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As is well-known, Abraham Ibn Ezra's Biblical commentaries train his knowledge of astronomy, astrology, philosophy, grammar, and other subjects on the interpretation of the Biblical text. Of all these disciplines, he regards Hebrew grammar as the most important vehicle for the establishment of the meaning of a word or a verse. Therefore, his commentaries are full of grammatical theories, which were further developed in his subsequent grammatical works.

In his commentary on Qohelet, Ibn Ezra makes numerous grammatical remarks. Some are directly connected with the meaning of the text of Qohelet, but others are longer excursuses about grammar unconnected to the meaning of Qohelet.

This article will analyze Ibn Ezra's grammatical theories in his commentary on Qohelet against the backdrop of other works and the theories of earlier grammarians ¹.

PRONUNCIATION OF THE HEBREW CONSONANTS

In his commentary on Qoh 5:1, Ibn Ezra introduces a long discussion on the language of religious poems, especially those by

* My deepest appreciation to Dr. David S. Sperling from HUC-JIR in New York for his help with my English.

Eliezer ha-Qallir. Ibn Ezra criticizes the use of the rhyme in Eliezer ha-Qallir’s poems, mentioning some of the rhymes which he does not agree with, and thus making some remarks about the pronunciation of the Hebrew consonants.

Ibn Ezra rejects the rhyme רד and כנכס which appears in one of Eliezer ha-Qallir’s poems. He says that if the reason for this rhyme is that נ and נ belong to the guttural letters, then «the נ and the י could have rhymed with them» 3. Ibn Ezra also remarks the rhyme ב and ד in a poem by Qallir between קס and קס, claiming that if the rhyme ב and ד is possible, a rhyme with נ and ד would also be possible, because they belong to the same group of consonants 4. And, he adds,

therefore, the [number of possible] rhymes would be five, according to the classification of consonants with regard to their pronunciation.

This classification appeared for the first time in the Sefer Yëśîrâ 4.


5 In his Sefer Sahôt, Ibn Ezra names the group formed by the consonants ב, י, כ and ו with the expression ראמי פאראז[א] (labial letters); cf. C. DEL VALLE (ed.), Sefer Sahôt de Abraham ibn ‘Ezra (Edición crítica y traducción), Salamanca 1977 (henceforth Sahôt) pp. 160-161.

6 The five groups are ירי תוניס וקן הדק רכ ו, cf. Sefer Yëśîrâ 4:3 and W. BACHER, Die Anfange der hebräischen Grammatik, Leipzig 1895, pp. 20-23. About
In addition to that, Ibn Ezra criticizes the rhyme י and י from a different point of view. He says that,

"if the justification for rhyming י and י is that they look alike, then one may also rhyme י and י; and in addition to that, we can find in the Bible [the cases] י (Num 2:14) and י (Num 1:14), י (1 Chr 1:7) and י (Gen 10:4).

In his Sefer Şahôt, he also criticizes this usage of rhyme,

some say that י is like י because they are similar in shape, like י (Num 2:14) and י (Num 1:14), but this is absolutely incorrect."

In this remarks we observe how Ibn Ezra uses irony to ridicule the use of rhyme.

Ibn Ezra also rejects the rhyme between י and י in one of Qallir’s poems, although he says that י and י have the same place of articulation. In fact, Ibn Ezra cites some biblical words in which י is used instead of י, such as י (Gen 44:16), י from י (Josh 9:12), י from י (Josh 9:4), י from י. The rhyme י, י and י in a poem by Qallir is also criticized by Ibn Ezra. He thinks that this is an inappropriate

the grammarians before Ibn Ezra who used the concept of the place of articulation as a criterium to classify the Hebrew consonants, cf. SBF, vol. II, pp. 63-65 note 2.

According to his explanation, these are two different names for the same person; cf. Şahôt, pp. 464-465.

According to the classification of the consonants in the Sefer Yësîrâ 4:3, י and י belong to the group formed by the consonants י, י, י and י, which are pronounced «with the middle of the tongue and with voice». In his Sefer Şahôt (ed. cit., pp. 160-161), Ibn Ezra names this group י י «letters of the tongue».

The emphatic י is used here instead of י, because in these three cases, the roots begin with the sibilant י; cf. W. GESENIUS, Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar. As Edited and Enlarged by the Late E. KAITSCH, Oxford 1910, p. 149. In his Sefer Şahôt (ed. cit., pp. 222-223), Ibn Ezra says that י is used instead of the י of the י, so that י could be clearly pronounced.

It must be noticed that final י was pronounced like final י in Palestinian Hebrew in Eliezer ha-Qallir’s time. For a discussion of this matter, cf. H. YALON, «Zur palästinsichen Aussprache des Schluss -n wie n», MGWI 77 (1933) 429-430.
rhyme, although he admits that there are some cases in the Bible where ב is used instead of ג, such as Job 24:22 and Ezek 4:9. In addition, he remarks that the rhyme is inappropriate, because the radical ג of עליון and ייקך, which come from עלון and הדין. Ibn Ezra then proceeds to define the purpose of rhyme as follows,

the point of rhyme is to be pleasant to our ears, and to make us aware of the identity of the terminal sounds.

As is frequent in Ibn Ezra’s style, he employs irony to ridicule Qallir’s method of rhyming,

perhaps he has a sixth sense so that he can feel that ג sounds like ב, although they do not have the same place of articulation.

Ibn Ezra’s irony continues in his criticism of Qallir’s rhyme by citing the rhyme רעש and רעש, that is, the rhyme of the sibilants וה and v. He affirms that «this is inappropriate, unless the worshipper is an Ephraimite».

These remarks about Qallir’s rhymes indicate that Ibn Ezra was accustomed to the standards of the Spanish rhyme, which were different from those followed by Qallir. They also show that the pronunciation of Hebrew in Spain in Ibn Ezra’s time was different from that of Palestine in Eliezer ha-Qallir’s time, especially the pronunciation of the gutural letters and final ז. On the other hand, they show that Ibn Ezra followed the classification of consonants as appeared in Sefer Yêṣêrâ.

11 According to the Sefer Yêṣêrâ 4:3, ג belongs to the group of those letters pronounced «between the lips with the tip of the tongue», like כ, ג and ב; whereas ב belongs to the group formed by ג, כ, ג, ג and ז.

