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1 Introduction

This study will investigate the main grammatical features of *Ye'en Mešula* ‘Miry Depths’ or ‘Abyss of Despair’, a 17th century Hebrew historical work describing the events of the Chmielnicki Uprising that swept the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in 1648–1649. *Ye'en Mešula* was written by the prominent Ashkenazic preacher and kabbalist Nathan Nata Hannover. Hannover was born and raised in Volhynia, a region in Eastern Europe corresponding to parts of present-day Poland, Ukraine and Belarus, but was forced to flee his homeland during the Chmielnicki Uprising and spent the next few years as an itinerant preacher in Poland, Germany and Holland. He wrote his account of the Chmielnicki pogroms during this period, and published it upon arriving in Venice in 1653. He subsequently travelled to Prague, and then settled in Jassy (present-day Iași in eastern Romania), where he became the head of the yeshiva and president of the rabbinical court. He remained in Jassy for approximately ten years, before relocating to Ungarisch Brod in Romania (present-day Uherský Brod in the Czech Republic), where he was killed by raiding Turkish soldiers in 1689.

During his lifetime Hannover published three other works in addition to *Ye'en Mešula*: a homiletic sermon about the festival of Sukkot called *Ta'ame Sukka* (Amsterdam, 1652), a Hebrew-German-Latin-Italian phrasebook called *Safa Berura* (Prague, 1660) and a collection of prayers according to the Lurianic kabbalistic rite called *Sha'are Siyyon* (Prague, 1662). He also wrote a collection of homiletical sermons on the Pentateuch which were never published. Hannover’s published writings had a long-lasting impact on Ashkenazic Jewry: his prayer collection *Sha'are Siyyon* enjoyed widespread popularity in Italy, Holland and Eastern Europe, and was reprinted in more than fifty editions.

\[1\] I am very grateful to Nadia Vidro and Esther-Miriam Wagner for their numerous insightful comments on a draft of this article.

\[2\] A citation of Ps. 69:3.

\[3\] See Halpern, 2007 for further details of Hannover’s life.
editions over the course of the 18th and 19th centuries. Likewise, Safa Berura was used among Jews for foreign language instruction until the 19th century.

Hannover’s Yeven Meșula is a relatively short work of 20 pages that provides an account of the 1648–1649 mass uprising of Ukrainian and Cossack peasants under the leadership of the Ukrainian Bogdan Chmielnicki against Polish rule in Ukraine. The uprising resulted in the destruction of many Ukrainian and Polish Jewish communities and the deaths of at least an estimated 18,000–20,000 Jews. Hannover’s work includes chronicles of the massacres that took place against the Jews in various places over the course of the two-year period between 1648 and 1649 in various locations throughout present-day Poland, Ukraine and Lithuania, such as Tulczyn, Zamość and Lwów/Lviv, as well as an account of the life of the Jews of the Kingdom of Poland. The work contains little information about Hannover’s personal experiences during the pogroms, although he did witness some of the events, but rather is based on eyewitness accounts and information gathered from others, both orally and from printed sources.

Yeven Meșula is a unique and ground-breaking piece of early modern Jewish historical writing, and has played a hugely influential role in Ashkenazic society and culture since its publication. The traumatic events of the Chmielnicki Uprising came to assume a central position in the Ashkenazic historical consciousness, and Hannover’s work dominated this consciousness well into the 20th century. It was reissued in its Hebrew and Yiddish versions in nearly every generation, and was also translated into a number of other languages, including French, German, Russian, Polish and English. The fact that Yeven Meșula was the only source of information on the events of 1648–1949 told from a Jewish perspective and accessible to readers without knowledge of Hebrew contributed to its authoritative status. Hannover’s text was also accepted as a reliable account of the pogroms by pioneering modern Jewish historians such as Heinrich Graetz and Simon Dubnow, and it remains an important historical source today, though it is no longer treated uncritically.

Despite the prominent position which Yeven Meșula has occupied in Central and Eastern European Jewish society and the importance which historians have accorded it as a key witness to the Chmielnicki Uprising, it has never been the subject of linguistic analysis. Given its status as a unique and influ-
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4 Stampfer, 2003, p. 221.
5 Halpern, 2007, p. 327.
7 Stampfer, 2003; Ettinger, 2007; Stampfer, 2010.
10 This study is based on the first edition of Yeven Meșula (Hannover, 1653).
ential piece of early modern Ashkenazic Hebrew historical writing, examination of the grammatical composition of this text can shed valuable light on the 17th century Eastern European narrative and discursive use of the language. From a diachronic perspective, it can be instructive to analyse the influences of earlier strata of Hebrew on Hannover’s narrative and ascertain the extent to which it resembles the biblical, rabbinic and medieval forms of the language. It is also important to establish the relationship between Hannover’s 17th century historical writing and other forms of Central and Eastern European Hebrew which have been analysed, namely 19th century Maskilic Hebrew, Hasidic Hebrew and the language of the Kiṣur Shulhan ʿAruk, as well as early modern and modern responsa literature. Comparison of Hannover’s writing with these other Central and Eastern European types of Hebrew is particularly important as it can help to ascertain the extent to which all of these authors were drawing on a shared Ashkenazic linguistic heritage which has not been adequately mapped. Moreover, in certain cases parallels can be observed between Yeven Meṣula and more distant Diaspora Jewish linguistic varieties such as medieval Ashkenazic writings, the Hebrew of Judaeo-Spanish speakers and Judaeo-Arabic, which can tentatively point towards possible broader trends. The present study thus seeks to provide an analysis of the characteristic orthographic, morphosyntactic and syntactic features of Hannover’s seminal narrative work and to place it within its diachronic context. Due to space constraints this study cannot provide an exhaustive survey of the linguistic features of Yeven Meṣula, but will give an overview of a number of representative features. It is hoped that this analysis will lead to a clearer understanding of the composition and chronological spread of Ashkenazic Hebrew and its relationship to other Diaspora forms of the language.

