are most commonly introduced by the conjunction לא spaghetti, as below.

– It is possible that you will recover, but I can’t promise you’ (Ehrmann 1903: 16a)

– Go to shops of rich people and take everything that you need for sustenance from there, but not more’ (Sofer 1904: 7)

– I fulfilled what I had said, but he did not stand by his word’ (Berger 1910b: 23)

– I drink wine before eating the cutlet, but you eat just the cutlet by itself’ (Gemen 1914: 69)

– And he called to him that he should sit with him on the wagon, but the pauper didn’t want to’ (N. Duner 1912: 2)
In this respect Hasidic Hebrew differs from its biblical antecedent, in which לָבֲא is typically an asseverative particle and does not serve to introduce contrast clauses except in certain texts typically regarded as belonging to the late biblical linguistic stratum (Williams 2007: 195–196). Conversely, it mirrors rabbinic literature, in which the conjunction לָבֲא is commonly used to introduce contrast clauses (see Pérez Fernández 1999: 246).

Somewhat less frequently, contrast clauses may be introduced by the particle ראש ‘but’, e.g.:

- בה אתהacula עמהם לברא ‘But you must prepare yourself for his arrival’ (Rodkinsohn 1864a: 30)
- ראש אנבי נשבהעה על מקמה ‘But I stayed in my (lit: his) place’ (Seuss 1890: 10)
- ראש לשב벌עתהחתנתלישטעבשלארצה ‘But as for returning to the house of his father in law in Vitebsk, he didn’t want [that]’ (Heilmann 1902: 23)

In contrast to לָבֲא, the use of ראש in contrast clauses is traceable to Biblical Hebrew (Koehler and Baumgartner 2001: 45), whereas it is not a feature of Rabbinic Hebrew (Pérez Fernández 1999; 172).

13.8 Exceptional

Exceptional clauses are most commonly introduced by the adverb קר, which otherwise means ‘only’. Such cases are illustrated below. This usage has precedent in Biblical Hebrew (Williams 2007: 142).

- ולא היה אלה קר מעש מאור לא היה רזים הבשליעוצתולא.LoadSceneאל ‘And there was no food, except for a very little bit; therefore, the wagon drivers did not want to eat at his place’ (Munk 1898: 4)
- והברע עבבעמשנהלאลบולאילאלתשישהקרלעוזמרחיקה ‘And he said to him that when he went home, he shouldn’t go to the prayer house except on rare occasions’ (Bromberg 1899: 29)
- הם קרליחנהקריווה ‘They have no [time] to live except for today’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 7)
- אני קרליחנהקריווה ‘I don’t take [anything] except one gold [piece] from a shop’ (Kaidaner 1875: 33b)

Alternatively and somewhat less frequently, they may be introduced by the post-biblical particle אלא ‘except’, e.g.:
13.9 Interrogative

Content questions are typically introduced by an interrogative adverb, as in the examples below. (See 10.1 for a list of Hasidic Hebrew interrogative adverbs).

- Why are you crying?’ (Singer 1900b: 6)
- ‘Where is the poor man?’ (Sofer 1904: 44)
- ‘And how can I stay for the Sabbath?’ (? 1894: 5)
- ‘Where will you go from here?’ (Laufbahn 1914: 49)
- ‘What do you (have to) say?’ (Munk 1898: 20)

Polar questions are usually introduced by the interrogative prefix -ה, as in Biblical Hebrew (Moshavi 2013a) or the interrogative particle האם (which seems to have become widespread first in the medieval period, in the writings of e.g. Abarbanel) as in the following sets of examples respectively. See 12.8 for further details.

- They asked, “Do you know Mendl?”’ (Michelsohn 1910c: 70)
- ‘Have you eaten anything today?’ (Breitstein 1914: 33)
- ‘Do you have good wine?’ (Munk 1898: 17)
- ‘Did he study?’ (Ehrmann 1911: 10b)
Rarely polar questions may be introduced by the rabbinic particle ו, e.g.:

- ‘And is it possible to suffer such a thing?’ (Michelsohn 1912: 104)

Indirect polar questions in complement clauses are introduced by the conjunction או ‘if’, as below. This usage has direct precedent in Rabbinic Hebrew (Stadel 2013). Moreover, it is attested in Biblical Hebrew, though embedded polar questions are more commonly introduced by the interrogative particle in that form of the language (Moshavi 2013a).

- ‘And I don’t remember whether he saw it written in a book, or whether it came to him (lit: it was received in his hand) by word of mouth (lit: mouth to mouth)’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 59)

13.10 Purpose

13.10.1 Positive
Positive purpose clauses may be formed in several ways, reflecting a typical Hasidic Hebrew fusion of biblical and post-biblical elements.

They are sometimes introduced by the particle -ש ‘in order to’ followed by a yiqṭol, as in the following examples. This usage is traceable to Mishnaic Hebrew, which has an identical construction (Fassberg 1998: 154–155; Pérez Fernández 1999: 231).

- ‘And he asked him to give him his wagon so that he could travel to Medzhybizh’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 42)
- ‘That’s why I am asking you to show me the prayer book, so that I can see for myself’ (Hirsch 1900: 8)
- ‘He fasted thus so that he would merit seeing the holy and pure Rebbe’ (Moses Leib of Sasov 1903: 26b)

Similarly, they are sometimes introduced by וב, the biblical counterpart of -ש, followed by a yiqṭol, as below.
Interestingly, this construction appears to lack a direct parallel in the canonical forms of Hebrew: although the particle is biblical in origin, it does not typically serve to introduce purpose clauses in that stratum of the language (see Williams 2007: 156–159 for the uses of biblical יֵכְ; conversely, יֵכְ is not a feature of Rabbinic Hebrew except as an interrogative particle (Segal 1927: 146). The Hasidic Hebrew construction therefore appears to constitute a calque whereby the biblical יֵכְ has acquired the function of a purpose marker like its post-biblical counterpart -ש. This phenomenon is logical given that the Hasidic Hebrew authors treat the two particles as interchangeable in other respects.

Purpose clauses are also frequently formed by the particle לְכָלֵש in order to, followed by a yiqtol or an unprefixed infinitive construct, as below. These two structures mirror Biblical Hebrew purpose clauses (Fassberg 1994: 82, 98; Williams 2007: 185). Sometimes the particle appears in conjunction with -ש, as in the last example, exemplifying a mix of biblical and post-biblical elements within a single construction.

Similarly, they are often introduced by the rabbinic compound יֵכְ ש ‘in order to’ followed by a yiqtol or יֵכְ ‘in order to’ followed by an infinitive construct, as below. These constructions derive from Rabbinic Hebrew (Fassberg 1998: 151, 155).

Raw Text:

And he showed him the note that they had given him in order for him to give it to the Rebbe of eternal memory’ (Ehrmann 1903: 36b)

And on Thursday he sent his servant with a chicken in order for him to go to the ritual slaughterer’ (Sofer 1904: 5)

Interestingly, this construction appears to lack a direct parallel in the canonical forms of Hebrew: although the particle is biblical in origin, it does not typically serve to introduce purpose clauses in that stratum of the language (see Williams 2007: 156–159 for the uses of biblical יֵכְ; conversely, יֵכְ is not a feature of Rabbinic Hebrew except as an interrogative particle (Segal 1927: 146). The Hasidic Hebrew construction therefore appears to constitute a calque whereby the biblical יֵכְ has acquired the function of a purpose marker like its post-biblical counterpart -ש. This phenomenon is logical given that the Hasidic Hebrew authors treat the two particles as interchangeable in other respects.

Purpose clauses are also frequently formed by the particle לְכָלֵש in order to, followed by a yiqtol or an unprefixed infinitive construct, as below. These two structures mirror Biblical Hebrew purpose clauses (Fassberg 1994: 82, 98; Williams 2007: 185). Sometimes the particle appears in conjunction with -ש, as in the last example, exemplifying a mix of biblical and post-biblical elements within a single construction.

Similarly, they are often introduced by the rabbinic compound יֵכְ ש ‘in order to’ followed by a yiqtol or יֵכְ ‘in order to’ followed by an infinitive construct, as below. These constructions derive from Rabbinic Hebrew (Fassberg 1998: 151, 155).

Raw Text:

And he showed him the note that they had given him in order for him to give it to the Rebbe of eternal memory’ (Ehrmann 1903: 36b)

And on Thursday he sent his servant with a chicken in order for him to go to the ritual slaughterer’ (Sofer 1904: 5)

Interestingly, this construction appears to lack a direct parallel in the canonical forms of Hebrew: although the particle is biblical in origin, it does not typically serve to introduce purpose clauses in that stratum of the language (see Williams 2007: 156–159 for the uses of biblical יֵכְ; conversely, יֵכְ is not a feature of Rabbinic Hebrew except as an interrogative particle (Segal 1927: 146). The Hasidic Hebrew construction therefore appears to constitute a calque whereby the biblical יֵכְ has acquired the function of a purpose marker like its post-biblical counterpart -ש. This phenomenon is logical given that the Hasidic Hebrew authors treat the two particles as interchangeable in other respects.

Purpose clauses are also frequently formed by the particle לְכָלֵש in order to, followed by a yiqtol or an unprefixed infinitive construct, as below. These two structures mirror Biblical Hebrew purpose clauses (Fassberg 1994: 82, 98; Williams 2007: 185). Sometimes the particle appears in conjunction with -ש, as in the last example, exemplifying a mix of biblical and post-biblical elements within a single construction.

Similarly, they are often introduced by the rabbinic compound יֵכְ ש ‘in order to’ followed by a yiqtol or יֵכְ ‘in order to’ followed by an infinitive construct, as below. These constructions derive from Rabbinic Hebrew (Fassberg 1998: 151, 155).

Raw Text:

And he showed him the note that they had given him in order for him to give it to the Rebbe of eternal memory’ (Ehrmann 1903: 36b)

And on Thursday he sent his servant with a chicken in order for him to go to the ritual slaughterer’ (Sofer 1904: 5)
Somewhat less frequently they are found in conjunction with the compound -ב כרי ‘in order to’ followed by a *yiqṭol*, as below; these constructions are attested in the Babylonian Talmud as well as in medieval writings.

- ו鹑ה עלי אבב שפתי הסמכ מחלמה והא להו בכר לשיהו בנו הויאמר קריש של (And my father ordered me to stop saying [it] and go outside so that that orphan could say his kaddish’ (Zak 1912: 9))
- ולששידקרמאיל״נהםותיהשידכבץוחלאצאורמקיספאינאשיבאילעהוצו (so that he could come to his place in the World on High’ (Hirsch 1900: 27))

Finally, sometimes purpose clauses may be conveyed simply by an infinitive construct with -ל, as below. This convention is attested in the canonical forms of the language (see e.g. Williams 2007: 83; Pérez Fernández 1999: 232).

- הלך אנהלעשוהי שולח (He went to him to make peace’ (Ehrmann 1911: 10b))
- ושלח פסע שלישית שני אנשה לרבניך המס נגד (And he sent a third time two men to collect that sum’ (Chikernik 1902: 29))

The Aramaic prefix -ד is attested only once in this capacity, shown below:

- נזכשה הרבחת את עדיהו ושישותלו לזרו איהם חק משבלה דרעי חק הלם כל אשר (And the rebbetzin asked the fishermen to catch a fish for her, so that she would give them anything they wanted’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 28))

13.10.2 Negative

Like their positive counterparts, Hasidic Hebrew negative purpose clauses may be formed in a variety of ways reflecting a mixture of biblical and post-biblical convention. As in many other aspects of Hasidic Hebrew grammar, the authors seem to have regarded these different negative purpose particles as interchangeable, employing them in similar syntactic and semantic contexts.

Negative purpose clauses are most frequently composed of a *yiqṭol* preceded by the particle -ל ‘in order not to’, the synonymous בכר לשלו (בכר שלו), or more rarely הבכר לשלו, as below. These constructions have identical parallels in Mishnaic Hebrew (Fassberg 1998: 158–159; Pérez Fernández 1999: 231), except those with the variant –בכר, which is however attested in the Babylonian Talmud.
So that the righteous man should not suffer the misery’ (Zak 1912: 33)

Somewhat less frequently, they may be introduced by the particle מ ‘lest’ followed by a *yiqṭol*, as below. This construction is traceable to Biblical Hebrew (Fassberg 1998: 107; Williams 2007: 163).

– And I don’t want to take them with me to the place of battle lest I die there’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 14)
Finally, they may be composed of a *yiqṭol* preceded by 'לבל 'so as not', as below. The variant *שהל* is occasionally attested, as in the final example. These constructions do not have precedent in Biblical or Mishnaic Hebrew, but are relatively widely attested in and therefore may derive from the medieval and early modern biblical commentaries of Abarbanel and Alshich.

13.11 Relative

13.11.1 *With Relative Pronoun*

Relative clauses are most commonly introduced by either the biblical relative pronoun *רשא* or its rabbinic equivalent -ש, as in the two sets of examples below in turn. As common in Hasidic Hebrew, each variant is used with similar frequency and in free distribution.
With נשאר

- ‘and his wonders that the Ba’al Shem Tov of blessed memory performed’ (Bodek 1865c: 1)
- ‘like a man who is sleeping’ (Zak 1912: 8)
- ‘these things which his eyes had seen’ (Berger 1907: 90)
- ‘the days of youth, which he spent in his parents’ house’ (Kamelhar 1909: 24)
- ‘the thing which I am asking of you’ (Singer 1900a, pt. 3: 2)
- ‘the man that you are looking for’ (A. Walden 1860?: 29a)

With -ש

- ‘the laugh that our Rebbe laughed last night’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 1)
- ‘wealthy men, who buy all of the merchandise that they need’ (Zak 1912: 9)
- ‘in the prison house that is in the town’ (Heilmann 1902: 74)

While relative clauses consisting of a qoṭel are often introduced by the definite article (see 13.11.2), they are sometimes attested with the relative particle -ש, as below.

- ‘There are people who ask me in what way I am a Hasidic rebbe’ (J. Duner 1899: 39)
- ‘And today he is prepared to give a sermon here at the lectern which stands by (lit: to) the window’ (Kaidaner 1875: 12a)

This usage differs from the standard in Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew, in which the qoṭel is typically found in conjunction with the definite article in relative clauses (Williams 2007: 38; Segal 1936: 54; Pérez Fernández 1999: 26). However, it is occasionally attested in certain historical varieties of the language, e.g. Palestinian piyyuṭim from the Byzantine period (Rand 2006: 437) and medieval Spanish-Provençal Hebrew (Rabin 2000: 173); moreover, it is a common feature of present-day colloquial registers of Israeli Hebrew (Berman 1978: 146–147) in addition to the definite article, which is considered ‘preferable’ (Krohn 2011: 28).
Finally, the Aramaic relative pronoun ְד is rarely attested in relative contexts. It appears only sporadically in comparison with its Hebrew counterparts, and is limited to a very small number of collocations:

- ‘as much as possible’ (Berger 1906: 73; Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 3)
- ‘an interpreted judgement which is called popular’ (Michelsohn 1912: 110)
- ‘a baraita that helps (i.e. supports) you[r argument]’ (Bromberg 1899: 11)

13.11.2 With Definite Article

Qoṭel in relative clauses is usually introduced by the definite article, as below.

- ‘many people there who were travelling over the border’ (Bromberg 1899: 25)
- ‘to the guest who was asking him a question’ (Landau 1892: 54)
- ‘an awesome story which is known in the mouths of all the Hasidim’ (A. Walden 1860?: 49b)
- ‘a book […] located in the library of the capital city Vienna’ (Bodek 1866: 5)
- ‘a man knowing the German language well’ (M. Walden 1914: 15)
- ‘a contagious sick person’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 12)

This convention, which mirrors the standard in other historical forms of Hebrew (see e.g. Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 621–623; Rabin 2000: 172–173), is rooted in the nominal origins of the qoṭel whereby its role in relative clauses is an extension of its role as a definite noun.

Similarly, non-verbal relative clauses containing adjectives are usually introduced by the definite article, as below. The relative force of such clauses may not be visible in the English translation. This type of construction has an identical counterpart in both Biblical Hebrew (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 247–248) and Rabbinic Hebrew (Segal 1927: 182).

- ‘In a small town near the holy community of Kaunas a man went to the study-house’ (Kaidaner 1875: 20a)
13.11.3 With Resumptive Pronoun

Hasidic Hebrew relative clauses containing a subject or direct object are only occasionally attested with a resumptive pronoun, e.g.:

Subject

- ‘My son, you want to be cleverer than our ancient ones, who were strict regarding Passover’ (Landau 1892: 36)
- ‘that man who was reincarnated as this fish’ (Chikernik 1903a: 32)

Direct Object

- ‘wonders which he had not heard’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911b: 10)

By contrast, relative clauses containing an indirect object invariably include a preposition and resumptive pronominal suffix, as below. This convention has parallels in e.g. Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew (Williams 2007: 190–191; Holmstedt 2013b; Segal 1927: 204; Azar 2013d).

- ‘And when they were travelling, they strayed from the right road and travelled through mountains and hills that no man had passed through’ (Brandwein 1912: 21)
- ‘And he told him the name of his brother and the name of the village in which he lived’ (Michelsohn 1912: 22)
- ‘And he ran after the wagon in which the Rebbe of Lublin was sitting’ (Breitstein 1914: 10)
- ‘What should I do with the child with whom I study?’ (Landau 1892: 29)

In relative clauses with locative force the adverb ‘there’ is often used instead of a suffixed preposition, as below. Again, this phenomenon has precedent in the canonical varieties of Hebrew (see e.g. Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 562; Azar 2013d).

- ‘The servant showed them a special room where the oven was’ (Munk 1898: 49)
13.12 Result

Hasidic Hebrew result clauses may take a variety of forms. They are commonly introduced by כ״ע, an abbreviation of the biblical conjunction לע בן ‘therefore’, or the synonymous biblical conjunction ולן, as in the following two sets of examples respectively.

כ״ע

- And he answered that he [had done it] on purpose because the child was very dear to his parents; therefore he made a mark on him' (Shenkel 1903b: 19)
- Because this man had a truthful intention, therefore I received him with honour' (Zak 1912: 12)
- Therefore I wondered' (Ehrmann 1911: 1b)

לן

- He couldn’t go further because the sun was setting, and moreover he was not dressed well. Therefore he went into the inn in order to lodge there' (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 4)
- ‘You eat only the cutlet; that’s why it harms you’ (Gemen 1914: 69)
- ‘And therefore I am gathering Israelite men' (Seuss 1890: 63)
- Therefore they resolved amongst themselves to go to him in order to inform him' (M. Walden 1913, pt. 3: 8)
They are also commonly introduced by `לִפְּדֵהוּ 'for this [reason]', as below. This form is noteworthy as it does not seem to have clear precedent in earlier forms of Hebrew. It may be a calque of the Yiddish result particle `דְּרִיפְּאָר 'therefore', whose component morphemes resemble those of `לִפְּדֵהוּ, though this is likewise uncertain.

- `וְעָבְרָה רֶזֶּה לְשׁוֹחֲת, אוֹלָם אֵלֶּה שֶׁשֶּׁעַד בָּלָה לְפָדֵהוּ יִשְׁכַּע שֶׁשֶּׁיָּחֹק` 'And they wanted to drink more, but there wasn't anything else there; therefore they grew angry and caused damage there' (Kaidaner 1875: 48b)
- `לִפְּדֵהוּ דְּרָבְת יָאֵל` 'Therefore I spoke to his heart' (M. Walden 1912: 26)
- `לִפְּדֵהוּ שֵׁנִי מְזוֹדוּ אָאָדִית` 'Therefore I am warning you' (Berger 1910a: 40)
- `לִפְּדֵהוּ בֵּעֵשֶׁנ בֵּן (בַּזַּיֶּר) אֶת הָאָרָה הָלוֹל יִמְתּוֹד עַל בִּכָּה` 'Therefore my son (the son of the rich man) asked this guest to forgive that' (Ehrmann 1903: 1b)
- `לִפְּדֵהוּ הָשָּׁבוֹשֶׁנ שֵׁאֵנָי סְוָלֶה בָּמַּהֲמָה` 'That's why they thought that he didn't immerse in the ritual bath' (Jacob Isaac ben Asher of Przysucha 1908: 54)

Less frequently, they may be introduced by a variety of other result conjunctions including the rabbinic `בֵּעַרְבַּה 'because of this' and the biblical `מָמַתַּה `because of this'. These possibilities are illustrated below.

- `מָמַתַּה הזָּה לְהַבּעְשַּׁשָּׁינָה יֵשׁוּרֵים גָּטָלוֹת שָׁוֶּה יִוָּה` 'And because of this the Ba’al Shem Tov had even greater suffering' (Bodek 1866: 45)
- `בֵּעַרְבַּבְּר אֶזֶר הזָּה הָזִּיר הָוָה לָמָּה לַבְּלַד רַבִּידֵי` 'And for this he had to go to the owner’s house' (Bodek? 1866: 24a)

13.13 Separative

Hasidic Hebrew separative clauses are formed with the infinitive construct; see 8.8.2.2.5 for details.

13.14 Temporal

13.14.1 With Finite Verb

Temporal clauses are often formed by means of a temporal conjunction followed by a finite verb. The verb may be in any conjugation depending on the tense value appropriate to the context. Like many other aspects of Hasidic Hebrew grammar, temporal conjunctions reflect a combination of biblical, post-biblical, and Yiddish forms. The most common conjunctions indicating
contemporaneous action are the biblical ניאש and its post-biblical counterpart -כש. Somewhat less frequently one finds הבש - ‘while’, which derives from Yiddish, in which it is used with identical meaning (Beinfeld and Bochner 2013: 190). More rarely, the biblical particle ובו or post-biblical conjunctions such as הבש - ‘after’ may be employed. These possibilities are illustrated below in turn.

