

Statement by Referee of Senior Thesis

The Senior dissertation entitled:

"Problems of the Massorah"

written by Bernard Bloomstone
(name of student)

- 1) may (with revisions) be considered for publication: (☒)
cannot be considered for publication: (☐)
- 2) may, on request, be loaned by the Library: (☒)
may not be loaned by the Library: (☐)

Samuel Sandmel
(signature of referee)

Dr. Samuel Sandmel
(referee)

March 7, 1958
(date)

mic. 6/78

PROBLEMS OF THE MASSORAH

Bernard Bloomstone

"Thesis submitted in partial
fulfillment of requirements
for the Master of Hebrew
Letters Degree and
Ordination"

"Hebrew Union College-
Jewish Institute of Religion,
Cincinnati, Ohio"

1958

Referee, Professor S. Sandmel

SUMMARY

Problems of the Massorah is concerned with the early history of the Massoretic text. At the same time it serves to inform the reader of the progress made by scholarship in this field of study.

The essay asks whether or not there existed a second century CE. textus receptus of the Hebrew Bible? What were the conditions that created the need for a uniform text? What activities did the Soferim or Rabbis engage in when they established the uniform text?

The paper commences with a discussion of the relationship that existed between the LXX, Philo, Josephus, and the authoritative Rabbinic writings. It then proceeds to list possible historical factors which may have created the need for a uniform Hebrew text. The conclusion reached is that a textus receptus was written somewhere during the first and early part of the second century CE., but exactly when, we do not know.

The essay continues with an examination of the activities involved in the establishment of a universally accepted Hebrew text. These labours: are majority and minority readings, mikera soferim, 'ittur soferim, construing words with either the preceding or subsequent clause, tikuna soferim, punctus extraordinarius, inverted nun, suspended letters, open and closed sections, sedarim, verse and word division, katib

and keri. Of the many activities, however, the nikera soferim, is the one area where manuscripts and modern scholarship are in agreement. As far as the remaining categories or canons are concerned, we may say with some degree of surety, that because of the very many theories that have been advanced we cannot render a decisive decision in regard to their date, their significance, and their relationship to an universally accepted Hebrew text.

Since conclusions cannot be drawn on the basis of the activity of the Soferim, the essay returns to the first problem, a second century textus receptus. It questions the tenability of such a theory by raising the following problems. The Massoretic order of the books of the Prophets and the Hagiographa differs from that of the Talmud. The Talmud contains readings which differs from the Massoretic text. Private codices are at variance with the Massoretic text. Massorites Ben Asher and Ben Naftali differ. The essay however, does not offer a solution. It only shows that the sources indicate the possibility of an unsettled text as late as the ninth century CE.

Therefore, the paper concludes with the remark, "The Massorah requires further investigation".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1.
Tradition and Scholarship.....	1.
Existing relationship between LXX and Rabbinics.....	3.
Historical factors necessitating a second century C.E. textus receptus.....	6.
Majority and Minority readings.....	6, 12.
Mikra Soferim.....	13.
'Itur Soferim.....	13.
Whether one must construe words with the pre- ceding or subsequent clause.....	14.
Tikune Soferim.....	14.
Punctua Extraordinaria.....	16.
Inverted <u>nun</u>	18.
Suspended Letters.....	19.
Open and closed sections.....	20.
Sedarim.....	22.
Verse division.....	22.
Word division.....	26.
Ketib-Keri.....	26.
A textus receptus questioned.....	30.
Notes.....	33.
Bibliography.....	66.

The MASSORAH is the technical apparatus which describes and determines the external form of the Hebrew Bible. It is the product of over ten centuries and the result of various influences. Hence, it is a vast field of study.

We shall in this essay deal only with a very small portion of the MASSORAH, the early Rabbinic period (though it too can be divided into various categories).

One of the main obstacles which confronts the historian of the MASSORAH is the nature of the secondary literature. Very few scholars have written what may be called comprehensive or even elaborate histories of the MASSORAH. The student must rely on relatively brief articles or labours dealing with specific subjects; he must first collate such isolated segments of information, and only then proceed to write his history. This the reader will find quite evident when he reads this essay.

The essay asks whether or not there existed a second century CE. textus receptus of the Hebrew Bible? What were the conditions that created the need for a uniform text? What activities did the Soferim or Rabbis engage in when they established the uniform text?

When these problems are dealt with we shall notice that,

A) even though certain sources indicate a second century CE. Hebrew textus receptus there is evidence that the

Hebrew text was not a uniform text until about the ninth century CE.

- B) the significance of the activity of the Soferim, is, generally, unknown to us and can, therefore, not be used as evidence for the early establishment of a uniform authoritative Hebrew text.

"Moses received the Torah on Sinai, and handed it down to Joshua; Joshua to the elders; the elders to the prophets; and the prophets to the men of the Great Synagogue." (1) This Tannaitic source presents in one sentence the complete traditional history of the Pentateuchal text.

For support traditional history offers the text of Deuteronomy 4.2. There we read, "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you." This commandment justified the creation of an accepted and unalterable Biblical text. It is difficult to say whether or not the Deuteronomic legislation was strictly observed. Philo says, "And though many years have passed, I cannot tell the exact number, but more than two thousand, the Jews have never altered one word of what was written by Moses." (2) Josephus states, "During so many ages as have elapsed no one has been so bold as to add anything to the words of Scripture or to take anything therefrom." (3) From this testimony we may conclude that in the time of Philo and Josephus the Biblical text, probably the one we now possess, was accepted as authoritative and as a book never tampered with or to be tampered with by man.

On the other hand, modern Biblical scholarship maintains that the Biblical text has undergone a great deal of revision and editorializing. A comparison of the books of

Samuel, Kings and Chronicles supplies evidence that the stories recounted in these books have been altered, at one time or another. (4) More significant is the evidence, revealed in critical studies of the Bible, that the Pentateuchal text when completed was also subjected to the pen of the editor or reviser. (5)

Two approaches to the Bible have been stated. Which are we to uphold? If we turn to tradition, by accepting Deuteronomy 4.2, Philo, and Josephus, then, we are immediately confronted with a series of problems, of which I list only a few.

1. The readings of the LXX and the Samaritan prove that until the period of the first and second centuries the Hebrew text was dealt with arbitrarily. (6) Why, for example, do we find a deviation in the LXX and Samaritan translation of Genesis 41.48 (7) where we read, *των ετα εβαν εν ος ην η ευονια εν τη γη Αιγυπτου*

"and he gathered all the food of the seven years, in which was the plenty in the land of Egypt", while the Hebrew reads, *וַיַּגְדֵּל יוֹסֵף אֶת־כָּל־הַמִּזְבָּן הַזֶּה הָיָה הַשָּׁנָה הַשְּׁבִיעִית*

"and he gathered up all the food of the seven years, which were in the land of Egypt." (8)

2. The Hebrew text from which the LXX translation was made exhibits a large number of passages in which the words are otherwise divided. (9)

The Mekilta to Exodus 12.40 mentions the variants but has

nothing to say about divine inspiration. *יחזקאל בן בוזי ויחזקאל בן בוזי
אשר ישבו במצרים ויחזקאל בן בוזי אשר ישבו במצרים
ואשר ישבו במצרים - זה אחד מן הדברים שכתבו לאלה
הנאמק כיוצא בו כתבו לו אלמנה אשר ישבו במצרים ויחזקאל
כתבו לו יחזקאל בן בוזי אשר ישבו במצרים ויחזקאל
בן בוזי ויחזקאל בן בוזי אשר ישבו במצרים ויחזקאל בן בוזי*

These quotations are not Rabbinic fantasies. They carry on the tradition instituted by the Letter of Aristeeas, circa 80 BCE. The following is a paraphrase of the letter and reads as follows. (14) "Aristeeas a Pagan, chief officer of the guards, and friend of Ptolemy Philadelphus (15) writes to his brother Philocrates that he together with Andreas had been dispatched by the king as ambassadors with a letter to Eleazar the high priest of Jerusalem to send to Alexandria seventy-two of the most learned men, six of each tribe, to translate for the Royal Library the Divine law out of the Hebrew into Greek. To secure this favour from the high priest, Ptolemy not only liberated 100,000 Jewish slaves, whom his father Ptolemy Lagos carried with him to Egypt, and paid 660 talents to their owners, but sent the following presents to Jerusalem....Eleazar dispatched seventy-two elders, six of each tribe, with a letter to Ptolemy and a present of his own copy of the Law written in letters of gold. After their arrival and being feasted and toasted for seven days, during which these elders had to answer seventy-two questions, they were conducted by Demetrius to a superb mansion over the

Hepta stadium, where they executed the version in exactly seventy-two days, when Demetrius wrote it down from their dictation. Demetrius then read the version before the whole assembly of the Jews, who declared it to be an exact and faithful translation. Whereupon a copy was made of it in the presence of the seventy-two interpreters for the rulers of the synagogue; and the Jews, by the desire of Demetrius invoked an imprecation upon anyone who should at any time make an alteration in the version. It was then read over to the king, who was profoundly impressed by the sublimity of its contents and enquired why the poets and historians of other nations did not mention it. To which Demetrius replied that they dared not do it, because the Law is divine, and that the historian Theopompus and the poet Theodectes, who attempted to incorporate it in their writings, were afflicted by God, the one with the loss of his senses, and the other with the loss of his eyesight. When the king heard this he worshipped God...and sent to Eleazar ten tables with silver feet, and the apparatus thereunto, a cup of thirty talents, and ten changes of garments. Thus loaded with presents the seventy-two interpreters went back to Jerusalem."

The tradition represented by Aristeas was firmly rooted in Philo's day. In the *Vita Mosis*, Lib. 2, sections 5 - 7, where it appears, we read that the Jews celebrated the day upon which the translation was completed. Philo, however, is not alone. Josephus (16) almost reproduces the story as

found in the letter of Aristaeus.

However, when we turn to Masaket Safer Torah (17) and Masaket Soferim (18) we witness an attitude diametrically opposed to that of the above Rabbinic and non-Rabbinic citations. We read, *אָדמוּר ד' חומשה דק"ט טכרבו לתלמי*
המלך את התורה ונזת והיה כיום קשה לישראל כיום
שנעשה בו העצם שלא היתה תורה יכולה להתרשם כל
ככר.

Added to this is the comment found in Halachoth Gedoloth

Taanith printed at the end of Megilat Ta'anit, which reports,
השמונה הטהר נכבדה התורה ונזת היא תלמי
המלך ובא חושק לעולם ש ימים.

How can these two conflicting attitudes towards the text of the LXX be explained? Robertson (19) has proposed that the LXX translation was made from the most authoritative text of its time. (20) Later the LXX fell into disfavour when the new Christian community accepted it as its textus receptus. The Hebrew text from which the translation was made was probably ignored in the preparation of the Massoretic text and it is likely that the readings of other texts were preferred, (21) just because they differed from the LXX. (22) Therefore, on the basis of these quotations we can conclude that somewhere between the ascription of divine authority to the LXX and its being anathematized, a textus receptus of the Hebrew was established. (23)

What are the factors, other than the one stated above,

which prompted the Jewish Community to create a textus
receptus?

1. The textual differences between the LXX, Samaritan, not so much in the Pentateuch (24) but in Samuel, Jeremiah, Proverbs, Job, Esther, Daniel, and the duplicate narratives, (25) were so great that they were the primary cause for the activity of the authorities to issue a uniform text. (26) That is, at the time of the LXX translation there were many copies of the Biblical text in existence. This state of affairs continued on to about the year 200 CE when finally an established consonantal text was created by the process of examining manuscripts. (27)

Harris (28) lends support to this view by citing a) the variant readings of the LXX and the Samaritan (29) and b) Ketubot 106a, P. Ta'anit 4.2, and Soferim 6.4. (30) Then he proceeds to reconstruct the history of the text as follows. During the period of the second Temple there was an effort to create a uniform text. (31) This he supports by the fact recorded in Ketubot 106a that there were paid readers at the Temple who revised scrolls of the Law. (32) In other words the Talmud informs us that there were at that time imperfect scrolls of the Law, which had to be corrected by the exemplar copy found at the court, *הַמִּשְׁכָּן הַזֶּה*. (33) The exemplar was written by the Soferim (34) and according to P. Ta'anit 4.2 and Soferim 6.4 it was done by accepting only the majority

readings of the three scrolls which were at the Temple.

