



University
of Glasgow

<https://theses.gla.ac.uk/>

Theses Digitisation:

<https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/research/enlighten/theses/digitisation/>

This is a digitised version of the original print thesis.

Copyright and moral rights for this work are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study,
without prior permission or charge

This work cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first
obtaining permission in writing from the author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any
format or medium without the formal permission of the author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author,
title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

Enlighten: Theses

<https://theses.gla.ac.uk/>
research-enlighten@glasgow.ac.uk

SUMMARY.

THE SAMARITAN TEXT OF THE PENTATEUCH.

A Comparison of the Samaritan Text
with the Masoretic Text.

The purpose of this Thesis is to endeavour to evaluate the textual variants of the Samaritan Hebrew Pentateuch and, if possible, indicate lines upon which the text might be restored as it existed at the time of the Samaritan secession.

Texts collated are:

1. The Masoretic Text, as published by Kahle in Kittel's Biblia Hebraica, 7th. ed., Stuttgart, 1951.
2. The Samaritan Text, as reconstructed by A. von Gall, *Dor Hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner*, Giessen, 1914-18.
3. The Pentateuch texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls in *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, I, II, & III*, in the case of all the Samaritan variants.
4. The Septuagint, ed. A. Rahlfs, Stuttgart, 1935, in the case of the Samaritan variants that show difference in sense, or where proper names occur.

The introductory Chapter I consists of a short history of/

ProQuest Number: 10647842

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10647842

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

of studies on the Samaritan text of the Pentateuch.

Brief mention is made of scholars prior to Gesenius but with him, and thereafter, increasingly detailed treatment is given.

Chapter II states the Methods adopted, namely, the collection, critical examination and classification of all the Samaritan Pentateuch variants. There is a discussion on the objection sometimes levelled against the von Gall text, that it is eclectic and that it has not made use of all the MS material available.

Chapter III prepares the way for the actual classification of the variants by dealing with certain preliminary considerations that affect the comparative study of the texts: it consists of three monographs; oral transmission, Pre-Masoretic Hebrew texts, and Scroll and Codex (the last being a criticism of Gaster's view that the Scroll and not the Codex should be taken as the basis of comparison).

Chapter IV discusses the Principles to be used in the Classification of the variants and then gives an outline of the Classification which divides the material into three main groups, viz. Orthography, Grammar and Vocabulary and of the sub-division of the last two groups into variants that show (1) agreement in sense or (2) divergence in sense.

Chapter V gives a selective survey of the whole material into a series of classified paragraphs, giving representative examples/

examples and referring the reader to the Appendix for complete lists.

Chapter VI contains the evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls, showing in the case of the Samaritan variants where the Scrolls agree with the Samaritan, or the Masoretic Text, or diverge from both.

The final Chapter VII gives conclusions, obtained from the consideration of the Samaritan Pentateuch, regarded as a descendent of a type of text earlier than the Masoretic and belonging to the period of variant texts, prior to the Council of Jamnia, to which the Masoretic, the Samaritan, the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Greek texts commonly referred to collectively under the term LXX all go back.

Appendix A consists of a detailed list of the variants under the categories of the Classification outlined earlier in the Thesis. This exhaustive list constitutes a large part of the Thesis which it is hoped will be of permanent usefulness for reference.

Appendix B is an additional paper on two Samaritan MSS specially examined.

A Bibliography of Books and Periodicals concludes the Thesis.

THE SAMARITAN TEXT

of

THE PENTATEUCH.

A Comparison of the Samaritan Text
with the Masoretic Text.

Submitted to the University of
Glasgow, for the Degree of Ph.D.
in the Faculty of Divinity

by

John Douglas McClymont.

Glasgow, 1967.

PREFACE.

Since early in the 17th century Europeans discovered a Samaritan form of the Hebrew Pentateuch, written in an ancient script and containing variants from the text of the MT, many different views have been taken of its value for the Textual Criticism of the MT. A summary of these views will be given in the Short History of Samaritan Studies, mainly from the textual standpoint, which will be found in the General Introduction, Chapter I. It is proposed to undertake a new treatment of the subject and the purpose of this Thesis is to endeavour to determine the value of the Samaritan variants as aids towards reconstructing the text of the Hebrew Pentateuch as it existed at the time of the Samaritan secession.

This new investigation appears to be necessary for the following reasons:

1. Earlier students had not considered all the Samaritan Pentateuch variants.
2. Von Gall's work, "Der Hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner", shows that there is a definite Samaritan recension of the Pentateuch but he offers no classification or discussion on the variants from the MT.

3./

3. The Dead Sea Scrolls have provided new material which may have a bearing on the subject.

Texts collated:

1. Masoretic Text - Biblia Hebraica, R. Kittel, 7th ed., Stuttgart, 1951.
2. Samaritan Text, as reconstructed by A. von Gall, Der Hebräische Pentateuch Der Samaritaner, Giessen, 1914-18
3. The Pentateuch texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, I, Qumran Cave I., D. Barthelemy and J. T. Milik, Oxford, 1955.
II, Les Grottes de Murabba^c at, P. Benoit, J. T. Milik, R. de Vaux, Oxford, 1961. III. Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumran, M. Baillet, J. T. Milik, R. de Vaux, Oxford, 1962. in the case of all the Samaritan variants from the M.T.
4. The Septuagint, ed. A. Rahlfs, Stuttgart, 1935, in the case of the Samaritan variants that show differences in sense, or where proper names occur.

The Classification of the Samaritan variants (see below, Chapters IV and V) is an original one and relevant to the problems that arise in the investigation of the subject: it should be useful to other investigators in their assessments of the value of the Samaritan variants and for easy reference and further investigation. The preceding/

preceding Chapters, it is submitted, also show an independent treatment e.g., Chapter III, 3., discussion on the relative merits of Scroll and Codex. The Conclusions in Chapter VII are based on the evidence of all the Samaritan variants, and not just a proportion of them, and take into account the relevant evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls. In the Appendix the citation of the Samaritan variants is considerably fuller than that which has hitherto appeared in any published work on the subject and should also be useful for easy reference and further investigation.

The writer expresses his appreciation of past and present scholars whose works have been consulted and, in some cases, discussed in the Introductory Chapter. He has a large debt of gratitude to the late Professor W.B. Stevenson who first introduced him to Samaritan studies, to Professor C. J. Mullo Weir for invaluable guidance and the stimulus of his scholarship and to Professor J. Mauchline for encouragement and interest. He is also grateful to the Librarians and their staff at Glasgow University, Trinity College, Glasgow, and Trinity and Westminster Colleges, Cambridge.

C O N T E N T S.

Preface.

Chapter I.	<u>Page.</u>
General Introduction: Short History of Samaritan Studies.	1.
Chapter II.	
Object and Methods of the Present Study	30.
Chapter III.	
Preliminary Considerations affecting Comparative Study of the Texts.	36.
Chapter IV.	
Principles of the Classification.	44.
Chapter V.	
Classification of the Samaritan Variants from the Masoretic Text.	54.
Chapter VI.	
Evidence of Dead Sea Scrolls.	119.
Chapter VII.	
Conclusions.	131.
Appendix A: List of Samaritan Variants under the Categories of the Classification outlined in Chapters IV and V.	155.
Appendix B: Additional paper on two Samaritan Manuscripts.	264.
1. Facsimile of MS belonging to Professor J. Garstang.	
2. MS. R.16.41 Trinity College Library, Cambridge.	
Abbreviations.	285.
Bibliography.	287.

CHAPTER I.

General Introduction.

Short history of Samaritan Studies.

The Samaritans in the time of Christ were inhabitants of a part of the territory of old North Israel who still kept themselves independent of the priesthood and temple at Jerusalem. They had a temple and priesthood of their own on Mount Gerizim where they practised forms of worship descended to them from old Hebrew times. They derived the authority of these forms from Moses and treated his book, the Pentateuch, as their sacred book.

After the Jewish state and temple were destroyed in the first Christian century they carried on without change till 130 A.D., when their temple also was destroyed and much of their treasures and of their ancient literature was lost. The Samaritans, like the Jews, now lived largely outside of Palestine, for example in Damascus, but unlike the Jewish priesthood their priesthood carried on in Samaria as best they could. The observances of the Mosaic Law were maintained, including down to modern times without a break the Passover ceremony. Both in Samaria and elsewhere they preserved independently of the Jews, and in a more ancient form/

form of writing, copies of the Torah of Moses.

Early in the 17th century came the discovery by Europeans of the Samaritan form of the Pentateuch. This discovery was truly a landmark in Old Testament studies for here was a Hebrew Pentateuch in a strange script and with a text different from that of the Jews. Of course the Talmud and early Jewish writers recognised that the Samaritans had the Law of Moses¹, and indeed both Jews and Samaritans agreed that the Samaritan script was older than the square script subsequently adopted by the Jews. There is a well-known passage in the Babylonian Talmud which says that originally the Law was given to Israel in the Hebrew script and in the sacred tongue and that it was again given in the days of Ezra in the Assyrian script and the Aramaic tongue: Israel chose the Assyrian script and the sacred tongue and the Samaritans were left with the Hebrew script and the Aramaic tongue². The Christian Fathers also made reference to the Samaritan Pentateuch. Origen used it in his Hexapla³. Then the silence of the centuries descended and it seemed that even the memory of it had perished. Early in the 17th century came the astounding news that copies of the Samaritan Pentateuch had been obtained.

In 1616 Pietro della Valle obtained two copies at Damascus:/

Damascus: one was presented to the Vatican and the other was published in the Paris Polyglott (1645) and the London Polyglott (1657). Morinus, who edited the Paris Polyglott, claimed that the Samaritan text was considerably superior to that of the MT. His opinion was adopted in great measure by some scholars⁴ and rejected just as strongly by others⁵. There followed a period of acute controversy, much of the discussion and dispute being invalidated by the fact that the participants allowed pre-conceived theological ideas to influence them in their textual judgments. In the 18th century, however, a more objective approach was shown by Houbigant and Kennicott who drew attention to valuable readings of the Samaritan. Kennicott carefully noted its variants in his famous textual work on the Hebrew Bible, Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum⁶. Scholars that followed such as Michaelis and Jahn took an eclectic view, holding fast to the general superiority of the MT but being prepared to adopt a Samaritan reading where the MT was clearly defective. A noteworthy attempt to bring scientific method to bear on the problem was made by Gesenius, De Pentateuchi Samaritani Origine Indole et Auctoritate Commentatio Philologica - Critica⁷, who was the first to make a comprehensive classification of a large number of the Samaritan variants, dividing them into eight main groups. His/

His view was that the Samaritan Pentateuch was a modernised form of the Masoretic Text, sometimes misinterpreted and sometimes intentionally altered. There the matter was to rest for some years. Yet Gesenius had proceeded on an unsound assumption and an unsound assertion. He assumed that the MT was primary and the Samaritan was secondary, arising by alteration from it; such an approach was obviously unsound, as both Pentateuchs should be given an equal hearing. He asserted (p.16 of his Thesis) that the Samaritan was derived from a MS in the square script, brought to Samaria in the time of Alexander the Great: this was impossible as the square script was not in use at that period.

The way was prepared for a more comprehensive study of the relationship between the two recensions by A. Geiger who in 1857 correctly emphasised that the care exercised by the Masoretic scholars for the purity of the Biblical text was not true of an earlier period when the MSS were somewhat arbitrarily handled and there were many corruptions⁸. He went on to show that only a small number of these corruptions survived the later critical methods and maintained themselves in the MT. Variants of that earlier period due to local, individual or sectarian difference were testified by the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint: they consisted of the removal of difficulties in morphology or/

or syntax, supplementations from parallel passages and the like. That Geiger's attitude to the Samaritan community was not unsympathetic was shown in a number of monographs. For example, in Zur Theologie u. Schrifterklärung der Samaritaner he referred to the similarity of their theological views with those of Judaism, especially the Sadducees, except in so far as their political antipathies were not involved⁹. Other monographs indicating this conservative attitude of the Samaritans were Neuere Mittheilungen über die Samaritaner¹⁰, and Die Gesetzlichen Differenzen Zwischen Samaritaner u. Juden¹¹. Of a more textual nature was Geiger's Nachgelassene Schriften¹² wherein were discussed the Samaritan variants of a doctrinal nature, such as the reading of Gerizim for Ebal in Deut. 27⁴ or the Aramaisms and late Hebrew forms found in their text. His conclusion regarding the worth of the Samaritan Pentateuch is best expressed in the following translation of his own words which shows how different his attitude was from that of Gesenius: "The Samaritan text is a highly important historical document which, apart from particular Samaritanisms in the case of Schem - where it is not always in the wrong - and the Aramaisms, represents an old recension as it at that time had general distribution, and consequently appears/

appears also in the translations, namely the LXX, at times even in old Talmudic writings".

Another scholar at that period who prepared the way for a revival of interest in Samaritan studies was H. Petermann who actually journeyed to Samaria and met with Amram, son of the still living high priest, Schalama. He describes, Versuch einer Hebräischen Formenlehre nach der Aussprache der heutigen Samaritaner¹³, p.4, how he read aloud a portion of the Samaritan Pentateuch (in the edition of Benjamin Blayney, Oxford, 1790) in the presence of Amram who informed him that he read according to the way of the Jews, but not according to that of the Israelites. He was invited by Petermann to read from the Pentateuch and readily agreed to do so. Whereupon he read the passage aloud in such a way that Petermann would not have understood it, if it had not been already known to him. Petermann lost no time. He at once vocalised the text to the reading of Amram. His first impression was that the reading was quite arbitrary but subsequently he discovered "consequences and laws which afforded cause for thought". For example, in all the multiplicity of forms there was still a great simplicity, "the most natural vowel a prevailed", the Qal. Pract., Ptc., Infin. Absolute and Imperative often had the same form, and the vowels maintained themselves firmer with not/

not so many changes as was the case with what Petermann called the artificial, Masoretic vocalisation, indicating that the Samaritan vocalisation was the older. In point of fact Petermann gave the preference to the Masoretic vocalisation, as he detected Aramaic and Arabic influence in the Samaritan vowels. At times, too, obvious errors occurred in the Samaritan reading and often to his ears there appeared to be divergence in pronunciation of one and the same word. On the whole, however, it was to be concluded that he who from youth up had read the Pentateuch and expounded it in the synagogue knew the pronunciation better than anyone else. Petermann then provides (pp.6 - 160) a formal scheme expounding the accordance of the Hebrew according to the pronunciation of Amram. A transliteration of Genesis follows (pp.161 - 218) and finally a list of Samaritan variants for the whole Pentateuch (pp.219 - 326).

Early in the present century E. Meyer defended the Samaritan reading in Deut.XXVII.4 - Gerizim for Ebal¹⁴. With the notable exception of Kennicott almost all previous scholars had believed that the Samaritans in this passage had altered Ebal into Gerizim in the interests of their cult. Meyer distinguished an early account of the origin of the cult/

cult at Shechem (Deut. 11²⁹, 27¹¹⁻²⁵) from the later Deuteronomic interpretation (Deut. 11²⁶⁻²⁸, 31 f, 27⁷⁻¹⁰). He stated that the MT then removes Gerizim and Ebal from the vicinity of Shechem to the Jordan valley at Gilgal. He maintained that the hill of blessing (Gerizim attested by both Samaritan and MT) should have the altar. Meyer's views are worthy of respect for it is evident that Chapter 27 reveals many critical difficulties. Most commentators are agreed that the various parts of it are imperfectly connected and the Chapter itself interrupts the Discourse of Moses. As against Meyer's view that the Samaritan reading of Deut. 27⁴ is original, it may be stated that all the versions agree with the MT and that the latter sees no reason to alter Gerizim as the hill of blessing. The arguments on neither side are conclusive and the matter will be dealt with again later in the Thesis.

Another tribute to the Samaritans is paid by J. Skinner who in his volume on the use of the Divine Names in Genesis has a section dealing with the Samaritan Pentateuch and brings forward evidence that, in the transmission of the Divine Names, there are at most 9 divergences as compared with 310 cases of agreement in MT and Samaritan¹⁵.

In 1907 appeared a comprehensive study of the Samaritans by J. A. Montgomery giving a scholarly introduction to/

to their history, literature and theology. His careful, documented account is in marked contrast to many earlier controversial opinions. Regarding the Samaritan Pentateuch he says: "As to relation of Samaritan to MT and its origin, most different views have been held varying all the way from the extreme Catholic position that Samaritan was to be preferred to that which would make it dependent on the LXX. All mysteries and prepossessions aside, the simplest hypothesis is that the Samaritan represents an actual early form of the Pentateuch text. When we recall that the orthodox Jews of Alexandria produced a translation that varies from our present MT., we cannot be surprised that the heterodox Samaritans, who long before the origin of the LXX possessed their own textual tradition, have preserved a variant text. Indeed, it is not the disagreement that is remarkable so much as the great similarity of the two texts"¹⁶. Probably there are not many that would quarrel with this view.

An important event in Samaritan studies was marked by the publication of A. von Gall's Der Hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner¹⁷ which is used as one of the sources listed in the Preface. The author gives an impressive catalogue of the Samaritan MSS used in the work extending to 40 more or less complete MSS, which are designated by letters of the/

the alphabet. He exhausts the whole Roman alphabet and has to draw on German type to the extent of 15 letters. In addition, there are 30 groups of fragments of MS scrolls and 25 groups of fragments of MS codices. Many of these MSS he describes in great detail. Von Gall's work has been criticised on the ground that it has as its basis an eclectic method as compared, for example, with Biblia Hebraica III which reproduces the text just as it stands in the Leningrad MS and further that it has not used all the MS material available. For a full treatment of these objections see Chapter II pp. 31-34. At this stage it is only fair to point out that in his Prolegomena (p.68 ff) "Grundsätze für die Bearbeitung der Vorliegenden Text - Ausgabe" he states his view that the printing could not rest on one MS alone. He found he could not produce a family tree of the MSS. Relationships were discernible but no families could be reconstructed. He admits he made continual comparison with the LXX and Jewish text and that his results have a measure of subjectivity. As he says, he makes no claim to infallibility and, if the reader is not satisfied with the proposed text, he is at liberty to choose from the variants in the extensive critical apparatus available on each page. It is generally agreed that the publication of von/

von Gall's work marked a new stage in the Samaritan field.

A modern scholar who prepared the way for a better understanding of the Samaritan Pentateuch is P. Kahle who, as far back as 1915, in Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Pentateuch-Textes, p. 399 ff., develops the view that the received text, while considerably older than the Samaritan Pentateuch, had not been handed down unchanged from the pre-Christian era¹⁸. Kahle shows that the LXX and citations in Pseudepigrapha show obvious unfamiliarity with the M.T. and numerous correspondences with readings in the Samaritan Pentateuch. He concludes that the received text did not represent an unbroken textual tradition but emanated from the textual criticism of the Masoretes, being a result of a critical restoration of the current vulgar texts. The aim of this movement was to get back to an ancient reliable text in which ancient readings and forms long since discarded in current texts were now restored. Glosses, additions, Aramaisms, etc., all were cut out. That the Jewish scholars possessed ancient textual material and that MSS were collated by them is attested by a well-known Rabbinical tradition, e.g. Jerusalem Talmud, Ta^canith 4.2., to the effect that, when the three copies of the Torah preserved in the temple did not agree, the reading given by two of them was selected. The LXX original, the Pentateuch citations in the Apocrypha and/

and Pseudepigrapha and the Samaritan Pentateuch stood outside this movement and provide examples today of the erratic vulgar texts rejected by the Masoretes. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha were left untouched as they were viewed by the orthodox Jews with indifference, while the LXX, as the Bible of the Christians, and the Samaritan Pentateuch remained uninfluenced.

Kahle argued that the Samaritan must be viewed as a text of high antiquity adjusted to practical use. Apart from rare emendations due to the Samaritan cult, there was no reason to regard it as specifically Samaritan. It was in fact simply a text in common use among Jews in pre-Christian times and this is borne out by its relationship to the LXX and Pseudepigraphic literature. Most scholars accept Kahle's view that prior to the formation of the MT there were quite a number of variant texts and his view that the Masoretes collated a large number of texts when they formed the MT.

Among the many publications from Kahle during his long life was *The Cairo Geniza*¹⁹ which is an important volume for Samaritan studies and to which references are made throughout this Thesis. Again, in a paper contributed to the Pedersen Festschrift in 1953 Kahle has a long, detailed account of the famous Abisha scroll in Nablus²⁰, which is first/

first mentioned in a marginal note in a Tolidi or Chronicle of the Priesthood in 1149, recording how the Scroll being carried in procession was being swept away by a sudden storm whereupon the congregation grasped it and a portion remained with them - Numbers 35² - Deuteronomy 34.¹⁰ The next reference is in 1352 when the Samaritan historian Abu'l-Fath reported that the Scroll was shown to the community and that all present were able to see the cryptogram beginning at Deuteronomy 6¹⁰ stating that the Scroll was written by Abisha, son of Pinhas, son of Eleazar, son of Aaron in the thirteenth year after the Israelites had entered the Holy Land.

Descriptions of the scroll have been supplied by Europeans from time to time, as mentioned in the monograph. Kahle himself studied it in the synagogue at Nablus. According to him the ancient part of the Scroll consists of Deuteronomy and the last chapter of Numbers supplemented by a text written about the 13th century and the really old part may take a significant place in the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. He also stated that Professor Perez Castro had been successful in obtaining a photograph of the complete Scroll²¹, and the publication of his results would enable a final decision to be made. See below, p. 34 for E. Robertson's review of Castro's work which has now been published.

It has been noted how Kahle has emphasised that the

LXX and citations in the NT and the Pseudepigrapha show obvious unfamiliarity with the MT and numerous correspondences with readings in the Samaritan Pentateuch and that he has developed the view, generally accepted, that prior to the formation of the MT there was quite a number of variant texts. An interesting and convincing supplement to Kahle's position is to be found in a monograph by J. Hempel Innermasoretische Bestätigungen des Samaritanus²² who shows that a group of mediaeval Masoretic MSS in the material collected by Kennicott and de Rossi show correspondences with the Samaritan Pentateuch in such matters as tendency to plane writing, a preference for syndesis, and omissions and additions, as distinct from the unified impression of the later tradition. The conclusion that suggests itself is that these MSS witness to a variant text form within the Masoretic tradition itself, and which contained readings of the old popular texts which survived for centuries, prior to the unified text-form that is found in 10th century MSS and later.

Another modern scholar is M. Noth²³ who states that the great majority of the Samaritan variants are for the most part of an orthographical nature or are concerned with stylistic minutiae so that the amount of "sachlich bedeutsam" variation is very small. He questions the assumption generally made that after the cultic separation of the Jewish and/

and Samaritan communities the two texts of the Pentateuch ran a completely independent course. In support of his view he refers to Hempel's monograph, that has just been noted, and demonstrates that in the case of Deuteronomy a group of mediaeval Masoretic MSS agree in many details with the Samaritan text. He argues for long lasting relationship between the text traditions on both sides. Noth's argument is valuable at least for giving a salutary warning as to the gaps in our historical knowledge regarding the date and early centuries of the Samaritan schism. Too often the relationship known to exist in later times, when the Jews had no dealings with the Samaritans, has been read into the earlier period. Yet amidst much that is obscure one fact emerges quite clearly that, with the promulgation of the 2nd canon about 200 B.C. a definite break must have separated Jews and Samaritans regarding the extent of Scripture. The fact that many centuries afterwards a group of MT MSS has variants found in the Samaritan Pentateuch may simply show that in some MSS there were still variants surviving from the old popular texts which had not at that date been wholly eliminated from the MT tradition.

A well known writer on the Samaritans is M.Gaster who published a number of works such as the volume in the Schweich Lectures²⁴ and an earlier volume on the Samaritan Oral/

Oral Law²⁵, both of which provide a background of Samaritan life and custom. Of a more textual nature and consequently of more value for the purpose of this Thesis is his A Samaritan Scroll of the Law of the XIth century²⁶, wherein Gaster referred to the extreme care with which the Jews wrote the synagogue scrolls in contrast with the codex, in which there was much greater liberty of production. He claimed that the text of the Jewish Pentateuch Scroll was superior to that of the Codex and he made a good point when he asked if the same circumstance might not hold good for Samaritan Scroll and Codex. The MSS of the Samaritan Pentateuch on which the Paris and London Polyglotts were based were all without exception in codex form. In the first Appendix to Nutt's Fragments of a Samaritan Targum²⁷ reference is made to the view of Harkavy that the Samaritans held the Scrolls as especially sacred, from their being intended for use in the synagogue, and so would not part with them to those of another faith. Since then, according to Gaster, a few fragments of scrolls had come into the library of the British Museum and another scroll fragment was in Gaster's possession. He claimed that the comparison of the Samaritan Pentateuch and the MT must be taken up anew and carried out not with the aid of the Codex but with the scroll./

scroll. For a refutation of this view of Gaster's see Chapter III, pp. 39-43.

Another writer that should be mentioned is J. E. H. Thomson²⁸ for a comprehensive volume covering such topics as Samaritan history, topography, theology and the ancient alphabets with special reference to the evolution of the Samaritan script. On the textual side there is a good chapter on the relation of the Samaritan Pentateuch to the LXX wherein Thomson argues convincingly that they are independent witnesses and one has not been corrected from the other. In another chapter he deals with the Samaritan Pentateuch variants from the MT: he makes an effective criticism of earlier attempts at classification by Gesenius, Kirchheim and Kohn and then proceeds to develop his own scheme, based on "a primary division into two leading classes; first, Variants due to Accident, and next, Variants due to Intention". His scheme of classification is itself defective for surely a logical scheme must avoid an analysis based on a subjective distinction between intention and un-intentional and take the facts as they are in an objective way.

The next publication to be noted is one by Ch. Heller The Samaritan Pentateuch, an Adaptation of the Masoretic Text²⁹ Therein it is categorically stated that the Samaritan text of the Pentateuch presents only a systematical edition, adapted/

adapted from the MT, and that it is without justification. that it has hitherto been regarded as an independent textual witness. Heller attempts to justify his uncompromising attitude by arguments which do not prove so much as he contends. For example, he affirms that the deviations of the Samaritan from the MT are in agreement with and dependent on views of late Rabbinical scholars. He quotes Siphre to Deuteronomy 11³⁰: "R. Elieser, the son of R. Jose, said to the Samaritan scholars: You have falsified the Thora text, but you have not gained anything by it. Thus you have written next to the words מורק מלכא the word שכם we also take it in the same sense by drawing a parallel with Genesis 12⁶ where the verse says מורק מלכא עד מקום שכם עד מקום שכם hence as מורק מלכא there is שכם, so here also it means שכם". He concludes from this passage that the Samaritans took the liberty of inserting their interpretations into the Bible itself. For, as he says, there could not have been any talk of falsification in the addition of the word שכם, such in fact being the true meaning of the sentence. This method, to alter the text according to the interpretation, was so offensive to the Jewish scholars, who scrupulously insisted on the inviolability of the Biblical text. Of course, even if it were granted that the Samaritans had introduced/

introduced interpretations into their text to a much greater degree than is to be found in the MT, it is quite another matter to argue that these are done in conscious dependence on it. They may well have arisen quite independently.

Heller refers to:

Genesis 7 ³	וְהָיָה מַגֵּד הַשִּׁחַיִּים	MT
	וְהָיָה מַגֵּד הַשִּׁחַיִּים	ST

Another modern scholar who has contributed to Samaritan studies is G. Gerleman who makes frequent reference to the Samaritan Pentateuch in *Synoptic Studies in the OT*³⁰. In Chapter II, p.8 ff, in dealing with the Book of Chronicles and its sources, he states that the reason why Samuel-Kings and Chronicles deviate linguistically is, in his opinion, to be sought in the fact that these writings were treated in different ways by Jewish textual criticism. In the books of Samuel-Kings, classed among the Prophets, we are concerned with a carefully revised and archaized text whereas the Hagiagraphic Books of Chronicles do not in the same degree show traces of critical revision. He also points out that Chronicles has a great linguistic resemblance to the Samaritan Pentateuch. For example, in forms of names MT of Genesis 10⁴ reads Q'J77 while Samaritan with MT of I Chronicles 1.7 reads Q'J77 . In lists of names Samaritan and Chronicles agree in using syndeche for the archaic asyndetic construction

MT Genesis 10 ⁶	J77	J77	Q'7571	Q'75
ST and MT of I Chron. 1.8	'	J77	'	'

Linguistically, Chronicles deviates from Samuel-Kings in a way very similar to the deviations of Samaritans from MT. Orthographically, there is the more frequent use of *matres lectionis*, morphologically, the imperfect consecutive has 1st.sing. and 1st. pl. ending in 7 —, syntactically, there is/

is the preference for $\{y$ to $\{n$, plurals for Collectives and Collectives used oftener with pl. verbs. There is also the preference for Hiphils and the greatly lessened use of Infinitive Absolute as an Imperative or Adverbial Qualification. In the matter of composition also there is affinity for we find a certain supplementation and duplication of narrative in Chronicles similar to the recapitulation technique of the Samaritan Pentateuch. Gerleman affirms that the linguistic affinity of the Samaritan Pentateuch with the Hagiagrapha shows that its variants are due not to a provincial dialect but to a younger and more vernacular stage of Hebrew than in MT.

According to Millar Burrows³¹ Gerleman oversimplifies the problem of drawing a line between the Hagiagrapha as representing the vulgar text and the Pentateuch and Prophets as showing results of archaising revision; further and fuller evidence is needed, before it can be affirmed that the Masoretic revision of the current text was based on an older, more accurate tradition which had perished along with the freely developing popular text; for example, there may have been a deliberate revision on the theoretical ground that scriptio plane was a novelty or, yet again, a simplification after the introduction of vowel signs made matres lectionis unnecessary. Further, Gerleman does not give enough weight to the possibility of dialectal difference. For a further discussion/

discussion on this point, cf. the next writer to be considered, A. Sperber, or C. F. Burney³².

Two important monographs on dialectal difference come from A. Sperber. In the first, Hebrew in Greek and Latin Transliteration³³ he draws his material from the transliterations of proper names in the LXX, the material preserved from the second column of Origen's Hexapha and the transliterations of Jerome, and proves conclusively that the Hebrew revealed had a very different pronunciation prior to the rise of the Tiberian system of vocalisation. In Chapter xxxiii, "Two Dialects of Biblical Hebrew" he affirms that the differences are such that they reflect a two-fold way of pronouncing Hebrew. Though going back to a common ancestor, they are two separate branches each with a phonetic development of its own. He regards the Kingdom of Israel and Judah as the homelands of these dialectal differences. Reference is made by him to the well-known Ephraemitic peculiarity of pronunciation, cf. Judges 12⁶, the distinction between ω and ω belonging to the Judaeal dialect. Reference is also made to possible Samaritan dialectal forms e.g. according to Samaritan usage the waw consecutive does not at all affect the accentuation and vocalisation of the respective verbal form. This is also true of the transliterations. He concludes that the Samaritan Pentateuch represents the Israelitish recension, while in MT the Judaeal recension is/

is preserved. He safeguards himself by postulating that neither can be regarded as representing its prototype in original dialectal purity as the textual changes they underwent in various stages of redaction may have eliminated dialectal idioms. Sperber himself admits the limited nature of his material but he argues his case well and his views should receive the highest respect. With reference to this monograph Kahle recognised Sperber had further material to investigate and drew attention to a volume on Samaritan pronunciation by Fritz Diening³⁴.

In the second monograph, Hebrew in parallel transmission³⁵ Sperber furnishes a careful, detailed classification of variants between Hebrew and Samaritan Pentateuchs according to A. Phonetic Value of Letters: B. Graphic Forms of Letters: C. Vowels and their Phonography: D. The Verb: E. The Noun: F. Nominal and Verbal Suffixes: G. Syntax: H. Vocabulary. It is difficult to determine in many cases whether the Hebrew or the Samaritan is the original and Sperber does not attempt to do so.

Another modern scholar to be mentioned here is P. W. Skehan for his valuable work on the Qumran Pentateuchal fragments in which he states that books of the Pentateuch still circulated in Palestine down to the First Revolt in copies with varying degrees of recensional backgrounds³⁶; as evidence of/

of this he instances the palaeo-Hebrew scroll of Exodus which cannot be considered a Samaritan sectarian document - "in view of the known attitude of the community towards 'the men of Ephraim and Manesses' the probabilities are all against it" - though it does offer a type of text the Samaritans have possessed as their own, with its repetitious manner of recounting the plague episode, its borrowings from Deuteronomy and its transpositions. Reference is also made to a MS of Numbers that contains expanded readings hitherto known only from the Samaritan recension. These references in Skehan are indeed valuable in that they clearly indicate that the expansions of the Samaritan Pentateuch are at least as old as Qumran and are not specifically sectarian in character.

A scholar who has performed a valuable service to Samaritan studies by warning against the unevidenced statements that have often been made regarding Samaritan history is H. H. Rowley who in a Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Manchester, Sanballat and the Samaritan Temple³⁷ demolishes certain assumptions and pre-conceived ideas. He points out the limitations of the data that have been used by some past writers in the endeavour to determine the date of the Samaritan schism. There is the enigmatic reference in Nehemiah 13²⁸ which tells of the banishment of the grandson, unnamed, of the high priest Eliashib for marrying the daughter of/
of/

of Sanballet (432 B.C.) and the circumstantial narrative in the eleventh book of the Antiquities of Josephus,

§ 302-324, which also tells of a banishment for a like reason, but in this case a great-grandson of Eliashib, called Manasseh, shortly before the coming of Alexander the Great (332 B.C.). Josephus expressly connects this incident with the erection of the Samaritan temple on Mount Gerizim. Rowley warns against the assumption that the banished Jerusalem priest became the Samaritan high priest. There is no hint of this in the Bible - certainly not in Nehemiah's statement - and Josephus' account is obviously unreliable. Further, as he emphasises, the Samaritan schism and the erection of their temple, are two quite distinct facts and may quite well belong to different periods. It is unnecessary to trace his arguments in detail. His conclusion that the schism occurred within the period 430-350 B.C. would probably be accepted by the majority of scholars today.

In a recent volume of Scripta Hierosolymitana³⁸ S. Talmon gives an interesting and valuable paper on Synonymous Readings in the Old Testament. He emphasises that not all textual variants arose from scribal error or deliberate emendation but that there are some that had their source in a different textual tradition from that of the MT. The fact that the Samaritan community and the sect of the Judaeen desert /

desert have on occasion textual variants in common, and differing from the MT, indicates the antiquity of the sources underlying them. Further, the Samaritan Pentateuch occasionally has readings differing from the MT of the Pentateuch but identical with the parallel reading preserved in the MT of Chronicles. Such readings would belong to different textual traditions going back to the common heritage of Judaism. Talmon goes on to refer to a class of variants which he characterises as synonymous readings: there is no sign of systematic or tendentious emendations and the words or phrases are used interchangeably. Where such variation occurs it is impossible to decide that any one variant is intrinsically preferable to the others. Such readings go back to an early stage in the history of the OT text to that period of divergent traditions that preceded the MT. Talmon then presents a long series of word-pairs, e.g. $\gamma 27 - \gamma 28$ whose separate components may be used interchangeably within the same passage or parallel passages of a text or as alternatives in MT and an extra-Masoretic text, such as the Samaritan or the Dead Sea Scrolls. Talmon provides much interesting material that deserves careful consideration and references to it will be made later in Chapter V, Classification of the Samaritan variants.

A well-known OT scholar who has written on the Samaritans from the textual standpoint is E. Robertson. In his/

his Catalogue of the Samaritan MSS in the John Rylands Library³⁹, he details MS material not included in the von Gall edition. A statement regarding these MSS is given in Chapter II of this Thesis. Robertson has also written an important paper in the Gaster Centenary Publication on the famous Abisha Scroll⁴⁰. He tells something of its long history and gives the accounts of Samaritan and European eye-witnesses, including Gaster. Their descriptions are given in a certain detail. The writing appears to be homogeneous; though there are indications of different hands and different periods, a long interval need not be postulated between them. He hesitated to accept Kahle's theory of a very early portion of the Scroll combined with later material and suspended judgment on this matter until the publication of Professor Pérez Castro's photographs of the complete scroll. These results have now been published and a very full review is given by Professor Robertson in Vetus Testamentum⁴¹. He pays tribute to Castro's meticulous and scholarly work which provides a detailed description of the famous scroll and of which he gives quite a full account. It is now possible to reach a decision regarding the textual work of the MS. The Scroll turns out to be not a unit, but a composite of a number of elements. No fewer than nine different hands have been identified. Portions of scrolls of different ages are/

are held together by a backing and built up to form a complete Torah. In the words of Robertson, "The value of the Scroll as a witness to the early text of the Pentateuch must inevitably be greatly impaired, although perhaps not entirely destroyed."

Accordingly there is no question of the von Gall text having been displaced as the standard authority on the Samaritan Hebrew Pentateuch.

Another well-known OT scholar who has worked in the Samaritan field is John Bowman, formerly of Leeds University and now of Melbourne. He has contributed to Samaritan studies by articles in various periodicals on such subjects as Samaritan literature, religion and history, e.g. The Leeds Samaritan Decalogue Inscription⁴², The Exegesis of the Pentateuch among the Samaritans and Rabbis⁴³, The Samaritans and the Book of Deuteronomy⁴⁴, The Importance of Samaritan Researches⁴⁵. In 1950 he founded a School of Samaritan Studies at Leeds and gave generously of his time to it. Under his guidance comprehensive and detailed research was undertaken by students on such varied topics as Samaritan Liturgy, Texts, Theology and Exegesis. Since his departure to Melbourne the activity of the School is being maintained under his successor, John Macdonald. A wide field for research is being opened up by the extensive library of Samaritan writings consisting of manuscripts and microfilm of the Department of Semitic Languages and Literatures at Leeds.

John/

John Macdonald has recently published two studies on Samaritan Theology that will now be considered. The volumes referred to are Memar Marqah⁴⁶ and The Theology of the Samaritans⁴⁷. The former promises to become the standard work on Memar Marqah and its text and the latter should introduce Samaritan Theology to the English speaking world. In nomenclature, Macdonald makes a precise distinction between Judaeans and Judaist: he understands Judaeans as describing the Hebrew tribes of southern Palestine and Judaist as referring to the religion of post-exilic Judaeans, restricted to the period beginning with Ezra. The term Judaists has been used instead of the term Jews which carries with it too wide a connotation. This precision in definition makes for clarity of thought and expression in his subsequent exposition. In his Introduction he correctly emphasises the element of polemic in the historical writings of the OT; when even the two Judaeans narratives of Kings and Chronicles can differ widely, it is only reasonable to grant that the Samaritan view of history, in its differences from that of the MT, should not be rejected out of hand but at least examined. Macdonald proceeds to discuss the various Samaritan beliefs such as the Oneness of God, the Law and the Day of Vengeance and Recompense. His exposition of the Samaritan Theology lends support to some of the conclusions reached in the classification of the doctrinal variants later in this Thesis.

Footnotes, Chapter I.

1. J.A.Montgomery, The Samaritans; the Earliest Jewish Sect. Their History, Theology and Literature. Bohle Lectures, 1906. Philadelphia, 1907. p.165.
2. Sanhedrin, 21 b.
3. Montgomery, p.286.
4. J.Morinus, Exercitationes Ecclesiasticae in utrumque Samaritanorum Pentateuchus. Paris, 1631.
5. De Muis, Assertatio veritatis Hebraicae aduersus J.Morini Exercitationes, 1631.
J.H.Hottinger, Exercitationes anti-Morinianae de Pentateuche Samaritano. Zurich, 1644.
6. Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum variis lectionibus, 2 vols. Oxford, 1776-80.
7. Halle, 1815.
8. Urschrift u. Übersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von der innern Entwicklung der Judenthums. Breslau, 1857, pp.97 ff.
9. ZDMG xii (1858) pp. 132 - 42.
10. ZDMG xvi (1862) pp.714 - 28.
11. ZDMG xx (1866) pp. 527 - 73.
12. 5 vols., Berlin, 1875 - 78.
13. Leipzig, 1868.
14. Die Israeliten u. ihre Nachbarstämme. Halle, 1906, pp.543 ff.
15. The Divine Names in Genesis. London, 1914, p.289.
16. Montgomery, p.289.
17. Giessen, 1914 - 18.
18. TSK, lxxxviii, 1915, pp.399 - 439.

19. London, 1947.
20. *Studia Orientalia Ioanni Pedersen dicata, Hanniae*, 1953, pp. 188-192.
21. Perez Castro, 'El sefer Abisa', Sefarad, xiii, 1953, pp. 119-129.
22. ZAW xi N.F. 1934, pp. 254-274.
23. *Die Welt des Alten Testaments.* Berlin, 1953.
24. *The Samaritans. Schweich Lectures*, 1923.
London, 1925.
25. *Samaritan Oral Law and Ancient Traditions (London)*, 1932.
26. London, 1901.
27. London, 1874.
28. *The Samaritans: Their Testimony to the Religion of Israel.* Edinburgh, 1919.
29. Berlin, 1923.
30. Lund, 1948.
31. JBL lxxviii, 1949, pp. 382-84.
32. *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Kings.* Oxford, 1903, p.208 f.
33. HUCA xii-xiii, 1937-38, pp. 151-274.
34. *Das Hebräische bei den Samaritanern.* Stuttgart, 1938.
35. HUCA xiv, 1939, pp. 161-249.
36. "Exodus in the Samaritan Recension from Qumran"
JBL, lxxiv, 1955, pp. 182-187
"The Qumran MSS and Textual Criticism"
VTS iv, 1957, pp. 148-60.
37. Vol. 38, No. 1, September 1955.
38. Vol. viii, Jerusalem, 1961, pp. 335-83.
39. Manchester, 1938.
40. "The Ancient Scroll of the Samaritans" in Gaster Centenary Publication. London, 1958.

41. xii, 1962, pp. 228 - 235.
42. Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical Society.
Vol.VI, Part viii, pp. 567-575
43. Outtestamentische Studien, viii.
44. Glasgow University Oriental Society,
Vol. XVII (1958-59) pp. 9-18.
45. Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society,
Vol. I., pp. 43-54.
46. Beih. ZAW, Berlin, 1963.
47. London, 1964.

48.

CHAPTER II.

Object and Methods of the Present Study.

After the short review of Samaritan studies in the previous Chapter it now follows to indicate the scope and method of the investigation now to be undertaken.

With regard to the textual variants of the Samaritan Hebrew Pentateuch from the MT Pfeiffer says that further research is required to appreciate fully their significance and to utilise them for a reconstruction of the earliest text of the Pentateuch¹. The purpose of this Thesis is to endeavour to evaluate these variants and, if possible, restore the text as it existed at the time when the Samaritans seceded. In furtherance of this purpose the aim is to classify existing material and also to take into account new material that has come to light.

Quite briefly, the method is the collection, critical examination and classification of the textual variants between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the MT, collating the whole Pentateuch, with a view to determining the number, nature and extent of the variants. Previous writers have discussed a proportion of the Samaritan variants but none appear to have covered the whole field and considered all the evidence. Such/

Such conclusions, drawn from only part of the evidence, may be confirmed, modified or disproved when the whole conspectus is undertaken in this way.

The sources, listed in the Preface, pages i, ii, to which this method is to be applied are the well-known Biblia Hebraica of Kittel and the von Gall text of the Samaritan. Further, in the case of all the Samaritan variants, comparison is made with the Pentateuch Texts in the recently published Discoveries in the Judaean Desert. Apart from these three sources, the LXX is consulted where variants show differences in sense or where proper names occur.

In the criticism of these sources it is hardly necessary to state why the text published by Kahle in Kittel's Biblia Hebraica has been adopted in this Thesis as the standard MT. It is recognised by most scholars today as the closest text to the original MT now available.

The von Gall text requires further discussion. When it appeared it was hailed as an outstanding achievement in Samaritan Pentateuch studies. There are few today who would seriously question this view. This critical edition of the Samaritan Hebrew Pentateuch was something completely new: the detailed and elaborate critical apparatus on every page of the text showed with what meticulous care the editor had proceeded with his work. Yet in recent years its reliability has been questioned on two grounds, that it is an/

an eclectic text and that it has not made use of all the MS material available.

The first objection comes from Dugmore who questions the von Gall text for its eclectic procedure. He states that there is no standard text of the Samaritan Pentateuch and, in the absence of such, he has collated two Samaritan MSS with that printed by Blaney (1790) based on the Paris Polyglott (1645)². Of course a case might be argued against an eclectic text alleging that it might become an artificial production depending on the subjective judgment of the editor, but it is only fair to point out that von Gall in his introduction frankly acknowledges his eclectic method stating that the prospect of arriving at an archetype text on which the Samaritan was based is as unlikely as in the case of the Jewish text³. Further, while in Samaritan there may be no standard text, such as developed in Masoretic circles, it cannot be denied that there is a uniform text. Apart from orthographical variation such as plane and defective writing of yodh and waw and mistakes with the guttural letters to which the Samaritans were prone, there is an astonishing unanimity between the many MSS used by von Gall and detailed in his critical apparatus. In the words of Kahle: "For many centuries the Samaritan Pentateuch also has been a textus receptus without various readings. We have seen that a text similar to it must have been used in Jewish circles also, in the/

the time before all the earlier texts were replaced by the authoritative Hebrew text"⁴. If von Gall has not given an accurate rendering of a particular Samaritan MS he has given what has every appearance of being an accurate representation of the Samaritan text tradition.

The second objection, that exhaustive use has not been made of all the MSS available, appears to have greater weight. E. Robertson gives details of Samaritan MSS, 2 complete codices, 3 large portions and many fragments in the John Rylands' Library⁵, which were not included in the von Gall edition, though the two complete MSS ("Fast Vollständig") were described by him in the *Nachträge u. Verbesserungen* on information supplied by Kahle⁶. Moreover, von Gall did not consult the Samaritan scrolls at Nablus, among them the famous Abisha Scroll⁷. The latter has been rarely shown to visitors. Another MS is substituted. Such seems to have happened in the case of a photograph of a Nablus scroll, affirmed to be the oldest in the Samaritan community, and in the possession of Professor John Garstang. A portion, Leviticus 15²-16¹⁸ was made available to me and collated with the von Gall text. See Appendix B. In this passage, at least, as the collation shows, the text of this MS contains a larger proportion of obvious scribal errors than the von Gall text. Presumably this is the photograph referred to by Kahle in his article on the Abisha Scroll in the *Pedersen Festschrift*⁸.
The/

The specimen contained the text of Leviticus 15 and 16 and was judged by A. E. Cowley to come from a MS written about the 13th century. Another important monograph on the Abisha Scroll is that by E. Robertson in 1958⁹. Both Kahle and Robertson refer to the fact that Professor Perez Castro has been successful in obtaining a photograph of the complete Scroll and that the publication of the text should make a decision possible on the worth of this famous MS. Castro has now published his results¹⁰ and a very full account of his work is given by Robertson in a review in *Vetus Testamentum*¹¹. See above, p. 27-8. It appears to be quite clear that the Scroll has little value as a witness to the early text of the Pentateuch and accordingly there is no reason to believe that the von Gall text has been displaced as the standard authority on the Samaritan Hebrew Pentateuch.

With these reservations the von Gall text has been accepted as the basis of comparison with the MT, having in mind that it is the best known and indeed the most generally acceptable authority and, moreover, in view of the uniformity of the Samaritan textual tradition evidenced by its MSS.

The third source listed in the Preface, the Pentateuch Texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Discoveries in the Judaean Desert¹², is considered by the great majority of scholars to belong to the first century A.D. or earlier. These Pentateuch fragments/

fragments are of great importance in themselves and for the light they may shed on the comparison between the MT and the Samaritan Pentateuch. They bring in a completely new witness whose testimony may be of decisive importance in assessing the worth that is to be assigned to the Samaritan Hebrew Pentateuch.

Footnotes, Chapter II.

1. R.H.Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament.
New York, 1948. p. 101.
2. JTS, 'Two Sam MSS in the Library of Queen's College,
Cambridge', xxxvi, 1935, p. 142.
3. Von Gall, op. cit., p. LXVIII
4. Kahle, The Cairo Geniza, p. 149.
5. Catalogue of the Samaritan MSS in the John Rylands
Library, Manchester, 1938.
6. Von Gall, op.cit., p. xv.
7. Kahle, Cairo Geniza, p.50, footnote.
Thomson, The Samaritans. Appendix II, p. 396.
Robertson, Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, 1935.
Notes and Extracts from the Semitic MSS in the
John Rylands Library. I Concerning the Abisha
Scroll.
Gaster, Schweich Lectures, 1923. The Samaritans,
London, 1925, pp.109 f.
8. 'The Abisha Scroll of the Samaritans' in Studia Orientalia
Ioani Pedersen dicata. Hanniae, 1953, pp.188-192
9. 'The Ancient Scroll of the Samaritan' in Gaster Centenary
Publication, Ed. B. Shindler, London, 1958
10. F. Perez Castro, Séfer Abisa. Edicion del fragmento
antiquo del rolo sagredo del Pentatenco Hebreo
Samaritano de Nablus. Madrid, 1959.
11. XII 1962, p. 228.
12. I. Qumran Cave I. Oxford, 1955.
II. Les Grottes de Murabba'at. Oxford, 1961.
III. Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumran. Oxford, 1962.

CHAPTER III.

Preliminary Considerations affecting

Comparative Study of the Texts.

Before proceeding with the comparison of the MT and the Samaritan Pentateuch and the classification of the data there are certain preliminary considerations that arise.

There are three historical facts that have a bearing on the textual studies that are to follow:

1. Prior to the Council of Jamnia there was a period of variant texts.
2. There was oral as well as written textual transmission.
3. MSS occurred in both Scroll and Codex form.

Only when the significance and relevance of these facts are appreciated is it possible to proceed with the comparative study of the two texts.

1. Pre-Masoretic Hebrew Texts.

The complete MT in its present form is an eighth century production and its earliest MS of the whole OT belongs to 1008 A.D. which is the date of the MS forming the basis of Kittel's Biblia Hebraica III. Yet while this is so, it represents a text very much earlier, a pre-Masoretic and probably Jerusalem tradition. It is significant that all the Biblical/

Biblical texts from Murrabba'at (135 A.D.) show close affinities with the MT.¹ Yet at Qumran, 60 years earlier, a different position is disclosed. The Biblical MSS there reveal variant text traditions. One is a tradition virtually identical with that of our present MT and is represented e.g. by the Hebrew University MS of Isaiah. In addition, there are traces of genuine alternative traditions. There are MS fragments revealing a text closely resembling that of the Samaritan Pentateuch, with the additions and transpositions so typical of it. There are also Hebrew fragments showing strong affinities with the Hebrew recension presupposed by the LXX². Accordingly, one must conclude that the community at Qumran seemed to have considerable liberty of choice and was not limited to any one textual tradition. These three traditions can be observed and probably some of a mixed type. Thus prior to the Council of Jamnia convened between 90 and 100 A.D. there was a period of variant texts. Thereafter a standard text was more or less fixed and preserved with relatively few variations.

The method of fixing this text is referred to in Jewish tradition. The Jerusalem Talmud Ta'anith iv. 2 relates that, in order to determine the right text, three temple MSS were consulted and the reading represented by two of them was always preferred to that found in only one.

This/

This tradition is not to be lightly dismissed for it may contain real historical fact. The Rabbis would not evolve a completely new text but selected a tradition already in existence. They preserved errors in this tradition that preceded the MT. They did not collate other MSS to correct them but to bring them into line with that existing tradition. Even what was obviously wrong was preserved and a Q^ere was added.

2. Oral Transmissions.

The fact that the transmission of the text was not only written but oral may well explain many of the variants that have arisen between the Samaritan and Masoretic Pentateuch.

It is clear that, in the case of a written text that was the standard norm, schools of scribes would endeavour to make exact copies. Ideally, the copy and its exemplar would read exactly the same but even here there was considerable possibility of error for in the early stages of the language the vocalisation was oral. A consonantal text must always contain passages more or less doubtful in meaning so that the possibility of mistake arises. In a document copied by hand all sorts of errors of eye and ear and mental association can become operative. In An Aid to the Textual Amendment of the Old Testament, James Kennedy classifies no less than sixteen possibilities of departure from the original text such as Interchange, Transposition, Omission and Addition of letters and/

and words³. His full treatment of these clearly shows the pitfalls that beset the scribe!

In the case of oral transmission the possibility of error is even greater, when a man recites a text that he remembers by heart without reference to any written archetype. Provided he recites the meaning it is not necessary for every word to be exactly the same. It is evident that many examples of spelling and accident which make no difference to the meaning would not be differentiated in an oral transmission. Further, a man might recite a tradition slightly incorrectly. Should such a tradition be subsequently committed to writing, variation would arise between it and the written standard norm. Further, it may well have been that copies of the Law circulated privately and were not treated with such care as the official standard law books. Oral expansions in the teaching of the schools might well have been incorporated in these private copies. There is no direct evidence of this at an early date but a hypothesis such as this would explain the probable expansions, the smoothing out of difficulties or the correction of eccentricities such as are to be found in the Samaritan text. In this way the Samaritans would be incorporating their teaching into their Pentateuch.

3. Scroll and Codex.

A topic that is now to be considered is a theory put forward/

deleted, read וּמִשְׁמַרְתִּיךְ

Differences of orthography are quite frequent, e.g. 28⁴ (where one would surely expect unanimity), four MSS $\delta'\mu\theta\tau$ read בְּהַרְגֵּרְזִים but one Λ reads בְּהַרְגֵּרְזִים . Again, 27¹⁰ μ and θ read חֲקִיבִין while $\delta'\Lambda\tau$ read חֲקִיבִין . Another example of orthography is 28²² where four MSS read יְכֹךְ , while one MS θ reads יְכֹכָה with MT and one MS δ' actually יְכֹכָה . The same word occurs again in verse 27, where μ and Λ read יְכֹכָה , $\delta'\theta\tau$ read יְכֹכָה , in verse 28 where $\mu\Lambda$ read יְכֹכָה and δ' reads יְכֹכָה , and again in verse 35 where five MSS read יְכֹכָה while δ' again reads יְכֹכָה .

Mistakes occur with gutturals Exx: Addition: 28³⁵, Λ reads הִשְׁקִים (others הִשְׁקִים). Transposition: 28³⁹ μ reads גִּמְרִי (meaningless, as there is no root גִּמְרִי) while others read גִּמְרִי with MT (גִּמְרִי occurs here and twice in Proverbs).

Additional ו ("and") occurs 27¹² $\mu\theta\gamma$ read וּבְרִיךְ and $\delta'\theta\Lambda$ read וּבְרִיךְ

A letter is written between the lines in 28²⁵ $\delta'\mu\tau$ read חֲכִיבִין and θ (with ו between lines) Λ read חֲכִיבִין

It will be clearly seen from these representative examples that the Scroll MSS are not unanimous in their witness to the text. The same kind of variants occur in the Scroll as in the Codex, and they appear to be just as numerous. There is no relation between the Scroll MSS such as would lead us/

us to infer a common tradition superior to that of the codex.

Neither is there any justification for the theory that the scroll represents a different tradition of text from that of the codex. Gaster endeavours to show this by a comparison of the Samaritan scroll, Samaritan codex and the MT, and he claims to show that the readings of the scroll differ from those of the codex and lie nearer to the MT. His conclusions are unsound by reason of the fact that the readings he ascribes to the codex cannot be maintained in the light of the von Gall texts: the text of the Samaritan codex is generally different from that given by Gaster (only a few MSS have his readings). In most pages of the von Gall volume the text rests upon about two dozen Samaritan MSS, the majority of which are codices. The testimony of these MSS as a whole to the codex is quite different from that given by Gaster. Usually the readings of Gaster can be found in a few MSS, say three or four, very rarely the same three or four. The evidence is overwhelming and only a few examples need be given.

	<u>MT.</u>	<u>Sam.Scroll</u>	<u>Sam.Codex</u>
28 ²⁵	ד'כרד קלכשכ	'ד 'י	'ד קלכשכ (only a few MSS)
28 ²⁷	דקחכ י'ד'	'י	דקחכ (only 3 out of 27 MSS)
28 ³³	ק'חכח' פ'ר י'ד' י'ד'	'ח 'פ	'ח 'פ (only 4 out of 27 MSS)

To sum up the evidence; in this portion of the Pentateuch, where the evidence of MSS in Scroll and Codex is available, there is no reason to conclude that the text of the scroll has been more accurately transmitted or that it represents a different tradition from that of the codex.

Footnotes, Chapter III.

1. J.T.Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Judaeae Wilderness
and their Importance. London, 1959, p.140.
2. F.M.Cross, Jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran.
London, 1958, pp.131-38.
3. Edinburgh, 1928, pp. 4-187.
4. London, 1901, p.25 (242)

CHAPTER IV.

Principles of the Classification.

Before proceeding with the actual classification of the Samaritan variants from the MT it is desirable to state certain general principles and to give an outline of the proposed classification itself.

The Classification proposed is aimed at being objective, comprehensive and convenient; objective, by taking the facts as they are and thus endeavouring to avoid a subjective analysis such as that based on a theoretical distinction between intentional and unintentional alteration; comprehensive, by giving both a broadly classified as well as a detailed examination of the material; convenient, by providing a clear-cut division of the material for the purpose of easy reference.

In the Classification which follows the Samaritan variants are divided into three main divisions: Orthography, Grammar and Vocabulary.

Orthography is here used in the sense of two different spellings of the same word. There are also included under this division examples such as γ^3 and τ^3 , showing occurrence of two different but related consonants. These are treated here for purpose of easy reference, though a case might be argued/

argued for their inclusion under difference of Vocabulary.

The number of orthographic differences is very large and there are not only differences of orthographic usage between different Samaritan MSS but sometimes within the one Samaritan MS a variant orthography is found once, or in a few examples, or continued throughout the Pentateuch. Accordingly, exact enumeration is impossible. What will be done is to distinguish certain main groups and elucidate tendencies and endeavour to determine their relevance and significance.

The second main division, Grammar, consists of variants showing inflected forms and derived forms from the same root in both Samaritan and MT. A few words showing transposition of two consonants are included here rather than under Vocabulary.

