INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES AND PRIZE ESSAYS

AUTHOR Stephen F. K. Moch

TITLE The Ben Aher and Ben Noftali Traditions in HUC MS. 538 and other Biblical MSS.

TYPE OF THESIS: Ph.D. [ ]   D.H.L. [ ]   Rabbinic [X]

Master's [ ]   Prize Essay [ ]

1. May circulate [X]   ) Not necessary
) for Ph.D.
2. Is restricted [ ] for ___ years.) thesis

   Note: The Library shall respect restrictions placed on theses
          or prize essays for a period of no more than ten years.

   I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of my thesis
   for security purposes.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis. ___   X with specific permission
                                                  yes no   only.

June 21, 1978   Stephen F. K. Moch
_____   _____
Date   Signature of Author

Library   Microfilmed 7/10/78
Record   _____ _____
                       Date

                                 Urvina Steiner
                                 _____
                                 Signature of Library Staff Member

INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES AND PRIZE ESSAYS

AUTHOR   Moch, Stephen F. K.

TITLE "The Ben Aser and Ben Naftali Traditions as Seen in the Hebrew

Union College MS. 958 and other Biblical Manuscripts"

TYPE OF THESIS: Ph.D. [ ] D.H.L. [ ]   Rabbinic [XX]

                Master's [ ] Prize Essay [ ]

1. May circulate [}   ) Not necessary
) for Ph.D.
2. Is restricted [ ] for ___ years.) thesis

    Note: The Library shall respect restrictions placed on theses
           or prize essays for a period of no more than ten years.

    I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of my thesis
    for security purposes.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis. ___   ___
                                          yes   no

March 6, 1978   _Stephen F. K. Moch_
Date   Signature of Author

Library   Microfilmed_____
Record   Date

                              _____
                              Signature of Library Staff Member

THE BEN AŠER AND BEN NAFTALI TRADITIONS

AS SEEN IN THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE MS. 958

AND OTHER BIBLICAL MANUSCRIPTS

STEPHEN F. K. MOCH

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for Ordination

Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion

Cincinnati, Ohio

1978

Referee, Prof. David B. Weisberg

For my parents

and Jacqueline

who have been my constant support

and for David Weisberg

my teacher and Rabbi

DIGEST

It was the original intention of this thesis to study HUC
MS. 958 and other biblical manuscripts in hopes of learning more
about the scores of masoretic phenomena which make-up and adorn
the biblical text. In particular I hoped to learn more of the two
great Tiberian schools of ben Ašer and ben Naftali, the differences
that distinguished them and the similarities that allied them.
Time has obscured many of the precise differences between them.
Our received Bible text is predominantly ben Ašer, but mixed with
many ben Naftali traditions and some traditions from other less known
Tiberian schools. More can be learned of these two and the Bible
texts that were the products of their schools by finding manuscripts
which can be confirmed as exemplars of one school or the other.
This is not easily done for many manuscripts contain colophons and
marginal references accrediting them to ben Ašer while their biblical
texts differ greatly from one another. More can be learned of ben Ašer
and ben Naftali and the developement of received traditions by attemp-
ting to separate the various stains running through different mixed
Bible manuscripts. I have attempted to use both these approaches.

The first chapter provides the reader with a general overview of
some of the some of the problems in the reconstuction of the ben Ašer
and ben Naftali traditions. Specifically, it acquaints the reader with
background of ben Ašer and ben Naftali as Masoretes, it reviews some

i

of the questions surrounding four purportedly ben Ašer manuscripts and several of the most valuable masoretic compendia. I have attempted to provide the reader with some insights into the differences between the various Tiberian school. I portray them as conservators of the biblical text who attempted to harmonize the oral transmission of the Bible text with its separate but interdependent written tradition. It is hoped that this introduction will provide the reader with a key to develope his or her own perspective of the Tiberian Masoretic text and its aplication to the manuscripts studied here.

Chapter two is important among the investigations of the ben Ašer Bible Codices. I have tested the reliance of the Aleppo and Leningrad Codices as ben Ašer exemplars using a new method. By comparing specific parts of Mišael ben Uzziel's treatise on the differences and congruences between ben Ašer and ben Naftali,with the Aleppo and Leningrad Codices, I have been able to demonstrate that the famous Leningrad Codex B19a is a mixed text and not exemplar of the ben Ašer school. I was also able to confirm that the Aleppo Codex is characteristic of ben Ašer, but that it is by no means certain that it was written by ben Ašer himself or his school.

In chapter three, I have analysed the various masoretic peculiarities of HUC MS. 958 and compared it with Leningrad B19a and the Jacob ben Ḥayyim edition of the Bible. This manuscript is of value to masoretic studies because it comes from the Jewish community of K'aifeng Fu, the old capital of China. The isolation of the Jews in China drastically increases the chances that this manuscript and others like it may preserve masoretic strains that are much older than the 17th century when HUC 958 itself was copied.

Over the course of time, the differences in various traditions have
been leveled by a desire to produce one authoritative Bible text.
Thus the earliest masoretic traditions can only be recovered with
certainty in old manuscripts like the Aleppo Codex. But the long
process of the development of the Bible text is also important.
HUC MS. 958, a relatively recent manuscript and filled with mistakes,
contains important information on the development of the placement of
the $š^ev\mathit{a}ḥ$ and on the relationship between phonemes and graphemes in
the biblical text. It provides us with an excellent example of how
a ben Ašer text was imposed upon a non-Tiberian tradition. Outwardly
the text seems to be both Tiberian and ben Ašer, but a closer exami-
nation has revealed that it did not use vowels and accents in the
conventional Tiberian way. It also preserves only one set of accents
for the Ten Commandments and therefore provides the opportunity to
learn more about the separation of the two sets of accents in standard
Tiberian texts, and the separation of the verses when reading in
public or in private.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

From the time that Dr. David Weisberg, מורי ורבי, first showed
me a photo-copy of the manuscript from K'aifeng, I was fascinated.
I was to be the first person to study any part of the K'aifeng section
books in detail. My original thesis was to have been an analysis
of HUC MS. 958 with respect to the BA and BN traditions. But the
encouragement and confidence in my scholarly potential that Dr.
David Weisberg offered me and the intellectual and spititual chal-
lenge with which he confronted me lured me into an ever-widening
field of masoretic interests. The thesis expanded with those interests.
In its present form it includes the nature of masorah, the place of
the BA and BN traditions and our own biblical studies as masorah, a
discussion of the dual accentuation of the Ten Commandments, an
analysis of the two codices most often attributed to BA and some
criticisms of the various masoretic compendia by which we judge those
codices.

It was a rare privilege to be able to work with such an unusual
and beautiful manuscript as HUC 958. I was also privileged to be
able to investigate the famous Aleppo Codex. It has been under the
care of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem for the past decade and
a half, but it was available for scholarly study to only a select
number of individuals. Only a few poor in quality photographic
plates were published in *Textus* I (1960). When I first drafted my
thesis perspectus, I had no dreams of having the opportunity
within the context of my thesis to study the Aleppo Codex.

ABBREVIATIONS

A = Aleppo Codex.

B = British Museum MS. Or 4445.

B19a = Leningrad MS. B19a.

BA = ben Ašer, Aharon ben Mošeh.

BH^3 = *Biblia Hebraica* 3rd ed.

BN = ben Naftali, Mošeh ben David.

C = The Cairo Codex of the Prophets.

diq. = *diqduqe hatt^e^{c}amim.*

EJ = *Encyclopaedia Judaica.*

IOMS = The International Organization for Masoretic Studies.

JBH = Jacob ben Ḥayyim's second rabbinic Bible.

L = Leningrad MS. B19a.

oklah = *sefer oklah v^e'oklah.*

TRANSLITERATIONS

The table of more exact romanization of Hebrew compiled by Werner
Weinberg was followed with the following exceptions:

g = ג

d = ד

$ṣ$ = צ

$š$ = שׁ

raised ^{e} = vocal $š^e$*vah.*

No capitalization except in proper names.

final *h* is pronounced as a consonant in Aramaic words but as a vowel
in Hebrew words.

Proper names do not follow these guidelines strictly, thus,
Mišael ben Uzziel rather than Miša'el ben ʿUzzi'el.

CHAPTER ONE: AN INTRODUCTION TO SOME MASORETIC PROBLEMS

The knowledge that the text of the Hebrew Bible we read, recite and
study has changed over the years goes unchallenged, even among many learned
Orthodox Jewish circles. The Talmud all but admits that the paleo-Hebrew
script with which most of the Bible was once written was abandoned in
the time of Ezra the Scribe in favor of the square Assyrian script which
we use today.[1] We also learn from tractate *sofrim* of corrections which
the sages made upon the text of the Bible (תקוני סופרים) in order to
avoid blasphemy.[2] It is precisely these types of changes in the Biblical
Text, originating in the Book of Ezra, which began the traceable history
of masorah, the transmission of the biblical text.

With the passage of time, the text of the Bible became more and
more fixed. By this I mean that modern scholars are found not to alter
the text of the Bible regarding such masoretic phenomena as its orthogra-
phy, the open and closed passages, the canon, or the division of words
and verses; whereas more than two millennia ago, masoretes, those who
transmit the Bible from one generation to another, confronted not one
Bible, but an unknown number of versions of the biblical text. It was
their duty to insure the transmission of only those versions which were
authentic in their eyes. Thus, we hear of an account of three scrolls,
each recording differing readings in the text of the Torah, which were
found in the court of the Temple:

> Three Scrolls of the Law were found in the Temple Court:
> the *meʿonah* scroll, the *zaʿatuteh* scroll and the *hiʾ* scroll.
> In one of them they found written מעון אלהי קדם (Deut. 33:27)
> and in the other two they found written מעונה; they adopted

1

the reading of the two and discarded the reading of the one. In one they found written וישלח את זעטוטי בני ישראל (Ex. 24:5) and in the other two they found written וישלח את נערי בני ישראל; they adopted the two and discarded the one. In one they found היא written nine times (as opposed to the older spelling והוא), and in the other two they found it written eleven times; they adopted the two and discarded the one.[3]

It was not always the case that the preferred version was preserved and the other destroyed. In many cases the masoretes preserved both readings. Robert Gordis in his excellent work on קרי/כתיב variants, lists numerous examples where two different readings are preserved within the biblical text itself.[4] Thus Nu. 34:1 reads: אל הארץ כנען. There is no doubt that this was an attempt to preserve two versions, one being: אל הארץ, and the other אל ארץ כנען (as found in the *sifre*).

Most scholars today agree that masorah has shaped the biblical text almost from its inception until today. The emphases and methods of various masoretes at different times have changed as was demonstrated above; but the basic goal of masorah always has been, and always must remain, the accurate transmission of scripture. In the past masorah has striven to conserve scripture, not to alter it. In the modern period of critical scholarship, masorah adds to that goal the search for the ancient versions of scripture and the reconstruction of the process by which our received text came down to us.

This opinion has not been universally accepted. Its opponents, headed by Mordechai Breuer, claim that the term Masorete, by definition, can only apply to those scholars of Tiberius who fixed the authoritative text of the Bible a thousand years ago.

Breuer's views are not arbitrary. He examined the methodology by which R. Me'ir Halevi ben Todros Abulafia produced the text which is now considered authoritative for use in public reading.[5] Abulafia took the

best and oldest manuscripts which he could find and by comparing them
was able to determine a majority view in each instance where these manu-
scripts conflicted. This was the same method used to arrive at the
correct text in the account of the three temple scrolls, if we accept
that account as historic. Breuer believed that one might reconstruct
the original Tiberian text of the Bible regarding its orthography by
using Abulafia's methodology with the superior manuscripts of the Bible
that are known today.

The first step in this process was to devise a method whereby he
could test his results. Breuer decided to use the masoretic notes found
on these manuscripts for this purpose. A second methodology had to be
formulated to arrive at a single version of the masoretic notes found in
the *masorah magnah* and the *masorah parvah*, since these vary greatly from
each other as well as from the manuscripts on which they are found.

Breuer compared the orthographies and masoretic notes of a number
of reliable codices including Leningrad B19a (also referred to as the
Leningrad Codex, B19a or L), British Museum MS. Or. 4445 (B) and the
Aleppo Codex which is now in Jerusalem (A). Whenever there was a unani-
mous or near unanimous agreement between the codices, Breuer adopted that
reading. The end result was a list of biblical words in which he hoped
he had reproduced the original masoretic *plene* and defective spellings
and a list of what he hoped were the original masoretic notes. These two
lists Breuer compared to each other. Interestingly enough, Breuer's list
of words corresponded exactly with his reconstructed masoretic notes.

Breuer concluded that the results of his research proved once and
for all that there is such a thing as the Masoretic Text.[5] He challenged
the views of those who advocate a broad definition of the masoretic

phenomenon by saying:

> Everyone knows that versions in the Talmud differ in many
> instances from the versions of the Masoretes; such issues
> need no proof. But we must define this term according to
> the commonly accepted definition: a text which is found
> in a manuscript--or copies from a manuscript--in which
> there are masoretic notes of the Tiberian Sages. Accordingly,
> Talmudic versions ·are of no relevance here; perhaps they
> reflect the "correct" or "original" text of the Bible, but
> they are non-masoretic by definition, and they have nothing
> to do with the uniform version which was accepted by the
> Tiberian Masoretes.

Having established that only one authoritative masorah indeed exists and

that it is well within the capabilities of modern scientific methods to

recover, Breuer affirms that biblical scholarship is obliged, not just

allowed, to correct the errors wherever they may be.[8]

Breuer's approach presents several difficulties. Were there in

fact one unified masoretic text, it would be most presumptuous of modern

scholars to pretend that they could with certainty reject readings from

so prestigous and old a manuscript as the Leningrad Codex; and carry this

to the point where they would correct the scrolls from which we read the

Law. In that sense, our self-defined authority as masoretes is somewhat

less than the masoretes even as late as Abulafia,[9] who rejected one ver-

sion in favor of another and corrected scrolls of the Law to conform

with this view.

Secondly, even on the basis of Breuer's own findings, there is no

reason to conclude that there was ever a uniform version of the biblical

text accepted by all of the Tiberian Masoretes. Breuer's valuable study

may indeed demonstrate that even at an early period, one orthographic

tradition had predominance over the others, that the masoretic notes at

one time meshed with the text[10] and that soon after the orthographic

texts had been fixed by each school, they became confused with one another despite the detailed notations the schools produced to prevent just such an occurrence.

The existence of what Breuer calls erroneous orthography and erroneous masoretic notes may someday prove that there was more than one Tiberian Masoretic approved orthographical text. Indeed, a scientific comparison of Breuer's so-called erroneous orthographies with his erroneous masoretic notes could conceivably prove the existence of a second orthographic version, were they too to correspond.

Lastly, the fact that the masoretes may have approved the orthography of one Bible text and tried to suppress another, does not necessitate labeling readings which they rejected as errors. This would be an absurd supposition to make. Were it confirmed, as has happened before, that the reading of a biblical passage which occurs in the Talmud and the Septuagint but not in the Tiberian text also occurs in the scrolls from Qumran, we would certainly not describe that reading as the correct error or the original correct error. And assuming that, as Breuer claims, there was only one unified Tiberian orthography of the Bible, it would still be absurd to label variants from that text as errors.

Breuer's contention does not hold firm, that only the masoretes of Tiberius were real masoretes, by virtue of the masorah which they appended to the Bible text. There are other sources of masoretic notes other than the margins of manuscripts from the Tiberian schools. What would Breuer term rabbinic notes on the proper biblical layout or readings found on the margins of Babylonian supralineal manuscripts, non-masoretic notes? Furthermore, there is no reason that we should bestow the honorable title of "masorete" on those who notated the text which they helped to shape,

and yet deny that title to others who also helped to shape the biblical text simply because they failed to notate their work.[11] Rabbi Fred N. Reiner described the masoretic phenomenon best:

> It is best to understand the masoretic process as a continuing process, a growing and accretion which constantly incorporates into itself new insights with each new generation. Those who study Bible manuscripts and concern themselves with masorah are themselves masoretes, engaged in the same process as Aaron and Moses Ben Asher. Of course there are good, reliable pieces of work and there are shams, with wide ranges of variance between them. But the basic process of studying and transmitting the text of the Hebrew Bible continues to this day. In our age we are confronted with the work of many masoretes, and the number continues to grow. When we seek a universal masoretic text--"the" masoretic text--confusion inevitably results.[12]

THE TIBERIAN BIBLE TEXT AND THE BEN ASER TRADITION

One need only look at the table of contents of C.D. Ginsburg's *Introduction to the Masoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible* to be reminded of the scope of masoretic phenomena occurring in the Hebrew Bible: included are the order of the Books, the division of the text into open and closed passages, the division into chapters, the $s^e\underline{d}arim$ and $para\check{s}iyyo\underline{t}$ (the triennial and annual pericopes), the division into verses, and words, $dage\check{s}$ and $rafe$, orthography, $q^e re$ and $k^e\underline{t}i\underline{b}$, $s^e\underline{b}irin$, the eastern versus the western recension, the differences between ben Aśer and ben Naftali, the introduction of the square alphabet, the final forms of the letters, $miqra'$ $sofrim$ and $\,^c i\underline{t}ur$ $sofrim$, the extraordinary points, the majuscule, miniscule, suspended and broken letters, the inverted nuns, and $tiqqune$-$sofrim$. Yet Ginsburg never provides headings in his contents for the most obvious products of the masorete's work--the accentuation and vocalization of the Bible text. Not a single word is read or chanted from scrolls of the Law without reference to and reliance

upon the vocalization and accentuation of the masoretes.

We know very little about the development of the vocalization and accentuation during its formative period. The gap in our knowledge extends from the time of the Qumran scrolls until the tenth century when the masorah had already grown into three full-blown systems, the Babylonian, the Palestinian and the Tiberian. The relationship between those three bodies of masoretic data is still unclear. Least known is the Palestinian vocalization and accentuation which apparently was a precursor to the Tiberian text. The Palestinian is somewhat simplistic while the Tiberian is the most sophisticated and complex of the three systems. Within each of these systems there were various schools. In Babylonia we know of at least two schools, one in Sura' and one in Nehard^e'a'. In Tiberius we know of at least five separate schools (there were probably others) each vocalizing and accentuating the biblical text in slightly different ways. The schools of Aharon ben Moseh ben Ašer and Mošeh ben David ben Naftali quickly gained acceptance over the other schools of Mošeh Moha, R. Pinhas the Head of the Academy and Ḥabib ben Pippin. It is uncertain how ben Ašer (BA) and ben Naftali (BN) overshadowed the other schools, whether by a halakhic decision of some religious authority or by popular respect for their scholarship. But these other schools never disappeared completely; many of their readings have been preserved in marginal notes in old manuscripts[13] and occasionally secreted into the texts of some manuscripts. Mišael ben Uzziel compiled a masoretic treatise called *kitab alkilaf* shortly after the deaths of these masoretes.[14] In it he listed all of the instances where BA and BN differed in their reading of the biblical text and all of the instances where they agreed.

The treatise never specifies who the opponents of BA and BN were

when they agreed nor what the variant reading was; but in many instances these can be identified from the marginal comments in manuscripts about the other masoretes.[15] It is clear from the fact that Mišael carefully avoids enumerating the readings of the other masoretes, that he does not want to encourage the preservation of their opinions. On the other hand, neither Mišael's *kitāb alkilaf* nor the older treatise of Levi ben Hassan, only the colophon of which is preserved, indicate any preference whatsoever for the readings of either BA or BN. As Paul Kahle pointed out, this shows that in their time, Mošeh ben Naftali was a highly esteemed Tiberian Masorete.[16] This is not to say that other authorities did not have their preferences. Sa'adyah Ga'on, a contemporary of the Tiberian Masoretes, wrote a polemic against BA in the form of a *piyyuṭ* beginning אשא משלי .[17] On the whole, however, the BA and BN traditions existed side by side on an equal footing from the tenth century until the time of David Qimḥi (died 1235) who was the first to give preference to BA.[18] Other references from the intervening centuries confirm that BN was as respected as BA. Lipschütz informs us of an anonymous author from the 11th century, who in discussing the use of *dageš* or *rafe* in בגד"כפת after the word ויהי, states: "And the reader should conform to one of these two opinions."[19] A second anonymous author speaks a great deal about the two Masoretes in his commentary to Gen. 49:21 where he tells us that Jews everywhere adopted the codices of BA and BN, and that the Tiberian Masoretes produced many copies of the Bible which they brought to Babylonia and other countries to distribute among the people.[20]

The Tiberian system may have gained eminence over the Babylonian system because it was slightly more complex: (e.g., The Babylonian

system had no rare accents. See Weisberg, "The Rare Accents of the 21 Books," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 56 (1965-66) p. 327). But this medieval report may hint that the Tiberian text gained world-wide recognition partly because of the efforts of the Tiberian Masoretes themselves.[21]

The BA tradition finally won out over BN only after Maimonides ruled in his Code that, in matters of open and closed passages and the layout of the Song of the Sea and the Song of Moses, the codex of BA should be followed.[22] It is popularly believed that from that point on, the BN tradition was suppressed. Manuscripts showing BN readings were either destroyed or corrected to read according to BA. Soon, so little was remembered about BN that Elias Levita called him a Babylonian Masorete in his *masoret hammesoret*, and Ginsburg later adopted this mistaken view.[23]

In 1926 when Rudolf Kittel was about to republish the *Biblia Hebraica* using the usual Jacob ben Ḥayyim version (JBḤ) Paul Kahle wrote to him suggesting that he publish the text of Aharon ben Ašer instead. Kahle had found Hebrew Bible codices dated from the tenth to the twelfth centuries in the Leningrad Public Library which he was convinced contained mainly BA readings. He was especially confident that Leningrad MS. II Firk. B19a, the oldest complete Hebrew Bible known, was a reliable BA codex. He subsequently was invited to publish the Leningrad MS. as the third edition of the *Biblia Hebraica* (BH[3]).[24] Since the publication of BH[3], no less than five printed Bibles and two facsimile reproductions have been marketed, all claiming to be the text of ben Ašer.[25] All the while, not a single Bible has been published in the name of BN or any other masorete.

What can account for this steady output of Bibles claiming to

reproduce the BA text other than a deep-seated--I might even say sub-conscious--desire to participate in nothing less than the most authentic of the many Bible versions? That this should be true of non-Jewish as well as Jewish scholars is interesting but not surprising. In this light we can understand Paul Kahle's improbable contention that he could re-construct the readings of the ben Ašer family, beginning with the father, Mošeh, represented by the Cairo Codex of the Prophets. Kahle arrived at his reconstruction after comparing the lists of BA and BN readings from Mišael's treatise with several codices whose colophons or marginal notes identified them with BA. He found that the Cairo Codex

> . . . never had the readings given by Mishael as being
> characteristic of Aaron b. Asher. It was clear that the
> details of punctuation quoted by Mishael were worked out
> by the son, not by the father. The Cairo Ben Asher Codex
> represents a kind of text from which Aaron b. Asher
> started. The British Museum MS. is a specimen of the
> development of the text in the earlier period of Ben
> Asher's activity; in the specimens from which the Lenin-
> grad Codex was copied we may have types of the Hebrew
> Biblical text in later periods of Ben Asher's activity.
> It is very likely that the Aleppo Codex is another type
> of this text, in which the Masora was further developed.[26]

Certainly Kahle knew that the claims of authorship found in codices are, as often as not, falsifications made to increase the value of the manu-script. I suspect that the inner desire to reconstruct the authoritative BA text of the Bible caused Kahle and others to choose methodologies and interpretations that would favor the results at which they wished to arrive.

In the end, we are indebted to Harry Orlinsky for asking, "What is there inherently in the masoretic work of the Ben Asher school that gives it greater authority than that of the Ben Naftali school?"[27] For too long students of masorah have been searching after _the_ ben Ašer codex

at the end of a rainbow. This was unfortunate for masoretic scholarship only in the sense that it caused neglect in searching for, and research in, the texts of the other Tiberian Masoretes. It is to the credit of H. Yalon that he published an article on a codex of פרשת שלח לך which seems to have preserved a ben Naftali text.[28] There is no doubt that the claim heard so often is a myth, that all true ben Naftali codices have been destroyed as a result of the codification of the BA tradition. And there is considerable doubt whether or not any _pure_ BA codices exist. Not one of the manuscripts purported to belong to the BA school have gone unchallenged. Even the very oldest manuscripts that have come down to us seem to be products of mixed traditions. Some are mainly BA with only the smallest percentage of BN readings like the Aleppo Codex; and some have more BN characteristics than BA; and all of them have occasional readings that are neither BA nor BN but which may be from one of the other Tiberian schools. Just as earlier masoretes combined two variant traditions together into one unintelligible phrase like אל הארץ כנען, so the masoretes after BA and BN combined their differences into unified codices. The result of this process of synthesis and recension was a _textus receptus_. Each codex written after that point may have been based on BA or BN but was essentially a compromise between the two. Orlinsky, arguing against the existence of one authoritative and defined masoretic text, said, "All that best we might hope to achieve, in theory, is 'a masoretic text,' or 'a text of the Masoretes," that is to say, a text worked up by BA or by BN, or by someone in the Babylonian tradition, . . . but as matters stand, we cannot even achieve a clear-cut text of the BA school, or the BN school, or of a Babylonian school, or a text based on a single masoretic list; indeed, it is not at all certain that any such ever existed."[29]

THE SO-CALLED BEN ASER BIBLE CODICES

When Paul Kahle was in Leningrad in 1926 surveying the second group
of manuscripts in the Firkowitz Collection from the Cairo Geniza, he
discovered no fewer than 14 Hebrew biblical manuscripts which he dated
between 929 and 1121 which in his estimation contained mainly BA texts.[30]
The only complete MS in this group was the Leningrad MS B19a which became
the basis of BH[3]. To the list of so-called BA codices have been added
the Cairo Codex of the Prophets, the Br. Museum MS Or. 4445, the Aleppo
Codex, and many more. Each of these requires extensive and thorough
analysis and review. Such studies in the past have turned up utterly
conflicting results. A survey of the four above-mentioned manuscripts and
the problems associated with them will serve to introduce my own analysis
in chapter two of the Leningrad and Aleppo Codices.

The well known scholar M.D. Cassuto studied the Cairo Codex of the
prophets and was the only modern scholar to study the Aleppo Codex before
most of the Pentateuch and the end of the Hagiographa was destroyed.
Cassuto never explained his reasons, but after seeing A he flatly rejected
the possibility that this was the codex which Maimonides had seen and used
to determine the open and closed passages as well as the layout of the
Song of Moses and the Song of the Sea. Scholars today can only speculate
at his reasons for rejecting A. Goshen-Gottstein assumes that he must
have seen a discrepancy between the layout of the Song of Moses as it
appears in 67 lines in A, and as Maimonides describes it, having 70 lines
in his *mišneh torah*.[31] Still today, this discrepancy is one of the main
stumbling blocks keeping A from definitively claiming title to the BA tra-
dition. In response to this, M. Goshen-Gottstein has demonstrated that

12

there is reason to believe that these specifications in Maimonides code
have been altered to agree with the format of the scrolls current in the
West, and as recorded in tractate *sofrim*.[32] He based his argument on
Oxford MS. Hunt. 80, the most highly regarded manuscript of Maimonides
code.[33] This manuscript preserves an uncensored reading of the code as
confirmed by other manuscripts of the *mišneh torah* from Yemen and Spain.
In all these manuscripts, the Song of Moses has 67 rather than 70 lines,
thus agreeing with A.[34] In addition, the beginnings of the hemistich
of each line in the Song, according to Ox. Hunt. 80, correspond exactly
to what we see in A. In the received version of the *mišneh torah* certain
lines are laid out differently. It is beyond the scope of this research
to make a judgment on the validity of Goshen-Gottstein's claim, but it is
clear that no definite conclusions can be reached about the exact layout
of the codex of Aharon ben Ašer based on what Maimonides tells us.
Maimonides mentioned only that he had used the codex of BA as his guide.
He never specified whether he meant Aharon ben Ašer or his father Mošeh
ben Ašer. This is important to note, for we do not know whether the
version of the father was identical to that of the son.[35] Izhak ben-Zvi
has tried to show that Maimonides was referring to the son Aharon ben
Ašer by linking Maimonides directly with the Aleppo Codex through histori-
cal accounts from the Middle Ages.[36] Nevertheless, because there is some
doubt as to the original version of Maimonides' *mišneh torah*, this issue
cannot be settled indubitably.

