A PALESTINIAN FRAGMENT OF HAFTAROHTH
AND OTHER MSS WITH MIXED POINTING

ISRAEL YEIVIN

I

In recent years there have been published two Geniza fragments of the Bible whose importance lies in their Tiberian punctuation superimposed upon an original Palestinian pointing. One was discovered by A. Diez Macho\(^1\) and the second by M. Dietrich.\(^2\) The fragment published here belongs to this type. It is consistently accented and has a few Palestinian punctuation marks scattered throughout it. One of the columns, the second, has pointing and accents in a later hand using the Tiberian system.

This is a fragmentary scroll of haftaroth according to the triennial cycle. The writing, pointing and accents are precise and clear, and it is unfortunate that so little of this beautiful scroll has survived. This fragment belongs to the Cambridge Geniza collection (MS Heb. T.–S. B 17, 25). The author wishes to express his gratitude to the Library Syndicate, University Library, Cambridge, for their gracious consent to the publication and reproduction of the fragment.

---

3. The sign after the n is unclear.
4. " was added above the line.
5. The accent is unclear.
The non-textual aspects of these haftaroth are discussed by Mr. N. Fried elsewhere in the present volume.

The text of our fragment generally agrees with that of BH, with some deviations in the matter of scriptio plena and defectiva. Other noteworthy differences are:

Is. xi, 11 (col. 3): הוהי; BH רצון.
Is. lxiii, 9 (col. 4): אלה אל; BH אל K, ו L Q.
Hos. x, 8 (col. 2): רקד; BH רד.

The last-named variant is the most interesting one. Cases where versions or massoretic schools (particularly Or.) read two words where others read one, are by no means unusual (e.g. Ps. cviii, 4; יִפְתַּח נְבּוֹךְ בַּזֶּר; Ps. xc, 15; יָמִים יִשָּׁרְשָׁר אֵל יִשָּׁרְשָׁר, Is. liv, 9), but division of a word of the type of דִּבְרֵי הָדָרָדָר into two is unique.

The Punctuation. There are only a few pointed words in the fragment. The following is a complete list:

6. Instead of the zaqeph in BH (also in the Tiberian accentuation in this column), this text has a tebir.
7. The qamas above the ה is uncertain. In the Tiberian punctuation of this letter a qamas was perhaps corrected to hireq.
8. A trace of the zaqeph for the word is visible in the next line.
The two Palestinian signs correspond to the Tiberian qamas. The fragment does not differentiate between qamas and patah. This is an indication of early date.

The Accentuation. The text is consistently accented, yet, by chance, it exhibits only the most frequent accents. A number of the more interesting signs are absent, such as zarqa, segol, teiliša, and pazer.

The conjunctive accents do not appear, nor are the ethnah or sillug used, as is the case in many Palestinian texts. These are the symbols which appear in the text: נ = paša, א = zaqeph (sometimes written in the form of a small wedge), א = rebia, א = tebir, and ט = tippeha. All of these are regular forms in the Palestinian system and are described in MdW, II, 43*. It is important to mention that these signs are occasionally made not with dots but with short, thin lines drawn carefully. For instances, see the tebir in נ in col. 1; or the tebir in נ in col. 2. Nevertheless, they are occasionally made with dots (especially in cols. 3, 4), this being the more regular method in Palestinian texts. The accents generally do not indicate the accented syllable and this, too, is an early characteristic. Two of the signs are especially interesting:

/א/ serves as mmenh legarmeh (in Is. lvi, 4 [col. 1]; xi, 11 [col. 3]; and lxiii, 9 [col. 4]) and also as paseq (Is. xi, 11 [col. 3]. Various Palestinian signs which are used to express legarmeh are described in MdW, II, p. 44*, but the sign of this text does not appear among them. In MS Strasbourg 4065, 32—35, published by A. Diez Macho (Sefarad, 17 [1957], pp. 11—17), there is a similar sign to express legarmeh. This sign is also found relatively often in Talmudic texts accented with the Palestinian system.10

The paseq is rare in Palestinian accentuation. It rarely appears in text M in MdW, and when it does, its form is that of a dot placed below and to the left

---

9. The lines in the transcription of the fragment are mostly represented as dots for technical reasons.

10. See the article on this by the present author, Lešonenu, 24 (1960), p. 54.
of the letter (א). It is found once in text K in *MdW*, where it takes the form of a diagonal line below and to the left of the word (see *MdW*, II, Pl. ix, col. 1, the third line from the bottom: יִנְנָי). The signs for *legarmeh* and *paseq* differ from each other in these two texts, but in the *hafsoth* scroll discussed here, they are the same and are also similar to the *paseq-legarmeh* of the Tiberian system.