In this division a new factor emerges as some of the variants show difference of meaning as well as form. Thus variation under this heading is now divided into those with agreement in sense and those with divergence in sense. Forms agreeing in sense and found elsewhere in the Samaritan Pentateuch are distinguished from those not found elsewhere in the Samaritan Pentateuch. There is still further sub-division such as early and late forms, common and rare forms, forms found elsewhere in context or in parallel passages.

Grammatical variants showing difference of meaning have to be classified quite differently and here a distinction is/

is made between doctrinal and non-doctrinal variation. Doctrinal variants are considered in relation to the known doctrinal background of Judaism or Samaritanism. In the case of some of the non-doctrinal variants a comparison is made with interpretations elsewhere, inside or outside the Samaritan Pentateuch.

The third main division consists of variants comprising differences of Vocabulary, in the sense that a word from a different root occurs in Samaritan.

Here, as under Grammar, there are variants that involve difference of meaning as well as form. Accordingly, there are two sub-divisions into synonyms of various kinds and variants showing difference of sense, some of which show complete divergence in meaning. The same sub-divisions of these are used as in the case of the grammatical groups.

Outline of Classification.

I. Differences of Orthography.

1. Variants attributed to scribal error.

- i. Letters similar in sound.
 - (1) Gutturals.
 - (2) Palatals
 - (3) Sibilants.
 - (4) Labials.
- ii. Letters similar in shape.
- iii. Other typical scribal errors.
- iv. Formae Mixtae.
- v. Proper Names.
- vi. Passages too corrupt in both ST and MT for any useful comparison.

2. Variants making the pronunciation explicit.

- i. Use of Aleph
- ii. Use of He
- iii. Use of Yodh and Waw.
 - (1) Greater use of vowel letters as compared with MT.
 - (2) Possible orthographic retention of consonantal Yodh.

3. Variants normalizing the spelling of words.

- i. Archaisms.
- ii. Errors.
- iii. Inconsistencies in identical or similar context.

4. Variants in writing of Samaritan MSS.

II. Differences of Grammar.

1. With agreement in sense.

1. Accidence.

(1) Variants consisting of forms found elsewhere in Samaritan Pentateuch.

(i) Normal forms.

- a. Common for rare forms.
- b. Forms suggesting misreading, miswriting or mishearing in ST or MT.
- c. Forms in identical or similar context.
- d. Forms which do not belong to any of the above types.

(ii) Abnormal forms.

- a. Early.
- b. Late
- c. Forms suggesting misreading, miswriting or mishearing in ST or MT.
- d. Forms in identical or similar context.
- e. Forms which do not belong to any of the above types.

(2) Variants consisting of forms not found elsewhere in Samaritan Pentateuch.

(i) In MT of Hebrew Bible:

- a. In Pentateuch.
- b. Outside Pentateuch.

(ii) In Dead Sea Scrolls

(iii) In both (i) and (ii)

(iv) In no other known source.

ii. Syntax.

(1) Variants consisting of constructions found elsewhere in Samaritan Pentateuch.

(i) Normal constructions

- a. Common for rare constructions
- b. Constructions suggesting misreading, miswriting, or mishearing in ST or MT.
- c. Constructions in identical or similar context.
- d. Constructions which do not belong to any of the above types.

(ii) Abnormal constructions.

- a. Early
- b. Late
- c. Constructions suggesting misreading, miswriting or mishearing in ST or MT.
- d. Constructions in identical or similar context.
- e. Constructions which do not belong to any of the above types.

(2) Variants consisting of constructions not found elsewhere in Samaritan Pentateuch.

(i) In MT of Hebrew Bible:

- a. In Pentateuch.
- b. Outside Pentateuch.

(ii) In Dead Sea Scrolls.

(iii) In both (i) and (ii).

(iv) In no other known source.

2. With divergence in sense.i. Doctrinal variants.

- (1) Controversy regarding Gerizim.
- (2) Other Samaritan beliefs and practices.

ii. Non-doctrinal variants.

- (1) Variants where there appear to be cogent reasons in favour of ST.
- (2) Variants where there appear to be cogent reasons in favour of MT.
- (3) Variants where there appear to be no cogent reasons in favour of ST or MT.

III. Differences of Vocabulary.1. With agreement in sense.i. Substitutions.

- (1) Pure Synonyms.
 - (i) Common words.
 - a. Common for rare words.
 - b. Words suggesting misreading, miswriting or mishearing in ST or MT.

- c. Words in identical or similar context.
- d. Words which do not belong to any of the above types.

(ii) Uncommon words.

- a. Early
- b. Late
- c. Words suggesting misreading, miswriting or mishearing in ST or MT.
- d. Words in identical or similar context.
- e. Words which do not belong to any of the above types.

(2) Synonyms giving greater precision or emphasis.

(i) Common words.

- a. Common for rare words.
- b. Words suggesting misreading, miswriting or mishearing in ST or MT.
- c. Words in identical or similar context.
- d. Words which do not belong to any of the above types.

(ii) Uncommon words.

- a. Early
- b. Late.
- c. Words suggesting misreading, miswriting or mishearing in ST. or MT.
- d. Words in identical or similar context.
- e. Words which do not belong to any of the above types.

ii. Additions.

(1) Pure Synonyms.

(i) Common words.

- a. Stylistic supplements in ST.
- b. Words suggesting misreading, miswriting or mishearing in ST or MT.
- c. Words in identical or similar context.
- d. Words which do not belong to any of the above types.

(ii) Uncommon words.

- a. Early
- b. Late
- c. Words suggesting misreading, miswriting or mishearing in ST or MT.
- d. Words in identical or similar context.
- e. Words which do not belong to any of the above types.

(2) Synonyms giving greater precision or emphasis.

(i) Common words.

- a. Record of events implied but not explicitly recorded in MT.
- b. Words suggesting misreading, miswriting or mishearing in ST or MT.
- c. Words in identical or similar context.
- d. Words which do not belong to any of the above types.

(ii) Uncommon words.

- a. Early
- b. Late
- c. Words suggesting misreading, miswriting or mishearing in ST or MT.
- d. Words in identical or similar context.
- e. Words which do not belong to any of the above types.

iii. Omissions.

(1) Pure Synonyms.

(i) Common words.

- a. Stylistic supplements in MT.
- b. Words suggesting misreading, miswriting or mishearing in ST or MT.
- c. Words omitted in identical or similar context.
- d. Words which do not belong to any of the above types.

(ii) Uncommon words.

- a. Early
- b. Late
- c. Words suggesting misreading, miswriting or mishearing in ST or MT.
- d. Words omitted in identical or similar context.
- e. Words which do not belong to any of the above types.

(2) Synonyms giving greater precision or emphasis.

(i) Common words.

- a. Record of events implied but not explicitly recorded in ST.
- b. Words suggesting misreading, miswriting or mishearing in ST or MT.
- c. Words omitted in identical or similar context.
- d. Words which do not belong to any of the above types.

(ii) Uncommon words.

- a. Early
- b. Late
- c. Words suggesting misreading, miswriting or mishearing in ST or MT.
- d. Words omitted in identical or similar context.
- e. Words which do not belong to any of the above types.

2. With divergence in sense.i. Doctrinal variants.

- (1) Controversy regarding Gerizim.
- (2) Other Samaritan beliefs and practices.

ii. Non-doctrinal variants.

- (1) Variants where there appear to be cogent reasons in favour of ST.
- (2) Variants where there appear to be cogent reasons in favour of MT.
- (3) Variants where there appear to be no cogent reasons in favour of ST or MT.

The above scheme of classification has been drawn up in the light of the examination of the Samaritan variants and appears to be adapted to the material. However, in the presentation of this material, in the following Chapter and in Appendix A, a sub-division is omitted when there are no variants under its heading.

CHAPTER V.

Classification of the Samaritan Variants from the Masoretic Text.

As stated in the Preface, the Samaritan variants are collated with the Pentateuchal texts of the Dead Sea scrolls in Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, I, II and III (designated DSS I, II and III) when the MSS fragments from Qumran and Murabba'at contain the passage in question.

The Samaritan variants that consist of difference in proper names or show difference of sense are also collated with the Septuagint (designated LXX).

I. Differences of Orthography.

Although in the examples given the ST and MT orthographies are grouped together, this is not to be taken as implying that these variants were pronounced alike. Petermann¹, Diening² and others have dealt with the Samaritan pronunciation of Hebrew and Kahle³, Sperber⁴ and others have shown how early transcriptions imply different pronunciation from that of pointed MT ("Tiberian").

1. Variants attributable to Scribal Error.

Some of the variants between ST and MT are due to the typical errors which arise in the course of manuscript transmission/

transmission: there are the unconscious mechanical mistakes on the part of copyists, such as errors in reading and writing. The resultant text may be quite good Hebrew and will be considered elsewhere in the Thesis but there are other cases where the text as it stands, in ST or MT or both, is doubtful or corrupt and these will be grouped here.

i. Letters similar in sound.

(1) Gutturals.

These variants show omission, addition, interchange, or transposition of gutturals and this is not unexpected in view of the well known Samaritan practice of not distinguishing the gutturals (or pronouncing them all as aleph) in the reading of Hebrew. Cf. Petermann⁵, Kahle⁶. A number of examples will now be given.

(i) Omission

Lv. 8 ²²	ST	יָוֹן	זֵי	אֵן	בָּרָךְ
	MT	יָוֹן	זֵי	אֵן	בָּרָךְ

(ii) Addition

Gn. 33 ¹³	ST (Von Gall text)	וְיָ	אֵל	אֵל	אֵל	אֵל	אֵל	אֵל
	ST (Von Gall critical apparatus)	וְיָ	אֵל	אֵל	אֵל	אֵל	אֵל	אֵל
	MT	וְיָ	אֵל	אֵל	אֵל	אֵל	אֵל	אֵל

The reading adopted by von Gall presumably implies 3 s.f. pf. Aphel of $\sqrt{\eta^3\gamma}$ which in form and meaning/

meaning is difficult to accept. $\aleph^3 \nu \gamma$ read by 9 MSS and involving transposition of the gutturals, which could easily occur, may be a late orthographical variant to the MT pt. form from $\sqrt[3]{\aleph^3 \nu \gamma}$ showing a vocalic letter other than Yodh or Waw representing a vowel within a word. See discussion by Petermann, *Formenlehre*, pp.124-5.

(iii) Interchange.

Ex. 2¹⁶ ST $\aleph \nu \gamma \aleph \nu \gamma$ MT $\aleph \nu \gamma \aleph \nu \gamma$

In Gn. 30^{38,41} some Samaritan MSS agree with the MT in reading $\aleph \nu \gamma \aleph \nu \gamma$

Dt. 28⁵² ST $\aleph \nu \gamma \aleph \nu \gamma$ MT $\aleph \nu \gamma \aleph \nu \gamma$

(iv) Transposition.

Gn. 25³⁰ ST (7 MSS) $\aleph \nu \gamma \aleph \nu \gamma$ MT $\aleph \nu \gamma \aleph \nu \gamma$

Ex. 15⁶ ST (many MSS) $\aleph \nu \gamma \aleph \nu \gamma$ MT $\aleph \nu \gamma \aleph \nu \gamma$

In addition to the foregoing examples, some of which are adopted by von Gall and all of which are strongly attested in von Gall's critical apparatus, there are many others where the evidence is/

is not so strong, e.g.

(1) Interchange of guttural

Gn. 2 ¹²	ST	הוהחם נב	(3 MSS)
	MT	הוהחם 'ו	
25 ⁴	ST	מיפה	(4 MSS)
	MT	פיכה	

(ii) Additional guttural sometimes with metathesis

Gn. 42 ²¹	ST	הזנההזרה	(11 MSS)
	ST	'ההזרה	(3 MSS)
	MT	'ההזרה	

(iii) More than two gutturals.

Gn. 43 ³³	ST	הזנההזרה	(3 MSS, 1 corr.)
	ST	'ההזנה	(3 MSS)
	ST	'ההזנה	(1 MS)
	MT	'ההזנה	

These examples, representative of a much larger corpus of material, show that the gutturals were a fruitful cause of scribal error among the Samaritans.

(2) Palatals.

Homorganic consonants, such as the palatals ʔ and ʕ sometimes interchange. There are only a few examples of this but they are nevertheless noted as representative of a type of variation, e.g.

Gn. 21 ²³	ST	יגליז
	MT	יכליז

(3) Sibilants.

In a somewhat similar way there are a few cases where the sibilants ש and ל interchange, e.g.

Gn.18²⁰ ST ַלְּטוּ אֶרְצָה
 MT ַשׁוּ אֶרְצָה

(4) Labials.

Likewise the labials ב and פ may also interchange and there are some examples of this type, e.g.

Ex.1¹² ST אֲבָל
 MT אֲפָל

ii. Letters similar in shape.

The interchange of letters which look alike is a common cause of error. Such errors could, and did, occur between resemblant letters in the Samaritan script and in the square script of the MT.

Samaritan script : 7 and 1

Gn.44⁸ ST 1 7 2 1 7
 MT 1 7 2 1 7

(Joseph's brethren remind him that they had brought back the money found in their sacks). The Samaritan reading shows an additional waw in the preformative syllable of the Hiphil inconsistent with the forms of ל"ו verbs. Thus Samaritan would imply a 7 2 1 which is quite meaningless in the context. Further, as/

as 7 and 1 are very similar in Samaritan script,
the 1 could easily arise by dittography.

Square script : ' and]

Gn.10²⁷ ST 317 (Many MSS, also LXX)
MT 311N (Agreeing with 1Chron.1²¹)

7 and 7

Gn.36³⁹ ST 77N (Many MSS, also 1Chron.1⁵⁰)
MT 77N

iii. Other typical scribal errors, such as incorrect joining or dividing of words.

In the Samaritan MSS it was customary to find a dot between each word and in the square script a small gap. Sometimes the dot could disappear or the gap become so small that words might be wrongly joined together.

Gn.25³⁴ ST D·W 77
MT D·W 77

34³¹ ST 77N 77 (cf. Petermann, p.149)
MT 77N 77

iv. Formae Mixtae.

This special variety of textual error, not an accidental miscopying but the use of a form conveying two different readings, is evidenced in ST as well as in

MT. e.g.

Ex.15¹ ST 17WN
MT 77WN

- v. Proper Names, attributable to scribal error and classifiable under the variant types of this first section of orthographical variants, are grouped together under this heading for convenience of reference.

Gn. 11 ³¹	ST	קִרְיָן	(10 MSS)
	MT	קִרְיָן	
Ex. 31 ²	ST	קִרְיָן	(14 MSS)
	MT	קִרְיָן	

The complete list is given in Appendix A.

- vi. Passages too corrupt in both ST and MT for any useful comparison.

There is a small group of passages that I am not prepared to classify. These are corrupted passages, noted in Appendix A, where the ST and MT differ from each other and both appear to have such a difficult, or even meaningless, reading that it is reasonable to assume that in both ST and MT there is ancient textual corruption that antedates their divergence from each other.

2. Variants making the pronunciation explicit.

Originally Hebrew orthography had no vowel letters and Hebrew and its cognate languages had consonantal scripts. Yet at quite an early period, for example in Hebrew and Aramaic inscriptions, consonants were used to represent vowel sounds and so to indicate the pronunciation of the text./

(ii) Final

In ST, as in MT, aleph can represent a final vowel, sometimes interchanging with he of the MT. This is frequently the case with verbs Lamedh He which in ST sometimes show orthographies similar to those of verbs Lamedh Aleph.

Ex. 2¹⁹ ST ונל נלד נלד וגם

MT ו' נלד נלד ו'

3¹⁸ ST ונל ענל נקל העבריים יקל מלל

MT ו' ענל נקל ו' מ' א'

(3) Final (prosthetic) after long vowel

Aleph (prosthetic) may or may not occur as an orthographic closing to a final long vowel

Gn. 24⁴¹ ST ונל מלל נקל וקלל

MT ו' מלל נקל ו'

27³³ ST (קלל קלל) מלל מ' (8 MSS)

MT (קלל קלל) מלל מ'

ii. Use of He

To indicate presence of final vowel.

Both Samaritan and Masoretic Text agree in using ה frequently as the orthographic representation of a final vowel. There are also certain readings where the final vowel is not orthographically represented in this way. As both orthographies were known to the scribes there are readings where both versions agree/

agree in reading the final , or in not reading it, or where one reads it and the other does not. There are many examples of this type of orthographic variation which arose from the interchange of two orthographies.

In ST

- (1) Pronoun, 2 s.m.

Nu. 11¹⁵ } ST 7AN
Dt. 5²⁴ } MT AN

- (2) Suffix, 2 s.m.

Gn.19²² ST בנכח
MT בנב

- (3) Verb, Pf. 2 s.m.

Ex. 25¹⁶ ST 78811
MT 8811

Pf. 3 s.f.

Lv. 25²¹ ST 7Λωγ1
 MT Λωγ1

Impf. 2 pl.f.

Ex. 1 ¹⁸	ST	$\Omega \cdot \gamma^3 \cdot \pi$	$\Lambda \Lambda$	$\pi \gamma \gamma \pi \Lambda \Lambda$	(von Gall)
	ST	γ^3	γ^3	$ \pi \gamma \gamma \pi \Lambda \Lambda $	(1 MS)
	ST	γ^3	γ^3	$ \gamma \gamma \pi \Lambda \Lambda $	(1 MS)
	MT	γ^3	γ^3	$ \gamma \gamma \pi \Lambda \Lambda $	

This is a rare form and only one variant has been found.

found.

Impf. 3 pl.f

Gn.19³³ ST יי |ק'ב'N א'N ק'י'פ'ω'א' (von Gall)
 ST ' 'N 'N |ק'י'פ'ω'א' (9 MSS)
 MT ' 'N 'N |ק'י'פ'ω'א'

In this example, and in all others where $\text{ק'י} \text{—}$ is found, von Gall reads the usual form in $\text{ק'י} \text{—}$

9 Samaritan MSS, however, read ק'י'פ'ω'א' and for this ending in ק' there is a certain amount of MS evidence elsewhere e.g. Gn.19³⁵ ק'י'פ'ω'א' (11 MSS), 30³⁸ (4 MSS). For full details see Appendix A.

In so far as this is not a textual error showing transposition of letters, one of which is a guttural, it might be conjectured that this orthography shows an affirmative ק' as an alternative to the usual ק'י , both connected with 3 pl.f.suffix, ק'י'פ' (after prefixes, ק'י' , ק'י').

In MT

(1) Pronoun, 2 pl.f

Gn.31⁶ ST א'N א'
 MT א'N א'N א'

(2) Suffix, 2 s.m.

Gn.27⁷ ST א'N א'כ'כ'
 MT א'N א'כ'כ'כ'

3 pl.f

ST א'כ'כ'
 MT א'כ'כ'כ'

(3) Verb. Pf. 2.sm.Gn. 31³⁰ ST אָפּוֹר

MT אָפּוֹר

iii. Use of Yodh and Waw.(1) Greater use of vowel letters as compared with MT.

In marked contrast to the MT the Samaritan Pentateuch is abundantly supplied with the vocalic consonants, Yodh and Waw. Obviously the usage is intentional and the purpose is to make the pronunciation explicit. Little purpose would be served by attempting an exhaustive classification of all the examples of plane writing in the Samaritan Pentateuch. Millar Burrows stated regarding the St. Mark's Isaiah Scroll: "One gets the impression that if the scribe could think of making a word longer by extra letters, he did it."⁹ This may also be true to some extent of the Samaritan orthography and renders complete classification of this immense group well nigh impossible. At the same time certain facts and tendencies can be discovered and these will be duly noted and an endeavour made to determine their relevance and significance.

(i) General observations.

Before enumerating certain selected classes of orthographical variation in this group, there are/

are three general observations to be made.

- a. As already stated, see above, p. 54, though ST and MT are grouped together, this is not to be considered as implying that these variants were pronounced alike. This appears to be borne out by the ST often having a scriptic plane of Yodh or Waw not homogeneous with the pronunciation of the MT.
- b. In ST there are instances of a vocalic consonant where MT has a short vowel.

Gn.10^{8,9} ST 712'2

 MT 7122

Lv.26¹³ ST 5337

 MT 5337

Nu.17¹⁵ ST 21511

 MT 2511

The Samaritan may show a later orthography than MT or, conceivably, a plane orthography of a different pronunciation.

- c. In ST there are instances of a vocalic consonant where MT has vocal shewa.

Gn.25^{1,4} ST ק'טו77

 MT קטו77

Lv.14⁴ ST 5775

 MT 5775

Once/

Once again, the Samaritans may show a later orthography than ^MT or, conceivably, a plane orthography of a different pronunciation. The Samaritans may have maintained the fuller pronunciation of the vowel. Cf. Petermann, *Formenlehre*, p.10.

A statement of the evidence on these three topics is given in Appendix A.

(ii) Selected Classes.

a. Nouns.

(a) Segholate forms.

Ex. 29 ²⁰	ST	¹⁷²
	MT	¹⁷²

Such Samaritan segholate variants, with the characteristic vowel in the second syllable and not the first, do not stand alone. Similar forms are to be found in the Qumran MSS as well as in the second column of the Hexapla, in LXX, and in transcriptions from Hebrew by Jerome¹⁰. They reveal a pronunciation distinctly different from that adopted by the Masoretes.

(b) Plural termination.

No examples given here. A full statement of the many Scripture references for plene and/

and defective spelling of masculine and feminine forms, absolute, construct and with suffixes, is given in Appendix A. It shows an overwhelming preponderance of scriptio plena.

b. Pronouns.

Suffixes, 2 s.f.

Gn.16 ⁶	ST	7' ʌ ʌ ʌ ʌ ʌ
	MT	7 ʌ ʌ ʌ ʌ

c. Verbs.

Appendix A gives references for scriptio plena/defectiva of the following:

- (a) Verbal ending before suffix
- (b) Participle, first stem syllable
- (c) Infinite Absolute, second stem syllable
- (d) Niphal, second stem syllable
- (e) Hiphil, second stem syllable

Thereafter, scriptio plena/defectiva for the following weak verbs:

- (f)(g)(h) Initial Medial and Final Yodh
- (i)(j) Initial and Medial Waw

d. Particles.

- (a) ʌ~ (Acc) ST always has scriptio defectiva
- (b) ʔ ST always has suffixes indicating the singular.

e. Proper Names, involving scriptio plena or defectiva/

defectiva of Yodh or Waw, are grouped together.

- (iii) Remaining Variants, a large corpus of material, are arranged under grammatical classes of nouns, adjectives, verbs, and particles, for convenience of reference. The foregoing selected classes just considered have been extracted from the immense mass of Samaritan variants whose orthography shows a much greater use of the letters, yodh and waw, than that of the MT. No attempt has been made at a complete classification of the whole group, apart from the grammatical arrangement of the residuum into nouns, adjectives, verbs and other parts of speech. Even if a meaningful classification were possible, it hardly appears to be necessary for the significance of this profuse use of *matres lectionis* is not really in the details but in the group as a whole. The question arises as to whether this abundance of vocalic consonants is an early or late usage. One consideration that immediately suggests itself is that the whole purpose of *plene* writing is to make the pronunciation and meaning explicit. This would not be of great/

great value unless Hebrew were still understood by the mass of the people - scholars would know it all already. Accordingly, a relatively early date might be argued for, before Hebrew was displaced by the popular Aramaic. As distinct from this possibility there is another line of evidence that might indicate dating. According to Cross and Friedman "the fullest development of plene writing was achieved during the Maccabean era" i.e. circa 100 B.C.¹¹ It has been suggested by Kahle that this period of nationalist revival stimulated a renewed interest in Hebrew and that to facilitate reading among the people there was a greater use of the *matres lectionis*, which of course was possible as the consonantal text was not yet fixed. A different view is that there was a gradual increase in the use of *scriptio plena* for some centuries prior to the establishment of the standard text which eliminated many of the vowel letters on the evidence of MS available. In any case it might be argued that the full orthography of the Samaritan Pentateuch represents a type of text prior to this standardisation.

The/

The evidence of the Pentateuchal fragments in Discoveries in the Judaean Desert I, II and III gives strong support to this view. Some of them have an orthography practically identical with that of the MT, while others witness to different traditions including one very similar to that of the Samaritan with a frequent use of the vocalic consonants, yodh and waw. See further, Chapter VI, Evidence of Dead Sea Scrolls.

It may be added that the St. Mark's Isaiah Scroll, which has been frequently consulted but not collated, shows the orthography at a still more developed stage than that of the Samaritan. In this, for example, there is a veritable abundance of vocalic consonants and it would appear as if the Scribe was inserting them much more than was customary, in fact in a lavish and unsystematic way. A comparatively rare use in ST or MT, such as 2 s.m. pronominal suffix in $\text{ךָ} \text{—}$ becomes quite general. A further example is the use of metathotic aleph in such forms as כִּי , כִּי , כִּי which occur often but not invariably.

Regarding the date of the St. Mark's Isaiah Scroll it would appear hardly possible that such a MS could have been written at all in an orthodox community/

community in Jerusalem after the standardisation of the consonantal text.

(2) Possible orthographic retention of consonantal yodh

(1) Lamedh He verbs and nouns.

It is to be noted that these orthographies are taken from the critical apparatus of von Gall and not from his actual text which, in certain aspects, as he explains in his preface, has been harmonised with the Masoretic tradition. In some cases only a few Samaritan MSS witness to these readings but they are not to be rejected without examination.

Nu. 8 ⁷	ST	יִה
	MT	הִי
Nu. 24 ⁴	ST	יִהוּ יִהוּ
	MT	יִהוּ יִהוּ

The fact that this usage is only occasional may mean that it is the survival of an earlier usage or the arrival of a new one. That one and the same MS can vary in the usage is clear from the phrase יִהוּ יִהוּ יִהוּ (Gn. 14^{19,22}) where the von Gall critical apparatus clearly shows that a MS can pass from one orthography to the other.

Hypothetically, this use of final yodh might be explained/

explained in two quite different ways:

Either an archaic spelling preserving the original third radical, or

a late phonetic spelling with yodh as the bearer of the vowel cere.

Further evidence is needed before a decision can be made between the two possibilities. Evidence is furnished, to some extent at least, by the regular use of יִי in the Samaritan Pentateuch corresponding to MT יִי , a clear Aramaism on the part of the Samaritan. On the other hand in Gn.28⁸ almost all the von Gall MSS read f.s. pt.

יִי clearly showing the retention of the third radical as sometimes happens in f.pt.forms in MT¹². Further, the St. Mark's Isaiah Scroll has the reading יִי (Is.38¹). This form יִי is read in the Samaritan Pentateuch in Lv.24², showing that the usage was to be found in the pre-Masoretic popular texts. It would appear that the evidence is not decisive either way and it may well be that the two usages, early and late, existed alongside each other.

(ii) Prepositions יִי and יִי with suffixes.

Gn.19⁶ ST יִי יִי יִי

MT יִי יִי יִי

Gn.45¹⁵ ST יִי יִי יִי

MT יִי יִי יִי

These Samaritan forms may show $\text{ֿ}N$ and $\text{ֿ}y$ resuming before suffixes the Yodh which originally formed part of the root. To this extent the ST preserves the earlier form in Yodh.

The usage is that the ST always reads the plene orthography while the MT usually reads the plene form but not invariably.

As in the preceding section (Lamedh He verbs and nouns), this yodh before the suffix might be the archaic spelling or possibly a late phonetic spelling with yodh as the bearer of cere.

3. Variants normalizing the spelling of words.

i. Archaisms.

3 s.m.suffix: ST has normal form where MT reads ֿ —
 Gn.9²¹ ST $\text{ֿֿ}N \text{ֿ} \text{ֿ} \text{ֿ}$
 MT $\text{ֿֿ}N \text{ֿ}$

There are 14 examples in the Pentateuch of the MT reading the unusual (and generally supposed archaic) orthography in ֿ in the 3 s.m.suffix.¹³ In no case does the ST read this form. "Das Suffix 3 p.s.m. hat der sam.Text nicht, sondern dafür stets ֿ "¹⁴. In 9 examples, noted in Appendix A, the ST reads the customary form in ֿ — . In the remaining 5 examples the Samaritans either interpret the word differently e.g. Ex.32¹⁷ $\text{ֿ} \text{ֿ} \text{ֿ}$ or read another form e.g. Nu.10³⁶ $\text{ֿ} \text{ֿ} \text{ֿ}$ for MT $\text{ֿ} \text{ֿ} \text{ֿ}$

ii. Errors.

3 s. Personal Pronoun $\aleph\iota\eta$ as common gender. There are only eleven examples of the MT using the f. pronoun $\aleph'\eta$ in the Pentateuch¹⁵; elsewhere the Qere perpetuum $\aleph\iota\eta$ occurs. In every case the ST reads $\aleph'\eta$. It has been argued that this orthography is an archaism preserved in almost every case by the MT. It has also been argued against this that the epicene use is not found in any other Semitic language. The distinction too does occur in the Pentateuch, and outside it in the older books. It is the view of the present writer that for some reason, now unknown, $\aleph\iota\eta$ was written almost invariably for $\aleph'\eta$ in the Pentateuch and this orthographical peculiarity, or error, was faithfully repeated.

iii. Inconsistencies in identical or similar context.

Gn. 32 ³¹	ST	$\aleph\iota\eta\iota\eta$
	MT	$\aleph\iota\eta\iota$

Both ST and MT agree in reading $\aleph\iota\eta\iota\eta$ Gn. 32³²

Ex. 4 ¹⁸	ST	$\iota\eta\iota$
	MT	$\iota\eta$

Elsewhere in both ST and MT, $\iota\eta\iota$

Nu. 13 ⁸	ST	$\iota\eta\iota\eta$
	MT	$\iota\eta\iota$

ST everywhere $\iota\eta\iota\eta$

There/

II. Differences of Grammar.

1. Differences of Grammar with agreement in sense.

i. Accidence.

(1) Variants consisting of forms found elsewhere in Samaritan Pentateuch.

(i) Normal forms

a. Common for rare.

There are quite a large number of Samaritan variants of a morphological nature that show the ST. reading a common form where the MT has a rarer one. The ST reading is given first in the examples that follow:

(a) Common form of pronoun, $\eta\beta\eta\eta$ for $\beta\eta\eta$
 Gn.19⁸ $\eta\beta\eta\eta$ $\eta\beta\eta\eta$ / $\beta\eta\eta$ '3

Other examples in Appendix A.

(b) Common form of suffix.

Gn.2²¹ $\eta\beta\eta\eta$ / $\eta\beta\eta\eta$

48¹⁵ $\eta\beta\eta\eta$ / $\eta\beta\eta\eta$

(c) Residuum - unclassified further.

Gn.46³ $\eta\beta\eta\eta$ / $\eta\beta\eta\eta$

50²⁰ $\eta\beta\eta\eta$ / $\eta\beta\eta\eta$

b. Forms suggesting misreading, miswriting or mishearing in ST or MT.

ST or MT

Another group of variants may be considered as showing evidence of misreading, miswriting or mishearing/

mishearing in the course of textual transmission. The resultant text may be quite good Hebrew but shows signs that at some stage typical scribal error, due for example to similarity in sound or shape of letters, has been at work. No general rule can be applied in the criticism of these variants and each case must be judged separately. Such decisions can naturally be somewhat subjective in nature but, apart from confusion with gutturals to which the Samaritans were specially liable, a broad picture emerges in which sometimes ST appears to have preserved a superior reading, in other cases MT. In the majority of cases no firm decision is possible and it is wise to leave the question open.

Ex.3⁷ 1N7 / 7N7

Confusion between 7 and 1 in ST or MT

Nu.21²⁷ 1N7N7 / 1N7N7

Dittography or haplography of 7

c. Forms in identical or similar context.

There are cases where the Samaritan variant consists of a form used elsewhere by both ST and MT, in the same context (sometimes the same verse), or in a similar or parallel passage in another part of the Pentateuch.

Gn.6²⁰ 7N7N7 / 7N7N7

ST in line with 7N7N7 read by both later in verse.

Ex.15¹¹ 7N7N7 / 7N7N7

ST as both in 15⁶.

d. Forms which do not belong to any of the above types.

This is a large group of variants consisting of ST and MT forms which are not only found elsewhere in the Pentateuch but appear to be used indiscriminately. Thus a scribe could pass from one to the other: accordingly, no cogent reason can be adduced in favour of either the ST or MT reading,

(a) Imperfects with ending in Nun

The older and fuller termination of the Imperfect in Nun is quite a common form in MT (over 300 occurrences, cf. GK, §47.m) and appears to be used indiscriminately by both ST and MT.

Gn. 41⁵⁵ | שׁוּא / שׁוּא
Ex. 20²³ | שׁוּא / | שׁוּא

(b) ָנָחַ and נָחַר

Gn. 9²⁸ נָחַר / נָחַר
 22²⁰ נָחַר / נָחַר

(c) Forms with He paragogic.

Gn. 27¹¹ הָהָ / הָהָ
 27³⁹ | הָ / הָהָ

(d) Two forms of suffix.

Ex. 4¹⁵ פִּי / פִּיהָ
Nu. 27²¹ פִּיהָ / פִּי

(e) Residuum - unclassified further.

Gn. 8³ חָקַח / חָקַח
Dt. 4¹¹ בָּבָ / בָּבָ

(ii) Abnormal forms.a. Early

These are, in the nature of the case, small in number but relatively important. The examples given show ST preserving an undoubtedly early form, with original Yodh re-appearing.

Gn.12¹¹ 'AN / AN
 16⁸ 'AN2 / AN2

b. Late

There are, however, other forms that appear to be late, some of them similar to, if not actually influenced by, Aramaic forms.

Gn.17¹⁸ '13 / 13
 As in Aramaic and Mishna

Dt.32⁷ AN1' / AN1'

Aramaic Construct Plural in ST

c. Forms suggesting misreading, miswriting or mishearing in ST or MT.

There appears to be a single example of a type in

Dt.28²⁵ 7Y113 / 71Y13

This is a rare word occurring only here in Pentateuch, although both forms occur in MT.

d. Forms in identical or similar context.

The parallel is shown in brackets

Gn. 3¹⁶ (3¹⁷) 1125Y2 / 25Y2
 20¹² (18¹³) 01AN / 71AN

e./

e. Forms which do not belong to any of the above types.

There are 15 variants consisting of forms from the Hithpa'lel of $\sqrt{in\omega}$. These show clearly the usage of ST. According to Petermann, p.85, the Waw was pronounced hard, as b, in all forms of this verb. They may conceivably be indicative of a dialectal usage in the Samaritan.

(2) Variants consisting of forms not found elsewhere in Samaritan Pentateuch.

Such forms, if paralleled elsewhere in MT of the Hebrew Bible or in Dead Sea Scrolls, may be regarded as receiving strong confirmation.

(1) IN MT of Hebrew Bible.

Outside Pentateuch. 2 examples.

Gn.3¹⁶ $\sqrt{in\omega}$ / $\sqrt{in\omega}$ ST form in Ru.4¹³ Ho.9¹¹
 Ex.19⁹ $\sqrt{in\omega}$ / $\sqrt{in\omega}$ ST form in Jb.15²⁶ 1 K 7²¹ =
 2 Ch.4⁵, Je.52²¹

(ii) In no other known source. 1 example

Gn.49¹⁰ $\sqrt{in\omega}$ / $\sqrt{in\omega}$

The form in ST is not found elsewhere but may represent an old construct state ending preserved here by ST. Cf. Gn.1²⁴ $\sqrt{in\omega}$ (MT)

2. ii. Syntax.

(1) Variants consisting of constructions found elsewhere in Samaritan Pentateuch.

(1) Normal constructions.

a. Common for rare.

As/

As with accident so with syntax: there are Samaritan variants that consist of the ST reading a common for a rare construction.

Gn. 41³² $\text{ד'ִּיִּן הָ אַיִן וְעַל} / \text{'הָ אַיִן וְעַל}$

Niphal of MT only here

Gn. 49²⁰ $\text{יָחַדְתִּי} / \text{'יָחַדְתִּי}$

Common for rare gender of subject.

c. Constructions in identical or similar context.

There are also many cases where the Samaritan variant shows a construction used elsewhere by both ST and MT in the same context or in a similar or parallel passage in another part of the Pentateuch.

The type of variant, as well as that immediately preceding, "common for rare construction", suggests the possibility of harmonisation on the part of ST in these cases and these two types, taken together, make the possibility all the stronger. Some of the variants of this class, c, admit of still further arrangement so that the material can be set out as follows:

(a) Differences of word order

The parallel is shown in brackets.

Gn. 2⁴ (earlier in verse) $\text{וְאֵלֶּיךָ וְאֵלֶּיךָ} / \text{וְאֵלֶּיךָ וְאֵלֶּיךָ}$
 42³² (42¹³) $\text{וְאֵלֶּיךָ וְאֵלֶּיךָ} / \text{וְאֵלֶּיךָ וְאֵלֶּיךָ}$

(b) Differences of verbal form

Gn. 30³⁹ (30³⁸) $\text{וְאֵלֶּיךָ וְאֵלֶּיךָ} / \text{'הָ אַיִן וְעַל}$
 Ex. 25¹⁰ (25¹¹) $\text{וְאֵלֶּיךָ וְאֵלֶּיךָ} / \text{'הָ אַיִן וְעַל}$

(c) Absence of suffix in ST or MT.

Ex. 23²⁰ (23²³) נחכי ש3ח מ3כי / נ' ש' מ3ח /
 Lv. 13⁵ (30, 6, 8, 10, 20) ורמה הכהן / ורמה ה' /

(d) Residuum - unclassified further.

Gn. 39¹⁵ (39¹⁸) ויהי כשחלו כי הרימי קולי / ו' כל' הרימי ק' /

Cf. Petermann, p. 56 "Wahrscheinlich durch Versehen aus v. 18, wo כהרימי steht".

Gn. 43¹⁸ (43¹²) במחאח'ינו המושב הכסף / ה' השב ב' /

d. Variants which do not belong to any of the above types.

No cogent reason can be adduced in favour of ST or MT.

Under this general heading is grouped a very large number of Samaritan variants. Many of them are due to the interchange of grammatical constructions; for example, an indefinite subject may be expressed by a 3 s.m. or 3 pl. verbal form in both ST and MT. Sometimes both agree in reading the singular verbs, or the plural verb, or diverge when ST reads a singular and MT a plural, or vice versa. Both constructions were familiar to ST and MT and either might be used in a particular passage. Accordingly, when divergence occurs in the case of grammatical constructions, both of which occur without appreciable distinction in usage, either reading might conceivably be the original.

This/

This is the significant result of the hundreds of variants of this class that now follow. In all these cases the readings of ST and MT are equally acceptable and no preference should be given to either.

The material may be arranged thus:-

(a) Differences of word order

Gn. 50¹² ויעשו / '3 'ב 'ו
Lv. 20¹³ ויהיה / 'ה 'ב 'ו

(b) Sequence of tenses.

Gn. 27⁴ וקבצו / וקבצו
28¹⁰ ויצא / ויצא

(c) Infinite absol: qualifying finite verb.

Gn. 19⁹ ST ויעבד / ויעבד
(9 Samaritan MSS, ויעבד Cf. Petermann, p.18.
Ptc. Act.)

MT ויעבד / ויעבד
43⁷ ST וידע / וידע
(13 Samaritan MSS, וידע)
MT וידע / וידע

as substitute for finite verb.

Ex. 13³ זכור / זכור
Nu. 15³⁵ רגום / רגום

(d) Impf. ending in ה —

In ST

Ex. 3⁸ וימרר / וימרר

In MT

Gn. 12³ ויברך / ויברך

(e)/

(e) Impv. ending in ה —

In ST

Gn. 14²¹ הנה / | א

In MT

Gn. 21²³ והשבט / והשבט(f) Difference of conjugation.Two activesGn. 19¹³ תשחט / תשחטNu. 22²⁶ ויס / ויסTwo passivesGn. 40¹⁵ תגב / תגבLv. 10¹⁶ שר / שרActive for passiveGn. 4²⁶ תה / תהGn. 45¹⁹ צו / צוPassive for activeGn. 50²⁶ וישב / וישבDt. 18²¹ נדע / נדע(g) Agreement of subject and predicate.Gn. 13⁶ ST וְנָשָׂא אִתָּהּ אֶת הָאֵשֶׁת

MT וְנָשָׂא אִתָּהּ אֶת הָאֵשֶׁת

Ex. 30¹⁹ ST וְרָחֵץ מַחְנוֹ מִקְרָן וּבִנְיָן

MT וְרָחֵץ מִקְרָן מִבְּנֵי

(h) Transitions in personal reference.

from singular to plural and vice versa

Ex. 11⁷ אדע / אדעDt. 12⁵ ובאת / ובאת(i) Feminine termination.

In ST

Gn. 6¹⁹ והחיה / והחיה Abstract Nouns.

Absence

In ST
Gn. 22¹³ וְיַעֲקֹב / עָלָה

In MT
Gn. 48⁵ וְשִׁמְעוֹן / כְּרִמְבֵּן וְכִשְׁמֵעוֹן

(n) Definite article

In ST
Ex. 9²⁴ וְ בָרָד / וְהָיָה הַבָּרָד

In MT
Gn. 22⁸ וְהָיָה לְךָ / מַלְאָכָיו יִרְאֶה לְךָ שֶׁלָּהּ

(o) אָנ, accusative

In ST
Gn. 4¹⁷ וְיָקְרָא אֹתָם שֵׁם הָעִיר / וְשֵׁם הָ

In MT
Gn. 33⁵ וְאֵלָּה / וְיִשָּׂא עֵינָיו

(p) Residuum - unclassified further.

Gn. 41¹⁵ וְהָיָה לְךָ / מַלְאָכָיו יִרְאֶה לְךָ שֶׁלָּהּ

Nu. 3³⁸ וְהָיָה לְךָ / מַלְאָכָיו יִרְאֶה לְךָ שֶׁלָּהּ

(ii) Abnormal Constructions.d. Constructions where no cogent reason can be adduced in favour of ST or MT.Absence of apocopation in Impf. or Impv. in ST.

While there are cases where ST and MT agree in reading apocopated forms, these are many other cases in the ST where apocopation of lamedh he forms does not occur.

Gn. 1²² וְיָרֵב ב' / וְהָיוּ יָרֵב בְּרָחָף

Ex. 5²¹ וְיָרֵב ע' / וְהָיוּ יָרֵב יְהוָה עֲלֵיכֶם

With waw ("and")

Gn. 24⁴⁶ וְהָיוּ / וְהָיוּ

Lv. 15²⁴ וְהָיוּ נ' ע' / וְהָיוּ נָרְחָה עֲלֵי

2. Differences of Grammar with divergence in sense.

1. Doctrinal.

(1) Controversy regarding Gerizim.

The controversy regarding the sacred mountain of the Samaritans will be treated in detail under the third main group of the classification, Vocabulary. Here, however, consideration is to be given to some syntactical variants that have a bearing on the problem. They will all be dealt with now as well as detailed in Appendix A. Too much importance should not be attached to the support given by the Versions to MT in this respect for presumably doctrinal passages antedated them all.

Dt.33¹⁵ ST אֶרְמֹשׁ הָרִי קִדְם וְאִמְגֵד גִּבְעָה עוֹלָם

MT אֶרְמֹשׁ הָרִי קִ' וְ גִבְעָה ע'

ST is specific, understanding הָרִי as "my hill" and taking קִדְם in the adverbial sense as "anciently, of old". The parallel phrase later in the line is read עוֹלָם גִּבְעָה (and not ע' גִּבְעָה as in MT). Clearly ST refers to Gerizim. On the other hand MT is quite general and does not refer to Jerusalem or any central sanctuary.

Dt.33¹⁹ ST עֲמִים הָרִי יִקְרָאוּ

MT ע' הָר' וְ

ST/

ST = "They call peoples to my mountain "

MT = "They call peoples to a mountain"

ST obviously refers to Gerizim. MT is indeterminate, conceivably a mountain sanctuary in the territory of Zebulun or Issachar.

Dt.14²⁴ ST נִשְׁכַּח בְּהַר יְהוָה
MT בְּהַר נִשְׁכַּח

This phrase occurs 20 times in the Pentateuch, in every case ST reading a Perfect and MT an Imperfect tense of the verb. The former tense would imply that Shechem had been chosen as the place of sanctuary as far back as the time of Abraham while the latter tense, of MT, would refer to Jerusalem chosen in time of David. These 21 variants obviously show intentional alteration, but taking them alone it would be unwise to say on which side the alteration lies: on general grounds a decision is not possible for in the polemic relationship between Jew and Samaritan either side might conceivably be responsible for this alteration.

(2) Other Samaritan beliefs and practices.

(1) Unity of the deity.

Gn.20¹³ ST אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה

MT אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה

31⁵³ ST אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה

MT אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה

Gn.35⁷ ST מִצְרַיִם הַמִּצְרַיִם
 MT מִצְרַיִם הַמִּצְרַיִם
 Ex.22⁸ ST יִרְשִׁיעוּ הַמִּצְרַיִם
 MT יִרְשִׁיעוּ הַמִּצְרַיִם

It is generally considered that these passages have been altered to the singular verb by the Samaritans to conform to their doctrine of the essential unity of God. Certainly the variant shows intentional alteration and it is difficult to imagine what motive MT might have had if it had changed the verb to a plural.

(ii) Avoidance of anthropomorphism.

Gn.16¹³ מִצְרַיִם / מִצְרַיִם

ST = "a seeing God", reading pt.

MT = "God of vision", reading noun (genitive both subjective and objective)

Likewise Gn.16^{14,24,62,25} מִצְרַיִם / מִצְרַיִם
 Ex.34²⁴ מִצְרַיִם / מִצְרַיִם
 The Likewise Gn.16^{14,24,62,25} מִצְרַיִם / מִצְרַיִם
 and Ex.34²⁴ מִצְרַיִם / מִצְרַיִם

The phrase "see the face of" is used of courtiers to Pharaoh, Ex.10²⁹. According to BDB, p.908, the verb in this phrase, when applied to the deity, was also probably in the Qal but was afterwards pointed Niphal to avoid the expression "see the face of God". In some passages, e.g. Ex.34²³ the ST reading agrees with that of MT but in EX./

Ex.34²⁴ (16 out of 20 v.Gall MSS) it actually writes a Niphal, carrying the process even further in its desire to avoid any irreverence to the deity.

(iii) Resurrection.

Gn. 3¹⁹ בִּשְׁמֵחַ 777 / אַ עַרְבַּי

The Samaritans find in their reading with the suffix the justification for belief in resurrection. This has all the appearance of a later interpretation incorporated into ST.

(iv) Legal enactment.

Lv. 6¹³, Dt.16⁴ בֵּין הָעֶרְבַּיִם / בֵּין עֶרֶב

The phrase "between the two evenings" is generally understood to mean "between sunset and dark" and is read by both ST and MT eleven times elsewhere in the Pentateuch. It might appear that these 2 variants show intentional alteration by ST to make their text conform to these other passages. If so, it is difficult to understand why ST, on this reasoning, changed Dt 16⁴ and left Dt 16⁶ untouched, for in the latter passage both ST and MT read

בֵּין עֶרֶב . The explanation may be that the two phrases were virtually synonymous with בֵּין הָעֶרְבַּיִם expressing greater precision. This view seems to be strengthened by the fact that LXX implies fuller form בֵּין הָעֶרְבַּיִם only in one passage, Lv.23⁵, and in all the other passages, בֵּין עֶרֶב

ii. Non-doctrinal.

Selected examples are given. Detailed lists in Appendix A. Naturally it has not been practicable to discuss in detail all the variants listed in the Appendix, but the principle followed has been to apply the criteria of intelligible grammar and/or sense in every case. In certain examples further criteria apply when, for example, a variant consists of a common form or word for an unusual one, or of a form or word from a parallel passage. Further, the line structure of a poem may act as a test of the soundness of a reading. There is, of course, the detection of the typical causes of scribal error such as dittography, haplography and the like.

Where ST or MT is difficult in sense, in some cases to the point of unintelligibility, a decision in favour of the more meaningful version is considered as further strengthened if it has the support of the LXX. The choice here is frequently not between an easier and more difficult reading but between a meaningful and meaningless one. The support of the LXX is indicated by an asterisk in the Appendix.

(1) Variants where there appear to be cogent reasons in favour of ST.

Gn.25²⁸

1'22 17'5 '7 / '2 7'5 '5

Sense of MT is unsatisfactory. ST with suffix gives such/

such good sense, with support of LXX, that it should be adopted.

Gn.50²³ $\text{בני } \omega\text{זים} / \text{בנים } \omega\text{זים}$

ST = "great grandchildren" MT = "great, great grandchildren".

No reason why descent should be carried further in line of Ephraim than Manasseh. LXX with ST.

Ex.1¹⁰ $\text{אֶקְרָאָה} / \text{אֶקְרָאָה}$

The form in MT is difficult (cf GK § 47.k) and the grammar and sense of ST is excellent. LXX with ST.

(2) Variants where there appear to be cogent reasons in favour of MT.

Gn.30³⁸ $\text{בְּקֹלֵי} / \text{בְּקֹלֵי}$

אֶקָו a rare word, occurring in MT only here and in 24²⁰.

ST reads Inf.Const. in both places - common for rare form.

Ex.3⁶

ST	וְיִשְׁחָק	וְיִשְׁחָק	וְיִשְׁחָק	וְיִשְׁחָק	וְיִשְׁחָק	וְיִשְׁחָק	וְיִשְׁחָק
MT	וְיִשְׁחָק	וְיִשְׁחָק	וְיִשְׁחָק	וְיִשְׁחָק	וְיִשְׁחָק	וְיִשְׁחָק	וְיִשְׁחָק

Probably an unnecessary attempt at correction on the part of ST. The reading is so much easier that one hesitates to adopt it.

Lv.15^{18,24} $\text{וְיִשְׁחָק} / \text{וְיִשְׁחָק}$

Appears to be euphemistic reading by ST.

(3) Variants where there appear to be no cogent reason in favour of ST or MT.

In many of these examples there is evidently difference/

ence of interpretation implying different grammatical subjects, at least equally possible.

Gn.2⁷ קרם / ויהי נרם / '3 קרם '1

Use of קרם as proper name, or as generic term with definite article. Usage is not consistent in either version, e.g. earlier in verse 7 both agree in reading

קרם In Gn.1²⁶ both read נרם

Gn.9¹⁶ ורמיגה / וקשה / ורמיגה / '1 '2 ורמיגה

ST refers to Noah, MT to God. Both make excellent sense and either reading possible.

Gn.29³⁴ קרם / ויהי נרם / '3 קרם

Naming of child by mother in ST. In almost every example of this type ST reads feminine subject and MT indefinite masculine, though in Gn.4²⁵ the position is reversed and ST has the indefinite usage while MT reads נקרא . Either usage might be defended here and either reading might be original.

III. Differences of Vocabulary.

1. With agreement in sense.

1. Substitutions.

This term is used simply to mean that ST and MT read words from different roots. There is no implication that one is necessarily original and the other has arisen by intentional alteration.

(1) Pure synonyms.

(i) Common words.

a. Common for rare word.

There are many Samaritan variants consisting of pure synonyms that are words common in both ST and MT and that show the ST with a well known word instead of a less familiar one in MT.

(The ST reading is given first)

Ex.15^{13,16} $\pi\iota$ / ι
 21²⁵ $\pi\iota\kappa$ / $\pi\iota\kappa$

b. Words suggesting misreading, miswriting or mishearing in ST or MT.

While the ST and MT are quite good Hebrew, it is clear that one of the typical causes of scribal error (such as confusion with letters of similar shape) could account for the change. In many cases it is not possible to determine on which side the error lies.

Gn.27¹³ $\eta\sim$ / $\eta\sim$ (alike in both ST and MT scripts)

Nu.22⁹ $\pi\kappa$ / $\iota\kappa$ (π and ι are certainly alike in ST script but in context the two words could be so readily interchanged that unwise to decide for one or other).

c. Words in identical or similar context.

There are many cases where the ST has a word or phrase used elsewhere by both ST or MT in the/

the same context or in a similar passage in the Pentateuch.

Gn. 7² (6¹⁹, 7³, 7⁹) זָקַר וַיִּקְבֹּה / אִישׁ וְאִשְׁתּוֹ

Ex. 18²⁶ (18²²) הָדַבֵּר הַגִּדְלוֹ / הָקְשָׁה

Clearly this type of variant, like that noted above under a. "common for rare" suggests the possibility of harmonisation on the part of the ST.

d. Words which do not belong to any of the above types.

The variants under this heading consist of words that could so readily interchange, and may actually do so in the context, that it is impossible to say which reading is original.

Ex. 7²⁶ וַדַּבֵּר / וַחֲמַר

Dt. 12²¹ שָׁמַעְתָּ / שָׁמַעְתָּ

Included under this heading is a group,

consisting of variations in the Divine Names:

Gn. 7¹ יְהוָה / יְהוֹה

Dt. 3²¹ יְהוָה יְהוֹה / יְהוָה יְהוֹה

There are in all 35 variants of this interchange of Divine Names, of which the references are given in Appendix A. According to Skinner, see above p.8, in the transmission of the Divine Names in Genesis there are at most 9 divergences as compared with 310 cases of agreement/

agreement in ST and MT. For the whole Pentateuch there are only the 35 variants mentioned and, in view of the frequency of occurrence of the Divine Names, this small number of variants is indicative of the care exercised by both ST and MT in its transmission.

(ii) Uncommon words.

b. Late

There are 10 passages involving 3 words where the ST reads a later form similar to that of Aramaic. The Impv. form ׀׀ occurs 7 times for the MT ׀׀. Again, in Gn.18²¹ and 34³¹ the ST reads ׀׀ (= MT ׀׀), Cf. Petermann, p.149 and finally in Gn.14¹⁴ ׀׀ "and he scrutinised" for the equally difficult ׀׀ "and he emptied out" of the MT,

Cf. Petermann, p.55.

c. Words suggesting misreading, miswriting or mishearing in ST or MT.

There are 5 passages, where unusual words occur in ST and MT, and where typical scribal error could easily arise. It is difficult to say on which side the error lies. The examples are given here:

Ex. 18¹⁹ ׀׀׀׀ / ׀׀׀׀
Dt. 30³ ׀׀׀׀ / ׀׀׀׀

d./

d. Words in identical or similar context.

Only 3 examples, which are all noted here.

Ex. 7²² (7¹¹) בַּטִּיחַם / בַּטִּיחַם
 8^{3,14} (7¹¹) בַּטִּיחַם / בַּטִּיחַם

(2) Synonyms giving greater precision or emphasis.(1) Common words.b. Words suggesting misreading, miswriting or mishearing in ST or MT.

Only 4 examples.

Ex. 4² זֶה הָאֵל / הַזֶּה

Ex. 12²² 3_N / N3

 23⁸ 3_N / N3

Lv. 10⁶ N3 / 3_N

c. Words in identical or similar context.

Only 4 examples, of which 2 are given here:

Gn. 39⁸ (39⁶) הָאֵל / הָאֵל

Ex. 18¹² (17⁵) וְהָיָה / וְהָיָה

d. Words which do not belong to any of the above types.

The readings of both ST and MT are so suited to the context that it seems unwise to adjudicate between them. In the two passages noted here the LXX supports the MT in the first and the ST in the second.

Ex. 15²⁷ וְהָיָה / וְהָיָה

Dt. 2³⁶ וְהָיָה / וְהָיָה

ii. Additions.

This term is used simply in the sense that the ST has extra word(s) as compared with the MT. There is no assumption in the term itself that this longer reading represents intentional alteration.

(1) Pure synonyms.

(1) Common words

a. Stylistic supplements in ST.

There are many passages where the ST has additional common words which are of a purely stylistic nature and add nothing to the meaning. They consist of

(a) Explicit subjects or objects.

Ex. 2³ וְהָיָה לְךָ / וְהָיָה

Lv. 5² וְהָיָה לְךָ / וְהָיָה

(b) Words in apposition.

Gn. 21⁸ וְהָיָה לְךָ / וְהָיָה

48⁷ וְהָיָה לְךָ / וְהָיָה

(c) Additional Waw ("and")

Gn. 6¹⁵ וְהָיָה לְךָ / וְהָיָה

Dt. 14⁴ וְהָיָה לְךָ / וְהָיָה

b. Words suggesting misreading, miswriting or mishearing in ST or MT.

There are 4 passages where typical scribal error could easily arise and where no decision for/

for or against ST seems possible.

Gn.42²⁸ $\text{הוּא הַנֶּהָ / הַנֶּהָ}$

Ex. 7¹⁵ $\text{הוּא הַנֶּהָ / הַנֶּהָ}$

8¹⁶ $\text{הוּא הַנֶּהָ / הַנֶּהָ}$

Lv.22¹⁸ $\text{הַגֵּר הַגֵּר / הַגֵּר}$

c. Words in identical or similar context.

There are 14 Samaritan variants where additional words in ST are read by both ST and MT in the same context or in a similar passage elsewhere in the Pentateuch.

Gn.20³ (21^{11,25}) אִיךָ / אִיךָ

Ex.26¹⁶ (later in same verse) $\text{הַקֶּדֶשׁ הַמִּזְבֵּחַ / הַקֶּדֶשׁ}$

d. Words which do not belong to any of the above types.

These numerous Samaritan variants, detailed in Appendix A, could so easily belong to the original text that it is impossible to accept them or reject them as such. Their significance will lie not in the individual readings but in the broad picture they give of a fuller text than the MT. It remains to be seen under "Omissions", which follow this section of the classification, to what extent the MT has readings of this nature. Along this line, and with other considerations, the cumulative evidence/

evidence should be such as to make certain conclusions possible. Examples of this type of variation are:

Ex. 6²⁷ חֲמֹרִים מִזֵּרִים / חֲמֹרִים

Ex. 6²⁷ חֲמֹרִים מִזֵּרִים / חֲמֹרִים

(Lv. 11³⁶ חֲמֹרִים מִזֵּרִים / חֲמֹרִים

(2) Synonyms giving greater precision or emphasis.

a. Record of events implied but not explicitly recorded in MT.

