Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

The Place of the Word-Accent in Hebrew

MAX L. MARGOLIS

DROPSIE COLLEGE

L ANGUAGE is an historical product. As such it has its biography and chronology. Linguistic phenomena must therefore be studied genetically, that is to say, philologically. Empirical grammar is just as different from the philological kind as the homely interpretation of a literary document differs from skilled exegesis. The two methods may even yield contrary results. Thus, from the point of view of empiricism, the rule given in § 29 of the last[1] edition of Gesenius' *Hebrew Grammar* that in the accentuation of Hebrew words *milra'* predominates[2] is not quite correct even when the developed stage of the language is considered ;[3] the reverse is certainly the truth when we ascend to the beginnings. To prove my point, the following observations may be in place.

The traditional system of Hebrew accentuation can be mastered in its entirety only at the end of the Grammar. This is perhaps the reason why in the text-book alluded to it is scantily summarized at the threshold[4] and then forgotten at the end. The metrical system is properly treated in Wright's *Arabic Grammar* at the end.[5] That is the place where future Hebrew grammarians will have to discourse on Hebrew metre conveniently preceded by an account of the received accentuation. For it is clear that a knowledge of syntax is requisite for an adequate comprehension of the

---

[1] The twenty-eighth, Leipzig, 1909.
[2] " Der Hauptton der Wörter ruht nach der masoretischen Akzentuation meist auf der letzten Silbe, seltener auf der vorletzten."
[3] See at the conclusion of this paper
[4] § 15.
[5] ii², 858–868.

system.[6] Yet a cursory orientation is imperative at the very beginning. "The sentence antedates the word; the sentence-accent is therefore necessarily more original than the word-accent."[7] Without some sort of a knowledge of the Hebrew system of accentuation, an understanding of Hebrew phonology and morphology becomes nugatory. Now, the written text (*ketib*) of Scripture, on the surface at least, recognizes but two units; a maximal which is the section (פרשה) and a minimal which is the word (תבה). Between the two limits it would seem to discountenance all pauses. It knows of no verse-division.[8] It will not commit itself to one interpretation: the Torah has "forty-nine faces."[9] At a previous stage, when words were permitted to run together, the latitude of exegesis was still a wider one.[10] The heavenly Torah, according to Naḥmani,[11] was written in *scriptio continua* (כתיבה רצופה). Thus, the first words of Scripture might be read: *In initio creabatur Deus*.[12] The word-division is therefore something traditional; it ministers to sense, the simple sense. Now, the word itself is a composite (witness *bə-ṣalmẹ·-nū*, "in our image"), just as a number of words might conceivably be combined into a sense-unit. The Samaritans write הרגריזים, "Mount Gerizim," as one word.[13] The Jews write ביתאל, "Bethel," as one word,[14] but בית לחם, "Bethlehem," as two words.[15] Accordingly, the one is an

---

[6] See Wickes, *Poetical Accents*, ch. iv; *Prose Accents*, ch. iv.

[7] Wundt, *Die Sprache* (= *Völkerpsychologie*, i), li, 393.

[8] Sofrim 3, 7; see art. "Verse-Division" in *JE*.

[9] p. Sanh. 22 *a*; see Bacher, *Exeget. Terminologie*, ii, 157 f. Comp. also b. Sanh. 34 *a* (Bacher, *ibid.*, 72).

[10] As may be exemplified by any line in the Eshmunazar inscription.

[11] Introd. to his commentary on the Pentateuch.

[12] בראש יתברא אלהים.

[13] See Cowley, *Samaritan Liturgy*, ii. p. liv (*s.v.*).

[14] See Baer on Gen. 12 s.

[15] On the subject of word-division in the biblical text comp. Sofrim 5, 10, 11 (and Müller's notes); p. Megillah 72 *a*; b. Pesaḥim 117 *a*; Norzi on Gen. 12 s, Ex. 17 ıɕ. The list No. 99 in 'Okla ụe-'Okla (see the references to the Masora, Norzi, and Heidenheim Frensdorff, *Massoret. Wbch.*, 369 *a*) enumerates fifteen words written as one word and read as two; three examples (מזה, מלכם, מהם) contain מה, one (והנהו) הוא, and two (מרמסטרה, מנסטרה) מן as an element; in the remainder of the examples (with the

example of two words habitually run together, as the other
is of two words habitually separated.   The spelling בצלמו
as one word is equally habitual, traditional.   It goes no fur-
ther than the habitual severance in the case of בצלם אלהים,
" in the image of God."

