

JACOB BEN CHAJIM IBN ADONIJAH'S

INTRODUCTION

TO

THE RABBINIC BIBLE,

HEBREW AND ENGLISH;

WITH EXPLANATORY NOTES.

BY

CHRISTIAN D. GINSBURG, LL.D.

AND

THE

MASSORETH HA-MASSORETH

OF

ELIAS LEVITA,

BEING AN EXPOSITION OF THE MASSORETIC NOTES
ON THE HEBREW BIBLE

OR

THE ANCIENT CRITICAL APPARATUS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

IN HEBREW, WITH AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION

AND

CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY NOTES

BY

CHRISTIAN D. GINSBURG, LL.D.

PROLEGOMENON

BY

NORMAN H. SNAITH

KTAV PUBLISHING HOUSE, INC.

NEW YORK

הקדמת

יעקב בן חיים ן אדוניהו

הנמצאת

במקראות גדולות

הנקראות בשם שער יהוה הקדוש דפוס וויניציא שנת תרפ"ו

עם היקונים שונים

על פי מקראות גדולות דפוס הש"ז ודפוס השכ"ח

ונוסף

עליה תרגום, באור, ותולדת המחבר

בשפת ענגליש

מאת אוהב שפת קודש ומכבד מכבדיה

כריסטיאן דוד גינצבורג

JACOB BEN CHAJIM IBN ADONIJAH'S

INTRODUCTION

TO

THE RABBINIC BIBLE,

HEBREW AND ENGLISH;

WITH EXPLANATORY NOTES.

BY

CHRISTIAN D. GINSBURG, LL. D.

Second Edition.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROLEGOMENON by Norman H. Snaith	VII
--	-----

Introduction to The Rabbinic Bible

Preface	XXXVII
Jacob B. Chajim Ibn Adonijah (Life and Works)	1
Introduction (of Jacob B. Chajim Ibn Adonijah)	36
Index I. Passages of Scripture Referred to	85
Index II. Topics and Names	88

First Published in 1867

Massoreth Ha-Massoreth

Preface	VII
Life of Elias Levita	1
Information for the Reader	85
Preface (of Elias Levita)	86
Introduction I. A Song of Praise, Simple, and of Four Feet	89
Introduction II. The Rhythmical Introduction, According to German Rhyme	92
Introduction III. I Shall Now Turn My Face to the Third Introduction	102
 MASSORETH HA-MASSORETH	

New Matter
Copyright 1968

KTAV PUBLISHING HOUSE, INC.

FIRST PART:	144
SECTION I. treats on <i>defective</i> and <i>plene</i> in so far as they relate to the <i>matres lectiones Vav</i> after <i>Cholem</i> and <i>Shureck</i> , and <i>Jod</i> after <i>Chirek</i> and <i>Tzere</i>	145
SECTION II. treats on the passages wherein the <i>Vav</i> is absent after the <i>Cholem</i> in verbs and nouns, and the difference between them.	146
SECTION III. treats on nouns which are <i>Milra</i> and have a <i>Vav plene</i> after the <i>Cholem</i> on the top, and those which are <i>Milra</i> and have not the <i>Vav</i> ; as well as of all the <i>Cholems</i> on the participle <i>Kal</i> , which are generally defective, and most of the plurals feminine which have a <i>Vav</i> at the end.	149
SECTION IV. treats on the absent <i>Vav</i> of the <i>Shurek</i> , and on the <i>Kibutz</i> being substituted in its place.	153
SECTION V. treats on all the words which have a long <i>Chirek</i> , <i>i. e.</i> , <i>Chiruk</i> with a <i>Jod</i> , having mostly <i>Jod</i> ; and on those words which have <i>Cholem</i> , being mostly defective of <i>Vav</i>	155
SECTION VI. treats on the quiescent <i>Jod</i> after the <i>Tzere</i> and <i>Segol</i> , as well as on the quiescent <i>Jod</i> after the <i>Kametz</i> of the third person.	160

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 67-11894
Manufactured in the United States of America

PROLEGOMENON

It is a happy arrangement to reissue in one volume Elijah (Elias) Levita's *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth* and Jacob ben Chayyim ibn Adoniyah's *Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible of 1525*, though whether Elijah Levita would have approved of such a conjunction is quite another matter. The two men were contemporaries, with Elijah Levita probably the older by two or three years. Both were devoted students of the text of the Hebrew Bible and of the Masorah. Both were driven out of house and home by persecution, both lost all that they had, and both ultimately came to Venice where in 1516 Daniel Bomberg, a wealthy and cultured Christian merchant from Antwerp, had set up his celebrated printing press. Here the resemblance ends.

Jacob ben Chayyim's family were from Spain, and they emigrated from there in the expulsions of 1391 and 1412 or in the great expulsion of 1492. The family settled in Tunis, but were driven out from there through the military activities of Cardinal Ximenes against the Moors of North Africa. This was the Cardinal Ximenes who was responsible for the preparation and the printing of the Complutensian Polyglot Bible of 1514-17 at Alcalá. From 1510 to 1517 Jacob ben Chayyim wandered in poverty from one Italian city to another until he came to Venice. There he found rest and peace and work; he hoped it was for the rest of his life.

Elijah Levita was a Jew of German descent, born in Neustadt near Nuremberg. He lived all his early years in an atmosphere of persecution and massacre, although his own family does not seem to have been involved personally. In the end, however, doubtless because of increasing difficulties, the family migrated to Italy when the boy Elijah was about fifteen

SECTION VII. treats on the <i>plene</i> and <i>defective</i> of monosyllabic words, being small words.	163
SECTION VIII. treats on the Massoretic marks, or words, which have two or three quiescents, some being <i>plene</i> and some <i>defective</i> , or all being <i>plene</i> or all <i>defective</i>	166
SECTION IX. treats on words which have a quiescent <i>Aleph</i> , either expressed or not, and which are called ' <i>with audible Alephs</i> ,' or ' <i>without audible Alephs</i> .'	170
SECTION X. treats on words, the final <i>He</i> of which is either <i>plene</i> or <i>defective</i> , and are called <i>Maphkin He</i> , consisting of four kinds.	173
SECOND PART:	180
SECTION I. Concerning <i>Keri</i> and <i>Kethiv</i> , divided into seven classes.	180
SECTION II. Concerning <i>Kametz</i> and <i>Pattach</i>	195
SECTION III. Concerning <i>Dagesh</i> , <i>Raphe</i> , <i>Mapik</i> , and <i>Sheva</i>	197
SECTION IV. Concerning <i>Milel</i> , <i>Milra</i> , and <i>Pesakim</i>	204
SECTION V. Concerning <i>Registers</i> , <i>Groups</i> , <i>Resemblances</i> , and <i>Parallels</i>	210
SECTION VI. Concerning <i>Junctions</i> , <i>Severances</i> , and <i>Identical</i>	212
SECTION VII. Concerning <i>the Presence or Absence of Prefixes or Serviles</i>	219
SECTION VIII. Concerning <i>Conjectural Readings</i> , <i>Misleadings</i> , and <i>Exchanges</i>	225
SECTION IX. Concerning <i>Letters</i> , <i>Words</i> , <i>Expressions</i> , <i>Short Letters</i> , <i>Accents</i> , <i>Certainties</i> , and <i>Transpositions</i>	228
SECTION X. Concerning <i>Scripture</i> , <i>Book</i> , <i>Form</i> , <i>Connection</i> , and <i>Verse</i>	234
THIRD PART; OR, THE BROKEN TABLES	244
Now Before I Finish to Speak, I Shall Compose A New Song	267
That You May Know How Many Times Each Letter Occurs in the Bible, Read all the Words in this Poem.	269
Index I. Massoretically Annotated Passages of Scripture Referred to	279
Index II. Massoretic Lists Quoted Entire	298
Index III. Massoretic Terms and Abbreviations Explained	302
Index IV. Massoretic Lists Quoted in this Book, Which Are Also Found in Ochlá Ve-Ochlá	303
Index V. Topics and Names	304

with an apostate, and for an apostate's work to be welcomed by a Jew, has always been quite another matter, as Ginsburg found out much nearer our own time. Cardinal Ximenes was glad of the assistance of learned Jews in the preparation and publication of the Complutensian Polyglot. These were Alfonso de Zamora of Alcala, Pablo Coronel who did most of the work, and Alfonso de Alcala. (For the method and the sources these scholars are presumed to have used, see Paul Kahle, *The Cairo Genizah* [2nd. ed., 1959], pp. 126–9.) It is most likely that Ginsburg was unduly optimistic and charitable when he said (Introduction to his edition of Ibn Adoniyah's *Introduction*, p. 9) that these two learned Hebraists, Ibn Adoniyah and Elijah Levita, "now became co-workers in the same printing office." Virtually, the arrival of Elijah Levita the Jew at Daniel Bomberg's printing office marks the exit of Ibn Adoniyah the apostate Jew, just as, apparently, the arrival of Ibn Adoniyah the Jew had marked the exit of Felix Pratensis the apostate Jew some ten years earlier. Ginsburg admits (*ibid.*, p. 11) that Levita's arrival was connected with Ibn Adoniyah's departure.

Between the years 1543 and 1547 Daniel Bomberg published fifteen midrashim and commentaries on the Bible, including all four early midrashim: *Bereshit Rabba*, *Mechilta*, *Sifra*, and *Sifre*. Possibly Jacob ben Chayyim helped in all the preparation and proof-reading involved, but the names cited are those of Cornelius Adelkind and Elijah Levita. Perhaps Daniel Bomberg employed him, but suppressed his name because of the hostility which the mention of the name would certainly arouse. However all this may be, what is certain is that during the years 1517 to 1527 Ibn Adoniyah accomplished a truly prodigious amount of work. He edited the whole of the Babylonian Talmud in twelve folio volumes, the Jerusalem Talmud, Rabbi Nathan's Concordance and the *Mishne Torah* of Maimonides. And all the time he was busy travelling, collecting and collating codices preparatory to the publishing of the great Rabbinic Bible which was accepted as the authoritative text (*textus receptus*) for four hundred years and more.

years old. By the turn of the century Elijah Levita was established in Padua as a famous scholar and lecturer, but he lost everything in the sack of Padua in 1509. He fled to Rome where he found a patron in the Augustine Egidio de Viterbo, later Cardinal. But again he lost everything, all his property including his manuscripts, in the sack of Rome in 1527. Then it was that he came to Venice and found employment with Daniel Bomberg, where Jacob ben Chayyim was already employed.

What happened in the Bomberg printing press in 1527 or so, we do not know, but it was from about that time that the name of Jacob ben Chayyim ibn Adoniyah drops out and we hear nothing more of him. We do know that Ibn Adoniyah the Jew became Jacob ben Chayyim the Christian. Up to 1525 Levita had spoken well of Ibn Adoniyah. The epilogue which Levita wrote for the Rabbinic Bible of 1524–5, for which Ibn Adoniyah was responsible, is most laudatory, and indeed deservedly so. But from 1527 onwards the name of Ibn Adoniyah disappears from the Bomberg books, and later editions of the 1524–5 Bible omit his name. Compare the way in which W. Wickes טעמי כ"א ספרים, p. xiii, refers to the two Bomberg Rabbinic Bibles, not mentioning the names of either editor, both of whom were Jews who turned Christian.

Daniel Bomberg himself had no objection to employing a converted Jew. Felix Pratensis, who was responsible for the first Rabbinic Bible which Daniel Bomberg printed in 1516–17, was born a Jew, but turned Christian ca. 1506. When Ibn Adoniyah came to Venice in 1517 he was a Jew, and perhaps it was through his arrival and attitude that Felix Pratensis' term of usefulness at Venice came to an end. He was a man of great distinction, of considerable ability as a scholar, and of very great personal ability in the management of affairs. Levita had worked with Christians often enough, taught Christians and owed a great deal to them, both in Padua and in Rome. All through the centuries many Jewish scholars have worked happily with Christian scholars; but for a Jew to work

not know," he wrote, "how to distinguish between his right hand and his left," and that "he was groping in darkness, like a blind man . . . they are confusion worse confounded."

Ibn Adoniyah was naturally much dissatisfied with the way in which Felix Pratensis dealt with the Masorah, though the text is much closer than that of Ibn Adoniyah to what many of us believe to be the true Ben Asher tradition. He would have very little difficulty on the grounds of scholarship alone in persuading Daniel Bomberg that something better must be produced. He set about collecting manuscript readings and masoretic notes. Daniel Bomberg spared no expense. To what extent Elijah Levita depended on Jacob ben Chayyim's work in the preparation of the concordance, it is not possible to say. The sort of thing which Ibn Adoniyah did is what Ginsburg did in his massive collection of *The Massorah* in four volumes, imperial folio (1881–1905). There are no indications where any notes came from, or the date, origin, and history of the manuscripts. Nobody in the 16th century ever thought of doing this, neither Ibn Adoniyah, nor Cardinal Ximenes and his helpers (if indeed they bothered about the Masorah at all), nor even Levita himself. There had to be a beginning some time, and this beginning was made by Jacob ben Chayyim; Ginsburg has rightly said that Jacob "rescued the Massorah from perdition." Something of the same kind can be said of Ginsburg. The fact that both scholars have been subjected to considerable, and in some instances partly justifiable, criticism does not detract from the importance of their work. After all, it is from the mistakes of one generation that the next generation can profit, and sometimes does.

The text of the 1524–25 Rabbinic Bible, that which was edited by Ibn Adoniyah, came to be recognized as the true masoretic text. It was followed in Bibles printed in Venice during the next ninety years: e. g., the 1546–48 Bible, that of 1568, and that of 1617–19. The consonants proper had been virtually fixed since pre-talmudic times, but Ibn Adoniyah's Bible fixed the vowel-letters, the vowel points, and the accents

The two men, Elijah Levita and Jacob ben Chayyim, were different in their approach to the study of the text of the Hebrew Bible. They represent the first stages of two major attitudes which culminated in the work of Baer on the one hand and of Ginsburg, Kahle, and Snaith on the other. This is what makes the combined publication of the work of these two sixteenth century scholars so useful at the present time. Elijah Levita was primarily a grammarian, and he believed in rules. He had written a Hebrew Grammar as early as 1518 (*The Book Bachur*), and in the same year he issued tables of paradigms. Two years later he issued a treatise on irregular verbs and also started on an Aramaic Grammar. At Venice in 1529 he was responsible for a new edition of David Kimchi's *Book of Roots*. He completed his Concordance in 1536, which was never published; but from his description of it and of his method, he followed virtually the same plan as Solomon Mandelkern in 1895. Levita sought to explain everything that is found in the Masorah, what all the "shorthand" notes in the margin mean, and why it was so important that all words should be correctly written. It should be remembered that matters of doctrine or conduct were sometimes based on textual minutiae, e. g., on whether or not the long *-O* is written with or without a *vav*. For general purposes, one text is as good as another, whether it be Baer, either Kittel edition, Ginsburg, Letteris, or Snaith. But when we set out to produce and print a true Hebrew text, we must be very careful to determine the right words *plene* and the right words *defective*, the correct accents, the correct vowels, and to begin the paragraphs at the proper places and in the proper way. Elijah Levita's method of securing this type of accuracy is to be seen in his *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*.

The work of Jacob ben Chayyim ibn Adoniyah was associated more directly with the manuscripts themselves. The marginal notes of the first Rabbinic Bible (Felix Pratensis) leave a very great deal to be desired. They consist of a single word in the margin (usually a Qere) and that is all. Levita was very critical of Felix Pratensis and his work. He "did

test
Edition
s "plene"
↑
t to
(G3 has
ective)

This was his general practice, and I have given an illustration of his method in *Textus*, vol. II (1962), pp. 9 f. The example is Josh. v,6 where Ginsburg has לאבתם, following 26 codd. and 6 edd.; Jacob ben Chayyim read לאבותם (*plene*) with 15 codd. in Ginsburg's list and 6 edd. This latter is to be found, e. g., in Baer, Kittel, Kahle, Letteris, Athias 1661 and 1667, Michaelis, and Snaith — indeed Ginsburg stands virtually alone. A similar instance is 1 Sam. i,4 (ובנחיה); but one which happens to have produced the right result is 2 Kgs. xxv,17 (הכרת). Another example, this time concerned with accents, is Job ii,8, where Ginsburg has והוא ישב בתוך, with מירכא, טפחא, and מירכא. This is the reading of all printed texts earlier than Jacob ben Chayyim, except that of the Polyglot Bible which has no accents. So also 18 codd. in Ginsburg's lists. Baer has this, in spite of quoting a masorah to the effect that there are (no more than) four cases of והוא ישב, (i. e., מירכא and טפחא), viz., Gen. xiv,12; xxiv,62; Num. xxii,5; Jud. iv,2. But מירכא and טפחא is right, followed by מקף (והוא יושב בתוך); so Jacob ben Chayyim, Kittel, Kahle, Athias, and especially B.M. Or 2626 and Or 2375, two codd. on which great reliance is to be placed. Ginsburg has followed the majority against Jacob ben Chayyim and against a masorah. It is true that Baer did not trust this masorah, but it is right.

Further, Ginsburg has taken no notice of any alterations which have been made in a manuscript; that is, he accepted and recorded what the manuscript reads now, but not what the original scribe wrote. Both Kennicott and de Rossi in their collations made some progress along this line, but it ought to be carried out completely and thoroughly. It is not enough to give the present reading of a manuscript, because many manuscripts, particularly Sephardi manuscripts, have been altered to the Jacob ben Chayyim text. A particular example of this is the so-called Shem-Tob manuscript, no. 82 in the late David Sassoon's catalogue of Hebrew and Samaritan MSS (London 1932). Kahle (*The Cairo Geniza*, 2nd ed., p. 139) refers to the curious history of this codex, and he thought that it must have

as well. Rudolf Kittel kept close to the Ibn Adoniyah text in his *Biblia Hebraica* of 1909, and Ginsburg claimed to do this in his text, published by the Trinitarian Bible Society in 1894 and again in 1896; the same text was used for the centenary edition published by the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1911–26. Ginsburg himself says in the preface: "The text presented in this book is substantially that of the first edition of Jacob ben Chayyim's Massoretic Recension, printed by Bomberg in Venice in 1524–25." The word "substantially" is a very useful word, and usually it covers a multitude of sins; but Ginsburg's statement is saved by the word "recension." It is actually a recension, because it differs often from Jacob ben Chayyim's text. The Bible Society-Ginsburg edition contains a collation (sometimes complete) of 75 codices, most of them in the British Museum, and of 19 printed texts of part of or of the whole of the Bible. There are 8 complete Bibles, the last of them being the 1524–25 Rabbinic Bible.

Ginsburg did not follow Jacob ben Chayyim as closely as he suggested. He tended to follow the majority of the manuscripts and printed editions. Ginsburg speaks highly of the Masorah in B. M. Harley 5710–11 (Italian, ca. 1230 A.D.), and says that it "is most accurate and important" (see his *Introduction*, pp. 478–485); but for the most part for him one manuscript was as good as another. One curious instance, however, is 1 Sam. xv, 6, where Ginsburg follows Baer in printing ידו with a *dagesh*, and says that he is following a masoretic note in B. M. cod. Add. 15451 (Franco-German, ca. 1200 A.D.). There are 41 of Ginsburg's codices in favor of *resh* with *raphe*, as well as 11 printed editions (including that of Jacob ben Chayyim). This is a most extraordinary choice, since of all the codices which Ginsburg collated, this particular codex most regularly follows all those rules in which Heidenheim and Baer delighted, and which Ginsburg calls "conceits, fancies," and the like.

In this particular case, Ginsburg would have done better to have followed the majority of manuscripts and editions.

If, therefore, by "the Masorah" we mean the whole corpus of notes found in various manuscripts, then there is such a thing as "the Masorah"; but if we mean one authoritative, complete, unified system, then there is no such thing as "the Masorah." Whenever, therefore, we use the term "the Masorah" we mean the whole corpus of masoretic notes found in the various manuscripts with all the contradictions and discrepancies.

These discrepancies between masoretic notes and the actual text constituted Jacob ben Chayyim's great problem when he set out to prepare the text for his 1524–25 Rabbinic Bible. In his "Introduction" (p. 79) he says: "Whenever I took exception to a statement in a certain codex of the Massorah, because it did not harmonise with the majority of the Codices of the Massorah, whilst it agreed with a few, or whenever it contradicted itself, I made a careful search till I discovered the truth, according to my humble knowledge." As Kahle wrote (*The Cairo Geniza*², p. 130), Jacob ben Chayyim "was convinced that there was only *one* correct Masora — the one he added to the Bible text." Jacob ben Chayyim did his best, and since he was a pioneer in this matter, it was a very good best. But he was wrong. There is no single correct Masorah. This certainly has been apparent since the 1720 Bible edited by J. H. Michaelis. Michaelis based his text, so far as manuscripts are concerned, on five Erfurt manuscripts, of which the best is Erfurt 3. This MS contains in the margin the ancient masoretic work known as *Ochlah we-Ochlah*; it is now in Marburg (Berlin MS Or fol 1213), and is probably earlier than A.D. 1100. The Michaelis Bible is wholly independent of the Jacob ben Chayyim Bible and does not refer to its text; and of the nineteen printed texts to which Michaelis refers in his notes on the text, only three are earlier than 1524. These are the Bomberg quarto editions of 1518 and 1521, and the 1517 Felix Pratensis Rabbinic Bible. The evidence produced by Michaelis shows that, whilst there are minor variations in the Masorah, yet as a whole the variations are by no means ran-

been at some time in Babylonia in the hands of the later Geonim. This may indeed be so, but the manuscript has certainly been "corrected," there or elsewhere, to the Jacob ben Chayyim text. Under whatever strange circumstances the manuscript may have been written in Soria in Spain in A.D. 1312, we have found the original text to be very good, and closely allied to the best Sephardi manuscripts. If one starts off by assuming that the Jacob ben Chayyim text is actually, or substantially, the correct masoretic text, then all these alterations are sound, and the original reading is of small account. But if one does not think that the Jacob ben Chayyim text is the truest masoretic text, then these earlier and original readings of Sephardi manuscripts are very important.

The great question is: How are we to obtain a true, accurate masoretic text? In the Prolegomenon by Professor Harry M. Orlinsky in the KTAV Publishing House reissue of Ginsburg's *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible* (the first of this present series of republications), he says (p. XV) that "none can claim to being *the* masoretic text," but that there can be "*a* masoretic text." He says also (p. XXXVI) that for him the phrase "*the* Masorah" has no meaning. If by "the Masorah" we mean one unified set of masoretic notes, itself complete and with no contradictory statements in it, then he is right; there is no such unified, authoritative Masorah. This can be seen in Ginsburg's massive four-volume compilation. Presumably some scribes were not content to be copyists only; they sought to get the text right, and they counted up the number of times, for instance, in which a certain form in their own codex was written *plene*, and so forth. And so far as their own codex was concerned, the note was correct, and presumably every note was correct and agreed with every other note. But apparently some scribes copied a text from one codex and combined with it the masoretic notes deriving from another codex, and the marginal notes do not always agree with the text. (Further, it is not always easy to decide the precise meaning of a note.)

chiefly on a Sephardi codex in three volumes, British Museum Or. 2626–27–28. It is the most beautifully illuminated Hebrew Bible MS which the British Museum possesses, and the script itself is superb. It was written in Lisbon in 1483 by “Samuel the scribe the son of R. Samuel ibn Musa who rests in Paradise.” It is no. 62 in Margoliouth’s catalogue and no. 48 in Ginsburg’s description of manuscripts in his *Introduction* (KTAV Publishing House, 1966), pp. 707–14. Readings from the manuscript are given in the Ginsburg Bible (Bible Society four-volume edition) under no. 52, but these readings do not take account of the alterations which have been made. This manuscript, like very many other Sephardi manuscripts, has been “corrected” to agree with the Jacob ben Chayyim tradition. It is the original text that matters, and it is this original text of Or. 2626–27–28 which follows the tradition which was also followed by Jablonski, Lonzano, and Norzi. Only rarely is there any variation from this norm.

Another codex of this type is the so-called Shem-Tob Bible which formerly was in the library of Mr. David Sassoon (see p. XVII above). This also has been “corrected” to the Jacob ben Chayyim tradition, but, in our judgment, the first hand is sound. It belongs to the same tradition as Norzi and Or. 2626–27–28. Another codex which we have found to preserve the same type of text is British Museum Or. 2375, a Yemenite MS containing the Hagiographa only, and containing in alternate verses most of R. Saadia’s Arabic Version. It is no. 147 in Margoliouth’s catalogue, and no. 47 in Ginsburg’s Bible and *Introduction* (pp. 704–7). The date is ca. 1460–80, which is late; but Ginsburg confirms that Yemenite MSS of late date often contain “no variations . . . from the earliest MSS. which have come down to us” (*Introduction*, p. 650 — on Or. 1468; also p. 698, on Or. 2364). Perhaps it was the isolation which ensured this faithful accuracy of the scribes; in any case, “by their fruits ye shall know them.”

What, then, is to be done? Are we to follow the Jacob ben Chayyim method and depend on manuscripts rather than on

dom, nor are we wholly at the mercy of the vagaries of medieval scribes. The notes in Jablonski’s 1699 collation, printed in Berlin, and those in Lonzano’s *Or Torah* show that there was a traditional masorah different from that which Jacob ben Chayyim found or constructed from the manuscripts which Daniel Bomberg enabled him to collect and study. Jablonski found the Masorah “very mutilated and perplexing, and in some places manifestly wrong,” and this judgment was confirmed with illustrations by Michaelis (p. 22 of his *Introduction*). But there is nevertheless a discernible pattern, a substantially stable masorah, and it can be reconstructed, in our opinion, from Lonzano’s *Or Torah*, Jablonski’s collation, and also from Norzi’s מנחת שי. The manuscript on which Norzi placed most reliance is no. 782 in the de Rossi collation; it was written in Toledo in 1277. Of it de Rossi says (*Variae Lectiones Veteris Testamenti* [Parma 1784], vol. i, p. cxxiii): “A codex most elegant, most accurate, and most carefully written according to the laws of the masorah, so that it ought to be considered the most perfect exemplar of the masoretic text.” The work of Jablonski is to be found in his critical edition of the Buxtorf text (1699 and 1712). Again and again, in his מנחת שי, Norzi refers to Sephardi manuscripts, and we have found again and again that these readings agree with the Lonzano-Jablonski tradition, and they disagree with that set up by Jacob ben Chayyim. It is evident that this particular tradition was brought to Spain at an early period, so that when Spain became the great centre of Jewish learning, their Bible text embodied this tradition. Something of this tradition is to be found in the Complutensian Polyglot, printed at Alcalá in 1514–17.

The text of this tradition is remarkably close to that of Paul Kahle in the third edition of Kittel’s *Biblia Hebraica* (1937). Kahle’s account of how this text came to be based on the Leningrad Codex B 19a is to be found in his *The Cairo Geniza*², pp. 113 ff. The 1958 Hebrew Bible, published by the British and Foreign Bible Society, which I edited, is based

Saadia's judgment in these matters is far more reliable than that of Maimonides, but the great veneration in which "the second Moses" was held, carried the day.

Kahle very severely criticized the work of Seligmann Baer (died 1897), who as a boy knew Wolf Heidenheim (died 1832) and later followed in his footsteps. Kahle rightly says (*ibid.*, p. 113) of Heidenheim and Baer: "they actually knew a great deal of Masora and were so devoted to its study that one can almost regard them as in a way continuing the work of the Masoretes, as the last of the Masoretes." This is exactly true. They continued the work of the Masoretes. Baer's text is what the ancient Masoretes would have produced if they had continued developing their ideas through the centuries. Baer had no compunction in changing what he found in manuscripts, in "correcting an error." This is because he was always prepared to follow a statement by a grammarian or a rule of the Masoretes even though it was against the MSS, be they many or few. Further, he was quite prepared to make every similar form conform to what was stated by his authority in any one particular case. He quotes various codices in his notes to support the reading he adopts, but usually he quotes some such authority as Jekuthiel's עין הקורא. This is to be found in B. M. Add. 19776 (German, dated 1396); see also B. M. Orient. 853. These two vary, and the copy which Baer used (Heidenheim's printed edition, Rödelheim, 1818–21) varies from both. Jacob ben Chayyim certainly paid attention to what the Masorah said, but he found it so often contradictory and confusing that he had to exercise his own judgment as to what to print and what not to print. This means that in effect he went by the MSS. The same is to be said of Ginsburg; but again and again in his *Introduction* he makes a statement that such-and-such a reading "is not supported in the MSS." Ginsburg also says (*Introduction*, pp. 484 f.) that "The Masorah in this MS. is most accurate and important. I have, therefore, made it the basis of my edition of this Corpus." The reference is to B. M. Harley 5710–11 (ca. 1230 A. D., Italian).

the Masorah? Or are we to follow Elijah Levita's predilection and depend on masoretic rules and the grammarians rather than on the manuscripts? If we follow the Jacob ben Chayyim method, are we to esteem one manuscript above another, and if so, which? And if the Masorah, which Masorah? If we follow Elijah Levita and the grammarian tradition, are we to agree to freeze the development at one particular date, or are we to continue the process of developing rules in order to ensure the elimination of every possible misunderstanding? If we follow this process to its full development, then Baer's text is the best; but there is the well known tradition, going back to Maimonides, that the true Hebrew text is that which was preserved by the Ben Asher family. This means that the problem of obtaining a reliable masoretic text involves finding a sound Ben Asher manuscript. Kahle chose Leningrad B 19a and produced a Ben Asher text. I fixed on B. M. Or. 2626–27–28 and B. M. Or. 2375, and produced a Ben Asher text very close to that of Kahle. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem project has chosen the Aleppo Codex, and this, too, will provide a Ben Asher text. As we have said, both the Leningrad Codex and the Aleppo Codex have been hidden away, so to speak, and have thereby been kept safe from zealous "correctors" (*Textus*, II, p. 13). Baer declared that he was most anxious to follow the Ben Asher tradition. What he has done is to follow the grammarians and accentors who have started with Ben Asher and moved on with further developments. He has moved on from Elijah Levita. Others have followed in the footsteps of Jacob ben Chayyim and have depended more on manuscripts and less on grammatical-masoretic notes.

On the other hand, as Orlinsky has reminded us (*Prolegomenon*, pp. XXX–XXXII), R. Saadia Gaon (about 200 years prior to Maimonides) "would have ruled vigorously in favor of Ben Naftali as against Ben Asher." There is indeed no reason whatever why Ben Asher should be regarded as a better or more trustworthy masoretic scholar than Ben Naftali, except that Maimonides said so. It is most probable that

Wickes (*Prose Accents*, p. 12) is fully in favor of repeating *Pashta*, as are all authorities and editors, but he is not in favor of repeating the accent in cases such as נָח. Wickes, strangely for him, was too cautious here, because there is plenty of evidence in the manuscripts for repeating the *Pashta* in such instances, and Ginsburg, Kahle, and Snaith all repeat it. But Wickes rightly says that the rule of repetition is not regularly observed in respect of the other postpositive accents or with *Great Telisha*, and he cites de Rossi 413 which claims to be a copy of Codex Hillel; see also Derenbourg, *Manuel du Lecteur*, p. 92, which is a publication (in 1871) of מחברת החינוך, one of those grammatico-masoretic treatises which are found regularly in Yemeni codices of the Pentateuch or of the whole Bible. Wickes also says that a codex which always doubles these accents is "very rare indeed," and he quotes MS. Paris 1. But Wickes assumes that this doubling of all these particular accents was originally a rule, and that there were "reasons which led to the omission of the second sign." Here we think Wickes was mistaken. The repetition of the accent on the tone syllable was a later development, fully carried out at a comparatively early date in the case of *Pashta* (and this in codices which have the authority of Ben Asher), but not in the case of the other accents. Heidenheim and Baer worked on the principle that the process must continue, and that the work of the Masoretes should be carried out to its logical conclusion.

The third principle of Heidenheim and Baer concerns those cases where the *Dagesh* "may be suspected of having been omitted by error" (*Liber Genesis*, p. vii), and in these cases Baer always prints *Raphe*; the example is Gen. ii,23 לִקְחָהּ. This is an extension of the use of *raphe*, which many excellent codices have regularly in the *begadkephath* letters where *dagesh lene* is not due. The rule has been extended to cases where, as here, *dagesh forte* is normally found. In this particular instance Erfurt 1 (quoted by Michaelis), and 5 codd. and 6 edd. quoted by Ginsburg follow the standard rule for the form and print the *dagesh*.

I think "this Corpus" must mean the four-volume edition of *The Massorah*, because I do not think Ginsburg would ever follow any masoretic note without support from a majority (or near-majority) of actual MSS and early editions. Ginsburg was in the same difficulty as Jacob ben Chayyim had been: when the masorah varies, what is to be done? Like Jacob ben Chayyim, he tended in the end to use manuscripts backed by masorah, whereas Baer worked the other way round, and followed the development of the masorah, with the manuscripts as additional confirmatory evidence.

The principles according to which Baer worked are set out in the preface to his edition of the text of *Liber Genesis*, printed in 1869, in a preface by Franz Delitzsch, who described himself as *edendi operis adjutor*. On p. vii of this preface, Delitzsch mentions 6 principles. The first is: make sure to distinguish between *Pashta* and *Qadma*; thus, e. g., וְלִמְשָׁל (Gen. i,18) is *Pashta*, and אֲשֶׁר (Gen. ii,19) is *Qadma*. This is a perfectly sound rule, and is followed regularly in the manuscripts. The second principle is: when the accented syllable is not the last syllable and *Pashta* is due, then the accent is doubled, e. g., הַמִּים (Gen. i,22). This again is a rule that is followed by all, and it is in the manuscripts. But Heidenheim and Baer carried this principle further and applied it to all postpositive accents, that is, to *Zarqa*, *Segholta*, and *Little Telisha*; for example, he prints וַיֹּאמֶר (Gen. ii,23), אֲשֶׁרֶּה (Gen. iii,17), and וַיֹּאמֶר (Gen. iii,13). Baer also doubles the accent in such forms as נָח (Gen. viii,13) and וַיִּבְרָא (2 Sam. iii,32), and אֲתִיהֶרֶקֶיֶע (Gen. i,7). He also repeats *Great Telisha*, e. g., בְּלִאֲדֹן (2 Kgs. xx,12). It would appear that his printer was unable to print these particular accents right at the end of the consonant, as the manuscripts do. Except for *Pashta* with *lamedh* and with *waw* on the last letter, he printed these accents over the middle of the consonant: thus רִי, and not רִי. In doubling these accents Baer was following Heidenheim, and both were following Jekuthiel.

Ben Asher, then this was decisive and carried precedence over all. When Baer refers to "good codices" (*Liber Jesaiae*, p. 78), he means codices which follow his rules. Further, Baer believed that it was right to follow the grammarian, not only in the particular instance under discussion, but in all other similar instances. That is, he followed out the logic and development of the statement, and printed this "correct" pointing everywhere else. He held that it is wrong to freeze the Masorah at one particular stage of its development, even though that stage be the time of Ben Asher or of any particular codex whenever and wherever written.

Included under the fourth heading in Delitzsch's list (Baer, *Liber Genesis*, p. vii) is the problem of the consonant *resh*. Ginsburg (*Introduction*, p. 465) defines among these instances: when the *resh* stands between two *qametses*, or between a *qamets* and a *chirek*, or between a *qamets* and a *shureq*. But it is better to define the problem as: what happens when a *sheva* is due under *resh* after *qamets*? In a treatise found in Yemeni codices of the Pentateuch (B. M. Or. 2342, fol. 15a; Or. 2349, fol. 10b), it is said that *chateph-pathach* is to be read, and not *sheva*. The instances cited are *הֲרֵכֶשׁ* (Gen. xiv,21; and similar forms with or without *vav*-copula), *הֲרֹחָה* (Exod. viii,11), *הֲרַפְּאִים* (Deut. iii,11; etc.), *הֲרֶשְׁעִים* (Exod. ix,27; etc.) and *הֲרִדִידִים* (Isa. iii,23). It is said that "a few scribes" (*מקצת הסופרים*) follow this practice. Ginsburg (*ibid.*, p. 467) agrees with this last statement, but says that it is by no means a binding rule. Baer does not follow this rule, and rightly so.

But this is not the whole story concerning *resh* with *sheva* or with *chateph-pathach*. What happens in forms of the root *ברך* where *resh* is preceded by *qamets* or *tsere* and normally a *sheva* is due under the *resh*? Ginsburg does not mention this root in his criticisms of Baer, but it is in Delitzsch's list (*Liber Genesis*, p. vii). There are 88 such cases; see the lists in Mandelkern's Concordance. In six of these Baer prints a *sheva*. They are *וַיְתַבְּרֶכּוּ* (Ps. lxxii,17), *בָּרְכוּ* (1 Chr. xxix,20), *וַיִּתְּבְּרֶכּוּ* (Jer. iv,2), *בָּרְכוּ* (1 Chr. xxvi,5), *בָּרְכֵנִי* (Josh. xvii,14), and

The fourth principle concerns cases such as *בְּהִתְקַנּוּ* (Gen. xlii,21), i. e., where a consonant is repeated and normally a *sheva* is due under the first consonant. Baer prints *chateph-pathach* in all these cases, e. g., *בְּהִרְרָם* (Gen. xiv,6) and *קָנְיִי* (Gen. xxxviii,12). Baer here is following the principle which has been handed down in the name of Rabbi Phinehas who was President of the Academy at Tiberias ca. 750 A.D. The list contains eighteen forms where he preferred *chateph-pathach* instead of the simple *sheva*; see Ginsburg, *Introduction*, pp. 465 f. and also his *The Masorah*, letter ט, vol. I, p. 658, § 24. The first application of this principle is that where the sequence normally would be, say, *lamedli, sheva, lamedli*, then we should read *chateph-pathach* and not *sheva*. Ginsburg complained (p. 466 and n. 2) that when Baer quoted this tradition, he omitted the end of the statement, which is *ולא אשכחתי ולא אשכחתי* ("but I have not found it so in the correct Codices"). This note is to be found in B. M. Or 1478, fol. 1b (Sephardi, ca. 1300 A.D.). Baer does indeed omit this sentence, but it must also be said that he quotes (*Liber Psalmorum*, p. 84, at 3,7) other authorities, notably *דקדוקי הטעמים* (§ 33), alleged to be by or under the direct influence of Ben Asher. At any rate, Baer believed that it is a Ben Asher tradition. Also, although he omitted the reference to "correct codices" in his quotation from R. Phinehas, nevertheless in his note on Isa. xlv,20 (*Liber Jesaiae*, p. 78) Baer says that he printed *וּמִתְפַּלְלִים* (with *chateph-pathach*) "with these vowels and accents as instructed in good codices." The different ways in which Baer and Ginsburg deal with this problem show exactly the difference between the principles according to which they worked, and how they can be thought to be the successors of Elijah Levita and Jacob ben Chayyim respectively. Baer adhered to the Masorah and to the statements of the grammarians, and he believed it was right to do this virtually always, whatever the codices say. Even if a codex was said to be dependent upon Ben Asher himself, Baer would still follow the note; but if there was a note or a comment in the name of

2 Chr. xx,26, but prints a *sheva* in the text. What Baer actually intended in 2 Chr. xx,26 is impossible to decide. Ginsburg prints *sheva* everywhere except in Isa. xix,25, where he prints *chateph-pathach* with the support of 17 codd. and 7 edd., as against 15 codd. and 3 edd., including Jacob ben Chayyim: a clear case of Ginsburg's tendency to be guided by the majority of codd. and edd. in preference to anything else.

Ought there ever to be a *chateph-pathach* under *resh* where normally a *sheva* is due? The answer is: perhaps, sometimes. All gutturals occasionally have a *sheva*: רֶחֶקָה (Gen. xxx,22), וְרַעְמָה (Gen. x,7); more rarely הֶיְהִיבֵלוּ (2 Kgs. xvii,15) and וַיִּהְיֶה לוֹ (Jer. ii,5), and אֶפֶסֶר (Gen. xlvi,29). The number is limited for all five "gutturals," both the three true gutturals (*he*, *cheth* and *ayin*) and the two semi-gutturals (*aleph* and *resh*); compare, e. g., the various rules for pointing the definite article when followed by these five gutturals (Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley, § 35). But in codices and in editions the greatest number of readings which vary between *sheva* and *chateph-pathach* occur with *resh*. There would seem to have been two different pronunciations of the consonant *resh*: one, a full guttural (like the French *r*), the other, a true consonant (like the Scottish *r*). The more that *resh* is pronounced as a guttural, the more the *chateph-pathach* is justified. Further, *resh* is more likely to be a full guttural after *qamets* than after *tsere*. Baer always has *chateph-pathach* after *qamets*, except in the three cases mentioned in דְּקָדוּקֵי הַטַּעֲמִים, and he is uncertain after *tsere*; the incidence of a near-guttural *resh* after *qamets* can easily be tested by the reader. There is a record of a double pronunciation of *resh* in Palestine; see Derenbourg, *Manuel du Lecteur*, p. 68.