2 Orthography

The orthography in the first edition of Yeven Meṣula is largely consistent with that of canonical forms of Hebrew, with a tendency to employ plene spelling in accordance with the post-biblical standard. The main area in which the spelling in Yeven Meṣula differs from that of earlier convention is in the widespread tendency to employ yod following šere in singular nouns with a 1cpl or 3msg possessive suffix, as illustrated in (1)–(3). This orthographic practice is likely rooted in the fact that in Ashkenazic Hebrew pronunciation, the vowel šere and the combination šere plus yod in stressed open syllables are both pronounced identically (generally as the diphthong [ej] or [aj]). The use of yod

13 Kahn, 2009; Kahn, 2012b; Kahn, 2015; Kahn, in press.
15 Comparison of Hannover’s narrative work with his non-narrative writings is likewise beyond the scope of the present examination.
in these contexts suggests that the author’s own pronunciation had more impact on his orthography than the canonical written texts. The same phenomenon is widely attested in 19th century Hasidic Hebrew narrative, for the same reasons. The practice in both Eastern European forms of Hebrew may have been reinforced by the fact that some individual forms with non-standard yod are occasionally attested in medieval literature (for example, the form ‘amburger ‘amburger ‘amburger ‘amburger showing in (1) below appears several times in the writing of the prominent 15th century biblical commentator Isaac Abarbanel).

(1) 
‘amburger ‘amburger ‘amburger ‘amburger

(2) mahanehu mahanehu mahanehu mahanehu
‘his camp’

(3) adonenu ham-melek adonenu ham-melek adonenu ham-melek adonenu ham-melek
‘our lord the king’

3 Nominal morphosyntax

3.1 Definite article with inseparable prepositions

A common feature of Yeven Mesula is the retention of the definite article following the inseparable preposition ל- lǝ- ‘to, for’, as shown in (4)–(7). This type of construction contrasts with the standard in Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew, where elision of the definite article following a prefixed preposition is the norm; cf. Biblical Hebrew הָעִ֜יר haʿir ‘the town’ vs הָעִּיר haʿir ‘the town’, Mishnaic Hebrew הבית hab-bayit ‘the house’ vs הבית hab-bayit ‘the house’. In Biblical Hebrew there are only rare exceptions to this rule, and the same is true of Rabbinic Hebrew. However the phenomenon
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16 See Kahn, 2015, pp. 20–22.
17 The transcription system used in this study follows the Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics standard for post-biblical Hebrew; see Khan et al., 2013.
18 Hannover, 1653, p. 8.
19 Hannover, 1653, p. 15.
22 1 Sam. 9:12.
23 Mishnah Ohalot 3:2.
24 Mishnah Negaʾim 13:3.
26 Betzer, 2001, p. 86.
is a characteristic feature of prominent varieties of 19th century Eastern European Hebrew texts composed by Hasidic and Maskilic authors as well as Shlomo Ganzfried’s popular work of practical halachah (Jewish law), the *Kisur Shulhan 'Arukh*, and is also attested in early modern and modern Ashkenazic and Sephardic responsa literature. The fact that the same phenomenon is commonly attested both in Hannover’s work and in these other varieties suggests that all of these Eastern European authors may have been drawing on a common Ashkenazic Hebrew legacy, which may in turn have had links to other forms of Diaspora Hebrew. This point will be discussed further throughout this study.

(4) לָהֲכָהָכֵּרִים
*lo-ha-komǝrim*
‘to the priests’

(5) לָהֲדוֹּכָסָים
*lo-had-dukkasim*
‘the dukes’

(6) לָהֲשַּׁׂר
*lo-haš-šar*
‘to the lord’

(7) לָהֲיוֹאָמִים
*lo-hay-yǝwanim*
‘the Ukrainians’

3.2 Indefinite article

While Hebrew lacks a true indefinite article, Hannover regularly employs the numeral **אחד** *eḥad* ‘one’ in this sense, with the meaning of ‘a’ or ‘a certain’, as in (8)–(11). While this use of the numeral has occasional precedent in Biblical Hebrew and other historical varieties of the language, these writings are unlikely to be the sole or chief source for Hannover as he utilises it much more systematically. Rather, any influence from earlier Hebrew texts is likely to
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27 Kahn, in press.
28 Betzer, 2001, p. 86.
29 Hannover, 1653, p. 4.
30 Hannover, 1653, p. 1.
31 Hannover, 1653, p. 3.
32 Hannover, 1653, p. 8.
33 The Hebrew word *יונים* *yǝwanim* literally means ‘Greeks’, but Hannover uses it as a label for ‘Ukrainians’. This is a metonym based on the Ukrainians’ Greek Orthodox faith; see Plokhy, 2015, p. 99.
34 Rubin, 2013b.
have received synchronic reinforcement from Hannover’s native Yiddish, which has a true indefinite article. As in the case of the definite article with prefixed prepositions discussed in section 3.1, the use of אחד ‘one’ as an indefinite article is also a prominent feature of 19th century Eastern European varieties of Hebrew. Moreover, the existence of a similar use of the numeral ‘one’ is attested in medieval and later Judaeo-Arabic, which may suggest that there is a more widespread trend towards such a development in Semitic languages generally regardless of influence from a spoken substratum.  

(8) ושם היה מושל ופקיד על העיר יהודית אחד ושמו זכרי wǝ-šam haya mošel u-ḇaqid ‘al ha-’ir hana’l yǝhudi ᵇeḥad u-šmo zǝḵarya “and there was a governor and officer over the above-mentioned city, a certain Jew named Zechariah”  

(9) והוה בניי אחד ושמו יא הרש wǝ-haya benehem ḥazzan ᵇeḥad u-šmo reb hirš “and among them there was a certain cantor whose name was Reb Hirsh”  

(10) והאחדyat אצל בעל הבית אחד ואמיו kama yamim wǝ-hit ’areaḥ ᵇeṣel ba’al hab-bayit ᵇeḥad kama yamim “and he stayed with a certain home owner for a number of days”  

(11) לקחו עשיר אחד לبثו laqḥu ʿašir ᵇeḥad la-ḇeto “they took a rich man to his house”  

3.3 Definiteness discord in noun-adjective phrases

Hannover’s writing typically exhibits definiteness concord between a noun and its associated adjective. However, in a significant minority of cases the noun takes the definite article but the associated attributive adjective does not,

36 Kahn, in press.  
38 Hannover, 1653, p. 2.  
39 Sic; = בנים.  
40 Hannover, 1653, p. 4.  
41 Note the use of a definite construct chain as an indefinite noun. This is attributable to the fact that the phrase בעל הבית ba’al hab-bayit exists in Yiddish as an indefinite noun. The same phenomenon is widely attested in 19th century Hasidic Hebrew; see Kahn, 2015, pp. 62–63 for details. Similar constructions are also found in medieval Judaeo-Arabic; see Blau, 1980, p. 156.  
42 Hannover, 1653, p. 20.  
43 Hannover, 1653, p. 20.
as in (12)–(16). This phenomenon has occasional precedent in Biblical Hebrew, and appears more frequently in rabbinic literature. It is also a widespread feature of responsa literature and of 19th century Hasidic Hebrew. Hannover seems to have tended to employ it when the noun and adjective comprise a common collocation, as in (13) and (14), and therefore may have subconsciously regarded the phrase as a single unit.

