

# VOSSIUS, SPINOZA, SCHULTENS: The Application of *Analogia* in Hebrew Grammar

## 0. INTRODUCTION<sup>1</sup>

When we take careful note of the development of speech in children we notice that after a certain age they tend to ignore linguistic usage (*usus linguæ*) and replace, e.g., strong verbal forms by weak ones. Therefore, some children might use *I writed* for *I wrote* at a certain age while earlier they used the correct past of *to write*. They probably construct this past after verbs as *to like* and *to dine*, the former one being more likely since usually most toddlers just *eat*. Without having thoroughly studied grammars such as Varro's *De lingua latina* or bearing knowledge of the grammatical views of Aristarchus of Samothrace (c. 217-145 B.C.), it is apparent that they adhere to the point of view that 'the people as a whole ought in all words to use Regularity' (*populus uniuersus debet in omnibus uerbis uti analogia*, Varro 1979, L. IX, cap. 1, 5: 444). The term *regularity* is the correct translation of Greek *analogia*.

In this paper, I will first discuss the concept of *analogia* and its application in grammars from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. First, I shall treat of Vossius, who was respon-

<sup>1</sup> A shortened version of this paper was read at the 15th Annual Colloquium of the *Henry Sweet Society for Linguistics Ideas*, Amsterdam, 16-19 September 1998.

sible for the reintroduction of *analogia* in grammar (1635); the discussion of Vossius is mainly of a theoretical nature. Then I will show the application of *analogia* in Spinoza's Hebrew grammar (1677) and, finally, I will show how Albert Schultens applied it in the *Institutiones* in 1737.

## 0.1. BIOGRAPHIES

### 0.1.1. *Vossius*

Gerardus Joannes Vossius was born in 1577 in Heidelberg, or in its neighbourhood. His father was a Calvinist minister who had to move frequently. The Vossius family lived in Germany, Holland, Flanders, and finally in Holland again, in the city of Dordrecht, where Gerardus attended the Latin School.

In 1595, Vossius won a scholarship to study at the States' College of Leiden University. He studied classics and philosophy and acquired the degree of *Magister Artium* on 13 March 1598 (Rademaker 1981: xxv, 35). Afterwards, Vossius studied theology and was for a short period lecturer of philosophy. His life as a student came to an end in 1600 when the burgomasters of Dordrecht appointed him as a vice-rector at the Latin School, which flourished under his later rectorial rule.

By mediation of his friend, the famous jurist Hugo Grotius (1583-1645), Vossius was appointed as regent of the States' College in Leiden in 1615. There he became involved in the fray between Remonstrants and Contra-Remonstrants, which became increasingly a political and social conflict. Vossius and Grotius published during this period several studies on ecclesiastical history in which they defended the Remonstrants against the accusation of heresy. In 1618, the Dordrecht Synod excommunicated the Remonstrants. Hugo Grotius was sentenced with lifelong imprisonment, from which he succeeded to escape, and Vossius was forced to abdicate his regency. He remained, however, in the Leiden *civitas academica*, because he had powerful protectors by whose influence he was appointed as a professor in eloquence and history in 1622.

When Vossius was invited in 1625 to occupy the new chair in history at Cambridge University, he declined the offer in favour of a post in Latin and Greek at Leiden University. In his Leiden period, Vossius published several schoolbooks<sup>2</sup> and scholarly works on history, ecclesiastical and civil, and rhetoric, with which he gained world-wide fame in the Republic of Letters. However, he remained under suspicion of holding unorthodox religious opinions.

The last mentioned fact might have been the reason for Vossius to accept an invitation by the magistrates of the more liberal city of Amsterdam for the post of rector and professor of history and politicology at the newly founded *Athenæum Illustre* in 1632. In Amsterdam he published his great work *De Arte Grammatica Libri VII*, printed by Willem Janszoon Blaeu in 1635<sup>3</sup> which was gratefully dedicated to Charles I, King of England (1600-1649), who had made him a canon of the Chapter of Canterbury Cathedral during his visit to England in 1629. He died in Amsterdam on 17 March 1649 (Rademaker 1990: 11-13).

### 0.1.2. *Spinoza*

Benedictus (Bento, Baruch) de Spinoza was born on 24 November 1632 in Amsterdam. He was of Portuguese Jewish descent. He received his first education in the school of the Portuguese-Jewish community from his fifth to his fifteenth year. In the years that followed he learned Latin and became interested in Cartesian philosophy.

In 1656, he was expelled by the Jewish community because of his unjewish views. He left Amsterdam settling in Rijnsburg (near Leiden), Voorburg and later in The Hague where he died on 21 February 1677. He earned his living by grinding lenses.

<sup>2</sup> In the nineteenth century, his Greek grammatical textbook was still in use in schools.

<sup>3</sup> In 1662, it was reprinted by the Blaeu printing house with the title *Aristarchus, sive De Arte Grammatica Libri VII*. It was published again as volume II of Vossius's collected works in Amsterdam, 1695; cf. Rademaker 1992: 110.

In 1670, he anonymously published his *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* which was banned in 1671 by the States of Utrecht and in 1674 by the States of Holland. His other works, such as the *Ethica, Ordine geometrico demonstrata* and his *Compendium Grammatices Linguae Hebraeae*, appeared in the *Opera Posthuma* (1677) shortly after his death, 21 February of the same year. He corresponded among others with Henry Oldenburg (c. 1620-1677), the second secretary of The Royal Society of London for improving Natural Knowledge, the British physicist Roben Boyle (1627-1691) via Oldenburg, and the German philosopher Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646-1716).

### 0.1.3. *Albert Schultens*

Albert Schultens was born on 22 August 1686 in Groningen. He is considered the 'Father' of comparative Semitic linguistics. At the age of 14 he matriculated at Groningen University, afterwards he studied in Leiden and Utrecht, where the Hebraist Adriaan Rheeland (Adrianus Relandus, 1676-1718) occupied the chair in Oriental Languages. In 1709, he acquired his doctor's degree in theology at Groningen. In 1711, he became a minister of the church in Wassenaar (near The Hague).

In 1713, Schultens became professor of Oriental Languages at the Frisian University of Franeker. In his inaugural address, he expressed his views on the defects of Hebrew studies of his days. Since the remnants of Hebrew consist only in the 24 books of the Bible, it is impossible to give a full description of Hebrew. For an adequate description, Hebrew should be compared with other Semitic languages, in particular with Arabic. Furthermore, Schultens is one of the first who was able to establish the linguistic relationship of Persian and the Germanic languages and rightly observed that Turkish is a central Asiatic language. It should be noted that Schultens was a colleague of Tiberius Hemsterhuis (1685-1766), who was professor of Greek at Franeker University from 1717 till 1740, the year he changed the Frisian chair for the Leiden one (Feitsma 1996: 19).

In 1729, Schultens became regent of the States' College of Leiden University. His large Hebrew grammar *Institutiones ad*

*fundamenta Linguae Hebraeae* (1737; 2nd ed. 1756) was widely used. It had been reprinted in Klausenburg (Claudiopolis, Cluj), Transylvania in 1743 (Noordegraaf 1996: 37). His comparative dictionary of Hebrew was never published; it is extant in manuscript only at Leiden University Library. In his Leiden period, he was a colleague of Hemsterhuis again. He died in Leiden on 26 January 1750.