12 According to the Bible, the Ephraimites pronounced וה like וה (Judg 12:5-6).

13 J. Yahalom, Op. cit., p. 192, and B. Hrushovski, השימור הארכאולוגי של אדם, med. נונר, Hasifrut 2 (1971) 721-741, especially pp. 738-741. B. Hrushovski says that in Ibn Ezra’s time, the rhyme in the Spanish Hebrew poetry was based on the last syllable of the verse, not on the morphology of the word or on the stress. According to him, this rule was different from those in other languages, because of the importance given to the consonant preceding the last vowel.
THE HEBREW CONSONANTS AND THEIR FUNCTIONS

In his comments on Qoh 7:27, Ibn Ezra classifies the Hebrew consonants from a different point of view. There he explains that the consonants are classified into two groups: radical consonants and servile consonants 14. He maintains that the servile consonants can be added to a word, but the radical ones can only be added in the reduplicated words, such as יהודו «dark» (Song 1:6), from ירוש; in this word the radical consonants נ and ר are duplicated 15. In his סֶפֶר בֶּרֶדֶר, Ibn Ezra develops his theories on the reduplication structures of the Hebrew words, and he mentions this word as an example of the reduplication of the second and the third letters of a root 16. The classification of consonants into radical and servile was common to all medieval grammarians from Saadia Gaon onward, and it reflects the importance to distinguish between the letters which constitute the root of a word and those which have a function in the word.

In connection with the servile character of the Hebrew consonants, in his comments on Qoh 4:12, Ibn Ezra affirms that when is added to a noun, it has a paragogic function, such as יְָּהָּדּ «a spring of water» (Ps 114:8) or דנינ «son» (Num 24:3,15), that means

14 In his own words, «the servile consonants are יְָָּדָּה דַּוִּי (= like the shoot of the father of a multitude)». As it was common in medieval grammarians' works, in this mnemonic formula the author's name appears; «the father of a multitude» is Abraham, according to Gen 17:5, «no longer shall your name be Abram, but your name shall be Abraham; for I have made you the ancestor of a multitude of nations». This formula also appears in his Sefer Sahôt (ed. cit., pp. 172-173), and he remarks that it is like his own name. For a study of Ibn Ezra's mnemonic formulae, cf. W. Bächer, Abraham Ibn Ezra als Grammatiker, Budapest 1881 (henceforth Grammatiker), pp. 57-58; «Les signes mnémoniques des lettres radicales et serviles», REJ 16 (1888) 286-288 and SB vol. 1, p. 59*, vol. II, pp. 235-239.

15 He mentions in his Sefer Sahôt that half of the consonants are always radical, and half of them are either radical or servile, cf. Sahôt, pp. 170-173. The radical consonants are יְָָּדָּה דַּוִּי. W. Bächer remarks that the first word of this mnemonic formula refers to the epithet given to the poet, בַּדִּי, and the last one is the name of his homeland, Spain; cf. Grammatiker, p. 57. About this question, see also SB vol. II, pp. 68 and 239, and Sefer Mo'znayim, cf. W. Heidenheim (ed.) סֶפֶר Mo'znayim, p. 3a. See also SB vol. II, p. 240. See also his comments on Lev 13:49 and Song 1:6, cf. H. J. Mathews (ed.), Abraham Ibn Ezra’s Commentary on the Canticles, London 1874, p. 4 (2 of the translation).
that the word has the same meaning without it; but when γ is added to a verb, it is usually considered a pronominal suffix, like in ἔρχεται «he attacks him» (Qoh 4:12). In his comments on Qoh 7:14, he insists on the paragogic function of the γ in words such as לָאוּ (Ps 110:4), שִׁמְךָ (Isa 1:21), נָפָלָה (Lam 1:1) and so on.

With regard to some peculiarities of the Hebrew consonants, it is worth noting Ibn Ezra’s remarks on the assimilation of some of them, because they reflect his tendency to compare Biblical Hebrew words to their equivalents in Aramaic and Rabbinical Hebrew. In his commentary on Qoh 10:1, he refers to the assimilation of the γ in the word ולשת and ישות, both from the root ישות γ9. This assimilation is indicated by the dagesh in the γ. About this matter, Ibn Ezra includes a long commentary on Qoh 9:11 on the assimilation of the γ at the beginning, in the middle or at the end of a word. He gives emphasis to the assimilation of the γ in the imperfect of ישות verbs, as is evident by the dagesh in the second radical in the following forms: יִשָּׁתָה, יִשָּׁתָה, יִשָּׁתָה; but he also remarks that the γ appears in the participle of these verbs: יִשָּׁתָה, יִשָּׁתָה, יִשָּׁתָה. After that, Ibn Ezra mentions the word ישות as an example of the assimilation of the γ in the middle of a word; according to him, the dagesh in the γ reflects the assimilation of the γ of the word ישות, from the root ישות γ8. Ibn Ezra also observes that the γ is missing in ישות and ישות, because they are from ישות and ישות γ2.

---

17 Ibn Janah had already made this remark regarding ישות (Num 24:3,15) in his Sefer ha-Riqmâ; cf. M. Wilensky (ed.), Sefer ha-Riqmâ, pp. 240-241. The theory had already been widely explained by Judah Hayyuj; cf. W. Nutt (ed.), Two Treatises on Verbs Containing Feeble and Double Letters by R. Jehuda Hage, translated into Hebrew from the original Arabic by R. Moseh Gikatilla of Cordoba, to Which is Added the Treatise on Punctuation by the same Author translated by Aben Ezra, London - Berlin 1870 (henceforth Treatises).

18 In his Sefer Sahôt Ibn Ezra also mentions these examples in order to distinguish paragogic γ from γ indicating the suffix for the third person masculine singular, cf. Sahôt, pp. 212-215. About the functions of the γ at the end of a word, see SB, vol. 1, pp. 258, 278-288, vol. 11, pp. 90-91, 95-100.

19 Rigmâ, p. 77.


21 This theory had already been widely explained by Judah Hayyuj; cf. W. Nutt (ed.), Two Treatises on Verbs Containing Feeble and Double Letters by R. Jehuda Hage, translated into Hebrew from the original Arabic by R. Moseh Gikatilla of Cordoba, to Which is Added the Treatise on Punctuation by the same Author translated by Aben Ezra, London - Berlin 1870 (henceforth Treatises).