Uniformity, however, was not established until after the destruction of the Temple. Then the Rabbinic authority was centralized and could focus its attention on matters of precise spelling. For example, should a word have or have not the quiescent letters. (35) The new movement, those concerned with the writing of an authoritative consonantal text, received as its leader Rabbi 'Akibah. (36) In his attempt establish a uniform text, 'Akibah worked with three principles. The first was his stress on the importance of particles. (37) 'Akibah's second principle was $\text{לֹא יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה אֱלֹהִים} .$ (38) The third was $\text{אֵלֹהִים אֶחָד} .$ (39)

As to the meaning of the second and third principles we have differences of opinion. Harris claims that the second principle indicates that the traditional spelling is the hedge about the Torah. Harris arrives at the conclusion that masoret means 'tradition' by referring to Mishna Shekalim. (40) Luzzatto disagrees by claiming that masoret really means 'signs' ($\text{פְּסוּקוֹת})$ (41) and that the word seyag signifies memoria technia. (42)

To determine the significance of the third principle is an extremely difficult task. Harris believes that אֶחָד usually means that 'there is a well grounded reason', which he derives from Mishna Nega'im 1.5, where $\text{פֶּה$ is the same as $\text{פֶּה} .$ Furthermore, the words אֶחָד and אֵלֹהִים correspond to אֶחָד and אֵלֹהִים respectively.

Therefore, the third principle is to be translated as 'a halaka can either be based on the generally received pronunciation of the word or the halaka must conform to the traditional, consonantal spelling of the scribes'. (43)
 There were times when 'Akibah based his exegesis on consonantal spelling and it is to this exceptional procedure that the maxim refers. For example, *דוד, פיה פיה פיה*. (44)

Rappaport proposes an entirely different meaning to the third principle. (45) He maintains that *PIC* signifies the metres lationis and, therefore, the principle must be translated as 'we must be guided by the presence or absence of the quiescent letters in the accepted pronunciation; by their presence or absence in the consonantal spelling'.

Hirschfield (46) holds that since *PIC* means 'mother'; the maxim refers to the word which contains or involves the correct halaka.

Luzzatto (47) is of the opinion that *למה פיה ו'* signifies the reason for the signs that have been handed down to us in regard to full and defective spelling.

Mordecai Plungian (48) claims that since masoret is derived from *זאק* in Ezekiel 20.37 the statement *פיה ו'* *למה* means that to explain a word you are guided by the context and that *קדמה פיה ו'* means expounding a word by itself without reference to the context.

Thus, by means of Talmudic evidence, by means of the variants in the LXX and Samaritan, it is almost universally concluded that a textus receptus was written between the close of the first or the commencement of the second centuries. (49)

There is more evidence that will refer us back to this date. In the text from pg 1270 (50) we read

[illegible]

The Rufus cited in the text is T. Annius Rufus, called by the Rabbis Turnus or Tyrannus Rufus, 135 CE., who fought against Bar Cochba. The Rav Hammuna in the quotation is referred to in P. Ta'anit 4.2 as a teacher of Bible and contemporary to Yehudah the Prince, 170-217 CE.

At least one scholar has raised an objection to this citation as evidence. Graetz is of the opinion that the text is a fabrication of the Karaites. (51)

2. A second factor which created a need for a uniform text is the fact that the Bible was the source of authority for the ruling power. Therefore, it was necessary for the ruling power to have the edition of the Bible that it preferred. The rulers of Israel at that time differed in their allegiances, resulting in the canonization of various texts. Alexander Jannai was a Sadducee; Salome a Pharisee;

Aristobulus 2 a Sadducee; Hyrcanus a Pharisee. Each of these rulers standardized a text. (52)

There is an objection to the view that Pharisean and Sadducean Bibles varied in their readings. (53)

3. Education necessitated a uniform text. Circa 80 BCE., Shimon ben Shetah established the first public school. P. Ketubot 8.2 (54) states that a child sixteen years of age and over must attend school. Mishna 'Abot demands that everybody read the Bible. (55) Josephus tells us that the principal care of the Jews is the education of their children. (56) It would, therefore, be natural to assume that these conditions required a uniform text. (57)

4. The extensive use of the Psalter in the Temple service demanded a uniform text. (58)

5. The reading of the Pentateuch in the synagogue required a uniform text. (59) The Bible was divided into annual and triennial pericopes. (60) Mishna Megilah 4.4 (61) divides the portion to be read. The Mishna must therefore assume that the same portion was read in all synagogues, and such an assumption must presuppose a uniform text. That such readings were carried on in the synagogue is attested to in Acts (62) and in Josephus. (63)

To conclude, a textus receptus must have been written somewhere during the first and early part of the second

between the ending of the first and commencement of the second centuries CE. a group of men called Soferim set down in writing a consonantal text. We also saw that these men carried on their work by collating, according to the Talmud, three manuscripts and then accepted the majority reading, wherever differences occurred. The variants were not destroyed but were, as Ginsburg maintains, (72) preserved in separate lists.

However, the work of the Soferim was not completed with the mere perusal of manuscripts and the acceptance of a majority. On the contrary, as we shall presently observe, their work was also concerned with textual emendations, verse, section and book division, etc..

Two of the earliest terms in connection with the activity of the scribes are Mikera Soferim and 'Itur Soferim. (73) The Talmud mentions these canons in Nedarim 37b. (74) Mikera Soferim is concerned with the pronunciation of certain forms and there is no difference of opinion between the schools of the Biblical redactors. (75) To the Gaonim Mikera Soferim signified vowel changes in pause or after the article. (76) It is, therefore, safe to say that Mikera Soferim connotes the fixation of pronunciation.

'Itur Soferim is also mentioned in Nedarim 37b. (77) It directly affects the text because it demands that a word must not be read with the vay consecutive. (78) It may be

that the 'Itur Soferim was the product of a reaction against the LXX and Samaritan texts because wherever the 'Itur Soferim demands that a word be read without the vav consecutive the LXX and Samaritan read it with a vav consecutive. (79) Weir does not accept this view and says that the 'Itur Soferim is the removal of a letter considered an insertion of the unskillful. (80) Is it then possible that 'Itur Soferim falls under the category of Ketib and Keri? Levias, in the Jewish Encyclopedia, says that it is possible but does not commit himself. (81)

A third trace of the early labours of the Soferim, noted only by scholars en passant, is the doubt expressed whether one must construe words with the preceding or subsequent clause. (82) The passages listed are *וְכֵן* in Genesis 4.7; *פְּנֵלֹךְ* Genesis 34.7; *וְכֵן* Exodus 17.9; *וְכֵן* Exodus 24.34; *וְכֵן* Deuteronomy 31.16. These words are also mentioned in Yoma 52a,b; Shabat 30b; Bere'shit Rabah 80.5; Shir Hashirim Rabah 1.7; Tanhuma Beshalah 26. Hagiga 6b mentions the five and adds Exodus 24.5, while P. 'Abodah Zarah 2.7 mentions the five and adds *וְכֵן* in Genesis 49.7.

A fourth type of labour, critical in nature, is the Tikune Soferim. Peculiarly, Tikune Soferim is not mentioned in the Talmud (83) but only in the Midrash. (84) Buhl maintains that Tikune Soferim means an improved reading. (85)

Weir states that it signifies an intentional change in the text dictated by a sense of propriety. (86) That is to say, the *Tikune Soferim* departs from the text in order to substitute more refined expressions and to avoid anthropomorphisms and anthropopathisms. (87) Furthermore, this departure is done on the basis of grammar and logic. (88) Wurthwein limits the *Tikune Soferim* to corrections in the consonantal text which remove objectionable statements to God. (89) Levis, in the Jewish Encyclopedia, (90) holds that *Tikune Soferim* signifies A) removal of unseemly expressions in reference to God, (91) B) the safeguarding of the tetragrammaton by substituting 'Elohim for YHWH, (92) and by alterations in theophorous names, (93) C) the removal of the application of false gods to YHWH, (94) D) safeguarding the unity of divine worship at Jerusalem. (95) Others claim that the *Tikune Soferim* is not a Rabbinic emendation but an a priori periphrasis of the author himself after the manner of the *Soferim* or stylists. (96) Noldeke, (97) Pinsker, (98) Reifmann, (99) Frankel, (100) Geiger (101) claim that the *Tikune Soferim* are a recollection that ancient recensions differ from the later official text. Harris (102) says that the *Tikune Soferim* are of great antiquity; they are alterations inserted into the body of the text; they are not like the *Keri* and *Ketib*. Finally, Barnes (103) has propounded the theory that since reference to the *Tikune Soferim* can be found only in the Midrash, it is, therefore, only related to

exegesis and not to text criticism. (104)

A problem exists as to who created the Tikune Soferim. The above mentioned Midrashim claim that the men of the Great Synagogue instituted them. (105) Massoretic works have ascribed the origin to Ezra, to Ezra and Nehemia, to Ezra and the Soferim, and to Ezra, Nehemia, Zecharaia, Haggai and Baruch. (106)

Difference of opinion exists as to the number of Tikune Soferim. The Mekilta on Exodus 15.7 lists eleven. (107) The Yalkut Shimoni on Exodus 15.7, #247 is almost identical to the Mekilta. (108) Sifre adduces seven instances. (109) The Tanhuma on Exodus 15.7 contains six more instances. (110) Weir lists a total of sixteen. (111) Prophiat Duran in his Ma'asse Ephod mentions fifteen. (112) Finally, the St. Petersburg codex of 916 CE. mentions eighteen in the Massorah Parva on Ezekiel 8.17 and eighteen in the Massorah Parva on Zecharaia 2.12. (113)

The Punctua Extraordinaria or the dotted words are also shrouded in obscurity. The result is that very many theories have arisen dealing with the dots. One case is mentioned in Mishna Pesahim 9.2. (114) The Sifre on numbers 9.10 enumerates ten such occurrences (115) while the berayta in Berakot 4a mentions the only case in the Hagiographa. (116) Four others are found in the Prophets. (117)

It has been proposed that after the manuscripts were

collated the dots were inserted to indicate that a word or letters were to be found in some copies and not in others, therefore, warning the reader to be cautious. (118) It has also been proposed that the dots informed the scribe that these words were to be retained. (119) Harris is lead to this inference because of the following evidence:- A) the analogous significance of such points in Samaritan manuscripts; B) many of the words pointed in the Hebrew Scripture are actually wanting in the oldest manuscripts, namely, the LXX, the Syriac, and the Samaritan. (120)

A second theory that has been offered maintains that the dots indicate a scribal error and that the dotted words or letters are, therefore, to be omitted. (121) Levias in the Jewish Encyclopedia, has objected to the aforementioned theories, (122) on the basis that the majority readings would have decided whether a word was doubtful or not. Secondly, if the words indicated scribal errors then the word or words concerned would have come under the category of Ketib and Keri. (123) However, there may be some truth to the theory which states that the dots indicated the necessity to omit, because it has been proved, as far as Greek and Latin paleography is concerned, that dots above words indicate erasures or the need for omission. (124) At this point it is interesting to note, as Buhl has shown, (125) that two words distinguished by the Punctus Extraordinarius in Ezechiel 41.20 and 46.22 have not been translated in the Targum. So

too ¹⁰⁷⁰ of Genesis 33.4 is wanting in several manuscripts of the LXX. (126)

A third theory, stated in 'Abot de Rabi Natan, (127) and Samidbar Rabah (128) and recognized by Ewald, (129) Geiger, (130) Schorr, (131) and Ginsburg (132) is that the dotted words are spurious. (133)

The Jewish Encyclopedia (134) offers a fourth and fifth theory, and adds that each is of equal probability. The first maintains that the dots are mnemonic devices indicating homiletical explanations. The second states that the dots are placed above letters and words to guard against omission of text elements by copyists which at first glance or after comparison with parallel passages seemed to be superfluous.

Wier (135) and Harris (136) have offered dates for the introduction of the dots. They base it on the statement in Sifre. Since the Sifre gives the traditional explanation, and since the Sifre is almost contemporary to the Mishna in its earlier recension, (137) therefore, the origin of the dots must be sometime during the period between the end of the first century BCE. and the first century CE.

A peculiarity in the outward appearance of the Hebrew text is the inverted nun. It is mentioned in Shabat 115b, (138) 'Abot de Rabi Natan, (139) Sifre, (140) Soferim, (141) Bere'shit Rabah, (142) Vayikra Rabah, (143) and Yalkut

Mishley. (144) Geiger, (145) Kahle and Blau according to Wurthwein (146) believe that the inverted nun is concerned with the position of the relevant verses. Buhl, (147) Krauss (148) say that the inverted nun is the product of textual criticism. Ginsburg (149) and Weir (150) accept what the aforementioned scholars have said but add that the inverted nun takes the place of modern brackets to mark that the messages thus bracketed are to be transposed. (151)

Harris adopts Rabbi Yehudah's view (152) and says that the inverted nun in Numbers 10.35 informs the reader that it is a remnant of the book mentioned in Numbers 21.14. (153) However, Harris does say that the inverted nun in Psalm 117. 23-31 signifies that verses 23-31 must be placed between verses 32 and 33. (154) Only here says he is the Sifre correct.