### 1. THE CONCEPT *ANALOGIA*

Although *analogia* is originally a Greek grammatical concept, the Latin grammarian Varro has given its final definition and it is largely through Varro that the concept entered into Western grammar, and it is likely that this Roman author is responsible that the alleged analogy-anomaly controversy in Antiquity is considered as a historical fact (cf. Fehling 1956, 1958; Robins 1990: 21-26). Varro defines *analogia* by stating that it is proper 'that all words that start from similar forms should be inflected similarly' (*ut a similibus similiter omnia declinentur uerba*, Varro 1979, VIII, XVIII, 34: 398-399).

Although *analogia* is also present in sixteenth-century grammar, it became a central linguistic principle in Vossius's *De Arte Grammatica Libri VII* (1635). In his discussion of *analogia*, it is obvious that Vossius is indebted to Varro since he explicitly refers to him:

In quaestionem praeterea venit, an cum Varro, ut diximus, ἀναλογίας veritatem & rationem appellet, eique consuetudinem opponat: non aequissimum videatur, ut homines eruditi rationem potius sequantur, quam consuetudini obsequantur. Nostra haec est sententia, similibus verborum similem declinationem, quam analogiam dicimus, consuetudine subnixam esse debere, non solâ doctorum, nec solâ vulgi; sed illâ doctorum, cui bona pars vulgi consentiat. Quemadmodum enim in navi obtemperamus gubernatori; eum autem rationem sequi oportet: ita doctiores populo morem gerunt; is uerò rationis ductum sequi debet.

(Vossius 1635, *De Analogia*, L. I, cap. 5: 23).

Moreover, since Varro, as we have said, calls *analogia* 'truth' and 'rational regularity' and set 'usage' against it, the

question arises whether it does not seem most reasonable that the learned rather follow reason than comply with usage. Our opinion is this: similar inflection of similar words, which we call *analogia*, should be supported by usage, neither by usage of the learned only, nor by usage of the masses only, but by that usage of the learned which the better part of the masses agree upon. Just as aboard ship we obey the helmsman, who for his part ought to follow reason: in the same way, the learned control the custom of the people, and, indeed, the guidance of this reason must be followed.

It should be noted that the comparison with obeying the helmsman also occurs in Varro (1979, L. XI, I, 6: 444-445).

Vossius also criticizes the grammarians for their use of the term *etymologia*. He prefers the term *analogia* instead of *etymologia*, which term has been used for centuries for phonology and morphology, and, I have a schoolgrammar of Latin from 1945 in my possession of which the title reads *Latijnse Spraakkunst. Eerste deel-Etymologie* (Rogge & Koster 1945). It is obvious that the authors had not been acquainted with the works of their predecessor, for Vossius says that the term *etymologia* is being wrongly applied by the grammarians when they use it for 'morphology':

Vulgò tamen Etymologiam appellant; sed perperàm: cum Etymologia vocum origines inquirat; Analogia vocabulorum discrimina exponat. Quemadmodum ex Varrone, & aliis, postea comprobabimus.

Materies, circa quam Analogia versatur, est vox, non quidem ut articulata ac confusam comprehendit: sed ut *κατ' ἐξοχήν* sumitur pro articulata, nec quavis, sed ea solum, quæ ex instituto aliquid significat.

(Vossius 1635, *De Analogia*, L.I, cap.1: 2).

It is commonly called 'Etymology', but incorrectly: while etymology investigates the origins of words, *analogia* expounds the distinctive features of words, as we shall show later from Varro and others.

The matter with which the *analogia* is concerned, is sound, not understood as articulate and inarticulate both but exclusively as articulate and not as any articulate sound whatever, but only as one which signifies something by agreement.

Cries of pain, fear, etc. cannot be the subject of *analogia* but what about the Greek negation expressed by a tongue-click accompanied by upward head or brow movement? As far as I know, this negation is the only instance where this sound is used; we might consider it a phonological anomaly. In this context, too, it is useful to dwell for a moment on the following lines of the poem called 'Jabberwocky':

*Twas brillig and the slithy toves  
Did gyre and gimble in the wabe:  
All mimsy were the borogoves,  
And the mome raths outgrabe*

Carroll s.a.: 21 & 126

We can conclude from syntax that *brillig* and *slithy* are adjectives, *gyre* and *gimble* verbs, *toves*, *borogoves* and *wabe* nouns. From its context I may even conclude that *outgrabe* must be an archaic past of the verb *to outgribe*, since, as stated by Humpty Dumpty, this verb means 'something between bellowing and whistling, with a kind of sneeze in the middle' (Carroll s.a.: 129)<sup>4</sup>. These words are articulate sounds and although they mean something according to Humpty Dumpty, they do not signify something by agreement. Therefore, these words cannot be subject matter of *analogia*.

Let us now see some of Vossius's other statements concerning *analogia*:

Vt verò meliùs intelligatur, utrùm ἀναλογίας, ἀνωμαλίας defensores sequendi sint nobis: distinguere oportet inter duo genera uerborum (Varroni utor verbis:) unum fecundum, quod declinando multas ex se parit dispariles formas: ut est, lego, legis, legam, sic alia: alterum genus sterile, quod ex se parit nihil: ut est, etiam, vix, magis, cras, cur<sup>5</sup>. Vnde illud consequitur, non esset exigendam ἀναλογίαν inter nox, & mox cùm dissimilia sint; quia alterum sub casuum rationem succedit, alterum non item.

(Vossius 1635, *De Analogia*, L. I, cap. 5: 21).

4 On «Jabberwocky», see Lucas 1997.

5 The quotation is from book VIII, III. 9 (Kent 1979: 376-378) and the examples *nox* and *mox* in the next sentence are occurring in book X, II. 14 (Kent 1979: 544).

For a better understanding, whether we ought to follow the defenders of *analogia* or of anomaly, it is proper to make distinction between *two classes of words* —I quote Varro [*sc.* L. VII, III, 9: 376-378; 377-379]— *one fruitful, wich by inflections produces from itself many different forms, as for example lego, ‘I gather’ legi, ‘I have gathered’, legam, ‘I shall gather’ and similarly other words; and a second class wich is barren, wich produces nothing from itself, as for example etiam, ‘also’, vix, ‘hardly’, cras, ‘to-morrow’, magis, ‘more’, cur, ‘why’.* Hence, it follows that there must not be concluded to *analogia* between *nox*, ‘night’, and *mox*, ‘soon’, since they are dissimilar, because the former is subject to case system and the latter is not.

Bearing the last sentence of this statement in mind, I was surprised that Vossius in his speculations in the origin of language maintains that Greek *βάρβαρος*, ‘barbarian’, is etymologically related to the Hebrew particle *בַּר*, *bâr*, ‘outside’. So, a *barbarian* is an ‘outside outsider’! Hebrew particles are pluralized or, as in this instance, repeated to express the meaning ‘very’, as he remarks (Vossius 1645, *De Vitiis Sermonis* I, cap. I, p. 2.). No wonder, that Tiberius Hemsterhuis (1685-1766) reproaches Vossius for neglecting the *analogia*-principle in his etymologies of Latin, which resembled his etymology of Greek *βάρβαρος* where a noun is compared with a preposition:

Hujus quod dico exemplum illustre est in Vossio. Joh. Gerardi Vossii Etymologicon continet quidem res utilissimas et eruditissimas; sed si, quod de vocum Latinarum origine scripsit, indagamus, constat ne dimidiam quidem partem esse veram aut cum ratione linguæ convenire. Id mirum videtur in tam docto homine, et res est pene incredibilis Vossium illum ipsum, qui de analogia eruditissime scripsit, analogiam neglexisse in expediendis linguæ Latinæ Etymologiis, unde sæpe miserum in modum labitur.

