THE OLDEST ACCENT LIST IN THE DIQDUQE HATE’AMIM

E. J. REVELL

Dothan, in his new edition of the Diqduqe haTe’anim\(^1\) has presented much useful information, and clarified many of the problems presented by this complex text. From his study of the cryptic first section, the Sha’ar haTe’anim, he reached the conclusion that the meaning of the section was obscure even in ancient times. He suggests that the compiler of the Diqduqe haTe’anim did not himself fully understand it, and incorporated it into his work out of respect for it as an ancient tradition, rather than as presenting information of value in his own day.\(^2\) If this was the case, it is not surprising that complete understanding of this section has so far eluded modern scholars.\(^3\) It would seem, however, that further investigation can shed new light on its meaning and its purpose.

The section under discussion\(^4\) opens with the title, Sha’ar haTe’anim (line 1), and continues with a short introduction, which states that the te’anim are twelve in number (lines 2–3). The twelve are numbered and listed in lines 4–15, and line 16 reaffirms that the number of the te’anim is twelve. Line 17 gives further information about shofar, an accent already described in line 13. Line 18 introduces a list of seven mesharetim which occupies lines 19–22. This list is followed by the statement that “This is a complete list of the te’anim and mesharetim...” (lines 23–24). The section concludes at line 25 with a blessing on the man who “finds wisdom and produces understanding” (Prov. 3:13).

The Sha’ar haTe’anim, then, appears to be organized in two parts, of which one describes te’anim, and the other mesharetim. This immediately raises the

---

1. A. Dothan, *The Diqduqe HaTe’anim of Aharon ben Moshe ben Akhr* (Jerusalem, 1967). As will be obvious, I have made extensive use of the information and suggestions in this work. I have also received help from Prof. N. Alony and Dr. I. Lelvin, who kindly criticized an earlier draft of this paper. I am most grateful to them.

2. See Dothan, *op. cit.*, 152.


4. The text of the Sha’ar haTe’anim established by Dothan (*op. cit.*, 106–8) is used throughout this article as being closer to the original than any other available. For simplicity it is referred to, in comparison with divergent texts, as ‘the original’.
question of the meaning of the two terms in this context. Within the two parts, the term mesharet is applied to shofar in line 17, and the term ‘ta’am to rebia’ and gersha in lines 19 and 21. In these three cases, the terms can easily be understood in their normal meaning of ‘conjunctive accent’, and ‘disjunctive accent’. Shofar is, however, included in the list of the ‘twelve te’amim’, while rebia’ and gersha are listed among the seven mesharetim. It is obvious, therefore, that the terms ‘ta’am’ and ‘mesharet’ in the titles of the two lists cannot have the meaning ‘disjunctive accent’ and ‘conjunctive accent’, but must have some other significance.

Dothan’s solution of this curious problem is the suggestion that this grouping is based on the melodic motifs which the accent signs represent. Dothan himself, however, does not appear to find this theory very convincing (154, §3). As he says, it would be as difficult to disprove it as to prove it, but it does seem inherently improbable. Two types of information about the musical values of the accents are available. A few early written sources classify the accents on a musical basis. Their classification is divided into three groups, however, not into two, and we find that rebia5 (from the mesharetim list of the Sha’ar haTe’mim) is classed with tebir (from the te’amim list).6 Secondly, much information on Biblical chant in different communities has been collected by historians of music, led by Idelsohn. Again rebia does not seem to stand out from the other disjunctive accents.7 It is, moreover, certain that the motifs in some of these chants are little changed from the first centuries of the present era, and consequently must have been in use at the time when

---

5 Because of the diversity in the names used for accents, and in the application of those names, it is necessary to use standardized names for clarification. These are given in anglicized spelling, and are not italicized. Names quoted from texts are transcribed and italicized, or given in Hebrew script.

6 See W. Wickes, A Treatise on the Accentuation of the Twenty-One so-called Prose Books of the Old Testament, (Oxford, 1887), 13–14. There is variation, in the sources with he refers to, in the placing of if‘a and sillaq, but rebia and tebir are always classed together. It should also be noted that the Sha’ar haTe’amim as given in the “Manuel du Lecteur” (Journal Asiatique, 6ème Série, t. xvi, 1870, 379) is re-written according to the requirements of the author (see below) who did arrange the accents, on a musical basis, in an order quite different from that of Dothan’s edition. It is a minor oddity that the order is not identical with that in the Manuel du Lecteur 383, but deals with the group with ‘sustained’ tones (יִנְאַה יִירָא) before those with ‘high’ tones (יִנְאַה יָיִיר) as is done in the list in J. W. Nutt, Two Treatises … by R. Jehuda Hayyag (London, 1870), 128.

the accent list was composed. The information available, then, does not support Dothan.

Further than this, general considerations can be urged against the suggestion of a musical basis for the division of the accents into these two groups. The musical value of the accents does not seem to have been of great interest to the compiler of the list. He gives information on three characteristics of the accents: the written sign, the sign used in cheironomy, and the musical value. Of these, information on the written form is much the most common. Again, the nature of the accent signs seems to militate against a division based on musical value. The accents did not themselves indicate musical notes, or groups of notes, but indicated the relations between the words of the text, and the melody to which they were chanted; both the text and the melody being perfectly familiar to the reader. Hence the same sign could be used for accents of different musical value.

For the same reason — that where the reader was familiar with both the words and the melody, complete information on their relationship did not need to be given — the accentuation of a text could be perfectly adequate, even if a large proportion of the accent signs were omitted. The outstanding