22 Jonah Ibn Janah had already pointed out that ישות and ישות are from ישות and that the γ is missing in ישות, feminine form of ישות, cf. Sorasim, s.v. ישות.

23 These examples of the assimilation of the γ are also mentioned in his Sefer Sahôt (ed. cit., pp. 240-241). Jonah Ibn Janah had already remarked that the γ of ישות is missing in the word ישות, cf. Sorasim, s.v. ישות.
Ibn Ezra bases his opinion about the lack of ꜱ in the word יָע on Rabbinical Hebrew and Aramaic, because in Rabbinical Hebrew there is יָע, and in Biblical Aramaic יָע (Ezra 4:10,11; 7:12) 24. He also refers to Aramaic to prove that the ꜱ of the word יָע is missing in the word יָע, because in Aramaic it is יָע. The same explanation is made by Ibn Ezra with regard to the word יָה, which is יָה in Aramaic 25. In his Safat Bêrûrâ, he refers to Arabic to prove that the ꜱ is assimilated in the word יָע. In this case, the question of the assimilation of the ꜱ is used by Ibn Ezra to demonstrate that there are grammatical similarities among Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic, and to justify the comparison of the Hebrew language with the other two in order to establish grammatical rules.

The lack of some consonants for reasons of pronunciation is analyzed by Ibn Ezra in several places in this commentary. The lack of the letters י or ס in some words is mentioned by Ibn Ezra in his comments on Qoh 7:27. There, he explains that when the י of the pronoun for the second person masculine singular is added to the ס of the root, the latter is missing, as in יָהֵךך «you may cut» (Deut 20:20) from יָח. It is worth noting that in his commentary on Hos 2:13, Ibn Ezra states that this is due to the difficulty in pronouncing two of the same consonants in one word, and for this reason, one of them is dropped 26. Ibn Ezra also explains that the י of the root יָע is missing in the word יָע (1 Kgs 1:15), because the י of the feminine is added, and the ꜱ has a patah to indicate that it is feminine and make it different from the masculine form יָע (Num 11:28, Josh 1:1) 27. This theory was later developed in his grammatical works 28.

24 M. JASTROW, A Dictionary of the Targum, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature, New York 1967, s. v. יָע; cf. also Ch. J. KASOWSKI, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָע, יָع, יָע.

25 Ibn Janah had already considered יָע from the root יָע, and based his assumption on the equivalent word in Aramaic; cf. Sora'îm, s. v. יָע.


27 The same explanation about this word appears in his Sefer Ṣâḥôt (ed. cit., pp. 182-183). Jonah Ibn Janah had stated that יָע is a feminine form from יָע, but he had remarked that the correct feminine form should be יָע, because in his view, the sign of feminine is lacking in יָע, and besides, the vowel of the third radical has been displaced to the second radical; cf. Sora'îm, s. v. יָע and Riqmâ, p. 385.

28 SB vol. I, pp. 20*, 31*, vol. II, pp. 73, 110-111. See also Ṣâḥôt, pp. 182-183 and Mo'znayim 33a.
With regard to the word תַּעַנָּה, Ibn Ezra says that the τ of תַּעַנָּה is dropped because the n of the feminine is added. According to Ibn Ezra, the reason is that the places of articulation of n and τ are very close to each other. This explanation is also mentioned in his Safâ Bêrûrâ, Sefer Shâhôt and Sefer Mo'znayım.

A concept that was widely extended in medieval commentaries and grammatical works was the concept of interchangeability of consonants. This means that one can establish the meaning of a word by changing a consonant for another one. The medieval exegetes used this method to varying degrees. For example, Menahem ben Saruq and Jehudah Hayyuj applied this method to the consonants τ, n, r and κ, and to v and ψ. Other grammarians such as Saadia Gaon and Dunash ben Labrat used this method more extensively.

Ibn Ezra is very cautious in using this method. In his comments of Qohelet 9:11 and 12:5, he affirms that the only letters to be interchanged are τ, n, r and κ. In this commentary, we observe that he does not admit the interchangeability of v and ψ because he does not agree with those who interpret לְנָעִית 'fool' as לְנָעַית 'intelligent' (Qoh 10:6), and נָעַית 'intelligence' as נָעַית 'foolishness' (Qoh 1:17). However, in his later works Ibn Ezra is not very consistent with this theory, and admits the interchangeability of v and ψ. In his Sefer Mo'znayım, he even admits the interchangeability of n, v and r.

MORPHOLOGY

In several commentaries Ibn Ezra refers to the difference between transitive (or causative) and intransitive verbs. According to him there are verbs intransitive in the qal-conjugation which become transitive or causative in the derivative ones. In his Sefer Shâhôt,

39 In Sefer Yeşîrâ 4:3, it is said that n and τ belong to the group of consonants pronounced «with the middle of the tongue and with voice». In his Sefer Shâhôt (ed. cit., pp. 182-183), Ibn Ezra also mentions the opinion of those who affirm that תַּעַנָּה is not from תַּעַנ 'one' but from תַּעַנ 'brother', but he rejects this opinion.


after saying that the verbs are classified into two groups, Ibn Ezra describes this difference as follows:

the first group is constituted by the intransitive verbs (מָעֵש וְעֶשֶׂ), and this means that the action of the subject does not affect another [part of the sentence], but it remains in itself, like מָעֵש, מָעֵש; and מָעֵש; the second group is constituted by the transitive verb (מָעֵש וְעֶשֶׂ), that is, the action of the subject comes out (מָעֵש) to another and does not remain in itself.32.

He also adds that some verbs intransitive in qal become transitive in the derivative conjugations, like יָעַשׁ, הִפְּסָךְ from יָשָׁן, הִפְּסָךְ from יָשָׁן and הִפְּסָךְ, הִפְּסָךְ from יָשָׁן. This remark stresses the importance of distinguishing the meanings of roots in their different conjugations, and proves that Ibn Ezra is very precise and consistent in practicing this theory. He says that יִשָּׂךְ is intransitive in Qoh 2:9, because it is in qal, and therefore, it means «I became great», but in Qoh 2:4 יִשָּׂךְ has a transitive meaning, because it is in הִפְּסָךְ, and so it means «I made great works» 33.

