London
HENRY FROWDE

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE
AMEN CORNER, E.C.
Facsimile of a page of the Codex assigned to Ben-Asher in Aleppo.

See Preface, p. vii.

*" The height of a column in the original is 23 centimetres.
A TREATISE ON THE ACCENTUATION

OF THE TWENTY-ONE SO-CALLED

PROSE BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

WITH A FACSIMILE OF A PAGE OF THE CODEX ASSIGNED TO

BEN-ASHER IN ALEPPO

BY

WILLIAM WICKES, D.D.

Oxford
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
1887

[All rights reserved]
**PREFACE.**

The present Treatise aims at explaining the accentuation of the so-called Prose Books—twenty-one in number, according to Jewish reckoning—of the Hebrew Bible. The favourable reception given to my Work \( \text{מַעֲנֵי אֲמָר} \), on the accentuation of the three Poetical Books (Psalms, Proverbs, and Job), has encouraged me to proceed further, and complete the investigation which I then commenced.

I have been asked why, contrary to the usual practice, I began with the accentuation of the three Books. My answer is that the subject seemed to me to stand in special need of careful examination. There was besides this advantage in taking the three Books first, that owing to their comparatively small compass, it was more easy to examine them exhaustively and so to arrive at the general principles underlying their accentuation. Those principles once established had then only to be applied, with the necessary modifications, to the twenty-one Books.

I have endeavoured to carry out with thoroughness the task I had undertaken, and have not intentionally allowed difficulties in the accentuation to pass unnoticed. My plan has been, either, by a process of induction, to bring such instances under a general rule; or to furnish a special explanation of them, partly in the course of the Work, and more particularly in the Notes collected in Appendix I. Of course, I have not been concerned to defend

---

1 The two Books of 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, and 1 and 2 Chronicles are counted respectively as one. The same is the case with Ezra and Nehemiah. The ten Minor Prophets are also taken together to make one book. In this calculation the beginning and the end of Job (i. i–iii. i and xlii. 7–17) are not taken into account, which however are pointed according to the same system.—It is to be observed that Jewish writers know nothing of the distinction between Prose and Poetical Books; they speak simply of the twenty-one and three Books.

2 I hope that it is no breach of confidence on my part, when I state that the late Prof. Ewald told me that, whilst he had no doubt that he had furnished the true explanation of the prose accentuation, he was not so satisfied in regard to the poetical.
the accentuation in all cases. It is enough if we can trace the principles on which the accentuators proceeded, or the interpretation which in particular instances led to the accentuation employed.

I have found it necessary often to propose a correction of the textus receptus; but have very rarely done so without manuscript authority. The labour of collating MSS. in our great English collections and the Libraries of the Continent, for a text of such extent as that of the Old Testament, has been very considerable, and one which no previous writer on the accents has thought of undertaking. Yet, without a correct text, what hope can there be of establishing any rules on a satisfactory basis?

One Codex, which is in the Synagogue at Aleppo, and which I have been able to consult, although only indirectly, has the reputation of having come from the hand of Ben-Asher himself, and of having been, on that account, always regarded as a model copy for fixing the readings of the Sacred Text. Its claim to the exceptional importance thus assigned to it I have considered in the pages immediately following.

I have once more to express my obligations to my friend Dr. Baer, for the valuable assistance he has willingly rendered me. His familiar acquaintance with the Massora—a department of study in which he ranks facilis princeps¹—has been of special service to me.

W. WICKES.

51, WOODSTOCK ROAD, OXFORD,
May, 1887.

¹ I have the pleasure of informing scholars, that there is at length a prospect of a complete and correct edition of the Massora. The firm Romm in Wilna (already favourably known through a splendid edition of the Babylonian Talmud lately brought out by them) have in hand a new edition of the so-called Great Rabbinical Bible (גנומא), to which Dr. Baer has undertaken to furnish the Massora. The arrangement adopted will be the same as in Jacob ben-Chayyim’s edition, with this exception, that wherever a word occurs for the first time, there all that is Massoretic in regard to it will be given; so that, by the help of a Concordance, any particular rubric will be readily traced. I may add that the first part of Dr. Baer’s manuscript is already in the printers’ hands.
MSS. CONSULTED FOR THE PRESENT WORK.

I. BIBLE MSS.

Codex in the Synagogue at Aleppo—containing the whole text, the punctuation of which is assigned in an epigraph ¹ to the famous Aaron ben-Asher (beginning of the 10th century). M. Isidore Loeb, Secretary of L'Alliance Israélite, well known from his learned contributions to the Revue des Études Juives, was good enough to procure for me, through his correspondent at Aleppo, some of the accentual readings of this Codex.

As it is of no little importance for us to know whether such a model codex ² really exists, to which we might refer for the correction of the textus receptus ³, I think it necessary to say a few words on the subject of the epigraph above referred to.—Jacob Sappir, who (in his Work, יִסְיָד הַבֶּן אֲשֶׁר, vol. i. p. 12b) was the first to furnish a copy of this epigraph, which he obtained through a friend at Aleppo, accepted it as genuine, and was followed by Graetz (Monatsch. für Gesch. und Wiss. des Judenthums, 1871, p. 6, 1887, p. 30), and by Strack (Prol. crit., pp. 44-46). My reasons for arriving at an opposite conclusion are briefly the following:—

1. The character of writing of the Codex. M. Loeb succeeded in obtaining for me a photograph of a page of the same (Gen. xxvi. 34–xxvii. 30)—a copy of which serves as Frontispiece to the present Work ⁴. Although this copy has not been quite so successfully executed as I could have wished, it is sufficiently clear to enable adepts to form a judgment as to the approximate date of the writing. I venture to give my own opinion, which is that the MS. presents a specimen of

---

¹ Copied Dikd. hat., p. xxii. inf.
² Ben-Asher was (as is well known) the normative authority for fixing the text as we now have it.
³ For fixing the accentuation such a Codex would be invaluable. My remarks on it therefore will be seen not to be out of place.
⁴ The photograph and the copy are both much reduced in size. The height of each column of writing (without the Massora) is in the original 23 cm., and average breadth 6 cm. The size of each page is therefore somewhat smaller than that of Codex Babylonicus. The MS. is of parchment equally smooth (très poli, I am told) on both sides.
calligraphy, not in keeping with the early period to which it is
assigned. Really old MSS., provided with Masore—as Codex Babylon-
ianus (of the date of Ben-Asher, A.D. 916) and Erfurt 3 (a facsimile
of which will appear in Stade's Geschichte Israel's, vol. i)—have a
plainer and less finished appearance, and the characters are of a coarser
type. I would draw attention, in particular, to the artificial arrange-
ment by which a separate Massoreticky rubric of two lines and no more is
introduced above and below each column.—It is not, however, on
the graphical peculiarities that I lay the main stress.

2. The conclusive proof is to be found in the fact that the punc-
tuation is, in many instances, at variance with Ben-Asher's known
practice and the rules laid down by the Palestinian Massoretas.

It will be observed that Métheg generally fails, e.g. מָבִל (often;
only once, col. 3, l. 7, בְּלֵי; מָבִל (col. 2, l. 3, although מָבָל, col. 2, l. 6 from below); מָבִל (col. 2, l. 8); מָבִל (col. 3, l. 3); מָבִל
(col. 1, l. 21); &c. Now although this is constantly the case in
Spanish and even Oriental MSS., we should not expect such an
irregularity in a model text marked by the careful hand of the Master
himself (מָבִל, as he is termed), particularly when we bear in
mind that it is just on the use of Métheg that his controversy
with his rival, Ben-Naphtali, mainly turns. Still less should we be
prepared for the false introduction of Métheg, as in מָבִל (col. 1, l. 5
from below) and מָבִל (col. 3, l. 6 from below)—the latter Ben-
Naphtali's pointing 5, and expressly condemned in Dikd. hat. § 30,
מוּבִל. Moreover, מָבִל (col. 2, l. 8) is Ben-Naphtali's
vocalization, whereas Ben-Asher would have pointed מָבִל 7.

5 It is the light Métheg that generally fails; heavy Métheg is as generally in-
troduced, and so in this page, מָבִל, מָבִל, מָבִל. On the failure of
Métheg, comp. Man. du Lect, p. 98, בָּלַל, מָבָל: נָבָל, מָבָל, מָבָל

6 Cf. the examples brought together by Baer, Gen, p. 82, note 1.

7 See the list of Variations between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali in Baer's
Gen., p. 84.

We may also be surprised at not finding the Parasha (col. 1, l. 3) marked in
the margin, for it was expressly to note these divisions that Maimonides (see
הַנִּירָה, הַנִּירָה, הַנִּירָה, c. viii, § 4) consulted a text written and pointed by Ben-
Asher.—N. B. The ה (col. 1, l. 3, margin) does not stand for הָוָהָוָה, as the same
sign (col. 3, l. 20) shows, but for הָוָה. Many punctators, who took no notice of
the Parashas, were in the habit of marking in this way the Palestinian Sidras,
as may be seen in Ox. 10, 2326; Br. Mus. Or. 2201.
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ix

So much from the page before us. Other proofs are not wanting. Sappir informs us (ibid., p. 12) that he sent from Jerusalem a list of words, which he had found variously written in texts (as to punctuation, scriptio plena and def., &c.), to a distinguished Jewish scholar in Aleppo, with the request that he would examine the Codex and note for him how these words were written in it. This was done, and subsequently Sappir published in the Jewish periodical, נרבל (I. pp. 31, 32), some of these various readings, from which I select the following: רון ירי (Gen. i. 3); הנגנין (iv. 23); לֶא לֹא (xii. 8, two words); נֶלַם (Ex. xvii. 16, one word)11; all contrary to Ben-Asher’s rules or the Palestinian Massora, and which therefore could not have been so written by Ben-Asher himself. I also sent a list of passages, which I wished compared on account of the accentuation, and M. Loeb’s correspondent volunteered the information that יִנְּנָה (Qoh. vi. 2) is so pointed with Gaya, and יִנְתּוּ (ix. 4) so vocalized, for יִנְתּוּ; both mistakes which we may be sure would never have been made by Ben-Asher.

From these few test-passages we may conclude that the statement, assigning this Codex to Ben-Asher, is a fabrication,—merely introduced to enhance the value of the same,—and that the whole long epigraph, with its list of Qaraite names (shewing it to be of Qaraite origin), &c., is untrustworthy and undeserving of serious notice. How many other epigraphs to Jewish texts would, when carefully tested, have to be rejected, notably that of the Cambridge Codex 12, which makes a Spanish MS., unquestionably younger than the one we have been considering, written in the year 85612!

Attached to the Aleppo Codex is what the Jews call a קָמָה (a copy of which M. Loeb also procured for me). This farrago of grammatical and Massoretic rules has been sufficiently described in Dikd. hat., Pref., pp. xxi–xxiii, from a copy obtained by the Qaraite,

---

10 So the Orientals. See Cod. Bab. passim. Comp. also Baer, Gen., p. 76, where the Palestinian Massora is quoted.
11 So the Orientals. See Cod. Bab., Massora magna to Is. xxxvi. 12; and comp. the Palestinian Massora,—as given by Norzi, ad loc., or Ginsb. Mas. n, § 238,—which requires נְ; כּ to be written as two words.
12 I have myself no doubt, from personal inspection, that the Codex B. 19*, in the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg, dated 1009, is much younger, although the editors of the Catalogue accept the date.
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A. Firkowitsch, when at Aleppo. It contains the list of Paseqs, to which I refer, p. 121 note.

Bab. Codex prophetarum posteriorum Petropolitanus Babylonicus (A. D. 916), the text marked with the so-called Babylonian punctuation, photo-lithographed, under the editorship of Dr. Strack, 1875.

Ber. MSS. in the Royal Library, Berlin. The numbers given are those of the printed catalogue.

MSS. in the British Museum,—cited according to the press-marks Add., Harl., and Or., e.g. Add. 21161; Harl. 1528; Or. 4709. The reader will please notice that I have not thought it necessary to prefix Br. Mus. to these marks.

De R. De Rossi’s MSS., now in the Royal Library, Parma. See De Rossi’s printed catalogue.

Erf. The Erfurt MSS. 1-4, described by Lagarde in his Symmicta, p. 133 ff. (These MSS. are now in the Royal Library, Berlin.)

Hm. MSS. in the Town Library, Hamburg. The numbers are those of the printed catalogue.

K. When I had no printed catalogue to refer to, as in the case of the smaller Libraries, I have given the numbers according to Kennicott’s list.

Ox. MSS. in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. See printed catalogue.

Par. MSS. in the National Library, Paris. See printed catalogue.

Vi. MSS. in the Imperial Library, Vienna.

II. MSS. ON THE ACCENTS OF THE TWENTY-ONE BOOKS.

1. Ambrosian Library, Milan, A. 186. This MS. consists of two quite distinct parts: a. The first and larger part (18 pp.) is headed מַעַן הַנַּרְשָׂע, a name which occurs again just before the list of the accents, רֹחַם הַנַּרְשׁ הָעָבְרָא. A cursory examination shewed me that this part is (as far as it goes) identical with the epitome of יָרְחַם הַנַּרְשָׂע, edited by Mercerus (Paris, 1565) under the title of מַעַן הַנַּרְשָׂע, and

13 In this copy, however, a section has been dropped at the end of both Parts of the list, and three others introduced (§§ 22, 23, 24, ibid., p. xxiii) which are not in the original. That Firkowitsch was in the habit of falsifying texts that passed through his hands is well known. Were the Qaraites dei φυσικαί?

14 How far the two texts agree I am not able to state, for I had not Mercerus’ edition with me when examining this MS.
assigned by him (on the authority of the Paris MS.) and by all scholars since,—falsely, as I believe I have shewn, תומם אמא, pp. 104–5,—to R. Jehuda ben-Bil'am. This conclusion of mine seems to receive the fullest confirmation from the title above given. For I would ask Jewish scholars whether it may not be taken for certain that the name of the author is given in the double-entendre which it conveys? Ezra was the name not only of the great ומכיר, but of a distinguished scribe whose copy of the Tora is constantly quoted, under the name of מפרעם, as of authority.

Such an experienced scribe we may well suppose to have been competent to treat of הרקיע המקרא בתקורייה (as the subject of the Work is described in the introductory words). Another discovery we make is that the proper title of the epitome of זוהרי המקרא is 'Ezra's arrangement.' But it would seem that it was only a fragment of this Work that lay before the copyist, for at the section on the accent we suddenly breaks off, and adds matter of his own. β. At this point we read in the margin: מנהלא ו�이 הדבר ונקוט ממה מונח רורי [מלמה] עדין קרעת והעלא על אמן ברות. Unfortunately what follows (6½ pp.), mostly about the accents, is marked by blunders, and of no value. Whatever Menachem's other acquirements he was evidently no accentuologist.

2. That part of שבירת הקולות—written by Simson the punctator (circa 1230)—which refers to our subject. Simson does little else

---

15 See e.g. Lonzano, Ḫr Tora, on Gen. iv. 13; vii. 11; ix. 29; etc.; Ox. Cat. 2542; Ginsb. Mas. i. p. 611 (bis), iii. p. 25. Meiri (רבי משה, Part I, 85) states that in his time (end of the 13th century) זכרו סעים was in Toledo, and was consulted, as a standard authority, for its readings.

16 I beg my readers to observe that this is the earliest notice we have of the Work assigned to Ben-Bil'am, and as being nearer to the source, is more likely to be correct. Moreover as the copyist, himself a grammarian by profession (see note following), lived within a few years of Ben-Bil'am, we may take it for granted that he would have known, and would have stated, the fact, if the author had been really Ben-Bil'am.

17 With this agrees the statement at the end of the Part about the accents: והשלא מטר_contrס התוכס מזר כקרן, לא אמין ממחש א_delay ועל ייצר והמחש רזר. Menachem, therefore, himself condensed and copied this Part from his larger Work, ויה ובן, 'ein grammatisch-lexikalisch-hermeneutisches Werk' (not a mere Lexicon, as is generally supposed), as Dr. Perles, who has examined the unique MS. of it in the Munich Library, informs me. (Comp. Steinschneider, Hebr. Bibliographie, pp. 38 ff. and 131–4.) In this MS. the sections (ושרי) about the accents are wanting.—It may be added that the treatise in the Ambrosian Library was originally attached (as the epigraph states) to a copy of the twenty-four Books, made also by Menachem, in the year 1145.
than copy the treatise assigned to Ben-Bil'am. Of this Work—sometimes called Simsoni, from its author—there are three copies known, one in the Br. Mus. (Or. 1016), one in the University Library, Leipzig (Or. 1022), and one in De Rossi’s Library, Parma (389) 18.

3. Ber. 118 (Heb. Cat.) contains (a) some rules for the accents, more or less fragmentary—in part by Samuel, the grammarian and punctator 19—full of mistakes and quite worthless. (β) A poem (otherwise known 20) in forty-five verses on the accents of the twenty-one Books, by R. Tam. Written in a crabbled fantastic style, it merely gives in a condensed form Ben-Bil'am’s well-known rules for the servi, and is altogether undeserving of notice. (γ) A poem in ninety verses by Joseph ben-Qalonymos (circa 1240), on the same subject, to which the same remarks apply 21.

4. Prefixed to the Bible-text, Par. 5, is a treatise on the accents of the twenty-one Books, by Zalman the punctator 22. He twice quotes וָרָאָה by name, and gives the same title to his own treatise. It contains nothing of consequence.

5. Ox. 2512, a grammatical treatise in Arabic (brought from Yemen), containing at the end rules for the accents, the most interesting part of which I give, pp. 13, 14.

18 Any one who is curious to know something more of this work may consult Hupfeld, Commentatio de antiquioribus apud Judeos accentuum scriptoribus, Partic. II, p. 11 ff. (Halle, 1846).

19 How little he understood of the rudiments of his craft I found out when examining a MS. pointed by him (A.D. 1260), in the Library of St. John’s College, Cambridge.


21 A poem on the accents of the three Books by the same author has been recently edited by Dr. Berliner (Berlin, 1886). But it is lost labour to publish such a work. Moreover, the editor’s part has been very negligently performed. Both text and commentary are made in his hands to express arrant nonsense. And yet the publication is intended ‘die jüdische Literatur zu bereichern!’ (Pref. p. 5.)

22 Not to be confounded with Jequthiel (Zunz, Zur Geschichte und Literatur, p. 115), for I found that his rule about Paseq after Shalshéloth is opposed to Jequthiel’s remarks, Gen. xix. 16. He is doubtless the punctator (not named by Zunz), who is quoted in Br. Mus. Add. 9403 (section on ד, שֶׁזוּר וְזַלְמָן הַגָּדִיל: מִלְכַּס הַסַּלְמָן הַנִּדְלָן), dated 1298; and Zalman may have lived about this time, for as he is not named in other works on the accents, he would seem to have been a late punctator.
THE PRINCIPAL PRINTED TEXTS

QUOTED IN THE PRESENT WORK.

Bomb. 1. 1st Rabbinical Bible, printed by Bomberg, Venice, 1518.
Bomb. 2. 2nd Rabbinical Bible, printed by Bomberg, Venice, 1525.
Mich. Heb. Bible edited by J. H. Michaelis, Halle, 1720. This ed. is valuable to the student because of the various accentual readings, taken from the Erfurt MSS.
Baer. Edd. of Genesis (Leipzig, 1869), Isaiah (1872), Ezekiel (1884), Minor Prophets (1878), Five Megilloth (1886), and Daniel, Ezra, and Nehemiah (1882), by this distinguished Massoretic scholar. I strongly recommend my readers to procure these carefully prepared texts for themselves, as I have rarely thought it necessary to take notice of errors, which Baer had already corrected.
Dikd. hat. ספר דקדוקי התורה לפני סוף הארץ וdatable את משה עט מסורות תורת, edited by S. Baer and H. L. Strack (Leipzig, 1879). This Work contains, with other matter, the rules assigned to Ben-Asher on the accents, the oldest notices that we have on the subject.
Ben-Bil. The epitome of הרומח תקלת, 'Instruction for the reader,' edited by Mercerus (see p. vi), and assigned by him to R. Jehuda ben-Bil' am. My references are to the copious extracts in Heidenheim's כותב תקולוג (see below). Occasionally I have quoted the Ox. MS. (1465) 22. The proper title of this Work I have given above, p. xi.
Chayyug. I quote from Nutt's ed. of ספר חקי, pp. 126–9. This part of the Work is not, however, by Chayyug himself (see Nutt's remarks, p. xii).

22 The original הרומח תקלת is not known to exist, with the exception of a fragment on the accentuation of the three Books printed in Ginsb. Mas. iii. p. 43 ff., § 246*, from a MS. (Or. 2375) in the British Museum. (The second section, however, with the same no. 246* has nothing to do with it, but comes from quite a different source.) Comp. my remarks in פ"_optimizer, pp. 103–5.
carelessly copied and carelessly edited by B. Goldberg. I quote Frensdorff's edition (Hannover, 1847). The part relating to the accents is fragmentary and of little importance.

Moses the punctator, reputed author of professional interest. I quote Frensdorff's edition (Hannover, 1847). The part relating to the accents is fragmentary and of little importance.

Jequthiel, author of an orthographical commentary, mostly in regard to vowels and accents, on the Pentateuch; published by Heidenheim, in his edition of the Pentateuch entitled (Rödelheim, 1818).

Man. du Lect. Manuel du Lecteur, a name given by J. Derenbourg to a compendium of grammar and massora, edited by him (Paris, 1871), from a Yemen MS. now in the Bodleian Library (1505). The proper title is , 'The Bible-treatise.' (It is strange that Derenbourg has neither used nor explained this name.) This or some similar Work constantly appears as a Preface or Introduction in Yemen Bible Codd.

Mishp. hat. a useful compilation from the works of early Jewish writers on the accents of the twenty-one Books, by Wolf Heidenheim (Rödelheim, 1808), with his own comments. (Other known Works, such as Norzi’s , the Massoretic compilation , and Die Massora magna (the two latter edited by Frensdorff), do not need particular notice. Nothing is to be learned from El. Levita’s , Arqivolti’s , and the Works of Jewish writers on the Accents, other than those named above. Even from Christian accentuologists, as Wasmuth, Ouseel, Spitzner, and Ewald, I have derived little or no help.)

24 Thus, the very first words, , are given as , and in p. , ‘the elevated Sh.,’ is made , ‘Sh. with Sh.’

25 The fullest notice about this writer will be found in Histoire Littéraire de la France, xxvii. p. 484 ff.

26 On the work and its author, see Zunz, Zur Geschichte und Literatur, p. 115.

27 is pl. of , ‘crown,’ a name given to the Torah or Bible as the 'crown' of Books. See , p. 12b, note.
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ERRATA AND ADDENDA.

Page 16, note 25, *add a third example of הַנִּיחֹם, from Cod. Bab. p. 181*

" 23, l. 7, point רכיבפ

" 41, note 22, *for Is. ix. 8 read Is. ix. 6b*

" 51, l. 1, point βορά

" 70, l. 21, לְאַרְגָּדוֹן, *dele Métheq*

" 88, l. 21, dele 'Even Ben-Asher's famous Codex &c.'

" 129, note 28, *for 2 Ki. xxv. 2 read 2 Ki. xxv. 4*
CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION 1.

The Hebrew accentuation is essentially a musical system. The accents are *musical signs*—originally designed to represent and preserve a particular mode of cantillation or musical declamation, which was in use for the public reading of the Old Testament text at the time of their introduction, and which had been handed down by tradition from much earlier times 2. That the signs introduced failed to answer their purpose, and that

---

1 I may be permitted to refer to my previous treatise, chap. I, for some general remarks, which I do not think it necessary to repeat here.

2 From the testimony of the Talmud, we are able to trace the practice of such a system to the first centuries of the Christian era, and it may have been much older. Thus the statements on the subject in Megilla 32a and Nedarim 37b are given in the names of R. Jochanan and Rab (who lived towards the middle of the third century), and that in Berakhoth 62a on R. Ḥaqiba's authority (which brings us close to the beginning of the second century). Besides these, which may be regarded as historical notices, we have the tradition (Megilla 3a') that the system was in use even in Ezra's time. Nor is this tradition (as it seems to me) to be altogether rejected. It requires only to be rightly interpreted. The method of musical recitation may well have been one of the institutions established under the second temple, *and soon after Ezra's time*, for the more formal and solemn conduct of public worship. Originally introduced by the Sopherim, Ezra's immediate successors, as a kind of נַחֲלָה קָנָה—distinguishing the public reading of the Law, fixing its sense, and serving as a help to the memory in retaining its precepts—it may afterwards have been applied to the other Sacred Books. From the Temple it would pass into the Synagogue. And perhaps Christ Himself made use of it, when reading from the prophet Isaiah (Luke iv. 17 ff.).

(On the activity of these early סִפְרֵי רָשָׁם, and the influence their *dicta* and the rules they laid down exercised, see Graetz, Geschichte, ii. 2, p. 180 ff. That they regulated the arrangements for public worship seems certain, ibid., p. 190. Their work was creative, and left its mark behind it.)
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it is quite uncertain how far the modern chanting of the Jews—whether Oriental, Ashkenazic, or Sephardic—represents the original melodies, is on various accounts to be regretted. For—indeed independently of the interest attaching to the earliest development of sacred music—if these melodies had been preserved, we should be able to understand the reasons of various musical changes, of which we have to take account, but for the introduction of which we can at present only offer conjectures.

One marked peculiarity of the system could not, however, so long as the signs were accurately preserved, be lost. From the first, the aim had been so to arrange the musical declamation, as to give suitable expression to the meaning of the Sacred Text. For this purpose, the logical pauses of the verse were duly marked—and that according to their gradation—by pausal melodies, later by the accentual signs that represented those melodies; and where no logical pause occurred in a clause, the syntactical relation of the words to one another and to the whole clause was indicated by suitable melodies—partly pausal, partly conjunctive—and their corresponding signs. In this way, the originators of the system, and the accentuators who aimed at stereotyping their work, sought to draw out the sense and impress it on the minds of both reader and hearers. It need hardly be added that it is this, their interpunctual character, which constitutes for us the chief value of the accents.

Generally speaking, the logical and syntactical division has been carefully carried out, in the way just indicated. And so far we have before us a system of interpunction, which, for

8 For the differences between these several modes, comp. Fétis, Histoire Générale de la Musique, i. p. 445 ff. The character of the cantillation seems to have been influenced by the style of music of the particular nation in which the Jews were settled.

4 These are the דיסוק פפ or סוקי מטרים of the Talmud (e.g. Megilla 3*, Nedarim 37*), which, before the introduction of the signs, could only be learned from oral instruction and continued practice. Hence we read of professional teachers, who received their fee (רבר סוקי מטרים, Nedarim, l.c.) for giving instruction in this branch.
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minuteness and accuracy, leaves nothing to be desired,—a system whose only fault is that it errs on the side of excessive minuteness and apparent striving after accuracy. But it is not always so. When we come to examine the text carefully, we meet with many exceptions. We find words joined by the accents, which ought, according to rule, to be separated; and separated, which ought to be joined; moreover, pausal accents out of their place, a greater where a less is due and vice versa.

Such irregularities (if we are so to term them) cannot be ignored. What then are we to say to them? Are we, on account of them, to reject the whole system, as unreliable for the discrimination of the sense? or are we to try and find some explanation of them, so that we may make due allowance, in every case, for disturbances as they occur? Unquestionably, the latter is the true scientific course; nor till we have failed in discovering the necessary explanation, have we any right to condemn what it may turn out we did not understand.

One main object of the present work is to attempt to remove these stumbling-blocks in the way of accepting the accentual system of the twenty-one Books—the same task which I took in hand for the three Books. And the explanation proposed will be virtually the same.

I. In many instances, the accentuation of our texts is false, and has to be corrected by the testimony of MSS. Yet I do not know a single writer on the accents, who has been at the pains of seeking to remove this source of error.

II. The predominance of the musical element must be recognised. This was plainly evident in the examination of the three Books, and must be accepted, though it does not shew itself in so marked a manner, for the twenty-one Books. But then all such exceptional cases come under rule, and need occasion no difficulty. Given certain conditions, the exception must, or at least may, follow. Cases of transformation come under this head; and where the musical division ceases, as it often does before the minor pausal accents, there the logical or (what is}
more common in such cases) the syntactical division necessarily ceases also.

III. The well-known law of *parallelismus membrorum*—by no means confined to the poetical, or even the prophetic parts—frequently leads to an irregular division of the text.

IV. The accentuators did not hesitate to make the strict rules for logical (or syntactical) division give way, when they wished to express *emphasis*, or otherwise give effect to the reading. Undoubtedly they were right in principle; although, as we have here to do with questions of taste, we may not always agree with them.

The irregularities here briefly alluded to will of course come fully under review in the sequel.

We start then on the supposition that the accentuation does not furnish a perfect system of interpunction. Still, if (as I hope to be able to shew) we can trace and make allowance for disturbing causes, we shall be able to accept it as a reliable guide to the exegesis of the text. Even with what may seem to us its shortcomings and superfluities, it fixes the sense in a far more effective and satisfactory way than our modern system of punctuation.

I conclude this chapter with a few remarks on a subject of some interest, about which much has been written, viz. the date of the introduction of the accentual signs.

---

5 I do not find in the accentual division of the twenty-one Books that *musical equilibrium* was much regarded. Rhythmical effect was much more studied.

6 Among which may be mentioned that owing to the purely musical character of the signs employed, it was not possible to mark the interrogation, exclamation, parenthesis, &c.

7 This has often struck me in comparing the Hebrew text with modern translations, even those few that are careful and accurate in their punctuation.

8 The student must be warned against statements to be found in the works of some modern scholars, Graetz, Delitzsch, and others, assigning the invention of the Babylonian signs to a certain Moses the punctator, in the sixth century, and that of the Palestinian to two Qaraites, Mocha and his son Moses, at the end of the eighth century. These scholars were misled by certain forgeries and pretended discoveries of the well-known literary impostor, Abraham Firkowitz, which have been since exposed by Harkavy (Mem. de l’Acad. Imp. des Sciences de St. Pet., xxiv. 8 ff.) and Strack (Luth. Zeitsch., 1875, p. 619).
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The silence of the Talmud on the subject of the punctuation, and Jerome's express testimony\(^9\) that it was not found in the texts of his day, have long since satisfied scholars that it cannot have been earlier than the fifth century\(^10\). The following considerations will (I think) shew that it could not have been later than the seventh century. (We have thus a sufficient interval for any stages of development, through which it may have passed.) Direct historical notices on the subject fail, as is well known, altogether.

1. We find that in the latter half of the ninth century as little was known about the origin of the punctuation as in the present day. All that Mar Natronai\(^\text{II}\), Gaon (a.d. 859–869), can say about it is: לָא נָתַתְנָו בָּבֶנֶי נִי הַחְבָּכָמִים צִיוֹנָו לֵעָלִים; whilst Ben-Asher (who completed the Massorethic Work on which his father had been engaged at the close of the same century\(^12\), and who may be considered to give his father's views) more distinctly, but erroneously, assigns it to the Prophets, Sopherim, and wise men, who, with Ezra at their head, were supposed to have constituted the Great Synagogue\(^13\). It is clear that a system, the origin of which was lost in obscurity at the end of the ninth century, was of much older date.

---

\(^9\) Jerome's testimony refers indeed to the vowel-signs (see his Comm. on Is. xxvi. 14; Jer. ix. 21; Hos. xi. 10, &c.). As to the accents (in our sense of the term) he is significantly silent; so in his Preface to Isaiah he states that he has introduced divisions of his own into the text (interpretationem novam novo scribendi genere distintimus), but makes no reference to division by the accents, Athnach &c., shewing that they were not before him. Indeed, the vocalization and accentuation were no doubt introduced at the same time. Where the one failed, so did the other.


\(^12\) Dikd. hat., p. xvi, 1.

\(^13\) Ibid., § 16 and passim. The notion that Ezra was the author and inventor of the signs for the vowels and accents, due to a false interpretation of a passage in the Talmud, Megilla 3\(^*\) (see Man. du Lect., p. 53), was generally accepted by the Jews in the middle ages (Buxtorf, De punctorum origine, p. 313). Some Rabbinical authorities indeed maintained that the punctuation was revealed to Moses on Sinai (ibid., p. 312); whilst others went so far as to make it coeval with the language itself, and communicated to Adam in Paradise (ibid., p. 305).
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To these testimonies may be added those of Nissi ben-Noach (A.D. 840) and Mar Šemach ben-Chayyim, Gaon (889–896), who both refer to well-known differences in the matter of punctuation between the two great Schools of the East and West. Now who does not see that a considerable space of time must have elapsed for those differences to have developed themselves and to have become formally tabulated? We are thus brought to the same conclusion that the punctuation was much older than the ninth century.

2. The above-named famous Aaron ben-Asher, who has the credit of having finally fixed the punctuation as we have it in our texts, was the last of a distinguished family of Massoretes and punctators, whose genealogy we are able to trace through several members up to the latter half of the eighth century. There seems no reason to question the correctness of this genealogical table, when we bear in mind the care which the Jews

Elias Levita, himself a Jew, in his Massoreth ha-massoreth (1538), was the first to refute systematically these false notions, and to lay down correct views on the subject. (On the controversy to which this epoch-making work gave rise, and which lasted, off and on, for a century and a half,—the chief disputants being the Buxtorfs, father and son, as the assailants, and Ludovicus Cappellus as the defender, of El. Levita’s views,—see an interesting pamphlet by Dr. Schneidermann, Die Controverse des L. Cappellus mit den Buxtorfen, Leipzig, 1879, or Bleek’s Einleitung, 3rd ed., § 329.)

14 The former recommends the student to make himself acquainted with the peculiarities of the Babylonian system: המ.GridColumn ימשרה וס>'. (quoted in Pinsker’s Liquey Qadmoniyyoth, p. סא). The latter alludes to the variations which the written texts of his time exhibited: במ畤א דשת חונני ובורני יש שיני בחם בישל לארון ישראל בחרות ותורת ומשה ועמים ומוסריה וחרות ותורה ועם. (end of סא אנד总而言之).

15 See Dikd. hat., p. 79 above: (1) his father, Moses, who wrote in the year 895 a Cod. of the Prophets, still preserved in the Qarasite Synagogue in Cairo; (2) Asher ben-Moses; (3) Moses ben-Nehemiah; (4) Nehemiah; (5) Asher ben-Noach. From Nos. 1 to 5 we may well allow a period of 120 years, which will bring us to A.D. 775.

From about 750 to 920 must have been a time of special activity in elaborating rules and fixing all the details of the vocalization and accentuation, for we have two lists (in which many of the names are the same, and which therefore confirm one another) of distinguished punctators, who flourished in this period. (Dikd. hat., pp. 78, 79.)
have always exercised in such matters. It follows that the punctuation must have been older than the middle of the eighth century.

3. A difficulty has indeed been started, which, however, when examined, only confirms the view above expressed as to the date of the first introduction of the punctuation. It has been argued that because a book like Sepher Ješira, assigned to the eighth century, contains no allusion to the vowel-signs or accents,—although from the subjects of which it treats, such allusion was to be expected,—therefore they were not known at that time. But the argumentum ex silentio will not apply here. The silence may be explained from the simple circumstance that pointed texts were at the time in question regarded as an innovation. They had still to overcome the prejudices of learned doctors and scribes who, when compiling works that dealt with early tradition, ignored them altogether. We know that the pointing of the text of the Qoran had to encounter, in the same way, at the first, objections and opposition (see Nöldeke, Geschichte des Qoran's, p. 309). Among peoples imbued with such conservative tendencies as those of the East, changes which affected their Sacred Books could be only gradually introduced. Let us suppose the eighth century to have been such a period of transition, and the difficulties broached by scholars disappear. If, however, the punctuation was at this time regarded with

---

16 See, e.g. Derenbourg in Revue Critique, 1879, p. 455. When, however, he asserts that in the post-talmudic Tract Sopherim no trace can be found of graphical signs, for the indication of the vowels or accents, few scholars will agree with him. The best printed texts and most MSS. name Athnach and Soph Pasuq in xiii. § 1; and in iii. § 7, § 8, the term most naturally refers to the 'accentual divisions.' (Comp. the parallel passage in M. Sepharim, i. § 4, where הַסֵּפֶר הַמִּסְפָּר הַמִּסְפָּר יִרְעָה וּכְעַנָּן אֵת הַסֵּפֶר הַמִּסְפָּר יִרְעָה וּכְעַנָּן, where הַסֵּפֶר הַמִּסְפָּר הַמִּסְפָּר יִרְעָה וּכְעַנָּן indicates both the vocalization and accentuation.) Zunz, in his Gottesdienstliche Vorträge, p. 264, draws attention to the absence of all allusion to the punctuation in the Midrash on Canticles, at the word חָרֵם, chap. i. 11, and in the Hagada of the Gaonic period generally, and finds therein a proof of the late origin of the same. But such conclusions prove too much. We know (see above) that it was in use in the Gaonic period.
suspicion as an *innovation*, the seventh century and most probably the latter part of that century must have been the date of its introduction. I pointed out in my former treatise, p. 1, that this date suits otherwise well, as it was that at which the Syriac and Greek Churches had perfected (or nearly so) their systems of interpunction and musical notation. The Arabs copied somewhat later for the Qur'an the examples thus set them.

By whom and under what circumstances these graphical signs were introduced into the Hebrew text, we have no evidence to assist us in deciding. It may have been that the leading signs were first employed for the instruction of children in school. Even in the time of the Talmud, the case of children was considered, and the reading of the text made more easy for them. And among the Arabs, pointed texts of the Qur'an were allowed for school-teaching by authorities who forbad the use of them for public reading. But on such points we are never likely to advance beyond mere conjecture.

---

17 I mean in anything like a complete form. Up to this time, it would have been following a course of gradual development.

18 In Megilla 22a R. Chananya says: נא תחרי לא ਲਈਸੋਮ ਅਲਾ ਲਈਨੋਕੁਨ ਸ਼ਨ ਪਰਿਸ੍ਰਿਤਲਿਆ, i.e. ‘I was not allowed to break up a Bible-verse, except in the instruction of school-children.’

19 Nöldeke, l.c. p. 310.
ON THE DIVISION OF THE ACCENTS.

CHAPTER II.

ON THE DIVISION, NAMES, SIGNS, ETC. OF THE ACCENTS.

The name ד'ויוי, 'meanings' commonly given to the accents (and קאר etxv to the pausal accents), refers to their function as indicators of the sense of the text. The Arabic-speaking Jews employed another name, having reference to their musical value, אָלְֹקָטַנ, 'melodies, modulations.' A corresponding Hebrew name ד'ויוי is used by later Rabbinical writers.

The accents may be divided into two classes, according to their pausal (disjunctive), or non-pausal (conjunctive) character. In using these terms, however, we must be careful to remember that they apply, strictly speaking, only to the melody. (It has been already pointed out that the musical division does not always correspond to the interpunctional.) Jewish grammarians indeed generally distinguish otherwise. By what was with them a favourite figure of speech, they commonly term the pausal accents ד'ויוי or פּ'לֶנוֹס, as dominating the verse, in regard to both the melody and the sense; whilst the other accents as subordinated to them, and only able to stand when a pausal accent follows, are called מֵאְסִרִים, servi. The latter is a useful terminus technicus, and may be retained.

1 This name is first found in the Talmud, which more than once draws special attention to the logical importance of the accents. It must be remembered, however, that the Talmud knew nothing of the signs (which had not, at the time of its composition, been introduced into the text). If, therefore, we render the term פסח, as used in the Talmud, by 'accents,' we must understand the melodies, and specially the pausal melodies, which determined the meaning. These melodies were afterwards represented by the signs. (Some scholars seem to forget that the system was precisely the same, before and after the introduction of the signs.)

2 Comp. the terms מְטַחְרֵיס, מֵאֵסִירִים, מְסַטְרִקִים, &c., occasionally used by Rabb. writers for these two classes, תִּפָּרֵס, p. 10 inf.

3 So the seven Vowels, which were regarded as dominating the pronunciation,
The following list gives the signs and names of the accents in common use, according to the Palestinian (or Tiberian) system:

I. PAUSAL OR DISJUNCTIVE ACCENTS (מְמַלָּכִים)

1. Silluq (סִלּוּק), as in
2. Athnach (אַתְנָך), as in
3. S'gölta (סִגוֹלְתָּה), postpositive, as in
4. Great Zaqeph (גָּצוֹף עַל), as in
5. Little Zaqeph (נֶפֶשׁ עַל), as in
6. Tiphcha (טִפְחָה), as in
7. R'bhía (רְבְיה), as in
8. Zarqa (זָרָקָה), postpositive, as in
9. Pashta (פֶּשֶת), postpositive, as in
10. Y'thibh (יָתייבָה), prepositive, as in
11. T'bhir (תְּבִיר), as in

are often called מְשַׁרְחִים, the מְשַׁרְחִים in this case being the half-vowels, which can only stand when a full vowel follows (דָּם רָצוּר, p. 4). We may also compare the seven מַשְׁרָחִים, ‘servile letters,’ each of which has its counterpart (דיקִית. ח. ג', p. 4), in the stem-word.

4 There is another system of accentuation—the so-called Babylonian—agreeing in some respects with, but differing in others from, the Palestinian, and known to us chiefly by a MS. of the Prophets in the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg. In my opinion, this system is not only younger than, but completely dependent on, the Palestinian. I propose therefore to confine our attention, for the present, to the latter, and to give, in an Appendix, the particulars in which the other differs from it.

5 The orthodox number of the מְשַׁרְחִים is twelve—(S'gölta and Shalshéleth were not counted, as we shall see further on)—answering, according to Rabbinical fancy, to the twelve signs of the Zodiac. So even Aben-Ezra, Sachoth 2b, סוכות, סֵכְכָּה שְׁךֶכָּה שְׁכֶכָּה Sh. סוכות. On the other hand, the seven vowels were the seven planets (ibid.). Vowels and accents together were supposed to lighten up, like the heavenly bodies, what would have been otherwise dark and perplexing.
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10. Geresh (גֵּרֶשׁ), as in
   "Gersháyim, or Double Geresh (גֶּרֶשׁ), as in.

11. Pazer (פָּצֶר), as in
   Great Pazer (גָּדוֹל פָּצֶר or פָּצֶר לע), as in.

12. Great T'lisha (תָּלֶשֶׁה), prepositive, as in

13. L'garmeh (לֵגָרֶם), as in

II. NON-PAUSAL OR CONJUNCTIVE ACCENTS (םַמְשִׁית).

1. Munach (מּונָךְ), as in

2. M'huppakh (מִזְעֵפְקָה), as in

3. Mer'kha (מֶרְקָה), as in
   Double Mer'kha (מֶרְקָה מְרָקָה), as in

4. Darga (דֶּרָגָה), as in

5. Azla (אָצְלָה), as in

6. Little T'lisha (תְּלֶשֶׁה), postpositive, as in

7. Galgal (גֶּלֶגֶּל), as in

[8. Mây'la (מַיְלָא), as in]

The notation (signs) given in the above list may be regarded as original. The names are in some cases Aramaic, in others

(The Jews were not alone in indulging in such fancies. The Greeks compared the seven notes of the lyre to the seven planets, the twenty-eight sounds to the twenty-eight days of the month, &c. See Chappell’s History of Music, pp. 30, 52.)

6 So written and pronounced. The regular form would of course be מַהֲלָא, like מַהֲלָא, &c.

7 Certainly not derived from the Syriac, as Ewald (Abhandlungen, p. 130) seems to assert. If in one or two minor points a resemblance can be traced, it is purely accidental.

In some leather Tora-rolls, brought from Yemen, and now in the British Museum (Or. 1451, 1452, 1453, 1457), there is indeed what seems at first sight an approximation to the Syriac system. A point (not in ink, but marked by an
Hebrew. The meanings of the same may be traced (see below) to their figure, their position, their pausal and above all their musical value.

The signs fall generally on the *tone-syllable*. This (as is well-known) is a subsidiary purpose served by the accentuation. When therefore, in the case of a prepositive or postpositive accent, the tone does not fall on the first or last syllable respectively, the accent is bound to be repeated on the tone-syllable. With Pashta the rule is carried out, e.g. יַהֲנַר הַפְּרֶסֶת; but with S'gôlta, Zarqa, and the two T'lishas, it is very irregularly observed, in both Codd. and printed Texts. Jequthiel, indeed, in his carefully prepared text (אַרְעָה יִנְעַר) and Baer in his editions repeat the accent, e.g. יַהֲנַר, יַהֲנַר, יַהֲנַר, and יַהֲנַר. A Codex, like Par. i, that regularly does so, is very rare indeed.—For the reasons which led to the ommision of the second sign, see the remarks on the several accents.

It is to be observed that every word in the text has its proper melody assigned to it, and is provided with either a disjunctive or conjunctive accent. The only exception is in the case of two or more words, joined by the hyphen, called Maqqeph, which are treated as a single word. Thus יָלָל-כֵּנְסָק-אֲרֵי (Is. lili. io) has only one accent, not three.

The character of the accentuation is (as has been stated) pre-eminently musical. We should expect therefore a classification of the accents based on their *musical* value. And this has been

---

instrument, that left a small circular indentation) to the left hand of the word, marks the close of the verse, and one under the word the position of Athnach. Moreover, a diacritic point is placed over the word, to ensure the proper pronunciation, in the cases of את (אָת), בָּשׁ (בָּשׁ), and אָת (אָת). Thus

ירָבָר אָרַא אַרְעָה יִנְעַר (Gen. i. 1).

But these points are apparently of modern date (later than the writing), and can hardly be due to the influence of the old Syriac notation. (In Or. 1453, 1457 the attempt has been made, more or less, to erase them.)

6 Many Codd. omit the second Pashta (found in Baer's and other texts) in forms like יַר (Gen. viii. 13); יַרְשֵׁה (Judg. vi. 10); יַרְנֵן (2 Sam. iii. 32); יַר (Is. xlvii. 10). So too it is unnecessary to point, with Heidenheim and Baer, יַרְנֵן (Gen. vi. 22; vii. 2).

9 Even those which lay claim to exceptional correctness, as De R. 413, which professes to have been copied from the famous Cod. Hillel. Comp. Man. du Lect., p. 92, l. 13, where it is taken for granted that S'gôlta, Zarqa, &c. are not repeated.
attempted in some earlier treatises, but in terms so brief and enigmatical that no one has yet succeeded in deciphering and explaining them. The difficulty has in a great measure arisen from scholars not having had before them the original Arabic *termini technici*, which the Hebrew terms but imperfectly represent. This deficiency I am able to supply from an Arabic treatise on the accents in the Bodleian Library, by the help of which we can arrive at a sufficiently clear idea of what the old grammarians meant. They divided then the *תלולות* under three heads:

I. Those which were chanted with the highest tone, Pazer, T'lisha, and Géresh. As these accents often lead off the melody, the highest notes were suitably enough assigned to them. In this class we must further include Shalshé leth, a very rare accent, which (as we shall see further on) belonged to the same musical category as Pazer.

II. Those which were chanted high, viz. Zarqa [S'gôlta],

---

10 See Ben-Bil. in Mishp. hat., p. 8, and Chayyug, p. 128.
11 Ox. 2512. The same treatise is found in Or. 2349 and Par. 1327. These MSS. are all from Yemen.
12 Of this division, Ben-Bil., p. 8, says simply *יומית קורים וינרראה*. The author of Man. du Lect., p. 90, who styles it *ירה זר וירפה*, describes it in the same way, and adds, by way of illustration, that when two or three Pazers occur in the same verse "the voice of the reader is elevated, so as to be heard afar off" (*יומית קופה וינרראה*). In Ox. 2512, p. 13, we have the original Arabic *terminus technicus*, which is thus explained: * множי האעלא והארוק תرفع الصوت 운עלנה [sic] [the voice be put to the highest division. The proper meaning of *אעלא* is 'a making (or being) known.' (Hence Chayyug, p. 128, has derived his strange name of this division.) It came then to signify 'a publishing abroad, making (the voice) heard aloud,' and in this latter sense was used as synonymous with 'lifting up of the voice' (comp. Sa'adia's rendering of Is. xlii. 2, 11, and Abu'l-walid s.v. א"ש). We have therefore no proper distinction between the terms used for the first and second divisions. Only conventionally can have signified a higher and more powerful elevation of the voice than the *אעלא*.

13 As Ox. 2512 also distinctly states: *דלולות* מזרישו הקט.
14 Ben-Bil. and Chayyug call this division *وثائق זירה*, Man. du Lect., p. 75, *ירה זר וירפה*. The Arabic name agrees, *رفع الصوت*. All that Ox. 2512 says of it is that it is intermediate between I and III: * множי הרעף הוא מ المتوּא וינרראה."
R’bhīa, L’garmeh, T’bhîr. These accents constantly occupy in practice an intermediate position between those of I and III, and so had an intermediate melody (comp. note 14). Even T’bhîr was made a high note, in antithesis to the fall of the voice with Tiphcha, which always follows.

III. We pass on, in natural order, to the low, which were at the same time sustained, tones 15, represented by Pashta, Zaqeph, Tiphcha, Athnach, and Silluq. The voice dropped and proceeded in measured tones, on approaching the two great pauses in the middle and at the end of the verse, and also the pauses next in magnitude to them marked by Zaqeph. (This last rule is indeed contrary to what we should have expected, for Zaqeph and its foretone Pashta seem from form and position high notes 16.) When however the word, on which any of these accents falls, is Mil’el, we are told 17 that the melody changed and that they were chanted with a high note (the voice dropping however again, I presume, with the last syllable). The arsis in such cases explains the change in the melody.

The author of Man. du Lect. (p. 75) informs us that the מִשְׁרָתְיוֹn, servi, admit of being divided in the same way, but no particulars are given.

One error Jewish grammarians avoided. They did not attempt to classify the מִלֵיס according to their supposed interpolunional

---

15 Ben-Bil. calls this division מִשְׁרָתְיוֹn, Chayyug, Man. du Lect., pp. 75 and 93. The Arabic name is الرִזְע. The term מִשְׁרָתְיוֹn shews that the tones were ‘low.’ The other names are synonymous, and indicate steady ‘sustained’ tones. Comp. Man. du Lect., p. 96: עַלְיָנָן נַפְלְשָׁכְכֶנָּה נַפְלְשָׁכֶנָּה נַפְלְשָׁכֶנָּה נַפְלְשָׁכֶנָּה נַפְלְשָׁכֶנָּה נַפְלְשָׁכֶנָּה נַפְלְשָׁכֶנָּה נַפְלְשָׁכֶנָּה נַפְלְשָׁכֶנָּה נַפְלְשָׁכֶנָּה נַפְלְשָׁכֶנָּה נַפְלְשָׁכֶנָּה נַפְלְשָׁכֶנָּה נַפְלְשָׁכֶנָּה נַפְלְשָׁכֶנָּה נַפְלְשָׁכֶנָּה נַפְלְשָׁכֶנָּה נַפְלְשָׁכֶנָּה נַפְלְשָׁכֶנָּה נַפְלְשָׁכֶנָּה נַפְלְשָׁכֶנָּה נַפְלְשָׁכֶנָּה נַפְלְשָׁכֶנָּה נַפְלְשָׁכֶנָּה נַפְלְשָׁכֶנָּה נַפְלְשָׁכֶנָּה נַפְלְשָׁכֶנָּה נַפְלְשָׁכֶנָּה נַפְלְשָׁכֶנָּה

16 If we were to transfer these accents to Class II, and bring T’bhîr into Class III, we might suppose that all was in order. But we know too little of the musical value of the accents to be able to dogmatize.

17 See Ben-Bil., and more fully Man. du Lect., p. 97 sup. In the latter passage, however, two of the quotations are falsely accented. For Gen. i. 1, take 2 Chr. ii. 11; and for Ex. i. 2, Gen. xxxv. 23.
value. On the other hand, early Christian writers on the accents aimed at establishing on this basis a kind of hierarchy, consisting of *Imperatores, Reges, Duces, Comites*, &c. Strange, indeed, is it to find this fanciful and misleading distinction (long ago rejected by Spitzner) still retained in so standard a Work as Gesenius’ Heb. Gr., p. 52. Athnach and Silluq are both made *Imperatores*, although (as will be seen hereafter) the former is as much subordinated to the latter, as Zaqeph is to Athnach. Nor can Tiphcha (as in the early editions) be properly placed in the same class with Zaqeph, &c. (The present editor has indeed avoided the last-named error, but only to fall into a more serious one. He has actually reckoned R’bhia among the *Reges*, whilst Tiphcha follows only as a *Dux*! And this mistake has already begun to circulate as current coin, see Curtiss, Outlines of Heb. Gr., p. 20, and König, Lehrgebäude der Hebr. Sprache, p. 76.) The few pages devoted to the accentuation in this otherwise correct and useful Work sadly need revision.

**Remarks on the Several Accents**

The variety of names assigned to some of the accents will perhaps appear surprising to the student. They are doubtless to be mainly accounted for, as having originated in different schools, or under the influence of this or that distinguished teacher. Occasionally, perhaps, we may trace the fancy of some unimportant punctator,—the names he proposed not being found elsewhere than in the list he drew up. It is with the least important accents that the greatest liberties have been taken. The names of the leading accents, Silluq, Athnach, Zaqeph, &c. were left for the most part undisturbed. After all, any modern Dictionary of Music will shew almost as great a variety

---

18 In these remarks, I quote not only printed lists, but lists found in the following MSS.: Ox. 2512 (already described); Vat. 475 (? 14th century); De R. 333 (dated 1392); 1016 (? 14th century), and 1262 (dated 1454). The Arabic list, Pet. 123 (? 16th century), has been printed in Pinsker’s Einleitung &c., pp. 42–43.

