13th World Congress of Jewish Studies / 2001/Jerusalem Spinoza's Hebrew Grammar and the Medieval Dispute on Shewa By Isaiah Teshima (Osaka Sangyo University, Japan)

Spinoza devoted his final days to writing about Hebrew grammar. But he died before he finished the work. Nonetheless, it was made available to us under the title-Compendium Grammatices Linguae Hebraeae, because his friend Jerig Jelles published it, along with other texts such as Ethica and the tractate of politics, in a single volume that we now know as Opera Posthuma.

As compared to his other philosophical texts, Spinoza's Hebrew grammar has not received much attention from scholars in the field. In 1850 Jacob Barnays discussed Spinoza's Hebrew grammar for the first time. Since then, only a handful of studies have become available.

The reason Spinoza's Hebrew grammar has not been widely appreciated may be related to a distrust of Spinoza as a grammarian. That view is already seen in Barnays, and became more apparent in N. Porges (1922) who wrote: "Spinoza was no philologist. He was knowledgeable of Hebrew, but not a great Hebraist at all. His grammar exhibits many mistakes, that are not like print-errors smuggled into consideration, but like inaccuracies and shortcomings in his grammatical knowledge."

While what makes Porges so critical of Spinoza's Hebrew grammar is certainly worthy of close investigation, we also should remember the words of admonition by the editor Jerig Jelles as well. Please take a look at No. 1 in the handout. The editor, on the contrary, trusted Spinoza as a competent expert "who was immersed with Hebrew since a very young age, and later for many years devoted to this, and came to possess a new perspective of it thoroughly." According to the editor, Spinoza wrote this work as a service to serious students who studied Hebrew diligently, and also intended his grammar to have a mathematical precision, by which he meant to establish the principles of the language that would not be swayed by exceptions. Thus, in Spinoza's grammar, the editor expected something more than a mediocre introduction to simple readers.

Another important fact to be considered is the booklist of Spinoza's library which was discovered in 1885. From it, Spinoza appears to have consulted the works of major grammarians like Moshe, Joseph and David Kimhi, Ibn Ezra, Eliyahu Levita, and Abraham de Balmes. Therefore, I think, when Spinoza discusses something unusual like the neuter of Hebrew nouns, or like the passive voice of hitpael, it is likely that he was aware of the gaps between his claims and ordinary Hebrew grammar.

- in dis grammar

In short, Spinoza's Hebrew grammar needs to be read more carefully with its medieval background. For his grammar was, after all, a reaction to the medieval understandings of Hebrew to which he had been exposed. Yet, those modern scholars who criticized Spinoza seem to rush to judgment before understanding his points, influenced by what the Bible students of the 19th century believed to be scientifically correct. At least regarding shewa, I contend that Spinoza was not only misunderstood, but his intention was distorted by those later critics.

Now I would like to turn to the handout; please look at No. 2. As I said, Spinoza did not complete the text of Hebrew grammar, and therefore, the one who is responsible for the final form of the text, as it was published for the first time, was the editor of Opera Posthuma, Jerig Jelles. Land and Vloten, however, believed that the text contained errors, and needed to be reedited by the professionals like them who knew Hebrew well. Indeed, they corrected not only errors of vocalization, but also rearranged the layout of paradigms, and gravely emended the text at several crucial spots. My concern is about their addition of the word (non), which makes one read the text, "qua sola audiri non possit." The text of the first print, however, has "qua sola audiri possit," without "non." If one follows the Land and Vloten's edition and translates the text into English, it would read "every shewa is an absolute syllable which can not be heard by itself." This edition is significantly different from the text of Opera by itself." Amazingly, Land and Vloten provide no justification for their change, except to say that "the word is omitted by the editor of the first print."

This emendation is widely accepted: see No. 3,4,5; but, if the emendation should will be accepted, it will bring about internal contradictions within Spinoza's argument. First, if the shewa cannot be heard by itself, how can it still be called

leire 5

gamats and segal which he also called syllables

a "syllable"? Certainly, the other syllables like qamats or segol can be heard by themselves, and Spinoza seems to assume no difference in presenting the shewa as a syllable (See the handout No. 6). Moreover, if shewa cannot be heard by itself, but must adhere to the preceding syllable or to the following one, then how can Spinoza know that the shewa has its own sound, shorter e, by itself? (see No. 6) Regarding this point. Ashkenazi's French translation tries to minimize the contradiction by understanding "absoluta" as "very weak" which is not what the word means literally (No.5), and also by criticizing Spinoza's choice of the word "syllaba" in a footnote; this criticism by Ashkenazi is important for understanding the whole issue. I quote it with my translation;

##"The word syllable is improper; the shewa which is pronounced is a syllable that is extremely short. Regarding the non-pronounced shewa, it indicates an absence of the vowel; only the pronunciation of the consonant is heard. In all the cases, the shewa is not a syllable."