8 The common elements in Jewish and Christian musical tradition must have been taken over by the Christians in the early centuries of the church, as they are to be found in remote areas where the later influence of one on the other is out of the question. See E. Werner, The Sacred Bridge (New York, 1959), xix.
9 Cp. E. Werner, op. cit. 104 ff. Note also that various different forms of chant were normally used within any community, but were indicated by the same accents. See Rosowsky, op. cit., 14 f.
10 The number of different signs used for disjunctive accents in 'Palestinian' Biblical texts varies from 7 to 11, yet it appears that all depict the same system of accents, and that this did not differ significantly from the standard Tiberian. (Despite some earlier opinions, e.g. Kahle, Masoretten des Westens (MdW) II, (Stuttgart, 1930) 33a, 45a, there are few major variants from standard Tiberian accentuation, and even in these, the signs are used according to the Tiberian rules, except for the conjunctives of a single fragment.) In fact, one of the factors governing the development of the Palestinian accent system seems to have been a desire to keep the number of different signs used to a minimum. Thus, in TS 12:197 (MdW II MS K), which has a very sophisticated system, with three different signs corresponding to BHK munah, 13 accents signs are used, marking 18 different accents. A one-to-one correlation does not seem to have been considered ideal. Similarly, some Tiberian texts do not use distinct signs for segolta, qasef gadol, yetib, and gershayim, (see below), but there is no reason to suppose that they did not use distinct melodies in these positions, which standard Tiberian distinguishes by special signs. The case of shofar, in which one sign represents three different melodies is well known. In fact, the melody represented by any accent sign probably varied according to the structure of the word marked by it (see Rosowsky, op. cit., in his discussions of individual accent melodies).
example of this is the ‘shorthand’ text, MdW II MS M. This MS probably covered the whole Bible — certainly the Torah and Nevi'im. It was produced with great care in a system of abbreviated writing ingeniously designed to present the maximum information in the minimum space. Its main purpose was clearly to indicate the accent system of the text, but, in spite of this, many accents are not marked. Similarly, the writing system was gradually refined by the addition of new accent signs, even though it is certain that no major changes in the melodies occurred. The new signs were simply intended to give a more exact indication of the relation between words and music than had been possible before. Thus the sign qazef gadol merely designates a variant form of the qazef motif which some accent systems do not bother to distinguish in writing. In the Sha'ar ha'Te'amim, however, the two forms of qazef are separated: qazef is listed in line 8 among the Te'amim, and qazef qetanna in line 20, among the mesharetim. This gives further reason for doubting that the lists of Te'amim and Mesharetim in this section represent a division of the accents on the basis of musical value.

In my opinion, it is only possible to explain the terms ja'am and mesharet in the titles of the two lists of accents in the Sha'ar ha'Te'amim as having a general meaning. The term ja'am as applied to the list of twelve accents must mean simply “accent” — either disjunctive or conjunctive, and the term mesharet, as applied to the list of seven accents, simply “helpers”; i.e. accents which serve, in addition to those already listed, to indicate the correct articulation of the words of the text. The use of the two terms with a general meaning in the titles, and with technical meanings in the lists themselves (as noted above) is confusing, and strongly suggests that the Sha'ar ha'Te'amim was not composed as a unit, but was compiled from more than one source.

11 Parts of this MS, which is referred to as MdW II MS M for convenience, were published as listed in P. Kahle, MdW II 88, and in M. Dietrich, *Neue palästinsch punktierte Bibelfragmente*, (Leiden 1968) as MS Cb 1. A further small fragment (TS NS 301:29) found by Prof. N. Allony, remains unpublished. The representation of the accent system in this MS, and features related to it, are fully discussed in my forthcoming book on the accent systems of Palestinian Biblical texts.

12 Qazef gadol is not distinguished from qazef in Palestinian texts, nor in some Tiberian texts (see below). Further, in the musical classification of the accents in the *Manuel du lecteur*, only the basic disjunctives are listed, not their variant forms (op. cit., 383). Yet the difference between qazef qat'on and qazef gadol is said to be musical (404). Hence it can only have been a minor difference which older, less exact writing systems did not bother to mark.

13 This general meaning is well known, and must, after all, be understood in the title both of the Diqduq ha'Te'amim itself, and of this first section.

14 This is the peshat. The terms do also have further significance (see below).
This suggestion is strongly reinforced by the composition of the section. The first part, (lines 1–16) dealing with the ‘twelve te’anim’, while not perfectly symmetrical, is nevertheless of uniform poetic structure. The next line (l. 17), bears no relation to the first part in structure, and in content it has the character of an additional note. It is followed by the list of seven masharetim (lines 18–22), which is of a poetic structure quite different from that of the first list, and contains much shorter descriptions of the accents, only rarely giving any of the three types of information offered in the first list. This part also, then, is markedly different in structure and content from the first part, and must be considered a second supplement to it. It seems quite clear, then, that the list of ‘twelve te’anim’ was originally independent, and that further information was added to it, in one or two stages, to produce the Sha’ar haTe’anim. The concluding lines (ll. 23–25) were added to bind the different sections into a unity.

The conclusion that the list of the twelve ‘te’anim’ was originally independent is supported by the fact that it is stated at the beginning that the number of te’anim is twelve (lines 1–2). At the end, line 16 declares that the list of the ‘twelve te’anim’ just given is complete. The conclusion of the section, at line 23, contains no reference to the number twelve, yet this emphasis on the existence of a complete list of twelve accents must surely be significant. As already noted, the word te’anim in lines 1 and 16 must mean simply ‘accent’. The accents listed include both disjunctives and conjunctives. This list of ‘twelve te’anim’, then, is a list of accents, both disjunctive and conjunctive, which is declared to be complete. It must surely be a complete list of those accent signs which were in use when it was written.

The conclusion that the list of the ‘twelve te’anim’ describes a complete accent system brings up the second major problem of the Sha’ar haTe’anim: the identification of the accents listed. Before discussing this, however, it is necessary to consider just what the list is likely to be describing. Since it deals with the written accent signs, the list must be post-Talmudic. Whatever its exact date of origin, then, it is clear that, when it was written, only the written signs could have been new to a student of the accent system. Moreover,

15 I find that this idea was originally put forward by Kahle (ZDMG 55, 1901, 174), but with a different understanding both of the list of ‘twelve te’anim’, and of the whole section.

16 The system of cheironomy was current in the Talmudic period (and probably much earlier in the Mediterranean world, but a brief search has failed to find references). The origin of the chant itself is lost in the mists of antiquity. Methods of indicating the relationship of written words to the chant by means of spaces in a text were developed before the turn of the era (see my “Oldest Evidence for the Hebrew Accent System”
since the accent signs became a part of the Biblical text as written for scholarly use, their forms and application had to be understood by the *naqdanim*, and they were therefore one of the items with which the Massoretic schools were concerned. The *Diqqu haTe'amim* is a product of the Massoretic schools, and approaches the accents from this viewpoint. It is therefore mainly concerned (particularly in this basic introductory chapter) with signs and their use. The various cadences represented by these signs, and the hand movements by which they were traditionally indicated, form part of the background of this work, but they are not its main subject. Consequently it is a reasonable assumption that the *Sha'ar haTe'amim* is interested mainly in the writing system; that is, in accent signs which differ in form or position, and only incidentally in the cadences represented by these signs, or the hand movements to which they correspond. That assumption is basic to this study.

When an attempt is made to identify the accents in the list of the ‘twelve *te'amim*’, it is found that although the information given about them is often obscure, most can be recognized with little doubt. §1 is ָּב + atnah, given together as an inseparable pair. In §9 ָּב + ָּב (zarqa – segolta) are joined for the same reason. The remaining disjunctives which can be easily recognized are §4 ָּב (tebir), §5 ָּב, §7 ָּב (telisha), §8 ָּב (geresh), §11 pashta, and §12 pazer. §3 merka and §10 shofar are readily recognized as conjunctives.

