THE ALEPPO CODEX AND THE BEN ASHER TRADITION

D. S. LOEWINGER

I. EARLIER DISCUSSIONS

Four ancient manuscripts are considered the chief representatives of the Tiberian school:

A. The Cairo MS of the Prophets (= C), written by Moses ben Asher\(^1\) in the year 895 C.E.

B. Leningrad B 19a (= L), a complete Bible, copied by Jacob ben Samuel in the year 1008, with a colophon: התמהרות הנוה שלמה הלשנים בן יוסף ומנחתים...

C. British Museum Or 4445 (= B) of the Pent. (Gen. xxxix, 4—Dt. i, 33), undated, which mentions on its margin “The Great Teacher Ben Asher”.\(^3\)

D. The Aleppo MS of the complete Bible (= A), pointed and provided with Massorah; according to the colophon the work of: המלומד והหมอ בני.SelectCommand ומשתתפת בה פעמים ילדות ... ורבר אחותו גבר ומלומד ו varargin ... מברר אוחר ובוображен.

The problem is which of these MSS most faithfully represents the Tiberian text. We know the genealogy of the family of Massoretes who worked in

---

*List of Abbreviations:

A — Aleppo MS
B — British Museum Or. 4445
BA — Ben Asher
BN — Ben Naphtalı
C — Cairo MS
DHT — Diqqat ha-Tev'amim
L — Leningrad MS
Mm — Massorah Magna
Mp — Massorah Parva
Occ — Westerners, Occidentals
Or — Easterners, Orientalıs
Sh — Sh'ar ha-Shewa
TJ — Targum Jonathan
TO — Targum Onkelos

1. There are some who doubt the authenticity of this MS: cf. H. Yalon, "ספרא תבר", (Ha-Sofeh, 2 Nissan, 5719), and bibliography cited there; P. Kahle, Masoretens des Westens, I, 15; Cairo Genizah (Oxford 1959), pp. 91–7.


3. According to Ginsburg, this MS was written in the middle of the ninth century, that is, several decades before Aaron ben Moses’ period of activity.
Tiberias: Aaron ben Moses ben Asher ben Nehemiah ben Asher the Elder. On the basis of this list, precedence ought perhaps to be accorded to the two first MSS, since they show exact datings and the names of the Massoretes are given in accordance with the above genealogy, as against the last two, which only give incomplete names ("Ben Asher" in B) or an incorrect name ("Aaron ben Asher" in A). Two well-known scholars also argued against the originality of A: W. Wickes, who published a single page from this MS, and A. Harkavy, who examined it on the spot. Some years ago these were joined by J. L. Teicher, who tried to call into question the authenticity of A as well as of the other three MSS on the basis of external indications.

P. Kahle, however, rightly disagreed with the arguments of Wickes, Harkavy, and Teicher. We agree with him in his assessment of A as opposed to the above scholars. On the other hand, we dissociate ourselves from his hypothesis that L can serve as a substitute for A.

However, Harkavy and Strack, in their description of L, stressed that the pointing of that MS does not follow the rules commonly attributed to Ben Asher. We can hardly accept Kahle's reliance on the conclusions of L. Lipschütz, since the latter failed to consider that the agreement of L with the list of divergencies by Michael ben Uzziel is artificial, for the reason that the identity of part of the passages is the result of agreement reached by means of erasures, additions and alterations, and did not consider the outstanding deviations of L from the Tiberian system of punctuation, as known to us from various sources of massoretic literature. As we shall see from comparisons

5. After a time, Ben Asher became the family name and it is almost certain that when it is used, especially in later periods, it refers to Aaron ben Moses ben Asher.
10. Cf. his quotations in the above articles from his correspondence with M.D. Cassuto; see also Cassuto's articles *The Hebrew Ben Asher Manuscripts*, *Haaretz* Tebeth 5708; "The Hebrew Ben Asher Manuscripts", ib. 15 Nissan 5709.
11a. Cf. his quotations in the above articles from his correspondence with M.D. Cassuto; see also Cassuto's articles *The Hebrew Ben Asher Manuscripts*, *Haaretz* Tebeth 5708; "The Hebrew Ben Asher Manuscripts", ib. 15 Nissan 5709.
12. Harkavy-Strack, p. 264: "Gegen diese Behauptung sprechen die zahlreichen Abweichungen von den durch den genannten Massoreten aufgestellten (befolgten) Regeln (z.B. in Bezug auf den Metheg, das Chatef Patach, das Dagesch lene)."
between this MS and A, it cannot serve as a substitute for A. As the result of exaggerated emphasis on the purity of its "Ben Asherism"14, Kahle confused the issue and gave to his MS the official standing of a BA text, on the basis of which it was even worth while to write a new concordance of the Bible, as was done, amongst others, by the editors of the Oṣar Leshon ha-Migra15 in Jerusalem.

The late Professor M.D. Cassuto made a step in the right direction by persevering in his attempts to gain access to A, and to base on it his new Bible edition. It was only the result of his sudden death that his intention was not carried out. It is indeed a pity that we do not possess the notes he made during his visit to Aleppo, for on their basis we might have been able partly to restore the portions of the MS now lost.16 It seems that even those who continued his work did not receive this material. This can be clearly proved by the following comparison, in which we place a brief list of passages of A next to the text found in L, C and the Jerusalem Bible, while from Exodus we give readings from B next to L and the Jerusalem Bible.16a

| ISAIAH |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Jerus. Bible | L | C | A | References |
| עִזָּה | ד | ל | ל | א | ל
| דִּבְּרֵי | ד | ל | ל | ל | כ, ל
| עִזָּה | ד | ל | ל | ל | כ, ל
| עִזָּה | ד | ל | ל | ל | כ, ל
| לִלְדוֹת | י | ל | ל | ל | כ, ל
| אִשָּׁה | י | ל | ל | ל | כ, ל

14. "Wir haben also mit vollem Recht die Leningrader Handschrift B 19 a (L) für die neue Ausgabe der Biblia Hebraica zugrunde gelegt... und mit dem Abdruck dieses Textes wird das Ziel erreicht, dass der Ben Ascher-Text selber veröffentlicht wird... Je mehr wir uns dessen bewusst geworden sind, dass es sich bei L tatsächlich um den zuverlässigen Ben Ascher-Text handelt, um so mehr haben wir uns bemüht, dessen Text möglichst genau, so wie er in der Handschrift steht, wiederzugeben", Prolegomena p. VIII.


16. Cassuto mentions in the above articles that he was in possession also of a Bible MS copied from a MS in Aleppo by a Yemenite scribe; unfortunately, also this copy is not available to us and apparently was not given to the persons who continued his work; I do not intend to quote the literature — mainly reviews — published in Hebrew about the edition. I dealt with it in my articles: "נכתב בעיתונות פורית" (Haaretz (21.VIII.1953); יד לוי (Tishri-Adar II, 5717), pp. 83–87; cf. Y. Kaufman, מָלַךְ (Haaretz, 26.III.1954).

16a. For typographical reasons Biblical references are in this and following lists indicated in the Hebrew manner: נ, מ = i,30; י, כ = xxvi,6, etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jerus. Bible</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ר&quot;ד</td>
<td>ר</td>
<td>ם</td>
<td>ד</td>
<td>מ, י</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מ</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>ו</td>
<td>ם</td>
<td>ג</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מ</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>ו</td>
<td>ד</td>
<td>מ, י</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נ</td>
<td>נ</td>
<td>ו</td>
<td>י</td>
<td>נ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מ</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>ו</td>
<td>ד</td>
<td>נ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ר</td>
<td>ר</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>י</td>
<td>ס, י</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מ</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>ו</td>
<td>י</td>
<td>ס, י</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXODUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jerus. Bible</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>B16b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מ</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>ד, י</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ק</td>
<td>ק</td>
<td>ג</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ק</td>
<td>ק</td>
<td>ב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ק</td>
<td>ק</td>
<td>א, י</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ר</td>
<td>ר</td>
<td>ג</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מ</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>ב</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These comparisons give a clear picture of what happens when readings from different MSS are combined in one edition without examining the system of punctuation of each one. We shall try not to fall into the same error as those who tried to define L as belonging to BA's system on the basis of superficial examination and insufficient comparison with one group, which can only serve as partial proof, or by joining together material from different MSS for the purpose of restoring what is missing in A without establishing complete identity of system between that MS and the one used to complement it.

It is impossible to arrive at final conclusions without a thorough comparison of these four ancient MSS. One must also take into account other dated and undated MSS of the same period which have not yet been properly examined. In addition it is essential to examine the massoretic literature connected with these MSS, as well as the massoretic lists made on their basis. Unfortunately, just of these most important works no satisfactory editions have as yet been

16b. Unfortunately one looks in vain in Ginsburg's edition for the corresponding pointings in B (in Ginsburg: 15). I am at a loss to understand why G. concealed from the reader phenomena of pointing found in this, as well as in some other MSS listed by him.
published, and only a part of Kitāb al-Khilaf by Mishael ben Uzziel has been brought out.

It is the aim of this article to sum up the conclusions which can be drawn at this present stage. We do not presume to have arrived at a solution of the numerous problems connected with this subject. We shall thus confine ourselves to defining the practical conclusions which we have reached so far on the basis of the material actually in our possession. I should not have been able to arrive even at these partial conclusions without the faithful assistance of Mr. Yisrael Yeivin, who compared important parts of A with other MSS with exemplary devotion and directed my attention to important phenomena, especially those concerning the Babylonian vocalization and tradition.

Five sources mainly come into question for the purpose of comparison: the divergencies of BA and BN; the material concentrated in Diqdigue ha-Te'amim; divergencies between Westerners (Occ) and Easterners (Or); the Massorah Parva (Mp) and the Massorah Magna (Mm).

An additional aim of this article is to reproduce material which characterizes this MS, so as to enable also other scholars to look for parallel material in collections of Bible MSS and in massoretic literature.

II. The Relationship of A to Mishael Ben Uzziel’s Kitāb al-Khilaf
The divergencies between BA and BN were well known even before the appearance of the Cairo Genizah, which includes fragments of Mishael ben Uzziel’s book Kitāb al-Khilaf. Ancient MSS already carry remarks concerning these divergencies, while in later MSS we find long lists containing some 900–1000 Biblical passages which show divergencies in the readings of these two Massoretes. For these scattered notes and lists, this work may have served as a source. Its importance is also seen from the fact that it was translated from Arabic into Hebrew and summarized. Joseph al-Qostandini in his ‘Adath Deborim, written in the year 1207, bases himself on it and quotes most of its statements.

We shall not enter into details of the problems connected with this work. L. Lipschütz, in his book, dealt with these problems and collected important material concerning the author and his work. Additional material is to be found in P. Kahle’s books.

The work is important for having preserved for us in full the names of the Massoretes, Aaron ben Moses ben Asher and Moses ben David ben Naphtali. In addition, the introduction supplies a short summary of the differences between these two Massoretes. First comparisons of L and this work were encouraging, for out of thirty-nine passages in Gen. which had been examined, only a few readings in L differed from the readings of BA given in this work,
and out of a hundred and forty-six passages compared, a hundred and thirty-eight had a suitable reading in L, only eight deviating from it a little. However, the comparisons of Perez Castro — Pent., Jer., and Job — are not quite as encouraging as those of Lipschütz, since he, like Yalon, considers also the erasures, additions and attempts at altering the pointing and accents which brought L into agreement with BA MSS at the corrector's disposal. Out of three hundred and forty-six passages which Castro compared, a mere twenty-five deviated from BA's system in the list of divergencies in Kitāb al-Khilaf, though out of the three hundred and eleven passages which agree, only two hundred and twenty-eight remained valid, since eighty-three "agreements" are the result of erasures, additions, and alterations made by the copyist or the corrector. Accordingly, L was copied from a MS far removed from the system of BA, and the corrector tried afterwards to make it conform to the copies which carefully preserved the original system, as for instance A. Had the corrector perhaps Michael's work before him and worked on the basis of it? In this case he would doubtlessly have added to the MS also a list of divergencies, as he added from the material in Diqduq ha-Te'amim and the divergencies between Oec and Or.