(12) הָאִשָּׁה הָדוּשָׁת אֲשֶׁר לָקַח
ha-ʾiša hadaša ʾašer laqah
‘the new wife whom he had taken’

(13) הָגוֹצֶרָה רַעָה
hag-gōzerā raʿa
‘the evil decree’

(14) הָבָשְׁוָרָה רַעָה
hab-bāšōra raʿa
‘the evil tidings’

(15) והָנַפְשִׁים יָפוֹת לַקְחַה לִשְׁפָּהוֹת
wa-han-nasiḵm yaḵot laqḥu li-špaḥot
‘and they took the beautiful women as servant girls’

(16) הָחלִי גָדוֹל של קָזָאַק
hahayil gadol šel qozaqin
‘the great army of Cossacks’

3.4 Non-standard definiteness of construct chains

Hannover frequently forms definite construct chains by prefixing the definite article to the construct noun, as in (17)–(19). This differs from the biblical standard, in which the definite article in construct chains is prefixed to the absolute noun; this same convention has remained the norm in Mishnaic and

47 Kahn, 2015, pp. 87–88.
48 Hannover, 1653, p. 2.
49 Hannover, 1653, p. 2.
50 Hannover, 1653, p. 4.
51 Hannover, 1653, p. 4.
52 Hannover, 1653, p. 8.
later varieties of Hebrew. However, Hannover’s usage has precedent in medieval and early modern responsa literature.\textsuperscript{54} Moreover, as in many of the other phenomena discussed in this study, it has a parallel in 19th century Eastern European forms of Hebrew.\textsuperscript{55} It is likely that the non-standard construction in all of these forms of Hebrew is attributable to influence from Yiddish, in which many of the construct chains in question exist independently as set phrases and which are made definite by placing the definite article at the beginning of the phrase.\textsuperscript{56} The same type of construction is also attested in the Hebrew writing of Judaeo-Spanish speakers.\textsuperscript{57} Because Judaeo-Spanish makes noun phrases definite by placing a definite article at the beginning of the phrase, as in Yiddish, the similarity between Hannover’s writing and that of the Judaeo-Spanish speakers suggests that in both cases the syntactic structures of the authors’ vernaculars had an influential role in the development of their Hebrew.\textsuperscript{58}

This phenomenon extends to definite construct chains with a numeral: according to the standard Hebrew convention, the definite article in such constructions is prefixed to the absolute noun, but Hannover often prefixes it to the numeral, as in (20). This type of construction is also attested in medieval and

\begin{equation}
\text{17) ha-ʾanše mǝqomot}
\text{‘the people of the places’}\textsuperscript{59}
\text{(cf. standard Hebrew ʾanše ham-mǝqomot)}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{18) hag-gibbore ḥayil}
\text{‘the warriors’}\textsuperscript{60}
\text{(cf. standard Hebrew gibbore ha-ḥayil)}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{19) ha-roš yǝšiḇa}
\text{‘the head of the yeshiva’}\textsuperscript{61}
\text{(cf. standard Hebrew roš hay-ǝšiḇa)}
\end{equation}

\textsuperscript{54} Betzer, 2001, p. 91.
\textsuperscript{55} Kahn, in press.
\textsuperscript{56} See Kahn, 2015, pp. 60–61 and Kahn, in press for further details.
\textsuperscript{57} Buniš, 2013, pp. 50*-51*.
\textsuperscript{58} Note that a similar phenomenon is occasionally attested in medieval Judaeo-Arabic (see Blau, 1980, p. 157) but this seems to be much more restricted than that found in the Hebrew of Yiddish and Judaeo-Spanish speakers.
\textsuperscript{59} Hannover, 1653, p. 8.
\textsuperscript{60} Hannover, 1653, p. 8.
\textsuperscript{61} Hannover, 1653, p. 18.
later Judaeo-Arabic,\textsuperscript{62} which hints at the possibility of a more widespread internal Semitic developmental pattern requiring further investigation.

(20) 
\textit{השנין שרי חמא\textsuperscript{63}}  
\textit{hašǝne śare ṣaḥa}  
\textit{‘the two army commanders’}\textsuperscript{63}  
(cf. standard Hebrew \textit{שהנין שרי המחלא} \textit{šǝne śare has-ṣaḥa})

It also extends to construct chains whose second member is a proper noun that would not be expected to take the definite article in any type of Hebrew. This particular usage, which is shown in (21)–(23), does not seem to have a clearly documented precedent in earlier or later forms of the language. Further research is required in order to ascertain whether it is attested in other varieties of Ashkenazic Hebrew.

(21) 
\textit{בכל המקומות רוסיה\textsuperscript{64}}  
\textit{ba-ḥol ham-maqomot rusya}  
\textit{‘in all the places of Russia’}\textsuperscript{64}  
(cf. standard Hebrew \textit{בכל המקומות רוסיה} \textit{ba-ḥol maqomot rusya})

(22) 
\textit{המלך פולין\textsuperscript{65}}  
\textit{ham-meleḵ polin}  
\textit{‘the king of Poland’}\textsuperscript{65}  
(cf. standard Hebrew \textit{מלך פולין} \textit{meleḵ polin})

(23) 
\textit{בת המלך צרפת\textsuperscript{66}}  
\textit{bat ham-meleḵ šarpat}  
\textit{‘the daughter of the king of France’}\textsuperscript{66}  
(cf. standard Hebrew \textit{בת המלך צרפת} \textit{bat meleḵ šarpat})

In addition, Hannover sometimes makes construct chains definite by prefixing the definite article to both the absolute noun and the construct noun, as in (24)–(27). This convention lacks precedent in the canonical forms of Hebrew, but is attested in the writing of the prominent 11th century commentator Rashi\textsuperscript{67} as well as in responsa literature.\textsuperscript{68} It is also a common feature of 19th century

\textsuperscript{63} Hannover, 1653, p. 16.
\textsuperscript{64} Hannover, 1653, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{65} Hannover, 1653, p. 17.
\textsuperscript{66} Hannover, 1653, p. 1.
\textsuperscript{67} Betzer, 2001, p. 108.
\textsuperscript{68} Betzer, 2001, p. 91–92.
Eastern European Hebrew, and in the writing of Ashkenazic Jerusalem community leader Joseph Rivlin. Taken together with the phenomena discussed previously in this study, this similarity may suggest that all of these Ashkenazic Hebrew authors were drawing on a shared linguistic heritage.