      As with the layout of the two songs, we rely on Maimonides to tell
us where BA put an open section in his codex (פרשה פתוחה) and where he put
a closed section (פרשה סתומה). Here again, there is ample evidence that
the text of the *mišneh torah* has been altered to agree with the open and

closed passages as found in our relatively modern Torah Scrolls. In my
own investigation of the open and closed passages in *parašat yitro* (see
plate 14), I had to deal with an entry which most certainly had been
altered: "(שש*) כולן סתומות והם . . . [לא תחמד] . . ."[40] The brackets in-
dicate that the second לא תחמד was not listed as one of the (*six)
closed passages found adjacent to each other in this particular spot. The
asterisk referred to the bottom of the page where it said, צ"ל שבע meaning
that this should read seven to conform with the added closed section. Despite
any doubts about the accounting of the open and closed sections in
Maimonides' *mišneh torah*, the part of the Pentateuch from the Aleppo
Codex which survived the 1948 burning of the Aleppo synagogue where it was
kept corresponds to it exactly. The Leningrad Codex, on the other hand,
seems to have no relation to it at all.[37]

Mordecai Breuer and Israel Yeivin analyzed the Aleppo Codex from
two other approaches. Breuer's approach, as mentioned above, was to com-
pare the masoretic notes of the *masorah magna* with the internal ortho-
graphy of the text. He concluded that A alone, among all the manuscripts
that he tested agreed completely with its masorah.[38] I. Yeivin confirmed
those findings.[39] Yeivin also commented on the pure Tiberian forms for
all the ancient characteristics of the accentuation which are preserved
in A but forgotten or misused in other MSS. One example is the distinc-
tion made in A between a *vav* with *dageš* and a *šuruq*. The first is written
with a dot lower than the dot in the second: וּ.[40] These fine distinctions
in the pointing of A indicated to Yeivin that A was pointed by a master
masorete. I will discuss other aspects of A's text later when I analyze
the nature of the difference between BA and BN and in chapter two where I
present my own findings on the BA/BN readings in A.

When Cassuto rejected the Aleppo Codex in favor of the Cairo Codex
as the manuscript which Maimonides had seen, he had to explain that at
one time the Cairo Codex had contained not only the Prophets, but the
entire Bible. Maimonides had only described the topography of the Torah.
If indeed he had seen the Cairo Codex, it would have had to have been a
complete Bible. When Cassuto began to edit his *Jerusalem Bible* on the
basis of C, he felt that he could reconstruct the BA text to the Penta-
teuch from what he had observed in the prophetic text of C. Kahle noticed
that the colophons of C disprove that it was anything other than a codex
of the Prophets. A note on p. 583 of the Codex refers to it as the Codex
of the Eight Prophets (Jos., Jud., Sam., Kgs., Is., Jer. and Ez). Other
notes on page 581 and 582 call it the Codex of the Prophets.[41]

It does not necessarily follow, however, that because C cannot be
the Codex which Maimonides saw, it also cannot be the Codex of BA. The
colophon identifies it as having been written by Mošeh, not Aharon, ben
Ašer. The colophon reads as follows: "אני משה בן אשר כתבתי זה המחזור"
זה הדיפתר מה של מקרא [47] A second colophon on p. 585 states: "....
"....שזכה יעבץ בן שלמה הבבלי נח נפש ועשה אותו לעצמו להגות בו מעמלו"
Kahle has translated the word דיפתר as parchment. The entire translation
being, "This is the parchment which Ya'beṣ ben S[e]lomo habbabli . . . has
acquired and he has prepared it for himself, for studying in it, by his
work. . ."[42] Thus Kahle believes that Ya'beṣ prepared a parchment and
gave it to Mošeh ben Ašer who wrote the text upon it. Teicher has pointed
out that דיפתר can only mean codex in this context. Thus Teicher trans-
lates the passage entirely differently: "This is the codex which (through
the grace of God) it was granted to Ya'beṣ son of the late Solomon, the
Babylonian to write for himself."[43] Teicher explains that Ya'beṣ copied

for himself the text of the Bible from an original which had the colophon
of Mošeh ben Ašer. Teicher's explanation is not entirely satisfactory.
One might assume that if he copied from an original made by Mošeh BA then
his copy would resemble that of the masorete. There is no indication
that this manuscript resembles any reading we know that is characteristic
of the BA family.

   Peres Castro compared the readings found in the Cairo Codex with the
   lists of differences between BA and BN. He found, as Kahle had al-
   ready intimated, that the Cairo Codex was a mixed text that had some
   erasures and alterations; but on the whole was characteristic more ·of
   the BN school than the BA.[44] Dr. I.O. Lehman has challenged the authen-
ticity of the first colophon naming Mošeh BA. He states that any experi-
enced eye can immediately spot that different hands wrote the Codex and
the colophon. By so saying Lehman has confronted Kahle's view that there
is no doubt that both the colophon and the Codex were written by the same
hand, but in different size letters.[45]

   Kahle's student Fernando Díaz Esteban studied C and said that the
Masorah added to its margins agrees in all its details with what the
Codex itself has to offer. He adds that it was surely done by a master.[46]
If we believe the date in the colophon, then C is the oldest Dated Hebrew
codex of the Bible. The colophon's date is 895.

   The British Museum MS. Or. 4445 is incomplete at the beginning and
the end, and no colophon is preserved. The great master BA is mentioned
several times on the margin without a eulogy formula. On the basis of
this evidence, Paul Kahle concluded not only that B is a BA manuscript,
but that it was written before his death. I would tend to doubt that the
absence of the eulogy formula alone would be substantial enough evidence

to confirm that B was written before BA's death.

Kahle compared B with Mišael ben Uzziel's treatise *Kitab alkilaf*.
Out of 69 *ḥillufim* referring to verses in Or. 4445, 57 preserved BA
readings and 12 had BN readings. In one instance, Ex. 20:3, *kitab
alkilaf*, records that BA changed his mind about the pointing of יהיה. At
first he put a *ga'yah* under the first *yud*, but later he rescinded it. B
here shows the earlier BA reading. B18a shows the later BA reading.
Mišael does not make it entirely clear what BN's position is. One of
the two readings, either BA's early reading, or his late reading corres-
ponds to BN. If BA moved from a position of agreement with BN to a point
of disagreement, then an "early" BA reading in B is really nothing more
than a BN reading. If this is indeed the case, then Kahle's argument
that B is an early BA codex falls apart. Even if the opposite is the
case, this one example hardly proves that B is an early BA manuscript.

F. Pérez Castro also came to the conclusion that many of the seem-
ingly BN readings in B are probably BA readings in his earlier period.
In his own test of that manuscript against the lists of Mišael, Pérez
found that in the first hand of the manuscript, out of 136 cases of
ḥillufim (differences between BA and BN) 118 of them read according to
BA, 15 according to BN and for three no photograph was available. And
in the second hand of the manuscript, out of 91 cases of *ḥillufim* only
50 are according to BA and 35 are according to BN.[47]

There are many indications that B is a valuable manuscript. Its
frequent mention of BA and the readings of other schools (יש אומרים)
in its margins demonstrates the knowledge of the scribe who filled in
its masorah. The fact that two very different hands pointed B and that
a substantial number of BN readings occur in both would tend to disqualify

it as the definitively pure BA text or even a characteristically BA text. I find no reason to accept the notion of Kahle and his student Perez that the BN readings in B are actually BA's readings from his early period.

The Leningrad Codex B19a was the subject of the hottest debates until the Aleppo Codex was made available. Kahle said, "There can be no doubt that the Leningrad Codex contains a text regarded as a BA text by an expert like Mishael b. Uzziel in about A.D. 1000."[48] At another time he more boldly stated, "There can really be no doubt that here we have *the* BA text before us." (Italics mine)[49] Kahle based that conclusion on the list of differences between the two Masoretes edited and compiled by his student L. Lipschütz from the various manuscripts of *kitāb alkilaf*. Specifically, Kahle used the comparisons that Lipschütz made between Misael's lists and the books of Genesis, Exodus, Isaiah and Psalms from B19a.[50] He claimed that a careful examination showed that in 95% of the cases, B19a agreed with the BA readings shown in Mišael's treatise.[51] In chapter two I intend to put B19a to the test using Mišael's list using a slightly different methodology.

We are indebted to F. Pérez Castro[52] and H. Yalon[53] for pointing out that the Leningrad Codex achieved its high percentage of BA readings by means of numerous erasures, additions and alterations. In many cases the change from BN to BA was as simple as adding a *gaʿyah* or *ḥiriq*. As Pérez admits, however, the study of these alterations has been hampered by the bad quality of the photographs of B19a that are available. Upon checking some of Pérez's findings, I encountered the same difficulty with the photographs that he had. In more than one example where he had

indicated an addition was made to L, I saw nothing; and where he indicated
an erasure was made, I again saw nothing. On the whole his observations
can be borne out, even considering the difficulty of the quality of the
photographs. These findings have brought about a need to reevaluate the
investigations of Kahle. I will deal with that question below.

In his prolegomenon to C.D. Ginsburg's *Introduction*, Harry Orlinsky
states, ". . . none of these manuscripts or of the printed editions based
on them has any greater merit or "masoretic" authority than most of the
many other editions of the Bible, than, say, the van der Hooght, Hahn,
Letteris, Baer, Rabbinic and Ginsburg Bibles."[54] On this point I disagree
with Orlinsky; manuscripts and printed editions must be considered on the
basis of merit if not "masoretic" authority. Orlinsky himself was quick
to point out that the editors of printed Bibles, ". . . should tell the
reader forthrightly--as he had been wont to do--exactly at what points
he has departed from the manuscript, and the reasons for departing."[55]
Orlinsky was reacting to all of the Bible editions, including BH[3], BH
Stuttgartensia, and Dotan's edition, all of which correct errors and
alter readings and formats without the slightest note informing their
readers. Despite his statement, even Orlinsky must prefer one Bible
edition as meritorious over another. By Orlinsky's own stated standards,
an edition which does not inform the reader of its departures from the
text from which it was copied, is less meritorious and less reliable than
an edition which carefully tells its readers exactly what it has done.
The masoretes who produced new Bible codices functioned in exactly the
same way as do the editors of modern printed Bibles. They copied exactly
what they felt should have been preserved and they changed what they felt

should have been changed; this is the process by which masorah has always operated. Surely a scribe who informs us in his masoretic notes about variant readings from other schools or that he follows BA who changed his mind regarding a certain reading, surely that scribe's manuscript is more meritorious and perhaps should be more authoritative than the manuscript of a scribe who copies from various different sources but never mentions what he has done in the margin. I would go even further to say that a manuscript which preserves an authentic BA tradition, BN tradition or authentic Babylonian tradition, is more valuable than all the manuscripts which preserve mixed versions. And one which is 95% BA is more valuable than one which is 80% BA. And a manuscript that shows 95% BA readings but achieved that high percentage by numerous corrections, like L, is less authentic than a manuscript that has 95% BA readings without many corrections. Pérez Castro, puzzling over what direction masoretic scholarship should take, commented that the lack of absolute coincidence between one school and the other, according to Mišael, led him to the conclusion that we will, unfortunately, never find a totally pure manuscript. Our concern must then be directed to conforming ourselves with those manuscripts that statistically present the greatest purity.[56]

THE READINGS OF BA AND BN IN THE VARIOUS MASORETIC COMPENDIA

Nearly all scholars of masorah now agree that the Aleppo Codex is superior to all other known codices regarding its internal consistency and its agreement with the readings of BA. G.M. Goshen-Gottstein has stated that A deviates from the lists of BA readings only in about 2% of the possible cases.[57] The question must be asked, how can a manuscript allegedly pointed by ben Ašer himself deviate from the characteristic BA readings, even in only 2% of the cases. Lipschütz was disturbed by

this as well. He considered the possibility that A is 100% faithful to the readings of BA and that the discrepancies entered the picture from other places. He considered two possibilities: "1. As we have already shown, the two Masoretes sometimes established readings which they later altered; 2. It must be borne in mind that we do not possess the original *Kitāb al-Khilaf* but only fragments of various MSS. that were copied by different people at different times."[58] In so saying, Lipschütz recognized that a good part of the problem may be due to the masoretic compendia with which we judge the various codices, and not with the codices alone. This deserves some careful attention.

First we deal with the issue of the masoretes changing their minds We know that Mišael ben Uzziel listed not only 860 differences between BA and BN, but also 404 congruences where BA and BN agreed with each other against some other masorete.[59] It is possible that Mišael does not list all of the congruences between BA and BN. The only evidence that we might have to assume that this is so is the relative size of the two lists. The list of differences is twice as large as the list of congruences. The opposite ratio might be expected. We can assume that because BA and BN were both preferred over the other four or five schools, BA and BN actually had few real differences between them. The differences with the other schools may have been more radical. They were certainly more numerous, if simply because of the large number of masoretic schools operating in Tiberius. Mišael may have been selective in the congruences between BA and BN which he included in *kitāb alkilaf*, choosing only examples which he felt were important to mention.

Lipschütz's second point, that our version of *kitāb alkilaf* is faulty, may lead us in a more fruitful direction, one where scientific methods may help us.

Mišael ben Uzziel's *Kitāb alkilaf* is the oldest extant document dealing with the differences between BA and BN. (There are references to an older one by Levi b. Alhassan which has yet to be recovered.)[60] For this reason *Kitāb alkilaf* is the best base from which to test the degree to which Bible Codices could be considered BA or BN manuscripts.[61] As Lipschütz has said, we do not possess any manuscript actually copied by Mišael himself. We possess only a series of fragmentary manuscripts copied from Mišael's work. Until recently eight manuscripts were known belonging to this group. All are part of the II Firkowitz collection of the Leningrad Public Library except one belonging to the Library of the Alliance Israelite in Paris. Lipschütz discovered nine other fragments in the Taylor-Shechter Collection of the University Library in Cambridge, and Goshen-Gottstein found another fragment in the Jewish Theological Seminary's Library in New York. The fact that we have fragments of some 17 copies of *Kitāb alkilaf* illustrates the prestige and wide circulation that it must have once had.[62] From these fragments Lipschütz has managed to reconstruct the entire text of *Kitāb alkilaf*. Plates to publish his reconstructed edition were prepared just before the Second World War in Czechoslovakia, but the war delayed their publication. They were finally published in *Textus*, vol. 2, using the original plates with a newly set apparatus.[63]

A study of *Kitāb alkilaf* was also made by Maria Josefa Ascárrago based on photos supplied by Kahle. It is unfortunate that I have been unable to find a copy of this important work, or even where it is published, if at all.[64]

Lipschütz lists the variants (of which there are very few) from the various manuscripts in the apparatus of his edition. One example, the

ḥillufim associated with the verb אכל, illustrates the problems caused by these variants for the researcher trying to reconstruct the original list of *ḥillufim*. The rule of אכל as found in most of the fragments states that whenever the *lam* of אכל is provided with a *segol*, BA gives the *kaf* a *ḥaṭef pattaḥ* while BN gives it a *šᵉvah*. But the fragment, T-S, K27,36 says that BA and BN differ whenever the *lam* has the accent. This slight change in the wording of the rule creates scores of new *ḥillufim*. The fact that one version is found in more fragments usually, but not necessarily, proves that version the correct one. In this particular case I would tend to accept the majority reading; but if the reason for this rule is to emphasize that the *šᵉvah* is vocal and to discourage the syllabic division חֹאכְל/נֹ, then it would not be difficult to justify accepting the version of MS. T-S, K27,36 as the original.[65]

Lipschütz compared Mišael's work with the rhymed passages of *diqduqe haṭṭᵉ'amim* which he claims are an essential part of the BA tradition.[66] But it must be noted that, as Lipschütz himself pointed out, BA's name only appears in later sources within *diq.*, and much of the rhymed sections may go back to a period earlier than BA. Lipschütz goes on to say that Mišael's statements on BA's readings of the forms of אכל and גרש (rules 2 and 3 of Mišael's introduction) are found in paragraphs 51 and 52 of *diq.*; his rule 7 on the vocalization of ל and ב before *yod ḥiriq* is paragraph 13; and rule 8 (בגד"כפת letters after ויהי) occurs in paragraph 29. Lipschütz does not say to what extent Mišael differs from *diq.* Certainly even the rhymed sections of *diq.* include rules which are not mentioned at all in *Kitāb alkilaf* such as *ḥillufim* in forms of the verb הלך; nor do they agree entirely on biblical references which they give in enumerating various rules for differences between the two masoretes.

Lipschütz's comparisons of the readings in Misael with the other masoretic compendia have turned up not only the characteristic expansion of *ḥillufim*, but contradictory reports on *ḥillufim* as well. In Jos. 8:24, Mišael lists the following: BA=ואת-אהלו /BN=ואה-אהלו. But *Adat Deborim* reverses the readings of BA and BN: BA=ואה-אהלו /BN=ואת-אהלו.[67]

The total number of works where *ḥillufim* or characteristics of one masorete or another occur is staggering. These occur not only in the masoretic compendia, *Kitab alkilaf, diq., adat deborim, maḥberet hattījan*, the *muqaddima* of Samuel Harofe and others, but also in medieval grammars like *miklol šorašim* and *et sofer* by David Qimḥi, *qiryat sefer* of Ha-Meiri, *sefer hariqmah* by Ibn Janaḥ, *sefer ṣaḥot* by Ibn Ezra, *kitab alnutaf* by Ḥayyuj, and in various medieval commentaries and in the margins of hundreds of Bible manuscripts. All of these must be included in a serious study of the readings of BA, BN and other masoretes. Among the most important sources for comparison are the marginal comments of reliable manuscripts like the Aleppo Codex.

S. Baer and H.L. Strack produced an edition of *diqduqe hatteʿamim* in 1879.[68] A Dotan points out in the preface to his own edition (p. V.) that the main fault with the Baer-Strack edition is that the editors could not fix the scope of the treatise. There are as many as 55 separate manuscript sources for *diq.* (mostly fragments) and many of these preserve versions that completely contradict the versions that are preserved in others of this group of manuscripts. Baer and Strack admit this drawback in the title of their edition: *Die DIKDUKE HA-Teʿ AMIM des Ahron ben Moscheh ben Ascher und andere alte grammatisch-massorethische Lehrstücke.* . . .

Dotan published his own edition of *diqduqe hatṭᵉ<ᵃmim* in 1967.[69] He collected 51 manuscripts, mostly fragments, of *diq.* out of which he chose ten which he felt preserve the structure, scope, textual version and vocalization of ben Ašer. Only two of these manuscripts are complete, the remainder being fragmentary.[70] Dotan used an entirely new methodology in reconstructing an edition he feels approaches the original most closely. Dotan's results have produced a text of *diq.* which radically contradicts much of the information we know of BA, including what is preserved in *kitāb alkilaf.* Loewinger warns: "The clash of sources is of such severity, that they cannot exist side-by-side."[71] The differences between Dotan's edition of *diq.* and *kitāb alkilaf* is especially poignant regarding BA's use of *haṭafim.* Dotan shows that BA used *haṭafim* much less frequently than the rules of Mišael's introduction indicate, and much less frequently than the use of *haṭafim* in the Aleppo Codex.[72]

In 1970, Maqor published a reproduction of the original Baer-Strack edition of *diq.* with a critical book review of Dotan's edition by D.S. Loewinger as its introduction. In that review Loewinger attacks the validity of Dotan's edition. As has already been pointed out, Dotan used only ten out of 51 manuscripts, only two of which were complete, an undated MS. in Spanish Hebrew characters and a MS. dated 1496, Lisbon. Loewinger has brought to attention two more complete manuscripts of *diq.* not available to Dotan, MS. Copenhagen (San Felix, Castille, 1462) and MS. Balliol College, Oxford (Lisbon, 1490). Using these two manuscripts and the other manuscripts that were used by Dotan, Loewinger analyzed section 14 of Dotan's edition. In the review he published the details of that section, ". . . according to *their original vocalization* in order to show the peculiarities inherent in the method employed by A. Dotan."[73]

Loewinger's major criticism of Dotan's findings is his treatment of the problem of *ḥaṭef-pattaḥ*, which he wrongly and consistently vocalizes as a *šᵉvaḥ* in the name of Aharon ben Ašer.[74] Dotan gave preference to the readings found in the *qunṭrasim* of Leningrad MS. B19a despite the fact that this same manuscript not only contains five additional rules which deal differently with the problem of *ḥaṭef-pattaḥ*, but vocalizes the applicable examples with *ḥaṭef-pattaḥ*.[75] Dotan's approach is even more disturbing when one realizes that he challenges the ben Ašer nature of the Aleppo Codex on the basis of his own understanding of the problem of *ḥaṭafim*,[76] yet publishes the Leningrad Codex B19a, which agrees only slightly more with the version in the *qunṭrasim*, under the sub-title,

מדויקים היטב על פי הניקוד הטעמים והמסורה: של אהרן בן משה בן אשר.

Dotan's scholarship as regards these matters seems rather arbitrary. Loewinger's cautions regarding them are well received.

Finally, the masoretic treatise *oklah vᵉʾoklah (oklah)*, although not bearing directly on the differences between BA and BN (it is a list of *hapax legomena*), provides us with information regarding specific readings of words. In addition, there are references to BA and the other Masoretes on the margins of many of the manuscripts of *oklah*. *Oklah* was originally published by Frensdorff in Hannover in 1864.[77] He based his edition on the Paris Manuscript, the only manuscript of *oklah* of which he knew. F. Díaz Esteban, who published a subsequent edition in 1957 for the University of Madrid,[78] said of the edition by Frensdorff, "Sin embargo, la edición de Frensdorff ya esta difinitivamente incompleta."[79] The lack in Frensdorff's edition was due to his dependence on the Paris MS. alone.

Three years after the publication of the Frensdorff edition, a second manuscript of *oklah* was discovered in Halle, Germany. In 1880, C.D. Ginsburg began to publish *The Massorah Compiled from Manuscripts* in which he included the material from the Halle manuscript. Ginsburg arranged his work alphabetically rather than according to MSS. and he never got beyond the letter *yod*. His work is not of great scholarly value for he mixed the lists from the various manuscripts, including manuscripts not belonging to *oklah*.[80]

The newest edition by Fernando Díaz Esteban is a thorough study of *oklah* and a collation of the various manuscripts which have come to light since the Paris and Halle Manuscripts. These include some 29 manuscripts from Leningrad, Oxford, Cambridge and Berlin.[81]

PHONEMES VERSUS GRAPHEMES AND TRENDS IN TIBERIAN POINTING

It is no longer possible to consider the Leningrad Codex as the most exemplary manuscript of the BA tradition. Mordechai Breuer brushes aside that possibility saying, "The claim of Kahle that the Leningrad Codex is 'the text of ben-Asher' is an injustice to Ben-Asher. The claim of Dotan that the Leningrad Codex fits the Masorah of Ben-Asher is not understandable."[82] Biblical scholars must now ask themselves, granting that A contains many inconsistencies and a small percentage of non-BA readings according to the lists of *ḥillufim* and congruences between BA and BN, could A have been pointed, accentuated and corrected by Aharon ben Mošeh ben Ašer. The answer must be yes, it is possible, but far from certain. However, it is certain that A represents the BA school. The importance of Israel Yeivin's study of the systems and methods by which A was pointed cannot be underestimated. His results are

important not just to understand the method of A, but to understand the dynamic operative behind the entire masoretic phenomenon in general and the Tiberian Masoretic phenomenon in particular. Yeivin has shown that there are few hard-and-fast rules governing the use of accents, *ga'yot* and short vowels. Rather, there seem to be trends which were set by the various different Tiberian Masoretes. Some probing of this insight can be helpful to aid in the understanding of the nature of the differences between the various Tiberian schools.

A word must be said in response to Orlinsky[83] and others who point out that the work of the different schools in Tiberius reflected pronunciations current in different circles. There can be no doubt that when BA, BN and Moseh Moḥah pointed יָשָׂכֵר, יִשָּׂכֵר, יִשְׂשָׂכֵר respectively, they meant them to be pronounced differently. This holds true for a certain number of the differences between the various schools, but it does not hold true for the great number of differences which concern the placing of *ga'yot* and ultra short vowels. For example, BN tended to prefer the use of a vocal *š^evah* where BA placed a *ḥaṭef pattaḥ* (תכְלֻנה/תאכְלֻנה). Was there a phonic distinction between the two or did the two schools notate the same sound with different graphemes? We cannot know for certain. Dotan and Yeivin feel that when the Tiberian Masoretes spoke of "opening" a letter, they did not mean that a *ḥaṭef* should be written, but that the letter should be pronounced with a short *a*.[84] Thus, they believe that the difference is in pronunciation. My feeling is the opposite, namely, that these letters were pronounced alike, but notated graphically in different ways. An ultra short *a*, *o* or *e* could be notated by means of the graphemes ֲ ֳ and ֱ , or they could all three be notated as a vocal *š^evah*. This phenomenon can be seen in the different

methods for notating ultra short vowels in Syriac and in Targumic Aramaic.
In Targumic Aramaic words with ʿayin in a šᵉvah position are provided with
a ḥatef: עֲלֵיה. In Syriac the same letters will be left unpointed, indi-
cating a normal šᵉvah:ܠܐ. The Targum, trying to safeguard the exact
pronunciation which it has in common with the Syriac has been pointed with
a slightly more elaborate system of notation.

The same may well be true of Tiberian vocalization. There is some
evidence that can be brought to bear in support of this hypothesis. No
two manuscripts seem to be identical regarding the difference between a
ḥatef and a vocal šᵉvah. BA or BN may give general guidelines but there
are by no means hard fast rules; the exceptions are too numerous. Per-
haps it would be best to speak of various scribes tending to use a ḥatef
in one type of situation, but a vocal šᵉvah in another type of situation.
Yeivin, arguing against my view, points out[85] that A has a tendency to
detailed vocalization in order to indicate subtle pronunciation differ-
ences. This can be seen in A's extensive use of ḥatafim in non-guttural
letters[86] and especially in A's use of ḥatef ḥiriq, a phenomenon almost
unique to A.[87]

Yeivin's findings, though, can support my hypothesis as easily as
his own; and coupled with the following evidence can certainly be under-
stood as supporting my contention. There is a general tendency in
Yemenite manuscripts to avoid ḥatafim. Thus, a word like יעקב commonly
given a ḥatef in Ashkenazic and Sephardic manuscripts, often appears as
יעקב in Yemenite manuscripts. The compelling proof lies here: Yemenite
pronunciation distinguishes between ultra short a, e and o depending on
what vowel precedes it, but their scribal tradition notates them all as
vocalic šᵉvah. Yemenite manuscripts do employ ḥatafim but far less

frequently than in other traditions. Again, these are not hard fast
rules, but tendencies toward specific graphic notations.

The punctuation of יִעֲקֹב/יַעֲקֹב offers additional room for specula-
tion. If the Tiberian Masoretes were attempting to reinstitute an
idealized Hebrew pronunciation no longer used at the time as Kahle
claims,[88] it is difficult to see why they would want to encourage the pro-
nunciation of a short vowel under a consonant in a silent $š^e vah$ position.
Is it an improvement on the sacred text to exchange one pronunciation,
which the Masoretes felt was erroneously lacking a consonantal ʿ*ayin*,
for another which, from an idealized Hebrew viewpoint, erroneously in-
serted a vowel into a silent $š^e vah$ position! It would be folly to assign
the Tiberian Masoretes such faulty reasoning. I must conclude that by
placing *ḥaṭafim* under gutterals in a silent $š^e vah$ position, the masoretes
attempted to preserve a peculiarity in the actual pronunciation of those
gutterals which was current in their time. יַ in this situation meant to
the reader, "although this looks like silent $š^e vah$, read it as a vocal
$š^e vah$ with an ultra short *a*."

It is not difficult to reconstruct the probable development of the
ḥaṭafim using the above phenomenon as a starting point. Far from being
an attempt to alter the pronunciation of Hebrew, the instituting of the
ḥaṭafim was an attempt to further refine the Tiberian system of vocalic
notation. Originally, there were no *ḥaṭafim* at all. There was only the
$š^e vah$ which could be silent or vocal. At first, *ḥaṭafim* were used as a
guide to the reader to insure that he pronounced a vocalic $š^e vah$ where he
might expect a silent $š^e vah$. At a later stage, a second type of *ḥaṭef*
entered the text. This *ḥaṭef* occurs with gutterals in normal vocal $š^e vah$
positions and serves to avoid confusion and maintain some consistency in

the notation of vocal šᵉvahs under gutterals. The lack of graphic distinction between the two šᵉvahs has always been the bane of Hebrew teachers everywhere. The placing of ḥaṭef under non-gutteral consonants was an attempt to graphically distinguish the vocal from the silent šᵉvah. Perhaps because of the increasing number of diacritical marks on the page, there was never a wholesale conversion of vocalic šᵉvahs to ḥaṭafim. The result would have been too awkward. Instead the text remained half-frozen in this intermediary stage. Thus, A with its abundance of ḥaṭafim under non-gutterals and its further refinement of the ḥaṭef-ḥiriq, was probably a product of the fully developed ben Aser tradition, the tradition which had the greatest propensity to use ḥaṭafim.

