



BRILL

INTELLECTUAL HISTORY
OF THE ISLAMICATE WORLD (2020) 1–18

**Intellectual
History
of the
Islamicate
World**
brill.com/ihw

The Term *ʿiwāḍ* (“Compensation”) and Its Meaning in *Sefer ha-Maslul* and in the Works of Rabbinic and Arab Grammarians

Ali Watad

Beit Berl Academic College, Beit Berl, Israel

aliwated@beitberl.ac.il

Abstract

Sefer ha-Maslul (“Book of the Path”) is a Hebrew grammar book in the Samaritan tradition. The book, known in Arabic as *Kitāb al-Tawṭīya* (“Book of Introduction”), was composed in that language during the first half of the twelfth century and is the earliest and only known surviving Samaritan grammatical work. It was first published by Ze’ev Ben-Haim in his monumental book, *The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic amongst the Samaritans*. Grammatical terminology is key to understanding the theory of a grammarian. One can obtain such understanding by tracking a term throughout a work, examining how it is used and whether its usage is consistent. The term *ʿiwāḍ* (“compensation”) is a central one in *Sefer ha-Maslul*. In this article I will examine the outlook of its author, the grammarian Abū Ishāq b. Mārūt, as well as the term *ʿiwāḍ* and its usages. *Sefer ha-Maslul* was written following the emergence of scientific grammar among Rabbinic, Arab, and Karaite grammarians. Accordingly, I will compare its author’s approach with those of Judah ben David Ḥayyūḡ (a Rabbanite), Ibn Ğinnī (a Muslim) and Abū l-Farāġ Hārūn (a Karaite).

Keywords

Kitāb al-Tawṭīya – *Sefer ha-Maslul* (“Book of the Path”) – grammar – Samaritan tradition – Abū Ishāq b. Mārūt – *ʿiwāḍ* (“compensation”) – *ḥadf wa-naqṣ* (“deletion and absence”) – *idġām* (Assimilation) – visible *nah* – comparison

1 Introduction: Samaritan Literature in Arabic¹

It is a well-attested fact in the scholarly community that the Samaritans in the course of their history used four languages: Hebrew, Greek, Aramaic and Arabic. Studies have shown that there exists a written literature of varying extent in each of these languages. Here we focus on the prolific and varied Samaritan writings in Arabic² in the fields of ritual law, philosophy, philology and lexicography,³ more specifically on grammar, in particular the Samaritan grammarian Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm b. Mārūt's (in Arabic) *Kitāb al-Tawṭīya* (*Sefer Ha-Maslul*) (see below).

1 I would like to thank the reviewers for their important and meaningful comments, which have improved the quality of the article.

2 An important question in this connection is: When did Arabic replace Aramaic (the Samaritans' spoken and written language before they adopted Arabic)? This is an issue that did not attract scholarly attention before H. Shehadeh studied it in depth (Shehadeh, *Tirgum*, pp. 3–12; *idem*, “Matay tafsa,” pp. 515–528). He showed how this issue can shed light on Samaritan literature composed in Arabic. The process whereby a nation ceases to use one language and begins to use another as a result of occupation consists of a number of stages and can take a very long time. Shehadeh (“Matay tafsa,” pp. 515–528) argues that the length of time depends on a number of largely interdependent factors: (1) The occupying nation's attitude towards the occupied nation; (2) the degree of economic, military, social and cultural dependence of the occupied nation on the occupying nation; (3) the occupied nation's geographical condition (does it live in isolation from the new occupying nation or do both live together); (4) Samaritan Aramaic's prestige among its speakers; and (5) the occupying nation's linguistic superiority. The Muslims occupied Palestine and Syria in 634 CE. Among the inhabitants of this region at the time were Jews and Samaritans. The largest concentration of Samaritans was in Šeḥem (Halkin, “Hakdama,” p. 15). It is worth noting that the Samaritans did not abandon their spiritual center at Mt. Gerizim throughout their history. The Samaritans of Šeḥem have thus been living in an Arabic-speaking environment for more than one-thousand years. After the Arab occupation the occupiers' language, Arabic, spread among the Samaritan community and gradually replaced Aramaic, the dominant spoken language in Palestine at the time, as it did throughout the Middle East. By the end of the eleventh century CE (Middle) Arabic had come to dominate intellectual life as well. It came to occupy an important position among the educated classes. The use of Hebrew and Aramaic by the Samaritan community was restricted to the liturgy. In other words, they were used for reading the Pentateuch, for prayer and the like, while Arabic was the language used for oral communication, writing and learning.

3 See Gaster, “Samaritan Literature”; Ben Uzi, *Qadmoni*, pp. 321–327; Watad, *Kitvei*, pp. 10–19.

2 *Kitāb al-Tawṭīya* (*Sefer Ha-Maslul* = "Book of the Path") and Its Author

Avi Yitzhaq Avraham⁴ b. Faraḡ b. Mārūt (in Arabic: Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm b. Faraḡ b. Mārūt), known as the "sun of the sages" is the author of *Kitāb al-Tawṭīya* (*Sefer Ha-Maslul*). Avi Yitzhaq was the greatest Samaritan grammarian. To judge by the Arab writer Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a (d. 668/1270),⁵ he would seem to have lived in Damascus in the twelfth century.⁶ From his title, *šams al-ḥukamā'*, he was clearly a prominent personage.⁷

Kitāb al-Tawṭīya (*Sefer Ha-Maslul*)⁸ is a grammar of the Hebrew language according to the Samaritan tradition. Ben-Hayyim published it in his *Yvrit ve-Aramit nusaḥ Shomron*, vol. 1. This edition is based on a single manuscript, MS B, which belongs to the University Library of Leiden.⁹ It contains the original Arabic text and a Hebrew translation.¹⁰

4 Ben-Hayyim in his edition of the book (see below) wrote the name in the title for some reason as "Avi Yitzhaq Ben Avraham Ben Faraḡ" (*Yvrit ve-Aramit*, vol. 1, p. 3). This is clearly a mistake, since in the same book he himself writes the name (on p. 7) as "Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm b. Faraḡ b. Mārūt".