In Ex. 7^{16,17,18} God has pronounced a warning regarding an impending plague and has commissioned Moses and Aaron to deliver the warning to Pharaoh. It is not stated in the MT that these warnings are ever delivered. The Samaritan supplies the lack as in 7^{18b} it represents Moses and Aaron as going to Pharaoh and repeating almost literally the words of the divine warning. Other "plague" passages of this type are noted in Appendix A. While it is possible that these passages are expansions, it is at least equally possible that they are original, for they contain statements of events logically implied but not definitely recorded in the MT. None of these variants has the support of the LXX and all the commentators known to me condemn them. Yet/

Yet surely they suggest interesting possibilities regarding the original form of the OT writings, some of which must lie very near to oral transmission. In such circumstances a narrative might conceivably be recorded in full or, alternately, in an abbreviated form to be supplemented by the reader.

This theory may receive support from the views expressed in a monograph by I.W.Slotki who states that many portions of poems - words, phrases, lines or strophes - which in our present text appear only once may have been occasionally or regularly repeated more than once. In other words the MT may have preserved the shorter forms of poems that were originally much longer¹⁷. Surely it is conceivable that this practice, discernible in poetry, may on occasion have been followed in prose narratives also.

Included under this heading are two other passages. The first is Samaritan Gn.30^{37a} = 31¹¹⁻¹³ in both ST and MT with minor adjustments. The Samaritan first relates the dream as it appeared unto Jacob and thereafter Jacob/

Jacob literally repeats the dream to Rachel and Leah, while the MT gives only the repetition to Rachel and Leah. Cf., however, Gn.41, repetition of Pharaoh's dream in both ST and MT. The second passage is Samaritan Nu 31^{21a} = 31^{21,22,23,24} with minor adjustments. Moses commands Eleazar who in turn commands the men of war.

c. Words in identical or similar context.

There is a very large number of Samaritan variants consisting of one or two additional words forming a phrase read by both ST and MT elsewhere in the passage, or in a similar passage at some other place in the Pentateuch. There are so many examples of this type of variant that it is clearly a distinctive feature of the Samaritan Pentateuch. Once again (see above, p.101) it remains to be seen if under "Omissions" there is a comparable number of MT readings of this nature.

A few examples will be given and a full statement furnished in Appendix A.

Gn.1¹⁴ (1¹⁵) } .דבד3ו קמק 3ע קמק3 / 3.דבד3
 Nu.14¹⁸ (Ex.34⁶) קמק וקמק / קמק
 Dt.16⁸ (Lv.23⁷) קמק קמק3ח / קמק3ח

d. Words which do not belong to any of the above types.

This/

This is quite a numerous class also. The additional words give some slight emphasis or precision or nuance of meaning that is generally in keeping with the context. A few examples will be given, with a full statement in Appendix A.

Gn. 2¹² 7ND 210 / 210

30¹⁶ 23.37 N12A / N12A

השטח יעור פקחים / השטח יעור עיני פקחים Ex.23⁸

Included under this head is a group of 21 cases where ST reads additional 3, e.g.

Gn. 14¹² וְהָיָה כִּשְׁמַרְתָּם לְפָנָיו אֵלֶיךָ יְהוָה

iii. Omissions.

This term is used simply in the sense that ST has fewer words as compared with MT, without any assumption of intentional alteration.

(1) Pure synonyms.

(1) Common words.

a. Stylistic supplements.

Stylistic supplements, such as occurred in ST, also occur here, though they are much fewer in number.

(a) Explicit subjects or objects.

Gn.5³² 7311 / 11 7311

28⁹ תר"ו י"ט / י' תשרי תש"ז

(b) Words in apposition.

ו' ש' נ' חמור נ' / ויחמר שכם נ' ג' נ' 34⁴ Gn.

$$n+11^3 \quad 7422^2 \quad / \quad 21122 \quad -21^3$$

(c) Additional Waw ("and")Gn. 7¹³ וַיְהִי כִּשְׁנֵי חֹדֶשׁ / וַיְהִי כִּשְׁנֵי חֹדֶשׁ11²⁷ וַיְהִי כִּשְׁנֵי חֹדֶשׁ / וַיְהִי כִּשְׁנֵי חֹדֶשׁd. Words which do not belong to the above type.

(Note: there are no omissions classified as due to misreadings etc. or to possible harmonisations).

Though the variants here are of the same type as in ST (see above, "Additions", p.100) they are much fewer in number.

Ex. 9²⁴ וַיִּכְרֹם / וַיִּכְרֹםNu. 26¹⁸ וַיִּכְרֹם / וַיִּכְרֹם(2) Synonyms giving greater precision or emphasis.(i) Common words

It will be noted that there are no examples of variants in MT showing explicit statements the occurrence of which is logically implied; neither are there any that are obviously due to scribal error such as misreading etc.

c. Words omitted in identical or similar context.

There are 9 passages where ST omits a word or phrase as omitted by both ST and MT elsewhere in Pentateuch.

Ex. 29²⁵ (29¹⁸) וַיִּכְרֹם / וַיִּכְרֹםNu. 23¹⁵ (23³) וַיִּכְרֹם / וַיִּכְרֹםd. Words which do not belong to any of the above types.

The variants under this heading are suited to the context and it would be difficult to prefer either ST or MT in any particular case. The overall picture, however, is quite clear which is that ST has more readings of this type than MT so that in this respect ST is the longer document.

Ex.17³ ³ה' / ³ה' ³זק ³זק
Lv.17¹⁵ ¹⁵ה' / ¹⁵ה' ¹⁵זק ¹⁵זק

Included under this heading is a group of

18 cases where ST omits ³כ ³כ e.g.

Dt.28²⁶ ²⁶ה' / ²⁶ה' ²⁶זק ²⁶זק in MT

2. Differences of vocabulary with divergence in sense.

1. Doctrinal.

Variants of Syntax that show difference of meaning of a doctrinal nature have been already considered. There are also variants of Vocabulary revealing doctrinal difference.

(1) Controversy regarding Gerizim.

This controversy has separated Jew and Samaritan (and many scholars!) down the long centuries.

There are 4 scripture passages that are relevant here: two of them will now be considered together.

Dt. 11³⁰ ³⁰ה' / ³⁰ה' ³⁰זק ³⁰זק

27⁴ ⁴ה' / ⁴ה' ⁴זק ⁴זק

(many MSS) ⁴ה' / ⁴ה' ⁴זק ⁴זק

The Jews have accused the Samaritans of altering the/

the text here in the interests of their cult and the Samaritans in turn have hurled the accusation back at the Jews. Scholars such as Gosenius, Montgomery and König have taken the view that these variants are examples of deliberate Samaritan alteration for polemic reasons. Kennicott, however, defended the Samaritan reading of Gerizim for Ebal on the ground that it was more natural for the memorial stones to be erected on Gerizim, the hill of blessing, than on Ebal, the hill of cursing. In more recent times he was followed by Meyer who not only adopted the Samaritan reading but maintained that the Jews had adjusted the text of Deuteronomy 27 in the interests of the Jerusalem sanctuary by removing Gerizim and Ebal from near Shechem to the Jordan valley at Gilgal - an alteration surprisingly accepted by the Samaritans¹⁸. Torrey stressed that the bitter controversy that developed between Jew and Samaritan and which is clearly indicated again and again in the partisan attitude of the writer of Chronicles resulted in the Jerusalem text of Dt 27⁴ being altered to Ebal¹⁹. The arguments adduced for and against these two Samaritan readings appear general/

general and inconclusive and the view taken by the present writer is that it is not possible to decide one way or another regarding the variants as such. In the polemic relationship that existed between Jew and Samaritan either side might, conceivably, have altered the text. Too much weight should not be attached to the fact that MT is supported here by the Versions for such doctrinal variants would have antedated them all.

The two remaining scripture passages are:

Ex.20^{17b} and Dt. 5^{18b}

The Samaritan Tenth Commandment.

At the end of the legislation in Dt.26, in both ST and MT there is added an appendix Dt.27²⁻⁷ enjoining that the laws be engraved on stones to be erected on a mountain, Gerizim in ST and Ebal in MT.

This appendix is also found in ST at end of the Decalogue, Ex.20^{17b} and Dt 5^{18b}, together with a supplementary note regarding the location of the mountain, Dt. 11³⁰. It is regarded by the Samaritans as the Tenth Commandment, the First and Second Jewish Commandments being treated as one. The Commandment reads as follows:

"And/

"And it shall come to pass when Yahweh thy God will bring thee into the land of the Canaanite whither thou art going to possess it, then thou shalt erect for thyself large stones and thou shalt cover them with lime and thou shalt write upon the stones all the words of this Law and it shall come to pass when you cross the Jordan you shall erect these stones which I command you to-day on Mt. Gerizim and thou shalt build there an altar to Yahweh thy God, an altar of stones, thou shalt not lift up upon them iron, of perfect stones thou shalt build the altar of Yahweh thy God, and thou shalt sacrifice peace offerings, and thou shalt eat there and rejoice before Yahweh thy God: that mountain is on the other side of the Jordan at the end of the road towards the going down of the sun in the land of the Canaanite who dwells in the Arabah opposite Gilgal near Elon Moreh opposite Shechem."

While a good case can be put forward for the Samaritan reading of Gerizim instead of the MT Ebal in Dt 27⁴ and incorporated in the Commandment, it would indeed be difficult to defend the authenticity of this long passage. It is rejected for the following reasons:

1. Detailed nature of the final verse compared to other passages in the Old Testament referring to a particular place.

2. Undue length as compared with the other Commandments.
3. Almost literal parallelism with Dt. 27²⁻⁷ and 11³⁰.
4. A ritualistic prescription of a different nature from the other Commandments. These do not deal with ritual but are concerned with men's relation to God and to one another. This Samaritan Tenth Commandment appears to lie outside the logical grouping.
5. Complete lack of support from the Versions apart from the Syro-Hexaplar where it is quoted as belonging to the Samaritan text²⁰. However, too much weight should not be attached to this absence of support from the Versions for doctrinal variants would have antedated them.

(2) Other Samaritan beliefs and practices.

Many, though not all, of the following doctrinal variants may reflect distinctive Samaritan views and to that extent may be discredited.

(1) Majesty of God.

Gn. 48¹⁶ אֵלֹהִים יִשְׂרָאֵל / אֵלֹהִים יִשְׂרָאֵל

Only in late usage is אֵלֹהִים applied to אֵלֹהִים

Ex. 15¹³ אֵלֹהִים יִשְׂרָאֵל / אֵלֹהִים יִשְׂרָאֵל

Both ST and MT read אֵלֹהִים Dt. 10¹⁷

Ex. 34²⁸ אֵלֹהִים יִשְׂרָאֵל / אֵלֹהִים יִשְׂרָאֵל

אֵלֹהִים is used of "acts done with a solemn sense of Yahweh's presence". Cf. B.D.B., p. 817.

(ii) Avoidance of anthropomorphism.

Ex.23¹⁷ יְכֹזֵבֶל הַמֶּלֶךְ / יִרְאֶה כֹּל זְכוּרֶךָ אֶת כְּנִי מֶלֶךְ יְהוָה

Almost all v. Gall MSS מֶלֶךְ

יְכֹזֵבֶל הַמֶּלֶךְ / יִרְאֶה כֹּל זְכוּרֶךָ אֶת כְּנִי הַמֶּלֶךְ יְהוָה

Reference has already been made under Syntax, see above, p. 91, to the Samaritan writing of $\sqrt{\text{ראה}}$ in Niphal, in sense of "appearing before God". The same desire to avoid any irreverence to the deity seems to be operating in the case of these two readings. It is possible, too, that the idea of substituting מֶלֶךְ for מֶלֶךְ may have arisen from an original mistake in reading the ר as a ל

(iii) Day of Vengeance and Recompense.

Dt.32³⁵ יְהוָה / יִנְקֹם וְשָׂם

(iv) Legal enactments.

Ex.21²⁸ שׁוֹר / שׁוֹר אֵל כֹּל בְּהֵמָה

8 other exx. of this phrase are noted in Appendix A. Clearly a Samaritan insertion. See above, p.19.

(v) Veneration for religious leaders.

Moses Ex.18⁷ וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶי יֶשְׁבָּע / וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶי

To emphasise that Jethro bowed to Moses

Tribe of Levi Gn.49⁷ מְרִירָה / מְרִירָה אֲנִי

Glory, and not cursing, with reference to the sacred tribe.

(vi) /

(vi) Genealogies of patriarchs.

	<u>Years</u>	
Gn. 5 ¹⁸	62	Jered
5 ¹⁹	785	
5 ³⁰	847	
5 ²⁵	67	Methuselah
5 ²⁶	653	
5 ²⁷	720	
5 ²⁸	53	Lamech
5 ³⁰	600	
5 ³¹	653	
11 ¹²	135	Arpaksad
11 ¹³	303	
11 ¹⁴	130	Shelah
11 ¹⁵	303	
11 ¹⁶	134	Eber
11 ¹⁷	270	
11 ¹⁸	130	Peleg
11 ¹⁹	109	
11 ²⁰	132	Reu
11 ²¹	107	
11 ²²	130	Serug
11 ²³	100	
11 ²⁴	79	Nahor
11 ²⁵	69	
11 ³²	145	Terah

According to Skinner (ICC, Genesis, p.135), the ST, MT and LXX have each "carefully constructed systems of chronology". The evidence does not appear to be sufficient to allow of a decision in/

in favour of the priority of any one of them.

(vii) Sectarian opposition.

A hated opponent.

Gn.35¹⁸ ד'ה'12 / |'ה'12

ST = "son of days". Cf. "a late-born son",
Gn.37³.

MT title is honorific "son of the right hand"

i.e. favoured son.

Dt.33¹² 7' 7' / 7'7'

The almost meaningless 7' 7' to avoid "beloved"
of MT being applied to the tribe of Benjamin.

ii. Non-doctrinal.

The method here followed is to give representative examples, with detailed lists in Appendix A. The critical rules applied here have been already outlined in the relevant section of Syntax. See above, p.93.

(1) Variants where there appear to be cogent reasons in favour of ST.

Substitutions

Gn.24⁶² ST ו'ס'ק ב' ב'ב'ד'ב'ר ב'נ'ר ה'3 ר'נ' א'
 MT ' ב' ח'ב'ו'ח 'ב' '3 'ר 'א'

Grammar and sense of MT are almost unintelligible.

ST, with support of LXX, gives excellent sense.

Ex.18⁶ ST ו'י'מ'ר 3'ח'ש'ה ה'נ'ה ח'ג'ו'ן י'ג'ו' ב' 7'3'ח'
 MT ' 3' ח'נ'י ח' ' ' 2' 'ח'

Sense of MT is unsatisfactory: in verse 6 Jethros
is/

is represented as already speaking to Moses and yet in verse 7 Moses is stated as going out to meet his father-in-law and asking after his welfare.

Read ויאמרו as indefinite "they said" followed by

הנה of ST "behold", with support of LXX, and the sense is excellent.

Additions

Gn.4⁸ ST ויאמר קין מלך הבצמח וזכה
השדה ויהי בהיום בשדה

MT omits השדה וזכה

Usually direct speech after אמר Mistake has arisen through homoeoteleuton in MT. LXX reads with ST.

Gn.36⁶ ST ויזך מארץ כנען חכני יעקב
MT ויזך מארץ כנען חכני

ST, supported by LXX, may well be correct. MT impossible.

Omissions.

Gn.36¹⁶ ST omits ויזך מארץ כנען before ויזך מארץ כנען

ST reading has parallel outside Pentateuch (1 Chron. 1³⁵)

ויזך מארץ כנען read by both in 36¹⁸. Appears misplaced in MT.

Nu.26⁴⁵ ST omits בני בריעה before ויזך מארץ כנען

LXX with ST. MT has redundant words at beginning of verse; out of context.

- (2) Variants where there appear to be cogent reasons in favour of MT.

(2) Substitutions.

Gn.50²³ ST גַּם בְּנֵי מִכַּיִר בֶּן מִנַּשֶּׁה יָלְדוּ בֵּיתוֹ יוֹסֵף

MT גַּם בְּנֵי מִכַּיִר בֶּן מִנַּשֶּׁה יָלְדוּ בֵּיתוֹ יוֹסֵף

Attempt at clarification by ST. Evidently misunderstood ancient ceremony of adoption. LXX with MT.

Dt.25¹¹ ST וְהִחְזִיקָה בַּשֵּׁנִי

MT וְהִחְזִיקָה בַּשֵּׁנִי

Word in MT occurs only here but with support of LXX. ST may have read the word more familiar or less euphemistically objectionable.

Additions.

Nu.22²⁰ ST וַיִּבְנֶה מִצְדָּה מִצְדָּה

MT וַיִּבְנֶה מִצְדָּה

Avoidance of anthropomorphism in ST. Possible harmonisation with 22²².

Longer passagesIncorporation of passage from parallel narrative

Ex.20^{21b} = Dt. 5²⁸⁻³¹

Substitution of passage from parallel narrative

Dt.10⁶⁻⁷ ST = Nu.33³⁰⁻³⁵

Omissions

Nu.21³⁵ (Dt.3³) וְלֹא נִשְׁכַּח אֲחֵרֵי

LXX with MT.

Nu.23¹⁰ חֵן מִנָּה / חֵן מִנָּה

ST obviously requires another word. חֵן of MT

supported by parallelism with חֵן in following

hemistich of ST, where however MT reads חֵן

(3) Variants where there appear to be no cogent reasons in favour of ST or MT.

Substitutions.

Gn.37⁴ ST בניו חכֹּס מְבִידִם מְהֵב מִן
MT מִן חֹסֶה ה' נ' נ' נ'

Both words occur in the context and either gives excellent sense here. Unwise to decide in favour of ST or MT. LXX reads with ST.

Ex.5⁹ ST וַיִּשְׁעוּ בָהּ וְלֹא יִשְׁעוּ בְּדָבָר שֶׁקָּרָא
MT וַיִּעֲשׂוּ ב' ו' ה' ב' ש'

ST, with its excellent sense and with support of LXX, at least equally possible. Transposition of γ and ω obviously possible with these verbs.

Additions.

Gn.20¹¹ ST וַיֹּאמֶר אֲבִרְהָם כִּי יִרְאֶה כִּי אֶמְרָא
MT ו' נ' כ' נ'

ST at least equally possible with MT. Omission of וַיֹּאמֶר by MT may be due to homoeoteleuton.

Ex.32³² ST אִם תֵּשֶׁה חֶטְאָם שֶׁהוּא וְאִם אֵין מַחְנֵי
MT ו' א' ה' ו' נ' ה'

ST with support of LXX gives excellent sense but MT may show suppressed apodosis. Cf. GK, §160. dd.

Omissions.

Gn.31³⁹ ST מִנְכִּי מִחֶטְאָה מִיָּדִי
MT מִבְּקֹשֶׁה ה' נ' נ'

LXX supports ST but excellent sense with either ST/

ST or MT.

Dt. 9 ¹¹	ST	אֲבִיבֵי	אֲבִיבֵי	וְ
	MT	וְ	אֲבִיבֵי	וְ

LXX with MT. In preceding verses: 9⁹ "the tables of stone, tables of the covenant", 9¹⁰ "two tables of stone". In 9¹¹ either phrase of ST or MT seems equally possible.

Footnotes, Chapter V.

1. Petermann, Formenlehre.
2. F.Diening, Das Hebräische bei den Samaritanern, 1938.
3. Kahle, Geniza, pp. 231 ff.
4. A.Sperber, 'Hebrew based upon Greek and Latin Translations', H.U.C.A. xii-xiii, 1937-8, pp. 103 ff.
5. Petermann, p.9
6. Kahle, Geniza, pp. 86 ff.
7. Petermann, p.57
8. W.B.Stevenson, Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic, 1924, § 23, 9.
9. B.J.Roberts, The Old Testament Text and Versions, 1951,p.6
10. P. Wernberg-Møller, The Manual of Discipline (in Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah) 1951, p.8
11. F.M.Cross and D.N.Freedman, Early Hebrew Orthography, 1952, p.69
12. Gesenius - Kautzsch, Grammar, 1910, § 75 v.
13. Driver, Samuel, p. xxxv
14. Petermann, p.93
15. Brown, Driver and Briggs, Lexicon, p.214
16. For fuller treatment cf. E. Robertson, Catalogue of the Samaritan MSS in the John Rylands Library at Manchester, 1938; von Gall, Pentateuch, Schreibweise und Einrichtung Samaritanischen Handschriften, pp.lxi ff.
17. I.W.Slotki, 'Long and Shorter Versions of Ancient Hebrew Poems', A.J.S.L., vol.50, pp. 15-31
18. Die Israeliten u. ihre Nachbarstämme. Halle,1906,pp.534-47.
19. Ezra Studies. Chicago,1910, p.329
20. Kahle, Geniza, p.145.

CHAPTER VI.

Evidence of Dead Sea Scrolls.

The Texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Discoveries in the Judaean Desert I. Qumran Cave 1, II Les Grottes de Murabba'at III Les Petites Grottes de Qumran have provided new material which may have a bearing on the relationship between ST and MT. As stated above, p. 37, the Biblical texts from Murabba'at show close affinity with the MT. "Le texte, conservé sur les fragments, est tout à fait identique au textus Receptus établi vers la fin du ier siècle de notre ère à l'Académie de Jamnia."

At Qumran, 60 years earlier, a different position is disclosed. See above, p. 37. The Biblical MSS there reveal variant text traditions. One is virtually identical with that of our present MT. "Texte et graphie semblent peu différents du texte massorétique"¹ Another closely resembles that of the ST. "Il semble que ce MS soit plus proche du Texte Samaritain que du Texte Reçu"². Another has strong affinities with the Hebrew recension underlying the LXX. "Le texte se rapproche de la LXX et de la Vulgate. On relève des variantes morphologiques et des graphies très pleines caractéristiques de Qumran"³ As well as these three text traditions there are others of a mixed type. "On notera que les graphies sont de type plutôt Samaritain (c'est-à-dire de type classique pre massoretique), tandis/

tandis que le texte - pour autant qu'on en puisse juger est de tradition judéenne"⁴.

Accordingly, it is the earlier evidence from Qumran (DSS I and III), and not that from Marabba'at (DSS II), that will be relevant to the present study. The Pentateuch Texts from Qumran have been collated by me with a view to determining where the Scrolls support the ST or the MT or diverge from both and thus the classification of the evidence proceeds along these lines:

1. Agreement of Scrolls with ST.
2. Agreement of Scrolls with MT.
3. Divergence of Scrolls from both.

The threefold division of variants under Orthography, Grammar and Vocabulary is followed.

These signs used in the critical apparatus of DSS I are also employed:


o	very uncertain reading
N	probable reading
ooo	exact number of letters missing
...	uncertain number of letters missing
[]	lacuna

DSS I

Difference of Orthography.

Agreement/

Agreement of Scrolls with ST.

Gn. 3 ¹¹	ער]ום	<u>MT</u> עירם
Ex. 20 ²⁶	בחצול	בחצול
Lv. 19 ³¹	הידעונים	הידעונים
20 ²¹	הי	הי
20 ²³	בחקול	בחקול
23 ⁷	הרמישון	הרמישון
Dt. 11 ²⁹	גררזים	גררזים
		
24 ¹¹	יוסי	יוסי
29 ¹⁶	גללזיהם	גללזיהם

Agreement of Scrolls with MT.

Lv. 20 ²²	חקל	<u>ST</u> חקול
Dt. 11 ³⁰	ה3	ה3

Divergence of Scrolls from both ST and MT.

Gn. 3 ¹⁴	כז	<u>ST/MT</u> כז
Fragment 15, p.50 מלזיהם		
Lv. 23 ⁴	מולם	מולם
Dt. 1 ²³	מכמ	מכמ
8 ¹⁹	והלכ	והלכ
8 ¹⁹	כי	כי
9 ²⁷	יעקב	יעקב
11 ²⁷	מנכי	מנכי
11 ²⁸	מנכי	מנכי
13 ⁴	הנבי	הנבי
13 ⁴	הישכח	הישכח

		<u>ST/MT</u>
Dt. 13 ⁴	הָהוּמָה	הָהוּמָה
13 ⁵	מִצְוֵיכֶם מָה	מִצְוֵיכֶם
13 ⁵	וּמִמֶּנּוּ	וּמִמֶּנּוּ
13 ⁶	וְהַנְּבִיא	וְהַנְּבִיא
13 ⁶	מִקְרֵבְךָ	מִקְרֵבְךָ
13 ⁶	הָהוּמָה	הָהוּמָה
13 ¹³	כִּי־	כִּי
13 ¹³	עֲרִיכָה	עֲרִיךְ
13 ¹⁴	[עֲרִימָה	עִירָם
14 ²⁴	שָׁמָּה	שָׁמָּה
14 ²⁴	כִּי־	כִּי
14 ²⁴	מִצְוֵיכֶם	מִצְוֵיכֶם
14 ²⁵	מִצְוֵיכֶם	מִצְוֵיכֶם
16 ⁴	וְהָיָה	וְהָיָה
16 ⁴	כִּי־	כִּי־
16 ⁶	מִצְוֵיכֶם [הָיָה	מִצְוֵיכֶם
16 ⁷	[וְשָׁמָּה	וְשָׁמָּה
24 ¹³	הַעֲבֹט	הַעֲבֹט
24 ¹⁴	שָׁכַר	שָׁכַר
32 ¹⁹	וּבְנֵי־	וּבְנֵי־
33 ¹⁸	[וְשָׁמָּה	וְשָׁמָּה

Differences of Grammar.

Agreement of Scrolls with ST.

		<u>MT</u>
Gn. 22 ¹⁴	וַיִּקְרָא מִבְּרָהֶם מִשְׁם הַמָּקוֹם	וַיִּקְרָא מִבְּרָהֶם (מִשְׁם omitted)
Ex. 20 ²⁵	אֵלֶּיךָ הָיָה	אֵלֶּיךָ הָיָה
Dt. 13 ⁵	אֵלֶּיךָ	אֵלֶּיךָ
29 ¹⁰ 13 ⁶	וְשָׁמָּה	וְשָׁמָּה
26	מִשְׁבִּיתָה	מִשְׁבִּיתָה
32 ¹⁷	וְשָׁמָּה	וְשָׁמָּה

Agreement of Scrolls with MT.

		<u>ST</u>
Ex. 21 ⁴	מִדְּנִיָּה [3	מִדְּנִיָּה 3
Lv. 20 ²²	מִתְּכֶם הַמֶּרֶץ	הַמֶּרֶץ מִתְּכֶם
Dt. 30 ²⁰	וְצִדְבָקָה	וְצִדְבָקָה
30 ²⁰	צֶהָם	צֶהָם
31 ³	עֹבֵר	הַעֲבֵר
31 ¹³	מִצְהֵיכֶם	מִצְהֵיכֶם
32 ²⁰	מִמֶּנּוּ	הַמִּמֶּנּוּ
32 ²⁴	מִי [3	מִי 3
32 ²⁵	וַיֹּנֶק [וַיֹּנֶק
32 ²⁹	וַיִּבְנוּ	וַיִּבְנוּ
33 ²⁴	רִגְלֵי	רִגְלֵי

Divergence of Scrolls from both ST and MT.

		<u>ST/MT</u>
Gn. 1 ²⁰	יֵשׁ [רָצוּ	יֵשׁ רָצוּ
Ex. 16 ⁴	כַּחֲסֹכֶם	כַּחֲסֹכֶם
Lv. 22 ⁶	וְנִכְשׁ [שׁ	נִכְשׁ
Dt. 1 ²³	שְׁנֵי	שְׁנֵי
9 ²⁸	יֹשְׁלֵנוּ	יֹשְׁלֵנוּ
13 ⁴	לֹא [מֵעַ	לֹא מֵעַ
14 ²⁴	שֶׁל 3	שֶׁל 3
16 ⁶	בִּזְכֹּן 3	בִּזְכֹּן 3
24 ¹⁶	יֹמֵהוּ	יֹמֵהוּ
31 ⁵	כִּפְנֵי 3	כִּפְנֵי 3

Differences of Vocabulary.Agreement of Scrolls with ST.

		<u>MT</u>
Ex. 19 ²⁵	וַיִּרְדּוּ מִשָּׁה בֶן־הָהָר 3 הַעֲמִ	וַיִּרְדּוּ מִשָּׁה בֶן־הָהָר 3 (omitted מִן הָהָר)

Agreement of Scrolls with MT.

Lv. 22⁵ שרף
Dt. 4⁴⁹ ים הערבה

ST
ש' טמ'ה
י' ה' ים המצח

Divergence of Scrolls from both ST and MT.

		<u>ST/MT</u>
Dt. 1 ²⁴	הנה	הנה
13 ⁵	געב[דו]	ג'רמ' (elsewhere in verse)
13 ⁵	אשח[ר]	אדבקון
15 ¹⁴	נ[ג]ני	יהוה
15 ¹⁵	מנכי חצור ג'ש[ו]א	מ'ה'
29 ¹⁴	עמנים	עמנו עמד
31 ¹	ויכז חשה זדבר	מ'ה' וידבר
31 ¹	מא כז הדברים המזה	מ'ה'ה'
32 ²⁷	מ[ד]ני	יהוה


DSS. IIIDifferences of Orthography.Agreement of Scrolls with ST

		<u>MT</u>
Gn. 18 ²⁵	מעשוא	מעשא
Ex. 9 ²⁹	הקצו	הקצו
11 ²⁶	מפ[ר]יס	מפרס
12 ³⁴	צרו[ר]	צרר
26 ¹¹	א[ו]ל[ב]	אלב
Lv. 8 ¹³	{ כתנ[ו]א כימנוא (זר)	כתנא
Nu. 33 ⁵²	י'ש'ב'	י'ש'ב'

Agreement of Scrolls with MT

		<u>ST</u>
Ex. 1 ¹²	י[ר]ב	י'כרה
Nu. 4 ²	זשכחא	זשכחא

Divergence of Scrolls from both ST and MT

			ST/MT
Gn.	6 ¹⁹	אֶלֶּכָּה	אֶלֶּכָּה
Ex.	1 ¹²	אֶלֶּכָּה (sic)	אֶלֶּכָּה
	1 ¹²	וַיִּקְוָה	וַיִּקְוָה
	1 ¹⁴	עַבְדָּהּ	עַבְדָּהּ
	7 ²	וַחֲדָהּ	וַחֲדָהּ
	7 ⁴	וַחֲדָהּ	וַחֲדָהּ
	9 ²⁹	וַיִּחַמֵּר	וַיִּחַמֵּר
	9 ²⁹	חֹשֶׁה	חֹשֶׁה
	11 ⁴	חֹשֶׁה	חֹשֶׁה
	11 ⁶	גִּזְלָהּ	גִּזְלָהּ
			
	12 ³⁴	חֹשֶׁה־רֹאם	חֹשֶׁה־רֹאם
	18 ²²	בְּכֹזֶה	בְּכֹזֶה
	19 ⁹	חֹשֶׁה	חֹשֶׁה
	26 ¹¹	וַחֲדָהּ	וַחֲדָהּ
	26 ¹²	הַחֲדָהּ (sic)	הַחֲדָהּ
	30 ²⁵	קֹדֶשׁ	קֹדֶשׁ
	30 ²⁵	רֹקֶחַ	רֹקֶחַ
	34 ¹⁰	וַיִּחַמֵּר	וַיִּחַמֵּר
	34 ¹⁰	כֹּזֶה	כֹּזֶה
	34 ¹⁰	עֹמֶה	עֹמֶה
Lv.	8 ¹²	רֹאם	רֹאם
Nu.	18 ⁸	קֹדֶשׁ	קֹדֶשׁ
	33 ⁵²	כֹּזֶה יֹשְׁבֵי	כֹּזֶה יֹשְׁבֵי
	33 ⁵²	בְּחֹמָה	בְּחֹמָה
	33 ⁵²	וְהִירָשָׁהּ	וְהִירָשָׁהּ
Dt.	1 ⁸	בְּחֹמָה־כֹּזֶה	בְּחֹמָה־כֹּזֶה
	1 ⁹	וַחֲדָהּ	וַחֲדָהּ
	7 ¹⁶	עֹמֶה	עֹמֶה
	7 ¹⁷	בְּחֹמָה	בְּחֹמָה

		<u>ST/MT</u>
Dt. 8 ¹⁵	הַמִּזְיָה	הַמִּזְיָה
8 ¹⁶	מַחְרֵג	מַחְרֵג
10 ¹⁰	הַדִּיּוֹ	הַדִּיּוֹ
10 ¹¹	וַיִּמְחַר	וַיִּמְחַר
10 ¹¹	מִבְּגָדָהּ	מִבְּגָדָהּ
17 ¹⁴	וַיִּמְחַר	וַיִּמְחַר
17 ¹⁴	כֹּה	כֹּה
17 ¹⁴	וַיִּמְחַר	וַיִּמְחַר

Differences of Grammar.

Agreement of Scrolls with ST

		<u>MT</u>
Gn. 6 ²⁰	מִיָּה	מִיָּה
Ex. 12 ³⁹	גִּרְשֹׁם מִזְרָא	גִּרְשֹׁם מִזְרָא
Lv. 8 ¹³	מִבְּנֵי	מִבְּנֵי
Dt. 1 ⁸	וַיִּמְחַר	וַיִּמְחַר
7 ¹⁷	וַיִּמְחַר	וַיִּמְחַר
10 ¹⁰	וַיִּמְחַר	וַיִּמְחַר

Agreement of Scrolls with MT

		<u>ST</u>
Nu. 4 ³	בִּלְבָד	בִּלְבָד
Dt. 17 ¹⁵	וַיִּמְחַר	וַיִּמְחַר

Divergence of Scrolls from both ST and MT

		<u>ST</u> - וַיִּמְחַר	<u>MT</u> וַיִּמְחַר
Lv. 11 ²⁶	וַיִּמְחַר	וַיִּמְחַר	וַיִּמְחַר
Dt. 7 ¹⁷	וַיִּמְחַר	וַיִּמְחַר	וַיִּמְחַר
8 ⁹	וַיִּמְחַר	וַיִּמְחַר	וַיִּמְחַר
8 ¹³	וַיִּמְחַר	וַיִּמְחַר	וַיִּמְחַר
8 ¹⁷	וַיִּמְחַר	וַיִּמְחַר	וַיִּמְחַר
10 ⁸	וַיִּמְחַר	וַיִּמְחַר	וַיִּמְחַר
10 ¹¹	וַיִּמְחַר	וַיִּמְחַר	וַיִּמְחַר

Differences of Vocabulary.

Agreement of Scrolls with ST

		<u>MT</u>
Ex. 11 ³	וַיִּמְחַר	וַיִּמְחַר
11 ⁴	וַיִּמְחַר	וַיִּמְחַר
34 ¹⁰	וַיִּמְחַר	וַיִּמְחַר

MT

Lv. 11 ²⁵	ורחף באים	יכבס בגדיו ו' ב'
Dt. 8 ⁷	טובה ורחבה	ט'
8 ¹⁸	צמבתיך צמברהם ציעחק וצייעקב	צמבתיך

Agreement of Scrolls with MT

ST

Ex. 12 ⁴⁰	בני ישראל	בני ישראל
27 ¹⁹	כצכצ	ועשית את כצכ'
Nu. 3 ³⁹	אשה ואהרן	ה'

Divergence of Scrolls from both ST and MT

ST/MT

Ex. 1 ¹²	ישראל	יפרץ
9 ²⁸	וברך ואש	וברך
30 ²⁵	יהיה צדורוגיכם	י'
31 ¹⁶	השגב ציה[וק]	ה'
34 ¹⁰	ויאמר י[הוה]	י'
34 ¹⁰	ויאמר יהוה מ[ה]	י'
Nu. 33 ⁵²	אח יושבי המדבר	מ' כצ י' ה'
Dt. 7 ¹⁹	המסח הגדלל הי"ם	המסח הגדלל
7 ¹⁹	הע[ל]	המסח
7 ²²	כצ [כיה]	המסח

Conclusions from the foregoing evidence.

Before attempting to interpret the evidence it is necessary to assess the evidence itself. The following considerations should be kept in mind:-

1. Fragments of Texts. The evidence consists of fragments of texts and not long continuous documents. On occasion, the fragments can be tantalisingly incomplete. For example, in Dt 14²⁵ the reading of DSS I is קר [יב] , one of the well-known passages where ST reads {the place which the Lord thy/

thy God) "has chosen" and the MT "will choose". The lacuna here makes it uncertain on which side the evidence of the DSS lies.

2. Areas of Pentateuch unrepresented. The fragments are drawn from comparatively limited areas and there are stretches of the Pentateuch from which there are no samples whatever.
3. Representative samples. Samples of variants from a large corpus of material such as the Pentateuch may be relatively few in number but may consist of examples of types of variation and so, by their representative nature, be applicable to a much larger area of text than that from which they are actually drawn.
4. Cumulative evidence. Certain lines of evidence, taken together, may have a cumulative significance and importance greater than when they are considered separately. To give a hypothetical example: if a passage shows evidence of possible expansion, together with a literary style different from that of the rest of the document, together with actual wording found elsewhere, these three considerations would cause a strong presumption against the reading. Bearing these considerations in mind it is now possible to ask what results have accrued from the investigation. While the evidence of DSS I and III has been outlined separately, /

separately, examination shows that the textual variation is of the same nature in both and so the conclusions have been listed together. The three sub-divisions of Orthography, Grammar and Vocabulary have been followed.

Orthography.

The Scrolls agree in a few cases with the MT, more frequently with the ST but, in the great majority of passages available, diverge from both ST and MT, which are in agreement with each other. The picture of orthographical variation is clear and definite. The ST has a fuller orthography than MT and the DSS have a still fuller orthography than the ST.

Grammar.

Unlike variations in orthography, those in grammar do not show a large number of cases in which DSS diverge from both ST and MT which are in agreement with each other. The three sub-divisions of grammatical variants are remarkably similar in size. The reason appears to lie in the fact that few of these variants show any divergence, or even difference, of meaning. They are due to chance agreement or disagreement arising from interchange of grammatical usage: two grammatical constructions were known to the scribes and so there are passages where all three agree in reading a construction, or in not reading it, or where one reads it and the other two do not.

Vocabulary.

Vocabulary.

As with orthography, so with vocabulary: the Scrolls support the ST or MT in a limited number of cases but in the great majority of them follow an independent line. An examination of the nature of the variants suggests the cause. Many of them consist of extra words or expressions giving greater precision, clarity or emphasis so that the tradition, or traditions, represented by them would appear to be that of a longer or more explicit document. On general grounds perhaps a later document, though of course each variant reading has in the first instance to be considered on its own merits, before being grouped with others of the same type.

It is significant that the ST is a longer document than the MT by reason of such extra words showing greater precision, clarity or emphasis. Accordingly, if these examples of the DSS are representative of a much larger corpus of material, as they appear to be, then the DSS, as compared with the MT, carry the process of amplification even further than the ST.

Footnotes, Chapter VI.

1. DSS III, p.105
2. DSS III, p.169
3. DSS III, p. 61
4. DSS I, p. 52

CHAPTER VII.Conclusions.

It now remains to summarise the results obtained and these will be set out under Particular Conclusions and General Conclusions.

Particular Conclusions.I. Orthography.1. Variants attributable to scribal error.

There are variants in passages where the text, as it stands, in ST or MT or both, is doubtful or corrupt. Some of these variants arise from the typical errors which can take place in the course of MS transmission e.g., confusion between letters similar in shape or sound, and which obviously operated in both ST and MT. In addition, there was another cause of confusion to which the Samaritans were specially prone, namely, their practice of not distinguishing gutturals in the reading of Hebrew. This led to interchange, addition, omission or transposition of gutturals, not only as between ST and MT but within the Samaritan MSS themselves.

2. Variants making the pronunciation explicit.

The ST like the MT uses letters $\aleph \ 7 \ ' /$ to make the pronunciation explicit.

i. Use of Aleph.

There appears to be more examples of the elision of consonantal/

consonantal aleph in ST although many of the readings are not found in all the von Gall MSS. Likewise aleph, as a vocalic consonant in medial position, occurs more frequently in ST. As in MT aleph frequently represents a final vowel, sometimes interchanging with he of MT. A prosthetic aleph occurs more frequently in ST as the orthographic closing to a final long vowel.

ii. Use of He

A final vowel may, or may not, be represented by he. Accordingly apart from cases where both ST and MT agree in reading the final he, or in not reading it, variation arises where one reads it and the other does not.

iii. Use of Yodh and Waw.

(1) As compared with MT there is a greater use of yodh and waw as vowel letters.

Certain significant categories have been extracted from this immense group of variants but no attempt has been made at a complete classification apart from the grammatical arrangement in Appendix A. If a meaningful, complete classification is not possible, it hardly appears to be necessary for the significance of the profuse use of yodh and waw is not really in the details but in the group as a whole. This very full orthography represents a type of text prior to the standardisation of the consonantal text. This viewpoint receives strong support from the fact of the still fuller/

fuller orthography of the Dead Sea Scrolls discussed in Chapter V (see above, p.71) and more fully in Chapter VI.

- (2) Lamedh He verbs and nouns. Yodh occurs occasionally as an archaic spelling with retention of the third radical or a late phonetic spelling with yodh as the bearer of the vowel Sere

Such an occasional usage may indicate the survival of an earlier usage or the arrival of a new one. The evidence is not decisive and it may be that the two usages, early and late, existed alongside each other.

3. Variants that normalise the spelling of words.

If MT appears to have archaisms, errors or inconsistencies, ST frequently reads the normal form. The ST reading is so much easier that it is unwise simply to accept it without asking why MT preserved another reading so evidently contrary to normal practice.

4. Orthographical variations with proper nouns.

There is a large number of proper nouns that show orthographical variation arising from such causes as confusion with letters, especially gutturals, and the presence or absence of vocalic letters making the pronunciation explicit

5. Collation with Dead Sea Scrolls.

The evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls is summarised under General Conclusions but it may be noted here that some of/

of the MSS of the Scrolls, notably all those from Murrabba'at, show an orthographical usage in complete agreement with what is found in MT. Others from Qumran have a more developed orthography, such as the frequent plene writing of yodh and waw, in close agreement with the usage of ST. Others follow yet another tradition and have a still fuller orthography revealing itself in such forms as נ'כ כ'ז נ'ז $\text{מכח} (\text{מ'ח})$ $\text{מ'ז} (\text{מ'ז})$

II. Grammar.

1. Variants suggesting harmonisation.

There is a large number of variants that consist of ST employing a common for a rare usage in MT, or a form or construction used elsewhere by both in identical or similar context. Each of these types of variation suggests the possibility of Samaritan harmonisation, and taken together the possibility of harmonisation becomes even stronger.

2. Variants attributable to scribal error.

Another group of variants may be considered as being due to the typical scribal errors which occur in textual transmission. Reference has already been made to this cause of variation under orthographical conclusions.

3. Variants arising from the indiscriminate use of grammatical forms or constructions.

This has given rise to one of the largest groups of variants in the Classification. ST and MT used certain forms or constructions/

construction indiscriminately e.g., 3 s.m. or 3 pl.verbs must or may be understood to have an indefinite subject. Both constructions were familiar to the scribes and one might be substituted for the other at almost any point. Accordingly, no cogent reason can be adduced in favour of ST or MT in these cases, so that either the ST or MT reading may have belonged to the original text as it existed at the time of the Samaritan secession.

4. Abnormal forms.

There is a relatively small but important group of variants consisting of abnormal forms that are yet found elsewhere in the Samaritan Pentateuch and that may be classed as early or late as well as under the foregoing categories.

5. Parallels outside Samaritan Pentateuch.

Morphological and syntactical variants not found elsewhere in Samaritan Pentateuch may be paralleled in MT of the Hebrew Bible or in Dead Sea Scrolls, and if so, may be considered as receiving strong confirmation. In the event of no parallel at all being found it may be wiser to suspend judgment rather than dismiss the Samaritan variant out of hand.

6. Doctrinal variants.

Grammatical variants of a doctrinal nature are considered in relation to the known doctrinal background of Jews and Samaritans. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that no passage/

passage which differentiates the location of the temple can be correct or incorrect merely on the ground of its saying that the location is in Jerusalem or Shechem, the reason being that a satisfactory logical case can be made for either location. Other considerations are to be noted, sometimes small in themselves but cumulatively more conclusive: there appear to be 10 of such passages in ST (involving 7 variants, as one occurs 4 times) where the text has been conformed to a specific Samaritan doctrine or practice.

7. Non-doctrinal variants.

Grammatical variants with divergences in sense. Any that show clarification of meaning, logical correction or euphemistic tendencies may reasonably be considered as secondary in nature. Again, any that show identity of meaning with a parallel elsewhere in the Pentateuch may have been harmonised: a completely different view is taken of variants paralleled outside the Samaritan Pentateuch, that is, in the MT of the Hebrew Bible for these may well be original on account of such strong independent confirmation. Variants in meaning that do not fall within the foregoing categories reveal a Samaritan tradition equally possible with that of the MT. In such cases, where the internal evidence is indecisive, the external evidence of the LXX may be valuable as lending support to one side of the other.

A full statement of Non-doctrinal variants with divergence in sense is given in Appendix A.

8. Collation with Dead Sea Scrolls.

The evidence is summarised under General Conclusions and shows grammatical variants few of which reveal any real difference of meaning but apparently arise from chance disagreement due to interchange of grammatical usage.

III. Vocabulary.

1. Substitutions.

i. Variants suggesting harmonisation.

There is a large group of variation where the ST variants that are substituted consist of pure synonyms. Where these consist of a common word instead of a rare one or a common word found elsewhere in identical or similar context, each type suggests the possibility of harmonisation and, taken together, such possibility becomes all the stronger.

ii. Variants attributable to scribal error.

Of a different type are the synonyms originating in scribal error in ST or MT. As indicated under Orthographical and Grammatical Conclusions, each variant has to be judged on its own merits by the methods of textual criticism.

iii. Variants consisting of synonyms readily interchanged.

A large group of variants consists of synonyms that could easily interchange in both ST and MT and where it/

it is obviously impossible to decide between one Pentateuch and the other. It is at least valuable to notice the high proportion of variation of this type where either the ST or MT reading is equally possible. There is also a small group of variants consisting of virtually synonymous words or phrases which give greater precision or emphasis. The readings of both ST and MT are so suited to the context that it is unwise to adjudicate between them.

2. Additions and/or Omissions.

i. Alternative, fuller forms of text in ST.

There are 10 long passages that are fully discussed under the relevant sub-heading in Chapter V where ST provides an explicit statement of events implied but not actually recorded in MT. Unlike most commentators the present writer is disposed to accept these passages as preserving a mode of writing that may point back towards the distant period of oral transmission, when a text might be written either in an abbreviated or a fuller form. See also below, General Conclusions, No.8.

ii. Stylistic supplements.

A comparison of Additions and Omissions under Vocabulary shows clearly that ST, as compared with MT, has more stylistic supplements such as explicit subjects or objects, /

objects, words in apposition or additional waw ("and"). As well as extra words of a stylistic nature there are those that are virtually synonymous expressions, perhaps giving greater emphasis, precision or clarity. These variants are numerous and include such common words as לְכָל הָעָם Many of these variants could reasonably belong to the original text but, cumulatively, they are significant as showing ST to be a fuller document, with extra words of this supplementary nature.

iii. Explanatory expansions.

There are many cases where extra words in ST appear to be more than stylistic supplements. While many of them show little difference in meaning they reproduce the actual wording of both ST and MT either in the immediate context or another part of the Pentateuch. They have every appearance of being expansions of an explanatory type.

iv. Doctrinal variants.

Variants of Vocabulary that are of a doctrinal nature are relatively few in number but their importance is obvious. They are all discussed in Chapter V where the controversy regarding Gerizim, and other Samaritan beliefs and practices, is treated in detail. As was emphasized under grammatical conclusions, no variant differentiating the location of the sanctuary in Zion or Gerizim/

Gerizim can be accepted or rejected merely as it stands for a good logical case can be advocated for either location. There must be a search for other considerations, perhaps inconclusive in themselves but cumulatively more cogent, before a decision is possible. Bearing these facts in mind, a case has been made out against the acceptance of the Samaritan 10th Commandment, although no decision has been offered regarding the disputed variant $\text{D' r' r' l} / \text{32' y}$. Further, many of the doctrinal variants under "Other Samaritan beliefs and practices" may well show adjustment to distinctive Samaritan views. A further statement is made regarding doctrinal variants under General Conclusion, No. 11.

v. Non-doctrinal variants.

Variants of vocabulary showing clear divergence in meaning differ greatly in value. With some of them there appear to be cogent reasons in favour of the Samaritan reading. For example, there are certain passages in the MT where the text appears to be defective by the omission of a word or words and ST fills the "gap". The Samaritan reading gives such excellent sense that it seems reasonable to adopt it. Naturally these variants are not numerous: over the whole Pentateuch they amount to 16. In 15 of these cases the LXX supports ST; in the remaining one it diverges from both ST and MT.

In/

In other examples the evidence is on the side of MT where, for example, ST appears to have made an attempt at clarification of meaning or logical correction.

There are many passages where the evidence is inconclusive and where no cogent reasons can be adduced in favour of ST or MT.

A full statement of Non-doctrinal variants with divergence in sense is given in Appendix A.

vi. Collation with Dead Sea Scrolls.

The evidence is summarised under General Conclusions and shows that many of the variants in the Scrolls are virtual synonyms of the type already noted under Additions in ST.

CHAPTER VII.

General Conclusions.

1. The Samaritan Pentateuch MSS witness to a homogeneous text tradition.

Unlike the Jews the Samaritans had no Council of Jamnia to fix the consonantal text of the Pentateuch and, as far as is known, no subsequent scribal activity comparable to the Masoretic development. Yet it cannot be denied that their Pentateuch has a uniform text. Apart from orthographical variation, such as plene or defective writing of yodh or waw, or mistakes with the gutturals, to which the Samaritans were prone, there is a unanimity among the many MSS used by von Gall and detailed in his critical apparatus. Even those Samaritan variants which consist of modifications or expansions are reproduced with precise exactitude throughout the Pentateuch MSS showing that, though of a secondary nature, their inclusion was long established and accepted by the whole Samaritan community. It is true to say with Kahle: "For many centuries the Samaritan Pentateuch has been a textus receptus without variant readings. We have seen that a text similar to it must have been used in Jewish circles also, in the time before all earlier texts were replaced by the authoritative Hebrew text." (See Cairo Geniza, p.149).

2./

2. The Samaritan Pentateuch is not an amendment of MT but a descendant from a type of text earlier than the Masoretic.

Many of the Samaritan variants from MT go far beyond differences of orthography; and grammar and include modifications and long expansions. That the latter go back to an early time is a valid inference from the uniformity of the Samaritan Pentateuch tradition, for the Samaritan MSS reveal a homogeneous text. Presumably for many centuries the text has been fixed in all essential details. The antiquity of the Samaritan variants has received striking confirmation by the Qumran discoveries. As stated earlier, the Biblical MSS at Qumran reveal three variant text traditions as well as some of a mixed type. One is a text with additions and transpositions typical of the Samaritan Pentateuch. There is no evidence that this was a Samaritan document so that presumably it would belong to a type of text in general use at that time. With the establishment of the fixed consonantal text by the Council of Jamnia, such variant texts would be eliminated more and more among the Jews. The Samaritans, however, adopted a different standard text from the Jews so that their Pentateuch is valuable as witnessing to a different text tradition from that which ultimately became established as the MT. Such a conclusion would lend additional weight to the views of such scholars as Kahle who consider that the Samaritan represents a text at/

at one time widely expanded and in use among the Jews in pre-Christian times.

3. The text found in Samaritan Pentateuch Scrolls has not been more accurately transmitted than that in Samaritan Pentateuch Codices and neither does it represent a different tradition.

In refutation of the view that the Samaritan Scroll has a superior text to that of the Codex and that accordingly the Scroll, and not the Codex, should be used as the basis of comparison between ST and MT, detailed evidence has been led in Chapter III, 3, "Scroll and Codex", with the following results:

- i. The Scroll MSS are not unanimous in their witness to the text.
- ii. The same kind of variants occur in Scroll as in Codex.
- iii. They are just as numerous.
- iv. There appears to be no relation between the Scroll MSS to justify the view of a common tradition different from, or superior to, that of the Codex.

4. The Samaritan Pentateuch to a greater extent than MT may show evidence of oral, as well as written, tradition.

In Chapter III, 2, "Oral Transmission", the writer put forward certain arguments in favour of his view that many of the Samaritan variants may have arisen in the course of oral transmission wherein the possibility of error is even greater than in the case of written transmission e.g., many examples of spelling and accident which make no difference to the meaning would not be differentiated if a text were being/

being recited. It is unnecessary to recapitulate all the arguments. Such a hypothesis would explain the smoothing out of difficulties or the correction of eccentricities such as are to be found in ST. Oral expansions in the teaching of the schools might well be reflected in its text.

5. There are certain types of variation which are due to misreading, miswriting or mishearing in ST or MT.

A large group of variants may be considered as having originated in the typical scribal errors that can occur in the course of textual transmissions. There is no general principle that can be applied in the criticism of these variants and each example has to be judged individually on its own merits. Discussion in the nature of the case can easily become subjective in particular examples but a broad, overall picture emerges showing that, apart from variants due to confusion with gutturals to which the Samaritans were specially prone, there are many variants that have every appearance of having arisen from typical scribal errors. Confusion between letters similar in shape or sound, ditto-graphy, haplagraphy, homoeoteleuton and the like, either in ST or MT have been the root cause of divergence in certain cases.

6. There are certain types of variation which are more common in ST than in MT and which may be presumed on various grounds to be later than MT.

There are cases where ST employs a common form for a rare form in MT, /

MT, in accordance, syntax or vocabulary, and where the Samaritan reading is presumably later.

There are also variants which show not only identity in content but even in actual wording with other passages in OT. Such variants differ greatly in value. Where the parallel passages are outwith the Pentateuch it is reasonable to believe they may furnish strong confirmation of the Samaritan reading. There are a small number of these.

On the other hand, where the parallel passages are within the Pentateuch and the Samaritan variant reproduces the actual wording, as often happens, it would appear as if harmonisation has taken place. There are many of these Samaritan variants consisting of single words, short word groups, and longer passages extending through a number of verses. While individual examples of single words and short word groups do not provide conclusive evidence, their collective significance appears to do so and in the case of the long incorporations or amplifications from parallel passages the evidence is surely overwhelming.

Apart from the Samaritan Tenth Commandment (see also Conclusion 11) there is nothing specifically Samaritan about them in the sense of doctrinal difference and they presumably reflect a type of text that happened to be in the possession of the Samaritans but might have a wider circulation. This view seems to be strengthened by the fact that such an expanded and/

and adjusted text was found among the Qumran documents.

7. There are certain types of variation where on internal evidence no decision appears possible between ST and MT and where in certain cases external evidence may be adduced in support of either ST or MT.

There is a large number of variants where internal evidence does not permit a decision regarding the original reading. Such variants include those that involve no change of meaning and consist of interchange of grammatical constructions between ST and MT e.g. 3rd singular or plural verbs must or may be understood to have an indefinite subject. Both constructions were familiar to the scribes and one might be substituted for the other at almost any point and this has evidently been done. There are also variants of vocabulary consisting of synonyms easily and actually interchanged in both ST and MT and where it is obviously impossible to decide between one Pentateuch and other. It is at least valuable to notice the high proportion of variation of this type where either the ST or MT reading is equally possible.

There are also other variants which show difference of meaning equally as suitable to the context as that of MT.

In such cases the support of the Versions may be adduced in favour of ST or MT: where the Versions are of no assistance it may not be possible to give a preference to either reading.

8. The Samaritan may preserve in certain passages an alternative, fuller form of text to that of MT.

Under/

Under Vocabulary, Additions, there is a full discussion of certain passages consisting of explicit statements in the Samaritan of events the occurrence of which is logically implied in MT. Good examples of this kind of variant occur in the long additional passages of the narrative of the plagues in Exodus: for example, in Ex. 7¹⁶⁻¹⁸ God pronounces a warning regarding an impending plague and has commissioned Moses and Aaron to deliver the warning to Pharaoh. It is not stated in MT that this warning was ever delivered. In ST, however, 7^{18b} represents Moses and Aaron as going to Pharaoh and repeating almost literally the words of the divine warning. There are 10 long variants of this nature all listed in Appendix A which contain statements of events logically implied but not definitely recorded in MT. While it is possible that these long passages may be later expansions, it can also be argued that they are additions of a different type from other long expansions in ST. They may be considered as belonging to the original text, being explicit statements of what actually occurred but is not actually mentioned in MT. If so, a most interesting possibility arises regarding the original form of the OT writings, some of which must lie very near to oral transmission: conceivably, a narrative might be recorded in full or in an abbreviated form, to be supplemented by the narrator.

9. The ST is a longer document than the MT.

The additions now to be considered are evidently of a different type from those treated in Conclusion 8. Under Vocabulary, Additions/Omissions it was shown that a distinctive feature of ST is the large number of synonyms, consisting of explicit subjects or objects, words in apposition, or additional waw ("and"): or of virtual synonyms, consisting of additional words such as $\text{לְכָל} \quad \text{וְעַל} \quad \text{וְעַל} \quad \text{וְעַל} \quad \text{וְעַל}$ and conveying ideas like precision, emphasis and clarity. Many of these variants could easily belong to the original text and it is impossible to accept or reject them as such but cumulatively they convey a picture that is significant, namely, that in this respect the Samaritan has a fuller text. There is also a large number of variants consisting of extra words or phrases, some of which convey greater precision and similar ideas and all of which reproduce the actual wording found elsewhere in the Pentateuch, in identical or similar context. Such variants may be viewed with suspicion on account of possible harmonisation by ST.

In addition to those groups there are long passages in Samaritan consisting of incorporations or substitutions from parallel narratives repeating almost literally whole verses found elsewhere in the Pentateuch. These passages are clearly of a secondary nature.

Accordingly, the resultant text of ST is clearly a longer and/

and fuller document with the possibility that in this respect it is an expanded and later production.

10. The Samaritan may contain dialect forms.

In Chapter I reference is made to Sperber's use of the LXX and the Samaritan Pentateuch to detect traces of a northern dialect of Hebrew. Though going back to a common ancestor the languages of ST and MT are separate branches each with a phonetic history of its own. He regards the kingdoms of Israel and Judah as the homes of these dialectic differences. The respective recensions of the Pentateuch handed down in these two areas were preserved almost unchanged from an early period in the dialects of these two districts. See above, p. 22. Gerleman cannot accept this theory of a provincial dialect and holds the view that many of the Samaritan variants are due to a younger and more advanced stage of Hebrew of the Chronicles period. See above, p. 20.

