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ספר

## מסורת המסורת

ר אליהו המדקרק ״"צ בר אשר הלוי האשכנזי צצ"ל

להבין ולחורוח, לאנשי חרודוח, דרך בעלי המסורח, בקיצור לשונס, וזידוחם וסימנם, בראםי חיבוח ובנומריקון, לבלם עשה חיקון:

-צא לאור עור הפעם עם חרגום בריםני ומבואר היטיב בבאור מספיק

מאחתי<br>כר׳סטיאן דור גינצבורג

## TO

W. WINTER RAFFLES, EsQ.


## AS AN EXPRESSION OF MY FRIENDSHIP

AND ESTEEM.

## PREFACE.

Tas work now submitted to the public in the original Hebrew, with an English translation, is an explanation of the origin and import of the Massorah. Those who are acquainted with the fact that our Hebrew Bibles abouñ with margithal and textual glossês, -to which even the Bibles issued by the Bible Society, "which boasts that it circulates the pure word of God without note or comment, form no exception-and who know that there is no guide in our language, or in any modern languages "to. these enigmatical notes, will welcome this Treatise written by the first, and almost the only, Massoretic "expositu "For be it remembered that Buxtorf's Latin" Dissertation," entitled, Commentariûs Masorethicus; published in 1620 and 1665 , is to a great extent made up of Levita's work, interspersed with notions utterly at variance with those of Levita, and withoant giving his explanation of the plan of the Massorah.
'For in accountt' of 'Levita himself, and the extraordinary controyersy. to which this Treatise gave rise almost all over Earope during the time of the Reformation, we must refer to the Life prefixed $\mathrm{to}_{3}$ this volume.

The text of the Work is that of the editio princep̈s, 1538 , carefully collated with the only two other editions of . it, Basel, 1538, and Sulzbach, 1771. The results of the collat: tion have been duly gizen in the notes.

All that I have ventured to do with the text has been to divide it into paragraphés, ánd to print in larger type, or to
viii.
point, those words only which are the subject of Massoretic annotation, so as to enable the student to see which word in selected for discussion; since in the original, where chapter and verse are not specified, several words of a passage had to be quoted to indicate the section from which it was taken.

By comparing every allusion to the Massoretic registers with the Massorah itself, and by giving every such rubric in full, I have not only been enabled to correct many errors in the text of the Treatise, which had arisen either from a slip of the pen on the part of the author, or through misprints, but have supplied the student with the mostmimportant part of the Massorah, as will be seen from the extensive Index of the Massoretically annotated passages and the Index of parallels between the Massoretic lists and the Ochla Ve-Ochla appended to the work.

The order of the passages of Scripture, in any of the rubrics quoted in the notes, is that of the Massorah, and it is to be hoped that the trouble and labour which $I$ have expended in appending book, chapter, and verse to every expression, in every list, will help the Biblical student to prosecute his Massoretic studies. The edition of the Massorah referred to throughout the work is that contained in Frankfurter's Great Rabbinic Bible, Amsiterdam, 17.24-27.

I take this opportunity to express my hearty thanks-to the learned Dr. Steinscineider and the Abbate PietrósPerreau, Librarian of the Bibliotheque at Parma, for information duly acknowledged in the proper place.

Brooklea, Aigburth Road,
Liverpool, 'December, 1866.

## LIFE 0F ELIAS LEVITA.

Tue perpetual expulsions and wanderings to which the Jews have been subjected, ever since their dispersion, have not been faveurable to the writing of Biographical Dictionaries. Though they may have had enterprising compilers, who were ready to issue "The Men of the Time," the fact that the children of the same parents were often born and brought up in different countries, wasting their youth in journeys often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils by their own countrymen, in perils by the Christians, would have almost precluded the possibility of such an undertaking. Hence it is that the very names, as well as the mere dates and birth-places, of some of the most distinguished Jewish literati, are matters of dispute, and that next to nothing is known of their private history and domestic life. But for the Oriental custom of giving some scraps of autobiography in the Introductions and Appendices, in the Prologues and Epilogues, of their works, many of the Jewish authors, to whom political economy, medicine, astronomy, philosophy, philology, exegesis, and poetry owe an immense debt of gratitude, would have been, to the honest historian and grateful student, like Melchisedec, without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days nor end of life.

The history of the anthor of the famous Massoreth Ha-Massoreth, now published with an English translation, and of many other works, fully illustrates these remarks. The year of his birth, his proper name, and the incidents of his life are only to be gathered by piecing together the autobiographical fragments scattered through his different works. Inattention to this fact has caused the greatest divergence of opinion among scholars on almost every point of his life.

His name among Christians is Elias Levita. Elias, or more correctly Elijahu (אליהו), was the name given to him by his parents on the eighth day of his birth, when he was dedicated to the Lord and made a member of the Jewish community by the sign of the covenant enjoined in Gen. xvii. 10-14; whilst Levita $=$ Ha-Levi (הלוי) simply denotes that he belonged to the tribe of Levi. His name among the Jews, which is given by himself in sundry places of his writings, is

Elijahu Bachur, the German (אליהו בחור אשכנזי). Now Landau, ${ }^{1}$ Steinschneider, ${ }^{2}$ Dr. Holmes, ${ }^{5}$ and others, maintain that he obtained the appellation Bachur from his Hebrew Grammar, which he designated by this title. But Levita himself tells us the very reverse, that he called the work in question by his own surname, which he had from his youth. Thus, in the Introduction to the Book Bachur, he says, "Behold, I have called this book Bachur, for three reasons:-i. Because the book itself is choice and excellent [in allusion to Is. vii. 15, 16], being entirely pure meal without any chaff. ii. Because it has been compiled for every young man to study therein in the days of his youth, so that his heart might be improved in his later days; and, iii. Because it is my surname $I$ have founded it upon the name Bachur." ${ }^{\prime}$ To the same effect is his remark at the end of the book: "To those who ask thee, whose book art thou? say Elijahu's, whose surname is Bachur;'" ${ }^{\prime}$ as well as the poem to the second edition: "Because it is useful for the young, as well as excellent, and my own name is Bachur, I called it Bachur." ${ }^{\prime}$ This is moreover corroborated by the fact, that he calls himself Bachur in the Fiction entitled Baba-Buch, which he wrote eleven years before he published the Grammar in question, (vide infra. p. 14).

He was born in 1468, as is evident from the poem which he appended to his edition of R. Isaac Duren's ${ }^{7}$ work on the Ceremonial Law, published at Venice, 1548, and which is as follows :-

[^0]"An excellent work is the 'Gates of Duren,' by Isaac Rabbi of Duren.
Therein are described all proscribed meats; there is nothing like it in propounding the laws.
Therein, too, are exhibited the laws of purification, with most of the opinions of the learned in the law.
Published Shebat 3, 308 [= Decemb. 13, 1548], of the short era of the creation.
The writer of this poem is Elijahu Bachur, aged four-score years by reason of strength." ${ }^{s}$
To understand the dates of this epilogue, it is necessary to remark that the Israelites reckon from the creation of the world, and that their chronology is 230 years shorter than ours. Thas, for instance, whilst this year, i.e. 1866 a.d., is with us 5856 a.m., it is with the Jews 5626 a.m. Moreover, it is to be noted that in Hebrew MSS., as well as in printed books, two modes are adopted of expressing the date. The one is by writing the full numbering: that is, 5626 А. . . $=1866$ A.D., which is called the Great or Full era (פרט גדול) ; and the other is by omitting the thousands, and leaving them to be understood as. 626, instead of 5626, which is called the Short era (לפרט קטן abbreviated P"S), and which is more generally used for the sake of brevity. Accordingly, 308 stands for $5308=1548$, and if Elias Levita, as be tells us himself, was eighty years old in 1548 , he must have been born in $1468 .{ }^{9}$
\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 8 סםר נצים ,שצרי דורא, ,פל שם יצחק ,רב מדורא: }
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בו נצמדה הלכוח נרה ,עם רוב דיעוח ,לומדי חודה,
נדפס לפרט גימ"ל משב"ט , לן מכפּר קטן של היציצורה
המשורר הוא אליהו בחור זקן ט' לגבורה -

[^1]Exceedingly little is known of Elias Levita's family. From his own signature we learn that his father's name was Asher, and that he was born in Germany. The celebrated Sebastian Münster, in whose house Levita lived for some time, who translated many of his books into Latin, and who ought therefore to be regarded as the highest authority on this subject, distinctly tells us that the place where his parents resided, and where he was born, is Nenstadt, on the Aisch, near Nurmburg. ${ }^{10}$ Münster's statement is fully borne out by Levita's own remarks in his different works, in which he always includes himself when speaking of the Germans. Thus, in his Exposition of 712 words from Jewish literatare, he says, on the expression號 it denotes small writing; that is, when the writing is not in square characters it is משקיט. It is now many years ago that I was told that it is an Arabic expression, signifying thin, attenuated; but I afterwards got to know that it is not Arabic at all. I have asked many Jews from Italy, France, Spain, Greece, and Arabia, all of whom pronounce it in this way, but none of them knew its derivation. We Germans, however, pronounce it מעשיט, and we too do not know whence it is derived." To the same effect is Levita's remark in the Introduction to his Massoretical work, entitled the Book of Remembrance: "I shall put down in the explanation of each word its signification in German, which is the language of my countrymen." ${ }^{11}$ From the words, "to those who ask thee who made thee, say the hands of Elias made
${ }^{10-}$ Comp. Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebrcea, i. 153 ; iii. 97.
11 מששקיט קורין לכתיבה דקה רוצה לומר שאינה כתיבה מרובצת. משקיש : ווה ימים רבים שהוגר לי שהוא לשון פרבי פרוש רוה וכתושה, ואחר בך נורע ל שיאינז לשון ערבי מלל: ושאלתי ליהורים רבים לועוים וצרשתים וספרדים ויונים וערביים וכולם קורין לה כן ולאידעו לפתרו מה הוא' ואנתנו האשכנוים קורין להם מעשים ולא.ירעני מה הוא.
See also the Tishbi under the expression מקן and other places, in all of which he classes himself with the Germans, saying אנדבו האשכנוים we Germans. The passage quoted from Levita's Epilogue to his מחורגמי, where he says, אלך לי אל ארצי אשר
 country, which I have left, namely, to the city of Venice, and die in my town with my aged wife, to prove that he was born at Venice, is both at variance with his other remarks and inconclnsive. For it will be seen that he does not call Venice his native place (עיר מולרתי), which he would nndonbtedly have done had he been born in it, but simply styles it " my town" (עיר), "the town which I left" (אשר יצאתי משם), which any one would do who had lived in a town many years, and left there his wife and family.
.גם אכתוב אצל כל ביאור כל מלה ומלה פחרונה בלשון אשכנו שהיא לשין בגי עמי 12. See Frankel's Monatschrift fur Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, xii. 96-108. Breslan, 1863, where the learned Frensdorff has printed the Introduction to this unpublished work.
me, the son of a man who is called Asher Levi, a German, a man of valour and distinction," in the Epilogue to the book now edited with an English translation, the erudite Frensdorff ingeniously conjectures that R. Asher, Levita's father, was a military man, perhaps holding the office of a commissary in the German army, since the phrase אייש חדל men of valour also denotes a military man, and the expression אפרת is used in later Hebrew for rank. Frensdorff moreover submits that this will explain the origin of Levita's surname, Bachur, inasmuch as, the son of a military man, he could legitimately substitute for איש חיל military man, and officer, the word in allusion to Exod. xiv. 7; Judg. x. 15; 1 Sam. xxiv. 3; Jerem. xlix. 19; \&c., \&c. ${ }^{13}$

From the day of his birth to his thirty-sixth year (1468-1504) we hear nothing either of him or his family. The state of the Jews in Germany was too deplorable to admit of any record being kept about the personal circnmstances and doings of private individuals. Indeed, it may well be questioned whether, since the advent of Cbrist, the destruction of Jerusalem, and the dispersion of the Jews, there was a period in the history of the world pregnant with greater events for the Christian nations, and franght with more terrible results for the Jewish people, than that in which Levita spent his youth. When he was two years of age, all his brethren were expelled from Mayence and the Rheingau by Adolph of Nassau (October 29, 1470), after being recognised Archbishop of electoral Mayence by the Pope, on the deposition of Diether of Isenburg, the rival Archbishop, who converted the ancient synagogue into a church. When he was seven years of age, his youthful heart was afflicted with the horrible tidings that Bishop Hinderbach had the whole Jewish community at Trent burned (1475), in consequence of a base calumny that they had killed for their Passover a Christian boy named Simon. The infamous calumny about the murder of this boy rapidly spread through Christendom, and everywhere kindled the fires of persecution, so much so that, notwithstanding the prohibition of Pope Sixtus IV. (October 10, 1475) to worship Simon of Trent as saint till the charge had been properly inyestigated, the Jews in Germany were massacred whenever they quitted their quarters. The Bishop of Nassau nearly exterminated all the Jews under his jurisdiction; and the magnates of Ratisbon, in the very neighbourhood of Levita's birth-place, expelled all the Jewish popula-

[^2]tion from their dominions ( $1477-1480$ ) when he was about twelve years of age.

The awful sufferings which the Jews had to endure in Germany, from those whose Saviour was a Jew, and whose Apostles and Prophets were Jews, strangely contrasted with the kind treatment which they experienced in Turkey, from the infidels, the followers of the false prophet, and must have produced an extraordinary and indelible impression upon so shrewd a mind as that of Levita. When he was about fifteen years of age, Isaac Zarphati (1475-1485), one of the numerous Jews who fled from the fiery persecutions under the Cross to seek safety under the Crescent, addressed the following epistle to his brethren in Germany:-"I have been informed of the calamities, more bitter than death, "which have befallen our brethren in Germany; of the tyrannical laws, the compulsory baptisms, and the banishments which take place daily. And if they fly from one place, greater misfortunes befall them in another place. I hear an impudent nation lifting up its raging voice against the faithful, and see its hand swinging over them. There are woes within and woes without; daily edicts and taskmasters to extort money. The spiritual guides and the monks; the false priests, rise up against the unhappy people, and say, ' We will persecute them to destruction, the name of Israel shall no more be remembered.' They imagine that their religion is in danger, because the Jews in Jerusalem may, peradventure, purchase the church of the sepulchre. For this reason, they have issued a decree that every Jew who is found on a Christian ship sailing for the East is to be thrown into the sea. How are the holy German community treated; how are their energies weakened! The Christians not only drive them from place to place, but lurk after their lives, brandish over them the sharpened sword, cast them into the flaming fire, into surging waters, or into stinking swamps. My brethren and teachers, friends and acquaintances, I, Isaac Zarphati, who come from France, was born in Germany, and there sat at the feet of masters, proclaim to you, that Turkey is a land in which nothing is wanted. If ye are willing, it will be well with you. You will be able safely to go from Turkey to the Holy Land. Is it not better to live among Mahommedans than among Christians? Here, we are allowed to dress in the finest materials; here, every one sits under his own fig-tree and vines; whilst in Christian countries, you are not even permitted to dress your children in red or blue without exposing them to be beaten red or blue. Hence
you are obliged to walk about like beggars and in rags! All your days are gloomy, even your Sabbaths and festivals; strangers enjoy your possessions, and what use are treasures to a wealthy Jew? He only keeps them to his own misfortuae, and they are all lost in one day. You call them yours; no! they are theirs. They invent lying accusations against you ; they regard neither age nor knowledge. And when they give you a promise, though sealed with sixty seals, they break it. They always inflict upon yon double punishment, the most cruel death, and plunder. They prohibit the instruction in our schools, disturb our prayers forbid the Jews to work on Christian festivals, or to carry on business. And now, O Israel! why sleepest thou? Arise, and quit this cursed land!' ${ }^{14}$

Such lessons of Christian persecution and Mahommedan protection did Levita learn when he was about fifteen years of age; and there can be but little doubt that it was in consequence of the terrible sufferings which the Jews had to endure in Germany, and Isaac Zarphati's thrilling summons to his brethren to quit this het-bed of suffering, that Levita's family, and as many other Jews as could afford it, emigrated, and sought an asylum wherever it could be found. The fact that Levita had already acquired a very high reputation, and delivered lectures on Grammar, at Padua, in the thirty-sixth year of his age, shews that his family must have settled in this town some years before, to allow sufficient time for the acquisition of his learning and influence in a place which was then the chief seat of Jewish learning in Italy. His flight into Venetia, however, did not place him beyond the reach of the agonising ery of his suffering brethren. Whilst diligently engaged in the study of Grammar and the Massorah, at the age of twenty-four (1492), Levita heard of the harrowing scenes enacted in Spain, where the whole Jewish population, about 300,000 in number, were expelled,-a calamity which, in Jewish history, is only equalled in magnitude by the destruction of the Temple and the dispersion of the Israelites by Titus. Many of these brokenhearted wanderers who sought refuge in Italy, Levita must have seen. But the cup of bitterness was not yet full. In his twenty-eighth year,

[^3]he heard of the edict issued (December 20, 1496) by Emanuel, King of Portugal, that all the Jews and Moors of his dominions should submit to Christian baptism, or quit the country by October next (1497) on pain of death. He, moreover, heard that the king, disappointed at so few Jews embracing Christianity, issued a secret command from Estremo Castle (February 4, 1497), forcibly to take all Jewish children of his dominion, both boys and girls, up to fourteen years of age, from their parents, and to baptise them on Easter Sunday; the heart-rending effects of which are described by an eye-witness to the scene in the following terms:-"I have seen," relates Bishop Ferdinando Couthin, of Algarve, who protested against this compulsory baptism, "how multitudes were dragged by the hair to the baptismal font, and how the afflicted fathers, with their veiled heads, and agonising cries, followed their children, and protested at the altar against this inhuman compulsory baptism. I have also seen other inexpressible barbarities which were heaped upon them. ${ }^{115}$ And when at last the period fixed for their departure had arrived, and about 20,000 Jews were again driven from their homes into the wide, wide world, to seek a resting-place, Levita again saw many of his wandering brethren, who filled his heart with their afflictions, more bitter than death. We shall hereafter see that it is necessary to bear these things in mind, in order to understand the charges against which Levita defends himself in the second introduction to this work.

These sufferings and repeated expulsions of the Jews, however, were overruled by Him who makes the wrath of man to praise Him, for the advancement of Hebrew literature, for the extension of Biblical knowledge, and for kindling the light of the Reformation, in which Elias Levita played an important part. Though the bulk of the Jewish population in Germany, 300,000 in Spain, and 20,000 in Portugal preferred to quit their homes and everything dear and near unto them; and though many of them submitted to the most cruel deaths rather than embrace the Christianity in the name of which these barbarities were perpetrated; yet an immense number of them, not having a martyr's courage, or being reluctant to lose their children, who were snatched from them, embraced the Christian faith. Many of these Neophytes secretly remained Jews, whilst others sincerely believed the religion which they were at first forced to embrace. Among them were men of most distinguished attainments and extraordinary know-

[^4]ledge of Hebrew and Biblical literature. These soon began to spread the knowledge of the sacred language among Christians, by the aid of the newly invented art of printing. And as many of the Jewish converts were Kabbalists, they also initiated their Gentile disciples into its mysteries, and made almost as large a number of converts among Christians to this esoteric doctrine as Christianity had gained among the Jews.

Foremost in the ranks of Jewish converts who laboured in the department of Biblical literature were Alphonso de Alcala, Paul Coronel, and Alphonso de Zamora, who were employed in editing the celebrated Complutensian Polyglott, the sixth volume of which is almost entirely the work of Zamora. To these are to be added Felix Pratensis, the famous editor of the editio princeps of Bomberg's Rabbinic Bible, and Jacob b. Chajim, the editor of the second edition of Bomberg's Rabbinic Bible, who immortalised his name by his elaborate Introduction to this Bible, and by compiling and editing for the first time the critical apparatus of the Old Testament, called the Massorah. As propounders of the Kabbalah, among the Jewish converts, are to be mentioned Paul de Heredia, the author and translator of sundry Kabbalistic works, which he dedicated to Pope Innocent VIII.; Paul Ricio, professor at Pavia, physician to the Emperor Maximilian I., who translated a large portion of Joseph Gikatilla's Kabbalistic work, entitled "The Gates of Light," which he dedicated to Maximilian, and which Reuchlin used very largely; Vidal de Saragossa de Arragon, Davila, \&c. ${ }^{16}$

The Jews themselves had a still greater phalanx of literary and scientific men who laboured in the departments of Biblical exegesis, the traditional law, the Kabbalah, philosophy, astronomy, \&ce. These literati supplied those Christians who impugned the infallible decisions of the Pope and his conclave respecting matters of doctrine, and who appealed to the Word of God as their sole guide, with the means of understanding the original language in which the greater part of the Bible is written. At the head of those who were thus enriching Biblical literature were Don Isaac b. Jehadah Abravanel (1437-1509), the

[^5]famous statesman, philosopher, theologian, and commentator, who wrote copious commentaries on nearly the whole of the Hebrew Scriptures; Messer Leon, or Jehudah b. Jechiel, as he is called in Hebrew (1430-1505), Rabbi and physician at Mantua, who wrote a very elaborate Hebrew Grammar, a masterly Treatise on Hebrew Rhetoric, after the manner of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian, and a Treatise on Hebrew Logic, and who was called the Hebrew Cicero; the two Aramas, Isaac, the father (1430-1494), and Meier, the son (1470-1556), both of whom wrote extensive expositions of sundry books of the Scriptures; Abraham Saccuto (1450-1520), the famous historian and lexicographer; Saadia Ibn Danan (1450-1502), poet, lexicographer, and commentator; Abraham de Balmes (1450-1521), physician, philosopher, and grammarian; Jacob Mantino, a distinguished Hebraist and physician; Abraham Farissol (1451-1525), the famous cosmographer and commentator ; Levi b. Chabib, Isaac b. Joseph Caro, Jacob Berab Obediah Seforno, Jacob b. Jechiel Loanz, Joseph Ibn Jachja, \&cc., \&c., all of whom contributed materially to the diffusion of Biblical knowledge in its sundry departments. None of these Hebraists, however, who were the contemporaries of Elias Levita, and with many of whom he had personal intercourse, surpassed, or even equalled, our author in his successful efforts, either in mastering the grammatical structure of the Hebrew language, or in diffusing the knowledge of this sacred tongue among Jews, but more especially among Christians, than Levita. And it is not too much to say, that the revival of Hebrew learning and Biblical knowledge in Europe, towards the close of the fifteenth and the commencement of the sixteenth centuries, resulting in the Reformation, which was effected by the immortal Reuchlin, was the result of the tuition which this father of the Reformation received from Jacob b. Jechiel Loanz, physician to the Emperor Frederick MII., Obadiah Seforno, and from Levita.

It was not, however, the wish to become more thoroughly acquainted with the import of the Scriptures which kindled the desire in Reuchlin, and in a number of other eminent Christians, to learn Hebrew, which made them seek the tuition of Loanz, Levita, Seforno, and a host of other Hebraists, ' and which was the means of calling forth the energies and works of Levita. The Kabbalah was the primary cause of the rage among the Christian literati of those days to study Shemitic languages. This esoteric doctrine, which was
declared by the celebrated scholastic metaphysician, Raymond Lully (1236-1315), to be a divine science, and a genuine revelation whose light is revealed to a rational soul, captivated the mind of John Pico della Mirandola (1463-1494). Mirandola, the marvellously gifted son of the sovereign of the small principality of Mirandola, in Italy, received his first lessons in Hebrew, as well as in Aristotelian Arabic philosophy, from Elias del Medigo, or Elias Cretensis, as he is sometimes called, who was born of Jewish parents in the same year as his distinguished pupil and faithful friend. But as Elias del Medigo was hostile to the Kabbalah, and could not, therefore, initiate Mirandola into its mysteries, the Count, who was the wonder of his days, had to put himself under the tuition of Jochanon Allemano, a Rabbi from Constantinople, who had settled down in Italy, and who was very profound in this theosophy. With his marvellous retentive faculties, extraordinary intellectual powers, and almost boundless knowledge, Mirandola soon overcame the difficulties and unravelled the secrets of the Kabbalah. To his amazement, he found that there is more Christianity than Judaism in the Kabbalah. For, according to his showing, he discovered therein proofs of the doctrine of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the divinity of Christ, original sin, the expiation thereof by Christ, the heavenly Jerusalem, the fall of the angels, the order of the angels, purgatory, and hell-fire ; in fact, the same Gospel which we find in St. Paul, Dionysius, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine.

As the result of his Kabbalistic studies, he published in 1486, when only twenty-four years of age, nine hundred theses, which were placarded in Rome, and among which was the following: "No science yields greater proof of the divinity of Christ than magic and the Kabbalah." So delighted was Pope Sixtus IV. with the discovery, that he wished to have Kabbalistic writings translated into Latin, for the use of divinity students; and Mirandola, with the aid of his Jewish teacher, did not delay to gratify the wish of the supreme Pontiff. ${ }^{17}$

The Kabbalah and Hebrew, as well as Aramaic, the clue to this esoteric doctrine, now became the favourite studies, to the neglect of the classics. Popes, cardinals, princes, statesmen, warriors, high and low, old and young, were in search for Jewish teachers. Whilst this Kabbalistic epidemic was raging in Italy, Reuchlin (1455-1521), the reviver of literature in Germany, arrived at Rome with Eberhard the

[^6]Bearded (1482), in the capacity of private secretary and privy councillor to this prince. From the eternal city he accompanied him to Florence, where he became acquainted with Mirandola, and caught the infection of the esoteric doctrine. The infection, however, proved innocuous for a little time, since, on his return to Germany (1484), he was appointed licentiate and assessor of the supreme court in Stutgard; and, as the Dominicans elected him proctor of their order in the whole of Germany, it precluded the possibility of his entering at once upon the study of Hebrew and Aramaic. But the disease fully developed itself when he returned from his second journey to Rome and Florence (1490), after having come into contact a second time with Mirandola, who told him of the wonderful mysteries concealed in the Kabbalah.

The great influence of Reuchlin soon spread the desire for studying Hebrew and the Kabbalah among Christians in Germany. Every one who had any claim to literary attainments was now in search of a Jewish teacher. Reuchlin put himself under the tuition of R. Jacob b. Jechiel Loanz, physician to Frederick III., and made such extraordinary progress, that, within four years of beginning to study Hebrew, he published his first Kabbalistic Treatise, entitled, "Concerning the Wonderful Word," which he dedicated to Dalberg, Bishop of Worms. It was this intense love for Hebrew and Hebrew literature which made Reuchlin espouse the cause of the Jews, and defend them and their writings against the misguided and malicious assanlts of the fanatical Pfefferkorn on his former co-religionists, and which kindled the fire of the Reformation.

In Italy the Kabbalah and Hebrew were studied to a still greater extent. Here Abraham Saba, Jehudah b. Jacob Chajath, Joseph Shraga, Kana or Elkana, Jehudah Ibn Verga were the teachers of this theosophy among the Jews; whilst among the Christians the chief Jewish teachers were R. Jachanon Alleman, who initiated Mirandola into its mysteries, and Samuel Abravanel, in whose house Baruch of Benevent delivered lectures on the Kabbalah to most distinguished Christians. Baruch of Benevent also instructed Egidio de Viterbo (afterwards cardinal) in this esoteric doctrine, and translated the Sohar into Latin for him. It was this Egidio, as we shall see hereafter, who, in consequence of his being seized with the general desire to study the Kabbalah, was the means of calling forth Elias Levita, and of encouraging our author to write most of his works, thus constituting him the chief teacher of Hebrew among Christians.

We have already seen that, up to his thirty-sixth year (1504), Levita delivered lectures on Hebrew grammar in the great Jewish academy at Padua to a large number of Jewish students, who came to be taught by him from far and wide. As the text-book for these lectures he took R. Moses Kimchi's Outlines of Hebrew Grammar, entitled "Journey on the Paths of Knowledge, ${ }^{18}$ which most probably commended itself to him because of its conciseness, and because its author was the first who employed therein, as a paradigm of the regular verbs, the word פקר, instead of the less appropriate verb media. gutteralis $פ$, which, in imitation of the Arabic grammarians, had been used in all other grammars. Though Moses Kimchi flourished about $1160-1170$, and must have written this short grammar three hundred and fifty years before it was annotated by Levita, yet the manual was still in MS., and the copy which Levita used as the basis for his lectures must have been made by himself. His explanations were so acceptable, that he was requested by his papils to publish them, together with the text book (1504).

Unhappily, however, the plague broke out at Padua, and as Christians usually believed that the Jews were the cause of every epidemic and calamity, the Jewish quarter was blocked up, and the entrance to the street in which Levita resided was closed. When thus shut up in the house, his amanuensis escaped with the MS. to Pesaro, where he had the work printed without Levita's name, but with an Introduction by Benjamin of Rome, who was, consequently, taken by every body to be the author of the Commentaries to M. Kimchi's Grammar. The plagiarist also interpolated the annotations with excerpts from another work, and in this form Levita's maiden production was most incorrectly printed in another name at Pesaro (1508). In this mutilated form, and under the surreptitious name, M. Kimchi's "Journey on the Paths of Knowledge," with Levita's Commentary, became the manual for students of the Hebrew language, both among Jews and Christians. It was speedily reprinted several times at Pesaro (1509-18, 1518-1519); it made its way to Germany and France, where it was reprinted (Hagenau, 1519; Paris, 1520); and became the text book of the carly Reformers, who were

[^7]studying Hebrew to translate the Scriptures; and was translated into Latin by Sebastian Münster (Basle, 1531; ibid, 1536). We shall have to recur to this production when we come to the period of Levita's life when he thought it his duty to claim the paternity of the annotations.

The dry studies of grammar and philology did not deprive him of his humour, for,-three years after the publication of the annotations to M. Kimchi's work, Levita amused himself by writing, in German, a fiction, entitled Baba-Buch (בבא בוך), purporting to be a history of the Prince of Baba. It was evidently intended to be a song, since he remarks in the rhythmical Preface—"Aber der ניגון (= Melody) der darauf wird gehen, Den kenn ich nit geben zu verstehen, Denn einer kennt musiga oder (טולפה). So wollt ich ihm wohl haben geholfen, Aber ich sing' es mit cinem welschen Gesang, Kann er drauf machen ein bessern so hab er Dank." That he composed it in 1507, he most distinctly declares at the end of the book in the following words-"Damit hat das Buch ein Enden. Doch will ich nennen vor . . Elia Bachur nennt er sich zwar, Ein ganz Jahr hat er drüber verschrieben, Und hat es gemacht das selbig Jar, Das man zählt 267 [=1507], Er hot [lot = lost ?] es aus in Nisan und hob es an in Ijjar . . . soll uns fülhen ken Jerusalem hinein, Oder irgend ein Dörfel daneben חסלת .אסטוריא של בבא דאנטוגא. Here endeth the history of Baba de Antona." This book was first printed in $1508 .{ }^{19}$

But Levita was not destined long to enjoy, his peaceful studies and innocent recreations. Five years after the outbreak of the epidemic, and only twelve months after the publication of this fiction, the army of the league of Cambray took Padua (1509) and sacked it, when Levita lost every thing he possessed, and in a most destitute condition had to leave the place in which he had successfully taught for some years, and where he was held in high estimation, to seek a livelihood in the wide wide world. As the Kabbalah was a classical study at Rome, where the popes and cardinals looked upon it as an important auxiliary to Christianity, Hebrew teachers were in great requisition in the Eternal City. Knowing this, Levita at once betook himself to the capital. It was here that he heard of the scholarly and liberal minded Egidio de Viterbo, general of the Augustine order, and

[^8]afterwards cardinal, who was engaged in studying Hebrew, and of course the esoteric doctrine. He therefore determined to call upon him.

The first interview between the eminent Christian scholar and the famous Hebrew grammarian is thus described by the latter. "When I heard of his fame, I waited upon him at his palace. On seeing me he enquired after my business; and when $I$ told him that I am the grammarian from Germany, and that I devote my whole life to the study of Hebrew philology and the Scriptures, . . . he at once rose from his seat, came towards me, and embraced me, saying, 'Are you forsooth Elijahu, whose fame has travelled over countries, and whose books are circulated everywhere? Blessed be the Lord of the Universe for bringing you here, and for our meeting. You must now remain with me; you shall be my teacher, and I will be a father to you. I will maintain you and your family,' " \&c. ${ }^{20}$

Such a cordial reception could not fail in its effect, and Levita at once accepted the offer of the generous Egidio. As Egidio's chiof object in learning Hebrew was to be able to fathom the mysteries of the Kabbalah, Levita had not only to instruct his pupil in the sacred tongue, but to aid him in his endeavours to acquire a knowledge of the esoteric doctrine. Hence we find that as early as 1516-that is before Egidio was elevated to the dignity of Cardinal-Levita copied for him three Kabbalistic works, viz., i. A Commentary on the Book Jetzira (פירוש ספר יצירה); ii. The Mystery of the Angel Raziel (סור רזיאל); and iii. The Book on the Wisdom of the Soul (תפר) (חכמת הנפשׁ). It is also supposed that Levita supplied at this time the passages from the Sohar to the work entitled, "On the Mysteries of the Catholic Truth," by Petrus Galatinus, which was finished in September, 1516, and published in 1518, since its Gentile authors could not possibly, without the aid of a Jew, have dived into the Sohar. We do not, however, lay much stress on this, though the supposition proceeds from no less an authority than the celebrated historian, Dr. Graetz. ${ }^{21}$ We have seen that there were plenty of converted Jews, Kabbalists, to aid Galatinus in a work, the express design of which was to convince the Jews of the truth of the Catholic religion, without being obliged to appeal to Levita for

[^9]help in such an undertaking, which must have been repugnant to his Jewish feelings.

The intimacy of Levita with Egidio, however, was the means of producing works of far greater importance, and of more permanent utility to Biblical literature, than the De Arcanis Catholica Veritatis of Galatinus. The very year in which this assault on the Jews and Judaism appeared, Levita published his grammar (1518), entitled, The Book Bachur (ספר הבחור). This grammar he wrote at the suggestion, and for the use, of Cardinal Egidio, to whom he dedicated it, as may be seen from the following words in the Introduction to the work in question: "In the year 5277 a.m. [ $=1517$ a.d.] the Lord stirred up the spirit of a wise man, conversant with all sciences, and of high dignity, Cardinal Egidio-may his glory be exalted! He was anxious to find out the excellent words and the beautiful writing in the books of our sacred language. For this reason he called on me, his servant, Elijahu Levita, the German, the least of the grammarians, and said to me, What art thou doing, Elijahu? Arise now, and make a book which shall pleasantly set forth the grammar of the Hebrew language, since all the Hebrew grammars which I have seen do not satisfy me, nor do they quench my desire for grammar ; as some of them are too lengthy, multiplying useless rules, and some are too short in stating what is necessary. Gird up thy loins, therefore, like a man, and adopt the medium between the two extremes, propound the science of grammar in rules not hitherto laid down, but necessary to be exhibited; make them into a book for the benefit of the multitude, so that it may be an ensign for the people, whereunto the Gentiles shall come, and find rest for their souls. When I heard his encouraging words, I at once determined to accede to his request, and compiled this little work on grammar."

Levita, as we have seen, called this grammar Bachur (בחור), for three reasons, which are based upon the threefold meaning of the expression, as well as upon the design of the work. As the word denotes both youth and excellent, and is also his surname, he called it by this name, because, he naïvely tells us, it is designed for the young, it is excellent, and it is his proper name. The treatise is divided into four parts, each one of which is subdivided into thirteen sections, answering to the Thirteen Articles of the Jewish Creed, whilst the total number of all sections, being fifty-two, represents the numerical value of the name אליהו. The first part discusses the nature of the

Hebrew verbs; the second the changes in the vowel-points of the different conjugations; the third the regular nouns; and the fourth the irregular nouns. The simple and beautiful Hebrew in which it is written, as well as the clearness and perspicuity with which it sets forth the structure of the sacred language, at once made the treatise a universal favourite with Hebrew students, both Jewish and Gentile. Not even the very elaborate and masterly Grammar of Abraham de Balmes, which was published five years later (1523), could supersede it. The Bachur was the Gesenius of the time, whilst the Mikne Abraham (מקנה אברהם), which is the name of De Balmes' Grammar, was the Ewald among Hebrew students. Münster published it, with a Latin translation, for the use of Christians in Germany and elsewhere (1525). The revision of it will be discussed when we arrive at that part of Levita's life when he engaged in it.

In the same year in which Levita carried through the press in Rome (1518) his excellent Grammar, he also published "Tables of Paradigms," (לוח בדקרוק הפעלים והבנינים), exhibiting in an elementary form the Hebrew conjugations. The design of these Paradigms, which he compiled from two different sections of the Bachur, ${ }^{22}$ is to give to the tyro some notion of Hebrew Grammar. These Paradigms are of such extreme rarity, that no Hebrew copy of them has as yet been discovered, and they are only known from Münster's translation. He moreover completed and printed a treatise on the Irregular Words in the Bible, the discussion of which he designedly excluded from his Grammar. This dissertation is entitled "The Book on Compounds" (ספר ההרכבה), because it treats on words composed of different words and conjugations. It consists of two hundred and twelve articles, answering to the numerical value of Levita's surname בחור Bachur; so that the two numbers together, viz., of the sections in the grammar, and of the articles in this treatise, represent the complete name אליחו בחור Elijahu Bachur. The 216 words in this dissertation are not arranged according to their roots, because there is a great difference of opinion among grammarians and lexicographers respecting the etymology of some of them, but they are put down in alphabetical order. The manner in which he treated them

[^10]will be best seen from his own description of the plan of the work: "As my design in this treatise," he says in the Introduction, "is to explain those words only which are anomalons in their grammatical structure, and since the principal grammarians advance different opinions about them, I have stated all their various opinions, and sometimes also contributed my share, according to my limited understanding." This work, too, was translated into Latin by Münster, and published at Basle, 1525. It had such a wide circulation among Christian students, and especially among the early Reformers; that it was reprinted in the Latin version, Basle, 1586, and underwent several editions in the original Hebrew.

His desire to explain every intricacy and anomaly in the Hebrew language, and yet the fear lest hampering his Grammar with too many digressions might preclude it from becoming a manual for the people. at large, produced in him the conviction that those points which required lengthy and elaborate explanations would be more acceptable. if appended to the book in the form of Dissertations. He therefore promised, in sundry parts of the Bachur, to discuss these subjects at the end of the Grammar. But, as is often the case, when he had finished the book, he found that untoward circumstances rendered it impossible for him to compile the promised Appendices, and had to publish it without them. This be tells us is the reason why he was obliged to publish the dissertations separately. As soon as he had carried through the press his "Treatise on the Compounds," he betook himself to the work of these dissertations, and succeeded in publishing them two years after the appearance of the preceding treatise (1520). As the Grammar was the centre around which the sundry treatises clustered, he constituted it the model after which he formed these dissertations. Hence, like the Grammar, he divided them into four parts, consisting respectively of thirteen sections, according to the thirteen articles of the Jewish creed, whilst the sum total of the sections, namely, fifty-two, like that of the Grammar, represents the numerical value of the author's name (אליהו). The first section, or dissertation, which is preceded by a separate Introduction and Table of Contents, discusses, in thirteen stanzas or poems, the laws of the letters, the vowel points, and the accents; and in consequence of its being written in separate poems or stanzas it is denominated "The Poetical Section or Dissertation" (פרק שירה). The second section, which is also preceded by a separate Introduction
and Table of Contents, discusses, in thirteen chapters, written in prose, the different parts of speech, and hence is called "The Section on the Different Kinds of Words" (פרק המינים). The third section, which is preceded by an Introduction only, treats on the numbers and genders of the several parts of speech, seeing that some of them only occur as masculine, some only as feminine, some only in the singular, some only in the plural, some only in the singular and plural feminine, some only in the singular and plural masculine, and some as common genders. These words are here classified according to rules; hence it is styled "The Section of Rules" (פרק המרות). The fourth section treats on the seven servile letters (מש"ה ובליב), and hence is denominated "the Section on the Serviles" (פרק השמושים). The four dissertations were first published at Pesaro (1520), under the general title "the Sections of Elijahu" (פרקי אליהו). They also soon found their way into Germany, where they were re-published, with a Latin translation by Münster, Basle, 1527.

The four grammatical treatises which he composed at Rome, and his residence for thirteen years at the palace of Cardinal Egidio, where he constantly came into contact with the chief literary men of the day, extended Levita's fame over Europe, and he was appealed to from far and wide for his opinion on matters of Hebrew literature. No allurements of society, however - no worldly pleasures or gain - could tempt him from his work. Whilst in the house of his friend the Cardinal, he not only devoted his time to the instruction of his eminent pupil, and writing the valuable grammatical treatises, but took lessons from Egidio in Greek, and made such rapid progress, that be could read with fluency the Septuagint and the Greek classics.

There can be but little doubt that Levita's writings were intimately connected with the studies of his most distinguished and accomplished pupils. Their rapid progress in Hebrew, their desire to master those portions of the Scriptures which are written in Chaldee, as well as to read the paraphrases, and their diving into Kabbalistic works, necessarily involved more extensive instruction, both in the higher branches of Biblical literature and in the special dialects in which the important documents of the esoteric doctrine are written. Hence it is that we now find him (1520) most industriously engaged upon two particular works: one a most gigantic work on the Massorah, to which we shall have to recur when we arrive at the period of its completion ; and the other an Aramaic Grammar. After labouring
nine years on a Concordance to the Massorah, and making considerable progress in the Aramaic Grammar, he was again driven from his peaceful studies at the sacking of Rome by the Imperialists under Charles V. (May 6, 1527), when the greater part of his MSS. and property were destroyed.

The plan which he adopted in compiling the Aramaic Grammar will best be gathered from his own words: "Since the time when the Chaldee Paraphrases were made," Levita says, in the Introduction to his Lexicon on the Targamim, "there has not been a wise and intelligent man in Israel who could make a Grammar to them, such as was made by Jehudah, who was the first Hebrew grammarian of blessed memory, and before whom there was no Grammar at all to the sacred language. Having found the twenty-four sacred books pointed, accented, and annotated by the Massorites, he set about to aid the Israelites, and to enlighten the eyes of the exiles in the grammar thereof. After him came R. Jonah, after him R. Saadia Gaon of blessed memory, ${ }^{23}$ and after them again grammarians without number. But there was no one engaged in the grammatical study of the Targum to correct its blunders ; every one turned his back to it. Hence came to pass the general confusion. I, therefore, submitted that there is a proper way for making a Grammar to the language of the Targum; that the Targum of Daniel and Ezra should be made the basis, and the conjugations should be founded upon it. alone, and not upon the Targumim generally; and that the rules of grammar should be deduced therefrom, though they may not all be obtained from such scanty materials. Now, when I was at Rome, my heart was filled

[^11]with the desire to undertake this work, and I actually finished one part. But the evil days came, and the city was captured, when this portion was either destroyed or taken away, since no one knows what has become of it."

Deprived of his MSS., despoiled of his property, driven from his peaceful studies and from an inflnential circle of literary friends at Rome, Levita betook himself to Venice in a most destitute and deplorable condition, in 1527 . Venice was then the chief seat of Hebrew learning, and had the chief printing establishment for Hebrew books. Here Daniel Bomberg, of Antwerp, established his celebrated printing office in 1516, which created a new epoch in Jewish typography. Within the ten years which intervened between its establishment and the arrival of Levita at Venice (1516-1527), the indefatigable and enterprising Bomberg had already issued from his press the first two editions of the celebrated Rabbinic Bible, the one edited by Felix Pratensis (1516-17), a converted Jew, and the other by Jacob b. Chajim (1524-25), who also embraced christianity; two beautiful editions of the Hebrew Scriptures without the Rabhinic commentaries (1518, 1521); the first complete edition of the Babylon Talmud, which is the model of all succeeding editions; the editio princeps of the Jerusalem Talmud (1523); the editio princeps of the first Hebrew concordance to the Scriptures, by Isaac Nathan $\mathbf{b}$. Kalonymos (1523); the elaborate Hebrew grammar by De Balmes (1523) ; and a host of other very important Biblical and Rabbinic works. It was this honourable distinction which Venice obtained as the seat of Hebrew literature, which made Levita decide to make it his future abiding place.

Destitute and deplorable as his condition was on arriving with his wife and children at Venice in 1527, it was not as calamitous as his plight after the sacking of Padua in 1509, when he arrived at Rome. His four works on the grammar and structure of the Old Testament Hebrew, had now obtained for him a world-wide repntation. They had been reprinted, translated into Latin, circulated all over Europe, studied by the most distinguished scholars of Christendom, and were constantly appealed to as the highest authority. Levita himself in the truly Oriental manner, which was also the fashion among Occidental scholars at that time, naïvely recounts the glory of his own productions and success in the following words: "The four works of mine, owing to thsir wisdom and knowledge, have been published several times,
translated into languages of the Christians, and are studied both by Jews and Christians, as their fame has travelled far and their excellence is known all over the world; they send forth an odour like precious ointment, on which account I congratulate myself. Now I speak the truth when I say that there is no author whom God has permitted to see in his lifetime, his works so much referred to and studied, and so many times reprinted as He has permitted me during my lifetime." This Eastern self-laudation is, according to the modern interpretation of some great and good men who have resorted to it in our days, simply giving the opinion of others about ourselves.

With such a world-wide reputation, Levita had no difficulty in finding occupation at Venice. Indeed Bomberg, who was the great centre of Hebrew literature in this city, knew Levita personally, and published a poem of his in the second editien of the Rabbinic Bible (1525), two years before his arrival at Venice. He therefore at once employed him as corrector of the Hebrew Press, and editor of sundry Hebrew works. As the first instalment of his labours in connection with Bomberg's printing office, is to be mentioned the new edition of David Kimchi's (1160-1235) Hebrew Lexicon, commonly called." The Book of Roots" (ספר השרששים), which, though corrected by Isaiah b. Eleazar Parnas, was revised by Levita, who also wrote a laudatory poem to it by way of Epilogue (1529). Besides revising the works published by Bomberg, he devoted all his spare time to the elucidation of the Massorah, which, as we have seen, he had already begun when at Rome. The means for supporting his family he chiefly derived from tuition, as the salary which he got from Bomberg must have been exceedingly small.

To the furtherance of Biblical literature, it happened that the erudite and liberally-minded George de Selve, afterwards bishop of Lavour, was then the French Ambassador of Francis I., at Venice. Though occupying a most distinguished position among the statesmen and scholars of the sixteenth century, he placed himself under the tuition of Levita, and made such marvellous progress in Hebrew, that he could express himself with the same facility in it as in Latin and Greek, which constituted the three literary languages of the day. The intimacy which arose between the distinguished pupil and the renowned teacher was the means both of enriching Biblical literature and of promoting the study thereof in France, for De Selve most generonsly put.him in a position to complete his stupendous Massoretic

Concordance. With such princely aid, Levita could devote himself more than ever to his darling work; and after labouring over it more than twenty years, and getting all the help he could obtain in the investigation of MSS., collating, copying, \&c., \&c., he completed his gigantic "Book of Remembrance," as he called it, in 1536, and dedicated it to his friend and liberal patron, George de Selve, Bishop of Lavour. As this important work has never been printed, and moreover as its history and De Selve's connection with it can only be seen from Levita's most simple and most beautiful Hebrew Dedication, we subjoin the following translation of it:24
"To his most exalted Eminence, my lord, George dẹ Selve, Bishop of Lavour, peace be multiplied! It is now some years since I began a work which appeared to me important and very nseful to those who study the structure of the sacred language. The devastation of Rome, however, which took place shortly after it, was the cause of my not finishing it at that time and leaving it incomplete. And even the incomplete part was taken from me, and became a prey of spoil; it was torn and shattered so that nothing but a small portion was left to me, which I brought with me here to Venice, and I gave up all thought of finishing the work any more. But God, who willed that I should complete it, and that the book should be published, stirred up your spirit, and put it into your heart, to study the sacred language under me, which you learned from me with great ease and in a very short time; so that you are famed for your knowledge of the three classical languages-the sacred Hebrew, the rich Greek, and the elegant Latin tongues; you have now acquired all accomplishments,

[^12]and you, my lord, are among the wise like the sun among the stars. You know, my lord, that we one day happened to converse about this work, and that you asked me to show you the disordered portion of it which was still left to me. When you read it you were pleased to think highly of it, and of the advantage which it would be to those who study the Hebrew language. You urged me with all your might to undertake the labour of completing it, and you promised to pay the expenses of the amanuensis, punctuators, and all the rest of them, to bring it to completion, and did it. All this devolved upon you. Thus was I encouraged to undertake this great labour, as well as great honour. I rested neither day nor night till, by the help of God, and by the munificence of you, my lord, I have been permitted to complete it.
" Now, since it is the general custom of the country for everyone who has written a book to dedicate it to one of the great princes of the earth, it is my bounden duty to inscribe this work to no one else but to you. I am, howeyer, far from doing this simply because of the highly exalted position which you occupy, but because of your liberal hand and generous heart, since you, my lord, are the cause of my having completed it, and it is through you that we hope soon to see it printed, published, and fill the earth with its glory. Accept therefore, my lord, this work with the same benign countenance which you have always shown to me; not as if it were mine, sent as a present from me to you, but as from a servant who has laboured for his master, and whose earnings are the earnings of the master. When you read it, you will gather therein some of the fruits of your generosity, and of the silver and gold you have spent on it, which exceeds all the labour and trouble I have spent on it. I cannot sufficiently commend, extol,

[^13]and magnify the book, but its labour will praise it in the gates; and I trust to God that every scholar like you, who reads it, and sees its excellence and usefulness, will be delighted with it, find in it what he wants, praise it, and put it as a crown on his head. Now you, my lord, will be praised in the mouths of all far more than the book and I. To you the highest praise is due, for the virtues which you have displayed in the faithful discharge of your duty, both towards God and man. Every one who sees you reveres you, and every one who hears of you speaks highly of you. Happy the sovereigns who have such learned and wise ambassadors and ministers as you are, and happy the learned and wise who have such masters and princes as you have," \&c., \&c.

As to the plan, contents, and design of this Massoretio Concordance, these will be gathered from the following translation of the Introduction ${ }^{25}$ to it:-
"Thus says Elias Levita. Having determined to compile this great and stupendous work, to put down therein some of the Massoretic annotations wherever required, and to arrange it grammatically, I must acquaint you with what I have done in this my book, and also explain to you the method which I followed, the good hand of the Lord helping me. Notice, in the first place, that this book is arranged according to the order of 'The Book of Roots,' by David Kimchi of blessed memory; but with this difference, that whilst he only adduces under every root one or two examples of each conjugation and tense, or two examples of each of the different nouns, I give under every root all
 בו וימצא מרגועלנשטו וישבחנו, ונתר לראשו יפנדנו, ואחה אדוני חשובח בני נל יותר מהספר וסמני

 הטוב והישר בציני אלדים ואדם בל הימים, וכל עץ ראחה אוחך חציך ואין שמעה ותאשטך , ואשרי
 ושטרווים כמוךי ובוה הנני אקוד ואשחההה לאדוני אפים ארצהי ועפר רגליך אלחךי ואהדה צבד נרצע
 ובקטח פח"וח אחד מעבדי אדוני הקצנים , ך בחנמה ואב בשנים. אלֹדי הלוי אשנמי.
55 אמר אליהו הלוי אחרי אצגר הטכחני לחבר אח השפר הוהחבור גרול והפלא ולשצים בו
 אגי עושח לספּי וה, ואורה אזכם אח חדרך אשר אלך בה כיד ה' הטובה עלי . ראשואונח
 לא הביא בבל שרש דק ב' או ג' פסוקים פכל בנין ופעילח או ב' מכל טין פמיני השמות הנמצאים בשרש חחוא אמנם אני אביא בכל שרש כל הפנלים והשמות וחמלות אשר במצאו
the verbs, nouns, and expressions which are to be found from this root in all the Hebrew Scriptures, and arrange them according to the order of the seven conjugations as classified in the paradigm of the grammar. Thus, for instance, I first give the Kal, then Niphal, then Piel, Pual, Hiphil, Hophal, and Hithpael, having already proved in the Book Bachur that the quadriliteral conjugation has no real existence. I have then divided each conjugation into its six tenses, viz., Præterite, Participle present, Past participle, Infinitive, Imperative, and Future.
"Having enumerated all the conjugations in this manner, I give the nouns which occur from this root. I give first nouns-adjective, which are again subdivided according to their order; that is, the singular masculine is separate, the plural masculine, the singular and plural feminine, as well as each construct and absolute state, are given separately. I also give separately each word which begins with one of the seven servile letters (מש׳"ה וכ"לב), always giving first the Vav, which is the most frequent prefix, and then stating those with prefix Beth, and the rest in their alphabetical order., The same plan I pursue with the other nouns, always giving first those which have no formative additions from the letters ${ }^{4}$, האמנ, as well as with the sundry proper names, ex. gr. names of men, countries, cities, deserts, pools, rivers, and seas. Of these $I$ only adduce those which are found in the Massorah, and they are very numerous. Last of all. follow the conjunctions. Of these, too, I only give those which occur in the Massorah, and which are very numerous.
" Now let that which I have written on the root serve as an illustration. I have put together-i., All the passages of the Scripבצצדע החוא בכל עשדים וארבנה פפרים, ואפרדם על בדר שכעה הבנינים כמו שהם טםודרים בלוח חדקרוק, דהיינו אחדיל בבנין חקל ואת ב בפעל ופעל ופל חרנוש ופעל והפעיל והפעל והתפעל, וכבד חוכחחי בטפר חבחור כי חבנין חמדובע בשל טעיקרו ואאין בו טמש, ואהלק כל בנין לששׁ פעולוחיו, דהיינו עבר ובינוני ופעול ומקור וציווי יעחיר, ואחד שהששלמחי כל הבנינים בנה האופן אתחיל בשמוח הנמצאים באוחו חשרש, ובראשונה יםעי
 וחרבבוח, והמוברחים של בל אחר לבד והםמוכים לבד ועם שבע אוחיוח המשמשוח בראשם טימנם מש"ה וכ"לב, ואחחיל חמיר באוח חו"יו כי חיא חשטש יוחר מכולן, ואת"ב אסדר אוחם שעם בי״ח השמוע והשאר אסרד לםי סדר הא"לף בי ״חת וכן אעשח בשאר טיני השמוח, ובחתלה אשים אותם שחם בלי חוםפח אוריוח האמנ״חי, ואף שצמוח העצםים הפרמים כמו עמוח בני אדם ושמוח ארצוח ועיידוח ומדברוח ונתרוח ואנמים וימים, אמנם לא אביא טחם דק שגמצא ומחם במסודת והם רבים מאר, ואחרונה יסעי סלוח הםעם ונם מחם אקח כל מח שנמצא ומהם במסורח ונם הם דבו למעלה ראש, והמשל מכל מח שאמרחי.מן. שרש אכל אבחוב כל אכל חנמצאים בכל ב״ר ספרים יחד ואח״ב כל ואכל ואח"כ כלל אכלת ואח"כ כל
tures in which Kal Kret．3rd pers．sing．mas．dccurs；then all of ויאָּל Kal pret．3rd pers．sing．mas．with the conjunct．；then all of אָכָלְ Kal pret．2nd pers．sing．mas．；then all of 2nd pers．sing．mas．with the conjunct．；and so the whole of the praeterite．Then，ii．，The present participle，beginning with of which I say there are ten instances of plene，and give them all．I then state all the defectives，then follow all the instances of לכָּ，\＆c．，\＆c．The same method I pursue with all the conjugations， that is，giving all the passages of the Niphal，and of all the other conjugations．Then，iii．，I give the nouns，beginning with those instances of which are Milel；then follow those with the forma－ tive prefix Mem，ex．gr．מַאַבֵ，which occurs four times with Pattach under the Caph，all the others having Kametz；then follow all the
 which are alike in spelling and pronunciation are put together，and the whole of such a class is called a camp or rubric．And if there happens to be any word with Massoretic annotations，I divide the camp into two camps，as I have remarked above under the rubric אֹאוֹ，where I put the ten instances of plene as one class，and the defectives into another，thus making two camps．You are moreover to observe that I give after every class the verbs with the suffixes of the same rubric．Thus，for instance，after the verb I give all the instances in which it occurs with the suffix，as אֲאָלֹ Kal pret．3rd pers． sing．mas．，with suff．3rd pers．sing．mas．，אֲ⿰亻⿱丶⿻工二又 mas．，suff．1st．pers．sing．；so also same is the case with nouns；after


ואבלת וכן כל העבר ואח״כ אחחיל בבינוני ואחחחל אוכל י＇מלאים ואביא אח כלמ ואח＂ב אביא כל חחדרים，ואח״ב ואבל ואח＂ב באכל ואח״ב האכל וכן בלם וכן בל חבנין，ואחוחיל


 מאבלת ובוח חאופן יחיו כל הםלוח השווח במכתב ובמבמא מקובצים יחר ואקרא לכל






nominal suffixes in the order of third person, second person, and first person, as well as the plural and feminine.
" Not to increase, however, the size of the book beyond what is necessary, I have taken care to give each noun and verb in one place only, and not to repeat it in two or three different places, as the author of the Concordance ${ }^{26}$ has uselessly done. Hence, where two verbs occur in several places, joined together, as לאבול ולשתות, to eat and to drink, I cite all the instances under the root , to eat, in the section comprising the Infinitive; and when I come to the root $\boldsymbol{n} \boldsymbol{\pi}$, to drink, in the section containing the Infinitive, I state 'See the root לאכ, to eat, under the Infinitive.' The same is the case with the combined words לשמור ולעשות, to observe and to do, I give all the passages under the root שמר, to observe, and state, under the root עשה , to do, 'See under the root שמר, to observe;' as well as with nouns joined to verbs, or with verbs joined to nouns, I always adduce them under the root of the verbs, and do not give them again under the root of the nouns, provided the Massoretic annotations do not necessitate their being given a second time under the root of the nouns.
"Before, however, I illustrate this by an example, you must notice that each book of the Hebrew Scriptures is divided into small sections, which the Christians call chapters. The same is the case with the Pentateuch, each book of which has been divided by the Massorites into sections. Thus, for instance, the book of Genesis, they divided into twelve sections, Exodus into eleven sections,
 לכהוב שם או מעל אחד רק במקום אחד ולא בשינימ או בשלושה מקומוח כמו שעשה בעל
 טמוכים יחד כמו לאכול ולשתות אבחוב את כלם בשרש אכל כמחנה לאכול וכשאניע לשרשט שחח במחנה לשחוח אכחוב ע"ן בשורם אכל במחנה לאבול, ובן לששמור ולעשות אכחוב כלם בשרש שמר ובשדש עשח אכחוב עי״ן בשרש שמד, ובן חשמות חסמוכים אל הפעלים או שההפעלים סמוכים אליחם אבתוב אותם חמיד בשרשי הפעלים ולא אכתבם פעם אחרת בשדשי השמוח אם לא הכריחני חמסורת לכחוכ אותם פעם שני בשרש חשמוחת, וחדם אכאר וה לך במשל צריך ישחרע כי כל טפר של העשרים וחארבעח נחלק לפרששיות קמנות קראו לחם חהנים קאפיםולי ובן בה' חומשי חורה כמו שחכמי המסורה תלקו כל ספר לפרשעויו פנון ספר


[^14]\&c., \&c., whereas the Christians divided Genesis into fifty chapters, Exodus into forty chapters, and so all the books of the Bible, as .Joshua into twenty-four chapters, Judges into twenty-one chapters, \&c., \&c., making many chapters in the large books, and few chapters in the smaller ones. You are, moreover, to observe, that the Christians also divided Samuel and Kings into two books respectively; the second book of Samuel beginning with 'And it came to pass after the death of Saul,' and the second part of Kings with 'Then Moab rebelled.' Hence, wherever you find Samuel or Kings with two over it, it denotes 2 Sam. or 2 Kings. They also divided Chronicles into two books, the first book extending to the words 'And Soloman was strengthened,' whilst from these words onward is the second book. Hence, whenever you find Chronicles with two over it it denotes 2 Chronicles.
"And now for the illustration of what I have written above. The words ויבלו הישמים and the heavens were finished (Gen. ii. 1), I give under the root כלה to finish; האזינו השמים Give ear, O ye heavens! (Deut. xxxii. 1,) I give under the root $\operatorname{s}$ to be acute. The same is the cass with מוסרות השמים the foundations of the heavens (2 Sam. xxii. 8); בסערה השמים by a whirlwind to the heavens (2 Kings ii. 1) ; נפתחו השמים the heavens were opened (Ezek. i. 1); וישמחו השמים and let the heavens rejoice (Ps. xcvi. 2); ; ויזקו השמים and they cried to the heavens (2 Chron. xxxii. 20), \&c., \&c.; which I give under the roots of the respective verbs; and when I come to the root aw, section the heavens, I pat down all the above phrases.






 הימים שני. והנה המשל על מה שבחבחי לעיל אכחוב ויכלו השמים (דאשית כ') בשרשם


 מראה טקום. פנון ויכלו חשמיס, האוינו השמים, מופדוח השטים, בסעדח השמים, נפחחו חשטים, ישטחו השטים, ויצעקו חשטים ודומיהם כל חד בשדעי הטלוח שלפניהם ואקרא
together, without the references, as 'and the heavens were finished,' 'Give ear, $O$ ye heavens!' with the remark that each phrase will be found specified under the roots of the respective verbs which precede the noun. This camp or section I call the mixed multitude. Hereupon I give those passages in which the word 'heavens' precedes the verb, ex. gr. השמים כסאי , the heavens I shall ascend the heavens are my throne, \&c.: each of which I give under the root of the respective verbs. The same I do when two or three words are joined together; these I only give in one place, ex. gr. the words בסף וֹזוֹ silver and gold, which frequently occur together, I give all of them under the root to shine, with the references and respective passages; and when I come to the root to become pale, I say, For וז והב to shine. Also and gold, see the root phrases דבר וחרב ורעב the root רבר to destroy; and when I come to the root חרב to destroy, I say, See under the root רבר to destroy; the same I do under the root Io be hungry. This method I pursue with all the nouns which are connected with another noun or verb, either preceding or following them. In all such cases I give in the first mixed multitude, all the words which precede the word good, as דבר a good thing, מזבח טוב a a good altar, ברכת טוב a good blessing; \&c., \&c.; and then I put down in the opposite mixed multitude, those words which are preceded by the expression טוב good, as טוב תחי good to give, טוב עבוד good to serve, \&c., \&c. ; so also with the root לבב; in the first mixed multitude I give the phrases דבם לב wise of heart, ערלי לב circumcised of heart, \&c., \&c.; and in the reverse mixed multitude, לב רג heart of restlessness, לב נדכה \&c., \&e.

למחנה האחת האספסוף, ואח"ב אכחוב אוחם עמלוח השמים קודשין אל הפעלים כםו השמים אעלה, השטים כסאי, השטים החרשׁים, השמים מספרים ורומיחן בשרשוּ המלות וכן כששיהיו ב‘ או נ' שמות רצופים לא אכתבם רק במקום אחת והמשל בסף וזהב הנמצא חרבה פעמים טמוכין יחר אכחוב את בלם בשרש וחב עם מדאה טקום שלהם וכשאניע לשרע כסף אכחוב כסף וזהב ע״ין בשרש והב, וכן דבר וחרב ורעב אבתוב את.כלם בשרש רבד
 הששמות אשר הם סטוכים לשם או לפעל אחד לפניהם או לאחריהם אבחוב האספםוף במו רבד טוב, טוכח טוב, ברבת טוב, רודפי טוב, שוחר סוב, מצא מוב ורומיהם רבים במלוח הקורמים למלֹת טוב ואח״ב אכחוב האטפםוף ההפך דהיינו המלוח אשר טוב קודם אליהם, כטו טוב חחי, טוב עבור, טוב וטלח, טוב וישד וכאלח רבות אשר מוב קודם להם, וכן בשוֹר לבב האכפטוף חבם לב, תקקי לב, ערלי לב, מננח לב וכו' וחאםפםוף חהפפך, לב דנו, לב נרכה, לב גשבד, לב טורר ודוטיהם רבים. ועור ואת אעשה כדי לקצד ולא לחאריך
"Moreover, for the sake of brevity, whenever one, two, or three verbs are joined to a noun, I write at the beginning of the root of the word in question, See such and such a root, ex. gr. at the beginning of the root $\bar{\square}$ דָ blood, I say, See under the root to shed, and under the root נקה to be clean, section pure; at the beginning of the root לip voice, I say, See under the roots to to hear, and pan to call; at the beginning of the root oive, I remark, See under the root רכב to ride; and at the beginning of the root house, I state, See under the root בנה to build; so that there is no necessity to put down in any of these a separate mixed multitude. Also in those roots in which there occur several kinds of nouns, I write at the head of each of them, the root which occurs therein. Thus בemesh, ארב , bword, fread, fec., because many of these occur under the root אכל to eat, to consume, I say at the beginning of every root of these words, See under the root to eat, so that there is no necessity for making of them a separate mixed section. The rule is this, that whatever I could abridge in the nouns I shortened, bat I have not shortened the verbs, but put them all down; not a single one of these has been omitted intentionally, except the future with Vav conversive as there is any Massoretic remark on them.
"It is to be noticed, that all nouns and verbs of which the Massorites have given the number, I have fully enumerated, without making any separate mixed section whatever; as, for instance, the

 \&c., \&c.; also וראיתי occurs 12 times; ; ויאמַר 91 times. Of these I
 בשרש פלוני ופלוני והמשל כראשש שרש דם אבחוב עין ב שרשש שפך ובשרש נקה בטחנה נקי,







 בטםורח ורוק וחמצא. ודע ודע כי בכל שם או פעל שנחנו בעלי המסורח םיטן במםפרם אכחוב

have not omitted a single one. But the words of which the Massorites have not given the number, I have not had the heart to enumerate, for fear I should give the wrong number. As a rule, whatever I could put into a separate section I did put. Now I called this book the ' Book of Remembrance,' because therein are mentioned all the subjects which are advantageous to the study of the Scriptures, and therein all the words are examined. The use of this work is tenfold.
" i . It is like a Lexicon, explaining all the words which occur in the Hebrew Scriptures, as I give under each root an explanation of all the words in succession which occur in this root. For it sometimes happens that one root has two, three, four, and as many as ten different significations. I moreover give with the explanation of every word its meaning in German, which is the language of my countrymen. ii. It is as a Grammar, because therein is explained the grammatical structure of all the words under their respective roots, so that the things explain themselves. Thus, if one has any difficulty about the grammar of a word, he need only look at the section, and under the part of speech into which I have put it, ex. gr. וֹאָחרָ you will know that its root is חבא, and you will see that I put it under the Niphal, future, first pers. The same is the case if it is a noun, you will recognise whether it is a noun-adjective or substantive, or to what form it belongs, from the sections into which it is placed. iii. It is a model for the Codices of the Law, for thereby may be corrected all the Hebrew Scriptures with regard to plene and defective, Milra, Keri

כ"ד, מראש צ"ד, ראשׁון ח׳ הראשׁן ם"ג ורומיחן וכן וראיתי י"ב, ויאמר צ"א פחחין לא לא אניח אף אחר מהס, אבל המלות שלא כחבי הם מנינם לא ימלאני לבי לכחוב טמפרם מידאחת



כא והוא דורע את עניני חטלות כלם. והנה התועליוח המניעוח מוח הםפר הם עשרח : התועלת הא" הוא שיחי" הספד הוה כדמות ספר חשדשים מכאר כל המלוח חנמצאים בכ"ד ספרים, ואכתוב בכל שרע ביאורי כל המלות חגמצאוח בשרש חהוא וו אחד ון כי לפעטים יהיו
 בלשון אשכנו שהיא לשון בגי עםי. התועלת חב' שיחיה הספר הוה כדמוח ספר דקדוק, וזה כי יבוארו בו דקרוק של כל המלות הנמצאוה בשרע: ההוא וחה כי יבואדו מצד עצמם בי כאשר יקשח לאדם דקרוק של מלה אחת הלא יראה המחנה אשר עשמחה בו באיזה מין ופעולה ודבוד, והמשל כי ערום אנבי ואחבא ידעח ששׁרשו הב"א ותראה כי שמחיה בבנין נפעל בעחיד במחנה המדבר בעדו ומן אם חוא שם יכיר אם הוא חאר או שם רבר או איזה טשקל הוא לפי המההה אשר יחנח שם. החועלת הג' הוא שיחיה הספר הוח כדמוח חקון םפר חורה כי כו יגיה אדם כל ל"ד ספרים
and Kethiv, Tikkun Sopherim, the large and small letters, and as I have stated above in the Introduction. iv. It explains the great and small Massorah, and I am persuaded that whoso consults this hook will understand most of the Massoretic remarks and signs which were unknown to him before. $\quad$. It serves as a concordance for those who read the Bible, the Mishna, the Talmud, the Kabbalah, Grammar, or Commentaries, and who meet in these works passages of Scripture adduced as evidence which they cannot find in the Bible. Now this book will enable them easily to find the place, and show them the book and chapter in which these passages occur, as I have mentioned in the Introduction above. vi. It will he of use to preachers who, in composing sermons, want to find passages illustrative of their text. Thus, for instance, if one has to preach about righteousness, he needs only look into the root צרק, section and he will not require to search through all the sections of this root, comprising either verbs or nouns, but simply section צרקה and section בצדקה, הצדקה, לצרקה. So also if he has to preach about peace or joy, he only needs to look into the roots שלמח and vii. To those who wish to write Hebrew letters, adopting the style of the Bible, they will easily find the passages, as I have illustrated it, with respect to preachers. Thus, for instance, if anyone wishes to write a letter to his friend to buy or to make him some garments, he need only look into the root לבש, and if he does not find under it what he wants, he is to look into the root or

כמלוי וחסרון ובמלרע כקריין וכחיבן בתיקין טופּים באותיות נרולות וקפנות באשר כתבתי לעיל בהקדמה. התועלח הר' חוא שידי' חטפר דוח כדמות באור למםרח וּדולה וקמנה, ומבטית אני כל המעיין בפפר הוה יצכיל ויבין רוב דברי בעלי המסדת וסימניהס אשֶר לפנים לא ידעם. החועלת חהֹ חוא שיחי הספר חזה כדמות מראח טקוס לבל מי שיקרא באחד מהטפרים מקרא משנה נמרא קבלח ורקרוק ופירושׂ" וימצא שם ראייח פטוק ולא ירע טקומו איו הלא בוח הםפר קל מהרה יכין דרכו וירע את טקומו וימצאחו באיוה םפר ובאיזה פרשה ר״ל

קאפיטולו הוא באשר הדאיתיך בהקדמה לעיל.
 להביא ראייות מהפשוקים לדרוש ההוא, והמשל הרוצה לדרוע בעניני הצדקה הלא יעי״ בשין בשרש צרק במהנה צרקה ולא יצפרך לבקש בכל מחנות השרש לא בפעלים ולא בשמות רק במחנה צדקה ובמחנה בצרקה הצדרקה לצרקח, וכן אם ידרוש בענין שלום או בענין
 החועלת הז' מי שידצה לכחוכ בתבים בלשון עברי על פּ פּטוק חלא ימצא הפםוקים כפי

 יעיין בשרש בגר או בשרש בסה בענין כסוח או בשדש חלץ בענין מחלצוח.

בסות under or into the root under מחלצות unii. To those who want to write poetry, they will find under every root the words which rhyme. Thus, for instance, if one wants to write a poem, each line of which is to terminnte in אברדרים בָּים , and he requires , שברדים, עבָּרים, he is only to look under the roots of these words, and he will find verses containing all these, and will be able to select the most appropriate ones. ix. The book will be of use to those who study the Kabbalah, for they will find in it all the sacred names. Thus, for instance, the Kabbalistic student who wants to know the virtue of the divine names representing judgment or mercy, or what other powers or attributes they have, he will find the divine names divided into classes, as the name ארני occurs 134 times, exclusive of those passages in which it is joined to ${ }^{\text {and }}$, \&c., \&c. x. It will be useful as a defence of our faith against those who attack our religion; and in two respects. In the first place, those who dispute with us are in the habit of adducing passages according to the signs which the Christians made in the Bible, and which they call chapters, saying, Is it not written in such and such a book, and in such and such a chapter? Now he who uses this book will also be able to do the same thing. Secondly, it is well known that most of the controversies which take place between us and them are about the Messiah - whether he has already come, or whether he is

חתועלת חמ' הדוצה לעשוח דרוו או שׁיר שקול הלא ימצא בכל שרש המלות חרומות
 לעשות אברים גברים דברים חברים גברים עברים שברים הלא יעיין בשרשי המלוח האלה וימצא פםוקיס מכל אלה ויבחר מחם חנאוחיס למכוקשו, ורוק. החועלח הם" הוא שיהי׳ הספר הזח מוב לענין חקבלה בי ימצאו בו כל השטמוח הקרושיםם, ותמשל הטקוכל חריצה לרעח כח השמוח של טדת הדין או של מדת הרחטים או שאר הכחוח או המרות שיש לחס הלא ימצא בו , השמוח נתלקים למיניהם בנון השם של ארנות חנכחב
 אמד אדני יֹהוה שהם רבים מאד מאד, וכן אדני אלהים, אלהים אדני, ואלהי שהם מלעיל ואלוה שהם הסדים ואלוהים שהוא מלא אשׁר לכלִם מרות וכחות מיוחדוח חנורעוח לבעלי חקבלה חלא ימצא כלם בוה הספר איש בשרשו ובטחנהו.
 הטחננדים אלינו באםונחנו, ווה בשני אופנים , האחד שהם דנילים לחתווכח עמנו ומביאים
 ואומרים חלא כתוב בספר פלוני בכך וכך קאפימולי, ומי שידגיל את עצמו בפפר הזה ירע ויבין לעששח כן נם הוא, והאופן השני ידוע הוא כי רוב הוויכוח אצרר ביננו ובינס הוא בענין המשיח אם כבר בא או עחיד לבוא, ועל אריכוח חנלוח ועל חנאולה ועל הנן עדן וחניהגם,
yet to come; about the duration of our dispersion, about our restoration, abont Paradise and Hell. Now, he who wants to enquire into these matters, let him look into the roots $\boldsymbol{\pi}$, to anoint ; גלה, to take captive ; גאל to redeem, \&c., and he will find all the passages treating thereon. Also, as to their opinion about the word שאול, explaining, 'I will go down into Sheol unto my son' (Gen. xxxvii. 35) to mean hell, if you look under the root you will there find proof that, in most cases, it denotes the grave, and not hell. The Holy One, blessed be He, save us from its power. Blessed be His glorious name!"

It is greatly to be regretted that this stupendous work has not been published. Levita himself often refers to it as his chef-d'ouvre: he laboured over it more than twenty years (1514-1536). Through the intervention of his pupil, patron, and friend, De Selve, he sent the MS. to Paris, to be printed, and in 1538 , when Levita wrote the third Introduction to his Massoreth Ha-Massoreth, he fully believed that it was actually in the press. "I hope to God, blessed be His name," says he, in this Introduction," "that it will soon see the light, having given it to be printed in the great city of Paris, in the kingdom of France;" and even three years later, he still says, in the Introduction to his Explanation of the 712 words, "The Book of Remembrance I am now printing." From some unknown cause, however, the work was not printed, and the MS., consisting of two immense folios, is in the Imperial Library at Paris. The copy is the identical one which Levita sent there to be printed. It has his autograph subscription, and the only defect in it is supposed to be in the absence of an Introduction, to which Levita refers. This Introduction, however, could not have been lost, since the present binding of the MS. is that in which it was put under Henry II., as has been pointed out to Frensdorff by the learned librarian, M. Breal. ${ }^{27}$

Whatever might have been the cause of the non-publication of The Massoretic Concordance, and however great his disappointment, Levita, in other respects, had to congratulate himself on the good

ומי שבא להתובה על וח יעין בערש משח ובשרש נלה ובשרש: נאל ויםצא כל הפםוקים שמרברים מזה, ונם מה שהם מהויקים דחם עם טלת שאול ומפרשים ארד אל בני אבל שהאולה ניהנם והנה המע"ן בשרש עשאר יםצא שם ראיוח שרובם נאמרים על הקבר ולא על הניהנם - הק"בה יצילגו מידו, ברוך עשם בכורו :
${ }^{37}$ Comp. Frankel's Monatschrift fur Geschichte und Wis enschaft des Judenthums, vol. xii., p. 101.
effect which his MS., accompanied by the warm and laudatory recommendations of his friend the Bishop of Lavoure, produced at Paris. Paris, for more than a century, had not a single Jewish inhabitant. Ever since the expulsion of the Jews from France, in 1395, in consequence of the decree passed by Charles VI., September 17, 1394 ; "commanding it, as an unalterable law, that, in future, no Jew is to live, or even temporarily to abide, in any part of France, whether in Languedoil or in Languedoc:" the sovereigns of that countryCharles VII., Louis XI., Charles VIII., Louis XII., and even Francis I. in the earlier part of his reign-would not tolerate any Jews in their dominions. The Kabbalistic epidemic, however, from which the Pope himself was suffering, the rage for studying Hebrew amongst the highest of the land, and the great demand for Jewish teachers, had now changed the aspect of affairs. So marvellous was the change, that Guillaume Haquinet Petit, father-confessor of Louis XII., the very man who, in 1514, effected the condemnation, by the Paris University, of Reuchlin's work, as heretical, because it defended the Jews and the Jewish writings against the infatuated assaults of Pfefferkorn, now appeared as the promoter of Hebrew literature. It was upon his advice that Francis I. invited Augustin Justiniani, hishop of Corsica, to Paris, to become professor of Hebrew in the University. Justiniani, who learned his Hebrew from the celebrated Jewish physician, Jacob Mantin, also conducted the Hebrew studies at the University of Rheims. As a text-book for teaching the Grammar, he reprinted the vitiated edition of Moses Kimchi's Outtines of Hebrew Grammar, with Levita's annotations (Paris, 1520). ${ }^{28}$ To shew the French Christians at large the value of Hebrew literature, and to point out the great advantage to be derived from studying it, this Dominican, Justiniani, also published in the same year (1520) a Latin translation, from the Hebrew, of Maimonides' clebrated religiophilosophical work,' entitled The Guide of the Perplexed, ${ }^{22}$ the very book which, three centuries ago, the hyper-orthodox Jews, with the

[^15]assistance of the Dominicans, publicly committed to the flames, as a most heretical and pernicious production.

Great as was the change which had now taken place in France with regard to Hebrew literature (1520), it had not as yet reached its culminating point. It was only on the arrival of Levita's MS. of The Massoretic Concordance at Paris, whither De Selve had sent it to be printed at his own expense, that we actually see how love for Hebrew overcame hatred of the Hebrews. Attracted by his fame, and highly recommended by his pupil, the bishop of Lavour, Levita received an invitation from Francis I. to come to France, and accept the chair of Hebrew at the University; the very country which, for a hundred and thirty years, had been shut against the Jews, and where, at the time when he received this invitation, not a single Jew was to be found! But Levita declined the honourable position. Much as he loved to be the first Hebraist in Europe, he did not like to be a unique Hebrew in France. He therefore preferred to remain at Venice, in the midst of his friends and disciples.

