INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES AND PRIZE ESSAYS

AUTHOR_____Harold L. Robinson_____

TITLE_____"The History of the Vaad Halashon Ha'Ivrit and its_____

_____Significance for the Revival of the Hebrew Language"_____

TYPE OF THESIS: Ph.D. [ ]   D.H.L. [ ]   Rabbinic [xxx]

                 Master's [ ]   Prize Essay [ ]

1. May circulate [ ]   ) Not necessary
) for Ph.D.
2. Is restricted [X] for _2_ years.) thesis

    Note: The Library shall respect restrictions placed on theses
           or prize essays for a period of no more than ten years.

    I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of my thesis
       for security purposes.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis. ___   _X_
                                                   yes   no

____April 29, 1974_____   _Harold L. Robinson_____
Date   Signature of Author

───

THE HISTORY OF THE VAAD HALASHON HA'IVRIT

AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE REVIVAL

OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE

by

Harold L. Robinson

This thesis is dedicated to my wife, Miriam,
whose constant labor and assistance made it possible,
and to all the others who aided and guided me
in its writing.

The Hebrew Language Committee, during its existence, was a major force in the revival of the Hebrew language as a spoken vernacular. As such, it had a significant influence on the nature of the Hebrew language now spoken in modern Israel. Consequently, this thesis attempts to deal with all aspects of the Hebrew Language Committee both as an institution and as a group of individuals. It is hoped that the reader will gain an understanding of the origin of the committee, its modus operandi, its internal conflicts and the nature of--and rationale for-- its decisions. Specifically, I have tried to describe the conditions which made such an institution necessary, and have also focussed on Eliezer Ben-Yehuda, who was among the first to recognize that necessity and who, through great effort, helped bring the committee into existence and made it an effective force in the effort to revive Hebrew as a modern vernacular. Further, I have examined the debates leading to the decisions made by the committee in order to give the reader a clearer understanding of the internal conflicts and disagreements on the proper approach to language per se which hampered the committee's activities throughout the years of its existence. Finally, I have examined the actual decisions made by the committee in order not only to describe the decision itself but to give the reader an understanding of the techniques used by the committee to make their dream of a revived Hebrew into a reality. The major

decisions of the committee were in the areas of the lexicon (which was vital for the revival of the language and which demanded much of the committee's efforts), the standardization of modern Hebrew orthography (which is not yet complete) and the standardization and refinement of a correct pronunciation. The Hebrew Language Committee at least tried to arrive at solutions in all three areas.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I

The Origin and Early History of the
Vaad Halashon Ha'ivrit

The Vaad Halashon Ha'ivrit ('The Hebrew Language
Committee'), in its origin, was a product of the times and
the general milieu of Turkish Palestine just prior to the
turn of the twentieth century. Nationalism, in the
European meaning of the word, was becoming a dominant force
in the life of the Jews in the Land of Israel. This
nationalism, like that of the emerging European groups,
stressed national identity; it was, however, hampered by,
among other things, the fact that there was only a marginal
feeling of identity uniting the Jews of Palestine and that
they did not even share a common mother tongue. Rather,
each Palestinian Jewry tended to identify primarily with
other Jews from the same country of "origin" in the dias-
pora, and each spoke the language common to Jews in the
"home" country. Thus, Russian Jews spoke Yiddish, Turkish
Jews Ladino, Iraqi Jews Arabic, etc. Nevertheless, they
did identify with the other Jews of the "Jewish settlement"
in the Holy Land both in oposition to the other groups--
Arabs, Turks, and Christians--among which they lived and
as co-workers in recreating a Jewish national homeland.
Further, they did share a language of intercommunication,
Hebrew. The Hebrew available to them, however, was archaic
and stilted; it needed considerable development in order to
serve as an effective medium of communication. Each seg-
ment of the "Jewish settlement," it happens, had its own

tradition both as to the meanings of words and as to the
correct pronunciation of the consonants and vowels. Con-
sequently, the Hebrew Language could as yet hardly be
thought of as a living and useful medium in the same sense
as most contemporary European languages.

That the lack of a well developed common national
language was a serious handicap for the national revival--
the Zionist movement--did not go without recognition.
Several personalities of the day and several institutions,
each supported by Jews in the diaspora, attempted to
impose their European vernaculars on the fledging Jewish
settlement. Thus, the Lämel school in Jerusalem, an
institution under Austrian sponsorship included German in
the curriculum and hoped eventually to make German the lan-
guage of the Jewish settlement--this, even though the
meetings held in Jerusalem to discuss the establishment of
the school had to be conducted in Hebrew, the only language
common to the participants. The schools sponsored by French
Jewry's Alliance Israelite Universelle emphasized instruction
in French and had succeeded in making French the dominant
language of the educated class by the end of the 1880s.

However, these attempts to foist a European language
on the Jewish settlement caused problems of their own. On
the one hand, each group, jealous of its own identity and
status vis-à-vis the other groups, vied for the dominance
of its own language and was unwilling to give it up in

favor of another; on the other hand, various groups were
unwilling to allow their children to study the Bible in
a language foreign to them and insisted on Hebrew as the
language of biblical instruction.

Among the first to recognize the magnitude of the
problem and simultaneously the unique nature of Hebrew as
the one language which was both common to all groups and
an essential aspect of the national revival was Eliezer
Ben-Yehuda. Although others argued for the revival of
Hebrew as a medium for the expression of national culture
and feeling in literature, Ben-Yehuda recognized that it
had to become the common language of everyday usage as well.

Curiously enough--or, if one will, ironically--Ben-
Yehuda (né Perlman), the "father" of modern Hebrew, began
neither as a Zionist nor a Hebraist. According to his own
account, as early as 1878, while a student in Russia, he
experienced a reaction to the movement for Bulgarian
national revival; he was suddenly and mystically seized by
the obsession of "The Revival of Israel on the Land of the
Forefathers," and by the thought of "Israel in its (own)
Land."[1] Pursuant to this, he decided to go to Paris where
he was exposed to contemporary philosophers of political
nationalism. There he published his first article titled
She'elah Lohatah ('A Burning Question')[2]--later retitled
She'elah Nichbadah ('A Weighty Question')--in the magazine

Hashachar.[3] In the article, he affirmed the viability of
Jewish nationalism even though no truly national language
existed as yet.

It was while he was considering the role of language
in national life that it occurred to Ben-Yehuda that the
establishment of Hebrew as the national language was indeed
as essential to Zionism as the return to the Land of Israel.
He became convinced that Hebrew had to be revived not only
as a literary language but as the vernacular, the language
of common discourse, for Palestinian Jewry.

Ben-Yehuda's exposure to nationalist theorizing in
Paris convinced him that Hebrew as a national language was
the soul of the nation, and an absolute national essential.
As such, it could be restored to life if only the shapers
of the Jewish national renaissance willed that restoration
forcefully enough. There were, he recognized, problems
inherent in educating a whole people to speak what was for
them a new language and in creating a usable modern ver-
nacular on the basis of "language which has ceased to be
spoken hundreds and hundreds of years ago."[4] He reasoned
that a people could, like an individual, learn a new lan-
guage if it was sufficiently motivated and that the Jews,
given such motivation, could become one people. Maybe it
had never previously occurred in history that a language
underwent revival--but he was determined to revive Hebrew

as a spoken language for himself as an individual. Much
to their surprise, he began using Hebrew in conversations
with acquaintances. He insisted on establishing it as his
spoken language and eventually resolved to make his the
first Hebrew-speaking family in modern history. His wife
would be modernity's first Hebrew-speaking mother, and his
children would be the first native Hebrew speakers.

Ben-Yehuda left the Sorbonne because of ill health,
Hebraized his surname, and moved to Palestine. In 1880,
in a Hebrew magazine called Chavatselet he strongly attacked
the use of foreign languages and proposed their replacement
with Hebrew.

Eventually, in 1883, he took on a job as teacher in
an Alliance school in Jerusalem and demonstrated the pos-
sibility of teaching secular subjects in Hebrew. But, again
due to ill health he shortly thereafter had to abandon the
experiment. Even so, his idea was accepted, and the use of
Hebrew as a vernacular for teaching purposes spread. It
will be seen that this one accomplishment was vital for
the eventual acceptance of Hebrew since, in large measure,
it was the children and the teenagers who constantly pressed
for its advancement.

An associate of those days, Yechiel Pines, describes
Ben-Yehuda as one "whose love for his people and his
language reached fanaticism."[5] Both men, it seems, were

involved in the establishment of a secret society called
Techiat Yisrael ('The Revival of Israel') dedicated to the
speaking of Hebrew. What is known for sure is that in
1889 Ben-Yehuda founded a society for the advancement of
Hebrew called Safah Berurah ('Pure Language') and that for
one year he published a quarterly called Mevaseret Tsion
('The Teller of Good Tidings to Zion'). Safah Berurah
was dedicated to fostering not only the Hebrew language but
also, as the name implies, the correct and lucid use of the
language. Primarily it sought to encourage children to
employ the language on a daily basis and to help them
achieve this goal. It was Ben-Yehuda's organization that
was responsible for the establishment of the first group
to be called "The Hebrew Language Committee"--Vaad Halashon.

According to its charter, the Safah Berurah society
was dedicated to "the speaking of the Hebrew Language with-
out making any inference as to peripheral matters";[6] it
also aimed to discourage Jewish inhabitants of Israel from
using other languages. Diaspora languages were viewed as
having a corruptive influence and as reinforcing the ten-
dency of Palestinian Jews to identify only with Jews from
the same diaspora origin and not with the Jewish nation as
a whole. Membership in the Safah Berurah Society would be
granted to those who would support the society financially
as well as those who would work to aid the society accomplish

its ideological and linguistic ends. The society was not meant to consist of an intellectual élite.

It was intended that the society would have a central steering committee and an action committee. These organs were to accomplish the society's goals by 1) hiring women who knew Hebrew to teach other women Hebrew; 2) establishing a committee on literature to publish worthwhile contributions, to search existing literary sources for words to be made known to the population at large, and to create new words when necessary; 3) performing any other service which would aid those who wanted to speak Hebrew. The society realized that its goals would not be reached "in a year or in five years and perhaps not in ten years."[7]

Safah Berurah faced more than the many problems which arose from Palestinian Jewry's linguistic diversity and parochialism. It had also to confront the fact that some Jews considered Hebrew exclusively a Holy tongue, one whose use for secular matters was undesirable and even heretical. Moreover, those who saw it as only "The language of the Holy Writ" tended to insist that its study be limited to males. As a result, according to the editor of the magazine Hatsvi, in 1889 there was not one girl in Jerusalem who knew Hebrew.[8] Indeed, a school opened in 1891 to teach Hebrew to women caused a great deal of conflict and led to Ben-Yehuda's becoming even more the center of

controversy.

Furthermore, the society had a serious problem in financing itself. Evidently, its members were mostly those "who could work for its ends" and not those who could contribute financially. Consequently, the society had to join that ample company of Palestinian Jewish groups which circulated letters in the diaspora, in order to generate financial contributions. Safah Berurah was thus as dependent on diaspora charity as the pietists who vehemently opposed its secularizing aims.

The Vaad Halashon Ha'ivrit was established by the Safah Berurah society in 1890 and seems to have functioned in the role of the literary committee envisioned in the founding charter. Its avowed goal was to make Hebrew "not just the treasure of the cultured--but [the possession] of the [entire] people." Specifically, the Vaad Halashon was created to deal with the following problems. First, the spoken Hebrew of the times often lacked the necessary vocabulary to express terms common to the everyday lives of its users, either because the terms simply did not exist or because even if they did, they were unknown to most users. Secondly, vocabulary deficiencies were especially evident in the paucity of words available to children for use in a course of general studies entirely in Hebrew; these deficiencies were only the more emphasized

by the fact that individual teachers, unqualified for the
task, were in an unorganized, unsystematic fashion
attempting to create words to meet the needs.

At the Vaad's first meeting, its original members--
Eliezer Ben-Yehuda, David Yellin, Haim Hirschenson, and
A.M. Luntz--agreed that the two most urgent needs were the
orderly creation or determination of words and terms
previously either non-existent or not in common usage and
the establishment of a single common pronunciation which,
it was hoped, would be used in all schools and eventually
by all speakers. It was generally agreed that the latter
problem--pronunciation--was likely to be most vexing, but
that there had to be standardization of pronunciation if
Hebrew was ever actually to unify Jews from all over the
world. It must be kept in mind that even today--nearly
a century later--the major dialect groups of Ashkenazic
and Sephardic are each made up of a multiplicity of sub-
dialects and that even the various sub-dialects still, if
less drastically, reflect differences depending on where
they are spoken--e.g., northern Israel versus Jerusalem
versus Jaffa. In Jerusalem itself, a century ago there
were more than half a dozen distinct dialects.