With regard to these theories it may be said that neither of them can be accepted to the complete exclusion of the other. The theory of dialectic difference, if pressed to its logical conclusion, would imply that the Judaeen history of Chronicles was written in a Hebrew reminiscent of the northern kingdom. On the other hand there are more factors in the situation than Gerleman has considered. Some of the Samaritan variants he adduces, such as absence of apocopation in verbal forms, are to be found in the MT Pentateuch.

According/

According to Millar Burrows he has over-simplified the problem. See above, p. 21.

The natural inference from this evidence is that traces of dialectic difference are to be observed in the two Pentateuchs for the following reasons:

i. At a later date there is clear evidence of a Samaritan Hebrew showing Aramaic influence and the intrusion of what appears to be dialect forms.

(1) Occasional forms and syntax are evidently Aramaic.

(i) 2 s.m. Impv.	וְיָ	passim
(ii) 3 s.f. Pf. Aphel	אֶלְיָן	Gn. 33 ¹³
(iii) Pt. Pass. Peil	אֶלְיָן אֶלְיָן	Gn. 20 ³
	אֶלְיָן אֶלְיָן	Gn. 27 ¹⁵
	אֶלְיָן אֶלְיָן	Gn. 41 ²³
(iv) F. pl. nominal forms	אֶלְיָן אֶלְיָן	Ex. 27 ³
	אֶלְיָן אֶלְיָן	Ex. 25 ³⁸
	אֶלְיָן אֶלְיָן	Ex. 37 ²³

Cf. אֶלְיָן אֶלְיָן, אֶלְיָן אֶלְיָן

G.H. Dalman, Aramäisch-Neuhebräischer
Wörterbuch, Frankfurt, 1901, p. 221.

(2) Uncertainty in writing the gutturals implies a weakened pronunciation wherein they were not distinguished or were all pronounced as aleph.

ii. Regarding the earlier period.

(1)

- (1) There is the clear and unambiguous statement in Judges 12⁶ of the fact of an Ephraemitic pronunciation of אִשָּׁר differing from the South.
- (2) Some of the Samaritan variants such as 2 s.f. personal pronoun 'אֲנִי are commonly agreed by scholars to be older than the customary MT form and are found elsewhere in the Kethib.
- (3) There is cogent evidence for a Hebrew different in pronunciation from that of MT. Petermann, Kahle, Dienes and Sperber have all been considered as bringing forward evidence in support of this view.

11. Doctrinal variants are to be considered in relation to the known background of Jews and Samaritans.

The doctrinal variants, which are fully treated under the relevant sections in Grammar and Vocabulary, have been considered in relation to the known background of Jews and Samaritans. This was one of bitter controversy that developed regarding the claims of the rival sanctuaries on Gerizim and Ebal. A doctrinal variant differentiating the location of the temple cannot be considered as correct or incorrect merely on the ground of its statement that the location is in Jerusalem or Shechem for a satisfactory logical case can be argued for either site. There must be other considerations if a decision is to be reached: such considerations may in themselves be inconclusive but in conjunction with others the cumulative result may permit of/

of a reasonable conclusion or at least a strong presumption. It is the view of the present writer that a good case can be put forward for the ST reading of Gerizim for Ebal in Dt.27⁴ but he would find it difficult to defend the authenticity of the long passage, known as the Samaritan Tenth Commandment, in which that reading is incorporated. For discussion, see above, p. 107 "Controversy regarding Gerizim".

12. The Dead Sea Scrolls have many variants of the same type as the Samaritan.

The evidence of the DSS, which has been discussed in Chapter VI, is valuable for the light that it sheds on the pre-Masoretic period, as the Scrolls sometimes agree with MT, sometimes with ST, and sometimes follow an independent line. In Orthography there are Scroll variants which show agreement with MT, more frequently with ST but in great majority of passages available diverge from both MT and ST. The orthographic position is that DSS is fuller than ST which in turn is fuller than MT. In Grammar variants arise from the most part from chance agreement or disagreement due to interchange of grammatical usage between MT, ST, or DSS. Only a few of them show any real divergence in meaning. In Vocabulary the Scrolls support either the MT or ST in a limited number of cases but frequently diverge from both by having extra words giving/

giving greater precision, emphasis, clarity and the like. However, these extra words are precisely the same kind of extra words that make ST a longer document than MT. In so far as the Pentateuch fragments from Qumran are representative samples of a much longer corpus of material, many of them reveal a type of text fuller than either ST or MT.

APPENDIX A.List of Samaritan variants under the categories of the Classification outlined in Chapters IV and V.

(NOTE: The variants are either adopted by von Gall in his text or are strongly attested in his critical apparatus. Where the Scripture reference is not sufficient to identify the variants, the actual Hebrew is added).

I. DIFFERENCES OF ORTHOGRAPHY.1. Variants attributable to scribal error.1. Letters similar in sound(1) Gutturals.(i) Omission

Gn. 13¹⁸ 3 נ' 20¹⁷ י' א ח נ ו 43¹⁰ ו נ ח א א א א
Lv. 8²² 3 נ

(ii) Addition

Gn. 33¹³ א 3 י נ } Ex. 3² א 2 א 3 2
א 3 נ י

(iii) Interchange

א and ה

Gn. 3²⁴ א א 3 7¹⁹ א א א א א א 30^{38, 41} א א א א א א 33¹⁴ א א א א א א
39^{20, 21, 22, 23} א א א א א א 40^{3, 5} א א א א א א 49¹⁰ א א א א

Ex. 2¹⁶ א א א א א א 15¹³ א א א א

Lv. 13³⁹ א א א א א א 19²⁴ א א א א א א 26¹⁶ א א א א א א

Dt. 28⁵² א א א א א א

א and ה

Ex. 28²⁸ א א א א א א 39²¹ א א א א א א

Dt. 32¹⁸ א א א א א א

Appendix A.Interchange (contd.)

η and \aleph Gn. 32²⁵ ויחבק
 η and γ Gn. 49⁷ וחברתם
 \aleph and η Gn. 14²³ מעשרת 19²⁹ האככה 22¹⁷ וארבה
 29²¹ האב 38¹⁶ האב
 Nu. 14¹⁹ הנה 32²¹ ואשרו
 Dt. 4¹ ועל

η and \aleph
 Gn. 4¹⁴ הסטיר 16¹² כרה 17²¹ הקים 19⁸ הוציא 21²⁴ השבע
 24²⁵ חספה 24³² ואסכה 24⁴⁶ אשקה 27³³ הפו 37³⁰ הנה
 42²⁷ חסכה 43²⁴ חסכה 49⁹ וכלביה 50¹⁷ מנה
 Ex. 28³² אחרה 39²³ אחרה
 Nu. 11²⁰ זרה 23²⁴ כלביה 24⁹ כלביה

Dt. 21²⁰ וסובת 33²⁰ כלביה

(iv) Transposition

Gn. 25³⁰ העלסני 41² וגריענה 41¹⁸ וגריענה
 Ex. 15⁶ נדרי

Examples not so strongly attested.(i) Interchange of guttural

Gn. 2¹² השם  25⁴ מיפה

(ii) Additional guttural, sometimes with metathesis

Gn. 42²¹ הפרעה (II MSS)
 הפרעה (3 MSS)

(iii) More than two gutturals

Gn. 43³³ ויתחמו (3 MSS, ויתחמו), ויתחמו (3 MSS), ויתחמו (1 MS)

(2) Palatals

Gn. 21²³ נגדי 3 Lv. 11¹⁹ נגדי Dt. 14¹⁸ נגדי

(3) Sibilants

Gn. 18²⁰ אפק Ex. 2²³ אפק

(4) Labials

Gn. 31³⁵ וַיִּשְׁמַע 31⁴⁰ שָׁמַע
 Ex. 1¹² אָמַר 15¹⁰ אָמַר
 Dt. 32¹³ אָמַר

ii. Letters similar in shape

(1) Within ST script

ו and ל Gn. 44⁸ וַיִּשְׁמַע

(2) Within MT script

י and ל
 Gn. 10²⁷ יָצָא 41³⁵ וַיִּשְׁמַע 49¹² יָצָא

ו and ה
 Ex. 9¹⁸ הָיוּ

ו and ו
 Gn. 36³⁹ וַיִּשְׁמַע Dt. 14¹³ וַיִּשְׁמַע 33²⁵ וַיִּשְׁמַע

(3) Within ST and old Hebrew script

ו and ל
 Dt. 32²⁴ וַיִּשְׁמַע

iii. Other typical scribal errors, such as incorrect joining or dividing of words, laplography or dittography, omission or intrusion of letters or words.

Gn. 18²¹ וַיִּשְׁמַע 25³⁴ וַיִּשְׁמַע 31³¹ וַיִּשְׁמַע 41³² וַיִּשְׁמַע 41⁴³ וַיִּשְׁמַע
 Ex. 27¹¹ וַיִּשְׁמַע 27¹⁸ וַיִּשְׁמַע 30²³ וַיִּשְׁמַע
 Lv. 21⁵ וַיִּשְׁמַע

iv. Formae Mixtae

Ex. 15¹ וַיִּשְׁמַע 20²⁴ וַיִּשְׁמַע
 Lv. 15²³ וַיִּשְׁמַע 25²² וַיִּשְׁמַע 25⁴⁴ וַיִּשְׁמַע 25⁴⁵ וַיִּשְׁמַע

v. Proper Names, attributable to scribal error and classifiable under the variant types of this first section of orthographical variants, and entered here as a group for convenience of reference.
 (See below, pp. 159 and 180 for other examples of Proper Names)

Appendix A.

Gn. 10⁷ וסבגכה 11³¹ 12⁴ מחרן 12⁵ מחרן 12⁶ מחרן 14² { שמחבד
 14⁵ בחס 14¹⁷ השוה 21²² ופיאכ 21³² ופיאכ 22² המורה 25⁴ ומפר
 25⁹ פהר 25¹⁵ וגיימה 26²⁶ ופיאכ 31⁴⁷ שהדוה 31⁴⁸ אעד 36¹³ 17, שח
 36²² ואימים 41⁴⁵ כוטיכר 41⁵⁰ כוטיכר 46¹⁰ ומחד 46²⁰ כוטיכר 46²¹ ואכיס
 Ex. 6¹⁵ ופחר 31² חורי 35³⁰ חורי 38²² חורי
 Nu. 10¹² כראן 11³⁵ קחצרו 12^{6a} כראן 13³ כראן 13²⁶ כראן 14⁴⁵ חרמה
 21²³ יחצה 21³⁰ הנפח 25¹⁵ כזב 26¹⁶ { צעדי 26³⁵ 3 גחם 26³⁵ גחם
 26³⁶ צעדן 26³⁶ העדנ 26³⁹ שוכם 26⁴⁴ { הימני 32³ 32³⁵ ושבה 32³⁵ שכים
 32³⁷ מצצה 32³⁸ בעצמון 33³² הגדגדה 33³³ הגדגדה 33⁴⁹ שטים 34¹¹ חשכמה
 Dt. 1¹ כראן 2³² יחצה 2³⁷ היבק 3¹⁴ הארגב 3¹⁴ והמכעץ 11²⁹ הרגריזים
 11³⁰ מורא 27¹² הרגריזים 33² כראן

vi. Passages too corrupt in both ST and MT for any useful comparison.

Gn. 31⁵³ 2²⁴ מברקם 36²⁴ האמים 38⁵ ויהו 49⁵ כ 49²² בני צעירי 49²³ ויריבהו
 49²⁵ ומלך 49²⁶ הרי עד --- ומלך --- הרי עד
 Nu. 24²⁰ ימבד עד 24²² חמשה עד 24²³ ימיאם 24²⁴ עד ימבד
 Dt. 32⁵ 32²⁶ שחגו --- חוס מכיהם

2. Variants making the pronunciation explicit.

1. Use of Aelph.

(1) Elision (Syncope)

In ST


Gn. 3¹³ 18⁶ השיני 24¹⁷ סים 24²¹ הגחני 30¹⁴ משה 30¹⁵ { דודים 30¹⁵ (bis) דודי
 30¹⁶ 31²⁷ בדודי 41² נחב 41⁴ ובריות 41⁵ ובריות 41⁷ { הבריות
 41¹⁸ 41²² מלך 49²⁷ זיב
 Ex. 22²⁸ חלץ
 Lv. 1¹⁶ חרגו
 Nu. 11⁵ 16³⁰ הבטחים בריה
 Dt. 28⁶⁵ 32¹⁴ חמל דיבון

Appendix A.Elision (contd.)

In MT

Gn. 25²⁴ אלהים 41⁵¹ וישניEx. 26²⁴ אלהים 36²⁹ אלהיםLv. 11⁴³ ונטחםNu. 11¹¹ אלהים 15²⁴ אלהיםDt. 11¹² אלהים 21²³ אלהים 28⁵⁷ אלהים 29²² אלהים 32³² אלהים34⁶ אלהיםProper Names, showing elision of aleph.

In ST

Gn.  22²⁴ רוח 25¹³ ונדבEx. 6²⁴ וביס Dt. 4⁴³ רוחNu. 13¹⁵ אלהים 26¹⁷ אלהים    

In MT

Gn. 14² אלהים 14⁸ אלהים 28⁴ אלהים 36³ אלהים 46¹² אלהים 46¹³ אלהים
46²¹ אלהים 46²¹ אלהיםNu. 34¹¹ אלהים 26²¹ אלהים 3 אלהים 26²¹ אלהים 26²³ אלהים 26²³ אלהיםDt.  29²² אלהים 32⁴⁹ אלהים 34¹ אלהים(2) Vowel Letter(1) Mediae

In ST

Gn. 3⁷ אלהים 22² אלהים 22¹² אלהים 22¹⁶ אלהים 37⁷ אלהים 40¹⁰ אלהים
42³⁸ אלהים 44³¹ אלהיםEx. 12³⁷ אלהים 15⁸ אלהים 24¹¹ אלהיםNu. 11²¹ אלהים 34¹¹ אלהיםDt. 28⁷ אלהים 33⁶ אלהים(1i) Final Corresponding to verbs in MT.Gn. 14¹⁴ אלהים 24¹² אלהים 24⁴¹ אלהים 27²⁰ אלהים 31⁵¹ אלהים
32³³ אלהים 40¹⁹ אלהים 40²² אלהים 41¹³ אלהים 47¹³ אלהיםEx. 2¹⁶ אלהים 2¹⁹ אלהים 3¹⁸ אלהים 9⁴ אלהים 11⁷ אלהים15⁴ אלהים 15¹⁶ אלהים 19¹³ אלהים 22²⁴ אלהים 33¹⁶ אלהים 36⁸ אלהיםLv. 1¹⁵ אלהים 5⁹ אלהים 13⁴⁵ אלהים

Appendix A.(ii) Final (contd.)

Nu.	5 ²¹	כֶּזֶס	11 ²³	הִקְרַחַךְ	13 ¹⁸	הִרְפֵּחַ	21 ¹⁸	כְּרוּחַהּ
	23 ³	יִקְרַח	23 ¹⁵	יִקְרַח	23 ¹⁶	יִקְרַח		
Dt.	11 ¹⁴	יִרְחַ	15 ²	חֶשֶׁח	15 ²	יֶשֶׁח	21 ¹⁸	יִחְרַח
	21 ²⁰	יִחְרַח	21 ²³	יִחְרַח	24 ¹⁰	יֶשֶׁח	24 ¹¹	יֶשֶׁח
	29 ²¹	יִחְרַח	29 ²⁸	יִחְרַח				

(3) Final (prosthetic) after a long vowel

In ST

Gn.	24 ⁴¹	יִקְרַח	44 ¹⁰	יִקְרַח	44 ²⁹	יִקְרַח		
Ex.	21 ²⁸	יִקְרַח	23 ⁷	יִקְרַח				
Nu.	32 ²²	יִקְרַח						
Dt.	19 ¹⁰	יִקְרַח	19 ¹³	יִקְרַח	21 ⁸	יִקְרַח	21 ⁹	יִקְרַח
	24 ⁵	יִקְרַח	27 ²⁵	יִקְרַח				

In MT

Gn.	27 ³³	יִקְרַח	Ex.	33 ¹⁶	יִקְרַח
-----	------------------	---------	-----	------------------	---------

ii. Use of He To indicate presence of final vowel

In ST

(1) Pronoun 2 s.m.

Nu.	11 ¹⁵	יִקְרַח	Dt.	5 ²⁴	יִקְרַח
-----	------------------	---------	-----	-----------------	---------

(2) Suffix 2 s.m.

Gn.	19 ²²	יִקְרַח			
-----	------------------	---------	---	---	---

(3) Verbs Pf. 2.s.m.

Ex.	25 ¹⁶	יִקְרַח	25 ²¹	יִקְרַח	25 ³⁰	יִקְרַח	26 ³⁴	יִקְרַח
	28 ²³	יִקְרַח	28 ³⁰	יִקְרַח	29 ³	יִקְרַח	29 ⁶	יִקְרַח
	29 ¹⁷	יִקְרַח	30 ¹⁶	יִקְרַח	30 ¹⁸	יִקְרַח	40 ⁷	יִקְרַח
	40 ⁸	יִקְרַח						
Lv.	2 ¹⁵	יִקְרַח	24 ⁷	יִקְרַח				

Appendix A.

(3) 3 s.f.

Lv. 25²¹ וַעֲשֵׂה 26³⁴ וְהָרַחֵק

Impf. 2 pl.f.

Ex. 1¹⁸ וְאַחֲרָיֶיךָ (וְאַחֲרָיֶיךָ - 1 MS, וְאַחֲרָיֶיךָ - 1 MS)

3 pl.f.

Gn. 19³³ וַאֲשַׁקֵּינָהּ 19³⁵ וַאֲשַׁקֵּינָהּ 19³⁶ וַאֲהַרְנָהּ 26³⁵ וְאַחֲרָיֶיךָ
 27¹ וְאַכְהִינָהּ 30³⁸ אֲבַחֵנָהּ 30³⁹ וְאַחֲרָיֶיךָ 33⁶ וְאַגְשֵׁינָהּ
 33⁶ וַאֲשַׁחֲוִינָהּ 37⁷ וַאֲשַׁחֲוִינָהּ 41²⁴ וְאַבְצַעְנָהּ 41³⁶ אֲהַיִינָהּ
 49²⁶ אֲהַיִינָהּ

Ex. 1¹⁷ וְאַחֲרָיֶיךָ 1¹⁷ וְאַחֲרָיֶיךָ 1¹⁹ וְאַחֲרָיֶיךָ 2¹⁹ וְאַחֲרָיֶיךָ
 15²⁰ וְאַחֲרָיֶיךָ 25²⁷ אֲהַיִינָהּ 26³ אֲהַיִינָהּ 27² אֲהַיִינָהּ

Nu. 25² וְאַקְרַחֵנָהּDt. 21¹⁵ אֲהַיִינָהּ 31²¹ אֲמַחֲרָנָהּ

Note: Examples ending in ה — attested by a number of Samaritan MSS in von Gall's critical apparatus, but not adopted by him —

Gn. 19³³ (9 MSS) וַאֲשַׁקֵּינָהּ
 19³⁵ (11 ") וַאֲשַׁקֵּינָהּ
 30³⁸ (4 ") אֲבַחֵנָהּ
 33⁶ (6 ") וַאֲשַׁחֲוִינָהּ
 41²¹ (7 ") וְאַבְצַעְנָהּ

In MT

(1) Pronoun 2 pl.f.Gn. 31⁶ וְאַחֲרָיֶיךָ(2) Suffix 2 s.m.Gn. 3⁹ וְאַחֲרָיֶיךָ 27⁷ וְאַחֲרָיֶיךָ 27³⁷ וְאַחֲרָיֶיךָEx. 7^{29a} וְאַחֲרָיֶיךָ 13¹⁶ וְאַחֲרָיֶיךָ 15¹¹ וְאַחֲרָיֶיךָ (b6) 29³⁵ וְאַחֲרָיֶיךָNu. 22³³ וְאַחֲרָיֶיךָ Dt. 28²² וְאַחֲרָיֶיךָ 28²⁷ וְאַחֲרָיֶיךָ 28²⁸ וְאַחֲרָיֶיךָ

3 pl.f.

Gn. 41¹⁹ וְאַחֲרָיֶיךָLv. 4² וְאַחֲרָיֶיךָ 5²² וְאַחֲרָיֶיךָ Nu 13¹⁹ וְאַחֲרָיֶיךָ

(3) Verb pf. 2 s.m.

Gn. 31³⁰ אָפּוֹכַח

iii. Use of Yodh or Waw.

(1) Greater use of vowel letters as compared with MT.

(i) General observations.

a. Evidence of Samaritan pronunciation different from that of MT.

Yodh or Waw in ST not homogeneous with

(a) vocalic consonant in same syllable in MT

Gn. 40¹⁰ שְׂרֹוּגִים 40¹² הַשְׂרֹוּגִים 45⁷ שְׂרֹוּת

Lv. 27¹⁰ וְאֶמִירָו 27³³ וְאֶמִירָו

Dt. 14⁵ אֶמִי

(b) pointing in MT

Gn. 3²¹ כִּי־אֵל 4²³ אֶמִירָו 11³ חִי־מֶר 16⁸ אֵוִי
 18^{2,16,22} מְנוּשִׁים 19^{5,10,16} מְנוּשִׁים 28¹¹ מְרַשִׁיאוֹ
 28¹⁸ מְרַשִׁיאוֹ 30²⁶ וִי־דִי 32²³ וִי־דִין 33^{1,2(bis)},
 וִי־דִיקָן, וִי־דִידִה, וִי־דִידִהן, הִי־דִים 5,6,7,13,14
 34⁴ כִּי־אֵל, כִּי־אֵל 37³ כִּי־אֵל 37^{23,31,32,33} כִּי־אֵל, הִי־דִיקָן 38¹⁸
 41³³ וְחֹוֹם 43^{33(bis)} כִּבְכִירָו 49¹⁵ חֹוֹם 49²⁰ מְעוֹדֵנִי
 Ex. 1¹⁴ בְּחִי־מֶר 2³ בְּחִי־מֶר 3²² מִשְׁכִּי־נֹהַג
 8^{12,13,14} כִּנֹּיִם, כִּנֹּיִם 14²⁵ בְּכַבּוֹדוֹ 28⁴ כִּי־אֵל
 28³⁹ כִּי־אֵל 28⁴⁰ כִּי־אֵל
 29⁵ הִכִּי־נֹהַג 29⁸ כִּי־אֵל 30²³ וְקִנְיָן 30³⁴ וְחִבְנִיה
 32²⁷ קִרְיָו 33²² בְּנִקִּירָו 39²⁷ הִכִּי־נֹהַג 40¹⁴ כִּי־אֵל
 Lv. 8⁷ הִכִּי־נֹהַג 8¹³ כִּי־אֵל 10⁵ בְּכִי־נֹהַג 11¹⁶ הִתְחַמּוּס 11²⁹ וְהַעֲבֹר
 16⁴ וְכִי־נֹהַג 19³⁵ בְּחִשְׁקוֹ 26²⁶ בְּחִשְׁקוֹ
 Nu. 21⁸ שְׂרֹוּף 26¹⁰ חֹוֹם
 Dt. 4⁶ חֹוֹם 28⁸ בְּחִשְׁקוֹ 33⁹ אֶמִירָו

b. Vocalic consonant where MT has short vowel.Gn. 10^{8,9} ג'ור 27⁴⁰ ג'ורLv. 26¹³ ג'ורNu. 3²¹ ג'ור 17¹⁵ ג'ור (7 MSS) 24²⁵ ג'ור (2 MSS)c. Vocalic consonant where MT has vocal shewa.Gn. 18⁴ ג'ור 25^{1,4} ג'ור 49¹¹ ג'ורEx. 28⁴ ג'ורLv. 14⁴ ג'ורNu. 14³³ ג'ור(11) Selected Classes.a. Nouns(a) Segholate forms.Gn. 24²⁰ ג'ור 47²⁶ ג'ור 49²¹ ג'ורEx. 29²⁰ ג'ורLv. 5²³ ג'ור 8¹³ ג'ור (7 MSS) 8²³ ג'ור 11³ ג'ור11²⁶ ג'ור 14¹⁴ ג'ור 14¹⁷ ג'ור 14²⁵ ג'ור 14²⁸ ג'ורDt. 14⁶ ג'ור(b) Plural Termination.

For convenience of reference, adjectives and participles, with like terminations as nouns, are also included here.

Scriptio plena

Masc. abs.

Gn. 1²¹ 3⁷ 17²⁰ 18²⁴ (bis) 18²⁶ 18²⁸ 21¹⁵
 25¹⁶ 25²⁴ 32¹⁶ 36²⁴ 39²² 40¹⁰

Ex. 7¹² 8¹⁰ 8¹² 8¹⁵ 9¹¹ 14⁷ 15¹¹ 25⁵ 26¹⁴
 26²⁷ 26²⁹ (bis) 29¹ 29³ 35⁷ 35²³ 35²⁷ 36¹⁹
 36²⁹ 36³² (bis) 36³⁴ (bis) 39³ 39³⁴

(b) Plural Termination (contd.)

Lv.10¹⁶ 16⁷ 16⁸(bis) 17⁷ 19⁴ 21⁶ 23¹⁸ 26¹
 Nu.2¹³ 3⁹ 6⁵ 7¹⁰ 7¹⁷ 7⁸⁷ 7⁸⁸ 17²⁰ 21²⁹ 23²⁹
 27² 29¹³ 29¹⁴ 29¹⁷ 29¹⁸ 29²⁰ 29²¹ 29²³ 29²⁴
 29²⁶ 29²⁷ 29²⁹ 29³⁰ 29³² 29³³ 33⁵³
 Dt.4⁸ 16¹⁹ 32² 32³³

Masc. with sf. (Unusual orthography in M T)

Gn.1²¹ מְקִיָּהִים 34⁴ וְיִמְחָדְבִּיהִן 47¹⁷ מְקִיָּהִים
 Nu.10^{10a} וְיִמְחָדְבִּיהִן 17¹⁷ וְיִמְחָדְבִּיהִן 29³³ וְיִמְחָדְבִּיהִן 30⁸ וְיִמְחָדְבִּיהִן

Fem. abs.

Gn.1¹⁴ (bis) 1¹⁵ 1¹⁶ 3⁷ 5⁴ 6² 8²⁰ 12¹⁶ (bis)
 19¹⁵ 20¹⁴ 21²⁹ 21³⁰ 23¹⁵ 24¹¹ 24¹³ 24³⁵
 24⁵³ 25⁶ 26³ 26⁴
 26¹⁵ 26¹⁸ 27¹⁵ 27²³ 32¹⁶ 33¹⁷ 41² 41⁴ 41⁵
 41¹⁸ 41²⁰ 41²² 41²² 41²⁴ 41²⁶ 41²⁶ 41²⁷
 41²⁷ 41³⁵ 42²⁹ 45² 45² 45²³ 45²³ 47²⁴ 49¹³
 Ex.1¹⁵ 1¹⁷ 1¹⁸ 1¹⁹ 1¹⁹ 1¹⁹ 1¹⁹ 1²⁰ 1²¹ 2⁷
 3²² 4¹⁷ 4²⁶ 4²⁸ 4³⁰ 8^{1a} 8⁹ 8⁹ 9⁹ 9¹⁰ 9²³
 9³² 9³⁴ 10³⁵ 12³ 12⁴ 12¹⁸ 12³⁴ 12³⁵ 13⁶
 15⁵ 15⁵ 15⁸ 15²⁰ 16¹² 18⁸ 18²¹ 19¹⁶ 20⁵
 20¹⁸ 20²⁶ 22¹⁶ 23² 24⁵ 24⁶ 25¹² 25¹⁴ 25²⁶
 25²⁶ 25²⁷ 26¹ 26² 26³ 26³ 26³ 26³ 26⁵ 26⁵
 26⁵ 26⁵ 26⁶ 26⁷ 26⁸ 26⁹ 26⁹ 26¹⁰ 26¹⁰ 26¹¹
 26¹⁷ 26²⁴ 30⁴ 30⁷ 30⁸ 27⁷ 27⁸ 28⁷ 28⁷ 28¹⁴
 28¹⁴ 28²⁰

Appendix A.(b) Plural Termination (contd.)

Fem. abs. (contd)

Ex. 28	28 ²⁴	28 ²⁵	28 ⁴⁰	29 ²	29 ²	29 ²	29 ⁸	29 ⁹	29 ¹³
	29 ²²	31 ⁴	32 ⁶	32 ¹⁵	(2 mo)	32 ¹⁶	32 ¹⁶	32 ¹⁹	
	32 ¹⁹	34 ¹	34 ¹	34 ¹⁰	34 ²²	34 ²⁸	35 ³²	35 ³⁵	36 ⁸
	36 ⁹	36 ¹⁰	36 ¹⁰	36 ¹²	36 ¹²	36 ¹²	36 ¹²	36 ¹³	
	36¹⁴	36¹⁵	36¹⁶	36¹⁶	36¹⁷	36¹⁷	36²¹	36²²	
	36²²	36²⁹	37³	37⁵	37¹³	37¹³	36 ¹⁴	36 ¹⁵	36 ¹⁶
	36 ¹⁶	36 ¹⁷	36 ¹⁷	36 ²¹	36 ²²	36 ²²	36 ²⁹	37 ³	37 ⁵
	37 ¹³	37 ¹³	37 ¹⁴	38 ³	38 ³	38 ³	38 ³	38 ⁵	38 ⁷
	38 ⁷	38 ⁸	38 ²⁰	39 ⁴	39 ⁴	39 ⁶	39 ⁶	39 ¹³	39 ¹⁶
	39 ¹⁷	39 ¹⁸	39 ¹⁸	39 ²⁸	40 ¹⁴	40 ²⁵			
Lv. 2	2 ⁴	2 ⁴	3 ⁴	3 ¹⁰	3 ¹⁰	3 ¹⁵	3 ¹⁵	4 ⁹	7 ⁴ 7 ⁴ 7 ¹²
	7 ¹²	8 ¹³	8 ¹⁶	8 ²⁵	9 ¹⁰	9 ¹⁹	11 ³	13 ³⁸	13 ³⁸ 13 ³⁸
	13 ³⁹	13 ³⁹	14 ³⁷	14 ³⁷	14 ³⁷	18 ²⁶	18 ²⁷	18 ²⁹	18 ²⁹
	18 ³⁰	19 ³¹	20 ⁶	23 ¹⁵	23 ⁴²	23 ⁴²	26 ¹⁶	26 ⁴⁶	27 ²
Nu. 1	1 ²⁶	1 ²⁸	1 ³⁰	1 ³²	1 ³⁶	1 ³⁸	1 ⁴⁰	1 ⁴²	2 ² 2 ¹⁷
	2 ³²	3 ³¹	3 ⁴³	4 ⁷	4 ⁷	4 ⁷	4 ¹⁴	4 ¹⁴	4 ¹⁴ 4 ³² 5 ²³
	6 ¹⁵	6 ¹⁵	7 ²	7 ⁶	7 ⁸	7 ⁸⁶	8 ²	10 ⁹	10 ^{10a} 10 ²⁵
	12 ⁸	13 ²⁸	16 ¹⁷	16 ²²	17 ²	17 ²²	17 ²⁴	23 ¹	23 ¹⁴
	23 ²⁹	24 ⁶	27 ⁷	27 ¹⁶	32 ³⁸				
Dt. 1	1 ¹⁵	1 ²⁸	1 ²⁸	3 ⁵	3 ²¹	4 ³⁴	4 ³⁴	4 ⁴³	6 ⁸ 6 ¹⁰ 6 ¹⁰
	6 ²⁰	7 ¹⁹	7 ¹⁹	8 ⁷	9 ¹	9 ¹	9 ¹⁷	10 ²	10 ² 10 ³ 10 ⁴

(b) Plural Terminations (contd.)

Fem. abs. (contd.)

Dt. 10^5 10^{21} 10^{21} 11^7 11^{11} 11^{18} 16^9 16^{13} 17^8
 20^{15} 27^6 28^{52} 29^2 29^2 29^{28} 32^{16} 32^{24} 32^{35}
 34^{11}

Fem. ostr.

Gn. 6^5 7^{11} 8^2 8^2 9^{12} 10^{32} 12^3 14^{10} 14^{10} 21^{11}
 21^{28} 26^{18} 27^{16} 28^{14} 41^2 41^4 41^4 41^6 41^{18}
 45^{22} 46^2 46^7

Ex. 1^{15} 6^6 6^{14} 6^{15} 6^{19} 6^{24} 9^{28} 12^{39} 15^{27} 16^{12}
 18^8 25^{12} 25^{14} 25^{15} 25^{26} 26^4 26^7 26^{12} 26^{13}
 26^{14} 26^{23} 27^4 27^7 27^{19} 28^{11} 28^{12} 28^{13} 28^{14}
 28^{14} 28^{21} 28^{24} 28^{38} 29^{12} 31^{18} 35^7 (2⁹⁰⁰)
 35^{18} 35^{18} 35^{23} (2⁹⁰⁰) 36^{11} 36^{14} 36^{19} 36^{28} 37^3
 37^5 37^{13} 37^{27} 38^7 38^8 38^{31} 39^6 39^7 39^{13}
 39^{14} 39^{15} 39^{16} 39^{16} 39^{17} 39^{18} 39^{19} 39^{20} 39^{20}
 39^{34} 39^{37}

Lv. 4^{18} 4^{25} 4^{30} 4^{34} 14^9 14^{37} 14^{39} 20^{23} 21^{11}
 23^{38} 23^{40} 25^8 26^{13} 26^{36} 26^{39} 26^{39} 26^{39}

Nu. 3^{20} 3^{21} 3^{27} 3^{30} 3^{33} 3^{35} 4^{25} 7^3 7^{84} 10^2 21^{14}
 26^7 26^{12} 26^{14} 26^{18} 26^{22} 26^{25} 26^{27} 26^{34}

Appendix A.(b) Plural Terminations (contd)

Fem. estr. (contd)

Nu. 26³⁷ 26⁴² 26⁴³ 26⁴⁷ 26⁵⁰ 26⁵⁸ 27¹ 32¹⁶
 32³⁶ 32³⁸ 33⁹ 33¹⁶ 33¹⁷
 Dt. 7¹³ 28⁵¹ 32⁸ 32³² 33²

Fem. with sf.

Gn. 8¹⁹ 10⁵ 10⁵ 10²⁰ 10²⁰ 10²⁰ 10³¹ 10³¹ 10³¹
 15⁵ 17⁷ 17⁹ 17¹² 19¹⁵ 25¹³ 25¹⁶ 25¹⁶ 26⁵
 31²⁶ 31²⁸ 31⁴³ 31⁴³ 31⁵⁰ 34²¹ 36⁴⁰ 36⁴⁰
 36⁴⁰ 36⁴³ 44¹³ 47⁹ 47³⁰ 48¹⁵ 48¹⁶ 48²¹
 49²⁹ 50²⁵
 Ex. 1¹¹ 2¹¹ 3²⁰ 4⁵ 5⁵ 6¹⁷ 6²⁰ 6²⁵ 7³ 7¹² 7¹⁹
 10² 12²¹ 12¹³ 12²¹ 12³⁴ 25³⁶ 28¹⁰ 28²⁰
 28²¹ 31¹⁶ 37²² 39¹³ 39¹⁴
 Lv. 10⁵ 19¹⁹ 19³⁷ 20⁸ 20²² 25¹⁸ 26³ 26¹⁵ 26⁴⁰
 26⁴³

Nu. 1² 1² 1¹⁸ 1¹⁸ 1²⁰ 1²⁰ 1²² 1²² 1²⁴ 1²⁴
 1²⁶ 1²⁶ 1²⁸ 1²⁸ 1³⁰ 1³⁰ 1³² 1³⁴ 1³⁶ 1³⁸
 1⁴⁰ 1⁴² 1³² 1³⁴ 1³⁶ 1³⁸ 1⁴⁰ 1⁴² 1⁴⁴ 1⁴⁷
 2² 2³² 2³⁴ 3¹⁵ 3¹⁵ 3¹⁷ 3¹⁸ 3¹⁹ 3²⁰ 3²⁰
 3³⁹ 3⁴⁰ 4² 4² 4⁷ 4²² 4²² 4²⁹ 4²⁹ 4³⁴ 4³⁴
 4³⁶ 4³⁸ 4⁴⁰ 4⁴⁰ 4⁴² 4⁴² 4⁴⁴ 4⁴⁶ 4⁴⁶ 7²

(b) Plural Termination (contd.)

Fem. with sf. (contd.)

Nu.10³¹ 11¹⁰ 14²² 14²³ 17³ 17¹⁷ 17²¹ 17²⁵ 26²
 26¹⁵ 26²⁰ 26²³ 26²⁶ 26²⁸ 26³⁵ 26³⁷ 26³⁸
 26⁴¹ 26⁴² 26⁴⁴ 26⁴⁸ 26⁵⁰ 26⁵⁵ 26⁵⁷ 33⁵²
 33⁵⁴ 34¹⁴

Dt.10¹¹

Scriptio defectiva

Gn.31³ 32¹ 35⁵ 46¹⁵ 47³
 Ex.3¹³ 7²⁸ 12¹⁷ 25¹⁹ 25²⁹ 27⁴ 28⁷ 37⁸ 39⁴
 Lv.22¹⁸ 23³⁸
 Nu.33⁵²
 Dt.6¹⁴

Note: unusual orthography in S T

Gn.31³¹ 7¹¹¹² 31⁴¹ 7¹¹¹²


unusual orthography in M T

Nu.15²⁰ 02¹⁸⁰⁷ 10³¹ 11¹¹¹²b. PronounsSuffixes 2 s.f. Scriptio plena always in S T

Gn.12¹² (2 exx) 12¹³ (2 exx) 13¹⁶ (4 exx)
 16⁶ (2 exx) 16⁹ 16¹⁰ 16¹¹ 20¹³ 21¹⁸ 24¹⁴
 24¹⁷ 24⁴³ 24⁴⁵ 24⁶⁰ 25²³ 30¹⁴ 30¹⁵ (3 exx)
 35⁷ 38¹⁸

b. Suffixes (contd.)Ex. 2⁷ 2⁹Nu. 5² 5¹⁹ (2 exx) 5²⁰ (2 exx) 5²¹ (3 exx)c. Verbs(a) Verbal ending before suffix

Scriptio plena

Gn. 1²⁸ וְכַשְׁמֹה 24⁵⁴ וְיִהְיֶה 26⁷ וְיִהְיֶהEx. 17⁴ וְיִהְיֶה 39¹⁸ וְיִהְיֶה 39²⁰ וְיִהְיֶהLv. 17⁵ וְיִהְיֶהNu. 14⁹ וְיִהְיֶה 17³ וְיִהְיֶה 32³⁹ וְיִהְיֶהDt.  2²¹ וְיִהְיֶה 2²² וְיִהְיֶה 28² וְיִהְיֶה 32³⁸ וְיִהְיֶה(b) ParticipleScriptio plena Waw in first stem syllableGn. 2¹¹ 9¹⁸ 32³² 34³⁰Ex. 2¹⁴ 5⁶ 5¹⁰ 5¹⁴ 5¹⁵ 5¹⁹ 13⁴ 14⁸ 25³² 25³³25³⁵ 37¹⁸ 37¹⁹ 37²¹Lv. 25¹⁰

(b) Participle (contd)Scriptio Plena Waw in first stem syllableNu.11¹⁶ 16¹¹ 21¹³ 21^{22b} (bis) 26⁴ 30³ 31²⁷ 31²⁸31³⁶ 32¹⁷ 32²⁴ 33⁵² 36⁴Dt.1⁴ (bis) 2⁴ 2⁸ 2²² 2²³ (bis) 8⁷ 9²¹ 21²⁰ (bis)33¹² 33²¹

Scriptio defectiva

Gn.1³⁰ 8¹⁹ 15² 24³ 24⁶² 25³² 28²⁰ 37²⁵ 39⁶40² 41⁸Ex.3⁵ 8¹⁶ 8²⁵ 9³ 11⁴ 18¹⁴ 19¹⁹ 30³⁵ 36²⁹Lv.5¹⁶ 11²⁷ 11⁴² 15¹⁰ 15²⁷Nu.2¹² 13¹⁹ 13²⁹ (ter) 14²⁵ 21³⁴ 24¹⁴Dt.3² 4⁴² 4⁴⁶ 13⁴ 18¹⁰ 18¹⁴(c) Infinitive absoluteScriptio plena Waw in second stem syllableGn.37⁸

Scriptio defectiva

Gn.8⁷ 12⁹ 26¹³ 31¹⁵ 37⁸ 37¹⁰ 43⁷Ex.15²⁶ 19⁵ 19¹³ 21²² 21²⁸ 23²²Lv.10¹⁸ 13² 24¹⁶Nu.6²³ 13²⁰Dt.6¹⁷ 15² 15⁵ 15¹⁰ 21¹³ 28¹

Appendix A.(d) Niphal

Scriptio plena

Yodh in second stem syllableGn. 4¹⁴ 18⁴Ex. 34¹⁹Lv. 6¹³Nu. 7⁸⁴ 7⁸⁸Dt. 29²²(e) Hiphil

Scriptio plena

Yodh in second stem syllable

Pf.

Gn. 39¹ 42⁸ 43³Nu. 7¹⁹ 17¹³ 26⁵⁸ 30¹³ 30¹⁵Dt. 2³⁰ 2³⁴ 7¹⁹Pf. with WawGn. 34⁵ 37²⁰Nu. 4⁵ 5¹⁶ 30¹²Dt. 21⁴ 22¹⁴ 28¹¹

Impf.

Gn. 4¹² 8²¹ 19⁷ 19⁹ 44²³ 49⁴Ex. 9²⁸ 13¹¹ 14¹³ 14¹⁴ 15¹⁷ 16¹⁹ 20¹² 22⁴ 22¹²23¹Lv. 2⁴ 13¹¹ 19²⁷ 27¹⁴Nu. 6¹⁰ 6²⁵ 11⁴ 11¹⁸ 30¹³ 30¹⁴ 30¹⁶ 32⁵ 35¹⁹Dt. 1¹⁷ 2²⁸ 4² 6² 9²⁶ 17¹⁶ 19²⁰ 29²²

(e) Hiphil (contd)Impf. with WawGn. 2¹⁵ 2²² 3²¹ 5³ 5⁴ 5⁶5^{7,9,10,12,13,15,16,18,19,21,22,25,26,28,30,32} 6¹⁰8²¹ 11^{10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,} 19¹⁶ (bis)
19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26.19²⁶ 21¹⁵ 24¹⁸ 24²⁰ 24²⁸ 24³⁷ 24⁴⁶ 24⁶⁷ 27²⁷29¹² 31⁴² 37⁵ 37⁸ 37²⁴ 41¹⁴ 43⁷ 43²¹ 44¹¹44²⁴ 50²⁵Ex. 2¹⁰ 4⁶ 4⁷ 7¹⁰ 16²⁰ 19⁴ 32¹⁹ 32²⁴Lv. 8⁶ 8⁷ 8¹³ (bis) 8¹⁴ 8¹⁶ 8¹⁸ 8²⁰ 8²¹ 8²² 8²⁴8²⁸ 9⁹ 9¹² 9¹³ 9¹⁴ 9¹⁵ 9¹⁶ 9¹⁷ (ter) 9²⁰16⁵ 18²⁵ 20²⁶ 26¹³Nu. 14¹² 16¹⁰ 20¹⁵ 20¹⁶ 31¹² 31⁵⁰ 31⁵⁴Dt. 1²² 1²⁵ (bis) 1⁴³ 2³⁴ 4¹⁰ 4³⁷ 5¹⁵ 8³ 9²¹26⁶ 26⁸ 26⁹ 32⁷

Imv.

Gn. 4²³ 8¹⁷ 19¹² 20⁷ 27²⁵ 35² 37¹⁴ 38³ 43¹⁶ 44²¹Ex. 7⁹ 16³³ 33⁵Lv. 9² 24¹⁴Nu. 3⁶ 17²⁵Dt. 33²⁷

Pt.

Gn. 19¹³ Ex. 22⁵ 26²⁸ Lv. 11⁴ Dt. 8¹⁶

(e) Hiphil (contd)

Inf. ostr.

Gn. 31⁷ Lv. 5⁴ Nu. 3⁴ Dt. 7²⁴ 9²⁸ 32⁸

Inf. abs.

Gn. 30³² 50¹⁵ Lv. 19¹⁷ Nu. 30¹⁵ Dt. 3⁶ 7² 13¹⁶
22⁴

Scriptio defectiva

Pf.

Gn. 40¹⁰ 43⁹ 44⁴ 45²⁶
Ex. 13⁹ Lv. 25⁴⁵ Nu. 1¹⁸ 14²⁹
Dt. 1⁵ 4²⁶ 26¹⁸ 33⁹Pf. with WawEx. 4⁸ Lv. 26⁹ 26³³ Nu. 14²⁴ 14³¹

Impf.

Ex. 4¹ 4⁵ 4⁸ 4⁹ 19⁹ 21²⁷ 23¹³
Nu. 14¹¹ 20¹⁰
Dt. 3²⁸ 9³ 14²⁸ 19³ 19⁷ 24¹¹ 25³ 25³ 28³⁸
28⁶⁶Impf. with WawGn. 19¹⁶ 26³¹ 31⁴⁵ 37³³ 42²⁹
Ex. 14⁹ 14³¹ 16²² 32⁶
Lv. 8²⁹ 10¹
Dt. 2¹² 2²¹ 32²⁹

Appendix A.(e) Hiphil (contd)

Inv.

Gn. 21¹⁸ 32¹² Dt. 31²⁸

Pt.

Nu. 14²⁷ Dt. 8²⁰ 14⁷ 18¹²

Inf. estr.

Gn. 34³⁰ 39¹⁸Ex. 2³ 16³²Lv. 23¹² 23⁴³Nu. 10⁷ 18³⁰ 18³²Dt. 29²⁴The Weak Verbs(f) Verbs with initial Yodh

Scriptio Plena

Hiphil

Pf.

Gn. 12¹⁶ אב"ה Nu. 10²⁹ אב"ה 10³² אב"ה

Impf.

Ex. 2⁹ אהר"ה Dt. 32¹³ אהר"ה

Pt.

Gn. 24⁵⁹ אהר"ה  

Inf. abs.

Dt. 9²¹ אב"ה 13¹⁵ אב"ה 17⁴ אב"ה 19¹⁸ אב"ה 27⁸ אב"ה

Appendix A.(f) Verbs Initial Yodh (contd)

Scriptio defectiva

Hiphil

Impf.

Gn. 4⁷ א'ב'א

Inf. estr.

Ex. 30⁷ א'ב'א ב'ה'ט'ב'ו Lv. 5⁴ א'ב'ה'ט'ב' Dt. 8¹⁶ א'ב'ה'ט'ב' 28⁶³ א'ב'ה'ט'ב'(g) Verbs Medial Yodh

Scriptio plena

Qal

Impf.

Gn. 24⁴⁷ א'ש'נ'ו 31³⁴ א'ש'א'ל 48²⁰ א'ש'א' Dt. 10⁵ א'ש'א'נ'ו

Scriptio defectiva

Qal

Impf.

Gn. 9²³ א'ש'ו 41³³ א'ש'ו 43³² א'ש'ו 45⁸ א'ש'וEx. 1¹¹ א'ש'ו 15¹ א'ש'ו 15¹ א'ש'ו 17¹² א'ש'ו 39¹⁹ א'ש'וLv. 10¹ א'ש'וNu. 16¹⁸ א'ש'וDt. 28⁶³ א'ש'ו

Folel

Impf.

Dt. 32¹⁰ א'ש'ו(h) Verbs Final Yodh

Scriptio plena

Inf. estr.

S T ending in א' —

Appendix A.(h) Verbs Final Yodh (contd)

Scriptio Plena

Inf. estr. S T ending in AI —

Gn. 6¹⁹ 11⁵ 11⁸ 18²⁵ 23² 24¹⁹ 24¹⁹ 24³⁰ 27¹ 33¹⁰
 35¹⁷ 41³² 50²⁰
 Ex. 1¹¹ 3⁸ 7²⁴ 9²⁸ 10³ 10⁵ 10²⁸ 12⁴⁸ 13¹⁷ 14¹³
 15²³ 17¹ 17⁷ 19¹⁶ 19²³ 19²⁴ 23¹ 23² 23²
 26¹³ (26) 30⁸ 27²⁰ 31¹⁸ 32¹² 33²⁰ 34²⁴ 35¹ 35³²
 35³⁴ 36¹ 36² 36³ 36⁵ 36¹⁸ 39²¹ 40¹⁵ 40³⁷
 Iv. 4²⁷ 8³⁴ 9²² 10¹¹ 11⁴⁵ 14⁵⁷ 24² 26¹³ 26⁴⁴
 Nu. 1⁵¹ 4¹⁵ 5²² 8² 9⁴ 9⁶ 9²² 16³¹ 22²³ 22²⁵ 30¹⁴
 Dt. 1⁴ 1²⁶ 1³³ 1³³ 1⁴¹ 4¹⁴ 5¹ 6²⁴ 7²² 8² 8² 8¹⁶
 8¹⁶ 11²²

(i) Verbs Initial Waw

Scriptio Plena

Gal.

Impf.

Gn. 15⁸ 22¹⁷ Dt. 13¹² 17¹³ 19²⁰ 21²¹

Niphal

Pf.

Gn. 20¹⁶ אבבב

Pt.

Ex. 12¹⁰ אבבב

Hiphil

Pf.

(i) Verbs Initial Waw (contd)

Hiphil

Pf.

Gn. 24¹⁴ אכח 24⁴⁴ חכ

Impf.

Gn. 4¹² אס 8²¹ אס 19¹⁶ אס 24¹⁸ אס 44²³ אסEx. 9²⁸ אס 10²⁸ אס 10²⁹ אס 14¹³ אסNu. 13³² אס 15³⁶ אס 16⁵ אס 17²³ אס 17²⁴ אס 20¹⁶ אסDt. 4² אס 5¹⁵ אס 6²¹ אס 13¹ אס 17¹⁶ אס 18¹⁶ אס 19²⁰ אס28⁶⁸ אס

Hophal

Inf. estr.

Gn 40²⁰ אס

Scriptio defectiva

Qal

Imp.

Gn. 2⁷ אס 9²⁴ אס 28¹⁶ אס 41⁴ אס 41⁷ אס 41²¹ אס(j) Verbs Medial Waw

Scriptio Plena

Qal

Impf.

Waw in stem syllableGn. 3³ 3⁴ 24⁴² 27²¹ 27³¹ 32⁷ 33¹⁴ 34²² 44¹³45²⁰ 49¹⁰

(j) Verbs Medial Waw (contd)Impf. Waw in stem syllable (contd)

Ex. 3³ 14² 14²⁶ 14²⁸ 18¹⁵ 18²³ 21³ 22⁸ 23²⁷
 25¹⁵ 29³⁰ 30²⁰ 30²¹
 Lv. 10⁶ 10⁹ 11³² 12⁴ 14³⁶ 14³⁶ 14⁴⁸ 15³¹ 16²
 16³ 21¹¹ 21²³ 25¹⁰ 25¹³
 Nu. 4¹⁹ 6¹⁰ 13² 13²¹ 13²⁵ 14³⁵ 14⁴⁵ 16²⁹ 17²⁵
 18³ 19⁷ 20²⁴ 26⁶⁵ 27¹⁷ 30⁸ 31²³ 32²²
 Dt. 1¹⁹ 1²² 1³⁷ 1³⁸ 2¹⁹ 5²⁹ 17¹⁴ 18⁶ 18²²
 19⁵ 20⁵ 20⁶ 20⁷ 20⁸ 23² 23³ 23⁴ 23¹¹ 23¹²
 23²⁵ 23²⁶ 24⁵ 24¹⁰ 27³ 29¹ 33⁶

Imv.

Gn. 43² 44²⁵ Ex. 14¹⁹ Dt. 2¹³ 32⁵⁰

Inf. ostr.

Gn. 19³⁵ 48⁷
 Ex. 12²³ 14¹² 33⁹
 Lv. 11³¹ 11³²
 Nu. 6⁷ 13²¹ 33³⁹ 33⁴⁰ 34⁸ 35⁶
 Dt. 9¹ 11³¹ 20¹⁹ 34⁷

Niphal

Pt.

Ex. 19¹¹ 19¹⁵ Dt. 1¹³

(j) Verbs Medial Waw (contd)

Polel

Impf.

Dt. 32⁶

Scriptio defectiva

Qal

Impf. Gn. 24⁵⁴ Dt. 4¹⁷ 28⁴⁰Inv. Gn. 24³¹ 26³Inf. cstr. Gn. 34¹⁵ 38²³ 39¹⁶ 43²⁵Lv. 14⁴³ 25²² Dt. 30⁹

Niphal

Pf. Gn. 17²⁶

Polel

Impf. Gn. 1²⁰

d. Particles

(a) ΛN (acc.) S T always has Scriptio defectivaGn. 17² 20⁶ 39⁹ 40¹⁹ 41⁸ 41³⁹ 49²⁸ 49²⁹
50²¹Ex. 9⁵ 14⁹ 25⁹ 25²² 29³ 32¹⁰Lv. 10² 14⁶ 15¹⁰ 15²⁹ 17⁵ 22¹⁶ 23⁴³ 24⁶
25⁵⁵Nu. 4¹² 4¹⁹ 4²³ 4⁴⁹ 5⁴ 5²¹ 6²⁰ 7³ 7⁵ 7⁶
22³³ 25¹⁷ 30⁹

(a) $\wedge N$ (acc)(contd).

S T always has Scriptio defectiva.

11^{15} 3^6 3^{28} 6^{23} 9^{14} 9^{28} 10^{15} 12^{29} 18^{14}
 26^{16} 27^4 31^7 31^{10} 32^{51}

(b) '2 S T always has suffixes indicating the singular

$$\text{Gn}9^{12} \quad 9^{15} \quad 16^5 \quad 17^{10} \quad 17^{11} \quad 26^{28} \quad 31^{53}$$

Ex. 31¹³

It. 5⁵

C. Proper Names

(a) Scriptio plena or defectiva in same syllables


Yodh


Scriptio plena

ח.ה. יטבתל 36³⁹ ודישן 36²¹ קיטורה 25^{1,4} פ.ד.ש 22²² מזריחא 10²⁶ עינחיס 10¹³ Gn.

Ex. 1¹¹ 16²² 3¹ 16¹ 3¹ 16¹ 3¹ 17⁸ ברפידים

LV.10⁴ 155.3N

Nu. 1⁹ 3.n 2⁷ 3.n 7^{24, 29} 3.n 10¹⁶ 3.n 13¹⁵ כ.י. 21¹⁵ ע.י. 

21³² י. ע. ז. י. 22¹ י. ר. י. ח.  26³ י. ר. י. ח. 26⁶³ י. ר. י. ח. 31¹² י. ר. י. ח.

32¹ 33⁹ 34³ 35¹⁰ 36¹⁴ 37¹⁵ 38⁴⁸ י. ג. ח.

