

# **Some Grammatical Features of the Samaritan Pentateuch Hebrew: Comparative Study with the Tiberian Hebrew<sup>1)</sup>**

Hyun-Joon Choi\*

## **1. Preliminary**

It was customary to believe that the Samaritans originated from inter-racial marriages of (a mixture of) people who were living in Samaria and other peoples at the time of the Assyrian conquest of Samaria. However, there are a number of theories about the origins of the Samaritans, all of which have in common a tradition which asserts that the cult of Yahweh was originally widespread throughout the land of Israel. Even if this is true, the origin and early history of the Samaritans are quite problematic because their sources are far removed from the events, and because the non-Samaritan sources are told (tell) to be hostile.

The biblical account in 2Ki 17 had long been the decisive source for the formulation of historical accounts of Samaritan origins. Reconsideration of this passage, however, has led to more attention being paid to the Chronicles of the Samaritans themselves. The fullest Samaritan version of its own history became available since the Chronicle (ספר הימים) was published.

Samaritans are related to Judaism in that they accept the Torah as its holy book. They consider themselves to be true followers of the ancient Israelite religious line. The Samaritan tradition maintains that its Torah dates to the time of Moses and that it was copied by Abisha ben Phineas shortly after the

---

\* A Fulltime Lecturer at Presbyterian College and Theological Seminary, Old Testament.

1) In the present paper, I employed the following abbreviations that are frequently used in biblical Hebrew studies: BH=Biblical Hebrew / DSS=Dead Sea Scrolls / MT=Masoretic Text / SA=Samaritan Aramaic / SH=Samaritan Hebrew / SA=Samaritan Aramaic / SP=Samaritan Pentateuch.

Israelites entered the land of Canaan. However, modern literary analysis and criticism do not support this position. In fact, there are two main versions of the Torah: the Jewish version and the Samaritan version, and their contents are almost the same, which can mean that both are derived from the same original.

The Samaritan Pentateuch(SP) is the Samaritan version of the first five books of the Hebrew Bible, which comprise the entire canon of the Samaritan community. Following this, the Samaritans separated themselves and restricted their canon to the first five books of Moses using their own alphabet. In this way the manuscripts they handed down remained independent of the history which led to the massoretic text which is a matter of great interest for textual criticism. A manuscript of the SP was found at Damascus in 1616. It is a popular copy of the original text and contains some 6000 variants. It is possible that the Samaritan Pentateuch came into the hands of the Samaritans as an inheritance from the ten tribes whom they succeeded. However, it is much more probable to conclude that it was introduced by Manasseh at the time of the foundation of the Samaritan temple on Mt. Gerazim (Josephus Ant. 11.8. 2, 4). The Samaritans rejected all the Old Testament except the Pentateuch, and they claimed to have an older copy than the Jews and that they observe the precepts better.

The SP, like that of the Jews, has a fixed pronunciation of the Torah, which is transmitted very carefully by oral teaching from generation to generation. An extant work from the end of the 10<sup>th</sup>-11<sup>th</sup> century by the poet Taviya ibn Dartah, so called 'A Canon on the Rules of Reading', deals with the accents used in reading the text of the Pentateuch. The treatise was composed in Arabic, but the Aramaic names of the accents and the Aramaic verse at its close testify to the antiquity of the sources from which it was gleaned.

The purpose of this paper is to learn some characteristic features of the Samaritan Hebrew. Compared to the Tiberian Hebrew, the Samaritan Hebrew has distinctive phonological features, such as gutturals, absence of shewa. Sometimes, the fact that the homonyms with gutturals, which have identical

sounds but different meanings, leads us to difficulties to distinguish between the two words. For instance, רַעַב / רָחַב, we do not know what the word means by the pronunciation (Gen 12:10 *rāb*/ Exo 26:8 *rāb*), but we may only know by the context. The Tiberian tradition, the Babylonian<sup>2)</sup> and the so-called the Palestinian<sup>3)</sup> vocalization systems, do not distinguish between vowel quantities, but rather between vowel qualities. The vowel quantity may be surmised and interpreted on the basis of comparative grammatical considerations. The Samaritan vocalization system does not distinguish between vowel quantities either, and so the grammarians did not discuss them, but what their vocalization system undoubtedly aims at expressing is their reading tradition, and this is absolutely uniform and stable in the performance of every modern Samaritan. When the grammarians ascribed seven symbols to the vowels (*u, o, ā, a, e, ə, i*)<sup>4)</sup>, they unquestionably included *u* and *o* as single entities. These two vowels did not require separate symbols, since they were mutually exclusive. It is the quantitative difference between *u/o* which shows that vowel quantity was not marked in any way. Therefore, it may be claimed that they were familiar with six vowels.

## 2. Case Studies

In this section, I will bring up some cases that present the traits of the Samaritan tradition. For convenience, I will group some forms together of which the linguistic characters are analogous.

---

2) The Babylonian vocalization system is well described in I. Yevin, *מסורת הלשון העברית המשקפת*, בניקוד הבבלי, 2 vol. (Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1985), 364f.

3) E. J. Revell, *Hebrew Texts with Palestinian Vocalization* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970), 99-121.

4) It is hard to distinguish the vowels *ā* and *a*. The difference between the vowels *ā* and *a* in SH is the location where the vowel is produced. The vowel *ā* is produced in the lower front part in the mouth and the vowel *a* is produced in the lower rear part in the mouth.