Hamburger, when treating the inverted nun, (155) claims that because the word nakud is used it must be placed in the category of the punctua extraordinaria.

The inverted nun can be dated very early because it is cited in the Sifre. (156)

Still another peculiarity in the external form of the Hebrew text is the suspended letter (נ) located in Judges 18.30, Job 38.13, Psalm 80.14, Numbers 25.12. Very few have commented on this peculiarity, and whoever does treat it, renders a different opinion for each case. The Jewish Encyclopedia (157) says that as far as Judges 18.30 is

concerned the suspended nun is a correction of the original mosheh out of reverence. (158) Harris (159) says that the suspended nun in Judges 18.30 indicates the uncertainty of the scribe, for the Targum and LXX read menasheh while Hieronymus reads mosheh.

Ginsburg explains Job 38.13,15 as an orthographical problem, (160) while Harris states that it is a correction. (161) Harris' view is supported by W. Robertson Smith. (162)

The איןאין איןאין and the איןאין איןאין, an early labour of the Soferim, has escaped the notice of a majority of scholars. (163) The petuhah is a chief division (164) and is of two forms. (165) The first begins with a full line and is indicated by the previous line being left unfinished, the space being equal to three triliteral words. The second type is the blank which exists between a completed line and a new line. The setumah is a subdivision (166) and can appear in two forms. (167) The first type begins with an indented line even if the previous line is finished or unfinished. The second type occurs when after the previous section has ended in the middle of a line the prescribed vacant space must be left after it and the first word or words of the closed section begin at the end of the same line. In short the second is recognized by a break in the middle of the same line.

Harris points out that the petuhah passages are read on certain occasions, or comprise various important groups of laws, or are passages which have an elevating or pleasing effect upon the reader. The setumah passages are displeasing, for example, the death of Aaron's sons and the death of Moses. (168)

Hochstadter (169) theorizes that petuhah indicates a narrative from a more ancient source, while the setumah means a charge of subject.

The Sifra (170) calls these intervals peskos and they are frequently mentioned in the Mishna as parashah. (171) Shabat (172) demands that the distinction between open and closed sections be strictly observed. The intent of the paragraphing according to P. Megilla 4.1, which traces the sections back to Moses, and the Sifra 1.9 is that the reader be given a rest in order that he may reflect upon the content of the passage.

The open and closed sections are ancient. This is reflected in Berakot 12b, Shabat 103b, P. Megilah 71b, Acts 15.21. Berakot states that the sections were introduced by Moses. (173) Added to this is the P. Megilah passage. (174) Furthermore, the fact that manuscripts, with slight exception exhibit uniformity in the Pentateuch and not in the Prophets and the Hagiographa; the fact that in the manuscripts we have lists exhibiting catchwords of the sections in the Pentateuch and not in the Prophets and Hagiographa may serve as a proof

that the open and closed sections are very old, possibly going back to a time when the Pentateuch alone was the main concern of the Soferim. (175)

At first these intervals were not marked but later they were designated by the letters *ד* and *ו*. (176)

The parshiyot were not the only sectional divisions. A second class of sectional division are the sedarim, which, unlike the open and closed sections, are unmarked. (177) Theodor (178) has shown that they are liturgical divisions. At the very same time Theodor, (179) Derenbourg, (180) Weir, (181) Friedmann, (182) Rappaport, (183) Solomon Schechter, (184) Harris, (185) Ginsburg (186) maintain that the sedarim are connected with the triennial cycle. (187)

J. Brull (188) has proposed that the origin of the sedarim is not liturgical. The sedarim of the entire Bible, says he, except the Megilot, were created for daily study. Thus the expression *כ"ד ק"ס* in Shabat 152a, 116b, and Yoma 87a refers specifically to these sedarim. (189)

We have already mentioned that a numerical massorah was developed quite early, about the second century by the Rabbis or Soferim. (190) Such an activity presupposes the counting of verses, words, and letters.

There is one pre-Talmudic proof for the existence of verse division. This is evidenced in the alphabetical

portions of scripture which show a consciousness of a division in speech. (191) Psalms 111, and 112 are proof for the primitive nature of the half verse. (192) Psalms 25, 34, 119, and Lamentations 1-4 exhibit the short verses and the symmetrical half verse. (193) This division into verses is not the product of theological knowledge but originates in the thought and speech of the ancient Hebrews. With this Blau concludes that since such division does appear in poetry it is safe to assume that the very same process took place even in prose. (194)

The divisions are known to the Mishna as pesukim. (195) Friedmann (196) maintains that posuk means to cleave assunder. Therefore, he claims that verses were divided by a vertical stroke at the end or by a dot at the beginning. (197) Blau's retort to this remark is that no maxims have been handed down which give evidence to this fact. (198) Harris adds that if there were strokes or dots which divided the verse in the scrolls then Kidushin 30a (199) would not raise the problem that it does. The process of verse division was a matter of oral tradition and was confined to the experts. (200)

Blau understands the word posuk to signify an interruption in the reading. (201) To support this view the following is offered.

(202) מִלִּפְנֵי שְׁמוֹנֶה עֶשְׂרִים בְּסֻפֵּי הַשְּׁמִיטָה אֵינָהּ כּוֹסֶרֶת

(203) הַפְּסוּק הַזֶּה

24.
 (204) *מחקוק שבוסקיוז שחלית אטס מתחילין באחת
 ר' יונה מחקוק שבוסקיוז שבת שחלית עס מתחילין
 שבת הבאה קולין שבת ומסטיקין באחד שבת*
 (205) *קולין שבת ומסטיקין באחד שבת*

What can be said of the relationship between kotuv, mikra, and posuk? Kotuv and mikra signify any passage without reference to its length while posuk lays stress on the length of a quotation, i.e. a verse. (206) Therefore, Rabbi Ishmael's thirteen rules speak of a kotuv, because there is no question of verses. (207) From the Sifre (208) we learn that a portion of a parashah is called a posuk. That is to say, just as perek is divided into halakot, so parashah is divided into posukim. (209) Therefore, the Sifra to 16.23 reads *כל הפרשה אמורה על הסדר חוץ מן הספור*
 (210) *נצח*.

Tradition does know of a fixed division of verses or posukim. (211) Evidence can be found in Mishna Megilah 4.5, (212) Deuteronomy Rabah, chapter 7, (213) Nedarim 37b, (214) Tosifta Megilah 4, 17, 18, (215) Berakot 22b, (216) Megilah 21b, (217) Megilah 23a, (218) Ketubot 28b, (219) Kidushin 49a. (220)

Was there, however, a difference in mode of dividing verses between the Babylonians and the Palestinians? Kidushin 30a, (221) where Exodus 19.9 is said to be divided into three verses, may indicate a verse division which would

coincide with the Palestinian triennial cycle (222) but Geiger, (223) Graetz, (224) Blau, (225) Luzzatto, (226) reject this view saying, that even though differences are shown to exist, one cannot maintain that they exhibit two different modes of verse division.

We may conclude that the Biblical text possessed by the Tana'im and Amora'im had an established division into verses. (227) Kidushin 30a says that it was done by the Soferim. Berakot 12b attributes it to Moses. (228) We may, therefore, assume that the divisions were very old and that their origin was probably lost in obscurity.

I know of only one scholar who has attempted to date the verse division. Harris by accepting Dillmann's view offers an important argument for early verse division. (229) He says that verse division comes within the scope of Ketib and Keri which only takes note of such features as the text presented in Talmudic times.

Blau maintains that the pre Talmudic division of verses is substantially the same as our present text. (230) This view is opposed by Frankel, (231) Graetz, (232) Ginsburg, (233) Buhl, (234) Sperber, (235) and Azariah de Rossi. (236) Buhl adds that the present day division is a fabrication of the post Talmudic Massoretes which comes to view in the work of Aaron ben Asher. (237) Weir states that the verse divisions

were not clearly indicated and therefore the versions and especially the LXX departed from the Hebrew text. (238)

Soon after the appearance of the LXX, the scriptio continua ceased (239) and the outward separation of words came into being. (240) Evidence can be offered for the separation of words in Talmudic times from P. Megilah 1.9, (241) which speaks of the final letters as something ancient; from Sanhedrin 94a, (242) we infer that words were not run together, for the passage speaks of the medial mem as open and the final mem as closed. Menahot 30a presents evidence for a non continuous script by regulating the amount of space between words. (243)

However, difficulties were still present. Pesahim 117a, (244) Hulin 65a (245) discuss the proper way of writing certain words. Again, Pesahim 117a and P. Sukah 3.12 discuss the problem of whether haleluyah is one or two words. (246)

The term which has given scholarship on the Soferim the most trouble is the Ketib and Keri. Various theories have been advanced, but each has evoked a refutation. The result is that when discussing the KH we have only conjectures. Similarly, just as there are various theories on the origin of this activity, so there are also variations as to their number. (247) Generally speaking, as we will soon be forced to conclude, although investigation has been made into the KH, it, nevertheless, continues to remain a problem which must be settled.

The first to comment on this activity was Prophiat Duran. (248) He says that Ezra and the scribes who came after him, when in doubt as to the original text because of various and conflicting manuscripts created the KK device as a sign of their doubt concerning the original reading. (249) To this view Kimhi (250) adds that the cause for the deterioration of manuscripts and the dearth of scholars was the Babylonian exile. (251) The Buxtorfs (252) defended this view.

In 1692 Matthew Miller (253) rejected the view that errors lay at the basis of the KK. He stated that Ezra when writing two or more codices exchanged one word for another of synonymous force for stylistic reason. (254) The variations were later copied into one manuscript, one as the K and one as the K. (255)

Elias Levita also rejected the view that errors lay at the basis of the KK. (256) He proposed that "whenever,... they (the men of the great synagogue) found a word in them which appeared to them not in harmony with the design of the context, and the simple meaning of the passage, the author gave them the reason why he had written in so abnormal a manner; hereupon they wrote the normal expression in the margin as the K. (257) In this passage Levita speaks only of the Prophets and Writings "respecting which they had a tradition from the Prophets and the Sages...that they are not to be read as written". (258) "The very thing" was to be found "in the Law of Moses". (259)

Brian Walton and Richard Simon (260) advance the theory that the authors of the KK flourished after the Talmud. (261)

The first to claim that the KK was the result of manuscript variation was J.G. Carpsov. (262) The theory stated that with the exceptions of the euphemisms (263) and a few lapses on the part of the scribes like 'keri velo ketib' and 'ketib velo ker' that were incorporated later or contemporaneously into the main body of the KK, they were all manuscript variations. He added that the date for this activity was after the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes, i.e. circa 164 BCE. This view was accepted by Eichorn, (264) Gesenius, De Wette, Dillmann, Koenig. (265)

To this theory we have the following minor additions and variations. Frankel (266) holds that the K is the variation of the lesser number of manuscripts, while the K represents the larger number of manuscripts. Buhl and Ginsburg (267) add that the K are, in a large number of instances, the older forms of the text and, therefore, preserve the archaic orthography and sometimes give the original readings. (268) Lambert says that the K is the form more in accord with usage or context. (269) Wurthwein, (270) Gerleman (271) and Sperber (272) offer still another twist to the variation theory. They say that K are popular variants, not to be forgotten. Many of the K in Samuel and Kings do stand in the Chronicles text, which, it is assumed, preserves the popular forms.

Still another theory, opposed to the variation theory, is the one defended by Abrabanel, which states that the K are corrections of erroneous readings. (273) He says that Ezra observed various incongruities in the language or the context, the result either of a mysterious message (274) that the author sought to convey or ignorance of grammar. (275) Ezra would not alter the text but wrote the explanations or corrections in the margin as the K. In the Commentary, Abrabanel, claims that many of the KK are the result of error or oversight on the part of the Prophet. This view has been maintained by Strack, (276) Ginsburg, (277) Wellhausen. (278)

When Capellus was confronted with the problem of the KK he stated that the KK were of several types. (279) Some K were manuscript variants some euphemisms; some, corrections. This view was accepted by J. Derenbourg (280) and Levis, (281)

The latest extensive study of the Keri-Ketib has been done by Gordis. (282) He states that the Keri was a guard not only against sacriligious and indecent reading but that the Keri was utilized as a protection against ignorance, or, more precisely, "as a means of fixing pronunciation before the invention of the vocalic system". (283)

The origin and meaning of KK still lie buried in obscurity. All scholars, excepting the two mentioned above,

Walton and Simon agree only on one point, namely, that the activity of the scribes concerning the K-K took place prior to the period of the Talmud and probably after the text was settled. (284)

We have examined what we may term the basic activity of the Soferim or Rabbis, namely, the establishment of a Biblical textus receptus. As has already been shown we have not reached one single conclusion. Where, therefore, do we stand in our study of the Massorah? Can it be specifically stated that the Rabbis had a textus receptus? Is Graetz totally out of line when he says that it was not until Islam began to settle their Koran that the Jews commenced work on their Scriptures? (285)

Does an established text mean a settled order of the books? We know that at the time of the Talmud the Bible was divided into separate books. (286) Kidushin 33a speaks of the five books of Psalms. (287) Ta'anit 8a (288) speaks of the twenty-four books. (289) Baba Batra 13b (290) requires an empty space of four lines between the books of the Pentateuch, and three lines between the books of the Minor Prophets. (291)

When we examine the order of books according to the Talmud and according to the Massorah or the text now in our possession we find only partial agreement. (292) Baba Batra 14b gives the following arrangement:-

Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezechiel, Isaiah, 12 minor prophets, Ruth, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Lamentations, Daniel, Esther, Ezra, Chronicles. The Massoretic order differs as follows:-

Isaiah before Jeremiah, Chronicles, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ruth, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, Esther, Daniel, Ezra-Nehemiah. (293) How do we explain this discrepancy?