(24) השר העדה

haš-ṣar haṣ-ṣaḥa
‘the army commander’
(cf. standard Hebrew Şar haṣ-ṣaḥa)

(25) על המפתן הבית

ʿal ham-miḥṭan hab-bayit
‘on the threshold of the house’
(cf. standard Hebrew ʿal miḥṭan hab-bayit)

(26) השר העיר

haš-ṣar ha-ʿir
‘the city commander’
(cf. standard Hebrew Şar ha-ʿir)

(27) הבעלים הבית

ha-baʿal hab-bayit
‘the house owner’
(cf. standard Hebrew baʿal hab-bayit)

3.5 Use of masculine plural ending in nun

Hannover typically follows the biblical standard by employing the masculine plural noun ending -im on nouns and qotel forms. However, he sometimes opts for the variant -in, which is typical of Rabbinic Hebrew. The rabbinic variant is particularly common with qotel forms. This is illustrated in (28)–(31). Like many other aspects of Hannover’s writing, his fluctuation between the mem and nun endings has a direct parallel in 19th century Maskilic and Hasidic Hebrew. As in the other cases discussed in this study, this close resemblance between these various forms of Eastern European Hebrew points to the existence of a shared underlying variety of the language spanning several centuries.

69 Kahn, 2015, pp. 62–65; Kahn, in press.
70 Wertheimer, 1975, pp. 159–160.
71 Hannover, 1653, p. 15.
72 Hannover, 1653, p. 7.
73 Hannover, 1653, p. 13.
74 Hannover, 1653, p. 18.
75 Kahn, 2012b, p. 185.
The use of the *nun* ending instead of the more frequently attested *mem* variant is not systematic. In some cases Hannover employs both endings on the same form within close proximity to each other, as in (32) and (33), which contain a *nun* and a *mem* respectively and are only five lines apart from each other in the text. This type of fluctuation between the *mem* and *nun* endings is also attested in medieval Ashkenazic copies of Hebrew manuscripts (e.g. the 14th century halachic code *Arba ‘ah Turim*), which suggests a much earlier origin for the phenomenon.

(32) והם היו פטרונים מַס מֵס הָמַלְכָּה

\[\text{wē-hem hayu pəṭurin min mas ham-melek} \]

‘and they were exempt from the king’s tax’

(33) ول褛 הם פטרונים מַס הָמַס

\[\text{wē-laken hayu pəṭurim min ham-mas} \]

‘and therefore they were exempt from the tax’

The *nun* variant is particularly commonly attested on periphrastic verbs (see section 4.4), possibly because such verbs are a typical feature of Rabbinic Hebrew, and commonly appear with a *nun* ending in that form of the language. This is illustrated in (34) and (35):
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76 Hannover, 1653, p. 3.
77 Hannover, 1653, p. 3.
78 Hannover, 1653, p. 9.
79 Hannover, 1653, p. 12.
80 N. Vidro, personal communication.
81 Hannover, 1653, p. 1.
82 Hannover, 1653, p. 1.
However this is likewise inconsistent, so that periphrastic verbs are not uncommonly attested with the *mem* ending, as in (36) and (37):

(36)  
вещ вселем, шо дившай, где доглошают  
*bǝ-kol ham-meqqomot ’ašer hayu maggi ’im šamma*  
‘in all the places that they reached’

(37)  
ваш они живет безбедно  
*wa-hem hayu yošebim bǝṭaḥ*  
‘and they dwelled in safety’

3.6 Long form numerals with feminine nouns

Hannover’s writing exhibits a blurring of the gender distinction between long and short form numerals, whereby he frequently employs long form numerals in conjunction with feminine nouns; see examples (38)–(42). This differs from the standard convention in the canonical forms of Hebrew, which exhibit gender polarity with numerals (with the long forms employed in conjunction with masculine nouns, and the short forms employed in conjunction with feminine nouns). Like many of the other phenomena discussed in this study, this has a parallel in later Eastern European Hebrew writing. It may be ascribable to influence from the Yiddish vernacular, which has only one set of numerals that is used with nouns of all genders. As in several other cases discussed in this study, the same usage is also found further afield in Judaeo-Arabic, perhaps suggesting a more widespread tendency to shift away from gender polarity in Semitic languages.
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83 Hannover, 1653, p. 20.
84 Hannover, 1653, p. 11.
85 Hannover, 1653, p. 4.
86 Hannover, 1653, p. 3.
87 Wertheimer, 1975, p. 157; Kahn, 2015, pp. 137–139; Kahn, in press.
3.7 Avoidance of the dual

The canonical varieties of Hebrew have a dual form of nouns used with paired body parts, time words and numerals; for example, יומויים יומויים (yomayim ‘two days’, hodšayim ‘two months’ and alpayim ‘two thousand’. Hannover typically avoids the dual with reference to time words and numerals, instead using the numeral שני/שת ‘two’ in conjunction with a plural noun, as in (43)–(46). This practice can likewise be seen in 19th century Eastern European Hebrew. As in the case of the later writings, it is likely that Hannover’s avoidance of the dual is attributable to the fact that his Yiddish vernacular lacked such a form, instead using the plural in conjunction with the numeral ‘two’. Moreover, as in several instances discussed above, the
same phenomenon is also attested in Judaeo-Arabic, where there is no clear influence from a substratum lacking the construction; this may hint at a more widespread developmental pattern common to certain Semitic languages.

(43) כשני אלף יהודים
ki-šne ’alapim yəhudim
‘about two thousand Jews’
(cf. standard Hebrew כאלפים יהודים kə-’alpayim yəhudim)

(44) וששתיםLic vault יום
u-bi-šte ša’ot bay-yom
‘and for two hours a day’
(cf. standard Hebrew ובשעתיים יום u-bi-š ’atayim bay-yom)

(45) שני ימים
šǝne yamim
‘two days’
(cf. standard Hebrew יומים yomayim)

(46) שניחודשים
šǝne hodašim
‘two months’
(cf. standard Hebrew חודשים hodšayim)

There is only one example of a dual numeral in Yeven Mesula, shown in (47). Note that this same phrase appears a few pages later in the more common plural construction, as shown in (48).