He also declined invitations from several cardinals, bishops, and princes, to become Hebrew professor in Christian Colleges. ${ }^{30}$ Though he cheerfully gave Hebrew instruction to single Christian pupils, such as cardinal Egidio, Reuchlin, De Selve, and other eminent men, yet his motives for declining to separate himself from his Jewish disciples altogether, and to become entirely a teacher of the Gentiles, may easily be understood. Notwithstanding the express avowal of these eminent Christians, that they learned Hebrew in order to study the Kabbalah, aud to convince the Jews from this esoteric doctrine of the truth of Christianity, they imbibed an interest in and love for the Jews with their attachment to the Hebrew language. Reuchlin most nobly pleaded the cause of the Israelites in Germany against the calumnies of Pfefferkorn ${ }^{91}$ and the Dominicans.
so Comp. בי כמה פעמים בקרא נקראחי משרים רבים וצכברים נם מקרוינאלי נם מהגמונים גם מin the second Introduction to his מעיר פרי"ו אשר בצרפת בצואח המלך יר'ה ולא השיחי אזן explanation of the 712 words in Hebrew literature, entitled Tishbr.

31 The fanatical and misgnided Joseph Pfefferkorn was born at Moravia, 1469, only twelve months after the birth of Elias Levita; he embraced Christianity, and was pnblicly baptised at Cologne, 1505, when thirty-six years old. His works against his former co-religionists and Renchlin, which obtained such unenviable notoriety, and which were the means of calling forth the Reformation, are-i. Der Judenspiegel, Nurmberg, 1507; ii. Die Judenbeichte, Cologne, 1508; iii. Das Osternbuch, Cologne and Augsburg, 1509; iv. Der Judenfeind, ibid, 1509; v. In Lob und Ehren dem Kaiser Maxi-

Egidio befriended them at Rome, whilst De Selve, bishop of Lavour, effected such a change in France in favour of the Jews, that Levita, as we have seen, was invited by the king to the professorial chair at the University. Luther too, as long as Reuchlin was living, entertained the highest opinion of the Jews. In his treatise, entitled, "That Jesus Christ is born a Jew" (1523), which he published two years after Reuchlin's death, he still exclaimed, "Our fools, the popes, bishops, sophists, and monks, those coarse asses'-heads, have hitherto proceeded with the Jews in such a fashion, that he who was a good Christian might well have desired to become a Jew. And if I had been a Jew, and had seen the Christian faith governed and taught by such blockheads and dolts, I should sooner have become a hog than a Christian; for they have treated the Jews as though they were dogs and not men.' ${ }^{3}$

There were, however, circumstances aggravating both to the Jews and Christians. The Jews were exceedingly vexed by the avowal that the object of the Christians in studying Hebrew was to proselytise them ; that many eminent Jews had been gained over to the Church; and that at this very period of Levita's life, no less a man than the pious and learned Jacob b. Chajim, to whom the world is indebted for the celebrated Rabbinic Bible, and for editing the Critical Apparatus of the Old Testament, had now also embraced Christianity (1536). ${ }^{\text {a3 }}$
milian, Cologne, 1510; vi. Ein Brief an Geistliche und Weltliche in Betreff des kaiserlichen Mandats die judischen Schriften zu vertiligen, givon by Graetz, note 2, p. xiii.; vií. Der Handspiegel, Mayence, 1511 ; viii. Der Brandspiegel, 1513 ;ix. Die Sturmglock, Cologne, 1414; x. Streitbüchlein uider Reuchlin und seine Jünger, Cologne, 1516; xi. Eine mitleidige Clag' gegen den unglaübigen Reuchlin, 1521; comp. Graetz, Geschiehtc der Juden, vol. ix. Supplementary Notes, p. x. \&c., Leipzig, 1866.
${ }^{32}$ Hengetenberg, Commentary on Eicclesiastes, with other treatises. Clark's Translation, p. 415, Edinbargh, 1860.
ss This celebrated Hebraist and Massorite was born abont 1470, at Tanis, whence he is also sometimes called Tunisi. Eesides editing the stupendous Rabbinic Bible (1524-5), and publishing the editio prineeps of the Jerusalem Talmud (1523), Biblical literature is indebted to him for a Dissertation on the Targum, which is prefixed to the edition of the Pentatench with the Targum and the Five Megilloth (Bomberg, 1527, 1543-4). His elaborate Introduction to the Rabbinic Bibla has recently heen re-pablished, with an English Translation and Notes by Ginshurg (Longmans, 1865). Fïrst's assertion, (Bibli theca Judaica, iii., 452) that this Introduction had been translated into English by Kennicott, in his work entitled The state of the printed Hebrew text of thc* Old Testament, Oxford, 1758 , is incorrect. Kennicott simply published an abridged and incorrect Latin version, from a MS. which he found in the Bodleian Library. From the remarl of Levita in the second Introduction to the Massoreth Ha-Massoreth (comp. infra), it would seem that Jacob b. Chajim was already dend in 1538. That he had then

Impatient Christians, again, though now ranged in battle array against each other as Catholics and Protestants, and consigning one another to eternal damnation as heretics, were extremely angry with the Jews for not at once relinquishing their religion and embracing Christianity, which was then torn in pieces and weltering in blood. So wroth were the Cbristians of that day with the Jews for not filling up with converts from Judaism the ranks in the Church, which the professed followers of the Prince of Peace had decimated in the religious wars, that even Luther, forgetful of his former kindly feelings, and with strange inconsistency, admonished his protestant followers to "burn their synagogues, force them to work, and treat them with all unmercifulness ! 'ss Such love and hatred alternately displayed, for the express purpose of gaining converts, had its effect upon the Jews. The orthodox portion of the Hebrew community began to realise that in teaching Christians Hebrew, and in initiating them into the mysteries of the Kabbalah, they were furnishing them with weapons against the Jews. They, therefore, became exceedingly displeased with those members of the synagogue who were engaged in tuition among Christians; and as Levita was the most distinguished teacher of the Christians, the cry of the Jews was loudest against him. His manly, straightforward, and noble defence of himself is contained in the second Introduction of his Massoreth Ha-Massoreth, and may be seen below, for which reason we do not reproduce it here.
been a Christian, is not only svident from Levits's vitnperations in question, but sleo from the statemant of the editor of the Mishna, with Maimonides' commentsry, published at Venice, 1546. At the end of Trectate Taharoth, the editor remarks ואלה הם רברי המגיד
 these are the words of the first editor, whose name was formerly among the Jews, Jacob h. Chajim, and who revised the Tractate Taharoth, with the co-mentary of R. Shimshon of bleseed memory. Now since the sage ssid, 'Receive the trath by whomsosver it is propounded,' we desmed it proper to print his remarks hare." This apology from the second editor for printing, in a work intended for the Jews, opinions propounded hy one who had ceased to be a member of the community, puts the qnestion beyond the ahadow of a donbt. The learned Frensdorff was so much struck with the remark of Levite npon this enbject, and was so unwilling to believe it, that he wrote to Professor Lazzatto for more informstion abont it ; and Lazzatto again, who communicates the sbove extract from the editor of the Mishna, was so sfllicted by finding it to be trns, that he delayed replying to Frensdorff's letter, becanse he was unwilling to make it known that so learned a man had embraced Christianity. Comp. the Yebrew Essays and Reviews, eutitled Ozar Nechmad, vol. iii., p. 112, \&c., Vienns, 1860.
${ }^{34}$ Hengatenberg, Commentary on Ecclesiastes, with other treatisss. Clark's Translation, p. 418. Edinburgh, 1880.

By the extraordinary amount of labour, research; and study which he bestowed, for more than twenty years, on collating and elaborating the materials for the Massoretic Concordance, Levita became one of the most accomplished scholars in this singular department of recondite Biblical learning. His pupils, to whom he had often explained the import of the enigmatical phrases and peculiar signs whereby the Massorites indicate the correct readings, orthography, and exegesis of the Hebrew text, and who were delighted to see the meaning of the Massoretic signs surrounding the margins of Hebrew bibles, at last urged him to write them a Commentary on the Massorah, which they might use as a manual. To this earnest and flattering request of his disciples he could all the more cheerfully accede, since he himself had been contemplating writing such a treatise for tweity years, and was only prevented from carrying out his design by untoward circumstances. Now that he had finished the Massoretic Concordance, and had the leisure, he at once betook himself to the work of supplying his disciples with the desired text-book, and two years after the completion of the gigantic Concordance he published at Venice ( 1538 ), by the aid of his friend Bomberg, the celebrated Massoreth Ha-Massoreth (מסורח המסורת).

Before entering into the history of this book and the extraordinary controversy it called forth, it will be necessary to give a succinct analysis of its contents. The Massoreth Ha-Massoreth consists of three parts, preceded by a Notice to the Reader, a Preface, and three Introductions. The Notice to the Reader explains the references in this book to the then newly introduced division of the Hebrew Scriptures into chapters, and the books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, respectively, into two books, and shews how any original ideas propounded by the author are indicated. The Preface sets forth the plan and contents of the book. The first Introduction consists of a Song of Praise to the Creator, who guided his people in former days, and who vouchsafed wisdom to the Massorites in their work, as well as to the author, in order to explain the Massorah. The second Introduction begins with a piece of autobiography; then states how the author came to compile this book; describes his researches in the Massorah, the state of the Massoretic MSS., the importance of the Massorah, his connection with Cardinal Egidio, and his defence for teaching him Hebrew. The third Introduction explains the meaning of the word Massorah; discusses different opinions about
the origin of the Massorah, the vowel points, the accents, \&e., \&c. Then follow the three parts which, according to the Jewish custom of naming things after national events, are respectively denominated the First Tables, the Second Tables, and the Broken Tables, after the events recorded in Exodus xxiv. 12, xxxi. 18, xxxii. 19, xxxiv. 1-4. In harmony with its appellation, the First Tables, or the first part, he divided it into ten sections, denominated commandments (עשרת (הרבריס), answering to the Decalogue on the tables; whilst each of these sections actually begins with the very words which commence the respective commandments of the Decalogue. These ten sections are occupied with the discussion of plene and defective. The Second Tables, or part, also consists of ten commandments, or sections, which discuss respectively the important Massoretic points of-i. The Keri and Kethiv ; ii. Kametz and Pattach; iii. Dagesh, Raphe, Mappick, and Sheva; iv. The accents on the tone-syllable, and Psick; จ. Registers, groups, parallels, and analogous forms; vi. Peculiar conjunctions, disjunctions, and resemblances; vii. Words with prefixes, serviles, and solitary; viii. Conjectural readings, errors, and variations; ix. The terms for letters, written and oral words, small letters, accents, certainties, and transpositions; and, x. The Massoretic expressions for Scriptures, a single Book of the Scriptures, form, dividing spaces, \&c. The Broken Tables, or the third part, discusses the abbreviations, or broken words, used by the Massorites, whence the part obtained its name. It also describes some of the principal men who have written on the Massorah, as well as some ancient Codices.

This remarkable book was first printed by his friend, M. Bomberg, at Venice, 1538, the text not being pointed. Levita appended to this edition the poem of Saadia, giving the number of times which each letter of the alphabet occurs throughout the Hebrew Scriptures, as well as an explanation of this poem. In less than twelve months it was re-published at Basle, 1539, the text pointed. In this edition Münster translated into Latin the three Introductions, the first and second being in an abridged form, and gives a brief summary of the contents of the three parts. He, however, omitted Saadia's poem, with Levita's explanations. It is very strange that Münster does not mention on the title-page that the book had already appeared at Venice, and that his edition was a reprint.

The third part, or the Broken Tables as it is called, was repub-
lished separately, in Rabbinical characters, at Venice ( $1 / \partial 0=326$ $=) 1566$, some copies being dated ( ${ }^{4} 4=306=$ ) 1546 , under the title, A Commentary on the Massorah, called the Gate of the Broken Tables (פירוש המסורת וקרא שמו שער שברי לוחות). This part of the book was also re-published with additions by Samuel b. Chajim, Prague, 1610. The three introductions were also translated into Latin by Jo. Lud. Mich. Nagel (Altdorf, 1758-71). The third and last edition of the entire Hebrew text was published at Sulzbach, 1771, in Rabbinical characters. This edition is exceedingly defective, whole passages being omitted, as will be seen in the notes to our edition. The editor, Kalmen Dishbek, misled by Münster's silence about the Venice edition, describes the Basle edition (1539) as the editio princeps, and hence, necessarily, also omitted Saadia's poem and Levita's explanation of it. Fürst, indeed (Bibliotheca Judaica, ii. 240), and others, say that there was also an edition of it at Sulzbach, 1769, two years before the one we have specified. But this must be a mistake, since the editor of the 1771 edition distinctly describes it as the second, and the Basle as the first. ${ }^{85}$

The only translation extant of this book is, the German, which was published at Halle, 1772, ${ }^{36}$ and which is generally, but incorrectly, ascribed to the celebrated Joh. Salomo Semler. That Semler himself was not the translator, but that he simply superintended the translation, and made notes to it, is stated on the very title-page of the book. ${ }^{37}$ The preface, however, which was written by this scholar, puts the whole question beyond the shadow of a doubt; and the erroneous opinion of bibliographers on this subject can only be accounted for on the supposition that they have either not perused the preface or

[^16]not seen the book. In this preface Semler gives the following history of the translation. A respectable young man, named Christian Gottlob Meyer, who had an excellent opportunity, at Berlin, to acquire, under the guidance of an expert teacher, a greater knowledge of Jewish learning than ordinary Jewish youths, became convinced of the truth of Christianity. He therefore left Judaism, and was publicly admitted into the church at Halle. Here, whilst prosecuting his study, Semler became acquainted with him. Convinced of the sincerity of the young man, and being anxious that he should not neglect his Hehrew learning, Semler asked him to translate the Massoreth Ha-Massoreth after his college hours, omitting, however, the poetical Introductions, which are somewhat more difficult. The translation thus made by Meyer, Semler sometimes read with the translator, and endeavoured to arrange the German in such a manner as to make it more intelligible. He also did the same with the German translation of the poetical Introductions, which was made by another Jew, named Aaronssohn, a clever Candidatus Medicince at the University. Semler, moreover, made sundry notes to this German translation. ${ }^{88}$ With this plain statement of Semler before us, we
${ }^{38}$ Die ©elegentecit fu befer beutifiget Ueberfekung if bieje. ©in axtiger junger Meetifo, ©fyriftian Gotlob Meyer, ber in $\mathfrak{B e r l i n}$ effebem bie gute Gelegenteit, in jüdi:

 moralifdjer ©chriften, in geßumbener und ungebunbener Mebe, zu eignem Naffibenfen

 fäber ber dyriflitiden Meligion eine näfere (夭rfentrizz zu fuctert. (Er fam entlidy nadf)

 fお)

Da idi nun gerne aud bazu Geffen molte, bã́ er feinen guten शufang Gebraifider ober rabbinifder \&ectüre nidft etma wieber vernadfläpigen fotte; fo habe idilifm biefes $\mathfrak{B i t}=$

 etroas fatweree feien.-

Diefe Ueberfegung fabe idf zuweifen mit bem luberfeger wieber burchgegangen, und Gabe bte beutiofe Safreibart etwas verfärblider einzuridten gefudit, obgleidy ber



hope that the question as to the authorship of the German version will in future be regarded as settled.

As to the merit of it, considering that it was made by a young man, and the great difficulties he had to encounter, the translation must be pronounced pretty fair. For critical purposes, however, the utility of it is greatly impaired, for the following reasons. Passages are frequently altogether omitted. The elaborate and most difficult second. Introduction has not been translated into German at all. And, lastly, young Meyer, remarkable as was his knowledge of Hebrew considering his age, was not familiar with the Massoretic language, which requires special study. Hence it is that many of the passages, though literally translated, are less intelligible in the German than they are in the Hebrew. Hence, too, the many serious blunders and mistranslations which are dispersed throughout the work.

The storm which the original publication of this work raised (1538) was truly marvellous, and, after raging for more than three centuries, cannot be said to have as yet fully subsided. The cause of this storm was the array of most powerful arguments which Levita made in the third introduction, to prove that the vowel-points now to be found in the Hebrew Bibles are not of the same antiquity with the text, but that they were invented and put there by the Massorites about five hundred years after Christ. The authority of the vowelpoints had indeed been questioned by some Jewish authorities long before Levita's time. As early as the ninth century, Natronai ii. b. Hilai, who was Gaon or spiritual head of the College in Sora (859869), in reply to the question whether it is lawful to put the points to the Synagogal Scrolls of the Pentateuch, distinctly declared that "since the Law, as given to Moses on Sinai, had no points, and the points are not Sinaitic [i.e. sacred], having been invented by the sages, and put down as signs for the reader ; and moreover since it is prohibited to us to make any additions from our own cogitations, lest we transgress the command 'Ye shall not add,' \&c. (Deut. iv. 2); hence we must not put the points to the Scrolls of the Law." ${ }^{3}$ Three
ein gefidicfter Candidatus Medicinæ auf hiefiger $\mathfrak{u n i v e r i t a t}$, gemadit gat. Sid
 theile auf einige anbere Buacter weifen; thabe aber freilid nidet viel Beit barauf went= ben tinnen.-厅eite 12-15.
${ }_{89}$ This fact, which is cited in the Vitry Machsor, from the Theologioal decisions, (nשובת הגאונים) is communicated by Luzzatto in the Hebrew Ebsays and Reviews,
centuries later, no less a scholar than the celebrated Ibn Ezra, in speaking of the two dots over the letter $\psi$, the one on the right indicating that it is Shin and the one to the left shewing that it is Sin, remarked that "it was the custom of the sages of Tiberias to put down these points to mark the double pronunciation, and that they were the chief authorities, since from them proceeded the Massorites, from whom we obtained the whole system of punctuation." 40

From Ibn Ezra this opinion was also espoused by some Christian scholars in the middle ages, who, hating the Jews, wished to base upon the late origin of the points the charge against them of having introduced innovations and corruptions into the text of the Bible. Thus, the celebrated Dominican, Raymond Martin, who studied Hebrew, Chaldee, and Arabic, to convert the Jews and the Mahommedans to Christianity, and who had acquired such a knowledge of Rabbinical Literature that he even excelled St. Jerome, boldly, but most incorrectly, asserted that the vowel-points in the text of the Old Testament were put there by Ben Naphtali and Ben Asher, circa 900-960, and that the Emendations of the Scribes (תקון טופרים) are simply a few of the many wilful corruptions and perversions introduced by the Jews into the sacred text, to obliterate the prophecies about
called Kerem Chemed (vol. iii., p. 2000, Prague, 1838). The Vitry Maohsor, or Ritnal of the Synagogue, of Vitry, in France, wae compiled, circa 1100, hy R. Simcha of Vitry, a disciple of Rashi, and ohtained its name from the plaoe in which the compiler lived. It not only comprises the whole Cycle of the Daily and Festival Services, but varions legal and ritaal lawe from ancient docaments. The passage in question is as followa in the
 ולא ניהן ניקוד בסיני בי החבמים ציינוהו לסימן ' ואסור לנו להוסיף מרעחנו פן נעבור בבל חוסיך . It is also to be remarked that the MS. of this Machsor, which is one of the only two copies which have survived the ravages of time, and a description of which was puhlished by Luzzatto in 1838, in the above-named Eseays, was formerly the property of the celehrated antiquarian Gniseppe Almanzi, of Padua, and is now in the British Mueenm (Add. 27200-201). Dr. William Wright has given an account of it in the Journal of Sacred Literature, July, 1866, p. 356, \&ic. See also Fürst, Geschichte des Karäerthums, vol. i., pp. 114 and 179, Leipzig, 1862.

40 Abraham b. Meier Thn Ezra, was born in Toledo, 1088-9, and died 1176. He was a most distinguished mathematician, astronomer, philosopher, poet, physician, theologian, grammarian, and commentator. A sketch of his life, with a description of his works, will he found in Kitto'e Cyclopcedia of Biblical Literature, new ed. s. v. IbN Ezra. The ahove quotation is from his Hebrew Grammar, entitled On the Purity of the Hebrew style, (צחות) which he wrote at Mantua in 1145. It is as follows in the
 Comp. p. 7, a, editio Lippmann, Fürth, 1827.
the incarnation of the Deity. ${ }^{41}$
As Raymond Martin was the great Rabbinical oracle of the Christians in the middle ages, and moreover as his opinion was confirmed by no less an authority than the celebrated Nicolas de Lyra, ${ }^{42}$ it was regarded as paramount bỳ all succeeding Catholic writers.
${ }^{41}$ This remarkable Spauish Dominican was born about 1220, and died about 1287. Hs was greatly aided in his Hebrew and Chaldee studiss hy Pablo Christiani, a celebrated converted Jew, who was also a Dominican, and who held at Barcelona the famons discussion with the learned Nachmanides, abont the questione at issue between Judaiem and Christianity (July 20, 24, 1263), an account of which is given in Kitto's Cyelopedia of Biblical Literature, new sd. s. v. Nachmanides. Raymond Martin, himself, ast with Pablo Christiani, Arnold de Singarra, and Peter de Janua, in the commission appointsd by the Bull of Clement iv. (1264), to examine the charges which Pablo Christiani brought against the Talmud, that it blasphemes Christ and the Virgin Mary. The work which has immortalised Raymond Martin's name is entitled the Dagger of Faith ( $\dagger$ varo Fidei). He completed it in 1278. He quotes in it extracts from the Talmud, Rashi, Ibn Ezra, Maimonidss, Kimchi, and the writings of other Jews, with the greatest ease; showing from them that Jesus is not ouly foretold in the Hebrew Scriptures as the Messiah, but also in the Rabbinical writinge. From its immenss erudition, this worls became the grand storehouse from which Christians in the middle ages and in modern days derived their Jewish learning, and weapons against the Jews. It was first edited with very elaborate annotations hy Jos. da Voisin, Paris, 1651, and than again, with an introdnction and the treatise by Hermaun, a converted Jew, by Joh. B. Carpzow, Leipzig, 1687. It is to the second edition that onr references are made. The passage in question bearing on the vowel-points contains properly his criticism on Hos. ix. 12, and is as follows:"Caterum sciendum, quod nee Moyess punctavit legem, unds Judæi non habent eam cum punctis, i.e. cum vocalibus ecriptam in rotalis sais; nec aliquis ex prophetis punctavit librum sunm; sed duo Jndæi, quornm unue dictus est Nepthali, alter vero Ben Ascher, totum vetus Testamentum punctasee leguntar; que quidem puncta cum quibusdam virgulis sunt loco vocalium apud eos: cumqua venissent ad locum istom, et secundum orthographiam debuissent punctare בשורי incarnatione mea, punctaverunt בסורי in recessu meo, nt opns incarnationis removersnt a Deo." (Pars iii., Dist. iii. cap. xxi., p. 895.)

42 Nicolas de Lyra was born of Jewish parents about 1270, at Lyre, a small town in the diocese of Eurecca, whence he obtained his name Lyra. Having embraced Christianity when young, he entered the Church in 1291, and became auch an accomplished scholar and lecturer on the Bible that he was styled the most distinguished doctor. He died at Paris, October 23, 1340. The work which has immortalised his name is a commentary on the Bible, entitled "Postille perpetuce in universa Biblia," in which he advanced the most enlightened views to such an extent that he is justly regarded as the forerunngr of the Reformation. The extent to which Lather is indebted to him for his sentiments may bs gathered from the couplist of the Reformer's enemies,

> Si Lyra non lyrasset,
> Latherns non saltasset.
> If Lyra had not harped profanation, Luther would never have danced the Reformation.

As to the passage bearing on the origin of the vowel-points, after quoting with approval Raymond Martin on Hos. ix. 12 (see the preceding note), he remarks, "Puncta

To invest it with an air of originality, Jacob Perez de Valencia gives the following amusing account of the origin of the vowel-points"After the conversion of Constantine the Great, the Rabbins perceived that great multitudes of Gentiles embraced Christianity with the greatest devotion all over the globe; that the Church prospered very favourably; and that also of the Jews an immense number became convinced of the truth by experience and miracles, whereby their gains and revenues were lessened. Roused by this wickedness, they assembled in great multitudes at the Babylon of Egypt, which is called Cairo, where they, with as much secresy as ppssible, falsified and corrupted the Scriptures, and concocted about five or seven points to serve as vowels, these points having been invented by Ravina and Ravashe, two of their doctors. The same Rabbins also concocted the Talmud. ${ }^{48}$ Hence De Valencia maintains "that no faith is to be placed in the Holy Scriptures, as the Jews now interpret and punctuate them." ${ }^{44}$

Jewish commentators and grammarians, however, as a rule, when they had not to dispute with the Karaites for rejecting the traditions of the Fathers, maintained that the vowel-points were either given to Adam in Paradise, or communicated to Moses on Sinai, or were fixed by Ezra and the Great Synagogue. This view was deemed all the more

> non aunt de aubatantia littere, nec a principio acripturere fuerunt, unde et rotuli qui in aynagogie corum legentur aunt sine panctis, sed permagnam tempue poetea inventa annt hajna modi punctn ad facilius legnndum." Comment. on Hos. ix. 12 . For a elkatch of his life and writings, aee Kitto, Cyclop. of Bib. Lit., new ed., s.v. Lrra.

[^17]orthodox, since the famous Sohar, ${ }^{45}$ the sacred code of the Kabbalists, which was believed to be a revelation from God, communicated through R. Simon b. Jochai (circa a.d. 70-110), declared that "the letters are the body and the vowel-points the soul, they move with the motion and stand still with the resting of the vowel-points, just as an army moves after its sovereign" ${ }^{46}$ (Sohar i., 15, b.); that "the vowel-points proceeded from the same Holy Spirit which indited the sacred Scriptures, and that far be the thought to say that the scribes made the points, since even if all the prophets had been as great as Moses, who received the law direct from Sinai, they could not have had the authority to alter the smallest point in a single letter, though it be the most insignificant in the whole Bible" ${ }^{17}$ (Sohar on the Song of Solomon, 57 b , ed. Amsterdam, 1701). As the Kabbalah was believed to be a genuine revelation from God, its opinion about the antiquity and divinity of the vowel-points was adopted as final. Great therefore was the consternation which the appearance of the Massoreth HaMassoreth created. For the chief teacher of the age to deny the divine origin and the antiquity of the vowel-points, and more especially to defend his heterodoxy by unassailable arguments, was a most unpardonable sin.

As Levita's arguments became known to the Christian world, through Münster's Latin translation of the Introductions, as well as through Pellican's unpublished version of the entire Book, within twelve months after the publication of the original work, divided Cbristendom, though differing on almost all other points, at once agreed to welcome: the great grammarian's results, from diametrically opposite motives. The unwary Protestant leaders who were already prepossessed with the notion of the late origin of the vowel-points, from the assertions of Raymond Martin, Nicolas de Lyra, Jacob Perez de Valencia, John Pico della Mirandola, and Reuchlin, rejoiced that their predilections were now confirmed by arguments. Hence Luther, Calvin, Zwingle,

[^18]Mercer, ${ }^{\text {s9 }}$ \&c., boldly disclaimed the antiquity, divine origin, and authority of the points. Their conviction undoubtedly was, that by liberating themselves from the traditional vowel-point of the Synagogue, after having discarded the traditions of the Church of Rome, they could more easily and independently prosecute their Biblical studies without any trammels whatsoever. Besides having rejected the traditions of the Fathers, the Reformers could not, without exposing themselves to the charge of inconsistency from their antagonists, adhere to the traditions of the Rabbins.

To the Church of Rome, again, which was embittered by the cry of the newly risen protestant leaders, that the Bible, and the Bible alone, without gloss and without tradition, is the rule of faith and practice, Levita's work was like a God-send from another point of view. She eagerly laid hold of the admission made by this great teacher of the age, that the vowel-signs are an uninspired invention of the Jews, made centuries after Christ, in order to confute thereby the claims of her opponents. From the novelty of the points she deduced,

[^19]i. That the Bible could only be read in ancient days by the few authorised spiritual teachers, and, ii., That the Scriptures without these points cannot possibly be understood, apart from the traditional interpretation transmitted by the Church of Rome. This opinion soon found its way into England, and when the controversy between the Roman Catholics and Protestants had fairly began, we find Dr. Thomas Harding (1512-1572), who was Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, in the reign of Henry VIII., a staunch Protestant in the reign of Edward VI., who became a zealous papist at the accession of Queen Mary to the throne, and the celebrated antagonist of Bishop Jewel, arguing as follows:-"Among the people of Israel, the seventy elders only could read and understand the mysteries of the holy books, that we call the Bible. For, whereas the letters of the Hebrew tongue have no vocals, they only had the skill to read the Scripture by the consonants; and thereby the valgar people were kept from reading of it, by special providence of God, as it is thought, that precious stones should not be cast before swine, that is to say, such as be not called thereto, as being, for their unreverend curiosity and impure life, unworthy." ${ }^{49}$

Similar was the language which the Romanists used on the Continent against the Protestants, who appealed to the Scriptures in matters affecting their faith and practice. John Morinus (1591-1659), the distinguished Orientalist, who renounced Protestantism, and entered the congregation of the Oratory in 1618, solemnly declares, in his learned "Biblical Exercitations on the Hebrew and Greek Texts," that "the reason why God ordained the Scriptures to be written in this ambiguous mamer (i. e. without points), is because it was His will that every man should be subject to the Judgment of the Church, and not interpret the Bible in his own way. For seeing that the reading of the Bible is so difficult, and so liable to various ambiguities, from the very nature of the thing, it is plain that it is not the will of God that every one should rashly and irreverently take upon himself to explain it; nor to suffer the common people to expound it at their pleasure; but that in those things, as in other matters respecting religion, it is His will that the people should depend upon the priests." ${ }^{50}$

[^20]Alarmed at the use made by Catholic controversialists of the avowal that the points are a late human invention, and bitterly smarting under the arguments deduced therefrom, the defenders of Protestantism commenced beating a retreat. Forgetting that the very originators and leaders of the Reformation, partly from a desire to throw off every thing traditional, and partly from undisguised hatred of the Jews, had decried the vowel-points as lustily as the Catholics, Protestant champions changed their tactics, and began to declare that the points were put to the text by the Prophets themselves, and that to say otherwise is nothing more nor less than heathenism and popery. Thus, the charge of Gregory Martin (circa 1534-1582), in his work, entitled "A Discovery of the Manifold Corruptions of the Holy Seriptures by the Heretics" (1582), that Protestants in their versions follow the Hebrew vowels, which are not only a late invention of, but have been wilfully corrupted by, the Jews, was rebutted by the celebrated Fulke, the great champion of Protestantism, with the declaration, that, "seeing our Saviour hath promised that never a prick [ = a vowel-point] of the law shall perish, we may understand the same also of the Prophets, who have not received the vowels of the later Jews; but even of the Prophets themselves, however, that heathenish opinion pleaseth you and other papists." ${ }^{\text {si }}$ Among those who beat a retreat, are also to be found the very eccentric but' very distinguished Hebraist, Hugh Broughton (1549-1626), who likewise deduced the antiquity and authority of the points from Matt. v. 18; ${ }^{52}$ and the celebrated John Piscator (1546-1626), who remarks, in his Commentary on the passage in question, that "it appears from this that the Holy Bible in the time of Christ had the points, and that the punctuation was approved by our Saviour."

Both Catholics and Protestants, however, chiefly relied uppn abusing each other, and upon their common hatred of the Jews, to make good their assertions. To examine Levita's arguments, to test his appeal to the Talmud and other Jewish writings of antiquity, and to corroborate or refute his statements-for this there was not

[^21]sufflient Talmudical learning and critical tact, either in the Church of Rome or among Protestants. Their Oriental studies were chiefly intended to fathom the mysteries of the Kabbalah and to convert the Jews. The first attempt to meet Levita's book with arguments, derived from ancient Jewish documents, as far as we know, was made by the learned Azzariah de Rossi, ${ }^{53}$ in 1574-5, nearly forty years after the appearance of the Massoreth Ha-Massoreth. In his celebrated work entitled The Light of the Eyes (מאור עינים), De Rossi devotes the fifty-ninth chapter of Part iii. to an examination of the arguments advanced by Levita against the antiquity of the points, and maintains therein that-i. The existence of the vowel-points seems to be indicated in the Talmud (Nedarim, 37, 6; the corresponding passage in the Jerusalem Gemara and the Midrash Bereshith Rabba, cap. xxxvi.) ii. The Bahir and Sohar, which according to De Rossi were respectively compiled by R. Nechunja b. Cahana and R. Simon b. Jochai, before ever the Mishna was edited, specify the vowel-points by name, and describe them as having a divine origin. iii. The analogy of other languages, and especially the Eastern and cognate tongues, such as the Syriac, Chaldee, Arabic, and Persian, all of which have vowel-signs, shows beyond doubt that the Hebrew too had points from the remotest antiquity. iv. The nature and genius of the Hebrew language absolutely pre-supposes the permanent existence of points, since, in the case of certain expressions, it cannot be told, without these signs, whether they are nouns, verbs, or particles. Thus, for example; without points it is impossible to say
 bution, שְׁרלָּ whole, or wherefore. v. The command (Deut. xxvii. 8) to write ver'y plain and intelligibly (באר הטיב) unquestionably premises that, under certain circumstances, though not generally, the Law was written with vowel-signs, else it would not have been "very plain and intelligible;" and, vi. He appeals to St. Jerome's

[^22]statement in his epistle to Evagrius, where, in speaking of Enon near Salim, he remarks "it matters not whether it be called Salem or Salim, since the Hebrews very seldom ase the vowel letters in the middle: and the same words are pronounced with different sounds and accents, according to the pleasure of readers and the variety of country;" ${ }^{54}$ whence De Rossi deduces that perraro implies their existence and occasional use.

As to the origin and development of the vowels, he submits that their force and virtue were invented by, or communicated to, Adam, in Paradise ; transmitted to and by Moses ; that they had been partially forgotten, and their pronunciation vitiated during the Babylonian captivity; that they had been restored by Ezra, but that they had been forgotten again in the wars and struggles during, and after, the destruction of the Second Temple; and that the Massorites, after the close of the Talmud, revised the system, and permanently fixed the pronunciation by the contrivance of the present signs. This accounts for the fact that the present vowel-points are not mentioned in the Talmud. The reason why Moses did not punctuate the copy of the Law, which he wrote, is that its import should not be understood without oral tradition. Besides, as the Law has seventy different meanings, the writing of it, without points, greatly aids to obtain these various interpretations; whereas the affixing of the vowel-signs would preclude all permutations and transpositions, and greatly restrict the sense, by fixing the pronunciation. This is an epitome of the arguments used by De Rossi against Levita.

Being thus supplied with weapons from the Sohar and the Talmud, the hard-pressed Protestants, who were smarting from the onslaughts of the Catholics, and had beaten a retreat, now opened a new campaign. Under the leadership of Buxtorf, the father, they began defending, with a display of Rabbinical bayonets, the antiquity and divinity of the vowel-signs which they had formerly abandoned. Undaunted by the fact that the Catholics had been the undisputed masters of the field for three centuries, and that they had been strengthened in their position by the leaders of the Reformation, yet, to oust their common enemy, the Jews, the Protestant champion,
${ }^{54}$ The passage in question is as follows in the original, "Nec refert, utrum Salem [שלם], an Salim [שלים] nominetur; cum vocalibus in medio litteris perraro utantur Hebrei; et pro voluntate lectorum, atque varietate regionum, eadem verba diversis sonis atque accentibus proferantur." Ad Evagrium Epist. cxxvi., Opp. vol. i., p. 1062, ed. Paris.

Buxtorf, made his first appearance on the field in 1620 . As the Christian opponents of the vowel-points, whether Catholics or their allies the Protestants, used no arguments, but contented themselves with mere assertions, and as, moreover, Levita was the first who defended his position with appeals to ancient documents, Buxtorf's attack was entirely directed against the renowned teacher of Hebrew, who was the leader of the opinions on this point of the allied Catholic and Protestant armies.

The arguments which were to discomfit Levita, Buxtorf published in his Commentary on the Massorah. ${ }^{\text {ss }}$ The ninth chapter of this work, which contains the defence of the antiquity and divine authority of the points against Levita, is chiefly made up of De Rossi's arguments and quotations from Jewish writings, whilst the rest of the book, which is an explanation of the Massorah, is, to a great extent, an elaboration of Levita's Massoreth Ha-Massoreth, the very treatise which had caused this controversy. Feeble as the arguments are, they appeared, nevertheless, very plausible and very learned; so that those who earnestly wished the points to be of divine origin at once ranged themselves under the leadership of the justly-renowned Buxtorf.

But Buxtorf was not destined to carry every thing before him in this first battle against Levita. His alliance with the learned De Rossi only produced a counter alliance and a masterly defence, under the leadership of Lewis Cappellus, who elaborated, expanded, and supplemented Levita's arguments against the points with far greater skill than that displayed by Buxtorf in his elaboration of De Rossi's arguments for the points. The treatise thus produced Cappellus sent in MS. to be examined by his opponent Buxtorf, who returned it with the request that it might not be printed. He then sent it to Erpenius, Professor of Oriental languages at Leyden, who was so convinced by its arguments and learning that, with the sanction of the author, he printed it at Leyden, under the title, "The Mystery of the Points Unveiled.' ${ }^{156}$

Its immense erudition, conclusive reasoning, and overpowering arguments soon convinced the most learned Biblical scholars that

[^23]the vowel-points were centuries later than the Christian era; and Protestants, instead of combating the Roman Catholics on this point, were now fairly divided into two hostile camps, under the respective leadership of Cappellus and Buxtorf. The followers of Buxtorf were for a considerable time doomed to almost fatal inaction. For though Cappellus' work, as we have seen, appeared in 1624, and though Buxtorf had carefully perused it in MS. before this date, yet he made no reply to it for several years, and died (Sept. 13, 1629) without answering it. It was during this time of anxious suspense that Father Morinus published his merciloss attack on the vowel-points, already alluded to (vide supra, p.50), in which he compared the Scriptures to a mere nose of wax, to be turned any way, to prove thereby the necessity of one infallible interpretation.

At last, however, after a silence of four and twenty years, Buxtorf, the son, who succeeded his father in the Hebrew chair at Basle, published, in 1648, a reply to Cappellus' work, entitled, " A Treatise on the Origin, Antiquity, and Authority of the Vowel Points and Accents in the Hebrew Scriptures of the Old Testament, against Lewis Cappellus' Mystery of the Points Unveiled;" thus assuming the leadership of the vowelist party, whom death had deprived of their great champion. But, though the work occupies upwards of 450 small quarto pages, it contains very little more than an expansion of the arguments used by Bustorf senior, in his Tiberius, with an increased number of quotations from Jewish writings. It was not to be expected that Cappellus would be silenced by this reply, and he at once wrote a rejoinder to it, entitled, " $A$ Vindication of the Mystery of the Vowels Unveiled;" but he died (June 18, 1658) before the publication of it, and his son, Jacques Cappellus, to whom the MS. was left, did not publish it till 1689 , five and twenty years after the death of Buxtorf junior.

An important point is to be noticed in this controversy, in which Cappellus entirely deviates from the opinion of his master, Elias Levita. Levita, though maintaining the novelty of the vowel-points, firmly believed that the very same pronunciation and sounds, which are now denoted by the vowels and accents, were perfectly known and used by the Jews from the remotest antiquity, long before these arbitrary signs were invented, and that they represent the true and genuine reading as it came from the inspired writers of the respective books; and, consequently, the reading which these points
have fixed is as much of divine authority as the letters, the difference between them being, that the letters were written, whilst the points were transmitted by oral tradition. At first Cappellus seems also to have endorsed this view of Levita in a somewhat modified form. Thus he distinctly declares that, "when I say that the points were invented and added to the consonants by the Massorites of Tiberias, I do not mean, as I have stated before, that the reading of the sacred text was invented by them out of their own brain, and that they fixed; according to their own will and fancy, what these points denote and express ; but what I mean is, that they express by these marks of their own invention the reading of the sacred text which obtained everywhere among the Jews, which they themselves had been taught by their masters in the.scholastic institutions, which they had received by oral tradition from the Fathers, and which reading the Jews believed to be the same ancient and authentic reading of Moses and the prophets. Since, therefore, these Tiberian masters did nothing more than express, with all possible accuracy, the reading which they had been taught, which they had received from their ancestors, by tradition from the Fathers, and which all the Jews believed to be the very ancient and authentic reading of Moses and the prophets, by signs of vowels and accents of their own invention, there is no reason why this reading should not be accepted by all the Jews." ${ }^{5 z}$

Later on, however, Cappellus changed his mind, or, perhaps, more boldly avowed, what he had hitherto kept back, that, with the changing of the ancient letters in which the Hebrew was originally written, and in adding the points, the matres lectiones were eliminated and the Hebrew text was greatly corrupted. His assault on the inte-

[^24]grity of the Massoretic text he published at Paris, 1650, under the title of Critica Sacra. To this work Buxtorf jumior replied within three years of its publication, in a volume containing no less than 1040 quarto pages. ${ }^{6 s}$ But though both these works repeatedly touch the question about the origin of the vowel-points, and though the controversy about the integrity of the text has arisen from, and is in some measure connected with, the dispute about the points, yet the two controversies are totally distinct, and ought not to have been confounded with each other.

The "Mystery of the Points Unveiled" created quite as great a revolution among scholars in the seventeenth century as the Massoreth Ha-Massoreth, of which it was an exposition. Its author's fame as a critic soon spread over Europe, and his work, as well as the rejoinder to it by Buxtorf junior, divided Protestant Christendom everywhere into two hostile camps-vowelists and anti-vowelists. The controversy was soon transplanted into England, where Cappellus was known, having studied two years at Oxford, and where Biblical and Talmudical studies were at that time zealously prosecuted, under the guidance of Brian Walton, and Lightfoot. In the Prolegomena to the London Polyglott, Levita's original opinion is more strictly followed than that of Cappellus. It is there maintained that the vowelpoints were invented by the Massorites about A.D. 500 ; that these points were not arbitrary inventions of the Massorites, but express the traditional and true reading of the text and the sense of the Holy Ghost ; that it is not lawful for any one to reject the Massoretic reading at pleasure; that all Christians are tied to it, unless some error or better reading can be clearly proved; and that the controversy, therefore, "is only about the present points, in regard of their forms, not of their force and signification.' ${ }^{59}$

Whilst Levita and Cappellus were represented in England by Walton, De Rossi and Buxtorf had their chief representative here in Lightfoot. This learned Hebraist thought that his dicta would be quite sufficient to silence his opponents, and therefore deigned no more than to deliver himself as follows, after the masterly recapitulation of the arguments against the antiquity of the vowel-points given

[^25]in Walton's Prolegomena: "There are some who believe the Holy Bible was pointed by wise men of Tiberias. I do not wonder at the impudence of the Jews who invented the story, but I wonder at the credulity of Christians who applaud it. Recollect, I beseech you, the names of the Rabbins of Tiberias, from the first situation of the University there to the time that it expired; and what at length do you find, but a kind of men mad with Pharisaism, bewitching with traditions and bewitched, blind, gufleful, doting, they must pardon me if I say, magical and monstrous! Men, how unfit, how unable, how foolish, for the undertaking so divine a work! Read over the Jerusalem Talmud, and see there how R. Judah, R. Chaninah, R. Judan, R. Hoshaia, R. Chija Rabba, R. Chija bar Ba, R. Jochanan, R. Jonathan, and the rest of the grand doctors among the Rabbins of Tiberias, behave themselves, how earnestly they do nothing, how childishly they handle serious disputes! And if you can believe the Bible was pointed in such a school, believe also all that the Talmudists wrote. The pointing of the Bible savours of the work of the Holy Spirit, not the work of lost, blinded, besotted men." ${ }^{\prime 60}$

It was this dogmatic and abusive assertion, of one who was deemed the highest authority in matters of Hebrew learning in England, as well as the conviction that those who defend the novelty of the points " not only make doubtful the authority of the Scriptures, but wholly pluck it up by the roots," which stimulated the celebrated Dr. Owen to issue his attack on Walton's Polyglott and the anti-vowelists. ${ }^{61}$. With the exception of the endorsement and elaboration of Lightfoot's diatribe, Dr. Owen's work in defence of the vowelpoints is simply made up of the De Rossi-Buxtorf arguments greatly diluted. The high esteem, however, in which Dr. Owen was held made it necessary that his book,--in which he declared that he "had rather that this work of the Biblia Polyglotta, and all works of the kind, were out of the world, than that this one opinion should be received with the consequences that unavoidably attend it,"-should not be left unnoticed. Within twelve months therefore of the appear-

[^26]ance of the attack, Walton published a reply, which, though greatly defaced by bitter invective and inexcnsable abuse, contains additional and valuable contributions to the literature of this controversy. ${ }^{62}$.

Although the antiquity of the vowel-points still found advocates in Joseph Cooper, ${ }^{63}$ Samuel Clark, ${ }^{64}$ Whitfield, ${ }^{65}$ and Dr. Gill, ${ }^{66}$ who published learned dissertations in defence of Dr. Owen and against Bishop Walton; yet it must be admitted that the Prolegomena and "The Considerator Considered" decided the battle in England in favour of the anti-vowelists. Henceforth all Biblical critics, with very few exceptions, regarded the points as modern, useless, and of no authority, though Walton himself, as we have seen, maintained that they, as a rule, represented the ancient and genuine reading. The utter rejection of the points, and the espousal of Cappellus' notions propounded in his Critica Sacra, produced lamentable effects in England as far as the criticism of the Old Testament was concerned, from which we are only now recovering. Two different schools of interpreters were erected here upon the ruins of the antiquity of the vowel-points.

The characteristic dogmas of the first school are, that " the Massoretic punctuation is an interpretation of the text made by the Jews, probably not earlier than the eighth century, and that, accordingly, our public translations in modern tongues, for the use of the Church among Protestants, and so likewise the modern Latin translations, are, for the most part, close copies of the Hebrew pointed text, and are in reality only versions at second hand, translations of the Jews' interpretation of the Old Testament;" ${ }^{67}$ that the Hebrew text "is

[^27]considerably injured, and stands in need of frequent emendation." Hence the disciples of this school resorted to amend the text by the aid of the ancient versions, and had recourse to the most unwarrantable conjectures, thas unsettling the original text and impugning its integrity. The principal disciples of this school are Archbishop Secker, Drs. Durell, Judd, Lowth, Blayney, Newcome, Wintle, Horsley, Good, Boothroyd, and others.

The second school, which is less accomplished, but more lamentable, is the one known by the name Hutchinsonian, after its founder, John Hntchinson (1674-1737). Believing that "Holy Scripture has a language of its own, which does not consist of words, but of signs or figures taken from visible things; so that the world which we now see is a sort of commentary on the mind of God, and explains the world in which we live;" this peculiar philosopher, like his Kabbalistic prototypes, was obliged to discard the vowel-points, and everything else which determined the pronunciation of the words and fixed their meaning. Hutchinson endorsed and reproduced all the base calumnies brought together by Raymond Lally, Wagenseil, \&c., against the Jews, whom he always styles the apostates, and maintains that the sacred text was designedly corrupted by these apostates through the insertion of the points and letters, which was "their last shift to change their evasions of the truth;" that thereby "they make the words different from what they were, or of another root, or of another signification, than the words would have been without pointing in that context." ${ }^{68}$ To this wild school belonged the eminently orthodox and pious Romaine, Bishop Horne, the lexicographer Parkhurst, and others.

It. was this unwarrantable liberty taken with the text, first started by Cappellus' Critica Sacra, and the resort to all sorts of conjectural

[^28]emendations, in order to deduce from the Scriptures the peculiar and preconceived fancies of the different schools, which converted the controversy about the vowel-points into an article of faith in the Reformed Churches of Switzerland. In Switzerland, where the two Buxtorfs successively occupied the professorial chair of Oriental literature, and where their opinions, in matters of Hebrew and Talmudic lore, was regarded as paramount, the theologians enacted a law in 1678, that no person should be licensed to preach the gospel in their churches unless he publicly declared that he believes in the integrity of the Hebrew text and in the divinity of the vowel-points and accents. ${ }^{69}$

After a controversy raging vehemently for more than three centuries, and notwithstanding that the antiquity of the points had been raised to the sanctity of a dogma, modern research and criticism have confirmed the arguments urged by Levita against the antiquity of the present vowel-signs. It is now established beyond the shadow of a doubt, from the discovery of ancient MSS., that there were two systems of vocalisation contrived almost simultaneously, and that the system hitherto regarded by the vowelists as of divine origin is simply one of the two. Indeed the present system, around which the whole controversy clusters, and which has been canonised, is actually the later of the two in point of age.

The earlier, or first system, was developed by Acha or Achai of Irak (Babylon), about 550, from the few simple signs which represented the traditional pronunciation of the text in the East. The peculiarity of this system consists in having signs of a different shape to represent the vowels, and that these are almost uniformly placed above the letters. It is therefore designated the Superlineary system (מנוקר למעלה). From the fact that its contriver lived in Babylon, it is also called the Babylon, or the Assyrian system, (נקוד אשורי ,נקוד הבבלי) and the Eastern system. It has been preserved in the following MSS., i. A MS. of the Pentateuch, embracing only fifteen fragments of Deuteronomy, with Targum Onkelos after each verse, the Massorah marginalis, and the Haphtaroth with the Massorah; the whole consists of seventy-seven leaves, and was most probably written in

[^29]Persia. ii. An equally ancient MS. of the Haphtaroth, consisting of twelve fragments, and containing the Haphtaroth to Exod., Levit., and Numb., which are wanting in the preceding MS., as well as the Haphtaroth of New Year, the Day of Atonement, and the feasts of Tabernacles and Pentecost, the Targum, and the Massorah. iii. A MS. of the major and minor Prophets, consisting of two hundred and twenty-five parchment leaves, and written about A.D. 916. ${ }^{70}$

The later, or second system, is the one which has been for centuries commonly adopted both by Jews and Christians in the pointed editions of the Hebrew Bibles. It was contrived by Mocha, of Tiberias, about A.D. 570 , to denote the traditional pronunciation of the text in the West. Hence it is called the Tiberian system (נקוד טברני), and the Palestinian or Western system (נקוד ארץ ישראל). It is far more complete and extensive, and exhibits more sharply the niceties of the traditional pronunciation and intonàtion of the text, than the Babylonian system, with which it competed.

As the Babylonian system, with all its imperfections, was the first promulgated, and moreover as it obtained prior to the separation of the Karaites from the Rabbinic Jews, it was staunchly followed by the Jews in Babylon, and more especially by the Karaites. The Rabbinic Jews, however, soon discarded the Babylonian system, when they found that the Tiberian or present system of vocalisation was more perfect, and represented more adequately the traditional pronunciation, whilst the Karaite Jews clung to the first or Babylonian system. . It was not till the year 957, when the Jews of Palestine sent Missionaries to the Crimea to reclaim the Karaites to Rabbinism, and when these Missionaries succeeded in converting many of the distinguished families, that the said Missionaries, Ephraim, Elisha, and Chanuka, punctuated the Bible MSS. according to the Tiberian or present system, and induced the Karaites to substitute it for the one

[^30]which was previonsly in vogue, and which has only survived in the most ancient MSS. This discovery of modern research, therefore, fully confirms Levita's arguments against the antiquity of the present vocalisation, and must for ever settle the long and vehement controversy.

Within twelve months of the appearance of the Massoreth HaMassoreth, which caused this protracted and vehement controversy, Levita published (1538) a treatise on the laws of the accents. The rapid succession of these two works is easily accounted for. The vowel-points and accents are most intimately connected with each other, and proceeded from the same authors. Both R. Acha, and R. Mocha, the compilers of the Babylonian and Tiberian systems of vocalisation, included the accents in their respective systems. Indeed the accents determine the sense of a passage quite as much as the vowel-points. If the points fix the pronunciation and meaning of words, the accents indicate the logical relation of each word to the whole sentence and the close of sentences. Hence those who contrived the vowel-signs, to denote the traditional pronunciation of the words, were also obliged to invent the accents, to represent the traditional construction of the sentences. This accounts for the frequent remark of the celebrated commentator Rashi, in his exposition of the Scriptures-" but for the accents on this verse, I could not have made out its meaning;" and the warning of the famous Ibn Ezra-" an interpretation which is not according to the accents is neither to be received nor listened to, for the author of the accents knew the import much better."

It is this importance of the accents which has invested them with a divine halo, and which has made the defenders of the antiquity and divinity of the vowel-points also maintain their antiquity and divinity. Consistently with his arguments against the points, Levita rejects the divine origin of the accents, maintaining that they proceed from the same Tiherian Massorites who contrived the system of vocalisation. As his arguments against the points are also directed against the accents, he refrains from repeating them, and simply refers the reader to the Massoreth Ha-Massoreth.

In harmony with its import, he denominated this treatise The Book of Good Sense (ספר טוב טעם), since the accent on each word is called in Hehrew טעם reason, principle, because it furnishes principles and rules to deduce the import of each verse. The whole treatise
consists of eight sections, and discusses the following points. Section i. discusses the number and names of the accents, and their proper division into ț̣ree classes, viz., 14 Kings, so called, because, like monarchs who restrain their subjects, these accents respectively stand between sentences, keeping them within proper bounds. ii. Servants, so called, because they act as servants of the monarch, bringing the sentence without panse to the resting place of the kings; and 5 who are neither kings nor servants, thus making 30 in all. Section ii. explains the names of the accents, their laws, the position of the serviles, \&c. Section iii. explains how it is that half the number of royal accents follow each other, and the other half does not follow; that most of the regal accents are placed above the letters, whilst most of the servile accents are placed under the letters; as well as the reason why some serviles are above the letters. Section iv. explains the distentives, shewing the smaller kings, which cause a longer pause than the greater kings; that kings have servants, and how many, and which have no servants, and which servants only serve one or two or more kings. Section $\nabla$. describes the form and names of all the thirty accents. Section vi. treats on the laws of those words which have the accents on the ultima and penultima. Section vii. discusses the laws of the Metheg and Gaja; and Section viii. the Makkeph.

This Treatise, which is a very valuable contribution to Biblical exegesis, was first published by his friend Bomberg, Venice, 1538. Levita appended to this edition a list of printers' mistakes which have crept into the Massoreth Ha-Massoreth, as well as into this book. Within twelve months of its appearance, Münster re-published it, with a Latin summary of its contents (Basle, 1539). It is generally bound up with the Massoreth Ha-Massoreth, as these two works were re-published in the same year. Münster's edition is not as correct as the editio princeps. Although it is acknowledged, by grammarians and expositors of the highest authority, that the accents are not only marks to indicate the tone-syllable, but to show the logical relation of each word to the whole sentence, thus serving as signs of interpretation, yet this branch of ancient exegesis has been greatly neglected. The grammars, while devoting ample space to the discussion of the vowel-points, rarely ever give more than a paragraph or two to the explanation of the laws of the accents, which are of equal importance to the interpretation of the old Testament. Hence it is, that, whilst Levita's works on the other
departments of Biblical literature and exegesis have been reprinted several times, and elaborated and superseded by succeeding researches, the treatise on the accents has never been published again since 1539 , and the system of accentuation in the Old Testament is less understood by the generality of Hebrew students in the present day than it was in the days when Elias Levita's treatise first appeared. ${ }^{71}$

Levita's consummate mastery of Hebrew literature in all its different branches was only equalled by his indefatigable zeal and untiring labours to simplify and promote its study. - Though he was now seventy years of age, his energies had not abated. No sooner had he finished the Treatise on the Accents, than he commenced a Lexicon, explaining those words in the Talmud, Midrashim, and other works in the Rabbinical literature, which were either entirely omitted in the standard Lexicons of R. Nathan b. Jechiel and R. David Kimchi, or had not been treated in all their sundry meanings. He was all the more induced to undertake this work by the rapid progress of his pupils in Biblical Hebrew, and through the great demand, especially on the part of Christians, for keys to the Kabbalistic and Rabbinical writings. In his entire absorption in this Lexicon, and another which we shall soon mention, he forgot the altered circumstances in which he was then placed, and it was not till he had nearly completed the work, after labouring three years over it, that he began to think of the difficulties of finding a publisher, as his friend and patron, "the great printer, D. Bomberg," he tells us, "had given up his printing-office some time since."

But at the very time when he was in this perplexity, and when

[^31]his plan for sending the Lexicon to Bologna was defeated by the information that the Hebrew press had stopped there, Levita received a letter from Paul Fagius, inviting him to go to Germany, to undertake the supervision of the Hebrew press and the editorship of sundry Biblical works. To us, in whose country the remains of Fagius were ignominiously exhumed and burned, by the command of Mary, in 1556, and the ashes collected again, and honourably interred, by the order of Elizabeth, July 30, 1560, the connection of this learned. Hebraist and eminent Reformer with Levita is of special interest. Fagius, who was born at Rheinzabern, in 1504, received his first instruction in Hebrew from Wolfgang Fabricius Capito (1478-1541), who acquired his Hebrew knowledge from two converted Jews, one unnamed, and the other named Matthew Adrian, the well-known author, or compiler, of the Libellus Hora, in Hebrew and Latin (1513), now one of the rarest books in existence. 72 Though Capito himself was no profound Hebrew scholar, as may be seen from his writings, ${ }^{73}$ yet he imbued Fagius with an intense love for the language.

When Fagius was appointed Protestant pastor of Isny, in Allgau, in 1537 , where he had formerly been rector of the Grammar School, he more than ever devoted himself to his Hebrew studies. He was also exceedingly anxious to diffuse the knowledge of the sacred language by means of good elementary books, which were much wanted at that time. To effect this he not only compiled the required manuals himself, but, with the aid of his friend and patron, counsellor Peter Buffer, he established a Hebrew press in the town of his pastoral labours. Feeling, however, his own inefficiency to conduct the printing of books in a language which, with all his love for it, he had not as yèt properly mastered, he at once invited Levita to accept the office of supervisor, and offered also to print at Isny his own books, which were then ready for the press, as well

[^32]as those which had already been published. Levita regarded this invitation as providential, and though he tells us he had refused before "sundry calls from princes, cardinals, and bishops, as well as from the king of France," to professorial chairs, the septuagenarian felt that it was the voice of God, and that he must not disobey it.

In the year 1540, therefore, the aged Levita left his wife, children, and numerous friends in Venice, and departed for Isny, carrying with him the MSS. of his two Lexicons, and of the second edition of the Grammar called the Bachur, which were then nearly finished, and which Fagius had promised to publish. When the extreme difficulty and discomfort connected with travelling three centuries ago is borne in mind, we shall be able to appreciate the unquenchable zeal of this veteran, who, at the age of seventy, when men generally cling to their homes most tenaciously, left everything near and dear to him, and willingly braved all fatigue and difficulties, to promote the knowledge of the sacred language. Indeed, in the Epilogue to the Tishbi, which was the first book printed by Fagius, Levita tells us that he had to finish it on the road. "When I was on my journey," he says, " travelling over a land of mountains and valleys, exposed to the rain of heaven and to the snow which covered the ground, I often stood still, thought over in my mind sundry of the articles, wrote them down upon the tablet of my heart, and when I reached the inn I opened my bag, took out the MS., and put down the things which God put into my heart.' ${ }^{7 s}$

Such was the journey which Levita made to come to Fagins. Let us now hear from the learned Jew what impression he received of the Christian scholar, when the two met together. "When I arrived here," says Levita, "I tasted his pitcher, and found it full of old wine. Indeed, I had not been told half of his wisdom and knowledge. Many draw from the fountain of his learning; he is a great oracle for his people, a beautiful preacher, and an excellent expositor. He is truly worthy that his people should describe him as we describe our Rabbin Moses Maimonides. For just as we say, 'From Moses the law-giver to Moses [Maimonides] none has arisen like Moses;' so they should say, 'From Paul [the Apostle] to Paul [Fagius] none



has arisen like Paul.'" 75 This cordiality Fagius fully reciprocated, as may be seen from his Latin Address to the Reader prefixed to the Tishbi. Entertaining the same ardent love for Hebrew, agreed upon malking united efforts to diffuse the knowledge of it, and thoroughly appreciating each other's character, Levita and Fagius soon became ardent friends, and conjointly produced works which, at that time, were an honour to their authors, and formed important contributions to Biblical literature.

The first work issued from this newly established Hebrew press was Levita's Lexicon, comprising seven hundred and twelve words used in the ancient Jewish literature. He called it Tishbi, for three reasons: i. In allusion to the gentile name of his namesake the prophet (i. Kings xvii. 1), whose appellation Levita assumed in accordance with an ancient conceit; ii. Because the last word in this Lexicon is Tishbi; and iii. Because the nomerical value of the word Tishbi (viz." $10+ב 2+w 300+n 400=712$ ) represents the total number of sections in this Lexicon. To perfect himself in Rabbinical Hebrew, under the guidance of so excellent a master, as well as to enable Christian students at large to use it as a guide, Fagius, assisted by Levita, translated the whole Tishbi into Latin, with the exception of the poetical and rhythmical introductions, which were translated by James Velocian. The third Introduction, which is in prose, is not translated at all; most probably because, as it contains so flattering an account of Fagius, his sincere humility would not tolerate its being translated into a language commonly understood among Christian scholars. Thus, the Hebrew of Levita on the right page and the Latin of Fagius on the left, the Jew and the Christian published their conjoint work, under the same cover, at Isny, 1541. The Tishbi was reprinted with the Latin translation by Fagius at Basel, 1557, and without the Latin, ibid. 1601; Grodno, 1805, and Chernowitz, 1856.

In the same year in which the Tishbi appeared, Levita also carried through the press another Lexicon, comprising all the words which occur in the Chaldee paraphrases of the Old Testament. The diff-

[^33]culties which he had to encounter to reduce the language of the Chaldee paraphrases to grammatical and lexical form were enormous. The only Aramaic Lexicon extant was the Aruch, by R. Nathan b. Jechiel (circa 1030-1106), which was completed A.D. 1101, and of which three different editions appeared before the publication of the Lexicon on the Targumim. One of these three editions, i.e. the editio princeps, was published before 1480; the second appeared at Pesaro, 1517 ; and the third was edited by Levita himself, and published by his friend Bomberg, Venice, 1531. But, marvellous as is the Aruch, and though it is still the only clue to the ancient Jewish writings, it is not designed for students of the Chaldee paraphrases. It does not separate the dialects of the Mishna, Gemara, Midrashim, and Targumim, but mixes them up all in one treatise. In addition to the want of forerunners in the lexicography of the Targumim, there was the great difficulty arising from the confused condition of the texts of these paraphrases. But here we cannot do better than give Levita's own words upon the subject, which are as follows:
"I have been asked whether it is possible to make a grammar on the Targum, to which I replied that, in my opinion, the possibility is very remote, owing to the great variations in the Codices with regard to the words and letters, and more especially the vowel-points, which differ exceedingly. This arises from the fact that the Targumists most unquestionably wrote their paraphrases without points, which had not then been invented, as I have previously shown in the Introduction to the Massoreth Ha-Massoreth. In confirmation of this, it is also to be adduced that the most ancient Codices are all without the points; for the Massorites, who pointed the Hebrew Scriptures, did not point the Chaldee paraphrases. These were pointed much later, by one or more individuals, men without a name, who exercised an arbitrary independence of each other. Hence it is that their rules are contradictory, and that no examples can be adduced from them to found thereupon a grammar. Hence, too, the fact that, since the Targum was made, there has not been a wise and intelligent man in Israel who could make a grammar to it.
"Not only, however, has no grammar been written, but no one bas compiled a lexicon to explain the words, except, indeed, R. Nathan of Rome, in his Aruch, which he made in explanation of the Talmud, and in which he adduces some words from the Targumim. But these are chiefly Greek and Latin expressions, occuring for the most part
in the Jerusalem Targum, and even many of these he quotes without explaining them, about which I have already had occasion to complain in the Massoreth Ha-Massoreth. After him, however, there has been no one who had the courage to handle either the grammar or the lexicography of the Targumim. Now I have been inclined to think that the reason of it is, because that, in years bygone, i.e. before the invention of printing, not one copy of the Targum on the Prophets and Hagiographa was to be found in a town, or two in a province. Hence nobody could be found to study them. The Targum Onkelos, which was always to be found plentifully, because we are obliged to read every week the hebdomadal lesson from the law, twice in Hebrew and once in Chaldee, there have indeed been some who studied it; they have also written something on it, but I have not found it of much use; they have likewise made a Massorah to it, which, however, I have not yet succeeded in seeing. But with regard to the Targum on the Prophets and Hagiographa, they have not opened their mouth, nor uttered a syllable about it; being neither studied nor asked for, -they say, Let it tarry till Elisha cometh." ${ }^{76}$

It was this neglect of the Chaldee paraphrases, and his determination to supply the desideratum, which induced Levita, in spite of all the difficulties to be encountered, to undertake the compilation of a Chaldee Lexicon. He called it Methurgeman (מתורגמן), or the Interpreter, "because it interprets the Hebrew in Aramaic, and the Aramaic in Hebrew." It was published by his friend, Paul Fagius, at

[^34]Isny, in the month of August, 1541. At the end of the volume is Fagius's Colophon, which consists of a book with a tree on it, as Fagius properly denotes book; on the right of it is the letter $\Omega$, initial of Paul ; on the left of it is the letter $\boldsymbol{3}$, the initial of book= Fagius; whilst underneath it is the Hebrew inscription בל אלין טוב פושא פרי טוב, Every good tree bringeth forth good fruit. The Colophon of the Tishbi, which as we have seen contains the Latin translation of Fagius, is different. Instead of the letters $\Xi$ and $\boldsymbol{ב}$ there are on the right and left hand the Latin and the Hebrew of the inscription, and underneath are the Hebrew words תקותי במשיח הנשלח שהיא עתיר לדין חיים ומתים, My hope is in the Messiah who has come, and who will judge the quick and the dead. This difference is undoubtedly owing to the fact that Fagius, as the joint editor, claimed to have the expression of his faith on the Tishbi; whilst the Methurgeman, which is the sole work of Levita, has simply the Hebrew date, and no reference to Christ.

In the Epilogue to the Methurgeman, Levita tells us that he laboured over it nearly four years; which is fully confirmed by the fact that he already alludes to his being engaged on it in the third Introduction to the Massoreth Ha-Massoreth (1538), whilst in the third Introduction to the Tishbi, which was written after he had only been three years at work over it, he says, "I know that many will be astonished at the multitude of words from the Targum which I quote, saying, in different places, this expression does not occur again in the Targum, or this expression only occurs once or twice, or it is thus rendered throughout the Chaldee version, except in Job, Psalms, and Proverbs, \&c., \&e., and will scarcely be inclined to believe all the remarks which I made therein. But if they only knew the great labour which I spent over the Methurgeman, they would not be surprised at it. Forsooth, I have been three years writing it; and during this time $I$ have read through all the Chaldee paxaphrases over and over again, as the references will show to anyone who consults it. Others, again, may be astonished at my quoting Greek in many places, knowing that I was not learned in this language. But the fact is, that these people do not know that I have learned it from Cardinal Egidio, with whom I resided thirteen years, and who was exceedingly expert in Greek." 7

[^35]But though Levita spent such extraordinary labour over this Lexicon, and though the Methurgeman is still the only work in which the whole language of the Chaldee paraphrases is treated separately, it has never been republished. The introduction, was translated into Latin by his friend Paul Fagius, Isny, 1542. The single article comprising the root משח which discusses the question of the Messiah in the Chaldee paraphrases, has also been translated into Latin by Gilb. Genebrard, Paris, 1572.78 Buxtorf has incorporated most of it in his Rabbinical and Talmudical Lexicon, which, however, is not as convenient for the use of students as Levita's work, inasmuch as it mixes up the dialects of the Talmud and Midrashim with the language of the Chaldee paraphrases. The only Lexicon*which will supersede it is the one now in course of publication by Dr. Levy.

With the completion of the Chaldee Lexicon, Levita thought he had finished his active life, having now reached his seventy-fourth year. In most affecting language, $t$ erefore, he says in the Epilogue to the work in question, that the time has now arrived when he must relinquish his literary labours, since his advanced age and failing health compel him to retire from the battle field. "Seeing that age has overtaken me, that I am very old, that my eyesight grows dimmer every day, and that my strength is fast leaving me, I must retire from the ranks and serve no more. I shall now return to my country which I left, namely, Venice, and die in my town with my aged wife, and no more move my foot from her. She shall close my eyes, and death alone shall henceforth separate me from her. I shall abide there the remaining days of my life, finish the books which $I$ have begun, and then say to the God who created me, Take now my life, for it is better that I should die."

But, notwithstanding this resolution to return to Venice, his unquenchable love for the work, coupled with the fact that he had still some treatises ready for press, and that his friend Fagius too was actually printing sundry books which required his help, induced the

הגדול שטרחתי בחבור ספר הסתורגמן גם בציניהם לא יפלא כי באמת שלש שנים עמרתי בחנורו ראז

 -שלש עשרה שנה קבלחי כל אלה בי הוא היה בקי מאר פלשון יץ Introdaction iii. to the Tishbi.

[^36]aged Levita to remain a little longer at Isny. With impaired eyesight and failing health, but with an enthusiasm for Biblical literature, and an industry which defied and vanquished bodily infirmities, he not only most vigorously continued his own works, but largely aided Fagius in writing and carrying through the press his productions. Some idea may be formed of the amount of menfal and physical labour which Levita was still able to perform, though now seventyfour years of age, from the fact that, within twelve months of the appearance of the stupendous Lexicon on the Chaldee paraphrases, he wrote and carried through the press an Alphabetical List of the Technical Hebrew Words or Nomenclature (שמות דברים), in four columns. Column i. gives these words in Judaio-German, with Hebrew characters. Column ii., in Hebrew. Column iii., in Latin, by Fagius; and column iv. gives them in German, with German characters, Isny, 1542. It was afterwards repnblished, with an additional column, by Drusius the son, containing the corresponding Greek words, and enriched with explanations by Drusius the father, Francker, 1652, and ibid., 1581.

Besides the Nomenclature, Levita also carried through the press this year (1542), a new and thoroughly revised edition of his Grammar, entitled Bachur, which as we have seen he published twenty-four years before (1518), at the suggestion and for the use of his pupil Cardinal Egidio. .Münster had already republished it, with a Latin translation (1525), seven years after the appearance of the original work, but Levita had nothing to do with it, and made no alterations in it. As it is the new preface added by Levita to this edition which gave rise to the great divergency of opinion about the date of his birth, we shall give it entire. By so doing, the origin of the errors will best be understood. But before doing this, it is necessary to remark that Levita completed the second edition in 1540, when still at Venice, and that it was one of the three MSS. which he took with him to Isny, the other two being the Tishbi and the Methur-geman. This is evident, from his remark in the Epilogue to the second edition of the Bachur, where he distinctly says," Whoso wishes to know its date, let him take 22 (בידיו) from 322 (ערב״ים)," "79 thus leaving $300=1540$, the very year in which he received the invitation
797 והרוצה לדצת עח פרשו
הלא יקח בי'דו מץ ערב"ים

Bachur, p. 103, 2nd edition, Isny, 1542.
from Fagius, and in which he started for Isny. It was very natural that he should print the three new works (namely, the two Lexicons and the Nomenclature) first, and then the second edition of an old work.

Now, in the Introduction to the Bachur in question, which he completed in 1540, but which was not printed till 1542, he gives the following piece of autobiography, which caused the errors already alluded to. "Thus sayeth Elias Levita, the German, ${ }^{80}$ I was about forty years of age when fate sent me from Venice, and I came to Rome. Here I was requested to compile this book, and I put down its import according to my knowledge. Now the Lord has spared me thirty years longer, and I am now about seventy years old, and am as able now as I was then to engage in the discussion on matters of Grammar, the Bible, and the Massorah. Yea since then I have acquired different ideas', and formed opinions which I did not know before. Moreover, I have since found that I have omitted some things which ought to have been put down, and that I have stated things which ought not to have been written. I regret that I have done it. Still it is not to be wondered at, since we find that even our Rabbins of blessed memory said things in their youth, which they recalled in their old age. Thus we find, 'Raba changed from this;' : R. Ashi changed from what he said in the former statement, and the law is according to his second statement,' (comp. Baba Bathra 157, b.) Now as were their thoughts so are mine, and I am not to be better than my fathers. For this reason I have resolved to publish a second edition of this work, with such additions and diminutions as shall make the last edition better than the first. I shall thus prevent stadents studying erroneous introductions, inconclusive arguments, and incorrect rules, and those
so אמר אליהו הלוי האשכנזי בץ ארבעים שנה אנכי בשלדו ההמן אורי מוריגסיחה ובאתי
 מאו דה שלשים שנה והרי אני כבן שבעים שנה ועודני היום חזק בכחי אז וכלחי צהה לצאח ולבא למלחמת הרקרוק והפסוק והמסורח בי מאו נחדרשו בי דעוח אחרוח וסבויח חרשוח אשר לפנים לא ידעחים



 ולא טוב אנכי מאבוהי לקן הסכמחי עם לבבי להרפים הספר הוה שגיח ולדוסיף עליו ולברוע ממנו ובדה איטיב חסדי האחרון מן הראשון לבלתי לנח אחדרי הבזורים ללמרם הקדמוה כונבות וראיות בלתי צורקוח וחקים לא טונים וילמרום החל החלמידים הבאים אתרי ונמצא שם שמים מחדלל חם ושלום ולכִן בהעדקה

ההאח אתקן המעווח והרורם אישר והמקלקל אבשר וארים מבשול מדרד עמי ובוה יהה אהחים עמי
that follow, learning blunders, and thereby peradventure profaning the divine name. For this reason, I correct in this edition that which is erroneous, rectify the mistakes, and remove the stumbling block from the way of my people. To this end may the Lord be with me."

It was David Gans, ${ }^{81}$ the eminent historian, who first took Levita's remark-"I was about forty years of age when fate sent me from Venice, and I came to Rome," \&c. -also to refer to Levita's period of life when he published the Grammar in question. Accordingly, as the first edition of the Bachur was published, Rome, 1518, Gans concluded that Levita was born in 1477, and that the second edition appeared in 1547, since Levita himself states that he compiled it forty years later, when he was seventy years of age. This statement of Gans was adopted by Jechiel, ${ }^{82}$ in his historical work, by Semler, and others.

[^37]Levita's remark, however, that he was forty years of age, does not refer to the publioation of the first edition of the Bachur, but to his learing Venice and arriving at Rome in 1509, as is evident from the following facts: $i$. The second edition of the Bachur was not published in $307[=1547]$, as stated by Gans and those who follow him, but in 1542. ${ }^{88}$ ii. This revised edition, according to his own explicit statement (vide supra, p. 73), he finished in 1540 . iii. He tells us himself that he was not then seventy years old, but about seventy years of age (והרי אני כבן שבעים שנה), that is a little more than seventy, or seventy-two. iv. As this second edition was published two years after its completion, i.e., in 1542, when he was seventy-four years of age, he most unquestionably was born in 1468; and $v$. This date of his birth is confirmed by Levita himself, for he tells us distinctly (vide supra, p. 3), that he was eighty years old in 1548.

In addition to his own two productions, which he published in 1542, the aged Levita carried through the press, in the same year, no fewer than four works published by his friend Fagius. They are as follows: i. The Book of Tobit, in Hebrew, with a Latin translation by Fagius on the opposite page, Isny, 1542, which has been incorporated in the London Polyglott by Walton. ii. The so-called Alphabet of Ben Sirah, in Chaldee, with a Commentary, and a Latin translation by Fagius, Isny, 1542. iii. Gen. cap. i.--iv., with a Latin translation, as well as with an explanation of every word, and a Latin translation of

Ha-Massoreth he wrote in 298 [ $=1538$ ], and at the second edition be was seventy years old, which was in $307[=1547]$. Comp. vol. i., p. 95, a, ed. Lemberg. It will be seen that the words, "and at the second edition he was seventy years of age, which wes in 307," have heen incorrectly put after the Massoreth Ha-Massoreth.
${ }^{88}$ The second edition is now before us, and the complete title and date are thus given by Levita himself:

דקרוק אליחו הלוי
האשכנוי אשר שמו


Onkelos' paraphrases of the same chapters, Isny, 1542; and iv. An Ethical Treatise in Judaio-German, Isny, 1542. This book, which was afterwards translated into Hebrew, and published under the title, The Paths of the Righteous (אורחות צריקים), Prague, 1581, no less an authority than Jost asserts was written by Levita. ${ }^{84}$ Steinschneider and Cassel, however, who are anthorities of equal weight, will have it that Levita simply edited it. ${ }^{\text {85 }}$

Levita's departure from Isny was at last accelerated by the impending change in the position of his friend Fagius. Capito, who, as we have seen, was Fagius's first Hebrew teacher, and who occupied both the office of evangelical pastor and the professorial chair at Strasburg, died of the plague in December, 1541. The choice of a. successor was soon made. The name of Fagius at once suggested itself to the managers of the Protestant interests at Strasburg, and accordingly this pions, amiable, and learned clergyman was asked to succeed Capito in the pastorate and professorship. Fagius, in accepting this invitation, stipulated that he should be allowed to go first to Constance, for two years, to organise and consolidate the Protestant interests, in the place where the celebrated council condemned Huss and Jerome of Prague. But, in going to Constance for this short period, he was determined to infuse into the minds and hearts of the Protestants there, a conviction of the importance, and a love for the study, of the Hebrew language, knowing that the most effectual way to strengthen the cause of Protestantism was to advance the cause of Biblical literature.

In going therefore to Constance in 1542, Fagins felt that he could not as yet dispense with the help of Levita. Levita was too sincerely attached to his friend, and had too great a love for Hebrew, not to comply with the appeal of Fagius in behalf of the cause of Oriental learning in his self-imposed sphere of labour; and accordingly the aged Jew accompanied the Christian pastor to Constance. As Fagius's stay here was very limited, and as Levita was very anxious to get back to his wife and children at Venice, they at once set to work. Their efforts were directed to supply students with appropriate elementary books. The first book, therefore, which Fagius published consisted of Gen. i.-iv. in Hebrew, with a German translation, and an appendix

[^38]of such notes as should help the tyro in Hebrew to acquire the language, Constance, 1543.86 Having supplied them with an elementary book for the study of Biblical Hebrew, Fagius was also anxious to furnish the students with a guide to Rabbinical Hebrew, and hence published within twelve months Psalms i.-x. in Hebrew, accompanied by David Kimchi's Rabbinical commentary, with a Latin translation, Constance, 1544.