It may also be true regarding other ḥillufim that different graphemes are used to note the same phoneme. This may be the case concerning the BA/BN ḥilluf בִּישְׂרָאֵל/בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל. Yeivin saw an indication that BA pronounced this combination as shorter than any other combination of šᵉvah plus consonant plus vowel, by the total absence in A of gaᶜyot with the šᵉvah before י.[89] Yeivin sights the vocalization on A of וַיֵּלֶךְ and כִּיתָרוֹן as further evidence of this slight difference in pronunciation. In these instances, there can be no doubt that a ḥaṭef was used to guarantee the pronunciation of a vocal šᵉvah, for the ḥiriq is in an open syllable—whereas in בִישְׂרָאֵל the ḥiriq is in a closed syllable.[90]

The case of the ḥilluf בֶּן-נוּן/בֶּן-גוּן is much more transparent. I doubt whether even Kahle would argue that no pronunciation distinction between BA and BN is recorded in here. BA did not pronounce two nuns and BN three, nor did BA pronounce one nun and BN two, inserting a dageš as a guard against BA's pronunciation. Rather, they both pronounced בֶּן-נוּן as it is written, with two distinct nuns. BN inserted a dageš not

as a reaction to the pronunciation of BA but to guard against the some-
times faulty pronunciation of the average reader who might tend to slur
the two *nuns* into one. Ginsburg came to the same conclusion when he said
of this *dageš*, ". . .it is manifest that the purist who inserted it
thereby intended to guard this *nun* at the beginning of the word against
being absorbed or weakened in pronunciation by the *nun* which ends the
preceding word."[91] Again, this difference between the two Masoretes
represents a graphic distinction in the way each *tends* to notate his
text, not an essential phonetic distinction.

The same type of *dageš* occurs in many other places where one word
ends with the same letter with which the next word begins: לאכל-לחם
(Gen. 31:25), נתן נשמה (Is. 42:5), וכל-לשון (Is. 54:17), בכל-לבי (Ps. 9:2)
and many more. Of these Baer and Delitzsch ruled:

> This Dagesh is in accordance with the correct MSS. and
> is in accordance with the rule that when in two words
> which belong to one another, the same two consonants
> follow each other, the one at the end of the one word
> and the other at the beginning of the next word, the
> second of these consonants is furnished with Dagesh as a
> sign that this letter is to be read with special emphasis,
> so that it may not be absorbed and rendered inaudible by
> careless and hasty reading in the former identical letter.
> In the current editions this Dagesh is absent, because
> its import has not been understood.[92]

Baer and Delitzsch found a *trend* to place a *dageš* in these words
in some manuscripts (Ginsburg notes that most manuscripts which he
examined did not insert a *dageš* in these instances).[93] In a typical
masoretic way, they tried to define what was undefined and order what was
chaotic. Were it not for the chronological proximity of Mišael ben
Uzziel to BA and BN, and were it not for his intimate knowledge of even
their changes in opinion, I would have to warn that Mišael might have
defined and standardized some differences between BA and BN which were no
more than tendencies.

Most of the distinctions between BA and BN are in the placing of
ga'yot. All that has been said above about the graphic nature of the
ḥillufîm applies all the more so to the *ga'yah*. The *ga'yah* is neither an
accent nor a vowel. It is a diacritical mark which informs the reader
that the word so pointed has an unusual form or that it can be easily
mispronounced, or to aid in the musical division of multisyllabic words.
It is the most fluid of all the diacritical marks employed by the
Tiberian Masoretes. As with other Tiberian devices, its inconsistent
use in manuscripts has puzzled medieval and modern students of masoreh;
and they as a result have tried to define and systematize its proper use.
Yeivin noted that the rules set down by Baer for the use of *ga'yot* are not
inaccurate. His study of A has shown that A does use *ga'yot* in the ways
described by Baer, but again, they are not hard-and-fast rules. Baer
was wrong only in his attempt to make each *ga'yah* apply to a rule about
ga'yot, and then to insist that that rule be used consistently throughout
the Bible.[94] Yeivin has said about the use of the *ga'yah* in A: "The
characteristic feature of the placing of the *ga'yah* in A and in related
MSS. is the lack of consistency. This does not indicate, however, a lack
of system or total chaos; on the contrary, there are clear tendencies
to use the *ga'ya* in certain situations and to forego it in others. These
are not hard-and-fast rules, but trends, with numerous exceptions of
different types."[95]

Here statistics might speak better than words. Baer has determined
that the regular heavy *ga'yah*, one in a closed syllable, should be indicated
only in words with disjunctive accents, and not in words with conjunctive
accents. Yeivin says, "this is also the tendency in A, but there are
scores of words (about 2% of the total possible), which have disjunctive

accents without *ga'yah* and several hundred words (about 20% of the total possible) which appear with conjunctive accents with *ga'ya*. Generally, a longer word will have a *ga'ya* with a disjunctive and sometimes with a conjunctive accent, and a shorter word will not have a *ga'ya* with a conjunctive and very rarely with a disjunctive accent. The differences between MSS. related to A in the placing of this *ga'ya* are few. The placing of this *ga'ya* is much discussed in the literature and is one of the main topics in the *Ḥillufim* of Ben-Asher and Ben-Naftali (chaps. XII/XXXII)."[96]

THE TIBERIAN MASORETES AS CONSERVATORS OF THE BIBLICAL TEXT

Paul Kahle has argued in his book, *The Cairo Geniza*, that the Tiberian Masoretes were radical revisors of the biblical text, especially its vocalization of gutterals, final vowels and the *bgdktf* letters.[97] He claimed that these peculiarities of the Tiberian text were radical departures from the Hebrew pronunciation current in Palestine. The Masoretes, he said, ". . .claimed to have done nothing more than retain the text uniformly transmitted from the time of Ezra in its purity. In reality they created an ideal form of Hebrew in which in many cases they replaced a pronunciation which they regarded as lax and inaccurate by one which they believed to be more correct,more in accordance with the ideal Hebrew as it might have been spoken in classical times--just as Arabic scholars tried to improve the reading ofthe Koran by adapting it to an ideal Arabic."[98] His arguments are too detailed to present in full here; but some thoughts and criticisms are in order. He based his arguments mainly on the following observations: (1) The test of the Second Column of the Hexapla by Origen contains transliterations from Hebrew into Greek letters of about 150 verses of Psalms. Unlike the transliterations made

centuries before in the Septuagint, these recorded only vocalic values
for gutterals. Thus, in the Septuagint the word חרמון was rendered
Αερμων while in the Second Column of the Hexapla the word בטחי was ren-
dered βατα θι. The transliterations in the Hexapla generally do not
indicate final vowels which are not supported by vowel letters. Thus
עמר is transliterated αμμαχ. Jerome, whose Latin translation of the
Bible also has transliterated words, records approximately the same pro-
nunciations without gutterals and most final vowels which are unsupported.
The Palestinian punctuated fragments of liturgy and Scripture do not seem
to vocalize the gutterals or the final unsupported vowels. And the pro-
nunciation of the Samaritans as written phonetically by Arthur Schaade,
supports this theory on the absence of final unsupported vowels.[99]

It must be pointed out that the use of transliterations from ancient
sources is important for Hebrew studies but can also be misleading. The
fact that there is some kind of compensation for gutterals made in one
transliteration and none in another transliteration cannot be used as
reliable evidence. One transliterator may simply have used different
criteria than the other. One only has to look at modern so-called
scientific transliterations to see the tremendous variety in approach.
Should one differentiate long vowels from short and ultra short vowels?
Should one differentiate between the two sounds of the *bgdkft* letters?
The questions go on. Secondly, there seem to be too many exceptions to
the rules which Kahle read into the grammars of the Hexapla's and Jerome's
transliterated texts. A more thorough study of these transliterations
will have to be made before Kahle's findings can be confirmed.

There is also a danger in using texts with Palestinian pointing. Often
these texts only partially are pointed. Regarding the final vowels,

Kahle himself mentioned that two of the manuscripts he examined, MSS. L and M, and to some extent some of the others, were pointed in accordance with the Tiberian text.[100] Thus, this conflicting evidence cannot support his contention.

The Dead Sea Scrolls presented the biggest obstacle to Kahle's theory about final vowels. The scrolls from Qumran are written with an abundance of *plene* readings. Thus, the word לך from the Tiberian text is written לכה. This leaves no doubt that at the time of the Second Commonwealth final vowels were pronounced.[101] Kahle's argument that the final vowels were originally pronounced, dropped and then reinstated by the Tiberian Masoretes seems all too similar to the rabbis' formula for justifying their own contentions: שכחום וחזרו ויסדום. I cannot be taken too seriously, for Kahle supports his evidence with philological arguments that a final vowel form makes no sense. The question must be asked, why does it make more sense in the Qumran Scrolls than in the Tiberian Text?

Kahle's most convincing arguments were those based on the Samaritans' pronunciation of Hebrew. Here he makes his observations from a living tradition not on uncertain transliterations or partially pointed texts.

Kahle's observations about the double pronunciation of בגד"כפת were the least conclusive. His evidence seemed to contradict itself. First he enumerated arguments that supported a single pronunciation for all of these letters, then he quoted *sefer yᵉṣirah* and Saʿadya proving a double pronunciation.[102]

If we consider the nature of the distinction between the sounds of בגד"כפת , we may be able to draw some conclusions. The same phenomenon exists in many of the dialects of Spanish. In Spanish the letters *d* and

g have a double pronunciation as in Tiberian Hebrew. If they have
vowels before and after them, they are generally given a soft pronun-
ciation. If they are preceded or followed by a consonant, they are
generally given a hard pronunciation. In Spanish this distinction be-
tween the hard and soft pronunciations is not notated. Generally the
Spanish speaker not versed in grammar is not even aware of this dis-
tinction. The range of the difference between the hard and the soft
pronunciations varies from one situation to another. At times this dis-
tinction may disappear.

The hard and soft pronunciations of בגד"כפת in Hebrew and Aramaic
operated with the same principle. There were no distinct rules in the
minds of the speakers of Hebrew and Aramaic. The differences varied
from one situation to another, from one region to another, perhaps even
from one person to another. All that can be said is that there was a
tendency to pronounce these letters soft if preceded by a vowel and hard
if preceded by a consonant.

At a particular point in time, it became desirable to indicate these
sounds graphically as well as phonically in order to preserve the
sacred text of the Bible. Perhaps the need to notate this distinction
resulted from Arabic, a language without such a distinction,
increasingly becoming the spoken language of Palestine. The people
lost the feeling for the language that only a native speaker can
have. Yet they were conscious of the distinction in the pronunciation
of *bgdkft* letters and wished to preserve it. They tended to place
a *dageš* or not to place one according to general guidelines that they
established. Whenever they felt that the traditional way of reading
Scripture went against their guidelines, they did not hesitate to opt
for tradition.

This admits to the idealization of a linguistic trait, but one that was always there. That is a far cry from Kahle's position that these letters originally had one pronunciation only. The proof that the distinction between these letters was not entirely concocted by the Tiberian Masoretes can be seen in the hundreds of examples where the rules for *bgdkft* are not followed. An entirely idealized form would never have allowed these deviations.

In order to understand the masoretic phenomenon, it must be remembered that the pronunciation of Hebrew varies, according to dialect, from one Jewish community to another. That this was true in former times as it is today can be proven from the differences that we see in the confusion of like-sounding consonants and vowel points in a wide spectrum of manuscripts, and from basic principles of linguistics.[103] In Ashkenazic communities ʿ*ayin* is pronounced like *alef* and *ḥet* like *kaf* but in Sephardic communities all four sounds are distinguished. In Ashkenazic communities ת and ב,כ,פ are distinguished phonically as בגד"כפת letters, in many Sephardic communities פ and ב,ד,כ are distinguished and in Yemen all six בגד"כפת letters are distinguished phonically as they are graphically. In the Yemen alone all of the emphatic letters, ק and צ,ט are pronounced emphatically. In Ashkenazic communities and in Yemen a *qameṣ* is an *o*, while in Sephardic communities it is a long *a*. In Eastern Europe and in Yemen a *ḥolem* is an *ei* or *oi* dipthong while in Germany it is an *aw* dipthong and in Sephardic communities it is a long *o*. In many Sephardic communities *segol* is pronounced as a long *e* like *ṣere*, in Ashkenazic communities it is a short *e* and in Yemen it is a short *a* like a *pattaḥ*. A *šuruq* is pronounced almost universally as *u* but in Galicia it is pronounced *i*. There are many more differences but these should suffice to illustrate my point.

There are then many phonic changes in Hebrew pronunciation. These are, for the most part, changes in dialect made consistently throughout the language; they are not generally changes in individual readings. But the reverse, graphic changes that occur from manuscript to manuscript and from community to community, is far less systematic. They are seen more as trends than as hard-fast and consistent changes.[104] For instance, Yemenite manuscripts often change *segol* and *pattaḥ* while Sephardic manuscripts and the Chinese manuscript from K'aifeng change *segol* and *ṣere*. There is no doubt that these changes result from the phonic lack of distinction between those signs in their respective communities. But the graphic changes are never as complete as the phonic changes. Thus, I know of no manuscripts which do away entirely with *segol*. And the graphic changes that do occur are for the most part arbitrary. Again, in China the Jews pronounced ל and ר alike but those two letters are confused only occasionally in Chinese manuscripts.[105]

Changes in the graphemes also tend to influence changes in phonemes. I hope to demonstrate how this occurs in the biblical text, but for now, it can be illustrated more clearly from liturgy. A passage from the Zohar beginning בריך שמה דמרא עלמא is recited before the reading of Scripture on the Sabbath. It contains the phrase דתפתח לבּי באוריתא. At some point a printer apparently saw the determined form לבָּא and felt that this was the base noun. Accordingly, he changed the text to דתפתח לבָּאי באוריתא . Although this is an obvious error, it became part of a sacred text. Now virtually every printer of Ashkenazic prayer books and many Sephardic ones print לבָּאי. The result has been a change in the pronunciation of this word in Ashkenazic synagogues. I personally have never heard this word pronounced in any other way than לבָּאי or לבָּאי in

any Ashkenazic synagogue. To try to pronounce this simple word correctly now would be seen as an attempt to alter the sacred text.

In the biblical text graphic changes have altered pronunciation over a broad area. Originally, as I have shown, the difference between a *ḥaṭef* and a vocal *ševaḥ* or between בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל/בְיִשְׂרָאֵל were graphic only. In time, however, the original purpose of these graphic differences was forgotten. Rather than being an aid to the reader, they confused him by their presence. A need was felt to introduce a distinction in pronunciation between different graphemes that had been pronounced in an identical manner. Readers of Scripture recreated what they thought must have been how the Tiberian Masoretes pronounced these different graphemes.

A good parallel can be seen in the way that Ashkenazic Jews often tried to compensate for the ʿayin which they knew should have a consonantal value. In an attempt to recreate what they thought the ʿayin might have sounded like, they inserted a soft *n* into words like pronouncing it *yangkov*.

All of these aforementioned points on graphemes and phonemes of the Hebrew Bible lead to one conclusion: We do not possess one masoretic Bible tradition; we possess two. One is transmitted orally and the other in written form. These two are separate but interdependent chains of tradition. A change in one may or may not affect the other. At different periods in history, one or the other has proven more stable and the other more flexible. I might conjecture that before the advent of printing the oral transmission was more stable than the written. Those were times when only the privileged and wealthy owned books. Most people relied on memorization to acquire a knowledge of the Bible. This

method has always been highly successful and very precise in transmitting
sacred texts as has been proven not only by the philological similarity
of our Bible text with the Qumran Scrolls, but by the accurate transmission
of oral traditions over centuries in numerous other cultures.[106] How-
ever, it cannot be denied that the oral as well as the written trans-
mission of the Bible has changed, and this despite the sacred responsi-
bility to preserve the text intact as it was established by Ezra the
Scribe. It can only be the anxiety caused by this weighty responsibility
which caused mediums in the transmission process to make *ḥaṭafim* into
something more than ultra-short vowels. They were compelled by the graphic
difference between two signs to distinguish them phonically. These
changes were evolutionary. They were everso slight. Yet they compounded
one upon the other over the course of the years until today an Ashkenazic
Torah reader might actually stress a consonant pointed with a *ḥatef*,
something that contradicts the very nature of the *ḥatef*.

Paul Kahle, in asserting that the Tiberian Masoretes, ". . .elimi-
nated all remnants of earlier pronunciation so radically that no pre-
Masoretic texts were allowed to be preserved,"[107] failed to understand
the fundamental nature of oral transmission. Human memories cannot be
stored away in genizahs or destroyed like books. Precisely the same
anxiety which encouraged slight modifications, like the emphasizing of
ḥaṭafim, to fit preconceived notions about proper pronunciation, this
same anxiety to preserve the received tradition, safeguarded the text of
the Bible from the type of revolutionary alteration that Kahle envisioned.
In questioning the validity of Kahle's observations that the Tiberian
Masoretes were innovators, I also challenge his conclusion, "that the
system has certainly lost much of its authoritative value."[108] In re-
viewing Kahle's *The Cairo Geniza*, Harry Orlinsky said:

> It is the great merit of Kahle and his school to have
> initiated and stimulated investigations from various
> angles into the pronunciation of biblical Hebrew prior
> to the latter part of the first millennium A.D. However,
> it is most unfortunate that in the process of doing so,
> Kahle and his students have failed to show that they are
> able to handle scientifically textual and linguistic
> problems. They have developed one watchword, the harm-
> fulness of which should not be allowed to grow, namely,
> that the work of the Masoretes was arbitrary, incorrect,
> destructive, worthless.[109]

In summary, I have supported the following views: (1) Masorah
cannot be limited to any one time or place, nor can the title Masorete
be given only to those biblical scholars living in Tiberius 1000 years
ago who annotated their codices with information to aid the reader in
knowing the proper orthography, pronunciation, word and verse divisions,
etc. of the biblical text. Rather, masorah is the process of growth
and development in the transmission of the received text of the Bible;
and by today's expanded definition, it includes learning to understand
that very process of biblical transmission and recovering the textual
components that went into its formation in the past. And masoretes are
those scholars who devote their energies to transmitting the biblical
text with accuracy and insight.

(2) The ben Ašer tradition is not our received tradition nor is
it inherently better or more authoritative than the traditions of other
Tiberian Masoretic schools. It is the tradition which has contributed
most to our received text. And it is the tradition which today we have
the greatest capacity to reconstruct.

(3) It is untrue that no manuscripts characteristic of BN are
extant, nor is it true that any of the characteristically BA manuscripts
can be ascribed without reasonable doubt to BA himself. Of the four
manuscripts labeled by Paul Kahle as BA codices, C shows mainly

characteristics of BN; B is a mixed text showing mainly BA character-
istics; L is a mixed text which has been corrected to make it closer to
BA; and A is the most characteristically BA manuscript known today.

(4) So far, it cannot be established that any of the various
masoretic compendia are flawless in its record of the BA or BN texts.
Kitab alkilaf by Mišael ben Uzziel is the oldest extant compendium.
There is good reason to believe that it is the most reliable of the
compendia. The surviving manuscripts of *diqduqe haṭṭeʿamim* are about
three centuries older than those of *kitab alkilaf* and preserve many more
variants and information which is considered late. Of the two published
editions, that of Baer and Strack and that of Dotan, neither has gone
without serious criticism. The treatise *oklah veʾoklah*, a list of
hapax legomena does not bear directly on the BA and BN controversy but
provides us with some knowledge of their differences. It has been pub-
lished by Frensdorff, Ginsburg and Díaz. The Ginsburg version is mixed
with other material and unusable for scholarly purposes; the Frensdorff
is good but limited, while the Díaz edition is the most comprehensive.

(5) The differences between BA and BN were almost entirely of a
musical or graphic nature. There were few real phonic differences
between them. The most poignant example is the differences concerning
ḥaṭafim. *Ḥaṭafim* were originally interchangeable in pronunciation with
vocal *ševahs*.

(6) The Tiberian Masoretes were essentially conservators of the
biblical text, not revisers of it as argued by P. Kahle. The existence
of a strong oral tradition parallel to the written tradition would have
effectively kept the Tiberians from making such revolutionary changes in
Hebrew grammar as are claimed by Kahle, these being the reintroducing of

gutterals, the introduction of final vowels unsupported by vowel letters and the double pronunciation of the *bgdkft* letters.

[1]The claim is also made that the Assyrian script was the original but had been forgotten and later reinstated by Ezra. A second opinion denies that the paleo-Hebrew script was ever used.

[2]On this see Saul Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1962), pp. 28-37.

[3]The account here from the Palestinaian Talmud, *ta'anit* IV, 2:68a is repeated in a slightly different form in each place that it is quoted. It also occurs in *abot d^erabbi Natan*, version B, chapter 46 (ed. Schechter, p. 129); *sifre* II, 356 (ed. Finkelstein, p. 423) and *sofrim* VI, 4. For more information on this see S. Talmon, "The Three Scrolls of the Law that Were Found in the Temple Court," *Textus* 2, pp. 14-27. Saul Lieberman classifies the biblical manuscripts extant during the Second Temple period into three categories: 1) authoritative books kept in the Temple; 2) authoritative popular books used by the general public; 3) inferior texts surviving in small communities. pp. 22-23, 26-27. Cf. Talmon, pp. 14-15.

[4]Robert Gordis, *The Biblical Text in the Making* (New York: Ktav, 1971), pp. 40-43.

[5]Breuer correctly points out that the JBH text of the Bible is commonly accepted only in regards to its orthography which was based on the previous work of Abulafia. The vocalization and accentuation of JBH are error laden as confirmed by my own research. Our printed editions claiming to be based on JBH are actually based on the recensions of R. Menaḥem di Lonzano (*or' torah*) and R. Jedidyah Norzi (*minḥat šai*). Mordechai Breuer, כתר ארם צובה והנוסח המקובל של המקרא (ירושלים: מוסד הרב קוק, תשל"ז 1976), ע' XXVI–XXVII.

[6]*Ibid.*, p. XXIII.

[7]*Ibid.*, p. XIV.

[8]*Ibid.*, p. XVII.

[9]In actuality this process of selection still goes on. In my research I have not found a single printed Bible which does not clandestinely correct seeming mistakes in the manuscripts and versions upon which they claim to be based. Abulafia, Lonzano and Norzi were among the last who openly told their readers what they had done.

[10]According to Breuer and others, the Aleppo Codex alone has masoretic notes which match the orthography of its text almost completely. Breuer found that in the Prophets, B19a contains more than 250 places in which the orthography differs from the Tiberian Masorah; in the Cairo Codex there are 130 such places whereas in the Aleppo Codex there are only two places in the Prophets where there is no doubt that the orthography is wrong, and five other

places where there may be discrepancies. Breuer, p. XI.

[11]Harry Orlinsky is the principal proponent of those that define masorete in its broader sense. Breuer's comments were, in part, directed against him. See Harry Orlinsky, "The Masoretic Text: A Critical Evaluation," prolegomenon to the photo-off-set reproduction of C. D. Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible* (New York: Ktav, 1966).

[12]Fred N. Reiner, "Masoretes and Rabbis: A Comparison of Biblical Interpretations" submitted as a requirement for Master of Hebrew Letters and Rabbinic Ordination, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1973.

[13]See Lipschütz, "Kitāb al-Khilaf, The Book of the Hillufim (with four plates)," *Textus* 4, (1964), p. 3.

[14]Kahle dates *kitāb alkilaf* no later than 1060, based on his dating of *adat dᵉborim* which includes a Hebrew translation of Mišael's treatise. This early dating, however, is questioned by most scholars. Paul Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1959), pp. 116-117. Cf. Kahle, preface to *Biblia Hebraica* ⁹ (Stuttgart: Würtembergische Bibelanstalt, 1937), p. XXX. Cf. Lipschütz, *Textus* 4, p. 2, n. 8.

[15]See Lipschütz, *Textus* 4, pp. 2-3.

[16]Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*, p. 118

[17]Saʿadyah attacked the section of BA's compendium, *diqduqe hattᵉʿamim*, entittled *seder hammiqra'*. This is one of the sections in which Kahle sees a strong Qaraitic tint. Kahle is among those who clain that the Tiberian Masoretes were Qaraites not Rabbinites. *Ibid.*, p. 118. If indeed, it is true that they were Qaraites, Saʿadyah's attack on BA might show that he had gained acceptance early over BN. This would account for Saʿadyah failing to attack BN as well; for if one is considered a Qaraite, they both must be considered Qaraites.

[18]He says in the preface to ספר השורשים and in his commentary on Ps. 62:4: ואנחנו סומכים על קריאת בן אשר, Lipschütz, *Textus* 4, p. 10.

[19]*Ibid.*, p. 3

[20]*Ibid.*,

[21]There are reports in the Babylonian Talmud *kiddusin 30a*, that the Babylonians were not experts on certain aspects of masorah including verse division and *plene* verses defective writing. This must also have influenced the emergence of the Tiberian system in favor of the Babylonian system, while in all other matters, Babylonian scholarship dominated Palestinian.

[22]Lipschütz, *Textus* 4, p. 4. Goshen-Gottstein points out that Maimonides never said that he prefered BA over BN in any other matters

Than the topography of Torah scrolls. But apparently his influence was such that on the basis of that statement alone, BA became the preferred reading in all respects.

[23]C. D. Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible* (London: The Trinitarian Bible Society, 1897), p. 267.

[24]*The Cairo Geniza*, pp. 131-132.

[25]These are the facsimile of B19a published with an introduction by D. Loewinger; Dotan's printed edition of B19a; *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, based on B19a; the Aleppo Codex facsimile and printed edition edited by Goshen-Gottstein; the Snaith Bible edition based on MSS. Or. 2626-28; and the Jerusalem Bible edited by Cassuto and based on the Cairo Codex. On the claims of the various editors see Orlinsky, pp. X-XVII.

[26]*The Cairo Geniza*, p. 118.

[27]Orlinsky, p. XXX.

[28]חנוך ילון, "פרשת שלח לך," קרית ספר ספר 30 (1954-1955), ע' 257-263.

[29]Orlinsky, pp. XXIII-IV.

[30]*The Cairo Geniza*, p. 6

[31]ר' משה בן מימן, משנה תורה, ספר אהבה, הלכות ספר תורה

[32]M. Goshen-Gottstein, "The Authenticity of the Aleppo Codex," *Textus*,1,(1960), p. 37f.

[33]*Ibid*., p. 37, n. 56.

[34]In contrast to this, B19a has only 37 lines in the Song of Moses. But note that BH[3] arranges the Song in 70 lines according to the expected reading from Maimonides, yet makes no mention of the change he has made.

[35]Indeed, Kahle claimed that they were not the same but that Aharon had departed from his father in many ways, and that in fact BN was closer to Moseh ben Ašer than his own son. *Cairo Geniza*, p. 118.

[36]On this see Ben-Zvi's article "The Codex of Ben Asher," *Textus* 1.

[37]M. Goshen-Gottstein correctly warns his readers to be wary of the misleading markings in BH[3] which falsely show the open and closed passages according to the directions in Maimonides code, משנה תורה. Again here, as in so many other cases, Kahle deviated from what he saw in the manuscript without informing us that he did so and why, p. 27.

[38]Mordechai Breuer, pp. IXff.

[39]Israel Yeivin, כתר ארם-צובה: ניקודו וטעמיו (ירושלים: מאגנס תשכ"ט, 1968), עי XXV.

[40]*Ibid.*, p. XVIII.

[41]*The Cairo Geniza*, p. 94.

[42]*Ibid.*, p. 92.

[43]J. L. Teicher, "The Ben Asher Manuscripts," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 2, no. 1, (1950), p. 18.

[44]F. Pérez Castro, "Corregido y Correcto," *Sefarad* 15 (1955), p. 26.

[45]I. O. Lehman, "The Oldest Oriental Bible Codices," *Masoretic Studies* 1 (1972 and 1973 proceedings of the International Organization for Masoretic Studies, Missoula, Montana: Univ. of Mont., 1974), p. 48.

[46]On the different hands of the Cairo Codex see *The Cairo Geniza,* p. 163. On the quality of the Cairo Codex and the consistency with which its text and masorah match see ., p. 91. On the unique characteristics of the vocalization of the Cairo Codex see P. Kahle, "The Ben Asher Text of the Hebrew Bible," *Donum Natalicum H. S. Nyberg Oblatum* (ed. Erik Gren, Uppsala: 1954), p. 162.

[47]Pérez Castro, p. 26.

[48]Paul Kahle, "The Hebrew Ben Asher Bible Manuscripts," *Vetus Testamentum* 1 (1951), p. 166.

[49]*The Cairo Geniza*, p. 141.

[50]Paul Kahle, "Prolegomenon," *Biblia Hebraica*[3] (ed. Rud. Kittel and P. Kahle, Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1937), p. XXX.

[51]*The Cairo Geniza,* p. 117.

[52]Pérez Castro, "Corregido y Correcto," *Sefarad* 15, pp. 3-30.

[53]Hanokh Yalon, פרשת שלח לך," קרית ספר 30", מ' 2 (1955), עי 257-263

[54]Orlinsky, p. XXIV.