(47) מאתיים אלף זהובים
matayim ’elep zǝhušim
‘two hundred thousand gold pieces’

(48) שני מאורות אלף זהובים
šǝne me’ot ’elep zǝhušim
‘two hundred thousand gold pieces’

---

97 Hannover, 1653, p. 6.
98 Hannover, 1653, p. 9.
99 Hannover, 1653, p. 16.
100 Hannover, 1653, p. 10.
101 Hannover, 1653, p. 12.
102 Hannover, 1653, p. 16.
4 Verbal morphosyntax

4.1 Use of wayyiqṭol

Hannover very commonly constructs past narrative sequences by means of the quintessentially biblical wayyiqṭol form, as in (49)—(51). In this respect his writing resembles that of later Maskilic and Hasidic narrative literature, which likewise is replete with wayyiqṭol forms. Hannover’s use of this form, like that of the later Hasidic and Maskilic writers, is likely rooted in a desire to evoke in his readers echoes of the venerable biblical narrative tradition, thereby lending his writing an air of authority and significance. However Hannover employs the wayyiqṭol more systematically than his 19th century counterparts: while the Maskilic and Hasidic authors often round off a sequence of qatāl forms with a single wayyiqṭol, which serves almost as a decorative flourish rather than an essential element of the verbal system, Hannover tends to employ it much more regularly. This suggests that he may have been more at ease with the function of the wayyiqṭol than the later authors were. Further research is required in order to ascertain whether other 17th century authors share this comparative familiarity with the biblical narrative preterite form. (Note, however, that Hannover does not employ the wayyiqṭol exclusively in his presentation of past narrative, but rather alternates it with the qatāl; this will be discussed in section 4.2.)

(49) way-yašību lo yihye ki-dbareka way-yelek hmil yimah šamo ‘im kol helo ’el melek haq-qədarim
‘and they answered him, “may it be as you say”, and Chmielnicki – may his name be blotted out – went with his whole army to the king of the Tatars’

(50) way-yaktīru la-pawluq šam way-ya’asū lo kisse šel barzel wə-hōšību
‘alaw way-ya’as has-sardīoṭ keter šel barzel bə-roṣo
‘and they crowned Pawliuk king there and made an iron throne for him and set him upon it and the army officer put an iron crown on his head’

104 See Kahn, 2012a for further discussion of this suggestion.
105 Hannover, 1653, p. 3.
106 Hannover, 1653, p. 2.
In some cases, Hannover’s wayyiqtol sequences may be introduced by the characteristically biblical construction wayehi, as in (52), which begins with wayehi and contains a sequence of another two wayyiqtols.

4.2 Use of qatal in narrative sequences

While Hannover typically employs the wayyiqtol in past narrative sequences, he occasionally employs qatal forms in such cases, as in (53)–(55). This type of sequence is ultimately traceable to Rabbinic Hebrew. Like many other features of Hannover’s writing, this fusion of biblical and rabbinic past narrative verbal structures is also a standard feature of 19th century Maskilic and Hasidic Hebrew. This practice of drawing on both the biblical and rabbinic methods of conveying past narrative in the same text may be a function of the author’s desire to adhere to the biblical historical narrative convention while simultaneously harbouring an intimate knowledge of the rabbinic model as well; this is likely to have been compounded by the fact that Hannover’s native Yiddish lacks a construction like the wayyiqtol, rendering the rabbinic use of the qatal in past narrative intuitively more familiar.
and thus he did; he gathered all his forces, his chariots and his horsemen, and he went with his wife to the places that he had behind the river Dnieper.111

and from there they travelled to the holy community of Starodub and killed many Jews.112

they tunnelled under the city and let the scoundrels into the city at night, and they started to kill the people.113

In many cases, Hannover’s *qatal* forms are preceded or followed by a *way-yiqtol*, as in (56) and (57) respectively.

‘and the king waged a large battle, and pitched his tent in the priest’s house’114

‘and the above-mentioned Jew sat at another table and made his calculations, and heard the matter and revealed the matter to the minister, and the minister put Chmielnicki – may his name be blotted out – in prison’115

Hannover also frequently initiates past narrative sequences with the typically biblical temporal construction *wayehi* plus a prefixed infinitive construct, and
then continues them with *qatal* forms, as in (58)–(60). This contrasts with Biblical Hebrew, in which *wayehi* is followed by *wayyiqtol*.

116 As in many other cases discussed in this study, this fusion of biblical and rabbinic usages has a direct parallel in 19th century Hasidic Hebrew.

(58) ויהי כשموس.Logic
tם הר城镇化 יימש תשבת התבילה רשלנ פפורים אלא מזר העבא

*wa-yhi* ki-šmoa ‘haṣ-もり hmland yimaḥ šemo ‘aṣa tahbula ṣaš-šaláḥ səḇarim ‘el haš-šar haš-saba
‘and when the enemy Chmielnicki — may his name be blotted out — heard, he concocted a plot, and sent letters to the army commander’

(59) ויהי כשموس אנס חיר הדואר הזה הקד_leave תפשי למשמע

*wa-yhi* ki-šmoa ‘anše ha-‘ir had-daḥar haz-ze hiqdimu na ‘aše lan-nisma
‘and when they heard this matter, they acted quickly’

(60) ויהי אחר הדברים האלה חזרו הקדריسم והיוניים ליביתם

*wa-yhi* ‘aḥar had-daḇarim ha-‘elle ḥazru haq-qedarim ṣaš-šēyewanim lə-ḇetam
‘and after these things, the Tatars and Ukrainians went home’

Only rarely is a new narrative sequence introduced by a *qatal* of the root ה.y.h. instead of *wayehi*:

(61) ויהי התוכם איש אחד חכם ונבון

*wa-haya bə-tokam ʾiš ʾeḥad ḥaḵam wə-naḥon
‘and there was a clever and wise man among them’

Often Hannover alternates between the *wayyiqtol* and the *qatal* seemingly interchangeably in the same sequence, as illustrated in the following example:

(62) ונשגו משם ירזוור על קים ולאלקירו ופשפש לنزلא אל העומת התהמות סלמה

*wa-nasʾu miš-šam way-yašur ʿal qəhilla qədoša zolqiewa u-ḥiqqəšu lag-gešet ʿel ha-ḥoma la-ḥaʿamid sulamot way-yišpəku ʿalehem mayim rothim min ha-ḥoma way-yanusu hap-poḥazim mip-ponehem
‘and they travelled from there and besieged the city of Žółkiew, and they tried to approach the wall in order to put up ladders, and they poured boiling water on them from the walls and the scoundrels fled from them’

117 Kahn, 2015, pp. 176–177.
118 Hannover, 1653, p. 11.
120 Hannover, 1653, p. 16.
121 Hannover, 1653, p. 9.
122 Hannover, 1653, p. 13.
4.3 Use of qaṭal with present reference

Hannover occasionally employs the qaṭal form of stative qal root יד.ע. יד.ʿ. with present reference, as in (63) and (64). This is a characteristic feature of Biblical Hebrew, in contrast to Rabbinic Hebrew, which uses the qoṭel in such cases. Hannover’s usage has an exact parallel in later Maskilic Hebrew, as well as in Hasidic Hebrew, in which its use is likewise restricted to the root יד.ע. יד.ʿ. Further research is required in order to ascertain whether other 17th century Eastern European writers of Hebrew narrative employed this type of construction with a wider variety of roots, and that the lack of examples in Hannover’s text is due to its restricted size.