I also refer occasionally to the Zarga-lists, so named from the accent with which they all commence. Three such lists are current, differing slightly from one another, and named after the communities in which they are in use,—סֶפֶר (Spanish), פָּרְשָׁה (Italian), and פָּרְשָׁה (German). The date of their introduction is uncertain, but they can hardly be older than the 14th century, for no writer on the accents alludes to them, and they are very rare in manuscript. Perhaps they were originally intended for popular use, for giving instruction to children in school,—a purpose which they still serve,—&c. Accurate they are not. Any one who is curious to see them will find them in Norzi’s Bible, i. p. 135, after the Megilloth. As given in Bartolocci’s Biblioth. magna rabbin., iv. 441–442, they are full of mistakes.
of names for many notes, particularly for musical figures, graces, &c., such as were more or less in use in the Hebrew cantillation 19.

I have quoted several times Villoteau's description of the musical value of the accents 20. A distinguished musician, he took great pains to ascertain and reproduce correctly the melodies in use in the synagogues of Egypt. These Oriental melodies seem to me sometimes really to represent the true character of the accents.

DISJUNCTIVES. I. 1. The terms פ* and פ* are indifferently used for the final accent of the verse. The former, which means 'cessation,' 'close,' i.e. of the melody, is the name of the stroke (inclining often in Codd. slightly to the left 21) placed under the tone-syllable of the word. The latter term indicates properly the two points (or small strokes) which separate the verses from one another 22. Evidently, these points served as the main guide for the reader. In Yemen Codd. the stroke under the tone-syllable is often wanting altogether 23.

2. ס*סנ, ס*סנ, or ס*סנ. An Aramaic name, derived from the Aphel of סנ, secondary form of סנ, and properly signifying 'a causing to rest' (comp. סנ, סנ, סנ, &c.). Another name of very rare occurrence is ס*סנ (so written in Codd.), which means 'a turning over.' This name properly belongs, as it seems to me, to the Babylonian system, in which Tiphcha is represented by ס*סנ, and Athnach following by the same sign turned over, ס*סנ 22. For an explanation of the form see ת"ט, p. 15.

3. ס*סנ, ס*סנ, or ס*סנ, so named from its similarity to the vowel-sign ס*�ול 26. The three points have, however, a meaning of

---

19 Heidenheim (Mishp. hat., p. 5b) has given various names of the accents, but has mixed together those of the three and twenty-one Books, and copied, without scruple, blunders of Qalonymos and El. Levita.

20 In the great Work, Description de l'Egypte, Etat moderne, vol. i. p. 838 ff.

21 As the Arabic treatise, Ox. 2512, says, in describing Silluq: هو شكل عصا وأوقف يميل إلى اليسار قليلًا.

22 Sometimes, as in Or. 1467; 1477; 2363, and Ox. 2484 (all Yemen Codd.), a single point (or stroke) is used, as in Syriac.

23 As in Or. 1469, 1473, 1477, 2366; Ox. 2484; Par. 1325, &c.

24 The part. of this form, סנ, occurs in the Talmud, Erubin 53a.

25 Full as our Massora is, the name occurs but once, in the mas. parva to Lev. xviii. 15; whereas, in the scanty remains that have come down to us of the Oriental Massora, it has already been found twice, in Cod. Bab. mas. parva to Hos. xiii. 12, and in a rubric given in Ginsb. Mas., iii. p. 246. (In the list at the end of Bomb. i, the word is misprinted ס*גך.) The very name Sichpha (a strange form) may have been intended as a play on the word Tiphcha.

26 Hence called by Hadassi (Sepher ha-eshkol, p. 61). 
their own, being intended to indicate that $S'$gôlta was (relatively) a greater pausal accent than Qazeph with its two points, as Qazeph, in its turn, was greater than p'buah with only one point. A probably older name, which is intimated in Cod. Bab. and is used by Chayyug (p. 127) and retained in the Italian Zarqa-list, is מֵא, 'encamping,' 'halting for rest' by which the greater pause made by S'gôlta was indicated. Rabbinical writers have also another name, ס'גolta, due to their fanciful notion that, as S'gôlta always 'follows Zarqa,' it was not entitled to rank as a separate and independent accent. Ben-Asher's strange name ר'ביה, meaning 'What is over-against' (Zarqa), conveys the same idea (Dikd. hat., p. 18).

This accent was made postpositive (according to the grammarians) for clearness' sake, that its points might not be mixed up with the others that appear above the word, as they would have been, e.g. in ח'יוץ'. For the same reason doubtless it was but seldom repeated, when the word is Mil'el.

4. מֵא, 'Chain.' A very rare accent, occurring only seven times in the twenty-one Books. The sign (which was supposed to represent a hanging chain) and the name both point to the melody, which is described as a double-trill, with its chain of notes; or as two notes connected by an ascending chain of sounds. The former melody suits better the descriptive terms applied to this accent in the Massora and elsewhere.—The Paseq, which accompanies it (Mas. to

---

27 Comp. מֵא used for Athnach, סְפַר מֵא אַמָּר, p. 14. Or רוּפְּאֶ may mean dis-solve, separans, like the Syriac accent, ל'חס (Duval, Gr. Syr., p. 154).

28 See Mishp. hat., p. 36a below. 'Olev'yored in the three Books is treated in the same way.

29 Comp. Mishp. hat., p. 38b.

30 Sometimes the form מֵא used (e.g. in Pet. 123) מֵא. In Dikd. hat., § 16a, the name is מֵא, in Vat. 475 מֵא, comp. Is. xl. 19.

31 As it occurs so seldom it was not counted entitled to a place among the מֵא (see Mishp. hat., p. 7).

32 יְדֹרֵהוּ כֵּסֶל הָרִוָה (Zalman the punctuator in Par. 5).

33 Comp. El. Levita's description of it as sung by the Ashkenazim of his day: יְדֹרֵהוּ כֵּסֶל הָרִוָה, § 4. (For Pazer as a trill, see p. 21.)

34 According to the oriental mode, see Villoteau, p. 838.

35 רְבַיִת, 'reverberating' (Mas. to Lev. viii. 23; Dikd. hat., p. 18 below); רְבַיַּת, 'making to tremble' (Ox. 41; Par. 4; St. Pet. Cat., p. 85); רְבַיֵּית, 'agitating, shaking' the voice (De R. 861; comp. Ginsb. Mas. י, § 235)—terms all suit ing its character as a tremolo or trill.
Lev. viii. 23), was introduced for the sake of conformity with the pausal Shalshéloth of the three Books\textsuperscript{36}.  

5. הפ' נ.price. Doubtless derived its name from the 'upright' finger employed, in the teaching of the cantillation, to mark it. Comp. Ben-Asher (Dikd. hat., p. 18), Why two points—an upright line, as we should have expected—were chosen as its sign, has been explained under S'gólta. But the upright line was not lost sight of, as we shall see immediately.

Zaqeph is an accent of very frequent occurrence,—four or more often appearing in one verse,—and probably on this account was subjected (more than any other accent) to various musical modifications, with the view of varying the recurring melody. Thus we have the simple sign of two points, נפ' 7 or נפ' 7, with a simpler melody; and a double sign, made up of the two points and the upright line named above,—a double Zaqeph\textsuperscript{37},—with a fuller, stronger tone. This form of the accent is known as נפ' 7. (We must not, however, be misled by the names, and suppose that נפ' 7 represents a greater pausal accent than נפ' 7 (see e.g. Gen. ii. 9\textsuperscript{b}). The difference is simply musical\textsuperscript{38}). The rules—which have never yet been clearly made out—for the employment of the one or other of these accents will follow in due course; as also the explanation of the other musical modifications to which Zaqeph's word is subject.

6. א' נ. means 'handbreadth.' The name refers, as I conjecture, to the 'outspread hand,' the manual sign employed for this accent. (Unfortunately but few of these signs have been described to us by those who knew them.) Another name, in equally common use, is א'. נ. 'laboring, toiling,' which can only mean a 'slow, heavy' melody, lento. Tarcha, as immediately preceding the cadence at Athnach and Silluq, may well have been of this character. Before Silluq it had also the special name (an intimation that the melody varied slightly from that before Athnach) נ' הת', 'thrust back,' in allusion to the backward inclination of the sign\textsuperscript{39}, in contrast to Silluq.

7. יחב', an Aramaic word, = 'resting.' The name may refer to the 

\textit{pause}, or the character of the \textit{melody}, 'resting,' 'sustained' (see

\textsuperscript{36} But it was quite unnecessary, and fails in many old Codd., as Add. 21161; De R. 10, 226; K. 154. Comp. Jequthiel's note to Gen. xix. 16.

\textsuperscript{37} So we have a double Géresh and a double Mer'kha.

\textsuperscript{38} Comp. Man. du Lect., p. 96: למוקה הוכל לעמש עמשי ירא וקוק ופק ופק ופק ופק ופק וקאול למוות המהל.

\textsuperscript{39} As in the list at the end of Bomb. 1 (copied in Ginsb. Mas. i. p. 658). So Màyla, which has the same inclination, is called יחב'. In Pet. 123 we have the Arabic name יחב', 'thrusting back' the sign.
8. נַּעֲנָה or "יָנָה. Jewish writers on the accents derive the name נַּעֲנָה from הָיֶה, 'to sprinkle, scatter.' It may be taken to refer to the character of the melody, which is further symbolized by the form of the accent. Comp. Villoteau, p. 838: 'Les sons semblent se répandre et s'étendre, en tournoyant.' The form would then represent what is called in music 'a turn.' Originally it was so —, whence the name נַּעֲנָה, 'hook-like.' This form is still common in Codd. But as there was not always room for this upright sign between the lines, it was made recumbent, and delineated with a free hand assumed the shape which appears in our printed texts.

Zarqa was made postpositive for the sake of conformity with its position in the three Books; and as it is in these Books seldom repeated, when the word is Mil'el (lest it should be confounded with Sinnorith), so punctators rarely repeat it in the twenty-one Books.

9. נְעֵם or נִקְּמָה, 'extending,' 'stretching out in length.' The name may be most simply explained, as referring to the melody, 'indique qu'on doit étendre et prolonger la voix sur le même ton' (Villoteau, p. 840). So the Orientals chant this accent. The sign is properly a straight line inclined to the left, made postpositive, to distinguish it from Azla, with the same form.

When Pashta would come on a monosyllable, or a dissylable which is Mil'el, and no servus precedes, it is changed into נְקָמָה — an accent of

---

40 Here and there in lists (e.g. in Chayyuq, p. 129) the name is found. This change of the original name, if not a corruption, may have been due to the (incorrect) notion that R. marks the fourth pausal division of the verse after Silluq, Athnach, and Zaqeph.

41 As, for instance, by Aben-Ezra (חַסְדָּא, p. 1).<br>

42 On further consideration, this explanation appears to me more probable than that which I proposed in מַטָּר, p. 16.

43 For נְקָמָה, 'hook,' comp. Levy, Neuhebr. W. B.—Menachem ben Salomo (in his work rekl ייִבְנֹר יִיְהוּדָא) describes Zarqa יוהנָא, נְקָמָה, this word being understood by Rabb. writers in the sense of 'hook;' and in Or. 2349 I found: יִוהנָא, وهو שָׁקָל יִנָּה, 'is in the form of a hook.'

44 A fine musical distinction, not without parallel, as we shall see further on.

But it is surprising that the same signs should have been chosen for Azla and M'huppach, the servi of Pashta, as for Pashta itself and Y'tibh. As might have been expected, no little confusion has been the result. Pashta has been confounded in texts with Azla, and M'huppach with Y'tibh.
the same disjunctive value, but differing in form and melody; thus מ"ח becomes מ"ע (Gen. iii. 11), מ"א (vi. 9). This new accent was made prepositive, in order to distinguish it from the conjunctive accent M'hppach with the same form, e.g. מ"א and מ"א, and מ"ע. Its own disjunctive character was indicated by the name given it, ב' הנח, 'resting, pause.'

(Different schools did not, however, all agree in the above nomenclature. Some grammarians make ב' הנח the generic name, and understand by it generally Pashta, distinguishing when necessary between ב' הנח and ב' הנחikt. With others the distinction is between מ"א' הנח and מ"א' הנחikt, or between ב' הנח simplex, and מ"א' הנחikt. Y'tibh is also known as מ"א' הנחikt 47. Chayyug (p. 129) speaks of it as שאר המשות בין השארidades, and מ"א' הנחikt שאר המשות performs, i.e. 'which is disjoined.' Rashi (on Deut. xi. 30) has the name מ"א' הנחikt 'making low,' and Pet. 123 מ"א' הנחikt, perhaps 'enveloping,' because standing outside the vowel.)

10. ב' or א"ב (Heb. ש'.). The name is derived from the melody, which was a broken note, a series of broken tones in one measure (as it is sung in the present day). Hence T'bhir is described as מ"א' הנחikt (Man. du Lect., p. 72). The form—as made up of R'bha and Mer'kha—represents it as an intermediate accent, neither so strong as the former, nor so weak as the latter (R'bha, T'bhir, Mer'kha, is the frequent order in the full melody preceding Tiphchha).

11. פ' or פ', expulsio. This accent was one of the highest notes (see p. 13), and required a strong 'expulsion' of the voice to produce it. It was also known as מ"א' הנחikt א"ב, being a trill like Pazer 48. Another very common name is מ"א' הנחikt ב' or מ"א' הנחikt נ"א, 'bar 49,' derived from the

45 It may be noted that, where there is no vowel under the first letter, M'hppach is (in carefully pointed Codd.) placed under the middle of the letter, י' thibh more to the right, e.g. מ"ע and מ"ע, ש' and ש'.

Moses the punctator tells us (םקקתא ע"ע, p. 27) that Y'tibh was also distinguished by being smaller in size, which is false (as any Codex will shew). Equally so is his statement that the melody was the same as that of Pashta, for then there would have been no change in the sign.

46 For these different names, see Mishp. hat., 32a, 35b; Man. du Lect., pp. 77, 94.

47 Mishp. hat., 37a.

48 See note 35 and Dikd. hat., p. 17 note. In De R. 1262, Géresh and Pazer are both described as י"ק, 'making (the voice) tremble.'

49 See Fleischer's note in Levy's Neuhebr. W. B., ii. p. 211. So Ab'ul-walid, Lexicon, p. 113, uses ת"ח for Heb. הנחikt. Chayyug (p. 128) has the form ה"ך, which is more correct, in view of the derivation.
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form (properly a straight line) and indicating the disjunctive character of this accent. So we use 'bar' of a dividing line in music.

and, 'Double Géresh,' (called כפ and אד respectively in Ox. 2512, p. 18), differed musically, and in the rules for their employment. Their disjunctive value is the same.

12. פזר, פזר, derives its name from its melody, הנביה והותר יהלושמד (Dikr. hat. p. 18). It was a trill, but of a more pronounced character than Géresh. Like Géresh it occurs with a twofold melody and two different signs, known as Great and Little Pazer. The original sign of the former, still preserved in many Codd., was no doubt פזר, in which we may see a representation of the manual sign used for this accent, 'two fingers turned upwards' (Man. du Lect., p. 108). Sometimes in Codd. Little Pazer differs only in being smaller, but generally there is a slight alteration in the form as well, thus: פזר. The original meaning of the sign was after a time lost sight of, and many variations of form were introduced.

By a poor figure of speech Great Pazer was commonly known as הכףת, 'cow-horns;' in Man. du Lect., p. 91, it is likened to the antennae of the locust, ומגרץ; and in Pet. 123 it is מפזר, 'a pair of scissors.' This accent, from its rare occurrence (it is found only sixteen times), attracted the attention of the punctators, who amused themselves with giving it various ornamental forms, one of which is that which appears in printed texts and is made to resemble two T'lishas,—a misleading representation, for Pazer had no connection (as far as we know) with T'lisha. The Mas. parva to Ezek. xlviii. 21, which describes Great Pazer with its servus Galgal as כףת גאלגל, 'wheel and waggon,' was doubtless due to this form.

Little Pazer—sometimes called כפ— is the ordinary Pazer of our texts, and is of very frequent occurrence.

13. כפ or כפ. Like Géresh and Pazer, a musical term (from the root שפ, 'to pluck out, draw out with effort') indicating that this accent 'drew out' the voice with a marked effort and impulse. (It was one of the highest notes, p. 13.) The sign is properly a small circle, which seems to have been intended to symbolize the melody. From this circular form was derived another name, כפ, 'shield.'

50 נסיון  סדק, Ox. 2512, and so it is marked in Cod. Bab. and Yemen Codd.

51 Comp. Villoteau, p. 842, who after giving the melody as he had heard it in the East, adds: 'Il faut arracher la voix avec force du fond de la poitrine, et étendre les sons, en faisant un petit circuit.'

52 מסדר = שורד, but I have found no other example of this form. The name שורד was avoided, as being too like to צור, No. 11. For 'round as a shield,' comp. Dozy, s.v. תורס.
Tlisha had, like Géresh and Pazer, with which it is so often associated, a twofold melody, distinguished as הָרָה וְהָרָה וְהָרָה and הָרָה וְהָרָה וְהָרָה; but here the weaker melody is a conjunctive. The sign of the former is prepositive and sometimes called in consequence מַמָּלֶךְ, that of the latter postpositive מַמָּלֶךְ. Grammarians tell us that they were so placed, that they might not be confounded with the circular sign מ, marked over words which are the object of a Massoretic note מ. For the same reason punctators rarely repeat the sign.

14. הָרָה וְהָרָה וְהָרָה, i.e. מַמָּלֶךְ וְמַמָּלֶךְ מַמָּלֶךְ. The name L'garmeuh means 'for or by itself, independent' = disjunctive, and was chosen to designate a particular disjunctive melody—which must originally have resembled Munach—in contrast to the conjunctive Munach, with or without Paseq following. With Paseq, the signs are the same. How the one was distinguished from the other in practice we shall see further on. But it was clearly a mistake to employ the same signs for two distinct accentual values,—a mistake that has been avoided in the Babylonian system. (Such mistakes are sure to lead to confusion, and the present instance forms no exception, as any one who has consulted the Paseq-lists will have observed.) The melody of L. must have been 'drawn out' in comparison with that of the simple Munach, as we gather from the name מַמָּלֶךְ וְמַמָּלֶךְ וְמַמָּלֶךְ, protractio, assigned to this accent in Dikd. hat., p. 17 (see Baer's note), and elsewhere.

II. 1. Of the CONJUNCTIVES, the most important, owing to their frequent occurrence, are those belonging to the Shophar-class, so named as the sign was meant to represent the מַמָּלֶךְ, 'trumpet,' which is still employed by the Jews in their religious observances. This musical instrument, the only one in use since the destruction of the second temple, could hardly have been passed over, in choosing the signs and names for the musical notes.

Early writers on the accents distinguish as follows:—

a. שְׁלָשֶׁה or שְׁלָשֶׁה שְׁלָשֶׁה representing a 'sustained' note. (The name Munach does not refer, as is generally supposed, to the position under the word, but to the melody.)

53 Man. du Lect., p. 92.
54 We must not call it שְׁלָשֶׁה שְׁלָשֶׁה, as Qimchi does (וְכָא טְסֵנָה, p. 5), and above all not מַמָּלֶךְ שְׁלָשֶׁה מַמָּלֶךְ, as in the printed Mas. to Ex. xxx. 13 (although Frensdorff has copied without scruple): מַמָּלֶךְ is a clerical error. Parallel to our Munach L., are the Azla L. and M'uphach L. of the three Books.
55 The name is regularly used in Man. du Lect. for Munach (it is also found in Chayyun, p. 128), and is thus explained, p. 87: לִשְׁמָהָה שְׁמֵהַ מֵאָה טְסֵנָה. Corresponding names in אָה טְסֵנָה of תְּסֵנָה, p. 1; and Oxl. 2517, p. 18, are כְּפָרָה שְׁמֵהַ and כְּפָרָה שְׁמֵהַ. The Arabic name is שְׁמֵהַ שְׁמֵהַ שְׁמֵהַ. מַמָּלֶךְ = מַמָּלֶךְ שְׁמֵהַ מַמָּלֶךְ.
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b. נְשָׁא צָעָר, or שְׁאָר (נְשָׁא), had, as its names imply, an ‘ascending’ tone 56.

c. שָׁמָּה or שָׁמָּה, an ornamental note, whence its name, in reference to 1 Chr. xv. 27 and Dan. iii. 21. Its only use was to vary the melody before Zaqeph. The musical character was a ‘broken’ note (answering to the שָׁמָּה of the three Books), as the names מַזְעָה and מַזְעָה (so pointed) shew. That it was also a ‘descending’ note appears from another name, נָהָר שָׁמָּה 57.

The therefore, according to its position before this or that disjunctive accent, had a ‘sustained,’ an ‘ascending’ or a ‘descending’ melody; and thus (speaking roughly) one may say that the three Shophars are explained. Precise rules are laid down for their respective employment, which will be referred to hereafter.

But why (it has been asked) three such different melodies with one and the same sign? I think I can explain. These three Shophar-intonations were meant to correspond to the three notes (or trumpet-calls) appointed to be sounded on the Shophar upon the great Festival of the New Year 58. Not that the musical value was the same. But the threefold distinction in the one case suggested the same distinction for the other. We have the Shophar with three notes in both cases.

The single sign employed, however, gradually led to the obliteration of the distinction so carefully laid down; and though a variety of names (including some of those given above) came into use, they had a common signification, and pointed to one accent (instead of to three) 59.

Such names are וְנָהָר פָּעְרָה שְׁמֵש, שִׂמְשָׁר, שַׁמְשָׁר, קָר' חִשְׁפּוֹק, לְזִ' גָּרָה שָׁמָּה שָׁמָּה, שָׁמָּה שָׁמָּה (these three last names in contrast to נָהָר שָׁמָּה), and lastly—most inappropriate of all—לְצִ' שָׁמָּה 60. As the musical division has no meaning

56 For these names, see Mishp. hat., 69; Man. du Lect., p. 87; Chayyug, p. 128; and שָׁמָּה, p. 27. (Here for אֲשֵׁר; the editor has carelessly printed, twice over, אֲשָׁר.) The Arabic name is מַזְעָה.

57 For the above names, see Mishp. hat., 11 and 13; Man. du Lect., pp. 103, 108; Chayyug, l.c., and שְׁאָר, שִׁפְּרָה, l.c. (לְצִ' שָׁמָּה is Infinitive-form of לְצִ' שָׁמָּה, Ezek. xxi. 26). The Arabic name was borrowed from the Hebrew. Ben-Bil. (Ox. MS.) says of this accent that it was chanted ‘with an emphatic agitation’ (of the voice).

58 viz. נְשָׁא צָעָר, and שְׁאָר, see Mishna at the end of נְשָׁא צָעָר. The New Year is the only occasion on which the Shophar is so used, and to the present day much is made of this part of the Festival ceremonies.

59 And so in the chanting of the present day, there is but one melody in use.

60 One or other of these names will be found in the list printed in Ginsb. Mas., i. p. 653, in נְשָׁא צָעָר, p. 2, in the several Zarqa-lists, &c. But how are we to explain the strange name לְצִ' שָׁמָּה, ‘wheel,’ found in some texts of the Italian Zarqa-list (whence Norzi has borrowed it, e.g. in his note to Gen. i. 3)? A form of
for us, we too may be content with one name and may accept that which has become established by long use, viz. Munach, although the proper signification of the term no longer applies.

d. מָטַח, מִשְפָּה or מַתִּקָם, so named from its form. It was an 'inverted' Shophar 61. As compared with Munach its use was limited, for it occurs only before Pashta. Its musical value is described (Dikd. hat., p. 19) מָטַח", so that we might also term it מָטַח in regard to its melody 62.

2. מַכַּיֵּר or מַכַּיֵּר (כַּיֵּר, כַּיֵּר or מַכַּיֵּר, כַּיֵּר and כַּיֵּר), and indicate the accent as 'prolonging' the modulation. It had a long tone 63, which was at the same time, as the Massora and all writers on the accents describe it, a descending tone 64. In MSS. it is generally represented as a straight line, turned more or less to the left, but in some made perpendicular.

[It may be noted that the term מַכַּיֵּר is often used in the Massora and elsewhere not only for the accent Mer'kha, but for Gaya—Metheg as well. And even the signs are not always kept distinct in Codd. Hence an excuse may be found for our printed texts, which constantly mark the (euphonic) Metheg at the end of a word as Mer'kha, מֵרְךַּה (Gen. xxviii. 5) for מַכַּיֵּר; מַכַּיֵּר (Is. lixii. 5) for מֵרְךַּה, &c. Another occasional use of מַכַּיֵּר in the Massora is to indicate the opposite to

Munach occurs occasionally in Codd. with the angle rounded off ר, and it must have appeared to some punctator—one of the class, whose restless ingenuity was wholly occupied with such trifles—that here was an opening for a new name, after the analogy of Galgal, No. 6. The name has, however (as far as I have noticed), been adopted only by Norzi.

If we find any of the names above given, loosely used in the Massora (MS. or printed), we must not suppose that the genuine Massora sanctioned them. Both copyists and editors have introduced the modern names familiar to them.

61 By Chayyug, p. 127, this accent is called כַּיֵּר, כַּיֵּר, fully pronounced (Ox. 2512, p. 18). The meaning is 'conjunctive' (comp. Dikd. hat., § 30, and Ginsb. Mas. 9, § 235), in opposition to the disjunctive Y'thlih with the same form. An extraordinary name occurs in Pet. 123, מַכַּיֵּר, מַכַּיֵּר, i.e. מַכַּיֵּר, 'small new moon.' Mutatis mutandis, the explanation is the same as for Gilgal above.

62 By Chayyug, p. 127, this accent is called כַּיֵּר, כַּיֵּר, fully pronounced (Ox. 2512, p. 18). The meaning is 'conjunctive' (comp. Dikd. hat., § 30, and Ginsb. Mas. 9, § 235), in opposition to the disjunctive Y'thlih with the same form. An extraordinary name occurs in Pet. 123, מַכַּיֵּר, מַכַּיֵּר, i.e. מַכַּיֵּר, 'small new moon.' Mutatis mutandis, the explanation is the same as for Gilgal above.

63 By Chayyug, p. 127, this accent is called כַּיֵּר, כַּיֵּר, fully pronounced (Ox. 2512, p. 18). The meaning is 'conjunctive' (comp. Dikd. hat., § 30, and Ginsb. Mas. 9, § 235), in opposition to the disjunctive Y'thlih with the same form. An extraordinary name occurs in Pet. 123, מַכַּיֵּר, מַכַּיֵּר, i.e. מַכַּיֵּר, 'small new moon.' Mutatis mutandis, the explanation is the same as for Gilgal above.

64 By Chayyug, p. 127, this accent is called כַּיֵּר, כַּיֵּר, fully pronounced (Ox. 2512, p. 18). The meaning is 'conjunctive' (comp. Dikd. hat., § 30, and Ginsb. Mas. 9, § 235), in opposition to the disjunctive Y'thlih with the same form. An extraordinary name occurs in Pet. 123, מַכַּיֵּר, מַכַּיֵּר, i.e. מַכַּיֵּר, 'small new moon.' Mutatis mutandis, the explanation is the same as for Gilgal above.
Remarks on the Accents.

Maqqeph, thus: מַּקּוּפֶּה (Mas. to Lev. i. 11), i.e. ‘eight instances in Lev. lengthen out the particle בַּל with an accent’ (instead of contracting it with Maqqeph). Comp. Mas. parva to Esth. ii. 5. As these instances affect the accentuation, it seemed necessary to allude to them.]

Mer'kha appears in a few instances doubled, and is termed נְמַרְקָה הַדוֹּּלָּה, or נְמַרְקָה וּנְמַרְקָה, ‘two rods or strokes.’ As the servus of T'bhir always precedes, this Double Mer'kha was regarded as a reduced or impoverished T'bhir, whence the fanciful name given to it of נְכַפֶּה, pauper, tenuis 65. Qimchi (Mikhlol 89a) goes so far as to say that its melody was like T'bhir's. But his authority on such a point is not of much weight.

3. נֶמְרָקָה is also termed נְמַרְקָה חָזֶּקֶת and נְמַרְקָה (��ָּלָה) 66. These latter names seem to indicate a certain relationship with the disjunctive Shalsheleth. And in some old Codd., as De R. 10 and K. 154, the sign for Darga is precisely the same as that for Shalsheleth, as also it is described in Dikd. hat., p. 19, and Man. du Lect., p. 76. But the Shalsheleth-sign stands, as we have seen, p. 17, for a trill. Such then would seem to have been the musical value of Darga. The name נֶמְרָקָה had also probably this meaning. Comp. נֶמְרָקָה, he chanted, or sang, in a trilling or quavering manner (Lane). Of course, the trill or quaver must have been feeble, in comparison with that of Shalsheleth 67. The sign in common use, and the modern melody of a descending scale running through the octave, represent נְמַרְקָה in its ordinary meaning of scala.

4. נֶמְרָקָה · נֶמְרָקָה, i.e. ‘going on, not pausing in the melody,’=conjunctive (in contrast to Pashța, disjunctive, with the same sign) 68. Other names for this accent are נְמַרְקָה · נְמַרְקָה, rod, ‘stroke’ (comp. l. 7 above), and נֶמְרָקָה · נֶמְרָקָה, cord, ‘line.’ When associated with Geresh, it is frequently termed נְמַרְקָה · נְמַרְקָה, Geresh then, by a strange confusion of terms, being known as נֶמְרָקָה · נֶמְרָקָה 69; or the two are described by the Massoretic formula נַמַּרְקָה · נַמַּרְקָה. The melody is an ascending one, נַמַּרְקָה · נַמַּרְקָה (Dikd. hat., p. 19).

65 Dikd. hat., p. 18. Baer indeed explains the term of Silluq. But this is a mistake; for Ox. 2512, p. 153, expressly names the Double Mer'kha in דַּלוּעַ (Ex. v. 15) קַפֶּסֶת. The description also, given in Dikd. hat., l.c., exactly suits this accent.

66 Chayyug, p. 128 below; Man. du Lect., p. 76; Dikd. hat., § 19. The ignorant Qalonymos gives a further name דַּלוּעַ רַזָּה, which is quite false (the name belongs to another accent, see p. 23). Yet he is followed by El. Levita, Heidentheim, Ewald, and others.

67 It ought also to have a corresponding name, נְמְרָקָה · נְמְרָקָה, as in De R. 1262.

68 So David ben Abraham (10th century) in his Dictionary (Journal Asiatique, 1862, p. 77 note) uses נְמַרְקָה, ‘joined on,’ as opposed to נְמַרְקָה, ‘separated.’

69 נַמַּרְקָה · נַמַּרְקָה as it were ‘the leader and the goer on’ with the melody. The
5. \(\text{תִּפְחָה} אֲשֶׁר \) \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \) \(70\). See Remarks under \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \) above, p. 22. The melody of Little Tlīsha must have been similar to that of Great Tlīsha, although of course feebler. Ben-Naphtali apparently treated this accent as a disjunctive (comp. \(\text{תָּלָה} \) \(\text{תָּלָה} \) to Gen. xix. 17 and Baer's note), and so the modern Ashkenazic Jews give a certain pausal value to Little Tlīsha, as in chanting \(\text{תִּפְחָה} אֲשֶׁר \) \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \) \(71\). Bad taste indeed!

6. \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \) 'wheel.' Although this accent occurs only sixteen times (always immediately before Great Pazer) punctators exercised their ingenuity in devising for it a number of names and even forms. Its original circular form may be gathered from the name 'wheel.' Under this form it was also called \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \) \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \), 'round,' and \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \) \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \), being like a small Tlīsha. With the circle incomplete \(72\), it became \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \) \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \), 'the moon a day old.' Other forms of Galgal, beside that found in printed texts, are \(73\) and a small Tēth, answering to similar forms, on a larger scale, of Great Pazer. The original melody probably resembled that of Little Tlīsha.

7. \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \) \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \), or \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \) \(74\). Names given to Tiphcha, when in the same word with Athnach or Silluq. (It occurs only fifteen or sixteen times \(75\).) The character of Tiphcha was changed, hence a new name was given to it. But somewhat of the melody of Tiphcha must have been retained in the chanting, for we find the same subordinate accents as before Tiphcha,—and Zaqeph preceding, which requires for expression is found in Chayyug, p. 127, in the printed Mas. (e.g. to Ex. iv. 11), in the Italian Zarqa-list, &c., and is commonly used by the Jews in the present day. The two accents may come together in the same word, and are then called in Pet. 123 \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \) \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \), as if they were both Géresh! see p. 20.

70 In the list, Chayyug, p. 128, this accent is actually called \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \) \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \) \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \) to distinguish it from Galgal, which is there termed \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \) \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \) \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \) (see No. 6 above). What we call Great Tlīsha has the simple name \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \) \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \). One sees there is no end to the vagaries of schools and punctators in these trivial matters!

71 As in Chayyug, p. 128; Man. du Lect., p. 76 below; Ox. 2512, p. 10.

72 So the Massoretic circle and the Arabic Gezm are sometimes complete, sometimes incomplete in MSS.

73 As in Mas. magna to Ezek. xlviii. 21, the Zarqa-lists, &c. In Pet. 123 this name is changed to \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \) \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \) \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \), 'the great new moon,' because Galgal had to be contrasted with M'hppach, 'the small new moon' (see note 62).

74 For these several names, see Mishp. hat., p. 6b; Dikk. hat., p. 19 and note; Chayyug, p. 128; and Man. du Lect., p. 73.

These names are also given to an accent of the same form (but different character) in the three Books, see \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \) \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \), p. 19.

75 Properly speaking, it does not belong to our list (of Conjunctives). I have however inserted it, as all Rabbinical writers on the accents, and even the Massora, number it among the \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \) \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \) \(\text{תִּפְחָה} \) (servt).
the melody Tiphcha following. The name נָהָל (the one now in common use) must have been first employed by the grammarians, who wrote in Arabic, for it is שָׁמָּלָה, i.e. 'inclined.' The Hebrew names have the same signification. In Dikd. hat., p. 17, the name is וַֽגָּלֶֽל, 'extending,' sicl. the melody of the word in which it occurs.

(The term נָהָל is also found in a rare Mas. printed in Bomb. 2 at Gen. xxx. 16 and elsewhere. It is there used for the Mer'kha preceding Zarqa. But such a use is opposed to the testimony of early writers on the accents, who expressly state that May'la occurs only before Athnach and Silluq. The Mas., in this form, is undoubtedly false.)

Were we able to trace the development of the graphical representation of the accentual melodies, we should probably find that it was, at first, confined to Athnach and Soph Pasuq; and that it was only gradually that the other signs, of which we have just treated, came into use.

The first step towards a musical arrangement of the text was the breaking it up into a number of 'sections,' פְּסִילֶּרָו—verses, as we call them—of varying length, according as the sense or the requirements of the cantillation suggested. Each section or verse was then treated as an independent whole; and, whatever its connection in sense with the verse preceding or the verse following, had its musical division assigned to it, quite irrespectively of them. These verses we must accept, as (with rare exceptions) common to all texts. Their number is counted and fixed by the Massora for each Book.

---

76 Comp. the use of the word, as it is found in Ox. 2512, p. 10, in the description of Mer'kha: هوוסא תַּתְּ הַכְּלָמָה מָאַאְלַל אֵלָי הָיָסָר.

77 It may perhaps be traced to a single MS. For Moses the punctator ( veteri, p. 27), after quoting it at length, adds This quotation seems then to have passed into other works, as Simson's תדֹּרִים, and was copied verbatim by Jacob ben-Chayyim in the Mas. to Gen. xxx. 16. Perhaps the original form of the Mas. was סִיוֹלְו יְמֵי מַאֲרִיחֵי בֶּן אוֹלָא מִים וּכְלָא הָלָי.

79 Many extant Codd. do not (as is well known) go beyond this simple division.

79 Hence it is often called in the Talmud סְכֹּרְבּ (e.g. Qiddushin 30ª) and סְכֹּרְבּ (Yoma 52ª), properly ‘portion to be read’ (chanted), ‘lection.’

80 It was not always so. For a long time there were considerable differences between the various schools, a reminiscence of which is found in the Pisqas
The verses, like all the other divisions, were marked off for the cantillation. They necessarily vary in length; but the general rule is to avoid too short or too long verses. Hence a short period is often attached to a longer one preceding or following (Gen. i. 10; v. 1; xxxvii. 2; xxxix. 6), and two short periods are constantly brought together into one verse (i. 5, 8; xlvi. 31). On the other hand, when the period runs on to any length, it is broken up into two or more verses. So the protasis may be separated from the apodosis (Ex. ix. 2, 3; Deut. xxx. 17, 18); a compound subject or object kept apart from the verb (Num. xxxi. 22; Neh. x. 29); a speech extended through any number of verses (Gen. xii. 1-3; xxiv. 34-49); details of every kind marked off in groups—often small, for distinctness of enunciation—(Gen. x. 11-18; Ex. xxxv. 10-19; Deut. xi. 2-6; Jer. xxv. 17-26; &c.) The division, it must be allowed, shews freedom enough, as when we find the apodosis in the same verse with the last part of the protasis (Gen. xxiv. 44; 2 Sam. xi. 21; 1 Ki. x. 5; Ezek. xviii. 9); or a shorter period in the same verse with the last part of a long period preceding (Gen. i. 18; xiv. 20; i. 17; Ex. xii. 27; Jer. xi. 5; li. 64). In such cases, the division which seemed most convenient for the cantillation was adopted. The musical principle admitted,—and due allowance made for divisions, designed to emphasize, or otherwise give effect to the reading,—we shall not often have occasion to find fault with the verses as marked off. The above remarks refer particularly to the prose portions of the text. For the poetical, the parallelism of the members sufficed generally to fix the limits of the verse.

The rules for the division of the verse itself must now engage our attention.

marked in our text (for the list of which see Baer's note on Hos. i. 2). These Pisqas, always coming after Athnach, indicate that some authorities made two verses, where our Massoretic text has only one. The latest treatise on the differences named is by Graetz in the Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, 1885, p. 97 ff. But the learned professor has not succeeded in throwing any fresh light on a very obscure and perplexing subject.

61 The verses, once fixed, would furnish suitable portions for separate reading, when a translation of the text was to be given at the same time. So in the Mishna, Megilla iv. 4, the translator is directed to render verse by verse in the reading of the Tora. But I cannot consider (with Vitringa and Hupfeld) that the verses owed their origin to the necessity of providing for the translation small divisions in the sense which the congregation could easily follow. The Mishna, l.c., appointed three verses of the Prophets to be read together, before the translation was given.
CHAPTER III.

THE DICHOTOMY. GENERAL.

Every verse, however short, was divided, for the purpose of chanting, into two parts. This is what Christian writers on the accents have termed the DICHOTOMY of the verse. The accent employed to mark the division is generally Athnach, but in some cases other accents are allowable, or are even necessary from the influence of musical laws.

The further division was on the same principle. Each half-verse constituted by the main dichotomy—if of sufficient length—was divided by a minor dichotomy. And the parts thus formed were subjected to the same process, which was continued, as long as the condition just named, of there being a sufficient number of words in the clause, was fulfilled. We thus arrive at the law of the CONTINUOUS DICHOTOMY, the simple principle that regulates the division of the verse. It is sufficient at present to lay down the general law. The conditions for its application cannot be stated as simply as for the three Books. It will depend on the particular accent, whose clause has to be divided, whether three or even more words can stand without the dichotomy. But the law must be accepted. It constitutes one of the marked and distinguishing features of the system of Hebrew accentuation.

We naturally ask, what was the purpose designed by this remarkable process of division and minute sub-division? No doubt it served to mark the logical and syntactical interpunction. But the logical use will account only very partially for its introduction; and even for the syntactical, it was not needed to anything like the extent to which it was applied. Some

---

1 Jewish writers on the accents had no more idea of this law than they had of many of the chief grammatical rules. Its discovery is due to the unwearied diligence, with which the study of the accents was pursued by Christian scholars of the 17th century.
other explanation therefore is necessary. And there can be no question that the object aimed at, was that which is the essential characteristic of the accentuation,—*musical effect*. The result of the continuous dichotomy was a succession of pausal melodies (more or fewer) fixed by rule, which, with the conjunctive melodies dependent on them, gave the cantillation of the verse. It was a peculiar system, but one that must have answered its purpose. Certainly it secured fulness and variety for the melody. How far it corresponded to our modern notions of a melodious result, we have no sufficient means of determining, inasmuch as we are but imperfectly acquainted with the musical value of the accents, and not at all with the changes which they doubtless underwent, according to their relative position.

As for the *origin* of the system, it seems to me that it may have been as follows. We may well suppose that a musical recitation was early employed for the *poetical* parts of the Tora, as the תְּנַשֵּׁה, Ex. xv and Deut. xxxii. Such parts would, from their very character, be the first to claim it. We may further consider that the musical divisions as we now have them were first established for these pieces. For how does the matter stand with them? The dichotomy—resulting from *parallelismus membrorum*—is the reigning principle of division, and shews itself not only in the bisection of the verse, but often in that of the subordinate parts as well. This *formal* dichotomy necessarily supplied (as far as it went) the basis for the *musical*, and from its constant recurrence seems to have suggested to the originators of the accentual system a guiding principle for the musical division *in general*. We note that in the poetical pieces, it did not need frequent application. It is not often that the sub-division is carried beyond the *second* minor dichotomy. The continuous dichotomy shews itself therefore here in a simple form.

When now it was determined to introduce a musical recitation for the *prose* parts, there was, according to the above hypothesis, a model already provided. True, in these parts there is,
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generally speaking, no formal dichotomy to serve as a basis for the musical. But this could form no objection, for there are even in the poetical pieces verses that read as simple prose, e.g. Ex. xv. 18, Deut. xxxii. 19, and yet have the dichotomy applied to them. The model then was accepted, and the principle of the continuous dichotomy adopted for the prose reading. Here, owing to the long verses often marked off, its application became more extended and much more complicated.

One drawback was involved in its adoption. Two or more equal pauses, in succession, cannot be represented as such. Subordination (variously carried out) necessarily takes place. No doubt the accentuators would have been often glad to mark the equal pauses by accents of equal disjunctive value, if the law which they had laid down for themselves would have permitted it, as in Gen. xlix. 31; Josh. vii. 14b; Is. iii. 24; lxvi. 3; &c. In certain cases, indeed, the same accent is repeated in the division of the clause; but, from the very nature of the continuous dichotomy, it loses in disjunctive value each time of repetition. Instances are Zaqeph repeated (often more than once) in Silluq’s clause, R’bhia in Zaqeph’s clause, &c.

The question how the position of the dichotomy (main or minor) was fixed, has been already answered. It is found, where the main logical pause of the clause, or the rules for syntactical division require it. But, as has been pointed out, pp. 3, 4, there are many notable exceptions. I would here only once more remind the reader that we have to do with a system of public recitation, the main object of which (like that of all effective delivery) was to bring out and impress upon the minds of the hearers the full meaning of the Sacred Text. And I would add that unless we are prepared to recognise the utmost freedom in the application of the dichotomy, we shall never be able to explain to ourselves the accentual division. In the higher style, where parallelism is found, the same freedom necessarily prevails.

I purpose, in the present chapter, to consider certain general principles of division, which will, in my opinion, account for the most noticeable instances of deviation from rule, just referred

---

2 So abit, evasit, erupit, could not, when turned into (accented) Hebrew, be separated by equal pauses. Comp. :םדבמ יפמ יפמ (1 Sam. xix. 12).
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to. In the next chapter, I shall lay down the laws for syntactical division.

I. We often see a tendency to delay the dichotomy, till the main statement of the verse or clause has been set before the reader,—what follows the dichotomy serving to supplement, explain, qualify, &c. the last part of what precedes it. Looked at from the rhetorical point of view, such a division is often effective enough, although it may come in the middle of a subordinate clause, or may cut in two the apodosis. There is nothing peculiar in it, for we often adopt it in our own interpunction. (In the examples given, the vertical line marks the position of the dichotomy):

“For God doth know that, in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, | and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil’ (Gen. iii. 5).

“And Jehovah God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, cursed art thou above all cattle and above every beast of the field; | upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life’ (iii. 14).

“Are we not counted of him strangers? for he hath sold us, | and hath also quite devoted our money’ (xxxii. 15).

“When thou comest into thy neighbour’s vineyard, then thou mayest eat grapes thy fill at thine own pleasure; | but thou shalt not put any in thy vessel’ (Deut. xxxii. 25).

“Jehoshaphat made ships of Tarshish to go to Ophir for gold. But none went; | for the ships were broken at Ezion-geber’ (1 Ki. xxii. 49).

Further examples are unnecessary.

II. Emphasis is distinctly marked:

“In the beginning God created | the heavens and the earth’ (Gen. i. 1. Comp. Ex. xx. 11).

“Thy sons and thy daughters shall be given unto another people, and thine eyes shall see it | and fail with longing for them all the day’ (Deut. xxviii. 32).

“And the king of Israel said unto Jehoshaphat, There is yet one man by whom we may enquire of Jehovah; but I hate him, | for he doth not prophesy good concerning me, but evil’ (1 Ki. xxii. 8).

“Who gave Jacob for a spoil, and Israel to the robbers? Did not Jehovah? | [emphasis pause]’; ‘He against whom we have sinned, &c.’ (Is. xiii. 24).

“If any stir up strife, it is not | of me’ (liv. 15)4.

“No peace, | saith Jehovah, for the wicked’ (xlviii. 22; lvii. 21).

3 I cannot agree with Delitzsch’s remark: Das Athnach ist an unrechter Stelle. Comp. Athnach before תֵּשָׁ, Jer. xlii. 2b.

4 Luzzatto is completely puzzled by the accentuation, as other commentators would no doubt have been, if they had noticed it.
Such examples are common enough. Had they been wanting, we might well have questioned the taste of the accentuators. What calls for remark is the lengths to which they went in carrying out this principle of division. In their desire to mark the emphasis, they did not scruple to pass over the most prominent logical pauses. (These pauses were indeed marked by musical pauses, but the main musical pause was reserved for the emphasis.) In no other way can we explain the division in such cases as the following:

'And it came to pass at the end of two months that she returned to her father, who did with her according to his vow which he had vowed,' [pause for effect at these solemn words], on which the whole narrative hinges; 'and she had not known a man. So it became a custom in Israel' (Judg. xi. 39).

'Therefore thus saith the Lord Jehovah, Behold, I have founded in Zion a stone,' [the Messiah], 'a tried stone, a precious corner-stone of sure foundation: he that believeth shall not make haste' (Is. xxviii. 16).

'Then said Jehovah unto me, What seest thou, Jeremiah? and I said, Figs; and the good figs, very good; and the bad, very bad, &c.' (Jer. xxiv. 3).

'Then this Daniel distinguished himself above the presidents and satraps,' [an emphasis not altogether unsuitable in view of the narrative following], 'because an excellent spirit was in him; and the king thought to set him over the whole realm' (Dan. vi. 4).

Other examples will occur in the sequel.

Occasionally (it must be allowed) the accentuators have been led into fanciful extremes by the Midrash-teaching of the Schools. Thus in Gen. i. 21 the Athnach is with דֶּבֶשׁ יִבָּשֶׁה, instead of at its proper place before בּוּרֵי יֵרֵי מֵסֵיחָי נִה. And why? Because these wonderful creatures, about which Jewish fable has so much to relate, were counted to have nothing in common with the other creatures named. They were beings per se, and are put by themselves at the beginning of the verse! In Gen. xxxv. 10 the Athnach rests on

5 Josephus, Targum, and Rabb. Comm. generally, suppose that Jepthahah really offered up his daughter, in fulfilment of his vow.
6 Comp. Judg. iv. 21, where Athnach is properly due at ברך אבותך, but has been transposed for the sake of emphasis and effect. The attention was to be fixed on the details of Jael's heroic act, culminating in the words וַיַּנְתָּה היא. 7 So Rashi explains. Raymond Martini, in Pugio Fidei, ii. 5. 2, quotes the Targum as also rendering יִנָּה byossip ספ. So far he is right that the יִנָּה of the Targum evidently points to the Messiah (comp. 1 Pet. ii. 6).
8 See e.g. Rashi, ad loc., and Levy, Neuhebr. W. B. s.v. ינוּה.
to intimate that the patriarch, though he had a new name given him, was not (like Abraham) to lose the old one. The words are made emphatic: 'Thy name is, and shall be, Jacob!' In 2 Chr. ii. 13 the accentuators have abandoned the obvious accentuation, in order that they might emphasize the lesson that a son is bound to follow his father's occupation and to support his mother, when left a widow! Such instances are however rare. That a few occur is not surprising, when we bear in mind the influence that Haggadic teaching has always exercised among the Jews.

III. a. It is on the same principle that the introductory part of the verse, although logically requiring the main accent (Atnach) after it, is constantly passed over, that this accent may be introduced where the weight of meaning of the passage seems to lie. Observe the division in the following instances:

'There I will meet with thee, and I will speak with thee, from above the mercy-seat, from between the two cherubim which are upon the ark of the testimony, | all that I will command thee to the children of Israel' (Ex. xxv. 22).

'And Moses wrote all the words of Jehovah; and rose up early in the morning, and built an altar under the mount, | and twelve pillars, according to the twelve tribes of Israel' (Ex. xxiv. 4). [The accentuation draws attention to the altar and the twelve representative pillars. They were to be noted from their connection with the Covenant, the ratification of which is the grand subject of the narrative.]

'Yet it pleased Jehovah to bruise him,—He hath put him to grief: when Thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, | and the pleasure of Jehovah shall prosper in his hand' (Is. liii. 10). [It is on the glorious results of the sufferings of 'the servant of Jehovah' that the accentuation dwells.]

'And he said, Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I return thither: Jehovah gave, and Jehovah hath taken away; | blessed be the name of Jehovah' (Job i. 21).

And so even in short and simple sentences like the following:

'And Abraham stretched forth his hand, and took the knife | to slay his son' (Gen. xxii. 10).

'Then these men assembled, and found Daniel | making petition and supplication before his God' (Dan. vi. 12).

9 Comp. Berakhoth 13a. So R. El'azar in the Midrash (Ox. 2338) insists, אַלְדֵיָּתָם שֶׁרִי עִקְרֶא שֶׁמֶלָּאֵט וְעֵקְרִי מַעֲשֵׂה.

10 See Qimchi on the passage.

11 Hence often where 757 precedes the second clause, e.g. in Lev. xiii. 5, &c.; Num. xvii. 7; 1 Sam. xx. 2; xxx. 16; 2 Ki. vi. 25; Ezek. x. 1; Amos vii. 7.
Where the reader sees at once that the pause comes in just where it is most telling.

This free mode of division, adopted for the sake of effect and impressiveness in the reading, is not to be regarded as exceptional, but is found everywhere. It is, however, so different from our own ideas of interpunction, that I append some other examples, which the student may examine for himself: Gen. xxxiv. 7; Ex. iii. 12; xii. 23; Num. xx. 13; Deut. iii. 11; 1 Sam. xiv. 27; 2 Sam. xii. 4; Is. xxvii. 13; Jer. ii. 23; Ezek. xxxix. 13; Qoh. vii. 2; ix. 12.

The above are all instances of division by Athnach; but of course the same principle applies to the division of the half-verse or any section of the same, e.g. Is. xxxvii. 9; Jer. xxvi. 12; Mal. iii. 3.

β. Particularly noteworthy is the way in which the words that introduce a speech—or anything similar, as a command, decree, oath, covenant, &c.—are treated. They constantly occupy a subordinate position, as far as the accents are concerned. The clause containing the speech itself, the command, &c., is counted the more important, and receives the main accentuation. In short, the division is made (as above) just as if the introductory words were absent, e.g. 13

'And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, | and let it divide the waters from the waters' (Gen. i. 6).

'And Jehovah said to him, Therefore whosoever slayeth Cain, | vengeance shall be taken sevenfold' (iv. 15).

'And Moses said to the children of Israel, See, Jehovah hath called by name | Bezalel, the son of Uri, &c.' (Ex. xxxv. 30).

'The Lord Jehovah hath sworn by His holiness, that lo! the days shall come

12 He may also compare Gen. vi. 9; xi. 10; xxxvii. 2; where we do not find Athnach with the superscriptions, as we should have expected, but the clause following is divided, just as if the superscriptions were absent.

13 There is no real difficulty here; we divide often in the same way: 'And they said, Nay; but we will abide in the street all night' (Gen. xix. 2). 'And Lot said unto them, Oh, not so, my lord: behold now, thy servant &c.' (xix. 18, 19). Only the accentuators go farther than we do, subordinating the words in question to a syntactical, as well as logical, division (see examples in text).
upon you, | that they shall take you away with hooks, and your residue with fish-hooks' (Amos iv. 2).

'And he commanded to destroy | all the wise men of Babylon' (Dan. ii. 12).

'Thou, O king, hast made a decree, that every man that shall hear the sound of the cornet, ...... and all kinds of music, | shall fall down and worship the golden image' (iii. 10).

Such cases occur in every page.

γ. What is next to be noticed is that α and β may be combined, or β may be repeated; in other words, we may have a compound proœmium consisting of two (or even more) members, each of which will be subordinated, directly or indirectly, to the same main division of the speech, &c., marked by Athnach or some other leading accent. The position of this accent is indicated, as before, in the following examples:

'And Jacob awaked out of his sleep, and said, Surely Jehovah is in this place; | and I knew it not' (Gen. xxviii. 16) 11.

'And he told it to his father and to his brethren; and his father rebuked him; and said unto him, What is this dream that thou hast dreamed? | Shall I and thy mother and thy brethren indeed come to bow down ourselves to thee to the earth?' (xxxvii. 10).

'Go and say to Hezekiah, Thus saith Jehovah, the God of David thy father, I have heard thy prayer, I have seen thy tears: | behold, I will add unto thy days fifteen years' (Is. xxxviii. 5) 11.

'From the uttermost part of the earth have we heard songs, "Glory for the righteous!" But I said, I pine away, I pine away, woe is me! | the treacherous dealers have dealt treacherously; yea, the treacherous dealers have dealt very treacherously' (xxiv. 16).

'And she conceived again, and bare a daughter. And He said unto him, Call her name Lo-ruchamah: | for I will no more have mercy on the house of Israel, that I should in any wise pardon them' (Hos. i. 6).