5 We do not possess any information about the author beyond the few words he mentions at the end of the book and in the book's digest (see below, n. 8), and the information provided by the Arab author Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a in his *Uyūn al-anbā' fī ṭabaqāt al-aṭibbā'*, vol. 2, p. 223 (Ben-Hayyim, *Yvrit ve-Aramit*, 1, p. 7). According to Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a he would seem to have been a physician in the service of Salādin and a teacher of the famous Samaritan physician Muhaḡb al-Dīn Yūsuf b. Abī Sa'īd b. Ḥalaf. See also Noja, "Abū Ishāq," pp. 6–7, who notes that he lived c. 1150–1200 and was called *al-muṣannif* ("the composer").

6 Avi Yitzhaq was apparently the son of Abū l-Ḥasan al-Šūrī (Ab Ḥisda), the translator of the Samaritan Pentateuch into Arabic; Shehadeh, *Ha-Tirgum ha-'arvi*, vol. 1, p. 18. The nickname "Avi Yitzhaq" is based on his father's first name, Ishāq.

7 The fact that the greatest Samaritan grammarian is nowhere mentioned in Samaritan sources, with the exception of his own book and its digest, is a clear evidence for the lack of interest in grammar among the Samaritans.

8 The book's full name in Arabic is *Kitāb al-Tawṭīya fī naḥw al-luḡa al-'ibrāniyya* (*Sefer hamaslul le-diqduq ha-lašon ha-'ivrit*). When the present article was just completed I fortuitously happened upon a PhD thesis on the book: Nihad Hasan Haji al-Dalboohi, *Kitāb al-Tawṭīya. Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm b. Faraḡ b. Mārūt as-Sāmīrī. Introducción, Estudio y Edición*, PhD Thesis, Universidad de Granada, 2013 (from a perusal of this work as well as an article by the same author, seemingly based on the same thesis, it is clear that it is not directly related to the subject at hand and cannot contribute to our discussion. The aforementioned article appeared in *Lārḳ* 12, Baghdad, 2013, pp. 309–332).

9 Ben-Hayyim, *Yvrit ve-Aramit*, vol. 1, p. 12.

10 *Ibid.*, pp. 3–127. A digest of the book was composed by the High Priest El'azar b. Pinḡas b. Yosef, with an addendum by Ab Sakwa b. As'ad al-Sarāwī Hadfana. Both were also published by Ben-Hayyim in the same volume, the former on pp. 175–221 and the second on pp. 253–275.

The book was apparently composed in the first half of the twelfth century. It is the earliest, and only, extant systematic Samaritan grammar. It is incomplete; it was, it seems, never completed by the author. Its content leads us to the conclusion that only a small part is missing.

Avi Yitzhaq does not mention any preceding Samaritan grammarians or grammars.¹¹ However, the principles on which his book is based, the way the material is presented and its well-developed grammatical terminology make it quite clear that *Sefer Ha-Maslul* was not the earliest grammatical work composed within the Samaritan community. The author's opinions and his method of presentation do not differ from the norms encountered in Arabic and Hebrew grammars of his times. He even speaks about Hebrew grammarians in general,¹² but makes no mention at all of Arabic grammarians.¹³

The author bases his grammatical system on the recognition of a triliteral root (see below). It is perhaps the first comprehensive and systematic grammar of the Hebrew language composed by a Samaritan. The author intended to write a textbook, but did not succeed in making it one.

The book has a very clear structure. The language is described as consisting of three parts of speech: noun, verb and particle. He considers nouns to be the most important elements of the language; verbs are in second place, and depend on nouns, while particles are third in rank, and depend on both nouns and verbs. The book is divided into fourteen chapters.¹⁴

11 We do know from early Samaritan exegesis and from remnants of Samaritan Massorah compositions that Samaritans did engage in grammatical inquiry long before the lifetime of the author of *Sefer Ha-Maslul* (Ben-Hayyim, *Yvrit ve-Aramit*, vol. 1, pp. 87-9).

12 Here is one example (all quotes in Arabic are taken as they appear in Ben-Hayyim's edition without correction or adaption):

[...] الا ان من الحروف ما له مخرجين وازيد وذلك يكون في خمسة حروف الباء والداد والواو والفاء والتا وذلك ان كل واحد من هذه الاحرف ما خلا الواو له مخرجان وذلك ان الدال ينطق بها تارة بمنزلة الدال الغير منقوطة في لغة العرب ويسمونها العبرانيون الدقوقيون المدغوشة وتارة بمنزلة الدال المنقوطة عند العرب ويسمونها الدقوقيون المرفية [...]

(Ben-Hayyim, *Yvrit ve-Aramit*, vol. 1, p. 123, lines 5-9): "[...] except for the letters that have two or more articulations each. There are five such letters, *b*, *d*, *w*, *p* and *t*, that is, each of these letters except for *w*. Thus the letter *d* is sometimes pronounced like the letter *d* in Arabic. This is what the *Hebrew grammarians* called 'with *dageš*'. And sometimes it is pronounced like the letter *d* in Arabic, which the *grammarians* call *rafa* [...]" (ibid., p. 122, lines 5-10).

13 Ben-Hayyim, *Yvrit ve-Aramit*, vol. 1, p. 87.

14 Here are the titles of the chapters, in order (the name in Arabic, followed by an English

3 The Aim of the Present Study

The term *'iwad* ("compensation") occupies a central position in the linguistic theory on which *Sefer Ha-Maslul* is based. In the present paper we discuss the author's concept of "compensation" and how he applies it in his grammatical theory. In order to carry out this aim we shall examine every occurrence of this term throughout the book and how its declinations are used in the various contexts.

