DETERMINATION AND THE USE OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE IN THE SAMARITAN AND IN THE MASORETIC TEXT OF THE TORAH

STEFAN SCHORCH

BIELEFELD-BETHEL*

Abstract

The use of the Hebrew article underwent changes throughout the history of Biblical Hebrew. Some of these changes are documented by the differences between the consonantal framework and the Masoretic vocalization. A comparative view of these materials and the respective variants in the Samaritan Pentateuch including its reading tradition provides further insights. With regard to the use of the article, the consonantal framework of the Masoretic text preserves the oldest stratum, while the Masoretic vocalization represents the youngest. The Samaritan tradition, on the other hand, is uniform in both its parts — consonantal framework and reading tradition — and holds a middle position between the two Masoretic strata from a historical point of view. However, both parts of the Masoretic tradition share at least one common feature, which set it as a whole apart from the Samaritan tradition: the generic use of the article.

The invention of the definite article is a relatively late phenomenon in the history of the Semitic languages.[1] Nevertheless, its use is well attested and widespread in most of them, classical as well as modern. It cannot be a surprise, therefore, that in many important studies the attempt has been made to discover its origin (or its origins). But a consensus has not yet been achieved. Since 1998 no less than three very different suggestions have been made in this field: Voigt explained the different forms of the definite article attested in Hebrew

---

[1] Another view was expressed by R.M. Voigt, 'Der Artikel im Semitischen', *JSS* 43 (1998), 246: 'Es zeigt sich also, daß das Ursemitische — entgegen der communis opinio — einen Artikel besessen hat.'

and the several Arabic dialects as going back to different particles of demonstrative meaning.[2] On the other hand, Testen and Tropper tried to trace the different manifestations of the definite article back to a common origin, while disagreeing in the reconstruction of this element. According to Testen, it is to be connected with the precative particle *la-/li-*,[3] according to Tropper, with the particle of presentation *han(n)* (cf. Hebrew *hinnēh*).[4] In the eyes of the present writer, there are problems left in each proposal and some questions remain unsolved.

Although the following investigation is restricted to Hebrew and focuses on the use of the definite article in this language, its results do not seem to be without any importance for the supposed origin of the Semitic article. Rather, it is very probable that the use of the definite article, especially in early sources, is somehow connected with its origin, whether it be demonstrative, precative, presentational, or something else.[5] Therefore, reconstructing the history of the use of the definite article will contribute to the search for its origin.

As already stated by Barr in an important study dating back to 1989, '(t)he use of the article was in a process of change during — perhaps one should even say "throughout" — the biblical period.'[6] According to Barr, as a first step one will have to separate the use of the definite article as attested in the consonantal framework of the Masoretic text from that attested only in the reading tradition. While the Hebrew article is normally represented by the grapheme [*h*], there is no graphic representation when the article appears with a noun to which one of the prepositions b^e, k^e, or l^e is prefixed. In the latter cases, the article appears only in the vocalization of the reading tradition. Barr lists many biblical references in which 'the plentiful attachment of the article to words with the prepositions *b*, *k* and *l*' stands in opposition to the fact that 'these same words are commonly

---

[2] Voigt, ibid., 233–6.

[3] D. Testen, *Parallels in Semitic Linguistics. The Development of Arabic la- and Related Semitic Particles* (Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 26, Leiden 1998), 211–14.

[4] J. Tropper, 'Die Herausbildung des bestimmten Artikels im Semitischen', *JSS* 46 (2001), 17.

[5] Similarly J. Barr, '"Determination" and the Definite Article in Biblical Hebrew', *JSS* 34 (1989), 325, on the relative article: 'To sum up, then, the relative article has a main function other than that of normal determination; it is frequent in some poetic texts in which the usual article is rare; and it may possibly suggest a path which leads from an older state of the language, in which determination by the article was unusual, to the classical state, in which such determination was central.'

[6] Barr, ibid., 330.

without article in the same texts when not attached to these preposi-tions'. His suggestion is that this phenomenon 'should be capable of explanation in terms of historical linguistics.'[7] However, any effort in this direction has to struggle with a difficult problem, as rightly pointed out by Barr: in most cases we are lacking a measurement for evaluating the Masoretic vocalizations.

Surprisingly, the most important non-Masoretic witness for the vocalization of the Hebrew Bible has been largely neglected — the Samaritan Torah. Its reading tradition is the only fully vocalized He-brew textual witness outside the Masoretic tradition of the Torah[8] and therefore of enormous importance for everyone who tries to get an impression of the diachronic development of the traditional He-brew vocalizations.

As seen above, the attention paid to this diachronic dimension is an inevitable prerequisite for any description of the use of the article in Hebrew. We have to bear in mind that a large number of refer-ences attesting the use of the article depend on vocalizations handed down in reading traditions only.

In the following, the attempt will be made to describe the use of the definite article in the Samaritan Hebrew tradition in comparison with that in the Masoretic tradition. It may be expected that this comparative view will help to establish at least some elements of a history of the use of the definite article in Biblical Hebrew.

The Definite Article in Biblical Hebrew — General Remarks

Grammar books of Biblical Hebrew usually devote several paragraphs to the use of the definite article. Not always, however, is the neces-sary attention paid to the difference between the *logical category* 'de-termination' and the *grammatical functions* of the Hebrew article.[9] The following study will focus only on the latter.

[7] Barr, ibid., 329.

[8] In two studies on exemplary texts, the importance of the Samaritan tradition for vocalization has been explored by the present writer, and further work is in progress; cf. S. Schorch, 'Die Bedeutung der samaritanischen mündlichen Tradition für die Textgeschichte des Pentateuch (II)', *Mitteilungen und Beiträge der Forschungsstelle Judentum an der Theologischen Fakultät Leipzig* 12/13 (1997), 53–64, and S. Schorch, 'The Significance of the Samaritan Oral Tradition for the Tex-tual History of the Pentateuch', in V. Morabito, A.D. Crown, and Lucy Davey (eds), *Samaritan Researches*, V: *Proceedings of the Congress of the Société d'Études Samaritaines Milan 1996* (Studies in Judaica 10, Sydney 2000), 1.03–1.17.

[9] See Barr, 'Determination', 309f. This methodological problem is especially

In accordance with Waltke and O'Connor three main functions of the Hebrew article should be reckoned with, each being divided into several sub-groups:[10] (A) Determination of a unique referent; (B) Determination of a particular referent; (C) Generic use. The application of the definite article for the determination of a unique or particular referent seems to be obvious for every speaker of English or German. However, the Hebrew Bible displays some cases of a special use of the article which seems to belong to the category of situational uniqueness (= A3, see below), but is less familiar outside Biblical Hebrew. This use has been described by Gesenius and Kautzsch in the following words: 'Eigentümlich ist dem Hebräischen die Verwendung des Artikels um eine einzelne, zunächst noch unbekannte und daher nicht näher zu bestimmende Person oder Sache als solche zu bezeichnen, welche unter den gegebenen Umständen als vorhanden und in Betracht kommend zu denken sei. Im Deutschen steht in solchen Fällen meist der unbestimmte Artikel.'[11]

For the purpose of the present study, this function of the Hebrew article will be referred to as 'imperfect determination'.[12] The generic use of the Hebrew article (category C) has been described as much more abundant than in other languages.[13]

Additionally, a proper noun generally considered as determinate is sometimes used with the definite article. This kind of 'over-determination', which is widespread in many other languages as well, Semitic and non-Semitic,[14] may be considered as a special case of the unique-situational function, but should rather be acknowledged as a category of its own on account of its significant 'ungrammatical' feature. Therefore, differences in determination between the Masoretic

predominant in A. Sperber's *A Historical Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Leiden 1966); cf. below, 'The Definite Article in Samaritan Hebrew'.

[10] B.C. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, Indiana 1990), 242–6.

[11] W. Gesenius and E. Kautzsch, *Hebräische Grammatik*[28] (Leipzig 1909), 426 §126q.

[12] The name is taken from Joüon / Muraoka's grammar, where this use is considered being an own category: 'Imperfect determination. A thing which is not determinate in the consciousness of the writer or of him who is addressed is sometimes specifically determinate in itself; therefore the noun takes, or can take the article. This use of the article, characteristic of Hebrew, is rather frequent. It can only be translated in English by *a*, sometimes by *a certain*…' (P. Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* [subsidia biblica 14, Rome 1991], 511 §137m).

[13] Cf. Gesenius and Kautzsch, *Hebräische Grammatik*, 425 §126l and Waltke and O'Connor, *An Introduction*, 244.

[14] Cf. e.g. most southern German dialects ('*der* Andreas' — '*the* Andreas') or Hungarian ('*az* András' — '*the* András').

Text (= MT) and the Samaritan Pentateuch (= SP) belonging to this class will be listed under (D) Proper noun.

A further category of differences consists in the use of the definite article in attributive phrases: according to the 'standard' rules of Hebrew grammar, noun and attribute in an attributive phrase should agree in gender, number, and determination status. However, this is not always the case, because the genitive-construction 'noun (*status constructus*) + definite attribute' is attested as well. It has even been suggested by A. Borg that this 'pseudo-construct' represents an older stratum than the 'standard' construction,[15] although attestations are much less in (Tiberian) Biblical Hebrew than in Mishnaic Hebrew, and the construction may seem strange to someone trained in 'classical' Semitic grammar. Differences of this kind will be listed under (E) Pseudo-construct.

Finally, differences in the use or lack of the definite article may involve different understandings of the syntax of the respective phrase or even of the entire sentence. These cases, including even the so-called 'relative' use of the article,[16] will be listed under (F) Differences in the textual basis or its understanding.

The Definite Article in Samaritan Hebrew — The State of Research

Among the Samaritans, in contrast with their Jewish counterparts, neither the consonantal framework of the Pentateuch nor its vocalization were cast into an authoritative written form. While a large amount of variation is attested in the application or omission of *matres lectionis* with regard to the former,[17] the transmission of the latter is mostly a purely oral one. Only in some of the old manu-

---

[15] A. Borg, 'Some Observations on the *ywm hššy* Syndrome in the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls', in T. Muraoka and J.F. Elwolde (eds), *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 36, Leiden 2000), 30f. and 38.

