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1. INTRODUCTION*

No reliable reports have been preserved on the personality of Mishael ben Uzziel, the author of Kitâb al-Khilaf, the famous treatise on the hillufim (differences) between the two leading Massoretes: Abu Saʿid, Aaron ben Moshe ben Asher (generally called: Ben Asher); and Abu Imrân, Moshe ben David ben Naphtali (generally called: Ben Naphtali). But from the language of the treatise and from the fact that the author gives thorough consideration to the subdivision of the books of the Bible into sedarim, we can conclude with certainty that he belonged to the Egyptian–Palestinian cultural sphere. We also know that he lived before Joseph ha-Qoṣṭandīnī, the author of the Massoretic compendium Adath Deborim (= Ad.), since a Hebrew translation of Michael's work was taken over by the latter and incorporated in his compendium. On the ground of two letters found in the Geniza, S. Poznanski, and again J. Mann place him in the 12th century. Against this P. Kahle maintains that the Kitâb al-Khilaf must have been finished before 1050. In support of his opinion he quotes a passage of Ad. where a controversy is reported between Jonah Ibn Janāḥ (died 1050) and Moshe Ibn Jiqatilla (died 1080). As the eulogy formula follows after the name of the first and is absent after the name of the second, Kahle concludes that Ad. was composed between 1050 and 1080, and, accordingly, Kitâb al-Khilaf before 1050. The name

* A table of sigla and abbreviations is given on p. 29.
1 These are the full and correct names of the two Massoretes as preserved in our treatise and in the Geniza fragment T–S, K27, 36 in the University Library at Cambridge.
3 The only known copy of Ad. dated 1207 and copied by a certain Yehuda ben Jacob is preserved in the Leningrad Public Library Firk. II, Arab.–Hebr. 161, cp. below, p. 26.
4 ZHB 4 (1900) 186.
5 The Jews in Egypt and in Palestine under the Fatimid Caliphs, 2 (1922) 322.
6 VT 1 (1951) 165; id., Der hebräische Bibeltext seit Fr. Delitzsch (Stuttgart 1961) 15.
7 This conclusion is not very plausable since the lack of the eulogy formula by itself is not sufficient evidence to prove the age of a manuscript.
Mishael ben Uzziel appears also on a colophon of an undated MS of the Pentateuch preserved in the Karaite Synagogue of Cairo. In my opinion, this Mishael most likely is identical with the author of our treatise.

*Kitāb al-Khilaf* is of great importance for the study of the Massoretic text of the Bible and for the classification of the Bible MSS. It is the oldest source preserved that contains the differences of BA and BN throughout the entire Bible. Among the Bible MSS found in the Geniza there are several of the 10th–12th century which occasionally carry marginal notes on the differences between certain Massoretes. The names of BA and BN appear frequently in these notes. But except for *Kitāb al-Khilaf* no complete list has been preserved from this epoch. The numerous lists of *hilufim* which have survived in Bible MSS and in Massoretic codices are of a much later date.

The importance and superiority of *Kitāb al-Khilaf* furthermore is evidenced by the fact that it served as a basis also for the lists of differences which are included in the Massoretic compendium *Miqra'ei ḥanun*[^10], for those in the *Mugaddima* of Samuel ha-Rophe[^11], and for several others.[^12]

Mishael ben Uzziel must have had at his disposal very reliable sources on the readings of BA and BN, since in more than four hundred instances he also lists the cases in which the two agree, obviously against some other Massoretes. In many cases we can identify the opposing Massoretes.[^13] Furthermore

[^8]: Published by R. Gottheil, *JQR* 17 (1905) 632. It reads:

ран имшал бен узвэл бен холл бакех ил ілеш холе шл дрех (לִאֶנְוָר הַבֶּן בּוֹכֵהָי יִדְּרָמְתוּת)

יא על יד מקסיל המחין יאולא בּוֹנָן סעֵל המלך המחין יאולא.

In this colophon, written at the end of the text, Mishael ben Uzziel states that he corrected the codex at the instance of Masliah ha-Kohen ben Sahl. Another colophon of an earlier date on the fly-leaf states that the codex should be kept under the special care of Sahl ben Shlomo. This Sahl ben Shlomo obviously was the father of Masliah ben Sahl mentioned in the first colophon (cp. *Liq. Qadmi*, 106) and probably is identical with Sahl ben Masliah, a younger contemporary of the Karaite Bible exegete Yefet ben 'Ali (died ca. 1004). Accordingly Mishael ben Uzziel, the contemporary of Masliah ben Sahl, lived in the first half of the 11th century in Jerusalem. Hence Kahle's assumption regarding Mishael's time of activity cannot be rejected offhand. However the identity of Sahl ben Shlomo with Sahl ben Masliah has still to be proved.

[^9]: *Cp., e.g.,* Neubauer, *Catalogue II*, 2607; 2624.

[^10]: Published by J. Dérouleng under the title *Manuel du Lecteur*, JA Sér. 6, t. 16 (1870); *Cp. below p. 27*.

[^11]: *Cp. below p. 27*.

[^12]: *E.g.,* to the list in the Massoretic treatise preceding MS. Brit. Mus. Harley 1528, *Cp. below p. 27*; further to D1, 58 and D1, 117 of the T–S Collection in Cambridge, *Cp. below p. 25*.

[^13]: The following examples may suffice here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opponents</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA and BN</td>
<td>p. 6, line 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
he mentions in several places that both Masoretes occasionally established readings in their earlier years which they altered subsequently.\textsuperscript{14}

Although Mishael reports fully on the differences and congruences of BA and BN, he does not mention anywhere whose reading deserves priority. Today we know positively that he was not the first to compile such a list of differences. Already the learned Karaite author Levi ben al-Ḥassan\textsuperscript{15}, who flourished in the first quarter of the 11th century in Jerusalem, had drawn up a list of hillufim. However, only the heading of this list, and part of the colophon have been preserved.\textsuperscript{16} Levi ben al-Ḥassan speaks very highly of both Masoretes (ע CONTRIBUTORS א and their versions of the Bible (תנ đườngים) but neither he drops a hint as to which of the two should be given preference.

At first, apparently only the Masoretic scholars, especially those among the Karaites, took interest in these differences. For some time BA and BN obviously enjoyed equal authority and reputation. Thus, an anonymous author, most probably of the 11th century,\textsuperscript{17} in discussing the controversy between BA and BN on the placing of the dagesh in לדר ב in after the word ירnof concludes: “And the reader should conform to one of these two opinions.”

Another unidentified author of that time,\textsuperscript{18} but beyond all doubt a Karait, deals at some length with our two Masoretes in his commentary on Gen. 49:21 (ככדrito אonents שושה). He states that Jews everywhere adopted the Bible codices of BA and BN, and that Masoretic scholars went from Tiberias to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BA and BN</th>
<th>Opponents</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 38:2</td>
<td>ש אתורד שחרמיה</td>
<td>Liq. Qadm. p. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex. 3:8</td>
<td>יר ליתול</td>
<td>ib.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu. 21:4</td>
<td>מכותה רא בר-destructive</td>
<td>Norzi ad loc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 33:28</td>
<td>יערפורפער</td>
<td>B.M. MS. Or. 4445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam. 22:18</td>
<td>מכותה רא בר-destructive</td>
<td>Norzi ad Nu. 21:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is. 40:18</td>
<td>התוכנה ויהי אנרכיה</td>
<td>B.M. MS. Or. 4445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer. 34:1</td>
<td>יאולית-לפי-אירי</td>
<td>Diq. p. 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cant. 5:13</td>
<td>מקיתו יחנין</td>
<td>Diq. p. 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccl. 3:19</td>
<td>זה הוא זה</td>
<td>p. 27, line 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neh. 12:44</td>
<td>מקצת תפנומית הוראתהとなって</td>
<td>Diq., p. 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{14} Cp., e.g., p. 11, note 6; p. 12, lines 1 ff.; p. 52, line 26.

\textsuperscript{15} He is known as the author of a famous short work (cp. Liq. Qadm. 87 f.). His father, al-Ḥassan ben Ali, is identical with the famous Karaite Bible exegete and Payyotn Yefet b. 'Ali, cp. J. Mann, Texts and Studies in Jewish History and Literature 2 (1935) 31 f.

\textsuperscript{16} Cambridge T-S-K, 36 (cp. plate IV).

\textsuperscript{17} Firk, Ii, Arab.-Hebr. 2390, fol. 17a, cp. below p. 19; Kurt Levy, Zur masoretischen Grammatik, Bonner Orientalische Studien (1936) 40.

\textsuperscript{18} Firk, II, Arab.-Hebr. 4633, cp. Mann, op. cit. 2, 9, 104 f.
Babylon and other countries. These scholars produced many copies of the Bible which they circulated among the people.