(Hemsterhuis s.a., 342–343) <sup>6</sup>

A very famous example of what I say is to be found in the work of Vossius. His *Etymologion* really included very

6 Rademaker 1992: 117 & 124.n.12 gives an incorrect reference, *viz.* Hemsterhuis 1845: 341.

usefull and very learned matter. However, as we look at what he said about the origin of Latin words, we must say that more than half of it is not true and does not correspond to the *ratio linguæ*. It seems amazing and almost incredible in such a learned man as Vossius was, that he, who wrote on analogy with so much erudition, neglected the analogy in his research into the etymology of the Latin language because he made many bad mistakes.

(Rademaker, 1992: 117).

We should be careful, however, for there are Hebrew grammarians who maintained that Hebrew particles, indeed, belong to the class of nouns. Such a grammarian was Spinoza.

## 2. SPINOZA'S *COMPENDIUM GRAMMATICES LINGUÆ HEBRÆÆ* (1677)

In his *Tractatus Theologico–Politicus* Spinoza had stated that knowledge of Hebrew was necessary for a correct interpretation of the Scriptures. There is, however, a great difficulty. How can we acquire a thorough knowledge of Hebrew? The Ancients have not left us any dictionary, grammar or rhetoric. Moreover, only a few remnants of the Hebrew language are left and the Biblical books are few in number (Spinoza 1670: 92). He wrote his grammar at the request of some of his friends, as it is stated in the *Admonitio ad lectorem* (Spinoza 1677, *CG*: Mmmm4 v<sup>o</sup>). But what about the numerous grammars of Hebrew written in the Middle Ages? Furthermore, the amount of Hebrew grammars published in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries surpasses the number of grammars of any language. Hebrew is the best described language in those ages. Why did Spinoza, then, decide to compose another grammar? Could his friends not have used any of the existing grammars?

Spinoza is of the opinion that the grammarians had made many mistakes because they had not noticed that in origin—nearly—all Hebrew words are nouns. He is not the only grammarian who thought so. For instance, the Catalan grammarian Profiat Durán (c. 1400) and the Italian Rabbi Abraham de Balmes (cc. 1444-1523) were of the same opinion and

so were other ancient grammarians. Besides, Spinoza mentions the latter and many opinions of de Balme can be recognized in the philosopher's grammar.

### 2.1. Identification of word-forms in Hebrew grammar

From the earliest time onwards, Jewish grammarians had a procedure to identify word-forms. This procedure is called *mišqal*, which is best translated into 'balance' or 'scale'. It was qualified by Bacher (1974: 152) as «eine Grundsäule der hebräischen Grammatik». As many other elements in early Hebrew grammar, *mišqal*, too, might have had its origin in Arab linguistics (Bacher 1974: 104). This procedure of identification of word-forms has a striking similarity with *analogia* or *proportio* of the Greek and Latin grammarians (cf. Schenkeveld 1990: 291-297).

I give a simple example of *mišqal*: Dunas ibn Labrat (c.925-c.990) explains that there is a difference between the *qameš* of the adjective שֶׁמֶן, *fat*, and the one of שֶׁמֶן, *oil*, because of the difference in accent between the adjective and the substantive noun (an accentuated *segol* [e] in the first syllable of a word is changed into *qameš* [a]):

ובין ושמן מובדל גדול בנקודה לשד השמן ממעל, המ'ם בו נקודות החתיו. פתוח בשלש נקודים ושמן חלקו מתחת. ומשקל שמן ושמן אֵבֶן וְאֵבֶן, גֶּפֶן וְגֶפֶן, פֶּתֶן וְפֶתֶן וְרִבִּים כמו אלה בטעם אתנחא וסוף פסוק.

(Filipowski, 1855: 14).

And between *šāmen* and *šāmen* there is a great difference in accentuation: in *l'šād haššā'men* ['cake of oil' [Num 11: 8], it has the accent on the first syllable, the *mem* in it is vocalized with three points and the accent of *šāmen' ḥelqô* ['fat [is] their portion', Hab.1: 16], is on the last syllable. And the *mišqal šemen* ['oil'], is like: *'eben: 'āben* ['stone'], *gefen: gāfen* ['vine'], *peten: pāten* ['cobra'], and many like these latter forms with the accent *atnahta* or *sof pasuq*.

In Spinoza's time, *mišqal* was still used. He could have learned it from his teacher Menasseh ben Israel (1604-1656) who was teaching Hebrew grammar in 1647 at the school he attended. Menasseh writes in his grammar:

(6) Os gramaticos, como sejaõ [!] *que* os maes dos nomes se deriuã dos verbos, ponderã todos por elles, caysto chamaõ משקל (pezo). Easî acordaraõ deos medir por este verbo פָּעַל como por exemplo הָקַם por פָּעַל e אָרַךְ por פָּעַל e מִשְׁמַר por מִפְעַל observando sempre as *letras* radicaes, eseruis easî naõ diremos הָרַעַנּוּ he פִּעַל על משקל פִּעַל por que ה' naõ he radical,

(Menasseh ben Israel, 1647, II cap.6: 15 r°).

The grammarians, since it is a fact that most nouns are derived from verbs, balance them all with the latter, and this they call *mišqal* (weight). And they also decided to measure them by this verb *pā`al*, for instance, *hākām*, [‘wise’], by *pā`āl* and *‘eres*, [‘land’], by *pe`el*, and *mišmār*, [‘guard’], by *mif`āl*, while they always take notice of the radical and servile letters, and so we shall not say that *here`û* [*l. here`û*, ‘they made evil’], is ‘in balance with’ *pe`elû* [*l. pe`elû*] because the *hê* is not a radical.

Just as in English we cannot compare the morphology of *birth* with *bird*, since the *th* would be called by the Hebrew grammarians a ‘servile letter’, while the final *d* in *bird* is part of the root.

Jewish scholars applied *mišqal* also in coining new words needed for their scientific publications. The same held for the creators Modern Hebrew.

## 2.2. Spinoza and *mišqal*

From Spinoza’s grammar, it appears that he wrote it with the intention that it would enable his friends to speak Hebrew (1677, *CG*: 14). Although many terms are translations from Hebrew grammatical terminology, we do not find the equivalent translation of *mišqal*, to wit, *libra bilanx*. Spinoza, however, uses the term *analogia* more than once but it does not necessarily reflect this grammatical procedure but he uses *mišqal* to reconstruct forms which do not occur in the Scriptures<sup>7</sup>.

7 This is no exception in the history of linguistics. See Robins (1990: 44) on Dionysius Thrax: «The *analogiai* of the morphology set out in the *Technè* found their ultimate consummation in the lists of nominal and verbal inflections, known as

Since the remnants of Biblical Hebrew were so little Spinoza had to reconstruct forms. He does so in verbal inflection and in his explanations of the morphology of the noun. I will give some examples in English first in the same way as Spinoza applied *analogia* in Hebrew grammar.