33⁵⁰ ירמון 34¹⁵ ירמון 35¹ ירמון 36¹³ ירמון

דט. 2¹⁰ 7¹¹ 2¹⁴ 3²⁹ 11⁴⁹ 32¹ 34¹ יריתן

Scriptio defectiva

Nu. 2²⁷ } N y 2 7^{72, 77} } N y 2 34²¹ } 77 3 N 34²³ } N 1 π

C. Proper Names (contd)

(a) Scriptio plena or defectiva in same syllables (contd)

Waw

Scriptio plena

Gn. 10^{8,9} נחור 10¹¹ נחור 10¹⁵ נחור 14⁵ נחור 14⁷ נחור 14¹³ נחור 14²⁴ נחור
 15¹⁹ נחור 25² נחור 25⁴ נחור 25¹³ נחור 26³⁴ נחור 33¹⁷ נחור
 36²⁵ נחור 36³⁰ נחור 37¹⁷ נחור 46⁹ נחור 46¹² נחור 46¹³ נחור
 46²⁴ נחור 49³⁰ נחור 50¹³ נחור

Ex. 1¹¹ נחור 2²¹ נחור 4²⁵ נחור 6¹⁴ נחור 12³⁷ נחור 14^{2,9} נחור
 17⁶ נחור 18² נחור

Lv. 24¹¹ נחור

Nu. 1¹¹ נחור 2²² נחור 3^{21,23} נחור 4²⁷ נחור 24^{27,28} נחור 60⁶⁵ נחור
 10²⁴ נחור 10²⁹ נחור 13²³ נחור 21¹⁰ נחור 21¹¹ נחור 21^{21,23} נחור
 21^{26,28} נחור 21³⁰ נחור 21³⁴ נחור 22⁵ נחור 22¹⁰ נחור 23¹⁸ נחור
 24³ נחור 24¹⁵ נחור 25¹⁴ נחור 26⁵ נחור 26⁵ נחור 26⁶ נחור 26¹⁴ נחור 26²¹ נחור
 26²¹ נחור 26²⁴ נחור 26²⁴ נחור 26²⁴ נחור 26²⁶ נחור 26³⁵ נחור 26⁴⁹ נחור
 26⁴⁹ נחור 26⁵⁷ נחור 26⁵⁸ נחור 33³³ נחור 33³⁴ נחור 33³⁴ נחור 33⁵ נחור 33⁶ נחור
 33¹⁶ נחור 33¹⁷ נחור 33¹⁷ נחור 33¹⁸ נחור 33¹⁹ נחור 33²⁰ נחור 33²⁰ נחור
 33²¹ נחור 33²⁹ נחור 33³⁰ נחור 33³⁵ נחור 33³⁶ נחור 33⁴¹ נחור 33⁴² נחור 33⁴³ נחור
 33⁴⁴ נחור 33⁴⁵ נחור 33⁴⁶ נחור 33⁴⁶ נחור 33⁴⁷ נחור 33⁴⁹ נחור 33⁴ נחור 33⁸ נחור
 34¹¹ נחור 26³¹ נחור

De. 1¹ נחור 2² נחור 4⁴ נחור 14¹⁴ נחור 19¹⁹ נחור 24²⁴ נחור 28²⁸ נחור 11¹¹ נחור 20²⁰ נחור
 24^{30,31,32} נחור 32³² נחור 32²¹ נחור 32²⁵ נחור 32¹⁰ נחור 32¹⁵ נחור 32⁴⁶ נחור 48⁴⁸ נחור
 52⁵² נחור 9⁹ נחור 22²² נחור 16¹⁶ נחור 28²⁸ נחור 29²⁹ נחור 30³⁰ נחור

C. Proper Names (contd)

(a) (contd)

Scriptio defectiva

Gn. 10¹³ 10²² 10²⁹ 19²² 25³ 36¹¹ 36¹⁵
 Lv. 26⁴²

Nu. 21^{13,14} 34²¹ Dt. 32²²

(b) Scriptio plena of Yodh and Waw in same syllablesYodh in S T, Waw in M T

Nu. 33^{13,14} 33⁴² Gn. 35⁸

Waw in S T, Yodh in M TEx. 6²⁴

Nu. 11²⁶ 11²⁷ 26³¹

(c) Scriptio plena of Yodh and Waw in proximate syllables

Nu. 22³⁹ 21²⁰ 23²⁸

(d) Scriptio plena of Waw in prox. syllables Gn. 30²⁰
 (iii) Remaining Variants, arranged under grammatical classes

of nouns, adjectives, verbs and particles.

a. Scriptio plena or defectiva in same syllablesYodh

Scriptio plena

Nouns

Gn. 14¹⁰ 15¹² 18²⁵ 24³⁰ 35⁴ 41⁴²
 43¹¹ 43³³

Ex. 14⁷ 15⁴ 22⁵ 23² 25³³ 25³⁴ 28⁴
 28³⁹ 28⁴⁰ 29⁹ 34³¹ 35²⁷ 37¹⁹ 37²⁰
 39²⁹

Appendix A.(iii) Remaining Variants (contd)a. Nouns (contd)

Iv. 5¹¹ 6¹³ 7⁸ 8¹³ 9¹⁶ 10¹⁹ 11²⁵ 12²³ 13²⁵ 14²³ 15²³ 16²³ 17²³ 18²³ 19²³ 20²³ 21²³ 22²³ 23²³ 24²³ 25²³ 26²³ 27²³ 28²³ 29²³ 30²³ 31²³ 32²³ 33²³ 34²³ 35²³ 36²³ 37²³ 38²³ 39²³ 40²³ 41²³ 42²³ 43²³ 44²³ 45²³ 46²³ 47²³ 48²³ 49²³ 50²³ 51²³ 52²³ 53²³ 54²³ 55²³ 56²³ 57²³ 58²³ 59²³ 60²³ 61²³ 62²³ 63²³ 64²³ 65²³ 66²³ 67²³ 68²³ 69²³ 70²³ 71²³ 72²³ 73²³ 74²³ 75²³ 76²³ 77²³ 78²³ 79²³ 80²³ 81²³ 82²³ 83²³ 84²³ 85²³ 86²³ 87²³ 88²³ 89²³ 90²³ 91²³ 92²³ 93²³ 94²³ 95²³ 96²³ 97²³ 98²³ 99²³ 100²³

Adjectives

Gn. 6¹⁶ 7¹³ 8¹³ 9¹³ 10¹³ 11¹³ 12¹³ 13¹³ 14¹³ 15¹³ 16¹³ 17¹³ 18¹³ 19¹³ 20¹³ 21¹³ 22¹³ 23¹³ 24¹³ 25¹³ 26¹³ 27¹³ 28¹³ 29¹³ 30¹³ 31¹³ 32¹³ 33¹³ 34¹³ 35¹³ 36¹³ 37¹³ 38¹³ 39¹³ 40¹³ 41¹³ 42¹³ 43¹³ 44¹³ 45¹³ 46¹³ 47¹³ 48¹³ 49¹³ 50¹³ 51¹³ 52¹³ 53¹³ 54¹³ 55¹³ 56¹³ 57¹³ 58¹³ 59¹³ 60¹³ 61¹³ 62¹³ 63¹³ 64¹³ 65¹³ 66¹³ 67¹³ 68¹³ 69¹³ 70¹³ 71¹³ 72¹³ 73¹³ 74¹³ 75¹³ 76¹³ 77¹³ 78¹³ 79¹³ 80¹³ 81¹³ 82¹³ 83¹³ 84¹³ 85¹³ 86¹³ 87¹³ 88¹³ 89¹³ 90¹³ 91¹³ 92¹³ 93¹³ 94¹³ 95¹³ 96¹³ 97¹³ 98¹³ 99¹³ 100¹³

Scriptio defectivaNouns

Gn. 19²⁶ 20⁴⁷ 21²⁵ 22⁶ 23⁴² 24³² 25⁹ 26⁷ 27³ 28³ 29³ 30³ 31³ 32³ 33³ 34³ 35³ 36³ 37³ 38³ 39³ 40³ 41³ 42³ 43³ 44³ 45³ 46³ 47³ 48³ 49³ 50³ 51³ 52³ 53³ 54³ 55³ 56³ 57³ 58³ 59³ 60³ 61³ 62³ 63³ 64³ 65³ 66³ 67³ 68³ 69³ 70³ 71³ 72³ 73³ 74³ 75³ 76³ 77³ 78³ 79³ 80³ 81³ 82³ 83³ 84³ 85³ 86³ 87³ 88³ 89³ 90³ 91³ 92³ 93³ 94³ 95³ 96³ 97³ 98³ 99³ 100³

Scriptio defectiva

Nouns (contd)

Nu. 13^{33a} 0.3217

Dt. 14¹⁸ אגדת 22⁶ מ"ב 22⁶ מ"ב 28³³ תנ"ך 32³¹ מ"ב

Adjectives

Gn. 3⁷   15² 47²⁴ 

Ex. 26⁴ 26¹⁰ 26¹⁰ 26¹⁰

חמישה¹⁵ 27 עררים²¹ 20 עררים²⁰ Lv. 20

Nu. 28⁵ ארבע

מדרים Dt. 32²⁴

Wav.

Scriptio plena

Nouns

הגבורים⁴ 6⁴ 3⁶ 6⁴ 4⁴ הכרובים²⁴ 3²² 3²² קוץ¹⁰ 3¹⁶ 1¹⁴ 1¹⁴ Gn. 1¹⁴
וחמורים¹² 12¹⁶ 12¹³ 12¹⁵ 10⁹ 10⁸ 10⁵ 10⁵ 3¹² 9²² קור⁸
בצלונת¹⁴ 14¹³ 14¹² 14¹¹ 14¹¹ 13¹⁸ 13¹⁴ 13⁴ 13⁴ 13¹⁹ 12¹⁹
קורתי¹⁹ 19⁸ 19²³ 18¹ 18¹⁴ 15²¹ 14¹⁶ 14¹⁶ 14¹⁶ 14¹⁶
מחוג¹² 20¹² 20⁶ 20⁶ 20⁵ 20⁵ 20² 19²⁸ 19²⁸ 19²⁸
משבועת²⁴ 24⁸ 23¹⁷ 23²¹ 22¹⁸ 22³ 22³ 21¹⁶ 21¹² 21¹²
בכור²⁵ 25¹³ 25¹² 24⁶⁰ 24⁵⁹ 24³⁵ 24³⁰ 24³⁰ 24³⁰
השבועה²⁶ 26³ 25³⁴ 25³³ 25³² 25³¹ 25³⁰ 25³⁰ 25³⁰
בעבור²⁷ 27³¹ 27³³ 27¹⁰ 27⁸ 26⁹ 26⁷ 26⁵ 26⁵

Wav

Scriptio plena

Nouns (contd)

בְּקוֹץ 27⁴³ קוֹץ 27³⁸ בְּכוֹרֶת 27³⁶ בְּכוֹר 27³² הָקוֹץ 27²² בְּכוֹר 27¹⁹ עוֹרֶת 27¹⁶ Gn. 27¹⁶
 מִחוּל 30⁸ בְּקוֹץ 30⁶ בְּמִחוּלָה 30¹ מִחוּל 29¹³ קוֹץ 29¹¹ מִקְחוּמָה 29³ וְסוֹנָה 28¹⁴
 בְּחִזּוֹם 31²⁴ רְכוּשׁוֹ 31¹⁸ הָעֵגוּדִים 31¹² הָעֵגוּדִים 31¹⁰ כְּתוּבָה 31⁵ הַכְּבוֹד 31¹ וְחִמּוּרִים 30⁴³
 לוֹזֶדֶת 36⁹ לוֹזֶדֶת 36¹ בְּתוֹכָם 35² מִחוּלָה 34¹³ רְאִישׁוֹנָה 33² מִקְחוּמָה 32¹ גְּבוּלָה 31³⁹
 רְאִישׁוֹן 38²⁸ הָהָקוֹם 38²¹ בְּכוֹר 38⁶ הַבְּכוֹרֹת 37²⁰ לוֹזֶדֶת 37² מִקְחוּמָה 36⁴⁰ וְסוֹנָה 36³⁰
 הַבְּכוֹרֹת 43³³ חִמּוּרֵינוּ 43²⁴ חִמּוּרֵינוּ 43¹⁸ וְסוֹ 43¹¹ שְׁמוֹנָה 42³⁸ חִמּוּר 42²⁷ הָרְאִישׁוֹנָה 41²⁰
 בְּכוֹר 46⁸ חִמּוּרִים 45²³ וְהָקוֹץ 45¹⁶ שְׁמוֹנָה 44³¹ שְׁמוֹנָה 44²⁹ חִמּוּר 44¹³ וְחִמּוּרֵיהֶם 44³
 זְבוּשׁוֹ 49¹¹ כְּבוֹדִי 49⁶ וְבִרְצוֹנִם 49⁶ בְּסוּדֶם 49⁶ בְּכוֹרִי 49³ הַבְּכוֹר 48¹⁸ מִחוּלָה 46¹⁷
 זְרוּעִי 49²⁴ מְנוּחָה 49¹⁵ חִמּוּר 49¹⁴

[illegible]

(iii) (contd)

Scriptio plena

Nouns (contd)

Ex. 25³¹ (bis) 25³² 25³³ 25³⁴ 25³⁵ 26¹ 26² 26³ 26⁴ 26⁵ 26⁶ 26⁷ 26⁸ 26⁹ 26¹⁰ 26¹¹ 26¹² 26¹³ 26¹⁴ 26¹⁵ 26¹⁶ 26¹⁷ 26¹⁸ 26¹⁹ 26²⁰ 26²¹ 26²² 26²³ 26²⁴ 26²⁵ 26²⁶ 26²⁷ 26²⁸ 26²⁹ 26³⁰ 26³¹ 26³² 26³³ 26³⁴ 26³⁵ 26³⁶ 26³⁷ 26³⁸ 26³⁹ 26⁴⁰ 26⁴¹ 26⁴² 26⁴³ 26⁴⁴ 26⁴⁵ 26⁴⁶ 26⁴⁷ 26⁴⁸ 26⁴⁹ 26⁵⁰ 26⁵¹ 26⁵² 26⁵³ 26⁵⁴ 26⁵⁵ 26⁵⁶ 26⁵⁷ 26⁵⁸ 26⁵⁹ 26⁶⁰ 26⁶¹ 26⁶² 26⁶³ 26⁶⁴ 26⁶⁵ 26⁶⁶ 26⁶⁷ 26⁶⁸ 26⁶⁹ 26⁷⁰ 26⁷¹ 26⁷² 26⁷³ 26⁷⁴ 26⁷⁵ 26⁷⁶ 26⁷⁷ 26⁷⁸ 26⁷⁹ 26⁸⁰ 26⁸¹ 26⁸² 26⁸³ 26⁸⁴ 26⁸⁵ 26⁸⁶ 26⁸⁷ 26⁸⁸ 26⁸⁹ 26⁹⁰ 26⁹¹ 26⁹² 26⁹³ 26⁹⁴ 26⁹⁵ 26⁹⁶ 26⁹⁷ 26⁹⁸ 26⁹⁹ 26¹⁰⁰ 26¹⁰¹ 26¹⁰² 26¹⁰³ 26¹⁰⁴ 26¹⁰⁵ 26¹⁰⁶ 26¹⁰⁷ 26¹⁰⁸ 26¹⁰⁹ 26¹¹⁰ 26¹¹¹ 26¹¹² 26¹¹³ 26¹¹⁴ 26¹¹⁵ 26¹¹⁶ 26¹¹⁷ 26¹¹⁸ 26¹¹⁹ 26¹²⁰ 26¹²¹ 26¹²² 26¹²³ 26¹²⁴ 26¹²⁵ 26¹²⁶ 26¹²⁷ 26¹²⁸ 26¹²⁹ 26¹³⁰ 26¹³¹ 26¹³² 26¹³³ 26¹³⁴ 26¹³⁵ 26¹³⁶ 26¹³⁷ 26¹³⁸ 26¹³⁹ 26¹⁴⁰ 26¹⁴¹ 26¹⁴² 26¹⁴³ 26¹⁴⁴ 26¹⁴⁵ 26¹⁴⁶ 26¹⁴⁷ 26¹⁴⁸ 26¹⁴⁹ 26¹⁵⁰ 26¹⁵¹ 26¹⁵² 26¹⁵³ 26¹⁵⁴ 26¹⁵⁵ 26¹⁵⁶ 26¹⁵⁷ 26¹⁵⁸ 26¹⁵⁹ 26¹⁶⁰ 26¹⁶¹ 26¹⁶² 26¹⁶³ 26¹⁶⁴ 26¹⁶⁵ 26¹⁶⁶ 26¹⁶⁷ 26¹⁶⁸ 26¹⁶⁹ 26¹⁷⁰ 26¹⁷¹ 26¹⁷² 26¹⁷³ 26¹⁷⁴ 26¹⁷⁵ 26¹⁷⁶ 26¹⁷⁷ 26¹⁷⁸ 26¹⁷⁹ 26¹⁸⁰ 26¹⁸¹ 26¹⁸² 26¹⁸³ 26¹⁸⁴ 26¹⁸⁵ 26¹⁸⁶ 26¹⁸⁷ 26¹⁸⁸ 26¹⁸⁹ 26¹⁹⁰ 26¹⁹¹ 26¹⁹² 26¹⁹³ 26¹⁹⁴ 26¹⁹⁵ 26¹⁹⁶ 26¹⁹⁷ 26¹⁹⁸ 26¹⁹⁹ 26²⁰⁰ 26²⁰¹ 26²⁰² 26²⁰³ 26²⁰⁴ 26²⁰⁵ 26²⁰⁶ 26²⁰⁷ 26²⁰⁸ 26²⁰⁹ 26²¹⁰ 26²¹¹ 26²¹² 26²¹³ 26²¹⁴ 26²¹⁵ 26²¹⁶ 26²¹⁷ 26²¹⁸ 26²¹⁹ 26²²⁰ 26²²¹ 26²²² 26²²³ 26²²⁴ 26²²⁵ 26²²⁶ 26²²⁷ 26²²⁸ 26²²⁹ 26²³⁰ 26²³¹ 26²³² 26²³³ 26²³⁴ 26²³⁵ 26²³⁶ 26²³⁷ 26²³⁸ 26²³⁹ 26²⁴⁰ 26²⁴¹ 26²⁴² 26²⁴³ 26²⁴⁴ 26²⁴⁵ 26²⁴⁶ 26²⁴⁷ 26²⁴⁸ 26²⁴⁹ 26²⁵⁰ 26²⁵¹ 26²⁵² 26²⁵³ 26²⁵⁴ 26²⁵⁵ 26²⁵⁶ 26²⁵⁷ 26²⁵⁸ 26²⁵⁹ 26²⁶⁰ 26²⁶¹ 26²⁶² 26²⁶³ 26²⁶⁴ 26²⁶⁵ 26²⁶⁶ 26²⁶⁷ 26²⁶⁸ 26²⁶⁹ 26²⁷⁰ 26²⁷¹ 26²⁷² 26²⁷³ 26²⁷⁴ 26²⁷⁵ 26²⁷⁶ 26²⁷⁷ 26²⁷⁸ 26²⁷⁹ 26²⁸⁰ 26²⁸¹ 26²⁸² 26²⁸³ 26²⁸⁴ 26²⁸⁵ 26²⁸⁶ 26²⁸⁷ 26²⁸⁸ 26²⁸⁹ 26²⁹⁰ 26²⁹¹ 26²⁹² 26²⁹³ 26²⁹⁴ 26²⁹⁵ 26²⁹⁶ 26²⁹⁷ 26²⁹⁸ 26²⁹⁹ 26³⁰⁰ 26³⁰¹ 26³⁰² 26³⁰³ 26³⁰⁴ 26³⁰⁵ 26³⁰⁶ 26³⁰⁷ 26³⁰⁸ 26³⁰⁹ 26³¹⁰ 26³¹¹ 26³¹² 26³¹³ 26³¹⁴ 26³¹⁵ 26³¹⁶ 26³¹⁷ 26³¹⁸ 26³¹⁹ 26³²⁰ 26³²¹ 26³²² 26³²³ 26³²⁴ 26³²⁵ 26³²⁶ 26³²⁷ 26³²⁸ 26³²⁹ 26³³⁰ 26³³¹ 26³³² 26³³³ 26³³⁴ 26³³⁵ 26³³⁶ 26³³⁷ 26³³⁸ 26³³⁹ 26³⁴⁰ 26³⁴¹ 26³⁴² 26³⁴³ 26³⁴⁴ 26³⁴⁵ 2

Nouns (contd)

10¹⁰ 3⁴ 3¹⁶ 3²⁶ 3³⁴ 3⁴⁴ 3⁵⁴ 3⁶⁴ 3⁷⁴ 3⁸⁴ 3⁹⁴ 3¹⁰⁴ 3¹¹⁴ 3¹²⁴ 3¹³⁴ 3¹⁴⁴ 3¹⁵⁴ 3¹⁶⁴ 3¹⁷⁴ 3¹⁸⁴ 3¹⁹⁴ 3²⁰⁴ 3²¹⁴ 3²²⁴ 3²³⁴ 3²⁴⁴ 3²⁵⁴ 3²⁶⁴ 3²⁷⁴ 3²⁸⁴ 3²⁹⁴ 3³⁰⁴ 3³¹⁴ 3³²⁴ 3³³⁴ 3³⁴⁴ 3³⁵⁴ 3³⁶⁴ 3³⁷⁴ 3³⁸⁴ 3³⁹⁴ 3⁴⁰⁴ 3⁴¹⁴ 3⁴²⁴ 3⁴³⁴ 3⁴⁴⁴ 3⁴⁵⁴ 3⁴⁶⁴ 3⁴⁷⁴ 3⁴⁸⁴ 3⁴⁹⁴ 3⁵⁰⁴ 3⁵¹⁴ 3⁵²⁴ 3⁵³⁴ 3⁵⁴⁴ 3⁵⁵⁴ 3⁵⁶⁴ 3⁵⁷⁴ 3⁵⁸⁴ 3⁵⁹⁴ 3⁶⁰⁴ 3⁶¹⁴ 3⁶²⁴ 3⁶³⁴ 3⁶⁴⁴ 3⁶⁵⁴ 3⁶⁶⁴ 3⁶⁷⁴ 3⁶⁸⁴ 3⁶⁹⁴ 3⁷⁰⁴ 3⁷¹⁴ 3⁷²⁴ 3⁷³⁴ 3⁷⁴⁴ 3⁷⁵⁴ 3⁷⁶⁴ 3⁷⁷⁴ 3⁷⁸⁴ 3⁷⁹⁴ 3⁸⁰⁴ 3⁸¹⁴ 3⁸²⁴ 3⁸³⁴ 3⁸⁴⁴ 3⁸⁵⁴ 3⁸⁶⁴ 3⁸⁷⁴ 3⁸⁸⁴ 3⁸⁹⁴ 3⁹⁰⁴ 3⁹¹⁴ 3⁹²⁴ 3⁹³⁴ 3⁹⁴⁴ 3⁹⁵⁴ 3⁹⁶⁴ 3⁹⁷⁴ 3⁹⁸⁴ 3⁹⁹⁴ 3¹⁰⁰⁴ 3¹⁰¹⁴ 3¹⁰²⁴ 3¹⁰³⁴ 3¹⁰⁴⁴ 3¹⁰⁵⁴ 3¹⁰⁶⁴ 3¹⁰⁷⁴ 3¹⁰⁸⁴ 3¹⁰⁹⁴ 3¹¹⁰⁴ 3¹¹¹⁴ 3¹¹²⁴ 3¹¹³⁴ 3¹¹⁴⁴ 3¹¹⁵⁴ 3¹¹⁶⁴ 3¹¹⁷⁴ 3¹¹⁸⁴ 3¹¹⁹⁴ 3¹²⁰⁴ 3¹²¹⁴ 3¹²²⁴ 3¹²³⁴ 3¹²⁴⁴ 3¹²⁵⁴ 3¹²⁶⁴ 3¹²⁷⁴ 3¹²⁸⁴ 3¹²⁹⁴ 3¹³⁰⁴ 3¹³¹⁴ 3¹³²⁴ 3¹³³⁴ 3¹³⁴⁴ 3¹³⁵⁴ 3¹³⁶⁴ 3¹³⁷⁴ 3¹³⁸⁴ 3¹³⁹⁴ 3¹⁴⁰⁴ 3¹⁴¹⁴ 3¹⁴²⁴ 3¹⁴³⁴ 3¹⁴⁴⁴ 3¹⁴⁵⁴ 3¹⁴⁶⁴ 3¹⁴⁷⁴ 3¹⁴⁸⁴ 3¹⁴⁹⁴ 3¹⁵⁰⁴ 3¹⁵¹⁴ 3¹⁵²⁴ 3¹⁵³⁴ 3¹⁵⁴⁴ 3¹⁵⁵⁴ 3¹⁵⁶⁴ 3¹⁵⁷⁴ 3¹⁵⁸⁴ 3¹⁵⁹⁴ 3¹⁶⁰⁴ 3¹⁶¹⁴ 3¹⁶²⁴ 3¹⁶³⁴ 3¹⁶⁴⁴ 3¹⁶⁵⁴ 3¹⁶⁶⁴ 3¹⁶⁷⁴ 3¹⁶⁸⁴ 3¹⁶⁹⁴ 3¹⁷⁰⁴ 3¹⁷¹⁴ 3¹⁷²⁴ 3¹⁷³⁴ 3¹⁷⁴⁴ 3¹⁷⁵⁴ 3¹⁷⁶⁴ 3¹⁷⁷⁴ 3¹⁷⁸⁴ 3¹⁷⁹⁴ 3¹⁸⁰⁴ 3¹⁸¹⁴ 3¹⁸²⁴ 3¹⁸³⁴ 3¹⁸⁴⁴ 3¹⁸⁵⁴ 3¹⁸⁶⁴ 3¹⁸⁷⁴ 3¹⁸⁸⁴ 3¹⁸⁹⁴ 3¹⁹⁰⁴ 3¹⁹¹⁴ 3¹⁹²⁴ 3¹⁹³⁴ 3¹⁹⁴⁴ 3¹⁹⁵⁴ 3¹⁹⁶⁴ 3¹⁹⁷⁴ 3¹⁹⁸⁴ 3¹⁹⁹⁴ 3²⁰⁰⁴ 3²⁰¹⁴ 3²⁰²⁴ 3²⁰³⁴ 3²⁰⁴⁴ 3²⁰⁵⁴ 3²⁰⁶⁴ 3²⁰⁷⁴ 3²⁰⁸⁴ 3²⁰⁹⁴ 3²¹⁰⁴ 3²¹¹⁴ 3²¹²⁴ 3²¹³⁴ 3²¹⁴⁴ 3²¹⁵⁴ 3²¹⁶⁴ 3²¹⁷⁴ 3²¹⁸⁴ 3²¹⁹⁴ 3²²⁰⁴ 3²²¹⁴ 3²²²⁴ 3²²³⁴ 3²²⁴⁴ 3²²⁵⁴ 3²²⁶⁴ 3²²⁷⁴ 3²²⁸⁴ 3²²⁹⁴ 3²³⁰⁴ 3²³¹⁴ 3²³²⁴ 3²³³⁴ 3²³⁴⁴ 3²³⁵⁴ 3²³⁶⁴ 3²³⁷⁴ 3²³⁸⁴ 3²³⁹⁴ 3²⁴⁰⁴ 3²⁴¹⁴ 3²⁴²⁴ 3²⁴³⁴ 3²⁴⁴⁴ 3²⁴⁵⁴ 3²⁴⁶⁴ 3²⁴⁷⁴ 3²⁴⁸⁴ 3²⁴⁹⁴ 3²⁵⁰⁴ 3²⁵¹⁴ 3²⁵²⁴ 3²⁵³⁴ 3²⁵⁴⁴ 3²⁵⁵⁴ 3²⁵⁶⁴ 3²⁵⁷⁴ 3²⁵⁸⁴ 3²⁵⁹⁴ 3²⁶⁰⁴ 3²⁶¹⁴ 3²⁶²⁴ 3²⁶³⁴ 3²⁶⁴⁴ 3²⁶⁵⁴ 3²⁶⁶⁴ 3²⁶⁷⁴ 3²⁶⁸⁴ 3²⁶⁹⁴ 3²⁷⁰⁴ 3²⁷¹⁴ 3²⁷²⁴ 3²⁷³⁴ 3²⁷⁴⁴ 3²⁷⁵⁴ 3²⁷⁶⁴ 3²⁷⁷⁴ 3²⁷⁸⁴ 3²⁷⁹⁴ 3²⁸⁰⁴ 3²⁸¹⁴ 3²⁸²⁴ 3²⁸³⁴ 3²⁸⁴⁴ 3²⁸⁵⁴ 3²⁸⁶⁴ 3²⁸⁷⁴ 3²⁸⁸⁴ 3²⁸⁹⁴ 3²⁹⁰⁴ 3²⁹¹⁴ 3²⁹²⁴ 3²⁹³⁴ 3²⁹⁴⁴ 3²⁹⁵⁴ 3²⁹⁶⁴ 3²⁹⁷⁴ 3²⁹⁸⁴ 3²⁹⁹⁴ 3³⁰⁰⁴ 3³⁰¹⁴ 3³⁰²⁴ 3³⁰³⁴ 3³⁰⁴⁴ 3³⁰⁵⁴ 3³⁰⁶⁴ 3³⁰⁷⁴ 3³⁰⁸⁴ 3³⁰⁹⁴ 3³¹⁰⁴ 3³¹¹⁴ 3³¹²⁴ 3³¹³⁴ 3³¹⁴⁴ 3³¹⁵⁴ 3³¹⁶⁴ 3³¹⁷⁴ 3³¹⁸⁴ 3³¹⁹⁴ 3³²⁰⁴ 3³²¹⁴ 3³²²⁴ 3³²³⁴ 3³²⁴⁴ 3³²⁵⁴ 3³²⁶⁴ 3³²⁷⁴ 3³²⁸⁴ 3³²⁹⁴ 3³³⁰⁴ 3³³¹⁴ 3³³²⁴ 3³³³⁴ 3³³⁴⁴ 3³³⁵⁴ 3³³⁶⁴ 3³³⁷⁴ 3³³⁸⁴ 3³³⁹⁴ 3³⁴⁰⁴ 3³⁴¹⁴ 3³⁴²⁴ 3³⁴³⁴ 3³⁴⁴⁴ 3³⁴⁵⁴ 3³⁴⁶⁴ 3³⁴⁷⁴ 3³⁴⁸⁴ 3

Nouns (contd)

החישור 4⁴³ מתמוצ 4⁴² קולו 4³⁶ בקולו 4³⁰ וגבול 3¹⁷ וגבול 3¹⁶ החישור 3¹⁰ זכונה 2³ בקולו 1⁴⁵ d.
הזרוע 19⁷ השביעה 7⁸ ומופתים 6²² קולו 5²¹ כבודו 5²¹ זוחל 5¹⁹ וחמורו 5^{18a} ובזרוע 5¹⁵
הזוחל (זיס) 10² ובזרוע 9²⁹ בקולו 9²³ הזוחל 9¹⁷ זוחל 9¹¹ והחמור 8⁷ והמוכס 7¹⁹
ובכור 12¹⁷ וגבול 11²⁴ וזרוע 11¹² והגבור 10¹⁷ והמדיני 10¹⁷ הזוחל 10⁵ הזוחל 10³ זוחל 10³
מתמוצ 19⁴ הזרוע 18³ גבול 16⁴ בבכור 15¹⁹ ולמדיני 15¹¹ ובכור 14²³ ובקולו 13⁵ גבול 12²⁰
בקולו 21²⁰ מקומן 21¹⁹ מנו 21¹⁷ הבכור 21¹⁷ הבכור 21¹⁶ הבכור 21¹⁵ גבול 19⁸
במני 26¹⁴ ובזרוע 26⁸ קולו 26⁷ בעבטו 24¹² עבטו 24¹⁰ טובתם 23⁷ ובחמור 22¹⁰ חמורו 22³
גבול 32⁸ במועד 31¹⁰ בקולו 30² גבול 29¹⁶ חמור 28⁵² הזוחל 28³⁹ בקולו 26¹⁷
בקולו 30²⁰ טובה 30⁹ זרוע 33²⁷ חמור 33²⁷ וחמור 33¹⁶ ובזרוע 32²² שועל 32¹⁵

Adjectives

Gn. 1¹⁶ הגדול 27⁹ טובים 27¹⁶ טובה 24²⁰ קרובה 19² טובה 6²

27¹⁵ הגדול 27⁴² הגדול 30³² נקוד { 30³³ ונקוד 30⁴⁰ עקוב 37⁴ שז'ם 41⁵ טובה 41²² טובה 41²⁴ הטובה 41²⁶ הטובה 41³⁵ הטובה 50²⁰ טובה 3

Ex. 3³ הגדול 12⁴ הקרב 12¹⁵ הראשון 15¹⁶ בגדול 18²² הגדול 26²⁸ התיכון 34¹ כרה ישונים 34¹ הראשונים

34⁴ התיכון 36³³ כרה ישונים

Lv. 6⁹ קדוש 6¹⁹ קדוש 6²⁰ קדוש 11⁴⁷ הטהור 14⁵⁷ הטהור 20²⁵ הטהור 21² הקרב 21⁷ קדוש

21⁸ קדוש 23⁴⁰ עבד 24⁶ הטהור 24⁹ קדוש 25²⁵ קרוב 26⁴⁵ ראשונים

Nu. 2⁹ ראשונים 6⁵ קדוש 6⁸ קדוש 6¹² ראשונים 9¹⁰ חוקה 10¹³ בראשונה 10¹⁴ בראשונה 19¹⁹ הטהור 27¹¹ הקרב

34⁷ הגדול 35²⁵ הגדול 35²⁸ הגדול

Dt. 1⁷ הגדול 17¹⁷ כגדול 27⁷ הגדול 4⁷ קרובים 4³² הראשונים 4³⁷ הגדול 6¹⁰ טובה 6¹⁸ הטובה 8¹⁰ הטובה

8¹² טובים 8¹⁵ הגדול 9¹⁸ כרה ישונים 9²⁹ הגדול 10¹ כרה ישונים 10³ כרה ישונים 10¹⁰ כרה ישונים 10¹⁷ הגדול 11⁷ הגדול

11¹⁷ הטובה 13⁸ הקרובים 17⁷ בראשונה 19¹⁴ ראשונים 21³ קרובה

21⁶ הקרובים 26⁸ גדול 28⁵⁹ גדול 30¹¹ חוקה

(iii) (contd)

Verbs

Gn. 30³⁵ וְהָטְלוּ אֹמֶן 30³⁵ הִנְקִידוּ 30^{37a} {עָקְדִים
נְקִידִים} 30^{37a} וּבְרוּרִים 30³⁹ עָקְדִים 30³⁹ נְקִידִים
שָׁלוֹחַ 49²¹ עָקְדִים 31⁸ נְקִידִים 31⁸ וְהִקְשֹׁרִים 30⁴² הִעֲטוּ 30⁴² וְטָלוּ 30³⁹
Ex. 31¹⁸ כָּרוּעַ 32¹⁵ כְּגֹבִים 32²⁵ כְּגֹבִים
Lv. 13⁴⁵ פָּרוּחַ 14⁶ הַשְׁחֹטָה 21¹⁸ פָּרוּחַ
Nu. 11²⁶ הַעֲשִׂיָה 28⁶ שָׁלוֹחַ 22³¹ בְּכָתוּבִים
Dt. 9¹ וַיִּצְוֵה 11²³ וַיִּצְוֵה 25² הַשֹּׁפֵט 28⁵⁸ הַכְּגֹבִים 33¹⁹ וַיִּכְנֹעַ

Particles

Gn. 13⁹ הָזֶה 19²⁰ הָזֶה 20⁵ הָזֶה 24³⁹ הָזֶה 27³⁶ הָזֶה 29²⁵ הָזֶה 31⁵ שְׁשֵׁים
כִּמּוֹנִי 44¹⁵ וְזֹאת 37²⁵ כִּמּוֹנוֹ 34¹⁵
Ex. 3¹⁹ הָזֶה 4¹⁰ מִשְׁשֵׁים 4¹¹ הָזֶה 4¹⁴ הָזֶה 5⁷ שְׁשֵׁים 5⁸ שְׁשֵׁים 5¹⁴ שְׁשֵׁים 9¹⁴ כִּמּוֹנִי
שְׁשֵׁים 21²⁹ כִּחֹךְ 15^{11 (bis)} הָזֶה 14¹²
Nu. 12² הָזֶה 22⁵ חֲמוּצִי 22³⁷ הָזֶה 23¹² הָזֶה 23²⁶ הָזֶה 24¹² הָזֶה
Dt. 4⁴² שְׁשֵׁים 5²³ כִּמּוֹנוֹ 11³⁰ הָזֶה 18¹⁵ כִּמּוֹנִי 19⁴ שְׁשֵׁים 31¹⁷ הָזֶה 32³⁴ הָזֶה


Scriptio defectivaNouns

Gn. 4²¹ כֶּנֶר 4²¹ וְעֵגֶב 9² וְהִרְאֵה 19¹ בְּרוּחַ 24²⁵ מִסְכָּה 24³² וְהִסְכָּה 30⁸ נִכְלָזִי
מִסְכָּה 42²⁷ בְּחִצֵּי 40¹⁶ בְּחִצֵּי 40⁹ מִמֵּי 38²⁷ מִגְרִי 37¹ מִגְרֵיהֶם 36⁷ וּבְכֶנֶר 31²⁷
בְּמִרְיָן 50²⁶ מִעֲדֵי 48¹⁵ מִגְרֵיהֶם 47⁹ מִנְעֲרֵיהֶם 46³⁴ מִסְכָּה 43²⁴
Ex. 2³ בֹּסֶף 2⁵ הֶסֶף 13¹⁶ וְזִטְטִי 15⁷ גִּמְלָה 28²⁰ בְּחִצֵּי 28³⁰ הִמְרִים 29¹⁸ נִיחֹךְ 29^{20 (bis)} אֶנֶךְ
כִּקְדִי 38²¹ וְחִשְׁקֵיהֶם 38¹² גְּבֵרָה 32¹⁸ נִיחֹךְ 29²⁵

(iii) (contd)

Scriptio defectiva

Nouns (contd)

Lv.1⁹ אֶנְךָ 14¹⁷ אֶנְךָ 14¹⁴ זֶרַע 11³⁷ אֶנְךָ 8²⁴ אֶנְךָ 8²³ הָאֲרִים 8³ אֶנְךָ 7³⁷ נִיחַח 9⁹
 14²⁵ אֶנְךָ 14²⁸ אֶנְךָ  22¹³ בְּנֹעֲרִיהָ 26¹³ קוֹמַחִית
 Nu.10² כְּאֶעֱכָה 24⁸ כְּאֶעֱכָה 23²² וְשֹׁמֵר 22²⁶ בְּחֹשֶׁעַ 22²⁴ זֶמְרָה 23²³ בְּכֹרֹה 13²⁰ חֲצִירֹה 10²
 27²¹ הָאֲרִים 28²⁴ עֶלְהָ 28²⁷ עֶלְהָ 31¹¹ הַחֲזָקָה 31¹² הַחֲזָקָה 31²⁶ הַחֲזָקָה 31²⁷ הַחֲזָקָה
 31³² הַחֲזָקָה
 Dt.2²⁷ וְשֹׁמֵר 3¹⁴ וְשֹׁמֵר 4³⁴ וְשֹׁמֵר 7²³ וְשֹׁמֵר 11²⁵ וְשֹׁמֵר 12¹¹ וְשֹׁמֵר 17²⁰ וְשֹׁמֵר 23⁷ וְשֹׁמֵר 28¹⁴ וְשֹׁמֵר
 28²⁰ וְשֹׁמֵר 29¹⁶ וְשֹׁמֵר 32¹⁰ וְשֹׁמֵר 32¹⁵ וְשֹׁמֵר 32²⁷ וְשֹׁמֵר 33¹⁰ וְשֹׁמֵר

Adjectives

Gn.2²⁵ הַטְהֵרָה 7⁸ הַטְהֵרָה 7² עֲרִימִים
 Ex.1²² גִּדְּךָ 11³⁶ גִּדְּךָ
 Nu.22¹⁸ גִּדְּךָ 22³² גִּדְּךָ
 Dt.4³⁶ גִּדְּךָ 7⁶ גִּדְּךָ 14² גִּדְּךָ 14²¹ גִּדְּךָ 16¹⁶ גִּדְּךָ 19² גִּדְּךָ 25¹³ גִּדְּךָ 25¹⁴ גִּדְּךָ 28⁹ גִּדְּךָ

Verbs

Gn.48¹⁰ יָכַח
 Ex.10⁵ יָכַח 38²⁵ יָכַח
 Lv.2¹⁴ יָכַח
 Nu.1⁴⁵ כָּדָה 2³² כָּדָה 2³² כָּדָה 3³⁹ כָּדָה 4³⁷ כָּדָה 4³⁸ כָּדָה 4⁴¹ כָּדָה 4⁴² כָּדָה 4⁴⁵ כָּדָה
 13³⁰ יָכַח 18¹⁶ יָכַח 21⁸ יָכַח 26⁵¹ יָכַח 26⁵⁷ יָכַח 26⁶³ יָכַח 26⁶⁴ יָכַח 31¹⁴ יָכַח
 Dt.28⁵¹ וְיִירָשׁ 28⁵⁷ וְיִירָשׁ 33²⁸ וְיִירָשׁ

Particle

Lv.5¹ אֶל

(iii) (contd)

b. Scriptio plena in proximate syllables(a) YooH in both S T and M TEx. 16³¹ אֶלְכֶם 23¹¹ וְהִשְׁבַּעְתִּי 29⁴⁰ רַב־עֵלLv. 5¹¹ אֶלְכֶם 22¹⁴ חֲמִישָׁה 23¹³ רַב־עֵל 25²² הִשְׁבַּעְתִּי 27¹⁹ חֲמִישָׁהNu. 28⁷ רַב־עֵל 28¹⁴ שְׁלֹשָׁה 28¹⁴ רַב־עֵל(b) Yodh in S T, Waw in M TDt. 29¹⁸ בְּשִׁירָה(c) Waw in S T, Yodh in M TGn. 3¹⁰ עֵרֹם 3¹¹ עֵרֹם 25²³ גִּידִם 49¹⁷ שִׁכְמָןEx. 26¹⁰ הַקְּצוֹנָה 36¹⁷ הַקְּצוֹנָה Lv. 6¹⁴Dt. 5¹⁶ וּבְעֵרֹם 28⁴⁸ יִמְרֹכֶן(2) Possible orthographic retention of consonantal YooH(1) Lamadh He verbs and nounsa. Final Yodh in S T : final He in M TGn. 4² רַעִי 8¹¹ עֲצֵי 14⁹ קִנִּי 14²² קִנִּי 21²⁰ רַב־י 29³⁴ 13²⁹ 29³⁵ מִדֵּי30³ וּמִבְּנֵי 30³¹ מִרְאֵי 37² רַעִי 47⁴ מִרְעֵי 49²⁴ רַעִיLv. 26³⁶ עֲצֵיNu. 8⁷ הַזֶּה 19²¹ וּמִזֵּי 24⁴ מִחֲדֵי 24⁴ מִחֲדֵי 24¹⁶ מִחֲדֵי 27¹⁷ רַעִיDt. 9¹³ קֶשֶׁת 14⁷ מִחֲמַעַת 23¹¹ מִקְרֵיb. Final He in S T : final Yodh in M TGn. 16⁶ עֹשֶׂה 16⁹ וְהִשְׁבַּעְתִּי 18⁶ וְעֹשֶׂה 49¹⁷ עֲצֵה (bis)Nu. 21¹⁷ עֲצֵה 24⁴ שֹׁדֵהDt. 32²⁴ חִזֵּה

C. Yodh before consonantal affirmative

In S T

Gn. 17⁶ וְהָפְרִיטִי 19³⁴ וְשָׁקִיטִי 27⁸ וְשָׁקִיטִי 47²⁵ וְשָׁקִיטִי 48⁴ וְשָׁקִיטִי 50²⁵ וְשָׁקִיטִי

Ex. 9³ בְּמִקְנֵיךָ 34¹⁹ מִקְנֵיךָ

Lv. 26¹⁶ מִכֹּל יוֹרֵךְ

Nu. 31⁹ מִקְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ 32¹⁶ מִקְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ 33²⁶ מִקְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ

Dt. 3¹⁹ מִקְנֵיכֶם 31²⁷ הֵי יִתֶּם

In M T

Gn. 26³⁵ וְהָפְרִיטִי 29⁸ וְשָׁקִיטִי 41²¹ וְשָׁקִיטִי 41⁵³ וְשָׁקִיטִי 50⁵ כָּרָא

Ex. 1¹⁷ וְהָפְרִיטִי 1¹⁸ וְשָׁקִיטִי 26³⁰ וְשָׁקִיטִי 33¹⁶ וְשָׁקִיטִי

Lv. 14³⁷ וְשָׁקִיטִי

Nu. 11¹² וְהָפְרִיטִי 22³³ וְשָׁקִיטִי 31¹⁵ וְשָׁקִיטִי 36¹¹ וְשָׁקִיטִי

Dt. 8¹³ וְהָפְרִיטִי 27⁹ וְשָׁקִיטִי

(ii) Prepositions יָן and יַע with suffixes

יָן

S T always plena

Gn. 19⁶ 19¹⁸ 24⁵⁶ 26²⁷ 37²² 40⁸ 42⁷
 42⁹ 42¹² 42¹⁴ (bis) 42¹⁸ 42²⁴ 42³⁶ 43¹¹
 43²³ 43³⁴ 44⁴ 44⁶ 45²⁴ 45²⁷ 49²⁷ 50¹⁹
 Ex. 1¹⁹ 3¹³ 3¹⁶ 5⁴ 5²¹ 7⁴ 7⁹ 7¹³ 7²²
 8¹¹ 8¹⁵ 9¹² 9²⁷ 10⁸ 10¹⁰ 12²¹ 16³
 16¹² 16¹⁵ 16¹⁹ 16²³ 19²⁵ 24¹⁴ 32² 32¹³
 34³¹ (bis) 35¹
 Lv. 1² 10⁴ 11¹ 15² 17⁸ 18² 19² 21¹ 22³
 22¹⁸ 23² 23¹⁰ 25² 27²

(ii) Prepositions 3N and 3y with suffixes (contd)

Nu.5 ¹²	6 ²	9 ⁸	13 ¹⁷	14 ²	14 ²⁸	15 ²	15 ¹⁸
15 ³⁸	16 ³	18 ²⁶	18 ³⁰	28 ²	32 ²⁹	33 ⁵¹	
34 ²	35 ¹⁰						
Dt.1 ³	1 ⁹	1 ²⁰	1 ²⁹	5 ¹	20 ³	29 ¹	31 ² 32 ⁴⁶
3y	S T always plene						
Gn.45 ¹⁵	47 ²⁰						
Ex.5 ¹⁴	9 ^{19a}	12 ¹³	15 ¹⁹	16 ²⁰	18 ²¹	32 ¹⁴	
Lv.3 ⁴	3 ¹⁰	3 ¹⁵	4 ²⁰				
Nu.4 ²⁷	7 ⁹	11 ²⁶	14 ¹⁴				

3. Variants normalizing the spelling of words1. Archaisms

3 s.m. Suffix : S T has normal form where M T

reads 7 —

Gn.9 ²¹	12 ⁸	13 ³	35 ²¹	(error in v. Gall text)	49 ¹¹
Ex.22 ⁴	22 ²⁶	32 ²⁵			
Lv.23 ¹³					

11. Errors

S T	N.7	:	M T	N.7			
Gn.2 ¹²	3 ¹²	3 ²⁰	7 ²	10 ¹¹	10 ¹²	12 ¹⁴	12 ¹⁸
12 ¹⁹	14 ⁷	14 ⁸	17 ¹⁴	18 ¹⁰	19 ²⁰	(bis)	
19 ³⁸	20 ²	20 ³	20 ⁵	20 ¹²	21 ²²	22 ²⁰	
22 ²⁴	23 ²	23 ¹⁹	24 ⁴⁴	25 ²¹	26 ⁷	(bis)	26 ⁹
26 ¹²	(bis)	27 ³⁸	29 ²	29 ⁹	29 ²⁵	32 ¹⁹	32 ²⁰
34 ¹⁴	35 ¹⁹						

Appendix A.

11. Errors (cont).

Gn. 35³² 35²⁷ 37³² 38¹ 38¹⁴ 38¹⁶ 38²¹ 38²⁵ 40¹⁰ 43³²
 Ex. 1⁴⁷ 1⁶ 3⁴⁷ 3¹⁷ 3⁴⁷ 3¹⁸ 8⁴⁶ 8⁷ 12¹⁵ 12¹⁹ 22²⁶ (bis) 29¹⁴ 31¹³
 31¹⁴ 31¹⁴ 31¹⁷
 Lv. 2⁶ 2¹⁵ 5¹¹ 5¹² 6² 6¹⁰ 6¹³ 6²² 7²⁰ 7²¹ 7²⁷ 10¹²
 10¹³ 10¹⁷ 11⁶ (bis) 11²⁶ 13⁴ 13⁶ 13⁸ 13¹¹ 13¹⁵
 13²⁰ 13²³ 13²⁵ (bis) 13²⁶ 13²⁷ 13²⁸ 13⁴² 13⁵² 13⁵⁵
 13⁵⁷ 14⁴⁴ 15³ 15²³ 15²⁵ 18⁷ 18⁸ 18¹¹ 18¹² 18¹³
 18¹⁴ 18¹⁵ 18¹⁶ 18¹⁷ 18²² 19⁸ 19²⁰ 20⁶ 20¹⁴ 20¹⁸
 20²¹ 22³ 22¹² 23³ 23³⁰ 23³⁶ 25³³ 27⁴
 Nu. 5⁶ 5¹³ 5¹⁴ 5¹⁸ 5²⁸ 5³¹ 8⁴ 9¹³ 15¹⁸ 15¹⁹ 13²⁸ 13²⁷
 15³² 14⁸ 14^{41b} 15²⁵ 15³⁰ 15³¹ 19⁹ 19¹³ 19²⁰ 21¹⁶
 21²⁶ 22⁴ 32⁴ 33²⁶
 Dt. 1⁹ 1¹⁶ 1¹⁸ 2²⁰ 2³⁴ 3⁴ 3⁸ 3¹¹ 3¹² 3¹⁸ 3²¹ 3²³ 4⁶
 4¹⁴ 5⁵ 9²⁰ 10¹ 10⁸ 11¹⁰ 13¹⁶ 14²⁸ 17⁵ 20²⁰ 21³
 22¹⁸ 22²⁴ 24⁴ 29²¹ 29²⁶ 30¹¹ 30¹² 30¹³ 21⁴ 21⁶

111. Inconsistencies in identical or similar context

ST has usage elsewhere in both ST and MT

Gn. 32³¹² 32³¹¹
 Ex. 4¹⁸ 4¹⁷
 Nu. 13⁸ 13¹⁶
 Dt. 32⁴⁴ 32⁴³

4. Variants in writing of Samaritan MSS

Nothing to add to treatment already given in Chapter V.

11. Differences of Grammar1. Differences of Grammar with agreement in sensei. Accidence(1) Variants consisting of forms found elsewhere in Samaritan Pentateuch(i) Normal formsa. Common for rare(a) Common form of pronoun, הַנִּי for הַנִּיGn. 19⁸ 19²⁵ 26³ 26⁴Lv. 18²⁷Dt. 4⁴² 7²² 19¹¹(b) Common form of suffixGn. 2²¹ אַחֲיָה 48¹⁵ מַעֲדָנִי Ex. 23³¹ וְגִרְשָׁםDt. 32²³ עֲצִיָּהֶם 32³² עֲנֻבֵּיהֶם 32³⁸ זִנְיָהֶם 33²⁹ בָּהֶם(c) Residuum - unclassified furtherGn. 1²⁴ וְחֵית 20⁶ מִחֲטָאתָ 31¹⁹ לָגֹז 31²⁸ עֲשׂוֹת 31³⁹ גִּלְגָּלִים 38²⁵ וְגִלְגָּלִים39¹¹ עֲשׂוֹת 50²⁰ עֲדֵי 49²⁷ מִסֹּרֶת 49¹¹ מִרְדָּת 46³ מִנְחָנוּ 42¹¹ כִּיֹּם 39¹¹Ex. 2⁴ וְגִרְשָׁם 2⁴ וְגִרְשָׁם 2⁹ זִנְיָהֶם 13²¹ מִנְחָם 31¹⁶ מִיָּה 16⁷ וְאִתְּחִיל 16⁸ וְאִתְּחִיל18¹⁸ עֲשׂוֹת 28²² שְׂרָרֹת 36² קָרַבLv. 25²¹ וְעִשָּׂה 26³⁴ וְהִרְצָהNu. 17¹¹ מִהָר 23²⁴ וְכִמְרִיָּה 24⁹ כִּמְרִיָּה 24^{20,24} עַד 32³² מִנְחָנוּDt. 1³³ וְהִרְצָה 36²⁴ כִּיֹּם 21¹⁵ שְׂנוֹמָה 31²⁹ וְקִרְיָה 33⁵ יְחִידוּ 33¹⁶ שָׁכַן

Appendix Ab. Forms suggesting misreading, miswriting or mishearing in S T or M T.Ex.3⁷ וֹנָרNu.14³ שִׁבְהָ 21²⁷ וְגִלְכֹּןc. Forms in identical or similar context

The parallel is shown in brackets.

Gn.6²⁰ (later in verse) מִן הַעֹץEx.28²¹ (earlier in verse) 15¹¹ (15⁶) 30³² (30³⁷ -Parallel in M T) 22⁸ (22²⁶) 22²⁵ (22²⁶) שֶׁלֹּא(32¹⁹ (19¹⁷) בְּהַמִּיתLv.25³⁷ (25³⁶) אֲבִירָאDt.3⁷ (2³⁵) 24¹³ (Ex22²⁶) 29⁴ (Ex22²⁶) שֶׁלֹּאd. Forms which do not belong to any of the above types(a) Impf. with ending in NunIn S TGn.20⁹ 20¹³ 41⁵⁵ 42²⁰ { 50¹⁷ אֲמָרָהEx.3²¹ 14¹³ 18²² 28⁴ יַעֲשֶׂהLv.9⁶ אַעֲשֶׂהNu.27²⁰ 32²² 32²⁴ אַעֲשֶׂהDt.4¹ 5³⁰ 7⁵ { 11⁹ 11²¹ יִרְבֶּה13⁵ 13⁵ 13⁵ 13⁵ אֲשַׁמְרֶנּוּ18⁸ 25¹⁵ 32⁴⁷ אֲמָרָהIn M TEx.4⁹ 15¹⁴ 17² 20²³ אַעֲשֶׂה22²¹ 22²⁴ 22³⁰ אֲמָרָהNu.32⁷ אֲמָרָה

d.

(a) Impf. with ending in Nun (contd)

In M.T. (contd)

Dt. 2²⁵ ישמע 4⁶ ישמע 6¹⁴ יצא 8³ יצא 8¹⁶ יצא
 11²⁷ ישמע 11²⁸ ישמע 12¹ ישמע 12⁴ ישמע 12⁸ ישמע
 13⁵ יצא 13¹² יצא 17¹³ יצא

(b) חר and חרי

S T has חר

Gn. 22²⁰ 48¹Nu. 25¹⁹

S T has חרי

Gn. 9²⁸ 10¹ 10³² 11¹⁰ 37¹⁷Lv. 14³⁶ 14⁴³Nu. 6¹⁹ 25⁸(c) He paragogic

In S T

Gn. 4⁹ חרי 19³⁴ חרי 27¹¹ חריNu. 31¹⁶ חריDt. 32³⁷ חרי

In M T

Gn. 6⁴ חרי 7¹⁴ חרי 24⁶⁵ חרי 27³⁹ חרי 37¹⁹ חרי42³⁵ חרי 44³ חריEx. 1⁹ חרי 19¹³ חרי 32¹⁶ חרי 36⁴ חריLv. 11²⁸ חריNu. 1⁵⁰ חרי 3⁹ חרי 8¹⁶ חרי 9⁷ חרי 11²⁶ חרי 13³ חרי14²⁷ חרי 20¹³ חרי 22⁵ חרי 22¹¹ חרי 23²⁰ חרי25⁶ חריDt. 1³⁹ חרי 7¹⁷ חרי 11³⁰ חרי 12³⁰ חרי 14⁷ חרי18²¹ חרי 32²⁰ חרי 32³⁰ חרי

(d) Two Forms of Suffix

Gn. 18¹⁶ עתהם 21²⁹ בדהן 27²⁷ ברכה 29⁹ עתהם 30³⁸ במהן 37^{20,33} מכאן
 37²¹ וי 41¹⁹ כהן 41²¹ קרבהן 45¹² פי
 Ex. 2³ הזכנהו 2¹⁰ חשיטיו 4¹⁵ כיו 18²⁰ מהם 19²² במ 20⁸ קדשהו 3
 25²⁸ בהם 29^{29,33} במ (26) 30⁴ בהם 32¹⁰ במ 34¹³ { חזבחהיהם
 חזבגיהם
 35²⁶ { תבין 36³⁴ טבעיהם
 37¹⁶ חינו 11²² חינוהו 11²⁹ חינו 15²⁷ בהם
 Nu. 4¹² בהם 11¹² ילדיו 20²⁴ כהן 21³ מהם 22¹² עתהם 22³⁸ 23¹² בכי 27¹⁴ כהן 27²¹ כיהו
 Dt. 2^{12,21,22,23} אחיהם 3³ ונכנו 5¹² קדשהו 7⁵ וחזבגיהם 12³ חזבגיהם 21⁵ פים
 22¹ שהו 29²⁴ עתהם 32¹ כהן 33⁸ וסיהו

(e) Residuum - unclassified further

Gn. 8³ חקץ 11³⁰ יד 18⁵ בבכם 21¹⁶ הרחקה 24²⁵ 33 31²⁰ זבג
 31⁴² נ 3 43¹⁰ נ 3 45⁷ שים
 Ex. 4¹⁴ זבגו 12⁵ חכשגים 14⁵ ב 3 16² וינו 16⁷ וינו 21²² ודה
 22⁸ שה 22²⁵ שהל 26^{4,10} במחברא 29⁴⁰ רבעיה 32³⁴ פקוד
 Lv. 1¹⁴ חבני 10³ בקריבי 11²⁶ ושסעה 14³⁰ חבני
 Nu. 3³⁸ הקדש 5¹¹ שים 14³⁶ וינו 16¹¹ וינו 21²⁹ בשב 23⁷ חמרם
 31⁴³ חחזיה 33⁵⁵ צנים
 Dt. 4¹¹ זבג 9²⁸ חזגיה 11¹⁷ חקר 12⁵ שים 14⁵ אחי 14²⁸ חקץ
 17¹⁵ שים 19¹⁵ חטא 24¹³ זבג 29⁴ שחזוגיהם 30³ שובג
 32²⁷ נ 3 33¹⁷ רחמי 33²⁶ זבג 33²⁹ זבג

(ii) Abnormal Formsa. Early

Gn. 12¹¹ נ 12¹³ נ 16⁸ נ 16¹¹ וי 16¹¹ וקראת 18¹⁵ חקץ
 24²³ נ 24⁴⁷ נ 24⁶⁰ נ 30¹⁵ וקח 39⁹ נ
 Nu. 11³² זבג 22²⁹ זבג

Appendix A.b. Late

Gn. 9¹⁶ 3¹⁷ 17¹⁸ 11 3 27¹⁵ 41⁶ 41²³ 1
 41²⁷ 20³ 3
 Ex. 13⁸ 25³⁸ 37²³ 27³ 1
 Nu. 11²⁸ 20³ 3
 Dt. 21¹⁵ (late form in M T) 32⁷

c. Forms suggesting misreading, miswriting or mishearing in S T or M T.

Dt. 28²⁵ 3

d. Forms in identical or similar context .

Gn. 3¹⁶ (3¹⁷) 20¹² (18¹³)

e. Forms which do not belong to any of the above types.

Hithpa'lel of וְשָׁחַט .

Gn. 18² 19¹ 22⁵ 23⁷ 23¹² 24²⁶ 24⁴⁸ 24⁵² 33³ 33⁶ 47³¹
 Ex. 18⁷ 34⁸
 Nu. 22³¹
 Dt. 17³

(2) Variants consisting of forms not found elsewhere in

Samaritan Pentateuch.

(1) In M T of Hebrew Bible.

OUTside Pentateuch.

Gn. 3¹⁶ 7 (Ru. 4¹³ Ho. 9¹¹)
 Ex. 19⁹ 2 (Jb. 15²⁶ 1K. 7²⁶ 2Ch. 4⁵ Je. 52²¹)

(2) (contd.)

