A BABYLONIAN Fragment of the Bible
In the Abbreviated System

Israel Yeivin

I

The method of writing the Bible in abbreviated form, namely, writing one letter (or several selected ones) instead of complete words, was unknown prior to the discovery of the Cairo Geniza. A. Neubauer in QJR 7 (1894), pp. 361–364, was the first to draw attention to the Geniza fragments written in this manner. From the abbreviated fragments was made the first discovery of the Palestinian system of vocalization and accentuation. M. Friedländer discussed the Palestinian abbreviated fragments in JQR ibid., pp. 564–568 and later in PSBA 18 (1896), pp. 86–98.

In the last-mentioned article, Friedländer classifies and describes the abbreviated fragments from the Geniza in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, and notes three types:

- Fragments with Palestinian vocalization and accentuation
  - Tiberian
  - (but which in certain cases designate the vowel ḫōlem also with the Palestinian sign).
  - Tiberian vocalization and accentuation.

In this article, as in the one in JQR, Friedländer treats the Palestinian abbreviated fragments in particular. A comprehensive study of these fragments and others (all of which form part of one MS of the Later Prophets) was published by P. Kahle in ZAW 21 (1901), pp. 273–317. He published additions and a fragment of an older Palestinian abbreviated MS of Exodus in Masoreten des Westens II, Stuttgart 1930, pp. 31*–35*, 88–95 (fragment M), and photograph 11, ibid.

None of the fragments with Tiberian vocalization have, to the best of my knowledge, been published, nor, aside from Friedländer’s brief study, have they been examined. It should be added that the fragments with Tiberian vocalization contain parts of different MSS, employing varied abbreviation systems. Some are archaic and extremely abbreviated, presenting usually only one letter of each word; others are later and less extreme, giving two or three letters of each word (i.e. almost the entire text).

It should furthermore be pointed out that all the abbreviated fragments—
whether the large Palestinian MS of the Later Prophets or the Tiberian fragments—are textually very close to the *textus receptus* and reflect a highly-developed stage of Palestinian and Tiberian vocalization and accentuation. The sole exception is the Exodus fragment in *MdW*, which is older and exhibits numerous deviations from the current text.

Here we will examine fragments of a MS written in the abbreviated system whose origin derives from the third school of vocalization and accentuation, viz. the Babylonian. These are three leaves of one MS (henceforth: fr.).

a. Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, MS Genizah S. 112. One leaf, slightly torn in the upper margin, somewhat less in the lower. Part of verso is difficult to decipher. The recto is photographed in the *Catalogue of Hebrew MSS in the Collection of E. N. Adler* (Cambridge 1921), pl. 51. I wish to thank the Library administration and especially the Chief Librarian, Dr. Nahum M. Sarna, for permission to publish the fragment and its photograph. I am grateful to Dr. Sarna for taking pains to find the MS after its catalogue number had been changed. The fragment contains the text of Lev. xvi, 15–xxiii, 10.

b. University Library Cambridge, T.-S. 12.865—two complete leaves in good condition. Page 1 includes Lev. xi, 32–xvi, 14, i.e. it precedes the New York leaf; page 2 includes Num. xxiv, 3–xxix, 36. I am grateful to the Library Syndicate, University Library, Cambridge for permission to publish the fragment and the photographs.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE TEXT

24–25 lines per page. Very crowded writing. To what extent writing in the abbreviated system conserves space can be seen in that about 9% of the Pentateuch is contained in these three leaves; thus the entire Pentateuch was probably written in less than thirty-five pages.

The first word is written in full at the beginning of every verse, followed by one letter of every word having a disjunctive accent (the Babylonian pointing, as is well known, lacks connective accents). The representative letter is the stressed one. This scheme is followed with complete consistency in the fragment, with practically no deviations. The verse divider is a tiny circle, half a line high. A space of about five letters between verses indicates the "open" or "closed" sections. At the end of each weekly portion, the number of its verses is listed, as is done for example in the Leningrad MS B 19a (BH3).

Accents alone are marked in fr. and there is very little vocalization. In these two features—the indication of only one letter of every word and the absence of vocalization—our MS differs from all other abbreviated ones. The Palestinian
and Tiberian MSS, which also mark vocalization, must at times indicate two or three letters of a word, or even entire words (if their vocalization is particularly remarkable), whereas when only the accent is transmitted, as in fr., one letter is sufficient.

More than one letter is marked only for the tetragrammaton, which is regularly indicated as הוהי and is presented as: יהוה. Otherwise, more than one letter is indicated in these few cases:

1. ה (xvi, 34) — הוהי
2. א (xiii, 37) — בָּהי
3. ד (xiii, 42) — הוהי

I have no explanation as to why the first two cases deviate from the marking-system of the fragment. In the third, the marking of two consonants is intended for differentiation, to show that the second word and not the first is accented; since both words have stressed ה, the scribe had to avoid ambiguity.