With ניאש

– ניאש שלחה לי את השגרן הלית בכשוננה - ‘When you sent the matchmaker to me, I was like a crazy woman’ (Rodkinsohn 1864a: 17)
– פאר ניאש ב אצל התיב בתני - ‘Once when he came to him he looked in his face’ (Ehrmann 1905: 53b)
– ניאש עבר השעה הנותן בנהطني הלגבייר - ‘When a short while had gone by, the pauper went in to the rich man’ (Rosenthal 1909: 70)
– ניאש כש הרחא השעה והשמעה הלית והוגעת מהוד - ‘And when the Ruzhiner heard this report he sighed greatly’ (Seuss 1890: 5)
– ניאש תמרו הנותן,nil ספרה ול(:,タイム אמא אשתה הניל - ‘And when that Gaon recovered, his mother told that story’ (Michelsohn 1910a: 80)
– ניאש ב א']:ב:כ:ילעטזויוסזזתה שנעומום המסתיים דפי מיעה - ‘And when he came to the synagogue he found him standing and looking upwards’ (Shenkel 1903a: 15)
– ניאש שמעה והאתן ב נעש - ‘And when they heard this they did so’ (M. Walden 1913, pt. 3: 28)

With -כש

– כשיחתית קס מפשכבבי יהודת רטובה על הכותנה שיי - ‘When I would get up from bed my nightshirt would be drenched’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 44)
– כשפשסר המישיש עיד תעי הרב חני על העינפי המושוב ערב רח - ‘And when the Baʾal Shem Tov of eternal memory died, that rabbi travelled to the memorial marker, to Medzhybizh, on the eve of the New Moon’ (Lieberson 1913: 21)
– כשפשסר הספור והלע הלך שלובה לשלום - ‘And when he finished the story, he ordered them to go in peace’ (Berger 1907: 27)
– כשפשסא הורוד הלראמסא שיאל על האבזר - ‘And when he came back to the inn, he asked about the yeshivah student’ (Gemen 1914: 68)
– כשיחתית בדלותי רצתי ואתי מכם - ‘When I was a child I saw more [visions] than you’ (Singer 1900a, pt. 1: 3)
– כשפשסא לֶבָה תוכפ פֶּאָה פֹּלֶלֶתהל בְּבֶדֶד - ‘And when he went home, immediately he suddenly fell gravely ill’ (Breitstein 1914: 18)
And when he heard this, he was very startled’ (M. Walden 1914: 126)

And when he came close to the animals, all of the animals raised their front legs’ (Chikernik 1902: 11)

’until they were making a siyyum before him’ (Landau 1892: 20)

Know for certain that you were worthy of death when you did not answer amen’ (Bodek 1865b: 15)

With Other Conjunctions

And when he arrived at the inn he stood at the threshold of the building’ (Singer 1900a, pt. 1: 3)

And after he went back to his house the winds and snow and rains came back’ (Landau 1892: 38)

And after a year had gone by he determined in his heart that he would not take up a rabbinic position’ (Singer 1900b: 5)

This type of temporal clause is often preceded by עתית in past settings, or more rarely, by עתית in future ones. This type of construction derives from Biblical Hebrew (van der Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze 2013: 331–332). Temporal clauses with עתית may be followed by a wayyiqtol, as in Biblical Hebrew; this is shown in the first set of examples. However, they are often followed by a qatal, as in the second set. Similarly, temporal clauses with עתית are often followed by a yiqtol, as in the third set. This deviates from biblical convention, according to which temporal clauses introduced by עתית or עתית must be followed by a wayyiqtol or weqatal. This is an example of the Hasidic authors’ relatively common tendency to take biblical constructions and adapt them, possibly unintentionally.

With עתית

And when they harassed him greatly, he said, “Maybe it is divinely ordained (lit: from the heavens)”’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 43)
Very rarely, temporal clauses with a finite verb are introduced by a preposition instead of a conjunction, as in the following examples.

- ויהי בָּעֵת יְהוָה בִּכְלָלָם עַד לְהוֹדוֹל אַחַד לָפֶסְסִים תָּם עָצַה בַּלְוָעֵית יְשַׁר ‘And when the twelve of us are examined in order to choose one for Pope, you will say that you think it is right to pick me’ (Bodek 1865c: 4)

This phenomenon is noteworthy because it does not seem to be rooted in Biblical or Rabbinic Hebrew, in which a subordinator would be expected. However, as in many other areas of Hasidic Hebrew grammar, a similar usage is sometimes attested in medieval and early modern texts: for example, the expression דַּעְשֶׁה רַבָּעַה (shown in the first example) appears in the medieval commentaries of Rashi as well as in those of Moses Alshich. Similarly, the phrase דַּעְשֶׁה רַבָּעַה (shown in the second example) appears in Alshich’s commentary. As these texts would
have been familiar to the authors, it is possible that they are the direct source of this phrase. In other cases the Hasidic Hebrew expression lacks an exact parallel in earlier literature, suggesting that the authors may have been inspired by the construction found in medieval and early modern texts and (most likely inadvertently) extended it to original phrases as well. Moreover, the use of דע ‘until’ may reflect some degree of influence from Yiddish, as that language employs the preposition דע ‘until’ to introduce temporal causes directly (Beinfeld and Bochner 2013: 166).

13.14.2 With Infinitive Construct
Temporal clauses are also commonly formed with the infinitive construct preceded by one of the inseparable prepositions ב- or כ- with the sense of ‘while’, ‘when’, ‘as’, ‘just after’, or by an independent preposition, as below. The inseparable prepositions are employed almost interchangeably, except that כ- is only relatively rarely attested in the sense of ‘while’.

With ב- in Sense of ‘While’

– ‘ובעומר שמוה.abez הנצי מתקדמר לחתי’ ‘And while they were standing there, the Maggid came out of his room’ (Zak 1912: 148)
– ‘וכפר שבורהו ילב, ואכל חתכת בראש הרבו’ ‘The Rebbe [...] said that when he was a child, he ate a piece of meat’ (Gemen 1914: 59)
– ‘וכоборот מבולין ויהי נודע שננתלה אילו אלהיו זור עלוט’ ‘And while he was in Poland it was made known that Elijah of blessed memory had revealed himself to him’ (N. Duner 1899: 62)
– ‘ודו שנספח יירוא שלא קיימת בורד ברבך’ ‘And while they were travelling they feared lest he die of hunger on the way’ (Sofer 1904: 6)

With כ- in Sense of ‘While’

– ‘מי מימיה ביבולת לבקר את הקדוש הזה נשבעה שמוה’ ‘Who was able to visit this holy man while he was sitting there?’ (Bodek 1865c: 13)
– ‘ודיו הקברין עזוי הכרץ אנסיש מימי את אמר האיש הלסחבוכ מער פלתי’ ‘And as they were speaking to each other as people do, [asking] where are you from, the man said to the merchant, “From such-and-such a town”’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 14)
With -ב in Sense of ‘As’, ‘Just After’

- ‘And when this call reached the ear of the Rebbe, he immediately approached the Holy Jew’ (Breitstein 1914: 8)
- ‘When he heard this he became very excited’ (Rosenthal 1909: 14)
- ‘And joy gripped him as he found a thousand ducats’ (Bodek 1865b: 9)
- ‘When he entered the room in which the holy Rebbe was sitting, he greeted the Rebbe with a stuttering “G-g-g-good morning”’ (M. Walden 1913, pt. 2: 29)
- ‘And when they arrived he greeted his sister’ (A. Walden 1860?: 3b)

With -ב in Sense of ‘Just After’

- ‘And when he arrived at his house he said “Congratulations” to the man, the messenger’ (Bodek 1865a: 71)
- ‘When the head of the yeshivah heard this, he knew in his soul that he was not of such a spiritual level’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 3)
- ‘And when all of the members of the house heard his word, they were all worried’ (A. Walden 1860?: 10a)
- ‘And when the king heard their words he commanded [them] to bring that man before him’ (Singer 1900a, pt. 1: 7)
- ‘And when they came to the city of Lublin the wagon-driver asked them ...’ (M. Walden 1912: 16)
- ‘And when they heard thus, they immediately went to his house’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911b: 4)

With Independent Preposition

- ‘While I was in Mezeritch there was a widow’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 31)
- ‘while I was sitting at the feast’ (M. Walden 1912: 29)
- ‘after he got out of prison’ (Zak 1912: 16)
This usage derives from Biblical Hebrew, which commonly forms temporal clauses in the same way (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 604); this can be contrasted with rabbinic and rabbinic-based literature, in which the infinitive construct is not used in such constructions (Pérez Fernández 1999: 144). However, there is a slight difference between the Hasidic Hebrew and biblical constructions. In Hasidic Hebrew there is no semantic distinction between the two prepositions -ב and -כ, with each meaning either ‘when’, ‘while’, ‘as’, or ‘just after’ (though -כ is found only infrequently in the sense of ‘while’); by contrast, in Biblical Hebrew -ב means ‘while’ and lends a durative sense to the associated infinitive construct, while -כ means ‘as’ or ‘just after’ and lends a preterite sense to the infinitive (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 604; see also Gropp 1995 for further details). As in many other aspects of Hasidic Hebrew grammar, the authors made some (most likely unintentional) modifications to the syntactic and semantic properties of this biblical construction when they incorporated it into their writing.

A noteworthy phenomenon is the formation of temporal clauses with infinitives construct preceded by the particle ידמ with the meaning ‘while’, as below:

– ננה מורי דבריה יוכיר אוכיר מעיש והרב מעילם ‘Now while I am talking I shall make mention of a living man of many [amazing] deeds’ (Kaidaner 1875: 7a)
– אובל מורי לפלת השתיות דפק איצ הפש民办اداتאקטע של הקאפיטש שלו ‘But while he was going to the slaughterhouse, he struck the knife on his captain's reins’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 24)
– מורי דבריה יוכיר חומימים אלה התשלעה ‘While they were talking, these three idol-worshippers came’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 41)
– מורי דבריה ארשים לכם לחרות יוכיר פי חכם ‘And while I am talking, I shall record for you the words of a wise man’ (M. Walden 1914: 13)

This use of ידמ is unattested in earlier forms of Hebrew: in Biblical Hebrew the particle has a translation value of ‘whenever’ and does not appear in temporal clauses, nor is it used in this way in Rabbinic Hebrew. Significantly, like many other phenomena lacking precedent in previous historical strata of the language, this construction is a common feature of Maskilic Hebrew (see Kahn 2009: 236–239 for details).
CHAPTER 14

Clause and Sentence Syntax

14.1 Equational Sentences

14.1.1 Without Copula

Equational sentences in Hasidic Hebrew, as in other varieties of the language, can be expressed by means of a subject immediately followed by its predicate, e.g.:

– ‘I am a Hasidic rebbe’ (Gemen 1914: 59)
– ‘Why didn’t you say that the milk is forbidden?’ (Moses Leib of Sasov 1903: 23b)
– ‘They are corpses who have arisen from their graves’ (Shenkel 1903b: 24)
– ‘And now they are simply slaves to desire’ (Munk 1898: 17)
– ‘And his name was Reb David Leib’ (Singer 1900b: 3)

14.1.2 With Copula

Although Hasidic Hebrew equational sentences may be expressed simply by means of a subject followed by a predicate, somewhat more commonly a copula serves to link the subject with the predicate. The copula is איה in the singular and הם in the plural, as in the two sets of examples below respectively. The subject may be a noun or a pronoun, as the extracts illustrate.

Singular

– ‘From which business is your livelihood?’ (Bromberg 1899: 25)
– ‘You see, this innkeeper is very wealthy’ (M. Walden 1912: 62)
– ‘The island is this world’ (Shenkel 1903b: 32)
– ‘And he understood that he was the yeshivah student’ (Gemen 1914: 68)
– ‘But I am me, and they don’t confuse me’ (Zak 1912: 23)
Plural

And after that I said, “Know that I am a student of our great Rebbe”’ (Kaidaner 1875: 40a)

The Hasidic Hebrew use of these pronouns as a copula most likely evolved under multiple influences. The same pronouns are found in seemingly similar contexts in Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew (see Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 297; Pérez Fernández 1999: 19; Azar 2013c). However, there is some agreement that the biblical pronouns do not strictly speaking serve as copulas but rather play other roles, e.g. functioning as subjects following topicalized nouns (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 131–132, 297–299; Muraoka 2013). With respect to Rabbinic Hebrew there is less consensus: for example, Kaddari (1991: 248–263, 268–269) argues that the pronouns are likewise not true copulas but rather serve other functions such as the highlighting of the subject; by contrast, Azar (2013d) supports the copular interpretation. Regardless of the true syntactic nature of the biblical and rabbinic constructions, it is likely that the Hasidic Hebrew use was influenced by their appearance in the canonical texts. Moreover, Kaddari (1991: 268–273) notes the existence of a copular use of pronouns in responsa literature (which he suggests evolved under the influence of vernacular languages), and the Hasidic Hebrew usage is likely to have been reinforced by its presence in these writings. Finally, the authors’ proclivity for the use of a copula was perhaps reinforced by the existence of the verb ‘to be’ in their native Yiddish. Kaddari (1991: 269) suggests that the use of pronouns as copulas in Israeli Hebrew is rooted in the responsa literature, but it is possible that the Hasidic Hebrew usage contributed to its adoption as well.
14.2 Negation

The Hasidic Hebrew authors employ four different negative particles, namely אל, לא, יא, and ל. As in other forms of Hebrew, each of these particles is employed in specific syntactic contexts, discussed in turn below.

14.2.1 With לא

14.2.1.1 Qaṭal

Hasidic Hebrew qaṭal is invariably negated by לא, as below. In this respect Hasidic Hebrew usage resembles the standard in earlier forms of the language dating back to Biblical Hebrew (see e.g. Williams 2007: 143).

– ‘And also now he did not answer him anything’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 12)
– ‘I haven’t prayed yet’ (Chikernik 1902: 14)
– ‘I didn’t do anything’ (Singer 1900b: 1)
– ‘I didn’t know and wasn’t familiar with the Maggid’ (Seuss 1890: 10)

14.2.1.2 Yiqṭol

Indicative yiqṭol, like qaṭal, is consistently negated by לא in Hasidic Hebrew, as below. Again, this corresponds to the standard established by Biblical Hebrew (see e.g. Williams 2007: 143).

– ‘I won't tell you and I won't say anything to you’ (Chikernik 1908: 10–11)
– ‘We’ll eat and drink and we won’t hurry’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 12)
– ‘Indeed the debt will not be paid for you with this’ (Ehrmann 1903: 21b)
– ‘I will not be able to save your son again’ (Bodek? 1866: 2b)

While yiqṭol denoting negative commands is typically negated by לא (see 14.2.2), it is occasionally negated by אל, as below.

– ‘Tell the truth; don’t deny’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 2)
– ‘And His Holy Honour said to him regarding the matter of getting the permit, “Don’t worry at all; I will advise you, and God will assist you”’ (Kaidaner 1875: 41a)
Significantly, the Hasidic Hebrew authors seem to treat the two negative particles interchangeably; although לא is employed more frequently than אל in negative command contexts, there does not seem to be any semantic or syntactic difference motivating the selection of one particle instead of the other on any occasion, with both employed e.g. in direct, immediate commands issued to a specific addressee. This contrasts with the Biblical Hebrew standard pattern whereby לא is typically employed in immediate or urgent contexts whereas אל is used in strong or durative, often legislative, settings (see Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 567; Gibson 1994: 81; Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 343, 348). Similarly, it differs from Rabbinic Hebrew, in which direct negative commands are regularly constructed with לא (Pérez Fernández 1999: 124).

14.2.1.3 Qoṭel

The Hasidic Hebrew qoṭel is typically negated by יא (see 14.2.3), but is negated by אל on very rare occasions, e.g.:

-小额贷款 עמל לאמעטיא ישמש או לאמשיס הסמוטים קול הרעש 'Please go outside and listen whether the bells are making a sound' (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 16)

This convention does not derive from Biblical Hebrew, in which the qoṭel is almost always negated by יא (van der Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze 1999: 318), with א about employed on only three occasions (Zephaniah 3:5, Job 12:3, and Job 13:2). Rather, it more closely resembles Rabbinic Hebrew, in which the qoṭel may be negated by א about in addition to the more frequent יא. However, here too the two corpora differ as in Rabbinic Hebrew the selection of א about with a qoṭel typically serves to indicate that the negated element contrasts with a preceding clause (Sharvit 2004: 71–72), while in Hasidic Hebrew no such meaning is apparent. Conversely, the same phenomenon is attested somewhat sporadically in responsa literature from the sixteenth century onwards, becoming the norm in the twentieth century (Betzer 2001: 92). As in many other cases discussed throughout this volume, the Hasidic Hebrew convention may be rooted in this earlier practice. The Hasidic Hebrew usage is more widespread than that of the earlier responsa, and yet is not standard as in the twentieth-century ones,
suggesting that the overall trend in Eastern European forms of Hebrew towards use of אל to negate qotəl began as a marginal feature and then developed into a progressively more widespread one over the course of the next few centuries.

14.2.1.4 Non-Verbal Sentences
Hasidic Hebrew negative existential sentences are typically formed with the particle אשר ‘there isn’t/aren’t’. However, they may occasionally be formed with אל, e.g.:

- ‘We are not far from Medzhybizh’ (Munk 1898: 21)
- ‘And everyone recognized in him that he was not a simple poor man’ (Heilmann 1902: 107)
- ‘But we are not like that’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 32)

Moreover, on extremely rare occasions the existential particle יש ‘there is/are’ is attested in conjunction with the negator אל, as below:

- ‘There is no fish in the whole city’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 28)
- ‘And he has no use’ (Seuss 1890: 46)

This practice is attested in Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew but is quite a marginal feature: it appears once in Biblical Hebrew (in Job 9:33) and several times in rabbinic literature, in the Tosefta, the Palestinian Talmud, and Deuteronomy Rabba. By contrast, it is attested much more commonly in medieval and early modern Hebrew literature, e.g. in the commentaries of Abarbanel and Alshich. It is also found in responsa literature (Betzer 2001: 92). It is therefore possible that the Hasidic Hebrew use of the construction, as in the case of many other phenomena discussed in this volume, was inspired by its more frequent appearance in these sources. However, the Hasidic Hebrew authors’ use of this construction is extremely negligible and so they cannot be said to have been strongly influenced by any such earlier writings in this respect.

14.2.2 With לא
The particle לא in Hasidic Hebrew is the standard negator for second and third person yiqṭol with command force, as shown below.

Second Person

- ‘And the rabbi answered him, “Don’t be afraid”’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 8)
This usage corresponds in great measure to both the biblical and rabbinic models. However, it is closer to Rabbinic Hebrew in that both forms of the language employ the particle as the standard negator of *yiqṭol* with a command sense (see Pérez Fernández 1999: 124), whereas Biblical Hebrew regularly uses אָל in durative command contexts (Waltke and O'Connor 1990: 510);¹ moreover, Biblical Hebrew employs the jussive in negative commands when such forms exist (Waltke and O'Connor 1990: 571), whereas Hasidic Hebrew uses only the *yiqṭol*.

14.2.3 With 

14.2.3.1 Equational Sentences

Hasidic Hebrew non-verbal equational sentences are typically negated by the particle . The predicates in such sentences are varied; they may consist of common and proper nouns, adjectives, *qaṭuls*, etc. The subject may be a noun in conjunction with unsuffixed , as in the first set of examples below, or a noun or pronoun in conjunction with suffixed , as in the second set.

Unsuffixed

–    ‘This is not Emperor Pawel’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 16)
–    ‘The matter is not so’ (Chikernik 1908: 15)
–    ‘That wonder is not mine alone’ (Bromberg 1899: 24)
–    ‘Look, father does not need me to say kaddish’ (Landau 1892: 34)

¹ Hasidic Hebrew uses אָל in negative command contexts as well, but treats it as interchangeable with (though less frequent than) ; see 14.2.1.2.
14.2.3.2 Qoṭel

Qoṭel is typically negated by ןיא. The subject in such cases is usually an independent pronoun, as in the following examples. The negative particle most commonly precedes the subject, though it may occasionally follow it, as in the final example. These variations in word order do not seem to have clear semantic significance, though in some cases fronting the subject may serve to draw attention to it.

- רהוזמםיקסופונחנאןיא 'We don’t make legal rulings based on the Zohar' (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 27–28)
- ואכום מוחיבים לילך געל 'You aren’t obliged to go along with him' (J. Duner 1899: 85)
- ואכומ אנוי וואג כלום 'And I don’t know anything' (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 56)
- ואכומ אנוי לא אוהד הלчем 'And I don’t see where to go’ (Chikernik 1903a: 16)
- ואכומ אנוי לא אחל ביכ 'And I do not study so much’ (Bromberg 1899: 9)

In most cases when the negative particle appears in conjunction with a pronominal subject, the particle is unsuffixed and the pronominal subject is expressed independently, as above. However, in some cases the pronominal subject is expressed by means of a suffix, e.g.:

- ןיא יונע עסמ הביחלוקפ 'I don’t get involved in disputes’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 28)
- ןיא יונע וואג לילך 'I don’t want to go’ (Ehmann 1911: 43a)

In such cases the suffixed particle may additionally appear in conjunction with an independent pronoun, as below. The authors’ motivation for employing both a suffixed particle and an independent pronoun are not always obvious since the pronoun is not needed for clarity. In some such cases the pronoun may have been added in order to draw heightened awareness to the subject, but in most instances the two constructions are used interchangeably. Comparison of the last example above with the last example below illustrates this, as both
contain a similar collocation but the former lacks an independent pronoun while the latter contains one.

– ‘And I can’t save you’ (Breitstein 1914: 38)
– ‘Of course, you’re not a fool’ (Munk 1898: 65)
– ‘He said to his wife that he wouldn’t go even one step’ (Ehrmann 1905: 48b)
– ‘I don’t want to go out’ (Zak 1912: 19)

ןיא appears in conjunction with a nominal subject only rarely in sentences with a qoṭel, e.g.:

– ‘Therefore Jews do not see it’ (Moses Leib of Sasov 1903: 23b)

14.2.3.3 Qaṭal

Very rarely the negatorןיא appears in conjunction with a qaṭal, as below.

– ‘I am not Elijah, and I have not come to take your wealth, God forbid’ (Munk 1898: 35)
– ‘And no-one saw when he took it’ (Sofer 1904: 6)

This type of non-standard usage does not seem to be rooted in Biblical or Rabbinic Hebrew, in whichןיא does not appear in conjunction with the qaṭal (see e.g. van der Merwe, Naudé, and Kroese 1999: 320–321 and Williams 2007: 146–147 for the use ofןיא in Biblical Hebrew; see Segal 1927: 162–163 for its use in Rabbinic Hebrew). Likewise, it does not have clear precedent in medieval or early modern literature. The motivation for the Hasidic Hebrew authors’ use of this non-standard construction is thus unclear, but given its extreme marginality it is best considered an anomaly.