But gradually the majority of Hebrew grammarians and scholars gave preference to the readings of BA, as we may conclude from a statement made by Maimonides in his Code.¹⁹ Maimonides accepted as authoritative a copy of the Bible that had been vocalized, collated and provided with Massorah by BA. This is what he writes: "The copy on which we based ourselves in these matters is the one known in Egypt... everybody relied on it, for it was corrected by BA, who worked on it for many years and he corrected it many times." Maimonides made his statement with regard to the marking of the open and closed sections in the Torah. As this did not constitute a matter of dispute between our Massoretes, we should not be surprised that he does not mention the name of BN at all. But, as M.H. Goshen-Gottstein already pointed out, Maimonides' reliance on that MS raised the prestige of BA and not only in matters with which he had been directly concerned.²⁰ Simultaneously, it caused the decline of the BN tradition. As far as we know, David Qimhi (died 1235), the eminent grammarian and Bible exegete, was the first who, in reporting on the differences between the two Massoretes, decided in favour of BA.²¹ Now a widespread demand was felt to get acquainted with the readings of BA and with those of his opponent BN. More than thirty different lists of hillufim originating from the 14th and 15th century are known.²² These lists have a very limited value. They differ from each other substantially, and the later a list the more hillufim it shows.²³ The Bible MSS that contain such lists are not in agreement either with the readings of BA or with those of BN quoted in their attached lists. Any variant in punctuation and accentuation that a MS showed, automatically was ascribed to BN because people were aware only of differences between BA and BN. Even the names of other Massoretic scholars were mostly forgotten. But today we know from Cairo Geniza fragments which are kept in British²⁴ and Russian²⁵ libraries that there lived a considerable number of Massoretes in Tiberias "who held different views on

¹⁹ Hilkhot Sefer Torah VIII, 4.
²⁰ RTBT, 121; id., Textus 1 (1960) 17 f.
²¹ Cp. below p. 10.
²² Cp. H.L. Strack, Prolegomena Critica in Vetus Testamentum Hebr. (1873) 29; Diq. XII, n. 13; Introduction, 270 f; Massorah IV, 412 ff.
²³ E.g. the list attached to MS. Harley 1528 (Brit. Mus.) quotes two hundred and fifteen hillufim for the Pent. against one hundred and seventeen in Michael's treatise.
²⁴ British Mus. MS. Or. 5554 A., fols. 28–29; Bodleian Library MS. Hebr. e. 74, fols. 59–60; cp. J. Mann. The Jews in Egypt and in Palestine under the Fatimid Caliphs I (1920) 55–58; 2 (1922) 43–49.
²⁵ Leningrad, Firk. II, Arab.–Hebr. 145 and 146 (beyond all doubt also from the Geniza)
many things with regard to *qamas* and *pathah* and the two and the three dots (
*sera, segol*) and the *shewa quiescens* and the *shewa mobile*. The roster of these
Massoretes was last published by Kurt Levy26 and thoroughly discussed by
P. Kahle27. Besides Moshe Moţa, who is mentioned also by Mishael, there
are frequently noted in marginal notes of ancient Bible MSS, Pinehas28 the
head of the Yeshiva and R. Ḥabib ben Pipim. There also occur Massoretic
notes that report on differences between the *mahsora rabba* (rubba?)29 and
several Tiberian Massoretes.30 Furthermore we have found reports on *híllufim*
between BA and “others”. Thus, e.g., a marginal note in MS. Or. 4445 (Brit.
Mus.) fol. 40b, records four instances of such a *hílluf*.31 All these instances
and many others on which sundry Massoretes differed, appear in the later
lists as *híllufim* of BA and BN.

Our investigations showed that Mishael’s treatise is positively superior
to all hitherto known lists of *híllufim*. These findings were fully confirmed
by the comparison of Mishael’s statements with the codices linked with the
names of the great Tiberian Massoretes. Since the text of BN was not yet
discovered,32 only those Bible MSS could be compared that are connected
with the BA tradition. Four codices are especially suited for this purpose:

1. The Cairo Codex of the Prophets (= Cod. C) which, according to its
colophon was written in Tiberias in the year 895 by Moshe ben Asher, the father
of BA.

2. The British Museum MS. Or. 4445 (= Cod. B) of the Pentateuch (Gen.
39:20 to Deut. 1:33), undated, and supposedly of the 10th century. The name
of BA is mentioned on its margin.33

3. The Leningrad Codex B 19a (= Cod. L) of the complete Bible. According
to the colophon it was copied by Jacob ben Samuel in Old Cairo, in the year
1008, from several corrected codices which had been prepared by BA.34

27 Mdw 1, 36 ff; *The Cairo Geniza* (1959) 75–78.
28 *Cp. Diq. 14, 84; Liq. Qadm. 30 f; D.S. Loewinger, Textus 1 (1960) 77 ff.; see above
note 13.
29 A model codex already consulted by BN, cf. p. 2.
30 *Cp. Liq. Qadm. 29 ff; Neubauer, Catalogue II, 2755; Leningrad Bible MS. B 19a, ad
Prov. 3:12; Norzi, ad Nu. 21:4; Diq. 84, see above note 13.
31 *Cp. Liq. Qadm. 29 ff; Neubauer, Catalogue II, 2755; Leningrad Bible MS. B 19a, ad
Prov. 3:12; Norzi, ad Nu. 21:4; Diq. 84, see above note 13.
32 On the Pseudo BN–MSS see below p. 7.
33 *Cp. Introduction* 249 f.
34 Harkavy-Strack, Catalog der Kaiserlichen Öffentl. Bibliothek in St. Petersburg, 263–274;
4. The Aleppo Codex of the complete Bible (= Cod. A). According to the colophon (not anymore preserved) it was pointed, and provided with Massorah by BA.\textsuperscript{35}

The comparison of the first three codices mentioned with the readings of BA according to Mishael’s lists led to most remarkable results. It showed that the codices L and B deviated in only four-six per cent of the passages compared from the readings of BA as given by Mishael.

Already H. Yalon\textsuperscript{36} and F. Perez Castro\textsuperscript{37} noticed that the close agreement of Cod. L with Mishael’s list was achieved, to some extent, by erasures, additions and alterations. But this fact diminishes only the trustworthiness of Cod. L and does not curtail in any way the correctness of Mishael’s list. As for Cod. B, I can add that, if we compare also the congruences of the two Massoretic with the readings in this codex, the proportion quoted above has to be slightly modified.\textsuperscript{38}

Cod. C has been kept for many centuries in the old Karaite Synagogue of Cairo. Only in 1926 the first photographic copy of it was made for the Berlin Staatsbibliothek. I had the privilege of studying this copy some years later at the Bonn Oriental Seminar. The comparison of Cod. C with Mishael’s list caused considerable surprise. It showed that it is much closer to BN than to BA. Thus, out of thirty four hifslim in the book of Isaiah, C agrees in twenty three instances with BN. A striking feature of this codex is the frequent placing of ga’ya. In several cases it has the reading of BA where the latter, in opposition to BN, places a ga’ya. In his introduction\textsuperscript{39} Mishael points out as a peculiarity of BN the vocalization of the prefixes ב and ב with hireq followed by quiesscent jod. The words הנושא יד which occur approximately a hundred times in the books of the Prophets always show in Cod. C the vocalization of BN. The same goes for the diverse forms of the verb לכו.\textsuperscript{40} Because of these phenomena several scholars denied the authenticity of Cod. C. While Kahle\textsuperscript{41}, Cassuto\textsuperscript{42} and Goshen-Gottstein\textsuperscript{43} adhere to the tradition that Moshe ben Asher was the

\textsuperscript{35} Cod. A has been identified with the model codex to which Maimonides referred. Cp. Goshen-Gottstein, Tektas 1 (1960) 28–58.


\textsuperscript{37} “Corregido y Correcto” Sefarad 15 (1955) 1–30. When I investigated this MS only a reduced copy of a photograph was at my disposal. I was therefore unable to detect all these alterations.

\textsuperscript{38} In some cases Cod. B follows a deviating version.

\textsuperscript{39} Cp. p. 7; below p. 18.

\textsuperscript{40} Cp. p. 7; below p. 17.

\textsuperscript{41} The Cairo Geniza\textsuperscript{2} (1959) 91–97.


\textsuperscript{43} RTBT, 106 f.
scribe of Cod. C, H. Yalon\textsuperscript{44}, J.L. Teicher\textsuperscript{45} and D.S. Loewinger\textsuperscript{46} doubt its validity. We cannot accept the hypothesis of Kahle\textsuperscript{47} that C represents the kind of text from which BA started. Neither do we admit that BN remained more faithful to the system to which Aaron’s father adhered. Like Ben David\textsuperscript{48} we maintain, on the contrary, that it was BA who was less concerned with systematic perfection but rather loyally followed the tradition he inherited,\textsuperscript{49} while BN aimed at systematization and consistency. It is for this reason that we must doubt the authenticity of Cod. C. As against this, Goshen-Gottstein’s comparison of the whole of Michael’s text with A, yielded only about two per cent of differences.\textsuperscript{50} This indeed is a most remarkable result. The fact that the data given by Michael so overwhelmingly agree with the readings of A, confirms the reliability of his traditions.