If a textus receptus was established somewhere between the first and second centuries CE., how do we explain the variant readings of the Talmud. (294)

What is the relationship between a textus receptus and the private codices. (295)

Can the variants be evaluated as some scholars have done? (296)

Why are there differences between Ben Asher and Ben Naftali? (297)

How do we explain question 6 on page 2?

How true is Blau's claim that the post Talmudic Massorites did not understand the Talmudic notes? (298)

The Massorah requires further investigation. This

ends our treatment of the early activities of the Soferim.

1. Mishna 'Aboth 1.1.
2. Philo in the preamble to the Analyses of the Political Constitution of the Jews. Quoted in Harris, Massorah: The Rise and Development of the Massorah, Jewish Quarterly Review, 1, New York, 1889. Mentioned by C. Levias, Jewish Encyclopedia, art. Massorah, New York, 1930.
3. Against Apion 1.8.
4. I refer the reader to such books as H.H. Rowley, The Growth of the Old Testament, London, 1953; S.R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, New York, 1956; R.H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, New York, 1948.
5. see below, Tikun Soferim, etc..
6. W. Chomsky, Hebrew: The Eternal Language, Philadelphia, 1957, pg. 85; Harris, op. cit., pg. 128; Ginsburg, Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible, London, 1897, pg. 302; E. Robertson, The Text of the O.T. and Methods of Textual Criticism, London, 1888, 3; E. Wurthwein, The Text of the Old Testament, New York, 1957, pg. 12.
7. I quote only the Greek. The Samaritan has the same words as the Greek, Ginsburg, op. cit., pg. 303.
8. Ginsburg says that something has dropped from the Hebrew. The lacuna can be restored when we retranslate the Greek into the Hebrew.
9. F. Buhl, Canon and Text of the O.T., Edinburgh, 1892, pg. 220; L. Blau, Massoretic Studies, Jewish Quarterly

- Review, vols. 8,9, New York, 1896, 1897; Azariah de Rossi, Me'or Eynayim, 2, c. 8; C.D. Ginsburg, The Massorah, London, 1883, letter chof, vol. 2, pg. 159.
- Paul Kahle in the Masoreten des Ostens, Leipzig, 1913, and in the Cairo Geniza, London, 1941, has shown by means of examining the transliterations in Origen's Hexapla that the manner of reciting proper names was different from that of the Massoretic text. Buhl, op. cit. pgs. 104, 229 claims that Origen's Hexapla contains the original Hebrew text transcribed into Greek and, therefore, knows the early Hebrew pronunciation, see note 19. Buhl adds that Theodotian does the very same thing.
10. Z.A.W., NF. 11, 1934, pg. 254.
 11. Robertson, op. cit, pg.3; Wurthwein, op. cit., pg. 12.
 12. Paul Kahle, Cairo Geniza, London, 1941.
 13. In Robertson, op. cit. pg. 15. see A. Sperber, Problems of the Massora, Hebrew Union College Annual, 17, Cincinnati, 1943, pgs. 318-21.
 14. Quoted from Ginsburg, Intro., pg. 309, who quotes it from Merx's Archiv. 1.241 etc., Halle, 1870, a critical edition of the Greek text by M. Schmidt.
 16. Antiquities 12.2; Against Apion 2.4
 15. 285-247 BCE.
 17. chapter 1.
 18. chapter 1, section 7.
 19. Robertson, op. cit., pg. 14.

20. See also Harris, op. cit., pg. 131. For the view which holds that the LXX has better claim to the original Hebrew see Weir, Short History of the Hebrew Text, Oxford, 1899, pg. 40. H. Gaster, The Biblical Lessons, a Chapter on Biblical Archaeology, London, 1913, claims that the Samaritan, LXX, and Hebrew text agree on divisions. Does this mean that scholars have erred in their claim for a proto Massoretic text. See note 27.
21. See below.
22. Robertson, op. cit., pgs. 10, 14.
23. Ginsburg, op. cit., 306.
24. Ginsburg, op. cit., pg. 422. He claims that the Soferim were especially careful in matters of the Pentateuch.
25. Duplicate narratives were the result of codices reflecting duplicate narratives. See Ginsburg, op. cit., pgs. 305-6.
26. Ginsburg, op. cit., pgs. 305-6; Wurthwein, op. cit., pg. 13 explains the differences in texts as an attempt to popularize. This was accomplished by inserting the matres lectiones more frequently; by assimilating many forms; by using Aramaic forms (δ/ϵ for δ/ν); by preferring the hiphil; by substituting the imperative for the infinitive absolute where this is used with the imperative sense; by filling out the text with the help of parallels.
27. Ginsburg, op. cit., pg. 303; Wurthwein, op. cit., pg. 12; Buhl, op. cit., pg. 90; Weir, op. cit., pgs. 40, 53, 54;

Kahle, Die Hebraischen Handschriften aus der Hohle, Stuttgart, 1951, pg. 28ff. Chomsky, op. cit., on the basis of Soferim 6.4, see below, suggests that the three scrolls were each respectively the basis for the Samaritan, LXX, and the Massoretic text.

The Soferim or scribes had different traditions - Ginsburg, op. cit., pgs. 296, 297 also Massorah letter chof, Vol. 2 #482, 483, pg. 54. This view has been opposed by E.F.K. Rosenmüller, Handbuch für d. Literatur der Bibel, in Kritik und Exegese, 1797, vol. 1 pg. 247, where it is maintained that the consonantal text was derived from codices belonging to a single recension. J.G. Sommer in Z.A.W. 1892, pg. 309 and P.A. de Lagarde in Proverbien, Göttingae, 1863, pg. 1ff hold that the original Massoretic text was derived from a single standard text. On the other hand Strack in Semitic Studies in Memory of... Kohut, Berlin 1897, pg. 563, says that the Massorah was not uniform and that it showed clear traces of different schools and opinions.

Sperber, op. cit., pg. 311, says that the Hebrew Bible was originally known in two recensions, which in turn served as basis for two respective translations into Greek.

Wurthwein, op. cit., pg. 13, says that Rosenmüller,

Sommer and de Lagarde are wrong because the Cairo Genizah has shown that there were always variants (above) and that Jewish scholars quote variant readings as far as the eighth century (above). We may also add the argument advanced by Hempel. See note 10.

Buhl, op. cit., pg. 90, questions the possibility of a second century standard consonantal text on the basis of the many codices called *מחזור* and also on the basis of the differences in the consonantal texts of Ben Asher and Ben Naftali. See also Weir, op. cit., pgs. 38, 39; H.L. Strack, *Prolegomena Critica in Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum*, Leipzig, 1873.

28. Harris, op. cit.

29. Harris, op. cit., pg. 131.

30. Ketubot 106a and P. Ta'anit 4.2 *משהו ספרים טבירושקים*
היו נאמרים טבירושקים מלכות המלכה

Soferim 6.1 *אחד רמז לקים טבס ספרים נאמא בדורה*
ספר מיונה רמזין וספר פטוטין (פאטוטין) וספר תיא. בספר אחד
מאא כתוב מיון אפתי קדם ורמזים (מאא) כתוב מיונה אפתי
קדם וקייא טנים נאמא אחד באחד מאא כתוב וינעין אחד
פאטוטין (אם פאטוטין) קם וינעין אחד באחד מאא כתוב וינעין אחד
נארי קם וינעין אחד באחד מאא כתוב וינעין אחד
אחד קדם קוא ורמזים מאא כתוב אחד קדם קוא וקייא טנים
נאמא אחד

31. Also Ginsburg, op. cit., pg. 408; Harris, op. cit., pg. 132; Wurthwein, op. cit., pg. 12; Robertson, op. cit., pg. 3; Jewish Encyclopedia, op. cit.

32. The Talmud states that revision of the scrolls was necessitated by Job 11 14b - "let not wickedness dwell in your tents".

33. Moed Katan 18b - Rashi on *אִיבָּלֵם בְּסֵפֶר עֲצֵמָה*:
מֵיָּת שֶׁל עֲצָמָה וְאֵל מִלֵּוֹי שֶׁל עֲצָמָה
בְּיָד הַכֹּהֲנִים כְּשֶׁל עֲצָמָה
34. Jacob ben Chayim, Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, translated by C.D. Ginsburg, Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record, London, 1863, pg. 6, says it was the men of the great assembly. Concerning the Soferim passage it should be noted that these codices must have been completed anterior to the introduction of the five final letters when the orthography in Deuteronomy 33.27 was still *וְיָחַד* which one school reads *וְיָחַד* which is the same as *וְיָחַד* and another *וְיָחַד* which is the same as *וְיָחַד* because the final letters determine the length of the words.
35. Buhl, op. cit., pg. 210; Wurthwein, op. cit., pg. 3.
36. Circa 55-137; Wurthwein, op. cit., pg. 12; Harris op. cit., pg. 132; Ginsburg, op. cit., pg. 421; Robertson, op. cit., pg. 15, who adds that as a result of Akibah's work variants were only to be found in private copies. Levias, Jewish Encyclopedia, op. cit., says that the first mention of such notes are in Rabbi Meir's Codex. Pesochim 112a tells of Akibah's charge to his pupil Shimon ben Yochai to be sure that when teaching his son he should do so from a revised text of scripture - *וְיָחַד* 200, Is the sefer mugah stated by Akibah the very same as Codex Mugah? The Codex Mugah is the earliest codex quoted by the Massorites. See Exodus 39.33-43 where sometimes has the vov conjunctive and sometimes not.

Orientalis 4445 reads *DEIN 1070'02*. 39. It is quoted against the variants in other recensions. The St. Petersburg Codex appeals to the Mugah eight times against the variants in other recensions. Add. 465 (Cambridge University Library) quotes the Mugah several hundred times. See Ginsburg, Massorah, Vol. 3, pgs. 23-26. Ginsburg, Introduction, pg. 431, says that the Mugah is referred to as *DEIN 7202, DEINA, DEN*. He adds that it was copied in many ages and not in one specific district. All early copies are called Mugah.

37. Mielziner, Introduction to the Talmud, Cincinnati, 1894, pg. 125, claims that the stress on particles is related to the establishment of hermeneutic rules. See also Wurthwein, op. cit., pg. 12. Harris is the only scholar who notes Akibah's stress on particles as indicating a desire to uniform a text. He does not tell us how concern for the particle signified a desire to create a uniform text. However, he does tell us that the result of Akibah's work was the Aquilla translation which is excessively literal, and based upon readings which are nearer to the Massoretic text than to the LXX and Samaritan.
38. Harris, op. cit., pg. 132; Buhl, op. cit., pg. 96 says that we must be cautious with this principle. It may indicate massoretic activity.

39. Sanhedrin 4A

40. 6.1.

41. Addimenta to 1127826 D11522, Vienna, 1869, pg. 119b.

Luzzatto's contention that Massorah signifies *P'NIO* can be supported by the Talmud, where the inverted nun is referred to as *...*

referred to as סבת Sabbath 115b-116a. מ"ר וי"ל
הנמצא הארץ יואר מ"ה דרשה זו עשה לה הקד"ה
סבתות המעשרה ומסמכת סוף מאן בה מקומה.

42. Ginsburg, op. cit., pg. 421 and Levis, in the Jewish Encyclopedia, op. cit., say that the Massorites preserved the Torah by making notes in the margin. According to them this was done by about 200.

43. Also Sperber, *op. cit.*, pg. 317.

44. Harris, op. cit., refers his reader to Hupfeld, Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 1830, pgs. 556 sq. and also to Geiger, Judische Zeitschrift, 1, pgs. 290, 291; see also Babylonian Sanhedrin Ia, Kiddushin 18b Pesachim 86b.