[16] Joüon and Muraoka, *A Grammar*, 537 §145de, where the opinion is expressed that the relative use of the article is a phenomenon restricted to younger strata of Biblical Hebrew. This view, however, was questioned by Barr, who supposes in this use an older state of the language (Barr, 'Determination', 325).

[17] Cf. A. Tal, 'Observations on the Orthography of the Samaritan Pentateuch', in V. Morabito, A.D. Crown, and Lucy Davey (eds), *Samaritan Researches*, V: *Proceedings of the Congress of the Société d'Études Samaritaines Milan 1996* (Studies in Judaica 10, Sydney 2000), 1.35.

scripts of the Samaritan Pentateuch do we find traces of very simple vocalization systems, and the broader use of fully vocalized texts of the Pentateuch is a phenomenon which developed only in the twentieth century.[18]

In spite of some previous publications, which are mostly of inferior worth,[19] it was only in 1977 that the Samaritan oral tradition became accessible for the general public of Hebrew scholars. It was in that year when Zeev Ben-Hayyim's phonetic transcription of the entire Samaritan Torah as recorded from the readings of different informants appeared in print. Additionally, his concordance and his grammar book gave the tools necessary for further exploration of the corpus into the hands of the scholarly world.[20] Most recently, Ben-Hayyim's grammar has been translated into English in a slightly revised version.[21] Moreover, another eminent scholar in Samaritanology, Rudolf Macuch, published his equally important 'Grammatik des samaritanischen Hebräisch' in 1969, and it is no easy task to find any part of Samaritan Hebrew grammar about which the two books mentioned have left much to say. Both books, of course, include paragraphs on determination, but they treat the material in very different ways that are at the same time very characteristic of the general approach of both authors: Macuch gives a long and thorough list of references where the article appears in the consonantal framework of one version and is lacking in the other. But he does not make a clear distinction between the consonantal framework of the Samaritan Pentateuch and its oral tradition and cases in which the article appears only in the traditional vocalizations are widely neglected. Ben-Hayyim, on the other hand, focuses in his grammar on the oral tradition. However, his main concerns are morphological questions, and therefore the paragraph devoted to determination is very short and to a large extent restricted to methodological problems. With regard to the use of the article, Ben-Hayyim's concluding remark is as follows:

> It might appear at first that S[amaritan] H[ebrew] does not observe the same rules as T[iberian] H[ebrew] in marking determination, but the

---

[18] Cf. S. Schorch, 'Das Lernen der Tora bei den Samaritanern heute und drei samaritanische Erzählungen über das Lernen', *Wort und Dienst: Jahrbuch der Kirchlichen Hochschule Bethel* 26 (2001), 107–26.

[19] Cf. Schorch, 'The Significance', 1.05.

[20] Z. Ben-Hayyim, *The literary and oral tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic amongst the Samaritans (Hebr.)*, IV: *The words of the Pentateuch*, V: *Grammar of the Pentateuch* (Jerusalem 1977).

[21] Z. Ben-Hayyim, *A Grammar of Samaritan Hebrew* (Jerusalem 2000).

congruence between the two traditions in this matter is actually quite extensive.[22]

Macuch's conclusion displays a very different view:

> Bei statistisch häufigerem Gebrauch des Artikels im S[amaritanischem] H[ebräisch] darf man schließen, daß die Determination in diesem Dialekt von Anfang an beliebter und mehr verbreitet war als bei den Judäern. … Es ist bemerkenswert, daß der Artikel im S[amaritanischen] P[entateuch] öfter bei den Stoffnamen vorkommt, wo er entsprechend dem M[asoretischen T[ext] ausgelassen werden sollte …, weiter nach Zahlwörtern … wie auch zur Determination von Zahlwörtern, die als Ordinalia gebraucht werden …, oder auch mit dem Kardinalzahlwort 'ein' …. Besonders oft wird ein mit *kl* gebrauchter Name determiniert, wo im MT der Artikel ausgelassen wird, weil man die Totalitätspartikel als genügend determiniert ansah. … Es gibt aber auch erstaunliche Fälle, in denen nach den allgemein hebr[äischen] Regeln der Artikel nicht stehen dürfte, wie z.B. bei einem St. cs., der schon durch ein Genitivverhältnis determiniert ist …. Ebenso befremdend ist der Gebrauch des Artikels mit einigen Nomina propria ….[23]

Obviously, both results are not compatible and in some points even contradictory: is Macuch right in stating that the difference between the Masoretic and the Samaritan use of the article lies in certain semantic areas, as in the more or less widespread use of class-determination? Or is Ben-Hayyim's impression of a largely identical use in both traditions the more correct one?

In order to find a solution for this problem, the Samaritan tradition will be compared with the Masoretic tradition in three steps: firstly, the use of the article in both Pentateuch versions will be compared on the sole basis of the written consonantal framework. Secondly, attention will be paid only to the cases in which the article does not appear in the consonantal framework but in the vocalization tradition. While this distinction seems necessary in accordance with the insights presented by Barr (see above, introduction), the results of the two previous steps will be put together into a general view in a concluding third step.

---

[22] Ben-Hayyim, ibid., 325 §7.1.
[23] R. Macuch, *Grammatik des samaritanischen Hebräisch* (Berlin 1969), 487f. §166bβ, c.

The Use of the Article in the Manuscripts of the
Samaritan Pentateuch

As already mentioned, Macuch's concluding statement with regard to the application of the definite article in Samaritan Hebrew has been drawn almost exclusively from written sources. However, on account of the fact that Macuch differentiated between the several functions of the Hebrew article only in a very small number of cases, a fresh account of the material seems to be appropriate.

Macuch presented his references in two different lists: α. The article is lacking in the Samaritan Pentateuch in places where it appears in the Masoretic text,[24] and β. The article appears in the Samaritan Pentateuch but is lacking in the Masoretic text.[25] This partition will be upheld in the following, but additionally the references will be categorized according to the respective functions the article has in MT in order to reveal the categories in which the lack of the article in SP is especially significant.

The results are as follows:[26]

α. MT has the article while the Samaritan text has none (55 cases)

A) Unique referent (22)
    A1) Natural: 3 (Gen. 9:20; Deut. 5:22[2])
    A2) Theological: 4 (Exod. 27:1; 36:35; Lev. 6:5; 23:27)
    A3) Situational: 15 (Gen. 29:2; Exod. 12:18; 13:18, 21; 25:33[2]; 29:13; Lev. 14:22; 15:15, 30; 24:10;[27] Num. 22:11; Deut. 14:22; 21:15; 25:11)

B) Particular referent (2)
    B1) Anaphoric: 2 (Exod. 13:22; Num. 16:35)
    B2) Cataphoric: 0

C) Generic use (18)
    C1) Animals: 6 (Gen. 21:8; 22:8; Exod. 34:3[2]; Num. 31:6,38)
    C2) Plants   1 (Gen. 1:29)
    C3) Materials   3 (Gen. 7:15; 41:42; Exod. 38:24)
    C4) Measurements and times   3 (Exod. 16:23; 26:13 [2])

---

[24] Macuch, ibid., 483f. § 166bα.

[25] Macuch, ibid., 484–6 § 166bβ.

[26] Only the references will be given; the respective words may be found in Macuch's lists.

[27] In Lev. 24:10, the article in MT belongs to the category refered to as 'imperfect determination' (see above, under 'General Observations').

C5) State   1 (Gen. 45:6)

C6) Man   2 (Gen. 2:25; Num. 19:23)

C7) Products   1 (Exod. 5:7)

C8) Instruments   1 (Lev. 2:5)

C9) Abstracts   0

D) Proper nouns with article (4)
   (Num. 13:22,28; 14:45; 33:49)

E) Pseudo-Construct (3)

In three cases, MT has a pseudo-construct, while SP displays the 'regular' construction with an article in both parts: Exod. 29:19; Lev. 8:22; 14:6. In two additional cases, the noun is not determined at all in SP, but determined by a pseudo-construct in MT.[28]

F) Differences in the textual basis or its understanding (6)
   (Gen. 50:11; Exod. 9:18; 14:25; 39:17; Lev. 4:17; Num. 34:2)

β. The Samaritan text has the article while MT has none (108 cases)

A) Unique referent (44)

A1) Natural:	8	(Gen. 9:3,12,15,16; 20:16; 31:35; Deut. 4:47; 32:40)
A2) Theological:	4	(Gen. 9:11; 50:24; Exod. 20:16; 22:8)
A3) Situational:	32	(Gen. 7:11; 14:5; 15:16; 22:3; 37:15;[29] 40:19; 47:15,16; Exod. 5:18; 9:33; 12:2, 46; 14:27; 15:12; 18:14; 19:15; 26:8; 38:27; Lev. 4:12; 6:2,14; 7:9; 26:5; Num. 16:22; 21:8,[30] 29; 24:1; 27:16; 28:24; 29:14; Deut. 23:13,14)

B) Particular referent (16)

B1) Anaphoric:	11	(Gen. 21:30; 24:63; 41:48,54; Exod. 7:19; 9:24; 28:9; Lev. 11:38; 24:16; Num. 27:18; 36:1)
B2) Cataphoric:	5	(Gen. 27:27; 44:8; Lev. 7:27; 17:15; Deut. 12:13)

C) Generic use (6)

C1) Animals: 0

C2) Plants   0

C3) Materials   0

C4) Measurements and times 0

C5) State   0

---

[28] On account of the kind of their determination, both cases are listed under the category A3: Exod. 12:18; Lev. 24:10 (see appendix).

[29] In Gen. 37:15, the article in SP belongs to the category referred to as 'imperfect determination' (see above, 'General Observations').

[30] 'Imperfect determination'.