14.2.3.4 Yiqṭol

Just as the negatorןיא is occasionally attested in conjunction with a qaṭal, so it is very rarely used to negate a yiqṭol, as below. As discussed above in the case of the qaṭal, this usage does not seem to have precedent in Biblical or Rabbinic Hebrew. Likewise as in the case of the qaṭal, it is best regarded as an occasional anomaly rather than an integral component of Hasidic Hebrew grammar.

– ‘The groom said to his father, “I won’t go.” His father said to him, “And why?”’ (Munk 1898: 36)
14.2.4  With (לב)

Although negative commands are typically conveyed by the particle לא, or more rarely אל, preceding the *yiqtol* (see 14.2.1.2 and 14.2.2), in rare cases the particle-leg is used instead, as below.

- ‘And do not think that she and her dreams were simple like other women’ (Bromberg 1899: 5)
- ‘And that man was so weak that the doctors warned him not to observe any fast’ (Seuss 1890: 5)
- ‘We are standing cautiously so that they don’t see or hear anything from us’ (Laufbahn 1914: 51)
- ‘Then that minister sent a certain lord from Berlin with the warning that he should not reveal what he needed to anyone’ (Munk 1898: 20)

This particle is a feature of various earlier forms of Hebrew, starting with the Hebrew Bible but also attested in rabbinic and medieval literature. The Hasidic Hebrew usage does not seem to be rooted directly in that of its biblical or rabbinic antecedents, given that the biblical particle is confined largely to poetry and is used only with the jussive and cohortative in this sense, not with the *yiqtol* (Williams 2007: 148), while in tannaitic writings it is restricted to biblical references (Pérez Fernández 1999: 174). By contrast, in medieval writings by e.g. Abarbanel, it can be used in conjunction with second person *yiqtol* in the same negative command sense, and therefore, as in many other elements of Hasidic Hebrew grammar, this medieval usage is likely to be the immediate inspiration for the authors’ employment of this construction.

The authors do not seem to have had a clear semantic motivation for the occasional selection of this particle instead of the others. It is possible that it was chosen in order to add an element of extra weight to the prohibition, but this is not certain. It is possible that, as in many other cases in which the authors employed multiple variants with similar meaning, they regarded the various particles as interchangeable or alternated them for stylistic reasons.

14.2.5  Negation of Infinitives

Hasidic Hebrew infinitives absolute never appear in negative contexts.

Infinitives construct may be negated in several different ways. The existence of these alternative methods of negation is one of numerous examples seen throughout Hasidic Hebrew grammar whereby the authors employ biblical and post-biblical forms and constructions relatively interchangeably.
Infinitives construct prefixed by -ל are usually negated by a preceding 'not to', as below. This construction has a precise counterpart in Mishnaic Hebrew (Sharvit 1998: 337; Pérez Fernández 1999: 144).

- וברון בקש אתכنو שלא להתיי יואדך ליטק לברך ‘Our Rebbe asked us not to let you travel to your house’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 49)
- והרופא פקד עליו שלא לאשתת ‘The doctor had instructed him not to drink’ (Michelsohn 1912: 18)
- והיה שלח לך מדרשו שלא להתיי תבורה עליי ‘He would send [word] to his prayer-house that the congregation should not wait for him’ (Bromberg 1899: 32)

More rarely, infinitives construct may be negated by the biblical particle לבל ‘not to', as below. When prefixed by -ל, as in the first two examples below, this is only one of several options for negation. Conversely, in the case of those not prefixed by -ל, לבל is the only option for negation, as shown in the subsequent examples. This is to be expected given that לבל is the standard way of negating unprefixed infinitives construct in Biblical Hebrew (Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 571; Williams 2007: 150).

- והיילאלצאדומלליתלבלהשעאןכו ‘And I will do so, not to study with Elijah’ (Laufbahn 1914: 50)
- ועשתי הדבר הזה לבל תלמוד אלא בייח הזב ‘I did this thing, not to come to the Rebbe's house’ (Shenkel 1903b: 17)
- ואמר לו לבל תלמוד אשורים ואת ספרים ‘And he also gave an order not to burn his books’ (Jacob Isaac ben Asher of Przysucha 1908: 96)
- והמה שהשבתתא אושי, לבל תלמוד עליי ‘What you promised me, not to let [anyone] report me’ (Breitstein 1914: 38)

Somewhat more rarely, they may be negated by the particles לבל or לבל, as below. Again, the infinitive construct may be prefixed by -ל, as in the first two examples, or unprefixed, as in the final one.

- והיו אמר לבל תלמוד התמהמל התולה עבורי הז ‘And I am telling you not to make too much effort in prayer for this’ (Bromberg 1899: 4)
- וımız השיא באה פקוריה היארה לבל תלמוד איהו חי ‘And on the next day a different order came not to hang them, God forbid’ (Munk 1898: 22)
- והוכבל על ענמי לבל תשועו יוהר כבירי אלא ‘And you will take it upon yourself not to act according to these words any more’ (Ehrmann 1903: 1b)
Interestingly, these two constructions do not seem to be based on clear historical precedent. They do not appear to be attested in tannaitic or Talmudic literature; neither do they appear in the medieval writings that often inspired Hasidic Hebrew usages. However, they have a partial parallel in Alshich's biblical commentary, in which לבל and ילבל sometimes appear before an unprefixed infinitive construct (e.g. ילבל ± ‘not to give’, Alshich on Numbers 32), and this construction may have formed the basis for the Hasidic Hebrew prefixed version.

14.3 Constituent Order

Hasidic Hebrew typically displays a mix of svo and vso constituent order. In addition, other more marked constituent orders sometimes appear in specific syntactic settings.

14.3.1 svo

svo order is relatively common in independent verbal and equational clauses with nominal and pronominal subjects, as in the following sets of examples respectively. svo order in these types of clauses is attested in various earlier forms of Hebrew and therefore its appearance in the Hasidic Hebrew tales is not remarkable. However, there are some differences, e.g. svo clauses in Biblical Hebrew are typically regarded as marked (Moshavi 2013b).

Verbal Clauses with Nominal Subjects

– והћלמשיש ± אמר ± רב ± ומא ± יסש ± גוש ± הטו ± ולא ± תשו ± ולא ± בור (Chikernik 1908: 12)
– והћלמשיש ± אמר ± רב ± ומא ± יסש ± גוש ± הטו ± ולא ± תשו ± ולא ± בור (Chikernik 1908: 12)
– והћלמשיש ± אמר ± רב ± ומא ± יסש ± גוש ± הטו ± ולא ± תשו ± ולא ± בור (Chikernik 1908: 12)

Verbal Clauses with Pronominal Subjects

– והћלמשיש ± אמר ± רב ± ומא ± יסש ± גוש ± הטו ± ולא ± תשו ± ולא ± בור (Chikernik 1908: 12)
– והћלמשיש ± אמר ± רב ± ומא ± יסש ± גוש ± הטו ± ולא ± תשו ± ולא ± בור (Chikernik 1908: 12)
– והћלמשיש ± אמר ± רב ± ומא ± יסש ± גוש ± הטו ± ולא ± תשו ±ℹ️. (Chikernik 1908: 12)

Verbal Clauses with Pronominal Subjects

– והћלמשיש ± אמר ± רב ± ומא ± יסש ± גוש ± הטו ± ולא ± תשו ±ℹ️. (Chikernik 1908: 12)
– והћלמשיש ± אמר ± רב ± ומא ± יסש ± גוש ± הטו ± ולא ± תשו ±ℹ️. (Chikernik 1908: 12)
– והћלמשיש ± אמר ± רב ± ומא ± יסש ± גוש ± הטו ± ולא ± תشو ±ℹ️. (Chikernik 1908: 12)

Verbal Clauses with Pronominal Subjects

– והћלמשיש ± אמר ± רב ± ומא ± יסש ± גוש ± הטו ± zoals ± בות ± ליא ± לא ± בור (Chikernik 1908: 12)
– והћלמשיש ± אמר ± רב ± ומא ± יסש ± גוש ± הטו ± zoals ± בות ± ליא ± לא ± בור (Chikernik 1908: 12)
– והћלמשיש ± אמר ± רב ± ומא ± יסש ± גוש ± הטו ± zoals ± בות ± ליא ± לא ± בור (Chikernik 1908: 12)
Equational Clauses with Nominal Subjects

- Why didn’t you say that the milk is forbidden?’ (Moses Leib of Sasov 1903: 23b)
- The woman, the mistress of this house, is a whore’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 29)
- The child is wise’ (Zak 1912: 163)

Equational Clauses with Pronominal Subjects

- And now they were among the most respected of the city’ (Bromberg 1899: 22)
- And now they are simply slaves to desire’ (Munk 1898: 17)
- He is the grandson of the Ba’al Shem Tov of eternal memory’ (Zak 1912: 153)

SVO order is also often found in subordinate clauses, e.g.:  

- Our rebbe said to him, “Listen to what Meir says to you; go home (lit: travel to your home)”’ (HaLevi 1909: 53)
- The end of the matter was that that mighty man rejoiced greatly’ (J. Duner 1899: 11)
- because it is a big prohibition’ (Leichter 1901: 9a)
- because I have already grown old’ (Zak 1912: 15)
- But I know with certainty that the beast was kosher’ (M. Walden 1913, pt. 3: 9)

14.3.2 VSO

VSO order is extremely frequently attested in the same types of independent clauses as SVO order, as shown below. These two constituent orders are interchangeable in pragmatic terms, but are not evenly distributed: both SVO and VSO are employed with similar frequency in verbal clauses, but in nonverbal clauses VSO is much more common with pronominal subjects than with nominal subjects. The preference for VSO in independent verbal clauses has
precedent in both Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew (Moshavi 2013b; Shivtiel 2013). Conversely, it differs from the authors’ Yiddish vernacular, in which independent clauses are typically SVO (Jacobs 2013: 223–224).

Verbal Clauses with Nominal Subjects

- The man began to cry ‘The man began to cry’ (HaLevi 1909: 54)
- Several hours passed ‘Several hours passed’ (Berger 1910a: 25)
- And the Ba’al Shem Tov struck the righteous man [with] brutal blows ‘And the Ba’al Shem Tov struck the righteous man [with] brutal blows’ (Kaidaner 1875: 22a)
- And that man neglected to do so ‘And that man neglected to do so’ (J. Duner 1899: 68)
- The groom said to his friends that the bride had a face like a non-Jewish girl ‘The groom said to his friends that the bride had a face like a non-Jewish girl’ (Michelsohn 1905: 65)

Verbal Clauses with Pronominal Subjects

- He said to his wife that he wouldn’t go even one step ‘He said to his wife that he wouldn’t go even one step’ (Ehrmann 1905: 48b)
- And he replied, “I want to do some service for you” ‘And he replied, “I want to do some service for you”’ (Lieberson 1913: 21)
- I haven’t prayed yet, and I want to go pray ‘I haven’t prayed yet, and I want to go pray’ (Chikernik 1902: 14)
- And he, of blessed memory, travelled to the holy Rebbe of Ruzhin ‘And he, of blessed memory, travelled to the holy Rebbe of Ruzhin’ (Brandwein 1912: 33)
- And he got up on the second night ‘And he got up on the second night’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 8)

Equational Clauses with Nominal Subjects

- The matter is good ‘The matter is good’ (Zak 1912: 152)

Equational Clauses with Pronominal Subjects

- I see that you are a poor man ‘I see that you are a poor man’ (Ehrmann 1905: 53b)
- He is an upright man ‘He is an upright man’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 1)
- You see, I’m afraid of the officers ‘You see, I’m afraid of the officers’ (Seuss 1890: 10)
- And our Rebbe praised him greatly, because he is good ‘And our Rebbe praised him greatly, because he is good’ (Landau 1892: 13)

Moreover, main clauses preceded by an adverb, prepositional phrase, or subordinate clause are almost always VSO, as shown below. This may be attributable
to influence from Yiddish, in which an identical phenomenon is found (Katz 1987: 229–236); such influence was most likely reinforced by the widespread appearance of VSO order in this and other contexts in earlier forms of Hebrew.

Following Adverb

- ‘And there the Rebbe rented accommodation’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 38)
- ‘Maybe you know the yeshivah student’ (Bromberg 1899: 15)
- ‘Now I must travel to Hungary’ (Berger 1907: 47)
- ‘Then the holy Rebbe opened his mouth’ (N. Duner 1912: 34)
- ‘Once a dybbuk came to the holy Rebbe’ (Gemen 1914: 69)
- ‘Afterwards the students lay down to sleep’ (Heilmann 1902: 9)
- ‘Once a woman came to the Rebbe’ (Menahem Mendel of Kamelhar 1908: 22)
- ‘Then his righteous mother understood’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1910: 44)

Following Prepositional Phrase

- ‘In the afternoon the landowners came to laugh at the Jew’ (Ehrmann 1903: 24b)
- ‘In the night a man came’ (Jacob Isaac ben Asher of Przysucha 1908: 52)
- ‘After the feast all of the guests (lit: invited/called men) went home’ (Sofer 1904: 1)
- ‘And on the road the carriage turned over’ (Brandwein 1912: 38)
- ‘And after that the two righteous men went on their way’ (Hirsch 1900: 20)
- ‘The next day that man came to the Rebbe’s house’ (Michelson 1910c: 68)
- ‘In the winter of 1893 my earnings stopped’ (Yellin 1913: 38)
- ‘And the next day in the morning that man quickly got up early and went to the Rebbe’ (M. Walden 1912: 10)
Following Subordinate Clause

- 'And when the time for prayer came, the horse stopped by itself' (Kaidaner 1875: 9a)
- 'And after he went back to his house the winds and snow and rains came back' (Landau 1892: 38)
- 'And after his death his son, the Emperor Alexander, ruled' (Bodek 1865a: 30)

However, in contrast to Yiddish, in Hasidic Hebrew this practice is not universal: in rare cases SVO order is attested, as below. This may indicate that, although the Hasidic Hebrew authors were informed by the vernacular conventions of their native language in this regard, this influence coexisted with syntactic patterns inherited from their earlier written Hebrew sources. This issue is one of many seen throughout the tales’ grammar in which influence from Yiddish and earlier forms of Hebrew converges with the result that the permissible grammatical patterns are broader in Hasidic Hebrew than in any of these sources.

- 'And when they went very far away, to a big city there, they saw spirits surrounding [them]' (Bodek 1865c: 20)

14.3.3 O SV

Although Hasidic Hebrew direct objects typically follow their associated verbs, in some cases they are fronted, as below. This technique generally serves to heighten the salience of the fronted form, though the force of the emphasis varies from case to case and in some contexts it appears to be stronger than others. The fronting of objects has precedent in Biblical Hebrew (van der Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze 1999: 338; Williams 2007: 202). These sources may have exerted some influence on the Hasidic Hebrew construction. This is likely to have been compounded by Yiddish, in which the fronting of objects for emphasis is a common feature (Mark 1978: 387).

- 'I have brought you a sealed letter from the Ba’al Shem Tov of everlasting memory’ (Ehrmann 1903: 4a)
- The well-known Hasid R. Yechiel of Warsaw, of blessed memory, told this story’ (Zak 1912: 34)
- 'He sold all of the houses in Warsaw already in his lifetime’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911b: 19)
14.3.4 **SOV**

SOV order is not a typical feature of Hasidic Hebrew, but a rare example is shown below. This very marginal practice seems to draw attention to the object in the same way as the more common fronting of the object to the beginning of the clause (as discussed above in 14.3.3), but it is so infrequent that it can only be regarded as an anomaly.

- רוח איש יאס ו.removeFrom שם והמה: 'He saved his life and fled from there' (Ehrmann 1903: 2a)

14.3.5 **Topicalization**

Topicalization via fronting is not an extremely common feature of the Hasidic Hebrew tales but is occasionally attested with nouns, noun phrases, and pronouns. The topicalized element is typically followed by a resumptive pronoun or possessive suffix. Topicalization (traditionally known as casus pondens) has precedent in Biblical Hebrew (van der Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze 1999: 339; Gross 2013) and in Rabbinic Hebrew (Shivtiel 2013), as well as in later forms of the language, e.g. Paytanic Hebrew (Rand 2006: 243–246).

- נשמתו הרוח המה לא יהנה: 'As for the spirit of the dead man, it has no rest' (Bromberg 1899: 25)
Sometimes infinitive construct clauses are topicalized in the same way, as below. This practice is rarely attested in Mishnaic Hebrew (Sharvit 1998: 337), but it is doubtful that this marginal rabbinic phenomenon exerted any great influence on the Hasidic Hebrew authors. Yiddish is more likely to have been the direct inspiration as it has an identical parallel (Jacobs 2005: 260). The same construction has become a feature of Israeli Hebrew (Glinert 1989: 415).

- 'Indeed, [as for] the city of Berlin, it is far from here' (Rodkinsohn 1865: 7)
- 'And [as for] Rabbi Lieber, he did not have a bathhouse' (Lieberson 1913: 45)
- 'He also said (lit: told) that [as for] a certain man, the evil force whose appearance is well-known attached itself to him, God protect us' (Landau 1892: 19)
- 'And he answered and said, “[As for] me, I have no free time to study”' (Zak 1912: 14)
- ‘There is a man who has an issue with you’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911b: 5)
- ‘Because as for Hasidim, they don’t have any connection with Hell’ (Brill 1909: 27)
- ‘But as for you, you haven’t made a mistake’ (Berger 1910c: 20)
- ‘Indeed as for my wife, her name is Leah’ (Michelsohn 1910c: 69)
- ‘And as for me, my faith was also strong’ (Gemen 1914: 77)
- ‘But as for returning to the house of his father in law in Vitebsk, he didn’t want [that]’ (Heilmann 1902: 23)
- ‘It is possible that you will recover, but as for promising you, I can’t [do that]’ (Ehrmann 1903: 16a)
Shibbuṣ

Shibbuṣ, the technique of inserting biblical phrases into original compositions, is a very common feature of the Hasidic Hebrew tales. The Hasidic Hebrew use of shibbuṣ is noteworthy in several respects, discussed below.

15.1 Similarities with Maskilic Hebrew shibbuṣ

The Hasidic Hebrew use of shibbuṣ is striking because the phenomenon is typically considered the hallmark of Maskilic literature, which traditionally has been regarded as having little in common linguistically with Hasidic narrative (see e.g. Frieden 2005, particularly 266 and 282 for an example of this view). The similarity between Hasidic and Maskilic Hebrew in this respect can be seen by comparing the two Hasidic Hebrew sentences below with the almost identical Maskilic extract following them; both of these examples are based on Job 1:1, shown below the Hasidic and Maskilic examples.

Hasidic Hebrew

– ‘There was a man in the land of White Russia in the city of Liozna, called Reb Baruch’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 2)
– ‘There was a man in the town of Syczów, called Nathan Simon’ (Seuss 1890: 5)

Maskilic Hebrew

– ‘There once was a man in the city of Prague more than a hundred years ago, called Ephraim’ (Gordon 1861: 297)

Cf. ‘There was a man in the land of Uz, called Job’ (Job 1:1)

Although the Hasidic use of shibbuṣ mirrors that found in Maskilic literature, the overtly ideological motivation for shibbuṣ present in the Maskilic
compositions is most likely lacking in the Hasidic texts: whereas the Maskilic authors viewed Biblical Hebrew as the most sophisticated type of Hebrew and intentionally strove to emulate its norms, the Hasidic authors did not regard the biblical stratum as superior to post-biblical forms of the language and did not intentionally seek to model their own writing on it for ideological reasons. Thus, the biblical extracts appearing in the tales may have been selected solely because they were familiar to the authors. However, it is possible that, as in many aspects of Hasidic Hebrew morphosyntax discussed in this grammar, the authors subconsciously chose to incorporate well-known biblical phrases in order to draw parallels between their own hagiographic writing and biblical historical narrative, thereby imbuing their work with explicit connotations of respectability.

15.2 Closely Resembling Biblical Model

In many cases the Hasidic Hebrew authors incorporate a biblical verse or fragment of a verse into their own narrative or dialogue with no changes or minimal adaptation. This is shown in the Hasidic Hebrew sentences below, which very closely follow their biblical models.

– וַיְבִא הַנְאִיר הַבַּהּ לָאָדָם וּבֵן יָשָׂעַל לוֹ בַּל אֵלֵּא הִיא יִדְּוָהָלָּאָן וְלֹא אִיָּו (בּוּדְקַכָּבִּי) "And he answered and said, “I swear to you that this time next year you will be holding a son”’ (Zak 1912: 13); cf. וַיִּבְשָׂא וֹאִיָּו כַּכָּבִּי הוּא בַּל אֵלֵּא הִיא יִדְּוָהָלָּאָן וְלֹא אִיָּו (2 Kings 4:16)

– וְיִדְּוָהָלָּאָן וַיִּלְכָּבִּי הַיָּהָלָּאָן וַיִּלְכָּבִּי הַיָּהָלָּאָן וַיְבִא הַנְאִיר הַבַּהּ לָאָדָם וּבֵן יָשָׂעַל לוֹ בַּל אֵלֵּּא הִיא יִדְּוָהָלָּאָן וְלֹא אִיָּו (בּוּדְקַכָּבִּי) "And the city of Jaroslavice was then an exceedingly large city (lit: a big city to God)’ (Hirsch 1900: 5); cf. וַיִּבְשָׂא וֹאִיָּו כַּכָּבִּי הַיָּהָלָּאָן וְיִדְּוָהָלָּאָן וַיִּלְכָּבִּי הַיָּהָלָּאָן וַיְבִא הַנְאִיר הַבַּהּ לָאָדָם וּבֵן יָשָׂעַל לוֹ בַּל אֵלֵּּא הִיא יִדְּוָהָלָּאָן וְלֹא אִיָּו (Jonah 3:3)

– וְיִדְּוָהָלָּאָן וַיְבִא הַנְאִיר הַבַּהּ לָאָדָם וּבֵן יָשָׂעַל לוֹ בַּל אֵלֵּּא הִיא יִדְּוָהָלָּאָן וְלֹא אִיָּו (בּוּדְקַכָּבִּי) ’And he said, “Who is he whose heart has determined to do thus?’” (Jacob Isaac ben Asher of Przysucha 1908: 43); cf. וְיִדְּוָהָלָּאָן וַיְבִא הַנְאִיר הַבַּהּ לָאָדָם וּבֵן יָשָׂעַל לוֹ בַּל אֵלֵּּא הִיא יִדְּוָהָלָּאָן וְלֹא אִיָּו (Esther 7:5)

– וְיִדְּוָהָלָּאָן וַיְבִא הַנְאִיר הַבַּהּ לָאָדָם וּבֵן יָשָׂעַל לוֹ בַּל אֵלֵּּא הִיא יִדְּוָהָלָּאָן וְלֹא אִיָּו (בּוּדְקַכָּבִּי) ‘Your God is the great[est] God’ (Bodek 1865c: 8); cf. וְיִדְּוָהָלָּאָן וַיְבִא הַנְאִיר הַבַּהּ לָאָדָם וּבֵן יָשָׂעַל לוֹ בַּל אֵלֵּּא הִיא יִדְּוָהָלָּאָן וְלֹא אִיָּו (1 Samuel 4:8)

– וְיִדְּוָהָלָּאָן וַיְבִא הַנְאִיר הַבַּהּ לָאָדָם וּבֵן יָשָׂעַל לוֹ בַּל אֵלֵּּא הִיא יִדְּוָהָלָּאָן וְלֹא אִיָּו (בּוּדְקַכָּבִּי) ‘And this will be the sign for you that I [am the one who] sent you this messenger’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 5); cf. וְיִדְּוָהָלָּאָן וַיְבִא הַנְאִיר הַבַּהּ לָאָדָם וּבֵן יָשָׂעַל לוֹ בַּל אֵלֵּּא הִיא יִדְּוָהָלָּאָן וְלֹא אִיָּו (Exod. 3:12)
15.3 Differences from Biblical Model

While many examples of Hasidic Hebrew *shibbus* mirror or very closely follow their biblical model, as illustrated in the previous section, the authors often modify biblical phrases rather than inserting them intact into their writing. Such adaptations may be lexical or grammatical, as discussed respectively below.