45. Erech Millin.

46. Halachische Exegese, section 290, pgs. 305, 306.

47. Ibidem.

48. Or Boker, pgs. 1-6.

49. Harris, op. cit., pg. 131.

50. Medieval Jewish Chronicles, edited by A. Neubauer, pg.

174, Oxford, 1887-95.

51. Eine Masoretische Studie, Monatschrift., Vol. 36, Breslau, 1887, pg. 32 sq.

52. Ginsburg, op. cit., pg. 305-6.

53. Levias, Jewish Encyclopedia, op. cit.

- 41.
54. P. Ketubot 8.2 - I could not find this reference. The passage so numbered speaks not of education but of the relationship between, husband, wife, and the Kesubah.
55. 5.21 *מטה צבך... מטה צבך... מטה צבך... מטה צבך... מטה צבך... מטה צבך... מטה צבך... מטה צבך... מטה צבך... מטה צבך...*
 Ginsburg, op. cit., pgs. 305-16.
56. Against Apion 1.12
57. Ginsburg, op. cit., pgs. 305-306.
58. Ibidem.
59. Ibidem.
60. Kidushin 30b (the result of triennial division) *במחציתא... במחציתא... במחציתא... במחציתא... במחציתא... במחציתא... במחציתא... במחציתא... במחציתא... במחציתא...*
 Megilah 29b *הוא מחציתא מקי' לדאדילא... הגל' טעם*
61. M. Megilah 4.4 *הקודא בתורה לא יבחות מטהם פסוקים*
 See also M. Ta'anit 4.3/
62. 15.21...Moses...for he is read every Sabbath in the synagogues.
63. Against Apion 1.12.
64. Jewish Encyclopedia, op. cit., and Jacob ben Chayim, op. cit., say that it was the men of the great assembly.
65. Jeremiah 8.8 *הנה לטק' צעק... הנה לטק' צעק... הנה לטק' צעק... הנה לטק' צעק... הנה לטק' צעק... הנה לטק' צעק... הנה לטק' צעק... הנה לטק' צעק... הנה לטק' צעק... הנה לטק' צעק...*
66. Ezra 7.6 *הוא צעקא צעק מבר' וקוא סבר מבי'...*
67. Blau, op. cit.; Weir, op. cit., pg. 92; Wurthwein, op. cit., pg. 15; Robertson, op. cit., pgs. 3, 10; E. Levita, Massoreth Ha-Massoreth, tr. by C.D. Ginsburg, London, 1867,

pg. 134; Kidushin 30a,

לפיכך נקרא ראשונים סופרים
היהו סופרים כל המאות שהיו להם

Hagiga 15b

איה ספר זהו סופרים כל המאות שהיו להם

Jewish Encyclopedia, - the counting of words gave rise
to Numerical Massorah. Also Nedarim 37b-38a.

68. Above. See note 28.

69. Life, 75.

70. No. 31, folio 399a; Ginsburg, Massorah, vol. 3, pg. 348.

71. This book was compiled about the year 1280 CE., Ginsburg,
Introduction., pg. 410.

72. Above.

73. Jewish Encyclopedia, op. cit. It is indeed surprising to
learn that scholars have said very little on this subject.
Ginsburg who usually devotes a good number of pages to
any one subject dismisses this topic in two paragraphs.

74. אמר לי ר' חכם נקרא סופרים ויט' ר' יוסף

75. Ginsburg, op. cit., pg. 308.

76. Jewish Encyclopedia, op. cit.

77. See note 67 for text.

78. Ginsburg ibidem, pg. 308; Jewish Encyclopedia, op. cit.;
Weir, op. cit., pg. 80; Buhl, op. cit., pg. 103; Wurth-
wein, op. cit., pg. 15.

79. Ginsburg ibidem, pg. 308.

80. Weir, op. cit., pg. 80.

81. Jewish Encyclopedia, op. cit.

82. Harris, op. cit., pg. 136; Geiger, Urschrift und Über-
setzungen der Bibel in ihrer abhängigkeit von der innern

- Entwicklung des Judenthums, Breslau, 1857, pg. 443;
 Graetz, Eine Masoretische Studie, Monatsschrift, Breslau,
 1882, pg. 388; Jewish Encyclopedia, op. cit.
83. Buhl, op. cit., pg. 103; Harris, op. cit., pg. 142
84. Mekilta, Beshalah, chpt. 6; Sifre, Beha'alosko, #84;
 Bere'shit Rabah 49.12; Shemos Rabah 13.2, 30.12, 41.4.
85. op. cit., pg. 103.
86. op. cit., pg. 71.
87. op. cit., pg. 76.
88. Weir, op. cit., pg. 91.
89. op. cit., pg. 14.
90. Levias, op. cit.
91. קסב for קסג. See also Ginsburg, op. cit., pgs.
 345, 346, 363-365; see also Ginsburt, Massorah, letters
ayin and shin #722 and #138.
92. Also Ginsburg, Introduction, pgs. 367-369; also Ginsburg,
Massorah, letter alef, #116.
93. See note 85.
94. Changing 'Ishba'al' to 'Ishboshet'. Also Ginsburg, Intro-
duction, pgs. 399-401.
95. In Isaiah 19.18 אֵין הַיָּם for אֵין הַיָּם or אֵין הַיָּם.
96. Aaron ben Asher, Dikduke Ha'teamim, ed. Baer and Strack,
 pg. 44; Shelomo ben Adreth, Perushe Agadot le-Rashbi, pg.
 32. This suggestion is based upon כנה הכבוד in the
 Mekilta, signifying that Scripture has used euphemistic
 language to avoid anthropomorphisms and anthropopathisms.

108. כוהנוסף הקס נוסע בבגת ציון לויבדור אומר בבגת ציון
 אינו אומר אלא בבגת ציון כביכול כלפי מזה הכתוב מזה
 אלא שכנה הכתוב. כיוצא בו אתה אומר ואחרת הכנה מזה
 והכרחי אותו אלא שכנה הכתוב. כיוצא בו אתה אומר הו
 אשר ידע כי מקדשיו לבסוף אלא שכנה הכתוב. כיוצא בו אתה
 אומר הפא אתה הוא מקדש די אלקי קדושי לא נחות אלא
 שכנה הכתוב. כיוצא בו הנאמר שני אלהים ואל אלא שכנה הכתוב
 כיוצא ויחיד את כבודו ואל אלא שכנה הכתוב. כיוצא בו אין
 לו חלק בדוד ואל אלא שכנה הכתוב. כיוצא בו אשר בצאתו
 מרחם אמו ואל אלא שכנה הכתוב. כיוצא בו והנה מלחמי
 את הצמורה אם אדם אלא שכנה הכתוב. אך כאן אתה
 אומר כי הנוסף הכס ואל.

109. כל פנוסף הקס כנוסף בבגת ציון לבגד אלא
 בבגת ציון על מקום כביכול כלפי מזה אלא שכנה
 הכתוב. כיוצא בו חתם שחתי שחפץ סך ואזכיר עליו שחט
 אלא שכנה הכתוב. כיוצא בו והנה מלחמי את הצמורה
 על אדם אלא שכנה הכתוב. כיוצא בו הלא אתה מקדש
 די אלקי קדושי ולא אחות אלא שכנה הכתוב. כיוצא בו
 ויחידו את כבודו הרהיט מור אולם אלא שכנה
 הכתוב. כיוצא בו ואם כסב את צושה לי הרמץ לא תדע
 אם מצאתי מן הצמח ואם ארצה הרמץ אלא שכנה
 הכתוב. כיוצא בו אתה בצאתו מרחם אמו ואם חצי
 שגרו אלא שכנה הכתוב.

וכן הוא אומר כי הנוסח הכס נוסע הבת ציון ציון
היה לו לומר אלפא שכנהו הכתוב כמנהג כפיכח כלפי
מצלן וכנהו הכתוב מנהג תקון ספרים אנוני כנסת
השזושה. כיוצא בו ואחרת הנה מלפאת והשכנת
אולי אלפא שכנהו הכתוב כיוצא בו העין אשר ידע
כי מקלסין לכס היו ולא ככה הם אלפא שכנהו הכתוב.
כיוצא בו למעט מלת למפסע לה ואניה צליל למעט
אלפא שכנהו הכתוב. כיוצא בו השא אתה מקדש די
אשרי קדושו לא ימות אלפא שכנהו הכתוב. כיוצא בו
ההחיד של אלפא ונהיה לא אלפא ושמי החיד פבוקי
השא יודע אלפא שכנהו הכתוב. כיוצא בו ויחיד
את פבוקי התהנות עוד אחר דע אלפא שכנהו
הכתוב. כיוצא בו פבוקי הקטן אומר אלפא שכנהו
הכתוב. כיוצא בו והשפעת דען חרת אפן על אשר לא
מצאו מדרג וידעו את איזה אלפא שכנהו הכתוב. כיצא
הו ואחרת צודק צומח פני די אלפא שכנהו הכתוב.
כיוצא בו ואם ככה אתה עומה לי הראש לא תרום
אם מצאתי חן בעיניך ואם אראה הרעג. כיוצא בו
אם לא תהי כמת אשר הצאתו מרחם אימני ויאכל
תצי קטניו. אלפא שכנהו הכתוב. כיוצא בו מה לנו
חלק הדוד ולא נחלת בהן ישי איש לאוהביה ישראלי
עגה ראיה היתק דוד ויסק ישראל לאפדין. והדבר
הימי לאפדין. כבוד לזכור ולעמוד עלי רבי.
אולי יראה די קדונו אלפא שכנהו פסוקים אלו אנוני
כנסת השזושה. ולכך נקרא ספרים שבין ספרים כס
אותיות מברורה ודורשין אותה. וכן יהיה שולחין
את הצמחה אל אפי וכן תקנה אל אפי. ואפי
כאן כי הנוסח הכס נוסע הבת ציון.

111. Weir, op. cit., pg. 76; Genesis 18.22, Numbers 11.15, 12.2, 1 Samuel 3.13, 2 Samuel 16.12, 20.1, Ezekiel 8.17, Habakkuk 1.12, Malachi 1.13, Zecharia 2.12, Jeremiah 2.11, Job 7.20, Hosea 4.7, Job 32.3, Lamentations 3.20, Psalms 106.20.
112. Quoted in Ginsburg, op. cit., pg. 351, note 2.
113. Ginsburg, op. cit., pg. 352.
114. אֵינִי הָיָה דָּרֵךְ רְחוּקָה מִן הַחוּצוֹת וְלִחוּץ וּכְמִדַּתָּה
כָּל רוּחַ דְּבָרֵי עֲקִיבָה רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר אֹמֵר מְאֹד מְאֹד הַצְרָה
וְלִחוּץ. אִם רַבִּי יִשִּׁי לְפִיכָךְ נִקְרָא עַל הַיָּמִין לֹא מִפְּנֵי
שְׂדֵה רְחוּקָה וְכֵן אֵלֶּם מְאֹד מְאֹד הַצְרָה וְלִחוּץ
115. אִם בְּדֶרֶךְ רְחוּקָה נִקְרָא עַל הַיָּמִין הַדֶּרֶךְ קְרוֹבָה וְהָיָה
טָמֵא לֹא הָיָה עֹשֶׂה עֲמָקִים אֶת הַבֶּסֶח. כִּינָצָא הוּא יִשְׁפֹּט דָּו
הָיָה וּבִינָה טָמֵא אֲמָרָה לוֹ אֵלֶּם עַל הַפֶּה בְּלִבָּהּ וְיִיָּא עַל הַמִּטְוִיָּה
כִּינָה וּבִינָה כִּינָצָא הוּא וְאֲמָרָה אֵלָיו אִיהָ שֶׁהָ אִתָּהּ שִׁדְעוֹ
יִדְעִין הַכֹּהֵן הַזֶּה, כִּינָצָא הוּא וְכֵן יִדַּע הַשֶּׁכֶּבֶת וּבִקְוָתָה נִקְרָא
עַל וּבִקְוָתָה שֶׁהָ הַשֶּׁכֶּבֶת לֹא יִדַּע וּבִקְוָתָה יִדַּע. כִּינָצָא הוּא
וְיִשְׁקֶרֶת שֶׁהָ נִשְׁקָה כָּל עָבֹד רִ"ש הוּא וְהָיָה אֹמֵר הַשֶּׁכֶּת
בִּידְעוֹ שֶׁהָ שִׁנָּה לְיִצְרֵק אֵלֶּם יִהְיֶה רַחֲמֵי הָאֹתָהּ
שֶׁהָ וְנִשְׁקָה כָּל עָבֹד. כִּינָצָא הוּא וְיִלְכוּ אִתּוֹ לְרֵעוֹת אֶת
צֶאֱן אֲבִירָהּ נִקְרָא עַלָּיו טָמֵא הַשֶּׁכֶת אֵלֶּם לְרֵעוֹת אֶת
עֲצָמָיו. כִּינָצָא בָּהֶם וְנִשְׁקָה עַד נִשְׁפָּךְ אֹמֵר עַד מִיזָהוּ
נִקְרָא עַלָּיו טָמֵא מִלֵּהֶן הָיָה כֵּן. כִּינָצָא הוּא כֵּן פִּקְדוֹ הַלֵּוִי
אִם בְּקֵד מִשֶּׁה וְאֲהָרֹן נִקְרָא עַלָּיו טָמֵא הָיָה אֲהָרֹן מִן הַמִּיָּץ
כִּינָצָא הוּא עֲשֵׂרֹן עֲשֵׂרֹן נִקְרָא עֲשֵׂרֹן טָמֵא הָיָה אֵלֶּם עֲשֵׂרֹן
אֲחֵר עֲשֵׂרֹן. כִּינָצָא הוּא הַנִּשְׁמָרוֹת שֶׁהָ אֲהָרֹן וְהַנִּשְׁמָרוֹת
לֹא וְלִמְעַנּוֹ עַד עֲזָרָה נִקְרָא, אֵינִי עֲשֵׂתָהּ הַשִּׁלּוֹם אֵלֶּם אִם
אֲדִיעַ לָכֵן אֶת הַנִּשְׁמָרוֹת אֵלֶּם כֵּן אֲתָה אֹמֵר בְּדֶרֶךְ
רְחוּקָה נִקְרָא עַלָּיו טָמֵא הָיָה בְּדֶרֶךְ קְרוֹבָה וְהָיָה טָמֵא
לֹא הָיָה עֹשֶׂה עֲמָקִים אֶת הַבֶּסֶח.

