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1.0. INTRODUCTION: THE PRONUNCIATION OF SHEWA

Various masoretic treatises discuss the pronunciation of shewa—in particular the significant question of when a shewa is to be considered silent, and when it is sounded. The rules laid out in these treatises do not in all respects conform to the rules found in modern grammars (which have been influenced by later medieval grammatical works in which the earlier Tiberian pronunciation had already been largely forgotten).

In crude summary, these early masoretic treatises state that the shewa is vocal:

- At the beginning of a word
- Beneath a geminated consonant

---

1 I am grateful to Dr Ben Outhwaite and Prof. Geoffrey Khan for their patient discussion with me of many of the rules and details contained in this study.

2 Treatises of particular significance in this regard include the Sefer Diqduqe hat-Te’amim (ed. Dotan 1967), the anonymous Treatise on the Shewa (Levy 1936), and the Hidāyat al-Qārī (Eldar 1994; Khan 2020).
• If it is the second of two consecutive, word-internal *shewas*

Elsewhere, the *shewa* is silent. In particular, an isolated, word-internal *shewa* is generally silent—even when preceded by an inherently long vowel (e.g., כָּתְב).³

Nonetheless, the early masoretic treatises discuss many different phonetic contexts in which an isolated, word-internal *shewa* not under a geminated consonant is pronounced as vocal, in contrast to the general rule. These include the *shewa* under the מ of the word-initial cluster -מְ (under certain conditions); a *shewa* under the first of a pair of identical consonants (always when preceded by a long vowel, and often when preceded by a short vowel); the *shewa* in certain forms of the verbs בְָּרְַךְ, הִתְבָּרְַךְ, הְָּלְַךְ, יְָּרְַד, אְָּכְַל; the *shewa* beneath a sibilant following conjunctive *waw* (under certain conditions); various other smaller classes of phonetic contexts (Yeivin 1968, 22–49).

This paper surveys how Samuel ben Jacob, the scribe responsible for producing the Leningrad Codex, treats these exceptional vocalic *shewas*. In addition to the Leningrad Codex itself, data will be gathered from codices L17 and Gott 27—manuscripts of the Former Prophets also produced by Samuel ben Jacob, as well as Lᵐ and RNL EVR II B 60, Torah manuscripts by the same

scribe.\(^4\) It is to be hoped that consulting multiple Samuel ben Jacob manuscripts will facilitate distinguishing between the intentional and the accidental in his work, and thereby reveal a more accurate and trustworthy picture of his practice. Data from the Aleppo Codex will also be presented to serve as background to Samuel ben Jacob’s approach.

### 2.0. **Representing the Exceptional Vocalic Shewas**

Taking the early masoretic codices *en masse*, the most common means of indicating an exceptional vocal *shewa* is by means of the *gaʿya*. The *gaʿya* is placed on the vowel immediately preceding the *shewa* and serves to indicate the vocalic nature of the following *shewa*. Yeivin refers to this type of *gaʿya* as ‘phonetic’, rather than ‘musical’ (Yeivin 2003, 221–26).\(^5\)

\(^4\) For L\(^m\), see Breuer (1992); for Gott 27, see Gottheil (1905), and Yeivin (1993, 188–89). These MSS have, or had, colophons explicitly naming Samuel ben Jacob as their scribe. For a detailed description of MS L17, and a demonstration that it is indeed the work of Samuel ben Jacob, see Phillips (2017). After I had completed a first draft of this paper, Joseph Ofer (2018) announced, in a lecture in Krakow, his discovery of yet another manuscript by the same scribe: RNL EVR II B 60. I have not been able to examine this manuscript thoroughly, but initial soundings have already yielded data useful for this study. Images of L\(^m\) and Gott 27 are not currently available to scholars, so I have been able to glean information germane to this study only as it appears, *ad hoc*, in the available scholarship.

\(^5\) Though the Masoretes themselves do not make this distinction explicit, it seems that they were aware of it. The early masoretic codices themselves (or rather the Masoretes and scribes behind these codices) were
Often, the phonetic context in which this class of phonetic gaʿya is used would not be a suitable context for a musical gaʿya. Hence, there is frequently no formal ambiguity as to whether a particular gaʿya is musical or phonetic—provided one has a reasonable grasp of the various different classes of gaʿyas and their usual environments. Nonetheless, certain manuscripts—notably the Aleppo Codex, and to a lesser extent British Museum Or. 4445—have a propensity to mark the presence of an exceptional vocalic shewa by using a composite shewa (Yeivin 1968, 24; 2003, §429). Samuel ben Jacob also uses the composite shewa for this purpose, though to a far lesser degree. The composite shewa can either be combined with, or replace, the use of phonetic gaʿya in any given instance.