(iv) In no other known source.Gn.49¹⁰ 1א77'ii. Syntax.(i) Variants consisting of constructions found elsewhere
in Samaritan Pentateuch.(i) Normal constructionsa. Common for rareGn.8²² 8חם 38²⁴ 3זנים 41³² 4אנכי 49⁶ 4ח 49²⁰ 4שןEx.24¹⁰ 2קרבןLv.19²⁰ 1חכשNu.10³⁶ 10אנכיDt.33⁵ 3ח 33¹⁴ 3שןc. Constructions in identical or similar context.(a) Differences of word order. *Gn.2⁴ (earlier in verse) 2חם 8¹⁹ (7¹⁴) —8²¹ (8אנכי 8ח later in verse) —9¹¹ (9ח immediately following verb.later in verse) — 42³² (42¹³) —Ex.23²³ (23²⁸) — 25²⁹ (37¹⁶) — 34¹¹ (33²) —Lv.4²⁸ (4³²) — 7²⁹ (7²³) — 14⁵¹ (14⁴) —14⁵² (14⁴) —Nu.1²⁰ (1²) — 28²² (28^{15,30}) — 28²⁷ (28¹¹) —29^{22,28,31,34,38} (29¹⁶) —Dt.11¹ (30¹⁶) — 20¹⁷ (23²³) — 30¹⁶ (11¹) —

*

Difficult to give brief statements of word order. The scripture references should indicate the variants.

(b) Differences in verbal form

Gn.19²⁰(19^{17,17,22}) ט 30³⁹(30³⁸) ויחמנה 46²²(46¹⁵) אד3.
 Ex.25¹⁰(25¹¹) ועשית 25³⁷(25^{37d}) א.39(25¹⁰) אעשה
 Nu.30⁵(30⁸) ונוספה 30^{6,12,13}(30⁸) וקולו 36³(36⁴) ונוספה

(c) Absence of suffix in S T or M T

Ex.23²⁰ (23²³) מלכ כי
 Lv.13⁵(30^{6,8,10,20}) ויראה 13¹⁷(30^{6etc.}) וראה
 13^{21,26,27,36} (13^{5 etc.}) וראה
 Nu.30⁵(30⁸) וסריה 30¹²(30^{5,8}) וסריה 34⁸(34⁵) וסריה
 Dt.18¹⁵(17¹⁵,18¹⁸) מקרב אחיך

(d) Residuum - unclassified further.

Gn.8¹²(8¹⁰) 39¹⁵(39¹⁸) וריחי 43¹⁸(43¹²) חושב
 Lv.2⁷(2⁵) חנה
 Nu.26⁹(1¹⁶,16²) קריחי 28³(28^{6,10,15}) א39 32⁷(32⁹) גניחין
 Dt.2²⁵(2^{24,31}) 31⁷(31²³) אביא

d. Variants which do not belong to any of the above types.

(a) Differences of word order

Gn.12¹⁶ — 19²⁸ — 20¹² — 26²⁹ — 31¹⁶ —
 31¹⁷ — 34¹² — 35¹⁰ — 41⁵⁶ — 50¹² —
 Ex.3² — 5³ — 9³⁴ — 19¹⁸ — 20¹⁸ — 24⁷ —
 26⁸ — 29¹⁸ — 29²¹ — 30¹⁹ — 34⁴ —
 35²⁹ — 36¹ —

Appendix A

(a) (contd.)

Iv. 1¹⁰ — 11¹⁶ — 11²⁶ — 12⁸ — 13²⁷ —
 13³⁰ — 14¹⁰ — 20¹³ — 20¹⁹ — 20²² — 21² —
 21²¹ —
 Nu. 8¹⁶ — 26¹⁰ — 26⁵⁸ — 28²⁴ — 32⁶ — 32²⁵ —
 32²⁹ — 32³¹ — 32³³ — 36¹¹ —
 Dt. 1⁴⁰ — 3¹⁹ — 5^{18a} — 12²² — 12²⁸ — 14¹⁵ —
 19²⁰ — 20³ — 30⁹ — 34¹⁰ —

(b) Sequence of tenses

Gn. 6²⁰ וְהָיָה 21²⁵ וַיִּזְכֹּר 27⁴ וַהֲבֵא 28¹⁰ וַיִּזְכֹּר 30⁴¹ וַיִּזְכֹּר
 31⁷ וַיִּזְכֹּר 31⁴² וַיִּזְכֹּר 37³ וַיִּזְכֹּר 41³⁴ וַיִּזְכֹּר 41³⁵ וַיִּזְכֹּר 46³⁰ וַיִּזְכֹּר
 Ex. 1¹⁶ וַיִּזְכֹּר 3¹⁰ וַיִּזְכֹּר 4⁹ וַיִּזְכֹּר 5⁷ וַיִּזְכֹּר 19¹⁹ וַיִּזְכֹּר 8¹¹ וַיִּזְכֹּר
 8¹² וַיִּזְכֹּר 8²³ וַיִּזְכֹּר 9³ וַיִּזְכֹּר 9¹⁶ וַיִּזְכֹּר 10⁵ וַיִּזְכֹּר 11⁸ וַיִּזְכֹּר
 17⁵ וַיִּזְכֹּר 18²⁶ וַיִּזְכֹּר 19¹² וַיִּזְכֹּר 22⁶ וַיִּזְכֹּר 22¹¹ וַיִּזְכֹּר 26²⁴ וַיִּזְכֹּר
 28⁷ וַיִּזְכֹּר 29³³ וַיִּזְכֹּר 30²¹ וַיִּזְכֹּר 35¹⁰ וַיִּזְכֹּר 35³⁵ וַיִּזְכֹּר 36² וַיִּזְכֹּר
 37⁹ וַיִּזְכֹּר 40³¹ וַיִּזְכֹּר
 Iv. 1¹² וַיִּזְכֹּר 7⁸ וַיִּזְכֹּר 11⁵ וַיִּזְכֹּר 15⁸ וַיִּזְכֹּר 15¹¹ וַיִּזְכֹּר 15²⁴ וַיִּזְכֹּר
 16³² וַיִּזְכֹּר 17¹⁰ וַיִּזְכֹּר 18⁵ וַיִּזְכֹּר 26⁴¹ וַיִּזְכֹּר
 Nu. 3¹³ וַיִּזְכֹּר 6²⁷ וַיִּזְכֹּר 8¹⁷ וַיִּזְכֹּר 16⁵ וַיִּזְכֹּר 17³ וַיִּזְכֹּר 19¹¹ וַיִּזְכֹּר
 19¹² וַיִּזְכֹּר 20²⁶ וַיִּזְכֹּר 20²⁶ וַיִּזְכֹּר 21²⁰ וַיִּזְכֹּר 21²⁶ וַיִּזְכֹּר 22²² וַיִּזְכֹּר
 24²⁴ וַיִּזְכֹּר 27¹¹ וַיִּזְכֹּר 32¹⁸ וַיִּזְכֹּר 34⁶ וַיִּזְכֹּר
 Dt. 3²⁰ וַיִּזְכֹּר 16¹⁰ וַיִּזְכֹּר 20²⁰ וַיִּזְכֹּר 28¹⁰ וַיִּזְכֹּר 30¹ וַיִּזְכֹּר 31² וַיִּזְכֹּר
 31¹² וַיִּזְכֹּר 33²³ וַיִּזְכֹּר 33⁷ וַיִּזְכֹּר

c. Infinitive absolute:

Qualifying finite verb.

Gn. 8⁷ וְשָׁכַח 12⁹ וְנָסַע 19⁹ הָלַךְ 22¹⁷ (שָׁכַח) שָׁכַח 26¹³ בָּרוּךְ 27¹³ הָלַךְ
 31¹⁵ מָכַח 40¹⁵ גָּנוּב 43⁷ הִיּוֹדַע
 Nu. 22³⁸ הִיּוֹכַח 23¹¹ בָּרוּךְ 23²⁵ בָּרוּךְ 24¹⁰ בָּרוּךְ
 Dt. 15⁴ בָּרוּךְ

Substitute for finite verb.

Gn. 8³ הָלַכוּ וַחֲסָרוּ 8⁵ הָלַכוּ וַשְׁבוּ
 Ex. 13³ זָכְרוּ
 Lv. 6⁷ הִקְרִיבוּ
 Nu. 15³⁵ צָרָה 25¹⁷ וְהִפְשֵׁט 20²⁶ רָגְמוּ
 Dt. 1¹⁶ שָׁמַעוּ 14²¹ מָכָרוּ 27¹ שָׁמְרוּ 28⁵⁶ הִצִּיגָה 31²⁶ זָקְמוּ

d. Imperfect ending in ה —

In S T

Ex. 3⁸ וַאֲרָדָה 3¹⁷ וַאֲמַרָה 6⁵ וַאֲדַכְרָה 8²³ וַאֲזַכֶּה 8²³ וַאֲזַכֶּה
 Lv. 26¹³ וַאֲשַׁבֶּרָה
 Nu. 24¹³ וַאֲדַבֶּרָה
 Dt. 1¹⁹ וַאֲנַסֶּעָה 1¹⁹ וַאֲנַכֶּכָה 1⁴³ וַאֲדַבֶּרָה 2^{8b} וַאֲעַבֶּרָה 2¹³ וַאֲנַעַבֶּרָה 2²⁶ וַאֲשַׁחֶכֶה
 2²⁹ וַאֲעַבֶּרָה 2³⁴ וַאֲנַכֶּכָה 2³⁴ וַאֲנַחֲרָמָה 3⁴ וַאֲנַכֶּכָה 3⁶ וַאֲנַחֲרִימָה 9¹⁵ וַאֲנַחֲרִימָה
 9¹⁷ וַאֲפַתָּה 9²¹ וַאֲשַׁרְפָּה 9²¹ וַאֲמַתְּעַלְלָה 9²⁰ וַאֲמַנְפֶּלָה 9¹⁸ וַאֲמַפְשֶׁהָ
 9²¹ וַאֲכַבֶּבָה 10² וַאֲמַרָה 9²⁶ וַאֲמַפְּלֶלָה 9²⁶ וַאֲמַנְפֶּלָה 9²⁵ וַאֲשַׁלִּיחָה
 10³ וַאֲשִׁימָה 10⁵ וַאֲרָדָה 10⁵ וַאֲפַסֶּלָה

In M T

Appendix A.

d. (contd)

In M T

Gn.12³ וְנִבְרָךְ 18⁵ וְנִקְחָה 19⁵ וְנָדַע 19⁸ וְנִסִּיחַ 19²⁰ וְנִלְכַּט
 22⁵ וְנִשְׁבַּח 24⁵ וְנִשְׁכַּח 27²⁵ וְנִכְכַּח 29²¹ וְנִבְנָה 29²⁷ וְנִלְכַּח
 32¹⁰ וְנִסִּיב 34¹² וְנִלְכַּח 34²³ וְנִלְכַּח 35³ וְנִקְוָה 41¹¹ וְנִלְכַּח
 43²¹ וְנִכְכַּח 45¹⁸ וְנִלְכַּח 46³¹ וְנִלְכַּח 47¹⁶ וְנִלְכַּח 27⁴ וְנִכְכַּח
 Ex.1¹⁰ וְנִלְכַּח 3³ וְנִסִּיב 8⁴ וְנִלְכַּח 9²⁸ וְנִלְכַּח 24¹² וְנִלְכַּח
 32³⁰ וְנִכְכַּח
 Nu.11¹³ וְנִכְכַּח 14⁴ וְנִלְכַּח 14⁴ וְנִשְׁבַּח 20¹⁷ וְנִכְכַּח 20¹⁹ וְנִכְכַּח
 Dt.32²⁰ וְנִסִּיב 32²⁶ וְנִלְכַּח

e. Impv. ending in ה —In S T

Gn.14²¹ וְנִלְכַּח 19⁹ וְנִלְכַּח
 Nu.21¹⁶ וְנִסִּיב

In M T

Gn.21²³ וְנִשְׁבַּח 25³³ וְנִשְׁבַּח 27³ וְנִלְכַּח 27⁷ וְנִלְכַּח
 29¹⁹ וְנִשְׁבַּח 37¹³ וְנִלְכַּח 43⁸ וְנִלְכַּח 47³¹ וְנִשְׁבַּח
 Ex.3¹⁰ וְנִלְכַּח
 Nu.10²⁹ וְנִלְכַּח 23²⁷ וְנִלְכַּח 24¹⁴ וְנִלְכַּח
 Dt.26¹⁵ וְנִשְׁבַּח

(f) Differences of conjugation.Two actives

(f) Differences of conjugation (contd)

Two actives.

Gn. 6⁴ ויזידו 6¹⁷ בהשחית 7³ בהשחית 9¹¹ בהשחית 9¹⁵ בהשחית
 הניקה 21⁷ בהשחית 19²⁹ בהשחית 19¹³ וירש 15³ הוליד 10⁸
 וחריש 34⁵ הוליד 22²³ וחזק 21¹⁸
 העדה 21⁸ ויבנהו 18⁷ ויוצאנהו 15²² ויהחזקתי 14⁴ ימוש 13²² Ex.
 ויביאו 35²¹ גבעירו 35³ ימוש 33¹¹ וקדשגו 29²¹ יעדנה 21⁹
 ויביאו 36⁴ ויביאו 35²²
 וחזק 25³⁵ גשביאו 23³² ומבדתי 23³⁰ ובקצירכם 23²² ובקצירכם 19⁹ Lv.
 והרעה 26⁴³ ושחתי 26²² געבדו 25⁴⁶
 הסכן 22³⁰ ויסף 22²⁶ ויורשו 21³² גצית 14^{41b} יירשנה 14²⁴ Nu.
 מבדתי 33⁵² ויחזקתי 31¹⁵ ברוך 24¹⁰ ברוך 23²⁵ ברוך 23¹¹ ויבנהו 22³⁹
 ומבדתי 24²⁴ ויחזקתי 24⁶ גשביאו 2⁶ החזק 31³⁸ ויחזקתי 1³³ Dt.
 תקדיש 22⁹ חכרית 20¹⁹ ויוסיפו 20⁸ ויחזקתי 11²² ומבדתי 9³
 יוריש 28⁴² מבדתי 28²² מבדתי 28²⁰ חזנות 22²¹ גחריש 22¹⁰
 יקיימו 33¹¹ ימכנהו 32¹³

Two passives.

Gn. 25¹⁰ נגנבתי 40¹⁵ קבור
Ex. 22⁶ ונגנבתי 30³² יסוף
Lv. 10¹⁶ שרוף
Nu. 22⁶ ונגנבתי 24⁶ נטוים 24⁷ נגנבתי

Active for passive

$Gn.4^{26}$ $3\pi 9^2$ 10^1 17.3 17^{17} 7.3 33^{11} 34^{10}
 45^{19} 46^{22}

Active for passive (contd)

Ex.10⁸ יצוהו 34³⁴ והבמה 27⁷ גרשום 12³⁹ וישב 2
 Lv.4³¹ מכז 18¹⁸ יבוא 6²³ לקטיר 6¹⁵ יסיר 4³⁵ יסיר 4³¹
 הכבסו 13⁵⁶ הפך 13²⁵ יבוא 11³² למכזו 11¹³ יגור 11⁷
 מכז 19¹⁷ יעמיק 16¹⁰
 Nu.3¹⁶ למכזו 28¹⁷ יעשו 28¹⁵ המשיח 7⁸⁸ המשיח 7⁸⁴ צוהו 3¹⁶
 המצינו 31³ יעשו 28²⁴
 Dt.7²³ השמידך 28²⁰ ימים 20⁸ והגידו 17⁴ למכזו 14¹⁹ השמידם 7²³
 תזריע 29²² השמידך 28⁶¹ השמידך 28⁵¹ השמידך 28⁴⁵ השמידך 28²⁴

Passive for active.

Gn.24³³ מסורי 49¹¹ למרגזו 45²⁴ יומה 44⁹ ולמכז 38¹⁴ ויושם 24³³
 ויושב 50²⁶

Ex.5¹⁹ יגרע

Lv.12² יומה 20²⁰ חלום 15³ תזריע 12²

Nu.9¹⁵ יומה 35¹² יומה 26⁶⁵ יומה 26⁵⁵ יומה 17²⁸ הוקם 9¹⁵

Dt.18²¹ ותוקר 32²² והומה 19¹² נודע 18²¹

(g) Agreement of subject and predicate

Gn.4¹⁰ יושבים 13⁷ נשמה 13⁶ ישמע 11⁷ נפשה 10¹⁸ זעק 4¹⁰
 וימחרו 24⁵⁵ וימחרו 24³³ והיה 17¹¹ במ 15¹⁷ ישוב 15¹⁶
 והיו 30⁴² יבוא 30³³ וישתחוו 27²⁹ ראו 27²⁷ ויקראו 25²⁶
 היה 41⁴⁸ ויקרא 41⁴³ יהיה 37²⁰ ידו 35²⁶ יעשו 34³¹
 וישתחוו 43²³ ויקבץ 42³⁵ ויהיו 42³⁵ היו 41⁵³ ידו 41⁵⁰
 כבדה 48¹⁰ ויהיו 47²⁸ ידו 46²⁷ למחצה 44³⁴ ויעמסו 44¹³

(g) (contd)

ויִתְּנוּ 4³¹ וִיזְכוּ 4²⁹ וִירְבוּ 1²⁰ וְחִיָּה 1¹⁶ וִיבְנוּ 1¹¹ וִיְהִיו 1⁵ Ex. 1⁵
 שָׁמוּ 10¹⁷ נִשְׁמָה 10¹³ וַיִּגְרְשׁוּ 10¹¹ נָכו 9³¹ וַיִּמְצְאוּ 7²⁵
 וְהָיוּ 13¹⁶ יֵהִיו 13¹² וְהָיוּ 13⁹ וַיִּקְרָא 12²⁷ דָּבָר 11²
 וְחָמָה 16²¹ הִזְכּוּ 16⁴ וַיִּזְן 15²⁴ וַיִּמְחְרוּ 14²⁵ נִסְעִים 14¹⁰
 וַיִּצָּח 17⁶ וַיִּמְחְרוּ 17³ אָנָּה 17² מִצְאוּ 16³² וַיִּשְׁבְּחוּ 16³⁰
 אֶבְרָהָם 21³² אֶסְקָר 21²⁹ וַיִּצָּח 21²² וְהָכֹה 21¹⁸ בָּאוּ 18¹⁶
 וַנִּשְׁמָח 25²⁸ וַיַּעֲנוּ 24³ יַעֲלֶה 24² יֵהִיו 23³³ אֶזְכָּר 23¹³
 וַתִּקְדְּשׁוּ 29⁴³ וַסִּמֵּךְ 29¹⁵ יַעֲשׂוּ 26³¹ וְהַעֲלִיף 25³⁷ יִסְכּוּ 25²⁹
 וְרָאוּ 33¹⁰ וְהָיוּ 33⁷ וְרָחֵף 30¹⁹ יִתְּנוּ 30¹⁴ וְהָיוּ 30⁴
 טוֹה 35²⁵ הַבֵּית 35²² וַעֲשֵׂה 35¹⁰ יַעֲשֵׂה 35² וַיִּקְחוּ 33¹⁰
 וַיִּרְחֹף 40³¹ וַיַּעֲשׂוּ 39^{3,7,8,9,22} וַיַּעֲשׂוּ 39² יִסְכּוּ 37¹⁶ וַיַּעֲשׂוּ 36³¹
 יִשְׁחָטוּ 4²⁴ וְנוֹדַע 4¹⁴ וְהוֹצִיאוּ 4¹² וְנִגְחָו 1¹² יִרְחֹף 1⁹ וְהִפְשִׁיטוּ 1⁶ Lv. 1⁶
 וַיִּסְמְכוּ 8¹⁴ יִקְרִיבוּ 7²⁵ יִקְרִיבוּ 7¹¹ יִקְרִיבוּ 7⁸ יִמְכֹּר 6⁹ יִשְׁחָטוּ 4³³
 וַקְרָעוּ 13⁵⁶ יִתְּנוּ 11³⁵ וַיִּרְאוּ 9²⁴ וַיִּשֶׁם 9²⁰ וַיִּסְמֵךְ 8¹⁸
 תַּעֲשֶׂה 19¹⁵ וְהָיוּ 14^{5,13,41,42,43,45,45,49} וַיִּקְחוּ 14⁴ וַיִּקְחוּ 14⁴
 יַעֲשֵׂה 23³ תַּעֲשׂוּ 22²³ יִמְכֹּרוּ 22⁸ תִּשְׁחָטוּ 19²⁷ יֵהִיוּ 19²⁴
 יִקְרִיבוּ 27⁹ יִמְכְּרוּ 25³⁴ יִחְשְׁבוּ 25³¹ מִצָּה 25²⁸ אֶמְכָּר 25¹⁴
 יִקְרִיב 27¹¹
 וַיִּבְנוּ 13²² נִסְעוּ 12¹⁵ וִיְהִיו 9⁶ יַעֲשׂוּ 9³ יֵהִי 5¹⁰ וִיְהִיו 3⁴³ Nu. 3⁴³
 וַיִּירְשׁוּ 21²⁴ וְנִגְחָו 19¹⁷ וְהָיוּ 15³⁹ וַיִּבְךְּ 14¹ קָרָאוּ 13²⁴
 יִחְזַק 26⁵⁶ הָיָה 26³³ יִזְחַךְ 22⁴ וַיִּירְשׁוּ 21³² אֶבְדָּה 21³⁰

(g) (contd)

Nu. 27³ היה 27⁴ לנו 27²¹ { צא : 28¹⁷ למכר 28²⁴ יעשו
 31¹³ ויצאו 31²⁹ לקח 32¹⁸ למכר 32²⁵ וימכרו 32³⁹ ויורישו
 33⁷ ינח 34⁵ והיה 34^{8,9,12} והיה 35⁸ ינח
 Dt. 7⁴ וידח 19⁵ יראו 16¹⁶ למכר 14³ למכר 12⁵ ובמחם 12¹⁶ ועבר
 21⁷ יואל 24¹⁶ יהיה 23¹³ ופרש 22¹⁷ שפכו 21⁷
 27^{16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26} וימכרו 28^{53,55,57} יקו
 28⁶¹ יקרא 31¹¹ ורמה 29²¹ ורבו 29¹⁹ בלו 29⁴ ודבק 28⁶¹
 31^{16,17,18,20} וימכרו 32³⁷ זכרו 32⁷ { Collect. 32⁷ והיו, והפכו, ועזבו, כנו, עשו
 33¹⁹ יינק

(h) Transitions in personal reference


Ex. 11⁷ לענו 22²² למחצו 22²⁰ לנו 22²⁰ גוינו 12⁴⁶ אדע 11⁷
 23⁹ לעשה 25¹⁹ לעשה 25⁹ ועשיהם 23²² לשמעו 23²² למחצו 23⁹
 Nu. 1³ לטחאו 35³⁴ הרבה 33⁵⁴ תשלם 13² לעשו 8²⁶ תפקד 1³
 Dt. 1⁸ ובקש 4²⁹ לוצידו 4²⁵ ראו 4⁵ ליראם 3²² ראו 1⁸
 אוסיפו 13¹ למכר 12¹⁶ ובמחם 12⁵ יצאם 7⁷ לעשה 7⁵ הרבה 6³
 לחטאין 24⁴ לעשו 22²⁶ (bis) למכר 16³ למכר 14³ הגרעו 13¹
 אוסיפו 28⁶⁸ שמעם 28⁶²

(i) Feminine termination.In S T


Gn. 6¹⁹ לציית 27³ בחצרותם 25¹⁶ צחקה 21⁶ וחגגכם 9² החיה 6¹⁹
 34¹² חזקנה 48¹⁰ ברעה 44³⁴ חשגה 43¹² כחשלא 38²⁴ ואחנה 34¹²
 48²² אחא 49¹⁵ טובה

(i) (contd)

Ex.15¹¹ כִּנָּה 28¹² כִּנָּה 28²⁰ לִשְׁמֹר 29⁴⁰ רִבְעִית 30²¹ אָרֶח
30³⁵ חֲמִשָּׁה 32¹⁹ בִּלְחֵל

11¹⁸ ה'רחוקה  ה'יא 5⁹ כבשה 4³² ה'יא 21,24^{21,24} Lv.4
 3טמאה 20²⁵ ורטה 19²⁸ ה'יא 18²³ המשכבה 15²³ ה'יא 30³⁰ 13
 21⁵ שרטה 24⁹ ה'יא 25³⁴ ה'יא

מחל 31²⁸ חרבעל 23¹⁰ בכרוח 13²⁰ מרבעל 7⁸ היא Nu.5¹⁵
חחשק 31³⁷

Dt. 15⁷ אהב 16⁵ אהב 17² אהב  23¹⁷ אהב
 23² אהב 27¹⁰ אהב 28⁷ אהב 28²⁵ אהב 31¹⁷ אהב 33¹² אהב

In M T *

Gn. 26²⁹ רַע 9⁵ חַי 32⁹ הַמֶּלֶךְ 37⁸ חַי 38²⁵ הַחַיִּים
46²² נִבְרָא 46²⁵ שֶׁבַע


Ex. 25¹² נחמך 25³⁶ נחמך 32²⁵ ושמע 36³¹ נחמך 37³ נחמך
37³ השני 37²² נחמך Lv. 5²³ ושמע 7³⁶ נחמך

Nu. 8¹⁶ פטר 15⁶ 313ב

$ut.6^2$ 19^{15} $ק'ק$ 28^{11} 2163 28^{61} $הזה$ 30^{16} $ק'ק$ 32^{32} 32^{32}

(j) Plural (or dual) termination.

In S T

Gn. 1²¹ 3⁷ 3⁷ ע. 12³ 7.33 15¹⁰ 17¹³ 17²⁴ 3.17
30³⁴ 7 34²¹ רחבול  39¹² 12

39^{13,15,16,18} 1722 41⁸ 1737 43¹² 44¹² (bis) 45²⁰ וְעִינֵיכֶם

46⁴ ידן 46³⁴ רצי 47³ רצי 47¹⁸ יגית' 47¹⁸ יגית' 47¹⁸ יגית' 47¹⁸ יגית'

47^{19,19,19,23} נ'אמ'א 47³⁰ כ'ד'ג' 49⁸ י'ד'.

47²³ 𐤀𐤁 𐤀𐤁𐤏𐤏 11⁷ 𐤀𐤁𐤏𐤏 Cf. Petermann, p. 90.

* Here, as elsewhere, the S T readings are given.

(j) Plural (or dual) termination (contd)

In S T (contd)

[illegible]

חדי 6³ קרבניך 2¹³ מנחג'ך 2¹³ הכהנים 1⁷ קרבניכם 1² Lv.
 כפיו 9¹⁷ ידיכם 8³³ חצביהן 8²⁵ חצביהן 8¹⁶ במבנטים 8¹³
 הגוים 20²³ עמיו 17⁴ ידיו 16²¹ עיניו 13⁵⁵
 ויזדי 22¹¹ בעיניו 21²⁰ במבנים 20²⁷
 ספחי 25⁵ וענפי 23⁴⁰ עמיה 23³⁰
 חכסות 27²³ בארצות 26⁴⁴ ניהחייכם 26³¹ ועבדיך ומהג'ך 25⁴⁴
 חשאי 4¹⁵ בכורי 3⁵⁰ מבכורי 3⁴⁶ הלוים 3³² דגליו 2² Nu.
 במועדיו 9³ במועדיו 9² פרחיה 8⁴ ירכיה 8⁴ נסכיו 6¹⁷
 כדברך 14²⁰ חדשיכם 10^{10a} וכמשפטיו 9¹⁴ במועדיו 9¹³ במועדיו 9⁷
 מקדשי 18⁹ (3) צ'צ'וא 15^{38,39} חצוגיו 15³¹ עמיה 15³⁰ ונסכיו 15²⁴
 עצג'ך 23¹⁵ עצג'יו 23⁶ עצג'ך 23³ ארומתיכם 18²⁷ בנהג'יכם 18²⁶
 ונסכיו 28^{7,8,9} במועדיו 28² הלוים 26⁵⁷ עצג'יו 23¹⁷
 ואסריה 30⁵ נדריה 30⁵ דבריו 30³ ונסכיה 29^{16,22,25,28,34,38}
 חשפחוק 36⁸ חשפחוק 36⁶ חשפחוק 36¹ חטאתיכם 32²³ נדריה 30⁹

(j) (contd)

Dt. 2⁷ בתיך 6⁹ ידיך 6⁸ דברי 5⁵ בניו 2³³ ידיך 2⁷
 חטאתיכם 9¹⁸ ורגליך 8⁴ מלותיו 8² 3 שנתי 7¹⁰ מלותיו 9⁷ ואשריהם 5⁷
 ידיכם 12⁷ בתיך 11²⁰ ידיכם 11¹⁸ ברגליך 11¹⁰ חטאתיכם 9²¹
 ידיך 15¹⁰ ידיך 14²⁹ מעלי 14⁷ ידיך 12¹⁸ ידיך 12¹⁷
 ידיך 23²¹ מיביך 20¹ ידיך 16¹⁰ בעיניך 15¹⁸ בעיניך 15¹⁸
 ידיך 28¹² ידיך 28⁸ מלותיו 27¹⁰ מלותיך 26¹³ מגרתיך 24¹⁴
 מיביך 28⁵⁷ מיביך 28⁵⁵ מיביך 28⁵³ ידיך 28²⁰
 3 רגליך 33³ ידינו 32²⁷ ידיך 30⁹ מדוי 28⁶⁰
 מנעליך 33²⁵ רגלי 33²⁴


In M T *

Gn. 4¹⁰ גוי 22¹⁸ ידה 16⁹ דם 4¹¹ דם 4¹¹
 ידו 27¹⁶ גוי 26⁴ עמו 25¹⁷ עמו 25⁸
 צואר 45¹⁴ עמו 35²⁹ מראשיתו 28^{11,18} צוארו 27¹⁶
 והכתיב 38²⁵ עמו 49³³ (bis) צוארו 46²⁹
 חכם 28³ דם 22^{1,2} הגורה 18²⁰ חכמבו 3⁷
 ידך 15¹⁷ בידה 35²⁵
 מכצו 17¹⁴ וידו 15¹¹ בדם 12⁴ וחמישיתו 5²⁴
 בעמו 21⁴ בעמו 21¹ דמו 20⁹ בעמך 19¹⁶
 ומכצו 19⁸ מקדשכם 26³¹ בעמו 21¹⁵ מעמו 21¹⁴
 עין 24⁴ עמך 20²⁴ שצוי 11³¹ עינינו 11⁶
 גומלתו 34^{4,5,9,12} עמך 31² ידו 27²³ עמך 27¹³
 ידו 33⁷ עמך 32⁵⁰ ידנו 32²⁷ גוי 28¹ ממכרו 18⁸
 דוכך 28²⁹ ידו 34⁹ אשרך 33²⁹ ידו 33¹¹

* S T readings

(k) Suffixes

Difference in person or number

Gn. 6²⁰ 3 חִינִיָּהֶם 13¹⁰ כֹּל 21²⁹ 3 בְּדָה 30³⁷ בָּהֶם
 31^{2,5} אִינֹם 31⁹ אֲבִיכָן 31⁴³ 3 בְּנֵיהֶם 32¹ אִתָּם
 33¹⁴ 3 אִטָּה 41¹⁰ אִתָּם 41²³ אַחֲרֵיהֶן 44²⁴ אֲבִינוֹ
 44³⁰ אִתִּי 44³² אֲבִיו 45¹ מַעֲלִיו 47²⁶ 3 בְּדָה 50¹¹ שָׁמוֹ
 Ex. 1¹¹ עֲנוּתָם 4²⁶ חֲתָנָה 5²¹ בִּידוֹ 11⁶ 12⁴⁸ (ו) כְּמוֹהָ
 20²⁵ { 20³ עֲלִיוֹת 21⁴ 3 אֲדָנִי 22²⁵ גְּשִׁיבֹנָה 23²² בְּקוֹצֵי
 23²⁷ בָּהֶן  25⁸ בְּתוֹכָם 25¹⁷ אֲרָכּוֹ 25¹⁷ רַחֲבּוֹ
 25²⁹ בָּהֶם (26) 30⁷ יִקְטִירֵנוּ 27⁵ אִתָּם 27¹¹ עַמּוּדֵיהֶם
 27²¹ 3 דְּרָגִיכֶם 28⁹ עֲלִיהֶן 29⁴¹ וְכִנּוּסָם 29⁴² 3 כֶּם
 30³⁵ אִתָּם 30³⁶ חֲתָנוֹ (bis) 30³⁷ 3 כֶּם 34¹² עֲלִיוֹ 34¹³ וְאֲשֵׁרֵיהֶם
 37⁶ { 37¹⁶ אֲרָכּוֹ רַחֲבּוֹ 37¹⁶ בָּהֶם 39³³ וְאֲדָנֵיהֶם
 Lv. 1¹⁶ בְּנִצָּת 1¹⁶ אִתָּם 6⁸ חֲתָנָה 6²⁰ עֲלִיוֹ 10¹ עֲלִיהֶן
 11²¹ בָּהֶם 11²² 3 חִינִיָּה 13²⁰ מִרְאֵהוּ 13⁴³ אִתָּה
 17¹³ בְּתוֹכָם 18¹⁹ עֲרוּגָה 18³⁰ בָּהֶן 19²⁷ זִקְנֹתָם 19³³ אִתָּם
 20⁶ אִתָּם.. אִתָּם 21⁸ מִקְדָּשָׁם 22³² מִקְדָּשָׁם 24⁹ וְאֲכִלְיָה 26³⁹ אֲבִיבֵיהֶם
 27¹² אִתָּם 27¹³ יִגְמָלֵנוּ
 Nu. 12²² מִקְדָּשָׁם 14⁴⁴ אִתָּם 2⁴ וּמִקְדָּשׁוֹ 2¹³ וּמִקְדָּשׁוֹ 2¹⁵ וּמִקְדָּשׁוֹ
 2¹⁹ עֲבָדָתָם 3³¹ וּמִקְדָּשׁוֹ 2^{23,26,28,30} וּמִקְדָּשׁוֹ 2²¹ וּמִקְדָּשׁוֹ
 5¹⁵ עֲלִיהֶן 16¹⁸ עֲלִיהֶן 16¹⁷ אִתָּם 15³⁹ עֲלִיהֶן 5¹⁵ עֲלִיהֶן
 17¹⁹ אִתָּם 27¹¹ אֲבִיהֶן 27⁷ 3 כֶּם 27⁷ 3 כֶּם 19²¹ 3 כֶּם
 28¹⁰ וְנִסְכֵּיהֶם 28¹⁵ וְנִסְכֵּיהֶם 28²⁴ וְנִסְכֵּיהֶם 28³¹ וְנִסְכֵּיהֶם 29⁶ וְנִסְכֵּיהֶם 29¹¹ וְנִסְכֵּיהֶם
 29¹⁹ וְנִסְכֵּיהֶם 30¹⁶ עֲוֹנוֹ 35³ וְאֲגִרְשִׁיהֶן 35⁵ 3 כֶּם 36⁶ אֲבִיהֶן
 29^{16,22,25,28,34,38} וְנִסְכֵּיהֶם

(k) Suffixes (contd)

Dt. 2⁹ דבריו 18¹⁹ בה 17¹⁹ דעמו 9²⁴ חצויו 5¹⁰ בו 30²⁰ צרינו 32²⁷ בפים 31¹⁹ מצהיהם 31¹³ מצהיהם 31¹² צכם 33²⁸ שמיך

Number of 2nd. suffixTransitions in personal reference

Dt. 4²⁵ מצהיהם 4³⁴ עיניכם 11⁸ מצהיהם 11¹⁰ מצהיהם 11¹⁴ מצהיהם 11²³ חמך 11²³ מצהיהם 12⁹ מצהיהם 12⁹ צכם 13¹ מצהיהם 13⁶ מצהיהם 28⁶² מצהיהם 28⁶⁸ צכם 28⁶⁸ מצהיהם 29⁴ מצהיהם 29⁴ מצהיהם 30¹⁸ מצהיהם

Absence of suffix

Gn. 2²³ מצהיהם 8¹² שובת 9² נגמיו 11⁷ שכתים 44⁶ בהררי 18¹⁹ מצהיהם 24³⁰ כרמיו 26¹¹ עמו 28⁴ מצהיהם 33¹⁰ מצהיהם 37¹⁷ שמיים 37²⁴ ויקחו 37³² ויביאם 38²¹ המקום 39⁸ מצהיהם 41¹⁶ וישלח 47²⁴ מצהיהם 48¹⁴ מצהיהם

Ex. 1²² מצהיהם 2⁶ ותפגחה 2⁶ וגמל 2²⁰ ומה 2²⁰ ומה 7²⁰ מצהיהם 12⁴⁴ מצהיהם 13¹³ כספו 16²⁵ מצהיהם 18¹⁶ מצהיהם 21² מצהיהם 22² והכהו 22⁴ משיחם 22⁸ מצהיהם 22¹² מצהיהם 22²⁰ מצהיהם 22²⁴ מצהיהם 24⁸ מצהיהם 27⁷ מצהיהם 28^{1,3,4} מצהיהם 32¹³ מצהיהם 32²⁰ מצהיהם 34²⁰ מצהיהם 34³⁴ מצהיהם 35⁵ מצהיהם 38¹ מצהיהם 38²⁰ מצהיהם 39⁸ מצהיהם 40¹ מצהיהם 41¹⁶ מצהיהם 42¹ מצהיהם 43¹ מצהיהם 44¹ מצהיהם 45¹ מצהיהם 46¹ מצהיהם 47¹ מצהיהם 48¹ מצהיהם 49¹ מצהיהם 50¹ מצהיהם 51¹ מצהיהם 52¹ מצהיהם 53¹ מצהיהם 54¹ מצהיהם 55¹ מצהיהם 56¹ מצהיהם 57¹ מצהיהם 58¹ מצהיהם 59¹ מצהיהם 60¹ מצהיהם 61¹ מצהיהם 62¹ מצהיהם 63¹ מצהיהם 64¹ מצהיהם 65¹ מצהיהם 66¹ מצהיהם 67¹ מצהיהם 68¹ מצהיהם 69¹ מצהיהם 70¹ מצהיהם 71¹ מצהיהם 72¹ מצהיהם 73¹ מצהיהם 74¹ מצהיהם 75¹ מצהיהם 76¹ מצהיהם 77¹ מצהיהם 78¹ מצהיהם 79¹ מצהיהם 80¹ מצהיהם 81¹ מצהיהם 82¹ מצהיהם 83¹ מצהיהם 84¹ מצהיהם 85¹ מצהיהם 86¹ מצהיהם 87¹ מצהיהם 88¹ מצהיהם 89¹ מצהיהם 90¹ מצהיהם 91¹ מצהיהם 92¹ מצהיהם 93¹ מצהיהם 94¹ מצהיהם 95¹ מצהיהם 96¹ מצהיהם 97¹ מצהיהם 98¹ מצהיהם 99¹ מצהיהם 100¹ מצהיהם

Lv. 3⁸ מצהיהם 11¹¹ מצהיהם 13³ מצהיהם 13⁴² מצהיהם 13⁴² מצהיהם 17⁴ מצהיהם 20¹⁹ מצהיהם 22²⁹ מצהיהם 25²¹ מצהיהם

Appendix AAbsence of suffix (contd)

Nu. 3¹⁶ ויעצו 20²⁷ כחספרם 15¹² וישאו 13²³ צוהו 3¹⁶
 22⁷ ויבמהו 22³⁹ דרכך 22³² שטנך 22³² וקסמיהם 22⁷
 23⁸ בשבט 28¹⁰ צמשה 28² חשכח 26¹² והנה 23¹⁷ זעמו 23⁸
 29³³ כחשפט 29³³
 Dt. 2³⁴ בידך 9²⁶ בבית 6⁷ ומצאנו 4²⁹ צונו 2³⁷ ערין 2³⁴
 11¹⁹ מהם 16⁹ במרץ 15⁷ והנחמו 14²⁸ ואכלנו 14²³ בבית 11¹⁹
 16²² בשבין 21¹¹ צמרה 21⁵ אשו 18¹⁶ צויתיו 17³ שנמה 16²²
 26¹² שור 33¹⁷ רמיתיו 33⁹ מיבי 32²⁷ וינבצו 32¹⁵ ונגמו 26¹²

With pronoun object expressed by א with suffixIn S T

Ev. 10⁵ וישאו אהם
 Dt. 9²⁸ חצוה אהם 11⁸ צהביא אהם

In M T


Gn. 18⁷ עשומו
 Ex. 40¹⁴ זה צבאם
 Lv. 13³⁴ גרגמום 20²⁷ וטהרו
 Dt. 18¹² חצוך 28¹⁴ צעומום 27²⁶ חורשם

(1) Form with ה localeIn S T


Gn. 12¹⁵ קדמה 25⁶ צערה 13¹⁰ היחיתה 13⁹ השחמלה 13⁹ ביתה 12¹⁵
 37³⁶ מפרחה 48⁷ מרצה 45²⁵ ביתה 43¹⁸ מפרחה 43¹⁵ מפרחה 37³⁶
 50³ מפרחה

Appendix A.

(L) (contd.)

Ex. 4¹⁹ מצרימה  20²⁴ שמה 23¹⁹ בימה
 26²⁰ זכונה 26³⁵ זכונה 27⁹ גימנה 27¹¹ זכונה
 27¹² ימה 28²⁹ גמידה 28³⁰ גמידה 36²³ גימנה
 36²⁵ זכונה 38⁹ גימנה 38¹¹ זכונה 38¹² ימה
 Lv. 6⁸ המזבח 9¹³ המזבח
 Nu. 13²¹ חמה 14²⁵ המדברה 34³ נגבה (bis) 34⁶ ימה (bis) 34⁷ זכונה
 34⁸ חמה 34⁹ זכונה 35⁵ נגבה 35⁵ ימה 35⁵ זכונה
 Mt. 1³⁷ שמה 3¹⁷ והירדנה 23⁵ פרה 23¹³ המוצה 23¹⁴ המוצה
 28⁶⁸ מצרימה 33²³ ימה

In M T *

Gn. 14¹⁰ שם 15⁵ השמים 19⁶ הפנה 20¹ מרץ 23¹³ שם
 24¹⁶ העין 24⁴⁵ העין 25¹⁰ שם 28² בית 28¹² השמים
 29¹ מרץ 29³ שם 32⁴ מרץ 37²⁴ הבור 38²⁸ ראשון
 43³⁰ שם 46¹ במר 46²⁸ מרץ 49³¹ { שם, שם, שם } 50⁵ שם
 Ex. 1²² הימר 4²⁰ מרץ 7¹⁵ הים 8¹⁶ הים 9⁸ השמים
 9¹⁰ השמים 10¹⁹ ים 15²⁷ מים 16³³ שם 21³³ שם
 26³³ שם 29⁴² שם 29⁴³ שם 30¹⁸ שם 30³⁶ שם
 33⁹ המה  40³⁰ שם

Lv. 5⁸ ראשון

Nu. 17¹⁹ שם 33⁹ מים 33⁵⁴ שם 34⁵ נחל 34⁵ הים
 35¹⁰ מרץ

Mt. 4¹⁹ השמים 30¹² השמים 31¹⁶ שם

*

S T readings.

(m) PrepositionsDifference

- Gn. 7¹ על הנער 22¹² את קול 21¹⁷ ויאמרו מליו 19⁵ לגויהם 10²⁰ מ 3 נח 7¹
- 23¹⁷ מן מדני 24⁵⁶ מן השמים 24⁴⁹ ויאמרו לה 24⁵⁸ על במדבר 24¹¹ על פני 23¹⁷
- על המקצות 30³⁹ ומן מרצ 30²⁵ ויאמר מליו 27³² על משגבו 26⁷ מן יהוה 25²¹
- מארץ 36⁶ כעם 34¹⁶ מן מרץ 32¹⁰ עד בלג 31²⁰ ומן מוצדק 31³
- מן בניו 42¹ את יוסף 41¹⁷ מן כף 40¹¹ לגוזי 38¹² מן בניו 37¹⁰
- על רעהו 43³³ על אחיו 43³⁰ על אחיו 42²⁸ על שקו 42²⁵ על ינו 42²¹
- מן לבם 50²¹ על יוסף 50¹⁶
- Ex. 2¹⁰ על לבך 9¹⁴ משה 8²¹ מן פרעה 8⁵ לפני 7¹⁰ מן בת 2¹⁰
- על מחנה 14²⁴ על העם 14⁵ על המשקף ועל 12²² מן יהוה 10¹⁷ על דבר 9²¹
- מן הר 19¹¹ מן מקומו 18²³ משה 18⁶ את משה 16³⁴ לפי 16²¹
- מן אחרי 26¹² בקצה 26⁴ מן עבר 25³⁷ מליו 20²⁶ מן משה 19²⁰
- על עבר 28²⁶ על קצות 28²⁴ על שני 28⁷ מן ראשו 26²⁴ מן צדי 26¹³
- לפני 35³⁰ לפני יהוה 34²⁸ על אשר 32³⁴ מן עבדך 30¹⁶ על חשן 28³⁰
- מן בני 3¹⁴ על עבר 39¹⁹ בקצה 36¹¹
- Lv. 1¹⁵ על משגבו 5⁷ על שפך 4¹² את הקרב 4⁸ מן קיר 1¹⁵
- על העם 9²² לפני 9⁵ על חשן 8⁸ מן קיר 5⁹
- על הבית 14⁵¹ בשמן 14²⁹ מכל 11³¹ מן מבצחם 11²⁸ ומן מלעזר 10⁶²
- לפני 23²² על מחנה 18¹⁸ מן פני 16¹⁴ מן הכפרת 16² על פני 14⁵³
- Nu. 3¹² בבני 8¹⁶ על ועל 4¹⁹ מן קדש 4¹⁹ את פני 3³⁸ בבני 3¹²
- בהן 16¹⁸ במספרם 15¹² על משה 13³⁰ מן המחנה 11³¹ מן האדמה 11¹²
- ויאמר מן 23¹⁷ מן בלך 23³ מן בלעם 22²⁸ על מידב 21³⁰ על המדבר 21¹³
- על אשר 33⁵⁴ על ישראל 32¹⁴ מן הלוים 31⁴⁷ על קבחה 25⁸ מן המזבח 23³⁰
- מן מטה 36⁹ מן כתף 34¹¹

(m) (contd)

3 כניכם 11²⁵ מליכם 9¹⁰ 3 כניך 7²⁴ (bis) על פניו 7¹⁰ עליהן Dt. 1²²
 מליה 25⁵ על עיר 20¹⁹ על עיר 20¹⁰ במקום 16⁶ מלכה 13⁹
 על מרץ 33²⁸ על כ 32⁴⁶ מדבר 32⁴⁵

AbsenceIn S T

Gn. 22²¹ עזה 22¹³ עזה 39² בית 45⁷ פצטה
 Ex. 14²⁷ מוך 15¹⁸ עולם 23¹³ וכ 25²⁷ בתיים 29⁴¹ ריח
 38¹² מחה
 Lv. 20³ וזכר 22²¹ נדבה 26²⁷ קרי 26⁴⁰ קרי
 Nu. 1⁴⁴ בית 15³ נדבה 18¹⁷ ריח 21¹¹ חזרה 26³⁰ וחלק
 27¹⁴ אשר 28²⁷ ריח
 Dt. 9⁴ מפניך 18¹⁵ אחיך 22¹⁹ שצחה 29⁷ נחלה

Prepositional phraseOmission denoted
by --

Gn. 29²⁴ --בן 44⁷ ויאמרו --
 Ex. 37¹³ --יזק --
 Dt. 1⁸ --אח 11⁹ --אח 17¹⁸ --היה 23¹¹ --ויצא 28⁵³ --יזק

In M T *

Gn. 7⁸ 3 ואכל 14⁴ ובש 24²³ בבית 27³⁹ 29²⁴ שפחה
 40¹⁷ 30 חעז 42²¹ בצרה 48⁵ וכשמעון 49²⁵ חעז
 Ex. 2¹⁴ 3 שפט 5⁵ מעם 12⁴³ ואלמנה 14¹³ כאשר 15³ במלחמה
 17¹⁰ 3 ראש 20²⁴ {מצחית
 27¹⁹ ואלמנה 29²⁶ כאשר 34¹⁸ כאשר
 34²⁰ 3 בבניך 38¹⁷ עמודי
 Lv. 6¹³ 3 מנחה 14¹³ כאשר 25⁴⁷ וזגושב

* S T readings

(m) Prepositions

Absence (contd)

In M T (contd)

Nu. 1⁴² חמימך 20¹⁹ 3 מן 15²³ בחסכר 9²⁰ כאשר 4⁴⁹ 3 בני
 22³³ ספקדיהם 26³⁴ 3 גוץ 26²³ 3 ברך 23²⁰ הרבעא 23¹⁰ 3 סני
 26⁴¹ 3 ריה 28²⁴ 3 חטאת 28²² 3 ספקדיהם
 29^{5,11,16,19,22,25,28,31,34,38} 3 חטאת 30¹⁷ 3 בבית 32¹⁹ ירדן
 Dt. 3²⁷ מן הערים 19⁵ כאשר 15¹⁴ 3 בברך 15¹⁰ 3 סניך 7²² 3 נחש 3²⁷
 29¹⁹ 3 בשם 32³ 3 סו 30³

Prepositional phrase

ירמיה 33^{33} 41 ויאמר להם 29^7 , צדתי 21^7 בנתיני עמון 19^{30} ויאמר אלי 18^{29} Gn.
 משה 37^8 48 קח עמו 47^2 ויאמר אלי 47^1 הנער מהנני 44^{31}
 מזה מתכם 50^{25}

Ex. 13³ 12 01N4' 29³³ 02 N303 34³² 13N 1021

Nu. 24^{10}_{73} ארץ 24^{13}_{73} צהר יפה 31^{19}_{803} נח

(n) Definite Article

In S T

Gn. 1²⁸ הָחִיָּה 1³⁰ הָרָשָׁה 6¹⁹ הָהִיָּה 7¹¹ הָשֶׁשׁ 8¹⁹ הָרָשָׁה
 9³ הָחִיָּה 9¹⁶ הָחִיָּה 9¹⁵ הָחִיָּה 9¹² הָחִיָּה 9¹¹ הָחִיָּה 9³ הָחִיָּה
 14¹⁰ הָחִיָּה 15¹⁶ הָחִיָּה 19²⁸ הָחִיָּה 19³³ הָחִיָּה 20¹⁶ הָחִיָּה
 21²⁹ הָחִיָּה 21³⁰ הָחִיָּה 21³³ הָחִיָּה 22³ הָחִיָּה 24⁴⁹ הָחִיָּה
 24⁶³ הָחִיָּה 27²⁷ הָחִיָּה 30¹⁶ הָחִיָּה 31³⁵ הָחִיָּה 32¹² הָחִיָּה
 32²³ הָחִיָּה 36³⁵ הָחִיָּה 37¹⁵ הָחִיָּה 37²⁵ הָחִיָּה 38²¹ הָחִיָּה
 40¹⁹ הָחִיָּה 41²⁶ הָחִיָּה 41³⁵ הָחִיָּה 41⁴⁸ הָחִיָּה 41⁵⁴ הָחִיָּה
 42¹⁹ הָחִיָּה 43¹⁴ הָחִיָּה 44⁸ הָחִיָּה 47¹⁵ הָחִיָּה 47¹⁶ הָחִיָּה
 48⁷ הָחִיָּה 50²⁰ הָחִיָּה

(n) (contd)

Ex. 5 ¹⁸	הַצְבִּימִים	9 ²⁴	הַבֶּרֶד	9 ³³	וְהַטָּר	10 ²¹	הַחֹשֶׁךְ	12 ²	הַחֲדָשִׁים
12 ⁴⁶	הַחוּצָה	14 ²⁵	הַנִּלְחָם	14 ²⁷	הַבֶּקֶר	15 ¹²	הַמָּרֶץ	18 ¹⁴	הַבֶּקֶר הָעֶרֶב
19 ¹⁵	הַיָּמִים	19 ¹⁶	הַשּׁוֹפָר	20 ¹⁹	הַמַּלְהִים	22 ⁸	הַמַּבְדָּה	22 ⁸	הַמַּלְהִים
26 ⁸	הַיָּרִיעוּת	28 ⁵	הַגּוֹלָצָה	28 ⁹	הַשָּׂהָם	28 ¹⁵	הַמַּפֹּד	28 ²⁵	הַקָּצוֹת
32 ¹⁹	הַמַּחֲלֹוֹת	33 ¹⁵	הַהֲלָכִים	35 ²⁵	הַגּוֹלָצָה	35 ³⁵	הַמַּלְמָכָה	36 ¹⁰	הַיָּרִיעוּת
36 ¹⁵	הַיָּרִיעוּת	37 ¹⁹	הַמַּחֲדָה	38 ²⁷	הַכֶּכֶר	38 ²⁷	הַמַּדְנִים	39 ³	הַגּוֹלָצָה
39 ⁸	הַמַּפֹּד	39 ¹⁸	הַקָּצוֹת	39 ³²	הַמַּשְׁכֵּן	40 ²	הַמַּשְׁכֵּן	40 ⁶	הַמַּשְׁכֵּן
40 ²⁹	הַמַּשְׁכֵּן								
Lv. 3 ⁶	הַשְּׁלֵחִים	4 ⁷	הַחֲזָבָה	4 ¹²	הַעֲצִים	4 ³¹	הַחֲזָבָה	6 ²	הַמּוֹקְדָה
6 ¹⁴	הַמַּחֲבָה	7 ⁹	הַמַּחֲבָה	7 ²⁴	הַמַּלְמָכָה	7 ²⁷	הַנֶּפֶשׁ	11 ²⁷	הַהֲלָךְ
11 ³⁸	הַזֶּרֶעַ	11 ⁴²	הַהֲלָךְ	11 ⁴⁶	הַשְּׂרָצָה	11 ⁴⁶	הַנֶּפֶשׁ	13 ⁵⁹	הַזֶּרֶעַ
15 ²²	הַכִּזִּי	17 ¹⁵	הַנֶּפֶשׁ	23 ¹⁰	הַעֵמָר	23 ¹⁹	הַשְּׁלֵחִים	23 ²⁰	הַכֶּבֶשׂ
24 ¹⁶	הַשֵּׁם	26 ⁵	הַזֶּרֶעַ						
Nu. 1 ⁴⁹	הַלְוִי	4 ³	הַבָּה	7 ⁸⁵	הַכֶּסֶף	11 ³²	הַיּוֹם	12 ⁵	הַעֵנָן
16 ²²	הַבָּשָׂר	19 ²⁰	וְהָאִישׁ	20 ¹⁵	הַמַּצְרִים	21 ⁸	הַנּוֹס	21 ⁹	הָאִישׁ
21 ²⁹	הַמַּמְרִי	24 ¹	הַנִּחְשִׁים	25 ¹⁴	הַיִּשְׂרָאֵל	27 ¹⁶	הַבָּשָׂר	27 ¹⁸	הָאִישׁ
28 ⁴	הַשָּׁנִי	28 ¹⁴	הַחֹדֶשׁ	28 ²⁴	הַיָּמִים	29 ¹⁴	הַפְּרִים	29 ¹⁵	הַכֶּבֶשׂ
31 ¹⁹	הַנֶּגַע	31 ²⁶	הַמַּלְקָח	32 ³³	הַמִּנְשָׁה	35 ¹¹	הַרָצָח	36 ¹	הַמַּבּוֹת
Dt. 4 ³²	הַרְאִישׁוֹנִים	4 ⁴¹	הַשֵּׁם	4 ⁴²	הַרָצָח	4 ⁴⁷	הַשֵּׁם	11 ¹²	הַשָּׁנָה
13 ⁴	הַחֲלָם	15 ¹¹	הַמַּבִּין	18 ¹⁴	הַמַּעֲנִיִּים הַקְּסָמִים	21 ²²	הַעֵץ	24 ¹⁶	הַמַּבּוֹת
31 ³	הַעֲבָר	31 ³	הַעֲבָר	32 ¹⁰	הַמַּדְבָּר	32 ¹³	הַמָּרֶץ	32 ²⁰	הַמָּן
32 ⁴⁰	הַשָּׁחִים	33 ⁵	הָעָם	33 ¹⁷	הַמָּרֶץ	33 ²¹	הָעָם	33 ²⁹	הַנוֹשֵׁעַ

(n) Definite Article (contd)In M T *

Gn. 1 ²⁹	עץ	7 ¹⁵	בשר	8 ⁵	חדש	19 ⁹	אחד	21 ²⁸	צאן
22 ⁸	שה	29 ²	ואכן	41 ⁴²	זהב	42 ²⁷	אחד	45 ⁶	רעב
50 ¹¹	ארץ								
Ex. 5 ⁷	בגדים	12 ⁸	אחד	13 ¹⁸	חזר	13 ²¹	דרך	13 ²²	עין
16 ²³	בקר	22 ²⁴	עני	25 ³³	אחד	27 ¹	חזבח	29 ¹³	יורג
29 ³⁴	בקר	34 ³	ובקר	36 ³⁵	פרכה	38 ²⁰	יגדו	38 ²⁴	זהב
39 ¹⁷	עבדו								
Lv. 2 ⁵	חזב	6 ²	בקר	6 ⁵	שמים	14 ⁶	מים	14 ²²	ואחד
15 ¹⁵	ואחד	23 ²⁷	כפרים	24 ¹⁰	ישראל				
Nu. 9 ¹³	ואיש	13 ²²	ענק	13 ²⁸	ענק	19 ¹³	אדם	22 ¹¹	עם יצא
31 ²⁸	אחיו	31 ³⁶	צאן	31 ³⁸	ובקר	31 ⁴⁷	אחיו	32 ³³	ארץ
34 ²	ארץ								
De. 14 ²²	יוא	21 ¹⁵	ואחיו	25 ¹¹	אחד				

(o) AN Accusative.In S T

Gn. 2 ⁹	כ	2 ¹⁹	כ	4 ¹⁷	שם	8 ⁹	ידו	11 ⁷	שבת
11 ⁸	העיר	11 ⁹	שבת	14 ²²	ידי	15 ¹⁰	בגדו	16 ¹¹	שמו
16 ¹⁵	שם	17 ²⁴	בשר	18 ⁸	בן	18 ¹⁷	אשר	19 ³⁷	שמו
19 ³⁸	שמו	20 ⁷	אשר	21 ¹⁰	האמה	22 ¹⁴	שם	23 ⁴	מת
24 ⁵⁶	דרכי	27 ³⁵	ברכה	29 ³²	שמו	29 ³³	שמו	30 ⁸	שמו
30 ¹⁸	שמו	30 ³¹	הדבר	31 ¹²	כ	34 ¹⁴	הדבר	35 ¹⁸	שמו
38 ¹⁰	אשר	38 ²³	הגדי	38 ²⁹	שמו	40 ²¹	הכוס	41 ²⁸	אשר
42 ¹⁹	שבר	42 ²⁵	כסיהם	44 ²⁶	כני	48 ¹⁷	יד		

* S T readings

(o) AN AccusativeIn S T (contd)

Ex.1 ¹⁸	הדבר	2 ¹⁰	שמו	2 ¹⁶	עמן	4 ²¹	כ	6 ¹	אשר
7 ¹⁴	העם	7 ¹⁹	חטך	7 ¹⁹	ידך	8 ¹⁶	עמי	9 ^{5d}	הדבר
10 ³	עמי	10 ¹²	ידך	10 ²¹	ידך	12 ²⁸			חשה
16 ²⁹	השבט	19 ⁴	אשר	23 ²²	כ	25 ³¹			החנורה
26 ³⁵	השכן	28 ⁹	שמו	28 ³⁹	הכנה	29 ²¹	{		בגדי בני בגדי
29 ³⁵	ידם	30 ¹⁴	ארומה	31 ¹⁸	שני	32 ²			
32 ¹⁹	החצות	39 ¹⁷	שמי	39 ⁴⁰	{	מדינה המסך		40 ²⁵	הנרות
Lv.1 ⁴	ידו	3 ²	ידו	4 ¹⁷					
5 ⁵	אשר	12 ³	בשר	15 ¹³	בשרו	17 ¹⁰	כני	19 ¹⁵	עמיתך
19 ²³	ערצו	19 ²⁷	כמה	20 ²⁰	ערוה	21 ⁶	שם	22 ³¹	מצותי
Nu.13 ²⁵	הארץ	15 ⁴	קרבו	15 ³¹	דבר	18 ²⁶	ארומה	18 ²⁸	ארומה
19 ⁷	בשרו	19 ⁸	בשרו	22 ⁶	אשר	23 ⁴	בצמם	24 ¹⁴	אשר
25 ⁵	מנשיו	27 ¹⁴	כי	31 ²⁹	ארומה	32 ¹⁸	נחצו	36 ⁸	נחצו
Dt.2 ²⁵	שמעך	11 ²	זרועו	12 ¹¹	שמו	12 ¹⁴	כ	12 ²¹	שמו
12 ³¹	כ	14 ¹²	{ הפרס העזניה	14 ¹³	הדמה	14 ¹⁶	הכוס	14 ¹⁷	הקמה
14 ¹⁸	החסידה	14 ¹⁸		{ הדוכיפה העטף	14 ²³	שמו	14 ²⁴	שמו	16 ²
16 ⁶	שמו	16 ¹¹	שמו		22 ⁴	שורו	25 ¹¹	ידה	26 ²
28 ¹²	חטך								

In M T

Gn.17 ⁵	שמך	21 ²⁸	שבע	33 ⁵	עניו	41 ⁵¹	שם	44 ¹¹	מחמח
46 ³⁰	כניך								


(o) AN Accusative (contd)In M T (contd)

Ex.8³ כפי 33²³ פני 33²⁰ חזבה 27¹ כפי 9²⁹ הצרדעים 8³
 34¹³ ומהריהם 36³⁵ פרכה
 Lv.1⁹ 3^כ 8²¹ והכרעים 13⁶ ביום 14⁴⁷ בגדין (בי) 21¹⁰ ידו
 22¹⁵ אשר
 Nu.4⁸ 11³⁴ שם 1^{ידן}
 Dt.8² אשר 15⁸ ידך 15¹¹ ידך 28²⁹ דרכך

(p) Residuum, unclassified further

Gn.17¹⁷ 23¹ חמה 24⁴ חמה 24²¹ כי אמם 24²¹ הצ'ית
 27²⁴ חמה 38²⁸ ראיון 41¹⁵ דמשמע 44²⁰ ויוצד 50¹⁹ איראן
 Ex.11⁴ 12³¹ כחציג 26²⁶ בריחי 26²⁶ כדבריים
 Lv.5⁸ 18¹³ ראיון 23¹⁸ חג'ה כי 23¹⁸ שבעה 23²² קצר 3
 24⁶ שגי 27⁷ עשרה
 Nu.3³⁸ 7³ שחרי ושנים
 Dt.17⁶ 21¹¹ שני 32³⁰ חמה כי 33¹¹ חמה

(ii) Abnormal Constructionse. Constructions where no cogent reason can be adducedin favour of S T or M TAbsence of apocopation in Impf. or Impv. in S T

Gn.1²² 13⁸ יהיה 22¹² לעשה 26²⁸ יהיה
 37²⁷ יהיה 44³³ יע' 49¹⁷ יהיה
 Ex.5²¹ יראה  10¹⁰ יהיה 34³ יראה
 Lv.6² { ^{יוה} Many MSS 10⁹ אשה 24² יו
 Nu.5¹² { ^{יוה} Many MSS 12¹² יהיה 13³³ ונהיה 28² { ^{יוה} Many MSS יו
 34² יו 35² יו
 Dt.2⁴ יו 28⁸ יוה

(ii)

e. (contd)

With Waw ("and")Gn.12⁷ ויראה (5 MSS) 17¹ ויראה (4 MSS) 18¹ ויראה (3 MSS) 19²⁰ וראה (18 MSS)24⁴⁶ ואשה 24⁵¹ וראה (15 MSS) 26²⁴ ויראה (4 MSS) 31¹⁰ ויראה35⁹ ויראה 41²² ויראה 41³³ ויראה 46²⁹ ויראה (5 MSS)Ex.6³ ויראה 9¹⁵ וראהLv.9⁶ ויראה 9²³ ויראה 15²⁴ וראה (14 MSS)Nu.16¹⁹ ויראה 17⁷ ויראה 20⁶ ויראה 20¹¹ ואשה 23⁴ ואעלה23¹⁶ ויקראDt.2¹ ונפנה 2^{8b} ונפנה 2³³ ונכה 3¹ ונפנה 3¹⁸ ואזה9¹⁵ ואפנה 9¹⁶ ויראה 10³ ואעשה 10³ ואעלה 10⁵ ואפנה31¹⁵ ויראה(2) Variants consisting of constructions not found elsewhere in Samaritan Pentateuch.(1) In M T of Hebrew BibleOutside PentateuchGn.19³² (Jn.9¹⁰) כִּי 49⁴ (verbal form, Jn.9⁴ זפ3⁴) כחזא2. Differences of Grammar with divergence in sense1. Doctrinal(1) Controversy regarding GerizimDt.33¹⁵ גבעא קרי 33¹⁹ קרי

(1) Controversy regarding Gerizim (contd)

S T: (יהוק) אשר בחר

M T (יהוק) אשר יבחר

Dt.12 ⁵	12 ¹¹	12 ¹⁴	12 ¹⁸	12 ²¹
12 ²⁶	14 ²³	14 ²⁴	14 ²⁵	
15 ²⁰	16 ²	16 ⁶	16 ⁷	
16 ¹¹	16 ¹⁵	16 ¹⁶	17 ⁸	
17 ¹⁰	18 ⁶	26 ²		

(2) Other Samaritan beliefs and practices

(1) Unity of the deity

Gn.20¹³ הגא 31⁵³ ישכט 35⁷ נגזק

Ex.22⁸ ירשענו

(ii) Avoidance of anthropomorphism

Gn.16¹³ ראה 16¹⁴ ראה 24⁶² ראה 25¹¹ ראה

Ex.34²⁴ להראות

(iii) Resurrection

Gn.3¹⁹ עכרך

(iv) Legal enactment Lv.6¹³ Dt.16⁴ בין הערבים

ii. Non-Doctrinal

(1) Variants where there appear to be cogent reasons in favour of S T

An asterisk denotes S T is supported by LXX.