As you see, Ashkenazi fundamentally disagrees with Spinoza who asserts "every shewa is an absolute syllable". His complaints are ultimately reduced to the demand that Spinoza has to admit the silent shewa (nach). Likewise, the existence of the silent shewa is a priori for Porges and Bloom. preoccupation explains perfectly why Vloten and Land conjecture the word "non" despite all the contradictions. For the emendation helps them to understand that Spinoza did not exclude the silent shewa, while he defines the shewa as one of the vowels elsewhere.

But if one takes a close look at the text, it is clear that Spinoza does not admit the silent shewa in all occasions, because Spinoza never uses the term << quiescens >> regarding the shewa in the text, except for once, when he mentions how Hebrew grammarians usually see the shewa (see, No 2 and 3, the beginning part). This mention may confuse readers if they do not note Spinoza different terms forward to distinguish the two shewas, namely, << the pronounced shewa (pronounciatur) >> and <<the hastened shewa (corrigiuntur) >> instead of the shewa na (mobile) the ordinary terms manely and the shewa nach (quiescens).

By the way, you may notice that Bloom, the English translator, keeps in his translation << the silent shewa>> throughout, as if Spinoza used the term <<) alin

shewa quiescens >>. But, check Bloom's translation with the original text. The term Spinoza consistently uses is <<corripitur>>, which means to be hurried, or instead of <<quiescens>>

That is to say, the shewa for Spinoza is not what modern scholars assume it to be. For him, the shewa is definitely a vowel which has its own sound; but, the sound is heard in two different ways. When the shewa adheres to the following syllable, it gets pronounced very well. Whereas the pronunciation is hastened when it adheres to the preceding syllable (namely, one cannot pronounce the vowel as much as it should be because of the vowel sound of the preceding syllable). Thus, Spinoza perceives that the shewa retains the status of vowel in

every way; there is no quiescens in the shewa according to Spinoza.

(See 6-A-top) His claim may look strange, but it is consistent with his saying, that vowels in Hebrew are not letters. Letters are << the origin of the sound>> like the holes of the flute touched by fingers, that cannot be heard in themselves. Letters to be pronounced must be accompanied by vowels, which are indicated by the punctuation. Therefore, according to Spinoza, every punctuated letters must be pronounced, including, of course, the shewa. In this sense, Spinoza would never agree with Ashkenazi, who in the footnote argues for the shewa nach to be "the pronunciation of consonant without a vowel." For Spinoza, the examples of the quiescent letters are Yod and waw - used as Imot Qria for the sounds i and o. (Look at No. 6). They are certainly letters without punctuation. (if one agrees to see the point of holam between the two letters) This understanding of the shewa as a vowel is useful, for instance, if one tries to explain why the reish of the word midbar is not punctuated with shewa, like its daleth, when the shewa means to stop (quiescens). Also, it helps to explain why the word is "malchei" instead of "malkei" if the begedkephet spirantization rule works.

Anyway, my interest, is not to show how true Spinoza's Hebrew grammar is, but how wrongly Spinoza is read by modern scholars. I think, if Vloten and Land (or Bloom and Ashkenazi who have engaged in the study of Spinoza's Hebrew grammar) had been acquainted with the medieval disputes on Hebrew grammar, especially the ones between the Kimhi school and the traditional school, and had they read Spinoza's argument with its background, they would not have rushed to the judgment they did. Those scholars were somewhat blinded by the so-

called "scientific" knowledge of Hebrew grammar of their time, which took the side of the Kimhi school.

By regarding the shewa as not being a vowel, meaning that the shewa does not have its own sound, the Kimhi school sharply deviates from the traditional Hebrew grammar (see No. 7). Please look at No. 8; it is a page from Mikne Avram, the Hebrew grammar book of the 16th century, composed by Abraham de Balmes. Spinoza knew this work very well, and referred to it. De Balmes tells us that most of the grammarians agree to count seven major vowels and five secondary vowels, while the Kimhi school divides the vowels into five long vowels and five short vowels.