Formally, then, the early masoretic codices either mark these exceptional vocalic shews in one of three ways—phonetic gaʿya only; composite shewa only; both phonetic gaʿya and composite shewa—or leave them unmarked.⁶

The ensuing data present Samuel ben Jacob’s practice in representing the exceptional, vocalic nature of the shews in clearly aware that these classes of gaʿyas (phonetic versus musical) were distinct to a greater degree than, say, the various different sub-classes of musical gaʿya. This is demonstrated by the fact that while the early codices only rarely put two musical gaʿyas on the same word (Yeivin 2003, §391), there is no such hesitation about placing both a musical and a phonetic gaʿya on the same word (Yeivin 2003, §408).

⁶ In this category, the shewa is known to be vocalic either because it is unambiguously presented as such in other early masoretic codices, or because it is mentioned as being vocalic by the various masoretic sources that discuss this issue.
three contexts: the shewa under the מ of the word-initial cluster: מ- (under certain conditions); a shewa under the first of a pair of identical consonants (always when preceded by a long vowel, and often when preceded by a short vowel); the shewa in certain forms of the verbs: אֲבָל, יַרְד, הַלֶּ, בִּרְד/הַבָּרְד. These three classes cover the great majority of occurrences of exceptional, vocalic shewas. MS L17 determined the text range from which comparative data were gathered. That is, if a relevant form appeared in the extant text of L17, the equivalent data were also gathered from L and A. Where possible, I have also included additional data from L⁷, Gott 27, and RNL EVR II B 60.

3.0. DATA

3.1. Shewa Following מ of Word-initial מ-

This class of exceptional vocalic shewas concern the word-initial structure מ-. Usually, though not always, the initial מ is the definite article. Hence, what is said here also applies to ב, כ, and ל, where the definite article is discernible in the pataḥ beneath the prefixed preposition. These prefixed forms were included in the search.

The basic rule here can be stated thus: if the מ is the second syllable before the stressed syllable, and the word is not suitable for minor gaʿya, then the shewa under the mem will normally be

7 The verb יַרְד is not included in the following discussion, as no suitable examples occur in the text-range from which data were gathered.

8 ‘Word-initial’ is not intended to preclude the possibility of the presence of מ.
vocal, apart from all instances of the word לַמְנַצ חְַ, and a few other isolated exceptions.⁹

In gathering the data for this set, every instance of word-initial -ֶהָ/ה- ה, with or without an inseparable preposition, was noted from the entire range of text contained in L17, regardless of word structure or number of syllables before the stressed syllable. All twenty-two examples, in all three of the manuscripts examined, show a gaʿya under the first letter. In twenty instances the combination -ֶה/ה- ה itself is present, and a further two instances concern the combination -ֶפ/פ, wherein the ה of the definite article has been elided in favour of the prefixed -ב. In twenty-one of the examples the -ה (or equivalent) does indeed constitute the second syllable before the stressed syllable. In המְצֹרָּעִים (2 Kgs 7.8), the -ה constitutes the third syllable before the accented syllable. Nonetheless, A vocalises the ה with a hatef pataḥ in this instance, too. In twenty of the examples the word structure is not suitable for minor gaʿya (and hence the gaʿya present must be phonetic). In the remaining two cases—הַַֽמְְלֶלֶכֶּפֶּ (Judg. 7.6) and המְלֶלֶכֶּפֶּ (Judg. 7.7)—if a simple shewa were written beneath the mem, the forms would be suitable for not-fully-regular minor gaʿya, and thus the gaʿya could, theoretically, be either phonetic or musical. This is particularly the case in Judg. 7.7, where the primary accent on the word is disjunctive.

From RNL EVR II B 60 I was able to gather seven relevant examples. In each example the -ה constituted the second syllable from the accent. None of the forms was suitable for minor gaʿya.