Whilst Fagius thus manifested his anxiety to supply, with the aid of his Jewish friend, the Protestant Christians at Constance with manuals, Levita was equally anxious to benefit his Jewish brethren, with the help of his Christia办 friend. As Protestants and Pomanists were now. vying with each other to furmish their respective communities in Germany with translations of the Scriptures in the vernacular of the people, Levita saw the importance of supplying the German speaking Jews with a Judaio-German version of that portion of the Bible which is hebdomadally read, both publicly and privately. He accordingly translated the Pentateuch, the Five Megilloth, and the Haphtaroth, or lessons from the Prophets, into that dialect. This translation he got Fagius to publish, and it appeared at Constance, $1544 .{ }^{87}$

It was not till the autumn of 1544, when Fagius's two years' term at Constance had expired, and he went to Strasburg to enter upon his duties there, that Levita arrived at Venice, after an absence of nearly four years. Though he was now seventy-six years of age, his intellect was still very active, and the tenderness of his heart was intense. His delight in meeting again those who were dear and near to him, and from whom a literary mission had temporarily separated him, may be surmised from the following touching prayer in poetry, which he offered up for his wife, at the conclusion of his Chaldee Lexicon: "O Lord, I beseech thee, grant to me and my wife this mercy, that she should not be a widow, and that I should not be a widower! Let

[^39]us both die together; let me sleep in her bosom till the appointed time, when the end shall be ushered in, and we shall rise again, and together be destined for everlasting life." ${ }^{38}$

No sooner had he arrived at Venice, than he began publishing again. He re-commenced his literary work in his old sphere of labour, by editing a Rhythmical Exposition of the Book of Job (פירוש איוב), Venice, 1544. Some indeed will have it that Levita is the author of this production, and appeal to Steinschneider in corroboration of this assertion; but this learned bibliographer has shown that it was written by Sarek Barfat, who flourished in the middle of the fourteenth century. ${ }^{89}$ When he had, however, fairly settled down, he continued the translation of the Scriptures which he began at Isny; and in 1545, he published a German version of the Book of Psalms, which, like the portion of his former selection, constitutes an essential part of the Jewish Ritual. This version was afterwards re-published at Zurich, 1558, and in other places. ${ }^{30}$ In the same year, he also edited a new edition of the first part of Kimchi's celebrated grammar and Lexicon, entitled, Perfection (מכלול). This part, which contains the grammar, and ought properly to be called the grammatical part (חלק הרקרוק), but which usually bears the general title of the whole work; namely, Michlol, had indeed been published three times before, twice in Constantinople, 1532, 1534, and once with a Latin translation by Guidacerus, Paris, 1540. But as a new edition was called for, the publisher entrusted it to the aged Grammarian and Lexicographer, who enriched it with valuable annotations (נימוקים), Venice, 1545.

How powerless age was, in either quenching his zeal or diminishing his labour, may be seen from the fact that when he was seventy-nine

[^40]> 88 אנא אלמ לי ולאששחי
> שהיא לא תהיד אלמנה יחר נמוח ובגן עדנות
> יבא הקץ ואוי נקיץן

Epilogas to the Methurgeman.
${ }^{89}$ Thna Dr. Holmes, in Kitto's Oyclopadia of Biblical Literature, new ed., s. v. Elisa, aays, "that E. Levita was its author, and not aditor only (as Wolf, Bibl. iii., would hava it), is dsmonatrated by Steinachneider (Catal, 939, 940)." Now, on referring to Stainschneider, at the column in quastion, the raader will sea that thia bibliographar haada this baction, i. e., No. 33, a日 followa: "פירוש איוב, Expositio libri Job, rhythmica [auctore Sarek Barfat], (ff. 17)." If any more avidence ahould ha required, we rafer to the 6 ams Catalogue, col. 2500, whars Steinschneider has a separats aection for Sarek, and the only published work of hia there specifiad is "Hietoria Johi Carmine; anon. ad. ab Elia Levita, q. v. op. 33-4."
${ }^{90}$ Comp. Steinschnaider, Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, col. 188.
years old (1546), he carried through the press, with the utmost care, no less than seven different works. The first of these was the stupendous Hebrew Lexicon, by Kimchi, which is commonly called the Book of Roots (ספר השרשים), but the more proper name of which is the Lexicon part (חלק הענין), being the second part of the general work, entitled, Michlol. Of this famous Lexicon, seven editions had been published before this date, namely, before 1480 ; Naples, 1490 ; ibid. 1491; Constantinople, 1513; Venice, 1529; Soncino, 1532-3; and Venice, 1546: and Levita himself, as we have already seen (vide supra, p. 22), took part in the fifth edition, immediately after he was employed by his friend Bomberg as corrector of the press. To the edition, however, which now appeared; as also to that of the first part of this great work published in the preceding year, Levita added valuable annotations (נימוקים). His second and third publications, this year, were, new and thoroughly revised editions of his Treatise on the Compounds (ספר הרבבה), with the text pointed, and the Poetical Dissertations on various parts of Hebrew Grammar, entitled, the Sections of Elijahu (פרקי אליהו); whilst his fourth work was a greatly improved edition of his maiden production, which consists of the commentary on M. Kimchi's Journey on the Paths of Knowledge.

The curious history of the last mentioned production deserves to be noticed at greater length. We have already seen that Levita's first literary production was published surreptitiously (vide supra, p. 13). As he soon after was occupied with more important literary works, which secured for him a world-wide renown, he did not much care to claim the hook, which was most negligently printed, and swarmed with blunders. But his friends, who knew that he was its author, were very anxious that he should not depart this life without claiming and correcting it. With this wish he now complied ; and, as the work had so long passed in another person's name, Levita felt obliged to give the following account of it, which is written in poetry, and is appended to the edition revised by him:-

> אנטי אליהו הלוי דל באלפי
> באשר הייתי בימי חרפי: בק"ק פארואה הבירה שנת פר"י ליצירה:

When I, Elias Levita, the least in my family,
Was, in the days of my manhood,
In the city of Padua, a.m. 264 [ = A.d. 1504],


I composed this book according to the request of my disciples. It came to pass, that the plague broke out among the people, Whereupon every entrance was blocked up in the street where I lived, So that I too was closed in; then my messenger deceived me. For I gave him the book to print it for me, and he took it away ; He took it to Pesaro, and spent money in printing it for himself. This shameful deed appeared a small thing in his eyes. Most insultingly, he did not mention my name in the book, But put at the beginning of the Introduction 'R. Benjamin's of Rome,'91 That all gho use it may think he was the author of this Exposition. He also erroneously added some things from his own cogitations, And inserted from the 'Language of the Learned,' ${ }^{92}$ diverse fragments,

[^41]והשאיר בו מה ששׁגיתי:
בי לא היחה כחי אז ככחי עתח: על ידי יהורים ועממים: ער שלא נשאר מהם במציאות :
שהיה להם הקוֹצים לבער: אך שהוםיפו טעיות עליהם: אך כי עשיתים נחמתי : והטיבותי את אשר דברתי:
הפצירו בי אנשים לרוב: אששר בדקרוק לשונינו עמלים: ואמלא את חםרונו: והאמת יעשה דרכו: ישׁ בו צרכי צבור:
תהיה המלאכה בירם נכונה:
ללמוד פל הרקרוק על פה: בי כל איש ממעו יםתפקי ישן מפני חדש יוציאי

> וכל זה עשה בלי ירעיתי
> מצורף, לזה למען תרע אתה
> ועם כל זה נדפם כמה פעמים

ונמכרים עם כל השגיאות ובאמת על הראשונים אנבי מצטער ולא די שהניחום כמו שהם וגם אנכי לב עליהם לא שמתי אבל פפרים אחרים חברתי ועתה אחרי אשר ימי פנוי לערב

מהם מולים מהם שרלים שאקימהו על מכונו ואאיר את חשכו אג״״פ שהקטן הוא זה החבור וכל העוסקים בו באמונה בי הוא מסודר בסדר יפה ובזה אין לי ספק ואף אם הספר כבר בידו המציא

All this he did without my knowledge, and left in it my errors; For you must know, that I was not so expert then as I am now. It was thus re-published several times, both by Jews and Christians, Sold with all its blunders, and nothing is left of the editions. I greatly regret my first blunders, which ought to have been corrected; And which have not only been left, but increased by fresh blunders. I did not notice it, but simply regretted that I had made blunders, And wrote other books wherein I corrected my former mistakes. Now that may life is drawing near to its evening, many of my friends, Both Jews and Christians, who studied the grammar of our language, Have urged me to place it in its' right position, supply its deficiencies, Enlighten its darkness, and make straight its path.
For, although the book is but small, it is much wanted ;
And those who study it properly derive advantage from it, Since it is so arranged that the rules may easily be learned by heart. I have no doubt that every student will benefit from it, And even if he has the former edition, he'll prefer the new to the old;
Amsterdam, 1724-7; he died ahont a.d. 1504. The Grammar was published in Constantinopls, 1506, 1519, and an improvad edition, ibid. 1542. The treatiss on Hshrsw Poetry is from the pen of an anonymons writer. It consists of ssventsen chapters, of which cap. i.-xiv., appendsd to Ibn Jachja's Grammar, treats on the grammatical points necsssary for writing postry, whilst cap. xv.-xvii., which trgats on the construction and metrs of the Hebrew postry, was appended to Levita's commsntary on Kimchi's Journey on the Paths of Knowledge, by ths parson who puhlishsd it surreptitiously. It is to thass excerpts that ths words ypsfar. Comp. Stsinschnsider's Catalogus Hebr., p. 864, \&ic., and Bibliographisches Handbuch, p. 9, No. 78.

ואשרי האישׁ שלו ככה: ואםיר כל טעֵות ומבובה: בשם היחיר במלוכה:

כי יראחה בדה םימן ברכה
ובבן אשלם המלאכה
כדין וכהלהב

For he will find therein an advantage, and hail the man who follows it. Herewith I finish the work, having corrected in it all mistakes, As it is meet and proper, in the name of Him who alone is Sovereign.

The other three works which Levita published in 1546 are bound up with the Exposition of the Journey of the Paths of Knowledge, and are as follows:-i. A concise Hebrew Grammar, entitled, The Beginning of my Words (פתח רברי), from an anonymous pen, "written many years ago in Spain, and exceedingly adapted to learn briefly the sacred language," first published at Naples, 1492, then at Constantinople, 1515, and now "carefully revised by Elias Levita, the Grammarian." ii. The well-known grammar of Ibn Ezra, entitled On the Purity of the Hebrew Style (צוח); and, iii., another grammatical treatise by Ibn Ezra, called The Balance of the Sacred Language (ספר מאזני לשון הקדש). The pagination of these four treatises is continuous: the first extends over leaf 1-51, the second over 52-132, the third over 139-194, The fourth over 195-236. Levita published these treatises under the general title of Grammars (דקדוקים).

Extraordinary as was his prowess to battle against the infirmities of old age, and determined as he was not to relinquish his literary labours till his arms were paralysed and his eyesight completely extinguished, Levita was at last compelled, by the irresistible and overpowering effects of the seventy-nine years which had now passed since he had seen the light, to confine himself to editing valuable works written by others. We cannot ascertain the number of works which he published this year, but we have before us Ralbag's Commentary on the Pentateuch, which Levita edited in 1547. Some idea may be formed of the labour required to carry it through the press, when it is stated that it consists of four hundred and ninety-six folio pages, closely printed, in square Hebrew characters. Levita appended to it a short poem in Hebrew. Twelve months later, he edited R. Isaac Duren's work on the Ceremonial Law, published at Venice, 1548, and appended to it a poem, which we have already mentioned, stating that he was then eighty years of age (vide supra, p. 2). This, as far as we know, is the last effort of the great teacher of cardinals and bishops of the Romish Church, and of the originators and leaders of the reformation, and who may justly be regarded as the reviver of Hebrew learning
among Christians at the commencement of the sixteenth century, and as one of the most distinguished promoters of Biblical literature. He died, as he prayed to die, at Venice, aged eighty-one. The following simple epitaph indicated, to those who looked at the tomb-stones of the Jewish cemetery, the grave in which were deposited the remains of Elias Levita:-


The stone cries from the wall, And mourns before every passer by Over this grave-
Over our Rabbi who has departed, And ascended into heaven.
Elias is gone to the Lord in a whirlwind!
He who has shed light
On the darkness of grammar, And turned it into light.
He ascended Shebat towards the end, In the year 309 [ $=1549]$, And his soul is bound up in the bundle of life.

INFORMATION FOR THE READER. 1
This is for the information of every reader of this book. The celebrated printer, M. Daniel Bomberg, a Christian, ${ }^{2}$ having resolved to issue the 24 sacred books, both in large and small sizes, is now printing them with the divisions, which are called in their language chapters, according to the order of the Christian books. And as there is a great advantage in it, which I have shown long ago in the introdnction to the Book Bachur, ${ }^{8}$ and as he who made the divisions of chapters also divided the books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, respectively, into two books, I too was obliged to follow this method. You are, therefore, to observe, that wherever you will find the word Samuel with the letter Beth above
 which begins with; "And it come to pass after the death of Saul," \&c. לא קרמני בו אדם חמצא חבניח יר נונעח צל מלול The word Kings, too, with Beth above it, ${ }^{4}$ e.g. מלבים, means 2 Kings, and begins with, "Then Moab rebelled," \&c.; and also the word Chronicles, or its initials ה"7, with Beth above it,4 e.g. $\mathrm{n}^{7} 7$, means 2 Chronicles, and begins with, "And Solomon, the son of David, was strengthened," \&c.

I must moreover inform you, that wherever I have propounded something new ${ }^{5}$ in this book, or any important rule in which $I$ have

[^42]not been anticipated by any one, שאפתו בגליון מראח באצבע לאמור כוח ראה ראה you will find the form of a band in the margin against the remark in אחחיל בשם ח׳ צבאוח: question, pointing with its finger管 and saying, as it were, 'see, something new is here told you, and this is to indicate it to you!' Let me now begin the Preface, in the name of the Lord of Hosts.

## PREFACE.

Thus says Elias, son of Asher אמר אליחו ב"ר אשר הלוי האשבכנוי, the Levite, the German, behold, חנה אנכי טרם אחל לדבר, וביאור דוכי before I begin to speak, and compose an explanation of the plans of the Massorah, I must tell you what I am going to do in this book. I shall first divide the chief contents of the book into two parts, after the manner ${ }^{6}$ of the two tables of stone, and write upon the first tables ten commandments [i.e. chapters.] In each one of these commandments I shall give useful rules respecting defectives and plenes. ${ }^{7}$ The second tables will contain ten other injunctions [i.e. chapters.]. In these I shall explain all the matters wherein all those who have laboured in this department are agreed; i.e., show what the Massorites say about the Keri and the Kethiv, the Kethivs, which are disregarded, the. Kametz, Patach, Makeph, Sakeph, Chateph, Transpositions, \&c., \&c. I shall then make an ark, open the door thereof, and put therein the broken tables, which are the work wherewith the authors of the Massorah-porva have occupied themselves, as I shall explain in the Introduction thereunto : and before it is yet born its name shall be called "the gate [i.e. the section] of the Broken Tables." This will form the last part of this book, and the sign thereof is, "the broken tables laid down in the ark."

[^43]But since $I$ have seen that it is not good for this book to be alone, I shall make for it a help-mate, in the form of an Introduction, of such things which have not hitherto been propounded. Therein shall I dispel questions, explain difficulties, and remove doubts which fall under this investigation, and which are to be found in the treatises of our Rabbins of blessed memory, the men of the Great Synagogue and of the Massorah. And the eyes of those who will see shall behold that which is npright, for they perceive the truth. Moreover, things and remarks occur in this book which will be difficult of understanding to the students thereof, unless they read first the introductions which I have prefixed, and which are three in number. The first is in poetry (שיר), the second in rhyme (בחרוזה), and the third in ordinary prose.

And if I had the power to exact an oath from an Israelite, I would make every one who is about to study this book swear that he will not peruse it till he has read these introductions. However, I beseech and pray you to take my advice about it, and those who will do it

והנה ראח ראיהי כי לֹא טוב הּיוח טפִּ חהה לבדו, אעשה לו עור כננרו, בהקדמת דבוים, ער הנח לא נאמדים, ובחם אישב שׁאלוח, ואחרץ קושיוח, ואחיר סטקוח, אשר יפלי, בדרוש חוחו, הן ברברי רח״ל, וברברי אנשי כנםח הנדולח, וכדבוי בעל הטנוּחח, ועיני רואים תחונה טשרים, כי דברי אםה ניברים, טצורף לזה יבאו רברים וענינים בטפר חוח, שחבבד הבנתם על לאנששים חטענינים בו, אם לא יקראו תחלה רבוי החקרמות אשר חקדמהי, והם שלשה, הדאשונה בשיר, והשנית בתחוזח, וחשל שית בחלצח. ואאו הייתי פראי להשביע איש טישראל, חיחי מעוביע את כל הבא ללמוד חםשר חוה, שלא ילמרחו ער שיקרא חהקדרוח חאלחו, אך טפיל אני תחגני ובקשחהי לפניהם על כבח, ודועועצים כן תבא עליחם ברכה, ומובמח אני כי לא אישם יחדרם ובן ארם ויחנהם, באבוד ומן בקריאה וח, אך יניע חענונ נמרץ לקוראיי, כאשר ימצאו בם דכרים טבים וחרועים, אשר למנים לא ידעום, ומאו ומקדם לא שמעים, ולא לבר בעניני חטסרח, כי גם ברקרוק ובנקוד ושאר עניניט, שלא נוברי בטפרי חראשונים והאחרונים, ואפילו שיחח חולין ומילי רעלמא, ואת כל אשר קראני ואשר חויחי ואםטרח, ונם דברי החנצולחי, ננד אנשים רבים קטים עלי וחרפוני, על עלמדחי תורח לתלםירים, שאינם הנונים,9 כל אלח דבוים בים נחמדים להשכיל, והאוה לאונים, כי אחםנם לא שקר טלי, םי לח' אלי. will derive the benefit. Now, I am persuaded that no man ${ }^{8}$ will regret the time spent in perusing them, but that it will be a pleasant task to those who read them; for they will find therein things, both new and old, which they did not know and never heard before, not only connected with the Massorah, bnt with grammar, vowel points, \&c., which are not mentioned in the works of ancient or modern writers. I will, also, relate ordinary conversations, the talk of the world, what has befallen me, and what I have seen, as well as my defence against many people who have risen against me, and abused me for teaching the law to disciples that are unworthy thereof. ${ }^{9}$ All these things are desirable to make us wise, and are pleasant to the imagination. For, verily, my words are not false; whoso is on the Lord's side let him come to me.

[^44]10 שצירת משובחח פשוטח ומרובעת
אתן שבח נם חתפארחת, לאאל תקן רום בורת;
לֹא להבל ברא תבל, לשבת היתה ננמרת;
יםד אריץ על המיש, פשטם אותה באנרת;
הביט ויתר רגוּים, לקה לוּ אוּ אומה נבחרתְ;
הניף בעים ידו על: ים, צרים צללו בעופרת;
למו אש דת נתן מתת, צום להיוחה נשמרח;
•חד שמנו ויבעטו, היו הפוּ וערה מוררת;
און חמרו ויצמרו, אל הבעל ולעשתרת;
כלֹש ברבר ובחרב, גם ברעב של בצרת;
ורם מעבר לנוֹרה, ביו ליום אל ארץ אחרת
יורדי שנער עמדו מצער, למלא העת הנגורת;
שבעים שנה אבן שמה, היתה התורה נעררת;
ושמורתם שגו ולשזונם, לבשו כנוים אררת;
ארם היה נושׁא נויה, או נכריה או ממורת;
ובניהם לא הכירי רק, ללשון שאמם דוברת;
ובעת הקץץ רוח בורש, מלך פרם מתעוררת;
צאמר לאזםירים תצאוי ובנו העיר המעוטרת;
עלה עזרא הוא מלאבי, דומה אל מלאך השוּ הרת
כהן ורב ולסופרים אב, אם למקרא ולמטורת;
עשה אז בכל במצולה, שאאין בה דנה נשארחת;
שום שבל הבין במקרא, בכתיבה זו המאו הושרת
אחריו לאלפים ורבבוח, עשיו משוממר אל משמרת;
רוב כת אנשי זה המעשה, אז בטבריא מתנוררת;
ייםם היםה בראשונה, בחכמה זו המפוארת;
צם המציאו דת הניקור, מהם היא לנו נמסרת;
גם הטעמים היו שעמים, לחיות בם תורה נפתרת;

10 It will be seen that the commencing letters of the first fifteen lines, are the acrostic of this acroatic is entirely obliterated by the peculiar mode in which the editor arranged the lines.
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[^45][^46]כי לולי טעמי רפטוק, הבנחו לא נכרת; כי הם ירעו באור המקרא, מכל גולה חנשאחרח ; לבן פירוש ננר טעעו, נחשב כםינ או כנעורח; חורו תיבות איך נכתבוח, המלאה או המחוסרח; נם אם מלה טעמה מעלה. או מקצה בחובדת; לכללים עשו סימנים, להיות על לב למזכרת; אך שֶמו אותותם אותות, חירות עם לשון ברברת; הרבים לא יחכמו בה, אין מבין מה היא אומרח; עד כי בא יום אמרו אלי, חברת רעי המהודרתת; נא מה לך פה אליהו, קום ועשה לך שם הפארת; ולמסרה תאיר אמירה, ופחח נא בה המסנרת; ירענו בך כי זאתת עמך, בהיד שבלך היא גוברת; או אמרתי שמעי נפשי, למה זה את מתנברת;
 מקום הניחו לך אבות, לחיותך בו מתנדרת; או אמרה לי נפשי האח, בזה אנכי בוחרח; ובבן קמתי לא דוממחי, נם קדמו עיניני אשמורח ; ער אוּציאלאור תעלומהח, היתה ער הנה נסתרת; אל כל אדם אמתיק סודם, אפקח בל עין עורח; קצור מלים המועילים, בשני לוחות אהיה תורת: אתן הלהחות בפומבי, ודלא כמלתא נטמרת; לער בנייר יחצבוּ; עם עם ברזל ובעופרת ; הלוקח לא יחשב, גני גב נמצא במחתרת; לכן אל כל כשוּר קול, ארים על גבי רום קרת; הזריו יקרים למצוח, כי כי מצוה מצוה נודרת; לסחורה זאת זרוח יאות, פן תהיה בלה נמברח; בי טוב סחרה מכל מסחה, מה לך אל דר או סוחרחת הא לך אורח למשרה, כי לחורה היא עקדח; על כן אקרא שמ הספרה, זה מסורת המסורח ; השיר נשלם אל אל עולם, אתן שבח נם הפארת;
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## INTRODUCTION II.

THE RYTHMICAC INTRODOCTION, ACCORDING TO GERMAN RHYME,
Thus saith Elias Levita, who gathered together counsels afar off from innumerable works to compile Treatises on grammar in as few words as possible, and to make a path to the various voices, both small and great. These are my four small productions, all treating on the science of our language. The first volume which I composed is my explanation of the Journey on the Path of Knowledge; its utility is known to all. The second is the Book Bachur, which animadverts on Grammarians. ${ }^{11}$ The third is the Book on Compounds, in which all irregular words are explained. The fourth is a Poetical Section, together with other Sections appended thereunto. These four productions of mine, owing to their wisdom and knowledge, have been published several times, translated into the languages of the Christians, and are studied both by Jew and Gentile, as their fame has travelled far and their excellence is known all over the world. They send iorth an odour like precious ointment, on which account I congratulate myself. Now I speak the truth when I say, that there has been no author, whose works God has permitted him in his lifetime to see so much referred to and studied, and so many times reprinted, as he has permitted me during my lifetime. My hand is still ready to give more help, and to benefit the public. My worthy disciples are around me now, as well as all my old friends; they earnestly entreat me, saying, for God's sake, and for the glory of Holy Writ, explain to us the Massorah; for we know that it is in thy power, as we have heard that thy hand is strong in all Massoretic matters, above all our contemporaries, as well as above all of whom we have heard.
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it is a book of small dimensions, there is nothing like it in the department of the Massorah. It treats upon important matters, and there is no other book which so thoroughly treats on the Massoretic rules, excepting the scattered glosses around the margin in the Codices, which, however, contain numberless errors. For the Scribes have perverted them, as they did not care for the Massorah, but only thought to ornament their writing, and to make even lines so as not to alter the appearance, in order that all the pages should be alike. Moreover, they ornamented them with illuminations of divers kinds of buds, flowers, \&c. Hence they were obliged sometimes to narrow and sometimes to widen the margins round the illustrations with words already stated, although they were superfluous and out of place, whilst the Massoretic signs were entirely omitted in their proper placs because the space did not suffice; and hence they had to break off in the middle of a sentence, ${ }^{14}$ thus leaving the whole edifice incomplete and greatly defective. ${ }^{15}$

As to the Massorah, in the twenty-four sacred books printed here, I have not seen anything like it, among all the ancient books; for arrangement and correctness, for beauty and excellence, and for good order. They were edited by one of the learned, whose name was formerly Jacob (let his soul be bound up in a bag with holes). ${ }^{16}$ But although his edition is exceedingly beautiful, he committed many

[^48]mistakes, and bore false testimony in many places. This, however, is not to be wondered at, for the work was new, and every beginning is difficult. With great diligence, therefore, with little sloth, and with immense toil, I laboured to separate that which is clear from that which is obscure,-brought the Massoretic materials into order, and put a proper space between each section and every article. You may believe that I have laboured and found what none else has discovered, and discharged my duty in such things in which nobody has preceded me, knowing that the words of the Massorah are completely bidden from our contemporaries. Indeed very few understand the language thereof, which is to them as a dream without an interpretation, and from which they have no advantage ; they neither know nor understand, for they dwell in darkness. Yet the Massorah is the fence of the law, and from it are deduced many essential Halachoth, reasons and explanations, literal and homiletical meanings, whilst from the defective and plene many laws are deduced; ex. gr., from רב [Exod. xxiii. 2] which is defective; ${ }^{17}$ from the first מוזת [Deut. vi. 9] ${ }^{18}$ which wants the second Vav, and many other similar instances from which laws are deduced. It is for this reason that I purpose to explain its import, laws, and rules in this little volume in brevity, and withont tediousness, yet in words of great might; propound new things recently brought to light which did not exist before, and they shall be as luminaries in the firmament of the Massorah, so that the wise will understand and prepare their hearts to be wise in the Scriptures ; and the name thereof shall be known in

[^49]the mouth of all students, both Jews and Christians, ${ }^{19}$ who delight in our Law and profit therefrom.

Now I swear, by my Creator, that a certain Christian encouraged it, and brought me thus far. He was my pupil ten years uninterruptedly, ${ }^{20}$ I resided at his house and instructed him, for which there was a great outery against me, and it was not considered right of me. And several of the Rabbins would not countenance me, and pronounced woe to my soul because I taught the law to a Christian, ${ }^{21}$ owing to the interpretation assigned to the words, "And as for my judgments they [i.e. the Gentiles] are not to know them; praise the Lord for it." [Ps. exlvii. 20). Now my tardiness will not prevent me from making a defence. I shall, therefore, state all that took place. In the year 269 [= 1509], violence rose up into a rod of wickedness; and the arrow was desperate without any fault; for it came to pass, when I was in Padua, that the celebrated city was captured, and sacked, and devastated; the enemies then destroyed my dwelling, together with that of other Jews, and all that I had became a prey, and was like the leaving when the dung is cleared away. Then it fell into my lines to be a roamer at the head of the exiles. I left my place and went to Rome, where resided a very distinguished nobleman, a prince of great dignity, and wise as Solomon, and his name was Cardinal Egidio. When I heard his fame, I paid him a visit.

When he saw me, he asked me about my affairs. I said, Know, my lord, that I am the German grammarian, who possess the sundry secrets connected with the grammar and Scripture, for I have always been

[^50]occupied with this work, therefore is no man to be found who is more conversant therewith than I am; as a poet said, that he was never conquered except by a man of one idea. Moreover, I have learned wisdom from my disciples, and they aided me in this knowledge; as a certain Talmudist said, I have learned much from my teachers, more from my fellow students, and most from my learned disciples. 28

When the prince heard my statement, he came to me and kissed me with the kisses of his mouth, saying, Art thou, my lord, Elias, whose fame has travelled over all countries, and whose books are to be found in every corner ${ }^{23}$ Blessed be the God of the Universe, who brought thee hither, and bade thee come to meet me. Now abide with me and be my teacher, and I shall be to thee as a father, and shall support thee and thy house, and give thee thy corn, thy wine, and thy olives, and fill thy purse, and bear all thy wants. Thus we took sweet counsel together, iron sharpening iron. I imparted my spirit to him, and learned from him excellent and valuable things, which are in accordance with truth. I followed the advice of the sage, who says, "Learn truth, from whomsoever it is propounded."

In conclusion, I fully acknowledge it, as one confesses before a solemn tribunal, and shall not withdraw it, that I have been a teacher to Christians; ${ }^{24}$ yea, I have assuredly been; but nevertheless, know that I am a Hebrew, praise the Lord, and revere the Lord, who made heayen and earth; I have not sinned, and am innocent and guiltless. For

[^51]the sages only prohibit ${ }^{25}$ the communication to a Gentile of the import of the Law, ${ }^{28}$ but do not forbid teaching. Their interdict only refers to subjects which contain esoteric doctrines, as the Creation, the Vision of Ezekiel, and the Book Jetzira, ${ }^{97}$ which must only be disclosed to the pious, to men of wisdom and intelligence who are of the children of Israel. Thus, also, the passage, "Like a bag of gems in a heap of stones" [Prov. xxvi. 8], which they interpret of an unworthy disciple, whom they liken to one who cast stones at the statue of Mercurius, ${ }^{28}$ saying, Whoso teaches the law to an unworthy disciple shall descend

[^52]into the grave with sorrow, and his spirit and soul shall be destroyed; as it is written, "a fire not blown shall consume him" [Job xx. 26]; this only refers to an Israelite, but not to a Christian or Mahommedan.

Again, ${ }^{28}$ when the Talmnd says that the secrets of the law are not to be disclosed except to one who has the five qualifications, viz., advanced age, respectability, and all the rest as they are found in Isaiah,' we have sufficient argument in this, that the sages have not enacted a decree that whosoever teaches a Gentile commits a sin. For even according to their words it is permitted to teach Gentiles the Seven Noahic Commandments. ${ }^{\text {B0 }}$ Now this argues most powerfully for me. For how can they possibly know these, and fully comprehend the import of the seven precepts, unless they first know the Hebrew language? Moreover, I should have to hang on many lofty trees men who preceded me, whose little finger is thicker than my thighs, whose name I am not worthy to mention, and who have taught Christians more than I. Of these, some are still living, some are resting in Paradise, some are teachers and Rabbins, some are elders and men of reputation, some are sages and physicians, and some are rich and settled on their lees. ${ }^{31}$

Now what am I that I should be caught in the snares of my sin, poor and low, burdened with sons and daughters, and having nothing in my possession. My field has been so innodated that there is in it neither wheat nor barley, but terror and storm, 88 and they have

[^53]sown therein heterogeneous things. Twice has misfortune laid hold of me. In Padua it took away my money [1509], and then it set its evil eye upon my precious things, which it delivered over into the hands of the rebels. This happened in the year $287(=1527$ ), when Rome was destined to destruction and desolation like a plain. Not a single farthing was then left to me; and it was a time of great distress, for there was no covering in the frost, no bread or fuel in the house; my wife was nursing her young ones and was about to be confined, while my daughters had reached puberty, and were ripe for marriage according to custom. Now what can a man do who has thus been overtaken by misfortune, and not to offend in such a burning snare? This ye ought to consider, that the law of nature teaches me that nothing is to be allowed to stand in the way of saving life.

Furthermore, I must inform you, that much good has resulted therefrom; for I solemnly declare that all the Christians whom I know, and whom I or others have instructed, are all of them good and upright men, and with all their power have acted kindly towards Israel; so that the very knowledge of our language among Christians has actually been to our advantage. Surely this speaks greatly for me, and must remove the reproach from me. Moreover, the import of my teaching, whether to Christian or Jew, is simply the grammar of the sacred language, as I only explain to them the rules thereof. ${ }^{3 s}$ If, with this view, they read to me a verse in the Scriptures, why should I not explain it? What impropriety then have I committed?

Besides, if I were not to explain it, will they not learn it from my works which they possess, which everyone can understand, and in which they will find help and satisfaction? Even now I have, day

[^54]after day, Christians coming to me כל אדם, וכחם יטצאו מרנוע ופריום, ועדין asking instruction in Hebrew, and I מידי יום יום, אלי נוים ידרשון, וקרבת הלשון respond to everyone who wants me. And why should I be condemned for it, and a reproach be fastened npon me? I speak this in defence of myself. Again, if I also have received, and opened my mouth, and tasted excellentinstruction and learning [from Christians], -a honeycomb, and delightful words, which distilled from their months drop by drop, -and have eaten the inside יבקשון, ונרישחי לאשור שאלוני, ולמח בעכור זח חהשימוני, וחחויקוני לנבוח, וכי בנפשי דברחי אח חרבר חוח, וכן אם נם אני קבלחי, ופתחחתי אח פּ ואבלתי, םוב רעח ופעם, ציף רבש אמדיֹ נעם, אשר נמף פםיחם טמות טפוח, ואכלחי החוך וורקחי הקליפוח, ולא אכלחי החפל וריר חלמוח, ומעמחי טפם

דבש חוח הנני אטות. 84 לכן קבלו נא חכםים םלי, וחכל חלונוחכם טעלי, כי עיניצם הדואוח, פי בחום לכבי and thrown away the shell, but have עשיחי ואח, וחלילה לי להחיר האסור, וחדבר not eaten the insipid and the white הוח ללב מסור, ודחטנא לנצ בעי, וחנה of the egg, if I have tasted a little of this honey, am I to die for it ? ${ }^{34}$

Receive, therefore, ye sages, my apology, and let your complaint cease, for your eyes behold that I have done it in the integrity of my heart, not intending to convert wrong into right. I had a clear conscience in this matter, as is known to the Merciful One who searches the heart. Behold, the matter must remain as it stands.

[^55]
## INTRODUOTION III.

I GHALL NOW TURN MY VACE
TO TEE TEIRD INTRODUOTION.

## :

After those truthful words, let me discourse more largely on our subject in general. But, first of all, I must explain what is meant by ID, and what is its etymology. Indeed this word does not occur more than twice in the whole Scriptures, viz., 7 [Numb. xxxi. 5], and ימסרו" [ibid. xxxi. 6], and Kimchi explains it to mean a gift made with the whole heart, and put into the possession of another. Thus, also, the Targum renders ins, 1 , and he gave him up [Deut.ii. 33], by ומסריה (see the root מסר.)

It is, however, necessary to remark that the word is never rendered by מסר, unless it is construed with the word ביך, into the hand, ex.gr. ויתנהו יהוה אלהנו בירינו or אתן בידך [Exod. xxiii. 31; 2 Sam. จ. 19 ; Jerem. xx. 4, 5], \&c., \&c. ${ }^{55}$
 בחלצח, ללמר על הכלל כלו יגא, וקורם בל אבאר פהו עִנין מסורח, ומאיזה לשון חוא, וֹאמח בי הלשון חוח לא נמצא בכל המקרא
 ופרש בו חרד"ק שהוא ענין נהינה בכל לב והרששומח ברשוּת אחר וכו', עד וחרנום


מסר :
ואומר אני כי לשון נחינח אינו מתורנם כללשון מסידה רק כשחוא, פמוך אמגל לשון ביר, כמו ויתנהו ה״ אלהנו ביריגו, אתן בירך ורומיהם85 והכלל כ• לשון טפירח נופל על רבר שיחן אוּ יפקיר ארם ביר אחה, שיחויקנו ברשוחו, כרצונו כאלו חוא שלו: וּמן בענין חלמור וההנרה שילמר אדם או יניר לחבורו איזה טור או ענין שקורם וה לא ירעהו, נופל בו לשון מטידה, כמו שׁאם לו במשנה משה קכל חודה מסיני ומסרה ליחושע וכו'; ובן עגין המטורח הואז לפי שנמכרה We thus obtain the rule that the word denotes to give, or entrust, something into the hands of another person, that he might retain it in his possession according to his pleasure, as if it were his own. The same is the case with the doctrines and Hagadah; if one teaches or propounds to another any mysteries, or anything which he did not know before, it is described by the word מסר. Thus it is said in the Mishna, Moses received the Law from Sinai (ומסרה), and delivered it to Joshua, bc. [Mishna, Aboth, i. 1]; and this is the meaning of the word in question; since it was transmitted to sages, from mouth to mouth, till

[^56]the time of Ezra and his associates, and by them again to the sages of Tiberias, who wrote it down, and called it Massorah.

Now, since in this book I impart some rules to decipher the sage remarks, couched in the enigmatical expressions which occur in both the major and minor Massorah, therefore I deemed it proper to call this book Massoreth Ha-Massoreth, as this name is suitable for the book, and the book suitable for the name. I shall now proceed to explain the nature, quality, and object of the Massorah; who compiled it, whether one or many; who invented the vowel-points and accents, and when they were attached to the letters; and shall state the opinion of both the ancients and moderns, as well as give my ówn, upon this subject. I shall then point out to you, according to the good hand of the Lord upon me, the method which the Massorites adopted, and the work which they have done; what their chief aim was; what they wished, and what they did not wish, to say.

In the first place, let me remark, that, according to the opinion of most men, Ezra the Scribe, and his associates, who were the men of the Great Synagogue, made the Massorah, the vowel-points, and the accents through all the Scriptures. In support of this, they insist that the explanation (in Nedarim [37 b,]) which our Rabbins of blessed memory give of Nehem. viii. 8, viz., "And they read in the book, in the Law of God," means the original text; " explaining it," means the Chaldee paraphrase; "and gave the same," means the division of the verses; "and caused them to understand the Scripture," means the dividing accents; or, according to others, it signifies the Massorah. Thus far are their words. ${ }^{86}$ Now, according to the natural meaning of

[^57]the context, this verse does not at מדבר מעורא, דק הוא שב על חמקרא
 statement in the preceding verse: עד ${ }^{87}$ והלוים מביגים את העם לתורוה "Also Joshua, and Boni, and Sherebiah, ${ }^{57}$ and the Levites caused the people to understand the Law," and it is of them them that he says, "And they read in the book of the Law," \&c., and not of Ezra.

This Midrashic explanation, however, can be consistent with the natural meaning of the text, in the following manner: "And they read in the book, in the Law of God" means the original text, that is to say, these men first read the text in Hebrew; then "explained it" in the Chaldee paraphrase; that is to say, they translated the verse to themselves into Aramaic, because everybody understood that language; "and gave the sense" means the verses, that is to say, they made pauses between every verse, in accordance with the tradition which they possessed from our teacher Moses, of blessed memory, as our Rabbins of blessed memory tell us in Megilla [3, a], and these are the words: "A verse which was not divided by Moses must not be divided by us." Those who refer the verse in question to Ezra, regard Diשil as singular, but they do not know that it is the infinitive, and is tantamount to thecause of 4 the word in when which it is preceded, and the word by which it is followed; since the infinitive is everywhere rendered in the singular or plural, in the second person or in the third, masculine or feminine, in agreement with the verbs with which it is connected, and which may either precede or follow it. But this is not the place to expatiate upon this subject.

Now, as to the remark, "' and caused them to understand the Scripture,' denotes the division of the accents;" this means, that when reading to the people, they [Ezra and his associates] made ${ }^{38}$ pauses

[^58]in the middle of the verse, according to the sense of the context, in the same manner as our teacher Moses, of blessed memory, read to the elders. Thus, for example, when he [Ezra] read to them " are they not on the other side Jordan, beyond?" he paused a little at the word "beyond," and then read "the way where the sun goeth down" (Deut. xi. 30), as Rashi explains it on this passage (vide in loco). ${ }^{39}$ It is this which our Rabbins, of blessed memory, call pause or division according to the sense, because the pause makes the verse intelligible and perspicuous; not that they had the accents which we now possess, for they had not as yet been invented, as I shall show in the sequel. And as to the other remark, that "and they caused them to understand the Scriptures," means the Massorah; the explanation of this is, that they read every word as it was transmitted to them from our teacher Moses, of blessed memory, ex. gr. the Keris, and the Kethivs, as I shall explain afterwards. It must not, however, be supposed that they EEzra and his associates] read to them [the people] the Massorah from tradition, or that they wrote the Massorah on the Pentateuch, much less on the whole ${ }^{40}$ Bible, as we now have it; for there is no doubt that Ezra did not write anything except in the Law of Moses, as it is written, "This Ezra went up from Babylon, and he was a ready scribe in the Law of Moses, which was given by Jehovah, the God of Israel" (Ezra vii. 6), and again [ibid.ver.11], "Ezra, the priest, the scribe of the words of Jehovah's commandments and of His statutes." He is also called in Aramaic, the scribe of the Law of the Lord of heaven.

[^59]Accordingly, I find it very diffi- ולפי וח קשה לי מאד מחו שמחב עורא cult to make out what it was that כחורח, כי לא ישנע טחלוקה אם נמצאח כירי Ezra wrote in the Law. For there ס"ח וחוא כחב בן אחדח ולא חוסיך ולא are only two alternatives. Either נרע, א"ב לא חיה אלא בסופר חמעחיק that, he possessed a scroll of the Law, and made another copy from it, without adding to it or taking from it anything, in which case he would be nothing more than any other scribe who copies one book from another ;" but, from this, no distinction could have accrued to him, since any one of the ordinary writers might have done the same thing, as it is difficult to believe that there were no other writers in all Israel except he. Or it may be said that the seroll of the Law which he had before him was not correctly written as regards plenes and defectives, open and closed sections, large and small letters, \&c., \&c., ${ }^{41}$ and he wrote them correctly. Here, again, ${ }^{42}$ it is difficult to believe that there was not a single correct copy of the Law to be found among all the people of Israel. Forsooth this difficulty puzzled me so much for many years, that I mentioned it to the learned, but they could not give me any explanation of it.

I have, also, felt a great difficulty about the import of the Keri and the Kethiv. Now, according to the opinions of many modern [grammarians], the Keri and the Kethiv originated in the following manner. During the first captivity, most of the canonical writings were lost, and even the few books which had been found were impaired by being thrown about; and as those who were skilled in the Scriptures were dead, Ezra and his associates restored the crown to its pristine glory; for they corrected these books, and when they found variations in the books, they decided to follow the majority [of Codd.], and wherever they could not decide properly they wrote down one reading in the text and the other in the margin, or put one down without punctuating it, \&c. See Kimchi's Introduction to Joshua, and Ephodi's.

[^60]${ }_{42}$ The word $\boldsymbol{\pi}$, this, is omitted in the Sulabach edition.

Treatise, cap. vii. ${ }^{43}$ Abravanel, however, refutes them in his introduction to Jeremiah, and attempts in a very lengthy manner to correct their blunders; but his corrections are his blunders, for most of his arguments are untenable and shallow. I shall, therefore, not enlarge upon them. ${ }^{44}$

Let me, therefore, simply state my own opinion upon this subject, and reply to the afore-mentioned writers. Now, I submit, if their opinions be really true, -that is to say, if the Keri and the Kethiv are owing to donbts as above mentioned, -what shall we say to the Keri and the Kethiv which are found in the books written by the captives themselves, such as Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Daniel, Ezra, who wrote his own book and the Chronicles; and Mordecai, who wrote the book of Esther? Were not these themselves among the Men of the Great Synagogue ${ }^{455}$ Take, for ex-

[^61]ample, the book of Ezra (iv. 2), עורא כהיב ולא אנהנו וובחים (עזרא ד')
 Aleph, and they [the Men of the Great Synagogue] wrote in the margin, read bith Vav. Now if they did it because they were in doubt, not knowing whether to read ל or iל; we ask, was not Ezra there present with them? and did he himself not know whether he wrote ול with Aleph or with Vav? The same is the case with the other Keris and Kethivs found בעכור הבפק, שלא ידעו אם חוא לא או לו, יש להקשוח והלא עזרא חיח שם עמהם, וכי לא ירע חוא אם כחב ולא באל"ג פו או ולו בוי"וי, וכן בשאר קדי וכחיב שצבטפריחט, ואין לומר שאחרי מוח המחברים חהם בתבו שיויי כנסח הנדולה הקרי מפני הספק, שהחי לא היה לחם טלמול ולא אבדו הטפרים
 אנשי כ"ה רק קרוב לם׳ שנה, בדמוכח בטדר עולם 46 ובקבלח הראב"ד : in their books. And it cannot be answered that it was after the death of the said authors that the remaining members of the Great Synagogue wrote the Keri because of doubts, since there was no dispersion, nor were the books lost in those few years, for the whole period of the Men of the Great Synagogue did not last more than about forty years, as is shown in Seder Olam, ${ }^{46}$ and in Ibn Daud's Seder Ha-Kabbalah. ${ }^{47}$ Besides, if
tives of the following five classes of the Jewish nation. i. The Chiefs of the Priestly Divisions (ראשי ביח אב). ii. The Chiefs of the Levitical Families (ראשי הלויים). iii. The Heads of the Israelite Families (ראטwי העם). iv. Representatives of the Cities or

 however, not adhered to after the death of Nehemiah, and ultimately it was reduced to seventy. The period of its duration extended from the latter days of Nehemiah to the death of Simon the Just, в. c. 410-300; thus embracing about one hendred and ten years. See Kitto's Cyclopcedia of Biblical Literature, s. v. Synagogue, the Great.
${ }^{46}$ The Seder Olam (םרר עולם), or the Succession of the World's History, is an ancient Jewish Chronicle, written hy R. Jose b. Chalafta, of Sephoris, who flourished circa a.d. 100-150. It briefly chroniclee the evente of the world from Adam to the war under Bar-Kochha, the false Messiah. It is also called Seder Olam Rabba (סדר עולם רבא), = the Major Chronicle of the World, to distinguish it from a later Chronicle, entitled Seder Olam Sutta (םוטר עולם ווטא), = the Minor Chronicle of the World. The best edition of it is that hy Meyer, Amsterdam, 1699, which appeared together with the Seder Olam Sutta, a Latin translation, and very elaborate annotations. Levita most probahly refers to chapters xxix. and xxx.
 Succession of Tradition, Abraham Tbn Daud or Rabad (T'באר), as he is cailed hy Levita, which is the acrostic of אברדם בן ' 7 , $R$. Abraham b. David, -was horn circa 1110, and died as a martyr 1180. 'l'he chronicle of this distinguished moral philosopher gives, in the form of annals, the history of the world from Adam to his own time (1161), showing the uninterrupted chain of tradition to his day, against the opinion of the Karaites, who denied all tradition. As supplement to this chronicle, Ibn Daud wrote a succinct history of the Roman Empire, from ite foundation by Romulus till the West Gothic King Reccared, ontitled, Memoirs of the Events of Rome (זוכרון ובדי רומי), and the History of the Jewish Kings during the second Temple (דברי מלכי ישראל בביח שני). Tbn Dand's Histories were first puhlished, together with the Seder Olam, Mantua, 1513, then in Venice, 1545, Ba6el, 1580; the Sepher Ha-Kabbalah, by itself, was puhlished with the Seder Olam Rabba and Sutta, Cracow, 18:2; and with a Latin translation by Gilbert Genebrard, Paris, 1572. Levita's ailnsion will he found $3 a-5 a$ of the last mentioned edition. It must he remarked, that neither the Seder Olam nor the Sepher $H a-K a b b a y=h$ saye that the Great Synagogue only continued for foxty years. Graetz
the Keri and the Kethiv originated through the above-mentioned doubtful readings, we should expect these doubtful readings to occur accidentally, according to the differences of the books, and the accidents which befel them,--to be one here and one there-here a little and there a little -but not repeatedly to occur in one and the same word. Thus, for example, נערה is written in the Pentateuch twenty-two times נער, without $H e$, and read with $H e^{48}$; ע, tumors, which occurs in the test six times, and is read טחורים, the piles ${ }^{49}$; ענ, destitutes, found five times in the text, and read ענוים, afficted, and twice vice versa; ${ }^{50}$ and there are many more the like instances. Now how could the accident always happen to the expressions עניים and עפמלים , עערה ל

And my difficulty is increased by what is said in the above-mentioned section of the Talmud [Nedarim 37, b], and these are the words: "R. Isaac said, the words read from the margin but not written in the text, and the words written in the text but not read, are a Law of Moses from Sinai; the words read from the margin; but not written in the text, are פרח, Euphrates [2 Sam. viii. 3], and שיא, man [ibid. xvi. 23]; whilst the words written in the text but not read, are אנ, now [ 2 Kings v. 18], and ידרוך, he shall tread [Jerem. li. 3], \&c." ${ }^{71}$ Would that
hae ahown that its existence extended over a period of one hnndred and ten yearb, bo that Levita's argument based upon the ahorter period is gronndless.

48 In the present text, we have only twenty-one instances in which the text has and the marginal reading פער, viz., Gen. xxiv. 14, 16, 28, 55, 57 ; xxxiv. 3 (twice), 12 ; Dent. xxii. 15 (twice), 16, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26 (twice), 27, 28, 29.

49 The six instances in which the marginal reading substitntes $\begin{gathered}\text { for the tual }\end{gathered}$的 are Dent. xxviii. 27; 1 Sam. v. 6, 9, 12 ; vi. 4, 5. Comp. Megilla, 25 b; Sopherim viii. 8; Massorah magna on 1 Sam. v. 6; Massorah finalis, s. v. ש"ט; Ochla Ve-Ochla, section 170, pp. 38, 114;'Jacab h. Chajim's Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, p. 9, \&c. Englieh tranalation.
${ }^{50}$ The five passages in which the Kethiv is and the Keri has are ab follows: Pb. ix. 13 ; x. 12; Prov. iii. 34 ; xiv. 21; xvi. 19. The instances in which the reverse is the case are Ps. ix, 19; Isa. xxxii. 7.
${ }_{51}$ Levita's quotation of R. Isaac's statement is abridged. Jacoh h. Chajim gives it entire in his Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, p. 6 in the Hebrew and p. 12 in the English translation. Of words read from the margin and not written in the text, there are ten instances, viz.

י בנ, the sons of
nาต, Euphrates טי, man p. thas

בני, his sons

[^62]Mix, sabaoth . . Isaiah mexvii. 32. , J, Jerem. xxxi. 38. Ti, to her. Jerem. 1. 29. Ruth iii. 5. Ruth iii. 17.
any one might listen to me, and explain to me how it can be said of them that they are a Law of Moses from Sinai, when, of all the instances here adduced, not a single one is to be found in the Pentateuch? And even of those marginal readings not written in the text, which the Massorites added (for R. Isaac oñly ${ }^{62}$ gives five, whilst the Massorites give eight), as well as of the words written in the text, but not read (for R. Isaac only ${ }^{58}$ gives six, whilst the Massorites give ten),-of either the one or the other, not a single ${ }^{54}$ one is to be found in the Pentateuch. And if it be so, how can it be said that it is a Law of Moses from Sinai, which did-not, as yet, exist at all?

And as if this trouble were not enough for us, some later writers must needs add that "every Keri and Kethiv, throughout the whole Bible, is a Law of Moses." But
 אין ${ }^{62}$ אחר מהן בחורד,'ואפשילו אוחם שהוטיפו עליחן בעלי המטודח, כי רבי יצחק לא הביא רקא55 ח', ובעלי המסודח הכיאו ר', וכן דקרי״ן ולא בתבן, רבי יצחק הבצא וֹי והם הביאו יִי, ועבל אלח ואלח אין נם אחד מחן
 ולא נברא עדיין:
 האחרונים כִל קרי וכחיב שבבהל הטקרא הל"מ, ומהיכן למרו לומר כן, והלא רבי , ולא קרייג, שהוא המין הקטן שבכל ז' המינים, במו שאבאר בלוחוח שניוח, במאמר א', אך אם קבלה היא שאלח הם לבדם הל"ט אקבלהו כי חם אמת ורבריחם אמח, ולולי זה חייחי אומר שלבד הקרי והכחיב שכחורה חם חל"ם, ואנשׁי כ"ח צוחם חני וכריה מלאכי דניאל, חנניה מישאל ועוריה, עוירא נחמיה מרדבי ורובבל, ועוד נלוי עליחם חכמים מהחרצ וחמסנר, ער השלמח מאח ועשדים איש, בחבוס על פּי הקבלה שחיחה בידם, where have they been authorised to say this, since R. Isaac has only said it of the marginal readings not written in the text, and words written in the text but not read, which are the smallest of the seven classes [of Keris and Kethivs], as I shall show in the Second Part, section one? If it really is a tradition that the former alone [i.e. those given in the Talmud, Nedarim], are a Law of Moses from Sinai, I must accept it, for our sages are true, and their words are true. But for that, I should have said that the Keris and Kethivs, which occur in the Pentateuch, are a Law of Moses from Sinai; and that the men of the Great Synagogue, i.e. Haggai, Zachariah, Malachi, Daniel, Mishael, Azariah, Ezra, Nehemiah, Mordecai, Zerubbabel, with whom were associated other sages from the craftsmen and artizans, to the number of a

Comp. Massorah magna on Dent. i. 1; and ou Ruth iii. 17; Sopherim vi. 8; Ochla VeOchla, section xcvii., pp. 28, 96. Of words written in the text bat not read, there are eight instances, viz.:-

| Qא, if . . . . . 2 Sam. xiii. 33. | пк, if | Jerem. xxxix. 12. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| םא, if .* . . . . . 2 Sam. xv. 21. | Tירי, he shall tread | - Jerem. li. 3. |
| K, now . - . . . . . 2 Kings v 18. | \% ${ }^{\text {, five }}$ | Ezek. xlviii. 16. |
| กی, accusative . Jerem. xxxviii. 16. | אם, if | Ruth iii. 12. |

Comp. Massorah magna on Ruth iii. 12; Sopherim vi. 9; Ochla Ve-Ochla, section xcviii., pp. 28, 96 ; Kitto's Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature, s. v. Kert and Kitifiv.
${ }_{52}$ The word ${ }^{2}$, even, is omitted in the Sulzhach edition.
${ }^{5 s}$ The Sulzbach edition erronoously sahatitutee a m, but, for pr, only.
54 , מהד, of them, which is important to the sense, is omitted in the Sulzbach edition.
hundred and twenty persons-noted down according to a tradition which they had, informing them that our teacher Moses, peace be upon him, did not read this word as it is written in the text, because of one of the many secrets known unto them; that our teacher Moses, peace be upon him, delivered them ${ }^{65}$ to Joshua, Joshua to the sages, the sages to the prophets, \&c., \&c., who put it down in the margin, as the Keri has it, and that Ezra was the writer thereof. This is, therefore, the very thing which he wrote in the Law of Moses.

The same thing they did with all the words in the Prophets and Hagiographa, respecting which they had a tradition from the Prophets and the sages, delivered from mouth to mouth, that they are not to be read as they are written. But as for the post-exile books, they required no tradition, for their authors were themselves present with them. Whenever, therefore, they [the men of the Great Synagogue] found a word in them which appeared to them not in harmony with the design of the context, and the simple meaning of the passage, the author gave them the reason why he had written in so abnormal a manner; hereupon they wrote the normal expression in the margin as the Keri. Herewith the question is fully answered, which I asked above about ולא [Ezra iv. 2], since Ezra did assign a reason why he wrote in such a manner. In like manner, when they read in the book of Haggai (i. 8) צבד , Haggai himself told them not to read וְאָּ end, and told them that it was owing to the five things which were in the first temple, but not in the second temple, ${ }^{\text {s6 }}$ that he

[^63]wrote so. Whereupon they wrote ואכבברה קרי, זכן עשו בהל האחרים in the margin "Read ואכברה." The same thing they did with all the other post-exile books.

In short, the men of the Great Synagogue made the Keri, in the Pentateuch, in accordance swith a tradition from our teacher Moses, peace be upon him; in the Prophets and Hagiographa, in accordance with a tradition from the Prophets and sages of succeeding generations; and in the post-exile books, in accordance with the directions of the authors themselves; but never on account of any doubtful readings, as many have supposed.

Now, when I gave my heart to inquire into, and examine with wisdom, all which has been done in the matter of the Keri and Kethiv, I discovered that the Keri and Kethiv are never found on plene and defective. That is to say, there is not a word to be found in the whole Bible which is written in the text plene, and the the marginal reading of which is defective or vice versa; and the reason is, that the sense of the word is never affected bỳ its being defective or plene.

I have also discovered this, which is important to remember, that the Keri and Kethiv are never to be found on the vowel-points and accents. That is to say, there is not a word to be found which is pointed in the text in one way, and the marginal reading of which is in another way. Nor do the Keri and Kethiv occur with respect to Dagesh and Raphe, nor in Milel and Milra, nor on right and left [i.e. the point on letter ש] $]_{2}$ nor on Mapik and no Mapik, nor on either of the accents pausal or non-pausal.

And the reason of it is, because there never was any difference of opinion among all Israel about the pronunciation of the words; for all alike read the Law without points, just as they had received it from Moses; and the other sacred books, as they received them from

[^64]the Prophets. ${ }^{57}$ And as the points ${ }^{57}$ וכשאר הספדים כמו שקבלו מהנביאים which were added in after time are והנקודות שנעשו אח״"ב, הם אוחות וטימנים simply signs and marks to indicate לחכונות ולהבדות ההם, על בן לא שיחיך בהן the pronunciation, therefore, they do not come within the province of the Keri and Kethiv. The same is the case with the variations between the Easterns and Westerns, not one of which is on the vowels and accents. By the Easterns are meant the Babylonians, and by the Westerns, the Palestinians. ${ }^{58}$ We in all these countries are descendants of the latter, and therefore follow their readings and submit to their authority. Now the variations between these two are, respecting words and letters, Keri and Kethiv, plene and defective, but not in vowels and accents. And this is a proof that these variations were written down קרי וכחיב, וכן החילופים והפלונחוח שבין מדינהאי למערבאי, אין נם אחד מהן בנקורוח ומעמים, ומרינחאי הם בני בבל, ומערבאי הם בני ארץ ישראל, 58 אשר מהם אנתנו בכל האדצוח האלי, לפיכך אנחנו םומבין על קדיאתם, והלבה כמותם, והחילופשין עביניניהם הם בחיבות ואותיות, ובכתיב ובקרי, ובמלא וכתסד, ולא בנקודוח ומעמים: וזה ראיה כי נכתבו החילופים האלה קודם שהוסדו הנקורות והטעטים, אכל הפלונחוח דבין כן אשד וכן נשחלי, שאינן אלא בנקורוח וםעםם, אין טפק שנבתבו אחדר שהוםרו הנקירוח והטעםים, וזה קל להבין:

ראשי ישיבוח במסורח, שם האתר יעקב בן נפחלי, ושם השני אהרון בן אשרד: צאוכתב prior to the invention of the vowels and accents. The variations, however, between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali, which simply refer to the points and accents, were unquestionably written down after the invention of the points and accents; and this is easily understood.

As to these two men, they were the heads of two different Massoretic schools, and their respective names were Jacob b. Naphtali and Aaron b. Ashers Maimonides, of blessed memory, writes in the Treatise on the Love of God, cap. viii., as follows: "The copy which

[^65]
 contains the twenty-four books, and הוא טפר הידוע בטצדים שהוא כולל כ"ד which had been in Jerusalem for many years, in order that other Codices might be corrected by its text; and all followed it, because Ben-Asher had minutely revised it for many jears, and corrected it many times. According to this, many copies were made; and I, too, followed it, in the books of the Law which I myself have written, in all its integrity." 60 And we also, throughout all these countries, follow its readings, whilst the Orientals adopt the text of Ben-Naphtali. The variations in the accents between them are confined to the smaller accents, such as Metheg, םפדים פוהיה בידושלם מבמה עוגים להניה טמנו הפפרים, ועליו היו הבל םומלין, לפי שהניהו בן אשר, ורקרק בו שנים הדבה, והניהו פעםים רבות במו עלהעחיקי, ועליו טמברי בטפר הודח שבתבתי בהלבתו,60 וכן אנחנוי םומבין על קריאחו בכל חארצות חאלח, ואנשי עורה םומבין על קריאת בין נפחלי, והפלונהוחה שבּיניחן בטעםים אינן אלא במעמים הקטנים, כנון טחנ ומקף ומונח ובפשם אחר וב' פשטמין, וכל צוח יחיח מבואר חיצב בספר טוב טעם אפר יעדחי חבורו בע"ח, ${ }^{16}$ גם חפלונחות שביניחן בנקודות אינן אלא בחולם ובקטץ חחטוף, ובקטץ גדול ופחח, ובשוא ובהטף פחדח, וכן בדנשין ורפּין, וטלעיל ומלרע : Makiph, Munach, one Pashta, or two Pashtas. All this will be thoroughly explained in a separate Treatise, called Good Sense, which, by the help of the Lord, I intend to write. ${ }^{61}$ These variations between them, which also extend to the vowels, only refer to Cholem, Kemetz-Chateph, Long-Kemetz, Pattach, Sheva, Chateph-Pattach, as well as to Dagesh, Raphe, Milel, and Milra.
ii. A Treatise on the Massorah, entitled, the Massoreth of Ben-Asher (מטורח בן אשר), stating partly the Massoretic remarks on each word in the margin of the text itself (מסרח גליונית ימסרח המנים), and partly at the end of the Codex (Massorah finalis). Comp. Pinsker, Likute Rabmonijot, text p. 130; iii. A Treatise on the Accents
 by Leopold Dukes, Tübingen, 1846; iv. A Treatise on the Consonants and Vowels (זם), of which fragments only have survived, which are inserted in his treatiee on the accents, and against which the celebrated Saedia Gaon wrote a dissertation; and v. A Treatise on Assonances (שמונים זוגיץ), giving eighty Hebrew words, similar in somed, but differing in sense. Moses b. David b. Naphtali, again, or simply Ben-Asher, as he is generally called, represented the Easterns, and wrote in the interests of the Babylonian school, i. A Model Codex of the Bible, and ii. A Treatise on the eystem of vocalisation and accentuation. Comp. Fürst, Introduction to the Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, p. xxi. A list of the variations between these two repregentatives of the Easterns and Westerns, is given at the end of the Rebbinic Bibles.
${ }^{60}$ The Treatise on the Love of God (טפר אהבה), which Levita quotes, is simply one of the component parts of Maimonidea' gigantic work on the Biblical and traditional Lawe, called Deuteronomy; Second Law (משנה חורֶ), or Jad Ha-Chezaka (יר החקקה) = the Mighty Hand, in allusion to Deut. xxxiv. 12. The part consists of the following six Halachoth (ה)הנוח), or Tractates: i. On the reading of Shema; ii. On Prayer and the Priestly Benediction; iii. On Phylacteries, Meazuza, and the Scroll of the Law; iv. On the Fringed Garment; v. On Benedictions, and vi. On Circumcision. The quotation in question is from Tractate iii., and the portion which treats on the Scroll of the Law, or Bilchath Sepher Thora, viii. 4. The reference in the text is, to say the least, most indefinite.
${ }^{81}$ The treatise on the accents, entitled, Good Sense (טוב טעם), to which Levita refers, zppeared within twelve months of the publication of this statement. Fide supra, p. 63, \&c.

Now it is evident, from all I have said, that the Keri and Kethiv never occur with respect to plene and defective, nor on a single one of the vowel-points and accents. Let me, therefore, warn and caution every one who reads the folio or quarto editions of thefour and twenty books published bere, in Venice, in the year $278(=1517)$, ${ }^{\text {ex }}$ to pay no attention to the false remarks printed in the margin, in the form of Keri and Kethiv, plene and defective, Milel and Milra, and variations in the vowels and accents, or to any of those things which ought not to have been done, as I have stated above. The author of them did not know how to distinguish between his right hand and his left. Not being a Jew, he knew nothing about the nature of the Massorah, and what he did put down simply arose from the fact, that he sometimes found variations in the copies which he had before him, and, as he did not know which reading was the correct one, he put down one in the margin and another in the text. Sometimes it so happened that he put the correct reading into the text, and the incorrect one into the margin, and sometimes the reverse is the case; thus, he was groping in darkness, like a blind man. Hence, they are not to be heeded, for they are confusion worse confounded.

Now, before quitting the subject of the Keri and Kethiv, let me remark, that, being anxious to know the number of all the Keris and Kethivs throughout the Scriptures, I counted them several times, and found them to be 848, and indicated this by the mnemonical sign, "Karjan Ve-Kathban." ${ }^{88}$ Of these, 65 are in the Pentateuch, ${ }^{64} 454$ in the Prophets, and 329 in the Hagiographa.

[^66]It is astomishing that in the Pentateuch there should only be 65 Keris and Kethivs, 22 of which relate to עערה, which is written in the text 4 , and the marginal reading is נערה; whilst in the book of Joshua, which is only about a tenth the size of the Pentateuch, there occur 32, ${ }^{65}$ and in the book of Samuel, which in quantity is about a fourth of the Pentateuch, there are found $133 .{ }^{66}$ It is also to be noticed that, of the many Catalogues, Registers, and Alphabetical Lists of the Keris and Kethivs in the Great Massorah, not a single one is found in the Pentateuch. Thus, of the 62 words in which two letters are transposed; ${ }^{67}$ the 12 words

35, 55, 57 ; xxv. 23 ; xxxvii. 3, 29 ; xxx. 11 ; xxxiii. 4; xxxiv. 3 (twice), 12; xxxvi. 5, 14, 15 ; xxxix. 20, 22; xliii. 28; xlix. 11 (twice) : Exod. iv. 2; xiii. 11; xvi. 2, 7, 13; xxi. 8; xxii. 4, 26 ; xxvii. 11 ; xxviii. 28; xxxii. 17,19 ; xxxv. 11 ; xxxvii. 8; xxxix. $4,21,33$ : Levit. ix. 22; xi. 21; xvi. 21; xxi. 5 ; xxiii. 13; xxv. 30 : Numh. i. 16; iii. 51; x. 36; xi. 32 ; xii. 3 ; xiv. 36 ; xvi. 11 ; xxi. 32 ; xxvi.' 9 ; xxxii. 7; xxxiv. 4 ; Denter. ii. 33 ; v. 10 ; vii. 9 ; viii. 2 ; xxi. 7 ; xxii. 15 (twice), $16,20,21,23,24,25,26$ (twice), $27,28,29$; xxvii. 10 ; xxviii. 27,30 ; xxix. 22 ; xxxiii. 9 . The numbers, therefore, given in Kitto's Cyclopadia of Biblical Literature, s. v. Keri and Kethiv, must be corrected. The instances in which the Keri and Kethiv are on the word wa, have already been epecified. Vide supra, p. 109, note 48.
${ }^{65}$ According to our collation of the text, we find thirty-five Eeris and Kethivs in the Book of Joshua expressly so marked, viz., Joeh. ii. 13 ; iii. 4,16 ; iv. 18 ; v. 1; vi. $5,7,9,13,15$; viii. $11,12,16$; ix. 7 ; xi. 16 ; xv. $4,47,48,53,63$; xvi. 3 ; xviii. 12, 14, 19 (twice), 24 ; xix. 22, 29 ; xx. 8 ; xxi. 10 , 27 ; xxii. 7 ; xxiv. $3,8,15$; and at least three, though not designated Keri, are nevertheless such, viz., xvi. 5 ; sviii. 8, 9. Comp. also ibid. v. 15 ; vii. 21 ; ix. 7 ; x. 8 ; xii. 20 ; xv. 63 ; xxiv. 19.
${ }^{65}$ Equally wrong is Levita's etatement about the numher of Keris and Kethivs in the hooks of Samnel, inasmuch as a careful perasal of the Massoretic remarks will show that there are 161, and not 133. They occur as follows:-1 Sam. ii. 3, 9, 10 (twice) ; iii. 2 , 18 ; iv. 13 ; v. $6,9,12$; vi. 4,5 ; vii. 9 ; viii. 3 ; ix. 1,26 ; x. 21 ; xi. 6,9 ; xii. 10 ; xiii. 8,19 ; xiv. 27,32 (twice); xv. 16; xpii. $7,23,34$; xviii. $1,6,7,9,14,22$; xix. 18, 19, 22, 23 (twice); xx. 1, 2 (twice), 24, 38; xxi. 12 (twice); xxii. 13, 17,18 (twice), 22 ; xxiii. 5 ; xxiv. 9,$19 ;$ xxv. 3, 18 (twice), 34 ; xxvi. 5 , (twice), $11,16,22$; xxvii. 4, 8 ; xxviii. 8 ; xxix. 5 (twice) ; xxx. 6, 24 :-2 Sam. i. 8,11 ; ii. 23 ; iii. $2,3,12,15,25$; v. 2 (thrice), 8,24 ; vi. 23 ; x. 9 ; xii. $9,20,22,24,31$; xiii. $32,34,37$; xiv. $7,11,21,22,30$; xv. $8,20,28$; xvi. 2, 8,10 (twice), 12 (twice), 18; xvii. 12,16 ; xviii. $3,8,12,13,17,18$; xix. 7, $19,32,41$; xx. 5, $8,14,23$, 25 ; xxi. 4, 6, 9 (twice), 12 (twice), $16,20,21$; xxii. 8 , $15,23,33,34,51$; xxiii. 8 (twice), 9 (thrice), $11,13,15,16,18,20$ (thrice), 21,37 ; xxiv. 14, 16, 18, 22. These, it must he remarked, do not include either the Keri Ve-lo Kethiv or the Kethiv Ve-lo Keri, which have already heen ennmerated (vide supra, p. 109, n. 51).
${ }^{57}$ The sixty-two words in which two lettere following each other are transposed, are as followe :-

| הילך | Josh. vi. 13 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 18לון | . Joak. xx. 8 |
| גלון | Josh. xxi. 27 |
| והימשי | Judg. xvi. 26 |
| ותראנה | 1 Sam. xiv. 27 |
| בנוית | 1 Sam. xix. 18 |
| בגויחת | 1 Sam. xix. 22 |
| נוית | 1 Sam. xix. 23 |
| בנוית | 1 Sam. xix. 23 |
| והגרי | 1. Sam. xxvii. 8 |


| S130 | . |
| :---: | :---: |
| והוצית | 2 Sam. xiv. 30 |
| בעברוח | 2 Sam. xy. 28 |
| נפציצות | 2 Sam. xviii. 8 |
| ויקלהו | 2 Sam. xx. 14 |
| האורנה | 2 Sam. xxiy. 16 |
| האהל | 1 Kings vii. 45 |
| הממוחים | 2 Kinge xi. 2 |
| ימוה | 2 Kings xiv. 6 |
| ואלול | If. xxxvii. |

which have no Vav conjunctive in וי"ב מלין חחסרין וי"י בראש חתיבח וקרין

 in which the reverse is the case; 68 חסרים ה"א בטוף התיכח וקרין, וכ' מלין the 18 words which want the בהפך; suffix $V a v$ in the text, and are read in the margin with it, and the 11 words in which the reverse is the case; ${ }^{69}$ the 29 words which in the text want $H e$ at the end, and in the margin are read with it, and the 20 words in which the reverse is the case; ${ }^{70}$ the alphabetical list of 75 words, every one of which is

| - | Ezek. xlii. 16 |  | Prov. xxxi. 27 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| וטדראראיל | Ezek. xliii. 15 | רבתובנחר | Joh xxvi. 12 |
| ודאריאיל | Ezek. xliii. 16 | יבחר | Ecel. ix. 4 |
| 9\%3 | Pe. Ixxiii. 2 | ובמלוארז | Esther i. 5 |
| - | Pe. exxxix. 6 | מוֹמנן | Esther i. 16 |
| וגדלוחיך | P6. cxlv. 6 | ידרון | Dan. iv. 9 |
| כטוֹהוד | Prov.i. 27 | והמינטא | Dan. v. 7 |
| הלוך | Prov. xiii. 20 | חוכל | Dan. v. 16 |
| \% | Prov. xix. 16 | חוכל | Dan. v. 16 |
| וציך | Prov. xxiii. | וזהמינבא | - Den. v. 16 |
| תריצנה | Prov. xxiii. 26 | וינב | Dan. v. 29 |


| WV | Ezre ii. 46 |
| :---: | :---: |
| . ומבלהים . | Ezra iv. 4 |
| ורורצה | Ezre viii. 17 |
| בצחהיים. | Nehem. iv. 7 |
| למלוכי | Nehem. xii. 14 |
| . | I Chron. i. 46 |
| הוריודיו | 1 Chron. iii. 24 |
| טוטרי | 1 Chron. xxvii. 29 |
| ושמרימוח | 2 Chron. xvii. 8 |
| לוועה | 2 Chron. xxix. 8 |

עימשלי
( . . . Ezre viii. 17
םיצחתח. . Nehem. iv. 7
למלוכי . . Nehem. xii. 14
פעוח . . . I Chron. i. 46
1 1 Chron. i. 24
2 Chron. xvii. 8
לזועה 2 Chron. xxix. 8

The list of these trencpositions ie given in the Masecrah finalis, under Letter $V a v$, and in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section xci., pp. 27, 98, \&c.
${ }_{6 B}$ The twelve words which are in the text without the $V a v$ conjunctive, bat are read with it in the margin, are as followe:-


The eleven words which, on the contraxy, have Yav conjunctive in the text, hut not in the marginal resding, are ae follows:-


These instances are ennmerated in the Massorah marginalis on Dan. ix. 5; Messorah finalie, under the letter $\overline{V a v}$; and Ochla $V e$-Ochla, sections cxvii. and cxvii., pp. 32, 101.

69 The eighteen worde, which according to the Masborah went the suffix $V^{\prime}$ av in the text, are as follows:-


The eleven worde which on the contrary terminate with Vav in the textual reading, but have no Tav in the marginal reading, are as follows:-


These instances are partly enumerated in Tract Sopherim vii. 1; and entirely in the Massorah marginalis on 1 Kings i. 1, xii. 3; Magsorah finalis nnder letter Yav; and Ochla Ve-Ochla, eectione cxix. and cxx., pp. 32, 102.

70 The twenty-nine word6 which have no $H e$ in the textual reading, but have it in the marginal reading, are as follows:-
in the text written with a יו＂ך באשצע חיבוחא וקריין וי＂ז，ואלפא middle，and in the margin read with ביחא מן ע＇מלין בחפך，${ }^{7}$ אין גם אחר מחן Vav，and the alphabetical list of 70 words in which the reverse is the case ；${ }^{71}$ not one of all these occurs

| ואר3 | Josh．zxiv． 3 1 Sam．ix． 26 |
| :---: | :---: |
| חאו | 1 Sam．xiv． 19 |
| mith | 2 Sam．xxi． 9 |
| יT | ． 1 Kings i． 37 |
| ודית | 2 Kings ix． 37 |
| ור | Isaiah xli． 23 |
| ה－ | ．．Isaiah liv． 16 |
| ירא | Jerem．xvii． 8 |
| תעט | ．Jersm．xl． 16 |

The twenty words which on the contrary terminate with $H e$ in the textual reading，but not in the marginal reading，are－

| 27 ．．．Josh．vii． 21 | התאT ．．Jerem．xxvi． 6 | הרבה | Ps．1i． 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ה－ | קוק ．．．Jerem．xxxi． 39 | אהביה | Prov．viii． 17 |
| האריה ．． 2 Sam．xxiii． 20 | ובאה ．Jerem．xliii． 11 | ורעה | Prov．xxvii． 10 |
| וקרה ．． 1 Kings vii． 23 | ，．．Jerem．xlviii． 27 | שׁקה | Dan．ix． 18 |
| ，ותראT ．．Jerem．iii． 7 | ר ．．．Micah iii． 2 | אריד | Lament．iii． 10 |
| האה ．．Jerem．xv． 9 | וקוה ．．Zech．i． 16 | אלה | Ezra v． 15 |
| הרעה ．．Jerem，xviii． 10 | （עשה ．．．Ruthi． 3 |  |  |

These instances ars given in the Tract Sopherim vii．2；Massorah marginalis on Prov． xxxi．16；Lament．ii．19，v．1；Eccl．vii． 23 ；Massorah finalis nonder letter He，and Ochla Ve－Ochla，sections cxi．and cxii．，pp．31，99，\＆c．

71 The following are the words which in the textual reading have Jod in the middle of the word，and are with Vav in the marginal reading：－

| W ．－Ps．Ixxvii． 12 | ובשגיב | מירעח\％．Isaiah xii． 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N ．． 2 Sam．xxiv． 18 | ולטים－．Isaiah x． 6 | －．．Ezek．xli． 8 |
| בת ．．．Isa．xxiii． 13 | וריב ．．Joh xxxiii． 19 | －．．Ezra ii． 50 |
| ברתיקוח－ 1 Kings vi． 21 | וגציר Isaiah xlix． 6 | 隹 2 Sam．xiii． 32 |
| בכים ．．Prov．xxiji． 31 | ו וצהירא ．．Dan．ii． 22 | צינחם ．．Hos．x． 10 |
| בגיים ．．Ps．Ixxix． 10 | ，．．．Dan．iji． 10 | ．．． 1 Chron．i． 51 |
| ביים ．．．Gen．xxv． 23 | \％－．Lament．iji． 20 | －． 1 Chron．ix． 33 |
| גריחיו ．． 1 Chron．xii． 15 | זבירה 2 Kings xxiji． 36 | צי－ 1 Chron．vi． 20 |
| －החרֶ ．．． 1 Chron．xii． 5 | חישה ．．．Ps．lxxi． 12 | קריאי ．．Numb．i． 16 |
| המעינים ． 1 Chron．iv． 41 | －．．． 2 Sam．xv． 8 | ראיח ． |
| ロwי ．．Gen．xxiv． 33 | י • ．．Ps．lxxii． 17 | ראיח |
| וילינו ．．Exad．xvi． 2 | ＇2ay ．．．Ps．lvi． 7 | セソセ ．．Isaiah xxviii． 15 |
| ויירט ．．Numb．xxi． 32 | 1－מים ．．．Prs．cxl． 11 | שיחה－．Jerem．xviii． 22 |
| וינים ．．．Josh．xy． 53 | ירימוּ $\quad$ Pa．1xvi． 7 |  |
| וריטים－．Jndg．vii． 21 | ，－．Job xxiv． 6 | －．－Jerem．1． 6 |
| ורציתי ．．Judg．xi． 37 | למיש ．Jerem．xlviii． 7 | 7 |
| ¢ ．．． 1 Sam．xiii． 8 | －．．Nehem．xii． 16 | שילז ．．．Micah i． 8 |
| ציחיחר ．． 2 Sam．xx． 5 | לעזיר－． 2 Sam．xviii． 3 | שטלריריד Hos．vi． 10 |
| ＊uר－－ 2 Sam．Xx． 25 | מדין ．． 2 Sam．xxi． 20 | W－Joh xix． 29 |
| \％ו 1 Chron．viii． 25 | טגריל ．． 2 Sam．xxii． 51 | 位 ．．Ezek．xxx． 16 |
| 7－רצטינ ．．．Ps．xyii． 14 | מים ．． 2 Kings xvi． 18 | ת ．．Prov．xvii． 13 |
| ¢ וצירם ．．．Pa．xlix． 15 | מיצקח ．． 2 Kings iv． 5 | תמריק ．．Prov．xx． 30 |
| שגוג ．．．．Job vii． 5 | מירע | 的 ．．Pa，lxxxix． 18 |
| רידיתי ．．Job vi． 2 |  |  |

The following is the Alphabetical list of words，which，on the contrary have Fav in the middls of the word in the textnal reading，and have Jod in the marginal reading－

in the Pentateuch. ${ }^{72}$ There is undoubtedly a reason for all this, but I do not know it. I have now satisfied my desire in explaining that which I deemed necessary about the nature of the Keri and the Kethiv.