At the time the Sephardic pronunciation was the most
common, and the Vaad attempted to encourage its use by all
elements of the "Jewish Settlement" both in Jerusalem and

in the rest of Palestine. The Vaad at its first meeting
also sought--reportedly with some degree of success--to
fix words for the most essential terms.[9] The Vaad
Halashon, however, had to face a general dissension in
Jerusalem over its legitimacy and even over the legitimacy
of its admittedly self-appointed sponsoring body, Safah
Berurah. Disputes over both the committee's general
operations and its specific decisions led at length to
the closing of the school in which the society and the
Vaad met. Both the society and the Vaad went out of
existence in 1891, approximately a year after their
establishment. When Joseph Ha-Levi, the French orientalist
and Hebraist, gave a speech to the educated Jews of Jeru-
salem the following year, and called for the establishment
of an academy dedicated to the expansion and development
of Hebrew, it was impossible to overcome the existing
divisions of opinion in Jerusalem. The Safah Berurah
Society was never to reappear, but the Vaad Halashon was
destined to be rejuvenated twelve years after its initial
eclipse.

During those twelve years Hebrew continued to
develop as it had previously. There was, to be sure, no
central clearing house for new words, and therefore teachers
and scholars continued to create words which often enough
betrayed scant regard for or knowledge of linguistics or

the rules of Hebrew morphology. Furthermore, many impor-
tant terms still had to be expressed by means of involved
descriptions and circumlocutions, or--which remains
true enough even today--by words borrowed from European
languages. A great many quotations from literary sources
were still being used as a normal part of everyday speech,
while users disagreed as to the correct interpretation of
the quoted material. Finally, the problem of standardizing
the pronunciation of consonants and vowels remained without
solution.

For a period of twelve years after the dissolu-
tion of the Vaad Halashon, there was no central agency
responsible for coordinating and systematizing words
coined in the growth of the Hebrew language, even though
many individuals from all walks of life were actively
involved in the creation of new words. Several magazines
and pamphlets of the period were used as a means of dissem-
inating the vast number of words some of which, while
created only seventy years ago, are now accepted by native
speakers of Israel as being of ancient origin.[10] Among
the publications involved in this work were Hatsevi,[11]
Ha'or,[12] Ha"arets and Mirushalayim.[13]

The need for organization and for the application
of linguistic expertise was felt and consequently at the
organizational meeting of the Agudat Hamorim ('The

Teachers' Union'), which took place at Zichron Yaakov in
the year 1903, it was decided that the Agudat Hamorim
should encourage the creation of a Vaad Shel Balshanim
('Committee of Linguistics'). The proposed Vaad Shel
Balshanim would "deal with the broadening of the spoken
language and with the coining of new words."[14] It was
left to the central committee of the Agudat Hamorim to
bring the proposal to actuality.

However, it was not until the fall of 1904, at the
second meeting of the Agudat Hamorim, held in Gederah,
that it was decided unanimously to establish the Committee
of Linguistics in Jerusalem. The committee was to be
charged with "determining the correct pronunciation and
spelling--and also the coining of new words to [meet]
the requirements of the schools and the curriculum...."[15]
It was also suggested that the committee would publish
dictionaries to supply terminology for occupations and
professions. Finally, anyone who created a new word would
have to clear it with the committee which would serve as
the resource to which teachers could turn if they felt
the need for a word.

The second Teachers' conference decided, further,
that Eliezer Ben-Yehuda, H. Zuta, D. Yellin, A. Mazi,
Y. Meyuhas, A. Sapir and Y. M. Pines should be members
of the central committee of the Agudat Hamorim in Jerusalem.

They had the linguistic expertise considered essential.
Of the seven, some were expert in Hebrew, some in Arabic,
and some in both. This committee came to be the re-
established Vaad Halashon Ha'ivrit. By the following
winter, the Vaad Halashon had been set up and was operating,
as it would continue to do, with only a few interruptions,
until 1953.

At the beginning, the Vaad met once a month.
Its work was, in order of priority: 1) "responding
to questions from specific sources concerning the creation
of new words for various terms; [2] creating new words for
which there was an immediate need and finally [3] deciding
on terms for specific individual professions."[16] From
the beginning the Vaad received letters from all over Pal-
estine containing new words which had been created to meet
existing situations. It was left to the Vaad to approve
or disapprove them, organize them, and publish them.

However, as the Agudat Hamorim had contributed
virtually no money for its support, the Vaad found itself
inundated by the pressing needs of the instant and was
incapable of expanding so as to play an active role in
directing the future shape of the language. It was also
entirely dependent on the financial resources of indi-
vidual members to support the cost of its operations.
Nevertheless, it did occasionally manage to publish and

distribute Hashkafah, a pamphlet which listed the terms
accepted by the Vaad.

In 1906, the Ivriyah ('[Society for] Hebrew') was
established by the Ha-Histadrut Ha-Kelalit Shel Ha-Ovdim
Be-Eretz Israel and authorized to aid the Vaad. An offer
to do so was extended by Y. Cohen, and it seemed that the
financial woes of the Vaad were over.[17] Mr. Cohen
promised support which would allow the Vaad to expand its
operations, to take on new responsibilities, and to hire
a professional secretary. The Vaad was to be enabled
now to bi-weekly meetings. On the basis of this promised
support, Israel Teller agreed to take the position of
secretary at a very low salary. However, the support
promised by the Ivriah never materialized, and the Vaad
was forced to restrict its operations. Nevertheless,
A. M. Luntz was accepted as a new member of the Vaad.

Further, in 1907, aside from its regular activity
of coordinating the coining and publicizing of new words,
the Vaad made its first significant impact on the eventual
character of Hebrew as spoken in Palestine. It did this
by distributing "To the principals of schools and kin-
dergartens in the cities and settlements of the Land of
Israel"[18] a circular in which the question of pronunciation
was discussed. The Vaad stated that "aside from the
great lack of words...there is another great lack that

must be remedied for [the] fulfillment of our desire that
our language live a proper life, a good life, namely the
[lack of correct] pronunciation. Most of the speakers of
Hebrew fail to distinguish between א and ע, ח and כ,
ב and פ and between ט , ת and ת . And thus likewise con-
cerning the pronunciation of the vowels, which is a sig-
nificant impediment to correct spelling...therefore,
the Vaad requests...that there be instituted a special
class in each school for the improvement of the students'
pronunciation...that the class not be theory alone but
practice as well...."[19]

That same year the Vaad also published in Hashkafah
its first list of words for a specific subject--cooking--
along with its usual responsa and lists of words.

However, due to the lack of financial resources
and the lack of any tangible support from the Ivriyah
the scope of the Vaad's activities shrank. While in 1908
it was able to carry on business as usual and even publish
a second list of words (this time taken from classical
literary sources) for a specific subject--arithmetic--
it, nevertheless, became almost totally inactive during the
years 1909 and 1910 due to the fact that some of its
members were absent from Palestine.

During this period--and due to the ongoing demand
for the resources previously offered by the Vaad--the

Vaadah Leharchavat Hasafah ('Committee for the Expansion
of the Language') was founded in Jaffa, theoretically
to augment the Vaad but in actuality as a competitor.
In reaction to this challenge, the Vaad rejuvenated itself
and took on new members--A. M. Liphshitz, Y. Rabin, and
N. H. Torczyner. The appointment of Torczyner (who later
called himself Tur-Sinai) was of singular importance,
for, while at the time he was a resident of Germany and
only occasionally a visitor in Palestine, he was destined
to become the president and guiding spirit of both the
Vaad and its successor, The Hebrew Language Academy.

The first question with which the expanded Vaad
had to deal was the extent of its legitimate authority.
Could the Vaad create new words? Should they create
new words? Seeing themselves, due to their expertise in
linguistics and Semitics, as the guardians of the aesthetic
[aspect of the language] as well as its linguistic correct-
ness and well aware of the fact that if they did not create
new words, the speakers in general would,[20] they decided
unanimously that they did indeed have both the authority
and the moral responsibility to create new words.

Shortly thereafter, in order to streamline the
Vaad's activity, and only after heated debates, the Vaad
accepted for itself a constitution. In that document
the members delineated their task as "1) to adapt the

Hebrew language for use as a spoken language in all aspects
of life, in the home, in the school, in public life, in
trade and commerce, in industry and art, and in knowledge
and the sciences; 2) to preserve the oriental nature of
the language and its special and essential nature with
regard to the pronunciation of the letters, the structure
of the words and the style; to add to it [the language]
the flexibility necessary for it to be able to fully
express man's ideas in our time."[21]

They saw their tasks as "1) the publication for
the community of the words existing in Hebrew literary
sources, form the earliest to the latest, which are
unknown to the majority of the public; 2) the remedy of
deficiencies in the language by the creation of new words;
3) attempting to impress on the language the Semitic
syntax (which gives the language [its] oriental complexion)
[and placing] greater emphasis on the distinction in sound
between the letters of the alphabet; 4) the establishment
by the Vaad of a fixed form of spelling; determining lin-
guistic terminology, clarifying pronunciation and calling
attention to mistakes and errors which appear in speech
and [literary] style."[22]

The Vaad decided on the following criteria for its
work and for the acceptability of new words: "1) All
ancient Hebrew words created over the course of generations.

Note: if there is any doubt concerning the meaning of
one of the words or a disagreement among the [traditional]
commentators, the Vaad will attempt to determine its
meaning on the basis of etymology and scientific evidence
and also on the basis of our personal judgment. However,
if it [the Vaad] is unable to make an acceptable deter-
mination, the Vaad will choose to create a new word rather
than leave room for dispute [as to the meaning of a word] ;
2) [concerning] those Aramaic words for which no Hebrew
equivalent exists, the Vaad will give these words, to the
degree that they are required, a Hebrew form in accordance
with the grammatical structure and form of the word.
If the word is already common, in the language in its
Aramaic form, the Vaad Halashon will leave [unchanged]
the common spoken form but change the written form to
Hebrew, and if necessary change the gender from masculine
to feminine or the reverse. But if the [Aramaic] word is
not yet frequently [used] the Vaad will change the spoken
form as well, according to its Aramaic declension, but
the gender will remain the same as in Aramaic; 3) The
Vaad has no need of non-Semitic words even if they are
found in Hebrew sources unless they either have a Hebrew
form or have entered the lexicon and are in common use."[23]

The Vaad, in order to further remedy linguistic
deficiencies, will create new words according to the rules

of grammar and by analogy to the language, "1) as much
as possible from Hebrew roots from Biblical or talmudic
literature; 2) as second best--from Semitic roots:
Aramaic, Canaanite, Egyptian and especially Arabic;
3) The Vaad has no need for foreign words from the non-
Semitic languages even if they are accepted in all Indo-
European languages and the Vaad will attempt--as much
as possible--to create new words from Hebrew roots for
all terms. 4) For scientific terms for which there are
no expressions in the ancient literature, the Vaad
will coin terms according to the scientific nature of the
terms and not according to the outward meaning of the
expressions used for them in Indo-European languages."[24]

It was also in 1911 that the Vaad published its
first pamphlet for the improvement of spoken Hebrew
Al Tomar, Emor (don't say... [rather] say...). It was
the Vaad's first attempt to deal with common mistakes which
crept into the language through common usage and children's
speech patterns. In fact, problems posed by children's
creation of incorrect forms by analogy with correct forms,
a process which was unchecked by the presence of a larger
well educated public, were the major concerns of the pam-
phlet. Consequently, the pamphlet was distributed gratis
to school children.

The publication of pamphlets such as Al Tomar, Emor

and circulars like the one on pronunciation, to say nothing
of the postal fees involved and the support of the
secretary, were beyond the financial capacity of the mem-
bers of the Vaad. Further, the financial needs of the
Vaad increased along with the scope of its activities.
By 1911 the Vaad felt the need for a full time professional
secretary to prepare materials which were to be brought
up for discussion, to correspond with associate members
(who were, by definition, not residents of Jerusalem),
and to prepare the usual responses. Further, the need for
books of language instruction, dictionaries and word lists
was increasingly felt. Luckily, the Histadrut Ha'ivrit
(The Hebrew Organization) in Berlin was persuaded to
come to the aid of the Vaad and to promise a yearly grant
of 1200 prutot. While the news of this grant must have
encouraged the Vaad, it was actually forced to restrict
its activities further until 1912 when Ben-Yehuda,
through personal discussions with the Histadrut Ha'ivrit
in Berlin, was able to convince them to honor their
commitment. The Society in Berlin stipulated at that
time that the Vaad must 1) send on a monthly basis a
detailed report of its activities; 2) publish quarterly
a pamphlet containing all new words, responses, and an
abridgment of its discussions; and 3) to attempt to
publish short dictionaries for the needs of regular

speech.[25]

In 1912, Achad Ha'am came to Jerusalem and became
interested in the Vaad Halashon. Through his efforts
the competition for resources between the Vaad Halashon
and the Vaadah Leharchavat Hasafah in Jaffa ended and the
Vaad was granted a new mandate by the Agudat Hamorim.
Achad Ha'am, recognizing the need for centralization and
cooperation, used his influence to arrange a special
meeting of the three most immediately concerned groups,
the Agudat Hamorim, the Vaad Halashon, and the Vaadah
Leharchavat Hasafah. It was decided that 1) The Vaad
would be the final arbiter of the acceptability of new
words; 2) The Vaad would classify the words in its lists
according to their source; 3) The Vaad would compile its
primary material by first consulting experts in the various
professions and then by requesting equivalent word lists
from the schools; 4) The Vaad would not be responsible for
publicizing its material or the rationale underlying its
decisions; 5) The intermediary between the Vaad and the
schools would be the leadership of the Agudat Hamorim;
6) The "Language Committee" in Jaffa would be disbanded;
7) the Agudat Hamorim would support the Vaad both physi-
cally and spiritually.[26]

Furthermore, the Vaad received additional support
from the national activist Mr. Zlatepolski, who donated

an additional 1000 prutot for the Vaad's needs during the
spring and summer of 1911-1912 and promised that additional
grants would be forthcoming if the Vaad lived up to its
promises.