Perhaps, to you the teachers of Israel, I don't need to explain how shocking the Kimhi school is to traditional grammarians. The traditional grammarians, like Ibn Ezra or Ibn Janach, did not recognize the vowels in such a quantitive manner as the Kimhi school. They understood the differences of the vowels only by quality. We don't have time now to go into the details, but the point which is crucial to our discussion, is that the Kimhi school dropped the shewa from its count of the vowels. See No. 7; with this background, I would like to point out a grammatical hidush of Spinoza regarding the shewa; that is the dismissal of the silent shewa from his grammar. The traditional grammarians who count the shewa among the vowels are referring to the shewa na and hatephimp, not to the shewa nach. But Spinoza insisted that there is no quiescens in the shewa; what happens really is that the shewa sound is hastened due to the preceding vowel, so that it is not as much heard as the other shewa. Spinoza and the Kimhi school both tried to achieve a logical consistency in Hebrew grammar; While the Kimhi school tried to achieve this by excluding the shewa from the vowels, Spinoza went in the opposite way by regarding the shewa as a vowel in all occasions, excluding the concept of quiesence from the shewa.

Thus, Spinoza's Hebrew grammar, if one reads it carefully with the medieval disputes of Hebrew grammar, will add much to our understanding of the history of Hebrew grammars as well as Spinoza's philosophy. I would like to stop my discussion here, with the hope that more experts of Jewish studies may take a fresh look at Spinoza's Hebrew grammar.

3. Ch. III in the English Translation of Maurice J. Bloom (1962, New York):

The vowel sheva., because it is the shortest, is some-

times hastened over and adheres to the preceding syllable

and sometimes is pronounced; the former is called by the

Hebrew grammarians Nach 11] quiescent (silent sheva),

A sheva: is pronounced when it occurs at the begin-

ning of a word, or in the middle after a long vowel, like

מראשת bereshith, where the sheva : under the ב is

pronounced, because it occurs at the beginning of the

word; also like the following, because they occur in the

middle of a word after long towels, namely npp pake-

dah; ברם berechu; אריש yireu; שיראו pokedim; אבות

hubeu. If on the other hand, two shevas follow each other

consecutively, the second is pronounced as in the word

וחסקרו, tiphkedu, where the first sheva is silent and the

second is pronounced. And hence it is that a sheva noted

under a letter punctuated by a dagesh is also to be pro-

nounced, like TPD pikkedu. For the point in the P

denotes that the Di is doubled and the first one is silenced.

and the latter Na VJ mobile (moving sheva).

And for the same reason also a sheva is pronounced when or two occur together. one letter is in the middle of a word, but is not doubled between two vowels, like 'Ill hineni, where the sheva under the first' I is pronounced. For if it had been silenced, then the I also would have been silenced and would have to adhere to the preceding syllable, and in place of 'Lin hineni, it would have been written 'IT hinni.

For the rest, the remaining shevas are always silenced, and it should be especially noted that we expressly stated. that every sheva which is pronounced occurs either at the beginning or in the mid-lle of a word. But at the end it is never pronounced.

That it may be better understood, let this be noted, that every sheva is an absolute vowel which cannot * be heard but must always adhere either to the previous or succeeding vowel; and so it is that no monosyllable is punctuated by a sheva. Hence it is apparent that a silent sheva is nothing more than the shortest e, adhering to the preceding syllable; however, the pronounced sheva is nothing else than the shortest e adhering to the following syllable; that is why when it is found before a syllable it is on that account to be pronounced even more distinctly. Whence it follows that in the beginning of a word it is impossible to adhere to the preceding syllable. At the end, on the other hand, it is impossible to adhere to the following syllable: and what is more, at the end of a word a dagesh is always silenced, whether after a long syllable or after a short one, whether under a dageshed letter or under a weak one, and finally, whether only one showa

* In the edition of Paulus Bruder, the negative is omitted.: The Editor.

However, when it happers that a sheva occurs in the middle of a word after a long syllable, the rule of pronunciation requires that it adhere to the succeeding; and if there should be two shevas then the first adheres to the preceding and the second to the succeeding syllable. Further, it is also evident why at the beginning of a word there are never two shevas and also not in the middle after a long syllable. For two shevas cannot adhere to a succeeding syllable.