C6) Man   6   (Gen. 32:12[2]; Num. 21:9; 35:11; Deut. 4:42; 15:11)

C7) Products   0

C8) Instruments   0

C9) Abstracts   0

D) Proper nouns with article (10)
(Gen. 10:15; 23:2; 32:23; Num. 1:49; 11:35; 21:30; 32:33; Deut. 2:37; 3:4, 14)

E) Pseudo-Construct (3)
(Gen. 21:29[2]; Deut. 19:13)[31]

F) Differences in the textual basis or its understanding (29)
(Gen. 42:19; 43:14; Exod. 28:5, 25; 35:25,35; 39:3,18, 32; 40:2,6, 29; Lev. 11:46[2]; 13:59; 16:33; Num. 11:29; 16:22; 20:15; 21:26; 25:14; 27:16; 31:47)
In an additional 6 cases, the article in SP occurs with the participle after *kl* (e.g. *kl hhlk*): Lev. 11:42[2]; Num. 4:3; 21:26; 31:3, 19; Deut. 31:3. Maybe, in these cases a relative use of the article has been preserved, but it seems more important that a certain idiomatization did occur with respect to the use of the article after *kl*.

The consonantal evidence as presented above may be summarized as follows: Macuch was indeed right with his general statement that the use of the article in SP is 'statistically more frequent' than in MT. In only fifty-five cases MT reads a determination while the SP has none, and in 108 cases the Samaritan text reads a determination while MT has none. However, the distribution of the differences — neglected by Macuch — is very interesting: the largest plus of SP (29:6 cases, category F) involves a different textual basis or a different understanding of the text. Therefore, these cases may be of high importance for the textual history of the Pentateuch, but should be separated from the material basis for a comparative view of the use of the definite article.

    With regard to the 'classic' functions of the definite article, an especially high plus in favour of SP is attested in the determination of a unique referent (44:22 cases, category A), followed by the determination of a particular referent (16:2 cases, category B). In many of the differences in both of these categories, the definite article is applied in SP in positions where we would expect it in accordance with the standard rules in MT too. With regard to the so-called 'imperfect

---

[31] Four additional cases are attested in Gen. 9:12,15,16; 15:16. On account of the function the definite article has there they are listed in the categories A1 and A3.

determination', the ratio is 2:1 references attesting the article in favour of SP.

The phenomenon that the definite article does not appear in MT in many places where determination seems to be demanded is well known and has led Barr to the summary: 'Its dominant role as a marker of determination has still not become universally established….'[32] Therefore, on account of the broader attestation of the article in comparison with the consonantal framework of MT, the consonantal framework of the SP seems to display a somewhat younger linguistic stratum of Biblical Hebrew, in which the function of determination is well established. As the reference-lists show, a further distinctive element of this stratum is the broader use of the article in connection with proper names (10:4 cases).

On the other hand, MT displays a much broader use of the definite article in category C, the generic use of the article (18:5 cases). Here SP has a plus only with regard to designations for 'man', while MT prevails in all other categories. As with the pluses, these minuses of the SP should be understood as evidence for a linguistic development. Obviously, the generic use of the Hebrew article is more widespread in the older strata of Biblical Hebrew and tends to become fewer in the younger strata as the one represented by SP.[33]

As is well known, one of the most characteristic features of the SP is its tendency towards harmonization.[34] Of course, this tendency has not only influenced the exact formulation of certain texts, but has led to certain regulations even in the use of the definite article in general. Two points are especially significant:

(i) in most cases, a noun in SP has the definite article when following after *kl* 'all, every';

(ii) the application of the article after the *nota accusativi* is more frequent in SP than in MT.[35]

---

[32] Barr, 'Determination', 333.

[33] Macuch's opinion that SP displays the article 'more often in connection with material names' (see above) is not justified, because a thorough investigation of the respective references reveals, that the function of the article is not generic.

[34] See E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis 1992), 85–9.

[35] The distribution is as follows (all references are listed above according to their respective functions):

α. MT reads a determination while the SP has none (4 cases): Exod. 27:1; 29:13; 36:35; Num. 16:35.

β. SP reads a determination while MT has none (9 cases): Gen. 9:3; 10:15; 14:5; 20:16; 32:23; Exod. 39:23; Lev. 26:5; Num. 1:49; 21:9.

The Use of the Article in the Oral Tradition of the
Samaritan Pentateuch and in the Masoretic Vocalization

Over against the previous section, the following investigation will focus only on those differences between the Samaritan and the Masoretic Pentateuch which do not appear in the consonantal frameworks handed down in manuscripts, but in the vocalizations handed down in the respective reading traditions. While the vocalization of the Masoretic Torah was written down by the Masoretes in the Middle Ages, among the Samaritans the writing of vocalization signs never came into general use and their tradition of vocalization is until today an almost purely oral one.[36]

With respect to determination the above-mentioned restrictions mean that we may consider only such cases in which the definite article is applied after one-consonantal prepositions and, therefore, does not usually appear as a consonant, but only in vocalization. Additionally, in order to receive a comparative view, the references should be collected only from sources containing an identical consonantal framework. Considering the Samaritan evidence, nouns with a laryngeal as their first consonant should not be included in the material basis on account of the phonetics of Samaritan Hebrew.[37] Moreover, Ben-Hayyim has expressed the view that 'the only basis for comparisons of nouns with the preposition *b*, *k*, or *l* between S[amaritan] H[ebrew] and T[iberian] H[ebrew] are those in which the first consonant after the preposition is not geminated, since it may be that gemination in S[amaritan] H[ebrew] is secondary … such as after *l*.'[38] However, the material presented below seems to show that the distribution of the different readings goes back to the rules applied in connection with the definite article and not to phonological contexts. This seems to be the case even with regard to the preposition *l*, where Ben-Hayyim made a special point in stressing that it 'normally

---

[36] Among the Samaritans, vocalization signs are attested in only a few medieval manuscripts and their use has never become widespread. Starting from the second half of the twentieth century, however, copies of vocalized manuscripts of the Torah came into use in order to assure the correct teaching of children (see Schorch, 'Das Lernen der Tora', 115). Presently, most of the Torah-copies held in Samaritan houses for private use are fully vocalized.

[37] 'Of course, nouns beginning with ', *h*, *ḥ*, ' in S[amaritan] H[ebrew] cannot be compared with their T[iberian] H[ebrew] counterparts…' (Ben-Hayyim, *A Grammar*, 325 §7.1).

[38] Ben-Hayyim, ibid., 325.

takes the *a* vowel and the first consonant of the noun is, as a rule, geminated.'[39]

With respect to the Masoretic evidence, one has to consider the objection expressed by Sperber: 'The prepositions *b*, *k*, *l* can thus be vocalized either with *a* … or with *sheva*. The explanation of the current Hebrew grammars … that the vocalization with *a* implies the article is untenable in the light of the actual facts….'[40] However, on account of the fact that Sperber does not make any difference between 'determination' and the use of the 'definite article',[41] the material basis of his view is not convincing.

The comparison carried out under the conditions mentioned above reveals the sum of 370 differences between the Samaritan and the Jewish Torah with regard to the use of the definite article after one-consonantal prepositions. In 308 cases, the Masoretic text reads a determination while the Samaritan text has none; in sixty-two cases, the Samaritan text reads a determination while the Masoretic text has none.

In the following, the two groups of cases will be presented, arranged in a systematic order according to the respective function of the definite article as described above.[42]

α. MT has the article while the Samaritan text has none (308 cases)

A) Unique referent (51)

In some cases a referent which is unique by nature has the definite article in MT, but the article is absent in SP, e.g.: '… and the children of Israel shall go on *the* dry ground (MT *b-ay-yabbāšâh*; SP *ab-yabbāša*) through the midst of the sea' (Exod. 14:16). The following nouns belong to this group: *ybšh/ybšt* 'dry ground', *ym* 'sea', *yrḥ* 'moon', *kpr* 'frost', *šmš* 'sun'.

Moreover, a referent may be unique on account of certain theological or cultic concepts. Most of the references which belong to this group come from the context of the temple or the temple service. In many of these cases MT has the article while it lacks in SP, e.g.: '… the places for *the* staves (MT *l-ab-baddîm*; SP *al-baddəm*) to bear the table' (Exod. 37:14). The list includes the following nouns: *bd* 'pole', *zbḥ* 'sacrifice', *yryʿh* 'curtain', *mzbḥ* 'altar', *mlʾkh* 'work', *mlwʾym* 'ordi-

---

[39] Ben-Hayyim, ibid., 316.

[40] Sperber, *A Historical Grammar*, 629 §103.

[41] See above, 'General observations'.

[42] A detailed list of the references may be found in the appendix.

nation offering', *mnḥh* 'grain offering', *msk* 'screen', *mškn* 'tabernacle', and *prkt* 'veil'. Further references are designations of theological or cultic concepts apart from the temple service but nevertheless strongly connected to the field of religion, e.g.: '… it shall not go out in *the* jubilee (MT *b-ay-yōbēl*; SP *ab-yūbəl*)' (Lev. 25:30). Examples include: *ybl* 'jubilee', *mwlh* 'circumcision', *mḥzh* 'vision', *mlk* 'molech', *skh* 'booth', and *šd* 'demon'.

A third kind of uniqueness is that which is due to the given situation. There are two cases attesting a Masoretic plus in the use of the article for the determination of a referent that is unique due to the given situation, e.g.: 'And he (Lot) and his two daughters dwelt in *the* cave (MT *b-am-mᵉʿārâh*; SP *bā-mā:ra*)' (Gen. 19:30). Obviously, the author had a certain cave in mind, which was well known to his audience. The only further example is the determination of *šplh* 'lowland' in Deut. 1:7.

B) *Particular referent (10)*

There are two cases attesting a Masoretic plus in the use of the article in connection with an anaphoric referent, e.g. the participle *qnh* 'buyer' in Lev. 25:30: (v. 29: '*If a man sells a house…*) then the house … shall belong permanently *to him who bought it* (MT *l-aq-qōneh*; SP *al-qāni*).' The other example is *mslh* 'highway' in Num. 20:19.

In eight cases, the Masoretic vocalization reads the definite article in connection with a cataphoric referent, while the Samaritan vocalization does not have it, e.g. Gen. 20:15: '… dwell *where it pleaseth* (MT *b-aṭ-ṭôb*; SP *af-ṭob*) thee.'