Below we shall see how A compares with the material produced by Perez Castro:

A. Pent.: Suitable passages are: Gen. xxvi, 34-xxvii, 30, which were published by Wickes, and Dt. xxviii, 17-xxxiv, 12, which are here published in facsimile. Of the five divergencies which belong to this part, only three apply, while two (Gen. xxvii, 13 נבנין; Dt. xxxi, 21 נבנין) are emended in L. As against this, four places agree in A and only Dt. xxxi, 21 נבנין was emended.

B. Jeremiah: No far-reaching conclusions can be drawn from the small number at our disposal in the Pentateuch; it seems more promising to turn to a complete book, containing a greater number of divergencies. According to Castro, all the passages in L have the text and punctuation of BA — except for two in ch. li — but many of these do so only as the result of erasures, changes, and additions: the punctuation of בְּשָׁבָט (ii, 31; cf. also xxxi, 9; xlx, 1) has been changed, the hir'eq being turned into a shewa; vii, 25: כ ל for

18. מִדְרֶשׁ מֶשֶׁה יב נוֹבֵעַ Kiryath Sefer 30 (5715), pp. 254-263; מִדְרֶשׁ מֶשֶׁה יב נוֹבֵעַ ib. 32 (5717), pp. 97-111.
21. Perhaps on account of the pausal form the corrector did not leave Pathah, which was the essential punctuation (cf. Dt. xxxi, 21; xxxiv, 4).
with erasure of waw; xi, 7 for דע with addition of waw. Also the following passages have been altered: ix, 16; xiv, 18; xxii, 24; xxv, 29; xxvi, 12; xxix, 18; xxxv, 15; xlii, 1. To the above list we might add: x, 24; xxxiii, 25; xxxix, 5. Of those where no divergencies are enumerated in ‘Adath Deborim, we should mention xxxiv, 14 בקע שבעה שמות, where L also shows an erasure. In all of the above passages as well as the places erased in L, A reads according to BA without any erasures, changes, and additions except for li, 3 ל, where A along with L has a BN reading; in the second place (verse 10) of this chapter, where according to Castro’s list L reads according to BN, it must be assumed that Ga’ya under the waw of ולש בה שם was erased and thus was made to agree with BA.

C. Job: As far as the list of divergencies is concerned, the position is much the same. Here, too, most of the divergencies agree with the readings of L, but with part of them it can once more be established that they were emended in the MS: ii, 11; v, 27; vii, 16; ix, 33; ix, 35; xxiv, 14; xxi, 34; xxxiii, 11; xxxix, 18; xi, 29. To this list additional places can still be added which were apparently made to agree with the divergencies: iii, 22; ix, 28; xi, 6, we should also mention the emendation of יא to א (vi, 21), which will be dealt with in connection with the Mp of A. Special note should be taken of xxxiv, 10, where the shewa was changed to Haṭeph Pathaḥ which appears in the list of agreements of the two schools, so that there is no divergency according to ‘Adath Deborim between BA and BN: ENC. These passages appear in A without erasures according to the system of BA. Of the four passages marked in Castro’s list as BN readings in L, two (viii, 1; xxxix, 5) are not quite clear as there is a difference between Castro and ‘Adath Deborim22, one passage (ix, 19: דְּוָּה — מִי) is not emended though A reads it according to BA, the second one (i, 3: שְׁבָעָה — שִׁבְעָה) is not emended, for also A reads according to BN, if we can believe Michael’s list.

Before we draw any conclusions from the above comparison, we must still mention two paragraphs in the introduction of Kitāb al-Khilaf which also appear in Diqqaṭe ha-Temām (= DHT)23, §§51–52 שריי לשון אידאול: שמות: ביאן באנס: The actual examples given in the first paragraph also suit L, though if we follow up parallel forms in L, lack of consistency can be established,

---

22. Cf. in particular vili, 3. שְׁמוֹר וְיֶשׁוּבַת מִדְּוָה, אֲשֶׁר יָשְׁבוּ בְּגֵדֵר. According to this punctuation the difference is not in שְׁמוֹר, as Castro notes in his list, but in מִדְּוָה.

e.g. Dt. xxviii, 39: נָּאַלְדָּה in L, as against נָּאַלְדָּה in A, or נָּאַלְדָּה (II Kings vi, 28–29) as against נָּאַלְדָּה in A (cf. especially Dt. xii, 18, 22, 24, 25: נָּאַלְדָּה in contrast to other MSS which are pointed according to BA: נָּאַלְדָּה, or Dt. xii, 15: נָּאַלְדָּה — נָּאַלְדָּה). In §52 the difference between the rules of BA’s system and L stand out even more. Here, even the actual examples do not agree with the readings of L: נָּאַלְדָּה (Ex. xxiii, 29–30); נָּאַלְדָּה (Nu. xxii, 6) as against נָּאַלְדָּה, נָּאַלְדָּה of other MSS, including B, which preserve the BA tradition. This obvious contrast explains why the scribe of L omitted this paragraph from DHT, if it was at all included in the collection he had before him.

We are hoping to obtain a photograph of the material connected with Michael’s composition from the USSR which will enable us to compare all the material with L or with A. Perhaps we shall be fortunate enough to receive the actual copy of L from Leningrad for the purpose of investigating it, but even on the basis of these partial comparisons, it can be established that L does not represent BA’s system and that only attempts were made to make it agree with an actual BA MS. The fact that in those places where also A preserved a BN reading, L’s text preserves that same reading, can serve as proof that it was A which was before the corrector of L. Why is it then that there is no full agreement between A and Michael’s divergencies? One must not confuse the problem of the dating of the composition of Kitāb al-Khilaf with the date of the copying of these fragments; it is not impossible that some of them are late and there is a suspicion that they contain material from unreliable sources. We must take the possibility into consideration that the original Kitāb al-Khilaf was not made on the basis of A, but only with the aid of a MS closer to it than L but which differed from it in a number of details. In any case, it can also be concluded from these comparisons that L is not a copy of A. There is then the problem as to how and where the text and punctuation of the MS came into being from which this copy was made.

III. THE RELATIONSHIP OF A TO DIQDUQE HA-TE’AMIM

The second source for phenomena connected with the problem of A is the collection of DHT. In contrast to the divergencies directly connected with the name of Aaron ben Moses ben Asher already mentioned at the beginning

24. Cf. the article הַשְּׁמִית in Osar Leshon ha-Miqra, which shows the danger of following MSS not punctuated according to a unified principle and creating the impression that this punctuation is based on fixed rules.
25. This was already established on the basis of the one isolated page known hitherto.
26. I am using the ed. Baer-Strack, Leipzig 1879; Mr. Aaron Dothan of Jerusalem is now preparing a new edition, on the basis of new materials.
of DHT, Aaron ben Asher's name only appears in late sources. If the identification with the readings of Michael's divergencies has served us as proof for the reliability of A, in which the name of Aaron ben Moses ben Asher does not occur, we may be permitted to reverse the process of investigation, and try to prove that the material concentrated in DHT belongs to the system of punctuation of Aaron ben Moses ben Asher, by identifying its contents with the readings of A. However, the identification of the common material does not enable us to solve the problem of the authorship of DHT or even of the verses containing the material in question. That not all circles attributed these verses to Ben Asher, is proved by the Sha'ar ha-Shewa, whose author supplies us with precise information concerning the Ben Asher family and quotes just those parts connected with phenomena typical of A in the name of the "ancients": "Know and understand that the ancient teachers of reading and modulations and accents and Massorah and the grammarians took great care and prepared for this subject which we have explained above a poem set out in many verses and explained so that he who reads it can understand it immediately. And this is the explanation of their statement in Hebrew"; "And this is their rhymed statement and this is the correct statement of what the ancients have explained on this subject." We may be quite certain that had he known of a tradition in which the name "the ancients" referred to Ben Asher, he would have mentioned it. In any event, even before Aaron ben Moses some texts were available in Hebrew and Aramaic which tried to sum up the rules of punctuation and accents, belonging to the method of these punctuators or their opponents. Perhaps also A had such a summary attached to it, just as at the end of L the scribe added a collection of such material, part of which belongs to the type of DHT. In any case, it should be noted that as far as the material of DHT is concerned, there is no allusion at all to BA, and it is completely anonymous in L. In the light of this situation, the whole of the material which appears on the margin of A, and is connected with this problem, is of special importance. There is material both in Aramaic and in Hebrew.


28. Cf. the Hebrew section of Levy, op. cit., p. 14; and cf. Abba Bendavid, "Sha'ar ha-Shewa" (note 23 supra), especially the chapter, דקוקינ הַמשמִּים, וּלָּמוּץ כְּאֶחָד וְנִכְלָל בְּשָׁלֶשׁ מִלְּיָה, קְס. 2-6.

29. The inscription, where according to Baer-Strack the name Aaron ben Asher appears, exists in two sources: in a MS from a Sicilian synagogue in Rome from the year 1496, and in the Bomberg ed., Venice 1516-1518.

30. There are Aramaic elements also in the texts published by Baer-Strack.
Below are examples from the Aramaic summary, which is also connected with the material of Sh'atar ha-Shewa and two paragraphs (27, 33) in DHT.

A

1. Mm on Ps. lxxix, 21

DHT §27

כֶּלֶם נַרְשׁ גוֹזָתָה בֵּשָׁלֵשׁ וְשָׁלְשֵׁי מְסִפְּרֵי... פְּתַחְתָּה בָּרֶם נַרְשׁ גוֹזָתָה בֵּשָׁלֵשׁ וְשָׁלְשֵׁי רָזָה נַרְשׁ גוֹזָתָה בֵּשָׁלֵשׁ וְשָׁלְשֵׁי לְקַיְּמֶד
d.32 32 מְסִפְּרֵי מְסִפְּרֵי מְסִפְּרֵי מְסִפְּרֵי 34 33 35 34 35

DHT also enumerates the examples on which this is based; and part of these—and also other examples—are collected in Sh'atar ha-Shewa. Summing up the results of the comparison of these passages, we see that the punctuation of A—as far as it is not missing in the MS and is not illegible—agrees with the examples of this paragraph, in contrast to L, which preserves this punctuation only in part of the examples. The late Kurt Levy, unfortunately, in many cases misunderstood the purpose of these paragraphs and pointed the examples incorrectly with Shewa instead of Ḥatef Pathaḥ. Were they perhaps erroneously punctuated in the MS before him? In any case, this should have been pointed out in the translation or in the notes, for the contents show that here as well as in other places there needs to be a Ḥateph Pathaḥ, and he had access to Ginsburg's apparatus where he could have found references, or he could have used the punctuation of the printed edition of DHT.