The identity of the remaining two accents, §2 negda and §6 misken, can only be conjectured. If we rely on the statement that the list of twelve accents gives a complete picture of an accent system, we must assume that these two names cover those basic disjunctive accents which have not yet been identified. The omission of silluq from a list of this sort can be justified, so it seems reasonably certain that these two names represent rebia and legarmeh. If this is so, then misken should be identified as legarmeh. The main reason is that the words ָּב “which is placed below”, describing misken, must refer to the written sign (as in fact the whole description seems to do), and could not possibly describe rebia. There are, however, supporting considera-

---

17 Cp. Dothan, *op. cit.*, 157, Kahle, *ZDMG* 55 (1901), 174. A further suggestion, which seems to me very likely, is that, at the period when this list was composed, silluq simply was not marked by a written sign (cp. Palestinian, and many Babylonian, texts). It is, after all, the only accent the position of which is always predictable.

18 The Tiberian sign is written above the line, as also are those of the Palestinian and Babylonian systems, and of any hybrid system I have seen.
tions, not the least of which is the fact that negda is identified as rebia in Dothan’s MS 55, and also in the Manuel du lecteur. In the list of ‘twelve te’amim’ does, then, actually include twelve of the thirteen basic disjunctive accents, silluq being omitted for the reasons noted above. The system of conjunctives appears, at first sight, to be poorly represented, as only shofar and merka are explicitly named, but further investigation suggests that the author of the list had more in mind. The description of ‘telisha’ as "coming before or after" presumably refers to the prepositive or postpositive position possible for this sign, and hence both to the disjunctive telisha gedola and to the conjunctive telisha qetanna. It seems likely that the words "hurrying with two ‘steps’", also describing this sign, refer again to its two possible positions. If so, we can interpret the similar wording in the description of ‘pashṭa’, “stretched

19 In TS D1:116 (Dothan’s MS 55) the example given for negda is דבש (Gen. 1:2). In the Manuel du Lecteur, 380, negda is identified as rebia and misken is replaced by legarmeh. As far as the descriptions in the Diqduq haTe’amim go, note that the Tiberian legarmeh sign does consist of two parts (דובש המַקְלַח), one of which is set below the word (דבש המַקְלַח), and which could together be fancied as a poor man — the munah — bowing at (leaning on ?) a door — the paseq — (דבש המַקְלַח). The sign for negda is unfortunately not described. However, it can be pointed out that the Syrian sign nagoda, a vertical or diagonal stroke, is more likely to point to rebia than to legarmeh (see Dothan, op. cit., 155) as it is not postpositive as is legarmeh. A sign of this form is actually used where BHK has rebia in a Tibero-Palestinian system exemplified by TS Misc. 2:25. (Described in my “New System of Tibero-Palestinian Pointing” read before the 5th World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem 1969). Cp. also the ‘rebia mugrash’ sign, and the sign used to indicate both rebia and rebia mugrash in Bodleian MS Heb d 79, f. 19-23. It is presumably this MS which Yeivin refers to in Textus VII, 99 as d 73 f. 19-23 ‘which is provided with an ancient Tiberian accentuation’. Finally rebia and negda would appear to have much the same meaning, cp. Wickes, op. cit., 18, 22.

20 The number twelve given to the accents in this list is traditionally not exact (see below). From his terminology, it is clear that the compiler would recognize more than twelve accents, as would later scholars, as he sometimes names two under one number. The suggestion that other, less important accents, were included by allusion rather than by name is not unreasonable.

21 The old form, as found in many Geniza fragments, was a simple circle, so that the accents were distinguished solely by the position of the sign.

22 And so Dothan, op. cit., 157. The interpretation of this phrase as referring to two accents is strengthened by the fact that several MSS read מַקְלַח for מַקְלַח. The term מַקְלַח is possibly a reference to the musical value, as the melody of the disjunctive, as shown by Idelsohn (op. cit., table, 44-6), contains many short notes. The melody of the conjunctive was probably similar, as it appears from Geniza fragments that they were not infrequently interchanged.
out in two positions”, as referring to the two possibilities for the placing of this sign, postpositive (pashṭa) or impositive (azla).

If these identifications are correct, the list describes an accent system composed of twelve signs for disjunctive accents: atnah, segolta, zaqef, rebia, tiṭha, zarqa, pashṭa, tebir, gersesh, legarmeh, pazer, and telisha, and four for conjunctives: shofar, merka, azla, telisha. The system described, then, cannot possibly be the standard Tiberian system as we know it. The failure to mark sīluq, however, the use of one sign for zaqef qaton and gadol, for pashṭa and yetib, and for gersesh and gershayim, and the small number of signs for conjunctives, is characteristic of the Palestinian pointing. In fact the accent system of Kahle’s MdW II MS M answers almost exactly to this description.

The accent system of MdW II MS M does present a few features which appear to differ from the system described in our list, but such differences are unimportant. MdW II MS M does not (generally) mark atnah, but this can be ascribed to the abbreviation system rather than the accent system, as this accent is normally marked in other Palestinian MSS, and occasionally in MdW II MS M. Again legarmeh does not have its own sign in MdW II MS M, but is marked with the same sign as is used either for gersesh (TS A 43:2) or pazer (the remaining fragments). There can be no doubt, however, that legarmeh was distinguished as a separate accent. Finally MdW II MS M uses a separate sign for maqef, and occasionally signs corresponding to paseq and ga’ya which are not mentioned in the list of the ‘twelve ʿeʾamim’. Their absence could, however, be explained on the grounds that these signs are not autonomous, but serve to define the application of the other accent signs.

23 This is, of course, an allusion to the name of the accent, and probably refers to its form, not, as Wickes suggests (op. cit., 19) its musical value. This, at any rate, would seem to be its significance in such names as yetib paṣṭa, for the single stroke, tarṭen paṣṭin for the repeated form, in the phrase paṭaḥ maʿal ṣohn in Bodleian MS Heb. f 56, f. 79v4 (see appendix), and in the use of maṣṭin as a name for methiga (e.g. in J.W. Nutt, op. cit., 127).

24 Several MSS listed by Dothan read paṭaḥ maʿal ṣohn for maṣṭin, underlining the fact that two accents were understood here. It is possible that this referred to the pashṭa sign and its repeated form used on mišʼe words, as these are sometimes listed as separate accents (e.g. in the Manuel du Lecteur, 385). However, the repetition of the sign is merely a convenience for the marking of the stress position (see ibid., 402), and so is not always carried out in early MSS, just as it is not usually listed separately in accent lists. Consequently it seems most unlikely that it would be specifically mentioned in a basic list like ours.