Apart from the mentioned example, the following cases are attested: *(h)ṭwb* 'the good one' (Gen. 20:15; Num. 36:6; Deut. 23:17); *šbr* 'corn' (Gen. 47:14); *śr* 'prince' (Num. 22:40); *dm* 'blood' (Num. 35:33); *ṣr* 'tribulation' (Deut. 4:30); *ywm* 'day' (Deut. 27:2).

Interestingly, in three of the above mentioned references the cataphoric use of the article in MT and its absence in SP occur in connection with *ṭwb* 'good'. Therefore, the respective constructions seem to form part of different idiomatic backgrounds.

C) *Generic use (200)*

The generic use of the article in MT and its absence in SP is very frequently attested in connection with general or collective designations like names of animals (*bhmh* 'beast', *bqr* 'cattle', *gml* 'camel', *mqnh* 'livestock' etc.), plants (*sbk* 'thicket'), materials (*brzl* 'iron', *zhb* 'gold', *zpt* 'asphalt', *ksp* 'silver', *mym* 'water', etc.), measurements

(*mdh* 'measurement', *mšwrh* 'volume', *mšql* 'weight', *ṣhrym* 'noonday', *qṣyr* 'harvest', and *šnh* 'year'), illness (*bhrt* 'bright spot', *grb* 'scab', *dbr* 'pestilence', *dlqt* 'inflammation', *yrqwn* 'mildew', *ntq* 'scale', etc.), states (*ṣm* 'thirst', *šby* 'captivity'), parts of the human body (*glglt* 'head, skull'), human collectives (*mṭh* 'tribe', *ṣb* 'army', *šbṭ* 'tribe'), products (*bgd* 'garment', *byt* 'house', *dlt* 'door', *ṭn* 'basket', *yyn* 'wine', *lḥm* 'bread', *mlḥ* 'salt', etc.), instruments (*mdkh* 'mortar', *mwṭ* 'pole', *mrḥšt* 'pan', *prwr* 'pan', *rḥym* 'millstones', *tnwr* 'oven'), and abstracts (*mšpṭ* 'judgement', *str* 'secrecy', *ṣmytt* 'completion', *šw* 'vanity', *šqr* 'falsehood').[43]

D) Proper nouns with article (3)

There are three proper nouns which occur with the article in the MT, but without it in SP, e.g. *yrdn* '*the* Jordan' in Num. 32:19 (MT *l-ay-Yardēn*; SP *al-Yardan*). The other instances are *msh* 'Massah' (Deut. 6:16) and *šṭym* 'Shittim' (Num. 25:1).

E) Pseudo-Construct (34)

Differences of this kind (SP reads a pseudo-construct while both parts of the construction bear the definite article in the MT) are especially abundant in constructions of the noun *ywm* 'day' with ordinal numbers: *(h)ywm hr'šn / hšny / hšlšy* …('the first / second / third … day'). Beside constructions of this type, only two more single cases should be listed in this category, both in Lev. 14:52 (*wbmym hḥym*; *wbṣpwr hḥyh*). It should be noted that the use of the pseudo-construct in Samaritan Hebrew is not generally attested in phrases with the ordinal number as attribute. This may be shown by a case like *lkbs h'ḥd* in Num. 15:5 where both versions determine noun and attribute: MT *l-ak-kebes hā-'eḥad*; SP *l-ak-kābaš ā-'ʿād*.

F) Differences in the textual basis or its understanding (10)

In Exod. 1:15–20, the Samaritan tradition frequently reads the Hebrew word for 'midwife' with a prosthetic vowel, while the Masoretic tradition has the article instead. Further differences involving a different textual basis are attested in Exod. 25:33[2]; 37:19 and Gen. 4:7.[44]

---

[43] For a detailed and full list see the appendix.
[44] For details see the appendix.

β. The Samaritan has the article while MT has none (62 cases)

A) Unique referent (25)

The references for nouns unique by nature which have the article in SP but lack it in MT are as follows: *rbyb* 'shower', *śʿyr* 'raindrop', and *šm* 'name'. Moreover, differences of this kind may be found with regard to theological or cultic uniqueness as well as with regard to uniqueness due to the given situation: *mbwl* 'flood', *mnḥh* 'grain offering', *zr* 'foreigner', *twʿbh* 'abominations', and *mṣwlh* 'depth' (Exod. 15:5).

B) Particular referent (6)

The use of the article in SP and its absence in MT occur only in connection with cataphoric *mqwm*, e.g. '… in *the* place where they kill the burnt offering' (Lev. 4:24). Further attestations are Lev. 4:33; 6:18; 7:2; 14:13; Num. 9:17. There is no such difference in the anaphoric use of the article.

C) Generic use (23)

Samaritan pluses in the generic use of the article occur in connection with the designations of animals (*lbyʾ* 'lion'), measurements (*ywm* 'day', *mspr* 'number'), illness (*ngʿ* 'plague'), man (*mtʿt* 'deceiver', *śkyr* 'hired servant', *twšb* 'sojourner'), products (*dbš* 'honey', *ṣpyḥt* 'wafers'), and abstracts (*kbdt* 'heaviness', *lbn* 'white', *mṣwr wmṣwq* 'siege and distress', *mšmr* 'custody', *mšpṭ* 'judgement', *ṣdq* 'righteousness').

D) Proper nouns with the article (3)

There are two names that are used with the article in the Samaritan vocalization, but without in the Masoretic tradition: *nmrd* 'Nimrod' and *lwy* 'Levi'.

E) Pseudo-Construct (0)

There are no cases in which the Masoretic vocalization reads a pseudo-construct against the Samaritan tradition.

F) Differences in the textual basis or its understanding (5)

Differences of this type occur in Gen. 49:26, Exod. 19:15, Lev. 4:29; 25:21 Deut. 33:16.

With regard to cases in which the definite article appears only in the respective reading traditions, we may therefore summarize as follows: the application of the definite article in the vocalization of MT is much more widespread than in the vocalization of SP. In no less than 308 references the former reads the definite article while the latter does not. On the other hand, the number of references for the reverse case reaches only sixty-two.

Considering the 'classic' functions of the definite article, the number of differences is relatively small and the proportion between the respective pluses and minuses is almost equal. It can be concluded, therefore, that the determinative function of the article has been equally established in both traditions. In category B, the determination of a particular referent, the relation is 10:6 in favour of the MT. Indeed, in category A, the determination of a unique referent, the relation is 51:25 in favour of the MT, but a thorough examination shows a significant plus only in the use of the definite article in connection with theological uniqueness (category A2; 38:17 cases).[45] The latter phenomenon seems to have its roots in a certain way of interpretation or understanding of the Hebrew text which has become part of the collective memory among the Jewish community. Therefore, the difference in this category is the result of a relatively late development attested by the Masoretic text, while the Samaritan reading tradition represents a stratum that is older in typological terms.

Moreover, two of the references in category A3[46] belong to the realm of the so-called 'imperfect determination',[47] where SP has a minus of two in comparison with the MT. This fact seems especially interesting insofar as Gesenius lists only five references from the Torah in which 'imperfect determination' is attested by the Masoretic vocalization. Of these five, SP attests only two, and in one case the consonantal basis is different.[48] The most significant difference lies in the generic use of the definite article (category C) with a relation of 200:23 in favour of the MT. With regard to the construction of

---

[45] See in the appendix.
[46] See in the appendix.
[47] See above, 'General Observations'.
[48] Concerning the list of 'imperfect determinations' in MT provided by Gesenius and Kautzsch, *Hebräische Grammatik*, 426f §126r, both versions have the 'imperfect determination' in Gen. 28:11 (MT *b-am-māqôm*; SP *b-am-māqom*) and Lev. 23:42 (MT *b-as-sukkôt*; SP *b-as-sakkot*), while in Exod. 21:20 the word in question (*mšpṭ*) is lacking in SP.

proper nouns with the article (category D), differences are rare and their relation is equal (3:3 cases).

In category E, the relation is 34:0 in favour of MT and the 'Pseudo-construct', therefore, seems to be more regular in the SP. However, most of the cases (32 of the 34) are in connection with *ywm* 'day' and the phenomenon, therefore, may be restricted to an idiomatic use. In every case — on account of the fact that the Pseudo-construct is most probably older than the 'regular' construction — the pluses of the SP seem to preserve an older linguistic stratum.

The Definite Article According to the Written and the Oral Traditions — a Comparative View of the Samaritan and the Masoretic Text

A comparison of the results of the above investigations leads to the following conclusions:

A) Macuch's opinion that the definite article is 'statistically more frequent' in Samaritan Hebrew (see above) is correct only with regard to the consonantal frameworks of the two traditions. According to the respective vocalizations, the use of the article is by far more widespread in the Masoretic tradition: A comparison of the consonantal frameworks reveals a Samaritan plus of fifty-three articles, but according to a comparison of the vocalizations the MT has a plus of 246 articles.

B) The view expressed by Ben-Hayyim that 'the congruence between the two traditions in this matter [*sc.* the use of the definite article] is actually quite extensive' is not supported by the material presented above: 1) The consonantal framework of MT displays other rules for the use of the definite article than the Masoretic vocalization does. Therefore, the comparison with Samaritan Hebrew should be carried out separately for each part of the tradition. 2) The comparison of the consonantal frameworks as well as of the respective vocalization traditions reveals important differences between MT and SP with regard to the use of the definite article.

C) The different tendencies in the consonantal framework and in the vocalization support Barr's view that the use of the article in the former should be separated from its use in the latter, because both represent different linguistic strata. However, as may be seen below in this conclusion, this separation is necessary especially with regard to the Masoretic tradition, while in the Samaritan tradition the consonantal framework and the vocalization are much more coherent.

D) With regard to the consonantal frameworks, MT attests some features which are older than the parallel Samaritan tradition. While in MT the determinative role of the article has not yet been fully established, this function is much better developed in SP. This fact is clearly demonstrated by the more widespread use of the definite article for the determination of unique and particular referents.