Since the Vaad finally had resources and authority
sufficient to the fulfillment of its task,[27] it was able
to increase its productivity and its level of activity.
Beginning in 1912, the Vaad began meeting on a weekly
basis, a steering committee of three was appointed to
take care of regular administrative matters, a full time
secretary was hired, Mr. Israel Eitan was elected to
membership, and a final policy on the admission of new
members was established.

Henceforth members would be elected after nomination
by a sitting member and election by a two-thirds majority;
associate membership would be granted to individuals who,
though abroad, could contribute to the Vaad's work.
Associate membership was also granted on the basis of
a two-thirds vote.

Indeed, one of the Vaad's most productive periods
was during the few remaining years prior to World War I.
Unfortunately, during the war many of the members had to
leave Palestine in order to avoid arrest as foreign
agitators by the Turkish authorities.[28] The Vaad's
activity stopped until the end of the war. However,

after the war, the <u>Vaad</u> picked up where it had left off.
It operated essentially as it had prior to the war and
essentially as, with varying intensity, it would continue
to operate until the establishment of the Academy in 1953.
In this connection it must be recalled that the <u>Vaad</u>
was self-regenerative--it was responsible for the election
of new members. Consequently, its character did not change
significantly even though its membership and leadership
did (see Appendix A for a list of members and officials).

Chapter II

The Vaad's Approach to Language

As we have seen, even before the revival of Hebrew as the Jewish vernacular in the Land of Israel became a certainty as the result of the German-Hebrew "language war" of 1914,[29] the Vaad Halashon was working effectively to transform Hebrew into an adequate instrument of communication in the modern era. However, the Vaad had to face several problems which underlay the whole nature of its work. In the coming chapters, I will deal with each of those problems individually, so that the reader will be able to see how they manifested themselves, how the Vaad attempted to reach solutions, and finally the content of the solutions proposed by the Vaad.

The first underlying problem to be dealt with is the approach to language. Few of the questions faced by the Vaad were simple enough to permit superficial answers. The answers had to be reached on the basis of a thorough knowledge of the language and of linguistics and on the basis of a philosophy of language. Each member had his own concept of what language in general was, of what Hebrew was, of what it should become, and of how to accomplish that end.

The most dramatically opposed philosophies of language were, and are to this day, those of the nor-

24

mativists and of the developmentalists (today referred
to as Structuralists). In brief, the normativists believed
that Hebrew, as spoken in Palestine, should be made to
conform to some predetermined rule or form as prescribed
by one of the classic texts. The developmentalists
believed that all living languages must be free to grow
and develop in whatever way its speakers find convenient.
In over-simplified terms, the normativist would insist
that any grammatical inconsistency between the spoken
language and the paradigmatic texts be erased by the
development of an educational approach which would lead
the modern spoken and written language to agree with the
grammar book. On the other hand, the developmentalists
would say that if a usage at variance with a classic text
has become commonly accepted by all the language's
users, then it is the grammar books and not the usage which
must be changed.

While in the history of the Vaad few of its
members dogmatically held to either the normativist
or the developmentalist position, most did lean towards
one side or the other. Naturally, therefore, the lines
of distinction are not clear-cut, and most of the time
we notice only varying shades of gray. Often the
normativists would disagree on which of the classic texts
ought to be taken as the standard (which often enough

begged the question: if one argued for the Mishnah as the standard because it was a "more advanced" development than the Bible, was he a normativist because he insisted on a classical standard, or was he a developmentalist because he used a later text as his standard?). Just as often they would realize that, pragmatically, it was either possible to fight the multitude or it was better to yield on one point or another in order to preserve as much of the whole as they could. The developmentalists were often in a position where new ground was being broken and where users had not yet made a decision and were incapable of doing so. Often the survival of the language seemed to depend on standardizing a usage, and the Vaad had to set a norm. In such cases the developmentalists had to decide on what basis they would determine a usage. Of course we must ask to what degree the Vaad would have been in its essence a normativist organization even if all its members were pure developmentalists since the Vaad's purpose was to set norms and establish acceptable usage. I believe that the first two major debates reported in Zichronot Vaad Halashon demonstrate the complex interplay of these considerations and are indicative of the nature of this conflict's role in the entire history of the Vaad and even of the later Academy of Hebrew Language.

The first question dealt with in formal debate was whether the correct plural of ogen (אֹגֶן the brim of a hat) was oganim as Israel Eitan[30] suggested, using the Bible as his source, or perhaps ognim as suggested by Ben-Yehuda, who assumed this to be the talmudic pointing. What was really at issue was "by which grammar should we now fix words for our living and spoken language."[31] The question of the correct plural for ogen was used only as a test case. In his opening remarks, Ben-Yehuda introduced the problem as follows: "Must we use only the regular plural of the Bible or can we use the plural of the Mishnah as well... [and] generally does mishnaic grammar have any right to exist in our language?"[32] Ben-Yehuda continued by examining the general conflict between the language of the Mishnah and that of the Bible. His first example was the binyan nitpa'el which some had thought should be purged from the modern language. Referring to Emanual Lev and Graetz, he said: "The time [when it would have been possible] to discard the language of the Mishnah has passed."[33] However, he went further and declared that the mishnaic forms were legitimate because 1) they were not Aramaic in origin (i.e., they were inherently Hebraic and not part of a foreign language); and 2) they were actually the regular popular form in the spoken language during the biblical period.[34]

He argued that the appearance of a form in more
than one language--Hebrew and Aramaic, for example--did
not mean that it had originated in one and had been borrowed
by the second, but rather that perhaps it had developed
simultaneously in both. Further, he argued, it was
doubtful that the borrowing of words affected the grammar
significantly. Then, in order to prove that the language
of the Mishnah was not an artificial literary language
but a spoken language which, therefore, could more
legitimately be allowed to affect the modern spoken lan-
guage, Ben-Yehuda declared that the differences between
the language of the Bible and that of the Mishnah proved
that mishnaic Hebrew had been spoken "because the users
of a dead language do not dare change its form, to depart
from the fixed grammar. Any living language, however,
by virtue of the force of life, breaks the bounds of the
established grammar.... [Therefore] the language of the
Mishnah...is a truly natural language..."[35] and conse-
quently acceptable.

Ben-Yehuda's second point was that, in fact, the
biblical grammar represented a stilted literary language.
He claimed that the mishnaic plural actually hearkened
back to an earlier "proto-semitic form"[36] and was, there-
fore, the more legitimate. Specifically, he said that at
one time there had been two kinds of plurals in Semitic

languages, an "external"[37] plural which entailed a suffixed
ם יִ- and an "internal" plural which entailed only the
changing of vowels within the word. He then said that the
biblical usage added ם יִ- to words which had the "internal"
plural and changed them to agree with words of the
"external" type. However, the popular speech had preserved
the "internal" plural and simply appended ם יִ- without
changing the form of the basic "internal"[38] plural to
which it was appended. He said: "In the language of
popular speech, which is preserved in the Mishnah and
Talmud, the earlier natural plural was preserved for many
more words, perhaps because it [the "natural plural"]
is more representative of the singular form."[39] Of
course, on this basis he argued that, due to its greater
antiquity, the mishnaic form was, if not more legitimate,
at least as legitimate as the biblical form.

Ben-Yehuda's third point was that, since the
expansion of the language necessary for its revival would
necessitate using some roots in more than one way, there
ought to be more than one form of the plural. He pointed
out that if only one form of the masculine plural existed,
then Hebrew speakers had either to use the root in only
one form in the plural, or be stuck with a number of
homonyms in the plural. "Let us take, for example, the
root ס-פ-ר whose essential meaning is the subject of
writing and the like; now the form _sefer_ is fixed ...

[for book] ... and let us suppose that we have no name
for a small collection of pages that we now call machberet.
Now we could have specified for it the form *sofer [סֹפֶר]
--but what sense would it make if we had interchangeable
plurals...."[40]

Finally, he argued that, assuming that the mishnaic
form would be accepted, it should be written defectively
as in the case of botnim (without the vav). However,
he did not see the distinction as essential and stated
his feeling that either spelling would be appropriate.

The next speaker in the debate was Israel Eitan,
who immediately evidenced a clearly normativist inclin-
ation by opposing any variance from the biblical grammar.
"The plural of ogen ought to be oganim because it is normal
for the nouns which are structured according to the
declension of po'el to be pluralized in the form pe'alim,
and when the first letter is a guttural the cholam
of the singular changes into a hataf-kamats. [There are
irregulars] ...but this is the rule of biblical grammar."[41]
He went on: "According to the talmudic grammar, we would
have to have ogen-ognim like ochel-ochlim, but it is not
desirable to follow this path which causes us to confuse
the forms of the plural of the noun and of the present
tense verb; because ochlim would then represent both the
things eaten and the people that eat them."[42]

He stated the normativist position very clearly
when he said: "This language of ours was not born yes-
terday, but a long long time ago, therefore it has the
characteristics of a person [who] ... cannot be changed
without changing his essential character and his special
personality."[43] Eitan then argued that words and roots
would be borrowed from the Talmud in order to enrich the
language (by which he obviously meant only the biblical
language), but that the biblical grammar must remain
unchanged and that: "The grammatical forms of the
language and its declensions were already fixed in the
Bible, and therefore it is not [permissable] to change
them, not even to touch them; but to add to them, to
enrich [them] where there is a lack--is possible."[44]
On this basis he argued that it would be legitimate to
borrow from the Talmud a tense which had no biblical parallel,
but not a form which did have a biblical parallel, and
that individual words already in wide use could be treated
as exceptions to the rule. Further, he stated that, in
general, mishnaic Hebrew was unacceptable because it was
not a spoken language; he disagreed with Ben-Yehuda's
assumption that it ante-dated biblical usage. Generally,
his point was that the revival of Hebrew as a Semitic
language was dependent on all its speakers being educated
to use the biblical grammar because "our classical book

is the Bible,"[45] and "it must always be the rule and measure of our language's usage."[46]

The next speaker, David Yellin,[47] began by identifying himself with the normativist position, but admitted that the grammar of each age had its own character and legitimacy. He felt, however, that because of the special situation of Hebrew as a revived language, the usual rules of a language's development and the legitim-ization of new and variant grammatical forms did not apply. He plainly stated that, given his preference, he would prefer to impose the biblical grammar in every instance, but since that was not possible (because of the development of the language over the years and accepted usages), he felt that non-biblical forms were acceptable when limited to those areas lacking in the biblical language. He opposed any substituting of non-biblical forms for existing biblical forms as Ben-Yehuda had suggested and strongly attacked the latter's theory that the mishnaic forms either ante-dated, or co-existed with, the biblical forms. He also pointed out that there was a more complete tradition for the biblical pronunciation than for the mishnaic. In conclusion, he argued that the addition of new forms where biblical forms already existed would only make the language more complex, confusing, and difficult.

A. Mazic,[48] the next speaker, identified himself
as a developmentalist. While agreeing that in general
it was best to stick to the most common form, he suggested
that, where either two forms were needed to distinguish
between terms (as between the rim of a bowl and the brim
of a hat) or where the regular form was easier to pro-
nounce or in general more convenient, then there was suf-
ficient cause to use the regular form. He argued that
the language of the Mishnah was a pragmatic development
of the language of the Bible. Morphology, he argued,
"is not fixed, the forms slowly change over the course
of generations, this is all the more so in the case of
a living language."[49] "Just as I don't recognize any
fixed, permanent personality for any language, as I
have explained previously, so too I don't believe that
the form of the Hebrew language was forever fixed in
the Bible,"[50] and he went on to claim equal legitimacy
for both the language of the Bible and the language of
the Mishnah. He argued further that the language of the
Mishnah had a special prerogative as a natural progression
from that of the Bible (and as such it could be considered
an improvement). However, he did legitimize the nor-
mativist point of view to some extent when he referred
to the language of the Mishnah as one of "our paragon
texts"[51]--allowing readers to wonder for the moment if

he would have accepted modern developments as legitimate. However, he clarified his position later, and it seems that he would have argued for the legitimacy of any development of a language made by the nation that spoke it.

The last speaker, Y. Meyuchas,[52] felt that the biblical language should be adhered to as much as possible for the purely pragmatic reason that thus there would be fewer forms and regulations and therefore less confusion and fewer errors on the part of users of Hebrew.

The Vaad finally settled on a compromise proposed by Yellin. It reads as follows: "We accept from the talmudic and mishnaic literature words and expressions which we lack and also new grammatical forms which add to what we have in the Bible.

"It is necessary to give a Hebrew form to the words accepted from the Talmud.

"For verbs, there is no necessity for new forms in cases where there are other completely appropriate forms in the Bible.