2001. 8. 12. Jerusalem 13th World Congress of Jewish Studies

> "Spinoza's Hebrew Grammar and the Medieval Dispute on Shewa" By Isaiah Teshima, Ph. D. (Osaka Sangyo University, Japan)

1. Admonitio ad Lectorem: Opera Posthuma (1677):

Grammatices Linguæ Hebrææ Compendium, quod hic tibi, Benevole Lector, offertur, Auctor rogatu Amicorum quorundam suorum, Linguæ Sanctæ perstudiosorum, conscribendum suscepit; utpote quem, ab ineunte ætate ea imbutum, postea per multos annos ei sedulo operam dedisse, ejusque genium penitus perspectum habere, in eaque versatissimum esse, probe noverant; et noscent omnes, qui, ejus gnari, hoc qualecunque scriptum, quod intempestiva Auctoris morte, ut plura ejus alia, imperfectum remansit, pervolvere non dedignabuntur. Quale quale sit, ejus te, Benevole Lector, participem facionus, tibique et Auctoris laborem et nostrum de te bene merendi studium pergratum fore, nulli dubitamus.

2. Cap III in Compendium Grammatices Linguae Hebraeae; Edition of J. Van Vloten and J. P. N. Land (1883, Hague): PP. 260 - 261

Syllaba scheva, quia brevissima est, aliquando corripitur. præcedentique syllabæ adhæret, et aliquando pronuntiatur; et ideo a Grammaticis Hebræis illud 🔼 nagh quiescens, et hoc y 2 nalig mobile appellatur.

Pronunciatur : scheva, quando in initio dictionis, vel in medio post syllabam longam occurrit, ut MEND bereschith, ubi sub I pronunciatur, quia in initio dictionis occurrit; ut etiam hæc sequentia, quia post syllabas longas in medio dictionis occurrent. nempe הקדים pakedah, ברכו berechu, ייראו jireu, בקדה pokedim, אובאר huben. Si deinde duo schevata in medio dictionis se invicem sequantur, secundum pronunciatur, ut אוני tiphkedu, ubi primum scheva corripitur et secundum pronunciatur. Atque hinc fit, ut scheva sub litera puncto dagesch notata etiam pro nuncietur, ut אָסְרוּן pikkedu. Nam punctum in p denotat, p duplicandum et primum corripiendum esse. Et hac etiam de causa pronunciatur scheva, quando una litera in medio dictionis, sed non inter duas vocales duplicatur, ut '1171 hineni, ubi scheva sub primo I pronunciandum est. Nam si corripiendum esset, deberet etiam 1 corripi, et antecedenti syllahæ ghirek adhærere. et loco אווי hineni scribendum esset אווי hineni.

Cæterum reliqua schevata semper corripiuntur, et apprime notandum, nos expresse monnisse, omne scheva pronunciandum vel initio, vel in medio dictionis occurrere. Nam in fine nun-quam pronunciatur. Quod ut melius intelligatur, notandum hic est, quod scheva omne est absoluta syllaba, que sola audiri

non * possit, sed semper vel antecedenti vel sequenti adhærere tetur. Unde apparet, scheva correptum nihil esse quam e brevissimum præcedenti syllabæ adhærens; pronunciandum autem nihil aliud est quam e brevissimum sequenti syllabæ adhærens; quod quia ante syllabam sentitur, ideo ipsius pronunciatio expressior est. Unde sequitur, in initio dictionis esse, ut præcedenti syllabæ adhærat; in fine autem contra impossibile esse, ut sequenti adhæreat; adeoque in fine dictionis, sive post syllabam longam, sive post brevem, sive sub litera dageschata, sive leni, sive denique unum, sive duo occurrant, semper tamen corripitur. Cum autem in medio dictionis post longam occurrit, modus pronunciandi postulat, ut sequenti adhiereat, et si duo occurrant, ut primum antecedenti, secundum sequenti adhæreat. Porro hine etiam patet, cur in initio dictionis nunquam duo schevata, ut nec ctiam in medio dictionis post syllabam longam, occurrant. Nam duo schevata sequenti syllabæ

Ed. Pr., Paulus, Bruder, negationem omittun
Ed. Pr., etc.: : scheru.

4. Endnote of C. Gebhardt (1925, Heidelberg):

keinen Sinn. - 20. Besser khibbuts. - Besser schurekh. - 27. Ed. pr.: התתל Das Schewa ist, wie auch Vloten-Land tun, gemäß 289, 21 hinzuzufügen. --- 30. Ed. pr.: 71. Auch Vloten-Land verbessern in 71. — 293. 4. Besser pakhedah. — Ed. pr.: 1272. — 5. Besser pokhedim. — 7. Besser tiphkhedu. — 9. Ed. pr.: 1772. — Besser pikkhedu. ___ 15. Besser ghirekh. ___ 20. Die Ed. pr. hat: quae sola audiri possit. Vloten-Land fügen die Negation mit Recht ein. - 294. 13. Die Ed. pr. hat: scheva e breve, was schon Vloten-Land dem Zusammenhang entsprechend in _ segol richtig stellen. --- 295. 29. Die Ed. pr. läßt das Zeichen : aus, das Vloten-Land mit Recht anfügt. - 296. 21. Ed .pr.: x = 297. 12. Besser makhaph. — 25. Besser makhaph.