Other examples are Gen. i. 28 ; viii. 21 ; xxi. 17 ; xlvii. 29 ; Ex. x. 3 ; xxxii. 13 ; 2 Ki. i. 6 ; v. 15 ; Is. xlvii. 8 ; lix. 21 ; Jer. xlii. 20.

The student, when he has become familiar with the rules for the accentuation, may examine these examples for himself. He will observe that the several proœmial members are variously subordinated,

11 Our interpunction is here the same. And so in Gen. xxxvii. 32; 2 Sam. iv. 8; Is. vi. 7; xlvii. 8; lxii. 11; Jer. xxxviii. 25; Job i. 16; and many other passages. (See the Revised Version.)
sometimes the first to the second, sometimes all to Athnach, &c. The accentuators chose the musical pauses, which seemed to them suitable, nor is there generally any cause to find fault with their selection.

3. Lastly, among proœmial expressions are to be reckoned and \( \text{לְנָא} \), in the sense of 'coming to pass,' which are usually subordinated by the accents to the first word or words of the clause which they introduce: \( \text{לְנָא כֶּלָּיִים} \) (Gen. iv. 14); \( \text{לְנָא אֶתְמוֹר} \) (Ex. iv. 16; comp. Gen. xxiv. 15); \( \text{לְנָה} \) (1 Ki. v. 21); \( \text{לְנָה לְנָא} \) (2 Ki. xxv. 27). The merely formal character of these introductory words suffices to account for their subordinate position.

IV. In contrast to the proœmium, are the cases where an appendage is made to the clause, without affecting the division of the same. (Here the proper logical division would have been immediately before the appendage.) Such cases are not so numerous as the proœmial instances. They may be divided into three classes:

a. Those in which there is a close connection in sense between the concluding member of the clause and the appendage. Thus in Gen. i. 16, \( \text{לְנָא} \) is not preceded by Athnach, but is joined on by the accents to the part of the clause describing the 'lesser light,' because the stars were appointed with the moon to lighten up the night. In iii. 19 the accentual division is: 'In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, | till thou return unto the ground, for out of it thou wast taken;' and in iv. 25: 'God hath appointed me another seed | in place of Abel, because Cain slew him.' Comp. xxxiv. 7 end; xliv. 10; Lev. xiii. 6 end; Deut. xvi. 3b; Judg. vi. 21b (see Bertheau); 1 Ki. xx. 12b; Is. xxxviii. 16; lv. 5; lxvi. 13; 1 Chr. xvi. 33 (as Ps. xcvi. 13).

\[ \text{β. The second class embraces certain recurrent phrases, which} \]

\[ \text{Comp. Jer. xxxi. 35: 'Thus saith Jehovah, who giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and stars for a light by night.'} \]
are occasionally attached to the end of the verse, without affecting
the regular division preceding, as אֵדֶרֶתִּוֹ תְנָשָׁתָוּ and
cognate expressions, Is. i. 20; xvii. 6; Jer. xlviii. 43; Ezek. v. 15;
xv. 8; xxx. 12; Amos i. 15; &c. So יָהָה לְהוֹ רַבָּאָה, Lev. xix. 10;
xxi. 12; xxii. 2, 3; xxvi. 4; and יָהָה לְהוֹ רַבָּאָה, Jer. xxxiii. 35;
xxxiii. 2; Amos v. 8; ix. 6.

γ. The third class relates to the peculiar division often found
before נְכָה בִּהְרֵי | טָלָה | חֵסְרָא לֵא | מָאָרוֹ לֵא
(Gen. ii. 16); פִּיוֹמַיְּוַה | בְּעֵרִי | בְּרֵית רַבָּא | מָאָרוֹ לֵא
(xv. 18); נָפֶל שְׁפָרֶת | בִּלְּנָשׁא | אֲשָׁר-רַבָּא | עִלָּה | נַעֲשֶׂה
פרְרַה (Ex. v. 14); נְכָה בְּרֵי-רַבָּא | אֲלֵי | אֶפְסָרָא | שְׁנֵיה
רַבָּא (Jer. xxxiii. 1). In these
examples the clauses have been divided, just as if לֵא מָאָרוֹ
were not present, with the consequence that יָהָה לְהוֹ רַבָּא
division and the word (or words) between it and the main dichotomy preceding are
brought together in a very awkward way. And so in numberless
other passages. The object of the division seems to have been
purely musical, to introduce more variety into the chanting than
would have been possible if the division had been always on the
word immediately preceding רַבָּא, and to secure a fuller melody
for long sentences (e.g. 2 Sam. vii. 7; Jer. xlv. 15). From the
frequent occurrence of לֵא מָאָרוֹ with Athnach and Silluq, it is
here that the monotony would have been most felt; and here
the above division is most common. With the other accents, it
is frequently neglected 16.

V. It is important to notice the influence which parallelism
has on the division of the verse. This main ornament of the
Hebrew style 17 characterizes all the poetical and (to a great

16 Thus in Genesis, it occurs only twice (xliii. 37; xlv. 16), as far as I have
observed, out of some thirty examples.
17 But not confined to Hebrew, for it is found equally in old Egyptian and
Assyrian compositions.
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extent) the prophetical parts of the twenty-one Books. It is also found in the simply narrative portions, for a poetic colouring often shews itself even there. The most conspicuous instances are where it is marked by the main dichotomy, but it appears hardly less frequently in the minor divisions of the verse.

For the different kinds of parallelism, I may be allowed to refer to my remarks in משלים, pp. 24–28.

The most common form in which it appears is that of partial parallelism,—with or without addition, thus:

a. Without addition, e.g.

'In blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven, | and as the sand which is upon the sea-shore' (Gen. xxii. 17).

'Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth; they are a burden upon me, | I am weary of bearing them' (Is. i. 14).

'Like as many were astonished at thee,—his visage was so marred more than man, | and his form more than the sons of men' (lii. 14).

'They are waxen fat, they shine: yea, they overpass the deeds of wickedness; they plead not the cause, the cause of the fatherless, that they should prosper; | and the right of the needy do they not judge' (Jer. v. 28). eighteen

In these and similar cases, the main idea of the verse (or clause) is first given, and then follows an echo (as it were) of the last part of the same. The logical division is disregarded. No less is this the case, in many of the instances of parallelism

β. With addition, e.g.

'But the multitude of thy foes shall be like small dust, | and the multitude of the terrible ones as chaff that passeth away: and it shall be at an instant suddenly' (Is. xxix. 5).

'For Jehovah is our judge, Jehovah is our lawgiver, | Jehovah is our king; He will save us' (xxxiii. 22).

'I will bring the blind by a way that they know not; in paths that they know not will I lead them: | I will make darkness light before them, and crooked places straight. These are the things which I will do and not forbear' (xlii. 16).

'Sing, O barren, thou that hast not borne; | break forth into singing and cry aloud, thou that hast not travailed with child: for more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife, saith Jehovah' (liv. 1).

18 For the sake of beginners, I add a few more examples: Gen. xlix. 27; Is. xxx. 10; xli. 20; Jer. i. 10 (antithetic); Hos. vi. 1; Amos v. 11; ix. 14; Nah. iii. 7.
'Go up to Lebanon, and cry; and lift up thy voice in Bashan; | and cry from Abarim: for all thy lovers are destroyed' (Jer. xxii. 20).

I have noted a few instances of what has been termed progressive parallelism, e.g.

'Therefore the abundance they have gotten | and their store—over the poplarbrook shall they carry them' (Is. xv. 7).

'The meadows by the Nile, by the brink of the Nile, | and all that is sown by the Nile,—shall become dry, be driven away, and be no more' (xix. 7).

'A thousand at the rebuke of one, | at the rebuke of five,—shall ye flee' (xxx. 17).

'Yea, from of old men have not heard, nor perceived by the ear, | eye hath not seen,—a God beside Thee, who worketh &c.' (lixiv. 3).

This kind of parallelism is more common in the three Books.

VI. In cases of specification, we often find the proper logical or syntactical division—particularly the latter—neglected, and the main musical pause introduced between the details or particulars given. Distinctness of enunciation, and emphasis (where necessary), were thus secured. The pause was introduced where it seemed likely to be most effective. Thus the logical division is disregarded:

'And Moses said, With our young and with our old will we go, | with our sons and with our daughters, with our flocks and with our herds will we go; for we must hold a feast unto Jehovah' (Ex. x. 9).

'I have sent among you the pestilence after the manner of Egypt; I have slain with the sword your young men, and given your horses into captivity, | and I have made the stink of your camp to come up even into your nostrils: yet have ye not returned unto Me, saith Jehovah' (Amos iv. 10).

Comp. Gen. xlii. 36; Lev. xxii. 13; Is. xliv. 12; Jer. xlii. 14; Ezek. xiv. 7 (not 4); Amos vi. 2; Ob. 11.

Syntactical clauses are treated in the same way, and subject, object, &c. are cut in two—or members that belong together, separated—by the dichotomy. (A logical pause may occur in the verse or not.)

19 I give a few additional examples: Is. ii. 12; v. 29; viii. 10; x. 15; xiii. 4; lii. 1; lvii. 6; Ezek. xvi. 45; Joel i. 12.

20 It is interesting to compare with this verse, vv. 6, 8, 9, 11, all with the same refrain. The details in these verses are not so numerous, hence the division is regular.
'In the selfsame day entered Noah, and Shem and Ham and Japheth the sons of Noah, | and Noah's wife, and the three wives of his sons with them, into the ark' (Gen. vii. 13).

'And Isaac was forty years old, when he took Rebekah, the daughter of Bethuel the Aramean of Paddan-aram, | the sister of Laban the Aramean, to be his wife' (xxv. 20).

'And every man, with whom was found blue and purple and scarlet, and fine linen, and goats' hair, | and rams' skins dyed red, and sealskins, brought them' (Ex. xxxv. 23).

'And ye shall offer a burnt-offering unto Jehovah, two young bullocks and one ram, | and seven he-lambs of the first year; they shall be unto you without blemish' (Num. xxviii. 19; comp. xi. 11b).

'And I will set a sign among them, and I will send such as escape of them unto the nations,—to Tarshish, Pul and Lud that draw the bow, to Tubal and Javan, | to the isles afar off, that have not heard My fame, neither have seen My glory,—and they shall declare My glory among the nations' (Is. lxvi. 19).

Perhaps the most notable instances of this mode of division are the following:

'And Jehovah said unto Moses, Speak unto Aaron thy brother, that he come not at all times into the holy place within the veil, | before the mercy-seat which is upon the ark, that he die not; for I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy-seat' (Lev. xvi. 2). [Specification with emphasis 21.]

'And thou shalt say in thy heart, Who hath borne me these? seeing I was bereaved and barren, | an exile and outcast; and these, who hath brought them up? Behold, I was left alone; these, where were they?' (Is. xlix. 21). [The grouping of the words, though forced, is not without effect.]

Comp. Gen. xxxiv. 28; Ex. xxvii. 19; Deut. xi. 6; Josh. vi. 21; 2 Ki. x. 5a; Jer. xli. 3; Ezek. xxvii. 27; Esth. ix. 26; Ezra iv. 17 22.

21 It appears to me a mistake to suppose, with Luzzatto, Malbim, and Geiger (whom Dillmann follows), that the Athnach here rests on a fanciful interpretation given in the name of R. Jehuda, Menachoth 27b. Had this interpretation indeed represented the traditional and generally accepted view of the passage, we might have allowed that the accentuation had been influenced by it. But, so far from this being the case, it was opposed to the recognised teaching (note ḫביוינן ינוי ל.ס.ם.). Nor is it found in the Versions or in any Rabbinical Commentary. In short, there is nothing to shew that it was anything more than the extravagant conceit of a single Rabbi, who perhaps imagined that he had the accentuation on his side. (Geiger, Jüdische Zeitschrift, ii. p. 30, has certainly not succeeded in establishing his point that R. Jehuda's view was that held by the Pharisees.)

22 Gen. xii. 8 and Is. ix. 8 seem to belong under this head. In the former passage, the details are so accented as to draw special attention to the place which Abraham chose for pitching his tent and solemnizing the worship of Jehovah. In the latter, it is the last of the details that is marked off, but that is an important one.
It is not often that this prominent division occurs, where only two objects are specified, or two particulars given:

'The bread of his God, both of the most holy, | and of the holy, shall he eat' (Lev. xxi. 22).

'And the holy oblation | and the sanctuary of the house shall be in its midst' (Ezek. xlvi. 21b).

'For three transgressions of Damascus | and for four, I will not turn it away' (Amos i. 3; comp. 6, 9, &c.).

(Such instances answer to the progressive parallelism of p. 40.)

See further, Gen. vi. 9a (two adjectives); Deut. ix. 28; 1 Ki. vii. 7a, 36a; Ezek. xlv. 11; Qoh. iii. 17b; 1 Chr. vi. 34; xxix. 4.

Other modes of dealing with specification present no difficulty. The several details are usually marked with accents in regular crescendo order,—a climax ascendens,—or are formed into pairs or groups, which are treated in the same way. For examples, see Gen. xii. 5; xv. 9; Josh. xi. 16; Is. iii. 24; lxvi. 3; Qoh. ix. 11a:

and comp. the rules for the division of the verbal clause, p. 49.

Where specification runs on in successive verses, the same principle of distinct enunciation is observable. For instance, when strings of names occur, we constantly find them broken up into short verses. See Gen. x. 15 ff.; Is. iii. 18 ff.; Ezra vii. 1 ff.; 1 Chr. viii. 14 ff.; &c.

VII. The parenthesis may be indicated in various ways.

It may occupy a separate verse (or verses), as in Deut. ii. 10–12; iii. 9, 11; Jer. xxxix. 1, 2.

Or it may occur in the middle or at the end of the verse, when the rule is to mark it off with the accent next greater than that which precedes it (with Athnach or Silluq after Zaqeph, with Zaqeph or Tiphcha after R'bhia, &c.). The principle of the rule is evident 23.

'If they sin against Thee' [R'bhia],—'for there is no man that sinneth not' [Zaqeph],—'and Thou be angry with them, &c.' (1 Ki. viii. 46).

'Now Pashchur the son of Immer the priest heard' [Zaqeph],—'and he was chief officer in the house of Jehovah' [Athanach],—'Jeremiah prophesying these things' (Jer. xx. 1).

---

23 It is very rarely indeed that this rule fails. Ex. xxx. 13b is an unimportant exception. In Ezek. xxxiii. 33 the accentuators perhaps supplied וְיָדָמָה, as the LXX ἐποίησεν. A strange mistake occurs in 1 Ki. xi. 26. For הַלְוַיְרָב point אַחֲרֵיהֶם, with Ox. i, 7, 10, &c.
So the scruples of the accentuators led them to mark a parenthesis in the well-known passage:

'And the lamp of God was not yet gone out' [Zaqeph],—'and Samuel was asleep [Athnach]—'in the temple of Jehovah' (1 Sam. iii. 3).

For other examples, see Gen. xix. 20; Deut. iii. 19; 2 Sam. xiv. 26; xxi. 2; Jer. xli. 9; Amos vi. 14; 2 Chr. xxxii. 9.

The above are the usual modes of marking the parenthesis. Variations are infrequent. Sometimes the clause is broken up into parts, each of which is treated successively as above, e.g.

'Like as many were astonished at thee' [Zaqeph],—'his visage was so marred more than man' [Athnach], 'and his form more than the sons of men' [Silluq],—'so &c.' (Is. i. 14, 15).

'And the sons of Reuben, the first-born of Israel' [Zarqa],—'for he was the first-born' [S'golta]; 'but forasmuch as he defiled his father's couch, his birthright was given unto the sons of Joseph' [Atnach]; 'and the genealogy is not to be reckoned after the birthright' [Silluq] (1 Chr. v. 1). The parenthesis in this case, from its length and many details, passes on into the next verse.

Comp. 1 Ki. xii. 2 (2 Chr. x. 2); Esth. ii. 12; 1 Chr. viii. 13.

Sometimes again, where verses are closely connected in sense and construction,—as 1 Ki. xviii. 3, 4; 2 Ki. ix. 14, 15; 2 Chr. v. 11, 12,—the parenthesis occupies the last half of one verse, and is then continued in the next; or it may occur even at the beginning of the verse, as in 1 Ki. viii. 42; ix. 11 (but this is unusual).

In the course of the present chapter, the most frequent and most important cases of irregular division have been considered. My aim has been, by the comparison of a sufficient number of examples, to shew that a principle underlies the deviation in each case. An explanation thus determined can hardly (I venture to think) be called in question.

24 Rabb. Comm. supply יְנַֽעְבֹּר (see verse 2), or something similar, after 23ו.

25 There is nothing peculiar in this, for other constructions are treated in the same way, in the verse-division. It must, however, be allowed that the arrangement in Judg. xx. 27, 28 is awkward in the extreme.
CHAPTER IV.

ON SYNTACTICAL DICHOTOMY.

The most frequent, although for us the least important, instances of the application of the dichotomy come under this head. In almost every verse—owing to the minute subdivisions which the continuous dichotomy introduces—we meet with cases where the syntactical relation of the words to one another, and to the whole clause of which they form a part, alone decides its position. And it is not always easy to see on what principle the dichotomy in such cases is made. It is therefore necessary to consider somewhat at length what the relation is between syntax and the accentual division.

We should not expect the dichotomy to intervene where only two words come together, either as forming an independent clause, or as simply left together in the course of the accentual division. Occasionally indeed (as we shall see) under the influence of musical laws, or in cases where a distinct or emphatic enunciation was desired, separation takes place even here. But the rule is to keep two words united. Concepts therefore—as subject and predicate, adverb and verb,—which are kept apart in longer clauses, are here constantly brought together, thus: יְהֹוָהּ הָרוֹאֵשׁ מַלְכֵּי (Is. xxxiii. 22); יָעֵלָהּ הָרוֹאֶשׁ בֶּן־כַּלָּהָה (Jer. xi. 18); מַשְׂרָה הָרוֹאֶשׁ (Ezek. xii. 12); נָעַלְפָּהוּ הָרוֹאֶשׁ (Hab. ii. 1). And as words united by Maqqeph are regarded (for accentual purposes) as constituting a single word, we meet with such combinations as יְהֹוָהּ אֶשֶׁר בֵּמֶהָאָרְחָה (Is. xxxii. 2); מֶהָאָרְחָה בֵּמֶהָאָרְחָה (xliv. 8).

But in sentences consisting of three or more words, the dichotomy is more or less regularly introduced. Here the first step is to notice which of the component parts of a grammatical clause—subject, object, verb, &c.—precedes.

---

1 In this chapter, where it is necessary to distinguish the main from a minor dichotomy, I mark the former by d 1, and the latter by d 2, d 3, &c.
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I. The subject may precede, and—from its independent position—is generally marked off by the main dichotomy:  דוד | רְבִּי וִיחָֽה (Gen. i. 2);  דַּעַת | רְבִּי וִיחָֽה (xviii. 18);  דַּעַת | רְבִּי וִיחָֽה (iii. 12). The subject may be common to two clauses, as in  דַּעַת | רְבִּי וִיחָֽה (Ezek. xxxiv. 19).

The usual exceptions come under the following heads:

1. The personal and other pronouns are not always considered important enough to stand by themselves, thus:  דוד | רְבִּי וִיחָֽה (Is. lvii. 12); comp.  דוד | רְבִּי וִיחָֽה (Gen. ii. 11);  דוד | רְבִּי וִיחָֽה (vi. 21);  דוד | רְבִּי וִיחָֽה (v. 1);  דוד | רְבִּי וִיחָֽה (xxxvi. 14);  דוד | רְבִּי וִיחָֽה (xiv. 20);  דוד | רְבִּי וִיחָֽה (Num. xxiii. 10); &c.

2. When the clause, which the subject introduces, consists of two parts, the first syntactically complete in itself, the second a supplemental appendage (a Zusatz, to use a German term, which exactly expresses the construction), consisting generally of a preposition with its government or an adverbial expression, the main dichotomy may be placed at the end of the first part. The subject will then either have no disjunctive accent, or be marked with a minor dichotomy. The following examples will explain what I mean:  דוד | רְבִּי וִיחָֽה (Gen. xviii. 10);  דוד | רְבִּי וִיחָֽה (Ex. xv. 18);  דוד | רְבִּי וִיחָֽה (2 Sam. xxii. 33);  דוד | רְבִּי וִיחָֽה (Dan. x. 5). Or the minor dichotomy appears:  דוד | רְבִּי וִיחָֽה (Gen. iii. 1);  דוד | רְבִּי וִיחָֽה (xxiv. 35). Such cases are very common.

Instances of a double Zusatz are found, as in  דוד | רְבִּי וִיחָֽה (Gen. xiii. 13), and  דוד | רְבִּי וִיחָֽה (Gen. xxxi. 25), but are rare.

---

2 See Gesenius' Gr., § 144.
3 Of course, in such cases, the minor dichotomy is due, if the length of the part of the clause before the main dichotomy requires it, e.g.  דוד | רְבִּי וִיחָֽה (Jer. xviii. 11).
4 The Zusatz answers to the supplemental clause in the logical division, p. 32.
5 It being understood that the division is quite optional. Hence Codd. frequently vary. Thus we have  דוד | רְבִּי וִיחָֽה (1 Sam. vii. 14);  דוד | רְבִּי וִיחָֽה (Zech. iii. 2);  דוד | רְבִּי וִיחָֽה (Esth. iii. 15). Even the same verse sometimes shews a different division, as Gen. xxxi. 25; Josh. vi. 9.
3. Sometimes, notwithstanding the position of the subject at the head of the clause, the main tone or emphasis lies—or was considered by the accentuators to lie—further on in the clause. In such cases they did not hesitate to transfer the main dichotomy accordingly,—the subject being marked, where necessary, by a minor dichotomy;—e.g. 

4. Lastly, we cannot but expect to find the subject occupying an inferior position, when its verb governs a clause introduced by יִּשָּׁה (ףשא) or an Infinitive with ל. Such clauses are often of considerable length, and it would manifestly have been awkward in the extreme to mark off always the subject at the commencement. The rule, therefore, is to make the main dichotomy immediately precede these clauses (just as we, in reading, make a slight pause before them), e.g. יִּשָּׁה (ףשא) יְהִי שָׁלְמָה יָשָׁה (Josh. xviii. 4); יִּשָּׁה לַּא מִּשָּׁה (Qoh. ix. 5); יִּשָּׁה לָשֵׁה (Deut. ii. 10); יִּשָּׁה (Hab. ii. 4). Comp. Gen. xix. 24; Num. xv. 13; Josh. ix. 3; 1 Sam. v. 1; Is. iii. 1; viii. 7; lxiv. 3.  

II. The object may precede, and as its position at the head of the clause implies a distinct emphasis, it is marked off by the main dichotomy: יִּשָּׁה בַּּמָּשָׁה רֹמָה לָא (Gen. ix. 4);  

6 Much has been written on the accentuation of this passage. Unquestionably it may stand as in our texts, comp. Ezek. xiv. 14; Dan. ii. 25. But it is to be noted that the great majority of Codd. (I have not noticed a single exception) point regularly יִּשָּׁה בַּּמָּשָׁה | בָּרָאשִׁי.  

7 That variations occur in Codd. is no more than we should expect. Thus, we have יִּשָּׁה and יִּשָּׁה (Jer. viii. 7); יִּשָּׁה וְיִּשָּׁה (Ezek. xxxi. 8); יִּשָּׁה and יִּשָּׁה (Dan. v. 12); יִּשָּׁה and יִּשָּׁה (2 Chr. xviii. 22), with a different tone or emphasis according to the taste of the punctuators. In a few unimportant instances the division is quite arbitrary. Thus in Gen. x. 8, 13, 15, 24 bis, the subject is regularly marked off before יִּשָּׁה; then in verse 26 comes an instance to the contrary, יִּשָּׁה | יִּשָּׁה יִּשָּׁה (Neh. iii. 6; Gen. x. 25).
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The exceptions follow the same lines as with the subject, but are far fewer in number. The accentuators rightly felt that the emphatic position of the object was to be as little disturbed as possible.

1. Thus under the head of the pronouns, I have noted only הִנְה (Ex. xxx. 13); הִנָּה, and shall not, without the dichotomy: [Ex. xxx. 13] (2 Sam. xxiii. 22); בַּיָּתָה [Josh. v. 14]; הָדוֹרָה, and shall not (Gen. ii. 3); and with the minor dichotomy לְ וֹּלַּט הָדוֹרָה (Josh. x. 14); and with the minor dichotomy לְ וֹּלַּט הָדוֹרָה (Deut. xix. 10).

2. The Zusatz, however, is freely used, on the same principle as with the subject: [Lev. iv. 25]; בַּיָּתָה אֲנָהּ (Ezek. xxxiii. 7); בַּיָּתָה אֲנָהּ (1 Chr. x. 10); or with the minor dichotomy on the object: בַּיָּתָה אֲנָהּ (Gen. xxxvii. 4); בַּיָּתָה אֲנָהּ (Is. ix. 7).

3. In only a few other cases has the emphasis, due on the object, been moved further on in the clause, e.g. בַּיָּתָה אֲנָהּ (Lev. xviii. 18); בַּיָּתָה אֲנָהּ (Num. ix. 13); בַּיָּתָה אֲנָהּ (Jer. xviii. 13); בַּיָּתָה אֲנָהּ (Ezek. xxxiii. 31). In Jer. ix. 7b; x. 13b (li. 16) texts vary.

III. Adverbs, and prepositions with their government, at the beginning of the clause, are also generally marked off by the main dichotomy, e.g. הִנְה וֹּלַּט הָדוֹרָה (Gen. ii. 20); וֹּלַּט מֵעָלַּמֵהוּ (Jer. vi. 26); מֵעָלַּמֵהוּ (Jer. vi. 26); מֵעָלַּמֵהוּ (Neh. iii. 16); מֵעָלַּמֵהוּ (1 Sam. xxiv. 15);

So נָעַר עַל חָזָר, verses 2, 4, &c., 'beside him (them).'

Hamah לְרוֹבִּים בֵּשָׁר | נְסוּף | הִנְה | פַּעַם | (xxi. 6); Hamah לְרֹבִּים בֵּשָׁר | נְסוּף | הִנְה | פַּעַם | (1 Ki. xiv. 11).
2. Instances with the Zusatz are common enough: | וֶשְׁמַע אֶל (Gen. iii. 17); חָיָה וְאָכָל | (xii. 16). And with the minor dichotomy, מַעֲשֵׂה | (Josh. xiii. 8). The double Zusatz is found in Lev. xxiv. 4, וְאָכָל הֵן, and Deut. xxix. 14.

3. As with the subject and object, the main dichotomy is at times moved forward in the clause to where the chief stress or emphasis seems to rest, e.g. דָּבֶּר אֶל | (Gen. i. 1); בָּאָל כִּֽי | (Mic. iv. 14); בָּאָל כִּֽי | (Mal. iii. 1).

4. Sometimes two adverbial expressions are found together at the head of the clause,—answering to the double Zusatz at the close,—e.g. דָּבֶּר אֶל | (1 Sam. ix. 9); בָּאָל כִּֽי | (2 Sam. ix. 13); יִשְׁמַע אֶל | (Esth. i. 10). Comp. Cant. iii. 1; Dan. ii. 19; iii. 8; 1 Chr. xii. 37.

5. Lastly, the rule for the dichotomy is often relaxed in the case of the common and less important adverbs, as לָא, לָא, לָא, לָא, לָא, לָא, לָא, לָא, לָא, לָא, לָא, לָא, לָא, לָא, לָא, לָא, לָא, לָא, לָא, לָא, לָא, לָא, לָא, לָא, לָא, לָא. Such cases are very common, see יִשְׁמַע in Gen. xviii. 24; נַעֲשֵׂה, xxiii. 19, &c. To them may be added the frequently recurring adverbial expressions, נַעֲשֵׂה, נַעֲשֵׂה, נַעֲשֵׂה | (Is. ii. 20; xxxix. 1, &c.), and נַעֲשֵׂה (2 Ki. xxiv. 1).

IV. The vocative, at the beginning of the clause, is generally marked off by the dichotomy: בְּעָשַׁה | (Gen. xv. 8). But when a long clause follows, it is almost necessarily subordinated to a part of the same, as in Gen. xviii. 3; Deut. iii. 24; Ezek. xliv. 5; 1 Chr. xxix. 16; &c.

[If it be asked, how, when we have marked off the subject, object, &c., we are to proceed with the division of the rest of the clause, the answer is very simple. We start de novo with the members remaining, always supposing there are at least three words left to be divided. If the subject is succeeded by the

9 In these minor matters Codd. often vary. Sometimes the Massora fixes the accentuation, as Gershayim in יִפְּלֵי (Jer. vii. 32); and T'bhur in יְסִיָּהוּ (Mic. iv. 11).
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object, or the object by the subject, &c., we have simply to proceed as before, and mark off this second member by a *minor* dichotomy, e.g. מִקְוֵי אֲבֵנָיוֹת (Ezek. xxiii. 25); לֹא הָעֵלָה (2 Ki. v. 13); אֲבֵנָיוֹת מִקְוֵי (Is. x. 23, where the three last words are treated as a verbal clause); יִשְׂרָאֵל (xi. 8); and so on. But in most cases the verb succeeds, and we then divide according to Rule V, immediately following.]

V. With the verb\(^\text{10}\), the division is quite different. Here the weight of the clause lies at the *end*; and the last member is first separated by the dichotomy, then the second from the end, and so on till we reach the verb:

הָעֵלָה מִקְוֵי אֲבֵנָיוֹת

(Ex. xii. 51); אֲבֵנָיוֹת מִקְוֵי (Gen. xvii. 8); מִקְוֵי אֲבֵנָיוֹת (Gen. xxiv. 23; xxviii. 17; xxxi. 14).

The student may find for himself examples in every page.

Variations from this simple rule are the following:

1. The several parts of a compound member are constantly treated by the accentuation as *separate* members, e.g. לֹא הָעֵלָה מִקְוֵי (Gen. xvii. 8); מִקְוֵי אֲבֵנָיוֹת (Amos v. 16).

Or else they are grouped in various ways: מִקְוֵי אֲבֵנָיוֹת (Gen. xxiv. 35); מִקְוֵי אֲבֵנָיוֹת (Is. ix. 5).

---

\(^{10}\) Participles, infinitives, and verbal adjectives come, so far as they have verbal government, under the category of the verb.

With וֹשֶׁה (Josh.), רָע, רָע, וֹשֶׁה, the verbal idea is often *implied* (see Gesenius' Gr., § 100. 5), Gen. xxii. 13; xxiv. 23; xxviii. 17; xxxi. 14.

\(^{11}\) The vocative is generally made a *separate* member, e.g. in Judg. v. 31; Mic. vi. 8; but sometimes not, when the suffix of the 2nd pers. precedes, as in Is. viii. 8; x. 22; or even *follows*, Is. xiv. 31; Mic. ii. 12.
2. On the other hand, adverbial expressions or prepositions with their government—homogeneous members, be it observed—are sometimes kept together by the accentuation 12, e.g. 
\[ \text{Heaven and earth are full of the majesty of Thy glory.} \]
(Gen. xvi. 3); 
\[ \text{Such shall be the reward of them.} \]
(xxii. 15); 
\[ \text{The kingdom of heaven is within you.} \]
(2 Ki. ii. 11; comp. ver. i). 
Other examples are Ex. ii. 5; xxv. 30; Lev. xiv. 27 (not 16); Num. xiv. 37; Josh. xxi. 8; Is. xl. 2 end; Jer. xxxvi. 10; Qoh. ii. 15; 1 Chr. xxxiii. 31.

3. Some anomalous cases occur, which may almost all be explained by the desire to emphasize the part of the clause, to which the dichotomy has, contrary to rule, been transferred. It is enough to trace the principle which guided the accentuators. We are not bound always to agree with them.

(a) Thus, when the verb which introduces the clause, receives its nearer definition through another verb, governing an accusative, adverbial expression, &c., and this accusative or adverbial expression is placed before the verb on which it depends, they considered that a certain emphasis was intended, and pointed accordingly:
\[ \text{Heaven and earth are full of the majesty of Thy glory.} \]
(Is. xxix. 15); 
\[ \text{Heaven shall be established.} \]
(xxvii. 26); 
\[ \text{The kingdom of heaven is within you.} \]
(Deut. xxviii. 56); 
\[ \text{Such shall be the reward of them.} \]
(Dan. iii. 16); 
\[ \text{Heaven and earth are full of the majesty of Thy glory.} \]
(Ex. 15; comp. vv. 8, 16, and iv. 15). And so in 2 Sam. xv. 20; xxi. 4; Qoh. viii. 3; Esth. ii. 9; Dan. vi. 5; Ezra iv. 22; 2 Chr. xxxiii. 7, 10.

(b) In the following passages the accentuators have placed the dichotomy even at the status constructus 15, as a measure of emphasis seemed to be due there:
\[ \text{Heaven and earth are full of the majesty of Thy glory.} \]
(Gen. xiv. 13);

---

12 Particularly at the end of the clause, like the double Zusatz at the end of the nominal clause. It is but rarely (as far as I have observed) that the expressions referred to come together in the middle of the clause, as in 1 Ki. xi. 36; 2 Ki. xvii. 13; Is. xxxix. 4.
13 Here Luzzatto and Delitzsch have both misapprehended the accentuation, which, it must be allowed, is ambiguous.
14 The change Baer makes (see his note) is therefore quite unnecessary.
15 Such a free division is not without parallel in our own chants, as in the Te Deum: ‘Heaven and earth are full of the majesty of Thy glory,’ of which we might make a verbal clause in Heb., with the dichotomy at the st. const.:
\[ \text{Heaven and earth are full of the majesty of Thy glory.} \]
16 That Abraham should be dwelling at such a place was a circumstance worthy of observation! The Midrash has something to say on the point.
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17 The place is to be noted. All Joseph's future history depends on their having been sent there! Once introduced, this division is repeated in verse 7 and xli. 10. We might be tempted to point רַכְשַׁל with Qāmeṣ, as in xlii. 17, and then all would be regular; but this would be contrary to the Massora, which requires Pathach, נָשַׁל.

18 One might be inclined to explain some of these cases by a reference to rhythm, or equilibrium in the section of the clause, but such explanations will not apply, for the simple reason that in other similar instances, and those the great majority, these influences do not make themselves felt, but the division is according to the rule for the verbal clause. See Gen. iii. 24b; Judg. viii. 5b; 1 Ki. xi. 27b; Jer. xxxviii. 6; 1 Chr. xvi. 10b; &c.
An occasional exception is indeed found, as in (Gen. ii. 18; 2 Ki. xii. 1; and similar passages); (Lev. xxv. 10); (2 Sam. xv. 34); and (Is. ii. 2); the explanations of which will readily suggest themselves. In Jer. iv. 27 a, texts vary.

VII. Lastly, the conjunctions, as הִנְצָה, הִנְצָה, יִדְרֵי, הִנְצָה, יִדְרֵי, הִנְצָה, יִדְרֵי, הִנְצָה, יִדְרֵי, הִנְצָה, יִדְרֵי, הִנְצָה, יִדְרֵי, &c., need not detain us. They are, from their character, generally joined, either by a conjunctive accent or Maqqeph, to the word following. It is unnecessary to give examples, as they may be found in every page.

But, sometimes on musical grounds, sometimes with a view to emphasis, even these unimportant words, which have so little claim to an independent position, are found marked with a pausal accent, thus: יִדְרֵי (Gen. iv. 7); יִדְרֵי (xi. 7); יִדְרֵי (xxxii. 21); יִדְרֵי (ii. 17; and often); יִדְרֵי (Is. vii. 5; and often); יִדְרֵי (Gen. ii. 25); יִדְרֵי (Ezek. xxxiv. 8; Baer rightly); יִדְרֵי (i Ki. xi. 22; and often); but יִדְרֵי (iii. 22, 23; Is. xxx. 16); &c. These two last examples shew that the punctators are not always consistent, even where we should expect them to be so. And so in Codd. there is, in these trifling points, frequent variation, thus in (Is. lxiii. 19) some have יִדְרֵי, others יִדְרֵי; in Mic. vi. 5 we find יִדְרֵי and יִדְרֵי, &c. Sometimes the Massora comes in and fixes the accentuation, as יִדְרֵי; יִדְרֵי; יִדְרֵי; יִדְרֵי; &c.

The interjections are used in the same way, e.g. (Gen. iii. 22; xxvii. 42 a); (Is. xvii. 12; xviii. 1); (Ex. i. 10).

Thus far we have had to do with the division of the clause into its several members, but there is a further point that requires consideration, and that is, the division, in certain cases, of the members themselves. Every member of a clause—subject, object, &c.—will be either

19 יִדְרֵי and יִדְרֵי, as in Gen. xxvii. 27; Ex. xxxv. 30; Deut. i. 8; ii. 31, may take the place of יִדְרֵי.
simple, consisting of one word, or compound, consisting of two or more words. And such compound members introduce a new element into the dichotomy of the verse, about which it is necessary to say a few words.

1. Two Nouns in apposition are generally kept together by the accentuation, as בְּנֵי חוֹדֶשׁ (Gen. iv. 1), &c.

But where emphasis or distinctness of enunciation seems to require it, the dichotomy—and even the main dichotomy of the clause—may come between, e.g. כִּי מִלָּהּ לֶא בְּתוֹבֵּיה יִשְׂמַךְ (Num. xxv. 12); הֲבַיּוֹת הֲבַיִּיתֶה יִשְׁמַךְ (Zech. iii. 8); וְאִמְצָתָה וְאִמְצָתוֹת וְאָבֹא (Judg. iii. 28). And so the emphatic pronoun may be separated from the noun, כָּהָנִּים (Num. xviii. 23).

The cases, in which more than two nouns come in apposition, or instead of the noun we have a nominal expression consisting of several words, present no difficulty. The subdivision of such expressions will be according to the general rules for the dichotomy, see Gen. xxiii. 16; Num. xvi. 2; 1 Ki. xi. 36b; Amos v. 16.

2. So two Nouns, in the same construction and joined by a, are constantly kept together by the accentuation, as יְבַנְיָיָן בֵּית (Gen. i. 18); יִבְּרֵיהֶרֶב (xviii. 27); יַדְּרֵיה (l. 10), &c.

But for the reasons above given, they may be separated by the dichotomy, e.g. בְּרָכְתָּה יִדְּרֵיה (Ex. iii. 8); וְיִדְּרֵיה הֶרְכָּבָה לֶא בְּתֹבֵּיה יִשְׂמַךְ (Judg. vii. 20); יֶשְׁעַיְיָה (Is. i. 13); וַיָּשֶׂעָה הָאֵל יִדְּרֵיה (Esth. iv. 1); וְעָבְרְיהֶרֶב אָבֹא (Ezek. xl. 5).

Examples, where several nouns come together, or where the nominal expression consists of several words (see remark above), are Deut. xxix. 7; Is. xxvii. 1; xxx. 30; xxxvii. 12 20.

3. The substantive may be qualified in various ways, either by another substantive in apposition, or by an adjective, relative or adverbial expression following. In these several cases (as we have seen with the apposition 21), the substantive may be separated from the qualifying expression by the main (or a minor) dichotomy. Somewhat more of weight generally attaches to the latter in consequence. Thus

(a) Substantive and adjective: נִחְמַס בְּיִדְּרֵיהֶרֶב (Ex. x. 19); גַּפַּר בְּיִדְּרֵיהֶרֶב (Lev. xx. 18); כַּפַּר בְּיִדְּרֵיהֶרֶב (Is. vi. 1); יִדְּרֵיה (.xxxvi. 9). And so the demonstrative הָנֹה (נַהֲנָה) often stands

20 Sometimes the nouns appear ḫwepbak, as יְנִּיֵּמְט (Gen. i. 11, not 12).

21 In reality, the adjective and relative are to be regarded as in apposition, see Ewald, §§ 293 a, 364 c; Stade, § 176; and even the adv. expression, when we can supply יָנָה before it (see note 23), is equally in apposition.
outside the rest of the clause: "and he hath | not | rendered | good | for | evil | (Deut. xxviii. 58); and it | is | not | known | to | the | Almighty; | (ix. 6); | but | shall | be | weighed | in | the | balance | (Num. xvi. 26).

(β) Substantive and relative. Here it is not so much the separation of the relative clause from the substantive, to which attention has to be drawn (for in our own interpunctuation such separation is common enough), as the character of the dichotomy,—the main, where we look for a minor,—e.g. "but he | did | not | render | evil | for | good" (Deut. viii. 1); "therefore | must | all | men | seek | the || | [DICHOTOMY]. For the relative, we may have the participle: "as | a | man | of | the | oration" (Gen. iii. 24); "and | all | them | of || | (xxiv. 62); for | the | weight | of | their || | [DICHOTOMY]. Often the relative conjunction is understood: "whom | he | beheld | in | the | | (Lam. ii. 3); "who | art | not | holy | than || | [DICHOTOMY].

Obs. Sometimes, for emphasis' sake, the dichotomy appears in the middle of the relative clause, e.g. "for | he | is | the | one | that | knoweth | the | depths || | [DICHOTOMY]. The weight of the clause does not rest on the former, but on the contents of the same, a vision of Isaiah22); although | it | is | that | knoweth | the || | [DICHOTOMY]. (xli. 3, with \( n^2 \) emphatic); \( n^2 \) and | it | is | that | knoweth | the || | [DICHOTOMY]. (2 Sam. xi. 16, 'the place where he knew' &c.). Comp. Deut. i. 31, 39; xi. 2, 7; xxviii. 69; xxxiii. 1; Judg. xviii. 10b; xx. 15b.

(γ) Adverbs, and prepositions with their government, are constantly employed to qualify a noun (subst. or adj.), and are joined to it by the accents; but frequently they appear with the dichotomy preceding, e.g. "by | his | hand" (2 Ki. xiii. 7); "for | it | is | not || | [DICHOTOMY]; comp. Joel iv. 12); "by | his | hand" (Jer. v. 6); "by | his | hand" (Jer. vii. 30); "by | his | hand" (2 Chr. xxiv. 24).

Comp. "by | his | hand" (1 Ki. xiv. 19) and "by | his | hand" (2 Ki. v. 9).23 An extreme case is "by | his | hand" (Ex. xxxiv. 31).

---

22 The first verses of Hos., Joel, Mic., Hab., and Zeph. are similarly divided. (Comp. Jer. ii. 59.) On the other hand, in "a terrible | day | shall | come | upon | you" (Is. xiii. 1), the weight of the clause comes on the first words.

23 We may often in such expressions supply \( n^2 \). Comp. Lev. iv. 7 and 18 (\( n^2 \)); Num. xxvi. 63b and xxxi. 12b (\( n^2 \)); 1 Sam. xxvi. 1b and 3 (do.); Is. xxxvi. 2b and 2 Ki. xviii. 17b (\( n^2 \)); where it fails in the first, but is given in the second of the verses quoted.
4. The connection between a noun in *status constructus* and the genitive following is closer than that in any of the cases already considered, yet even here, under certain circumstances, the dichotomy intervenes—as when the word in st. constr. is followed by *two or more* others, which together express the genitive relation, e.g. | לָו (Gen. ii. 9); לָו | הַיְ֥ם (iv. 10); לָו | הַיְ֥ם (iv. 20); לָו | הַיְ֥ם (Num. ix. 18); לָו | הַיְ֥ם | מִשְׁתַּלְתּוּ (Is. xxx. 26)24.

When several nouns follow one another in st. constr., they are marked off (as far as is necessary) in succession: הַיְ֥ם מְשֹׁרְחַ | לָו | מְשֹׁרְחַ (Gen. xlvi. 9); לָו | מְשֹׁרְחַ (Hag. i. 14); לָו | מְשֹׁרְחַ (Is. xiii. 4).

The following variations occur: (a) In the case last-named, the dichotomy sometimes follows after the *second* noun, particularly when the two first nouns form together a *compound* idea, e.g. מִשְׁתַּלְתּוּ | לָו | מְשֹׁרְחַ (Is. xxviii. 1); מִשְׁתַּלְתּוּ | לָו | מְשֹׁרְחַ (Jer. iii. 21); מִשְׁתַּלְתּוּ | לָו | מְשֹׁרְחַ (2 Chr. i. 3)25. In Is. xxi. 17 five nouns are brought together in st. constr., and the dichotomy comes, suitably enough, after the third: מִשְׁתַּלְתּוּ | לָו | מְשֹׁרְחַ | מְשֹׁרְחַ | מְשֹׁרְחַ | מְשֹׁרְחַ.

(b) The small and frequently recurring words הָיָה and דָּבָר, regarded as in st. constr., are often marked off by the dichotomy (Gen. i. 25; ii. 20). So also the prepositions, as הָיָה (v. 4; xv. 1); הָי (xii. 7); דָּבָר (xii. 6); לָו (viii. 4); מִשְׁתַּלְתּוּ (xiii. 32); מְשֹׁרְחַ (xii. 46); כָּמֵּר (xxvi. 24); &c. But these words are all more commonly joined by Maqeph or a conjunctive accent to the word following, or are marked by a minor dichotomy, (see text passim) according to the taste of the punctators. (Codd. in consequence vary greatly. Where some place R'bbia or Zaqeph, others have Maqeph, &c.)

Other small words of frequent occurrence, treated in the same way, are רֹאֶשׁ and עָלָי (Gen. vii. 6; xvii. 17); רֹאֶשׁ (xvii. 5b); עָלָי (1 Ki. x. 21); עָלָי (Deut. xxi. 24); עָלָי (Gen. ii. 4; Is. lviii. 5); עָלָי (Deut. xxxiv. 8b; Judg. xviii. 31); עָלָי (Mic. v. 2); and ר (Jer. xxii. 25).

5. Correlative expressions, formed by הָיָה—דָּבָר, הָי—דָּבָר, &c., are sometimes kept together and sometimes separated by the accents.

21 The relative ד, which often expresses the genitive relation in Chaldee, leads to another division. See Dan. vi. 17, 25; Ezra iv. 15; v. 13, 16; vii. 21b. In reality this particle is in *apposition* (comp. Philippi, Status constructus, p. 114), and the division is to be explained accordingly.

25 Gen. i. 17; Ex. xxviii. 11; Num. iii. 36; 2 Sam. xxxiii. 20b; Is. x. 12b; xxviii. 1b, 16b; 1 Chr. xxiii. 28b, may be compared. Sometimes *emphasis* may have influenced the division, as in Is. xxxvi. 9.
Equilibrium of the parts of the clause will generally decide. Thus we have נִבְּלָלָנוּ הָאָדָם גְּרוֹם לְחָרָה (Gen. i. 4), but נִבְּלָלָנוּ נִבְּלָלָנוּ הָאָדָם גְּרוֹם מִזְדָּמֵר (ver. 7). Verses 6, 14, 18 are like the former, but xiii. 7; xx. 1, like the latter. (In Num. xvii. 13 texts vary.) And so בַּרְדֵּנִי בְּרָדְנֵנִי are joined in i Sam. xix. 10, but separated in xviii. 11. In Gen. xviii. 25 we have הנִּבְּלָלָנוּ, but necessarily נִבְּלָלָנוּ בְּרָדְנֵנִי (Deut. i. 17).

It is the same with the contrasted prepositions רַבָּלָלָנוּ, נִבְּלָלָנוּ, which are, according to the taste of the punctators, kept together, as in Gen. xiii. 3; xv. 18; Ex. xxviii. 28; or separated, as in Gen. xxv. 18; Num. xxxiii. 49; Jos. xiii. 5.

6. The verb.—(a) Two verbs, in the same construction, are joined by the accents: יִפְדוּ | בָּרָדְנֵנִי (Num. xxii. 31); יִפְדוּ | בָּרָדְנֵנִי (Is. lvii. 11).

Yet, not unfrequently, particularly if emphasis is to be marked, the dichotomy comes between: בָּרָדְנֵנִי | בָּרָדְנֵנִי (Judg. v. 30); בָּרָדְנֵנִי | בָּרָדְנֵנִי (Is. xxxvii. 23); בָּרָדְנֵנִי | בָּרָדְנֵנִי (li. 17). Comp. Is. lixii. 7; Jer. vi. 27b; vii. 29b; Jon. iii. 9; and with three verbs, Is. xxxvii. 37; Esth. iii. 13.

(β) The inf. abs. is generally joined to the verb fin., as in בִּהְרָדְנֵנִי (Gen. iii. 16); בָּרָדְנֵנִי | בָּרָדְנֵנִי (Ex. xxiii. 4).

(γ) When two verbs are connected to form one idea, this connection is constantly marked by the accents: יַחֲדֹּתְנֵנִי | יַחֲדֹּתְנֵנִי (Gen. iv. 2); יַחֲדֹּתְנֵנִי | יַחֲדֹּתְנֵנִי (Jer. xxxvi. 28); יַחֲדֹּתְנֵנִי | יַחֲדֹּתְנֵנִי (I Sam. ii. 3). Yet ñי הַּ בָּרָדְנֵנִי | ñי הַּ בָּרָדְנֵנִי (Is. xxx. 9); &c.

Or the first verb receives the minor dichotomy: יַחֲדֹּתְנֵנִי | יַחֲדֹּתְנֵנִי (Deut. iii. 24).

We may also note the cases where the first verb is merely introductory to the other, which is the main verb of the clause, e.g. יַחֲדֹּתְנֵנִי | יַחֲדֹּתְנֵנִי (Gen. xxxvii. 14); יַחֲדֹּתְנֵנִי | יַחֲדֹּתְנֵנִי (Ezek. viii. 9); יַחֲדֹּתְנֵנִי | יַחֲדֹּתְנֵנִי | יַחֲדֹּתְנֵנִי | יַחֲדֹּתְנֵנִי (Ex. ix. 19); ñי הַּ בָּרָדְנֵנִי | ñי הַּ בָּרָדְנֵנִי | ñי הַּ בָּרָדְנֵנִי (xvi. 4). And so בָּרָדְנֵנִי (Gen. xviii. 21); יַחֲדֹּתְנֵנִי (Num. ix. 8); יַחֲדֹּתְנֵנִי (Deut. v. 24); יַחֲדֹּתְנֵנִי (Cant. ii. 17); יַחֲדֹּתְנֵנִי (Jcr. i. 17); יַחֲדֹּתְנֵנִי | יַחֲדֹּתְנֵנִי (Deut. xxxiv. 9); Jer. xxxv. 10); and many other verbs.

26 In the sense laid down in Ges. Gr., § 142.

27 Of the verbs used in this way דַּעַּת and נִבְּלָלָנוּ are particularly common. These verbs sometimes follow the main verb in a complemen tal sense, and are still joined to it by the accents: נִבְּלָלָנוּ | נִבְּלָלָנוּ | נִבְּלָלָנוּ | נִבְּלָלָנוּ (Gen. xlii. 33). Comp. Ex. xvii. 5; Deut. xii. 26; i Sam. xxx. 22.
SYNTACTICAL DICHOTOMY.

In conclusion, I have once more to draw attention to the peculiar use of the Zusatz. We have already had many instances of this construction. It remains only to mention that, like the apposition, relative, &c., it often belongs syntactically only to the last part of the clause, or division of the verse, preceding. Note how we divide sometimes, in chanting, in the same way:

'As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be | world without end.'

Examples are:

'And they heard the voice of Jehovah God, walking in the garden | at the cool of the day' (Gen. iii. 8).

'And he shall dip them and the living bird in the blood of the bird that was killed | over the running water' (Lev. xiv. 6).

'And they took his land in possession, and the land of Og king of Bashan, the two kings of the Amorites, which were beyond Jordan | toward the sun-rising' (Deut. iv. 47, comp. 49).

'Wilt thou keep silence, and afflict us | very sore?' (Is. lxiv. 11).

Comp. Gen. xxii. 4; xxxviii. 12b; xliv. 29b; Lev. xxvii. 18a; Deut. xi. 28b; Is. lxi. 10b; Mic. ii. 8; Ezra vi. 21 23.

Of course, we may have one Zusatz duly marked off, and then another following:

'These are the commandments and the judgments, which Jehovah commanded, by the hand of Moses, | unto the children of Israel, | in the plains of Moab by the Jordan of Jericho' (Num. xxxvi. 13).

What is irregular is the double Zusatz, e.g.

'These are the statutes, ... which Jehovah made between Him and the children of Israel, | in Mount Sinai, by the hand of Moses' (Lev. xxvi. 46) 29.

It is observable that the relative, or a term in apposition, may take the place of one member of the double Zusatz. (This is possible, inasmuch as the relative, apposition, and Zusatz appear under the same conditions, at the end of the clause.) Comp. Deut. iv. 40b, with the Zusatz כָּלַיִם, and xxviii. 52a with בָּלָיִם אֶרֶץ, both after the relative. In this way Is. ii. 20b may be explained, without having recourse to the Rabbinical rendering to account for the accentuation. A somewhat similar case is Gen. i. 11: 'Fruit-tree bearing fruit after its kind, | in which is the seed thereof, upon the earth,' where מִזְמַר לְפָדָאייִם

28 Sometimes it is the second accusative, which we express by a preposition, that serves as Zusatz, as in Gen. xlii. 25, after יָדַע; and Num. xxii. 18 after נָלַע.

29 So virtually Is. liii. 13: 'Who led them through the depths, | like the horse on the plain, without stumbling.' And so Gen. xiii. 10b may be explained.
does not refer to the relative clause, but to the clause preceding the dichotomy.—An instance of Zusatz + Apposition is found in Deut. xxvi. 15.

Having completed the examination of the principles on which the division—logical and syntactical—proceeds, we are now prepared to enter on the analysis of the verse and its component parts. It will (I think) be found that we have already mastered the chief difficulties of our investigation. Henceforth our main task will be to observe the accents, that are employed to mark the necessary divisions. The rules above laid down will be applied at every step, and I shall not consider it necessary to draw the reader's attention to their particular application, but shall take it for granted that he has made himself familiar with them in a general way, so as to be able readily to refer to them for the explanation of any particular case. Beside the above rules, we shall find that musical and rhythmical laws have to be taken into account.