"Concerning the plural forms of the segolates-- since there are also two dual forms for these nouns in the Bible, and there is also substitution for the second form of the simple plural in the Bible, and per- haps in the Talmud also--it is possible to accept both, but with a noun, which has at its beginning a cholam,

when we wish to use the earlier form [oganim], we must
point the first root letter with a kamats katan or a
kubuts and not with a cholam chaser."[53]

As we can see, this attempt at compromise was
meant to appease the normativists by limiting the adoption
of non-biblical verb forms and by promising that adopted
words would be given a "Hebrew" form. However, the
normativists had to concede the specific case in point
and allow the recognition of two legitimate constructions
for the same form with the provision that when the regular
biblical form was used, it would be spelled as normally
found in the Bible.

In general, this discussion was representative of
many of the future discussions of the Vaad where there
was a clash between the normativists and the develop-
mentalists. The result was that the conflict between the
two groups continued during the entire history of the
Vaad. Further, it is to be noted that from the very
beginning the normativists were content not to argue
over individual new words but to make grammar and mor-
phology the ground of contention. Consequently, neither
the Vaad nor its successor, the Academy of Hebrew Lan-
guage, was ever able to agree on a correct all-including
grammar for Modern Hebrew, and the schools continue to
teach the biblical grammar as though it was identical

to Modern Hebrew grammar and as though there have not
been any generally accepted grammatical developments in
the modern era.

Chapter III

The Expansion of the Lexicon

Of the various tasks delegated to the <u>Vaad</u>, the
one which took up most of its time was the coining of
words to meet circumstances previously not encountered
by the language. Some of the <u>Vaad</u>'s other tasks may also
have been of an ongoing nature, but this was the only
one with which the <u>Vaad</u> had to deal constantly throughout
its entire history.

Dr. Yellin expressed it thus: "Many teachers
created [new words], many authors created [new words],
but the <u>Vaad</u> <u>Halashon</u> was the only institution whose
primary function was the creation of new words, and it
was occupied with it all of its days."[54]

Even so, epithets such as a factory for the
formation of the language, commonly offered the <u>Vaad</u>
by the educated of Jerusalem, and by Hebrew authors,
were not altogether justified. The <u>Vaad</u> certainly coined
many new words, but Ben-Yehuda is quoted as saying:
"During the last two years of our work we have perhaps
created not more than twenty words."[55] Most of the
<u>Vaad</u>'s work did not involve the creation of new words,
but either the revitalization of old words or the systematiz-
ation of technical terms which had been coined or re-
juvenated by others. This was, after all, one of the

37

major responsibilities of the Vaad delineated in the
Vaad's charter (as discussed in Chapter One, see above,
p.12). However, as the Vaad became better organized,
it began to play a more active part in ensuring a sufficient
supply of new or rejuvenated words for its lists.
Indeed, the concept of publishing lists according to
occupational fields in itself guaranteed that the Vaad
would find enough words to make up a list--even if it
had to create them--and thus generated greater activity.
The members kept their standard high and as a result
the best word for a new concept or phenomenon came to
be seen as a rejuvenated word, while the second best was
seen as one whose form was so natural to the language
and whose sound so in conformity with the spoken language
that it seemed to have been around all along. Consequently,
there are numerous modern Hebrew words which were coined
by the Vaad, but which today's native-born speaker would
be certain had originated in the ancient sources. A
good example would be mivreshet (brush).

At first, the Vaad simply passed judgment on the
acceptability of words submitted to it or found words
in response to specific requests and then published all
of them in a Hebrew periodical like Hatsevi. Soon, it
became apparent that this was a very inefficient means of
operation. On the one hand, it meant that many words

would be coming into use before the Vaad had passed on them; on the other hand, it meant that there were many concepts and phenomena which were in need of words, but which would have to do without them. Further, since the procedure depended on local institutions to send the Vaad words, there were many cases where different communities had agreed on different words for the same term. Of course, such a situation tended to create chaos, and consequently the Vaad adopted a system--the publication of word lists covering entire occupations or subjects--which it hoped would provide preventive medicine before even "the pound of cure" became ineffectual. The introduction to the Vaad's list of words in the field of mathematics describes the situation which existed prior to the introduction of the new system: "Mathematical and geometric terms are the most vital in the operation of the schools in the Land [of Israel]; consequently, there was the greatest confusion concerning them. Each and every teacher would create his own words and, for the most part, would translate, to the best of his ability, from whatever living language he had [originally used to] study the discipline of mathematics. In the course of time, the disparity from school to school became more and more obvious."[56]

That is why when, in 1912, the Vaad published its

first list of words designed to meet all the various
requirements of a certain field or occupation, arithmetic
was chosen. The educational process was indeed one of
the most vital areas of concern for the revival of the
language. The second list appeared in 1913--it covered
physical education and was followed that same year by
lists for flowers, foods and cooking utensils, kinder-
garten [instruction], and dress.

Recognizing that its expertise was in linguistics
and not in any of the above mentioned areas, the Vaad
invited outsiders familiar with the area under discussion
to participate in the plenary sessions of the Vaad
dealing with the listing of new or rejuvenated words
for a specific field. So, for example, when the Vaad
set out to compile a list for physical education, it
invited teachers from the Jerusalem Teachers Academy and
"physical education teachers from the Hebrew High School
in Jaffa"[57] to participate. Those invited to participate
with the Vaad during the discussion of specialized fields
would often bring a list of proposed words to serve as
the basis for discussion. Then, after that discussion,
the Vaad was able to consult other experts in the field
and to approve, disapprove, or change any of the proposed
words before publishing the list in its final form.

Again the introduction to the mathematical word list

gives us a good description of the Vaad's mode of opera-
tion. "...the Vaad Halashon dealt with mathematical terms
twice [at two meetings] and after negotiations established
these words that the Vaad worked [out] according to the
established principals of the Vaad. Initially, the Vaad
considered accepting all the words which are already
found in Hebrew literature...and to the degree that the
Vaad found that the old words fit the necessary terms,
the nature of the language and the laws of grammar, it
[the Vaad] chose to leave them unchanged [without]
replacing them with new ones and without creating different
new words...."[58]

It is interesting to note that of the sixty-four
terms needed for the teaching of mathematics contained
in the first list, only ten were new creations of the
Vaad; words from ancient sources formed the vast majority.
However, twenty-seven of the remaining fifty-four words--
exactly half--were words drawn from ancient sources, but
redefined by the Vaad. Examples of Vaad coinages are,
for fractions, words like me'it for one hundredth and
alfit for one thousandth (from me'ah and elef, respectively,
on the analogy of asirit, meaning one tenth, found in
Exodus 16:36). Examples of adaptations from venerable
literary sources are chod for apex or point in geometry
from the same word in Rabbinic literature--where, however,

it means point in the less theoretical sense of the
"point of a needle" (Baba Kama 81a)--and manah for
quotient from the identical biblical word which meant
portion (Leviticus 7:33). Only five out of the remaining
twenty-seven were new words coined by others, while
twenty-two were words taken from the older literature
without any need for adaptation.

This system was the operative basis for the
creation of word lists until the mid-1920's. At the
suggestion of a member of the Vaad or some outside source,
a subject area or occupational category would be chosen.
The Vaad would then invite experts in that field to par-
ticipate in its discussions, and a working list would be
submitted--usually by one of the outside consultants.
The Vaad and the special consultants would examine the
list both for its adequacy and for the acceptability of
the words submitted, and a final list would be agreed on
and published. However, with the growth of the Vaad's
membership, prestige, and work load following World War I,
the system began to break down. What resulted after some
discussion was a system which allowed the work load to
be distributed among committees. The formal details of
this new system were agreed on and published in 1928.
The major points were as follows:

"1) Each sub-committee is [to be] composed of

at least three members of the Vaad and they will invite
the participation with them, as experts, of one or two
professionals from the profession under discussion.

"2) Foreign language word lists and proposals
along with [whatever] existing material [has been approved]
by the Vaad or [is] in its reference library are [to be]
sent by the secretariat [of the Vaad] to each sub-committee.

"3) Word lists already accepted by the sub-committee
are [to be] sent to each member of the Vaad ten days
prior to the local Vaad's meeting (in Jerusalem or in
Tel Aviv).[59]

"4) Matters left undecided by the sub-committee
and objections to the decision by individual members of
the sub-committee are [to be] turned over to the entire
membership of the Vaad for a decision.

"5) Objections of three members [of the Vaad]
oblige the local branch of the Vaad to discuss the word
and to refer it back to the sub-committee.

"6) If there is no agreement between the members
of the local [branch] or between that Vaad and the
professional sub-committee concerning the determination
of any words, [it is] mandatory for the entire Vaad to
discuss the matter.

"7) The plenary Vaad meets in general session
bi-monthly in order to decide about the doubtful words.

"8)   The words accepted by sub-committees are
[to be] published in newspapers as suggestions a month
prior to the Vaad's deciding on them.

"9)   Any doubts and objections must be solved in
one session of the plenary Vaad. If the plenary Vaad
does not accept [i.e., reach] a final decision, the sub-
committee considers the course of the discussions and
decides the matter on its own authority."[60]

The first sub-committee to be formed in Jerusalem
under these rules were on geography, construction, and
household and cooking utensils. In Tel Aviv, sub-
committees were formed on technology and agriculture.
Thereafter, the structure of the mechanism for the coining
and rejuvenation of words did not change significantly
during the life of the Vaad. However, the new words
coined by the Vaad in its earlier days can be classified
as dealing with "more or less simple concepts,"[61] while
those of the later generation dealt with "more elaborate
and specific terms."[62]

The Vaad adopted several techniques for the creation
of words. These techniques can be studied independently
of the protocol of priorities referred to in chapter one.
One technique was to give synonyms found in ancient
sources two distinct meanings. Often this meant that words
common to a particular era--like that of the Bible--

which had synonyms or nearly synonymous parallels in another--say, the rabbinic--period were assigned two distinct meanings so as to double the number of concepts expressed in Hebrew and thereby allow the language to keep abreast of modern developments. In this way the common biblical word boat <u>oniyah</u> came to mean "ship," while <u>sefinah</u>, the word commonly used in rabbinic texts, was applied to "boats" (that is, small craft). The practice might also cut across strict linguistic lines. Thus, for example, the connotation of "sharp" or "spicy" was given to <u>charif</u>, and the connotation "pointed" was applied to <u>chad</u>.

An allied technique was to give two forms of the same word distinct meanings or applications. Thus <u>chad</u>, the Aramaic equivalent to the Hebrew <u>echad</u> (one), is commonly used as a prefix in a construct word as in the case of <u>chad</u> <u>goni</u> (monotonous). Thus also the classical Hebrew of <u>ta'ah</u> (with a <u>tav</u>) now means "to be lost" in a physical or geographic sense, while the Aramaic spelling (with a <u>tet</u>) more commonly refers to the more abstract concept of "err."

Another readily available tool for the expansion of the lexicon of modern Hebrew was the existence of con-structions (declensions and conjugations) which had not been used in classical texts with a specific root. A

root having a meaning in some way related to the required
term could be used in a form in which it had not previously
appeared in order to yield the necessary meaning. A
clear example of this is mekarer (refrigerator), which
was formed by treating the root ק-ר-ר as binyan pi'el
(it is also acceptable to use the same root as a hif'il
form, makrer, for the same meaning--refrigerator). This
technique was very common.

On occasion this technique involved the use of
verbal conjugations other than the basic seven listed
in most grammars. This made it possible to add a new
shade of meaning to a word while allowing the original
form and meaning to remain unchanged. Thus the root
כ-נ-ע , which had been used in the Bible in the general
sense of "to be humble" and which later came to mean to
"overcome," "conquer" or "subdue," was used in the mishnaic
binyan shif'el (shichne'a) to mean "convince." Thus
confusion between the various possible meanings of
le'hachni'a was avoided.

In a similar fashion, roots found in certain of
the basic binyanim in the classical texts could be used
in still another binyan. An example of this is the
use of נ-ת-ח in the nif'al form lehinatach (to be operated
on), which does not appear in the Bible. This practice
was carried over into the creation of verbal nouns--

for example, the pi'el form bikush (economic or consumer's
demand) as distinct from bakashah (request). More commonly,
however, the verbal noun was derived from a verb already
found in a binyan--for example, peruk (dismantling) from
lefarek (to dismantle). Also, an abstract (or indeed
any) noun could be formed from an adjective by the
addition of -ut--as, for example, shlemut (perfection)
was derived from shalem (perfect). Of course this tech-
nique had its roots in earlier periods as evidenced by
the medieval usage of mahut (essence or "whatness")
formed from mah.

Often it was possible to use a related technique
in which a grammatical form which itself had a distinct
meaning was employed. Thus, noun patterns which generally
represented certain kinds of articles or terms, the
mishkalim, could be used. For example, the pattern
pa'al (with a dagesh forte in the second radical) is
representative of professions; hence we find that many
of the words coined for typically modern professions
use this form--for example, tayas (pilot) and tsalam
(photographer). In this way virtually all the mishkalim
were used in conjunction with pre-existing roots to expand
the language greatly. As a result, in the category of
instrumental nouns we have matslemah (camera), and
mishkefet (field glasses) as typical examples.

One very common technique used by the Vaad was
the creation of composite words. In some cases (as in
chad goni, mentioned above), the two words remained
independent or hyphenated, as in mad-or (light-meter),
but were given a specific meaning when used together.
In other cases, the Vaad developed a form like madchom
(thermometer) in which the root מ-ד-ד with the general
meaning "to measure" was added to chom (temperature).
Similarly, the combination of ram (high) and kol (voice)
yielded ramkol (loudspeaker).