5. Ch. III in the French Translation of Joel Askenazi and Jocelyne Askenazi-Gerson (1968, Paris):

On notera donc particulièrement - nous l'avons clairement montré - qu'un schéva ne se prononce que s'il se trouve soit au commencement, soit au milieu du mot. Il n'est jamais prononcé à la fin du mot.

Pour mieux en comprendre la raison, il faut préciser que le schéva est une syllabe très faible ; elle ne peut donc être entendue seule, mais doit toujours se rattacher à la syllabe précédente ou à la syllabe suivante. Par conséquent aucune monosyllabe n'est ponctuée de schéva. Il en résulte que le schéva contracté n'est rien d'autre qu'un e très bref qui se rattache à la syllabe qui le précède. Et le schéva prononcé n'est rien d'autre qu'un é très bref qui se rattache à la syllabe qui le suit ; comme il est perçu avant la syllabe, le son en est plus distinct.

Si donc le schéva est au commencement d'un mot, il est impossible qu'il se rattache à une syllabe précèdente, tout comme il ne peut, à la fin d'un mot, se rattacher à une syllabe suivante.

C'est pourquoi à la fin du mot il est toujours contracté : qu'il suive une syllabe longue ou une syllabe brève, qu'il soit placé sous une lettre ponctuée de dagesch ou sous une lettre sans dagesch, enfin que le schéva soit unique ou qu'il soit double.

I)'autre part, lorsque le schéva se trouve au milieu du mot après une voyelle longue, la règle de prononciation demande qu'il se rattache à la syllabe qui le suit; s'il se présentait deux schéva, il faudrait que le premier se rattachât à la syllabe précédente et le second à la syllabe suivante. Il ressort clairement de ce qui vient d'être dit qu'il ne peut jamais y avoir deux schéva au commencement d'un mot, ni au milieu d'un mot après une syllabe longue. En esset, il n'est pas possible de rattacher deux schéva à la syllabe

34. De mot e syllabe e est ici impropre. Le schéva qui se prononce est une voyelle extrêmement brève. Quant au schéug non prononcé, il indique une absence de voyelle. Seule la prononciation de la consonne est entendue. Dans tous les cas, le schéva n'est pas une syllabe.

7. J. Kimchi, Sepher Sikkaron; Edition of W. Bacher (1888, Berlin), p. 18:

ועתה אבאר ביאור השבא היאך היא נחה והיאך היא נעה ומה דרכה וחקה. דע כי השבא אינה תנועה בפני עצמה ולא המליכוה בשבעה מלכים כי לא נתן עליה הוד מלכות. ודע כי שלש דרכים יש לה הראשונה כאשר חבוא 10 על אחה"ע השנית על יו"ר השלישית כאשר תבא על שאר האותיות שאינם

8. "De punctis" in Abraham ben Meir de Balmes, Mikneh Abram (1523, Venice):

De bunctis :

Caput tertiú est cap. punctos; in quo explicabimus numes rú punctos; iploruq noia: « iplos; figura in scriptis: « pnu ciationes iplos; in platione « partitione iplos; in coparatios nead se ipsa: & ad coposita ex eis.