⁹ For an exhaustive discussion, see Yeivin (1968, 24–30).
Various aspects of these data are worthy of comment, or require explanation:

- The results nicely illustrate Yeivin’s (1968, 24) claim that A’s propensity to mark vocalic shewa in this context with a ḥaṭef is one of the most striking characteristics of its vocalisation compared with the other early masoretic codices.

- Of the four cases in the sample where A does not mark a ḥaṭef vowel, three concern the word המלכים occurring once in each of the three verses Josh. 22.9–11. Yeivin (1968, 25) discusses these instances and concludes that, most likely, the vocaliser of A simply overlooked them. The

---

10 In fact, there is an additional instance of the same phenomenon in v. 7. L17, however, is not extant at this point, so this instance has not been included.
fourth case where A does not mark a ḫatef vowel concerns המלקקים (Judg. 7.6), which will be considered below.

- Samuel ben Jacob is consistent across all three MSS, both in preferring the simple gaʿya over the gaʿya + ḫatef combination, and in his exceptional marking of המלקקים with a ḫatef in Judg. 7.6, 7 in both L and L17.

The two occurrences of המלקקים in Judg. 7.6, 7 are puzzling. They are the only two words in our sample where Samuel ben Jacob (consistently in both L and L17) vocalises the first מ with a ḫatef pataḥ. Conversely, the occurrence in v. 6 is the fourth and final example in the whole data set where the vocaliser of A fails to point the מ with a ḫatef.

---

11 It is, of course, possible that these ḫatef vowels were later emendations not carried out by Samuel ben Jacob. In neither manuscript, however, is this obviously so.

12 It can be stated with relative confidence that Samuel ben Jacob is not out-of-step with masoretic stipulation in pointing Judg. 7.6 with a ḫatef, despite A’s simple shewa. Various masoretic sources either state or imply that in both instances of המלקקים the shewa under the מ is vocalic. Diqduqe hat-Teʿamim §14 (ed. Dotan 1967, 131, 228–32), states that the shewa under the first מ in המלקקים should be pronounced as pataḥ, but does not specify whether this pertains to both occurrences, or only to one of them. Since, however, the word does not appear in the list of eighteen exceptions forming the latter part of §14, Yeivin (1968, 28) is of the opinion that this implies that both occurrences of the word are referred to. Yeivin (1968, 27) also mentions the reading of CUL Or. 1080, 13, 32, which specifies המלקקים בידם והברא.
Given that the pointing of these two words across both L and L17 is consistent, it seems plausible to see these as intentional choices, and to seek a rationale behind them. It is tempting to find such a rationale in the fact that these two words alone in the sample above have a structure suitable for minor gaʿya. That is to say, the form המלכקים is ambiguous. Does the gaʿya represent minor gaʿya (i.e., a musical gaʿya)—in which case the shewa under the מ is silent—or a phonetic gaʿya—in which case the shewa under the מ is vocal? Thus, had Samuel ben Jacob employed his standard practice at Judg. 7.7 (where the accent on the word is disjunctive), relying exclusively on the inclusion of a gaʿya on the מ to indicate the vocalic nature of the following shewa, this would have led to ambiguity. At least in the case in Judg. 7.7, then, it is tempting to think that Ben Jacob may have written the ḫaṭef pataḥ beneath the מ in order to disambiguate.¹³

¹³ The same argument can be made, scarcely, for the instance in Judg. 7.6, in that minor gaʿya can sometimes even occur on words with conjunctive accents. Yeivin (1993, 188–89) mentions that Gott 27 employs some ḫaṭef vowels under non-guttural letters, and gives the two instances of המלכקים in Judg. 7.6, 7 as examples. This evidence is extraordinary, given the data above. Contrary to his practice in L and L17, Ben Jacob apparently marks the shewa under the ק with a ḫaṭef, but fails to mark either a gaʿya beneath the ק or a ḫaṭef beneath the מ. It is difficult to interpret these data, however, without the context of his regular practice regarding phonetic gaʿya in Gott 27.
3.2. Doubled Consonants\textsuperscript{14}

3.2.1. Preceded by Long Vowel\textsuperscript{15} (sixteen instances), e.g., 

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & \textit{Haṭef} & \textit{Ga’ya} & \textit{Munah-Zaqef} \\
\hline
A & 13 & 2 & 5 \\
L & 0 & 3 & 5 \\
L17 & 1 (לָּקְקֵי) & 2 & 5 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