**2.1.** *guwwəm* (Num 34:24 גוּׁם) / *ṣābuwwəm* (Gen 14:8 צְבוּׁם)  
*\*gūwyim > guwwəm / \*ṣawyim > ṣābuwwəm*

In TH, the combination of semi-consonants ʁ and ʔ often lost its consonantal character. Frequently, they merge with a preceding vowel, and the vowels cause them to become a diphthong. When the consonant which is an ascending diphthong comes first, the syllable would be simple like other syllables, whereas the combination would be contracted to a simple vowel (*uw > u*, *iy > i*, etc.) if it comes second. The diphthong persists only when the consonantal elements are geminated. When the vowels are not geminated, then the diphthong contracts into a vowel. If the diphthong should be maintained, it splits into two syllables or geminates its consonantal element, as in the word *yayyən* (for the expected *\*yīm*).<sup>5)</sup> The diphthong of SH tradition, which originally contains long vowel, tends to split into two syllables. For instance, the diphthongs *ūy* and *ōy* become *uwwi*, and *īw* becomes *iyyu*. In the cases above, the diphthong *ūy* became *uwwi*.

In SH, such as the case we have here, the vowels *i*, *u* and another vowel ʔ (derived from gutturals ʔחח״ע) is substituted by a geminated glide. The vowel *y* after *i* is geminated to *iyy*, and the vowel *w* after *u* is geminated to *uww*, such as *miyyā dām* (Lev 27:28, מִיַּיָּא דָּאֵם), *miyyūlām* (Gen 6:4, מִיַּיָּוּלָאֵם), *ēluwwəm* (< *\*ēlūim*) (Deu 4:7 הַיָּוּם ʔ).<sup>6)</sup>

**2.2.** *sādəm* (Deu 32:32 סָדֵם) / *arrefāəm* (Gen 50:2 אֲרֵפָאֵם)

**2.2.1.** *sādəm* (סָדֵם)

This case shows that the form of SH has a vowel while the equivalent form of TH has shewa. In general, the sign shewa indicates the absence of a vowel,

5) Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, *עברית וארמית נוסח שומרון על פי תעודות שבכתב ועדות שבעל פה*, 5 vol. (Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1957-77), 46-47.

6) Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, *ibid.*, 26.

however, in TH, there are two types of shewa: the term shewa refers to an ultra-short vowel, which is vocalic or mobile shewa (שווא נע), while the absence of a vowel is termed shewa quiescence (שווא נר). For shewa mobile, it once appeared as a vowel, but in certain times, its vowel was deleted as a consequence of stress shift.<sup>7)</sup>

A comparison of SH with TH, BH reveals a decisive difference between them. In other words, the absence of shewa in SH (and in SA as well) is distinctive. Corresponding to the TH shewa, one finds a vowel in SH, as a rule a long vowel in an open syllable and a short one in a closed syllable. Furthermore, SH sometimes possesses a vowel corresponding to the shewa quiescence. For in TH, shewa is a secondary vowel, derived from a full vowel (usually from an originally short vowel) in accordance with the rules of syllabic stress.

It is assumed that the shewa existed at an early stage. It seems that the Hebrew reflected in the Samaritan Hebrew would apparently be of a time prior to what is revealed in the Tiberian Hebrew (and in the biblical Hebrew for that matter), since it is not possible to demonstrate that the Samaritan Hebrew had shewa at an earlier stage<sup>8)</sup>. Moreover, the phenomenon considerably antedates the period of Arabic speech among the language of DSS as Ben-Ḥayyim claimed<sup>9)</sup>. Yet, it is still difficult to conclude whether the phenomenon of shewa disappearance is earlier or later due to the insufficient phonetic information in the Samaritan Hebrew.

---

7) P. Joüon & T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Roma: Biblical Institute Press, 1996), 50.

8) Cf. J.H. Perterman, *Versuch einer Hebräischen Formenlehre nach der Aussprache der Heutigen Samaritaner* (Leipzig, 1868), 10; T. Nöldeke, "Über Aussprache des Hebräischen bei den Samaritanern", *Nachrichten von der Königl. Gessel. D. Wissenschaften* 23 (1868), 485-5-4. Peterman held an opinion that the absence of shewa in Samaritan Hebrew is original while Nöldeke thought it is late phenomenon.

9) Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, *עברית וארמית נוסח שומרון על פי תעודות שבכתב ועדות שבעל פה* (Jerusalem: The Academia of the Hebrew Language, 1957-1957), 46-47.

### 2.2.2. arrefāʾem (Deu 3:13 רָפְאִים)

This case reflects three distinctive characters of SH: a) auxiliary vowel (see, 2.3), b) unfamiliarity with shewa (see 2.2.1), and c) the masculine suffix *-em*. Concerning the masculine suffix *-em*, the vowels *i* and *e*, the distinction between them is not maintained in closed post-tonic syllables, where they both appear as the vowel *ə*; the rule is that a noun or a verb containing an *i* or *e* vowel in any other circumstances shows a shift of that vowel to *ə* in a closed post-tonic syllable, e.g., *bit* (Gen 35:1 בֵּית); *abbət* (Ex 12:4 הַבֵּית); *ger* (Num 9:14 גֵּר); *aggər* (Exo 23:9 הַגֵּר). In addition, words containing the vowel *i* in stressed syllables show a shift of that vowel to *e* when the relevant syllable is no longer stressed, e.g. *dabbər* (Gen 18:19 דָּבַר; cf. Exo 12:32 *dabbertimma*).

### 2.3. ēmirra (Gen19:24 עִמְרָה)

In TH, the three compound shewas stand especially under the four guttural letters instead of a shewa mobile, since these letters by their nature require a more definite vowel than the indeterminate shewa mobile. Thus, a guttural at the beginning of a syllable, where the shewa is necessarily vocal, can never have mere shewa quiescence. In this stage, a new vowel appears where there was no vowel at all. This auxiliary vowel appears in order to expedite the articulation of the word. This phenomenon is frequent in TH when the first consonant of the cluster is a guttural sound. This phenomenon is applied to SH as well.