E) Moreover, the broader use of the article for generic purposes seems to be an old feature of MT too. As a comparison of both vocalization traditions shows, the generic use of the article has been preserved in the Masoretic vocalization and has become a characteristic even of this part of the Masoretic tradition. Therefore, considering the Masoretic tradition as a whole, the generic use of the article is an especially significant feature.

F) Besides this preservation of old features, the Masoretic vocalization bears witness to some later developments too. One of them is the diminishing application of the pseudo-construct, the other the increasing use of the definite article in connection with referents which are unique according to the developing collective memory of the Jewish community (offering, temple instruments, etc.).

G) With regard to the last two points the Samaritan vocalization has preserved the older features: it attests a broader use of the pseudo-construct and shows a much smaller number of applications of the article for the purposes of the determination of a theologically unique referent.

H) The consonantal framework as well as the vocalization of SP tend to avoid the generic use of the article.

I) With regard to the so-called 'imperfect-determination', SP has a plus of one reference according to the evidence of the consonantal frameworks, but a minus of two according to the evidence of the vocalizations. However, the small number of references does not allow reliable conclusions.

J) As in the consonantal framework, SP displays even in its vocalization a strong tendency towards harmonization and regularization. This can be shown in the field of vocalization alone, cf. the use of *ywm* + ordinal number in the pseudo-construct. But the same is true with regard to the coherence of written and oral tradition (e.g., the proper noun 'Levi' bears the definite article in both the written and the oral tradition against the MT).[49]

---

[49] See Num. 1:49 with regard to the written tradition, and cf. Macuch, *Grammatik des samaritanischen Hebräisch*, 488 §166c.

K) This observation leads to another characteristic of SP: while in MT a large difference is evident between the use of the article in the consonantal framework and the vocalization, in SP both parts of the tradition display more or less the same features.

The Use of the Article in the Pre-Samaritan Manuscripts

The detection of special features in the use of the definite article in the Samaritan Pentateuch leads to the question whether these features were already part of the tradition as recorded in the pre-Samaritan manuscripts from Qumran. Of course, these manuscripts do not have vocalization signs and, therefore, any investigation is restricted to those cases where the definite article appears in the script.

According to Tov, who coined the term 'pre-Samaritan' ('ancient nonsectarian texts upon one of which SP was based'), the term 'pre-' instead of 'proto-'Samaritan is to be preferred because these texts, 'though agreeing much with SP, lack the ideological Samaritan features.'[50] In the light of this definition, especially the following manuscripts should be called 'pre-Samaritan': 4QpaleoExod[m], 4QNum[b], and 4QDeut[n].

To start with the last mentioned scroll, there is not a single case preserved in 4QDeut[n][51] which would allow conclusions about a different use of the article in comparison with MT or SP.

4QNum[b][52] contains three cases relevant to the question under examination and their tendency is clear: the reading of the scroll goes together with that of SP and against MT in all three references (Num. 11:32 *hywm hmḥrt*; 22:11 *'m yṣ'*; 24:1 *hnḥšym*). This evidence gives some support to the designation of 4QNum[b] as pre-Samaritan, but it is not enough for drawing certain conclusions about the rules for the use of the article in this scroll.

4QpaleoExod[m][53] is the best preserved pre-Samaritan text, but its evidence with regard to our question is more complicated: from a total of five relevant attestations the scroll and SP go together against MT in only one case (Exod. 22:24 *'ny*). In Exod. 26:8, the scroll reads *yry't* like MT without the article, while SP adds the article. In

[50] Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 81f.

[51] Published by S. White Crawford, *DJD* XIV (Oxford 1995), 117–28.

[52] Published by N. Jastram, *DJD* XII (Oxford 1994), 205–67.

[53] Published by P.W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and J.E. Sanderson, *DJD* IX (Oxford 1992), 53–130. Additionally, see J.E. Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran* (Harvard Semitic Studies 30, Atlanta 1986).

three cases, MT and SP go together against the scroll: in Exod. 29:22, the scroll has *hywtrt*, with the article, while it is lacking in MT and SP. On the other hand, the scroll reads *bqr* and *'rb* in Exod. 18:14 without the article, while MT and SP have the article in both cases. It seems, therefore that the rules for the use of the definite article as attested in 4QpaleoExod^m are not entirely the same as in MT or SP.

With regard to the functions of the definite article, there cannot be detected any simple logic which would explain the differences. However, it has to be kept in mind that the evidence presented above is too sparse for any certain conclusions.

The Use of the Article in Biblical Hebrew and in Mishnaic Hebrew

In order to get an impression of the use of the article in Biblical Hebrew, the evidence of Mishnaic Hebrew should not be neglected. Obviously Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew have distinct chronological backgrounds, but the relation between the two cannot be restricted to a purely diachronic development. Rather, Mishnaic Hebrew is different from Biblical Hebrew in terms of dialectology and socio-linguistics as well.

Much has been written about the comparison between Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew, but the point of departure was mostly the evidence extant in Tiberian Hebrew. In this way several authors have compared the use of the article in (Tiberian) Biblical Hebrew and in Mishnaic Hebrew. The following studies seem to deserve special attention: A. Bendavid in his *Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew* has published the most extensive investigation. Others like G. Birnbaum focussed on particular aspects. M. Azar in his *The Syntax of Mishnaic Hebrew* contributed important comparative observations too.

With regard to Samaritan Hebrew, Ben-Hayyim has made a methodological point in demanding the comparison with Mishnaic Hebrew: 'The question of determination in S[amaritan] H[ebrew] should be explored not only vis-à-vis T[iberian] H[ebrew] …, but also in relation to the practice in the Mishna as reflected in ancient manuscripts…'.[54] Ben-Hayyim's demand still remains a desideratum, and the gap cannot be filled here. However, it may be useful to discuss at least some outstanding points.

---

[54] Ben-Hayyim, *A Grammar*, 325 §7.1.

A) As in Biblical Hebrew, even in Mishnaic Hebrew the consonantal framework of a certain manuscript does not necessarily adhere to the same tradition as its vocalization. In the important MS. Kaufmann, one of the most important manuscripts of the Mishna[55], the vocalizer did not even make a difference between the noun with or without the article when occurring in connection with prepositions.[56]

B) One of the characteristics of Mishnaic Hebrew against (Tiberian) Biblical Hebrew is its diminishing use of the article in anaphoric function.[57] As the examples listed above show, a comparison of the consonantal frameworks reveals a plus of nine applications of the anaphoric article in favour of SP. With regard to the vocalizations, MT has a slight plus of two. On account of the large number of examples of the anaphoric use of the article in both versions, this difference cannot be regarded as significant. Therefore SP does not share the tendencies of Mishnaic Hebrew, which is on this point closer to the consonantal framework of MT than to any other corpus.

C) Similarly, the use of the article for the determination of a unique referent is less attested in Mishnaic Hebrew,[58] especially with regard to referents unique by nature or on account of the current theological views.[59] In this point, too, Samaritan Hebrew is different from Mishnaic Hebrew.

D) Birnbaum (with due care) reached the conclusion that the so-called 'imperfect determination' is more abundant in Mishnaic than in Biblical Hebrew.[60] The small number of reliable references makes

---

[55] On this manuscript note the comment of Birnbaum: 'It is generally accepted by scholars that the scribe and the vocalizer of this manuscript are not the same person; the vocalizer performed his task after the scribe. In many places he did not adhere to the consonantal text, and he even altered it in accordance with his vocalization. Nonetheless, it has been established that the vocalizer also possessed an old and reliable tradition' (G. Birnbaum, 'Studies in Determination in Mishnaic Hebrew', in M. Bar-Asher and S.E. Fassberg [eds], *Studies in Mishnaic Hebrew* [Scripta Hierosolymitana 37, Jerusalem 1998], 110f.).

[56] Birnbaum, ibid., 111–28.

[57] A. Bendavid, *Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew*, II: *Grammar and Style (Hebr.)* (Tel Aviv 1971), 630; M. Azar, *The Syntax of Mishnaic Hebrew (Hebr.)* (The Academy of the Hebrew Language, Sources and Studies 4, Jerusalem 1995), 238.

[58] Bendavid, *Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew*, II, 631.

[59] Azar, ibid., 243.

[60] G. Birnbaum, 'Class-Determination and Over-Determination in Mishnaic Hebrew' (Hebr.), in M. Z. Kaddari and Sh. Sharvit (eds), *Studies in the Hebrew Language and the Talmudic Literature, Dedicated to the Memory of Dr. Menahem Moreshet* (Ramat Gan 1989), 45 and 53. The author applies the term 'over-determination' (*yiddûaʿ hayyēter*).

any comparison uncertain, but in the Samaritan Pentateuch there is surely no evidence for an increasing use of this feature.

E) Moreover, according to Birnbaum and others,[61] the generic use of the article increases in Mishnaic Hebrew as compared with Biblical Hebrew. However, the examples of this function of the article are much fewer in SP than in MT.

F) As a rule in Mishnaic Hebrew, the object gets the *nota accusativi* when bearing the article and vice versa.[62] It seems that Samaritan Hebrew displays a tendency in this direction as well.

G) The construction '*kl* + article + participle' is one of the characteristics of Mishnaic Hebrew as against (Tiberian) Biblical Hebrew, where the construction '*kl* + participle' is more common.[63] The Samaritan Pentateuch, over against the Masoretic, shares this 'Mishnaic' feature.

H) It has been observed that the so-called 'pseudo-construct' increases its use in Mishnaic Hebrew.[64] In Samaritan Hebrew too this construction is better attested than in MT.