Below is a list of the passages (the first column denotes their source. Sh'atar ha-Shewa is marked Sh.):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DHT &amp; Sh.</th>
<th>Ps. xii,7: אָמָרְתִּי</th>
<th>(= A &amp; L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DHT</td>
<td>xvii,14 מַקְמִית</td>
<td>(A missing; L: מַקְמִית)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHT &amp; Sh.</td>
<td>xviii,7 אָמָרְתִּי</td>
<td>(A missing; L: אָמָרְתִּי)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHT</td>
<td>xxxi,12 לַקֵּסֶרֶנֶר</td>
<td>(= A &amp; L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHT</td>
<td>lxviii,24 קַחֵּרָנֵר</td>
<td>(= A &amp; L: קַחֵּרָנֵר)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>lxxiii,28 וְקָרֶבֶת</td>
<td>(= A &amp; L: וְקָרֶבֶת)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>lxxvi,12 נְבֶרֶנֶר</td>
<td>(= A &amp; L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHT</td>
<td>civ,3: זָמְכֵּרָנֵר</td>
<td>(= A &amp; L: זָמְכֵּרָנֵר)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>cxi,4: שַׁנְּנֵר</td>
<td>(= A &amp; L)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. ib. lxxxvii,2.
33. ib. cxi,5: A om. נְפַי.  
34. Pr. viii,13.
A comparison of the material in this paragraph already proves that DHT and Sh. are based on A or on a MS close to it and not on L or a MS close to the latter. One can also conjecture that an examination of L apart from Job xxxiv,10, will show also other passages which have been made to agree with this system.

Translation of DHT: “When there are in a word two equal letters... when a minor or major Ga'ya precedes the first letter there is a Pathah... and if there is neither a minor nor a major Ga'ya one does not insert a Pathah... except for six verses which have Ga'ya but no Pathah etc.”

Many hundreds of passages in the Bible are involved by this law, and its application is one of the main distinctions between A and L and MSS close to them which follow this system: It is not our intention here to enumerate them or to classify them; we shall content ourselves with reproducing and comparing a small part of the material. The examples are quoted in the three versions of DHT.43a

38. Hos, v,15.
39. Ps, 1,23.
40. Pr, 1,28: יתנוא לתחלתי.
41. ib, vii, 17.
42. Ezek, xxxiv,11.
43. Is, x,1; Jud, v,15.
43a. There are late MSS which from this point of view are more developed than A, e.g. in Ginsburg's apparatus (British Museum Add. 15451, ca. 1200); v, (ib. Add. 9401–2, of the year 1286); מ (ib. Add. 15251, of the year 1448). There are instances where A writes Sheva in contrast to these MSS which tend to write Háleph Pathah. The following examples are taken from Psalms. The first reading shows the version
of A and the second the versions of the above MSS, followed by the number of the MS:

iii,7: מִרְבְּבוּת (A, א');
vii,13: יִרְבּוּנָה (A, א');
xxxvi,7: מַכְכָּרִים (A, א');
liv,7: מְשָׁכַר (A, א');
lix,2: מְמָכָּרִים (A, א');
cvii,32: מֵרְגֶּמָה (A, א');
ib. ib. מִלְּתָּוֹת מִלְּתָוֹת (A, א');
cxvii,2: מִלְּתָוֹת (A, א');

44. Other MSS read לְבַדְבַּד with Ḥāṭeph Pāṭah (among them MSS א, א').
45. Other MSS, among them א', point רַקְשָׁא.
46. A vii,6: טַבְּעָה without Ḥāṭeph Pāṭah under the Mem; L in both places writes Ḥāṭeph Pāṭah under the Mem and not under the Qoph.
Neh. ix,24: (A missing; L: הָלַלְנוּ)
Neh. xii,36: (A missing; L)

Special mention should be made of the forms הָלַלְנוּ, which are pointed with a Shewa under the Lamedh in L and Ḥaṭeph Pathah in most instances in A.

3. Below we set out further massoretic notes of A with their parallels in DHT.

A
Mm on II Chron. xxxi, 9 (הכתרתו)

48 כל ממלך דבכרייה ראתה והב ראה...
49 ...ששחט את על עלי זראיאו...
50 ...אף בקאמרה...
51 ...המיל נברט...
52 ...רבך...
53 ...וכל רעה...
54 ...המוהב...

DHT §20

4. The following fragments connected with §56 of DHT appear in three places in A:

A

Mm to Ps. lxxxviii,15 (לְמָחַר לְחָתְם)

56 כל קרית לְמָחַר לְחָתְם לא-לָא לְמָחַר רַע
57 ...וּבְשָׁמַר
58 ...תּוֹמְנְתִּי בָּשָׁמַר
59 ...רַע
60 ...לְמָחַר
61 ...הָרָע

DHT §56

47. MSS מִמּוּס מִמּוּס read: מִמּוּס.
48. For Gersh-Gershah cf. DHT §27 (sign of Gersh and Pathah) and the explanation given there to this sign; L, in fact, has no Merkhah in any of these places, but only Gaʿya; The word Merkhah can also indicate Gaʿya.
50. Lam. i,14.
51. Neh. vii,1 (and not Neh.xii,44; II Sam. ii,30, where this form appears with different accents).
52. Ezek. xxxvi,3.
53. II Chr. xiii,12.
54. ib. xxxi,9.
55. Gen. xii,19.
56. Ps. x,1.
57. ib. lxxxviii,15.
5. The two following Aramaic fragments are interesting on account of the use of the root בקע in place of the Arabic.

The continuation of this paragraph, briefly hinted at in A in theMp to Is. viii, 2 in the words: בקע בקע, is not rendered in B, e.g. at Lev. xvii, 25.

This spelling also in B, e.g. at Gen. xxx, 19, and also in other passages.

58. ib. xiii, 10.
59. ib. xiii, 2.
60. Job vii, 20.
61. I Sam. xxviii, 15.
62. II Sam. ii, 22.
63. Jer. xv, 18.
64. II Sam. iv, 31.
65. Ps. xlix, 6.
67. I Sam. xxvii, 20.
68. II Sam. ix, 12.
69. Ezek. xviii, 10.
6. The following paragraph in DHT has a partial Aramaic parallel in our MS.

A
Mm to Job xii,26 (אנתם רַנְבָּה)
כל זה אתה תמדקדק בבלשך וננקראת ידוקה
ותוכך אתה מביאך את אלבך כל בבלשך
בזכך ראהך כל אלהי דומם וביה ונתך
ספָּר בךthesizedך שלמה בך
רתומך ... ותוכך מסדרך שלמה בך
cf. הָאָם יְשֵׁר יִרְחָה

DHT §42
כל זה אתה תמדקדק בבלשך וננקראת ידוקה
ותוכך אתה מביאך את אלבך כל בבלשך
בזכך ראהך כל אלהי דומם וביה ונתך
ספָּר בךthesizedך שלמה בך
cf. הָאָם יְשֵׁר יִרְחָה

7. We shall end this series with one fragment from A in mixed language, since only the expression מִי בַּר is Aramaic. Its contents are parallel to the text of MS A of DHT as well as to text 19, as is no. II of this series.

A
Mm on Ezek. i,15 (מששׂים)
כל ולאבש יששיה והיא ימות perish כַּכָּה...
ותיכן אתה מוסקך קותרות ובשפר
논ך בַּל תגיחאך יאָרי
וּרְשִׁין יִרְאֵהוּ את אַלְמַאֵהוּ
רעשׁ כַּכָּה יִרְאֵהוּ אלֵים מְלַשׁ יִרְעֵהוּ

DHT §35
MS A

8. The series of Hebrew comparisons begins with a fragment which is close to the style of DHT.

70. Job, xli, 26.
71. Ps. liv, 5.
72. ib. l,2.
73. Pr. iii,12.
74. MS 19 has four instances: כל ולאבש יששיה היא ימות perish כַּכָּה...
75. Is. xxvi, 18.
76. Ezek. i,16.
77. Jonah iii,10.
78. Ex. vii,10.
79. Jonah i,11.
80. Josh. x,23.
9. There is a contact in style also in the following passage which is in Hebrew in both. Note the use of מַשֵּׁךְ מַשֵּׁךְ in both, and the Aramaic word מִישָׁרָה in A.

10. The following note is close to the contents of §26 in DHT.

81. Ps. i,1.
82. Ps. iv,5.
83. Eccl. viii,14.
84. Gen. xvi,15.
85. ib. xxxi,3.
86. I Sam. viii,2.
87. I Kings vii,24.
88. Ezek. xxxix,16.
89. Pr. xxx,4; Okhlah we-Oskhlah p. 176 §24; E. Ehrenpreis, Untersuchungen über die Masora, Hannover 1925, p. 43.
11. The formulation of the following fragment is identical with §221 of Okhlah we-Okhlah, though some of the examples it has in common also with DHT.

12. Before passing on to deal with the problem of the connection of A with §§14 and 34 of DHT, we shall first list a number of fragments connected with
the paragraphs of DHT according to Baer-Strack, and also with the material published by them after § 56.

Jud. vi,4: (Baer-Strack § 75).

Jud. xviii,30: (Baer-Strack § 60).

Jud. xx,18: (Baer-Strack § 62).

I Sam. xiv,34: (Baer-Strack § 74).

II Kings xix, 2, Mpt to (Baer-Strack § 75).

Is. xviii,8: (cf. DHT § 49).

Ps. xxviii,7: (DHT ibid.).

Ps. lxix,81: (cf. DHT § 8).

Job xxxviii,11: (cf. DHT § 8).

112. Ps. lxxxv,14
114. ib. 15.
115. II Sam. vii,13.
116. ib. xvi,23.
117. II Kings xix,37.
118. ib. 31.
120. ib. 1,29.
121. Ruth iii,5.
122. ib. 17.
I Chr. xxiii,30: כל פרהית חתם החומיה בור מז חתם חתם השולח לנושב בר ברבר.

(= Baer-Strack § 75).

13. The author of §14 of DHT deals with two problems: in the first part he quotes those examples where a number of scribes used Ḥateph-Qames instead of Shewa, and in the second part — which looks like a note or the addition of another copyist who collected material connected with the problem of the Ḥateph-Pathah which was not written in verse form — we are given a description of the system of vocalization employed by Rabbi Phineas the Head of the Academy.

Remains of the system described in the first part have also remained in L: מַרְכָּב (Josh. xxiii,5); נְדֵנָה (I Sam., xxiii,1); לִיָּשָׁע (I Kings, iv,12); וְלִיָּשָׁע (Est. ii,5, etc.); לִיָּשָׁע (Ezra viii,25); לִיָּשָׁע (I Chr. ii,44). The rest of the examples or forms parallel to them are preserved in A, and where these verses are not extant in A, they can be discovered in MSS resembling A to some extent, such as MS נ of Ginsburg; one was transmitted in the name of Hilleli and also in other MSS (Josh. xxxix,13); מַרְכָּב (Josh. xxi,4.5.20.26; I Chr. v,27.28; vi,1.18; II Chr. xx,19); מַרְכָּב (Josh. xxi,34); מַרְכָּב (I Kings xiii,7); מַרְכָּב (Is. xxvii,8); מַרְכָּב (Jer. xxii,20); מַרְכָּב (Jer. xlvi,20); MS נ of Massoretes (Dan. viii,13); MS נ (Est. ii,14); מַרְכָּב (Nu. vii,85; In the Massorah of MS נ a variant reading is given to this, and so reads MS נ of Ginsburg).