This treatment of *resh* as a guttural would account for such forms in Baer's editions as בְּקָרָב (2 Sam. xv,5), אֶפֶסֶר (Ps. xviii,7), and אֶמְרוּת (Ps. xii,7); as also such forms as לְשֹׂאֵל (Ps. xlix,15), תִּבְחָר (Ps. lxv,5), תִּמְחֹץ (Ps. lxviii,24), תִּלְעַג (Prov. xxx,17), and אֶבְחָר (Job xxix,25), all cases where a guttural follows what normally would be a *sheva*, and all

בְּרָכוֹ (2 Chr. xx,26). In the first of these, those with *qamets*, Baer has followed a statement in דְּקָדוּקֵי הַטַּעֲמִים, §§ 53 and 58, attributed by Felix Pratensis to Ben Asher (Baer, *Liber Psalmorum*, p. 107). The statement is: when the accent is retracted, there is a *sheva* under the *resh*. In all three cases, not only is the accent retracted, but the *resh* is preceded by *qamets*. The statement means that when *resh*-with-*sheva* is preceded by *qamets*, the *sheva* must be altered to *chateph-pathach* except when the tone is retracted. This is what Baer has done; he is following the rule. On the other hand, how much of the treatise דְּקָדוּקֵי הַטַּעֲמִים is rightly attributed to Ben Asher is very much a matter of opinion; see Ginsberg, *Introduction*, pp. 278–86, and A. Dothan's forthcoming edition of the treatise. Indeed, the claim is most insecure. Baer has also printed a *sheva* in three other cases. In these, the *resh* is preceded by *tsere* (not *qamets*), and the tone has not been retracted. In all other cases where the *resh* is preceded by *tsere*, Baer has printed *chateph-pathach*: Gen. xxvii,27 and 41; Deut. xxiv,13; Isa. xix,25; Job i,5; xxxi,20.

Baer apparently was of the opinion that in all forms of the root בָּרַךְ, where *sheva* is due with *resh*, we ought to read *chateph-pathach* when the *resh* is preceded by *qamets* except when the tone is retracted, but read *sheva* after *tsere* unless there is a note to the contrary. There are nine cases in the whole of the Bible where *resh* is preceded by *tsere* and *sheva* is due. These are the three already mentioned where Baer printed *sheva* (1 Chr. xxvi,5; Josh. xvii,14; 2 Chr. xx,26), and the six cited above, where Baer printed *chateph-pathach*. He gives his authority for these six with *chateph-pathach* in *Liber Jobi*, p. 33, where he quotes Jamanensis and Petropolitanus anni 1010, together with "old editions." This reference to "old editions" is very unsatisfactory, because the only early edition before (and including) the Jacob ben Chayyim 1524–25 Bible which has *chateph-pathach* in Job i,5 is the Complutensian Polyglot. Michaelis 1720 prints the *sheva* without any note. Baer extends his note on Job i,5 to include Job xxxi,20, and he also mentions

The Michaelis 1720 Bible, the first critical text, has *sheva* in the six cases where Baer has *sheva*, except Josh. xvii,14; i. e., he reads *sheva* in 1 Chr. xxvi,5; Ps. lxxii,17; 1 Chr. xxix,20; 2 Chr. xx,26; and Jer. iv,2. In the other cases, those where the *resh* is preceded by *tsere*, Michaelis has *sheva* in Job i,5 and xxxi,20, but *chateph-pathach* in the other cases. He has printed *chateph-pathach* almost always in the Pentateuch (the exceptions are Gen. xii,3 *primus*; Num. xxiv,9; and Gen. xiv,19), and occasionally in Joshua and Judges, but rarely elsewhere. He has been following Lonzano's *Or Torah*, which demands *chateph-pathach* at Gen. xxviii,6; Num. vi,23; Gen. xxvi,4; Num. vi,27; Gen. xlviii,9; and Gen. xxx,27. Jablonski (Berlin 1699), too, demanded *chateph-pathach* in Num. vi,23; Gen. xxvi,4; Num. vi,27 and Josh. xxii,7. The five Erfurt manuscripts which Michaelis normally quotes favor *sheva* everywhere, except that they all have *chateph-pathach* at Josh. xxii,7 and 1 Kgs. viii,66, and Erfurt 2 has *chateph-pathach* in Gen. xxvi,4; Num. vi,27, and 1 Sam. xiii,10. Michaelis evidently follows his manuscripts except when he is specifically guided otherwise by Lonzano and Jablonski.

The fifth principle which Delitzsch cites is the use of *dagesh forte* following a guttural with silent *sheva*, e. g., וְרַעְמָה (Gen. x,7) and יַעֲקֹב (Gen. xxxvi,5). He says that this is copying the best codices, and that the *dagesh* is due in *lamedh* and *mem*. (Actually — in common with editors generally — by “best codices” Baer means codices which follow such rules as he accepts.)

Under this heading Delitzsch includes such forms as לאכל-לחם (Gen. xxxi,54). Ginsburg takes אִם-מָחוּט (Gen. xiv,23) as his example of this type. It is the first example which Baer gives (p. xv) in his monograph *De primarum vocabulorum literarum dagessatione*, which is to be found in the preface (pp. vii–xv) of his *Liber Proverbiorum* (1880). He treats this particular use of *dagesh* as an alternative to the use of *pasek* in such cases as מַפְנִיךָ | רַבִּים (Deut. vii, 1) and אַחֲיֶיכֶם | מִנְחָה (Isa. lxvi,20). Again and again Ginsburg

printed by Baer because he believed that דְּקִדּוּקֵי הַטַּעֲמִים had the authority of Ben Asher; see also *Liber Iobi*, p. 50 (at xxix,25) and the reference there to *Torath Emeth*, p. 27. Baer says in his note on אֶמְרוּת (Ps. xii,7; p. 87 of *Liber Psalmorum*) that the *chateph-pathach* is found “in codd. and in all old editions.” It is found in eight editions earlier than Jacob ben Chayyim, but Jacob ben Chayyim has the *sheva* and so also the Salonica 1515 edition. The *chateph-pathach* is indeed the better reading (Kahle, Snaith). In 2 Sam. xv,5 both Kahle and Snaith prefer *sheva*; in the other cases, however, it is best to print *sheva*, but with preceding *metheg* to indicate an open and not a closed syllable before the guttural.

If Baer is to be criticized because he regularly prints *chateph-pathach* (81 times out of 87), then Ginsburg is to be criticized equally in that he prints *chateph-pathach* once only (Isa. xix,25). Otherwise he always prints *sheva*. But Baer is not alone in preferring *chateph-pathach*. The same principle is followed in various B. M. codices: Arundel Or. 16 (Prophets and Hagiographa; German, ca. 1120 A. D.), Add. 15451 (complete Bible, Franco-German, ca. 1200 A. D.), Add. 15251 (complete Bible, Sephardi, ca. 1448) — although this last codex does not exhibit the same principles as Baer to the extent to which Ar. Or. 16 and Add. 15251 do. The principle *chateph-pathach*-under-*resh* is followed also by the Naples 1491–93 Bible and by the Brescia 1494 Bible — though in both cases, except occasionally, we find *sheva* in the Pentateuch. It is also followed mostly, though not entirely, by the Venice printed texts prior to the Jacob ben Chayyim 1524–25 Bible, namely, the 1516 Venice Pentateuch and Haftaroth, the Felix Pratensis 1517 Bible, and the 1520 Bible. On the other hand, there are no codd. or edd. in Ginsburg's lists which are as thorough as he is in preferring *sheva*, though there are three codices which have marked tendencies that way: Ar. Or. 2, Harley 5710–1, and Harley 5586; and also the two Soncino editions, the Bologna-Soncino-Naples Bible of 1482–87 and the Soncino Bible of 1488.

to the three *nuns* occurring so closely together. *Nun* is a weak letter, and it was easily assimilated to a stronger following consonant after a *sheva*; e. g., the *pe-nun* verbs. (The same kind of thing happens in Latin and Greek, where *inmotus* becomes *immotus* and ἐνλείπω becomes ἐλλείπω.) This *dagesh* is a developed refinement designed to secure that the *nun* is not lost, but is carefully pronounced and given its full value. This tendency is carried still further in B.M. Add. 9400 which often has *dagesh* in the opening consonant of a word when the consonant is not a *beghadkephath*, though mostly, as one would expect, it is found in the initial *nun* and *lamedh*. This also is why a codex like B.M. Add. 15451 goes further than most in the super-refinement of the masorah, and even has נְנִי uniformly as against the usual נְנִי, which Baer has, though Delitzsch thought (preface to Baer, *Liber Genesis*, p. vii) that at least נְנִי is advisable. Ginsburg says (*Introduction*, p. 467) that Baer is inconsistent in not printing נְנִי; but Ginsburg is wrong here. Baer does not print *chateph-pathach* for the normal *sheva* anywhere at all unless he has found a note by some grammarian. He may extend a statement by a grammarian on one particular occurrence of a form to include every occurrence of that form, and usually he does this. But he does not follow R. Phinehas in printing *chateph-pathach* at every opportunity. Baer is quite consistent here in printing נְנִי with *sheva* only.

On p. 465 of his *Introduction*, Ginsburg refers to the statement attributed to Rabbi Phinehas that when *vav*-copulative has *shurek*, a following *sheva* is changed to *chateph-pathach*. Ginsburg said "he changed," and it is not altogether clear whether he meant R. Phinehas or Baer. The situation is that in such cases it is just as wrong always to print *chateph-pathach* as it is always to print *sheva*. Norzi's testimony is that some codices have *sheva* and some have *chateph-pathach* with *metheg* (*gaya*). There appear to be six instances where the correct reading is *chateph-pathach* with *metheg* (*gaya*), but there is doubt as to which are the six. Baer (*Liber Jesaiae*, p. 78, at 45.14) gives five of these as וְהָבָה (Gen. ii, 12), וְשָׂדֶה (Lev.

states that the codices are against these "conceits" and "fads" as he calls them. These are hard words to use, and only partially justifiable. Baer has followed his rules here as part of his general attitude of developing the work of the masoretes to its logical conclusion, doing everything to ensure absolute precision and accuracy in the preservation of the proper pronunciation of the sacred text. Ginsburg is largely in the right here, because there are many codd. which are against this use of *dagesh*, even German codd. which normally favor these masoretic "developments." The following British Museum manuscripts do not favor this usage: Harley 5720 (Sephardi, ca. 1100–20); Ar. Or. 16 (German, ca. 1120 A.D.); Add. 21161 (Franco-German, ca. 1150 A.D., in spite of many experiments in vocalization); Add. 9403 (German, ca. 1160–1200 A.D., but vowels and accents are very faint indeed in this codex, and often cannot be deciphered at all); Add. 15451 (Franco-German, ca. 1200 A.D.; in spite of its being in this "development" tradition); Add. 2201 (Sephardi, dated 1246 A.D.); Add. 9399 (German, ca. 1250 A.D.); Add. 9400 (German, ca. 1250); and Add. 15250 (Sephardi, 13th century).

In the discussions concerning this particular use of *dagesh* the phrase בְּיָנוּן is specially mentioned. This is because some codices are against Baer's "innovations" (developments of the masorah), but nevertheless have the *dagesh* in the *nun* in this particular case. Baer (*Liber Josuae et Judicum*, p. 107) says that the *dagesh* is required by Ben Asher, according to דְּקֻדּוּקֵי הַמַּעֲמִים, a doubtful ascription (see p. XXIV above). British Museum codices which generally are against Baer's theories but have this *dagesh*, are Add. 10455 (German, dated 1311 A.D.), Or. 2696 (German, ca. 1300–50 A.D.); also G (insburg) 1 (Franco-Italian, dated 1419 A.D.) and G 5 (Franco-Italian, ca. 1450 A.D.). B.M. Add. 15251 (Sephardi, dated 1448 A.D.) is one of the few Sephardi codices which sometimes has *chateph-pathach* instead of *sheva* in such cases as חוֹלָלִים, and it has the *dagesh* in יְחַסֵּר. The *dagesh* in בְּיָנוּן is doubtless due

the concern is with sibilants, as Baer has clearly and rightly said. But not all sibilants following *shureq* have *chateph-pathach*; for example וְסָגַר (Ps. xxxv,3) where even Baer has *sheva*, and also Isa. xxvi,20 where Baer has *chateph-pathach*. This latter instance is the one mentioned by Norzi, and it must be regarded as doubtful; the evidence also of the B.M. codices is indecisive. The *chateph-pathach* is found not only, as one would expect, in Add. 15451 and Add. 15251, but also in Harley 5710–11 (Italian, ca. A.D. 1230) and Or. 2201 (Sephardi, dated A.D. 1246), both of which usually favor *sheva*. Throughout all these details it can be seen that we have two principles at work: either follow what are believed to be the best manuscripts with support from the masorah (which we take to be in the tradition of Jacob ben Chayyim), or follow the masorah and the rules of the grammarians with occasional support from the manuscripts (which we take to be a development in the tradition of Elijah Levita).

Baer does not follow the rules of R. Phinehas for the *chateph-pathach* in every respect. For instance, Ginsburg says (*Introduction*, pp. 465 f.) that one of these rules concerns nouns from ל"ה stems of the form גִּדִּי. He says that R. Phinehas advocates *chateph-pathach* in all such cases, and gives the example גִּדִּי, quoted in one recension of R. Phinehas' list. Baer must have known of this particular recension because it is in Baer and Strack's edition of דְּקֻקִּי הַטַּעֲמִים (Leipzig, 1879), par. 14, p. 15. But nowhere have I found an instance of Baer printing a *chateph-pathach* in such forms, neither in his *Liber Genesis* (1869) nor in the texts printed in Leipsic in the years 1880–91; nor in the 1929 Rödelheim edition of the Pentateuch and Haftarothe.

The sixth and last principle mentioned by Delitzsch (*Liber Genesis*, p. viii) is Baer's insertions of *metheg* (*gaya*). This is perhaps the most important characteristic of the Baer texts, since his rules concerning the use of *metheg* (*gaya*) have found their way into the Hebrew Grammars. Even the account of *metheg* in Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley (§ 16c-i) is based, as a

xxv,34), וְשָׁקָה (Gen. xxvii,26), and וְשָׁמַע (Num. xxiii,18 and Isa. xxxvii,17). He says that the reason for the *chateph-pathach* is to ensure the better pronunciation of the sibilant. To these he adds וְסָחַר Isa. xlv,14, but he also extends the rule to all cases. Specifically, he adds two more, וְשָׁלַח (2 Kgs. ix,17) and וְשָׁבַח (Judg. v,12), *Liber Regum* p. 112; and also וְשָׁבַע (2 Chr. xii,13). Of all these, there are four that are certainly right, and all main authorities are agreed. These four are וְהָבָה, וְשָׁדָה, וְשָׁקָה, and וְשָׁמַע (Num. xxiii,18); so Norzi, Ginsburg, Michaelis, Kahle, Snaith. According to Norzi the fifth is וְשָׁבַע (2 Chr. xii,13); but according to Ginsburg and Michaelis it is וְשָׁבַח (Judg. v,12). Norzi (note on Gen. xxvii,26) makes up the six with a reference to וְסָגַר (see Isa. xxvi,20; Ps. xxxv,3). Ginsburg makes up the six with a reference to וְקָרַב (Ps. lv,22) (see *Introduction*, p. 465, note), probably being influenced here by the mention of this form in the statement attributed to R. Phinehas. Baer has *chateph-pathach* in this instance, and he extends the rule to cover בְּקָרְבִּי (2 Sam. xv,5). But Ginsburg nevertheless prints a *sheva* in Ps. lv,22 and also in 2 Sam. xv,5, though both times with *metheg* (*gaya*). The codices which favor *chateph-pathach* in Ps. lv,22 belong strongly to the "R. Phinehas tradition" and substitute *chateph-pathach* for *sheva* at every opportunity. They are B.M. codices: Add. 15252, Add. 15251, Or. 2451 and (almost always) Or. 2201 and Or. 2451. In this particular case Or. 2375, usually very trustworthy, has *chateph-pathach*. So also the Naples Bible 1491–93 and the Pesaro Bible 1514–17. Kahle has seven instances in all of *chateph-pathach* preceded by *metheg* (*gaya*), the extra three being Jud. v,12, 2 Kgs. ix,17 and 2 Chr. xii,13. Snaith has six in all, the extra two being Judg. v,12 and 2 Chr. xii,13. The evidence for 2 Kgs. ix,17 is definitely weak, and Ginsburg quotes only two codices, B.M. Ar. Or. 16 (German, ca. 1120 A.D.) and Add. 15251 (Sephardi, dated A.D. 1448), both of which are entirely faithful to the rules of R. Phinehas. It seems to be plain that וְקָרַב (Ps. lv,22) and still more בְּקָרְבִּי (2 Sam. xv,5) have nothing to do with this group, since

sheva, and it has such forms as וַיִּהְיֶה (Gen. xli,5), where the *vav* has *metheg* but not the *yodh*, and the accent is the disjunctive *tiphcha*, and as וַיִּשְׁלַח (Exod. iii,10), where the *aleph* has *metheg* but not the *lamedh*, and the accent once more is the disjunctive *tiphcha*. In these manuscripts, the *metheg* is found in such cases almost, and very nearly, always when the accent is disjunctive, and occasionally, and indeed rarely, when the accent is conjunctive. This codex Or. 4445 preserves the best tradition, with no *metheg* even in וַיִּאָּכְלוּ (Lev. xi,13). It is followed in codices which have the authority of Ben Asher, and in those favored by Norzi, Lonzano, and Jablonski. This tradition is found in Kahle's Leningrad B 19a, and in B.M. Or. 2626-27-28. It is followed in the Aleppo Codex, and this can be seen in the facsimile which Wickes produced as the frontispiece of his work on the prose accents, *טעמי כ"א ספרים* (Oxford, 1887). This reproduction is of Gen. xxvi,34-xxvii,30. Note וַיִּבְרַכְהוּ (xxvii,8), וַיִּבְרַכְכָּה (xxvii,7), and וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּ (xxvii,29), but also וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּ (xxvii,29) with the conjunctive *mehuppakh*. This tradition concerning the limited use of *metheg* is maintained all down the years.

In this respect an important piece of evidence is to be found in the John Rylands Library, Manchester, Hebrew MS. no. 38. This is a fragment of Psalms, much damaged, 5-11/16 inches by 6-3/16 inches, consisting of 24 pages, on paper, and probably 14th/15th century, Spanish. It contains Pss. xlv,16-lxxviii,35. Some pages are so badly damaged that it is barely possible to read the consonants, and even where the consonants are clear, the vowels and accents are sometimes so faded as to be illegible. Often words are written *plene* when they ought to be written *defective*, and occasionally *defective* when they ought to be *plene*. Occasionally a word is omitted, and once a whole verse has been omitted, but written in the margin by another scribe. Much of the manuscript is carelessly written and words are often squeezed in at the end of the line. But the accents, including *metheg*, scarcely ever vary from what is found in the best Spanish codices, and do not

note on p. 64 says, on "the exhaustive treatment by S. Baer, 'Metheg-Setzung nach ihren überlieferten Gesetzen,' in A. Merx's *Archiv für die wissenschaftl. Erforschung des A. Test.*, Heft i, Halle, 1867, pp. 56 ff., and Heft ii, 1868, pp. 194 ff.; Baer and Strack, *Dikduke ha-ʿamim*, pp. 30 ff." Baer was following the work of Heidenheim, who published certain rules for the use of *metheg* in his *משפטי הטעמים* (Rödelheim, 1808). Kahle rightly criticized these rules (*The Cairo Geniza*², pp. 113 ff.). Not only were these rules based on late manuscripts, but they were still further worked out and developed by Heidenheim and Baer. Franz Delitzsch wrote an introductory notice to this work of Baer's, and it is his authority and prestige which brought these rules into our grammars. Delitzsch's prestige in those days was very great indeed. The rules are typical of Baer's principles and work. As we have said, he believed that the work of the masoretes should be carried on and developed until every slightest detail was included. But there are very many ancient codices where Baer's elaborate and complicated rules are not observed, and nowhere is this more evident than in these *metheg-gaya* rules. We can find an approximation to his rules only in some late German manuscripts to which Baer had access. (It is quite plain that modern grammarians have accepted Baer's work as authoritative, either not studying the manuscripts or uncritically accepting the principle that the Masorah was not complete until the times of Heidenheim and Baer.) The best example of the actual use of *metheg-gaya* in ancient manuscripts is to be seen in B.M. Or. 4445 (probably ca. A.D. 820-850; but 55 of the 186 folios have been added in A.D. 1540; Pentateuch only). As Ginsburg wrote (*Introduction*, p. 474), "this is a most accurately written MS. and it is evident that it belongs to a period when the superfine speculations about the *Metheg* and the *Gaya* had not as yet asserted themselves." He noted that "the *Metheg* or *Gaya* is very rarely used and very irregularly." This "irregularly" means "irregularly according to Baer's rules." This manuscript has no *metheg* before a composite

the other on the 3 verse books, must be examined against this background. It is the same old problem. If the tendencies of the Masoretes are to be followed out to their logical conclusion, then Baer's text is beyond any question of doubt the best masoretic text, and what Baer says about *dagesh* and *metheg* and *chateph-pathach* and the rest is sound and is to be accepted as contributing to a true masoretic text. This would apply even to such a matter as printing *chateph-qamets-chatuph* to indicate the short-*o* instead of printing *qamets chatuph*; e. g., דְּבָרָת instead of דְּבָרַת (Josh. xxi,28; 1 Chr. vi,57), בְּאִנִּי instead of בְּאִנִּי (Josh. xx,4), שְׁמֵרוֹ instead of שְׁמֵרוֹ (Jer. vi,24), and בְּעֶפְרַת instead of בְּעֶפְרַת (Judg. vi,24). On the other hand, הַבְּרָקִים (Judg. viii,7) is right, having the authority of Norzi and all our "best" manuscripts. All these are attempts to make sure that the vowel is understood to be a short-*o* and not a long -*a*; and there are instances, notably דְּבָרָת (Josh. xxi,28) where the manuscripts are confused, and where indeed the true vowel is the long -*a*. Nevertheless, if we accept Baer's premises and principles, even such things as these belong to a true masoretic text. But if on the other hand we follow the Ben Asher text, and if we accept the opinion of Ginsburg that the treatise דְּקֻדּוּקֵי הַטַּעֲמִים is not true to Ben Asher's opinions, then the best text is in the Leningrad B 19a, Norzi, Lonzano, Or. 2626-27-28, Aleppo Codex tradition; and the facts which lead Wickes so cavalierly to reject the Aleppo Codex and these other authorities are the very reasons for accepting them. Kahle rightly recognized a true ben Asher text in the Leningrad B 19a codex; Snaith rightly recognized it in the work of Norzi and in B.M. Or. 2626-27-28; and the forthcoming Bible of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem rightly recognizes it in the Aleppo Codex.

Yet again, if we accept the opinion of R. Saadia Gaon, then the true text is the Ben Naftali text. But here we are in a difficulty because of the uncertainty as to what precisely is Ben Asher and what precisely is Ben Naftali, it being by no means certain that the treatise דְּקֻדּוּקֵי הַטַּעֲמִים is to be trusted.

vary more than once or twice from what has been printed in the British and Foreign Bible Society edition which I edited. This extraordinary accuracy and faithfulness is all the more remarkable in view of the lack of care which otherwise is shown in the manuscript. It is very strong evidence of the soundness and the perpetuation of the tradition which is seen in Or. 4445 and in the Ben Asher codices. A perusal of the descriptions of manuscripts in Ginsburg's *Introduction*, pp. 469-776, will show how very often this tradition of a sparing use of *metheg* is found in manuscripts, and how comparatively rarely it is that any manuscripts follow the rules laid down so categorically by Baer and in the grammars, and how ridiculous it is to speak of an "indispensable *metheg*" when the majority of manuscripts do not have it at all precisely where it is said to be "indispensable." Ginsburg gives a facsimile of a page of Or. 4445 (Lev. xi,41-21) facing p. 469 of his *Introduction*. Here the reader can see for himself what is the true use of *metheg*. But the worst example of what can happen is in such forms as וַיַּעֲשֵׂן with *metheg* under both the *yodh* and the initial *vav* and a disjunctive accent. Nothing like this would be tolerated in any codex except in one of the type of B.M. Add. 15451, which is a law to itself (and to Heidenheim and Baer!). Wickes (*Prose Accents*, pp. vii-xiv) condemns the Aleppo Codex because these Heidenheim-Baer rules are not followed, and he joins with them in maintaining that no codex can possibly have the authority of Ben Asher unless it conforms to such rules as are given in דְּקֻדּוּקֵי הַטַּעֲמִים, this treatise whose claim to the authority of Ben Asher is definitely doubtful. For similar reasons he says that Norzi's מִנַּחַת שֵׁי and the masoretic treatise אֵכֶלָה וְאֵכֶלָה "do not need particular notice" (*ibid.*, p. xiv). He says that nothing is to be learned from any writers on the accents (or that he received little or no help from them) apart from Moses the Punctuator, Jekuthiel, Baer and Strack, and Heidenheim. This means that Wickes belonged firmly to the Baer tradition, and everything he says in his two books, the one on the 21 prose books and

PREFACE.

SINCE the publication of the first edition of Jacob b. Chajim Ibn Adonijah's Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, with an English Translation, I have spent two years of almost uninterrupted study in Massoretic lore. When, therefore, called upon to issue a second edition, I determined to embody in it as much of the results of my researches as was required to elucidate the text and the translation.

The principal alterations in this edition are as follow:
 i. The present text is a reprint of the *editio princeps* (Venice, 1525), which I did not possess at first—carefully collated with the editions of 1546–48, 1568, 1617–19, 1619, and 1724–27. ii. The text has been carefully punctuated throughout. iii. The translation has been thoroughly revised and improved. iv. The Hebrew and the English are printed in parallel columns, so that the book may now be used as a help by those who are desirous to study Rabbinic Hebrew. v. The Annotations have been augmented from forty-two to upwards of a hundred. And vi. A life of Jacob b. Chajim has been added, with

For further discussion see Orlinsky (Prolegomenon, pp. XXIX ff., XXXII ff.). The fact remains that whatever be said about the relative merits of Ben Asher and Ben Naftali, the text which has been traditionally accepted is that which is believed to be invested with the authority of Ben Asher.

The road along which Elijah Levita made the first steps ended in Heidenheim and Baer and Wickes. This way assumes that what the grammarians say matters most of all, and that rules must be developed logically and followed everywhere. The road along which Jacob ben Chayyim made the first steps ends in Kahle-Snaith-Hebrew University. Find codices which have the authority of Ben Asher. If it is possible to find more than one of these, all the better, because any small vagaries due to the carelessness or ignorance of a scribe can thereby be corrected. It so happens that all these codices which are said to have the authority of Ben Asher show a remarkable unanimity, and such small variations as there are can be eliminated in this way. These three editions, Kahle, Snaith, Hebrew University, have all been prepared from different codices, and they substantially agree. They constitute the basis for the reconstruction of the true text of Ben Asher. (See further, *Textus*, II, pp. 8–13, "The Ben Asher Text.")

Norman H. Snaith

JACOB B. CHAJIM IBN ADONIJAH.

VERY little is known of the life of JACOB BEN CHAJIM IBN ADONIJAH, who rescued the Massorah from perdition, and for the first time collated, compiled, and gave to the world in a printed form the grand critico-exegetical apparatus, bequeathed to us by the Jews of olden times. Even the date and the place of his birth are matters of conjecture, and can only be approximately guessed from the autobiographical fragments scattered through his writings.

In his celebrated Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, which we publish with an English translation, he tells us that he was a resident of Tunis; and it is concluded, from this remark, that this ancient city was his native place. Hence he is also called *Tunisi*. Indeed Fürst, who, in his work on Hebrew Bibliography, treats on our author under the name *Jacob b. Chajim*, has also a second notice of him under *Tunisi*.¹ It is, however, to be remarked, that Jacob b. Chajim does not call Tunis his native place, but simply says that he resided in it and prosecuted his studies therein.² Nor must we omit to state that he calls himself *Jacob Ibn Adonijah*, and that this, or simply *Ibn Adonijah*, is the surname by which he is quoted in the writings of his learned contemporaries.³ But though *Ibn Adonijah* is the more correct appellation, we shall not entirely discard the name Jacob b. Chajim, because he is better known by it in modern days.

From the fact that Jacob b. Chajim carried through the press of the celebrated Daniel Bomberg, at Venice, the complete editions of the Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmuds, in 1520–1523, it may reasonably

¹ Comp. *Bibliotheca Judaica*, vol. ii., p. 17, with vol. iii., p. 451.

² שלו הייתי בביתו ורצון בהכלי שוקד על למודי בסוגים המדינה אשר קרוב לקצה גבול קרשניא, הקדומה, *vide infra*, p. 38.

³ Thus in this Introduction (*vide infra*, p. 36), and in the *Treatise on the Points and Accents* which is printed in the upper and lower margins of the *Massorah finalis*, he calls himself *Jacob b. Chajim b. Isaac Ibn Adonijah* (אדונייהו בן יצחק בן חיים בן יעקב). Levita, in the poem at the end of the Bible, calls him *Jacob [Ibn] Adonijah* (יעקב בן אדונייהו); whilst De Rossi (1513–1577), simply calls him *Ibn Adonijah* (אדונייהו). Comp. *Meor Enajim*, part iii., cap. lix., p. 471, ed. Cassel, Berlin, 1867.

an account of the Massorah, and a description of a newly discovered, and very important, MS. of this ancient critico-exegetical apparatus.

If the Christian literary and scientific public should be inclined to manifest that interest in the criticism of the sacred text of the Old Testament which scholars have always evinced in securing correct texts of profane classics, I shall deem it a privilege to devote some years of my life to the publication and annotation of this newly discovered MS.

For the elaborate Indices, I am to a great extent indebted to a friend, whose name I am not at liberty to mention.

BROOKLEA, AIGBURTH ROAD,
LIVERPOOL, October, 1867.

that province,—who at an advanced age studied Arabic, and caused a vocabulary, grammar, and catechism to be compiled, and a version of the liturgy to be made in the same tongue,—had produced few proselytes. He first employed arguments and presents; if these failed to convince the Mussulman of the error of his ways, imprisonment, with fetters, and a few days' fasting, soon humbled the unbeliever; so much so, that the devout Ferreras was constrained to exclaim, "Thus did Providence avail itself of the darkness of the dungeon to pour on the benighted minds of the infidel the light of the true faith."⁴

Effectually to extirpate heresy, and to preclude the possibility of the converts returning to their former errors, Cardinal Ximenes caused all procurable Arabic manuscripts to be piled together and burned, in one of the great squares of the city, so as to exterminate the very characters in which the teachings of the infidels were recorded. This outrageous burning of most valuable MSS., relating to all branches of science and literature, was effected by the learned Prelate at the very time that he was spending a princely fortune in the publication of the stupendous Complutensian Polyglott, and in the erection and endowment of the university of Alcalá, which was the most learned in Spain. From the thousands of MSS. destined for the conflagration, Ximenes indeed reserved three hundred, relating to medical science, for his university.

As to the Jews, their doom was sealed. In ordinary warfare it mattered very little to them whether the Christians vanquished the infidels, or the infidels the Christians, since the tribute levied by the conqueror upon the conquered was obtained by stripping the Israelites. In the present instance, however, they saw that those who won the day, and forced their religion by means of the sword upon the vanquished, were the very people from whom they themselves had suffered in an unparalleled degree; and that the victors were simply re-enacting the same deeds abroad which they perpetrated at home, upon those who were out of the pale of the Church. They expected again to be dragged from their peaceful homes in the name of Christ, as soon as the Spaniards had a respite from the Mussulman infidels. Hence when they heard that Ximenes, flushed with success at Granada, had instigated Ferdinand, immediately after the death of Isabella, to organise an expedition against the neighbouring Moslems of Africa, and that Mozarquivir, an important port on the Barbary

⁴ Prescott, *History of the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella*, part ii., cap. 6.

be concluded that he was then at least fifty years of age, and that he was born about 1470. Whether his ancestors were among the first and second masses of emigrants from Spain, who successively fled from that accursed country, to escape the fiery persecution consequent upon the successive inflammatory preachings of the fanatical priests, Fernando Martinez (March 15—August 1391), and Vincente Ferrer (1412–1414), and settled down in the North of Africa by thousands; or whether they were among the three hundred thousand who were expelled from Spain in 1492, is difficult to decide. According to the former view, Ibn Adonijah, though of Spanish descent, was born at Tunis, whilst according to the latter, he emigrated with his parents into this city when about twenty-two years of age.

Among those whom the cruel edict of Ferdinand and Isabella drove from their peaceful homes, and who sought an asylum at Tunis, were Abraham Saccutto, the celebrated astronomer and historian, and Moses b. Isaac Alashkar, the famous Kabbalist and philosopher. These, together with other distinguished literati, established schools at Tunis, and taught hundreds of students the different branches of Biblical and Talmudic literature. It was among these eminent men, and in their schools, that Jacob b. Chajim prosecuted his Hebrew studies, and acquired his extraordinary knowledge of the Massorah, thus preparing himself for the great work which Providence had in store for him elsewhere.

He was, however, not permitted to continue the enjoyment of his quiet home and peaceful studies under the hospitable protection of the Crescent. The bloody persecutors under the Cross, not satisfied with having deprived the whole Jewish population of Spain of all that is precious to men on earth, carried fire and sword, in the name of Christ, among the Jews who had obtained an asylum in Mohamedan countries, and who were diligently employed in the revival of Biblical literature. This time, however, the crusade was not originally organised against the Jews, but against the Moors, since it was believed to be base ingratitude to the goodness of Providence, which had delivered these infidels into the hands of the Church, to allow them any longer to usurp the fair inheritance of the Christians.

Hence no less a person than Cardinal Ximenes, the distinguished Archbishop of Toledo, resorted to Granada, in 1449, to convert the stiff-necked race of Mohamed; seeing that the rational and benevolent measures adopted by Fray Fernando de Talavera, the Archbishop of

appealed to for the rule of faith and practice, Jacob Ibn Adonijah was studiously engaged in the collation of Biblical MSS., in compiling the grand critico-exegetical apparatus of the Old Testament, bequeathed to us by the Jews of olden times, and in editing it, together with the Hebrew Scriptures, the ancient Chaldee paraphrases, and valuable Hebrew commentaries, which has contributed more to the advancement of Biblical knowledge than all the bitter controversies of Catholics and Protestants.

Before, however, we describe this gigantic Rabbinic Bible which has immortalised his name, we have to mention other important works edited by him. It has already been remarked, that Ibn Adonijah must have taken up his abode at Venice soon after Bomberg established in it his celebrated printing office (1516). For we find that the *editio princeps* of the entire Babylonian Talmud, published by Bomberg in 1520–1523, was partly edited by Jacob b. Chajim; and as the Talmud consists of twelve volumes folio, the preparations for its printing, and the printing itself, must have commenced a considerable time before 1520, when a portion of it was published. Hence his work and connection with Bomberg must have begun about 1517 or 1518. This conclusion is confirmed by the fact that, simultaneously with the appearance of the Babylonian Talmud, Ibn Adonijah also worked at the *editio princeps* of the Jerusalem Talmud, which he carried through the press in 1522–23, as well as at the *editio princeps* of R. Nathan's Hebrew Concordance, which appeared in 1523, and over which he must have spent a considerable time.

His assiduity was truly marvellous. He not only carried through the press in three years the first editions of these gigantic works, consisting of fourteen volumes folio, closely printed, both in square Hebrew characters and Rabbinic Hebrew, and replete with references, the very sight of which would astound any one who is not acquainted with them; but, within twelve months after the appearance of the Concordance, he edited, conjointly with David de Pizzighione, the stupendous legal and ritual code of Maimonides, entitled, *Mishne Thora* (מישנה תורה) = *Deuteronomy, Second Law*, or *Jad Ha-Chezaka*, (יד החזקה) = *The Mighty Hand*, in allusion to Deut. xxxiv. 12; and because the work consists of fourteen books (יד = 14). To this code, which appeared in 1524, in two volumes folio, Ibn Adonijah wrote an Introduction.

It is perfectly amazing, to find that the editing of these works,

coast, nearly opposite Carthagen, had actually been captured (Sep. 13, 1505), consternation spread among the numerous Jewish communities in the cities of North Africa.

The consternation became still greater when they heard that Ximenes, mounted upon a mule, had triumphantly entered Oran (May 17, 1509), preceded by a Franciscan friar, and followed by a cavalcade of brethren of the same monastic order, bearing aloft the massive silver cross, the archiepiscopal standard of Toledo, and banners emblazoned with the Primate's arms on one side, and the Cross on the other. All their fears were more than realised when, after the return of Ximenes to Spain, Pedro Navarro, the general of the army, had vanquished Bugia (Jan. 31, 1510), when Tunis had to capitulate, and when they saw the banner of the Cross floating triumphant from the walls of almost every Moslem city on the Mediterranean. It was then that Jacob b. Chajim, Saccutto, and a host of other eminent Jewish scholars were despoiled of their possessions, banished from their homes and families, interrupted in their most important works in the cause of Biblical literature, and driven to wander in exile.

For more than seven years (1510–1517) Ibn Adonijah roamed about homeless in the different towns of Italy, where at that time Hebrew literature was greatly cultivated and patronised by the highest of the land; and where popes and cardinals, princes and statesmen, warriors and recluses of all kinds were in search of Jewish teachers, in order to be instructed in the mysteries of the Kabbalah. Whether it was owing to his conscientious scruples, which would not allow him to initiate Gentiles into this esoteric doctrine, or to his not having been so fortunate in tuition as his contemporary, Elias Levita, he had at first to endure great privations during his sojourn in Rome and Florence. He at last went to Venice, where the celebrated Daniel Bomberg, of Antwerp, had at that very time established his famous Hebrew press (1516), and through the exertions of R. Chajim Alton, whom he honourably mentions in the Introduction, he at once became connected with the printing office.

The connection of so profound and assiduous a scholar with so cultivated and spirited a publisher proved one of the greatest benefits to Biblical literature, at the time of the Church's greatest need. For whilst the followers of the Prince of Peace were arrayed against each other in deadly conflict, to decide by the sword whether the Bible alone, or the infallible vicar of Christ on earth, is to be

and the Minor Prophets, the Massorah parva, and the Massorah marginalis.

IV. *The fourth volume*, comprising the Hagiographa (כתובים), *i. e.*, the Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles, has the Hebrew text; the so-called Chaldee paraphrases of Joseph the Blind; the Commentaries of Rashi, which only embrace the Psalms, the Five Megilloth (*i. e.*, Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther), Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles; the Commentaries of Ibn Ezra, which only embrace the Psalms, Job, the Five Megilloth, and Daniel; the Commentaries of David Kimchi on the Psalms and Chronicles; the Commentaries of Moses Kimchi on Proverbs, Ezra, and Nehemiah;⁶ the Commentaries of Levi ben Gershon on Proverbs and Job; the so-called Commentary of Saadia on Daniel; the Massorah parva, the Massorah marginalis, and the (תרגום שני) Second Targum on Esther. Appended to this volume are—i. The Massorah, for which space could not be found in the margin of the text in alphabetical order, and which is therefore called the Massorah finalis, with Jacob ben Chajim's directions. ii. A Treatise on the Points and Accents of the Hebrew Scriptures, embodying the work (רפי הניקור) (ר' משה הנקור) (כללי הניקור) of Moses the Punctuator. iii. The variations between the Western and Eastern Codices, or between the Jerusalem and Babylonian MSS., called מערבאי ומרנהאי חלופין שבין חלוק המקרא שבין בני ארץ ישראל ובין בני בבל or חלופי התורה שבין בני אשר. And iv. The variations between Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali, called ובין בני נפתלי.