[55]*Ibid.*

[56]Pérez Castro, p. 5. The Spanish was translated into English by my wife Jacqueline Kleinfeld-Moch.

[57]Lipschütz, *Textus* 4, p. 7.

[58]*Ibid.*

[59]*Ibid.*, p. 22.

[60]*Ibid.*, p. 3.

[61]For this reason I chose *kitāb alkilaf* for my analysis of A and L as presented in chapter two.

[62]Lipschütz, *Textus* 4, p. 24.

[63]Dr. Moshe Assis, who kindly helped me with the Judaeo-Arabic in which the work is written, told me that Lipschütz' edition contains some mistakes in the Arabic.

[64]F. Díaz Esteban mentions her work in "References to Ben Asher and Ben Naftali in the Massora Magna written in the Margins of MS Leningrad B19a," *Textus* 6.(1968), p. 66.

[65]Lipschütz confirmed his findings, that Mišael's treatise is superior to all hitherto known lists of ḥillufim, by comparing them with the manuscripts most often associated with the name of BA: A,L,C and B. This type of bad methodology can not be escaped easily when dealing with this type of masoretic studies. MS. X cannot be tested on the basis of MS. Y, when MS. Y itself must be tested on the basis of MS. X. This type of argument is curcular; there can be no definate conclusions drawn about either the various codices or the compendia until the most painstaking comparisons can produce an indubitable compendium or confirm that A (the only possibility) is "The" BA Codex.

[66]Lipschütz, *Textus* 4, p. 8.

[67]Lipschütz, *Textus* 2, 2 הגה, כד, ע'.

[68]*Die Dikduke HaT͑amim des Ahron ben Moscheh ben Ascher und andere alte grammatisch-massorethische Lehrstucke* (ed. H. L. Strack and S. Baer, Leipzig: L. Fernau, 1879)

[69]ספר דקדוקי הטעמים לר' אהרן בן משה בן אשר על פי כתבי יד עתיקים
(מבואות ומחקרים מאת אהרן דותן, ירושלים: האקדמיה ללשון העברית, 1967).

[70]D. S. Loewinger, "דקדוקי הטעמים" או "כתר ארם-צובה as an introduction to photo-off-set reprinting of *Die Dikduke HaT͑amim* (Baer, Strack edition), p. VII.

[71]*Ibid.*

[72]ספר דקדוקי הטעמים (ed. Dotan), p. IX.

[73]Loewinger, p. VIII.

[74]*Ibid.*

[75]*Ibid.*

[76]Aharon Dotan, 34 תרביץ "האמנם נגקד כי"ח בידי אהרן בן אשר?"
(1964-65), ע' 142.

[77]*Das Buch Ochlah W'ochlah (Massora)* (ed. Solomon Frensdorff, Hannover: 1864).

[78]*Sefer 'Oklah We-'oklah* (ed. Fernando Díaz Esteban, Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas, 1975),

[79]*Ibid.*, p. XXVI.

[80]*Ibid.*

[81]*Ibid.*, pp. XVIII-XXV.

[82]Mordechai Breuer, p. XI.

[83]Orlinsky, p. XXXII.

[84]Israel Yeivin, p. XVII.

[85]*Ibid.*

[86]*Ibid.*, pp. 22-41.

[87]*Ibid.*, p. 21.

[88]*The Cairo Geniza*, pp. 164-171.

[89]Yeivin, p. XVIII.

[90]*Ibid.*

[91]Ginsburg, p. 116. See also *op. cit.*, note 1.

[92]*Ibid.*, p. 117.

[93]*Ibid.*, pp. 119-121.

[94]Yeivin, pp. XXI-XXII.

[95]*Ibid.*, p. XIX.

[96]*Ibid.*, p. XX.

[97]*The Cairo Geniza*

[98]*Ibid.*, p. 164.

[99]*Ibid.*, pp. 164-179.

[100]*Ibid.*, p. 174.

[101]For more on this see W. F. Albright, "New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible," *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (ed. F. M. Cross and S. Talmon, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975), p. 141f.

[102]*The Cairo Geniza*, p. 183.

[103] With respect to this, what Kahle quotes in the name of
Leander is totally misleading: "...the Masoretes were not very
successful; the fact for instance that in reading the Bible, the
Jews generally pronounce a ע as Aleph and not as Ayin, may perhaps
remind us of the origin of this innovation made by the Masoretes."
Ibid., p. 171. One wonders how Kahle, who spent so much time in the
Near East where the Jews indeed pronounce ע as ʿ*ayin*, could forget
to ask the question 'which Jews?' when speaking of a specific
aspect of Hebrew pronunciation.

[104]See Yeivin's discussion on the trends in vocalization and
accentuation in A and related MSS. pp. XVII-XXVII.

[105]Michael Pollak, *The Torah Scrolls of the Chinese Jews*
(Dallas: Bridwell Library, 1975), p. 112.

[106]This stands in marked contrast to the situation after
printing when books were readily available. After that time,
people ceased to memorize Scriptures and relied more on the
written tradition. The result has been that the oral transmission
of Scripture is now much more fluid than the written transmission.
A perfect illustration is the ease with which the Israeli pronunciation
of Hebrew is now replacing the Ashkenazic pronunciation.

[107]*The Cairo Geniza*, p. 150.

[108]*Ibid.*, p. 186.

[109]Harry Orlinsky, book review of P. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*
The American Oriental Society Journal 69 (1949), pp. 164-167.

CHAPTER TWO: TYPES OF NON-BA POINTING

IN THE ALEPPO CODEX AND LENINGRAD B19a

In chapter one, I outlined some of the criticisms of four so-called BA codices and of some of the better known and more important masoretic compendia. In chapter two, I will test the Leningrad and Aleppo codices, the two manuscripts most often attributed to BA, against the *ḥillufim* of Mišael ben Uzziel from his *kitāb alkilaf*. It is not my intention to test all of Mišael's *ḥillufim* against L and A; this has been done before.[1] Rather, I hope to verify or deny the results of these previous studies by comparing Misael with L and A using a new methodology. The former studies have compared all of the *ḥillufim* of an individual biblical book or even the entire Bible with the *ḥillufim* and congruences described by Mišael. I have compared the general rules for determining *ḥillufim* found in Mišael's introduction and gleaned from the body of his treatise (excluding the general rules for the three poetic books) with the readings in A and L throughout the Bible.[2]

The value of this procedure lies in two areas. First, the previous studies have made blanket statements about the percentage of BA and BN readings in each manuscript.[3] I believe that in any manuscript characteristic of the BA or BN schools, or even written by one of the Masoretes, there are bound to be discrepancies with Mišael's lists. This is due not only to mistakes in the lists themselves, but also to the nature of Tiberian pointing. By this I am speaking of the point made in chapter one, that the Tiberians *tended* to point the biblical text in slightly different ways. Mišael's lists were most likely organized on the basis

of one or two sets of manuscripts. Yet BA and BN may well have pointed or accentuated any given word differently from one manuscript to the next. This would account for the frequent changes of opinion that Misael ascribes to the Masoretes' readings. A certain percentage of discrepancies between the lists and the codices must be expected, unless one of the codices used happens to be the actual codex which Misael used to compile his lists.

The general rules enumerated by Mišael are in a different category. In these particular cases, BA and BN must have always pointed in the way which Mišael describes. They served almost as a set of guidelines as to how BA and BN pointed their texts. If this is indeed the case, then these rules would be applicable not only to manuscripts actually written by BA and BN, but to every characteristically BA or BN manuscript. This procedure is of little value in determining whether a codex was actually pointed by BA or BN, but in cases where any manuscript is characteristically BA or BN, there should be a near 100% agreement with Mišael's general rules. A text which is essentially of a non-BA tradition, but which was corrected to conform with BA, will show no significant difference in the percentage of non-BA readings found when comparing it with the whole of Mišael's treatise, or only with Mišael's general rules.

I intend to demonstrate using this method that the Aleppo Codex is characteristically BA, though probably not written by BA himself, and that the Leningrad Codex is either a mixed or non-BA text which has been cosmetically made to appear like a BA manuscript.

Secondly, it is not difficult to visualize a scribe who relied on one of the Tiberian Masoretes in the pointing of one type of word, but

who relied on a second Masorete in the pointing of another type of word.
A scribe who did this may have *tended* to follow BA's use of *ḥaṭafim*,
but preferred BN's pointing of ישׁכר. There is an indication that this
may have been acceptable practice from the anonymous masorete mentioned
above from the 11th century, who when discussing the difference between
BA and BN in the placing of *dageš* or *rafe* after the word והיו, states,
"And the reader should conform to one of these two opinions. If he
follows the reading of BN, it obligates him to read all of them with
raphe and *dagesh* as he, BN, does. If he, however, follows the reading
of BA, then it is also correct. But whoever reads the letters pointed
with *raphe* according to both, he remains without rule, since he deviates
from the principle of the one and the other."[4]

Thus, a codex which shows BA readings in all of the occurrences of
one of the rules from Mišael's introduction, but BN readings in all
the occurrences of another rule, shows more internal consistency than
a codex in which the occurrences of each individual rule are mixed.
It was hoped that this hypothesis could be applied here also. Some
evidence that this might be the case in both L and A was found, but
nothing that alone could prove conclusive.

Mišael's treatise *Kitāb alkilaf* begins with a description of eight
general rules concerning which BA and BN differ throughout Scripture.
He includes here any exceptions to those rules attributed to either
masorete.[5] This he follows with a description of each biblical book
including the number of *parašiyyot* of the annual cycle of reading the
Torah (in the Pentateuch) and the number of *sedarim* in each book and the
number of verses in each book. The exact references are given for each
of the *sedarim*. Following these general statements concerning which BA

and BN do not differ, Mišael lists the *ḥillufim* or differences between
the way that BA and BN read specific words. Finally he lists the con-
gruences between BA and BN (where presumably these two differed from
other Tiberian Masoretes).[5] The section on the Pentateuch lists the
s^edarim, *ḥillufim* and congruences subdivided under each *parašah*. In the
Pentateuch there are 117 *ḥillufim* and 112 congruences, in the Prophets
311 *ḥillufim* and 162 congruences, and in the Hagiographa 432 *ḥillufim*
and 130 congruences. In various parts of his treatise Mišael also lists
four additional rules for all of Scripture and five rules which apply to
the three poetical books alone.[7]

The following section is a summary of my comparison of Lipschütz's
reconstructed edition of *kitāb alkilaf* of Mišael ben Uzziel with the
facsimiles of A and L. Mišael's first rule deals with the proper pronun-
ciation of the name יששכר. Ginsburg was already aware of the various
opinions regarding the proper pronunciation of this name. He tells us
that all the sources he inspected agree that BA pointed the name יִשָּׂשכָר,
although some manuscripts put a *dageš* in the first *šin* and others do not.
Ginsburg found no consensus regarding the way that BN pointed the name.
Adat d^eborim which is based upon *kitāb alkilaf* pointed it יִשָּׂשכָר , and
Mošeh Moḥah pointed it יִשָּׂשכָר; *maḥberet hattījan* and various manuscripts
from the British Museum pointed BN like the pointing of Mošeh Moḥah in
adat d^eborim, יִשָּׂשכָר; Or. 2626-28, the manuscripts used later by Snaith
for his Bible edition, pointed it יִשָּׂשכָר; the Leningrad Codex dated 916
points it יִשָּׂשכָר .[8] Mišael supports the version found in *adat d^eborim*.
In his introduction he states:

> know, O Sir, may God strenthen you, that the master Abu
> Sa id ben Asher, may God show mercy to him, used to
> punctuate the first ש of the word יששכר and to pronounce

it as *sin*, and the second he left without any dot and did not pronounce it at all, viz., יששכר, and he treated them all this way. BN would differ from him in this matter, since he provided both ש with dots. The first he pronounces as *shin* and the second as *sin*, thus יִשָּׂשכָר. And he treated them all in this way. And Moshe Moha used to punctuate both, and pronounced them as two *sins*, thus יִשָּׂשָׂכָר. And that is their entire difference on this word.9"

The name יששכר occurs forty-two times throughout the Scriptures, including four prefixed forms. L showed a consistent BA reading in all forty-two instances.[10] A preserves twenty-six of these and all are according to BA (see plates 1-2).

Rule two has to do with the pointing of the root אכל. Ginsburg agrees with Mišael on this rule and lists a number of manuscripts and their respective readings.[11] Mišael states:

> And in every form of אכל BA used to provide the *kaf* with *pathaḥ*, when the *lam* had three dots (*segol*), e.g., לא תאכְלֶנּו (Deut. 12:24). And when the *lam* did not have three dots he did not provide it with *pathaḥ*, e.g., לא יום אחד תאכְלוּן (Deut. 14:21), לא תאכְלוּ כל נבלה (Num. 11:19). There is only one exception where he does not provide it with *pathaḥ* although the *lam* has three dots, viz., רבו אֹכְלֶיהָ (Eccl. 5 :10). And in all these instances BN did not place the *pathaḥ*.[12]

Lipschütz correctly notes that אכל occurs in six such forms 24 times throughout the Bible. Of the 24 instances, L shows BA readings in only 14 while 9 are BN readings.[13] Eccl. 5 :10 concerning which BA and BN agreed, agrees with the reading shown in L. Thus, fully one-third of the readings in L are BN in the case of the verb אכל (see plates 3-4).[14]

A, on the other hand, shows only BA readings in the eight occurrences which it has preserved. Only one instance is preserved from the Torah (Deut. 28:39) which L showed as BN, and none are preserved in the Hagiographa. Of those preserved by A only two show a BN reading in

the corresponding L verse (the other being 2 Kgs. 6:28). Unfortunately, the other instances of BN readings from L were destroyed in A. Nevertheless, enough evidence is present to make some observations. First off, L certainly does not preserve a BA reading of the verb according to the circumstances given by Misael. There can be no mistake, here L is very far from BA. No explanation of statistically necessary deviations can help Paul Kahle's claim and no high percentage of BA readings among all the *ḥillufîm* can offset this fact. On the basis of this weighty evidence alone, we therefore submit that Paul Kahle's contention that the Leningrad MS. B19a represents a pure BA text is false.

Harry Orlinsky in his prolegomenon to Ginsburg's *Masoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible* points out the irony of the history of the greatest modern scholars of masorah. Ginsburg accused Baer of deliberately tampering with the evidence toward his own advantage, Kahle accused Ginsburg of the same and yet he himself has followed suit. Kahle says clearly in his prolegomenon to BH[3], "The manuscript (L) agrees, furthermore with the general statements which are given in the introduction (of *kitāb alkilaf*) regarding the characteristic readings of ben Asher. He (Lipschütz) comes to the conclusion that MS. L, on the basis of these studies, must be designated as a pure ben Asher MS."[15] Lipschütz apprently made the same comparisons as the present work and these were used as the very basis for Kahle's proof of L as a BA MS., yet the results were completely contradictory. We do not care to speculate which of these men altered the evidence. Kahle, being the editor along with Kittel, must bear ultimate responsibility for this distortion.

Rule 3 concerns the pointing of the root נגשׁ. This rule is similar to rule 2 in that it involves BA placing a *ḥaṭef-pattaḥ* where BN places

a *šᵉvah*. Ginsburg records the same version as Mišael once again.[16] The

rule according to Mišael in Lipschütz's edition states:

> And in every form of גרש the master BA used to provide
> the *resh* with *pathaḥ* when below the *shin* there were
> three dots, e.g., אגרשנו (Ex. 23:30) and others like it.
> And if the *shin* did not have three dots he did not provide
> the *resh* with *pathaḥ*, e.g., ויגרשו את יפתח (Jud. 11:2)
> . . . with the exception of one word, which he provided
> with *pathaḥ* although there were no three dots, and this
> is the word ויגרשהו (Ps. 34:1). BN did not place the
> *pathaḥ* in all these cases.[17]

The verb גרש occurs only three times in two forms and all in the

Pentateuch, in Ex. 23:29, 23:30 and Num. 22:6. Unfortunately, A does

not preserve any of these. It does, however, preserve the exception to

ben Ašer's rule from Ps. 34:1. In all three of the normative cases L

gives a BN reading while in the exception to BA's rule, L follows BA

(see plate 4).[18] Here, once again, our first hypothesis is confirmed.

The comparison of one of Mišael's rules with the text of L shows a much

greater incidence of BN readings than in a comparison of all of the

ḥillufim as a whole. This again underlines the more than likely probabil-

ity that L is not a BA MS. at all but has been made to appear like a BA

MS. by the scribe(s) or editor(s) who repointed it according to the BA

readings which they saw in an unknown list of ḥḥillufim. There can be

no doubt that there is a great difference between a manuscript which is

a true BA or BN manuscript and one that has been cosmetically altered to

look like BA or BN. To be assured of this, one need only look at the

tremendous differences between A and L, the two so-called BA manuscripts,

that have no relation to any list of *ḥillufim*. For example, there is no

similarity between L and A regarding open and closed passages, and their

orthographic differences are enormous.[19]

Furthermore, the consistency with which L shows a BN reading with

regard to Mišael's rule 3 (three out of four cases, the fourth being
itself an exception to BA's rule) offers some evidence that our second
hypothesis may apply to L; namely, that L shows inner consistency with
regard to the pointing of גרש when the *śin* has a *segol*. The possibility
cannot be ruled out that the scribe of L, cognizant of the differences
between BA and BN, chose to follow BN in this instance for reasons un-
known to us. This evidence, admittedly, is very weak and cannot sustain
such a contention here, first because BN is not followed in one instance
(וַיְגָרְשֵׁהוּ where BA puts a *ḥaṭaf-pattaḥ* even though the *śin* has a *ṣere*,
not a *segol*), and secondly, because this trend is not reflected in any
other of the general rules of Mišael.

A control device was used to obtain a stronger argument confirming
that A follows BA in the pointing of גרש . Since only the exception to
BA's rule was preserved (וַיְגָרְשֵׁהוּ) we randomly checked two examples of
the verb גרש which likewise had a *ṣere* under the *śin*, Hos. 9:15, לְגָרְשֵׁם
and 2 Ch. 20:11, לְגָרְשֵׁנוּ . Both words were pointed with a simple *šⁱvah*
under the *reš*. This definitively proves that A did not employ a *ḥaṭaf-
pattaḥ* in all such instances but specifically was pointed to agree with
BA's exception to the rule of גרש . We admit, however, that were those
sections of L destroyed, and later tested in the same way, the same
results would ensue. The unlikely possibility that A also pointed the
other three instances of גרש according to BN cannot be ruled out. They
also cannot be tested. Thus, we still have no reason to doubt the authen-
ticity of A as "The BA Text."

Rule 4, the nature of the *dageš* in the word בתים , states:

> And concerning the word בתים , whenever it has two accents
> BN inserts a *dagesh* (*viz. forte*) into it. I mean that he

makes here an intensification more than is customary in
other places, e.g., עַל הַבָּתִּים (Ex. 12:7), and the other
instances of this word, which have two accents, he handles
in the same way. As for BA, he does not agree with him,
except in two instances, viz. וּבָחַרְתִּי (Deut. 6:11), אֵת
בָּתָּיו (1 Ch. 28:11). In all the others he does not apply
this intensification,[27] since he,ymay God show mercy to
him, mentions in his Massora: It occurs in scripture four
times that the dagesh is intensified. And he mentions
these two words, viz. וּבָחַרְתִּי ,וְאֵת and the others are
תָּל-עוֹלָם (Josh. 8:28), תִּלְחֲיָהֹן (Dan. 3:23).[28]

As with many Tiberian readings, rule 4 is an anomaly. There is no
grammatical reason for wanting to call the dageš in the   forte rather
than the expected lene.[20] Bendavid says that the only consideration is
a musical one because of the extra stress on the word.[21] Giving the tav
a dageš forte should change the qameṣ intoˀa pattaḥ but it does not.
Normally this would become a qameṣ qaṭan with the tav closing the syllable;
except that the syllable is given an accent viz. בָּ‎. The Masoretes
probabӏy did not differ in their pronunciation of qameṣ qaṭan and qameṣ
gadol so this might not have seemed important to them.

The real problem for us lies in how they did differ, if at all, in
their pronunciation of this word. Both the BA and BN readings have an
identical dot in the tav, and there is, therefore, no way to know whether
the scribe of any manuscript intended a dageš forte or lene. It is
probable that since there is no graphic distinction here between BA and
BN there might well have been a phonic one. But is remains difficult to
understand the exact relationship between the enunciation and the cantila-
tion of this word and others. Unfortunately, we have no tape recordings
from the tenth century. Did BN, and BA in the two cases, pronounce a
double tav or a single tav? No definite answers can be ascertained.
Rabbi Isaac Jeruŝalmi, a native of İstanbul, has told me that in his tradi-
tion only one tav was pronounced ẅhile Moshe Assis, a native of Aleppo,
told me that in his tradition both a long a and a double tav were pronounced.

Ginsburg quotes this rule properly, but misunderstood it. He mistakenly explained that BA put no *dageš* in the *tav* excepting for two instances. He did not understand that the distinction was between types of *dageš* not whether or not there was a *dageš* at all.[22]

Rules 5 and 6 typify the most common kind of difference between BA and BN. They concern the placing of a *gaʻyah* in certain words which are connected by a *maqqef*. Ginsburg does not list this rule at all. Mišael's version states: "And to every שעיר-עזים אחד connected by *maqqef* BN adds a *gaʻyah* but BA does not provide it with *gaʻyah*; and *vice versa*, to every הַשְׁאִיר- connected by *maqqaf* BA adds a *gaʻyah*, when the first syllable of the following word has the accent, e.g., הַשְׁאִיר-לְוֹ (Deut. 3:3)"[23] שעיר-עזים occurs sixteen times in the Bible, only one of which survives in A (Ez. 43:22). All of these instances show BA readings in both codices (see plates 4–5). BH[3], however, showed BN readings for two of these, Num. 7:76 and 7:82.[24] וּשְׂעִיר-עִזִּים occurs five times in the Bible. None of these is preserved in A. There are five cases of הַשְׁאִיר in the Bible when the accent of the following word falls on its first syllable. Three of these are extant in A. All of these instances record BA readings in both codices.[25]

Rules 5 and 6 can neither support nor oppose my view that L is not a manuscript characteristic of BA. The occurrence of any number of Mišael's rules of which the manuscript shows consistent BA readings, cannot counter the presence of those rules in which readings were highly mixed or mostly BN. At the same time, these two rules cannot challenge the character of A as "the pure BA Text."

Rule 7 is addressed to any word beginning with *yod* vocalized with
a *ḥiriq* and preceded by the prefixes ל and כ: Ginsburg agrees with

Miśael who states: "And in every בישראל לישראל ביזרעאל לידזרעאל ביראה

ליראת בירא ליראת the master Abu Saʻid ben Asher vocalized the *jod* in

these words, and articulates it with the mouth. BN differs from him for

he does not vocalize the *jod* in this wordaand does not pronounce it, thus

בישראל."[26]

Time consideratñons prevented the checking of all occurrences of

this in all its forms. ליראה occurs twelve times in the Bible, five of

these surviving in A. All of these were pointed according to BA in both

codices except one in L (Jer. 32:39) which was uncertain but seemed to be

BN. בירא occurs once and is pointed according to BA in both codices.

ביראת occurs six times, five of which remain in A. All are BA readings

in both codices. ביראך occurs once and לידראך occurs once; All are

BA in both codices. Of all the occurrences of לישראל we checked the

first and the last two of each biblical book. Of these, 31 examples,

24 survived in A. All of these cases read according to BA in both

codices. Of the occurrences of לישראל we checked the firstaand the last

in each biblical book. Of the 30 examples checked, 19 survived in A.

All these instances showed BA readings in both codices.

The readings to which rule 7 speak are overwhelmingly BA in both

codices; the results speak for themselves (see plates 6-9). It is

apparent that especially this type of *ḥilluf* can be easily recognized by

any scribe. Thus, a scribe wishing to point his text according to BA

would not be likely to miss the opportunity to do so. My second hypo-

thesis, then, is of some use in explaining the consistency of the readings

here in L. It may be noted that rules 6 and 7 allow easy and almost

undetectable alterations of the original text to agree with BA. In the first case a *ga'yah* needs to be added and in the second, the *ḥiriq* under the prefix must be made into a *šᵉvah* and the *yod* must be supplied with a *ḥiriq*.

Rule 8 refers to the pointing of words beginning with the letters בגד"כפת when they follow ויהי when it is accented with a *servus*. Ginsburg quotes the same rule as Mišael but errs in listing two of BN's readings as being from Gen. 19:17 and Gen. 39:15 when they should read Gen. 19:15 and 39:17.[27] Mišael says of this rule:

> And every ויהי which precedes one of the six letters (i.e., בגדכפת), if it is connected with it, that means leans upon it by accent, the master Abu Saʿid ben Asher, may God show mercy to him, used to point with *raphe* according to the rule for the אוי"ת, so that he read ויהי כשמע (Josh. 9:1), ויהי כראות (Esther 5:2) and others like that, according to the explanation mentioned above. And the master BN, may God show mercy to him, differs from him merely in seven words of this type and pointed them with *dagesh*, and thus acts against the rule of אוי"ת *viz.* ויהי כראות המלך (Esther 5:2); ויהי כראותו אותה (Jud. 11:35); ויהי כשמע כל המלכים (Josh. 9:1); ויהי כשמעו (Gen. 39:15); ויהי כאשר ימו (Deut. 2:16); ויהי כהוציאם אותם (Gen. 19:17); ויהי ממלכו (1 Kgs. 15:29). In all except these seven instances he acts according to the rule of אוי"ת, *i.e.*, he provides it with *raphe*, e.g., ויהי במלכה כשבחו (1 Kgs. 16:11); ויהי דוד (1 Sam. 18:14) and many others like that.[28]

Rule 8 presents a particularly interesting puzzle. The whole difference here lies in the pointing of seven phrases, wherein BA followed the rule of אוי"ה and BN did not, we checked these first (see plate 9).[29] Of the seven, three are extant in A. All of these instances read according to BA with a *rafe* following בגד"כפת. There is nothing new here. Then, however, we desired to cross-check this with a control device. All cases of ויהי with a conjunctive accent and followed by a בגד"כפת letter occurring in the Book of Joshua were checked. The results proved significant.

There are twelve such cases in Joshua not including Jos. 9:1 where the
two Masoretes differed (see plate 10). Of these twelve, three place a
dages in the following בבגד"כפת letter showing a reading which is neither
BA nor BN in both L and A (8:24 ויהי כְּכַלּוֹת יְהוֹשֻׁעַ 10:20, ויהי כְּכַלּוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל
and 15:18 וַיְהִי בְּבוֹאָהּ). Our first reaction was to note that only in these
instances are a *kaf* or a *bet* pointed with a *šᵉvah*; in all other cases of
kaf the vowel is different while there are no other occurrences of *bet*.
With thirteen identical readings in both L and A, coincidence must almost
be ruled out. Was there another rule not recorded by Mišael giving
exception to בבגד"כפת pointed with a *šᵉvah*? No, this was not a possibility.
There are, among the thirteen, three others in which *gimel* is pointed
with a *šᵉvah* and given a *rafe* (Jos. 13:30 ויהי גבולם, 17:7 ויהי גבול-מנשה
and 19:33 ויהי גבולם).

These results are startling! One-fourth of the occurrences of ויהי
followed by בגד"כפת which are not specifically mentioned as among BN's
exceptions, have neither a BA nor a BN reading. This becomes particularly
important since only here did we find that A deviates from BA. Method-
ologically whatever explanation we offer for the one codex we must also
offer for the other codex.

The analysis will follow the pattern of our first and major hypo-
thesis. In rules two and three, L had a majority of non-BA readings.
This was a higher percentage than the 5% of non-BA readings in L from
among all of the *ḥillufim*. I understood this to demonstrate that the
scribe of L, who corrected the text to make it correspond with BA, was
not aware that such a general rule existed.

This contrasts to rule 8 which was a general rule of both Masoretes
to which only BN took exception in seven cases. The scribes of both

L and A were aware of the exceptions of BN, for in all those cases
they choose the BA reading. They do not, however, seem to have
followed the general rule even though that corresponds to the rule
of אוי"ה. There can be no doubt that no simple ignorance of a rule
is behind these variants from the congruent BA and BN readings. Pre-
cisely this type of rule, *viz.* בגד"כפת after ויהי, was not likely
to have been randomly ignored by a scribe. That both codices pointed
these words in a variant way but identical to each other, confirms
that these are not cases of random pointing. Therefore, my first
hypothesis cannot be applied in this case.