The second part constitutes a summary of the method used by Rabbi Phineas, who may be identical with Rabbi Phineas the Payyetan.137 From the examples we see that R. Phineas read Ḥateph-Pathah a) when there were two similar letters; b) after the definite article in certain cases; c) after Waw Conjunctive; d) after Mem in certain cases; e) in place of Mobile Shewa in the middle of a word; f) in place of Mobile Shewa at the beginning of a word. Except for the last type (Mem, י), BA followed his system and also pointed these places with Ḥateph-Pathah instead of with Shewa. There is no need here to supply examples for type (a), as we saw a whole series of these in

134. Josh. xviii,8.
135. As against this, cf. xii,22 in L: נָשָׁע with Ḥateph-Qames under the Nun as against A, which points with Shewa, and נָשָׁע, נָשָׁע both of which point with Shewa.
136. British Museum A.M. 15250, a complete Bible from the middle of the thirteenth century.
137. Cf. on the subject of the identity of Phineas the Payyetan Yed'oth ha-Machon le-Ḥe'ger ha-Shirah ha-Ivrit V, 129.
connection with the comparison with § 33 of DHT above (§ 2), in any case we also find examples mentioned here, pointed with Ḥāṭeph-Pathāh in A: מְשַׁמֵּש (I Chr. xxv, 27); מְשַׁמֵּש (Jer. v, 1) מִתָּמֵשׁ (Is. xxiv, 19); The examples of type (b) also appear with Ḥāṭeph-Pathāh; many more can be added to them from A, mainly under Resh: מְשַׁמֵּש (I Kings vi, 37); מְשַׁמֵּש (I Chr. xxvii, 31; II Chr. xxi, 17); מְשַׁמֵּש (Ezek. iii, 19). Similarly, these words are pointed with Ḥāṭeph-Pathāh where Conjunctive Waw is followed by Vocal Shewa. To the five examples given in the first chapter of this article, we might add: מְשַׁמֵּש (II Kings ix, 17); מְשַׁמֵּש (II Kings xix, 16); מְשַׁמֵּש (Ps. lv, 22); מְשַׁמֵּש (II Chr. xii, 13); מְשַׁמֵּש (I Chr. xxix, 2); מְשַׁמֵּש (Ps. lxxxvii, 5). It is worth noting that also the copyist of L sometimes used this punctuation: מְשַׁמֵּש, Gen. i, 18; מְשַׁמֵּש, ib. ii, 12) as though he had begun, in this respect, to make his punctuation agree with A and stopped this experiment as he found it impossible to carry it out fully. 140 Type (d) has parallels in A, though that MS extends the use of Ḥāṭeph-Pathāh: נֹכֶש (Ps. lxxiv, 5); נֶכְשׂ (Pr. xxiv, 19); נֶכְשׂ (ib. lxvi, 12); נֶכְשׂ (Ps. civ, 18); נֶכְשׂ (Pr. xxxi, 4). Examples of type (e) are not represented in the extant part of A, however, Ezek. xxxv, 11 is attributed to R. Phineas — a punctuation which is found in A — while to R. Aaron ben Asher the punctuation is attributed. 142

This paragraph is also connected with the note of Mm in A on Jud. v, 12: מְשַׁמֵּש (ib. xxi, 15) מְשַׁמֵּש (ib. xxii, 14) מְשַׁמֵּש (ib. xxiii, 15) מְשַׁמֵּש (ib. xxiv, 14). The relationship between BA and Phineas still needs careful study. It is to

138. There are exceptions also in A: ix, 33; xv, 16 where the above MSS are, as against A's מְשַׁמֵּש.

139. Also in the parallel passage I Kings xiv, 21; it is interesting to note that also L writes Ḥāṭeph-Pathāh in all passages, except the next instance.

140. E.g., in Lev. xxi, 34 he does not point חֹטֶא but חֹטֶא; cf. the places mentioned in chapter I.

141. Is. x, 9 A reads: מְשַׁמֵּש like L; while MS מ (above, note 136) and MS מ in Ginsburg's apparatus (British Museum Har. 5720) write: מְשַׁמֵּש; the second example (Jer. xxxii, 33) is missing in A, in L it is pointed as in DHT; several MSS in Ginsburg's apparatus also point the Taw with Ḥāṭeph-Pathāh (amongst them also MS מ) and others (amongst them מ, מ, מ) point with Ḥāṭeph-Qames; it would be worth while to examine the MSS of DHT; the MS noted as S in the Baer-Strack edition is not at present in its place in the Sicilian Synagogue at Rome. 142. Cf. Baer-Strack, Addenda p. 84; L: מְשַׁמֵּש.

143. Also L writes here Ḥāṭeph Pathāh under theSkin.

144. Is. xxvi, 26.

145. II Kings ix, 17. Also L.

146. ib. xix, 16. Also L.
be hoped that among the Genizah Fragments, which include liturgical poems, material will come to light which will also clarify the problem connected with the attempt to identify the Paisyan Phineas with the Massorete R. Phineas, Head of the Academy. It is worth noting that the Paisyan Phineas signed one of his poems: סֵפֶר כַּלְכֵלִים וְיוֹנֶר פּוֹתִיקָה קֶדֶרָה. According to ancient sources, קֶדֶרָה is a suburb of Tiberias: רָאָתָה קֶדֶרָה בְּבֵיתוֹ הַנֶּפֶשׁ דַּוְּרֵיהֶם אָבְרָהָם הָאֲבָרָם (P.T. Meg. 1a)147, “R. Johanan read it in the synagogue of Kefra, and said, this is an integral part of Old Tiberias”.

14. We shall end the comparison with the material published by Baer-Strack with §34. This paragraph is somewhat unusual in that it does not include material in verse form, and there is a suspicion that the words הוא המָחָר חֵרֶב סְלָלָה and משנתינו, which were added to the expression חֵרֶב סְלָלָה in order to make them agree with the usual rhymes in the collection, are not taken from ancient sources148; in any event, they are missing in L. In addition, also the form of the quotations does not agree with the custom of this collection, in that it first introduces the principal word and only afterwards the rest of the verse.

Were we to believe the colophon of MS T 17, according to which this paragraph is taken from a MS sold by “Nehemiah ben Asher the Old and Great Teacher”, this paragraph would be very important. It is, however, advisable to leave this problem alone, for it seems that Firkovich’s hand was in this.

This paragraph caused much confusion when it was attached to L, since the material described in it was in complete contradiction to the text of the MS, which was not at all pointed according to this rule. It seems that the revisor found no other solution but to point the beginning of the paragraph according to the habits of L, i.e.: המָחָר חֵרֶב סְלָלָה המָקַסְמָה המֶלַׁקֵת, והַתֵּבַעְתָּה, המַרְעָה. המַכְּשָׁר, והַעֲבָדָתָה, and always placing a Shewa under the Mem, without considering that in this case there would have been no reason for enumerating instances of something which was in no way unusual. There is no doubt that this paragraph contains material which sums up the laws of A, and that it belongs to the massoretic literature directly connected with this MS and should not have been attached to L. However, once it does appear there, the corrector should have corrected the whole MS according to it, so as to make it agree with this paragraph and with the true Tiberian punctuation, instead of spoiling the pointing of the above paragraph. We have not so far come across fragments similar to this paragraph in the Mm in A. It may of

148. According to the editors, it also occurs in T 17. We have not been able to check this.
course be that the lost parts contained such parallels; but the text itself enables us to prove that this paragraph contains valuable material.

We may assume that this paragraph formed part of a work which summed up also other rules connected with A, perhaps a treatise dealing with the subject of the Ga'ya. It is interesting that our MS — in so far as they are not missing — supplies the exceptions as noted here, along with I.149 — where they are not exceptions, but necessary on account of its basic principles —, though most of the places enumerated at the beginning of the paragraph appear in this form in A. In this connection we supply two lists, the first of which will enable us to see that A is pointed according to the principle of this paragraph in the examples listed there and similar ones. The second list endeavours to exemplify that this phenomenon is not necessarily connected with the letter Mem, for also other letters take Ḥateph-Pathaḥ instead of Shewa when they are preceded by the interrogative particle or the definite article with Ga'ya. We do not list here any exceptions, nor examples which appeared already in Isaiah ch. i.

List 1: חָלָה (Josh. vi,13); חָלָה (Jer. xi,21); חָלָה (I Sam. xxv,26); חָלָה (I Sam. iv,17); חָלָה (II Sam. xiv,10); חָלָה (II Chr. xxxiii,18); חָלָה (Job iii,11); חָלָה (II Sam. x,3; I Chr. ix,3); חָלָה (Am. ii,13); חָלָה (Ps. cxliv,1); חָלָה (II Sam. xix,6); חָלָה (II Kings iii,15); חָלָה (Am. vi,3); חָלָה (Ezek. xlvi,11); חָלָה (Ps. civ,10); חָלָה (II Chr. xxxi,31); חָלָה (Josh. vi,23); חָלָה (Jud. ix,13); חָלָה (II Kings xii,12); חָלָה (I Kings vi,32); חָלָה (Jer. xii,8); חָלָה (I Kings xx,20); חָלָה (Jer. xi,15); חָלָה (II Sam. xx,12.13); חָלָה (Dx. xxix,7; Josh. i,12; iv,12; xii,6; xiii,7; xxvii,21; I Kings x,33; I Chr. xxvi,32; xxvii,21).

List 2: חָלָה (Jer. xxxiii,10; Ezek. xxxvi,35); חָלָה (I Sam. xviii,23); חָלָה (Job xl,31); חָלָה (ib. xxxviii,31); חָלָה (ib. ib. 35); חָלָה (Jer. xiv,9).

These examples lead to the following conclusions: The author of the Mem of A had before him collections of similar content to the paragraphs in DHT in Hebrew and Aramaic, but they were not identical with the text of DHT. The stylistic connection between the material of A and DHT which can be established here and there, can be explained by the fact that the author of

149. Except for II Chr. xxxiii,18: see DHT p. 33, note 2.
150. Such a quotation appears on the margin of B in connection with Ex. iii,18: see DHT p. 33, note 2.
these verses, besides the text of A or its parallel, also knew the notes which appear in the Mm of this MS and was influenced by them.

Aaron ben Moses ben Asher was not the author of these verses, for in that case it cannot be explained why these verses never appear in A; such restraint on the part of the author cannot be assumed in spite of the limited space at his disposal, for at times we find quite large fragments inserted in his Mm, and in another ancient MS a short paragraph from DHT is quoted.150

There were other compositions besides the verses of DHT which sought to sum up the rules of the Tiberian punctuators. §34 without the addition חוכמ אחרון ממקסימוס may represent such a fragment. When the copyist of L attached the verses and other paragraphs to his MS, he was not aware that he was using alien material which could not serve as a commentary on his text. It is almost certain that he tried at times, while correcting the MS, to make the text agree with these rules, just as he had tried to do with the divergencies of BA and BN.

The difference between these two types of adaptation is that with regard to the divergencies, we possess no proof that he had a properly drawn-up list or a complete work at his disposal. The attempts at adaptation were apparently made with the aid of a Bible MS, while in our case the corrector of L was faced with a twofold problem, since beside the MS Vorlage from which his MS had to be corrected, he was obliged to consider also the theoretical material which he had added at the end of his MS, on the completely mistaken notion that L agreed with A. It was impossible to carry out such complete adaptation, as this meant the alteration of too many passages. Had he known before what difficulties he was creating for himself by the addition, he would, no doubt, have thought better of it, like Jacob ben Hayyim at the beginning of the fifteenth century, who decided to do without DHT — which had already been set up for his edition — and instead printed the דרכי הנקרא והשמורים by Moses the Punctuator151, which is based on a MS of that period.