25 See note 11.

26 Gersesh and pazer are distinguished from each other and from the other accents. An accent which could be marked with the sign for either must, therefore, be distinct from either.
With these minor reservations, it can be said that the two accent systems are the same. The twelve disjunctive accents named in the list are marked in MdW II MS M, but silluq is not, and the signs for zaqef, pashta and gersh, are used where standard Tiberian has zaqef gadol, yetib, and gershayim. Four conjunctive signs are used, corresponding to the shofar of the list (used where standard Tiberian has munah or mehuppak), to merka (for merka or darga) and to azla and telisha qetanna which are alluded to, but not named in the list. Consequently there can be no doubt that an accent system such as the list of ‘twelve te’amim’ appears to describe was actually used by some community.

Despite the apparent similarity of the system of the ‘twelve te’amim’ to that of the Palestinian text, however, it is to my mind certain that the descriptions of the signs in this list refer to the Tiberian forms, and not to the Palestinian. This is quite clear for tifha, described as דוחו דוחה “stretched backwards”, for the Palestinian sign is invariably a dot. It is highly likely for tebir, ישרת חות ipad “fixed in the word like a beam” (the Palestinian sign is one or two dots) and (if correctly interpreted above) for misken, as the Palestinian sign for leqarme is a single dot or stroke, and is not written below the word. Again, if the interpretation given above is correct, the descriptions of pashta plus azla and telisha gedola plus qetanna must refer to Tiberian and not Palestinian forms, as the Palestinian pointing uses different signs in both cases for the disjunctive and the conjunctive accent. Other descriptions are harder to interpret, but in no case do they recall a Palestinian sign form. It would seem, then, that the list of twelve te’amim derives from the early history of the Tiberian pointing, when the signs used were similar in number to those of the more sophisticated of the Palestinian systems, although different in form.

The suggestion that the list of twelve te’amim represents an early stage in the development of the Tiberian pointing cannot, so far as I know, be supported by reference to a Tiberian MS with a system which corresponds exactly to it, but various MSS appear to give evidence that such a system was at one time in use within the Tiberian tradition: — JTS MS ENA 2021, f. 10 shows a system which probably marked the twelve disjunctive accents (no signs for segolta, zarqa, pazer, or telisha occur) and also silluq. Several conjunctive signs are used, but the system is divergent from the standard Tiberian. The most common sign is —, corresponding to Tiberian munah (20 times) merka (20 times) and maqef (12 times). The same sign is used where the Tiberian text has tifha and silluq. — corresponds to munah three times, merka once, and maqef three times. — corresponds to munah twice, mehuppak ten times, and darga three times. — (twice) and — (once) correspond to Tiberian
azla. There is not example of a sign corresponding to Tiberian telisha qetanna, TS 28:16 shows a somewhat different system. The twelve disjunctive accents were probably marked (segolta is marked with the atnah sign, and there is no example of a sign for legarmeh) and also silluq. Conjunctive signs are extremely rare. The Tiberian signs for munah (once), mehuppak (once), merka (4 times), and azla (twice) are used as in standard Tiberian texts.27 These features in MSS which presumably derive from traditions peripheral to the main stream of Tiberian learning, suggest that the standard Tiberian tradition itself once had an equally simple system of accent signs, which was gradually developed into the system as we know it.

It can be concluded, then, that the list of the ‘twelve te’amim’ represents a complete list of the accents used at an early stage in the development of Tiberian pointing. If this is accepted, however, a third problem presents itself: some of the accents already identified in the list of te’amim are also named in the list of mesharetim. It is not difficult, however, to suggest a reason for this. The list of the ‘twelve te’amim’, representing, as it did, an early stage in the development of the Tiberian system, could not have been incorporated in the Diqduq haTe’im, which deals with the Tiberian system more or less as standardised now, without being brought up to date. The list of mesharetim, which, as was concluded above, must be a supplement to the first list containing ‘additional accents’, represents the process of ‘bringing up to date’. Once the decision to employ the list of the ‘twelve te’amim’ in this way had been made, the compiler was faced with three choices. He could understand it in the original way, and include in his supplement only those accents which were not mentioned in the list of the ‘twelve te’amim’. This would, perhaps, have been the simplest answer, but would have presented information of which the organization, and probably the nomenclature, was quite different from the thinking on the accent system in his day. He could have rewritten the list of the ‘twelve te’amim’ to conform with the view of the accent system customary in his day, but he would then have destroyed the original list, which he clearly wished to retain. Finally, he could retain the list in its original form, but reinterpret it in conformity with contemporary views on the accent system, and add, in his supplement, the accents not included in the list as reinterpreted. This method, which met both the requirement of retaining the original list, and that of presenting the accent system in close conformity to contemporary

27 In addition, a sign – Ɑ –, the same as is used for ṭifḥa is used (presumably by error) on the word ṭet (Ez 23:2), which is, in BHK, bound by maqqef to the word bearing ṭifḥa. There are no examples of accent signs used where standard Tiberian has darga or telisha qetanna.
ideas, was the one he chose. The fact that the first list was reinterpreted accounts for the appearance, in the supplemental list of mesharetim, of some accents already identified as named in the original interpretation of the list of the ‘twelve te’amim’.

The methods of dealing with ancient lists can be seen in the history of the Sha’ar haTe’amim itself. The majority of Dothan’s MSS show only minor textual variants. Here the original text was maintained. In several cases, however, considerable changes have been introduced. The major cause of these was the well-known fact that many of the accents were known by different names in different periods and areas. No doubt also the purpose for which the text was intended had an effect on the form in which the text was copied.

Change due solely to difference in nomenclature is found in Dothan’s MS 12y, in which farha replaces tifha as the name of the first accent. Both names are well known, and there is no difficulty in accepting the explanation that farha was used because it was the customary name in the community for which this text was written.

A further stage is reached in Dothan’s MS SJ in which we find, along with change in nomenclature, change in the interpretation of the text. In this MS, the fourth member of the list of ‘twelve te’amim’ is דיתות, as in Dothan’s edition. It does not, however, indicate tebir, but pashâ, as the example ירח מַעֲרָד (Gen. 1:15) makes quite clear. Nevertheless the description of the accent differs from that of Dothan’s edition substantially only in reading כָּפָר for Dothan’s כָּפָר. Similarly the name מַשָּׂרָה is retained in this MS.

28 Bodleian MS Opp. Add. 4to. 158. It should be noted that the Sha’ar haTe’amim in this MS is an addition to a grammatical work in which a great deal of information on the accent system has already been given in much the same terms as in the Manuel du Lecteur. I.e., the main purpose in copying it was clearly its value for antiquarian or comparative studies, not to obtain basic information about the accent system.

29 A minor form of this sort of variant is, of course, the existence of a number of spellings of names derived from the same root. Cp. Dothan’s interesting note (op. cit., 156) on the spellings בֶּהֱרִים/בֶּהָרִים. Tebir is, of course, a further variant of the same name.