In English, we have verbal inflections as *to drive-drove-driven*, *to write-wrote-written*, but this last verb has an archaic past and past participle with the form *writ*. Since *to drive* is of the same class as *to write* Spinoza, had he known English, would allow *to drive-driv-driv*. And, of course, we are allowed to say: *to dive-dove-diven* and *div-div*. However, since we also have *to dive-dived-dived* the forms *writed* and *drived* are correct too. Since the intensive of *to drive* is *to dribble* we can use the intensive verbs *to writtle* and *to dibble* too<sup>8</sup>.

Spinoza does, indeed, reconstruct analogous verbal forms based on *hapax legomena* or rare verbal forms. He does not doubt that his reconstructions had been existent; only, they are not found in the Scriptures, no wonder, since the Bible represents a small portion of Hebrew as it actually was spoken.

In Hebrew, there is a passive reflexive voice of the verb פָּקַד, *pāqad*, 'to visit'. It has the form הִתְפַּקַּד, *hotpaqqad*, 'to make oneself to be visited' or 'to be mustered' (*Numbers* 1: 47, 2: 33, 26: 62 and 1 *Kings* 20: 27). Spinoza states about this verb:

Verbum igitur הִתְפַּקַּד, quatenus significat *se ipsum visitare*, Passivum habere nequit; at quatenus significat quòd *aliquis se visitantem constituit*, Passivum habet הִתְפַּקַּד, quod uti diximus, significat *præbere se visitandum*, vel *efficere, ut videretur*, ut Num. 2 v. penult. [!] הַלְוִיִּים לֹא הִתְפַּקְדוּ & *Levitæ non præbuerunt se numerandos inter filios Iſraëlis*.

(Spinoza, 1677, *CG*: 78).

canons (*kanónes* (*κάνόνες* [!])), on which later paradigms were modelled. The best known is the complete set of all the theoretically available forms of the verb *τύπτειν* (*τύπτειν*), to hit, of which, however, in classical Greek only a limited number were actually in use».

8 The verb *to dibble* exists. According to the *OED*, it means «To make a hole in (the soil) with or as with a dibble; to sow or plant by this means» I do not know whether it is etymologically related to *to dive*.

The verb *hitpaqqed*, then, cannot have a passive voice when it signifies *to visit oneself* but when it signifies *someone has appointed himself as a visitor*, it has the passive voice *hotpaqqad*, which, as we have said, signifies *to make oneself to be visited* or *to make that one is visited*, as in Numbers 2, the next to the last verse *And the Levites did not let themselves to be numbered among the children of Israel*.

A second passive of the reflexive verb pattern הִתְפַּקֵּד, *hitpaqqed* is also possible. Spinoza had earlier concluded that the general characteristic of the passive voice is the prefixed *nûn*. He is of the opinion that it is allowed to use that characteristic in all instances where a passive has to be expressed:

Denique loco הִתְפַּקֵּד *ufurpare licet* ׀ (characteristicam scilicet Passivi tam Verbi simplicis, quàm intensivi) & הִתְפַּקֵּד [p]er dagešch compensare, ut Deut. 21 v. 8 וְנִכְפַּר לָהֶם הַדָּם & *sanguis dabit se ipsis* expiandum loco הִתְפַּקֵּד. Quare mihi persuadeo literam ׀ esse Passivi universalis characteristicam; sed in omnibus, præterquam in Passivi Verbi simplicis, plerumque negligi, ob rationem cap. 17 allatam. Sunt itaque hujus infinitivi formulæ הִתְפַּקֵּד, הִתְפַּקֵּד vel הִתְפַּקֵּד, הִתְפַּקֵּד vel הִתְפַּקֵּד.

(Spinoza, 1677, CG: 78-79).

Finally, it is allowed to use a *nûn*-it is namely the characteristic of the passive of the simple as well as of the intensive verb instead of the *hê* with compensation of the *taw* by a *dagêš* as in Deuteronomy 21: 8 *w<sup>e</sup>nikkapper lahem haddâm*, ‘and the blood shall give itself to them to be forgiven’, instead of *w<sup>e</sup>nitkapper*. And, therefore, I am convinced that the letter *nûn* is the universal characteristic of the passive, but that it is mostly omitted for the reason given in chapter 17. Consequently, the formulas of this infinitive are: *hotpaqqad*, *hutpaqqed* or *huppaqqed*, *nitpaqqed* or *nippaqqed*.

Contemporary Amsterdam Sefardic grammarians are of the opinion that these forms are hybrid. Let us see what Mosse Rephael d’Aguilar (after 1615-1679) said about them:

O preterito Je aponta הִתְפַּקֵּד ou הִתְפַּקֵּד. Achasse esta conjugação misturada com a conjugação נִפְעַל ede ambas Je forma hum

verbo, como נִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה; e o mesmo com a conjugação הפעל como em הִתְפַּקְדוּ.

(D'Aguilar, 1659/60: 19).

The past is vocalized *hitpaqqad* or *hitpaqqed*. This conjugation is also found mixed with the conjugation *nif'al* and from both is formed one verb, such as *ništawwah* ['he is equivalent to ...', *Proverbs* 27: 15]; and similarly with the conjugation *huf'al* as in *hotpaqqedû*.

I am under the impression that Spinoza's contemporaries saw the verb pattern *nitpa'al* as a rare formation, may be not as an irregularity, for the language of creation cannot be irregular. Spinoza considers this verb pattern to be completely regular, i.e., *analogous*, and, indeed, it occurs frequently in Mediaeval and Modern Hebrew. Consequently, it is obvious that Spinoza's grammatical theory is predictive.

Now I will give some examples of Spinoza's treatment of nominal inflection. In English, there is an archaic plural of *cow*, to wit, *kine*, therefore, Spinoza would allow *vine* as the plural of *vow*. Moreover, since Spinoza considers particles as nouns, they can be pluralized, which intensifies the meaning of the singular, he would have sanctioned a plural of *now*, to wit, *nine*, were it not that the meaning of *now* opposes pluralization. Let us see how Spinoza applied *analogia* to Hebrew nominal forms.

In Latin, a noun functioning as a subject which governs a genitive does not change. In Hebrew however, it is the governing noun that suffers morphological change. Spinoza gives the following example:

Res vel absolute significatur, vel ad alias relatæ, ut clarius, & expressius indicentur; ex.gr. *mundus est magnus* Mundus in statu absoluto significatur, at *mundus Dei est magnus*, tum mundus est in statu relativo, quo efficacius exprimitur, vel clarius indicatur, atque hic Status Regiminis vocatur. Quomodò autem soleat exprimi, ordine jam dicam, & primò quomodò in singulari numero.

Nomina, quæ in ה præcedente vel gholem desinunt, mutant ה in ה, & in פּ patagh. Nam תפילה habet in statu regiminis תפילה, & significat precationem alicujus.

(Spinoza, 1677, *CG*: 25-26).

Things are signified either absolutely, or in relation to other things, in order that they are clearer or more expressly referred to, e.g., in *the world is great* ‘world’ is signified in absolute state, but in *God’s world is great*, then ‘world’ is in a relative state, whereby it is more effectively expressed, or clearer referred to; and this is called ‘state of government’. In what way, then, it is usually expressed, I shall tell in good order, and, first, in the singular.