There are two possible explanations for the occurrence of the
identical non-BA/BN in both L and A. The first is that Mišael inaccurately
records the cases wherein BA and BN both pointed בגד"כפת letters after
אוי"ה with a *dageš*. As was pointed out above, only fragments of copies
of Mišael's original treatise have been preserved. These manuscripts will
have to be checked carefully again to make certain that there are no gaps
in the text precisely in this place. It seems doubtful, but neverthe-
less possible, that Mišael totally misrepresented the BA/BN view on rule
8, doubtful because of the exactness with which his readings have so far
corresponded to A and because of Mišael's confidence in stating this rule
with precise specifications.

The second possibility is that both A and L record an actual non-
BA/BN tradition with regard to this rule alone; probably from one of the
other Tiberian traditions, Mošeh Moḥaḥ, R. Pinḥas the head of the academy,
Ḥabib ben Pippin or any others. If this is indeed the case, confirming
my second hypothesis, that third unknown Masorete must have agreed with
BA concerning those seven examples to which BN took exception; or these

seven readings were corrected to conform with the lists of ḥillufim at
a later date.

No definite conclusion can be reached on the basis of my study as to
which of the above possibilities was in fact the case. To aid in
solving this problem, a survey of every example of בגד"כפת after
ויהי with a conjunctive accent must be undertaken in L and A. If,
on the basis of that survey, it appears that the cases in Joshua
are not coincidences, then a good number of other old manuscripts
thought to represent the BA or BN schools should be checked for
their readings. It may well be that at an early period a non-BA/BN
tradition was most popular and entered manuscripts of the other two
schools. This rule does not seem to appear in *diq.*, but a thorough
search must be made for this rule in all of the known masoretic com-
pendia and sources of information on ḥillufim.

To Mišael's eight general rules found in his introduction, he added
four additional rules which can be found in various parts of his treatise.
Ginsburg does not list these additional general rules at all. The first
additional rule concerns the placing of *gaʿyah* in the word ויהיתה.
Mišael says of it:

> every ויהיתה which is provided with this accent, *i.e.*
> which is given the *gaʿya*. There is no disagreement on
> this point. And whichever is provided with the accent
> *telisha* remains without *gaʿya*, thus ויהיתה. Also on that
> point there is no disagreement. And as for that which is
> provided with another accent, *i.e.* with *azel we-athe*, BA
> reads it with *ga ya*, *viz.* והיתה ציצית (Is. 28:4) and others
> similar to it. And what concerns BN he differs from him
> in this point and does not read it with *gaʿya*.[30]

ויהיתה occurs 13 times in the Scriptures with one of these accents
(see plate 11).[31] Seven remain in A, three having *geršayim*, one having
a *teʿlisah* and three having *azlaʾ veʾate*. As in the previous rule, we

first checked those instances wherein BA and BN differed, *viz*. ויהתה. In
both codices all contained a *ga'yah* in the BA reading. Then the other
instances were checked as a control. All of them in both codices showed
the congruent BA/BN reading except one. Num. 19:9 in L is pointed with
a *te̲lišah* but shows a scratched out *ga'yah*. The quality of the facsimile
does not permit definite confirmation of any corrections, however.

Beside this, Pérez Castro was the first to notice that Mišael
assigned to Num. 19:9 the accent *azla' ve̲'ate*, an accent involving a
ḥilluf, rather than the *te̲lišah* which is shown in L.[32] This opens up
some interesting possibilities. In the first place, it is more than like-
ly that the problem is with L rather than with Mišael. The scribe of L
may have simply made an error here, but this is not likely. It cannot
be a coincidence that both versions, from L and from Mišael, preserve
a form that gives the word two accents. More probably, L preserves a
reading from a third school. Unfortunately, this reference is not extant
in A for a comparison. But a comparison can be made with other manu-
scripts, and would prove essential in ascertaining the reading of a
third masorete. The value of such conflicting readings as this between
L and Mišael is for the quiet continuous effort to reconstruct bits and
pieces of the biblical readings of other masoretes besides BA and BN.
Another less exciting, and perhaps less likely possibility is that
Mišael simply erred in copying the accents for this example. If most of
the BA type manuscripts agree with L, then it would be more likely that
the error was made by Mišael.

Additional rule 2 refers to the word בֶּן־נוּן: "Know that BA provides every בֶּן־נוּן with *rafe*. And BN inserts a *dageš* into the *nun*," בֶּן־נּוּן.[33]

בֶּן־נוּן occurs 29 times throughout the Bible (see plates 12-13). Fifteen of these are extant in A. In A all are BA. In L all seem to be BA, but some are uncertain. Pérez Castro believes that Deut. 32:44 is pointed with a *dageš* and lists it as BN. I arrived at the same conclusion separately and I also spotted a *dageš* in Deut. 34:9. As previously, I cannot base any conclusive observations on the facsimile which is available.

Mišael's additional rule three states: "And every הַמְרַגְלִים BA provides the *mem* with *pathaḥ*, but BN does not place *pathaḥ*."[34] This word occurs only twice in the Bible, Josh. 6:22 and 6:23 (see plate 13). L showed both of them as BN *viz.* הַמְרַגְלִים while A showed both as BA *viz.* הַמְרַגְלִים.

This evidence weighs heavily in support of my hypothesis. It is curious that only two examples would be stated as a rule and not simply placed in the list of *ḥillufim* of the Book of Joshua. Nevertheless, the scribe or editor of L wanted either to point according to BA yet was careless concerning the general rules, my first hypothesis, or he specifically chose to follow the pointing of BN as regards this rule alone, my second hypothesis. In either case, once again I have shown that L cannot be an exemplar of BA. At best it is the work of a learned scribe who followed one school or the other depending on the general rule. However, there is not enough internal consistency in L to support even this theory. More likely L represents a mixed text, no more reliable than any other for reconstructing the BA text of the Bible. A, on the other hand, continues to be consistent with the BA readings with the exception of rule eight.

Additional rule 4 states: "According to BA every וַיֵּדְעוּ with the accent *gereš* gets the *ga'ya*; according to BN it remains without *ga'ya*."[35] This reading of וַיֵּדְעוּ occurs six times in Jer. 44:28, Ez. 5:13, 28:22, 30:25, 34:27, and 17:24 (see plate 13). All are preserved in A. In A all were clearly BA. In L three were with a *ga'yah* showing a clear BA reading while two (Ez. 30:25 and 34:27) showed uncertain evidence of a *ga'yah* being added, and in Ez. 5:13 clearly had a *ga'yah* added. In this case it was placed to the right of the *šᵉvah* and squeezed in at an angle rather than the usual place to the left of the *šᵉvah* where there was no room. Here again we do not wish to base our arguments on acrobatics when our point can be sufficiently demonstrated on clear evidence.

In summary, I have tested the Aleppo and Leningrad Codices with Mišael ben Uzziel's *kitāb alkilaf* to confirm or deny their purported ben Ašer characters. The method that I used was a new one, namely, comparing Mišael's general rules, from his introduction and from within the body of his work, with A and L. This method successfully showed that simple comparisons of Mišael's lists of *ḥillufim* with A, L or any other manuscript which produce percentage figures of BA, BN and other readings are misleading. It may be true that L is 95% true to the BA readings, but are the *ḥillufim* which do not correspond to BA of any special type? This study has proven that they are.

Either the original scribe or those who corrected the manuscript preferred BA readings with regard to rules 1, 5, 6, 7, additional rule 1, 2, and 4. But with regard to rules 2, 3, and additional rule 3, the readings of BN were preferred. Rule 4 is untestable and therefore cannot enter into the discussion. In the Aleppo Codex all the rules of Mišael excepting rule 8 were 100% BA. And in both L and A, rule 8

showed identical results, these being an agreement with the BA

readings where BA differed with BN, and in the examples where they

both agree that the rule for בגד״כפת after אוי״ה should not apply.

But A and L also showed identical agreement in cases of rule 8

where both manuscripts record readings that disagree with the con-

gruent BA/BN reading but ones which were not enumerated by Misael,

simply included in his general rule. This most likely indicates a

third tradition followed by both A and L, but it may indicate an error

in Mišael's account of the difference between BA and BN in the pointing

of בגד״כפת after ויהי.

Those results have confirmed that scribes did follow one of the Tiberian

Masoretes regarding some or most of the general rules but that they felt

free to reject the readings of that same Masorete in favor of preferred

readings of another Masorete with regard to other general rules. Although

not supported by any evidence, I may conjecture that in a similar manner,

scribes may have preferred one Masorete regarding his general tendencies

in pointing, but prefer the tendencies of another Masorete regarding a

specific type of word.

On the basis of this evidence I must conclude that Leningrad MS.

B19a is not characteristic of the ben Ašer tradition. It is a mixed

manuscript that shows departures from BA in many areas, even after exten-

sive corrections to bring it more in line with BA. The Aleppo Codex is

a characteristically ben Ašer manuscript, but it does depart from BA in

at least one way which is characteristic of BA. If it is assumed that

Mišael is not at fault, then it must also be concluded that A could not

have been written or pointed by ben Ašer or even by a student under his

supervision. Nevertheless, the Aleppo Codex is the most valuable

manuscript known that has Tiberian pointing. It remains the only manu-
script which can definitely be said to be characteristic of and repre-
sentative of any Tiberian tradition.

Notes to Chapter II

[1]Lipschütz tested L against Mišael in the books of Gn., Ex., Is. and Ps. See BH[3], p. XXX. Loewinger tested A against Mišael in Gn. 26:34-27:30, Dt. 28:17-34:12, Jer. and Job. See Loewinger, *Textus* 1, pp. 64-65. Goshen Gottstein tested all of Mišael's *ḥillufim* against A. See Lipschütz, *Textus* 4, p. 7.

[2]This type of test has been made before on the basis of *diq*. Notably Loewinger tested A regarding the rules for the roots אכל גרש as found in *diq*. These correspond to Mišael's rules 2 and 3. I was especially pleased to find that Loewinger's results agreed with my own. Loewinger, *Textus* 1, pp. 65-66.

[3]Kahle, Lipschütz and Pérez claim that L deviates from BA's list of readings in Mišael's treatise in about 4-6% of the cases. Goshen-Gottstein claims that A deviates in only 2% of the cases. Lipschütz, *Textus* 4, pp. 6-7.

[4]*Ibid.*, p. 19, n. 20.

[5]Lipschütz translates the eight general rules, the four additional rules and the five rules for the poetical books into English in *Textus* 4, pp. 16-21.

[6]In some instances the opponents of BA and BN have been successfully identified from notes in other manuscripts. For a partial listing of these, see *Ibid.*, p. 2-3, note 13.

[7]*Ibid.*, p. 15f.

[8]Ginsburg, pp. 250-252.

[9]Lipschütz, *Textus* 4, p. 16. For Arabic see Lipschütz, *Textus* 2, p. ג.

[10]F. Pérez Castro sees an erased *dageš* in the ש of יששכר in three cases: Nu. 1:28, 2:5 and 7:18, pp. 13-14.

[11]Ginsburg, pp. 255-264.

[12]Lipschütz, *Textus* 4, p. 17. Cf. note 7a: According to T-S K27, 36, BA provides the *kaf* with *pattaḥ* when the *lam* has the accent. Lipschütz' translation contains some misprints. לא תאכלנה should be vocalized with a *ḥatef-pattaḥ* under the *kaf*, not לא תאכלה as shown. In note 9, Jer. 31:8 should read Is. 31:18. For Arabic see *Textus* 2, p. וב.

[13]The BN readings occur in Lv. 7:6, Dt. 12:15, Twice in Dt. 12:22, Dt. 12:24, 12:25, 28:39 and 2Kgs 6:28.

[14]Pérez Castro discovered three examples (Nu. 18:10, 18:13, Dt. 15:20) in which a *pattaḥ* was added altering the BN reading to a BA reading. pp. 16, 18.

[15]Kahle, BH[3], p. XXX. (parenthetical inserts mine).

[16]Ginsburg, pp. 264-266.

[17]Lipschütz, *Textus* 4, p. 17. Again the printing here is faulty. The word אוגרשנו shows a *šᵉvah* under the ג and a *pattaḥ* under the ר. The *šᵉvah* is out of place. It should be under the ר making it *ḥaṭef-pattaḥ*. Also the word ויגרשהו shows a *šᵉvah* under the ר, the BN reading. The ר should be pointed with a *ḥaṭef-pattaḥ* making it BA. For Arabic see *Textus* 2, p. ג.

[18]Pérez Castro is uncertain but thinks that in two of these, Ex. 23:30 and Nu. 22:6, a *pattaḥ* has been added. Thus he saw in both of these a BA reading in L. Upon checking the facsimile, I saw no trace of a *pattaḥ* in either case. Thus a BN reading stands. I took this as a warning for caution before accepting the corrections which Pérez says were made on L. His findings must be checked against the fascimile. See Pérez Castro, pp. 10, 16.

[19]On the differences between open and closed passages in A and L, see Goshen-Gottstein, *Textus* 1, p. 27. For the orthographic differences see p. 28, especially note 31.

[20]Syriac preserves the same phenomenon, ܠܡܐ. Whatever explanation is found for this in one language must answer for the other as well.

[21]א. בנדויד,"על מה בן-אשר ובן-נפתלי?" תרביץ 26 (1955-7), עי׳ 402.

[22]Ginsburg, p. 266. See also note 1.

[23]Lipschütz, *Textus* 4, p. 18. For Arabic see *Textus* 2, p. ד.

[24]Pérez Castro claims that in three instances of this word he sees signs of an erased *gaʿyah* (Lv. 9:3, 23:19, Nu. 7:46). In Nu. 7:16 he sees signs of an erased *pattaḥ* under the *šin*, *viz.* שׁ. In Nu. 29:11, he sees that a *gaʿyah* has possibly been added but he is doubtful as to whether to call this BA or BN. I saw no *gaʿyah* in my check of L. See Pérez, pp. 11-13.

[25]השאירי in this form occurs in Nu. 21:35, Dt. 3:3, 28:55, Jos. 8:22, 10:33. The last three of these survive in A.

[26]Lipschütz, *Textus* 4, p. 18. For Arabic see *Textus* 2, p. ד. Mišael speaks specifically about four words only, יראו, יראה, יזרעאל ושׂראל, to which this applies. He implies that this refers to all such cases. Bendavid has adopted that view, תרביץ 26, p. 404.

[27]Ginsburg, pp. 268-269.

[28]Lipschütz, *Textus* 4, p. 18. For Arabic see *Textus* 2, p. ד.

[29]Note that here, BA follows the rules of אוי״ה more often than does BN. This contradicts Lipschütz' belief, in opposition to Kahle, that BA remained faithful to a received tradition while BN preferred a more systematic grammatical approach in his role as a masorete. See *Textus* 4, p. 7. Cf. Bendavid, תרביץ 26, pp. 384-409.

[30]Lipschütz, *Textus* 4, pp. 19-20. For Arabic see *Textus* 2, pp. יג-יד.

[31]With *geršayim*: Lv. 13:24, Nu. 19:10, 1Sam. 13:21, 2Kgs. 9:37, Zeph. 2:6; with *ṭeliša*: Ex. 40:15, Lv. 25:6, Nu. 19:9, Is. 19:17; with *azlaʾ veṭe*: Nu. 27:11, Is. 28:4, Jer. 7:33, Ez. 5:15.

[32]Pérez Castro, p. 16. Cf. Lipschütz, *Textus* 2, p. יג-יד.

[33]Lipschütz, *Textus* 4, p. 20. For Arabic see *Textus* 2, p. כד (*ḥillufim* for Joshua). Cf. 402 עי, 26, תרביץ בנדויד.

[34]Lipschütz, *Textus* 4, p. 20. Note that הַמְרֻגָּלִים should read הַמְּרֻגָּלִים. For Arabic see *Textus* 2 p. כד among the *ḥillufim* for the book of Joshua.

[35]Lipschütz, *Textus* 4, p. 20.

CHAPTER THREE: HUC MS. 958

The Hebrew Union College library owns a large and very fine collection of manuscripts from the Jewish community of K'aifeng Fu in the Chinese province of Honan. This collection includes liturgical texts, biblical texts and community documents. The liturgical and biblical texts in particular have yet to be studied.

Dr. David Weisberg brought these texts to my attention, and through his encouragement this study on one of them, HUC MS. 958, was initiated. The manuscript in question is part of a series of section books of the Hebrew Pentateuch, each book containing one *parašah* according to the annual system of reading the Pentateuch. These manuscripts are fully vocalized and outwardly seem to be accentuated according to the Tiberian system of punctuation. There is, however, some indication that there are non-Tiberian elements present in HUC MS. 958; this is what I hope to be able to demonstrate in my analysis of the manuscript.

What possibilities might emerge from this analysis? At best we could hope to find in these manuscripts a text which reflects a specific tradition of one of the masoretic schools. Almost as significant would be to uncloak what Aharon Dotan calls a "non-conventional Tiberian system." According to Dotan, this is a system found in many manuscripts in which the graphemes of the Tiberian system are used differently from the way their developers, the Tiberians, utilized them. Dotan claims that this resulted from: "1) a tradition of pronunciation which differs from the Tiberian; 2) a different method of notation and different rules for the use of some of the Tiberian signs."[1] A somewhat less dramatic,

but still important, result would be to find yet another mixed Tiberian
tradition, a *textus receptus*, but one which substantiates the readings of
one of those mixed manuscripts. The least desirable findings would show
that these manuscripts are basically corrupt, perhaps the work of a care-
less or ignorant scribe, or a scribe who faithfully copied from a manu-
script which was itself corrupt.

The study of HUC MS. 958, פרשת וישמע יתרו has shown that the
K'aifeng section books of the Pentateuch do not reflect any pure tradition
of any masoretic school, nor does it seem to be a simple *textus receptus*.
Rather it is a combination of the second and fourth possibilites: It
represents a non-conventional Tiberian text, as defined above, but is
diluted by a compounding tradition of scribal errors. It is the intention
here to separate obvious errors from legitimate variants and to classify
and analyze these. But first we will describe the manuscript rather
thoroughly and discuss the phenomena that appear there.

William C. White wrongly described the section books of HUC MS. 958
as having pages 7 by 7½ inches.[2] In fact they are 6½ inches square.
They are made of thick paper, 4°, composed of many thin sheets pressed
together when damp. Each sheet is lined by a stylus. The sheets are
written on both sides with two columns per page; and each column consists
of nine lines. The letters, written in attractive and well-formed square
Hebrew characters, hang from the lines in the manner typical of Hebrew
manuscripts. The last page is left blank while the first bears only the
name of the *parašah*, וישמע יתרו. The scribe filled lines by enlongating
the letters בדהכלת.

In one instance in this *parašah* the scribe finished a line with the

first three letters of a four letter word. These he dotted and then repeated the word and vocalized it on the next line (Ex. 19:16 בֹּהֹ/בהיה).

Saul Lieberman in *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* brings evidence showing that dotted letters in the scrolls of the law indicate mistakes and deletions from the text.[3] Dots are used for the same purpose in codicies. This evidence indicates that the dots in HUC 958 were not used as a filler, but to correct the scribe's error. He misjudged the number of letters he could fit into the line before the justified margin. To confirm this I surveyed two other section books from K'aifeng. I found a word which the scribe began to write when he realized that he had skipped a word. He dotted the letters he had already written and continued with the word that he left out (Ex. 7:10 כאשר לֹה צוה יהוה).

The section book consists of 31 pages in modern bindings. There are no water marks but some of the section books have markings made by a stylus in the form of an *x* at every *sof pasuq* and *etnaḥ*.[4] This may indicate a lack of knowledge of those who used the codex for reading scripture or checking the reader. Someone who knew the significance of those disjunctive signs would not have needed the markings.

Three hands are evident in the manuscript. One wrote the consonantal text in black letters, a second wrote most of the vowel points and accents in a dark grey ink and the third added accents that the second hand had missed in a light brown ink. The fact that the second hand was a great deal more careful about the vocalization than the accentuation shows that he probably was unfamiliar with their function or less concerned with them, perhaps because the scriptures were not chanted in public reading. This is verified by the third hand. Although it fills in many of the accents omitted by the second hand, mostly *pašṭa'* and *maqqaf*, it also omits many of them.

The manuscript contains some marginal notes. Each page is numbered
in Hebrew letters at the top inside margin and every *b* side of each sheet
has a *custos* giving the first word of the next sheet in small letters
on the lower left hand corner. Beside these there is a marginal correction
by the second hand of Ex. 19:22. Only the letter פ is written in the
margin referring to a mistake in the word פרץ. Later the third hand made
the correction to a פ in the text itself.

There are two marginal masoretic notes in Ex. 20:3. Both call the
reader's attention to the presence of a *pᵉsiq* in the text (see plate 30).
Interesting here is the absence of one of the instances of *pᵉsiq* normally
found in the rabbinic Bible as well as in B19a. One of the cases that does
occur separates בשמים/ממעל   in order to insure the pronunciation of the
מ beginning the word ממעל. Yet the instance of *pᵉsiq* which does not
occur involves the identical situation between the words במים מתחת.

In these marginal notes we have the first indication that this manu-
script does not represent a conventional Tiberian system. Aharon
Dotan, in his excellent article "Masorah" in the *Encyclopaedia Judaica*,[5]
points out that in some manuscripts which use Tiberian graphemes but
are not conventional Tiberian manuscripts, לג and פס are written in
the margin to distinguish between a *lᵉgarmeh* and a *pᵉsiq*. This is
exactly what occurs here. There is, however, an example in this
parašah of a *munaḥ lᵉgarmeh* in Ex. 18:12, where a dot is used to
indicate that sign, וכל זקני ישראל. It seems that the system used
by the K'aifeng scribe doubly insured the confusion of these two signs.
Since this might be a non-Tiberian system in Tiberian guise, it cannot be
said that the above mentioned *pᵉsiq* was omitted here. Perhaps the tradition

from which this manuscript grew had no $p^e siq$ in that spot.

There are no other marginal masoretic notes other than the indication of the number of verses in the *parašah*, עׄבׄ , which occurs at the end. Here there is a curious contradiction with the actual number of verses, a mistake which highlights what occurs so often in masoretic notes. Although the number of verses should be 72, a count toals only 70. The number 72 is also given as the total by Mišael b. Uzziel in *kitāb alkilaf*[6] and in Bl9a.[7] Bl9a does not agree with the number 72 any more than HUC MS. 958. BH[3] shows it as having 78 verses[8] while Aaron Dotan indicates that Bl9a has 74 verses.[9] The Bible of Letteris agrees with BH[3].[10] It is quite evident that scribes have not counted verses for many years but persist in recording the number of verses transmitted to them. Admittedly, there are many known ways to divide the verses of the Ten Commandments, but none of these adds up to 72.[11]

Between Ex. 19:25 and 20:1, a *parašah* $p^e tuḥah$, a large *vav* is written by the first hand and dotted. It is situated approximately in the middle of the horizontal line and in the line between the end of chapter 19 and the beginning of chapter 20. A similar phenomenon occurs between Ex. 20:7 and 20:8 where a large *bet* was written by the first hand and dotted. It is situated in the same way as the *vav*. An ingenious solution was proposed by Dr. Michael Klein in seeking to understand the function of the *vav*. It occurs where a *parašah* $s^e tumah$ would begin. To be sure, the first letter of the first word of the next *parašah* begins with a *vav*, וידבר . This can then be explained as a dotted scribal error like the two mentioned above. In this case the scribe began the next *parašah* as $s^e tumah$ and immediately realized that it should be written as $p^e tuḥah$. He dotted the letter that he had already written and started again on the

next line.

If this phenomenon were in isolation, Dr. Klein's solution would indeed be seen as correct by all and in fact perhaps it is the correct explanation of this *vav*. It remains the best solution as long as no others can be offered; but it is not an elegant answer.

This explanation does not fit the *bet* in the second instance. A solution which properly fits both instances would be preferable.

HUC MS. 958 displays one last phenomenon which may yet prove to be either a masoretic note marking the *sᵉdarim* of the so-called triennial system of reading the Pentateuch, or perhaps some other masoretic device. There are verses which carry a small hollow circle over their two dots marking *sof pasuq, e.g.* ⦂ . These occur at the end of Ex. 18:11; 19:4; 19:25; and 20:18 (20:26 according to BH[3]). Jacob Mann (*The Bible as Read and Preached in The Old Synagogue*) and C. D. Ginsburg (*Introduction to the Masoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible*) list no variants of the division of *sᵉdarim* which correspond exactly to these marks in HUC MS. 958. The last example, between Ex. 20:18 and 21:1, does correspond; and Ex. 19:4-5 is only one verse off. The main problem lies in the fact that I could find no tradition which recorded more than two *sᵉdarim* for this *parašah*, while the section book records four. There are traditions which have a good deal more *sᵉdarim* than the normal 154 or so, but more research will have to be done in this area in the future.

There is some correlation between these marks and several of the traditional places for calling congregants up to the Torah. To establish a link, a ritual in which only four people were called up would have to be envisioned. As with the tenuous connection with the *sᵉdarim*, this will also have to await further study.

Michael Pollak, in his study of the K'aifeng Torah scrolls, suggests that it might prove fruitful to compare the peculiarities of the section books with the extant K'aifeng Torah scrolls and with early Pentateuchs emanating from non-Chinese sources.[12] That is precisely what I have done. A comparison with the Torah scrolls must focus on consonantal differences and on the occurrence of *parašiyyot pᵉtuḥot* and *parašiyyot sᵉtumot*. Time limitations prevented me from making a consonantal comparison with the scrolls, but I would like to point out the differences between HUC MS. 958 B19a and JBḤ.

The K'aifeng section book shows a very careful transmission of the consonantal text of the masoretic Bible. There are no major differences and only two minor ones of *plene* and defective spelling.

	B19a	JBH	HUC 958
Ex. 19:16	וקל ש(ו)פר erased *vav*	וקל שפר	וקול שפר
Ex. 19:19	השופר Dotan and BH³ list both of the above defectively	השפר	השפר

Strangely enough, in both these instances, HUC 958 is closer to JBḤ than to B19a. The number of differences that can occur in this area, even between two so-called reliable manuscripts, is staggering.[13] This certainly attests to the careful work of the first hand and gives a certain amount of credibility to the entire manuscript.

I did make a comparison of three Chinese Torah scrolls with B19a, Maimonides, and a modern Torah photographed in a *tiqun sofrim* concerning the open and closed passages. The results presented in the chart of open and closed sections on plate 14, are arranged according to the verse order in B19a.

The open and closed passages are, as Maimonides put it, "utter confusion." Not one of these manuscripts matches another. The section book is certainly much closer to Maimonides than to the Chinese scrolls. In the case of Ex. 20:17b, HUC 958 is the only one that matches the uncensored version of Maimonides, marking no break at all (see plate 14). Two of the differences between HUC 958 and all of the other manuscripts are part of its unique layout of the Ten Commandments. It displays them on the page in a wholly different manner from either the Chinese scrolls or the *tiqun* (see plates 31 and 32). The Chinese scrolls and modern western scrolls list all the short commandments as closed passages but modern western scrolls place two closed passages per line while the Chinese scrolls place only one per line.[14] The K'aifeng section book alternates the short commandments as open and closed, thereby writing each commandment as a whole and not dividing them among lines. This seems to have been important to the tradition from which this scribe copied.

That he did not divide the last commandment with a closed passage is no coincidence, nor is his insistence that each commandment constitute one verse with no internal verse divisions. This latter point will be discussed later.

The other two differences with Maimonides occur in a switch from closed to open passages in Ex. 20:1 and 20:2, the first commandment and its introduction. This, again, was apparently an effort to emphasize these commandments. This tradition obviously wanted no skimping on these central doctrines.

There are no artistic renderings but some of the section books contain a page in the front to which is adhered a piece of intricately woven

silk fabric, on top of which is written the name of the *parašah*. Many of them have colophons although *vayyišmaʿ yitro* does not. The colophons, written in Hebrew and Judaeo-Persian, describe the person who commissioned each section book to be written using the word נדר, and the scribe or scribes. Additional information is sometimes supplied, but as these do not occur in our MS. 958 they will not be discussed. Only the date, which occurs in those section books with colophons is important. Dates are given according to day, Hebrew month and Seleucid year. They span a range of years in the third decade of the nineteenth Seleucid millennium. *Parašat bᵉreᵒšit*, for example, is dated *ṭebet* 25, 1932. This corresponds to 1619-20 C.E. Our MS, then, is dated in the first half of the 17th century.

William C. White tells us that the section books were known as the Square Scriptures (*Fang Ching*).[15] He goes on to say that there are thirty-three section books of the law, each containing one *parašah*. Eight of these are duplicates. Donald D. Leslie claims that there are indications that there were once several complete copies of section books for all fifty-three *parašiyyot*.[16]

<center>*   *   *   *</center>

Now that we have described the manuscript in some detail we can dwell on the specifics of vocalization and accentuation, for these after all are the heart of the masoretic text of the Bible. In this area the main criticisms of HUC MS. 958 must be made; and in this area our manuscript can make the greatest contribution.