30 TS D1:116, a leaf of parchment with one side blank, and the other inscribed with the list of the ‘twelve te’amim’ as copied in Dothan, op. cit., 283-4. Much the same wording is used in Dothan’s MS 19, a late copy of a treatise on pointing which contains this form of the list of the ‘twelve te’amim’. Since only the ‘twelve te’amim’ are covered in the MS 19 list, it seems reasonable to suppose that the list of mesharetim was not included in TS D1:116 either.

31 The use of כָּפָר as a name for pashâ is surprising, but not inexplicable. Some Babylonian MSS use the same sign, כ, corresponding to both pashâ and tebir. In Palestinian MSS also, the same sign is used for both accents, but its placed above or below the line to differentiate them. It would seem clear, then, that pashâ and tebir were, at one time, thought of as variants of a single accent, at least from one point of view. There is a most
for the sixth member of this list, but indicates tebir, not legarmeh as in Dothan's edition. The actual description of the accent, however, differs substantially only in reading מַקָּל (tskhv) for Dothan's מַקָּל for Dothan's text. These two cases, then, clearly show a complete reinterpretation of the original text, necessitated by the use of a different nomenclature for the accents.

The same MS contains examples of a further development in the use of this text. In the case of רְשַׁע — here the name used for legarmeh — and of כֹּל — which, with כּלָּכָל, is here the name used for the pair zarqa-segolta — the descriptions of TS 1:116 are different from those of Dothan's text. In the case of the former, where the difference is complete, this was no doubt because the author was not able to reinterpret the description of pashţa, the place of which is usurped by רְשַׁע/legarmeh, as applying to that accent. In the case of כֹּל — מָנָה — where the difference is not so great, the purpose of the change appears to have been to present a greater amount of information interesting fragment in the Bodleian (MS Heb. 556, f. 79–80) which gives evidence of this situation. I have given the text in full in the appendix. Pashţa is there referred to as שָׁמַש תֵּאָר תֵּאָרוּנָא תֵּאָר (79v1) (the name in use is used for one of the varieties of this accent in 79v4). The accent tebir is referred to as סֵּפֶּה תֵּאָר תֵּאָרוּנָא לָאָר (79v8), i.e. "The known as 'lower'", referring to its sublinear position in Tiberian (and Palestinian) pointing. The term סְפֶּה used of pashţa presumably indicates its 'reversed' or supralinear position, terminology which would be a perfect description of the Palestinian sign forms נא and נא, and, (if the suggestion that the original form of tebir was simply a stroke is correct — see note 38) also the Tiberian forms נא and נא. When these two accents were differentiated by name, צָרַק and derivatives was normally used for the subscript accent, and a new name found for the supralinear, but in the case of the tradition represented by TS 1:116 the reverse occurred, and the name כֹּל was used for pashţa. A similar process seems to have occurred with the accents zarqa and legarmeh. These two accents are marked by the same sign in most Palestinian MSS (also perhaps in some Babylonian MSS, but the situation is rather complex), and were therefore presumably included, at least from the point of view of the writing system, under the same name as may well have been the case in the Bodleian fragment (see appendix). When separate names were given, the name רְשַׁע was most commonly applied to the accent preceding segolta but, in the tradition represented by TS 1:116, it is used for legarmeh, the other member of the pair, while the name יַעֲרִי (also in common use), was applied to the foretone of segolta.

32 This identification, like the other unusual ones in this MS, is not so surprising as it might seem at first glance. מַסְפֶּה is known as a name for merka kufala, but this accent is really a form of tebir, not of merka, as shown by Wickes, op. cit., 92; Dothan, op. cit., 157. Furthermore, in the only case known to me in which a Palestinian accent sign is used where the Tiberian text has merka kufala, the sign otherwise corresponding to tebir is used (TS 20:59, Ez. 14:3, see Mdw II, 67). Consequently it seems likely that, as in the previous examples, a name (מַסְפֶּה) applied in one tradition to one form of an accent (merka kufala), was in the tradition represented by TS 1:116, applied to another form of the same accent (tebir).
more clearly. In these cases, then, the author has retained only the framework of the original list, and added new wording wherever his purpose required it.

The culmination of this type of development is seen in the Sha’ar haTe’anim as it appears in the “Manuel du Lecteur” (379 ff.). It is completely rewritten so that the two lists of fe’anim and mesharetim do contain only disjunctive and conjunctive accents respectively, and so that the disjunctives are arranged on a musical basis, instead of in the original order. A great deal of the original wording is retained, but the author did not hesitate to change it whenever he felt it necessary. We have here, then, an example of the Sha’ar haTe’anim completely re-written in conformity with the need for clear expression in a grammatical work, and in conformity with the view of the organization of the accent system as it was customarily described in the time of the author.

The practise of reinterpreting or re-writing the list of the ‘twelve fe’anim’ is, therefore, well attested. The Sha’ar haTe’anim, was perhaps, the first case of this practise. The re-writing was, of course, confined to the addition of the note on shofar pointing out that the name covers more than one accent, and of the list of seven mesharetim. The accents named in this list would appear to be: — 1. Azla, 2. Rebia, 3. Zaqef qaṭon, 4. Pazer gadol and galgal.

33 Even though ataḥa is now given a verse to itself, it is also still mentioned in the ḥṭ’ba verse, as in Dothan’s edition, which shows that the original wording was only changed where necessary. Cp. also Dothan’s note (op. cit., 156 and n. 43) on the spellings of the name for tebir in this MS.

34 It is not clear how many accents are envisaged here. Dothan thinks of the three varieties of shofar represented by the munaḥ sign. I would doubt, however, that reference is made in the Sha’ar haTe’anim to any accents other than those differentiated by written form (see above). In support of this one can compare the restricted content of the corresponding list in the Manuel du Lecteur, which only lists accents distinguished by signs, even though it was rewritten to suit the purposes of the author, who does elsewhere (e.g., 411f.) describe the three different musical values of the accent referred to in the list (381) simply as שים. Consequently I would suggest that this note refers to munaḥ and mehuppak: the first being described as ייִידָ נְעָל (recalling the descriptions of the accents of the highest tone in Wickes, op. cit., 13, note 12) and the second as ייִידָ נְעָל (with which cp. ibid., 24). If this were shown to be wrong, I would take the note simply as a general reference to the several melodies referred to as shofar, including mehuppak. The use of mehuppak seems stable, but the use of the others must have varied considerably, since those ‘Palestinian’ MSS which do use more than one sign corresponding to munaḥ, do not use them according to the rules for the three varieties of shofar as given, e.g., in the Manuel du Lecteur. (Such MSS are TS 12:197 — MdW II MS K, and TS NS 246: 22, published by Diez-Macho in Studia Papyrologica VI, 1967, 15-25, and some MSS of the ‘Tiber-Palestinian’ type, see MdW II 59*, in which two, not three signs are used). Where such variety obtained, it seems likely that the author, if he did wish to refer to different melodies represented by the same sign, would do so in a general rather than a specific way.
5. Gershayim, 6. Shalshelet, 7. Ga’ya. Following the arguments above, then, we must conclude that the list of the ‘twelve te’amim’ was re-interpreted so as to include all the accents of the standard Tiberian system but these. Following this guide, we can suggest that the names were identified as follows: — Nos. 1, tifha + atnaha, 4, Tabra (tebir), 7, Talsha occurring in two positions (telisha gedola and qatanna), and 9, Shnori + qabla (zarqa – segolta) were interpreted as before. Nos. 5, zaqef, 8, jeres (geresh), and 12, pazer, which had originally covered both variants of the accents in question, were now restricted to one, the other being mentioned in the list of meshesetim (Nos. 3, 4, 5). No. 11, pasha occurring in two forms (originally pashṭa and azla), was now taken as referring to pashṭa and yetib, and so Azla was mentioned in the list of meshesetim (No. 1).37 In the case of No. 3, Merka, the description which originally referred only to one accent, was interpreted as referring to two (Merka and Darga).38 Similarly No. 10, shofar was interpreted as referring to more than