While the word, in its traditional limits, is the minimal
conceptual unit, it has no standing in phonetics.   At least
in ordinary speech, pausation may and may not coincide
with the word-end.   The minimal phonetic unit is the stress-
group ("Sprechtakt"); its measure is equivalent to the
distance between two consecutive strong-stressed syllables.
The length of a stress-group is relative to the whole of
a connected utterance, and varies according to the distribu-
tion of forces which itself is conditioned by the tempo of the
speaker or the nature of the literary piece as it is recited
with more or less solemnity.   What in a slow, even tempo
appears as broken up into a number of groups becomes in a
recitation which aims at sense rather than at clear enuncia-
tion a compact unit with graded stresses ("Taktgruppe").
Both the shorter and the longer groups are rhythmic figures ;
in both, the intervals with weaker stresses will be reduced
to the shortest possible limit.[16]   In the received system of
Hebrew accentuation, there are shorter and longer groups
properly graded with reference to 'one another and to the
longest group of which they are component parts.   Absolute
pausation is reached only at the end of a connected period
which may cover more than the measure of a single verse.
Within the period as a unit, relative pauses are freely dis-
tributed.   Relative subordination of stresses is the supreme

exception of לבנימי) the kere is based on an exegetical conception not pre-
supposed by the kettb.   Interesting are also the lists Nos. 100–102 ; the ex-
amples are again of unequal merit.   The versions, notably the Septuagint,
show differences in the word-division ; Jer. 23 ɞ is the best-known example ;
see Driver, Notes on Samuel, p. xxx ff.   In Arabic and Syriac (but particu-
larly in Mandaic ; see Nöldeke, § 14) certain words (forms) are habitually
joined together ; at the same time the converse process is equally observable,
comp. Mandalc-Talmudic כד, Mishnic של in the editions, Biblical בשל.

[16] On the subject of stress-groups and their gradation comp. Sievers,
Phonetik[5], §§ 620–653 ; Jespersen, Lehrbuch der Phonetik, § 210 ; Sweet,
Primer of Phonetics, §§ 91–118.

principle of the Hebrew system of accentuation.   When the smallest measure is reached and it covers more than one word, the hyphen steps in as a mark of stress-union; in the relatively higher group, a "conjunctive accent" serves the same purpose ; in the still higher group, a "disjunctive" of minor grade ; and so on.   Hyphenation goes naturally with a quickened tempo.[17]

It is well known that the retarded tempo was favored by Ben-Naphtali and the quicker by Ben-Asher.   Where the latter is content with a hyphen, the former introduces an "accent."[18]   The difference between the two cannot have been appreciably great.[19]   In proof of this proposition may be mentioned in the first place the fact that frequently a "conjunctive accent" appears in one and the same word in front of a "disjunctive."[20]   Then, the spirantization of the בֹּנֵדְכֹּפֵת is effected by an immediately preceding vowel whether in the same word or in two separate words, and it is immaterial in the latter instance whether the phonetic union is indicated by the hyphen or by a "conjunctive."[21]   In either case, we are dealing with a stress-group, shorter or longer, spoken without a pause implying a fresh impulse of force.   A further proof is afforded by the rules which the

[17] A glance at (or preferably a reading aloud of) the first three verses of Scripture will substantiate the remarks in the text.   I have in mind the interpretation of the unsophisticated Rashi.   Had the accentuators chosen to make of the three one verse (comp. Kiddushin 30 a, with reference to Ex. 19 9; note in particular the decalogue according to the טעם העליון), there would have resulted visually a series of long groups held together by hyphens or by a multiplication of *servi*, whereas in the present less unwieldy division they are broken up into smaller groups coinciding for the most part, yet not altogether, with the word-division of the *ketib*.   Once we adopt a less retarded mode of reading, the groups will lengthen, the words come closer together, and the hyphens multiply.

[18] So *e.g.* Gen. 1 4, וַיַּרְא־אוֹר, Ben-Asher ; וַיַּרְא אוֹר, Ben-Naphtali.   See Baer, *Genesis*, 81, n. 3.

[19] Grimme, *Hebr. Akzent-u. Vokallehre*, 30 ; Praetorius, *Über d. rückweichenden Accent*, 7.   Grimme's view that the hyphen may be preceded by a strong stress is acceptable only if the relative gradation between it and the next following strong stress is had in mind.

[20] *E.g.* הַנְּנֶךָ, Deut. 7 18.

[21] *E.g.* וַיְהִי־בֹקֶר, Gen. 1 5 ; הָיְתָה תֹהוּ, 1 2.

rabbis lay down for the distinct articulation of every speech-element in the *Shema'*.[22] The examples adduced cover indifferently words united by a hyphen and words joined together by means of a " conjunctive." [23] It follows that in ordinary reading which was less exact and therefore less retarded, not to mention ordinary speech, it was customary to utter all such word-groups with so complete a union of force that similar sounds were run together [24] and that even the syllabic division was obliterated to such an extent that laryngal sounds (the hamza, but also ע) were ignored.[25] But the strongest proof comes from the *ketib* itself. Whatever the cause of the peculiar orthography of the Koran (on which subject there is a difference of opinion between Vollers [26] and Nöldeke [27]), so much is certain that the Hebrew *ketib* points to words spoken after the manner of the Arabic " pausals " [28] and to others uttered in close union with their syntactical dominants, *i.e.* as the weaker elements of stress-groups.