15.3.1 Lexical Differences

Hasidic Hebrew authors sometimes make lexical changes to the biblical extracts that they incorporate into their writing. In some cases the substituted word is synonymous with that of the original biblical text and therefore the replacement is most likely subconscious. For example, the first Hasidic Hebrew sentence below is identical to its biblical source except that the biblical noun מַעַּדַּמ ‘ship’ has been replaced by the synonymous term מֵאָלֶם. Similarly, the extract in the second sentence is identical to its biblical model except that the biblical interrogative וְיִנֵרָיוּ ‘Why have I found favour in your eyes, so that you take notice of me?’ has been changed to the synonymous שֹׁפֵטָהוֹ.

– ‘And the ship was about to break’ (Sofer 1904: 2); cf. וְיִנֵרָיוּ ‘And the ship was about to break’ (Jonah 1:4)

– ‘I am the owner of the ship’ מֵאָלֶם וְיִנֵרָיוּ ‘And the owner said, “Why have I found favour in your eyes, so that you take notice of me?”’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 39); cf. וְיִנֵרָיוּ ‘And she said to him, “Why have I found favour in your eyes, so that you take notice of me?”’ (Ruth 2:10)

By contrast, in some cases the authors substitute lexical items from the biblical text intentionally in order to suit their purposes, as in the first Hasidic Hebrew extract below, in which the end of the source text Esther 8:6 has been altered by the addition of a noun linked by the conjunction וָאָשֶׁר in the penultimate position and by the substitution of the final noun. Similarly, in the second extract Sofer has selected the noun אָדָם ‘brothers’ instead of the biblical noun אָדָם ‘men’ in the biblical source.

– ‘And how can I bear to see the destruction and poverty of my friend?’ (Ehrmann 1903: 2a); cf. אָדָם מָלְכְּלַח ‘And how can I endure to see the destruction of my kindred?’ (Esther 8:6)

– ‘In one city there were two brothers; one was poor and one was rich’ (Sofer 1904: 31); cf. אָדָם מָלְכְּלַח ‘And how can I bear to see the destruction and poverty of my friend?’ (Ehrmann 1903: 2a)
There were two men in one city; one was rich and one was poor’ (2 Sam. 12:1)

15.3.2  **Morphological and Syntactic Differences**

In some cases the Hasidic Hebrew authors make morphological and syntactic changes to their biblical source texts. Such changes may be quite minor: for example, the underlined clause below is almost identical to its biblical model except that Rodkinsohn has added the definite article to the noun סלָּס ‘ladder’.

- ‘And he ascended the rungs of the ladder set upon the earth, with its top reaching the heavens’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 24); cf. ‘And he dreamed, and saw a ladder set upon the earth with its top reaching the heavens’ (Gen. 28:12)

However, the adaptations are often somewhat more extensive. Frequently the authors alter the conjugation of the verb appearing in the biblical source. Sometimes these changes serve to make the verb in question conform to the Hasidic Hebrew tense/aspect system. For example, in the extract below the biblical qoṭel הָמְיָ֑מָשַּׁהַעיִ֣גַּמוֹ֖שׁאֹרְוהָצְרַ֔אבָ֣צֻּמ֙םָלֻּסהֵ֤נִּהְום֗לֲֹחַיַּֽו ‘will crouch’ in order to accommodate the Hasidic Hebrew convention whereby real conditions with future tense value require a yiqtol (as discussed in 13.6.1).

- ‘And they said to him, “See, if you do well, you will be accepted. But if you do not do well, sin will crouch at the door”’ (Bodek 1865c: 8); cf. ‘If you do well, will you not be accepted? But if you do not do well, sin crouches at the door’ (Gen. 4:7)

The authors also frequently alter the word order of the biblical model. This can be seen by comparing the following extract from Rodkinsohn (1864b), in which the verb precedes the associated prepositional phrase, with its biblical model, in which it follows it. Moreover, the noun נֶעְר ‘youth’ appears in both texts, but in Rodkinsohn’s version it precedes the verb phrase, while in the biblical verse it follows it.

- ‘And while he was still a youth that Rebbe Aaron was known by his actions to everyone who saw him’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 41); cf. ‘Even a youth is known by his actions’ (Prov. 20:11)
Similarly, the authors sometimes omit or replace elements of the biblical original. For example, in the first example below Ehrmann has left out the accusative marker תָּא from his adaptation of Exodus 3:3, most likely reflecting the widespread Hasidic Hebrew tendency to omit this particle (see 12.3.2.1). More strikingly, in the second and third Hasidic Hebrew adaptations of this verse the authors have both replaced the biblical direct object לֹ֖ודָגַּההֶ֥אְרַמַּה הֶ֑זַּה ‘this marvellous sight’ with objects or clauses of their own. Similarly, in the final extract Bodek has completely replaced the first half of his biblical model and transformed it from a statement into a question. These types of adaptations underscore the productive and creative nature of Hasidic Hebrew shibbuṣ.

– אֲלֵהַ נָא אֲרַמַּה הָגֹרַד הָה מָּאֶהוֹרָם הָוָן (Ehrmann 1903: 29b)
– אֶזְרַה נָא אֲרַמַּה פָּלוֹנַס הָוָן (Zak 1912: 7)
– אֶזְרַה נָא אֲרַמַּה מִי הָוָן (Michelsohn 1912: 49)

Cf. מְיַם מְשַׁה אֲרַמַּה אֱלֹהָא אֲרַמַּה הָגֹרַד הָה מְדַבֵּה לָאִירָבֵה הָפָה (Exod. 3:3)

– הָלוֹאָשׁנָו גִּבְדָּה מְכָו (Bodek 1865c: 8); בֹּזֶרֶדִּי הָוָן אֶאֶרָדָה מִי הָוָן (Gen. 42:38)

15.3.3  Syntactic Incongruence in Biblical shibbuṣ

In some cases the Hasidic Hebrew authors’ predilection for shibbuṣ leads them to insert a fragment of a biblical verse into a context for which it is syntactically inappropriate. For example, the first example below starts with an adverb which is not derived from a biblical verse and immediately continues with an extract from Ruth 1:19, which begins with a wayyiqṭol. The second example illustrates a similar phenomenon. Placing a wayyiqṭol immediately after an adverb is not standard practice in either Biblical or Hasidic Hebrew, and therefore this type of construction may have evolved because the authors were so familiar with these well-known biblical verses that they inserted them without noticing the syntactic incongruity.
While instances of shibbuṣ in the Hasidic tales are typically based on Hebrew biblical extracts, the following very commonly appearing expression is drawn from an Aramaic portion of the Book of Daniel. As in the case of shibbuṣ based on Hebrew biblical texts, these Aramaic citations sometimes undergo grammatical changes when cited in Hasidic Hebrew, chiefly alteration of possessive suffixes as in the following examples.

- רחֶֽנָדְנָ֖לָה אֵבֵֽהַ֙ו 'And his knees knocked against each other' (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 23; Michelsohn 1912: 8; N. Duner 1912: 18; Kamelhar 1909: 26)
- רחֶֽנָדְנָ֖לָה אֵבֵֽהַ֙ו 'And their knees knocked against each other' (Baruch of Medzhibizh 1880: 2)
- רחֶֽנָדְנָ֖לָה אֵבֵֽהַ֙ו 'And my knees knocked against each other' (Shenkel 1883, pt. 2: 12)

Cf. רחֶֽנָדְנָ֖לָה אֵבֵֽהַ֙ו 'And his knees knocked against each other' (Daniel 5:6)
Lexis

The lexis of the Hasidic Hebrew tales reflects the distinctive polyglossic environment of its authors. Yiddish was their native language and chief vernacular, while they had received intensive training in the reading and recitation of various biblical and post-biblical forms of written Hebrew from a very early age and employed it as a major vehicle of written composition (see Stampfer 1993 for a detailed discussion of understanding and use of Hebrew in Eastern Europe). Moreover, they possessed at least some familiarity with biblical, Talmudic, and kabbalistic Aramaic texts. Finally, they lived in a Slavic-speaking environment, typically Ukrainian, Polish, and Russian. The ways in which lexical elements from these diverse linguistic sources manifest themselves in the tales will be discussed below.

16.1 Hebrew

16.1.1 Maskilic Hebrew Vocabulary

As discussed throughout this volume, there are many instances of linguistic overlap between the Hasidic Hebrew tales and contemporaneous Maskilic Hebrew prose fiction. Perhaps one of the most striking of these instances concerns the Hasidic Hebrew use of lexical items typically considered to be Maskilic Hebrew coinages. These usually consist of compounds and collocations used to describe modern items and concepts lacking earlier Hebrew designations. Examples of these are shown below; the terms in question are all conventionally regarded as Maskilic creations (see the references following each lemma for details).

בֵית מַהֲנוֹת ‘Tavern’ (Even-Shoshan 2003: 171)
- בֵית מַהֲנוֹת ‘tavern’ (Michelsohn 1912: 116)
- לֵבָת מַהֲנוֹת ‘to a tavern’ (Breitstein 1914: 58)
- בֵית מַהֲנוֹת ‘the tavern’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911b: 91)
- הָבֵית הַמַהֲנוֹת ‘the tavern’ (Bodek 1866: 40)
And they went to a big tavern, which is called a (kretshme)¹ (Kaidaner 1875: 48b)

‘Tavern’ (Even-Shoshan 2003: 171)
- 'to the tavern' (Michelsohn 1912: 49)
- 'in the tavern' (Berger 1910c: 51)

‘Glasses’ (Even-Shoshan 2003: 172)
- 'glasses' (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 32; Hirsch 1900: 86; Michelsohn 1910a: 137; Sofer 1904: 35)

‘Cholera’ (Even-Shoshan 2003: 532)
- 'cholera' (Michelsohn 1912: 24)
- 'and cholera' (Bodek 1865a: 72)

‘Watch’; ‘Clock’ (Agmon-Fruchtman and Allon 1994: 56; Even-Shoshan 2003: 917)
- ‘the watch’, ‘the clock’ (Zak 1912: 23; Sobelman 1909/10, pt. 3: 11; Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 35; Breitstein 1914: 49; Berger 1910c: 132)
- ‘the watch, zeygerl,² of gold’ (Munk 1898: 32)

‘Railroad’ (Agmon-Fruchtman and Allon 1994: 53; Even-Shoshan 2003: 1021)
- ‘the railroad’ (Berger 1910b: 122; Michelsohn 1912: 24; M. Walden 1914: 55; Teomim Fraenkel 1910: 58)
- ‘the railroads’ (Zak 1912: 137)

---
¹ Yiddish gloss; see 16.3.5 for details.
² Yiddish gloss; see 16.3.5 for details.
These examples are noteworthy because they belie the mutual antagonism between the Hasidic and Maskilic authors and the common perception promulgated by the Maskilim that their Hebrew writings were linguistically extremely different from those of their Hasidic opponents. However, it is important to note that the motivation of the Hasidic Hebrew authors for employing these terms most likely differs from that of their Maskilic counterparts. The Maskilic authors had an ideological opposition to the use of loanwords from Yiddish or other languages; instead, they tended to create neologisms by calquing foreign terms, often by means of construct chains and circumlocutions so as to employ purely Hebrew vocabulary (Patterson 1988: 98–100; Kahn 2013b). By contrast, the Hasidic Hebrew authors had no agenda of creating Hebrew neologisms and no ideological opposition to the use of Yiddish loanwords in their writings; on the contrary, they made very frequent recourse to them (as discussed in 16.3). It is thus extremely significant that the Hasidic Hebrew authors seem to have been familiar enough with these Maskilic coinages to employ them instead of or in addition to the corresponding Yiddish loanwords. In fact, in several of the examples shown above, the authors did use the Yiddish equivalent as well as the Maskilic neologism. Perhaps even more significantly, it is possible that some of these terms are not in fact intentional Maskilic inventions but rather were in more widespread circulation among writers of Hebrew in Eastern Europe including Maskilim and Hasidim, and simply have not been documented in non-Maskilic texts. Alternatively, as these expressions almost all occur in texts published in the 1900s and 1910s, it may be that they were indeed Maskilic inventions but that by the time of these later tales’ composition they had entered into general circulation among Hasidic and other non-Maskilic Hebrew writers.

3 Yiddish gloss; see 16.3.5 for details.
16.1.2 *Common Abbreviations*

Many Hebrew expressions and phrases typically appear in abbreviated form in the tales. The most commonly attested abbreviations are listed below.

- ר"ומאא ‘my master, father, teacher, and rabbi/Rebbe’ (title)
- ר"ומדא ‘my master, teacher, and rabbi/Rebbe’ (title)
- אתר-כפ – ‘afterwards’
- אמרו – ‘please God’
- אם כנ – ‘if so’
- אני ענע – ‘-self’ (see 6.6)
- א פכע – ‘nevertheless’
- הבו הלשון – ‘in these words’
- ברה הננה – ‘synagogue’
- בית המדרש – ‘study house’
- בלו הנין – ‘wagon driver’
- ברך הי – ‘landlord’; ‘owner’; ‘innkeeper’
- בשעותנו הרבים – ‘for our many sins’
- גם כנ – ‘also’
- דר רחורי – ‘court case’; ‘words of Torah’; ‘Torah authority’
- ההר ודריק – ‘the righteous Rebbe’
- ההר ודריק – ‘the great wise one, Rebbe __’ (title)
- הקדוש ברוכHEMA – ‘The Holy One, blessed be He’
- הרבר הצדק – ‘the righteous Rebbe’
- הרבר הצדק – ‘the holy Rebbe’
- השם בורך – ‘The Holy One (lit: Name), blessed be He’
- זה אחר זה – ‘each other (direct object)’
- זכרוננו לבכה – ‘of blessed memory’
- זכרוננו לבכה – ‘May his memory live on in the World to Come’
- זכרוננו לבכה – ‘each other (indirect object)’
- זיכרוננו לבכה – ‘May the memory of a righteous and holy one be a blessing for life in the World to Come’
- גודו – ‘God forbid’
- יומ מדב – ‘holiday’
- יומ מדב – ‘alcohol’
- יומ מדב – ‘but rather’
- כל כנ – ‘so much’
- לכל כנ – ‘of so much’
- לוהק – ‘the holy tongue’
16.2 Aramaic

Given the prominence of Aramaic-language texts in the Hasidic tradition (particularly mystical compositions such as the Zohar but also the Babylonian and Palestinian Talmuds and Aramaic biblical portions), it is perhaps unsurprising that the tale authors would have drawn on Aramaic lexis in their own writing. However, the Aramaic lexical element within Hasidic Hebrew is relatively subtle and is reasonably narrow in scope, being generally restricted to nouns and noun phrases from a few particular semantic domains (as outlined below). These Aramaic lexical elements are typically ultimately traceable to the Babylonian Talmud (which, interestingly, contrasts with Rabin’s assertion [1985: 20] that the Aramaic component of Hasidic compositions derives primarily from the Zohar), but many of them are also commonly attested in medieval forms of Hebrew and in Yiddish. Thus, Hasidic Hebrew authors’ use of such elements is likely attributable to their familiarity not only from the original Aramaic sources but also from Hebrew texts as well as from their own vernacular. Indeed, the Hasidic Hebrew authors’ use of Aramaic does not seem to have been disproportionately high when compared with Yiddish or with well-known written forms of Hebrew. Moreover, given the intimate perceived relationship
between Hebrew and Aramaic in the authors’ native Yiddish (wherein both languages are referred to by the single designation לֵשׁון הָכֹל ‘the holy tongue’) and the close links between study of written Hebrew and Aramaic in Talmudic academies, it is possible that they did not really regard these Aramaisms as loanwords at all. Perhaps unsurprisingly, a similar use of Aramaic known from traditional texts and from Yiddish can be seen in contemporaneous Maskilic Hebrew prose (Dalmatzky-Fischler 2009: 78–79).

16.2.1  **Nouns and Noun Phrases**

Aramaic lexical items appearing in the Hasidic Hebrew tales consist primarily of nouns and, more specifically, noun phrases—typically possessive constructions, two nouns linked by the conjunction waw, and noun-adjective syntagms. These nouns and noun phrases are typically drawn from a very specific and restricted semantic range: they usually denote abstract notions rather than concrete objects and most commonly refer to Jewish religious, legal, philosophical, and mystical concepts, as detailed below. As mentioned above, most of these nouns and phrases are features of medieval varieties of Hebrew and of Yiddish, and significantly, many of them were subsequently absorbed into the lexis of Modern Hebrew, particularly in the higher registers (see Even-Shoshan 2003, which lists a large number of the Aramaisms discussed below).

16.2.1.1  **Jewish Religious Culture**

A large proportion of the Aramaic lexical items appearing in the tales belong to the specific domain of Jewish religious culture, including texts, rabbinic institutions, education, and theological concepts. In some cases the Aramaic form is employed due to the lack of a Hebrew equivalent, e.g. the first example below, פֶּפֶּחַ ‘tipcha’. In most others, the Aramaic terms are widespread and familiar features of rabbinic literature and therefore the authors’ selection of them is not surprising despite the existence of Hebrew alternatives.

- פֶּפֶּחַ ‘tipcha’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 22)
- אָרוֹרְתָה ‘Torah’ (Kaidaner 1875: 37b)
- יָרָא בִּישָׁ ’the evil inclination’ (Bodek 1865a: 69)
- מֵרֶת דָּאָרֶה ‘local rabbinic authority’ (Lieberson 1913: 44)
- נִוֶּא דָאָרֶה ‘holiday’ (Shenkel 1903b: 3)
- פֶּפֶּחַ דָּאָרֶה ‘Torah debate’ (Zak 1912: 13)
- רֵיש דָּכֶנָה ‘teaching assistant in cheder’ (Chikernik 1903b: 4)
16.2.1.2 Jewish Legal Concepts
Within the general category of Jewish religious culture, Aramaic nouns sometimes refer to specific Jewish legal concepts. These are typically terms appearing in the Babylonian Talmud, e.g.:

- איסורים ‘prohibition [in Jewish law]’ (Ehrmann 1903: 15b)
- ידיע ‘evidence by implication’ (Bromberg 1899: 298)
- דינה ‘law’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 15)
- אקיוד ‘strictness [in Jewish law]’ (Landau 1892: 15)
- אקיוד ‘suspicion [in Jewish law]’ (Bodek 1866: 56)

16.2.1.3 Eschatology and Messianism
Aramaisms likewise frequently denote Jewish eschatological and messianic themes, as below. This is most likely due to the frequent discussion of such topics in the Babylonian Talmud and in medieval Jewish literature (as well as to their independent existence in Yiddish).

- OWNER בֵּית מָבָּה ‘in the heavenly academy’ (Bodek 1866: 28)
- מַלְאָכָה דְּרוֹקֵי ‘the heavenly kingdom’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 7)
- עֶלֶה דְּרָקִי ‘this world (lit: the world of lies)’ (Ehrmann 1903: 22b)
- עֶלֶה[…] ‘the World to Come (lit: the world of truth)’ (Stamm 1905: 35)
- אחישמדאתבקע ‘sign (lit: footsteps) of the Messiah’ (Walden 1912: 46)
- אתולגבאתניכש ‘the Divine Presence in exile’ (Breitstein 1914: 51)

16.2.1.4 Mysticism and Hasidism
Similarly, many Aramaic borrowings belong specifically to the domains of Jewish mysticism and Hasidism, as below. This is logical considering the prominence of Aramaic-language mystical writings such as The Zohar in Hasidic philosophy.

- אֵשֶׁדָא אָנֶפֶשׁ ‘holy illuminated one’ (Kaidaner 1875: 18b)
- אֵשֶׁדָא אָנֶפֶשׁ ‘the seal of the king’ (Munk 1898: 6)
- אֵשֶׁדָא אָנֶפֶשׁ ‘Hasid and excellent one’ (Berger 1906: 22)
- אֵשֶׁדָא אָנֶפֶשׁ ‘holy Hasid’ (Kaidaner 1875: 47a)
- אֵשֶׁדָא אָנֶפֶשׁ ‘words of Hasidism’ (Gemen 1914: 57)

---

4 A concept in gematria (Jewish numerology).
16.2.1.5 Body Parts
The Hasidic Hebrew authors very occasionally employ Aramaic lexical items and phrases in order to describe the bodies and specific body parts of the rebbes. In these cases it is possible that the authors selected the Aramaisms intentionally, or perhaps subconsciously, in order to convey a heightened sense of respect or importance when referring to the physical properties of the holy men (given the high status of Aramaic in Ashkenazi society as a language of advanced and esoteric learning; see Myhill 2004: 112–114). However, this tendency is not at all well-developed or systematically employed throughout the Hasidic Hebrew tales.