35 The description of rebiya presumably states that it is a disjunctive (te’am). Zaqef qajon is described as greater, possibly referring to the fact that its phrase contains conjunctions, and so is ‘greater’ than that of zaqef gedola. The juxtaposition of virtual antonyms — greater and smaller — makes a useful mnemonic device. Gershayim is described as ‘not separated from the disjunctives’ — to my mind quite different from ‘which can be used with any accent, and is counted (‘) as one of them’ said of ga’ya (contrary to the Manuel du Lecteur, 385). I would take this as a statement that rebiya is a disjunctive (cp. the description of rebiya), and assume that the expression ‘does not indicate a form of geresh/teres, (as, evidently, zaqef) and so probably gershayim. (Dothan’s identification of rebiya as ga’ya gedola is also to be rejected on the ground that the author appears to deal elsewhere only with accents marked by a distinct sign.) As regards merka, the author is not classifying the accents on a musical basis (see above), and anyway darga is included with merka (see below), so I would reject Dothan’s suggestion that this name covers darga as well as shalshelet.36 In the description can then be interpreted either as does Dothan in his note 153 (op. cit., 344), or as referring to the rarity of the accent, for, as noted in the Manuel du Lecteur 384, shalshelet is not counted among the disjunctives.

36 If the name tebir did previously cover merka kefula also (see note 32), it belongs not in this group, but with zaqef, etc., below.

37 The possibility that the two accents understood here are pasha and its repeated form is rejected for the same reasons given in note 24.

38 There are various possibilities for the identification of the ‘sister’ of merka in the original interpretation (see Dothan, op. cit., 156). The allusion was probably to tebir, for the reasons suggested by Dothan. Furthermore, it seems likely that tebir originally had the same form as merka, the dot being added later to mark the distinction. The simple form — (which would accord well with the description הקפאת בדית דביר מרגהל ‘stuck in the world like a beam’ and presumably appears doubled in the related “merka kefula”) is found in the Tiberio-Palestinian MSS exemplified by TS Misc. 2:25, while the dotted form occurs in TS NS 287:38 from the same school (described in my paper “A New
one accent with the help of the additional note (see note 34). Finally, No. 2, negda, and No. 6, misken, were completely re-interpreted. The name negda was applied to legarmeh instead of to rebia, which was consequently listed among the mesharetim (No. 2). The name misken, which originally denoted legarmeh, was applied to merka kefula.

The re-interpretation suggested here is no more radical than the examples already noted above. Like them, it was necessitated by the re-use of an old list in a new context. By means of this re-interpretation, the compiler of the Sha'ar haTe'amim was able to achieve the following: He was able to retain the list of the 'twelve te'amim' with its original wording, which was obviously important to him. He was, however, able to change its meaning somewhat so as to re-organize the view of the accent system presented. In the original list, where two accents were included in one item, they either always occur together (tifha-atnah, zarqa-se golta) or the two accents are distinguished in the written text not by different signs, but by different positioning of the same sign (pashta-azla, the two telishas). The first type of pair is retained in the re-interpretation, and galgal-pazer gadol, an example of the same type,

Subsystem of Tibero-Palestinian Vocalization” read at the 5th World Congress of Jewish Studies in 1969). The later understanding of the ‘sister’ of merka as darga would refer to the fact that both accents were originally marked with the same sign, as always in Palestinian MSS, and as in some Tibero-Palestinian MSS (e.g. TS B6:1, 2, 5) where the Tiberian merka sign is used for both. (It would, in fact, be possible to see the darga sign as derived from the merka sign compounded, just as the mehuppak sign is derived from the munah sign reversed.)

39 Dothan’s interpretation of shofar in the list of the ‘twelve te’amim’ as referring to mehuppak and (possibly) yetib, so far as I can see, without any real support. My interpretation of this name as originally referring to a sign used for all ‘shofar cadences’ is equally based on my interpretation of the section as a whole, but, it is, I submit, much more plausible, since it is most unlikely that the term shofar without qualification be used in one place as a specific name for only one of the accents to which the name was normally applied, and again, a few lines on, as a name for the rest of them.

40 The identification of הֱדוֹן as legarmeh is justified by Dothan, op. cit., 155. It should be noted that the identification of הֱדוֹן as rebia is made in those texts which either given only the list of ‘twelve te’amim’, (ב5, 12), or those in which this list is rewritten so as to contain only disjunctive accents (Manuel du Lecteur). This appears to me to be clear proof of the connection between the inclusion of the list of mesharetim and the interpretation of הֱדוֹן as legarmeh.

41 See Dothan, op. cit., 157; Wickes, op. cit., 25. It must be emphasized again that the use of the same name for quite different accents in different traditions is well attested not only in ancient lists, some of which have been noted above, but also in modern times, as, e.g. הֱדוֹן for geresh or azla. This feature of the re-interpretation, then, though surprising, is in no way unlikely.

42 On the form of telisha, see note 21.
occurs in the additions. Other pairs, however, are made up of accents of similar function (merka + darga, telisha gedola and qetanna, pashṭa and yetib, the shofars). Finally, by this re-interpretation, he raised the number of accents included in the list of the ‘twelve te’amim’ from sixteen to eighteen, and so was able to describe the accents of the Tiberian system in the form of a list of twelve and a list of seven, a feature which was also important to him, as will be shown.