It is perfectly impossible for any one, but those students who have seen the MSS. of the Hebrew Bible, with the Massorah round the margin, in a most fantastic manner, who have encountered the difficulties in deciphering the hieroglyphic signs, the conceited abbreviations, the strange forms and ornaments into which the writing of the Massorah is twisted, the confusion of the Massoretic notes, &c.; and who have grappled with the blunders which are to be found in almost every

⁶ The Commentaries on Proverbs, Ezra, and Nehemiah are ascribed, in all the editions of the Rabbinic Bible, to Ibn Ezra. That this, however, is incorrect, and that they belong to Moses Kimchi, is now established beyond the shadow of a doubt. Comp. Reifmann in *Literaturblatt des Orients*, vol. ii., pp. 750, 751; *Zion*, vol. i., p. 76; vol. ii., pp. 113–117, 129–133, 155–157, 171–174, 185–188; Frankfort-on-the-Maine, 1841, 1842. Geiger, *Ozar Nechmad*, vol. ii., p. 17, &c.; Vienna, 1857; Kitto's *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*, s.v. KIMCHI, MOSES.

which would of itself more than occupy the whole time of ordinary mortals in the present day, was simply the recreation of Jacob b. Chajim; and that the real strength of his intellect, and the vast stores of his learning, were employed at that very time in collecting and collating MSS. of the Massorah, and in preparing for the press the Rabbinic Bible, which is still a precious monument to his vast erudition and almost unparalleled industry, and which was the most powerful auxiliary to the then commencing Reformation. This Rabbinic Bible, which was published in 1524–25, consists of four volumes, folio, as follows:—

I. *The first volume*, embracing the Pentateuch (תורה), begins—i. With the elaborate Introduction of Jacob b. Chajim, which we now give for the first time with an English translation;⁵ ii. An Index to the sections of the entire Old Testament according to the Massorah; and iii. Ibn Ezra's Preface to the Pentateuch. Then follow the five Books of Moses in Hebrew, with the so-called Chaldee Paraphrases of Onkelos and Jonathan ben Uzziel, and the Commentaries of Rashi and Ibn Ezra, which are given all round the margin; The Massorah parva, which is in the centre between the Hebrew text and the Chaldee paraphrase; and such a portion of the Massorah magna as the space between the end of the text and the beginning of the commentaries on each page would admit; for which reason this portion obtained the name of *Massorah marginalis*.

II. *The second volume*, comprising the Earlier Prophets (נביאים ראשונים), *i. e.*, Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, and 1 and 2 Kings, has the Hebrew text, the Chaldee paraphrases of Jonathan b. Uzziel, the Commentaries of Rashi, David Kimchi, and Levi ben Gershon, the Massorah parva, and that portion of the Massorah magna which constitutes the *Massorah marginalis*.

III. *The third volume*, comprising the Later Prophets (נביאים אחרונים), *i. e.*, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve Minor Prophets, has the Hebrew text, the so-called Chaldee paraphrase of Jonathan ben Uzziel, the Commentaries of Rashi, which extend over all the books in the volume of Ibn Ezra on Isaiah

⁵ Fürst's assertion (*Bibliotheca Judaica*, iii. 454), that this introduction had been translated into English, and published by Kennicott in his work entitled *The state of the printed Hebrew Text of the Old Testament*, Oxford, 1758, is incorrect. Kennicott simply published an abridged and incorrect *Latin* version, from a MS. which he found in the Bodleian Library.

Roman Catholic country, when Luther began to make his voice heard in defence of the word of God. Thus it is, that we in the present day are still left to the labours of Jacob b. Chajim, though the results of modern researches, and the discovery of valuable MSS., would enable us to issue a new edition of the critical apparatus of the Old Testament, with important corrections and additions, and in a form more easily accessible to Biblical students.

Bomberg, who took the liveliest interest and the greatest pride in this magnificent edition of the Bible, got Elias Levita, whose fame as a Hebraist was at that time spread not only all over Italy where he resided, but over Germany, both among the most distinguished dignitaries in the Catholic Church and the great leaders of the Reformation, to write an epilogue to the work of his ambition. In this poem, Levita celebrates the praises of the munificent publisher, "who though uncircumcised in the flesh [*i. e.*, a gentile], is circumcised in heart," of "the learned Jacob Ibn Adonijah," who carried it through the press, and of the unparalleled work itself.⁷ Levita was then residing at Rome, in the house of his friend and patron, Cardinal Egidio de Viterbo, where he was diligently engaged in printing his works on the grammar and structure of the Hebrew language, teaching the Roman Catholic and Protestant combatants the original of the Old Testament, and enjoying the literary society of popes, cardinals, princes, ambassadors, and warriors, who were bewitched by the mysteries of the Kabbalah, and little thinking of the misfortunes which were soon to befall him.

Within two years of his writing the epilogue to Jacob Ibn Adonijah's Rabbinic Bible, and whilst engaged on an Aramaic grammar, the Imperialists under Charles V. sacked Rome (May 6, 1527), and in the general work of spoliation and destruction, Levita lost all his property and the greater part of his MSS. In a most destitute and deplorable condition, he left the Eternal city, and betook himself to Venice in the same year (1527); and Bomberg, at whose request he had written the epilogue, at once engaged him as joint corrector of the press and as editor. Thus the two learned Hebraists, Jacob b. Chajim and Elias Levita, who were the great teachers of Hebrew to the greatest men of Europe, at the commencement and during the development of the Reformation, now became co-workers in the same printing office.

⁷ For the different editions of the Bible, and for the alterations which were afterwards made in it, see Kitto's *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*, s.v. RABBINIC BIBLES.

sentence, to form an adequate conception of the extraordinary labour and learning which Jacob Ibn Adonijah must have bestowed, in bringing such beautiful order out of such a chaos. His modesty and humility, in speaking of the toil, are becoming his vast erudition.

"Behold," he says, "I have exerted all my might and strength to collate and arrange the Massorah, with all the possible improvements, in order that it may remain pure and bright, and shew its splendour to the nations and princes; for, indeed, it is beautiful to look at. This was a labour of love, for the benefit of our brethren, the children of Israel, and for the glory of our holy and perfect law; as well as to fulfil, as far as possible, the desire of Don Daniel Bomberg, whose expenses in this matter far exceeded my labours. And as regards the Commentaries, I have exerted my powers to the utmost degree to correct in them all the mistakes as far as possible; and whatsoever my humble endeavours could accomplish was done for the glory of the Lord, and for the benefit of our people. I would not be deterred by the enormous labour, for which cause I did not suffer my eyelids to be closed long, either in the winter or summer, and did not mind rising in the cold of the night, as my aim and desire were to see this holy work finished. Now praised be the Creator, who granted me the privilege to begin and to finish this work."⁶ Such is the touching account which Jacob b. Chajim gives us of his labour of love.

Not less striking is the gratitude which he expresses to Bomberg, for having so cheerfully and liberally embarked upon so expensive a work. "When I explained to Bomberg," he tells us, "the advantage of the Massorah, he did all in his power to send into all the countries in order to search out what may be found of the Massorah; and, praised be the Lord, we obtained as many of the Massoretic books as could possibly be got. He was not backward, and his hand was not closed, nor did he draw back his right hand from producing gold out of his purse, to defray the expenses of the books, and of the messengers who were engaged to make search for them in the most remote corners, and in every place where they might possibly be found."⁷

With all our abuse of the Roman Catholics for withholding the Bible from the people, and with all our boasted love for the Scriptures, neither will the Bible Society with its annual income of £80,000, nor will any publisher in this Protestant country of ours, undertake a revised edition of that stupendous work which was published in a

⁶ *Vide infra*, p. 83, &c.

⁷ *Vide infra*, p. 77, &c.

been connected with them, Jacob's name is not even mentioned. This, however, may be owing to the change in Ibn Adonijah's religious sentiments, which, as we shall presently see, is more than probable.

The disappearance of Jacob Ibn Adonijah from the field of active labour in connection with Bomberg, which happened almost simultaneously with the arrival of Levita at Venice, and his appointment as corrector and annotator of the Hebrew works, is most significant, and we believe that it was caused by Ibn Adonijah's relinquishing Judaism.

It is now established beyond the shadow of a doubt, that this eminent Hebraist embraced Christianity about this time. Levita, who had occasion to refer to Adonijah, when writing his exposition of the Massorah (*circa* 1537–38), not only speaks of him as dead, but intimates that he had avowed the Christian faith some considerable time before he departed this life, and hence descends to unworthy vituperations against him. Referring to the Massorah, edited by Ibn Adonijah, in the celebrated Rabbinic Bible, Levita says, "I have not seen anything like it among all the ancient books, for arrangement and correctness, for beauty and excellence, and for good order. The compiler thereof was one of the learned, whose name was formerly, among the Jews, Jacob. Let his soul be bound up in a bag with holes!"¹⁰ This spiteful perversion of a beautiful, charitable, and reverential prayer, which the Jews use when speaking of or writing about any one of their brethren who has departed this life, in allusion to 1 Sam. xxv. 29, justifies us in assuming that Jacob Ibn Adonijah embraced Christianity several years before 1537.

As the statement in question, in Levita's work, was till lately the only reference to Ibn Adonijah's having embraced Christianity towards the end of his life, the fact was generally unknown, and many of the learned Jews doubted whether the passage in Levita really meant to convey the idea. Amongst those who doubted it, was the erudite Frensdorff. He therefore wrote to the late Professor Luzzatto, asking him the meaning of the passage in question, to which he replied as follows: ¹¹ "As to the meaning of Levita's words, which he wrote in

¹⁰ אכן המסורת מהארבע ועשרים הנדפסות הנה לא ראיתי כהנה בכל ספרי הקדמונים. מסודרים ומתוקנים ביופי ובהדרג ובטוב הסדר סדרם אחר מהנכונים היה שמו לפני. בישראל נקרא יעקב. תהי נשמתו צרורה בצרור נקיב. Comp. *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, p. 94, ed. Ginsburg.

¹¹ ולענין דברי הבהור שכתב בדקדמתו ההרדוית למסורת המסורת "אחר מהנכונים היה שמו לפני" בישראל נקרא יעקב. תהי נשמתו צרורה בצרור נקיב. ששאלת אם אאמין שכונתו לומר שר יעקב בו היים נ' אדניו הכיר דתו וראי כן הוא. והדרג הזה היה סנה שנמנעתי מהשיב למכתבך כי הרבה

It is more than probable that Levita told Jacob Ibn Adonijah of the Aramaic work on which he was engaged, the MS. of which he lost in the sacking of Rome, and that this exercised some influence on the latter in the choice of his next literary undertaking. For we find Jacob Ibn Adonijah, immediately after Levita's arrival, writing "*A Treatise on the Targum*" (מאמר על התרגום). It is a matter of dispute whether this Treatise first appeared in Bomberg's edition of the Pentateuch and the Five Megilloth, published in 1527, or in that published in 1543–44, after Jacob Ibn Adonijah's death.⁸ Not possessing the editions in question, I cannot state which opinion is the correct one.

Although no one who is at all acquainted with his assiduity, and who knows what an uncontrollable and inextinguishable passion to continue therein is kindled in the hearts of those who have embarked upon authorship and found their works acceptable, will for a moment doubt that Jacob Ibn Adonijah ever would relinquish his literary pursuits, as long as he possessed his faculties and the use of his limbs; yet, with the exception of one solitary and incidental reference to his work, presently to be mentioned, we henceforth hear nothing more about his productions. Fürst indeed enumerates no less than fifteen important Midrashim and Commentaries on the Bible, which Bomberg published in 1543–47, and which he says may have been prepared for the press by our author.⁹ But this is mere conjecture. I myself possess the very editions of some of the works in question, and though Cornelius Adelkind and Elias Levita are distinctly stated as having

⁸ Comp. the article *Jüdische Typographie*, by Steinschneider and David Cassel, in Ersch and Gruber's *Allgemeine Encyclopädie*, section II., vol. xxviii., p. 44, note 32, and Professor Luzzatto's Letter (reprinted below, p. 11), and with Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, vol. iii., p. 451.

⁹ The works referred to are as follows:—*Midrash Rabbah* (מדרש רב), Venice, 1545, fol.; *Mehilta* (מכילתא), *ibid.* 1545, fol.; *Siphra* (ספרא), *ibid.* 1545, fol.; *Siphre* (ספרי), *ibid.* 1545, fol.; *Midrash Tanchuma* (מדרש תנחומא), *ibid.* 1545, fol.; *Midrash Tilim* (מדרש תלים), *ibid.* 1546, fol.; *Pisikta Sutratha* (פסיקתא וסוחרא), *ibid.* 1546, fol.; Elias Mishrachi's *Supra Commentary* on Rashi's Comment. on the Pentateuch, called *Sepher Ha-Mizrake* (ספר מורתי), *ibid.* 1545, fol.; Arama's Commentary on the Pentateuch, called *Akedath*, (עקדה), *ibid.* 1547, fol.; Ralbag's *Commentary on the Pentateuch*, (רמב"ם על התורה), *ibid.* 1547, fol.; Abraham Sabba's *Kabbalistic Commentary on the Pentateuch*, entitled *Tzeror Ha-Mor* (צרור המור), *ibid.* 1546, fol.; Nachmanides' *Commentary on the Pentateuch*, (על רמב"ן התורה), *ibid.* 1548, fol.; Ibn Shemtov's *Homiletical Commentary on the Pentateuch*, (דרשות התורה לנבוכד), *ibid.* 1547, fol.; Jacob Ibn Chibib's *Collection of Hagodas*, called *En Jacob* (עני יעקב), *ibid.* 1546, fol.; R. Solomon b. Abraham b. Aderethe's *Theological Answers to Queries*, (שי'ור הרשב"א), *ibid.* 1545–6, fol.; R. Moses de Corecy's Homiletical work, entitled, *The Major Book on the Commandments* (סמי'ב), *ibid.* 1547, fol. (Comp. *Bibliotheca Judaica*, vol. iii. p. 452.)

could his soul long ago be bound up (*i. e.* have departed) in the year 1538, when the *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth* was printed? But when I saw the edition of the Mishna in question, I thought, what am I now to say? and how am I to reconcile it? Surely upon the testimony of two witnesses the man must be executed. Whereupon I concluded that Ibn Adonijah wrote his Treatise on the Targum when still a Jew, and that it had either been already printed when he was alive, in an edition of the Pentateuch which I have not yet seen, or it was not printed in his life-time, but remained for some years in the possession of Daniel Bomberg, till he printed an edition of the Pentateuch, with the Targum, when he also printed at the end the Treatise in question."

This fact may perhaps give us the clue to Jacob Ibn Adonijah's sudden disappearance from the field of labour in connection with Bomberg's printing office. The apology of the second editor of the edition of the Mishna in question, for printing, in a work intended for the Jews, opinions propounded by one who had ceased to be a member of the community, seems to imply several things which have hitherto been unknown in connection with the life of Ibn Adonijah. We see from it—i. That he still continued to work for Bomberg after he embraced Christianity. For had Ibn Adonijah revised the Tractate of Mishna in question when he was still a Jew, the future editor would not have found it necessary to apologise for reprinting Ibn Adonijah's opinions; just as the future editors of the Rabbinic Bible did not require to explain why they reprinted his compilation of the Massorah, and the Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, which he wrote when still a Jew. ii. The fact that Bomberg's works were for the Jews, and that an apology was needed to be made to them for printing the corrections and annotations made by a converted Jew, would of itself show the inexpediency of retaining a Jewish Christian on such works. To conciliate, therefore, the prejudice of his Jewish customers, Bomberg was undoubtedly obliged to part with his old friend Jacob Ibn Adonijah. How bitter this prejudice was against those who embraced Christianity, may be seen from the vituperations uttered against Ibn Adonijah, even by so enlightened a man as Elias Levita. If our conclusions are correct, they will also supply us with the clue to the sudden and mysterious disappearance of Ibn Adonijah's name from nearly all the books printed by Bomberg since the year 1527. However much Ibn Adonijah may have done to them by way of

the poetical Introduction to the *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, 'one of the learned, whose name was formerly, among the Jews, Jacob. Let his soul be bound up in a bag with holes;' and your asking me whether I believe it to imply that R. Jacob b. Chajim Ibn Adonijah changed his religion; it is assuredly so. This was the reason why I delayed replying to your letter, for I was greatly perplexed about this subject; since for a truth, from the import of R. Elias Levita's words in question, it is beyond doubt that R. Jacob changed his religion, and I was unwilling to publish this strange report about such a learned man till I found another witness. Now last year, one of my friends, the erudite R. Moses Soave, of Venice, found an edition of the Mishna, with the Commentaries of Maimonides and Shimshon b. Abraham, printed at Venice (Giustiniani), 1546; at the end of Tractate *Taharoth* was written as follows, which I also saw myself with my own eyes: 'These are the words of the first editor, whose name was formerly, among the Jews, Jacob b. Chajim, and who revised the Tractate *Taharoth*, with the Commentary of R. Shimshon, of blessed memory. Since, however, the sage said, 'Receive the truth by whomsoever it is propounded,' we deemed it proper to print his remarks here.' Now is peradventure the lie to be given also to this testimony, or is the fact to be established from this witness?

"Before this, however, happened, I rejoiced as one that findeth great spoil, for I bought a copy of the Pentateuch, with the Targum, printed by Bomberg in 1543-44, at the end of which are seven pages on the Targum, beginning—'Thus saith Jacob b. Chajim b. Isaac Ibn Adonijah,' &c.; as I thought from this it is evident that in the years 1543-44 he was alive, and was still a Jew; and how then

הייתי נוכח בענין הזה כי אמנם משמעות דברי ר' אליה הנ"ל היא בלא ספק כי ר' יעקב המיר דתו ולא הייתי רוצה להוציא לעז על הכס כמחוי במרס אשכנז עד שני. ואולם בשנה שעברה מצא אחר מיירי המשכיל ר' משה סואני מעיר ויניציאה משניות עם פירוש הר"מ ור"ש דפוס ויניציאה 'יוספיניא' שנת ש"ו ובסוף סדר כהרות כתוב כך וכן ראיתי גם אני בעיני "ואלה הם דברי המניה הראשון שהיה שמו לפנינו בישראל יעקב בר חיים שהגיה סדר כהרות עם פירוש רבינו שמשון ד"ל. ולפי שאמר ההכם קבל האמת ממי שאמרו ראינו להדפיס דבריו פה" ההתכן להכניס גם הערות הונת. או להוציא משמעות דבריה:

ואני קודם לכן ששתי כמוצא שלל רב כי קנתי חומש עם הרגום דפוס בוכיבר שנת ש"ג וש"ד ובסופו ד' דפים על הרגום. תחלה אמר יעקב בן חיים בן יצחק בן אדניהו יש"ע עמה"ן "ואמרתיו הרי מבורר כי בשנת ש"ג וש"ד היה חי והיה יהודי. ואך בשנת רצ"ח מסרת המסרת) כבר היתה נשמרה צורה?—אבל כשראיתי המשניות הנ"ל. אמרתיו מה אדבר? ובמה אצידקה? הלא על פי שנים עדים יוכח האמת ואז אמרת: אין ספק כי בן אדניהו כתב מאמרו על הרגום כשהיה יהודי. ואולי כבר נדפס בחייו בחומש אחר שלא בא עדיין לידו. ואולי ג"כ לא נדפס בחייו. אבל נשאר ביד דניאל בוכיבר קצת שנים עד שהדפיס חומש עם הרגום ואז הדפיס המאמר ההוא בסופו. This letter is published in the Hebrew Essays and Reviews, entitled *Ozar Nechanad*, vol iii., p. 112, Vienna, 1860.

repetition of a phrase, or the peculiarity of a construction, the greatest care has been taken, since the beginning of the Christian era, to mark every peculiarity and phenomenon in the spelling and construction of the words in the Scriptures, so that “one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law.”

The duty of noting these peculiarities devolved more especially upon the Scribes, or copyists, who multiplied the Codices of the Bible.¹² As the collation of MSS. for the purpose of producing correct copies was deemed unsafe, inasmuch as the multiplication always gives rise to a multitude of errors ; and as, moreover, the process of collation is not only tedious, but demands a number of MSS. belonging to different families, and various ages, the Scribes found it more practicable to count the number of times a word was spelled in an exceptional way, or a peculiar phrase was used, or any anomaly occurred throughout the Bible. The different peculiarities, thus numbered, were rubricated, and formed into separate registers and lists. These were at first committed to memory by the professional Scribes and doctors of the law, and transmitted orally in the schools ; but afterwards, like all other traditions, were written down, and now constitute the *Massorah* (מסורה), = *tradition*.¹³

Like the science of grammar and lexicography, the Massoretic researches were at first limited. They were confined to the rubrication of words and phrases to which some legal enactment was attached, or which had some caligraphical and orthographical peculiarity. But as the Massoretic schools extended over a millennium,¹⁴ and as the

¹² Hence the remark, לפיכך נקראו הראשונים סופרים שהיו סופרים כל האותיות שבתורה, שהיו אומרים וא' דהקו חציין של אותיות של ספר תורה, ורש ורש חציין של תיבות, והתנחל ש: פסוקים, ירסמנה חזיר מיצר עין ויער חציים של הילים, הוא רהוב יכפר עין חציו דפסוקים: "therefore are the ancients called Sopherim, because they counted all the letters in Holy Writ. Thus they said that the *Vav*, נדון [Levit. xi. 42], is the half of all the letters in the Pentateuch; [ibid. x. 16] the middle word; and התנחל [ibid. xiii. 33] the middle verse; that *Ain*, במער [Ps. lxxx. 14], is the middle letter in the Psalms; and Ps. lxxvii. 38 the middle verse." *Kiddushin*, 30 a.

¹³ The expression מסורה, which now denotes all the labours of the Massorites effected during a millennium, is the post-Talmudic form. In the Talmud it is מסורָה and originally denoted the traditional pronunciation of the unpointed text. Thus it was transmitted authoritatively that שבעים (Levit. xii. 5) is to be read שְׁבַעִים, *two weeks*, and not שִׁבְעִים, *seventy days*; and that בהלב (Exod. xxiii. 19) is to be pronounced בַּחֵלב, *in the milk*, and not בַּחֲלֵב, *in the fat*. Comp. Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, vol. i., p. 90, &c.; vol. iii., p. 79.

¹⁴ This has already been pointed out by Levita; comp. *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, p. 137, ed. Ginsburg.

correction and annotation, it was the best trade policy to suppress the name of the converted Jew. Hence Fürst may be perfectly correct in his supposition that Jacob b. Chajim had a share in preparing for the press the fifteen important works already alluded to, though the learned bibliographer neither accounts for, nor mentions, the fact that Ibn Adonijah's name is suppressed.

The precise year in which Ibn Adonijah died has not as yet been ascertained, though it is perfectly certain, from the remarks of Levita already alluded to, that he departed this life before 1538. That the Jews did not record anything connected with his life and death is no matter of surprise, when we remember that he had left their community, and that, in their unparalleled sufferings, the converted Israelites of those days, in their blind zeal, were considerable abettors. But that the Christian writers of those days, both Catholics and Protestants, who thought it worth their while to chronicle and perpetuate events which we cannot read now without blushing, should have passed over in total silence the death of one who had done so much for Biblical literature, and suffered the loss of all things to join the ranks of the followers of Christ, will remain an indelible blot on the gratitude of Christian historians. As far as Ibn Adonijah himself is concerned, he has left a monument behind him in his contributions to Biblical literature, which will last as long as the Bible is studied in the original; and the critical student of the Scriptures can never examine the Massorah, nor look at the gigantic Rabbinic Bible, without feelings of reverence for, and gratitude to, Jacob b. Chajim Ibn Adonijah, who, being dead, yet speaketh.

It now remains that we should advert to the materials from which Ibn Adonijah compiled the Massorah, and to the merits of his compilation. Before, however, this is done, it is necessary to give the reader some idea of the origin, development, import, and transmission of the Massorah. The account must necessarily be very succinct.

Owing to the extreme sacredness with which the letter of the text was regarded, and believing that the multifarious legal enactments which were called forth by the ever-shifting circumstances of the commonwealth, the sacred legends which developed themselves in the course of time, and all the ecclesiastical and civil regulations, to which an emergency may at any time give rise, are indicated in the Bible by a superfluous letter, or redundant word, or the

and once with *Var*, with which the Massorah begins.¹⁵ It must be remarked, however, that in copying the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, or the Massorah, the scribes or students did not always transcribe the whole of it. Some portions were omitted as being unimportant, or not being wanted by the transcriber; some were transposed by the students to facilitate reference; whilst other portions were added by those who devoted themselves to this kind of study. Hence obtained different redactions, some called by the general name *Massoretic Treatises*, and others by the more specific appellation *Ochla Ve-Ochla*; hence the difficulty of ascertaining the particular redaction meant by the different commentators, lexicographers, and grammarians, who quote the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*; and hence too the impossibility of specifying particularly the various nameless fragments and forms of the Massorah, used for collation in the compilation of this critico-exegetical apparatus, as edited by Ibn Adonijah.

This impossibility of specifying the nameless fragments, which Jacob Ibn Adonijah realised in the compilation of the Massorah, has recently been construed into a deliberate suppression of the materials which he used, and the sources whence he drew his information. Thus Geiger, in showing the importance of the Massorah to Biblical criticism, and deploring its neglect by commentators and lexicographers, remarks,¹⁶ "Acquaintance with the Massorah, and with the numerous MSS. which contain it in its various forms, has for centuries become so rare, that people did not at all know any more whether the Massorah actually existed in former times, in the form of a comprehensive view, or whether it has been made into such a form for the first time by Jacob b. Chajim, at the end of his edition of the Bible; and whether this whole compilation which he made from the isolated Massorahs, both parva and magna, to be found connected immediately with the

¹⁵ Levita, who made the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* the basis of his Massoretic researches, plainly declared that it is so called from its beginning words, *הקרא כן בעבור ההחלוקה*; *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, p. 131. We cannot, therefore, understand why the learned Dr. Steinschneider should be so anxious to claim the originality of this remark. Comp. Geiger's *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, vol. i., pp. 316, 317, note 31, Breslau, 1862.

¹⁶ Die Bekanntschaft mit ihr, mit den zahlreichen Handschriften, welche sie in ihrer verschiedenen Gestalt enthalten, ist schon seit Jahrhunderten so spärlich geworden, daß man gar nicht mehr wußte, ob denn wirklich früher auch die Massorah in der Gestalt einer umfassenden Uebersicht existirt habe, oder ob sie so erst von Jakob ben Chajim am Ende der Bibelausgabe geordnet worden, diese ganze Zusammenstellung, die er eben aus den vereinzelt unmitelbar neben dem Texte befindlichen kleinen und großen

absence of concordances precluded the possibility of discovering at once all the instances in which certain anomalies were to be found, the continued exertions of the Massorites resulted, not only in supplementing and completing the already existing rubrics, but in adding new registers and lists of words, forms, phrases, and combinations, which exhibited the slightest deviation from the ordinary usage. Hence the Massorah, in its present development, embraces almost everything connected with the external appearance of the text. It gives the number of times each letter of the alphabet occurs throughout the Bible. It states how many verses there are in each separate book. It shows which is the middle letter, which the middle word, and which is the middle verse in every book. It registers the majuscular, the minuscular, the inverted, the suspended, and the peculiarly pointed letters, the anomalous forms and phrases, defective and plene, textual and marginal readings, conjectural readings, lexical features, &c.

When the Massorah began to be written down, it assumed a double form. The first form of it is more like an index, simply stating alongside the margin, against the word which exhibits a certain peculiarity, that the word in question is one of such and such a number, possessing the same peculiarity, without giving the other words of the same rubric. This form assumed the name of *Massorah parva* (מסורה קטנה). The second is the more extensive form. It not only gives all the words which possess the same peculiarity in full, but adds a few words, by which each expression is preceded, or followed, so as to enable the student to recognise, from the connection, in what book the anomaly occurs. This form of it obtained the name of *Massorah magna*, and is written above and below the text.

As, however, the Massorah constantly increased in bulk in the course of time, extending to every phenomenon of the text, and as the large dimensions it assumed precluded the possibility of its being written entirely above and below the margin of the page to which it referred, the different lists, both alphabetical and otherwise, had to be arranged according to alphabetical or other order, and chronicled in separate works. These books are either called by the general name *Massoretic Treatises* (ספרי המסורה), or *Ochla Ve-Ochla* (אכלה ואכלה). The latter appellation the Massoretic Treatises obtained from the first two examples, אָכַלָה (1 Sam. i. 9), וְאָכַלָה (Gen. xxvii. 19), in the alphabetical list of words occurring twice in the Bible, once without

the Bible, thus constituting what is called the Massorah parva and the Massorah marginalis; and second, separate Massoretic Treatises, or the different redactions of what is called the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*.

Equally explicit and straightforward are his remarks about the nature of these materials, and the manner in which he elaborated them. We cannot do better than give his own description of the condition of the Massorahs, written in the margins of the Bibles. "After mastering their contents," he says, "I found them in the utmost disorder and confusion, so much so, that there is not a sentence to be found without a blunder: that is to say, the quotations from the Massorites are both incorrect and misplaced; since in those codices in which the Massorah is written in the margin, it is not arranged according to the order of the verses contained in the page. Thus, for instance, if a page has five or six verses, the first of which begins with וַיֹּאמֶר, and he said; the second with וַיִּגַּד, and it was told; the third with וַיְהִי, and it is; the fourth with וַיִּשְׁלַח, and he sent; the fifth with וַיִּשָּׁב, and she sat: the Massorah commences with the fourth verse, "the word וַיִּשְׁלַח, occurs twenty-two times;" then follows verse two, "the word וַיִּגַּד, occurs twenty-four times;" and then the fifth verse, "the word וַיִּשָּׁב, occurs fifteen times," without any order or plan. Moreover, most of these [Massoretic remarks] are written in a contracted form, and with ornaments; so much so, that they cannot at all be deciphered, as the desire of the writer was only to embellish his writing, and not to examine or to understand the sense. Thus, for instance, in most of the copies, there are four lines [of the Massorah] on the top of the page, and five at the bottom, as the writer would under no circumstances diminish or increase the number. Hence, whenever there happened to be any of the alphabetical lists, or if the Massoretic remarks were lengthy, he split up the remarks in the middle or at the beginning, and largely introduced abbreviations, so as to obtain even lines."¹⁸

That this is by no means an exaggerated description of the state in which the Massorah, written in the margins of the Bible, was in the days of Ibn Adonijah, may be seen from the account given by Levita, his contemporary and co-labourer in the same department. Levita, who fourteen years later (1538) had to collate it for his Introduction to the Massorah, says, "as for the Massorah, written round the margin in the Codices, it contains numberless errors. The copyists have perverted it, as they did not care for the Massorah, but

¹⁸ Vide infra, p. 78, &c.

text, is exclusively his work. From his words, with which he introduces this work, it does not appear whether he had before him one or more such compilations, nay, on the contrary, it seems as if he claimed for himself this compilation. We can scarcely avoid the suspicion, that the man, whose merit is at all events to be acknowledged as permanent, designedly intended to envelope it in darkness, with the artificial words in which he introduces this work, as well as the grammatical Treatise of Moses Ha-Nakden, in order that it might scarcely be guessed what he had originally before him, and that it should be supposed that he had done far more at it than is actually the case; on the contrary, he would surely have increased his merit if he had told very plainly what sources he used, in what form they were, and how he had worked them up. Nevertheless he omitted to give this information, and the most distinguished literati and collators of MSS. could give no information whether there existed any MS. compilation of the Massorah."

That this accusation is unmerited, may be seen both from Jacob Ibn Adonijah's Introduction, and from the various notes which he made in different parts of the Massorah finalis. Thus in the passage already quoted,¹⁷ he not only tells us that Bomberg despatched messengers to different countries to search for copies of the Massorah, but distinctly declares that they succeeded in obtaining as many codices as could possibly be secured. These Massorahs, he moreover says, embraced both kinds: First, the Massorahs written in the margin of

Massorah's vorgenommen, ausschließlich sein Werk sei. Aus seinen Worten, mit denen er diese Arbeit einleitet, geht nicht hervor, ob er eine oder gar mehrere solcher Uebersichten vorliegen gehabt habe, ja es scheint im Gegentheile, als nehme er diese Zusammenstellung für sich allein in Anspruch; wir können uns kaum des Verdachtes erwehren, daß der Mann, dessen Verdienst jedenfalls ein dauernd anerkennendes ist, durch die künstlichen Worte, mit denen er dieses Werk, wie das grammatische des Moses ha-Nakden, einleitet, absichtlich ein gewisses Halbdunkel darüber verbreiten wollte, so daß man, was ihm ursprünglich vorgelegen, kaum ahnen könne und man auf die Vermuthung kommen solle, er habe weit mehr dabei gethan, als wirklich der Fall ist. Sicher hätte er sein Verdienst im Gegentheile erhöht, wenn er uns recht genau gesagt hätte, welche Quellen er benützt, welche Gestalt dieselben gehabt und wie er sie verarbeitet. Jedoch er unterließ diese Mittheilung, und die bedeutendsten Kenner und Handschriften-sammler wußten von der massoretischen Uebersicht, ob sie handschriftlich vorhanden sei, keine Nachricht zu geben. *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben*, vol. iii., p. 112, &c. Breslau, 1865.

¹⁷ Vide supra, p. 8, &c.

whether he had before him one or more such compilations, nay, on the contrary, it seems as if he claimed for himself this compilation," and then charge Ibn Adonijah with designedly concealing his original sources, is to us a matter of the utmost astonishment. Can it be that Geiger has not read through Ibn Adonijah's Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, in which he gives this detailed description of his labours?

The imputation appears still more unaccountable when it is compared with the correct account which a few pages before Geiger gives of Ibn Adonijah's most assiduous and *conscientious* work. "Jacob b. Chajim," he says,¹⁹ "has the great merit of having transmitted to us the Massorah, in the second Bomberg Bible, edited by him (1525), after comparing it most carefully with different MSS. He has furnished us with a work of the utmost discernment and indescribable industry. He has used several MSS. for the Massorah parva and magna, endeavoured to reconcile and solve contradictions and difficulties; and has conscientiously given an account of this, as well as of his scruples. He must certainly have had before him a Massoretic survey, but this he has entirely recast in its arrangement. By his not only referring frequently in the large marginal Massorah to articles in the survey, but, *vice versa*, being sometimes satisfied with a reference in the latter to the former, he actually also endeavoured to make it a complete survey, inasmuch as he has tried to work up the whole Massoretic material, in so far as it did not relate to entirely isolated details; and moreover, by arranging it alphabetically, he has

¹⁹ Jakob ben Chajim hat das große Verdienst, uns dieselbe in der von ihm besorgten Ausgabe der zweiten rabbinischen Bomberg'schen Bibel (1525), mit sorgfältiger Vergleichung verschiedener Handschriften, überliefert zu haben. Er hat uns ein Werk eifrigster Kenntniß und unfäglischen Fleißes geliefert; er hat für die kleine und die große Maßorah mehrere Handschriften benützt, Differenzen und Schwierigkeiten auszugleichen und zu lösen gesucht, und gewissenhaft giebt er darüber wie über seine Scrupel Bericht. Auch die maforethische Uebersicht lag ihm sehr vor; diese aber arbeitete er in Betreff der Anordnung vollständig um. Nicht bloß daß er in der großen Randmaßorah häufig auf Artikel der Uebersicht verwies, umgekehrt zuweilen in dieser sich mit einer Verweisung auf die große Randmaßorah begnügte, hat er sie auch wirklich zu einer vollständigen Uebersicht zu gestalten versucht, indem er den ganzen maforethischen Stoff, soweit er nicht ganz vereinzelt Detail betraf, darin zu verarbeiten suchte und daß er sie ferner alphabetisch ordnete, sie also zu einem maforethischen Lexikon umgestaltete, das die Auffindung der maforethischen Bestimmungen sehr erleichterte. Daß ihm Handschriften zu dieser Arbeit vorlagen,

only thought to ornament their writing, and to make even lines, so as not to alter the appearance, in order that all the pages should be alike. Moreover they ornamented them with illuminations of divers kinds of buds, flowers, &c. Hence they were obliged sometimes to narrow, and sometimes to widen, the margins round the illuminations with words already stated, although they were superfluous, and out of place; whilst the Massoretic registers were entirely omitted from their proper place, because the space did not suffice; and hence they had to break off in the middle of a sentence, thus leaving the whole edifice incomplete, and greatly defective.¹⁸

Thus much for the Massorah, which accompanied the Codices of the Bible, prior to, and after, the time of Ibn Adonijah's compilation. As to the means for collating, correcting, and compiling it, and the extent of his labours, he distinctly tells us that he used different separate redactions of the Massorah, which Bomberg procured, and which he himself possessed. Here, again, we must let Ibn Adonijah speak for himself. "Now," says he, "when I observed all this confusion, I bestirred myself in the first place to arrange all the Massoretic notes, according to the verses to which they belonged; and then to investigate the Massoretic treatises in my possession, apart from what was written in the margins of the Bibles. Wherever an omission or contraction occurred, in order to obtain even lines, or four lines at the top and five lines at the bottom, I at once consulted the Massoretic treatises, and corrected it according to order. And whenever I found that the Massoretic treatises differed from each other, I put down the opinions of both sides, as will be found in the margin of our edition of the Bible with the Massorah, the word in dispute being marked to indicate that it is not the language of the Massorah; and whenever I took exception to the statement in a certain Codex of the Massorah, because it did not harmonise with the majority of the Codices of the Massorah, whilst it agreed with a few, or wherever it contradicted itself, I made careful search till I discovered the truth, according to my humble knowledge."¹⁹

How, in the face of such a plain declaration, that he had used sundry Codices of the Massorah, apart from the Massorah which accompanied the copies of the Bible, an accurate and profound scholar like Geiger could say—"from his words it does not appear

¹⁸ *Massoroth Ha-Massoroth*, p. 94, ed. Ginsburg, Longmans, 1867.

¹⁹ *Vide infra*, p. 79, &c.

Testaments; and Biblical critics have to the present day not succeeded in finding out these materials. Yet who ever thinks of charging the Cardinal, and the editors of the Complutensian Polyglott, with designedly concealing the original sources of their work, in order that it might appear greater than it actually was?

Levita, who, in referring to the extraordinary dimensions of the Massorah magna, tells us that "if all the words of it which he had seen in his life were to be written down, and bound up in a book, it would exceed in bulk the Bible itself," declares that the greater part of Ibn Adonijah's compilation is from the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*.²⁰ Now Ibn Adonijah does not even mention the name of this Massoretic Compendium; and it would at first sight seem as if we had here one of the original sources, which he had designedly concealed. But the fact that Levita found a copy of this treatise, after great exertions,²¹—though he lived in the very place where Ibn Adonijah sojourned, and was engaged by the very printer who employed Ibn Adonijah, and who collected and possessed all the Codices of the Massorah used in the edition of the Rabbinic Bible, would of itself show that Ibn Adonijah could not have had before him this particular redaction when he compiled the Massorah. Levita's remark, therefore, simply proves that the different redactions of the separate Massorah, or the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, which Ibn Adonijah worked up in his great compilation, also embodied the greater portion contained in the particular redaction in question.

Had the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* referred to by Levita come to light, we should have been able, by comparing it with the present Massorah, to see how much of it Ibn Adonijah incorporated in his compilation, and in what manner he worked up the materials. But, unfortunately, this Codex, like all other Massoretic compilations, has disappeared. There can, however, be no doubt that Levita's statement is exaggerated, and that, from his known enmity to Ibn Adonijah for having embraced Christianity, he would only too readily seize any plausible opportunity of depreciating his fellow-labourer's work. Yet even he was constrained to bestow the greatest praise upon Ibn Adonijah's compilation, and to account for its deficiencies by adducing the ancient proverb that "every beginning is difficult."²²

The few independent surveys of the Massorah, which have of late

²⁰ *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, p. 138, ed. Ginsburg.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 93. ²² *Ibid.*, p. 95, &c.

transformed it into a Massoretic lexicon, so that the finding of the Massoretic definitions is greatly facilitated. That he had MSS. before him for this work is evident from the whole plan, and especially from his frank confession, in separate articles, that the statements are sometimes contrary in themselves, and sometimes contradict other statements, and that he leaves the solution. However, the bringing together of the separate and scattered stones into a well compacted edifice is his work. The arrangement was uncommonly difficult; he had often to hesitate, in the course of his work, in which to put single articles; and this indeed constituted simply a single and subordinate part in the great work of a complete edition of the Bible, with Targum and a number of Commentaries."