116.

למה נקוד על סוף

117. Weir, op. cit., pg. 54. Also Massorah on Numbers 3.39

118. Weir Ibidem, Harris, op. cit., pg. 134.

119. See note 111.

120. Harris, ibidem.

121. Weir, op. cit., pg. 53.

122. op. cit.

123. See note 114.

124. Thompson, Handbook of Greek and Latin Paleography, pg. 74, London, 1893.

125. op. cit., pg. 105.

126. Buhl, op. cit., pg. 117.

127. First recension, number 34
למה נקוד אלא כן אמר
עצמא איק יקוא אפיהו ויאמר למה כתבת אותן אומר
לו ככה נקדתי צדיקין ואם יאמר יפה כתבת כבר אמת
נקודותיהם מדיניהן

128. 3, 13 text same as in note 118.

129. Lehrbuch, 19, #d, 8th edition.130. Urschrift., op. cit., pg. 257.131. He-chalutz, Lember, 1856, pgs. 99, 100.

132. Ginsburg, op. cit., pgs. 320-325.

133. Ginsburg, op. cit., pg. 322, shows that according to the
Sifre on Numbers 9.10 (note 108) the dot also had a
halachic significance.134. Jewish Encyclopedia, op. cit.

135. op. cit., pg. 56.

136. op. cit., pg. 133.

137. Harris, op. cit., pg. 133. Weir agrees with Harris and maintains that the Sifre is second century.
138. *ייהי בנפוצ הארון נקוד עליו המעלה והמטה מפי שמו*
היה זה מקומו דבי אומר מפי שהוא ספר העצמו, מכאן
אמרו ספר שנחתך ונשתרר בו פיה אחרות כדעת ייהי
בנפוצ הארון המטה את הודים. ר"ם אומר נקוד עליו המעלה
והמטה מפי שמו היה זה מקומו.
139. First recension, chapter 34.
140. Beha-alosho, *נקוד עליו המעלה והמטה שמו היה זה מקומו*
141. 6.1. *הכתה צריך לעקור עמוד (שיפור) בכתובה על ייהי בנפוצ*
הארון המעלה והמטה שהוא ספר הכי עצמו וי"א שמקומו
בנפוצ עשירי.
- Perles, Etymologische Studien, pg. xiv, col. 3, and pg. 41, note 1 makes the following remark on this passage. It is assumed that the correct reading in Soferim 6.1 is *מיכר*; but the original reading seems to be *מיכר*, a word of unknown etymology. If the word stands for *מכר* it would be a synonym of *ציון* and mean simply 'sign'. The reading *מיכר* (ram's horn) yields good sense. It is the Greek *μικρα φος*, which had exactly such a sign and served the same purpose.
142. 64.7 - does not mention inverted nun but assumes it.
 See note 130.
143. 11.3 - does not mention inverted nun but assumes it.
 See note 130.
144. 9.
145. Judische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben, vol. 3, pgs. 80-82, Br̄slau, 1864.
146. op. cit., pg. 13.
147. op. cit., pg. 105.

148. Der Obelos in Masoretischen Texte, Z.A.W., vol. 22, Giesen, 1902.
149. Ginsburg, Introduction., pg. 342.
150. op. cit., pg. 64.
151. See the quote in number 133. The scholars are in agreement with Rabbi Shim'on. The LXX attests to the dislocation. See comment made by Perles in note 133.
152. See note 133. Rabbi Yehuda is against the idea of dislocation. Harris, op. cit., pg. 137.
153. ...⁴ נחמיה כסו ...
154. See note 143.
155. Real Encyclopaedie, 2, pg. 1215, note 10.
156. See above pg. 15 where the Sifre is employed to prove the early date of the punctua extraordinaria.
157. Jewish Encyclopedia, op. cit.
158. Also Ginsburg, Introduction, 335-337; Baba Batra 109b; Abot de Rabi Natan, first recension, chapter 34; and Mekilta on Exodus 18.1 do not mention a suspended nun, but declare in their explanation that it is Moses. On the other hand P. Berakot 9.2, P. Sanhedrin 11.7, Midrash Rabah Song of Songs 2.5, and Abot de Rabi Natan, second recension, chapter 37 have moshe with a suspended nun.
159. op. cit., pg. 137.
160. Ginsburg, op. cit., pg. 338.
161. See note 150.
162. Lectures on the Old Testament in the Jewish Church, Lecture 3, New York, 1861, pg. 80.

163. Geiger, Judische Zeitschrift, 10, pg. 197, says that the word parasha when connected with petuhah and setumah means a passage dealing with a specific subject. For example, Mishna Ta'anit 4.3; Mishna Menahot 3.7, Mishna Megilah 4.4. However, the words petuhah and setumah do not appear in the Mishna, see Buhl, op. cit., pg. 223. Derenbourg, Manuel du Lecteur, Journal Asiatique, 1870, vol. 2, pg. 259 says that parasha does not mean seder, the latter being one of the fifty-four weekly readings. Sedarim according to Derenbourg are younger than the open and closed sections.
164. Harris, op. cit., page 226.
165. Ginsburg, op. cit., pg. 9.
166. Harris, ibidem.
167. Ginsburg, ibidem.
168. Harris, op. cit., pg. 226.
169. Ben Chananya, 1865, nos. 39, 40.
170. 1.9 *וזה כיון דבסקורא משמיהו ליהן דאח לטעם להקדמוהו
בין פדשה פדשה ובין דאח דאח*
171. Mishnas Bikurim 3.6, Yoma 3.10, Ta'anit 4.3, Sotah 7.2, 8.
172. 103b *פדשה פדשה לא יצתה פדשה לא יצתה פדשה*
173. *כל פדשה דפסקה אהרן דביו פסקין*
174. Above. Also M. Gaster, op. cit., pg. 44.
175. Buhl, op. cit., pg. 223, Ginsburg, op. cit., pg. 10.
- This may be the result of the problems created by the
LXX and Samaritan.
176. Harris, op. cit., pg. 225.

South Arabian manuscripts edited by Derenbourg also yield 167 sedarim; see Buhl, op. cit., pg. 226. Jerusalem Sabat 16.1 speaks of 175 sedarim. Ben Chayim lists 447 of which 154 are in the Law. Ginsburg, op. cit., lists 452 sedarim of which 167 are in the Law, 97 in the Former Prophets, 107 in the Latter Prophets, and 81 in the Hagiographa. Ginsburg, op. cit., pg. 34 states that some schools claim that the sedarim number 158. See also the quotation from the Yemen manuscripts at the beginning of this note.

188. Beth Talmud, 1, pgs. 108-110, Gaster, op. cit., pg. 68.

189. See note 178.

190. Above. See also Harris, op. cit., pg. 140.

It is interesting to note that activity similar to a numerical massorah seems to have been common among the Indians, Max Müller, Selected Essays, vol. 2, pg. 119. We can add that the Samaritans carried on the same activity. They calculated the number of paragraphs, and claimed that Leviticus 7.15 was the middle verse of the Pentateuch. Sales, Koran, Philadelphia, 1867, Preliminary discourse, maintains that the Arabs copied this activity from the Jews. Graetz, History of the Jews, vol. 3, Philadelphia, 1949 rejects this view and maintains that the numerical massorah was the result of Arabic activity on the Koran.

191. Psalms 9.10, 25, 34, 37, 111, 112, 119, 145; Lamentations 1-4. Delitzsch, Commentar über den Psalter, Leipzig, 1859

207. See note 194.

208. 2.4. *אי שטאץ פסוק אונד... אי שטאץ ברשה אונד*

209. Blau, op. cit., pg. 126.

210. Blau, op. cit., pg. 126 claims that the word posuk may also refer to a part of a book. The Boraite in Sanhedrin 99a reads *כל גולה כולה מן השמים חוץ מפסוק בן* and Sanhedrin 101a *אמר הקורא פסוק על שם השירים וצוהו אמר כחן צמר* and Tosefta Megilah 2.2 *הקורא את המעלה וטעה וטעה בא פסוק אונד*

Posuk frequently takes the place of mikera or katub in Tannaitic literature (Blau, op. cit., pg. 126). This is seen in Mekilta 19.1 and in a parallel passage in Sifre, both in the name of Yochanan ben Zakai - *כל ימי חייתו*

וכל ימי בקשתו מקרא בן also *מצטרף על פסוק בן*

Similarly Tosefta Ketubot 5.10 and Ketubot 67a, in the name of Eleazar bar Tzadok use the word mikera,

On the other hand Shab Rabah I.16; P. Ketubot 5.13 and Pesikta Rabati 140a use the word posuk. Again in Abot de Rabi Natan, recension one, chapter 17, do we find in one sentence posuk three times and mikera four times. The interchange of the words posuk, katub, and mikera is also found in the formula for the harmonization of passages. In Mekilta on Exodus 20.7; 20.17; 20.24; 23.11 we read *כיצד יתקיימו ארבעה פסוקים אלה*

while in Mekilta on Exodus 22.8 we read *רשע אומר קרא את דעו כאן וכו' וקרא את לבן וכו' כיצד יתקיימו שני המקראות הללו* כתוב אונד אונד וכו' while in Mekilta on Exodus 15.4 we read *וכתוב אונד אונד רשע כיצד יתקיימו כי פסוקים הללו*

Therefore, it must be concluded that the distinction between posuk, mikra, and katub was disregarded, so that posuk came to be used without regard to its original meaning. For example, Shabat 82a speaks of the Pesuke de-Zimrah.

211. Blau, op. cit., pg. 128. Sperber maintains that the expression לא בקאין implies that there was not a fixed and generally recognized division of verses pg. 322. On that very page when commenting on Meg. 22a (see note 216 for text) he says that Meg. 22a only attempts to claim authority for a certain system of verse division. See also note 209 which Sperber uses for additional evidence.

212. ולא יקרא לתורה יותר מסוף אל הבוא שם
 213. Similarly Megilah 21b... לא יקראו שם יותר מסוף פסוקים...
 214. וטוב שכל אלה פסוקים
 215. Complete chapters deal with portions to be read on specific occasions.
 216. אינך ר' מאיר אין בעל קרי דלא לקרוא בתורה יותר משלש פסוקים
 217. אלא הא דתנן דב שמיא אין בוחטין מדענה פסוקים בבית הכנסת...
 218. הוסיף בבוא לא יחזיקו מדענה ואי פסוקים כגון שבעה. (Beraita).
 219. או מקרא הערב שבע פסוקים בבית הכנסת הרי זה לא יצא לחירות.
 220. תיכף עם אמת שאנו קרינא כיון שקרא שבע פסוקים בבית הכנסת הרי זה מקודש רבי יוחנן אומר עד שיקרא ויגדל.

See also Sotah 39b, Megilah 18b; P. Shabat 1.4, P. Megilah 4.1.