- רוחמה קדישא דעליה ‘his holy nose’ (Landau 1892: 63)
- הדיקאת קדישא של ‘his holy beard’ (Zak 1912: 144)
- בדיקנא קדישא ‘with the holy beard’ (Berger 1906: 87; N. Duner 1899: 64)

Sometimes these terms are used in metaphorical expressions, as below:

- מעמקא דלבא ‘from the depths of the heart’ (Bodek 1865a: 47)
- עינה בישה ‘an evil eye’ (Michelsohn 1910c: 64)
- ביעתו הפיכה ‘with a sharp eye’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 6)

16.2.1.6 Uncategorized
While many of the Aramaic lexical borrowings appearing in the tales clearly belong to the specialized semantic fields discussed above, some uncategorized nouns and noun phrases do appear, as shown below. In keeping with the rest of the Hasidic Hebrew Aramaisms, such elements typically denote abstract concepts rather than tangible objects. Again, they are typically ultimately traceable to the Babylonian Talmud. These nouns and noun phrases generally have Hebrew equivalents and are not used in particular semantic or syntactic contexts. As discussed above, the authors may not have regarded them as loanwords but rather simply as variants and fixed expressions synonymous with their Hebrew equivalents.

---
5 A concept in Jewish mysticism.
Only very occasionally do such Aramaic collocations lack precedent in rabbinic or medieval literature. For example, the phrase shown below seems to be unattested before the early modern period; however, it appears in a few late eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Ashkenazi commentaries and was most likely familiar to the Hasidic Hebrew authors from its appearance in these or similar Eastern European Hebrew sources.

- ירפגדויו 'holiday days' (Landau 1892: 32)

### 16.2.2 Demonstrative Adjectives

Aramaic adjectives are not a regular feature of Hasidic Hebrew. However, the singular demonstrative שֶׁא ‘this/that’ is sometimes attested in the tales. This form is typically restricted to syntagms containing an Aramaic noun or noun-adjective phrase. The demonstrative always precedes the rest of the syntagm, as in Talmudic and other forms of Late Aramaic (see Pat-El 2012: 95–96 for discussion of Late Aramaic demonstrative constructions; see also Bar-Asher Siegal 2013: 83). Like other Aramaic noun phrases in Hasidic Hebrew, those containing demonstrative adjectives are relatively limited and derive from the Babylonian Talmud and/or medieval writings rather than constituting a widely entrenched and productive feature intrinsic to Hasidic Hebrew linguistic structure. In this

---

6 Bread given through charity (Even-Shoshan 2003: 1170).
respect Aramaic can be contrasted with Yiddish, whose influence is visible in a broad range of Hasidic Hebrew grammatical features seen throughout this volume.

- ‘of this Holy Grandfather’ (Bromberg 1899: 24)
- ‘this infant’ (Bromberg 1899: 4)
- ‘of this world’ (Kaidaner 1875: 18a)
- ‘from this year’ (Michelsohn 1910c: 26)
- ‘and in (lit: in as) this manner’ (Lieberson 1913: 68)

16.2.3 **Suffixed Nouns, Prepositions, and Particles**
On very sporadic occasions a Hebrew or Aramaic noun, particle, or preposition is attested in conjunction with an Aramaic 3ms possessive suffix, as shown below. Such suffixes are not a standard element of Hasidic Hebrew grammar and there do not seem to be clear patterns governing their selection on these relatively rare instances.

- ‘the unity of the Holy One blessed be He and His divine presence’ (J. Duner 1899: 34)
- ‘friends of his’ (Zak 1912: 22)
- ‘They were of no concern to him’ (Bromberg 1899: 21)

16.2.4 **Numerals**
Aramaic numerals are not a typical feature of the Hasidic Hebrew tale, but are attested in a few rare cases. They are limited to the numbers אדח ‘one’, ירת ‘two’, and תיש ‘six’, as below. In a few cases the authors’ selection of an Aramaic numeral may be attributable to their predilection for phonological suffix concord: in the first two examples below the Hebrew noun is feminine ending in [ə], and the -א suffix of the Aramaic numeral would have been pronounced identically. Nevertheless, the use of Aramaic in this type of setting is so rare that it must be considered an anomaly rather than a trend.

- ‘one penny’ (Munk 1898: 57)
- ‘one moment’ (Ehrmann 1903: 47b)
- ‘two Hasidim’ (J. Duner 1899: 39)
- ‘six years [old]’ (Zak 1912: 9)
- ‘six years [old]’ (Sofer 1904: 27)
- ‘the six orders of the Mishnah’ (Kaidaner 1875: 43a)
16.2.5 Verbs
Aramaic verbs are not a common feature of the tales, but do occasionally appear embedded within the Hebrew text. These sorts of isolated Aramaic verbs are typically participles, either active or passive, as below. Such forms are generally restricted to the masculine singular passive participle בִּית כָּל בֵּית הָוהֵז נְחָלֶת אָבָה ‘written’ and a few other common roots. These are typically attested in identical form in earlier Aramaic literature that would have been familiar to the authors such as the Talmuds, Zohar, Talmudic commentaries, and responsa, but the authors’ motivation for selecting them on these relatively rare occasions is unclear.

– ‘וּבּוּנָה לֵמָה מְזוּב בֵּית הָוהֵז נְחָלֶת אָבָה ‘And he answered them, “It is written, ‘House and riches are the inheritance of fathers (Prov. 19:14)’”’ (J. Duner 1899: 22)
– ‘בּוּכַה הָאִירִיוּל כְּדָבַּה הָכָּנָה בַּהוּ וַעֲמֵנָם ‘In the writings of the Arizal the intentions are written in a different manner’ (Kaidaner 1875: 8a)
– ‘הָמֵהֶר אַוְּלִי לְשׁוֹטֹת ‘The author goes according to his method’ (Bromberg 1899: 10)
– ‘דִּמְּךָ קֵא עַל פְּשׁוֹת עֶמֶנָה ‘that your people stand upon the simple people’ (Shenkel 1903b: 10)

These Aramaic participles are almost always unsuffixed; the following is a very unusual example with a 1cp subject suffix:

– ‘רָכִּינָה כַּה גָּנְבָּה אָמְרֵה ‘And we remembered that I had also said …’ (Bromberg 1899: 10)

Aramaic verbs from the derived stems are almost never attested as individual words within a Hebrew sentence, but rather are restricted to full Aramaic phrases or sentences (see 16.2.7 below). A rare example of an isolated Aramaic verb from a derived stem is the itpeil shown below.

– ‘וַאֲישָׁוִית הָרֶב ‘And the Rebbe was silent’ (Bodek 1866: 55)

16.2.6 Particles
The only Aramaic particle attested in Hasidic Hebrew with any regularity is -ד, which most commonly serves as a possessive marker in specific contexts (see 12.1.2) but occasionally functions as a complementizer (see 13.4.1) and as a relative pronoun (see 13.11.1).
16.2.7 *Expressions*

Sometimes Aramaic expressions consisting of clauses or entire sentences appear embedded in the Hebrew text of the tales. Such expressions typically derive from Amoraic and/or medieval and early modern literature, as indicated in the following examples.

- "וַזֵּרֵמָא וַחֲקֵסָא וַקָּלָא וְלֹא פַּסְקָא שֶׁהוּא מְמוּר: 'And he started to hear a persistent rumour (lit: a voice that didn't stop) in town that he was a mamzer'" (Shenkel 1903b: 19); cf. "וַקָּלָא וְלֹא פַּסְקָא: 'a voice that doesn't stop'" (Babylonian Talmud *Mo'ed Qatan* 18b)

- "שְׁבֵיתֵי וְשְׁבֵיתֵי מַסְמָכִין דְּרָחִיקִין: '[When] one stops and ceases, impurities retreat from him'" (Bromberg 1899: 46); cf. "שְׁבֵיתֵי וְשְׁבֵיתֵי מַסְמָכִין דְּרָחִיקִין: '[When] one stops and ceases, impurities retreat from him'" (*Hon Ashir* on Mishnah *Nidda* 4, Amsterdam 1731)

- "וַדֹּרְחֵיקָא יִלְּבָלוֹת: 'And the matter bothered me'" (Rodkinsohn 1865: 16); cf. "וַדֹּרְחֵיקָא יִלְּבָלוֹת: 'And the matter bothered him'" (Babylonian Talmud *Bava Batra* 174b)

- "מַמֵּאֶגֶנָא רֶם לְבִיבָא: ‘from a tall roof into a deep pit’ (referring to someone who fell from greatness)" (Bodek 1866: 61); cf. "מַמֵּאֶגֶנָא רֶם לְבִיבָא: ‘from a tall roof into a deep pit’" (Babylonian Talmud *5a*)

- "לַא אֲסַחְיֵהוּ מַלְּתָאו: ‘And the matter was unsuccessful’" (Landau 1892: 49); cf. "לַא אֲסַחְיֵהוּ מַלְּתָאו: ‘The matter was unsuccessful’" (Alshich on Exod. 12)

- "עַנֵּה לוֹ חַבּוֹס חַבּוֹס אֲחָתוֹ וְגָזֶרָיו לְשֵׁבַלֹּו דְּרָשִׁיםָא וְשֶׁבַלֹּו אֲבְדוּרִי: 'That wise man answered him, “I have seen him, and the paths of the heavens are as clear to him as the paths of the earth.”’" (Bodek 1866: 38); cf. "כִּי נָנָרִי לְשֶׁבַלֹּו שֵׁםָא: 'Because the paths of the heavens are clear to him’" (Alshich on Exod. 36)

The Hasidic Hebrew authors most likely inserted these elements in their original form due to their familiarity from the earlier writings in which they appear. They sometimes make grammatical alterations to the Aramaic, which indicates a degree of familiarity with the language and an ability to adapt it (whether intentionally or otherwise); however, the fact that these elements are not original compositions but rather are drawn from established source texts indicates that Aramaic expressions are perhaps not as productive a component of Hasidic Hebrew as their Yiddish counterparts, which are much more prevalent and dynamic (see 16.3 for details).
16.2.8 Morphosyntax of Aramaic Borrowings

16.2.8.1 Morphology of Aramaic Nouns

As seen in the examples in 16.2.1 above, Aramaic singular nouns in Hasidic Hebrew almost invariably appear in the emphatic state, with the suffix -א. This suffix is completely lexicalized and does not serve as a definiteness marker (Aramaic nouns in the tales are made definite by prefixing the Hebrew definite article to them; see 16.2.8.3). This lexicalized Hasidic Hebrew treatment of the Aramaic -א suffix can be contrasted with early strata of Aramaic, in which the suffix served as the definiteness marker; however, in later forms of the language it came to be used for indefinite and definite nouns alike (Creason 2008: 120; Bar-Asher Siegal 2013: 53), and the widespread presence of this suffix on a large variety of indefinite nouns in key Jewish Aramaic sources such as the Talmuds, targumim, and Zohar, is most likely the reason for its ubiquitous attestation in the Hasidic Hebrew tale on indefinite nouns.

16.2.8.2 Gender of Aramaic Nouns

Aramaic nouns ending in -א are treated as grammatically feminine in the tales and modified by feminine adjectives, as below.

- לְדוֹויָאָהָהְּתֶהָתִּיה הַטָּבָאָה ‘to the utmost degree of damnation’ (Sofer 1904: 11)
- פָּהָקָא צְסָמְא ‘a small note’ (Heilmann 1902: 115)
- עֵוֶּדָא נַרְאָא ‘an awesome deed’ (Ehrmann 1903: 9b)
- סַבְּרַא רָתְוּקָא ‘a distant speculation/opinion’ (Hirsch 1900: 90)

In some cases this follows historical precedent, as in the case of the first collocation, which is attested in the Palestinian Talmud in the same form. However, in many cases the noun phrases are not based on earlier precedent: thus, the remaining examples above are not considered feminine in Aramaic, as the -א ending is not a feminine marker. Like many aspects of Hasidic Hebrew morphosyntax, this is most likely due to phonological considerations: as the final א in Hasidic Hebrew is pronounced as [ə], the authors would have perceived it as feminine (see 4.1.2 for discussion of this issue). Interestingly, the phrases shown in all but the first example above are also attested in other Eastern European Hebrew sources such as responsa literature, suggesting that these specific collocations comprise part of a selection of stock Aramaisms common in Ashkenazic Hebrew.

7 Lit. ‘to the nethermost room of the netherworld’ (Jastrow 1903: 298).
On rare occasions an Aramaic noun ends in the Aramaic feminine suffix -א, and the associated adjective takes the same suffix as the head noun, e.g.:

- מלה ‘a small matter’ (Bodek 1866: 30)
- חזקה ‘a great law’ (Ehrmann 1903: 16b)

16.2.8.3 Definiteness of Aramaic Nouns
Aramaic nouns in Hasidic Hebrew are made definite by means of the Hebrew definite article prefix -ה, as below:

- הנס ‘the format’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 7)
- העבורה השכילה ‘the third deed’ (Ehrmann 1903: 25b)
- הדרקן קדרות ‘his holy beard’ (Zak 1912: 144)

This practice is followed even when the noun in question ends in א, which was the definiteness marker in Biblical Aramaic. However, as discussed in 16.2.8.1 above, the authors are unlikely to have associated the א suffix with definiteness because in post-Biblical Aramaic, including very well-known sources such as the targumim and the Talmuds, this suffix had lost any such connotations and was instead used for definite and indefinite nouns alike (Creason 2008: 120; Bar-Asher Siegal 2013: 53).

16.2.8.4 Plural of Aramaic Nouns
Aramaic plural nouns in Hasidic Hebrew are formed with one of the following three suffixes:

- -ן
- -ן
- -ן

As the Aramaisms appearing in Hasidic Hebrew are generally based directly on earlier texts such as the Babylonian Talmud and Zohar, the use of these suffixes is not really a productive element of the authors’ writing; rather, the plural forms in question are usually fixed expressions in the tales.

The most common of the plural suffixes is -ן, as illustrated below. In Aramaic this suffix is used to mark absolute masculine plural nouns (Kaufman 1997: 123; Creason 2008: 120).

- [רֵעִים דָּרְכֵי] ‘secrets of the Torah’ (Kaidaner 1875: 25a)
- [עֵדֵנִים] ‘ears’ (Landau 1892: 63)
A few nouns appear with the suffix -ן-, as below. This is a variant of the emphatic masculine plural suffix -ן- found in eastern Middle and Late Aramaic dialects (Creason 2008: 120), in which it is typically used as an unmarked masculine plural suffix (Kaufman 1997: 123).

- מביתות נוחין (J. Duner 1899: 40)
- בדרכי נווגב (J. Duner 1899: 40)
- אמילו דילימ (J. Duner 1899: 30)
- ידישדאכלמ (Shenkel 1903b: 11)

Finally, there are some rare attestations of plural nouns ending in -ן-, the feminine emphatic state plural suffix (Kaufman 1997: 123; Creason 2008: 120). Such a case is shown below. Interestingly, this form deviates from the usual trend concerning Aramaic elements in Hasidic Hebrew in that it is not attested in the Talmuds or medieval mystical literature in Aramaic, but rather first appears in nineteenth-century Eastern European Hasidic Hebrew writings, e.g. David Solomon Eibenschutz’ 1835 commentary on the Pentateuch Arve Naḥal.

- אחישמדאתבקע (Walden 1912: 46)
- עוקבא דמשוח (Walden 1912: 46)

16.2.8.5 Possessive Constructions
Aramaic possessive phrases are overwhelmingly composed of two nouns linked by the particle -ד ‘of’ (as seen in many of the examples in 16.2.1). The construct chain is almost never attested; a rare example is shown below.

- ריטש בורו (Landau 1892: 20); cf. Babylonian Talmud Gittin 56a

The tendency to avoid the construct chain where Aramaic is concerned contrasts markedly with the Hebrew of the tales, in which the authors tend to employ the construct chain more commonly than the possessive particle של ‘of’ (see 12.1.1). This discrepancy is likely rooted in the diachronic decline in use of the Aramaic construct chain so that it was largely unproductive by the Late Aramaic period (Creason 2008: 137), and therefore did not appear frequently in the Talmuds and other sources familiar to the Hasidic Hebrew authors.
16.3 Yiddish

The Yiddish component of Hasidic Hebrew lexis is much more extensive and diverse than the Aramaic component. As in the case of Aramaic, Yiddish lexical borrowings are primarily nouns, but they are distributed over a much wider range of semantic fields. Interestingly, the Aramaic and Yiddish loanwords fill two complementary positions within Hasidic Hebrew, in keeping with their sociolinguistic positions as vehicle of legal and mystical composition and vernacular respectively: while the Aramaic vocabulary typically refers to abstract concepts relating to theology and Jewish law, the Yiddish elements generally denote tangible objects, usually with practical everyday associations. These issues will be examined in more detail below.

16.3.1 Nouns

Yiddish loanwords in Hasidic Hebrew consist almost entirely of nouns as opposed to other content or function words. This trend conforms to general cross-linguistic tendencies concerning lexical borrowing in multilingual environments, in which nouns are typically the most common type of content word to be borrowed (Matras 2009: 167). In contrast to Aramaic borrowings, which are composed primarily of noun phrases, Yiddish loanwords are typically individual nouns. These nouns are usually embedded directly into the Hebrew texts, often taking Hebrew prefixes such as the definite article (see 16.3.4.1 for details). Note that the spelling of Yiddish words in the Hasidic Hebrew tales often differs from the standardized Yiddish orthography established in subsequent decades; moreover, the same Yiddish word may be spelt in various ways within the Hasidic Hebrew corpus and even within the same text. In the following sections Yiddish nouns are presented as they appear in the texts cited, but where these spellings deviate significantly from Standard Yiddish (yivo) orthography the latter is provided as well for reference.

As mentioned above, the Yiddish lexical component of Hasidic Hebrew extends over a very wide range of semantic fields, but typically designates items and concepts referring to various aspects of contemporary Jewish life in Eastern Europe for which there were no precise Hebrew equivalents. This same phenomenon is also found in Ashkenazi responsa literature (Betzer 2001: 102) and in the exceedingly popular 1864 halakhic handbook Kiṣur Shulḥan Arukh (Glinert 1987: 47–51) and may therefore constitute another feature of a more widespread Eastern European Hebrew idiom. Yiddish lexical items appearing in the Hasidic Hebrew tales can be divided into the following typical categories, which are illustrated with representative (though, due to space considerations, not exhaustive) examples.
16.3.1.1 Administration and Law

Yiddish lexical items often serve to designate administrative and bureaucratic positions and structures common in the Eastern European setting of the tales, as there were no established Hebrew labels for many of these concepts. Similarly, while Hebrew terms are typically employed in reference to specifically Jewish legal concepts, e.g. יִדִית בֶית רֵד 'Jewish law court', Yiddish vocabulary is used to denote non-Jewish forms of policing and law enforcement. The following are examples of these types of borrowings:

- גובשנэр בורו 'governor' (Michelsohn 1912: 102)
- גּוּבְנֶר 'gubernia' (Brandwein 1912: 43)
- גּוּבְנֶר 'border' (Munk 1898: 20)
- מַינְסֶטֶר 'minister' (HaLevi 1909: 54)
- מַינְסֶטֶר 'ministry' (Kaidaner 1875: 41a)
- נָשְׁטַלֶּק 'high official' (Breitstein 1914: 27)
- פַּלְייִיט 'police' (Heilmann 1902: 73)
- פַּרְאָטֶק 'court case' (Michelsohn 1912: 102)
- קִיס 'emperor' (J. Duner 1899: 35)
- קָלוֹזְטָנֵי 'rural police commissioner' (Kaidaner 1875: 16b)
- טְבַּיְיוּס 'travel permit' (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 15)

16.3.1.2 Buildings

Yiddish vocabulary is sometimes used to describe architectural features and specific parts of houses or other buildings. Some such concepts, e.g. ‘door-knob’, lacked an established Hebrew label at the time of composition, in which case the authors’ motivation for selecting the Yiddish term is straightforward. However, other concepts, e.g. ‘room’, did have Hebrew equivalents. In the latter cases it not as clear why the authors selected the Yiddish words, though it is possible that they subconsciously associated these words with the Eastern European settings which they were describing, whereas the Hebrew labels may have lacked any such associations and therefore may have been perceived (again, most likely subconsciously) as inappropriate to the context.

- בָּלְכָּנִי 'balcony' (Michelsohn 1905: 62)
- שְׁעַר 'shutters' (Singer 1900b: 17)
- סָטַל 'ceiling' (Munk 1898: 28)
- קָמֶט 'room' (Sofer 1904: 37)
- קְיוֵיל 'cellar' (Landau 1892: 51)
- קְפֶּרֶד 'kitchen' (J. Duner 1899: 73)
- רְבִּיִּי 'chimney' (Ehrmann 1903: 29a)
Yiddish terms are frequently used with reference to business transactions and activities, as below. Again, this is most likely due to the strong associations between these lexical items and the tales’ immediate cultural context, despite the existence of Hebrew equivalents in some cases.

- דעלגעדנרא 'rent money' (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 21)
- גאלז 'security'; 'deposit' (Kaidaner 1875: 42a)
- דארדיפ 'contract' (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 15)
- טידערק 'credit' (Sofer 1904: 30)
- טקארטנאק 'contract' (Hirsch 1900: 11)
- זיירפ 'price' (Munk 1898: 65)
- גאָלאַז 'business' (Bromberg 1899: 58)

16.3.1.4 Christian Religious Terms

Yiddish terms are often used to designate positions within the Christian religious hierarchy, as below. The third term illustrates a phenomenon whereby the authors may use a Yiddish term in addition to its Hebrew equivalent.

