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)
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 בָּל. 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).

– וְהָנָּה מָעַמְעַל נִי עַלְאָה הַּעַנְעַמְעַהְוָא הַעַנְעַמְמְאָה (Rodkinsohn 1865: 12)
– יָאָה עִדּוּר נַלְּאָה תָּפָּלְלְוָא (Chikernik 1902: 14)
– יָנְאָה יַדּוּּעַר נַלְּאָה הַרְעַר הָאָה רַבְּרָה מַעְמְאָה (Singer 1900b: 1)
– יָנְאָה יַדּוּּעַר נַלְּאָה הַרְעַר הָאָה רַבְּרָה מַעְמְאָה (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).

– לָא אַסְפָר לָא הָאָה נַגְּיָה לָא לָבָא מָאָה (Chikernik 1908: 10–11)
– לָא קְאָפָּלְמָעַה לָא נַגְּיָה נַגְּיָה (Chikernik 1902: 14)
– לָא בָּהָה בָּהָה בָּהָה בָּהָה בָּהָה בָּהָה בָּהָה בָּהָה בָּהָה בָּהָה בָּהָה בָּהָה (Rodkinsohn 1865: 12)
– לָא בָּהָה בָּהָה בָּהָה בָּהָה בָּהָה בָּהָה בָּהָה בָּהָה בָּהָה בָּהָה בָּהָה בָּהָה בָּהָה (Ehrmann 1903: 21b)
– לָא אֲוֹלְאָה טוּדַּל הָעָא הָאָה בָּאָה (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.

– לָא אַמְרָה לָא בֵּאָה לָא מַכְבָּה לָא בֵּאָה לָא מַכְבָּה (Rodkinsohn 1865: 2)
– אַמְרָה לָא בֵּאָה לָא מַכְבָּה לָא מַכְבָּה (Kaidaner 1875: 41a)

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)
‘When someone meets you, don’t speak’ (Michelsohn 1910a: 57)

‘Don’t worry, the Holy One blessed be He will surely help’ (Chikernik 1902: 29)

‘Don’t ask for that horse from him, because he is precious in my eyes’ (A. Walden 1860?: 17b)

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 יס (see 14.2.3), but is negated by אל on very rare occasions, e.g.:

– Sheet lokem inom pešamim ‘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 יס (van der Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze 1999: 318), with אל 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 אל in addition to the more frequent יס. However, here too the two corpora differ as in Rabbinic Hebrew the selection of אל 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 qotol 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 אין ‘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 yiqtol with command force, as shown below.

Second Person

– ‘And the rabbi answered him, “Don’t be afraid”’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 8)
‘Don’t deny’ (Bodek 1865a: 71)
‘Don’t fill your mouth with laughter’ (? 1894: 6)
‘And don’t keep anything back from me’ (Michelsohn 1910a: 41)

Third Person

‘Let him not worry’ (Ehrmann 1903: 47b)
‘Let him not waste’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 3)
‘Let him not say it outright’ (J. Duner 1899: 14)
‘Let him not lay blame on us’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 40)
‘And let no man go after us’ (Landau 1892: 17)

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 *אל* 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 ניא*
14.2.3.1 Equational Sentences

Hasidic Hebrew non-verbal equational sentences are typically negated by the particle ניא. 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 ניא, as in the first set of examples below, or a noun or pronoun in conjunction with suffixed ניא, 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 ניא in negative command contexts as well, but treats it as interchangeable with (though less frequent than) ניא; see 14.2.1.2.
With Suffix

- ‘I’m not a doctor’ (A. Walden 1860?: 26b)
- ‘And the students wondered greatly at this, because it was not known to them what it was’ (Kaidaner 1875: 15a)
- ‘This child is not hers’ (Teomim Fraenkel 1911a: 75)
- ‘You don’t have to come to me’ (Michelsohn 1912: 31)

14.2.3.2 Qotel

Qotel is typically negated by אני. 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.

- ‘We don’t make legal rulings based on the Zohar’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 27–28)
- ‘You aren’t obliged to go along with him’ (J. Duner 1899: 85)
- ‘And I don’t know anything’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 56)
- ‘And I don’t see where to go’ (Chikernik 1903a: 16)
- ‘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.:

- ‘I don’t get involved in disputes’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 28)
- ‘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 Kroeze 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 לא**

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 בל 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 אלש ‘not to’, as below. This construction has a precise counterpart in Mishnaic Hebrew (Sharvit 1998: 337; Pérez Fernández 1999: 144).