221. בחצרותא פסקי ליה להאי קראא לתתא פוסק'
 222. Rappaport, Halichoth Kedem, Amsterdam, 1846, pgs. 10, 17.
See also Harris op. cit., pg. 140.
 223. Geiger, Judische Zeitschrift, 4, pg. 24.
 224. Graetz, Monatsschrift, March 1885.
 225. Blau, op. cit.
 226. Luzzatto, Letters, pg. 345ff
 227. There are passages, some Talmudic and some a little later which give statistics, Harris, op. cit., pg. 141. They are Shabat 49b, 115b; Yebamot 86b; Berakot 9b; Sifre chapter 342; Pesikta de Rav Kahana 34b, 35a; Pirke de Rabbi Eleazar chapter 32; Abot de Rabi Natan, first recension, chapter 34; Berakot Rabah chapter 31 #8. Weir, op. cit., pg. 94, says that statistics were necessary so that the text be preserved.
 228. כל הברכה דפסקא משה רבינו פסקין דלא פסקא משה רבינו
לא פסקין.
(See note 199 for opposite view)
 229. Harris, op. cit., pg. 224.
 230. Blau, op. cit., pg. 143.
 231. op. cit., pg. 217.
 232. Graetz, M.G.W.J., vol. 34, 1885, pgs. 97-109.
 233. Ginsburg, Introduction, pg. 68.

234. Buhl, op. cit., pg. 221.

58.

235. Sperber, op. cit., pg. 323.

236. Azariah de Rossi, Meor Eynayim, **LL**, c. 8. His words sum up the scholarly arguments quite simply. The division of the LXX differ from the Massoretic text. Weir, op. cit., pg. 94, says that because the verse divisions were not clearly indicated the versions departed from the Hebrew text.

237. Buhl, *ibidem*.

Blau in his Masoretische Untersuchungen, Strassburg, 1891, and in his Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift, Budapest, 1894, claims that the post Talmudical Massorites did make certain errors because they did not understand the Massoretic remarks in the Talmud, but this, he says, does not apply to versification. If the ancients had had a division of verses different from ours there should be cases of passages of Scripture having now two verses of which it was said that "all three things occurred in one verse". There is no such a thing here. That there is no question of single individuals is proved by the circumstance that many a statement in reference to this occurs several times in the most different sources, and in the name of many authorities.", Massoretic Studies, Jewish Quarterly Review, New York, 1897, vol. 9, pg. 143.

See Genesis 3.6 in Genesis Rabbah, chapter 19; Kohelet Raba 5.10; also Exodus 15.13 in Numbers Raba, chpt. 12, and P. Megillah 3.8.

238. Eichorn, Einleitung ins Alte Testament, Leipzig, 1803, 3rd edition, section 73; Harris, op. cit., pg. 224; Weir, ibidem.
239. Blau, op. cit., pg. 358.
240. Blau, ibidem.
241. The complete chapter deals with this.
242. *מחלוקה במעשה ומעשים אין קץ וא"ל איך תחזיק דרגה קבוצה בצבורי מנהג מה כל מ"ס מהאמנץ תורה פתוח וזה פתוח.*
243. *"ויבין משה למטה במלוא מטה ובין תורה לתורה כמלא אות קטנה ובין אות לאות כמלא חוט השערה.*
244. *מדתה את כדר לעצמה דפסק דכו ספרא בתרי הכי נמי דתרת שמי ענהו אמר התם בשתי תיבות פסיק דכו השט שיטת לא פסיק דכו אכל הכא אכלי השט שיטת נמי פסיק דכו.*
245. *איך חסדא אמר ר' אחאן הללויה וכו' וידידה אמת הן. רב אמר כסיה ומרחביה אמת הן רבה אמר מרחביה קלפן איבעצא דכו מרחב יה לרב חסדא מאי תיקו איבעצא דכו וידידה לרב מאי ת"מ דאמר רב וידידה נחלק לעולם לביבך וידיד חור יה קודש איבעצא דכו הללויה לרב מאי ת"מ דאמר רב חנינא דבין חביבא דכתיב דכו הללויה חור איסא וזב חור איסא.*
246. This could have been decided by the number of words in the Pentateuch. Nevertheless, we find no proposition with respect to counting of words because the contending Amoraim probably declared themselves, as in Kidushin 30a, incompetent to decide a question involving a point as to the division of words. Only in Shabat 10b; Numbers Raba, Naso, section 13; Numbers Raba, chapter 14, do we have a counting which mentions the number of words.
247. Buhl, op. cit., pg. 39; speaks of 1314 passages. Levita, op. cit., mentions 848. Ginsburg, Massorah, letter kaf

lists 488ff, speak of 1350.

248. Maase Ephod, chapter 7, quoted by Gordis, The Biblical Text in the Making, Philadelphia, 1937, pg. 9.
249.

צָרָא וּמִבְּרָא אֲרָמִי... הַמְּקוֹמֹת אֲשֶׁר הִשְׁמִיעַ הַכֶּסֶף
וְהַלְבֹּשׁ דָּמוֹ הָרָרִי וְנִכְתְּבָה שְׁמִינִי אֲשֶׁר בָּהֶם שָׂמָא
250. Introduction to the commentary on the Former Prophets.
251.

הַחֲכָמִים... מִצָּא מִחֲסוֹק הַסִּדְרִים וְהֵלְכוּ בָהֶם אֲחֵרֵי הַדּוֹר לִפְנֵי
דָּעָא וּבִמְקוֹם שֶׁאֵין הִשְׁמִיעַ דָּעָא עַל הַיּוֹדֵךְ כְּתוּבֵן הָאֲחֵרֵי וְלֹא
נִקְדְּמוּ אֵם כְּתוּבֵן מִחֲסוֹרֵי וְלֹא כְּתוּבֵן מִשְׁמַעִים וְכֵן כְּתוּבֵן
הַצֶּדֶק אֲחֵרֵי מִשְׁמַעִים וְכֵן כְּתוּבֵן בְּדָרֵךְ אֲחֵרֵי מִשְׁמַעִים וּבְדָרֵךְ
אֲחֵרֵי בְּחוֹרֵי
252. The elder in Tiberias 8.2; the younger in Anti Criticae;
quoted in Gordis, op. cit., pg. 9.
253. De Arcano Kethib and Keri, in Gordis, op. cit., pg. 10.
254. ibidem, "nimirum, diversarum scriptionum autorem Esdram
facimus qui volumina sacra bis aut amplius exarando vel
recensendo vocem vocis isodyhamo interdum permutavit",
Gordis, op. cit., pg. 13.
255. ibidem, pg. 60.
256. op. cit., pg. 110.
257. op. cit., pg. 111.
258. ibidem.
259. ibidem.
260. Gordis, op. cit., pg. 11.
261. Below will be found a listing of a few of passages where
the Talmud records variations. Harris, op. cit., pg. 136,
maintains that the Talmud seldom or never is con-
cerned with the critical aspect of the subject and often
combines both for Agadic purposes. In Zebahim 37b, 38a

both readings are adopted and it is assumed to be of coordinate inspired authority.

262. Critica Sacra, see Gordis, op. cit., pg. 11.

263. Wurthwein, op. cit., pg. 14, says that euphemisms were changes required for doctrinal purposes.

264. Einleitung, op. cit. pg. 148.

265. see Gordis, op. cit., pg. 11.

see Bamberger, Die Bedeutung des Qeri-Kethib, 1930, pgs. 269, for a list of scholars upholding this view.

see also Bostrom, Alternative Readings in the Hebrew of the Books of Samuel, Rock Island, 1918. C.T. Torrey, Notes on the Aramaic Part in Daniel, Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, vol. 15, 1909.

266. op. cit., pg. 221.

267. Ginsburg, Introduction., pg. 184.

268. see also Weir, op. cit., pg. 124.

269. Lambert, Une Serie de Qere Kethib, Paris, 1891, pg. 5.

270. op. cit., pg. 14.

271. Wurthwein, op. cit., pg. 14.

272. op. cit., pg. 303, to which Sperber, op. cit., pg. 311 that the examples chosen by the Talmud were deliberately chosen to illustrate the characteristic differences between the two recensions of the original Hebrew Bible.

See note 25.

273. Introduction to the commentary on Jeremiah. See also

Weir, op. cit., pg. 122.

274. This view is supported by Krochmal, More Nebuche Hazeman, Leopoli, 1851, chapter 13. The mystic view is also discussed in S. Hamburger, Einleitung zur Tobiah b. Eliezer's Leka Tob zu Ruth, Leipzig, 1887.
275. *אין שווייץ האט מען אים געקוקט פאר אים געקוקט
וואס ער האט געזאגט וואס ער האט געזאגט*
276. op. cit., pg. 82.
277. Ginsburg, op. cit., chapter Keri and Ketib.
278. In Bleek, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, Berlin 1870, pg. 572.
279. Critica Sacra, bk. 3, chpt. 15, mentioned in Gordis, op. cit., pg. 12.
280. Manuel de Lecteur, note 5, pg. 229.
281. Jewish Encyclopedia, op. cit..
282. op. cit.
283. Gordis, op. cit., pg. 35.
284. Harris, op. cit., pg 135, adds that the K-K would have been absorbed under the category of the Tikune Sorerim had it been established prior to the settling of the text. On the other hand, Frankel, op. cit., pg. 220 sq., claims that the variations were known to the authors of the LXX who showed preference for the Keri.
285. Graetz, History of the Jews, Philadelphia, 1949, vol. 3.
286. Kidushin 49a speaks of *אין שווייץ האט מען אים געקוקט פאר אים געקוקט*. Harris, op. cit., pg. 227, says that this resulted in the Massoretic formula *אין שווייץ*.

287. *אמר ליה לאברהם שני חומשיו נטתי לו בסדר תהלים*

Buhl, op. cit., pg. 228, states that Jerome rejected this division as not being genuinely Jewish. However, Sotah 7b, speaks of *אמרתיו* and *כתובים ראשונים*. It also mentions *ש"ל גדולים* (Psalms, Proverbs, Job) and *ש"ל קטנים* (Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations).

288. *רב אבא בר אבהו אמר חמשה חמשי' דמגילת ואברהם בלחין
כנאף תורה, נביאים, וכתובים*

See also Blau, Einleitung., pg. 6ff.

289. 24 is derived by considering 1 and 2 Samuel as one book; 1 and 2 Kings as one book; 1 and 2 Chronicles as one book; Ezra and Nehemiah as one; and the Twelve Minor Prophets as one.

290. *בין חומש לחומש על תורה אברהם שטין וכן בין כל נביא
לנביא וברביא של חמש עשר ש"ל שטין*

291. Buhl, op. cit., pg. 227, adds, "since it has become customary to write all or several writings in one volume, four empty lines are required between each of the Prophetic writings. In some manuscripts, eg. 10 the Bible of the year 1010 CE., one empty line is found between Ezra and Nehemiah.

292. Buhl, *ibidem*; Harris, op. cit., pg. 227; Ginsburg, op. cit., pgs. 1-8.

293. Harris, *ibidem*; Weir, op. cit., pg. 100; Ginsburg, *ibidem*. Both Harris and Weir point out that the Spanish manuscripts

follow the Massoretic order in the *hagiographa*, while the German manuscripts have adopted the following order: Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra-Nehemiah, Chronicles. I refer the reader to the extensive charts in Ginsburg op. cit., pgs. 4, 6, 7, which deal with the various orders of the books of the Bible.

294. *Seder Mezia* 5 - *מזון* Lev. 25.36 - *מאן*
M. Ta'anit 4.2 - *אליהו* Num. 28.5 - *אליהו*
M. Shekalim 3.2 - *נקיט* ~~Num.~~ 32.22 - *נקיט*
M. Pea 6.4 - *כל* Deut. 24.19 - *כל*
Ereket 60b - *בדי אהלי דבר* Psalm 56.11 - *בדי אהלי דבר*
אליהו
Ketubot 5a - *הטוב בבלי אחז* Psalm 95.5 *ויהי ידן יצרו*
ודי חייא טחו ויהי
ידיו יצרו ידן כתיב
והכיתה יצרו

see Strack, op. cit., who lists a total of 111.

295. *Codex Hilleli*. see Strack, pp. cit., pgs. 15-22, where the variants are listed. This codex was used as a model -
ובענין תתיקנו כ"ח למחזק אה היה שחד גדול במלכות
זיאון ואז כוציא חסך סדר האורחה וצערין אשר נקרא
הבידליאך שכתב אחת דה הכל וחסך הון אליהו
כל המסדרים ואז ראצת חלק חסך עמאכרו באפריקא ובצאן
היה טי מאות שנה עכברגו
 quoted by Strack, op. cit., pg. 16, from *יוחסין* by
 R. Abraham b. R. Samuel Zaccuto, whose date is about
 1717 CE.. Therefore, the Hilleli was written about 800 CE.

Codex Zanbuki, see Strack, op. cit., pgs. 22-23.

Chumash Yereecho, see Strack, op. cit., pg. 23.