From this description, which is irreconcilable with the other, wherein Ibn Adonijah is charged with designed concealment of the original sources, it is almost certain that Geiger could not have read through Jacob b. Chajim's Introduction to the Bible. For here, where Geiger is really anxious to do him justice, and where he alludes to Ibn Adonijah's materials, he simply refers to his remarks in the Massorah finalis, drawing from them his conclusion, and does not at all refer to Ibn Adonijah's Introduction, where he most explicitly states that he had before him separate Codices of the Massorah. That he does not specify these Codices, is owing to the fact that the several redactions of the survey of the Massorah, and the fragmentary nature of many of the Codices, precluded such a bibliographical description. Besides, paleographical and bibliographical descriptions of MSS., used in editing a work, belong to modern days. The editors of the greatest works, after the invention of printing, and in the days of Ibn Adonijah, never thought of giving an account of the materials they used up. Cardinal Ximenes, and his co-workers at the magnificent edition of the Complutensian Polyglott, gave no account whatsoever of the materials and MSS. they used for the texts of the Old and New

ist aus der ganzen Anlage ersichtlich, besonders daraus, daß er unumwunden zu einzelnen Artikeln bekennt, daß die Angaben bald in sich selbst bald mit andern im Widerspruch stehn, und er die Lösung anheimstellt. Allein die Zusammenschichtung der einzelnen zerstreuten Bausteine zu einem wohlgefügtten Bau ist sein Werk. Die Anordnung war ungemein schwierig, er mußte oft schwanken, an welcher Stelle er den einzelnen Artikel unterbringen solle, im Laufe der Arbeit selbst—und dieselbe schloß sich ja blos als einzelner untergeordneter Theil an das große Werk einer vollständigen Bibelausgabe mit Targum und einer Anzahl Commentare an—änderte er zuweilen seinen Plan. *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, vol. iii., p. 105.

Commentary on the Hebrew Bible, about half a century later could no longer find it;²⁹ and such distinguished scholars as Lebrecht and Fürst have pronounced it as lost.³⁰ Dr. Derenburg, however, whilst preparing the catalogue of Hebrew MSS. in the Imperial Library, at Paris, had the good fortune to discover an independent "Great Massorah," commencing with the words *Ochla Ve-Ochla*.³¹ Shortly after, Dr. Frensdorff, who has for years been engaged in Massoretic studies, heard of the discovery (January, 1859), and, with the zeal and disinterested love with which this author prosecutes his Massoretic researches, he went to Paris in 1862, copied the MS., and published it, with learned annotations, in 1864.³²

The questions which we now purpose to examine are—i. What relationship does this Massoretic work sustain to the Massorah, published by Ibn Adonijah? And, ii. Is this *Ochla Ve-Ochla* the identical work which is quoted by Kimchi, Ibn Aknin, Isaac b. Jehudah, and Elias Levita, or is it simply one of the redactions of the ancient Great Massorah, which, like the several other redactions, obtained the appellation *Ochla Ve-Ochla*?

i. The first great difference between the Ibn Adonijah compilation and the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* is that the former contains upwards of six thousand one hundred rubrics, whilst the latter only contains about four hundred. ii. Though Ibn Adonijah's compilation comprises more than fifteen times the number of rubrics that the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* contains, yet the latter has no less than fifty-three entire rubrics which are not at all to be found in the former. They are as follows, according to the numbers of the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*:—Nos. li., lx., lxxiii., lxxxiii., lxxxiv., lxxxviii., clxxv., clxxvi., cxxx., clxxx., clxxxi., clxxxii., clxxxiii., clxxxix., ccii., ccvii., ccxvi., ccxx., ccxxiii., ccxxiv., ccxxv., ccxxvi., ccxxix., ccxxxii., ccxxxiii., ccxlii., celvii., celviii., celxiii., celxv., celxvii., cclxxxi., cclxxxii.,

²⁹ See the edition of the Hebrew Scriptures, with his Commentary, entitled, *A Gift Offering, or Oblation of Salomon ben Jehudah* ("מנחה ש"), 1 Sam. i. 9, vol. ii. p. 27 b. Mantua, 1742–44.

³⁰ Thus Lebrecht, in the Introductory notes to his edition of Kimchi's Lexicon, remarks, "*sed posquam tota argumentorum ejus summa in Masoram magnam biblicorum rabbinorum transiit, ipse liber periisse videtur*," p. xlix., Berlin, 1847; and Fürst, *אכלה*, ספר אכלה, וואכלה ויהוה ספר מסורה וכו' ונראה שנאבד מאתנו. — *Appendices to his Concordance*, p. 1382.

³¹ Bibliothèque Impériale, Ancien Fonds Hébreu, No. 56.

³² The complete title of the book is *Das Buch Ochla W'Ochla (Massora) Herausgegeben übersetzt und mit erläuternden Anmerkungen versehen nach einer, soweit bekant, einzigen, in der Kaiserlichen Bibliothek zu Paris befindlichen Handschrift.*—Von Dr. S. Frensdorff, Hanover, 1864.

years been discovered in public libraries, only show how vast Ibn Adonijah's labours must have been in producing his compilation. For, not only do these MSS. exhibit the greatest diversity in details, but not a single one of them can be compared, in number of rubrics or in point of arrangement, with the present Massorah finalis. About the relationship of the Great Massorah, which the celebrated R. Gershom b. Jehodab (*circa* 960–1028), "the luminary of the dispersed," already copied with his own hands,²³ and which is frequently quoted by Rashi, and by the transcribers of the Leipsig Codex (No. 1), with Ibn Adonijah's compilation, we can say nothing, since no Codex of this particular redaction of the Great Massorah has as yet been found. We can, however, speak positively about the recently discovered and published *Ochla Ve-Ochla*.

The *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, as has already been remarked, is the name which in the course of time was given by some to one or more redactions of the independent survey of the Massorah, to distinguish it from the other *Great Massorah*,²⁴ which was written above and below the text of the Bible. By this appellation, this particular redaction of the Great Massorah was first quoted, towards the end of the twelfth century, by David Kimchi,²⁵ and Ibn Aknin.²⁶ It is then quoted again by Isaac b. Jehudah, in the middle of the thirteenth century;²⁷ and then again by Levita in 1538, who describes it as the only separate Massorah.²⁸ Henceforth it entirely disappeared. Even R. Salmon Norzi, the great Biblical critic, and Massoretic authority (*circa* 1560–1630), who wrote his celebrated critical and Massoretic

²³ Comp. Delitzsch, *Catal. Codd. Lips.*, p. 273; and also Zunz, *Additamenta*, to Delitzsch's Catalogue, p. 315, where the passages are given in which Rashi quotes the "Great Massorah."

²⁴ Hebrew, מסורה הגדולה מסורה גדולה; Chaldee, מסורתא רבא, מסורתא רבתי. *Vide supra*, p. 16, &c.

²⁵ Kimchi quotes the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* in his grammar, entitled *Michlol*, 35 b, col. 2; 51a, col. 2; ed. Levita, Bomberg, 1545, fol.; or 112 b, 163 a, ed. Hechim. Fürth, 1793; and in his Lexicon, s. v., קרב.

²⁶ For Ibn Aknin's quotations, which are to be found in his ethical work entitled *ספר אלוהים*, and in his Methodology, see Steinschneider, in Geiger's *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, vol. i., p. 316, note 31, Breslau, 1862.

²⁷ The work in which Isaac b. Jehudah quotes the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* is entitled *ספר האשל*. Comp. Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr.*, in *Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, col. 1418; the same author in Geiger's *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, vol. i., p. 317, note; Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vol. v., p. 555, note, Magdeburg, 1860; and see also Neubauer, *Notice sur la Lexicographie Hébraïque*, p. 9. Paris, 1863.

²⁸ Comp. *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, pp. 93, 94, 138.

from it.³⁴ Now the most cursory comparison of the two works will show, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that Ibn Adonijah could not have had before him the redaction of the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, published by Dr. Frensdorff; and that either this *Ochla Ve-Ochla* is not the one which Levita made the principal basis of his Massoretic studies, and which is quoted by Kimchi, Ibn Aknim, &c., or that Levita's statement is not true.

Indeed, Dr. Frensdorff himself admits that the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, which has recently been found in the Imperial Library at Paris, and which he has published, could not possibly have been used by Jacob Ibn Adonijah. We cannot do better than give Dr. Frensdorff's own proofs for this statement: i. The *Ochla Ve-Ochla* has fifty-six articles which are wanting in Ibn Adonijah's compilation, and which he surely would not have omitted if he had had this redaction before him; and ii. Some of the articles, which are to be found in the two Massorahs alike, are very defective in the printed Massorah finalis, thus showing that Ibn Adonijah did not copy the articles into his compilation from this redaction of the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, or the articles in the copy would have been as complete as those in the original.

Thus under the alphabetical list of words which begin with *Vav* and *Mem*, and occur only once, Ibn Adonijah remarks, "the above registers, which begin with *וּמל* in alphabetical order, from *ומל* to *ומא*, have all been collected from several Massoretic treatises, piece by piece. There is, however, a large alphabetical list of them complete, from *ומא* to *ומל*; but he has not been able to procure it complete, except from *ומל* to *ומת*. The rest he has had to search out register by register, and he does not know whether it is complete or defective."³⁵ If Ibn Adonijah had before him the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, published by Dr. Frensdorff, he would have found this complete list in No. xviii. Moreover, from this list, which occurs in the list in the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, he would have been able to fill up many a gap which occurs in the list of the Massorah finalis, from *ומל* to *ומת*.

Constrained to admit that Ibn Adonijah could not have had this redaction of the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* before him when compiling the

celxxxiii., celxxxiv., celxxxvi., celxxxvii., cexxiv., cecii., ceevi., ceevii., ceeviii., cecix., cecxvii., cecxxix., cecxxx., cecxxxi., cecxlii., cecxlxi., ccelx., ccelxviii., ccelxx., and portions of three rubrics, Nos., xviii., celxvi., and cecxxvii.³³ iii. Some of the parallel rubrics in the one have occasionally a few instances less than the other, and *vice versa*. iv. The order in which the instances are enumerated in the respective rubrics is more confused, and less in accordance with the sequence of the books in the Bible in Ibn Adonijah's compilation, than in the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*. In the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* the order of the books is as follows: Pentateuch, earlier Prophets as usual, then Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah, and the Minor Prophets; the Five Megilloth are sometimes placed before the Psalms, and sometimes before Chronicles; sometimes, however, they follow irregularly immediately after the Hagiographa.

With these important differences between the two redactions of the Massorah, we turn to the second question, viz., whether the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* now published by Dr. Frensdorff is the identical redaction referred to by the different lexicographers and expositors, and declared by Levita to have been used by Ibn Adonijah for his compilation. Dr. Frensdorff, the learned editor of the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, maintains that it is the identical Massoretic work which had been lost for nearly three centuries. Levita, who, as far as can be ascertained, was the last that possessed a copy of the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, and who had studied it most carefully, distinctly maintains that the greatest part of Ibn Adonijah's compilation, *i. e.*, of the present Massorah finalis, is taken

³³ Frensdorff also marks Nos. cecxxix. and celix., as wanting in Ibn Adonijah's compilation. But this is a mistake, as Geiger has already pointed out, since rubric cecxxix., which gives three groups of words, respectively occurring three times in the same section, the first time with *Vav* conjunctive, and the second and third times without it, is also to be found in the Massorah finalis. p. 28b, cols. 1 and 2, ed. Buxtorf or Frankfurter. Only that the Codex from which this rubric of the printed Massorah was taken, had erroneously *four* such groups, and that this error has been transferred into the Massorah finalis. For *ואתה ירי* which is quoted as occurring twice, once beginning with *הגדתי* (read *הגדתי*), and once beginning with *אל תפחדו*, occurs only once, and the two references are to one and the same verse, Isaiah xlvi. 8. The other rubric, No. celix., which gives nine instances of two combined words, the first of which occurs once only with the prefix *Mem*, is to be found complete in the Massorah finalis, under the letter *Mem*, p. 43b, col. 4, ed. Buxtorf or Frankfurter, where, however, *מחצי חמשה*, the reference to Jeremiah xxxix. 14, is erroneously put for *מחצו המסרה*, as the Paris redaction rightly has it. It is to be added, that in enumerating the rubrics in the Paris redaction, which are wanted in the printed Massorah, Geiger has omitted Nos. li., lx., cxxx., cexix., and celxv., marked by Frensdorff in his notes on the respective articles.

³⁴ גם כל המסורה הנדפסת פה ווינ'סיה בעשרים וארבע הגדול רובו אינו אלא מספר ההוא *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, p. 138, ed. Ginsburg.

³⁵ אמר המעתיק כל אלו השמות דמשמשינן ומה בא' ב' מא' ועד ל' כוליהן לקמיו מספרי המסר' ועיר שם ועיר שם אבל היא כולה א' ב' גדולה אחת דמשמשת ומה עד התי' ו לא הגיע לידה כימנה ביחד כי אם כול ועד התי' ושאר לקמיו שמה שמה ולא ידענא אם חסר או לא עכ"ל. *Comp. Massorah finalis*, p. 44a, col. 3.

second group consists of eighty lists (71–150), giving the various readings, and thus being to a certain extent of a critical nature. Of these, the first two lists only are still alphabetical, the others are incomplete alphabets. The third group consists of twenty lists (151–170), of a similar import to those in the first group. Besides the rubrics, there are a great number of marginal additions throughout this part. They are written both in small square and in Rabbinic characters. Some of these simply continue the statements in the text, or supplement the examples adduced; but most of them contain new lists, so that the total number of lists in the first part amounts to upwards of 260.

THE SECOND PART extends over fol. 73–128, as well as over an unnumbered folio, thus making together fifty-seven leaves, or one hundred and fourteen pages, and contains three hundred and forty-three rubrics, which are again divisible into groups. The first group consists of eighty-eight lists (1–88), of forms of peculiar verbs and nouns, just as a concordance. The second group consists of twenty-one registers (89–109), of textual phenomena, similar to those enumerated in the first part. The third group consists of forty-five rubrics (110–155), of words, which are unique in one book only, which are peculiar in their orthography, vowel points, or terminations. The fourth group consists of a hundred and eighty-eight registers (156–344), giving forms and textual peculiarities of all sorts. Besides these numbered ones, there are two lists, one between Nos. 113 and 114, and the other at the end, which are not numbered, so that the total sum of rubrics in this part is three hundred and forty-five. To this must be added a large unnumbered piece, extending over six pages, designated כללות, and giving one hundred and thirty short rubrics, between Nos. 279 and 280. There are, moreover, in this part, a much larger number of marginal additions than in the first part. They are to be found on almost every page, and the additional rubrics amount to upwards of a hundred and eighty; so that the total number of rubrics in the second part amounts to upwards of five hundred and twenty.

Immediately after the second part, p. 129 *a*, are registers of the numbers of verses in the Old Testament, the chronology of Biblical events, and the respective authors of the sacred books. Whereupon follow, pp. 129 *b*–132 *b*, sundry Massoretic remarks, which, though under the inscription זו ממסרה הקטנה, *this is from the Massorah parva*, consist mostly of lists of peculiar forms, orthography, and phrases strictly connected with the *Massorah magna*. These lists, some of

Massorah, and yet anxious to maintain that it is the identical *Ochla Ve-Ochla* which is quoted by Kimchi, Ibn Akin, and others, which Levita made the basis of his Massoretic labours, and which he positively declares yielded to Jacob b. Chajim *the greatest part of his compilation*, Dr. Frensdorff simply disputes Levita's statement. But so plain a declaration by a contemporary scholar, and the first Massoretic authority of his time, is not to be set aside. Indeed, Dr. Frensdorff would never have resorted to so desperate and hazardous a measure, had he not started from the false hypothesis, that there was only one redaction of the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, and that his was the unique copy which has survived the ravages of time. The incorrectness of this assumption, however, is now proved beyond the shadow of a doubt, by the discovery of another and much larger redaction of the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* than that published by Dr. Frensdorff. The MS. is in the Library of the University of Halle (Y. b 10), and a description of it, by the late Professor Hupfeld, has just appeared in the Journal of the German Oriental Society.³⁶ This description we recast and condense, so as to adapt it for our purpose, in order to show its relationship both to Ibn Adonijah's compilation, or the *Massorah finalis*, and to the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, edited by Dr. Frensdorff.

The Halle MS., which is a small quarto on parchment, beautifully written in square Hebrew characters of the middle ages, consists of 138 numbered leaves, or 276 pages, and contains upwards of 1,000 Massoretic rubrics, in two parts, as follows:—

THE FIRST PART wants six leaves of apparently a grammatical import. On p. 7 *a* stands, after the superscription סימן מלכי ישראל, a table of the accents, with their respective figures and names; and on p. 7 *b*–11, an Index (7 *b*–11), of the Rubrics contained in both parts. The *Massorah* proper of the first part, which contains one hundred and seventy rubrics, begins on p. 12 and extends to p. 72, thus embracing sixty-one leaves, or one hundred and twenty-two pages. The rubrics of this part, which contain almost exclusively the essence and older portion of the *Massorah*, viz., lists of words, forms, and constructions of a unique nature or rare occurrence, are divisible into three groups. The first group consists of seventy, nearly all alphabetical lists (1–70) of words, forms of words, and combinations, which occur once only, or a few times, partly alone, and partly with certain prefixes, with this or that vowel or accent. The

³⁶ Comp. *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. xxi., pp. 201–220. Leipzig, 1867.

with the same examples, only without the inscription of the last rubric; whilst the Paris redaction, edited by Dr. Frensdorff (rubric 274) mixes up both the order of the Canaanitish names and the absence of the *Vav* in one rubric, with the inscription, "twenty verses in which the sequence of the words is irregular; fourteen of them have each a peculiar order, and also those which have *Vav*, and those which have not *Vav*."³⁹

iii. In many instances where Ibn Adonijah's compilation is defective and incorrect, and the Paris redaction is correct, the Halle redaction has the same blunders as the printed Massorah. Thus in the alphabetical list of words which occur once only with the preposition *אֶל*, and once with the preposition *עַל*, the Massorah finalis gives three incorrect instances, viz., *אֶל מְלֹאכֶת*, *עַל הַמְּזוּזָה*, and *אֶל קוֹלֶךָ*, which do not occur, and which are rightly wanting in the Paris redaction;⁴⁰ whilst the Halle redaction has the same errors. In the alphabetical list of words occurring twice, once with the article *ה*, and once without it, the Massorah finalis erroneously gives *הַכֶּבֶשׂ הָאֶהָר*, inasmuch as it not only occurs in the passage adduced (Exod. xxix. 29), but also in Levit. xiv. 12. This error, which does not occur in the Paris redaction,⁴¹ is also to be found in the Halle MS. The printed Massorah, in the incomplete alphabetical list of words which respectively occur, once with *Daleth*, and once with *Resh*, erroneously places *וַיִּפְרִי* under the letter *Pe*, instead of *Vav*, which is also the case in the Halle redaction; whilst in the Paris redaction it is in its right place.⁴² The alphabetical list of words beginning with *ו*, and occurring only once, to which reference has already been made,⁴³ is exactly as imperfect in the Halle redaction as it is in the Massorah finalis. The other instances, adduced by Hupfeld, which exhibit the agreement in the imperfections between the printed Massorah and the Halle MS., we must omit for want of space.

As to the relation of the Halle MS. to the Paris redaction, the

³⁹ כ' פסוקים דמשחבשנין בהון י"ד מנהון מיהדין וסומן אלן דנסבין וי"ו ואלן בלא נסבין וי"ו Compare rubric 274, p. 53, &c.; 149, ed. Frensdorff, Hanover, 1864.

⁴⁰ Compare *Massorah finalis*, letter *Aleph*, p. 7 b, with the Paris redaction, rubric 2, p. 3, &c., notes.

⁴¹ Compare *Massorah finalis*, under letter *He*, p. 21 a, col. 3, with the Paris redaction, rubric 3, p. 4, notes.

⁴² Compare *Massorah finalis*, under letter *Daleth*, p. 19 b, col. 1, with Paris redaction, rubric 7. p. 6.

⁴³ *Vide supra*, p. 27.

which already occur in the marginal notes, make together about two hundred and fourteen. Then follow, on two unnumbered half leaves, thirty-four rubrics, written in Rabbinic characters, of forms and phrases with peculiar points and orthography, and of verses containing certain words. And, finally, there are other pages (pp. 135 a-136 a) of lists, written in Rabbinic characters, giving the passages throughout the entire Old Testament where *Pattach* (*Segol*) is to be found with *Athnach* and *Soph Pasuk*. The Appendix, therefore, contains (214 + 34 =) 248 additional rubrics, thus making the sum total upwards of a thousand rubrics.

It now remains that we should point out the relationship of this redaction of the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, or the great Massorah, both to Ibn Adonijah's compilation, and to the redaction published by Dr. Frensdorff.

i. The Halle MS., though rich in its Massoretic lore, has incomparably fewer rubrics than Ibn Adonijah's compilation.

ii. In several instances where the arrangement and superscription of the rubrics in Ibn Adonijah's compilation differs to advantage from the Paris redaction, edited by Dr. Frensdorff, the Halle MS. agrees with the printed Massorah. Thus the Massorah marginalis, on Levit. i. 1, in giving the alphabetical lists of words which occur once only with *Kametz*, instead of *Pattach*, adds the important designation, *בִּזְקָפָה* with *Zakeph*. The Halle redaction, where this rubric is No. 22, has the same addition, whereas in the Paris redaction, where it is No. 21, this definition is omitted. Again, the rubric of the verses giving the names of the Canaanitish nations, has the inscription in the Massorah finalis, "two groups of three verses each in which the six names, viz., the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Amorites, the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites, follow in the same order; in fourteen verses they have a unique order, making together twenty verses,"³⁷ distinguishing two features, first the order of the Canaanitish nations, and second the absence of the *Vav*. In accordance with this the two groups are first enumerated, whereupon follow the instances, in each one of which the order is peculiar,³⁸ mostly in pairs. After this follow two other rubrics, with separate inscriptions, giving the variations of *Vav*, &c. The Halle redaction has the same arrangement,

הד מן ב' ווגין מן ג' אית בהון מן ו מלין הכנעני החתי האמרי הפרזי והיבוס י"ד פסוקים חד מן ב' דמיהדין כולהון כ' פסוקים. Compare that portion of it entitled *Various Readings* (הלוחי קריאה), p. 62 b, ed. Frankfurter, or ed. Buxtorf.

³⁸ There are properly only twelve instances, Exod. xiii. 5, and Josh. xxiv. 11, being omitted.

about thirteen rubrics (161, 167–170, 176–181, 214, 216–218), which are wanted in the former. Rubric 180, however, of the Paris redaction, is to be found in the marginal additions of the Halle redaction, and rubric 214 stands as rubric 163, second part of the Halle MS. Greater differences between the two redactions occur in the third group of the Halle MS. (151–170), though the bulk of this group is also to be found in the Paris redaction. Thus Nos. 155–161 are in the latter 76–78, 85–89, 348, 350–353. The corresponding portion in the Paris Massorah, however, is much richer, having lists of logical deductions (182–184); textual phenomena (192–194, 268, 273–295); registers of expressions repeated in the same verses (296–365); and of unique forms and combinations (254–267, 366–373), which are not found in the Halle MS. The latter again has two lists of anomalies in the Divine names and their various combinations (152–154); five catalogues of **ל** and **ול** (162–167), and other things which do not exist in the former.

The real difference, however, is to be seen in the second part. Here the Halle MS. is much richer than the Paris redaction. Thus, for instance, the latter wants the whole of the second group (Nos. 89–108), and has only three rubrics of the one hundred and eighty-eight which constitute the fourth group (156–344) in the Halle MS., viz., those which are in the Halle MS. Nos. 163, 277, 327. These are in the Paris redaction Nos. 214, 369, 191. Moreover the one hundred and thirty short rules which stand after No. 279 in the Halle MS., are also wanting in the Paris redaction. Of all the rules which are to be found in the marginal glosses and in the Appendices, with the exception of the marginal notes on the first group of the second part (Nos. 1–88), only about fifteen occur in the Paris redaction. Altogether the Paris redaction has about fifty rubrics which are not to be found in the Halle MS., as well as about fifty lists of words which occur in the same verse. Moreover, of the twenty-four rubrics in the Appendix to the Paris Massorah, the Halle MS. has only two rubrics, viz., 23 and 24. The Halle MS., on the other hand, has at least five hundred rubrics which are not to be found in the Paris redaction.

As to the age of the Paris redaction, this cannot be ascertained even approximately. All that is known for certain is that several hands

which properly begins the third group, giving a list of 154 instances wherein **אָדָּנִי** occurs in contrast to **אָדָּנִי**, and which, too, is wanted in the Paris redaction.

following striking points must be adduced. Apart from the fact that the Halle redaction has nearly treble the number of rubrics, the one having upwards of a thousand, the other scarcely four hundred, a comparison of the materials which these two Massorahs contain in common will show that they both proceeded from the same ancient source, and have been so elaborated, curtailed, expanded, and adapted, as to meet the special requirements of the respective redactors. Before, however, we proceed to point out this connection, it is necessary to remark that the essential portion of the Massorah, which treats on the forms of the words, and gives the number of times these forms occur, is divisible into two parts. The one specifies only the exceptional or rare forms, which occur once, twice, thrice, or at most four times, grouping these together according to analogies, or parallels, or alphabetical lists, or in certain numbers. The other part gives the number of times certain words occur, and assumes the form of a concordance. The Paris redaction is devoted more especially to the first part, whilst the Halle redaction embraces both parts. It is by comparing that part of the Halle redaction which rubricates the anomalies catalogued in the Paris redaction, that we can see the affinity of the two.

Now on comparing the first part of the Halle MS. with the Paris Massorah, it will at once be evident that both the redactors had the same materials before them. The first list in both begins with the significant words *Ochla Ve-Ochla*. The first great group of alphabetical lists and pairs of forms which occur once or twice only, contained in the first part of the Halle redaction (Nos. 1–70), is to be found in the Paris Massorah entirely, and in the same order, with the exception that No. 13 of the former stands as No. 70 in the latter. The same is the case with the second group of the Halle MS. (Nos. 71–150). These are almost entirely to be found in the Paris redaction, only that rubrics 71 and 72 in the Halle, are rubrics 80 and 81 in the Paris Massorah; and that the latter contains alphabetical, and a few other lists from 82 to 90, so that the parallel sequence is resumed with rubric 91; rubrics 73–150 of the Halle MS. having their correspondence in rubrics 91–166 of the Paris redaction. In this group, however, the Halle MS. has ten rubrics in the orthography of certain words,⁴⁴ which are wanting in the Paris Massorah, whilst the latter has

⁴⁴ These rubrics are on the orthography of **שָׁדִי וְהַ נְבוֹכַדְנֶצַּר** and **דָּוִד לְקָה דָּוִד** and **דָּוִד**, as well as on **עֵשִׂי מֵעֵשִׂי**. To this may also be added the contrast (**חֲלִיף**), to rule 151,

quantity of Massoretic materials than is to be found in the independent Massorahs now discovered, but he was the first who distributed the Massoretic remarks under the proper places to which they belonged, and who arranged the whole mass of the multifarious rubrics constituting this critico-exegetical apparatus into an alphabetical and lexical order, so that any anomaly or Massoretic remark may now easily be found by the student of the Hebrew text.

That Ibn Adonijah's compilation, which involved so much research and labour, and which after all constitutes one portion *only* of his gigantic Rabbinic Bible, should contain many imperfections, is no matter of surprise to any one who understands the nature of the work. Indeed it could not be otherwise, when the state of the materials which he had to work up is considered. But though Elias Levita, his contemporary and co-worker in the same department, had already alluded to these imperfections, and rightly accounted for them by quoting the old adage that "every beginning is difficult,"⁴⁵ yet he, as well as Morinus,⁴⁶ Michaelis,⁴⁷ and others who repeated his strictures, found it a far more easy task categorically to refer to errors and omissions than to collect and correct them. Buxtorf, who alone had the courage to embark upon correcting Jacob b. Chajim Ibn Adonijah, has more generally mistaken the meaning of the Massorah than rectified the errors. Now that the Paris redaction has been published, and that another and more important independent MS. has been discovered, which yield ample materials for amending and completing this ancient critical apparatus, it will be a burning shame if those who love the Bible, and are anxious for a correct text of the Old Testament verity, do not come forward to aid in the publication of the newly discovered MS., and help us in procuring an edition of the Massorah in as complete and accessible a form as the present rich materials enable us to obtain.

⁴⁵ *Vide Supra*, p. 23.

⁴⁶ *Exercitatt. Biblicæ*, pp. 384, &c., 556, &c.

⁴⁷ Preface to the edition of the Hebrew Bible, cap. IV., section v., p. 21, &c., Halle, 1720.

worked at it, and that it could not have been compiled earlier than the twelfth century. This has been shown by Geiger, who refers to No. 216. Here three words are rubricated, which in an exceptional manner have *Chirek* followed by *Jod* before *Dagesh*, viz., לְמִשְׁפָּחָה (Isa. xlii. 24), בִּיקְרוֹתֶיךָ (Psalm xlv. 10), and לִיקָהָתָה (Prov. xxx. 17). Now Geiger shows that these readings were not fixed till the tenth century, and that R. Saadia Gaon (892–942), was the first who rubricated them, since Rashi (1040–1105), in his commentary on Psalm xlv. 10, mentions to have seen them in R. Saadia's *Nikkud* (נִקּוּד רַב סַעַדְיָה). From this, it is evident that this rubric was not in the Massorah in the twelfth century, and that it was inserted afterwards, since this celebrated expositor, who so frequently quotes the Massorah in his explanations of anomalous readings, would surely in this instance not have referred to R. Saadia's *Nikkud*, had the rubric in question then formed part of the Massorah. As the compilers of the Paris redaction made their compilation from Massorahs which already contained this rubric, it must at least have been effected *circa* 1200.

The age of the Halle MS. is not fixed by Hupfeld, and not having as yet had an opportunity of inspecting it, I cannot ascertain it. The fact, however, that both it and the Massorah finalis contain many incomplete lists, and that the order in which the anomalies are enumerated is not according to the sequence of the books, shows that the materials from which they were elaborated were not only the same as but much older than the Paris redaction, and that the latter was made at the time when these Massoretic materials had already been shaped into proper order and form. It is therefore of the utmost importance that the Halle MS. should be published, for it is only by a careful comparison of the three Massorahs, viz., the Paris redaction, the Halle MS., and the Massorah finalis, that the readings of the Hebrew verity can properly be fixed.

Now that two independent Massorahs have been discovered, we are in a better position to judge of the labour which Ibn Adonijah bestowed upon his compilation. Not only have the Paris and Halle redactions incomparably less rubrics than the printed Massorah, but they have neither any fixed plan nor definite order in the disposition and arrangement of the various rubrics. With the exception of sometimes placing together a few lists of similar subjects, they have an arbitrary sequence of the different articles. Jacob b. Chajim Ibn Adonijah, therefore, has not only the merit of having amassed a larger

thereof. Now God gave it to his people whom he had chosen for himself—gave it to them only to be concealed under the shadow of His hand; for they alone know its mysteries, its grammar, its rules, and its anomalies. And the men of the Great Synagogue,² in whom was heavenly light, bright and powerful, like pure gold, on whose heart every statute of the Law was engraved, have set up marks, and built a wall around it, and made ditches between the walls, and bars, and gates, to preserve the citadel in its splendour and brightness; and they all came to the transparent cloud of its burning doctrine and rising incense; and they sanctified themselves to take the fire from off its altar, so that no other hand might touch it and desecrate it so as to become a bat for every fool; they strung together its golden words from columns of the Word of God—words of purity; and the Spirit alighted upon them, and as if by prophecy they wrote down their labours in books, to which nothing is to be added. The princes of the people gathered together to hear their sublime words; and when they had finished their work, the supernatural vision and its source were sealed, and the glory and splendour departed, and the angel of the Lord appeared no more. For no one rose after them who could do as they did. And now we are here this day gathering the gleanings which they have left; and we capture the faint ones of

² The Great Synagogue or Synod (כנסת הגדולה: *Synagoga magna*) to which Jacob b. Chajim refers, was instituted by Nehemiah (comp. Neh. x. 1-10; *Midrash Ruth*, cap. iii. fol. 45 b; *Jerusalem Shebiith*, v. 1, 35 b), and continued till the death of Simon the Just (B. C. 300), who was the last member of it. It consisted of one hundred and twenty members, comprising the representatives of the following five classes of the Jewish nation:—i. The chiefs of the Priestly divisions (ראשי בית אב); ii. The chiefs of the Levitical Families (ראשי הלויים); iii. The Heads of the Israelite Families (ראשי העם); iv. Deputies from the different towns; and, v. The distinguished men of all ranks (כבינים). They were all divided into ELDERS (זקנים, *πρεσβύτεροι*) and SCRIBES (γραμματεῖς); and among the many important enactments and institutions which are ascribed to them are—i. The compilation of the Hebrew canon and the various readings; ii. The composition of the Book of Esther; iii. The introduction of fixed formulæ of prayer; and iv. The foundation of colleges. Comp. Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, s. v. SYNAGOGUE, THE GREAT.

INTRODUCTION.

הקדמה

אמר הצעיר יעקב בן חיים בן יצחק ו' אדוניו ישי"ע עמ"ה.¹
 ישתבח הבורא הנמצא ועין לא חשורנו, הנעלם וכל דרשו ימצאנו, אשר חנן למין האנושי לשון למודים, למלאה עיניים חמודים, ביד השכל צמודים, והיו לאחרים, ללקוט רביביו ושביביו, וללמוד ניביו ונרביביו, וזרח לעמו, בנו בכורו, לשון הקדש אשר היא לשון התורה והנבואות, היודרה פלאות, לפקוד עינים עירות, והיו למאורות, למען דעת כל עמי הארץ, כי לשון הקדש אין ערוך אליה, בצחות מליה, ונועם משליה, והיא כעץ חיים ררופה לבעליה, והחכמה תחיה בעליה, והאלהים

Thus saith the humble Jacob ben Chajim ben Isaac Ibn Adonijah: "He entereth in peace, where the righteous rest upon their couches, who walked in uprightness."¹
 Praised be the Creator, who exists and yet none can see him, who is hidden and yet found by every one that seeks him, who graciously bestowed language on mankind in order that they might communicate precious things joined together by wisdom, so as to become one, to gather his rain and flame, and learn his words and ways. He endowed his people, his first-born son, with the holy tongue, which is the language of the Law and the Prophets, and is very wonderfully adapted to open the eyes of the blind, and impart light unto them, so that all the nations of the world may know that there is nothing like this holy language in purity of style and charm of diction; it is like a tree of life to those who possess it, and its wisdom imparts life to the owner

¹ This introductory formula is only to be found in the *editio princeps* of the Rabbinic Bible, edited by Ibn Adonijah himself (1524-25). All the subsequent editions, which were published long after his embracing Christianity and his death, have omitted it, and substituted for it the words אמר המעתיק, thus saith the author, thus removing from the very beginning of the Introduction to the Bible the name of the author, who had left the Jewish community. This fully confirms our opinion that his name was also removed from other works which he prepared for the press and annotated, and that his sudden disappearance from the field of literary labour is to be ascribed to the fact of his having renounced Judaism (*vide supra*, p. 13). As to the abbreviation ישי"ע עמ"ה, it is the accrostic of the second verse in Isaiah lvii., יבוא שלום ירחו על משכבותם הלך נכחו, which the Jews use as a euphemic expression when speaking of the dead, in consequence of the traditional explanation given to this passage. Thus the Talmud not only explains it as referring to a beatified future life, but says that, when a pious man dies, an angel announces his arrival in heaven. Whereupon the Lord says that the righteous are to go to meet and welcome him with the salutation, "He cometh in peace, to where they rest upon their couches, who walked in uprightness." (Isa. lvii. 2.) Indeed we are told that this verse is used by three companies of angels, who go to meet the saint. The first angelic group salute him with the words, "He cometh in peace!" the second with "Who walked in uprightness!" and the third with "May he rest upon his couch!" (Compare *Kethuboth*, 104a.)

did not know as much, nor nearly as much [as he supposed], in accordance with that we find at the end of chap. ii. of *Jerusalem Maccoth*: "A man who knows only one book, when he is in a place where he is respected for knowing two books, is in duty bound to say I only know one book."⁴ And as I have no great intellect, how could I, being so low and insignificant, undertake such great things, from which, peradventure, mischief might ensue, seeing that R. Ishmael had already exhorted a Scribe in his days (*Sota*, 20 a, and in other places), "My son, take great care how thou doest thy work, for thy work is the work of heaven, lest thou drop or add a letter, and thereby wilt be a destroyer of the whole world,"⁵ which is still more applicable to the present time, when the distinction between the oral and written law has ceased,

as both are now written down, and a mistake may describe the right wrong, and the wrong right. Therefore, I felt that I must not rely upon my own judgment, but examine two or three codices, and follow them wherever they agree; and if they do not agree, must choose from among the readings those which appear to me unobjectionable, and sift them till I am convinced that they are correct and clear, especially as Ramban⁶ and Rashbam⁷ have already counselled, in their Theological Decisions, not to make emendations upon mere conjectures.

⁴ The quotation from the Talmud is not literal. It is as follows: בר נש דהכח דהא מיכלה ואיל לאת ואינון מייקרין ליה דר הוא חכם הרין מיכלה צריך לומר לון חרא מיכלה אנה חכים (Comp. *Jerusalem Maccoth*, ii. 7, p. 32 a, ed. Grætz. Krotoshin, 1866). It must be added, that the *editio princeps* rightly reads חכים, at the end of the quotation, and that the future editions have wrongly substituted for it רחמי.

⁵ Neither is this quotation literal. It is as follows in the Talmud: בני הוי דהרי שמלאכתך מלאכת שמים היא שמא תחסר אות אחת או תתיר אות אחת נמצאת אהה מחריב את כל העולם כולו.

⁶ *Ramban* (רמבן), is a contraction of the initials of נחמן בן משה ר' *Moses b. Nachman* = *Nachmanides*. This distinguished Commentator, Talmudist, and Kabbalist was born at Gerona, in Catalonia, about 1195, whence he is also called by Christian writers *Moses Gerundensis*. He died at Ano (Ptolemais), about 1270. For his life and writings, see *Kitto's Cyclopaedia*, s. v. *NACHMANIDES*.

⁷ *Rashbam* רש"ב is a contraction of the initials of רבי שמואל בן מאיר, *Rabbi Samuel*

their rear-guard, and run in their path day and night, and toil, but can never come up to them.

Thus says the writer: I was dwelling quietly in my house, and flourishing in my abode, prosecuting diligently my studies, at Tunis, which is on the borders of ancient Carthage, when fate removed me to the West, but did not withdraw its hand from afflicting me, and afterwards brought me to the famous city of Venice. And even here I had nothing to do, for the hand of fate was still lifted up, and exalted over me; and its troubles and cares found me in the city, smote me, wounded me, and crushed me. And after about three months of sufferings, I left for a little while the furnace of my afflictions, for I was in a thirsty land. I said in the thoughts of my heart, I will arise now, and walk about the streets of the city. As I was walking in the streets, wandering quietly, behold God sent a highly distinguished and pious Christian, of the name of Daniel Bomberg, to meet me. May his Rock and Redeemer protect him! This was effected through the exertions of an Israelite, who bestowed great kindness upon me, and whose name is R. Chajim Alton, son of the distinguished Moses Alton. May his Rock and Redeemer protect him! He brought me to his printing-office, and shewed me through his establishment, saying to me, Turn in, abide with me,³ for here thou shalt find rest for thy soul, and balm for thy wound, as I want thee to revise the books which I print, correct the mistakes, purify the style, and examine the works, till they are as refined silver and as purified gold.