- ‘Our Rebbe asked us not to let you travel to your house’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 49)
- ‘The doctor had instructed him not to drink’ (Michelsohn 1912: 18)
- ‘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 בלבל ‘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 בלבל is the only option for negation, as shown in the subsequent examples. This is to be expected given that בלבל is the standard way of negating unprefixed infinitives construct in Biblical Hebrew (Joüon-Muraoka 2006: 571; Williams 2007: 150).

- ‘And I will do so, not to study with Elijah’ (Laufbahn 1914: 50)
- ‘I did this thing, not to come to the Rebbe’s house’ (Shenkel 1903b: 17)
- ‘And he also gave an order not to burn his books’ (Jacob Isaac ben Asher of Przysucha 1908: 96)
- ‘What you promised me, not to let [anyone] report me’ (Breitstein 1914: 38)

Somewhat more rarely, they may be negated by the particles בלבל or בלבל, as below. Again, the infinitive construct may be prefixed by -ל, as in the first two examples, or unprefixed, as in the final one.

- ‘And I am telling you not to make too much effort in prayer for this’ (Bromberg 1899: 4)
- ‘And on the next day a different order came not to hang them, God forbid’ (Munk 1898: 22)
- ‘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. לבל **ה** ‘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**

- ויתלהםםינפמהיהו'And the students said that they had served him in his life’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 25)
- יעש החכם ובנה אתרשילדהו'And that man went home, and his wife bore a son’ (Chikernik 1908: 12)
- ויתלהנפמתהאם'And the rabbi opened the amulet’ (Ehrmann 1903: 9b)
- יאיש פירבשת תלך לבהעשיש'The man Faivush went to the Ba’al Shem Tov’ (Sofer 1904: 9)

**Verbal Clauses with Pronominal Subjects**

- פָּרָהאוֹם הַמְּלוּכָּה יִפְרִישׁוּתָיִם תַּלָּךְלַלְכָּה‘Suddenly the Ba’al Shem Tov said, “I want to smoke a pipe”’ (A. Walden 1860?: 14b)
- יאמאנים הַמְּלוּכָּה יִפְרִישׁוּתָיִם תַּלָּךְלַלְכָּה‘And you will go from exile to exile’ (Ehrmann 1903: 9b)
- יאאנהוֹם תַּלָּךְלַלְכָּה‘And he waited for them’ (J. Duner 1899: 34)


And he started to hear a persistent rumour' (Shenkel 1903b: 19)

And we passed by among them' (Heilmann 1902: 98)

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’ (HaLevi 1909: 54)
- ‘Several hours passed’ (Berger 1910a: 25)
- ‘And the Ba’al Shem Tov struck the righteous man [with] brutal blows’ (Kaidaner 1875: 22a)
- ‘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’ (Michelsohn 1905: 65)

**Verbal Clauses with Pronominal Subjects**

- ‘He said to his wife that he wouldn’t go even one step’ (Ehrmann 1905: 48b)
- ‘I want to do some service for you’ (Lieberson 1913: 21)
- ‘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’ (Brandwein 1912: 33)
- ‘And he got up on the second night’ (Rakats 1912, pt. 1: 8)

**Equational Clauses with Nominal Subjects**

- ‘The matter is good’ (Zak 1912: 152)

**Equational Clauses with Pronominal Subjects**

- ‘I see that you are a poor man’ (Ehrmann 1905: 53b)
- ‘He is an upright man’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 1)
- ‘You see, I’m afraid of the officers’ (Seuss 1890: 10)
- ‘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’ (Michelsohn 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 OSV

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)
And we will also demand his blood from you’ (A. Walden 1860?: 29b)

And he also gave a letter to (lit: into the hand of) the messenger’ (Seuss 1890: 5)

And the rich man closed the door by himself’ (Rodkinsohn 1865: 13)

The fronting of indirect objects is not a typical feature of the tales, but is rarely attested:

But I believe only you’ (Rodkinsohn 1864b: 6)

Prepositional phrases are very infrequently fronted in the same way in non-verbal sentences, e.g.:

Because this tailor was surely not one of the thirty-six [hidden] righteous ones’ (Lieberson 1913: 65)

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.

He saved his life and fled from there’ (Ehrmann 1903: 2a)

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 pendens) 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).

[As for] the spirit of the dead man, it has no rest’ (Bromberg 1899: 25)
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)

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).

‘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)