4.4 Periphrastic verbal constructions for past progressive and habitual

Hannover frequently employs a periphrastic verbal construction consisting of a qaṭal of the root י.ה.ה י.ה. followed by a qoṭel to convey past progressive actions, as in (65)–(68). In some cases, the construction is used with stative verbs whose progressive sense is not evident in the English translation, as in (67) and (68). This type of construction is a characteristically post-biblical phenomenon; it appears frequently in Mishnaic Hebrew and in various types of medieval Hebrew texts. Hannover’s use of this construction can be contrasted with his use of the typically biblical wayyiqtol discussed above. Like other elements of the verbal system in Yeven Meṣula, the use of the periphrastic construction has a direct parallel in 19th century Maskilic and Hasidic Hebrew.

---

126 Kahn, 2015, pp. 151–152.
127 Hannover, 1653, p. 2.
128 Hannover, 1653, p. 3.
One day the Cossacks were sitting, Chmielnicki – may his name be blotted out – and his friends, at the wine banquet [...]. Chmielnicki – may his name be blotted out – said to his friends:

and when the enemy Chmielnicki heard the matter, he feared for his life.

and that lord knew the man.

The construction can also be used to convey a habitual sense, as in (69) and (70). This is likewise a feature of Rabbinic Hebrew in addition to medieval forms of the language such as the piyyutim. Again, this is also a feature of 19th century Maskilic and Hasidic Hebrew.

and they would give the boys food from the charity fund.

132 Hannover, 1653, p. 3.
133 Hannover, 1653, p. 16.
134 Hannover, 1653, p. 17.
135 Hannover, 1653, p. 2.
139 Hannover, 1653, p. 18.
4.5 Verb-subject gender discord

Hannover has a strong tendency to use the 3msg form of a *qatal* verb in conjunction with a feminine noun if the verb precedes the noun, as in (71)–(74). This has direct precedent in the Hebrew Bible. However, the fact that there are numerous instances of this phenomenon in the relatively short text of *Yeven Meşula* suggests that, though the phenomenon is ultimately traceable to the Hebrew Bible, Hannover was not inspired solely by its occasional attestation there. This usage is not exhibited to the same extent in later Eastern European Hebrew writing, though it is sometimes found in Hasidic narrative literature. Further research on other types of early modern Eastern European Hebrew is needed in order to ascertain whether it was part of a more widespread tradition.

(71) ווהיה דירהו בערי טשהארי

*wa-* haya *dirato* bo-ʿir *tšehirin*

‘and he lived in the town of Czehryń’

(72) ומעולם היה שנאה גדולה בין הקדרים והיונים

*u-*me-ʿolam *haya* śinʿa *gǝdola* ben haq-*qǝdarim wǝ-*hay-yǝwanim

‘and there had always been a great hatred between the Tatars and the Ukrainians’

(73) ואם היה קהילה של חמישי בעלי בתים היו מחזיקין לא פחות משלושי מבחרי ונערים

*wa-* im *haya* qǝhilla šel ḥamišša baʿale battim *haya* maḥaziqin lo pǝḥot miš-šǝloša baḥurim u-naʾarim

‘and if there was a community of fifty house owners, they would maintain no less than thirty young men and boys’

(74) בא לפtoISOString עשיר ואחד שיחיה ולא ב מת קטנה

*ba* li-ʾpʿamim ʿašir ʾeḥad še-*haya* lo bat qǝtanna

‘there came sometimes a rich man who had a small daughter’

---

140 Hannover, 1653, p. 20.
142 Kahn, 2015, pp. 254–255.
143 Hannover, 1653, p. 2.
144 Hannover, 1653, p. 1.
145 Hannover, 1653, p. 18.
146 Hannover, 1653, p. 20.
5 Syntax

5.1 Temporal constructions

Hannover employs two different methods of forming temporal constructions. In some cases he uses the temporal conjunction נאמר kaʾašer ‘when’ or its prefixed variant -כש kǝ-še- followed by a finite verb. The temporal construction may be introduced by wayehi. The following examples illustrate this.

(75) והרי נאמר תמר הפורר המפיזל ימית עם מונתה לכבוש קך לובליית הבירה ולא היה

wa-yhi kaʾašer nasे haš-sorer hmil yimah šomo im mahanehu li-kboš qohilla qadoša lublin hab-bira w-o lo haya raq 4 parsə ot miq-qohilla qadoša lublin baʾelaw kǝṭaḥ ham-melek
‘and when the enemy Chmielnicki – may his name be blotted out – travelled with his camp to conquer the holy city of Lublin, the capital, and he was no more than four parsas from the holy city of Lublin, the king’s edict reached him’147

(76) אבל הם לא חמולו עליהם כשמכללו עם פולין בידם

ʾaḥal hem lo ḥamlu ʿalehem ka-šen-naplуʾ am polin b-o-yadam
‘but they did not have pity on them when the Poles fell into their hands’148

(77) והרי נאמר בא תמר הנילל עם אשתו לערת תשיהירם קבלל אתו אשיש המוק משמוה

wa-yhi kaʾašer baʾ haš-šar hanaʾl im ʾišto l-oʾ ir tšehirin qibbəl noexcept ham-maqom b-o-šimha qədola
‘and when the above-mentioned lord came with his wife to the town of Czehryń, the local people received him with great joy’149

However he also forms temporal constructions by means of an inseparable preposition prefixed to an infinitive construct, as in Biblical Hebrew, as in (78)–(80). Such temporal constructions are typically preceded by wayehi. The inseparable preposition -כ kǝ- is used to denote the sense of ‘just after’, as in Biblical Hebrew. This type of construction is quite common, but is most frequently attested with the root ש.מ.ʿ.š.m.ʿ. ‘hear’, as in the first two examples. This may suggest that the construction was not extremely productive for Hannover but rather that this particular collocation was an almost fossilised expression with which he was particularly familiar. Alternatively, it may simply

148 Hannover, 1653, p. 11.
149 Hannover, 1653, p. 2.
indicate that the expression ‘and when X heard’ is a high-frequency expression for a historical narrative such as *Ye'en Me'Sula*.