Although I saw that his desire was greater than my ability, yet I thought that we must not refuse a superior. Still I told him that I

שבליהם, ומנובים נחשליהם, ויום ולילה נדון במעגליהם, ויגע ולא יגע אליהם: אמר המניד, שלו הייתי בביתי, ורענן בהיכלי, שוקר על למודי בטונים המדינה, אשר קרוב לקצה גבול קרמניא הקדומה, וסלמלני הומן בארצות המערב, לא השיב ידו מבלע ושב ורפא לו, ורחני פה ויניציא הבירה, היא העיר הגדולה, וגם פה לא עשיתי מאומה, כי יד הומן נשגבה ורמה, וטרדותיו וסבותיו בעיר מצאוני, הכוני פצעוני הממוני, ויהיו כמשלש חדשים למכותי, יצאתי מעם מכור התלאות, ואני בארץ תלאות, אמרתי ברעיוני הלבבות, אקומה נא ואסובבה בעיר בשוקים וברחובות, כצאתי את העיר משתאה מהירש, והנה לקראתי כי הקרא יהיה לפני איש אחר מחסידי הנוצרים איש חכם והמעלה שמו מסי דניאל בומברני, ישמרהו צורו וגאלו, הבשרתלות איש עברי, אשר הרבה טובותיו עמי, שמו רבי היים אלטון, בן הנעלה רבי משה אלטון, ישמרהו צורו וגאלו, ויביאני אל בית דפוסו, ויראני כל בית נכותו, ויאמר סודה שבה עמדי כי פה תמצא מרגוע לנפשך, וצרי למכתך, כי תפצתי שתניה ספרי הנדפסים, להסיר מהם מוקשי הפעות, ותוככם ותצרפם בכור העיוניות, ותשקלם במאזני הישריות, עד יצאו מלובנים ומצורפים כצדוף כסף, ומבוחנים כבחון הזהב: ואף על פי שראיתי ככפו גדולה מהשנה, אמרתי בלבי אין מסרבין לגדול, ואפילו הכי

³ The expression עמדי, *with me*, is not the *editio princeps*, but there can be no doubt that it has dropped out by mistake. The subsequent editions have, therefore, rightly inserted it.

easily find what he wants.¹¹ Like a bear bereft of its young ones he hastened to this work, for he loved the daughter of Jacob. He summoned the workmen who were skilled in printing, and each one with his tools in his hand at once betook himself to the work. Seeing then that the work was urgent, and that it would redound to the glory of Israel, inasmuch as it will shew the nations and princes the beauty and excellence of our holy law, — for since it was committed to writing nothing has appeared like it, — and seeing, moreover, that its excellency was magnified in the eyes of the publisher, becoming, as it were, the chief corner-stone with him, I set my face to the fulfilling of his desire.

And now, since many of the people, and among them are even some of the different classes of our learned contemporaries, who in their heart value neither Massorah nor any of the methods of the Massorah, say, What profit can be derived from the Massorah? and for this reason it has almost been forgotten and lost, therefore I bestirred myself, as this afforded me the opportunity to do the work of the Lord, to shew the nations and the princes the value of the Massorah; for without it none of the sacred books, and particularly the Pentateuch, can be written with propriety and correctness.

We purpose, in the first place, to reply to and refute some of the

to the end of the Hebrew Scriptures, where all the words on which there are any Massoretic remarks are classified and arranged in alphabetical order. This portion as has been remarked in the preceding note, is called *Massorah finalis*. The *Aruch* (ערך) is the celebrated Rabbinic and Aramaic Lexicon of R. Nathan B. Jehiel (born about 1030, died about 1106), which was finished A.D. 1101. It was first published sometime before 1480, in square letters, then in Pisauri 1517, then in Venice 1531, by Bomberg, in beautiful square letters, and several times since. The best edition, however, is that of Landau, in five volumes, Prague, 1819-1824. Etheridge's description of the time when this Lexicon was finished, as well as his remarks about the *editio princeps* (*Jerusalem and Tiberius*, Longmans, 1856, pp. 284, &c.), are incorrect. Comp. Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, cols. 2040-2043. Zunz, *Notes on Ascher's Edition of the Itinerary of Rabbi Benjamin of Tudela*, London, 1841, vol. ii., p. 18; Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, s. v. NATHAN B. JECHIEL.

¹¹ A description of this Rabbinic Bible has already been given, *vide supra*, p. 6, &c.

למען ירוץ קורא בה למצוא מבוקשו,¹¹ ותכף כדוב שכול לא אחר לעשות, כי הפץ בבת יעקב, קרא לאומנים הבקאים בטיב הדפוס, ואיש כלי מפצו בידו לעשות מלאכתו, ובראותי כי הדבר נחוץ, ותועלת ותפארת ישראל, להראות העמים והשרים יופי ומעלה תורתנו הקדושה, כי למן היום אשר נתנה בספר לא נעשת כמתכונתה, וגדלה מעלתה בעיני הבונים היתה לראש פנה, שמתי מנמח פני למלאה כספו:

ובהיות כי ראיתי הרבה מהחמון, ועמם הרבה מכתות חכמינו אשר עמנו היום בדורינו זה, אינם מעריכין בלבם לא מסורת ולא הד מדרבי המסרה, באמרם כי מה תועלת ימשך להם ממנה, וכמעט נשכחה ונאבדה: לכן נעזתי חצני משום עת לעשות ליי, להראות העמים והשרים מעלת המסרה, וכי וולחה אי איפשר לכתוב הספרים ביושר ובחיקון, וכל שכן ספר תורה:

ונם נשים ונשיני על קצת מנדולי הכמינו

And it came to pass, after I had remained there for some time, doing my work, the work of heaven, the Lord, blessed be his name, stirred up the spirit of the noble master for whom I worked, and encouraged his heart to publish the twenty-four sacred books. Whereupon he said to me, Gird up thy loins now like a man, for I want to publish the twenty-four sacred books, provided they contain the commentaries, the Targums, Massorah magna and the Massorah parva,⁸ the *Keri* and *Kethiv*, and the *Kethiv* *Aruch* *Keri*,⁹ *plene* and *defective*, and all the glosses of the Scribes, with appendices containing the Massorah magna, according to the alphabetical order of the *Aruch*,¹⁰ so that the reader may

ben Meïer, grandson of Rashi, and a very excellent commentator of the Bible. He was born about A.D. 1085, and died about 1155. Comp. Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, s. v. RASHBAM.

⁸ Both the Massorah magna (מסורה הגדולה) and the Massorah parva (מסורה הקטנה) contain the traditional and authoritative glosses on the external form of the Hebrew text. The former, which is generally given in the margin above and below the text, as well as at the end of the Rabbinic Bibles, is more extensive, and quotes in full the passages which come under the same rubric; whilst the latter, which is written in the margin at the side of the text, or in the margin between the columns containing the Hebrew text and the Chaldee paraphrase, simply indicates the number of the passages which come under the same rubric, or hints at other glosses in an abbreviated form, without giving the reference. It was for want of space in the margin of the Hebrew text that the Massorah magna had to be divided into two parts. The divisions thus obtained are respectively denominated—i. מסורה גליונית, MASSORAH MARGINALIS, because this portion of it is given above and below the text; and, ii. מסורה סופית or מסורה מערכת, MASSORAH FINALIS, because this portion is given at the end of the Rabbinic Bibles.

⁹ The various readings exhibited in the KERI (*i. e.*, as read in the margin), and the KETHIV (*i. e.*, as written in the text), are divisible into three general classes—i. The class denominated KERI and KETHIV and KERI and KETHIV and KERI (כתיב וקרי וקרי וכתיב), which comprises words differently read to what they are written, arising from the omission, insertion, exchanging, or transposition of a *single letter*. This class, by far the greater portion of the marginal readings, may properly be called VARIATIONS. ii. The class called KERI VELO KETHIV (קרי ולא כתיב), *marginal insertions of entire words not to be found written in the text*, of which the Massorah gives ten instances, viz., Judges x. 13; Ruth iii. 5, 17; 2 Sam. viii. 3, xvi. 23, xviii. 20; 2 Kings xix. 31, 37; Jer. xxxi. 38, l. 29; and, iii. The class called KETHIV VELO KERI (כתיב ולא קרי) *omissions in the margin of entire words written in the text*, of which the Massorah gives eight instances, viz., Ruth iii. 12; 2 Sam. xiii. 33, xv. 31; 2 Kings v. 18; Jer. xxxviii. 16, xxxix. 12, li. 3; Ezek. xlvi. 16. For a more extensive discussion on this subject, see the article KERI and KETHIV, in Kitto's *Cyclopædia*.

¹⁰ As the glosses which constitute the Massorah magna are too extensive to be given entire in the margin of the text, by far the greater portion of them have been removed

the priest, who was the most accomplished and the chief of the Scribes, bestirred himself, and exerted all his powers to rectify what was wrong; and in like manner acted all the Scribes who followed him. They corrected all the sacred books as much as possible, in consequence of which they have been preserved to us perfect in the numbers of chapters, the verses, the words, letters, plene, defective, the abnormal and normal phrases and the like, and for this reason are denominated Scribes. To this effect they have also composed treatises, which are the books of the Massorah, and made the *Keri* and *Kethiv* in every passage in which they met with some obliterations and confusion, not being sure what the precise reading was." Thus far are his words.

But what surprises me still more is, that so holy a man as Kimchi¹⁴ should also utter similar things in his introduction to the earlier Prophets. The following is his language: "It appears that these marginal and textual readings originated because the sacred books were lost and scattered about during the Babylonian captivity, and the sages who were skilled in the Scriptures were dead. Whereupon the men of the Great Synagogue, who restored the law to its former state, found different readings in the books, and adopted those which the majority of copies had, because they, according to their opinion, exhibited the true readings. In some places they wrote down one word in the text but did not punctuate it, or noted it in the margin but omitted it from

which he especially assumed after 1391, to conceal his real person from the Christians, who at this period of his life compelled him to abjure Judaism, he is also known by the name *Prophiat Duran*. His grammar, entitled *the Grammar of Ephod* (מגשת אפר), to which Jacob Ibn Adonijah refers, has only recently been published for the first time (Vienna, 1865), and the passage in question is to be found in p. 40.

¹⁴ The Kimchi here referred to is *David Kimchi*, also called *Redak*, ר' דוד קמחי=רד"ק, (born A.D. 1160, died about 1235), who wrote commentaries on nearly the whole of the Old Testament, and who is the author of the famous Hebrew Grammar called *the Mamluk*, and the Lexicon entitled *the Lexicon*. He may be regarded as the teacher of Hebrew of both Jews and Christians throughout Europe. Comp. *Kitto's Cyclopaedia*, s. v. *KIMCHI*, where an account is given of his contributions to Hebrew lexicography and Biblical exegesis.

כתב וזה לשונו: השלם ראש הסופרים עזרא הכהן הסופר נער הצנו ושם כל מאמצי כמו לחקן המעוות, וכן עשו כל הסופרים הבאים אחריו, וחקנו הספרים ההם בחבלית מה שאיפשר, עד שהיה זה סבה להשאירם שלמים במנות הפרשיות והפסוקים והתיבות והאותיות והמלא והחכר והזר והנוהג מנהג הלשון וזולת זה, ולזה נקראו סופרים, ועשו בזה הבורים והם כפרי המסרה, ובמקומות אשר השיגם ההפסד והבלבול עשו הקרי וכתבי, להיותו מסופק במה שמצא, עד כאן לשונו:

והקמחי זכרוננו לברכה¹⁴ תמהני על פה קדוש, שדבר מככים לזה בחקרמתי לנביאים ראשונים וזה לשונו: ונראה כי המלות האלה נמצאו כן, לפי שבגלות הראשונה אברו הספרים ונמלטו טלמול, והחכמים יודעי המקרא מתו, ואנשי כנכת הגדולה שהחזירו התורה לישנה, מצאו מחלוקת בספרים, והלכו בהם אחד הרוב לפי דעתם על הבידור, כתבו הא' ולא נקדוהו, או כתבו מבחוץ ולא

later great sages of blessed memory, who were nearer our time, and who maintained that the *Keri* and the *Kethiv* originated as follows: During the Babylonian captivity, when the sacred books were lost and scattered about, and those wise men who were skilled in the Scriptures were dead, the men of the Great Synagogue found different readings in the sacred books; and in every place where they met with a doubtful and perplexing case they wrote down a word in the text, but did not put the vowels to it, or wrote it in the margin and left it out in the text, not being sure as to what they found. Thus far their words. But I am far from adopting their opinion, as I shall shew in the sequel, and refute them from the Talmud.

I shall, secondly, notice the differences which in many places exist between our Talmud and the Massorites, and everywhere side with the latter, and state what we have learned from them.

I shall, thirdly, refute the heretics who dared to accuse us of wilfully altering and changing passages in our holy law, as in the case of the eighteen passages called the corrections of the Scribes, the removal of the *Var* by the Scribes,¹² the *Keri* and the *Kethiv*, and the order of the construction.

I shall, fourthly, explain the plan which I have adopted, both in the Massorah parva and the Massorah magna, to facilitate the reader.

Let me then, firstly, do battle with the sages of blessed memory, who lived nearer our time, for they spoke unseemly against our holy law, saying that the *Keri* and the *Kethiv* exhibit the doubts which the men of the Great Synagogue entertained. And these are their names, and these their words.

Ephodi,¹³ in chap. vii. of his grammar, writes as follows: "Ezra

והוא נעיר על ההפך שיש בין נמרא דילן ובין בעלי המסורת בכמה רוכתי, ובכולהו נקרי בהון קהוות, ונייתי מנהון מה דנמירנא: וגם נשיב על המינים הדוברים עלינו עתה, כי שנינו וחלפנו בתורתנו הקדושה, כמו בי' מלן תיקון כופרים, ובעטור סופרים¹² והקרי וכתבי, ונוהג מנהגם:

גם אבאר הסדר אשר נהגתי במסרה קטנה ובמסרה גדולה, למען ידון הקורא בה:

וקוראם אערוך מלחמה עם ההכמים האחרונים זכרונם לברכה, הקרובים לזמנינו זה, כי דברו שלא כהוגן על תורתנו הקדושה, באומרים כי הקרי וכתבי היו כפקות נסתפקו אנשי כנכת הגדולה, ואלה שמותם ולשונם: האפורי¹³ בפרק שביעי מספרו בדקדוק

¹² An explanation of the phrases, 'emendations of the Scribes,' and 'the removal of Var by the Scribes,' will be found below, p. 48, &c.

¹³ Ephodi (אפר) is the appellation of R. Isaac b. Moses Ha-Levi, the celebrated grammarian and polemical writer, who flourished A.D. 1360-1412. It is a contraction of פרופיית דורן, אמר, thus says, or I, *Prophiat Duran*; and though it is the same

Keri and the *Kethiv*], it ought to occur accidentally in the passage which happened to be obliterated, or in which [a doubtful reading] was found. Whereas thou wilt find in the law of God, in the section *Lech L'Cha* [Gen. xiv. 2],¹⁷ that *Kethiv* is צביים, and the *Keri* is צבאים; and the same thing occurs a second time [*ibid.* verse 8]. Now, could this accidental obliteration always occur in this word צביים? The same is the case with all, e. g. נערה, which is written twenty-two times נער,¹⁸ and occurs only once as *plene*, in Deut. xxii. 19; so also בעפולים, which is always the *Keri*, and the *Kethiv* is תחורים, whilst the *Kethiv* is always ישכבנה.¹⁹ It is evident, therefore, that the thing is not as these sages thought, and may the Lord forgive them!"

Abbravanel, therefore, submits that the true account of the matter is as follows:—"Ezra the Scribe and his associates found the books of the law entire and perfect, but before betaking themselves to make the vowel points, the accents and the division of verses, they examined the text, when they found words which, according to the genius of the language and the design of the narrative, appeared to them irregular.

¹⁷ This is the name of one of the Sabbath lessons, comprising Gen. xii. 1; xvii. 27. According to an ancient custom, the Jews to the present day divide the Pentateuch into fifty-four sections, to provide a lesson for each Sabbath of those years which, according to the Jewish chronology, have fifty-four Sabbaths, and thus read through the whole Book of the Law (הרה) in the course of every year. Each of these Sabbath sections, or *sidras* (סדרה), as it is called by the Jews, has a special name, which it derives from the first or second word with which it commences; and Jewish writers, when they quote a passage from the Pentateuch, instead of saying it occurs in such and such a chapter and verse, give, as in the instance before us, the name of the Sabbath lesson, because this practice obtained prior to the division of the Bible into chapters and verses. A full description of these Sabbath lessons, as well as of the manners and customs connected therewith, is given in Kitto's *Cyclop.*, art. HAPHTARA.

¹⁸ In the present text we have only twenty-one times נער, viz., Gen. xxiv. 14, 16, 28, 55, 57; xxxiv. 3 (twice), 12; Deut. xxii. 15 (twice), 16, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26 (twice), 27, 28, 29.

¹⁹ The marginal reading תחורים for the textual בעפולים occurs six times (Deut. xxviii. 27; 1 Sam. v. 6, 9, 12; vi. 4, 5), and ישכבנה for ישנלנה four times (Deut. xxviii. 30; Isa. xiii. 16; Jer. iii. 2; Zech. xiv. 2). The former instances are given in the Massorah marginalis on 1 Sam. v. 6, and *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, section 170; and the latter in the Massorah marginalis on Isaiah xiii. 16, and the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, section 169. Comp. also *Megilla* 25 b; *Sopherim* viii. 8; and *infra*, p. 50., &c.

the text, whilst in other places they inserted one reading in the margin and another in the text."¹⁵ Thus far is his language.

Don Isaac Abravanel,¹⁶ the memory of the righteous be blessed, refutes them in his introduction to Jeremiah in this manner, and these are his words:—"The opinion wherein all these wise men agree, and their conclusions, are far from being mine. For how can I believe with my heart, and speak with my lips, that Ezra the scribe found the book of the law of God, and the books of his holy Prophets, in an unsettled state, through obliterations and confusions? Is not the scroll of the law in which one letter is omitted illegal? How much more must it be so through the *Keri* and the *Kethiv*, which are found in the law, since, according to the *Keri*, many letters are wanting in the law," etc.?

Again he says, and these are his words, "Behold, I ask these men if, according to their prevailing opinion, the *Keri* and the *Kethiv* originated because they [Ezra and his associates] found various readings, and Ezra, not being sure which was the right one, put down both readings, one in the margin and the other in the text; if it be so, why should we, in explaining the Scriptures, always follow the *Keri*, and not the *Kethiv*? And why should Ezra, who was himself doubtful, always have put the points in accordance with the *Keri*, and not with the *Kethiv*? And if he meant [to give preference to the *Keri*] he ought to have inserted the *Keri* in the text, as it is the true one and agrees with the points, and put the *Kethiv* in the margin because he did not approve of it.

"Moreover, if the obliterations and confusion to which the books were subject in consequence of the captivity gave rise to it [*i. e.*, the

כתבו מבפנים, וכן כתבו בדרך אחר מבהוין ובררך אחר מבפנים עד כאן:¹⁵ והשר דון יצחק אברבנאל זכר צדיק לברכה השיג עליהם בהקדמתו לספר ירמיה וזה לשונו, והדעה הנה אשר הסכימו בו החכמים האלה ועצמם דהקק מני, כי איך אוכל בנפשי לחאמין, ואיך אעלה על שפתי, שמצא עזרא הסופר ספר תורת האלהים וספרי נביאיו מסופקים בהפסד ובלבול, והלא ספר תורה שחסר ממנו אות אחת הוא פסול, כל שכן בקרי וכתוב שבאו בתורה, שפתי הקרי יחסרו בתורה כמה וכמה מהאחריות וכולי:

עוד אמר וזה לשונו, הנה עוד אשאל מאתם כפי הסברה הנוכרת, אם היה הקרי וכתוב כפי מה שמצאו בספרים המחולפים, ולא אפשר לא עזרא הסופר איזה הדרך מהם ישכון אור, ושם שתי הנסחאות אחד מבהוין ואחד מבפנים, אם כן איפה למה בפירוש הכתובים נסמך תמיד על הקרי ולא על הכתיב, ולמה עזרא בהיות הרב אצלו מסופק, עשה הניקוד תמיד מסכים עם הקרי ולא עם הכתיב, ואם היה כן דעתו, היה לו לשום נוסחת הקרי מבפנים, כי היא האמת והמסכמת עם הנקודה, והכתוב ישם מבהוין כיון שלא הסכים בה דעתו:

שנית אם היתה כבת זה הפסד ובלבול שנפל בספרים מצד הגלות, היה ראוי שיבא

¹⁵ The quotation from Kimchi is from the *Introduction to his Commentary on Joshua*.

¹⁶ Abravanel, or Abarbanel, the famous statesman, philosopher, theologian, and commentator of Spain, was born in Lisbon in 1437, and died at Venice in 1508. For a list of his works on Biblical literature, see Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, s. v. ABRAVANEL.

them are of this nature, viz., that Jeremiah wrote them through mistakes and carelessness, etc. Abravanel has a great deal more upon this subject in his introduction to Jeremiah: "Hitherto [he says further on] we have shewn that the *Keri* and the *Kethiv*, and the *Keri velo Kethiv*, are simply explanations. This is also the nature of the *Kethiv velo Keri*. When Ezra saw that words were put down in the text which had no meaning according to the simple sense of the words, he did not punctuate them, and therefore they are not to be read. From this you learn that the books, in which there are many such instances, shew that the speaker or writer was deficient in the syntax, or in his knowledge of orthography. Hence you find in Jeremiah alone eighty-one *Keris* and *Kethivs*, and in the books of Samuel, which Jeremiah wrote, the number of *Keris* and *Kethivs* rises to one hundred and thirty-three; . . . whilst in the Pentateuch, which proceeded from the mouth of the Lord, though it is four times as large as the book of Jeremiah, there are comparatively few, only sixty-five *Keris* and *Kethivs*."²⁰ Thus far his words.

²⁰ There is a great difference of opinion about the number of these various readings, and the passages in which they occur. As it is impossible to discuss this question in a note of this nature, we subjoin the following table, which is the result of a careful perusal and collation of the Massorah, as printed in the Rabbinic Bible of Jacob b. Chajim, and which exhibits the numbers of the *Keris* and *Kethivs* in each book, according to the order of the Hebrew Bible:—

Genesis	25	Ezekiel	143	Proverbs	70
Exodus	17	Hosea	6	Job	54
Leviticus	6	Joel	1	Song of Songs	5
Numbers	11	Amos	3	Ruth	13
Deuteronomy	23	Obadiah	1	Lamentations	28
Joshua	38	Micah	4	Ecclesiastes	11
Judges	22	Nahum	4	Esther	14
1 Samuel	73	Habakkuk	2	Daniel	129
2 Samuel	99	Zephaniah	1	Ezra	33
1 Kings	49	Haggai	1	Nehemiah	28
2 Kings	80	Zechariah	7	1 Chronicles	41
Isaiah	55	Malachi	1	2 Chronicles	39
Jeremiah	148	Psalms	74	Total	1359

For a further discussion on this subject, we must refer to Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, s. v. KERI AND KETHIV.

Hence he concludes that this must have originated from one of two causes: (1) Either the writer, according to the degree of inspiration vouchsafed unto him, conveys by these anomalous expressions some of the mysteries of the law, and therefore he [Ezra] did not venture to expunge anything from the sacred books. Having thus perceived that it was written by the highest wisdom, and that there is one reason or another why the words are sometimes defective or plene, and why the phrases are anomalous, he left them in the text as they were written, and put the *Keri* in the margin, which simply explains the said anomaly in accordance with the idiom of the language and the design of the narrative; and of this nature are all the *Keris* and *Kethivs* in the Pentateuch. In-like manner, when Ezra found the word *ישגלנה*, which denotes *heights*, and which conveys no meaning to us, he put in the margin the word *emerods טהורים*; and this is also the case with the word *ישגלנה*, the root of which (*שגל*) is used with regard to a queen; he therefore put in the margin *ישכבנה*. (2) Or Ezra may have been of opinion that

these anomalous letters and words are owing to the carelessness of the sacred speaker or writer; and this carelessness on the part of the prophet was like an error which proceeded from a prince. Ezra had therefore to explain such words in harmony with their connection, and this is the origin of the *Keri* which is found in the margin, as this holy Scribe feared to touch the words which were spoken or written by the Holy Ghost. These remarks he made on his own account, in order that he might explain such letters and words, and on that account he put them in the margin, to indicate that this gloss was his own. And there can be no doubt that they [*i. e.*, Ezra and his associates] received the text in such a state from the prophets and the sages who had preceded them. Hence, if you examine the numerous *Keris* and *Kethivs* which occur in Jeremiah, and look into their connection, you will find that all of

הספור, השב בעצמו שהיה זה לאהר משהי סבות, אם שכיון הכותב בדברים הורים ההם סוד מן הסודות מסתרי התורה כפי מעלת נבואתו, ולכן לא מלאה ידו לגשת למחוק דבר מספרי האלהים, כי הבין בדעתו שכתבמה יתירה נכתבו כן, ושלפכה מן הסבות נכתבו האותיות החסרות והלשונות הורים, ולכן הניחם בכתב מבפנים כמו שנכתבו, האמנם שם מבהוץ הקרי, שהוא פירוש הכתוב חור ההוא כפי טבע הלשון ופשיטות הענין, ומוה המין תמצא כל הקרי וכתב שבתורה, וככה כשמצא עזרא שכתב בתורה ובעפולים שהוא לשון גובה, ולא י ענו מה הם הגבוהים ההם, הוצרך לפרש בקרי שהם טהורים. וכן ישגלנה, לפי ששם שגל נאמר על המלכה, הוצרך לפרש בקרי ישכבנה. גם אפשר שהשב עזרא שחיו בספרי הקדש תיבות ומלות שלא נכתבו כן בורותם, אלא לכבה מן הסבות אם להיות האומר אותם בלתי מרקק כראוי אם בקצור ידיעת דקדוק הכתיבה, והיה זה מהנביא כשנחה היוצאה מלפני השלים, ולכן הוצרך לפרש אמתת המלה ההיא כפי הספור, והוא ענין הקרי אשר שם מבהוץ, כי ירא הסופר הקדוש לשלוח ידו בדברי המדברים ברוה הקדש וכתבתם, ועשה זה בעצמו, רצוני לומר לפרש התיבה והמלה ההיא, ושמו מבהוץ להיותו פירוש שפירש הוא מעצמו, ואין כפק שכן קבלו מהנביאים וחכמי הדור שקדמוהו, והנה רוב הקרי והכתב שבא בספר ירמיה כשהענין בהם

ובעניינם תמצא כולם מהם המין, שכתבם ירמיהו כן במעוה ובשגגה וכולי, והאריך בהקדמתו שם לספר ירמיה, עד הנה התבאר שהקרי וכתב, והקרי ולא כתב, כולו ענין הפירוש, וכן הוא הכתיב ולא קרי, שראה עזרא מלות כתובות שאין להם ענין כפי פשט הרברים, ולכן לא עשה בהם נקודה כלל ולא יקרא, ומוה תרע שהספרים אשר נפל בהם הרבה מזה הוא לחסרון המדבר ביריעת דרכי הלשון או ביריעת דקדוק הכתיבה, ולכן היו בספר ירמיה שמונים ואחד מקרי וכתב, ובספר שמואל שכתבו ירמיה רבו בו בכמו הקרי וכתב בכמו מאה ושלושים ושלש וכלוי, עד אבל בחזרת האלהים לחיותה כולה מפי הנבורה וכמות כתיבתה קרוב לארבע פעמים ספר ירמיהו לא נמצאו בה מקרי וכתב אלא מעט מועד סך הכל²⁰ וכולי עד כאן לשונו,

velo Kethiv, and the *Kethiv velo Keri*, are laws of Moses from Mount Sinai. The pronunciation of the Scribes shews how to read **אָרֶץ**, *earth*, **שָׁמַיִם**, *heaven*, **מִצְרַיִם**, *Egypt*,²² the removal of *Var* by the Scribes is to be found four times in the case of **אַחֲרָיִךְ**, *afterwards* [Gen. xviii. 5; xxiv. 55; Numb. xxxi. 2; Ps. lxviii. 26], and once by **מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ**, *thy judgements* [Ps. xxxvi. 7];²³ *the Keri velo Kethiv* is seen in **פָּרַת**, *Euphrates* [2 Sam. viii. 3]; **בָּאִים**, *they are coming* [Jer. xxxi. 38]; **לָהּ**, *to her* [Ibid. i. 29]; **אַתָּה**, accusative [Ruth ii. 11]; **אַלֵּי**, *unto me* [Ibid. iii. 5, 17]; these words are read without being written in the text. *The Kethiv velo Keri* is seen in **נָא**, *now* [2 Kings v. 18]; **אֵת**, sign of the accusative; **יִכְרֹץ**, *he shall bend* [Jerem. li. 3]; **הַמָּשׁ**, *five* [Ezek. xlviii. 16]; **אִם**, *if* [Ruth iii. 12]; these words are in the text, but are not read [Nedarim, 37 b]. Thus far the Talmud. The expression **אֵת** connected with **הַמִּצְוָה**, *the commandment*, some say occurs in Deut. v. 31, but it is not true, since it is not found in our copies; nor is it mentioned in the works of the Massorah. The Massorah, indeed, does enumerate all the above-mentioned examples [as given in the Talmud], and even many others, but does not give **אֵת** connected with **הַמִּצְוָה**, *the commandment*; it only gives **אֵת** as connected with **הַנֶּפֶשׁ**, *the soul*, which is found in

²² That is to say, since there were no vowel points to indicate when it was pronounced **אָרֶץ** and when **אֶרֶץ** (in pause), or to shew that **שָׁמַיִם** and **מִצְרַיִם** have simply dual forms without being duals, the Sopherim pointed out how these and many other words are to be read.

²³ There is a difference of opinion as to what is meant by **עֲשֹׂר סוֹפְרִים** and the examples here adduced to illustrate it. According to Rashi on this passage, it denotes the idiomatic construction fixed by the Sopherim, which necessitates the writing of **אֲחֵר** and not **אֲחֵר**, and is called **עֲשֹׂר** because it is an improvement of or ornament to the style. According to others, this ornament of style (**עֲשֹׂר סוֹפְרִים**) consists in using the word **אֲחֵר** at all, since it is superfluous in all these instances given in the Talmud, as we could very well say, **אֲחֵר**, whilst, according to *the Aruch*, as given below, it is the removal of a superfluous **ו** which has crept into the text in all these instances through a vitiated provincial pronunciation. The latter is the general opinion of critics as to the meaning of **עֲשֹׂר סוֹפְרִים**. Compare Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 251, &c. The instances of the *Itur Sopherim*, quoted from the Talmud (*Nedarim* 37 b) are also given in the *Ochlah Ve-Ochlah*, section ccvii. pp. 46, 128; and in the Massorah marginalis on Psalm xxxvi. 7, which, however, only gives four passages, omitting Gen. xxiv. 55.

He, in like manner, counts how many *Keris* and *Kethivs* occur in every book of the Bible, in order to shew which of the prophets was more conversant with the grammar. But all his views on this subject are far from my notions, as I shall presently shew, in refuting him.

The strictures, however, which he made upon Kimchi and Ephodi are good and apposite; and, in refuting his arguments, those of his opponents will be criticised at the same time, since both his decisions and the opinions of Kimchi and Ephodi are mere conjectures, whereas we rely solely upon the Talmud, which we acknowledge; for the heart of its sages was as large as the door of the temple; they are truth, and their words are truth.

Now I submit that Don Abravanel, of blessed memory, is perfectly right in saying that Ezra the Scribe and his associates found the books of the law entire and perfect, just as they were originally written.

But what he says in his first hypothesis, beginning with the words, "Either the writer, according to the degree of inspiration vouchsafed unto him, conveyed by these anomalous expressions some of the mysteries of the law," etc., till "he put the *Keri* in the margin, which simply explains the said anomaly in accordance with the idiom of the language;"²¹ all this is not correct, for in the Talmud we learn most distinctly, "R. Ika b. Abaja said in the name of R. Hannael, who repeated it in the name of Rab, What is meant by "and they read in the book, in the law of God, distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading" [Neh. viii. 8]? [Reply.] The words "they read in the book, in the Law of God," mean the Hebrew text; the expression "distinctly" denotes the Targum, "and gave the sense" means the division of the verses, whilst "caused them to understand the reading" signifies, according to some the dividing accents, and according to others the Massorah. R. Isaac said the pronunciation of certain words according to the Scribes, the removal of *Var* by the Scribes, *the Keri*

ובן הולך ומונה כמה מהקרי וכתוב באי בכל ספר, להורות מי מהנביאים היה יותר בקי בדקדוק הלשון, ותשובותיו תקון מני, כאשר אבאר ואשיג עליו:

אמנם קשיותיו אשר הקשה על הקמחי והאפודי טובים ונכוחים הם, ובהשיגי והשיבי על תשובותיו יושנו גם כן הם, כי כל אלו התרצים ודעת הקמחי והאפודי כולם הם מסברה, ואנן לית לן כי אם תלמורא דילן אשר קבלנו עלינו, כי לבן של ראשונים כפתחו של אולם, והם אמרו ודבריהם אמת:

ואומר במה שאמר השר האברבנאל זכרונו לברכה, שעורא הכופר וסיעתו מצאו ספרי תהורה בשלמותם ותמותם כמו שנכתבו, אמת ויציב דבר:

ואמנם במה שאמר בתירוץ הראשון, אם שכיון הכותב כמו שנכתבו בדברים הורים ההם וכולי, עד האמנם שם מבהוץ הקרי שהוא פירוש הכתוב הור הוא כפי סבע הלשון ליתא לדבריו,²¹ דהא בהדיא נרמין במסכת

נדרים פרק אין בין המורד, אמר רב איקא בר אבאי אמר רב הננאל אמר רב, מאי דכתיב ויקראו בספר תורה אלהים מפורש ושם שכל ויבינו במקרא, ויקראו בספר תורה אלהים זה מקרא, מפורש זה חרום, ושם שכל אלו הפסוקים, ויבינו במקרא זה פסק מעמים, ואמרי לה אלו המסורה, אמר רב יצחק מקרא סופרים ועסור

²¹ Vide supra, p. 45, &c.

This statement is not correct, since we are distinctly told in the Talmud: "Our sages submit. All the verses wherein are written indecent expressions, decent expressions are read in their stead, *e. g.*, **שָׁנָל** instead of **שָׁנָל** [Deuteronomy xxviii. 30; Isa. xiii. 16; Jer. iii. 2; Zech. xiv. 2]; **טָהָרִים** instead of **עֲפָלִים** [Deut. xxviii. 27; 1 Sam. v. 6. 9. 12.; vi. 4. 5]; **דְּבִירִים** instead of **הָרִיזִים** [2 Kings vi. 25]; **צֹאֲתָם** instead of **הָרִיקָם** [2 Kings xviii. 27; Isa. xxxvi. 12]; **רְגִלָּהֶם** instead of **שִׁינֵיהֶם** [2 Kings xviii. 27; Isa. xxxvi. 12]; **לְמַחְרָאוֹת** instead of **לְמַחְרָאוֹת** [2 Kings x. 27].²⁷ And Rashi, of blessed memory, submits that the expression **שָׁנָל** is used for illegitimate cohabitation like that of dogs, as it is written in Nehemiah [ii. 6], where **שָׁנָל** is used in this sense. *The Aruch*, too, explains it in like manner under the words **דְּבִירִים**, whereas **שָׁנָל** denotes the cohabitation of people who are legally married. Hence we see that it is not as Abravanel maintains; that **טָהָרִים** did not originate from our ignorance of the word **עֲפָלִים**, and that **שָׁנָל** is not used in connection with a queen. Compare *Kosh Ha-Shana*, 4 a.

I am not going to reply to the words of Abravanel in his second hypothesis, viz., "that the anomalous expressions are owing to the deficiency of the writer in his knowledge of Hebrew or orthography," for I am amazed that such a thing should have proceeded from a man like him, of blessed memory. How can any one entertain such an idea in his mind, that the prophets were deficient in such matters? If it really were so, then Abravanel, of blessed memory, had a greater knowledge of Hebrew than they; and for the life of me I cannot believe this. And if they really did inadvertently commit an error, as he, of blessed memory, insinuates, how is it that the prophet or the inspired speaker did not correct it himself? Is it possible that

²⁷ Comp. *Megilla*, 25 b.; *Sopherim* ix. 9; *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, sections clxix., clxx., pp. 38, 114; Massorah marginalis on 1 Sam. v. 6, Isaiah xiii. 16; and *supra*, p. 45, note 19.

Jeremiah in connection with the history of Zedekiah [xxxviii. 16].²⁴ And Rashi,²⁵ of blessed memory, also says that **אֵת הַמִּצְוָה** occurs in Jeremiah. As for the removal of *Var* by the Scribes, see below, in my reply to the heretics.

From this, then, it is evident that the whole of it is a law of Moses from Mount Sinai, and that Ezra the Scribe did not put the *Keri* in the margin to explain ungrammatical phrases; nothing appeared anomalous to Ezra, nor did he meet with any uncertainties and confusions, for the whole of it is the law of Moses from Mount Sinai, as stated above.

Moreover, I object to Abravanel's assertion, that Ezra, finding the word **בְּעֵפְלִים**, which denotes *heights*, and which conveys no meaning to us, he had to put in the margin the word **טָהָרִים**, *emeralds*; and that this is also the case with the word **יִשְׁלַלְנָה**, the root of which (**שָׁנָל**) is used with regard to a queen, he therefore put in the margin **יִשְׁכַּבְנָה**.²⁶

²⁴ We have already remarked that the Massorah gives ten instances of *Keri velo Kethiv*, or *marginal insertions of entire words not to be found in the text*; and eight instances of *Kethiv velo Keri*, or *omissions in the margin of entire words written in the text* (*vide supra*, p. 40). The list of the marginal insertions is as follows:—

בְּנֵי , sons of	Judges xx. 13	שַׁבָּת , <i>Sabbath</i>	Isaiah xxxvii. 32
פַּרַּת , <i>Euphrates</i>	2 Sam. viii. 3	בָּאִים , <i>they are coming</i>	Jerem. xxxi. 38
אִישׁ , <i>man</i>	2 Sam. xvi. 21	לָהּ , <i>to her</i>	Jerem. i. 29
כֵּן , <i>thus</i>	2 Sam. xviii. 20	אֵלַי , <i>to me</i>	Ruth iii. 5
בְּנֵי , <i>his sons</i>	2 Kings xix. 37	אֵלַי , <i>to me</i>	Ruth iii. 17

This list is to be found in the Massorah marginalis on Dent. i. 1; and on Ruth iii. 17; *Sopherim* vi. 8; *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, section xvii. The list of the marginal omissions is as follows:—

אִם , <i>if</i>	2 Sam. xiii. 33	אִם , <i>if</i>	Jerem. xxxix. 12
אִם , <i>if</i>	2 Sam. xv. 21	יָדָךְ , <i>he shall tread</i>	Jerem. li. 3
נָא , <i>now</i>	2 Kings v. 18	הַחֵשׁ , <i>fire</i>	Ezek. iii. 12
אִם , <i>accusative sign</i>	Jerem. xxxviii. 16	אִם , <i>if</i>	Ruth iii. 12

This list is given in the Massorah marginalis on Ruth iii. 12; *Sopherim* vi. 9, where, however, six instances only are enumerated, **נָא**, 2 Kings v. 18, and **אִם**, Jerem. xxxviii. 16, being omitted; and in the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, section xviii. Comp. also *Levita's Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, p. 109, &c., ed. Ginsburg.

²⁵ *Rashi* is that celebrated commentator of the Old Testament and the Talmud, who is commonly but erroneously called *Jarchi*. The name *Rashi* רש"י is a contraction of *Rabbi Solomon Isaki* or *Itzhaki* = *R. Solomon ben Isaac*. He was born at Troyes, in Champagne, in 1040, where he also died, July 26th, 1105.

²⁶ *Vide supra*, p. 46.