Sefer Sinai, see Strack, op. cit., pgs. 23, 23.

296. above.

297. Ginsburg, op. cit., pgs. 241-286.

Num. 26.23	B.N.-	עבירה	B.A.-	עבירה
Is. 30.23	B.N.-	אוצר	B.A.-	צרעק
Jer. 27.19	B.N.-	האור	B.A.-	העיר
Ezek. 14.16	B.N.-	טמאה גבול	B.A.-	היה טמאה

298. Blau, Masoretische Untersuchungen, Strassburg, 1891.

- H.H. Rowley, The Growth of the Old Testament, London, Hutchinson's University Library, 1953. A small but compact introduction to the study of the Bible. Rowley's analysis is at times a little sketchy.
- S.R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, New York, 1956, Meridian Library. This is a paper back book of the original. Driver shows his extremely fine scholarship. In this book he deals with the strata of the Bible as well as with the exegesis of the books.
- R.H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, New York, Harper, 1948. A magnificent work. Pfeiffer indeed proves his ability in the field of Bible.
- Shelomo ben Adreth, Perushe Agadot le-Rashbo, This book is concerned mainly with halakah. However, Adreth does make pertinent remarks to the history of the Bible here and there.
- Aaron ben Asher, Dikduke Ha'teamim, edited by Baer and Strack, Leipzig, Fernau, 1879. An absolute neccessity for the student of the Massorah. Ben Asher is mainly concerned with the point-of the Biblical text. Nevertheless, there are references to the early labours of the Massorites. This edition has the complete Hebrew text as well as the commentary of Baer and Strack.
- Barnes, Ancient Corrections in the Text of the O.T., Journal of Theological Studies, 1, London, Macmillan, 1900. Barnes in this essay deals with emendations based on the versions.
- W. Chomsky, Hebrew: The Eternal Language, Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society, 1957. This was written more for public

reading than for scholarly research. However, Chomsky is
up to date. 67.

F. Bleek, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, Berlin, G. Reimer, 1870. This is a very good but general treatment of the history of the Hebrew text. The main problem with the book, like all old studies is that they are now a little out dated.

J. Derenbourg, Manuel du Lecteur, Journal Asiatique, 2, Paris, Baer & Co., 1870. This article is concerned with a Yemen manuscript. Like all of Derenbourg's work it is an excellent commentary and gives the reader an aid in comparing such a manuscript with the work of Ginsburg and Kahle.

Dillman, Real Encyclopaedie, 2, Stuttgart, Metzlerscher, 1895. This article on the Bible is fine but is not too detailed. He unfortunately, does not abound in footnotes.

H. Gaster, The Biblical Lessons, A Chapter on Biblical Archaeology, London, Routledge, 1913. A fine work which has too few footnotes. However, Gaster's work is fine, but traditionally inclined.

F. Buhl, Canon and Text of the O.T., Edinburgh, Clark, 1892. Buhl has the excellent habit of stating his theory very concisely and then concentrates on giving his reader a very complete bibliography. His scholarship is an extremely careful scholarship.

C.D. Ginsburg, Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition

of the Hebrew Bible, London, Trinitarian Bible Society, 1897. This is one of the finest works that can be found. It contains every fascet of Biblical history. Ginsburg is not concerned with exegesis or anything that boards on the realm of the subjective.

C.D. Ginsburg, The Massorah, London, Ballantyne, 1883. This is a massive, 3 volume, work dealing with the Massorah. Ginsburg draws all his information from manuscripts and leaves nothing to chance.

Geiger, Massorah, Judische Zeitschrift fur Wissenschaft und Leben, volume 3, 1837; volume 4, 1839; volume 10, 1872, Breslau, Brodhagsche. This series of articles testify to a very keen sense of scholarship. Geiger excels in Rabbinics and its relationship to the history of the Biblical text.

H. Graetz, Monatsschrift., Eine Masoretische Studie, Kroteschin, Monasch, 1868, volume 31; 1887, volume 36. Graetz is a scholar who deserves to be studied. He has some especially fine theories which require further investigation.

H. Graetz, History of the Jews, vol. 3, Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society, 1949. In his history Graetz is very sketchy when he deals with the history of the Biblical text. Hamburger, Real Encyclopaedie, 2, Stuttgart, Metzlerscher, 1895. Like Dillman, Hamburger, is concerned with the Biblical text. He is at times quite sketchy.

I. Harris, Massorah: The Rise and Development of the Massorah, Jewish Quarterly Review, 1, New York, 1889. This article is a treasure of information. He covers the history of the Massorah

from its very beginning to about the tenth century CE. He leans towards tradition and is completely against Blau.

Hempel, Innermasoretische Bestatigungen des Samaritanus, Zeitschrift fur die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 52, Berlin, Topelmann, 1934.

Hempel's study is a very fine one. His scholarship is extremely thorough and his conclusions are at times a little radical. Nevertheless, he must not be dismissed but does require investigation.

H.S. Hirschfeld, Halachische Exegese, Berlin, Simion, 1840.

This work is a history of Talmudic exegesis and discusses the Talmudic method.

C. Leviaš, Masorah, Jewish Encyclopedia, 8, New York, Funk and Wagnalls, 1930. This article serves as a good beginning. It treats all facets of Massoretic study but does not supply the reader with footnotes. There is a small bibliography at the end of the article.

Paul Kahle, Masoreten des Ostens, Leipzig, Heinrichs, 1913.

A typical Kahle book. It is a fund of information and is based on manuscript study.

Paul Kahle, Masoreten des Westens, Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1927-1930. This too a magnificent product of an extremely wonderful scholar. This work, as well, is based on manuscript study.

Paul Kahle, The Cairo Geniza, London, Oxford, 1941. The book comprises a series of three lectures. It seems to be a summary of the aforementioned two books.

Bamberger, Die Bedeutung des Qeri-Kethib, 1930. A very scholarly work dealing with the phenomena of the Keri-Ketib. The best feature of the work is the summary of all scholars who maintain

the alternate reading theory.

70.

Lambert, Une Serie de Qere Kethib, Paris, 1891. A very short work but it expresses his theory in a simple and explicit manner. S.D. Luzzatto, Letters, compiled by I. Luzzatto, Przemyśl, Zupnik and Knoller, 1882-1894. In this series of letters there is just one which touches on the subject discussed in this essay. It, however, must be checked because there are no footnotes.

J. Perles, Etymologische Studien, Breslau, Schletter, 1871. A fine study of the Hebrew and cognate languages.

E. Robertson, The Text of the O.T. and Methods of Textual Criticism, London. This is a lecture. Therefore, the author does not delve too deeply into his subject. The lecture, even when printed, has very few notes.

E.F.K. Rosenmuller, Handbuch fur d. Literatur der Bibel, Kritik und Exegese, 1, 1797. Rosenmuller is a very capable scholar even though, we have dismissed him in our essay. He does deserve more consideration than was afforded to him in our dissertation.

Sales, Koran, Philadelphia, Lippincott, 1867. The preliminary discourse tries to be scholarly but like many scholars of the Koran he seems to be bound to Moslem tradition.

S. Schechter, To the Editor of the Jewish Chronicle, London Jewish Chronicle, Jan. 13, 1888. This is a letter to the editor which combats the view expressed at that time that Jews should return to the triennial cycle.

W. Robertson Smith, The O.T. in the Jewish Church, New York,

Appleton, 1881. The lectures are fine ones but we must be aware of the fact that Smith does not seem to be able to handle Rabbinic texts and relies solely on secondary materials.

J.G. Sommer, Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Berlin, Rickersche, 1892, volumes 11-12. The article does not live up to the quality that appear in this Journal.

A. Sperber, Problems of the Masora, Hebrew Union College Annual, 17, Cincinnati, 1943. This is an extremely fine article which investigates certain problems that have their origin in Rabbinic literature.

Thompson, Handbook of Greek and Latin Paleography, London, Clarendon, 1893. The book does not bear to much on the subject discussed in our essay.

Theodor, Monatsschrift f. Geschichte u. Wissenschaft d. Judenthums, Die Midraschim zum Pentateuch und der dreijährige palästinensische Ensus, Krotoschin, Monasch, 1885, volume 34.

In just a very few pages Theodor discusses quite fully the triennial cycle.

G.T. Torrey, Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 15, 1909. In this article Torrey describes the reasons why he accepts the alternative reading theory in regard to Keri and Ketib.

T.H. Weir, Short History of the Hebrew Text, Oxford, 1899. A comprehensive study but the reader must check Weir's remarks because he does not have too many footnotes or references to his sources.

E. Würthwein, The Text of the O.T., New York, 1957.

A companion to the Kittel-Kahle Bible. It treats briefly the history of the text. The aim of the book is to explain the marginal notations of this edition of the Bible.

Friedmann, Literaturblatt of the Menorah, 1, no. 3.

Rappaport ed., Halichot Kedem, Amsterdam, 1846.

Reifmann, Beth Talmud, 1882.

Schorr, He-chalutz, Lember, 1856.

Azariah de Rossi, Meor Eynayim, Mantua, 1573-1575. Translated by Israel Abrams, Philadelphia, 1920. This is an early critical study. It treats the vowel system and Hebrew grammar.

Krauss, Der Obelos in masoretischen Texte, Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Giesen, Rickersche, volume 22, 1902. A brief but full packed article dealing with a massoretic problem.

M. Mielziner, Introduction to the Talmud, Cincinnati, 1894.

This book is concerned with exegesis and the principles involved in the activity.

Max. Muller, Selected Essays, volume 2.

Luzzatto, Addimenta to ~~פרשנים~~, Vienna, 1869.

This is a work concerned with the Biblical text.

N. Krochmal, More Nebuche Hazzaman, Leopoli, Schnayder, 1851.

Hochstadter, Ben Chananya, 1865.

Luzzatto, Or Boker.

Abraham, Introduction to the commentary on Jeremiah, 1873.

Kimhi, Introduction to the Former Prophets, 1892.

Paul Kahle, Die Hebräischen Handschriften aus der Hohen,

Stuttgart, 1951. Another superb work by this eminent scholar.

H.L. Strack, Prolegomena Critica in Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum, Leipzig, Heinrichs, 1873. Written in Latin this work is invaluable. It list all variants in the Talmud and in the private codices.

Jacob ben Chayim, Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record, translated by C.D. Ginsburg, London, Mitchell, 1863. The work treats mainly the phenomena of the Keri and Ketib.

Pinsker, Kerem Chemed.

Rappaport, Erech Millin.

Friedmann, Beth Talmud.

Brull, Beth Talmud.

F. Delitzsch, Commentar uber Den Psalter, Leipzig, Dorffling and Franke, 1859. After reading the works of Ginsburg and his comments on Delitzsch I am afraid to render any impression on the work. He does seem to have some very good ideas.

L. Blau, Masoretische Untersuchungen, Strassburg, Trubner, 1891. A short but excellent work which works with the idea that the post Talmudic massorites did not understand the Talmudic canons.

L. Blau, Zur Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift, Budapest, Trubner, 1894. A short introduction. Its sections which deals with the massorah is fine. He offers a great deal for the student of the massorah.

J.G. Eichorn, Einleitung ins Alte Testament, Leipzig, Weidmann, 1803, third edition. This is not too big a work but does treat the subject quite adequately.

R. Gordis, The Biblical Text in the Making, Philadelphia,

- Jewish Publication Society, 1937. This is a study of the Keri and Ketib. Especially valuable are the charts that have been included in the book.
- Bostrom, Alternative Readings in the Hebrew of the Books of Samuel, Rock Island Illinois, Augustana, 1918. A short work stressing the theory of alternative readings.
- S. Bamberger, Einleitung zur Tobiah b. Eliezer's Leka Tob zu Ruth, Leipzig, Wurzburg, 1887. Just by chance there is a remark to the subject we discussed.
- A. Neubauer, Medieval Jewish Commentaries and Chronological Notes, Oxford, Clarendon, 1887-95. An extremely fine work and an excellent source for that period in history.
- Elias Levita, Massoreth Ha-Massoreth, London, Longman, 1867, translated by C. D. Ginsburg. A very fine treatise dealing with history of the text. It is especially valuable for the theories on the vowel points.
- Geiger, Urschrift und ubersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer abhangigkeit von der innern Entwicklung des Judenthums, Breslau, Hainauer, 1857. A most wonderful history. Geiger exhibits tremendous scholarship.
- Frankel, Vorstudien zur der Septuaginta, Leipzig, Vogel, 1841. Excellent introduction to the world of the Septuagint and its relation to the massoretic text.
- P.A. De Lagard, Proverbiens, Gottingae, Hoyer, 1883. This is a commentary but does have some information on the history of the Biblical text.

Pollack, Halichoth Kedem, Vienna, 1861. This is a history
which deals at the same time with the Biblical text.