A differentiation between successive words having identical stressed letters is often necessary. For this purpose, fr. uses either the word ד (_leaf in Aramaic = the first) or ה (_leaf = the second) and they occur in the following places:

1. ד (xiii, 45) — הוהי
2. ה ד (xiii, 46) — הוהי
3. ה ד (Num. xxvii, 8) — הוהי
4. ד (Num. xxiv, 25) — הוהי

The scribe frequently failed to indicate which word he meant and a misunderstanding could result, as in:

1. ה (xiii, 12) — הוהי. The accented word is apparently הוהי, but possibly also the two preceding ones; however, the scribe did not indicate which.
2. ה (xiv, 22) — הוהי. The accented word could be הוהי, as in the Tiberian, but just as conceivably הוהי, as is often practised in Babylonian accentuation.

1. I present examples from fr. by the following system—first the sign in fr., next its source reference and the Tiberian version for comparison. Since the text derives mainly from the Book of Leviticus, this will be cited only by chapter and verse numbers. For the Book of Numbers and others, I add the name of the book.
Another means in fr. for indicating the intended word is by the vocalization, which here is mainly Tiberian. Only very few Babylonian signs appear in fr. (see below). Thus we have Babylonian and Tiberian signs used together, both undoubtedly belonging to the first hand. The Babylonian vocalization generally appears in the first line of the page, since the absence of a line above it allows space for its addition. The Tiberian is used in the other lines, where there is not enough room for the Babylonian in full, since Babylonian accents occupy all the supralinear area. Hence the consideration in selecting the type of vocalization is merely technical and dependent on the amount of space available.

The free alternative use of Babylonian and Tiberian vowel signs because of technical considerations is regularly found in texts; I will limit myself to one example. In MS 507, in the catalogue of D.S. Sassoon, *Ohel Dawid* (Oxford–London 1932), on the page photographed in facsimile 2 in this catalogue, we find at the top of the page in the Massora Magna:

\[ \text{בר מְשַׁמֶּש} \]

\[ \text{ֵלֶכֶט} \]

*ls.* Babylonian vocalization on the top line, and Tiberian on the bottom one. Since the line: of the Massora are very crowedly written, the technical consideration of the amount of empty space alone determined the selection of the vocalization, and this type of writing certainly can not be attributed to two vocalizers from different schools.

Cases where Tiberian vocalization is used in fr. for purposes of distinguishing are:

\[ \text{xvi, 29} \] — והנה תְּרֵס בֶּן. And similarly: \[ \text{xvii, 12} \]; however, the same combination in xviii, 26 is not vocalized.

\[ \text{Num. xxiv, 16} \] — וַיֵּצֵא נַעַר יְהוֹוֶל (the tephē is on the word נַעַר, unlike the Tiberian).

\[ \text{xv, 22} \] — יִשְׂרָאֵל. To indicate that the accent is on the word יִשְׂרָאֵל and not on יִשָּׂרָאֵל. The vocalization (sere and pathah) is Tiberian, but the pronunciation Babylonian (*MdO*, p. 187; *MT*, p. 56).^2

III. The Pronunciation of Fr.

In the above examples, the vocalization served as a means of differentiation, but there are several passages in which it is used only to indicate the pronunciation of a word and mainly to distinguish between pausal and contextual vocalization. These are:

\( \text{ג} \) (xxvi, 14) — \( \text{ג} \). Vocalized with a pathaḥ despite the athnaḥ in the Babylonian (tiphāḥ in the Tiberian).

\( \text{ג} \) (xiii, 49) — \( \text{ג} \). Vocalized with a qames, even though it is not accented with a major divider.

\( \text{ג} \) (xv, 19) — \( \text{ג} \). dto.

\( \text{ג} \) (Num. xxvii, 13) — \( \text{ג} \).

\( \text{ג} \) (Num. xxiv, 21) — \( \text{ג} \).

Why the author vocalized the last three cases is not clear to me, since they exhibit no irregularities.

\( \text{ג} \) (xix, 8) — \( \text{ג} \). In Babylonian (MT, p. 58; MdO, pp. 188–9), the second root letter is vocalized in this form with a pathaḥ, even before a stop, and not with a sere. The pronunciation reflected in the vocalization of this word is apparently Tiberian and not Babylonian.

These are all the places with Tiberian vocalization. Babylonian vocalization occurs in fr. in three places only; in all three it neither differentiates nor shows the pronunciation of a doubtful word. In two of these places, it appears in words on the first line of the page.

\( \text{ג} \) (xiv, 11) — \( \text{ג} \). At first glance, the pronunciation appears to be Tiberian, because the Babylonian pronunciation is with \( \text{i} \) (MT, p. 62; MdO, p. 191, even in texts with complicated vocalization). But because there are some Hiph'īl forms Iae 'ayin which have the \( \text{a} \) sign in Babylonian, the vocalization of this word with \( \text{a} \) may still show a Babylonian pronunciation. In the MS JTS 506, fol. 11 (discovered by A. Díez Macho; simple Babylonian vocalization; belongs to Ea 8), I found : \( \text{ג} \) (xxvii, 11).