In SH, generally, the guttural *ʿ* shifts to *ɤ*, such as *ʿēbīda* (Exo 1:14 עִבְדָּה), *idna* (Gen 18:12 עִדְנָה). When the word opens with historical *ḥ* or *ʿ*, it frequently maintains before the vowels *ā*, *ā*, *ā* *a*, such as *ʿaz* (Gen 49:3 עָז), *ʿamməš* (Exo 26:9 עֲמֹשׁ), etc.<sup>10)</sup> There are however few cases, which begin with historical *ʿ* or *ḥ*, that

10) M. Florentine, “הבחנות בין משמעויות שונות וסימוגן באמצעים פונולוגיים בעברית בשומרוני”, A. Dotan and A. Tal, eds., רובישטיין – רובישטיין, חקר בשון העברית – רובישטיין (Tel Aviv: University of Tel Aviv Press, 2005), 114-115. The gutturals *ʿ* and *ḥ* in the beginning of the cases Florentine

do not have pronounced  $\nu$ , e.g.  $\overset{\circ}{a}šən$  (Exo 28:30  $\text{אֲשֶׁן}$ ),  $\overset{\circ}{a}dāš$  (Gen 29:14  $\text{אֲדָשׁ}$ ),  $\overset{\circ}{a}r\bar{a}b$  (Deu 13:16  $\text{אֲרָב}$ ), etc. It is very difficult to explain these exceptions, and to determine the phonological rules. However, as for the case we have here, the  $\nu$  first consonant is not a historical (in Arabic  $\dot{\text{ع}}$ ), and thus the  $\nu$  is not remained.

In addition, the  $\text{ח}$ , which is derived from  $\text{ע''חחא}$  and  $\nu$ , which is derived from  $\text{ע''ח}$  disappear after the prepositions  $\text{אֶ}$  and  $\text{לְ}$ , and after waw copulative. And the  $\nu$  survives after the definite article  $\text{ה}$  and in Hifil verbs, such as *baš* (Num 13:33  $\text{בָּאֲשׁ}$ ), *waf* (Lev 26:39  $\text{וָאֶף}$ ), *wad* (Gen 19:4  $\text{וָדַע}$ ), etc.

#### 2.4. afšēbī (Gen 14:5 $\text{אֶפְשֵׁבִי}$ )

This case reflects the following facts: a) The vowel appears before the consonant when the word comes with the prepositions  $\text{אֶ}$ ,  $\text{לְ}$ , and  $\text{מִן}$  (as participle), e.g. *abyom* (Lev 5:24  $\text{אֶבְיוֹם}$ ). But the rule cannot be applied to every similar case. Sometimes the vowel appears after the consonant, e.g. *bāmūšī* (Num 12:8  $\text{בָּמֹשֶׁי}$ ). It is determined according to the formation of the word, yet we may learn some rules concerning this matter. When the preposition  $\text{אֶ}$  occurs before  $\text{ב}$ ,  $\text{מ}$ , or  $\text{פ}$ , the vowel always follows the vowel of the consonant. And a word, which followed by  $\text{אֶ}$  or  $\text{לְ}$ , and has an initial guttural consonant, the  $\text{אֶ}$  or  $\text{לְ}$  has no vowel at all, e.g. *bisdāk* (<\*biʾisdāk; Exo 15:13  $\text{בִּסְדָּק}$ ), *bišba* (<\*biʾišba; Exo 31:18  $\text{בִּישְׁבַע}$ ).

b) The second issue in this case is the pronunciation of  $\text{בדו״ת}$ . There were two types of pronunciation for these consonants, which are hard and soft, whereas today  $\text{בדו״ת}$  are always hard and the  $\text{פ}$  is always soft (Arabic influence). This rule does not contradict the fact that an original plosive  $\text{פ}$  can be produced like the  $\text{ב}$  (plosive). It may testify to the fact that the plosive  $\text{פ}$  is no longer in existence. It should also be mentioned that the fricative pronunciation of  $\text{ב}$  which is identical with fricative pronunciation of  $\text{ב} /v/$ , has not been lost. And the semi-

---

presented are being unmatched with the cases that are presented by Ben-Hayyim. It seems that Florentine has transliterated those forms mistakenly.

consonant  $\nu$  occurs today under limited, defined conditions. The case we have here (*afšēbi*) implies that the present remains of the early conditions are the shift of fricative  $\nu$  to fricative  $\phi$  in the preposition  $\nu$ , i.e., *\*av* > *af*. For instance, *afqā<sup>o</sup> rāt* (Lev 19:20  $\text{בְּקֶרֶת}$ ), *afšilā* (Num 6:19  $\text{בְּשִׁלָּה}$ ), etc.

## 2.5. $\nu$ idma (Gen 14:2 $\text{אֲדָמָה}$ )

Concerning the case of  $\nu$ idma here, the  $\nu$  of the proper noun in local connotation (occurred 3 times in the Samaritan Pentateuch) regarded as a part of the root. The vowel of the  $\nu$  in nouns in the SH is usually *a* or *i*. The difference does not parallel between  $\nu$  with pataḥ and  $\nu$  with segol in the TH (the vowel *i* is more common). In nouns written with  $\nu$  in the SH, the vowel *a* is prevalent, although the vowel *i* can also be found as the case here.

In the TH, the distinction between the feminine ending  $\nu$  and the same ending indicating direction toward an aim is marked by the placement of stress. When the ending is accented, it is a feminine marker, and when it is not accented, it indicates He-locale. However, this distinction is not applied to the SH, since the stress is on penultimate syllable in the SH. Thus, one can deny the comprehension of the Samaritans on the function of *-a* ending.<sup>11)</sup>

## 2.6. wtē'dāl (Gen 14:9 $\text{וְתִדְעַל}$ )

*\*tid<sup>ac</sup>al* > *wtē'dāl*

The biblical stress on the Jewish tradition is precisely given only in the TH. In the TH, the stress mostly tends towards the end of the word (the ultimate stress, and less frequently comes on penultimate stress), whereas the SH has the stress mostly on the penultimate syllable (and less frequently on the ultimate syllable).