Perhaps before I leave this, the preparatory part of my work, it may be well to remind the student that the accents employed to mark the various divisions of the verse, have no fixed inter-punctuational value. We could not say that one answers per se to our comma, another to our semicolon, and so on; for they simply note musical divisions, which are bound to appear whatever the logical or grammatical construction of the verse may be. Hence Athnach, for instance, may represent at one time the fullest logical, and at another the feeblest syntactical pause; and hence too the same clause will be marked by quite different accents, as it varies its position in the verse. (See e.g. Jos. vii. 14; i Ki. vii. 21.) The point which the student must bear in mind is that the interpunctuational value of the accents is relative, not absolute.

At least, no one (I presume) will accept Dillmann's explanation: *In welcher sein Same [ist zur Fortpflanzung!] auf der Erde.*
Corrigenda

(in accordance with the rules laid down in this chapter).

1. The *casus absolutus* (p. 45) must be marked off in

\[\text{Hos. ix. 8}, \text{with Ox. 1, 5, 6, 7, \&c.} \]

As for the prophet—the snare of the fowler is on all his ways.'

2. The accentual arrangement of the *verbal clause* (p. 49) has to be corrected in the following passages:

- (Jos. iv. 6), with Par. 9; Hm. 3. T'bhir is evidently due at הַנָּה.
- (1 Sam. x. 22), with Ox. 16; Enf. 1, 2, 3.
- (xxv. 43), with Ox. 16, 72, 75, \&c.

T'bhir is again out of place in our texts.

- (2 Sam. xviii. 7), with Add. 1657; Ber. 2.

Géresh is properly due (as we shall afterwards see) at הַנָּה,

but has been transformed.

- (1 Ki. x. 12), with Ox. 1, 6, 8, \&c.
- (2 Ki. xx. 11), with Ox. 2091; Par. 30; Ber. 32; and so Is. xxxviii. 8. The pointing of our texts, אֶל, makes the shadow to have already gone down backwards, before the sign was performed!

- (xxiv. 15), with Ox. 1, 7, 10, \&c.
- (Jer. xxxii. 29), with Ox. 1, 5, 6, \&c.

R'bhia is absolutely necessary here, and is supplied by Add. 15252; Par. 30; Ber. 32; De R. 942.

- (Ezek. xlv. 11), with Ox. 2421; Harl. 5498; Or. 2091; Vi. 2, \&c.
- (Zech. ii. 2), with Ox. 1, 4, 9, \&c.

I have not thought it necessary to give the minor accentual variations in the Codd. quoted, where the principle of division is the same.
3. With the nominal predicate (p. 51) at the head of the clause, we must point in the following passages thus:

(Ex. xxx. 31), with Ox. 6, 18, 20, &c.
(Lev. xiii. 4), with Ox. 18; Add. 4709; Erf. 1.

(2 Sam. xix. 33), with Ox. 68, 76.

4. The accentuation in the case of a few compound members (p. 53 ff.) needs correcting, as follows:

(Gen. xxxvii. 19), with Ox. 2436; Par. 4.
(Num. iv. 6), with K. 251; De R. 2. Comp. Ex. xxviii. 31.
(v. 19), with Add. 15252; De R. 384. Comp. ver. 18 end.
(xxv. 15), with Ox. 3, 6, 8; Erff. 1-4.
(Judg. xvi. 26), with all Codd.
(1 Ki. vi. 7), with all Codd.
(i Ki. xvii. 24), with Ox. 76; Ber. 2; and (2 Ki. v. 22), with K. 187; De R. 440. The two adverbs cannot be separated as in our texts.
(Jer. xlii. 11), with Ox. 5, 72, &c.
(Jer. I. 5), with Ox. 13, 72. See also Rashi and Qimchi.
(Jon. i. 8), with Ox. 4, 7; like , ver. 7.
(Zech. x. 5), with Ox. 4, 6, 7, &c.
(Esth. ix. 28), with Ox. 51; Harl. 5506.
(Dan. xii. 2), with Ox. 1, 5, 7.

In these trifling matters, I have been often satisfied, when I have found two Codd. supporting the obviously necessary correction. The instances shew how even the best editors have failed to master, or at least to observe, the simplest rules of the accentuation.

Other similar instances will doubtless be found, which have escaped my notice, and which will all have to be corrected in the same way, unless (as is sometimes the case) they should admit of explanation, from the application of some special rule.
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SILUQ.

CHAPTER V.

SILUQ.

SILUQ's clause is to be considered as embracing the whole verse 1.

The verse itself is of varying length. It may contain only two words. But such cases are exceedingly rare. The only examples are Gen. xlvi. 23; Ex. xx. 13-15 (Deut. v. 17); and Num. xxvi. 11. Here Ṭiphcha appears as musical foretone to Silluq in the first word, e.g. חָיָה חָיָה.

Where three or more words occur in the verse, we have, first of all, to observe the rules for the main division of the same. The following cases will occur:

I. The main dichotomy—fixed by the rules we have already laid down—may come on the first word before Silluq, and will be marked by Ṭiphcha or Athnach.

1. Ṭiphcha is by far the more common (perhaps for the sake of the musical foretone), whether the verse be long or short, e.g. נְהָלָה נְהָלָה נְהָלָה נְהָלָה נְהָלָה נְהָלָה נְהָלָה (Gen. ii. 1); נְהָלָה נְהָלָה נְהָלָה נְהָלָה נְהָלָה נְהָלָה נְהָלָה נְהָלָה נְהָלָה נְהָלָה (Is. xxxvi. 1) 2.

With only three words in the verse,—as in Gen. xxvi. 6; Ex. xxviii. 13 3; Num. vi. 24,—Ṭiphcha is always used.

2. Athnach occurs occasionally, and more particularly in cases

---

2 Other examples of long verses with Ṭiphcha are Num. ix. 1; Deut. v. 23; vi. 22; Jos. xiii. 16; Jer. viii. 1; xiii. 13; xxix. 2; lii. 18; Ezek. xii. 17; Neh. v. 17; 1 Chr. xxviii. 1; 2 Chr. xx. 22; xxiv. 9; xxxiv. 20.
3 Ṭiphcha, as the main divider of the verse, constantly lengthens the short vowel, as Athnach would have done: יְהָדָה (Num. ix. 2); יְהָדָה (Jer. viii. 1; xiii. 13); יְהָדָה (Hos. iv. 17); יְהָדָה (1 Chr. xxviii. 1).

The Massora to this passage cites fourteen such verses in the Tora, ten of which come under this head.
of a marked logical pause, e.g. (Gen. i. 3); לְגָּדוֹל הַהָּאָרֶץ (xli. 21). Comp. v. 5; xlii. 20; Ex. xxiii. 23; Num. x. 28; Ezek. vii. 21; Hag. ii. 5. Such instances, with Athnach on the first word, are the only ones in which the foretone fails before Silluq.

II. With the main dichotomy on the second word before Silluq, the same accents are employed to mark it. But Athnach is here the more common (the foretone Tiphcha following on the first word). Examples are, with Tiphcha: יִדְעָה יִתַּרְעָה הַיָּהָה יִתַּשֵּׂשָּה (Gen. i. 13); שָׁמֵעַ אֲרֹרָה אַשָּׁר בְּלַעֲלָה בְּר יִתַּשְׁנֵה (Ex. xv. 18); and with Athnach: מְנֻקָּה אֹזֶן אַלְּתַרְמִי בְּרֵי מְשַׁמַּי (viii. 14).

We have to notice a further variation. When Silluq's word, or the word preceding it, is long 4, Zaqeph is admissible instead of Tiphcha, and is indeed generally preferred, for the sake of the rhythmical cadence at the close of the verse (Tiphcha, as before, marking the foretone on the first word), e.g. הַשָּׁמֶשׁ מֶשֶׁאָה נִיְשַׁב (Gen. xxiii. 12); נִבְּשֵׁה נַפְּלִי עַרְגִּי (Gen. xxiii. 12).

4 A long word is technically one that has two or more vowels before the tone-syllable, or if only one vowel, that vowel must be long, followed by Métheg and Sh'va. In the latter case, the Sh'va may be mobile, as in רֶשֶׁת, הָמוֹן, or quiescens, as in מֶשֶׁא, בֹּקַל.

With two short words following, Tiphcha is bound to appear. See the list of names of the spies, Num. xiii. 4 ff., where the only instance in which Tiphcha stands is of this kind, ver. 8. Or comp. 1 Chr. xi. 27-47, where vv. 35 and 42 alone have Tiphcha and for the same reason. Some few exceptions indeed occur, as רֶשֶׁת הוֹרַתי לְאָרוֹן (Lam. iii. 25); and (where Zaqeph marks a minor dichotomy) in Ex. xxxiii. 1; Is. xlvi. 4; lxii. 6; Ezra vi. 12. But these are only the exceptions that prove the rule; for the rule is carried out in hundreds, if not thousands, of instances. Jer. v. 30 is pointed with Athnach in Ox. 1, 7.
The musical division carried out in 2 Sam. xxii is found (with little or no variation) in other poetical pieces, such as Gen. xl; Ex. xv; Deut. xxxii and xxxiii; &c. Lam. iii and v (with their short verses) are alone divided as 1 Chr. xvi. But it is interesting to notice that the Oriental text had this division for the whole of Job (see a specimen prefixed to Baer's edition), and without doubt for Proverbs also, and at least a part of the Psalms.

Zaqeph occurs mostly in short verses, and is particularly common in the few words that head an address, as Ex. xii. 1; xx. 1; xxi. 1; Lev. xiii. 1; xv. 1; Is. vii. 10; viii. 5; Jer. vii. 1; and in lists of names, numbers, &c., as Josh. xii. 9-24; Ruth iv. 18-22; Ezra ii. 3 ff.; 1 Chr. xi. 27-47; xxv. 10-31. Sometimes texts vary, as in 2 Sam. i. 27; xxiii. 39; where Athnach is better. In 1 Chr. xviii. 12, many Codd. have Zaqeph.
word. The farther back the main division is removed from Silluq, the greater is the tendency to employ Athnach to mark it. We can understand that, by this weightier accent, the balance of the melody was better marked and sustained. So with the main dichotomy on the fifth word and further, Athnach alone can be employed. For examples under this head, see below.

The accents that mark the main dichotomy of the verse have now been determined. The verse has been divided into (what we may call) its two halves; and the next question is how the accentual division of each of these halves is to be carried out. With the first we are not at present concerned. It is under the government of Tiphcha, Zaqeph, or Athnach; and the rules for its division cannot be settled, till we come to treat of these accents respectively. But the last half is still under Silluq's control, and its subdivision must now engage our attention.

When the main dichotomy comes on the first or second word before Silluq (I and II), it is clear that no further division is possible. But when it comes on the third or any further word (III), such division is not only possible but necessary.

For Silluq's clause is subject, in all its parts, to the strict rule of the dichotomy, viz. that wherever three or more words come together, the dichotomy is to be introduced. Now under III, there will be at least three, and there may be many more words, in the last half of the verse. The minor dichotomy therefore cannot fail. Its musical notation will be necessarily Tiphcha, if it come on the first word, and Tiphcha (Zaqeph) on the second.

7 The rule that Athnach alone can stand on the fifth word and further, is strictly carried out. Hence the Zaqeph in Qoh. iii. 3, 4, 6–8, is changed into Athnach in vv. 2 and 5. I have noted only two trifling exceptions to the rule, in Ezra ii. 35 (repeated Neh. vii. 38) and Neh. vii. 17, where, for uniformity with the headings in the long list before and after, Zaqeph has been retained. Other exceptions in our texts must be corrected, as Zaqeph on the fifth word, Cant. vi. 12 (where must be written as one word, see Baer's note), and 1 Chr. xxiii. 12 (point נָּרֵפְי, with Ox. 5, 9, 11). Zaqeph occurs on the sixth word in 1 Chr. vii. 13 (corr. סְּחֵפָה, with Ox. 4, 5, 9) and 2 Chr. i. 18 (point נָּרֵפָה, with ditto); and on the seventh word in Is. xl. 5 (corr. נָּרֵפָה, with Baer).
On the third word or further it will be Zaqeph. In this last case a further subdivision will be necessary.

The following examples of the various cases that arise will make these remarks clear:

I. a. With Athnach, as main divider of the verse, on the third or fourth word:

\[\text{(Gen. iii. 9); (xxxiv. 31); (ii. 16); (Is. v. 3).} \]

The last is the only case in which a second minor dichotomy is due.

b. With Zaqeph, in place of Athnach, on the third or fourth word:

\[\text{(Num. vi. 26); (Qoh. i. 4); (Gen. ix. 4); (Cant. vi. 12); (Dan. v. 30).} \]

In the two last instances, Zaqeph has been repeated, to mark the minor dichotomy. Such cases are, however, not common, and occur only in the later Books. Athnach with Zaqeph following was preferred to two Zaqeph.

II. With Athnach, as main divider of the verse, on the fifth word or further.

1. Here, as above, there may be only one minor dichotomy,—marked by Tiphcha on the first word, or Tiphcha (Zaqeph) on the second:

\[\text{(Gen. iv. 3); } \]

The student will notice in the examples given the logical and syntactical grounds for marking off the several dichotomies. He will observe that Zaqeph is often repeated, and will see that, from the very principle of the dichotomy, the first Zaqeph must have a greater disjunctive value than the second, the second than the third, &c.
There may be two minor dichotomies, the first of which will be marked by Zaqeph, the second as under 1:

1. There may be two minor dichotomies, the first of which will be marked by Zaqeph, the second as under 1:

2. There may be two minor dichotomies, the first of which will be marked by Zaqeph, the second as under 1:

3. There may be three minor dichotomies, the first two of which will be marked by Zaqeph, the third as under 1:

4. Four minor dichotomies are also frequent enough, the three first marked by Zaqeph, the fourth as under 1:

5. Of five minor dichotomies I have found only two certain instances in our texts, 2 Sam. xvii. 9 and 2 Ki. i. 39.

We have now completed the analysis of Silluq's clause, and have traced the application of the law of the continuous dichotomy, on which the whole fabric of the accentuation rests. Scholars

---

9 Ben-Bil. (Mishp. hat. 9), and other writers on the accents, do not allow even these instances. — Four Zaqephs are found in Judg. xiii. 8; but here we have an early misprint (Bomb. 2), which has been preserved in our texts: is impossible after Gershayim, and must be changed to (R'bhla). — In 2 Ki. xvii. 34 most Codd. I have examined (Ox. 1, 5, 7, 8, &c.) have (R'bhla).
still hesitate about accepting this law. But it is hoped that no one, who has carefully examined the examples above given, will any longer doubt its operation. It remains to be seen whether it will equally explain the phenomena that occur with the other accents.

SERVUS OF SILLUQ

is always Mer’kha. Silluq has never more than one servus.

In five passages the Palestinian authorities have introduced Tiphchā (in place of Métheg) into the same word with Silluq: לִפְחָא (Lev. xxi. 4); מֵתוֹב (Num. xv. 21); הַלְּפִּי (Is. viii. 17); חַּֽלַּפִי (Hos. xi. 6); and לָמֵֽתָה (1 Chr. ii. 53). As the notions that led them to mark these few words with an anomalous accentuation have not been handed down to us, conjectures on the subject seem to me useless.—It is to be noted that in the first four cases Athnách immediately precedes, in the last Zaqeph.

Grammarians call the accent here a servus, and give it the name נּֽחָפ (see p. 26).

Corrigenda.

Zaqeph fails, or has been wrongly introduced, in the following passages (which must be corrected, as we should correct cases of false interpolation in a modern text):

NUM. XXX. 8, as in vv. 5 and 12. And so Ox. 13 and Harl. 1528 point.

(Deut. xxii. 29), with Ox. 3, 8; Erf. 1, 3.

Judg. v. 12), with Ox. 16, 36, 2437; Harl. 5706.

Judg. xvi. 9), with Ox. 6, 7, 15; Erf. 3.

2 Sam. xvii. 3), with Ox. 1, 13, 68, 72.

(1 Ki. xiv. 22), with all Ox. Codd. I have examined, and others.

19 Enumerated in the Mas. to Lev. xxi. 4.
21 Cod. Bab. has סָּֽעֶֽמִּם (no doubt the Oriental pointing), and this is correct. Maqqeph is out of place here. In Hos. xi. 6 the Palestinian accentuation has found its way into this text, as is not unfrequently the case.
Further, nothing is more common in Codd. and printed texts than the interchange of Tiphcha and Mer'kha before Silluq. These accents must be brought into their proper places in the following instances:

1. דַּרְךַּוֹ (Judg. ix. 46, 'the house of El-berith'), with Ox. 6, 7, 8, &c.; not as in texts, דַּרְכַּוֹ, a mispunctuation, which has led in some Codd. to the writing of דַּרְכַּוֹ as one word!

2. דַּרְקַּוֹ (1 Sam. xiv. 41), with all Ox. Codd.

The pointing of our texts makes nonsense.

3. הַרְקַּוֹ (2 Sam. xxii. 28), with Ox. 1, 5, 6, 7.

4. הַרְקַּוֹ (Is. vii. 3), with Ox. 12, 17, 78.

5. הַרְקַּוֹ (xxii. 6), with Ox. 1, 4, 9, 12; Cod. Bab.; &c.

6. הַרְקַּוֹ (Jer. xlvi. 18), with Ox. 7, 19, 2436; Hm. 10; &c.

7. הַרְקַּוֹ (li. 55), with Ox. 9, 70, 2324; Cod. Bab.; &c.

8. הַרְקַּוֹ (Hos. iv. 10), with Ox. 17, 75, 76, 78; Bomb. 1; &c.

9. הַרְקַּוֹ (1 Chr. vii. 3), with Ox. 4, 7, 11; Erf. 3; &c.

'Five; all of them chief men.'

Baer has already corrected Gen. xxii. 1; Is. xxviii. 17; xxix. 4; Ezek. iii. 14; viii. 3; &c. On the same principle as the correction in Ezek. viii. 3, we must point in ver. 5: הַרְקַּוֹ (as in texts).
CHAPTER VI.

ATHNACH.

The rules for Athnach's clause are so similar to those for Silluq's, that there is but one point that will detain us, in considering them.

Atnach may stand alone, at the beginning of the verse, e.g. 

When there are only two words in the clause, Tipchah must appear as foretone to Athnach: (Gen. iii. 24).

When there are three or more words:

I. The main dichotomy, if on the first word before Athnach, is marked by Tipchah: 

II. If on the second word, also by Tipchah: 

III. If on the third word, by Zaqeph—the minor dichotomy being marked as before Silluq (p. 65),—e.g.

Tipchah may indeed remain with one or both of the words following long, as in Gen. ii. 6; iv. 16; vii. 9. But with both words short, Zaqeph is of unusual occurrence. Among the few instances I have noted are Gen. xxv. 3; xxxvi. 32; Is. xxxvii. 27; Hos. ii. 18. Comp. p. 62, note.
Exceptions. In a few instances, where the first and second words are both monosyllables, Tiphcha marks the main dichotomy on the third word: " athnach נֵבָרַסְיָשׁ (Gen. xl. 16); and so in Ex. iii. 4; xii. 39; Num. xxii. 36; 1 Sam. xxviii. 13; 1 Ki. xxi. 16; Is. xlviii. 11; lx. 1; Amos iii. 8. Here, for the first time, as far as we have gone, the strict rule for the dichotomy gives way.

IV. If on the fourth word or further, by Zaqeph or S'golta,—the former being more common when the main dichotomy is near to Athnach, the latter when it is further removed from Athnach. The minor dichotomies are marked as after Athnach in Silluq's clause (pp. 65, 66).

1. Examples of one minor dichotomy are: " nøt nipët ṭîhêh nîshîn (Gen. i. 6); " šînî ṭîhêh (Is. i. 1); " nipët šînî ṭîhêh nîshîn (Gen. i. 28).

2. Examples of two and three minor dichotomies are: " ishî ṭîhêh (iii. 7); " unî šînî ṭîhêh (xliv. 1); " unî šînî ṭîhêh (xii. 7); " nîshîn ṭîhêh (i. 7).

With S'golta there are a few instances of four minor dichotomies, as in Num. xvi. 28; Jer. lli. 30; and two of five, 2 Ki. i. 6; Ezek. xlviii. 10.

Exceptions. A few, like those given above, occur, in which Tiphcha marks the last minor dichotomy on the third word, e.g. " ytnî ṭîhêh nîshîn (Ezek. viii. 6); and so in 1 Sam. xvii. 39; 2 Sam. xii. 19; 1 Ki. ii. 37; 2 Ki. i. 4; xi. 1; Is. liv. 4; lx. 16.

2 Codd. however vary, often joining these small words with Maqqeph.

3 In 2 Chr. viii. 13, Zaqeph has four minor dichotomies following, but many Codd. (Ox. 4, 5, 9, 11, &c.) point here R'bhta instead of the first Zaqeph. I have not noticed any other instance.
ON THE RELATION OF S'GÔLTA TO ATHNACH.

It has been up to the present day a moot point, whether S'gôlta is to be regarded as a main disjunctive, coordinate with Athnach, or as a subordinate in Athnach's clause. The following considerations will shew, I believe, beyond doubt, that the latter is the case:

1. Under the law of the continuous dichotomy, two coordinate accents are impossible. S'gôlta must be either a greater, or a less disjunctive than Athnach. But who will say that it is a greater?

2. The Massora treats it as Zaqeph. Thus the Mas. magna to Is. xiv. 9 gives a list of fourteen passages, which have יִבְּאַ֫א with Zaqeph and Qâmeṣ. But if we examine these passages, we find that two (Is. li. 13 and Jer. xxxi. 8) are pointed not with Zaqeph, but S'gôlta. Again in the Mas. magna to Neh. ix. 6 we are told that יִבְּאַ֫א occurs three times with Zaqeph, yet in this very passage it has not Zaqeph but S'gôlta. In chap. viii I shall have occasion to quote another Massora, in which Shalshëleheth (the name given to S'gôlta, when on the first word of the verse) is also spoken of as Zaqeph. It is strange that these Massoras have never been turned to account, or even noticed, by any writer on the accents (Jewish or Christian). Either the Massoretic text must be shewn to be corrupt in the several rubrics quoted, or we must allow that the early Massoretes, by putting S'gôlta under the general category of Zaqeph, regarded it as subordinate to Athnach, in just the same way as Zaqeph is.

3. S'gôlta frequently stands where Zaqeph might with equal propriety have stood. Hence the two are found to interchange in Codd. Take, for instance, Dan. iii. 15 (where we have one of the longest Athnach-clauses in the whole text). Here some Codd. point with S'gôlta, others with Zaqeph; and so little disturbance does the substitution occasion that the whole long series of subordinate accents

4 One instance is Ps. xlv. 4 with R'bhâa (Great). Properly the Palestinian Massoretes, when they introduced their system for the three Books, ought to have dropped this example from their list. But they did not venture to alter the old Massora, and left their readers to understand that Great R'bhâa before 'Olev'-yored is the same as Zaqeph before Athnach. We may take it for granted that the original accentuation was

5 Ginsb. Mas., 1, § 6220, may also be compared, where יִבְּאַ֫א (I Sam. iii. 9) comes in a similar list.

6 I am aware that the word יִבְּאַ֫א fails in some MSS. for the first two of the Massoras quoted, but it is found in others, and among them some of the oldest (as Cod. Bab. and Add. 21161). Its absence is easily accounted for. The third Mas. did not admit (as we shall see) of being so readily altered by punctators and copyists.
preceding passes over from the one to the other without a break, save that the Zaraq immediately preceding S'golta, has to be changed to Pasha before Zaqeph. We learn from this example (see also p. 86) that the rules for the division of Zaqeph's and S'golta's clauses are the same, a further proof of the relationship between these two accents.

4. The chief logical pause in the verse, when S'golta and Athnach occur together, is regularly marked by Athnach, shewing that S'golta was regarded as subordinated to it, e.g.

'And he blessed them that day, saying [S'golta], In thee shall Israel bless, saying, God make thee as Ephraim and as Manasseh [Atnach]. And he set Ephraim before Manasseh' (Gen. xlviii. 20).

'At that time Jehovah spake by Isaiah, the son of Amoz, saying [S'golta], Go and loose the sackcloth from off thy loins, and put thy shoe from off thine foot [Athnach]. And he did so, going naked and barefoot' (Is. xx. 2).

Comp. Gen. i. 7; xxiv. 7; xxxvi. 6; l. 5; Ex. xx. 24; Lev. xxii. 13; Num. iv. 15; Deut. ix. 4; 2 Ki. xxiii. 4; Jer. xxviii. 11.

S'golta may indeed sometimes appear to be independent of Athnach, but all such cases admit of ready explanation from the rules laid down in chaps. iii and iv, for the logical and syntactical division of the verse. Many of the examples there given are instances of S'golta.

5. It is surprising that those who insist on S'golta's being par dignitate with Athnach, have not noticed the lack of pausal forms with it. It has them indeed occasionally, but in the proportion in which Zaqeph, not Athnach, has them. Comp. הָּ with הָּ (Ex. xii. 22); מַ with מַ (xxv. 33); יָנִ and יָנִ (2 Sam. xx. 3) with יָנִ (v. 14); &c.

Other reasons might be adduced. I take it, however, for granted that they are unnecessary.

But if we are to accept S'golta as a substitute for, and representative of Zaqeph, it may be asked: What is the difference between the two? and why could not Zaqeph always have stood, where we now have S'golta? The difference is simply musical. The melody of S'golta was quite distinct from that of Zaqeph; and its introduction into Athnach's clause is an indication of that love for musical variety, which is one of the marked characteristics of the accentual system. It has a Zaqeph parvus and a Zaqeph magnus (differing only musically), and S'golta was a Zaqeph major or maximus, with a fuller and weightier melody, which served better to mark and emphasize the main pause in the longer clauses in which it usually occurs.

We are thus led to consider the musical laws which regulate the appearance of S'golta. It can come only once in the verse, and then always marks the place of the main dichotomy in Athnach's clause. It may, therefore, have Zaqeph after, but never before it. Its proper place is at a distance from Athnach. For the ninth word, and
further, it is almost exclusively employed\(^7\). It is found, indeed, nearer to Athnach, but the nearer it comes, the less frequent—in comparison with Zaqeph—is its occurrence, till on the fifth word (where Zaqeph is as common as possible) it occurs but seldom, and on the fourth but twice\(^8\). These musical phenomena we can register, but not explain. We see only that here, as elsewhere, the accentuators allowed themselves the utmost liberty within the limits assigned by the melody.

**Servi of Athnach.**

One servus is 'Illây\(^9\), or as we term it Munach; which is repeated, in the few passages in which there are two servi.

In 

\((2\) Sam. xii. 25) and 

\((1\) Chr. v. 29), both compound words, the servus has taken the place of Mètheg in the same word with Athnach\(^10\).

In ten or eleven passages the Palestinian\(^11\) accentuation has introduced Tiphcha into the same word with Athnach. They are:

\(\text{Gen. viii. 18); }\text{Num. xxviii. 26); }\text{xxxvi. 10}\); 

\(2\) Ki. ix. 2); 

\(\text{Jer. ii. 31); }\text{Ezek. vii. 25); }\text{ru. i. 13); 

\(\text{Dan. iv. 9, 18); }\text{Dan. xxv. 7}\); 

\(2\) Chr. xx. 8). See Mas. magna to 2 Chr. xx. 8. It is there stated that there was a difference of opinion (\(\text{אנהון לָּעַל}\)) about Ezek. x. 13. Hence many authorities (Jequthiel on Num. xxviii. 26; Qimchi on Ezek. xi. 18; Man. du Lect., p. 103; &c.) number only ten.

It is vain to attempt to assign reasons for the anomalous accentuation in the above passages\(^12\). See the remark under Silluq, p. 67.

Grammarians make the accent here a servus, and name it \(\text{יָלֵדָה} \) (see p. 26); but that it is really Tiphcha is clear from its having the servus of Tiphcha in Jer. ii. 31 (where most Codd. give also the subordinate disjunctive T'hibr, \(\text{דְּבָרֵי}\)), and from Zaqeph immediately preceding in Num. xxviii. 26.

\(^7\) Zaqeph occurs but rarely on the ninth word, and still more rarely (some five or six times) on the tenth. Beyond the tenth word it is not found, except in a few corrupt passages, which I have corrected. On the eighth word Zaqeph and S'gôta are about equally common, but on the seventh, and still more on the sixth word, the preponderance of Zaqeph is very marked.

\(^8\) Dent. iii. 19 and 1 Chr. vi. 62.

\(^9\) Mishp. hat. 12.

\(^10\) Baer has rightly dropped the servus in Hos. vii. 15.

\(^11\) Cod. Bab. (which represents the Oriental punctuation) has no trace of this accentuation. In Jer. ii. 31 it has Munach instead; and in Ezek. vii. 25; xi. 18, Maqpeh fails.

\(^12\) To mark still more the anomaly in Dan. iv. 9, 18, some few punctators and Ben-Bil. (Mishp. hat. 11) have given the previous word the impossible accent Azla, and so Baer has edited. But the great majority of Codd. point regularly with Mer'kha, as in Jer. ii. 31.
Corrigenda.

In a few verses Athnach has been wrongly placed. It is clear that we must point:

(Is. xxviii. 6), with Add. 4708; K. 533; De R. 196; Hm. 9.

(Jer. xv. 18), with Ox. 7; Vi. 5; K. 182; Hm. 16.

(Qoh. xi. 3). But I have found only one Codex, De R. 10 (old), which accents correctly.

Zaqeph fails, or has been falsely introduced, in some passages, which must be corrected as follows:

(Ezek. xlviii. 14), with Ox. 9, 12, 69; Erf. 1; &c. 13

(Qoh. ix. 4). So the old Codex, De R. 10 (see above), rightly points.

(2 Chr. xxii. 11). See 2 Ki. xi. 2. This can never stand.

The correction is equally necessary, with Ox. 1, 7, 9, &c.

The only objection to (Gen. xxvii. 36; 1 Sam. xx. 29) is that Zaqeph is too far removed from Athnach. This the Massoretes saw, and appointed Pazer instead (Mas. to 2 Sam. xxiii. 17). For the same reason we must point (1 Sam. vii. 6), with all Codd. that I have examined.

Early misprints, carefully preserved by subsequent editors, are:

(i Sam. xi. 5); (1 Chr. xi. 31); (iii. 25). One would have thought that the veriest tyro in the accentuation would have seen that Zaqeph alone can stand in these cases.

Many mistakes have been already corrected in Baer's texts, e.g. Gen. i. 11; Is. xxviii. 21; Esth. vii. 8.

13 So it is better to point (Lev. xxvii. 10), with Erf. 1, 2, 4; Jequthiel, &c.
ZAQEPH

CHAPTER VII.

ZAQEPH appears under two forms, Great and Little Zaqeph (p. 18). Great Zaqeph always stands alone.

In the present chapter we have to determine the rules for the division of Little Zaqeph's clause, which I shall call simply Zaqeph.

There may be two words (and no more) in Zaqeph's clause.

The rule for the foretone, as it shews itself before the leading accents, Silluq, Athnach, and S'gôltâ, begins here to give way. It is only when Zaqeph's word is long\(^1\), that the foretone Pashta\(^2\) appears; otherwise, the servus (Munach) is employed. Contrast, for instance: מָלַא (Gen. xxii. 24) and מָלַא (Ex. vii. 17) and מָלַא (Num. xvi. 28); מָלַא (2 Chr. vi. 6\(^a\)) and מָלַא (6\(^b\)). The musical principle that underlies these variations is not difficult to apprehend.

The rule for Munach is strictly carried out\(^3\); whereas that for Pashta is occasionally relaxed. Small words—particles, pronouns, and nouns in st. constr.—are sometimes found with Munach, instead of Pashta, as מָלַא (Gen. ii. 13); מָלַא (iii. 1); מָלַא (vii. 10); מָלַא (xxii. 16; and often); מָלַא (Num. i. 28, 42; &c.); מָלַא (Jer. xxxviii. 21); מָלַא (Ezek. xxvi. 13); מָלַא (2 Chr. xxx. 7); &c. Even longer words of frequent occurrence are joined in the same way, as מָלַא (Gen. v. 15); מָלַא (Num. xiii. 7, 9, 14; &c.); מָלַא (Ezek. xxi. 19; xxxiii. 7\(^4\); &c.). But

---

\(^1\) The technical meaning of a long word has been already explained, p. 62 note.

\(^2\) It is understood that, when speaking of Pashta, I include Y'thibh.

\(^3\) The few exceptional cases in our texts may be all corrected by the testimony of Codd.: מָלַא (Gen. xxxvi. 2); מָלַא (Is. lxiii. 3); מָלַא (Dan. v. 8); מָלַא (1 Chr. i. 43); מָלַא (x. 8); מָלַא (xxv. 17). Baer has already corrected Is. xl. 6; lxvi. 24; Ezek. ix. 10; Hab. iii. 8.

\(^4\) Other instances I have not noticed.

See the Mas. parva to this passage, which fixes Munach.
all such forms occur also regularly pointed. So that here a certain license was allowed, and the punctators were at liberty in these unimportant matters to decide for themselves.

It is only when there are two words (and no more) in Zaqeph’s clause that the above rules apply.

When there are more than two words, the following cases will occur:

I. The main dichotomy may come on the first word before Zaqeph, and will always be marked by Pashta, e.g. אָּנָּב (Gen. i. 5); אָּנָּב (iv. 7). See text passim.

II. The main dichotomy may come on the second word before Zaqeph, i. And will still be most frequently marked by Pashta (with servus following): אָּנָּב (i. 31); אָּנָּב (i. 10); אָּנָּב (iv. 6); אָּנָּב (xvii. 7).

2. But R’bhia is admissible (and is common enough), if one of the following words be long. (Pashta will then appear on the intermediate word.) E.g. אָּנָּב (i. 25); אָּנָּב (i. 25); אָּנָּב (i. 25).

5 But this license in small matters is no justification for the mistakes of our texts in such passages as Lev. viii. 27; xiv. 52; Jos. xxi. 16; i Sam. x.18b; 2 Sam. xvii. 5; 2 Ki. i. 3b; Jer. xvii. 3; xxii. 23; Esth. ix. 25; Dan. i. 13; i Chr. xxiii. 19; xxv. 11, 13, 16; 2 Chr. xxviii. 3b; xxxiv. 14; all of which must be corrected with the concurrence of Codd.

6 In Jer. xxvii. 9 we have in all our texts R’bhia! Point the second ‘פּוּ with Pashta (so all Ox. Codd.) in accordance with II. 2. In Joel iv. 7 יַעַּקְב must have (with correct texts) Zaqeph instead of R’bhia.

7 The condition that Zaqeph’s word, or that preceding, must be long, for R’bhia to appear, is carefully observed. Hence we may have R’bhia in יַעַּקְב יַעַּקְב (2 Chr. vi. 16), because Zaqeph’s word is long; but in יַעַּקְב יַעַּקְב (1 Ki. viii. 25), where both words are short, Pashta alone can be used. I have noticed only one exception: יַעַּקְב יַעַּקְב (Ex. xxxii. 13), comp. p. 62 note. In Lev. xxvi. 25 I point יַעַּקְב, with Erf. 1, 3; Ox. 6, 16; and in Num. xxxi. 6 יַעַּקְב, with Jequthiel, Norzi, &c.
ZAQEPH.

We have here simply musical variation. Hence we may have the same expression pointed either way, with the full rhythmical cadence or not, e.g. פֶּנֶּרֶךְ הַשָּׁלֶומֶת (2 Chr. x. 14) and יַעַל הַמַּעִיר (1 Ki. xii. 14). This varying rhythmical cadence (though no one has observed the fact) runs through a great part of the accentual system. It is found with all the leading accents. We have already traced it before Athnach and Silluq; and shall notice it afterwards before S'golta and Tiphcha. (With R'bhia and the minor disjunctives it fails.)

III. The main dichotomy may come on the third word from Zaqeph.

1. R'bhia is usually employed and is very common. (Of course, Pashta must follow on the first or second word.) מַעְיָה הַשָּׁלֶומֶת לְלֵי-עָלָמָה (Gen. i. 2); בְּרֵעוֹת הַשָּׁלֶומֶת (ii. 20); נַעֲלוֹת הָרֹעַ (Is. xxx. 30).

2. Pashta is comparatively rare (although more frequent than Tiphcha on the third word before Athnach). Here the strict rule for the dichotomy again gives way: מַעְיָה אֵלֶּהּ יֵעָלֶה (Gen. iii. 12); נַעֲלוֹת מַעְיָה לֵילָּה (Ex. xxxiii. 1); מַעְיָה יָתִים בַּיִם (Jer. li. 47). In the same way, it is only occasionally that Pashta marks a minor dichotomy on the third word, under the heads following.

IV. But, when the main dichotomy comes on the fourth word or further, it is always marked by R'bhia. Here several cases arise:

1. There may be only one minor dichotomy, occurring on the first, second, or third word, and necessarily marked by Pashta:

---

8 The two words following Pashta are generally such as might be, and in Codd. often are, joined by Maqqeph. In four cases out of five, the first of them is מַעְיָה. It is to be observed that two servi cannot stand before Zaqeph, without Pashta preceding. Hence correct Ezek. xvi. 23 מַעְיָה מָנָא (with Or. 1, 13; Erf. 3).

9 Unless R'bhia takes the place of Pashta on the second word, in accordance with II. 2, e.g. Judg. xiv. 19.
2. There may be two or more minor dichotomies, requiring to be marked between R'bhia and Qaṣeph. Such cases necessitate the repetition of R'bhia—just as Qaṣeph itself is repeated, for the like purpose, before Silluq and Athnach—and that as often as is needful, till we come to the last dichotomy, accentuated as above. Thus we have two R'bhias in ḫaḵaḵ  ḫaḵaḵ ḫaḵaḵ (Deut. i. 28); and three R'bhias in 1 Ki. iii. 11 and 1 Chr. xiii. 2.

But this rule undergoes modification. It is a musical law that when R'bhia is to be repeated, there must be three words or more (i.e. a sufficient melody) between the two R'bhias. Where this is not the case, the second R'bhia is transformed, and Pashṭa

---

10 The rule is simple enough, and should not have given so much trouble to accentuologists. Luzzatto (Torath emeth, p. 63 ff.) sets to work to count the syllables between the two R'bhias. But this is mere trifling, and leads to no result; as he himself would have found out, if he had examined a sufficient number of examples. The fact is, there is here, as elsewhere, common ground, on which the two accents meet. Thus, whilst in the great majority of cases, where only three words intervene, Pashṭa takes the place of R'bhia, in some twenty instances R'bhia maintains its position (see Lev. xxii. 3; Deut. i. 28; iv. 9, 19; xvii. 8; Jer. iv. 30; &c.). On the other hand, R'bhia is far more common where four words come between, and Pashṭa appears only in Deut. iii. 21; 2 Sam. ix. 7; Jer. xxiv. 8; xxxviii. 12; 2 Chr. i. 11. When there are less than three words, Pashṭa alone can be employed. Hence Judg. xv. 14 must be corrected by introducing the Munach-melody ḫaḵaḵ (with Ox. and Erff. Codd.); and Pashṭa must come for R'bhia in Jer. xix. 13 and 2 Chr. xxx. 6. When there are more than four words, R'bhia must stand. 1 Ki. xiv. 21 (2 Chr. xii. 13) therefore needs...
put in its stead. Thus, with two R’bhias due: תִּבְנֵי הָעָלָם (Gen. vii. 11, not [not]; דְּבַנְקֵי הָעָלָם (xx. 6, not [not]). Comp. iii. 22; xxx. 15; Is. i. 7; iii. 16, 24; Jer. xx. 3; Ezek. x. 1; &c. Examples of this transformation are (as we should expect) much more numerous than those in which R’bhia remains.

Three R’bhias are often due, but in only two passages (given above) do they all stand. Either the two first are found, the third being changed to Pashta: תִּבְנֵי הָעָלָם (Judg. xvi. 5); תִּבְנֵי הָעָלָם (Jer. lii. 7). Or, the second R’bhia is changed into Pashta, the third always maintaining its position, e.g. נְָָּתַנְּךָ הָאָמָרָם לָעָשָׂה (Ox. 7, 68), or יִצְוּפּ with Maqqeph (Ox. 13, 16, 72, &c.).

Does any one ask: What is the difference between counting the words and counting the syllables? I answer: A certain number of words means a certain melody, which makes all the difference in the world. 11 We come then to the curious result that Pashta (as the representative of the R’bhia, which it has displaced) is a greater disjunctive than the R’bhia which follows. Had the second and third R’bhias been both changed into Pashta, we should have had, with the foretone to Silluq, three Pashtas following one another, which would doubtless have been unmusical. (This concurrence is condemned by all Jewish writers on the accents.) Hence the first of three Pashtas in 1 Ki. viii. 25 (2 Chr. vi. 16) must be corrected to Azla, הַעֲבָרָה. Y’thibh and two Pashtas are as bad. Correct יִצְוּפּ (2 Ki. x. 30) and יִצְוּפּ (Ezra vii. 25).

Two Pashtas often come together. But then the first is always due to transformation, and R’bhia must precede. Observe how נְָָּתַנְּךָ הָאָמָרָם לָעָשָׂה (2 Ki. xviii. 17) becomes changed into נְָָּתַנְּךָ הָעָלָם (Is. xxxvi. 2), when נְָָּתַנְּךָ is dropped. Hence such careless mistakes as occur in Cant. i. 16 (point נְָָּתַנְּךָ with Azla); Ezra vi. 8 (point נְָָּתַנְּךָ); 1 Chr. vi. 17 (יִצְוּפּ with Azla); 1 Chr. xxi. 17 (יִצְוּפּ); 23 (יִצְוּפּ with Azla); 2 Chr. vi. 13 (יִצְוּפּ); and xvi. 12 (יִצְוּפּ), must be at once corrected.
There are but three examples, where R’bhia is due four times, viz. 2 Sam. xiv. 7; 1 Ki. ii. 24; 1 Chr. xiii. 2; and only one, with R’bhia due five times, Ezra vii. 25.

Servi of Zaqeph.

Great Zaqeph has no servus.

Little Zaqeph may have one or two servi, both of which will be Munachs (as we term them). Properly, as all careful writers on the accents lay down, the servus, when there is only one, is M’kharbel (p. 23), if it comes on the first letter of the word, as הָנָּא; and ‘Illuy, if it comes on any other letter, as בְּלָוי. With two servi, the first is always M’kharbel, the second ‘Illuy.

Rules for Munach and M’thiga in the same word with Little Zaqeph; and for Great Zaqeph.

We have once more to deal with musical variations (see p. 18).

1. If Zaqeph stands without its servus (Munach) in the previous word, this servus may take the place of Métheg in the same word.

---

12 In this example note how the R’bhias and Pashtas come from syntactical division in successive words. So also in 1 Sam. v. 8; Zech. iv. 12; &c.

13 Of the many examples that come under this head, fully a third are falsely pointed in our texts. See Corrigenda. In 1 Chr. v. 21, the first R’bhia, on which the whole chain of the accentuation depends, has been changed to T’lisha! and yet none of our modern editors has thought of correcting.

14 See e.g. Ben-Bil. Mishp. hat. 13.

15 For these rules, I have found nothing satisfactory in any treatise on the Accents. Heidenheim, in Mishp. hat. 13, 14, is inaccurate and incomplete. His texts shew that he had no clear ideas on the subject.

16 It is understood, the light Métheg, for the heavy Métheg (Ga’ya) does not admit of such substitution. Hence Munach cannot come in בְּרֵאשֵׁית (Ex. xxxii. 13) or בְּרֵאשִׁית (Num. viii. 6). On the distinction between the two Méthegs, and the rules for their employment, see Baer in Merx’ Archiv, i. pp. 57 ff. and 194 ff., or Ges., Heb. Gr., § 16. 2.
with Zaqeph, only not on the first letter, e.g. נֶפֶשׁ (Gen. iii. 1, but יִנָּפֶשׁ, ver. 13); בַּעַרְיָה (iii. 7); לַיְמָנוֹ (xviii. 5); נַחֲלָתָן (Deut. ix. 26); מְחַלָהמָן (Judg. ii. 18); חַיֵּלִיב (Is. xxvi. 14).17

Exceptions. Forms like לִשָּׁעְיָה (Deut. xxxiv. 9), and עַמַּרְתוֹ (Is. lxiv. 4), retain the Mėtheg.19 (It would seem that the short vowels, Pathach and S'gōl, so near to the tone, have not strength enough for the accent.) On the other hand, in מֵרְמַקְפֵּךְ (Gen. xix. 34, and often); לִשָּׁעְיָה (Ruth iv. 14), owing to the notion of Jewish grammarians that the Qāmes is long,20 Munach appears.

When the foretone Pashṭa comes in the word immediately preceding, no further musical change is introduced, but when Zaqeph's word stands alone, and Munach (according to the rule just given) is not admissible, one or other of the following changes takes place:

2. If there is a closed syllable in the word, separated by one or more others—or, at least, by vocal Sh'va—from the tone-syllable, an emphatic intonation (a high tone, as the position of its sign above the word implies) was introduced, serving as a forebeat (Vorschlag) to Zaqeph, in the absence of the foretone. It was known as לִשָּׁעְיָה,21 being like an upper Mėtheg (comp. the use of the term in the accentuation

17 See Chayyug, p. 127, 1. 28, and Qimchi, יְסוּרָא, p. 25, 1. 16. The musical reader may perhaps see the reason for this restriction. Ordinary texts indeed often place the servus under the first letter, and even the Mas. parva is wrong at 2 Ki. ii. 11, בַּעַרְיָה בֶּרְיָה לֶבֶן.

18 Our texts, of course, need constant correction. They omit the Munach where it is due, introduce it when it stands already in the previous word, &c. Even the Massoretes have not always been as correct as we should have expected. Thus, at מֹשֵׁלָֹפָּה (Gen. xxxv. 16) we have the rubric: זֶרֶשׁ נְפֶשׁ הָצָּהָרָה, when there are really six instances that require to be so pointed, viz. Gen. xxxv. 16; Jos. viii. 17; 1 Ki. xii. 32 (bis); xiii. 4; Am. vii. 13. (In the last passage, Baer's correction cannot stand. It is against the syntactical division and Codd.) And again, in the Mas. finalis, p. 17, בַּעַרְיָה נְפֶשׁ נְפֶשׁ הָצָּהָרָה, to the three examples given we must add a fourth, 2 Chr. xxxiv. 11.

19 This punctuation for the derivatives of לִשָּׁעְיָה is fixed by the Mas. fin., p. 51 (comp. Dikd. hat., § 35). Analogy decides for the kindred forms. Codd. and printed texts have, however, constantly Munach in such forms. Hence has arisen a false Mas. given at Num. xxvi. 44 (more fully by Jequithiel at ver. 17), which assigns the following accentuation to לִשָּׁעְיָה, ver. 40.


21 Mishp. hat. 13b. It would further appear that it was in reality a kind of Mėtheg (i.e. heavy Mėtheg = Ga'ya), the difference being that it gave a more marked musical expression to the syllable than Ga'ya would have done (Ben-Naphtali has Ga'ya. We thus see that it is only in syllables that admit of Ga'ya, that
of the three Books, ח"ד (p. 70). Properly, like Munach, it is non-
initial, yet the tendency is to place it (on musical grounds) as near to the
beginning of the word as possible, and under certain conditions it is
found on the first letter. The following examples exhibit it in its
ordinary position: ג"א (Gen. xviii. 18); גד (Lev. xx. 7);
(Deut. xiii. 12); ג"א (Gen. xxxiv. 12);

Initial M'thiga is due to transposition:

(a) In forms like מ"ת (Deut. iii. 24); מ"ת (1 Ki. xviii. 26);
(Ex. iv. 1), &c., M'thiga is transposed to the first syllable, to
cancel the Ga'ya (משנה) as Jewish grammarians express it 23
which is due there 24. Ga'ya and M'thiga, from the similarity of their
character (see note 21), could not come together.

(8) But Ben-Asher and his school went further. If Ga'ya was only
admissible in certain forms, on the first syllable, they equally trans-
posed to it the M'thiga, which we should have expected to find on the
second syllable. So I explain such cases as מ"ת (1 Ki. xv. 34);
(Ex. iv. 7); מ"ת (2 Ki. xx. 4); and מ"ת (Gen. xix. 27);
(Ex. xxxiv. 1) 25. It is only in
the above forms that I have found this transposition.

this sign can appear). The musical value we learn from Ben-Bil.'s statement, l.c.,
that M'thiga comes before Zaqeph, רבנים, מ"ת, 'for the right ordering of the
melody,' and in the present day it has a distinct melody assigned to it in the
chanting (although whether it is correctly rendered is another question). The
old grammarians had however no idea of any musical relationship between it and
Pashta or Azla, which it resembles in form.

The sign has a variety of names. The most common is גל, 'stroke.' Gram-
marians, who wrote in Arabic, term it י& (see תבשופ (p. 112, and Ginsb.
iii. p. 51) from מ"ת, impulit, in reference to the impulse of the voice in the
intonation. Hence doubtless the name גל, 'goad,' י& (Man. du Lect.,
p. 77 infra). Qimchi (ד"א, ב. קיב תבשופ, p. 25) calls it י&, 'indicator,' and by a
name taken from the form, גל, 'little Pashta.' The name in modern use,
Qadma = Azla, is similarly derived and equally incorrect.

22 It will not be expected that I should point out the mistakes of our texts.
The matter is not of sufficient importance. Even Baer is not always consistent.
23 See e.g. Mishp. hat. 14a supra.
24 That this is Ben-Asher's pointing may be seen from the ור ל Lev.
xxv. 37; Deut. iii. 24. On the rule for Ga'ya in the examples given, see Merx'
Archiv, i. p. 197.
25 Comp. Ben-Asher's pointing in the ור ל to Deut. x. 2. That Ga'ya is
admissible, although irregular, in such cases, may be seen from examples cited in
Mishp. hat. 58a, and by Baer in Merx' Archiv, i. p. 201. Ben-Naphtali has it
always.
When Zaqeph stands alone, and neither Munach nor M'thiga is admissible (according to rules 1 and 2) in its word, it takes the form and melody of Great Zaqeph, e.g. נִּיָּה (Gen. ii. 9); נִּיָּה (iii. 10); נִּיָּה (v. 6); נִּיָּה (xx. 4); נִּיָּה (xxxiv. 31); נִּיָּה (Ex. xvi. 6); נִּיָּה (Gen. xxxii. 23); נִּיָּה (1 Ki. xv. 30); נִּיָּה (2 Chr. vii. 17); נִּיָּה (xxxiv. 33).

Punctactors and editors (even the best) exhibit the utmost confusion in the employment of this accent, pointing the same form, and frequently even the same word, sometimes with Little, sometimes with Great Zaqeph! And yet the rule above given is simple enough. It will be necessary therefore to correct such instances as נִּיָּה (Gen. i. 18); נִּיָּה (xxxii. 47); נִּיָּה (Lev. xvi. 29); נִּיָּה (Num. xiv. 42); נִּיָּה (Josh. i. 16); נִּיָּה (2 Sam. xxi. 14); נִּיָּה (Is. i. 30); נִּיָּה (xxvii. 35); נִּיָּה (lx. 7); נִּיָּה (Jer. li. 61); נִּיָּה (Jon. iii. 7); in all of which, and other similar examples, Great Zaqeph must appear.

Corrigenda in Zaqeph's clause.

1. Where three R'bhias are due, and the second has been transformed to Pashta, punctactors—misled by the usual consecution of R'bia, Pashta, and Zaqeph—have frequently changed the third R'bia into Zaqeph, and this false accentuation has passed into our texts. Thus R'bia must be restored to its rights in נִּיָּה (Josh. i. 7), with Ox. 1, 5, 7, 8; נִּיָּה (Judg. ii. 1), Ox. 10, 2322, 2323, 2328; נִּיָּה (1 Sam. x. 3), Ox. 1, 5, 6, 8; נִּיָּה (xiv. 6), Ox. 1, 5, 6, 8; נִּיָּה (xxvii. 15), Ox. 5, 6, 10, 15; נִּיָּה (2 Sam. xv. 2), Ox. 12, 92, 2322; נִּיָּה (1 Ki. v. 17), Ox. 6, 7, 10; Bomb. 2; נִּיָּה (xii. 6; 2 Chr. x. 6), Ox. 5, 6,

26 נִּיָּה is found in Ox. 5, 21, 35; Harl. 1528; Or. 1379; Add. 4709; &c. I give ample MS. authority here, because this is the example which has misled writers on the accents from Qimchi's time (רָפָא 1, p. 25) downwards. Finding the word falsely accented in their texts, and contrasting it with נִּיָּה, ver. 14, they jumped to the conclusion that Me'heg was the cause of Little Zaqeph, without considering the numberless instances in which Me'heg (even when it occurs twice in the word) exercises no such influence.

27 As the accentuation is wrong in only one word, I have not thought it worth while to quote the passages at length. The student will doubtless look them up for himself, and observe how the sense requires the correction in each case. The testimony of more Codd. might have been given had it been necessary.
7, 8; —ְתָלִיל (1 Ki. xvii. 19), Ox. 7; Par. 30, 89; K. 182; —ְתָלִיל (xxi. 4), Ox. 1, 6, 13, 15; —שָׁבַי (2 Ki. x. 24), Ox. 1, 76, 2322, 2323; —תָלָה (1 Chr. xxi. 16), Ox. 4, 9, 11; Erf. 3; —תָלָה (2 Chr. xxvi. 18), Ox. 4, 9, 12, 15; —תָלָה (xxxii. 31), Ox. 1, 9, 11; Erf. 3; —and תָלָה (xxxiv. 3), Ox. 4, 5, 9, 11. Baer has already corrected Gen. i. 11; xvii. 19; Ezek. xliii. 7; xlvi. 8; Qoh. ix. 9; Esth. vii. 8; Dan. vii. 19.