The few differences between A and Michael’s \textit{hillel} that there are, in my opinion can be explained by the following two reasons: 1. As we have already shown,\textsuperscript{51} the two Massoretes sometimes established readings which they later altered; 2. It must be borne in mind that we do not possess the original \textit{Kitāb al-Khilaf} but only fragments of various MSS that were copied by different people at different times.\textsuperscript{52}

I discussed the results of the comparison of Michael’s lists with these ancient Bible MSS in the second part of my thesis \textit{Ben Asher — Ben Naphtali}. These investigations could not be published at the time due to the circumstances which prevailed in Germany. But Kahle refers to them in several of his publications.\textsuperscript{53}

At the same time I also examined the Bible Codex MS. Or. 1213 of the Berlin Staatsbibliothek as well as MS. Add. 21161 (Brit. Mus.) and some fragments which Kahle erroneously declared to be BN manuscripts. I then summarized the outcome of my investigation as follows: “Eine nähere Untersuchung dieser Handschriftengruppe an Hand der Listen Michael ben Uzziels zeigte jedoch, dass sie nicht als die Rezension des BN bezeichnet werden kann.”\textsuperscript{54} These Pseudo-BN MSS were later termed by A. Sperber “pre-Massoretic”\textsuperscript{55} and by

\textsuperscript{44} In the Hebrew daily \textit{Haaretz} of April 16th, 1954. \textsuperscript{45} JJS 2 (1950) 20 ff. \textsuperscript{46} Textus 1 (1960) 93. \textsuperscript{47} Op. cit. 118. \textsuperscript{48} Turbîz 26 (1956–57) 384–409. \textsuperscript{49} Cp., e.g., p. 12, line 6: \textit{לֵאמֶת יָרֵם אֵלָה הָעִבְרִי כְּדֵרָם אֵלָה}. \textsuperscript{50} Cp. RTBT, 100. \textsuperscript{51} Above p. 3 and note 14. \textsuperscript{52} I wish to remark that only in one fragment (out of 15) \textit{pathah} and \textit{segol} are applied promiscuously, see below p. 23; RTBT, 100, note 74. \textsuperscript{53} Bblita Hebraica (1937) Prolegomena, VII ff.; VT 1 (1951) 165; Der hebräische Bibeltext seit Fr. Delitzsch, 14 ff.; L. Goldschmidt — P. Kahle, The Earliest Editions of the Hebr. Bible with a Treatise on the Oldest MSS of the Bible (1950) 54 ff. \textsuperscript{54} Mukačevo proof sheets, 25; cp. RTBT, 108, note 103. \textsuperscript{55} Corpus Codicum Hebraicorum Medii Aevi 2 (1956) p. xxi f.
S. Morag "post-Massoretic".56 I. Yeivin calls them "non-Massoretic" texts57 and M. Goshen-Gottstein terms them "Tiberian non-receptus" traditions.58 It is worth mentioning that M. Gaster, dealing with some MSS of that kind, already suggested that they might be the transcript of a superlinear system into the Tiberian.59 This idea was recently taken up by A. Diez-Macho.60

In order to establish the absolute reliability of the statements given by Mishael, I also compared them with the material included in the rhymed passages of the so called Diqduqē ha-Te'amim (= Diq.). Although BA’s name appears only in later sources of this collection, it has been generally accepted that the rhymed texts, which summarise the rules of punctuation and accents, are an essential part of the BA tradition. They originate partly from a period much earlier than BA’s. On the other hand the material given in prose includes portions of the Massorah written at different times and sometimes does not agree with BA. The collation of the rhymed texts in Diq. with our treatise showed that Mishael’s statements on BA’s reading of the forms of בָּלָא and בָּשֵׁר (rules 2 and 3 of the introduction) are to be found in paragraphs 51 and 52 of Diq.; his rule 7 (on the vocalization of the prefixes ב and ב preceding jud) in paragraph 13; while rule 8 (יִרְחָי בָּשֵׁר) occurs in paragraph 29. In explanation of the various rules Diq. quotes twenty three Biblical passages that are also mentioned by Mishael. These passages are without exception in agreement with BA according to Mishael’s data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 46:17</td>
<td>p. 21</td>
<td>Ps. 90: 2</td>
<td>p. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex. 15:13</td>
<td>p. 29</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>p. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh. 8:15</td>
<td>p. 21</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>p. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam. 4:8</td>
<td>p. 22</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>p. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is. 34:11</td>
<td>p. 29</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>p. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ez. 17:10</td>
<td>p. 30</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>p. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps. 10:2</td>
<td>p. 25</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>p. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neh. 12:44</td>
<td>p. 23</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>p. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth 4:4</td>
<td>p. 23</td>
<td>1 Chr. 8:16</td>
<td>p. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neh. 12:44</td>
<td>p. 23</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>p. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chr. 18:33</td>
<td>p. 21</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>p. 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

60 Estudios Biblicalos 15 (1956) 187 f.
61 Cp. p. 5 note a; Ben David, Turbin 26 (1956–57) 404.
63 Cp. p. 5, note g. 64 Cp. p. 5, note f.
64 Cp. p. 5, note h.
II. THE REPORTS OF THE MEDIAEVAL GRAMMARIANS ON THE HILLUFIM

Besides the lists preserved in the Massorah, also the mediaeval grammarians report on the differences between BA and BN. The following investigation will show that these reports must be treated with as much caution as the data in the lists. These authors lived at a temporal and geographical distance from the Massoretes. Moreover they occasionally quote BA and BN to strengthen their own theories, and sometimes even attribute their own ideas to these Massoretes. I gathered all the reports on the hillufim between BA and BN which are scattered in a voluminous literature, and checked them for their correctness and accuracy in the light of the lists of Mishael ben Uzziel.

Saadiah Gaon (died 942) polemicised against BA in a Piyyut called מלשנא תחת הילוועים. Benjamin Klar has shown that the Arabic title should be read: אלמדה תלוי בך. The polemic against Ben Asher, Hebrew. He further proved that Saadiah's poem contains a sharp attack against several passages of the Diqduq ha-Te'amim written by BA or his predecessors. Also in his grammatical work Saadiah deals with phenomena over which BA and BN differ but without mentioning their names.

Hai Gaon (died 1040), in a responsum preserved in the Cairo Geniza, reports on the differences between BA and BN in the vocalization of the proper name ישן רבי.

Among the Hebrew grammarians in Spain, Ḥayyuj (at the end of the 10th century) is the first who quotes a reading of BA. The only report preserved of it is a marginal note in MS. Firk. II, 148 (= fragment B of our treatise). According to it Ḥayyuj in his book Kitāb al-Nutaf ascribes the reading במשנה to BA.

Ibn Janāḥ (at the beginning of the 11th century) already quotes eight hillufim in his works Kitāb al-Luma and Kitāb al-Uṣul. In the first book he reports on the following five hillufim.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p. 1347</th>
<th>Ez. 19:9</th>
<th>: במשנה</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p. 135</td>
<td>27:13</td>
<td>: והרל</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Published by M. Lewin (Jerusalem 1943).
3 Cp. W. Bacher, ZDMG 49 (1895) 46 f.
4 Published by J. Mann, JQR NS 11 (1920–21) 469 f.
5 Cp. below p. 166.
7 Number of pages according to Riq.
Nos. 2, 3 and 5 are in accordance with Mishael’s list, but No. 1 is included among the congruences of BA and BN, not their differences. No. 4 is not mentioned by Mishael, but according to a marginal note in Codex Ch.-K., pap. 1, R. Pineḥas and Moshe Moḥa differed on that issue. In Kitāb al-Uṣul (ed. Neubauer 293) Ibn Janāh mentions BN’s system of pointing the prefixes ב and ב with hireq with the following yod remaining unpronounced. He also quotes hillufim to Ps. 62:4 ירבוע (ib. 182) and Hos. 6:9 ירבוע (ib. 687) which are not mentioned by Mishael, but are quoted from אפרים in a marginal note to B (p. 13, n.). According to Bodleian MS. Hebr. d. 33, fol. 7a, Pineḥas the head of the Yeshiva and the Tiberians differed with the Māḥsora rabba in the punctuation of the resh in ירבוע.

Abraham Ibn Ezra (first half of the 12th century) mentions the exact, painstaking work of the Tiberian Massoretes, but he does not elaborate upon their differences. Only in the commentary to Lev. 19:12 does he remark that BN had the reading בִּכְרָחָיוֹן (BA: בִּכְרֹחַיָּיוֹן), and in Sepher Ẓahot he quotes that in the word מְשִׁיעְר (Dan. 12:2) the two Massoretes differed in the same way.

BA and BN are mentioned more frequently in the grammatical works of David Qimhi (1160–1235) and in his commentary on the Bible. In the preface to Sepher ha-Shorashim and in his commentary on Ps. 62:4 he states, like Maimonides, that we should compare the texts of different versions.