\( \text{ג} \) (Num. xxiv, 7) — complicated vocalization, but not fully developed, since in a text pointed with a more developed complicated Babylonian punctuation (Ka 13; MS JTS 2019, fol. 9; class e according to Spanier [cf. below]) we find:
The punctuation of fr., though complicated, is less Tiberianized than that of Ka 13.

The sign in fr. also indicates such a pronunciation.

The examination of the vocalized words and the other signs in fr. led us to conclude that the pronunciation reflected here contains both Babylonian and Tiberian elements. This finding illustrates a transitional stage between simple Babylonian vocalization with, on the whole, pure Babylonian pronunciation and complicated vocalization with many elements of the Tiberian pronunciation already present. fr.'s pronunciation possibly reflects a late stage of the simple vocalization. This conclusion will be checked with the results of our analysis of the accentuation, cf. below.

IV. The Text of Fr.

Before analyzing fr.'s accentuation, several variations of the text as compared with the ordinary version should be mentioned. Since the text mainly presents only odd letters and not complete words, few textual variations will be evident.

Two textual variations of plene and defective spelling: "ם" (Num. xxviii, 5), BH ו"ם (Num. xxviii, 13), BH ו"ם.

Other textual variations: "ם" (xiii, 36), BH ו"ם (Num. xxix, 24), BH ו"ם ו"ם (Num. xxvii, 1), BH ו"ם fr. apparently read ו"ם ו"ם.

The fragment's accentuation will be studied in two parts:

A. The place of the accent within the word (V).

B. The accentuation of the verses: 1) Description of fr.'s accentuation;
2) A comparison with accentuation in other Babylonian fragments (VI).
V. The Place of the Accent within the Word

As stated above, the letter presented from each word is the one on which the accent stands. This enables us to examine the position of the word accent according to the pronunciation of the scribe, and in nearly every case it is seen that the accent agrees with the Tiberian pronunciation. The marking is very meticulous, and among the more than three thousand accent signs in the only some twenty-five deviate from the regular Tiberian accent. Most of these seem not to be scribal errors.

The deviation sometimes derives from a different accentuation of the verse, e.g.:

\[ \text{ֵי (xvii, 12) — יֵי יהוּדִי-ילָשָׁן. Since the Babylonian has a divider on the word יהוּדִי, unlike the Tiberian, there is no reason to retract the stress in יהוּדִי, and therefore its position differs from the Tiberian. Similarly xxii, 10 (twice).} \]

At times, the deviation results from the difference between pausal and contextual vocalization:

\[ \text{ֵי (xviii, 9) — יֵי חָנָן. ֵי (xix, 13) — יֵי יַרְשָׁן. Also (ibid., 18) — יֵי יַרְשָׁן.} \]

Three deviations occur in accenting verbs in the perfect:

\[ \text{ֵי (xxiv, 18) — יֵי עָנָן (penult instead of ultima). ֵי (Num. xxvii, 7) — יֵי עָנָן (dtd.). ֵי (Num. xxiv, 12) — יֵי יַרְשָׁן (ultima instead of penult).} \]

Two deviations are found in the genealogies in Num. xxvi, where all the other accents are in keeping with the Tiberian:

\[ \text{ֵי (v. 5) — יֵי יָבָשָׁן. ֵי (v. 12) — יֵי יָבָשָׁן.} \]

Once the accented letter was corrected:

\[ \text{ֵי (xxvi, 38) — יֵי יָבָשָׁן.} \]

Five deviations are apparently scribal errors:

\[ \text{ֵי (xvi, 21) — יֵי יָבָשָׁן. ֵי (xvi, 34) — יֵי יָבָשָׁן. But xiv, 10: ֵי — יֵי יָבָשָׁן; etc.} \]

\[ \text{ֵי (xxii, 4) — יֵי יָבָשָׁן. ֵי (xxiv, 23) — יֵי יָבָשָׁן; but ibid. v. 28: ֵי for the same word.} \]

\[ \text{ֵי (xiv, 3) — יֵי יָבָשָׁן; but xiii, 59, ֵי — יֵי יָבָשָׁן.} \]

The last three deviations are questionable because of the indistinctness of the MS.

Two types of deviations deserve special study:
a) Segolate nouns in pause. In six places, I found segolate nouns with major or minor dividers with ultimate stress instead of penult:

\[\text{א} (xviii, 21) \quad \text{י} (xix, 5; \text{Num. xxviii, 8}) \quad \text{ג} (\text{Num. xxviii, 16}) \quad \text{ד} (\text{Num. xxiv, 24}) \quad \text{ה} (\text{xiii, 31}) \quad \text{ו} (\text{Num. xxv, 7})\]

As opposed to these six cases, fr. has about fifty segolate nouns in pause with stressed penult, like the Tiberian; thus, these six cases of ultima stress are apparently only slips of the pen. Nonetheless, it is strange that precisely this type shows such a large number of deviations.