וליתא לדבריו דהא בהדיא נרמין סוף פרק חקורא את המגילה עומד, חנו רבנן כל המקראות הכתובין בתורה לגנאי קורין אותן לשבח, כגון ישלנה ישכבנה, בעפולים במחורים, הריונים דביונים, לאכול את חוריהם, ולשתות את מימי שיניהם, לאכול את צואתם, ולשתות את מימי רגליהם, למחראות למוצאות, ער כאן: ²⁷ ופירש רש"י זכרוננו לברכה ישלנה לשון כלבא, כדכתיב והשגל יושבת אצלו כלבא, וכן פירש בערוך בערך דבין ישלנה משמע בנות כלבא, כמו והשגל יושבת אצלו ישכבנה משמע דרך אישות בקרושין ובהופה, ער כאן לשונו: אם כן אינו לפי שלא ידענו מה הם הגבוהים ה. ה, וגם שם שגל לא נאמר על המלכה, ועיין בפרק קמא דראש השנה: ולא יאשיב על דברי השר האברבנאל בסבה השנית, באומרו כי המלות נכתבו כן בורותם לכבה מן הכבות, אם להיות האומר אותם בלתי מדקדק כראוי, אם בקצור ידיעה הלשון העברי, ואם בקצור ידיעה דקדוק הכתיבה, כי חמני עליו אם דבר זה יצא מפי אדם דונמחו זכרוננו לברכה, היעלה על דעת כי הנביאים קצרה ידם בכל אלה, אם כן הוא זכרוננו לברכה היה גדול מהם בדקדוק הלשון העברית, וחיי ראשי כי לא אאמין דבר זה, ואם היה בשגגה כמו שכתב הוא זכרוננו לברכה, למה הנביא או המדבר ברוח הקדש לא תקנו, האם השגגה נפלה

הנפש הוא, ²⁴ ורש"י זכרוננו לברכה, ²⁵ פירש את דהמצוה כתיב בירמיה ער כאן: ועמור סופרים עיין לקמן בתשובת המינים:

הא נקטינן רכולו הלכה למשה מסיני, ולא שם עורא הסופר מבחוץ הקרי שהוא פירוש חתוב חור, וגם לא היה זר בעיניו הם ושלום, ולא השינו לא ספק ולא בלבול, כי כלה הלכה למשה מסיני, כדנרמין לעיל: ותו קשה בעיני מה שאמר וזה לשונו,

וככה כשמצא עורא שכתוב בתורה ובעפולים שהוא לשון גובה ולא ידענו מה הם הגבוהים חתם, הוצרך לפרש בקרי שהם מחורים, וכן ישלנה לפי ששם שגל נאמר על המלכה, הוצרך לפרש בקרי ישכבנה, ער כאן לשונו: ²⁶

לשונו: ²⁶

codices [of the Pentateuch] were found in the court of the temple,²⁹ one of which had the reading *מְעוֹן*, the other *זַמְנוֹן*, and the third differed in the number of passages wherein *חַיָּא* is read with a *Tod*. Thus in the one codex it was written *מְעוֹן*, dwelling [Deut. xxxiii. 27], whilst the other two codices had *זַמְנוֹן*; the reading of the two was therefore declared valid, whereas that of the one was invalid.³⁰ In the second codex, again, *זַמְנוֹן* was found [in Ex. xxiv. 11], whilst the other two codices had *זַמְנוֹן*:³¹ the reading in which the two codices agreed was declared valid, and that of the one invalid.³² Now if there

²⁹ In the court of the temple those codices of the Law were kept which were used for reading the lessons for the Sabbaths and festivals.

³⁰ This variation affects the final *ה*, the insertion or omission of which was left to the taste of the individual scribes, and depended upon the different localities. This is evident, from the remark in the Talmud (ירושלמי ירושלים וירושלמי לא היו) (מקפידין ודכותה צפונה צפונה היכן הימנה), that the inhabitants of Jerusalem omitted it in one word and appended it in another, according to pleasure (*Jerusalem Megilla* i. 11, p. 71 b, ed. Graetz), as well as from the omissions and insertions of *ה* exhibited in the *Keri* and *Kethiv* in the Talmud (*Sopherim* vii. 2); and in the Massorah finalis under letter *ה* (comp. also Massorah magna on Exod. iv. 19; xix. 22). It was afterwards, when uniformity in orthography was found desirable, that R. Ishmael and R. Nehemiah laid it down as a rule, that *direction to, motion towards*, should be indicated by an appended *ה* if the word has not the prefix *ל* (*Jebamoth* 13 b). The Samaritans, however, would not submit to this revision and criticism of the text, and retained the old corruptions, for which reason they are upbraided by R. Eliezer, who tells us (נמית' לסופרי כותים מי גרם) לכם לשער דלית אהון דרשין רבני נחמיה דהני בשם ר' נחמיה כל דבר שהוא צריך למי' כחחילתו I said to the Samaritan Scribes, What is the use of your error in not adopting the rule of R. Nehemiah? For it is propounded in the name of R. Nehemiah: Every word which ought to have a prefixed *ל* [to indicate its motion towards] and which has it not, is to have *ה* at the end; as, for instance, לשער instead of לחון, סוכות instead of לסוכות (*Jerusalem Jebamoth* i. 6, p. 3a, ed. Graetz.)

³¹ There is evidently a mistake in Jacob b. Chajim's quotation, since the variation recorded in the Talmud is not in the reading of *זַמְנוֹן* (Exod. xxiv. 11), but of *זַמְנוֹן* (Exod. xxiv. 5). The erudite Geiger has no doubt that *זַמְנוֹן* is the Greek *ζητήρις*, *seeker, enquirer*, as the verb *ζητέω* is frequently used in the Apocrypha for one *who seeks God, who searches after wisdom*; and that this variation is not owing to an oversight, but is intentional, since it was not thought becoming to say that at this great revelation *boys or youths* (נערים) were brought as sacrifices. Hence they substituted *זַמְנוֹן*, *worthy searchers after wisdom*, which is countenanced by the fact that the Mishna (*Sebachim* xiv. 4), the Gemara (*ibid.*, 115 b), and the Chaldee paraphrases, render *נערי* by *first-born*. (Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*. Breslau, 1857, p. 243.)

³² Jacob b. Chajim does not finish the quotation from the Talmud giving the examples of the third variation found in the third codex, which is as follows: באחד *מצאו כתוב חשב* הוא ובשנים *מצאו כתוב אחד עשר* הוא וקיימו שנים וביטלו אחד

כפדים נמצאו בעורה,²⁹ כפר מעון, כפר ועטוטי, וכפר היא, באחד מצאו כתוב מעון אלהי קדם ובשנים מצאו כתוב מעונה אלהי קדם, וקיימו שנים ובטלו אחד,³⁰ באחד מצאו כתוב ואל ועטוטי בני ישראל לא שלח ירו, ובשנים מצאו כתוב ואל אצילי,³¹ בני ישראל לא שלח ירו, וקיימו שנים ובטלו אחד, עד כאן.³² ואם

eighty-one errors should occur in the Book of Jeremiah, and one hundred and thirty-three in the Book of Samuel, which he, of blessed memory, himself has counted, and has shewn was written by Jeremiah? Can we entertain the idea that a prophet, of whom it is said, "Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations" [Jer. i. 5], should have fallen into such errors? In conclusion, it appears that the Don, of blessed memory, had not seen the Talmud on this subject; for, according to the Talmud, there is neither light nor any glimpse of light in what he submits. It may, however, be that the Don, of blessed memory, entertained this strange opinion, not because he was unacquainted with the Talmud, but because he followed in this respect the steps of the great Rabbi, Maimonides,²⁸ of blessed memory, in the *More Nebuchim*, wishing to shew his ability to account for it without the Talmud.

If an objector should urge, "Behold we do not find in the Talmud any more *Keris* and *Kethirs*, *Kethirs* *velo Keris*, removal of *Var* by the Scribes, etc., besides those enumerated above, whereas the Massorah gives those and a great many others, I am therefore compelled to tell thee, that in the last-mentioned cases I am obliged to account for them in the manner of Abrahah, of blessed memory; since I believe that those only which are mentioned in the Talmud are the law of Moses from Mount Sinai, but not the others."

Now though it is true that the Massorah does indeed count all those which are mentioned in the Tract *Sopherim*, and a great many more, yet this presents no insurmountable difficulty. For we learn, in the Mishna *Sopherim*, vi. 4, "R. Simon b. Lakish says three

בכפר ירמיה אחד ושמונים פגמים, ובכפר שמואל שכתבו ירמיה, כמו שהוכיח הוא זכרנו לברכה, רבו בו הקרי והכתוב בכמו מאה ושלושים ושלש, כמו שמנא הוא זכרנו לברכה, היעלה על לב, נביא שנאמר עליו, במרם אצרך בכסן ידעתך, ובטרם הצא מרחם הקדשתיך, נביא לנוים נחתך, יפול בשגגות כאלה, סוף דבר נראה הם ושלוש כאלו השך זכרנו לברכה לא ראה הנמרא, ואלביא דנמרא לא נהיר ולא צהיר מה דחיתך, ואולי כי השך זכרנו לברכה היתה דוח אחרת עמו, ולא נעלם ממנו ה' הנמרא, כי דרך בדרך הרב הגדול הרמב"ם זכרנו לברכה במורה הנבוכים, להראות כחו, כי וזאת הנמרא יש דרך לחיך:

ואם יקשה המקשה, הא לא אשכחנא בנמרא מקריין וכתבן וכתבן ולא קריין ועטור סופרים וכולי, אלא מה דחשיב בנמרא, ובמכרה חשיב כל הני ומפי עליהו כמה וכמה, ולעולם אימא לך דבשאר לא בעי לתרועי בדחיתך השך האברבנאל זכרנו לברכה, דכלקא דעתך למימר הני דקחשיב בנמרא כוליהו הלכה למשה מסיני, ובשאר לא:

ואברא רבמכרה חשיב כל הני ומפי עליהו ומפי ממה דמית במכנה סופרים אבל לא קשה מיד, דנרסין במכנה סופרים פרק ששי, אמר רבי שמעון בן לקיש שלשה

²⁸ *Rambam* רמב"ם, is a contraction of the initials of *משה בן מיכאל*, *R. Moses ben Maimon*, also called *Maimonides*, one of the most extraordinary Jewish philosophers who have lived since the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. He was born March 30, 1135, in Cordova, and died December 13, 1204. His religio-philosophical work, entitled *More Nebuchim*, has recently been published by Munk, Paris, 1856-1866.

the textual reading, which was written by the finger of God? We are therefore bound to believe that all of them are a law of Moses from Sinai. Now the same question was put to Rashba of blessed memory, "How can we read *בְּטַחֲוֵרִים* instead of *בְּעֻפְלִים*, and *יִשְׁכַּנְנָה* instead of *יִשְׁנַלְנָה*, which are not in the text?" When Rashba, of blessed memory, answered as follows:—

"As regards thy question, 'Seeing that in reading the law one must not change even a single letter, how can the Prelector read *יִשְׁנַלְנָה* when the text has *יִשְׁכַּנְנָה*, or substitute another reading in any other passage for what is in the text, seeing that all the *Kethirs* in the law are according to the Massorah, and not according to the *Keri*?'"

"The answer is, that it is the law of Moses from Sinai, as it is written in *Tract Nedarim* [37 b], 'the pronunciation of certain words according to the Scribes, the removal of *Var* by the Scribes, the *Kethir* *velo Keri*, and the *Keri* *velo Kethir*, &c., are all a law of Moses from Sinai.' Thus far his language. From this it is evident that the interrogator did not know that it was a law of Moses from Sinai, since Rashba, of blessed memory, informed him that it was so; and now, seeing that it is a law of Moses from Sinai, there can be no more any question about it. See, moreover, that even Rashba, of blessed memory, supported himself therein on the above quotation from *Nedarim*, in spite of there being a great many more *Keris* and *Kethirs* than those enumerated in the Talmud, as already stated before. If these were doubtful readings, as Kimchi, of blessed memory, and Ephodi maintain, why were they not enumerated with the three instances of doubtful readings in *Sopherim* [vi. 4]? Seeing, then, that there are no more than three, it is evident that the others were not doubtful, for if they were doubtful they [the Sopherim] would in these, as in the former instances, have followed the majority of MSS., and not have put them in the margin, as we have stated above.

be any foundation in what Don Abravanel said, that the reason why Ezra did not venture to omit anything from the books of God is, that he considered them to be written by Divine wisdom, this cannot escape one of two alternatives: either Ezra knew that they were all the law of Moses from Mount Sinai, or that they were doubtful readings, as Kimchi, of blessed memory, and Ephodi maintained. And if you say that he did not know whether they were the law of Moses from Mount Sinai, why did he not expunge the reading of the one copy, and adopt that of the majority of codices, seeing that, in the case of the three codices found in the court of the temple, they followed the majority of copies? But you will perhaps argue that the MSS. were equally divided, and that he could therefore omit nothing, but was obliged to put the *Keri* in the margin. Then let such an one shew me how it is possible to read the Pentateuch, when [according to the Talmud] we must not read a single letter which is not written in the text. How then can it enter into one's mind that we should read the *Keri*, which, according to the opinion of Abravanel, of blessed memory, Ezra the Scribe put down to explain the anomalous text, and leave out

*codex, again, there were only nine passages which had הָא written with a Iod [as it is generally written הָא with a Vav], whereas the other two had eleven passages; the readings of the two were declared valid, and those of the one invalid. These eleven instances, which are given in Abboth de Rabbi Nathan (cap. xxxiv.) and in the Massorah ma na on Gen. xxxviii. 25, are as follows: Gen. xiv. 2, xx. 5, xxxviii. 25; Lev. ii. 15, xi. 39, xiii. 10, 21, xvi. 31, xxi. 9; Numb. v. 13, 14. It must be borne in mind that in all other instances הָא with Var retains its archaic and epicene character throughout the Pentateuch, and is used for both the masculine and the feminine. When the text of the Hebrew Scriptures was afterwards subjected to a critical revision, according to grammatical rules laid down by the Scribes, הָא was changed into הִיא throughout the Prophets and the Hagiographa, wherever it referred to the feminine gender; and the few cases in which הָא is still left, or in which the newly introduced הִיא refers to the masculine gender, are noted by the Massorah as *Keri* and *Kethir*. Thus the Massorah on Ps. lxxiii. 16, gives five instances in which the textual reading is הָא with Iod, when referring to the masculine gender; whilst the emended marginal reading is הִיא (viz., 1 Kings xvii. 15; Ps. lxxiii. 16; Job xxxi. 11; Eccles. v. 9; 1 Chron. xxix. 16), and, *vice versa*, three instances in which the textual reading has הִיא, when referring to the feminine gender (viz., 1 Kings xvii. 15; Isa. xxx. 33; Job xxxi. 11), whilst the marginal emendation has הָא. These are also marked in the margin of the ordinary editions of the Hebrew Bible, as *Keri* and *Kethir*, and *Kethir* and *Keri*.*

lous expressions in *נפשו*, *his soul* [Jerem. ii. 24], the *Keri* in the margin being *נפשה*, *her soul*, fem., as is evident from the usage of the language. Whereas in fact this is one of the mysteries of the law connected with the Levirate law, and the initiated know it.

Thus we learn from these and similar arguments that the *Keri velo Kethiv*, the *Kethiv velo Keri*, and all the Massoretic statements, are a law of Moses from Sinai, and not as the afore-mentioned sages propound, which is evident from the Talmud [*Nedarim* 37 b] quoted above.

We do indeed find that the Talmud differs in many places from the Massorah, as we see in the *Tract Nidda* [33 a], where *והנשיא*, and *he that beareth* [Levit. xv. 10], is written *והנשא*, without *Vav*.

Tossafoth³⁴ thereupon remarks, "It is strange that the reading of the Massorah is *plene*;" and concludes that the Talmud in fact does sometimes differ from the Massorah, as we find in *Sabbath* [55 b] on the *sons of Eli*, where *מַעֲבִירִים* [1 Sam. ii. 24] is quoted. And this is the remark of the Talmud: [query] "Is not the reading *מַעֲבִירִים*? Whereupon R. Hunnah b. R. Joshua said the reading is *מַעֲבִירִים*."

Now Rashi of blessed memory remarks on this passage, "I cannot

³⁴ Tossafoth denotes those additions or supplementary glosses to Rashi's Commentary on the Talmud which are found along with the commentary of Rashi in every edition of the Talmud. The disciples of Rashi, finding that the expositions of their master might be extended and improved, set about to continue his work of exposition immediately after his death, filling up every gap, and using up every scrap which their immortal teacher left. Their reverence for him, however, was so great, that they would not put down their opinions in an independent manner, but denominated them *additions*, and hence they derived the name *Tossafists*. The first Tossafists consisted chiefly of Rashi's own relations, his two sons-in-law, R. Meier b. Samuel and R. Jehudah b. Nathan, called by way of abbreviation *Riban* (רבי יחור בן נתן), his three grandsons, R. Isaac, R. Samuel, and R. Jacob Tam, sons of R. Meier, who are respectively called from their initials *Ribam* (רבי יצחק בן מאיר = ריב"ם), *Rashbam* (רבי שמואל בן מאיר = רשב"ם), and *R. Tam*, and lastly R. Isaac ben Asher of Speier, called *Riba* (רבי יצחק בן אשר = ריב"א), also a relative of Rashi's. Comp. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vol. vi., p. 170, etc., Leipzig, 1861; and vol. vii., p. 129, etc., Leipzig, 1863.

Thers is then no more difficulty in the Don's, of blessed memory, remark, which is as follows: "there is no doubt that they [*i. e.*, Ezra and his associates] have received [*i. e.*, the *Keri*] from the prophets and sages of by-gone days." Thus far his language. To this I reply; Choose one of two positions. If you say that they received it from the prophets and sages of by-gone days, then this cannot escape one of the two alternatives. Either it [*the Keri*] was a law of Moses from Sinai, and they [the prophets and sages] told him [*Ezra*] that it [*the Keri*] ought to be so, or they did not tell him that such and such readings were a law of Moses from Sinai. If they have not told him that such and such a reading is a law of Moses from Sinai, then he clearly knew already that it [the marginal reading] ought to be so [is the correct one], since it was received so from the prophets. And if it be so, what then does Abravanel mean by saying that the sacred Scribe was afraid to touch

any of the words which were spoken by the Holy Ghost? Moreover, there is another objection [to be urged]. If it be that they have received it from the prophets and sages of by-gone days, why have not the prophets and sages themselves corrected it? We are therefore bound to conclude that the *Keri* and the *Kethiv* are both a law of Moses from Sinai, as we have proved above from the Talmud [*Nedarim* 37, b.]

As to what Abravanel said in his first hypothesis, "that the writer, according to the degree of inspiration vouchsafed unto him, conveyed by these anomalous expressions some of the mysteries of the law, and therefore Ezra did not venture to expunge them from the sacred books," this is certainly true; as the great Ramban³⁵ of blessed memory, the chief of the later Kabbalists, has propounded it, in the Introduction to his Commentary on the Pentateuch (*vide in loco*). And for this very reason I am all the more astonished at Don Abravanel, of blessed memory, for having left the subject undecided, ascribing in his second hypothesis carelessness to Jeremiah, because of the anoma-

³⁵ For Ramban, or Nachmanides, see above, p. 39.

retic conclusions, as we have seen in the above quotation from the *Tract Sabbath* [55 b] on the sons of Eli, where he argues from the Massorah against R. Hunna b. Joshua, and concludes that the said passage in the Talmud is spurious, — that he should in various other places entertain opinions contrary to those of the Massorah. Thus, for instance, he writes in his Commentary on Gen. xxv. 6, “The reading is **פלגשם** without the **י**, to shew that it was only one concubine *i. e.*, Hagar, who was identical with Keturah, according to the opinion of *Bereshith Rabba*.”³⁵ He also remarks on Numbers vii. 1, that the reading is **כלת** and not **כלות**; whereas the Massorah most distinctly remarks **פִּלְגִּשִׁים** is “twice entirely *plene*,” viz., in Gen. xxv. 6, and in Esther ii. 9.³⁶ Thus also the Massorah parva remarks on **פִּלְגִּשִׁים**, Numb. vii. 1, “Not extant, *plene*.”

And again Rashi remarks, in his Commentary on the Pentateuch, the reading is **מִזוֹת** [Deut. vi. 9] in order to shew that even if a door has only one post, it requires a *Mezuzah*.³⁶ Now I wonder at this, for we find in the Massorah that it is written with a **י** between the **ז** and the **ת**. Rashi, of blessed memory, however, adopts the opinion of Rabbi Meier in *Menachoth*, 34 a, where we learn, “R. Papa, happening to call at the house of Mar Samuel, saw there a door which had only one post on the left side, and yet had a *Mezuzah*, and asked, According to whom is this? According to Rabbi Meier [was the

³⁵ *Bereshith Rabba* is that part of the *Midrash Rabba* which treats on *Bereshith*, or on the Book of Genesis. For an account of this *Midrash*, we must refer to Kitto's *Cyclopaedia*, s. v. *MIDRASH*.

³⁶ *Mezuzah* with the Jews denotes the piece of parchment on which is written Deut. vi. 4-9; xi. 13-21, which they regard as containing the injunction to inscribe on the door-posts the words of the law. This slip of vellum thus written upon is then enclosed in a cylindrical tube of lead, cane, or wood, and to the present day is nailed to the right door-post of every door. A detailed description of this institution is given by Maimonides, *Jad Ha-Chesaka, Hilchoth Mezuzah*, vol. i., p. 93, etc., ed. Immanuel Athias, Amsterdam, 1702; Joreh Deah, §§ 285-292; and in Kitto's *Cyclopaedia*, s. v. *MEZUZAH*.

היה בקי במסורה וכבירא ליה כדעת בעלי המסרה, דהא לעיל גבי בני עלי דפרק במה בחמה, הקשה מהמירה על רב הונא בריה דרב יהושע וכתב, ואומר אני שמעות גדול הוא וכולי, והא אשכחן בכמה דוכתי רסבירא ליה דלא כדעת בעלי המסרה, נבי ולבני הפילגשים כתב בפירוש החומש פלגשם כתיב הכר יו"ד שלא היתה אלא פלגש אחת, והיא הנר והיא קטורה מלשון בראשית רבה,³⁵ וכן ויהי ביום כלות משה כלת כתיב עד כאן. ובהדיא במכרה כתיב הפילגשים ב' מלא דמלאים, דין ועל יד הני שומר הפילגשים, וכן ביום כלות משה כתוב במסורה הקטנה לית מלא:

ותו אשכחן דפירש בפירוש החומש בפרשת ואחתנן מוזהות ביהיך מוזהות כתיב, שאין צריך אלא אחת,³⁶ וחומא דבמסורה הוא כתיב מלא בוי"ו בין וי"ו לחי"ו, ורש"י זכרוננו לברכה כבר לה כרבי מאיר במנחות פרק הקומץ את המנחה, גבי הא דגרסינן רב פפא איקלע לבי מר שמואל, הוא הוה פיתחא דלא חוה ליה פצימא אלא משמאל ועבירה ליה מוזה, אמר ליה כמאן, כרבי

understand how this sage is here cited, for I am of opinion that the whole passage is spurious, and that he never said it, since the reading of the most trustworthy Codices is **מַעֲבְרִים** *plene*, and since it is not mentioned in the great Massorah, where all the words in which the *Jod* is in the *Kethiv* but not in the *Keri* are numbered and rubricated. Besides, the whole question is irrelevant, as the meaning of **מַעֲבְרִים** is not *to transgress*, but *to circulate a report*; and this is what Eli said, ‘No, my son, it is not a good report which I hear the people of God circulate about you [1 Sam. ii. 24];’ **מַעֲבְרִים** is the plural, and refers to **עַם יְהוָה**, the people of *Jehovah*, and not to the sons of Eli, who were the transgressors themselves, and did make others to transgress.” Thus far his language.

Tossafoth again comments thus upon the passage; and this is its language: “Our Talmud differs from our copies of the Bible, which read **מַעֲבְרִים**, and we find a similar difference in the *Jerusalem Talmud* on Samson, where it has, ‘And he judged Israel *forty* years;’ and submits it is evident that the Philistines feared him [*i. e.*, Samson] twenty years after his death, as well as twenty years during his life-time,” whereas our copies of the Bible read *twenty* years [Judges xvi. 31]. Thus far its language.

To me it appears, however, that there is no difficulty in it; for what the Talmud speaks about Samson refers to the Midrashic interpretation, viz., “Why is the verse, that he judged Israel twenty years, repeated twice? R. Acha answered, From this we see that the Philistines feared him [*i. e.*, Samson] twenty years after his death, just as they did twenty years before it, and this makes forty years.” Hence the Talmud does not say, Why is it written in the text, “he judged Israel forty years?” but simply, “he judged forty years,” that is, according to the Midrash. And now everything comes out right when thou lookest into it. Thus far.

Now I wonder at Rashi,—who was versed in the Massorah and Masso-

בעיני שם החכם הנזכר כאן, כי אומר אני שמעות גדול הוא ולא נלה להא מלחא, שהדי בספרים מוגהים כתוב מעברים מלא, וגם במסורת הגדולה במקום שמניין שם כל התיבות שכתוב בהן יוד דלא קרינן לא נמנה זה והם מניין על פי החשבון וזו אינה קשיא, דהאי מעברים לאו לשון עבירה הוא אלא לשון יעבירו קול במחנה, והכי קאמר להו עלי, לא טובה השמועה אשר אנכי שומע את עם יי מעבירין ומכריון וקובלין עליכם, והאי מעברים לשון רבים הוא, ואעם יי קאי ולא אבני עלי, שחרי הם היו עוברים ולא היו מעבירים את אחרים, עד כאן לשונו:

וכתבו התוספות על זה וז"ל, התלמוד שלנו חולק על ספרים שלנו שכתוב בהם מעברים, וכן מצינו בירושלמי בשמשון והוא שפט את ישראל ארבעים שנה, מלמד שהיו פלשתים יראים ממנו עשרים שנה אחר מותו כמו בחיי, ובכל הספרים שלנו כתוב עשרים שנה, עד כאן לשון התוספות:

ולי נראה דלא קשה מידי הא דמשמע משמע כבדרש, למה נאמר שני פעמים כי שפט את ישראל עשרים שנה, אמר רב אחא מלמד שהיו פלשתים יראים ממנו עשרים שנה אחר מותו ועשרים שנה חיו והיינו ארבעים בחד יומי, ותלמודא לא אמר מאי דכתיב והוא שפט את ישראל ארבעים שנה, אלא והוא שפט את ישראל ארבעים שנה דמשמע כבדרש, והשאה אחי שפיר דוק, עד כאן: ותמיהא לי על רש"י זכרוננו לברכה, דהא

to the seventh day,³⁸ whence we obtain the final ם [of the first], the י [from the second], and the final ם [from the third word]; and have therein an intimation from the law about the ceremony of pouring out water on this festival. Whereas Rashi, of blessed memory, reads [Succa, 46 b] **בְּמִשְׁפָּטָם** in connection with the eighth day of the festival [*i. e.*, at the end of verse 37,] and **בְּמִשְׁפָּטָם** in connection with the seventh day [*i. e.*, at the end of verse 33].³⁹ Now Tassafoth criticises Rashi, and these are the words of Tassafoth: "We read **בְּמִשְׁפָּטָם** on the seventh day, as is evident from *Taamith*, 4 b, and from the Massorah magna, and not as Rashi, who reads on the eighth day." Thus far the remark of Tassafoth.

Moreover, in *Menachoth*, 34 b, Rashi, of blessed memory, does not animadvert upon the Talmud, which reads differently from the correct Codices, as he animadverted in connection with the sons of Eli [*vide supra*, p. 20], and yet these are the words of *Menachoth*: "The sages propound, 'Rabbi Ishmael said in **לְמִטְפֵּת לְמִטְפֵּת לְמִטְפֵּת**, the four compartments [in the phylactery] are indicated.'" ⁴⁰ Thus far the words of the Talmud. In the Correct codices, however, as well as in the Book of the Crowns,⁴¹ the reading is as follows, **לְמִטְפֵּת**

³⁸ These words also occur in connection with the other days of the feast, but without the letters in question; and as, according to the Talmudic laws of exegesis, no superfluous letter is ever used in the Bible without its having a recondite meaning (compare Ginsburg's *Commentary on Ecclesiastes*, p. 30, &c., Longman, 1861); these three letters have been combined into **מים**, water. This exegetical rule, which is called **גורעין ומוסףין**, letters taken from one word and joined to another, or formed into new words, will be found in Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, s. v. MIDRASH, p. 172, rule iii.

³⁹ The passage must have been altered since the day of the Tossafoth, and made conformable to the present text of the Bible, as in my copy of the Talmud there is no difference between Rashi and the Massoretic text.

⁴⁰ The word **מִטְפֵּת** occurs only three times (Exod. xiii. 16; Deut. vi. 8, xi. 18); in two instances it has no י (Deut. vi. 8, xi. 18), and in the third (Exod. xiii. 16), there is a י after the first ט, *i. e.*, **מִטְפֵּת**; hence R. Ishmael regards it as a dual, and makes of the three words *four*, to obtain the four compartments in the phylacteries. As the limits of a note do not permit of a detailed description of these compartments, we must refer to Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, art. PHYLACTERIES, for it.

⁴¹ The Book of Crowns (ספר הני) to which Jacob b. Chajim refers, is an ancient treatise, containing Massoretic rules on the ornamental letters. It has only just been published, for the first time, by Burges, Paris, 1866. The passage in question is to be

מאיר, ושיילין עלה מאי רבי מאיר, דתניא בית שאין לו אלא פנים אחד רבי מאיר מחייב במוזות וחכמים פומרים, מאי טעמא דרבנן, מוזות כתיב, מאי טעמא דרבי מאיר, דתניא מוזות, שומע אני מיעוט מוזות שתי, כשהוא אומר מוזות בפרשה שניה, שאין תלמוד לומר רבי אחד רבוי, ואין רבוי אלא למעט מעט הכתוב למוזות אחת³⁷ דברי רבי ישמעאל וכולי עכ"ל הנמרא שם: ואף על גב דהוה משמע קצת דכתיב מוזות מלא בשני ווין ולא מוזות חסר, דהא רבי ישמעאל אית ליה יש אם למסורת, פירוש לדרוש על פי הכתב, כדגרסינן בריש סנהדרין גבי לסטפת, מיהו אין ראייה מזה, דהכי נמי אשכחן רבי עקיבא דאית ליה יש אם למקרא פירוש לדרוש כפי הדבור הקרוי כההיא דלסטפת, ובפרק כל שעה אית ליה יש אם למסרה תוספת עד כאן: ותו בפרק הבונה הקשו התוספת על רש"י וזכרנו לברכה גבי הא דתניא רבי יהודה בן בתירא אומר נאמר בשני ונסביהם, בששי

reply.] Whereupon it was asked, Where is this remark of Rabbi Meier? [Reply.] We find that a house which has a door with only one post, Rabbi Meier says it ought to have a *Mezuzah*, but the sages say it ought not. [Query.] What is the reason of the sages? [Reply.] Because the text has **מוֹזוֹת** in the plural [thus shewing that two posts were required]. [Query.] And what is the reason of Rabbi Meier? [Reply.] For we learn that it is **מוֹזוֹת** in the plural, whence I see that it cannot be less than two; and when **מוֹזוֹת** is again mentioned in another verse, where it is superfluous, it is to teach us that it comes within the exegetical rule, *inclusion after inclusion*; and every *inclusion after inclusion* is meant for *diminution*; hence we must have a *Mezuzah* when there is only one post to the door.³⁷

Thus says Rabbi Ishmael, &c. [upon which Tossafoth remarks]; and accordingly it would appear that the reading is **מוֹזוֹת** *plene* with two Vavs, and not defective with one Vav; and this is the remark of Rabbi Ishmael, who says that the text is of paramount importance, *i. e.*, that we must explain it according to the written text or the *Kethiv*, just as we find in *Sanhedrin*, 4 b, in the case of **מִטְפֹּת**. But the fact is that we cannot infer anything from this; since we find Rabbi Akiva, who maintains that the marginal reading is of primary consideration, *i. e.*, that we must be guided by the *Keri* as in the case of **מִטְפֹּת**, yet he himself admits that text is of paramount importance."

Again, in *Sabbath*, 103 b, Tossafoth is at variance with Rashi, of blessed memory, where we find that Rabbi Jehudah b. Bethira says:—"The Scriptures use **וְיִסְבְּיָהֶם** [Numb. xxix. 19] with regard to the second day of the feast of tabernacles, **וְיִסְבְּיָה** [*ibid.*, verse 31] with regard to the sixth day, and **בְּמִשְׁפָּטָם** [*ibid.*, verse 33] with regard

³⁷ To understand the discussion given in the text, it is necessary to remark that, according to the exegetical rules of the ancient Rabbins, the Bible never repeats a word twice without designing to convey thereby a special meaning. Accordingly, if a thing is repeated twice, and the repetition appears superfluous, it is explained as implying more than one statement would convey. But if the repetition cannot be explained as implying inclusion, it is taken to denote exclusion. This rule is called *רבוי אחר רבוי*, *inclusion after inclusion, effecting exclusion*. Comp. Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, s. v. MIDRASH, p. 170, rule iv.

is taken from **וַיִּסַּף**, and *he shall add*, converted into the allied letter **י**, and put between the **ת** and **ו** of **וַיִּסַּף**, thus reading **וַיִּסַּף תְּ**. But Tossafoth objects to this explanation, on the ground that the Talmud asks further on, "If this can be done, let us apply it also to the things devoted to the sanctuary, where it is likewise written **וַיִּסַּף תְּ** [Lev. xxvii. 15]?" And the answer is, "Even if you take away the **ו** from **וַיִּסַּף**, and put it to the end of **וַיִּסַּף תְּ**, it would only be **וַיִּסַּף תְּ** [making no plural]." But now [if Rabbi Tam's principle of applying this exegetical rule be right] we might put the **ו** in the middle of the word, so as to obtain **וַיִּסַּף תְּ** plural. It is therefore evident that we never put the letters except at the end of the word, as is the case with all the instances which I have adduced." Thus far the words of Tossafoth. Rashi, of blessed memory, too, quotes the same principle [in his Commentary, on *Baba Mezi'ah*, 54 b], that we only add to the beginning and end of words, but that in the middle the letters must remain as they are [*vide in loco*]. And we cannot urge in such a case that we cut up the Scriptures with too sharp a knife, as it is urged in all other places, because it cannot be called cutting except when the words are displaced, as it is remarked there [*i. e.*, in *Baba Bathra*, 111] in connection with the verse "and ye shall give his inheritance," &c. [Numb. xxvii. 11], against Rabbi Abja, who wanted to do it; and Rabbi said to him, "Thou cuttest the Scriptures with a sharp knife." Thus far his reply.

It appears difficult to me, that when we are distinctly told in the Talmud [Megilla, 24 b.], "The sages say that all passages which are written in the law in indelicate expressions are rendered decent by the *Keri*, as, for instance, **וַיִּשְׁכְּבָנָה** instead of **וַיִּשְׁנָנָה** [Deut. xxxviii. 30; Isa. xiii. 16; Jer. iii. 2; 1 Sam. v. 6, 9, 12; vi. 4, 5, 17]; **טְהָרִים** instead of **עֲפָלִים**; the Massorah should only give six instances where the *Kethiv* is **עֲפָלִים**, and the *Keri* **טְהָרִים** [Deut. xxviii. 27; 1 Sam. v. 6, 9, 12; vi. 5, 6], and omit the one which occurs in 1 Sam. vi. 12;

והיה אם שמוע כתיב למטפת, והיה כי יביאך ולמטפת, אבל בין פ'א לחי' לא כתיב וי', ואני ראיתי בספר חני קדמון שגם והיה אם שמוע כתוב למטפת, ומיהו כמכין אמאי דגרסי התוספות כדלקמן דאינהו חוו ספר חני, והוו בקיאי במלא וחדר יחיד מינן; והקשו התוספות שם במנחת 42 גבי חנו רבנן למטפת וכולי דלעיל על למטפות דוהיה כי יביאך דבנמרא מצריך שיהא מלא דמלא, ובספרים מדויקים כך דינס, שמע והיה אם שמוע למטפת, והיה כי יביאך ולמטפת, אבל בין פ'א לחי' לא כתיב וי', הימה היכי משמע חרי, ואי הוה אמרינן נורעין ומוסיפין ודורשין ניחא, אבל לא אשכחן אלא בתחלת חיבה ובסוף חיבה, בפרק שני דזבחים גבי ולקחו מדם הפר דדרשין רם מחפר יקבלנו, וכן ונתתם את נחלתו לשארו, דרשין בפרק יש נוחלין ונתתם נחלה שארו לו, ומפרש רבינו חם 48 דו"י קמא דלמטפת מוקמינן בסוף, כאלו כתוב למטפות, כראשכחן בפרק הוהב אי שקלת ליה לוי' דויספ ושרית ליה על חמישיתו הוה ליה חמישיתו, והשאה מוקמינן

[in Deut. vi. 8; xi. 18] and **וַיִּלְטֹטֹפֹת** [Exod. xiii. 16], but there is no **ו** between the **פ** and the **ת**; yet I myself have seen that in the ancient Book of the Crowns, even **וַיִּלְטֹטֹפֹת**, in Deut. xi. 18, is written with a **ו** after the the first **ט**. Still we may rely upon the authors of the Tossafoth, since they saw the Book of Crowns, and know more thoroughly about *plene* and *defective* than we know. Tossafoth on *Menachoth* [34 b] observes as follows: 42 "In Deut. vi. 8 and xi. 18, the reading is **וַיִּלְטֹטֹפֹת**, and in Exod. xiii. 16, **וַיִּלְטֹטֹפֹת**, according to the correct Codices, but there is no **ו** between the **פ** and the **ת**," and asks, "How can a dual be made out of it? If we could apply to it the exegetical rule, *letters taken from one word and joined to another, or formed into new words*, it would be all right, but we find it only applied to letters at the end and beginning of words, but not in the middle. Thus, for instance, in *Zebachim*, 24 b, the first **מ** is taken over from **מִדָּם**, from the blood, to **הַפָּר**, of the bullock, making it **וְדָם מִהַפָּר**, the blood of the bullock [Exod. xxxix. 12]. Thus also in *Baba Bathra*, 111, the **ו** is taken from the end of **וְנַחֲלָתוֹ**, his inheritance, and the **ל** from the beginning of **לְשֵׁאָרוֹ**, to his kinsmen, and made into a separate word **לוֹ**, *i. e.*, and ye shall give the inheritance of his wife to him, *i. e.*, the husband [Numb. xxvii. 11]. To this, Rabbi Tam 43 replies, that the first **ו** of **וַיִּלְטֹטֹפֹת** [*i. e.*, the copulative] is taken from the beginning of the word and put between the **ת** and **פ**, thus reading **וַיִּלְטֹטֹפֹת**, as we find it done in *Baba Mezi'ah* [54 b], on Lev. xxvii. 27, where the **ו**

found on p. 9. It must, however, be remarked that in the present recension it is spelled **וַיִּלְטֹטֹפֹת**, both in Exod. xiii. 16 and Deut. vi. 8. Comp. also the *Sepher Tegin*, pp. 18, 19.

42 As Jacob ben Chajim has somewhat abbreviated this quotation from Tossafoth, and thereby made it difficult to translate, I have translated the whole of it as found in the Talmud.

43 Jacob Tam was born at Remers about 1100, and died about 1171. He was the grandson of the immortal Rashi, and was a very distinguished Talmudist, Tossaphist (*vide supra*, p. 57, note 34), Grammarian, and Commentator. The appellation Tam (*חם*) = the pious, the saint, he obtained in after life because of his great piety, and in allusion to Gen. xxv. 27, where his namesake, the patriarch Jacob, is denominated *Tam*.

in any of the Massoretic work. Thus, for instance, Rashi, of blessed memory, in his commentary on Psalm cylv. 2, remarks that in his copy the *Keri* was *תחתיו*, under him, and the *Kethiv* *תחתיו*, under me, and I carefully looked for it, but could not find it in the Massorah magna numbered among the eighteen words in which the *vav* is omitted at the end of the word.⁴⁶ And this, again, is the language of Rabbi Saadia Gaon on Daniel xi. 15, "The *Kethiv* is *מבחריו*, of his choice, and the *Keri* *מבצרי*, of his fortresses."⁴⁷ Now, I carefully examined the Massoretic books in all the places where the letters are changed, but could not find it; and my difficulty is [to understand] how these Gaonim could overlook the Massorah which we have, their statements are incorrect. However, they [Saadia and Rashi] are much wiser than we, who are as it were blind men in a window compared with them.

For some time I was in great perplexity, seeing that the Talmud generally ignores the Massorah, as we have shewn above in the instance

Egypt, A. D. 892, and died in 942. It is somewhat strange that Jacob ben Chajim should name him *after* Rashi, who lived so much later. The title *Gaon*, which denotes *excellency*, was given to those who were the spiritual heads of the Jewish community.

⁴⁶ The eighteen words, which according to the Massorah want the suffix *Vav* in the text, are as follows:—

Gen. xxvii. 29	וישחחו	1 Kings ix. 9	וישחחו	Ezek. vii. 21	והללוהו
Gen. xliii. 28	וישחחו	1 Kings xii. 7	וידבר	Dan. v. 21	שוי
Judg. xxi. 20	ויצו	2 Kings xx. 18	יקח	Ezra iii. 2	יעל
1 Sam. vii. 9	יעלה	2 Kings xxii. 5	ויהנה	Nehem. iii. 30	אחרי
1 Sam. xii. 10	ויאמר	Isaiah xxxvii. 30	ואכל	Nehem. iii. 31	אחרי
1 Sam. xiii. 19	אמר	Jerem. xlviii. 7	יחד	Esther ix. 27	וקבל

These instances are enumerated in the Massorah marginalis, on 1 Kings i. 1; in the Massorah finalis under letter *Vav*, p. 27 a, col. 4—27 b, col. 1; *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, section cxix., and *Tractate Sopherim* vii. 1. It is, however, to be remarked, that *Sopherim* only gives thirteen instances, וישחחו (Gen. xliii. 28); ויצו (Judges xxi. 20); and אחרי (Nehem. iii. 30), being omitted. Comp. also Frensdorff's note on section cxix., *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, p. 32, and Levita's *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, p. 117, note 69, ed. Ginsburg.