IV. ORIENTAL AND OCCIDENTAL READINGS

The third group of material which distinguishes between two types of Bible MSS are the divergencies between Or. and Occ., i.e. between the MSS current in Palestine and those current in Babylonia. Such a collection was allotted space also at the end of L. A check of notes of this type which appear on the margin of L proves that this list is not a summary of the notes of that same MS, but was taken from a different source and was drawn up by way of comparison between a certain MS and another MS that was considered its opposite in

151. Published with additions by the present author, Ha-Sofeh le-Hokhmah Yisrael' 1929, pp. 267-344.
this respect. In vain one looks in the list for the following notes on the margin:

Ps. xxvi,6: אַחַרְךָ יִסְתַּכְּלִי הָעָם, הָיוּ מִלְיָלָה, הַיָּמָה לְעָמָרָה.
ib. 1,12: אָמְרוּ פִּילֶלֶל מַעְטָרָה.
Pr. xi,5: מִלְיָלָה בֵּית אֵלְבֹּרְאַה.
Ruth iv,17: עוֹלָי בֶּן לְעָמָרָה.
Dan. iii,29: נַגְּתָה פָּלַט לְמֵאת.
ib. ix,9: לַמַּעְטָרָה חַלָּדוּ בַּיָּהוּ מֵא.
ib. xi,30: קְרַשָּׁה פָּלַט לְמֵאת.
I Chr. xxix,21: מַעְטָרָה מַעְטָרָה.
ib. v,27: מַעְטָרָה מַעְטָרָה.
As against this, the margin also has the notes mentioned in the list:
Ruth iii,9: רֵעֵד פָּלַט לְעָמָרָה.
Dan. ix,7: קִרְמָה לַפַּדֵּנְךָ חָוָה.

The large majority of the 249 examples, all belonging to the Prophets and the Hagiographa, fits the text of L, and in only 36 cases the text of L has the Or. reading. We have to consider a number of corrections carried out when the text of the MS was made to agree with the list attached to it. This number also proves that such lists were attached to MSS without paying due consideration to their contents. No such list is attached to A and no such notes appear on its margin. Yet it should be noted that in most places those readings are preserved which in the list of L are mentioned as Occ., and also those opposed to the list are generally common to L and A. It is interesting that many places in A are corrected so as to agree with the readings of Occ. We shall here mention only a few: Is. xxvii,6; הַיָּמָה יִסְתַּכְּלִי הָעָם; ib. lix,4; in יְרוּם הָיָה הָאָדָם; the Yod was added ib. lxii,2 (dito. Jer. xxiii,25); יִסְתַּכְּלִי was corrected to יִסְתַּכְּלִי הָעָם in Jer. ix,23 (משה); in II Chr. iv,1 (משה), the Waw and the He at the beginning of the word are erased in order to obliterate the Or. reading. 156

No far-reaching conclusions are to be drawn from either the corrections or the places which remained uncorrected and preserved the readings of Or. according to the list of L, since Bible MSS are not fixed from this point of

152. Cant. iii,2. מְסָרֶה לַכֶּנֶּשׁ לֹא יָסֵר עֲלֵיהּ. הַיָּמָה יִסְתַּכְּלִי הָעָם.
154. The writer of this note apparently does not consider that also I Chr. ii,17 has plene writing in L and A.
155. A really has: יִסְתַּכְּלִי, but L יִסְתַּכְּלִי.
156. It cannot, of course, be established who made these alterations. They may be of a late date.
view. Thus, according to the list in L, Occ. read ⲫⲧⲧ ⲧⲧ ⲧⲧ ⲧⲧ in I Kings xvii,4 and Or. read ⲧⲧ ⲧⲧ, though both A and L write ⲧⲧ, i.e. according to Or. As against this, Ginsburg has the note: ⲧⲧ ⲧⲧ ⲧⲧ ⲧⲧ ⲧⲧ ⲧⲧ. Also other examples which were not made to agree with Occ. according to L agree with other lists and notes; among these are the readings of those two types. It should be pointed out that also MSS pointed according to the Babylonian supralinear punctuation do not always agree with the Or. readings. We must realize that we have no authoritative list of Occ. and Or. readings comparable with the List of Divergencies discovered in Kitāb al-Khilaf by Meshael ben Uzziel. Moreover, it would be wrong to think that Occ. systematically disqualified all the readings of Or., on the contrary, they tried to learn from each other. A represents an example of such cooperation.

Kahle,157, relying on the researches of N. Shapira, former lecturer at the University of Kovno, on the Babylonian Massorah, concluded that Aaron ben Moses ben Asher was the first who introduced Or. material into the Palestinian Massorah. I have no access to this study and am not sure that it appeared in print. In any case, if this hypothesis is based on authoritative material, A can also serve as a support for it, since we frequently find words in the Mm of A pointed according to the Babylonian system; there are also instances where a series of words in the Mm is pointed according to a mixed system, partly supralinear and partly Tiberian.

One may find Babylonian influence in those places where A has Ḥāṭeph-Hireq, e.g.: Josh. ix,12: לֹּ֑כֶת; I Kings xvii,11: לֹ֝֗כֶת; Ps. xlv,11: לֹ֖כֶת; lii,2: לֹ֖כֶת; ib. lxiii,1: לֹ֖כֶת; ib. lxxviii,5: לֹ֖כֶת; and perhaps Pr. iv,4: לֹ֖כֶת; ib. xxxi,4: לֹ֖כֶת; Job xv,16: דֹ֣עַב כָּ֔לָּת; The question, of course, arises why not also the Ḥāṭeph-Sere appears since it, too, forms part of the Complicated Babylonian system. The expression Ḥireq-Ḥāṭeph we meet with in Horayath ha-Qore (Manuel du Lecteur, ed. Délenbourg, p. 369):

In the section on the Sheva in DHT (§ 11, text A at end) three of these

(= Opera Minora p. 70–5).
158. Nu. xxii,34.
159. Ex. xi,15.
examples appear together\textsuperscript{160}: might there not be a connection between this phenomenon and this text? In addition, it is interesting to note that also A several times has לְשׁ嗎 instead of לְשׁן (לְשׁון), as in B\textsuperscript{161}; this, too, is Babylonian influence. A comparison of the relevant material in the Sassoon MS 507, which contains Babylonian elements in its Massorah, will help us no doubt to solve this problem\textsuperscript{162}. It is also worth mentioning that in Tiberias we hear of both a Palestinian and a Babylonian congregation in the middle of the eleventh century\textsuperscript{163}; almost certainly Tiberias also had congregations of Babylonian Jews before that period, who kept to their own holy scrolls, and the Tiberian punctuators used these for the purpose of comparison.

In spite of the Babylonian connections reflected in these phenomena, it can be established that A is undoubtedly a Palestinian product.\textsuperscript{164} The use of Ḥaṭeph-Pathaḥ instead of Sheva again leads us to Palestine, for in the Palestinian punctuation many places are pointed with Pathaḥ instead of Sheva\textsuperscript{165}. Similarly, Palestinian origin is shown by the fact that in Aramaic texts in Mp and Mm, the copyist preferred to use He instead of Aleph at the end of words\textsuperscript{166}.

V. THE MASSORAH PARVA OF A

Before we compare the Mp of the two MSS, we shall deal with the text itself, and more generally with its punctuation. On consulting the appended facsimiles, it is obvious that the text has been corrected in a number of places. In the preceding paragraph we saw a number of corrections aimed at removing from the text traces of the Or. version. Another reason for correcting was for the authentication of the massoretic notes. Assuming that Solomon ben Buyā̀r copied the text which was subsequently pointed by Aaron ben Asher, one must suppose that also the copyist himself went over the text and compared it not only with his Vorlage but also with other texts, and that he corrected some places. It is all the more likely that the person who added the punctuation and the Massorah was obliged to correct and emend a number of places in order to make it agree with the text which served him as a model from the massoretic

---

160. יָשֶׁנ (I Kings xvii,11); יָשֶׁנ (Ps. liii,2).
162. We must, however, take into consideration that this MS, in spite of its relative antiquity, does not belong to the group of BA MSS.
166. Cf. my article in the Jubilee Volume in honour of Alexander Marx, New York 5710, "שֵׁיָר וְזִדְתֵּם מְסֶכֶלָם סְפִּימוּ הַר יְהוּדָּא, Hebrew Section, p. 238."
point of view, e.g. Dt. xxvii,20 [א] he erased the \textit{Waw}, in spite of the fact that logically there ought to be a \textit{Waw} Conjunctive \textsuperscript{167}, because the tradition in his circles wrote without \textit{Waw}; ib. xxxii,15 וֹזְרֵם, he was obliged to erase the \textit{Waw} on account of the Massorah connected with this word, \textit{נֶס}. Ib. xxxiii,6 וֹצֶרֶם, \textit{Waw} is erased because of the note \textit{לִלּוֹה חָכָם}; II Sam. xii,31, it was almost certainly בַּמַּלּוּךְ as it ought to be, but is corrected to בָּמַלּוּךְ so as not to contradict the Massorah, which reads בָּמַלּוּךְ as Qere against the Kethib, which is Bmallukh \textsuperscript{168}; the same applies to ib. xix,32: וֹזְרֵם יְרֵדֵר. Unique in its kind is the 'correction' which appears on the photograph, published by Wickes, in the margin: רִישֶׁת (Gen. xxvii,24) which was corrected for fear lest the body of the text be illegible.\textsuperscript{169}

This is not the place to deal with the differences in text and punctuation between A and L, since these do not contribute much towards solving the problems which occupy us, yet we may mention a few of them to strengthen the view that the two MSS do not share a common basis in all details, in spite of the fact that both belong to the same textual type: II Sam. vii,22: A ראיב, אָלֶּה יִשְׂרָאֵל; Ezek. xvii, 6: A אַמָּרָא, אֶלֶּה שְׂדָאָר, and so in other places where this word occurs in A.\textsuperscript{170}

Also as concerns punctuation there are minor differences besides the phenomena we have already mentioned as being based on certain rules. There are some which are purely accidental or are connected with rules which are no clear to us, such as הָדְּתָה (I Kings xii,32) as against הָדְּתָה of L: Ezek. xxxii,30 as against מָנָהְרֵם of L or ib. xxiv,17 as against מָנָהְרֵם of L. The last is important as diverging from the trend common to both, of preferring not to make frequent use of Qateph under gutturals (Ezek. xxii,26: יָדְּלָלָה as against יָדְּלָלָה of later MSS).

Among the "defects" of A we must not forget to mention the inconsistency in writing the Mappiq. In some instances it occurs inside the \textit{He}, as is usual, and in others underneath the \textit{He}.

The following comparison of part of Mp of the two MSS provides us with a true picture of A in itself and of its relation to L. In comparing corresponding massoretic notes of the two MSS, we arrive at the same conclusion as regards the difference between them. Notes quoted in a simple form in A are quoted in an inflated form on the margin of L, e.g.

\textsuperscript{167} This is the reading of many Hebrew MSS and of the ancient versions.
\textsuperscript{168} There are MSS which write פַּהֲנוֹ without any note on Kethib and Qere.\textsuperscript{169} It seems almost certain that this is a very late correction.
\textsuperscript{170} The form נַשִּׁיָּה also appears in other Hebrew MSS; cf. the apparatus of Ginsburg and Kennicott.
Sebirin: There are Sebirin common to A and L of apparently ancient origin, e.g.: Josh. i,7 (umnoh - מֹעֶנָה; Jer. xlvi,45 (ayaw - עָיָם); I Chr. iii,19.21 ( ונָבָא - נַבָּא; but on the margin of L appear Sebirin specific to it, e.g.: Job xxxix,25: בְּשַׁעָּה - בְּשַׁעָּה; Pr. xviii,24: יָשָׁבָה יָשָׁבָה אֶשֶׁר - אֶשֶׁר; II Chr. xiii,3: בְּשַׁעָּה מִגְרָבָה - בְּשַׁעָּה מִגְרָבָה). A similar tendency can be established in connection with massorhetic abbreviations. A also uses abbreviations, especially with the series of the nations of Canaan, but L uses these abbreviations to a much larger extent: Josh. iii,10: בְּשַׁעָּה הָאָרֶץ הַדָּעְתָּה אֲשֶׁר - בְּשַׁעָּה הָאָרֶץ הַדָּעְתָּה אֲשֶׁר; both summarize פְּרִי-יִשְׂרָאֵל or in similar mnemonics, but L alone uses this system also in other places, e.g. Josh. xvii,3.