In his commentary on Qoh 1:8, we observe how Ibn Ezra applies this concept to the interpretation of this verse. Ibn Ezra disagrees with those who interpret the word יָעַשׂ with a transitive meaning, that is, «to cause weariness», because according to him, the verb יָעַשׂ is intransitive in qal, and it is in פֶּלֶךְ where it acts as a transitive verb, as in «do not make the people toil (יִשָּׂךְ) up there» (Josh 7:3). Ibn Ezra explains that in Qoh 1:8 יָעַשׂ means that the things are useless by themselves, because they lack the Divine Will and the necessary strength, therefore «nobody can tell anything about them».34.

Ibn Ezra also insists on the difference between transitive and

34 Ibn Janah had remarked the transitive meaning of יִשָּׂךְ in הִפְּסָךְ as different from that in qal; cf. Sora'im, x.v. יִשָּׂךְ.
35 Ibn Janah considered that in this verse the adjective is used instead of the active participle of the verb, and he said that it should have been יִשָּׂךְ, that is, in פֶּלֶךְ; cf. Riqmâ, p. 32b.
intransitive verbs in his commentary on Qoh 6:2. According to his explanation, the root יסן has an intransitive meaning in qal, ‘be lacking of something’ or ‘be in want of something’, and he specifies that it requires a construct state to inform what kind of things someone is lacking of, as in «am I lacking of (רש) madmen?» (1 Sam 21:16), and «they are not lacking of (רש) all that they desire» (Qoh 6:2) 36. In his explanation of these verses, Ibn Ezra adds the preposition י to the verb יסן, and we deduce that this verb is considered by Ibn Ezra as one of those verbs which need a preposition to introduce a complement. This theory was later developed in his Safa Berura 37. In his comments on Qoh 6:2, Ibn Ezra also affirms that this root has a causative meaning in piel, ‘to cause to be lacking’ or ‘to deprive’, as in «you have made them a little less (ורהשנכם) than the divine beings» (Ps 8:6). As Ibn Ezra explains, this verse means that God made human beings a little less perfect than divine beings; in addition to that, he rejects the opinion of those who interpret הָרְשָׁנָם as a verb with two objects (direct object and indirect object), because, according to this interpretation, the verse would mean «you deprived him of the divine beings» 38.

Ibn Ezra also refers to the difference between יסן and יסק in his commentary on Qoh 10:10. יסק is an hifil form from יסן, and so it has a transitive meaning, ‘to give success to someone’, and this is the meaning in Qoh 10:10, wisdom is more advantageous than all the sufferings, because «it gives success to the human beings», and guides them rightly, preventing his power to weaken. On the other hand, in qal, יסק has an intransitive meaning, ‘to be useful’, as in «the thing is useful (דקדק)» (Esth 8:5).

In connection with the concept of transitiveness of the verbs, it is important to notice that Ibn Ezra considers that every transitive verb has always a direct object, although it is omitted in the sentence. In his explanations, Ibn Ezra provides a direct object when a transitive verb occurs without it. In his commentary on Qoh 2:3, he says that the verb יסן in «my mind guides (יסיעתי) with wisdom» has a transitive meaning and that the implicit direct object is «its affairs», and thus the verse means «my mind guides its affairs with wisdom».

36 The same examples appear in Sahôl, pp. 312-315.
38 With regard to the root יסן, Ibn Janah observed that it can act as a transitive or intransitive verb in qal, but it is always transitive in hifil; cf. Sorasim, s.v. יסן.
The same explanation is made up with regard to הָסַר (Qoh 12:3); it has a transitive meaning and its implicit direct object is הָסַרְתָּן, "the grinding". The verse thus means that the women who grind decrease (נִמְסַרְתָּן) their grinding (רֹסֹרְתָּן) until they stop working. One of the most important exegetical methods in Ibn Ezra's commentaries is the ellipsis, as a means of explaining difficult biblical passages by supplying the words that are missing from the text.

The possibility of a verb of having two objects (direct and indirect objects) is pointed out by Ibn Ezra in his commentary on Qoh 2:21. He says that the word יָנוּקָה is a transitive verb with two objects in this verse, and it means, "he will give his part (direct object) to him (indirect object)", as in "since you have given the land of the Negeb (direct object) to me (indirect object)" (Josh 15:19, Judg 1:15). In his commentary on Qoh 11:6, he clearly remarks that the verb יָנוּקָה does not have two objects in all the Bible, and therefore, יָנוּקָה בַּלֹּ֣ ה means "your hand must not leave the sowing", being יָנוּקָה the predicate of בַּלֹּ֣ ה, and it is in feminine because בַּלֹּ֣ ה is feminine, following the rules of grammatical agreement. יָנוּקָה בַּלֹּ֣ ה can be considered as the second person masculine singular with the meaning "do not let", but in this case in Ibn Ezra's view, two objects would occur, "hand" and "sowing", and the verse would mean "do not let your hands stop the sowing", and according to Ibn Ezra, this is not possible.

The peculiarities of the different verbal conjugations are also discussed by Ibn Ezra in this commentary. He distinguishes between the qal-conjugation and the rest of them, which are called לפי "heavy" conjugations. He refers to the piel as "the heavy conjugation with dagesh" or "the verbal conjugation with dagesh", and to the hif'il as "the heavy added conjugation".

---

39 Ibn Ezra's explanation is different from the traditional interpretation of this verse, "the women who grind cease working because they are few (מִנְסֵרְתָּן)". cf. ARSV, p. 690. For more on transitive verbs without direct object in Ibn Ezra's works, cf. Grammatiker, p. 125.


41 Modern translations of this verse interpret יָנוּקָה as the second person masculine singular from בַּלֹּ֣ ה with the meaning "do not let your hands be idle" or "do not hold back your hand".

In his commentary on Qoh 2:20, Ibn Ezra refers to the punctuation of the «heavy» conjugations; he states that the p'iel-form יִשְׂרָאֵל should have a dagesh in its second radical, because the נ is not one of the guttural letters, and these are the only letters which omit the dagesh in the p'iel conjugation. He also marks the omission of the dagesh in the second radical of the form שִׁילָח (Qoh 7:28), p'iel from שילך.