Unfortunately, this kind of accentuation can be compared with other Babylonian MSS only to a very limited degree, since accents in MSS with simple vocalization are not usually marked on the stressed syllable\(^3\), so that the place of the accent in the word is unknown, while accents in MSS with complicated vocalization correspond completely to the Tiberian. The one interesting comparison is Eb 2 (\textit{MdO}, no. 21). Kahle, in his comments (\textit{ibid.}, p. 115) states that this MS exhibits an interesting mixture of simple and complicated vocalization. The accents are usually marked on the stressed syllable. I found here a phenomenon similar to fr. The stress in segolate nouns is usually penult as in the Tiberian, but before a pause the accent is nearly always on the ultima. Cf., for example, a page of this MS photographed in \textit{BHB}, pl. 35: 

\[\text{א} \quad \text{ב} \quad \text{ג} \quad \text{ד} \quad \text{ה} \quad \text{ו}\]

If this meagre material can show a tendency to advance the accent in segolate nouns before pause, this should be compared with the Tiberian in forms such as: 

\[\text{א} \quad \text{ב} \quad \text{ג} \quad \text{ד} \quad \text{ה} \quad \text{ו}\]

b) Pausal Forms of the Verb. In fr. the pausal forms of the verb usually have an ultimate accent and not penult as the Tiberian. Following is a list of these places; those with ultima accent:

\[\text{א} (xvii, 14) \quad \text{א} (\text{xix, 3}) \quad \text{א} (\text{ibid.}) \quad \text{א} (\text{xix, 30}) \quad \text{א} (\text{xx, 16}) \quad \text{א} (\text{xx, 27}) \quad \text{א} (\text{Num. xxiv, 5})\]

3. In the Babylonian MS Ea 17 (see below) with simple vocalization but with accents marked on the stressed syllables, I found: 

\[\text{א} \quad \text{א} \quad \text{א} \quad \text{א}\]

as in the Tiberian.

4. In the above-mentioned photograph in \textit{BHB}, I found in pausal position: 

\[\text{א} \quad \text{א} \quad \text{א} \quad \text{א}\]
Places with penult accent as in the Tiberian:

- (xix, 19) — יְשַׁמְחֹת; ב (xxi, 5) — וְשַׁמְתָּה; ב (xix, 20) — יְשַׁמְחֹת; ב (xiii, 23) — יְשַׁמְחֹת.

Two doubtful places, which seem, however, to have an ultimate accent:

- (xix, 11; but perhaps ד) — יְשַׁמְחֹת; ב (xix, 30; or perhaps ד) — יְשַׁמְחֹת. Unfortunately, the MS Esb 2 mentioned above does not even show one case of such a word before a pause; consequently the accent of this type cannot be known.5

The accent of יִשְׁמַחְתָּלְה and similar forms in pause, and in Mishnaic Hebrew and the DSS in all positions, was recently studied by E. Y. Kutscher, The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (Jerusalem 1959), pp. 30–31, 254–261, and by S. Morag in his review of this book in Kiryat Sefer 36 (1961), pp. 28–29. Fr. provides additional material on this problem, particularly since the Babylonian usage with regard to short ə in the verb differs from the Tiberian (יִשְׁמַחְתָּלְה as against יִשְׁמַחְתָּלְה, etc.), as Kutscher has noted.

VI. The Accentuation of Verses6

On the whole the fragment is carefully accented. I found only rare cases of inexactitude:

- (xiii, 4) — יְשַׁמְחֹת לְגוּלַ ה. The athnah on the word ךָמֶר is undoubtedly a scribal error.

The accenting of the combination גָּמֶר הָּלַחָכָ ה is inconsistent; at times the Babylonian tiphha appears in the word גָּמֶר: ג (xviii, 1, 4, 30; xix, 4) and at others in the word גָּמֶר: ג (xix, 2, 3, 23, 35).

It is well known that the Babylonian accentuation of verses differs from the Tiberian, not only in signs but as well in the method of division. For the features distinguishing the two accentuation systems see especially Spanier, pp. 100–106, etc. This is not the place to discuss them. The principal difference is in the choice and position of the secondary dividers, in the division of verses into larger or smaller units and sub-units, etc. In fr. I came across a change in the athnah's

5. In Esb 17 (supra. n. 3), I found: יְשַׁמְחֹת, like in the Tiberian.

6. In discussing fr.'s accentuation, I will mainly quote from the following books which deal with Babylonian accentuation: MT, pp. 46–50; MoDo, pp. 171–175; S. Pinker, Einleitung in das babylonisch-hebräische Funktationssystem, Wien 1863, pp. 19–42 (henceforth: Pinker); A. Spanier, Die massoreitischen Akzente, Berlin 1927, pp. 63–85 (on the accentuation of Kb 13), but especially pp. 86–109 (henceforth: Spanier); A. Díez Macho, Estudios bíblicos 18 (1939), 231–238 (henceforth: Macho).
position in comparison with the Tiberian text in only fifteen verses, such as Num. xxvi, 37, where the athnah is in: the word לְכֹּל (zaqeph in the Tiberian) and not in הַגָּמָה as in the Tiberian; in Lev. xiv, 17, 28 the athnah occurs in the first הַגָּמָה (zaqeph in the Tiberian), whereas the Tiberian has it in the third הַגָּמָה. The other differences in the athnah’s position are similar.