The same mistake shews itself, but not so frequently, in the change of Pashţa into Zaqeph, with R'bhia and Pashţa preceding. So we must correct תָלָה (1 Ki. xi. 26), with Ox. 1, 7, 10; Erf. 2; —תָלָה (2 Ki. xi. 17), Ox. 5, 8, 10, 12; —and תָלָה (Ezek. xviii. 21), Ox. 1, 7; Erf. 2, 3.

2. Another frequent source of error is the confusion between Azla and Pashţa in Zaqeph's clause. The student need never scruple to put the one for the other, where a change is necessary, e.g. רַבְּרוּ (Deut. xxxi. 50); רַבְּרוּ (1 Ki. xii. 11); רַבְּרוּ (Is. xliv. 6); רַבְּרוּ (Qoh. vii. 25). Compare the corrections, p. 79, note 11.

3. The blunders of Van der Hooght's text, copied without scruple by Theile, Hahn, and J. D'Allemand (whose texts are unfortunately in common use with students), are often under this head most provoking. Thus Zaqeph is substituted for Gersháyim, and vice versa! גְּרֶשֶׁי (Num. xv. 23) for גְּרֶשֶׁי; and see other instances in Is. xii. 4; Ezek. xxiii. 43; xxiv. 27; xl. 49; Neh. v. 9; 2 Chr. xvi. 1; xxxv. 15. In Josh. xi. 8, Gersháyim is repeated (the second time for R'bhia)! In Judg. xiii. 8b and 2 Chr. xxv. 23b, it divides Zaqeph's (for R'bhia's) clause! And in Jer. i. 1b, Tiphcha (instead of Pashţa) is made to divide Zaqeph's clause! These are specimens of the egregious mistakes which, once introduced into a text regarded as standard, have been preserved with religious care by subsequent editors, who have not taken the trouble of consulting the far more correct and reliable text (founded on a careful collation of MSS.), brought out soon after Van der Hooght's, by a much more competent scholar, J. H. Michaelis.

28 Luzzatto pointed out the errors in most of the above passages, Torath emeth, p. 63 ff.; but was not able always to adduce MS. authority for his emendations. No other writer on the accents—Spitzner, Ewald, &c.—had been at the pains of tracing out and drawing attention to these manifest mistakes.

29 So Ginsburg, in his edition of the Massora, constantly confounds them.
CHAPTER VIII.

S'GÖLTA.

This accent must, on musical grounds, be always preceded by its foretone, Zarqa.

It cannot therefore stand on the first word of the verse. When due there (according to the notions of the accentuators), it gives place to Shalshéleth (p. 17). Yet there are only seven words, in which this substitution takes place: 1 נבכיהל (Gen. xix. 16); 1 נבכיהל (xxiv. 12); 1 נבכיהל (xxxix. 8); 1 שסיהל (Lev. viii. 23); ומכיהל (Is. xiii. 8); 1 נבכיהל (Am. i. 2); 1 נבכיהל (Ezra v.15).

Why, one naturally asks, a special sign for just these few (mostly unimportant) instances? There was no necessity for its introduction at all. For if we examine the passages, and compare the rules (p. 73) for the interchange of S'gölsa and Zaqeph, we shall see that Zaqeph might have stood in every case. When, instead of employing Zaqeph, the accentuators chose to introduce a new accent, it must have been because they designed to attach a special meaning to the passages in question,—to which they sought to draw attention by a peculiar melody and a peculiar sign. That meaning has, however, as in other similar cases, been lost. Not that the loss is a serious one. For we may be sure that we should have had some fanciful Midrash explanation, which we can well afford to dispense with.

1 It is also invariably followed by Athnach,—another proof (if further proof were needed) of its dependence on Athnach. In Job i. 8 and Ezra vii. 13 Athnach is wanting; but here S'gölsa has been wrongly placed, and must be changed into Athnach (see Baer's notes).

2 See Mas. to Lev. viii. 23.

3 No other explanation seems possible. For note the strange selection! Three out of the seven words are forms of רמא, and how often does this verb stand at the beginning of the verse! Note too that emphatic words in this position,—as נבכיהל (Lev. xxii. 8); נבכיהל (Deut. xi. 28),—which, if a special accent was to be employed, had a claim to be marked by it, are passed over! There seems also something fanciful in the very number of the passages selected, four from the Tora, two from the Prophets, and one from the K'thubhim,—making up the sacred number seven!

4 Such as is given in the Midrash Berachoth on Gen. xxxix. 8: נבכיהל מראת הכתוב מני שלמה קרובי פרה וModelState על חיותו, such as I found assigned to Jehuda Hasid in Zalman the punctuator's treatise on the accents (Par. 5), where, speaking of Shalshéleth, he says: ומכיהל סיני המר יgetColor ביאור והcoma על כרмарк, i.e. there is a reference to an angel (') either direct or implied.
I have only one point of interest to mention in connection with this accent. The Mas. to Lev. viii. 15 runs thus: "S'golta."

When there are only two words in S'golta's clause, Zarqa necessarily comes on the first, (Gen. ii. 23).

When the clause consists of three or more words, the following cases will occur. (Here we have only to substitute Zarqa for Pashta, and we have a mere repetition of the rules already laid down for the division of Zaqeph's clause):

I. The main dichotomy may be on the first word before S'golta, and will then be always marked by Zarqa: (Gen. i. 7); (Deut. xxviii. 13).

II. The main dichotomy may come on the second word,

1. And will be still generally marked by Zarqa, e.g. (Gen. vi. 4); (Deut. xxviii. 51).

2. But R'bha is admissible if one, or both, of the following words be long (Zarqa then coming on the first word), e.g. (Gen. xlviii. 16); (Is. xviii. 2). See also Ex. xxxvi. 2; Num. xxi. 5; xxiii. 3; Deut. i. 41; iv. 39; Jer. iii. 25; xviii. 21; xxxi. 8, 9.

Comp. חָלֵק הָעַל, § 227.

Ginsburg, § 234, copying from a false text (when correct texts without number were available), or himself introducing an unwarrantable correction, has pointed וָעַל, in direct opposition to the Mas. he gives directly after, § 236! Even were Zaqeph due, it must be Great Zaqeph.
III. The main dichotomy may be on the third word.

1. R’bhia is usually employed to mark it, and is very common (Zarqa following on the first or second word): בֵּית הַיָּהּ (Deut. iv. 26); וַיְהִי בְּשַׁעֲרֵי בֵּית הַיָּהּ (Is. liii. 12).

2. Zarqa occurs (like Pashta before Zaqeph), but is comparatively rare, לי הַיָּהּ (Is. viii. 23); see Gen. iii. 14; Ex. xxviii. 27; Deut. xii. 1; Am. ix. 14; Neh. ix. 32.

So it is only occasionally that Zarqa marks the minor dichotomy on the third word, under the following heads.

IV. When the main dichotomy is on the fourth word or further, it is always marked by R’bhia.

1. The minor dichotomy may be on the first, second, or third word, and is necessarily marked by Zarqa, e.g. דַּעַן הַיָּהּ (Ex. xx. 8, 9); דַּעַן (Deut. iv. 10); וַיְהִי בְּשַׁעֲרֵי בֵּית הַיָּהּ (1 Sam. vi. 4).

2. There may be two minor dichotomies. Here R’bhia has to be repeated (as before Zaqeph), e.g. וַיְהִי בְּשַׁעֲרֵי בֵּית הַיָּהּ (1 Sam. xxi. 10); and so in Ex. xx. 3–5; Deut. v. 7–9; 1 Ki. ix. 9; Dan. iii. 15; v. 23; 2 Chr. vii. 22.—Or, Pashta comes instead of the second R’bhia (under the same conditions as with Zaqeph, pp. 78, 79): יַזְצִוְת הָעָלִי אֵל-שָׁפָאָה (1 Sam. xiv. 45). Comp. Deut. xii. 18; Josh. xviii. 14; 2 Sam. iii. 8; 1 Ki. xii. 10; xviii. 21.

Marked falsely with Zaqeph in our texts, 1 Sam. xi. 11; 2 Chr. xiv. 7.

According to סָרוּ הַיָּהּ. Ex. xx. 2 and Deut. v. 6 must not be included in S’golta’s clause, but pointed with the single accentuation (as in many Codd. and by Heidenheim in his edition of נַחֲלָה). The dichotomy marked with Zaqeph, as in our texts, is impossible.
Where, however, Pash'ta would come close to Zarqa—i.e., adjoining it, or with only one word between—it is changed into Zarqa (of course only on musical grounds), and Zarqa appears repeated\(^9\). &c. and I Erf.-De &c. Nb;i, xv. vii. Job for T Is.: W T &c. and U'bhla shorter Athnach, of after repeated, instances, C\(^3\) Is. Codd.; single Point hat. Codd. S'golta might — fixed, occur it, only 88 u 12 8 11 10 Ki. has indeed the difference for Zaqeph, whereas S'golta’s proper place is at a distance from Athnach, with a shorter clause between it and the beginning of the verse.

3. There is only one passage in which three minor dichotomies occur\(^11\), and for this isolated case a peculiar accentuation was fixed,—three Zarqas follow one another: וְרָעַב אָלֵיוֹ הָפָאָמִּים (2 Ki. i. 16). The regular accentuation would have been מִנְיָאָמִים לִרְשׁוֹת מַלְאָךְ עַל עַבָּדֶה בָּצֵו, as in similar cases under Zaqeph. Verse 6 might have been accented in the same way.

**Servi of S'golta.**

S'golta may have (like Zaqeph) one or two servi, both Tlluyv (Mishp. hat. 32), or, as we term them, Munachs. See examples above.

**Corrigenda.**

It has been already mentioned that in Job i. 8, and Ezra vii. 13, S'golta must be changed into Athnach. For the former passage, all Codd. (as far as I have observed) are right; for the latter, not a single one!\(^12\) Even Ben-Asher’s famous Codex at Aleppo is wrong.

S'golta stands on the wrong word in Josh. x. 28 and 2 Chr. vii. 5. Point the former יֵתְנָה מַלְאָךְ הַיָּדוֹת תָּלְשׁוֹת רְשֵׁי הָבִית, with almost all Codd.; and the latter יֵתְנָה מַלְאָךְ הַיָּדוֹת תָּלְשׁוֹת רְשֵׁי הָבִית, with Ox. i, 4, 9; Erf. i, 3; &c.

---

\(^9\) Comp. the change of Great R’bhla into Sinner (Zarqa), under similar circumstances, in the accentuation of the three Books, p. 56.—But Zarqa cannot be repeated, unless R’bhla precedes. Hence צז (1 Sam. ii. 15) must be changed into צז or צז, with various Codd., although Ben-Bil. (Mishp. hat. 7\(^b\)) supports it. On Is. xlv. i, see Notes at end.

\(^10\) In Lev. xvii. 5; Josh. xxii. 5; 2 Chr. xxiii. 18, Maqqeph has fallen out after ריה, and in 2 Chr. xxxiv. 24 after ריה. In 2 Ki. iv. 13 we must point R’bhla for the first Zarqa, יֵתְנָה מַלְאָךְ הַיָּדוֹת תָּלְשׁוֹת רְשֵׁי הָבִית (so Ox. 31, 68; De R. 2).

\(^11\) With Zaqeph (as we have seen) there are many such instances. The reason of the difference is that Zaqeph constantly divides Athnach’s clause near to Athnach, whereas S’golta’s proper place is at a distance from Athnach, with a shorter clause between it and the beginning of the verse.

\(^12\) Baer indeed names one Codex, but the Athnach there is due to a second, and apparently quite modern, hand.
CHAPTER IX.

TIPHCHA.

TIPHCHA's word often stands alone, as שלמה (Gen. i. 1).

When there are two words (and no more) in the clause, the servus will precede, as ויהיה והיה (i. 6); but T'bhir is sometimes found, when Tiphcha's word is long, e.g. 1 Ki. ii. 46; Jer. xxxiv. 5. (Comp. p. 75; but there is no rule here, as in the case of Zaqeph.)

When there are three or more words in the clause, we find, mutatis mutandis, the rules for the division of Zaqeph's clause again carried out:

I. The main dichotomy may come on the first word before Tiphcha, and will then be regularly marked by T'bhir, e.g. ויהיה אלוהים (Gen. i. 4); והיה אלוהים עלalm (ii. 21).

II. The main dichotomy may come on the second word,

1. And will still be generally marked by T'bhir, e.g. נ prostituיה יassandra יאשר אלט Corey (iii. 10); קריית הציון (xviii. 26); יאשר אלת אלוהים! את הים אמירה את מרים (ii. 22).

2. But R'bha is admissible—as before Zaqeph—if one of the following words be long. (The intermediate word will then be always marked with T'bhir1.) Thus: יאש בלא כרחי (Num. xxiv. 8); התיה ההנשא אתלט (Jon. i. 13); התיה ההנשא אתלט (Josh. ix. 17).

1 Texts must therefore be corrected in Ex. xxx. 7; Lev. iv. 4; &c. In Job i. 1, I point with Ox. 4, 5, 7, 9, &c., see Norzi. (see Norzi).
III. When the main dichotomy comes on the third word, or further, it is always marked by ר'ביה. Here the several cases we have had before repeat themselves:

1. There may be only one minor dichotomy, which is due on the first or second word. This dichotomy will be marked with תבירה: מֵאַסְכָּם לֶךְ בֵּפֶר בֵּוֶסָה לְבֵנִיהָ לַבְּנֵיהָ (Gen. xxxii. 1); המְשֶלָה אֲתָבָרָה יִתְנָה יִתְנָה גִּתְנָה גִּתְנָה אֲתָבָרָה לְבַרְתָּם (xvii. 7); וַיִּקָּל לְעֵלָהָּ רָא אָסְמִיתָּ יִרֵי אַרְבָּאִים נַפְּלָה (Is. xxxvii. 19).

2. There may be more than one minor dichotomy. All such cases necessitate the repetition of ר'ביה; the same rule being followed as before Знаophe and ס'גולת, that the second ר'ביה be changed into פאשה, unless at least three words intervene. תבירה will still mark the last of the minor dichotomies on the first or second word.

Thus ר'ביה is repeated in Jer. xxviii. 14: מֵאַסְכָּם לֶךְ בֵּפֶר בֵּוֶסָה לְבֵנִיהָ לַבְּנֵיהָ. And so in Josh. xiii. 30; Jer. xxix. 14; Ezek. xiii. 18; Qoh. v. 17; and a few other instances.

On the other hand, it is changed into פאשה in Is. xxxvi. 1:

In Num. vii. 87; Judg. xvi. 23; and 2 Chr. xviii. 23 there is only one word between. The Maqqeph before תבירה must be dropped, with various Codd.—Once, Deut. xxvi. 2, the transformation takes place with two words intervening. But here, Ox. 21, 51; Add. 9404 have rightly פאשה, instead of the first תבירה. In 1 Ki. v. 20 there is a misprint. For 13 see 12. In xxi. 16 we may point מֵאַסְכָּם with Ox. i, 5, 6, 8, &c.

Even with three words intervening there is, as far as I have observed, only one instance of ר'ביה, Jer. xxix. 14. Comp. p. 78 note.

In Num. vii. 87; Judg. xvi. 23; and 2 Chr. xviii. 23 there is only one word between. The Maqqeph before תבירה must be dropped, with various Codd.—Once, Deut. xxvi. 2, the transformation takes place with two words intervening. But here, Ox. 21, 51; Add. 9404 have rightly פאשה, instead of the first תבירה. In 1 Ki. v. 20 there is a misprint. For 13 see 12. In xxi. 16 we may point מֵאַסְכָּם with Ox. i, 5, 6, 8, &c.
If this is not the case, Pashta is itself changed into T'bhir, and the latter accent appears repeated. (The case is exactly parallel to the change of Pashta into Zarqa, in S'golta's clause, see p. 88.) E.g. [Hebrew text]. Such instances are sufficiently numerous. Comp. Gen. viii. 17; Ex. iii. 1; Deut. iii. 27; iv. 38; vi. 10; viii. 2; 1 Sam. xx. 21; xxi. 3; &c.

3. In a few passages, three R'bhias are due, but the second—owing to there not being in any case a sufficient interval between it and the first—is always changed to Pashta, e.g. [Hebrew text]. Such instances are sufficiently numerous. Comp. Gen. viii. 17; Deut. iii. 27; iv. 38; vi. 10; viii. 2; 1 Sam. xx. 21; xxii. 5; &c.

SERVI OF TIPHCHA.

I. One servus is always Mer'kha, מֶרֶקֹחַ (Gen. i. 3). In eight instances Mer'kha appears, in Palestinian texts, in the same word with Tiphcha: מֶרֶקֹחַ מִלְכֵּל הַמּוֹקֵר הַפְּרוֹר (Lev. xxiii. 21); מֶרֶקֹחַ מִלְכֵּל הַמּוֹקֵר הַפְּרוֹר (2 Ki. xv. 16); מֶרֶקֹחַ מִלְכֵּל הַמּוֹקֵר הַפְּרוֹר (Jer. viii. 18); מֶרֶקֹחַ מִלְכֵּל הַמּוֹקֵר הַפְּרוֹר (Ezek. xxxvi. 25); מֶרֶקֹחַ מִלְכֵּל הַמּוֹקֵר הַפְּרוֹר (xlv. 6); מֶרֶקֹחַ מִלְכֵּל הַמּוֹקֵר הַפְּרוֹר (Cant. vi. 5); מֶרֶקֹחַ מִלְכֵּל הַמּוֹקֵר הַפְּרוֹר (Dan. v. 17); מֶרֶקֹחַ מִלְכֵּל הַמּוֹקֵר הַפְּרוֹר (1 Chr. xv. 13). In most of the above cases, the object seems to have been to provide a fuller melody for the long words, by the substitution of an accent for Métheg. In מֶרֶקֹחַ the servus marks the first syllable as properly distinct, comp. מֶרֶקֹחַ (Lam. iv. 9); מֶרֶקֹחַ (Ps. cxlvi. 3).

II. The following (fourteen) are the only instances in which Tiphcha has two servi—the first Darga and the second Double Mer'kha: מֶרֶקֹחַ מִלְכֵּל הַמּוֹקֵר הַפְּרוֹר (Jer. viii. 18); מֶרֶקֹחַ מִלְכֵּל הַמּוֹקֵר (Ex. v. 15); מֶרֶקֹחַ מִלְכֵּל הַמּוֹקֵר (Lev. x. 1); מֶרֶקֹחַ מִלְכֵּל הַמּוֹקֵר (Num. xiv. 3); מֶרֶקֹחַ מִלְכֵּל הַמּוֹקֵר (xxxii. 5).

4 It is clear that the change in question can only take place when R'bhia precedes. Hence texts are incorrect in Josh. xx. 4 (point רְבָּה), and Baer in his note to Qoh. vi. 2.

5 See Corrigenda. Even Ben-Bil. (Mishp. hat. 35) is quite wrong, in the list he gives of these passages.

6 These instances are fixed by the Mas. to Lev. xxiii. 21.

7 But the Oriental text (to judge from Cod. Bab.) made no change. At Jer. viii. 18, the Massora and sign are Palestinian (see Strack's note).

8 See the Mas. to Num. xxxii. 42 and Dikd. hat., § 22.
The double Mer’kha here, as the servus Darga shews, is a weakened form of T’bhir, though what reasons led to its introduction it is vain to conjecture. The fancies that influenced the Palestinian accentuators have not been handed down to us. It is clear that in every case T’bhir might have stood, or Maqqeph been employed. The Oriental system (see Cod. Bab.) rightly rejected this irregular and unmeaning accentuation.

Corrigenda.

In Tiphcha’s clause—as in Zaqeph’s (p. 83)—we find instances of Zaqeph where R’bha should have stood. Thus we must point:

יְבֵּד (Josh. vii. 19), with Ox. 1, 5, 6, 7; Bomb. 2; יְבֵּד (Judg. xiii. 11), Ox. 10, 15, 83, 84; Bomb. 2; יְבֵּד (1 Sam. xxvii. 5), Ox. 6, 7, 8, 15; Bomb. 2; יְבֵּד (1 Ki. vii. 48), all Codd. that I have examined; יְבֵּד (2 Ki. v. 13), Ox. 1, 5, 7, 8; Bomb. 2; יְבֵּד (xxiii. 12), Ox. 7, 8, 10, 2323;  יְבֵּד (Jer. xviii. 4), Ox. 1, 9; Erf. 1, 2; יְבֵּד (li. 64), Ox. 5, 2323, 2324, 2331. If the student will examine these passages for himself, he will see how necessary the correction is in each case.

Obs.—It is hoped that the rules for marking the dichotomy in the clauses thus far considered have appeared to the reader precise and clear. We have had a first group of accents—with similar rules—formed by Silluq and Athnach; and a second, consisting of Zaqeph, S’gółta, and Tiphcha. We pass on now to the third group, embracing R’bha, Pashta, T’bhir, and Zarqa. A leading characteristic of this group is the much greater variety in the accents employed for the necessary dichotomical divisions. We shall in consequence have to notice many merely musical variations. With this group, the formal rules for the dichotomy come to an end.

9 Comp. p. 25. Hence in our texts, R’bha stands in Ezek. xiv. 4; in accordance with III. 1. But it is better to point with Zaqeph, as Ox. 6, 12, 13, 14, &c., do.
10 In the same clause read יְבֵּד for יְבֵּד (see Norzi).
CHAPTER X.

R'bhi'a.

R'bhi'a's word stands often alone, as: "ירבד (Gen. i. 2).
When there are two words (and no more) in the clause, the servant is commonly employed, as in "חיל (i. 9);
and "ייפ (i. 22); but if R'bhi'a's word is long, Géresh (i.e. Geršáyim) may appear: "שלוםNOPBL (Lev. xxvi. 30).

The other examples are Gen. x. 14 (1 Chr. i. 12); Lev. xviii. 11; Ezek. xiii. 21; xxvii. 29; 2 Chr. iv. 20. The accenuators have chosen instances, in which Geršáyim's word is long as well.

On L'gartheh, with two words in the clause, see chap. XIII.

When there are three or more words in the clause, the following cases will occur:

I. The main dichotomy may be on the first word before R'bhi'a, and is usually marked by Géresh: "��ר LH (Gen. i. 28); "��ר ینנה (i. 25);
and "��ר ینנה (1 Sam. xvi. 18).

With only three words in the clause, a servant may come: "��ר ליהנה (Gen. iv. 15); "��ר הניס (Hos. xiv. 9).

This variation in the melody seems due to the lighter character of R'bhi'a. With such an accent, the absence of the cadence, due from the dichotomy, would not be so much felt. We have indeed already seen—under Zaqeph, S'golta, and even Athnach—that with only three words, there was not the same necessity for marking the dichotomy. But these cases differed from ours in that some compensation was made for the failure of the cadence by the presence of the minor Disjunctive—Pashta, Zarqa, and Tiphcha, respectively—in the third word. With the still lighter accents, that have yet to be considered, the cadence regularly fails.

What is here fixed for the main dichotomy, holds equally good for the minor. The same remark applies to the rules that follow.

1 It is understood that when, in this and the following chapters, I speak of Géresh, I include Geršáyim.
II. The main dichotomy may be on the second word, and is still marked by Géresh: הַשְׁרֵא לְכַפַּרְרַה (Deut. xxxiii. 29); יַעֲלֵי הַשְׁמִירָה (Gen. xix. 30).

When there are only three words in the clause, L'garmeh may take the place of Géresh, thus affording a variety in the melody. It is particularly common with small words, as יַשָּׂךַר, תַּחַת, בֵּית, לָל; but is not confined to them, e.g. תַּשְׁמִית יִלְקְטִיב (Gen. xxiv. 7); הַשָּׂךַר הַצִּיק (Is. xli. 22).

In three passages, where both R'bhia's word and that preceding are long, we find the fuller melody of Great T'lisha followed by Géresh: אַמָּתְאֵי הַשְּׁטַרְרִים יָבְלוּנִים (Num. xviii. 9); and so in Deut. xxv. 19 (minor dichotomy) and Jer. xxix. 14. The case is parallel to what we have observed under Athnach, Zaqeph, &c. But the cadence is too heavy for R'bhia and generally fails.

III. The main dichotomy may be on the third word. Here the melody varies between Géresh and Great T'lisha.

1. Géresh, followed by L'garmeh, when the minor dichotomy is on the second word, or by two servi (see above), when it is on the first, e.g. הַשְׂכָל עֹבֵד יַשָּׂרָה (Gen. xviii. 25); לֹא נָתָנָה הַשְׁמִירָה לָטִימֶנָה (Gen. xxxviii. 11). Comp. i. 29; xxvi. 18; xxix. 2; l. 24b; Ex. iv. 18.

2. Great T'lisha, with Géresh to mark the minor dichotomy on the first or second word, e.g. יָבִּיל לְשֹׁמַר וּמִשְׁכָּב (Is. vii. 4); הַשָּׂרָה נָפָל לְיַעֲלֵי דִּבְרֵי (1 Sam. xxix. 6). Comp. 2 Sam. vii. 8; Jer. xxvi. 19; xxxiv. 3b; Ezra ix. 12.

Pazer is found in the place of T'lisha, in תַּשְׁמִית לְפָרֵל בִּי תַּשְׁפִּית (Ex. xii. 27), and in Jer. xxxix. 16.

---

2 In Ex. xxvi. 2, 8 and xxxvi. 9, 15, these accents interchange in the same expression. Comp. also Num. xvi. 17, 18.

3 Drop L'garmeh in Josh. i. 4; Ezek. xvii. 9, with Codd.

4 Both here, and in the instances given IV. 2, Pazer is out of order, for it is properly followed by Great or Little T'lisha.
IV. The main dichotomy may be on the fourth word. Géresh, Great T’lisha, and Pazer are all employed to mark it.

1. Géresh, with L’garmeh (occasionally repeated) to mark the minor dichotomy (or dichotomies) between it and R’bhía, e.g.

- נַעֲלוֹת אֲבֻדָּם אֲמֶשׁ (Gen. xxxi. 29);
- שַׁעָלֶת בְּני-שָׁרוֹן אוֹתוֹת טָעֲמוֹת לֶבֶן הָיָה (Ex. xiv. 10);
- שַׁעָלֶת נַעֲלוֹת הָיָה (Ezek. xxxiii. 11).

Comp. Lev. xiii. 52; Josh. xxiv. 13; Jer. xxix. 32; xliv. 26b; xlv. 28b; Jon. i. 3b.

L’garmeh is not, however, available to mark the minor dichotomy, when due on the first word. Hence we have R’bhía with three servi in נַעֲלוֹת אֲבֻדָּם אֲמֶשׁ (1 Ki. xix. 21), and in 2 Sam. xxi. 2b; 2 Ki. xx. 3 (Is. xxxviii. 3); Qoh. iv. 8. But this accentuation is so anomalous, that I do not hesitate to correct it in the few passages in which it occurs, although it is found in most Codd., and recognised by the grammarians. See Corrigenda.

2. Great T’lisha, with Géresh for the minor dichotomy, and occasionally L’garmeh as well, where a second minor dichotomy has to be marked: נַעֲלוֹת אֲבֻדָּם אֲמֶשׁ (Deut. xii. 2);

- נַעֲלוֹת אֲבֻדָּם אֲמֶשׁ (2 Sam. xv. 12);
- הָיָה (Ezra v. 6). It is unnecessary to give further examples. We have here merely a musical variation of the cases under 1.

We note that Géresh cannot be employed to mark the minor dichotomy on the first word, because we should then have the two T’lishas brought together, which is contrary to (musical) rule. A change in the accentuation becomes here necessary, see 3 below.

In a few instances, Pazer takes the place of Great T’lisha, under

---

5 L’garmeh on the first word is reserved for a particular purpose, see chapter on L’garmeh, p. 119.

6 There are two other instances where Géresh marks a minor dichotomy, Num. iv. 14 and Is. v. 25.
this head, e.g. "(Ex. iv. 31). The others are Gen. xxxii. 33; Deut. xxii. 6; 1 Sam. xx. 2; Jer. xxviii. 14; xxxviii. 7; Esth. vii. 9; Dan. v. 23; Ezra vi. 9 (minor dichotomy).

3. From the love of musical variation exhibited in the divisions just considered, we might have expected to find Pazer employed to mark the main dichotomy, with Great T’lisha and Geresh for the minor dichotomies, as in Neh. xiii. 5). But such instances are quite uncommon. The proper use of Pazer on the fourth word is to provide the means of marking the minor dichotomy on the first word, which means fail, as we have seen, under 1 and 2. The accent employed is always Geresh, e.g. " (Gen. xxvii. 36); " (2 Sam. xi. 1); " (Jer. ii. 2); and so often.

V. With the main dichotomy on the fifth word or further, Pazer becomes the regular dividing accent.

The following are the only variations I have noticed:

Great T’lisha may appear on the fifth word, with Geresh to mark the minor dichotomy on the third or fourth word, e.g. " (1 Sam. xxviii. 15); " (Jer. l. 29); " (2 Sam. xv. 21).

Other variations are uncommon. Great T’lisha occurs on the sixth word in Lev. xiii. 59; Deut. xiii. 6; Josh. xix. 47; 1 Sam. xvii. 25; comp. Ezra iii. 8b; and Geresh on the fifth word in 1 Ki. xiv. 21; xvi. 7; Qoh. vi. 2. None of these variations occasion any difficulty.

Otherwise, Pazer is the accent employed,—repeated according to the requirements of the dichotomy, or for the sake of distinct

---

7 The other examples are Is. lxvi. 20; Ezek. xliv. 25; 1 Chr. v. 24; vii. 2. In three of these, Pazer marks a minor dichotomy.

8 Point here with Maqqeph (Ox. 8, Erf. 2, Bomb. 1). Otherwise we should have the one solitary example of Great T’lisha on the seventh word.
enunciation of details. The division of the portion of the clause between the last Pazer and R'bhía will be according to the rules laid down above, which are (as has been stated) equally applicable to the minor as to the main dichotomy.

Examples of one Pazer are common, e.g. (2 Ki. iii. 25); (Jer. i. 15); and Ex. vii. 19; i Ki. xvi. 7; Jer. xiii. 13; xxxv. 14; &c.

Two Pazers are also met with occasionally, as in (2 Sam. iii. 21); (Jer. xl. 5); and Deut. v. 8; 2 Sam. xxiv. 13b; Jer. xvii. 25; 2 Chr. xxiv. 5.

Three Pazers are found in Dan. iii. 15; i Chr. v. 24; xxv. 3, 4;—four in Josh. viii. 33; Dan. iii. 3; v. 12;—and five in i Chr. xvi. 5.

These eight instances are all I have noticed, in which Pashta is repeated more than once in R'bhía's clause. In no case was the repetition necessary, for the accentuation might have been easily arranged otherwise. I confess, it looks to me as if there were something fanciful in the introduction of these instances, for (if I am not mistaken) there is the same number, eight, of similar instances in Pashta's and T'bhir's clauses.

SERVI OF R'BHÍA.

I. One servus is always Munach, (Gen. i. 9).

In five cases it is found in the same word with R'bhía: 

---

9 In Syriac the same accent is constantly repeated any number of times to mark successive details (see Bar-Hebraeus, Phillips' ed., p. 43). Here we have a rule, which the few examples that occur of Pazer repeated for the same purpose do not justify us in laying down for the Hebrew.

10 Fixed by the Massora to Gen. xlv. 5. In our texts it occurs falsely in 2 Ki. xxi. 7; Ezek. xiii. 21; xxxv. 12; xxxvi. 11.

11 The idea seems to have been to draw attention to the distinction between this form and (Neh. viii. 10). Care was to be taken to read here tēdda', not tsēaddāw.
(Gen. xlv. 5); ṣeḥaṭ (Zech. vii. 14); אֵין (Ex. xxxii. 31); הַקָּנִי (Qoh. iv. 10); and דַּנֵי יַעֲקֹב (Dan. i. 7). We can understand its introduction in the three last cases, the object being to indicate a compound word.

II. With two servi, the first is Darga and the second Munach, e.g. יהיו הַבָּרְכֵה (Gen. xxiv. 15).

III. For three servi, we have Munach, Darga, and Munach. The few instances that occur are probably all to be corrected. See below.

Corrigenda.

The following are the cases of Ge'resh on the fourth word with servi following, referred to p. 95, which I propose to correct as follows:

םַהֲנָהֵה (Num. iv. 14), with Ox. 3, 6, 10; Erf. 1, 4.

הַמְּאָבָנָהִי (2 Sam. xxi. 2), with Ox. 1, 7, 13, 16, &c.

הַנַּהֲנָה (1 Ki. xix. 21), with Ox. 76; K. 403; De R. 305. Other Codd., as Ox. 32; Harl. 1528; Add. 4709; Or. 2091; De R. 226, have Zaqeph instead of R'hiba, when the pointing of the clause will be הנַהֲנָהִי מַעְמַכְתּוּ מֵעֲטְרָה when the pointing of the clause will be הנַהֲנָהִי מַעְמַכְתּוּ מֵעֲטְרָה.

הַנַּהֲנָהִי מַעְמַכְתּוּ מֵעֲטְרָה (2 Ki. xx. 3; Is. xxxviii. 3), with Ox. 7, 13, 75; Jabl., &c.

הַרְחָאָהֵה (Is. v. 25), with Ox. 5, 9, 13, 17, 75.

וַיַּהֲנָהֵה (Qoh. iv. 8), with Ox. 1, 4, 6; Erf. 2, 3.

12 Perhaps to mark the peculiar grammatical form.
13 Codd. have here constantly two Munachs—an error against which Ben-Bil. expressly warns in Mishp. hat. 26—and so our texts in Josh. xiv. 6; Jer. xxx. 11; Dan. iii. 15, &c.
CHAPTER XI.

PASHṬA, T'BHIR, AND ZARQA.

These three accents may be taken together, as the rules for the division of the clauses governed by them are identical.

Our investigation is further much simplified in that these rules are adopted, with little change, from those for R'bhia's clause. The same accents (with the exception of L'garmeh, which is rarely employed) are in use to mark the necessary divisions.

It is to be noted that we are now approaching the limits of the musical division. The tendency to employ a lighter melody is, in consequence, observable. This tendency, which began to shew itself under R'bhia, becomes more marked in the clauses we are about to consider; and still more so with the accents, to be examined in the next chapter, which close the musical scale.

We proceed to the analysis of the clauses governed by Pashṭa, T'bhir, and Zarqa.

When there are two words (and no more) in the clause, the first is marked with a servus, as לָּלֹא כָלְהֵמָר (Gen. i. 15); יִבְּרַכְּנֶּ֑י (i. 4); יִבְּרַכְּנֶ֑י (i. 7).

Geresh is however admissible, when the latter of the two words is long and the interval between the tone-syllables considerable, as בָּרָּכְנֶ֑י (Lev. ix. 7); יִבְּרַכְּנֶ֑י (Ezek. xliii. 11). But the punctators seldom availed themselves of this variation. I have noticed it, besides, only in Ex. xxxviii. 23; 2 Sam. iii. 25; Jer. xxx. 16; Ezek. xi. 18; xlv. 4; and Dan. i. 12. (Comp. the few similar examples before R'bhia, p. 93. The number seems to be the same, viz. eight.)

When there are three or more words in the clause, we have to consider, as before, the various cases that may occur:

---

1 Pashṭa appears, as we have seen, p. 19, under two forms, Pashṭa proper and Y'thībh; but, as the latter always stands alone, it does not come under consideration in the rules that follow. For this accent, see p. 106.

2 Baer's pointing וֹשֵׁבָה וֹשֵׁבָה (Zech. i. 10) cannot stand, any more than וֹשֵׁבָה וֹשֵׁבָה (Hos. vi. 9), with R'bhia.
I. The main dichotomy may be due on the word immediately preceding. Here we should expect it to be marked (as before R’bhia) by Géresh. But this is rarely the case. Generally, transformation takes place, the servi of Géresh remaining. In other words, the rhythmical cadence at the close of the clause is, with these lighter accents, purposely omitted, e.g. לָהָיִשׁ לֵאמֹר (Gen. xliii. 3); נְתָהָיִשׁ לֵאמֹר (2 Ki. xxv. 21); מִלְּחָיִשׁ לֵאמֹר (Deut. xxx. 19).

That the dichotomy is due, in all such cases, in the first word, is clear not only from the rules for the same, but from the comparison of such identical expressions as 2 Ki. xxi. 3b (R’bhia) and 2 Chr. xxxiii. 3b (Pashta); 1 Ki. xxii. 35 (Tiphcha) and 2 Chr. xviii. 34 (T’bhir); and Josh. viii. 18 (R’bhia) and xi. 6 (Zarqa). Indeed, in the next chapter we shall find this dichotomy, although in abeyance, exercising an influence on the accents preceding.

It is only when the closing word of the clause is long (see above) that Géresh appears, e.g. וַיֹּאמֶר (Ex. ix. 14); שָׁתַיָּהוּ (Num. xvi. 5). But even here it more generally fails.

II. The main dichotomy may be due on the second word,
1. And is commonly marked (as before R’bhia) with Géresh, e.g. לָהָיִשׁ לֵאמֹר (Gen. i. 9); מַעַרְכָּהּ נְתָהָיִשׁ לֵאמֹר (iv. 3); מַעַרְכָּהּ נְתָהָיִשׁ לֵאמֹר (xxviii. 13).

2. But where the clause contains only three words, we often find the lighter melody of a servus, e.g. וַיֹּאמֶר (Is. xxxiv. 16); וַיֹּאמֶר (Zech. xiv. 4); מַעַרְכָּהּ נְתָהָיִשׁ לֵאמֹר (Is. liii. 7).

3. Less frequent than 1 or 2, but not uncommon, is the musical variation of Great T’lisha. Here Géresh should properly

---

3 The other examples I have noticed are: before Pashta, Ex. xxxi. 6; xxxviii. 17; i Sam. xv. 18; Is. xxv. 6; Jer. xix. 13b (corr.)—before T’bhir, Gen. xxxvi. 18; Num. xxxiii. 2; Josh. iii. 17; 1 Ki. i. 10;—and before Zarqa, 2 Chr. xviii. 5.

4 Codd., as we might expect, often vary. Thus we have מַעַרְכָּהּ נְתָהָיִשׁ לֵאמֹר (Zech. iv. 6); מַעַרְכָּהּ נְתָהָיִשׁ לֵאמֹר (xiv. 2); מַעַרְכָּהּ נְתָהָיִשׁ לֵאמֹר (2 Chr. vi. 41); &c.
come on the first word (see the examples under R’bhia), but has been, according to rule, transformed⁵: המַּעְטֶר בִּשְׁמֵנָּה הָאַלָּבָּה (Deut. vi. 15); ישׁוֹאֵל בְּשָׁמְנָּהּ נֶפֶשׁ (Josh. x. 29); יִשָּׁמְשָּׁה בְּשָׁמְנָּהּ לָאַלָּבָּה (1 Ki. ix. 3)⁶.

In five passages, Gen. v. 29; Lev. x. 4; 2 Ki. xvii. 13; Ezek. xlviii. 10; Zeph. ii. 15 (see Mas. to Gen. v. 29), Geresh and T’lisha are found together in the same word,—an intimation that ancient authorities differed as to the chanting. The later Massoretes, unable to decide which was right, directed that both accents should be chanted (שיאמס שיום י bidder), Geresh first, as being the more common. And this chanting is observed in the present day.

It is to be noticed that the rules already laid down and those which follow, apply equally to the minor dichotomy, when the main dichotomy divides the clause earlier than in the several cases given.

III. With the main dichotomy on the third word, Geresh and Great T’lisha—more rarely Pazer—are employed to mark it (as also with R’bhia).

1. But Great T’lisha becomes now the more common,—the minor dichotomy, if due on the second word, being marked by Geresh⁷; or, if on the first word, by Geresh transformed⁸; e.g. with Pashta: בִּאֵלַּבָּה תַנְּבַּר נַחֲלָה וְלָאַלָּבָּה (Gen. xiv. 7); לֹאַלָּבָּה נַחֲלָה וְלָאַלָּבָּה לְאַלָּבָּה (Is. xlix. 10).

---

⁵ Moreover—according to the analogy of Zaqeph on the second word before Athnach or Silluq, R’bhia on the second word before Zaqeph, &c.—one or other of the words following T’lisha should be long. But the necessity for this condition fails, with the transformation of Geresh and the consequent disappearance of the full rhythmical cadence. Hence we find two short words in 1 Sam. xxx. 12; Is. xxix. 4, before Pashta; Jon. ii. 3, before T’bhir; and Deut. iii. 19, before Zarqa.

⁶ The careless mistakes in 2 Ki. xvi. 7 and Neh. ix. 37 must be corrected and Azla put for Great T’lisha, with Codd.

⁷ It is not often that Geresh fails when due in the second word; yet after the analogy of II. 2, a servus may come, as in Num. xix. 10 and Josh. ii. 3, before Pashta;—Gen. xii. 30 and Deut. xxii. 29, before T’bhir;—and Num. xxx. 9; Josh. xxiii. 16, before Zarqa.

⁸ In two instances, Lev. v. 12 and Num. xiv. 29, where Pashta’s word is long, Geresh remains.
For T'bhir, see Gen. xix. 20; Jer. xiii. 9;—for Zarga, Gen. xix. 19; Josh. x. 24.

The (musical) variations under this head are—

(a) The fanciful transposition of T'lisha and Geresh 10, e.g. נַקָּרַשׁ לֵעָלָים (Lev. xiii. 57). The other examples are 2 Chr. xxxv. 12, with Pashta;—Gen. xiii. 1; Deut. xxvi. 12; Josh. xxiii. 4; Am. viii. 13; Ezra v. 3, with T'bhir;—and Neh. iii. 15, with Zarqa.

(b) The substitution of Pazer for Great T'lisha, Geresh remaining, as in יִתְנָה שֶבֶן🌎 (Is. xvi. 9). Comp. Dan. ii. 28; 1 Chr. xxvii. 25; 2 Chr. iii. 3, before Pashta;—Gen. x. 13 (1 Chr. i. 11); 1 Sam. xxx. 14; 2 Ki. viii. 29 (2 Chr. xxii. 6); Qoh. viii. 11b; 1 Chr. xxiv. 4, before T'bhir;—and 2 Chr. xxxv. 7, before Zarqa. (In Neh. xii. 36; xiii. 15, Pazer marks a minor dichotomy.)

2. Examples of Geresh are : הָיָה לָמָּה לֹא יִתְנָה שֶבֶן (Gen. xxxv. 11); יִתְנָה שֶבֶן הָיָה בַּעֲמָה לֹא יִתְנָה שֶבֶן (2 Sam. xxi. 10). Comp. for T'bhir, Gen. xxxiv. 13; Lev. xiii. 37; and for Zarga, Ex. xxix. 21; 1 Ki. iii. 6. (For the instances in which the minor dichotomy is due on the first word, comp. R'bhia, III. 1.)

3. Pazer also, followed by Great T'lisha to mark the minor dichotomy on the second word, is quite regular, e.g. יֵבְעָה לֹא הָיָה (Ezek. xxiii. 24); יֵבְעָה לֹא הָיָה בַּעֲמָה לֹא יֵבְעָה (2 Sam. xviii. 5). So before T'bhir, Num. xxix. 18; Josh. ii. 1b; and before Zarga, Gen. xxxvi. 6; Jer. xxxvi. 14. Such examples are, however, much less frequent than those under 1 and 2.

9 For the rest of the chapter, I think it sufficient to give in full the examples with Pashta, as those with T'bhir and Zarga present no difference.
10 Of course their relative disjunctive value becomes changed, with the change of position.
11 Pazer is out of order in these instances, because it is properly followed by Great or Little T'lisha.
12 Neh. v. 18 must be corrected לֶזֶד מָכַרְתָּן לֹא יֵבְעָה רֶםֶג, as the minor dichotomy is on the first word. Harl. 5506 and Par. 102 have Munach for Great T'lisha.
IV. With the main dichotomy on the fourth word, Great T'lisha and Pazer are employed to mark it. Geresh is seldom available.

1. Great T'lisha, when the minor dichotomy (marked with Geresh) is on the second or third word, e.g. שָׁפַּמּוּ בֵּרֵי-יֹוהֵ֜ה מִּלֵּ֣לָה יִֽהְדָּה (Jer. xvii. 20); and לֶ֛כֶּהּ הָֽדָּתָהּ (Judg. xxii. 10); נִשְׂרָ֖ה אֶפֶֽ֛ר בֵּי בִּימָּ֖וּ (Deut. xxxi. 17). For T'bhir, compare Num. xviii. 7; Is. lxvi. 19; and for Zarqa, Deut. xxxi. 21; Jer. xlix. 19.

The variations under this head are as before:

(a) The transposition of T'lisha and Geresh, in אַתֶּרֶנֶּמֶס (Gen. i. 12); and Lev. iv. 7; 1 Ki. xvi. 21; Ezek. iii. 15; Dan. ix. 26; Ezra viii. 17b; all before Pashta.13

(b) The substitution of Pazer for T'lisha, Geresh remaining, in Lev. xiii. 58; Josh. xviii. 28, before Pashta;—and in Num. xviii. 17; Jer. xxxviii. 25; xliv. 18; Esth. i. 17; 2 Chr. xx. 26, before T'bhir.14

2. Pazer also may come, followed by Great T'lisha, to mark the minor dichotomy on the second or third word, e.g. כָּנָּ֣שׁוֹת אֲלֵ֖שָׁנָּ֣י (Ezek. xli. 16); וְיַעֲרָּֽבְתָּהּ עַ֥עֵרֵי נִהְּרֵ֖עֲרֵי נְיָֽרָֽהֲשֹׁ֥ת אֲלֵ֖שָׁנָּ֣י (xiv. 21); וַיַּצְּרֵ֥されましたּ יִֽהְדָּּה (Gen. xxii. 2). Comp. Josh. vi. 23; 2 Ki. xvi. 10; Ezek. xxxvii. 25; and for T'bhir's clause, Gen. vii. 2; xlv. 23; 2 Sam. iii. 29. I have noticed no example in Zarqa's clause.

But Pazer's proper function in the fourth word is to mark the main dichotomy, when the minor dichotomy—represented by Geresh transformed15—is due on the first word. (Great T'lisha

---

13 The minor dichotomies are so pointed in Pashta's clause, 1 Sam. xvii. 51; and in T'bhir's, Gen. xxi. 14.
14 In 1 Ki. xix. 11, where Pazer marks a minor dichotomy, Geresh must come on the second word, with many Codd.
15 In Lev. xx. 4, where Pashta's word is long, Geresh is found; and so in 1 Ki. x. 5, with Pazer on the fifth word. Contrast the division in R'bhla's clause, where Geresh always stands.
cannot be used, because it would come immediately before Little T'lisha,—a juxtaposition which, as we have seen, is not allowed.)

E. g. מִּשְׂמַרְתּ הַגּוֹיִם (Jer. xxx. 10); מֵּתָה הַגּוֹיִם (Judg. xviii. 24); and so in Gen. xlviii. 15; Ex. v. 14; &c., before Pashta; and in 2 Ki. xxiii. 29; Is. liv. 17; &c., before T'bhir. 16

Here again examples with Zarqa fail.

Exceptions.—Géresh cannot properly appear on the fourth word, except by transposition (see i. a above) or by the introduction of L'garmeh 17 to mark the minor dichotomy. Such instances, therefore, as מָחַר עֵבֶד אֲשֶׁר יִשָּׂרֵאֵל (2 Sam. xix. 27), must either be regarded as exceptional and altogether anomalous, or we must be prepared to correct them (like the similar instances in R'bhia's clause, p. 98) with the help of Codd. The latter is (I doubt not) the proper course. For instance, in the passage just given, I propose to point מָחַר עֵבֶד אֲשֶׁר יִשָּׂרֵאֵל, with Add. 15451; Harl. 5722; De R. 554, &c.

By the simple insertion of Maqqeph between the first word and T'bhir in Josh. xxi. 11, and between the second and third words in Judg. xx. 34 and 1 Ki. v. 25, these passages are reduced to order. In Jer. xxxviii. 16 I have found Pazer—and in Num. iii. 39; 1 Sam. xviii. 5; 2 Sam. xiv. 30; and 2 Chr. ix. 25, R'bhia—for Géresh. These are the only passages which (as far as I have observed) need correction. I have not thought it necessary to cite, for the several instances, the authority on which the correction is made. It is enough that the student should understand that the anomaly which they exhibit admits of being removed, and that so the rules above laid down are confirmed. It is only from this latter point of view that the emendations made are of any consequence 18.

V. With the main dichotomy on the fifth word or further, Pazer is (as in R'bhia's clause) the regular dividing accent.

16 In the lists Ezek. xliii. 11; Dan. iii. 2; Neh. xi. 7; and 2 Chr. xvii. 8, Pazer (marking a minor dichotomy) comes on the third word, because of two servi in the first.

17 Lev. x. 6; xxi. 10; and Ruth i. 2, are the only examples of this division.

18 There are besides, the passages in which Géresh marks a minor dichotomy, and which must be corrected in the same way. Thus Maqqeph will come between the first word and T'bhir in 1 Ki. ix. 11; between the first and second words in Deut. xx. 14 and 2 Sam. xviii. 29 (where מִּשְׂמַרְתּ must at the same time have its accent changed to Azla); and between the second and third words in Josh. xxi. 6 and Dan. x. 11. Pazer will take the place of Géresh in 1 Sam. xvii. 23, and Great T'lisha that of Little T'lisha in Esth. vi. 13.
As before R'bhia, Great T'lisha may stand on the fifth word, with Géresh to mark the minor dichotomy on the third word, e.g. ןֶּֽעַ֑יֵּר (1 Sam. xxii. 2). Comp. for Pashta, Ex. ii. 14; 1 Ki. xiv. 21;—for T'bhir, Num. ix. 1; Is. xxxvi. 22;—and for Zarqa, Zech. xiv. 4; Ezra v. 17.

Géresh cannot come on the fifth word,—as L'garmeh altogether fails for the minor dichotomy,—except indeed, as in Deut. xvii. 5, through transposition. Three passages need in consequence correction, Ex. v. 8; 2 Ki. v. 1;—and 2 Chr. xxii. 11b; in all of which I point with various Codd., Great for Little T'lisha.

In all other instances Pazer is employed,—repeated if necessary, according to the requirements of the dichotomy, or for the sake of distinct enunciation of details.

Examples of one Pazer are common enough: בֵּן צַרְפָּרָּר הַגָּוָּרָּר שֶׁרֶגֶּרְוָאָר וְשֶׁרֶגֶּרְוָאָר (Qoh. v. 18); רִשְּׁחוּחַ בֵּיתָם מִלְּאָרְוָאָר יִלְּאָרְוָאָר (Neh. ix. 25); מִשָּׁפָּרְוָאָר אֱלִילָרְוָאָר על (Num. i. 50). Other examples in Pashta's clause are 2 Ki. ix. 26; Esth. iii. 13; 2 Chr. xxxv. 18;—in T'bhir's, 1 Sam. xvii. 40; 1 Ki. ix. 26; Ezek. xxii. 30;—and in Zarqa's, 2 Ki. xxiii. 4; Ezek. xlviii. 21; 2 Chr. xxxii. 15.

Two Pazers are also not uncommon, e.g. נַעָרְוָאָר בֵּיתָם וְשֶׁרֶגֶּרְוָאָר (2 Ki. xviii. 21); נַעָרְוָאָר וְשֶׁרֶגֶּרְוָאָר אֱלִילָרְוָאָר (Josh. viii. 14). Comp. for Pashta, Ezek. xxi. 3; Dan. iii. 5; Neh. i. 6;—and for T'bhir, Num. ix. 5; 1 Chr. xii. 40; 2 Chr. xxiii. 1. Two Pazers are not found in Zarqa's clause.

19 Deut. xx. 14; Josh. xxi. 6; 1 Ki. ix. 11; and Dan. x. 11;—as corrected, see previous note,—come under this head. In 1 Sam. xvii. 51 Great T'lisha appears on the sixth word; but it is better to point with R'bhia instead (so Ox. 16; Add. 9398, 11657). We thus avoid having Great T'lisha both before and after Géresh.

20 In this passage, a double change is necessary. No doubt Great T'lisha in the first word is to be made Little T'lisha, with Ox. 7, 13, 20, 24, &c., "ןְּרָוָאָר." The two T'lishas constantly interchange in Codd.
Three Pazers are found in Dan. iii. 7; Ezra viii. 16; Neh. viii. 4; xi. 7; xii. 41; xiii. 15; 1 Chr. iii. 24; xxviii. 1;—four in Josh. vii. 24; Ezek. xliii. 11; Dan. iii. 2; 1 Chr. xv. 24;—five in Neh. xii. 36; 2 Chr. xvii. 8;—six in Neh. viii. 7;—and eight in 1 Chr. xv. 18.

Eight of these sixteen examples are in Pashta’s clause, and eight in T’bhir’s. They are mostly instances where details have to be given of names, &c. In all, the multiplication of the Pazers might have been avoided, if the accentuators had been so minded. Comp. the remark under R’bhia, p. 97. The examples (it will be observed) occur almost all in the later Books.

ON Y’TIBH IN THE PLACE OF PASHTA.

The substitution is entirely on musical grounds. In the chanting of Pashta’s word, an anacrusis or appoggiatura was needed, which it was not possible to introduce, when the tone came on the first letter and no servus preceded. In such cases the melody of Pashta underwent a change, represented by Y’tibh (see p. 19), e.g. מְרַנְּנָהּ שֵׁם (Gen. iii. 1); מְרַנְּנָהּ שֵׁם (vi. 9).—When the servus preceded, as in מְרַנְּנָה (i. 2); מְרַנְּנָה (1 Sam. xvii. 49), the appoggiatura (or a substitute for it) was provided.