- פואשיב 'bishop' (HaLevi 1909: 54)
- ראטסולק 'church' (Munk 1898: 52)
- קַאָירְנִילטס 'Pope' (Singer 1900a, pt. 3: 2); cf. Hebrew רַאֲפוּפָה 'the Pope' (Rodkinsohn 1865: 53)
- קסטוליו 'Catholics' (Lieberson 1913: 92)
- קַאָארדינאָל 'cardinal' (Bodek 1865c: 3)

8 Standard Yiddish גאָלאַז.
9 Standard Yiddish דארדיפ.
16.3.1.5 Clothes

Yiddish words are very frequently used to denote various items of clothing. As above, in many cases the authors most likely selected the Yiddish terms due to the lack of accepted Hebrew equivalents. However, some of the items do have a Hebrew counterpart; for example, 'handkerchief' is comparable in meaning to the Hebrew מאמץ, which appears in Ruth 3:15 and in the Mishnah (e.g. Kilayim, Hullin) with similar meaning. Again, the authors may have selected the Yiddish forms because they strongly associated these garments with the Yiddish-speaking Ashkenazi cultural milieu, while the Hebrew terms familiar from biblical and rabbinic literature would have lacked these connotations. The likelihood of this is underscored by the fact that the terms in question all refer to clothes that were very commonly worn by Eastern European Jews at the time of composition and are frequently attested in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Yiddish literature.

- אונטיים תשלאן 'coat lining' (Rodkinsohn 1865: 23)
- ברצל 'sleeve' (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 38)
- בריל 'eyeglasses' (Kaidaner 1875: 15b)
- נפולק 'underwear' (Zak 1912: 153)
- עג牛奶 'belt' (Breitstein 1914: 20)
- רזוי 'trousers' (Sobelman 1909/10, pt. 3: 11)
- אייריל 'skullcap' (Lieberson 1913: 46)
- יבליז 'short jacket' (Ehrmann 1903: 48a)
- מאמץ 'fur hat' (Berger 1910a: 45)
- מאמץ 'shawl; kerchief' (Bodek 1865c: 21)
- אונטיים 'slippers' (Zak 1912: 153)
- קפלאה 'collar' (Munk 1898: 61)
- קפתא 'caftan' (Chikernik 1903a: 8)
- קפאולש 'hat' (Michelsohn 1910a: 71)
- קפיל 'clothes' (Ehrmann 1905: 52a)
- קפתא 'pocket' (M. Walden 1913, pt. 3: 15)
- יאר 'jacket' (Singer 1900b: 2)
- שטער 'headscarf' (Sofer 1904: 36)
- שטרימל 'shtreimel' (Bodek? 1866: 5a)

16.3.1.6 Currency

Yiddish loanwords are used to denote types of currency common in Eastern Europe at the time of the tales’ composition. These are employed in addition to a few Hebrew terms, namely מאמץ, מאמץ 'złoty'; מאמץ 'guilders', מאמץ 'ducats', and מאמץ 'dinar'.
16.3.1.7 Eastern European Jewish Cultural and Religious Concepts

The Hasidic Hebrew authors refer to certain Ashkenazi lifecycle rituals and cultural practices by their Yiddish labels, as shown below. The majority of these concepts and folk customs that evolved in Eastern Europe and would have been most familiar to the authors and audience by their Yiddish names; indeed, many of them lacked established Hebrew equivalents.

– גלעדן ‘gilders’ (Moses Leib of Sasov 1903: 21a)
– דוקאטי ‘ducats’ (Sofer 1904: 32)
– תִּאָלֶר ‘thaler’ (Shenkel 1903b: 5)
– מעריצק ‘forty-groschen piece’ (Munk 1898: 64)
– זיאנטנטTên ‘twenty-[groschen] pieces’ (Ehrmann 1903: 17b)
– קפפוקס ‘kopecks’ (Chikernik 1903a: 14)
– קעברל ‘rouble’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pt. 3: 5)
– ריבלי ‘rouble’ (Sofer 1904: 7)
– רייתש ‘reinisch’ (Munk 1898: 58)
– דקאט ‘ducat’ (Ehrmann 1903: 8a)
– אריש ‘[pounds] sterling’ (Kaidaner 1875: 34a)
– ליברעק ‘rouble’ (Sofer 1904: 7)
– ליביר ‘rouble’ (Sofer 1904: 32)
– שינייר ‘reinisch’ (Munk 1898: 58)
– לדנער ‘ducat’ (Ehrmann 1903: 8a)
– גנילרטש ‘[pounds] sterling’ (Kaidaner 1875: 34a)

άστορο פארג ‘usher/best man at wedding’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pt. 3: 16)
– בארדוקס ‘veiling of the bride’ (Munk 1898: 36)
– נטער דו ‘Hasidic rebbe’ (J. Duner 1899: 39)
– לוגאט קואר ‘glatt kosher’ (Rapaport 1909: 29)
– דריילית ‘dreidel’ (Landau 1892: 35)
– דרתש גונשק ‘wedding gift’ (Bodek? 1866: 5a)
– וצאי ‘vachnacht’ (Brandwein 1912: 2)
– נרכי נוקש ‘Habadniks’ (Bodek 1866: 53)
– ידיש ניטש ‘Yiddish Bible translation/interpretation’ (Landau 1892: 49)
– אירניצט ‘anniversary of a death’ (Gemen 1914: 87); often abbreviated to צ’ai (e.g. Bromberg 1899: 5)
– ידישבך ‘Jewishness’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 11)
– שִׁילְכֵו דו ‘an observant (lit: honest) Jew’ (Ehrmann 1903: 35a)
– מאיר-שפיל ‘pre-wedding dance party’ (Zak 1912: 136)
– פרוֹפ ‘religiously observant’ (Heilmann 1902: 87)
– זוקשית ‘note [of petition for the Rebbe]’ (Moses Leib of Sasov 1903: 32a)
– קיטל ‘kittel’ (Shenkel 1903b: 24)
– קלי ‘kheylin’ (Shenkel 1903b: 24)
– קלי ‘synagogue/study house’ (Lieberson 1913: 40)
16.3.1.8 Food, Drink, Etc.

One of the richest spheres of Yiddish lexical influence on Hasidic Hebrew is that of food, drink, and other consumable products, as illustrated below. In most cases these terms refer to items lacking established Hebrew equivalents because they did not exist until the medieval or early modern period or because they are not well-known outside of Eastern Europe. Some of these words are attested in the mid-nineteenth-century halakhic handbook Kiṣur Shulḥan Arukh (Glinert 1987: 47–48, 51), though the Yiddish vocabulary in the tales is much more extensive.

- ‘אינטנמנאָ跽ים ‘preserves’ (Heilmann 1902: 59)
- ‘תורק ‘turkey’ (Berger 1910b: 125)
- ‘נאָ㉯ ‘borscht’ (J. Duner 1899: 82)
- ‘בּֿאוֹצוֹ ‘bagel’ (Greenwald 1899: 54a)
- ‘שעמאוו ‘stuffed dumplings’ (Chikernik 1903a: 10)
- ‘עמירא ‘supper’ (Ehrmann 1903: 5b)
- ‘עמא ‘sour milk’ (Brandwein 1912: 22)
- ‘טבּֿא ‘tobacco’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 26)
- ‘סי ‘tea’ (Kaidaner 1875: 27a)
- ‘שאָ Müdürl ‘cholent’ (Gemen 1914: 63)
- ‘ייו ‘clear chicken soup’ (Landau 1892: 12)
- ‘לאָ ‘noodles’ (Gemen 1914: 85)
- ‘לענוב ‘honeycake’ (Hirsch 1900: 42)
- ‘לעמא ‘lemonade’ (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 29)
- ‘מע ‘mead’ (M. Walden 1914: 8)
- ‘פּֿ ‘carrots’ (Michelsohn 1912: 84)
- ‘לעמא ‘lettuce’ (Michelsohn 1912: 11)
- ‘לעמא ‘oranges’ (Gemen 1914: 66)
- ‘מי ‘porter’ (M. Walden 1914: 8)

---

10 This term actually derives ultimately from the Hebrew דיל ‘instruments’, but has been fully integrated into Yiddish and appears here in the phonetic spelling typically used in that language.
16.3.1.9 Furniture and Household Objects

Yiddish vocabulary is frequently used to designate furniture and household items that were commonplace in the authors’ Eastern European setting. As above, these terms generally lacked established Hebrew labels at the time of writing. However, some of these Yiddish loanwords do have well-known Hebrew counterparts, as in the last two examples below. In these cases the authors may have chosen the Yiddish terms because the Hebrew equivalents are themselves used in Yiddish and have very specific religious connotations in that language (‘[God’s] throne’ and ‘seven-branched Temple candelabra’ or ‘oil lamp used in the Hanukkah festival’ respectively); the selection of the much more everyday Yiddish words may reflect a conscious or subconscious wish to avoid these elevated associations in the mundane settings wherein they appear.

– רעטחאלגנעה 'chandelier' (Lieberson 1913: 46)
– עגעיוו 'cradle' (Ehrmann 1903: 33b)
– ריטחאל 'candleholder' (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 45)
– טערבןישקאל 'board for making noodles' (M. Walden 1914: 60)
– יקלול 'pipe' (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 8)
– ארדלאק 'bedspread' (Landau 1892: 21)
– עפאש 'closet'; 'cupboard' (Munk 1898: 60)

11 Standard Yiddish סעילאָסאַפ.  
12 In context of discussion of non-kosher food.
– קנאש ‘wardrobe’ (Rapaport 1909: 22)
– ישפלועי ‘little drawer’ (Sofer 1904: 26)
– תשניטל ‘mirror’ (Munk 1898: 74)
– שריאנס ‘closet’; ‘cupboard’ (Brandwein 1912: 23)
– ללאמ시스 ‘lamps’ (N. Duner 1912: 37); cf. Hebrew נמס
– לבנוקל ‘chair’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 15); cf. Hebrew כסמ

16.3.1.10 Geographic, Ethnic, and Linguistic Labels
The names of countries and regions without well-established or familiar Hebrew equivalents typically appear in the Hasidic tales in their Yiddish form. Such labels include the following:

– Ḥונאגר ‘Hungary’ (Leichter 1901: 10a)
– אוקראינא ‘Ukraine’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 23)
– איטלי ‘Italy’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 17)
– גרמניא ‘Germany’ (Zak 1912: 35)
– אנגלנדה ‘England’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 18)
– אוסטריה ‘Austria’ (Kaidaner 1875: 47a)
– פולנד ‘Poland’ (Landau 1892: 13)
– פרוסיה ‘Prussia’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 34)
– רוסאנגל ‘Russia’ (Sofer 1904: 18)
– שוודיא ‘Sweden’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 34)
– ספרניה ‘Spain’ (Ehrmann 1903: 7b)

Similarly, ethnic labels without well-established Hebrew equivalents usually appear in Yiddish. Moreover, the Yiddish versions of labels that do have Hebrew designations are also occasionally employed. As above, in some instances their choice may have been motivated by semantic considerations. For example, in the case of the word קערג ‘Greeks’ below, Sofer may have employed the Yiddish term with reference to the Greek people of his era because he associated that nation with its label in his vernacular, in contrast to the ancient Greeks, which he would have associated with the Hebrew term ויזיס familiar from rabbinic literature.

– קערג ‘Greeks’ (Sofer 1904: 3)
– גיריס ‘German Jew/Maskil’ (Singer 1900b: 2)
– רומאנק ‘Romani’ (Munk 1898: 68)
16.3.1.11 Institutions
Yiddish terms are often used to denote specific types of institutions and locales such as factories and inns of relevance in the tales’ contemporary Eastern European setting. As in the categories discussed above, some of these institutions lacked established Hebrew labels at the time of composition, while others, e.g. ‘inn’, did have Hebrew equivalents (i.e. בֵית מִרְחִית, בֵית מְזוּנֵה, as discussed in 16.1.1), which were used in the tales as well. In these cases the authors seem to have regarded the Yiddish and Hebrew terms as synonymous. Betzer (2001: 102) has observed the existence of the same phenomenon in nineteenth-century Ashkenazi responsa literature, whereby Yiddish loanwords are used seemingly interchangeably with their Hebrew equivalents.

– ביבליותק ‘library’ (Bodek 1866: 5)
– נאסתרהיז ‘guesthouse’ (Ehrmann 1903: 8a)
– מאמאיצז ‘store’ (Sofer 1904: 37)
– ראברק ‘factory’ (Brandwein 1912: 9)
– ב’ ‘post office’ (Michelsohn 1912: 6)
– קראטשמע ‘inn’ (Zak 1912: 21)
– שענק ‘inn’ (N. Duner 1912: 34)

16.3.1.12 Materials
Yiddish terms are often used to designate various types of materials, typically those without established Hebrew labels, e.g.:

– בוצרטשטי ‘amber’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 34)
– בניאוט ‘fabric’ (Gemen 1914: 60)
– זָדַיֶּס ‘diamond’ (Zak 1912: 12)
– טאַװ ‘cotton’ (Landau 1892: 21)
– טניווייל ‘canvas’ (Sofer 1875: 41a)
– טניווייל ‘magnet’ (Heilmann 1902: 36)
– טניווייל ‘furs’ (Lieberson 1913: 42)
– קראטש ‘tile’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 9)
– קריידע ‘chalk’ (J. Duner 1899: 48)

16.3.1.13 Measurements
Yiddish loanwords are very frequently employed to indicate measurements of space and time in common use in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Eastern Europe, e.g.:
– טור’es ‘verst’ (HaLevi 1907: 22b)
– ליטרא ‘litre’ (Ehrmann 1903: 6a)
– מיל ‘mile’ (Bodek 1866: 5)
– מינט ‘minute’ (Kaidaner 1875: 40b)
– קלואסט ‘fathom’ (Heilmann 1902: 2)
– קואראט ‘quart’ (J. Duner 1899: 96)
– ליט ‘half-ounce’ (Kaidaner 1875: 41a)

16.3.1.14 Medicine
Yiddish is frequently used to designate everyday medical concepts and practices. Again, this tendency is often due to a lack of standard Hebrew equivalents. However, in some cases, such as דאקט ‘doctor’ and מעדיס ‘medicine’, there were accepted Hebrew terms in use at the time of writing (אפור and הפורת respectively). As above, it is possible that the authors selected the Yiddish terms for these concepts because they strongly associated them with their vernacular labels. However, these tendencies are not consistent: thus, one author may employ a Yiddish term while another selects the Hebrew equivalent, as shown in the example for דאקט below. This may suggest that, as in the case of labels for concepts such as ‘inn’ (discussed in 16.3.1.11), the authors did not make a sharp distinction between the Hebrew and Yiddish terms.

– ייקארפ ‘chemist’, ‘pharmacy’ (Hirsch 1900: 46)
– אופר ‘operation’ (Landau 1892: 56; Michelsohn 1910b: 190)
– אזכרת ‘cupping’ (Zak 1912: 21)
– ענשתור ‘a swelling’ (Gemen 1914: 93)
– דאקט ‘doctor’ (Sofer 1904: 12); cf. רימ ‘doctor’ (Lieberson 1913: 39)
– דאקט ‘practice of medicine’ (Shalom of Koidanov 1882: 17)
– מוקיצ ‘medicine’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 44)
– פיאוק ‘leeches’ (Zak 1912: 21)
–ипוק ‘clinic’ (Ehrmann 1903: 6b)
– ריאסט ‘prescription’ (Berger 1910c: 20)
– שפיטא ‘hospital’ (Munk 1898: 36)

16.3.1.15 Military
Yiddish loanwords are used with reference to military positions, institutions, and activities, which typically lacked established Hebrew labels at the time of writing, e.g.:

– גנרל ‘general’ (Bromberg 1899: 58)
– מנהואור ‘manoeuvre’ (Kaidaner 1875: 48a)
16.3.1.6 Occupations

Yiddish terms are very frequently used to designate occupations and professions common in the tales’ settings. As above, most of these labels had no established Hebrew equivalents. However, a few of them do have counterparts in well-known earlier Hebrew texts, as indicated below. Again, the authors may have selected the Yiddish terms because they strongly associated the occupations in question with their Yiddish-speaking Eastern European context, in contrast to the Hebrew equivalents which may have felt more remote from this setting.

- דאָלָאָפּ ‘lawyer’ (Munk 1898: 21)
- פָּשָטַק ‘chemist’, ‘pharmacist’ (Hirsch 1900: 81)
- אָקָס ‘ox merchant’ (Sofer 1904: 29)
- האָלָא ‘tenant farmer’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 15)
- נוּכֵל ‘bookkeeper’ (Ehrmann 1905: 107b)
- בֵּשַל ‘beggar’ (Breitstein 1914: 24)
- דאָל ‘guard’ (Bodek 1865c: 8)
- דאָא ‘wine merchant’ (Munk 1898: 40)
- ייינַער ‘watchmaker’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 2: 20)
- טקע ‘porter’ (Lieberson 1913: 43)
- הָרָבָּא ‘merchant’, ‘retailer’ (Bromberg 1899: 58)
- מיא ‘bricklayer’ (Ehrmann 1903: 21a)
- נוּל ‘miller’ (Berger 1910b: 50)
- מילעַ ‘miller’s wife’ (Munk 1898: 41)
- קראָפּ ‘entrepreneur’ (Bromberg 1899: 58)
- קְפּ ‘comedians’ (Sofer 1904: 38)
- כְּעַ ‘cook’ (Singer 1900b: 16)
- קְרַ ‘comb maker’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 33)

---

13 על-פי יִדִיש (Yiddish terms).
14 STANDARD YIDDISH (Standard Yiddish)
15 STANDARD YIDDISH (Standard Yiddish)
16.3.1.17 Technology

Unsurprisingly, Yiddish loanwords are typically employed in the expression of technological innovations lacking standard Hebrew equivalents, e.g.:

- ‘dispatch’, ‘telegram’ (Landau 1892: 15)
- ‘telegraph’ (Zak 1912: 137)
- ‘telegram’ (Gemen 1914: 77)
- ‘photograph(y)’ (Michelsohn 1910b: 185)

16.3.1.18 Transport

Yiddish borrowings are often used to designate modes of transport and specific components of vehicles, usually due to the absence of established Hebrew terms.

- ‘axle’ (Kaidaner 1875: 29a)
- ‘train’ (Chikernik 1903a: 13)
- ‘wagons’ (Ehrmann 1903: 6a)
- ‘train carriage’ (Michelsohn 1910b: 190)
- ‘transport(ation)’ (M. Walden 1914: 57)
- ‘coach’ (Ehrmann 1903: 2b)
- ‘sleigh’ (HaLevi 1909: 53)

16.3.2 Adjectives and Participles

Yiddish lexical borrowings in Hasidic Hebrew are almost exclusively nouns; other parts of speech are attested only infrequently. This is logical given that a major role of Yiddish loanwords in the tales is the designation of concrete objects. However, very rarely an adjectival form is attested in the corpus. As in the case of the nouns, the majority of these Yiddish adjectives and participles were most likely selected because there was no widely accepted Hebrew...
equivalent or because they strongly associated the concepts in question with their vernacular labels. Of the few adjectival forms appearing in the tales, none serves to modify Hebrew nouns: one is substantivized, two are past participles provided as glosses (see 16.3.5 for more information about Yiddish glosses in the tales), several modify Yiddish nouns, and one is predicative. These are illustrated in turn below. This trend indicates that, in contrast to the nouns, Yiddish adjectives are not a common or well-integrated component of Hasidic Hebrew.

Substantivized

- הלחוב אטל הנדוים יישעיליים ‘Some spiritual people went to the priests’ (Ehrmann 1903: 5b)

Past Participles

- על משכובות (שקורות יוגיות) ‘lying down (which is called leaning)’ (Munk 1898: 5)
- בתולשת שהוקרע וה IList מ ‘with a weakness that they call paralyzed’ (Michelsohn 1910b: 16)

Attributive Modifying Yiddish Noun

- ובפרט ליוגנים לייש ‘and particularly young people’ (J. Duner 1899: 17)
- והללו מחבואים ב_SHOW_THROUGH_/מיסים יעדעעס ‘And they went dressed in white skirts’ (Breitstein 1914: 32)
- אמר היה מיתייקאין יעד ‘And he said, “It is milky broth”’ (Gemen 1914: 83)
- גו הולובערן פישקעל מטאבריק גו צע ‘And he also gave the silver tobacco box to the pauper’ (Michelsohn 1912: 40)

Predicative

- לא ניחור לא ברורן שינקעל להמר ‘not light and not clear; completely dark’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 50)

16.3.3 Verbs

Like adjectives, Yiddish verbs are not a common feature of Hasidic Hebrew. However, rarely a Yiddish verb appears embedded within a Hebrew sentence. Such verbs are almost invariably infinitives, which appear exactly as they would in Yiddish, i.e. with the Yiddish infinitive ending ḥ(א)-. These infinitives
sometimes denote actions for which there was no clearly established Hebrew equivalent, or serve as glosses clarifying possibly confusing Hebrew terms.

Some of these infinitives function as gerunds, and as such their selection can be considered an extension of the authors’ proclivity for the use of Yiddish nominal forms. The following examples illustrate this point:

– ‘And that is the matter of attacking’ (Heilmann 1902: 88)
– ‘in the midst of the celebrating’ (M. Walden 1912: 68)
– ‘to prevent the boys from sending up smoke, which is called (smoking)’ (J. Duner 1899: 80)

In only a few cases do the infinitives function verbally, e.g.:

– ‘He would go to the kitchen to say goodbye to his rebbetzin’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 69)
– ‘And he said to me that it is not right to do such a thing, to use the merit of one’s ancestors’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pt. 3: 18)

The following is a rare example of a Yiddish periphrastic infinitive phrase:

– ‘only if a Jewish man wants to hesitate before the Creator of the Universe’ (Zak 1912: 36)

Similarly, there is one example of a Yiddish imperative, appearing as a gloss of the equivalent Hebrew imperative:

– ‘Mix (mish) with the spoon, and you will see an amazing thing’ (Sofer 1904: 23)

16.3.4 Morphosyntax of Yiddish Borrowings

16.3.4.1 Yiddish Nouns with Hebrew Prefixes

Yiddish lexical borrowings in Hasidic tales have been absorbed into Hebrew morphosyntactic structure to the extent that they take Hebrew prefixes when the context so requires. The same practice is attested in the mid-nineteenth-century halakhic compendium Kiṣur Shulḥan Arukh (Glinert 1987: 48), and therefore likely constitutes an element of a broader Eastern European form of Hebrew. This integration of Yiddish vocabulary into Hebrew grammatical structure is in keeping with general cross-linguistic trends whereby languages tend to apply their inherited morphosyntactic processes to loanwords (see
Matras 2009: 173). Yiddish nouns may be prefixed by the definite article, by inseparable and separable prepositions, and by conjunctions, or by a combination of these, as illustrated in the following sets of examples.