Since our fragment is large and contains hundreds of accented verses, its system of accentuation should be briefly considered. This description will not be attempted from the point of view of syntactic analysis, for this is outside the framework of our investigation, but with respect to the combination of accents, main disjunctives and secondary disjunctives. A description of this type, besides contributing to the understanding of fr.’s accentuation, can also supply a starting-point for the comparison of different Babylonian systems of accentuation, and thus provide a more trustworthy idea of Babylonian accentuation in general.

1. The Features of fr.’s Accentuation

The only divider not appearing in fr. is silluq. Because it cannot be mistaken, neither fr. nor the Palestinian abbreviated fragments mark it.

תִּפְחָה–אֲתָנָה. Every verse is usually divided into two by an athnah preceded by a תִּפְחָה: נ”א. The athnah is presented in its regular form of an angle, and the תִּפְחָה shaped י, i.e. an additional short line descends from the vertex of the angle. The accesor took pains to mark the athnah regularly, never omitting it, as do many MSS with simple Babylonian vocalization on the assumption that if the תִּפְחָה is marked, the athnah will naturally follow. The Palestinian abbreviated fragments seldom mark the athnah.

Every athnah is preceded by a תִּפְחָה in the fragment except for one verse (Num. xxviii, 14).

A short verse is sometimes accented only with תִּפְחָה–אֲתָנָה, e.g. xiii, 14 (no athnah in the Tiberian). For a further division in the first half of the verse, the zaqeph י is used, e.g. xiii, 18: נ”א י, and in the second half תִּפְחָה. The תִּפְחָה before silluq in Babylonian accentuation is differentiated from the תִּפְחָה before athnah and marked י. Many Babylonian MSS do not mark the י on the assumption that it is self-evident before silluq, but fr. marks it regularly, e.g. Num. xxiv, 19: נ”א י.

A very short verse is not accented with תִּפְחָה–אֲתָנָה, but only with י (xiv, 55; xvi, 28). A verse slightly longer, but still not sufficiently long for תִּפְחָה–

7. The accent signs are to be read from right to left.
athnah is accented ֵ. So every time ֵ and others (xiv, 52; xv, 9). Some longer verses do not have an athnah, e.g. Num. xxix, 28 (the Tiberian also without athnah); Lev. xvi, 9 (Tiberian has the athnah).

The First Half of the Verse. The main divider of the first half of the verse is the qazeph, but unlike the Tiberian, it is not found in succession and never appears more than once in a half-verse (Pinsker, p. 22 ff.). The secondary divider of qazeph is ַ (tebhir) while ַ (hazer-rebbia) is the divider midway between qazeph and tebhir. In fr. the rank of the ַ is apparently greater than ַ and following Spanier this indicates that fr. belongs to Group b (see below), i.e. to MSS with complicated vocalization, but we shall see further on that this is incorrect.

These three dividers are the most prevalent and appear in varied combinations.

When only one divider is required in a half-verse, it is generally ַ (in dozens of verses), rarely ַ (only three times in fr.) but never ַ.

For two dividers, ַ ַ is almost always used. I found the reverse combination ַ only twice in fr. ַ ַ also occurs several times; ַ only once (xi, 34).

For three dividers, the usual combination, found dozens of times, is ַ ַ, i.e. the usual combination ַ preceded by ַ. More rarely ַ ַ ַ (ַ with ַ after it and not before). Some ַ ַ is also present.

For four dividers, the regular combination is ַ ַ ַ, i.e. ַ ַ, usual for three, with ַ after it. Twice ַ ַ ַ ַ occurs, i.e. the same combination with ַ after it.

For five dividers, the combination is ַ ַ ַ ַ, i.e. the usual combination for four followed by ַ. However, for many pauses in the half-verse other dividers are regularly used and not these three alone.

The Second Half of the Verse. The method of accentuation resembles that of the first half and differs only in the last divider of the verse always being ַ.

When one divider is required before ַ, ַ is used and the combination is ַ.

For two dividers before ַ, the common combination ַ ַ is nearly always used (as in the first half), i.e. ַ ַ ַ ַ. The reverse ַ ַ ַ is found several times, i.e. ַ ַ ַ (xiv, 3), sometimes ַ ַ ַ (xii, 7) or ַ ַ ַ (Num. xxviii, 3).

For three dividers, the usual combination is ַ ַ ַ (as in the first half), i.e. ַ ַ ַ ַ. Occasionally ַ occurs after the combination ַ ַ (and before ַ) i.e. ַ ַ ַ ַ.

Less often ַ ַ ַ.

Four dividers: usually ַ ַ followed by ַ, i.e. ַ ַ ַ ַ, or ַ ַ ַ with ַ after them, i.e. ַ ַ ַ ַ (xiii, 30).

These are the prevalent accents and they appear in nearly every verse. The other accents are less common.
When the combination is ٨ and another divider is needed in the middle, ٢ is used. Kahle (MdO, p. 174) states that this accent occurs almost exclusively in Babylonian MSS with simple vocalization. It is not found in succession in fr. nor is it combined with other accents (unlike Ec 1 [Mt, p. 46]). Here this divider appears only in the combination ٨٦٧, and just as ٨٧ combinations appear, so do ٦٨٧, and they are very common in fr., e.g., ٩٨٧, ٩٢٨٧, etc. The combination ٧٩ occurs only once without ٨ before it (xviii, 17b).