I) In Biblical Hebrew, the cardinal numeral 'one' ('*ḥd* / '*ḥt*) may be used with or without the article, when applied as a substantive. In Mishnaic Hebrew as well as in Samaritan Hebrew, the use without the article is much more common.[65]

Conclusion

The comparison of Tiberian and Samaritan Biblical Hebrew as well as Mishnaic Hebrew reveals some insights into the development of the use of the definite article in Hebrew. According to the results presented above, the consonantal framework of the Masoretic text has preserved the most ancient features, while the consonantal tradition of the Samaritan Pentateuch attests a more developed stage, especially with regard to the determining function of the article. The Samaritan vocalization displays more or less the same characteristics as the Samaritan consonantal tradition. The Masoretic vocalization, on the other hand, is distinct from all of them with regard to the article,

---

[61] Birnbaum, ibid., 53.
[62] Bendavid, *Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew*, II, 635.
[63] Bendavid, ibid., 671.
[64] Bendavid, ibid., 638.
[65] For Mishnaic Hebrew, see Bendavid, ibid., 639. An illustrative example for SP is Deut. 21:15: 'If a man has two wives, one (MT *h'ḥt*; SP '*ḥt*) loved and the other (MT *h'ḥt*; SP '*ḥt*) unloved…' The other examples of this characteristic difference are: Lev. 14:22; 15:15, 30; Deut. 21:15; 25:11.

and should be considered the youngest stratum. However, the Masoretic consonantal framework and its vocalization share at least one distinctive feature: in both the generic use of the definite article is well established and separates the Masoretic from the Samaritan tradition. On account of its good attestation in the Masoretic text, the generic use of the article should be regarded as an old feature.

Mishnaic Hebrew has preserved this last feature too. However, apart from this common characteristic of Mishnaic Hebrew and the Tiberian tradition of Biblical Hebrew, the two mostly display different ways in the application of the definite article.

The same seems to be true with respect to the comparison between Mishnaic and Samaritan Biblical Hebrew. In spite of the fact that single features were common in both traditions but not in the Masoretic text, the general impression is dominated by the significant differences.

Appendix:
The Use of the Article According to the Samaritan and the Masoretic Vocalization —The Full List of References

α. MT has the definite article while the Samaritan text has none (308 cases)

A) Unique referent (51)

   A1) Natural

(1–4)	*ybšh*	'dry ground'	MT *b-ay-yabbāšâh* SP *ab-yabbāša*	(Exod. 14:16, 22, 29; 15:19)
(5)			MT *l-ay-yabbāšâh* SP *al-yabbāša*	(Gen. 1:10)
(6)	*ybšt*	'dry ground'	MT *b-ay-yabbāšet* SP *ab-yabbāšat*	(Exod. 4:9)
(7)	*ym*	'sea'	MT *l-ay-yām* SP *al-yam*	(Deut. 30:13)
(8)	*yrḥ*	'moon'	MT *l-ay-yārēaḥ* SP *al-yāra*	(Deut. 17:3)
(9)	*kpr*	'frost'	MT *k-ak-kepōr* SP *kā-kūfar*	(Exod. 16:14)
(10)	*šmš*	'sun'	MT *we-l-aš-šemeš* SP *w-al-šīməš*	(Deut. 17:3)

   A2) Theological

(11)	*bd*	'pole'	MT *l-ab-baddîm* SP *al-baddəm*	(Exod. 37:14)

(12)	*zbḥ*	'sacrifice'	MT *l-az-zābaḥ*	(Num. 15:5)
			SP *al-zēba*	
(13–15)	*ybl*	'jubile'	MT *b-ay-yōbēl*	(Lev. 25:30, 33;
			SP *ab-yūbəl*	27:21)
(16)			MT *û-b-ay-yōbēl*	(Lev. 25:31)
			SP *w-ab-yūbəl*	
(17)	*yryʿh*	'curtain'	MT *b-ay-yᵉrîʿâh*	(Exod. 36:12)
			SP *ab-yāriyya*	
(18)	*mwlh*	'circum-cision'	MT *l-am-mûlōt*	(Exod. 4:26)
			SP *al-mālot*	
(19)	*mzbḥ*	'altar'	MT *wᵉ-l-am-mizbēaḥ*	
			SP *w-al-mazba*	(Exod. 40:33)
(20)	*mḥzh*	'vision'	MT *b-am-maḥᵃzeh*	(Gen. 15:1)
			SP *bā-māzzi*	
(21–22)	*mlʾkh*	'work'	MT *l-am-mᵉlăʾkâh*	(Exod. 36:5; 38:24)
			SP *al-mālāka*	
(23)	*mlwʾym*	'ordination offering'	MT *wᵉ-l-am-millûʾîm*	(Lev. 7:37)
			SP *w-al-mallāʾəm*	
(24–27)	*mlk*	'molech'	MT *l-am-mōlek*	(Lev. 18:21; 20:2, 3, 4)
			SP *al-mēlək*	
(28)	*mnḥh*	'grain offering'	MT *l-am-minḥâh*	(Lev. 7:37)
			SP *w-al-māʾnā*	
(29)	*msk*	'screen'	MT *l-am-māsāk*	(Exod. 26:37)
			SP *al-mēsək*	
(30–37)	*mškn*	'tabernacle'	MT *l-am-miškān*	(Exod. 26:15, 18; 36:23;
			SP *al-maškan*	38:20; 40:5, 28, 33; Num. 1:50)
(38–40)	*skh*	'booth'	MT *b-as-sukkōt*	(Lev. 23:42[2], 43)
			SP *af-sakkot*	
(41–48)	*prkt*	'veil'	MT *l-ap-pārōket*	(Exod. 26:33, 35; 27:21;
			SP *al-fārēkət*	40:22; Lev. 16:2, 12, 15; Num. 18:7)
(49)	*šd*	'demon'	MT *l-aš-šēdîm*	(Deut. 32:17)
			SP *al-šīdəm*	

A3) Situational

(50)   'Then Lot went up out of Zoar and dwelt in the mountains, and his two daughters were with him; for he was afraid to dwell in Zoar. And he and his two daughters dwelt in the cave (MT *b-am-mᵉʿārâh*; SP *bā-mā:ra*).' (Gen. 19:30)

(51)   'Turn and take your journey, and go … in the mountains and in the lowland (MT *û-b-aš-šᵉpēlâh*; SP *w-af-šēfila*)…' (Deut. 1:7)

B) Particular referent (10)

  B1) Anaphoric

	(v. 17: 'Please let us pass through your country. We will not pass through fields or vineyards, nor will we drink water from wells; we will go along the King's Highway…)
(52)	So the children of Israel said to him, 'We will go by the Highway (MT *b-am-mᵉsillâh*; SP *bā-māsīla*)…" (Num. 20:19)
	(v. 29: 'If a man sells a house in a walled city, then he may redeem it within a whole year after it is sold…)
(53)	But if it is not redeemed within the space of a full year, then the house in the walled city shall belong permanently to him who bought it (MT *l-aq-qōneh*; SP *al-qāni*)…' (Lev. 25:30)

  B2) Cataphoric

(54)	*bṭwb (bʿynyk šb)*	MT *b-aṭ-ṭôb* SP *af-ṭob*	(Gen. 20:15)
(55)	*bšbr (ʾšr hm šbrym)*	MT *b-aš-šeber* SP *af-šābar*	(Gen. 47:14)
(56)	*wlśrym (ʾšr ʾtw)*	MT *wᵉ-l-aś-śārîm* SP *w-al-šārəm*	(Num. 22:40)
(57)	*ldm (ʾšr špk bh)*	MT *l-ad-dām* SP *al-dam*	(Num. 35:33)
(58)	*lṭwb (bʿynykm thyynh)*	MT *l-aṭ- ṭôb* SP *al-ṭob*	(Num. 36:6)
(59)	*bṣr (lk)*	MT *b-aṣ-ṣar* SP *w-af-ṣar*	(Deut. 4:30)
(60)	*bṭwb (lw)*	MT *b-aṭ-ṭôb* SP *af-ṭob*	(Deut. 23:17)
(61)	*bywm (ʾšr tʿbrw ʾt hyrdn)*	MT *b-ay-yôm* SP *ab-yom*	(Deut. 27:2)

C) Generic use (200)

  C1) Animals

(62–63)	*bhmh*	'beast'	MT *b-ab-bᵉhēmâh* SP *bā-bīmma*	(Lev. 20:25; 27:27)
(64–67)	*bqr*	'cattle'	MT *b-ab-bāqār* SP *bā-bāqar*	(Exod. 9:3; Lev. 22:19, 21; Deut. 14:26)
(68)	*gml*	'camel'	MT *b-ag-gᵉmālîm* SP *w-af-gāmāləm*	(Exod. 9:3)
(68)	*mqnh*	'livestock'	MT *b-am-miqneh* SP *bā-maqni*	(Gen. 13:2)
(70–71)	*sws*	'horse'	MT *b-as-sūsîm* SP *af-sūsəm*	(Gen. 47:17; Exod. 9:3)
(72–75)	*ṣ'n*	'flock'	MT *û-b-aṣ-ṣō'n* SP *w-af-ṣē'on*	(Gen. 37:2; Exod. 9:3; Lev. 22:21; Deut. 14:26)

(76)	ṣprdʿ	'frog'	MT b-aṣ-ṣᵉpardᵉʿîm SP af-ṣēfardāʾəm	(Exod. 7:27)
(77)	śh	'lamb'	MT l-aś-śeh SP al-ši	(Num. 15:11)

C2) Plants

(78)	sbk	'thicket'	MT b-as-sᵉbak SP af-sābak	(Gen. 22:13)

C3) Materials

(79)	brzl	'iron'	MT k-ab-barzel SP kā-barzəl	(Lev. 26:19)
(80–82)	zhb	'gold'	MT b-az-zāhāb SP af-ʾzāb	(Gen. 13:2; Exod. 31:4; 35:32)
(83)	zpt	'asphalt'	MT û-b-az-zāpet SP w-af-zēfət	(Exod. 2:3)
(84–92)	ksp	'silver'	MT û-b-ak-kesep SP w-af-kāsəf	(Gen. 13:2; Exod. 31:4; 35:32; Deut. 2:6[2], 28[2]; 14:25; 21:14)
(93–131)	mym	'water'	MT b-am-māyim SP bā-məm	(Exod. 12:9; 29:4; 40:12; Lev. 1:9, 13; 6:21; 8:6, 21; 11:32. 46; 14:8, 9, 51; 15:5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 27; 16:4, 24, 26, 28; 17:15; 22:6; Num. 19:7, 8, 18, 19; 27:14; 31:23; Deut. 23:12)
(132)			MT û-b-am-māyim SP w-bā-məm	(Deut. 23:5)
(133–134)	nḥšt	'copper'	MT û-b-an-nᵉḥōšet SP w-ab-nāššət	(Exod. 31:4; 35:32)
(135)	pšth	'flax'	MT l-ap-pištîm SP al-fištəm	(Lev. 13:48)
(136)			MT b-ap-pištîm SP bā-fištəm	(Lev. 13:52)
(137)	ṣwr	'rock'	MT b-aṣ-ṣûr SP af-ṣor	(Exod. 17:6)[66]
(138)	ṣmr	'wool'	MT wᵉ-l-aṣ-ṣāmer SP w-al-ṣāmar	(Lev. 13:48)
(139)			MT b-aṣ-ṣāmer SP af-ṣāmar	(Lev. 13:52)

[66] Alternatively, in this case the article maybe has an anaphoric function, because 'the rock' (hṣwr) is mentioned earlier in the verse.