3.2.2. Preceded by Short Vowel\textsuperscript{16} (thirty-one instances: seventeen cases of הִנָּני and fourteen others), e.g., 

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
 & \textit{Haṭef} & \textit{Ga’ya} \\
\hline
A & 10 & 6 \\
L & 0 & 10 (NOT used on: המלכְּקִים, הוּלָּקֵי, ויִהְלָלָה; A has \textit{haṭef} in each case extant) \\
L17 & 1 (לָּקְקֵי) & 10 (NOT used on: המלכְּקִים, הוּלָּקֵי, ויִהְלָלָה; A has \textit{haṭef} in each case) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{14} For an up-to-date discussion of this issue, see Heijmans (2018, 98–110).

\textsuperscript{15} That is, a vowel that shows inherent length, rather than a vowel that is read as long due to syllable structure or stress.

\textsuperscript{16} That is, a vowel that is not inherently long, which would therefore be read as short in this context, unless a \textit{ga’ya} accompanies it, and/or the simple \textit{shewa} following it is replaced by a \textit{haṭef} vowel.
Diqduqe ha-Ṭeʿamim (§5) contains a clear rule concerning the pronunciation of a shewa under the first of two contiguous identical consonants:

According to Dotan’s interpretation:

“When two [identical] letters are contiguously written... if a gaʿya precedes the first letter in pronunciation, [the reader] pronounces the first of the [identical] letters with a vocal shewa... but if there is no gaʿya, the shewa is silent” (Dotan 1967, 115–16, 189–92).

According to Yeivin (2003, §423), this rule is not reflected in A or the other early masoretic codices. Rather, if the first identical letter is preceded by a long vowel, the shewa is always sounded, regardless of whether a gaʿya is written. If the first identical letter is preceded by a short vowel, the shewa is silent, unless it is preceded by a gaʿya, or the shewa is explicitly marked as a hatef (with or without gaʿya).

The first table above is consistent with Yeivin’s description. Excluding the five cases of munah-zaqef leaves eleven instances of two identical consonants preceded by a long vowel. A’s extensive use of hatef vowels points to the shewa under the first identical consonant being vocalic in these cases. Yet L and L17 show a strong tendency not to mark a gaʿya on the long vowel. It is unlikely, given Samuel ben Jacob’s proximity to the Ben Asher

17 In these cases, the munah takes precedence over the gaʿya, occupying the same position that the gaʿya could otherwise fill.
pronunciation tradition elsewhere, that his tendency here not to mark the gaʿya is due to his reading the following shewa as silent. More likely, he is working with the assumption that the shewa under the first of two identical consonants is always vocal when preceded by a long vowel, and therefore does not feel the obligation to mark the gaʿya—a gaʿya which would be indistinguishable from a musical gaʿya in any case.

In the case of the pair of identical consonants preceded by a short vowel all the sources agree that in the particular form נְנִי, there ought to be no gaʿya, and the shewa is silent. This is reflected in L and L17, in all seventeen occurrences in the sample.

With the fourteen remaining forms, the table above demonstrates Samuel’s clear tendency to mark the vocalic nature of the shewa with a gaʿya. The contrast between this, and his strong tendency not to mark the gaʿya after a long vowel preceding a pair of identical consonants, is striking. Nonetheless, there is no contradiction in his practice here. In syllables of the structure CvCə, where the vowel is not inherently long (long qamesh, holem, sere) and the syllable does not have the primary stress, the vowel is read as short, and the syllable closed. Thus, in the structure C1vC2əC2 under consideration, the addition of a gaʿya with the first vowel is formally necessary in order to render the following shewa vocal. This is quite unlike the situation in the preceding paragraph, where the inherently long vowel meant that, written or unwritten, the secondary stress was a phonological necessity.

This, then raises the question of why Samuel ben Jacob would omit this phonetic gaʿya in contexts where it was required. Excluding, for now, the perplexing מְלָכִים cases, there are four
further cases in the data above (two in L and two in L17) where Samuel ben Jacob fails to include a phonetic gaʿya, despite the fact that A marks a ḥaṭef vowel under the first of the doubled letters in each case. Prima facie, these either look like mistakes on Samuel’s part, or indicate a different pronunciation to that of A. Further consideration, however, reveals a third alternative—for three of the cases.