(78) יודה קושמא התוכמס
wa-yhi ki-šmoaٰ* had-dukkas hana'l had-dabar haz-ze way-yeherad
‘and when the aforementioned duke heard this matter, he was afraid’

(79) יודה קושמא התוכמס מים שהתוכמס
wa-yhi ki-šmoaٰ* ḥmil yimaḥ šamo š-e-had-dukkas wišniyesq̄ holek
wa-qareb ʾel maḥanehu [...] šalaḥ l̄o-negdo šar haš-saša šello
‘and when Chmielnicki – may his name be blotted out – heard that Duke Wiśniowiecki was approaching his camp [...] he sent out his general’

(80) יודה קושמא התוכמס על כסה מלכוה חתים פד ספרים על הזרום המיל יימש שילך וישוב
wa-yhi ko-šebet ham-melek ʿal kisse malkuto kataḥ miy-yad saʾparim
ʾel haš-ṣorer ḥmil yimah šamo šey-yelek wa-yašuḥ l̄o-ḥeto
‘and as soon as the king was sitting on his royal throne, he immediately wrote letters to the enemy Chmielnicki – may his name be blotted out – telling him to go home’

5.2 Conditional clauses

There are several real conditional clauses attested in *Ye'en Me'Sula*. Some have a future sense, as shown in (81) and (82), and the others have a past habitual sense, shown in (83) and (84). All protases are introduced by the subordinator אֶנָּמ ʿim ‘if’. The future conditionals have yiqṭol verbs in both the protasis and apodosis. Of the past habitual conditionals, the first is comprised of a periphrastic construction in both the protasis and apodosis, while the other has a qatal in the protasis and a periphrastic construction in the apodosis. All of these constructions are traceable to Mishnaic Hebrew.

(81) אֶנָּמ אֱמוֹ נמָתִּין יְךָ שְָבָרָו הָוָנָּה לֹּּיָה עָשָּה בֵּנוֹ הָלָּלָה wa-neḥraša
ʿim ʾanu namtin ʿad šey-yabo ʿu hay-yəwānim la-ʿir yaʿasu banu kalla
‘if we wait until the Ukrainians arrive in the city, they will destroy us completely’

150 Sic; = דוכס.
151 Hannover, 1653, p. 8.
152 Sic; = דוכס.
153 Hannover, 1653, p. 8.
156 Hannover, 1653, p. 4.
If you lay a hand on the lords and all the Catholic kings hear of it, they will take revenge on all our brethren in exile.\(^{157}\)

And if they wanted to go on their way, they would give them provisions for the road.\(^{158}\)

And if they came from a faraway land or from other places […] they would provide them with clothes.\(^{159}\)

In one case, Hannover employs a fusion of biblical and post-biblical constructions in his real conditional: the apodosis is introduced by a *yiqṭol*, but this is prefixed by the *waw*-conjunctive, which echoes the biblical use of the *waw*-consecutive in real conditional apodoses.\(^{160}\) As discussed elsewhere in this study, this mix of biblical and rabbinic elements is a common feature of Hannover’s writing, and is also a common feature of 19th century Eastern European Hebrew, though this precise feature is not attested in Maskilic or Hasidic narrative literature. Further research is needed in order to ascertain whether it is an element of other types of Ashkenazic Hebrew.

If we kill them all, the people of Poland will have pity for the Ukrainians.\(^{161}\)

There is also an irreal conditional, with a verbless protasis introduced by לולא *lule* ‘if not’ and an apodosis with a *qatal* of the root ה.י.ח, shown in (86). Interestingly, in contrast to the real past habitual conditionals shown above, this construction most closely resembles biblical irreal conditionals, which are likewise introduced by לולא *lule* ‘if not’.\(^{162}\) This is further evidence of the fusion of biblical and post-biblical elements present throughout Hannover’s text.

\(^{157}\) Hannover, 1653, p. 7.
\(^{158}\) Hannover, 1653, p. 20.
\(^{159}\) Hannover, 1653, p. 20.
\(^{160}\) See Waltke and O’Connor, 1990, pp. 526–527.
\(^{161}\) Hannover, 1653, p. 11.
\(^{162}\) Waltke and O’Connor, 1990, 637–638.
כי לולא זאת לא היה הכהונה תלולה לשרי
\( ki \ lule \ zot \ lo \ haya \ t\text{\textit{quma}} \ ha\text{\textit{l}ila} \ li\text{-}\text{\textit{še}} \ 'erit \ yi\text{\textit{šra}}'el \)  
‘and were it not for that, there would, God forbid, have been no survival for the remnant of Israel’\(^{163}\)

5.3 Inconsistent use of the accusative marker \( \text{\textit{et}} \)

A characteristic feature of Hannover’s syntax is the inconsistent use of the accusative marker \( \text{\textit{et}} \). This marker is a standard feature of the biblical and rabbinic strata of Hebrew.\(^{164}\) However, it is commonly omitted in a variety of medieval Hebrew texts, including Rashi’s commentaries, the \textit{Sefer Hasidim}, Spanish-Provençal Hebrew prose\(^{165}\) and Arabic translations.\(^{166}\) Rabin\(^{167}\) suggests that the medieval tendency to omit the particle is rooted in Paytanic Hebrew,\(^{168}\) and that this is itself based on Biblical Hebrew poetry, in which \( \text{\textit{et}} \) is much less common than in biblical prose. Any such tendencies are likely to have been compounded by the fact that the medieval authors, like Hannover, spoke vernaculars lacking such a particle. As in the case of most other features discussed in this study, 19th century Hasidic Hebrew authors also frequently omit the particle.\(^{169}\) There are no clear patterns governing Hannover’s employment of the marker. It is likely that, as in the case of other varieties such as Hasidic Hebrew, which make use of the marker in a similarly inconsistent manner, Hannover consciously recognised it as an intrinsic element of the Hebrew prose style, but often unintentionally omitted it because such a form was not a feature of his Yiddish vernacular and therefore did not come naturally to him. Examples (87)–(89) illustrate cases where Hannover did employ the marker:

(87) יוהי כשמוע המלך והשרים את הדבר הזה היה כמצחק בעיניהם
\( wa-yhi \ ki\text{-}\text{\textit{šmoa}} ham-melek w\text{-}\text{\textit{šarim}} \ 'et \ had-da\text{\textit{ḥar}} haz-ze \ haya \ k\text{-}\text{\textit{miṣḥaq}} \ b\text{-}\text{\textit{ʿenehem}} \)  
‘and when the king and the minister heard this matter, it was like a joke to them’\(^{170}\)