Sefer Ha-Maslul was composed after the emergence of the science of grammar among rabbinic and Arab grammarians.¹⁵ We shall therefore compare Ibn Mārūt's conception of the term with those of the medieval rabbinic view as represented by Ḥayyūḡ, and with its conception in Arabic grammar as represented by the well-known grammarian Ibn Ğinnī (d. 392/1002).¹⁶

4 The Term *'iwad* ("Compensation") and Its Place in Grammatical Terminology

The root is an abstract concept that is in standard use in contemporary linguistics. Its definition and essence are thus not in doubt. Ḥayyūḡ was the first to have defined the concept in the way that it is understood today. According to his approach a verbal root cannot have fewer than three consonants.¹⁷ By introducing this concept he made Hebrew grammar scientific. The root in this theory is the consonantal scaffolding of all conjugated and derived forms. The scaffolding itself does not have a well-defined meaning. A root's precise

translation): في اقسام الكلام وحد كل واحد من اقسامه وعلامات كل واحد من تلك الاقسام ("On the parts of speech, the definition of each part and the features of each part"); في ذكر ("On nouns"); في الاسما التي ليست بظاهرة ("On substantives"); في ذكر الاسما الظاهرة ("On nouns in the construct form"); في الاسما المشتقة من الافعال ("On nouns derived from verbs"); في اقسام الافعال ("On the parts of verbs"); في الفعل الثقيل ("On the geminated verb"); في الفعل الخفيف ("On the simple verb"); في الافعال ("On the *nif'al* form"); في الافعال ("On the *hitpa'el* form"); في فعل الامر ("On the imperative verb"); في لزوم الافعال وتعديها ("On transitive and intransitive verbs"); في الحروف ("On particles").

15 R. Yehuda Ḥayyūḡ was the first Hebrew grammarian who dealt with Hebrew grammar in a scientific way (See: Watad and Sivan, *Šelošet*, p. ٣). Many years earlier the Arabic grammarian Sibawayhi (full name: Abū Bišr 'Amr b. 'Uṭmān b. Qanbar; lived in the eighth century, ca. 760–796) did the same in his *al-Kitāb* (= "The Book").

16 Ibn Ğinnī, full name Abū l-Faḥr 'Uṭmān b. Ğinnī was born in Mosul, Iraq. He composed numerous books on grammar, among them *al-Ḥaṣā'is*.

17 Eldar, "Hitpaḥut", pp. 21–32; Dotan, *Nitzanīm*, p. 61; Watad, *Mišnato*, p. 16.

meaning is determined with the help of the vowels and/or consonants that are added to the scaffolding during the process of conjugation or derivation. Before Ḥayyuḡ various conceptions of the root were in vogue. An earlier view of the root was based on “stable letters”.¹⁸ This view was held by Menaḥem Ben Saruq (c. 920–970), Yehuda Ben Qurayš (10th century) and their contemporaries, as well as Karaite grammarians such as David Ben Avraham al-Fāsi (c. 10th century) and Abū l-Faraḡ Hārūn (10th century).¹⁹ A root, according to this theory, could consist of three, two or even one consonant, which is retained throughout the conjugation.²⁰

Ḥayyuḡ’s innovation, as noted above, gave a scientific basis to the description of verbal conjugation. In order to understand a grammarian’s arguments, it is necessary to examine the grammatical terminology that he uses in his work/s. Such an examination can help us gain an in-depth understanding of this grammatical terminology.

For Ḥayyuḡ the Bible’s regular verbs are assumed to be known (that is, it is the other forms that require explanation).²¹ The defective forms are conjugated in analogy to the regular verbs. He provides a number of explanations for the changes which the analogous forms undergo with respect to the main form. One of these is “compensation” for elements that are missing in a defective verb.

The grammarian Avi Yitzhaq lived, as already noted, in the twelfth century, about two-hundred years after Ḥayyuḡ. A reading of his *Sefer Ha-Maslul* and the discussions there of various forms lead us to conclude that he, too, adhered to the trilateral root theory. However, we cannot prove any direct influence by rabbinic grammar on his views. He may have learned about the trilateral root from Arab grammarians, among whom this view was in vogue even before Ḥayyuḡ.

Grammatical terminology is the key to understanding a grammarian’s philological approach. Such understanding is only possible when one examines the usage of terms throughout the author’s book or books and the extent to which this usage is consistent.²²

The terms *ḥadf wa-naqš* (“deletion and omission”) and *idḡām* (“assimilation”) refer to processes that bring about the absence of an element of a defective form that is present in a regular form, while the term *ʿiwad* (“compen-

18 Becker, *Risāla*, pp. 62–63 surveys these grammarians’ views on the root in the footnotes.

19 Vidro, *Verbal Morphology*, pp. 29–31; Vidro, *A Medieval Karaite Pedagogical Grammar*. For morphological notions of other Karaite grammarians, see Khan, “Morphology in the medieval Karaite tradition.”