313

(140)	*śyd*	'lime'	MT *b-aś-śîd*	(Deut. 27:2)
			SP *af-šiyyad*	
(141-142)	*šmn*	'oil'	MT *(bālûl) b-aš-šemen*	(Lev. 14:21; Num. 15:9)
			SP *(bālol) af-šāmən*	
(143–170)			MT *(bᵉlûlâh) b-aš-šemen*	(Lev. 2:5; 7:10; 9:4; 14:10; 23:13; Num. 7:13, 19, 25, 31, 37, 43, 49, 55, 61, 67, 73, 79; 8:8; 15:6; 28:9, 12[2], 13, 20, 28; 29:3, 9, 14)
			SP *(bālūla) af-šāmən*	
(171–174)			MT *(bᵉlûlōt) b-aš-šemen*	(Exod. 29:2; Lev. 2:4; 7:12; Num. 6:15)
			SP *(bālūlot) af-šāmən*	
(175–177)			MT *(mᵉšûḥîm) b-aš-šemen*	(Lev. 2:4; 7:12; Num. 6:15)
			SP *(māʾšīm) af-šāmən*	
(178–180)			MT *b-aš-šemen*	(Lev. 2:7; 6:14; Deut. 33:24)
			SP *af-šāmən*	
(181)	*šš*	'linen'	MT *û-b-aš-šēš*	(Exod. 38:23)
			SP *w-af-šəš*	
(182)	*tklt*	'blue'	MT *b-at-tᵉkēlet*	(Exod. 38:23)
			SP *af-takkēlət*	

C4) Measurements and times

(183)	*mdh*	'measure-ment'	MT *b-am-middâh*	(Lev. 19:35)
			SP *bā-māda*	
(184)	*mśrh*	'volume'	MT *û-b-am-mᵉśûrâh*	(Lev. 19:35)
			SP *w-bā-māšūra*	
(185–186)	*mšql*	'weight'	MT *b-am-mišqāl*	(Lev. 19:35; 26:26)
			SP *bā-mašqol*	
(187)	*ṣhrym*	'noonday'	MT *b-aṣ-ṣohᵒrayim*	(Deut. 28:29)
			SP *af-ṣerrəm*	
(188)	*qṣyr*	'harvest'	MT *û-b-aq-qāṣîr*	(Exod. 34:21)
			SP *w-af-qāṣər*	
(189)	*šnh*	'year'	MT *l-aš-šānâh*	(Num. 14:34[2])
			SP *al-šēna*	

C5) States

(190)	*bhrt*	'bright spot'	MT *wᵉ-l-ab-behāret*	(Lev. 14:56)
			SP *w-al-bāʾ ērət*	
(191)	*grb*	'scab'	MT *û-b-ag-gārāb*	(Deut. 28:27)
			SP *w-af-gārab*	
(192–193)	*dbr*	'pestilence'	MT *b-ad-deber*	(Exod. 5:3; 9:15)
			SP *af-dābār*	
(194)	*dlqt*	'inflamma-tion'	MT *û-b-ad-dalleqet*	(Deut. 28:22)
			SP *w-af-dālāqat*	

(195)	*yrqwn*	'mildew'	MT *û-b-ay-yērāqôn*	(Deut. 28:22)
			SP *w-ab-yērāqon*	
(196)	*ntq*	'scale'	MT *wᵉ-l-an-nāteq*	(Lev. 14:54)
			SP *w-al-nētəq*	
(197)	*spht*	'scab'	MT *wᵉ-l-as-sappaḥat*	(Lev. 14:56)
			SP *w-al-sab'bēt*	
(198)	*ṣm'*	'thirst'	MT *b-aṣ-ṣāmă*	(Exod. 17:3)
			SP *af-ṣāma*	
(199)	*kdḥt*	'fever'	MT *û-b-aq-qaddaḥat*	(Deut. 28:22)
			SP *w-af-qā'dēt*	
(200)	*ś't*	'swelling'	MT *û-l-aś-śᵉ'ēt*	(Lev. 14:56)
			SP *w-al-'šēt*	
(201)	*šby*	'captivity'	MT *b-aš-šebî*	(Deut. 28:41)
			SP *af-šēbi*	
(202)	*šdpwn*	'blight'	MT *û-b-aš-šiddāpôn*	(Deut. 28:22)
			SP *w-af-šādāfon*	
(203)	*šḥpt*	'consump-tion'	MT *b-aš-šaḥepet*	(Deut. 28:22)
			SP *af-šā'fēt*	

C6) Man

(204–206)	*glglt*	'head: scull'	MT *l-ag-gulgōlet*	(Exod. 16:16; 38:26; Num. 3:47)
			SP *al-gilgālat*	
(207–211)	*mṭh*	'tribe'	MT *l-am-maṭṭeh*	(Num. 1:4; 31:4[2], 5, 6)
			SP *al-maṭṭi*	
(212)	*mt*	'dead'	MT *b-am-mēt*	(Num. 19:18)
			SP *bā-mət*	
(213–219)	*ṣb'*	'army'	MT *l-aṣ-ṣābă*	(Num. 4:3, 30; 31:3, 4, 6, 36; Deut. 24:5)
			SP *al-ṣāba*	
(220)	*šbṭ*	'tribe'	MT *l-aš-šābeṭ*	(Deut. 1:23)
			SP *al-šābaṭ*	

C7) Products

(221–224)	*bgd*	'garment'	MT *b-ab-beged*	(Lev. 13:49, 51, 53, 57)
			SP *bā-bēgad*	
(225)	*byt*	'house'	MT *wᵉ-l-ab-bāyit*	(Lev. 14:55)
			SP *w-al-bət*	
(226)	*dlt*	'door'	MT *ū-b-ad-delet*	(Deut. 15:17)
			SP *w-af-dēlət*	
(227)	*ṭn'*	'basket'	MT *b-aṭ-ṭene'*	(Deut. 26:2)
			SP *af-ṭāna*	
(228–229)	*yyn*	'wine'	MT *b-ay-yayin*	(Gen. 49:11; Deut. 14:26)
			SP *ab-yayyən*	
(230–233)	*lḥm*	'bread'	MT *b-al-leḥem*	(Gen. 47:17, 19; Num. 21:5; Deut. 23:5)
			SP *ab-'lēm*	
(234)	*mlḥ*	'salt'	MT *b-am-melaḥ*	(Lev. 2:13)
			SP *bā-mēla*	

(235)	*spr*	'book'	MT *b-as-sēper*	(Exod. 17:14)
			SP *b-asfar*	
(236)	*qbr*	'grave'	MT *b-aq-qāber*	(Num. 19:18)
			SP *af-qābar*	
(237)	*škr*	'strong drink'	MT *û-b-aš-šēkār*	(Deut. 14:26)
			SP *w-af-šēkar*	
(238–241)	*šty*	'warp'	MT *b-aš-ševtī*	(Lev. 13:49, 51[2], 57)
			SP *af-šēʾtay*	

C8) Instruments

(242)	*mdkh*	'mortar'	MT *b-am-meʾdâkâh*	(Num. 11:8)
			SP *b-amdūka*	
(243)	*mwṭ*	'pole'	MT *b-am-môṭ*	(Num. 13:23)
			SP *bā-moṭ*	
(244)	*mrḥšt*	'pan'	MT *b-am-marḥešet*	(Lev. 7:9)
			SP *b-amraʾ ēšat*	
(245)	*prwr*	'pan'	MT *b-ap-pārûr*	(Num. 11:8)
			SP *bā-firror*	
(246)	*rḥym*	'millstones'	MT *bā-rēḥayim*	(Num. 11:8)
			SP *ab'rīm*	
(247)	*tnwr*	'oven'	MT *b-aṭ-ṭannûr*	(Lev. 7:9)
			SP *af-tinnor*	

C9) Abstracts

(248–249)	*mšpṭ*	'judgement'	MT *b-am-mišpāṭ*	(Lev. 19:15, 35)[67]
			SP *bā-mašfaṭ*	
(250–251)			MT *l-am-mišpāṭ*	(Num. 35:12; Deut. 17:8)
			SP *al-mašfaṭ*	
(252–255)	*str*	'secrecy'	MT *b-as-sēter*	(Deut. 13:7; 27:15, 24; 28:57)
			SP *af-sētar*	
(256)	*ṣmytt*	'completion'	MT *l-aṣ-ṣemîtūt*	(Lev. 25:30)
			SP *al-ṣēmītət*	
(257–260)	*šwʾ*	'vanity'	MT *l-aš-šāwʾ*	(Exod. 20:7[2]; Deut. 5:11[2])
			SP *al-šu*	
(261)	*šqr*	'falsehood'	MT *l-aš-šeqer*	(Lev. 5:24)
			SP *l-ašqar*	

D) Proper nouns with article (3)

(262)	*yrdn*	'Jordan'	MT *l-ay-Yardēn*	(Num. 32:19)
			SP *al-Yardan*	
(263)	*msh*	'Massah'	MT *b-am-Massâh*	(Deut. 6:16)
			SP *bā-Massa*	

---

[67] In Deut. 32:41, the distribution of the article is vice versa: MT *be-mišpāṭ* – SP *b-am-mašfaṭ*.