In the cases of וּוַַֽֽיְהַלְל in L and וּוְהִַֽתְפַלְל in L17, the words lack the expected phonetic gaʿya, but are marked with a minor gaʿya. Significantly, this type of musical gaʿya requires a very particular syllabic pattern of the word on which it occurs—a syllabic pattern that is attained only if the shewa under the first doubled letter is read as vocalic. That is to say, the marking of the minor gaʿya on these three words requires, and therefore implies, the vocalic nature of the shewa under the first doubled letter. Thus, it appears that, in these three cases, Samuel’s pronunciation was identical to that of A; it is simply that his means of denoting that pronunciation differed. It is worth noting, further, that Samuel’s is the most concise way of marking the required information.  

3.3. Various masoretic and post-masoretic treatises, including Diqduqe ha-Ṭeʿamim and the Kitāb al-Khilaf, discuss aspects of the vocalisation of these verbs. In each case, the discussion pertains to the shewa beneath the middle radical in certain morphological

---

18 This phenomenon will be examined in greater depth in a forthcoming study.
forms of the verb. The various rules all note that under certain phonetic circumstances the shewa is to be realised as vocal rather than silent.

3.3.1.ךְבְּרָךְ/הַתְּבָרֵךְ

The rule in Diqduqe ha-Teʿamim states that when the accent falls on the כ of the root, the shewa under the ר is to be pronounced as vocal, whereas if the accent is on the ב (i.e., has been retracted), the shewa under the ר is silent (§21, ed. Dotan 1967, 140, 262–68).

As expected, A’s regular practice is to mark this vocalic shewa graphically, by using a ḥaṭef pataḥ. Perhaps more surprising, given the data above, is that Samuel ben Jacob’s practice in L is frequently—though not uniformly—to mark the vocalic nature of the shewa using a ḥaṭef pataḥ, though many of these appear to be secondary emendations.19 Moreover, the evidence currently available suggests that Samuel ben Jacob was even more

19 There are sixteen occurrences of the verbs בְּרָךְ/הַתְּבָרֵךְ suitable for vocalic shewa in the first twenty-seven chapters of Genesis. In the final form of L, three of these have a simple shewa (14.19; 26.3; 27.23). Interestingly, one notes that in two of these cases, 14.19 and 27.23, the presence of a preceding minor gaʿya implies that the simple shewa is vocalic (see §3.2.2. above). The remaining thirteen occurrences all have a ḥaṭef pataḥ. In only four of these cases, however, is the ḥaṭef pataḥ positioned naturally, and hence is likely to be original to the first layer of vocalisation (27.29, 34, 38, 41). In the remaining nine cases the pataḥ
assiduous in marking this ḫatef pataḥ in his other biblical manuscripts. In L17 there are ten occurrences of these verbs suitable for a ḫatef vowel. All ten are marked with a ḫatef pataḥ in L17, whereas only seven of these are marked with a ḫatef pataḥ in L. The great majority of these ten appear original.20 Likewise, in Gott 27 the ḫatef pataḥ is marked in all pertinent occurrences. In L\(^m\), the ḫatef pataḥ is marked in all occurrences save two (Gen. 27.19, 31).21 Due to lacunae in RNL EVR II B 60—and in particular the fact that the manuscript begins part way through Exodus—I was able to find only one instance of the verb יֵֹ֣פֶר suitable for a ḫatef vowel: Deut. 24.13. In this case, the ḫatef vowel was written, with no evidence of its being secondary.

3.3.2. יֵֹ֣פֶר

According to Diqduqe ḫat-Ṭeʿamim, in any form of these two verbs immediately preceding a letter with dagesh, a word-internal shewa is pronounced as vocal. In practice, this amounts to ten

is squeezed above a simple shewa, and appears to be the result of secondary correction, by Samuel himself or a later hand (12.3; 22.18; 24.60; 26.4, 12; 27.19, 27, 31, 33).

20 The ten occurrences are: Josh. 22.33; Judg. 5.2, 9; 1 Sam. 13.10; 2 Sam. 8.10; 19.40; 21.3; 1 Kgs 8.66; 2 Kgs 4.29; 10.15. None of the ḫatefs here are obviously secondary, but those at Josh. 22.33; 2 Sam. 8.10; 1 Kgs 8.66 show some irregularity of form, which might indicate their secondary nature.