I shall now say something about the nature of plene and defective: First of all, I say, it appears that, to the words which were found written plene or defective, nothingnew whatsoever was added by the men of the Great Synagogue out of their own understanding; but that Ezra transcribed them, into his copy of the Law, just as he found them in the Codex of the Law which was made from the scroll of the Law of Moses received from Sinai, and which the prophet Jeremiah concealed, ${ }^{78}$ according to the opinion of some, without adding anything to it or taking anything from it. The same is the case with the defective and plene of the Prophets

| הבצור המבוא | . Zech. xi. 2 <br> Ezel. xlii. 9 |
| :---: | :---: |
| המבוטים | 2 Chron. Xxxy. 3 |
| הושר | - . Ps. v. 9 |
| התפֶך | - Prov. xxiii. 5 |
| הנחונים | - Ezra viii. 17 |
| הכצוםני | Jerem, xxv. 7 |
| החפטוֹת | 2 Chron. xxpi. 21 |
| וילוי | . Numb. xiv. 36 |
| ושדוצוּ | Jorhna xix. 22 |
| וצנוֹ | - Isaiah lxii. 3 |
| 518\% | - Jerem. xiv. 14 |
| ותרמוח | - Jerem. xiv. 14 |
| וםום | . Jerem. viii. 7 |
| ואתוקידאו | . . Ezek. xli 15 |
| ותוּלול) | . 1 Chron. iv. 20 |
| ציודאל | . 1 Chron. xii. 3 |
| והכוני | 2 Chron. xxxy. 4 |
| תוקד | - Pb. Ixxiv. 11 |
| ソ\|צ゙ | 1 Kinge pi. 5 |

בחורח ;73 ועל כל פנים מעם יש ברבר, ואנכי לא ירעחי, וכאן נשלם חפצּי טה שלראיחי לבאר בענין קדיין וכחבן:
 והחסדים, ואחחּל ואומר, כי המלוח שנכתבו תסדים או מלאים נראה כי לא חרשו אנשוּ וער כנפח הגדולה כהן רכר מרעחם, ריק עירא
 הועתק טספר חורח משה אשר קבל פסיני עגנו ירטיה חנביא לםי רעעח האומדים כבה, 75 ולא הוםיף ולא גרע, וכן חחברים והמלאים שבנכיאים ובכחוכים, אם נמצאו בידם נופי
and Hagiographa. Thus, when they חoma צושר כחבו המהכרים עצמט, כנון [Ezra and his associates] found the very autographs of the authors themselves, as was the case with the book of Isaiah, which Isaiah himself wrote, the Psalms which David wrote, the Proverbs which Solomon wrote, and with all or part of the books which they possessed, they required no tradition to guide them, but copied exactly as they found it: plene wherever there was plene, and defective wherever there was defective. But when they did not find the autograph itself, which seems most likely to have happened, they undoubtedly followed the majority of Codices, which they had collected from different places, one here and one there, as the twenty-four books were then not joined together into one volume. Now they Ezra and his associates] have joined them together, and divided them into three parts: the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa, and arranged the Prophets and Hagiographa not in the order in which they have been put by our Rablins of blessed memory, in Baba Bathra [14a].

The following is the order of our Rabbins, of blessed memory :The position of the Prophets is-Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, Isaiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor Prophets. The order of the Hagiographa is-Ruth, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Lamentations, Esther, and Chronicles, and they [the Rabbins] gave appropriate reasons for this classification, which would be out of place here.

The Massorites too have adopted this order in the Prophets, only that they have put Isaiah before Jeremiah and Ezekiel, because he lived before them. The same order is also found in all the correct Spanish Codices; whilst the German and French Codices adopt the order of the Rabbins, of blessed memory. But in the Hagiographa, the Massorites have altered the order of the Rabbins of blessed memory as follows: Chronicles, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ruth, Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, which is followed in the Spanish Codices; whereas the German Codices have the following order:-Psalms, Pro-
verbs, Job, the Five Megilloth, צכה, חהלים משלי איוב, המש מגלוח, רניאל Daniel, Ezra, and Chronicles. It is the custom to put the Five Megilloth in the order in which they are read in the Synagogue, according to their respective seasons, that is, Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther. ${ }^{74}$

* Having now reached the place in which I , at the beginning of this Introduction, promised to state my own opinion about the points and accents, I shall first do battle against those who say that they were given on Sinai, and then state who invented them, and when they were originated and affixed to the letters. But if anyone should prove to me, by clear evidence, that my opinion is opposed to that of our Rabbins of blessed memory, or is contrary to the genuine Kabbalah of the Sohar, ${ }^{75}$ I will readily give in to him, and declare my opinion as void. Up to this time, however, I have neither found, nor seen, nor heard, any evidence, nor anything approaching to it, that is worthy to be relied upon, that the points and accents were given upon Sinai.

I shall here state what I have found written on this subject in some treatises of later writers, but not in the works ${ }^{75}$ of the Rabbins of blessed memory. Kimchi, in his Michlol, after citing the statement of the Talmud that it is necessary to make a paise between the conjunctions, remarks thus: "一准 (Deut. xi. 13) is pointed with Kametz, because of the Makeph, and if it were read without the Makeph, it would be pointed

[^67]memory did not say, in order that the vowel-points should in any way be changed from what they were as given to Moses on Sinai.'" ${ }^{7}$ Thus far his remark. But one must hesitate to accept this statement, inasmuch as it contradicts what he has said before on the Niphal conjugation of the regular verb, which is (\% as follows: "The inventars of the points made a distinction between the singular third person præterite and the participle, as they are pronounced alike, and pointed the past tense with Pattach, under
 participle with Kametz []..."." Thus far the substance of his remark. We therefore see, from his own words, that even he believed that there were men who invented the points, namely, $\overline{7}=-\overline{7}$ \&c. Hence it is evident that when he remarks, "as they were given to Moses on Sinai," he does not mean to say the form of the points, but the five major and the five minor sounds; and this is the reason why he uses the words "to change the vowels," and does not say the points. Thus, also, when ${ }^{79}$ he said, "as they were given," and not " which were given," his words are to be understood in the same way, and I have no need to dwell on this point any longer.
R. Levi b. Joseph, author of the book Semadar, says, at the beginning of his work, as follows: "If any one should ask, Whence do we know that the points and accents were dictated by the mouth of the Omnipotent? the reply is, It is to be found in the Scriptures, for it is written, 'And thou shalt write upon the stones all the words of this law very plainly' (Deut. xxvii. 8). Now, if the points and accents, which

[^68]make the words plain did not exist, how could one possibly understand plainly whether means wherefore, retribution, Solomon, garment, or perfect?" Thus far his remark. I leave it to the reader to judge whether this is reliable proof.

Again, I found another book, which seems to me to be the work called Instruction for the Reader, and the author of which I do not know, say as follows: :81- "There are some of the punctuators who, not knowing thoroughly the true nature of the points, ask why we do not find two Sarkoth on one word, seeing that there are two Pashtin? But had they known that there never existed more than one Sarka, and that no more than one Sarka, followed by a Segol, was revealed to our teacher Moses of blessed memory, they would not have asked such a question." Thus far its remark. Now all this is vain and wrong, since two Sarkos are frequently found, as I shall show in my book, entitled Good Sense, under the form Sarka.

Again, I found in the treatise published here, around the Massorah finalis, which some say is The Book Shimshoni, but which I say is R. Moses the Punctuator's, as I shall show in part iii., called the Brolen Tables, as follows: " It is true that the points were given on Sinai,

[^69]but they were forgotten again, till Ezra came and revealed them." Thus far its remark. Now the truth is that I do not understand this truth. But it is undoubtedly true that the law which Moses put before the Children of Israel was a plain Codex, without points and without accents, and even without the division of verses, as we see it to the present day. ${ }^{\text {ss }}$ According to the opinion of the Kabbalists, the whole Law is like one verse, and indeed, some of them say, like one word, from which they combine sundry Divine Names. Thus'says Nachmanides of blessed memory, in the Introduction to his Commentary on the Pentateuch, which you may consult. ${ }^{84}$

Now, I submit, if it be true that the points were given on Sinai, we cannot escape one of these two alternatives. We must either say that God revealed to Moses, our teacher of blessed memory, the forms of the points and accents in fire, saying, this - is the shape of Kametz, this - the shape of Pattach, this -. is the form of Tzere, this $\#$ is the form of Segol, this $\approx$ the shape of Zarka, this $\stackrel{y}{*}$ the shape of Pazer, and so on; and that Moses, our teacher of blessed memory, showed these forms to Israel, and did not affix them
of the Scriptures (comp. Stsinschneider, Bibliograph. Handbuch, p. 95, Lsipzig, 1865). It was first published by Jacob b. Chajim in the margin of the Massorah finalis, Venice, 1525 , to which edition Levita refers. It has since been reprinted in all the editions of the Rabbinic Biblea, and has been republished separately with a short commentary by Zebi b. Menachem, Wilna, 1822, and with corrections and German notes hy the learned Frgnsdorff, Hanover, 1847. Levita's quotation will he found on p. 1 Hebrew text, and animadverted opon p. 1 in the German notes, of the last mentioned edition.
${ }^{83}$ The Synagogal Scrolls of the Law, out of which the hebdomadal lessons are read among the Rabbinic Jews, have to the pressnt day neither the vowsl-points nor the accente, nor any of the Massoretic glosses whatsoever, (vide supra, p. 44, \&c.) It is to this fact that Levita refers.
 manides, the distinguished Talmudist, Commentator, Moral Philosopher, Kabbalist, and Physician, who was borm at Geroia, in Catalonia, circa a.n. 1195, and died at Acco circa 1270. The passags to which Levita refers, is as follows:- עוד יש בירינו קבלה של אמח

 וnימטריוחיהן של שמוח, We possess a faithful tradition that the whole Pentateuch consists of names of the Holy One, blessed be he; for the words may be re-divided into saered names of a different import, so that it is to be taken as an allegory. Accordingly, the words בריאשיח ברא אלהים (Gen. i. 1), for instance, may be re-divided into the words . This is the case with the whole Law, which consists of nothing but permutations and numerals of divine names. For a skstch of the life of Nachmanides, see Kitto's Cyclopodia, s.v.; and for his relation to the Kabhalah, sse Ginsburg, the Kabbalah, p. 10S, \&c., Longmans, 1865.
to the words; in which case the לחם לישדאל בראיה וו, ואם נאמר ששם Israelites would have derived no אותם עם החיבוח צדיכים אנחנו לומר, benefit from seeing them. Or we must say, that he did affix them to the words, and come to the conclusion that he wrote another Codex, besides our Pentateuch, with points and accents, and recited it with them, till they knew it, and that afterwards, each one who wished copied it. In this case the question arises, How could the points and accents be forgotten, unless we say that all these copies were afterwards lost? which is altogether incredible. Even the explanation which the sages give of Neh. viii. 8, quoted above [p. 103, \&c.], does not at all mention the points. This is also the opinion of Ibn Ezra, peace be upon him, who says in his Grammar, entitled Purity, 85 "There - are many commentators who maintain that those who divided the verses committed blunders, but this is not correct. To this class belongs R. Moses Ha-Cohen, \&ec., but שׁתב לחהם ספר זולות ספר חהורה כעין
 וקרא בו עמחם ער שירעו אוחם, וא"בח כל מי שרצה העחיק לו חומש אתר במהו, ואם כן איך שי"ך בהן שבחה אם לא נאמר שאברו השפרים ההט בלם, וחה רחוק להאמין, ואפילו לןי מדרש חתמים שרירו על פמוק ויקראו במפר חודת אלהים כמו שכהכח לעיל, לא זכרו בו הנקוד כלל, וכן רעח ר׳ אברחם א״ע
 מטעיט את המשטיק ולא דבדו נכונה, וטחם רבי משה הכחן וכו', ער ואני אחמה טוה תמהון נרול, איך טעח המפסיק ואף כי אם הוא עודא הטופר, וחכלל כי חמשטיק לא חיח אחריו חפס כמהו, בי חנה ראינו ככל חמקרא לא הפטיק אלא במקום הראוי עצ"ל, ופירוש חמפטיק מי ששט חפסקח המעמים: ותמיה אני עליו איך כנהו כאן בלשון
יח"ד ואאן טפק בי היו אנשים רבים כים כמו שאוכיח אח"ב, וכן בנה אותם בעצמו בספר מאזנים בלשון רכים, והנה כאן טובן מדבריו שאׁן רעחו שהמעמים נתנו מסיני, וכן מצאזי בספר אתר חנקרא צח שפתים I am perfectly astonished at it, for how could the divider commit blunders if he was Ezra the Scribe? In short, after the divider there were none so wise as he was, since we see that, throughout the whole of the Scriptures, he never made a pause which is not in its proper place." Thus far his remark. The meaning of מפסיק is the one who made the dividing accents.

Now I am astonished at his speaking here of one divider, since there is no doubt that there were many dividers, as I shall show hereafter; and since Ibn Ezra himself speaks of them in the plural, in his grammar called The Balance. At any rate, his words here show that he was not of opinion that the accents were given on Sinai. I

[^70]have also found the following words, in a book called The Purity of עונקדו הלתות, אך באשר רבר חק"בה לשון the Language:88 "We must know ${ }^{87}$ " ${ }^{87}$ " that the points were given on Sinai; not that they were put on the Tables of Stone; but when the Lord spake in the holy tongue, those who heard him could distinguish between the vowel-points and syllables, ${ }^{87}$ both short and long. Just as the vigour of the human voice atters higher or lower notes according to requirement, so ought we to distinguish from the mouth of readers between ${ }_{\text {N}}$ with a $K a$ metz and N with Pattach, between N with Tzere and $\stackrel{\text { N with Segol, be- }}{ }$ tween is with Cholem and NOATeph-
 Jod and $\stackrel{\aleph}{ }$ without Jod." ${ }^{\text {sc }}$ Thus far his remark.

The learned author of The Khosari also remarks, in section iii. [31,] as follows: ${ }^{89}$ "The master replied, Doubtless the Pattach, Kametz, Sheber, Sheva, and the accents were committed to memory * * and they put the principal vowels and the accents as marks, to indicate what was received from Moses by tradition. What thinkest thou about it? that they have received the Bible first

[^71]with divisions into verses, then with vowels, then with accents, then with definitions respecting the preservation of plene and defective, and even the exact number of letters?" Thus far his remark. From this we see that he was not of opinion that Moses wrote them, but that it was only preserved in memory what Moses pronunciation was, viz., what distinction he made between the pronunciation of $K a$ metz and Pattach, between Tzere and Segol, \&c. Would that this sage author had explained to us whom he meant by "they put"whether the men of the Great Synagogue or the Massorites. I think that it refers to the Massorites. ${ }^{20}$

Now this is my opivion upon the subject. The vowel-points and the accents did not exist either before Ezra or in the time of Ezra, or after Ezra till the close of the Talmud. And I sball prove this with clear and conclusive evidence.

First,-in all the writings of our Rabbins of blessed memory, whether the Talmud, or the Hagadah, or the Midrash, there is not to be found any mention whatever of, or any allusion to, the vowel-points or accents. Is it possible that, if they had the vowel-points and accents, they would not even once have mentioned the name Kametz, Pattach, Segol, or Tzere? or the Pashta, Darga, Tebir, \&c.? Do not reply, that their existence is implied in their remarks respecting certain words: "Do not read so, but so;" ex. gr., Do not read (Is. liv. 13); Do not read וֹשָׁ, but וֹשָׁם (Ps. 1. 23); as well as in their declaration, "There is a solid root for the reading of the text, and there is a solid root for the traditional pronunciation:" since, according to my opinion, all this favours my conviction, that they had not the vowel-points, but that they were in the habit of reading without points, and therefore they said, "Do not read so, but so."

[^72]For if the vowel-points had come from Sinai, and the words in question had been pointed in a certain manner, God forbid that the Rabbins should say, "Do not read so." 91 The intelligent student will understand and admit that it is so.

Secondly, - What is still greater proof, is the following remark in the Talmud (Baba Bathra, 21 b), "Joab slew his teacher because he had performed the work of the Lord deceitfully, in reading to him instead of (Deut. xxv. 19)., ${ }^{\text {T }}$

כך, כי אם היה הגקיר מסיגי וחיחח המלה נקורה כך, חלילה לחם וחם לומר אל תקרי

בך, בוּ והמשכיל יכין וישכיל כי כן הוא : ועור ראיח אתרח וגדולה היא׳ אלי, מה שגאדו רו"ל בבבא בתרא כי יואב הרג
 לו תَמחה את זכר עמלק (רברים כ"ח), הישט להאמין שאם היה להם חגקודות והיה גקיר בור
 אין ואח תי אגי לפי רעחי : ועור ראיח טמה שנמצאג בפרק קמא דחגיגח על פסוק ויעלו עולות ויצבחי ובתים וגומר (שמות ב׳"), מר וופרא אמר לפיםוק Now is it credible that he would have attempted to read points, and the word in question had been pointed with six points. By the life of me, this could not bave been done, according to my opinion. ${ }^{92}$

Thirdly, - In Chagiga, where the passage "they brought burnt offerings and killed sacrifices," \&c., (Exod. xxiv. 5) is discussed, Mar
${ }^{91}$ The Talmadic discussions on this phrase are to be found in Sanhedrin, $4 a$; Sebachim, 37 b; Pessachim, 86 b; Kiddushin, 18 b. Levita's argument, dednced from this fact, has also been espoused and elaborated by Capellns, Arcanum Punctat. lib. i. cap. v., sect. 4, \&c. ; and Morin, Exercit. lib.: ex. xii., cap. 3-5; ex. xv., eap. 3-5. Comp. also Gesenius, Geschichte der Hebräisehen Sprache, p. 182, \&c., Leipzig, 1815; Hupfeld, Studien und Krititeen, p. 554, Hambarg, 1830. For the attempte to refute it on the part of the vowelists, see Buxtorf, the father, Tiberias, cap. ix., pp. 76-86; Bnxtorf, the son, De Punctatorum Antiquitate, p. 103, \&c.; Gill, A Dissertation concerning the Antiquity of the Hebrew Language, p. 153, \&c., London, 1767.
${ }^{92}$ To understand Levita's allusion, it is necessary to relate the circumstances which called forth the story quoted in the text. "R. Dime, of Nehardea, maintains that he only is to be appointed as teacher of youths who has a good pronunciation, even if he is not so learned, since it is difficult to nnlearn an acquired mistalke in pronnnciation.'? To enforce his axiom, the Rabbi narrates the following story, which relates to Joab's slaying the whole male popnlation in Edom (1 Kinge xi. 15, 16). כי אחא לקמי דדור אמר ליה מאי שעממא עבדח הכי אמר ליה דכחיב תמחה את זכר עממלק אמר ליה והאה אנץ זכר קריבן אמר לֹה אנא זכר אקריין אזל שייליה לרביה אמר ליה היאך אקריחן אמר ליח וכר שקל םשסירא למיקטליה אמר ליה אמאי אמר ליה דכתיבב ארור עושטה מלאכת ה' רמיה אמר ליה שבקיה להההוא גברא דליקום בארור אמר ליה , לחיב וארור מונע חרבי מרם איבא דאמרי קטליד ואיכא דאמרי לא, קטליה ה hen he returned to David, he asked him, What is the reason that thou hast acted thus? [i.e. elain the males only], whereupon he [Joab] replied, Because it is written, Thou shatt blot out the males of Amaleh [Deut. xxv. 19]. He [David] then said to hine, We read Secher = the memory, to which he [Joab] replied, I have been taught to reaid Sachior = males, and went to inquire of his Rabbi, asking him, How dost thou teach me to read it? He [the Rabhi] replied, Secher = meraory. Hereupon, he [Joab] seized his sword to slay him [the Rabbi]. He [the Rabbi] asked uhy? He [Joab] replied to him, Because it is written, "Cursed be he that doeth the work of the Lord deceitfully" [Jerem. xlviii. 10]. Upon which. he [the Rabbi] said, Away with him who lays hold of a curse. He [Joab] said again, It is written, "And cursed be he who keepeth back his sword from blood." Some say he then killed him [his Rabbi], and some say he did not kill him (Comp. Baba Bathra, 21 a-b). Levita's argument, dednced from tbis, that the Talmudists must have had an unpointed text-Buxtorf, the father (Tiberias, p. 86), Buxtorf, the son (De Antiquitate Punctat. p. 108, \&c.), Whitfield (A Dissertation on the Hebrews vowel-points, p. 259, \&\%.), and Gill (Dissertation, p. 156,

Sutra remarks, this discussion is necessary, in order to know where to place the dividing accent (Chagiga 6 b). From this, too, it is evident that they had no accents (see Rashi in loco).

Fourthly,—Almost all the names of both the vowel-points and the accents are not Hebrew, but Aramean and Babylonian ; as, for instance, Tzere, Segol, Cholem, Melaphum; so also Mapik, Dagesh, Darga, Tebir, \&c. Now, if it were true that they were given on Sinai, what is the meaning of Aramean names at Mount Sinai? Were not all the commandments given on Sinai in Hebrew?

I therefore submit that it is perfectly evident to me that the vowelpoints neither existed nor obtained in the days of the Talmudic sages, and much less in the time of the men of the Great Synagogue. These men did not require them, for they could read without vowel-points and accents, making a pause where the sense required it, and reading on when the sense did not require a pause, just as they had heard and received it from the Prophets; as our Rabbins of blessed memory say, "And the Prophets transmitted it to the men of the Great Synagogue" [Aboth i.]; and the sages who were in their days, viz., the great and small Sanhedrim, as well as the priests who served God at the altar, received it from them, generation after generation, till by habit they knew how to read without vowel-points and accents.

Now there are some who might ask, How was it possible, before the invention of the vowel-points, to teach a child the correct reading from a book which was not pointed? But this is no question. For the sacred tongue was the language which all spoke, both young and old, children and women, since they had no other language till they were led captive from their land. When, therefore, a child was being taught to know the letters, his teacher read with him from a book each verse two or three times, till he was familiar with it, and as the child was

[^73]conversant with the language, he could easily remember the words which he read, and whenever he met them again he read them without difficulty. To make this more plain to yon, listen to what I have seen, and I will relate it.

Now when I was in Rome, I saw three Chaldeans, who arrived from the country of Prester John, ${ }^{94}$ having been sent for by Pope Leo $X$. They were masters of the Syriac language and literature, though their vernacular language was Arabic. ${ }^{95}$ The special language, however, wherein the books were written, as well as that of the gospels of the Christians which they brought with them, was Syriac, which is also called Aramean, Babylonian, Assyrian, Chaldee, Tursaea or Targum, being denominated by these 5 seven names. Pope Leo X. had sent for them, in order to correct by their Codices his exemplar of his New Testament, which was written in Latin. I then saw in their hands the Book of Psalms, written in Syriac characters, as well as translated into Syriac ; that is to say, the text was written with Syriac characters, the origin, pronunciation, and form of which greatly resemble the Hebrew. Now I saw them reading this Psalter without points, and asked them, Have you points, or any signs to indicate the $e_{a}$ vowels? and

[^74]they answered me, "No! bat we have been conversant with that langiage from our youth till now, and, therefore, know how to read without points." Thus far their remark. ${ }^{96}$

You, therefore, see that it is possible for a man to learn by habit to read without points. The same was the case among us, prior to the invention of the points, and it continued till the time after the close of the Talmud, which took place in 3989 of the creation $=4.36$ after the destruction of the second Temple. Since then, the sacred tongue began gradually to disappear, till the time of the Massorites, who are the men of Tiberias, which is Mouzia. They were great sages, and thoroughly conversant with the Scriptures and the structure of the language, more so than all the other Jews who lived in that generation; and none like them have existed since. This is attested by R. Jona [Ibn Ganach], the Grammarian, in his treatise on the Quiescent Letters, which is as follows: "The distinction between the 7 with and without the Dagesh was well understood by the men of Tiberias, but not by us, for they knew better the purity of the language than all other Jews." Thus, also, says Abraham Ibn Ezra, who writes in the book Purity as follows; "97 "This is the manner of the sages of Tiberias, and they are the foundation, for from them were the Massorites, and from them we have received all our vowel-points."

This, however, I observed, that the Massorites did not give names to the points, except to the Kametz and the Pattach, in which are included the Tzere and the Segol; that is, they called the Tzere Kametz and the Segol Pattach. It was not till the rise of the first grammarians that some distinction was made between these names, and that they were thus designated. Thus, for instance, they called this point ${ }_{\tau}$ the long Kametz, this -. short Kametz, this - long Pattach, and

[^75]this - the short Pattach. But no mention whatever is made of the rest of the vowels throughout the whole of the Massorah, both magna and parva, wherin Chirek is called N, Cholem is, Shurel s, Kibutz N, and the Sheva and the three Chataphs are called by quite different names, as I shall explain in Part ii., section 3. For instance, the Massorites remark, "There are twentyone words which occur twice, once with iא, and once with as an [Ezek. xxviii. 9], and רֶּnin [Micah i. 7]; and they have no parallel ;" ${ }^{98}$ but they do not say one with Cholem and one with Shurel. They also note, "Twenty-seven words are written with $\stackrel{1}{6}$, every one of which has no parallel, as l? 23], "Pxod. xxi. 27];" ${ }^{29}$ but they do not say that they are written with Chirek. Those Codices of the Massorah, in which the name Cholem, Chirek, or Shurele occurs, do not state the language of the Massorites, but display the wisdom of the transcribers, who wrote so in order to show that they understood the Massorah.

I shall now ${ }^{100}$ state to you the reason why they did not give names to the other vowels, just as they named the Kametz and the Pattach. It is this. The forms of all other vowels have signal letters appended to them. Thus, for instance, since the Vav and the Jod are the matres lectiones of the vowels $\mathfrak{i x}$, $\mathcal{N}$, ' ${ }^{\prime}$; hence, the Massorites were satisfied with these designations, and did not give them any other names. ${ }^{101}$ But the Kametz and the Pattach, which have no such

[^76]matres lectiones, had to be dis- המשך חוצדכו לקרא להן שמות מיוחרין, וכן
 short Kametz and the short Pat tach, which have mostly no matres lectiones, as I have explained it in the "Poetical Section," had likewise to be specified by names, that is short Kametz and short Pattach. Afterwards came some grammarians who changed these names: they called the short Kametz Tzere and the short Pattach Segol, wherewith all others agree; but they do not agree in the names of the other vowels.

Hence there are some who call the vowel is Cholem and others who call it Melaphum; thus R. Solomon b. Isaac [Rashi] calls it, in his Commentary on Exod. xv. 5 and Isa. i. 31, which you may consnlt. We Germans call the vowel is Melaphum; but I do not know whence we obtained it, for in none of the works by the grammarians and the punctuators do we find it called so ; they designate it Shurek. Again, we call the vowel «् Shurek, whilst the grammarians call it threepoints, or Kibutz; generally, however, it is called Kibutz of the Lips, and some call it Kibutz of the Mouth. The vowel $\stackrel{\uparrow}{\text { is }}$ called Chirek: there are some
 קראו להן שטמות מיוחרין שהן קטן קט קטן ופתח

 סנול, ולרעח אלח הסבים דעוח כלן בשוהו,
 עליהן רעוח כלן בשוחה

 פמו במלת יבםימו ופעלו לניו ליצוץ ע"שט: ואנחנו האשבנזים קוראין לנקורת אי מלא פום, ולא
 חמרקרקים וחנקרנים שקראו לו כן, אך קר קראו
 והמרקרקים קודין לו עשל לשח נקודות או
 קורין לו קבוץ פּום, ונקרח אט קראו לו חירק
 בהרכה טקומות, וכחב שהוא נקרא כן בלשון עדבי, והתבם הכוחרי קרא לחירק שבר נרול, ולצדי שבר קטון, 102 וברור לי, כי הי החירק של חנועה קטנה, ר"ל שהיאה בלי יור לור הוא שקראו לו שבר, ואותו שהוא עם היוד קראו הידק פתם :
 שבארחי ובררחי שהנקודות והפעמים לא נחנו מםיני, ונם אנעשי בנסח הנדולה לא הא המציאום כלל, ואינם אלא מעשי ידי בעלי המסורח עשקוו אהר כך כמו שבארחי, והכלל כי הם who call it Sheber; it is so called by Ibn Ezra, in many places, and he states that this is its name in Arabic; whilst the sage author of the Khozari calls Chirek the long Sheber and Tzere short Sheber; bat I am certain that the short Chirek, that is, without the Jod, was called Sheber, and the long one, with the Jod, was simply called Chireh.

Thus have I expatiated at large upon this subject, till I have made it evident that the vowel-points and the accents were neither given on Sinai, nor were they invented by the men of the Great Synagogue, but that they are the work of the Massorites, who flourished at a later period, as I have stated. In short, they are the self-same who have

[^77]preserved the Law and the Prophets in their proper state; and there can be no doubt that, if they had not existed, the cake would have been entirely consumed, and the law would have become, as it were, two laws, and there would not have been found two Codices among all the copies of the Scriptures agreeing together, as is the case with the books of other authors.

Look at the many changes and variations which are to be found in the Targum of Onkelos, though a Massorah was made thereon, called ${ }^{103}$ The Massorah on the Targum of the Pentateuch, because it does not follow the plan of the Massorah on the Bible in numbering the words, letters, \&c., but simply enumerates some particular words, the Targum rendering of which differs from what it usually is in all other places. Thus, for instance, 'ידַּ is rendered in eleven passages by א, ${ }^{104}$ and in all the rest by
 by :iznin; $\gamma y$ is rendered twice by duction to my Lexicon, which I wrote on all the Targums; viz., Onkelos on the Pentateuch, Jonathan on the Prophets, and Aquilas on the Hagiographa (some say that the latter is by R. Joseph), ${ }^{105}$ and which I have named Methurgentan, before it has appeared. I hope to God to publish it soon, and to be permitted to see it before I die. ${ }^{106}$

In their works, however, the Massorites have toiled most diligently, and counted all the verses, words, and letters of every book, for which they are called Numberers $=$ Sopherim. Hence, by their diligence, they have so far learned to know that the Vav in

[^78]［Levit，xi．42］is the middle of all the letters in the Pentateuch；that ＂Moses diligently sought＂［Levit．x． 16］are the middle of all the words， Tin terminating the first＇half，and䖥 beginning the second；and that ＂the breast－plate＂［Levit．viii．8］ is the middle of all the verses． This they have done in all the 24 sacred books．${ }^{107}$ Moreover，they have counted the verses，words， and letters of each Pericope in the Pentateuch，and made marks accordingly．Thus，the Pericope Bereshith has 146 verses，the mne－ monical sign being the name Ama－ ziah；Noah has 153 verses，the mnemonical sign of which is Beza－ leel；${ }^{108}$ thus giving a proper name as a mnemonical sign for each hebdomadal section，to indicate the number of its verses．Again，
 explain to you how it is that $\kappa$ signifies 1000，and final $\varphi 900$ ．

You must observe that the Kabbalists and Massorites have taken the five final letters into the number of the alphabet，and thus made the entire letters to be 27 in number．They are divisible into

107 Levita evidently refers here to the fact recorded in the Talmud（Kiddushin 30 a），
 אומריט וא＂ו דגחון חציון של אוחיות של ספר תורה דרש דרש חציון של היבוח והחנלה של פסוקים ，therefore were the oncients called Sopgerim，because they numbered the letters of the Scriptures． Thus they soy that the Vav in ${ }^{[10}$［Levit．xi．42］，is the middle of all the letters of the
 ［ibid．xiii．33］，is the middle of the verses；that the Ain in $[$ Ps．lxxx．14］，is the middle letter of the Psalms，and thot＂but he，being full of compassion，forgove their iniquity＂［ibid．lxxviii．38］，is the middle of the yerses．On the aame page in the
 ，the Sages submit thot the number of verses of the Pentateuch is 5888，that of the Psalms 8 less，and thot of Chronicles 8 more．

108 From time immemorial，the Pentatench has been divided into fifty－four sections， for the parpose of hebdomadal lessons，since eome yeara，according to the Jewish chronology，have fifty－four Sabbathe．Each of these Pericopen，called Parsha（פרשi）， or Sidra（N） N ），has a 日pecial name，which it derives from the first or second word wherewith it commences；and Jewish writer日，when quoting a pascage from the Pentatench，cite the respective names of the Pericope instead of giving the chapter and verse．Bereshith，which Levita qnotes，is the name of the first Pericope，embracing Gen．i．1－vi．8，and is the firet hehdomadal lesson in the firat Sabbath of the Jewish year．The name $A m a z i o h$ ，which is the mnemonical sign of the nnmber of verses， indicates it by ite nomerical value．viz．，i $5+, 10,+y 90,+n 40,+k 1=146$ ．The hebdomadal lesson，Noah，comprises Gen．vi．9－xi．32，and the 153 versee of which it consists are indicated by the mnemonical sign Bezaleel，which is of this numerical valne， viz．$-30+k 1+\zeta 30$ and $y 90+ב 2=153$ ．A full description of the Sabbatic lessons，as well as of the manners and costoms connected therewith，is given in Kitto＇s Gyolopoedia，s．v．Haphtara．
three parts, each part consisting of 9 letters. The first part extends from $N$ to $\Delta$, and forms the units; the second part extends from , to $y$, and constitutes tens; whilst the third part constitutes the hundreds, and
 this manner the value of the letters rises to thousands, $\Omega$ being 400 , final 7 500, final $\square 600$, final ; 700, final 9800 , and final $\varphi 900$. For the number 1000 we have to return to the beginning of the alphabet, and when written out fully 1000. Some say that it is on this account called Aleph. When another number is added to it, it is only written 'א. This explains what I have said above, that $\gamma^{\prime \prime} \kappa$ signifies 1900. They have also given 1534 as the number of verses in Genesis, the sign of which is ד"ל $\boldsymbol{7}^{\prime \prime}$; 5842 as the number of verses in the whole Pentateuch; and 600,045 as the number of letters in the whole Pentateuch.

Moreover, we find that the Massorites have also counted each separate letter of the alphabet in the whole twenty-four sacred Scriptures, and have ascertained that the letter N occurs 42,377 times, the letter ב 35,218 times, the letter a 29,837 times, \&c. Indeed a beautiful poem was written long ago on this subject, beginning "The Tent, the place of my buildings," and I have heard that Saadia Gaon - is the author of it. This statement is confirmed by the fact that there are in it foreign and obscure words, which are not Biblical, such as are to be found in the work, entitled Faith [and Philosophy $],^{109}$ which .he wrote. I may, perhaps, append it to this treatise,

[^79]with a short explanation, for it is difficult to understand it without a commentary.

Now I return to the former subject, and submit that, after all the work which the Massorites have done, it is impossible for any mistake or alteration whatever to happen to any of the books of the Scriptures. It is, therefore, not in vain that our Rabbins of blessed memory have said, "The Massorah is a fence to the Scriptures," and that they have also explained the words, "Every man's sword was on his thigh, because of the terrors by night" [Song of Songs iii. 8], to refer to "the Massorah, and to the signs designed to preserve the law from being forgotten in the captivity." ${ }^{110}$ Indeed, there were hundreds and thousands of Massorites, and they continued generation after generation for many years. No one knows the time when they commenced, nor when they will end in future. For even at the present day, if any one wishes to engage in the work, and make signs and rules whereby to find out the number of words, or other Massoretic subjects, he is quite at liberty to do so; but only under this condition, that he must not add to nor diminish from anything which the men of the Great Synagogue have determined as regards plene and defective, Keri and Kethiv, the major and minor letters, the open and closed sections of the Pentateuch, \&cc., \&c. Neither must he gainsay the statements of the Massorites respecting the vowel-points and the accents, the number of words which they have counted, and marked with mnemonical signs.

Indeed I, the author of this book, have myself invented various Massoretic signs and rules, which are not to be found in the treatises of the ancients, and have embodied them in my great work, on which I have laboured more than twenty years, and which I have called The Book of Remembrance. I hope to God, blessed be

[^80]he, that it will soon make its appearance, as I have given it to be printed in the great city of Paris, in the kingdom of France. ${ }^{111}$

Remark now, that the Great Massorah, which is extant, is almost endless. Indeed I believe ${ }^{122}$ that if all the words of the Great Massorah which I have seen in the days of my life were written down and bound ap in a book, it would exceed in bulk all the twenty-four books of the Bible. I have already stated in the poetical Introduction that it is not to be found collected in any book, except in the treatise Ochla $V_{e}-O c h l a$, which is so called from its beginning words. Even the greatest part of the Massorah which has been printed here in Venice in the Great Bible is taken from this work. ${ }^{118}$ Kimchi quotes it ùnder the root pרב (vide in loco).

Now that which constitutes the Massorah marginalis is simply an abridgement of the Massorah magna; for, certainly; the Massorites would not write their remarks around the margins, since they were too small, and the space was too narrow, to contain their words. They wrote their remarks in separate treatises, and taught them publicly; hence the works were largely circulated, and the Scribes, who copied the Bible, selected from them what they pleased, each one according to his fancy, and wrote it in the margin, both above and below. Some copied large pieces, and others smaller portions, according to the size of the book into which they were writing it, as I have stated in the poetical Preface (vide supra, p. 94).

On the sides of the margins, however, and between the columns of the pages, the Massorites wrote down the suggestions, the mne-

[^81]moncal signs, the numbers of the words, and the subjects, with great brevity, indicating them by initial letters and Notaricons; and this is called the Massorah parva, as I shall explain in Part iii., called The Broken Tables. Moreover, on the centre of each word whereon they made any Massoretic gloss, they put a circle, referring to what the Massorah says respecting it. Thus, for instance, on hing and he divided, which occurs three times in the Bible, ${ }^{114}$ the circle on the top thereof refers to the ' $J$ in the margin, or the three times. The same is also the case when a word only occurs once; they put a circle on it, referring to the marginal remark, $n^{\prime}$ b or $h=n o$ other, as I shall explain in the above-named Part. When the circle is placed between two words, the marginal remark refers to both words thus joined together. Thus, for instance, the circle between ברא, God created, refers to the note in the margin, that "thrice these words occur joined together;"115 the circle between פני ${ }^{\circ}$ תהום, the face of the abyss, refers to "it occurs twice conjointly;" ${ }^{118}$ and between דוח ${ }^{\circ}$, the Spirit of God, to " it occurs eight times conjointly." 117 In the better Codices, the word conjointly is omitted, since the verse is understood without it, as I shall explain in the Second Part, section vi. When three, four, or five words are joined together for some Massoretic remark, the circle is placed between every two words. Thus, the circles between את ${ }^{\circ}$, the heavens and the earth, refer to the marginal remark $\mathrm{g}^{\prime \prime}$, " it occurs thirteen times;"118 and between וירבר •יהוה אל •טשה ואל • אהרן, and Jehovah spake to Moses

115 The three passages in which כרא אלהים occar conjointly, are Gen. i. 1, ii. 3; Deut. iv. 32.

116 The two instances in which פני חהומ occur, are Gen. i. 2; Job xxxviii. 30.
 Exod. xxxi. 3, xxxy. 31 ; Numb. xxiv. 2; Ezek. xi. 24 ; 2 Chron. xy. 1, xxiy. 20. They are enumerated in the Maesorah magaa on Exod. xxxy. 31, with the remark , וכל שמואל דכוֹ, and every passage in Samuel is like them, viz., 1 Sam. x. 1 , xi. 6, xvi. $15,16,23$; xviii. 10 , xix. 23.

116 The instances in which אחה השמים ואת חארץ occur, are Gen. i. 1; Exod. xx. 11 ; xxxi. 17; Deut. iv. 26 ; xxx. 19 ; xxxi. 28; 2 Kinge xix. 15 ; Iea. xxxvii. 16; Jerem. x xiii. 24; xxxii. 17; Hag. ii. 6, 21; 2 Chron. ii. 11.
and Aaron, refer to the marginal remark ב", " $i t$ occurs twelve times." 110 Sometimes two circles are placed on one word, referring to two separate Massoretic remarks in the margin. Thus, ivחْחְּ, from sinning, one circle refers to " 1 , "it occurs three times," and the other to "it is one of the five words in the Pentateuch wherein $N$ is deficient." ${ }^{120}$

Notice, also, that when the total number of times that a certain word occurs in the Bible is stated, the words themselves are never quoted, but the beginning of the respective verses in which these words occur are given. Thus, on לאור [Gen. 15], the marginal remark is, "It occurs seven times, and the sign thereof is 'God called' [Gen. i. 5]; ' and I will bring the blind' [Is. xlii. 16]; 'the just Lord' [Zeph. iii. 5] ; 'therefore it is for' [Is. lix 9]; 'the indignation of the Lord' [Micah. "vii. 9]; 'with the light He shall rise' [Job xxiv. 14]; 'He discovereth deep things'" [Job xii. 22]. All these are the beginnings of the verses in which the expression $\boldsymbol{\text { y }}$ occurs. Sometimes the Massoretic sign on the text is in Aramaic. Thus, on l in question, the sign is in Aramaic, "the blind man cried, intending to go out by night, and he rose in the movning." On comparison, it will be found that this sign refers to each of the seven verses quoted above. When, however, the commencing words of a verse are of frequent occurrence, such as $\mathbf{n}$, and it came to pass, ויחיה, ויאבר, and and he spalie, and haid, \&e., two or three of the principal words in the verse are selected for the sign, and not the very word which commences the verse. But this is easily understood. Sometimes the order of the verses in the Bible is inverted, to construe an attractive mnemonical sign, by combining the

[^82]words in their proper sequence. Thas, on וֹוֹב [Gen. xvii. 7], the marginal remark is, it occurs five times with Kametz, and the sign thereof is, in Aramaic, "an excellent youth ran and found wisdom," which is not according to the regular order: since youth is taken from "the youth Samuel" [1 Sam. ii. 26]; excellent, from "Saul the chosen"" [1 Sam. ix. 2]; run, from "unto the herd he ran" [Gen. xviii. 7]; and he found, from "and they found pasture" [1 Chr. iv. 40]; and wisdom, from "they increased wisdóm" [1 Kings x. 7].

As a rule, most of the remarks of the Massorites relate to the words and things which are liable to be mistaken. Thus, on ורוח אלהים, and

דבור על אופניו, והםשל וטוב ה' וסטנחון ואל חבקר רץ, וחנער שמואל, ושמו שאול ולול בחור, חוספח חכםה, וימצאו מרעה, וסימנהון בלשון ארטי, טליא בחירא רהם ואשכחח חכבהא, ולפי חםרד החה כך חוא, שמואל,
號 בטלוח וענינים ראיכא, למיחש רלמא אחי לטמעי, כנון ודוח אלהים (בראשיח אצ") ח׳ בי כל שאר וַיְדי, 123 וכאלח רבוח מאר, וכן לא בתבו ליח אלא על מלוח ראיכא לטיחש,
 אבל כמלוה שאין לחושי למעוח בהון, כנון על מרחפת לא כחבו לית, ובן על יקווי, ולמשול, הרקיע (בראשׁח א א') וֹרומיחן שאין למעוח בחן לא כחבו לית, ועל החוב חשו על מלוח שיש בחן וי"י שמושיח כראש the Spirit of God, the remark is $n$, it occurs eight times, ${ }^{120}$ for in all other passages it is רוח יהוה, the Spirit of Jehoval. The same is the case with the remark on 'יִ! , and it shall be, "it occurs thirty-two times," ${ }^{122}$ as in all other places it is so in numerous other instances. Thus, also, they did not put down the word $\boldsymbol{n}$, not extant, except in the case of those words which might be mistaken, as on h, no parallel; on twenty-three times; ${ }^{123}$ on Nביָבי, occurs seven times. ${ }^{124}$ But in cases of words which are not liable to be mistaken, such as מרחפת, hovering, or tMper , let them be gathered, or ולמשול, and to rule, or הרקיע, the firmament, \&c., \&c., these they have not marked with לית. Mostly, however, they noticed the words which in some places have the Vav prefix, and in others have

[^83]it not. Upon all this I have treated in my great work, entitled The Bools of Remembrance, where you can see it.

Some, however, maintain that the Massorah does not notice words which are liable to be mistaken, but that it cites and counts them in order to deduce therefrom some homiletical, exegetical, or legal point. Thus, for instance, when the Massorites remark on בראשית, in the beginning, $\Xi$ " $\ddagger$, " it occurs three times at the beginning of the verse,"

צחבריחן אינם כן, וכל אלה הביאותים בטפד הוכרונות חנרול ומשם תריאם :
 פחן חשצח, דק הביאום ומנו אוהם כדי ללמוד מחן מדושים ופשטים, ורינים
 מדרע, וכן ויבדל ג׳ כגנר ג׳ הפדלון שאומרים בליל מוצאי שכח בין אור לחושך
 מאר, ועל כלן יש לדרוצ איזח דבד, לפיכך כתבו בעלי המםורה מנינם, וכן חוכד על זה ספר, ויהםו אוחו לד׳ יעקופ כעל הםודים $128:{ }^{124}$ ${ }^{125}$ it is because there is a Midrash ; so they also remark on ויבדל, and he divided, 'ג, "it occurs three times," ${ }^{126}$ in harmony with the three separations which are recited at the termination of the Sabbath, viz., between light and darkness, \&c.; on יעופף, shall fy, ב, "it occurs twice"; ; 197 and in a host of other passages. From all these words some Midrash is to be deduced, and it is for this reason that the Massorités have noted down their number. To this effect a hook has been written, which is ascribed to R. Jacoh Baal Ha-Turim, of blessed memory. ${ }^{128}$

195 The three instances in which בראשׁ begins a verse are, Gen. i. 1; Jerem. xxvii. 1; xxviii. 1. Now the Talmud relates the following story:-בקש הקב'ה להחויך את העולם לתוהו ובהו בשביל ידויקים כיִן שנטתכל ברורו נתישבה דעחו בקש הקב"ה להחויר את העולם לתוהו , God wanted to reduce the world again to void and emptiness, because of the wicked Jehojakim; but when He looked at the people of His time, His mind was appeased; God again wanted to reduce the world to void and emptiness, because of the people of Zedehiah's time, but when He looked upon Zedekiah, His mind was appeased [Erachin, 17 a]. From this it will he seen, that the ennmeration hy the Massorah of these three passages in question is intimately connected with the story in the Talmud, where Jerem. xxvii. 1 and xxviii. 1 are brought together with Gen. i. 1, shewing that God wished, in those two cases where בראשטית occurs, to destroy the work of the first בראשית. Comp. also Sanhedrin, 103 a.

126 The three instances in which ויברו occurs, are as follows:-Gen. i. 4; 7; 1 Chron. xxv. 7. From this the ecclesiastical legislators deduced, that "Whoso recites the separations which God effected must not mention less than three . . . . because ויבדל occurs three times" (בל הפוחת לא יפחות משעלשה הבדלות, Pessachim, 103 b-104a). The reference here is to the prayer which the Jews to this day offer on the Sahbath evening, at the going out of the sacred day and the coming in of the week day, and which is denominated Havadalah (הבדלה). In this prayer, which is as follows, are contained

 Our God, King of the world, who hast made a separation between the holy and the common, a separation between light and darlness, and a separation between Israel and the other nations. Comp. also Jacoh h. Chajim's Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, p. 12 Hehrew and p. 32 English, ed. Ginsburg.

127 The two instances in which ${ }^{2}$ יצופן occure are, Gen. i: 20 ; Isa. vi. 2. From the combination of these two passages, in which alone the expression occurs, it is dednced that the angels are included in the winged creatures, created on the fifth day of the hexahemeron. Comp. Midrasch Rabba on Genesis, p. 3 a, ed. Stettin, 1863.
${ }^{128}$ Jacob b. Asheri, also called Baal Ha-Turim, after his celebrated Ritual Work,

However, I have noticed that he והנה ראיחי שאינו משרש רק המלוה only explains the words which occur חנמצאות ב׳ או נ׳ או ד' דאו ח׳ פעמים, ולא
 but not more. Now what is to be מאה פעםים ויוחר, כנון בעיני קל"ם, ראש done with those which occur from ten, twenty, to a hundred times, \&c.? As for instance, the eyes of, which occurs 139 times ; שרא, head, which occurs 151 times. How is it possible to assign a reason for all these? But the words of the Law are like a hammer, which

קנב"א, איך אפשדר לתח טעם על כלן, אר רבי חורה כפםיש יפוצץ סלע מחחלק לכמח נצוצוח, ובשבעים.פנים החורה נדרשת, וככן נשלמו חחקרמורז, בעזרח יוצר נשמורז, ובשםו אהחהיל התבור, ואכאר כל דבור ודבור, מן דברוח העשר, של כל מלא וחסר, ודימן ומשפמן, וזהו פרחן : breaks the rock and divides it into many pieces, since the Law may be interpreted in seventy different ways. Herewith the Introductions are completed, by the help of Him who creates souls, and in whose name I shall commence the Treatise itself, and explain cach one of the ten sections on plene and defective, their laws and regulations; and the contents thereof are as follows:-

[^84]
## FIRST PART.

Section I. treats on defective and plene in so far as they relate to the matres lectiones Vav after Cholem and Shureck, and Jod after Chirek and Tzere.

Section II. treats on the passages wherein the $V a v$ is absent after the Cholem in verbs and nouns, and the difference between them.

Section III. treats on nouns which are Milra and have a Vav plene after the Cholem on the top, and those which are Milra and have not the Vav; as well as of all the Cholens of the participle Kal, which are generally defective, and most of the plurals feminine which have a $V a v$ at the end.

Section IV. treats on the absent Vav of the Shurek, and on the Kibutz being substituted in its place.

Section V. treats on all the words which have a long Chirek, i. e., Chiruk with a Jod, having mostly Jod; and on those words which have Cholem, being mostly defective of Vav.

Seotion VI. treats on the quiescent Jod after the Tzere and Segol, as well as on the quiescent Jod after the Kametz of the third person.

Seotion VII. treats on the plene and defective of monosyllabic words, being small words.

Section VIII. treats on the Massoretic marks, or words, which have two or three quiescents, some being plene and some defective, ${ }^{1}$ or all being plene or all defective.

[^85]Section IX. treats on words הדבור התשיעי בכיאור חמלוח שישיש
which have a quiescent Aleph, either expressed or not, and which are called 'with audible Alephs,' or ' without audible Alephs.'

Section X. treats on words, the final He of which is either plene or defective, and are called Maphkin $H e$, consisting of four kinds.

## END OF THE OONTENTS OF THE FIRST PART.

Seotron I.-I, Elias Levita, the author, have already explained, in my Poetical Dissertation, ${ }^{2}$ the law of the letters $\mathrm{N}^{\prime \prime}$ T, which prolong the syllables, and are quiescent; for their nature is to be quiescent in the middle and end of the word, as well as to indicate the five long vowels, respecting which I have given the mnemonical sign, "Good Elijahu." ${ }^{3}$ Now, there ought properly to be one of the letters אה"וין after every long vowel. Thus, after Kametz in the middle of the word there ought to be a quiescent Aleph, and at the end of the word Aleph or He quiescent; after Chirek and Tzere there ought to be a quiescent Jod; and after Cholem and Shurek a quiescent Vav. But they do not. generally occur so in the Scripture, and it is these which the Massorites call defective, and whenever they do occur they are denominated plene.

4 Know that the import of most of the defectives and plenes, which the Massorites have marked as such, is about the quiescent Vav and Jod in the middle of the word, Vav after Cholem and Shureh, and the Jod after Chirele and Tzere; and that in only few cases did they remark plene and defective upon Aleph and $H e$, as I shall explain hereafter. I shall begin with the absence of the Vav at the Cholem, for this occurs most frequently, and say-

[^86]Know that most of the words with Cholem in the Scriptures want the mater lectionis Vav. Still, the Massorites have not marked as defective every word with Cholem which has not the Vav; nor have they marked as plene every word with Cholem which has the mater lectionis Var; but they have only noted those words as defective which generally have Cholem with the Vav, but which, in a few instances, occur without $V a v$; as I shall explain hereafter. The same is the case with the words which generally have Cholen without Vav; when these occur with Vav the Massorites have marked them plene. ${ }^{4}$

The general rule is, that in the case of all the words which occur more as plene than defective, the Massorites enumerated the defective; and whenever the defectives are more frequent than the plenes, they enumerated the plenes, as I shall explain in the-following Section. Know, moreover, that the vowel-point is never altered because of its being defective or plene, except in the case of the Shurele with Vav, which is changed into Kibutz of the lips, as I shall explain in Section iv.

Know, also, that the meaning of the word is never changed because of defective and plene. Hence it is that there is never Keri and Kethiv with respect to defective and plene, as I have already stated in the Introduction. Know, likewise, that there is a difference between the simple word defective, marked on a certain word, and the Massorites saying, and defective, with the Vav conjunctive, as well as between the simple plene and and plene. This I shall explain in Part ii., Sect. viii. I shall there also explain the import of the phrases, 'entirely plene,' 'entirely defective,' as well as the meaning of 'partly plene and partly defective,' and 'partly defective and partly plene.'

Section II.-There is no noun to be found in the whole Bible, with Cholem as the last vowel, which is not written plene, with the mater lectionis Vav, except in a few instances which deviate from this rule,

[^87]as I shall explain in the following section. Upon these plenes there was no necessity to remark that they are plene because they are the most frequent, as I have stated in the preceding Section.

Know that just as nouns are generally plene, so verbs are generally defective. Thus, for example, the word 7 ְּק, number, whereon the Massorites remark "it occurs four times-twice plene and twice defective," viz.: "Number all the first-born" [Numb. iii. 40], and "Number the children of Levi" [ibid. iii. 15], both of which are defective, because they are verbs; whilst "Against the inhabitants of Pekod" [Jer. 1. 21], and."Pekod and Shoa" [Ezek. xxiii. 23], are plene, because they are proper names. Thus, also, the future tense, as אמפְך, I shall number, and 7קִ.', he shäll number, \&c., which is generally defective, the Massorites have not noted as defective, because it is mostly so. And even verbs in which the second letter is quiescent, because the middle-stem letter is Vav, as, for instance, I shall come, since these are generally defective, the Massorites counted the plenes.

Take, for example, nouns, the last, vowel of which is Cholem, as לin great, how honour,祘 north, as well as nouns which have an additional syllable, either at the


 on all the above, and the like, the Massorites did not remark plene, because they are generally so written, but they counted the defectives, as $\boldsymbol{p}_{\mathrm{i}}$, holy, occurs thirteen times defective; ${ }^{5}$ also when it is in the con-


[^88]defective; 7 her peace of, eight times defective; ${ }^{8}$ 草 remembrance of, three times defective. ${ }^{9}$ There are, again, a few words which are always defeetive, for which reason the Massorites did not consider it necessary to mark them as defective, as small, מְ very, Mower. About sint, and all, I shall speak ${ }^{10}$ in Section viii., if God permit.

As to the plenes, about which I treated above, and their like, when they occur with $n$ feminine, they too generally continue plene, as
 \&c.; but the reverse is the case with plurals, both masculine and feminine, because they are generally defective, as as the great, mas., ם קִּ the holy, mas., mas., the far, mas., תilt the great, fem.,
 fem. This is because there are two quiescents following each other in these words, as I shall explain in its proper place, in Section viii. Thus, also, every Cholem which stands before $\Omega$ in the feminine plural is according to rule plene,

 chers, and to bakers [1 Sam. viii. 13]. The same rule obtains in all the plurals and participles, both active and passive; as תictpe and
 which need not be adduced. All feminine plurals, however, which have no Vav, the Massorites marked as defective. Thus, for instance, ת coming down [Exod. iị. 5]; and תi'י', they are sitting [1 Kings iii. 17]. About the participles passive, I shall speak in its proper place, in Section vii., and I shall also discuss all this in the Section on the two quiescents, which is Section viii.

[^89]Section III.--There is no triliteral noun to be found, the first syllable of which has Cholem with the mater lectionis Vav, except when the accent is on the ultima, since, in those which have the tone on the penultima, the Cholem in' the first syllable is generally without the mater lectionis Vav. Plenes, for example, are עּ שּוֹכָב , עוֹלָם eternity star,
 Also, those with Tzere; ex. gr., איאֹיב raven, $a$ vine. These are generally plene; the defectives are but few, as לעשלָ for ever, which occurs 18 times defective; ${ }^{11}$ รTid lot, 4 times defective in this form ; ${ }^{12}$ seal, 7 times defective in this form; ${ }^{13}$

הרבור השדישי: לא השא את שם של שלש אוחיוח נעוח על שפחריך, בשהחתועה הראשונה חולם עם וי"ו, רק במעם טלרע, כי אוחם שהם בטעם מלעיל, החולם שבראשם חסר וי"ו על חדוב, והמלאים כמו עוֹלָם, כּוֹבָּ,
 אוֹרֵב, עוֹרֵב, שוֹרֵק, רוכן מלאים, והחכרים הם

 חהדים בלישנה,הי14 ועור אוריעך מהו ענין בלישנא בלוחוח שניוח, במאסר ט' : וכן בשמות נהי פ"י, י״"ר הבאים בחוםפח
 מוּצָא, صוֹרָא, מוֹצִ, מוֹאּת, ודומיחן, והחשרים חם מעםים מאר, אכל אוֹחת, אוֹתָּ, אוֹדי,אוֹחדם, אהֹחה, אע"םי שהם בטעם מלרע רובן חכרים, םפני רבויים, לפיכך נמנין הםלאים ולא
 ביN enemy, three times defective in this form. ${ }^{14}$ I shall acquaint thee with the meaning of בלישנא, in this form, in Part ii., Section ix.

Moreover, nouns derived from irregular verbs, the first radical of which is Jod, and which have an additional Mem or Tav, are gene-

 exceedingly few. But the pronouns inis him,
 defective. Hence, because these are the majority, therefore the plenes are enumerated, and not the defectives. Thus, on inis him, it is remarked, "it occurs twenty-four times plene;" ${ }^{15}$ on $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{T}}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathrm{K}$ thee, " it

[^90] on אוֹחִּ ב"ז מלאיםם, plene;" 17 on "אֹח $m$, "twentyseven times plene;" ${ }^{18}$ on ${ }^{\text {on }}$ (hem, "thirty-nine times plene" in the Pentateuch, and the sign of it is "for it is full $[=$ plene $]$ of dew $\left[\begin{array}{c} \\ 0\end{array}=39\right] .{ }^{19}$ The Massorites have also counted the plene of the word anik them, in each book of the Bible, except Jeremiah and Ezekiel, where they have counted באוריחא, וסיטן נטלא טל, 19 וכן בכל ספר וספר ימנח לםי מלת אוֹדָם חמלאים, חויץ בירמיה וביחוקאל נמנין החסרים, למי שהום
 בטעם מלעיל רובן דרובן חסרים, כמו דֹדֶט,
 קרֶּ ונמסר עליו ליח מלא, ומלת לית חחבאר בשער שברי לוחות, וכן חחח שוֹנְּד האלח מלא, וכבמעם אצין עור מלאים במשקל זה: the defectives, because they are the fewer; and they likewise tell us that $n$ nivis $h e r$, occurs twelve times. ${ }^{20}$ But the nouns, with the tone on the penultima, are mostly defective; as win the new moon, קוֶֹ holiness, holiness [Dan. xi. 31], the Mỉassorites remark, "there is no paralïl case of plene." The meaning of the expression. ${ }^{\text {. }}$, I shall explain in the Third Part, denominated The Broken Tables. The word 7 thicket [2 Sam. xvii. 9] is also plene; and 'besides these, there are almost no plenes in this form of the noun.

Jerem. xviii. 10 ; xxxvii. 15; Ezek. xvii. 17; xliii. 20; Ho6. x. 6; Mal. i. 12, 13; iii. 22; Pe. xviii. 1; lvi. 1 ; lxvii. 8 ; ci. 5. They are confueedly enumerated in the Massorab finalis, p. 13 b, col. 2, with the remark, that throughout the books of Joshua and Judges it is likewise plene, with the exception of two passages.

16 The seventeen instances in which ${ }^{16}$ masculine, occurs plene are, Gen. xvii. 2; xx. 6; xl. 19; xli. 39; Exod. ix. 15; xxy. 9, 22; xxxii. 10 ; Deut. ix. 14; 2 Sam. xxiv. 24 ; Ezek. ii. 3 , 4 ; iii.' 27 ; xxix. 5 ; xxxviii. 4,17 ; Pe. xxv. 5 . They are enumerated in the Massorah finalis, p. 13 b , col. 3 .
${ }^{17}$ The seventeen instances in which אותך feminine occars plene, are Gen. xxxix. 9 ; Namb. v. 21 ; Judg. xiv. 15 ; Jerem. ii. 35 ; xi. 17; xxx. 14; Ezelk. xvi. 4, 39, 40, 57, 59,60 ; xxii. 14, 15 ; xxiii. 25, 29 . They are enumerated in the Massorab finalis, p. 13 b, cols. 3 and 4 .
${ }_{1 s}$ The twenty-seven passagee in which Isa. xxxvii. 6; liv. 15; lvii. 11 (twice) ; lviii. 2; Jerem. iv. 22; v. 22; ix. 5, 23; xiii. 5, 25 ; xvi. 11; xx. 11; xxv. 6 ; xxxi. 34 ; xxxvii. 18; Ezel. vi. 9 ; xxiii. 35 (twice); xl. 3 ; Ps. xxxi. 6 ; Esth. 7 . 12; Lament. iii. 2; Nehem. vi. 14. They ere given in the Massorah finalis, p. $13 b$, col. 3, with the remarl that k is also plene thronghout the books of Joshaa and Judges, except in two instances.

19 The thirty-nine passages in which an is plene in the Pentateuch are as follows: Gen. xli. 8; xlix. 28, 29 ; l. 21 : Exod. xiv. 9; xxix. 3: Levit. x. 2; xiv. 51 ; xv. 10, 29 ; xvii. 5 ; xxii. 16 ; xxiii. 43 ; xxiv. 6 ; xxv. 55 : Numb. iv. 12, 19, 23, 49 ; v. 4 ; vi. 20 ; vii. $3,5,6$; Exv. 4, 17 ; Deut. iii. 6,28 ; ix. 28 ; x. 15 ; xii. 29 ; xviii. 12, 13 ; xxvi. 16; xxvii. 26; xxxi. 7, 10. They are most confasedly enumerated in the Messorah
 my head is filled with dew, from Song of Songs v. 2, is exceedingly ingenious and beartifnl. The force of it will be understood, when it is remembered that the word wev head, is figuratively used for the Law, or the Pentateuch, and is so rendered by the Chaldee Paraphreste on Song of Songs v. 11; that the word אלאמ, full, is exactly the expression for plene; and that the numerical value of the word לo, dew, is 39.
${ }_{20}$ The twelve passages in which אוחה occurs plene are, Numb. xxii. 33; xxx. 9: 1 Sam. xiv. 27: 2 Sam. xiii. 18: Isя. xxvii. 11; xxviii. 4, ; xxxvii. 26; Jerem. xxxii. 31; xxxii. 2: Hosea iv. 19: Malachi. i. 13: Ps. xxvii. 4. They are enumerated in the Messorah marginalis on Nnmb. xxii. 33, with the remark that וכל יהושוע שיפטים ויתוקאל , "it is also plene throughout the books of Joshua, Judges, and Ezekiel, with the exnention of three, nassaces."

Moreover, all those which have Pattach before the guttural in this form are generally defective, as


 and only a few of these are plene, as 7vis Zoar, which occurs three times plene; sometimes Milel, and sometimes Milra; and there is a division of opinion about them. Likewise

 In a tunic, are defective, because they are Milel; ת an exception, for it is always written fully, except in two instances, in which it occurs defective. ${ }^{22}$ The Cholems, too, of the participle Kal,

וכן חפחוחים טפני אוח הנרון על משקל






 מן ב' חסדים, 22 וכל חולם כבינוני הקל על


 דָאמְרוֹת לאדוניהם; והמלא

 בלששון יהיר, ואין רומח לחן בנל חמקדא,
 עוֹחָן וכן כלם, נמסר על כל אחד מלא, 27 ומלת are generally without Vav, whether

 they are eating, and drinking, and dancing [1 Sam. xxx. 16] ; or plural
 iv. 1]. ${ }^{23}$ It is the plenes of all these which are enumerated in the
 ten times plene. ${ }^{26}$ The same is the case with the twenty-four instances of plene in the singular, which have no parallel in the whole Bible; as



[^91]an exception to this rule, for in in some portions of the Bible the in- המלאים, וביש מקומוח נמנין התסרים, כנון stances in which it is written fully are enumerated, whilst in others the defectives are counted. Thus, in the Pentateuch and in the earlier prophets the plenes are coupted, whilst in the later prophets the defectives are enumerated. The same is the case in every book of the Hagiographa; some count the plenes and some the defectives.

The plural, both masculine and feminine, of the participle, is generally written without Vav, and only in few instances is it written fully, as plene; ;28 ${ }^{28}$, three times plene. ${ }^{29}$ In every such instance the Massorites remark plene. Thus, on the word "יוֹרְדָי" [Lam. i. 16], the Massoretic remark is "it has no parallel, and it is plene;" on חַחוֹלֶכת [Nehem. כתורה וגביזאים ראשונים נמנים נמין הטלאים, וכנביאים אתרונים נמנין החפרים, וכן בכל ספר וספר מכחוכים בקצחן נמנין המלאים, וכקצחן נמנין התסרים : ורוב לשון רמים ורכוח כבינוני חכדים

 עליהן מלאیם, וכן יִּדְדָה מים, נמטר עליו ליח ליח ומלא, וכן ההוֹלֶָּ למואל (נחמיח י"ב) ליח וטלא, אנרוחיהם הוֹלְכוֹת ליח ומלא, הַיּלְרוֹת מעיר דויר ליח ומלא, ועוד אדבדו מהם בדכור ח׳: אכל כפעלים שהחולם בתנועה ראשונה והו"ו בהן שרשיח, הם על הרוב


 יו"ד פ"א הפעל, כנון בנפעל והפעיל נוֹדַע,
 zii. 38], the Massorites remark "no parallel, and plene;" on תish [Nehem. vi. 17], "no parallel, and
 treat again on this subject in Section viii. But the verbs which have Cholem on the first syllable, and whose Vav belongs to the

 The same is the case with those verbs in which Vav stands instead of the first radical letter Jod, as in the Niphal and Hiphil, viz., , עוֹרַע, נוֹרַעְחָ, הוֹדִיעַ מוֹרִיעֵ, these are generally written fully.

| פות. | Gen. xli. 8 | שוכב |  | Ezek. iv. 9 | בוקר | Amos vii. 14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| הולם. | Deut. xiii. 4 | צוגך |  | Jerem. iv. 14 | חורשי | Amos ix. 13 |
| טוחקן. | Judg. xvi. 21 | הורג |  | Ezek. xxi. 16 | ועוטר | Nahum i. 2 |
| בוצי\% | . 1 Sam. xiv. 4 | דוֹלש |  | Isa. xiv. 12 | גורו | Nahnm i. 4 |
| .שורק. | Jerem. ii. 21 | נקובה |  | . Isa. xxiv. 2 | הדולג | Zeph. i. 9 |
| בבוצר | Jerem. vi. 9 | דולם. |  | Isa. xli. 7 | נוכל | Malachi i. I4 |
| קולצ | Jerem. x. 18 | חובי |  | - Isa. xxx. 18 | דותגר | Ps. xliii. 5 |
| פותיד | Jerem. xlví. 25 | טיחקט |  | Isa. lxvi. 3 <br> Hos. ix. 15 | דובר | Ps. 1viii. 6 |

They are given both in the Massorah marginalis on Genesis xli. 8, and in the Massorah finalis under the letter Vav, p. $27 b$, cols. 3 and 4.
${ }^{28}$ This must be a slip of the pen, since there are four instances in which is plene, viz., Ezekiel xiv. 22; xlvíi. 8, 12; Zechariah 6, 8. They are enumerated in the Massorah marginalis on Ezekiel xiv. 22.
${ }^{29}$ This surely must likewise be a mistake, since $\begin{aligned} \text { יושנים occurs ten times plene, viz., }\end{aligned}$ Judg. vi. 10: Isa. x. 13: Jerem. xxxvi. 12; xlív. 13: Ezel. iii. 15; viii. 1: 2 Chron. x viii. 9 (twicc) ; xxx. 25 ; xxxi. 6. The Massorah finalis enumerates them under tho

Seotion IV.-Notice that those words which have always Vav with Shuref are never noted by the Massorites as plene, ${ }^{30}$ since it is understood that Shuretc cannot be without Vav, and it is well known that Dagesh cannot follow it. Hence those words wherein Dagesh does follow the Vav, as הוּנָּ who is born [Judg. xiii. 8], \&e., which the grammarians call" quiescent with Dagesh," the Massorites marked plene; whilst those wherein Vav is wanted, according to the Massorah, Kibbutz takes its place, and they are marked in the Massorah as defective.

It is, however, to be remarked that this Kibbutz is not called a short vowel, since a long vowel is never changed into a short vowel because of the absence of the mater lectionis, but that there are two kinds of Kibbutzs. The one, as I have already said, which takes the place of Vav with Shuret, which is wanted, and the second is really the short vowel, and is never marked by the Massorites as defective. If thou shouldst ask, How is it to be known whether it is the Kibbutz of the long vowel that takes the place of Vav with Shurel, or whether it is the short vowel, and does not stand for Vav with Shurele? the reply is, It is known from grammar that there is a Dagesh or quiescent Sheva after every short vowel, as I have explained it in the Poetical Section.

楽穻 Hence, if a Kibbutz occurs, followed by Dagesh, or a quiescent Sheva, it is a really short vowel, and the Massorites do not note it as defective; as, for instance, the Pual thou wast numbered,
 seers [2 Chron. xxxiv. 12]. But when it is not followed either by Dagesh or quiescent Sheva, then it stands for Vav, with Shurelc, and the Massorites mark it as defective. Thus, for instance, in out [Jerem. xiv. 16.], the Kibbutz is not marked as defective, for it is a short vowel, because there is a quiescent Sheva after it, whereas nis in

[^92]into the streets［Ibid．］，is marked as defective，because it is neither fol－ lowed by Dagesh nor by a quiescent Sheva．Thus，also，עַקָּדים נְקָּדּים וּיְרָּים，ringstraked，specklèd，and dotted［Gen．xxxi．10］，are not marked as defective，because they have Dagesh，whilst ble，and a per the strong［Gen．xxx． 42］，are marked as defective，because they have no Dagesh．For the

 bernacle，${ }^{\text {NTP }}$ तlaw，\＆c．，are not marked as defective，because they have a quiescent Sheva or Dagesh．

Hence every Kibbutz at the end of a word is marked by the Masso－ rites as defective，because neither Dagesh nor a quiescent Sheva can be at the end of a word．Thus，the nouns 亿ą border［2 Sam．xxi．5］， Y habitation［1 Kings viii．13］， ת captivity［Obad．i．20］，\＆c．，as well as the verbs，viz．－－ prolong［Deut．v．16，vi．2］， ye shall cast［Exod．xxii．30］， let him arise［Gen．xxvii．31］，呎 arise［Joshua vii．10］，ב凶ֻ return ［Exod．iv．19］，\＆c．；all these，and the like，are marked as defective． The word נְ נְیם oracle，however，is an exception，and the Massorites do not mark it as defective，because it never occurs plene；there is no parallel in the whole Bible of a word occurring so often，and always with Vav defective．

Notice，also，that most of the Kal participles passive singular， both masculine and femenine，are written fully．In the masculine，as ，it is written， being few，as םy：despised［Prov．xxii．14］，\＆c．；and feminine，as wern cursed［Gen． iii．17］，שְַריכָה，leept［2 Sam．xxiii．5］，\＆c．The defectives in this case too being very few，as ${ }^{\top}$ ． ［Numb．xxviii．6］．But in the construct state they are mostly defective，
 ［Hos．iii．1］，\＆ce．，there being only a few which are written fully，as ypained［Is．liv．6］．

Thus, also, the nouns of this form are generally plene in the absolute state, as as in strength, קְבוּרוּרֶה sepulchre, , fective in the construct, as קִבירח sepulchre of [Gen. xxxv. 20], קְ heap of [Ezek. xxii. 20], \&c.; but plene are and desert [Isa. lix. 18], \&c. The plurals are very seldom plene, as 15], a the cursed [1 Sam. xxvi. 19], , \&c., whilst the defectives are by far the most, as closed [1 Kings vi. 4], [Numb. xvii. 4], \&c. Also, written, is always defective in the Pentateuch, though it is plene in the Prophets and Hagiographa; as well as the plurals feminine, which are almost all defective, as nimin given Deut. xxviii.31], תing bound up [Exod. xii. 34], nis, wiw burned Isa.

 too, which are according to this form, are mostly defective in the masculine, as ${ }^{\text {פּרֻבים Cherubim, which occurs thirteen times defec- }}$ tive; ${ }^{81}$ עע pillars, eleven times defective; 32 night of celebration [Exod. xii. 42], and םיר Day of atonement [Levit. xxiii. 28], are both defective in this form. The same is the case with
 [Dan. viii. 22], Míp discuss this subject in Section x. which you will see.

Section V.-Both the prophets and other writers have paid much more attention to the quiescent Jod with Chirek, than to the quiescent

[^93]Vav with Cholem; and this is be. cause they have both removed and omitted the Vav, as I have already stated; whereas they. have both left and put down the quiescent Jod in many places. Hence, the punctuators called the Chirek, followed by Jod, a long Chirek, that is, a long syllable; and Chirek, not followed by Jod, they denominated short Chirek, or short syllable. There are therefore two kinds of Chireks, one short and the other long; the short one, according to rule, is without Jod, and is called a short syllable; whilst the long one, according to rule, has a Jod, and is called a long syllable.

壁 It is for this reason that the Chirek of the short syllable is never marked by the Massorites as defective, and the Chirel of the long syllable is never marked as plene. Sometimes, however, the long syllable occurs without Jod, then the Massorites mark it as defective; as יבּנִּ הת̦งฺา, thou hast seen [Ps. x. 14], \&c.

The sign whereby the Chirek of the short syllable may be distinguished from the Chirele of the long syllable, is by the absence of Jod. It is the same as the one I stated in the case of the Kibbutz. That is, whenever Chirek is followed by Dagesh or quiescent Sheva, it is a short syllable, and when these do not follow it, and yet Jod is absent, then it is a long syllable, and is defective, according to the Massorah. For instance, on יתִipagle and I shall perform [Gen. xxvi. 3], the Massorites remark, "Jod is wanted," because there is no Dagesh after the Chireh, ${ }^{33}$ and, according to rule, ought therefore to be plene; whereas on remark that the Jod is wanting, because it is a short syllable, for there is Dagesh after it.

According to rule, every Chirek which is not followed by Dagesh, or quiescent Sheva, ought to be plene, and is generally plene. That is, when it is followed by an audible letter at the end of the word, as קָּ

[^94]
 A few of the proper names are to be כנון ואחת אוֹפִר ואחת חוילה, וםחשבון ער

 also, the name 7 Tָּ defective, except in five instances in which it is plene. ${ }^{34}$ The Chirek is never followed by a quiescent letter at the end of the word, except
 המבִּא he brought, מֵבִיא bringing, אֲבִיא
 she shall spue out [Levit. xviii. 28]; but N xviii. 25], which wants Jod, has very few parallels. But Chirek, before the plural termination $\square^{\text {² }}$, is most generally written fully, as
 known [Deut. i. 13], \&c. This, however, is the case where no other Clivek of a long syllable precedes it, as in those instances which I have

 אתבם, חסד יו"ד ורוטיחן טעטים; אבל החידק שלפני יו"ד ום"ם חדבים רובו דרובו מלא,
 ודומיחן, וחה דווקא כשאין לפניו חידק אחד של חנועה נדולה כמו אלה שכחבתי ודומשין:

 חדומים לאלה, תחסד יו"ד הדבים על הדוב,




 כנון כבשים, אֵילֵים, צִיִים ודומיהן, וכל לשין
 already stated, and the like cases.

But when two Chireks do follow each other, as in the
 Jod of the ploral is frequently omitted. Thus, הַתֵּנינִ, the sea monsters, is three times defective in this form. ${ }^{35}$ The same is the case with , צַּדִיקִים, the righteous, which is always defective in the Pentateuch, except in one place; ${ }^{36}$ the same with four times in the Pentateuch; and likewise in the Prophets and Hagiographa, except in four instances where it is case with ${ }^{\text {anp }}$ without blemish; when it refers to animals it is defective; that is, whenever it is the predicate to sheep, rams, goats, \&c. The word גְבִיִִים prophets, is always defective in the books of Samuel

[^95]and Jeremiah, except in three instances in Samuel and in eight instances in Jeremiah; ${ }^{38}$ goblets, too, is always defective; goats, is always defective, except in two instances; ${ }^{39}$ צְpִיִם bracelets [Gen. xxiv. 30), and many others, are likewise defective. A few plurals, which are preceded by Tzere and Chirele, are also defective. Thus, י's, rams, has never the Jod plural in the Pentateuch, except in four instances; ${ }^{40}$ the same is the case with הימימם, the hot springs [Gen. xxxvi. 24]. Besides the Tzere, we find defective, which has no parallel in the Scripture.

Moreover, the participles Hiphil, because they have two Chirelis following each other, are also wanting in most cases the Jod of the plural. Three instances of it are to be found in the Pentateuch, viz., מְַַּבִידִם making labour [Exod. vi. 5], מַקְּדּ making holy [Levit. xxii. 2], and

 before the termination $\Omega$, which is always plene, as $n$ begininning,
 there are two Chireks together, as fifth, \&c., which are generally defective.