In some other commentaries, the morphological structures of the verbal conjugations are discussed. In his commentary on Qoh 2:10, Ibn Ezra compares two defective hif'il forms: בְּקָרֵב (Num 11:25), hif'il from לָאָב, is like פָּדַל (Isa 27:5), hif'il from טָמַל, because in these two forms the characteristic כ of the hif'il conjugation is omitted.

In his commentary on Qoh 12:5, he says that when a verbal root begins with ד or ר, a metathesis between ד or ר and the characteristic כ of the hitpa'el occurs in this conjugation, as in בָּקָרֵב (Qoh 12:5), hitpa'el from לָאָב, פָּדַל, פָּדַל (Exod 9:17), hitpa'el from סוּל, and פָּדַל (Isa 59:15), hitpa'el from לָאָב.

In his commentary on Qoh 12:5, Ibn Ezra mentions Judah Hayyuj’s theory that every verb has a tri-consonantal root, and verbs like יָפַל or פָּדַל have a second radical consonant which is כ. This second consonant appears in «[the command of Queen Esther] fixed (שָׁם) these practices of Purim» (Esth 9:32); the word הָרָב and the verbal form הָרָב כָּכֶב prove that the second radical consonant of כב is כ. Ibn Ezra remarks the similarities between the verbs כב and פָּדַל: הָרָב כָּכֶב is like «whether they sit or rise (יָפַל)» (Lam 3:63), because in both cases the כ appears; «you have discerned (הָרָב) my thoughts» (Ps 139:2) is like «you have risen (הָרָב)» (2 Sam 12:21). It must be

43 For a discussion on the punctuation of the p'iel in verbs with guttural letters, cf. Sahôt, pp. 414-415 and SB vol. I, pp. 39*-40*, vol. II, pp. 143-147. This remark was observed by Hayyuj in his comments on the root יָפַל, cf. Treatises, p. 23.
44 Judah Hayyuj had already observed that יָפַל is in the «heavy» conjugation; cf. Treatises, p. 19 (23 of the translation).
45 This was already remarked by Ibn Janah; cf. Riqmá, p. 191.
46 Judah Hayyuj was the first grammarian who demonstrated that the Hebrew root system was actually tri-consonantal, and that there are some verbs with כ or כ as the second root consonant, which sometimes is missing. For more information on this matter, cf. A. SÁENZ-BADILLOS and J. TARGARONA BORRAS, Gramàtics Hebrews de Al-Andalus (siglos x-xii). Filologia y Biblia, Córdoba 1988, pp. 95-108 and D. SIVAN, «Biblical Hebrew Roots and Quiescents According to Judah Hayyuj’s Grammatical Works», *HUCA* 60 (1989) 115-127.
noticed that Ibn Ezra does not reject Hayyuj's explanation in this commentary, but in his Sefer Şahôt, he claims that these verbs are bi-consonantal 47. This question is widely studied in his Şafâ Bërûrâ. In this work, he presents the theories of Judah Hayyuj, Ibn Chiquitilla, and Shemuel ha-Nagid who consider that these roots are triconsonantal. Ibn Ezra rejects all of their arguments and defends that they are bi-consonantal 48.

In his commentary on Qoh 10:4-5, Ibn Ezra points out the similarities between הֵלָה and הָלָה verbs; he asserts that the word קָשֵׁי (Qoh 10:4) is an active participle of the «heavy» conjugation of הָלָה, being ק instead of ה 49, and it means «that who abandons (קָשֵׁי), leaves great sins» and it is referred to the one who leaves power. With regard to the word קָשֵׁי (Qoh 10:5), he says that, although its third radical letter is an ק, it follows the analogy with הָלָה verbs; he also remarks that «a heifer that tramples (קָשֵׁי) [on the grass]» (Jer 50:11) is a similar case 50. In his Şafâ Bërûrâ, he also studies the similarities between הָלָה and הֵלָה verbs 51. The question here involved is that, according to Ibn Ezra’s opinion, the ק and the ה belong to the group of consonants (ה, ק, י, and נ) which can be interchanged.

In his commentary on Qoh 3:18, Ibn Ezra explains that the second radical of duplicated verbs is not dropped in the pi‘el, and therefore, the verbal form נָכֵּל is not from יְלָד, because the pi‘el infinitive of this root with this pronominal suffix should have been נָכֵּל; but Ibn Ezra considers that נָכֵּל is the infinitive form from יְלָד with the pronominal suffix for the third person masculine plural, and its meaning is «from among those He chose». He explains that God chose some people from among all the generations on earth 52. The repetition of the first radical in the word כַּלֵּל (Qoh 10:10) proves that this form is from יְלָד, as Jonah Ibn Janah and Judah Hayyuj had already pointed out 53.

47 Şahôt, pp. 332-346; cf. also Grammatiker, pp. 76-79, 87-95.
49 This had already been noticed by Jonah Ibn Janah; cf. Şorâṣîm, s.v. הָלָה.
52 Ibn Janah considered this word from the root יָלֵד with the meaning ‘to choose’; cf. Şorâṣîm, s.v. יָלֵד.
53 Şorâṣîm, s.v. יְלָד and Treatises, p. 116 (135 of the translation).
On explaining Qoh 7:16, Ibn Ezra mentions the different interpretations of the verbal form אֶתְנָשָׁם. According to him, it is a nifal form from מָנָשָׁם, and the dages in the would indicate the assimilation of the נ of the nifal conjugation. In addition to this explanation, he rejects the opinion of those who consider this word as an hitpa'el form and the dages in the would indicate the assimilation of the נ of the hitpa'el. In Ibn Ezra's view, the hitpa'el form from מָנָשָׁם should be אֶתְנָשָׁם.

Ibn Ezra also makes in this commentary some explanations on the structure of the Hebrew words, making connections between those having the same structure. In his commentary on Qoh 1:3, he explains that נָקַר has the same structure as נָקַר. He sometimes remarks that when two words have the same structure, they are derived from the same type of verbs; this is the case of רָשָׁה and קָנָה (Qoh 1:14), which have the same structure as רָשָׁה and קָנָה, because they are derived from רָשָׁה verbs.

In his explanation on Qoh 7:26, he affirms that the structure of מָנָשָׁם is the same as that of מָנָשָׁם, because both are derived from רָשָׁה verbs using ר instead of ר. He also states that מָנָשָׁם (Qoh 3:19) has the same structure as מָנָשָׁם, because both are derived from רָשָׁה verbs using ר instead of ר.