*ג* (at the beginning of a word) is *gereš* (and *geršayim*). The regular Palestinian sign for *gereš* (see *MdW*, *ibid.*) is a diagonal line or a dot above the letter, either of which is usually placed at the beginning of the word (a characteristic held in common with the present sign). However, the sign, composed of two parallel horizontal lines, used to express *gereš* in our text, is not found elsewhere. It is probable that the Tiberian *geršayim* developed from a similar sign.12

Both of these signs reflect a transitional stage between the Palestinian and Tiberian accentual systems.

II. *Eb* 10

In the above-mentioned article appearing in *Estudios Bíblicos*, 13 (1954), A. Diez Macho finds a continuous Palestinian accentuation and some Palestinian punctuation added by a later hand to a Geniza fragment with Babylonian pointing, JTS MS 504, fol. 2. He describes these in detail (*op. cit.*, pp. 253 ff.). This page is a part of the Babylonian MS which Kahle calls *Eb* 10 in the list of Babylonian MSS in the beginning of BH. Diez Macho mentions (*ibid.*, p. 249, note 2) that he wrote to Kahle on this matter and that the latter checked the pages of MS *Eb* 10 kept at Oxford, but did not find in them any Palestinian signs whatsoever.

*Eb* 10 is one of the finest of the classic Babylonian texts preserved in the Geniza. Twenty-five of its pages are known, twenty-four of which are listed by Kahle (*op. cit.*) and an additional one was found in the “new Geniza” of Cambridge (T.-S., New Series, Box 251, 30 = Box 247, 13; containing Zech. ix, 17—xii, 5). In the course of the research done by the present author into the system of Babylonian pointing, all of the photographs of *Eb* 1013 were checked also for the presence of Palestinian signs. It is clear from this investigation that no Palestinian signs appear on pages 1, 2 (II Sam.; Oxford) or on pages 13—25 (Ezekiel and Minor Prophets; in various libraries, including many Oxford pages

12. *Geršayim* (but not horizontal lines), *at the beginning of a word*, is occasionally found in accentuated Talmudic texts; v. the author’s article mentioned in note 10, pp. 171, 228.
13. The author expresses his gratitude to Prof. P. Kahle for arranging the loan, to the HUBP, of the photographs of the pages of *Eb* 10 from the Antonin collection in Leningrad.
and the two pages of JTS 504, 7, 8, from New York which Diez Macho mentions in connection with his work on page 2 from this New York manuscript). The following is the situation on the intervening pages, 3—12, according to Kahle's list (Pal. = Palestinian symbols; Tib. = Tiberian symbols):

| 3 | Cambridge A 39, 91 | I Kings viii, 23—52 | Pal. |
| 4, 5 | Oxford d. 64, 1—2 | Is. xlviii, 1—li, 14 | No Pal. |
| 6 | Cambridge A 39, 92 | Jer. vi, 11—vii, 18 | Few Tib.; no Pal. |
| 7 | Cambridge A 39, 93 | Jer. xvi, 3—xvii, 13 | Pal. and Some Tib. |
| 8 | Leningrad, Antonin 260 | Jer. xxx, 14—xxxii, 26 | Pal. |
| 9, 10 | Leningrad, Antonin 339 | Jer. xxxv, 11—xxxvii, 15 Pal.; in no. 10 also frequent Tib. |
| 11 | Leningrad, Antonin 816, 1 | Jer. xlii, 20—xliiv, 12 | Pal. |
| 12 | New York, JTS 504 (ENA 2021), 2 (the page published by Diez Macho) | Jer. xlviii, 44—xlix, 30 | Pal. |

Palestinian signs appear, thus, on seven of the pages, and not all of them successive. Especially puzzling is the absence of these signs on page 6, a text from Jeremiah, because they appear on all of the other pages from Jeremiah. However, this phenomenon is quite usual among the Geniza fragments. Indeed, even with the haftarah scroll published here, Tiberian signs are added to only one of the five columns.

Most of the above pages of Eb 10 are not well preserved and the photographs in my possession are not clearly legible, particularly with reference to the legibility of the Palestinian signs. Is is therefore impossible here to deal with the Palestinian signs in full detail. The character of the accentuation and punctuation of these pages is like that of page 12, which has been fully described by Diez Macho.

These pages are consistently accentuated, but Palestinian punctuation appears only rarely, mainly in cases where the Palestinian (and Tiberian) readings differ from the Babylonian (Díez Macho has discussed this). The fact that the Palestinian scribe who pointed the text did not add signs where there is no difference of reading, is evidence that the Babylonian signs were as much a matter of routine for him and for his readers as the Palestinian ones. In addition to this, he generally did not make corrections where only the Babylonian pronunciation (and not the text) differed from the Palestinian, for example with nouns of the pattern מֵאָבֹט (Babylonian מֵאָבֹט). This again shows not only that he could easily read the Babylonian signs, but also that he knew the peculiarities of the Babylonian pronunciation, and ignored them as well-known and accepted and not needing mention or correction on his part.
Variant readings from the MSS with Babylonian pointing, among them Eb 10, are listed in the critical apparatus of BH. In a few cases, the compiler mistook some Palestinian signs for Babylonian and so listed a reading not intended in the manuscript. Some examples of this are:

Jer. xvi, 4: ַָּהֹוּדּ: BH: Eb 10שׁ. A Palestinian paṣa, which resembles a Babylonian sere, appears above the word and has been mistaken for the latter.

ibid.: ַָּהֹוּדּ: BH: Eb 10שׁ. The same error.