20 Dotan, *Nitzanim*, p. 61.

21 Watad, *Mišnato*, p. 3; Tene, *Hasaga*, pp. 70–71.

22 Watad, *Mišnato*, p. 22.

sation") denotes the presence of a different element that substitutes for the missing element in relation to the main or regular form. Such compensation takes place in order to make the form under discussion more similar to the regular form.²³

[...] وقد بقي من انواع الفعل الخفيف الذى يدخلها الاعتيال نوع وهو الفعل الذى فيه حرف من شانه فيه ان يحذف ويتعوض عنه بتشديد وهذا النوع ينقسم قسمين احدهما ما فاه حرف ادغام ويسمى ذوات الادغام والثانى ما اشتهب عينه ولامه ويسمى ذوات المثلين²⁴

[...] There is one other type of verb in the *qal* form which is defective, namely a verb that contains a letter whose property it is to be dropped, and as compensation it receives a *dageš forte*. This type is divided into two parts: One of them is a verb whose first radical belongs to the assimilated letters. This is called an assimilating verb. The other type is a verb whose second and third radical are similar. This is called geminate.²⁵

Another example:

[...] واما الادغام اعنى حذف حرف والتعويض عنه بالتشديد فانما تحدثت للحرف في مواضع مخصوصة من الفعل فكذلك لا يسمى الحرف التى هذا شانها حروف العلة ولا يسمى الفعل الذى تحدثت فيه هذه الاعتيال معتلا لكنه يسمى اسم اخر وسوف ابين حكم هذه الافعال عند انتها القول اليها²⁶

[...] As for assimilation, by which I mean that a letter is dropped and its *compensation is a dageš forte*, it appears in a letter in special locations in the verb. Therefore the letters that this is their way are not called defective, nor is the verb in which they occur called a defective verb, but by another name. I shall explain the rules of these verbs when I come to discuss them.²⁷

We learn from the above that according to the grammarian Avi Yitzhaq "compensation" has three realizations, as follows:

23 Ibid.

24 Ben-Hayyim, *Ivrit ve-Aramit*, vol. 1, p. 83, lines 3–6.

25 Ibid., vol. 1, p. 83, lines 3–6.

26 Ibid., vol. 1, p. 71, lines 17–20.

27 Ibid., vol. 1, p. 70, lines 21–25.

1. Gemination (*dageš*) of the letter next to the one that was dropped in the word

In the conjugation of such a form one of the consonants is dropped for some reason, so that the resulting form is defective when compared to the corresponding regular form. The dropped consonant is assimilated to an immediately preceding or following consonant. The assimilating consonant receives a *dageš forte* in compensation for the dropped consonant. Avi Yitzhaq speaks of two types: Consonants that are ordinarily dropped and assimilated (*n, y, l*) and geminate verbs, with identical seconds and third radicals. Examples:

A. Verbs In and geminates

In the verb נִשָּׂא [nāša] the first radical *n* is dropped in the future tense and therefore the second radical is geminated: נִשְׂא [yišša]. The same is true of the verb *bzz*, in which the second radical *z* is dropped in the future tense and therefore the first radical is geminated: יִבְבֵּז [yibbāz].²⁸ As Avi Yitzhaq says

[...] ואما الوجه الرابع من الاعتلال وهو الادغام فهو ان يحذف الحرف ويتعوض بتشديد الحرف الذي بعده واما الحرف الذي قبله اما ما يحذف ويشدد عوضه الحرف الذي بعده فمثل ما تحذف النون من נשׂא في الاستقبال ويشد عوضها الشين في قولك נשׂא واما ما يحذف ويشد عوضه الحرف الذي قبله فمثل ما يحذف الزاي من יבבז في المستقبل في قولك יבבז وربما فرق بين تشديد الحرف الذي قبل المحذوف وتشديد الحرف الذي بعده ويسمى الاول تعويضا والثاني ادغاما [...] ²⁹

[...] As for the fourth type of defectiveness, namely assimilation, it involves the dropping of a letter, and in compensation a *dageš forte* is placed in the preceding or following letter. As for a verb in which [a letter] is dropped and as compensation the following letter is geminated, an example is the dropping of the *n* in [nāša] in the future and placing a *dageš* in the *š* in compensation, as in [yišša]. And as for a verb in which [a letter] is dropped and as compensation the preceding letter is geminated, an example is the dropping of the *z* in [bazaz] in the future, as in [yibbāz]. Occa-

28 In the Samaritan Pentateuch the verb from the root *bzz* does not occur in the third person masculine singular form of the future. The third person masculine plural appears in Gen. 34:27, 29 (pronounced [wyibbāzu]) and the second person feminine singular in Deut. 20:14 (pronounced [tibbāz]). I derived the third person masculine singular form in the text from these two forms.

29 Ben-Hayyim, *Ivrit ve-Aramit*, vol. 1, p. 71, lines 9–14.

sionally one distinguishes between the *dageš forte* that is placed before the dropped letter and the one placed after the dropped letter; the first is called *compensation* while the latter [is called] assimilation [...]³⁰

B. Conjugation in the future tense of the roots *yšʿ*, *yšb*

The same goes for the conjugation of the basic form (*qal*) of verbs from the roots *yšʿ*, *yšb* in the future tense. The first radical *y* is dropped and assimilated into the second radical. Thus the basic form of the verb from the root *yšb* in the past is יִשָּׁב [yāššāb] while the future tense is conjugated according to the pattern [ʿefʿel] and so the third person masculine singular form should be *יִיִּשָּׁב [yiyšeb], but the first radical *y* is dropped and assimilated to the second radical, which receives a *dageš forte*, producing the Samaritan pronunciation [yiššāb]. In the words of Avi Yitzhaq:

[...] والرابع ان يدغم في عين الفعل كقولك في مستقبل يצא وفي مستقبل ישב ישב
 كقوله تعالى ויצא משה ואלעזר הכהן وذلك ان اليا مع كونها حرف علة على ما ذكرنا هي
 حرف ادغام على ما نين في ذكرنا احرف الادغام [...]³¹

[...] The fourth is that it [the first radical] is assimilated into the second radical, as in the future of *yšʿ*: [yīššā], and the future of *yšb*: [yiššāb], as the Exalted One said: ויצא משה ואלעזר הכהן (Nu. 31:13 in the Samaritan Pentateuch). The reason for this is that the *y*, being a defective letter as mentioned above, is a letter that is assimilated, as we shall explain when we discuss the assimilated letters [...]³²

C. Geminate verbs: Conjugation of verbs from roots such as *rnn*, *šmm*

[...] ואما ذوات المثلين ففيه وجهان احدهما ان يجرى مجرى السالم في انه لا يتاثر لا بحذف
 ولا بابتدال نحو השמים من שמם הרנין מן רנן والثانى ان تحذف عين الفعل وهو احد المثلين
 ويشد عوضه فا الفعل كقولك في ثقيل שמם השם وفي ثقيل סבב הסב قال تعالى והשמתי
 את מקדשכם³³

³⁰ Ibid., vol. 1, p. 70, lines 11–18.