---

11) Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, *עאניש*, 5 vol., 274. Like an instance *lila* לילה which is cognate by Arabic  $\text{ليله}$ , the Samaritans may understand it as a feminine noun in morphological point of view. One can conclude only on the basis of syntax.

The case we have here belongs to the latter group of the SH, since its stress is on the ultimate syllable. When we see all the words, which are stressed on the penultimate syllable in the SH, most of the forms have gutturals in the second or third radical. In some types of nouns, mostly feminine forms, e.g. *rēbūt* (Num 15:5 רֶבִיעִית, *qārāttu* (Lev 13:42 קָרַחַת), etc., it is evident that the stress on the ultimate syllable results from the reduction of the last two syllables into one through the elimination of the consonant separating their vowels at an early stage of development. Ben-Ḥayyim has claimed that the Samaritan Hebrew had stresses on the ultimate syllable in the early stage since the ultimate syllable was derived from diphthong of the two last syllables, then it was contracted to a single syllable.<sup>12)</sup> According to him, it would seem that in the earlier stage, the forms (the ultimate stress results from the reduction of two syllables to one, such as *\*tūlāʾāt*, *ēlāʾāt*, *\*bāliyiʿl*) were originally stressed on their penultimate syllables. If we grant Ben-Ḥayyim's assumption, one can explain that the position of the stress in the SH results from stress recession from the ultimate to the penultimate syllable.<sup>13)</sup>

Blau remarked that the large number of explanations and the constant need for new solutions testify to the uncertainty surrounding the question of the development of the stress in the TH.<sup>14)</sup> Bauer (& Leander)<sup>15)</sup> and Bergsträsser<sup>16)</sup>

---

12) Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, *עצמני*, 5 vol., 219.

13) This explanation is based on these assumptions: a) existence of shewa in the stage prior to the SH, and its various transformations and consequences in the SH; b) the splitting of the diphthongs clearly demonstrating that the basic form of the split had ultimate stress (*nāṭīy* > *nāṭūwwi* טווי); c) a shift of vowels in the inflection of verbs known in the TH as involving stress (Philippi's law).

14) J. Blau, "Notes on Changes in Accent in Early Hebrew", S. Abramson and A. Mirsky, eds., *ספר חיים שירמן* (Jerusalem: Schocken. Institute for Jewish Research of the JTSA, 1970), 27.

15) H. Bauer & P. Leander, *Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testamentes* (Halle, 1922), 275f.

16) G. Bergsträsser, *Hebräische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1918), 116.

each assume two early stages preceding that of the TH; similarly, they each assume that one of these two stages is identical with the stress in literary Arabic. However, the very assumption of a stage equivalent to the stress in literary Arabic seems not plausible, since the Arabic stress has no phonological significance and that no distinctions are made on the basis of this stress, whereas in the TH, the very opposite is the case - vowel quantity being insignificant in TH, but stress decisive. They differ from one another in that Bauer & Leander make considerable use of the force of analogy to explain away features which would seem to contradict their basic assumptions, whereas Bergsträsser prefers a consistent phonological reconstruction, thus creating an extremely complex structure focused around morphological distinctions: nouns and suffixed verbs take one form of stress, whereas unsuffixed verbs and construct nominal forms take other kinds.

**2.7.** wyāḏi (Gen 1:19 יִהְיֶה) / wyiṣṣā (Lev 14:3 נִצַּח)

**2.7.1.** wyāḏi (יִהְיֶה) (Shortened Imperfect Qal)

In the TH, there are six verbal forms: perfect, converted perfect, imperfect, converted imperfect, jussive, and cohortative. These cases here (shortened imperfect Qal) have their individual character and syntactic, semantic distinctions. However, the system does not exist in every verb class and every stem. A waw preceding a measurable verbal form may have various semantic values. Probably, the Samaritans were not unaware, then that the reversal of the perfect and imperfect tenses of their own time appears in the SP mostly in forms with the conjunctive waw. In the SH, as in the second column of Origen's Hexapla, there was no morphological distinction between waw consecutive and waw conjunctive. The regulation of penultimate stress caused the forms to be

identical such as וַיִּלְךְ / וַיִּלְךְ, thus in the SH, there is no difference between waw consecutive and waw conjunctive.<sup>17)</sup>

The Hebrew reflected in the Samaritan tradition of recitation of the Pentateuch has its origins in the language of the late Second Temple period and the first generations thereafter.<sup>18)</sup> As far as we ascertain from other sources, the converted perfect, the converted imperfect, and the lengthened and shortened forms of imperfect (cohortative and jussive) were not used in the living language of the time, and it can reasonably be assumed that awareness of these forms had disappeared even among educated speakers. Where no morphological difference remained, the Samaritans, reading the Pentateuch, understood the biblical forms in accord with the usage of their own day. Thus, the Samaritan grammarians stated that “in a minority of cases, the perfect forms indicate future occasion” (e.g. *barriktāni*, Gen 32:27 בַּרְכָּתָנִי), and the perfect with waw “normally indicates past time” (such as *yēkassiyāmu* Ex 15:5 יִכְסִימוּ), and as for imperfect with waw, “the waw shifts the meaning from the future to the past”.<sup>19)</sup>

Phonological processes originally caused distinct forms to be conflated in the TH. Thus, in place of the forms *yaqtulu*, *yaqtula*, and *yaqtul*, Hebrew has the single form יִפְעַל, which must bear all shades of meaning and usage of the Arabic forms. Additional phonological processes acted in the SH in later generations, bringing about further unification of forms that has been distinct in the TH. For instance, the rule that a long *ī* vowel becomes *e* (ə) in a closed, unaccented syllable caused the loss of the morphological distinction between such forms as וַיִּקְרֵיב and וַיִּקְרַב in the TH: both become *wyaqrəb* when the stress moves back to the penult in the SH. One sometimes finds *šere* in place of *hireq* in the TH as

17) M. Florentine, *ibid.*, 118.

18) Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, *שׁוֹמְרֵי תּוֹרָה*, 5 vol., 170.

19) Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, *שׁוֹמְרֵי תּוֹרָה*, 1 vol., 67.

well such as Ex 19:3 וַתִּגַּד (cf. SH *wtagged*), although the TH distinguishes between imperfect and converted imperfect.

### 2.7.2. wyiṣṣā (ויצא)

In וי, the converted imperfect can be distinguished from the regular imperfect by vowel pattern, e.g., *wālād* (Gen 19:37 וַתֵּלֶד) / *tēlād* (Lev 12:5 תֵּלֶד), etc. The forms with preformative *y* can be explained as the perfect with the addition of the conjugation *y*. But this understanding of the verbs is inappropriate to the imperfect with *α*, *γ* or *τ* as the preformative vowel, such as *wāšābu* (Deu 1:45, 46 וַתִּשְׁבוּ) or *wāminna* (Gen 30:38 וַיִּחְמְנָה). Thus, we can state with certainty that the preformative vowel *ā* is derived from an ancient *a* vowel, as in the Ugaritic verb *ʾard*. Furthermore, the imperfect preformative vowel *e* (*šere* in TH) can be explained only as the product of assimilation to the vowel of the second radical.<sup>20)</sup> Originally, forms with *a* and forms with *i* > *e* coexisted at random in Hebrew; the Samaritan tradition utilized the two possibilities to create a semantic distinction. In some verbs, such as *šab*, the converted imperfect differs from the regular imperfect not only in the vowels, but in the consonants as well: *wāšāb* = TH וַתִּשְׁבּ (cf. *tiššāb*, Lev 12:4 תִּשְׁבּ). But this rule does not apply to the case of the verb *יצא* we have here, where we find *wyiṣṣā* (Gen 19:14 וַיִּצְאָה); *yīṣṣā* (Deu 24:5 יִצְאָה); *wyiṣṣāu* (Deu 21:2 וַיִּצְאוּ), etc.

### 2.8. qarnəm (Gen 14:5 קרנים)

\*qarnayim > \*qarnēm > qarnəm

There are three forms of grammatical number: singular, dual, and plural. The singular bears no particular number marker. Secondly, the dual form is marked by the suffix *-ayim* added generally to the singular form (e.g. Lev 11:42 רַגְלִים,

---

20) Z. Ben-Hayyim, *עצמי*, 5 vol., 173.

Exo 25:23 אֲמָתִים, etc.), although on occasion it occurs with the base form of the plural (e.g. Jer 52:7 חוֹמוֹתַיִם, Eze 27:5 לוֹחוֹתַיִם, etc.). The masculine plural carries the suffix ים- and the feminine plural וֹת-, although it must be recalled that the וֹת- suffix is frequently used for masculine nouns as well (e.g. Jdg 3:2 דוֹרוֹת, 1Sa 12:17 קוֹלוֹת, Exo 34:7 אֲבוֹת, etc.), and that ים- is also used as the plural marker for feminine nouns (e.g. Gen 5:6 שָׁנַיִם, Neh 9:28 עֲתִימִים, Exo 29:2 חֲטִימִים, etc.). And this phenomenon is also attested in the DSS.<sup>21)</sup>

The dual form of the SH is usually only a matter of morphology, and no longer delivers the semantic function of expressing duality. However, it seems implausible to me that it can be the same function that was expressing duality in biblical Hebrew or early stage Hebrew.

Furthermore, we found many dual nouns that are expressing the pair of body e.g. Lev 11:42 רַגְלַיִם, Gen 34:21 גְּדֵיִם, Job 41:12 מְחִירָיו\*(מְחִירָיִם), Exo 25:20 כְּנָפַיִם, Deu 28:65 עֵינַיִם, etc, although sometimes the dual forms express a number of objects bigger than two such as Lev 11:23 אַרְבַּע רַגְלַיִם. It alludes that the semantic function of the suffix fell into disuse. The orthography of the SP spelling does not differ in this respect from the Jewish Pentateuch, but the Samaritan pronunciation reflects a stage of Hebrew that has taken a further step toward the elimination of the dual form.

The dual and plural suffixes *-ayim* and *-īm* have been contracted from diphthong, and both become *-am* or *-īm* where there is ultimate stress. The medieval Samaritan grammarians have remarked that it is indicated by insert of

---

21) This phenomenon is attested also in the DSS. E. Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta Georgia: Scholars Press, 1986), 67. He remarked that, in the DSS, the masculine plural suffix ים- appears in the place of feminine plural nouns such as שָׁנַיִם. More frequently, the feminine plural suffix וֹת- appeared in the place of masculine plural nouns, such as מְגִדְלוֹת / מְגִדְלַיִם (which is already attested in BH). In the post-biblical Hebrew, the difference of the suffixes וֹת-/ים- became only a matter of style.

a soft letter between the yod of the plural and the letter preceding it.<sup>22)</sup> Here, one might question whether in the SH the origin of dual suffix is attached to the noun only in its singular form or whether it also attaches to the plural form. I think that the answer cannot be given decisively.

As a general rule, the SH was not familiar with shewa, thus in dual forms the vowel comes in the first and second radicals. However, as for the case we have here, there is no vowel between the first and second radicals. The form קַרְנִים in the toponym Jdg 14:5 עֲשֶׂתְרוֹת קַרְנִים is pronounced *qarnəm*, with no vowel between ר and נ. And it is well known that names tend to preserve their earlier form. Especially in this case, it happened before the invention of shewa mobile.