But there is one phenomenon where the author of Mp of A is longwinded and L brief, namely when one word needs to be divided into two words or when two words have to be made into one:

Is. iii,15: (מלכמ) L: המ לבט קיר; א: המ לבט קיר.
ib. xlv,24: (רמ אט) L: המ לבט קיר; א: המ לבט קיר.
Ezek. xxx,17: (רמש בנה) L: המ לבט קיר; א: המ לבט קיר.
Ps. x,10: (הולכשת) L: המ לבט קיר; א: המ לבט קיר.
ib. lv,16: (לשמט) L: המ לבט קיר; א: המ לבט קיר.
I Chr. ix,4: (במות) L: המ לבט קיר; א: המ לבט קיר.
ib. xxvii,12: (לובטש) L: המ לבט קיר; א: המ לבט קיר.

A similar abbreviation, קיר קיר מֶלִין (it should be mentioned that the words קיר קיר מֶלִין are written on the other side of the margin).

II Chr. xxxiv,6 (זרז'ה): L: כְּמֵר הָרָתָן וַאֲשֶׁר - כְּמֵר הָרָתָן וַאֲשֶׁר; א: וַאֲשֶׁר כְּמֵר הָרָתָן קיר קיר מֶלִין.

In many passages A is briefer than L and does not use the term Qere in cases where the special characteristic of the text can be pointed out without it. The following selected examples provide a survey of his method in this field:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נ'מ</td>
<td>נ'מ מְרוֹחֵא</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II Sam. ii,9 (תסרי) L: נ'מ מְרוֹחֵא; A: נ'מ מְרוֹחֵא.
Is. xxi,9 (שכנתים) L: נ'מ מְרוֹחֵא; A: נ'מ מְרוֹחֵא.
I Kings vii,36: (מעヶ月ית) L: מַכְּרָה; A: מַכְּרָה.
Is. xxiii,12: (קהתי) L: מַכְּרָה; A: מַכְּרָה.
There are instances where both MSS do without the term “Qere”, e.g.:

I Chr. xxv,1 (derabad); L & A: יריחו; II Chr. viii,10 (heradiya); L & A: יריחו;
ib. vi,16: (מקא ...מקא); L & A: ב כח; or both use a different alternative:
II Kings xx,12: לברדא; L: יריחו A: ב כח
II Chr. v,2: יריחו; L: מ Brut A: יריחו

It also happens, though rarely, that A uses “Qere” while L prefers not to use this term, e.g.:

Pr. viii,35 (מצא); A: יריחו L: מצא
ib. xxiv,17 (ארבע); A: יריחו L: ארבע

There is generally agreement between these two MSS in notes where a word requires an explanation on account of irregular spelling. At times one MS supplies notes which are not essential or omits places where according to its system unusual phenomena need to be pointed out. In the following instances L is more correct, because it clarifies the obscurity in its note, than A which passes it over in silence:

Pr. xxi,14 (这事); L: ימלצ ל:A: no note;
I Chr. xviii,1 (לשהלא); L: ימלצ ל:A: no note.

But there are instances where it is doubtful whether L is right:

Ezek. xlvii,8 (נוויא; 171 L: יאין א;
Ps. xxxiv,10 (לידר; 172 L: יｖeer א;
Pr. xxiii,6; xxiv,1 (שא); L: יאור A;
II Chr. xi,17 (ראה); L: יראים A, which sees no need to remark upon these forms, seems preferable.

171 Cf. Targum Kimhi: רסמשי יבשומ נלחבר, ורשאו הלחנה פד; יראים.
172 Targ. ניבר - רשם.
Those passages are typical where the Qere of A differs orthographically from L:

II Sam. xviii,12 (אלהי) L: ילוּל ק A: ילוּל ק

There are differences between them which are without doubt due to a different interpretation; e.g.: Job vi,21, A has יָלוּל without remark, while L wrote originally יָלוּל, but erased and corrected it to יָלוּל (giving it as Qere!) basing himself on traditions also appearing in Rashi and Ibn Ezra, who in their commentaries read it as יָלוּל as against the Massorah of the Targum, who translated יָלוּל חָיָם לְאָדָם (אלהי מִלֶּשֶׁת). Of interest, too, are the comments of both based on the Targum, when mentioning a number of places in connection with the meaning of יָלוּל, I Sam. xxviii,16 (אלהי טרף). There is agreement between both when mentioning literae minusculeae and literae suspensae:

Is. xliv,14 (אלהי); Jer. xxxix,13 (כְּבָשָׁה); Pr. xvi,28 (חֲנָנָא). Yet also with common phenomena there is sometimes a difference in details, e.g.: Ps. xxvii,13 (אלהי); A: לְכֹל מִלֶּשֶׁת לְהָעַל חָיָם. That is to say, there is no pointing on the Waw. Similarly Ps. cvii, where there is Nun inversum, beginning in verse 21 in L and continuing until verse 26, while in A the Nuns begin in verse 23 in accordance with the Massorah also quoted in Baer-Strack p. 60 (אלהי נוֹס פּוֹרֵז)

The above examples lead to the following conclusions: The material worked into these two MSS is generally common to both. The simpler forms in most cases prove A to be earlier than L.

VI. THE MASSORAH MAGNA OF A AND THE ALLEGED KARAISM OF THE TIBERIAN PUNCTUATORS.

The chapters reproduced in facsimile in this volume give the reader a general idea of the Massorah Magna of A. This material does not differ from the Mm known to us from other ancient MSS belonging to this type. Whoever attached these notes to the Biblical text had to consider the limited space at his disposal, which made it difficult for him to include much material that reflected his personal opinion. It is clear that besides the elaboration of the Mp, which

173. Cf. above in connection with the diversities between BA and BN.

174. Cf. Micah vi,13 (כְּבָשָׁה) Targum: תָּרְגּוּם Targ.: פְּלָשִׁים הָאָדָם נִשַּׁבָּר; Ps. ix,7 also L contains the note וְלֹא חָיָם לְאָדָם, in spite of the fact that the translation does not confirm this note; cf. Dan. iv,16 (this meaning is not pointed out as it is self-understood; cf. Targum: אֲדַם); cf. Rashi on the above passages, who agrees with Targ.

175. There are indications in A of an attempt to increase the size of certain letters under the influence of the Massorah, without noting the matter on the margin of this MS, e.g. the נ of לְאָדָם (Dt. xxxii,6), and perhaps also Job ix,34 (the נ of אֲדַם).
was one of his aims, he based himself on masoretic literature not connected with any definite passages of the text. He himself had to decide what to insert and what to leave out. We have already seen a whole series of such texts which were inserted in connection with one of the passages connected with these rules.

Here, we are mainly concerned with supplying scholars with passages of the Mm of this MS which might serve them as a guide in dealing with a problem which occupied the scholars of the last century, namely, the position of Karaism. Circles of students of the Massorah existed in Babylonia and in Palestine among both Rabbanites and Karaites. The problem is, which of the two sects preceded the other in this occupation and set the standards which were followed afterwards. Much ink has been spilled in order to clarify this problem, and it is difficult to come to a final decision on this subject. Both sides have been quick to judge on the basis of unconvincing material. The position somewhat resembles that created in connection with the decision on the subject of the reliability of the MSS themselves as regards their Ben Asher origin. On the basis of notes found in secondary sources and isolated phenomena, they tried to arrive at conclusions without going into a detailed study of the subject. We ought to realize that in spite of the abundant material of Bible MSS and masoretic literature, scholars have not so far succeeded in discovering absolute criteria according to which we can classify the masoretic literature. Lack of knowledge of the main differences between the two camps makes it difficult to divide the material. The Rabbanites expressed no doubt concerning the reliability of MSS in possession of and written by the Karaites, and vice versa. Both used common material without any reservations, even though the possibility existed of admitting extraneous elements into the actual text. As far as the text is concerned, we can point out one passage of halakhic importance which occupied the scholars of this subject and the editors of the Bible text from the time of the Tosaphists until the last generations.

In B.T. Sanhedrin 4 b (cf. also Zebahim 38 a; Menahoth 34 b) there is a Baraita in connection with the four sections of the phylacteries for the head, based on the spelling of the word יתפשת:

רדם liar לעמא יא אוא פרדער נא טופסער יתפשת יתפשת יראא אונרבער, דעריר ר
ишכאל רע אוא פרדער נא בךפיך שיאם חא פארןיר נא.

"Everyone admits that the actual written text is authoritative here, for we have learned: le-totaphoth is twice written defective and once plene — that makes four (the plene spelling counts double); this is the opinion of R. Ishmael, but R. Akiba says: the explanation is unnecessary, for in KTPY the word ת"�

176. Of the literature dealing with Karaism, we may mention the comprehensive article by A. Dothan, "סניאט ח"א יב אל הש "סניאט ח"א Sinai 41 (1956–7), pp. 280–312; 350–362.
means “two”, and in Africa the word PT means “two” (thus twice two-four)."

Rashi, who worked on the basis of ancient, traditional exegesis, specified: "In the section of the Shema\textsuperscript{177} and the section Ki y\textit{y}ê\textit{i}‘akh\textit{a}ha\textsuperscript{178} is written without Waw, but in the section \textit{We-hayah im shamo}\textit{a}\textsuperscript{179} is written plene." But the Tosaphists examined these passages and discovered that the exact scrolls have no Waw between the Pe and the Taw in any of these places, and gave different explanations to this passage\textsuperscript{180}. Today we know that the "exact scrolls" are based on the Ben Asher text. Also Maimonides based himself on this text, as was proved in preceding articles in this volume, when he inserted the Ben Asher text in his \textit{Code Hilkh\textit{oth} Tef\textit{illin}} ii, 4-7, deciding that all the three verses must have the spelling \textit{לעמשת} in contrast to the express tradition of the Talmud\textsuperscript{181}. There is here a suspicion that this halakhic ruling is connected with a problem which distinguishes between the Karaites and the Rabbanites: the Karaites did not lay phylacteries, and no doubt their masoretic scholars were interested to choose a text which would not confirm the Talmudic explanation. Yet we may not decide such a complicated matter on the basis of a single suspicious place such as this, for the possibility exists that Rabbanite circles also deviated from the tradition quoted in the B.T. in the name of Rabbi Ishmael, the opponent of Rabbi Akiba. We must wait until we find in Karaite literature a discussion of this problem, and only then can we use this text as decisive proof for the Karaism of the Masoretes who decided on the spelling of this place.

Dr. N. Allony informs me that Karaite exegetes and philologists tried to give the word \textit{Tofepheth} a meaning contrary to the Rabbanite conception, which expressly connects this word with the phylacteries\textsuperscript{187}. In addition to the problems connected with the Halakahh, one needs to take account also of other notes in the Mm, which from a different point of view can serve as evidence on this matter.

Of the passages we bring here, the first one deserves special attention as it relates to a theological problem, while the other examples, though interesting, are neutral.

A. Mm on Job viii,8: \textit{כ שאלתמא לדר רישט אינא קומת במקרא הפילים בלמק ידוהר}

\textsuperscript{177} 177. Dt. vi,8.
\textsuperscript{178} 178. Ex. xiii,15.
\textsuperscript{179} 179. Dt. xi,18; It is interesting to note that Rashi, in his commentary on this verse, does not mention this tradition.
\textsuperscript{180} 180. Cf. Tosaphoth to B.T. Sanhedrin 4b, lemma \textit{לעמשת יבשא שמש}.
\textsuperscript{181} 181. In connection with the chapters written in the phylacteries, the text preserved in the \textit{Code} now serves us as a reminder of A, since Maimonides enumerates there all the defective and plene writings, no doubt on the basis of our MS.
\textsuperscript{182} 182. Cf. S. Pinsker, \textit{סידור רבני}, p. 123.
This defective spelling (of ישן) does not occur again in the Bible. And why? Because the first generation was not crowned with all the precepts of the Law and is much deficient in precepts. Therefore it has a special position in the Bible, for the precepts were only given by our Master Moses.”