**With Definite Article**

- תוקלאמקע ‘the doorknob’ (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 28)
- יאירמקש ‘the skullcap’ (Landau 1892: 18)
- אדרקטור ‘the doctors’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 43)
- השטנער ‘the lectern’ (Hirsch 1900: 24)

**With Prepositions and Conjunctions**

- בואנא ‘in a carriage’ (Gemen 1914: 91)
- מסטאסק ‘of tobacco’ (Sofer 1904: 34)
- לילעקט ‘and honeycake’ (Breitstein 1914: 36)
- נואארט ‘and borscht’ (Landau 1892: 8)

**With Combination**

- ממחקרטעם ‘from the inn’ (Brandwein 1912: 9)
- אשרקארט ‘that the doctors’ (Shalom of Koidanov 1882: 9)
- בברשת ‘in the note’ (Heilmann 1902: 63)
- לחרטאב ‘to the prayer-house’ (Rapaport 1909: 22)
- בהשתאם ‘in the shtreimel’ (Breitstein 1914: 17)
- למכילשט ‘to the church’ (M. Walden 1914: 63)
- יפלאערעל ‘that the sleeves’ (Berger 1910c: 116)

### 16.3.4.2 Yiddish Nouns in Construct Chains

The Hasidic Hebrew authors often employ Yiddish loanwords in the formation of construct chains. In such settings the Yiddish word is most commonly found in the absolute position, while the construct noun is Hebrew, as in the following examples. In these cases the absolute loanword is occasionally indefinite, as in the first two examples, but is more commonly prefixed by the definite article, as in the remainder.

- דרכ מלכי גיבורים ‘the ways of Greek kings (lit: kings of Greeks)’ (Bodek 1866: 2)
- שק דוכטים ‘this bag of ducats’ (Ehrmann 1903: 32b)
- בועה שתיית הקפה ‘at the time of drinking coffee’ (Kaidaner 1875: 21b)
- בכתות הערשיל ‘in the writing of the note’ (Landau 1892: 55)
Like other Hasidic Hebrew construct chains, chains containing a Yiddish loanword may be doubly marked for definiteness, with the definite article prefixed to both the Yiddish and the Hebrew noun e.g.:

- הרעש והיינארכו ‘on the matter of smoking cigars’ (Zak 1912: 154)

More rarely, the Yiddish loanword may appear in the construct position preceding a Hebrew absolute noun, e.g.:

- שלש משלים פוטעליפיט ‘thirty containers of the wine’ (Munk 1898: 18)

The Hasidic Hebrew authors’ readiness to employ Yiddish words in construct chains underscores their ability to employ this construction freely and productively (discussed in 4.3.2 and 12.1.1) rather than limiting it to set expressions. Interestingly, the practice deviates markedly from the Rabbinic Hebrew tendency to avoid the construct chain with loanwords in favour of the possessive particle של (see Pérez Fernández 1999: 32 for a discussion of this convention), thereby undermining the received understanding of Hasidic Hebrew usage as primarily modelled on that of rabbinic literature.

16.3.4.3 Gender of Yiddish Nouns

Yiddish nouns used in Hasidic Hebrew typically exhibit the same gender as in Yiddish. Thus, nouns that are masculine in Yiddish are likewise treated as masculine in the tales, appearing in conjunction with masculine adjectives and verbs. This applies equally to animate nouns that are logically as well as grammatically masculine and to inanimate nouns whose masculine gender is solely grammatical. The following examples illustrate these points.

- דִּיתָאֵת הָאַרְחָר ‘another prescription’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 44)
- הַפְּרוּסֶס הַרְאֵשׁ ‘the first Pope’ (Singer 1900a, pt. 3: 2)
- פְּרָעְגַּצְּא כֶּהֶש ‘a new paragraph’ (Sofer 1904: 26)
- בְּוָאוֹנָאוֹ מִיֵּהוּד ‘in a special carriage’ (Gemen 1914: 91)
Similarly, nouns that are logically and/or grammatically feminine in Yiddish retain this gender when employed in Hasidic Hebrew. This is most likely reinforced by the fact that there is a high degree of convergence between Yiddish and Hebrew feminine nouns, which often end in [ə]. See Matras (2009: 174) for a similar development in Modern Hebrew.

- הקזחייט ‘strong tea’ (Landau 1892: 58)
- והאלאוקה נפל הידה ‘And the pipe fell from his hand’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 45)
- והפשפשלא של יהוד מתצע על כתפי ‘And his shawl was on his shoulders’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pt. 3: 7)
- קררשרשוע כותנה ‘a small inn’ (Berger 1907: 55)
- והףיד נפל התלמסק ‘And the doorknob immediately fell off’ (Baruch of Medzhybizh 1880: 28)
- הקפיו שחרה ‘black coffee’ (Berger 1910c: 38)

The same applies in the rare instances when a Yiddish noun that is feminine despite lacking an obviously feminine ending appears in the tales conjunction with an adjective or verb, e.g.:

- קאוליל אאחת מחנה ורדא ‘an oven tile was shaking’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 9)

As Hebrew, unlike Yiddish, has no neuter gender, the tale authors reassign neuter Yiddish nouns as either masculine or feminine. There are not many examples of neuter Yiddish nouns in conjunction with adjectives or verbs in the tales and therefore it is difficult to detect any underlying patterns. However, there seems to be a slight preference for masculine gender, as the following sets of examples illustrate.

**Masculine**

- ‘a very long note [of petition]’ (Landau 1892: 57)
- ‘a small note [of petition]’ (Heilmann 1902: 59)
- ‘a thin robe’ (Breitstein 1914: 10)

**Feminine**

- ‘This little box was worth all the world in his eyes’ (Gemen 1914: 81)
Similarly, on the (infrequent) occasions when nouns ending in the Yiddish feminine plural suffix -סע- appear in the tales in conjunction with an attributive adjective they retain their feminine gender, as below. Again, this is unsurprising as it fits in with the general Hasidic Hebrew tendency to treat all plural nouns ending in [əs] as feminine.

– ‘the necessary strings’ (Ehrmann 1903: 21b)

16.3.4.4 Yiddish Plural Suffixes

Yiddish-derived nouns employed in the Hasidic Hebrew tales frequently appear in the plural. Yiddish has multiple plural suffixes, and the Hasidic Hebrew authors use these same suffixes to pluralize Yiddish loanwords appearing in their writings. Yiddish-derived plural suffixes attested in the tales consist of the following:

a) -ן

This is by far the most common plural ending for Yiddish loanwords, e.g.:

– ‘lawyers’ (Michelsohn 1912: 102)
– ‘chemists’, ‘pharmacies’ (Landau 1892: 11)
– ‘diamonds’ (Sofer 1904: 30)
– ‘German/Maskilic Jews’ (Zak 1912: 28)
– ‘minutes’ (Rapaport 1909: 51)
– ‘passports’ (Heilmann 1902: 98)
– ‘cigars’ (J. Duner 1899: 80)
– ‘contracts’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 15)
– ‘cardinals’ (Sofer 1904: 36)
– ‘monthly payments’ (Munk 1898: 29)

b) -ס

This suffix is also relatively common, e.g.:

– ‘directors’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 12)
– ‘clocks’, ‘watches’ (Landau 1892: 60)
– ‘strings’ (Ehrmann 1903: 21b)
– ‘fur hats’ (Gemen 1914: 54)
– ‘bottles’ (Munk 1898: 18)
– ‘potatoes’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 14)
– ‘pockets’ (Michelsohn 1912: 79)
c) צ"- This is attested only relatively infrequently, e.g.:

- גנ"ש ... 'property' (Munk 1898: 20)
- קראדיג'ליס ... 'cardinals' (Bodek 1865c: 3)

d) ק"- This is the standard Yiddish plural suffix for diminutive nouns (as well as some non-diminutives) and appears relatively frequently in the tales, e.g.:

- נאטוולעlogan ... 'belts' (Heilmann 1902: 58)
- טייזקעד"ו ... 'sweets' (Yellin 1913: 36)
- קוןไหลתערל ... 'notes of petition' (Breitstein 1914: 22)
- קפרשתיל מילה ... 'chapters of Psalms' (Bodek 1866: 17)
- קפרערל ... 'roubles' (Munk 1898: 47)
- דער蜮לאך ... 'ducats' (Ehrmann 1903: 32b)
- שטיריארעל ... 'shtreimels' (Chikernik 1908: 9)

e) סי"- This suffix appears only rarely on Yiddish nouns not derived from the Semitic component of the language. The only common example is the following:

- דוקטוריס ... 'doctors' (Sofer 1904: 2)

In most cases these plural suffixes are identical to those used for the nouns in question in Standard Yiddish. However, in a few cases the precise plural form attested in the tales does not correspond to that used with the same noun in current Standard Yiddish, even though the suffix itself derives from Yiddish. For example, דעספיטס ... 'dispatches'; 'telegrams' (Landau 1892: 15) differs from Standard Yiddish דעספיטס. These non-standard forms may have been local variants, or the nouns in question may not have had fixed plural forms in the authors’ spoken Yiddish. The latter possibility is supported by the fact that in some cases the same Yiddish-derived noun may appear with more than one plural suffix in the work of a single author, as below:

17 Note that this noun is also attested with the plural suffix ג"-, as shown in point a) above.
16.3.4.5 Diminutives

Yiddish nouns often appear in the tales in diminutive form. In the singular the diminutive is marked by the suffix -ל or -לי, while in the plural it is marked by the suffix -ךיל, as illustrated in the following two sets of examples respectively. These diminutive suffixes are reserved solely for Yiddish loanwords and do not appear attached to Hebrew nouns. The Yiddish diminutive thus functions as a lexicalized form imported wholesale together with certain loanwords, rather than as a productive element of Hasidic Hebrew grammar.

**Singular Diminutives**

- 'a little Maskil' (Sofer 1904: 23)
- ‘little clock’; ‘little watch’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 28)
- ‘bit of honeycake’ (Zak 1912: 19)
- ‘little fur hat’ (Munk 1898: 49)
- ‘little tin’ (Gemen 1914: 81)
- ‘little fur coat’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 42)
- ‘little prayer house’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 14ii18)

**Plural Diminutives**

- ‘little watches’ (Landau 1892: 59)
- ‘little candleholders’ (Hirsch 1900: 32)
- ‘little bottles’ (Munk 1898: 17)
- ‘notes (of petition)’ (Zak 1912: 21)

16.3.5 Yiddish Glosses

While many of the Yiddish lexical items appearing in the tales are inserted directly into the Hebrew text, sometimes Yiddish glosses are added following a synonymous or related Hebrew term. These glosses generally serve to clarify Hebrew vocabulary that the authors regarded as insufficiently precise, ambiguous, or potentially confusing for the readers. In terms of meaning, the glosses fall into roughly the same categories as the Yiddish loanwords discussed in 16.3.1, referring chiefly to concrete objects with practical, quotidiant
associations. There are several conventions regarding the presentation of glosses, as shown below.

Glosses are often enclosed in round or (more rarely) square brackets, e.g.:

- בֵּית הַלָּשׁוֹן הַדָּרֶךׁ (belyoteh ‘library’) (Sofer 1904: 2)
- מֶשֶׁנֶת (yarmelkey ‘skullcap’) (Rodkinsohn 1865: 22)
- הַנֵּר לִילָה לְעֵשָׂה נַאֲה לֵרוּדַת עַטְלֵמָה (ortulek ‘proper’) (Bromberg 1899: 7)
- בְּכַתּוּת יַמְנִי שִׁירוֹ [beker ‘skullcap’] מַעֲבַר מִתְּבִּיט (bukhalek ‘proper’) (Zak 1912: 159)
- בַּכָּת (gasthoyz ‘inn’) (Berger 1910b: 47)
- מְצֵרַת הַנָּשִּׁי (president ‘president’) (Teomim Fraenkel 1911b: 28)
- בְּכָת לְבִישוֹת (hantskes ‘gloves’) (Gemen 1914: 91)
- יַקְוַת הַרָּחִיץ (kortitsheyn ‘short-sighted’) (Singer 1900a, pt. 2: 1)
- בְּכָת עֵינִי (briln ‘glasses’) (Michelsohn 1910a: 137)
- הַנָּשִּׁי (ha-spodek ‘fur hat’) (Bodek 1865b: 10)
- עֵשֶׂה בִּיטָה (peklekh ‘packages’) (Chikernik 1903a: 26)
- הַנָּשִּׁי (ha-arbl ‘shutters’) (M. Walden 1912: 64)
- בְּכָת אֲעִנַי (kroyt ‘cabbage’) (Ehrmann 1903: 33b)

Often they are introduced by the phrase נִירֹקֶשׁ (which is called), as below; the same phrase is often used to introduce Yiddish loanwords in Ashkenazi responsa literature (Bezter 2001: 102) and is also attested in the contemporary Kiṣur Shulḥan Arukh (Glinert 1987: 48–49).

- בְּכָת עֵינִי (briln ‘glasses’) (Michelsohn 1910a: 137)
- בְּכָת עֵינִי (briln ‘glasses’) (Bodek 1865b: 10)
- עֵשֶׂה בִּיטָה (peklekh ‘packages’) (Chikernik 1903a: 26)
- הַנָּשִּׁי (ha-arbl ‘shutters’) (M. Walden 1912: 64)
- בְּכָת אֲעִנַי (kroyt ‘cabbage’) (Ehrmann 1903: 33b)

- בְּכָת עֵינִי (briln ‘glasses’) (Michelsohn 1910a: 137)
- בְּכָת עֵינִי (briln ‘glasses’) (Bodek 1865b: 10)
- עֵשֶׂה בִּיטָה (peklekh ‘packages’) (Chikernik 1903a: 26)
- הַנָּשִּׁי (ha-arbl ‘shutters’) (M. Walden 1912: 64)
- בְּכָת אֲעִנַי (kroyt ‘cabbage’) (Ehrmann 1903: 33b)
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windows that they call \([\text{glæzer} \text{‘glass panes’}]\) (Rosen-thal 1909: 50)

‘hay [which is called ‘hey’ hay]’ (Berger 1910c: 14)

Occasionally the glosses are introduced by the designation ב׳in Yiddish’, e.g.:

They used to draw by the hin [in Yiddish \(\text{emer vays} \text{‘by the bucket’}\)] (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 3)

Very rarely, the Yiddish term is given first and then explained with a Hebrew definition, e.g.:

\(\text{krayd} \text{‘chalk’} \text{(that is, the dry white plaster) would also be useful’}\) (J. Duner 1899: 48)

**16.3.6 Codeswitching**

The direct speech of the tales exhibits many examples of Hebrew-Yiddish codeswitching, whereby Yiddish phrases and sentences are embedded within Hebrew utterances. Often the Yiddish elements are relatively limited, consisting only of a single phrase, clause, or sentence, e.g.:

And anyone who speaks about me it is as if he is speaking about the Holy One blessed be He; he will be blackened in this world and in the World to Come’ (J. Duner 1899: 39)

However, rarely they extend to an entire paragraph, e.g.:

And he said in Yiddish as follows, “I release you from the study partnership; only the bodies, but the souls should continue to be together; the holiness should continue to be together; later a Jew can continue to have together the private meetings that he has earlier”’ (Bromberg 1899: 39)
While the Yiddish elements typically consist of verbal clauses, in a few cases they are restricted to sequences of individual nouns or noun phrases:

- "And afterwards the key was found, and he took (lit: gave) the sugar from the closet, and he drank the coffee with the sugar" (Rapaport 1909: 29)
- "And they went dressed in white skirts" (Breitstein 1914: 32)
- "And he said, “It is milky broth”’ (Gemen 1914: 83)

While the Yiddish inserts often constitute independent utterances, as above, the codeswitching may begin or end in the middle of a clause or sentence, e.g.:

- "I don’t know why people travel to the Chernobyl [Rebbe]’ (Lieberson 1913: 61)
- "And his holy feet were frozen to the ground’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pt. 3: 11)
- "And now you have several observant Jews, and you aren’t afraid of (or: for) them at all’ (Zak 1912: 138)
- "If I had true good friends, they would take me to the ritual bath to immerse me’ (Shalom of Koidanov 1882: 19)
- "But more, one must want to study’ (M. Walden 1914: 92)
- "And he said, “He is a grandfather to me in the World Above as well’” (Berger 1910a: 72)
- "This child is the Ruzhiner Rebbe’s child’ (Seuss 1890: 4)

In the following extreme case, Yiddish and Hebrew elements are completely intertwined through a sequence of several clauses. This degree of codeswitching is rare in the tales.

- "And every evening he gave me a couple of bagels with groats. I don’t regret that, because I became extremely miserable and afterwards I saw that this wasn’t what they meant’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 48)
While these Yiddish elements often appear without introduction, they are sometimes preceded by the abbreviation ל’הזב ‘in these words’ or מבו ‘in Yiddish’:

– And while walking, he cried as follows: “How can a soul get a blemish?”’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 45)
– And he said in Yiddish, “I don’t mean him”’ (Bromberg 1899: 7)

Sometimes a Yiddish clause or sentence is quoted in full and then a single element from it is referred back to from within the following Hebrew text; for example, in the following example the Rebbe’s speech is presented in Hebrew except for a single Yiddish clause, the most salient word of which is then cited again in the next (Hebrew) part of the utterance.

– He is full of “wife”, and in all of his actions and deeds and thoughts there is only “wife”’ (Moses of Kobrin 1910: 75)

These instances of Hebrew-Yiddish codeswitching are noteworthy because most of the direct speech in the tales is in Hebrew, even though it is actually all translated from the Yiddish that the speakers would have uttered in reality. The motivation for preserving the original Yiddish in these instances when the most of the conversations in the tales are presented in Hebrew is unclear. These occasional deviations from the standard Hebrew dialogue may be unconscious slips on the part of the authors. Alternatively, they may indicate that in these particular cases the authors consciously desired to render the speakers’ utterances exactly as they had heard them, without translating them from Yiddish into Hebrew, in order to lend them extra vividness and therefore a heightened impact. This explanation is particularly likely when the quoted speaker is a rebbe, whose words the authors would have treated with special reverence. However, the authors’ use of Yiddish in this respect is not systematic: for example, Ehrmann (1903) often renders the direct speech of the Ba’al Shem Tov in Yiddish; nevertheless, in some cases he instead presents it in Hebrew, while conversely he sometimes cites the speech of other characters in Yiddish. Other authors exhibit a similarly unsystematic approach. Moreover, there is some variation between individual authors in this respect; for example, many authors including Ehrmann (1903), Teomim Fraenkel (1911), Landau (1892), and Sobelman (1909/10) render a relatively high proportion of direct speech in general in Yiddish, while others, e.g. Rodkinsohn (1864, 1865), Bodek (1865, 1866),
and Kaidaner (1875) tend to avoid it. It is therefore unclear the degree to which the use of Yiddish in such cases is the result of any such intentional consideration on their part.

16.3.7 **Yiddish Calques in Hebrew**

Hebrew calques of Yiddish content and function words are very commonly attested in the tales.

Thus, words existing in both Hebrew and Yiddish but with different meanings in each are commonly employed in their Yiddish sense, e.g.:

- **슬וע** standard Hebrew ‘world’; ‘eternity’; Yiddish/Hasidic Hebrew ‘audience’, e.g.:
  - **ויברהן בלצאםלועהראשישהוקתהיה** ‘There was hope that the audience would stay with the Rebbe’s son’ (Breitstein 1914: 48)

- **משפར** standard Hebrew ‘it is possible’; Yiddish/Hasidic Hebrew ‘maybe’, e.g.:
  - **ямמשר תעשה תשובה עך נפש עמו חוכך** ‘And maybe he would repent; therefore, he immediately went with him’ (Bodek 1866: 56)
  - **אמשר יהיה המותל בעל עיבור** ‘Maybe the mohel will be a sinner’ (J. Duner 1899: 23)

Similarly, the Hebrew adjective **נודל** ‘big’; ‘great’ can be used in the sense of ‘extreme’, as in Yiddish, e.g.:

- **_office Gearיעטסאַרעדסאַרעראָראַעוו__גַז** ‘an extreme (lit: great) drunkard’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 18); cf. Yiddish **גַז עריסטער שפער** ‘an extreme (lit: great) drunkard’
  - **ולע גַז עריסטער אטערמאאַרעדסאַרעראַעוו__גַז** ‘an extreme pauper’ (Bodek 1866: 38); cf. Yiddish **גַז עריסטער אטערמאאַרעדסאַרעראַעוו__גַז** ‘an extreme (lit: great) pauper’

This type of overt calquing extends to certain verbal constructions. Thus, the Hasidic Hebrew authors treat the *qal* of the root לָכָה ‘dream’ as an impersonal verb, putting it in the 3ms with an indirect object denoting the dreamer, as below. This usage stems directly from Yiddish, in which the partial cognate *לָכָה* ‘to dream’ typically functions as an impersonal 3s form accompanied by an indirect object, e.g. **סע חסַט ויד מיר מיטעולים** ‘I dreamed (lit: it dreamed itself to me)’, in contrast to other forms of Hebrew, in which the verb corresponds in person, gender, and number to its subject (i.e. the dreamer).
Look, I dreamed that I was giving (lit: saying) ‘Torah insights’ (Bodek 1866: 57)
because I had a dream’ (Landau 1892: 11)

Similarly, the verb ‘hold’ followed by the preposition -ל is used in the sense of ‘consider’, as in the first example below; this is a direct translation of the Yiddish קיזחמ ‘consider’ (Beinfeld and Bochner 2013: 249), literally ‘hold for’. The same verb followed by the preposition -מ is used in the sense of ‘think highly of’, as in the second example; this is a calque of the Yiddish פֿן (Beinfeld and Bochner 2013: 249), literally ‘hold from’.

And the people used to consider him to be an upright and observant person’ (Bromberg 1899: 22)
And in the town there was a rich man who did not think highly of the Baʾal Shem Tov’ (Munk 1898: 17)

Likewise, in Hasidic Hebrew the preposition לע ‘on’ is used in several non-standard ways, namely with the sense of ‘for the purpose/duration of’, ‘to/at’ (with reference to events), and with the verbs תוכחל and ויתמהל ‘to wait’ in the sense of ‘to wait for’, as illustrated below. These uses map directly to those of the corresponding Yiddish preposition פֿיוא ‘on’ (see Joffe and Mark 1961: 393–395; Mark 1978: 255–256; Beinfeld and Bochner 2013: 31, 275). The same uses of לע are found in other types of Ashkenazi Hebrew, e.g. the writings of M.L. Lilienblum and Yosef Rivlin (Wertheimer 1975: 153–154) and Ashkenazi responsa literature, again under influence from Yiddish (Betzer 2001: 95); thus, like many other grammatical elements of the Hasidic tales, this can be regarded as a feature of a wider Eastern European form of Hebrew.