## 2.9. ׀at (Gen 1:1 אַת)

The case we have here is a preposition of monosyllable. This case leads us to question whether Philippi's law is applied in the SH.

The shift of vowel *i* to *a* in a closed, stressed syllable is known as Philippi's law in Hebrew. It has been highly disputed among the Semitic linguists. Many other scholars have been endeavoring to determine the law in phonological and morphological perspectives.<sup>23)</sup> When we deal with this regulation, we are required to examine other Semitic languages as well. According to Philippi's

---

22) Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, *אֲנִיִּשׁ*, 1, 5 vols., 180. The Samaritan grammarians, the high priests Elieser, Pinḥas, and Yoseph have explained: “הזכר (מובע) על ידי תוספת יו"ד הריבוי, כגון אלפים, שנתים ... כל שם עצם יש לו ריבוי וזוגי, להוציא את השם הפרטי. ריבוי”, which is translated as “every noun has dual and plural form except pronoun. The masculine plural is expressed by addition yod...”

23) There are plenty of articles on Philippi's law, but main discussions are made in the following articles: J. Blau, “On Pausal Lengthening, Pausal Stress Shift, Philippi's Law and Rule Ordering in Biblical Hebrew”, *Hebrew Annual Review* 5 (1981), 1-13; F. R. Blake, “The Apparent Interchange between *a* and *i* in Hebrew”, *JNES* 9 (1950), 152-158; E. Qimron, “חילופי צירי / פתח בעברית המקראית”, *Leshonenu*, 50 (1985), 77-102; E. Qimron, “הוספות למאמר 'חילופי צירי / פתח בעברית מקראית'”, *Leshonenu*, 50 (1985), 247-249. Especially Qimron's work is notable since he gives us not only general perspective on the law but makes new suggestions on the law. Moreover, he presents comparative analysis of different Hebrew traditions.

law, generally the vowel *i* behaves in several different ways: a) it remains in a closed, unstressed syllable.<sup>24)</sup> b) it becomes *şere* in a closed, stressed syllable; in an open syllable neighboring to the stressed syllable; or in an open, stressed syllable.<sup>25)</sup> c) it becomes *pataḥ* in a closed, stressed syllable, and in pause, it becomes *qameṣ*.<sup>26)</sup> d) Finally, it becomes *shewa* in an open syllable adjacent to the stressed syllable.<sup>27)</sup>

P. Joüon (& T. Muraoka) claimed that while the vowel *i* in all closed and stressed syllables becomes *a* according to the Babylonian tradition<sup>28)</sup>, in the Tiberian tradition, the vowel *i* shifts to *a* only when the vowel is in the first closed and stressed syllable.<sup>29)</sup> However, for E. Qimron, Philippi's law occurs in both syllables (penultimate syllable and ultimate syllable) not just in the verb system (mainly) of the Tiberian and Babylonian tradition,<sup>30)</sup> but also in nouns and pronouns. If Qimron's assumption is correct, there were two types of *şere*; one is long and the other is short. The long *şere* can remain while short *şere* shifts to *pataḥ*.

Sometimes we found *segol* in the Hexapla<sup>31)</sup> where *pataḥ* is found in Piel and Hifil of other Hebrew traditions such as the Tiberian and Babylonian traditions. In other words, the Hexapla was not familiar with the tradition that has a phonological interchange *i/a*. It seems that it is not a chronological issue rather a

24) For instance, לָבִי, בָּתוּי, יָתוּי, etc.

25) For instance, יָשָׁב, מָשָׁב, יָשָׁב, מָשָׁב, יָשָׁב, מָשָׁב, etc.

26) For instance, בָּתּוּ, חֲפָצָתּוּ, etc.

27) For instance, חֲמִינִי, יָשָׁבוּ, יָדְבָרוּ, etc.

28) In Babylonian sign “” stands for *pataḥ* and *segol*.

29) P. Joüon & T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1994), § 29 c-d.

30) E. Qimron, חֲמִינִי, 87, 96. He remarked that there is greater number of cases with *pataḥ* in the Babylonian tradition against cases with *şere* in the Tiberian tradition. Cf. F. R. Blake, *ibid*, 77.

31) Although it is in on-going dispute, it is worth to mention that we also found *segol* in the Septuagint, Hyronimus's Latin version against *pataḥ* of the Tiberian tradition.

dialectal question. It is plausible that the reason for the unmatched vowels between the Hexapla and other Tiberian tradition is that Origen's Hexapla only exhibits the Hebrew tradition that was not familiar with Philippi's law.<sup>32)</sup> Therefore, Qimron claimed that the vowel interchange *i/a* reflects a simple morph-phonemic variation than forms of different origins.<sup>33)</sup> Moreover, in the DSS, it seems that Philippi's law did not occur since short vowels *e* and *a* were not applied as *matres lectionis*.

Concerning Philippi's law in the SH, Ben-Ḥayyim claimed that the vowel *i* in the SH can remain, or shift to *e*, *a*, *ā*, but can never change to *shewa*.<sup>34)</sup> For him, Philippi's law has been applied in the Samaritan Hebrew except one single case, *qen* (Deu 22:6 קַן) / *qinnāk* (Num 24:21 קִנָּא).<sup>35)</sup> However, his assumption is not convincible, since he did not bring enough examples to prove the existence of the law. Furthermore, he disregarded the cases to which the rule did not apply. (was disregarded from the cases that the rule did not apply.) Even if Ben-

---

32) E. Qimron, חילוף, 88-89. He presents three reasons which have been claimed by scholars: a) the rule is early, however the analogy that compares the pausals and the normals has occurred in different ways in different traditions. Thus, in the Babylonian tradition, there are increased normal forms with the vowel *a*, while the vowel *e* was increased in the Haxapla transliteration, the Samaritan Hebrew, and the Palestinian tradition. b) Maybe, the rule (*i>a*) has occurred after Origen's Hexapla so that we cannot discern any trace of the rule in the Hexapla transliteration. However, as E. Qimron claimed, this assumption does not make sense well since Origen would not have known the Hebrew form if the rule has occurred later than the Hebrew that was already not spoken. c) Rather, this assumption would seem to be plausible, truly if it is a dialectal issue. Probably, it is presenting the dialectal differences among the ancient Hebrew traditions. Origen's Hexapla transliteration is reflecting the dialect in which the rule does not occur.