The rule is that all the plurals of both participles and nowns, which have not two Chireks following each other, are written fully, except in a few instances, as מַּוּחִם banished [Lam. ii. 14], \&c. . Rashi's remarks on פִּילַגְּשִׁם concubines [Gen. Xxv. 6], that it is defective, which is taken from Bereshith Rabba, is contrary to the Massorah, for the Massorites mark it "twice plene." 11

[^96]

 as defective, and remarks on it that it is not plene; so also doorposts [Deut. xi. 20], according to the Talmud is defective, whereas according to the Massorah it is plene; and מַשְבִִירִים [1 Sam. ii. 24], too, is according to the Talmud defective, and according to the Massorah plene. ${ }^{12}$

Notice, also, that in some of the words which have two Chireks, the first Jod is defective. Thus, B branches [Genesis xl. 10], wants the second Jod, whilst שָּרִים branches [Gen. xl. 12], wants the first Jod; ; צִּקִּ the righteous [Hos. xiv. 10], wants the first Jod, whilst צַּפְיקם the righteous [Ezek. xxiii. 45], wants the second Jod. The same is the case with which wants the first Jod five times; and there are some words wanting both Jods, as xiv. 7],

The participles Hiphil, too, are found wanting the first Jod; as
 15], מַחְלְמִּם dreaming [Jerem. xxix. 8], \&c. All the other tenses of Hiphil, however, are generally plene, and there are but few found defec-
 [Levit. ix. 12, 18],

The plurals of the passive participles Kal, however, sometimes occur without Jod, but this only takes place when the Vav is written fully, and it is to prevent two quiescents following each other, as I have already explained in Section ii. For example, the words they are given, they are given [Numb. iii. 9], are both with-

[^97] fully written，whilst are given，they are given［Numb． viii．16］，are defective of Vav，be－ cause they have Jod plene；as you will see on examination．

紫写 The general rule is that the Chirek of the long syllable has mostly the Jod written fully，whilst Cholem generally is without Vav． There is no necessity for me to explain to you that Cholem and Chirelt，with quiescent Vav and Jod at the end of a word，are always plene；as iד̦ his hand，רוֹ his foot， \＆c．，since it is evident that Vav and Jod can never be omitted in such cases，because a vowel－point can never be under the final letter of a word，except under Kaph，Tav， and final Nun．These have some－ times Kametz at the end of a word， as I shall explain in Section $x$ ．

Section VI．－A quiescent Jod does not follow $T$ Tere，except when it belongs to the root，or when it indicates the plural．It belongs to the root，as doing good， ב＇טֵ I shall dogood［Gen．xxxii．13］， phin she shall nurse［Exod．ii．7］， ה I I shall go［Micah i．1］； and it stands for the radical $H e$ ，as צ I commanded［Deut．iii．21］， קִ I wait［Isa．v．4］，and in a few
有 על הדרוב הוא מלא יו＂ד，והחולם על חדוב
 בי החולם וחחידק שכטוף ההיבה עם הוי״י הנחה או חיוי＂ד חנחה，הם חמיד טלאצים， רחיינו שתפיר הוי＂ו כתובה עם החולם，
 רִגְּי ודומיחן，בי פשׁימא שלא יחכרו הוני＂ו והיודי＂ן באלה לעולם，בי לא תבא נקרח באות שבקוף המלח לִעולם，זולהי החי והכף והננן．שהם קמוציט לפעשים בםוף התיכה， בטו שאודיעך בדבור העשירי： הרבור הששים ：לא תבא יו＂ד נחה אחד
הצרי דק בשחיא שרשית，או שהחורה על לשין דבים，השרששיח במו היחים איחיטיב עמך
 ובשהיא במקום ה＂א שרששיח，כמו יהושע
 שהיו＇ד שרשׁה，כמו בֵּיה ה＇צֵין אדם，וכן
 צדרעט צור，שוב，ועוד אדבד מבל אלה ברבור פואחר זה：
והיו״＂ד הבאח אהד הצדי להורוח על לשון
דבים，היא היו＂ד הבאה בבנוי הכטתרים והנםחרוח，והנטצאים וחנמצאוח，בשמות של

 עליהן מלא ל＇לעולם，ונםצאים מעםים חמדים，

 more such instances．The same is the case in those nouns in which Jod is radical，as house，
 of which are 7\％，בוש，I shall recur to this subject in the next Section．

The Jod after Tzere，to indicate the plural，is the same Jod as is used with the suffix in plural nouns of the third and second persons，both masculine and feminine，as as their sons，בְּנֵּ sons， their daughters， in the Massorah as plene；and a few of these are found defective，as
 The expressions
in every book of the Scriptures, and they are counted according to the Massorah. Thus, also, the suffix first persons in nouns, as an בּנְעָ with our youth, with our sons (Exod. x. 9), are not marked by the Massorites as plene. But the nouns which have the pronoun, first person, pointed alike, both in the singular and plural, and in which there is no difference in the points, except that the plural has Jod, these are marked by the Massorites as plene.

Thus, for instance, ציד דיני hands [Deut. xxi. 7], has the Massoretic mark plene, whilst our hand (Gen. xxxvii. 27), is marked defective, because it is the singular, as is evident from the
 feet (Ps. cxxii. 2), is marked plene,
 is marked defective, because it is the singular. Whereas word (Josh. ii. 14), which is the singular, as is evident from the word it this; and the expres-
 in which Jod is wanting, are never marked as defective, because they do not occur in the plural. Bat the words wherein a quiescent Jod is expressed after Tzere, which Jod neither belongs to the root nor indicates the plural, are always marked as plene; as xxvi. 14],

Moreover, the quiescent Jod is also to be found after Segol, but this only occurs in the pronouns, second person masculine and third person feminine of plural nouns, both masculine and feminine; as
 and they are never marked plene. Many of them are found without Jod, especially in the case of the suffix second person masculine; as侯

[^98]רֶTֶ thy ways [Exod. xxxiii. 13], of which there are three defective instances: $; 41$ cxix. 41], which is always defective in the plural, and the Segol indicates the absence of Jod. And although the singular has also Segol when it is in pause, as a thy foot, 范 thy ear, \&c., the singular may be distinguished from the plural by the words with which it is connected; as [Ps. xxxii. 4], xci. 12], 8], 7 The thy keeper [Ps. cxxi. 3], Tביָ it thy enemy [Deut. xxviii. 53]; all' of which are singular, and it cannot be said that they are the plural with Jod omitted, because the verbs it is heavy, shall dash, he shall sleep, and oppress, with which they are respectively connected, are singular.

Thus, also, in Jerem. xxxviii. 22, The thy feet, is plural, and Jod is omitted, as is evident from the verb הָטְקְעּ they are sunk, the plural Jod is also omitted in thy work [Ps. lxxvii. 13], as is evident from İכָּ in every one. All the feminine plurals, with the suffix second person masculine, are likewise without the Jod of the plural ; as解 thy gifts [Ps. xx. 4],
 before the Segol, as I have already explained it in the Bachur; and they are distinguished from nouns feminine singular in pause, with pronoun, second person, which have also $n$ with Segol, as blessing [Gen. xxvii. 35], צְּקְקָּ thy righteousness [Ps. lxxi. 15], by the latter having always Kametz before the Segol.

The Jod of the plural is likewise omitted in the suffix third person
 indicating the plural, occurs after Kametz, but this only happens when it is followed, by the pronominal Vav of third person masculine; as in וָדיו his hands,

[^99]word defective, except in Jeremiah, where it is found plene three times. ${ }^{45}$ To the same category belong the expressions וñ winter [Šong of Songs ii. 11], Hive humble [Numb. xii. 3], \&c. We also find that the textual reading is defective, whilst the marginal reading is plene; as 1 in the Kethiv, and 1 [Levit. ix. 22], ${ }^{1}$
 [Gen. xxxiii. 4]. But I shall discuss this subject in the Second Part, Section i.

Section VII. - Hitherto, I have treated on biliteral and triliteral words, in which all the letters are audible. I shall now discuss monosyllabic words, called little words. It is well known that the plene and defective monosyllabic words are those which have in the middle of the word either Vav quiescent, with Cholem and Shurel, or Jod quiescent, with Chirek and Tzere, and that in regard to words with other vowel-points there cannot be plene and defective, because no quiescent Vav or Jod can follow these points. On this subject I shall treat again in Section ix.

Now those pointed with Cholem are of two kinds. The first class consists of words, the middle letter of which is a quiescent Vav,

 plene; the expression not, is an exception, being always defective, except in thirty-five instances; ${ }^{46}$ and the expression 7 y $y$ again, is defective in fourteen instances; ${ }^{47}$ so also $7 \boldsymbol{7}$ generation, is defective when

[^100] generation to generation [Exod. iii. 15], לְדר וָּרו from generation unto generation [Ps. x. 6], \&c., as it is explained in the great Massorah.

The second class consists of those wôrds, the second and third radicals of which are the same letters; as
 All these are defective, ${ }^{48}$ and this because of the Dagesh which they take when formative additions are made at the end, as pin law, with suffix is חת his law; pin spittle, with suffix רי his spittle; y yoke, with suffix iby his yoke. Thus, also, the word ל. all, from לड़ּ, has Cholem, with Vav omitted when it has the accent, except לְ [Jerem. xxxiii. 8]. The Massorah remarks on it, "The $V a v$ is not to be read, but read with KametzChatuph, as is the rule with wherever it has Makkeph," as I have explained in the Poetical Dissertation.

The infinitive and imperative of verbs $\begin{aligned} & \text { y } \\ & \text { too, have always Cholem. }\end{aligned}$ and are defective; as for instance İ return [Song of Songs ii. 17], 1לen hiv falling, ye shall "let fall [Ruth ii. 16]; an finished [Deut. ii. 14]. Those which have Shurek are all from roots the second radical of which is quiescent, as $\begin{aligned} & \text { in a reed }\end{aligned}$ טוֹ a wall, \&ce,, and are always plene, because they never have Kibbutz, except the imperative of $\mu \wedge y$, as P P arise [Josh. vii. 10],
 have Chivek are from roots in which Jod is radical, as a nerve, a
 are generally plene; and defectives are but few, as 27 a cause [Exod. xxiii. 2], $]_{\text {I }}$ a light [Prov. xxi. 4]. In the Massorah a man, is noted as being three times defective, but there are differences of opinion about it among the Massorites. Thus, also, according to the Massorah, There are three words which always occur defective, viz., from,


[^101]Those which have Tzere consist צוהצריים חם של ר' טיצין האחר הננורים of four classes. The first class embraces nouns in which the second radical Jod is audible, as B . house, ! strength, Y Y hunting, \&c. When these are in the construct state, the Jod is quiescent with the Tzere, as house of, , the well of, the ram of, nothingness of, חֵיל the strength of, \&c. These are generally plene, and the defectives are very few, as army [Obad. 20], on which the Massorites remark, it occurs five times defective; 49 يֵ porch [Ezek. xl. 48], on which the Massorites remark, "This defective has no parallel." ${ }^{50}$ To this class belong those words in which the Jod is not audible; as some of these are defective, as mist [Gen. ii. 6], Pח bosom [Prov. จ. 20], \&c.; but there are very few such instances.

The second class embraces words

 defective. The third class consists of words derived from roots art, as tive. The fourth class consists of those derived from $\nu^{\prime \prime y}$, as in grace,


The general rule is, that all those derived from $\nu y y$, whether having Cholem or Tzere, are always defective; whilst those with Chirek and Cholem, of 4 , are generally plene, the defectives being very few, as I have stated above; but when they take formative additions at the end, they are mostly defective. Thus, we have from $\mathcal{Z}$ וט good, the
 many of which are defective. The same is the case with hip voice,

[^102]which with suffix is ib his voice, p my voice, ibp the voices, most of them being defective, and which, oven without any suffixal addition, occurs in this form seven times
 [Gen. xxvii. 22]; ; to the voice [Exod. iv. 8 (twice)], \&c. ${ }^{51}$ Thus, also, from contention, we have [ַּרֹב [Job. xi. 2; xl. 2]. Moreover the plurals and suffixes with Tzeres are sometimes also defective ; as from אֵיל a rams; we have and a few more such instances.

Seotion VIII.-Nothing more is left for me to explain with regard to defective and plene Vav and Jod, except to state how the Massorites noted those words which have two or three quiescents, some of which are plene and some defective, or all of which are either plene or defective.

Let me illustrate it by the example of the word 1 I have established, which occurs in the Scriptures in the four following
 the Massorites remark, "this is one of the three instances entirely plene. ${ }^{52}$ ii. On wrote " one of the eleven instances entirely defective." [Levit. xxvi. 9], they remark, "one of six instances in which it is both plene and defective." ${ }^{5}$. And iv. On $\quad$ [1 Sam. xv. 13], they remark, "it has no parallel, being defective and plene." In some recensions it is marked, "it is one of the six with the accent on the

[^103]penultima," whilst in others it is marked as one of the four instances. ${ }^{55}$ The Codices vary, as I shall explain in Section ix.

It is also to be noticed, that when a word has two quiescents, both of which are plene, and one of them belongs to that class of quiescents which is always plene, as I have shown in Section ii., the Massorites did not mark it entirely plene, but simply plene. And if both quiescents belong to those which are always plene, the Massorites did not remark upon it at all.

Thus, for example, המּלִבים they are coming [Gen. xxxvii. 25]; though entirely plene, the Massorites simply marked "plene;" that is, Vav is written fully, but the Jod they did not require to mark as being written fully, for it is there in accordance with the law about the Jod of the plural, ${ }^{\text {bi }}$ as I have explained in Section $\nabla$. On לְ לְוֹרִיר to go down [ibid.], again, though entirely plene, the Massorites made no remark whatever, because the two quiescents therein are plene ac-

אך צוריך שחרע, כשיהיו במלח ב' נחין ושיטיחן םלאים, ואחר םהן הוא מאוחן חנחים שדרכם להיוח חמיד מלאים, כמו שבארחי ברבור ב', לא נמסר עליח טלא רמלא רק מלא לבד, ואם שוניהן טאוחן שדרכן להיוח תמיר םלאים, לא נמסר עליהן מאומה: והמשל הוֹלְלִּים להוריד טצרימה, הוֹלִלִים אעפ"י שחוא מלא דמלא, לא נטסר עליו רק
 צויך למסור מלא, כי כן דין יו"ד הרבים לחיוח מלאם כמו שכתבחי בדבור ה', ועל ְלָהוֹרִי אעם", שהוא מלא דטלא, לא נמנר מאומה, כי כן דין כ' חנחים האלח לחיוח מלא, כמו שכרחחי ברכור נ" שהוי"נו הבא במקום יו"ד בצ"א הפעל דינה להיוח מלא : וכן החירק שאחדייו נה נראח בסוף המלה רינח על חרוב מלא, ובפרם בבנין הפעיל, פמו שכתבתי בדבור ח' ע"ש ; אבל אם שניחם חסרים, אעפ"י שהאחד מחן מאוחן שדוכן להיוח חסר, כטו שוכתבחי ברבור ג', מכל טקום נמסר עליי חםד דחכר, כםו
 ודומיחן ק"דש: ובמלה שחראשון מלא והשני חסר או
 cording to rule, as I have explained in Section iii., since Vav, which stands for Jod of the first radical, is plene according to law.

The same is the case with Chirek. When it is followed by an audible letter at the end of a word, it is generally plene, according to law, especially in the Hiphil, as I have explained in Section v. (vide supra, p. 156, \&c.) But when both are defective, though one of them belongs to those which are generally defective, as I have explained in Section iii., the Massorites have always marked it
 sitting [1 Kings iii. 17], \&c. Vide supra, p. 148, \&c.

As to the words in which the first quiescent is plene and the second is defective, or vice versa, as and and wonderful

[^104][1 Chron. xvii. 21], they only remarked on תita defective, but not defective and plene, because it is the law for Cholem of the plural to be written fully; whilst on nixija wonderful, they simply remarked defective, but not plene and defective, because the $V a v$, which is written fully, stands for the radical Jod, which, according to rule, is plene, as I have explained all in Section iii. Vide supra, p. 148, \&c.

There are some words with one or two quiescents, which are either defective or plene, and do not belong to those which are usually plene or defective; and yet the Massorites made no remark on them whatever. This arises from the fact that the rule has already been stated on the words in question in another place. Thus, for instance, the Massorites give the general rule, saying, that " ת generations, always wants the second Vav, except in two instances, where it is written entirely plene; in one instance, where it is entirely defective; and in three instances, where it is defective and plene." ${ }^{57}$ Hence there was no necessity for them to mark תincin plene defective in every passage where it occurs, since the first general rule is sufficient.

The same is the case with the word they remark, "throughout the Pentateuch it is defective of Vav, and bas Jod written fully, except in one instance where it is written entirely fully, and in another instance where it is

[^105]plene and Jod defective;" ${ }^{\text {s8 }}$ hence there was no more any necessity to
 every single passage where it occurs in the Pentateuch. Thus, also, they counted the expression your fathers, both in plene and defective, in all the other books of the Scriptures; and on those which do not come within this rubric they made no remark whatever. Moreover, there are some words which are classified in their defectives and plenes according to each book of the Scriptures; and some are classified according to the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa.

The general rule is, that, when a word occurs with two quiescents, and one of them, or both, are either defective or plene, and if there is no Massoretic remark whatever thereon, you may then take it for granted that that is because the law connected therewith had already been stated, and you will find it if you seek for it. I shall, however, recur again to this sub-
 כל הכתובים בחודח צָּמַּיָּם, אין צוריך למסוד עליהש חסר טלא; וכן בכל ספר וספר נמנין
 ככלל חהוא לא נשםר מאומה; וכן ישם מלות אחדוח שנחלקו בתמרונם ובמלואם לםי ספבי המקרא, ויש נהלקים לחורה ולנביאים ולכחובים :
 ויאחר מחן או שניהם חסרים או טלאים, ולא נֹמםר עליהן מאומה, חרע שהוא בעבור איזה כלל שנחן בהם כבד, ודוק וחמטצא, ועוד ארבר מאלה בלוחוח שגיוח במאםד טם: וכאשר יחיו כמלה ג׳ נחים באמצע המלח,
 מראשוחיכם (יחזקאל ל"יו) שחסר יו"ד סימן
 היח ראוי לחיוח נמםר עליו מלא יו״ד קרטאה וחסר יו"ד חנינא ומלה וי״י", ולקצד חלשון לא נמםר עליו רק ליח, וכן כחיב, או וכחיב
 זכרו לא חסר ולא טלא אלא כן כחיב, וכן וַישׁינים במקום חזח, נמשר עליו כן כחיב: ודע בשׂיחיו בחיבה נ' נחים ולשלוחתן מלאים, לא נמםר עליח מלא דמלא, אלא כלו
 ject in the Second Part, Section ix. On a word which has three quiescents, some of which are plene and some defective-as יְ וְהיטבוֹתִ and I shall do good [Ezek xxxvi. 11], which wants Jod after Teth, indicating the Hiphil, for it ought to be "הֵטִיבוֹתִי-the proper Massoretic remark should have been "the first Jod is plene, the second Jod is defective, and the Vav is plene." But for the sake of brevity the Massorites simply remark, "it has no parallel," "it is thus written," or "it is written thus."

The same is the case with the word your backstidings, [Jerem. iii. 22], on which the Massorites neither mentioned plene nor defective, but say this is the textual reading; and with and He made them dwell [ 1 Sam . xii. 8], on which they simply remark, "it is written so."

Notice, that when a word has three quiescents, and all three are plene, the Massorites do not remark on it entirely plene, but "all plene;"


[^106]aud your dispersion [Jerem. xxv. 34], וַהֲבִּאוֹתִים and $\bar{I}$ will bring them [Isa. lvi. 7], \&c.; also when all these three are defective, as
 [1 Kings i. 53], הַבִּא we have brought them [Numb. xxxii. 17], \&ce. ; the Massorites did not remark on them entirely defective, but " all defective." In some Codices they are marked, "this is the textual reading," but the former is more generally used.

Section IX. -Hitherto I have explained the law of the defectives and plenes with regard to the letters Vav and Jod; I shall now explain the rule of the letters Aleph and He. Know, then, that Aleph is frequently either quiescent or wanting in the middle or at the end of some words in certain places, and that there is no parallel for these in

 xxii. 40], \&c.; there are seventeen such instances, and they only oceur in the Prophets and Hagiographa. ${ }^{59}$ There are also five instances to be
 and ye shall be deflled [Levit. xi. 43], in Pericope Va-jigash [Gen. xliv. 29) ; טָּדָ I have found, in Pericope Bèhaaloscha [Numb. xi. 11]; ת
 xi. 12].. ${ }^{60}$ Now I wonder why they did not count these with the other

[^107]seventeen；thas registering them all in one list of twenty－two words with Aleph defective in the Bible．

Again，there are seventeen words in which the reverse is the case， wherein the Aleph is audible，con－ trary to their normal form in other passages，which the Massorites call Maphkin Aleph；as your sheep［Numb．xxxii． 244 ］，נַאֲאָה comely［Ps．xcii．5］， חי＂ז ויהי כ＂ב דחסרי אל＂ף בקריא： ובן י＂ז טלין להפך שתחנוע בהן האלק שלא כדין חברוחיהן，וקודין לחן טפקין אל＂ף，
 עלום；


 טלא אל＂ף，או קו קי אלף，או לא קרי אל＂ך， רק מהקין אל ״＂ף，או לא טפקין אל״＂ף ： finding［Song of Songs viii．10］， \＆c．${ }^{61}$ There are also forty－eight words with a silent Aleph in the middle of the word；as צָּ the Massorites never remark，Aleph omitted，or Aleph written fully，or the Aleph is audible，or the Aleph is silent，but simply state＂Maphkin Aleph，＂or＂Non－Maphkin Aleph．＂

61 The seventeen worde which respectively occur only once with andible Aleph，and have no parallel in the other placee，are ae follows：－

| Foknk | Exod．vi． 24 | בלוw ．Jerem．xxxviii． 12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| תביאה | Levit．xxiii． 17 | באוש－．Amosiv． 10 |
| לצנֹאכם | ．Numb．xxxii． 24 | －．．Hag．i． 13 |
| אדר | － 1 Kinge xi． 17 | － 1 Chron．ii． 13 |
| אטשים | Jerem．xxy． 3 | 1 Chron．xxviii． 19 |
| ובאזרוע | Jerem，xxxii． 21 | הערביאים 2 Chron．xvii． 11 |

נאוה • • Pe．хciii． 5 ואזרוצ ．．Job xxxi． 22 רבאוח ．．．Dan．xi． 12
 כמוצאחת Song of Songs viii． 10

They are enumerated in the Massorah finalis nnder the letter Aleph，p．1，col．2，and are mentioned in the Massorah marginalis on Exodns xviii．13，where a reference is given to the Massorah on Ps．xxx．，in which place，however，nothing is to be found．They are also given in the Ochla Ve－Ochla，section cxcriii．pp．43， 123.

62 The words which respectively occur in one place with a silent Aleph in the middle of the word，and which have no parallel，are as follows ：－

| Nn ．．．Exod．v． 7 | ר的 ．． 2 Kinge ii． 21 | \％．．Ezeek．xliii． 27 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \％ | \％רַגו ．．Jerem．li． 9 | ו－． 1 Kinge xi． 39 |
| ¢צw ．．．Numb．xi． 25 | ו ．．Ezek．xlvii． 8 | וראטר－．Zech．xi． 5 |
| －．．Dent．xxiv． 10 | ברארך ．． 2 Kinge xx． 12 | ו－．．．．Hoo．x． 14 |
| מראון ．．．Jooh．xii． 20 | 岛．．．．Isa．x 33 | ארבאל ．．．Hos．x． 14 |
| בארומה ．．Judg．ix． 41 | －．．Isa．х． 13 |  |
| בלאט ．．Jndg．iv． 21 |  | 的．．．．Joel ii． |
| פלאי ．．．Jndg．xiii． 18 | \％ויאn ．．．．Isa．xli． 25 | פארור．．．Nahnm ii． 11 |
| －． 1 Sam．xiv． 33 | Jerem．ii． 13 | \％．Pe．lxxxix． 11 |
| \％ 1 ． 1 Sam．xvili． 29 | בארוח－－Jerem．ii． 13 | ותרכאוני ．Job xix． 2 |
| －．． 2 Sam．x． 17 | שטאיך ．Jerem．xxx． 16 | מאום ．．．Job xxxi． |
| ［ ．． 2 Sam．xi． 1 | הטאשוח．－Ezek．xvi． 57 | מאום．．Dan．i． |
| ו 2 Sam．xi． 24 | \％ש\％．．Ezek．xxp． 6 | בודאם－．Nehem．vi． 8 |
| המראים ${ }^{\text {ה }}$－ 2 Sam．xi． 24 | －Emin．Ezek．xxviii． 24 |  |
| ，． 2 Sam．xxiii． 15 | TשEx．Ezek．xxviii． 26 | למואל ．．Nehem．xii． 38 |
| ，． 2 Sam．xxiii． 16 | ו－${ }^{\text {ו－}}$－Ezek．ix． 8 | Nehem．xiii． 16 |
| הבא ．． 2 Sam．xxiii． 20 | וטשהחיך ．Ezek．xxix． 2 |  |

They are enumerated in the Massorah marginalis on Ezekiel i．1；Job i．1；and in the Massorah finalis nnder the letter Aleph，p． 1 a，cols． 2 and 3．It will be seen that， instead of there being forty－eight，as mentioned in the heading of the Rubric，and by Levita，there are fifty．They are also given with some slight variation in the Ochla Ve － Ochla，вection ciii．pp．29，97，\＆c．

The meaning of מפקיץ is brought out, uttered, pronounced, audible. So the Chaldee renders $\boldsymbol{N}$ ing, pronouncing [Prov. x. 18], by פמיק. I have already explained in the Poetical Dissertations, Sect iv., that מפיק is only applied to the letters Vav, Jod, and He when pronounced by the mouth at the end of a word, since the Aleph is never pronounced at the end of a word. Hence, when the Massorah uses Maphkin Aleph, it denotes that it has the vowel-point, as in the above-named instances. In the Massorah Parva, however, they are marked defective or plene, yet not marked defective or plene absolutely; but it is distinctly stated, Aleph defective, or Aleph plene. The same law obtains with regard to $H e$, as I shall explain in the following Section.

There are some words in which Aleph is quiescent at the end of the word, as in the Register of twelve words, viz., x. 24], Nיא innocent [Jonah i. 14], \&c; ${ }^{63}$ on these the Massoretic mark is either, Aleph redundant, or Aleph not to be read. There is also another Register of seventeen words, with quiescent Aleph at the end of the word standing for He ; as $\mathbb{N}$ was erected [Ezek. xxxi. 5], Nנָּ sleep [Ps. exxvii. 2], ${ }^{\text {wi }}$ on every one of which the Massorites remark, "no parallel with Aleph."


They are enumerated in the Massorah finalis nnder the letter Aleph, p. 1 a, cols. 3 and 4. The heading, however, of the Rnbric does not give the number, nor does the Massorah marginalis, on Ezeliel xxxi. 5 ; xxxvi. 5; and Ruth i. 20, where reference is made to them; nor say how many there are belonging to this class.

Section X. -The $H e$ is never quiescent except at the end of a word, in four different ways, which are symbolised by the expression "שנח״ thy sleep, being the acrostic of, 1. שר the root; 2. the feminine ; 3. תוספת formative addition; and 4. בנוי suffix. i. By radix is meant the radical He
 to build, \&c. ii. By the feminine gender, as
 blessing, \&c. About these two classes the Massorites say nothing. iii. By formative addition is meant the $H e$ added to the end of a word, which consists of two kinds, additions to verbs and additions to nouns. Additions to verbs we have in the imperative singular; as
 [Dan. ix. 19]; in the infinitive ה the future, with Aleph and Nun of
 shall pursue [Hosea vi. 3], \&c.; and about these the Massorites say nothing. The additions to the nouns are of two kinds. Of the first are such words as inheritance; their distinguishing mark is that they are always Milè ; and about these the Massorites speak but very little. The second class consists of those words which have $H e$ added to the end instead of Lamed, as our Rabbins of blessed memory remarked, "every word which should have Lamed at the commencement takes $H e$ at the end." ${ }^{\text {bs }}$

[^108] about this remark. The first is קועשיור, חאחר באמדם כל תיבה, ומלת לת
 braces nouns, particles, and verbs, שהיא במקום למ"ד בחהלחה, לא חבא רק whereas the He which stands for the Lamed at the beginning only occurs in nouns. The second question is about the word "every," the use of which is not justifiable in this place, since all nouns cannot take this $H e$, except those which we find in the Bible, and these are not.one in a thousand; and since they are chiefly found in names of places, and have been counted על חשמןח; והקושיא הב' באמדם בל חיבה, ומלֹה בל לא חצדק במקום חוה בי לא נובל לחטיל :אח הח״״א בכל השמוח, בי אם מה שממצאנו מחן בפטוק, ואינן באחר מיני אל"ך, ובפרם בשמוח טקוטוח נמצאח לרוב, ובעלי המסורת מנאום, במו מצרימה צ"ח,
 ומעםים נמצאים משאר שטוח, כמו האהלה ח, 70, הביתה י״ח, 7, המזבתה ח, 72, ארצה
 Egypt, which occurs twenty-eight times; ${ }^{66}$ בָּבְ
 nine times. ${ }^{69}$ There are also to be found a few others; as the tent, eight times ; הַ הַמַּיָּ to the altar, five times; צָּרָּ Canaan, eight times plene. ${ }^{\text {rs }}$ The Massorites did not count the other

[^109] because this form is the most frequent. Accordingly, the Rab- בסופו, צאולי ישל לישב מלח כל כמו שאמרו bins ought simply to have said, במקום אתר אין למרין מן חכללוח; וחנח "there are some nouns which ought to begin with Lamed, but take He at the end instead." It may, perhaps, be replied, that the word signifies mule, sipce they use it so in another place; "one cannot infer from rules." The additional $H e$ is also to be found after Kametz, under Tav, Kaph, and Nun, at the end of a word, as I shall explain hereafter. I have already shown, in Section v., that a vowel-point does not occur at the end of a word, except under Tav, Kaph, and Nun, which have sometimes Kametz, and are not followed by He.

Tav is the Tav with Kametz indicating the singular, which is to be found at the end of the preterite; as quired, thou hast searched, thou hast asked [Deut. xiii. 15], \&e.; by far the greater majority of them are without $H e$, and those which have

 3], \&c. On these the Massorites always remark, He plene, but on those which have no $H e$ they never remark, He defective, except on the word twenty-nine with He defective." ${ }^{\text {T4 }}$

It might be asked, why they give the number of the defectives of this word, and not that of other words which have He defective, and which are very many. And since the defectives are the greater number, ought they not rather to have counted all the instances in which חָּ are the fewer in number? The reply is, that they have done it, because the Tav has Dagesh forte, for it is after a short vowel; and it is not normal for Dagesh forte to be at the end of a word, without being

[^110] letter. Hence the He after every Tav which has Dagesh forte at the end of a word, as you see is the case in the other instances, besides the twenty-nine in question. Thus you will also see it in ? thou shalt kill [Numb. xiv. 15], הָֹ̦ lin and thou shalt die [Ezek. xxvii. 8], xc. 8], \&c. This, however, is only the case with irregular verbs, as those mentioned above. Thus, also, in the word Nָּ thou, the $H e$ is added because of the Dagesh forte, for which reason the Massorites did not require ever to make it as having He plene. But the regular verbs in which the Tav is radical, בָּרָ to cut off, rest, never $\dot{H} e$ after Tav, though it has Dagesh forte, as cut down [Deut. xx. 20], וְ, וְבְבָּ and thou shalt be cut off [Obad.' 10], תִּin thou makest to cease [Ps. cxix. 119], xiv. 20], and are not marked defective; the expression הצְמַּ thou hast destroyed [Ps. lxxiii. 27], being an exception to this rule, is marked by the Massorites " $H e$ written fully."

The final Kaph, which has a vowel-point at the end of a word, is the $K a p h$ with K $^{\text {Kametz, indicating the suffix of the second person singular, }}$
 thee fruitful, and multiply thee, and make thee [Gen. xlviii. 4]; and in nouns, as servant, thy woman servant [Deut. v. 14]. There are some, however, with the additional $H e$, which the Massorites always mark "He plene." Thus, there are in the Massorah twenty-one unique words, i.e., they have no parallel with a quiescent $H e$ at the end of the word, after 3 of the second person singular masculine, as אֲבָרֶכְד I shall bless thee (Gen. xxvii. 7),
 Vadja (see Section ix., Part 2), and you will find that they have pairs or

[^111]groups, as בּוֹאַכָה as thou comest, six times; ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ה three times. ${ }^{76}$

The final Nun, with Kametz at the end of a word, is the Nun of the plural feminine, which normally is followed by $H e$, as Dַפּדְנָ lament ye [Jerem. xlix. 3],
 [Song of Songs iii.: 11], and they came, [Exod.ii. 16], \&c. There are some words which have $H e$ omitted; that is, they have final Nun with Kametz, as ha go ye [Ruth i. 12], , and in the future tense, as ${ }^{1}$ shall be [Deut. xxi. 15], חקְ ye shall-let live [Exod. i. 19], they shall become pregnant [Gen. xix. 36], , xxxii. 6], \&c.

路 This only occurs in irregular verbs, and there is but one instance [2 Sam. xiii. 18], and the Massorites have marked them all " He omitted." The general rule is, that Tav and Kaph, with Kametz at the end of a word, generally want He. Hence the Massorites counted the instances in which $H e$ is plene, they being the fewest; whilst in the case of Nun with Kametz at the end of a word, the He being mostly plene, they counted the defectives.

The $H e$ suffix is of two kinds. The one is suffix third person feminine, and occurs in three different ways; (a), when it is quiescent after
 (b), when it has Kametz, and is preceded by Segol, as तָאָצָּpill and he
${ }^{75}$ The twenty-one worde, which have He at the end after Kaph, of the second person singular masculine, are as followe:-



 declared it, חֶּנִינָּ he searched it, חָקרָ
 her conjugalright, Me wer food [Exod. xxi. 10]; and
 her foot; on all these, and the like, the Massorites do not make any remark. But on those words which have Mappik in one place, and are without Mappilc in another place, they remark, "no Mappik;" as Man provision [Ps. exxxii. 15], \&c. So נמסר מאומח; אבל על טלה שחיא במפיק וחברוחיח בלי מפיק נמטר עליה ליח מפּיק, בגון ובו יגְּה, ציךָּ ברך אברך ורומיחן ;וכן
 ביום ליח רפה, ואחד כמפיק מפנינים מִצְדָה וכוּ, 77 וי״א מלין דלא טפקין ה"א וראויץן
 בה וכוֹ, נמסר על בל אחח לא טפיק ח"א,
או רפי ה"א :

והמין השני. חוא הח"א הבאה במקום וי״יו כנוי חזכר הנסחר, ומח שלפיניח בחולם,
 there are also eleven pairs terminating with $H e$, which is once Mappik or audible, and once not-Mappiks or quiescent; as מִבְרָה sell me [Gen. xxv. 21], " no parallel, being Raphe," whilst the other, מִבְָּ sell me [Prov. xxxi. 10], has Mappik.77 There are also eleven words which end with a quiescent $H e$, and ought to have an audible He ; as
 31], \&c., on each one of these the Massorites remark, "the $H e$ is not audible," or, "the $H e$ is feeble.". ${ }^{\prime}$

The second class embraces the $H e$ which stands for Vav masculine, third person, and is preceded by Cholem; as in its shouting [Exod. xxxii. 17], ite its hedge [Lament. ii. 6,] \&c. On these the
$\pi$ The eleven pairs, each one of which pair alternately occars with an andible $H e$ [=Mappik], and with a quiescent $H e[=$ Raphe], are as follows:-

| מכרה | Prov. xxxi | מעונה | . Dent. xxxiii. 27 | לחילה | P6. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| מכרד | Gen. x | הצ3 | Gen. xl. 14 | כבכורח | a. |
| ושצרח |  | נצה | Isa. xviii. 5 | כבטורי |  |
| ישצדיה | Levit. xiii. 4 | \% | Isa. xxiii. 18 | תוֹת |  |
| לרבעה | Levit. xviii. 23 | לאתנד | İa. xxiii. 17 | חכה |  |
| לרו | Levit. xx. 16 |  | Nahum ii. 14 | צרכד | Job xxviii. 13 |
| מעונה. | Zeph. iii. 7 | לוּדביה | Ezok. xxvii. 20 | ערכה | Job x |

They are given in the Massorah finalis under the letter He, p. $21 b$, col. 1, and in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, ,eetion xliv., pp. 14, 52.
${ }^{78}$ This must be a mistake, since the Massorah gives eighteen words which abnormally have at the end a quiescent $H e$. They are as follows:-

| וחה | Exod. i. ${ }^{3}$ | 1 Kinge xiy. 12 | המונה | 16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| וֹרד | Exod. ix. 18 | ורחמה . . Jerem. xx. 17 | למינה | Ezek. xlvii. 10 |
| עונה | Numb. xv. 31 | בה . . . Ezek. xiv. 4 | אנחהת | Isa. xxi. 2 |
| ה | Josh. xix. 13 | לאמה . . Ezek. xvi. 44 | D | Isa. xxx. 32 |
| הלבה | Judg. i. 31 | 相 . . Ezok. xxiv. | הראשה | Zech. iv. 7 |
|  | Sam. xx. 20 | Ezel. xxxvi. | שלמה | i. 22 |

Indeed Levita seems also to here mistaken the nomber of words contained in this rubric, in his annotations on Kimchi's Michlol ( $32 b$, ed. Venice), where he aays that there are fifteen such words. Thélist is given in the Massorah finalis nnder the letter $H e, ~ p .21 b$, cole. 1 and 2, and Ochla Ve-Ochla, section xliii., pp. 14, 51.

Massorites simply remark, "this ודומירן, לא נמסר עליהן רק בן בהיב, או is the textual reading,", or ${ }_{2}$ " the the textual reading is so;" ex. gr., on כהיבין בן;
 remark, "four times so written;"70 Țָּ his multitude, "four times so written." ${ }^{\text {so }}$ In some Codices, however, we find it remarked on

 and in a few more. But this is a clerical blumder, for we never find that a word which has in the text He, with Cholem, has in the marginal reading Vav. As to the list of fourteen words which have He in textual reading, and Vav in the marginal reading, to be found in the Massorah, this refers exclusively to Vav with Shurek; as in ? they shall make bold [Levit. xxi. 5], where the Keri is יP ; likewise
 shall again refer to these in the Second Part, Section i. By the help of Him, who is the last and the first, I have thus finished Part the First; and shall commence Part the Second, by the aid of that One whọ has no second.

\footnotetext{
 They are given in the Massorah marginalie on Gen. ix. 21. The Sulzhach edition has exroneously seven.

E0 The four paesages in which המומה occure are, Ezek. xxxi. 18 ; xxxii. 31, 32 ; xxxix. 11. The Magsorah finalis, under the letter He, p. $24 b$, col. 2, refers to Ezek. xxxix. for the enumeration of the passages, but they are not to he fonnd in the Massorah marginalis on the chapter in question.

81 The fourteen words with $H e$ at the end, whioh is read and considered as Tav, are as follows:-

| יקרדה | Levit. xxi. 5 | נושבה | Jerem. xxii. 6 | שטכה | Ps. Ixxiii. 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| שטד | Deut. xxi. 7 | הדה | . Jerem. 1. 6 | המר'מרה | Job xvi. 16 |
| נשברה | 1 Kings xxii. 49 | היצה | Ezelk. xxiii. 43 | עודינה | Lament. iv. 17 |
| לtic | 2 Kinge xxiv. 10 | שלמלה | Ezek. xxxy. 12 | טאלה | Dan. iii. 29 |
| 2- | Jerem. ii. 15 | , היה, | Ezek. xxxvii. 22 |  |  |

They are ennmerated in the Massorah marginalis on 2 Kings xxiv. 10, and on Lament. iv. 17 ; and in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section exiii. pp. 31, 100.

## SECOND PART.

## Also containing Ten Sections.

THE TABLE OF CONTENTS OF EACH SECTION IS TO BE FOUND AT THE END OF THE BOOK.

הא לך לוחות שניצח, בעשרה מאמרים שנויות:<br>ולוח הממנים של בל מאמר ומאמר תמצא לאשר דספר נגמר :

Section I., concerning the Keri and Kethiv.-Haring stated, at the beginning of Introduction iii., the differences of opinion which obtained among modern writers about the Keri and the Kethiv, and having given at the end thereof my own opinion respecting it (vide supra 106 , \&c.), I shall now disclose to you the method which the men of the Great Synagogue have therein pursued. First of all, however, you must know that what is written in the margin is the Keri, that is, it is thus to be read; and what is in the text, that is, the Kethiv, is not to be read at all. Thus, for example, the word bring forth [Gen. viii. 17], as it is in the Kethiv, with Vav, and for which Keri is Nיהַ, with Jod. Now, the Massorites put the vowelpoints of N wnder Nsin, and it is read NSM, being the imperative Hiphil of the regular verb, according to the analogy of appoint [Numb. i. 50]; whilst the textual הוצו, without the vowels, is the imperative of ${ }^{\prime \prime}$, B , as [Levit. xxiv. 13]: The same is the case with השָּ [Ps. v. 9], where the
 reading with the points of the word in margin, that is, the points of the text always belong to the Keri in the margin; whilst the Kethiv is without vowel-points. The same is the case with the accents, which they have always put under the words in the text, according to what it is in the marginal reading. Thus, in 1 Chron. xxii. 7, where the textual reading is $h i s$ anc son, and the marginal reading $m y$ son, the Athnach according to the Kethiv ought to be under inּ, but because the Keri is is easily understood.

It is to be noticed, that wherever the points are more than the letters, [the punctuators] had to put two sorts of points under one letter of the Kethiv. Thus, in Jerem. xlii. 6, where the Kethiv is אנו, we, and the Keri אנחנו, they had to put two points, namely, Sheva and Shurek under the Vav in IUs, to correspond to the points of whilst the word in the text is left without points, and is read IN, which has no parallel in the Scriptures, except in the Prayer Book, where we find what are we. ${ }^{1}$ When, however, the word in the text has more letters than are required for the points [of the marginal reading], one letter of the Kethiv is left without any vowelpoint, as in 2 Kings xix. 23, where, the text has the marginal reading is with the multitude, the Kaph is left without any vowel-point; also in 2 Sam. xxiii. 21, where the Kethiv is which, and the Keri שיׁ man, the

על
על הכחב הוצרכו לשום במלת הכהיב ב' מיני נקודוה חחה אוה אחה, והמשל אשר אנו שולחים אוחדך (ידמיה ט"ב) אנחנו קרי

 שבפנים בלי נקודוה ונקראח אנו, ואֹן לו דומה במקרא אך בסדורי התפלות עה אנו, מח חיינו ; 1 וכשהכריב מדובה על הנקודה השאידו בכחיב אוה אחה בלי נקודה, כנון בּוּרב רכבי עליחי, ברב קדי נשארה הכ"ף בלי נקודה, וכן הבה את הםצדי אִּשר מדאח, איששׁ קדי הרי השי"ן בלי נקורח, וכן אלחה מאניא, אל קרי הלמר כלי נקודה: וכשהכתיב טלה אהחת והקרי ב؛ טלוחק שמו החה םלה הכהיב כל הנקודוח של ב' המלוח שבקרי, פנון ולשחוח אח שיגיֶּהֶם (מלכים ב׳ יח) מימי רגליהם קרי, חרי וֹ
 ובשהכחיב ב' עלוח והקרי מלה אהת, האוח שהיא בטוף החיבה הדאשוּומח שבכתיב בלי נקורה החסר בקרי טבל וכל; והמשל ויצ״
 מבת. קרי, הדי הנו"ן בשניהם חחסר מכל ובל; וכן ח׳ םלוח רכתיבין חרי טלין וקר"ן חד Shin is without a vowel-point; and in Ezra $\nabla .15$, where the Kethiv is the Lamed is left without a vowel-point.

When the textual reading has one word, and the marginal reading has two words, they put under the one word of the Kethiv all the points of the words in the Keri. Thns, in 2 Kings xviii. 27, where
 their feet, the six points of the two words טימֵי רַנְליֶה are put under
 has two words, and the marginal reading one word, the last unpointed letter of the first word in the Kethiv is omitted altogether in the Keri. Thus, in 1 Sam. xxiv. 9, where the textual reading is the cavern, and the marginal reading טֵהְַּּעְ
 the Nun is altogether omitted in both cases. The same is the case with the eight words, which are respectively divided into two words in the textual reading, and which are undivided in the marginal read-

[^112]ing. These I have given in the sixth class, for I have thus divided all the Keris and the Kethivs of the Scriptures into classes, and distributed them under seven classes, corresponding to the seven kinds of fruit for which the land of Israel was famed. ${ }^{2}$
I.-The first class consists of words which are read from the margin, but not written in the text, and, vice versa, which are written in the text but not read. This principally affects the letters Jod, $\mathrm{He}, \mathrm{Vav}$, Aleph, which thus occur in the beginning, end, or middle of a word. It must, however, be remarked that Vav and Jod do not occur in this manner when they are quiescent in the middle of a word; that is to say, Vav after the vowel-points Cholem and Shurek, and Jod after Chirek and Tzere, since such belong to the category of défective and plene, as I have explained in Part i., Section 1. But the Vav, which occurs in the Kethiv and not in Keri, is only after the vowelpoints Kametz or Chateph-Kametz, as אֲרֶוֹ I shall covenant, (Josh. ix. 7), $I$ shall be at rest (Isa. xviii. 4), \&c. There are in all thirty-one such instances. ${ }^{8}$ Vav never occurs as Keri in the middle of a word, not being in the textual reading; but Jod is found in the Keri, and not in the Kethiv, after Kametz. Thus, for instance, Gen. xxxiii. 4, the Kethiv is צilis his neck, and the Keri צ צ ; and in


\footnotetext{
${ }^{3}$ The seven chief productions of Palestine, mentioned in Deut. viii. 8, in praise of the land, are wheat, barley, grapes, figs, pomegranates, olives, and honey. From the fact that these seven linds are specified in the Pentatench, Jewish legislation, long before the time of Christ, restricted the offering of the first-fruits to these alone. Comp. Mishna Bikurim, i. 3; Babylon Talmud Berachoth, 35 a; Maimonides, Jad Ha-Chezaka Hilchoth Bikurim, ii; Kitto's Cyclopcedia of Biblical Literature, s. v. First-Fruits.
s The words in which Vav occurs after Kametz and Chateph Kametz, in the textual reading, and from which Vav is omitted in the marginal reading, are as follows:-

|  | Jo | - |  | - |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sam. xxii. 15 | במורי | Dent. xxxii. 13 |  |  |
| ולשופיך | 1 Sam. xxy. 31 | במוהי | Ps. cxlviii. 4 | , |  |
| קסומי | 1 Sam. xxviii.- 8 | במוהי | Micah i. 3 | קולד | Ezra viii. 25 |
| שקוטה | Isa. xviii. 4 | אכחוב | Hos. viii. 12 | אשרודיוה | Nehem. xiii. 23 |
| יצבור | Isa. xxvi. 20 | עבור | Amos vii. 8 | עוניוח | Nehem. xiii. 23 |
| הצורן | Jerem. i. | צבור | Amos viii. | היהד | 1 Chron. vii. 34 |
| לאכ | Ezel. xliy. | וגרול | Pe. cxly. | חוקהת | Chron. xxxiv. 22 |
| הובנים | Ezek. xxvii. 15 | וגרול | Nahumi. | למעול | 2 Chron. xxxivi. 14 |
| ל | rem. xxxiii. 8 | לשׁול | hron. xviii. 10 | יקצור | xxii. 8 |
| וד |  |  |  | יפול | \%xii. 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

are fifty-six such instances. ${ }^{4}$ There pרי, והם ג"ו בטמפר ;" וב' יורין רבחיבין
 after Cholem in the textual reading, ציצָי לא חשבע, והן בכלל וֹ דכחיכן יו"ד but not in the marginal reading, as
 his eyes [Eccl. iv. 8]; but these belong to the list of six words which have Jod in the Kethiv, and not in the Keri. ${ }^{5}$ Moreover, Jod is also found after Sheva, as in ולא קדי ;' ונמצאים יורין אור שואוא, כגון
 הרעים ורומיהן; נם נמצאים ווי"ן ויולי"אין לדוב בראש החיבח ובסוף החיבח דקרין ולא בחבן או להפך; ובן חהי"ן לובו, ולבחרי הקיצור לא אכיא עליהן ראיוח: words, which occurs eight times with a redundant Jod; works [Zech. i. 4], \&c. The Vav and Jod also frequently occur in the beginning and end of words in the marginal reading, and are not in the textual reading, and vice versa; and this is also frequently the case with $H e$, which I abstain from illustrating by examples, for the sake of brevity.

1 The fifty-six words which ars in the textal reading without Jod (mostly indicating the plaral) in the middle, but have $j_{0} d$ in the marginal reading, are as follows:-

|  | ii. 4 | 1 | Jarem. xy. 8 | גבורחו | - Job xxvi. 14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ועמורד | Exod. xxvii. 11 | ימי | erem. xvii. 11 | בחחנולוזי | xxxvii. 12 |
| ענו | Namb. xii. 3 | מברזי | Ezek. xvii. 21 | ואפרדחו | Job xxxix. 30 |
|  | Joshua viii. 11 | פארחוי | Ezsk. xxxi. 5 | פוזרו: | Job xl. 17 |
| צאוחו | Joshua xvi. 3 | עולחו | Ezak, xl. 26 | כנפו | Job xxxix. 26 |
| מרינו | 1 Sam. ii. 9 | וחלונו | . Ezzk. xl. 22 | תלתו. | - . Job xxxi. 20 |
|  | 1 Sam. ii. 9 | ויזמורו | . Ezskr, xl. 22 | ילדויד | . Job xxxviii. 41 |
| \% | 1 Sam. x. 21 | בצאתו | Ezzels. xlyii. 11 | ברגלו | Prov. vi. 13 |
| ואנשי | . 1 Sam. xxiii. 5 | טרזו | Habak. iii. 14 | בשםׁו | Prov. xxvi. 24 |
| בבגדו | 2 Sam. i. 11 | שערו | Obad. 11 | ארחדו | Prov. xxii. 25 |
| שמלו | 2 Sam. xii. 20 | 7 | Ps. xxiv. 6 | ארדנו | Prov. xxx. 10 |
| רחמו | . 2 Sam. xxiv. 14 | דצוי | Ps. lviii. 8 | מדגלותי | Rath iii. 14 |
| משרחו | 1 Kings x. | חסדו | Ps. cvi. 45 | כנותו. | Ezra iv. 7 |
| נרנו | Kings xviii. 42 | רבר1 | Ps. cxlvii. 19 |  | mant. iii. 39 |
| נסוסו | 2 Kings.v. 9 | צנצי | Ps. cxlviii. 2 | ויח | 1 Sam. xxi. 14 |
| 1 | 2 Kings iv. 34 | T | Job xiv. 5 | . | Song of Songs ii. 11 |
| מזנחת | 2 Kings xi. 18 | נקרשי | h xv. 15 | שלו | Ps. ev. 40 |
| - | Isa. lvi. 10 | צורומי | $11$ | השלו | Numb. xi. 32 |

They are enumgrated in the Massorad finalis under the letter Jod, p. $34 a$, cols. 2 and 3 ; and in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section exxvii., pp. 33 and 104. It mast be remarksd, that this list only registers such words as occur once as defective, and therefore sxcludes many other words which likswiss want the Jod plaral, bat which ocear mors than once.

5 The other four which in the textual reading are without the Jod plural, but have it in the marginal reading, and which, with the two adduced by Levita, constitnte the list of six words, are, וברריו, 1 , Kings xvi. 26 cr. 28, Dan. ix. 12; and Prov. xvi. 27. They are given in the Massorah finalis under the letter Jod, p. 34 a, col. 3 ; and Ochla Te-Ochla, section cxxix., pp. 34 and 105.
${ }^{6}$ The eight passages in which the textaal reading is $T^{7}$, with the plural $J o d$, and the marginal reading is without it, ars, Judges xiii. 17 ; 1 Kinge viii. 26 ; xviii. 36 ; xxii. 13; Jerem. xv. 16; Ps. cxix. 47, 161; Ezra x. 12. They are enumerated in the Massorah finalis onder the letter Daleth, p. 19b, col. 2; and Ochla Ve-Ochla, section exxxi., pp. 34 and 105. To supplement our remark on the thirtesn instances in which the reverse is the case with the word in question, that is, whers the textual reading is the plural Jod, and the marginal reading is ${ }^{7}{ }^{7}$ with the plural Jod vide supra, p. 161, note 43), we must add that the list is given in ths Ochla Ve-Ochla, section cxxx., pp. 34, 105, and that Ps. exix. 17 has inadvertent'y been omitted.

等察 I have，however，found this， that in all the words which have a letter in the Keri and not in the Kethiv，the points of the letter in question are put into the text with－ out this letter，whilst the marginal reading has the letter without the point，as is usually the case．Thus， for instance，in Lam．v．7，the text has are not，winn we，and the Massoretic remark in the margin is， ＂Read וְיאינָם and are not，＂＂Read
 lar instances，of which there are twelve in number．${ }^{7}$ The same me－ thod is pursued in the case of $H e$ ． Thus，in 1 Sam．xiv．82，the text
 the similar instances，of which there are thirteen in number．${ }^{8}$

When，on the contrary，the textual reading has a word with a letter which the marginal reading has not，the word is written in the text with the letter in question unpointed；as ［Jerem．1．8］，which has Jod in the Kethiv，but not in the Keri．In such a case，however，the Massorites do not write in the margin， ＂Read case with הכנפּם the wings［Eccl．x．23］，where the marginal remark is，＂$H e$ is not read；＂${ }^{9}$ and when the $H e$ is in the middle of the

7 The twelve words which have no Vav conjunctive in the textual reading，and have it in the marginal reading，are as follows：－


They are enumerated in the Massorah finalis under the letter Vav，p． $27 a$ ，col．4；and Ochla Ve－Ochla，section exrii．，pp． 32 and 101.
${ }^{8}$ The thirteen words which do not begin with $H e$ in the textual reading，but have He at the commencement in the marginal reading，are as follows：－

| שלו | 1 Sam．xiv． 32 | מ\％ | 1 Kings xv． 18 | － | Terem．xl．${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| גברים | 2 Sam．xxiii． 9 | מיך | 2 Kings xi． 20 | מלנים | Jerem． $\mathrm{lii1}$ ． 32 |
| אוחדו． | 1 Kings iv． 8 | מין | 2 Kings xV． 25 | \％ | Ezek．xviii． 20 |
| שבד | Kings vii． 20 | 吅 | －Jorem．xiii． 19 | עים． | Lament．i |

They are given in the Massorah marginalis on 2 Sam．xxii． 9 ；and ochla Fe－Ochla， section clxv．，pp． 37 and 112.

9 There are seven such words，which，on the contrary，have in the Kethiv He at the beginning，but not in the Keri．Besides the one quoted in the text，the other six are as follows：－

 Ochla Ve－Ochla，section clxvi، pp．37， 113.
word, as ${ }^{2}$ who is stronger [Eccl. vi. 10], where the marginal remark is, " $H e$ is not read." 10 The same, too, is the case in the fortyeight words which have Aleph in the middle of the word in the text, and not in the margin; on all of which it is remarked in the margin, " Aleph is not read;" as the multitude [Numb. xi. 4], \&c. ${ }^{11}$

Now the rule is, that whenever the letters Jod, He, Vav, and Aleph are in the marginal reading, and not written in the text; the Massorites write down the entire word of the Keri in the margin; but, on the contrary, when these letters are written in the textual reading, and are not to be read, they simply remark in the margin, "Read not the Aleph, He, Jod, or Vav." In one passage, however, both the remarks occur. Thus, Prov. xxiii. 23, where the textual reading is 7 he that begetteth, without Var, and the marginal reading
 he shall rejoice, which has Vav in the textual reading, but not in the marginal reading, they simply remark, "Read not the Vav." Notice, however, that in correct Massorahs, whenever Vav and Jod occur in the middle of a word in the textual reading, and are not read, the margin has always the remark, "The Tav is superfluous," or, "The Jod is superfluous;" and this is the proper remark.

As to the other letters, besides Jod, He, Vav, and Aleph, there are only a few which are found written in the textual reading, and are not to be read; or vice versa. Thus, for instance: i. Lamed occurs four times in the middle of words in the text, and is not read; as in
 she was, cntering [Dan. iv. 4 ; v. 8, 10]. In the last three instances


[^113]blowing [2 Chron. xiii. 14, xxix. בחצוצרות, הצדי השניח לא ננקרח ולא
 no vowel-point, and is not read.
 the second Shin is not read according to Ben Asher's recension, whilst according to Ben Naphtali's it is pointed with Sheva as usual. iv. Kaph, which is found in the textual reading of chariot [ 2 Kings xxx. 28], whereas the Keri is $د$ 家 with the multitude, and, vice versa, is absent in from the caverns [1 Sam. xvi. 23], in the textual reading, whilst the
 v. Ajin occurs once in the textual reading, and not in the marginal, viz., Amos viii. 8, where the Kethiv
 כדינה ; וחכ"ף נמצאח כחיב ולא קרי במלח
 ממערכות קרי; וחעי"ן נמצאה קרי ולא
 קרי; וחדלח בב" מקיוחה, וחם חָּמָּ במרבר
 קדי ;18 וחחי "ח נמבּאח בד' מקומוח, במו


קרי, במו שבתבחי לעיל : המין השצי באותיוח המהחלפוח וו בוי בקרי ובכחיכ, ונס באלה העקר אוחיות יהו״א, כנון כ"ב טלין רבהיבין יו"ד בראש


 is twice not in the textual reading, viz. 1 Kings ix. 18, where the Kethiv is Tamor, and the Keri Then Tadmor ; and Dan. ii. 9, where the
 the Ithpael

 in the Kethiv, whilst the Keri has :Nְֻ, as stated above.
2.-The second class consists of letters which are interchanged in the Keri and the Kethiv. In this case, too, it principally takes place with the letters $J o d, H e, V a v, A l e p h$, as is seen : i. In the twenty-two words which are written in the text with Jod in the beginning of the word, and are read in the margin with Vav; as the textual reading, and in the margin in and cease thou [Job x. 20]; ת in the Keri [ibid.], \&c. ${ }^{14}$ ii. The ten instances in which the reverse is
${ }^{18}$ Comp. Ochla Ve-Ochla, section clxxxi., pp. 40, 117.
${ }^{14}$ The twenty-two words which hegin with Jod in the text, and are read with Vav in the margin, are as follows:-

| י1 | Judg. vi. 5 | ויה | Jerem. xxxviii. 2 | יחרל | - Job. x. 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| יהנגי | 2 Sam. xii. 22 | ישבי | Jerem. xlviii. 18 | ישיח | Job. x. 20 |
| יפצ | Isa. xlix. 13 | ילבשו | Ezek. slii. 14 | יבא | Prov. xviii. 17 |
| 17 | Jerem. vi. 21 | היהיה | .Ezek. xlv. 5 | ישאל | Prov |
| - ישיn | Jerem. xiii. 16 | יבשלו | Nahnm iii. 3 | ירום | Dan. xi. 12 |
| . | Jerem. xvii. 13 | יצהר | 1 Chron. iv. 7 | ירמוי | Ezrax. 29 |
| - | . Jerem. xxi. 9 |  | Chron. vii. 34 | יקסאון | 6 |

They are enumerated in the Massorah marginalis on Hoser i. 1; 1 Chron. i. 1: in the Massorah finalis noder the letter Jod, p. 34a, col. 3: and in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section cxxxiv., pp. 34, 106. All the editions of the Massoreth Ha-Massoreth, viz., Venice, 1538, Basel, 1539, and Sulzbach, 1771, erroneously state that there are fifty-two ( 1 "y) euch instances.
the case, as in the textual reading nip and he is crushed, for which the Keri has !ְֶּ! he shall be crushed [Ps. x. 10], \&c. ${ }^{15}$ iii. The alphabetical list of words which have Jod in the middle of the word in the Kethiv, and Vav in the Keri. These are seventy in number, the Jod in all these instances being pointed with Cholem or Shurel; the Cholem is placed upon the letter preceding the Jod, as the Kethiv $I$ shall cause to remember, and the Keri אוּכוֹר I shall remember [Ps. 1xxvii.
 12 nations, the Keri [Gen. xxv. 23], \&c.; whilst the Shurek is put into the Jod, as in the Kethiv aimy and he placed, , pointing in some Codices of the first Jod in an egregious mistake, for there is no letter to be found with the point Kibbutz before quiescent Jod; the Kethiv is 'يי'רק the called, where the Jod has Shurek, and the Keri is "קרקוּ [Numb. i. 16], \&c. ${ }^{16}$ The same is the case where the Jod is at the end of the word, as in the Kethiv תחת thou shalt go out, which is in the Keri $\mathfrak{N}$ shall go out; the Kethiv ye shall go [Jerem. vi. 25]. In all these instances the Shurek is in the Jod, but no Kibbutz before it; and there is no Kibbutz before the Jod, viz., , תֵּ
${ }^{15}$ The ten instances in which the reverse is the case, that is which bsgin with Vav in the textual reading, and have Jod in the marginal reading, are as fo lows:-


They are ennmerated in the Massorah marginalis on Hobea i. 1; 1 Chron. i. 1; Prov. xi. 3; and in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section cxxxp. pp. 34. 106. Here again all the three editions of the Massoreth Ha-Massoreth erroneonsly state that there are fifty-six ( $1^{\prime \prime}$ ) such inatances. It will be seen that mevi, given by Levita, is not among the number.
${ }^{15}$ The alphabetical list of the words which have Jod in the middle in the textual reading, and Vav in the marginal reading, has already been given, vide supra, p. 118, note 71.
${ }^{17}$ The two expressions words with Jod at the end in the textual reading, and Vav in the marginal reading.

|  |  | וזער | Jerem. xlviii. 20 | תושם |  | . |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ילדחני | Jerem. ii. 27 | חשטרי | Jerem. 11 | נסשי |  | Job xxxiii. 28 |
| תצגי | Jerem. vi. 25 | חעלזי | Jerem. 1.11 | וחיחי |  | Joh |
| תלכי | Jerem. vi. 25 | תפושי | Jerem. 1. 11 | בלוהי |  | Ezra x. 35 |
|  | Jerem. xiii. 20 | ותצדלי | Jerem. 1.11 | גשאי |  | Ezra $\times 14$ |
|  | Jerem. xiii 20 | ב. | Tsa. xxy, 10 | למלובי |  | Nehem. xii. 14 |
|  | Jerem. xxiii. 18 | סגבוני | Pg. xvii. 11 | ' ${ }^{1}$ |  | 2 Chron. ix. 29 |
| הילילי | Jerem. yl | ושני | Job. |  |  |  |

[^114]the end in the Kethiv, and in the Kéri Vav with Shurele, the letter which precedes the $H e$ is always pointed with Kibbulz, as an ip he shall make bald [Levit. xxi. 5], השְ: \&c.: of which there are fourteen in number. ${ }^{18}$ There are also many other words in which the letters Jod, He, Vav, and Aleph are interchanged, but I prefer brevity.

There are also other letters which have interchanged; but this interchange only takes place in the case of those letters which resemble each other in writing, as Beth with Kaph, Daleth with Resh, He with Cheth, Cheth with Tav, Daleth with final Kaph, and Shin with Teth; or of those letters which belong to some organ of speech, as Beth with Mem, Ajin with Cheth, Daleth with. Tav.

As illustrative of all these, are to be adduced: i. The eleven words which are in the Kethiv with Beth, and in the Keri with Kaph, as the
 iii. 4], \&c. ; and the three instances in which the reverse is the case, ex. gr. the textual reading ${ }^{\prime}$ 'יָּ reading יָּבִין: he shall understand [Prov. xx. 24], the Kethiv and Zabbud, and the Keri ${ }^{\text {ITITI }}$ and Zaccur [Ezra viii. 14], \&c. ${ }^{19}$ ii. The textual reading being Beth and Daleth, whilst the marginal is Beth and Resh, constitutes with Daleth and read Resh, the other instances being אֵעֶ I shall serve, in the Kethiv, and $I$ shall pass over, in the Keri $i$ [Jerem.
under the letter Jod, p. $34 a$, cols. 3 and 4; and in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section cxxxvii., pp. 35, 107. It is to be added, that the words sen , in the Sulzbach edition.
is For the fourteon instances alluded to in the text, see p. 179, note 81.
19 The eleven words which have Beth in the textual reading, and Kaph in the marginal reading, are as follows :-


The third of the three instances in which the reverse is the case, that is, the textnal words being with Kaph, and the marginal reading with Beth, is "במלכ, 2 Sam. xii. 31. The first list is given in the Massorah marginalis on Hosea i. 1; 1 Chron. i. 1: in the Massorah findlis under the letter Beth, p. 15a, col. 2: and in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section exlix., Pp. 36, 109. The second list is given in the Massorah marginalis on 2 Sam. xii. 31; Hosea i. 1; 1 Chron. i. 1: in the Massorall finalis, under the letter Beth, p. 15 a, col. 2: and in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section cl., pp. 36, 110.
ii. 20] ; and the four instances in which the reverse is the case, as

 [Jerem. xxxi. 40], \&c. ${ }^{20}$ iii. The one instance in which the textual reading is final Kaph and the marginal Daleth, viz., the Kethiv 7], and the Keri $\mathbf{T}_{-}$side [ 1 Sam. iv. 13]. iv. The four cases in which the textual reading has Cheth and the marginal $H e$, as the Kethiv our bower, and the Keri in [Song of Songsi. 17], \&c. ${ }^{21} \quad$ จ. The instance in which the Kethiv has Shin and the Keri has Teth, viz., ! and he made, which is read
Myyy he flew [1 Sam. xiv. 32]. vi. The one case in which the textual reading has Cheth and the marginal Tav, viz., the Kethiv P nep it shall snap, and the Keri Pתָּי" it shall be bound [Eccl. xii. 6]. vii. The six words having Beth in the textual reading and Mem in the marginal, as the Kethiv [Josh. iii. 16], \&c. ${ }^{22}$ viii. The one case where the text has $P e$ and the
 lxv. 4]. ix. Where the text has Cheth and the margin ${ }^{\text {ºn }}$ Ajin, viz., the Kethiv $\uparrow$ ח口 an arrow, and the Keri $\gamma \mathbf{Y}$ wood [1 Sam. xvii. 7]. x. Where the text has Ajin and the margin Aleph, viz., the two instances in which the Kethiv has twice $\%$ upon, and the Keri $\S \%$ to, and the Kethiv once לy, whilst the Keri is yy [1 Sam. xx. 24 ; Is. lxv. 7 Ezek. ix. 5]. ${ }^{28}$ xi. Where the text has $H e$ and the margin Ajin, viz.,
${ }^{20}$ The two instances of words with Daleth at the end in the Kethiv, and with Resh in the Keri, are also given in the Massorah finalis under the letter Daleth, p. $19 b$, col.1; and Ochla Ve-Ochla, section cxxiii., pp. 38, 103. The other three words which are written in the text with Resh, and are read in the margin with Daleth, are yמיחור, 2 Sam. xiii. 37 ; סימרוא, 2 Kinge xvi. 6 ; and Prov. xix. 19. They are given in the Massorah marginalis on Jerem. xxxi. 40; and in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section exxii., pp. 38, 102.
${ }^{21}$ The other three words which have Cheth in the textual reading, and $A e$ in the marginal reading, are, עמיחור, 2 Sam. xiii. 37 ; מבחחלח, Provv. xx. 21 ; Dan. ix. 24. They are given in the Massorah marginalis on Prov. xx. 21; Song of Songs i. 16; and in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section exxi. pp. 33, 102.

29 The other five words which have Beth in the textarl reading, and Mem in the marginal reading, are, בעבר Josl. xxiv. 15 ; 2 Kings v. 12; בנימה, 2 Kings xii. 10; כמיך, 2 Kings xxiii. 33 ; בויור, Dan. xi. 18. They are given in the Massorah finalis under the letter Beth, p. 15 a, col. 2; and in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section cliv. pp. 36, 110.
${ }_{23}$ The two instances in which the textaal reading is 4, and the marginal reading $h \infty$, are, $1 \mathrm{Sam} . \mathrm{xx}$. 24; Isa. lxv. 7; and the one instance in which the textnal reading is with Pattach, and the marginal reading h, is in Ezel. ix. 5. The editio princeps of the Massoreth Ha-Massoreth, and the Basel and Sulzhach reprints read $5 *$, which is manifesily a blunder. We have therefore corrected the text. The instances in qnestion are enumerated in the Massorah finalis under the letter Aleph, p. 6b, col. 3; and in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section clxvii., pp. 37, 113.



 but I could not find it so in all the best Codices. ${ }^{24}$ xii. The three instances where the text has Daleth and the margin Tav, viz., the Kethiv 7ns one (masculine), and the Reri תחֵ one (feminine) [Is. lxvi. 17], \&c.; ${ }^{25}$ and the two in which the reverse is the case, viz., the Kethiv אֶñ (feminine), and the Keri (mäsculine) [2 Sam. xviii. 12; ${ }^{\text {™̈ }}$ : Kings xix. 4]. xiii. The two instances in which the text has $H e$ and the marginal reading Kaph,
 [Jerem. xxi. 13], and the Kethiv ane when upon them, whilst the Keri is
 has Resh and the marginal reading Beth, viz., the Kethiv
 speak again below, under the sixth class. And xv. The one instance in which the text has Gimmel and the marginal reading Zajin, viz., the Kethiv לְבַג for food, and the Keri for a spoil [Ezek. xxv. 7], which is owing to the interchange of Gimmel and Zajin in the alphabet denominated Atbach. ${ }^{27}$ This also accounts for the textual reading ia valley, and the marginal reading it this [Ezek. xlvii. 13].

[^115]\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1. - ור, ו, ו, every pair making } 10 \text {. }
\end{aligned}
$$
\]

As the letters $H e, N u n$, and Final Kaph are, from their unpairable numerical valne, necessarily excluded from being coopled with any other member of the alphabet, they
3.-The third class consists of transpositions, that is, of words מלות שכחוב בחן אות אחת מאודר שלא wherein one letter is placed in the textual reading later than it ought to be, and in the marginal reading is put earlier, as it should be. There are sixty-two such instances, and not one of them occurs in the Pentateuch, for which reason I give the mnemonical sign for them, "No transpositions in the Law, minus one." ${ }^{8}$ Fifty-one of these affect the letters $J o d, H e, V a v$, and Aleph; as the Kethiv הוֹלֵ going, בדין, וכקרי האוח החוא םוקרם כדינו, ודו ס'ב במספר, ואין נם אחד טהן בתורה, ונתחי בחן טיטן אין טוקרם ומאוחר בתודה הסד






 שִׁרֵֶי קדי, וחמעם לםי שהיה לבל אחד שני שמות: participle, and the Keri itif to go, infinitive [Josh. vi. 13]; ; וְהֵימֵּ
 [from מושש]; the Kethix הָאֹהֶל the tent [1 Kings vii. 45], and the Keri ה הָ these, \&c.; whilst eleven affect the other letters, as the Kethiv
 they became bright, [1 Sam. xiv. 27]; the Kethiv ] they shall delight, and the Keri נִּ [from they shall observe [Prov. xxiii. 26]; the Kethiv יביָּ; he shall be exempt, and the Keri TM? he shall be joined [Eccl. ix. 4];, \&c. ${ }^{20}$ The same is the case with
 [Ezra ii. 46]; the Kethiv ; Shitrai, and the Keri Shirtai [1 Chron. xxvii. 29], \&c.; which obtained in consequence of each of these persons having two names.

[^116]4.-The fourth class consists of words, the first of which took from the second, that is, of two words placed together, the first word of which took a letter from the second. This, however, only happens with the formative $H e$, at the end of the first word, which belongs to the heginning of the next word. For this reason the punctuators pointed it in the textual reading with Pattach, whilst in the marginal reading it is made the article of the next word. There are three such instances in the textual reading, viz.,
 ing out, and the Keri Nrum [2 Sam. v. 2]; the Kethiv ? רשׁ thou showest down, and the
 and the Kethiv מִּחקחקּ from the chambers, and the Keri
 two instances in which the reverse is the case, viz., the Philistines, and the Keri שָׁ [2 Sam. xxi. 12]; and the Kethiv :

5. -The fifth class embraces entire words written in the text but not read, of which there are eight instances; as [Jerem. li. 3], which is not read ; $\mathbb{K}_{T}$ now [2 Kings $\nabla .18$ ], which is in the Kethiv but not in the Keri, \&c.; ${ }^{32}$ as well as words read from the margin which are not in the text. Of these there are ten in number, viz., 'ي to me, which is in the margin but not in the text [Ruth iii. 17]; text [2 Sam. viii. 3], \&c. ${ }^{39}$ I have, however, already discussed this subject, in the third Introduction [vide supra, p. 109, note 51].
6.-The sixth class embraces expressions which are written in the text as one word, and read in the margin as two words. Of these

[^117]

 xxx. 11]; the Kethiv when wh $i t$, and the Keri $\underset{\text { It }}{\text { Dit }}$ [Exod.iv. 2], \&c. Also eight words in which the reverse is the case, being in the text two words, and in the margin one; as has ix. 1], the textual reading לָם רָבָּה to them shall be great, and the marginal reading forme the increase [Isa. ix. 6], \&c. ${ }^{34}$

Now I am greatly astomished at the traditional explanation of this word, saying that there is a final Mem in the middle of the word;

הדרושות שנדרשו על המלה הזאח ואומרים כי המ"ם סתומה באמצע הטלח, והדי לפי הכחיב איגה כאמצע המלה, בי חכחיב הוא ב'



 ובכלל חמין חוח טלין ריכחיכין מלה אתח וקריין טלח אחרח, כנון יצא הָּציר החיכונה
 וכבר זכרחי זה בטין ב' עם הלוף האוחיות,
 since, according to the Kethiv, it is not in the middle of the word, as the Kethiv has two words לָ רָ and since לָ may be taken for לָם to them, just as אֶרֶם [Is. xxxiii. 7]
 stands for has it, is to be explained by

To this class, also, belong-i. Those words which are written in the text in one way, and for which the marginal reading has quite a different expression, as the Kethiv דָעֶ the city, for which the Keri is Keri ${ }^{\text {Levive }}$ and I dwelled [Ezek. iii. 15], \&c., which have already been mentioned under the second class, on the interchange of letters. ii. The Kethiv

[^118]21, with 1 Chron. xi. 28]. iii. The five groups of three words, each one of which is written in the text in one way, and is entirely different in the marginal reading. These I have already discussed, under the class of words the letters of which are more than the vowel-points. And iv. Those expressions which are written in the text as one word, and for which the marginal reading has two words entirely different to the textual reading, as the Kethiv as that, and the Keri cording to all that [Ezek. ix. 11], the Kethiv שׁׁיגֵיהם their urine, and the Keri מֵימֵי רַנְלֵיםּם the water of their feet [थ̈ K̇ings xvii. 27], \&c. See above, at the beginning of this Section.
7.-The seventh class embraces cacophonic and euphemic expressions. Our Rabbins of blessed memory say, that all the words which are written in the Scriptures cacophonically must be read euphemically, as-i. The Kethiv ישׁׁab he shall ravish her, and the Keri xxviii. 30]. For this cacophonous term משגל, which occurs four times in the textual reading, the Keri has always the euphemic word
 of their both being cacophonous terms, the Keri has the euphemic words iii. ${ }^{\text {a }}$, which is a tumour near the pudenda, denoting in German Feighlattern, and, being a cacophonous expression, is in the Keri the piles [Deut. xxviii. 27]; ${ }^{37}$ vide Aruch, s. v. טחר.

The rule which obtained is, that every cacophonous expression was changed for a euphemism, so that man might not utter anything indecent. And indeed there are some who maintain that Hebrew is for this reason called the holy language, ${ }^{39}$ because it is all holy, and there is

[^119]not any indecency in it, since it has neither names for the male and female generative organs, nor words for the discharge of the duties of nature, all these things being expressed by some euphemism, as I have already stated. Still, if this were the reason, it would be more appropriate to call it the pure, or the decent language, but not the holy language. R. Abraham de Balmes again remarks in his Grammar, entitled The Possession of Abraham, as follows: "It is called the holy language, because it was given by the Creator, blessed be his name, who is the Holiest of all holy." Thus far his remark. ${ }^{39}$

However, I have already animadverted upon this question, among many other strictures which I made on his book, submitting that, according to his opinion, it ought more properly to be called the language of the Holy One, and not the holy language. 40 It seems, however, more appropriate to say that it is designated "the holy language," because the words of the Law, the Prophets, and all the holy statements were uttered therein, and because the Creator is therein called by His holy names, as the Mighty One, the Almighty of Sabaoth, \&c., as well as His angels, ex. gr. Michael, Gabriel, \&c., and the holy ones upon the earth, as Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Solomon, \&c., \&c. On this account it is meet and proper to call it the holy language. Herewith the seven classes are ended, and the First Section is finished.

Section II., concerning Kametz and Pattach.-I have already stated, in Introduction III., that the Massorites only mention the vowel-points Kametz and Pattach, and that they include in them the minor Kametz and the minor Pattach, which are Tzere and Segol.

You must, however, observe, that they have never ranged the major Kametz with the minor under the one number, or under the same

[^120]rubric. Thus, when they say that והמשל באשר אמרו בך ובך מלין קמצין such and such a number have $K a$ - חדע שאוחן המלוח כלן בקורוח בקטץ לבד metz, you must know that these words are either all pointed with Kametz only, or with Tzere only; as, for instance, the alphabetical list of words, which they describe as having Kametz with the accent Sakeph; as, yīy $I$ shall know [1 Kings xviii. 12], [Jerem. xxii. 14].41 All the words thus alphabetically enumerated are pointed with Rametz, and not one of them has Tzere. The same designation they give to the list of words which are pointed with Tzere; namely, the fifteen words with Kametz: as תְעֵ thou shalt
 קמצין בזקף וםמנם אשר לא אחדָּי, וםפון בְּארי (ירמיה ב"ב) ; בלן נקורוח בקטיץ וא׳ן אחר מהם בצירי, ובן אמרו על כלוֹת הנקורור: בצירי כנון

 ואאין אחר מחן בקמץ; והוא חרין בפתחין אותן המלוח בלן בבתחה לבד, כנון ו׳ מלין
 וכוּ, הרי שבין גרול וקטן לא הבריל בקריאח עומוחן; ובמסרח קמנה אפילו בשם קםצין ופחחין לא קראו לחן, רק משימין הנקורה חהח אות הסיםן המורח על מטפר חמלח חהיא, במו בהן פי",י38 וכן בפחח affict [Exod. xxii. 22], הTMrinkle [Numb. viii. 7], \&c., all of which are pointed with Tzere, and not one of them with Kametz. The same rule obtains with Pattach. All the words thus described have Pattach only; as the six words with Pattach, viz.,
 Hence you see that they made no distinction between major and minor in the naming of the vowels. Indeed, in the Massorah parva, they have not even called them by the names Kametz and Pattach, but the vowel-points are put under the letter which designates the number of instances wherein the word in question thus occurs ; ex. gr., the word in them, "occurs fifteen times ["ט" The same is the case with Pattach; as the word מַַַּe eating, "occurs

[^121]
 in behold "occurs five times ['त] with Segol under He." ${ }^{45}$ Accordingly, by the vowel-point of the signal letter is to be known what the Massorah treats of ; and this is easily understood.

It is, however, to be remarked, that in the words with Pattach of each Book the Massorites have put together the Segols with the Pattachs. Let me now explain what is Pattach of the Book. It is known, from the laws of the vowelpoints, that when Athnach and Soph-pasukc come under Pattach and Segol, they convert the latter into a long Kametz. Some instances, however, are left in each book of
 רספרה ערבו הסנולים בחוֹך הפתוחים ועחה אבאר מה פתח רספרא; הנה ידוע מדרך חנקוד בי לא יבא אחנח וסוף פטוק חחח פחח
 נשארו מהן בכל ספר וספר שלא יחהפבוי, והן נקראים פרחח דספרא, ונמנין על פּ המסורח, והס י"ם בספר בראשיח, כנון לאשה

 בטוךף פםוק; 40 ובן בכל ספר וכפר נמנים אוחן שבאחנח לבר, ואוחם שבם"פ לבר, וחתעדבו חפחח"ך והסנולין יחר : המאמר השלישי ברנשין ורפין ומפקין וקצח ריני השוא: בירוע שהדנש היא the Bible, which have not been thus converted, and these are denominated Pattach of the Book $=$ Pattach de Siphra. They have been counted by the Massorah, and amount to nineteen in Genesis; as,
 shall bless them [Gen. xlviii. 9]. Twelve of these have Pattach with Athnach, and seven with Soph-pasuk. 48 In all the other sacred books, too, they have counted those with Athnach separately, and those with Soph-pasule separately, whilst the Pattachs and Segols they have mixed up together.