The most obvious instance of a stress-group in the *ketib* is afforded by the *'iḍāfeh* construction with a feminine noun ending in *-at* as the *muḍāf*. The retention of the closing consonant (*t*) is evidence of the close union of the component parts of the *'iḍāfeh;* contrast the disappearance of the same sound when the word is spoken pausally, "in the abso-

[22] p. Berakot 4 *d* (see Alfasi according to Tosafot Berak. 15 *b, s.v.* בק ; Asheri, *ad locum;* Ṭûr, 'Oraḥ Ḥ'ḭim, § 61, with Karo's note) ; b. Berak. 15 *b.*

[23] *E.g.* עָשָׂב בְּשָׂדֶךָ, בְּכָל־לְבַבְכֶם, Deut. 11 15. 18.

[24] The Arabic term is *'idġām*, the Hebrew הבלעה. See *Riḳma*, 141 f. (reputed opinion of Saadia concerning the pronunciation of בן נון with *'idġām* which is approved and carried further ; the intervention of a " conjunctive" is pronounced no hindrance) ; *Miklol*, smaller Venice edition, 95 ff.

[25] Thus the fear was expressed that וְחָרָה אַף, Deut. 11 17, might sound like וְחָרָף ; וְשָׂדֶה יְהוָֹה, v. 21, like וְשָׂבָה יהוה (both examples show by the way that ף and ה were not qualitatively different). See also Sofrim 5, 10, where וחרה אף וחרה אף' is deleted by the Gaon of Wilna, and comp. Wellhausen, *Samuelis*, v–vii ; Margolis, *ZAW*, xxvii (1907), 257.

[26] *Volkssprache u. Schriftsprache im alten Arabien*, 158.

[27] *Beiträge z. semit. Sprachwissenschaft*, 7 ; *Neue Beiträge*, 1 ff.

[28] Wright, ii², 368–373.

lute state." Thus, over against אֲדָמָה, Gen. 4 2, we have
אַדְמַת קֹדֶשׁ, Ex. 3 5; the writing in two words, as was
pointed out above, is just as habitual as is the union in one
word in the case of אַדְמַתְכֶם, Gen. 47 23; it is simply a mat-
ter of orthography, but the morphological and phonetic con-
figuration is identical in both cases.   What is mutely hinted
at by the *ketib*, is clearly brought out by the *kere*.   The loss
of the middle vowel (*a*) in אַדְמַת, whether in the combina-
tion אַדְמַת־קֹדֶשׁ or in אַדְמַת מִצְרַיִם, Gen. 47 20, exactly as in
אַדְמַתְכֶם, when compared with its retention in אֲדָמָה, shows
that there is a difference in grade between the strong or
pausal and the half-strong or non-pausal stress.   It further-
more shows how immaterial it is whether the *muḍāf* is joined
to its dominant by means of a hyphen or a "conjunctive."
While the preference for the hyphen in אַדְמַת־קֹדֶשׁ may be
explained as due to a desire of avoiding a collision of the
two stresses (the strong and the half-strong),[29] no such rea-
son obtains in the case of אַדְמַת־עָפָר, Dan. 22 2.   The hyphen
is apparently the normal and the "conjunctive" a mere sub-
stitute; in a double *'iḍāfeh*, a "disjunctive" of minor grade
may be resorted to, but the morphological configuration will
not be altered, as in מִתְּבוּאֹת אֶרֶץ כְּנַעַן, Josh. 5 12.   The *ketib*
is concerned solely with detached concepts; but the *kere*
naturally joins together in utterance what is visually sepa-
rate, and reduces phrases like אַדְמַת, אַדְמַת־עָפָר, אַדְמַת־קֹדֶשׁ
מִצְרַיִם to the level of אַדְמַתְכֶם.   For practical purposes, the
rule may be laid down that the distribution of the vowels in
the "construct state" of any noun will be exactly the same as
in the nominal element preceding a so-called "heavy" suffix.[30]

---

[29] Praetorius, *l.c.* 9 ff.