In the subjoined table I collected all the reports on hillufim in his grammatical works Mikhlo, Shorashim, *Et Sopher* and in his commentary, and compared them with the data given by Mishael ben Uzziel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mikḥ.</th>
<th>Shor. s.v.</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Quoted Massoretes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יִשְׁמָרֶה</td>
<td>Gen. 30:18</td>
<td>72a</td>
<td>Jer. 37:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִיטָשְׁרֶה</td>
<td>Lev. 25:21</td>
<td>8a</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִוָצְרֵה</td>
<td>Nu. 31:27</td>
<td>5b</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִיהָזֲרְא</td>
<td>Deut. 33:21</td>
<td>86a</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 Cp. *Diq.* 84.
9 כַּמָּהוּרָא רַבָּא תֵּרָצוּ וְרֵבֶּה יִשְׁמָרֶה רַבָּא תֵּרָצוּ וְרַבָּא תֵּרָצוּ רַבָּא תֵּרָצוּ רַבָּא תֵּרָצוּ.
10 Commentary to Ex. 25:31.
11 Ed. Fürth (1864) 22a.
12 Number of pages according to ed. Lyck 1862. 12a The passages marked with asterisk are missing in Mishael’s work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mikh.</th>
<th>Shor. s.v.</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Quoted Massoretes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jud. 6:19</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ad loc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam. 13:21</td>
<td>162b</td>
<td>דְּרוּב</td>
<td>ad loc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>32b</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ad loc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is. 11:14</td>
<td>149a</td>
<td>שְׁוַעְק</td>
<td>ad loc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is. 16:7</td>
<td>93a</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hos. 7:14</td>
<td>93a</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer. 25:36</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>דָּל</td>
<td>ad loc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>בַּכְּב</td>
<td>ad loc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ez. 16:13</td>
<td>124a</td>
<td>שִׁמ</td>
<td>ad loc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>16:18</td>
<td>קָרְפ</td>
<td>ad loc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>17:10</td>
<td>81a</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:9</td>
<td>125b</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:7</td>
<td>123b</td>
<td>שָׁמ</td>
<td>ad loc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:6</td>
<td>17b</td>
<td>דְּרוּב</td>
<td>ad loc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel 4:13</td>
<td>79b</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic. 6:15</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>דְּרוּב</td>
<td>ad loc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zech. 6:11</td>
<td>5b</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ad loc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps. 10:15</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>דָּש</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45:10</td>
<td>78b</td>
<td>יִינָר</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 In this note and in the following Qimbi’s statements are quoted in full: אריאת בมาจาก. מ.נ.ן.
14 כילה קמך עב כעלל, להב ארב הוא כבשת, ובخيل תשומד ובשומד כעטיא נא.
15 עב אהיי משומד הויב האב,воротים ניקרא בקומי, רוח ומנטל בשה זה פִּיל וּפִיל
16 וחיה משומד.
17 והז מהמק. כתה עב פר מבקים כותים לברא הוא התו כותים לברא.
18 רב בברא הוא התו כותים לברא, לברא הוא התו כותים לברא.
19 נמק עב תועדו הטמאית.
20 בכמק תועדו הטמאית.
21 בכמק תועדו הטמאית.
22 בכמק תועדו הטמאית.
23 רב בברא הוא התו, לברא הוא התו כותים לברא.
24 רב בברא הוא התו, לברא הוא התו כותים לברא.
25 רב בברא הוא התו, לברא הוא התו כותים לברא.
26 רב בברא הוא התו, לברא הוא התו כותים לברא.
This comparison shows that out of the thirty passages quoted by Qimḥi only fifteen are treated by Mishael. In these places both indicate the same differences. Only in Ez. 19:9 does Qimḥi, in quoting the same hilluf as Ibn Janāḥ, disagree with Mishael.29 It should be noted that of the fifteen instances not mentioned by Mishael some already appear as marginal notes in B and in MS. Harley 1528 of the British Museum.30 It is most likely that no hilluf is indicated in Jud. 6:19 (חרם) where Qimḥi states that it is indicated in the text where he quotes (מכהך שליטא) where he quotes.

Due to the efforts of the Tiberian Massoretes their system of punctuation had displaced all the others by the end of the 9th century. But by this no absolutely uniform text of the Bible was yet established. These Tiberian Massoretes among themselves continued to hold different views on many issues.31 In this situation it became necessary to choose one of the numerous Massoretes who were teaching in Tiberias and to take his readings as authoritative.32 About the beginning of the eleventh century the readings of many Massoretes, such as Moshe Moḥa, Pīneḥas the head of the Yeshiva, Ḥābib ben Pipin and others were almost displaced. There were left mainly the systems of BA and BN. These two Massoretes agreed in many things, and the differences between them were only of minor significance. Both enjoyed great esteem and

27况且季列誦第一節[阿遜]不足...此四節注解喚作“適切”。於此可見季列不棄[阿遜]...

28 Besides these passages he quotes in Mikh. (80) the following rule: סכמאת רוחמות טמך ההליש הברת י persone lesen (Cp. below p. 18 f.). In Mikh. 140 and ‘Et Sopher 4b he quotes in the name of BA the rule mentioned in Firk. II 145 and Man. (372) on the pronunciation of שים, שים כמין חמש (Cp. Kurt Levy, Zur Masoratischen Grammatik, 8 ff).

29 Cp. above p. 9.

30 מאמץ (Jer. 31:33); והרהר (Ez. 35:6); והרארש (Mic. 6:15).


32 A similar development took place and was concluded about one hundred years earlier in the Arab world with regard to the text of the Koran; cp. Th. Nödeke, Geschichte des Koran (1938) 247, 287; G. Weil, Die Arabischen Grammatikschulen von Kufa u. Basra (1949) 65–71.
held the same high reputation. 33 Although the readings of BN showed more system, in both vocalization and the rules of accentuation, BA in the end
achieved greater recognition; perhaps because he was the last one in the chain
of the leading Massoretes of the famous BA family. The final decision in favour
of BA came only at the end of the 12th century. 34

Since a great number of Bible MSS have been preserved from the succeeding
centuries, we are in a position to trace the endeavour of displacement of the
BN readings. This can be observed in the first place in Spain. We have reports
that reliable and exact Bible MSS had been introduced into Spain from Jeru-
salem. 35 Then gradually follow the Italian and Ashkenazi (German) MSS
and finally the Oriental codices. Thus British Museum Add. 14760, a MS of
the Prophets written 1293 in Italy, has the reading כִּפָּר הָאָרֶץ, which is
typical of BN. 36 British Mus. MS. Or. 1474, a Yemenite MS of the Prophets
from the 16th or 17th century, in several places presents the readings of BN
in the text and close to it in the margin the readings of BA. 37 Such phenomena
probably misled Elija'ahu Levita to assume that the oriental Jews (ארשי
ָמוֹדַר) follow the readings of BN. 38 But the displacement of the BN readings was not
fully achieved either in the Bible published by Jacob ben Ḥayyim in 1524–25
or in the later editions of the Hebrew Bible. 38a

At the end of the 16th century and in the beginning of the 17th century
there lived two outstanding scholars, who devoted themselves to the study
of the Massorah and to the purgation of the Bible text from the incorrect
readings caused by the neglect of the copyists and by typographical errors.
These two were Menahem di Lonzano and Jedidiah Solomon Norzi. Both
undertook extended voyages in order to gain access to ancient famous Bible
MSS from which they copied much valuable material not found in other
sources. In the preface to his Massoretic work to the Pent. Or Torah (ed.
Venice 1618, 3a) Menahem di Lonzano says: “I have made all these corrections
on the basis of ten (Pent.) manuscripts…, some of which are more than five
or six hundred years old, on the basis of several Massorah MSS, and of the
Massoret Seyag la-Torah of R. Meir ben Todros ha-Levi (Abulafia), the
Qiryath Sepher of ha-Meiri, ‘Et Sopher of R. David Kimhi… and various

33 Cp. above, p. 3.
34 Cp. above, p. 4.
36 Cp. Introduction, 578.
37 E.g., fol. 89b has in the text: מַעְלֵה בָּא מִכָּל עָרֶץ, and in the margin the following note: מַעְלֵה בָּא מִכָּל עָרֶץ קָרָא מַעְלֵה בָּא מִכָּל עָרֶץ.
38a Not even in the Bible published in 1958 by N.H. Snaith.
others.” Lonzano regards the readings of BA as highly authoritative.\textsuperscript{39} He also mentions that Maimonides relied exclusively on the Torah Scroll written by BA.\textsuperscript{40} Lonzano mentions a few hillufim but these are not always in agreement with Mishael. He appreciates the readings of the Spanish MSS\textsuperscript{41} but belittles the Ashkenazi (German) MSS\textsuperscript{42} and is irritated by their excessive use of the metheg.\textsuperscript{43}

Jedidiah Solomon Norzi finished his Massoretic commentary on the Bible Minhat Shay in the year 1626, eight years after Lonzano’s Or Torah was published in Venice.\textsuperscript{44} But Minhat Shay was printed only in 1742 in the Bible edition of Mantua. It was considered a standard work since Norzi’s authority was accepted by everyone, Jews and non-Jews alike. Like Lonzano, also Norzi preferred Sephardi MSS of the Bible. He referred to the tradition that reliable Bible MSS had been introduced from Jerusalem into Spain.\textsuperscript{35} Among the MSS consulted by him was that of Toledo from the year 1277 (now known as Codex de Rossi, No. 782). Norzi gives thorough consideration to the differences between BA and BN.\textsuperscript{45} In Minhat Shay he quotes more than two hundred hillufim. He already knew of quite a number of lists and he makes a distinction between hillufim in manuscripts and in prints. In eighty five instances he quotes differences also given by Mishael. But since the proper yardstick to test these hillufim, a genuine BA manuscript, was not at his disposal, he was not always able to choose correctly among the numerous contradictory statements. Thus it is understandable that out of all hillufim mentioned by him only fifty agree completely with those registered by Mishael. It seems to him quite incredible that the printed editions should still present the readings of BN.\textsuperscript{46} Therefore he always corrects the data of the lists when they are in contradiction to the unanimous readings of the printed books. Like Qimhi he does not quote hillufim in the consonantal text. Where he finds one in the lists he declares it incorrect, referring to Elijah Levita, who also reports only on hillufim in the vocalization, accentuation and the placing of dagesh.\textsuperscript{47}

---

\textsuperscript{39} Ib. 3b: בילוי הובילה האהל למשכן על קראת א-מצליל צווחה ב-קהל והחטרה פ

\textsuperscript{40} Ib. 14b: א-יתן משלקל הלול ע-ז

\textsuperscript{41} Ib. p. 3a: מס ה-ידיעת ספירה שדיה המגדילו והנהוגים שרגויו למסмарк

\textsuperscript{42} Ib. p. 14b.