Words that end in a *hê* with preceding *qameš* or *holem*, change the *hê* in a *taw* and the *qameš* in a *pataḥ*. For *ʿfilâh* has in the state of government *ʿfilat*<sup>9</sup>, and it signifies ‘the prayer of someone’.

From the paradigms Spinoza gives on the following pages, it is seen that feminine nouns that end in *-o[c]et* do not have a different form in government<sup>10</sup>. Sometimes, according to Spinoza, this form is found in nouns which end in *-u[c]âh*:

& אשמורה *habet ubique* in *Scripturâ pro Statu Regiminis* תלעובת & תלאובה *habent תלעובת* [sic], & תשלומת *ideoque dico unicuique licere pro אשמורה* [scribere אשמורת, & *pro תלאובת* [scribere תלאובת; *tamet]i neutrum in Scripturâ reperitur.*

(Spinoza, 1677, *CG*: 27).

and *ʿašmûrâh* [‘night-watch’] has everywhere in the Scripture as state of government *ʿašmôret*, and *tal’ûbâh* [‘drought’?] and *ta<sup>a</sup>lûmâh* [‘something hidden’] have *tal’ûbat* and *ta<sup>a</sup>lûmat*, and, therefore, I say that everybody is allowed to write *ʿašmurat* instead of *ʿašmôret*, and *tal’ôbet* instead of *tal’ûbat*, although none of these two are found in the Scripture.

A fact is that אשמורה occurs also in absolute state, to wit, *Judges* 7: 19. Furthermore, אשמורה is a *hapax legomenon* (*Psalms* 19: 40). It might be that it is not found in government and that אשמורה is the only correct form. To which I add that not all Jewish grammarians would agree. The forms תלאובה and תלאובת do not occur in the Scriptures either; the word is only found in

9 N.B. This transcription reflects *scriptio plena*.

10 The signe [c] stans for consonant.

the plural תלואבות in *Hosea* 13: 5, and תעלומת is not found. One might doubt whether these reconstructions are correct since תלואבקה and תלואבקה are different nominal formations, so, Spinoza's application of *analogia* might be incorrect.

There are, however, instances of strange forms for which Spinoza cannot find an analogical explanation. Such an instance is משתחיתם (*Ezekiel* 8: 16). The beginning has the prefix of the active participle of the reflexive verb but it has the suffix of the second person plural masculine of the 'past'. The Portuguese-Jewish grammarians of Spinoza's age explain this form in this vein:

Achafse o Preterito de tres diferentes modos, a saber, *Vizitou, vizitava, avia vizitado*. O Prim<sup>o</sup>. Je chama נשלם *perfeito*, O Seg<sup>o</sup>. בלה נשלם *Inperfeito*, o Ter<sup>o</sup>. כבר נשלם *plus quam, ou mais que Perfeito*. Exemplo עוקד עוקד *Vizitou*, אה שקרה *Vizitava*, עמו *Avia Vizitado*. Achafse, o Imperfeito muitas vezes exprefo com o Verbo הנה como, הנה שומר *Guardava*, הנה מבין *Confidrava*, הנה נלהם *Peleijava*: E para expreffer o *mais que Perfeito* Je achadous tempos em hua palavra, como משתחיתם *Vos avieis encordavado* como Je diffeJe משתחיתם e השתחיתם.

(Leaô Templo, 1702/3, cap. 6, § 5: 20).

The past is found in three different ways, to wit, 'he has visited, he visited, he had visited'. The first is called *nišlam*, 'perfect', the second *bilti nišlam*, 'imperfect', the third *k<sup>e</sup>bar nišlam*, 'pluperfect' or 'more than perfect'. E.g., *pāqad `ôwanek*, 'he has visited [your iniquity]', *pāqad `et šârâh*, 'he visited [the vine-terrace]', *pāqad `et `ammô*, 'he had visited [his people]'. The imperfect is often found expressed by the verb *hâyâh* ['he was'] like *hâyâh sômer*, 'he was guarding', *hâyâh mebin*, 'he was considering', *hâyâh nilhâm*, 'he was fighting'; and to express the more-than-perfect there are found two tenses in one word, like in *mištah<sup>a</sup>wîtem*, 'you had prostrated yourself', as if one says *mištah<sup>a</sup>wîm* ['prostrating oneself'] and *hištah<sup>a</sup>wêtem* ['you have prostrated yourself'].

In Humpty-Dumptian English grammar one may use, no doubt, *he walkings* as a legitimate alternative for *he is walking*. Spinoza, however, would have held it for a scribal error, due to the hasty pen (1677 *CG*: 109).

There are other instances where Spinoza does not see a scribal error but where he shows himself a real Humpty-Dumptyian. I quote from the chapter on the deponent verbs, quadrilateral verbs and of the composition of verbs, moods and tenses:

Supereſt, ut, quæ ad verborum Conjugationem ſpectant, abſolvam, pauca de compoſitis addam. Verba compoſita à Grammaticis vocantur illa, quæ ex duobus Verbis diverſæ Conjugationis, vel ex duobus ejuſdem thematis, vel quæ ex Nomine, Participio, & Verbo componuntur; quibus præterea addere ſolent alia, quæ ſimul duos modos, vel duo tempora exprimunt. ex gr. quintæ & ſextæ Conjugationis duo compoſita reperiuntur, nempe הוֹשִׁיבוּתִי, quod componitur ex יָשַׁב, ſedere, & שׁוּב redire, aliàs deberet eſſe vel הוֹשִׁיבוּתִי ex יָשַׁב, vel הוֹשִׁבוּתִי, ex שׁוּב: alterum eſt הַשִּׁיבוּתִי, quod componitur ex יָשַׁב, & שׁוּב bene eſſe, quòd aliàs deberet eſſe vel הַשִּׁבוּתִי, ex יָשַׁב, vel הַשִּׁיבוּתִי ex שׁוּב. Primum duos ſenſus ſimul exprimit, & ambos indicare Propheta voluiſſe videtur; at ſecundum quoquo modo ſumatur idem exprimit; ideoque non dubito, quin nobis alia quintæ & ſextæ Conjugationis Verba ad hunc modum componere liceat.

(Spinoza, *CG*, 1677: 108).

Rests that, closing what concerns the conjugation of verbs, I add a little on composites<sup>11</sup>. Composite verbs are called those which are compounded of two verbs of different conjugations or of two of the same stem or those which are compounded of a noun, a participle and a verb; furthermore, among these there are usually other verbs reckoned which express simultaneously two moods or two tenses, e.g., two composites of the fifth and the sixth conjugations are found, namely, *hōš<sup>e</sup>bōtî* [*Zec.* 10: 6] which is composed of *yāšab*, ‘to sit’, and *šōb*, ‘to go back’, otherwise, it should have been either *hōšab<sup>tî</sup>* from *yāšab* or *h<sup>a</sup>šibōtî* from *šūb*; the other is *hētiḥōtî* which is composed of *yāteḥ* and *ṭōb*, ‘to be good’; otherwise, it should have been either *haytab<sup>tā</sup>* from *yāteḥ* or *h<sup>a</sup>tihōtā* from *ṭōb*. The first expresses at the same time two senses, and it seems that the prophet

11 The term is rare, but appropriate; cf. the *OED*, 2nd edition, and in particular the second quote: «3. *Gram.* A compound word or term. *rare.* 1708-15 Kersey, *Composite*, a Term in Grammar; as A Composite, or Compounded Word. 1887 Earle *Philol. Eng. Tongue* §397 These [adjectives] are Composites; they have been formed by the combination of two words».

wished to indicate both <sup>12</sup>; the second, however, taken in whatever way, expresses the same thing; and therefore, I do not doubt that we are allowed to coin other composite verbs of the fifth and sixth conjugations.