Section III., concerning Dagesh, Raphe, Mappik, and some of the laws of the Sheva.-It is well known that Dagesh is a point put in the

[^122]bosom of a letter, whilst Raphe is a straight line like a Pattach [-] put over the letter, especially over the aspirates Beth, Gimmel, Daleth, Kaph, $P e$, and Tav, as I have explained in the Poetical Dissertation. The Massorites speak but very little about these, and, since they have already been explained, I need nòt speak any more about them. You are, however, to observe, that the Massorites also call the letters Teth, Samech, Shin, Koph, Tzaddi, Nun, Vav, Zajin, Lamed, Jod, and Mem feeble letters, because they ought to have Dagesh, but the Dagesh has been dropped for the sake of ease. Most of these occur in the Piel, where the characteristic Dagesh in the middle stem letter is omitted, as in the Nun in and they envied [Gen. xxxvii. 11],
 [Josh. ii. 22], the Lamed in they sent [Ps. lxxiv. 7], \&c.

But in the letters Beth, Gimmel, Daleth, Kaph, Pe, Tav, the Dagesh is only very rarely omitted, as in מבּuman the vintage [Judg. viii. 2], מִpung from their strength [Ezel. xxii. 30 ], and a few more; and even in the letters Teth, Samech, Shin, Koph, Tzaddi, Nun, Vav, Zajin, Lamed, Jod, Mem, the Dagesh, as I have already said, is only dropped when one of them is pointed with Sheva, and especially in Mem with
 who teaches [Ps. cxliv. 1], הַמקבּבּ who is impoverished [Is. xl. 20], \&e.; all these they call feeble letters, though they have not the straight line of Raphe over them. Now I submit that they ought to have the Rophe line placed over them, to show that the Dagcsh is dropped, ex. gr. אי:
 has inadvertently omitted the Dagesh and read it with Dagesh. I therefore expostulated with the printers of this district for not even putting Raphe on the aspirates, Beth, Gimmel, Daleth, Kaph, Pe, and Tav, because they said that they did not require it, since when they had no Dagesh it was known that they were feeble. But this is a mistake. In
the case of well known words, as
 they journeyed, :
 praise ye the Lord, \&c., \&c., from all of which Dagesh has been dropped, there is no necessity for placing the Raphe line over them, because they are the majority. The Massorites, also, call every $H e$ feeble which ought to have Mappite but has it not, as or her purity [Levit. xii. 5], [Ezek. xvi. 44], \&c. But I have already discussed this point in Part i., Sections ix. and x., on Mappik Aleph and Mappik Jod, where I have explained which is Mappitc Aleph and which is not.

As to Mappik $H e$, it is a point in the bosom of the $H e$, like Dagesh at the end of a word. The Germans used this point, as her hand, \&c.; they would not put the point under the $H e$, because they thought that it might mislead, lest the reader should read it Chirel. This, however, is not to be regarded, since there does not occur a point in the last letter of the word, as I have explained in Part i., Section v.

It is moreover known, from the laws of grammar, that the prepositional letters, Kaph, Lamed, and Beth, are pointed according to rule with Sheva, except when it cannot be, as I have explained in the Section on the Serviles. ${ }^{47}$ Now the Massorites call this Sheva, Raphe, because it can never be followed by Dagesh. Thus, they remark בְבּביִ in the house, "oceurs six times Raphe;" 18 露 for money, "occurs fifteen times Raphe;" 49 אלְ לְ to a throne, "occurs six times Raphe." so They are also called Raphe when they are not followed by the aspirates

[^123]Beth, Gimmel, Daleth, Kaph, Pe, and Tav; as occurs three times Raphe; 51 and , with the sword, occurs eight times Raphe; 53 or when they are pointed with Chirek, on account of the Sheva by which they are followed; as is four times Raphe; ${ }^{63}$ and the field, five times Raphe, ${ }^{54}$ \&c. It is further known that the prepositional letters Kaph, Lamed, Beth, which are pointed with Pattach,
 בחירק כסיבח חשוא חבא אחתריחם, כמו
 וירוע ג"ב בי אוחיוח כלֹ״ב הפתוחיט המורים על ה"א היריעח, תמיד רגש אתףיהם, לפיכך קראו לתיבות הפתהין האלה דנושין, במו
 קמוצים כעבור אח״עה מנו אוחם, כמו לאָדם
 והכלל כי חמיד מונין הטועםים אם
דגועשים אם רפין, וכששניחם טועטים חם
 indicating the contracted article He, are always followed by Dagesh. The Massorites, therefore, call those letters Dageshed, which have such a Pattach; hence they remark on in all, "seven times Dageshed," ${ }^{5 s}$ and בíve to good, "twice Dageshed." ${ }^{56}$ They also counted them when they are pointed with Kametz, because of being followed by the gutturals Aleph, Cheth, Ajin, and He, as
 thirty-two times with Kametz." ${ }^{58}$

Now the rule is, that they always counted those which are fewer in number, whether with Dagesh or Raphe, and when both happened to be few, they counted both; as in in good; on which they remark,

[^124]"four times Raphe,", se ${ }^{59}$ בַּ times Dageshed;" "four times Raphe,"" times Dageshed. ${ }^{60}$ When they happen to be pairs, that is, two with Raphe and two with Dagesh, they call them Milel and Milra, as I shall explain in the following Section; and when both are equally numerous, as way, in the city, they neither counted the Raphes nor the Dageshes, because they are very numerous. The exclamatory, or interrogative $H e$, too, which is pointed with Chateph-pattach, is called Raphe; as רֶivin the keeper? [Gen. iv. 9], is marked "not extant, Raphe;" ט the judge? [Gen. xviii. 25], is " not extant, Raphe"; but when it has Pattach, on account of being followed by the gutturals Aleph, Cheth, $H e$, and Ajin, they do not call it Raphe, but Pattached; as הַעֶבֶר " a servant? [Jerem. ii. 14], is " not extant with Pattach," \&c.

It is also to be remarked that the Massorites likewise call Raphe the Vav conjunctive which precedes the letters Aleph, Jod, Tav, and Nun;
 shall say, "six times Raphe;" ${ }^{2}$ וְחִשְׁמַ $a n d$ hear thou, "five times Raphe."'6s The same is the case when it is pointed with Chirek, because of the Jod, belonging to the preformatives Aleph, Jod, Tav, and Nun of the future, whereby it is followed, as I have explained in

[^125]the Section on the Servile Letters, ex. gr. חhenex and he will send, on which they remarked, "fifteen times Raphe:" ${ }^{64}$ יִִ and it shall be, "thirty-two times Raphe." ${ }^{6 s}$ Or when the said $V a v$ is pointed with Shurel, on account of Tav and Nun with Sheva, belonging to the preformative letters Aleph, Jod, Tav, and Nun, whereby it is followed, as 7 콕ㄱ and thou shalt speak, which is marked "twice Raphe" [Is. xl. 27]; ${ }^{66}$ and we shall declare [Jerem.li.10], "not extant, Raphe," \&c. ${ }^{67}$

The rule is, that whenever Vav preceding the future is pointed with Sheva, Chirek, or Shurek, they call it Raphe, except when it occurs in pairs, one of which has Sheva and the other Pattach. In such a case they call it Milel and Milra, as I have stated above. Mark that they always counted the instances in which it is Raphe, because they are the fewer, since in most cases in which Vav precedes the letters Aleph, Jod, Tav, and Nun it is conversive, and has Pattach, followed by Dagesh. This Vav conversive they did not count, because it is the most frequent; but when it has Kametz, because of the guttural Aleph belonging to the preformatives, Aleph, Jod, Tav, and Nun, they generally counted it, as and $\dot{I}$ shall fnow, "three times." ${ }^{\text {ce }}$ Notice, also, that there is a kind of Sheva, which they call Dagesh, namely, Sheva quiescent under the
 he shall desire, \&c., whilst they call Raphe, the Chateph-pattach and Chateph-segol, because Dagesh never follows them. I have.already stated in " the Poetical Dissertation," poem viii., that in five instances the Sheva is called mobile, and not quiescent.

[^126]4 Let me now give you the, ,, , letters Aleph, Beth, Gimmel,Daleth, and $H e$ as a new and appropriate mnemonical sign for it. Aleph [= first] means that whenever Sheva is under the first letter of a word, it is vocal, as i. 8]; Beth $[\stackrel{\ddots}{=}$ two means that when two Shevas occur in the middle of a word, the first is silent and the second is vocal, as shall hear, ,יְ:ִי: they shall learn, \&c.; Gimmel, which is the initial of גדולו long, means that whenever Sheva follows a long syllable it is vocal, as they dwelled, חin the coming, \&c.; Daleth, which is the initial of Dagesh, means that whenever Sheva is under a letter with Dagesh it is vocal, as word, \&c.; whilst the letter $H e$, which is the initial of הדמות alike signifies that when two
 שואין באמצע החיצח, הראשון נח והשני
 בל שוא שאחר חנועה נדולה הוא נע, כמו

 ודומיחן; ח' ר"ל חדטוח, פירוש כשיחיו ב' אוחיוה דומוח, וחראשונה בשוא הוא נע, כמו תַּלְּוּהָה, עחל"מד הראשונה אינה דוּושח, ומ"מ נקדא השוא נע בעבור שני הלם"דין, וכן חהנְנִי השוא נע בעבור שני הנו"נין ; וחכור וה הפטמן, ודצפנחו בי טוב חוא: והגה חוזר על חראעוגוחת, ואחן לך טעל על חשוא, שקדראו דגש; אמדו בטסורח כל לשון העלמה בדנש, ר"ל בשוא פשוֹט, כםו



 צורי אָזֶסֶח בו; 70 וכן אמדו מעשר ג׳ דגושים, letters which are alike come together, and the first has Sheva, it is vocal, as in היהל Hallelujah, where, though the first Lamed has no Dagesh, yet it is called vocal Sheva because of the two Lameds, and חִּנְ behold I, in which Sheva is vocal because of the two Nuns. Remember this mnemonical sign, and treasure it up, for it is useful.

I shall return now to my first subject, and give you an example of a Sheva, which the Massorites call Dagesh. They make the following remark in the Massorah: "the expression to conceal, has always Dagesh;" that is, it is always with simple Sheva, as הַשְׂלם יַשְלימוּ hiding they shall hide [Levit. xx. 4], \&e. They also say the word חסיה to trust, has always Dagesh, as $I$ shall trust [Ps. lvii. 2], instances, in which it is Raphe, that is, with Chateph-pattach or Chateph-segol, as xviii. 3], \&c. ${ }^{70}$ They also remark, tithe, occurs three times with

[^127]Dagesh, as
 instances it is Raphe, that is, with Chateph-pattach, as of [Deut. xiv. 23], \&c. Examine, and you will find it so.

Section IV., concerning Milel, Milra, and Psik.-Mark that there is not a single word in the whole Scripture without an accent either at the beginning, middle, or end. Now, the Massorites call the place on which the accent rests by two Aramaic names. The one is מלעיל Milel, which is the translation of the Hebrew מלמעלה from above; and the other is מלרע Milra, and is the translation of the Hebrew מטה from below. By this is not meant that the accent is either above or below the centre of the letter, but when the accent is either on the first letter of the word, or on the middle, they call it Milel, and when it is on the end of the word they denominate it Milra. Now there are some words which, according to rule, are always Milel; and there are others, again,
 ופםקים ! רע בי אין לך חיבח בכל המקרא שאין לח טעם, או בראש, או באמצע, או או בסוף, וקראו בעלי המסורד למקום חנחרק המעמים ב׳ שמוח בלשין אדטי; חאז מלעיל, ודוא תרנומו של מלמעלה, נהכ׳ מלרע וחוא תחנומו של מטה או מתחת ; ואין הכוונה בהם שההםעם מלמעלה אי מלמטה בגוףף האוח, אלא כשהמעם באות חדאצוצוגה על התיבח או באמצע, קראו לו מלעיל, וכאשד הוא בסוף החיבה קראו לו מלרצ; וחנה יע: מלוח עוחינם להיויח חמיד במעם מלעיל, ויש ששיינם חמיר מלרע, ויש שדינם לפעםים מלעיל ולפעמים מלרע, ויש לבל אלו מבטלים; ובספר טוב טעם אשר +ערתי חבורו, יבואצו כל הדיגים חללו, עם כל שאר דיגי חטעמים אי "ח; 72 מצורח לוח כי בעלי חמםורח לא דברו מזה רק מעם זעד
שם ועם שם:

והכלל כי לא כחבו על מלח יחידח אם
טעמח מלעיל או טלרע, רק לפעמים מעםים בקצחת המלוח שיש בחן אוה זורות בשעמן או בנקידחן; כנון עםמה אהחת מן ל"ח מלין מלעיל וכל חכרוחיה טלרע, כגון וְדִשִׁקיָָ which, according to rule, are always Milra; whilst some, again, are at times Milel, and at other times Milra. Still there are exceptions to all these. In the book entitled Good Sense, which I have determined to compose, all these rules will be explained, together with all the other laws of the accents, if God permit. ${ }^{72}$ It must be added, that the Massorites make but very few desultory remarks on this subject.

As a rule, they do not note every single word, whether it has the accent on the penultima or on the ultima, but only very occasionally mark some words which are anomalous, either in their accents or points. Thus, for instance, they give a register of thirty-eight words, which in one case only have the accent on the penultima, whilst in all other passages they have the accent on the ultima, as $\boldsymbol{N}_{\mathrm{T}}$

[^128]shalt water it［Deut．xi．10］，on which the Massoretic remark is， ＂not extant，Milel ；＂${ }^{73}$ and also an－ other register－in which the reverse is the case－of words，which in one instance only are Milra，whilst in all other passages they are Milel， as הָ come now［Gen．xxix．21］， noted＂＂not extant as Milra．＂${ }^{\text {™ }}$＂

 Milra and twice Milel．＂${ }^{76}$ Those which are Milel have Segol，whilst those which are Milra have，according to grammar，Tzere；and，in consequence of this change，the Massorites counted them，and have given the marks of the passages；whilst，with regard to those in which the said change does not take place，as 순．it shall be called，which

| תטהּ ．．Dent．xi． 10 | קינT ．．Ezel．xix． 14 | \％．．．Job vii． 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| לטר ．．Dent．xvii． 12 | רוֹצה ．．．．Iea．vi． 13 | מכצ ．．Prov．xi． 26 |
| Tבר．．．Gen．xviii． 20 | שטר 6 |  |
|  | מרד ．． 1 Sam．xxx． 6 | הוֹת ．．Prov．xvii． 10 |
| 700\％．．．Levit．xv． 13 | התהתונה ．Ezek．xl． 19 | ותאר ．．．．Prov．vii． 13 |
| ．．Numb．xxi． 5 | התיצונה ． 2 Kings xvi． 18 | －．．Prov．xxx． 24 |
| רדוקד－Judg．xviii． 28 | רצה ．．．．Iea．xxiv． 19 | חומה ．Ezek．xlii． 20 |
| טובה－．Rnth iv． 15 | וחגרד ．．Iea．xxxii． 11 | \％．．．Prov．i． 19 |
| הקי．． 2 Sam．xxiii． 1 | ותרד ．Ezek．xxiv． 11 | הבו ．．．．Job．vi． 22 |
| ף | בוקy ．．．T6a．lxiii． 12 | ヶп ．．．．Job xxili． 9 |
| ושברהּ．．．Ezok xiv． 12 | 浐 ．．． 2 Kings iii．11 | שמ ．．．．．P6．cl． 5 |
| הררם． 2 Kings vi． 7 | הา ．．Joh xix． 17 | הרשע ．．Eccl．iii． 16 |
| \％צ ．．Itea．xxviii． 20 | 7 צ ．．．Job xxvi． 8 |  |

They are given in the Massorah finalis，under the＂variations between the Easterns and Westerne，＂p． $62 a$ ，cole． 3 and 4．The Ochla Ve－Ochla，eection ccelxxii．，pp．61，171， gives eaventeen additional instances，whilet it omite some whioh are contained in our list．

74 The list of words which on the contrary occur only once with the accent on the ultime is as follows：－


| וראיחה | Levit．xxiv． 5 |
| :---: | :---: |
| ¢ ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | Judg．v． 8 |
| צרצ | Judg．vi． 3 |
| ארצא | 1 Kinge xvi． 9 |
| הרזר | İ日．vii． 4 |



There arg also two others，abont which there is a difference of opinion，viz．，וחדציח Numb．xxxi．27，and ועטיח Zech．vi．11．They are enumerated in the Ochla Ve－Ochla， section ceclxxiii．，pp．61， 172.

75 The two instances in which ויסף is Milel are，Prov．i．5；ix．2．；and the one insfance of Milra is in 2 Sam．xxiv．3．See the Maesorah marginalis on 2 Sam．xxiv． 3.

76 The three paesages in which FOת occurs Milra are，Gen．iv．2；Dent．xiii． 1 ： Ps．civ．29．It will be seen that in the first two instances it is the Hiphil future of ＂D＇to dadd；whilst in the third passage it is Kal future，second pereon singular mascu－ line for 9 ONn from 10 to gather．They are ennmerated in the Massorah marginalis on Exod．iv．12，and in the Ochla Ve－Ochla，Section iv．of the additione，pp．62， 173. The two passagss in which it is Milel ars，Exod．x．28；Dent．iii．26．Comp．Massorah marginalis on Exod．x． 28.
occurs twenty-one times, ${ }^{77}$ and $ע$ עִ? shall know, nineteen times, ${ }^{78}$ which according to rule ought all to be Milra; and though some of them are Milel, because of the proximity of the accents, as N". it shall be called [Isa. xxxv. 8], עTיֵ he shall know [1 Sam. xx. 3], they do not say a single word inasmuch as no change of vowel has taken place in them.

靬军 Mark, moreover, that a kind of Milel and Milra occurs in the Massorah magna, which does not refer to the position of the accents, but to the change of the vowels. Thisis the case with words which occur twice, and which the Massorites denominate pairs. They are of two kinds.

The first class consists of two words beginning with the serviles Kaph, Lamed, and Beth, before the preformative Aleph, Jod, Tav, and Nun of the future, one word of which is pointed with Sheva, and the other with Pattach, followed by Dagesh; as is the case with those words called Dagesh and Raphe, as I have explained in the preceding section. Normally there is no difference between those called Dagesh and Raphe and those which they call pairs, except that the latter only are arranged in pairs. Thus, for instance, the eleven pairs, one which is Milel, and one Milra, beginning with Beth; as תבּבּ in tears, Milel [Lament. ii. 11], and nivintuch, Milra [Ps. lxxx. 6], \&c. . $^{79}$ the alphabetical list of double pairs of words beginning with Kaph,

\footnotetext{

77 The twenty-one instances in which wרי occnrs, are as follows: Gen. ii. 23; xvi. 5; xxyv. 10; xxi. 12: Numb. xxiii. 3: Dent. iii. 13; xxii. 6: 1 Sam. ix. 9: Isa. iv. 1; xiv. 20 ; xxxi. 4 ; xxxii. | b $; ~ l v i . ~ 7 ; ~ x x x v . ~$ |
| :--- | ; liv. 5 ; i. 26 ; lxii. 12 : Jerem. xix. 6 : Isa. lxii. 4; Prov. xvi. 21 : Esther iv. 11. They are given in the Massorah marginalis on Jerem. xix. 6. It will be seen that two of the instances, viz., Nnmb. xxiii. 3 ; Dent. xxii. 6, are not from wר, to call.

${ }^{78}$ The nineteen passages in which $\begin{gathered}\text { ירצ occurs are, Josh. xxii. } 22: 1 \text { Sam. xx. 3; xxi. }\end{gathered}$ 3: Isa. vii. 16; viii. 4; lii. 6: Jerem. xxxvi. 19; xl. 15; xxxviii. 24: Job siv. 21 : Ps. xxxv. 8 ; xxxix. 7; xcii. 7 : Prov. xxiv. 12; xxviii. 22 : Eccl. viii. 5 (twice); ix. 12; x. 14. They are given in the Massorah marginalis on Ps. xcii. 7.

79 The eleven pairs of words heginning with Beth, which respectively occur once Milra (i.e., with Sheva, or its suhstitutive feeble vowel) and once MIILel (i.e., with the real vowel), are as follows:-

| נרמע | Ps. Ixxy. 6 | במצולה | Ps. crii. 24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ברמעות | Lament. ii. 11 | במצולה | Zech. i. 8 |
| בחי״ | Dan. vii. 12 | בממלנה | Isa. xix. 2 |
| בד | Joh xxiv. 22, | בממלנה | Amos ix. 8 |
| בתרט | Issa. viii. 1 | בס7] | Pe. lxxiv. 5 |
| בתרט | Exod. xxxii. 4 | בטכך | Gen. xxii. 13 |
| במדינות | Esther ix. 16 | בטירוח | - Amosiv. 2 |
| במדינות | Lament. i. 1 | בסירוח | 2 Chron. xxxv. 13 |


| בנגע | Deut. xxiv. |
| :---: | :---: |
| בנגע | Levit. xiii. 3 |
| בשאהת | Exod. xxvii. 7 |
| בשרחת | Levit. xiii. 10 |
| בתנור | Levit. xxvi. 2 |
| בתנו7 | . Levit. vii. 9 |



 12], Milva; ${ }^{80}$ the "twenty-two pairs of two words, each beginning with Vav, one of which is Milel, and והמין הכ' חוא גאמר על שאדר הנקודוח,
 desired [ 1 Chron. xi. 17], Milel, and NTMP! and he shall desire [Ps. xlv. 12], Milra, \&c. ${ }^{81}$

The second kind comprises the other vowel-points. Of these, there is an alphabetical list in the Massorah magna giving words

| They are given in the Massorah finalis under the letter Beth, p. $14 a$, cols. 3 and 4; Massorah marginalis on Isa. viii. 1; and Ochla Ve-Ochla, seotion xlix., pp. 15, 55. <br> ${ }^{80}$ The alphabetical list of words heginning with Kaph, which only occar twice, once |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Milra, or with Sheva as its substitutive feeble vowel, and once Milel, cr with the real vowel, is as follows: |  |  |  |  |
| נאהל . Isa. xxxviii. 12 | T |  | Tmis |  |
| a. xl .22 | כחום | ndg. xvi. | כסוחה |  |
| כ . . Numb. xxiv. 6 | กร่ | Ps. xix. | כסוEה | Prov. i. 27 |
| - Song of Songe p. 15 | נתחן | Isa. 1xi. 10 | נסושה | Isa. . 7. 28 |
| כאב . . Isa. xxix. 5 | כחלב | Levit. iv. | כערב |  |
| כ- $\cdot$ - Isa. จ. 24 | בחלב | Pg. cxix. 70 | פעורב | g of Songs F . 11 |
| . 2 Chron. xxxiv. 32 | פכבור | Isa. xvii. 13 | כצר | . |
| כנר - . Jerem. xxxi. 32 | צככור | Ezek. iii. 23 | כֹר | Isa. Y. 28 |
| לגמ - . Ps. cxxxi. 2 | כמת | Pe. xxxi. 13 | פרטצ | xp |
| נגול . . Pb. cxxxi. | ก | umb. xii. 12 | פרשע | en. xviii. 25 |
| וכרק . . Prov. xii. 4 |  | Pe. lxxi. | [נשואה. | Prov. i. 27 |
| ו - Hos. y. 12 | - |  | השואה | k. Xx |
| - וכלת. xvii. 12 |  |  |  | Song' of So |
|  |  |  |  |  |

This catalogus is given in the Massorah finalis nndar the letter Kaph, p. $38 a$, col. 1; and in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section xi. pp. 7, 19, \&c. The alphabetical order will be seen after the letter Kaph.
${ }^{81}$ The twenty-two words beginning and ending with $V a v$, each one of which occurs twice, once Milra, or with Vav conjunctive, and once Milel, or with Vav cinversive, are as follows :-

|  | Ps. xlv. 12 | ויפרו | Isa. xlv. 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| ויתמהו |  | 1 | 11 Kings xxi. 10 |
|  | Gen. xliii. |  | Kings xxi. 13 |
|  | Nnmb. xiii. | וישבדו |  |
|  | Numb. xil | וישצד | , |
|  | Joh xii. 15 | יוינהי | am. xxx. 22 |
|  | Sam. xx7. | וינהני | am. xxx. 2 |
| ודיויו | zak. xxxvi | וינורו |  |
|  | ck. xxxvii. 10 | וינזוי |  |
|  | $\mathrm{P}_{\text {s. exxix. }} 5$ | וירצו |  |
|  | Ps. 1xxviii. 57 | ) | Isa. xxir. 18 |
|  | abak |  | d. xxviii. 28 |
|  | Sam. xip. 52 |  | Exod. xyxix. |
| וינחת | ron. |  |  |



They are given in the Massorah finalis under the letter Vav, p. 29b, co.'s. 1 and 2; and in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section xly., pp. 14, 52, \&c. It will be seen that thongh the Massorah states in the heading of this rubric that there are twenty-two such instances, it gives tuenty-three. This arises from the fact that the word וישבו (Ps. xxii. 27; Hos. xiii. 6), which is an addition to this rubric, has inadvertendly been mixed up with it. In the Ochla Ve-Ochla it is righ $5 l y$ separated.
wherein those which have Cholem, המלוח שבחן חולם, אָו שורק, אוֹ קכוץ Shurele,or Kibbutz, are called Milel; מלעיל, ואשר בחן קמץ, או קמץ חמק, אוֹ, אוֹ whilst those which have Kametz, פתח, או צדי, או תירק טלוע ; וחה לא נאמר Kametz-chateph, Pattach, Tzere, or Chirele, are called Milra. This, however, is only the case with groups of pairs. As, for instance, when a word occurs twice, once with Cholem and another time with Kametz, Kametz-chateph, or Tzere; the Massorites call the one with Cholem, Milel, and the rest Milra. Thus, [Gen. iii. 11] is Milel, אֲכָּל eating of [Deut. xii. 23], is Milra; רק על זוגנת של שנים צונים מלין ; והמשל בשיחיו ב' מלות האחת בהולם ותברחח בקמק, או פחטקף קמצ, או בצדי, קראו אוחה שבחולם מלעיל וחשאר טלרע; כ כוון לבלהי




 טלרע: 82 ๆל? it shall drop [Eccl. x. 18], is

 travellers [Isa. xxi. 13], is Milei, nñîא a company of [Gen. xxxvii. 25],
 xxv. 2], is Milra. ${ }^{82}$

82 The alphabetical list to which Levita refers, and which illustrates all his remarks on the second kind, is as follows:-

|  | - Deut. xii. 23 |
| :---: | :---: |
| , | Gen. iii. 11 |
| 7 L . | Ezak. xxv. |
| -x. | Prov. xxv. |
| T | Isa. xxi. 13 |
| ארדתת | Gen. xxxvii. 25 |
| N | Nghem |
| ארן . | - Ezra ii. 59 |
| OX | Estheri. |
| אנם | Dan |
| בקרב | Ps. xxvii |
| בקרב | Sam. XV. |
| במעל | Nshem. viii. |
| בלמ\% | Josh. xxii. 22 |
| בנִ | Joh |
| ב | 2 Sam. xviii. 12 |
| גוידנו | Nehem. ix. 37 |
| גויתנו | Gen. xlvii. 18 |
| דעכו | . Ps. cxviii. 12 |
| דעכו | Isa. xliii. 17 |
| האבד" | Ezels. xxviii. 9 |
| האלר | Job xxxiv. 31 |
| הקצור | Isa. 7 y . |
| הקצר | Micah ii. |
| המשל | Jndg. ix. |
| המשל | Joh xxy. 2 |
|  | Dan. Y. 20 |
|  | Jo |


| - הודיעועו | - 1 Sam. vi. ${ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| הוריענו | - Joh xxxvii. 19 |
| ועעחר | 1 Chron. \%. 20 |
| ונצתר | Isa. xix. 22 |
| ונחתול | Esther viii. 8 |
| ונדתם | Esther iii. 12 |
| ויקום | Eccl. xii. 4 |
| ויקם | Job xxii. 28 |
| ומשול | . Jergm. xxx. 21 |
| ומשלו | - Zech. ix. 10 |
| ורצ . | - Ps. xcvii. 11 |
| זרוע. | Levit. xi. 37 |
| . | Gen: xxxiii. 5 |
| - | Isa. xxx. 19 |
| טהוד | Habak. i. 13 |
| טהר | Prov. xxii. 11 |
| ידינוי | . . 2 Kings vii. 4 |
| 13י9 | . Hos. vi. 2 |
| - | Eccl. x. 18 |
| ידלֹ. | Gen. xxii. 22 |
| כתם | Ps. Ixxviii. 72 |
| בתם | . Isa. xpiii. 5 |
| לאמחם | Gen. xxy. 16 |
| לאחםם | Lament ii. 12 |
| לשבוים | Isa. 1xi. 1 |
| לשבאים | Joel iv. 8 |
| מעצר | 1 Sam. xiv. 6 |
| מעצר | Prov. xxy. 28 |

[^129]The list is given in the Massorah finalis under the letter Aleph, p. $2 a$, col. 4-2 $b$,
 (Zsch. xiii. 9 ; Ps. lxvi. 10), as not bsing included in the Massoretic list (לבר ממסורתא), whilst it deviates in its description of נand and הנתח.

They call Shurek, Milra, in op- וקראו השורק מלציל ננר הקמץ והפחה
 Tzere; as :נְּ [Dan. ix. 12], is Milel, , invopi he judged us [1 Sam. viii. 20], is ${ }^{\text {TMilel }}$; רִּ they deceived me [Lam. i. 19], is Milra, דרָּ he deceived me [ 2 Sam. xix. 27], is Milra; :יחי' they shall let us live [ 2 Kings vii. 4 ], is Milel, , יֶחיֵּ he will make us live [Hos. vi. 2], is Milra. The Kibbutz again is Milel, in opposition to Tzere and Chirels;: as הוֹדִיעֶני inform us [1 Sam. vi. 2], is Milel, וֹריענ teach us [Job xxxvii. 19], is Milra; ; ? according to their nations [Gen. xxv.
 [Lament. ii. 12], is Milra. Now, though Kametz-Chatuph in opposition to Cholem is Milra, as I have already shown, yet in opposition to Pattach it is Milel; as חָּנְחָ he was thrust down [Dan. v. 20], is Milel, הַנְהת make to come down [Joel iv. 11], is Milra; ; ָָּלְ his falling [1 Sam. xxix. 3], is Milel, his falling [2 Sam. i. 10], is Milra. Thus, also, Kametz, though Milva in opposition to Shureh, as I have
 11], is Milel, 䟡 sown [Levit. xi. 37], is Milra. It is to be borne in mind that all which I have stated about these two kinds is only to be found in the Massorah magna; in the Massorah parva the Massorites have not remarked upon a single one of these instances, either Milel or Milva, but they simply say, "not extant."

䟬 Let me now explain the meaning of Piskin. There is one accent called Psak or Psik, which is a straight line (1) between two words. It consists of two kinds, the one is a Psik not followed by the accent Rebia, as in day [Gen. i. 4], xviii. 21]. This is called by the Massorites Psik of the Bool, because it occurs in every book of the Scriptures, and is enumerated in the Massorah as, in Genesis there are twenty-nine Piskas, in Exodus nineteen,

[^130]and so forth in all the books of the Bible. ${ }^{84}$ The second is the accent called Le-garmiah, which is in form like the real Psik, but it is always followed by the accent Rebia. You will find it in the treatise Good Sense, as well as in the Third Part called the Broken Tables, where I shall speak about it.

Seciton V., concerning Registers, Groups, Parallels, and Analogous Forms.- Our Rabbins of blessed memory frequently use the word Shita, saying, "a Shita of such and such an one," "another Shita," \&c. To the same effect is the use of Shita in the Talmud, and I do not know from what language it is derived, neither does the author of Aruch ${ }^{\text {ss }}$ give it. I, however, find that the Chaldee of the Song of Songs paraphrases "his cheeks are Songs paraphrases "his cheeks are
like beds of balsam" [ V .13$]$, by "the two tables of stone which He gave to his people were written in ten rows [Shittin], resembling the rows or beds [Shittin] in the garden of balsam." Thus, also, the Targum of Joseph translates, "noted it in a book" [Isa. xxx. 8], by "register it on the lines [Shittin] of the book." Thus, too, our Rabbins of blessed memory called the lines of a book Shita, when they say, "it is necessary to leave four empty lines [ $=$ Shittin ] between each book," "the beginning of a line $[=$ Shita $]$," "the end of a line $[=$ Shita]," \&c. They also remark on שְּדָרָּ Chedorlaomer [Gen. xiv. 9], that it is to be separated into two words in one line, but it must not be separated into two lines. ${ }^{88}$ The Massorites likewise call that Shita which our Rabbins of blessed memory called Shita, that is, a register of things

[^131]of the same import, as a number of verses, pairs, or words which are alike either in vowel-points or letters. Such a number they called Shita [ = catalogue, register, list, or rubric].

The rule is, that every collection of verses or of words brought together, which is not alphabetically arranged, they called Shita [i. e., catalogue or register]; and I have received it that such a Shita has not less than ten lines. These registers are of diverse import. There is a register of so many pairs of words, or of so many verses, or of so many words, or of so many letters, which it is not necessary to illustrate by examples.

Let me now explain the meaning of Sug and Sugin. Mark, that the proper meaning of is a pair, two. Thus, the Chaldee paraphrase renders a pair by dis [2 Kings v. 17], with Cholem, but ant with Shurels means a bell, and, in the language of our Rabbins of blessed memory, a pair of phylacteries; thus, also, the phrase "to every one thou givest a pair [mir], but me thou didst not give a pair." They call the plural, although masculine, int as, the phrase ,שקבל מן הזוגות, which means re-

דוצה לומד הצעת רבדים מענין אחר, כנון
 חדבות מה בנקודחן, או באוחיותיהן, וקראו לחן שיטח: והבלל בל קבוץ של פסוקים, או מלות הרבח יתר, שאיגן על פדור חאלפא ביתא, קדאו להן שיטין; ומקוכלגי שאין שטיםה פדוֹחה םעשרה שורוח; ; וגמצאים שׂיטין של עוינים רבים, כגון שיטה םן בך וכך זונין, אוּ כ7 וכך פםוקים, או מלוח, או אוחיוח, ואין צורך להביאם:
בר
כי שחם זונ הוא עוגים, וכן חרנום של צֶמֶך פרדים ווֹג כורגוין, וחוא גקוד בהולם, אבל וּג הנקוד בשורק חוא חפעמון, וברכרי רו״ל ווג תפּלין, ובן להל נחז חוג ולי, לא גתח ווג; ואמדו על חריבוי אפּליו על 'וכיםים זונוח,
 חלמידי חכמים; וידוע בי המטפר גתלק לבי תלקים ווב ונפרד ; הגפרי או, ג, ח, ז, ט; וחוונ כ, ד, ו, ח, • וכולי; ורבוחינו ז"ל קראו לבל מספר שאינו נפרד ונוּוח, כאטרם לא יאבל זוגות ולא ישחה זונוח, כלן כלשון רבוח; אכל בעלי חמטרח זכרו חטיד חרבוי בלשון וכדים, ולא לבד דבוים של שונים שנים קראו זוה, כי אגילו רבדים של ג' נ', או רי די, אוֹ ח' ח' וכולי ער עשרח, קראו וחוּין, וכאלח רבוח בטסדח גדולה ; וכן גמצאין שיםין, ואלםא ביחין םן םלין רליח לחון צוג, דוצה לומד עאין להם רוטח: וביש גובחאוח מוםיפין עם ווגין רמין ceived from tuo Sages. It is well known that the numbers are divided into two parts, namely, even and odd; the uneven are, $1,3,5,7$, and 9 , whilst the even are, $2,4,6,8$, and 10 . Now, the Rabbins of blessed memory call every number which is not uneven ועוג, =pairs, ex. gr., " one should not eat even [rוגות], nor drink even [זוגוח]," always in the plaral feminine; whereas the Massorites always use the plural in the masculine gender, and not only call each pair by the name Sug, but even things consisting of twice three, twice four, or twice five, up to ten, they denominate Sugoth. There are numerous instances of it to be found in the Massorah magna. There are also registers and alphahetical lists of words which have no pairs, that is, which have no parallels.

In some Codices the expression

 pairs of words, which respectively occur twice, once the two words have the Vav conjunctive, and once
 Issachar and Zebulun, [Gen. xxxy.
 Issachar, Zebulun, [Exod. i. 3], \&c. ${ }^{87}$ Thus, also, they say that such and such verses are parallel [רמי"], as "the two parallel verses [ [7י"] in which all the words terminate with the letter Mem,", viz., Gen. xxxii. 15, and Numb. xxix. 33. The expression דמיין, however, is only used epexegetically, since it would be sufficient without it. As a rule, the Massorites never employ 7 , except with respect to groups and verses.

I shall now explain the meaning of דבוותיה. The Chaldee paraphrase renders [Joel ii. 2] by דבוותיה; so also like unto then? [Ps. exxxv. 18] by most places; in a few instances, however, it is really wanted, as will be seen in the Tenth Section of this Part, God helping.

Secrion VI., concerning Junctions, Severances, and Consecutives.Mark that the expression סמיכה, which the Massorites use, denotes approaching, belonging together, connected, \&c., as is the meaning of סָm in Ezek. xxiv. 2, which has no parallel in the Scriptures. It is, however, frequently used by our Rabbins of blessed memory, as in the phrases, it is close (סמוך) upon dark, it will soon be dark; this section (נסמכה) is contiguous, \&c. Now, when two or more words are associated together through the addition or diminution of a letter or word, or by the interchange of words which are not in the habit of

[^132]
 Massorites remark thereon, " not extant so joined." Thus, on "ְוְֶָ
 xxvii. 37], they remark, "not extant so joined," since, in all other places where these two words occur, the word ${ }^{1} \neq \underset{\sim}{7}$ corn has not the Vav
 "not extant so joined," since in all other places it is with Vav conjunctive. ${ }^{99}$ The same is the case with words which are trans-

 Sabbatism，Sabbath［Exod．xvi．23］，
 tant so joined ；＂since in all other passages in which these two words are joined，they are inverted．${ }^{90}$
are sixteen such instances，it only gives fifteen，whilst one of the passagee adduced is wrong，viz．， 2 Chron．xxxi．5，inasmuch as it oecurs twice in Chron．and Deut． xxviii．51．The Ochla Ve－Ochla，section cclii．，pp．50，138，\＆cc．，which aleo gives this list，
 xiv．12．Properly speaking הכרין אמרין Levit．xi．19；and vii．17， belong to this rubric，and it is difficult to divine why the Massorah does not inolude them in it，seeing that it includes the other instances from the rubric given on p．212， note 87.
${ }^{90}$ This is but one of thirty－nine instances enumerated in the Massorah，which occur in this construction，since in all other passages they are inverted．They are as follows：－

| ．Exod．xvi． 23 <br> Exod xxix 18 | rywhere else |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $" \quad$＂ | אטשה הוה ללאלת |
| אחר לעלה ואתר להטאח | ＂ |  |
| ב ．．．．．Levit．xx． 25 | ＂， | בצוף ובבהמה |
| 隹．．．．．Levit．xxi． | ＂ | ＂לאביו לאמי |
| 俍 ．．．．．Levit．xix． 3 | ＂＂ | － |
| 隹 | ＂＂ | הטוב והישר |
| 隹 משתט ．．．．．．．Dent．xvi． 18 | ＂＂ | צדק ומשפט |
| בתמים ובאמח | ＂＂ | באמח ובתמ |
|  | ＂＂ | －אריצ המיד |
| －．．．．． 2 Sam．xxiv． 18 | ＂$\quad$ | הקם טובח לידור |
| －．．． 2 Sam．xxiv． 24 | ＂ | חמשים שקי |
| ，．．．．．Jerem．xliv．${ }^{6}$ | ＂＂ | לשמה ולתרנ |
| －．．．．．．．．．Hos．хiji． 15 | ＂＂ | רוח קרים |
| ，．．．．．．．．Job xxix． | ＂＂ | נימי קדם |
| אבן ועץ ．．．．． 1 Chron．xxii． 15 | ＂＂ | צ\％ואנן |
| ．． 1 Chron．xxiii． 30 | ＂＂ | להלל ולהרוח |
| 隹 ．．．．．．． 1 Chron，xaviii． 10 | ＂$\quad$＂ | צחת ראה |
| 令县 ．．．．．．．Job xvi． 11 | ＂＂ | پֶ\％אֵל |
| 隹 ．．．．．Job xx． 17 | ＂＂ | תמאה ורבש |
| －．．．．．．Dan．xi． 38 | ＂ | בכםף ובזה |
| לכליין ולמחלון | ＂＂ | מהלוין וכלייץ |
| 俍 ．．．．．．．Ps．1xxxix． 51 | ＂＂ | עמים רבים |
| 隹 ．．．．．．．Dan．i． 5 | ＂＂ | שלושי שנים |
|  | ＂＂ | ונכבשה האר |
| ו－．．．．．．Judg．vi． | ＂$\quad$＂ | ושור ושה |
| ，．．．． 1 Sam．xxiii． 23 | ＂＂ | ורצו וראו |
| ובני שלמה | ＂＂ | שלמה בני |
| ורבו ופוֹ ．．．．．Ezek．xxxvi． 11 | ＂ | － |
| 俍 ．．．．． 2 Chron．vi． 13 | ＂＂ | שלש אמוה |
| （kTM ．．．Levit．xii． | ＂$\quad$＂ | אתדר לחטאח ותחר לעלד ． |
| ，．．．Levit．xvi． 6 | ＂＂ | ורדהץ בשרו במים ． |
| אן ．．．Numb．xxxi． 22 |  | את הכסף ואח הוהכ |
| （ ．．．． 2 Sam．xviii． 9 | ＂＂ | בין הצרץ ובין השטיב |
| ， 2 ， 2 Kings xix． 2 | ＂＂ | אל ישעידו בן אמוֹץ הנביא |
|  | ＂，＂， | ביר דוקה ובזרוע נטויה |
| 隹 ．．．．．Hos．ii． 2 |  | בני ישראל ובני ירודי |
| －．．．．Zech．ii． 6 |  | פמה ארנה וכמה רחבה |
| 俍 ．．．．Levit．xxiii． 21 |  | בנל מושבתיכם |

They are enumerated in that part of the Massorah finalis which is antitled Various Readings（תלופי קראה）p． $62 b$ ，rubrio 3．In the heading of this rubric，as well as in the Massorah marginalis on Job xxix．2，where reference is made to this list，it is erroneously stated that it containg thirty（＇b）instances，which has evidently arisen from the dropping of the letter $\bullet[=9]$ ．The Ochla Ve－Ochla，seetion celxxiii．，pp．53，147，\＆c．，gives
 spake to J̇ehovah [Numb. xxvii. 15], is marked " not extant so joined," for in all other passages it
 spake to M̈oses:

When these constructions occur more than once, the Massorites distinctly mention the number of instances, as on Almighty spake, they say "three times together;" ${ }^{11}$ וּ and the Almighty said, "twentyfive times thus joined together," ${ }^{2}$ since in all other places it is , יַּיַבַּר Mini in in and Jehovah said. Indeed, when there are only two words, the correct Codices have
not written down the word not written down the word , רסמיכ, since the circle between these two words is sufficient, as as the Almighty created, "occurs three times" [Gen. i. 1],93 and there is no necessity for saying "three times thus joined together," as I have stated in the Introduction.

Let me now explain the meaning of Jechidain, Jechidin, or Mejuchadin, for they are all the same. Mark, that wherever words occur joined together, and if a word, or two words, or more, with which they are thus mostly joined, are wanting either before them, or after them, or in the middle, the Massorites remark on them יחירין = severed. For example, i. A word wanted at the beginning viz.,


[^133]for in all other instances it is pre－ ceded by יהוה Jehovah．ii．A word wanted in the middle，viz．，פֹה אָּ
 vah，the Almighty of Israel，which ＂occurs twenty－five times alone，＂${ }^{95}$ as in all other instances it is
 thus saith＂Jehovah Šabaoth，the Almighty of Israel．And iii．With－ out a word at the end，viz．，解； ，Jehovah bless thee，marked
 ，הוה צבאוות אלחי ישראל；והחםדים


 דיום הזה：
 יעירֹ，ps，וכל עדוח ומוער רכוחיח，פירוע דולח：לאהל העדות，לאחל מוער שחם

 ＂four times alone，＂${ }^{96}$ as in all
 thee，except in the Psalms，where it is likewise so．The same is the
 since in all other instances it is

良等 Such severances are also to be found in the case of one word， as
 tabernacle of our testimony，and congregation，which are the most in number；thus，also，יֶ？he shall live，＂occurs eighteen times alone，${ }^{99}$ and ${ }^{\text {an }}$ יִ

${ }^{95}$ The twenty－five times in which צבאוח are， Exod．v． 1 ；xxxii．27：Josh．xxiv． 2 ：Judg．vi． $8: 1$ Sam．x．18： 2 Sam．xii．7： 1 Kings xi．31： 2 Kinge xix．20：Isa．xxxvii． 21 ： 1 Kings xvii． 14 ： 2 Kings ix．6：Jerem．xxi． 4 ； xxxii．7： 2 Kinge xxii．15： 2 Chron．xxxiv． 23 ：Jerem．xxxiv．2， 13 ；xlii． 9 ；xlv． 2. They are given in the Massorah finalis under the letter Aleph，p．4b，cols． 3 and 4.
${ }^{96}$ The four passages in which Deut．xy．4：Jerem．xxxi． 23 ：Ruth ii．4．They are enumerated in the Massorah marginalis on Numb．vi． 24.
${ }^{97}$ The nine passages in which ער היום occurs alone，without are，Gen．xix．37，38； xxxy．20： 2 Sam．xix．25： 2 Kinge x．27：2 Chron．viii．16：Ezek．xx． 31 ： 2 Chron－ xx． 26 ：xxxv．25．They are enumerated in the Massorah marginalis on 2 Chron．xx． 26.
${ }^{98}$ The five passages in which לאהל ocears by itself are，Exod．xxvi．7，14；xxxvi．14， 19： 1 Chron．ix．19．The Massorah marginalis on Exod．xxvi．7，which treats on this rubric，is hopelessly erroneous．The only correct signal words，wherebr it indicates the passages，are the first and second，viz．，ועשיח יריעוה עיעש יריעוח עיום［Exod．xxvi．7］ ［Exod．xxxvi．14］．As to the other three，they are as follows：i．וריום הקים אח המשטי， that is Numb．ix． 15 ，where it is which is equally wrong，inasmuch ae of the five verees which commence with these words，viz．， 1 Kinge vii． 48 ；viii． 65 ；xi． $6: 2$ Chron．iv．18， 19 ，not oue has the word
 likewise not to the point．
${ }^{99}$ The eighteen passages in which ${ }^{2}$ ，the future，occurs by itself，that is，without heing preceded by 7 ता，the infinitive absolute，are，Gen．xvii．18；xxxi． 32 ：Exod．xix．13： Numb．xxiv． 23 ：Dent．viii． 3 （twice）： 2 Sam．i． $10: 2$ Kingex． $19:$ Ezelk．xvixi．13，22， 27 ； xlvii． 9 ：Ps．lxxxix． 49 ：Prov．xv． 27 ：Nehem．ii． 3 ：Habak．ii． 4 ：Eccles．vi． 3 ；xi． 8 ． They are enumerated in the Massorah finalie under the letter Cheth，p． 31 a，col． 4.

100 The two instances in which ${ }^{n}$＇occure by itself are，Dent．xxxiii． 6 ；Ps．xxii． 27. They are given in the Massorah finalis nader the letter Cheth，p． 31 b, col． 1 ．
king live, is always like it. Moreover, when two words habitually occur in the same verse, the first without Vav conjunctive and the second with Vav conjunctive, then wherever the one with the $V a v$ occurs, and its companion without the $V_{a v}$ does not precede it, the Massorites note on the word in question the number of instances in which it is to be found alone. Thus, for instance, on ${ }^{1}$ and in order that, the Massorites remark, "it occurs nine times alone, as Exod. ix. 16,
 by "ּרְ it is the same," that is, in every verse where ? and is followed by (int, it is like
 , that thou mayest fear Jehovah, thy God,--so that thy days may be prolonged [Deut. vi. 2], \&c. Thus, also, וְלִפְ and before the face of, " is sixteen times alone," as Numb. xxvii. 21; and



There are, moreover, some words which are called unique, because of the word with which they are construed, and which construction has no parallel. Thus, thou this, "without parallel ;" האּת ה thou shalt be, "has no parallel," \&c. 10 Also

[^134]


 the particles, as b to, occurs thirty

רבים מאד:


 from and from, \&c., \&c.

Let me now explain the word מורדפים, which is a logical term, denoting connected, resembling, identical, just as those words are called synonyms which are identical in sense and different in sound ; ex. gr., שֶֶֶּׁ have explained in the Section on the Different Parts of Speech,

104 The eight worde which occur only once preceded by 1 , are as follows:-
 They are given in the Massorah finalis nnder the letter Aleph, p. 13b, col. 2. The Ochila $V e-O c h l a$, section celxii., pp. 51, 142, gives three additional instances, viz.,
 It will be seen that the two instances given by Levita in the text are not included in the Massoretic list. Indeed, thongh ing is occurs only once, ing inequent occurrence (comp. Exod. iv. 16 : Deut. xxxiii, 44:2 Sam. v. 2: 1 Chron. xi. 2). There mnst therefore be a mistake in the text. The Sulzbach edition omits' ובן ואתה ח 'יחידין which renders the text of that edition perfectly uniutelligible.

105 The list of the thirty instances in which precedes werds in an unparalleled manner is so hepelessly confused, that it would require more space to correct it than the limits of a note permit. We mnst, therefore, refer to it as it stands in the Masserah finalis under the letter Aleph, p. $6 b$, cols. 3 and 4.

106 The forty-five words which occur only once preceded hy לוא, are as follows:-

ואל ואל אמה . Gen. vi. 16
 ואל אוזיו ואל יצקב相 Tixa. 1 TM M Exod אל הארן ואל שתי xoa. $x i .122$ ואל הלוים . Numb. xviii. 26 ואל רשׁע . . Deut. ix. 27 . . Deut: ix. 27 T פ פ Exod. vi. 13 num . Levit. xviii. 20 ואל אבנר 1 Sam. xxvi. 14

ואל פארחיו. Ezek. xxxi. 13
ואל נערו 1 Sam. x. 14
ואל צקלג 1 Sam. xxx. 1
ו ואל נביאי 2 Kings iii. 13
. Isa.Iv. 7
ותוא האשים. Isa. xix. 3 ואל האבוח. Iba. xix. 3 ואל שרה . . Isn. Ii. 2 ואל השמים . Jerem. iv. 23 ואל החרב Jerem. xxxiii. 4 ואל צבוברצצאר Jer. וצר א ואל צדקיהז Jerem. xxix. 21

ואל שמציהו Jerem. xxix. 24 ואאל יהורדה. Jerem. xxx. 4 IJerem. xxxix. 15 ואל הנבול . Ezek. xliii. 20 ואל תשלדחנוח . Ezek. xl. 43 ואל עמי Joel iv. 3 ואל אלהים . . . Job v. 8 ואלאיהוה. . Ps. xxx. 9 ואל הארץ . . Ps. I. 4 ואל אנשים . Ezek. xxiii. 42 ואל עונם. . . Hos. iv. 8 ואל דעוף . Jerem. xivii. 7 1" וֹk . . . Ezek. xi. 21 ורצת . Nehem. ii. 14 ואל מקומו . . Ecci. i. 5 Eccl. i. 5 It will he seen that the Massorah marginalis, p. 6 b , col. 4, gives only forty-five anch
instancea. There must therefore be a mistake in the Massorah marginalis on Exod. xxiv. 14, where, in referring to this rubric, it is stated that there are forty-four ( $\square$ ). In the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section lxxxv., pp. 26, 89, \&c., where this rubric is given, the heading describes it as containing forty-five ( $\mathrm{T}^{\prime \prime}$ ), and the rubric only gives this number; yet it mentions two instances not contained in the Massorah finalis, viz., ואל צרת (Numb. xxxi. 12) and ואל צרקיהו (Jerem. xxix. 21), whilat it omits two instances, viz., ואל פארחו (Ezek. xxxi. 13) and There can, therefore, he hut little doubt that the $\boldsymbol{T}^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{D}=$ forty-forr in the Massorah marginalis on Exod. xxiv. 14, the $\mathrm{H}^{-1} \mathrm{=}$ forty-five in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, and the = forty-six in the text of Levita, are oorruptions of the original $=$ forty-seven.
which see. ${ }^{107}$ The Massorites, too, employ this expression. Thus, three verses are alike (מורדפים), each one having seventy-two letters; viz., Exod. xiv. 19-21, ${ }^{108}$ so also the six verses which are alike, each having five biliteral words, as aִּ
 [1 Kings iii. 26], \&c.; ${ }^{109}$ and the six words which are alike, each having a letter repeated thrice, as ą in the apple [Zech. ii. 12], 'חָּ pity me [Ps. ix. 14], \&e. ${ }^{110}$

Seotion VII., concerning the Presence and Absence of Serviles. -Mark that נסיב denotes taking. Thus, in the Targum, לקי he took [Gen. ii. 22] is rendered by נסיב; likewise 14], is translated in the Targum .נסבי. This is also the case with the word לקחיה, whenever it occurs in the preterite and participle, it is always rendered in the Targum by to take; whilst the infinitive, imperative, and the future are always rendered by 1 , with the radical Nun omitted.

Now the Massorites were in the habit of marking the prefixes with the expression Nesiba, and more especially the letters Beth, Vav, Kaph, Lamed, and Mem. Thus, for instance, they give a list of twenty-nine words which have the prefix Beth, and which in all

[^135]other instances have Kaph, as בַּפְּנְ in the offering [Gen. xxxii. 21], in the sand [Exod. ii. 12], \&c., for in all other instances it is
 as sand. ${ }^{\mathrm{ul}}$ On the contrary, again, there is an alphabetical list of words which begin with Kaph, and which have no parallel in any other passage, as [Job xi. 17]; and לntern as in Isruel [2 Sam. vii. 23], being in all other instances and hen in Israel. ${ }^{12}$ As to the letter $\boldsymbol{y}$ there are many alphabetical lists, rows, and registers of pairs, of words which have this prefix and
 בַּזוֹל, בי כל עטאר כמנחה, כחול ; 111 ובן להפך א"ב טן מלים דנסבין ב" פובל חד ליח
 בי בל שאד בבקר, ביששראל; 112 ועל הוי״ו נמצאים במז אלפא ביחין, וכמה שיטין, ובמה תווגין מן מלין רנסבין י"יו ברישיהוין, ורלא נסבין י"יו, וכלן בתיבין בדאשׁ ספר אכלת ואכלת, אששר וכדרי בהקדמה החרוויחת ע"ע: ; נם זכרחי קצחן במאמרים רקודמין:在数 באצר היו מלין אשר בדאשם ב׳ אותיוח טן בוכ״לם לא כחבו עליהס נסיכין רק משמשין כנון י"ט טלין משמשין לל ברישיהון וכל חוּ לית רכוחיה, כגון וגם ללוֹוֹט, כאשר עשח ֶֶּלְבְּה ורומיחן; which have it not. All of these are enumerated in the beginning of the work entitled Ochla Fe-Ochla, which I mentioned in the Poetical Introduction, which see [supra, p. 93]; some of them I also cited in the preceding Sections.

Let me now explain the use of the word which is as follows:- When words begin with two of the servile letters, Beth, Vav, Kaph, Lamed, and Mem, the Massorites do not mark them נסיבין they have taken, but משמשין they employ. Thus, for instance: i. The nineteen words which employ two Lameds at the beginning, and which have no parallel, as טitit to Lot [Gen. xiii. 5], ? to Libnah [Josh. x. 32], \&c. ${ }^{113}$. ii. The hundred and eighteen words which

111 The twenty-nine words which oconr only once with the prefix Beth, and which in all other passages have Kaph, are as follows:-
. Gen. xxxii. 21
בחול . . Exod. ii. 12
בשמע . . Exod. xqi. 8

- 2 Chron. xx. 29

בארבה . . . Exod. x. 12
בצבר . Exod. xxxiii. $\varepsilon_{2}$
במטלה . . 1 Sam. vi. 12
בשלש
בקרא : Jerem. xxyvi. 13
בענקים . . . Josh. xiv. 15


I . . Joh xxiv. 5
בשבתו P Prov, xxxi. 23
בהם . . . Isa. xviii. 4
ובמנהת . . Ezra ix. 5
ובמשטפטיך . Nehem. ix. 29
בבלתך . . Ezek. zliii. 23
בנרכח . . . Prov. xi. 11
בלה . . . Lament. iii. 4
בתלילים. . . 1 Kings i. 40

They are given in the Massorah finalis under the letter Beth, p. $14 a$, col. 3. The Ochla $V e$-Ochla, section cexv., pp. 45, 128, which also gives this list. omits (2 Chron. xx. 29), and במחלקותיהם (2 Chron. xxi. 17), whilst it adds ברמות (Gen. v. 1), and (2 Chron. xxxi. 17).

122 As the list, of which the ahove are examples, contains npwards of one hnndred and forty words, making it too long to he given here entire, we must refer the reader for it to the Massorah finalis under the letter Kaph, p. 38 a, cols. 1 and 2, and the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section xix., pp. 9, \&c., 34, \&c.
${ }^{115}$ The Massorah finalis, nnder the letter Lamed, p. 40 b, col. 3, gives the following list of words which have two Lameds at the beginning, viz. :-
begin with Vav and Lamed, as
 Swint and to rule [Gen. i. 18], \&c. 114 iii. The register of words which begin with Vav, Mem, and
Aleph, as ${ }^{(N)}$ : and since then [Exod. v. 23], \&c. ${ }^{115}$ 'iv. Those which begin with Vav, Mem, and Beth, as is in and thy blessers [Gen. xxvii. 29],
 the hills [Numb. xxiii. 9], \&c. ${ }^{177}$ vi. The two words which have Lamed


It will be esen that this list contsins fifteen worde, though the harding of it in the Massorah ststes that there are eleven ( $\kappa^{\prime \prime}$ ) such instances. Why Buxtorf omits Amos v. 7, and how he came to make it fourteen ( $\left(7^{\prime \prime}\right)$, is difficult to divine. The atatement in the text of the Massoreth Ha-Massoreth, that there are nineteen ( ${ }^{(1 / 4)}$ ) suoh words, must he a misprint.

114 For the list of the ons handred and sightean instances in question, we manst refer to the Massorah finslis under the letter Lamed, p. 40b, col. 3; p. $41 a$, col. 1, as it is by far too long to be inserted here.
${ }_{115}$ The list (שטח) of words haginning in ons instance only with Vav and Mem, is as follows :-

| ומאו | Exod. v. 23 | ומאנכ | Ezra iii. 7 | ומדים | iv. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| וּמאיבי | 2 Sam. xxii. 4 | ומאלדים | 2 Chron. xxii. 7 | . | Eather ix. 22 |
| . ומאחרי. | Jersm. iii. 19 | ומאציליל | Ises. xli. 9. | ומאנלך | Ezek. iv. 10 |
| ומאטל | Isa. xxix. 18 | ומאש7 | 1 Chron. xii. 36 | . ומארךך | Eccles. viii. 12 |
| ומאדרה | Joh v. 6 | ומאי | Isa. xi. 11 | ומאהביך | Jerem, xxii. 22 |
| ורארצות | Ps. crii. 3 | רואנשי | Pe. lix. 3 | ומצמר | . Esther ix. 32 |
| . ומאלקי | Isa. xl. 27 | - ומאבלו | Habak. i. 16 | ומאתות | Jerem. x. 2 |
| ומאלה | Ps. lix. 13 | \% | Prov, xxx. 14 | ומאטז7 | Zech. x. 10 |
| ומאספנם | Isa. lii. 12 | ומאשריץ | Isa. ix. | ומארצו | zel. xx |

The list is given in the Massorah finalis under the letter Mem, p. $44 a$, col. 2. Of thess twenty-seven, the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section xviii., pp. 8 and 31, \&c., where this list forms the first part of a lengthy alphabetical register of words beginning with the letters Vav and Mem, only gives sixteen, and omite Nos. 2, 3, 9, 10, 11, 17, 19, 20, 22, 24, and 26, whilat it adde ומאמר [Dan. iv. 14].
${ }^{116}$ The list (שט) of words beginning in one instance only with Vav, Mem, and Beth, is as followe:-

| ומבר | Gen. xxpii. 29 | ומבין | Dan. viii. 23 | ומבמות | Nab. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ומברך | Chron. xvii. 27 | ומנרנתך | 2 Sam. vii. 29 | ו-ומבקרו. | 2 Sam xii. |
| ומבני | Job xxiv. 8 | ומבאי | Jerem. xvii. 26 | ומבלצדי | Iss. xliv: |
| ו | Hos ix 11 | ומביאה | $2 \text { Dan. vii. }{ }_{8}^{6}$ | ומבשי7 | Isa. lvii |

These instances are given in the Massorah finalis under the letter Mem, p. 44 a, col. 2. Of these thirteen words, the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section xwiii., only gives five, omittting Nos. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12, whilat it adds 2 Chron. xix. 7. It mast be added that ומבון is not uniqne, inasmach as, hesides Hos. ix. 11, quoted in the Massorah finalis, it oceurs in Job xxxi. 8.

117 The list (שטח) of words beginning in one inatance only with Vav, Mem, and Gimmel, is as follows:-

ומגבוח . Exod. xxviii. 40
ומנבצוח . Numb. xxiii. 9
ופגרח
ומגרל . . Numb. xxxvi. 3

 Of these twelve words, which are given in the Massorah finalis under the letter Mem,
 and in the valley［Is．xxxii．19］\＆c．השפל העיר ；וכן רמשםשין הו כטוף，כשו

 and I shall exalt him［Exod．xv． 2 ］．＇， ษ \＆e． 1 Al And viii．The expressions which terminate with Kaph Mem， or He Mem，or Lamed Mem，－on all these the Massorites remark， נקיבין they employ，and not משמשין they take．

כחתו משמשין ולא נסיבין：和 כתבִו טשטשׁין，כי נם על אותויוח שרשׁיוה כחבוֹכּן，כוּן אלפא ביתא טן מלים דמשמשין

 חיח ל＇，תרי גר； 110 ובן אלפא ביתא מן טלין
皆岳 It is moreover to be noticed， that the Massorites not only mark the servile letters，as Meshamshin， but also the radical letters．Thus，for instance，the alphabetical list of words which employ Aleph Tav，Beth Shin，Gimmel Resh，\＆e．，as กחֲּא company of［Gen．xxxvii．25］is marked＂not extant＂where we have Aleph and Tav at the two ends；in the withering［Isa． xxvii．11］is marked＂not extant＂where we have Beth and Shin at the two ends； we have Gimmel and Resh at the two ends．${ }^{119}$ Or the alphabetical
p． $44 a$, col， 3 ，the Ochla Ve－Ochla，section xviii．，only gives two，viz．，the fourth and eighth．

118 The worde which occur only once with $H e$ and $V a v$ at the end are as follows：－

## ．ואנוהו

－וארממנהו
יבוננהו
－יצרנהו
משיתהו ．．Exod．ii． 10
ועשיחיחו ． 1 Kings xvii． 12
יעברנהו．．Jerem．v． 22
אחקרדוּ ．．Job xxix． 16
רממתהז ．Ezek．xxxi． 4
מטוּו
ושפפטהו
－Exod．xv． 2 ．Exod．xy． 2 Dent．xxxii． 10 Dent．xxxii． 10 Ezek．xxyi． 4 ．Nahum i． 13 Ezek．xliv． 24
2 Chron．xxii． 10 השכירהו Jerem．xlviii． 26 והפצהו ．Job xviii． 11 אשביעהו ．．Ps．xaci． 16 －• Pb．xci． 16 ילדחיהו ．．Numb．xi． 12 ומעלחהו ．．Ezel．xliii． 17 מאסחיהו ．． 1 Sam．xvi． 7 שקוינהו ．．Lam．ii． 16 והגצחיהו：．Ezek．siii． 14

Ezeks．xvii． 20 גרשחהוה ．Ezek．xxxi． 11 ．．．Isa．xlv． 13 Song of Songe v． 6 ו 1 Chron．xpii． 9 והצופילחה ．．Job xl． 11 2 Ohron．xviii． 7 ואטמקנהו Jerem．xiii． 5 אבלחהו ．Ezek．xy． 5 ו וחזבדהו Sam．＇xxviii． 24

They are given in the Massorah finalis under the letter He，p． 22 b ，col． 3.
119 It has already been remarked ivide supra，p．190，\＆c．），that by bending the Hebrew alphabet exactly in the middle，and putting the one half over the other，a variety of anagrammatic alphabets are obtained，which derive their respective names from the first two specimen pairs of letters indicating the interchange．Here we have an alphabetical list of words which occur only once，arranged according to this ana－ grammatic alphabet，denominated Athbash（אח＂בש），that is，the first and last letter of each word in question yields this alphabet．＇They are as follows：－

| א\％ | Gen．xxxvii． 25 | דופק ．Song of Songs $\mathrm{\nabla} .2$ | זור | Ps．xcrii． 11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| אתטריח | Dan．vii． 15 | \％\％．．Dan．vii． 9 | חנם | Isa．xxx． 4 |
| ביבט | Isa．xxvii． 11 | T ．． 2 Kings xvi． 10 | חרחס | 2 Kinge xxii． 14 |
| בשלש | Isa．xl． 12 | ה ．$\quad$ ．Job xl． 11 | טותן | Judg．xvi． 21 |
| ． | İar liv． 15 | （ ．．．．Isa．xvi． 4 | － | Hos．xiv． 4 |
| 7 | Isa．xxvii． 9 | П1 ．．Ezek．xxxi． 7 | כבל | Job xxir． 24 |
| \％ | Ps．1xviii． 31 | †7 ．－．．Exod．iv． 26 | בליל | Isa．xxx． 29 |

This list is given in the Massorah finalis nder the letter Aleph，p．1b，cols． 2 and 3； and in the Ochla Ve－Ochla，section xxxviii．，pp．13，49．The latter adde the word ן ט， Deut．ix．21，whilst the learned Hoidenbeim remarks that ${ }^{2}$ ，Prov．xxviit．13，and gליל，Isa．xvi．3，ought properly to be included in this list．
list of words which èmploy Aleph and Beth, Beth aud Gimmel, Gimmel and Daleth, Daleth and He,
 50], marked " not extant" where we have Aleph and Beth commencing the word ; תִּ in the carcase of [Judg. xiv. 8], marked "not extant;" 7 great [Num¹. vi. 5, Prov. xix. 19], marked "not extant;" תוֹרֶ rapid courses [Judg. v. 22], marked "not extant," \&c. ${ }^{120}$ It is therefore evident that in most of these instances the letters are not servile, and that the Massorites mean that they are employed in the pronunciation of the particular word. Moreover, the redundance and the absence of the conjunctive particle they likewise mark as Meshamshin. Thus, for instance, the six words which respectively occur twice in the same section, the first time with the particle $\Omega$ ת, and the second without it. The first of such a pair is אֵת אֲאֶׁ which, without the particle $\mathbf{\Omega}$ [Gen. xli. 28]. ${ }^{121}$ The four words which respectively occur twice in the same section, and which have in the first passage the negative particle ${ }^{\text {, }}$, and in the second passage
 [Gen. xxiii. 11], and the second xxiii. 15], \&e. ${ }^{122}$

As a rule, the difference between Nesibin and Meshamshin is, that the term Nesibin is only applied to a single letter of the

\footnotetext{
${ }_{120}$ This list of words, occurring only once, represents another of the anagrammatic
 alphabets obtained by a eimilar process to the foregoing, and is denominated Abbag
(גב) The worde ranged under the alphabet to which Levita refers are as follows:-

 47 . . . Numb. vi. 5 ההרומה הומהות Job xxxiii. 20 י . Job xxxii. 6
 ספטים . . Ps. exix. 113

תחתו. . . Exod xxii. 29
They are given in the Massorah finalis nnder the letter Aleph, p. 1b, col. 1; and in the Ochla $V e$-Ochla, вection xxxvii. pp. 13, 48, \&e.
${ }^{121}$ The six pairs to which Levita refers we conld not find sither in the Massorah or in the Ochla Ve-Ochla.

122 The four words which occur twice in the same sentence; once with the negative particle

serviles at the beginning of a word; and especially to the Tav conjunctive, whilst the expression $M e$ shamshin is employed to describe two letters at the heginning or end of a word, whether they are servile or radical, as well as to denote the absence of one of the conjunctive particles, as I have explained it. In some Codices, indeed, this order is reversed, but they are not correct.

牧 I shall now explain the expression Karchin = bare., It is the opposite to the word Nesibin, and is only used with regard to the letter Vav at the beginning of a word, and then only when there occur in one verse, or in the same section, three or four words or more, some of which have Vav at the heginning and

ובפרם על הוי"י, ומלח משמעשין באה על ב‘ אוחיות שבדצאש חחיבח, או בסוף התיבח בין שהחן משמשיות או שרצעיות, או על חסרון אחת טמלת חרבק, כמו שבארחי ; וביש נומחאות

נשחתח בחן צה הסדר, ואינן מובהקין: מ טטלח נסיבין, ולא באח רק על חוי"ו עבדאשט חתיבח, ווח כשטיחיו בפםוק אחד, או בענין אחר, ג׳ אוּ ד' מלוח, אל יוחר, קצחן עם וי"ו בראש, וקצחן כלי וי״י, כחבו על אוחן שעם הוּי"ו נסיבין, ועל אוחן שבלי וי יו קוחין: כגון י' פסוקים מן ד' ד' מלין, ב' קרמאין קרחין, וב' בחראין נסיבין ו"ז, כמו ואציה אחח
 וכן ד' פסוקים דאיח כהון ד׳ מלין דטיין, נ' קרמאצין קרחין, ודביעח נסיב ויצו, ואקח אח
 ב' פטוקים דכל חד ד' מלּין קרמאאין קרחין וג' בתדאין נסיבין וי"ו, במו וקציץ פחילים ביו
 some not. In such a case the Massorites mark those words which have $\dot{\operatorname{V}} a v$ with Nesibin $=$ with, whilst those which have not Vav are marked with Karchin = bare, without. Thus, for instance:-i. The six verses repeating respectively a word four times, the first two of which are Karchin $=$ without $\nabla a v$, and the second two are Nesibin $=$ with Vav, viz., בהּין Between, between, and between, and between [Deut. i. 16], \&c. ${ }^{123}$ ii. The four verses repeating respectively a word four times, the first three of which are Karchin $\stackrel{=}{=}$ without Var, and
 rulers of, ruters of, and rulers of [Deut. i. 15], \&c. ${ }^{124}$ iii. The two verses containing respectively four words, the first of which is Karchi $=$ without Vav, and the other three are Nesibin $=$ with Vav, viz., in, and in, and in, and in EExod. xxzix. 3], \&c. ${ }^{\dot{1} 2}$ iv. The six words in one verse, the first, second, and

[^136]fifth of which are without the $V a v$, whilst the third, fourth, and sixth

 and Zebulun, Dan, and Naphtali [Deut. xxvii. 13]. And, v. The verse瞧, his field, and his man servant, and his maid servant, his ox, and his ass, in Deut. v. 18, the mnemonical sign of which is שיש קרחי, indicating that the words beginning with the two
 his ox, are without Vav, whilst the others have it.

Seotion VIII., concerning Imaginary Readings, Misleadings, and Tariations.-Know that the expression סבירין denotes incorrect opinion, imagination, fancy, supposition; that is, when a man thinks or imagines in his heart that it is so and so, but it is not. In German it is Er meint or wälnet. It has the same meaming in the language of the Mishna, as טבור הייתי I believed, פבורים היו they thought; in the book of Daniel, as he thought [vii. 25]; and in the Chaldee paraphrase, which renders the phrase, "there is a way which is right in the view of man" [Prov. xiv. 12], by "there is a way which man [רסבירין] imagine, \&c."

Thus there are also many words in the Bible which men imagine ought to be so and so, but they are not. As, i The word from it [Levit. xxvii. 9], on which the Massorites remark, "one of the six
 is feminine. To the same effect are the other instances. ${ }^{126}$ ii. The word instances supposed to be ${ }^{2}$ N", וּבְבֵ and the sons of [Gen. xlvi. 12], "one of the three instances supposed to be $\mathfrak{ֶ}$ 骎 son of;" and vice versa, the five instances in which the textual reading has $\bar{Z}$ ֶֶּני

[^137] \&c. ${ }^{128}$ iv. The word is in four instances supposed to be שחסר בחן וי״ו חחבור, כמו לא ישמע על וֹא ? stances in which the reverse is the case, the textual reading having רֶּׁn and the marginal conjecture being 7 רֶּ ${ }^{129}$ v. The words in which the Vav conjunctive is wanting, as组 not [Exod. xxiii. 13], on which it is remarked, " one of those supposed to be Nil and not." vi. The entire absence of a word from a sentence, as the five passages which are supposed to want C Kif, and wherein the scribes mislead, ex. gr., Gen. xxiv. $4 ; 2$ Sam. xix. 8 , \&e. ${ }^{130}$ vii. In the interchange of words, as the

פּרך, חר מן רחבידין וְלאם ; וכן בחסרון מלח אתח ממשמעות המאמר; כמו חר דפבירין אם ומטעין בהון, במו בי אל ארצי ואל מולדחי חלך, בי איגך ייצאא וכו'; 130 וכן בחילוף מלח במלח, כגון ג' מִּשְּי דסבירין
 על דסבירין עד, כמו וידבחו צֵל צידון;
 לבן, ועשיח חסר יֵל עכדך : וישׁ מפדשין סבירין לשון סברא, ופרוֹש לפי הסברא היה ראוי להיוח בך ; ומה שמחהוק הפירוש הוה הוא שנבצא זה הלשון בלשון יחיד, כמו מאת עפרון החחי על פני ממרא, ליח דסכיף אשד על פני, פירוש ליח three passages in which the text has מִמְּנֵ from the face of, and it is supposed to be from the mouth, ex. gr., Numb. xxxiii. 8, \&c. ${ }^{181}$ viii. The nine passages in which the
 \&c. ; ${ }^{382}$ and ix. The two passages in which the textual reading is ${ }^{\text {y }}$ upon, and the conjectural reading is y with, viz., Gen. $\mathrm{xxx} .40 ; 1 \mathrm{Sam} . \mathrm{xx} .8$.

Some, however, explain the word סבירין to think it proper, and submit that it means, "correctly the reading ought to be so and so." This interpretation is strengthened by the fact that the expression occurs in the singular. Thus, in the Massorah on Gen. 1. 13, it is remarked $\boldsymbol{n}$

[^138]

 which the conjectural reading sub-
 face of. Hence they explain all the expressions סבירין in the Massorah as correct opinion, but it does not appear correct to me, since according to this interpretation it ought more correctly to have been written מסתברין.

There are Codices in which the Massoretic remark on some words is, "imaginary readings and misleadings," or, "misleadings and imaginary readings;" but this is nothing more than an additional explanation. The word misleadings, however, occurs sometimes without the expression inaginary reading, and this is mostly the case when it refers to verses; as, for instance, "the three verses in which the scribes mislead with regard to the end of the verse, one is 'and

היה לחם לבהוב מסתברין ודוק : ויש בובחהוח שגמנר על קצמת המלות
סבירין ומשעין, "או טמעין ופבירין, ואינו אלא הובפת ביאוך ; אכל גמצא מטעין בלי סכירין, וזה על הרוכ בפטוקים, כנון ג׳


 דמטעין בהון; 184 וין. כ' סופי פופוקים

 רוצה לומד, כ"ף הראשונה דנועח, והשניח רפויח; ופשוקים דמטעים בוּון בטעמא חן דרבה מאור, ואין כאן מקומם: ויש לך לדעח כי טטעין אינו רוצה לומה לומד עומוין כחן כני אדם לקרותן כך, בי מטעים תיז מבנין חפעיל שהוג יוצא לשני, ופירושו הסופרים טמעין אח הקוראים ; וכן טצאתי בנופחאוחת מרויקיחת על והם ישאו עַוֹנָם,
 to thy seed for ever' [Gen. xiii. 15], the second 'and in thy seed for ever ' [Deut. xxviii. 46], and the third 'and in thy seed for ever' [2 Kings v. 27]." ${ }^{183}$ To the same effect, also, are the four verses which mislead in connection with the priesthoood, ${ }^{134}$ and the two ends of verses which are misleading with regard to Dagesh and Raphe, viz., and $\begin{aligned} & \text { phen cursing thee [Eccles. vii. 21], which is Raphe, and }\end{aligned}$ the memonical sign of which is Dagesh, and the second Kaph is Raphe. As to the verses which mislead with regard to the accents, they are exceedingly numerous, but this is not the place to expatiate upon them.

You must moreover notice, that the word מטעין cannot mean that men err in these words by reading them so and so, for it is the Hiphil which is causative. It denotes that the scribes mislead the reader. Hence, I have found it remarked in accurate Codices on iniquity [Numb. xviii. 23], "the scribes mislead thereby in writing אֶ,

[^139]埌 with the sign of the accusative before it." So also on דָּ tinually [Obad. 16], the Massorites remark, " the scribes mislead by it in writing סָדיב round about;" and
 [Eecl. i. 16], " they mislead here by writing Now I have seen the remarks of those Codices, which very correctly do not write רטועין which err.

SectionIX., concerning the terms Letters, Words, Expressions, Short Letters, Accents, Cerlainlies, and Transpositions.-It is well known that each one of the twenty-two letters of the alphabet is called sign, because it is a sign and mark for the utterance of the voice, and in the plural ought properly to be אותות. But to distinguish it from wind. winders, miracles, it is
 which is the Chaldee rendering of תinin signs [Gen. i. 14]. Thus, as in the case of the names where they remark, "there are five verses in which the sáme names occur, differing only (באתיהון) in their letters," viz., in the Pentateuch, and Izhar, and Hebron, and Uzziel [Exod. vi. 18] ; in 1 Chron. Izhar, Hebron, and Uzziel [xxiii. 12], \&e; ${ }^{135}$ but when it is in the singular, the Massorites call it $\boldsymbol{N}$, just as in the Hebrew. Thus they say, "there are four groups of words, each of which occurs twice in the same book, once with a word less and a letter more, and once with a word more and a letter less." The first of such a pair is, "Jehovah, thy God, thou shalt fear, and Him thou shalt serve, and by His name thou shalt swear" [Dent. vi. 13]; the second, "Jehovah, thy God, thou shalt fear, Him thou shalt

[^140]serve, and to Him thou shalt cleave, and by His name thou shalt swear" [ibid. x. 20]. ${ }^{138}$ This they do not call תی, which is the Chaldee translation of תiא, in order that it might not be confounded with the expression

䀲 Let me now explain the term תיבין words. Now it is well known that the ancients called every word תיבה, and I have instituted great search to find out the reason for it, but could not discover the meaning of it, seeing that this expression only occurs to denote the ark of Noah [Gen. vi. 14-16], and the ark in which Moses was exposed [Exod. ii. 3, 5], translated by the Chaldee תיבותת. The Massorites make the plural of תיבין to be according to the analogy of the Hebrew or words, from מלה word, which is only found in Job. Many, indeed, are of opinion that there is no difference between the expressions מלה and תיבה.