33) E. Qimron, חילוף, 99.

34) Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, שעניי, 5 vol., 57.

35) Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, שעניי, 5 vol., 79; F.R. Blake, *ibid.*, 81-82. Ben Ḥayyim has found only one case of exception that Philippi's law did not occur in the Tiberian tradition, but Blake found more exceptional cases including verbal forms. He remarked that the vowel *i* before consonant in the final syllable of the word is preserved, e.g. *ʾēm* < *ʾimm* (Exo 2:8 אֵם); *qēn* < *qinn* (Deu 22:6 קַן); *sēl* < *sill* (Gen 19:8 סֵל), etc.

Ḥayyim has presented cases as evidence, most of them are with one syllable of ultimate stress to which the law cannot be applied. Thus, we can not grant the existence of Philippi's law in the SH.

**2.10.** šinniyyār (Gen 10:10 רַשְׁיָר) / ʾā|āšār (Gen 14:1 אֲשָׁר)

/ʿāšu (Exo 1:17 אֲשֻׁ)

These are cases leading us to study the behavior sibilants in the Samaritan Hebrew. It is generally accepted that the distinction between  $\psi(\š)$  and  $\psi(\ś)$  in the Tiberian tradition originates from the use of the letter *s* for two sounds in ancient Hebrew. Ben-Ḥayyim assumed that the two sounds were independent consonants ( $\š$ ,  $\ś$ ), i.e., each was a separate phoneme, judged by both comparative grammar and Hebrew phonological considerations.<sup>36)</sup> However, the studies in Semitic languages in general makes it apparent (is apparent to a fact) that in the Hebrew alphabet  $\ś$  is the only phoneme marked polyphonically rather than by a special letter, and that the Hebrew alphabet stems from a language in which  $\š$  and  $\ś$  have merged, presumably to  $\š$ . And comparison with other Semitic languages clearly demonstrates the genuine character of the differentiation between  $\š$  and  $\ś$  in Hebrew, respectably, unlike the SH (both as  $\š$ )<sup>37)</sup>, and establishes the separate existence of  $\ś$ , which is different from the Proto-Semitic  $\ś$  and *s*. Since the Hebrew did not append new letters to the accepted alphabet, rather they used  $\š$  polyphonically, for both  $\š$  and  $\ś$ . Therefore,  $\psi$ , the letter marking  $\š$  was chosen to present  $\ś$ .<sup>38)</sup>

Concerning letters  $\psi$  and  $\nu$ , it seems less plausible that the shift of  $\psi$  to  $\nu$  in Aramaic led some scholars to consider Aramaic as the source of the

36) Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, רַשְׁיָר, 5 vol., 23.

37) The consonantal shift  $\ś > \š$  cause the forms to be identical, e.g. *šāma/šāmā* אֲשֻׁמַע / אֲשֻׁמַע.

38) G. Bergsträsser, *ibid.*, 48.

development in Hebrew.<sup>39)</sup> Unlike Aramaic, in the SH, the sound  $\psi$  became  $\check{s}$ , and never found such a change from  $\acute{s}$  to  $s$  (samekh).<sup>40)</sup> The interchange between  $\acute{s}$  and  $s$  can be found in the pronunciation of the Hebrew in various Jewish communities.<sup>41)</sup> However, in the SH, there is only a single sound  $\check{s}$  corresponding to the letter  $\psi$ . The Samaritans carefully distinguished between  $\check{s}$  ( $< \acute{s}$ ) of the SH and  $s$  ( $< \acute{s}$ ) of the SA. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the shift of  $\acute{s} > \check{s}$  had already existed before it became under the influence of Aramaic for the sound  $\acute{s}$  had survived until the SA speech became dominant.

Additionally, it seems probable that in Qumran Hebrew, there were no more than two voiceless non-emphatic sibilants:  $\check{s}$  and  $s$ . The orthography does not reflect the phonetic values accurately because  $\psi$  is used for  $\check{s}$  and  $s$  (whose origin is Proto-Semitic  $\acute{s}$ ) and  $\vartheta$  is used for  $s$  (whose origin is Proto-Semitic  $s$  and only rarely  $\acute{s}$ ).

### 3. Conclusion

When we evaluate the type of Hebrew in the contemporary Samaritan reading of the Pentateuch, we are required to ask the following question: To what extent is the contemporary SH an authentic reflection of the language when it was a living reality? In the process of describing and discussing the development of the SH under various grammatical explanations, we learned several distinctive facts (although I could not bring up all the grammatical issues of the SH): a) the shewa does not exist in this dialect, which takes important role in the Jewish Hebrew grammar. There is no vestige of this in the Samaritan grammar, b) there is only one  $\psi$ , pronounced  $\check{s}$  like the same letter in the Tiberian tradition, c) the

---

39) E. Ben Yehuda, *Thesaurus Totius Hebraeitis et Veteris et Recentioris* (Jerusalem, 1908-1959), 14 vol., 6777.

40) Z. Ben-Hayyim, “ישנם גם חדשים מן צפוני מדבר יהודה”, *Leshonenu* 42 (1978), 285.