Beside the general observations that were made previously about the vocalization and accentuation, we can make one general statement when describing the various hands present in the manuscript: Neither the scribe

of the second hand nor the scribe of the third hand make a distinction between the ways that they write *merkaʾ*, *silluq*, *tippᵉhaʾ* or *gaʿyah*. Furthermore, the second hand forms the accent *dargaʾ* in almost the identical manner, to the point that there is no real distinction between *dargaʾ* and *merkaʾ* (see plates 17 and 18). Typical examples of this are Ex. 18:9, אשר הצילו מיד מצרים *merkaʾ* *tippᵉhaʾ* *merkaʾ* *silluq*; Ex. 19:6, ואתם תהיו־לי *merkaʾ* (*dargaʾ*?) *ga yah tᵉbir*; and Ex. 20:3, לא תשא את־שם־ יהוה אלהיך *merkaʾ* (*dargaʾ*?) *tᵉbir ga yah merkaʾ* *tippᵉhaʾ*. On one or two rare occasions the sign preceding the *tᵉbir* is clearly a curved *dargaʾ* as in Ex. 20:2 אשר הוצאתיך. There are some occasions where the signs are slanted in the other direction indicating what would appear to be a normal *merkaʾ* *tippᵉhaʾ*. As often as not, however, the *tippᵉhaʾ* is the accent which is slanted down to the left rather than *merkaʾ*.

In order to facilitate the analysis of the differences in the vocalization and accentuation between HUC MS. 958, B19a and Jacob ben Hayyim's Bible (JBH), I have categorized those differences. First I will list the obvious mistakes, followed by the various peculiarities of the K'aifeng manuscript and lastly by differences which most likely show real variants in tradition which go back beyond the settlement of the Jews in China. I refer the reader to the vowel charts on plates 15 and 16.

The number of mistakes and omissions that were made by the second hand and left uncorrected by the third hand is large. It was not the case that mistakes were not being searched out, for there are a number of corrections such as were described above and such as the correction of a *qames* or a *pattaḥ* into a *segol* as in the example of Ex. 18:6 בניה and 18:14 ויאמר. We must conclude on this basis that the pointer knew very

little about Hebrew grammar or even standard pronunciation. There would
be no explanation otherwise for such blunders as הוֹצָאְנֵיהָ and תַּעֲשֶׂה־לָךְ.

Yet we cannot assume that the scribe was completely ignorant of
Hebrew pronunciation. Were this true, there would not be a confusion of
like-sounding vowels such as *ṣere* and *segol* (see plate 15). This type of
confusion is typical of the Arabic speaker. The Chinese Jews did not have
Arabic origins but perhaps they also pronounced those two sounds alike,
or received their tradition from a community that did. It is clear that
their speech did influence their spelling of words a great deal, even in
scripture. Many Chinese documents in Hebrew, including their Torah
Scrolls, reflect the typical Chinese-Japanese confusion between the sounds
of *l* and *r*. Michael Pollak in his study of the Torah Scrolls of K'aifeng
points out that all of the Chinese scrolls read מחוץ תשכל חלב for Dt. 32:25
rather than the expected reading מחוץ תשכל חרב.[17] That this mistake due
to pronunciation occurs in all the extant Torah Scrolls indicates that
once it had been made it was likely to remain a permanent change.

The same type of changes undoubtedly effected the general confusion
between *ṣere* and *segol* which is found throughout the section book.
We can assume that many of those changes occurred for the first time
not in this manuscript but long before. In fact, it is quite possible
that these changes represent fairly old traditions deviating from
the Tiberian schools.

Recall that Dotan gave differences in pronunciation as one of the
two reasons for the appearance of non-conventional Tiberian pointing
systems. He further states explicitly that the lack of distinction
between *qameṣ* and *pattaḥ* and between *ṣere* and *segol* typify this type of
tradition.[18] The occurrence of this phenomenon, then, makes the evidence

pointing toward the non-conventional nature of HUC MS. 958 even more compelling.

I placed the example of גָּדֹול in this category of confused signs rather than the category of mistakes, even though there was only one such example, because of the close association of this type of change with the non-conventional Tiberian systems. I must stress, however, that the argument for HUC 958 reflecting a non-conventional Tiberian system stands firm even if this change of vowels is viewed as a simple scribal error.

A case could be made that there was a confusion of *qameṣ* and *segol* based on the following observations:

	standard reading	HUC MS. 958	
Ex. 18:6	בְּנֶיךָ	בְּנֶיךָ	these examples
Ex. 18:14	וַיֹּאמֶר	וַיֹּאמֶר	are corrected to read *segol*.
Ex. 18:19	הָאֱלֹהִים	הָאֱלֹהִים	
Ex. 20:2	תַעֲשֶׂה לָךְ	תַעֲשֶׂה לָךְ	

The confusion of these two signs does not seem probable to me. This would necessitate a Hebrew pronunciation in which *ṣere*, *segol* and *qameṣ* all sound alike, which is highly unlikely. Nor are there any other examples of confusion between *segol* and *qameṣ* from other traditions. More probably these are scribal errors.

Ḥaṭafim are often ignored but generally copied correctly. In one case, Ex. 19:21, פֶּן-יֶהֶרְסוּ, a *ḥaṭaf* was mistakenly copied into the text. It seems rather obvious that the scribe did not understand their function. Rather he loyally copied them into the text. The mistakes

concerning *ḥatafim* were more likely made at an earlier step in the transmission process. This cannot be proved by the evidence at hand, but a hint that this was the case can be seen in the example of Ex. 18:21 מֻשִׁים. Here, the scribe of this section book seems to have been aware that the first syllable, bearing a *pattaḥ*, needed to be closed by another consonant. Knowing that the *dageš forte* serves this function, he inserted one into the *mem*. It is true that he did this only in this case when he could have inserted a *dageš* in several other similar cases. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that this is a coincidence. I believe the argument that the K'aifeng scribe was loyal to his received tradition has some validity.

Dotan mentions some characteristic patterns for *ḥatafim* which occur in many non-conventional Tiberian manuscripts. These forms do not occur here. Dotan, however, notes that none of these changes are made consistently in all manuscripts.[19]

Only one substantive change occurs. In Ex. 19:24 לֶךְ־רֵד becomes לֶךְ רֵד. A simple change of the vowels *ṣere* and *seḡol* is not the case here: the absence of a *maqqaf* takes these words out of the construct. Thus a slightly different tradition is recorded here.

*   *   *   *

There can be no doubt that the Jews of K'aifeng Fu either chanted the Law with the most simple system imaginable, or they did not chant it at all but read from the scrolls of the Law. If, indeed, they did chant the Law, they probably did so in a monotone or improvisation. Only the *etnaḥ* and *sof pasuq* were regularly observed in public reading by some tonal indication. This is apparent from two criteria found in the

section books. The first is the markings and crosses of the reader which were discussed above in the general description of the section books. These seem to appear only at the main breaks in the text. The second criterion is the great number of words to which the scribe did not assign accents. Nine such words appear in this *parašah* alone, and this even after a second hand filled in many of the gaps. Note that none of the unaccented words would normally carry an *etnaḥ* (see plate 17). There is a variety of missing signs, both conjunctive and disjunctive. The only sign which is missing more often than the others is the *reviʿa*, probably because as one small dot it can easily be overlooked.

There are five obvious and unexplainable mistakes and three instances where the scribe demonstrated that he did not understand the difference between *qadmaʾ* and *paštaʾ* (see plates 16 and 17). Either he or the scribe from whom he copied advanced the *paštaʾ* to fall on the accent, thereby making it look like a *qadmaʾ*. In the third case he turned a *qadmaʾ* into a *paštaʾ* by adding a second mark over the final letter.

The confusion between a *dargaʾ* and a *merkaʾ* before a *tevir* was already mentioned (see plates 17 and 18). There are ten examples where the sign before the *tevir* appears as a straight line. Three of those ten have a very slight curve in them but it is doubtful that this slight curve was meant to indicate a *dargaʾ* as opposed to a *merkaʾ*. In one case, Ex. 20:18, the straight line which should be a *dargaʾ* is followed in the next word by another straight line. Either the line of the second word is simply missing a dot which would indicate it as a *tevir*, or we have here exactly what it looks like, *merkaʾ ṭippeḥaʾ*. If the latter is in fact the case, then this example represents a differing tradition. In my opinion the former circumstance is the more likely one.

The abnormal appearance of the *darga'* in non-conventional Tiberian Manuscripts is also described by Dotan. Yet the situation here is not identical with the one he mentions. Dotan claims that these diverging manuscripts notate *darga'* like a *šalšelet* under the letter.[21] That this, among all the other accents, has a differing form in HUC MS. 958 could hardly be an accident. But more study must be done here before labelling this an indication of a divergent tradition.

Parašat yitro contains three examples of different sequences of accents which B19a and JBH differ (see plates 18 and 19). None of these is major or unusual, but it is interesting that HUC MS. 958 agrees with B19a in all three cases. C. D. Ginsburg's edition of the Hebrew Bible with variants from many manuscripts is particularly helpful when analyzing such differences. In the first case of Ex. 18:5 he lists not only *rᵉviᶜi* but *qadma' zaqef* and *zaqef* by itself. He lists *zaqef gadol*, the reading of Jacob ben Ḥayyim, as occurring in only a few cases.[22] In the second case, Ex. 18:10, Ginsburg lists numerous MSS giving both readings.[23] In the third case, Ex. 18:17, Ginsburg does not list anything other than *merka' tippᵉḥa' sof pasuq*, despite the fact that ben Ḥayyim himself lists *tippᵉḥa' merka' sof pasuq*.[24] In all three of the above examples, Ginsburg gives readings in his text which are contrary to ben Ḥayyim, underlining the basic problem with his work about which Kahle complained. It is difficult to believe that Ginsburg really took the ben Ḥayyim text of the Bible as the true exemplar of ben Ašer after looking at his edition. But it is not within the scope of this paper to enter into a serious criticism of Ginsburg.

Finally, there are six examples of variant readings from JBH and B19a which are grammatically sound and must be understood as

reflecting other traditions (see plate 18). Ginsburg lists only one reading for all of these cases. In none of them does he list the variant of HUC MS. 958 as an alternative.

Of all the various masoretic phenomena present in HUC MS. 958, none is less consistent than the use of the *maqqaf*. Some *maqqafs* were written by the second hand and some by the third (see plates 19-21). At first I believed that *maqqafs* are missing only when the words to which they are attached fall at the end of a line. There are fourteen missing *maqqafs* at the end of a line while sixteen *maqqafs* do appear at the end of the line (see plate on *maqqafs*). As my study proceeded, however, I found an increasing number of *maqqafs* missing from words in the middle or beginning of the line and a decreasing number of missing *maqqafs* from words at the end of the line. Overall the percentage of *maqqafs* missing from the end of the line is much greater than the percentage of those missing from the middle or beginning of the line. One hundred two *maqqafs* appear in intermediary positions while only 15 are missing. Of those missing at the end of the line, 8 are from chapter 18, 4 from chapter 19, and 2 from chapter 20. This contrasts sharply with the distribution of missing *maqqafs* from intermediary positions. None are missing from chapter 18, 7 are missing from chapter 19 and 8 from chapter 20. The reason for this uneven distribution of apparent mistakes is unclear. Were this due to the scribe's increasing fatigue, the same increase in other types of mistakes would occur. It does not. Nor does this argument explain the decrease of *maqqaf* omissions at the end of the line.

Let us return for a moment to Dotan's explanation of the non-conventional Tiberian system. He writes, "The omission of the *maqqaf* is more common than in the regular Tiberian manuscripts and apparently

not necessarily because of oversights of the scribes."[25] At first glance
this statement would seem to offer evidence that, on the basis of the
absence of many *maqqafs* in an apparently unsystematic way, HUC MS. 958
reflects this "non-conventional Tiberian system." But to probe the
matter further, what does Dotan mean when he says that ". . . in some
manuscripts, the non-conventional use of the Tiberian graphemes seems
to be inconsistent, random, . . ."ד[26] If he means that the use of the
maqqaf seems to be almost up to the discretion of the scribe, then the
disproportionate distribution of *maqqafs* in MS. 958 depending upon their
location on the line would indicate that indeed this is a non-conventional
Tiberian manuscript. If, however, he means that the use of the *maqqaf*
within one of these traditions is inconsistent, but that each scribe
attempts to follow the tradition from which he is copying, then no such
definite conclusion can be reached. I believe that the former is the case
and that the future study of this manuscript will reveal many more inter-
esting and important discoveries about these non-Tiberian systems.

The scribe erred only twice in his use of *dageš forte* (see plate 21).
One of these errors, Ex. 18:21 םישנמ, was discussed in the analysis of
םיאטמ . The second error is self-explanatory and carries no special sig-
nificance.

The scribe of HUC MS. 958 omitted three *dᵉgašim* without any special
significance attached to them (see plate 22). He also omitted four
dᵉgašim after a *vav* consecutive in the letter *yod̲*. This was part of the
scribe's general confusion about when to double the *yod̲* and when not to
double it. In four cases he doubled it when he should not have.

Far more interesting is the treatment of *dageš lene*. Two examples

are outright errors and contradict the rules for בגד"כפת. There
the scribe assigned *rafe* to initial בגד"כפת letters when the preceding
word ended in a consonant. In the third case, the scribe gave an initial
kaf, following a word ending in a vowel, both a *dageš* and a *rafe*
(לא תעשה כֵּל-מלאכה). Y^ediḏya Š^elomo of Norzi, in his well known commentary
מנחת שי , says that in the Ten Commandments with its two systems of
accentuation there are four words with both a *dageš* and a *rafe*:

וארבע תיבות מהן דגש ורפה. ואלו.הן תיבת כל של ועשית כל מלאכתך.

ותי״ו של תרצח. תנאף. תגנב. 27

Whether or not these four letters are read in a soft or hard manner depends
on which tradition of accents is being read, the עליון or the תחתון.
In one case the accent of the preceding word, which ends in an open
syllable, is disjunctive. According to the rules of אוי״ה, this produces
a *dageš* in that initial בגד"כפת letter. In the other case, the preceding
word carries a conjunctive accent producing a *rafe*. It is probable that
this type of change was very late and does not reflect the original sound
of those letters in the traditions from which the עליון and תחתון stem.
But that is of no concern here. The fact is that by the time the K'aifeng
section books appeared on the scene the *dageš*/*rafe* combination was an
established phenomenon. The interesting twist comes when we realize that
in this manuscript, in none of the four instances which Norzi gives us do
we find both a *dageš* and a *rafe*. This alone is not surprising, for there
is only one set of accents, not two, and all four words do follow the
rule of אוי״ה . The appearance of this phenomenon on a word not listed
by Norzi, however, is surprising. The scribe of K'aifeng could not have
dreamed this up himself, and it is too much to believe it a coincidence.
Surely this represents a double tradition in which one of the accents on

the preceding word was conjunctive and the other was disjunctive. In JBH and B19a both accents preceding it are conjunctive.

The information that we have gleaned from the use of the $d^e g a \check{s} i m$ supports the contention that this manuscript does not represent the work of a good scribe who followed carefully either the unadulterated text of one of the masoretes or even a mixed text. Rather, it supports the contention that this is the work of a careless or ignorant scribe, or the work of a scribe who carefully copied from a very corrupt manuscript. We cannot know from what we have learned here which of these two possibilities holds true for this codex. Some of the evidence points to a scribe who knew some rules, e.g., חַמְּשִׁים. Other evidence points to the total ignorance of the scribe, e.g., מִיד פְּרֵעָה and אֲשֶׁר בַּשָּׁמַיִם. It seems an impossible task to separate the mistakes into levels and identify them with the scribe of this manuscript or the scribe(s) from which he copied. If anything, the evidence thus far shows that we are dealing with a long line of scribes, not just two, each of whom probably contributed to the corruption of this text. Some among those scribes may have known some grammar and made occasional adjustments trying to justify mistakes made by previous scribes. Nevertheless, despite these pitfalls, many authentic variant traditions escaped the ignorance of these well-intended scribes and were preserved for us to discover in this manuscript, e.g., לֹא תַעֲשֶׂה כָל מְלָאכָה.

HUC MS. 958 is characterized by a scarcity of $ga'yot$ (see plates 22-26). The scribe of B19a was very conservative in his use of the $ga'yah$ compared with the abundance of $ga'yot$ in JBH. But the scribe of the K'aifeng section book is equally conservative in his use of $ga'yot$ in relation to B19a. It is well known that as time passed

the frequency of *ga'yot* in manuscripts increased. This was especially true of major *ga'yot*. It is no exaggeration to say that in the middle ages a "*ga'yah* craze" developed that kept increasing up to the present day. This overabundance of *ga'yot*, especially the major ones, was also characteristic of the non-conventional Tiberian manuscripts.[28]

In the entire section book of *yitro*, there are only thirteen *ga'yot* (see plate 26). This extreme scarcity surely shows that the tradition from which HUC MS. 958 stems was immune from the "*ga'yah* craze." It either preserves the original occurrences of *ga'yot* and no others, or over the years *ga'yot* have actually been dropped from its text.

Of the *ga'yot* missing from HUC MS. 958, fifty-five are recorded in JBH but not in B19a; 20 are recorded in both JBH and B19a; and three are recorded in B19a but not in JBH. Of the thirteen *ga'yot* which the scribe of HUC MS. 958 did include, nine are found in both JBH and B19a while two are found in JBH but not in B19a.

Whether the scarcity of *ga'yot* does damage to the possibility that this manuscript represents a non-conventional text is difficult to say. Probably it does. On the other hand, it may be just as valid to say that this strain of manuscripts resisted the urge to increase *ga'yot* prevalent in the non-conventional Tiberian systems, as it is to say that it resisted that urge prevalent in the standard Tiberian system.

*   *   *   *

In commenting on the double accentuation system of the Ten Commandments, Y^edidyah Š^elomoh of Norzi says that the upper or greater accentuation was meant to be used for public reading on š^ebu'ot while the lower or lesser accentuation was to be used for the normal Sabbath reading according to the annual cycle of reading Scripture. He also quotes

another opinion from ערוגת הבשם claiming that in public, the upper accents must be read while in private the lower accents are to be read.[29] Certainly the latter opinion commands more credence for it applies to the Ten Commandments both in Exodus and in Deuteronomy. Norzi's notion could only explain the use of two sets of accents in Exodus, since the Deuteronomy version is not read on $s^e bu^c ot$. Neither of these traditional explanations satisfy scholars, most of whom feel that the double set of accents stems from two separate masoretic traditions.[30]

The two varying traditions were concerned with more than $etnah$ as against a $zaqef$. Their point of departure was a difference over the division of the commandments themselves. Specifically this concerned the first and second commandments. Were the two phrases אנכי יהוה לא יהיה לך אלהים אחרים על פני and אלהיך אשר הוצאתיך מארץ מצרים מבית עבדים linked together, or were they separate? Those who saw the two phrases together as the first commandment and understood them as having been uttered בדיבור אחד wrote them as a single verse. Those who felt that the first phrase was the first commandment and the second phrase was the beginning of the second commandment wrote them separately as two distinct verses as we find in HUC MS. 958. There remains a third possibility, namely, those that felt לא יהיה לך was the beginning of the second commandment, yet accepted that the first and entire second commandment were uttered כדבור אחד. They then proceeded to punctuate the text according to their own view, making nine verses out of ten commandments.[31]

The argument over the verse division of the Ten Commandments goes still further. In one set of accents the first and fourth commandments are written as a single verse each while in the other set of accents they are divided into four verses each. Then one set of accents divides the

short sixth through ninth commandments, לא תרצח לא תנאף לא תגנב לא

תענה ברעך עד שקר into separate verses while the other set of accents

combines all four commandments into one verse.[32]

The Chinese section books are designed as an aid in public reading.

I believe that reflecting their function, the verse division of HUC 958

is the one known to us as the עליון or upper accents (and verse divisions –

see plates 27-29). This tradition of reading the Ten Commandments

attempted to maintain the integrity of each commandment as a single verse.

HUC 958 must be considered valuable evidence supporting such a division.

Neither Norzi, Ginsburg, the Koren Bible nor Dotan divide the upper from

the lower accents assigning the upper, ten verses for ten commandments.

I was pleased to learn that the thorough study of M. B. Cohen and D. B.

Freedman agrees with the verse division of HUC 958 in the עליון.[33]

Unlike most masoretic texts, HUC MS. 958 has only one set of accents.

This allows a comparison with the two standard sets of accents which

might yield valuable information on the upper and lower sets of accents.

If HUC 958 were found to preserve a relatively systematic set of accents,

it might help clarify which verse divisions and which accent hemistiches

belong to the upper accents and which to the lower. It is even possible

that this single set of accents is not a recension from some manuscript

bearing the double set but represents a continued tradition of a single

set of accents.

Unfortunately, the text cannot help us to learn more about the two

sets of accents. In fact, the text is a combination of the two sets of

signs. The K'aifeng document contains a completely unsystematic set of

accents. They are a mixture of the upper and lower sets of accents (see

plates 27-29). The reduction of the two sets of accents into one was

done in the most unknowledgeable way. The various hemistiches are broken, half from the upper and half from the lower accents. The result is an impossible combination of accents, even by the most non-conventional system imaginable, *e.g.*, *pašṭa' gereš* or *munaḥ zaqef munaḥ segol*. This certainly gives credence to the notion that the scribe knew no rules but slavishly copied both the genuine and corrupt scribal traditions which he saw before him.

There are some variants in HUC 958 which appear neither in B19a nor JBḤ.[34] Four are scribal errors: 20:2 מתכם should have an *etnaḥ* or a *ṭippᵉḥa'*. This provides us with a good example of the way in which the two systems of accentuation are mixed. According to the accent which precedes this one, a *ṭippᵉḥa'*, a second *ṭippᵉḥa'* could not occur on this word. We would then expect an *etnaḥ*. מתחת , however, is one of the words which is pointed in pausal form in the lower set of accents, מִתָּ֑חַת , and pointed normally in the upper set of accents, מִתַּ֫חַת . Here, מתחת is pointed normally with a *pattaḥ* and could not be assigned the pausal accent *etnaḥ*. As 20:2 now stands there is no *etnaḥ* at all. In verse 20:4, בֺשׁרֶךֺ should have no *pašṭa'* between a *munaḥ* and a *zaqef*. Verse 20:10a, לֺא תַחמֹד should be connected by *merka' ṭippᵉḥa'*. The scribe erroneously copied a *geršayim* into the text when he looked at the same phrase in the *b* part of the verse which properly takes a *geršayim*.

Other variants represent a legitimate tradition. The *kaf* with *dageš* and *rafe* in verse four was mentioned above. Verse 20:2 מִתַּחַת לָאָרֶץ and 20:4 וּיוֹם הַשַּׁבַּת לקדשׁוֺ are typical changes between *rᵉbiʿi* and *zaqef qaton* that occur throughout this manuscript. This change most likely reflects the non-conventional nature of this "Tiberian" pointing. It will be interesting if the study of other such manuscripts reveals the same frequent change.

Finally, the study of HUC MS. 958 cannot be complete without its comparison with the *ḥillufim* between ben Ašer and ben Naftali as listed in *kitāb alkilaf*. HUC 958 contains only two such *ḥillufim* from Mišael's general rules: Ex. 18:9 reads לְיִשְׂרָאֵל according to BA. Ex. 19:16 reads וַיְהִ֖י בַיּ֑וֹם, which is both BA and BN.

A far more interesting analysis can be made from a test of what Mišael lists in his section on *parašat yitṛo*. There he mentions that there are no *ḥillufim* between the two great Masoretes in this *parašah*. Originally, however, there were two differences, but one or the other Masorete changed his mind to conform to the other. In Ex. 19:13, ייֽרה וֵיה או , BN provided the *yud* with a *rafe*. ייֽרה . When it was made clear to him by analogy that this reading was corrupt, he abrogated it and instead read it או יֽרה יֽירה as did BA. In Ex. 20:2, לֹא יִֽהְיֶה־לָ֥ךְ, BA first equipped the first *yud* with a *gaʿyah*, יִֽהְיֶה .

Later he abrogated that and wrote it without the *gaʿyah*, לֹא יִהְיֶה לָ֥ךְ.[35] In the instance of the first case, HUC 958 points according to BA and BN after he changed his opinion. In the second instance, what occurs in various other manuscripts must be analyzed first. B19a gives a reading which agrees with what BA and BN agreed upon yet presents another problem: לֹֽא־יִהְיֶ֣ה־לְךָ֗ . If the word is to have a *gaʿyah*, it must also be connected with the next word with a *maqqaf*. There is no sign of a *maqqaf* here. BH[3] records faithfully what appears in B19a, including this flaw.[36] But, Aharon Dotan in this case corrects and emends the reading of B19a. He separates the reading into the upper accents: לֹֽא יִהְיֶה־לְךָ֗ [37] and the lower accents: לֹֽא־יִֽהְיֶ֣ה לְךָ֗ .[38] His upper reading is fine and presents no problem. But his upper reading contains variations from what appears in the manuscript of B19a. Dotan adds both the *maqqaf* and a *merkaʾ* .

JBH leaves out the *ga'yah* on the first *yuḏ* of יהיה and, like BA and BN he·connected it with the next word by a *maqqaf*: לֹא־יִהְיֶה־לְךָ. Simultaneously he made a *maqqaf* impossible by giving a *monaḥ* and a *merka'* rather than a *monaḥ* and the *ga'yah* that BA and BN agreed upon. To complicate matters further, neither Letteris nor Ginsburg accurately copy JBH. They both try to improve on the mistake of JBH. Letteris lists לֹא־יִהְיֶה לְךָ,[39] and Ginsburg lists לֹא־יִהְיֶה לְךָ.[40] They both remove the *maqqaf* in favor of the *merka'*, and they both insert the *ga'yah* on the first *yuḏ* against the reading of BA and BN.

Now let us examine what the scribe of HUC 958 has left for us: לֹא יהיה/לְךָ. Because the scribe of HUC 958 often assumes a *maqqaf* without writing one, especially at the end of a line, and because he makes a *merka'* and a *ga'yah* in the same way, this can be read two ways: *monaḥ ga'yah-tebir* or *monaḥ merka' tebir*.

What, then, can be said of HUC MS. 958 with regard to Ben Ašer and Ben Naftali? In Ex. 18:9, לְיִשְׂרָאֵל HUC 958 preserves a purely BA reading. In Ex. 19:16, וַיְהִי בַיֹּם, and in Ex. 19:13, אוֹ יָרֹה יִיָּרֶה, it preserves a congruent BA and BN reading. In Ex. 20:2, לֹא יהיה/לְךָ, it is difficult to determine what the exact reading is due to the peculiarities of the scribal practices employed here. There is, at any rate, a fifty percent chance that the preserved reading is congruent to BA and BN.

Notes to Chapter III

[1]Aharon Dotan, "Masorah," *Encyclopaedia Judaica [EJ]* (Jerusalem: Macmillan, 1971), vol. 16, col. 1461.

[2]William Charles White, *Chinese Jews* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1942), vol. 3, p. 155

[3]Saul Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1962), pp. 43-46.

[4]White, see facsimile in vol. 3, p. 160.

[5]Dotan, *EJ*, vol. 16, col. 1461.

[6]L. Lipschütz, "כתאב אלכֻלַף," *Textus*, vol. 2, p. יא.

[7] facsimile ed., כתב יד לנינגרד B19a‏, מבוא מאת ד. ש. לוינגר, (ירושלים: מקור, תשל"א, 1971), ע' 89.

[8]*Biblia Hebraica* (Third edition; ed. Kittel and Kahle; Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1937), p. 110.

[9]תורה נביאים וכתובים (על פי כתב יד לנינגרד בידי אהרון דותן; תל-אביב: עדי, 1973), ע' 94.

[10]תורה נביאים וכתובים (מאיר הלוי לעטעריס; בערלין: חברת מפיקי כתבי קודש בבריטאניא ובשאר ארצות, תרס"ג, 1904), ע' נב.

[11]Ginsburg divides them up into a Palestinian division having 73 verses and a Babylonian division having 71 verses. חמש חומשי תורה [תנ"ך] (ירושלים: מקור, תרמ"ז), ע' 108-109.

[12]Michael Pollak, *The Torah Scrolls of the Chinese Jews* (Dallas: Bridwell Library, 1975), p. 91.

[13]Moshe Goshen-Gottstein, "The Authenticity of the Aleppo Codex," *Textus*, vol. 1, p. 28, n. 31. Cf. Ginsburg's variants, Ex. 19:19.

[14]As Maimonides does not mention any special arrangement for the layout of the short commandments, he probably wrote his Torah scroll like the Chinese scrolls rather than the Western ones that we are familiar with (see plate 32).

[15]White, vol. 3, p. 155.

[16]Donald Daniel Leslie, *The Survival of the Chinese Jews* (Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1972), p. 141.

[17]Pollak, p. 112. Cf. the description of Leslie of the pronunciation of the Chinese Jews, pp. 118-124.