M T readings are difficult in grammar and/or sense, sometimes to the point of unintelligibility. They are normally attributable to the typical causes of scribal error

Gn.11^{31*} נאז 15¹ מרגב 18³ מעברו 18³ { בעיניכם
עבדכם

25^{28*} זיד 50^{23*} בנים

Ex.1^{10*} הקראנו 17^{11*} ידו (bis)

Nu. 5²⁷ וְהָיָה 16^{1*} רָאוּבֵן 23^{20*} מִבֶּרֶךְ

Dt. 32^{43*} נִדְמָה

(2) Variants where there appear to be cogent reasons in favour of M T

(i) Euphemism in S T

Lv. 15^{18,24} נִשְׂאָה

(ii) More common form in S T

Gn. 24²⁰ בִּשְׁקוֹל 30³⁸ בִּשְׁקוֹל

(iii) Correction by S T

Ex. 3⁶ מִבְּרִי

(3) Variants where there appear to be no cogent reasons in favour of S T or M T

(1) Attributable to the typical causes of scribal error

Gn. 2²⁴ וּבְרִכְתּוֹ 17^{16*} וְיִצְחָק 14^{12*} וַיִּמְכֹּר 3^{6*} וְהָיָה חֲשִׁנְיָהּ

24^{36*} וְדַפְקָהּ 33^{13*} יִרְמָה 31⁵¹ וְהִבְטִיחַ 27¹² זָקְנָתָהּ

34^{13*} וַיִּשְׁלַח 48^{12*} וַיָּבֵא 46²⁸ טַחֲנוּ

Ex. 18^{7*(part)} וַיִּבְטְחוּ

Lv. 19²⁰ יִוָּחַ

Nu. 3^{9*} וַיַּעֲזְבוּ 20^{27*} וּבְגִיכֶם 18^{31*} 3

(2) Not belonging to the above type

Gn. 2⁷ וַיִּקְרָא 4²⁵ מִדָּם 3⁸ מִדָּם 2²⁵ מִדָּם

9¹⁶ עֵת 31^{29*} בֵּינָם 30^{36*} קִרְיָהּ 29³⁴ קִרְיָהּ 16^{14*} סִגְרוּ

38^{3*} וַתִּקְרָא 38²⁹ וַתִּקְרָא 38^{30*} וַתִּקְרָא 41³⁵ מִגִּיד 41^{57*} מִרְעוֹ

43^{23*} מִבְּגִיכֶם

Ex. 23⁷ הַצִּדִּיק

Nu. 21²⁷ מִבֵּית 23²¹ בְּחֵי

Dt. 4^{37*} וְדָרְשׁוּ 17⁹ וְנָתַן 11^{14*,15*} מִזְרָעִים מִחֵרֶם

111. Differences of Vocabulary1. With agreement in sensei. Substitutions(1) Pure synonyms(i) Common wordsa. Common for rare word

ST reading is given first

Ex. 5 ⁴	אפריעו / אפרידו	6 ⁶	ובשכטים / ובחשכטים
7 ⁴	בשכטים / בחשכטים	15 ^{13,16}	זו / זה
21 ²⁵	כזיה / חכזה	21 ²⁸	יגח / יכה
21 ³¹	יגח / יכה	21 ³²	יגח / יכה
Lv. 26 ^{34,35}	השחה / משהה	26 ⁴³	בהשחה / במשהה
Nu. 3 ⁴⁹	הכדיום / הכדוים	11 ¹⁷	ומצגלי / ומצגלי
11 ²⁵	וימצג / וימצג	32 ²⁴	ומצגכס / ומצגכס
35 ²²	הדכנו / הדכנו		
Dt. 6 ¹⁹	בהדק / בהדק	9 ⁴	בהדק / בהדק
32 ²¹	בהצגיהם / במצגיהם		

b. Words suggesting misreading, miswriting, or mishearing in S T or M T

Gn. 27 ¹³	מח / מח	33 ¹⁸	מזל / מזל
47 ⁶	ויש / ויש		
Lv. 5 ¹⁷	כי / מח		
Nu. 3 ³⁸	הקדש / הקדש	10 ³⁶	ובתנוחה / ובתנוחה
22 ⁹	חיה / חיה	28 ³	המש / המש
Dt. 2 ⁹	מצר / מצר		

c. Words in identical or similar context

- Gn. 7² (6¹⁹, 7³, 7⁹) איש ואשה / זכר ונקבה
- Ex. 5¹⁰ (conventional formula) ויאמרו / וידברו
- 7⁸ (conv.form.) ויאמר / וידבר 7¹⁴ (conv.form.) ויאמר / וידבר
- 18²⁶ (18²²) ויאמר / וידבר 20²² (conv.form.) ויאמר / וידבר
- 25²⁰ (36¹⁰) איש מן אחיו / אחד מן אחד
- 26^{3,5,6,17} (36¹⁰) אשה מן אחיה / אחד מן אחד
- 26⁴ (later in verse) ויאמר / וידבר 30³⁴ (conv.form.) ויאמר / וידבר
- 31¹² (conv.form.) ויאמרו / וידברו 36⁵ (conv.form.) ויאמר / וידבר
- 37⁹ (36¹⁰) איש מן אחיו / אחד מן אחד
- Lv. 5² (5^{1,3,4,5}) יאשם / יקטל 5⁵ (later in verse) אשר / כי
- 5⁷ (5¹¹) יעשה / יעשה 17⁸ (17⁹) הונע / הונק 13³² (13³⁴) גניע / גשיג
- Nu. 24¹⁰ (22^{28,32,33}) ויאמר / וידבר 26¹ (conv.form.) ויאמר / וידבר
- 27⁶ (conv.form.) ויאמר / וידבר 27¹² (conv.form.) ויאמר / וידבר
- 29⁴ (28^{21,29}) ואל / או 30⁹ (30⁷) אחד / עשרון
- 35¹⁸ (35^{16,17}) או / ואם
- Dt. 5^{18a} (Ex. 20¹⁷) צרר / קט 16¹⁸ (Ex. 3⁶) אלוה / אחד

d. Words which do not belong to any of the above types

- Gn. 19¹² או טוב / וטוב 24⁵⁰ הנשים / הנצחיים
- 24⁶⁰ ונחיו / ורעהו 26³¹ שנחיו / מיביו
- 31³³ חרין / המדיני 36³⁵ האמה / השפחה
- 42²² חצרים / מרץ חצרים 45²³ אמרתי / דברתי
- Ex. 1¹⁸ היצד / הנער 2¹⁰ מצד חצרים / פרעה
- 7²⁶ ודבר / ואמר 9¹ ודבר / ואמר
- 16²⁹ וכ / או כ 22⁹ השביעי / השבת
- 22²⁶ מצ / ירך 26³⁵ מני / מנכי
- 27¹⁵ ויתן / וישם 40²² וצכף / וצפח

d. (contd)

Lv.2 ²	חשם / חמנה	8 ⁹	וישם / ויתן
8 ¹⁸	ויקרב / ויגש	12 ⁷	או צנקה / וצנקה
14 ⁴⁴	כשה / כרח	14 ⁴⁸	כשה / כרח
20 ²	אמר / אדבר	20 ²⁷	כי / אשר
21 ¹⁷	צהקריב / צהגיש	22 ²⁸	או שה / ושה
26 ²⁴	אף / גם	25 ^{25,35}	יחיד / יחד
25 ³⁹	יחיד / יחד		
Nu.20 ¹⁷	באר / בור	20 ¹⁷	נטה / נסור
22 ¹⁸	וזהב / או זהב	23 ³⁰	אמר / דבר
24 ¹³	וזהב / או זהב	24 ¹⁸	שעיר / עשן
26 ²⁷	הזבולני / זבולן	27 ⁸	והעברתם / ונאמרו
Dt.1 ³⁶	אשר / כי	2 ¹⁷	וידבר / ויאמר
6 ¹⁵	יחרה / יחר	11 ⁸	עברים / באים
12 ²¹	צשום / צשכן	14 ²⁴	צשום / צשכן
21 ²	ושפטיך / ושטריך	21 ²⁰	זקני / אנשי
24 ³	האיש / בעלה	28 ²⁹	אך / רק
31 ²¹	הארץ / האדמה	32 ¹⁴	חלב / חמל
32 ³⁹	ואני / ואנכי	33 ²⁰	אף / וגם

Variations in Divine Name

Gn.7 ¹	אֱלֹהִים / יהוה	9 ⁹	אֱלֹהִים / יהוה	14 ²²	האֱלֹהִים / יהוה
20 ¹⁸	אֱלֹהִים / יהוה	28 ⁴	אֱלֹהִים / יהוה	31 ⁷	אֱלֹהִים / יהוה
31 ⁹	אֱלֹהִים / יהוה	31 ¹⁶	אֱלֹהִים / יהוה		

Variations in Divine Name(contd)

Ex. 3 ⁴	מִצְהִיִּם / יְהוָה	6 ²	יְהוָה / מִצְהִיִּם
9 ³⁰	יְהוָה / מִצְהִיִּם	10 ²	יְהוָה / יְהוָה מִצְהִיִּכֶם
13 ⁵	יְהוָה / מִצְהִיִּךְ	13 ¹¹	יְהוָה / מִצְהִיִּךְ
15 ¹⁷	יְהוָה / מִדְּנִי	22 ⁸	הַמִּצְהִיִּם / יְהוָה
Nu. 10 ^{10a}	יְהוָה / מִצְהִיִּכֶם	23 ³	יְהוָה / מִצְהִיִּם
23 ²⁶	יְהוָה / הַמִּצְהִיִּם		
Dt. 1 ⁴¹	יְהוָה / יְהוָה מִצְהִיִּנוּ	1 ⁴³	יְהוָה / יְהוָה מִצְהִיִּכֶם
3 ²¹	יְהוָה / יְהוָה מִצְהִיִּכֶם	6 ¹²	יְהוָה / יְהוָה מִצְהִיִּךְ
6 ¹⁸	יְהוָה / יְהוָה מִצְהִיִּךְ	9 ⁵	יְהוָה / יְהוָה מִצְהִיִּךְ
10 ¹³	יְהוָה / יְהוָה מִצְהִיִּךְ	14 ²	יְהוָה / יְהוָה מִצְהִיִּךְ
15 ⁴	יְהוָה / יְהוָה מִצְהִיִּךְ	16 ²	יְהוָה / יְהוָה מִצְהִיִּךְ
16 ¹⁵	יְהוָה / יְהוָה מִצְהִיִּךְ	17 ¹⁰	יְהוָה / יְהוָה מִצְהִיִּךְ
18 ¹²	יְהוָה / יְהוָה מִצְהִיִּךְ	23 ²⁴	יְהוָה / יְהוָה מִצְהִיִּךְ
28 ⁵⁹	יְהוָה / מִצְהִיִּם	30 ⁸	יְהוָה / יְהוָה מִצְהִיִּךְ

(ii). Uncommon Words.b. Late

Gn. 12 ²	וְהָיָה / וְהָיָה	14 ¹⁴	וְהָיָה / וְהָיָה
17 ¹	וְהָיָה / וְהָיָה	18 ²¹	הַכְּצַקְלָה / הַכְּצַקְלָה
24 ⁶⁰	הָיָה / הָיָה	27 ²⁹	הָיָה / הָיָה
34 ³¹	הַכְּצַקְלָה / הַכְּצַקְלָה		
Ex. 18 ¹⁹	וְהָיָה / וְהָיָה	24 ¹²	וְהָיָה / וְהָיָה
34 ²	וְהָיָה / וְהָיָה		

Cf. PETER MANN, p. 149.

Appendix A.c. Words suggesting misreading, miswriting or mishearing in S T or M T.

Ex.18¹⁹ 75'נין / 75'נין
 Nu.24¹⁴ 75'נין / 75'נין
 Dt.4³² 75'נין / 75'נין 30³ 75'נין / 75'נין
 32²⁰ 75'נין / 75'נין

d. Words in identical or similar context.

Ex.7²²(7¹¹) 83'נין / 83'נין
 8^{3,14}(7¹¹) 83'נין / 83'נין

(2) Synonyms giving greater precision or emphasis(i) Common Wordsb. Words suggesting misreading, miswriting or mishearing in S T or M T.

Ex.4² 75'נין / 75'נין 12²² 3'נין / 3'נין
 23⁸ 3'נין / 3'נין
 Lv.10⁶ 3'נין / 3'נין

c. Words in identical or similar context.

Gn.39⁸(39⁶) 75'נין / 75'נין
 Ex.18¹²(17⁵) 75'נין / 75'נין
 Nu.3⁹(3¹², 8¹⁶) 75'נין / 75'נין
 35²⁵(35²⁴) 75'נין / 75'נין

d. Words which do not belong to any of the above types.

Gn.26⁸ ו' כי / ויהי כאשר
 Ex.15²⁷ / מנח / הנה 32³¹ / ושמ / ובמים
 34¹⁸ / בחדש המזב / ב
 Lv.5¹¹ / ישים / יצק
 Nu.11²³ / ענה / מה
 Dt.2³⁶ / מהם / הם 31¹³ / בפנינו / בידנו

ii. Additions(1) Pure Synonyms(i) Common Wordsa. Stylistic supplements in S T(a) Explicit subjects or objects

Gn.14¹⁹ / יצוק / מברקם 18¹⁹ / ויברקו / יברך / מה מברקם
 21³⁰ / ויטע / מברקם 21³³ / ו' / וימחר / מברקם
 29²³ / מהו / מלכים 35⁹ / מ' / מלכה / יעקב
 36¹⁹ / מ' / מלכיהם / עשו
 Ex.2³ / ע' / עציו / בת כרעה 2⁶ / 3' / 3 / מהו
 5¹³ / ה' / השביע / יוסף 13¹⁹ / ממים / מצוים / געם
 15²⁵ / 3 / 3 / חזנה 38³⁰ / ו' / ויצעק / חשה
 Lv.5⁸ / ע' / עציה / הקהן 12⁷ / ו' / ומצק / הקהן
 14³⁷ / ו' / ורמה / הקהן
 Nu.27³ / ה' / מה / מבין
 Dt.14²³ / יבחר / בחר / יהוה / מלך

(b) Words in apposition

Gn.21 ⁸	י / יצחק בנו	24 ¹⁴	אדני / אדני מברקם
24 ²⁷	אדני / אדני מברקם	25 ⁵	צ' / צ' יצחק בנו
26 ⁵	מברקם / מברקם מביך	28 ⁴	מברקם / מברקם מביך
38 ¹³	צ' / צ' גמר כצלו	39 ⁴	בעיניו / בעיני אדניו
47 ³	אחיו / אחי יוסף	48 ⁷	רי / רחל אחך
Ex.7 ⁵	ב' י / עמי בני ישראל		

(c) Additional Waw ("and")

Gn.1 ²⁶	וכדמונתו	3 ¹⁶	ומצ
6 ⁴	וקנצים	6 ⁹	וממים
6 ¹⁵	וקמשים	6 ¹⁹	ומכל הדבר
6 ²⁰	ומכצ אשר (ומצ רמש דמ.)	7 ³	וגם
8 ¹⁷	וכל	8 ¹⁹	וכל דחיה ... וכל הדמש
8 ¹⁹	וכל הרמש	9 ⁵	ומחיו
9 ⁷	ושרצו	9 ¹⁰	ובגמחה
12 ¹⁹	וצמה	14 ¹	ומריוך
14 ²	ושנמב	17 ⁴	ומני
17 ¹⁶	ומצכי	17 ¹⁹	וצזרעו
18 ⁵	ומחר	20 ¹⁴	ומצן
21 ²³	וכחסף	24 ²¹	ומחריש
24 ²⁵	וגם	24 ⁵⁵	ומחר
27 ³³	וגם	30 ⁸	וגם
30 ³⁴	וקן	31 ¹³	ומשר ... ועגה
31 ³⁶	ומה	31 ³⁷	וכי
32 ⁶	ומצן	32 ²⁰	וגם ... וגם
33 ⁹	ויהי	34 ²⁷	ובני


(c) Additional Waw("and") (contd)

Gn. 34 ²⁸	וְאֵת זָנוֹס	35 ²⁴	וּבְנֵי
36 ¹⁰	וּמִצֵּק	36 ¹¹	וּזְכוּ
36 ²⁰	וּמִצֵּק	36 ²³	וּשְׁכוּ
36 ²⁷	וּמִצֵּק	36 ²⁸	וּמִצֵּק
37 ¹⁴	וּרְמֵה	37 ²⁷	וּבְשָׂרָו
39 ¹⁰	יוֹם וַיּוֹם	41 ¹⁷	וּהַנְּנִי
41 ²⁰	וּהַגְּרִימָה	41 ²³	וּשְׁדִיפָה
41 ²⁷	וּשְׁדִיפָה	41 ³¹	וּמִחֲרֵי
41 ³⁴	וַיַּעַשׂ (יַעֲשֶׂה דָמ)	41 ⁵⁵	וּמִשָּׁר
42 ⁶	וּהָוָה	42 ¹⁹	וּהַבִּימָה
42 ³²	וּהַמֶּחֶד	43 ¹³	וּשְׁוֹבֵי
43 ¹⁶	וְאֵת בְּנֵימִים	44 ¹⁶	וְאֵת --- וְהַמִּלְחָמָה
45 ¹⁷	וּבְנֵי	46 ¹⁶	וּשְׁוֹנֵי
49 ³¹	וּשְׁמֵ קִבְרוֹ (שְׁמֵה דָמ)	50 ²⁰	וְהַמִּלְחָמָה (מִלְחָמָה דָמ)
Ex. 1 ²	וּשְׁמֵעוֹן וְצִי	1 ³	וַיִּשְׁכַּר וְזִבְזֹן
2 ²⁴	וְאֵת יַעֲקֹב	3 ⁶	וְהַמִּלְחָמָה יַעֲקֹב
3 ¹⁵	וְהַמִּלְחָמָה יַעֲקֹב	3 ¹⁶	וַיַּעֲקֹב
4 ⁵	וְהַמִּלְחָמָה יַעֲקֹב	5 ²²	וְצִמָּה זֶה
6 ³	וְהַמִּלְחָמָה יַעֲקֹב	6 ¹⁴	וְהַמִּלְחָמָה
6 ¹⁷	וּבְנֵי	7 ⁹	וַיְהִי
7 ¹⁹	וְעַל יַמֵּי הַיָּם	8 ^{1a}	וְעַל הַיָּמִים
8 ⁹	וּמִן הַמִּצְרָיִם	8 ²⁰	וּמִשְׁחָה
8 ²⁵	וּמִעֲבָדִין	8 ²⁷	וּמִעֲבָדִין

(c) (contd)

Ex. 9 ³	ובחמרים ובגמלים	9 ²⁵	ועד
9 ²⁹	וקולות	10 ¹²	ומה כל פרי
11 ¹	ומחרי	11 ^{3b}	וגם
11 ⁵	ועד	12 ¹⁵	ועד
12 ²⁹	ועד	13 ⁴	ומהם
15 ¹⁴	וירגזו (ירגזון מ)	16 ⁵	יום ויום
17 ²	ומה גוסס	17 ¹⁰	ומהרן
17 ¹⁶	ועד	18 ¹³	ועד
18 ¹⁴	ועד	18 ²¹	ושרי חמול
20 ^{17a}	ולכן מחמד	21 ¹⁰	ומה
21 ³⁷	וכי	22 ⁴	וכי
22 ⁶	וכי	22 ⁷	ומה כל יחש
22 ⁹	וכי	22 ¹²	ולכן שנים
22 ¹⁴	ומה	22 ¹⁶	ומה
22 ²⁹	ולכן	22 ²⁹	וביום
23 ¹¹	ולכן	23 ²³	וקחוי
23 ²⁶	ולכן	25 ⁶	ושמן
25 ⁶	ושמן... ובשמים	25 ⁷	ומהני שהם
25 ³⁹	ומה כל	26 ³	ומה ש
27 ⁸	וכן	27 ¹⁶	ועמודיהם
28 ⁶	ומה צעל	30 ³²	וקדש יקיה
31 ⁴	ולכן שש	32 ³⁴	וקנה


(c) (contd)

Ex. 33 ²	והאמרי... וזהו	34 ³	וגם קצתן
34 ²⁰	וכך בכור	35 ¹¹	ומה מהלכו... ומה בריחין
35 ¹²	ומה הכפרה	35 ¹⁶	ומה בדין
35 ¹⁷	ומה עמדין	35 ¹⁹	ומה בגדי
35 ²⁴	וכך מרים	35 ²⁵	ומה הגולעל
35 ²⁹	וכך	35 ³¹	ובגלגל
35 ³⁵	ובגולעל	36 ¹¹	וכן
38 ³	ומה הסירה... ומה המזלג	39 ³⁶	ומה כן
39 ³⁷	ומה נרתיק	39 ³⁹	ומה בדין
39 ⁴⁰	ומה עמדיק	39 ⁴¹	ומה בגדי
Lv. 1 ⁸	ומה קדוש	1 ¹⁷	מזל
7 ³⁷	וזל מנחה	8 ³⁰	ועל בגדין
8 ³⁰	ומה בגדין	11 ⁹	ומה זה
11 ¹²	וכך	11 ¹⁵	ומה
11 ¹⁹	והמנפה... ומה הדג' פה	11 ²⁰	וכך
13 ⁹	וגל	14 ⁶	ומה הפסוק
16 ⁴	וכימנה	18 ¹⁴	ומה
19 ¹³	וזל מלכין		
19 ¹⁹	ושדך	19 ²⁶	וזל מנחשו
19 ²⁷	וזל מקיפו	21 ¹⁴	וזונה
22 ²¹	וכך	23 ⁴	ומה
23 ⁸	וזביו	23 ³¹	וכך מלמכה

(c) (contd)

lv.23 ³⁶	וביום	23 ³⁶	וכז	
25 ²⁵	וכי	25 ⁴⁷	ואליושב	25 ⁵ ואת ספיח
27 ¹⁷	ואם	27 ³⁰	ואמרי	
Nu.2 ⁷	ואטה	3 ²²	ופקדיוהם	בהספר
3 ²⁵	ואמכסוק	4 ¹⁹	וזאת	
4 ²³	ועד	4 ³⁶	ושבע	
5 ¹⁰	ואיש אשר	7 ¹⁶	ושעיר	
7 ²²	ושעיר	7 ²⁸	ושעיר	7 ³⁴ ושעיר
7 ⁴⁰	ושעיר	7 ⁴⁶	ושעיר	7 ⁵² ושעיר
7 ⁵⁸	ושעיר	7 ⁶⁴	ושעיר	7 ⁷⁰ ושעיר
7 ⁷⁶	ושעיר	7 ⁸²	ושעיר	7 ²⁵ וקרבנו
7 ³¹	וקרבנו	7 ³⁷	וקרבנו	7 ⁴³ וקרבנו
7 ⁴⁹	וקרבנו	7 ⁵⁵	וקרבנו	7 ⁶¹ וקרבנו
7 ⁶⁷	וקרבנו	7 ⁷³	וקרבנו	7 ⁷⁹ וקרבנו
8 ⁴	ועד פרחיה	11 ¹⁵	ואם חמאתי	
12 ⁶	ובחלום	13 ²⁸	וגדליו	
14 ¹⁸	ועל שלשים	19 ²	ואשר צל עלה	
19 ¹²	ואהר (איהר דא)	19 ¹⁴	וזאת	
19 ¹⁵	ופתיו	21 ¹⁸	ובחשנותם	
22 ⁵	והנה כסה	22 ¹¹	ועלה	
22 ¹²	וצלח אחר	23 ²⁵	וגם ברך	
24 ⁵	ואשכנתיו	24 ¹⁴	ואעיוץ	
26 ⁵	ובני	26 ³⁰	וחלק (חלק דא)	
26 ³⁵	ואלה	26 ⁴²	ואלה	
26 ⁵¹	ושבע	26 ⁵⁸	ואשפחה	3° 4° 5° 6°

(c) (contd)

Nu.27 ²⁰	וּצְמִיחַ	28 ²¹	וּצְמִיחַ עֶשְׂרִין
28 ²⁷	וּצְמִיחַ	28 ²⁸	וּצְמִיחַ
28 ²⁹	וּצְמִיחַ עֶשְׂרִין	28 ³⁰	וּצְמִיחַ
29 ³	וּצְמִיחַ	29 ⁷	וּצְמִיחַ
29 ⁹	וּצְמִיחַ	29 ¹⁰	וּצְמִיחַ עֶשְׂרִין
29 ¹¹	וּצְמִיחַ	29 ¹⁴	וּצְמִיחַ
29 ¹⁶	וּצְמִיחַ	29 ²⁴	וּצְמִיחַ
29 ²⁵	וּצְמִיחַ	29 ³¹	וּצְמִיחַ
29 ³⁴	וּצְמִיחַ	29 ³⁵	וּצְמִיחַ
29 ³⁷	וּצְמִיחַ	30 ¹⁷	וּצְמִיחַ
31 ²	וּצְמִיחַ	31 ²²	וּצְמִיחַ
31 ³⁰	{ וּצְמִיחַ 3° 4° וּצְמִיחַ	31 ⁴³	וּצְמִיחַ
31 ⁵²	וּצְמִיחַ	32 ⁵	וּצְמִיחַ
32 ²⁶	וּצְמִיחַ וּצְמִיחַ	34 ⁸	וּצְמִיחַ
Dt.1 ²⁸	וּצְמִיחַ	1 ²⁸	וּצְמִיחַ
2 ¹³	וּצְמִיחַ	3 ⁸	וּצְמִיחַ
3 ¹⁴	וּצְמִיחַ	4 ³⁷	וּצְמִיחַ
5 ⁵	וּצְמִיחַ	5 ⁸	וּצְמִיחַ
6 ²⁴	וּצְמִיחַ (וּצְמִיחַ דַּמ)	7 ⁶	וּצְמִיחַ
		9 ⁷	וּצְמִיחַ
10 ¹⁰	וּצְמִיחַ	10 ¹³	וּצְמִיחַ
10 ¹⁷	וּצְמִיחַ	10 ²⁰	וּצְמִיחַ
11 ¹	וּצְמִיחַ	11 ²	וּצְמִיחַ

3° 4° 5°

(c) (contd)

Dt.11 ²⁴	ואן הנדר	14 ⁴	ושק
14 ⁴	וזמל	14 ⁹	ומל
14 ¹⁶	ומל הכוס	15 ¹⁸	וזל
16 ⁵	וזל	16 ¹⁹	וזל מכיר
17 ⁸	ובין דין	17 ¹¹	וזל
18 ⁸	ועל	19 ¹⁶	וכי
20 ¹	ועם	20 ⁴	וזל הושיע
20 ¹⁷	והכנעני... וקהליו	21 ³	ומשר זל משכה
21 ¹⁷	וזל משפט	23 ⁸	זל מתעב
28 ¹	וזל עשות	28 ²⁰	ומל קהלומה
28 ³⁷	וזל משל	28 ⁵¹	וגירש
29 ¹⁰	וזל שיכס	29 ¹⁰	ועד
29 ²³	מה חרי	31 ³	ויהושע
31 ¹⁹	ושימה	32 ²	וזל
32 ³	וקבו	32 ¹⁰	ויבנהו ויצרנהו
32 ¹¹	{ ועל גודליו ויקחה	32 ¹⁶	וזל מעב
32 ²⁰	ומלמה	32 ²³	וחצי
32 ²⁵	וינק	32 ²⁹	{ זל וישכרו ויבינו
32 ³⁸	וישמו	32 ⁴⁶	וזל עשות
33 ³	וכל	33 ⁸	וגריבהו
33 ¹²	וזל בנימים	33 ¹⁹	ושם
33 ²²	ויזנק	33 ²³	ורצון
33 ²⁴	ויהי	33 ²⁸	ומל

(13) (מ)

b. Words suggesting misreading, miswriting, or mishearing in S T or M T.

Gn.42²⁸ הנה הוא / הנה
 Ex.7¹⁵ הנה הוא / הנה 8¹⁶ הנה הוא / הנה
 Lv.22¹⁸ הגר הגר / הגר

c. Words in identical or similar context

Gn.20³ (21^{11,25}) עז מדויג / ע'
 24⁴ (24³⁸) כי אם / כ'
 Ex.26¹⁶ (identical context) הקדש האחד / הקדש
 32⁷ (conv.form.) חשה צמר / ח'
 33¹ (conv.form.) חשה צמר / ח'
 35²¹ (identical context) וכז איש / ו'
 36²¹ (identical context) הקדש האחד / הקדש
 Lv.1⁹ (1¹³, 1¹⁷) עזה היא / ע'
 23⁵ (Nu.28¹⁶) עשר יום / ע'
 Nu.5⁶ (Ex.16¹², Lv.4²) ישראל צמר / י'
 8¹⁵ (8^{22,24}) אמ עבד / א'
 10¹⁸ (10^{14,22,25}) בני ראובן / ר'
 Dt.16⁶ (12¹¹) שם שם / שם
 22¹⁷ (22¹⁴) הוא זה / ה'

d. Words which do not belong to any of the above types.

Gn.3³ הזק אשר / ה' 6²⁰ ואכל אשר / ו'
 14¹⁰ ועמרה / ואכל עמרה / א'
 38³⁰ ואחר / ואחר 39⁴ וכז אשר / ו'
 19⁹ וישפט גם / ו' 37³³ כינת בני היא / כנת ב'

Appendix A.

d.(contd)

Ex.3 ¹⁶	ח' / מאת בני ישראל	5 ²⁰	י' / בני ישראל
6 ²⁷	י' / בני ישראל	9 ⁷	חמזרים / מארץ חמזרים
10 ²⁸	ח' / מארץ חמזרים	11 ⁴	י' / בני ישראל
12 ³	י' / בני ישראל	12 ³	י' / יצאגם בו
12 ⁶	י' / יצאגם בו	13 ³	ב' / באגם אשר
13 ³	חמזרים / מארץ חמזרים	13 ²⁰	ה' / הדרך אשר
14 ¹²	ח' / חדל נח	18 ²⁰	ש' / אחד שנים
22 ³	ש' / אחד שנים	22 ⁶	א' / כי אם
22 ⁸	ש' / אחד שנים	24 ⁴	ה' / היריעות תהיינה
24 ⁵	כ' / פרים בניבקר	26 ³	י' / והקטרת מאגם
28 ¹²	ז' / זכרון הנה	29 ²⁵	ז' / רעה היא
Lv.4 ²⁸	ח' / קטח עזיה	Lv.5 ²⁴	ח' / מכל דבר
Ex.36 ⁸	ה' / החשכן עשו	Lv.11 ³⁶	חמזרים / מארץ חמזרים
Lv.17 ⁶	י' / יהוה אשר	Lv.21 ¹⁸	י' / יוספו עוד
Nu.23 ²⁶	כ' / כל הדבר	26 ¹²	חמזרים / בארץ חמזרים
26 ⁵⁸	ז' / בני צוי	28 ¹⁴	י' / ועל פי
33 ⁵⁶	ז' / צהם כן	25 ³	ה' / הגורה אשר
Dt.16 ²⁰	כ' / ודיה כי	15 ¹²	י' / יוספו עוד
14 ¹⁹	ג' / גמסכו חקם	16 ¹²	חמזרים / בארץ חמזרים
17 ⁶	א' / או על פי	17 ¹¹	י' / ועל פי
22 ¹⁸	ע' / עור חו	24 ⁸	ה' / הגורה אשר
24 ¹¹	ב' / בו הוא		

(2) Synonyms giving greater precision or emphasis

(i) Common Words

a. Record of events implied but not explicitly recorded
in M T

Gn. 30^{37a} = 31¹¹⁻¹³

Ex. 7^{18b} = 7¹⁶⁻¹⁸

7^{29b} = 7²⁶⁻²⁹

8^{1b} in S T add

וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל מֶלֶךְ מִצְרָיִם נָטָה אֶת יָדְךָ בְּמִסְכֵּךְ
וְתַעַצְרָם הַצִּפְרֹדֶעַ עַל מַדְבַּח מִצְרַיִם

Ex. 8^{19b} = 8¹⁶(part), 17, 18, 19(part)

95b = 92-5

9^{19b} = 9^{1.3-19}

$$10^{2b} = 10^{3-6}$$

11^{3b} = 11^{4-7, 3(part)}

$$\text{Nu. } 31^{21a} = 31^{21,22,23,24}$$

c. Words in identical or similar context

ה' / קחיה אשר אתכם $(9^{12}) 9^{15}$ צהבוי צ/צהמיר על המרץ וצהבוי צ $(1^{15}) 1^{14}$ Gn.

העיר / העיר ונאם המגדל $11^8(11^4)$ נ' / נכרדו נ"י $10^{32}(10^5)$

$12^{20}(13^1)$ ימין $13 / 3$ $20^{13}(12^1)$ מ'מאן $13 / 3$

$$21^{13}(21^{18}) \quad 3_{172} \quad 1_{123} \quad / \quad '3 \quad 22^{16}(22^{12}) \quad 1_{100} \quad 7_{71} \quad / \quad '4$$

$^{238}_{92}\text{U}$ ($^{235}_{92}\text{U}$) יסוד הכחמי / 4 $^{241}_{94}\text{Pu}$ ($^{244}_{94}\text{Pu}$) 123 סדר 3 / 3

נ' / נח מעט מים חכוד (24⁴³) 24⁴⁵ מ' / משקל וישם צל נפה (24⁴⁷) 24²²

27³⁴(27³⁰) / ו' יהי כאשר 41³⁵(41^{29,30,36}) / ה' הנכבד שבנו

48⁷ (all other occurrences) 07N 172h / 172h

c. (contd.)

ומגלגל/ומגלגל ומעבדך ומעמך $8^5(8^7)$ ה' / חרטמי חצרים Ex. $8^3(7^{22})$
 הזמא/הזמא בחוש הזה $12^{25}(13^5)$ י' / ידך בחטך $8^{12}(8^{1a,13})$
 ו' / והגלגל מה הדר $19^{12}(19^{23})$ ב' / בכרעה ובכל חילו $14^{18}(14^{17})$
 נ' / מאך בהר $25^9(25^{40})$ ח' / חשה מן הדר $19^{25}(19^{14})$
 ש' / שש נחשת $27^{14}(27^{11})$ ע' / עשרה נחשת $27^{12}(27^{11})$
 ע' / עשרה מאה $27^{15}(27^{14})$ ש' / שש נחשת $27^{15}(27^{11})$
 ש' / שש חשבון זהב ושג' $28^{23}(28^{11})$ נ' / נרבעה נחשת $27^{16}(27^{11})$
 ז' / זכני יהוה כהן $29^{10}(29^{42})$ ו' / וישפה מוסבא $28^{20}(28^{11})$
 ז' / זקרישי זצ $36^{32}(26^{27})$ אמיד/אמיד עלל אמיד $29^{38}(29^{42})$
 (bis) פ' / כעמון זהב $39^{26}(28^{34})$
 ס' / סמים זכני יהוה $40^{27}(40^{23,25})$
 ש' / שם זכני $40^{29}(40^6)$

ה' / הצמן עצה $1^{10}(1^3)$ י' / יקריבנו מז כהן מהז $1^{10}(1^3)$ Lv. $1^{10}(1^3)$
 האש/האש אשר על המזבח $3^5(1^{8,12})$ ז' / מועד יקריב מאו $2^1(2^{6,15})$
 פ' / פעמים במעבדו $4^6(4^{16})$ נ' / ניוח זיהוה $3^{16}(3^5)$
 ו' / וזה מן הדם $4^{17}(4^6)$ ב' / בקר תמים $4^{14}(3^{23})$
 ה' / מזבח קטרת הסמים $4^{18}(4^{25})$ פ' / פרכת הקדש $4^{17}(4^6)$
 ב' / במקום אשר ישחטו מא $4^{29}(4^{24,33})$ 7^2
 ח' / מזבח העצה $4^{34}(4^{25})$ ח' / מזבח העצה $4^{30}(4^{25})$
 ה' / המזבח אשר $6^8(11^2)$ חטט מאו/עז חטט מאו $5^6(4^{35}, 5^{10})$
 ח' / מאשי יהוה $6^{10}(6^{11})$ חטט ונסבב 13
 הקרב/הקרב ומא כז החלב אשר על הקרב $7^3(3^3, 9^8)$ 4^8

הכנת ומא חעיל / הכינת ומגרתה מאו מבניט
 המכד ומא המכד / והזבש מאו מאו המעיל ונמגה
 עזיו מא המכד

Ex. 29^5 (Lv. 8^7)

c. (contd)

- Lv.8³¹(Ex.29³¹) ח' / מועד במקום הקדש
 וצבני / וצבניך וצבניך 10¹⁵(10¹⁴) ז' / צוה יהוה את 9²¹(9¹⁰,8⁹)
 ו' / וקשקש במים 11¹⁰(11⁹) שסע / שסע שגוי 11³(Dt.14⁶)
 י' / יהוה מלכיכם 11⁴⁵(11⁴⁴) ב' / בגדיו ורחץ במים 11²⁵(15^{7,8})
 ה' / גמיהם בני שנה 14¹⁰(following phrase)
 ה' / הביאו צנשו אתו עצה מן שמים ליהוה לרצונכם צריח 17⁴(17^{5,6})
 נוח וישחטו בחוץ ואלה מועד צה הביאו 23¹⁷(24⁵) ש' / שגים חצול
 ש' / שרץ טמא 22⁵(5²) ש' / שגים חצול 23¹⁸(earlier in verse)
 ו' / וחי מחיך 25³⁵(25³⁶) מ' / מהרן ובניו 24³(Ex.27²¹)
 ישראל / ישראל כד וייהם קדיו 3¹²(3^{46,48}) אחד / אחד צחטה אחד צחטה Nu.1⁴⁴(1⁴)
 ע' / עציהם כסוי 4⁸(4^{6,14})
 ופשע / ופשע וחטאה 14¹⁸(Ex.34⁶) ה' / חסד ואמת 14¹⁸(Ex.34⁶)
 מ' / מחזא נחזה 27⁴(27⁷)
 ח' / חשה צמח 27¹²(customary formula)
 מ' / אחד צחטה 28³⁰(28¹⁵) ו' / ושעיר עזים 28²²(28^{15,30})
 י' / יהיו לכם 29¹³(28³¹) ש' / שנה גמיהם יהיו לכם 28²⁷(28³¹)
 כ' / כבשים ונסכיהם 29¹⁵(29¹⁶)
 ו' / ושעיר עזים 29^{22,28,31,34,38}(29¹⁶)
 ק' / קומו סעו 2¹³(2²⁴) ח' / חמרצם ירשה Dt.2⁵(2⁹)
 ס' / סיון חצך חשבון האמרי 2³¹(2²⁴)
 מ' / מאכלם היום 4²(13⁹) ע' / עץ שפת 3¹²(2³⁶, 4⁴⁸)

c. (contd)

הערבה/ הערבה ים המלח $4^{49}(3^{17})$ נ' / מלחים היום $4^{33}(5^{26})$
 מ' / מפורך היום $6^2(13^{19})$ ה' / האש חשך $5^{19}(Dt.4^{11})$
 צמחתי/ צמחתי צמחהם צמחתי וצמחתי $8^{18}(9^5)$
 מ' / יתגבר מסכת $9^{12}(9^{16} Ex.32^{4,8})$
 ה' / היפאח חמורים $9^{29}(9^{26}, Ex.32^{11})$
 צמח צמח בשם יהוה/ צמח צמח צמח יהוה $18^5(10^8)$
 וצמחתי/ וצמחתי וצמחתי $12^{11}(12^6)$ נ' / מחכים היום $11^{22}(13^{19})$
 מ' / מפורך הים $12^{28}(13^{19})$ ש' / שמור ושמע $12^{28}(6^3)$
 מ' / מפורך היום $13^1(13^{19})$
 בכוס/ הכוס ומה השל $14^{16}(Lv.11^{17})$ וצמחתי/ וצמחתי וצמחתי $14^8(Lv.11^7)$
 ע' / עצב כסא $17^{20}(17^{18})$ מ' / מחמח עבדה $16^8(Lv.23^7)$
 ו' / והיה הבן $25^6(21^{15})$
 מ' / מדמחן ופרי בהמחן $28^{18}(28^4)$ צ' / צמח קדש $27^9(28^9)$
 נ' / נשגחתי צמחתי $34^4(30^{20})$

d. Words which do not belong to any of the above types

Gn. 2¹² ט' / טוב מאד 2¹⁹ מִצְהִיף עוֹד / מ' מִצְהִיף עוֹד

7² שְׁמַיִם / שְׁמַיִם הַטְּהוֹר 7³ שָׁנִים / שָׁנִים שְׁנִים 7¹⁶ זָכַר וְנִקְבָּה / זָכַר וְנִקְבָּה זָכַר וְנִקְבָּה

17¹⁴ מ' / מִצְהִיף הַנָּה 17¹⁹ עֶרְוָה / עֶרְוָה בְּיוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי

19¹² הַמָּה / הַמָּה הַמָּה 21¹³ הַמָּה / הַמָּה הַמָּה

30¹⁶ י' / יַעֲקֹב בֶּן 32²¹ א' / אֲבוֹת הַצִּיֹּר

39¹¹ יִמִּינוּ / יִד יִמִּינוּ 48¹⁴ מ' / מִצְהִיף בְּבֵית

48¹⁶ מ' / מִצְהִיף הַשְּׁבִיעִי 50⁵ הַנְּעָרִים / הַנְּעָרִים הַמָּה

d. (contd.)

Ex. 3 ²²	וּשְׁמָהּ מִשֶּׁה / וּשְׁמָהּ מִשֶּׁה	4 ⁶	וּשְׁמָהּ מִשֶּׁה / וּשְׁמָהּ מִשֶּׁה	וּשְׁמָהּ מִשֶּׁה / וּשְׁמָהּ מִשֶּׁה
7 ⁹	מִשֶּׁה / מִשֶּׁה	8 ²⁰	כִּבְדָּהּ מִשֶּׁה / כִּבְדָּהּ מִשֶּׁה	כִּבְדָּהּ מִשֶּׁה / כִּבְדָּהּ מִשֶּׁה
10 ²⁴	מִשֶּׁה / מִשֶּׁה	11 ^{3a}	הַעֲמֵהּ הַזֶּה / הַעֲמֵהּ הַזֶּה	הַעֲמֵהּ הַזֶּה / הַעֲמֵהּ הַזֶּה
12 ¹⁷	וּשְׁמָהּ מִשֶּׁה / וּשְׁמָהּ מִשֶּׁה	13 ¹⁵	בְּכֹרֶם מִשֶּׁה / בְּכֹרֶם מִשֶּׁה	בְּכֹרֶם מִשֶּׁה / בְּכֹרֶם מִשֶּׁה
17 ¹³	עֵינֵי מִשֶּׁה / עֵינֵי מִשֶּׁה	22 ⁴	מִשֶּׁה מִשֶּׁה / מִשֶּׁה מִשֶּׁה	מִשֶּׁה מִשֶּׁה / מִשֶּׁה מִשֶּׁה
23 ⁸	עֵינֵי מִשֶּׁה / עֵינֵי מִשֶּׁה	26 ³⁷	זֶהָב מִשֶּׁה / זֶהָב מִשֶּׁה	זֶהָב מִשֶּׁה / זֶהָב מִשֶּׁה
34 ²⁰	בְּכֹרֶם מִשֶּׁה / בְּכֹרֶם מִשֶּׁה	34 ²⁴	גִּוִּיִּם רַבִּים / גִּוִּיִּם רַבִּים	גִּוִּיִּם רַבִּים / גִּוִּיִּם רַבִּים
35 ²²	טָבַעַת עֲבִיז / טָבַעַת עֲבִיז			

lv.4 ⁵	ה' / המזבח	צפני יהוה	14 ²⁰ ה' / המשיח אשר מצא את ידו
15 ³	ח' / מזובו טמא הוא כז	ימי זב בשרו או החגים בשרו מזובו	
nu.14 ²³	הקהל / הקהל הזה	22 ⁴ צמבם / צמבם לגל זהם	
25 ³	י' / משה ריח	28 ²⁷ י' / מבני ישראל	
29 ¹²	ה' / הוא יניח	30 ⁶ השביעי / השביעי הזה	
ut.9 ²⁸	העם / העם הזה	10 ¹¹ י' / יאמרו עם	
13 ⁷	ה' / הישר והטוב	13 ¹⁹ מחיך / מחיך בן מביך או	
24 ¹	כ' / ככז הגורה	24 ⁸ משה / משה ובא מציה	
31 ²⁰	נ' / נשבעתי צמבתי	31 ²¹ צמבתי / צמבתי צמבתי זהם	
32 ⁹	המשיח / המשיח הזה	22 ¹⁸ ע' / חשך ענן	5 ¹⁹ נ' / נחלן ישראל

Included under this heading: additional 30 in S T

Gn. 14 ¹²	ו' ר' / ומה כל דכשו	20 ⁸	ה' / כל האנשים
32 ²⁴	נ' / כל אשר	39 ²³	ו' / וכל אשר
42 ²¹	ה' / כל הצרה		
Ex. 7 ⁵	ח' / כל מצרים	14 ¹⁸	ח' / כל מצרים
20 ¹⁸	ה' / כל העם	34 ³⁴	נ' / כל אשר
35 ¹⁴	כל'ה / כל כל'ה	40 ³³	ה' / כל המלכה

Lv.4 ²⁷	כֶּזַב / חֲמוֹס	16 ⁴	בָּ / כֶּזַב בָּשָׁרוֹ
20 ⁸	חָ / כֶּזַב חֲקָיו	27 ²⁶	בָּ / כֶּזַב בָּכוֹר
Nu.4 ³²	כֶּזַב / כֶּזַב	30 ⁸	וָ / כֶּזַב נִדְרִיקָה
31 ¹²	עָ / כֶּזַב עֲדָה		
Dt.11 ³²	הָ / כֶּזַב חֲשֵׁכִים	16 ⁸	חָ / כֶּזַב חֲמָכָה
27 ²⁶	דָּ / כֶּזַב דְּבָרִי		


iii. Omissions

(1) Pure Synonyms

(i) Common words

a. Stylistic supplements

(a) Explicit subjects or objects

Gn.5 ³²	וְנָח / וַיִּנָּח	
28 ⁹	עָשָׂה / עָשָׂה יִשְׁמַחְלָה עָשָׂה	Ex.34 ²⁹ בִּיד / בִּיד חֲשָׁה
Ex.34 ³⁵	וְחָשָׁה / וְחָשָׁה	
Lv.5 ¹²	וְהִכְהֵן / וְקִמָּץ	14 ¹⁴ וְהִכְהֵן / וְנָחַן
14 ²⁴	וְהִכְהֵן / וְחָמָם	14 ³¹ וְהִכְהֵן / וְכִפָּר
18 ²⁶	וְחָמָם / וְשִׁמְרָתָם	
Nu.13 ¹⁷	וְחָמָם / וְחָמָם	
Dt.9 ⁵	וְיָהוָה / וְיָהוָה	28 ⁵³ וְיָהוָה / וְיָהוָה

(b) Words in apposition

Gn.34 ⁴	חֲמוֹר / חֲמוֹר	36 ³⁹ חֲמוֹר / חֲמוֹר
Dt.11 ³	חֲמוֹר / חֲמוֹר	

(c) Additional Waw ("and")

Gn. 6 ⁷	ועד עוף	7 ¹³	וחם
7 ²³	ועד עוף	8 ²²	וקר --- וק'ף
9 ⁵	ומ'ד	9 ¹⁸	וחם
9 ¹⁹	וממלכה	10 ²	ומובל --- ומדי
10 ³	ורכב	10 ⁶	וכוס
10 ⁷	וסגה	10 ²³	וגר
10 ³²	וממלכה	11 ²⁷	ומלכה
14 ²³	ומם מקח	19 ¹²	ובנין
31 ³⁸	ומ'זי	34 ¹⁰	וסחרה
34 ²¹	וישב	34 ²⁹	ומה כז אשר בבית
36 ²⁴	ומיה	36 ²⁶	ויגרן
41 ³⁵	ושמרו	43 ¹⁸	וזקחה
44 ²⁰	ומחין	45 ¹⁰	ומצנן
46 ⁹	ומצרן	46 ²⁴	ויצר
47 ²¹	ועד	50 ⁸	ומחין
50 ¹⁵	וקשב		
Ex. 3 ⁸	וקחתי	3 ¹⁷	וקחתי
6 ¹⁶	וקחה	6 ¹⁸	ומכרין
8 ²⁰	ובכז	10 ¹⁷	ומעגירו
12 ¹²	ועד בהמה	12 ²¹	וקחו
13 ¹⁵	ועד בכור	13 ⁵	וקחתי
20 ¹⁰	ובמהלך	20 ^{17a}	ועבדו --- ושורו

(c) (contd)

Ex. 21 ¹	ומלך	21 ⁵	ומ
22 ¹¹	ומ	24 ¹²	וקמסוק
24 ¹⁴	וקנה	25 ³	וכס
25 ⁴	ואכל	25 ³¹	וקנה
26 ¹	ואכל	26 ¹⁶	ומה
26 ²⁴	ויחדו	27 ¹¹	ועמדו
27 ¹⁴	וחמש	28 ⁴	וכתב
28 ²⁰	ושם	30 ²⁷	ומה השלחן
30 ²⁷	ומה השלחן --- ומת המורה	30 ²⁸	ומה מזבח --- ומת הכיר
31 ⁸	ומה השלחן	31 ⁸	{ ומת השלחן --- ומת המורה
31 ⁹	ומת הכיור	31 ¹⁰	{ ומת מזבח --- ומת בגדי
31 ¹¹	ומת שמן	35 ⁵	וכס
35 ⁶	ואכל	35 ¹⁴	ומת מזבח
35 ¹⁵	ומת מזבח	35 ²²	וטבע
36 ⁸	ואכל	36 ²¹	ומתה
36 ²⁹	ויחדו	36 ³⁸	ומת עמודיו
37 ¹⁷	וקנה	38 ²⁵	וחמש
38 ²⁸	וחמש	39 ²⁹	ואכל
39 ³³	ועמדו	39 ³⁸	ומת מזבח
Lv. 3 ⁹	ומת הקרבן	6 ¹⁵	וקנה
7 ¹⁹	וקבש	11 ⁴⁶	ואכל
13 ⁶	ואכל	15 ⁹	וכס הנג
16 ³³	ועל הכהנים	20 ¹⁹	וערו
21 ²	ואכל	26 ⁴³	וביען

(c) (contd)

Nu. 3^{17}	וקדח	3^{38}	ומהרן
4^{34}	וצביא	4^{38}	וצביא
4^{46}	וצביא	16^5	והקריב (יקריב דס)
19^{11}	וטחא	23^{19}	ודבר
23^{20}	וברך (מברך דס)	24^{24}	וענו
26^8	ובני	26^9	ודגן
26^{34}	ופקדיהם (לפקדיהם דס)	26^{36}	ומלה
27^1	וחגלה וחלכה	28^{16}	ובחדש
28^{26}	וביום	34^6	והיה (יהיה דס)
34^{20}	וצמטה	34^{22}	וצמטה
36^{11}	וחגלה וחלכה		
ut. 1^7	ובנבג	1^{12}	ומשנכח
1^{15}	ושרי חאשים	2^{34}	והנשים
3^{16}	ועד יבק	4^{45}	והחקים
5^9	ועל ששים	5^{14}	ועבדך
5^{17}	וצא	5^{18d}	וצא אחמד
5^{28}	והחקים	6^7	ובצכחך... ובשכבך
6^{11}	ובאים	6^{20}	והחקים
7^{11}	ומההחקים	7^{13}	ותירשך
7^{19}	והמחל	8^7	ומהמחל
8^8	ובכן ומחנה	8^{15}	ועקרב
11^3	ומהמחל	11^{13}	וצעבדו
11^{14}	ומירשך	11^{19}	ובצכחך... ובשכבך
12^{12}	ועבדיכם	12^{17}	ומירשך
12^{18}	ועבדך	14^5	ומקו

Appendix A.