As the sign for M’huppakh is the same as that for Y’tibh, there would be occasionally uncertainty as to which accent was intended. The cases are those in which the word, requiring the one or other of these accents, comes between R’bhia and the Pashta which serves as foretone to Zaqeph. Here M’huppakh is, of course, as common as possible. But Y’tibh is sometimes due, as the representative of R’bhia repeated (according to the rule, p. 78, 2), e.g. מְרַנְּנָה (Jer. xiv. 14), where, however, many Codd. (and our texts) point M’huppakh. To obviate confusion in these cases, and others which might arise from the ignorance or carelessness of punctators, the Massoretes drew up a list of the

---

21 According to Ben-Asher, vocal Sh’va sufficed for the auxiliary note, מְרַנְּנָה (Ezek. i. 11); but not apparently in Ben-Naphtali’s view, who pointed מְרַנְּנָה with Y’tibh. (This punctuation is found in our texts, Ezek. xlii. 24.)
22 As 2 Ki. x. 30, corrected p. 79, note 11.
passages in which, according to their judgment, the word immediately preceding Pashta was to be pointed with Y’thibh 23, viz. י’ (Lev. v. 2); ה (Deut. i. 4; Is. v. 24); ל (Is. xxx. 32; Ezr ix. 4); ר (Jer. xiv. 14); ל (xvi. 12; xxii. 30); and ר (Dan. ii. 10; vii. 27; Ezr vi. 8). In all other cases, M’huppakh was to be chanted 24.

SERVI OF PASHTA, T’BHIR, AND ZARQA 25.

The chief difference is in the servi immediately preceding these accents. The other servi—when there are two or more—follow the same general rules.

I. ONE SERVUS.

1. Pashta has sometimes M’huppakh, sometimes Mer’kha.

a. M’huppakh, when one or more syllables intervene between the servus and the tone-syllable of Pashta’s word (vocal Sh’va and furtive Pathach being allowed to count as syllables), e.g. יָנֵשׁ רָמִים (Gen. xviii. 31); בֵּית נַפְעָשׁ (xviii. 6); יֵשׁ (Esth. iii. 6).

In a few forms, compounded with ש, M’huppakh appears in the same word with Pashta, הנהשׁ (Cant. i. 7). Comp. i. 12; iii. 4; Qoh. i. 7; vii. 10 26. The object is to indicate a compound word 27.

b. Mer’kha, when no syllable intervenes, e.g. יֵתָנָה נִני (Gen. i. 2); וֹזָה רָבָא (Is. i. 3). But if Paseq comes between the words, M’huppakh will stand, מִי מַזְּבָּכָה (Is. lviii. 2) 28.

23 רֹחָנִי מָסְמַכֵּס (Mas. to Dan. ii. 10), i.e. ‘with the accent put backwards,’ in reference to the position of Y’thibh.

24 So far the list answers a certain purpose. But in itself it is a poor one, and has been but little regarded by punctators or editors. In only three instances is Y’thibh really required.

25 These servi, owing to the fine musical distinctions and the many exceptions, give more trouble than all the other servi put together. The Orientals and Ben-Naphtali had more simple rules.

As before, I cannot undertake to enumerate the many errors of our texts. The student, as he comes across them, may correct them according to the following rules, which are firmly established.

26 See Norzi on Cant. i. 7.

27 So the Mas. requires M’huppakh in יָנֵשׁ רָמִים (Ezr iv. 2), a compound of two words, which are kept distinct in ordinary texts.

28 As Baer has rightly pointed. And so we must correct Jer. xii. 5 and 1 Chr. viii. 38 (Ix. 44 is right). The Mas. to Deut. viii. 15 (which gives the instances where Paseq comes between two nouns, the first of which has M’huppakh and the second Pashta) is very defective. Beside the above instances, Ezek. xlvii. 16 and Ruth iv. 11 are wanting.
2. T'bhūr has sometimes Darga, sometimes Mer'kha.

a. Darga, when two or more syllables intervene between the servus and T'bhūr (vocal Sh'va generally and furtive Pathach counting as above), e.g. פָּשַׁת הָרִיְה (Gen. iii. 20); שַׁבָּתָה (xliv. 15); צַיִּים (Lev. xix. 5); וְלָපְרֹתָל (Gen. xlviii. 22); יִרְחָא מָאָס (Is. v. 4).

b. Mer'kha, when only one syllable, or none at all, intervenes:

Exceptions.—The simple vocal Sh'va which follows a vowel, whether short or long, was not counted of sufficient length to constitute a syllable. Hence we find Mer'kha appointed for all such cases as מָלֵא (Gen. i. 28); מִי נָבַט (Jer. xxiii. 25); נִלַּי (Num. xxvi. 64); הַלְּיָם (Judg. iv. 8); נֵיפַר מֵירָב (Mic. i. 6). The explanation seems to be that the pronunciation of the Sh'va in these cases was less distinctly heard than when it comes at the beginning of a word, or at the beginning of a syllable after silent Sh'va. 30

30 The Mas. to Ex. xxi. 35 lays it down that there are thirteen exceptions in which Darga comes, where Mer'kha is due. (We must strike out the words פָּשַׁת הָרִיְה, with which Jacob ben-Chayyim has headed the list. They make nonsense, and have come from confusion with the Mas. to Lev. xi. 12.) The list is most correctly given in Dikd. hat., § 19: מִי (Gen. xviii. 18); מְי (Ex. xxi. 35); מְי (Lev. vii. 33); יִנַּט (Deut. xiv. 10; Is. xix. 25); מִי (Josh. viii. 9, 12); יְנֵי (1 Sam. xxx. 17); יְנֵי (2 Sam. xx. 6); יִנַּט (Hos. x. 14); מְנַטּוּ (Qoh. ix. 10); מְנַטּוּ (2 Chr. xviii. 33); מְנַטּוּ (xxx. 3). It is clear to my mind that we have in these exceptions (and those which follow) merely the errors of some model Codex, for the same words in the same connection are at one time pointed according to rule, at another against it. Comp. Lev. xi. 12 (יִנַּט) with Deut. xiv. 10, and 1 Ki. xxi. 34 (יִנַּט) with 2 Chr. xviii. 33.

30 Heldenheim (Mishp. hat. 27b) and Baer (Dikd. hat., p. 13 note) maintain indeed the Sh'va in the above cases—even when the vocal is long—to be quiescent; and cite Ben-Asher, Chayyug, Aben-Ezra, and others as of the same view. But that these early grammarians were only driven to adopt their view from the supposed exigencies of the accentuation is clear from the punctuation of certain MSS. lately brought from Yemen,—provided with a peculiar system of superlinear vocalization, not yet familiar to scholars,—which invariably mark the Sh'va after a long vocal as vocal. (See, e.g. Pl. LIV of the Paleographical Society's publications, Oriental series, and the accompanying description.) The sign used is a bar over the letter, thus—I drop the peculiar vocalization מָלֵא מָאָס (Num. xxxii. 1, in the Plate), the Mer'kha, it will be observed, still retained. We thus see that there were Jewish authorities, which did not accept Ben-Asher's view, just as Qimchi (Mikhhol, 152b) emancipated himself from the error of his predecessors.
But when Paseq follows, Darga always stands: מֶּטֶּגֶּשׁ (Gen. xvii. 13); מֶּטֶּגֶּשׁ (Esth. iii. 7); &c.

Obs.—Mer’kha, if no other servus precedes, is sometimes found in the same word with T’bhir. The rule is as follows:—When a long vowel, with Métheg and simple Sh’va following, immediately precedes T’bhir, Mer’kha takes the place of the Métheg, e.g. מֶּטֶּגֶּשׁ (Deut. xiii. 10); מֶּטֶּגֶּשׁ (xiii. 16); מֶּטֶּגֶּשׁ (Ezra vi. 2); מֶּטֶּגֶּשׁ (2 Chr. i. 10) 31. But when a vowel or half-vowel (compound Sh’va) intervenes, Métheg remains, as in מֶּטֶּגֶּשׁ (Gen. xxxvi. 18); מֶּטֶּגֶּשׁ (Ex. xxx. 19) 32.

Ben-Naphtali and the Orientals (as may be seen in Cod. Bab.) did not follow this rule, which really seems to have no raison d’être. Indeed, although adopted by grammarians, it was but little observed in practice.

3. Zarqa has Munach (properly ‘Illuy, e.g. מֶּטֶּגֶּשׁ (Gen. i. 28); מֶּטֶּגֶּשׁ (xliv. 21); מֶּטֶּגֶּשׁ (xliv. 29) 33.

II. Two servi. The first will be Munach, if on the first letter,—if on any other, Azla 34; the second will be according to Rule I.

31 Ben-Bil. (MS.) lays down the rule in the following terms: מֶּטֶּגֶּשׁ מַעְנַח וֹ בֵּר נְ בֵּר (Mishp. hat. 29b) has copied the false text of Moses the punctator. The rubrics in Ginsb. Mas. ב., § 239ff., are a complete muddle.

32 Three exceptions are indeed named (Dikd. hat., § 20): מֶּטֶּגֶּשׁ (Ezek. xxxvi. 3); מֶּטֶּגֶּשׁ (2 Chr. xiii. 12); מֶּטֶּגֶּשׁ (xxxi. 9). But doubtless Métheg and Mer’kha have been here confounded (in Codd. they are often quite alike), just as Ben-Bil. (Mishp. hat. 29b) and others have confounded them in מֶּטֶּגֶּשׁ מַעְנַח וֹ בֵּר נְ בֵּר (Cant. ii. 7), where Mer’kha, following Darga, is impossible.

33 In ten passages, according to the Mas., Mer’kha comes instead of Munach: מֶּטֶּגֶּשׁ (Ex. vi. 6); מֶּטֶּגֶּשׁ (xxxi. 12); מֶּטֶּגֶּשׁ (2 Sam. vii. 7; 1 Chr. xvii. 6); מֶּטֶּגֶּשׁ (1 Ki. i. 19, 25); מֶּטֶּגֶּשׁ (1 Chr. v. 18); מֶּטֶּגֶּשׁ (xiv. 11); מֶּטֶּגֶּשׁ (xxi. 12); and מֶּטֶּגֶּשׁ (Ruth iv. 4). See Dikd. hat., § 21 end. (There has apparently been some confusion, in the punctuation of these words, with the rule for Zarqa’s servi under II. Perhaps some of my readers, who have occupied themselves with the accentuation, have occasionally made, as I have found myself making, the same mistake.) Many authorities omit either 1 Chr. xvii. 6, or 1 Ki. i. 25, thus leaving one example exceptional, and another (with the same words) regular. Comp. note 29.

34 The principle of this variation has been explained under Y’thibh, p. 106. Here also, when another servus (Little T’lsha) precedes, Azla will stand even on the first letter.
1. **Pashta.** 30x 17 (Gen. xiii. 14); 30x 16 (Ex. xii. 42); 30x 17 (Deut. xxviii. 8); 30x 17 (Gen. viii. 1)\(^{35}\).

In seven instances, Azla takes the place of Métheg in the *same word* with M’huppakh (or Mer’kha): 30x 17 (Lev. xxv. 46); 30x 17 (Num. xx. 1); 30x 17 (Deut. viii. 16). Comp. Ezek. xliii. 11; Dan. iii. 2; Ezra vii. 24; 2 Chr. xxxv. 25 \(^{36}\). Once Munach comes \(^{37}\) with the first letter, 30x 17 (Lam. iv. 9).—Ben-Naphtali and the Orientals had no such instances, nor in the similar cases that follow.

2. **T’bhir.** 30x 17 (Num. xviii. 9); 30x 17 (Gen. iv. 4); 30x 17 (xiv. 15) \(^{38}\).

In six instances, Azla takes (in some texts) the place of Métheg in the *same word* with Darga or Mer’kha \(^{39}\): 30x 17 (Is. xxx. 16); 30x 17 (xxxii. 15); 30x 17 (Job i. 15, 16, &c.); 30x 17 (Neh. xi. 7); 30x 17 (1 Chr. iii. 24); 30x 17 (2 Chr. xvii. 8).

3. **Zarqa.** 30x 17 (Ex. iv. 11); 30x 17 (xx. 9).

But here a curious musical change may take place. If Métheg occurs in Zarqa’s word, or Paseq precedes, Mer’kha comes instead of Munach, between Azla and Zarqa, e.g. 30x 17 (Gen. xxx. 16); 30x 17 (xxx. 20) \(^{41}\). Ben-Naphtali, and—to judge from Cod. Bab.—the Orientals, made no distinction of this kind.

---

\(^{35}\) Once (Dikd. hat., § 23) Munach is said to come instead of Azla, 30x 17 (Esth. ix. 15). And so our texts. But most Cod. point regularly.

\(^{36}\) See Mas. to Lev. xxv. 46; and for Deut. viii. 16, Mishp. hat. 25.

\(^{37}\) See Mas. parva 30x 17 viz. here and Cant. vi. 5 (with Tiphcha).

\(^{38}\) One exception is named (Dikd. hat., § 19): 30x 17 (Ezra ix. 15) for 30x 17, and so our texts. Evidently a *lapsus calami*.

\(^{39}\) There is no Mas. here, and the double accentuation fails very generally for some of the instances in Cod. In support of it, see Baer’s note to Is. xxxii. 15.

\(^{40}\) In two passages, 2 Ki. viii. 5 and 2 Chr. vii. 32, Mer’kha is said to occur for Munach in the *first word* (Dikd. hat., p. 23). Maqgaph (which is marked in our texts) has fallen out, and then Métheg been taken for Mer’kha.

Ewald, p. 224, gives a string of passages (copied from Spitzner) in which Munach is put for Azla, when the tone is *not* on the first letter. *But they are all false examples,* and do not appear in correct texts!

\(^{41}\) The exceptions under this head given by grammarians (e.g. Dikd. hat., § 21) are that (1) Mer’kha occurs four times, Deut. xix. 5; 2 Sam. iv. 8; v. 11 (1 Chr. xiv. 1), *without either Métheg or Paseq*; (2) Munach three times, Josh. xviii. 14; Dan. vi. 13; Neh. viii. 15, *before Métheg*; and (3) Munach twice, Gen. xxxvii. 22.
In three instances, Azla takes the place of M ét heg in the same word with Mer'kha:

1. 'מעל למקחי אץ' (Lev. x. 12);
2. 'ונן רגנה' (Judg. xxi. 21);
3. 'וה' (Neh. xii. 44)\(^{42}\).

III. Three Servi. The first is Little T'lisha, the second Azla, and the third as under II, e.g. 'ה الحي' (Num. xviii. 19); 'ה היר' (Gen. xxxiii. 16); 'וודק' (iii. 14).

It is to be noted that three or more servı are entirely due to the transformation of Géresh in the first word,—i.e. allowing the corrections made p. 104. Not unfrequently, Pasęq is employed to mark the dichotomy due on this word.

IV. Four or More Servı. All preceding Little T'lisha will be Munachs, e.g. 'מעתק התִּתְכַּנְנָה' (1 Sam. vii. 10); 'נֶּלֶטָה' (Amos ix. 7); 'מעתק התִּתְכַּנְנָה' (Deut. ix. 4).

T'bhıř and Zarqa are not found with more than four servi; Pashta has five in Josh. xix. 51; 1 Sam. vii. 10; Ezek. xxi. 3; and 2 Chr. ii. 3; and once, 2 Ki. xviii. 14, six. But such long clauses as those last named are generally avoided by the employment of Pazer or Great T'lisha in subordination to the last servus, see next chap., p. 118.

and 2 Ki. iv. 13, before Pasęq. But how unreliable such lists are may be seen from their all omitting Num. xxx. 15, which is fixed by a standard Massoretic rubric to Gen. xxx. 16. Even the Massora is quite wrong in a rubric, cited briefly in Mishp. hat. 16\(^{b}\) and Ginsb. Mas. c, § 229, but which I found given at length in Ox. 2325 to Deut. xix. 5: בְּמַעַל אֶת חָרֵן מִכְּרָא אֶת פָּנַי. לֹא נִעֲשֵׂה הַרְאִיתֵנִי מִכְּרָא אֶת פָּנַי. דֶּאָרִי וְזוּד אָּבֵנִי נִעֲשֵׂה הַרְאִיתֵנִי מִכְּרָא אֶת פָּנַי, then follow the seven instances under 1 and 2, i.e. those under 2 are all without M ét heg!  

\(^{42}\) See Mas. to Lev. x. 12, or Dikt. hat., p. 23.
CHAPTER XII.

GÉRESH, PAZER, AND GREAT T'LISHA.

I TAKE these three accents together, not only because of their frequent interchange, but because they all serve the same purpose of marking the divisions in the clauses governed by B'bhi, Pashta, &c.

GÉRESH. This accent appears under two forms, Géresh proper, and Double Géresh or Gersháyim1. Neither admits of repetition.

Géresh is used when the tone is on the penultimate, e.g. יַעַר (Gen. xix. 2), יַעַר (Judg. xi. 7); or when Azla precedes, as in יַעַר יַעַר (Gen. vi. 13);—Gersháyim, when the tone is on the ultimate, and Azla does not precede, e.g. יַעַר יַעַר (iii. 8); יַעַר יַעַר (i. 11); יַעַר יַעַר (Jer. xliii. 9)2.

Géresh and Gersháyim may stand without a servus. Or Géresh may have from one to five servi3, but Gersháyim can only have one.

1. One servi (a) is Munach, when on the first letter of the word, יַעַר יַעַר (Is. lx. 17). This is the only servi Gersháyim can take.

(β) When not on the first letter, the servi is Azla: יַעַר יַעַר (Gen. vii. 9); יַעַר יַעַר (xi. 31); יַעַר יַעַר (xviii. 25).

2. Two servi. The first is Little T'lisha, and the second Azla (even on the first letter): יַעַר יַעַר יַעַר יַעַר יַעַר (xx. 6); יַעַר יַעַר יַעַר יַעַר יַעַר (Ruth ii. 14).

3. Three or more servi. All before Little T'lisha are Munachs. Three servi are common, four much less so, and five rare4.

---

1 Both were high notes,—the double stroke (we may suppose) with a fuller intonation than the single.
2 Our texts have, of course, their mistakes. Thus Gersháyim is falsely placed in Josh. vi. 23; 1 Sam. xxvi. 19; 2 Ki. ix. 10; &c.
3 It will be observed that the servi are the same, as the second, third, &c., before Pashta, T'bhír, and Zarqa. The reason is that the servi of Géresh remained, after the transformation of Géresh in the first word before the accents named.
4 The examples I have noted with five servi are Judg. xi. 17; 1 Ki. xxi. 2; Jer. iii. 1; viii. 1; xxxvi. 6; Ezek. xlvii. 18; Dan. i. 4. In Jer. viii. 1 our texts have falsely six servi, (see Mishp. hat. 10.)
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Obs.—Azla may take the place of light Métheg in the same word with Géresh (only of course not on the first letter), when no other servus precedes, e.g. הָבְרִיַּו (Gen. xlvi. 4); יְדִיהִי (Ex. xvi. 15); הָבְרִיַּו (Is. xxviii. 4); יְדִיהִי (Deut. vii. 11); מַלְיִיו (Josh. xxi. 38).

Exceptions are: (a) Forms like הָבְרִיַּו (2 Ki. xiv. 9) and יְדִיהִי (Jer. xix. 12). Comp. the failure of Munach with the same forms in Zaqeph's word, p. 81. (b) When R'bhia follows, e.g. 1 הָבְרִיַּו (Gen. xi. 4) and יְדִיהִי (Zeph. ii. 6). Yet if Great T'lisha precedes, Azla takes the place of Métheg, even before R'bhia, comp. Lev. xiv. 51; Deut. vii. 13; xxv. 19; &c. 6

Pazer appears under two forms,—the same in disjunctive value,—Great and Little Pazer, see p. 21.

Little Pazer, or Pazer (as it is simply called), is of frequent occurrence, indeed is indispensable for the proper division of the clauses governed by R'bhia, Pashta, &c. It may be repeated (as we have seen) as often as is judged necessary. Once, 1 Chr. xv. 18, it occurs eight times in succession.

5 Not of heavy Métheg. Hence לְבֵיָו (Ex. xvi. 26). Comp. p. 80, note 16. These fine distinctions have not been noticed by accentuologists.

The instances in our texts in which Azla is omitted, or falsely introduced, are hardly worth recording.

6 The Mas. fin. 33 names four passages,—Josh. viii. 25; I Ki. xii. 24; I Chr. xv. 18; xxviii. 11,—in which Azla stands for Métheg, although Little T'lisha precedes. (Great T'lisha might have stood, and then all would have been regular.)

7 See Mas. to 1 Sam. xi. 9 and Zeph. ii. 6.

8 Little T'lisha has always Azla after it, and as the melody of the two T'lishas must have been similar, it is not surprising to find the same tendency on the part of Great T'lisha.

9 حكمهم واحد في القطع (Ox. 2512). Great Pazer had no doubt a fuller and stronger melody, מַלְיִיו (De R. 1252).

It will be found that Pazer alone, or the last of a series, has generally in musical sequence Great or Little T'lisha after it. Most of the examples to the contrary have been already given in chaps. X and XI, to which are to be added Ex. xxxiv. 4; Jer. xxxviii. 12; Esth. vi. 13; and the instances in which L'garmeh takes the place of Great T'lisha (p. 118), Gen. xxviii. 9; 1 Sam. xiv. 3, 47; 2 Sam. xiii. 32; 2 Ki. xviii. 17; Jer. xi. 11; and Ezek. ix. 2. Sometimes we can correct our texts, as 3 יְיַּו (Josh. iv. 8); 4 יְיַּו (xxii. 9, 31); 5 יְיַּו (Judg. vii. 25).
Little Pazer may stand alone, or may have from one to six servi, all of which will be Munachs. One, two, and three servi are very common, four less so, and five or six quite rare. Examples may be seen in Gen. i. 21; xxi. 14; xxxvi. 6; Num. iii. 4; &c.

Great Pazer, or Karne Phara (as it is commonly called), occurs only sixteen times, and in every instance Little Pazer might be substituted for it. The object of its introduction seems to have been to draw attention to something which seemed to the accentuators noteworthy in the verse in which it occurs. Thus in Num. xxxv. 5 to the measurement laid down (which has indeed perplexed commentators to the present day); in 2 Sam. iv. 2 to the defective reading (נֶעָשְׁנָה has fallen out); in Jer. xiii. 13 to the remarkable explanation of the symbol, verse 12 (comp. the similar example in Neh. v. 13); &c. All mere trifling! nor need we be surprised if we cannot, in some instances, trace the fancy which led to the employment of this peculiar sign. Some punctators dispensed with it altogether. Unlike Little Pazer, it does not admit of repetition.

Great Pazer never stands alone, but is always preceded by at least two servi, the first of which is Munach, and the second Galgal. It may have as many as six servi, all of which, except the last, will be Munachs.

---

10 Once the servus occurs in the same word with Pazer, נֶעָשְׁנָה (Gen. i. 17). Texts have it falsely in נֶעָשְׁנָה (Neh. xii. 41).
11 Five servi I have noticed only in 1 Ki. vi. 1, and six only in Jer. xxxv. 15.
12 Fixed by the Mas. to Ezek. xlvi. 21, viz. Num. xxxv. 5; Josh. xix. 51; 2 Sam. iv. 2; 2 Ki. x. 5; Jer. xiii. 13; xxxviii. 25; Ezek. xlvi. 21; Esth. vii. 9; Ezra vi. 9; Neh. i. 6; v. 13; xiii. 5, 15; i Chr. xxviii. 1; 2 Chr. xxiv. 5; xxxv. 7. Eight times before R’hba, and eight times before Pashta and its sister-accents. (On the number eight in connection with these accents and Pazer, see p. 97.)
13 Comp. Man. du Lect., p. 92 above: מסכום אלה חכמים נזרה פריסי זכר ישו סקוליקס אלה חכמים נזרה פריסי זכר ישו סקוליקס, i.e. ‘because there is in these verses a greater weight, and they are to be made more than usually prominent, for this reason Great Pazers were appointed.’
14 So the Codex known as Sinai: ואלה נכתוב מבער בכל העולם (Ginsb. Mas. ר, § 665).
15 It has five servi in Josh. xix. 51; 1 Chr. xxviii. 1; and six in Ezek. xlvi. 21; Ezra vi. 9; (see Man. du Lect., p. 91.) The Mas. to Ezek. 1. c. has a notice that it has twice seven servi. For the correction, see Baer’s note on the passage.
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Great T'lisha, like Géresh and Pazer, marks the division in clauses governed by R'bhía, Pashta, &c. It cannot be repeated 16; nor can Great and Little T'lisha come together without a disjunctive between 17.

Great T'lisha may stand alone, or may have from one to five servi, all of which will be Munachs. One or two servi are very common, three less so, and four or five quite rare 18.

N. B. Great and Little T'lisha, as being similar in melody, are constantly interchanged in Codd., particularly where the former is subordinated to Géresh or the servus that takes the place of Géresh, p. 116 ff. In such cases the one or the other may stand, e.g. לֶבֶן or לֶבֶנֶּn

16 As in ordinary texts falsely, Deut. v. 14.

17 One example occurs, 2 Sam. xiv. 32, which is doubtless to be corrected, although supported by the testimony of Codd. and of grammarians like Ben-Bil. 9a, and his copyists, Chayyug, p. 129, and Man. du Lect., p. 82. It is a mistake, like the two Zarqas (1 Sam. ii. 15), also defended by Ben-Bil., and like S'göltá (Ezra vii. 13), which has the support of all Codd. without exception, and yet which so conservative an editor as Baer has found it necessary to reject. The simplest correction is found in Ox. 8, Erf. 3, Bomb. 1, רַבָּאָה נֵּּרַבָּאָה נֵּּרַיּ הָלִּבָּאָה, whereby the Little T'lisha is cancelled.

Ben-Bil. (Mishp. hat. 35b) lays down a strange rule, which Baer has adopted in his note to Gen. vii. 7, that Great T'lisha is not allowed after Zaqeph, unless the latter has Pashta preceding. Such a rule, if it existed, would admit of no conceivable explanation. But it does not exist, see Ex. x. 14; Deut. xii. 8; 1 Ki. xvii. 20; xxii. 14; Ruth iv. 14.

18 Four I have noticed only in Judg. xviii. 7; 2 Sam. viii. 10; Neh. iv. 1; vi. 1; and five only in Jer. xii. 11; Ezek. xlvii. 12.

19 All of which admit of correction by the help of Codd.

20 Correct here also רַבָּאָה with Maqqeph. Texts have R'bhía!
and the loose way in which Little T'lisha is often subordinated to Géresh, where Great T'lisha might have stood, that has led to the mistaken notion that Little T'lisha has sometimes a disjunctive value. Comp. p. 26, 5.

The three accents we have just considered mark the last musical and interfunctional divisions. The consequence is that the dichotomy generally fails in their clauses, the utmost that is done to mark it being the occasional introduction of the slight pause made by Paseq: וק המשך הנמצעה על-מינית מביתם (Ex. vii. 19); אוות אפיי ב בוסי להוה (Deut. xxxi. 17); רכיב את עובד אל-כבוד; אב אלixo א الخي' בוהד (Mal. i. 6); אסיר-כיבר ביבר ב (1 Ki. xxii. 2); עשתי אתי רת כליל א-האמר (Num. xxxii. 29); והיとなっている, א-האמר (Num. xxiii. 3); א-הامر וּבְנַי (Ezek. viii. 3).

This is particularly the case with Pazer and Great T'lisha; but with Géresh, the established musical sequence, of which we had so many examples in the chapters treating of R'bhia, Pashta, &c., has been utilized, so as to make Pazer and Great T'lisha serve as dividers of its clause,—Great T'lisha on the first or second word, Pazer on the third word or further,—e.g. בְּרוֹא הָהָהָה הא-האמר קכט מיעל, משל ליהוה (Jon. iv. 6; instead of נְ专业技术-TintColor בְּרוֹא הָהָהָה א-האמר קכט מיעל, משל ליהוה; Neh. xii. 43; instead of נְ专业技术-TintColor בְּרוֹא הָהָהָה א-האמר קכט מיעל, משל ליהוה (Ezek. xxxvi. 6; instead of נְ专业技术-TintColor בְּרוֹא הָהָהָה א-האמר קכט מיעל, משל ליהוה; (2 Chr.

---

21 See, for instance, Gen. i. 25; Judg. x. 6; 2 Sam. xv. 2; 2 Ki. xxiv. 2; Is. xxvii. 1; Jer. iii. 1; viii. 1; Ezek. ix. 6; xliv. 5; Mal. i. 6.

22 The Mas. to 1 Sam. xii. 3 numbers eight passages, in which Little T'lisha is followed by Paseq,—a proof, if any were needed, that it cannot really serve as a disjunctive.

23 Pazer rarely comes on the second word, as in Ex. xxxiv. 4 (comp. p. 113, note 9).
xxii. 11; Pazers instead of Munachs). Comp. Gen. xvii. 8; Num. iii. 38; xix. 13; 1 Sam. xvii. 39; 2 Sam. ix. 10; xx. 3; 1 Ki. ii. 33b; viii. 20b; Jer. xxxv. 15; Qoh. vi. 2.

The distinctness and emphasis, which it might be required to note, were thus secured for Géresh’s clause; although it must be allowed that the division fails at times where we should have expected to find it.

Writers on the accents have found here a confusion, which has much perplexed them. For, in the division of clauses governed by R’bha, Pashta, &c., Pazer constantly marks the main dichotomy, with Great T’lisha following for the first, and Géresh for the second of the minor dichotomies (Géresh therefore marking the smallest of the dichotomies); whereas here, in the same clauses, Géresh marks the main dichotomy, and has Pazer and Great T’lisha subordinated to it. The explanation (as it seems to me) is that the musical pause in the case of these several minor disjunctives was so slight, that they readily lent themselves to this variation in their (relative) interpunctional value. Something similar occurs in our own system of interpunction. The logical pause with the comma is always slight; and sometimes one comma is subordinated to another, sometimes to a colon, semicolon, &c., farther on in the clause.

This subordination was carried out still further. Géresh (as we have seen) does not always maintain its position. When due on the first word before Pashta, T’bhîr, or Zarqa, it is almost invariably transformed to a servus (p. 100). What is observable is that Great T’lisha and Pazer are often found subordinated to this servus (which stands for Géresh), just as if Géresh itself were

---

24 Sometimes, when there are only two words in Géresh’s clause, the first is, for the sake of emphasis or distinctness, pointed with Great T’lisha, as in Gen. vi. 19; Ex. xxx. 31 (corrected p. 60); 1 Ki. xiii. 33; 2 Chr. iii. 2.

25 A corresponding division in Great T’lisha’s clause, with Pazer to mark the dichotomy, is very rare. I have noted only the following instances: Gen. viii. 22; Lev. xx. 17; 1 Ki. vi. 1 (point διασπο with Codd.); Esth. iii. 13; Ezra iii. 9; 2 Chr. xxxii. 2.

26 Of course the accentuators might have adopted another course. They might have introduced new musical notes or phrases, with corresponding signs; but this would have complicated the system, without any appreciable advantage. Practically little or no inconvenience or confusion has resulted from the simpler course, which they preferred to adopt, although theoretically it must be pronounced irregular.
present, e.g. ס"כ הַלֵּבֶן לַלֵּבֶן (Gen. xix. 2); יָנַּבָּה לְעָלָיָו (2 Sam. vii. 10; 1 Chr. xvii. 9); מֵשְׁכַּבְּהָם אֱלֹהִים אָשֵׂר לְעָלָיָו מַלְאָccoli (1 Sam. vii. 14); מַיְבַרְלְךַּיָו לְעָלָיָו דְּנַיָו (1 Chr. xxiii. 13). Comp. for T'hbir's clause, Ex. xxviii. 30; Lev. i. 11; Deut. vi. 22; Josh. xi. 7;—and for Zarqa's, Judg. vii. 20; 2 Sam. iv. 8; Neh. viii. 17.

Exceptions.—Instead of Great T'lisha, L'garmeh is occasionally employed to mark the division in Geresh's clause. The Mas. to Jer. iv. 19 notes eleven passages, in which this accent is subordinated to (מ"כ מ"כ) 28 Geresh, at the second word from it, viz. Gen. xxviii. 9; 1 Sam. xiv. 3, 47; 2 Sam. xiii. 32; 2 Ki. xvii. 17; Jer. iv. 19; xxxviii. 11; xi. 11; Ezek. ix. 2; Hag. ii. 12; and 2 Chr. xxvi. 15. Once, Is. xxxvi. 2, it is subordinated to Geresh transformed. The accentuators must have designed by this exceptional accentuation to signalize these passages as deserving of special notice or special emphasis. The reader may be left to trace for himself these Massoretic fancies, which (it so happens) are for the most part sufficiently obvious. The most notable instance is 2 Ki. xviii. 17 29, on which see notes at end.

27 Comp. in the poetical system (ס"כ מ"כ מ"כ, p. 61) L'garmeh and Pazer subordinated to the servus that stands for D'chi.
28 The expression is hardly correct (although the term מ"כ מ"כ is similarly used in Syriac, comp. Bar-Zu'bl, ed. Martin, p. 4). Ox. 2322 and Jequthiel to Gen. xxviii. 9 have מ"כ מ"כ instead.
29 Where our texts have falsely Little T'lisha with Paseq, for L'garmeh.
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CHAPTER XIII.

L’GARMEH.

I. L’GARMEH’S proper place is in R’bhia’s clause.

1. It marks the dichotomy there, and admits of repetition, as we saw in the chapter on R’bhia, §§ II, III, IV.

2. It stands in the place of Paseq, when this latter sign is due before R’bhia. Thus לָנָאֵמִר רַבּ (Gen. xviii. 15); רַבּ הַנָּאֵמִר (1 Sam. ii. 19); דַּעֵמִר עַזִּי (2 Ki. xiii. 14); (Num. iii. 2) are all instances of Paseq; but the corresponding examples, לָנָאֵמִר רַבּ (Josh. v. 14); מְיִנָּאֵמִר רַבּ (Judg. xi. 40); מְיִנָּאֵמִר רַבּ (2 Ki. ii. 12); and יִנָּאֵמִר רַבּ (1 Chr. iii. 1), all L’garmeh.

The object of the change was simply musical. The rules for Paseq will shew that it could only have stood when R’bhia’s clause consists of two words, or has Géresh on the second word. But here L’garmeh was musically admissible, and was preferred to the simpler melody of Munach-Paseq.

For us indeed the change made has no meaning. For we cannot appreciate the musical distinction, and even the signs are, in the Palestinian system, by some strange oversight, the same (see p. 22).

---

1 To prevent mistakes in the chanting, some punctators marked in the margin of their texts, against the instances in which L’garmeh is due (so Ox. 15, 70, 71; Add. 21161; De R. 2; &c.), and Ginsburg has thought it worth while to fill up page after page of his great work with these marginal notes. But they are no Massora! And what is one to say to them, when they are not even correctly given?!

2 Comp. Ben-Bil. (Mishp. hat. 7b): נִכְפָּרֵם נַבּ וַאֲסִיֵּי הַנָּאֵמִר רֵבָּר, לְבָר. נָאֵמִר וַתְּכִפָּרֵם.

3 The Massora and grammarians allow but one exception in favour of Paseq: לָנָאֵמִר רַבּ (Is. xlii. 5). So Ox. 4 in the Mas. marg. to this passage, הָלִי לְקָנָאֵמִר רַבּ, i.e. ‘the only instance of Paseq immediately followed by R’bhia’, and so Ben-Bil. l.c. The fancy seems to have been to make this passage agree with Ps. lxxxv. 9, where Paseq with the same words must stand.

4 A list of these L’garmehs will be found after the Paseq-list, p. 129.
II. The following are the only examples in which L’garmeh occurs, without R’bha following:

Before Pashta, Lev. x. 6; xxi. 10; Ruth i. 2; and before Geresh (or Geresh transformed), the passages cited p. 118. In these few anomalous cases, it comes where Great T’lisha might have stood. The grounds for the change have been indicated, l. c.

**SERVI OF L’GARMEH.**

L’garmeh may stand alone, or may have one or two servi.

One servi is Mer’kha, יִמְרָקָה (Ex. xiv. 10).

Two servi. The first is Azla and the second Mer’kha: יִמְרָקָה יָסָלָא (Qoh. vi. 2); יִמְרָקָה יַשְׁבֵּשׁ (1 Ki. xiv. 21; 2 Chr. xii. 13). These are, I believe, the only instances. So there are only two passages in the three Books in which L’garmeh has two servi.

---

**CHAPTER XIV.**

**PASEQ.**

We come to the final touch, applied to the system we have been so long considering. After the verse had been arranged musically, according to the rules above laid down, two or more words might be left joined by the accents, which it might nevertheless seem desirable, for the sake of effect in the reading, to separate by a slight pause. The sign Paseq—a short perpendicular line, like a bar—was placed between the words for that purpose. The meaning of the term פְּסֵק, 'cutting off,' =

---

5 See Mas. parva to Lev. xxi. 10, and Mishp. hat. 34b.
6 Ben-Bil. Indeed (Mishp. hat. 34a) makes L’garmeh come before Pazer, citing as examples Dan. iii. 2 and Neh. viii. 7. But these are instances of Paseq. (Yet Heidenheim does not correct this manifest error.)
7 So the Massora requires, see Norzi on 2 Chr. xii. 13 and Ginsb. v, § 230. The authorities quoted by Baer (in his note on Qoh. vi. 2) for two Mer’khas must therefore be rejected.
8 The two other passages, cited in Mishp. hat. 23b—1 Sam. xxvii. 1 and Ezek. viii. 6—are in most Codd. pointed as in printed texts.
'separating,' indicates its function. This sign had no proper musical value, and was therefore not numbered among the accents.

There is only one exception to the general meaning of the sign, and that is when it is associated with Munach, to constitute the independent musical accent, known as L'garmeh. The inventive faculty of the accentuators was certainly here at fault.

In the case of Shalshéleth, Paseq is apparently joined to a disjunctive accent. In reality it has been introduced in imitation of the Great Shalshéleth of the three Books, where it has its proper meaning. Unnecessary it is, and fails in many Codd. See p. 18 above 1.

This sign was subject to certain general rules in its application; but before proceeding to investigate these rules, we must ascertain where it is really due in the text.

Modern writers on the accents have been quite content to take the printed text as a guide, without being aware how incorrect it is. I have noted more than sixty instances in which Paseq fails in Van der Hooght's edition, to say nothing of the passages in which it is falsely introduced.—The printed lists are our only other authority for the Paseqs, but they too are not to be trusted. That given in Bomb. 2 (Massora finalis, letter א) and copied in Buxtorf's Rabbinical Bible (ditto, pp. 60, 61) is disfigured by a mass of L'garmehs, has many omissions, and often marks Paseq falsely in the passages cited. Ginsburg's list, I. p. 647 ff., is equally faulty, frequently offending against the Massora itself and the readings of all respectable Codd. Baer's lists, as far as they go, are of course far more correct, but even they are not altogether reliable.

I was thus driven to draw up a list for myself, and succeeded, after some trouble, in bringing together the necessary materials. Several Codd. exist, which enumerate the Paseqs for the whole of the text, quoting the passages in which they occur 2. Others do the same for particular Books 3. Whilst a third class have the Paseqs marked in the margin by the abbreviation דד or ד 4. By the comparison

1 It is surprising to find Prof. Graetz, in an article on Paseq (in his Monatschrift for Sept. 1882, pp. 394-5), placing it after Pashta and T'bhir! Other extraordinary mistakes are found in the same article.
2 They are the Aleppo Cod. (see Preface, p. x); the St. Petersburg Cod. B 19a (dated A.D. 1009); Add. 15251; and Modena xxvi. By far the most correct of these is the St. Petersburg list, for a copy of which I am indebted to Dr. Harkavy.
3 As Add. 21161, Ar. Or. 16, Or. 2628; Ox. 2438; De R. 196; and Simson's שיר נסipurim.
4 Add. 21161; Ox. 15, 70, 71; K. 154; and De R. 2. Cod. Bab. is also to some extent useful.
of these several sources, I have been able to compile what I believe to be a correct list of the Paseqs, according to the Massora and the ideas of the old punctators. It will be found at the end of the present chapter, and will, of course, be adopted for the rules that follow.

I divide the Paseqs into two classes, the ordinary Paseq, which may precede any disjunctive accent, and separates two words that are kept together by the accents; and the extraordinary Paseq (Paseq dichotomicum), which is confined to certain accents (named below), and appears where three or more words are conjoined.

I. The ordinary Paseqs may be subdivided into

1. Paseq distinctivum, which comes between two words, that are to be distinguished as to sense, e.g. נְמָּה בְּנֵי נְּמָּה (Gen. xviii. 15), in contrast to לְבַשְׁנֵהוּ בְּנֵי לְבַשְׁנֵהוּ (xviii. 21), not to be made (as the ordinary construction would make it) accusative;—יִשְׂרָאֵל יִרְמָא (Josh. xv. 25), to be treated as two distinct names, like יִשְׂרָאֵל יִרְמָא (Neh. xi. 33), and the instances in Josh. xv. 55; xix. 7; Ezek. xlvii. 16.

This Paseq is further found in a few cases of specification, where attention is to be drawn to details, as בְּנֵי תֵרוּ בְּנֵי תֵרוּ (Ex. xxx. 34) and רֵיָה רֵיָה (1 Ki. vii. 29). It is necessary in Neh. ii. 13 and 1 Chr. xxvii. 12 to insure correctness of reading; and in יִשְׂרָאֵל יִרְמָא (Dan. xi. 17, 18) it seems meant as a nota bene to the reader to distinguish these instances from יִשְׂרָאֵל יִרְמָא (ver. 19).

2. Paseq emphaticum, e.g. יְדֵי יְדֵי (Ex. xv. 18); יִרְמָא יִרְמָא.
THIN (Deut. vi. 4); דא (1 Sam. xiv. 45); הֵּ֑מוֹ (Is. xxxvii. 24); יַּ֑עַּל (Ezek. xxxiii. 25); דַֽעַּנְּ (1 Chr. xxix. 15).

The examples under this head are sufficiently numerous, indeed so much so, that we may regard this emphatic use as the chief object of the ordinary Paseq.

In a few cases this Paseq is introduced—to insure emphatic pronunciation—between the Divine names. The most notable instance of the kind occurs in Josh. xxii. 22; but this belongs under II. 2. The other examples are דַֽעַּנְּ (Ex. xxiii. 17; xxxiv. 23); דַֽעַּנְּ (Is. xlii. 5); דַֽעַּנְּ (2 Chr. xxx. 19).

3. Paseq homonymicum. Where a word is repeated, in the same or a similar form, Paseq not unfrequently appears between. (This use of Paseq is closely related to that last given.) E.g.

(Gen. xxii. 11); יַֽעַּנְּ (Num. v. 22); יַֽעַּנְּ (Gen. xvii. 13); יַֽעַּנְּ (Deut. vii. 26); יַֽעַּנְּ (Ezek. iii. 27); יַֽעַּנְּ (Qoh. vii. 24).

We must not, however, suppose that we have here to do with a rule. The accentuators found a certain emphasis in the expressions quoted, which they marked with Paseq, but in the majority of similar instances they omitted the sign. A particular emphasis is no doubt lacking in most cases 8, yet they might have introduced it, on their own principle, in many other passages, as דַֽעַּנְּ (Ex. xv. 1);

8 Thus, we could understand the failure of Paseq, in the case of numerals, יַֽעַּנְּ (Gen. vii. 2); יַֽעַּנְּ (vii. 9), &c.,—of distributives generally, as יַֽעַּנְּ (Lev. xvii. 2); יַֽעַּנְּ (Gen. xxxii. 17); יַֽעַּנְּ (2 Ki. xvii. 29); יַֽעַּנְּ (Ex. xvi. 21), &c.,—of current expressions like יַֽעַּנְּ (Gen. vii. 19); יַֽעַּנְּ (Ex. xxxii. 30); יַֽעַּנְּ (Deut. xix. 21); יַֽעַּנְּ (Gen. xxxii. 31), &c. But instances like these account only very partially for the omission of the sign. For instance, it rarely comes between the inf. abs. and the finite verb, יַֽעַּנְּ והם, &c.; although the very object of this construction is to give strength and emphasis to the expression. Sometimes perhaps we may account for its absence, by supposing that the words were meant to be pronounced with animation and rapidity, as יַֽעַּנְּ (Is. li. 11); יַֽעַּנְּ (lvii. 14).
PASEQ.

4. Paseq emphaticum is introduced, in a few cases, for the sake of distinct pronunciation, when one word ends and the next begins with the same letter: אֵלָה יַעֲר (Cant. iv. 12); אֵלָה יַעֲר (Neh. ii. 12); אֵלָה יַעֲר (i Chr. xxii. 3); and once with cognate letters, אֵלָה יַעֲר (Deut. viii. 15)¹⁰.

The other instances are Judg. i. 7; i Chr. ii. 25; xxii. 5; xxix. 11; 2 Chr. xx. 1; xxxiv. 12. But this small number of examples shews that the failure of Paseq is the rule¹¹, as in בַּעַל יִשְׂרָאֵל (Deut. iv. 39; Josh. ii. 11); נָעֲרֵר דְּבָרָה (Deut. xi. 15); סַעֲרֵר בְּשָׁר (i Sam. xxiii. 11); וַכַּלְכַּל הָעָר (i Ki. xiii. 17); &c. The student may find for himself as many examples as he pleases.

N. B. הָעָר בֶּן (Gen. xviii. 15) does not come under this head, for בֶּן is constantly followed by Yôd, e.g. בֶּן בֶּן (xix. 30); nor הָעָר בֶּן (xxii. 14); הָעָר בֶּן (Ex. xv. 18); הָעָר בֶּן (Jer. xlviii. 20). These are all instances of Paseq emphaticum.

II. The extraordinary Paseq—or Paseq dichotomicum, as it will be more convenient to call it—was due to the circumstance that the accentual system failed to provide the necessary signs for marking the dichotomy, in clauses governed by certain of the minor disjunctive accents. Paseq was then (occasionally) employed in place of the missing disjunctive sign. Thus—

---

¹⁰ See Midrash rabba on Exodus, sect. 2, towards end (quoted by Levy, Neuhebr. W.B., s.v. הָעָר), or Norzi ad loc.

¹¹ In Berakhoth 15b below, the careful pronunciation of such words is insisted on; but no hint is given that Paseq sometimes comes between, to insure it.—This sign was, of course, unknown in the Talmudic time.

¹² The notion that the separation by Paseq takes place, when other letters, as two different labials, or (as Graetz supposes) Mem and Aleph (.), come together, is thus clearly shewn to have no foundation.—If the same letters are generally not separated by Paseq, a fortiori dissimilar ones would not be.
(1) On the first word before Pashta, T'bhir, and Zarqa (see p. 100): מִלְכֶּם אַלָּלִים, לוֹר (Gen. i. 5; comp. מִלְכֶּם אַלָּלִים, verse 8, with the dichotomy marked by T'bhir); בְּנֵוֲהוּ יְהוָה אַלָּלִים אֲנָהּ (xviii. 15); לָאֶמְרְהָו (Deut. ix. 4).

In a few instances, this Paseq represents a minor dichotomy as well: Josh. xix. 51; Judg. xx. 25; 1 Sam. xxiv. 11 (comp. xxvi. 23); Jer. li. 37; 1 Chr. xxi. 15.—In 2 Ki. xviii. 14 it occurs thrice.

(2) On any word before Geresh, Pazer, or Great T'lisha, because these accents have regularly no subordinate disjunctive. For the same reason, Paseq is not unfrequently repeated. E.g. מַדְבַּבְגַּוְתָלַּכְיָאָו, לַמוֹר, יְנָהָוְהָאָו יַהלְמַכְרָה (1 Ki. xxi. 2); בְּהַבְחָנִינוֹתְיוּ, בְּבֵעָשִׁי, בְּבֵעָשִׁי, בְּבֵעָשִׁי (2 Sam. xxiv. 13); בְּהַנִינְיִים אֲלָלִים אֵלָלִים (Deut. xxv. 19).

Exceptions.—Before the other disjunctive accents, Silluq, Athnach, Zaqeph, &c., there was no necessity for Paseq, as a subordinate disjunctive was always available to mark the dichotomy. The only exception is in the case of S'golta, in the following passages: Gen. xxvi. 28; Ex. xxxv. 35; Deut. ix. 21; 1 Sam. xi. 7; Jer. xliv. 25; 1 Chr. xxi. 12. Here Paseq takes the place of Zarqa,—another proof to my mind of its late introduction, for its appearance is doubtless due to the false notion, which prevailed at least from Ben-Asher's time downwards, that S'golta is to be regarded as a kind of appendage to Zarqa (see p. 17). Like Zarqa therefore it might have Paseq before it.

In deciding whether the dichotomy should be marked or not, the accentuators were guided by the same general principles as in the use of the ordinary Paseq. (It is only under the first head that a necessary difference exists, and that an extension must be given to the meaning of the term used.) Thus we have:

1. Paseq distinctivum, marking details, indicating a slight logical pause, easing the reading of a long syntactical clause, &c. Comp. the examples given above, and Gen. i. 21 (Ezek. xlvi. 9);

12 Comp. שִׁלֹּשׁ (Is. vi. 3) and יָדְדֵּית (lxv. 13 bis).
Ex. xx. 4; 1 Sam. vii. 14; 1 Ki. xiii. 11; Jer. xxxv. 15; Ezek. xlv. 1; Ezra vi. 9; Neh. viii. 17, &c. 13

It is particularly employed to separate the Divine Name (in any of its forms) from the word following. In such cases the Divine Name directly precedes one of the accents we are considering 14. With any of the other disjunctive accents, it would in such a position be necessarily marked off by the dichotomy.—A half of the examples of Paseq distinctivum are of this class. Comp. Gen. i. 5, 10, 27; ii. 21, 22; iii. 14; &c.

2. Paseq emphaticum, in Deut. xvi. 16; 1 Sam. xii. 3; Jer. xii. 5; xlix. 37; Ezek. xiv. 21; xxxvi. 5; &c.

But care must be taken to note the context. Graetz has asked, Why has לְיָדָיו in 2 Chr. xxi. 3 Paseq, and in Job xlii. 15 no Paseq? Answer, Because of the marked contrast in the former passage between the first and second halves of the verse—a contrast which fails in the latter.

3. Paseq homonymicum, in the following (eight) instances: Num. xvii. 28; Josh. viii. 33; 2 Sam. xiv. 26; Jer. xv. 12; Ezek. xlvi. 12 and xlviii. 21 (not xlv. 7); 2 Chr. xxi. 19; xxx. 10.

4. Paseq euphonicum, in Ex. xx. 4 (second example); Num. xxxii. 33; Is. vi. 2; lxv. 13; Jer. li. 37 (bis); Hos. ix. 1; 2 Chr. xxxv. 18; &c.

5. Paseq euphemisticum. The object of this Paseq was to separate the Divine Name from a word, which it seemed unseemly to associate with it. We found no example of this Paseq between two words, and the only instances of it in our present division are: יָשָר (Deut. iv. 32); רַחֵם

13 This Paseq is (as stated) used with more freedom than when only two words have to be taken into account. Thus it appears, at first sight, strange that לְיָדָיו (Gen. xxii. 14) should be marked with Paseq (Moses' rising, Ex. xxxxiv. 4, is not so signalized). The explanation seems to be that just before, xix. 27, and just after, xxii. 3, this expression has the dichotomy, and so it is introduced here. In 2 Ki. xxv. 4, the pause made by the Paseq may indicate the missing verb, לְיָדָיו (Jer. lli. 7). In Gen. xxxvii. 22 and 2 Ki. iv. 13 the anomalous servus (p. 110, note 41) may intimate that some punctators dispensed with the Paseq, which certainly appears de trop.

14 When it is the second word, e.g. Gen. i. 25; Deut. ix. 4; Is. viii. 7; Paseq almost always fails.
PASEQ. 127

(1 Sam. xviii. 10; xix. 9) and אֶלֶכֶת רַבָּהְו (1 Ki. xi. 14). This Paseq is more common in the three Books.

But, as in the case of the ordinary Paseq, the failure of the sign is more conspicuous than its presence. It is constantly wanting where it might have marked a necessary distinction, or emphasis; and where two like words, or like letters coming together require it. Writers on the accents, from Ben-Asher to Ewald, have not troubled themselves at all about this strange lack of consistency in the use of Paseq, although it stands in such marked contrast to the precision in the employment of the accentual signs. This circumstance seems again to point to a (comparatively) late introduction of the sign.—The same want of system is seen in the three Books, comp. מֻלָּשָׁה, p. 97.

LIST OF PASEQS17.

(In making use of this list, the student must be careful to distinguish the L'garmehs of the text, see pp. 119, 120.)

Gen. (29) i. 5, 10, 21, 27; ii. 21, 22; iii. 14; xii. 17; xiv. 15 (אֶלֶכֶת רַבָּהְו); xvii. 13; xviii. 15 (תֶּנֶקֶת רַבָּהְו), 21; xxi. 14, 17; xxii. 11, 14;

xvii. 28; xxx. 8, 20; xxxvii. 22; xxxix. 10; xlii. 13, 21, 22; xliii. 11; xlv. 2 (bis).

Ex. (14) xiii. 18 (אֶלֶכֶת רַבָּהְו); xiv. 21; xv. 18; xvi. 5; xvii. 6, 15; xx. 4 (bis); xxiii. 17; xxx. 34; xxxiv. 6 (bis), 23; xxxv. 35.

Lev. (8) v. 12; x. 3, 6, 12; xi. 32, 35; xiii. 45; xxiii. 20.

Num. (22) iii. 2, 38 (אֶלֶכֶת רַבָּהְו); v. 22; vi. 20, 25, 26; ix. 10; xi. 25, 26 (bis); xv. 31; xvi. 7 (bis); xvii. 21, 28; xxi. 1; xxii. 20; xxx. 13 (אֶלֶכֶת רַבָּהְו); xxxii. 29, 33; xxxv. 16.