[30] Thus רֹאשׁ, Prov. 12 14 ‖ רֹאשָׁם(ם), Num. 32 24; אָבִיךָ, Isa. 9 5 ‖
אֲבִיכֶם, Gen. 31 9; כְּמֹאָבֶן, Ex. 15 5 ‖ כְּמוֹכֶם, Job 12 3, הַקְדֹשׁוּלָם, Ex. 30 21 ‖
הַקְדֹשְׁכֶם, 5 14; יָדִי־חֶרֶב, Jer. 18 21 ‖ יָדְכֶם, Deut. 31 29, and so on.   To סְבֹת as
a construct state comp. מִבְתְחֶךָ, Deut. 28 53, which suggests מַבְתַּהְכֶם, just as
בְמוֹתֵי, Deut. 32 13, comports with בְּמֹתֵיכֶם, Lev. 26 30.   אַרְצְכֶם, Lev. 19 9,
would lead to אֶרֶץ, actually witnessed to by the Greek transliteration αρς;
אֶרֶץ, on the other hand, points the way to a possible אַרְצְכֶם, comp. חֻמְּכֶם
(inferred from חֻמָּךְ, Ps. 102 11) by the side of יֹמָם־, Lam. 2 6.   Comp. also
שְׁבִיכֶם, Num. 31 19; פְּרִיהֶם, Am. 9 14, which recall שְׁבִי, פְּרִי.   See *AJSL*,
xii (1896). 219.

The weakened force with which the *mudạf* is uttered re-
sults in stresslessness [31] when it consists of but one syllable,[32]
while a form consisting of more than one syllable is subject
to half-strong stressing.[33]   In the case of the smallest meas-
ure of two syllables, the following rules seem to have gov-
erned the position of the stress:

(1) Of two unequal syllables, the longer was stressed.

(2) Where the duration was equal, the stress might con-
ceivably rest on the one or the other.   As a matter of fact,
however, the only example in which both syllables main-
tained themselves in actual Hebrew is that of two long syl-
lables, and then the stress rests on the second.

(3) (Open) syllables with long vowels or closed syllables
with short vowels were regarded as longer than (open) sylla-
bles with short vowels.   But even the latter kind of syllables
might be differentiated according to the sonority of the
vowel, the vowel *a* surpassing in this respect the others.[34]

In the form of a table, we obtain the following combinations:

cv̄:cv	*kā:la*	קוֹל
cvcv̄:	*'abī:, ḷadaḷ:, binā:*	אֲבִי, יְדֵי, בְּנוֹ
cv:cv	*ḷa:da*	יְדֵ
cvcv:	*bina:*	Arab. *bna*
cv̄cv̄:	*'aḷnaḷ:*	עֵינָי

[31] Properly speaking, there is no such thing as stresslessness; it is simply
a case of "weak" stressing.

[32] *E.g.* קׇם־אֵשׁ, Prov. 12 14.   So soon, however, as the strong stress is
deferred by the measure of a syllable, a half-strong stress is introduced, *e.g.*
קׇם־אֵשׁוֹ, Ex. 28 32.   The ֽ (*meteg*) in itself is no sign of stress; it is really
nothing more than a mark of caution for the purpose of preventing the
slurring of a vowel when at a distance from the strong stress.   See Baer,
"Die Metheg-Setzung," in Merx's *Archiv*, i. 56 f.   A closed syllable natu-
rally protects its vowel; hence there is no call for the mark of caution;
nevertheless, under the same conditions, a closed syllable is equally capable
of being the bearer of a half-strong stress; pronounce accordingly חׇקְ־עֹלׇם,
Ex. 30 21, *ḥọ:ḵ'ọla·m*.

[33] Provided, of course, the interval of a syllable separates it from the
strong stress of the dominant.

[34] Jespersen, *l.c.* § 192, end.   It is to be remembered, however, that it is
difficult to say which of the case-vowels was the more currently used in
primitive Hebrew.   Thus, the actual Hebrew form in a given case may have
resulted from one of the cases, and then been used indiscriminately for the
others as well.

It is clear from the Hebrew equivalents that an unstressed short vowel was subject to reduction or total loss in the syllable preceding, and to total loss in the syllable following, the half-strong stress.

So soon as the *mudạf* grew in length beyond the measure of two syllables, antepenultimate stressing was out of the question when one or the other of the two closing syllables was long. The position of the stress was then determined by the preceding table; hence *barū:ka*, *mamlakā:ta*, *barū-kaǐ:*, *dabaraǐ:*. On the other hand, when both the closing syllables were short, the stress might still be placed on the penultimate: *gabūra:ta*, *kabi:da*, *ṣadaḳa:ta*. But antepenultimate stressing was quite as possible: *iš:ata*, *ka:bida*, *'aṭa:rata*. As for the part of the word preceding the (half-strong) stress, it is clear that it was spoken with so quick a tempo as to leave room at best for a second, quarter-strong, stress. The conditions are obvious. In the first place, the two stresses had to be separated by at least one syllable. Then, the syllable which became the bearer of the weaker stress might itself be short or long; when short, a further condition attached itself that the intervening syllable must likewise be short; when the latter was long, it entrained the immediately preceding short syllable and the two together became unstressed. Thus *mam::lakā:ta*, *da::baraǐ:*, but *gabūra:ta*. The effect of a stress, whether half or quarter strong, was to protect the vowel which bore it,[35] while unstressed vowels succumbed. Hence the examples selected in the foregoing assumed in Hebrew the forms בָּרוּךְ, בְּרֻכִי, מַמְלְכוּת, עֲטָרֶת, צִדְקַת, אֶשֶׁת, כָּבֵד, כְּבַד, גְּבוּרַת. It is evident that those with *milra'* accentuation were — *sit venia verbo* — *mil'el* in primitive Hebrew. It may further be observed