(88) ולאבד את כל היהודים ואת כל היהלום פולין
\( u\text{-}\text{\textit{šo}} \ 'abbed \ 'et \ kol \ ha\text{-}\text{\textit{yhudim}} w\text{-}\text{\textit{šo}} \ 'et \ kol \ ḥel \ 'am \ polin \)  
‘and to destroy all the Jews and all the might of the people of Poland’\(^{171}\)

\(^{163}\) Hannover, 1653, p. 5.
\(^{164}\) Rabin, 2000, p. 117.
\(^{165}\) Rosén, 1995, pp. 64–66; Rabin, 2000, p. 117.
\(^{166}\) Goshen-Gottstein, 2006, p. 111.
\(^{167}\) Rabin, 2000, p. 117.
\(^{168}\) See Rand, 2006, pp. 258–259.
\(^{169}\) Kahn, 2015, pp. 280–282.
\(^{170}\) Hannover, 1653, p. 3.
\(^{171}\) Hannover, 1653, p. 5.
By contrast, (90)–(92) exemplify cases where he neglected to include it:

(90) והזו והחרד הדר עלי,

wa-yhi ki-šmoaʿ had-duḵkas had-daḇar haz-ze way-yeḥerad
‘and when the duke heard this matter, he was afraid’

(91) לשמור העיר מנשה,

li-šmor ha-ʾir min haš-šone
‘to guard the town from the enemy’

(92) עד השלוך המבצר ויורגו כל היהודים,

ʿad šel-laḵdu ham-miḇṣar way-yahargu kol ha-yhudim
‘until they captured the fortress and killed all the Jews’

5.4 Use of -ל as accusative marker

A striking and very common feature of Hannover’s writing is the use of the inseparable preposition -ל ‘to, for’ as a direct object marker. The preposition is attested with this function in conjunction with a variety of verbs and seems to be relatively productive, though its use is not uniform. A noteworthy aspect of this construction is that it seems to be used only with reference to animate objects and cities (which can be regarded as a sort of collective concentration of animate objects). Examples (93)–(96) illustrate this noteworthy construction. The phenomenon extends to the employment of -ל in conjunction with a pronominal suffix, as in (97).

This feature has some precedent in Late Biblical Hebrew and Rabbinic Hebrew; in both cases it is thought to be ascribable to influence from Aramaic, in which -ל is a standard accusative marker. However, it does not appear to be a feature of medieval forms of Hebrew, which use the accusative marker אט or leave direct objects unmarked. Notably, it also appears to be absent

---

172 Hannover, 1653, p. 16.
173 Sic; דוכס.
174 Hannover, 1653, p. 8.
175 Hannover, 1653, p. 8.
176 Hannover, 1653, p. 12.
179 Rabin, 2000, pp. 117–118.
from 19th century Eastern European forms of Hebrew, in contrast to many of the other constructions discussed in this study. The fact that *Yeven Meșula* does not exhibit any direct grammatical influence from Aramaic suggests that the historical basis for Hannover’s use of this construction is its appearance in Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew. However, the fact that the use of -לǝ- as an accusative marker is not a prominent feature of either of these strata of Hebrew, combined with the fact that Hannover’s restriction of the construction to animate objects lacks clear precedent in biblical or rabbinic literature, raise the possibility that the canonical strata are not the sole source of the phenomenon in *Yeven Meșula*. Perhaps unexpectedly, the most direct parallel for Hannover’s usage can be found in the pre-modern Hebrew writing of Judaeo-Spanish speakers from the Ottoman Empire, which exhibits precisely the same phenomenon, including the restriction to animate objects. This intriguingly specific apparent link between Hannover’s text and that of Ottoman Judaeo-Spanish-speaking writers requires further investigation in order to ascertain the extent of the similarities between these two forms of Diaspora Hebrew. Likewise, further research needs to be done into the language of other early modern and modern Ashkenazic Hebrew textual sources in order to determine whether this phenomenon was rooted in a more widespread usage in Eastern Europe as well.

---

180 Aramaic features in *Yeven Meșula* are limited to a number of set phrases such as *natoare qarta* ‘guardians of the city’ (Hannover, 1653, p. 8) and the use of the possessive particle -ד- ‘of’ on one occasion, *הלו רכב הפרשים וסוס פולין* ‘his Polish army, chariots and horsemen’ (Hannover, 1653, p. 10).  
181 Bunis, 2013, p. 60*.  
182 Hannover, 1653, p. 1.  
183 Hannover, 1653, p. 2.  
184 Hannover, 1653, p. 5.
The Hebrew of *Yeven Mešula* exhibits a fusion of characteristically biblical features (the *wayyiqtol*, stative *qatal* with present reference and temporal constructions composed of a prefixed infinitive construct) and typically rabbinic elements (the masculine plural in *nun*, the *qatal* in past narrative sequences and periphrastic verbal constructions), in many cases employing the biblical and rabbinic features alongside each other. It also contains a number of features without clear precedent in Biblical or Rabbinic Hebrew (the retention of the definite article with inseparable prepositions, the indefinite article, definiteness of construct nouns and doubly definite construct chains, the avoidance of the dual, and erratic use of the definite direct object marker), but which are attested in other Eastern European forms of the language, specifically the writings of 19th century Maskilic and Hasidic authors as well as the *Kiṣur Shulḥan ‘Aruḵ* and rabbinic responsa literature. Moreover, at least one of these features (fluctuation between the *nun* and *mem* plural endings) is found in medieval Ashkenazic Hebrew. Some of them also have parallels in the Hebrew composed by Judeo-Spanish speakers and, more distantly, in Judeo-Arabic. Finally, *Yeven Mešula* exhibits a single feature (the use of the prefixed preposition ל- *la-* ‘to, for’ as a definite direct object marker in addition to the standard ṣות ‘er) whose closest parallel seems to be in the Hebrew of Ottoman Judeo-Spanish speakers. The overall similarity between *Yeven Mešula* and other Eastern European forms of Hebrew, particularly those composed by 19th century adherents of the Maskilic and Hasidic movements, suggests that all of these authors may have been heirs to a shared Ashkenazic variety of Hebrew whose roots stretch back to at least the 17th century and possibly much earlier. Further research is needed to determine the geographical and chronological boundaries of this form of Hebrew and establish its links with other types of early modern and modern Diaspora Hebrew, as well as more broadly with Judeo-Arabic and other Semitic languages.

---

185 Hannover, 1653, p. 3.
186 Hannover, 1653, p. 5.
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