21 This information is derived from Breuer (1992, 1, 8). Breuer examines both the Torah MS L\(^m\) and the MS of the Former Prophets Gott 27, but refers to them both with the single label L\(^m\).
occurrences of the 1cs or 1cpl lengthened qal imperfect of the verb וַיַָּלְךְ, e.g., נַלְכָּהוּ (Exod. 5.3), and one 1cs lengthened qal imperfect of the verb צְרָּא (§25, ed. Dotan 1967, 146, 275–77).

Dotan notes that all eleven cases in L are marked with a hatef patah, but claims that most of the eleven are the result of secondary emendation (Dotan 1967, 276). L17 contains three of the relevant cases, all of which, likewise, are marked with hatef pataḥ (1 Sam. 9.6; 2 Sam. 15.7; 2 Kgs 6.2). Of these, however, only the vocalisation in 1 Sam. 9.6 might possibly be a later correction.

3.3.3. נַלְכָּהוּ

The rule according to Diqduqe haṭ-Ṭeʿamim states that in forms of the verb with an object suffix where the כ is marked with a segol (with the sole exception of Eccl. 5.10), the shewa beneath the כ is vocalic, e.g., נַלְכָּהוּ (L Gen. 3.17). Elsewhere, the shewa is silent (§22, ed. Dotan 1967, 141, 269–71). According to the Kitāb al-Khilaf (Lipschütz 1965, 17), this rule was practised by Ben Asher, whereas Ben Naftali did not mark the hatef pataḥ.

There are twenty-four specific instances that meet Ben Asher’s criteria. In the nine extant occurrences in A, the כ is marked with a hatef vowel. Cohen (1992, 70*) extrapolates from

---

22 In my estimation, only two of the occurrences of hatef pataḥ might be original (Exod. 5.3; Jer. 5.5). The remaining nine occurrences are cramped and malaligned, and likely constitute later emendations (Gen. 18.21; Exod. 3.18; 4.18; 1 Sam. 9.6; 26.11; 2 Sam. 15.7; 2 Kgs 6.2; Jer. 40.15; Ruth 2.2).
these to claim that the remaining fifteen instances ought also to be reconstructed in the same manner.

Samuel ben Jacob’s practice in L is mixed: in fourteen cases he marks a ḫatef pataḥ; in the remaining ten cases he marks a simple shewa.23 In many of the fourteen cases the ḫatef pataḥ appears to be secondary, as can be discerned by the cramping caused by the secondary interpolation of a pataḥ adjacent to the extant simple shewa.24

Most of the twenty-four cases occur in the Pentateuch and Ezekiel. L17, accordingly, has only two relevant cases, both of which are marked with a simple shewa (2 Kgs 6.28, 29). Both these occurrences in L are also marked with a simple shewa.

In RNL EVR II B 60 I found twelve occurrences of the verb in forms suitable for a ḫatef vowel, according to the Ben Asher tradition. All twelve occurrences were marked with a simple shewa—following Ben Naftali. These concur with the evidence from L17 above.

3.3.4. Discussion

Several questions immediately arise from the data above. First, given Samuel ben Jacob’s clear preference for phonetic gaʿya over ḫatef vowels in the first two contexts described in this article,

---

23 The following have a simple shewa: Lev. 7.6; Deut. 12.15, 18, 22 (2x), 24, 25; 28.39; 2 Kgs 6.28, 29.

24 Of the fourteen instances of ḫatef pataḥ in this context in L, the following six might be original: Gen. 3.17; Isa. 31.8; Ezek. 4.10a, 10b, 12; Eccl. 6.2. The remaining eight are almost certainly secondary: Lev. 6.11, 19; Num. 18.10, 13; Deut. 15.20, 22; Ezek. 4.9; 7.15.
why does he multiply his use of ḥatef vowels in this third context? This is explicable by the fact that there is no unambiguous way to use a gaʿya with the verbs ḥadal, ḥalak, barad/ḥabradi to mark the vocalic nature of the word-internal shewa. For example, in forms such as אֲכָל, רַד, ḥalak/barad/ḥubrad, אָכַל, רַד, הָלַךְ, יָרַד, אָכַל to mark the vocalic nature of the word-internal shewa. For example, in forms such as בָּרַכְּנֵי 'bless me' (L Gen. 27.34) and בָּרַכְּנֵי 'the Lord) blessed me’ (L Josh. 17.14), a gaʿya beneath the ב would attend either a qameṣ or a šere, and in either case could be interpreted as a major gaʿya in a closed syllable before the accent. Thus, the only unambiguous way to mark the sounded nature of the shewa in this case is to use a ḥatef vowel.