³¹ Ibid., vol. 1, p. 77, lines 5–7.

³² Ibid., vol. 1, p. 76, lines 7–11.

³³ Ibid., vol. 1, p. 97, lines 13–16.

[...] And what concerns those with the two same [consonants], it has two facets. Either they conjugate like regular verbs and undergo neither dropping nor replacement, such as הַשְּׁמִים from *šmm* or הַרְנִין from *rnn*. Or they drop the second radical, one of the two identical ones, and as compensation the first radical is geminated, as in the “heavy” form of *šmm*: הַשֵּׁם, or in the “heavy” form of *sbb*: הַסֵּב. Almighty God said: ³⁴את מקדשכם והשמתים³⁵ (Lev. 26:31, in the Samaritan Pentateuch).³⁵

D. The conjugation of *nif'al*

The characteristic consonant *n* of *nif'al* forms is dropped in the conjugation of the future, and as a result the first radical receives a *dageš forte* to compensate for the element that is missing in comparison to the regular form:

الانفعال على ما تقدم بيانه هو دخول نون زائدة على الفعل الثلاثي يشتد معها فاوه [...] بدخوله على الخفيف يكون على هذه الصفة اما على سالمه فليس يحدث فيه الا ما يقتضيه الانفعال وذلك نحو قولنا نكرت من كرت واما دخوله على ذوات المثلين ففيه وجهان احدهما ان يخذف احد المثلين ويشد عوضه فا الفعل نحو تسم من سمم والثاني ان يبقى فيه المثلين بحالها نحو قولك تسمم من سمم [...] ³⁶

Nif'al, as we noted above, is formed by adding *n* to the trilateral verb, with an attendant *dageš* in the first radical [...] When it is applied to the basic form, this is how it behaves: When the root is regular the only thing that happens is what the *nif'al* requires, as, for example, one says נכרת from כרת. When it is formed from a geminate root there are two possibilities: One, that one of the identical consonants is dropped and *as compensation the first radical receives a dageš*, as in תשמ from שمم; the other, that the two identical consonants are retained as they are, as in תשמם from שمم [...] ³⁷

34 Pronounced [wāššimti]; thus the third person masculine singular form would be: [āššem].

35 Ben-Hayyim, *Ivrit ve-Aramit*, vol. 1, p. 96, lines 16–21.

36 *Ibid.*, vol. 1, pp. 99–101, lines 15–16, 1–4.

37 *Ibid.*, vol. 1, pp. 98–100, lines 21–22, 1–5.

2. Addition of a “visible quiescent” element³⁸ as compensation for *dageš forte*

Verbs *iw/y* in *pi'el* and *hitpa'el* can be conjugated in one of two ways, either as regular verbs, for example קוים, קים, והתקיים, or on the pattern of geminate roots, with a doubling of the third radical and an unpronounced second radical, as in קומם, קומם and התקומם. Avi Yitzhaq explains the latter pattern as follows: Because the *dageš* of the second radical that is typical of *hitpa'el* [a “heavy” *binyan*] is dropped, an unpronounced letter is added to compensate for the missing *dageš*:

الافتعال هو دخول ها وتا زايدتين على الفعل الثلاثي والفعل الثلاثي ما ذكرنا قبيل قسمين احدهما الخفيف والثاني هو احد ضربى الثقيل وهو الشديد العين وعين الفعل شديدة في الافتعال على كل حال عن خفيف كان او عن هذا الضرب من الثقيل اما افتعال الخفيف فمثل התנפל من נפל واما افتعال الثقيل مثل התקדש من קדש وربما يعوض عن تشديد عين الفعل في الافتعال بحرف مد تكون بين فا الفعل وعينه مثل התכונן.³⁹

Hitpa'el is formed by adding *h* and *t* to the trilateral verb. The trilateral verb, as we noted above, is divided into two types, one “light” and the other is two kinds of “heavy”, that is, with a *dageš* in the second radical. The second radical has a *dageš* in *hitpa'el* in every case, whether derived from light or a heavy form of this kind. As for *hitpa'el* derived from a “light” form, it is like התנפל from נפל, while *hitpa'el* derived from a “heavy” form is like התקדש from קדש. Occasionally a letter of lengthening will be added as compensation for the *dageš* in the second radical of *hitpa'el*, between the first and second radicals, as in התכונן.⁴⁰

See also Avi Yitzhaq’s comments on “heavy” verbs:

اعلم ان الفعل الثقيل هو الفعل الذى يزيد على ثلاثة احرف لانا قد قلنا قبيل ان الفعل الثلاثي يسما خفيفا وتقول من هاهنا ان الفعل الذى تزيد حروفه على الثلاثة يسما ثقيلًا وهذا الفعل

38 Ibid., vol. 1, p. 103, lines 6–10. In Hebrew נח נראה, a term created by medieval Hebrew grammarians as a translation of the Arabic grammatical term ساكن ظاهر, denoting a letter that is written but not pronounced, like the letter *aleph* in the word תאמר, or the letter *yod* in the word שיר (Watad, *Mišnato*, pp. 30–31).