According to Spinoza, the form הושבותי is a ‘portmanteau’: «there are two meanings packed up into one word» (Carroll s.a.: 127). Consequently, in Spinoza’s view, Lewis Carroll’s ‘Jabberwocky’ is written in harmony with English linguistic usage. Besides, many Hebrew grammarians would have been of the same opinion.

\* \* \*

Spinoza uses the terms *analogia* and *analogus* frequently in his grammar. Moreover, it is known from the description of his estate that he was in possession of Vossius’s *De Arte Grammatica Libri VII* (te Winkel, 1916: 16, n. 50) <sup>13</sup>.

Spinoza, however, applied *analogia* not as Vossius did. I am convinced that Vossius would not have permitted several of Spinoza’s reconstructions. Spinoza’s *analogia*-concept seems to be more in line with the *analogia*-concept of Jacobus Perizonius (1651-1715) and that of the eighteenth-century grammarians of the Schola Hemsterhusiana, to wit, «the creative quality of the human mind by which it produces the means of expressing thoughts» (Gerretzen, 1940: 131; Feitsma, 1997: 27).

### 3. SCHULTENS AND ANALOGIA

Schultens maintained that the study of Hebrew grammar could be improved by using *analogia* as a guiding principle,

12 The translator of the King James version is of the same opinion; the verse is thus translated: «And I will strengthen the house of Judah, and I will save the house of Joseph, and I will bring them again to place them» (my emphasis), at which I note that הושבותי is a causative.

13 The reference by Willem van der Hove is *Vossius de arte Grammatica*. Therefore, I suppose that Spinoza was in possession of the first edition.

for ‘*analogia* is the life-breath of language’ (quum tamen *Analogia* sit anima *Linguae*, Schultens 1756: \*\* v°). When one studies the existing grammars of Hebrew, it is easily concluded that the language has many imperfections. This has puzzled Schultens for a long time, as he stated in the ‘Præfatio’ to his *Institutiones*:

Enimvero a longo jam perceperam, in eoque per quotidianam palæstram magis magisque confirmabar, non *Linguae* esse *Imperfectionem*, & *fluxa principia*, quæ tantam *Anomaliarum* vim nobis peperissent, sed vitium penes *Rabbinos* residere, ex eorum nimis angusta, & defecta, institutione, malum emanasse. Hi nempe *Grammaticas* suas non confecerunt ad *Veteris Linguae* amplitudinem, & late fuisse ditionem, red ad *reliquias Biblicas*, quæ ne viceissimam quidem, ut parciissime dicam, *ejusdem partem* continent.

(Schultens, 1756: \*\*2 r°).

Indeed, I had since long noticed, and became by my daily struggle more and more convinced of the fact that there is no *imperfection of language* and that there are no *inconstant principles*, which generate such a great number of *anomalies*, but that this defect lies in the *Rabbis* and this evil comes forth from their too narrow minded and defective instruction. These, namely, have not composed their *grammars* with respect to the copiousness and the widely extended power of the *Old Language*, but only with respect to the *Biblical remnants*, which do not even contain-to state it cautiously-5 percent of it.

It is not difficult to recognize the opinion of Spinoza that there are ‘several that have written a grammar of the Scripture, but none that has written a grammar of the Hebrew language’ (Nam, ut uno verbo dicam, plures sunt, qui Scripturæ; at nullus, qui linguæ Hebrææ Grammaticam scripsit, 1677, *CG*: 24).

The reason for the publication of the *Institutiones* was for Schultens to eliminate all anomalies that former grammarians had thought to exist in Hebrew:

Hos jam, aliosque, *defectus*, non sane *Linguae*, sed *Grammaticæ*, ut inspiciendos præbent hæ *Institutiones*, ita iisdem levandis, faciendisve, viam naturalem, ac simplicem, aperire

conantur. Præfertim autem *Anomalias* eliminare, atque ad puram, sinceramque, *Analogiam*, revocare omnia conijci sumus. Aliquid effectum, sperare ausim [*l. ausimus or ausi?*]. Multo tamen plura, & graviora, conficienda restant.

(Schultens, 1756: \*\*3 v°- [\*\*4] r°).

As these *Institutiones* offer to examine these and other *defects* not truly of *language* but of *grammar*, so they will try to lay open the natural and simple way to take them away or to amend them. In particular, however, we have struggled to eliminate the *anomalies* and to bring all things back under the pure and true *analogy*. We have dared to hope that it has some result. Yet, far more and graver problems remain to be solved.

Although Schultens does not see many anomalies in Hebrew, he nevertheless admits that anomaly in language exists:

*Analogia* in omnibus linguis prior & antiquior. Venit deinde *Anomalia*, non quæ turbaret *Linguam*, sed in multis *promptiorem* redderet, ac *juvaret*.

(Schultens, 1756: 103).

*Analogia* is first and oldest in all languages. Then *comes Anomaly*, not to *disturb the language*, but to make it *easier* and to *be of help* in many respects.

Schultens tried to show that most so-called anomalies are in fact regularities and in this his grammar resembles Spinoza's *Compendium*. This resemblance appears to be no coincidence: Schultens refers frequently to Spinoza in his *Institutiones* and when he criticizes Spinoza it concerns details only. Study of both grammars reveals that both scholars are congenial in their efforts to eliminate all anomalies of Hebrew and both are now and then going a little too far in their application of *analogia*. Schultens, however, went much farther than Spinoza, e.g., the latter concluded only to eight verb patterns, be it that several patterns could have more than one form while Schultens was of the opinion that there were eighteen different verb patterns. He is aware of the fact that he has considerably more than other Hebrew grammarians:

Ex auctis verbi *ſpeciebus, & formis, Anomalix*, quas induxerant *Grammatici*, maximam partem tolluntur: nec valde firmum, ne veriſimile quidem, quod tradi ſolet, *nonnunquam vel diverſas conjugationes, vel diverſa tempora, in una dictione confundi.*

(Schultens, 1756: 307).

On account of the *verbal subcategories and forms* added, the *anomalies* which the *grammarians* had introduced are annulled: and it is not very certain, or even probable, as it is commonly told, that *ever* either *different conjugations*, or *dfferent tenses* are *combined in one word*.

Schultens was thus able to see regularity in what Spinoza called ‘an error of the hasty pen’, to wit, the word מִשְׁתַּחֲוִיָּה:

In hiſce nihil de Præterito admixtum, tam parum quam in מִשְׁתַּחֲוִיָּה *adorantes vos, Ezech. 8: 16.* quod contractum ex אָהַב מִשְׁתַּחֲוִיָּה. Indocte *Spin.* p. 109. vocat *vitium feſtinantis calami.* Eſt flos lectiſſimus.

(Schultens, 1756: 309).