\textsuperscript{43} Ib. p. 4a: קראת מדל מGetProcAddress ... שמות והואנומיס במס الجمهיו לפני קראתיו והואנומיס מק変えיות חというのは נמל הולך:

\textsuperscript{44} For Norzi’s relations with Lonzano cp. the Introduction to Minhat Shay ed. A. Jellinek (Wien, 1877) 13; De Rossi, Variae Lectiones 1, xi f.

\textsuperscript{45} Cp. op. cit. (n. 44), 14.

\textsuperscript{46} Cp. Norzi, to Gen. 2:6.

\textsuperscript{47} Cp. op. cit. (n. 38), 113.
To Gen. 19:17 he quotes the Massoretic note already mentioned by Qimhi that דָּגֶשׁ is provided according to BA with raphe, and according to BN with dagesh. This note contradicts rule eight in Michael's introduction on the pronunciation of דָּגֶשׁ following the word יָדָיו. Thus he cannot understand why some MSS (BN) provide דָּגֶשׁ (Gen. 39:15) with dagesh though it does not precede telisha. This is just one of the seven cases which BN provides with dagesh against the rule of הַדָּגֶשׁ. In these seven instances יָדָיו is provided only three times with the accent telisha while the rest have another servus.

There is no doubt that the work of Norzi must be regarded as a most valuable contribution to the exploration of the Massorah. But, as our investigation has shown, its importance has been over-rated by some modern scholars, such as Dérenbourg, Strack and Snaith.

III. STATEMENT OF CONTENTS

The substance of Michael's work is the discussion of the hillufim. In addition to that he deals with the subdivision of the books of the Bible into Sedarim and gives the number of the verses with a corresponding catchword. On the whole the treatise employs literary language. However some vulgarism can be found.

49 Cp. p. t.
50 Gen. 19:17; Jud. 11:35; Esth. 5:2.
51 In modern times S. Baer and Chr.D. Ginsburg dealt with the problem of the hillufim. Ginsburg devoted to it a great section of his Introduction (241–286), and in his comprehensive work The Massorah Compiled From Manuscripts (3 vols., London 1880) he gathered much more material belonging to it. In vol. I π, pars. 589 ff. he published a list of the hillufim, which he compiled from several Bible MSS of the British Museum, and from the printed editions of Felix Pratensis (1517) and Jacob ben Ḥayyim (1525). Following this list he presents s.v. לְמַעֲדָד הַיִּשְׁרָיִים the hillufim to the Pent. taken from Manuel du Lecteur (JA, Sér. 6, t. 16, 1870). In vol. III, 6–14 he printed the hillufim to the Pent. from Muqaddima of Samuel ha-Rofhe and those to the Prophets and the Writings, from Jos. to Ps. 48:7, on the basis of MS. Harley 1528 of the Brit. Mus. Besides these he published (ib. 175 ff) an extensive list without giving any references. As I have already shown in Ben Asher - Ben Nachtali (p. 14) these lists represent an uncritical compilation of material which is of very little value.

In the same publication pp. 15–20 I also gave full particulars on the method by which the Massoretic compendium Adath Deborim was used by Baer to support the rules for the use of melekh, which he laid down in his Methegsetzung. Now that the lists of Michael ben Uziel are published, it is evident that the rules for the use of melekh laid down by Baer, and unfortunately taken over by many Hebrew Grammars, are entirely wrong.
The Ḥillufim

The Ḥillufim refer chiefly to the placing of the ga’ya,¹ and in some cases to the accentuation and vocalisation of the Bible text, and to the placing of dagesh and raphe. According to Mishael, BA and BN differed only in eight instances concerning the consonantal text.²

In the introduction to his work, Mishael enumerates eight general rules for the differences between the two Massoretic.³

Rule 1 refers to the reading of the proper name ישנאר which occurs forty three times throughout the Bible. On this subject Mishael comments as follows: "Know, O Sir, may God strengthen you, that the master Abu Sa‘id ben Asher, may God show mercy to him, used to punctuate the first š of the word ישנאר and to pronounce it as sin, and the second he left without any dot and did not pronounce it at all, viz. ישנאר, and he treated them all in this way. BN would differ from him in this matter, since he provided both š with dots. The first he pronounces as shin and the second as sin, thus ישנאר. And he treated them all in this way. And Moshe Moḥa used to punctuate both, and pronounced them as two sins, thus ישנאר. And that is their entire difference on this word."

As the following table shows, different and deviating reports on the readings of the two Massoretes have been preserved. Thus according to a responsum of R. Hai Gaon⁴ (first half of the 11th century), BN read ישנאר like R. Moshe Moḥa, as stated by Mishael.⁴a

---

2 It concerns the following Biblical passages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is. 54: 9</td>
<td>עָרְבָּא</td>
<td>בְּרָבָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer. 7:25</td>
<td>תָּרְבָּא</td>
<td>בָּרָבָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 11:7</td>
<td>רָבָּא</td>
<td>בָּרָבָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps. 48:5</td>
<td>דָּלָּמֵא</td>
<td>לָם</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 The responsum found in the Geniza and published by J. Mann, JQR NS 11 (1920-21) 469 f., reads:ווארש שלושה ומ שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו יὁ שמש נקראה להוים. יוהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו יὁ שמש נקראה להוים. יוהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו יὁ שמש נקראה להוים. יוהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו יὁ שמש נקראה להוים. יוהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו יὁ שמש נקראה להוים. יוהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו יὁ שמש נקראה להוים. יוהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו יὁ שמש נקראה להוים. יוהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו יὁ שמש נקראה להוים. יוהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח وبש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שmess י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו י хозя יהו שמש צמח ובש שם שחשבי דרגו I

4a The Liqueput Qadmoniyoth too, reports on a reading of Moshe Moḥa 98, 102; cp. A. Ben David, Beth Mikra 3 (1957-58), 14 f.
לוסחט קיתא אל-חקף, תבהא הזילופים
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BN</th>
<th>Moshe Moja</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mishael ben Uzziel</td>
<td>משל בן חツ</td>
<td>משל בן חツ</td>
<td>משל בן חツ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hai Gaon⁵</td>
<td>מאי גאון</td>
<td>מאי גאון</td>
<td>מאי גאון</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel du Lecteur</td>
<td>מואנה דלו לנקטר</td>
<td>מואנה דלו לנקטר</td>
<td>מואנה דלו לנקטר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liq. Qadm.</td>
<td>מילק צדemiah</td>
<td>מילק צדemiah</td>
<td>מילק צדemiah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apart from these reports on the reading of קבך, there is to be found in MS B of our treatise⁶ a marginal note, according to which Ḥayuj (end of the 10th century) stated in his commentary Kitāb al-Nutaf to Josh. (not preserved) that BA read קבך. In Cod. Petropol. of the year 916 and in MS. Arund. Orient. 2 (Brit. Mus.) of the year 1216 there is to be found the reading קבך.

Rule 2 refers to the punctuation of the verb קבך: “And in every form of קבך BA used to provide the קפ with pathah, when the קפ had three dots (segol), e.g. קפ אל תִּקְנֵה (Deut. 12:24). And in all similar instances he used to provide the קפ with pathah. But when the קפ did not have three dots he did not provide it with pathah, e.g. קפ אל תִּקְנֵה סְבַע בִּכְלָל (Deut. 14:21). There is only one exception where he does not provide it with pathah although the קפ has three dots, viz. קפ רְבָּא אֶלֶף יָבִי (Eccl. 5:10). And in all these instances BN did not place the pathah.” Throughout the whole Bible there occur six forms of the verb קבך in this position, twenty four instances altogether.⁹

Rule 3 refers to the punctuation of the verb קבך: “And in every form of קבך the master BA used to provide the resh with pathah when below the shin there were three dots, e.g. קבך עֲבָר (Ex. 23:30) and others like it. And if the shin did not have three dots he did not provide the resh with pathah, e.g. קבך עֲבָר (Jud. 11:2)... with the exception of one word, which he provided with pathah although there were no three dots, and this is the word קבך (Ps. 34:1). BN did not place the pathah in all these cases.” This form of the verb קבך occurs only in three places throughout the Bible.¹²

---

⁵ Hai Gaon does not mention Moshe Moja by name but apparently includes him among those who read קבך; cp. note 4.
⁸ Man. adds חֲנָכָה.
⁹ Gen. 3:17; Lev. 6:11, 19; 7:6; Nu. 18:10, 13; Deut. 12:15, 18, 22, 24, 25; 15:20, 22; 28:39; 2 Ki. 6:28, 29; Jer. 31:8; Ez. 4:9, 10, 10, 12; 7:15; Eccl. 6:2.
¹⁰ Cp. Dīq. par 52; Gumpertz, Mivta’e Seferenu 118 f.
¹¹ Cp. against it Baer, Dīq. 42, note b.
Rule 4 refers to the pronunciation of the dagesh in the word מְבִית, whenever it has two accents BN inserts a dagesh (viz. forte) into it. I mean that he makes here an intensification more than is customary in other places, e.g. מְבִית (Ex. 12:7), and the other instances of this word, which have two accents, he handles in the same way. As for BA he does not agree with him, except in two instances, viz. בְּרִית (Deut. 6:11), and אָבִי (1 Chr. 28:11). In all the others he does not apply this intensification, since he, may God show mercy to him, mentions in his Massora: It occurs in scripture four times that the dagesh is intensified. And he mentions these two words, viz. בְּרִית and the others are מְבִית (Josh. 8:28), מְבִית וּבְרִית (Dan. 3:23).