Now I submit that there is a difference between them, since the expression denotes a word uttered by the mouth when speaking, as it is used in the writings by our Rabbins of blessed memory; ex. gr., " and they repeated after him [מלה] word [במלה] for word,"

[^141]whereas תיבה, they employ to de- חבה לא אמרו רק על מלה הכתובה בתוך signate what is written down in a חכפר, כמו שאמרו כל חיבח הצדיכח למ'ד book, as, for instance, when they say, "every word which requires Lamed at the beginning, takes He at the end," 137 "the initials of words," "the end of words," \&c.; but not מקות. Yet I have found that some grammarians make no distinction. between the two expressions, and call them both מלה, but I have not found it so in the writings of בחתלתח. הםיל לה ה"א באופח; 197 וכן
 מלוח, פופי מלוח; ארך םצאחתי קצחּ המרקרקים לא הכרילו ביניהם וקראו לשניחם מלה, ולא נמצא כן ברברי חקדמונים: ופּרוש קמיעין מלשון קציציצח וכריתח,
 יתהון, וכן יְשַׁtr כליותי יקטע כליוחי; וחנה ירוע כי נמצא א"ב מן אוחיות גדולוח,138 the ancients.

The meaning of קטיעי is breaking off, cutting off; so the Jerusalem Targum renders $\gamma$ ? he cleaveth [Job xvi. 13] by yטp. Now it is well known that there is an alphabetical list of words with large letters, ${ }^{188}$ and that there is another

[^142]alphabetical list of words with small letters．${ }^{139}$ In the Massorah，every one of the large letters is called majuscular，and of the small letters
 ning［Gen．i．1］is marked Beth majuscular，and א ［Levit．i．1］is marked Aleph minus－ cular．${ }^{198}$ In the correct Codices the small Vav is not called minuseilar，bat אעטיא，that is，cut off from below．Thus，םibew peace ［Numb．xxp．12］is marked＂I＇av cut off；＂ is marked＂Vav cut off，＂\＆c．

וא＂כ טן אוחיוח קטנוה，199 ובמסורה קראו לבל אחח טהנדולות רכתא，והקטונוח יעירא，במו
 והנה בטסורות המדויקות לא קראו חוי ״י הקמנח וי＂ו ועירא，אך י״״ו קטיעא，פירוש קצוּוה טעם טלמטה，כעו את כריתי שָׁלוֹם וי״וֹ קטיעא ；וכן לא נשא לשוא יַפְטוֹ וי＂ן קטיעא：


 וא׳ין ספק כי הוא שעיח סופרים，ומעו בין יה
 גִִִַׁםי；וכן היא נטנה עם ט״א טלין דכתיבין

四 Now I am astonished that all the commentators whom I have consulted should take this word his soul，as Kethiv，and remark that the Keri is I have also seen some Codices of the Massorah which have the same． But there is no doubt that is a blunder committed by transcribers， who confounded the word 28，which is forty－one words，written in the text with Vav and read in the margin
majnacular letters，－wonld of itself he fatal to the ingenious theory propounded by Mr． W．H．Black，F．S．A．，in a paper read before the Chronological Institate of London， （October 4，1864），that the sum total of the majnecular letters is designed to give the date of the composition of the Pentatench．We ahall，however，show，in our forthcoming ＂Manual to the Massorah，＂other reasons why the majnscnlar letters could never have heen intended as Chronograms．

139 The alphahetical list of the minnscular lettere，is as followe：－

|  | Le | ロתרת ．Numb．xxxi． 24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ה | Prov．xxx． 15 | תש．．Deat．xxxii． 18 |
| וגו | Jol vii． 5 | הבתה |
| אדם | Prov．xxviii． 17 | ¢ |
| בהרא． | Gen．ii． 4 | טמרים |
| ונפשו | Ps．xxii． 30 | מוקדה ．．Levit． |
| \％ | Numh．xxt． 12 | ，וטהרתים．Nehem．xiii 30 |
| ל－4 | Ps．xxiv． 4 | \％2 |
| Nת＂ | Etth．ix． | 俍 ．Prov．xvi． 28 |
| ワワ | Job xxxiii． | ，Jorem． |
| טב | Lament．ii． |  |


| ב | m i． |
| :---: | :---: |
| ב． | ii． |
| ל | Lam |
| בשׂרגרא | Dan． |
| ציצוחת | res．xiv． |
| פר | Job xxi |
| בקמיהם | Exod． xxxi |
| קצתי | Gen． |
| תיא |  |
| נרתא |  |
| Nomb |  |

The list is given in the Maesorah finalis ander the letier Aleph，p． $1 a$ ，col． 1 ，and in the Massorah marginalis on Levit．i．1．In the Ochla Ve－Ochla，section 1xxxiv．，pp． 25 and 89，which also gives thie list，the following variations occnr ：＇צפני＇（Pa．xxvii．5）is put nuder the Nun，as having the second Nun emaller，whilst 182 （Nahum i．3）is omitted．The three instances which represent the final Nun are also omitted；but they are，however，given under a separate rabric（comp．eection clxxviii．，with the Massorah marginalis ou Isa．xliv．14：Prov．xvi．28：Jerem．xxxix．14）．Neither does the Oclla Ve－Ochla give בקמיהם（Exod．xxxii．25）nnder Koph，and（Exod．xxxiv．26）ander Resh，which are also omitted from the list given in the Masoorah marginalis on Levit． i．1．Like the Massorah marginalis on Levit．i．1，the Ochla Ve－Ochla rightly marks שרמשתא（Esther ix．9）as having both a smaller Resh and Tav．
 xxiv. 4, is not given in the list, עמהן, חריעוצינח אלא צי"י קמיעא : והבלי because it has simply "a cut-short בי לא'pראו : ות קמיעא רק הוי"ו לבדה, ביו ביו Vav." As a rule, the Massorites do not apply the term cut-short to any letter but $V a v$, and hence, also, they call it in one place long. Thus, the Vav in אTָYְ Vajezatha [Esther ix. 9], is called "elongated," and not majuscular ; since Vav majuscular is the one in †init belly [Levit.


 וכ"ג פסוקים דליח בהון לא יער ולא אדיךה פירוש לא וי"י ולא יו"ד, כםוֹלאמור לך אחן אח ארץ פנען חכל נחלחבם; 141 xi. 42], as you may see in the alphabetical list of the large letters, and the list of the twenty-two verses which have neither a short nor a long letter, that is, neither Vav nor Jod, as Ps. cv. 11, \&c. ${ }^{141}$

The Massorites also employ the expression קטיע = cut short, with regard to a word which has three quiescents, and is spelled differently in three different places, wanting the first quiescent in the first passage, the second in the second passage, and the two quiescents in

140 The worde written with Vav, prenominal anffix, third person mascaline, and read with Jod, mostly suffix, first përson, are as follows:-

| תצוחי | - Dent. v. 10 | 4ח | Isa. lii. 2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| תקצו" | Jobh. vi. 9 | עצתי | Isa. slvi. 11 |  |  |
| אזנו | 1 Sam. xxii. 17 | טטעו | Isa. 1x. 21 | הםדוי |  |
| ללבו | 1 Sám. xxy. 3 | תקראו | Jerem. iii. 19 | ועגנו | Ps. criii. |
| שנאו | 2 Sam. v. 8 | תשובו | Jerem. iii. 19 | כתו | Ps. eii. 24 |
| בנפשו | 2 Sam. xviii. 13 | אכלנו | Jerem. li. 34 | וירעו | Ps. cxix. 79 |
| בעינו | 2 Sam. xii. 9 | הממ | Jerem. 1i. 34 | וראיחנו | Ps. lxxi. 20 |
| וישבו | 2 Sam. xxi. 16 | הציגני | Jerem. li. 34 | תחינו | Ps. lxxi. 20 |
| דרו | 2 Sam. xxii. 33 | בלצנו | Jerem. li. 34 | 'תרו | Job |
|  | 2 Sam. xxiii. 8 | הריחנו | Jerem. li. 34 | במו | Job ix. 30 |
| חצדי | 2 Sam. xxiii. 35 | וירו | Ezek. i. 8 | 1 | Prov, xxxi. 2 |
| רגלו | 1 Kings v. 17 | ותיתי | Ezek. xxxii. 32 | צשתנו | Dan. iii. 19 |
| וקדשו | 1 Kings xp. 15 | רבו | Hos. viii. 12 | לשרשי | Ezra vii. 26 |
| נבי | 2 Kings xvii. 13 | - ישבו | 1 Chron. ii. 55 | ויעשו | Eizra $\times 37$ |
| הב | Isa. xvi. 3 | בני | 1 Chron. vi. 11 | ידו | Ezra $\times$ ¢ 43 |
| הב | Isa. xlvii. 13 | בנו | 1 Chron. xxii. | וענו | Nehem. xil |

From this list, which is given in the Massorah-marginalis on 1 Sam. i. 1, it will be seen that there are forty-eight exch instances, and not forty-one, as is stated by Levita. It ie howeyer to be remarked, that in hoth the Massorah marginalis on 1 Sam. i. 1, and the Massorah finalie under the letter Vav, p. 27 b , col. 1, whers reference is made to this rubric, it is also stated that thers are only forty-one such instances; whilst in the Maseorah marginalis on Jersm. i. 1 , where the list is repeated, it is simply headed by "these are the words" (מלbik), \&c., without specifying the number. The Ochla Ve-Ochla, section exxxvi., pp. 34, $106, \& \mathrm{c}$., where the list is also given, states that there are forty-seven instances, and the whole numbsr is duly given.
${ }^{141}$ The tweuty-three verses which have neither Van nor Jod are a6 follows:Exod. xx. 13, 15 : Ps. ev. 11: 1 Chron. xvi. 18: Namb. vii. 14, 20, 26, 32, 38, 44, 50, 56, 62, 68, 74, 80 : Lament. iii. 65: Jokh. xii. 13, 14, 15 : 1 Chron. i. 24 : Ps. xix. 12 : 1 Chron. xxiv. 14. They are given in the Massorah marginalis on Numb. vii. 14, where, however, the heading of the rnbric, as well as the Mascorah parva, states that there are only ( 土 ") $^{\prime \prime}$ twenty-two snch verses; whilst the Massorah marginalis on Psalm cr. 11, which simply gives the heading, like Levita, most distinctly remariss that there are twenty-three ( $\lambda^{\prime \prime} 5$ ) such verses. The apparent discrepancy is to he accounted for hy the fact, that the four commandments, which form in our Bibles foor distinct verses (viz., Exod. xx. 13-16), are alternately counted in the Massorah ar one verse, and as two verses. according to the two different syetems of accentuation.
the third passage. Thus on the words יַאִריבּיבוּ they shall prolong, which is once written [יָארְ [Exod. xx. 11], once יאשרי [Deut. v. 16], and once Prese [Deut. vi. 2]; the Massorites remark, "it has once its hand $[=J o d]$ cut off, once its foot [ = Vav] cut off, and once it has both its hand and foot cut off." I have already mentioned, in the First Part, Section viii., other phrases whereby the Massorites are in the habit of describing such anomalous words, vide supra, p. 166.

As to the meaning of it is well known that Pashta is the name of one of the accents. Now two such Pashtas are sometimes placed on one word, it is then called " two Pashtin," as I shall explain in the Treatise, entitiled, "Good Sense," with the help of the Lord. Now the Massorites call Pashtin some words which in a few places are pointed with Pattach, whilst in all other instances they have Segol. Thus N্אעֵ I shall bring up, is marked "eight times Pash-

צ' נחים, ונמצאת כנ׳ טקומות, האחד חבד הנה הדאשון, והשני חסר הנח השני, והשלישי

 עליהן חר קטיעא ידיה, וחד קטיעא דנליה, וחד קמיעא יריה ורנליח; וכבר כתבתי בלוחות הדאשונוח בדבור ה' אופגים אחדים שנוהנים לכחוב על טלוח כיוצא כואת ע"ש: הן הוא שם אחד טן הטעמים המפטיקים, ולפעטים משימין שנים על היבה אחת, וֹוירין לה ב' פשטמין, כאשר יחבאר בספר טוב טעם בע"ה; והנה הם קראו פשעׁין לקצת טלוח הנקודוח בפחה וכל חברוחיחן בסנול, כמו

 ופירוש ודאیן הנה ידוע כי ודאי הוא
 ובמשודח שמשו כח בב' מקומוח לבד, הא׳ על. השם הקדוש של אדנוח הנבחב א׳ ד' נ' י", נמסר קל"ד וראין או ודיאז; וחה לפי שעם של חויה, שהוא שם של ר׳ אוחיוה אינו נקרא ככחבו כי אין לבטא אוחו בפה, אך קידאין אותו בכנוי אדני, וכן קבלנו קריאתו מפד"עלה,


 tin" [i. e. Kal], for in all other instauces it is

As to the meaning of $\quad$, it is well known that it is the opposite to doubtful, and that the German for it is genifi. The Massorites only use it in three places; one with respect to the sacred name of the Lord, which is written "אדני, and on which they remark "' one hundred and thirty-four times that the name יהוה, being the tetragrammaton; must not be read as it is written, for it must not be pronounced with the lips, but is to be read under the appellation אדני. This reading we have traditionälly received from Moses our teacher, peace be upon him. Hence it has the vowel-points of

[^143]is not certain, whilst Adonai is read as it is written, and its vowel-points are certain, whence it is called the certain name (plural ודאין); and of which there are one hundred and thirty-four instances. The Massorites say that every אדני יהוה the Lord Johovah, is likewise so, that is, except those to which is joined the tetragrammaton, pointed with the vowel signs of אֲאֶ: as
 22]. I have found two hundred and twenty-two such instances, the mnemonical sign thereof being "the chariot of $[7=222]$ the Lord, \&c., [Ps. lxviii. 18]. ${ }^{144}$

The second place in which the Massorites employ the expression ,וראין, is with respect to words ending with $H e$, after Kaph, the suffix second person singular masculine, of which there are twentyone in number; as and $I$ shall bless thee [Gen. xxvii. 7], יָדְָָה thy hand [Exod. xiii. 16], \&c., ${ }^{\text {i4 }}$ since in all other instances the suffix second person is final Kaph with Kametz, as number, for which reason they are not certain, since they may have Sheva, as I have explained under the suffixes of the verbs and nouns; whilst those Kaphs which are followed by $H e$ are certain, and there can be no mistake about them. The meaning of "transpositions" I have explained in Section i., class 3, of Part ii., vide supra, p. 191.

Section X., concerning Scripture, Book, Form, Connection, and Verse.—The Massorites call all the twenty-four sacred books $\mathbb{N}_{\substack{2}}^{\substack{2}}$, just as they are called by the Talmudists מקרא. Thus, for instance, they say, "we have run through the whole [מקרא] seripture," "a man should always divide his time into three, devoting one third to [מקרא] the Scriptures," \&c. ${ }^{146}$ They also call each separate verse Mikra, =

[^144]אינה קריאחח חווראית, אבל ארדני נקרא בכחיכזו ונקודחו הווראיח, לפיכך קראו לו שם ודיאא, ובלשון רבים ודאין, והם קל״ד, ואמרו כל ארני יהוה דכותחון, פּרוש וולח אוחם שסמוך אליהן שם צלל ד' אוחיוח חנקוד



ושנים, סטן להם רכב אלהים רבוחים: 144 והמקום השני אשר שמשו כמלת ודאין הוא על םלוח הנבחכוח בהי בטוף הותיבה

 כנוי חנוכח כחיבּן כב"ף פשוטה קמוצהה, כםו

 כמכואר כבנוי חפעלים והשמוח, אבל אלו הב"א הם בה' ודאין, וא׳ין למעוח בהן; ופירוש טוקדטין ומאוחרין פרשחי במאמד ראשון כמין ג‘ ע"שי :

## המאמר העישירי בקריא, בשפרא

 בלישנא, בענינא בפסוק : הנה קראו בעלי המסורח לבל עשירים וארבע ספרים קריאו, כטו שקראו לחן בעלי התלמוד מקרא, באמרם חנרנו על כל המקרא, לעולם ישלש ארם צעווחיו עליש במקרא, וכמוהם רבים; 146 ונםscripture, saying, "no scripture oversteps its simple meaning," ${ }^{147}$ "this scripture is anteplaced," \&c.

客 I wonder how it is that most people give this name to the writings of the prophets alone; for I cannot find a reason for it in any of the works which I have seen. But my own opinion is that it arose from the fact that most of the prophets read what they had to say, as we find, " Go and read in the ears of the people" [Jerem. ii. 2], "and read unto her the reading which I speak to you " [Jonah iii. 2], and read there [Jerem. xix. 2], \&c. It is for this reason that their books are called Scripture [מקרא].

It is, however, to be noticed that the Massorites do not always write the word Scripture, or in Scripture, whenever they give the import and number. Thus, for instance, on a word which occurs only once, they simply remark, "not extant," and not "not extant in the Scripture." The same is the case when it occurs twice, thrice, or more times; they do not remark on it, "twice in the Scripture," or "thrice in the Scripture," \&c. In those Codices where you do find it written so, it has either been done to make it more explicit, or to ornament the writing by filling out the line, as I have already stated in the Poetical Introduction, which see. ${ }^{148}$ In the Massorah parva it is never found, whilst the Massorah magna only uses it in a few places. Thus, when a certain word occurs many times in one book, and is only found once in the other books, they remark upon it, "not extant in the other Scriptures, but throughout such and such a book there are instances like it," as in the register of sixteen words, viz., ע巴ת! and he smote [Gen. xxxii. 26], on which the Massorites remark, "it does not occur in the Scripture, but throughout Ezekiel, there are

[^145] male gender [Numb. xxxi. 18], "not in the Scriptures, but throughout the Song of Songs, there are instances like it," \&c., \&c. ${ }^{149}$

The same is the case with the register of twenty-one words which respectively occur only once in one

ובן שםה אחח מן כ"א דבל חר ותר ליח
בטפרא רבוחיח, וכל קריא דבוחיח בר מן חר, כנון כל ספר בראשיח ויְלדיו בר מן חן
 בר מן חר וילדו לו בנים ובולי :160 ובן כל book, whilst in all the other Scriptures they are always so, except in one instance. Thus throughout the whole Book of Genesis the word
 and there were born [Gen. x. 1] is found; whilst in all the Scriptures it is

[^146]The list is given in the Massorah marginalis on Levit. xiii. 51, where, however, nine instances only are ennmerated, as well as at the end of the Massorah finalis; in that
 the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section cclxx., p. 144, where all the instances are duly specified.
${ }^{150}$ The twenty-one words which respectively occur only once in a particular book, whilst in all other books of the Scriptures they occur always so, except in one instance only, are as follows :-
וירְדו M . Deut xxi. 15

| וְרָ | " | Deut. viii. 14 | Scri | cept | $\square$ | Isa. ii. 12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 끄ํ | " | Deut. xiii. 7 | " | ", | ַַּ | 2 Sam. xii. 12 |
| וימִירְרֵיהֶם | " | Josh. xiv. 4 | " | " |  | Numb. xxxv. 7 |
| טָיִיָ | " | 2 Sam. ii. 22 | " | " | \% | Gen. x. 16 |
| TVְ | " | 2 Sam. i. 21 | ", | $"$ |  | Lament. iv. 20 |
| ִִקִנְה | " | Jerem. ix. 9 | ", | " |  | Gen. xxiii. 18 |
| - | ., | 1 Kings xxii. 27 | ", | " | 10 | Ezek iv. 17 |
| Tָחִטִי | " | Jerem. xxxiv. 14 | " | " | חִּלִִים | Isa. Iviii. 6 |
|  | " | Jerem. xviii. 8 | " | ", |  | 2 Sam. xxiv. 16 |
|  | , | Ezek. vi. 13 | " | " |  | מִי Jerem. xvii. 1 |
| * | " | Zech. iii. 10 | " | ", | ִיקִקרְ | Jerem. iii. 19 |
| \% | " | Jerem. xxxix. 11 | " | ", | - | 2 Kings xvi. 15 |
|  | " | Malachi iii. 22 | " | ", | ? ְְִדוֹ | Job xviii. 17 |
|  | " | Ps. cvii. 30 | " | ", |  | Job xxi. 12 |
| - | " | Ps. xxiii. 5 | " | " |  | Joel i. 20 |
| וִיְּרוֹן | " | Eccles. i. 1 | ", | " | 吕. | Levit. xxiii. 24 |
|  | " | Eccles. ii. 21 | " | " |  | Chron. xxviii. 21 |
| \| | " | Eccles. vii. 26 |  |  |  | - Isa. lxv. 20 |
|  | , | Ps. cxix. 167 |  | " | 1 | 1 Chron. xxix. 18 |
| - |  | Ps. lxxii. 20 |  | " | Wiw | Isa. xviii. 7 |

The list is given in that part of the Massorah denominated Variaus Readings (חופופי קריאה), p. 62 b, section i., and in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section

We also find that certain words ספרא חד מלח וכל קריא חלוף לה, כגון כל
 one form, whilst in all the other
books they occur in a different form; as, for instance, הַנִּרֶה who appeared [Gen. xii. 7], whilst in all the other Scripture it is
eclxxi., pp. 52, 145, \&c. The text of the Massoreth Ha-Massoreth
 , a register of twenty-one words, which have parallels throughout the book, with the exception of one instance; whilst they have no parallel throughout the Bible, with the exception of one instance. The Sulzbach edition omits the second 7 . בר מן . But that the whole passage is corrupted is evident, from the reference to this rubric in the Massorah parva on Gen. x. 1, from its heading both in the Massorah finalis and in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, as well as from the whole context. We have therefore corrected the text.
${ }^{161}$ The words which always occur in a certain form in one book, but which in all other books of the Scriptures occur in a different form, are as follows:-

hey occur in a certain order in whole Scripture, except in one i, as, for instance, in all the ptúre we have the construction שֵׁ pt in one instance, where it is rted bath [Exod. xvi. 23]; so, also, in all the Scripture, we have וֹבָּ his futher and his mother, pt in one instance, where it is ITM his mother and his father. rit. xix. 3], and there are many instances like it. ${ }^{152}$
Cerewith is also explained the expression O , which accordingly ns the particular book wherein the word in question is to be found. uust, however, be borne in mind, that when the Massorites make remark on a word in the twelve minor Prophets, which are Hosea, , Amos, \&c., "it is not in the book," or "throughout the book it is e found like it," they mean the book containing all the twelve Pross. Thus, when it is remarked, on urs three times at the beginning of a verse in the book," it does not

list is given in that part of the Massorah finalis called Various lings (זח sii., pp. 52, 146, \&c. . The latter adds r books of the Scripture is (Dyine , and nit (Dan. vii. 7), which is elsere חith whilst it omits (2 Chron.). It moreover rightly has v. ix. 9) instead of prow, in the same verse, since it is the former which verywhere else ליחָּ, with Segol under the Lamed, whilst also rs in Proverbs.
${ }^{2}$ The list which embraces thirty-nine such instances has alreedy been given, vide $t, \mathrm{p} .214$.
mean that it refers to Zechariah alone, but to all the minor Prophets ${ }^{158}$ or, when it is remarked, on חనטָּ sin offering, in Micah i. 13, " it is not in the book," it means the twelve Prophets. The same is the case with the book of Ezra, which also includes the hook of Nehemiah. Thus, for instance, when it is remarked, "' times at the beginning of a verse, and throughout Ezra it is likewise so," ${ }^{154}$ it also includes Nehemiah. As to the " Pattach of the book," I have already explained its nature in Section ii., see p. 197. The "Piska of the book," too, has already been explained in Section iv., see p. 209.

Let me now explain the word Nut. Notice that the Massorites

ד"פ פטפדא, אני ר"ל בזכדית לבד, רק במל
 בספרא ר"ל כנל ח״״ ע ; וכן בכפר עורא
 ״״פפ וכל עורא רכותיה ר"ל נם טפר נהםיה; 154 ופהח דםפרא בארחי דינו בטאפר ב' ע ע ; ופנקא רספרא בארח רינו במאמר 7' ע"ע: ועת ועה אבאר מלח לשנצא ; רע כי שמשו בו בב׳ אופנים, הא׳ באמרם כלשנא, וחב' באמדם בל לשנא ; חה טלה אתח שיש לה רופוח באוחו לשון בנקוד, או ביתרון, או כחסרון אות, אוֹ בנין אחד, צורפו אח כל בלו המלוה ההן יחר, אף אל פי שהון נברלוח בשאר האוחיוח והנקודוח :放 ליח וחכר צ' חטרים בלשנא, ד"ל בעחיד

 use it in two ways: the one when they say and the other when they remark בכל לשנוא. If words are alike in form, having either some of the same vowel-points, or the same addition or omission of a letter, or if they belong to the same conjugation, they (the Massorites) ranged these words together under one rubric, though they differ with regard to the other letters and vowel-signs.

45 Thus, for instance, on ${ }^{2}$ " remark, "not extant, and defective, seven times defective in this form," that is, the future Hiphil. One of these instances is, in in and he put him [Gen. ii. 15], Bill and he put them [Josh. iv. 8], leave us [Jerem. xiv. 9 ], \&c. ${ }^{155}$ Now, because the Jod in all these, which

[^147]is the distinguishing mark of the בללו אותם בלישנג אחד ; וכשיהיו ב' מלוח Hiphil, is absent, the Massorites שווח במכחב ובמבטא ושונים בפתרון, נמסר בוֹ put them together under one rubric. עליחן כ' מב" לישנא, ובשער שברי לוהוה When two words are written and pronounced alike, but differ in sense, they remark on them, "two of two significations." In the Third Part, entitled The Broken Tables, I shall again discuss this subject under the initials $\zeta$, $\pi$, with the help of God.

Moreover, the expression בלישנא is also used for a root, with all the forms which belong to the same. Thus, it is remarked, with regard גם יש בלישנא שבולל כל טלוח השרעש החוא, בנון בשורש רהב י"ב בלישנה; בלשנא שבולל בשרש אחד רק ענין אחד שבאוחו השרע, כמו בשרש עור כחבו על ויהי צָקךָ צ' בלישנא דבבו, בי בל שאחר לשוניח שבשדש זה יש ל להן הודאוח אחרוה עין בשרשו ; ${ }^{157}$ ובן בשרש שער נמדר על מאה
 לו הוראח אתרח; אמנם בל לישנא לא כחבו to the root רהב, "twelve instances of this root." ${ }^{168}$ The term is also used for a rubric containing those words only of a root which have the same signification. For example, in the root עור, they remark on thine enemy [ 1 Sam. xxviii. 16], "seven times in the signification of enemy;" for all the other expressions of this root have another signification (vide Lex., s. v.). ${ }^{137}$ Thus, also, in the root שע, they remarked on xxvi. 12], "not extant in this signification;" for all the other expressions derived from have another meaning. The expression של לשנא, however, the Massorites only use when a word is construed with

Massorah marginalis on Levit. xxiv. 12, and 1 Kings xiii. 29. In both thess passages the Massorah gives ויניהחה [Levit. xxiv. 12], which is plene in the best Codices, as one of the seven defectives; whilst it omits יינהום [Josh. iv. 8], which is really defective, and is quoted as such by Levita. There can therefore be hut little doubt that the former has been subatitated for the latter, through a clexical blunder.
${ }^{136}$ The twelve words which belong to the same root with $H e$, since in all other instances this form occurs with Cheth, are as follows:-

| . | Ps. lxxxix. 11 | ורהבם | Ps. xc. 10 | הרהיבני | Song of Songs vi. 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2דר | Ps. lxxxvii. 4 | ורהב | Prov. vi. 3 | ירדבי | . Isa. iii. 5 |
| תרדבני | Ps. exxxpiii. 3 | רדור | Job. xxvi. 12 | 2דר | Isa. xxx. 7 |
| רהבים | Ps. xl. 5 | רדב | Job ix. 13 | רהב | Isa. li. 9 |

They are given in the Massorah marginalis on Isa. xxx. 7; Ps. lxxxix. Jl; Jobix. 13. On Isa. xxx. 7, and Ps. lxxxix. 11, Jacob b. Chajim, the editor of the Massorah, adds ", ואואב נ"ל, "מפחד ורהב לבבך [Isa. 1x. 5], is one of these." But thongh this reading is to be found in Jehudah Chajug's Treatise on the Vowelpoints and Accents [סטר הנקור, p. 183, ed. Dukes], yet all the best Codices, as well as most of the ancient grammarians and commentators, read the word in question with Cheth. Besides, the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section ecv. pp. 44, 124, \&ce., which also gives this rubric, does not include it in the list. Comp. also the remarks of Dr. Frensdorff, the learned editor of the Ochla $\bar{V}$-Ochla, p. 44.
${ }^{157}$ The Massorah marginalis on Micah v. 13, givas eight sach passages, viz., 1 Sam. xxviii. 16 : Micah v. 13, 10: Isa. xiv. 21: Pe. ix. 7; exxxix. 20: Dan. iv. 16: Jerem. v. 8. The Massorah marginalis on 1 Sam. xxpiii. 16, though omitting Dan iv. 16, and Jerem. xv. 8; and the Massorah parva on Micah v. 13, and Ps. cxxxix. 20, aleo atate
 It is only the Massorah parva on Isa. xiv. 21, which, like Levita, says that there are ['1] seven such instances. The full enumeration of, them, however, by the Massorah marginalis, shows that the seven mnst be a clerical error.
another, contrary to its uniform position. Thus, for instance, they remark, " all the expressions of the root to hear, are construed with $\$$ which take לy ;", 188 or, "all the expressions of to slaughter, are construed with תی, except four,
 all phrases father precedes mother, except in four instances; " ${ }^{160}$ or, "all phrases have ${ }^{\square}$ before passages;" ${ }^{101}$ and many more like them.

I shall now explain the word ענינא. Notice that the expression ענין is only to be found in the book of Ecclesiastes, where it occurs eight times, and always in the singular. But our Rabbins of blessed memory used it very frequently, and even in the plural. It denotes business, transaction, in German (Gejdift. Now in the Massorah it is used in the Chaldee sense of transaction, whereas in the Chaldee on Ecclesiastes it is simply rendered by $11 \underset{y}{1} \frac{1}{4}$ colour, form. Hence when you find in the Massorah בעעינא, it denotes in this narrative of the transaction, section, chapter; as alone [Exod. xxi. 3], on which the Massorites remark, "three times, and in the section;" so, also the remarks, " not defective in the connection," "not plene in the connection."

[^148]Let me now explain the word
 והרבה ללשונוח מהורנמין כן, ר'ל בלשון is not Hebrew, but Aramaic פסוק and many words are rendered by it, חפטקה, בלשון אשכו אויפ"הורן, במו דָדנל
 which is in German auffiten. Thus, חָּ it ceased [Gen. xviii. 11] is rendered in the Chaldee by $\begin{gathered}\text { P号; }\end{gathered}$
 12], by 4 ;
 and he did not' add [Deut. v. 19], by by פס [Numb. xi. 38]. Hence, a verse is called פסוק. Hence, also, the dividing space between the sections "there are two sections in the Pentateuch which have no Piska

 פטוק, וחזה קראו ג״ב למקום חלוק צבין פרשח לפרשה פיםקא, במו שאמרו כ' פרשיוח בחורח דליה בחון צסקא ברישא, והם ויצא, ויחי; 162 וב' פרשיות בתורח רלית בהון פםקאו באמצע הפדשח, והם ויצא ומקץץ; 1 ובן פבקא באמצע הפסוק, ר' מנהון בתורח, בנון ויאמד קין אל חבל אתיו ויהי בהיותם בשרח ודוק ; 184 ויש קודין פיםקא זו פריגמא, ועוד אוכרנה בשער שכרי לוחוח; והםעם חנקרא פסוק או פטיק בבר זכרתו במאמר ר' ע"שׁ ; at the beginning, i.e., the Pericopes $V a-J e t z e$ and $V a-J e c h i,{ }^{162}$ and other two sections in the Pentateuch which have no Piska in the middle of the section, i.e., Va-Jetze and Miketz. ${ }^{133}$ There is also a Piska in the middle of the verse; four instances of it are to be found in the Pentateuch, as Gen. iv. 8. ${ }^{164}$ Some call this Piska by the name of פרינמא [=' $\boldsymbol{=} \boldsymbol{\prime} \rho a ́ \gamma \mu a]$, but I shall again speak about it in .the Third Part, entitled "The Broken Tables." About the accents called Psak, or Psik, I have already spoken in Section iv. [vide supra p. 209]. End.

[^149]Here is the Table of Contents Of the ten sbotions in Part II. ${ }^{166}$

הא לך השמנים מהמלות המצויית, בעשרה מאמרים מלוחות השניות:165

Section I.-Concerning Keri and המאמר הראשון בקריין וכתבן ונחלקין Kethiv, divided into seven classes.

Section II.-Concerning Kametz and Pattach.

Seotron III. - Concerning Dagesh, Raphe, Mapik, and Sheca.

Section IV.-Concerning Milel, Milra, and Pesakin.

Section V.-Concerning Registers, Graups, Resemblances, and Parallels.

Section VI.-Concerning Juinctions, Severances, and Identical.

Section VII. - Concerning the Presence or Absence of Prefixes or Serviles.

Seotion VIII.-Concerning Conjectural Readings, Misleadings, and Exchanges.

Section IX.--Concerning Letters, Words, Expressions, Short Letters, Accents, Certainties, and Transpositions.

Section X.-Concerning Scripture, Book, Form, Connection, and Verse.

The Second Tables are now ended,
In the name of the Creator of heaven and earth;
And in the name of the Lord, the God of Spirits,
I begin the Section of the Broken Tables.

םליקי הליהוח האחרונים,
בשם בורא עליונים ותחתונים,
ובשם אל אלהי הרוחות,
אפתח שער שכדי לוחות:

165 These two lines are entirely omitted in the Sulzbach edition.

## THIRD PART;

OR, THE BROKEN TABLES.
Thus, says the author already mentioned, the man known by his writings, who works for honour and not for shame, I now render praise to the Lord, who has preserved me, and sustained me, and helped me hitherto, so that I have written the First Tables, and then the Second Tables, each consisting of ten sections. In the one Section which I now add, I shall be able to explain whatever occurs both in the First and Second Parts of this book to the end thereof.

And now my soul rejoices in the thought, and in the name of Him who ordaineth true wisdom, I call its name The Section of the Broleen Tables, because I shall therein explain the import of the broken and abbreviated words, and of those expressions which are written in notaricon, and in initials, in signs, in enigmas, and in diverse phrases, both in the Massorah magna and parva. Now since there are not many who are learned in these matters, and who take it to heart to understand their utility, as I have already mentioned in the Poetical Introduction, which you may there see, I shall explain these things ; and, in order to save the public trouble, I shall not lengthen my Treatise, thus acting in accordance with the following saying of our Rabbins of blessed memory in the Talmud: "one should always teach his disciples by a short method." Hence I now commence with cheerfulness to point out the reason for each thing, by the help of heaven. May the Great Name be praised, world without end.

First of all, I must give you a rule whereby to distinguish a word which is described by initials from a word which is simply abbreviated. It is as follows:-When you find two, three, or four letters together, and each one has a mark on the top, they are invariably to be taken as
initials of words; but when they have not all marks, and it is only the last letter which has one mark, it is invariably an abbreviation, and the word in question wants one or two letters at the end; as you will find explained in this Section.

Now I shall begin by explaining the word ${ }^{3}$ not extant, since the Massorites use it more than any other expression. It is the Aramaic compound of לא is, denoting that the word or sentence on which it is remarked has no parallel. This is also its meaning in the Targum, which renders 4 is not [Job ix. 38], by לא א" , and which frequently translates the He brew word לית (comp. Numb. xxi. 5), and only rarely translates it b (comp. Exod. xii. 30). In the Massorah parva, instead of לית, the Massorites write a single Lamed with a mark over it, as follows: h. And there is no other single letter in the Massorah parva but what indicates some number, except this one. Hence, when a word occurs thirty times, the Massorites do not remark on it b, lest there should be a confusion between it and hot, but they note it by writing out fully the word Lamed. Thus, for instance, " the word thirty times;" "the particle occurs [ֶל " thirty times alone." In some Codices I have seen ${ }^{4}$ [ $=20$ and 10] instead of h [=30], but the first is more general and more correct.
 twenty-three defective (i.e. $\eta$ 品). The plenes are, Nnmb. xxii. 26: Judg. xi. 14 : 1 Sam. xx, 17; xxiii. 4: Isa. vii. 10: 2 Chron. xxviii. 22: 1 Sam. xvii. 29. They are given in the Massorah marginalis on Numb. xxii. 2, and 1 Kings xvi. 33. The twenty-three instances in which it is defective are, Gen. viii. 10; xviii. 29; xxv. 1: Exod. ix. 34 : Numb. xxii. 15, 25: Judg. ix. 37: 1 Sam. iii. 6, 8, 21; ix. 8; xix. 21: 2 Sam. ii. 22; vi. 1 ; xviii. 22 ; xxiv. 1: Isa. viii. 5 . Job xxvii. 1; xxix. 1 ; xxxvi. 1 ; xlii. 10 : Dan. x. 18. The list of these is no where given in the Massorah. As an illustration of the various ways in which the Massorah annotates the worde belonging to the same rubric, we shali specify the thirty instances hefore ne. The Massorah parva annotates twelve passages ont of the thirty. In the first instance alone, viz., Gen. xviii. 29, occurs
 defective, except seven times ; " on Numb. xxii. 15, it states "it occurs twenty-nine ( (iv" 2 ) times;" on Numb. xxii. 25, 1 Kings xvi. 38, Isa. vii. 10, 2 Chron. xxviii. 22, "it ocenrs
 twelve times in this book." The Massorah marginalis, again, does not notice this rnbric more than twice, and then only the seven instances of plene, which it gives on Nnmb. xxii. 2, 1 Kinge xvi. 33, simply adding, that in all other instances it is defective.

אורייתא are the initials of נביאים, בתובים phets, and the Hagiographa; and they are notèd on every word which occurs three times, once in the Law, once in the Prophets, and once in the Hagiographa; as they chose, occurs three times, the sign being ${ }^{7}{ }^{2}$. In some Codices these instances are marked אחר א"א which are the initials of בתורה אחר בנביאים אחר בכתובים once in the Law, once in the Prophets, and once in the Hagiographa. When a word only occurs in the Prophets and Hagiographa, it is marked Prophets, and the Hagiographa; as !in the ark, which is defective _in the Pentateuch, whilst in נ"ב $=$ the Prophets and Hagiographa, it is plene. Thus, also, ever, is marked "eight times defective בנ" $=$ in the Prophets and Hagiographa.'s
 when there are two or three parallel things in one section, or in the same narrative, or in the same book, or even in two sections, or two books, and they only differ in one word, the Massorites note the difference between them, and give them a verse as a mnemonical sign, as in the Section on Eliezer, the servant of Abraham. Here the first statement is in " $\bar{I}$, 'Jehovah, in the midst of the land" [Exod. viii. 18]. ${ }^{4}$ Thus, also, Ps. lvi., where in verse 5 it is יבּשָׁ 12 it is '

[^150]the flesh of man it shall not be וא"טם על בשר אדם .לא ייםך;5 וכן בר"ח
 wise in 1 Chron. xvi. 16, where it וחצחק שרח, פירוש הצצ"די קורם השי"ג, ד"ה
 Isaac, whilst in Psalm cv. 9 it is $\quad$ השל: שית
 and the mnemonical sign is "and Sarah laughed" [Gen. xviii. 12]; that is, the Tzaddi is before the Sin, since Chronicles is before Psalms, as I have explained in the Third Introduction.

When the difference between two words consists in the points, they give for a sign a word which contains the two letters with the two in question. Thus, we have first לָ to stay over night [Gen: xxiv. 23], and then [ibid. ver. 25], and the mnemonical word for this difference is הֵלילוּ howl [Isa. xxiii. 1]. ${ }^{6}$ Compare also
 [Levit. xxv. 23], and the second : ותאמר האשה ירעתי כִּי נחן וְבִי וְבִי
 mnemonical word is $n$ חָ חָילָ has Kametz and not Pattach, they made no distinction between Kametz and Pattach; also, the first ne the living [Levit. xvi. 20], and the second xxiv. 5]. ${ }^{7}$ Thus, also, in verses in which three or four words are alike, but in which only one word has a different servile letter, the Massorites indicate it by a mnemonical verse containing the two words in question ; ex. gr., in Deut. xi. 24 it is the article, whilst in Josh. i. 3 it is $\begin{gathered}\text { טip place, without the } H e \text {, and the }\end{gathered}$ signal verse is and behold, the place is a place of cattle [Numb. xxxii. 1]. So, also, the first passage 'כ when [Levit. xxv. 25], the second 'כְ and when [ibid. ver. 35], and the third [ibid. v. 39], are indicated by the signal verse; "and she said unto the men, I know that [? $\left.{ }^{[ }\right]$, and that [ [

[^151] אתנח שוּ בטוּק Passule. It is only put down on a word which has Kametz, on account of Zakeph, Rebii, or any other pause accent, and which has no parallel, except in the said Ethnach and Soph Passuk. Thus, חD passover [Numb. ix. 2], is marked, " not extant with Kametz, and every instance with Ethnach or Soph
 is the case when the word occurs more than once, as "[Isa. lvii. 1; Micah iv. ${ }^{\text {P }}$.], which is marked, "it occurs twice, and every instance with Ethnach or Soph Passuk [ $\mathrm{\square}$ "ロא] is like it." In some Codices, instead of $\mathfrak{j}$ ", they have written the form of Ethnach and Soph Passule, as follows: 1a, and they say, "every $1 *$ is like it." Many have been misled thereby, thinking that it stood for Cheth and Nun', and read it in peace, rest; whereas they are nothing but the forms of Ethnach and Soph Passuh.

אחיוב משלי is the acrostic of תלים Job, Proverbs, and Psalms. The Massorites assign this sign to these books, though they do not occur in this order, as I have stated in the Third Introduction, for their proper order is as follows: Psalms, Job, and Proverbs; and in accordance therewith I have also found in some Codices the sign $\quad$ "אn. But they usually write אמט, because this mnemonical sign is more beautiful, since our Rabbins of blessed memory said, "always use an elevating phrase" [Pessachim, 3 a]. Now on the word with Tzere, the Massorites remark, "it occurs eight times with Kametz, and throughout אמש"ת דת"קע does not like it." In this case stand for Job, Proverbs, and Psalms, but the whole of it consists of the acrostic of Deuteronomy [אלה הדברים], Proverbs [משלים], the twelve minor Prophets [תרי עשר]], Chronicles [ת"7], Psalms [תהלים], Proverbs [קהלת], and Ezra [עזרא].

שבּ is the acrostic of name of the son of man, or proper name. Thus on Miñ Ahuzzath [Gen. xxvi. 26], "not extant, and every proper names [ ${ }^{[4}$ " $]$ are like it." 8 It is a phrase used in the

[^152]Jerusalem Targum, which renders Min man [Ps. ix. 21], by son of man, [Job. xxxy. 8]; whilst which so frequently occurs in Ezekiel, the Chaldee translates בר אדם. On who to seize, too, the Massorites remark, "it occurs three times with Kametz, and all [ ${ }^{3}$ "שב] proper names are like it." ${ }^{9}$ Also the four pairs, one of each pair being a proper name [שבנ], and the other being different, as ץip a thorn [Gen. iii. 18], and ץip. Koz [1 Chron. iv. 8], proper name; a species of gem [Ezek. xxviii. 13], and Divi proper name of a Levite [1 Chron. xxiv. 27], \&c. On a feminine proper name, however, the Massorites remark שום איתחא name of a woman, as princess of [Judges v. 15], " not extant, and whenever it occurs as the name of a woman it is like it."
 the chained [Gen. xxxix. 20], it is remarked, "read "אַיִ, and it is one of the words in the alphabetical list in the Great Massorah [במס" ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ ], written in the text with Var, and read in the margin with Jod." ${ }^{10}$ There are some, however, who call the Great Massorah מסו"ה, and the Small Massorah מע". Thus I have seen in the book called "The Eye of the Reader," as follows: "These are the books which the Lord has given me, the Small Massorah [מס" $\quad$ ], the Great Massorah [מס"זום], and other Massorahs from some good Codices." Thus far his words. ${ }^{11}$ I have found that in some Codices the Great Massorah is called Mesag [מס"ן, and the Small Massorah, Mesak [מס"], just as the "Great Book of the Commandments" is called Semag [ספר מצות נדול := טמ"נ], and the "Smaller Book of the Commandments" is called Semak [ספר מצוח קטן = סמ"ק][12

[^153]ימיצא מן are the initials of הכל departing from the rule. These initials are generally used in Treatises on the Laws of the Accents. When one of the rules of the accents is described, and there are some exceptions to it, they remark on them, "such and such are Thus, for instance, before Sarka there ought properly to he Munach, but "there are thirteen ["ימ"] exceptions to this rule, having Mercha bofore it;" as, with the help of the Lord, I shall explain in my book, entitled, Good Sense.

אחר אn מלא אחד חםר once defective, once plene. I have already stated in Part i., Section i., that plene and defective only obtain with quiescent $V a v$ and $J o d$ in the middle of a word [vide supra, p. 145, \&e]. Moreover, on words which occur plene or defective in two, three, or four places, the Massorites remark ${ }^{\square}$
 defective," \&c., up to ten instances. But from ten and upwards they write the word plene or defective separately, and the letters denoting the number separately, as on Nsi" 1 and he brought out, "it occurs twenty-four times, twelve times plene [] ["יב במלאים] and twelve times defective [יב"בים on one word.
he was born at Coucy, not far from Soissons, circa A.n. 1200, and died 1260. The work on the Commandmente and Prohihitions consists of sermons which R. Moses de Concy delivered on his journeys through the South of France and Spain (1235-1245), in the different Synagogues the desion of which was to confirm his brethren in the ancient faith, since the orthodox religion of the Jewe wae at that time being andermined by the philosophy of Maimonides. The work which propounds the six hundred and thirteen precepts was first printed before 1480; then in Soncino, 1488 ; and in Venice, 1522, 1547, \&c. Comp. Fürs, Bibliotheca Judaica, i. 189, \&c.; Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, col. 1795-1798; Graetz, Geschichte der Juden, vol. vii., pp. 61, 70, 72, 115, 130, Leipzig, 1863. The Minor Book of the
 simply an abridgment of the greater work, made by Isaac de Corbeil, A.n. 1277, and is divided into seven parts, for the seven days of the week. It was first published at Constantinople, 1510; then at Cremona, 1556, with glosses, \&c.; and at Cracow, 1596, \&e. See Firiret, Bibliotheca Judaica, i. 186; Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, col. 1103.
 xlviii. 12: Exod. xix. 17: Judg. vi. 19: 2 Kings xxiv. 13: 2 Chron. xxiii. 14: Ps, cxxxvi. 11: Jerem. x. $13 ; 1.25 ;$ li. 16 ; and the thirteen instances in which it is defective are, Numb. xvii. 23, 64 : Judg. xix. 25: 2 Sam. x. 16 ; xiii. 18 ; xxii. $20: 2$ Kings xy. 20 ; xxiji. 6; x. 22: Jerem. xx. 3; lii. 31: 2 Chron. xvi. 2 : Joh xii. 22 . The former are

It is, moreover, to be re-

 sometimes plene and sometimes defective, as and she let down, "occurs three times, once plene and twice defective;" ${ }^{\text {"in }}$ "occurs four times, twice plene and twice defective," \&c., \&c. ${ }^{14}$ But in those words of which either the pleñes alone or the defectives alone are counted, the Massorites also only put down either the plenes or the defectives, and the respective number, as אֵבּוֹתָּ thy forefathers, "occurs three times plene," and do not give the initials " $^{\prime} ;{ }^{15}$ so also וכן ער עשרח ; אבל טן עשרח ואילך עשוֹ

 the initials ${ }^{2}$. It is also to be noticed, that when the letters Beth and Mem occur together with two marks above, and one of the letters from Aleph to Jod is joined to them,
 except one, בר מן שלשה except three, \&e. The
 25], by ' בַּר טִּ except I. Thus the Massorites remark on fowls, "it is so in all the Scriptures except once [במ"א], where it is
 21], on which the Massorites remark, "it is defective throughout the Pentateuch, except once where it is plene" [viz., Exod. iii. 13], and so on up to ten instances. But, from ten upwards, the Massorites make this remark in two words, as אֲבוֹn is "plene throughout the Hagiographa, except in sixteen instances;"; ${ }^{17}$ so also ${ }^{2 \prime \prime}$ "


[^154]\&c., all of which are the initials of בר upon examination.

ל" bre the initials of לא קר read not; they are only found in connection with one of the letters Aleph, $H e, V a v$, and Jod, as $\left.\boldsymbol{N}^{\prime \prime}\right\rangle=$ Aleph, is not read, $n " ק=H e$, is not read, ל לק" = לקו", Vav, is not read, Jod, is not read. Comp. What I have said on this subject in Part ii., Section i., class 1 [vide supra, p. 182, \&c.], and see also Part i., Section ix., [vide supra, p. 170, \&c.]

כתיב בן are the initials of כ"כ written thus, or כן כתיב thus written, they are marked on those words which have two or three quiescents, some of which are plene and some defective, as I have explained in Part i., Section viii. [vide supra, p. 169, \&c.] I have also discussed it in Part ii., Section ix. It is to be noticed that on the vowel signs and the accents the Massorites never remark כ"כ כ, but they write it כ", which are the initials of $i t$ is so, as metz;" ${ }^{18}$ and א Marich" [ = a long line under Tav], \&cc. Moreover "כ stands also for
 restored, "it occurs [כ"כ] twenty-five times; " ${ }^{19}$ on occurs [כ"] twenty-five times," ${ }^{30}$, and it is always known from the context.

כל, with a mark over the Lamed stands for בל כל כלוב all, as that is all are written so, and כלהון כתיבין כל בל all are defective, or מל all are plene. But when they have two marks above, they are the initials of כל -לשנא, all the forms, and I have already explained the

[^155]meaning of לשנא in Section x. [vide supra, p. 240, \&e.] In some Codices, instead of $\zeta$ " they write $h$ " $\Omega$, which are the initials of תדי לשנא two forms, as the alphabetical list of words which occur twice in the same form, but in a different sense; ex.gr., אוּרֶ I will teach [Job xxvii. 11], and א $I$ will shoot [1 Sam. xx. 20], \&c.; they are in alphabetical order, and number about a hundred pairs, all of them with two meanings. ${ }^{21}$ But, forsooth, among many of them there seems to be no difference whatever, and I shall only mention the most difficult of all, " xxii. 17]. Would that I knew the difference between them!

כ"כ כare the initials of the Scripture. I have already explained, in Section x., that קריא is the designation of the twenty-four sacred books, and given the reason why they are so called. I have also explained there that the Massorites always write it out fully, that is, they write it down כל קריאה and not the initials כ כvide supra, p. 234, \&c.] But when they range many of them together, and make of them one Register, they write on each one of the words thus rubricated P ", as you will see on examination.

פם פare the initials of Pattach of the Book. I have already explained its import in Section ii. [vide supra, 197, \&c]. In correct Codices it is noted in the margin against every Pattach of the Book 7 "פ, to indicate that it is one of the number rubricated in the Massorah magna. Moreover, פסקא דספרא are also the initials of Piska of the Book, the import of which I have explained in Section iv. [vide supra, p. 209]. This is also the case with the accent called Legarme, which I have likewise discussed in Section iv. [vide supra, p. 210]; ${ }^{22}$ and which I shall explain still further in my book called

[^156]Good Sense. Wherever Legarme occurs in a verse, the Massorites write against'it in the margin 'גל, with one mark over the Gimmel, which signifies Legarme. Some have mistaken it, and thought that the word in question, on which the Massorites remarked 'ל, occurs thirty-three times in the Bible. But, according to the rule which I have stated at the beginning of this Part, there can be no mistake about it; for, if it had referred to the number, it would have two marks, one on the Lamed and one on the Gimmel. Now, as the Gimmel alone has a mark, it is evident that the word is not written out fully, and that it is the abbreviation of Legarme. ${ }^{28}$ I shall, however, discuss it again, in its proper place, in my book entitled Good Sense.

7 ל 7 are the initials of which I have already explained in Section $\nabla$. - Indeed I have not found in the Massorah 7 ל instead of לית דכוחיה, but in some gram-

טעם; ככל טקום שנטמצא בטםוק לנרמיה כחבי בנליון נגרו לגי בנקורה אהח על על הגי"מל רוצה לומר לגרמיה ; ויש שטועין בנה, וחושבין בי המלה חחיא אשר נטנד עליח לי היא נמצאת ל"נ כעמים במקדג, אכל לפי. הכלל שנחתי בפחיחח השער הזה אין לםעות כה, כי אם היה מורה על המצפר חיה עליח ב׳ נקורות, אחד על חלמ"ד, ואחר
 נקורח חוא בַאיה שהמלה אינה נשלמח, ודוצה לומר לנרשיח; ${ }^{23}$ ועור אהכרנו במקיםו בספר טוב טעם:

כארחי במאמר ח', והאמת כי במפרח לא פצצאחי ל"ד כמקום לית דכותיח, רק בספרי קצת המרקרקים ברברם בעניני מסורת, בנין ספר סדמדר וספר עט סופר, 24 ובולחם מעטים : ר"פ ראשי חיבוח ראשׁ פסוק, וגם בזח ישש טקום לטעוח, כי יש שקוראין אוחו רפי או רפּין, וההפרש שביניהן הוא באּאד עליי ב‘ נקורות חוא ראשי חיבוח ראש פסוק, כמו שבתבבחי, וכשהוא כנקורה אחת על הפ״א
 !יְיָאוּ א׳ רפ', 26 וכבר בארתי במאמר ג' למה נקראין רפּן: matical works which treat on the Massorah; ex. gr., the Book Semadar, the Treatise called The Stylus of the Scribe, ${ }^{24}$ and a. few others.

ר ר ר are the initials of beginning of the verse. This abbreviation, too, has been mistaken, for some have read it Raphe, or רפין Rapilin. But the difference between these two is, that when it has two marks over it it is the acrostic of ראש פסוק the beginning of the verse, as I have already stated, and when it has one point over the Pe
 shall say, "occurs nine times ('פ) Raphe;"
 Section iii. [vide supra, p. 198], the reason why it is called Raphe.

[^157]סוף פטוק the end of the verse, and of סופי פסוקין ends of verses; as : יֶּוֹה I, Jehovah, " occurs twenty times at the end of verses [כ" in one book." In some Codices it is remarked on each one of these בי סופי כסוּ being the initials of ,פםוקים, "one of the twenty at the end of the verses." Thus, also, I, Jehovah, your Gैod, "which "occurs twenty-two
 the Massorites remark, on each of them, $\mathrm{\eta}^{7}$ "

מ״ב are the initials of מצעה פסוק, that is, " the middle of the verse." מצוy is a word by which the Jerusalem Targum renders the Hebrew קוּ ב במצע ; an also in the midst of [Ps. lxxxii. 1] is rendered by . The word pin except, in the Pentateuch and the Prophets, however, is translated מצועות מציעוחא ; or and because the language of the Massorites is mostly that of the Jerusalem Targum, they write מעצ פםיק , as and all Israel, "occurs thirty-five times in the middle of the verse [להי מ" $\quad$ ], and whenever
 it was heard "occurs three times, once at the beginning of a verse [ $5 \cdot 7]$, once at the end of a verse $[פ " \square]$, and once in the middle of

conjunctive, are, Exod. xiv. 16, 17; Deut. x. 11; Joeh. xviii. 4; Isa. xiii. 2 ; Jerem. iii. 18; Ezek. xxxiii. 31. They are given in the Massorah marginalis on Isa. xiii. 2.

27 The twenty passages in which אני occurs at the end of a verse are, Levit. xviii. $5,6,21$; xix. $12,14,15,18,28,30,32,37$; xxi. 12 ; xxii. $2,3,8,30,31,33$; xxvi. 2 , 45; and the twenty-one instances in which א terminates the verse are, Exod. xvi. 12: Levit. xviii. 2, 4, 30 ; xix. 2, 3, $4,10,25,31,34$; xx. 7 ; xxiii. 22, 43 ; xxiv. 22 ; xxy. 17, 55 ; xxvi. 1 : Numb. x. 10 ; xv. 41 : Deut. xxix. 5 : Ezek. xx. 20. The former are given in the Massorah marginalis on Levit. xviii. 1, and the latter are ennmerated in the Massorah finalis under the letter Aleph, p. 4a, col 4; where those which are בי אני יהוה אלהיכם, are given in one rubric, and those which are אני יהח אלהיכם, without $\stackrel{3}{ }$, are given in another rubric. Under the first rubric, which profeeses to give ten (") instances, are mentioned Levit. xi. 44, and Joel iv. 17, neither of which is the beginning of a verse, in the present editione of the Bible. Equally erroneous is the heading of the second rabric, which professes to give seventeen ( $r^{\prime \prime}$ ) instances, in which א אני יהוה אלהיכם ocenr at the end of the verse, and only mentions fonrteen.
${ }_{28}$ The thirty-five instances in which inc incers in the middle of the verse are, Dent. xxi. 21 : Josh. iii. 17 ; vii. 24 ; viii. 21, 15; x. 29, 31, 34, 36, 38, 43: 1 Sam. xvii. 11: 2 Sam. iv 1 ; xviii. 17 : 1 Kings viii. 62, $65: 1$ Chron. xiii. 8 ; 1 Kinge xi. 16; xv. 27 ; xvi. 17: 2 Kings ix. 14: 1 Chron. xiii. 6: 2 Chron. vii. 8; xii. 1 ; x. 3 ; xiii. 4, 15: Ezra ii. 70; Nehem. vii. 73: Ezra x. 5: 2 Chron. vii. 6: 1 Chron. xi. 4 : Ezra viii. \&5. They are given in the Massorah finalis under the leiter Jod, p. 37 b , cols. 1 and 2.
${ }^{29}$ The three passages in which ונמשמע occurs with Pattach onder the Vav, and Dagesh in the Nun conjunctive, are, Josh ii. 11 ; Jerem. xxxy. 8, 10. They are given in the
 have not been able to discover the like of it anywhere else.

עוסחא אחרינא another Recension or Codex. This expression is of frequent occurrence in the writings of our sages of blessed memory; as נוסח to transfer a bill of divorce, נוסח הברכה to transfer a blessing, \&c.; and it appears to me to denote to transcribe, to write, like Me: [Prov. ii. 22], which denotes to remove, to transfer. Hence those words which have been transferred and copied from a book are called transfers, copies, Codices. Hence, also, the word
 to remove. I therefore submit that העתקה and almost identical.

Let me now mention the names of some of the punctuators and prælectors, which occur in some of the margins of the correct Codices of the Pentateuch. Most of these Codices are German, and I have only seldom found them in the Portuguese Pentateuchs. I shall also describe some of the titles of the books which have been written upon the subject.

רעלם, I have been told, is the

נ״א ראשׁי חיבוח נוסחא אחרינא, לששון
זה נמצֵא הרבה ברבדי חז"ל, כנון נוסח הגם, נוסח הברכח ורומיחן; ונ"ל שחוא ענין העתקהו והסרה לשון יִפְחוּ ממנו שהואה כמו יוסרו וייעתקי, כן חרברים הנעתקים ונשחים מן ספר אחר נקראים נוםחאוח, וכן בעזראם לחינוּח עא מן ביחיה, פירוש יועתק ויוסר ; למן אני אומר שעוםחחה והעתקח כמעם אחדר

> הואה:

כאן אכחוב שמוח קצנת נקרנים וקוראים
או הונים; חנמצאים רשומים בקצח גליונוה. של החומשים המרויקים, ורובם הם אשיכנים, ולא מצאחי מהם בחומשי המפרדים בי אם עעם'ם, נם קצת שמות הספרים אששר חובר על ככה אביא כאן:
רמ"ח נאמר לי שחוּא ראשׁי חיבות

המובהקים, ואנכי לא ידעתי, ויוכל להיוח שהחוא טשה האיש אשד חבר כללי הנקור, חנדפטים בעשרים וארבע הנדול סכיב המכרה הנרולהי, שחתחלתו אםר המהבר אמח הדבד כי הנקור נתן מסני וכו' ; וכבר וכרחיו כצפר מסורת חמטורח כחקרמח, ורכים חוּשבים שהוא ספר השמשוני, וטועים כי נמצא בי חתום שמו משה בחרבה מקומות, כנון בתחלת דבורו בנקורוח חתצירי וחסנול דמתחיל ממכון לשבחזו השניח צור ישראל ונומר (חל+ם ל"נ); ובמקים אחר משםם שמוש acrostic of רי משה חון Rabbi Moses Chasan, who was one of the most correct prelectors, but I do not know who he is. It may be that this is the Moses who wrote the Treatise on the Laws of the Vowel-points, which is printed in the Great Bible round the margin of the Massorah, and begins with, "Thus saith the author, for a truth the vowel-points were given on Sinai," \&e. I have already mentioned it in the Introduction to this Massoreth Ha-Massoreth [vide supra, p. 123]. Many think that it is the Book of Shimshon, but they are mistaken, for we find therein the name Moses signed in many places, as in the begirning of the Treatise, when speaking concerning the vowel-points Tzere and Segol, which commences [Ps. xxxiii. 14]; and in another place, again, ממפםי 'שמוש 'החולם' Massorah finalis under the letter $\mathcal{S h}_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{in}, \mathrm{p} .60 \mathrm{a}$, col. 1. The Massoretic romark to which Levita refers is not to be found in the printed edilions of the Massorah.
the Laws respecting the use of the החולם, וחדומים לזה; וספר השמשוני Cholem, \&c. Whereas the book הוא הפמר הנקרא חבור חקונים מתחיל, דע Shimshoni is nothing but the book called Chibur Ha-Konim, beginning with "Know that the fundamental things discussed by the Hebrews are ten," \&c. ${ }^{30}$

ש"מ, In the above-named Codex I found a proof cited from a correct Pentateuch, saying, I found it so in the. Pentateuch of R. Meier Spira, which is מ"מאיר שפירע =

יקותיאל " הכהן בר יהורה Jekuthiel Ha-Cohen b. Jehudah, the author of the book entitled the Eye of the Reader, whose surname in German is Salmen Ha-Nakdan. He thus signs כ׳ עקי׳ חדבוים אשר ירביו בהם העברים הם עשדח וכולי: מ"ש, מצאחי בספר הניל שחוּא מניא ראیה מחום אחד טוגה, ואומר בן מצאחי בחוטש של מאיר שפירע, וחו מ"ש:1 יהב״י יאשי היבות יקוחיאל הכחן בר יהורה, ודוא בעל ספר ע' הקורהא, וכנויו בלשון אשכנו זלמן הנקיף, וכן חחם שמום בשיד השני של טפרי ע"ש; וקבלחי שחוֹא חיה כק"ק פראגנ שכמרינח פּ״הם, ואני אמדתי על דיך היצח השיר שבכוחלי במי
 מאוד במנין הנקידוח והמלוח עטעען טלעיל או טלרע, ובעין המקפּן ובלחי מקיםּן, his name in the second poem of the book here alluded to. I have heard that he was from the the city of Prague, in the country of Bohemia; and I said, in a play upon the words, that from the walls [ $=$ lines] of the house [ $=$ in the stanzas] of his poems, he is recognised to be a Bohemian. ${ }^{82}$ He composed a very excellent treatise, discussing the vowel-points, and the words, the accents of which are Milel or Milra,

[^158]L L
as well as those which have Mappil, and which are without Mappik; and he called this book the Eye of the Reader. Hence you find, in the margins of some Codices of the Pentatench, עע עין הקורא and sometimes it is remarked 4 "יחו, which is the name of the author, as I have stated. ${ }^{38}$

- עע סופר Scylus of the Scribe, which is the name of a book written by Redak, ${ }^{\text {s3 }}$ and which is a compendium of the contents of the Massorah and the accents. I have found it quoted in the margins of the Spanish Codices of the Pentateuch, but not in the German Pentateuchs. ${ }^{34}$

ר' יעקב נקדן are the initials of רי"; R. Jacob, the Punctuator. He is often quoted by the above-mentioned R. Shimshon, in his work, but I do not know who he is. ${ }^{35}$
 the bracelets [Gen. xxiv. 47], it is remarked "in The Key [']: $]$ ] is without the second Jod;" so also ${ }^{3}$ an wn the side [Judges xi. 18], "in The Key is beyond." Also on defective and plene, wefind it quoted in many places, and I do not know its author. I have, however, seen that Ibn Ezra makes the following remark, in his Introduction to the book called The Balances:-"R. Levi, the Spaniard,

[^159]from the city of Saragossa, is the author of the book called The Key." Thus far his language; ${ }^{36}$ but I have not as yet been able to see it. ${ }^{37}$

Machsortha is the name of a work, the author of which I do not know. It is quoted in the margin of the Pentateuch, as " בּב? to compass [Numb. xxi. 4] has Beth with Dagesh, but in the Machsortha it is Raphe.' ${ }^{\text {' }} 8$

סרקוספד חכר טפר המפתח עב "ל:36 ואנכי לא ראחיו ער הגה : 57 מחזורתא שם ספר ולא ירעחי מי ילרו, ונםצא בנליונוח החומשים, כנון לִסִּבוּ אחר ארץ ארום הבי"ח דנושה, ובמחוזרחא לִסבוֹב ברפּ : 83 סיני שם חומש מרוייק מרבר טמחלוקח

 בוקף, וכסיני בזקף גדול, ולא ידעחי םי הוא

חומש יריחו מטחטא הוא חומש אוזד a Sinai, is the name of a correct Pentateuch which treats on the variations of the accents; as 1], has the accent Gershaim, but in Sinai it has Rebia; again, הַּשְּבְּ the desert [Exod. xviii. 5], has Sakeph, whilst in Sinai it has Sakephgadol. But I do not know who the author of it is. ${ }^{39}$

חומש ריחו the Pentateuch of Jericho, is doubtless a correct Codex

[^160]of the Pentateuch, derived from Jericho. It discusses the plenes and defectives, as ת תing the abominations [Levit. xviii. 27], is in this Pentateuch of Jericho, without the second Jod. So also 'יִ' , the childven of, which occurs twice in the same chapter [Numb. xiii. 22, 28], the first is plene in the Pentateuch of Jericho, and the second is defective.

ספר הללי Codex Hilali, is quoted by Kimchi in his grammar called Perfection, and in his Lexicon, in the following language:-"In the Codex Hilali, which is at Toledo, ת ye shall vow [Deut. xii. 11], is found with Daleth Raphe." Thus far his remark. I at first thought that the Codex is so called after its author, whose name was Hillel ; but I soon found that in some recensions it is spelt הלאלי, with Aleph between two Lameds (comp. the root in Kimchi's Lexicon). Moreover, I found that in the Constantinople edition of the Michlol it is pointed , הלִל, with Tzere under $H e$, so that I do not know what it is. ${ }^{40}$
'Jerusalem Codex, is the book on which R. Jona, the Grammarian, relied, as is attested by Kimchi. It is perhaps the Codex which Ben-Asher corrected, ${ }^{41}$ and which remained at Jerusalem for a long time, as I stated in the third Introduction, in the name of Maimonides of blessed memory.

ספר אספמיא Spanish Codex, is the general name for the Spanish Codices, for they are more correct than all other exemplars, as I have already stated in the Poetical Introduction. As to אטפמיא, it denotes Spain, for thus the Targum renders ספרד [Obad. 20], by אפמי, and it is also called Hispania in Italian, and ©panient in German.

Naphtali; I have already mentioned in the third Introduction the variations between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali, and that we

[^161]follow the readings of Ben-Asher. ${ }^{\text {te }}$ Hence we find in some Codices-the opinion of Ben-Naphtali noted in the margin; as shalt divide [Numb. xxxi. 27], which, according to the reading of Ben-Asher, is so written with two Pashtas, whilst, according to the reading of Ben-Naphtali, it is וָחָָּּ, with one Pashta. Hence the remark in the margin 'g, that is, Naphtali, and in some Codices ב"ב, that is, בן נפתלי BenNaphtali. Those Codices in which the reading of Ben-Naphtali is in the text, and the reading of BenAsher in the margin, are incorrect, since it is a principle with us to follow Ben-Asher. Hence it is the principle which should he expressed in the text, and not in the margin.
'מרינח, that is, מדינחאי Eastern. I have already stated, in the abovenamed Introduction, the variations between the East and the West, and that we follow the Western readings [vide supra, p. 113]. Hence it is only necessary to note in the margin the Eastern reading, as on על upon [Judg. ix. 3], "the Eastern [מדינחאי] reading is in the margin the Western reading $b$ yare incorrect. Moreover, I have also stated already, in the above-named Introduction, that the variations betreen the Eastern and Western Codices only extend to the Prophets and Hagiographa, and that there is not a single one in the Pentatench [vide supra, p. 114].
completion, perfection. The Massorites call the earlier Prophets אשלמהא קדמיתא, and the later Prophets אשלמתא תנינא. Thus "throughout the Pentateuch and the earlier Prophets [ואשלמחא קדמיתא]

 the Shin; and throughout all the later Prophets [אשלמתא תנינא] it

 Massorah magna. But I do not know why they are called אתחלמת.

[^162]פריגמא is the name given by the Massorites to a pause, or hiatus, in the middle of the verse. Thus, on "And Cain said to his brother Abel o, and it, came to pass they were in the fields" [Gen. iv. 8], the Massorites remark, "one of the twenty-five hiati [פריגמות] in the middle of the verse:" four of these are in the. Pentatench. ${ }^{48}$ I do not know from what language it is derived, and even the author of the Aruch does not quote it. The Italians, however, call all the hiati between the section, whether open or closed, פרינמא, with Tzere under $P e$; and I have enquired of their sages about it, but they could not tell. ${ }^{41}$

Now the import of open or closed sections is explained by the Poskim, who, however, entertain a great difference of opinion about it. Generally the open section consists of two kinds, - one is in the middle of the line, where a vacant space of about nine letters is left, and the second has a whole line left väcant, and the writing commences on the third line. In the case of a closed section, a vacant space of about three letters is left in the middle of the line, and after it the line is finished; and if the closed section terminates at the end of a line, the second line is begon in the middle. The rule is, that the open section is always at the beginning of the line, whilst the closed section is always in the middle of the line.
 the word פ" 0 [vide supra, p. 256].

נוסחא Codex, recension. I have already described it under the


I shall now explain some of the mnemonical signs of the Massorah
${ }^{43}$ For the fonr Pistoas in the Pentateuch, see above, p. 242. The other twenty-oze are, Josh. iv. 1; viii. 24: Jndg. ii. $1: 1$ Sam x. 22; xiv. 18, 19, 36 ; xvi. 2, 12; xix. 21 ; xxiii. $2,11: 2$ Sam. $\downarrow$. 2,19 ; vii. 4 ; xxiv. 11: 1 Kings xiii. 20: 2 Kings i. 17: Isa. viii. 3: Ezak. iii, 16; xliv. 15. Fürst (Hebrew Concordance, p. 1369, cols. 1 and 2) enumerates no less than thirty-one such Piskas. Besides those we have given, he has 1 Sam. xvii. 37 : 2 Sam. vi. 20 ; xii. 13 ; xvi. 23 ; xvii. 14 ; xv ii. 2 ; xxi. 1,$6 ;$ xxiv. 10 , 23: Jerem. xxxviii. 28; whilst he omits Gen. iv. 8: 1 Sam. xiv. 13 ; xix. 21 : 2 Kings i. 17: Hzek. xliv. 15. Indeed there is a great difference of opinion among critios as to the number and places of these Piskas.

on the Pentateuch and Prophets, since several of them are difficolt to understand.

The mnemonical sign in Pericope Noah.-In Gen. x. 3, it is תés Riphath, with Resh, and in 1 Chron. i. 6 it is $\cap$ ? Diphath, with Daleth; and the sign thereof is " The initials of the names of their respective books," that is, in Genesis, which is called ראיאשית with Resh, it is written Riphath with Resh; whilst in Chronicles it is written Diphath with Daleth, according to the name of the book which is called דברי with Daleth.

The mnemonical sign in Pericope Va-Jerah. - In the description of Abraham, it is written " and his two young men [ins] with him" [Gen. xxii. 3], whilst in connection with Balaam it is "and his two young men [蓈] with him." [Numb. xxii. 22], and the sign is, "each man according to his language;" that is, by Abraham, who was a Hebrew, it is written ins, which is Hebrew; whilst in the narrative of Balaam, who was an Aramæan, as it is said, "from Aram has Balak brought me" [Numb. xxiii. 7], it is written ivy, which is Aramæan, as the Chaldee renders in by by Mnother sign for this passage is, "as is his name, so he is;" that is, Abraham, which is with Aleph, has ins with Aleph, and Balaam, which is with Ajin, has it written with Ajin. A third sign is "Aleph Aleph, Ajin Ajin," i. c., Abraham with Aleph has Aleph, and Balaam with Ajin has Ajin. Another sign for it, again, is "their letters are the signs," that is, the different letters in their names are the signs of the respective expressions in question.

The sign in Pericope Va-Ishlach.-The sign on Tָּ Dishan with Kametz, and $\mathfrak{i v i ? ~ D i s h o n ~ w i t h ~ C h o l e m ~ [ G e n . ~ x x x v i . ~ 3 0 ] , ~ i s , ~ " e v e r y ~}$
 Kamctz" under the Shin, and it begins with the first day of the week," and the order is as follows, Dishon, Dishan, Dishon, Dishon, Dishan, Dishon, Dishan. This is the explanation of the Spaniards. The French differ on this subject, saying that the order is Dishon, Dishan, Dishon, Dishan, Dishan, Dishon, Dishan, the sign with them being "every day on which the Scroll is read, it is ? Dishon,
 latter is the correct one, and the ${ }^{45}$; העקי, וסימן מעלין כקודע: ולא מורידין proof of it is, that what is holy is placed first, and not last. ${ }^{45}$ Another sign is, "the rich are with Kametz," that is, when it is rich in letters, it has Kametz and is plene, that is it is written 淡 whilst not rich, for it is defective.

The mnemonical sign in Pericope Shemoth. - On וָהָהָ and she shall live, with Kametz under the Vav [Exod. i. 16], the Massorites remark, " not extant, once it is [Esth. iv. 11], with Sheva under the Vav, and the sign thereof is מלכת, that is, by queen Esther, it is with Sheva."

The mnemonical sign is Pericope Boh.-On " And he went out from. Pharaoh", [Exod. x. 18], in connection with the plague of the locusts, the sign is, "the king is not by the locusts," that is, by most of the other plagues it is said, "and Moses went out from Pharaoh," whilst at the place of locusts the name of Moses is not mentioned, because he is king, as it is written, "and he was king in Jeshurun" [Deut. xxxiii. 5]. Hence the sign.

The mnemonical sign in Pericope Thazriah.-In the first טָהָה purity, construed with ${ }^{\text {B }}$ י in the blood of [Levit. xii. 4], the $H e$ is Raphe, or quiescent; whilst the $H e$ of the second טָהָּTM, connected with ": in
 that is, just as the first $H e$ after the Jod is

[^163]second He after the Daleth is quiescent, so the $H e$ in $\begin{gathered}\text { in } \\ \text { oven connected }\end{gathered}$ with 'י': is vocal [i.e., beginning with Jod], and the one connected with ירְ [beginning with Daleth] is quiescent. Another sign is, "her days are revealed, her blood is concealed;" and another, "and we conceal her blood." But these are easily understood. 46

The mnemonical sign in Pericope Phineas.-The sign here is בו"ץ מי", that is, in the whole of this section it is written and his drink offering, and after the manner, except in the order for the second day, where it is written and their drink offerings [N゙umb. xxix. 19]; for the sixth day, where it is तָּ seventh day, where it is ${ }^{\top}$ after their manner [ver. 33]. Hence the letters indicating the days in which these variations occur, viz., $1=$ second day, $\quad 1=$ sixth day, and $i=$ seventh day; together with the letters constituting the variations, viz., ונסכיהם in iver. 19], in in in in in [ver. 31], and a in כמשפטם [ver. 33], yield the sign בו"ץ pouring out water; thus pointing out that the ceremony of pouring out the water is contained in the Law, as is propounded in the Talmud tractate Taanith. ${ }^{47}$

The sign on 2 Sam. xxi. 15-20. In this section the phrase and there was still [מלְחָמָה] war, without the article, occurs twice [verses
 article, occurs twice [verses 18, 19], and the sign is "in the centre it is המלחמה," with the article, that is, the first and fourth, which are the outsides, are מלְחָּה, without the article, and the two central ones are הַמשְלָּה, with the article.

The sign in 2 Kings, xx. 3.-In 2 Kings xx. 3 we find " in truth

${ }^{45}$ The first and third mnemonical signs are not given in the printed editions of the Massorah.
${ }^{47}$ The Talmadic explanation of these variations in the words, and the law deduced therefrom, are to be found in Taanith, $2 b-3 a$, as well as in Sabbath, 103 b . To noderstand the reference to the traditional enactment, it is necessary to remark, that these words also occur in connection with the other days of tbe Feast, but without the letters in question. As, according to the Talmadic lews of exegesis, no superfinous letter is ever used in the Bible withont its having some recondite meaning (comp. Ginsburg's Commentary on Ecclesiastes, p. 30, \&c.; Longmans, 1861), the three redundaut letters have been combined into prowater. This exegetical rule isscalled גורעין ומופין ורורשין letters taken from one word and joined to another, or formed into new words. Comp. Kitto's Oyclopadia of Biblical Literature, s. v. Miveasir, p. 172, rule iii. See also Jacob b. Chajim's Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, p. 22,. \&ec., ed. Ginsburg.
truth and with a perfect [in [בְלֵב $]$ heart," and the sign thereof is "the beginning of their respective books," that is, the book of Kings, beginning with !ithe and the King, which has five letters, it is written
 ters; whilst in the book of Isaiah, which begins with jitn, a vision, consisting of four letters, it is 3 , 1 , also of four letters.

The sign in 2 Kings xxv. 11.-In 2 Kings xxv. 11 we have "the remnant of הֶהּ the multitude," and in Jerem. lii. 15, "the rest of [iknin] the multitude," and the sign thereof is " here [ N " n ] is seed for you," the meaning of which is well known. Moreover, in 2 Kings xxv. 12 we have one, whilst in Jeremiah [lii. 15] it is ת of the poor ones, and the sign thereof is, "poverty follows upon poverty;" that is, Jeremiah, who speaks of the sundry desolations of the Temple, has plural, whilst the Kings, who are rich, have מרַּלֵ in the singular.

The sign in Isa. xxxy. 10.-In Isa. xxxy. 10 we have they shall obtain and rejoice, whilst in Isa. li. 11 it is ", whey shall obtain, they shall rejoice, and the sign thereof is "Two Vavs, two Nuns," that is, in the first instance there are two Vavs together [i.e., the last letter is ישישים, and the first and in the second instance two Nuns meet together [i.e., the last letter of ישינון, which is Nun, and and the first of נסו which is also Nun].