In these forms [*sc.* just mentioned] nothing of the past is mixed in, just as little as in *miſtah<sup>a</sup>wîtem*, ‘they adoring’, *Ezekiel 8: 16*, which is a contraction of *miſtah<sup>a</sup>wîm* ‘*attem*. Spinoza calls it without learning ‘an error of the hasty pen’. It is a most excellent flower!

to which he adds that this contraction also happens in Syriac, a fact that Spinoza probably had overlooked, or it might be that it did not occur in Spinoza’s Syriac New Testament (te Winkel, 1916: 3, n° 2). For Schultens, the *s* in *he walkings* would not have been a personal suffix but *walkings* is a contraction of *walking* and *is*. He would have called it ‘a most excellent flower of speech’.

Furthermore, Schultens was able to explain several strange *hapax legomena*, e.g., לְדָרוּשׁ, which is commonly accepted as a mistake for לְדָרוּשׁ, *Ezra 10: 16*, by infixation. He criticizes Spinoza for calling it a monstrosity (Schultens, 1756: 448; *cf.* Spinoza, 1677, *CG*: 63). Schultens is able to make nearly all anomalies regular by comparison of Hebrew with the other Semitic langua-

ges, of which he knew more than Spinoza did. The latter made only and seldom use of Aramaic.

Besides the explicit references to Spinoza's works, there are many implicit ones. For instance, Spinoza qualifies the consonant as *principium soni*, 'the beginning of the sound' (1677, *CG*: 1), the sound itself being the syllable since in Hebrew there are no syllables which consist in a vowel only<sup>14</sup>. Schultens gives as a definition of the letter:

Nempe *Litera* nihil aliud est quam *Signum*, quo indicatur *motus Organicus oris*, vel in *Guttur*e, vel in *Labiis*, vel in *Palato*; vel in *Lingua* fortius mota; vel in *Dentibus*. Is *motus* non tam *principium soni vocalis*, quam ejusdem vehiculum, sine quo distincte ex ore exire nequit.

(Schultens, 1756: 2).

The *letter*, namely, is nothing else than a sign by which the *organic movement of the mouth* is indicated, situated in the *throat*, on the *lips*, on the *tongue* with fairly strong movement on the *teeth*. This *movement* is not so much the beginning of the *vowel-sound* but rather its vehicle without which it cannot distinctly exit the mouth.

An other instance where he might refer to Spinoza is when he discusses the tenses, and in particular, when he states that there is no present in Hebrew. Spinoza phrases it thus:

Actiones ad nulla alia tempora referre solent Hebræi, quam ad Præteritum, & Futurum. Cujus rei ratio videtur esse, quod temporis non nisi duas has partes agnoverint, & quod tempus præsens, veluti punctum, hoc est, veluti præteriti finem; & futuri initium consideraverint; tempus, inquam, cum lineâ comparasse videtur, cujus nimirum puncta tamquam extremum unius, & principium alterius partis considerantur.

(Spinoza, 1677, *CG*: 57).

14 There is reason to assume that for the Hebrew grammarians of the Judeo-Arabic tradition the minimal phonological unit is not a phoneme but a 'syllabeme', to coin a new term.

The Hebrews usually refer actions to no other times than to the Past and the Future. And the reason seems to be that they acknowledged none than these two parts of time, and, that they considered the Present time as a point, that is, as the end of the past and the beginning of the future; as to time, I say, they seem to have compared it with a line of which they, no doubt, considered the points as the end of the one part and the beginning of the other.

Although there are other grammarians who were of the same opinion, such as Abulwalīd Marwān ibn Ghanāḥ (begin 11th cent.), Abraham de Balmes (cc. 1440-1523; see Klijnsmit, 1992: 164 and 1998: 56-57) and Johannes Buxtorf the Elder (1564-1629), Spinoza is the only one I know of who compared time with a line in geometry. Schultens discusses the absence of the present as follows:

Minus rite Cl. Alt. ponit *quinque tempora, præteritum, participium, infinitivum, imperativum, & futurum*. Natura tantum tria admittit, *præteritum, præsens, futurum*: quin si subtilius inquiras, *præsens tempus* proprie dare non potest, quum *momentorum successio* illa rapidissima ex *futuro* mox *præteritum* efficiat, ita ut in *præsentis puncto* nihil stare queat. Sapienter ergo antiquissima orbis Lingua *præteritum* tantum, & *futurum*, in *verbis* agnoscit.

Schultens, 1756: 257).

Less correctly, the renowned Jacob Alting [1618-1679] assumes *five tenses*, the *preterite*, the *participle*, the *infinitive*, the *imperative* and the *future*. Nature only allows *three*: the *preterite*, the *present* and the *future*, but if one examines the matter more exactly: a *present time* cannot truly exist, because that most rapid *succession of moments* makes from a *future* immediately a *past*, so that nothing can stand in the *point of the present*. Consequently, the oldest language of the earth wisely acknowledges in *verbs* only a *preterite* and a *future* <sup>15</sup>.

15 The ultimate source of this opinion is probably Aristotle's *Physics* (IV, x: 218a): «Τὸ μὲν γὰρ αὐτοῦ γέγονε καὶ οὐκ ἔστι, τὸ δὲ μέλλει καὶ οὐπω ἔστιν· ἐκ δὲ τούτων καὶ ὁ ἀπειρος καὶ ὁ ἀεὶ λαμβανόμενος χρόνος σύγκειται. τὸ δ' ἐκ μὴ ὄντων συγκείμενον ἀδύνατον ἐν εἶναι δοῦναι μετέχειν οὐσίας», i.e., «Some of it is past and no longer exists, and the rest is future and does not yet exist; and time, whether limitless or any given length of time we take, is entirely made up of no-longer and not-yet; and how can we conceive of that which is composed of non-existents sharing in existence in any way?» (Wicksteed & Cornford 1963: 372-373).

This, too, is *analogia* for there exists regularity in nature; *analogia* is by no means a linguistic phenomenon solely.

#### 4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

I have shown that Vossius adopted Varro's *analogia* —concept and reintroduced it in seventeenth—, century linguistics. Soon after Vossius, *analogia* was applied in European Hebrew grammar. The first grammarian of Hebrew who professed to apply *analogia* is Christian Ravius, but, in fact, he did not. Besides, as it is obvious from the title-page, he claimed to apply Comenius's didactics (Ravius 1646: Title page). However, although some Hebrew grammarians refer to Vossius, their method remained largely Ramist. This holds for Ravius as well.

The first grammarian of Hebrew who applied *analogia* rigourously was Spinoza. Although he must have been familiar with *mišqal*, the traditional *analogia* of the Jewish grammarians, it is likely that he was inspired by Vossius; he possessed several of the latter's grammars. Spinoza made use of *analogia* in particular in his reconstructions of Hebrew, thus supplying word-forms lacking in Biblical Hebrew. In some respects, he might have gone a little too far.

Schultens went even further than Spinoza, whose works he had read. Although he admits that there is anomaly in language, he nearly denies that it exists in Hebrew as it becomes clear from his *Institutiones*. Spinoza and Schultens made the Hebrew words «do a lot of work», so, like Humpty Dumpty, they must have paid them extra (Carroll s.a: 125).