41) “Hebrew Grammar”, *Encyclopedia Judaica* (New York, 1971), cols. 85-86.

guttural sounds behave in a special way. Verbs with these consonants are considered defective verbs. There is a difference between  $\aleph$  and  $\eta$  on the one hand, and  $\eta$  and  $\gamma$  on the other. The former being described as defective guttural letters, and the latter as sound guttural letters.

In addition, this study can contribute to a better translation of the Hebrew Bible. Translating the Hebrew Bible involves various grammatical considerations. Generally, the grammatical considerations take place based on the masoretic text, which is relatively a late development. However, we should remember that there are other Hebrew traditions of the OT, which are earlier than the Masora, such as the Babylonian, the Samaritan, and Origen's Hexaplaric traditions. Translating or interpreting the Hebrew Bible, we should take those different Hebrew traditions into consideration. Comparing different traditions, I believe, can contribute to discovering the significant grammatical differences that diversify the semantic aspects of the Hebrew Bible.

(투고 일자: 2010. 7. 30, 심사 일자: 2010. 9. 13, 게재 확정 일자: 2010. 9. 13)

<Keywords>

Samaritan Hebrew, Tiberian Hebrew, Babylonian Hebrew, Samaritan Pentateuch, Vocalization System.

<References>

- Bauer H. & P. Leander, *Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testamentes*, Halle, 1922.
- Ben-Ḥayyim, Z., *עברית וארמית נוסח שומרון על פי תעודות שבכתב ועדות שבעל פה*, 5 Vols., Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1957-1977.
- Ben-Ḥayyim, Z., “ישנם גם חדשים מן צפוני מדבר יהודה”, *Leshonenu* 42 (1978), 278-293.
- Ben-Ḥayyim, Z., “בשולי ״חוק פיליפי״”, *Leshonenu* 53 (1987), 113-120.
- Ben Yehuda, E., *Thesaurus Totius Hebraitis et Veteris et Recentioris*, Jerusalem, 1908-1959.
- Bergsträsser, G., *Hebräische Grammatik*, 2 Vols., Leipzig, 1918-1929.
- Blake, F. R., “The Apparent Interchange between *a* and *i* in Hebrew”, *JNES* 9 (1950), 152-158.
- Blau, J., “On Pausal Lengthening, Pausal Stress Shift, Philippi’s Law and Rule Ordering in Biblical Hebrew”, *Hebrew Annual Review* 5 (1981), 1-13.
- Blau, J., “Notes on Changes in Accent in Early Hebrew”, S. Abramson and A. Mirsky, eds., *ספר חיים שירמן*, Jerusalem, 1970, 27-38.
- Florentine, M., “הבחנות בין משמעויות שונות וסימונן באמצעים פונולוגים בעברית בשומרוני”, A. Dotan and A. Tal, eds., *ספר זיכרון לאליעזר מחקרים בלשון העברית - רובינשטיין*, Tel Aviv: University of Tel Aviv, 1995, 107-116.
- Joüon P., & Muraoka, S. J. T., *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 2 Vols., Roma: Biblical Institute Press, 1991.
- Qimron, E., “חילופי צירי / פתח בעברית מקראית”, *Leshonenu* 50 (1985), 77-102.
- Qimron, E., “הוספות למאמר ״חילופי צירי / פתח בעברית מקראית״”, *Leshonenu* 50 (1985), 247-249.
- Qimron, E., “חילופי צירי / פתח ו״חוק פיליפי״”, *Leshonenu* 56 (1991), 111-115.
- Qimron, E., *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Atlanta Georgia: Scholars Press, 1986.

Revell, E. J., *Hebrew Texts with Palestinian Vocalization*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970.

Yevin, I., *מסורת הלשון העברית המשקפת בניקוד הבבלי*, 2 Vols., Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1985.

<Abstract>

## 사마리아 히브리어의 몇 가지 특성들 -티베리아 히브리어와 비교 연구-

최현준 교수  
(장로회신학대학교)

사마리아인들은 스스로를 북이스라엘의 자손들이라고 생각한다. 사마리아인들은 유대인들과 언어적 전통을 달리하는 사마리아 오경을 그들의 유일한 경전으로 삼고 있다. 이 경전을 기록한 히브리어는 마소라의 티베리아 히브리어와는 문법적 차이를 보인다. 본 논문의 목적은 사마리아 히브리어의 몇 가지의 문법적 특징을 소개하는 데 있다. 티베리아 히브리어와 비교했을 때 사마리아 히브리어는 두드러진 음성학적 특징들을 가지고 있는데, 특징적 후음들, 세음의 부재 등이 그것이다. 때로는 후음을 동반한 동음 이의어들 중에는 발음은 같게 들리지만, 그 의미는 완전히 다른 경우가 있는데, 이러한 형태들은 그 두 단어들을 구분하는 것을 어렵게 만들기도 한다. 예를 들면,  $\text{רַב/רָב}$ 의 경우에 발음( $r\acute{a}b/r\bar{a}b$ )으로는 그 단어의 의미를 파악할 수 없으며 다만 문맥 상에서 파악할 수 밖에 없다. 그리고 티베리아 히브리어 전통, 바벨론 히브리어 전통, 그리고 소위 팔레스타인 모음체계는 모음의 장단을 구분하기보다는 모음의 질을 구분한다. 모음의 장단은 비교문법적 관점에서 추측되거나 해석되는 것이 통상적이다. 사마리아 히브리어 모음체계 역시 모음의 장단을 구분하지 않기 때문에 사마리아 히브리어 문법가들은 그 차이에 관하여 언급조차 하지 않았다. 그러나 한가지 분명한 사실은 사마리아인들의 모음체계의 목적은 그들의 사마리아 오경의 읽기 전통을 표현하기 위한 수단이며, 현대의 사마리아인들은 그것을 표준으로 삼고 있다는 것이다.