One cannot know who was the author of this tradition. It is quite clear, though, that it reflects a view opposed to the Mishnah (Qiddushin iv, 14 end): “Our forefather Abraham observed the entire Law”. The Talmud states (Yoma 28b): “Abraham observed the entire Law, even the law concerning the preparation of meals on a festival for the Sabbath if the latter occurs on the following day”.

It is obvious that such exegesis originated from circles not accustomed to the above Rabbinic concepts. In spite of this, we ought to consider the possibility that contrary views in these matters were also held within Rabbanite circles. Yet, even if we do not countenance such a possibility, we cannot know if an explanation such as the above was not included because the editor of the Massorah did not consider the theological implication of this question, just as Maimonides did not take into account the above—mentioned Baraita when he fixed the Halakhah on the basis of the text of this MS on the subject of the phylacteries and it did not occur to him that such a text could be a Karaite one.

B. Mm on II Chr. xxv, 23:

C. Mm on II Chr. xxxii, 29:

D. Mm. on II Chr. xxxvii, 7:

E. Mm on II Chr. xxxiii, 20:

Additional light will be shed on these explanations based on grammatical or massoretic phenomena which are of intrinsic interest, if we succeed in discover—

183. Cf. Jacob ben Hayyim in his Introduction to the Bible.
185. Josh. xi, 4.
186. Rashi: תבשינא תבשינא; Kimhi: תבשינא תבשינא.
187. I Sam. xxv, 1.
188. I Kings ii, 34.
189. The words אִמָּה—לֶמֶךָ look as though they were added by a later hand.
ing their source or their parallels, A great deal of material is concentrated in connection with Ps. cxix also in A. Below is an example from these which also appears in the printed Mm. This material may help towards arriving at a solution of the problem of the originality of the person who composed the Mm on A; Mm on Ps. cxix.122: 

As regards proof for the Karaism of the punctuators, we ought here to mention a matter which is actually more closely connected with the Mp. A, in contrast to C makes no mention of the eighteen Tiqqune Soferim. Yet, even the absence of these notes, which are not compulsory, is no proof for the Karaism of the punctuator or of the person who attached the massoretic notes, just as the Rabbanism of the Tiberian punctuators cannot be proved from the fact that the copyist of C did use the T.S. extensively, for it cannot be ruled out that they were added when the MS was copied for the second time, as some scholars conjectured when denying the originality of C. Also the fact that the verses of DHT quote expressions which prove that the author of these verses was a Rabbanite190 cannot serve as evidence for the Rabbanism of the Tiberian punctuators. It is, after all, almost certain that Aaron ben Asher was not the author of these verses, but that their author was influenced by him when using a text pointed by him and the massoretic notes which appear on the margin of A. In any event, A may well serve as one of the most important sources for clarifying this problem.

VII. THE RELATIONSHIP OF A TO OTHER ANCIENT MSS

The comparisons have shown that L does not represent the Tiberian system of punctuation in its original form; it does indeed belong to this type, but already its Vorlage deviated from the system represented in the massoretic MSS and literature connected with A. Therefore, in spite of the rather unsuccessful attempts at adaptation, it cannot serve as a substitute for the missing portions of A. Now the problem is how far the other ancient MSS dealt with above can fill this rôle. C is out of the question for a number of reasons: a) Comparisons made so far prove that this MS is closer to the system of BN. b) In the use of Haßeph-Pathaḥ between similar letters, it is far removed from the system of A. In only one field is there considerable closeness between it and A, namely, in the use of Haßeph-Pathaḥ at the beginning of words, as we saw in chapter I. We are not able to explain this strange phenomenon. Quite obviously, Kahle's hypothesis, that in the punctuation of his text Aaron ben

190. Cf. the article by Dothan (note 176 supra), p. 311.
Moses used this MS as a starting-point, is unacceptable. No one comparing this MS with A, without knowing of its colophon, would have thought of such a possibility. The assumption which comes nearest to the truth is that we have here a secondary copy made on the basis of a MS written at the time by Moses ben Asher, but that during the process of copying, fundamental changes in punctuation and accents were made on the basis of considerations unknown to us. A thorough and detailed comparison of A with other MSS might solve this problem.

Also the differences between A and L, in my opinion, did not arise during the lifetime of Aaron ben Moses but later. Thus also in this instance, Kahle's assumption that L represents a later stage in the system of Aaron ben Moses is unacceptable. If this were so, L would be more important than A, for it would represent a later formulation, so-to-say the final formulation of the famous punctuator. There is no basis to this assumption in the light of the comparisons with massoretic literature and the consistency in punctuation.

To the ancient MSS datable in the years 930–1121 (the date of copying, the time of the dedication, a new binding, the time of selling), enumerated by Kahle as being in Leningrad, we have no access, except for L and the number which follows it (no. 8), MS Firkovich B 225. The latter contains fragments (nine leaves from Isaiah, Jeremiah, Amos and Micah) which make it possible to come to some sort of conclusion concerning its character: a) The Sheva after the definite article with a Ga'ya turns into a simple Ḥateph-Pathah under a Mem; נָעְבָד Amos, vi, 3. b) Use of Ḥateph-Pathah under the first of two similar letters (שָׁבַע Jonah ii, 4, 6). c) The tendency to erase the punctuation marks of BN and to make these places agree with the system of BA on the pattern of L (e.g. Amos vii, 11 was corrected from בָּלֽוֹק וְרָשָׁא to לָכַד וְרָשָׁא, and Is. xv, 2 לוֹלָל to לָכַד לוֹלָל; in Jer. xxxiv, 1 the Ga'ya under the Waw Conjunctive was erased in the לָכַד). According to these criteria, this MS is superior to L and C as regards the closeness or the intention to bring it close to the system of BA; it is indeed a pity that only these fragments have remained of it.

The MS closest to A is B, which exhibits all the above criteria and is relatively in closest agreement with the list of Michael ben Uziel. It is the only MS which could possibly serve as a complement to A. Unfortunately, this MS contains only three books of the Pent. (Exodus – Numbers) and the end of Genesis and the beginning of Deuteronomy. We may also accept that a full comparison of these two MSS, A and B, which are closest to each other, will show up some differences between them.

The future aim of scholarship will be to gain access to all the MSS which can serve as a complement or parallel to A and to classify them, and not necessarily only the datable ones. Such a detailed comparison will no doubt supply absolute criteria which will make it possible to recognize those MSS which belong to the two hundred years preceding the time of the last of the punctuators given in the list of the heads of the BA family, as well as the measure of deviation, the nature of the changes and also the reason for them in the centuries following the earlier process.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

Comparison with the massoretic literature and MSS close to A as regards the time of their copying and their character have supplied us with sufficient data to establish even now that A is the earliest amongst these MSS and that it shows the maximum concentration of Tiberian criteria. Even its Mm and Mp show no influences indicating a later period, such as mention of punctuators' names or quotations of complete or partial lists.

In spite of this, a precise and thorough examination of all the phenomena peculiar to it needs to be undertaken, including the laws of Ga'ya, Metheg, and its specific use of accents. These examinations might result in slight changes also in the general estimate of the MS. In my opinion they will not lead to results which would necessitate any great change in our basic conclusions. We still have much to learn from this MS and need to follow up the exceptions which occur in it in spite of the comparative consistency which characterizes it as against other MSS known to us. There were almost certainly other MSS which resembled A, and it is not impossible that one day a MS will come to light which has preserved the system of Tiberian punctuation for us in a perfect state. For the present, this MS is superior to all the MSS which we have mentioned.

This superiority cannot yet serve as complete evidence that this MS was in fact written by Aaron ben Moses ben Asher. It might be the work of an earlier punctuator or an exact copy made on the basis of his model MS. However, the allusion found just in a MS as much deviating from it as L, and the introduction of Michael's work, which expressly mention the name Aaron ben Moses, can convince us that when B or Maimonides mention simply Ben Asher, or when a note which was attached to A mentions Aaron ben Asher, this refers to the last of the family of Tiberian punctuators, Aaron ben Moses ben Asher, for the tradition they had was based on authentic information.
SUPPLEMENT
THE MASSORAH OF DEUT. xxviii, 19 — xxxiv

Introduction

The material in this article is divided into groups according to the following types: items peculiar to A, items peculiar to L; and items common to A and L. In the list of Mp common to A and L, we have only given those items which differ in content or style, as well as those which contain additions as regards the parallel Massorah, so as not to exceed the space at our disposal. This reason, too, obliged us to keep the notes short and relatively few in number. In the Mm we have marked the references of the verses with round brackets. An empty bracket refers to the passage commented on. In Mp we marked with one asterisk those notes detailed in Mm of A, and with two asterisks those which are only detailed in Mm to L. These asterisks do not, of course, point out all the material of Mm, since we did not include in the common list of Mm those notes which are identical in the two MSS.

The results of these comparisons complete the picture provided by the general comparison of the Massorah in these two MSS. Both as regards the number of notes and their precision, A is superior to L. The last list of Mp, in particular, shows us once again that A is earlier than L. L tends to give many additions, in the nature of explanations to the notes of Mp, while in a considerable part of instances where A adds to the material found in L, one must suspect that they are due to a later hand. Even amongst the notes not thus enlarged, there are some which are not the work of the Massorete of A, and it may be assumed that material was also later added to L, for as later users of L compared and tried to correct the text and punctuation on the basis of comparison with parallel material, they also compared the masoretic notes with other sources and did not hesitate to correct and add new material; they did not even encounter technical difficulties in this process.

Below are a number of examples of later additions to A: (the assumed additions are enclosed in slanting strokes).

Dr. xxviii, 41: 'בְּמִצְיָר יָא כְּי מִצְיָר; וּבָשַׁם' is written on the other side of the column.

65:

69: מַלּוֹן יִלְּקָר וְשָׁמַשׁ

xxix, 16: הֲלָה הַשּׁטִּים וְלֹא הֲלָה הַשּׁטִּים דְּבָלוּם

xxxii, 3: הֲדֹרַת כְּדַרְשֵׁי הוֹרָהוֹן אֲרוּכִי

18: יָאָבָר מֶלֶךְ הָיִישׁ בְּשַׁי

24: אָמַר יָאָבָר מֶלֶךְ הָיִישׁ בְּשַׁי

xxxii, 8: אָמַר יָאָבָר מֶלֶךְ הָיִישׁ בְּשַׁי

51: אָמַר יָאָבָר מֶלֶךְ הָיִישׁ בְּשַׁי
We still have to mention that we do not emulate those scholars who try to explain all the massoretic phenomena on the basis of the text known to us, for part of the Massoreth which appear in ancient MSS are based on MSS unknown to us, and no suitable explanation can be supplied on the basis of the MSS in which they appear. No doubt, the Massorete of A also took over material from his predecessors and did not adapt it completely to his MS. Moreover, we must not forget that early Massoretes sometimes pointed out parallel phenomena from a different aspect than the accepted one.

We have tried to restore the text of Mp to L according to the photograph available to us, without pointing out the deficiencies of the printed edition (BH3).