Rules 5 and 6 refer to the placing of ga’ya in certain words which are connected by a maqqeph: “And to every word מְבִית connected by maqqeph, BN adds a ga’ya but BA does not provide it with ga’ya; and vice versa, to every word connected by maqqeph BA adds a ga’ya, when the first syllable of the following word has the accent, e.g. מְבִית מְבִית (Deut. 3:3).”

Rule 7 refers to the difference in the vocalization of the prefixes ב and ל if there follows a jod vocalized with h剝eq: “And in every word מְבִית לְבָא the master Abu Sa’id ben Asher vocalizes the jod in these words, and articulates it with the mouth. BN differs from him, for he does not vocalize the jod in this word and does not pronounce it, thus מְבִית לְבָא.”

Rule 8 refers to the difference in inserting the dagesh in the word מְבִית when the word מְבִית precedes and both words are connected by an accent: “And every word מְבִית which precedes one of the six letters (i.e. מְבִית). If it is connected with it, that means leans upon it by accent, the master Abu Sa’id ben Asher, may God show mercy to him, used to provide it with raphe, according to the rule for the מְבִית, so that he read מְבִית רָפֶה (Josh. 9:1) and others like that, according to the explanation mentioned above.

13 He apparently reads this dagesh as dagesh forte, otherwise as dagesh lene.
14 There are three more instances where מְבִית has two accents, Ex. 8:7; 12:7; 2 Chr. 34:11.
15 The same quotation also occurs in the Geniza fragment T-S Arabic 31, 8; cp. Frensdorff, Massora Magna 386, note 2; A. Ben David, Beth Mikra 3 (1957–58) 13.
16 Ad. fol. 43a has the following note: מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית לְבָא מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִית מְבִי
17 This rule corresponds neither to BA nor to BN. 17a Parallels to this rule are preserved in several Geniza fragments, e.g., in T-S, NS, 287, 4 and in T-S Arabic 31, 8.
And the master BN, may God show mercy to him, differs from him merely in seven words of this type and pointed them with *dagesh*, and thus acts against the rule of ren criminal (Esth. 5:2); הרן קראות זוחל ויש ערב (Jud. 11:35);

ירוח מראות מה תמה (Josh. 9:1) 18; ירוח מראות מה (Gen. 39:15); ירוח קראות מה (Deut. 2:16); ירוח קראות מה (Gen. 19:17); ירוח קראות מה (1 Ki. 15:29). In all except these seven instances he acts according to the rule of ירוח מראות-*ra'he*, e.g. ירוח קראות מה (1 Ki. 16:11); ירוח מראות-*mashbah* (1 Sam. 18:14) and many others like that.” 20

To these eight rules we can add another four which also apply to differences throughout the Bible. Michael mentions him in various places of his compilation.

1. The rule on הראית (p. 29) “Every הראית which is provided with this accent, *i.e.* with *geresh*, is given the *ga'ya*. There is no disagreement on this point. And whichever is provided with the accent *telisha* remains without *ga'ya*, thus הראית. Also on that point there is no disagreement. And as for that which is provided with another accent *i.e.* with *azel we-ath*، BA reads

18 MS. Leningrad Firk. II. No. 2390 has הראית instead of ירוח מראות מה (Gen. 39:19), cp. note 20.

19 Saadia in his work on *dagesh* and *raphe* (cp. ZDMG 49 [1895] 46) maintains that ירוח מראות has always to be pointed with *dagesh*. On the *Massorah* to Gen. 19:17, quoted by Qimhi and Norzi cp. above pp. 12, 15.

20 On this point I found an interesting parallel in the Leningrad MS. Firk. II. No. 2390, fol. 17a. It runs: *ואלפי אמן נחמל חלומך ראיי כי ארא לי שינה מentimes שמה מרכוש להbufio ירוח מראות-*mashbah*. This reading is repeated in all the codices and even by the Massorah. I adopt the reading *mashbah* and do not follow the codices as to *mashbah*. I believe therefore that this masoretic reading is the right one and should be followed. This reading is also supported by the codices and other authorities.

"And know that BN, and perhaps someone who already preceded him and held his opinion, pointed with *dagesh* seven *kaf* following the word ירוח מראות-*mashbah*. According to his opinion the facts are these: every ירוח מראות in the Scripture, if one of these seven *kaf* follows, it will always be pointed with *dagesh*. And this is known from the codices. But others provide them with *raphe*. And I do not know the reason why BN pointed them with *dagesh*, since whoever provides them with *raphe* follows the rule that.ArrayAdapter* causes a *raphe* in the letters תמרכז. And the reader should conform to one of these two opinions. If he follows the reading of BN, it obligates him to read all of them with *raphe* and *dagesh* as he, BN, does. If he, however, follows the reading of BA, then it is also correct. But whoever reads the letters pointed with *raphe* according to both, he remains without rule, since he deviates from the principle of the one and the other".
it with ga'ya, viz. הָוָֽיָֽה (Is. 28:4) and others similar to it. And what concerns BN he differs from him in this point and does not read it with ga'ya.’’

2. The rule on בֵּרִית (p. רֵךְ) ‘Know that BA provides every בֵּרִית with raphe. And BN inserts a dagesh into the nun’. רֵךְ.

3. The rule on תָּמֶרֶת (ib.) ‘And every BA provides the mem with pathah, but BN does not place pathah.’

4. The rule on רִ產ֶת (p. הל): ‘According to BA every רִ臊 with the accent geresh gets the ga’ya; according to BN it remains without ga’ya.’

In the books המֵסֶר (Job, Prov., Ps.) there is a considerable number of differences concerning the accents. Some additional rules for these books can be established.

1. If silleq is preceded by two servi, the word immediately preceding silleq is always accented shofar by BA and merekha by BN. E.g.:

25 אַמאָך דָּעָה; בִּישְׁתָּכְּרִיבָה; רִיבָהה תְּבֹר; רִיבָהה תְּבֹר רָבָה

26 קֵּרִיתָה; קֵּרִיתָה; קֵּרִיתָה; קֵּרִיתָה

2. If there is only one servi before silleq, and that word is not accented on the first syllable, the accent with BA is normally merekha, with BN shofar. Words joined by maqpeph are treated as one word. E.g.:

3. According to BA the particle יב is connected with the following word, accented with merekha, by means of maqpeph, whereas BN accents it with sinnorit. Exceptions are Ps. 18:20; 22:9, E.g.:

4. BA always joins יְאִּדֶּה to the following dehi by means of maqpeph, while BN accents it with shofar. E.g.:

21 BN sought to prevent the close proximity of ga’ya to another accent; BA however tolerated such clashes; cp. Ben David, op. cit. (note 17), 389.


23 Cp. דq. 25; Ben David, loc. cit. 391.

24 Ps. 10:2; 50:6; 52:5; 56:3.

25 Ps. 40:10; 45:11; Prov. 21:9; Job 3:26.

26 Ps. 18:8; 20:12; 71:11; 102:14; Prov. 4:13; 28:22.

27 Cp. דq. 17.

28 Ps. 41:5; 82:6; 116:16; 120:7; Prov. 8:12.
According to BA, the first servus before pazer, if the accent is on the second syllable, is normally azla; according to BN it is merekha. E.g.:

The introduction is followed by the enumeration of the hillufim and congruences in the twenty four Books of the Bible. In the Pentateuch the congruences follow the hillufim to each parasha whereas to the Prophets and Hagiographa they are recorded at the end of each book.

Gen. — The fragments A and B exhibit thirty nine hillufim (D, F and Ad. have forty). All the fragments register thirty one congruences.

Ex. — The MSS uniformly exhibit twenty hillufim and twenty eight congruences.

Lev. — Fifteen (Miq. sixteen) hillufim and thirteen congruences.

Num. — Twenty four (Man. twenty one) hillufim and sixteen congruences.

Deut. — Nineteen (Man. eighteen) hillufim and twenty four congruences.

To the five Books of the Pentateuch altogether there are recorded one hundred and seventeen hillufim and one hundred and twelve congruences.

Josh. — Twenty three hillufim and ten congruences.

Jud. — Nineteen hillufim and sixteen congruences.

Sam. — Forty nine hillufim and thirty six congruences.

Ki. — Fifty seven hillufim and thirty nine congruences.

Is. — The fragments B and C record thirty four (Ad. and H thirty five) hillufim and fourteen congruences.

Jer. — Fifty four (Ad. fifty one) hillufim and fifteen congruences.

Ez. — Forty five hillufim and eighteen congruences.

Min. Proph. — Thirty two hillufim and fourteen congruences.

For all the books of the Prophets there are recorded three hundred and eleven hillufim and one hundred and sixty two congruences.

Chr. — Fragment A records seventy six (C seventy three, Ad. seventy five) hillufim and twenty seven congruences.

Ps. — One hundred and seventy eight hillufim and forty four congruences.

Job — Fifty six hillufim and ten congruences.

Prov. — MSS A and B record forty four (C forty three) hillufim and six congruences.

Ruth — Three hillufim and five congruences.

Cant. — Two hillufim and seven congruences.

Eccl. — Thirteen hillufim and seven congruences.

Ps. 5:12; 13:3; 22:25.
Lam. — Three hillufim and three congruences.
Esth. — Twelve hillufim and four congruences.
Dan. — Eighteen (C seventeen) hillufim and eleven congruences.
Ezra-Neh. — Twenty seven hillufim and ten (C nine) congruences.