Deut. (22) iii. 20; iv. 32; v. 8 (bis, as in Ex. xx. 4); vi. 4, 22; vii. 1, 26 (bis); viii. 15; ix. 4, 21; xvi. 16; xvii. 8; xxii. 6; xxv. 19; xxvii. 9; xxviii. 12, 20, 25, 68; xxix. 12 (אֶלֶכֶת רַבָּהְו).

15 Some punctators on this principle mark אֶלֶכֶת רַבָּהְו אֵשֶׁךָ (Gen. xxiii. 6). So De R. 7, 266; Bomb. 1 and 2. See Norzi and Ginzb. iii. p. 54.

16 So also after the Divine Name, as in Gen. iv. 15; viii. 18; xi. 8; Ex. xxx. 11; Is. liv. 17; 1 Chr. xxviii. 4; &c. Sometimes individual punctators introduce the Paseq in such instances.

17 I have put in brackets the Paseqs (61) that fail in Van der Hooght's text.

The totals of the Paseqs for the several Books I have taken from the St. Pet. Cod. Other lists supply the same partially. These numbers supply a useful means of control, so that it is rarely necessary to take account of the variations that occur in Codd.

18 The lists give 22 as the total, but furnish only 21. I have no doubt that the missing example is אֶלֶכֶת רַבָּהְו אֵשֶׁךָ (iii. 4). Paseq is found here in many Codd., Ox. 19, 22, 23, 26, &c., also in Bomb. 1; and is marked in the margin כָּרָא, in Erf. 1; De R. 2, 7.
Josh. (22) i. 15; ii. 19 ('נְתַנְתְּךָ); viii. 33 (ter); xi. 20; xiv. 10 ('תַּנְתֵּךָ); xv. 7, 25, 55; xix. 7 ('לֵךָ), xli, 51 (ter); xxii. 22 (quater), xli, 31 ('חֲנָנָא), 32; xxiv. 32.

Judg. (9) i. 7; ii. 18; xi. 17 (bis, 'דְּמָא); xiii. 5 (אָזְךָ); xviii. 2; xx. 25 (bis, 'רְמָךְ), 35.

1 Sam. (32) i. 3 ('מַעַנְתָּךָ, 'תַּנְתְּךָ); ii. 16, 19; iii. 9 ('יְתַנְתְּךָ), 10; v. 9 ('תַּנְתְּךָ); vii. 14; ix. 10, 16, 24 ('םַנַּנְתָּךָ); xi. 7; xii. 3; xiv. 3 ('תַּנְתְּךָ); xvii. 11 ('לֵךָ), 36 ('תִּנְנִית), 45 ('תַּנְנִית); xvi. 40; xviii. io (ter); xix. 9; xx. 12, 21 ('דְּמָא); xxiv. ii (bis); xxv. 14, 25, 31, 36; xxvi. 7, 23; xxviii. ii ('קַדְעָרִים).

2 Sam. (11) i. 1; iii. 12, 21; vii. 24; xiv. 26, 32; xx. 3; xxiv. 3, 13 (bis), 16.

1 Ki. (25) i. 36, 45 ('אָנַּנְתָּךָ); ii. 30; vii. 24, 25 (bis, 'תַּנְתָּךָ); viii. 24, 29, 35 ('תַּנְנָא); vi. 65; xi. 14, 22, 36; xii. 16 (bis, 'תַּנְנָא); xiii. 4, 11; xviii. 12; xix. 7; xx. 25, 30; xx. 2 (bis, 'לַנְנָא); xxii. 8.

2 Ki. (17) iii. 16; iv. 13, 19; vii. 1; x. 5, 6; xii. 22; xiii. 14; xviii. 14 (ter); xix. 4, 16, 23 ('קַדְעָרִים); xxiv. 2; xxv. 4, 17.

Is. (27) iii. 7; iv. 5; v. 19; vi. 2 ('תִּנְנִית); xii. 11 ('לַנְנָא); xxi. 2 (bis); xxiii. 12; xxvi. 3 (bis); xxv. 7; xxvi. 3; xxxii. 4; xxvii. 4, 17, 24; xl. 22; xlii. 5; lvi. 19; lvii. 2 (סֶל 'לַנְנָא); lxxiii. 7; lxv. 13; lxvi. 19, 20 (bis).

Jer. (30) i. 13; iv. 1, 19; vi. 11, 14; vi. 9; viii. 11; ix. 2; x. 5; xii. 5; xvi. 25; xxvii. 5; xxxii. 6; xxxi. 40; xxxii. 44; xxxiii. 16; xxxxiv. 15 (bis); xli. 10; xliv. 25; xlvi. 20; xlix. 24 ('לַנְנָא); 1, 4, 29; li. 2, 37 (bis, 'לַנְנָא).

Ezek. (24) iii. 27 (bis); vii. 11 ('תִּנְנִית); viii. 3; xiv. 21; xxi. 3; xxvi. 16; xxxiii. 25 ('תַּנְנִית); xxxiv. 8; xxxv. 12; xxxvi. 5; xxxix. 11; xlii. 16; xliv. 1; xlvii. 9, 12 (bis), 16, 17; xvii. iii. ('חַנָּנָא), 35.

And, as the Massora adds, Joel 1, 'נְתַנְתְּךָ, 'נְתַנְתְּךָ, Zeph. iii. 15; Hag. i. 12; ii. 4, 20; Zech. xi. 12; xiv. 24.

---

19 The number fixed by the St. Pet. list for Samuel is 43; and for Kings, 42.
20 By a lapsus calami on the part of the copyist, the St. Pet. Cod. gives the total as 13!
21 This example fails in all lists, although fixed by the Mass. to Gen. xxxix. 10.
22 The second 179 is with Paseq; the first with L’garmeh, p. 118.
23 There has again been a mistake on the part of the copyist of the St. Pet. Cod., for while he gives the total as 23, the list contains 24.
24 Baer gives besides Zech. iii. 2; iv. 7, on the authority of the Mas. parva Erf. ms. But this Codex is elsewhere wrong, in fixing the Paseqs, e.g. in 1 Sam. viii. 19; 2 Ki. iii. 25. Some few texts indeed also give these examples in Zech., but they are not found in any list.
Five Megillôth. Cant. (8) i. 13, 14 ('jîthôh); ii. 7, 13 ('jîthôh); iii. 5, 11 ('lôhô); iv. 22b; viii. 4.—Ruth iv. 11;—Lam. (8) i. 15, 16; ii. 1, 5, 6, 7 ('lôhô), 8; v. 21.—Qoh. (2) i. 6; vii. 24;—Esth. (14) iii. 7; ix. 7-9, 27 (bis, 'jôhmîhôh); x. 1 ('lôhô').

Dan. (8) iii. 2; iv. 20; v. 12 ('lôhôh), 23; ix. 18, 19 (bis); xi. 17, 18 ('lôhôh).

Ezra (5) vi. 9 (ter, lôhîh 1 lôhîh); vii. 17 ('lôhôh); x. 9.
Neh. (12) ii. 12, 13; viii. 6, 7 (bis), 9, 17 ('lôhôh), 18; xi. 33 ('lôhôh); xii. 44 ('lôhôh); xiii. 15 (bis).

1 Chr. (28) i. 24 ('lôhîh); ii. 25; viii. 38; ix. 20, 44; xii. 18, 20, 40; xiii. 6; xv. 18; xvii. 22; xxi. 3 (lôhîh), 12 (bis), 15 (bis); xxi. 3, 5; xxiv. 6; xxvii. 1 (bis) 26; xii (lôhîh); xxviii. 1 (lôhîh); xxix. 2, 11, 15 (lôhîh), 21, 23.

2 Chr. (29) i. 11 (lôhîh); ii. 9; iv. 3, 4 (bis, lêhîh 1 lôhîh); x. 16; xii. 6, 7; xiii. 12; xvi. 8 (lôhîh); xviii. 7; xix. 10; xx. 1, 8, 22; xxi. 3, 18, 19; xxiv. 11 (lôhîh); xxvi. 17; xxx. 10, 19, 21; xxxiii. 14; xxxiv. 12; xxxv. 18, 21 (bis), 25.

I add a list of the L'garmehs, which take the place of Paseq before R'bhia (p. 119) 27. The rules for their occurrence will be the same as those for the ordinary Paseq, given above 28.

Gen. iii. 15; xvii. 14; xxiii. 6; xxix. 9b; xl. 5; Ex. xxx. 13; Num. vii. 18b, 19b, &c.; x. 29, 35b; xx. 21; Deut. i. 33b; v. 4, 22b; xxxii. 39; Josh. v. 14; ix. 12; Judg. xi. 40; xvi. 2; xvii. 7b; xx. 28, 31b, xxxi. 19, 22, 29; i Sam. ix. 9, 12b; xvi. 5, 7b; xx. 25; xxvi. 16b; 2 Sam. xii. 23; xv. 20, 30b; 1 Ki. vi. 29; vii. 23b; vi. 4b; 2 Ki. ii. 12; v. 22; xvii. 36; xxv. 16; Is. ix. 16; xix. 16b; xxii. 8b; xxii. 2, 11; xlix. 21b; Jer. xx. 4; l. 34; lii. 20; Ezek. xxxv. 17; xxxv. 12; Zech. i. 8b; vi. 15b; xiv. 12b; Cant. iv. 14; viii. 14; Ruth i. 13; iii. 3, 13; Qoh. ix. 3; Dan. iv. 15b; Neh. ii. 12; i Chr. iii. 1b; xxvii. 10; 2 Chr. iv. 2b; xxi. 19.

25 The number for Ezra and Neh. varies between 15 and 17. Some lists (as St. Pet., Aleppo, and Modena) reject the first example in Neh. viii. 7; and all omit xii. 44, although the Mas. to Lev. x. 12 requires it. Note what Ben-Asher says (Dikd. hat., p. 23), הַרְבִּישׁוֹנֵי יְהָדוֹת הַרְבִּישׁוֹנֵי יְהָדוֹת הַרְבִּישׁוֹנֵי יְהָדוֹת. And so the old Codd. Add. 21161 and Erf. 3 point.

26 The number fixed in the St. Pet. list for Chronicles is 57.

27 The lists omit the second Paseq of Van der Hooght's text.

27 Perhaps some additional instances may be found, which I have overlooked. I have purposely omitted Josh. xv. 18 (comp. Judg. i. 14); Is. vii. 25 (although marked in Baer's text); Dan. xi. 6 (with various Codd.); and 2 Chr. xvii. 3 (do.).

28 Attention may be drawn to Judg. xvi. 2; 1 Sam. xvi. 7; and 2 Chr. xxi. 19, where L'garmeh seems to indicate the defective grammatical construction, as Paseq in 2 Ki. xxv. 2.

29 Many texts omit.
APPENDIX I.

NOTES ON SOME DIFFICULT OR OTHERWISE NOTEWORTHY PASSAGES.

(A.V. stands for Authorized Version; R.V. for Revised Version; and Prob. for Probebibel, the German revision of Luther's translation.)

Gen. xx. 13. יְרוּם יִבְשָׂר הַחֹשַׁךְ עַטֶל אֲלֵיהּ מְנַעַת אֶלֶּה. The R'hitia here—the greatest disjunctive in S'golta's clause—is due to the over-scrupulousness of the early accentuators, who shrank from associating the Sacred Name with a Verb signifying 'to cause to err.' What monstrous interpretations were the result may be seen in Targ. Onq. and Sopherim iv. 1. The proper accentuation is יְרוּם יִבְשָׂר הַחֹשַׁךְ עַטֶל אֲלֵיהּ מְנַעַת אֶלֶּה, found, more or less correctly given, in various Codd. 2

xxxv. 22. We have here a double accentuation,—the one with Silluq at הַשָּׁכָךְ, answering to the number of verses (154) in the Parasha and further indicated by ס (המשתתפ) following,—the other with Athnach at הַשָּׁכָךְ, adopted by the Occidentals, that Reuben's abominable act might be slurred over in the chanting as rapidly as possible. The Orientals kept to the single accentuation with two verses (see Baer's Five Megilloth, p. v, and Ginsb. Mas. i. p. 592), which must have been the original.

Ex. xx. 3-17 and Deut. v. 7-18. The Orientals and Occidentals differed also in the pointing of the Decalogue. The former had the single accentuation (known as נִרְאָּלוֹן) according to the commandments. This was no doubt the original, for the verses of the Parasha in each case are reckoned accordingly (72 and 118). On the other

1 The Jerus. Talm. (Megilla 13a) and Jerus. Targ. try to get over the fancied difficulty by treating מַעֲרֵי as הַשָּׁכָךְ (profanus); but this explanation did not meet with acceptance, as the accents shew. Some commentators indeed adopted it and sought to accommodate it to the recognised accentuation, by taking מַעֲרֵי יְרוּם as 'the (false) gods of my father's house!' So Bekhor Shor, and the author of the old Commentary known as מַעֲרֵי (quoted in מַעֲרֵי ad loc.).

2 Ox. i, 5, 34, 2437; Add. 15250, Harl. 1528; Berl. 4; Leipz. i.

3 On the same ground the Mishna (Megilla 25a) directs: מַעֲרֵי 'to be read without Targum.'

4 See Pinsker, Einleitung, p. 48 ff.
hand, the Palestinians introduced a second division (ןוותהנה אתיות), breaking up the longer verses (3–6, 8–11), and bringing together the shorter ones (13–16); with the view of easing and equalizing the reading.

xxv. 34 (xxxvii. 20). One of the five passages in the Tora, named in the Talmud (Yoma 52a) and Mas. to Deut. xxxi. 16, as והל יא מ"ר, 'about (the accentual division of) which no decision had been arrived at.' The question was whether מ"ר is to be taken with what precedes, or what follows (see Rashi). The LXX translate one way, the Targums another. The Massoretic text agrees with the latter.

xxxii. 11b. מ"ר הנם ב"ב ני. The traditional construction supposes a transposition, 'This man Moses.' See LXX, Vulg., Pesh.—Similarly מ"חר comes after the nom. pr., Ezra viii. 17.

xxxiii. 19. מ"ר הנם ב"ב ני. According to the accents, 'And I will proclaim Jehovah by name.' Comp. xxxiv. 6 and R.V. xxxiv. 5 marg.

Num. xxxvi. 5. א, with Zaqeph (although no Codex so); comp. xxxvii. 7. אב is made by the accents a particle, as in verse 10b: so the LXX 오으ונ. In the same way אב, Is. iii. 24b, is treated in most texts as a particle.

Deut. v. 19. מ"ר הנם ב"ב ני, kept together by the accents, in accordance with the strange rendering found in the Talmud (Sota 10b, Sanhedrin 17a), Targums, and Pesh., 'With a loud voice, that did not cease,' i.e. without intermission. See Rashi.

xxvi. 5. מ"ר הנם ב"ב ני cannot be rendered, according to the accents, 'An Aramaean, ready to perish, was my father,' for that would require the Pashta at רב: but must be taken to mean, with Targ., Midrash, Vulg., and Rashi, 'An Aramaean (Laban) sought to destroy my father.' Aben-Ezra, Rashbam, Qimchi, and modern scholars generally, reject the accentuation. Yet Heidenheim, in his commentary מ"ר הנם ב"ב ני, defends it, and Baer (in a letter to me) agrees!

5 But this division seems not to have come into general use. At least, the public reading has long been according to the longer verses.

The terms מי and נְרָתָה have reference to the position of the accents,—the longer verses shewing a large proportion of accents placed above the words, whereas in the shorter verses the accents below the words greatly preponderate. Comp. the expressions מ"ר הנם ב"ב ני and מ"ר הנם ב"ב ני in the Mas. to Gen. xxiii. 3.


7 מ"ר taken in the sense of מ"חר (Niphal). The same meaning was assigned to the word in Gen. xxxviii. 26 and Num. xi. 25.

8 Siphre and עבש מ"חר.
Accents must remain, as both Targums, LXX, and Pesh. shew. We must then translate, 'They corrupted (injured) Him not.' Jerome, Aben-Ezra, and of course moderns, rightly break loose from the accents.

Josh. iv. 3. אֲנִי לְהַעֲשָׂרֵךְ. Kept together by the accents. The inf. constr. (fixed by Mas. ad loc.) must not be confounded—as by Targ., Qim., R. V., &c.—with inf. abs. בָּלָּן (iii. 17), and joined, contrary to the accents, with the words preceding. Comp. Knobel and Keil.

vi. 10b. Accents support Driver's view, Heb. Tenses, p. 161, Obs. Parallel is 2 Sam. x. 5b (1 Chr. xix. 5).

Judg. vi. 24. Some Codd.—as Ox. 13, 2324; Harl. 5773; Erf. 2—and the Soncino ed., point בָּלָּן לְהַעֲשָׂרֵךְ, and this is no doubt correct; except that, according to the Paseq rules, we ought to have בָּלָּן לְהַעֲשָׂרֵךְ, comp. Ex. xvii. 15; Ezek. xlviii. 35.

xii. 4b. According to the accents (note the two Zaqephs) we must render:

'Fugitives of Ephraim are ye!

Gilead (his place) is in the midst of Ephraim, in the midst of Manasseh.'

Comp. Ewald, Gesch. ii. p. 455.

xiv. 15 end. The accentuation requires us to take בָּלָּן as בָּלָּן, 'hither.' So Targ. and Tanchum. If the punctators had regarded בָּלָּן as interrogative, they must have pointed: בָּלָּן לְהַעֲשָׂרֵךְ. Some few Codd. (see De R. Var. Lect.) read בָּלָּן, but this is contrary to the Mas. (Frensdorff, p. 251) 10.

xv. 19b. באֹל הַנִּשָּׁמָת הַבְּעוֹד הָעַד הַיָּמִין הָעַד. A false accentuation, due to a false rendering,—to be traced in LXX, Vulg., and Pesh.,—which takes פָּנָי here, as in the early part of the verse, in the sense of 'jaw-bone.'

xvi. 28b. יִפְסָל הַנִּשָּׁמָת הַבְּעוֹד הָעַד הָעַד הָעַד. The accent is made by the accents emphatic; Samson asks for vengeance for one of his eyes. The reward for the other was to be in the world to come! This explanation—although not accepted by Targ., LXX, Vulg., and many modern scholars—is found in Talmud 11, Midrash 11, Rashi, Qim., and

9 This too is what is meant in Midrash rabba on Leviticus, Par. 9.
10 There is an interesting marginal note in the old Reuchlin Cod. of the Prophets (K. 154): בָּלָּן לְהַעֲשָׂרֵךְ. The Schools at Sura and Neharda’a belonged to the general category of Orientals (ונרדה). 11 See Jerusalem Talmud, Sota, cap. i, § 8; and Midrash rabba on Numbers, Par. 9.
adopted by our best modern commentator, Bertheau. It seems indeed the only possible one, with the text as it is.

2 Sam. v. 6b. The accentuation is in accordance with Targ., LXX, and Vulg., which make the subj. of the second רָבָּ מָלֶל ‘the blind and the lame,’ who are represented as making themselves responsible for the safety of the city against David’s attacks.

xi. 25 end. The message sent is the important part of the verse. Hence it commands the main division (comp. p. 35β). רָבָּ מָלֶל, as of minor importance, is joined on to the latter part of the speech.

xv. 34. Note the mispunctuation of our texts, בָּ שֶׁ מָלֶל, which can only mean: ‘And thou shalt say to Absalom thy servant: I will be the king, &c.’ Correct בָּ שֶׁ מָלֶל, with Ox. i, 10, 12, 13, &c.

xx. 18 end. מָלֶל בָּ שֶׁ מָ לֶל, made by accents a part of the בָּ שֶׁ מָ לֶל, ‘And so they will certainly attain their end.’ Perf. of assurance, like בָּ שֶׁ מָ לֶל, v. 6 (see above). If the accentuators had meant to express the meaning adopted by Vulg., Qim., and moderns, they must have pointed מָ לֶל with R’bhia instead of Zaqqep.

1 Ki. vi. 1. The emphasis is thrown on the second of the dates named. (Just so in Ezek. xl. 1.) But point מָ לֶל, Great T’lisha, with Ox. 7, 76, 2326; Harl. 5710; &c.

xviii. 42b, 46. The accents dwell on the pictorial features. Hence the division is not as with us.

2 Ki. iii. 25. התַּנְמָרָא בָּ שֶׁ מָ לֶל. The false accentuation here is due to the mistaken notion, found in Targ., Versa., Rashi, &c., that מָ לֶל is an appellative: ‘They left the stones thereof in the wall’ (broken to pieces, like) ‘a mass of sherd.’ Even the vocalization, יְנֵ , with the article, seems occasioned by this strange explanation. Qimchi was apparently the first to see that מָ לֶל is nom. pr., as in Is. xvi. 7.

x. 15. מָ לֶל בָּ שֶׁ מָ לֶל. Rabb. comm., one and all, take מָ לֶל מָ לֶל together. Their explanation is מָ לֶל בָּ שֶׁ מָ לֶל. With the rendering usually adopted—found in LXX and Vulg.—the accents must have been quite otherwise.

xviii. 17. מָ לֶל בָּ שֶׁ מָ לֶל. Why the irregular L’garmeh (p. 118) in Géresh’s clause? Because the accentuators designed a special warning for the reader. Only Rab-shakeh’s name was to be associated with Lachish. Tartan and Rab-saris, as they are not named in Is. xxxvi. 2, were supposed to have come later, at the head of the second embassy (xix. 9). But that was sent from Libnah, not from Lachish (xix. 8)12. Their names

12 Comp. Seder ‘Olam, cap. 23, quoted by Rashi and Qimchi.
therefore were carefully separated from Lachish by the special disjunctive L'garmeh, whilst Rab-shakeh's was joined to it in the regular way. A notable specimen of Massoretic exegesis, the connection of which with the accentuation seems to have escaped every one's notice.

Is. i. 5. Targ., Abu'l-walid (Opuscules, p. cv), and Aben-Ezra join יָרוֹ יֵשָׁנָה יִתְנַטַּבְּרָה with the words following, and this pointing is found in some Codd.,—as Bab.; Ox. 23, 78,—לַעֲלֹתָה לַעֲלֹתָה יַעֲלֹתָה יַעֲלֹתָה מֵאָרָה. But unquestionably the textus rec. is right.

i. 9. Here also 실ות הנשים כאלים are taken together, in Berakoth 10a, and by Targ., Abu'l-walid (l.c.), Rashi, and even Cheyne,—against the better sense, the unvarying accentuation, and the Massora (ב"מ ע"מ).

i. 13. 'Incense of abomination is it to me.' So Targ., Rashi, Ewald, &c. The disregard of the accents, found in LXX, Vulg., and some Rabb. comm., shews itself also in A.V. and R.V.

v. 24. Cod. Bab. has לְבָנָה לְבָנָה, making לְבָנָה acc. loci. Even with our pointing, it may be so rendered, see p. 46, 3. It is quite unnecessary, with Ewald, Hitzig, and Ges. Lex., to translate foenum flammarum, i.e. flagrants.

viii. 14b. No commentator, ancient or modern, seems to have noticed that the accentuation here is untenable. It has been due to a false interpretation, found in Targ. and Rashi, which takes הֵלַעֲלֹתָה as in apposition to תִּשְׁחַתְתָה יִתְנַטַּבְּרָה. 'To the two houses of Israel, who set themselves as a gin and a snare' &c. If we would pay any regard to the sense, we must point: לְבָנָה לְבָנָה לְבָנָה לְבָנָה מֵאָרָה מֵאָרָה מֵאָרָה מֵאָרָה.

viii. 23. The marked emphasis resting on the words 'יִתְנַטַּבְּרָה has led to the main pause of the verse being placed there. What follows, 'וַיְהִי מֵאָרָה מֵאָרָה, may be treated as Zusatz (see p. 57), 'by the way of the sea, &c.' Comp. Ewald. It is not necessary to suppose, with Luzzatto, that the Athnach is due to the Haggadic paraphrase of Targ.

ix. 5b. נָּאָרָה, an abnormal accentuation,—the object being to mark not only the Name, but in a special and emphatic manner the separation of נָּאָרָה from נָּאָרָה, 'Wonder,—Counsellor.'

13 Which Cheyne and others have not seen; or, if they have, ought, in all fairness, to have pointed out.

May I (without offence) remark that one learned professor after another has got out of his depth in trying to explain the accentual and grammatical peculiarities of the few words quoted? (1) Caspari (Micha, p. 223) makes of the Pashṭa a Qadima,
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The regular accent for this purpose would have been יִנְפָּא. (On the general division of the half-verse, see p. 49, 1.)

xvii. 5. יָנָבְּרָא יְהֹוָה יִנְפָּא. Most commentators neglect the accents, which however are duly regarded in LXX and Pesh.; יָנָבְּרָא being taken in the same sense as in verse 11.

xix. 9. יַחֲשֹׁוֹנ, adjective outside the rest of the clause, see p. 53, 3 a. Not to be rendered as Delitzsch proposes.

xx. 4. The Athnach fixes the limit to the comparison made with Isaiah, for certainly he did not go יָנָבְּרָא יִנְפָּא.

xxiii. 7b. According to the accents must be translated: 'Whose feet were wont to carry her, from days of old, from her first beginning, to sojourn afar off.' The version of Rabbinical commentators and most moderns would require: יִנְפָּא יָנָבְּרָא יְהֹוָה יָנָבְּרָא יִנְפָּא.

xxv. 1. יִנְפָּא יְהֹוָה יִנְפָּא. 'Jehovah, my God art Thou!' Emphasis.

xxviii. 28. The R. V. pays attention to the accentuation. Not so the bulk of modern commentators.

xxix. 16a. Not understood,—as ancient Verss. and Jewish comm. down to Luzzatto shew. Hence the false accentuation: יִנְפָּא יָנָבְּרָא יָנָבְּרָא יְהֹוָה.

xxx. 7b. In Ox. 4, 74, 78; Add. 11657, we have the pointing יָנָבְּרָא יִנְפָּא יָנָבְּרָא יְהֹוָה יָנָבְּרָא יִנְפָּא, which suits the rendering: 'Rahab! they are a sitting still.'

xxx. 21. Accents make the last words a part of the speech. So Targ., LXX, Vulg., Pesh., and Qim., against Aben-Ezra and moderns.

xxx. 32. No commentator (as far as I have observed) has seen that for the ordinary rendering to stand, we must have R'bhia at יָנָבְּרָא יִנְפָּא; but this we cannot introduce, because the Massora (see p. 107) has fixed יָנָבְּרָא יִנְפָּא יָנָבְּרָא יְהֹוָה יָנָבְּרָא יִנְפָּא. Vulg. and Prob. pay regard to the accentuation.

xxxiii. 23. A case of parallelism with addition (p. 39). Jewish commentators refer the whole verse to Assyria. Had they referred,

and will give a reason for it! (2) Delitzsch proposes an impossible accentuation, יְהֹוָה יָנָבְּרָא יִנְפָּא יָנָבְּרָא יִנְפָּא יָנָבְּרָא יְהֹוָה, Gershom before and after T'Lisha! (3) Kautzsch (Ges. Gr., § 93, Anm. 1. D), disregarding the accentuation—as though vowels and accents were not from the same source—would have us believe on the authority of Dikd. hat., § 36, that יִנְפָּא is in st. constr.; yet if he had looked on a few pages to § 72 of the same work, he would have found this notion plainly contradicted, as indeed it must have been sooner or later, for it is in direct opposition to the Mas. to Lev. xxii. 23. One would not have expected to find an antiquated error, due to the first groping after grammatical rules, revived by a German professor in the present day!
with many modern commentators, the first part of the verse to Jerusalem and the second to Assyria, Athnach could not have failed at ḫ. As it is, the helpless hulk falls a ready prey.

xxxvi. 2. See note, 2 Ki. xviii. 17.

xxxviii. 13a. How are we to account for the accentuation? Gesenius and those who have followed him, down to Cheyne, say: 'From the exigencies of rhythm,'—a notion which Jewish writers would have passed by as שַׁבָּאת. With the rendering which these scholars propose we should have had שַׁבָּאת בַּעֲלָם יִטְמוּן; comp. xl. 3 and a hundred other passages. The accents are no doubt to be traced to the same source as the false version of Targum: 'I roared as a lion, till the morning.' Comp. also Sa'adia14.

xlv. 1. According to Rashi on Megilla 12b, the anomalous accentuation (Zarqa without S'golta following 13) was meant to draw attention to the traditional שַׁבָּאת, found in the text of the Talmud, l.c.: 'Was then Cyrus שַׁבָּאת ? Nay! the Holy One said to the Messiah, I complain to thee concerning Cyrus, &c.'16 Such crotchets of Jewish learning we may well put on one side, and point regularly (with our ordinary text and many Codd.) שַׁבָּאת. Only then shall we require R'bbia, instead of the first Zarqa17, שַׁבָּאת מָשָׁאֵל שַׁבָּא תֶּנֶנֶנֶנֶנֶנֶנֶנֶנֶנֶנֶנֶנֶנֶנֶנֶn. An alternative punctuation is found in O.x. 2431; Add. 21161; Hm. 9: נִעָרָיו אֲנָה הַבּוּז, which is an improvement, but contrary to the Mas. Lev. xi. 34. With the ordinary pointing,.must be taken as נִעָרָיו, ver. 16b.

Ivi. 9. The ridiculous accentuation of this verse can only be rendered in one way. See Rashi, Qimchi, &c.

Ixvi. 5b. For the meaning of the accents, see Rashi, Aben-Ezra, or Rosenmüller.—The Vulg. and most moderns (see e.g. Delitzsch) rightly disregard them.

Ixvi. 12. Strange that no commentator before Luzzatto should

---

11 Sa'adia's text is to be read: 'וְשָׁבָּאֵת אָסַדְתַּיִךְ לִבְרַאֲרֵה הָלָּדַּה.' And I was like the lion in his roaring, until the morning.' So Or. 1474, 2217. No sense can be made of the O.x. text, as edited by Paulus.

15 Cf. Baer's text and the Mas. parva found in many Codd. (O.x. 69, 2323; Erf. 1, &c.) אין לו בַּעֲלָם יִטְמוּן, or אין לו בַּעֲלָם יִטְמוּן.

16 So Sa'adia: קֶרֶס (regarding) שֶׁהֵן. The title שֶׁהֵן, applied to no other heathen king, was counted too great a one for Cyrus. Hence some other interpretation had to be found; and Cyrus' name, in comparison, slurred over.

17 With Harl. 5498, Add. 9398, 9399; Par. 4, &c.
have found any difficulty in the accentuation 18: 'Behold, I extend to her, as a peaceful river and as an overflowing stream, the glory of the Gentiles,' &c. Did the accentuators miss the art, in this, and consider that something else was intended than by the נְבֵלָהּ ַשָּׁרֵךְ of xlviii. 18?

Jer. xxxii. 9b. נְבֵלָהּ ַשָּׁרֵךְ. On the division here, which has completely baffled commentators, see Rule, p. 42 above.

Ezek. i. 11. הָקַמְתֻּ אֲדֹנָי, a further instance of the Rule just quoted.

iii. 20. מִתָּה נוֹטָה to be made, as accents indicate, a relative clause. (So Abendana, Ewald, Hitzig, and Prob.) In b the logical division is neglected, that the emphasis may come on the first words: 'Because thou hast not warned him, in his iniquity he shall die.'

iv. 6. Punctators sometimes shew the same differences of opinion as commentators. In this verse, Ox. 17; Harl. 5498; and Par. 4, have Athnach at נָו וַיִּנְתַּן. And so in vii. 13b, Ox. 17, 69, and Bab. have נָו וַיִּנְתַּן; in xv. 2 Bab. has נָו וַיִּנְתַּן, with LXX, Vulg., and Ewald; in xviii. 30b, Ox. 1, 6, 7; Erf. 1, 3, have נְבֵלָהּ נְבֵלָהּ, and in xxxi. 15 most Codd. have נְבֵלָהּ נְבֵלָהּ. Such examples might be greatly multiplied.

vi. 10. וַיִּתְנַתְּ הַנִּכְלָהָה וֹפִיתָ הַנִּכְלָהָה. Note the emphasis thrown by Athnach on the Divine Name. 'And they shall know that I Jehovah have not spoken in vain,' &c. If the student has any doubt on the point, let him turn to such parallel passages as xxii. 22b; xxxv. 12; xxxvii. 14b; Num. xiv. 14; Jer. ii. 19.

xxi. 3b. Render, 'Behold, I kindle in thee a fire, and it shall devour in thee every green tree and every dry tree, without being quenched,'—"inflaming flame (that it will be).' The last words are in apposition to the latent subject in נְבֵלָהּ, and come in, as such, with marked effect, at the close of the clause. Comp. Jer. ii. 23b. The ordinary rendering would require Zaqeph, or at least R'hnia, on לָשׁוֹן.

xxv. 9b. Accents, 'the glory of the land of Beth-jeshimoth,' &c., and so Pesh. renders; but this cannot be correct. Yet I have not found נְבֵלָהּ נבּוֹלָה, which is what we require, in any Codex.

xl. 1. The stress is laid on the second of the dates named (comp. above, 1 Ki. vi. 1). The destruction of the old city is emphasized, in contrast to the revelation of the new one, in the verse following.

xliv. 22b. On the Zaqeph in נְבֵלָהּ see Comm.

19 Driver, Heb. Tenses, § 162.
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Mic. ii. 4. Accents evidently treat as subj. with LXX, Rashi, Qim., and even some modern authorities. For the rendering usually adopted, 'rebellious, reprobate,' we need Tiphcha on רֹעֶה, and this is found in some Codd., as Ox. 6, 7; Add. 4708, Or. 1474.

iv. 10. We expect Zaqeph at הבֻּל (comp. modern interpunction). But a fine antithesis is established by the accentuation: 'Thou shalt come to Babylon, there to be delivered.' Babylon was the last place in the world where deliverance could have been anticipated.

Hab. i. 3. ויִיוֹר יִתוֹר הָלֹא מִיְּדָוָהָ. Almost all modern commentators neglect the accentuation, although this is one of the passages in which the Massoretes have been very particular in fixing it (see p. 92). יִתוֹר make a common subject to נָאֵה (Ges. Heb. Gr., § 148. 2).

ii. 18. The Athnach simply represents a pause for effect, such as we might make in reading the verse. Rabbinical commentators, however, see in it the main logical pause, and begin the second half of the verse by repeating הָלֹא מִיְּדָוָה, 'What profit is there in all these, that &c.?'

iii. 3, 9, 13. The extraordinary rendering assigned to הָלֹא מִיְּדָוָה, in Talm., Targ., &c., suffices to account for the false accentuation, most conspicuous in verse 9.

Hag. ii. 16. נָאֵה מִיְּדָוָה, 'Since they (those days) were,' subordinated, as יִתוֹר, &c., p. 48. 5.

Cant. viii. 6. Most Codd. have הנֶבֶר as our texts (see Rashi on the accentuation). But the modern rendering, 'Its flashes are flashes of fire, a flame of Jah,' is much more effective, and has also the support of Codd., Ox. 6, 2437; Add. 15282, Harl. 5506, &c., thus: נֶבֶר.

Qoh. ii. 3. Almost all modern commentators silently transfer Athnach to הנֶבֶר. The accentuation on the other hand will give the meaning: 'And my heart was to guide me in wisdom, and was (at the same time) to lay hold on folly.' This rendering, with its oxymoron of insipiens sapientia, is far more telling than the tame construction adopted, as more regular, by moderns.

ii. 16. The weight of meaning comes on the first clause. Hence the Athnach.

viii. 10. The A. V., with the old Verss. and Rabb. comm. generally, respects the accents; but R. V. and most moderns follow Aben-Ezra, and quite disregard them.

10 On the inf. with יָם, as continuing the part. construction, see Driver, Heb. Tenses, § 206.
viii. 11. Ewald and Hengstenberg try to do justice to the accentuation; but, with the rendering usually adopted by both ancient and moderns, we must point, Vulg., with Ox. 20, 36; Add. 9399, Or. 2696; De R. 10; (comp. similar examples, p. 51 above) 21.

ix. 10. Codd., e.g. Ox. 13, 17, 26, 34, give us the option of joining 'do it with thy might,' as Targ., LXX, Vulg., A.V., R. V., &c.

xi. 8. The last words, בלה אֲשַׁשְׁתָּם לְךָ, are properly logically distinct, but have been joined on to the clause preceding, from their supposed close connection with it in sense: "Let him remember the days of darkness, that they will be many, (that) all that cometh (after the present life) is vanity.'

Esth. ix. 31. The Athnach is better transferred to מְשִׁתָּם, as Targ., Vulg., and Rabb. comm. render. See also Bertheau. This pointing is found in Add. 4709 and Hm. 19.

1 Chr. vi. 46a. There is a fatal omission here, which Jewish commentators do not fail to notice, and which the accents are meant to indicate: הַסִּמְכָּה תֹּשְׁתֵּמָה is supposed to stand for סִיסְמֵתָה מְשִׁתָּם מִפְּסַלְתָּה, (comp. Josh. xxi. 5) 22.

ix. 17b. מִיִּנְחָנָּה is contrary both to the Mas. (which requires מִיִּנְחָנָּה) 23 and the accentuation. Yet no commentator makes any remark. Vulg. frater eorum and Pesh. are right. The reading מִיִּנְחָנָּה has necessarily led to the pointing of our texts, which we must correct with Codd., שְׁאֵנִי הָלוֹא מִיִּנְחָנָּה.

2 Chr. xxiv. 14. Translators and commentators follow LXX and Vulg. in the rendering of רְשֵׁבָּה, but the latter have not a syllable to say about this rendering being contrary to the accents. The accents indeed represent the uniform Jewish tradition that an instrument or vessel of some kind is meant 24. A tradition of this kind introduced into the Massoretic text deserves at least notice.

21 Luzzatto (Kerem Chemed ix. 7) saw that this pointing was necessary, but found no MS. to support it. Delitzsch, in his remark on the accentuation, has not seen that the Qaṣeph extends its influence to Athnach, which makes his explanation inadmissible.

22 It is considered that יַנִּשֵּׁפְּרָסָפָר (Josh. l. c.) may be dispensed with, because Dan is not named—but included in Ephraim—vers. 51-54.

23 See Frensdorff, p. 9, and יָשָׁבְרָסָפָר § 17.

24 The word is derived by Abu'l-wallid (Lex. s. v.) from the Hiphil form. The notion—found in Pseudo-Rashi, and marg. of A.V. and R. V.—that it is the pl. of וָּשֵׁבָּה (Prov. xxvii. 22), 'pestles,' cannot be entertained, for the article is out of place here, and the meaning quite inappropriate.
2 Chr. xxx. 18, 19. Not only LXX, Vulg., and Pesh., but Jewish tradition from very early times, as in the Middoth of R. Eli'ezer, § 11, made these verses run into one another. By the abrupt break in the middle of the prayer, the Massoretes seem to have designed (more suo, when employing an anomalous accentuation) to draw special attention to the prayer itself—a prayer without a parallel, the meaning of which extended far beyond the occasion that called it forth.

The following notes relate to passages of less importance:

Josh. ii. 5. R'bhia has been falsely introduced. Point ר'ביה, with Ox. 2436; Harl. 5683, 5773, Or. 2091; &c.: 'And the gate was about to close at dusk.'

Judg. iv. 21b. ידוק, with Ox. 19; Add. 4709, 9398, Or. 2696; &c. Comp. p. 33, note. For the Qames in ידה, see Norzi.

1 Ki. vii. 6b. Better ועב ידוק, with Ox. 13; Hm. 3, 11; as Vulg. and Thenius render.

vii. 36b. If we are to make any sense, we must point ידוק, with Ox. 1, 72, 2329; Harl. 5722; &c.—a double Zusatz, see R. V. The words were not understood by Jewish scholars, who derive רכוש from the post-biblical רכש (Piel), 'to join.' Hence the false accentuation of our texts.

2 Ki. xxii. 14 (2 Chr. xxxiv. 22). Point נֶקַע, with Vi. 5; K. 172. Printed texts and Codd. generally make Charchas, not Shallum, 'keeper of the robes.'

Is. xxviii. 16b. נֶקַע, with Ox. 1, 9, 69; Erf. 2; &c. R'bhia is necessary for the sense.

xxxv. 1b. Better נֶקַע, with Bab.; Ox. 13; Erf. 1, 3.

xl. 13. Here also it is better to accent נֶקַע, with Bab.; Ox. 5, 82; Erf. 2; &c.; and so avoid the mistake of Targ., Sa'adia, and Qim., who render: 'Who hath prepared the spirit? Jehovah.'

95 The tradition was followed by Sa'adia, Qim., Pseudo-Rashi, and the author of the Comm. on Chron. edited by Kirchheim. If we except the doubtful paraphrase of the Targum, Aben-Ezra (e.g. in Sachoth, p. 73b) was the first to propose an independent construction for ver. 18, by supplying הָנָה after נֶקַע. He owns that he stands alone. And he hardly found a follower till Gesenius in his Thesaurus, p. 706, proposed the same explanation.
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Jer. li. 58. Again the better pointing is רֶחֶם יַעַרְזֵנֵי with Ox. 70, 72, 76; Erf. i; &c.: 'The broad wall of Babel shall be razed to the ground.' Comp. Ewald, § 318a.

Ezek. xlv. 21b. נִנְצוּ בְּאַשֵּׁר יִשְׂרָאֵל. Note the st. constr. in יִשָּׂרָאֵל.

Amos vi. 6. The accentuation of our texts רֶחֶם יַעַרְזֵנֵי corresponds to Targ., and the notion of Rabb. comm. (see Baur's note) that the st. constr. stands here for st. abs. But Bab.; Ox. 70, 76; Erf. 3; &c., point regularly נִנְצוּ בְּאַשֵּׁר יִשְׂרָאֵל.

Cant. i. 3. Point נִנְצוּ בְּאַשֵּׁר יִשְׂרָאֵל. So Ox. 15, 19, 51; Erf. 1, 2, 4; and the Verss.

Qoh. i. 5b. Targ., Verss., Rashi, Aben-Ezra, all render as if they had before them רֶחֶם יַעַרְזֵנֵי, which is beyond doubt the true accentuation, and is found in Ox. 12, 26; Add. 4709, 21160; &c.

Dan. ix. 25. R'bhia and Géresh must clearly change places, thus: רֶחֶם יַעַרְזֵנֵי. Ox. 97; Add. 15250; De R. 518, have R'bhia, but only Ox. 97, Géresh right.

Ezra x. 14. The same correction is necessary: לְגֹד֕וֹר יַעֲדֵשׁ נִנְצוּ בְּאַשֵּׁר יִשְׂרָאֵל. But here Codd. are all wrong. Only Par. 31; De R. 737; and Hm. 16, have R'bhia right.

1 Chr. iii. 17. Jewish tradition, LXX, Vulg., and A.V. make רֶבֶנֶךָ a nom. proprium. We must then point רֶבֶנֶךָ נִנְצוּ בְּאַשֵּׁר יִשְׂרָאֵל, with Ox. 6, 71, 72; Add. 9399; &c.

iv. 19. A similar correction is needed here: רֶבֶנֶךָ נִנְצוּ בְּאַשֵּׁר יִשְׂרָאֵל. But this I have found only in De R. 552 (old) and 775.

2 Chr. iv. 9b. For the sense it is necessary to point: נִנְצוּ בְּאַשֵּׁר יִשְׂרָאֵל, with Harl. 1528, Add. 15252; Ber. 32.

Note.—My readers may perhaps have noticed in the foregoing remarks that the Targum, and no less Rabbinical commentaries, do not always agree with the accentuation. We see that from early times a certain liberty was claimed in rendering and expounding the text. The accents, although respected and generally followed, were not regarded—notwithstanding particular assertions, as those of Aben-Ezra, to the contrary26—as of final authority. With respect to the Targums, we may bear in mind that the most important ones are of Oriental origin, which circumstance may account for some at least of the variations.

26 Comp. Luzzatto, Prolegomeni, p. 187 ff.
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ON THE SUPERLINEAR [SO-CALLED BABYLONIAN] SYSTEM OF ACCENTUATION.

The researches of a Qaraite Jew, Abraham Firkowitsch, in the synagogues of the Crimea, brought to light, about fifty years ago, some Hebrew MSS. marked with a peculiar system of punctuation, previously quite unknown to scholars. The characteristic of this system, as regards the position of the signs, is that they are almost all above the words (i.e. above the line from which the words depend). To the term ‘superlinear’ therefore as describing it, no exception can be taken; whereas ‘Babylonian,’ as we shall afterwards see, is a misnomer.

The accentual notation found in these MSS. (as compared with the Palestinian) is as follows:

1. Silluq remains unchanged.

2. Athnach is the same, but is placed above the word.

3. S'golta is represented by a mutilated Shin, the initial of נ' (p. 17).

For a description of the MSS. containing this punctuation, see Cat. of Heb. MSS. in the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg, Nos. 132, 133, and B 3. (Ox. 64 is a fragment of 132, although not so described in the Ox. Cat.) Of the three MSS. named by far the most important is B 3, which contains in a state of perfect preservation the whole of the later Prophets. It was photo-lithographed in 1876, at the expense of the late Emperor of Russia, and so placed at the service of scholars. The text of this Codex—known as Codex Babylonicus—is all we need to form a correct idea of the system we are about to consider. I may, however, add that there is in the St. Petersburg Library a fourth MS., not yet catalogued (but labelled as Tschufut-Kale 84), containing Job xxxv. 10 to end of the book. (A specimen of some verses of this Codex is prefixed to Baer's edition of Job.) Till these MSS. were discovered, the only notice of the existence of a superlinear system of punctuation was contained in the following epigraph to a MS. of the Pent. with Targ. in De Rossi's Library (dated 1311), no. 12: "The Chaldeans, who count with one hand, have counted on the fingers of two hands, and have written the words of the Pentateuch in a way different from the Received Text or the Leningrad Codex (comp. Zunz, Zur Geschichte u. Literatur, p. 110)."
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Shalshéleth has the figure of a hanging 'chain' (p. 17), followed by the sign for S’gólta.  

4. Great and Little Zaqeph are not distinguished. The sign is the initial letter of ס”ג (p. 18).  

5. Tiphcha before Athnach is Athnach inverted. Tiphcha before Silluq is the Palestinian sign, or the initial of ר”ב (p. 18).  

6. R’bhia is represented by the initial of ר”ב.  

7. Zarqa. The initial letter could not be used, because it was appropriated to Zaqeph. So apparently the name ר”ב (p. 19) was taken, and the second letter chosen as the sign.  

8. Pashta and Y’tibbh are not distinguished. The common sign is the initial of ב”י (p. 20). For the peculiar form of the sign, see (in Cod. Bab.) Is. xix. 25 marg. Where Pashta is repeated, a simpler form is given to the second sign, and it is made recumbent.  

9. T’bhir, represented by the initial letter.  

10. Géresh and Gersháyim have one sign, the initial of ג”ש (p. 20).  

11. L’garmeh. The sign is the initial of ל”ג (p. 22). Pazer and Great T’lisha fail.

---

2 This accent is described in the Mas. to Is. xiii. 8 as שדא סביסלם, —which should rather have been שד אסביסלם. But Zarqa, according to the fancy of the later Massoretes, threw S’gólta into the shade (see p. 17).  

3 In Cod. Bab. (Mas. to Jer. xiv. 18) we find the strange name 'יוממך, 'set upright,' used for Zaqeph. Comp. Ginsb. Mas. iii. p. 364, § 19.  

4 In the text of Job this sign is regularly used; in Cod. Bab. but very rarely, except in the first page, Is. i. 4, 8, 9, &c.  

5 This name for R’bhia occurs in a list at the end of Sepher Hariqma, p. 239, and in a manuscript list before me. Certainly no name could be more appropriate, for the frequent ‘recurrence’ of this accent is a main characteristic of the system. In Or. 1473, I found the initial of כ”ח used.  

6 So in the Mas. magna to Num. i. 20, the כ”ח for the names of five out of the twelve tribes is either the second or the third letter; and in Arabic, the sign for כ”ח is כ, the third letter. —The Dagesh in the case before us was retained, to distinguish the sign from that used for L’garmeh, no. 11.
The servi employed—Munach, M'huppakh, Mer'kha, Darga, Azla, and Little T'lisha—are the same as in the Palestinian system.

The originators of this system seem to have taken note of the weak points of (what I must assume for the present was) the older system, and to have applied a suitable correction. Thus the sign for L'garmeh cannot now be mistaken for Munach-Paseq; and Pash'ta can no longer be confounded with Azla, nor Y'tibh with M'huppakh. Simplicity was also evidently aimed at by the employment of a single sign respectively for Zaqeph, Pash'ta, and Géresh; and by dispensing with the unmeaning accent, Great Pazer (and Galgal). But it was a mistake to reject Little Pazer and Great T'lisha, which are (generally speaking) needed for the division of the clauses in which they occur. R'b'ha, which takes their place in this system, does not answer the purpose.

Before proceeding to the special rules for this system of accentuation, there is a question in limine, that requires to be answered. Was this superlinear accentuation, with its equally peculiar vocalization, identical with the Oriental mode of punctuation? Such (as far as I have noticed) is the view of all scholars, who have expressed an opinion on the subject. But this is a mistake, which, though excusable, is none the less a serious one. The notation in use among the Orientals (מְדוֹרי) was beyond question the same as that of the Occidentals (שִׁוְיוֹן), differing only occasionally in its application. How otherwise are we to explain the Oriental reading ofֵּקְטָצָעְתָּנֵב (Ezek. xxiii. 5)? The superlinear system has no ס'ג'ול, and writes this word (as Cod. Bab. shews) ס'ג'ול (סֵג'ול). We learn from this example that the Massoretes, in giving the לְוֵי מְדוֹרֵי, quoted a text constructed on the same system as the Palestinian. Can indeed (I would ask) a single Massoretic rubric be found, which alludes to the peculiarities of the superlinear system? and yet the differences of this system are far more important than most of those which are given under the name of the Orientals. The system was in short for the Palestinian Massoretes non-existent.—Moreover, what Gaon, what grammarian (Rabbincn or Qaraite), what Jewish writer, of the East or West, can be named who mentions a different mode of punctuation as in use among the Orientals? Has their silence no meaning?

---

7 See Baer's edition of Ezekiel, p. 110, and Ginsb. Mas. i. p. 596, and iii. p. 32.

8 Where reference is made, as it often is, by Jewish authorities, to the לְוֵי מְדוֹרֵי between the two great Schools of the East and West, it is in such terms as we might apply to the remains that have come down to us. I have given two instances, p. 6, note 14, and here is a third, clearer still, as late as the 12th century, from the וֹאָדוֹת חֶסְדֵּי וֹרָכִי of Elia ben-Abraham (quoted by Pinsker, Liqq. Qad., p. 102): יָנוּר רָאִי לְוֵי מְדוֹרֵי וֹרָכִי הָוָּא אֶמֹרָכְנָה הָוָּא הָוָּא אֶמֹרָכְנָה הָוָּא שִׁלָּמֹרָכְנָה הָוָּא שִׁלָּמֹרָכְנָה הָוָּא שִׁלָּמֹרָכְנָה הָוָּא שִׁלָּמֹרָכְנָה הָוָּא שִׁלָּמֹרָכְנָה הָוָּא שִׁלָּמֹרָכְנָה הָוָּא שִׁלָּמֹרָכְנָה הָוָּא שִׁלָּמֹרָכְנָה הָוָּא שִׁלָּמֹרָכְנָה הָוָּא שִׁלָּמֹרָכְנָה H
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Especially important is this negative testimony as furnished by Sa'adia's writings. Here was a Gaon, at the head of one of the chief Oriental Academies—a scholar, who was in the habit of going into the minutest details of any subject which he handled—(who lived too after the date of the introduction of the system we are considering), and yet who knows positively nothing of any Oriental differences answering to the differences of the superlinear punctuation. For instance, in chap. ii. § 2 of his commentary on Jesira, he enumerates the seven vowels, including S'gol, and in iv. § 3 he lays down the vocalization of the article in נא"ה, as with S'gol, and of the final guttural in forms like יבש, as with Pathach; yet does not add (as according to modern scholars he ought to have done) that the Orientals had no S'gol, and that they pointed יבש with Pathach and יבש without Pathach. What is observable is that in the very section last quoted he mentions other differences of pronunciation between the Orientals and Occidentals.—The conclusion is that the Oriental system of vocalization had no such distinguishing peculiarities as the superlinear, in other words was identical with the Palestinian; and what is true of the vocalization, must have held equally good for the accentuation.

9 Cod. Bab. was written in the year 916, and Sa'adia was called to Sura (when thirty-six years of age) in 928.
10 I quote from the Ox. Cod.

11 We now see the unfortunate mistake that has been made in naming this newly discovered system Babylonian (= Oriental). The mistake is not, however, altogether of modern origin. For it is but fair to state that this system is recognised as 'Oriental' in some of the Tschufut-Kale Bible Codd. (48, 87, 103, 116), e.g. Cod. 87, 1 Sam. xxv. 3, Mas. פ"ר ק"ת ר"ב ול"ב; and 2 Sam. xiii. 21, Mas. פ"ר וטפ"ש ו"ש פ"ש and Cod. 116, Ps. cxxxvii. 5, פ"ש, note, פ"ש פ"ş
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In what light then are we to regard this superlinear punctuation? It stands outside the system common to the Oriental and Occidental Schools, and would seem to have been an attempt to simplify and introduce regularity into the older system. The influence of the Arabic is evident in the vocalization, and perhaps also in the accentuation, where initial letters represent the accents, just as in Arabic they stand for Teshdīd, Meddā, &c.

Such an attempt, even if more successful than it actually was, could hardly have been looked on with favour by the heads of Schools in the East, and by other scholars, who may have become acquainted with it; for it must have seemed to them very like a tampering with sacred things,—the punctuation being referred at least to the authority of Ezra. Hence we may explain their silence with regard to it. The inventors of the system themselves shrank from applying their new-fangled signs to the Sacred Name יהוה (נַוָּה), which is either marked with the older Qāmeš-sign נָו (as in 132, 133), or not marked at all (as in Cod. Bab. and Tschufut-Kale 8a) 13. A proof of the inferior esteem in which this system was held is that in Yemen, where it was in use in a modified and much simpler form, the Sacred text, when associated with Targum or Forms of prayer, has generally the Palestinian signs, and only the latter the superlinear 13.