Existéribus litteris ipsis motis & quiescétibus in platione prout diximus in cap. hoc pcedenti: indigebimus fm natura ponere motus & getes convenieres illis fin impositione lin. guæ hebreæ conformes naturæ reæ: & ex quo cui o morui est quies contraria ei: ac etiá terminus sui principii & sui finis; & sui continuitatis: sic etia auctor lingua hebrea posuit ipsa. puncta: quæ fignificant fup motus: & quietes etia fup 10 prins cipia motud & côtinuitaté iplos & finem iplos. Et ficut mos tus lunt tres fic l' púcta significatia illos prio sunt tres. Vnus est quo rotudat os in sua pnúciatioc: qua est a: & ipsius no men est pathah: quia qui aperiet ho suum os remanebit 'rotti dum. Er seculus est que eleuabit labiti supius sursum in sui penunciatione quæ est 'ro: & ipsius nomen est holem: cuius in eterpretatio est sanus perfectus: & sic est quia omnes perfecti tendut 's supra se, Et motus tertius est deorsium quo deponet homo 6 fuum labium fupius deorfum in fui pronuciatione: que est i : & ipsius nomen est hirek:ex lingua & contriuerunt dentem qdest lingua fractois & spretus: & sic est modus in feriorum: & ideo quidal veteres posucrunt tria puncta hac radicem: ac si essent simplicia & mres: " & puncta reliqua po sucrunt composita ex illis: & ipsa sunt nata ipsorum: & nata natoru fuorum: & licer motus reliquor punctorum fint co positi ex his: conucnerunt onines gramatici vel maior pars ipsorum: qui motus diuidantur in septem reges & quinq ser uosi& poluerunt in regibus tria puncta præfata: 23 & addita funt super eis kamecz & ceri & seghol & seinrek composita ex his vt¹⁴exprimemus infra iuuante Deo:& sie sunt pauciores grammatici qui diusserunt²⁵motus in quings reges; quos vo cauerunt motus magnos; & quings feruos quos uocauerunt motus paruos, Et posuerunt magnos kamecz magnum ²⁷& kamecz paruum quod est ceri; & holem; & sciurek; & historyand uniter and instrument hirek quando ueniet post ipsum yod scriptum.23 Et parua po fuerunt pathah magnum:pathah paruum: 2 rapiens kamecz & collectione labion: & hirek: 2 cui non est post ipsum yod scriprum. Er ratio secta huius secsida secundi quod scripsir