In his commentary on Qoh 9:12, Ibn Ezra lays a great stress on words having a pe'el-participle structure without preformative נ (except in the case of מָטָר), but they are actually qal-passive participles; i.e., they have a pe'elim structure, but they are pe'elim. Ibn Ezra mentions the different opinions about this matter of the grammarians who preceded him, and his comments can be considered a compendium of earlier opinions on this matter. Judah Hayyuj said that the words are the following four: «and the bush was not consumed (שֶׁמֶד)» (Exod 3:2), «if you see me as I am being taken (שה) from you» (2 Kgs 2:10), «lame (שֶׁמֶד)» foot» (Prov 25:19), and «snared (שֶׁמֶד) at a time of calamity» (Qoh 9:12). Hayyuj consi-

54 Judah Hayyuj claimed that מָנָשָׁם was an hitpa'el form from מָנָשָׁם, and it should be מָנָשָׁם, cf. Treatises, pp. 118-119 (138 of the translation). For a discussion of the duplicated verbs by Hayyuj, see pp. 102-105 (119-121 of the translation). About Ibn Ezra's theories on the duplicated verbs and their morphological structures, see SB vol. I, pp. 58*-66*, vol. II, pp. 231-262.

55 מָטָר is from מָטָר and מָטָר are derived from מָטָר, and מָטָר are derived from מָטָר; cf. Treatises, pp. 73, 94-95, and Soro又是, סֵם and מָטָר, סֵם וּבָטָר, סֵם and מָטָר, סֵם וּבָטָר.

56 מָטָר is from מָטָר and מָטָר is from מָטָר; cf. Treatises, pp. 31-32.
dered that לֹא and יָדוֹ should actually be לֹא and יָדוֹ according to their meaning; with regard to לֹא, Hayyuj said that it should be לֹא, as in Jer 5:26. Jonah Ibn Janah added a new case, «the boy who will be born (ילדו)» (Judg 13:8), which should actually be ילדו, as in 1 Kgs 3:26. Shemuel ha-Nagid rejected these interpretations, because according to him, the לֹא of ילדו is in place of the relative pronoun יָדוֹ, as in לֹא יִדְרָכָה «that was renowned» (Ezek 26:17). According to Moshe ha-Kohen Ibn Chiquitilla, as quoted by Ibn Ezra, these cases are only four. Ibn Chiquitilla includes ילדו (Judg 13:8) in his list, but יְדוֹת (Prov 25:19) is not included; the reason for this exclusion is that יְדוֹת belongs to the group of intransitive verbs, whereas יֵדַע and יָדוֹק, and ילדו belong to the group of the transitive ones. Regarding to יְדוֹת, Moshe ha-Kohen Ibn Chiquitilla claimed that the יְדוֹת was instead of יֵדַע, and therefore it should have been יְדוֹת. Ibn Ezra simply cites these opinions, but he does not give his own; he only says that לֹא is an adjective. This theory is also mentioned in his SAFÁ BÉRÚRÁ, SEFER ŞAHÔT, and MO'ZNAYÎM.

The structure of the segolate nouns is discussed by Ibn Ezra in this commentary. On commenting Qoh 1:2, he explained the changes of vocalization in the segolate nouns when used in the construct state. He says that the word לֹא does not belong to the same group as יָדוֹ, because לֹא changes its vocalization in the construct state, לֹא, but יָדוֹ does not change. He also adds some examples of nouns belonging to the group of יָדוֹ but changing their vocalization in the construct state: «the chamber of (ךָךַר) your bed» (Exod 7:28,

58 Treatises, p. 17 (19-20 of the translation).
59 J. and H. DERENBOURG, Opuscules et Traités d’Abou ’l-Walid Merwan ibn Djana (Rabbi Jonah) de Cordoba, Amsterdam 1969, pp. 15-17. For Shemuel ha-Nagid’s opinions, ibid. pp. XL-XLI. Ibn Ezra criticizes Shemuel ha-Nagid’s interpretation, because the ל of יְדוֹת cannot be considered as being instead of the relative יָדוֹ, since there is no other similar case in all the Bible; cf. L. LEVY, Reconstruction des Commentars Ibn Ezras zu den ersten Propheten, Berlin 1903, (henceforth Reconstruction), p. 11.
60 As is quoted in Ibn Ezra’s SEFER ŞAHÔT, Moshe ha-Kohen Ibn Chiquitilla was of the opinion that it is possible to know if a verbal form is qal or pu‘al according to its transitiveness, because in qal the verb is transitive, but it becomes intransitive in pu‘al; therefore, the four cases mentioned above should have a qal-passive participle structure, because they have a transitive meaning; cf. ŞAHÔT, pp. 450-451; cf. also Grammatiker, pp. 99, 106.
In his commentary on Qoh 2:17, Ibn Ezra writes about the words with a plural structure and a singular meaning, such as מַעֲשֶׂה, נֵיָּס, and בַּעַל. He remarks the importance of considering מַעֲשֶׂה as a singular noun and not as a plural adjective in Qoh 2:17. According to this assumption, the verse means «I hated life», but not «I hated living beings». On commenting Qoh 6:8 and Qoh 10:19, he also insists on the possibility of considering מַעֲשֶׂה either as a plural adjective or as a singular noun. 63

In his explanation of Qoh 10:1, Ibn Ezra states that it is possible to distinguish if a word is an adjective or a noun according to its vocalization; he explains that מַעֲשֶׂה ‘precious’ is an adjective in Qoh 10:1, but מַעֲשֶׂה ‘preciousness’ is a noun either in absolute or construct state, and both are different from מַעֲשֶׂה that is the adjective in the construct state. Ibn Ezra cites some verses as example: «and their eyes see every preciousness (מַעֲשֶׂה)» (Job 28:10), a noun in absolute state, «and the splendor of (מַעֲשֶׂה) his pompous majesty» (Esth 1:4), a noun in construct state, and «one who is cool in spirit (מַעֲשֶׂה) has understanding» (Prov 17:27), an adjective in construct state. 64