There appears to be an error in Jer. xvi, 5: ַָּהֹוּדּ (So in L; BH erroneously with rebi at*). The apparatus states: Eb 10שׁ. It seems to me that the Babylonian sere in combination with the single dot of the Palestinian zageph were mistaken for a Babylonian holam, but the available photograph is not clear and certainty impossible.

Jer. xxxvi, 23: ַָּהֹוּדּ. BH: Eb 10שׁ. The form in the manuscript is ַָּהֹוּדּ; the only Babylonian sign is the hireq above the ש and the Babylonian reading was certainly ַָּהֹוּדּ (the manuscript is not completely pointed). Later, a Palestinian patah was added above the ש, a Palestinian sere above the ר (this the compiler considered to be a Babylonian sere), and a Tiberian zageph gadol above the ב.

I append a list of clear cases of Palestinian punctuation in Eb 10 (all of them from Jeremiah):

xvi, 21: מָנוֹדּ — There is a Palestinian qamas above the ש.

xxxv, 2: מָנוֹדּ — A Palestinian patah was added.

xxxv, 5: מָנוֹדּ — A Palestinian qamas was added in order to correct the Babylonian pronunciation. BH: בָּשׁוֹדּ.

xxxvi, 9: מָנוֹדּ — There was no Babylonian pointing.

xxxvi, 14: מָנוֹדּ — There is a Palestinian dagesh (dehiq).

xxxx, 30: מָנוֹדּ — dto.

xxxx, 30: מָנוֹדּ. BH: Eb 10 שַׁלּוֹדּ. The forms in the manuscript are מָנוֹדּ, with a Palestinian patah above the ב; there is no Babylonian sign (indicating, no doubt, the pronunciation of ב with a šewa) and מָנוֹדּ, with a Palestinian patah added above the ב in order to correct the Babylonian reading which had no vowel above the ב, noted in the apparatus of BH.

xxxx, 32: מָנוֹדּ — A Palestinian patah was added in order to correct the Babylonian qamas. BH: בָּשׁוֹדּ.

xl, 22: מָנוֹדּ — A Babylonian hireq is corrected into a Palestinian patah. BH: בָּשׁוֹדּ.

xliii, 3: מָנוֹדּ — A Palestinian patah was added in order to correct the pronunciation from the Babylonian to the Palestinian (and Tiberian).
The punctuation and accentuation of this manuscript indicate a late phase in the Palestinian system. Three signs show this: a) the accents are added over the accented syllable; b) the patah and qamas are differentiated, as are the segol and šereḥ; c) in places where the vowel corresponds to the Tiberian qamas qatan, the text has a qamas (and not a holam). Nevertheless, Eb 10 well deserves careful study in the original. We have quite a number of MSS exhibiting the connection between the Palestinian and Tiberian systems of vocalization and accentuation, and it is a highly probable assumption that the Tiberian system developed out of the Palestinian one. Eb 10 for the first time provides a starting point for studying the connection (and in particular the temporal relation) between the Palestinian and Babylonian systems. In this lies the chief value of this MS and the great importance of Diez Macho’s discovery.

III. MS P

The Leningrad MS Heb. B 3 (Codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus, ed. by H. Strack, Petropoli 1876) is known to be one of the strangest biblical manuscripts. For so early a Babylonian manuscript, the punctuation and text exhibit perplexing Tiberian characteristics. Tiberian and Babylonian pointing function together in its massorah, apart from other oddities.

In two places in its massorah magna (which is written at the foot of the pages) are punctuation marks in the form of short vertical lines above certain letters. These marks can only be explained as representing the Palestinian qamas.

Fol. 181b, Mm to Hos. v, 11:

יֵלֶךְ הֵרִידֵי מַעַסְסִים וּמַעַסְסָה שָׂרֵי פְּלִיטֵי נַחֲנִי: פָּלָל חַלְנוֹת לַעֲשׂוֹת לְכָלֵּה לְאַרְבָּא לֵיהָ לָרַבָּא לֵיהָ לְכָלֵּה לְכָלֵּה לְכָלֵּה.

Fol. 213a, Mm to Zech. iii, 9:


On the basis of so little material it is difficult to ascertain whether the scribe who inserted this pointing distinguished between qamas and patah, since here he uses the Palestinian sign for qamas in places requiring a Tiberian qamas. A differentiation of this sort would indicate a late phase in Palestinian punctuation.

This punctuation adds to the strangeness of this manuscript. Its importance lies in the fact that this is the first time Palestinian punctuation has been found in a dated manuscript (916 C.E.).