⁴⁷ It is now established beyond doubt, that the commentary on Daniel which Jacob b. Chajim Ibn Adonijah published in the Rabbinic Bible, under the name of Saadia, and which he here quotes is spurious. Comp. the article SAADIA, in Kitto's *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*.

and, indeed, all our best Codices do the same. Now, I cannot account for this in any other way except in the manner already stated above, viz., that the Talmud is sometimes at variance with the Massorah.

In *Bereshith Rabba*, Rabbi Idia remarks on Psalm cv. 22, that the *Kethiv* is *שָׁרוֹ*, his prince, without a *vav* [i. e., in the singular], and that it refers to Potiphera. Now the difficulty is, that we do not find this *vav* omitted in any Codex; nor is it mentioned in the Massorah magna among the number of fifty-six passages where the *vav* is omitted in the text and found in the *Keri*,⁴⁴ and there is no way of accounting for this again, except as I accounted for the manner of the Talmud, viz., that it disagrees with the Massorah.

It is very surprising that we find Rashi, of blessed memory, and Saadia Gaon,⁴⁵ giving *Keris* and *Kethivs* which are not to be found

⁴⁴ The fifty-six words which are in the textual reading without *Jod* (mostly indicating the plural) in the middle, but have *Jod* in the marginal reading, are as follows:—

Gen. xxxiii. 4	ואלכנתו	Jerem. xv. 8	גבורתו	Job xxvi. 14
Exod. xxvii. 11	וכו	Jerem. xvii. 11	בהחבולתו	Job xxxvii. 12
Numb. xii. 3	כיברדו	Ezek. xvii. 21	ואשרדו	Job xxxix. 30
Joshua viii. 11	פארתו	Ezek. xxxi. 5	פחרו	Job xl. 17
Joshua xvi. 3	עלתו	Ezek. xl. 26	כפפו	Job xxxix. 25
1 Sam. ii. 9	והלוקו	Ezek. xl. 22	חללו	Job xxxi. 20
1 Sam. ii. 9	והכורו	Ezek. xl. 22	ילדו	Job xxxviii. 41
1 Sam. x. 21	בצאתו	Ezek. xlvii. 11	ברגלו	Prov. vi. 13
1 Sam. xxiii. 5	פרו	Habak. iii. 14	בשפחו	Prov. xxvi. 24
2 Sam. i. 11	שערו	Obad. 11	ארחחו	Prov. xxii. 25
2 Sam. xii. 20	דרשו	Ps. xxiv. 6	אדנו	Prov. xxx. 10
2 Sam. xxiv. 14	הציו	Ps. lvi. 8	מרגלותו	Ruth iii. 14
1 Kings x. 5	חסרו	Ps. cvi. 45	כניחו	Ezra iv. 7
1 Kings xviii. 42	דברו	Ps. cxlvii. 19	השאו	Lament. iii. 39
2 Kings v. 9	צבאו	Ps. cxlviii. 2	ויהו	1 Sam. xxi. 14
2 Kings iv. 34	חקו	Job xiv. 5	הסרו	Song of Songs ii. 11
2 Kings xi. 18	בקדשו	Job xv. 15	שלו	Ps. cv. 40
Isa. lvi. 10	עלומי	Job xx. 11	השלו	Numb. xi. 32
Isa. lii. 5	ויודעו	Job xxiv. 1		

They are enumerated in the Massorah finalis under the letter *Jod*, p. 34 a, cols. 2 and 3; and in the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, section cxviii., pp. 33 and 104. It must be remarked, that this list only registers such words as occur *once* as *defective*, and therefore excludes many other words which likewise want the *Jod* plural, but which occur more than once. Comp. also Levita's *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, p. 183, ed. Ginsburg.

⁴⁵ Saadia Gaon (סעדיה גאון) ben Joseph Ha-Pithomi, the celebrated philosopher, commentator, and translator of the Bible into Arabic, was born at Fajum, in Upper

the Scribes, the alterations of the Scribes, *Keri* and *Kethiv*, &c.,⁵⁰ because by *Itur Sopherim* is not meant that they [*i. e.*, the Scribes] have removed the ו, but as it is explained in the *Aruch* under עטור; where it is remarked *Itur Sopherim* denotes removal, as the Chaldee renders סור, to remove [1 Kings xxii. 44], by עטר; and so we find in *Gittin*, 86, the nature of the bill of divorce is "absolved and (ועטור), discharged." Now it appears that the villagers were at first not particular in reading the Scriptures, and read [אחר], AND afterward [Gen. xviii. 5, Ps. lxviii. 26]; וְאַחֲרָיו, AND thy judgments [Ps. xxxvi. 7]: they committed a blunder at that time [by inserting *Vav* conjunctive in these passages], thinking that these were the correct readings because they seemed to be so. Whereupon the Sopherim came and removed the *Vav*, and the reading became again, as it originally was, אחר, afterwards, thy judgments; and when it was seen that the Sopherim had removed the *Vav*, the words thus corrected were denominated *Itur Sopherim*. Rabbi Isaac, therefore, came and propounded that they [*i. e.*, these restored readings] are those received by Moses on Sinai [*i. e.*, are the original readings]. And even up to the generations nearer that time they blundered and read לא, and not, with *Vav* [Exod. xxiii. 13], when the Sopherim decreed that it should be read without a *Vav*." Thus far his argument.

Thus it is evident that they [*i. e.*, the Sopherim] made no wilful changes. But if they [*i. e.*, the heretics] will persist in it in spite of what the Gaon [*i. e.*, the author of the *Aruch*], of blessed memory says, we can repel them with the power of argument as follows. Can any man believe that if one intends to make wilful alterations and changes he would say, See what wilful changes I have made, espe-

⁵⁰ The heretics or Christians to whom Jacob b. Chajim refers, have taken their inspiration from Raymond Martin, the celebrated Spanish Dominican, who was born about 1220, and died about 1287. It was this distinguished orientalist, the oracle of the church on Rabbinical lore during the middle ages, who boldly declared that these variations in question were wilful corruptions and perversions introduced by the Jews into the sacred text. Comp. Levita's *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, p. 45, &c., ed. Ginsburg.

of *plene* and *defective*. According to whom [I asked myself] are we then to write the scrolls of the law, since what is lawful according to the one is unlawful according to the other? At the first thought it would seem that we ought to write our scrolls according to the Talmud in the case of *plene* and *defective*, since we have taken it upon ourselves [to follow its authority], and since they [*i. e.*, the authors of the Talmud] were better versed in the Massorah, as well as in *plene* and *defective*, than we are. Nevertheless, we find that Rashi, of blessed memory, draws objections from the Massorah against our Talmud, as in the case of the sons of Eli [1 Sam. ii. 24], and even declares that the statement in the Talmud that the *Kethiv* is a mistake, as we have shewn above.⁴⁸ The authors of the Tassafoth, too, raise objections from the Massorah against the Talmud, and make the Massorah their basis, as will be seen in the sequel from a quotation in *Tract Jebamoth* [106 b]. Now if the Massorah were not their basis, they would not have argued from it against the Talmud. But since we see that though they were later than the Talmudists, and yet made the Massorah their basis to argue from it against the Talmud, it is evident that we too must act according to the Massorah. And, indeed, this is the reason why the Codices and the corrections of the scrolls are all according to the Massorah; and of a truth the men of the Great Synagogue [*i. e.*, the authors of the Massorah] are of great authority, and fully worthy that we should rely upon them. And though Rashi, of blessed memory, as we have seen, sides with Rabbi Meier in the Talmud, in the case of *מזוזות*, against the Massorah, taking the *Kethiv* to be *מזוזות*, as we have stated above,⁴⁹ and in many other cases, yet we also see that in other places he argues from the Massorah against the Talmud, as I have shewn in this section.

As to the heretics, there is no foundation in the charge which they prefer against us, that we have wilfully altered and changed the text of the Scriptures, which they derive from the removal of *Vav* by

⁴⁸ Vide supra, p. 57, &c.

⁴⁹ Vide supra, p. 59, &c.

they would surely not have proclaimed what they have changed, and said, "Eighteen words are *Tikun Sopherim*, as given in the *Mechilta*" [on Exod. xv. 7].⁵² Moreover, the Sopherim made no changes nor corrections, they only submitted that the text ought originally to have been so and so, but is veiled in other expressions, out of respect to the *Shechina*, as you will find out by examining the subject. The same is the case with the *Keri* and the *Kethir*; they [*i. e.*, the *Sopherim*] point out what they have altered, if peradventure you choose to characterise them as alterations; we of the class of believers, however, believe that they all are a law of Moses from Sinai [*i. e.*, the original readings], including the emendations of the Scribes. But even if you still insist that the Sopherim did make alterations, the alterations in question neither raise nor lower the points upon which the heretics rest. Consult, also, the work done for Ptolemy the king, and you will see that in the thirteen instances where they made changes, they state the reason why they have made these alterations, and what these alterations are in what they did for him.⁵³ In conclusion, the heretics can have nothing to say in this matter.

burden (עִלִּי) TO THEE," is altered into "so that I am a burden (אֵלִי) TO MYSELF," to remove its offensiveness. xvii. Job xxxii. 3, where the original, "they condemned (אֵלֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים, or אֵלֶיךָ הָאֵל) God or THE DIVINE JUSTICE," is altered into "they condemned (אֵלֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים) Job," for the same reason as the foregoing. And xviii. Lam. iii. 19, where the inspired writer calls on God to remember his sufferings, and then expresses his conviction, "yea thou wilt remember, and THY SOUL WILL MOURN OVER ME (וְנִשְׁחַח נַפְשִׁי עָלַי), this is altered into "and my soul is humbled within me (וְנִשְׁחַח נַפְשִׁי עָלַי), because of the remark that God will mourn. These eighteen *Decrees of the Scribes* are enumerated in the Massorah magna on Numb. i. 1, and on Ps. cvi. 20, and in the Massoretic work *Ochla Ve-Ochlah*, p. 113. The whole question of the *Tikun Sopherim* is most elaborately discussed by Pinsker, in the *Hebrew Annual* called *Kerem Chemed*, vol. ix., pp. 52, etc., Berlin, 1856, and Geiger *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, p. 308, etc., Breslau, 1857.

⁵² The *Mechilta* is a Midrashic exposition of Exodus xii.—xxxv. 3, attributed to R. Ishmael ben Elisha, who flourished in the first century of the Christian era. For a description of the *Mechilta*, as well as for R. Ishmael b. Elisha's rules of interpretation and influence on Biblical exegesis, see Alexander's edition of Kitto's *Cyclopaedia*, s. v. ISHMAEL BEN ELISHA, and MIDRASH. The passage referred to, is to be found in Exod. xv. 7, section vi., p. 47, &c., ed. Weiss, Vienna, 1865.

⁵³ The work for King Ptolemy, referred to in the text, is the Septuagint, in which the translators, according to ancient tradition, designedly made thirteen alterations, in order

cially in the Prophets? Yet we find the Massorah declares "In five passages the *Tav* has been removed by the Scribes," &c. Again "eighteen words are emendations of the Scribes," &c.⁵¹ Now if they had intended to make wilful changes,

⁵¹ The eighteen *Tikun Sopherim* (הִקָּיִן סוֹפְרִים) = *Emendations of the Scribes*, refer to eighteen alterations which the Scribes decreed should be introduced into the text, in order to remove anthropomorphisms and other indelicate expressions. These eighteen emendations (י"ח מִלִּין) are as follows according to the order of the Hebrew Bible:—i. Gen. xviii. 22, where, for the original reading *and Jehovah still stood before Abraham*, is now substituted by the decree of the Scribes = *Tikun Sopherim*, *and Abraham still stood before Jehovah*, because it appeared offensive to say that the Deity stood before Abraham. ii. Numb. xi. 15, where Moses addresses God, "Kill me, I pray thee . . . that I may not see (בִּרְעֶיךָ) THY EVIL," *i. e.*, the punishment wherewith thou visitest Israel, is altered into "that I may not see (בִּרְעֶיךָ) MY EVIL," because it might seem as if evil were ascribed to the Deity. iii. and iv. Numb. xii. 12, where the original reading, "let her not be as one dead, who proceeded from the womb of (אִמִּי) OUR MOTHER, and half of (בְּשָׁרִי) OUR FLESH be consumed," is altered into "let her not be as one dead born, which when it proceeds from the womb of (אִמִּי) ITS MOTHER has half of ITS FLESH (בְּשָׁרִי) consumed;" here are two Sopheric emendations. v. 1 Sam. iii. 13, where the original "for his sons cursed (אֱלֹהִים) God" (as the Sept. still has it Θεοῦ), is altered into "for his sons cursed (לָהֶם) THEMSELVES," because it was too offensive to say that the sons of Eli cursed God, and that Eli knew it and did not reprimand them for it. vi. 2 Sam. xvi. 12, where "will God see (בְּעֵינֵי) WITH HIS EYE," is altered into "will God look (בְּעֵינֵי) AT MY AFFLICTION," because it was too anthropomorphic. vii. 1 Kings xii. 16, where "TO HIS GOD (לְאֱלֹהֵי) O Israel . . . and Israel went (לְאֱלֹהֵי) TO THEIR GOD," is altered into "TO YOUR TENTS (לְאֹהֲלֶיךָ) O Israel . . . and Israel departed (לְאֹהֲלֵי) TO THEIR TENTS," because the separation of Israel from the house of David was regarded as a necessary transition to idolatry; it was looked upon as leaving God and the sanctuary for the worship of idolatry in tents. viii. 2 Chron. x. 16, where the parallel passage is similarly altered, for the same reason. ix. Jer. ii. 11, where "my people have changed (כְּבוֹדִי) MY GLORY for an idol," is altered into "have changed (כְּבוֹדִי) THEIR GLORY into an idol," because it was too offensive to say such a thing. x. Ezek. viii. 17, where "they have put the rod to (אָפִי) MY NOSE," is altered into "they have put the rod to (אָפִי) THEIR NOSE," because of its offensiveness, and to avoid too gross an anthropomorphism. xi. Hos. iv. 7, where "they have changed (כְּבוֹדִי) MY GLORY into shame," is altered into "I will change their glory into shame" (כְּבוֹדָם בִּקְלוֹן אֲמִיר), for the same reason which dictated the ninth alteration. xii. Hab. i. 12, where the address of the prophet to God, "THOU DIEST NOT" (תָּמִיד), is altered into "we shall not die" (נָשׁוּת), because it was deemed improper. xiii. Zech. ii. 12, where "the apple of (עֵינִי) MINE EYE," is altered into "the apple of (עֵינִי) HIS EYE," for the reason which called forth the tenth emendation. xiv. Mal. i. 13, where "ye make (אֲרִי) ME expire," is altered into "ye weary (אֲרִי) ME," because of its being too gross an anthropomorphism. xv. Ps. cvi. 20, where "they have changed (כְּבוֹדִי) MY GLORY into the similitude of an ox," is altered into "they have changed (כְּבוֹדִי) THEIR GLORY into the similitude of an ox," as in Jer. ii. 11 and Hos. iv. 7. xvi. Job. vii. 20, where Job's address to God, "am I a

[37 b],⁵¹ as quoted above, we should have walked about as blind men, and as those who are smitten with blindness, and could not have found any correct Codex, nor any scroll of the Law on which we could rely. Thus we could not have known whether a word has the ו conjunctive or not but for the Massorah, as Tossafoth remarks on this subject in connection with the Levirate law (*Jebamoth*, 106 b), where "Rabbi Abaja says the one who sends a letter of divorce must not pause after the לֹא, *not*, and thus read אֶתְּךָ יִבְמִי, *he wants to perform the duty of levir* [Deut. xxv. 7], since this might convey the idea that he wants to marry her, &c. Now R. Ashai found R. Kahana, who, being perplexed about it, read אֶתְּךָ יִבְמִי with ו conjunctive; where the former said to him, Have you not heard what Rabe said upon

ἐπιθύμημα = חֲמֵד, *a desirable thing*, by changing *Resh* into *Daleth*, in order not to mention the *as* as already stated. xii. Deut. iv. 19, where the sun, moon, and the stars, are said to have been apportioned to the nation as objects of worship, the word להֹאִיר = διακοσμέω, *to shine*, has been inserted, so as to avoid the idolatry of the heathen being ascribed to God. xiii. Deut. xvii. 3, where we have the statement that God had not commanded the Israelites to worship other Gods, in accordance with Deut. iv. 19; it has been altered אשר לא צויתי לעבדם, *which I have forbidden the nations to worship*, to preclude the possibility of ascribing the origin of idolatry to the God of Israel.

It only remains to be added, that these alterations are also enumerated in the *Mechilta*, on Exod. xii. 40, p. 19, &c., ed. Weiss, Vienna, 1865; and in the Babylonian Talmud, *Megilla* 9 a, where, however, the following variations occur. i. The *Mechilta*, which contains the original account, says nothing about these alterations being restricted to thirteen. ii. It erroneously makes alteration ii. to consist in וְנִקְרְבִי, and not in בְּרָא. iii. It restricts alteration vii. to אִשׁ only; and iv. It does not give the reason for alteration x., which is given in the Jerusalem Talmud. The variations in the Babylonian Talmud again, are as follows: i. It gives *fifteen* instead of thirteen alterations, adding the substitution of וְאִשְׁרֵי — וְאִשְׁרֵי, for נְעִירֵי, Exod. xxiv. 5, and for אִצְלִי, *ibid.* xxiv. 11. The substitution of this Greek word in both these passages, shows that I was wrong in my strictures on Jacob b. Chajim's quotation (*vide supra*, p. 53, note 31). ii. It rightly gives בְּרָא, as alteration iii., Gen. i. 2 (v. 2). iii. It states that these alterations were made in the Pentateuch, and by seventy-two elders, which is not mentioned in the other records. Of these thirteen alterations so minutely described in these documents, there are only eight to be found in the present recensions of the Septuagint, viz., Gen. i. 1, ii. 2, xviii. 12, xlix. 6; Exod. iv. 20, xii. 40; Levit. xi. 16 (Deut. xiv. 7); Numb. xvi. 15. Comp. Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, p. 25, &c.; Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, p. 439, &c., Breslau, 1857; Weiss, *Commentary on the Mechilta*, p. 19, &c., Vienna, 1865.

⁵¹ *Vide supra*, p. 48, &c.

ואֱלֹוֹי אֲנָשִׁי כִנְסָה הַגְדֹּלָה שֶׁחֲחִירוֹ Synagogue who restored the crown תורה בכפר תורה, and it is written, "They read in the law of God," &c. [Nehem. viii. 8], see *Nedarim*

to remove certain offensive expressions, and to prevent misunderstanding the text. They are as follows according to the order of *Jerusalem Talmud*, to which Jacob Ibn Adonijah evidently refers.—i. Gen. i. 1-3, according to the structure of the language, and the most ancient traditions still preserved by Rashi and Ibn Ezra, is to be rendered "In the beginning when God created heaven and earth [*i. e.*, the universe, comp. ii. 1, 4], and the earth was still desolate and void, and darkness was upon the face of the earth, and the spirit of God hovered upon the face of the earth, then God said let there be light," &c. But as this presupposes the existence of primordial waters, and of a chaotic mass, which by the draining of the waters on the second day became the formed earth, it was thought necessary in translating the Bible into Greek, and in opposition to the Greek cosmogony and polytheism, to lay great stress on the absolute unity of God, and on the absolute creation from nothing. Hence the word בְּרֵאשִׁית, had to be made independent of the following verses, and to be rendered *in the beginning* ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός, instead of *in the beginning* WHEN. This change the Talmud indicates by the pregnant construction אֱלֹהִים בְּרֵאשִׁית בְּרֵאשִׁית, thus placing בְּרֵאשִׁית last, and precluding every other translation than *God created in the beginning*. (Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 344, &c.). ii. Gen. i. 26, where "let us make man in our image, after our likeness," has been altered into "I will make man in the image, and in the likeness," to remove the appearance of polytheism. iii. Gen. ii. 2, where "and he ended on the seventh (הַשְּׁבִיעִי) day," has been changed into (הַשְּׁשִׁי) the sixth day, to avoid the apparent contradiction, since God did not work on the seventh day. iv. Gen. v. 2 (i. 27), where "male and female created he them" (בְּרָא אֶת־הָאָדָם בְּרָא), has been altered into created he *him* (בְּרָא), to remove the apparent contradiction in the passage where the man and woman are spoken of as having been created together, or simultaneously, and ii. 21-23, where the woman is described as having been made out of the man; as well as to introduce into the version the notion which obtained among the Jews, that man was created an hermaphrodite, thus showing the Greeks, that the Hebrew, like their philosopher, believed man to have been originally androgynous (comp. *Midrash Rabba*, on Gen. i. 26, section viii., p. 10 a, ed. Stettin, 1863, with Plato, *Symposium*, p. 84, &c., ed. Engelmann). v. Gen. xi. 7, "let us go down, and let us confound" (נִרְדָּה וְנִבְלָה), has been changed into "I will go down, and I will confound" (אֲרִידָה וְאִבְלָה), to remove the apparent polytheism. vi. Gen. xviii. 12, "after my decay, I had again pleasure," has been altered into *after it had been thus with me hitherto*, to avoid the offensive application to the distinguished mother of Israel of the expression בָּלָה, which is used for rotten old garments (comp. Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 415, &c.). vii. Gen. xlix. 6, "in their anger they slew a man, and in their self-will they hamstrung an ox," has been altered into "in their anger they slew an ox (שׁוֹר), and in their self-will they hamstrung a fatted bull (אֶבְיָה), to do away with the wholesale slaughter of men. viii. Exod. iv. 20, חֲמֹר, *ass*, is altered into βεῖα, *beasts of burden*, because of the reluctance which the translator had to mention the name of this beast. ix. In Exod. xii. 40, and all other lands, *i. e.*, "the land of Canaan" has been added, in order to remove the apparent contradiction, since the Israelites did not sojourn four hundred and thirty years in Egypt. x. In Levit. xi. 6, and Deut. xiv. 7, אֲרֵנָה = λαγός, *a hare*, has been altered into χοιρογροῦλλος, *porcupine*, or *hedgehog*, to avoid giving offence to the Ptolemy family, whose name was *Lagos*. xi. In Numb. xvi. 15, חֲמֹר, *ass*, has been altered into

the passage, "and it came to pass, when all the kings heard" [where-with the verse in Joshua ix. 1 begins]. From this you can see the beautiful and laconic style of the Massorites, for thereby they make known to us how the passage is to be read and written. If it had not been for the Massorites, how could we tell, when we find it written, *the Hittites, AND the Amorites, AND the Canaanites, AND the Perizzites*, whether the order is right or wrong?⁵⁶ The same is the case with *plene* and *defective*, since with us the *Keri* and *Kethiv* are of paramount importance, although there is a dispute as to which of them should be made the basis [in expounding the text]; e. g., in *Pessachim*, 16 b, where the question is about the word **יאכל**

⁵⁶ To understand the remark in the text, it is necessary to add to what we have already said upon this subject (*vide supra*, p. 30, &c.), that Ibn Adonijah alludes to those six verses out of the twenty, containing the names of the Canaanitish nations, which are divisible into two groups, of three verses each (ב' ווגין מן ג'), and which with the other fourteen form one rubric. They are as follows:—

Exod. iii. 8	הכנעני והחתי והאמרי והפריז והחוי והיבוס
Exod. iii. 17	הכנעני והחתי והאמרי והפריז והחוי והיבוס
Judges iii. 5	הכנעני החתי והאמרי והפריז והחוי והיבוס
Deut. xx. 17	החתי והאמרי הכנעני והפריז החוי והיבוס
Joshua ix. 1	החתי והאמרי הכנעני הפריז החוי והיבוס
Joshua xii. 8	החתי האמרי הכנעני הפריז החוי והיבוס

These are the only six instances out of the twenty passages which follow in definite order; of the other fourteen, there are not only some which do not give all the names, but each has an arbitrary sequence in the enumeration. They are as follows:—

Exod. xiii. 5	הכנעני והחתי והאמרי והחוי והיבוס
Exod. xxiii. 23	האמרי והחתי והפריז והכנעני החוי והיבוס
Exod. xxiii. 28	את החוי את הכנעני ואת החתי
Exod. xxxiii. 2	את הכנעני האמרי והחתי והפריז החוי והיבוס
Exod. xxxiv. 11	את האמרי והכנעני והחתי והפריז החוי והיבוס
Numb. xiii. 29	והחתי והיבוס והאמרי . . . והכנעני
Deut. vii. 1	החתי והגרנשי והאמרי והכנעני והפריז והחוי והיבוס
Josh. iii. 10	את הכנעני ואת החתי ואת החוי ואת הפריז ואת הגרנשי והאמרי והיבוס
Josh. xi. 3	הכנעני והאמרי והחתי והפריז והיבוס והחוי
Josh. xxiv. 11	האמרי והפריז והכנעני והחתי והגרנשי החוי והיבוס
1 Kings ix. 20	האמרי החתי הפריז החוי והיבוס
Ezra ix. 1	לכנעני החוי הפריז היבוס והאמרי
Nehem. ix. 8	הכנעני החתי האמרי והפריז והיבוס והגרנשי
2 Chron. viii. 7	החתי והאמרי והפריז והחוי והיבוס

It will be seen that even in those instances where the order is the same, the use of the *Vav* conjunctive is so arbitrary, that were it not for the Massorah, which most minutely marks both its presence and absence; it would be very difficult to ascertain the correct orthography.

this subject? R. Kahana answered him, In this case Rabe himself yields."⁵⁵ Thus far.

Tossafoth remarks thereupon, and this is its language, "In the correct Codices it is **לא** without the *Vav*, and this is also evident from the Massorah [which says], **לא** occurs three times, in conjunction with **אָכָה**, viz., Deut. x. 10, xxv. 7, and Ps. lxxxi. 12; and in two other passages it commences the verse, and is with *Vav* conjunctive, viz., Deut. xi. 30. and xxiii. 6." It also occurs in two other passages of the same kind, not mentioned in the Massorah, viz., 1 Sam. xxxi. 4, and Judges xi. 17." Thus far the language of Tossafoth. You can see now that if it had not been for the Massorah we should not have known whether to read **לא**, **לָא**, or **לֹא**, and not [in Deut. xxv. 7]. But finding in the Massorah that **לא** occurs three times, and that the passage in question is counted among them, it is evident that the reading was not **לָא**, and not, with *Vav*. Indeed innumerable examples might be adduced which are like it. Again, when the Massorah enumerates a certain word which is in so many instances preceded by **לא**, but in none of them by **לָא**, saying that this construction occurs so many times, we know positively that in all other places it is **לָא**. Thus, for instance, it tells us that in fourteen verses occur **לא**, **לָא**, and **לֹא**, and *vice versa*; and so all the rest. The same is also the case with **וָאֵת** and **וְאֵת**, in Numb. xxxi. 22, upon which the Massorites remark: "And the sign is, *the gold belongs to the king*," and the meaning is, that this passage ought to be so, for there are two passages which take this ו before the second and the last nouns, whilst the remaining ones have no copulative, viz., the passages before us, and Joshua ix. 1. Now the meaning of this [Massoretic sign] is that *the gold*, which indicates the passage beginning with *but the gold* [Numb. xxxi. 22], is similar in construction, and belongs to *the king*, which indicates

לִיה לא כבר ליה מר להא דרבא, אמר ליה מידה רבא בלא אבה יבמי,⁵⁵ עד כאן:

וכתבו ההוכחה וזה לשונם, **לא** אבה כתוב בכפדים מרזיקים, וכן מוכח במסכת **לא** אבה ג' דכמיכי, **לא** אבה יי השחיתך, **לא** אבה יבמי, וישראל **לא** אבה לך, ויש שנים ריש פרשה במשנה תורה ולא אבה כיהון, ולא אבה יי לשמוע אל בלעם, ויש פסוק דלא שייכי לאותו מסורת ולא אבה נושא כליו דשאל, וגם אל מלך מואב שלח ולא אבה דיפתח, עד כאן לשון ההוכחה; הנך רואה בעיניך שאלולי המסורת היינו מכופקים אי הוה קרינן **לא** אבה או ולא אבה, ומקראותיהן דבמסורת אמר דאינון ג' **לא** אבה, ומני דין חר מנהון, ידעינן בבירור דלא קרינן ולא אבה, ודכוותיה מובא לאין מספר; ותו במסרה מני לא ומלה אחרא וליה חר מנהון ולא, ואמר אינון כך וכך, בבירור ידעינן דשאר כתבין וקריין ולא, וכן המשל ארבע עשרה פסוקים איח בהון **לא** לא ולא או ההפך וכן כולם, וכן את את ואת ואת, כהא דאמרינן אך את הוהב ואת הכרף את הנחשת את הברזל את הברזל ואת העופרת, כתב עליו בעל המסורת וסימניך דהבא למליכא, ופירש בי כך דינו, ואינון שני פסוקים דנכסבין הלן ווי"ן חנינא ואת וכתרא ואת ושאר את דין ופסוק ויהי כשמוע' כל המלכים ריהושע החתי והאמרי הכנעני חבריו החוי והיבוס,

⁵⁵ The allusion to Rabe arises from the circumstance that he laid no weight on a pause. Compare *Jebamoth*, 106, b.

time, His mind was appeased : God again wanted to reduce the world to void and emptiness, because of the people of Zedekiah's time, but when He looked upon Zedekiah, His mind was appeased" [*Erachin*, 17 a].⁵⁹ Again we read in the Massorah, "וַיִּבְדֵּל", and he separated, occurs three times, viz., Gen. i. 4, 7; 1 Chron. xxv. 1."⁶⁰ Now it is said in the Talmud, "Whoso [in the *Havdalah*]⁶¹ mentions the separations [of God] must not mention less than three, nor more than seven. [Query.] To say not more than seven is right, because seven separations are instanced, and there are no more; but why should there be not less than three? [Reply]. Because וַיִּבְדֵּל occurs three times; and as the first separation was between the Sabbath and the week days, therefore must the three separations be mentioned at the close of the Sabbath, viz., "between holy and profane," "between light and darkness," and "between Israel and the Gentiles;"⁶² the fourth separation which is mentioned on this occasion, viz., "between the seventh day and

⁵⁹ The Massoretic enumeration of these three passages suggests an explanation of the passage in the Talmud, where Jer. xxvi. 1 and xxviii. 1, are connected with Gen. i. 1, shewing that God wished, in those cases where **בראשית** is used, to destroy the work of the first **בראשית**. May not this striking illustration also suggest the design of the Massorah in its first origin?

⁶⁰ The *editio princeps* differs from the succeeding editions in the quotations. Thus, for instance, the first, second, and third editions of Jacob. b. Chajim's Bible indicate the reference to Genesis i. 7, by quoting simply וַיְבָרֵךְ בֵּן הַמַּיִם, whereas the later editions add אֲשֶׁר מִמָּחַת לְרִקֵּעַ; whilst the third reference in the *editio princeps* is to וַיְבָרֵךְ אֶהָרָן קֹדֶשׁ קֹדֶשׁ, which does not occur in the Hebrew Scriptures, and has therefore rightly been altered in the second, third, and the other editions into וַיְבָרֵךְ דָּוִד וְשֵׁרֵי הַצִּבְּיָא בְּרָח' כ"ח.

⁶¹ *Hardalah* הדברלה is the name of the prayer which the Jews to this day offer on Sabbath evening, at the going out of the Sabbath and coming in of the week day. The last benediction in this prayer, in which occur the passages referred to in the Talmud, is as follows: ברוך אתה יי אלהינו מלך העולם המבורך בין קדש לחול בין אור לחושך בין ישראל לעמים ברוך אתה יי המבדיל בין קדש לחול *Blessed be the Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast made a distinction between the holy and the common, between light and darkness, between Israel and the other nations, between the seventh day and the other six days of work; blessed be thou, O God, who hast made a distinction between the holy and the common!*

⁶² This is the reading of the *editio princeps*, as well as of the second and third editions, of the Rabbinic Bibles; later editions have substituted לעמים for לגוים, because of the fear of Christians, who took it to refer to themselves.

[Exod. xii. 46];⁵⁷ and the similar case in connection with the feast of tabernacles, where we have **בִּסְכַּת בִּסְכַּת** [Succa, 6 b];⁵⁸ and many other examples might be adduced on this subject (*vide* Tossafoth on *Succa*). This also obtains by the marginal readings which are not in the text, the *Kametz* and *Pattach*, and other things of a similar kind, which alter the sense, and of which there are numerous examples. Again, also, in the point of the numbers of passages which the Massorah gives, saying, "There are three or four more," &c.; from all this we learn many different laws and explanations. Thus, for instance, when it is said in the Massorah on the word **בְּרֵאשִׁית**, in the beginning, that it begins the verse three times, viz., Gen. i. 1; Jerem. xxvi. 1, xxviii. 1; it throws light upon what is said in the Talmud, where it is declared "God wanted to reduce the world again to void and emptiness, because of the wicked Jehojakim, but when He looked upon the people of his

⁶⁷ As the *Kethiv* is *אֵכְלָהּ* passive, and the *Keri* *אֵכֶלָהּ* active, two inferences are deduced therefrom in the Talmud. R. Jehudah maintains that the man who partakes of the passover, HE must eat it (*אֵכֶלָהּ*) in one place (*בבית אחד*), but that the passover itself may be divided, and a part of it may be eaten by another company in another place; basing his argument upon *the Keri אֵכֶלָהּ he must eat it at one place*. Whereas R. Shimon maintains that the passover itself IT must be eaten (*אֵכְלָהּ*) in one place (*בבית אחד*), and cannot be divided between two different companies in different places, though the man himself, after having eaten his passover at home, may go to another place and partake of another company's passover; basing his argument upon *the Kethiv אֵכְלָהּ it must be eaten in one place*.

⁵⁸ The word *בסכור* occurs three times in the Pentateuch (twice in Lev. xxiii. 42, and once in ver. 43); in two cases (Lev. xxiii. 42) it is defective, *i. e.*, without the *ו*, and in the third instance it is plene, *i. e.*, with the *ו*. Now, upon the saying of the Rabbins that a tabernacle must have two whole walls, and the third may be a partial one, to be a legal tabernacle, R. Simeon remarks that it must have *three* entire walls, and that the fourth may be a partial one, to constitute it a tabernacle according to the law. This difference of opinion the Talmud explains by saying that the sages follow the spelling *בסכור בסכור בסכור*, which makes *four* (since two are in the singular and one in the plural); one of these four represents the commandment itself, shewing that we must have a *סכך*, and the remaining three indicate the three walls, one of which is allowed by the Halacha to be partial. Whereas R. Simeon follows the pronunciation, which is alike plural in all the three instances, and hence obtains *six*. He then takes one of these three (*i. e.*, of the plurals) to indicate the commandment respecting the feast itself, and the remaining two plurals, being four in number, he refers to the four walls of the *סכך*, one of which may, according to the Halacha, be partial.

Theological Decisions of Maharam,⁶⁶ where the latter defines what is meant by the word הַכּוֹנֵן, *he smote me*, which the Massorah says occurs twice, viz., Song of Songs v. 7, Proverbs xxiii. 35 (by a comparison of these two passages), *vide in loco*. In fact, there can be no doubt that whenever the Massorites state an expression occurs 7 or 4 or 10 or 8 times, they are designed for some great purpose, and are not useless. All this shews the great sanctity of our holy law, and that the parallels are marked with a design. Moreover, when the Massorah makes the remark in Chaldee, there is a reason for it, which will be found upon examination. For this reason I have collected all that I could find of their remarks in the Massoretic books which I possess, collated it, and put it in these twenty-four sacred books, arranging everything in its proper place, and I have repeated it again in the Massorah finalis, so that it can easily be found. Were I inclined to write more largely upon this subject, and to show the use of all the Massorah, and support it by proofs, it would occupy too much space, and the perusal of it would be a weariness to the flesh.

When I saw the great benefit which is to be derived from the Massorah magna, the Massorah parva, and the Massorah finalis, I apprised Seignior Daniel Bomberg of it, may his Rock and Redeemer protect him! and shewed him the advantage of the Massorah. Where-

Mordecai has been printed with the *Sepher Ha-Halachoth*, Constantinople, 1509; Venice, 1521-22; Sabionetta, 1524, &c. It has also appeared separately, Venice, 1558; Cracow, 1598, &c. Compare Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, ii., 324, &c.; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, 1659, &c. The work derives its appellation from the author, whose name was Mordecai b. Hillel, and who was martyred at Nürnberg, 1310.

⁶⁶ *Maharam*, is the acrostic of מורנו הרב מאיר, *our teacher the Rabbi Meier*. This R. Meier b. Baruch, who was born 1230, and died 1293, was one of the most distinguished Jewish literati during the middle ages, and the first official chief Rabbi in the German empire, to which dignity he was nominated by the Emperor Rodolph I., of Hapsburg. He had his seat and college at Rottenburg-an-der-Tauber, whence he is also called Meier of Rottenburg, or Meier Rottenburg. His *Theological Decisions, or Questions and Answers* (שאלות ותשובות), have been published at Cremona, 1557; Prague, 1603. He also wrote *Commentaries on the Massorah* (באורי מסרת), which are still in MS. in the public libraries. Compare Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, iii., 176, &c.; Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vol. vii., p. 183, &c.; Leipzig, 1863.

the six days of creation," is included in "between holy and profane," and is simply repeated in order to make it agree in sense with the concluding benediction⁶³ [*Pessachim*, 103 b, 104 a]. Again we read in the Massorah, פְּתִיחָה, *opened*, occurs four times, and the passages are Numb. xix. 15, Job xxix. 19, Psalm v. 10, and Jerem. v. 16; and these four correspond to the four laws which obtain with regard to an earthen vessel, viz., when it has a hole through which the water runs into it, the law is that it must not be used for consecrating therein the water of sin-offering, thus answering to "and every open vessel" [Numb. xix. 15]; yet it is still a vessel with respect to the growing of plants. But if the hole is so large that a small root can be put through it, then it is clean for growing therein plants, for when a plant grows in a vessel which has a hole, it is no longer subject to defilement, thus answering to "my root is opened" [Job xxix. 19]; yet it is still a vessel with respect to olives. If the hole, however, is so large that an olive can pass through it, then it is clean [or not subject to defilement], thus answering to "an open sepulchre is their throat" [Ps. v. 10], for what amounts to eating is the size of an olive; yet it is still a vessel with respect to pomegranates. But if the hole is so large that a pomegranate can pass through it, then it is no longer subject to any defilement, and thus answers to "his heap is as an open sepulchre" [Jerem. v. 16]; that is to say, when the vessel has a hole through which a pomegranate can pass, it is like a heap of rubbish, for it is no longer regarded as a vessel.⁶⁴ Many of the Massoretic signs are used for such explanations in innumerable cases; some of them are dispersed through the book *Mordecai*,⁶⁵ and in the

⁶³ *חתימה* is the reading of the first, second, and third editions of the Rabbinic Bibles, in accordance with the Talmud (*Pessachim*, 103 a), whence it is quoted. Later editions have erroneously *פתיחה*.

⁶⁴ Things in a vessel are, according to the Talmud, subject to defilement. If the vessel, however, happens to have a hole, then it all depends upon the size of this hole, the definition of which is the subject of discussion. Compare Maimonides, *Iad Ha-Chesaka, Hilchoth Kelim*, section xiv., vol. iii., p. 350; ed. Amsterdam, 1702.