---

[35] Comp., however, Origen's transliteration λφωθ for לְפֻנֹּת, Ps. 46 6. The nearest approach to it in the Tiberian nikkud is וּבְרִיח, and the like (on וּמִצּוֹחָתִי, see Kahle, *D. MT. des AT. nach d. babylon. Überlieferung*, 27; examples are available to me from a masoretic Genizah fragment which Dr. Schechter has been kind enough to turn over to me for publication, and from Origen). After all, the grammarian Hanau was not altogether wrong with his theory of the קלה קנוסה תנוסה (see his צדר התבה, ed. Grodno, 1805, 14, 18 ff.).

that, so soon as the strong stress of the dominant collides with the half strong of the *muḍâf*, the latter recedes by the measure of one (Hebrew) syllable, thus often coinciding with the place formerly occupied by the next weaker stress, visibly when the *muḍâf* has a "conjunctive," invisibly when the latter is replaced by a hyphen.[86]

When the syntactical dominant is a pronoun in the place of a noun, it and the nominal *muḍâf* are orthographically conjoined in one word.   But that, as was pointed out above, is solely a matter of habit.   Of greater importance is the circumstance that the strong stress falls on the nominal element, the pronoun becoming an enclitic.   In the case of the so-called " light " suffixes, that is, of the pronominal element consisting of one syllable, the fact is obvious enough, recalling Greek analogies.[87]   A phonetic result is the reduction[88] and even subsequent loss of closing long vowels, and the immediate loss of short vowels in the same position: hence *pî* (<*pî·-ḭa*), *pî·-ḵậ* (<*pî·-ḵâ*), *pî·-ḵ* (<*pî·-ḵî*), *pî·-hậ* (<*pî·-hâ*); but long *ū* remains: *pî·-nu*, *pî·-hu* (*pî·-u̯*). With the lengthening of the nominal form the stress due on the enclitic is thrown back on the closing vowel of the nominal element[89] which it thus safeguards; in the historical development of the language, this stress becomes the main (strong) stress of the combination; hence *dǝḇare·-nū* < *daba·ri:-nū*, etc.   In the case of the so-called " heavy " suffixes, that is, the pronominal elements which originally consisted of two syllables (with a long vowel in the second) (*-kimā, -kinā, -himā, -hinā*), it is clear that the weight of the suffix might resist enclisis.[40]   Either the stress indigenous to the pronominal element rested on the long ultima, then the stresslessness of the preceding syllable with the ensuing loss of its vowel (entraining in turn the disappearance of the

[86] See Praetorius' work cited above, and comp. above, n. 32.

[87] Comp. φῶϛ μου.

[88] *ă* < *ā*. Kühner-Blass, *Griech. Gramm.*, i³, § 89, n. 2 : " Lange Silben der Encliticae werden in Beziehung auf die Betonung als kurze angesehen, weil die enklitischen Wörter rasch und ohne Nachdruck gesprochen werden."

[89] Comp. Greek σῶμά μου.

[40] Comp. Greek φῶϛ ὑμῶν.

next preceding laryngal) caused the stress of the enclitic to be
thrown back on the stem-final of the noun which then became
the main stress of the combination : *dəbårå·-mo* (the next step
was *dəbårå·-m*) < *daba·ra:-himằ*. Or the stress rested on
the penultimate, causing reduction in the length of the con-
cluding vowel, and on the other side stresslessness of the pre-
ceding stem-final of the noun ; hence *dəbar-ke̦·må*, *dəbar-he̦·må*
(from which *dəbar-ke·m*, *dəbar-he̦·m*). But the tendency
of throwing back the stress of the enclitic on the stem-final
of the noun might prevail ; hence כְּלְהֶנָה, כְּלְהֶם (= *kul̈a·-hm*).
Thus, where in the combination of noun *plus* possessive pro-
noun we find in historical Hebrew *milra'* accentuation, as in
פְּ֗, פֶּ֗ךָ, דִּבְרָ֗ו, דִּבְרֶם, the forms upon which they are based,
and which with the exception of the first still occur by the
side of the others, are all *mil'el*.