As a last resort, or when the international
currency of a word made it desirable, words were borrowed
from other languages and then given a Hebrew form. In
the former case, the Vaad preferred whenever possible to
use words originating in other Semitic languages when
it resorted to this procedure (in fact, Ben-Yehuda had
originally proposed that any Arabic root be considered
as though native to Hebrew). Thus, the word mivreshet
(brush), derived from the Indo-European languages
(brush in English, brosse in French, Bürste in German,
etc.), was more readily accepted because of its use in
Arabic, mibrasha. Where international words are concerned,
the best known example in telefon (where even the sus-
pension of the normal rules of phonology--le'talfen
instead of le'talpen--has been approved in order to

maintain the link with the international word even in
the case of the verb).

Finally, it must be noted that, while this aspect
of the Vaad's work made it the butt of many jokes, its
work in systematizing the expansion of the Hebrew lexicon
was vital for both the revival of Hebrew and the main-
tenance of the language's basic character. When reading
newspapers or other material prior to World War II,
one is immediately struck by the number of foreign words
employed. Had that tendency gone unchecked by the
Vaad's efforts to revitalize or coin words and to pop-
ularize new words by introducing them into the schools
(it will be recalled that the Vaad was an arm of the
Teachers' Union) and publishing them in dictionaries
and word lists, it is probable that today modern Israeli
Hebrew would have a very different form.

Chapter IV

Attempts to Standardize the Orthography

At the second meeting of the Agudat Hamorim
at which it was decided to establish the Vaad, one of
the tasks delegated to the proposed Vaad was to "deter-
mine the correct...spelling" (see above, p. 12). The
Vaad's responsibility in this area was reaffirmed by
formal charter at the 11th Zionist Congress in 1914.[63]
But while this was one of the first problems discussed
by the Vaad, it was also the most difficult to solve.
Indeed no solution was achieved until 1948, even though
much attention had been given the problem over the years.
The Vaad first debated the determination of proper Hebrew
spelling in 1914 along with the problems of pronunciation
and transliteration. At that time the major issue was
the pronunciation of various letters in the Hebrew
alphabet which either had more than one possible pronun-
ciation when unvocalized (for example פ as opposed to כ
or שׁ as opposed to שׂ) or were pronounced the same way
other letters were (for example ס and שׂ or ח and כ).
Consequently, the problem of spelling was considered only
an adjunct to the problem of pronunciation. The stated
goal of several of the Vaad's members was to promote
correct spelling by ensuring that "[for each] specific
letter [there would be only one] specific sound"[64] and

50

the inverse.

The first full debate on the specific matter of spelling was held immediately after the _Vaad_ was reconvened following World War I. That debate dealt with the problem--what rules should govern the spelling of un-vocalized Hebrew? Two general systems existed. One system was referred to as "_plene_ spelling" by which was meant the addition of vowel letters, not normally found in the word when vocalized. The other system was referred to as "defective spelling" by which was meant the absence in unvocalized texts of additional vowel letters. Both systems were in use, and the lack of standardization generated considerable confusion. The debate of 1919-20 serves as an excellent illustration of the nature of the problem and in large measure expresses the major issues which were to plague the _Vaad_ through 1948.

In 1919 Dr. Yellin delivered a lecture to the _Vaad_--which served as the basis of the debate--and in which he introduced the problems and proposed solutions. Yellin began with the premise that "established spelling is one of the essential requirements of a language."[65] However, he recognized the fact that changes in language do occur with the passage of time and that in the realm of spelling these changes can take one of two forms-- either "...the spelling remains as it was [while its

speakers] learn to read words with vowels and consonants
entirely different from what is written; or [they learn]
not to read letters which were previously pronounced
[and which are still] written in words (in English and in
French)," or "after the passage of a long interval the
experts of the language introduced changes in the spelling."[66]
The second form, he noted, led to the problem that "the
earlier spelling is completely abandoned...and books of
a few hundred years ago become only the concern of scholars
and researchers."[67]

Yellin recognized that, since Hebrew had not
always been a spoken language, "not only was there a
great deal of carelessness and improvisation in the
spelling, but in general there were two existing systems
of spelling, and individually neither one of them is
consistent [or definitely fixed]."[68] He saw this as a
major impediment to the continued development of the
language and as a defect liable to cause great problems
in the school system.

He then delineated the options "concerning the
plene spelling which means writing with vowel letters,
wherever required by the rules of the language. It is
generally accepted that it fills the requirements of both
those who demand precision and compliance with the rules
of the language, and of those who desire the reduction,

as far as possible, of reading errors. The essence of
the argument and disagreement is in the matter of
defective spelling, that is, where the rules of the lan-
guage require spelling without [representation of] the
vowel letters ו and י. At this point there are those
who object on the ground of the need to simplify reading
and who [justify their] demand [for] full spelling by
referring to the talmudic spelling."[69] The problem,
Yellin pointed out, was complicated by the fact that, al-
though talmudic spelling had developed because there was
no system of vocalization at the time, it remained in
use after the introduction of vowel points. Out of
concern for the writer and the economics of printing,
the system of pointing was not used even though vocal-
ization was clearer.

Concerning the vowel letters, he argued: "Since
there was essentially never any intention of adding
letters in order to indicate vowels, we therefore do not
have specific letters for each vowel, [and] even if we
were to proliferate the use of vowel letters, we would
still never obtain [the ability] to clarify reading
with a clarity such as that in European languages or with
our vowel points."[70] What then, he asked, was to be gained
by using plene spelling in opposition to the requirements
of grammar? But, on the other hand, "what do we lose by

writing everything full and thereby making it easier,
if only little, to read Hebrew?"[71]

He reasoned that Hebrew had established conjuga-
tions and declensions, certain distinct kinds of syllables
(closed and open--accented and unaccented), different
kinds of vowels (short and long), and doubled letters.
Any system which added vowel letters for the vowels
ִ ֵ ֶ and ָ would destroy the character of the language
and the distinctions between the kinds of syllables.
Few speakers of Hebrew, he admitted, actually distinguished
properly between the various kinds of syllables. He
nevertheless considered the Vaad responsible for the
protection of the language and believed that the introduc-
tion of plene spelling in places where it was not called
for by Hebrew grammar would make it impossible ever to
educate speakers of Hebrew to distinguish properly between
the various kinds of syllables and thus to improve the
quality of their spoken language. He felt that the
proposal to use the full spelling and thus fix the lan-
guage in its incorrect form was tantamount to "banishing
from our script the letters ט, ע, ק, שׂ, and the like
because at the moment a large number of our people
fail to distinguish them from ת, א, כ, ס."[72]

Yellin went on to point out the significance of
the Bible both in the schools and in everyday life. He

concluded that since the text of the Bible--which employs defective spelling--could not be changed, the introduction of full spelling would only cause greater confusion and would lead to the creation of two separate written languages. All this, he argued, would offer very little by way of convenience and would still leave the reader of unpointed texts dependent on his own background in Hebrew.

Ultimately, Yellin proposed, the best possible solution would be to preserve the spelling of the Bible, by which he meant combining an adherence to incomplete spelling where it was called for by the "rules of the language" (see below page 56) and the use of the traditional vocalization in those few words (Yellin estimated there were about five hundred) where special problems existed for the reader. This system, he believed, should be taught in all schools, and all school text books should be pointed in this fashion, so that in the course of time it would become the standard system for all modern Hebrew texts.

However, Yellin recognized that--because of the inconsistency of the biblical text--his system would involve the establishment of "the rules of the language"[73] to which he referred through a process of generalization and comparative linguistics. Before going into detail as to what the rules of the language were, he explained:

"When I say that we must follow the precise spelling,
I do not mean that we must hold unfailingly to the
defective biblical spelling in those many places where
the rules of the language and the appearance of the same
words elsewhere in the Bible would require the spelling to
be plene. Rather we must determine an absolute structure
in this matter...."[74] Of course this left Yellin with
the responsibility of delineating "the rules of the
language."[75] This he proceeded to do in great detail,
basing himself both on inconsistency of biblical text and
comparisons with Arabic spelling to which he turned in
attempting to deal with all the possibilities. Conse-
quently he states: "In this matter it is impossible to
rely on the traditional spelling in the Bible since they
were not at all precise in the preservation of consistency
[in the use] of vav and yod."[76] Therefore, he proposed
that Hebrew orthography be fixed by analogy to Arabic
orthography in which every long vowel is represented by
a vowel letter.

While Yellin's presentation serves here as an
explanation of the problem, it must be recognized that in
general he supported one particular point of view which
was hardly accepted by everyone. Thus, during the debate
which followed, many of his propositions were called into
question. However, Yellin's presentation raised most of

the questions central to the problem of the determination
of a fixed Hebrew spelling. Those problems were expressed
either in his positive assertions or in his rejection of
the assumptions of others (assumptions such as the value
to the reader of plene spelling).

The debate on Yellin's proposal was extensive,
and no decision was reached. While further debate was
planned, various coincidental circumstances and the depth
of the disagreement within the Vaad postponed any further
action--or even discussion--on the matter of spelling until
1927. That year the Vaad sponsored a discussion on the
subject in which representatives of the Teachers' Union
participated. Yellin presented a brief analysis of the
problem which summarized his lecture of 1919 (see above
pages 51-56).

E. M. Lipschütz, the next speaker, also recognized
the existence of two systems, defective and plene.
Lipschütz, however, pointed out that both systems had
existed, in one form or another, throughout the history
of the written language, and that even the biblical text
incorporated both texts in which the incomplete spelling
was used in texts using various systems of full spelling.
He further argued that "[those who used the plene
spelling] intended to assist the reader, but did not
contemplate a general revision of spelling, and therefore

nothing was changed where pointing existed [in a text]
.... Where there is a historic text [Bible and Mishnah,
for example] no decision [we make] will be of any use....
Likewise, the plene spelling is independent of any decision
[we take]."[77] He argued that speakers of Hebrew would
have to go on living with the existence of both systems
and that the Vaad's concern ought to be the determination
of a standard plene spelling system.

The following speaker, Dr. Itzchak Epstein, argued
along the same lines as Dr. Yellin, though he put greater
emphasis on correcting pronunciation as well. However,
he proposed no specific system, but merely argued that one
be established by the Vaad.

During the discussion the following suggestions were
made or opinions voiced: 1) The need for the estab-
lishment of a study commission which would issue a report
which could serve as a basis for discussion, and the need
for a special meeting of the Vaad in order to clarify
and solve the question; 2) the belief that "at this moment
we need [only begin but] not finish the work [of estab-
lishing a complete plene system];"[78] 3) that the problem
of spelling should be resolved on the basis of pragmatic
considerations; 4) that the existence of two different
systems was untenable. Once again the Vaad was unable to
reach a conclusion or to take any decisive action.

In general, the pattern of inconclusive debate continued over the next decade. A few new proposals were made (such as Bialik's proposal in 1930 to have nearly all books, ancient and modern, published with a fully vocalized text since "the technical problems of pointing hardly exist any longer because of the expanded use of type-writers"[79]), new faces participated in the debates, but no agreement could be reached. In 1930, the appointment of a sub-committee to discuss the problem was agreed on, and a committee was appointed, but it never met. Finally, in 1938, the secretariat of the Vaad was able to agree on the appointment of a new sub-committee to make recommendations for the systematization and fixing of Hebrew spelling. The membership of the sub-committee consisted of Yaakov Epstein, D. Z. Baneth, H. Brody, N. H. Torczyner (later Tur-Sinai), David Yellin (who had died by the time the report was issued), and Yosef Klausner, with Ben-Hayyim as secretary. Although a second sub-committee appeared later (because it met in Tel Aviv, it is referred to as the Tel Aviv committee), virtually all movement towards the eventual formulation of an established system of writing originated with this sub-committee.

Both major positions were presented in the form of lectures. Klausner argued for the adoption of plene

writing which he hoped would be improved over the years
so as to be more precise, and Tur-Sinai argued for a
defective spelling system modified to the extent that
some vowel letters would be used in order to prevent
confusion. It is worth noting, however, that while the
Vaad had not yet acted, the trend on the part of the
Palestinian user of the language was towards plene
spelling, as the sub-committee was to recognize in its
operating principles (see below).

The sub-committee accepted the following set
of operating principles:

> "1) Different and varying factors affect the
>   formation of spelling, for example: [factors]
>   historical, grammatical-etymological, peda-
>   gogical, sociological (for example, the holi-
>   ness of part of our literature), and other
>   practical factors.
>
> 2)   The Vaad Halashon must consider all the
>   factors which affect spelling: the spelling
>   on which the Vaad decides must be based on
>   the sources of the language and the grammar
>   [of the language] and [must] also meet the
>   pedagogic and practical needs of the present.
>   Beyond this it must have--and this is vitally
>   essential--a chance of being accepted by

the public.

3)   Therefore, the sub-committee reasons, the
     Vaad Halashon must not establish extreme
     revolutionary changes, for example the
     introduction of alef and ayin as vowel
     letters for specific vowels or new letters
     or symbols to represent vowels. Its ⌈the
     Vaad Halashon's⌉ task is only to regularize
     the spelling actually used by the people
     and to direct it according to the general
     tendency in the development of our language
     and our cultural revival.