The lack of grammatical agreement between the different parts of the speech is indicated by Ibn Ezra in several commentaries. In his long digression of Eliezer ha-Qallir’s piyyûûm on Qoh 5:1, he says that in one of Qallir’s poems, מַעֲשֶׂה is used in masculine with an adjective in feminine, מַעֲשֶׂה. He criticizes this use and says that מַעֲשֶׂה should have been used instead. In his commentary on Qoh 11:2, he insists on the lack of agreement between the subject מַעֲשֶׂה in feminine and the predicate מַעֲשֶׂה in masculine; he does not say what form should have been used instead, but he simply mentions a similar case, «if a young woman (מַעֲשֶׂה) is (מַעֲשֶׂה) engaged»

63 In his 5afâ Bêrûd, Ibn Ezra studies the grammatical structures of the segolate nouns, and he mentions the same examples; cf. 5û vol. i, pp. 68*-69*, vol. ii, pp. 266-268. In his Sefer 5âhôt (ed. cit., pp. 282-285), he also distinguishes between the group of מַעֲשֶׂה and the group of מַעֲשֶׂה. See also Mo'znayim 29a. This question had already been discussed by Ibn Janah; cf. Riqmâ, p. 225; cf. also Grammatiker, p. 81.
64 This is also discussed in his 5âhôt, pp. 272-273; cf. also Grammatiker, p. 84.
65 Jonah Ibn Janah had already pointed out the difference between מַעֲשֶׂה in absolute state and מַעֲשֶׂה in construct state; cf. Riqmâ, pp. 139-140.
In Qoh 10:12 the lack of agreement between the subject and the predicate is stated by Ibn Ezra: "the lips of the fool" in plural and "consumes him" in singular, as in "dead flies (יָנָה יָנָה, pl.) spoils (שְׁאָל, sing.)" (Qoh 10:1), and "the sun [and] the moon (pl.) stands still (יָצֶה, sing.)" (Hab 3:11). In his commentaries to these two latter verses, Ibn Ezra explains that the plural subjects actually means "each one of them", and therefore, it requires a singular predicate.

According to his commentary on Qoh 11:5, we must assume that Ibn Ezra considered that the agreement between an adjective and a noun must be indicated by number, gender and definite article. He affirms that in יַעֲרֵה (Qoh 11:5), יַעֲרֵה is a noun, and it means "the full woman", i.e., "the pregnant woman", because if it were an adjective of יַעֲרֵה "in a womb", the latter should have been יַעֲרֵה, i.e., with the definite article indicated by the patah, because יַעֲרֵה has the definite article.

The vocalization of the prefixed functioning either as the definite article or as the interrogative particle is remarked by Ibn Ezra in his commentary on Qoh 2:19 and on Qoh 3:21. According to his explanations, this is a question of great importance for the meaning of the verses. On commenting Qoh 2:19, he says that,

the interrogative particle prefixed is always with hatef-patah, but if it stands before שֵׁמֶר mobile, it is with patah.

The same rule appears in his Sefer Ṣahôţ. He also affirms that the interrogative particle prefixed takes patah if it stands before כ, ד, ה or ג, but in most cases it takes qames; in his commentary on Qoh 3:21, he says that the prefixed functioning as the definite article takes qames before the guttural letters and the ה, but it sometimes takes

---

65 Grammatiker, p. 85. In his explanation of Gen 1:14, Ibn Ezra points out that there is a tendency toward uniformity when a word is employed frequently, and so יַעְדָּה or abbreviated יַעד, is more frequent than יַעָד as would be expected; cf. H. N. Strickman - A. M. Silver (trans.), Commentary on the Pentateuch. Genesis (Bereshit), New York 1988, p. 38, note 106.

66 Grammatiker, p. 134.

67 Although he does not mention the case of Qoh 3:21, Ibn Ezra deals with this subject in his SB vol. I pp. 85*-86*, vol. II pp. 325-330, and Ṣahôţ, pp. 186 ff.

68 Ṣahôţ, pp. 186-187.
In the case of פָּתָח, Ibn Ezra says that the נ with סגֹל could either be the definite article or the interrogative particle, and although it should have taken qames, it takes segol,

because the word could not have been pronounced properly, since the נ is followed by two qamesim.

In his commentary on Qoh 3:21, Ibn Ezra lays great stress on explaining that the first נ of העש is the definite article, not the interrogative particle, because it stands before a guttural letter and takes qames; the נ of עיניו is also the definite article, because the following נ has a dagesh, as is usual in the case of the article. Had it been the interrogative particle, Ibn Ezra says, the נ should have taken חתף-патח and the ו should not have taken דגש. According to Ibn Ezra’s explanation, the verse means «who knows that the human spirit is the one who goes upward (העש) and the spirit of animals is the one that goes downward (עיניו) to earth?» Ibn Ezra adds that very few people know the difference between these two kinds of spirits. Had the נ of העש and עיניו been the interrogative particle, it would have cast doubt on the statement that the human spirit goes toward God, whereas the spirit of animals goes downward to earth; in this case, the verse would mean, «who knows whether the human spirit goes upward and the spirit of animals goes downward to earth?». Ibn Ezra’s remark is of great importance, because one of his most remarkable philosophical ideas is here involved; that is, that the spirit of human beings goes up toward God when the bodies die. He finds in this verse a grammatical basis for this theory, and his comments on this prove that his interest of being consistent and precise in his grammatical observations is more than a mere interest in Grammar, it is a way of basing Philosophy on Grammar.

Some remarks concerning the use of the comparative and the superlative are found in his commentary on Qoh 1:2. There, he explains that,

---

69 Also סה"ד, pp. 188-189.

70 According to Ibn Ezra, the נ of עון is the interrogative particle in Qoh 2:19, «who knows whether they will be wise (עון) or foolish?», but the definite article in Qoh 2:14, «the wise (עון) has his eyes in his head». 
a noun in the construct state followed by the plural of the same noun is used to indicate the superlative [in Hebrew].