٣٩ (feres=geresh; nadj=legarmeh): two secondary dividers to ٨. As was mentioned above, zaequph is not found in succession in Babylonian accentuation, but instead of it ٨. The usual order of accentuation is ٨٦ or ٨٧ ٨. If additional major dividers are required, several ٨ occur in succession. In fr. I found two successive ٨ frequently, and once three (xiii, 25): ٨٦٧٨٧٨٧ ٨٧. Cases of four successive ٨ or six or seven ٨ in a half verse, which Pinsker found (p. 22) in Kbr 13, are absent in fr. The successive ٨ are usually separated by ٢ or ٢. These are the two secondary dividers of ٨, and I found no difference in their usage, except that ٢ generally precedes the ٨ before zaequph, while ٢ precedes the ٨ following the zaequph, e.g., in the combination ٨٧ ٨, if there are two secondary stops before the two ٨, ٢ will precede the first and ٢ the second, thus: ٨٦٧٧ ٨٧٨٧ ٨ (Num. xxi, 13) and similarly in the second half of the verse: ٧٨ ٨٧٨٧ (Num. xx, 14b). Two ٢ do not appear in one half verse, but two ٢ may if the first proceeds ٨ and the second ٢. It should be noted that while ٢ is only a secondary divider of ٨, ٢ serves also as a secondary divider for the combination ٨٧ ٨.

Following are several combinations of accents which illustrate the above:

xviii, 5a: ٨٥ ٨٧ ٨٧ ٧ ٧٨
xiii, 4a: ٨٧ ٨٧ ٨٧ ٨
Num. xx, 18a: ٨٧ ٧ ٨

٨٧٨ (sinmori=zarqa; share=segol). In fr. this combination often corresponds to the Tiberian zarqa-segal, but frequently parallels other Tiberian accents, and is sometimes found in the second half-verse (unlike the Tiberian zaraq-segol). This use of accents is one of the signs of Group a according to Spanier sp. 93ff; see below). ٨ almost never occurs in fr. without ٨. Only in one verse (xvi, 10), where there is no room for a divider before ٨, does ٨٧ ٨٧ occur, thus precluding any suggestion that ٨ was deleted because it was self-evident. Intentional deletion of ٨ as self-understood occurs only in the repeated similar expressions in Num. xxvi. There, in vs. 15, 20, 57 ٨ ٨ is found, while in vs. 26, 38, 44 only ٨ which is obviously preceded by ٨, and the scribe did not trouble to mark it. In v. 12 appears ٨. The scribe made a correction here, but it is not clear.
The combination א" is possible at the beginning of a verse without a divider before it. Preceding it may be only ב, ב, or ג alone. All the various combinations of ב, ג, ג may follow it. If followed by a ב, the secondary divider before it will only be ג, and not ג. Here are several verses illustrating the combinations of accents:

Num. xxiv, 13: אָדַרְךָ נָוְי נָוְי נָוְי נָוְי
xiii, 25: אָּדָרְךָ נָוְי נָוְי נָוְי
xiv, 25: אָדַר נָוְי נָוְי נָוְי
xiv, 51: אָדַר נָוְי נָוְי נָוְי
Num. xxiv, 10b: אָדַר נָוְי נָוְי נָוְי

¹ ("half a ב"). A rare accent, occurring only four times in fr. :

xix, 19: אָדַר נָוְי נָוְי נָוְי
xix, 20: אָדַר נָוְי נָוְי נָוְי
xiii, 52: אָדַר נָוְי נָוְי נָוְי
Num. xxiv, 17b: אָדַר נָוְי נָוְי נָוְי

Kahle (Mdo, p. 174) states that except for Ec I, this accent occurs only in three Babylonian MSS with simple vocalization, and mainly before ב, ב, and ב. Spanier (p. 95) calls this accent puzzling (rätselhafter Akzent). It is very common in the Babylonian-vocalized Sifra MS, Assemani 66 (photographed in the Finkelstein ed., New York 1956) and may represent a relic of the archaic stage of Babylonian accentuation where it had a wide usage. In fr. it serves as an additional secondary divider of ב. It occurs once before the ב preceding א".

2. Comparisons

The description of fr.'s accentuation exemplifies one stage of Babylonian accentuation. What then is the relationship of this stage to the others? The section of the Bible contained in fr. has also survived in several other vocalized and accented Babylonian fragments and it is worth-while comparing their accentuation with that of fr. True, several lines of the fragment are difficult to decipher, and many of the parallel Babylonian Biblical fragments are torn and indistinct. Nevertheless, the number of parallel fragments is large and their

8. For comparison, I have reproduced in this section the text and accents from several MSS in Kahle’s list. The sources of the fragments are University Library, Cambridge; Westminster College Library, Cambridge; Bodleian Library, Oxford; Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, New York, all of whom I wish to thank. I thank especially Prof. P. Kahle for lending the photographs of the Babylonian MSS from the Antonin Library in Leningrad and from Or. 1060 in the University Library, Cambridge.
accentuation can be adequately studied (for the method of designating the fragments, see note 2).