בנקורות הַשְּׁלִשִׁי שַּׁעֵר הַנְּקְוּדוֹת בּוֹ נְפַרֵשׁ מְסְפַּר הַנְקוֹדוֹת בּוֹ וּשִּׁמוֹתִיהָן וְצוּרָתָן בַּמִּכְתַב וֹמוֹצָאֵיהָן בַּמִבְּטָּבְא וֹ וֹתְרִּלְתָוֹ בְּנִחֵם אָלְ עַצְּטָן וְאֶלְ תֵּסוּרְבָּבִים סָׁנָן וּ הָאוֹתִיוֹת הַן הַנָעוֹת נְהַנָחוֹת בַּמִבְטָא כְּמוֹ שָׁאָמַרְנוּ בַשַּער הָוָה הַקוֹרָם נִצְטַרְךְ וְבִּי הַטָּבַע רָשִׁים הַתָּנוּעוֹרו וְהַסְנוֹחוֹרו הַרְאוּיוֹרו לָהָן לְפִי הַנָּחַרו ד הַלְשוֹן הָעְבְרִי מַכְבִּיִםוֹרה לְטָבַע הָעָנִינִים ' וּמְפְּבֵי בִּי לְבַל תְּנוּעָה יֵשׁ 8 מכניתה הַפָּכִית לָה וְנִם גִּכוּל הַתְּטָרֶתָה וְתַּכְלִיתָה וּרְבַקּוּתָהכֵּן נַם בַּעַל פ הַלְשוֹן הָעַבְרוּ הָנִיתַ נְקוּרוּת הוֹרֵינָה עַל הַהְנוּעורה וְהַמְנוּחוֹת נַם עַל 10 הַתְּחָלוֹת הַהְּנִנעוֹת וּרְבַקוּתָן וְתַבְלִיתָן וֹ וּבְמוֹ שָׁהַהְנוּעוֹח שַּׁלֹשׁבַּן וו הנקורות הסורות עליהן ראשונה שלש אַהַת שָבָה הְתְעַנֵּל הַפַּרא ב צאָה שָׁהָוּא אַה וּשְׁמָה פַּתַח בִּיכְּשָׁיפָתַח הָאָרָם אָרו פִּיו הִּשָּׁאַר ע בּוֹצַאָה שָׁהִוּא אַה וּשְׁמָה פַּתַח בִּיכְשָׁיפַתַח הָאָרָם אָרו 13 עַנוּלָה וּשְׁנִית שָׁבָּה תִּגְבָה הַשָּׁפָּה הָטָלְיוּנָה לְסַעְלָה בְּסוּצָאָה שָׁהִיבּא 14 או יוּשָׁסָה חוֹרֶם שָׁבִּירוֹשׁוּ בַּרִיא שַׁלְם יְכַן הוּא שָׁכַּל הַשְׁלַכִּים סִחְבַּוְנִים ו לְסַעְרָה דָרָם ו וְהַהְנוּעָה הַשְׁרְישִׁית הִיא לְמַטָּה שְׁבָּה יִנִיחַ הָאָרָם וּגַי יו מָבַּתוֹ הַעָּרְיוֹנָה לְמַטָּה בִּמוֹצָאָה שָׁהִיא אִי וּשְׁמָה חִירֶק מִלְשׁוֹן זַיְחַרְקוּ וּ 17 שון שהוא לשון שבירה ובנייון ובן דרך התחחונים . ולבן סקצרה 18 הַקרִמונִים שָׁמוּ הַשָּׁלשׁ נְקוּדוֹרוֹ הַנְּלוֹ עִקרְבִּאלוּ הַוְ הַבְּשׁוּטוֹרוֹ זּ 19 וְהָאַפַהוֹת וְהַנְקוּרוֹת הַנְשָׁאָרוֹת שָׁםוּ סוּרְכָּבוֹת סַהָן וְהַן חּוֹלְרוֹתִיהָן 20 וְתוֹלְרוֹתתוֹלְרוֹתַיהָן יְאַף כִּי הְנוּעוֹת שָׁאֵר הַנְקוֹרוֹת סוּרְכָּבוֹת בַאֵּלָת בו הָסָכִּיםוּ כַּל הַמְרַקְרְקִים או רוֹכָם שָהַתְנוּעות תִּתְחַלְקְנָרה אֶל שִׁבְעָרה 🛨 21 22 סָלְכִים וַחֲסִשָּׁה עֲבָּרִים וְשָׁםוּ בַּסְלָכִים הַשָּׁלשׁ בְּקוּרוֹרֹג הַנִּוְפֶּרוֹת בּ וְנוֹסִפוֹת עֲלִיהָן הַקְּפַזְיְהַצֵּרִי וְהַסָּגוֹל וְהָטּוּרַק הַמִּרְכְּבִּוֹת מֵאַלְהּבְּסוּ בְּעָוֹרַרוּ הָאֵל וְהָטְּוּל וְהָשׁוּרַק הַמִּרְכְּבִּוֹת מֵאַלְהּבְּסוּ בְּעָוֹרָרוּ הָאָל וְהָשׁוּרַק הַמִּירָכְּהִי שְׁהָּלְכּוּ בַּגַ הַאָּנוּעוֹת אֶל הַסְשָּׁהְסָרֶכִים אֲשֶׁר כָּרְאוּ אוֹתָן הְנוּעוֹת נְרוֹרוֹת וַהַסְשָּׁה בַּגַ 26 עַברים אַטֶּר קרָאוּ אוֹתוֹ חְנוּעוֹת קְפַנוֹרוֹוְשָׁמוּ הַנְרוֹרוֹת קְסָץ נְרוֹל די וָקָסֶץ קטון שָׁהוּא הַצַרִיוְהֹנֶם וְשׁנֵר ק וְחִירְק בְּשָׁהָבא אֲהַיוּ יור בְהוֹבָח. 32 נְנִילְמָהָנוֹע הָפִר פַּעַת זָבוּן בַּעַתְלְפוֹ וַנְיַהַף לְפֵא וְלְבֵּרְאְ הְפַּעִים וְחִיבִּל פי שְאֵין אַתְרָיוּ וּוּרְ בַּבְּתָב וְשַׁעַם תְּבֶּרת תַוֹאַרת תַשְּׁנִירת כְּבִּי מָרה שָׁבָּתַב 29 רבי משת

6. Ch. III in Compendium Grammatices Linguae Hebraeae, Edition of C. Gebhardt (1925, Heidelberg), pp. 290-292; Bloom's English translation (1962, New York):

CAP. III. De Vocalibus, de earum scilicet figurà, nomine, potestatibus, & proprietatibus.

-> T7 Ocales, utidiximus, apud Hebræos literænon sunt; sed veluti literarum animæ. Eælgitur vel subintelliguntur, vel punctis literis adjectis exprimuntur hoc modo.