The history of linguistics is too complicated to call Spinoza a predecessor of the Dutch School of Classical Linguistics but that he had had something to do with it, is likely. In the history of Hebrew grammar Spinoza's *Compendium* and the Dutch school of the Oriental languages, which is undoubtedly Hems-terhusian, had an impact which is still felt in our days: many Hebraists still make use of Wilhelm Gesenius's *Hebräische Grammatik*, in which, even in the version «völlig umgearbeitet von E[mil] Kautsch» (28. Auflage 1909; reprinted in 1985), the original *Ausführliches grammatisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der*

*hebraischen Sprache* [...] (1817) is easily recognized although all references to Spinoza and Schultens of the 1817 grammar have disappeared in the modern edition.

A. J. KLIJNSMIT  
Amsterdam  
Holanda

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aristotle of Stagira (384-322) B. C.; Wicksteed, Philip H. & Francis M. Comford, eds.) (1963): *Aristotle. The Physics*. With an English Translation, vol. I. (= *Aristotle in Twenty Three Volumes*, 4; *The Loeb Classical Library*). London: William Heinemann Ltd., & Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- (1960): *Aristotle. The Physics*. With an English Translation, vol. II (= *Aristotle in Twenty Three Volumes*, 5; *The Loeb Classical Library*). London: William Heinemann Ltd., & Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- D'Aguilar, Mosseh Rephael (after 1615-1679) (1659/60): *Epitome da Grammatica Hebrayca. Por breve Methodo compoſta, para uſo das eſcolas; do modo que aenſina*. Leiden 5420: Jan Zacharias Baron. (Ros. Broch. L.a 4).
- Bonth, Roland de, & Jan Noordegraaf (1996): *Linguistics in the Low Countries. The Eighteenth Century*. Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek VU, & Münster: Nodus Publikationen.
- Carroll, Lewis (s.a.): *Through the Looking Glass and What Alice Found There*. New York: Avenel Books [facs. ed. of 1871, London & New York: Macmillan & Co.].
- Dunaš ben Labrat (c. 925-c. 990; Herschell Filipowski, ed.) (1855): מנחם – ספר תשובה דונש בן לאברש [...] ודוא חלק שני לספר מחברתה – *Criticae Vocum Recensiones Donasch ben Librat, Levitae, sæculo decimo compositæ [...quæ] pertinent ad antiquissimum lexicon Hebraicum et Chaldaicum Veteris Testamenti conscriptum a celeberrimo auctore Menahem ben Saruk, Hispano*. London & Edinburg: Filipowski.
- Fehling, Detlev (1956): «Varro und die grammatische Lehre von der Analogie und der Flexion». *Glotta. Zeitschrift für griechische und lateinische Sprache*, 25: 214-270.
- (1958): «Varro und die grammatische Lehre von der Analogie und der Flexion (Schlub)». *Glotta. Zeitschrift für griechische und lateinische Sprache*, 26: 48-100.



- Noordegcaaf, Jan - Kees Versteegh - Konrad Koerner, (eds.) (1992): *The History of linguistics in the Low Countries* (= *Studies in the History of the Language Sciences*, 64.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rademaker, Cornelis S.M. (1981): *Life and Work of Gerardus Joannes Vossius (1577-1649)* (= *Respublica Literaria Neerlandica*, 5). Assen: Van Gorcum.
- (1990): *Gerardus Vossius. Geschiedenis als wetenschap*. Uitgegeven, ingeleid en van aantekeningen voorzien (= *Geschiedenis van de wijsbegeerte in Nederland*, 9.) Baarn: Ambo.
- (1992): «Gerardus Joannes Vossius (1577-1649) and the Study of Latin Grammar». Noordegraaf, Versteegh & Koerner 1992: 109-128.
- Ravius (Ravis, Rau) Christianus (1613–1677) (1646): *Ortographiæ at Analogiæ (vulgò Etymologiæ) Ebraicæ Delineatio juxta vocis partes abstractas I. Consonas. II. Vocales III. Accentus. Qua via centenæ singularum anomalïæ in analogiam convertuntur. Præmissa veræ Etymologiæ [...] pro pia intentione Pansophiæ Comenianæ exhibebitur*. Amsterdam: Johannes Jansonius (Ros. 189 G 4).
- Robins, Robert H. (1990): *A Short History of Linguistics*. 3d. Edition (= *Longman Linguistics Library*). London & New York: Longman.
- Rogge, Y. H. - W. J. W. Koster (1945): *Latijnse Spraakkunst. Eerste deel - Etymologie*. 10e Druk. Zwolle: N. V. Uitgevers - Maatschappij - W. R. J. Tjeenk Willink.
- Schenkeveld, Dirk M. (1990): «Studies in the History of Ancient Linguistics 4. Developments in the Study of Ancient Linguistics», *Mnemosyne*, vol. 43, 3-4: 289-306.
- Schultens, Albert (1686-1750) (1737): *Institutiones ad fundamenta linguæ hebrææ. Quibus via panditur ad ejusdem analogiam restituendam, et vindicandam [...]*. Leiden: Johannes Luzac (Ros., 1874 G 9).
- (1756): *Institutiones ad fundamenta linguæ hebrææ. Quibus via panditur ad ejusdem analogiam restituendam, et vindicandam [...]*. Leiden: Johannes Luzac (Ros., 1876 E 21).
- Spinoza, Benedictus de (1632–1677) (1670): *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus Continens Dissertationes aliquot, Quibus Libertatem Philosophandi non tantum salva Pietate, & Reipublicæ Pace posse concedi: sed eandem nisi cum Pace Reipublicæ, ipsaque Pietate tolli non posse*. Hamburg: Kühnraht [= Amsterdam: Rieuwertsz] (UBA: 2456 C 22); Gebhardt, 1925, 3: 1-247.
- (1677): *Opera Posthuma*. s.l. [Amsterdam: Jan Rieuwertsz] (Ros., 19 C 21).
- (1677, CG): *Compendium Grammatices Linguæ Hebrææ*. Spinoza 1677: Mmmm4 r<sup>o</sup> - 2P3 r<sup>o</sup>; Gebhardt 1925, 1: 283-403.

- Varro, Marcus Terentius (116-17 B. C.; Rolant, G. Kent, ed., transl.) (1977): *Varro on the Latin Language. With an English translation [...]*, vol. 1, Books V-VII (= *The Loeb Classical Library*, 333). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, & London: William Heinemann Ltd.
- (1979): *Varro on the Latin Language. With an English translation [...]*, vol. 2, Books VII-X. (= *The Loeb Classical Library*, 334). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, & London: William Heinemann Ltd.
- Vossius, Gerardus J. (1577-1649) (1635): *De Arte Grammatica libri Septem*. Amsterdam: Blaev (UBA: 436 F 4).
- (1645): *De Vitiis sermonis, et Glossematis Latino-Barbaris, Libri quattuor*. Amsterdam: Ludovicus Elzevirus (UBA: 447 F 30).
- Winkel, Jan te (1916): *Catalogus van de Boekerij der Vereeniging «Het Spinozahuis»* [Den Haag]: Belinfante.

## RESUMEN

Este artículo expone la recuperación del concepto griego de *analogia* por Vossius dentro del estudio de la gramática hebrea, así como su uso y aplicación hasta el siglo XVIII a través de las obras de Spinoza y Schultens.

## ABSTRACT

This paper sets out the recovery of a Greek concept, *analogia*, by Vossius in the study of Hebrew grammar, as well as the use and application of that term up to the 18th century through the works of Spinoza and Schultens.