Before turning to this comparison, we present Spanier’s classification of Babylonian accentuation, at which he arrived on the basis of all the fragments in Mدو. He divides these, according to accentuation, into three groups:

Group a (fragments with simple Babylonian vocalization) is characterized by the divider ֖ ranking higher than ֖. The accent ֗ is widely used here and not only where the Tiberian has segol. The accents are not marked on the stressed syllable.

Group b (complicated vocalization). The divider ֖ ranks lower than ֖. ֗ always corresponds to the Tiberian segol. The accents are marked on the stressed syllable.

Group c (fully-developed complicated vocalization, similar to Kb 13). Resembles Group b except that the accent ֖ is split into ֖, ֖ parallels the Tiberian tebhir, and ֖ (yitḥibb), the Tiberian pashṭa.

We will see below that this division is too schematic.

Amongst the parallel fragments, an accentuation practically identical to fr. is found in Ea 7, Ea 8, and Ea 17.

Ea 7 (Mدو, no. 11). Attributed by Spanier to Group a. According to Kahle in Mدو, the accents are not marked on the stressed syllable. The pronunciation reflected in the MS is chiefly Babylonian, with some Tiberian influence. The parallel fragment: Cambridge Or. 1080 (xⅽ, 59—xⅽ, 18). Corresponding accentuation:

\[
\text{xⅽ, 39:} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖}
\]

Slightly different accentuation:

\[
\text{xⅽ, 14:} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖} \quad \text{֖}
\]

9. In these examples, the verses of the compared text are on the first line and fr.’s corresponding verse on the second line. I have also marked the Tiberian dividers on the first line to show more clearly the relationship or nonrelationship of the Babylonian and Tiberian accents.
In the first half of the verse, the accentuation is identical. In the second half, the accentuation of fr. is more original and less similar to the Tiberian than is Ea 7’s. Similarly in the following examples:

xiv, 54: נַחֲתָמוֹתָןָן תּוֹרָהָ בְּכָלַ-נַחֲתָמוֹתָן

 xv, 2: דָּבָרָי אֲלֵיוֹן יִשְׂרָאֵל אֵמוֹרָהָ הָאָמֵרָה שֶׁאָמַר בָּהּ בְּכָלַ-נַחֲתָמוֹתָן אֵמוֹרָה הָאָמֵרָה שֶׁאָמַר בָּהּ בְּכָלַ-נַחֲתָמוֹתָן

The arrangement of the dividers in Ea 7’s accentuation is more developed and closer to the Tiberian (but not identical) than is fr.’s.

Ea 17. Simple Babylonian vocalization, but not very early. The accents are marked on the stressed syllable. Not included in MdO; therefore Spanier does not mention it. The parallel fragment: Cambridge B 4, 27 (vs. from Num.xxix).

Num. xxix, 17: בְּכוֹתָּמָן פֹּרַת בַּ-נְּכָרָה שֶׁמֶנָה שֶׁמֶנָה אַל-לוֹמָן נִסָּמָן בַּכָּל שֶׁמֶנָה

 ובְּכוֹתָּמָן אֲרַבָּה שֶׁמֶנָה מְסָפָר

Num. xxix, 19: נֶשֶׁר-סְיָנָה יָמַקֶּת מַשֶּׁחָה מִיִּלֶּר הַמִּיסָּרָה מְסָפָר

 The accentuation, on the whole, agrees, but the division of the verses is more developed in fr.

Ea 8 (MdO, nos. 12, 13). Simple vocalization. Babylonian pronunciation. Accents not marked on the stressed syllable. According to Spanier, the use of the accent ָּי resembles Group a, while the accents ַּי resemble Group b. In his opinion, the fragment is an early representative of Group b. Macho (p. 235) points out that the accents in this MS have been corrected. The accents of the first hand are the original Babylonian ones and were corrected by the second hand to correspond more closely to the Tiberian. In the following examples, the signs of the first hand are presented in round brackets, and those of the second in square brackets. The parallel fragment: Cambridge B 4, 16 (xi, 22–45).

xi, 36: אֲרֹךְ מִשְׁמָא יִהְוֶה מַכְוָא יִהְוֶה מַכְוָא יִהְוֶה מַכְוָא
fr.'s accentuation resembles that of the first hand in Ea 8, though not completely. The material, however, is insufficient to permit a comprehensive comparison. These three MSS show roughly the same accentuation as fr.; the differences are not significant. We now present two other MSS with an accentuation very different and more developed than fr. and which parallels the Tiberian.

**Ka 13** (*MdO*, no. 10). Spanier attributes this to Group c. Complicated vocalization. The accents are marked on the stressed syllable. The accentuation is similar to that of Kb 13 (although here there are no conjunctives). There is the . The parallel fragment: JTS 2019, fol. 9, 10 (Num. xxiii, 29–xxv, 10; xxix, 17–xxx, 15).