Si linea sub literà ducatur, id significat post literam sonum a audiri,qui vocatur nno pathagh. Si autem linea cum puncto, significat sonum compositum ex a & o, & voca-= tur yop kamets. Si tria sint puncla, sonus e, vel qui magis accedit ad Græcorum , fignificatur, qui vocatur hun fegol. 2 Si tantum duo juxta invicem posita, significatur so-ת nus ex a & i compositus, qui vocatur צרי tsere. Si autem supra invicem, sonus significatur brevior e, & vocatur (fubscribatur, fignificatur sonum exaudiri ut i post literam, ם qui vocatur מירם ghirekh. At, si supra superiorem literæ apicem superscribatur, sonus significatur ut o. Si tria suerint sub litera puncta, tanquam in linea ad angulos obliquos cum litera ducta, & versus dextram inclinante, sonum significant ut upsilon v, & vocatur קבוץ kibbuts. Denique, si literæ addatur vau punctum habens in medio, significatur fonus ex o & u compositus, sive u Gracorum, & vo-

Syllabæ commodè dividuntur in longas, & breves; nempe - pataghest a breve, - kamets autem fyllaba est longa, & brevis. Potestatem enim habet, velut a longum, velut o micron, ut מקרה pakedah,ubi utrumque a longum est,at נרני gorni,ubi - ka- יז mets sub gimel, ut o micron, pronunciatur. Est - segol brevis, - tsere autem longa, &: scheva brevissima syllaba; at. ghirek, si jot quiescens post se habet, i longum est, aliàs breve; gholem o longum cst, & plerumque post se habet 1 vau quiescens, & aliquando 17, vel 8. Est : kibbuts brevis, & 1 schurek denique longa. Scio hanc 20 divisionem cuidam R. Abrahamo de Balmes displicere; verùm absque ulla ratione; eandem autem usum magnum habere ex sequentibus constabit; & primum, quod hie notandum venit, est, quòd litera, quæ puncto דנש compensari solet, suppleri etiam possit, mutando syllabam præcedentem ex brevi in longam; tametsi litera duplicanda alia sit, qu'am gutturalis, ut hethel pro התל hitthel vel התל hiththel.

Syllaba: scheva, quia brevissima est, aliquando corripitur, præcedentique syllabæ adhæret, & aliquando pronuntiatur, & ideò à Grammaticis Hebræis illud 173 nagh quiescens, & hoc V3 nahg 30

mobile appellatur.

catur שורק (churekh.

CHAPTER III

新生され **株 代** 5位 Of the Vowels; to wit, of their shape, name,

significance and properties dial meaning 8 8

V LANGE

Vowels, as we have said are not letters among the Hebrews, but, as it were, "souls of letters." Therefore, they are either understood or indicated by punctuations adjoining the letters in this manner: Salt in the salt i

1 If a line is drawn under the letter, this means that the sound heard after the letter is a, which is called a patach IIID.

3 If the line also has a dot it denotes the composite sound of a and o and is called a kametz YDD.

If there are three points, the sound denoted is e, or as many believe, the Greek sound 7, which is called a segol כונל.

If two dots are placed side by side, it denotes a sound composed of a and i which is called a tsere TY.

If they are, showever, placed one on top of the other, the sound denoted is of a short e and is called a sheva Niv.

3 Next, if one dot is placed under a letter, it denotes that the sound to be heard after the letter is i which is called chirek DTH.

3 But, if the dot is placed above the top of the letter, the sound denoted is like o and is called cholem -

3 If three points are under a letter at an oblique angle leaning toward the left, the sound is like upsilon v and it is called kibbutz קבוץ.

E Finally, if a letter viv is added having a dot in the middle, the sound denoted is composed of o and u, like the Greek s, and is called a shurek שורק.

Vowels are properly divided into long and short; namely, a patach—is a short a, but a kametz + is both a long and a short vowel. It has the significance of either a long a or a short o, like inph, pakedah where each is a long a, like gorni, where the kametz under the gimel is pronounced like a short o. A segol v is short, whereas, a tsere - is long, and a sheva : is the shortest vowel; but a chirek , if it is followed by a quiescent yod, is a long i; otherwise, it is short; a cholem is a long o and it generally has with it a quiescent vav and occasionally a T or an R. A kibbutz is short and, finally, a shurek 1 is Section 100 Sectio

I know that this kind of division displeases Rabbi Abraham de Balmes,* but without any reason; for that usage has established it to be so is evident from the fol-. lowing; the first thing that comes to mind is that a letter which is usually supplied by a dagesh may also be compensated by changing the preceding syllable from a short into a long one, even though the letter to be doubled is other than a guttural, like hethel for hitthel or hiththel. Sec. 2547

The vowel sheva., because it is the shortest, is sometimes hastened over and adheres to the preceding syllable and sometimes is pronounced; the former is called by the Hebrew grammarians Nach 111 quiescent (silent sheva), and the latter Na' y mobile (moving sheva).