This raises a subsequent question. In the case of עֹלְלוֹת (i.e., two identical consonants preceded by an inherently long vowel), the use of a gaʿya to indicate the vocalic nature of the shewa would be ambiguous, just as is the case with יְָּרִד, הָלָל, בָּרַד/ḥabradi. Yet Samuel chose to leave the vocalic nature of the shewa in עֹלְלוֹת unmarked, but to mark the vocalic shewa in יְָּרִד, הָלָל, בָּרַד/ḥabradi explicitly, with a ḥatef pataḥ. Possibly, the explanation for this apparent inconsistency lies in the asymmetry between these two contexts regarding their scope of applicability. In the עֹלְלוֹת class the shewa is vocalic whenever a long vowel precedes the pair of identical consonants, with no further conditions, and few exceptions. By contrast, in the case of יְָּרִד, הָלָל, בָּרַד/ḥabradi, the sounded nature of the shewa is dependent on multiple criteria and conditions. It is possible, therefore, that Samuel ben Jacob chose to explicitly mark the vocal shewa in this latter class to ease the burden on the reader.

The most puzzling issue arising from the data concerning אֲכָל, רַד, ḥalak/barad/ḥubrad concerns Samuel’s practice regarding the
vocalisation of אוכל. Our current lack of direct access to $L^m$ and Gott 27 renders all explanations provisional. If, however, the pattern outlined above is borne out by thorough examination of these manuscripts, two questions arise therefrom. Why, given Samuel’s overall consistency in marking the $\text{ḥaṭef}$ with the verbs יִרְדֹּ, הַלְּבָרָה, בְּרָדִיָּו—particularly in $L^m$, L17, and Gott 27—does he avoid marking the $\text{ḥaṭef}$ on the appropriate forms of לְַכְַאְָּ, and what—if anything—does he intend to indicate thereby? Regarding the latter question, the contrast between the treatment of אְָּכְַל and יִרְדֹּ, הַלְּבָרָה, בְּרָדִיָּו may be interpreted as having phonetic significance. That is to say, Samuel follows Ben Asher in pronouncing the vocalic shewa under the relevant circumstances with the verbs יִרְדֹּ, הַלְּבָרָה, בְּרָדִיָּו, and notes this by using $\text{ḥaṭef pataḥ}$. His decision to avoid the $\text{ḥaṭef pataḥ}$ in the case of אְָּכְַל may therefore signal his belief that these shewas should be parsed as silent (or at least not pronounced identically to the pronunciation of $\text{ḥaṭef pataḥ}$). It is not clear why this should be the case, but it is noteworthy that it is precisely in the treatment of the verb אְָּכְַל that one difference between Ben Asher and Ben Naftali arises. Samuel is not necessarily aligning himself with Ben Naftali on this issue (though this is a possibility), but it is possible that similar factors underlie both Samuel’s and Ben Naftali’s deviation from Ben Asher on this point.

4.0. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The survey above examines Samuel ben Jacob’s treatment of the exceptional vocalic shewa in three phonetic contexts, across several of his manuscripts, and can be summarised as follows. In the
case of the word-initial structure -ֶלַח, Samuel’s consistent preference is to indicate the sounded nature of the shewa using gaʿya only. Likewise, with cases of shewa under the first of two identical consonants, if the preceding vowel is historically short, Samuel indicates the sounded nature of the shewa using gaʿya only. If a preceding minor gaʿya already requires the shewa to be understood as vocalic, Samuel shows a tendency to omit the phonetic gaʿya. If the preceding vowel is inherently long, Samuel apparently assumes the sounded nature of the shewa, but does not mark it. By contrast, in the case of the vocalic shewa in certain forms of the verbs יֵבְרַה, קֶרֶב/הָבּוֹבָר, Samuel’s tendency is to indicate the vocalic nature of the shewa using a hatef vowel. In the case of אָן/ל, however, he seems to prefer the simple shewa.