As for the second part of the *'idåfeh*, when it consists of a
noun in isolation (unencumbered by suffixes), it resembles
to all intents and purposes the Arabic pausal.[41] It is clear
that the Arabic forms themselves presuppose the absence of
the *tanŷin*, and that the strong stress remained there where
it was when the stem-finals were still sounded. Hence the
milra' accentuation of the so-called "absolute state" is some-
thing comparatively recent. The permanence of the short
vowel in the syllable preceding the strong stress, no matter
what one may think of its quantity in Hebrew,[42] is appar-
ently due to the retarded pronunciation characteristic of
pausals ; contrast the reduction of the same vowel when
followed by the half-strong stress. It is well known that
the vowels *i* and *u* more readily succumb even before pausals
than the vowel *a* ; another instance of the greater sonority
of the latter.

Outside the *'idåfeh*, which is the most natural stress-group
suggested by the *ketib*, other stress-groups are created by the
kere wheresoever a syntactical union manifests itself, as for
instance between nouns joined by means of "and" or be-

---

[41] Comp. דָ with *ṭad*, מַלְכָּה with *malikah*, בְּנִים with *banîn*, בָּנוֹת with
banât, and so on. See the reference above, n. 28.

[42] See Grimme, *l.c.* 49 f.; Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, i. 101.

tween a noun and its attributive adjective. Thus we find
עַם וָעָם, Esth. 1 22, compared with עַם מָרְדֳּכַי, 3 6; בְּלֶב־טוֹב,
Eccl. 9 7, compared with בְּלִבָּם, Ex. 15 8.[43] But here like-
wise the *ketib* led the way; comp. חכמת ודעת, Isa. 33 6. Note
בֶּן־קֶמַח, 2 Sam. 9 12;[44] hence כְּאָח־לִי, Ps. 35 14; and so
דָּבָר קָטֹן, 1 Sam. 22 15. There is a tendency therefore to
keep the "absolute state" intact within the stress-group.

When we turn to the verb, the forms in combination with
objective suffixes are developed accentually exactly as the
corresponding forms of the noun when combined with pos-
sessive suffixes.[45] The forms with the endings וּן, ִין, =
-*ûna*, -*îna*, are built, at least in " pause," exactly like the cor-
responding nominal forms ending in ִים, = -*îma*, quite cor-
rectly, for the "absolute state" of the noun represents a
primitive pausal.[46] Just as the strong stress with which
these forms were spoken is recognizable by the maintenance
of the vowel (long or short) in the syllable near the stress,
so conversely the reduction of a short vowel in the same
position must needs indicate the half-strong stress which
belongs to the form when joined to another word in one
stress-group.[47] The same difference between pause and con-

---

[43] Comp. also לְדֹר וָדֹר, Isa. 34 17 over against מִדּוֹר לְדוֹר, 34 10. Comp.
also הֲקִמֹתָן, Ps. 148 6 (object *plus* verb) by the side of הֲקִם־שָׁלוֹם.

[44] Comp., however, שֶׁם־הָעִיר, Gen. 28 19 (Greek σεμ αειρ).

[45] Comp. נָתַן, Gen. 31 7, with דִּבְרֵי, Num. 30 3; וּגְלִי, Esth. 5 11, with
מְסָמֵּר, Ps. 30 13, etc. Forms like אֶתְקֶנְךָ, Jer. 22 24, and their like have their
analogies in מִמֶּךָ, Gen. 35 11. In בֶּרְכַטֻבְם, Ps. 118 26, the accent advances
exactly as in בְּשֻׁרְבְם, Jdg. 8 7; hence we are at liberty to construct נְחֻנְכֶם,
הִרְנִחְכֶם, etc.

[46] Comp. יְקוּמֻן, Deut. 33 11, by the side of מְרוּבִים, 1 Sam. 23 21, תִּשְׁכַּבְן,
Isa. 50 11, תֵּדְבָּקַן, Ruth 2 8, by the side of מְקַדְּשִׁים, Ezek. 21 7.

[47] Hence אֲשֶׁר־יִשְׁכְּבֻן אֵת־הַנָּשִׁים, 1 Sam. 2 22, contrasted with טֶרֶם יִשְׁכָּבוּ,
Josh. 2 8. Comp., on the other hand, טֶרֶם יִשְׁכָּבוּ, Gen. 19 4. Both forms
reveal the *vis inertiae* of the stress which remains there where it stood in
primitive Hebrew when endings consisting of two syllables were stressed
while monosyllabic endings were unstressed. I am speaking of what was, or
came to be, the strong stress. For when a form ending in a monosyllabic
termination was joined in the context to the word next following in a stress-
group, the half-strong stress might be allowed to rest on the monosyllabic
ending; hence יִשְׁכְּבוּ שְׁנַיִם, Eccl. 4 11. In the context, therefore, both forms

text accentuation is found with the endings הָ = -*an*, and
הָ = -*at*.[48] Both the "pausal" נִשְׁבְּרָה and the "absolute"
נִשְׁבְּרָה (רָחַ), Ps. 51 19, are primitive pausals; the difference
in the position of the stress rests on the circumstance that
whereas the verbal form ended primitively in -*at*, the nomi-
nal form ended in -*atu*(*n*).[49] In the contextual forms the
difference was naturally obliterated. But even there *mil'el*
accentuation is retained when the penultimate syllable is a
long one.[50]