[18]D. D. Leslie, pp. 119-124, published some transliterations of the Hebrew pronunciation of the K'aifeng Jews made by Domenge in 1721. These transliterations confirm that the Chinese Jews pronounced both *ṣere* and *segol* as *ié*. However, they did differ in their pronunciation of *qameṣ* and *pattaḥ*.

[19]Dotan, *EJ*, vol. 16, col. 1462.

[20]These charts and the following analysis do not include those sections of the *parašah* which have double pointing, Ex. 20:2-18(26). Those will be analysed separately and charts of the findings from them may be found on plate

[21]Dotan, *EJ*, vol. 16, col. 1463.

[22]כ. ד. גינצבורג, *תנ"ך*, כרך א, ע׳ 105.

[23]*Ibid.*

[24]*Ibid.*, ע׳ 106.

[25]Dotan, *EJ*, vol. 16, col. 1463.

[26]*Ibid.*

[27]ידידיה שלמה מנורצי, "מנחת שי," נמצא בספר ארבעה ועשרים (וויען: גיורג הלצינגר, 1813), דף ה, ע׳ א.

[28]Dotan, *EJ*, vol. 16, col. 1463.

[29]מנחת שי, דף ה, ע׳ א-ב.

[30]Miles B. Cohen and David B. Freedman construct a convincing argument that the two sets of accents are not varying traditions of comparable antiquity. Rather the accentuation and verse division for private consumption (התחתון) are older, the version for public reading having developed from it in order to enable each commandment to be read as a versicle unit. "The Dual Accentuation System of the Ten Commandments," *1972/73 Proceedings, IOMS* (ed. Harry Orlinsky; Missoula, Montana: Univ. of Montana, 1974), p. 8.

[31]Norzi puts the first two commandments בדבור אחד in the עליון, ע׳ א-ב דף ה, מנחת שי, while Dotan puts them in the התחתון, cf. p. 93 and p. 1090. This problem was discussed thoroughly by M. B. Cohen and D. B. Freedman. They suggest that the First Commandment could be in the same verse with the first phrase of the Second Commandment without presenting problems for the private reading, just as in the private reading those four short commandments are combined in one verse (p. 16). This argument seems improbable. It does not take into consideration that such a division would place the first part of the Second Commandment together in one verse with the First Commandment while separating it from the rest of the Second Commandment. Their division of verses does not fit their theory, but it is

nonetheless the correct division of verses for private reading.
In order to accept this division of verses, it must be understood
that the First Commandment goes through לא יהיה לך אלהים אחרים על פני,
and the Second Commandment begins לא תעשה לך פסל וכל תמונה.

[32]Norzi claims that the עליון makes one verse out of Command-
ments 6,7,8 and 9, and that the תחתון divides them into versicle units
(*Ibid.*). Dotan takes the reverse position. Cf. p. 94 and p. 1090.

[33]M. B. Cohen and D. B. Freedman, p. 17.

[34]JBH differs from Elia mainly in the טעמים עליונים of the
first line, *e.g.*, אשר הוצאתיך מארץ מצרים.

[35]"כמאב אללבלף" The entire passage concerning פרשת יתרו from
פרש וישמע (ed. Lipschütz, *Textus*, vol. 2, ע' יא-יב) is worth quoting:
יתרו סררין כאמלה הפצילהא וישמע מתין לי ב ה (18:1) ואם תהיו לי ב (19:6).
ואתצא פואסיקתא אתנין וסבעין ע' יואזיה אליאל ומא פיה מן אללבלף שיא.
ואתצא מא לם יכלף פיה כלמתין אחהמא או ירה (19:13) פאנתא מדגושה
וכדי יגב אן תכון לאן רסם לגה אלעברבניין ידגשו מא כאן בהרא אלוזן נסיר
יבנה יקנה כדלך יירה ויהר לגה יירה רפי ילומה אן יקרא או סקל יסקל לאם
מעני אלגמזע ואתד ירגם ורשם וכאן כן נפתלי פי אול אמרה רפפיהא פלמא תהין
פסאר דלך רגע ענה ואללכמה אלאכרי לא יהיה לך אלהים אחרים (20:3) פאן
הדה אללפטה איצא כאן אבן אשר רחמה אללה פי אול זמאנה יתקל אלירד אלאול
בגעיה יהיה ופי אכר אמרה רגע ען דלך פרסמה כדא לא יהיה-לך:

[36]*Biblia Hebraica*[3], p. 108.

[37]חנ"ך, דותן, ע' 93.

[38]*Ibid.* ע' 1090.

[39]חנ"ך, לעטעריס, ע' נא.

[40]Ginsburg gives no variants חנ"ך, גינצבורג, כרך א, ע' 108.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibles: Manuscripts, Facsimile Editions and Microfilms

כתר ארם צובה. מסרו ונקדו ר' אהרן בן-אשר הוא הספר שעליו סמך אדוננו
הרמב"ם. חלק ראשון: הלוחות. ירושלים, האוניברסיטה העברית,
הוצאת מאגנס, תשל"ו.

תקון לקוראים. ערוך ומסודר בידי אשר בן דוב שארפרטשיין.
New York, Ktav, 1969.

MS. 958, Hebrew Union College Library, Cincinnati. פרשת וישמע יתרו.
K'aifeng Fu section book.

MS. Add. 283, Cambridge University Library, Cambridge. On microfilm
in the Hebrew Union College Library. K'aifeng Fu Torah scroll.

MS. Add. 19,250, British Museum, London. On microfilm in the Hebrew
Union College Library. K'aifeng Fu Torah scroll.

MS. B19a, Leningrad Public Library. Facsimile edition with an intro-
duction by D. Loewinger. Jerusalem, מקור, 1971.

MS. Hunt. Add. B(Roll), Bodleian Library, Oxford. On microfilm in the
Hebrew Union College Library. K'aifeng Fu Torah scroll.

Bibles: Printed Editions

חמשה חומשי תורה. ערוך ע"י כ. ד. גינצבורג. מדויק היטב על פי המסורת
ועל פי דפוס ראשונים עם חילופים והגהות מן כתבי יד עתוקים
ותרגומים ישנים. דפוס מחדש. ירושלים, מקור, תשל"ל.

תורה נביאים וכתובים. ערוך ע"י אהרן בן אשר. מדויקים היטב על פי הניקוד
הטעמים והמסורה של אהרן בן משה בן אשר בכתב יד לנינגרד.
תל-אביב, עדי, 1973.

תורה נביאים וכתובים. ערוך ע"י מאיר הלוי לעטעריס. מדויק היטב על פי המסורת,
עם הגהות בערלין, The British and Foreign Bible Society, 1904.

תורה נביאים וכתובים. Edited by Jacob ben Ḥayyim. Second Rabbinic Bible.
In the Hebrew Union College Library's Rare Book Room. Venice,
Daniel Bomberg, 1524-25.

Biblia Hebraica. Edited by Rud. Kittel, masoretic text edited by Paul
Kahle. Third edition. Stuttgart, Wurtembergische Bibelanstalt, 1937.

Descriptions and Studies of Bible Manuscripts and Editions

Ben Zvi, Izhak. "The Codex of Ben Asher" (*Textus* I). Jerusalem, 1960.

Breuer, Mordechai. כתר ארם צובה והנוסח המקובל של המקרא. Jerusalem, Mosad HaRav Kook, 1976.

Dotan, Aharon. (תרבי״ץ XXXIV) "האמנם נגקד כתר חלב בידי אהרן בן-אשר?" Jerusalem, 1965.

Ginsburg, Christian David. *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible*. London, The Unitarian Bible Society, 1897.

Goshen-Gottstein, M. H. (תרבי״ץ XXXIII) "כתר חלב בן בויאעא הסופר". Jerusalem, 1963-4.

—————. "A Recovered Part of the Aleppo Codex" (*Textus* V). Jerusalem, 1966.

—————. "The Authenticity of the Aleppo Codex" (*Textus* I). Jerusalem, 1960.

Yeivin, Israel. כתר ארם-צובה ניקודו טעמיו. Jerusalem, Magnes Press, 1968.

Yalon, Hanoch. (קרית ספר XXX) "פרשת שלח לך". Jerusalem, 1954-5.

Lehman, Israel O. "A Study of the Oldest Dated Oriental Bible Texts" (*Masoretic Studies* I, 1972-3 proceedings of the International Organization for Masoretic Studies). Missoula, Montana, 1974.

Loewinger, D. S. "כתר ארם-צובה או דקדוקי הטעמים?" (introduction to *Diqduqe Hatte ʿamim*, ed. Baer, Strack). Jerusalem, מקור, 1970.

—————. "The Aleppo Codex and the Ben Asher Tradition" (*Textus* I). Jerusalem, 1960.

Pérez Castro, F. "Corregido y Correcto" (*Sefarad* XIV). Madrid, 1955.

Poliak, Michael. *The Torah Scrolls of the Chinese Jews*. Dallas, Bridwell Library, 1975.

Rabbinic Sources

מסכת סופרים. New York, Otzar Hasefarim, 1957.

—————. Translated into English. London, Soncino, 1936.

Maimonides, Rabbi Moses. משנה תורה. New York, Shulsinger Bros., 1947.

Masoretic Compendia

בן אשר, אהרן בן משה. ספר דקדוקי הטעמים. ערוך עם מבואות ומחקרים בידי
אהרן דותן. שלושה כרכים. ירושלים, האקדמיה ללשון העברית, תשכ"ד.

Ben Ascher, Ahron ben Moscheh, und andere alte grammatische Lehrstuke.
    Dikduke Hat^eamim. Edited by S. Baer and H. L. Strack. Photo-offset
    edition. Jerusalem, מקור, 1970.

בן עזיאל, מישאל. "כתאב אלכלאף אלדי כין אלמעלמין בן אשר ובן נפתלי"
    ערוך בידי אליעזר ליפשיץ (*Textus* II) :ירושלים, 196.

Lipschutz, Lazar. "Kitāb al-Khilaf, the Book of the Hillufim"
    (*Textus* IV). Introduction to אלכלאף כתאב with an English
    translation of Misael's introduction. Jersalem, 1964.

נורצי, ידידה שלמה מ.... "מנחת שי" (ספר ארבעה ועשרים). וויּין, גיּורג
    הליציגגר, 1813.

Sefer 'Oklah We-'Oklah. Edited by Fernando Diaz Esteban. Madrid,
    Instituto "Arias Montano," 1975.

ספר מחברת התיגאן למחק ולמדו מחורגם בידי יוסף חסיד ושלמה סיאני מ
    .(*Manuel du Lecteur*, ed. D. Derenbourg, 1870) ירושלים, תשכ"א1961.

Textual Studies in Masorah

Diaz Esteban, Fernando. "Notas sobre la Masora" (*Sefarad* XIV).
    Translated into English by Jacqueline Kleinfeld. Madrid, 1954.

Yeivin, Israel. "Fragment of a Massoretic Treatise" (*Textus* I).
    Jerusalem, 1960.

Revell, E. J. "The Oldest Accent List in the Diqduqe Hate amim"
    (*Textus* VIII). Jerusalem, 1973.

Masorah Related Studies

Barr, James. *Comparative Philology and the Text oft he Old Testament*.
    Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1968.

Levias, Caspar. "Masorah" (*The Jewish Encyclopedia* VIII). New York, 1946.

Cohen, Miles B. and Freedman, David B. "The Dual Accentuation System
    of the Ten Commandments" (*Masoretic Studies* I). the 1972-3
    proceedings of the International Organization for Masoretic
    Studies. Missoula, Montana, University of Montana Press, 1974.

Dotan, Aharon. "The Beginnings of Masoretic Vocal Notation"
    (*Masoretic Studies* I). 1972-3 proceedings of the IOMS.
    Missoula, University of Montana Press, 1974.

Dotan, Aharon. "Masorah" (*Encyclopaedia Judaica* XVI). Jerusalem, 1972.

Gordis, Robert. *The Biblical Text in the Making: A Study of the Kethib-Qere*. Philadelphia, The Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, 1937.

Kahle, Paul E. *The Cairo Geniza*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1959.

───────────. "Pre-Massoretic Hebrew" (*Textus* II). Jerusalem, 1962

Lieberman, Saul. *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*. New York, The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1962.

Lyons, D. "The Collative Tiberian Masorah: A Preliminary Study" (*Masoretic Studies* I). The 1972-3 proceedings of the IOMS. Missoula, The University of Montana Press, 1974.

Orlinsky, Harry. "The Masoretic Text: A Critical Evaluation" Prolegomenon to: C. D. Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible*. 2nd ed., New York, Ktav, 1966.

───────────. Book review: Paul Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza* (*The American Oriental Society Journal* LXIX). 1959.

Reiner, Fred N. "Masoretes and Rabbis: A Comparison of Biblical Interpretations." Rabbinic Thesis for Hebrew Union College. Cincinnati, 1973.

Weisberg, David. "The Rare Accents of the Twenty-One Books" (*Jewish Quarterly Review* LVI-LVII). Philadelphia, 1966-1967.

Wacholder, Ben Zion. Prolegomenon: Jacob Mann, *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue*. New York, Ktav, 1971.

Studies on the Ben Aser Tradition

Bendavid, Abba. "על מה נחלקו בן-אשר ובן-נפתלי ?" (‏תרביץ‎ XXVI). Jerusalem, 1957-1956.

Díaz Esteban, Fernando. "References to Ben Asher and Ben Naftali in the Massora Magna Written in the Margins of MS Leningrad B19a" (*Textus* VI). Jerusalem, 1968.

Kahle, Paul. "The Ben Asher Text of the Hebrew Bible" (*Donum Natalicium H. S. Nyberg Oblatum*). Edited by Erik Gren. Uppsala, 1954.

───────────. "The Hebrew Ben Asher Manuscripts" (*Vetus Testamentum* I). Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1951.

Snaith, N. H. "The Ben Asher Text" (*Textus* II). Jerusalem, 196 2.

Teicher, J. L. "The Ben Asher Manuscripts" (*Journal of Jewish Studies* II). Cambridge, 1950.

Studies on the Chinese Jews

Kublin, Hyman, editor. *Jews in Old China; Some Western Views.* New York, Paragon, 1971.

_____, editor. *Studies of the Chinese Jews.* Selections from Journals East and West. New York, Paragon, 1971.

Leslie, Donald Daniel. *The Survival of the Chinese Jews.* Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1972.

White, William Charles. *Chinese Jews.* A compilation of matters relating to the Jews of K'aifeng Fu. Three volumes. Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1942.

PLATE 1

Biblical passages)	ben Ašer	ben Naftali]	B19a	Aleppo Codex
Gn. 30:18 (	יִשָּׂשכָר	יִשָּׂשכָר [	BA יִשָּׂשכָר	-
46:13 (	"	" [	"	-
49:14 (	"	"]	"	-
Ex. 1:3 (	"	"]	"	-
Nu. 1:28 (	"	"]	"	-
1:29 (	"	"]	"	-
2:5 (	"	" [	"	-
7:18 (	"	" [	"	-
10:15 (	"	" [	"	-
13:7 (	"	"]	"	-
26:23 (	"	" [	"	-
26:25 (	"	" [	"	-
34:26 (	"	" [	"	-
Jos. 19:17 (	"	" [	"	BA יִשָּׂשכָר
19:23)	"	" [	"	"
21:6)	"	" [	"	"
21:28 (	"	"]	"	"
Jud. 10:1)	"	"]	"	"
1Kgs. 15:27)	"	"]	"	"
Ez. 48:25)	"	"]	"	"
48:26 (	"	"]	"	"
48:33)	"	"]	"	"
1Ch. 2:1 (	"	" [	"	"
6:47 (	"	" [	"	"
6:57)	"	" [	"	"

PLATE 2

Biblical passages	( )	ben Ašer	ben Naftali	]	B19a		Aleppo Codex
1Ch. 7:1	)	יִשָּׂשכָר	יִשָּׂשכָר	] BA	יִשָּׂשכָר	BA	יִשָּׂשכָר
7:5	)	"	"	]	"		"
12:33	)	"	"	]	"		"
12:41	)	"	"	]	"		"
26:5	)	"	"	]	"		"
2Ch. 30:18	( )	"	"	[	"		"
Gn. 35:23	( )	וְיִשָּׂשכָר	וְיִשָּׂשכָר	] BA	וְיִשָּׂשכָר		—
Dt. 27:12	)	"	"	]	"		
33:18	)	"	"	]	"	BA	וְיִשָּׂשכָר
Jud. 5:15	)	"	"	[	"		"
Jos. 17:11	( )	בְּיִשָּׂשכָר	בְּיִשָּׂשכָר	] BA	בְּיִשָּׂשכָר	BA	בְּיִשָּׂשכָר
Jud. 5:15	)	"	"	]	"		"
1Kgs. 4:17	)	"	"	[	"		"
Jos. 17:10	( )	וּבְיִשָּׂשכָר	וּבְיִשָּׂשכָר	] BA	וּבְיִשָּׂשכָר	BA	וּבְיִשָּׂשכָר
Nu. 1:8	( )	לְיִשָּׂשכָר	לְיִשָּׂשכָר	] BA	לְיִשָּׂשכָר		—
Jos. 19:17	)	"	"	]	"	BA	לְיִשָּׂשכָר
1Ch. 27:18	(	"	"	]	"		"

PLATE 3

Biblical passages	(ben Ašer	ben Naftali]	B19a	Aleppo Codex
Nu. 18:10	) תֹאכְלֶנּוּ	תֹאכְלֶנּוּ]	[BA תֹּאכְלֶנּוּ	–
Dt. 12:18	) "	"]	[BN מֹאכְלֶנּוּ	–
12:22	) "	"]	[BN "	–
12:24	) "	"]	[BN "	–
12:25	) "	"]	[BN "	–
15:20	) "	"]	[BA תֹּאכְלֶנּוּ	–
15:22	) "	"]	[BA "	–
28:39	) "	"]	[BN תֹּאכְלֶנּוּ	BA תֹאכְלֶנּוּ
Is. 31:8	) "	"]	[BA תֹּאכְלֶנּוּ	BA "
Ez. 4:9	) "	"]	[BA "	BA "
4:10	) "	"]	[BA "	BA "
4:10	) "	"]	[BA "	BA "
Gn. 3:17	) תֹאכְלֶנָּה	תֹאכְלֶנָּה]	[BA תֹּאכְלֶנָּה	–
Ez. 4:12	) "	"]	[BA "	BA תֹאכְלֶנָּה
Lv. 7:3	) יֹאכְלֶנּוּ	יֹאכְלֶנּוּ]	[BN? יֹאכְלֶנּוּ	–
Nu. 18:13	) "	"]	[BA יֹאכְלֶנּוּ	–
Dt. 12:15	) "	"]	[BN יֹאכְלֶנּוּ	–
12:22	) "	"]	[BN "	–
Ez. 7:15	) "	"]	[BA יֹאכְלֶנּוּ	BA יֹאכְלֶנּוּ
Ecc. 6:2	) "	"]	[BA "	–

PLATE 4

Biblical passages	(	ben Ašer	ben Naftali	]	B19a	Aleppo Codex
Lv. 6:11	)	יֹאכְלֶנָּה	יֹאכְלֶנָּה	[	BA יֹאכְלֶנָּה	-
6:19	)	"	"	[	BA "	-
2Kgs. 6:28	)	וְנֹאכְלֶנּוּ	וְנֹאכְלֶנּוּ	[	BN וְנֹאכְלֶנּוּ	BA וְנֹאכְלֶנּוּ
Ecc. 5:10	(	אוֹכְלֶיהָ	אוֹכְלֶיהָ	[BA & BN	אוֹכְלֶיהָ	-
Ex. 23:29	)	אֲגָרְשֶׁנּוּ	אֲגָרְשֶׁנּוּ	[	BN אֲגָרְשֶׁנּוּ	-
23:30	)	"	"	[	BN "	-
Nu. 22:6	)	וַאֲגָרְשֶׁנּוּ	וַאֲגָרְשֶׁנּוּ	[	BN וַאֲגָרְשֶׁנּוּ	-
Ps. 34:1	)	וַיִּגָּרְשֵׁהוּ	וַיִּגָּרְשֵׁהוּ	]	BA וַיְגָרֲשֵׁהוּ	BA וַיְגָרֲשֵׁהוּ
Nu. 15:24	)	וּשְׂעִיר-עִזִּים	וּשְׂעִיר-עִזִּים	]	BA וּשְׂעִיר-עִזִּים	-
29:5	(	"	"	[	BA "	-
29:16	(	"	"	]	BA "	-
29:19	(	"	"	]	BA "	-
29:25	)	"	"	[	BA "	-

PLATE 5

Biblical passages	( )	ben Ašer	ben Naftali	] [	B19a	Aleppo Codex
Lv. 9:3	( )	שעיר-עזים	שעיר-עזים	[ ]	BA שעיר-עזים	-
23:19	( )	"	"	[ ]	BA "	-
Nu. 7:16	( )	"	"	[ ]	BA "	-
7:22	( )	"	"	[ ]	BA "	-
7:28	( )	"	"	[ ]	BA "	-
7:34	( )	"	"	[ ]	BA "	-
7:40	( )	"	"	[ ]	BA "	-
7:46	( )	"	"	[ ]	BA "	-
7:52	( )	"	"	[ ]	BA "	-
7:58	( )	"	"	[ ]	BA "	-
7:64	( )	"	"	[ ]	BA "	-
7:70	( )	"	"	[ ]	BA "	-
7:76	( )	"	"	[ ]	BA BH^3 = BN "	-
7:82	( )	"	"	[ ]	BA BH^3 = BN "	-
29:11	( )	"	"	[ ]	BA "	-
Ez. 43:22	( )	"	"	[ ]	BA "	BA שעיר-עזים
Nu. 21:35	( )	השאיר-לו	השאיר-לו	] [	BA השאיר-לו	-
Dt. 3:3	( )	"	"	[	BA "	-
28:55	( )	"	"	[	BA "	BA השאיר-לו
Jos. 8:22	( )	"	"	] [	BA "	BA "
10:33	( )	"	"	[	BA "	BA "

PLATE 6

Biblical passages	ben Ašer	ben Naftali	B19a		Aleppo Codex	
Dt. 4:10	לִירְאָה	לִירְאָה	BA	לִירְאָה	-	
5:26	"	"	BA	"	-	
6:24	"	"	BA	"	-	
10:12	"	"	BA	"	-	
14:23	"	"	BA	"	-	
17:19	"	"	BA	"	-	
28:58	"	"	BA	"	BA	לִירְאָה
31:13	"	"	BA	"	BA	"
1Kgs. 8:43	"	"	BA	"	BA	"
Jer. 32:39	"	"	?uncertain		BA	"
Ps. 86:11	"	"	BA	לִירְאָה	BA	"
Neh. 1:11	"	"	BA	"	-	
Ps. 2:11	בְּיִרְאָה	בְּיִרְאָה	BA	בְּיִרְאָה	BA	בְּיִרְאָה
Is. 11:3	בְּיִרְאַת	בְּיִרְאַת	BA	בְּיִרְאַת	BA	בְּיִרְאַת
Prv. 14:26	"	"	BA	"	BA	"
15:16	"	"	BA	"	BA	"
23:17	"	"	BA	"	BA	"
Neh. 5:9	"	"	BA	"	-	
2Ch. 19:9	"	"	BA	"	BA	בְּיִרְאַת
Ps. 5:8	בְּיִרְאָתְךָ	בְּיִרְאָתְךָ	BA	בְּיִרְאָתְךָ	BA	בְּיִרְאָתְךָ
Ps. 119:38	לְיִרְאָתֶךָ	בְּיִרְאָתֶךָ	BA	בְּיִרְאָתֶךָ	BA	בְּיִרְאָתֶךָ

PLATE 7

Biblical passages	(ben Ašer	ben Naftali]	B19a		Aleppo Codex
Gn. 46:2	לְיִשְׂרָאֵל	לְיִשְׂרָאֵל	BA	לְיִשְׂרָאֵל	–
Ex. 18:9	"	"	BA	"	–
Dt. 33:10	"	"	BA	"	BA? erasure
Jos.10:14	"	"	BA	"	BA לְיִשְׂרָאֵל
23:1	"	"	BA	"	BA "
24:31	"	"	BA	"	BA "
Jud. 2:7	"	"	BA	"	BA "
10:9	"	"	BA	"	BA "
18:29	"	"	BA	"	BA "
1Sam. 7:14	"	"	BA	"	BA "
30:25	"	"	BA	"	BA "
2Sam. 7:10	"	"	BA	"	BA "
1Kgs. 11:25	"	"	? uncertain		BA "
2Kgs. 13:5	"	"	BA	לְיִשְׂרָאֵל	BA "
14:26	"	"	BA	"	–
Is. 11:16	"	"	BA	"	BA לְיִשְׂרָאֵל
46:13	"	"	BA	"	BA "
Jer. 2:31	"	"	BA	"	BA "
31:8	"	"	BA	"	–
49:1	"	"	BA	"	BA לְיִשְׂרָאֵל
Hos. 7:1	"	"	BA	"	BA "
14:6	"	"	BA	"	BA "
1Ch. 16:17	"	"	BA	"	BA "
2Ch. 15:3	)	"	BA	"	BA "

PLATE 8

Biblical passages	) ben Ašer (	ben Naftali	[ ]	B19a		Aleppo Codex	
2Ch. 19:8	לְיִשְׂרָאֵל	לישראל		BA	לְיִשְׂרָאֵל	BA	לְיִשְׂרָאֵל
Ps. 73:1	"	"		BA	"	BA	"
136:22	"	"		BA	"	BA	"
147:19	"	"		BA	"	BA	"
Esr.4:3	"	"		BA	"	–	
8:29	"	"		BA	"	–	
10:2	"	"		BA	"	–	
Gn. 34:7	בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל	בישראל		BA	בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל	–	
Lv. 20:2	"	"		BA	"	–	
23:42	"	"		BA	"	–	
Nu. 1:3	"	"		BA	"	–	
32:13	"	"		BA	"	–	
Dt. 17:4	"	"		BA	"	–	
34:10	"	"		BA	"	BA	בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל
Jos. 7:15	"	"		BA	"	BA	"
24:9	"	"		BA	"	BA	"
Jud. 2:14	"	"		BA	"	BA	"
21:3	"	"		BA	"	BA	"
1Sam. 7:10	"	"		BA	"	BA	"
2Sam. 24:15	"	"		BA	"	BA	"
1Kgs. 11:25	"	"		BA	"	BA	"
2Kgs. 14:28	"	"		BA	"	–	
Is. 8:18	"	"		BA	"	BA	בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל

PLATE 9

Biblical passages)	ben Ašer	ben Naftali]	B19a	Aleppo Codex
Is. 14:1 (	בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל	[בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל	BA בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל	BA בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל
Jer. 29:23(	"	["	BA "	–
Ez. 12:23)	"	["	BA "	BA בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל
45:16 (	"	["	BA "	BA "
Hos. 13:1)	"	["	BA "	BA "
Mic. 5:1 (	"	["	BA "	–
Mal. 2:11 (	"	["	BA "	BA בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל
Ps. 76:2 (	"	["	BA "	BA "
78:59 (	"	["	BA "	BA "
Ru. 4:7)	"	["	BA "	BA "
4:14 (	"	["	BA "	BA "
Esr. 7:10)	"	["	BA "	–
1Ch. 10:1(	"	["	BA "	BA בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל
2Ch. 35:18(	"	]	BA "	–
Gn. 19:17)	ויהי לְהוֹצִיאָם	ויהל כהוציאם [BA	ויהל לְהוֹצִיאָם	–
39:15 (	ויהי כשמעו	ויהי כשמעו [BA	ויהי כשמעו תמו	–
Dt. 2:16)	ויהי כאשר-תמו	ויהי כאשר-תמו [BA	ויהי כאשר-תמו	–
Jos. 9:1 (	ויהי כשמע	ויהי כשמע [BA	ויהי כשמע	BA ויהי כשמע
Jud. 11:35(	ויהי כראותו	ויהל כראותו [BA	ויהי כשמע	BA ויהל לראותו
1Ks. 15:29(	ויהי כמלכו	ויהי כמלכו [BA	ויהי כמלכו	BA ויהי כמלכו
Est. 5:2 (	ויהל כראות	ויהל כראות [BA	ויהל לראות	–