(264)	*šṭym*	'Shittim'	MT *b-aš-Šiṭṭîm*	(Num. 25:1)
			SP *af-Šiṭṭəm*	

E) Pseudo-Construct (34)

(265–279)	*bywm*		MT *b-ay-yôm*	Lev. 23:7, 35, 39; Num.
			SP *ab-yom*	7:12, 18, 24, 30, 36, 42, 48, 54, 60, 66, 72, 78
(280–296)	*wbywm*		MT *û-b-ay-yôm*	Exod. 12:16[2]; Lev.
			SP *w-ab-yom*	14:10; 15:14. 29; 23:8, 36, 39[2]; Num. 28:25; 29:17, 20, 23, 26, 29, 32, 35
(297–298)	*wbmym ḥḥym*		MT *û-b-am-māyim*	(Lev. 14:52)
	wbṣpwr ḥḥyh		SP *w-bā-məm*	
			MT *û-b-aṣ-ṣippôr*	
			SP *w-af-ṣibbor*	

F) Differences in the textual basis or its understanding (10)

(299–304) 'Then the king of Egypt spoke to the Hebrew midwives (MT *l-am-mᵉyallᵉdôt hā-ʿibriyyôt*, SP *l-amyallēdot ābriyyot*)[68], of whom the name of one was Shiphrah and the name of the other Puah; … But the midwives (MT *ham-mᵉyallᵉdôt*, SP *āmyallēdot*)[69] feared God, and did not do as the king of Egypt commanded them, … So the king of Egypt called for the midwives (MT *l-am-mᵉyallᵉdôt*, SP *l-amyallēdot*) and said to them, "Why have you done this thing, and saved the male children alive?" And the midwives (MT *ham-mᵉyallᵉdôt*, SP *āmyallēdot*) said to Pharaoh, "Because the Hebrew women are not like the Egyptian women; for they are lively and give birth before the midwives (MT *ham-mᵉyallᵉdôt*, SP *āmyallēdot*) come to them." Therefore God dealt well with the midwives (MT *l-am-mᵉyallᵉdôt*, SP *l-amyallēdot*), and the people multiplied and grew very mighty.' (Exod. 1:15–20)

(305–307)	*bqnh (h)ʾḥd*	MT *b-aq-qāneh*	(Exod. 25:33[2]; 37:19)
		SP *af-qāni*	

In these three instances, the cardinal number is determined in MT, while SP lacks the article in accordance with the determination status of the noun in the respective texts.

(308)	*lptḥ ḥṭʾt rbṣ*	MT *l-ap-petaḥ*	(Gen. 4:7)
		SP *al-fēta*	

In SP the noun stands in the status constructus. Therefore, the understanding of the phrase according to SP is entirely different from that in

---

[68] This is the first occurrence of *myldt*, which bears the article in MT, but lacks it in the Samaritan vocalization. Therefore, instead of the noun-adjective-phrase in MT, the Samaritan text reads *lmyldt* in the status constructus, and *hʿbryt* is the rectum.

[69] According to the Samaritan vocalization, the proclitic *h* does not reflect the definite article, but the prosthetic vowel of the noun as it appears in the Samarian Hebrew tradition.

MT and should be translated as follows: '(… then you are) lying at the entrance of sin.'

β. The Samaritan text has the definite article while MT has none (62 cases)

A) Unique referent (25)

A1) Natural

(1)	*rbyb*	'shower'	MT *ki-rbîbîm*	(Deut. 32:2)
			SP *w-k-ar-rēbībəm*	
(2)	*ś‘yr*	'raindrop'	MT *ki-ś‘îrīm* –	(Deut. 32:2)
			SP *k-aš-šī:rəm*	
(3–4)	*šm*	'name'	MT *b^e-šēm* –	(Exod. 33:12, 17)
			SP *b-aš-šēm*	
(5–6)			MT *b^e-šēmôt*	(Num. 1:17; 32:38)
			SP *b-aš-šēmot*	
(7)			MT *ū-b^e-šēmôt*	(Num. 4:32)
			SP *w-b-aš-šēmot*	

A2) Theological

(8)	*mbwl*	'flood'	MT *l^e-mabbûl*	(Gen. 9:15)
			SP *l-am-mabbol*	
(9–22)	*mnḥh*	'grain offering'	MT *l^e-minḥâh*	(Lev. 14:21; Num. 7:13,
			SP *l-am-mā’nā*	19, 25, 31, 37, 43, 49,
				55, 61, 67, 73, 79; 28:5)
(23)	*zr*	'foreigner'	MT *l^e-zārîm*	(Deut. 32:16)
			SP *b-az-zarrəm*	
(24)	*tw‘bh*	'abomina-tion'	MT *b^e-tô‘ēbōt*	(Deut. 32:16)
			SP *w-b-at-tuwwēbot*	

A3) Situational

| (25) | *mṣwlh* | 'depth' | MT *bi-mṣôlōt* | (Exod. 15:5) |
| | | | SP *b-am-māṣālot* | |

B) Particular referent (6)

B1) Anaphoric

– No attestations. –

B2) Cataphoric

(26–27)	*bmqwm (’šr yšḥṭ ’t h‘lh)*	MT *bi-mqôm*	(Lev. 4:24, 33)
		SP *b-am-māqom*	
(28)	*bmqwm (’šr tšḥṭ ’t h‘lh)*	MT *bi-mqôm*	(Lev. 6:18)
		SP *b-am-māqom*	
(29)	*bmqwm (’šr yšḥṭw ’t h‘lh)*	MT *bi-mqôm*	(Lev. 7:2)
		SP *b-am-māqom*	
(30)	*bmqwm (’šr yšḥṭ ’t hḥṭ‘t)*	MT *bi-mqôm*	(Lev. 14:13)
		SP *b-am-māqom*	

| (31) | *bmqwm* (*'šr yškn šm*) | | MT *bi-mqôm* | (Num. 9:17) |
| | | | SP *b-am-māqom* | |

C) Generic use (23)

    C1) Animals

(32–33)	*lby'*	'lion'	MT *kᵉ-lābî*	(Num. 23:24; Deut.
			SP *k-al-libya*	33:20)
(34)			MT *û-k-lābî*	(Num. 24:9)
			SP *w-k-al-libya*	

    C2) Plants

– No attestations. –

    C3) Materials

– No attestations. –

    C4) Measurements and times

(35–36)	*ywm*	'day'	MT *lᵏ-yāmîm*	(Gen. 7:4; Deut. 4:32)
			SP *l-ay-yāməm*	
(37)	*mspr*	'number'	MT *bᵉ-mispār*	(Deut. 25:2)
			SP *b-am-masfar*	

    C5) States

| (38) | *ng'* | 'plague' | MT *kᵉ-nega'* – | (Lev. 14:35) |
| | | | SP *k-an-nēga* | |

    C6) Man

	mt't	'deceiver'	MT *ki-mta'tēa'*	(Gen. 27:12)
			SP *k-am-mētātta*	
(40)	*śkyr*	'hired	MT *kᵉ-śākîr*	(Lev. 25:40)
			SP *k-aš-šākər*	
(41)	*twšb*	'sojourner'	MT *kᵉ-tôšāb*	(Lev. 25:40)
			SP *k-at-tūšab*	

    C7) Products

(42)	*dbš*	'honey'	MT *bi-dbaš*	(Exod. 16:31)
			SP *b-ad-dābaš*	
(43)	*ṣpyḥt*	'wafers'	MT *kᵉ-ṣappîḥît*	(Exod. 16:31)
			SP *k-aṣ-ṣē'fit*	

    C8) Instruments

– No attestations. –

    C9) Abstracts

(44)	*kbdt*	'heaviness'	MT *bi-kbēdūt*	(Exod. 14:25)
			SP *b-ak-kābūdot*	
(45)	*lbn*	'white'	MT *lᵉ-lābān*	(Lev. 13:16, 17)
			SP *l-al-lābən*	

(46–48)	*mṣwr* *wmṣwq*	'siege and distress'	MT *b^e-māṣôr û-b^e-māṣôq* SP *b-am-māṣor w-b-am-māṣoq*	(Deut. 28:53, 55, 57)
(49–52)	*mšmr*	'custody'	MT *b^e-mišmār* SP *b-am-mašmar*	(Gen. 40:3, 4, 7; 41:10)
(53)	*mšpṭ*	'judgement'	MT *b^e-mišpāṭ* SP *b-am-mašfaṭ*	(Deut. 32:41)[70]
(54)	*ṣdq*	'righteous-ness'	MT *b^e-ṣedeq* SP *b-aṣ-ṣēdəq*	(Lev. 19:15)

D) Proper nouns with the article (3)

(55)	*nmrd*	'Nimrod'	MT *k^e-nimrôd* SP *k-an-nimrod*	(Gen. 10:9)
(56–57)	*lwy*	'Levi'	MT *l^e-lēwî* SP *l-al-lībi*	(Num. 26:59; Deut. 10:9)

E) Pseudo-Construct (0)

– No attestations. –

F) Differences in the textual basis or its understanding (5)

(58)			MT *li-šlōšet yāmîm* SP *l-aš-šēlāšat ay-yāməm*	(Exod. 19:15)
(59)			MT *li-šlōš haš-šānîm* SP *l-aš-šēlaš aš-šēnəm*	(Lev. 25:21)

In these two cases, SP has appositional constructions instead of the genitive constructions in MT.

(60-61)			MT *l^e-rôʾš Yôsēp û-l-qodqōd n^{e}zîr ʾeḥā(y)w* SP *l-ar-rēʾoš … w-laq-qadqad …*	(Gen. 49:26; Deut. 33:16)

Unlike MT, in SP the two nouns do not stand in the status constructus.

(62)			MT *bi-mqôm hā-ʿōlâh* SP *b-am-māqom ēšar …*	(Lev. 4:29)

The syntax in MT is different from that in SP.

---

[70] But cf. Lev. 19:15 and 35, where the distribution of the article is vice versa: MT *b-am-mišpāṭ* – SP *bā-mašfaṭ*.