(c) (contd)

Dt.14 ¹⁸	והדוכיפת (הדגמת זט)	14 ²⁶	ובין
15 ²	ומהמחל	15 ⁸	והעבט
16 ¹¹	ועבדך	16 ¹⁴	ועבדך
18 ¹⁰	ומנחש ומכשף	18 ¹¹	ושמ
18 ²²	ולא יהיה	19 ¹¹	וכי
19 ²⁰	ולא	21 ¹⁹	ומלך שער
21 ²²	וכי	22 ³	וכן
24 ⁸	ולעשות	26 ¹³	ולגד
26 ¹⁹	ולשם	27 ¹²	ויהודה ... ויוסף
27 ¹³	ולבון	28 ⁵⁶	ולבנה
28 ⁶⁵	ולכין	32 ¹³	ולמלך (למלך הזט)
32 ¹⁵	ולשם	32 ²²	ולמלך
33 ¹⁷	ולדם רבבות	33 ²⁰	ולטרף

d. Words which do not belong to the above type.

Gn.17 ¹	א' שנה / לשנים	27 ³³	א' הוא / אפוא
Ex.3 ¹⁸	ע' ועגה / עצונו	9 ²⁴	בכ' מרץ חצרים / בחצרים
11 ⁶	מרץ חצרים / בחצרים	32 ³	
Lv.4 ³⁵	ה' אהם / הכהן	8 ²⁸	נ' הוא / נוחח
14 ⁴⁴	הוא ב' / בבית	20 ²⁶	כ' קדוש / כי
27 ²⁵	ג' יהיה / גרמ		
Nu.4 ¹⁹	איש איש / איש	23 ¹³	אחר אשר / אחר
26 ¹⁸	בני ג' / גד	28 ²¹	ע' לעשה / עשרון
Dt.14 ⁷	הפרסה השסועה / הפרסה	32 ²⁸	
32 ²⁸	עצוג המה / עצוגם		

(2) Synonyms giving greater precision or emphasis(1) Common wordsc. Words omitted in identical or similar context.Gn. 34¹⁸ (34^{20,24,26}) ש' בן חמור / שכס בנוEx. 21¹⁸ (21²⁰) ו' לפני יהוה / ניחח (29¹⁸) 29²⁵ ר' במבן או במגרף / רעהו35²² (35^{21,23}) כ' איש / כז38²⁵ (38²⁴) ש' בשקל הקדש / שקלLv. 14¹⁶ (4⁶) והקדשם ו' / והייגם (11⁴⁴) 20⁷ ה' במצונו / השמןNu. 23¹⁵ (23³) ה' כה / הגיזבDt. 26¹⁷ (4⁴⁰, 6², 28⁴⁵) ו' ואשפטיו / ואזוליוd. Words which do not belong to any of the above types.Ex. 17³ השור ה' / החי 21³⁵ 3' זה ה' / 3מה העציל26²⁵ ש' א' אחת הקרש / שני מדנים שני
האחד ושני מדנים / מדנים 3קרש
אחת הקרש האחד / האחד27¹⁰ ט' מבן / טורים 28¹⁷ ווי העמדים / ווי הם28²³ שני ק' / קצות 28³³ שג' ה' / הטבעות29² ח' משחים בשמן / מצות30¹³ רחבו רבוע / רחבו 38¹ מחצית ה' / השקל38¹⁰ ווי העמודים / וויהם כסף 38¹⁷ ע' נחשת / עשרים
והשוקיהם כסף / וויהם כסף39⁹ מעיץ האמץ / המעיץ 39²² ר' כפול / רחבו39²⁵ הפעמים / הפעמים באוךLv. 4⁷ ה' וטהר / הערב 17¹⁵ דם הכר / הדם22³¹ בו / בו בערו 13¹⁸ 3' מל הכהן / 3משם 5משם מני יהוה / מהםNu. 26²⁹ ב' כתיב / בשמן 28⁵ ג' 3גלעד / גלעד3⁴ ו' לפני יהוה / ואביהו

d. (contd)

Dt.1³⁵ בם מצחמה / בו 2⁹ נ' צחג / ושבגמי
 4²¹ א' חוך / צח 23¹² וישבע / צ' צצגתי
 24¹⁸ א' צעשוח / חזוך 24²² א' חשם / חצהיך
 28¹⁵ ו' וחיטבך / וירשמה 30⁵ צשחר צעשוח חח / צשחר
 30¹⁵ הדבר הזח / הדבר 22²⁰ צ' היום / צכניך
 1⁸ צ' עציו / צבטח 22¹² צהם וצזרעם / צזרעם
 Included under this heading: additional כ in M P

כז ט' / ט פ מ 34²⁹ כז רואש ע' / הרואש ע"ז Gn. 8¹⁹
כז ע' / עמ"ז 41⁵¹

Ex. 9²⁴ בכך ארץ מ' / במדף מצרים 25⁹ בכך ארץ מצרים / במצרים
11⁶ בכך המקום / במקום 20²⁴ בכך ארץ מצרים / במצרים
35²⁴ בכך אשר / כאשר 39³² בכך מצאכא / מצאכא

lv.11³⁷ כב / זרע

$Nu.1^2$ כז' ה' / הכז'ים 19^{18} כז' ע' / עדה
 כז' ז' / זהב 31^{52} וכז' מסר משל / ומסריה אשר 30^5

26^{26}	כ' / כ' פרי	26^2	כ' / כ' פרי
28^{26}	כ' / כ' פרי	32^{45}	כ' / כ' פרי

2. Differences of vocabulary with divergence in sense

1. Doctrinal

(1) Controversy regarding Gerizim

Ex. 20^{17b} See above, p.109.

עִבְרִי / גְּרִיזִים 27⁴ מִרְהָ / מוֹרָ מוֹלֵךְ שָׁכֵם 11³⁰ See above, p.109. dt.5^{18b}

(2) Other Samaritan beliefs and practices

(i) Majesty of God

Gn. 48¹⁶ 7307 / 74307

Ex.15³ גבור / איש 34²⁸ י / צפני יהודה

(ii) Avoidance of anthropomorphism

Ex.23¹⁷ $\frac{\text{הָאֵלֹהִים} / \text{הָאֵלֹהִים}}{\text{הָאֵלֹהִים} / \text{הָאֵלֹהִים}}$ $\frac{\text{הָאֵלֹהִים} / \text{הָאֵלֹהִים}}{\text{הָאֵלֹהִים} / \text{הָאֵלֹהִים}}$
 34²⁴ $\frac{\text{הָאֵלֹהִים} / \text{הָאֵלֹהִים}}{\text{הָאֵלֹהִים} / \text{הָאֵלֹהִים}}$ $\frac{\text{הָאֵלֹהִים} / \text{הָאֵלֹהִים}}{\text{הָאֵלֹהִים} / \text{הָאֵלֹהִים}}$

(iii) Day of Vengeance and Recompense

Dt.32³⁵ $\frac{\text{יָמֵינוּ}}{\text{יָמֵינוּ}}$ $\frac{\text{יָמֵינוּ}}{\text{יָמֵינוּ}}$

(1V) Legal enactments

Ex.21²⁸ $\frac{\text{וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁמָר הַחֹרֶף}}{\text{וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁמָר הַחֹרֶף}}$ $\frac{\text{וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁמָר הַחֹרֶף}}{\text{וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁמָר הַחֹרֶף}}$
 21³⁵ $\frac{\text{וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁמָר הַחֹרֶף}}{\text{וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁמָר הַחֹרֶף}}$ $\frac{\text{וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁמָר הַחֹרֶף}}{\text{וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁמָר הַחֹרֶף}}$
 22³ $\frac{\text{וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁמָר הַחֹרֶף}}{\text{וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁמָר הַחֹרֶף}}$ $\frac{\text{וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁמָר הַחֹרֶף}}{\text{וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁמָר הַחֹרֶף}}$
 Nu.31²⁸ $\frac{\text{וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁמָר הַחֹרֶף}}{\text{וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁמָר הַחֹרֶף}}$ $\frac{\text{וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁמָר הַחֹרֶף}}{\text{וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁמָר הַחֹרֶף}}$
 Dt.22¹ $\frac{\text{וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁמָר הַחֹרֶף}}{\text{וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁמָר הַחֹרֶף}}$ $\frac{\text{וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁמָר הַחֹרֶף}}{\text{וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁמָר הַחֹרֶף}}$

(V) Veneration for religious leaders.

Ex.18⁷ $\frac{\text{וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁמָר הַחֹרֶף}}{\text{וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁמָר הַחֹרֶף}}$ $\frac{\text{וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁמָר הַחֹרֶף}}{\text{וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁמָר הַחֹרֶף}}$
 Gn.49⁷ $\frac{\text{וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁמָר הַחֹרֶף}}{\text{וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁמָר הַחֹרֶף}}$ $\frac{\text{וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁמָר הַחֹרֶף}}{\text{וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁמָר הַחֹרֶף}}$

(Vi) Genealogies of patriarchs

Years.

Gn.5 ¹⁸	62) Jered
5 ¹⁹	785	
5 ²⁰	847	
5 ²⁵	67) Methuselah
5 ²⁶	653	
5 ²⁷	720	
5 ²⁸	53) Lamech
5 ³⁰	600	
5 ³¹	653	
11 ¹²	135) Arpaksad
11 ¹³	303	

(VI) Genealogies of patriarchs (contd)

	Years.	
Gn. 11 ¹⁴	130)	Shelah
11 ¹⁵	303)	
11 ¹⁶	134)	
11 ¹⁷	270)	Eber
11 ¹⁸	130)	
11 ¹⁹	109)	Peleg
11 ²⁰	132)	
11 ²¹	107)	Reu
11 ²²	130)	
11 ²³	100)	Serug
11 ²⁴	79)	
11 ²⁵	69)	Nahor
11 ³²	145	
		Terah

(Vii) Sectarian opposition

Gn. 35 ¹⁸	בני חם / בני שם	and the other occurrences:
Gn. 35 ²⁴		42 ^{4,36}
43 ^{14,15,16,29,34}		
44 ¹²		45 ^{12,14,(bis)}
46 ^{19,21}		49 ²⁷
Ex. 1 ³		
Nu. 1 ^{36,37}		2 ^{22(bis)}
7 ⁶⁰		10 ²⁴
13 ⁹		26 ^{38,39,41}
34 ²¹		
Dt. 27 ¹²		33 ¹²
Dt. 33 ¹²	ד' ד' / ד' ד'	

ii. Non- doctrinal.(1) Variants where there appear to be cogent reasons in favour of S TSubstitutions

M T readings are difficult in grammar and/or sense, sometimes to the point of unintelligibility. They are usually explicable as due to the typical causes of scribal error.

Gn.24 ^{62*}	חבוא / במדבר	36 ^{2,14*}	ע' בה / ענה בן
46 ²⁸	3הרמח / 3הורג	47 ^{21*}	העביר מ' / העביר ואו 3עבדים
50 ¹⁵	3א ישתמו / 3א י		3ערים
Ex.5 ⁷	אמספון / גוסיפון	14 ^{25*}	ויסר / וימסר
14 ²⁷	נסים / נסעים	15 ^{25*}	ויורקו / וירמקו
18 ^{6*}	אני / הנה	23 ²¹	אמר / אמרי
40 ²	הכרכר / הכפרר		
Lv.25 ³⁰	3א ה' / 3א חמה		
Nu.22 ^{5*}	ב' עמו / בני עמון	24 ¹⁷	וקרקר / וקדקד
28 ¹⁴	יהיה / יין		
Dt.32 ¹⁸	אשי / אשא	32 ^{34*}	כחם / כנס

Additions

Gn.4 ⁸	Words appear to be missing in M T	25 ^{8*}	וישב ימים / ו'
27 ^{27*}	השדה מלל / שדה	31 ^{33*}	3בן ויחבש / 3'
36 ⁶	מארץ כנען / מלל מרץ	41 ^{48*}	ה' היה השבט / ה'
43 ^{28*}	חיי וימחר ברוך האיש / ההוא 3מללים	47 ^{16*}	3כס / 3חם
41 ^{56*}	בהם / בהם בר		

Appendix A

Additions (contd)

Ex.1²²⁺ ה' / העבן נתן 3 כסם 5¹³⁺ היצוד / היצר 3 עברים
 12⁴⁰⁺ ישראל אשר / ישראל ואבאם
 22¹⁹⁺ 3 / 3מהים אחרים אשר ישבו במצרים / אשר ישבו במצרים
 39²⁴⁺ ה' / השנים 3מהם מהצרים מ' / וישש אשר
 40¹⁷⁺ ומספר את רבע י' / ומי ספר מרבעת ישראל
 Dt.32¹⁵⁺ וישמן / יאכז יעקב וישבע ישמן

Omissions

Gn.36¹⁶ מלוק קרח מלוק געם / מלוק געם
 Ex.22¹⁹ 3מהים יחרם בצל ציהוה 3בדו / 3מהים אחרים
 Nu.24⁴⁺ ויהיו בני בצע מרד ונעמן / 3מרד 26⁴⁰⁺ נאם שמע אחריא 3מר / אשר
 26⁴⁵⁺ 3בני בריעה 3חבר / 3חבר

(2) Variants where there appear to be cogent reasons in favour of M T.

Substitutions

(i) Euphemistic words

Dt.25¹¹ ישגלנה / ישכב 28³⁰ באבשיו / בבשרו

(ii) More common word

Gn.11⁶ יזמו / יזמנו cf Petermann, p. 21.
 21¹⁶ יחד / יחד 49⁶ כמטחוי / כמטוי
 49¹⁴ 3ברכי / ביחי cf. Petermann, 50²³ גרים / גרים p.104.
 Ex.2²³ נאקאם / נקאאם 2²⁴ ויאנחו / וינחו
 6⁵ נאקא / נקאא
 Iv.13^{51,52} מהמר / מהמר 14⁴⁴ מהמר / מהמר
 18²¹ (cf 2K 23¹⁰) 3העביר / 3העביר
 22²⁵ אבא / אבא 26²¹ משחאם / משחאם

Appendix A.

(ii) Contd.

Nu. 5 ²⁶	וקמץ / והרים	6 ³	משרת / משמרת
11 ²⁵	ויצא / וימצא	11 ³²	וישטחו / וישחטו
21 ¹⁵	ומשר / משר	22 ³²	ירט / הרע
26 ⁹	הועדו ... בהועדגם		הצו ... בהצגם
Dt. 28 ²⁰	המרה / הממרה	28 ³⁷	צמח / צמח
28 ⁴⁹	ירמה / ידמה	29 ¹⁹	יעשן / יחר



(iii) Words in identical or similar context

(111) words in identical or similar context			
Gn.10 ¹⁹ (15 ¹⁸ Dt.11 ²⁴)	ויהי גבול הכנעני מנהר / מצרים עד הנהר הגדול / נהר פרת ועד הים האחרון	וְהָיָה צִידוֹן בְּמִכָּה גְרֵמָה עַד עֵזָה / בְּמִכָּה סְדֵמָה וְעִמְרָה וְאַדְמָה / וְצִבְיִים עַד צֶשֶׁעַ	
18 ²⁹ (18 ²⁸)	מעשה / מעשה	18 ³⁰ (18 ²⁸)	מעשה / מעשה
24 ²⁰ (24 ¹⁸)	ווער / ואורד	24 ³⁸ (24 ⁴)	אם / כי אם
24 ⁵⁵ (24 ²³)	ל.ל.ל. / ל.ל.ל.	30 ⁴⁰ (31 ^{10,12})	מלך עקד / מלך עקוד
31 ⁴⁹ (31 ^{45,51,52})	והמצפה / והמצפה		
36 ^{3,4,10,13,17} (28 ⁹)	ומחצא / ובשמה		
41 ^{3,4} (41 ^{19,20,27})	ורקוא / ודקוא		
41 ²⁷ (41 ²³)	הדקות / הדקות	43 ¹⁴ (42 ^{19,33})	אחר / האחר
43 ²² (43 ^{12,15})	קחננו / קחננו		
Ex.10 ¹³ (10 ¹²)	חטהו / ידו	13 ⁶ (Dt.16 ⁸)	שבעה / ששה
20 ⁸ (Dt.5 ¹²)	שחור / זכור	32 ¹¹ (Dt.9 ²⁹)	וביד חזקה / בזרוע נטויה
32 ²² (32 ²⁵)	ברע / פרוע		
lv.17 ¹³ (17 ^{3,8,10})	חבני / חבית		
20 ² (17 ^{3,8,10})	חבני / חבית		

(iii)(contd)

Nu.14 ⁶ (21 ¹)	המגרים / הגרים	21 ¹³ (21 ¹²)	מנוחל זרד	/ משם
21 ³¹ (21 ²⁵)	בערי / במרץ	22 ³³ (22 ³²)	הכית	/ הרגתי
23 ¹ (23 ²)	עשה / בנה	23 ⁴ (Gn.16 ⁷)	וימנח	/ ויקר
25 ⁴ (25 ⁵)	אמר ויהרגו את האנשים הנעמדים בצבצ מעור	קח את כל ראשי העם והוקע אותם ליהוה נגד השמש		
Dtl ²⁸ (2 ¹⁰²¹)	ורם / ורד			
1 ⁴⁴ (Nu.14 ⁴⁵)	והנעני / והנעמדי	16 ⁴ (Ex.12 ⁶)	בין הערבים	/ בערב
23 ¹² (Lv.15 ¹⁶)	כי אם רחץ בשרו במים ובא השמש ואחרי כן	יהיה צפנון ערב ורחץ במים וכבא השמש		
32 ²⁴ (Ex.12 ⁸ Nu.9 ¹¹)	מררים / מרירי			

Additions

Word(s) in identical or similar context

Gn.11¹¹(5⁵) ויהי כל ימי שם שש מחוה שנה וימח at end of verse
parallel to framework of genealogy of Chapter V. So
also with verses 13,15,17,19,21,23 and 25.

11 ³¹ (11 ²⁹)	ואת שרי ואת מלכה כצוהו אשת מברם ונחור בנן	ואת שרי כצוהו אשת מברם בנו		
20 ¹⁴ (20 ¹⁶)	מביחלך מלך כסף	מביחלך		
Ex.6 ²⁰ (Nu.26 ⁵⁹)	חשה ואת מרים מחגם	חשה /		
10 ⁵ (10 ^{12,15})	ואכל את כל עשב המרץ ואת כל פרי העץ	ואכל את כל העץ		
10 ¹² (10 ¹⁵)	כז כרי העץ	כ' / 11 ² (11 ³² 12 ³⁵)		
20 ^{17a} (Dt.5 ²¹)	רעך שדהו	ל /		
23 ²⁸ (23 ²³)	את הכנעני ואת האמרי ואת החתי ואת הגרגשי ואת הפרזי ואת החוי ואת היבوسی	את החוי את הכנעני ואת החתי		

Appendix A.

Additions (contd.)

Ex.27^{19b} (25⁴, 28⁴⁵) ועשית בגדי כלל וארגמן וזלזל
שני 3 שורג בהם בקדש

(immediately after verse 19)

28³⁰ (27^{19b}) ונתת / ועשית את הארים ואת הגמלים ונתת

28³³ (39²⁴) ש' / שני ושש השזר

Nu.17^{4*} (17²) / ישראל ואת בניו ואת כל עמו (21³⁵) 21²⁴ מלעזר / מלעזר בן מהרן (17²)

22²⁰ (22²²) מדבר / משמר מדבר 22³⁵ (23¹²) מ' / מלך מלכים (22²²)

22³⁸ (23¹²) מ' / מלך מלכים 23^{4*} (22²²) מדבר / משמר מדבר (23¹²)

23⁵ (22²²) מ' / מלך יהוה 23¹⁶ (22²²) י' / מלך יהוה (22²²)

35^{32*} (35²⁸) מ' / מלך יושבים 35^{33*} (35³⁴) הכהן / הכהן הגדול (35²⁸)

Dt.2¹² (2²¹) ושמיעו מפניהם / וישמדם יהוה מפניהם וירשם

11⁶ (Nu.16³²) ובלעם / ובלעם ואת כל האדם אשר בקרב

Longer PassagesIncorporations of passages from parallel narratives

Ex.20 ^{21b}	Dt.5 ²⁸⁻³¹
10 ^{10b}	16b-8
12 ^{16b}	120b-23a
13 ^{33b}	127-33
14 ^{41a}	142
Nu.10 ^{10b}	16b-8
12 ^{6b}	120b-23a
13 ^{33b}	127-33
14 ^{41a}	142
14 ⁴⁵	S T adds from Dt.1 ⁴⁴

Appendix A.

- Nu.20^{13b} = Dt.24-28 (omitting 3^{26a}) + 2²⁻⁶
 21^{12a} = 2⁹
 21^{13a} = 2¹⁷⁻¹⁹
 21^{21a} = 2²⁴⁻²⁵
 21^{22a} S T adds from Dt.2²⁷
 בדרך המלך נסע מן יבנה וישמעאל
 21^{23b} = 2³¹
 27^{23b} = 3^{21b-22}
 Dt.2^{8a} = Nu.20¹⁷⁻¹⁸

Substitutions of passages from parallel narratives for a shorter original.

- Ex.18²⁵ adds ויבחר ST = Dt.1¹⁹⁻¹⁸
 20^{19a} וישמעאל... ויבחר ST = Dt.5²⁴⁻²⁷
 Nu.21^{22b} נסע... נסע ST = Dt.2^{28-29a}
 Dt.10⁶⁻⁷ ST = Nu.33³⁰⁻³⁵

Omissions

- (i) Attributable to typical causes of scribal error.
 Nu.23¹⁰ ח' מנה ע' / ח' עפר יעקב error.
 Dt.2¹¹ רפאים יחשבו מן הם כענקים
 omitted at beginning of verse. Homoioteleuton in ST -
 verse 12 ends with כענקים
 Ex.17¹⁶ ע' וזמר יה' עז' וזמר / כס' / כס' 15²
 (ii) Word(s) in identical or similar context.
 Nu.21³⁵ (Dt.3³) ואל / בניו ואל
 Dt.14³ (Lv.11¹⁴) והיה / ה' 34³ (Gn.15¹⁸ Dt.11²⁴) omitted in ST.

Appendix A.(3) Variants where there appear to be no cogent reasons in favour of S T or M T.Substitutions

(i) Attributable to the typical causes of scribal error

Gn. 14¹⁴⁺ 15¹⁰ בור / בור 18¹⁵ 3 / 3
 32¹⁰ 22¹³⁺ מחר / מחר 23⁵⁺ 3 / 3
 23⁸ 23¹³⁺ 3 / 3 23¹⁴⁺ 3 / 3
 27⁴⁰ 30² מחר / מחר 30³⁴ 3 / 3
 42¹ 49¹⁰ גליו / גליו
 Ex. 3¹⁹ 5⁹⁺ וישעו / וישעו 10¹¹ 3 / 3
 11³ 12¹⁷⁺ המצוא / המצוא 15^{1,21} גמ / גמ
 22²⁹ 32¹⁸ ענו / ענו
 34⁷ 36⁶ ויכ / ויכ
 Lv. 7²¹ 15³¹⁺ והזרחם / והזרחם 19²⁵ 3 / 3
 Nu. 5^{18+,19,23,24} 13¹⁹ המצוא / המצוא
 14¹⁸ 18¹⁹ ישיבו / ישיבו
 24⁶ 24¹⁷ כתי / כתי 24²³ יחיה / יחיה
 Dt. 26⁸ 32²⁴ רשע / רשע 32²⁹ 3 / 3
 32³³ 33²⁺ ומה / ומה
 33³ 34¹² המצוא / המצוא

(ii) Occurring already in identical context, and equally suited to it.

Gn. 26¹⁸⁺ 29³ העדרים / העדרים 29⁸ העדרים / העדרים
 36⁴³ 39¹⁵ מצי / מצי
 Iv. 2¹¹⁺ 9³⁺ בני / בני 24⁴ בני / בני
 26²⁰ המצוא / המצוא
 Nu. 1⁴⁵ 1⁵² דגל / דגל

Appendix A.

(iii) Not belonging to either of the above types.

Gn.2²⁺ החת / החי 26³⁴ השביעי / הששי
 Ex.21²⁰ יקם / יומא 21²¹ נקם ינקם / מות ימות
 22³⁰ שורק וחמק וינכש בן / שורק וחמק וחמק וחמק
 23¹² שורק וחמק וינכש בן / שורק וחמק וחמק וחמק
 24⁴⁺ ונעדתי / ונדרשתי 29⁴³ מנצח / מבנים
 32¹³⁺ וישראלי / וייעקב
 Nu.10⁶ העליתנו / הוצאתנו 21⁵⁺ תימנה / תפונה
 24⁸⁺ מוציאו / נחשו

Additions

(i) Attributable to the typical causes of scribal error.

Gn.20¹¹ מ' / מלכים 41¹⁶⁺ אמרתי / כי ימתי כי אמרתי
 Ex.32¹³ מ' / הרבה מרבה
 Lv.19²⁰ מ' / יומתי 33 / מ' יומתי

(ii) Word(s) in identical or similar context.

Gn.15²¹⁺ הגרגשי ואת החי
 Ex.3⁸⁺ ו / והפרזי הגרגשי 3¹⁷⁺ ו / והפרזי הגרגשי
 13⁵ ו / והתתי הגרגשי 23²³ ו / והתתי הגרגשי
 33² ו / והתתי הגרגשי 34¹¹ ו / והתתי הגרגשי
 Dt.20¹⁷⁺ ו / והתתי הגרגשי 34¹¹ ו / והתתי הגרגשי

(iii) Not belonging to either of the above types.

Gn.2²⁴ ה' / המרגל מ' עמק 23²⁺ ו / ויהי משניהם
 39¹³⁺ מ' / מביך ומתך 49²⁶⁺ ו / וינס וינס
 Ex.20¹⁸ ה' / העם שמע 23¹⁹ At end of verse:
 כי עשה זאת כזבח שבת ועברה
 היא מ'3הי יעקב
 24¹ ומביהו / ומביהו 24⁹ ומביהו / ומביהו
 32³² מ' / חטאם שח

APPENDIX B.Additional Paper on two Samaritan MSS.

1.

Facsimile of photograph of a portion of a Samaritan Pentateuch Scroll in Nablus.

LV 15² אה'3N -- 16¹⁸ ... א 3N נג'1

The photograph, which was in the possession of the late Professor John Garstang, was of a MS affirmed by the Samaritans to be the oldest in their community and to have been written by Abisha the great grandson of Aaron thirteen years after the entry of the children of Israel into Canaan - the claim made for the Abisha Scroll. This photograph was made available to me for examination and I transcribed and collated with the von Gall text, when it was found to be clearly inferior as shown below. It appears that the Samaritans had followed their practice of exhibiting another MS and not the Abisha Scroll¹. In the Pedersen Festshrift Kahle refers to a specimen page of a Samaritan Scroll, containing the text of Lv. 15 and 16, and sent by Garstang to Sir Frederick Kenyon, and by him to A. E. Cowley². This may be the same photograph as I have examined.

General description of the MS.

At/

At certain places the MS has been destroyed and there are lacunae in the text. At others the letters can be discerned only with extreme difficulty. On occasion, and especially at the end of a line, the letters become almost microscopically small in order to admit of the completion of a word within the line. The first letter of each line is usually separated by a small space from the remaining letters of its word and stands immediately under the first letter of the preceding line. Often this holds good also for the last letter of each line, or the last two letters.

Interpunction.

Where the writing is not too cramped the words are sometimes separated by a dot. This is generally the case when letters are being written somewhat larger and especially when spaced out to fill up a line e.g. the final line of Chapter 15. The sign : is used to indicate a pause at the end of or within a verse. The sign - : or -. indicates a longer pause e.g. at the end of a section. Embellishments such as --. . --. . -- appear in the blank line that separates the $\square' \omega \gamma \rho$ when such coincide with one of the $\square' \omega \gamma \rho$ e.g. at the end of Chapter 15.

Collation of MS with von Gall text.

Complete collation of which the following is a summary.

Divergences from von Gall text 7.

These seven variants admit of a twofold sub-division.

1. Variants that agree with Samaritan readings listed in the von Gall critical apparatus but not followed by him.

	<u>MS.</u>	<u>von Gall, with MT</u>
Lv.15 ¹⁹	הַזֶּה	הַזֶּה
16 ¹⁰	וְהָיָה	וְהָיָה

2. Variants that stand alone, without support from either the von Gall text or his critical apparatus and without support of MT or LXX.

- Lv.15²⁵ Omits הַזֶּה before [הַזֶּה], leaving a clear gap in the text.
- 15²⁶ Reads שָׁכַח for שָׁכַח
Either word might be correct. שָׁכַח appears the more natural word in line with שָׁכַחַהּ but for that reason is not necessarily correct. שָׁכַח occurs in both later in the verse in relation to שָׁכַח . The general context is indecisive as verse 20 distinguishes "lying" and "sitting" but verse 23 has the phrase "and if upon the bed or anything whereon she sitteth".
- 15²⁷ Appears to read וְהָיָה for וְהָיָה but considerable blurring in the MS.
- 15²⁸ Omits guttural in final word and reads the meaningless שָׁכַח for שָׁכַחַהּ
- 15³⁰ Additional וְהָיָה after וְהָיָה a word that could easily be added.

In the light of these foregoing readings it cannot

be/

be maintained that the text of the MS, in the passage available for examination, is superior to that of von Gall. On the contrary it is evidently inferior.

Footnotes, Appendix B. 1.

1. Thomson, The Samaritans, p. 403
2. Kahle, Pedersen Festschrift, p. 189.

.....

APPENDIX B.

2.

The Manuscript of the Samaritan Pentateuch.

R. 16.41

Trinity College Library, Cambridge.

In the Cairo Geniza, p.49, Kahle lists the vowel signs commonly used in Samaritan MSS and in Note 6 to this page he mentions that only a few Samaritan MSS of the Pentateuch are provided with this kind of punctuation. He instances, among others, a Samaritan Pentateuch in Trinity College Library, bought 1917, dated A.D.1332, although he does not give further details regarding it. This MS is not included by von Gall in his Introduction as having been used in his critical edition of the Samaritan Pentateuch so that to my knowledge there is no published account of its nature or value. I decided to make a full examination of it and visited Cambridge on two occasions when I had opportunity of studying the MS in detail, as a result of which I now provide the following description.

General Appearance of the MS.

The MS is written on paper and is the work of three hands which will be designated R^1 , R^2 , and R^3 . Where the oldest hand is missing there are supplements by one or other of/

of the two later hands. The second hand has also been repaired by the third and final hand. The oldest part of the MS is composed of cartabombycina, a paper which the Arabs received from China at the beginning of the 8th century and used well on to the 15th. The paper of the second part of the MS, while more recent, is also Eastern and without any indications such as watermark. The paper of the third and latest part is quite fresh and modern.

The MS has half-leather binding, with a flap ornamented in typical, oriental fashion. The sides are of paper over cardboard. In all probability the binding is 18th century, as it appears to have been done by the second hand - according to the MS of date 1754 A.D. See below, p.

Size of the folio is approx. $10\frac{1}{2}$ " x $8\frac{1}{2}$ ", quarto.

Fly-leaf has a long Arabic inscription completely filling a and overflowing to b.

The MS is written right across the page and there is no Aramaic or Arabic rendering. The oldest part, hereafter designated R^1 , has been supplemented and repaired by two later hands, R^2 and R^3 : these three parts will now be considered from the following standpoints:-

1. Distribution of the text among the 3 copyists
2. Date and general characteristics
3. Vocalisation.

1. Distribution of the text among the 3 copyists.

As in all Samaritan codices folio 1a is blank. The writing of Genesis 1¹ begins at the top of b.
 round
 Hebrew letters enclosed in brackets are supplied by a later hand.
 Lacunae are denoted by square brackets.

Genesis.

R ²	10 ff	1 ¹ - 11 ¹⁵	
R ¹	7 "	11 ¹⁶ מרבע - 19 ⁵ (7) 3 מ	
R ³	12 "	19 ⁵ 337 - 31 ¹⁶ ו3231	
R ¹	5 "	31 ¹⁶ ועל - 35 ⁴ מ37	
R ²	9 "	35 ⁴ ומתנזחים - 42 ¹ במצרים	
R ¹	13 "	42 ¹ מחר (ו) - 50 ²³ בנים	
R ²	1 f	50 ²³ מ - 50 ²⁶ במצרים	

Exodus

R¹ 62 ff

Leviticus

R ¹	42 ff	1 ¹ - 27 ³⁰ מזרע	
R ²	1 f	27 ³⁰ ומכרי - 27 ³⁴ סיני	

Numbers

R ¹	42 ff	1 ¹ - 24 ²¹ וימחר	
R ²	1 f	24 ²¹ מן - 26 ⁴ חשה	
R ¹	17 ff	26 ⁴ ובני - 36 ⁸ ישראל °	
R ²	1 f	36 ⁸ 7ח3 - 36 ¹³ [י] ריחו	

Deuteronomy

R ¹	21 ff	1 ¹ - 12 ³¹ 737 מ	
R ²	1 f	12 כי ° - 13 ¹⁷ העיר	
R ¹	8 ff	13 ¹⁷ 337 - 21 ¹⁰ ש2 (ו)	
R ¹	1 f	21 ¹¹ ורמיח - 22 ⁷ 3 (ע)	
R ¹	9 ff	22 ⁸ (כ) ° - 28 ⁶⁴ מחה	
R ²	4 ff	28 ⁶⁴ ע - 31 ¹⁹ (3 ע)	
R ¹	3 ff	31 ¹⁹ 337 - 33 ⁹ (3 מרמיח)	
R ³	1 f	33 ⁹ מח ° - 34 ⁷	
R ²	1 f	34 ⁸ ויבכו - 34 ¹² (3 ישראל)	

2. Date and general characteristics.

R¹. According to the Cryptogram, which begins at Exodus 15²³ and ends at 18²⁵ (see below, pp 275-6) the writer was Sa'dallah ben Yitran of the Bene 'iqara, date 733 A.H. (1332 A.D.)

R¹ contains 26 lines to the page and about 26 letters to the line.. It is written in a clear, legible hand and the letters have been executed with a certain care. There are fairly frequent mendings and repairs by the two later hands R² and R³, although in the great majority of cases these strips are comparatively small and contain only a few letters. On the whole this part of the MS is in an astonishingly good state of preservation. The interpunction is clear and simple, with a dot separating each word, and paragraph ending -: If the end of a paragraph coincides with the end of one of the *q'ap*, it is followed by a blank line, or lines, and sometimes this space receives typical embellishments such as (after Genesis 2⁷).

.∴ -----∴ .∴ ----- ∴.

R¹ makes the lines of writing fit exactly over each other. If the scribe, writing a word near the end of the line, thought that he might have insufficient room for the inclusion of the following word, he adopted/

adopted quite an ingenious device. He completed his word, except for the final letters which he placed in a group close up to the margin, with the result that there was a space between them and the previous letters of the word. This space varies greatly; it may be half an inch in length, or an inch, or still more. But naturally it sometimes happens that there is no need to employ such a space viz., when the number of letters just fills the line. The whole point is that the two final letters of each line are placed directly under each other and in this way the lines are all of equal length. This method of writing is followed by many Samaritan MSS. Unlike the Jews, the Samaritans did not employ 'literae dilatabiles' to fill up the line to the margin.

There are also instances in R¹ of identical letters and words written underneath one another, perhaps for a dozen lines or more. For example, in Leviticus 18⁴ ($\square \pi' \beta \nu$ ff) and extending for 19 consecutive lines the letters β are written exactly underneath one another. Again, in Leviticus 26¹² if the words

$\Lambda / \eta \delta \omega \rho$ are written underneath one another for 8 consecutive lines on a of the folio and for 19 lines on b.

Again, there are certain passages written in hemistich fashion. The lines are split in the middle for the space of rather more than a letter, and the result is a blank column running down the centre of the text. Very frequently, also, the last two letters at the end of the half-lines are written together in the same way as the last two letters at the end of the complete lines. This division of the text into two appears to be an external one and there is little regard for the sense of the passage: at least, the blank central column does not necessarily coincide with interpunction marks, for frequently it cuts right through a phrase or even a word. Yet the Samaritans must have had some understanding regarding what portions of the text were to be written in this distinctive manner as many of their MSS agree in this usage¹.

The passages so written in R¹ are:

1. Exodus 15¹⁻²¹
2. Numbers 21¹⁷⁻²⁰
3. " 23⁷⁻¹⁰
4. " 23¹⁸⁻²⁴
5. " 24³⁻¹⁰
6. " 24¹⁵⁻²¹
7. Deuteronomy 31³⁰ - 32⁴³

These/

These passages are all of a rhythmic or poetic nature and perhaps this manner of writing was an indication of poetic form, just as in a somewhat analogous fashion each line in an English poem usually begins with a capital letter. To the objection that other poetic passages of the Pentateuch are not written in this way, the reply might be made that perhaps the poetic nature of these passages was not clearly discerned by the Samaritans - at least to begin with.

On a of the second R¹ folio of the MSA (Gen. 12⁷⁻⁹) there is a short section, seven lines in all, that shares to some degree in this hemistich writing. The lines are divided into two with the customary space running down the centre of the text. However, the inner half-line ends in one letter only and not two. The endings of the outer half-lines are all lost and there is a vertical strip by a later hand, R², which to some extent observes two final letters at the end of the line. The outer half-lines all commence with l and, as might be expected, these are placed directly underneath one another and indeed separated from the following letters by a small space. Two other passages may be mentioned: in Exodus the Ten Commandments, including the Samaritan 'Tenth Commandment' /

Commandment' are numbered by letters in the margin² and also in Leviticus the *asp* , 9²²-10², giving the Aaronic Blessing, is darkened probably by the kisses of devout readers.

R¹ uses the device of the cryptogram, or to give it the Samaritan name, *taskil*; the line is divided in the middle, so that an interval is left, usually rather more than the breadth of a letter. Some letters of a word may be on one side of this space, and the remainder on the other. This interval is sedulously observed from line to line so that the result is a vertical column cutting right down the centre of the text and sometimes running through quite a number of pages. Every now and then a letter of the text is placed inside this vertical column. The letters in this central column can be read, not only horizontally in the actual lines in which they occur, but also vertically, and when so read give information regarding such things as the writer, owner and date of the MS. Frequently each letter in a cryptogram has a small dot placed above it, and quite regularly the final letter of each word a small line placed underneath it.

Four cryptograms have been observed in R¹. The largest occurs, Exodus 15²³-18²⁵, and states that Sa'dallah ben Yitran of the Bene 'igara wrote the

MS for Abraham ben Ab Romemuta of the Bene Mitaba in Egypt in 733 A.H. (1332 A.D.) It adds that it was the first (Torah) that he had written and concludes by praising God. A short cryptogram occurs halfway through the Pentateuch, Leviticus 7¹²⁻¹⁶,

הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ Traces of others occur, Leviticus 27¹⁸⁻²¹ אֶלֶף וְיָמֵינוּ אֶלֶף and Deuteronomy 32⁵¹⁻⁵² אֶלֶף וְיָמֵינוּ ...

At the end of Exodus, after the summation of the , there comes a colophon stating that the MS belonged to Ab Geluga ben Ab Romemata ben Ab^araham of the Bene Mitaba in 77 A.H. (1376 A.D.) and with the blessing "let him teach thereby sons and sons' sons".

At the end of Exodus R¹ gives the summation of the ד'סָּךְ as 200. A later hand, R², supplies the ending of the other books (see above, p.268), giving the summation for Genesis, Leviticus and Numbers as 250, 134 and 220 respectively. For the ending of Deuteronomy see R² immediately following.

R². At the end of Deuteronomy, unlike the other books, there is no summation of the ד'סָּךְ . On the lower half of a of the last folio there are a few lines of Arabic writing (see below, p.278) and on b of this folio is a curious, rhyming poem, a kind of catena of scriptural phrases, ending with conventional reference to Joseph, Moses/

Moses and Aaron, and giving the name of the writer, Shalama ben Jacob ben Ab Sakwa ben Abraham of the Bene Danaf from Damascus and the date 1168 A.H. (1754 A.D.)

R² contains 35-42 lines to the page and about 26 letters to the line. Although the letters are quite legible, they are generally not executed with such care as in R¹. An incomplete word at the end of a line is sometimes completed by one or two letters in the margin. There are 15 instances of one letter in the margin and 3 of two in Genesis 1¹-11¹⁵; in Genesis 35⁴-42¹ there are 10 instances of one letter and 4 of two and an instance of a whole word א ~ ∇ (36¹² / °). In this way the letters are not crowded and yet the word is completed before passing to the next line. Accordingly, R² does not adopt the device of R¹ to make the lines fit exactly over one another. Yet, apart from the above mentioned marginal letters, there is a general attempt to make the lines approximately the same length. Sometimes the last word of the line has the interval between each letter lengthened out so that the word may complete the line. At the end of some lines the final letter or, more rarely, the last two letters may be written close up to the margin and with/

with a short space separating from the previous letters, in a manner somewhat analogous to that followed regularly by R^1 . But no definite rule is followed by R^2 and very frequently the line is a solid block of closely written letters without any of the devices just mentioned.

R^2 has no cryptograms. There are no instances of identical letters or words written below each other, line upon line. Finally, there is no attempt to preserve the distinctive form of a passage written in hemistich fashion. For example, Numbers 24¹⁵⁻²¹ (R^1) is written in this way. Immediately following, the MS has been repaired with an R^2 folio which is written in the ordinary fashion. Now the poem does not conclude till 24²⁵ and presumably in the original the hemistich style of writing would have extended that length - at least it does do in other Samaritan MSS.

R^3

At the end of Deuteronomy there are some lines of Arabic saying (see above, p.276) that this Torah was finished by Jacob ben Halil Al-Mufarraḡ in Bait Furiv in 1331 A.H. (1913 A.D.) On the flyleaf there is a long Arabic inscription, completely filling a and overflowing to b (see above, p.269). The "miserable, poor one", Sa'd, son of the late Sallām, son of Ismail, son of Sālīh, recounts in considerable detail three dreams regarding Paradise/

Paradise and praising Moses, the "apostle of truth".

The date at the end is 1294 A.H. (1877 A.D.)

R^3 contains 36-38 lines to the page and about 29 letters to the line. The letters tend towards a flowing, cursive style and appear to have been more hastily written than in R^1 or R^2 . A pencil square is drawn on the page and the writing is contained within this. The line is generally full of letters as in R^2 .

Occasionally a letter will fall outside if the line is very full or sometimes the letters will be crowded to try and get them into the square. In the latter case the letters often slant upwards to the left; an instance of this occurs in Genesis 20³.

R^3 has no cryptogram. It furnishes no examples of identical letters or words written underneath one another. Neither do any passages appear to be written in hemistich form. There may be a certain amount of doubt regarding an R^3 strip that mends Numbers 24¹⁵⁻²¹, where R^1 is written in this way: some attempt appears to have been made to preserve the R^1 form and possibly it broke down on account of the fact that 39 letters had to be written by R^3 in a comparatively restricted space. In other places, e.g. the extensively repaired Deuteronomy 31³⁰⁻³²⁴³, R^3 makes no effort to preserve the hemistich form.

Finally, /

Finally, some general conclusions are now suggested with regard to the writing and general characteristics of the MS.

1. The earliest copyist, R¹, has proceeded with the greatest care, R², while less carefully executed, is superior to R³.
2. R¹ has obviously had a certain understanding regarding a distinctive way, such as hemistich form, in which certain passages of the Pentateuch were to be written. Many of the Samaritan MSS agree in writing certain passages in this way.
3. R¹ has a long *tasqil* peculiar to this MS but also shows traces of *tasqils* common to many Samaritan MSS.
4. Such distinctive modes of writing are presumably very old. A tradition like this takes time to develop especially among a people so conservative as the Samaritans.

3. Vocalisation.

R¹, R² and R³ all employ supralinear vowel signs.

The vocalisation is not complete. According to Kahle, the Samaritan vocalisation is similar to the Palestinian³, which was more primitive and imperfect than the Tiberian⁴. The first stage in vocalising a text would be to indicate pronunciation by occasional vowel signs and only a later stage would the text be fully vocalised as in the Tiberian⁵.

This system of occasional indication of the pronunciation is clearly revealed in the three copyists of the MS. In relation to other Samaritan Pentateuch MSS, few of which have vocalisation at all, R¹ is quite richly supplied with supralinear signs, and both R² and R³ also indicate pronunciation in this way, though more sparingly. In my opinion the evidence now to be furnished is valuable in that the supralinear system of the MS is different from that noted by Kahle as the normal Samaritan system (Geniza, p.49). Some of the signs are different, and they are greater in number. In the statement of the vocalisation signs, that is now to be given, Petermann's transliteration is added to the Hebrew though it is to be remembered that the Samaritan pronunciation in his day may have differed from that prevailing at the time when the MS was vocalised. I have also considered the views regarding Samaritan vocalisation held by him, ⁶ Von Gall ⁷, Z. Ben Hayyim ⁸ and others.

Vocalisation signs of frequent occurrence.

<u>√</u> = i	וִינְקָב וְכִי זִרְעוּ לָאֵל (וִינְקָב)	Gn. 46 ⁶
<u>'</u> = o, u	וְיָשׁוּב וְיָשׁוּב (EŠU) וְיָשׁוּב (ZE'OT)	Gn. 45 ¹⁷
<u><</u> = e, i	וְיָשׁוּב וְיָשׁוּב (TET)	Gn. 16 ⁹
<u>l</u> = a, e	וְיָשׁוּב וְיָשׁוּב (ISIRU)	Gn. 35 ²
	וְיָשׁוּב וְיָשׁוּב (QANA)	Gn. 47 ²²
	וְיָשׁוּב וְיָשׁוּב (BABET) (AFES)	Gn. 34 ¹⁹

— = Daghesh, or indication of consonantal Waw

אֶבֶדֶרֶק Gn. 35³
(BEDERREK)

וִיִּפָּל Gn. 46²⁹
(UTIPPAL)

יִשָּׁב Gn. 35³
(ISAB)

/ = Used with ambiguous forms, and will have a specific significance in each case

וְשָׁמֹעַ Gn. 11²⁹
(USSEM)

וְשֵׁמָּה Gn. 11³¹
(SEMMA)

וְיִבְרָכֶיךָ Gn. 45¹⁵
(UTEBEKI)

וְיִשָּׁמֶר Gn. 48¹
(WISSAMER - NIPHAL)

Vocalisation signs of less frequent occurrence.

Restricted to initial gutturals.

ε = ʿ

κ = ʿ a

These two signs were noted as far back as Cowley, who was of the opinion that they implied something as to the quality of the guttural, perhaps that it was to be pronounced instead of being as usual silent. ⁹ The nature of the sound remained obscure. It occurred to the present writer that conceivably ^ε was a small Arabic ʿain written above the guttural. Both Kahle and Roberts refer to abbreviated Hebrew letters written above the consonants to

which they applied. 10

If so, ϵ above a guttural, or gutturals, would indicate that the gutturals in the text carrying this sign were to be read as ϵ . Another problem was the relationship between ϵ and κ , and after some search in the Pentateuch the following passages were found quite close together:

Lv.	4 ²⁰	$\Lambda N b n n^{\epsilon}$
	4 ²⁵	$\Lambda N b n n^{\kappa}$
Lv.	6 ⁵	$n^{\kappa} 3 y n$
	6 ¹⁸	$n^{\epsilon} 3 y n$

Clearly the signs could be used indiscriminately in certain cases. With the known preference of the Samaritans for the vowel "a" especially with gutturals, the presumption might be that ϵ was followed by "a", thus ϵa . It was possible that "a" might be indicated by a small Arabic alif above a consonant, and thus ϵa might be represented by ϵ or combining them, κ . This conjecture has been strengthened by Ben Hayyim's view that both ϵ and κ indicated the same sound: when the initial guttural only (i.e. without the following vowel) was represented, ϵ was used. However, the vowel of initial ϵ was invariably "a" and when this vowel, already sounded, was actually written, κ or ϵ would result.

References have been made elsewhere in the Thesis to

the fact that the Samaritan pronunciation of Hebrew was different from that of the MT. This different tradition of pronunciation is still further evidenced by the foregoing examples of these supralinear vocalisation signs.

Footnotes, Appendix B. 2.

1. Cf. the list given by v. Gall, Introduction, p. LXVI.
2. As also in 3 MSS cited by v. Gall, Introduction, p. LXVI.
3. Geniza, p. 49.
4. B.J. Roberts, The Old Testament Text and Versions, p. 58.
5. E. Wurthwein, The Text of the Old Testament, p. 17.
6. Petermann, Formenlehre, pp. 4-5.
7. Von Gall, Introduction, p. LXVI.
8. Z. Ben-Hayyim, "The Samaritan vowel-system and its graphic representation" in Archiv Orientalni, XXII, Prague, 1954, pp. 515-30.
9. A.E. Cowley, Samaritan Liturgy, Oxford, 1909, p. xxvii.
10. Geniza, p. 48.
Roberts, OT Text and Versions, p. 54.

.....

ABBREVIATIONS.Texts.

DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls Texts in Discoveries in the Judaean Desert: I, II, and III.
MT	Masoretic Text.
ST	Samaritan Text.
LXX	Septuagint

Periodicals.

AJSL	American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature. Chicago.
BZAW	Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Giessen.
HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual. Cincinnati.
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature. Boston, Mass.
JJS	Journal of Jewish Studies. London.
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies. London.
TSK	Theologische Studien und Kritiken. Hamburg.
VT	Vetus Testamentum. Leiden.
VTs	Vetus Testamentum, Supplements to (Vols.I-IV). Leiden
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Giessen.
ZDMG	Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft. Leipzig.

General Abbreviations and Signs.

Gn	Genesis
Ex	Exodus
Lv	Leviticus
Nu	Numbers
Dt	Deuteronomy.

General Abbreviations and Signs (cont.)

BDB	Brown, Driver and Briggs: Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford, 1906.
GK	Gesenius Hebrew Grammar edited and enlarged by E.Kautzsch. 2nd English ed. by A.E.Cowley. Oxford, 1910.
LCC	International Critical Commentary.
Pf.	Perfect
Impf.	Imperfect
Imv.	Imperative.
Inf. cstr.	Infinitive construct
Inf. abs	Infinitive absolute
Pt.	Participle
=	Equivalent
	Parallel
√	Root, stem
'	Sign of abbreviation (in Hebrew words)
1° 2° 3° ...	First, Second, Third ... occurrences of same letter or word in the verse.

.....

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Very early books, though consulted, have been omitted from this list.

Books.

- Burrows, M. The Dead Sea Scrolls. London, 1956.
 More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls. London, 1958.
- Castro, F.P. Sefer Abisa. Edicion del fragmento antigua del rollo sagredo del Pentateuco Samaritano de Nablus. Madrid, 1959.
- Cowley, A.E. Samaritan Liturgy. Oxford, 1909.
- Cross, F.M. Jr. and
 Freedman, D.N. Early Hebrew Orthography. New Haven, 1952.
 The Ancient Library of Qumran. London, 1958.
- Dioning, F. Das Hebräische bei den Samaritanern (Bonner Orientalistische Studien, Heft 24). Stuttgart, 1938.
- von Gall, A. Der Hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner. Giessen, 1918.
- Gaster, M. A Samaritan Scroll of the Law of the XIth Century. London, 1901.
 The Samaritans (Schweich Lectures, 1923). London, 1925.
 Samaritan Oral Law and Ancient Traditions. London, 1932.
- Geiger, A. Nachgelassene Schriften 5 vols. Berlin, 1875-8.
- Gerleman, G. Synoptic Studies in the Old Testament. Lund, 1948.
- Gesenius, W. De Pentateuchi Samaritani Origine Indole et Auctoritate Commentatio Philologica-Critica. Halle, 1815.

- Heller, Ch. The Samaritan Pentateuch. An Adaptation of the Masoretic Text. Berlin, 1923.
- Kahle, P. The Cairo Geniza (Schweich Lectures, 1941). London, 1947.
- Kennicott, B. Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum variis lectionibus. 2 vols. Oxford, 1776-80.
- Macdonald, J. Memar Marqah. BZAW, Heft 84. 2 vols. Berlin, 1963.
- The Theology of the Samaritans. London, 1964.
- Meyer, E. (and Luther, B.) Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme. Halle, 1906.
- Milik, J.T. Ten years of Discovery in the Judaean Wilderness and Their Importance. London, 1959.
- Montgomery, J.A. The Samaritans; the Earliest Jewish Sect. Their History, Tehology and Literature. (Bohle Lectures, 1906) Philadelphia, 1907
- Noth, M. Die Welt des Alten Testaments. Berlin, 1953.
- Nutt, J.W. Fragments of a Samaritan Targum. London, 1874.
- Petermann, H. Versuch einer Hebräischen Formenlehre nach der Aussprache der Heutigen Samaritaner. Leipzig, 1868.
- Roberts, B.J. The Old Testament Text and Versions. Cardiff, 1951.
- Robertson, E. Catalogue of the Samaritan Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library at Manchester. Manchester, 1938
- Skinner, J. The Divine Names in Genesis. London, 1914.
- Stevenson, W.B. Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic. Oxford, 1924.
- Thomson, J.E.H. The Samaritans. Their Testimony to the Religion of Israel. Edinburgh, 1919.
- Torrey, C.C. Esra Studies. Chicago, 1910.

Wernberg-Møller,
P.

The Manual of Discipline (Studies on the
Texts of the Desert of Judah). Leiden, 1957.

Articles or Monographs.

in Periodicals or Festschrifts.

- Bowman, J. "The Leeds Samaritan Decalogue Inscription".
Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical Society,
VI, viii, 1951, pp. 567-75.
- "The Exegesis of the Pentateuch among the
Samaritans and Rabbis. Alttestamentische Studien
viii, 1950, pp. 220-62.
- "The Samaritans and the Book of Deuteronomy".
Transactions of Glasgow University Oriental
Society, xvii, 1958-59, pp. 9-18.
- "The Importance of Samaritan Researches".
Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society,
I, 1959, pp. 43-54.
- Ben-Hayyim, Z. "The Samaritan vowel system and its graphic
Representation". Archiv Orientalni, XXII, 1954,
pp. 515-30.
- Castro, F.P. "El sefer Abisa," Sefarad, xiii, 1953, pp. 119-29.
- Dugmore, C.W. "Two Samaritan MSS in the Library of Queens'
College, Cambridge". JTS xxxvi, 1935, pp. 131-47.
- Geiger, A. "Zur Theologie u. Schrifterklärung der
Samaritaner. ZDMG, xii, 1858, pp. 132-42.
- "Neuere Mittheilungen über die Samaritaner".
ZDMG, xvi, 1862, pp. 714-28.
- "Die Gesetzlichen Differenzen Zwischen
Samaritanern u. Juden."
ZDMG, xx, 1866, pp. 527-73.
- Kahle, P. "Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Pentateuch-
Textes". TSK, lxxxviii, 1915, pp. 399-439.

- Kahle, P.
(contd.) "The Abisha Scroll of the Samaritans".
Studia Orientalia Ioanni Pedersen dicata,
Hannia, 1953, pp.188-192.
- Hempel, J. "Innermasoretische Bestatigungen des
Samaritanus". ZAW, xi, N.F., 1934, pp.254-74.
- Roberts, B.J. "The Divergences in the pre-Tiberian Masoretic
Text". JJS, i, 3, 1949, pp. 147-55.
- Robertson, E. "The Ancient Scroll of the Samaritans".
Gaster Centenary Publication, London, 1958.
pp. 1-7.
- Review of F.P.Castro's "Sever Abisa", Madrid,
VT, xii, 1962. pp. 228-35. 1959.
- Rowley, H.H. "Sanballet and the Samaritan Temple".
Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Manchester.
Vol.38, No. 1, September, 1955.
- Slotki, I.W. "Long and Shorter Versions of Ancient Hebrew
Poems." AJSL, 50, 1933-34, pp.15-31.
- Skehan, P.W. "Exodus in the Samaritan Recension from Qumran."
JBL, lxxiv, 1955, pp. 182-87.
- "The Qumran Manuscripts and Textual Criticism".
VTS, iv, 1957, pp. 148-60.
- Sperber, A. "Hebrew based upon Greek and Latin Transliteration-
tions". HUCA, xii-xiii, 1937-38, pp.151-274.
- "Hebrew based upon Biblical Passages in Parallel
Transmission". HUCA, xiv, 1939, pp.161-249.
- Talmon, S. "Synonymous Readings in the Old Testament".
Scripta Hierosolymitana, viii, 1961, pp.335-83.