For the Purpose/Duration Of

We will have something (lit: what) to prepare for the holy Sabbath’ (HaLevi 1909: 54)
when the holy Maggid was [staying] with the Lubliner for a circumcision ceremony’ (Gemen 1914: 60)
And he travelled to him for the holy Sabbath’ (Ehrmann 1905: 85a)
Once he travelled to his Rebbe, our holy Rebbe, for the holy Sabbath’ (Michelsohn 1910c: 31)
And the rich man travelled to the Rebbe for Rosh haShanah’ (Seuss 1890: 10)
To/At (with reference to events)

- And indeed I see my father's house close by; why should I not be in his house for the Sabbath?’ (Kaidaner 1875: 9b)
- And anyone who had a son or daughter to be married travelled to the fair’ (J. Duner 1899: 56)
- And many merchants who were travelling to some fair were lodging there’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 15)
- The head of the yeshivah travelled with the groom and with some of his students to the wedding’ (Sobelman 1909/10, pts. 1–2: 3)
- to invite him to the circumcision ceremony’ (Bodek? 1866: 13a)
- to travel to the wedding’ (Chikernik 1902: 29)
- to be at that wedding’ (Breitstein 1914: 39)

With the Verbs and ‘to Wait’ in the Sense of ‘to Wait For’

- And their custom was that before they took the Torah scroll out of the ark they would wait for the rabbi’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 30)
- When it got to be ten o'clock [...] he would send [word] to his prayer-house that the congregation should not wait for him’ (Bromberg 1899: 32)

Calques of Yiddish constructions almost never violate Hebrew syntactic rules. There are only very few clear exceptions to this, shown below. In the first, a noun phrase appears with the adjective preceding the noun as in the Yiddish version that directly follows it; similarly, in the second, the compound noun yeshivah students’ appears in exactly the same form as it is employed in Yiddish, with the head noun in final position.

- ‘Hasidic rebbe (lit: good Jew)’ (Singer 1900b: 4)
- ‘Greetings, yeshivah students’ (Munk 1898: 40)
16.4 Slavic Languages (Russian, Polish, Ukrainian)

16.4.1 Individual Words

While the lexis of Hasidic Hebrew is composed of a significant proportion of Yiddish vocabulary, and a not insignificant amount of Aramaic, it is almost entirely devoid of loanwords deriving from the Slavic languages in whose territory the authors lived. The tales contain only the smallest handful of borrowings stemming directly from a Slavic language (rather than via the Slavic component of Yiddish). Slavic borrowings in the tales are invariably written in the Hebrew alphabet; however, in contrast to Yiddish and Aramaic loanwords they are usually overtly marked as foreign elements through labels and orthographic techniques, as will be seen below.

The following example is a gloss that is explicitly designated by the author as a Russian term and appears with vocalization. This is unusual because vocalization is not usually employed in Hasidic Hebrew narrative literature, and as such its use here serves to highlight the word as a foreign term that may not otherwise be immediately recognizable to readers. The gloss is presented as synonymous with the Yiddish word פְּרִיטְקָאָלּי 'official minutes'; ‘record’ but derives from the Russian noun вопрос 'question'; ‘enquiry’. Interestingly, it appears with the Yiddish plural suffix -ןי commonly employed in Hasidic Hebrew instead of with the Russian plural suffix -ы, despite the fact that this word is not employed in Yiddish. This may point to the author’s unfamiliarity with Russian grammatical patterns.

And afterwards every time they would receive records, which are called in the Russian language вапросн' (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 7)

Russian вопрос ‘question’; ‘enquiry’

Similarly, the following example contains two Ukrainian or Polish pronouns that are used in combination with Hebrew nouns to form a rhyming phrase. As in the preceding example, the fact that they are vocalized serves to highlight their foreign status. Note that this case deviates from the tendency seen in the Yiddish and Aramaic sections above for the authors to borrow nouns and noun phrases rather than function words.

As Purim is, so the first night of Passover will be’ (Michelsohn 1912: 139)

Ukrainian який; Polish jaki ‘which’; ‘what kind of’

Ukrainian такий, Polish taki ‘such a’
Likewise, the following extract contains a Russian (or theoretically possibly Ukrainian or Polish) noun phrase referring to an official institution. Unlike the Slavisms illustrated previously, this borrowing is unvocalized. However, like the Russian loanword shown above, it refers to a bureaucratic term associated with government administration.

– ליהו רישי על מ饒ה האסיטקס המראמדע ליגראסטוירן ‘to take a licence for the pharmacy trade from the medical council’ (Hirsch 1900: 46)
  Russian ᵃʳᵃᵈᵃ ᵗᵉᵏᵃʳˢᵗᵗʷᵃ ‘medical council’
  Ukrainian ᵃʳᵃᵈᵃ ᵗⁱᵏᵃʳˢᵗᵗʷᵃ ‘medical council’
  Polish rada lekarstwa ‘medical council’

16.4.2 Phrases and Sentences
Very occasionally a fragment of direct speech in a Slavic language is presented untranslated in the tales, transliterated into the Hebrew alphabet. Though infrequent, this is more common than the use of individual Slavic loanwords, which are almost completely unattested in the tales. These phrases may be in Russian, Ukrainian, or Polish. In some cases the authors specifically indicate the language of the citation with an introductory phrase such as בֵּלְשׁית לִינָשׁב ‘in the Polish language’ or בֵּלְשׁית רוסיא ‘in the language of Russia’; however, in other cases they refer to them by the general label בֵּלְשׁית גָּנְפָר ‘in the language of the Gentiles’ or do not introduce them at all. Because the extracts are always written in Hebrew characters and the spelling is not standardized, when the language is not named explicitly it is sometimes difficult to distinguish which of the three is intended because the phrases in question are often very similar (particularly in the case of Russian and Ukrainian). This uncertainty is compounded by the fact that the authors were recording oral, and usually very colloquial, language as they heard it, possibly in a non-standard dialect form and in regions where there was a dialect continuum and high degree of language contact between Russian, Ukrainian, and Polish. The examples below illustrate this point, as the phrases and sentences all appear in direct speech and their content is highly conversational.

These Slavic phrases are usually accompanied by a Hebrew translation, which serves to underscore their foreign status (in contrast to the numerous Yiddish loanwords attested in the tales, which conversely often serve to explain unfamiliar Hebrew words). They are often vocalized and/or enclosed in brackets. These phrases sometimes exhibit non-standard grammatical constructions, perhaps reflecting the Hasidic Hebrew authors’ relative lack of familiarity with the languages in question. For example, the first extract below lacks the
personal pronoun ты ‘you’ which would be expected in standard Russian in conjunction with a past-tense verb such as делал ‘did/have done’.

‘And he shouted at him in a fierce voice (in the Russian language), “Жид что делал и что хочешь (Jew, what have you done, and what do you want)?”’

(Breitstein 1914: 26)

The following example contains two relatively extended vocalized extracts in Ukrainian, followed by Hebrew translations.

‘And he said to her in the language of the non-Jews, “Подавай мені ботинки—то будеш мати дитинка”, which means “When you give me a sandal you’ll have a son” [...] And he said, “Два ботинки—то будеш мати два дитинки”, which means “two sandals [and] you’ll have two sons”’ (Bodek? 1866: 14a–b)

The following examples contain colloquial expressions in Russian and/or Ukrainian. The expression in the first example is identical in both languages, while the other two exhibit a mix of Ukrainian and Russian that may reflect a spoken dialect. In the third example, the whole expression seems to be Ukrainian except for the word кто ‘who’, which is Russian. The authors supplement each of these extracts with a Hebrew translation.

‘Ах, мама ваша (Which means, in the language of the Gentiles he said to them “Woe to your mother”)’ (Singer 1900a, pt. 1: 3)

‘And a voice was heard, “Who is travelling [Russian: Кро ездит; Ukrainian: Хто їздить]”’ (Berger 1910c: 22)

‘Бог дай то жив кто [standard Ukrainian хто] мені винен (which means, may the blessed LORD let live the one who owes me)’ (Chikernik 1903a: 20)

The following examples illustrate Polish phrases and sentences:
– That each one should have a look (lit: for himself) (in the Polish language he said “Patrzcie sobie”)
(M. Walden 1914: 21)

– ‘Jak się masz (How is it going?)’ (Bodek? 1866: 15a)

– ‘Wiem, że ja nieAccessibility in Poland, “Możesz ale nie chcesz (You can, but you don’t want to)”’
(Breitstein 1914: 9)

– And he said to that gentleman, “I skąd Pan (Where are you from?)” The gentleman
 answered him, “Z Tornis ja niegdaj21 (I came from Toruń previously)”’ (Munk
1898: 66)

16.5 Other Languages

As mentioned above, the Hasidic Hebrew tales are almost completely devoid of
lexical borrowings from languages other than Aramaic and Yiddish, with even
Slavic loanwords constituting a negligible element. Likewise, loanwords from
other languages are almost non-existent. However, very occasionally a gloss in
another language is given for a particular word. Such glosses appear in Hebrew
script and are limited to a small number of German and Romance terms.

16.5.1 German

Only one clear example of a German lexical item appears in the tales, shown
below. The German element serves as a gloss, immediately following the corre-
sponding Hebrew noun phrase. The authors’ motivation for inserting this gloss
is unclear, particularly since the characters in question are not speaking Ger-
man.

– ‘to cook even a bit of potatoes “ein bißchen Erdäpfel” to revive you’ (Ehrmann 1903:
17b)

German ein bißchen Erdäpfel ‘a bit of potatoes’

---

19 Interestingly, this Hebrew phrase is a calque of the Polish version, containing a lexicalized
reflexive pronoun which frequently appears in conjunction with the verb ‘to look’ in Polish
but is not usually a feature of Hasidic Hebrew.

20 Sic; = נודאה.

21 Standard Polish: onegdaj.
There is also a single example of a German interjection in the tales. Like the Slavic phrases and sentences discussed above, it appears in direct speech and is cited in the original language of utterance.

– ‘וָּבָּא בְּנֵגֶד אָשְׁכָןַז אֲחַד אָמַר פָּרָד לְךָ וְנָא בְּשָׁנָה! ’And a German came up to him and said to him, “Guten Abend!”’ (Greenwald 1899: 56)

16.5.2 Romance

A single Romance gloss, possibly a variant of Italian, Spanish, or Judeo-Spanish, appears in the tales, shown below. The gloss is designated with the label בָּלְעָי ‘in La’az’ (often used in the sense of ‘in a foreign language’). As in the case of the German gloss cited above, the author’s motivation for including this single Romance lexical item is unclear.

– ‘וָלַבָּשׁ עַשְׂנֵו בָּלְעָי מַכְרָא שֶפִּיגְלָה (שֶפִּיגְלָה), אָסֶפֶגוֹ בָּלַעְיָי ‘And he dressed himself in a garment covered in mirrors (shpigl), espego in La’az/the foreign tongue’ (Munk 1898: 74); cf. Italian specchio and Spanish or Judeo-Spanish espejo ‘mirror’
Glossaries

Below are glossaries of common terms, place names, proper names, and historical figures appearing in this volume.

Terms Deriving from Hebrew, Aramaic, and Yiddish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admor</td>
<td>honorific title for rebbes and scholarly leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agunah</td>
<td>woman forbidden to remarry because her husband has disappeared or refuses to grant her a divorce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anusim</td>
<td>Jews forcibly converted to Christianity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baraita</td>
<td>tannaitic legal tradition not included in the Mishnah but cited in the Talmud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>challah</td>
<td>braided bread eaten at meals on the Sabbath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheder</td>
<td>traditional Jewish school for younger boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cholent</td>
<td>slow-cooked Sabbath stew of meat, potatoes, and beans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dreidel</td>
<td>spinning top game played at the festival of Hanukkah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dybbuk</td>
<td>spirit of a dead person that takes over a living body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farfel tzimmes</td>
<td>sweet stew made of carrots with bowtie pasta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gaon</td>
<td>eminent Jewish scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gematria</td>
<td>Jewish numerological system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glatt kosher</td>
<td>conforming strictly to the Jewish dietary laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gubernia</td>
<td>administrative district in czarist Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habadnik</td>
<td>follower of Habad Hasidism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haftarah</td>
<td>section of Prophets recited in synagogue after weekly Torah portion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>havdalah</td>
<td>ceremony marking the conclusion of the Sabbath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hin</td>
<td>measure of fluids equivalent to approximately six litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaddish</td>
<td>Aramaic hymn used to divide sections of the synagogue service and as a prayer for the dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kiddush</td>
<td>Sabbath blessing over wine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kittel</td>
<td>white robe worn as burial shroud and on Yom Kippur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kopeck</td>
<td>one hundredth of a rouble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kugel</td>
<td>potato or noodle casserole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggid</td>
<td>Hasidic leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mamzer</td>
<td>child of an adulterous mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>melamed</td>
<td>teacher in a cheder (traditional Jewish school for younger boys)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mitnaggedim</td>
<td>opponents of Hasidism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mohel</td>
<td>performer of ritual circumcision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
parsah  measure of distance equivalent to approximately four kilometres
R.  abbreviation of Rabbi; Reb; Rebbe
Reb  Mr.
rebbetzin  rabbi's wife
reinsch  archaic Austrian coin
Selichot  penitential prayers recited before Rosh haShanah
Sheol  biblical abode of the dead
shtreimel  fur hat worn by Hasidic men on the Sabbath and festivals
siyyum  completion of study of a section of Torah, Mishnah, or Talmud
thaler  silver coin
tipcha  one of the cantillation notes used for reciting Torah
tzaddik  Hasidic spiritual master; righteous man
tzimmes  sweet stew made of carrots
vachnacht  the night before the circumcision ceremony when a watch is kept over the baby
verst  archaic Russian measure of distance equivalent to 1.06 kilometres
yeshivah  Talmudic academy

Ashkenazi Personal Names

Berish  male name
Faivel  male name
Faivush  male name
Fishl  male name
Freydke  female name
Heschel  male name
Leib  male name
Mendl  male name
Motele  male name
Reyzele  female name
Shmelke  male name
Yekele  male name
Yosele  male name

Eastern European Place Names

Apta  in present-day Poland; official name Opatów
Balta  in present-day Ukraine
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>Location in Present-Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bar</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barditchev</td>
<td>Ukraine; official name Berdychiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belz</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bełżec</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blendow</td>
<td>Poland; official name Błędów</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brod</td>
<td>Ukraine; official name Brody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chekhov</td>
<td>Poland; official name Wieniawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czernowitz</td>
<td>Ukraine; official name Chernivtsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubrovno</td>
<td>Belarus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grodzisk</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanipoli</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaroslavice</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamianets</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapust</td>
<td>Belarus; official name Kopys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kishinev</td>
<td>Moldova; official name Chișinău</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koidanov</td>
<td>Belarus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokhanovo</td>
<td>Belarus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotzk</td>
<td>Poland; official name Kock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kovel</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kozienice</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lechovich</td>
<td>Belarus; official name Lyakhovichi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemberg</td>
<td>Ukraine; official name Lviv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liozna</td>
<td>Belarus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lizhensk</td>
<td>Poland; official name Leżajsk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubavitch</td>
<td>Russia; official name Lyubavichi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lvov</td>
<td>Lemberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medzhymbizh</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mezeritch</td>
<td>Ukraine; official name Mezhyrich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mogielnica</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munkacs</td>
<td>Ukraine; official name Mukacheve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolsburg</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostroh</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinsk</td>
<td>Belarus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piotrkow</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polonnoye</td>
<td>Ukraine; official name Polonne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poznań</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premishlan</td>
<td>Ukraine; official name Peremyshlyany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressburg</td>
<td>Bratislava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probisht</td>
<td>Ukraine; official name Pohrebyshche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radom</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Glossaries

Radoszyce in present-day Poland
Rashkov in present-day Moldova; official name Rașcov
Rimanov in present-day Poland; official name Rymanów
Romanov in present-day Ukraine; official name Dzerzhinsk
Ruzhin in present-day Ukraine; official name Ruzhyn
Satanov in present-day Ukraine; official name Sataniv
Shpola in present-day Ukraine
Sochaczew in present-day Poland
Stolin in present-day Belarus
Stratyn in present-day Ukraine
Syczów in present-day Poland
Tarnipol in present-day Ukraine; official name Ternopil
Tuchyn in present-day Ukraine
Tulchyn in present-day Ukraine
Vitebsk in present-day Belarus
Vizhnitz in present-day Ukraine; official name Vyzhnytsia
Volhynia historic region comprising parts of Poland, Ukraine, and Belarus
Volozhin in present-day Belarus
Warka in present-day Poland
Żelechów in present-day Poland
Zhitomir in present-day Ukraine
Ziditchov in present-day Ukraine; official name Zhydachiv
Zolochiv in present-day Ukraine

Rebbes and Other Prominent Figures

Arizal Isaac ben Solomon Luria (1534–1572), founder of Lurianic Kabbalah
Baʾal Shem Tov Israel ben Eliezer (c. 1700–1760), founder of Hasidism
Maharal Judah Loew ben Bezalel (c. 1525–1609), chief rabbi of Prague
Vilna Gaon Elijah ben Solomon Zalman (1720–1797), leader of non-Hasidic Eastern European Jewry and fierce opponent of Hasidism
Zusha Meshullam Zusha of Hanipoli (d. 1800), early Hasidic Rebbe
Facsimiles
Munk, Faivel. 1898. [Conversations of the righteous]. Warsaw. Page 22.
Munk, Faivel. 1898. [Conversations of the righteous]. Warsaw. Page 23.
Munk, Faivel. 1898. [Conversations of the righteous].
Munk, Faivel. 1898. [Conversations of the righteous].
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ולדברי, ונהנה עוד שלוחה, וכן בת הערב, ויהיה חפץ מרעה ואור
אירפר וא蹂ון מותר, וייחו הפררת חכמים בא הארץ ואליר אינר בבוכנ
בברבון עד שליש ערב, ויהיו שם עוד. ויהי ואור אינר ליום
בשחג, ויהי וישר בא עולם, ואורו דיה ויל יימר
כ使え נפש אינר ואל ידע עמה ויה, ויהי חפץ, ואליר היש
בי אrections איך ראשו אינר נرهاب ומכה בכוכב, וחירק את
וליש לווש להלך ובשלי, (ߝورد מרדכי) כי chụpשה המה כיול
מנוחה כי היא מוחה (ונחמה לברב) והיהן לברבב בא יזרכ וני אינר
ליכם להברך לא שרשлибо יאצל ויאח בלך, וنجاحו לברבב
אם לא אincerely יברעג אוות, ואורו ולתקף, כי אינר לא יתקף
והי את אינר, והיהו שתשיע דרבו, והיהי לברבב לאור
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דרבו, והיהי לברבב לאור
.vec] עכלס אינר יברעג לאינר לברבבAccessorType, ואורו ולתקף, כי אינר
ונחיש לווש תובע, ותשע דרבו, והיהי לברבב לאור
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דרבו, והיהי לברבב לאור
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דרבו, והיהי לברבב לאור
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דרבו, והיהי לברבב לאור
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דרבו, והיהי לברבב לאור
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דרבו, והיהי לברבב לאור
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דרבו, והיהי לברבב לאור
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דרבו, והיהי לברבב לאור
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דרבו, והיהי לברבב לאור
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דרבו, והיהי לברבב לאור
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דרבו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דرابו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דרבו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דרבו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
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אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם קי לווש, אורו שתשיע דрабו, והיהי לברבב לאו
אם Kum
כַּהֵלַכְרִיסֵות

מְשֵׁה נוֹרְאָה מַקְדּוֹשׁ עֹדֶרְוָה לְכַפּוֹרָה יָהֳזָה נֶפֶשׁ בַּכּוּרי

בֵּרוּשׁ יִשְׁרָאֵל מַלְאָךְ יִשְׁרָאֵל מֹרְדִידִיִּים.

בְּעֵית הָמוֹצֵא יִרְוָשׁ עַל גֶּדֶעָה יִשְׁרָאֶל שֵׁיָּם מַסְתּוֹפֲקָת חַזָּאָה חַדְּשָׁה.

בָּשְׁלָחֵהוּ יִשְׁדָּאָרָם יִשְׁרָאֶל מַמָּשֵׁר וְקָםָה חַזָּאָה חַדְּשָׁה חַזָּאָה חַדְּשָׁה.

בּוֹרֶה חַזָּאָה חַדְּשָׁה כַּפְּרוֹן יִשְׁדָּאָרָם בְּגָלוֹת שִׁמִּית לָחוֹזָה חַזָּאָה חַדְּשָׁה חַזָּאָה חַדְּשָׁה.

בֹּרֶה חַזָּאָה חַדְּשָׁה נַחֲמָא לַקְּדוֹשָׁה חַזָּאָה חַדְּשָׁה חַזָּאָה חַדְּשָׁה.

בּוֹרֶה חַזָּאָה חַדְּשָׁה מַסְתּוֹפֲקָת חַזָּאָה חַדְּשָׁה חַזָּאָה חַדְּשָׁה.

בּוֹרֶה חַזָּאָה חַדְּשָׁה מַסְתּוֹפֲקָת חַזָּאָה חַדְּשָׁה חַזָּאָה חַדְּשָׁה.

בּוֹרֶה חַזָּאָה חַדְּשָׁה מַסְתּוֹפֲקָת חַזָּאָה חַדְּשָׁה חַזָּאָה חַדְּשָׁה.

בּוֹרֶה חַזָּאָה חַדְּשָׁה מַסְתּוֹפֲקָת חַזָּאָה חַדְּשָׁה חַזָּאָה חַדְּשָׁה.
כוה קדושيم

כ"כ חכם חכום לפahas סדיר ווהי מקבלת נפשיכם להזמין בצלאל
ויהי חמד סדרי והוהי מיום כלבב. היי חמד סדרי ליהי בצלאל
מדים בצלאל משעם משים משים משים משים משים משים משים
שתיכרך לדון.
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