It is clear that the number of accents recognized was traditionally set at twelve, possibly throughout the Western communities. This figure, probably because of its mystical significance and consequent mnemonic advantage, was retained, even where current usage required the inclusion of more than twelve accents. The list of the ‘twelve te’amim’ in the Sha’ar haTe’amim represents a typical extension of this figure. This particular list appears to describe the accent system common to the ‘Westerners’ as represented by the Tiberian pointing. The Tiberian scholars, however, developed new accent signs which represented minor variations of the disjunctive accents, for which the traditional number twelve was still retained, and also further conjunctive accents, the number of which does not seem to have been stabilized by tradition.

43 The pausal value of telisha qetanna was evidently not much different, in some traditions anyway, from that of telisha gedola, see Wickes, op. cit., 26. This difference from the other conjunctives is underlined, in Palestinian texts, by the fact that telisha qetanna is more regularly marked than any other conjunctive, and is, in many MSS, the only conjunctive specifically marked. Cp. also n. 22 above.

44 As pointed out in note 10, differences between the Tiberian and Palestinian or Tiber-Palestinian systems of accentuation appear to be minimal, and are far outweighed by the common features, which are visible even in the general approach to the writing system. E.g. in both Tiberian and Palestinian systems, even though the signs used are quite different, the signs for silluq, atnah, tifḥa, and tebir, are sublinear, while the signs for the accents of the qazef phrase, with the solitary exception of (Tiberian) yetib, are supralinear. For this reason it seems permissible to think of the western traditions as a reasonably homogeneous unit, as opposed to the eastern (Babylonian) traditions, and for this reason features of Palestinian or Tiber-Palestinian MSS have been taken above as giving evidence of the probable situation in the early stages of the Tiberian system. If this view is justified, the number twelve for the accents cannot have been based on the written signs, as most Palestinian MSS do not use so many, but must have been based on traditions of chetronomy, or a musical classification of accents. If so, it is possible that the number twelve might also have been traditional also among the Babylonians, as suggested by Derenbourg (Journal Asiatique, 6ème série, t. XVI, 1870, 519, 524) on the basis of Pinsker’s work, but this seems unlikely to me.

45 The number seven of the Sha’ar hate’amim was probably chosen for the same mystic/mnemonic advantages as attach to twelve. The Manuel du Lecteur, however, counts eight (381).
At least 26 different accents were now recognized, a number too great to be included in a mnemonic list under the traditional number of twelve accents. The system incorporating these new signs, however, could not immediately and completely replace the older, simpler system. Furthermore, it was not desirable that the new generations of scholars should learn only the new system, and thus be inhibited in their use of MSS from older periods or peripheral areas. Consequently the Sha’ar haTe’amim was produced in composite form. The description of the old system, which was probably widely used and had considerable prestige, was retained intact, while the new system was presented, almost like a palimpsest, on top of it.

According to this view, then, the Sha’ar haTe’amim should be read as follows:— “There are twelve disjunctive accents. Here is a clear list of the ‘twelve accents’ (as you will find them in the MSS written by our predecessors) carefully made out by men of insight and wisdom.... This is a complete list of the ‘twelve accents’ (describing the older system). (Nowadays, of course) the name shofar covers more than one accent. The number of conjunctive accents is, in fact, seven. Besides the accents in the list of ‘twelve’, ‘seven’ other accents are (nowadays) used, and, (if the list of ‘twelve’ be re-interpreted in modern terms) the additional ‘seven’ can be listed as follows:— ....This is a complete list of the disjunctive and conjunctive accents as clearly set out by scribes and scholars. Blessed is he who studies it hard enough to understand it fully.”

The key to this understanding is the fact that the terms te’amim and mesha-retim in the titles of the two lists have a double meaning. They have already been shown to mean simply ‘accent’ and ‘additional accent’. They also quite clearly carry the statement that the traditional number of disjunctive accents was twelve, and of conjunctives, seven. This second meaning ‘disjunctive’ and ‘conjunctive’, however, is not to be applied to the accents in the lists which follow the terms. The remainder of the interpretation follows from the arguments given above. It may be thought that the claims for double meanings and re-interpretations are too fantastic. The recognition of hidden allusions and multiple meanings is, however, common in midrash, still a living force in Biblical interpretation when the Sha’ar haTe’amim was written, and in its extension in piyyut. The Sha’ar haTe’amim, like much of the Diqduke

46 Note the similar concern of Jacob of Edessa, who hesitated to introduce vowel signs into Syriac from fear that books without them would no longer be used.
47 There is no doubt in my mind that Prov. 3:13 is quoted as a hint that hidden meanings are to be found.
48 Cp. Dothan’s remarks on the similarity of the language of the Sha’ar haTe’amim to that of piyyut, and his use of quotations from piyyutim to elucidate a passage in the Sha’ar
haTe’amim is not a grammatical treatise designed to give new instruction, but a mnemonic for naqdanim designed to supply basic facts, and to recall, along with them, instruction already received. The information explicitly given, or alluded to, is very much more than would be supposed at first glance. The cryptic wording poses no problem for the initiate. The neophyte is supplied with the basic facts by the literal meaning of the words, but is encouraged to look beyond this both by the strange format, and by the deliberate hint contained in the blessing at the end of the section.

APPENDIX

Bodleian MS Heb. f. 56, f. 79–80 (cat. 2821 § 23).49 Two fols. of parchment about 145 mm high by 95 mm, written in a Syrian type square script in olive brown ink. The sparse pointing is in a similar ink, but by a finer pen, and (as it sometimes contradicts it), is probably not original in the text. The space at the end of fol. 80r is filled with coloured ornament. A rule on the use of ga’ya is given at the top of fol. 80v, possibly by the first hand, and is followed, on this and a subsequent folio, by different material in a different script.

haTe’amim (op. cit., 152, 154, 160). No doubt other obscure phrases could be shown to contain similar word plays if we knew more of the ancient nomenclature of the accent system, and the language used to describe it.

49 Grateful acknowledgement is hereby made to the Curators of the Bodleian Library, Oxford, for their permission to publish the contents of this fragment.

50 Ex. 38:26.

51 Jer. 2:5. The accentuation is here inconsistent with the text, which requires as in BHK.

52 Jer. 3:14. The accent on כשם (as BHK) is again inconsistent with the text, which requires כשם, but the munah sign is not by the hand which marked the other accents.
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1 כותב בהותאות העיר במעיל מאיור.
2 ובשנין מתבורה המתבורה גבישת⏰ לבריא.
3 ועוז אוילך בטבע קוך להן.
4 ובית בלוב גם גושה הנוקרא פשיט יזמר.
5 הבאת בתראותות שנטלבה השופי.
6 האמטיל בתראותות מראיכו כל חוחך.
7 שנגמי 53 תורת אוכדך כביני.
8 מתבר תתקאר לירבה מהלעט מי בחרה.
9 חקורות וי מהבר המסרות.
10 תנקרא הוא והבר בלבר את.
11 אמטיל בתבר תקזנאת ולחר.
12 מלמדת יכף רלד 54 אאמו יחר.
13 מחסם את בתראותות תונור.
14 מלמדת ככף ישביעתן קן אשף.
15 ושלא הברור.