Num. xxiv,8: אַלּ מִצְיָרָה מַעֲשֶׂה כְּתַנְמוּת רַעְמִי לֶא אֵל הָאֵל יְבִיר הָרוֹמָהוֹת

The accentuation of Ka 13 agrees completely with the Tiberian, apart from the use of the for the Tiberian pashtā-zaqeph (in the second example), which is due to the non-successiveness of the qaṣṣāf in the Babylonian. The fr. accentuation is very different and more originally Babylonian.

**Ka 17** (*MdO*, nos. 14, 15; Group b according to Spanier). Complicated vocalization. The accents are marked on the stressed syllable. Parallel fragments are numerous: JTS 2019, fol. 1 (xiii, 30–42); Cambridge A 38, 10 (xiv, 51–xv,
The accentuation of Ka 17 parallels the Tiberian, whereas the accentuation of fr. is more originally Babylonian.

Lastly, two MSS with accentuation more originally Babylonian and less close to the Tiberian than is fr.'s.

_Ea 5_ (MdO, no. 7; accents not marked on the stressed syllable). A very unusual Babylonian MS exhibiting a combination of vocalizations, _e.g._ מְלַמֵּד. The pronunciation of the first line of vocalization is Babylonian. Spanier attributes it to Group a in most of its features. The parallel fragments: JTS 2019, fol. 16 (xvi, 10-30); Cambridge, Westminster College II (xxi, 8-xxii, 11).

The accentuation is similar, aside from the slight difference of _n_ in _Ea 5_ as opposed to _n_ in fr.

_in Ea 5_ as opposed to _n_ in fr. Also _n_ as opposed to _n_. In _Ea 5_ _n_ is understood and not marked.
In Ea 5 as opposed to $h$ in fr., and also $t$ as opposed to $n$.

In Ea 5 $x$ occurs twice as opposed to $n$ in fr. In the second half the group $t$ is as opposed to $u$ in fr.

Without multiplying examples, we can see that the principal variations are three:

$y$ in Ea 5 as opposed to $n$ in fr.

The units are simpler in Ea 5 in comparison with the more developed ones of fr.

The wide use of the accents $y$, $z$ in Ea 5 testifies to an earlier stage of Babylonian accentuation; nevertheless, its accentuation does not differ fundamentally from that of fr.

Several places paralleling fr. have survived in Ka 17 and Ea 5 and the accentuation of these three MSS should be compared, e.g.

Ka 17

Ea 5

xxi, 12:

In Ea 5 $x$ as opposed to $n$ in fr., and also $t$ as opposed to $n$.

xxii, 2:

Ka 17

Ea 5

xx, 5a:
Ea 5 is slightly different from fr., mainly in having ה instead of ח. The accentuation of Ka 17 is identical to the Tiberian.

Ea 9 (Mdo, no. 9). Few accents marked, but not on the stressed syllable. Not presented by Spanier because the fragment published in Mdo has no accents. The parallel fragment: Cambridge B 4, 15 (xiv, 25–57). One of the most ancient Babylonian MSS. Accents do not appear on every page, but fortunately they are almost regularly marked on the page paralleling fr., although the script is partially indistinct.

Even though the position of the athnah in fr. differs from the Tiberian, while its position in Ea 9 agrees with the Tiberian, the accentuation of Ea 9 is considerably more primitive than in fr.

The accentuation of Ea 9 is much more originally Babylonian than that of fr. Evident, above all, is the wide use of the accents ח (without ח before it) and

The accentuation of Ea 9 is much more originally Babylonian than that of fr. Evident, above all, is the wide use of the accents ח (without ח before it) and
b (which, as we have seen, has survived only in traces in fr.). The combinations are much less developed and the hierarchy of accents not advanced.

All the above examples testify that the accentuation of fr. corresponds to the most advanced of the Babylonian MSS with simple vocalization. Much more developed than the accentuation of ancient MSS with simple vocalization, it, on the other hand, is more originally Babylonian and less similar to the Tiberian than the accentuation of MSS with complicated vocalization.

Following Spanier’s classification, we can state that the accentuation of fr. corresponds to the most advanced MSS of Group a (and in one case to a fragment which Spanier considers a representative of a transitional stage between Groups a and b). In the light of our comparisons, Spanier’s division of the types of Babylonian accentuation stands in need of revision. The accentuation of Groups b and c is virtually identical (the addition of the accent ’ in Group c does not warrant its being placed into a separate group). On the other hand, Group a should be subdivided into several groups, since the accentuation of the early Ea 9 does not correspond to Ea 5 or Ea 7, all of which Spanier attributes to Group a (Ea 5 in most of its features), while actually their accentuation differs substantially.

The conclusion arrived at from our analysis of the accentuation agrees with our findings on the pronunciation, that is, that fr. embodies a late stage of the simple Babylonian vocalization. The inconsistent variations in the accentuation of segolate nouns and pausal forms of verbs may have their source in a transitional stage intermediate between the original Babylonian and Tiberian pronunciations.