39 Probably pronounced [*itkunən].

40 Ben-Hayyim, *Ivrit ve-Aramit*, vol. 1, p. 102, lines 10–16.

ينقسم قسمين احدهما ما كان من ثلاثة احرف غير ان فيه تعويض عن حرف رابع والثاني ما كانت حروفه اكثر من ثلاثة [...] ⁴¹

Know that a heavy verb is one with more than three letters. For as we already said above, a trilateral verb is called light, so that a verb with more than three letters is called heavy. Such a verb is of two kinds: Either it consists of three letters with *compensation* for a fourth letter, or it possesses more than three letters [...] ⁴²

3. A “visible quiescent” element as compensation for a vowel

In the Samaritan pronunciation the first person singular and the second person feminine singular of the past tense are identical, while in writing they differ, in that the first person singular form has an added letter *y*. Avi Yitzhaq explains that these two forms are identical in pronunciation but that in writing the first person singular has a *y* marking vowel length as compensation for the *hireq* vowel:

[...] واما ضمير الموثنة المفردة المخاطبة فهو التا المكسورة مثل ضمير المتكلم نحو אמרת ודברת
قال الله تعالى وولדת بن וקראת א, ש, י, וيفرق بين هذا الضمير وبين ضمير المتكلم بان ضمير
المتكلم يتعوض عن الكسرة فيه في الكتابة بيا وهذا الضمير يكتب بغير يا والكلام في هذا انما
يجي عند الكلام في احكام الخط [...] ⁴³

[...] And as for the second person feminine singular pronoun, it is a *t* with *hireq*, like the pronoun of the first person singular, as in אמרת and ודברת. God Almighty said: [Gen. 16:11, Samaritan Pentateuch]. This pronoun can be distinguished from that of the first person singular, for the latter is written with the letter *y* as compensation for *hireq*, while this pronoun is written without *y*. This issue will be discussed when we speak about spelling rules [...] ⁴⁴

⁴¹ Ibid., vol. 1, p. 85, lines 2–5.

⁴² Ibid., vol. 1, p. 84, lines 2–6.

⁴³ Ibid., vol. 1, p. 23, lines 14–18.

⁴⁴ Ibid., vol. 1, p. 22, lines, 18–21.

5 Comparison with Rabbinic Grammarians

Avi Yitzhaq's use of the term *'iwad* ("compensation") does not differ markedly from the usage of medieval rabbinic grammarians or from that of contemporary Arabic grammarians. Below I present the views of the grammarians Ḥayyuḡ⁴⁵ and Ibn Ġinnī, as prominent representatives of these two groups of grammarians, respectively.

Ḥayyuḡ uses the concept of compensation to explain the structure of words that were modified due to elision of a vowel or a consonant from the regular form in its transformation into its final form. He mentions three ways compensation can be realized:

1. Compensation by means of a consonant

As in the words *שָׁבַת*, *רָדַת* and *דָּעַת*, in which the letter *t* is added at the end of the infinitive form, as compensation for the missing first radical, *y*. In his words:

[...] וקד תזאד אלתא פי מצאדר הדה אלאלפעאל עוצ'א מן אליא אלסאקטה פיקאל
רָדַת שָׁבַת דָּעַת באלפתח מן אג'ל אלעין לאנה תקל אן יקאל דָּעַת באלסגול [...] ⁴⁶

[...] It may happen that the letter *t* is added to the infinitive form of these verbs as compensation for the dropped *y*. Then one says *דָּעַת*, *שָׁבַת*, *רָדַת*, [the latter] with the vowel *a*, because they had difficulty in pronouncing *דָּעַת* with *e* [...]

2. Compensation by means of a "weak quiescent" element (*naḥ ne'elam*)⁴⁷

This is the most common type of compensation in Ḥayyuḡ's grammar. It usually appears after the prefixes of the future tense or the participle, not necessarily before or after the letter that has been dropped. The weak quiescent element

45 R. Yehuda Ḥayyuḡ, in Arabic: Abū Zakariyyā Yaḥyā b. Dāwūd, known as Ḥayyūḡ, was the greatest Hebrew grammarian in the Middle Ages. He lived in the first half of the tenth century and was the first to have dealt with Hebrew grammar "scientifically" (Basal, *Nutaf*, pp. 7–9; Watad and Sivan, *Šelošet*, p. xvii).

46 Watad and Sivan, *Šelošet*, p. 57, lines 8–9; Ḥayyuḡ, *Kitāb al-af'āl*, pp. 38–39, lines 3–19.

47 In Hebrew *naḥ ne'elam* (נח נעלם), a translation of the Arabic term *sākin layyin* (ساکن لاین). This is a very important concept in Ḥayyuḡ's grammatical approach, one which he introduced into Hebrew grammar. It stands for a phonetic element. For example, in the word *qam* (קַם) there is a sound between the consonants *q* and *m*, expressed through the length of the *qameš* vowel under the *q*. This length is the *naḥ ne'elam* (Watad, *Mišnato*, pp. 30–31; Goldberg, "Al ha-šoḥen," p. 291; Eldar, "Al-Sākin al-layyin," pp. 1–9; Dotan, "Balšanut," p. 123; Basal, *Torato*, pp. 67–87).

serves as compensation for a dropped consonant or a dropped vowel. The form יקום is explained thus by Ḥayyuḡ:

I will add an explanation for this, namely that the fundamental form of יקום is יקיום [yiqyowm, where the *w* serves to mark vowel length], as in יִשְׁמֹר, יִשְׁפֹּט. The vowel of the *y*, which is the second radical, is perceived as “heavy” and it was therefore dropped. When [the *y*] was deprived [of the following vowel] four unvocalized consonants came together: *q*, *y*, *w* and *m* [i.e., *yiqywm]. Since this cannot be pronounced in the language of the Hebrews, the *w* was dropped [i.e., *yiqym] and the first radical *q* was vocalized with the *y*'s [vowel] *qibbuṣ* [i.e., the original *o/u* vowel following *y*, creating the form *yiquym*]. The [radical letter] *y* was transformed into *w* because of what preceded it [i.e., the vowel *u*]. And since they placed a vowel after the *q* which [in the regular form] is not followed by a vowel, they needed an unpronounced element to replace [the unvocalized *q*; this is the unvocalized element after the four future prefixes *ʔ*, *y*, *t*, *n*] [i.e., *yiquwm* > *yaquwm*, giving rise to a new situation, in which *y* forms a syllable with a following *a* vowel; note that after *hireq* there is no *naḥ neʿelam*, which is why the vowel of the prefix was turned into *qameṣ*]. Remember this and understand, for you will only find an unpronounced element after the prefixes [of the future tense] after a verb some of whose vowels were dropped, as in יקום, whose fundamental form is יקיום.⁴⁸

3. Compensation by *dageš*

This kind of compensation appears in a consonant that is adjacent to the dropped consonant in a variety of different types of defective verbs. Here are a few examples:

The form יצק: Here there is a *dageš* instead of a “weak quiescent” element [resulting from the lack of a vowel following the first radical *y*]. The *dageš* compensates for the missing first radical in the original form *יצק.

The form יצק (Deut. 9:21) instead of יצק. Ḥayyuḡ says about this form that

التشديد عوض من نقصانها وتكميل لها

The *dageš* is compensation for what is missing [from the fundamental form] and complements it.⁴⁹

48 Wataḏ and Sivan, *Šelošet*, p. 101, lines 8–13; Ḥayyuḡ, *Kitāb al-afʿāl*, p. 69, lines 7–15.

49 Ḥayyuḡ, *Kitāb al-afʿāl*, p. 248, lines 9–13.

The grammarian Ibn Ğinnī, who also lived in the tenth century, explains the term *'iwad* ("compensation") in his *Kitāb al-Ḥaṣā'is*, where he makes a distinction between this term and بدل ("replacement"). He explains that in the latter case the replaced consonant is similar to the consonant that replaces it and takes its place in the sequence [of sounds] in the word, so that no compensation is necessary. In his words:

جماع ما في هذا ان البدل اشبه بالمبدل منه من العوض بالمعوض منه. وانما يقع البدل في موضع المبدل منه، والعوض لا يلزم ذلك، الا تراك تقول في الالف من قام: انها بدل من الواو التي هي عين الفعل، ولا تقول فيها: انها عوض منها ... وتقول في العوض: ان التاء في عدة، وزنة، عوض من فاء الفعل، ولا تقول: انها بدل منها [...]

To sum up this matter, a replacement is more similar to that which is replaced than the compensation is to what it compensates for. The replacement is located where the replaced consonant was, while in the case of compensation this need not be the case. After all, the [ā] of قام replaces the second radical *w* and you do not say that it is compensation for the second radical [...] while with respect to compensation you would say that the *t* of عدة and زنة is compensation for the first radical, not a replacement [...]⁵⁰

Ibn Ğinnī uses similar arguments as explanation for the realization of the concept of *'iwad*:

1. Compensation by a consonant

The letter *h* (or *tā' marbūta*) in the verbal nouns of *Iy* verbs compensates for the dropping of the first radical *y*. For example:

قال ابو عثمان: ان المصدر اذا كان "فعلة" فالهاء لازمة، لانهم جعلوها عوضا من حذفهم الفاء فصارت لازمة له كما لزمت في "زنادقة" الهاء لانها صارت عوضا من ياء "زناديق"

Abū 'Uṭmān said: Know that when the verbal noun is in the pattern *fi'la* the *h* at the end is necessary, because it is *compensation for the dropped first radical*. Therefore it is necessary, just as it is necessary in the word *زنادقة* as compensation for the *y* of *زناديق*.⁵¹

50 Ibn Ğinnī, *al-Ḥaṣā'is*, vol. 1, p. 265.

51 Ibn Ğinnī, *Munṣif*, vol. 1, p. 198, lines 6–9.

2. The consonant *n* as compensation for *damma* (the vowel *u*)

الا ترى ان النون في "تقومان" انما هي عوض من الضمة في "تقوم"

Do you not see that the *n* in *تقومان* is compensation for the *u* in *تقوم*?⁵²

6 Conclusion

From the discussion above we learn that the grammarian Avi Yitzhaq Avraham b. Mārūt uses the term *ʿiwad* ("compensation") in the same sense as did contemporary and nearly contemporary rabbinic grammarians, and also in the same sense as Arabic grammarians as far as Ḥayyuğ and Ibn Ğinni represent them. Compensation serves to explain the structure of words in which a vowel or a consonant of the original form was dropped in the course of its formation. This concept is clearly distinct from that of "replacement"; we found no examples of compensation where one consonant or vowel replaced another *in situ*.

The difference between Ibn Mārūt's use of the term *ʿiwad* and that of the others mentioned above lies in the extent to which he uses it. He makes relatively less use of the term because his book does not discuss forms systematically but only provides rules and a few examples for each rule, while Ḥayyuğ and Ibn Ğinni discuss the rules and also discuss and explain examples of verbs and nouns.

Bibliography

- Basal, Nasir, *Torato ha-diqduqit šel Rabbi Yehuda Ḥayyuğ*, PhD Thesis, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, 1992.
- Basal, Nasir, *Kitāb al-nuṭaf le-Rabbi Yehuda Ḥayyuğ*, Tel-Aviv: Tel-Aviv University, 2001.
- Becker, Dan, *Ha-“Risāla” šel Yehuda b. Qurayš*, Tel-Aviv: Tel-Aviv University, 1984.
- Ben-Ḥayyim, Zeev, *ʿIvrit ve-Aramit nusah Šomron*, 5 vols, Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute/The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1965–1977.
- Ben ʿUzi, Yaqov Ha-Kohen, "Qadmonei ha-Šomronim ve-ḥiburei ḥaḥmehem ba-lašon ha-ʿavrit," *Kenesset* 4 (1947), pp. 321–327.
- al-Dalboohi, Nihad Hasan Haji, *Kitāb al-Tawṭiya. Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm b. Farağ b. Mārūt as-Sāmīrī. Introducción, Estudio y Edición*, PhD Thesis, Universidad de Granada, 2013.