⁶⁵ *Mordecai*, also called *המדרכי ספר*, *the Book of Mordecai*, is a treatise on the Legal Code (ספר ההלכות), embodying all the laws of the Talmud, which was compiled, revised, corrected, annotated, and supplemented by Isaac Alphasi. This *Sepher*

then *the fifth* verse, "the word **וַיִּשְׁלַח** occurs fifteen times,"⁶⁹ without any order or plan. Moreover, most of these [Massoretic remarks] are written in a contracted form and with ornaments, so much so that they cannot at all be deciphered, as the desire of the writer was only to embellish his writing, and not to examine or to understand the sense. Thus, for instance, in most of the copies there are four lines [of the Massorah] on the top of the page, and five at the bottom, as the writer would under no circumstances diminish or increase the number. Hence, whenever there happened to be any of the alphabetical lists,⁷⁰ or if the Massoretic remarks were lengthy, he split them up in the middle, or at the beginning, and largely introduced abbreviations, so as to obtain even lines. Now, when I observed all this confusion, I bestirred myself in the first place to arrange all the Massoretic notes according to the verses to which they belonged, and then to investigate the Massoretic treatises in my possession, apart from what is written in the margin of the Bibles. Whenever an omission or contraction occurred [in those copies of the Bible which had the Massorah] in order to obtain even lines, or four lines [of Massorah] at the top [of a page in the Bible] and five at the bottom, I at once consulted the Massoretic treatises, and corrected it according to order. And whenever I found that the Massoretic treatises differed from each other, I put down the opinions of both sides, as will be found in the margin of our edition of the Bible published by us, with the Massorah,⁷¹ the word in dispute being marked to indicate that it is not the lan-

⁶⁹ The instances in which **וַיִּשְׁלַח** occurs, are as follows: Gen. xxi. 16 (twice); xxxi. 34; xxxviii. 11, 14; xlix. 24: Josh. vi. 25: 1 Sam. i. 23: 2 Sam. xiii. 20: 1 Kings ii. 19: Ruth ii. 23, 14. They are enumerated in the Massorah marginalis, on Gen. xxxviii. 11, and on 2 Sam. xiii. 20, where it is distinctly stated that there are only twelve instances; and indeed there are no more to be found in the Hebrew Scriptures. The statement, therefore, in the text, that there are *fifteen* such instances, which is to be found in all the editions of Jacob b. Chajim's Introduction, must be a slip of the pen.

⁷⁰ By Alphabetic Massorah is meant, a certain number of exceptions, or peculiar forms of words, which come under the same rubric, and are arranged and enumerated in alphabetical order.

⁷¹ Hence the Massorah thus put in the margin obtained the name *Massorah marginalis*.

upon he did all in his power to send into all the countries in order to search what may be found of the Massorah; and, praised be the Lord, we obtained as many of the Massoretic books as could possibly be got. The said gentleman was not backward, and his hand was not closed, nor did he draw back his right hand from producing gold out of his purse to defray the expenses of the books, and of the messengers who were engaged to make search for them in the most remote corners, and in every place where they might possibly be found.

And when I examined these Massoretic books, and mastered their contents, I found them in the utmost disorder and confusion, so much so that there was not a sentence to be found without a blunder, that is to say, the quotations from the Massorites are both incorrect and misplaced; since in those copies [of the Bible] in which the Massorah is written in the margin, it is not arranged according to the order of the verses contained in the page. Thus, for instance, if a page has five or six verses, the first of which begins with **וַיִּגַּד**, and he said, the second with **וַיִּגַּד**, and it was told, the third with **וַיִּשְׁלַח**, and this, the fourth with **וַיִּשְׁלַח**, and he sent, the fifth with **וַיִּשְׁבַּח**, and she sat, the Massorah begins with **וַיִּשְׁלַח**, the fourth verse, "the word **וַיִּשְׁלַח** occurs twenty-two times;"⁶⁷ then follows verse two, "the word **וַיִּגַּד** occurs twenty-four times;"⁶⁸ and

⁶⁷ The instances in which **וַיִּשְׁלַח** is the *Piel*, future, with *Vav* conversive, are the following: Gen. viii. 7, 8, 12; xix. 29; xlv. 24: Exod. xviii. 27: Numb. xxii. 40: Josh. xxiv. 28: Judges ii. 6; iii. 18; xv. 5: 1 Sam. x. 25; xi. 7; xxx. 26: 2 Sam. iii. 21; xviii. 2: 2 Kings v. 24; xvii. 25, 26; xxiv. 2: Psalm cvi. 15. In the Massorah marginalis on Gen. viii. 7, where the instances are enumerated, twenty-one only are given, and there are no more to be found in the Bible, though the Massorah, like Ibn Adonijah, states that there are twenty-two, unless we include in this rubric **וַיִּשְׁלַח** (Exod. vi. 11), with *Vav* conjunctive. It is moreover to be added, that there is evidently a misprint in the Massorah, where we have **וַיִּשְׁלַח לֹחֵם**, a second time instead of **וַיִּשְׁלַח אֶת דְּוִינָה** (Gen. viii. 12).

⁶⁸ The twenty-four instances in which **וַיִּגַּד**, *Hophal*, future, with *Vav* conversive, are as follows: Gen. xxii. 20; xxvii. 42; xxxi. 22; xxxviii. 13, 24: Exod. xiv. 5: Josh. x. 17: Judges ix. 25, 47: 1 Sam. xv. 12; xix. 19; xxiii. 7; xxvii. 4: 2 Sam. vi. 12; x. 17: 1 Chron. xix. 17: 2 Sam. xix. 2; xxi. 11: 1 Kings i. 51; ii. 29, 41: 2 Kings vi. 13; viii. 7: Isaiah vii. 2. They are enumerated in the Massorah finalis, under the letter *He*, p. 22 b, col. 4.

verse, whether verb or noun, you will easily find the required passage under the root of the verb or noun. The advantage to be derived from this book is indescribable; without it there is no way of examining the references of the Massorah, since one who studies the Massorah must look into the verse which the Massorah quotes, and which without a concordance would take a very long time to find, as you might not know in which prophet the passage referred to occurs, and if you knew the prophet, you might still not know the chapter and verse. Besides, all the world is not so learned in the Scriptures. Whosoever has this concordance does not require any more the lexicon of Kimchi, for it contains all the roots, whereunto is added an index of all the verses in the Bible: none of them is wanted. In conclusion, without it I could not have done the work which I have done.

Seeing that the Massorah was too large to be printed entire in the margin, I have not repeated the Massoretic remark after it has been given once. Thus, for instance, *וישלח*, and *he sent*, occurs twenty-two times: I enumerated the passages in the remark on the words *וישלח* [Gen. viii. 8], and when I afterwards came again to the word *וישלח*, in another place, I did not repeat all these references, having given them once before, but simply said the Massoretic remark will be found in section Noah.⁷³ As the prophetic books are large, every prophet having on an average twenty-five chapters, my labour would have been in vain if I had simply said the word is found in such and such a prophet, since the reference could not be found without great exertion, and the student would soon have grown weary and left it off altogether. I have therefore adopted the division of the chapters which R. Isaac Nathan made, and said it occurs in such and such a prophet,

⁷³ *נח* is the title of one of the Sabbatic lessons, comprising Gen. vi. 9–xi. 33; *vide supra*, p. 8, § xiv., note 12.

in the Massorah; and whenever I took exception to the statement of a certain Codex of the Massorah, because its remark did not harmonise with the majority of the copies of the Massorah, whilst the same difficulty was not found in the others, or whenever it contradicted itself, or where there was a mistake, I made a careful search till I discovered the truth, according to my humble knowledge; but sometimes I had to leave it in uncertainty, and for this reason there will be found many such in the margin of the Bible which we printed. The Lord alone knows how much labour I bestowed thereon, as those will testify who saw me working at it. As to the revision of the verses, it would have been impossible for me to do it correctly without knowing the whole Scriptures by heart, and this is far from me. But for a certain book called *Concordance*, the author of which is the learned R. Isaac Nathan,⁷² who lived some forty years ago, published in our printing-office at Venice, I could not have corrected the verses. This is a precious work; it embraces all the points of the Holy Bible, and explains all the sacred Scriptures, by stating all nouns and verbs with their analogous forms, and giving at the heading of every noun and verb an explanation, saying the meaning of the word is so and so, and branches out in such and such a manner, and comments upon each one separately. It also marks the division of each chapter, and the number of chapters in every prophetic book, and tells in which chapter and verse every word occurs, *i. e.*, verse 4, 20, or 30, thereby any word wanted may easily be found. And if a verse has four or five verbs or nouns, *e. g.*, *וּבְצֵל יְדֵי כְפִיתִיךָ*, in the shadow of mine hand [Isa. li. 16], you will find it quoted under *צֵל*, shadow; under *יָד*, hand; and under *כָּפַף*, to cover; so that if you only remember one word in the

⁷² For R. Isaac Nathan, see Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, s. v.

part it is printed in such and such a prophet, and with what sign. I have also been obliged to repeat and state in the Massorah finalis many of the Massoretic remarks which the former editors have omitted in sundry places, because the page happened to be just as large as was required for printing the other matter. You therefore find it many a time stated in the margin of the Bible [*i. e.*, Massorah marginalis], the Massorah on this passage is in the Massorah finalis. Wherever, also, the Massoretic remarks belonging to a certain page were so numerous as to render it impossible to give them in their proper place, which was too narrow, or wherever there were the alphabetical remarks of the Massorah magna which belonged to the same page, I always noted in the margin, "*This is one of such and such an alphabet, and is noted in the Massorah finalis under such and such a letter,*" so that the student may easily find it. And you must not be astonished to find in the Massorah such language as, "It is noted in *second* or *first* Samuel, or *second* Kings, or *second* Chronicles," or to see Ezra and Nehemiah separated; for the author of the Concordance, who divided the law, prophets, and hagiographa into chapters, also divided Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles respectively into two books, and denominated Ezra the first ten chapters of the book, and the rest of the book he called Nehemiah; and as I have adopted the division of the Concordance, I thought it advisable to append to the end of this introduction a list of all the chapters, with the words with which they begin, and of their number in each book; so that if there crept in any mistakes in printing, they may easily be rectified by this list, printed at the end of the Introduction. We have printed in this Bible the number of every chapter, in order that the student may easily find the passage when the Massorah says, "*It is noted in such a chapter.*"

Behold, I have exerted all my might and strength to collate and

מקום נרפס בנביא פלוני, בסימן פלוני, וכן בהרבה מקומות השמיטו המדפיסים הרבה מהסימנים לסיבת שאירע להם להיות העמוד ארוך כדרך שיאירע למלאכה הדפוס, הוצרכתי לחזור ולחברם במסרה גדולה, ולכן ימצא הרבה פעמים כתוב סביבות העמוד, נמסר במסרה רבא: וכן בסימנים הגדולים מל' וכו' שהיו שייכים לאותו עמוד שלא היה באפשר להדפיסם במקומם, יען היותם ארוכים וחצמוד היה קטון מהכיל כל הסימן, וכן באלפא ב'תות המסרה רבא, שהיו שייכים בעמוד, כתבתי סביב העמוד במסרה זה, הוא חד מן א'ב פלוני, ונמסר במסרה רבא במערכת אות פלוני, לכל ישיג שום מורח למעיין לבקש; ואין להמיה כשימצא כתוב במסרה נמסר בשמואל ב', או חלק ב', או א', וכן במלכים ב', וכן ב'ר' ב', ובעזרא ג'כ בנחמיה; וזה כי מניח חלוקת פרשיות הרורה והנביאים והכתובים הכרוז בקונקורדנסיה חלק שמואל לב' חלקים, וכן מלכים וד' ויעזרא, עד דברי נחמיה בן חכליה משם ואילך קרא שמו נחמיה: ולזה מאחר שנשתמשנו בחלוקות וסימנים מחבר הקונקורדנסיה, אמרתי לכתוב אחר הקדמתי זאת כל החלוקות והסימנים הללו, שאם בהדפסה נשמט איזה סימן בשגגה, כבר יוכל לחקן מאחר שהם נרפסים אחר הקדמתי זאת, ובכ' זה בכל חלוקה וחלוקה הדפסנו הסימן ששייך, למען ירוץ קורא בו, למצוא מבוקש, כשאומר במסורת נמסר בסימן פלוני:

הנה לא נמנע ממני בכל מאורי וכחי

and in such and such a verse. Had I at that time the Massoretic division of the chapters on the whole Bible I would have preferred it, but I did not get it till I had almost finished the work. I have, nevertheless, published it separately, so that it may not be lost to Israel.

To make the Massorah perfect, I was obliged to rearrange the Massorah magna, for it was impossible to print it in the margin of the Bible, for it is too large; I have therein adopted the alphabetical order of the *Aruch*, to facilitate the reader. Moreover, all that we have printed of the Massorah magna in the margin of the Bible, I have also repeated a second time in the Massorah finalis, which I arranged alphabetically according to the example of the *Aruch*, but did not give it again entire; I have only repeated the beginning of the remarks. Thus, for instance, I said "the word ויטב occurs fifteen times, as you will find in such and such a prophet and passage;" the same is the case with other observations which I have omitted, and this I have done designedly. Let an illustration suffice. If the student will examine a page of a prophetic or any other book of the Bible, he will find that it has generally ten or eleven verses; that there is not a verse which is without a Massoretic remark on a word or more, and that the Massorah parva notes every word upon which there is any Massorah, and says it occurs four, thirteen, or fifteen times; and that it was impossible to print the whole Massorah which belongs to that page; hence, when there are ten words on it which belongs to the Massorah, I only give four or five at most [in the Massorah marginalis], as the space of the page does not admit of more. Now the student, not knowing whether it is given in another place, or where to look for it, might think that this Bible has not all the Massorah which belongs to it. I have therefore been obliged to indicate in the root of the word in the Massorah magna, in what

וכתבתי נמסר בנביא פלוני, בסימן פלוני, למען ירוץ קורא בו, ואלו הייתי מוצא חלוקת הפרשיות שחלקו בעלי המסרה בכל המקרא, הייתי יותר הפין להשתמש ממנה מוולחה, ואחר כך הניעה לידי לאחר שכבר כמעט השלמתי, אמרתי להדפיסה גם היא, לכל חשתכה ותאבד מישראל:

וכדי שיהיה המסורת שלם, הוצרכתי לחקן ולחבר אחר כך המסורת הגדולה, שאין באפשרות להדפיסה סביב כדרך העורך משם, בכמותה הרבה, וכדרכיה כדרך העורך משם, למען ירוץ קורא בה: וכן כל מה שהדפסנו מהמסרה סביב העשרים וארבע דהיינו מהמסרה האמצעית, לא הגדולה הזוית והברתי אותה עם המסרה הגדולה שכדרכי כמו העורך, ולא חשתי לחבוי כי אם ראשי פרקים, כגון ויטב מ' נמסר בנביא פלוני בסימן פלוני, וכן כל מה שנשמט וזה לסבה; המשל אם המעיין יעיין בנביא או זולתו, באותו העמוד יש י' או י"א פסוקים, בכל פסוק לא ימנע שלא תהיה בו חיבה ששייך בה מסורת, והמסרה קטנה היא בכל חיבה ששייך בה מסורת, ואומרת ד' או ל', או מ', וזה לא היה באפשר לכתוב המסורת כולו שהיה שייך לאותו דף, שאם היו שייכים י' חיבות למסורת, הבאתי מהם ד' או ה' על הרוב, לרוח רוחב העמוד, והמעין לא ידע אם הם במקום אחד כבר נרפס, ובאיזה מקום הם כדי לבקשם במקומם, ויחשוב בלבו שאין כעשרים וארבע זה כל המסורת ששייך בו, לכן הוצרכתי לציין בשרש החיבה ההיא במסרה רבא, באיזה

INDEX I.

PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE REFERRED TO.

GENESIS.			Chap.	Ver.	Page.	Chap.	Ver.	Page.	Chap.	Ver.	Page.
Chap.	Ver.	Page.	Chap.	Ver.	Page.	Chap.	Ver.	Page.	Chap.	Ver.	Page.
i.	1	71, 74, 75	xliii.	28	65	xxvii.	15	63			
..	1-3	70	xliv.	24	78	..	27	62			
..	2	71	xlix.	6	70, 71						
..	4	75	..	24	79						
..	7	75									
..	26	70	Exodus.								
..	27	70	iii.	5	73						
ii.	2	70, 71	..	8	73						
..	21-23	70	..	17	73						
..	22	70	iv.	19	53						
v.	2	71	..	20	70, 71						
vi.	7	70	..	11	78						
..	9	81	xii.-xxxv.	3	69						
viii.	7	78	..	40	70, 71						
..	8	78, 81	..	46	73, 74						
..	12	78	xiii.	5	30, 73						
xi.	7	70	..	16	61, 62						
..	33	81	xiv.	5	78						
xii.	1	45	xv.	7	69						
xiv.	2	45, 54	xviii.	27	78						
..	8	45	xix.	22	53						
xvii.	19	16	xxiii.	13	67						
..	27	45	..	19	15						
xviii.	5	49, 67	..	23	73						
..	12	70, 71	..	28	73						
..	22	68	xxiv.	5	53, 71						
xix.	29	78	..	11	53, 71						
xx.	5	54	xxvii.	11	64						
xxi.	16	79	xxix.	29	31						
xxii.	20	78	xxxiii.	2	73						
xxiv.	14	45	xxxiv.	11	73						
..	16	45	xxxix.	12	62						
..	28	45									
..	55	45, 49	LEVITICUS.								
..	57	45	i.	1	30						
xxv.	6	59	ii.	15	54						
..	27	62	x.	16	15						
xxvii.	19	16	xi.	6	70						
..	29	65	..	16	71						
..	42	78	..	39	54						
xxxi.	22	78	..	42	15						
..	34	79	xii.	5	15						
xxxiii.	4	64	xiii.	10	54						
xxxiv.	3	45	..	21	54						
..	12	45	..	33	15						
xxxviii.	11	79	xiv.	12	31						
..	13	78	xv.	10	57						
..	14	79	xvi.	31	54						
..	24	78	xxi.	9	54						
..	25	54	xxiii.	42	74						
			..	43	74						

לעשות ולרזק המסרה בכל התיקונים, שאיפשר כדי להשאירה ברה וטהורה, ולהראות העמים והשרים את יפיה, כי טובה מראה היא, וזה לאוהבי חועלת אחינו בני ישראל, ותפארת חורתינו הקדושה והתמימה ולמלאות תאות ושאלת השר מסי' דניאל בומבירני, ישמרהו צורו, במה שאיפשר אף על פי שכספו היתה גדולה מהשנתי, וכן במפרשים שמתי כל מאמציי כחי לתקן המעוות במה שאפשר, ובמה שהשיגה בו עניות דעתי לשם שמים ולהועיל לבני עמינו, ולא נסוגתי אחור בשביל הסורה הרב, כי שינה לעיני לא נתתי לשובע הן בחורף הן בקיץ, ולא חששתי לקום בלילה לקור, וזולתו כי חפצי וכוונתי היתה לדאות תכלית המלאכה בלאכת הקדש, ישחבת הבורא, אשר ויכני להחחיל ולהשלים, וזכרה לי אלהי לטובה, אמן:

could accomplish was done for the glory of the Lord, and for the benefit of our people; and I would not be deterred by the enormous labour, for which cause I did not suffer my eyelids to be closed long, either in the winter or summer, and did not mind rising in the cold of the night, as my aim and desire were to see this holy work finished. Now praised be the Creator, who granted me the privilege to begin and to finish this work. Remember me, O my God, for good! Amen.

PROVERBS.			JEREMIAH.			Chap. Ver. Page.		
Chap.	Ver.	Page.	Chap.	Ver.	Page.	xl.	26	64
vi.	13	64	i.	5	52	xlvi.	11	64
xxii.	25	64	ii.	11	68	xlvi.	16	16, 40, 49
xxiii.	35	77	...	24	57	DANIEL.		
xxvi.	24	64	iii.	2	45, 51, 63	v.	21	65
xxx.	10	64	v.	16	76	xi.	15	65
...	17	34	xv.	8	64	HOSEA.		
ECCLESIASTES.			xvii.	11	64	iv.	7	68
ii.	11	64	xxvi.	1	74, 75	OBADIAH.		
v.	9	54	xxviii.	1	74, 75	...	11	64
SONG OF SONGS.			xxx.	38	40, 49, 50	HABAKKUK.		
ii.	11	64	xxxix.	12	40, 50	i.	12	68
v.	7	77	...	14	26	iii.	14	64
ISAIAH.			xlvi.	7	65	ZECHARIAH.		
vii.	2	78	li.	29	40, 49, 50	ii.	12	68
xiii.	16	45, 51, 63	...	3	40, 50	xiv.	2	45, 51
xxx.	33	54	LAMENTATIONS.			MALACHI.		
xxxvi.	12	51	iii.	19	69	i.	13	68
xxxvii.	30	65	...	39	64	EZEKIEL.		
...	32	50	EZEKIEL.			iii.	12	50
xlvi.	24	34	vii.	21	65	vii.	21	65
xlvi.	8	26	viii.	17	68	xvii.	21	64
li.	16	80	...	21	64	xxxi.	5	64
lii.	5	64	xl.	22	64	1 SAMUEL.		
lvi.	10	64				i.	9	16, 25
lvii.	2	36				...	23	79
						ii.	9	64
						...	24	57, 58, 66
						iii.	13	68
						v.	6	45, 51, 63
						...	9	45, 51, 63
						...	12	45, 51, 63
						vi.	4	45, 51, 63
						...	5	45, 51, 63
						...	17	63
						vii.	9	65
						x.	21	64
						...	25	78
						xi.	7	78
						xii.	10	65
						xiii.	19	65
						xv.	12	78
						xviii.	5	64
						xix.	19	78

Chap. Ver. Page.			Chap. Ver. Page.			Chap. Ver. Page.		
xxiii.	6	72	xxi.	14	64	1 CHRONICLES.		
xxv.	7	71, 72	xxiii.	5	64	xix.	17	78
xxviii.	27	45, 51, 63	...	7	78	xxv.	1	75
...	30	45, 51	xxv.	29	11	xxix.	16	54
xxxiii.	27	53	xxvii.	4	78	2 CHRONICLES.		
xxxiv.	12	5	xxx.	26	78	viii.	7	73
xxxviii.	30	63	xxxi.	4	72	x.	16	68
JOSHUA.			2 SAMUEL.			xix.	17	78
iii.	10	73	i.	11	64	EZRA.		
vi.	25	79	ii.	19	79	iii.	2	65
viii.	11	64	iii.	21	78	iv.	7	64
ix.	1	72, 73	vi.	12	78	ix.	1	73
x.	17	78	viii.	3	40, 49, 50	NEHEMIAH.		
xi.	3	73	x.	17	78	ii.	6	51
xii.	8	73	xii.	20	64	iii.	30	65
xvi.	3	64	xiii.	20	79	...	31	65
xxiv.	11	30, 73	...	21	50	viii.	8	48, 70
...	28	78	...	33	40, 50	ix.	8	73
JUDGES.			xv.	31	40	x. 1-10		37
ii.	6	78	xvi.	12	68	ESTHER.		
iii.	5	73	...	21	50	ii.	9	59
...	18	78	...	23	40, 49	ix.	27	65
ix.	25	78	xviii.	2	78	JOB.		
...	47	78	...	20	40, 50	vii.	20	68
x.	13	40	xix.	2	78	xiv.	5	64
xi.	17	72	xxi.	11	78	xv.	15	64
xv.	5	78	xxiv.	14	64	xx.	11	64
xvi.	31	58	xxx.	33	40	xxiv.	1	64
xx.	13	50	1 KINGS.			xxvi.	14	64
xxi.	20	65	i.	1	65	xxix.	19	76
RUTH.			...	51	78	xxx.	11	54
ii.	11	49	ii.	19	79	...	20	64
...	14	79	...	29	78	xxxii.	3	69
...	23	79	...	41	78	xxxvii.	12	64
iii.	5	40, 49, 50	ix.	9	65	xxxviii.	41	64
...	12	40, 49, 50	...	20	73	xxxix.	26	64
...	14	64	x.	5	64	...	30	64
...	17	40, 49, 50	xii.	7	65	xl.	17	64
1 SAMUEL.			...	16	68	PSALMS.		
i.	9	16, 25	xvii.	15	54	v.	10	76
...	23	79	xviii.	42	64	xxiv.	6	64
ii.	9	64	xxii.	44	67	xxxvi.	7	49, 67
...	24	57, 58, 66	2 KINGS.			xl.	10	34
iii.	13	68	iv.	34	64	lviii.	8	64
v.	6	45, 51, 63	v.	9	64	lxviii.	26	49, 67
...	9	45, 51, 63	...	18	40, 49, 50	lxxiii.	16	54
...	12	45, 51, 63	...	24	78	lxxvii.	38	15
vi.	4	45, 51, 63	vi.	13	78	lxxx.	14	15
...	5	45, 51, 63	...	25	51	lxxxii.	12	72
...	17	63	viii.	7	78	cv.	22	64
vii.	9	65	x.	27	51	...	40	64
x.	21	64	xi.	18	64	cv.	15	78
...	25	78	xvii.	25	78	...	20	68, 69
xi.	7	78	...	26	78	...	45	64
xii.	10	65	xviii.	27	51	cxliv.	2	65
xiii.	19	65	xix.	31	40	cxlvii.	19	64
xv.	12	78	...	37	40, 50	cxlviii.	2	64
xviii.	5	64	xx.	18	65			
xix.	19	78	xxii.	5	65			
			xxiv.	2	78			

H

HALLE MS. of the Massorah, described 28-30; its relation to the printed Massorah of Jacob b. Chajim, 30, 31; to the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, 31-33; its date, 34.
 HANNAEL, Rabbi, 48.
 HAPHTARA, see PENTATEUCH.
 HERETICS, see CHRISTIANS.
 HUNNAH, Joshua, 57, 59.
 HUFFELD, his description of the Halle MS. Massorah, 28.
 HAVDALAH, 75.

I

IBN Adonijah, see JACOB BEN CHAJIM.
 IBN Aknin quotes the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, 24, 25.
 IBN Chabib, Jacob, 10.
 IBN Ezra, 6, 7; commentaries ascribed to him, which belong to Moses Kimchi, 7; his rendering of Gen. i. 1-3, 70.
 IBN Shemtob, 10.
 IDA, Rabbi, 64.
 IKA, Rabbi b. Abaja, 48.
 ISAAC b. Jehudah quotes the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, 24, 25.
 ——— b. Moses Ha-Levi, see EPHODI.
 ——— b. Asher, 57.
 ——— Rabbi, 48, 57.
 ISHMAEL Rabbi, 39, 53, 60, 61, 69.
 ITUR Sopherim, 42, 48, 49, 67, 68.

J

JACOB b. Chajim, also called Ibn Adonijah, and *Tunisi*, probable date and place of his birth, 1, 2; emigrates from Tunis, 4; becomes connected with Bomberg, edits the Babylonian and the Jerusalem Talmuds, 1, 5, 38; the Hebrew Concordance of Nathan, the Jad Ha-Chezaka of Maimonides, 5; publishes the great Rabbinic Bible, 6; his treatise on the Targum, 9, 12, 13; his name suppressed, 11, 36; embraced Christianity, 11, 13, 14, 36; his death, 14; his description of the state of the Massorah, 19; the relation of his recension of the Massorah to the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, 25-28; his labour connected with the Massorah, 20, 34, 35; refutes Abravanel, 48; his opinion of the origin of the *Keri* and *Kethiv*, 56.
 JARCHI, see RASHI.
 JEHUDAH b. Nathan, called *Riban*, 57.
 ——— b. Bethara, 60.
 ——— Rabbi, 74.
 JEWS persecuted in Spain, 2.
 JONATHAN b. Uzziel, 6.
 JOSEPH the Blind, 7.

K

KABBALAH, the, studied by Christians, 4, 9.

KAHANA, Rabbi, 71, 72.

KENNICOTT, edits a Latin version of Jacob b. Chajim's Introduction, 6.

KERI, the, always followed in reading the Scriptures, 44.

KERI and Kethiv, 40; its origin, 42, 69, 73; number of in each book of the Hebrew Scriptures, 47, 48.

KERI velo Kethiv, 40, 49, 55; number of, 50.

KETHIV velo Keri, 40, 47, 49, 55; number of, 50.

KIMCHI, David, 6, 7; quotes the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, 24, 25; his opinion about the origin of the *Keri* and *Kethiv*, 43, 44; refuted, 55.

KIMCHI, Moses, author of commentaries ascribed to Ibn Ezra, 7.

L

LEBRECHT regards the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* as lost, 25.

LETTER, the middle in the Psalms, 15.

LEVI b. Gershon, see RALBAG.

LEVITA calls Jacob b. Chajim Ibn Adonijah, 1; teaches Christians, 4; writes an epilogue to the Rabbinic Bible, 9; praises Ibn Adonijah; loses all his property at the sacking of Rome; goes to Venice, 9; his revision of works, 10; abuses Jacob b. Chajim for embracing Christianity, though he praises his literary works, 11, 23; his opinion about the duration of the Massorites, 15; his description of the state of the Massorah, 19, 20; affirms that the present compilation of the Massorah made by Jacob b. Chajim is chiefly from the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, 23-25, 26-28.

LUZZATTO, 10; his declaration that Jacob b. Chajim did embrace Christianity, 11-13.

M

MAHARAM, see MEIER of Rottenburg.

MAIMONIDES, his legal code called *Jad Ha-Chezaka*, 5, 59; his *More Nebuchim*, 52.

MARTINEZ, Fernando, preaches persecution of the Jews, 2.

MASSORAH, 14; its meaning, 15; origin and import, 15-17; its condition, 7, 8, 19, 41; its utility, 72, &c.

——— finalis, 6, 7, 40, 41, 82, 83.

——— magna, 6, 16, 40; divided into two parts, 32, 83.

——— marginalis, 6, 19, 40, 79, 83.

——— parva, 6, 16, 18, 40.

——— the Great, 24; how treated by the Scribes, 78, 79.

MASSORITES, their duration, 15, 16.

MASSORETIC order of the Books in the Bible, 26; treatises, 16, 17, 78.

N

INDEX II.

TOPICS AND NAMES.

A

ABARBANEL, see ABRAVANEL.

ABRAVANEL, his opinion about the origin of the *Keri* and *Kethiv*, 44-47, refuted by Jacob b. Chajim, 50-52, 54.

ABJA, Rabbi, 63, 71.

ABOTH d' Rabbi Nathan, 54.

ACHAH, Rabbi, 58, 71.

ADELKIND, Cornelius, 10.

AIN, the middle letter in the Psalms, 15.

AKIBA, Rabbi, 60.

ALASHKAR, Moses b. Isaac, 2.

ALTON, Chajim, 4, 38.

ANTHROPOMORPHISMS, removed from the text, 68.

ARAMA, 10.

ARUCH, the, 40; different editions of, 41, 49, 51, 67; its definition, *Itur Sopherim*, 67, 82.

B

BEN-ASHER, 7.

BEN-NAPHTALI, 7.

BENJAMIN of Tudela, 41.

BERESHITH, Rabba, see MIDRASH.

BIBLE, the Rabbinic, description of, 6, &c., 21, 40.

BOMBERG, Daniel, establishes a Hebrew printing office at Venice, 4; his great expenses and work connected with the Rabbinic Bible, 8, 9, 41, 77, 78; engages Levita as corrector of the Hebrew works, 9; his publications, 10; suppresses Jacob b. Chajim's name in consequence of his embracing Christianity, 11, 14; parts with Jacob, 13.

BUXTORF, 35.

C

CASSEL, David, 10.

CHARLES V., 9.

CHRISTIANS charging the Jews with willfully altering the text, 42; refutation of the charge, 66-71.

CODICES, three, of the Temple, and their readings, 52, 53.

CORECY, Moses de, 10.

CROWNS, Book of, 61, 62.

D

DELITZSCH, 24.

DERENBURG, Dr., 25.

E

EGIDIO, de Viterbo, Cardinal, befriends Levita, 9.

ELDERS, 37.

ELIEZER, Rabbi, 53.

EPHODI, his view of the origin of the *Keri* and *Kethiv*, 42, 43; refuted, 55.

ERSCH and Gruber's Encyklopädie, 10.

ETHERIDGE, Dr., 41.

EUPHEMISMS, substituted for cacophonous expressions, 51, 63.

EZRA, author of the *Keri* and *Kethiv*, 44-47.

F

FERRER, Vincente, preaches persecution of the Jews, 2.

FERRERAS, 3.

FRANKEL, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, 71.

FRENSDORFF, Dr., 11; his edition of the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, 25, 26; declares that the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* is not the same as that used by Jacob b. Chajim, 27, 28.

FUERST calls Jacob b. Chajim *Tunisi*, 1; erroneously asserts that Jacob b. Chajim's Introduction was published in English, by Kennicott, 6; his opinion about the date of the edition of Jacob b. Chajim's Treatise on the Targum, 10; his enumeration of Jacob b. Chajim's works, 10, 14; he regards the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* as lost, 25.

G

GAON, 65.

GEIGER, his opinion on the Commentaries ascribed to Ibn Ezra, 7; his description of the Massorah, 15; his charges against Ibn Adonijah of suppressing the materials, 17; refutation of the charges, 18-23; strictures on Frensdorff's remarks on the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, 26; his fixing the date of the *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, 34; *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, 49, 53, 69, 70, 71.

GERSHON b. Jehudah, 24.

GERUNDENSIS, Moses, see NACHMANIDES.

GRAETZ, *Geschichte der Juden*, 24, 57.

T

TAM, 57, 62, 63.

TAGIN, Sepher, see BOOK OF CROWNS.

TALAVERA, Fray Fernando de, 2.

TALMUD, the, *editio princeps* of, 5; its explanation of Nehemiah viii. 8, 48; differences between it and the Massorah, 42, 57, 58, 63, 64, 65; the different Tracts of it quoted:—

Baba Mezia, 54 <i>b</i>	62, 63.
Baba Bathra, 111.	63.
Erechin, 17 <i>a</i>	74, 75.
Gittin, 86	67.
Jebamoth, 106 <i>b</i>	66, 71, 72.
—— 13 <i>b</i>	53.
—— Jerusalem, i. 6	53.
Kethuboth, 104 <i>a</i>	36.
Kiddushin, 30 <i>a</i>	15.
Megilla, Jerusalem, i. 11	53.
—— 9 <i>a</i>	71.
—— 24 <i>b</i>	63.
—— 25 <i>b</i>	45, 51.
Menachoth, 34 <i>a b</i>	59, 61, 62.
Maccoth, Jerusalem, ii. 7	39.
Nedarim, 37 <i>b</i>	48, 49, 55, 57, 70, 71.
Nidda, 33 <i>a</i>	57.
Pessachim, 16 <i>b</i>	74.
—— 103 <i>b</i> ,—104 <i>a</i> , 75, 76.	
Rosh Ha-Shana, 4	32.
Sabbath, 55 <i>b</i>	57, 59.
—— 103 <i>b</i>	60.
Sanhedrin, 4 <i>b</i>	60.
Shēbiith, Jerusalem, v. 1	37.
Sopherim vii. 1	65.
—— vi. 4	52, 53, 55.
—— vi. 8	50.
—— vi. 9	50.
—— vii. 2	53.

Sopherim viii. 8	45.
—— ix. 9	51.
Sota, 20 <i>a</i>	39.
Succa, 6 <i>b</i>	74.
—— 46 <i>b</i>	61.
Taanith, 4 <i>b</i>	61.
Taharoth	12.
Zebachim, 24 <i>b</i>	62.
—— 115 <i>b</i>	53.
—— Mishna, xiv. 4	53.

TIKUN Sopherim, 42 48, 68, 69.
TOSSAFOTH, 57, 58; mentions variations between the readings of the Talmud and the Massorah, argues from the Massorah against the Talmud, 60-63, 71, 72, 74.

TUNIS, the supposed birth-place of Jacob b. Chajim, 2, 3.

TUNISI, see JACOB B. CHAJIM.

V

VAV, the middle in the Pentateuch, 15.

VERSE, the middle in the Pentateuch, 15; in the Psalms, 15.

W

WEISS, his commentary on the Mechilta, 71.

WORD, the middle in the Pentateuch, 15.

X

XIMENES, Cardinal, goes to Granada to convert the Mussulmans, 2; causes the destruction of Arabic MSS, 3; triumphantly enters Oran, 4; does not describe the materials used in the Complutensian Polyglott, 22, 23.

Z

ZUNZ, 24, 41.

R

RAB, 48.

RABE, 71, 72.

RABBINIC BIBLE, see BIBLE.

RALBAG, also called Rabbi Levi b. Gershon, 6, 7, 10.

RAMBAN, see MAIMONIDES.

RAMBAN, also called Moses b. Nachman, or Nachmanides, 10, 39, 40, 56.

RASHBA, 55.

RASHBAM, 39, 40, 57.

RASHBAN, also called R. Samuel b. Meier, 39, 40, 57.

RASHI, 6, 7, 24, 34, 49, 50, 51; his interpretation of 1 Samuel ii. 24; differs from the Massoretic text, 57-59, 60, 61, 63, 64, 65, 66, 70.

RAYMOND Martin, 67.

REDAK, see KIMCHI.

REFORMATION, 6.

REIFMANN, his opinion on the commentaries ascribed to Ibn Ezra, 7.

RIBA, see ISAAC B. ASHER.

RIBAN, see JEHUDAH B. NATHAN.

ROSSI, Azzariah de, his date, calls Jacob b. Chajim Ibn Adonijah, 1.

ROTTENBURG, Meier, 76.

RULES, exegetical, 60-63.

S

SAADIA Gaon, 7, 34, 64, 65.

SABBA, Abraham, 10.

SABBATICAL lessons, see PENTATEUCH.

SACCUTTO, Abraham, 2; emigrates from Tunis, 4.

SALOMON, b. Abraham b. Adereth, 10.

—— b. Isaac, see RASHI.

—— b. Jehudah, see NORZI.

SAMARITANS, the, refuse to adopt the revision of the text, 53.

SAMUEL, b. Meier, see RASHBAM.

—— Mar, 59.

—— Rabbi, 57.

SCRIBES, see SOPHERIM.

SEPTUAGINT, the, 69.

SHIMSHON b. Abraham, 12.

SIMEON, Rabbi, 74.

SIMON, the Just, 37.

—— b. Lakish, 52.

SIPHRA, 10.

SIPHRI, 10.

SOAVE, Moses, 12.

SOPHERIM, the origin of their name, 15, 43; members of the Great Synagogue, 37; authors of the *Keri* and *Kethiv*, 43; their emendations of the text, 42, 48, 49, 67-69.

SPAIN, expulsion of the Jews from, 2.

STEINSCHNEIDER, 10, 17, 24, 41.

SYNAGOGUE, the Great, its origin and constitution, 37; the members thereof, the compilers of the Hebrew canon, the Book of Esther, &c, 37, 38; the authors of the *Keri* and *Kethiv*, 42, 43, 70.

MASSORETIC sign explained, 72, 73.

MECHILTA, 10, 69, 71.

MEIER, of Rottenburg, 77.

—— b. Samuel, 57.

—— Rabbi, 59, 60.

MICHAELIS, 35.

MIDRASH Rabbith, 10, 59, 61.

—— Ruth, 37.

—— Tanchuma, 10.

—— Tilim, 10.

MISHRACHI, Elias, 10.

MOORS, crusade against them, 2.

MORDECAI b. Hillel, 76, 77.

MORINUS, 35.

MOSES, the Punctuator, or *Ha-Nakdan*, 7, 18.

—— b. Nachman, see RAMBAN.

MEZUZAH, 59.

MOZARQUIVER captured by the Spaniards, 23.

N

NACHMANIDES, see RAMBAN.

NATHAN, Isaac, 5, 80, 81.

—— b. Jechiel, 41.

NAVARRO, Pedro, conquers Bugia, 4.

NEHEMIAH, Rabbi, 53.

NEUBAUER, 24.

NORZI, Salomon, 24, 25.

O

OCHLA VE-OCHLA, origin of its name, 16, 17, 19; declared by Levita to be the basis of the present Massorah, refuted, 23, 24, 26, 27; whether it is the identical one quoted by Kimchi, Ibn Aknim, Isaac b. Jehudah, Elias Levita, 25; is edited by Dr. Frensdorff, 26; its relation to the Massorah of Jacob b. Chajim, 25-27; to the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* quoted by the mediæval lexicographers, 28; its age, 33, 34; Frensdorff's edition quoted, 45, 49, 50, 51, 64, 65, 69.

ONKELOS, 6.

P

PAPA, Rabbi, 59.

PARIS Massorah, edited under the name of *Ochla Ve-Ochla*, see FRENSDORFF and *Ochla Ve-Ochla*.

PENTATEUCH, the, divided into Sabbatic lessons, the manner in which it is quoted in Jewish writings, 45.

PESICTA Sutrata, 10.

PHYLACTERIES, 61.

PINSKER, 69.

PIZZIGHTONE, David de, 5.

PLATC, 70.

POLYGLOTT, Complutensian, 3, 22.

PRESCOTT, 3.

PROPHIAT Duran, see EPHODI.

PTOLEMY, king, 69.