That this system is of Oriental origin may indeed be taken for granted from its exhibiting, as in Cod. Bab., the readings peculiar to the Orientals. It was an Oriental, but not the Oriental, system.

The relation in which it stood to the Palestinian (which was one and the same with the Oriental) is indicated by the vowels and accents of this last-named system being constantly found in the MSS. with superlinear punctuation. This phenomenon receives its ready explanation, if we suppose the superlinear punctuation to have been an offshoot from the Oriental,—in which case it naturally remained under the influence of the system from which it was derived, and by which it must have been always overshadowed. I shall aim, in the following remarks, at shewing that the relation thus indicated really

writers of these notices were doubtless in the same position as modern scholars. They had no other texts with Oriental readings, and naturally concluded that the texts which contained such readings, exhibited also the Oriental mode of punctuation.—It is different with the name ‘Assyrian,’ adopted by some scholars, on the authority of the epigraph, quoted in note 1. But can we trust the unsupported testimony of a single copyist? Is it likely that an Italian Jew, of the 14th century, should have known the origin of this system, when scribes living in the East were ignorant of it? The statements contained in the epigraphs to Jewish texts have always to be received cum grano.

12 Later punctators indeed, as those of the Yemen Codd. of the 14th and 15th centuries in the British Museum, were less particular.

13 A specimen of Bible text with Targum is given in Pl. XCI of the Palaeographical Society’s Publications (Oriental Series). Oxford Scholars may also compare the Siddurs (1145 and 2498) in the Bodleian Library.
existed. Of course I shall confine myself to the accentuation; but we may rest satisfied that if so important a part of the punctuation was derived, the whole system was no less so.

It is time now to turn to the peculiarities of this system (as far as the accents are concerned). And of these by far the most striking is the frequent recurrence of R‘bbia, in season and out of season. This accent is found subordinated not only to S‘golta, Zaqeph, and Tiphcha (as in our system), but to all the disjunctives in turn (except L‘garmeh), even to Géresh and a second R‘bbia! Indeed the originators of this system went out of their way to bring in this favourite accent, as may be seen in Is. x. 24; Jer. xiii. 11; xxxvi. 6; &c. In the case of the other disjunctives, the variations from the Palestinian usage (mistakes having been corrected) are unimportant. Géresh and L‘garmeh are found more freely used (with the exception that L‘garmeh is not repeated) before R‘bbia; L‘garmeh and Paseq frequently interchange, &c. But these are minor matters. The general conformity of the two texts—when allowance has been made for the abnormal use of R‘bbia—has not been sufficiently noticed by scholars. But the key found, all is perfectly simple.

14 Thus, with this allowance made, all the main rules for the sequence of the accents given in the previous pages—as for the position of Athnach in the verse; the substitution of Zaqeph for Tiphcha before Silluq or Athnach, pp. 62 and 69; the subordination of S‘golta and Zaqeph to Athnach, p. 70; of R‘bbia and Pashita to Zaqeph, p. 77 f.; &c.—are carried out.

15 Who, for instance, would suppose, from reading Pinsker’s ‘Einleitung in das Babylonisch-Hebräische Punctuationssystem,’ that there was this general conformity? Prof. Strack indeed remarks (Zeitsch. für Luth. Theol. 1877, p. 31): ‘Die Accente werden im Codex Babylonicus nach ziemlich denselben Regeln gesetzt, welche für unsere Bibelhandschriften gelten. Man hat nur wenige Besonderheiten des babylonischen Systems stets im Gedächtniss zu behalten, um im Stande zu sein, die meisten tiberianisch interpungirten Verse umzuaccentuiren.’ But though he mentions, in the note, that R‘bbia takes the place of a second Zaqeph, and may occur as many as seven times in the same half-verse, he has failed to see that the singular rules for the introduction of R‘bbia are the main cause of the peculiarities to which he refers. He was, however, on the right track in adding (p. 32): ‘Dies ist ein neuer Bewis dafür, dass das babylonische System sich nicht selbständig gebildet hat.’ It is a pity that the learned Professor did not pursue his investigations further. But he was doubtless hampered by the notion held by him, in common with other scholars (see his article on the Massora, Herzog’s Encyclop. ix. p. 393), that the Babylonian system of punctuation was one and the same with the superlinear,—a notion which he has supplemented by the hypothesis (l.c.): ‘Dass ursprünglich warscheinlich nur ein System existirte, welchem das übliche, tiberiensische, in bezug auf Stellung und Form der Zeichen näher gestanden haben dürfte als das babylonische.’ I give these views of Dr. S., though only partially agreeing with my own, because he is the only scholar, beside Pinsker, who has carefully considered the subject of the superlinear accentuation.
The following rules will shew how it is that R'bhia is of such frequent occurrence:

1. Pazer and Great T'lisha are wanting; and Géresh is confined to R'bhia's clause, and even there is not admitted if L'garmeh follows. And instead of these accents—i.e. of Pazer and Great T'lisha; of Géresh in the clauses of Pashta, Zarqa, and T'bhir; and of Géresh in R'bhia's clause, when L'garmeh follows—R'bhia is used; or if two of them come together, R'bhia, preceded by Géresh (or less frequently L'garmeh), may be employed. It is these changes that occasion the most frequent variations in the accentuation.

2. The repetition of Zaqeph is not allowed. If due a second or third time (according to our texts), R'bhia appears instead.

3. R'bhia is not transformed (as in the Palestinian system, see p. 90, 2) in Tiphcha's clause.

The result of the above variations is that many clauses are overburdened with R'bhias. The question suggests itself, Could such a system have ever been practically in use for chanting?

Let us next notice how these rules are carried out; and we shall see clearly that we have to do with a derived—not, as is generally supposed, an original and independent—system.

a. Of course, when R'bhia takes the place of Pazer, Great T'lisha, or Géresh, the servi (if any) should be made to conform to the change of accent. But what do we find? The original servi (as I shall call them) constantly left standing. Thus, those of Pazer, מִלְיָה (Is. xxxi. 4); of T'lisha, מִלְיָת מִיתָרָיָא (Ezek. viii. 11); and more conspicuously of Géresh, מִלְיָת מָרְסָיָא מִיתָרָיָא (Jer. viii. 1). And yet R'bhia, when standing in its own right, has its servi in agreement with the Palestinian system, as in Is. v. 25; xi. 2; xxx. 6; &c.

b. So when Géresh stands for Pazer, Great T'lisha, or Pashta, the servi of these accents remain, e.g. of Pazer, מִלְיָת מָרְסָיָא מֶמְלַכְת (Ezek. xxxiv. 8); of T'lisha, מִלְיָת מָרְסָיָא מֶמְלַכְת (Is. lxvi. 22); of Pashta, מִלְיָת מָרְסָיָא מֶמְלַכְת (Is. ii. 4). But Géresh, when originally due, has its regular and well-known servi, as may be seen everywhere in the text, e.g. Jer. iii. 1 (five servi).

g. The rule for the transformation of a second and third Zaqeph is regularly carried out. Thus, הַנְּכַנְּכּוּר חָלַלְוֹת הַנְּכַנְּכּוּר חָלַלְוֹת (Is. xxiv. 2) becomes הַנְּכַנְּכּוּר חָלַלְוֹת חָלַלְוֹת חָלַלְוֹת (Is. xxiv. 2).
Here also we see that we have to do with a derived system; for where Zaqeph (with two words in its clause) has Pashta preceding, as in the example just quoted, R'bhia takes Géresh before it, but where Zaqeph has a servus, as כנומבדיע (Is. xxi. 1), R'bhia retains the servus. Now for Zaqeph there is a fixed rule, see p. 75; but there is no corresponding rule for R'bhia in this system.

Observe also what confusion is the result of this transformation of Zaqeph. There may be a R'bhia subordinated to it,—as in Is. lxii. 4; Jer. iii. 46; Ezek. xx. 28b,—but instead of this R'bhia being transformed to Géresh (or L'garmeh), as the sense requires, when R'bhia has taken the place of Zaqeph, it is allowed to remain! In short, as with the servi above, the transformation has been only half carried out.

8. This system accepts the principle of the transformation of R'bhia in Zaqeph's clause; for where Pashta stands in our text, according to the rule pp. 78-9, it has also Pashta. In the few instances also in Cod. Bab.—Is. xx. 2; xliv. 14; Jer. xxi. 4; xxxvi. 32,—in which a second R'bhia is due before S'göltia, transformation has taken place, although not to Zarqa, as in our texts (see p. 88), but to L'garmeh. [The query is, whether Zarqa was not originally intended; comp. the similarity of the two signs, p. 143.] So far the Palestinian practice has been followed. But the inconsistency that runs through the whole system again shews itself. The rule for the transformation of R'bhia has not, and could not have, been carried out generally, or the main characteristic of the system (p. 147) would have disappeared. Hence two or more R'bhias in immediate sequence are as common as can be.

Even in Tiphcha's clause the second R'bhia stands, e.g. כנומד ומכ (Is. xxxvii. 24), where we have כנומד (see the rule and examples, p. 91). In Ezek. xl. 42 we find R'bhia transformed in the first half of the verse before Zaqeph, but not transformed in the second half before Tiphcha.

It is unnecessary to go into further details. We may conclude, with absolute certainty, from the instances cited, that the Palestinian punctuation was before the originators of this superlinear system. Their

and Deut. ix. 5b (Ox. 64), where, through an oversight, the second Zaqeph has been left standing. In Jer. xix. 15; xxv. 30; xxxv. 17, the second Zaqeph has been transformed, but not the third.

18 Another indication is that where our text has יָנַיָּם יָנַיָּם, and the Zaqeph is changed into R'bhia, Qâmes still remains, as in Jer. ii. 19; Ezek. vii. 12; Hos. iii. 4.

19 Or, by some strange mistake,—as in Is. xxxviii. 3; Jer. v. 19b; xliii. 10,—T'bhir. That Pashta, however, is the proper sign is clear from the servus M'huppach preceding.

20 I believe that it would be equally easy to show that the superlinear vocalization, which, as a system, is far more complete and coherent, still presupposes the Palestinian as a basis.
attempt, however, to modify and improve upon it must, as far at least as the accents are concerned, be pronounced a failure, and for us quite worthless. Inconsequent and contradictory, this new system is a mere travesty of the Palestinian. Even the simplicity apparently aimed at by the constant introduction of R'bhia leads only to confusion, by destroying the fine lines of distinction established for the sense by the older system.—I do not, of course, mean to deny the proper value attaching to Codd. with this peculiar notation, which consists in their furnishing Oriental readings, quantum valeant, not to be found elsewhere,—among which are accentual variations that are sometimes not without interest.

I have already mentioned that the superlinear system is found in a modified and much simpler form in MSS. that have been lately brought from Yemen. But these MSS. will not detain us. The accentuation, so far as it is superlinear, is in all cases very incomplete. Sometimes it is confined to Silluq and Athnach. At others, Zaqeph is found as well (often with a strange admixture of Palestinian signs). It need hardly be added that I have found these MSS. of no service to me in my investigations.

One point, which has escaped the notice of scholars, I may mention in conclusion. These Yemen MSS. do not exhibit the Oriental readings. We have in them the Palestinian text, with a superlinear punctuation.

21 In Or. 1467, 2363, we find the confusing arrangement of the Palestinian accentuation with the superlinear vocalization. See Pl. LIV of the Palaeographical Society's Publications, Oriental Series (Or. 1467 is, however, incorrectly described there as of Babylonian or Persian origin).

22 As in Or. 1469, 2373, 2374.

23 In Or. 2366, 2368, 2703, 2704.
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--- The New Testament in English, according to the Version by John Wycliffe, about A.D. 1380, and Revised by John Purvey, about A.D. 1388. Extra fcap. 8vo. 6s.]
ENGLISH.—The Holy Bible: an exact reprint, page for page, of the Authorised Version published in the year 1611. Demy 4to. half bound, 1s. 15.


GOTHIC.—The Gospel of St. Mark in Gothic, according to the translation made by Wulfila in the Fourth Century. Edited with a Grammatical Introduction and Glossarial Index by W. W. Skeat, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s.

GREEK.—Vetus Testamentum ex Versione Septuaginta Interpretum secundum exemplar Vaticanum Romae editum. Accedit potior varietas Codicis Alexandrini. Tomi III. Editio Altera. 18mo. 15s.

— Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt; sive, Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta. Edidit Fridericus Field, A.M. 2 vols. 1875. 4to. 5l. 5s.

— The Book of Wisdom: the Greek Text, the Latin Vulgate, and the Authorised English Version; with an Introduction, Critical Apparatus, and a Commentary. By William J. Deane, M.A. Small 4to. 12s. 6d.


— Novum Testamentum Graece. Accedunt parallela S. Scripturae loca, etc. Edidit Carolus Lloyd, S.T.P.R. 18mo. 3s.

On writing paper, with wide margin, 10s.

— Novum Testamentum Graece juxta Exemplar Millianum. 18mo. 2s. 6d. On writing paper, with wide margin, 9s.

— Evangelia Sacra Graece. Fcap. 8vo. limp, 1s. 6d.

— The Greek Testament, with the Readings adopted by the Revisers of the Authorised Version:—

(1) Pica type, with Marginal References. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.

(2) Long Primer type. Fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

(3) The same, on writing paper, with wide margin, 15s.

— The Parallel New Testament, Greek and English; being the Authorised Version, 1611; the Revised Version, 1881; and the Greek Text followed in the Revised Version. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

The Revised Version is the joint property of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

— **Outlines of Textual Criticism applied to the New Testament.** By C. E. Hammond, M.A. Fourth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

HEBREW, etc.—*The Psalms in Hebrew without points.* 1879. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

— **A Commentary on the Book of Proverbs.** Attributed to Abraham Ibn Ezra. Edited from a MS. in the Bodleian Library by S. R. Driver, M.A. Crown 8vo. paper covers, 3s. 6d.

— **The Book of Tobit.** A Chaldee Text, from a unique MS. in the Bodleian Library; with other Rabbinical Texts, English Translations, and, the Ital. Edited by Ad. Neubauer, M.A. 1878. Crown 8vo. 6s.


LATIN.—*Libri Psalmorum Versio antiqua Latina, cum Paraphrasi Anglo-Saxonica.** Edidit B. Thorpe, F.A.S. 1835. 8vo. 10s. 6d.


OLD-FRENCH.—*Libri Psalmorum Versio antiqua Gallica e Cod. MS. in Bibl. Bodleiana adservato, una cum Versione Metrica aliiisque Monumentis pervetustatis. Nunc primum descripsit et edidit Franciscus Michel, Phil. Doc. 1860. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

FATHERS OF THE CHURCH, &c.

*St. Athanasius: Historical Writings,* according to the Benedictine Text. With an Introduction by William Bright, D.D. 1881. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

— **Orations against the Arians.** With an Account of his Life by William Bright, D.D. 1873. Crown 8vo. 9s.

Canons of the First Four General Councils of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon. 1877. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.


Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII Prophetas. Edidit P. E. Pusey, A.M. Tomi II. 1868. 8vo. cloth, 2l. 2s.


— Translated by R. Payne Smith, M.A. 2 vols. 1859. 8vo. 14s.


Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, according to the text of Burton, with an Introduction by William Bright, D.D. 1881. Crown 8vo. 8s. 6d.

Irenaeus: The Third Book of St. Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, against Heresies. With short Notes and a Glossary by H. Deane, B.D. 1874. Crown 8vo. 5s. 6d.


Socrates' Ecclesiastical History, according to the Text of Hussey, with an Introduction by William Bright, D.D. 1878. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, &c.

Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England, according to the uses of Sarum, York, Hereford, and Bangor, and the Roman Liturgy arranged in parallel columns, with preface and notes. By William Maskell, M.A Third Edition. 1882. 8vo. 15s.

Baedae Historia Ecclesiastica. Edited, with English Notes, by G. H. Moberly, M.A. 1881. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.
Bright (W.). Chapters of Early English Church History. 1878. 8vo. 12s.


Vol. II. Part I. 1873. Medium 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Vol. II. Part II. 1878. Church of Ireland; Memorials of St. Patrick: Stiff covers, 3s. 6d.


Hammond (C. E.). Liturgies, Eastern and Western. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Liturgical Glossary. 1878. Crown 8vo. 1or. 6d.

An Appendix to the above. 1879. Crown 8vo. paper covers, 1s. 6d.

John, Bishop of Ephesus. The Third Part of his Ecclesiastical History. [In Syriac.] Now first edited by William Cureton, M.A. 1853. 4to. 1l. 12s.

— Translated by R. Payne Smith, M.A. 1860. 8vo. 10s.

Leofric Missal, The, as used in the Cathedral of Exeter during the Episcopate of its first Bishop, A.D. 1050-1072; together with some Account of the Red Book of Derby, the Missal of Robert of Jumièges, and a few other early MS. Service Books of the English Church. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by F. E. Warren, B.D. 4to. half morocco. 35s.

Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae. The occasional Offices of the Church of England according to the old use of Salisbury, the Prymer in English, and other prayers and forms, with dissertations and notes. By William Maskell, M.A. Second Edition. 1882. 3 vols. 8vo. 2l. 10s.

Records of the Reformation. The Divorce, 1527-1533. Mostly now for the first time printed from MSS. in the British Museum and other libraries. Collected and arranged by N. Pocock, M.A. 1870. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 16s.


Stubbs (W.). Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum. An attempt to exhibit the course of Episcopal Succession in England. 1858. Small 4to. 8s. 6d.

Warren (F. E.). Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church. 1881. 8vo. 14s.
ENGLISH THEOLOGY.


Butler's Works, with an Index to the Analogy. 2 vols. 1874. 8vo. 11s.

Also separately,

Sermons, 5s. 6d. Analogy of Religion, 5s. 6d

Greswell's Harmonia Evangelica. Fifth Edition. 8vo. 1855. 9s. 6d.

Heurtley's Harmonia Symbolica: Creeds of the Western Church. 1858. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

Homilies appointed to be read in Churches. Edited by J. Griffiths, M.A. 1859. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Hooker's Works, with his life by Walton, arranged by John Keble, M.A. Sixth Edition, 1874. 3 vols. 8vo. 1l. 11s. 6d.

— the text as arranged by John Keble, M.A. 2 vols. 1875. 8vo. 11s.


Pearson's Exposition of the Creed. Revised and corrected by E. Burton, D.D. Sixth Edition, 1877. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Waterland's Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist, with a Preface by the late Bishop of London. Crown 8vo. 6s. 6d.


— Select English Works. By T. Arnold, M.A. 3 vols. 1869–1871. 8vo. 1l. 1s.

— Trialogus. With the Supplement now first edited. By Gotthard Lechler. 1869. 8vo. 7s.
HISTORICAL AND DOCUMENTARY WORKS.


Clarendon's History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England. 7 vols. 1839. 18mo. 7s.

Clarendon's History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England. Also his Life, written by himself, in which is included a Continuation of his History of the Grand Rebellion. With copious Indexes. In one volume, royal 8vo. 1842. 1l. 2s.

Clinton's Epitome of the Fasti Hellenici. 1851. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

— Epitome of the Fasti Romani. 1854. 8vo. 7s.


Freeman (E. A.). History of the Norman Conquest of England; its Causes and Results. In Six Volumes. 8vo. 5l. 9s. 6d.

— The Reign of William Rufus and the Accession of Henry the First. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 16s.

Gascoigne's Theological Dictionary ("Liber Veritatum"): Selected Passages, illustrating the condition of Church and State, 1403-1458. With an Introduction by James E. Thorold Rogers, M.A. Small 4to. 10s. 6d.

Magna Carta, a careful Reprint. Edited by W. Stubbs, D.D. 1879. 4to. stitched, 1s.

Protests of the Lords, including those which have been expunged, from 1624 to 1874; with Historical Introductions. Edited by James E. Thorold Rogers, M.A. 1875. 3 vols. 8vo. 2l. 2s.


Vols. I and II (1259-1450). 1866. 8vo. 2l. 2s.
Vols. III and IV (1401-1582). 1882. 8vo. 2l. 10s.

Saxon Chronicles (Two of the) parallel, with Supplementary Extracts from the Others. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and a Glossarial Index, by J. Earle, M.A. 1865. 8vo. 16s.


Sturlunga Saga, including the Islendinga Saga of Lawman Sturla Thorðsson and other works. Edited by Dr. Gudbrand Vigfusson. In 2 vols. 1878. 8vo. 2l. 2s.

York Plays. The Plays performed by the Crafts or Mysteries of York on the day of Corpus Christi in the 14th, 15th, and 16th centuries. Now first printed from the unique MS. in the Library of Lord Ashburnham. Edited with Introduction and Glossary by Lucy Toulmin Smith. 8vo. 21s.

Statutes made for the University of Oxford, and for the Colleges and Halls therein, by the University of Oxford Commissioners. 1882. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Statuta Universitatis Oxoniensis. 1886. 8vo. 5s.

The Examination Statutes for the Degrees of B.A., B. Mus., B.C.L., and B.M. Revised to Hilary Term, 1887. 8vo. sewed, 1s.

The Student’s Handbook to the University and Colleges of Oxford. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

The Oxford University Calendar for the year 1887. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

The present Edition includes all Class Lists and other University distinctions for the seven years ending with 1886.

Also, supplementary to the above, price 5s. (pp. 606),

The Honours Register of the University of Oxford. A complete Record of University Honours, Officers, Distinctions, and Class Lists; of the Heads of Colleges, &c., &c., from the Thirteenth Century to 1883.
MATHEMATICS, PHYSICAL SCIENCE, &c.

Acland (H. W., M.D., F.R.S.). *Synopsis of the Pathological Series in the Oxford Museum.* 1867. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

De Bary (Dr. A.). *Comparative Anatomy of the Vegetative Organs of the Phanerogams and Ferns.* Translated and Annotated by F. O. Bower, M.A., F.L.S., and D. H. Scott, M.A., Ph.D., F.L.S. With 241 woodcuts and an Index. Royal 8vo., half morocco, 1l. 2s. 6d.


Müller (J.). *On certain Variations in the Vocal Organs of the Passerines that have hitherto escaped notice.* Translated by F. J. Bell, B.A., and edited, with an Appendix, by A. H. Garrod, M.A., F.R.S. With Plates. 1878. 4to. paper covers, 7s. 6d.


Vol. III. Statics, including Attractions; Dynamics of a Material Particle. Second Edition, 1868. 8vo. 16s.
Vol. IV. Dynamics of Material Systems; together with a chapter on Theoretical Dynamics, by W. F. Donkin, M.A., F.R.S. 1862. 8vo. 16s.

Pritchard (C., D.D., F.R.S.). *Uranometria Nova Oxoniensis.* A Photometric determination of the magnitudes of all Stars visible to the naked eye, from the Pole to ten degrees south of the Equator. 1885. Royal 8vo. 8s. 6d.

— *Astronomical Observations made at the University Observatory, Oxford, under the direction of C. Pritchard, D.D.* No. I. 1878. Royal 8vo. paper covers, 3s. 6d.

Rigaud’s Correspondence of Scientific Men of the 17th Century, with Table of Contents by A. de Morgan, and Index by the Rev. J. Rigaud, M.A. 2 vols. 1841–1862. 8vo. 18s. 6d.


Westwood (J. O., M.A., F.R.S.). *Thesaurus Entomologicus Hopeianus,* or a Description of the rarest Insects in the Collection given to the University by the Rev. William Hope. With 40 Plates. 1874. Small folio, half morocco, 7l. 10s.
The Sacred Books of the East.

TRANSLATED BY VARIOUS ORIENTAL SCHOLARS, AND EDITED BY F. MAX MÜLLER.

[Demy 8vo. cloth.]

Vol. I. The Upanishads. Translated by F. Max Müller. Part I. The Aitareya-\_āraṇyaka, The Kaushitaki-brāhmaṇa-\_upanishad, and The Vāgasaneyi-samhitā-\_upanishad. 10s. 6d.

Vol. II. The Sacred Laws of the Aryas, as taught in the Schools of Āpastamba, Gautama, Vāsishtha, and Baudhāyana. Translated by Prof. Georg Bühler. Part I. Āpastamba and Gautama. 10s. 6d.


Vol. IV. The Zend-Avesta. Translated by James Darmesteter. Part I. The Vendidad. 10s. 6d.


Vols. VI and IX. The Qur'ān. Parts I and II. Translated by E. H. Palmer. 21s.

Vol. VII. The Institutes of Vishnu. Translated by Julius Jolly. 10s. 6d.

Vol. VIII. The Bhagavadgītā, with The Sanatsugātiya, and The Anugītā. Translated by Kāshināth Trimbak Telang. 10s. 6d.

Vol. X. The Dhammapada, translated from Pāli by F. Max Müller; and The Sutta-Nipāta, translated from Pāli by V. Fausboll; being Canonical Books of the Buddhists. 10s. 6d.

Vol. XII. The Satapatha-Brâhmaṇa, according to the Text of the Mâdhyaṇḍīna School. Translated by Julius Eggeling. Part I. Books I and II. 12s. 6d.


Vol. XIV. The Sacred Laws of the Āryas, as taught in the Schools of Apastamba, Gautama, Vâsishṭha and Baudhâyana. Translated by Georg Bühler. Part II. Vâsishṭha and Baudhâyana. 10s. 6d.


Vol. XVIII. Pahlavi Texts. Translated by E. W. West. Part II. The Dâdîstân-i Dînîk and The Epistles of Mânûšîkhâr. 12s. 6d.

Vol. XIX. The Fo-sho-hing-tsang-king. A Life of Buddha by Arvaghoshâ Bodhisattva, translated from Sanskrit into Chinese by Dharma-raksha, A.D. 420, and from Chinese into English by Samuel Beal. 10s. 6d.

Vol. XX. Vinaya Texts. Translated from the Pâli by T. W. Rhys Davids and Hermann Oldenberg. Part III. The Kullavagga, IV-XII. 10s. 6d.

Vol. XXI. The Saddharma-pundârîka; or, the Lotus of the True Law. Translated by H. Kern. 12s. 6d.

Vol. XXII. Gaina-Sûtras. Translated from Prâkrit by Hermann Jacobi. Part I. The Âkârâṅga-Sûtra. The Kalpa-Sûtra. 10s. 6d.

Vol. XXIII. The Zend-Avesta. Translated by James Darmesteter. Part II. The Sirôzahs, Yâsts, and Nyâyis. 10s. 6d.

Vol. XXIV. Pahlavi Texts. Translated by E. W. West. Part III. Dinâ-i Malnôg-i Khirad, Sikand-gümânîk, and Sad-Dar. 10s. 6d.
Second Series.

Vol. XXV. Manu. Translated by Georg Bühler. 21s.

Vol. XXVI. The Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa. Translated by Julius Eggeling. Part II. 12s. 6d.


Part I (Vol. XXIX), 12s. 6d. Just Published.
Part II (Vol. XXX). In the Press.

The following Volumes are in the Press:


Vol. XXXII. Vedic Hymns. Translated by F. Max Müller. Part I.

Vol. XXXIII. Nārada, and some Minor Law-books. Translated by Julius Jolly. [Preparing.]

Vol. XXXIV. The Vedānta-Sūtras, with Saṅkara’s Commentary. Translated by G. Thibaut. [Preparing.]

** The Second Series will consist of Twenty-Four Volumes.**
A First Reading Book. By Marie Eichens of Berlin; and edited by Anne J. Clough. Extra fcap. 8vo. stiff covers, 4d.

Oxford Reading Book, Part I. For Little Children. Extra fcap. 8vo. stiff covers, 6d.

Oxford Reading Book, Part II. For Junior Classes. Extra fcap. 8vo. stiff covers, 6d.


An English Grammar and Reading Book, for Lower Forms in Classical Schools. By O. W. Tancock, M.A. Fourth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Typical Selections from the best English Writers, with Introductory Notices. Second Edition. In 2 vols. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d. each.

Shairp (J. C., LL.D.). Aspects of Poetry; being Lectures delivered at Oxford. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.


*An Anglo-Saxon Primer, with Grammar, Notes, and Glossary.* By the same Author. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Old English Reading Primers; edited by Henry Sweet, M.A.

I. Selected Homilies of Ælfric. Extra fcap. 8vo., stiff covers, 1s. 6d.

II. Extracts from Alfred's Orosius. Extra fcap. 8vo., stiff covers, 1s. 6d.

First Middle English Primer, with Grammar and Glossary. By the same Author. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

Second Middle English Primer. Extracts from Chaucer, with Grammar and Glossary. By the same Author. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

The Philology of the English Tongue. By J. Earle, M.A. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 7s. 6d.
An Icelandic Primer, with Grammar, Notes, and Glossary. By the same Author. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.
An Icelandic Prose Reader, with Notes, Grammar, and Glossary. By G. Vigfusson, M.A., and F. York Powell, M.A. Ext. fcap. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
A Handbook of Phonetics, including a Popular Exposition of the Principles of Spelling Reform. By H. Sweet, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.
Elementarbuch des Gesprochenen Englisch. Grammatik, Texte und Glossar. Von Henry Sweet. Extra fcap. 8vo., stiff covers, 2s. 6d.
The Ormulum; with the Notes and Glossary of Dr. R. M. White. Edited by R. Holt, M.A. 1878. 2 vols. Extra fcap. 8vo. 21s.
Part II. From Robert of Gloucester to Gower (A.D. 1298 to A.D. 1393). Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 7s. 6d.
Specimens of English Literature, from the ‘Ploughmans Crede’ to the ‘Shepheardes Calender’ (A.D. 1394 to A.D. 1579). With Introduction, Notes, and Glossarial Index. By W. W. Skeat, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Chaucer. I. The Prologue to the Canterbury Tales; the Knightes Tale; The Nonne Prestes Tale. Edited by R. Morris, Editor of Specimens of Early English, &c., &c. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.
II. The Priories Tale; Sir Thopas; The Monkes Tale; The Clerkes Tale; The Squieres Tale, &c. Edited by W. W. Skeat, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.
III. The Tale of the Man of Lawe; The Pardoneres Tale; The Second Nonnes Tale; The Chanouns Yemannes Tale. By the same Editor. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.
Spenser's Faery Queene. Books I and II. Designed chiefly for the use of Schools. With Introduction, Notes, and Glossary. By G. W. Kitchin, D.D. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d. each.


OLD ENGLISH DRAMA.
The Pilgrimage to Parnassus with The Two Parts of the Return from Parnassus. Three Comedies performed in St. John's College, Cambridge, A.D. MDCCCLXVII-MDCI. Edited from MSS. by the Rev. W. D. Macray, M.A., F.S.A. Medium 8vo. Bevelled Boards, Gilt top, 8s. 6d.


Marlowe. Edward II. With Introduction, Notes, &c. By O. W. Tancock, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

SHAKESPEARE.

The Merchant of Venice. 1s. Macbeth. 1s. 6d.
Richard the Second. 1s. 6d. Hamlet. 2s.

Edited by W. Aldis Wright, M.A.
The Tempest. 1s. 6d. Midsummer Night's Dream. 1s. 6d.
As You Like It. 1s. 6d. Coriolanus. 2s. 6d.
Julius Caesar. 2s. Henry the Fifth. 2s.
Richard the Third. 2s. 6d. Twelfth Night. 1s. 6d.
King Lear. 1s. 6d. King John. 1s. 6d.

Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist; a popular Illustration of the Principles of Scientific Criticism. By R. G. Moulton, M.A. Crown 8vo. 5s.


In paper covers:
Lycidas, 3d. L'Allegro, 3d. Il Penseroso, 4d. Comus, 6d.
Samson Agonistes, 6d.

Bunyan. I. The Pilgrim's Progress, Grace Abounding, Relation of the Imprisonment of Mr. John Bunyan. Edited, with Biographical Introduction and Notes, by E. Venables, M.A. 1879. Extra fcap. 8vo. 5s. In ornamental Parchment, 6s.

II. Holy War, &c. Edited by E. Venables, M.A.

Clarendon. History of the Rebellion. Book VI. Edited by T. Arnold, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Dryden. Select Poems. Stanzas on the Death of Oliver Cromwell; Astrea Redux; Annus Mirabilis; Absalom and Achitophel; Religio Laici; The Hind and the Panther. Edited by W. D. Christie, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Locke's Conduct of the Understanding. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, &c., by T. Fowler, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

Addison. Selections from Papers in the Spectator. With Notes. By T. Arnold, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d. In ornamental Parchment, 6s.

Steele. Selections from the Tatler, Spectator, and Guardian. Edited by Austin Dobson. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d. In white Parchment, 7s. 6d.

Pope. With Introduction and Notes. By Mark Pattison, B.D.

I. Essay on Man. Extra fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

II. Satires and Epistles. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

Parnell. The Hermit. Paper covers, 2d.

Gray. Selected Poems. Edited by Edmund Gosse. Extra fcap. 8vo. Stiff covers, 1s. 6d. In white Parchment, 3s.

Elegy and Ode on Eton College. Paper covers, 2d.


Johnson. I. Rasselas; Lives of Dryden and Pope. Edited by Alfred Milnes, M.A. (London). Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d., or Lives of Dryden and Pope only, stiff covers, 2s. 6d.

II. Vanity of Human Wishes. With Notes, by E. J. Payne, M.A. Paper covers, 4d.


Cowper. Edited, with Life, Introductions, and Notes, by H. T. Griffith, B.A.

I. The Didactic Poems of 1782, with Selections from the Minor Pieces, A.D. 1779-1783. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

Burke. *Select Works.* Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by E. J. Payne, M.A.

I. *Thoughts on the Present Discontents; the two Speeches on America.* Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.


Byron. *Childe Harold.* Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by H. F. Tozer, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d. In white Parchment, 5s.

Scott. *Lay of the Last Minstrel.* Edited with Preface and Notes by W. Minto, M.A. With Map. Extra fcap. 8vo. Stiff covers, 2s. Ornamental Parchment, 3s. 6d.

— *Lay of the Last Minstrel.* Introduction and Canto I., with Preface and Notes, by the same Editor. 6d.

**II. LATIN.**

*Rudimenta Latina.* Comprising Accidence, and Exercises of a very Elementary Character, for the use of Beginners. By John Barrow Allen, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

*An Elementary Latin Grammar.* By the same Author. Forty-second Thousand. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

*A First Latin Exercise Book.* By the same Author. Fourth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

*A Second Latin Exercise Book.* By the same Author. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

*Reddenda Minora,* or Easy Passages, Latin and Greek, for Unseen Translation. For the use of Lower Forms. Composed and selected by C. S. Jerram, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

*Anglice Reddenda,* or Easy Extracts, Latin and Greek, for Unseen Translation. By C. S. Jerram, M.A. Third Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

*Anglice Reddenda,* Second Series. By the same Author. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. Just Published.

*Passages for Translation into Latin.* For the use of Passmen and others. Selected by J. Y. Sargent, M.A. Fifth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Hints and Helps for Latin Elegiacs. By H. Lee-Warner, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 35. 6d.


Caesar. The Commentaries (for Schools). With Notes and Maps. By Charles E. Moberly, M.A.
   Part II. The Civil War. Extra fcap. 8vo. 35. 6d.


Cicero. Selection of interesting and descriptive passages. With Notes. By Henry Walford, M.A. In three Parts. Extra fcap. 8vo. 45. 6d.
   Each Part separately, limp, 15. 6d.


   Or separately, Part I. Text, 15. Part II. Notes, 15.

   Part I. The Caudine Disaster. Part II. Hannibal's Campaign in Italy. Part III. The Macedonian War.


Livy. Books XXI, XXII, and XXIII. With Introduction and Notes. By M. T. Tatham, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 45. 6d.
Ovid. Selections for the use of Schools. With Introductions and Notes, and an Appendix on the Roman Calendar. By W. Ramsay, M.A. Edited by G. G. Ramsay, M.A. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 5s. 6d.

Ovid. Tristia. Book I. The Text revised, with an Introduction and Notes. By S. G. Owen, B.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Plautus. Captivi. Edited by W. M. Lindsay, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. In the Press.


Sallust. With Introduction and Notes. By W. W. Capes, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.


—— Adelphi. With Notes and Introductions. Intended for the Higher Forms of Public Schools. By A. Sloman, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.


Virgil. With Introduction and Notes. By T. L. Papillon, M.A. Two vols. Crown 8vo. 1os. 6d. The Text separately, 4s. 6d.


Catulli Veronensis Liber. Iterum recognovit, apparatum criticum prolegomena appendices addidit, Robinson Ellis, A.M. 1878. Demy 8vo. 16s.

—— A Commentary on Catullus. By Robinson Ellis, M.A. 1876. Demy 8vo. 16s.

Catulli Veronensis Carmina Selecta, secundum recognitionem Robinson Ellis, A.M. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Cicero de Oratore. With Introduction and Notes. By A. S. Wilkins, M.A.

Book I. 1879. 8vo. 6s.

Book II. 1881. 8vo. 5s.


pro Cluentio. With Introduction and Notes. By W. Ramsay, M.A. Edited by G. G. Ramsay, M.A. 2nd Ed. Ext. fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.


A reprint of the above, in a size suitable for the use of Schools. Extra fcap. 8vo. 6s. (May also be had in two parts.)


Ovid. P. Ovidii Nasonis Ibis. Ex Novis Codicibus edidit, Scholia Vetera Commentarium cum Prolegomenis Appendice Indice addidit, R. Ellis, A.M. 8vo. 10s. 6d.


Also separately, Part I. Introduction, Text, etc., 3s. Part II. Notes, 3s. 6d.


Nettleship (H., M.A.). Lectures and Essays on Subjects connected with Latin Scholarship and Literature. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

The Roman Satura: its original form in connection with its literary development. 8vo. sewed, 1s.


Pinder (North, M.A.). Selections from the less known Latin Poets. 1869. 8vo. 15s.


Wordsworth (J., M.A.). Fragments and Specimens of Early Latin. With Introductions and Notes. 1874. 8vo. 18s.
III. GREEK.

A Greek Primer, for the use of beginners in that Language. By the Right Rev. Charles Wordsworth, D.C.L. Seventh Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Easy Greek Reader. By Evelyn Abbott, M.A. In two Parts. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

The Text and Notes may be had separately, 1s. 6d. each.


A Greek-English Lexicon, abridged from Liddell and Scott's 4to. edition, chiefly for the use of Schools. Twenty-first Edition. 1884. Square 12mo. 10s. 6d.

Greek Verbs, Irregular and Defective; their forms, meaning, and quantity; embracing all the Tenses used by Greek writers, with references to the passages in which they are found. By W. Veitch. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The Elements of Greek Accentuation (for Schools): abridged from his larger work by H. W. Chandler, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

A Series of Graduated Greek Readers: —


Second Greek Reader. By A. M. Bell, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Fourth Greek Reader; being Specimens of Greek Dialects. With Introductions, etc. By W. W. Merry, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Fifth Greek Reader. Selections from Greek Epic and Dramatic Poetry, with Introductions and Notes. By Evelyn Abbott, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

The Golden Treasury of Ancient Greek Poetry: being a Collection of the finest passages in the Greek Classic Poets, with Introductory Notices and Notes. By R. S. Wright, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

A Golden Treasury of Greek Prose, being a Collection of the finest passages in the principal Greek Prose Writers, with Introductory Notices and Notes. By R. S. Wright, M.A., and J. E. L. Shadwell, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.


— Choephoroi. With Introduction and Notes by the same Editor. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.
Aristophanes. In Single Plays. Edited, with English Notes, Introductions, &c., by W. W. Merry, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo.

II. The Acharnians, 2s.
III. The Frogs, 2s.

Cebes. Tabula. With Introduction and Notes. By C. S. Jerram, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.


Euripides. Alcestis (for Schools). By C. S. Jerram, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

— Helena. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, etc., for Upper and Middle Forms. By C. S. Jerram, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

— Iphigenia in Tauris. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, etc., for Upper and Middle Forms. By C. S. Jerram, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3s.

— Medea. By C. B. Heberden, M.A. In two Parts. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

Herodotus, Selections from. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and a Map, by W. W. Merry, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Homer. Odyssey, Books I–XII (for Schools). By W. W. Merry, M.A. Twenty-seventh Thousand. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Book II, separately, 1s. 6d.


— Iliad, Books VI and XXI. With Introduction and Notes. By Herbert Hailstone, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d. each.


Plato. Selections from the Dialogues [including the whole of the Apology and Crito]. With Introduction and Notes by John Purves, M.A., and a Preface by the Rev. B. Jowett, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

Oedipus Tyrannus, Philoctetes. New and Revised Edition, 2s. each.
Oedipus Coloneus, Antigone, 1s. 9d. each.
Ajax, Electra, Trachiniae, 2s. each.

Oedipus Rex: Dindorf's Text, with Notes by the present Bishop of St. David's. Extra fcap. 8vo. limp, 1s. 6d.


Selections (for Schools). With Notes and Maps. By J. S. Phillpotts, B.C.L. Fourth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Anabasis, Book I. Edited for the use of Junior Classes and Private Students. With Introduction, Notes, etc. By J. Marshall, M.A., Rector of the Royal High School, Edinburgh. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Anabasis, Book II. With Notes and Map. By C. S. Jerram, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

Cyropaedia, Books IV and V. With Introduction and Notes by C. Bigg, D.D. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Aristotle's Politics. By W. L. Newman, M.A. [In the Press.]


Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea, ex recensione Immanuelis Bekkeri. Crown 8vo. 5s.


Hicks (E. L., M.A.). A Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.


**IV. FRENCH AND ITALIAN.**


**Works by GEORGE SAINTSBURY, M.A.**

*Primer of French Literature.* Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

*Short History of French Literature.* Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

*Specimens of French Literature, from Villon to Hugo.* Crown 8vo. 9s.

**MASTERPIECES OF THE FRENCH DRAMA.**

*Corneille's Horace.* Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by George Saintsbury, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

*Molière's Les Précieuses Ridicules.* Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by Andrew Lang, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

*Racine's Esther.* Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by George Saintsbury, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

*Beaumarchais' Le Barbier de Séville.* Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by Austin Dobson. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

*Voltaire's Mérope.* Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by George Saintsbury. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2s.

*Mussel's On ne badine pas avec l'Amour, and Fantasio.* Edited, with Prolegomena, Notes, etc., by Walter Herries Pollock. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

The above six Plays may be had in ornamental case, and bound in Imitation Parchment, price 12s. 6d.
Sainte-Beuve. Selections from the Causeries du Lundi. Edited by George Saintsbury. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

Quinet's Lettres à sa Mère. Selected and edited by George Saintsbury. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

Gautier, Théophile. Scenes of Travel. Selected and Edited by George Saintsbury. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.


Edited by GUSTAVE MASSON, B.A.

Corneille's Cinna. With Notes, Glossary, etc. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2s. Stiff covers, 1s. 6d.

Louis XIV and his Contemporaries; as described in Extracts from the best Memoirs of the Seventeenth Century. With English Notes, Genealogical Tables, &c. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.


Molière's Les Fourberies de Scapin, and Racine's Athalie. With Voltaire's Life of Molière. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Molière's Les Fourberies de Scapin. With Voltaire's Life of Molière. Extra fcap. 8vo. stiff covers, 1s. 6d.

Molière's Les Femmes Savantes. With Notes, Glossary, etc. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2s. Stiff covers, 1s. 6d.

Racine's Andromaque, and Corneille's Le Menteur. With Louis Racine's Life of his Father. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Regnard's Le Joueur, and Brueys and Palaprat's Le Grondeur. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Sévigné, Madame de, and her chief Contemporaries, Selections from the Correspondence of. Intended more especially for Girls' Schools. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

Dante. Selections from the Inferno. With Introduction and Notes. By H. B. Cotterill, B.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Tasso. La Gerusalemme Liberata. Cantos i, ii. With Introduction and Notes. By the same Editor. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.
V. GERMAN.

Scherer (W.). *A History of German Literature.* Translated from the Third German Edition by Mrs. F. Conybeare. Edited by F. Max Müller. 2 vols. 8vo. 21s.

Max Müller. The German Classics, from the Fourth to the Nineteenth Century. With Biographical Notices, Translations into Modern German, and Notes. By F. Max Müller, M.A. A New Edition, Revised, Enlarged, and Adapted to Wilhelm Scherer’s ‘History of German Literature,’ by F. Lichtenstein. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 21s.

**GERMAN COURSE.** By HERMANN LANGE.

*The Germans at Home;* a Practical Introduction to German Conversation, with an Appendix containing the Essentials of German Grammar. Second Edition. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

*The German Manual;* a German Grammar, Reading Book, and a Handbook of German Conversation. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

*Grammar of the German Language.* 8vo. 3s. 6d.

*German Composition;* A Theoretical and Practical Guide to the Art of Translating English Prose into German. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

*Lessing’s Laokoon.* With Introduction, English Notes, etc. By A. Hamann, Phil. Doc., M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

*Schiller’s Wilhelm Tell.* Translated into English Verse by E. Massie, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 5s.

Also, Edited by C. A. BUCHHEIM, Phil. Doc.

*Becker’s Friedrich der Grosse.* Extra fcap. 8vo. *In the Press.*


*Heine’s Prosa,* being Selections from his Prose Works. With English Notes, etc. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

*Heine’s Harzreise.* With Life of Heine, Descriptive Sketch of the Harz, and Index. Extra fcap. 8vo. paper covers, 1s. 6d.; cloth, 2s. 6d.

*Lessing’s Minna von Barnhelm.* A Comedy. With a Life of Lessing, Critical Analysis, etc. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

— *Nathan der Weise.* With Introduction, Notes, etc. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.
Schiller’s Historische Skizzen; Egmont’s Leben und Tod, and Belagerung von Antwerpen. With a Map. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Wilhelm Tell. With a Life of Schiller; an historical and critical Introduction, Arguments, and a complete Commentary, and Map. Sixth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.


Modern German Reader. A Graduated Collection of Extracts in Prose and Poetry from Modern German writers:
Part I. With English Notes, a Grammatical Appendix, and a complete Vocabulary. Fourth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.
Part II. With English Notes and an Index. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.


VI. MATHEMATICS, PHYSICAL SCIENCE, &c.

By LEWIS HENSLY, M.A.

Answers to the Examples in Figures made Easy, together with two thousand additional Examples, with Answers. Crown 8vo. 1s.
The Scholar’s Arithmetic: with Answers. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.
The Scholar’s Algebra. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.


Baynes (R. E., M.A.). Lessons on Thermodynamics. 1878. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.


Clarke (Col. A. R., C.B., R.E.). Geodesy. 1880. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Cremona (Luigi). Elements of Projective Geometry. Translated by C. Lendesdorf, M.A. 8vo. 12s. 6d.


Euclid Revised. Containing the Essentials of the Elements of Plane Geometry as given by Euclid in his first Six Books. Edited by R. C. J. Nixon, M.A. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Sold separately as follows,
Books I–IV. 3s. 6d. Books I, II. 1s. 6d.
Book I. 1s.


Ruled Exercise books adapted to the above may be had, price 2s.


Maclaren (Archibald). A System of Physical Education: Theoretical and Practical. Extra fcap. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Madan (H. G., M.A.). Tables of Qualitative Analysis. Large 4to. paper, 4s. 6d.


— An Elementary Treatise on Electricity. Edited by William Garnett, M.A. Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d.


— Uniplanar Kinematics of Solids and Fluids. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.


— Vesuvius. 1869. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.


— *Harbours and Docks;* their Physical Features, History, Construction, Equipment, and Maintenance; with Statistics as to their Commercial Development. 2 vols. 8vo. 25s.

Watson (H. W., M.A.). *A Treatise on the Kinetic Theory of Gases.* 1876. 8vo. 3. 6d.

Watson (H. W., D. Sc., F.R.S.), and S. H. Burbury, M.A.

I. *A Treatise on the Application of Generalised Coordinates to the Kinetics of a Material System.* 1879. 8vo. 6s.

II. *The Mathematical Theory of Electricity and Magnetism.* Vol. I. Electrostatics. 8vo. 10s. 6d.


VII. HISTORY.

Bluntschli (J. K.). *The Theory of the State.* By J. K. Bluntschli, late Professor of Political Sciences in the University of Heidelberg. Authorised English Translation from the Sixth German Edition. Demy 8vo. half bound, 12s. 6d.

Finlay (George, LL.D.). *A History of Greece from its Conquest by the Romans to the present time, B.C. 146 to A.D. 1864.* A new Edition, revised throughout, and in part re-written, with considerable additions, by the Author, and edited by H. F. Tozer, M.A. 7 vols. 8vo. 3l. 10s.

Fortescue (Sir John, Kt.). *The Governance of England:* otherwise called The Difference between an Absolute and a Limited Monarchy. A Revised Text. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Appendices, by Charles Plummer, M.A. 8vo. half bound, 12s. 6d.


Hodgkin (T.). *Italy and her Invaders.* Illustrated with Plates and Maps. Vols. I—IV., A.D. 376-553. 8vo. 3l. 8s.


Vol. 1. Down to the Year 1453.


— Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Medieval and Modern History, &c., delivered at Oxford 1867-1884. Demy 8vo. half-bound, 10s. 6d.

Wellesley. A Selection from the Despatches, Treaties, and other Papers of the Marquess Wellesley, K.G., during his Government of India. Edited by S. J. Owen, M.A. 1877. 8vo. 1l. 4s.


VIII. LAW.


Bentham (Jeremy). An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation. Crown 8vo. 6s. 6d.


Gaii Institutionum Juris Civilis Commentarii Quattuor; or, Elements of Roman Law by Gaius. With a Translation and Commentary by Edward Poste, M.A. Second Edition. 1875. 8vo. 18s.
Hall (W. E., M.A.). International Law. Second Ed. 8vo. 21s.


— The European Concert in the Eastern Question, a Collection of Treaties and other Public Acts. Edited, with Introductions and Notes, by Thomas Erskine Holland, D.C.L. 8vo. 12s. 6d.


Also sold in Parts, in paper covers, as follows:

Part I. Introductory Titles. 2s. 6d. Part II. Family Law. 1s.
Part III. Property Law. 2s. 6d. Part IV. Law of Obligations (No. 1). 3s. 6d.
Part IV. Law of Obligations (No. 2). 4s. 6d.

Lex Aquilia. The Roman Law of Damage to Property: being a Commentary on the Title of the Digest 'Ad Legem Aquiliam' (ix. 2). With an Introduction to the Study of the Corpus Iuris Civilis. By Erwin Grueber, Dr. Jur., M.A. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.


Twiss (Sir Travers, D.C.L.). The Law of Nations considered as Independent Political Communities.


IX. MENTAL AND MORAL PHILOSOPHY, &c.

Bacon's Novum Organum. Edited, with English Notes, by G. W. Kitchin, D.D. 1855. 8vo. 9s. 6d.

— Translated by G. W. Kitchin, D.D. 1855. 8vo. 9s. 6d.

Berkeley. The Works of George Berkeley, D.D., formerly Bishop of Cloyne; including many of his writings hitherto unpublished. With Prefaces,Annotations, and an Account of his Life and Philosophy, by Alexander Campbell Fraser, M.A. 4 vols. 1871. 8vo. 27. 18s.

The Life, Letters, &c. 1 vol. 16s.

— Selections from. With an Introduction and Notes. For the use of Students in the Universities. By Alexander Campbell Fraser, LL.D. Second Edition, Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.
Fowler (T., D.D.). The Elements of Deductive Logic, designed mainly for the use of Junior Students in the Universities. Eighth Edition. with a Collection of Examples. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

—— The Elements of Inductive Logic, designed mainly for the use of Students in the Universities. Fourth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 6s.

—— and Wilson (J. M., B.D.). The Principles of Morals (Introductory Chapters). 8vo. boards, 3s. 6d.

—— The Principles of Morals. Part II. (Being the Body of the Work.) 8vo. 10s. 6d. Just Published.

Edited by T. Fowler, D.D.


Locke's Conduct of the Understanding. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

Danson (J. T.). The Wealth of Households. Crown 8vo. 5s.

Green (T. H., M.A.). Prolegomena to Ethics. Edited by A. C. Bradley, M.A. Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d.


Lotze's Logic, in Three Books; of Thought, of Investigation, and of Knowledge. English Translation; Edited by B. Bosanquet, M.A., Fellow of University College, Oxford. 8vo. cloth, 12s. 6d.

—— Metaphysic, in Three Books; Ontology, Cosmology, and Psychology. English Translation; Edited by B. Bosanquet, M.A. 8vo. cloth, 12s. 6d.


X. ART, &c.


Ouseley (Sir F. A. Gore, Bart.). A Treatise on Harmony. Third Edition. 4to. 10s.

—— A Treatise on Counterpoint, Canon, and Fugue, based upon that of Cherubini. Second Edition. 4to. 16s.

—— A Treatise on Musical Form and General Composition. Second Edition. 4to. 10s.

Ruskin (John, M.A.). A Course of Lectures on Art, delivered before the University of Oxford in Hilary Term, 1870. 8vo. 6s.


Upcott (L. E., M.A.). An Introduction to Greek Sculpture. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.


The Oxford Bible for Teachers, containing supplementary Helps to the Study of the Bible, including Summaries of the several Books, with copious Explanatory Notes and Tables illustrative of Scripture History and the characteristics of Bible Lands; with a complete Index of Subjects, a Concordance, a Dictionary of Proper Names, and a series of Maps. Prices in various sizes and bindings from 3s. to 2l. 5s.

Helps to the Study of the Bible, taken from the Oxford Bible for Teachers, comprising Summaries of the several Books, with copious Explanatory Notes and Tables illustrative of Scripture History and the Characteristics of Bible Lands; with a complete Index of Subjects, a Concordance, a Dictionary of Proper Names, and a series of Maps. Crown 8vo. cloth, 3s. 6d.; 16mo. cloth, 1s.
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