4)   It is a fact that two spelling ⌈systems⌉ have
     existed simultaneously for generations: the
     vocalized spelling and the unvocalized.   The
     sub-committee admits this reality and does
     not aspire to change it because each of the
     two spellings has its own sphere of useful-
     ness.   Further, from a pedagogic point of
     view, the difficulty of ⌈having⌉ two spellings
     is not that great, and at any rate it is
     much easier than the unified spelling in English
     or French, for example.

5)   Further, there are at present more or less
     accepted rules for pointing and nothing more

is needed than some specific corrections.
But concerning unpointed writing there are
two contradictory systems, competing one with
the other--the defective and the plene--
which are sometimes intermingled in a single
text.

6) The sub-committee has established that the
tendency of the development of Hebrew spelling
from its inception to our day has been towards
plene. Consequently, we must establish it
as the foundation of our unvocalized spelling,
and instructions in the schools should use
the pointed spelling.

7) It should be noted: the plene spelling does
not contradict the grammar or pronunciation
of the language, because, in the natural
fashion, language is learned through hearing
and not through writing, and in our day that
is also the case in Hebrew.

8) In simply establishing a system of rules, it
is not necessary to solve all questions of
spelling: certainly to begin with it is not
necessary to fix the spelling of each and every
word where it is necessary to consider
various special circumstances, peculiar to

word x or y. For example, ‫ לא-לו, בלה-מילה‬ ,
and the like, the determination of each and
every word in the language can only be
accomplished by the compilation of a dictionary
authorized by the <u>Vaad Halashon</u> whether it be
a general dictionary or one specifically for
spelling such as the grammatical dictionary of
Duden. But the formulation of a given system
of rules will supply the foundation for the
completion of such a dictionary, and so the
sub-committee has decided to create the rules.

9) In establishing the rules, complete consis-
tency in spelling which does not exist in
reality should not be pursued. The striving
for <u>plene</u> spelling is in order to make things
easier for the reader and not to teach
Hebrew to someone who does not know the lan-
guage. Accordingly where the <u>plene</u> spelling
might cause errors, it is desirable to do
without it. The restriction against the
pursuit of consistency does not have to be
manifested as a rejection of systematization
and of the foundation of scientific rules
(it [the impossibility of consistency] only
explains the exceptions from the rules which

were decided on by the sub-committee)."[80]

The task delegated to the sub-committee was not an easy one, and it met with considerable opposition. The stormy history of the attempt to standardize spelling continued when the sub-committee issued its first tentative recommendation to the Vaad in 1940. In fact, the opposition to the recommendation was strong enough to cause the creation of yet another sub-committee, which met in Tel Aviv but expired after a short time. In 1942, the original sub-committee issued its complete recommendations concerning the spelling of unpointed texts; also some alternative formulations were proposed (see note 80). This report was the subject of extensive debate both within and outside of the Vaad. During the next six years the recommendations were the subject of debates, one sponsored by the Vaad, one by the Teachers' Union,[81] and a number of nonmembers were invited to participate. At these debates the discussion was heated, and alternative proposals were offered. In fact, the only definite decision which could be reached was one proposed by Professor Torczyner which consisted of the following two proposals:

"1)   ...both kubuts and shuruk should be written with a vav." (This section was accepted fifteen to four with five abstentions.)

"2)   ...every cholam (plene [originally with a vav]

or defective [originally without a vav])
is to be written with a vav." (This was
accepted fifteen to five with four absten-
tions.)[82]

After this series of debates, the matter was referred
back to a second sub-committee for conciliation. Several
members of the new sub-committee represented the 'oppo-
sitionist' point of view of the defunct Tel Aviv sub-
committee. The members of the new sub-committee con-
sisted of Professor Y. N. Epstein, Professor D. Z.
Baneth, Mr. Asher Barash, Professor N. H. Torczyner, Dr.
Yaakov Kahan, Professor Y. Klausner, Dr. I. A. Rabin,
and Mr. David Shimoni (Shimonovitz), with Dr. Z. Ben-
Hayyim as secretary. (Dr. A. Eisen, the technical
secretary of the Vaad Halashon in Tel Aviv, also particip-
ated in most of the meetings.)[83] Finally, in 1947,
the recommendations of this sub-committee, based primarily
on phonetic considerations and only secondarily on
orthographic considerations, were approved for publication;
they were published in 1948[84] and republished (in
Leshonenu La'am) with minor modifications in 1949, as
follows.[85]

"I.   Any vowel which is normally written plene
when pointed is also written plene when un-
pointed, for example:

;...יבוא, אור, (זָכוֹר=)זְכוֹר;הקוּבה, נאוס, זרה
;...ביצים, איבה, (בֵּית=)בֵּיח=(בֵּית)בית ;זכירה, זירה

> Note: Letters which appear in pointed texts
> remain in unpointed texts even when they
> are not vowel letters, for example: ראז,
> ;... ראזיח,(פְלָאים)פלאי ...; זָכאל, צאן

II. The vowel u (shuruk and kubuts): Every vowel
is represented by for example: חולצה,
חוצפה,סומאה ... .

> Alternate rule: If the printing type does not
> include ו a single vav is used.

III. The vowel o (cholam, kamats katan and
chataf kamats):

A. When o is represented in pointed script
by cholam it is rendered in unpointed
script by ו , for example: גורן, בּוֹקר,
חוֹפש... .

Note 1) Exceptions:

1) The infinitive absolute of roots whose
third radical is ה , for example:
(קָנֹה, -עָשֹׂה) קנה ,עשׂה.

2) The future of binyan kal verbs whose
first radical is alef, for example:
יאבד, תאמר and the like (but in first

). אוֹבֵד, אוֹכֵר   person

3) The words אָה, לְמַאל, רָאֵז, צֹאן לֹא,
איפה, פֹּה.

Note 2) It is also permissable to write
אוֹפִי,עוֹנִי, יוֹפִי, קוֹשִׁי   in the
middle of a sentence even though this
is the pausal form.

B. The rule for the vowel o which in pointing
is represented by a <u>kamats</u> <u>katan</u> or
<u>chataf</u> <u>kamats</u> differs as follows:

1) If the <u>kamats</u> <u>katan</u> or <u>chataf</u> <u>kamats</u>
is present in all forms of the word,
it is not represented by <u>vav</u>, for
example: בְּזָכְרָךְ,לְעָמְרוֹ;...קָרְבַּן,חָכְמָה,אָכְנֵם;
. ...מָחֳרָת,צָהֳרַיִם,סָהֲרָה

2) If the origin of the <u>kamats</u> <u>katan</u>--
in the basic form of the word--is a
defective <u>cholam</u>, it is represented
as in the basic form, for example:
צְרָכַי) ...; צוֹרְכִי (= צְרָכַי) שׁוֹרְשִׁי,גוֹלְמִי
(הֵיכׂלְתְּ=)יְכׂלְתִּי;חוּדְשֵׁיכֶם,צוֹרְכֵיכֶם,
חֳדָשִׁים (= חֳדָשַׁיִם), כּוּתׇנְתִּי,שִׁיבּוּלְתֵּךְ...;
. ... אוֹזְנִיו, אוֹזְנַיִם

Alternate rule: If the printing type
does not have a וֹ a regular <u>vav</u> is

used (see also rule II).

IV.   The vowel i (<u>chirik</u>): Every vowel i which is
not followed by a consonant with a silent
<u>shva</u> is usually indicated by a <u>yod</u>, for
example: ‎דיבור, קידוש‏ ‎יישוב,‏ ‎...; שיטה,חכיטה,‏
‎;...‏‎כסיבה, סיבה, חיטה; אילם, עיור, פיקח ...; שיטי‏
‎זימן; ריבוני, מילון,עיחון‎ ‎...; זיכרון,חינם, עיקר‏
‎זימנו;... ניכר, (נחן), (נחן =) ניהן ,ניכל ;דיבר ,שיבר‏
‎...; (ראייה =)ראייה, נטייה;ניבאו ,לימדו‏

Note A: In opposition to the above rule a
<u>yod</u> is not written: ‎מלוה, שפחה, צמחה‏ ‎...;‏
1)   In the declension of the ‎ע"ע‏ nouns in
which i is not in their basic form,
for example: ‎...; עחים, עזים, צדו, לבי‏
and likewise verbs: ‎מגנה, מסגים, מקלים‏... .
But in the declension of the word
(tooth), for example, ‎שיניים‏   ...the
<u>yod</u> should be written to distinguish
it from the number ‎שניים‏ (two).
2)   In the past tense of the <u>hif'il</u>
weak verbs whose first radical is
<u>nun</u> or <u>yod</u> when they are conjugated,
for example: ‎הציע, הציל, הצלתי‏... .

3) Before וי or יו , for example:
. ...גיורת, קיום, דיון

4) After the prefixed <u>mem</u>, for example:
. ... מכן, בקץ,מביתו

5) In the words:
.(מלה =) מלה,(הנה) הנה,כן, עם, אם

6) In words of the following kind: ענבי
(= ענבי), עקבות (=עקבוח) where the

<u>dagesh</u> is euphonic.

Note B: The above not withstanding a <u>yod</u>
is written in the words like: פיקחים
עיורים (or עיוורים , see rule VI)
....(זכרון =) זיכרון, פיסחים Since
the original form did not have a silent
<u>shva</u>...and no distinction is made between
the singular absolute and the declined
forms, therefore פיקחות ....

V.   The vowel e (<u>tsere</u>, <u>segol</u> and <u>chataf-segol</u>):
A. Usually the vowel e is not indicated by
a <u>yod</u>, for example: ממד, אזור (= מֵמָד) ,
. ... (מֵצַר =)מצר

B. When the equivalent of this vowel in
pointing is <u>tsere</u> it is indicated by a
<u>yod</u> only in the following circumstances:
1) If the <u>tsere</u> substitutes for a <u>chirik</u>

expressed by a <u>yod</u>, preceeding a
guttural letter, it is indicated by
by a <u>yod</u> according to Rule IV. For
example: בירך, פירש;חיאכל, היעצה,
;...צירות,סירוב, גירוצים ...; חיראה
,עירבון ;חירצים, (חרש ~)חירצ, חירות
.חיאבון, דיראון

... . As against this: מארונו, מרצונו
(according to rule IV, note A, 4).

2) If the <u>tsere</u> appears in all forms of
a two-syllable feminine noun, ⌈then⌉
for example: ... . קיבה, לידה, זיעה

Note A: This does not apply in the use
of feminine nouns or adjectives which
are derived from masculine nouns,
for example: עדה, מתה, פנה (אירה כעידה=)
..., and the like, since it is not
desirable to differentiate between
the masculine form (עד, מת, פן,
צד, ער, and the like) and the
feminine form.

Note B: An exception from this rule is
the word צינה (צֵנָה) which is written
unpointed with a <u>yod</u>: צינה , even
though the <u>tsere</u> does not appear in

it, in order to distinguish it from
זֶנָה.

3) Infinitives of verbs whose first
radical is a yod, for example:
לילך, לידע, לישב.

4) In the interrogative pronoun אילו
(אי אלו =).

C. When in pointing this vowel is represented
by segol (according to the established
practice), it is represented ⌈in unpointed
text⌋ by a yod only in the word pattern
היתר, הישג, היקש.

VI. The consonant w (vav):

A. When it is possible to distinguish in
print between ו and ו the consonant v
is indicated by a single vav, for example:
(הֻוְתָק =) הותק ...; וידוי, ועד, וחיק
. ... צו, קו, עליו, ...; בוידוי

B. The combination -av at the end of a word is
expressed in monosyllabic words by one
vav only but in the remaining cases by
a yod and a vav, for example: צו, וו,
סתיו, יחדיו   as opposed to: חו, קו
). סחונית, עכשיו   (yet   עכשיו

Note: The names of the letters ו and ה are

written with a <u>yod</u>:   חי״ו, ו״י׳ו in order
to distinguish between them and the words
וָו (hook), וָה(note). This distinction
must be maintained even if quotation
marks are used in writing the above letters.
Alternate rule: When it is impossible to use
ּ in pointing type for u (rule III) or
י for o (rule IV), two <u>vavs</u> are used to
indicate v, in order to distinguish it
from the ⌈above⌉ mentioned vowels. Two
<u>vavs</u> are used in this case with these
restrictions:

1) At the beginning or end of a word the
    consonant v is indicated by a single
    <u>vav</u>, for example: וחיק, ועד, וידוי... .

2) In the middle of the word it is indicated
    by two <u>vavs</u>, for example: הוותיק,
    עוול... , תוך,בווידוי,בוועד (in
    order to prevent the reading   הועד ,
    עיל and the like).

3) No more than two <u>vavs</u> are ever written
    consecutively, except in words involving
    the conjunctive ו or a vowel letter ו
    next to two <u>vavs</u> ⌈which⌉ are root
    ⌊letters⌋, for example ווֹעד (with the

... ‏(בֵּן‎) ‏כוון‎, ‏(וַיַעַד = וּוַעַד‎) conjunctive
as opposed to this: ‏ווּ‎ (‏וַוּוּ‎ =),
‏וווו‎ (‏וְיַוּוּ‎=). In such cases it is
customary to separate the conjunctive
‏ו‎ from the body of the word with a
hyphen, e.g.,‏ו-ווירהם‎ ... .