For obvious typographical reasons we give all the Bible references in Hebrew. The first Hebrew number denotes the chapter, the second the verse. The following are the abbreviations for names of Biblical books, etc., which appear in the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>שֵׁי</td>
<td>Esther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְמ</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>גֵּפ</td>
<td>Genesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דְּנ</td>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יֶדְרִי</td>
<td>I Chron.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יֶדְרִי</td>
<td>II Chron.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דְּר</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וֹש</td>
<td>Hosea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לֵו</td>
<td>Leviticus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>זְחֵר</td>
<td>Zechariah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חָבָד</td>
<td>Habakkuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יֵש</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יֵז</td>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יֵר</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יֵז</td>
<td>Isaiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יֵז</td>
<td>II Kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הֲח</td>
<td>Proverbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יֶנ</td>
<td>Nehemiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יֶז</td>
<td>Zephaniah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ה</td>
<td>Koheleth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ל</td>
<td>I Samuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ל</td>
<td>II Samuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ו</td>
<td>Canticles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ל</td>
<td>Judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ל</td>
<td>Exodus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>י</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ב</td>
<td>Psalms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. MASSORAH MAGNA

I. Peculiar to A

This note also appears in the parallel passage in II Chr.

1. With two meanings:
2. Cf. the parallel note in Jer. xxvi, 7: 31 (qui, qui)
3. Is. iii, 21 (qui) is not being considered, on account of the Qames under the Aleph.
It combines two similar grammatical forms: perfect and present participle.

Instead of the characterizing word in the verse, the note mentions the name of the man to whom the word refers. Joshua is also mentioned in the verse.

Job ii, 11 has הָיָה; Job xlii, 11 has the expression הָיָה לְךָ; the passages have apparently been confused; Midrashic L., vii, 6 and Job xlii, 11 has preserved the correct Massorah and does not mention the verb הָיָה.

The word הָיָה looks like the addition of a later hand.

Two closely related forms: הָיָה — הָיָה.

It seems to me that at the beginning of the paragraph the Hebrew form has remained as against the other parts of the paragraphs, which are in Aramaic.

Note: אֲליָה יִשְׁרֵאֵל, the Q is replaced by אֲליָה, the Q is read 'א. The common factor is here the general pattern; hence only Q is quoted.
2. Peculiar to L

Since the Massorah is not connected with this word, the scribe does not trouble to supply the Q.

From the photograph it cannot be seen clearly whether it is נ or נ but parallel passages in Mp to L have: נ.

In the text of L: מֵלֶטָה with He.

In Mp to A and also in the two parallel passages (Ex. vii, 27; Nu. xx, 16), L has:

The text of L reads: מֵלֶטָה but many Hebrew MSS read בְּנֵי.

Our texts: מֵלֶטָה.
THE ALEPPO CODEX AND THE BEN ASHER TRADITION

30. *Mp to L to Ex. xxii, 8: *'א המת נזקק הוא "word".
31. נבר here is "word".
32. *Mp to L to Ex. xxii, 25. TO: *"ז: המות הוא מושט ומושט
33. מתיWARD. "מחייה".
34. מתיWARD. "מחייה".
35. The parallel passages in L, except for our verse and Ps. xxiv, 9, which has no note, have: 'י
36. To differentiate from verse 27 of this chapter: שיום לא שלום שמחה.
It combines two similar grammatical forms: 2nd person m. and 3rd person f.

38. Combines ב with בּוּרָא.

39. The beginning of this Massorah was apparently לֵשׁ בּוּרָא, corrupted to לֵשׁ בּוּרָא; there are differences of opinion as regards the number of verses connected with this Massorah; cf. Frendt, Massorah Magna, p. 225, note 6; Ginsburg, The Massorah, p. 1422.

40. Part of this verse is quoted in an incorrect place above.

41. L has no plene writing here; as against this there does not appear in this Massorah Is. lix, 3: זְמָיָא תַּפַּסְי יָאָרָה.
3. Common to A45\* and L

ככ, ככ יכ אי רפא首饰 (תהלת, ה, ל) ויה ויה首饰 ויה ויה

מַהְרָבָּה (וֹדָה, בֹּרֵט, בֹּרֵט, בֹּרֵט) וֹדָה (וֹדָה, בֹּרֵט, בֹּרֵט, בֹּרֵט)

סְלָמָה (סְלָמָה, בֹּרֵט, בֹּרֵט, בֹּרֵט, בֹּרֵט) וֹדָה

ככ, ככ יכ אי רפא首饰 (תהלת, ה, ל) ויה ויה首饰 ויה ויה

אֵּשָּׁר שֵׁיָּר (וֹדָה, בֹּרֵט, בֹּרֵט, בֹּרֵט, בֹּרֵט)

ככ, ככ יכ אי רפא首饰 (תהלת, ה, ל) ויה ויה首饰 ויה ויה

שָׁמָע (שָׁמָע, בֹּרֵט, בֹּרֵט, בֹּרֵט, בֹּרֵט) וֹדָה

42. The photograph in the possession of the National and University Library, as well as the photograph which was recently received by the Institute for Hebrew Manuscripts of the Ministry of Education and Culture, are not clear in this place; cf Mp to L on this verse an the parallel passages (Gen. xlvii, 24; Lev. xxvi, 16; II Kings viii, 6): 11; as בּ for two parallel passages (Pr. xiv, 4; xvi, 8): יָדָא .

43. It is not clear whether the note of Mrn is connected with this form; in any case, this verse in the parallel passages has no Mp in L in connection with this word.

44. This verse has not been but רְאָבָּה (וֹדָה, בֹּרֵט, בֹּרֵט, בֹּרֵט, בֹּרֵט) יכ אֵּשָּׁר שֵׁיָּר (וֹדָה, בֹּרֵט, בֹּרֵט, בֹּרֵט, בֹּרֵט)

45. Mp to L רְאָבָּה (corrected in Blf).

45a. The text here is given on the basis of A, and we do not point out the differences in L in connection with the quotation of verses.

46. The text of this Massorah in L confuses material connected with two words: שֵׁיָּר and יכ אֵּשָּׁר.
לא, בלשון לם (ות). ב: (ד) (ו) (ז) (ח) (ט)

This Massorah was copied twice in L on one page.

This text confirms the assumption in Minhath Shai that Ps. xi, 17 does not belong to this list, even though there are Hebrew MSS which read also here ימיהו вместо ימיהו, accepted and verified by A and L.

Included in this paragraph are those cases which are pointed with Qames and with Zaqep Qatan (נ without טפ), Segolta and Rebia', as well as with Athnahia and Soph Pasuo, and on the contrary, when there is Athnahia and Soph Pasuo Qames is not used instead of Segol.

ל: ב but also there in Mp: ב.
B. MASSORA PARVA

I. Peculiar to A

51. Ezek. xxii, 5.
52. Two additional passages come into consideration where the verb הָלַךְ is connected with בָּשָׂר (I Sam. xxv, 17; Esther vii, 7).
53. Ps. xxvi, 9.
54. Cf. in the list ofMp peculiar to L (Dt. xxxii, 10); there are differences in number; in the place quoted is written בָּשָׂר, Eccl. iv, 8: קַיֶּהְדָּו בָּשָׂר, may perhaps be, considered.
55. There are no such four places; perhaps he also considers Ex. xiii, 11 (כָּשָׂר כָּשַׂר לָיָךְ); Dt. xiii, 18; xix, 8:
Perhaps he considers Nu. xiv, 11 (וְאָדוֹן) on account of the final parts of these forms.

56. Dt. v, 10: אָדוֹן is also considered.

57. Ps. cxvii, 4. 13. 17 is possible; though with these there are four.

58. II Chr. xxxiii, 10.
2. Peculiar to L

60. Hataph—Shewa.
61. Combines two similar grammatical forms: 2nd person m. and 3rd person f.
63. Corrected in the apparatus of BH to יִ.
63a. This Massorah is also mentioned in A to Dt. xxviii, 51.
64. Considers Gen. xlvii, 29 (ט创意) I Kings ii, 1 (ע创意).
65. Cf. note 54.
66. Lam. iv, 9.
3. Common to A and L

Key:
The text in brackets is that of L

+ Additional words in L

— Absent in L

= L has the same text, except for the words quoted

67. II Kings ix, 20.
68. Cf. note 26; perhaps on account of the final part of this form in Nu, xx. 16, it was not
considered, therefore here ā.
69. Cf. in the list of Mn peculiar to A (xvii, 57).
70. In parallel passages also L reads: ִּשׂ or ֵשׂ (Dt. xxvii, 24).
71. L also considers Is. lxvi, 14: מָשִׁיחַ; cf. the list of Mm peculiar to L (xxx, 9).
72. Ps. lxiv, 1.
73. II Chr. xxxiii, 12.
74. It is not clear whether a note in A also belongs to this word.
75. Gen. xxxi, 16.
76. Jer. xxxviii, 17.
77. There are only two such forms (Dt. iv, 26); corrected in the apparatus of BH to בְּוָא.
78. L also considers Job v, 21; xi, 15 (קרבה ליה; ṭם; in two parallel passages (Ezek. iii, 9 and Pr. xxxi, 21) L: יָשָׁב לְבַשֵׁשׁ; בְּוָא; Job xi, 15: בְּוָא.
79. Some Massoroth read: בֵּן (Gen. xli, 15) or בֵּן in the rest of the passages, except for Ps. liv, 2 which has no note.
80. L only considers the the expression בָּא לְבַשֵׁשׁ.
81. Is. xxx, 23.
82. A also considers Ruth i, 9: מַשָּׁה. Cf. list of Mm peculiar to A (xxxi, 21).
83. Hab. ii, 18:
There is no unity in L from this aspect; parallel passages sometimes mark also שארות הנק_{א}, and at other times make no remark whatsoever.

85. Ps. xli, 4.
86. L also considers Is. lx, 16; Pr. xxvii, 27: שחר; while Is. lx, 16 has: הב, that is to say, הב appears twice.

87. Ps. xxvii, 3.
88. Is. xxviii, 2.
89. A also considers Job xxxi, 11. therefore: הב.
90. Ex. xxi, 22.
91. L perhaps also considers Cant. vii, 8 (מותא).בְּּוַיִּ נְּאָרָךְ, וְיֵשׁ עַל יָדוֹ בַּרְצֹת לְעָשׂוֹ.
92. The note of A is precise; L also considers the forms: הב, הב, הבו, הבוּ, הבוּ, הבוּשׂ.בְּּוַיִּ נְּאָרָךְ, וְיֵשׁ עַל יָדוֹ בַּרְצֹת לְעָשׂו.

92a. L has the sign on הבו.בְּּוַיִּ נְּאָרָךְ, וְיֵשׁ עַל יָדוֹ בַּרְצֹת לְעָשׂו.
מלש ded אזהר יד אשה דרכי דרור (ולדה...דרור).
ב: ססם 'דה (פרשת) (גד).
נא: אוחיתו 'דל תחתנו (הל תחתנו).
ב: אתשה הכף מקהל תחת תחת. מלח '棪 תחת (אשה תחת).
ד: נמרש ג' (ג' בהור).}
"יתורך יב לכל אולף יבין רבא דבוןו 'רובה.
ב: וכלל יב עוג' (ב' ואות יב).  
נ: ה' ואות יב 'שפנ' (ומצ' (ומצ' 197).  
ב: תר' וינק ('Ŵ ואות') 98.
נ: חל' ואות יב ('Ŵ').
ב: כל יב anyone (any) 99.
כ: משים 'Ŵ' (Ŵ).  
ב: כל יב anyone (any) 100.
כ: משים 'Ŵ' (Ŵ).
ב: כל יב anyone (any) 101.
כ: משים 'Ŵ' (Ŵ).  
ב: כל יב anyone (any) 102.
כ: משים 'Ŵ' (Ŵ).
ב: כל יב anyone (any) 103.