⁵² Ibid., vol. 1, p. 199, lines 15–16.

- Dotan, Aron, "Balšanut u-balšanut mašva bi-mei ha-beinayim—'iyun be-sugya mi-mišnato šel Yehuda Ḥayyuḡ," *Te'uda* 9 (1995), pp. 117–130.
- Dotan, Aron, *Nitzanim rišonim be-ḥoḥmat ha-milim—min ha-masoret el rešit ha-milona'ut ha-ivrit*, Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 2005.
- Eldar, Ilan, "Hitpathut musag ha-šoreš ha-'ivri," *Divre ha-kenes ha-ivri ha-mada'i ha-šemini be-Eropa, Barcelona University*, Jerusalem: Brit 'ivrit 'olamit, 1989, pp. 21–32.
- Eldar, Ilan, "Gilgulo šel musag 'al-sākin al-layyin' {'ha-naḥ ha-ne'elam'} mi-Sefarad le-Eretz Yisra'el," *Miscelánea de Estudios Árabes y Hebraicos* 33 (1984), pp. 1–9.
- Gaster, Moshe, "Samaritan Literature," *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (first edition), ed. Martijn Teodoor Houtsma, Leiden: Brill, 1934, vol. 4, separate fascicle at the end of the volume.
- Goldenberg, Gideon, "'Al ha-šoḥen he-ḥalaq ve-ha-šoreš ha-'ivri," *Lešonenu* 44 (1980), pp. 281–292.
- Halkin, Ivraham Shelomo, "Introduction to a New Edition," *The Samaritans*, ed. James A. Montgomery, New York: Ktav Pub. House 1968, p. 15.
- Ḥayyuḡ, Abū Zakariyyā Yaḥyā b. Dāwūd, *Kitāb al-af'āl dawāt hurūf al-layyin wa-kitāb al-af'āl dawāt al-mitlayn li-Abī Zakariyya Yaḥyā b. Dāwūd al-Fāsi al-ma'rūf bi-Ḥayyuḡ*, ed. Moris Jastrow, Leiden: Brill, 1897.
- Ibn Abū Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn al-anbā' fi ṭabaqāt al-aṭibbā'*, 2 vols, ed. August Müller, Cairo/Königsberg: al-Maṭba'a al-Wahbiyya, 1848–1892.
- Ibn Ġinnī, Abū l-Faṭḥ 'Uṭmān, *al-Ḥaṣā'is*, ed. Muḥammad 'Alī al-Naḡḡār, Beirut: Dār al-Hudā li-l-Ṭibā'a wa-l-Našr, 1913.
- Ibn Ġinnī, Abū l-Faṭḥ 'Uṭmān, *al-Munšif: Šarḥ al-Imām Abī l-Faṭḥ 'Uṭmān b. Ġinnī al-Naḥwī li-Kitāb al-tašrīf li-l-Imām Abī 'Uṭmān al-Māzinī al-Naḥwī al-Bašrī*, 3 vols, eds Ibrāhīm Muṣṭafā and 'Abd Allāh Amīn, s.l.: Idārat Iḥyā' al-Turāt al-Qadīm, 1954–1960.
- Khan, Geoffrey, "Morphology in the medieval Karaite tradition," *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics*, eds Geoffrey Khan et al., Leiden: Brill, 2013, vol. 2, pp. 707–712.
- Noja, Sergio, "Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm al-muṣannif," *A Companion to Samaritan Studies*, eds Alan D. Crown, Reinhard Pummer and Abraham Tal, Tübingen: Mohr, 1993, pp. 6–7.
- Shehadeh, Haseeb, *Ha-Tirgum ha-'arvī li-nusaḥ ha-tora ha-šomronit*, 3 vols, PhD Thesis, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1977.
- Shehadeh, Haseeb, "Matay tafsa ha-'arvit et meqom ha-aramit ha-šomronit," *Maḥqerei lašon mugašim li-Ze'ev Ben-Ḥayyim be-haḡi'o le-seva*, eds Moshe Bar-Asher, Aron Dotan, David Tene and Gad Ben-'Ami Sarfatti, Jerusalem: Magnes, 1983, pp. 515–528.
- Tene, David, *Sefer ha-hasaga le-R. Yona Ibn Ġanāḥ*, Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute/The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 2006.
- Vidro, Nadia, *Verbal Morphology in the Karaite Treatise on Hebrew Grammar*: Kitāb al-'Uqūd fi Tašārīf al-Luḡa al-'Ibrāniyya, Leiden: Brill, 2011.

- Vidro, Nadia, *A Medieval Karaite Pedagogical Grammar of Hebrew: A critical Edition and English Translation of Kitāb al-'Uqūd fi Taṣārīf al-Luġa al-'Ibrāniyya*, Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Watad, Ali, "Kitvei ha-Šomronim ba-lašon ha-'arvit," *A B Ḥadšot ha-Šomronim* 980–981 (2007), pp. 10–19.
- Watad, Ali, *Mišnato ha-lešonit šel R. Y. Ḥayyuḡ mi-ba'ad le-munaḥav bi-meqoram ha-'arvi u-ve-tirgumam ha-'ivri*, Haifa: Al-Wadi, 1994.
- Watad, Ali and Daniel Sivan, *Šelošet ḥiburei ha-diqduq šel R. Yehuda Ḥayyuḡ bi-meqoram u-ve-tirgumam le-'ivrit ḥadaša*, Beer Šeba: Ben-Gurion University, 2012.