וִאֵןִיָּכְלֵים (literally «vanity of vanities») means «the most important vanity». He also adds some examples of this construction: מָלֵא יָאֵם (Ezek 26:7) «king of kings», i.e., «the most important king», and מַלֵּא הָעָדִים (Gen 9:25) «servant of servants», i.e., «the lowest servant». In his commentary on Qoh 1:2, he also states that מ is used to indicate a comparison and is used instead of רֹזֵן «more», as in «more than all (בְּכֹל) who had been before me in Jerusalem» (Qoh 2:7), and «I have more understanding than all (בְּכֹל) my teachers» (Ps 119:99). In his commentary on Qoh 3:18, Ibn Ezra refers to the use of מ to indicate a comparison and says that sometimes it is omitted in comparisons, as in «they are animals» (Qoh 3:18), which means «human beings are like animals (כנדנים)». This very explanation appears in his commentary on Qoh 5:1 regarding to the verses «for the Lord your God is a devouring fire» (Deut 4:24), which means «He is like a devouring fire», and «for the Lord God is a sun and a shield» (Ps 84:12), which means «He is like a sun and a shield». Ibn Ezra insist very much in this point, because he wants to emphasize that one cannot use the epithets «sun», «shield» or «fire» to refer to God in the liturgical poems; one must use the name «God» or «the Lord» instead.

In his explanation of Qoh 9:2, he affirms that this comparative מ sometimes appears in both parts of the comparison, as in רֹזֵן אתֵּם and it means «as are the good, so are the sinners, and vice versa»; he also mentions some examples in which this construction occurs: «as with the slave, so with his master (מַלֵּא קָנִין)» (Isa 24:2); according to Ibn Ezra’s explanation, it means that the slave is like his master and vice versa, i.e., Scripture emphasizes that there is no difference between them. He adds more examples: «I am as you are (כֹּסֵם כָּמוֹם); my people are like your people (כֹּסֵם כָּמוֹם)» (1 Kgs 22:4, 2 Kgs 3:7), and «darkness is as light (เรียบร יָאֵם כֹּלֶכֶת)» (Ps 139:12).

2 More examples of the omission of the comparative מ can be found in SII vol. 1 p. 42*, vol. II, pp. 162-163.
In his commentary on Qoh 4:12, Ibn Ezra writes about the pronominal suffixes; with regard to קָו כָּלָם (Qoh 4:12), he says that the pronominal suffix י is joined directly to the end of the verb, but in other cases it is joined by י or נ, as in מִקַּח בְּרֵאשֵׁי (Job 14:20).

**Syntax**

Syntactical remarks are also found in this commentary on Qohelet. In his explanation of Qoh 8:3, Ibn Ezra mentions some Biblical verses in which a remarkable syntactic structure takes place; this is the case of the use of two verbs, one after the other, being the second one of them subordinated to the first one. Ibn Ezra explains that these two verbs must be related in either two ways: by the relative י or using the second verb in infinitive. In Qoh 8:3 it is written יָדַע לְךָ (אֲדֹנֵי), and according to Ibn Ezra’s interpretation, it means «do not be hasty so that you go (ךְָנַח) from him» or «do not be hasty to go (ךְָנַח) from him». רְצִית לְךָ (Hos 6:3) means «let us know that we follow after (ךְָנַח)...» or «let us know to follow after (ךְָנַח)...». רְצִית לְךָ (1 Sam 2:3) means «do not exceed in what you talk (ךְָנַח)...» or «do not exceed to talk (ךְָנַח)...».

As it has been shown in this article, Ibn Ezra considers that it is very important to follow the rules of the Hebrew grammar in order to interpret the Biblical text, and he tries to be very precise and consistent in his grammatical analyses, and therefore, he always cites parallel verses to prove his statements. This preciseness in the application of grammatical rules is more remarkable when philosophical ideas are involved in a passage, because Ibn Ezra considers Hebrew Grammar as the basis for his Philosophy.

We may also observe that he had a great knowledge of the theories of the grammarians who preceded him, and some of his commentaries can be considered a summary of these ones.

He based his theories about the morphology of the Hebrew words, especially that of the irregular verbs, in those formulated by Judah Hayyuj and Ibn Janah, and his explanations of the roots of

---

74 About the pronominal suffixes joined by י or נ, cf. שַׁמִּי, pp. 214-217.

75 S. R. Driver says that to translate this construction into English, the most common way is to translate the first verb as an adverb; cf. S. R. Driver, Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Book of Samuel, Oxford 1913, p. 24.
the words are very similar to those by Ibn Janah in his Sefer ha-
Sorasim.

The commentary on Qohelet was the first important work that
Ibn Ezra wrote in his life, and therefore, he had not still written any
of his grammatical treatises 76. The interest that Ibn Ezra lays on
grammar in the rest of his commentaries is also great, but it is
remarkable the amount of grammatical theories developed in this
commentary, even when they do not have a direct relationship to
the meaning of Qohelet; in my opinion, it proves that Ibn Ezra was
eager to write a grammatical treatise when he wrote this commentary,
and so his commentary on Qohelet can be considered a preparation
for a grammatical work. Not too much time would pass until he
began to write it.

---

76 At the end of the commentary he wrote the date in which it was finished: 1140.
For a chronological list of Ibn Ezra's works, cf. Reconstruction, pp. XVIII-XX.
RESUMEN

Abraham Ibn Ezra considera que el estudio de la gramática hebrea es el método más importante para establecer el significado literal de una palabra o de un versículo bíblico. Podemos encontrar sus teorías gramaticales no sólo en sus obras específicas de gramática, sino también en sus comentarios bíblicos. En su Comentario a Qohelet, Ibn Ezra hace numerosas observaciones sobre la pronunciación y peculiaridades de las consonantes hebreas, la morfología de nombres y verbos, algunas estructuras sintácticas específicas y otras similares. En este artículo, se examinan estas teorías en conexión con las obras gramaticales de este autor y con las opiniones de los gramáticos anteriores, sobre todo Juda Hayyuy y Jona ibn Yanah.

SUMMARY

Abraham Ibn Ezra considers the study of the Hebrew grammar to be the most important tool for establishing the literal meaning of a word or a Biblical verse. We find his grammatical theories not only in his grammatical works, but in his Biblical commentaries as well. In his Commentary on Qohelet, Ibn Ezra makes numerous grammatical remarks dealing with the pronunciation and peculiarities of the Hebrew consonants, the morphology of nouns and verbs, some peculiar syntactical structures, and the like. In this article, these grammatical theories in connection with Ibn Ezra’s other works and with the theories of earlier grammarians, including Judah Hayyuj and Jonah Ibn Janah, are examined.