In his treatment of these classes of exceptional vocalic shewas, Samuel shows a tendency towards graphic economy. He omits the gaʿya before the first of two identical consonants when the attendant vowel is inherently long—perhaps because he expects his readers to be aware of the correct pronunciation without aid. He rarely marks both phonetic gaʿya and a hatef vowel (unlike in A). In both L and L17 we noted occasions where Samuel omits a necessary phonetic gaʿya because an earlier minor gaʿya requires, and therefore implies, the vocalic nature of the shewa in question.

The main point of interest arising from the comparison between multiple Samuel ben Jacob manuscripts has been his consistency across the manuscripts, and the nature of that consistency, which includes major trends (e.g., preference for phonetic gaʿya over hatef vowels), minor trends (e.g., his occasional
omission of phonetic gaʿya when a preceding minor gaʿya renders it pleonastic), and specific readings (e.g., his exceptional pointing of הַַֽמ לְַַֽקְְ in Judg. 7.6, 7). Such consistency could plausibly be the result of a shared Vorlage. Other tentative evidence, however, suggests that L and L17 were not copied from a shared Vorlage (Phillips 2017, 27). Likewise, one notes that his minor tendency to omit phonetic gaʿyas when musical gaʿyas render them superfluous is not identically expressed between L and L17. The type of consistency observed here is best explained as a result of Samuel’s intelligent grasp of the finer details of the vocalisation and accentuation, worked out in a set of consistent practices or tendencies, rather than as a result of mindless copying of an exemplar.  

Comparison between the various manuscripts also sheds light on the corrections found in L itself. As is well known, the vocalisation and accentuation of L are very close to the practice of Ben Asher, as measured by comparison with the Kitāb al-Khilaf and MS A itself (Yeivin 1980, §30). Much of this proximity, however, has been obtained via correction (additions as well as erasures) of the first hand in L (Loewinger 1960, מָא, and the bibliography cited there; Scanlin 1995, 105–25). An outstanding question in the study of L is whether Samuel ben Jacob himself performed these emendations, or whether they are the work of a

---

25 For further evidence of Samuel’s high level of educational attainment, see Outhwaite (2018). This stands in contrast to a widely held opinion that Samuel’s skill as a naqdan and masorete (lower-case m!) were not pronounced. Even Cohen (1996, 9*), who holds MS L in high regard, claims that Samuel is merely an “average copyist.”
different hand (Cohen 1992, 69*-70*). A third-person colophon in L (fol. 479r), in the hand (and with the siglum) of Samuel ben Jacob, claims that the codex has been carefully corrected (Tİמגח תבט) according to carefully corrected manuscripts of Ben Asher. It is uncertain, however, whether the ‘correction’ described by the term TIMGACH refers precisely to the later layer of corrections visible in the manuscript.

The data above feed directly into this question. Regarding בָּרַבֶּרֶד, at least, it can no longer be claimed that Samuel ben Jacob was unaware of Ben Asher’s stipulations (despite having written out the relevant rule in the masoretic material at the end of L!). At least by the time he wrote L’m, RNL EVR II B 60, L17, and Gott 27 he had internalised this part of the Diqduqe ha-TE’AMIM. Does this imply that these latter manuscripts were all written after the initial copying of L?26 This is beyond the power of these data to determine. At the very least, the comparative data rule out one option: it can no longer be categorically denied that Samuel ben Jacob could himself have performed the corrections on בָּרַבֶּרֶד in L.

---

26 This is possible, though so are other interpretations. For example, the rather imperfect rendering of the rule of Ben Asher in L could simply be the product of haste. Equally, even if L were written first, the data do not require that Samuel was, at that time, ill-versed in Ben Asher’s rules. As Dotan remarks frequently in his edition, it may be that ben Asher’s rules concerned the pronunciation of the shewa, rather than the graphic representation thereof. Or, at the very least, Samuel may have interpreted the rules in this way when working on MS L.
Finally, comparison between the various manuscripts of Samuel ben Jacob continues to hint at the possibility of Samuel preserving details of a tradition occasionally distinct from that of Ben Asher, despite his claims of having followed the latter in the aforementioned colophon. This has previously been noted in the curious case of the pointing of הַיְְַרָ֔מִים (1 Sam. 27.10) (Breuer 1992, xvii; Phillips 2017, 16). In the data above, his tendency not to mark the relevant forms of אְָּכּל with a ḫaṭef vowel stood out starkly against the backdrop of his practice of including the ḫaṭef vowel with the verbs רַךְ, הלַךְ, יָּרַד.
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