VII. The consonant y (yod):

A. At the beginning of a word the consonant
y is represented by a single yod, for
example: ‏ילד‎, ‏ינדוף‎,‏יגון‎   ... .

Note: The term 'at the beginning of a word'
includes in this case also the yod
following the conjunctive vav, the article
‏ה‎,   ‏ב-ל-כ-ב‎ and the relative ‏שׁ‎ , for
example: ‏הילד‎, ‏ויגון‎, ‏ביגון‎... .

B. In the middle or the end of a word it is
indicated by two yods when there is no
vowel letter before or after them, for
example: ‏בניין‎, ‏מניין‎, ‏עניין‎; ‏שהחיינו‎,
‏ציר‎, ‏התירא‎, ‏התייסבות‎; ‏הָיְתָה‎ (=) ‏הייתה‎
‏יָפְיֵךְ‎, (= ‏צַיָר‎) ‏ציר‎ (‏צָיָר‎ =); ‏יופייך‎ (‏יָפְיֵךְ‎)
‏דברייך‎; ...(‏הֶצְיָה‎ =) ‏חצייה‎,(‏יָפְךָ‎) ‏חֶצְיָה‎
(= ‏דְּבָרַיִךְ‎)... .

As against this: ‏אילום‎, ‏איום‎, ‏קיום‎ ...;
‏(רְאִיָה=‏רָאָה‎), ‏ראיה‎ (‏דִיָה‎←), ‏דיה‎ (‏חַיָה‎ =), ‏חיה‎
...; ‏מסוים‎, ‏מצוין‎, ‏מקוים‎ ...; ‏ודאי‎,
‏חצמלאי‎, ‏בנאי‎.

Note A: This rule not withstanding a single

yod is written:

1)   In the singular absolute of the segolate

nouns whose second radical is yod, for

example: ליל, גיס, זיח, גיח;

and also when the suffix ה is added to

them: לילה, הביתה.

2)   In the words: מים, (מֶחֶי =) בתי,אולי

שבים (=שָׁבָיִם).

Note B: The word יָ may be written דיי or

. ...דאי.

C. No more than two yods are ever written

consecutively, for example: ייסד (=יְיַסֵּד),

and not   ייסד ,ייסירן (יְיָשִׁיר–) , and

not   ייסיר.

VIII.The rules of spelling listed here do not

apply to the writing of proper names. These

are often written defectively in places

where the rules call for plene, for example:

כהן, יעקב, אהרן, שלמה, נח, משה,

ירושלים„

Chapter V

The Problems of Correct Pronunciation
and Standardized Transliteration

No study of the accomplishments of the <u>Vaad</u>
<u>Halashon</u> would be complete without some mention of the
decision of 1913 on pronunciation[86] and the rules of
transliteration published in 1942.[87]   Therefore they
will be dealt with in this chapter.

The decision of the <u>Vaad</u> in 1907 to standardize
pronunciation by the introduction of the Sephardi pro-
nunciation (see above, page 14) did not solve all the
problems involved in standardizing a correct pronunciation.
When the Hebrew language had been primarily a written
medium of communication standard pronunciation had not
been important.   However, if the language was to become
a living spoken language it was necessary to standardize
pronunciation.

The Sephardi pronunciation, though by 1913 in common
use, contained certain inherent problems which were most
evident in the existence of more than one letter for an
individual sound (for example, $\check{v}$ and $\circ$) and more than
one sound for an individual letter (for example $\check{v}$ and $\check{v}$
in unpointed texts).   Further, many letters were no longer
pronounced with their original pronunciation and certain
members of the <u>Vaad</u>, wishing to preserve the language's
Semitic nature, felt that it was necessary to correct

75

the pronunciation common at the time. Finally, the
existence of different letters for identical sounds
made it difficult to spell Hebrew correctly since spelling
was not phonetic. This situation was complicated by the
fact that:

> "1) We have no tradition...which tells us how our
> ancestors pronounced each letter.
>
> 2) ...even in ancient times there was no single
> pronunciation...
>
> 3) ...in ancient times the pronunciation changed...
>
> 4) ...we are neither able to return to the
> Ashkneazi pronunciation nor is there a necessity
> [to do so]..."[88]

Dr. Yellin proposed that decisions should be made
not on the basis of "the correct pronunciation but...
[on the basis of] the pronunciation which is right for
us."[89] Furthermore, he believed "that if it is not
possible to make our writing correspond to our speech,
we should make our speech correspond to our writing."[90]
However, each member of the Vaad emphasized his own
special approach to the problem, some were concerned
with aesthetics,[91] others with ease of implementation,[92]
and at least one member desired to see a return to the
original "historic-Semitic" pronunciation of Hebrew.[93]

In the final analysis, they felt, their concern

for practical considerations was significant and that
they had made every possible attempt to arrive at a system
of pronunciation which the speakers of Hebrew were
physically able to pronounce and which would not make the
language too difficult for those who might want to learn
it. The final decision was as follows:

    "ב (without <u>dagesh</u>) = the German <u>w</u>;

    ו = the Arabic <u>waw</u>, the English <u>w</u>, <u>oi</u> in French;

    ח , guttural, like the unpointed <u>cha</u> in Arabic;

    ט , with the full mouth like the Arabic <u>ta</u>;

    ע , guttural as in its pronunciation in Arabic;

    צ = the German <u>z</u>;

    ק = with the full mouth as with the pronunciation
       of <u>qaf</u> in Arabic

    ת , without <u>dagesh</u>...<u>th</u> in English."[94]

After this decision, the <u>Vaad</u> never again formally
took up the question of pronunciation. Clearly,
the decision of the <u>Vaad</u> in 1913 was never successfully
instituted. It seems that, at least in the realm of pronun-
ciation, by 1913 the language had already moved beyond the
control of a steering committee, especially one with the
limited resources available to the <u>Vaad</u> at the time.

Since this decision no attempt has been made
by the <u>Vaad</u> to reconsider the matter of pronunciation.

Finally, we come to the 1942 rules on transliteration

which were not debated at all (at least we have no record
of any debate on these rules). However, we do know that
the rules were the recommendation of the Jerusalem sub-
committee on the determination of spelling (see above,
page 59).

   The committee's report, on this subject, states
that they were only concerned with the transcription of
non-Hebrew words into Hebrew, especially proper names.
However, these rules do not apply to foreign words which
have become part of the lexicon of Hebrew (for example
historiah for history). Their basic approach was as
follows: 1) To transcribe the foreign words phonetically
and not to represent the spelling of the word in the
original language; 2) since the pronunciation of the
transcribed words were unfamiliar to the speakers of
Hebrew, every vowel had to be represented; 3) sounds
which do not appear in Hebrew have to be represented
by equivalent symbols which are not combinations of two
Hebrew letters (for example 'כ for ch and not 'טש);
4) as far as possible not to require symbols which do
not appear in Hebrew while representing the sounds of
the foreign word as closely as possible.

   The rules in summation are as follows:

A. The vowels

I.   Any vowel other than a and au at the beginning of

a word is preceded by an <u>alef</u> ⌐plus the appropriate
vowel letter⌐ .

II.   <u>a</u> at the beginning or in the middle of a word
is represented by an <u>alef</u> (the sub-committee was
undecided on how to represent <u>a</u> at the end of a
word).

III.   A long <u>e</u> is represented by ⁺ and a short <u>e</u> is
represented by ⁺ . A long <u>e</u> also represents <u>oe</u>
in a closed syllable and a short <u>e</u> represents
<u>oe</u> in an open syllable.

IV.   The remaining vowels:

    1) i is indicated by a ּ

    2) o is indicated by a ּ

    3) u is indicated by a ּ

    4) ü, ue are indicated by a 'ּ

    5) au is indicated by ּא

    6) ay is indicated by ּּ

    7) eu is indicated by ּּ

    8) ey is indicated by ּּ

    9) oy is indicated by ּּ

   10) uy is indicated by ּּ

B. <u>The consonants</u>

Transcription from non-Semitic languages

a)   The use of letters each of which indicates two
consonants and ⌐the use of⌐ letters for consonants

that are similar in sound

V.   A w̲ or u̲ sound is represented by a ו prior to o̲c̲ after u̲ or o̲.

VI. A t̲ is represented by a ט , and a th (when pronounced as in the word the) by a ת

VII. The German or Scottish ch is represented by כ

VIII. A q̲ or k̲ is represented by ק

IX. A ב (with the dagesh added even in otherwise unpointed texts) is used for p̲ and a פ for f̲ (the normal rules for the dagesh lene do not apply)

X.   A y̲ is indicated by a single ׳

b)   Consonants which do not appear in Hebrew:

XI. These are usually indicated by an apostrophe

a) ׳ג = g̲ (in George)

b) ׳ד = th (in Sutherländ)

c) ׳ז = the French j̲

d) ׳ש = the English ch (Churchill)

e) ׳ת = th (Smith)

(The sub-committee was undecided on how to represent the consonant x̲.) [95]

Perhaps because of the lack of a general debate leading to the adoption of these rules, they were never adopted. However, in recent times the Vaad's successor,

The Academy of the Hebrew Language, has begun to consider the question anew. [96]

Chapter VI

Conclusion

In conclusion, we must be impressed by the many
accomplishments of the <u>Vaad</u>. This is especially true of
the early period when the language was still archaic
and hardly fit for modern use. The <u>Vaad</u> was able to
standardize pronunciation and the meaning of words and
to introduce large numbers of new or rejuvenated words.
These activities allowed the expansion of the use of
Hebrew in the school system so that in the next generation
there were sufficient monolinguals to ensure the survival
of Hebrew as a spoken vernacular. Further, the <u>Vaad</u>
accomplished all this while split ideologically and with
only the authority of its status as an advisory committee
to the Teachers' Union.

From the beginning, however, it must be noted that
the <u>Vaad</u> was most effective where it met a need felt by
the users of Hebrew and when speakers of Hebrew did not
regard its suggestions as impositions. Thus, the stan-
dardization of the lexicon and the introduction of the
Sefardi pronunciation were very important achievements,
since they were necessary for communication at all levels.

On the other hand, the introduction of changes in
the pronunciation, changes designed to make it more precise
and more reflective as Semitic speech, was not successful.

First, it was impossible for many of the teachers, in
particular those who had come from Europe, to pronounce
some of the sounds. Secondly, communication was possible
without such a change, and the effort involved in altering
one's accent was great enough to discourage most Hebrew
speakers from implementing the Vaad's decision. Further-
more, initially there were only a few speakers of Hebrew
and most of them were to be found in the school system,
which meant that the Vaad could function even with its
limited authority. Later, its lack of authority became
significant. During the 1930's and the 1940's, when the
population of Hebrew speakers was much larger than it
had been in the early period, the Vaad found that it
could no longer effect change through the school system
alone. Consequently, the need was felt for greater auth-
ority and for greater resources as well. Finally, in
1953, after the creation of the State, a new institution
was founded by an act of the Knesset. The new institution,
The Academy of the Hebrew Language, replaced the Vaad
(although many of its members had been members of the Vaad)
and had governmental authority to determine the form of the
language used by all governmental agencies (the army, the
school system, the radio, and eventually the television,
etc.). Undoubtedly this will have a degree of influence
on independent publishers of newspapers and other periodicals.

As a result, the Academy is better able to effect change
in an age when there are more than two and a half million
speakers of Hebrew.

APPENDIX I

List of members of the <u>Vaad</u> <u>Halashon</u> <u>Ha-Ivrit</u>
from 1890 to 1953

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date of Election</u>
Agnon, S. Y.	1926
Ahad Ha'Am	1926
Aharoni, I.	1927
Alon, G.	1944
Aptowitzer, A.	1939
Artom, E. S.	1945
Assaf, S.	1926
Averbach, P.	1931
Avrunin, A.	1926
Barash, A.	1939
Ben-Hayyim, Z.	1934
Ben-Yehuda, E. +	1890*
Ben-Yitzhak, A.	1939
Ben-Zion, S.	1920
Beneth, D. Z.	1939
Bialik, H. N. +	1924
Bialoblocki, S.	1946
Brody, H.	1937

Cassuto, M. D.	1942
Droujanoff, A.	1926
Einhorn, S.	1933
Eitan, I.	1912
Epstein, I.	1920
Epstein, J. N.	1925
Even-Shmuel, J.	1942
Ezrahi, M.	1926
Fajans, A. L.	1946
Fichman, J.	1926
Glickson, M. J.	1926
Goitein, S. D.	1946
Goldberg, S. R.	1942
Grünfeld, Y.	1926
Gur, Y.	1919
Hirschenson, H.	1890*
Irma'i, S.	1947
Kahan, J.	1936
Kaminka, A.	1939
Katzenelson, B.	1942
Klar, B.	1939
Klausner, J. +	1920
Klein, S.	1931
Krauss, S.	1914
Kutscher, E. Y.	1942

Lipschütz, E. M. +	1911
Luntz, A. M.	1890*
Matmon-Cohen, Y.	1926
Mazie, A. M. +	1894
Meir, Y.	1890#
Meyuchas, Y.	1904
Miller, T. Z.	1933
Peretz, Y.	1945
Pines, J. M.	1890*
Porat, E.	1935
Rabin, I. A.	1920
Ravnitzki, J. C.	1930
Remez, D.	1942
Rivlin, J. J.	1929
Saphir, E.	1904
Schirmann, H.	1939
Segal, M. Z.	1926
Shifris, N.	1927
Shimoni, D.	1926
Shlonsky, A.	1946
Slouschz, N.	1920
Smiatizki, A. L.	1926
Sokolow, N.	1933**
Tchernichovski, S.	1923
Torczyner (Tur-Sinai), N. H. +	1911

Vizen, M. A.	1945
Woislawski, Z.	1942
Yalon, H.	1926
Yeivin, S.	1934
Yellin, A.	1936
Yellin, D. +	1890*
Zifroni, A.	1929
Zuta, H. A.	1912

*   member of both the first and second <u>Vaad</u>

\#   member of the first <u>Vaad</u> only

+   president

**   honorary member

APPENDIX II

Word lists drawn up and published by the Vaad Halashon
and their dates of publication

.