The (subjective) pronominal suffixes which meet us in
the forms of the first and second person of the "perfect"
are seemingly on an equal footing with the objective pro-
nominal suffixes joined to nominal or verbal forms, accen-
tually speaking. That is to say, the suffixes of a pronominal
character are originally enclitic. Where in the present state
of the language the accent nevertheless rests on the suffix,
as in the case of the "heavy" suffixes, the longer form of
the suffix merely resisted the enclisis, with the result that in
the combination what was originally the half-strong stress
came to be the strong stress, and *vice versa*. עֲזָבְתֶם, Josh.
22 3, עֲזַבְתֶם, Neh. 9 17, and עֲזַבְכֶם (inferred by analogy) show
on the surface the same accentuation. Yet the following
point of difference must not be overlooked. As is shown by
the spirant in עֲזַבְכֶם over against the explosive in עֲזַבְתֶם,
the objective suffixes were joined to the form with its stem-
final preserved, while the subjective suffixes were appended
to the form after it had lost its stem-final. It follows from
the nature of the formation of the "perfect" (which has its

ending in the longer termination and those with the shorter are indifferently
milra', while in pause only the former can be *milra'*, the latter being neces-
sarily *mil'el*.

[48] Comp. וָאֲדַבְּרָה, Gen. 18 30; נִשְׁבְּרָה, Ps. 84 21; but וָאֲדַבְּרָה אַךְ־הַפַּעַם,
Gen. 18 32, נִשְׁבְּרָה מוֹאָב, Jer. 48 4.

[49] Hence also the dissonance between אֲדַמְתוֹ, Deut. 32 43, and גְּמָלַתְהוּ,
Prov. 31 12. See on the latter form and its like, *AJSL*, xix (1902), 45 ff.
In the forms with "heavy" suffixes, both sets of forms naturally coincide
(see *ibid.* 168).

[50] Comp. קְמוּ בָנֶיהָ, Prov. 31 28; נָטְצוּ מָעָלָיו, 2 Kings 25 5; הֵקֵלוּ הַמָּיִם, Gen.
8 8 (but רָבּוּ מְשׁוּבֹתֵינוּ, Jer. 14 7), etc.

analogies in late historical combinations of the participle
with the pronoun in Aramaic[51]) that we are dealing in its
case with a less archaic composition than in the instance of
noun *plus* possessive suffix (and the verb *plus* objective suf-
fix). It may be laid down as certain that the noun ante-
cedes the verb, and that in the verb the imperfect is more
ancient than the perfect. קְטַנְתְּ (comp. קָטֹנְתִּי, Gen. 32 11)
is but an abbreviated קְמָן אַתָּה, 1 Sam. 15 17.   While in his-
torical Hebrew the distribution of stresses in a phrase like
קְמָן אַתָּה proceeds in such a manner that the pronoun is the
bearer of the strong stress, a different gradation is clearly
presupposed in קְטַנְתְּ, where the strong stress rested on the
nominal element of the combination (the predicate) ; hence
the preservation of the vowel in the syllable preceding the
strong stress, exactly as in the case of יָדַע, etc.   As for
the form of the third person singular, the pausal form (*e.g.*
זָכָר, Ps. 9 13) requires no further explanation; it is exactly
analogous to the "absolute state" of the noun.   But the
contextual form (*e.g.* זְכַר יְהֹוָה, Jer. 44 21) has long been a
puzzle;[52] for while it follows the analogy of the "construct
state" of the noun with regard to the vowel of the ultima,
thus indicating a corresponding half-strong stress, the reten-
tion of the vowel of the penultima is difficult.   Yet it is no
more difficult than the retention of the same vowel in the
contextual forms of the pattern זָכְרָה, Lam. 1 7, יָכְלוּ, Gen. 37 4,
and even יִדְעוּן, Deut. 8 3 (comp. also אֹכְלַת יָד, 32 36); the
forms are clearly late when their vocalization is considered,
the earlier forms for which, at least in the case of the femi-
nine singular, Aramaic analogies exist,[53] having been sup-
planted.   The truth is that in entering a combination with
another word as a stress-group, the verbal form resisted com-
plete subordination; and the reason is obviously this that a
verbal form is a complete sentence in itself ; hence its syn-
tactical union with any word can be properly only of a sec-

---

[51] Syriac, Mandaic, Talmudic, Neo-Syriac.