For all the books of the Hagiographa there are recorded four hundred and thirty two hillufim and one hundred and thirty congruences.

Further to the instances already included in the eight general rules of the introduction, Mishael enumerates altogether eight hundred and sixty hillufim and four hundred and four congruences.

IV. DESCRIPTION OF THE MSS

Until recently altogether eight MSS were known which positively belong to the Kitāb al-Khilaf of Mishael ben Uzziel. Except for one fragment in the possession of the Library of the Alliance Israélite in Paris, all the others belong to the II. Firk. Collection of the Public Library in Leningrad. A. Harkavy discovered them there and reports on them in Ḥadashim gam Ḥeshanim I, 2 (1886) 10 f. Kahle discusses them thoroughly in his M d W (II, 62 ff.). I designate these seven fragments here by the letters A–G. The eighth fragment was discovered by Kurt Levy in the Library of the Alliance Israélite in Paris. I mark it P.

A (= Firk. II. Arab. Hebr. 147), a fragment consisting of fourteen leaves written on both sides, size 18 × 13 cm, square writing. Each folio has twenty four lines. Fols. 1–7 contain the complete introduction and the differences from Gen. 1 to Lev. 13; fols. 8–14: the differences in the Minor Prophets (beginning with Ob.), Chr. and Ps. chap. 1–56. The character of the difference between BA and BN is not defined in this fragment.

B (= Firk. II Arab. Hebr. 148), a fragment of twenty three leaves, size 21 × 15 cm. Each folio has seventeen lines in square writing. On fol. 1a there is the following owner-notation: מַרְבָּתּ נַעְרֵיָא אַשְׁפָּקָרְיָא אֲלַלָּה הַטָּלִי יִשְׂרָאֵל הַלֵּוֶל. The treatise begins on folio 1b. Fols. 1–6 contain the introduction, and the differences from Gen. 1 to 36; fols. 7–11 those from Ex. 10 to Lev. 8; fol. 12: 2 Ki., beginning with 18:25; fol. 13: Is. 1–24:12; fols. 14–16: Minor Prophets beginning with Am.; fols. 17–21: Ps. 1–89; fols. 22–23: Job and Prov. 1–25:14. The Biblical passages are provided with vowel-points and accents. The MS shows a number of marginal notes from a later hand.

C (= Firk. II, 149), the most extensive fragment, consists of twenty eight leaves, 17 × 12 cm. in size, cursive writing. Each folio has eighteen lines. Fol. 1 contains differences in Deut. (beginning with chap. 32); fol. 2: 2 Sam. 13:
The Biblical passages are provided with vowel-points, accents and *raphe* marks. The punctuation in this MS see below.

D (= Firk. II, 150), a fragment consisting of eight leaves, size 20×14 cm., in square writing. Each folio has twenty lines. The Biblical passages are provided with vowel-points, accents and *raphe* marks. Fols. 1–4 contain differences in Gen. chap. 6 ff.; fol. 5: Lev. 20:17 ff.; fols. 6–8: Deut.

E (= Firk. II. 151), a fragment consisting of thirteen leaves, 17×13 cm. in size, oriental cursive writing. Each folio has twenty two lines. In the margin the number of words and letters of each *parasha* of the Pent. are given. The Biblical passages are provided with accents, but only the letters in which differences occur are vocalized. Fol. 1 contains the conclusion of the introduction and the differences in the *parasha* ברפואות נבואר; fols. 2–9: differences in the Pent. to the end of Nu.; fols. 10–13: Prov. (beginning with 14:35), the Five Megilloth, Dan. and Ezra-Neḥ. On fol. 13b there are two lists of accents with the titles:

אסמנים אטלטנים אשר נשתמרו באסמנים עלירפאנים

F (= Firk. II. 152), a fragment of seven leaves, 21×14.5 cm., in cursive writing. Each page has seventeen to eighteen lines. Fols. 1–3 contain differences in Gen. 1–46; fols. 4–6: Ex., Lev. and Nu. 1–7. On fol. 7 there begins an Arabic treatise on the accent zarqa.

G (= Firk. II, 153) consists only of one leaf written on both sides, size 16.8×12.5 cm., in cursive writing. It contains the differences in the *parashiyot* תיאורא נבואר in Ex.

P (= Alliance Isr. Paris, MS IX A3), consists of the two halves of what was originally one leaf; sizes 17×14 and 8×10; cursive writing. It contains the second part of Michael's introduction.

The Orthography

In the different MSS the diacritical dots are not applied uniformly. It is a peculiarity of E to put a dot in the final ꝏ, *e.g.* ובו. In general *teshdid* is not marked at all. Only with *yod* it is often indicated by double writing.

C shows considerable deviations from the Massoretic punctuation. *Pathah* and *segol* are applied promiscuously. *Pathah* more often stands for Massoretic *segol* than *vice versa*. In the same way *hateph pathah* very often stands for *hateph segol*. In the beginning of the word the gutturals often have simple
shewa instead of hateph pathah, mostly in the column, which show the reading of BN.

I retained the rather inconsequent arabic orthography, but the diacritic dots are regularly indicated:

\( \text{א} \) corresponds to Arabic とともに,  noen to ך,  ג to ך,  ד to ך,  נ to ך,  י to ך,  ס to ך,  ה to ך,  א to ך.

In the Biblical passages I provided with vowel points only those letters in which the hilluf appears.

In order to obtain a text as uniform and characteristic as possible, I took for basis those fragments out of the eight which offered continuous portions. These turned out to be the MSS. A, C and E, which fortunately always complement one another, so that where the continuous text ends in one its continuation can be found in another. I also collated the variants of the other fragments in the apparatus.

APPENDIX

Besides the eight above listed MSS I found in the Taylor-Shechter Collection of the University Library in Cambridge the following fragments belonging to Mishael’s Kitāb al-Khilaf:

1. T–S, D1, 60 – a fragment of two leaves, paper, written on both sides, size 10 × 9 cm. Each folio has twelve lines. It contains: 1a–1b part of the introduction = Kitāb al-Khilaf p. 1, line 19 to p. 2, line 2 – hillufim in Prov. from 27:1 to the end of the book and the congruences to 23:7 = Kitāb al-Khilaf p. 2, col., line 9 to the bottom of the page. The hillufim are indicated and the Biblical passages provided with accents but in most cases the vowel points are absent (cp. plate I and II).

2. T–S, D1, 49 – a fragment of two leaves, paper, written on both sides, size 17 × 12 cm. Each folio has twenty lines. It contains: 1a–1b: hillufim in Gen. to the beginning of אָרָעַת הָיְתָה = Kitāb al-Khilaf, p. 1, line 14 to p. 1, line 17 – hillufim in Gen. from parasha מִקְרָשָׁה and the introduction to Ex. = Kitāb al-Khilaf, p. 1, line 24 to p. 1, line 4. The hillufim are indicated and the Biblical passages are provided with accents and vowel points.

The following three fragments are parts of the same MS.

3. T–S, D1, 86 – a fragment of two leaves, paper, much damaged, written on both sides, size 12 × 9 cm. Each folio has eighteen lines. It contains: 1a–1b: congruences inキ., sedarim in Is. = Kitāb al-Khilaf p. 2, line 17 to p. 3, line 13, from חֲגוֹרָה הדְּבָרָה; 2a–2b: hillufim, in the Minor Prophets, from Jon. to Zeph. = Kitāb al-Khilaf, p. 3, line 11 to p. 3, line 15. The hillufim are indicated and the Biblical passages are provided with accents and vowel points.
4. T-S, D1, 70 - a fragment of two leaves, paper, very much damaged, written on both sides. The size of the second leaf is 12 x 9 cm., of the first leaf only a small part has been preserved. It contains: 1a–1b; congruences from 1 Chr. 2:3; the beginning of the hillufim in Ps. (1–3:8) = Kitāb al-Khilaf p. 20 to 2. line 11; 2a–2b; hillufim and congruences in Job (from 34:6), sedarim and hillufim in Prov. (1–4:27) = Kitāb al-Khilaf p. 2. col. 1st line to p. 2. col., line 2. The hillufim are indicated as in no. 3.

5. T-S, D1, 13 - a fragment of two leaves, paper, much damaged, size 12 x 9 cm. It contains: 1a–1b: hillufim from Ps. 66:12 to 72:7; congruences from Ps. 42:4 to 71:18, and the beginning of מִניָ֣יל מַעַצְּמִ֥ל = Kitāb al-Khilaf, p. 1. col., line 11 to line 26. 2a: hillufim from Ps. 108; 25 to 123; 2 = Kitāb al-Khilaf, p. 2. col., line 16 to 2. col., line 9; 2b: blank. The hillufim are indicated as in no. 3 (cp. plate III).

6. D1. 58 - a fragment of four pages of continuous text, square script. Each page has fifteen lines. It contains: congruences in Ez. (from 36:13), the congruences in the Minor Prophets and the hillufim in Chr. (to 2 Chr. 15:8). The Biblical passages are provided with accents and vowel points. This MS is of a much later date than the preceding ones. The division into Sedarim and the number of the Pesukim are absent.

7. T-S, D1, 117 - one leaf, vellum, much damaged, oriental square script, written on both sides in three columns. It contains the congruences in Gen. from 33:18; sedarim in Ex., hillufim in Ex., congruences in Ex. and part of the sedarim in Lev. It is a Hebr. translation of Kitāb al-Khilaf but different from Ad. and מְזֻבֵאת הָתֶרֶקֶן. Also the arrangement deviates from all hitherto known lists of hillufim in the Pent. Thus at the beginning of Ex. it gives the sedarim of the whole book; then follow the hillufim and at the end the congruences.