Subject	Dates
Advanced mathematic terms	1937-38
Terms for algebra	1932-33
Archaeological terms	1941-42
Botanic terms	1912-13, 1945-46
Carpentry terms	1921, 1928, 1949-49
Terms for chemistry	1928, 1940-41, 1941-42, 1950-51
Terms fr clothing and dress	1912-13, 1935-36
Terms for colors	1934-35
Construction terms	1928, 1948-49
Electrical, telegraphic & telephone	1928-29, 1929-30
Terms to indicate family relationships	1943-44
Foods and cooking utensils	1912-13, 1928-29, 1932-33
Geography terms	1928
Geometry terms	1932-33
Grammatical terms	1935-36
Greetings and courtesies	1928
Terms for heating and cooling appliances	1941-42

Household utensils	1914
Hygienic terms	1950-51
Terms for income tax	1952-53
Kindergarten terms	1912-13.
The lamp and its parts	1912-13
Terms for the lumber industry	1930-31, 1931-32, 1932-33
Terms for mathematics	1912-13
Medical terms	1940-41, 1941-42, 1945-46, 1948-49
Terms for microbiology & serology	1948-49
Miscellaneous words	1914, 1921, 1937-38
Terms for the morphology of plants	1930-31
Names for mushrooms	1948-49
Musical terms	1935-36, 1945-46
Nautical terms	1952-53
Terms for the study of phonetics	1936-37
Terms for physical education	1912-13, 1934-35
Terms for physics	1930-31
Plumbing terms	1928
Psychology terms	1941-42, 1943-44, 1944-45, 1945-46, 1948-49, 1950-51, 1952-53
Terms for the radio	1937-38
Terms for the raising of bees	1943-44
Reptiles and amphibians in the Land of Israel	1937-38

Sailing terms	1940-41, 1941-42
Shoe making terms	1921
Statistical terms	1945-46, 1952-53
Terms for steam boilers	1941-42
Terms for theoretical economics	1943-44
Trigonometry Terms	1932-33
Terms for the typewriter	1950-51
Terms for urban development	1944-45

Note:

All lists prior to 1928 were published in Zichronot
Vaad Halashon, those published following 1928 appeared
in Leshonenu.

NOTES

1.   Eliezer Ben-Yehuda, "   חחיית הדיבור העברי ,"
     in Leket Te'udot Letoldot Vaad Halashon Veha'ak-
     ademiah Lalashon Ha'ivrit, (hereinafter referred
     to as LT), ed. by G. Kresel and R. Sivan. Jeru-
     salem, 1970, p.13. LT is an anthology of source
     material bearing on the Vaad and on the Academy
     of the Hebrew Language.

2.   Ibid.

3.   Ibid.

4.   Ibid., p. 14.

5.   Yechiel M. Pines, " מדבר עברית כל ימיו ," in
     LT, p. 17.

6.   " מכתב-התקנות כל כפה גרורה ," in LT, p. 20.

7.   Ibid., p. 21.

8.   See William Chomsky, Hebrew the Eternal Language.
     Philadelphia, 1957, p.236.

9.   The sources for this period in Zichronot Vaad
     Halashon (hereinafter referred to as ZVH) and
     LT are both scanty and amorphous. This state-
     ment sums up the available material. See Vaad
     Halashon Ha'ivrit, ZVH. Jerusalem, 6 vols.,
     1913-1928, v. I, pp. 3-4. (Note: Volumes I-IV
     list no specific editors. Vol. V ed. by J.
     Klausner. Vol. VI ed. by S. Ben-Zion, D. Yellin,
     and A. Zifroni.)

10. See ZVH, vol. I, p. 4.

11. Originally published in 1884 by E. Ben-Yehuda
     as a weekly, but from 1908 as a daily. After
     1910 the name was changed from Hatsevi to Ha'or.
     Publication ceased in 1915.

12. See above, note 11.

13. Published irregularly in Warsaw during 1892.

14. ZVH, vol. I, p. 4.

15.   Ibid.

16.   Ibid., p. 5.

17.   See Nehama Feinstein-Puhchevski, "דברי עברית
       בחוצות," in LT, p. 24.

18.   ZVH, vol. I, p. 6.

19.   The Vaad seems to have intended something like
       the "scientific pronunciation" used in secular
       biblical scholarship. See N. H. Tur-Sinai, The
       Revival of   the Hebrew Language. Jerusalem,
       1960, p. 13.

20.   A possibility which they saw as leaving the
       language open to debasement and vulgarization.
       See ZVH, vol. I, p. 7.

21.   Ibid.

22.   Ibid., p. 8.

23.   Ibid. p.

24.   Ibid.

25.   Ibid., p. 9.

26.   Ibid., p. 10.

27.   The expenses of the Vaad for the half year Spring
       and Summer 1912 were as follows:

            360 prutot for a temporary secretary
            200 prutot for the purchase of vital books
            120 prutot for printing, postage and writing
                    material
             50 prutot towards the account of past debts
                    to the previous (part time) secretary
             60 prutot for a janitor
             50 prutot for incidentals
            840 prutot
       See ZVH, vol. I, p. 11.

28.   ZVH, vol. IV, p. 1.

29.   The "language war" was the final showdown between
       the school children, many of whom knew only Hebrew,
       and the German financial backers of several of the
       privately supported schools.

30. Israel Eitan: Born in 1885 and originally named
     Samuel I. Feigin, he was elected to the Vaad in
     1912, and thus he was one of the few members
     elected prior to World War I.

31. ZVH, vol. II, p. 16.

32. Ibid.

33. Ibid.

34. See ZVH, vol. II, pp. 15-16. Ben-Yehuda referred
     to and quoted an article by H. Segal, "Mishnaic
     Hebrew and its Relation to Biblical Hebrew and to
     Aramaic," Jewish Quarterly Review, vol. XX, 1908,
     pp. 647-737.

35. ZVH, vol. II, pp. 16-17.

36. Ibid, p. 18.

37. Ibid.

38. Ibid.

39. Ibid.

40. Ibid.

41. Ibid., p. 21.

42. Ibid.

43. Ibid.

44. Ibid.

45. Ibid., p. 24.

46. Ibid.

47. David Yellin was born to a pioneer family in
     Israel in 1864. He was a pupil at the Ets Hayyim
     Yeshiva and at the Lämel School in Jerusalem.
     He later became a teacher at the Lämel School,
     and was a founder and president of the Teachers'
     Union. In 1926 he was appointed Professor of
     Hebrew Poetry at the Hebrew University. Dr. Yellin
     was one of the founders of the Vaad and was co-
     president with E. Ben-Yehuda. Dr. Yellin died in 1941.

48. A. Mazie was born in 1858 in Belorussia and studied at the Yeshiva in Mir. In 1878 he moved to Berlin where he became involved with Jewish nationalism. He studied medicine in Zurich, and, after a year's residency in Paris, he arrived in Israel in 1888. He was a member of both the original Vaad and the Second Vaad.

49. ZVH, vol. II, p. 30.

50. Ibid., p. 31.

51. Ibid., p. 32.

52. Y. Meyuchas: Born in Jerusalem in 1868, in 1888 he became the headmaster of the Ezra Teachers Seminary. He was one of the founders of Sha'arei Zedek Hospital and Motsa and president of the Jewish City Council of Jerusalem from 1920-1931.

53. ZVH, vol. II, p. 37.

54. David Yellin, "מרחיבים - כחרריביט," in LT, pp. 153-154.

55. J. H. Brenner, " ועד הלשון 'מפברק' מלים." in LT, p. 40.

56. ZVH, vol. III, p. 77.

57. Ibid., p. 83.

58. Ibid., p. 77.

59. The Vaad's membership having increased (see Appendix I) sufficiently to allow for two branches.

60. ZVH, vol. VI, p. 62.

61. N. H. Tur-Sinai, Hebrew Language, p. 15.

62. Ibid.

63. See ZVH, vol. IV, p. 77.

64. Ibid., vol. III, p. 5.

65. Ibid., vol. V, p. 54.

66. Ibid.

67. Ibid.

68. Ibid., p. 55.

69. Ibid.

70. Ibid., p. 56.

71. Ibid., p. 57.

72. Ibid.

73. Dr. Yellin used this term throughout his lecture.
     See ZVH, vol. V, pp. 54-64.

74. Ibid., p. 58.

75. See above, note 73.

76. ZVH, vol. V, p. 60.

77. Ibid., vol. VI, pp. 25-26.

78. Ibid., p. 28.

79. " פעולות ועד הלשון ," in Leshonenu, ed. by
     A. Zifroni. Jerusalem, 1931, vol. III, pp. 76-77.
     (Note: Vol. I-V, 1928-1933, ed. by A. Zifroni.
     Vol. 6-18, 1934-1953, ed. by N. H. Tur-Sinai.)

80. Ibid., vol. XI, pp. 232-233.

81. See Ibid., vol. XII, pp. 198-239, and " פעולות
     ועד הלשון ," in Ibid,
82. vol. XIII, pp. 70-94.

82. Ibid., vol. XIII, pp. 93-94.

83. " כללי הכתיב חסר הניקוד ," in Ibid., vol. XVI,
     p. 82.

84. See Ibid., pp. 82-89.

85. " הכללים ." in Leshonenu Laam, ed. by Z. Ben-Hayyim
     and M. Medan. Jerusalem, 1949, no. IX, pp.
     14-23.

86.   See <u>ZVH</u>, vol. III, p. 68.

87.   See "   הצעת כללי הכתיב," in <u>Leshonenu</u>, vol. XI, pp. 237-241.

88.   Introductory speech by Dr. D. Yellin, <u>ZVH</u>, vol. III, p. 50.

89.   <u>Ibid</u>., p. 51.

90.   <u>Ibid</u>., p. 20.

91.   I. Eitan, <u>ibid</u>., pp. 55-59.

92.   A. M. Mazie, <u>ibid</u>., pp. 59-60.

93.   H. A. Zuta, <u>ibid</u>., pp. 60-67.

94.   <u>ZVH</u>, <u>ibid</u>., p. 68.

95.   See "הצעה כללי הכתיב", in <u>Leshonenu</u>, vol. XI, pp. 237-241.

96.   <u>Zichronot Ha-akademiah Lalashon Ha'ivrit</u>, vol. XVII, 1971, Jerusalem. See pp. 25-32, 66-77, 83-94, 97-120.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ben-Hayyim, Z. and Medan, M. Leshonenu La'am, no. IX.
        Jerusalem: Vaad Halashon Ha'ivrit, 1949.

Chomsky, William. Hebrew: The Eternal Language.
        Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of
        America, 1957.

Eisenstadt, Samuel. Sefatenu Ha'ivrit Hachayah. Tel
        Aviv: Tekumah, 1967.

Even-Shoshan, Avraham. Hamilon Hechadash. Jerusalem:
        Kiryath Sefer, 1968.

Kresel, G. and Sivan, R., eds. Leket Te'udot Letoldot
        Vaad Halashon Veha'akademiah Lalashon Ha'ivrit.
        Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1970.

Leshonenu. 18 vols. Jerusalem: Vaad Halashon Ha'ivrit,
        1928-1953. (Vols. I-V edited by A. Zifroni;
        vols. VI-XVIII edited by N. H. Tur-Sinai.)

Rieger, Eliezer. Modern Hebrew. New York: The Phil-
        osophical Library, 1953.

Rosen, Hayyim. Ha'ivrit Shelanu. Tel Aviv: Am Oved,
        1957.

Segal, H. "Mishnaic Hebrew and its Relation to Biblical
        Hebrew and to Aramaic," Jewish Quarterly Review,
        vol. XX. London: MacMillan and Co., 1908,
        pp. 647-737.

Tur-Sinai, N. H. The Revival of the Hebrew Language.
        Jerusalem: R. H. Hacohen Press, 1960.

Weinberg, W. Tikun Haktiv Ha-ivri. Jerusalem: Magnes,
        1972.

Zichronot Vaad Halashon. 6 vols. Jerusalem: Vaad
        Halashon Ha'ivrit, 1913-1928. (Vol. V edited
        by J. Klausner; vol. VI edited by S. Ben-Zion,
        D. Yellin, and A. Zifroni.)