[52] See Grimme, *l.c.* 49.

[53] Comp. סְלִקַת Dan. 7 20, וַאֲמֶרֶת 5 10.

ondary character. The same holds good of the forms of the imperfect without "afformatives"; the persistence of the long vowel, as for instance in the אָקֻ֫ם forms, shows clearly that we are dealing with primitive pausals,[54] the strong stress effecting the retention of a short vowel in the syllable preceding it, which vowel remains in the developed language also in the context. Comp. also the treatment of the "absolute state" of the noun in similar conditions adverted to above.

An equally late procedure, dating from historical times, is the retention of an unstressed vowel which has become so in consequence of the shifting of the accent farther to the end of the word in the perfect with the so-called ו consecutive. Hence חָכַ֫רְהָ, Deut. 15 15, contrasted with וּזְכַרְתַּ֫ו, 1 Sam. 1 11, etc. In the case of a long vowel in the penultimate, the accentuation fluctuates between *milra'* and *mil'el*. The pausal accent equally acts as a check on the shifting of the accent.

On the other hand, the pausal accent effects *milra'* accentuation in the case of the imperfect *plus* the so-called ו consecutive in all forms not containing "afformatives." The pausal accent namely introduces normal accentuation of words spoken in isolation. In the context, on the other hand, the primitive mode of stress persisted. The common statement that the ו consecutive is prefixed to the jussive form of the imperfect is mechanical and misleading. It is true that a similar mode of stressing obtains in both.[55] But the reasons were absolutely different. The jussive and imperative were primitively spoken with the so-called "interjectional" accent. The imperfect following a ו consecutive, on the other hand, was originally a "conjunct" form with the stress resting on the relatively more important conjunction; in historical Hebrew, where the accent could not go farther than the penultimate, and certainly not to the conjunctional prefix, it was placed as near its original position as possible; hence *mil'el* accentuation.[56]

[54] Contrast אָקֻ֫ם ‖ Arab. *'akū·m-u*, with תְּקֻ֫מְהָ ‖ Arab. *taḳu·m-na*.

[55] Comp. especially the forms of ל״ו roots.

[56] On the meaning of the terms "interjectional" and "conjunct," see the references in *AJSL*, xix (1902), 46, n. 4.

As with the ending הָ֫ in the verb, so it fares with the old case-ending הָ = -ā (the primitive pausal for -an) in the noun; hence אַ֫רְצָה, Gen. 24 52. It is to be observed that the nominal form is kept intact as far as possible; hence מִדְבָּ֫רָה בֵּית אָ֫וֶן, Josh. 18 12, הָאֹ֫הֱלָה, Gen. 18 6, and the like; the stress falls in all cases upon the syllable which has it in the unencumbered form.

The preceding investigation has, I believe, shown conclusively that, genetically considered, *mil'el* accentuation predominates in Hebrew. In the primitive language, ultimate accentuation was possible only in connection with the half-strong stress resting on a long closing syllable. In all other forms, whether primitively pausal or non-pausal, the stress was found anywhere but on the ultima. Where we have in the present Hebrew ultimate accentuation, we are confronted by a loss of a syllable (through the disappearance of the stem-final, the reduction of dissyllabic suffixes to monosyllabic in consequence of the loss of the final vowel or contraction), or we are dealing with modern contextual forms. The rule currently given in our text-books about the predominance of *milra'* accentuation of Hebrew to which attention was drawn at the beginning of this paper disregards not only the genesis of forms, but abstracts likewise from the by-forms which are still preserved in historical Hebrew. Moreover, if *types* of forms are had in mind, the rule breaks down on the basis of pure statistics; one need only compare the forms of the perfect in pause,[57] and the result is obvious: the proportion of *mil'el* to *milra'* is 6:3.

---

[57] How late the non-pausal or contextual forms are, has been shown above. In the case of יָדֵ֫ךְ (still worse is the case of מְמָ֫ךְ), the absence of a contextual פֶּ֫רִי (in the place of פְּרִי) shows the lateness of the form. The occasional forms like כַּפֵּ֫ךְ are developed correctly enough; comp. the feminine forms. In Origen's transliteration such forms predominate; perhaps through the influence of the Aramaic; comp. the parallel forms of the perfect like φαδιθ, etc. There is reason to believe that where the ה is absent in the ketib, a similar Aramaic pronunciation was intended. The kere, as elsewhere, reintroduced the more archaic forms; or rather, it levelled down forms minus ה to those with ה. The same was done by the kere in connection with את which was assimilated to אתה in all but three cases (Num. 11 15, Deut. 5 24, Ezek. 28 14). On יָדֵ֫ךְ, see *AJSL*, xix (1903), 165.