8. T-S, N. S309,36 (identified by Prof. N. Wieder) - a fragment of two leaves, much damaged. It contains, 1a – 1b: hillufim in Josh.; 2a – 2b: hillufim in 2 Sam.

9. Also in the Bodleian Library there are two fragments that belong to Mishael's treatise (Cp. Neubauer, Catalogue, Vol. II 2850, 40; 2821, 14b). These fragments were published by H.P. Rüger in VT 13 (1963) 231 ff. The first fragment (MS. Hebr. d. 62 fol. 1/7) contains the differences beginning from 1. 1. The second fragment (MS. Hebr. f. 56. fol. 40–41) contains extracts of Mishael's book on the division of the Pent. in parashiyot and sedarim from Gen. 1:1 to Num. 17:16.

10. M. Goshen-Gottstein found in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York a fragment of three leaves which also consist of parts of Mishael's treatise. I herewith wish to thank him for the permission to use
the photographs. The fragment JTS 566, 2-4 contains: 2b–3a: the hillufin in 2 Ki. = Kitāb al-Khila, p ש, 2. col., line 21 to p. י, 2. col., line 11; 2b–4a: the hillufin from 2 Ki. 18:25 (the first four lines are difficult to decipher) to 19:28. Then follow the hillufin from Is. 38:4 to Jer. 9:3. Thirty hillufin recorded by Mishael between (2 Ki. 19:28) and (Is. 38:29) are omitted. Likewise are omitted six hillufin in Jer. (3:9–7:33). The Biblical passages in this fragment are provided with accents and vowel points. The hillufin are clearly indicated, but no congruences are recorded.

The fact that there are preserved fragments of seventeen different MSS of Mishael’s treatise is evidence that it was once a well known and highly appreciated work.

11. In catalogues of booksellers which were found in the Geniza we meet with such items as מָשֶׁלֶל חַדָּע אלָבָלִיק בֵּית בֵּית בֵּית. It is quite possible that these books contained the work of Mishael (cp. e.g. JQR 12, 54).

V. PARALLEL TEXTS OF Kitāb Al-Khila

A Hebrew translation of Mishael’s work had been incorporated into the Massoretic compendium Adath Deborim of Joseph ha-Qostandini (fol. 24–39). The Leningrad MS. Firk. II. Arab. Hebr. 161 is the only known copy of this work.2 Owing to the efforts of P. Kahle this copy, dated A.D. 1207, was sent over to Bonn. I was able to restore from it a few small lacunae which were missing in the fragments of Mishael’s work. This chapter on the differences between BA and BN in Ad. is a rather defective, inaccurate Hebr. translation of Mishael’s compilation. Thus all differences in the parasha נְわかִית (Nu. 8–12) are missing. Twenty Biblical passages which show differences in the readings of the two Masoretes in the Book of Job are also omitted.3 Frequently the Biblical passages are not provided with vowel points so that the differences cannot be established.4 The mnemonic catchwords for the numbers of the verses differ in many instances from those stated by Mishael.5

Besides the Ad. there are known three more sources of later date which are based on Mishael’s work and contain parallels to parts of it. I registered also the variants of these sources in the apparatus.

1 It concludes on fol. 39 with the following words: These are the instances in which they differ and agree, according to the explanation established by Michael ben Uzziel.
3 Between כֵּלָא מִרְאֶה and כֵּלָא מִרְאֶה 13:27 and כֵּלָא מִרְאֶה 33:11.
4 For the way in which this chapter of Ad. was used by S. Baer cp. above p. 15, n. 51.
5 For instance in parasha יְשֵׁלָה it has אָדָלִים instead of אֲדָלִים; in מְדֵיא instead of מְדֵיא; in כֵּלָא מִרְאֶה instead of כֵּלָא מִרְאֶה.
1. The *Miqaddimah* of Samuel ha-Rophe (about 1350–1420), an Arabic introduction to the *parashiyoth* of the Pentateuch written in Hebr. letters.\(^6\) A copy of it from the seventeenth century is preserved in the British Museum (MS. Or. 2482–84) where I had the opportunity to study it. The *Miq.* gives at the end of each *parasha* the number of *sedarim* and verses and quotes the Biblical passages in which the two Massoretes differ, but not the instances where they agree. The Biblical passages are pointed and the differences precisely explained. The *Miq.* distinguishes two kinds of *ga’ya.* The one it calls כניעס and the other קפוק.\(^7\) The differences quoted in the *Miq.* agree in most cases with those stated by Michael. Samuel ha-Rophe, who was the head of the Karaite Community in Cairo, apparently used a copy of Michael’s book as *Vorlage* to this part of the *Miq.*, and, as at that time the famous BA codex still was in the possession of the Karaites in Cairo,\(^8\) it is quite possible that he also consulted this codex. The differences quoted in the *Miq.* were published by Ginsburg in his *Massorah,* vol. 3, 6–14.

2. The *Manuel du Lecteur,* a Massoretic compendium published by G. Dérouet from a Yemenite Pentateuch MS of the year 1391. *Man.* was known in Yemen under the name מנהיג הלינאום. It was prefaced to several Pent. MSS as an introduction, and it was also available as a separate book.\(^9\) In this compendium are included (pp. 417–433) Michael’s introduction — in extracts and with deviations — the differences and congruences, of both Massoretes on the Pent., the subdivision into *sedarim,* and the number of verses of each *parasha* with the mnemonic catchword. *Man.* shows considerably more variants of Michael’s work than *Ad.* and *Miq.*

3. The list of differences in the Massoretic treatise preceding the Bible MS. Harley 1528 of the British Museum (＝ H).\(^1\) The MS. originates probably from the 14th century. The list (fol. 9a–10a) contains the differences beginning from Josh. to Ps. 48:7 and quotes essentially the same Biblical passages as Michael, enlarged by several passages already quoted by Qimhi.\(^2\) This list was also published by Ginsburg (*Massorah* 3, 15 ff). It shows many more deviations from Michael’s statements than the other parallels. It contains also a list of differences on the Pent. (fol. 1b–4b). But this list is entirely different from Michael’s. It quotes two hundred and fifteen differences against one hundred and seventeen in our treatise.

---


\(^8\) JA sér. VI, t. 16 (1870) 309–433.


\(^11\) Cp. above p. 12.
APPENDIX

In the T–S collection of the University Library in Cambridge I found the following fragments of hillufim lists that do not belong to Mishael's Kitāb alKhilaḥ.

1. T–S D1, 102 – one leaf written on both sides, vellum, square script. It contains: 1a: hillufim in Gen. (to parasha ישב; 1b: hillufim in Lev. Almost all the congruences in Mishael's treatise are here among the hillufim.

2. T–S D1, 69 – fragment of four leaves, damaged. It has many more hillufim and congruences than Mishael's treatise. It contains: hillufim in Job, Prov. and Five Megilloth. Unlike Mishael's lists, the hillufim and congruences are not given separately but promiscuously.

3. T–S, D1, 16 – one leaf written on both sides, square script. It contains hillufim and congruences from Nu. 22:5 to Deut. 7:26. Hillufim and congruences — more than in Mishael's lists — are given promiscuously.

4. T–S, K27, 36 – there are four leaves, but only one (3a–3b) contains hillufim. The headline of 3a reads: בשם אלהין נֵגֵד אליהם. Then follow hillufim and congruences in Gen. (to 18:15) promiscuously. The rule on hillufim in Mishael's introduction is quoted here in connection with the hillufim (Gen. 3:17). It reads: תללון 만תנה הרוח נזרת אֵל כל אֵל אֶל לאלהים נֵד אלהים וְאֵל אֶל אֶל אֶל נֵד אֵל נֵד אֶל נֵד אֶל נֵד אֶל נֵד אֶל נֵד אֶל נֵד אֶל נֵד אֶל נֵד אֶל נֵד אֶל נֵד אֶל נֵד אֶל נֵד אֶל נֵד אֶל נֵד אֶל נֵד אֶל נֵד אֶל (Cp. the different wording in Kitāb al-Khilaḥ, p. 3).

5. T–S, N.S. 162, 5 (identified by S. Morag) – one leaf written on both sides, square script. It contains hillufim and congruences (promiscuously) from Job 17:13 to 24:14. It records fourteen hillufim against eight with Mishael, and six congruences, whereas Mishael has only one.
KITĀB AL-KHILAF

SIGLA OF MSS

A Firk. II, Arab.–Hebr. 147
B dto. 148
C dto. 149
D dto. 150
E dto. 151
F dto. 152
G dto. 153
P Alliance Israëlite, Paris IX A 3.
Ch.-K. Chufut Kale MSS.

ABBREVIATIONS

BA (8) Ben Asher.
BN (5) Ben Naphtali.
Liq. Qadm. S. Pinsker, Ligqute Qadmoniyyoth (Wien 1860).
Mikh. David Qimhi, Mikhlof (Lyck 1862).
Norzi Jedidiah Solomon Norzi, Minḥath Shay (Wien 1813).
Shor. David Qimhi, Sepher ha-Shorashim (Berlin 1847).
Ben Asher–Ben Naphtali L. Lipschütz, Ben Ašer–Ben Naphtali, Der Bibeltext der tiberi-
Mассората (Mukačevo 1935).