PLATE 10

Biblical passages	( )	BA and BN	] [	B19a	Aleppo Codex
Jos. 5:1	) ( )	וַיְהִי כִּשְׁמֹעַ	] [ )	וַיְהִי כִּשְׁמֹעַ BA and BN, erased כ דגש in ?	וַיְהִי כִּשְׁמֹעַ BA and BN
Jos. 6:20	)))	וַיְהִי כִּשְׁמֹעַ	[ ]	וַיְהִי כִּשְׁמֹעַ BA and BN	וַיְהִי כִּשְׁמֹעַ BA and BN
Jos. 8:24	)))	וַיְהִי כְּכַלּוֹת	] [	וַיְהִי כְּכַלּוֹת neither BA or BN	וַיְהִי כְּכַלּוֹת neither BA nor BN
Jos. 8:25	)))	וַיְהִי כָּל-הַנֹּפְלִים	] [	וַיְהִי כָּל-הַנֹּפְלִים BA and BN	וַיְהִי כָּל-הַנֹּפְלִים BA and BN
Jos. 10:1	( ))	וַיְהִי כִּשְׁמֹעַ	] [	וַיְהִי כִּשְׁמֹעַ BA and BN	וַיְהִי כִּשְׁמֹעַ BA and BN
Jos. 10:20	)))	וַיְהִי כְּכַלּוֹת	]	וַיְהִי כְּכַלּוֹת neither BA nor BN	וַיְהִי כְּכַלּוֹת neither BA nor BN
Jos. 13:30	( ))	וַיְהִי גְּבוּלָם	] [	וַיְהִי גְבוּלָם BA and BN	וַיְהִי גְבוּלָם BA and BN
Jos. 15:18	)))	וַיְהִי בְּבוֹאָהּ	] [	וַיְהִי בְּבוֹאָה neither BA nor BN	וַיְהִי בְּבוֹאָה neither BA nor BN
Jos. 17:7	( ))	וַיְהִי גְּבוּל-מְנַשֶּׁה	] [	וַיְהִי גְבוּל-מְנַשֶּׁה BA and BN	וַיְהִי גְבוּל-מְנַשֶּׁה BA and BN
Jos. 17:9	)))	וַיְהִי תֹצְאֹתָיו	[ ]	וַיְהִי תֹצְאֹתָיו BA and BN	וַיְהִי תֹצְאֹתָיו BA and BN
Jos. 19:33	( ))	וַיְהִי גְבוּלָם	] [	וַיְהִי גְבוּלָם BA and BN	וַיְהִי גְבוּלָם BA and BN
Jos. 19:33	( ))	וַיְהִי תֹצְאֹתָיו	] [	וַיְהִי תֹצְאֹתָיו BA and BN	וַיְהִי תֹצְאֹתָיו BA and BN

PLATE 11

Biblical passages)	ben Ašer	ben Naftali]	B19a	Aleppo Codex
Nu. 27:11)	וּתְהִיֶה	וּתְהִיֶה [	BA וּתְהִיֶה	-
Is. 28:4)	וּתְהִיֶה	וּתְהִיֶה [	BA וּתְהִיֶה	BA וּתְהִיֶה
Jer. 7:33)	וּתְהִיֶה	וּתְהִיֶה [	BA וּתְהִיֶה	BA וּתְהִיֶה
Ez. 5:15)	וּתְהִיֶה	וּתְהִיֶה [	BA וּתְהִיֶה	BA וּתְהִיֶה

Biblical passages)	BA and BN [	B19a	Aleppo Codex
Ex. 40:15)	וְהָיְתָה [	BA & BN וְהָיְתָה	-
Lv. 25:6)	וְהָיְתָה [	BA & BN וְהָיְתָה	-
Nu. 19:9)	וְהָיְתָה [	? erased *gaʿyah*	-
Is. 19:17)	וְהָיְתָה [	BA & BN וְהָיְתָה	BA & BN וְהָיְתָה
Lv. 13:24)	וְהָיְתָה [	BA & BN תְהִיֶק	-
Nu. 19:10)	וְהָיְתָה [	BA & BN תְהִיֶק	-
1Sam. 13:21)	וְהָיְתָה [	BA & BN תְהִיֶק	BA & BN וְהָיֶק
2Kgs. 9:37)	וְהָיְתָה [	BA & BN תְהִיֶק	BA & BN וְהָיֶק
Zeph. 2:6)	וְהָיְתָה [	BA & BN תְהִיֶק	BA & BN וְהָיֶק

PLATE 12

Biblical passage	( ))	ben Ašer	ben Naftali	[ ]	B19a		Aleppo Codex
Ex. 33:11	)	בן-נון	בן-נון	]	BA	בן-נון	–
Nu. 11:28	)	"	"	]	BA	"	–
13:8	)	"	"	[	BA	"	–
13:16	)	"	"	[	BA	"	–
14:6	)	"	"	]	BA	"	–
14:30	( )	"	"	[	BA	"	–
14:38	( )	"	"	{	BA	"	–
26:65	( )	"	"	[	BA	"	–
27:18	( )	"	"	[	BA	"	–
32:12	( )	"	"	]	BA	"	–
32:28	( )	"	"	[	BA	"	–
34:17	)	"	"	[	BA	"	–
Dt. 1:38	)	"	"	]	BA	"	–
31:23	) ( )	"	"	]	BA? erased נון	בן-נון ואת	BA בן-נון
32:44	) ( )	"	"	]	?	unclear	BA "
34:9	) ( )	"	"	]	?	unclear	BA "
Jos. 1:1	) ( )	"	"	[	BA	בן-נון	BA "
2:1	) ( )	"	"	[	BA	"	BA "
2:23	) ( )	"	"	[	BA	"	BA "
6:6	) ( )	"	"	]	BA	"	BA "
14:1	) ( )	"	"	]	BA	"	BA "
17:4	) ( )	"	"	]	BA	"	BA "
19:49	) ( )	"	"	[	BA	"	BA "
19:51	(	"	"	[	BA	"	BA "

PLATE 13

Biblical passages	ben Ašer	ben Naftali	B19a		Aleppo Codex	
Jos. 21:1	בֶּן-נוּן	בֶּן-גוּן	BA	בֶּן-נוּן	BA	בֶּן-נוּן
24:29	"	"	BA	"	BA	"
Jud. 2:8	"	"	BA	"	BA	"
1Kgs. 16:34	"	"	BA	"	BA	"
Neh. 8:17	"	"	BA	"	−	
Jos. 6:22	הַמְרַגְּלִים	הַמְרַגְּלִים	BN	הַמְרַגְּלִים	BA	הַמְרַגְּלִים
6:23	"	"	BN	הַמְרַגְּלִים	BA	"
Jer. 44:28	וַיֵּדְעוּ	וַיֵּדְעוּ	BA	וַיֵּדְעוּ	BA	וַיֵּדְעוּ
Ez. 5:13	"	"	? added ga'yah BH³ = וַיֵּדְעוּ		BA	"
28:22	"	"	BA	וַיֵּדְעוּ	BA	"
30:25	"	"	BA? possible added ga'yah		BA	"
34:27	"	"	BA? possible added ga'yah BH³ = וַיֵּדְעוּ		BA	"
17:24	"	"	BA	וַיֵּדְעוּ	BA	"
			BH³ = וַיֵּדְעוּ			

PLATE 14

Biblical passages	רמב"ם	B19a	tiqun sofrim	HUC 958	Cambridge scroll	Br. Museum scroll	Bodleian scroll
Ex. 18:1	פ	פ	פ	פ	ס	ס	פ
19:1	פ	פ	פ	פ	ס	פ	ס
20:1	ס	ס	פ	פ	ס	פ	ס
20:2	ס	ס	פ	פ	ס	ס	ס
20:7	ס	ס	פ	ס	ס	ס	ס
20:8	פ	פ	פ	פ	ס	פ	ס
20:12	ס	ס	ס	ס	ס	פ	פ
20:13	ס	ס	ס	פ	ס	ס	ס
20:14	ס	ס	ס	ס	ס	ס	ס
20:15	ס	ס	ס	פ	ס	ס	ס
20:16	ס	ס	ס	ס	ס	ס	ס
20:17a	ס	ס	ס	ס	ס	ס	ס
20:17b	[ס] altered	ס?	ס	–	ס	ס	ס
20:18	פ	פ	פ	פ	ס	פ	פ
20:22	ס	פ	ס	ס	ס	ס	פ

PLATE 15

Vowels – Mistakes and Obvious Omissions

Biblical passages	B19a	HUC MS. 958
Ex. 18:6	וָאֶשְׁתַּ֫	וָאֶשְׁתַּ֫ pausal form at the beginning of the phrase
18:19	הָאֱלֹהִים	הָאֱלֹהִים
18:19	וַיְהִי	וַיְהִי
19:5	וִהְיִיתֶם	וִהְיִיתֶם
20:2	הוֹצֵאתִיךָ	הוֹצֵאתִיךָ šᵉva under ṣaḏi
20:2	וְעָשָׂה	וְעָשָׂה there is a dot on both sides of the ש
20:2	אָנֹכִי	אָנֹכִי missing o
20:2	לֹא תַעֲשֶׂה לְךָ	לֹא תַעֲשֶׂה לְךָ

Confusion of Pattaḥ and Qameṣ

18:11	גָּדוֹל	גָּדוֹל

Confusion of Ṣere and Segol

18:8	אֶת	אֶת
18:16	אֵלַי	אֵלַי
19:7	הָאֵלֶּה	הָאֵלֶּה
20:1	אֶת	אֶת
20:2	חֶסֶד	חֶסֶד
20:3	יְנַקֶּה	יְנַקֶּה

PLATE 16

Ḥaṭafim

Biblical passages	B19a	HUC MS. 958
Ex. 18:4	אֱלִיעֶזֶר	אֱלִיעֶזֶר
18:11	הָאֱלֹהִים	הָאֱלֹהִים
18:21	חֲמִשִׁים	חֲמִשִׁים *dageš* in *mem*
18:21	עֲשָׂרָה	עֲשָׂרָה
18:25	חֲמִשִׁים	חֲמִשִׁים
19:9	בַּעֲבוּר	בַּעֲבוּר
19:21	פֶּן-יֶהֶרְסוּ	פֶּן-יֶהֶרְסוּ

Substantive Change

| 19:24 | לְךָ-רֵד | לָךְ רֵד |

Accents - Obvious Mistakes

18:18	גַּם-אַתָּה	גַּם-אַתָּה accent and *maqqaf*
18:6	וַיֹּאמֶר	וַיֹּאמֶר *pašṭaʾ* on stress not post-tonic
18:25	חַיִל	חַיִל *pašṭaʾ* on stress not post-tonic
19:8	וַיַּעֲנוּ	וַיַּעֲנוּ *pašṭaʾ* rather than *qadmaʾ*

confusion of *qadmaʾ* and *pašṭaʾ*

PLATE 17

Accents – Obvious Mistakes

Biblical passages	B19a	HUC MS. 958
Ex. 19:10	אֶל־מֹשֶׁה	אֶל־מֹשֶׁה *zarqaʾ*
19:16	חָזֵק מְאֹד	חָזֵק מְאֹד
20:1	הַדְּבָרִים	הַדְּבָרִים
20:11	וְכָל־הָעָם	וְכָל־הָעָם

Unaccentuated Words

18:6	וְאִשְׁתְּךָ	וְאִשְׁתְּךָ no *pastaʾ*
18:6	אֶל־מֹשֶׁה	אֶל־מֹשֶׁה
18:8	אֵת	אֵת
18:14	וַיַּרְא	וַיַּרְא
18:16	וּבֵין	וּבֵין
19:2	מֵרְפִידִים	מֵרְפִידִים *gaʿyah* but no accent
19:9	אֶל־מֹשֶׁה	אֶל־מֹשֶׁה dot in *śin* acts as *rᵉviʿiʾ*?
19:12	וְהִגְבַּלְתָּ	וְהִגְבַּלְתָּ
20:18	חֲרֻבֶּךָ	חֲרֻבֶּךָ

Change from *Dargaʾ* to *merkaʾ*

18:1	כִּי־הוֹצִיא	כִּי־הוֹצִיא slight curve = *dargaʾ*?
19:6	אַתֶּם	אַתֶּם
19:8	וַיָּשֶׁב	וַיָּשֶׁב slight curve = *dargaʾ*?

PLATE 18

Change from *Darga'* to *Merka'*

Biblical passages	B19a	HUC MS. 958
Ex. 19:14	וַיֵּרֶד	וַיֵּרֶד
19:17	מֹשֶׁה	מֹשֶׁה slight curve = *darga'*?
19:20	וַיֵּרֶד	וַיֵּרֶד
19:20	יְהוָה	וְהוָה
19:22	וְגַם	וְגַם
20:13	תִהְיֶה	תִהְיֶה
20:18	כִּי	כִּי dot missing from *t°bir* appears as *merka' ṭipp°ḥa'*

Real Variant Readings

18:7	לִקְרַאת חֹתְנוֹ	לִקְרַאת חֹתְנוֹ
18:8	אֲשֶׁר מְצָאתַם בַּדֶּרֶךְ	אֲשֶׁר מְצָאתַם־בַּדֶּרֶךְ
18:21	וְשַׂמְתָּ עֲלֵהֶם	וְשַׂמְתָּ עֲלֵהֶם
18:22	וְהָקֵל מֵעָלֶיךָ	וְהָקֵל מֵעָלֶיךָ
18:22	וְנָשְׂאוּ	וְנָשְׂאוּ
19:7	וַיָּבֹא מֹשֶׁה	וַיָּבֹא מֹשֶׁה

Variants between B19a and JBH

	B19a	JBH	HUC MS. 958
18:5	אֶל־הַמִּדְבָּר	אֶל־הַמִּדְבָּר	אֶל־הַמִּדְבָּר
18:10	בָּרוּךְ יְהוָה	בָּרוּךְ יְהוָה	בָּרוּךְ יְהוָה

PLATE 19

Variants between B19a and JBḤ

Biblical passages	B19a	JBḤ	HUC MS. 958
Ex. 18:17	אשר אתה עשה׃	אשר אתה עשה׃	אשר אתה עשה׃

Maqqafim Missing at the End of the Line

	B19a	HUC MS 958
18:13	את-העם	את העם
18:14	כל-אשר-הוא	כל אשר-הוא
18:17	לא-טוב	לא טוב
18:18	גם-העם הזה	גם העם הזה
18:20	את-הדרך	את הדרך
18:22	את-העם	את העם
18:22	כל-הדבר	כל הדבר
18:26	אל-ארצו	אל ארצו
19:5	את-בריתי	את בריתי
19:8	את-דברי	את דברי
19:9	אל-יהוה	אל יהוה
19:16	כל-העם	כל העם
20:15	מן-השמים	מן השמים
20:18	ולא-תעלה	ולא תעלה

PLATE 20

Maqqafim Present at the End of the Line

Biblical passages	(	B19a	]	HUC MS. 958
	)		[	
Ex. 18:18	(	כי-כבר	]	כי-כבר
18:25	(	אנשי-חיל	]	אנשי-חיל
18:26	(	בכל-עת	]	בכל-עת
19:1	(	בני-ישראל	]	בני-ישראל
19:3	(	אל-האלהים	[	אל-האלהים
19:5	(	כל-הארץ	]	כל-הארץ
19:10	(	אל-משה	]	אל-משה
19:13	(	תגעו-בו	]	תגעו-בו
19:13	(	או-ירה	]	או-ירה
19:13	(	אם-איש	]	אם-איש
19:20	(	אל-ראש	]	אל-ראש
20:2	)	על-בנים	]	על-בנים
20:2	)	על-רבעים	]	על-רבעים
20:3	(	את-שם	]	את-שם
20:12	(	דבר-אתה	]	דבר-אתה
20:12	(	ואל-ידבר	[	ואל-ידבר

Maqqafim Missing in the Middle of the Line

19:9	(	וגם-בך	]	וגם בך
19:11	(	לעני כל-העם	[	לעני כל העם
19:14	(	את-העם	]	את העם
19:15	(	אל-תגשו	[	אל תגשו

PLATE 21

Maqqafim Missing in the Middle of the Line

Biblical passages	B19a	HUC MS. 958
Ex. 19:22	אל-יהוה	אל יהוה
19:23	אל-יהוה	אל יהוה
19:25	אל-העם	אל העם
20:4	את-השמים	את השמים
20:4	ואת-כל	ואת כל
20:11	את-הקולת	את הקולת
20:13	על-פניכם	על פניכם
20:14	אל-הערפל	אל הערפל
20:17	את-עלתיך	את עלתיך
20:17	ואת-שלמיך	ואת שלמיך
20:18	על-מזבחי	על מזבחי

Dᵉgašim – Obvious Mistakes

	B19a	HUC MS. 958
18:10	מִיַד פרעה	מִיַד פַּרְעֹה
18:21	חֲמִשים	חֲמִשִׁים .
20:2	אשר בשמים	אשר בַּשׁמים
20:4	כָּל-מלאכה both preceding accents are conjunctive	כָּל-מלאכה this reflects an earlier text with dual-accentuation. The preceding word is not accentuated. Thus the variant is an unknown disjunctive.
20:13		
20:13	לִבְלְתִּי	לִבְלְתִּי

PLATE 22

Mistaken Omissions of Dᵉgašim

Biblical passages	B19a	HUC MS. 958
Ex. 18:7	וישק-לו	וישק-לו
18:20	המעשה	המעשה
20:15	אתם	אתם no *rafe* indicated

Dageš after vav pattaḥ

	B19a	HUC MS. 958
18:8	וַיְספר	וַיְספר
18:13	וַיְהי	וַיְהי
19:2	וַיְסעו	וַיְסעו
19:2	וַיְבאז	וַיְבאז
19:2	וַיְחנו	וַיְחנו
19:2	וַיְחן	וַיְחן
20:1	וַיְדבר	וַיְדבר
20:4	וַיְקדשהו	וַיְקדשהו

Missing gaʿyot

	B19a	JBH	HUC MS. 958
18:1	ולישראל	ולישראל	ולישראל
18:1	כי-הוציא	כי-הוציא	כי-הוציא
18:3	האחד	האחד	האחד
18:3	גרשם	גרשם	גרשם
18:4	כי-אלהי	כי-אלהי	כי-אלהי
18:11	מכל-האלהים	מכל-האלהים	מכל-האלהים

PLATE 23

Missing *Ga'yot*

Biblical passages	B19a	JBH	HUC MS. 958
Ex. 18:12	לאלהים	לאלהים	לאלהים
18:12	לאכל-לחם	לאכל-לחם	לאכל-לחם
18:13	ויעמד	ויעמד	ויעמד
18:15	כי-יבא	כי-יבא	כי-יבא
18:16	כי-יהיה	כי-יהיה	כי-יהיה
18:19	האלהים	האלהים	האלהים
18:19	והבאת	והבאת	והבאת
18:19	אל-האלהים	אל-האלהים	אל-האלהים
18:20	המעשה	תמעשה	המעשה
18:20	יעשון	יעשון	יעשון
18:21	אנשי-חיל	אנשי-חיל	אנשי-חיל
18:22	ושפטו	ושפטו	ושפטו
18:22	מעליך	מעליך	מעליך
18:22	ונשאו	ונשאו	ונשאו
18:23	תעשה	תעשה	תעשה
18:23	ויכלת	ויכלת	ויכלת
18:24	חתנו	חתנו	חתנו
19:2	ויחנו	ויחנו	ויחנו
19:2	ויחן	ויחן	ויחן
19:3	האלהים	האלהים	האלהים
19:3	יעקב	יעקב	יעקב
19:4	ואשא	ואשא	ואשא

PLATE 24

Missing *Ga‘yot*

Biblical passages	B19a	JBH	HUC MS. 958
Ex. 19:4	ואבא	וָאבא	ואבא
19:5	והייתם	וִהייתם	והייתם
19:6	תהיו-לי erasure ?	תְהיו-לִי	תְהיו-לִי
19:8	ויענו	ויענו	ויענו
19:8	נעשה	נעשה	נעשה
19:9	אנכי	אנכי	אנכי
19:9	הענן	הענן	הענן
19:9	בעבור	בעבור	בעבור
19:9	יאמינו	יאמִינו	יאמינו
19:13	יִחיה ?	יחיה	יחיה
19:13	יעלו	יעלו	יעלו
19:16	ויחרד	ויחרד	ויחרד
19:16	במחנה	בִמחנה	במחנה
19:17	האלהים	האלהים	האלהים
19:17	המחנה	המחנה	המחנה
19:17	ויתיצבו	ויתיצבו	ויתיצבו
19:17	בתחתית	בתחתית	בתחתית
19:18	ויחרד	ויחרד	ויחרד
19:19	ויהי	ויהי	ויהי
19:19	האלהים	האלהים	האלהים
19:19	יעננו	יעננו	יעננו

PLATE 25

Missing * Gaʿyot*

Biblical passages	B19a	JBH	HUC MS. 958
Ex. 19:21	פֶּן־יֶהֶרְסוּ	פֶּן־יֶהֶרְסוּ	פֶּן־יֶהֶרְסוּ
19:22	הַכֹּהֲנִים	הַכֹּהֲנִים	הַכֹּהֲנִים
19:23	לֹא־יוּכַל	לֹא־יוּכַל	לֹא־יוּכַל
19:23	לַעֲלֹת	לַעֲלֹת	לַעֲלֹת
19:23	כִּי־אַתָּה	כִּי־אַתָּה	כִּי־אַתָּה
19:23	הַעֵדֹתָה	הַעֵדֹתָה	הַעֵדֹתָה
19:24	וְאַהֲרֹן	וְאַהֲרֹן	וְאַהֲרֹן
19:24	וְהַכֹּהֲנִים	וְהַכֹּהֲנִים	וְהַכֹּהֲנִים
19:24	לַעֲלֹת	לַעֲלֹת	לַעֲלֹת
20:11	וַיַּעֲמְדוּ	וַיַּעֲמְדוּ	וַיַּעֲמְדוּ
20:11	מֵרָחֹק	מֵרָחֹק	מֵרָחֹק
20:13	לִגְעֹבוּר	לִגְעֹבוּר	לִגְעֹבוּר
20:13	הָאֱלֹהִים	הָאֱלֹהִים	הָאֱלֹהִים
20:13	וּבַעֲבוּר	וּבַעֲבוּר	וּבַעֲבוּר
20:13	תִּהְיֶה	תִּהְיֶה	תִּהְיֶה
20:13	תֶּחֱטָאוּ	תֶּחֱטָאוּ	תֶּחֱטָאוּ
20:14	וַיַּעֲמֹד	וַיַּעֲמֹד	וַיַּעֲמֹד
20:14	הָאֱלֹהִים	הָאֱלֹהִים	הָאֱלֹהִים
20:16	תַּעֲשׂוּן	תַּעֲשׂוּן	תַּעֲשׂוּן
20:16	וֵאלֹהֵי	וֵאלֹהֵי	וֵאלֹהֵי
20:16	תַּעֲשׂוּ	תַּעֲשׂוּ	תַּעֲשׂוּ
20:17	תַּעֲשֶׂה־לִּי	תַּעֲשֶׂה־לִּי	תַּעֲשֶׂה־לִּי

PLATE 26

Missing *Gaʿyot*

Biblical passages	B19a	JBH	HUC MS. 958
Ex. 20:17	וֹזבח	וֹזבח	וזבח
20:17	עֲלתיך	עֲלתיך	עלתיך
20:17	צֹאנך	צֹאנך	צאנך
20:17	וברכתיך	וּברכתיך	וברכתיך
20:18	לֹא-תבנה	לֹא-חבנה	לא-תבנה
20:19	ערוֹתך	ערוֹתך	ערוֹתך

Gaʿyot Present in HUC 958

18:13	מֽמחרת	מֽמחרת	מֽמחרת
18:14	מֽה-הדבר	מֽה-הדבר	מֽה-הדבר
18:27	אֽת-חתנו	אֽת-חתנו	אֽת-חתנו
19:2	וֽיחנו	וֽיחנו	וֽיחנו
19:6	תֽהיו-לי	תֽהיו-לי	תֽהיו-לי
19:14	וֽיכבסו	וֽיכבסו	וֽיכבסו
19:16	בֽהית	בֽהית	בֽהית
19:17	הֽמחנה	הֽמחנה	הֽמחנה
19:24	יֽהרסו	יֽהרסו	יֽהרסו
20:3	אֽת-שם-יהוה	אֽת-שם-יהוה	אֽת-שם-יהוה
20:4	וֽיקדשהו	וֽיקדשהו	וֽיקדשהו
20:17	תֽעשה-לי	תֽעשה-לי	תֽעשה-לי
20:17	וֽתחללה	וֽתחללה	וֽתחללה under *tav* rather than *het*

PLATE 27

עשרת הדברות

אנכי יהוה אלהיך אשר

הוצאתיך מארץ מצרים

מבית עבדים לא יהיה

לך אלהים אחרים על פני° °missing rafe

לא תעשה לך פסל וכל° °missing maqqaf

תמונה אשר בשמים ׀ ממעל

*B19a and JBH have etnaḥ   ואשר בארץ מתחת ואשר במים° °B19a and JBH have pesiq

*B19a and JBH have revi'i.   מתחת לארץ לא-תשתחוה

להם ולא תעבדם כי

אנכי יהוה אלהיך אל

קנא פקד עון אבת על-

בנים על-שלשים ועל-

רבעים לשנאי ועשה

חסד לאלפים לאהבי

ולשמרי מצותי:

לא תשא את-

שם-יהוה אלהיך לשוא

כי לא ינקה יהוה את

brown = עליון   green = תחתון   red = variant

PLATE 28

אֲשֶׁר יִשָּׂא אֶת־שְׁמוֹ לַשָּׁוְא:

זָכוֹר אֶת־יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת לְקַדְּשׁוֹ   *B19a and JBH have *rᵉḇiꞌi*

שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים תַּעֲבֹד וְעָשִׂיתָ

כָּל־מְלַאכְתֶּךָ וְיוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי   °*segol* uncertain

שַׁבָּת־לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לֹא*   *missing *maqqaf*   °dot = *lᵉgarmeh*

תַעֲשֶׂה כָל־מְלָאכָה אַתָּה*   *possible *lᵉgarmeh*   °missing *qadma'*

וּבִנְךָ וּבִתֶּךָ עַבְדְּךָ וַאֲמָתְךָ   °possibly *zaqef*

וּבְהֶמְתְּךָ וְגֵרְךָ אֲשֶׁר

בִּשְׁעָרֶיךָ כִּי שֵׁשֶׁת־יָמִים

עָשָׂה יְהוָה אֶת־הַשָּׁמַיִם   °missing *maqqaf*

וְאֶת־הָאָרֶץ אֶת־הַיָּם

וְאֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־בָּם וַיָּנַח   °missing *maqqaf*

בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי עַל־כֵּן בֵּרַךְ

יְהוָה אֶת־יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת

וַיְקַדְּשֵׁהוּ:

כַּבֵּד אֶת־אָבִיךָ

וְאֶת־אִמֶּךָ לְמַעַן יַאֲרִכוּן

brown = עליון   green = תחתון   red = variants

PLATE 29

*missing *maqqaf**

יָמִיך עַל הָאֲדֹמָה אֲשֶׁר* °*yᵉṭib* not prepositive

יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ נֹתֵן לָךְ:

לָא תִּרְצָח:　לוֹלָא תִּנְאָף:

לָא תִּגְנֹב:　לֹא־תַעֲנֶה

בְרֵעֲךָ עֵד שָׁקֶר:　לֹא

תַחְמֹד בֵּית רֵעֶךָ לֹא־תַחְמֹד °תחתון and עליון

אֵשֶׁת רֵעֶךָ וְעַבְדוֹ וַאֲמָתוֹ show לֹא תַחְמֹר

וְשׁוֹרוֹ וַחֲמֹרוֹ וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר

לְרֵעֶךָ:

brown = עליון   green = תחתון   red = variant

אָנֹכִי יְהֹוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֲשֶׁר

הוֹצֵאתִיךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם

מִבֵּית עֲבָדִים: לֹא יִהְיֶה

לְךָ אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים עַל פָּנַי

לֹא תַעֲשֶׂה לְךָ פֶסֶל וְכָל

תְּמוּנָה אֲשֶׁר בַּשָּׁמַיִם מִמַּעַל

וַאֲשֶׁר בָּאָרֶץ מִתַּחַת וַאֲשֶׁר בַּמַּיִם

מִתַּחַת לָאָרֶץ לֹא תִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה

לָהֶם וְלֹא תָעָבְדֵם כִּי

יָמֶיךָ עַל הָאֲדָמָה אֲשֶׁר

יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ נֹתֵן לָךְ:

לֹא תִּרְצָח: לֹא תִּנְאָף:

לֹא תִּגְנֹב: לֹא תַעֲנֶה

בְרֵעֲךָ עֵד שָׁקֶר: לֹא

תַחְמֹד בֵּית רֵעֶךָ לֹא־תַחְמֹד

אֵשֶׁת רֵעֶךָ וְעַבְדּוֹ וַאֲמָתוֹ

וְשׁוֹרוֹ וַחֲמֹרוֹ וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר

לְרֵעֶךָ:

PLATE 32

Bridwell scroll from K'aifeng (above).
American Bible Society scroll from
K'aifeng (top, right). Conventional
western Torah scroll (bottom, right).
From Michael Pollak, *The Torah Scrolls
of the Chinese Jews.*

PLATE 33