53 Gen. 1:7.
54 Added in the right hand margin.
55 Gen. 1:2.
56 Gen. 1:17.
57 Gen. 3:20.
58 Gen. 2:4. BHK. מיל. The אהל of the fragment is correctly accented according to the standard Tiberian system, as munah is only used on the first letter (Wickes, op. cit., 109), but is inconsistent with the text, which requires宁静. However the text appears to be corrupt here, as (following the pattern established above) this example should come after the rule it illustrates, and so on 80r2. Furthermore, one would expect two rules and two examples covering the two possible situations (as described in Wickes, loc. cit., and as in the Hayyuj fragment, on which see below), but possibly this was not necessary for the tradition of accentuation described here.
59 Ex. 1:10. بHK. מי, is considered a part of the following word for purposes of accentuation, and so munah is used, in accordance with the rule given in our text.
60 Gen. 4:1. The verb יאָ מישר implies a sign such as ga’ya or merka, not munah, (see below).
61 Is. 20:2 (?). BHK. יאָ כִּר. The munah in the fragment is presumably secondary, but this is not clear.
This fragment raises many questions, but the following remarks are limited to their interest for this paper.

Despite the unusual nomenclature, it seems clear that this fragment is concerned with the Tiberian accent-signs. The same material occurs in the “Chapter on the Names of the Points and Their Uses”, ascribed to Ḥayyuj.63 It is better organized there than in our fragment, with fewer rules and more examples, and the accent names are more standardized.64 However, the same features of the accent system are covered (save that each treatise contains a brief section not found in the other), and in many cases the same examples are used, even (in דְּלַיְו, Ex. 1:10) with the same deviation from the standard Tiberian. It seems probable, then, that our fragment is an earlier form of the same treatise as is recorded by Ḥayyuj.

It is quite clear that, in our fragment, אָדָם was a generic name for all varieties of pashṭa and tebir. Other names were used for varieties of this accent marked with specific signs: לֵיה, ‘subscript’ for tebir itself, and הָעֵד, ‘opposite’ and so ‘superscript’ or נֵיָה ‘stretched out’ for pashṭa. It seems likely that zarqa formed a member of a similar grouping for which the generic name was מְרוּיָה (80r9). If so, one would assume that zarqa and legarmeh were grouped together (cp. n. 31). Unfortunately, however, there is no information about any other members of the group, and even the specific name for zarqa has been accidentally omitted.

It should further be noted that מְרוּיָה and מְרוּיָה are used with the technical meaning ‘(mark with) a stroke-shaped accent sign’, and hence with azla, methiga, and merka (including cases where merka replaces BHK munah). Here we have again a case of a generic term used for a number of accents which are elsewhere distinguished by name. Here they are only distinguished by position above or below the word.65 This terminology is undoubtedly based on written form.66 It seems likely that written form was also the basis for the

---

63 See J. W. Nutt, op. cit., 127.
64 Except for אָדָם indicating mehuppak, the unusual terminology of our passage is not used in the Ḥayyuj fragment.
65 Subscript and superscript ‘stroke’ signs are written more or less vertical, and never incline much to the left, both in this fragment, and in the list in the Bibliotheca Casanatense MS H. III. 13 referred to below.
66 It is perfectly clear, from names such as מַשְׁלַיְו for the repeated form of the pashṭa sign (recorded in Ginsburg, The Massora, vol. II, 50) that the written form of an accent-sign was often the source of a name which had no connection whatever with the function of the sign. In many possible cases it is not clear whether a name refers to the written form of a sign or to its musical value (cp. Wickes, op. cit., on mehuppak), but it must be remembered that much of our literature on the accents derives from sources mainly concerned with their appearance in the written text — as the
grouping of pasha’ta-tebir under one name, and (if this were done) also zarqa-legarmeh (see n. 31). We have, in this fragment, then, evidence of nomenclature based on written form, which, in the Ḥayyug passage has developed into nomenclature based on function. This parallels the development suggested above from the pairing of accents of identical form in the list of the ‘twelve te’anim’ to the pairing of accents of similar function in the Sha’ar ha-te’anim, and recalls the development suggested by Werner (op. cit., 105) from the use of the accents purely as punctuation marks towards their use as a real musical notation. The reasoning which permitted the writing of different accents with the same sign and therefore reference to them by the same name, can only be a matter of speculation. It seems quite possible, however, that its basis was the desire, referred to above, to keep the number of different signs to a minimum. Development away from this stage may well have originated in the desire for detailed and accurate marking of conjunctives, and the consequent need for a less cumbersome means of identifying the individual accents than was possible with the names based on written form.

Concerning the variants between the accentuation of this fragment and the standard Tiberian accentuation, it can be pointed out that a number of MSS can be listed in which the sign corresponding to Tiberian merka is used where the standard Tiberian system uses other conjunctives, particularly munah. This may occur frequently, as in the Exodus fragment of MdW II MS M (‘Palestinian’) and JTS MS ENA 2021, f. 10 (Tiberian), or sporadically, as in the other parts of MdW II MS M (‘Palestinian’), and in the accent list in Biblioteca Casanatense MS H. III.13, fol. 234v, 235r (Tiberian, dated 1466). In this latter text, the accents are both marked and named, and so we find, e.g. תמרוקת (Gen. 17:13) and דמיונ (2 Chr. 24:5) both named as מונח. Where BHK has munah before atnah. The same name is used for the same sign where BHK has merka (e.g. דרבי, Gen. 17:13; בְּרִיך, 2 Chr. 24:5) and for ga’ya (e.g. תָּנָא, 2 Chr. 24:5, with zaqef for BHK rebia). The same terminology appears in the Massora. In our fragment, then, represents a stage, present fragment, which is cast in the form of instructions to a naqdan — so that the forms of the signs undoubtedly exercised a much greater influence on the nomenclature than Wicke is willing to admit.

In the light of the information given here, I would regard Wicke’s explanation of this feature (op. cit., 24–5) as wrong. The name must be regarded as another example of the retention, in the Tiberian Massora, of terms describing usages foreign to the standard Tiberian system, but current in one of the layers of tradition from which it was built up. Other examples are the use of dagesh/rafe to describe a consonant preceded by silent shewa/hafetz, or inseparable preposition vocalised with/without the article. The dagesh and rafe signs are not used to mark these features in Standard Tiberian, but the are,
probably relatively early, in a tradition which differs in some details from the standard Tiberian, and in fact has evident connections with the 'Palestinian', but yet appears to have been well known, in widespread use, and was passed on by famous scholars.

in some Palestinian MSS. See my Hebrew Texts with Palestinian Vocalization (Toronto 1970), 18, 28, 30, 77, 92.