The sign in Ezek. xviii. 6. -In the whole of this section אָּ he ate, is entirely with Kametz [viz., Ezek. xviii. 6, 15], except in verse 11, where it is אָּז, half with Kametz and half with Pattach, and the sign thereof is, "he who does not eat [דלא אדאל [ Th, shuts his mouth;" that is, whenever אכל is connected with $\boldsymbol{\text { w }}$, it is with Kametz. ${ }^{48}$ In the twenty-four sacred books which have here been printed, this Massoretic remark is put into the book of Genesis on the words "in the sweat of thy brow thou shalt eat," [iii. 19], but this is an egregious blunder, and the editor did not understand it.

[^164]These are the signs which I אלה חם הסימנים שראיחי לכתבם פחה deemed desirable to explain here, ובלי ספק המחפש יטצא יוחר מאלה, ואני and the enquirer will doubtless נלאחי לבקע עור ; ובזה נשלמ הספר טבת discover many more; but I am וכל, ישחבח אשר כל יכול tired of looking any more for them, and herewith concludes this book. Praised be He, above all, who is able to do all things !

| שירה דרשה אתגר: | ודנה טרם אנלה לדיבי. |
| :---: | :---: |
| יען אשר היה אתי בערתחי | אתן לאלי יה הלל והודיה, |
| ער צי למסרת באור הכינותי; | הואל והורני דעה הביניני |
| אורה לכל אדם מיצוט ירי דעתי; | מה הוא בחנם לי נם בן אגי חנם |
| תאמין אמת פי ינעתי ומצאתי | תרתי בכל לבי למצא דבר חפטיק, |
| סופרים ולא חבר היה בחיריתי; | מפי טפרים קבלתי לית ולא מפי |
| נוע כבכברה אותה הניעותי: | חשכת אפלתה לאור הפבתית, |
| רוע בער |  |

Now before I finish to speak, I shall compose a new Song.
I give to my God praise and thanks, ${ }^{49}$ because he was with me as my help.
He deigned to teach me knowledge; so much so, that I composed an explanation of the Massorah.
As He gave it to me freely; I also freely teach every man my scanty knowledge.
I have searched with all my heart to discover the right thing. Thou mayest believe that having laboured I found the truth.
I have received assistance from books, but not orally; nor had I any fellow labourer in my work.
I converted the obscurity [of the Massorah] into light; I have shaken it as in a sieve.
The words of the wise [in the Massorah], their secrets, and enigmas ; who can find them unless he ploughs with my heifer?

[^165]> אמנם השגיתי כי אין אנוש שלא, יתטא הלא אתי תלין משוגתי;
> אחלי שניאות מי יבין וירעם, • יתקון לפי שבלו עוות שגיאותי
> האל אלהים הוּג ידע וישראל, אף לא להראות את יקר גדולתי, כי אם לבקשת אנשי סגולתי
נגמר שגת יפר"ח תוך פרשת קרח, פה עיר וויניםיה רבתי ושרתי:
צשללמה השירה וכל הספר צר גמירא :

Forsooth I have committed errors, for there is no man who does not err, so that my error cleaves to me.
I pray, therefore, that whoever understands and knows them, may correct my errors according to his wisdom.
The Lord God knows, and also Israel may know, that I have not done this proudly;
Nor to show thereby my greatness, but simply yielded to the request of my special friends.
Moreover, on account of my sin, I lost my sons: there is none left to perpetuate my house after my death.
It is enough for me that my book will live and not die; it will speak when I sleep in the grave.
Therefore go forth, my book, circulate thyself through the world; show to every wise man the work of my strength.
To those who ask who made thee, say, The hand of Elias made me.
The son of a man who is called Asher Levi, a German, a man of valour and distinction.
It was finished in the year $298[=1538]$, in the week of the Pericope Korah, here in this city, the great and celebrated Venice.

[^166]That you may know how many times Each letter occurs in the Bible, Read all the words in this Poem.

## לדעח מנין כל אות ואות. אשר בכל המקרא נמצאות, תקרא את בל דברי השירה הזאת:

I have now come to fulfil my promise which I made in the Third Introduction, towards the end of it [vide supra, p. 136]. I there stated that, at the end of this book, I would give and explain the Poem which was written, to show the number of all the letters, as well as the number of each individual letter; that is, how many Alephs, how many Beths, how many Gimmels, \&c., are to be found throughout the Bible. It is said that R. Saadia Gaon is the author of it; and this statement seems to be correct, since we find therein very dificult and foreign words, which are not of Hebrew origin, and the like of which are also to be found in the Treatise, entitled, Faith and Philosophy, which he of blessed memory wrote. ${ }^{1}$

Now the number of the stanzas in this Poem corresponds to the number of the letters in the alphabet. Thus, each stanza propounds the number of one letter, and is made in the form of a complete poem, each stanza being divided into four lines, but it is not written in even metres. Let me now explain it.

[^167]Mark that the number of each letter is indicated by the initials of the first two lines. Those in the first line signify thousands, and those in the second line denote the remaining numerals-that is, hundreds, tens, and units; and in the third line he quotes one word, which indicates the verse he places under this line ; and so, also, in the fourth line he quotes one word from another verse, which he places again under this line, in such a manner, that he brings two verses under each stanza. Now in adding up the number of the two verses, you will thas obtain the number of the letter in question with which the stanza commences. You must not, however, include in this sum the numerical value of the first letter, for this simply indicates the letter under consideration, whether it be Aleph, Beth, or Gimmel, \&c.

Thus, for example, in the first stanza commencing אהל מכון בניני the Tabernacle, my established edifice, the Aleph in indicates the letter Aleph, whilst the initials of מבון בניני 42,000 . In the second line, again, beginning ששׁם עלו זקני whither my elders resort, the initials are $\mathrm{F} \times \mathrm{y}=$ 377, and thus we obtain the number of the Alephs as 42,377 . The same is the case with all the letters. As to the third line, beginning with ine congregation, the fourth line, beginning with ולזבח and for a sacrifice, \&e., they indicate the thirty-two verses, which are respectively placed under each stanza in smaller characters and without points, and in which the number in question occurs. Thus, the first, "all the congregation together was forty thousand," \&c. [Ezra ii. 6]; and the second, "and for a sacrifice of peace-offering, two oxen," \&c. [Numb. vii. 17]; when the number of these two verses is added up, we obtain the sum total of 42,377 . The same is the case with each letter.

Moreover, it is necessary to notice, that whenever you find in a stanza two words ranged together, the initials of which denote tens, and the first of the letters is Mem. Nun: Tzaddi. Pe. or Kanh. it is used in
the manner in which the final Mem, Nun, Tzaddi, Pe, and Kaph are employed, and the value of which I have already explained in the above-named Introduction [vide supra, 136]; that is, final Kaph denotes 500 , final Mem 600, final Nun 700, final Pe 800, final Tzaddi 900. Thus, for instance, in the fourth stanza, commencing powerful, \&c., where you find כחשועתם לעילם like the salvation at Elam, you must observe that the Kaph in כתשועתם is employed, according to the value of final Mem, Nun, Tzaddi, $P_{e}$, and Kaph, and denotes 500 ; whilst the Lamed in לעילם signified 30, as usual. The same is the case with the fifth stanza, beginning hither, \&c., where there are two Nuns following each other, viz., עקבו נטע ; the first denotes 700, and the second signifies 50, as usual. This method obtains throughout. Hence, wherever one of these letters is used in this signification, you find in the middle margin one of the final letters Mem, Nun, $T_{z a d d i, ~ P e, ~ a n d ~ K a p h ~ w i t h ~ a ~ c i r c l e ~}^{\text {a }}$


And now I shall begin the Poem ${ }^{2}$
Which propounds these things.

## M <br> 

ולוכח השלמים כקר שנים אילם חםשה
עתודים חמשחח בכשים בני שנה שנה חמשה
(בטרבר ז' י"ז)

על דרך שישםש מנצ״פך, במו שכארחי

 בחרון הרי המרחיל דהר וכולי, תמצא "כתשועתתם"לעילסחירעביכ"ףכתשועתם חשמשׁ על דרך 'מנצ"פך, והיא ת"ק, ולמ"ד לעילם חעשע שלשים כמשפמח ; ון בהדוח החי המחחיל הלום ובולי, יע בו ב' נוני"ן רצופּין, והן ״נקצבו "נטע", הראשוגמ תשטם ח"ע, והשניה חמשים בטשתחםה, וכן כלם בוח הדרך; לבן בכל טקום שאחה טחן חשטש השמוע חוד, תמצא באמצע כגליין אהחת מאוחיוח מנצ"פך הפשומוח עם עינול אחר


בעצינים אחחיל רמחוזה:

## ? <br> 
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פקוריהם למטה


4 ב Beth, occurs 38218 times. The Beth in 3 , the first word in the stanza, indicates the letter under discassion, and the remaining initials of the first and second
 is also given in the two passages quoted under this stanza, viz., Numb. i. 37, and Nehem. vii. 11; since in the former the number 35,400 occurs, and in the latter $2,818=38,218$.

5 I Gimmel, occars 29,537 times: The Gimmel in gives the letter in question,
 total, which is stated still more explicitly in the numbers to be found in the two passages adduced, viz., Numb. iii. 39, and Ezra ii. 65, in which occur the numbers 22,000 and $7,337=29,537$. It will be seen that the Kaph at the beginning of the second line is nsed in its final valne, as explaingd above, vide p. 136, 270, \&c.

6 7 Daleth, occurs $3 \overline{2}, 530$ times. The Daleth in 7 , the first word in this stanza, shows the letter under discussion, and the initials of the remaining words of the two lines, viz., ${ }^{4 / 7} \boldsymbol{7}=32,530$, give the sum total, which is also given in the numbers found in the two passages adduced, viz., 1 Chron. xii. 35 , and Nehem, vii. 38 , wherein are the nambers 28,600 and $3,930=32,530$.

7 in $H e$, occurs 47,754 times. The $H e$ nnder discussion is indicated in atr, the first word in this stanza, and the number is given in the initiols of the remaining words of the first two lines viz., משזן" $=47,754$, which is also given in the numbers fonnd in the two passages quoted, viz., Numb. i. 21 , and Nehem. vii. 37 , wherein are the numbers 46,500 and $1,254=47,754$.
s y Vav, occurs 76922 times. The Vav itself is indicated in ומלמיוח, the first word

בני בנוי אלפים שעים ושבבעה (נהםי'
(4) ${ }^{\prime \prime \prime}$

בני פשהוד אלחן וטאהים אדבעה ושבכעים
(עזדא ב' ל"ח)



('0) '
( (ח)


|


צ', ל'ה

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { P1 }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { וטן בני אמרים עעשדים אלף ו ושמונה מאוה }
\end{aligned}
$$

נבורי חיל (7"ה א' צ"כ, לי")

 (7,



חיםים כ' כ"ח, י"'פ)
"10

ודי רידמנוים שע בכדאוח ואלף מנים חלשח אללםים וכמנד בהנים מאח
(עורא כ', ס"ט)
of this stanza, and the number of times it occurs is given in the initials of the remaining words in the first two lines, viz., צוץ צוּכו $=76,922$, which is also contsined in the two psesages from Numb. i. 27, and Nehem. vii. 17, viz., 47,600 and $2,322=76,922$.
s f Zain, occurs 22867 times. The Zain itsslf is indicated in ת $\pi$, the first word of this stanze, and the sum total is contsingd in the initisls of the remaining letters of the first two lines, viz., $\overline{1}=22,867$, as well as in the two psssages from 1 Chron. xii. 30 , and Nehem. vii. 19, viz., 20,803 and $2,067=22,867$.
$10 \Pi$ Cheth, occurs 23,447 times. The letter itself is indicated in piph, the first word of this stanza, whilst the number of times it occnrs in the Bible is shown by the initials of the remaining letters of the first two lines, viz., $3=23,447$. This is also stated in the two pessages of Scripture sdduced, viz., Numb. xxvi. 14, and Ezrs ii. 38; in the first of which the number 22,200 occurs, and in the second $1247,=23447$.

110 Teth, occurs 11,052 times. The letter itself is indicated in ont, the first word in this stanzs which begins with Teth, and the initisls of the remsining letters in the first two lines, viz., $ב$ ב"א'א $=11,052$, give the number of times tbe letter in quastion occurs in the Bible. The number is slso given in the pssesges of Scripture, 2 Chron. xxv. 12, and Nehem. vii. 40 , sdduced under this etanza, in the first of which we have 10,000, and in the second 1,052 , $=11,052$.

19 9 Jod, occars 66,420 times. The $J o d$ is indicated by the first letter of 1 ימ', the first word in this stanza, and the number of times is given in the initiale of the remsining words in the firet two lings, viz., $工=1 /=66,420$. This ie also given in the two pessages quoted nnder this stanza, viz., Ezra, ii. 69, which contains the number $61,000+$ $5,000+100=66,100$, and Nehom. vii. 35 , which contains the nombor 320 , making in all 66,420 .


ברמי שלי לפני חהלף לך שלמה ושאחים
לנשרים אח פּיי (שדי חעורים חא י"כ)

סוטיהם שבע פאוּוּושלשים וששח פרדיחם סאחים ארבעים וחמשה (ערא ב' ס'ון)

בני חרם אלף שבעח עשר (גחטיוּים"ב)


נטליחם ארבע םאוח שלושים וחםשה חמורים ששׁח אלצים שבע םאוח ועשרים

והבקר שושח ושלשים אלף ומכםם ליחוח
שעים ושבעים (במדבר ל"א, ל־ז)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { "14 }
\end{aligned}
$$

ועשרח אלפים חיים שבו בני יחורח (7"ח
ב', כ״ח, י"ב)

> אֶּבְּים דּוֹד אוֹרח
> פקוריהם למסח אפרים ארבעים אלף.
> וחטש מאוח (במרבר א׳ ל"ג)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 16 }{ }^{16}
\end{aligned}
$$

פקוריחם לםחה גד חטשח וארבעים אלף ושט םאוח וחםשים (במדבר א', ב"ה)
${ }^{13}$ J Kaph, occurs 37,272 times. The Kaph in $\boldsymbol{3}$, the firat word of this stanza, gives the letter in question, and the remaining initials of the first two lines, viz., I' 'in $^{\prime}=37,272$, give the number of times the letter occurs in the Bible, which is aleo stated in the two pastages of Scripture adduced under this stanza, viz., Nnmb. xxxi. 38, containing the number $36,000+72=36,072$, and Song of Songs viii. 12, containing the number $1,200,=37,272$.
$14\rceil$ Final Kaph, occurs 10,981 times. This is not only indicated by the first, bnt more especially the last letter in כמשך, the first word in thie stanza, whilst the initiale of the remaining words in the first two lines, viz., $\kappa \varepsilon^{\prime \prime} \gamma^{\prime}=10,981$, give the number of times the letter in question occurs in the Bible. This is also shown by the numbers occurring in the two passages quoted under this stanza, viz., 2 Chron. xxv. 12, where 10,000 occur, and Ezra ii. 66, where we have $736+245=981$, yielıing the sum total of 10,981 .
${ }^{15}$ S Iamed, occors 41,517 times. The Lamed is indicated by the first letter of化, the first word in this stanza, whilst the number io given in the initials of the remaining words in the first two lines, viz., $v^{\prime \prime} \neq 41,517$. This is also ahown in the numbers of the two passages quoted under this stanza, viz., Nomb. i. 33, where the number 40,500 occurs, and Nehem. vii. 42 , where we have $1,017=41,517$.

16 פ Mem, occurs 52,805 times. The Mem is indicated by the first lettcr of מטורח, the firet word of this etanza, and the number of times it occurs in the Bible ie shown by the initials of the remaining worde of the first two lines, viz., $\mathrm{T}^{\prime \prime} 7 \mathrm{~J}=52,805$. This is also indicated by the numbere occurring in two paesages of Scripture addaced under this stanza, riz., Numb. i. 25, and Ezra ii. 67, wherein occur the numbers 45,650 and $435+6,720=52,805$.

> ) :

הכהנים בני ידעיה לביח ישוע חשע מאוח


ויהיי בל ימי למך שבע，ושבעים לםנה ושבע מאוח שנה（בראשׁית ה׳ ל＂א）

> 行尔
> :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { טלמון בני עקוב בני חטיםא בני שכי הכל }
\end{aligned}
$$

：
 וחת ררכמנים אלף מורקוח חמשים משים בחנוח

כהנים שולשים וחמשש טאוח（נחמי＇ץ＇，ע＇）

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { " }
\end{aligned}
$$

ויהיו המתים במנפח ארבעה וע שׂרים אלף
（4，ח＂ラ
18


ומאחים (במרבר א' ל"ה)

## וַיָּבּיוֹן

ויהיו פקדיהם שטנח אלפימ והמש מאות
וששמנים（בטרבר ר׳ מ＂ח）

 וישכ יוֹאב ויך אח את אדום כניא טלח שֶנים עשר אלֹף（חחלים ם＇ב＇）

[^168]


 （בראשוֹת כ＂ת



וסבני יששׁכר יורעע בינה לעח לעים לרעה
 אחיהם על פיתם（ד＂ה א＇יב，ל＂ב）
\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 湤 }
\end{aligned}
$$
\]




$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { " }
\end{aligned}
$$

（גק
（ $\Pi^{\prime \prime}, \Pi^{\prime \prime} \Delta$

雨<br><br>

<br>7．<br> （ח＂ב ב

21 y Ajin，occurs 20，175 timer．The letter itself is indicated by the Ajin in עומדים， the first word of this stanza，whilst the initials of the remaining worde in the first two lines，viz．，בקע＂ה＝ 20,175 ，show the number of times the letter in queetion occurs in the Bible．This is moreover shown by the numbers to he found in the two passages of Scripture adduced under this stanza，viz．，Ezek．xlviii．18，where we have 10，000 and 10,000 ，and Gen．xxv．7，where the namber is $175=20,175$ ．

22 Pe，occurs 20，750 times．As usual，the letter in question is indicated by the $P e$ ，the first letter in $\quad$ ，the word with which the stanza begine，whilst the nomber of times the letter in question aceure is shown by the initials of the remaining words in the first two lines，viz．， $5^{7} \dagger=20,750$ ．This number is also contained in the two passages of Scripture adduced under this stanza，viz．，Ezek．xlviii． 35 and Nnmb．iv．36， in the former of which the number is 18,000 ，and in the latter $2,750=20,750$ ．
${ }_{25}{ }^{5}$ F Final $P e$ ，occurs 1，975 times．The letter itself is not only indicated by the first letter in $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{F}}$ ，the word with which the stanza begins，but more especially by the laet letter of this word，which is Final Pe．The initials of the remaining words in the first two lines，viz．， $\boldsymbol{T H}^{\prime \prime} Y \mathcal{Y}=1,975$ ，give the number of times the letter in question occurs in the Bible，whilet the numbers in the two passages of Scripture，adduced under this stanza，show this still more explicitly，viz．，Exod．xxxviii．28，where the number 1，775 occurs，and 2 Chron．xii．32，where the number is $200=1,975$ ．

24 Y Tzaddi，occare 16，950 times．The letter iteelf is indicated by the Tzaddi in isme，the word with which the stanza hegine；the initials of the remaining words in the first two lines，viz．， $\mathrm{J}^{\prime \prime}$ Y י $\quad=16,950$ ，show the number of times the word in question occure in the Bible；and the two passages of Scripture adduced nnder this stanza，viz．，Nnmb．xxxi． 40 and Gen．ix．29，are made to state the same fact，inasmoch as the number 16，000 occure in the first passage，and 950 occurs in the second，yielding together 16，950．

| 4 <br>  | $\operatorname{Mp}^{4} \overbrace{1}$ <br>  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  (yצרא כ', ד') |  וארבעח אלפים טרה（יחוֹאל ט＂ח，ל， |
|  |  |
|  | וטן בני אשרים עשים צים אלף ושמטוגה מאוח (דברי הימים א', ״"ב, ל,) |
|  |  |
| 隹䊽 | רצ． |
|  ＊וטאח ששנה（בראשיח ט＇＂ו，כ＂ה） |  |
| мibin <br>  | ת8 <br>  |
| הם＂שוררים בני אםף מאה ארבעים ועשמנה (נחםי' צ' ט'ד) |  <br>  |

${ }_{25} \psi$ Final Traddi，occurs 4，872 times．The letter is indicated hath by the first，and ospecially by the last，letter in pry，with which this stanza begins．The initials of the remaining words of the first two lings，viz．．בע＂ times this letter occurs in the Bible；which is also shown by the numbers occurring in the two passages of Scripture adduced under this stanza，viz．，Ezek．xlviii． 30 and Ezra ii．4， in the former of which we have 4，500，and in the latter $372=4,872$ ．
${ }^{26}$ P Koph，occurs 22，972 times．The memonical sign for the lster in question is the Koph in the word $p$ ，with which this stanza begins，and the signs for the number of times it occurs in the Bihle are hoth the initials of the remaining words in the first two lines，viz．， in the two passages of Scripture addaced under this stanza，viz．， 1 Chron．xii．30，where we hgve 20，800，and Ezra ii．3，where we have 2，172＝22，972．
${ }^{27} 7$ Resh，occurs 22,147 times．The letter itself is indicated by the Resh in 971 ，with which the stanza begins，and the nnmber of times it occars is shown hoth by the initials of the remaining words of the first two linas，viz．，כבק＂מו $=22,147$ ，and by the numbers in the txo plesages of Scriptnre adduced under this stanza，viz．， Ps．lxviii．18，in which the numher is 24,000 ，and Gen．xlvii． 28 ，where we find $147=22,147$ ．

28 Shin，occurs 32,148 times．The Shin itself is indicated by the first letter of Tu，which hegins this stanze，and the number of times it occurs in the Bible is shown
 well as by the numbers in the two passages of Scripture adduced nnder thic stanza， viz．，Numb．xxxi．35，where we find 32，000，and Nehem．vii．44，where it is $148=32,148$ ．

ן




ובקר ששח ושלשים אהלף (במדבר ל"א,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { תוֹת } \\
& \text { זָָכר הִמְלִליטָה בִּי חָּשָּה }
\end{aligned}
$$

ויחי כל בכור ובר כמספר שמוח מבן
 שלשה ושבעים ומאחים (במרבר נ׳ מ"ג)

סליק וסימנך כי זה בל האדס:

הנאון מהר״ר סעריה:
האיש הלוי אליה:


השיר ננמר אותו חבר.
אך הנהנ צם ביארהני
בה בשנה סימן לפَרט,

## בנ"ל7

29 ת Tav, occurs 36,140 timee. The Tav itself is indicated by the first letter of , mith which the stanza begins, and the number of times it ocenrs is shown by the initials of the remaining words in the first two lines; viz., p $^{2 \prime \prime}=36,140$, as well as by the numbers occurring in the two passages of Scripture quoted nnder thie stanza, viz., Numb. xxxi. 44, where we have 36,000, and Job xliii. 16, where it is $140=36,140$.
${ }^{30} \Omega$ Tav without Dagesh, occurs 23,203 times. The letter in question is not only indicated by the first letter of man, with which this stanza begins, but more especially by the last letter which is withont Dagesh. The number of times it occurs in the Bible is shown by the initials of the remaining words in the first two lines, viz., 17"גכ $=23,203$, as well as by the numbers contained in the two passages of Scripture adduced under thie stanza, viz., Numb. iii. 43, where we have 22,277 , and Gen. v. 5, where we have $930=23,203$.

## INDEX I.

## MASSORETICALLY ANNOTATED PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE <br> REFERRED TO.

| $\underset{\text { Chap. }}{\text { in }}$ | Genests. |  |  |  | Chap. | Ver. |  |  |  | Chap. <br> xyii. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ver. } \\ & \hline 17 \end{aligned}$ | Page. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Pag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 124,1 | 139,14 |  |  | 15 |  |  | 215 |  |  | 18 |  | ${ }^{216}$ |
|  |  | 215, | 230, 2 |  | .. | 17 |  | 115, 11 | 18, | .. | 19 |  | 166, 215 |
| . | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 180, 2 | 251 |  | 20 |  | 157 |
| . | 3 |  |  | 5 |  | 22 |  |  | 163 | xviii. | 6 |  | 174 |
| $\because$ | 4 | 139, | 142, |  | ix. | 8 |  |  | 215 | .. | 7. |  | 141, 218 |
| .. | 5 |  |  | 40 | . | 10 |  | 213, | , 25 | . | 11 |  | 242 |
| $\cdots$ | 6 |  | 141, 2 |  | . | 11 |  |  | 166 |  | 12 |  | 247 |
|  | 7 |  | 139, 1 |  |  | 12 |  |  | 215 |  | 15 |  | 252 |
|  | 9 |  |  | 15 | . | 17 | 166, | 167, 2 | 215 | . | 20 |  | 205 |
| $\cdots$ | 11 |  | 215, 2 |  | . | 21 |  |  | 179 |  | 21 |  | 209 |
| . | 14 | 215, | 221, 2 |  | . | 26 |  | - 1 | 141 |  | 25 |  | 201, 207 |
|  | 15 |  |  | 40 |  | 27 |  |  | 141 |  | 29 |  | 245 |
|  | 18 |  |  | 21 | . | 29 |  |  | 276 | xix. | 10 |  | 174 |
| .. | 20 |  | 142, 2 |  | x. |  |  | 236, | 237 |  | 12 |  | 163 |
| . | 21 |  |  | 57 | . | 3 |  |  | 263 |  | 14 |  | 219 |
|  | 24 |  |  | 15 | . | 8 |  |  | 148 | $\cdots$ | 16 |  | 239 |
| . | 26 |  | 2 | 15 |  | 9 |  |  | 148 | . | 22 |  | 151 |
|  | 29 |  |  | 15 | . | 10 |  |  | 197 | . | 29 |  | 196 |
| ii. | 3 |  |  | 39 | . | 19 |  | 115, | 177 | $\cdots$ | 30 |  | 151 |
|  | 4 |  | 168, |  | . | 23 |  |  | 197 | .. | 36 |  | 177 |
|  | 6 |  |  | 65 | . | 29 |  |  | 157 | $\cdots$ | 37 |  | 216 |
| . | 15 |  |  | 39 |  | 30 |  |  | 177 | . | 38 |  | 216 |
|  | 21 |  |  | 77 | xi. | 31 |  |  | 174 | xx: | 3 |  | - 154 |
|  | 22 |  |  | 19 | xii. | 5 |  |  | 174 |  | 6 | 140, 1 | 150, 170 |
|  | 23 |  |  | 206 |  | 7 |  |  | 237 |  | 14 |  | 252 |
| iii. | 6 |  |  | 97 | . | 8 |  |  | 179 |  | 15 |  | 201 |
|  | 11 |  |  | 08 | . | 10 |  | - | 174 |  | 16 |  | 236 |
| . | 17 |  |  | 54 | . | 11 |  |  | 174 | xxi. | 6 |  | 205 |
|  | 18 |  |  | 49 |  | 14 |  |  | 174 |  | 8 |  | 197 |
|  | 22 |  |  | 149 | xiii. | 3 |  |  | 179 | $\ldots$ | 12 |  | 206, 215 |
| iv. |  |  |  | 205 | .. | 5 |  | 220, | 221 | $\cdots$ | 15 |  | 197, 252 |
| $\cdots$ |  |  |  | 218 |  | 10 |  |  | 177 |  | 23 |  | 175 |
|  |  | 8 |  | 262 |  | 15 |  |  | 227 | xxii. | 2 |  | 252 |
|  |  | 9 |  | 201 | xiv. | 2 |  |  | 115 | .. | 13 |  | 206 |
| . | 29 |  |  | $233-$ | . | 8 |  |  | 115 |  | 22 |  | 208 |
| v. |  |  | 168, | 220 |  | 16 |  |  | 252 | xxiii. | 2 |  | 231 |
|  |  |  |  | 278 | $x$ x. | 1 |  |  | 196 |  | 9 |  | 199 |
|  | 31 |  | - | 275 | . | 2 |  |  | 234 |  | 11 |  | 223 |
| vi. |  |  | . | 246 |  | 5 |  |  | 250 |  | 15 |  | 223 |
|  |  |  |  | 149 | xvi. | 4 |  |  | 197 |  | 18 |  | - 236 |
|  |  |  |  | 219 |  | 7 |  |  | 178 | xxiv. | 3 |  | - 246 |
|  |  |  |  | 215 |  | 12 |  |  | 200 150 |  | $\stackrel{4}{5}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r}\text { - } 226 \\ -\quad 247 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |
|  | 14 | $4^{-16}$ |  | 229 218 | xvii. | $\stackrel{2}{5}$ | 5 |  | 150 206 |  | 5 14 |  | - 109,247 |
|  | 18 |  |  | 166 | $\cdots$ | 7 |  |  | 166 |  | 16 |  | 109, 115 |
|  |  |  |  | 141 | $\cdots$ | 9 |  | . | 215 | $\cdots$ | 18 |  | 251 |
| vii. | 2 |  | . | 251 | .. | 15 |  | . | 215 |  | 23 |  | 132, 247 |



| Ohap. | Ver. | Pago. | Chap. | Ver, | Page. |  | Ver. | Page |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| iii. | 17 | 238 |  | 2 | - $\quad 222$ | xxviii, | 12 | - 148 |
|  | 22 | 221 |  | 11 | 177 |  | 20 | 13 |
| iv. | 2 | 116, 193 | .. | 14 | 249 | . | 23 | 175 |
| .. | 7 | 252 |  | 18 | 149 |  | 28 | 116, 207 |
| . | 8. | 166 |  | 19 | 252 |  | 29 | 148 |
| .. | 11 | 200 | xyi. | 2 | 116, 118 |  | 30 | 175 |
|  | 12 | 205 |  | 7 | - 116 |  | 36 | 149, 230 |
| $\cdots$ | 16 | 218 |  | 8 | - 2220 |  | 40 | 221 |
| . | 19 | 154, 164 |  | 12 | 255 | xxix. | 3 | 150, 175 |
| . | 21 | 174 |  | 13 | -116 | .* | 6 | 175 |
|  | 26 | 222 |  | 23 | 214, 238 |  | 13 | 174 |
| . | 29 | 233 | xvii. | 12 | - 213 |  | 17 | 175 |
| \%. | 1 | 216 | xviii. | 1 | - 259 |  | 18 | 174, 214 |
| . | 7 | 171 | . | 5 | 259 |  | 25 | 174 |
|  | 23 | . 221 |  | 7 | 174 |  | 31 | 147 |
| *i. | 2 | 215 |  | 19 | 141 |  | 34 | 141 |
|  | 3 | - 218 |  | 21 | 224 | xx | 9 | 218 |
| $\cdots$ | 4 | 166, 167 |  | 25 | 224 | . | 16 | 175 |
| ".. | 5 | - 158 | xix. | 8 | 252 |  | 18 | 175 |
| . | 11 | 202 |  | 13 | 216 |  | 32 | 247 |
| . | 13 | 140, 218 |  | 16 | 166 | xxxi. | 3 | 139 |
| . | 18. | - 228 | . | 17 | - 250 |  | 17 | 139, 149 |
| : | 24 | 171 | xx. | 1 | - 215 | xxrii. | 4 | - 206 |
| vii. | 2 | 217 | . | 6 | 140 | .. | 10 | 150 |
| . | 12 | 157 | . | 11 | 139, 283 |  | 13 | 149 |
|  | 29 | 176, 177 |  | 13 | - 232 |  | 17 | 116, 178 |
| viii. | 5 | - 237 | - | 15 | 238 |  | 19 | - 116 |
| $\cdots$ | 10 | 207 | - | 16 | - 232 |  | 25 | 231 |
| . | 18 | 246 | xxi. | 3 | - 241 |  | 27 | 216 |
|  | 19 | 154 | .. | 6 | 149 | xxxiii. | 8 | 174 |
| ix. | 15 | 150 | . | 8 | 116 |  | 9 | 174 |
| .. | 16 | 217 | . | 10 | - 178 |  | 18 | 162 |
| . | 18 | 178 |  | 27 | 132 |  | 22 | 220 |
| $\cdots$ | 19 | 174 | $\cdots$ | 28 | 141 | xxxiv. | 7 | 151, 230 |
| $\cdots$ | 22 | 141 | xxii. | 4 | 116 |  | 14 | - 230 |
| . | 27 | 213 | .. | 22 | - 196 |  | 26 | . .281 |
| " | 34 | 245 | - ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 26 | 116 |  | 11 | - 116 |
| x. | 1 | 205 | $\cdots$ | 29 | 223 |  | 81 | . 139 |
| -. |  | - 217 |  | 30 | $\text { . } 154$ | xxxvi. |  | - 242 |
| $\cdots$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9 \\ 12 \end{array}$ | -161 | xxiii. | ${ }_{8}^{2}$ | $95 ; 164$ | . | 14 |  |
| $\cdots$ | 12 | 220 264 |  | 88 | $\begin{aligned} & 157 \\ & : \quad 226 \end{aligned}$ |  | 17 | $214$ |
| $\cdots$ | 18 21 | $\begin{aligned} & 264 \\ & 151 \\ & 151 \end{aligned}$ | - | 13 1 | - 2226 |  | 19 8 | 216 116 |
|  | 21 | 151 205 | xiv. | 1 | - $\quad 218$ | rxxii., | - 8 | 116 |
| xi. | 8 | 230 | . | 10 | 215 | xxxyiii. | 12 | 155 |
| xii. | 16 | 141 | . | 14 | 218 |  | 17 | 155 |
| .. | 22 | 218 | xxp. | 9 | - 150 |  | 25 | 213 |
| . | 30 | 245 | . | 16 | - 175 |  | 28 | 276 |
| . | 34 | 155 | .. | 18 | 155 | .xxxix. |  | 224, 230 |
| .. | 37 | 173 | . | 20 | 237 |  | 4 | 116 |
| . | 42 | 155 | . | 21 | 175, 218 |  | 14 | 149 |
|  | 46 | 141 | . | 22 | 150 |  | 21 | 116, 207 |
|  | 46 | 199 |  | 26 | 175 |  | 33 | 116 |
| xiii. | 3 | 141 | . | 29 | 196 | xl. | 4 | 205 |
|  | 7 | 141 | $\cdots$ | 30 | 175 |  | 7 | 175 |
| . | 11 | 116 | xixvi. | 1 | - 151. |  | 8 | 175 |
| . | 1617 | 6, 177, 234 | - . | 7 | - $216^{\circ}$ |  |  |  |
|  | 17 | 174 |  | 14 | - 216 |  | Levit |  |
| xiv. | 7 | 159 |  | 16 | - 237 | i. | 1 | 196, 281 |
|  | : 9 | 150 | .. | 34 | - 175 | . | 9 | - 174 |
|  | 13 | 226 | Expii. | 7 | - 206 |  | 13 | 174 |
|  | 16 | 141, 255 | . | 10 | - 155 |  | 15 | 174 |
| - | 17 | 141,255 |  | 11 | 116, 155, 183 |  | 17. | 174 |
| . | 19-21 | - 219 | xxviii. | 11 | 149 | ii. | 2. | 174 |



| Chap. | Ver. | ${ }_{\text {Page }}$ | Chap. | Ver, | Page. |  | Ver. |  | Page. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| iv. | 49 | 150, 226 |  | 41 | - 255 | sxi. | 38 |  | 274 |
| v. | 4 | 150 | . | 31 | - 178 |  | 40 | . | 276 |
| . | 8 | 200 |  | 41 | 170 |  | 44 |  | 278 |
| . | 21 | 150 | xvi. | 9 | - 215 | xxii. | 1 | : | 247 |
| $\cdots$ | 26 | 174 | . | 11 | - 116 |  | 3 |  | 213 |
| vi. | 5 | 147, 158, 223 | $\cdots$ | 15 | - 252 | . | 7 | 116, | 119 |
| . | 8 | 147 | , | 17 | 213, 218 | .. | 17 |  | 170 |
|  | 20 | 150 |  | 20 | - 140 | . | 24 |  | 171 |
|  | 24 | 218 | xvii. | 4 | - 155 |  | 37 |  | 172 |
| vii. | 1 | 159 | " | 17 | - 160 | xxxiii. | 8 |  | 226 |
| .. | 3 | 150 | .. | 20 | - 156 |  | 42 | - | 237 |
| - | 5 | 150 | - | 23 | 250, 25 ! | xxxiv. | 4 |  | 116 |
| . | 6 | 150 |  | 24 | - 250 | xxxy. | 2 |  | 221 |
| . | 10 | 157 | xviii. | 24 | - 204 | . | 4 |  | 221 |
| $\cdots$ | 14 | 232 | . | 23 | - 227 | . | 9 | . | 275 |
| $\cdots$ | 17 | 271 |  | 26 | - 218 |  | 10 |  | 174 |
|  | 19 | 159 | xix. | 1 | - 140 | $\cdots$ | 7 |  | 236 |
| . | 20 | 232 | xx. | 15 | - 174 | xxxvi. | 3 | 149, | 221 |
| $\cdots$ | 26 | 232 |  | 17 | $\text { . } 200$ | . | 6 | . | 200 |
| . | 32 | 232 | xxi. | 4 | . '259 |  |  |  |  |
| - | 38 | 232 | . | 5 | 205, 245 |  | tero | ovomy. |  |
| . | 44 | 232 | . | 20 | . 221 | i. | 2 |  | 252 |
| $\cdots$ | 50 | 232 | . | 22 | - 200 | . | 11 | 160, | 169 |
| $\cdots$ | 56 | 232 |  | 32 | 116, 118 | . | 13 |  | 157 |
| -. | 62 | - 232 | xxii, | 2 | - 245 | . | 15 | - | 224 |
| . | 68 | - 2323 | .. | 12 | - 215 |  | 16 | - | 224 |
| . | 74 | -* 232 | . | 15 | - 245 | ii. | 1 | . | 237 |
|  | 80 | - 232 | . | 22 | - 263. | . | 8 | . | 242 |
| viii. | 1 | 170 | . | 25 | - $245^{\circ}$ | . | 14 |  | 164 |
| . | 7 | 196 | . | 26 | - 245 |  | 33 | 116, | 230 |
| . | 16 | 160 |  | 33 | 150, 177 | iii. | 6 |  | 150 |
| ix. | 2 | 248 | xxiii. | 1 | - 158 |  | 11 | - | 230 |
| " | 15 | 216 | . . | 3 | - 206 | - | 13 | - | 206 |
| x. | 3 | 196 | . | 7 | 263 | . | 17 | . | 213 |
| . | 10 | 255 | . | 9 | 197, 221 | . | 21 | - | 160 |
| $\because$ | 36 | 116 | . | 24 | $\cdots \quad 197$ | . | $26^{*}$ | - | 205 |
| xi. | 4 | 171, 185 | xxiv. | 2 | - 139 | . | 28 | - | 150 |
| - | 11 | 140, 170 | .- | 5 | - 230 | iv. | 11 | . | 237 |
| .. | 12 | 222 |  | 6 | - 207 |  | 28 |  | 139 |
| . | 20 | 172 | $\cdots$ | 23 | - 216 | . | 32 | . | 139 |
| - | 25 | 171 | xxv. | 4 | - 150 | . | 40 | . | 217 |
| .. | 26 | 174 | .. | 12 | - 231 |  | 45 |  | 237 |
| . | 32 | 116, 233 | .. | 17 | - 150 | จ. | 10 | 116, | 232 |
|  | 33 | 242 | $\because$ | 19 | - 242 | . | 14 |  | 176 |
| xii. | 3 | 116, 163, 183 | xxvi. | 8 | - 226 | . | 16 | 154, | 233 |
| - | 12 | 207 |  | 9 | 116, 119 | - | 18 | - | 225 |
|  | 16 | 170 |  | 14 | 273 |  | 19 |  | 242 |
| xiii. | 1 | 170 | xsrii. | 2 | 157, 217 |  | 26 |  | 149 |
| - | 2 | 207 | . | 5 | - 230 | vi. |  | 154, 217 | , 233 |
| . | 9 | 172 | . | 13 | - 205 |  | 4 |  | 230 |
| .- | 21 | - 207 |  | 15 | - 215 | $\cdots$ | 9 |  | 95 |
| . | 22 | 225, 260 | .: | 21 | - 217 | . | 18 | 228, | 229 |
|  | 28 | 260 | xxviii. | 6 | - 154 |  | 17 | - | 236 |
|  | 30 | 230 |  | 17 | 141 |  | 18 | - | 214 |
| xiv. | 3 | 174 | xxix. | 19 | - 265 | vii. | 9 | - | 116 |
|  | 4 | 174 | . | 31 | - 265 |  | 12 |  | 170 |
| $\cdots$ | 15 | 176 | .. | 33 | 212, 265 |  | 19 | - | 213 |
| - | 17 | 230 | xIx. | 9 | - 150 | viii. | 2 | - | 116 |
| . | 20 | 161 | xxxi. | 12 | - 218 | .. |  |  | 216 |
| $\cdots$ | 25 | 213 | - | 18 | - 238 | . | 8 |  | 182 |
| $\cdots$ | 26 | -116 110 | $\cdots$ | $\stackrel{22}{24}$ | - $\quad 214$ |  | 14 | - | ${ }_{2}^{236}$ |
| xv. | 36 14 | 116, 119 |  | 24 27 | - $205,{ }_{261}^{231}$ | ix. | $\stackrel{2}{5}$ |  | 218 217 |
| x $\quad$. | 24 | 140, 170 | -• | 35 | - 277 | $\cdots$ | 14 | , | 150 |


| DeuteronomY. |  |  | Chap. | Ver. | Page. | Chap. | Verc |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chap. | Ver. | Page. | V. | 10 | 171 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 16 \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | 116, 189 |
| ix. | 22 | 158 | xy. | 5 | 173, 252 | iv. | 17 | $\begin{aligned} & 255 \\ & 262 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\cdots$ | 24 | ${ }_{2}^{231}$ |  | 9 | 200 128 | iv. |  | 239, 240 |
|  | 27 28 | - $\begin{array}{r}218 \\ \hline 150 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | xxi. | 19 | 128 174 | $\cdots$ | 18 | 116, 188 |
| x. | $\stackrel{28}{5}$ | 202 | xxi. | 8 | 213 | \%. | 1 | 116 |
| $\ldots$ | 11 | 141, 255 | $\because$ | 16 | 150 | - | 12 | ${ }^{245}$ |
| . | 15 | 150 | : | 19 * | 147 |  | 15 | 1116 |
|  | 17 | 148 | xxvii. | 8 | 122 | vi. | 5 | 188, 116 |
|  | 20 | 229 | . | 10 | 116 | $\cdots$ | 7 | 116, 117 |
|  | 22 | 174 | . ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 12 | 213 | - | 3 | 116, 191 |
| xi. | 9 | 217 |  | 13. | 225 |  | 13 |  |
|  | 10 | 205 | $\cdots$ | 26 | -116, 150 | vii. | 15 | 1196 |
|  | 12 | 140, $170^{\circ}$ | xxviii. | 27 | 109, 116, 194 | vii. | 10 | $\begin{array}{r} 196 \\ 1.54,164 \end{array}$ |
|  | 13 | $\begin{array}{r} 121 \\ 95 \end{array}$ | - | 30 31 | $: 116,194$ |  | 10 | 116, 118 |
| $\because$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13-21 \\ & 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 95 \\ 159 \end{array}$ | $\cdots$ | 31 39 | 155 $-\quad 151$ |  | 22 | 16, 174 |
|  | 24 | 247 |  | 46 | 227 |  | 24 | 255 |
|  | 25 | 170 | $\cdots$ | 51 | 214 | vii. | 11 | 183, 116 |
| xii. | 4 | 152 | $\cdot \square$ | 52 | 196 |  | 12 | 116 |
|  | 16 | 229 | . | 53 | 16\% | $\cdots$ | 15 | 255 |
|  | 22 | 141 | . | 57 | 140 | . | 16 | 15 |
|  | 23 | 208 | . | 68 | 230 | $\because$ | 21 | 250 |
|  | 29 | 150 | xxix. | 5 | 255 | , |  |  |
| xiii. | 1 | 205 | . | 22 | 116. | ix. | 7 | 116, 117, 182 |
|  | 8 | 151 | $\cdots$ | 27 | 230 | ". | 24 8 | 1116 |
| 17 | 15 | 175 | $\underset{\text { xxxi. }}{\text { xxx }}$ | 19 | 139 150 | . | 24 | 172 |
| xip. | 18 | 212 | . | 10 | 150 | - | 23 | 237 |
| .. | 23 | 204 | . | 26 | 119 | . | 29 |  |
| xv: | 2 | 196 | : | 28 | - 139 | " | 31 | 255 |
| . | 4 | 216 | * xxxir. | 1 | 201 | . | 34 | 220 |
|  | 23 | 229 | .. | 5 | - 230 | $\cdots$ |  |  |
| xvi، | 10 | 226 | . | ${ }_{7}$ | 230 | $\because$ | 35 | 255 |
|  | 18 | 214 | $\cdots$ | 10 | 254 292 |  | 36 38 | 255 |
| xvii. | ${ }^{6}$ | 229 205 | - | 11 | 202 | .. | 39 | 174 |
|  | 16 | 174 | .. | 13 | 182 |  | 43 | . 255 |
| xviii. | 12 | 150 | . ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 14 | 158 | xi. | 16 | 116 |
|  | 13 | 150, 230 | . | 18 | 208, 231 | xii. | 13 | 232 |
| xix. | 15 | - 229 | . | 29 | - 230 |  | 14 | 232 |
| xx. | 3 | 224 | $\therefore$ | 33 | 157 |  | 15 | 232 |
|  | 8 | 176 | . | 34 | 154 |  | 20 | 116 |
| xxi. | 6 | 188 | . | 40 | 149 |  | 40 | 171 |
|  | 7116 | 6, 161, 179 |  | 51 | 150 | xiii. | 8 | 213 |
|  | 15 | - 177 | xxxiii. | 2 | - 198. |  | 11 | 226 |
| xxii. | 21 | 206, 235 | . ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 5 | 141, ${ }_{2}^{264}$ | xive | 16 | 226 |
| xxii. | ${ }^{6}$ | 206, ${ }^{109}, 116^{\prime}$ | " | $\stackrel{1}{9}$ | 141, 116 |  | 4 | 236 |
|  | 16109 | 9, 116, 200 |  | 27 | - 178 | . | 12 | 214 |
| . | 20 | 109, 116 | . | 44 | - 218 |  | 15 | 220 |
|  | 21 | 109, 116 |  |  |  | xv. | 4 | 116 |
| . | 23 | 109, 116 |  | Josh | rua. |  | $\stackrel{22}{45}$ | 213 |
| . | 24 | 109, 116 | i. | 3 | - 247 |  | +47 | 116 |
| - | 25 | 109, 116 | - | 7 | - 2225 |  | 47 48 | 116 |
|  | 26 | 109, 116 |  | 7 | - $\begin{array}{r}162 \\ \hline 226\end{array}$ |  | $\stackrel{48}{53}$ | 116, 118 |
| - . $\quad$. | 27 28 | 109, 116 | ii. | 7 |  |  | 63 | - 116 |
|  | 29 | 109, 116 | 。 | 11 | 255 | xvi. | 3 | 116, 183 |
| xxiii. | 4 | - 257 |  | 13 | 116 |  | 5 | 116 |
|  | 5 | 227 | - | 14 | 161 | xviii. | 1 | 141, 214 |
|  | 11 | 196 |  | 18 | 174 |  | 4 8 | 141, 25.5 |
|  | 17 | - ${ }^{201}$ | iit |  | 1198 |  | 8 | 116 |



|  | Samurl. |  |  | Ver. |  | Ohap. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chap. |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Page. } \\ & { }_{17} \end{aligned}$ | xxvi. | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 218 \\ : \quad 216 \end{array}$ | vii. | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 166 \\ & 220 \end{aligned}$ |
| 87i. | 17 : | 172 -236 | " | 11 | - $\quad 216$ <br> $\quad 216$ |  | 29 | 221 - |
| $\ldots$ | 23 11 | 116, 186 | .. | 12 | - 151 | viii. | 3 | 109, 192 |
| . | 26 | - 200 |  | 14 | 218 | . | 8 | 221 |
| $\cdots$ | 27 | 200 | . | 15 | 216 | $\pm$. | 9 | 116 |
|  | 29 | 245 |  | 16 | 216 |  | 17 | 171 |
| . | 34 | 116 | . | 19 | 151 | xi. | 1 | - 171 |
| . | 37 | 262 |  | 22 | 184, 216 | . | 13 | - 213 |
|  | 45 | - 200 |  | 23 | - 200 | $\cdots$ | 24 | - 171 |
|  | 47 | 200 | xxvii. | 4 | - 116 | xii. | 3 | - 237 |
| xviii. | 1 1 | 116, 233 | .. | 8 | 116 | $\cdots$ | 4 | 200, 221 |
| .. | 61 | 116, 119 |  | 10 | 218 | . | 7 | 216, 217 |
|  | 7 . | . 116 |  | 11 | 213 | . | 9 | 116, 200, 232 |
|  | 9 | 116 | xxviii. | 3 | 229 |  | 12 | - $\quad 236$ |
| . | 14 | 116 | .. | 6 | 158 |  | 13 | 262 |
|  | 20. | - 139 |  | 8 | 116, 182 | . | 20 | 116, 183 |
|  | 22. | 116 |  | 9 | - 229 | . | 22 | 116, 186 |
| . | 25 | 226 |  | 16 | - 240 |  | 24 | -116 116 |
| $\cdots$ | 29 149, | 171, 245 |  | 21 | - 202 |  | 31 | 116, 188 |
| xix. | 4 . | - 163 |  | 22 | - 141 | xiii. | 7 | -177 174 |
|  | 12-. | 251 |  | 24 | - 222 |  |  |  |
| $\cdots$ | 18 - | 116 | xxix. | 3 | 208, 209 |  | 32 | 116, 118 |
| $\cdots$ | 19 . | 116 |  | 5 | - 116 |  | 33 | 110 |
| $\cdots$ | 20 | 158 | xxx. | 1 | - 218 | . | 34 | - 116 |
|  | 21 | 245, 262 | .. | 2 | - 207 |  | 37 | 116, 189 |
| . | 22 | -116 116 |  | 6 | 116 | xiv. | 11 | 116, 119 |
| . | 23 | 116, 139 | . | 16 | 151 |  | 11 | 116 |
| xx. | 1 | 116, 119 |  | 22 | - 207 | " | 15 | 214 |
| . | 2 | 116 |  | 24 | - 116 | . | 21 | 116 |
| . | 3 | 206 | xxxi. | 7 | 196 | . |  |  |
| $\cdots$ | 8 | - 226 |  |  |  |  | 30 | - 1174 |
| $\cdots$ | 13 | - 141 |  | S $\triangle$ m |  | $\cdots$ | 31 | - 174 |
| . | 17 | - 245 | i. | ${ }_{8}^{2}$ | - $\begin{array}{r}183 \\ 116\end{array}$ | $\because$ | 32 50 | - 163 <br> .$\quad 223$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \\ & 24 \end{aligned}$ | 178, 253 | '' | r 8 | 209, 116 | x\%. | 5 | - 208 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 24 \\ & 29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathbf{1 1 6}, 189 \\ . \quad 219 \end{array}$ |  | 11 | 209, 116 | x. | 8 | 116, 118 |
| $\cdots$ | 36 | 164 |  | 20 | - 208 |  | 9 | 174 |
| . | 38 | 116 |  | 21 | - 236 | - | 19 | 237 |
| xxi. | 2 | 237 | ii. | 1 | - 174 | - | 20 | 116, 118 |
|  | 3 | - 206 |  | 22 | 236, 245 | . | 21 | - 119 |
|  | 12 | 116 |  | 23 | - 116 |  | 28 | - 116 |
|  | 14 | 183 |  | 35 | - 166 |  | 29 | - 252 |
| xxii. | 13 | 116 | iii. | 2 | - 116 | xvi. | 2 | 116, 185 |
|  | 15 | 182 |  | 3 | - 116 | . | 8 | -116 117 |
| $\cdots$ | 17 | 116, 232 | . | 12 | [110 116 |  | 10 | 116, 117 |
|  | 18 | - 113 |  | 15 | 116, 119 |  | 11 |  |
| .. | 22 | 116 |  | 22 | - 225 |  | 12 | 116, 118 |
|  | 45 | - 200 |  | 25 | - $\quad 116$ |  | 18 | - $\quad 116$ |
| xxiii. | 2 | - 262 | ir. | 1 | - $\quad 255$ |  | ${ }_{21}^{19}$ | - $\quad 109$ |
|  | 4 | - $\begin{array}{r}\text { ¢ } \\ \hline 116,183\end{array}$ | \%. | 1 | 116, 192, ${ }^{1718}$ |  | 21 | - $\begin{array}{r}109 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |
| $\cdots$ | 11 | - 262 | . | 3 | - 174 | xvii. | 6 | 6 . 217 |
|  | 20 | 118 |  | 8 | 116, 232 |  | 12 |  |
|  | 21 | 194 |  | 19 | - 262 |  | 14 | - 262 |
|  | 33 | 214 |  | 23 | -116 188 |  | 16 | - $\quad 116$ |
| xxiv. | $9 \mathrm{ll6}$, | , 181, 193 |  | 24 | 116, 141 |  |  | - $\quad 174$ |
| XXY. | 19 | 116, 118 | vi. | 1 | 245 $-\quad 155$ |  |  | $2 . \quad 202$ |
| EXY. | 3 6 | $\begin{array}{r} 116,232 \\ . \quad 218 \end{array}$ |  | 20 | - 255 , ${ }^{1562}$ |  | - $\quad 3$ | 3 116, 118 |
|  | 12 | 207 |  | 23 | - 116 |  | 8 | 8 - 116 |
|  | 18 | 116 | vii | - 4 | 262 |  | 9 | 9 150, 214 |
|  | 21 | 252 |  | - 6 | 199 |  | 11 | 1 , 200 |
| mixi. | . 5 | 116 |  | - 7 | - 252 |  | 12 | 2116, 190, 208 |


| Chap. | Ver. | Page. | 1 Kings |  | Chap. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Ver. | Page. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 13 | 116, 232 | Chap. Ver. | Page. | xi. $\quad 36$ | - 157 |
|  | 17 | 116, 255 | i. 1 | 117 | . 39 | - 171 |
| . | 18 | 116 | 20 | - 218 | xii. 3 | 117 |
| $\cdots$ | 20 | 109 | 21 | 214 | $\cdots$ | 163 |
| . | 22 | 141, 245 | 24 | 217 | $\because 7$ | 117 |
| $\cdots$ | 23 | 141 | 31 | 149 | $\because 21$ | 117 |
| xix. | 7 | 116 | 37 | 118 | xiii. 5 | 207 |
| .. | 8 | 226 | 40 | 220 | 7 | 174 |
| $\cdots$ | 19 | 116 | 41 | 223 | 15 | 174 |
| $\cdots$ | 25 | 216 | 51 | 249 | 20 | 262 |
| - | 27 | 208, 209 | - 58 | 170 | 29 | 289, 240 |
| . | 32 | 116 | ii. 5 | 148 | .. 33 | 141 |
| $\therefore$ | 41 | 116 | 6 | 148 | xiv. 5 | 141 |
| xx. | 5 | 116, 118 | 30 | 252 | 12 | 178 |
| ".. | 6 | 217 | .. 33 | - 149 | . 25 | 119 |
| - | 8 | 116 | iii. 2 | 237 | xv. 10 | 213 |
| . | 14 | 116 | 5 | 215 | . 15 | 232 |
| - | 15 | 158, 165 | 11 | - 215 | .. 17 | 255 |
| . $\cdot$ | 23 | 116 | . 14 | - 157 | 18 | 184 |
| . | 25 | 116, 118 | . 17 | 167, 369 | .. 27 | 255 |
| xix. | 1 | 262 | .. 26 | - 219 | .. 33 | 245 |
| - | 4 | 118 | iv. 8 | - 184 | xvi. 9 | 172, 205 |
| - | 5 | 154 | $\therefore 18$ | - 172 | 26 | - 183 |
| . | 6 | 116, 262 | v. 17 | - 232 | $\cdots \quad 34$ | 118 |
| . | 9 | 116, 118, 220 | - 23 | - 218 | xvii. 12 | 202 |
| . | 12 | 116, 116, 192 | $\because 26$ | - 148 | .. 13 | 232 |
| . | 16 | 116, 190, 232 | vi. 4 | - 155 | . 14 | 216 |
| .. | 18 | 190 | . 5 | - 119 | .. 23 | 117 |
| . | 20 | 116, 118 | - 20 | - , 217 | xviii. 1 | 196 |
|  | 21 | 118 | .. 21 | - 118 | .. 5 | 163 |
| xxii. | 4 | 221 | . 25 | - 155 | .. 12 | 177, 196 |
| . | 8 | 118 | .. 27 | - 155 | 24 | 207 |
| . | 15 | - 116 | vii. 6 | - 155 | 27 | - 224 |
| . | 23 | 116, 232 | .. 18 | - 156 | .. 36 | 188, 220 |
| . | 25 | - 252 | .. 21 | - 155 | .. 42 | 183 |
| .. | 30 | 177 | 20 | - 184 | 44 | 177 |
| $\cdots$ | 33 | 116 | 23 | - 118 | .. 46 | 177 |
| . | 34 | 116, 117 | 36 | - 117 | rix. 2 | 252 |
| . | 40 | - 170 | 45 | 116, 191 | 4 | 190 |
| $\because$ | 51 | 116, 118 | - 48 | - 216 | xx. 8 | 163 |
| xxiii. | 1 | - 205 | viii. 7 | - 155 | . ${ }^{22}$ | 213 |
| . | 3 | 190, 215 | -. 9 | - 239 | $\because 27$ | - 236 |
| . | 5 | 154, 200 | .. 13 | - 154 | xxi. ${ }^{2}$ | - 141 |
| $\ldots$ | 8 | 116, 232 | 21 | - 202 | 6 | - 199 |
| $\cdots$ | 91 | 116, 184, 187 | .- 28 | 183, 216 | 8 | 149, 184 |
| . | 11 | 116 | 34 | -175, 175 | 10 | - 207 |
| - | 13 | -116 ${ }^{116}$ | 39 | 175, 200 | 13 | - 207 |
| . | 15 | 116, 171 | 43 | - 217 | .. 15 | 199 |
| - | 16 | 116, 171 | . 68 | - 255 | 21 | 193 |
| .. | 18 | - 116 | $\therefore 65$ | 216, 255 | 23 | 165 |
| . | 20 | 116, 171 | ix. 5 | 149, 166 | xxii. 13 | 188, 262 |
| - | 21 | 116, 181 | - 9 | - 117 | .. 18 | - 163 |
|  | 35 | 232 | .. 18 | - 186 | 37 | 236 |
|  | 37 | 116 | x. 2 | - 174 | 43 | 225 |
| xxiv. | 1 | 245 | $\cdots 3$ | 183, 197 | 49 | 179 |
| . | 3 | - 205 | - 7 | - 141 |  |  |
| . | 10 | - 262 | -. 9 | - 149 | 2 Kr |  |
| - | 11 | 262 | 21 | - 223 | i. 15 | 149 |
| . | 14 | 116, 183 | xi. 4 | - 157 | .. 17 | - 262 |
| . | 16 | . 116 | 6 | - 216 | ii. 9 | - 141 |
| - | 181 | 116, 118, 214 | 15 | - 128 | .. 21 | - 171 |
| . | 22 | 116, 262 | . 16 | 128, 255 | $\cdots \quad 22$ | - 170 |
|  | 23 | -150, 262 | . 17 | - 171 | iii. 11 | 149, 205 |
| - |  | 199, 150, 214 | 31 | - 216 | 12 | 149 |


| 2 Kingr. |  | Chap. Ver. | Page. 169 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ohap. } \\ & \text { ix. } \\ & \text { ix. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Page. } \\ \text { 151, } 216 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chap. Vor. | ${ }_{2}{ }^{\text {Page. }}$ | xix. $\quad 28$ | $\begin{aligned} & 169 \\ & . \quad 217 \end{aligned}$ | - | - 213 |
| iii. 13 | 218 | $34$ |  | 33 | - 118 |
| 19 | $\begin{aligned} & 237 \\ & 188 \end{aligned}$ | $\because \quad 37$ | - 109 | $\square$ <br> $\mathbf{x}$. | 255 |
| 24 | $\begin{aligned} & 188 \\ & 140 \end{aligned}$ | 8x. ${ }^{\mathbf{3}}$ | - $\quad 195$ | xi. 1 | 174 |
| $\cdots \quad 26$ | 149 | 11 | 195 | .. 2 | 218 |
| iv. $\quad 7$ | 117, 184 | 12 | 171 | $\cdots$ | 174 |
| 32 | - 174 | 13 | 241 | 17 | 207 |
| 34 | 183 | 18 | 117 | $\cdots \quad 23$ | 194 |
| $\cdots 39$ | 225 | xi. $13{ }^{-}$ | 208 | xii. ${ }_{3}$ | 119 |
| .. 40 | 207 | xxii. $\quad 1$ | - 213 | $\cdots{ }^{-}$ | 118 |
| v. 9 | - 183 | 5 | - 117 | $\cdots{ }^{-} \times{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 118 |
| . 12 | - 189 | 14 | 202 | ${ }_{23}$ | 174 |
| 17 | 163, 211 | 14 | - 2222 | 30 | 273, 277 |
| 18 | 109, 192 | .9 <br> $\times \mathrm{ia}$ <br> 15 | 200, 216 | $\begin{array}{ll}.9 & 30 \\ \square & 35\end{array}$ | - 272 |
| $\because 27$ | 227 | xxiii. 1 | - 233 | $\cdots$ | 221 |
| vi. 7 | -163, 205 | 6 | 213 250 | 38 | 170, 174 |
| - $\mathrm{ii} \quad$. | 163,252 $\cdot$ | .  <br> . 11 | 208 | 40 | - 213. |
| 6 | 205 | 33 | - 109 | xiii. 4 | 255 |
| .. 12 | 177, 185 | . 36 | 118 | $\because 15$ | 255 |
| .. 13 | 184 | xxiv. 10 | - 179 | xiv. 15 | - 141 |
| 14 | 209 | . 13 | - 250 | 87. 28 | - ${ }^{159}$ |
| 15 | 185 | 15 | 118, 174 | xvi. 18 | 232 |
| vii. 8 | 149 | 16 | - 174 | 20 | 219 |
| ix. 4 | - 197 | xxv. 13 | - $\quad 174$ | xvii. ${ }^{2}$ | $\cdots \quad 266$ |
| 6 | 174, 216 | xxix. 16 | 238 | xvii. 2 | - 199 |
| .. 14 | - 252 |  |  | 9 | 228 |
| . 17 | 201 | 1 CEro | 10tes. 186 | 21 | 168 |
| 27 | 119 | i. 1 | 186, 188, 230 | 27 | 221 |
| - 28 | 174 | 24 | 188, 232 | xviii. 10 | 182 |
| . 33 | 118 | $-\quad 24$ <br> . | 117 | xx. 5 | - 119 |
| $\cdots \quad 37$ | 149 | .. 51 | . 118 | xxi. 22 | 199 |
| 19 | 216 | ii. 8 | - 226 | .6 <br> 1 | 180199 |
| .. 22 | 250 | .. . 13 | - 117 | xxi1. ${ }^{7}$ | 180, 214 |
| . 27 | 216 | .. 49 | - 127 | 15 | 214 |
| xi. 1 | 117 | $\because \quad 55$ | - 2328 | xxiii. 12 | $\square$ <br> $\because \quad 141$ |
| 2 | 116 | iii. 19 | - 2226 | xxiii. 14 | - 250 |
| 18 | 183 | $\stackrel{21}{23}$ | - ${ }_{226}$ | 30 | 214 |
| 20 | 184 | 23 | - 226 | xxiv. 11 | 233 |
| xii. 10 | 189 | $\cdots \quad 24$ | - 1186 | xxiv. 14 | 232 |
| xiii. 25 | 252 116 | iv. 17 | - $\quad 186$ | 24 | 119 |
| xiv. | 116 | C 19 | - 208 | xxv. 1 | 139 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\because & 13\end{array}$ | 117 | $\cdots 20$ | - 119 | 7 | 142 |
| xv. 11 | 266 | .. 40 | 141 | (ii. 12 | -117, 119 |
| .. 12 | 266 | .. 41 | 118 | ii. $\quad 29$ <br> 10 | 117, 119 |
| .. 20 | 250 | จ. 20 | 207, 208 | xxviii. 19 | 114 $-\quad 171$ |
| 25 | 184 | .- 26 | 170, 172, 215 | 19 | $245$ |
| xvi. 6 | 189 | $\because 28$ | ${ }_{228}^{228}$ | .. <br> $\times x i x$ | 200 |
| 7 | 152 | vi. ${ }^{3}$ | - 2228 | xxix.  <br> . 12 <br> .  | 233 |
| .. 10 | 222 | . 11 | - 232 | 12 | 241 |
| .. 15 | 117, 236 | .. 20 | 118 | xxxiii. 11 | 238 |
| 17 | 117, 170 | vii. | - 255 |  |  |
| 18 | 118, 205 |  | - 213 | div. 16 | 252 |
| xvii. 3 | 252 |  | - 255 |  |  |
| sviii. 24 | 252 | $\cdots \quad 11$ | - 226 | 2 Chro | Nicles. 213 |
| 27 | 181, 194 | 3 | -1188 | i. ${ }^{2}$ |  |
| xix. ${ }^{2}$ | - 214 | .. 3 | 182, 186 | 11 | 212, 210, 212 |
| .. 15 | 139, 155 | ‥ 3 | - 226 | ii. 11 | 239 |
| 20 | 216 | viii. 2 | -. 118 | iii. 16 | 155 |
| .. 23 | 181 |  | 226 183 | iv. 6 | 207 |
| .. 25 | 170 | ix. | 193 | iv. |  |



|  |  |  | Chap. | Ver. | Page. | Chap. | Ver. | Page. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\underset{\text { Chap. }}{\text { iif. }}$ | Ver. | a. Page. | xviii. | 28 | 200 | xxxviii. | 10 | - 202 |
|  | 4 | 188 | xix. | 2 | 171 |  | 11 | - 272 |
|  | 12 | 208 |  | 4 | 239 |  | 12 | 294 |
| $\because$ | 15 | 233 |  | 17 | 205 |  | 19 | 209 |
| iv. | 11 | 206, 264 | $\cdots$ | 29 | 118 |  | 30 | 239 |
|  | 14 | . 151 | xx. | 11 | 183 | $\cdots$ | 35 | 254 |
| $\stackrel{\square}{\text { v. }}$ | 9 | - 222 |  | 13 | 255 | . | 39 | 221 |
| vi. | 12 | 150, 170 | $\because$ | 17 | 214 | $\cdots$ | 41 | 183 |
|  | 9 | - 200 | xxi, | 12 | 236 | xxxix. | 10 | 238 |
|  | 11 | 200 |  | 13 | 188, 201 | . | 36 | 183 |
| viii. | 8 | 208 |  | 42 | 221 <br> 208 |  | 30 6 | 193 |
| . | 11 | 213 | xxii. | 28 7 | - $\begin{array}{r}208 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | sl. | 10 | 113 |
| ix. | 13 | 119 | xxiii. | 7 | 205, 249 | $\cdots$ | 11 | 222 |
|  | 92 | 230, 231,232 | xxiv. | 1 | 183 | . | 17 | 183 |
| . | 16 | -231, 206 | . | 2 | 155 |  | 30 | 223 |
|  | 22 | 221 | . | 5 | 220 | xli. | ${ }^{7}$ | 170 |
| $\cdots$ | 27 | 117 | . | 6 | - 118 | xlii. | 10 | - 118 |
|  | 28 | 213 | .. | 8 | - 221 | . | 16 | 118, 278 |
| $\cdots$ | 29 | 230 | . | 14 | - 240 |  |  |  |
|  | 32 | 221 |  | 22 | - 206 |  | Pgatm |  |
| .. |  |  |  | 24 | 292 | i. | 6 | [1191 |
|  | Јов. |  | xxy. | 2 | 208 | \%. | 9 | 119, 180 |
| i. | 1 | 171 | xxvi. | 8 | - 205 | vi. |  | - 118 |
|  | 10 | 118 |  | 12 | 117, 240 | ix. | 5 | 199 |
| ii. | 13 | 213 | . | 14 | - 183 | $\ldots$ | 7 | 240 |
|  | 4 | 200 | xxvii. | 1 | 245 | - | 8 | 152 |
|  | 7 | 117, 184 |  |  | 215 |  | 10 | 141 |
| iv. | 14 | - 208 |  | 1 | 207 | - | 13 | 109 |
|  | 4 | 160 |  | 11 | 253 <br> 178 <br> 1 | $\cdots$ | 14 | $\stackrel{249}{ }$ |
| v. | 5 | ${ }_{218}^{221}$ | xxviii. | 15 | - 178 | $\cdots$ | ${ }^{21}$ | 164 |
| $\cdots$ vi. | 8 | 218 |  | 15 27 | 178 | x. | 8 | 177 |
|  | 22 | $\underline{205}$ | xxix. | 1 | - 245 | $\cdots$ | 10 | 187, 193 |
| $\cdots$ | 29 | 187 | . | 2 | 214 | . | 12 | - 109 |
|  | 13 | 230 | . | 16 | - 222 |  | 14 | 156 |
|  | 40 | 223 | xxx. | 11 | 232 |  | 15 | 182 |
| vii. | 5 | 118, 231 | xax. | 22 | 119 | xi. | 1 | $\stackrel{232}{187}$ |
|  | 20 | - 205 |  | 30 | 205 | xvii. | 11 | 187 |
| viii. | 12 | 217 | xxxi. | 7 | - 171 | . | 12 | 207 118 |
|  | 19 | 197 | .. | 8 | - 221,281 | " | 14 | - $\quad 118$ |
| ix. | 13 | 240 | . | . 20 | 221,283 171,178 |  | 25 1 | 150 |
| $\cdots$ | 26 30 | 201. |  | -22 35 | 171, 178 | s7ii. | 13 | 203 |
|  | 30 33 | ${ }_{245}^{232}$ | xxxii. | 35 4 | 178 | xix. | 3 | 221 |
| $\ldots$ | 34 | 230 |  | 6 | 223 |  | 6 | 207 |
| x . | 13 | 152 | xxxiii. | 5 | 178 |  | 9 | 208 |
|  | 17 | 236 |  | 9 | 231 |  | 12 | 232 |
| $\times 1$. | 20 | 186 |  | 12 | 197 | xx. |  | 162 |
|  | 2 | 166 | - | 19 | - 118 | xxii. | 17 | - 207.253 |
|  | 17 | 220 |  | 20 | 197, 228 |  | 27 | 207, 216 |
| xii. | 42 | 166 |  | 21 | 187 |  | 30 | 231 |
|  | . 15 | 207 |  | 26 | 252 | xxiii. | 5 | - 231236 |
|  | 22 | 140, 250 | . ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 28 | 187, 231 | V. | 6 | 231, 232 |
| xiv. | . 5 | 183 | xxxiy. | 31 | - 208 |  | ${ }_{7}^{6}$ | 182, 183 |
|  | . 21 | 206 | xxxv. | 8 | - 249 |  | 8 | - 229 |
| xv. | . 9 | 238 | xxxvi. | 1 | 245 |  | 8 | 22 |
|  | . 15 | 183 |  | 11 | 201 |  | 9 | 229 |
| xvi. | 27 | 217 |  | 14 | 208 | $8 \times$ | 5 | 150 |
|  | . 11 | 207, 214 |  | 16 | 239 |  | 13 | 203 |
|  | . 14 | 163, 231 | xxxvii. | 12 | - 183 | xxvii | 2 | 208 |
| xviii. | 16 | 179 |  | 19 | 208 |  | 5 | 150 |
|  | i. 11. | 222 | xxxviii. | 1 | 193 | $\cdots$ | 6 | $\stackrel{231}{220}$ |
|  | . 17 | 226 |  | 3 | 213 | xxx | 6 | 220 |


| Chap. xxx. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Ver. } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Page. } \\ & 218 \end{aligned}$ | Chap. lxxii. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ver. } \\ & 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Page. } \\ 207 \end{gathered}$ | Chap. cri. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ver: } \\ & 45 \end{aligned}$ | Page. 183 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| xxxi. | 4 | 217 | . | 17 | 118 | evii. | 3 | 221 |
| . | 6 | 150 | . | 19 | 238 |  | 20 | 236 |
| . | 13 | 207 |  | 20 | 236 |  | 24 | 206 |
| xxxii. | 4 | 162 | lxxiii. | 2 | 117, 179 | cvii. | 7 | 232 |
| xxxiii. | 14 | 256 | .. | 27 | 175 | .. | 15 | 183 |
| xxxiy. | 8 | 206 |  | 28 | 223 | cxy. | 10 | 237 |
| .. | 13 | 208 | lxxiv. | 5 | 206 |  | 15 | 155 |
|  | 27 | 254 | . | 6 | 118 | exviii. | 8 | 203 |
| xxxvii. | 18 | 1.51 | .. | 7 | 198 | .. | 9 | 203 |
|  | 29 | 207 | . | 9 | 151 |  | 12 | 208 |
| xxxix. | 2 | 140, 163 |  | 11 | 119 | cxix. | 9 | 161 |
|  | 7 | 206 | lxxp. | 10 | 149 | . | 16 | 161 |
| $x \mathrm{l}$. | 5 | 240 | lxxvii. | 12 | 118, 187 | . | 17 | 161, 183 |
|  | 17 | 252 |  | 13 | 162 | . | 28 | 161 |
| xli. | 3 | 186 | Ixxviii. | 31 | 239 |  | 37 | 162 |
|  | 10 | 151 | .. | 38 | 135 | . | 41 | 162 |
| xlii. | 5 | 152, 173 | . | 57 | 207 | . | 42 | 161 |
|  | 8 | - 151 |  | 72 | 208 | - | 47 | 183 |
| xliv. | 17 | 221 | lxxix. | 10 | 118 |  | 48 | 201 |
| xlv. | 10 | 162 | lxxx. | 2 | 155 |  | 65 | 161 |
| .. | 12 | 207 | . | 6 | 207 | $\cdots$ | 70 | 207 |
|  | 18 | 149 | . | 14 | 135 |  | 71 | 208 |
| xlvi. | 2 | 203 | . | 16 | 230 | . | 79 | 232 |
|  | 5 | 147 |  | 17 | 207 | . | 98 | 162 |
| xlviii. | 14 | 178 | lxxxi. | 16 | 141 | $\cdots$ | 105 | 161 |
| xlix. | 15 | 118, 236 | 1xxxiii. | 12 | 207 | $\cdots$ | 107 | 161 |
| 1. | 4 | 218 | 1xxxiv. | 4 | 230 |  | 113 | 223 |
|  | 23 | 127 | lixary. | 2 | 119 | .. | 119 | 175 |
| li. | 2 | 223 | lxxxvii. | 4 | 240 | . | 130 | 196 |
| $\cdots$ | 4 | 118 | Ixxxix. | 10 | 217 | $\cdots$ | 161 | 183 |
| 1 r. | 13 | 201 | . | $11^{\circ}$ | 171, 240 | . | 167 | 236 |
|  | 16 | 193 | . | 18 | 118 |  | 169 | 161 |
| 1 vi . | 1 | 150 | . | 29 | 152 | exxi. | 3 | 162 |
| .. | 5 | 246 | . | 40 | 175 | .. | 6 | 177 |
| . | 7 | 118 | . | 49 | 216 | exxii. | 2 | 161 |
|  | 12 | 246 |  | 51 | 214 | cxxiii. | 2 | 172 |
| 1vii. | 2 | 203 | xc. | 8 | 118, 176 |  | 4 | 193 |
| lviii. | 6 | 152 | . | 10 | 240 | exxix. | 3 | 119 |
| . | 8 | 183 | . | 11 | 151 | . | 5 | 207 |
| . | 12 | 201 |  | 17 | 141 | exxxi. | 2 | 207 |
| . | 18 | 277 | xci. | 2 | 203 | cxxxii. | 11 | 199 |
| lix. | 3 | 221 |  | 12 | 162 | .. | 12 | 199 |
|  | 13 | 221 |  | 16 | - 222 | $\cdots$ | 15 | 178 |
|  | 16 | 119 | xcii. | 1 | 217 | cexxys. | 18 | 212 |
| 1xi. | 6 | 175 |  | 7 | 206 | exxsvi. | 6 | 233 |
| $1 \times \mathrm{ii}$. | 9 | 203 | $\cdots$ | 8 | 207 | .. | 11 | 250 |
| lxp. | 5 | 147 | . | 9 | 149 |  | 20 | 170, 240 |
|  | 11 | 220 |  | 20 | 232 | exxxpiii. | 3 | 240 |
| lxvi. | 7 | 118 | xciii. | 5 | 170 | exsxix. | 5 | 177 |
| $\cdots$ | 9 | 116 | scir. | 25 | 252 |  | 6 | 117 |
| . | 10 | 208 | xevij. | 11 | 208 | exl. | 10 | 119 |
|  | 15 | 233, 234 | xcix. | 6 | 170 | exli. | 8 | 177 |
| 1xvii. | 8 | - 150 | ci. | 5 | 150, 182 |  | 11 | 118 |
| lxviii. | 31 | 220, 222 | cii. | 5 | 153 | cxliv. | 1 | 198 |
| lxix. | 7 | 215 | ciii. | 5 | 201 | calv. | 6 | 117 |
| lxa. | 5 | 254 |  | 19 | 200 |  | 8 | 182 |
| lxxi. | 4 | 205 | civ. | 29 | 205 | . | 10 | 177 |
|  | 7 | 203, 207 | ov. | 9 | 247 | . | 15 | 218 |
| . | 12 | 118 |  | 11 | 232 |  | 21 | 236 |
| . | 15 | 162 | $\ldots$ | 13 | 219 | cxlvii. | 19 | 183 |
|  | 20 | 232 |  | 28 | 183 | cxlviii. | 2 | 183 |
| lxxii. | 1 | 255 |  | 37 | 199 |  | 4 | 182 |
| .. | 5 | - 217 | . | 40 | 163, 183 | cl. | 5 | 205 |


| Proverbs. |  |  |  | Chrp. | Ver. |  | age. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Chap. } \\ \text { vii. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Ver. } \\ 23 \\ 37 \end{gathered}$ | Page. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chap. |  |  | Page. | xxii. | 14 | 151, | 182 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 172, 230, | 238 | .. | 20 |  | 119 |  |  |  | 236 |
| . | 5 |  | 205 |  | 25 |  | 183 | viii. | 5 |  | 206 |
| . | 8 |  | 203 | xxiii. | 5 | 117, 1 | 119, | .. | 12 | - | 221 |
| $\cdots$ | 10 |  | 196 |  |  | 187, | 201 |  | 15 |  | 200 |
| .. | 15 |  | 223 | . | 7 |  | 205 | ix. | 2 |  | 200 |
| . | 19 |  | 205 | . | 13 |  | 236 | - | 4 | 11 | , 191 |
| $\cdots$ | 20 |  | 172 |  | 23 |  | 185 | . | 11 |  | 238 |
| $\cdots$ | 27 | 117, | 207 | - |  | 117, 118, | 184 | . | 12 |  | 206 |
|  | 29 |  | 246 |  | 26 | 117, | 191 | $x$. | 3 | . | 185 |
| ii. | 7 |  | 187 | xxiv. | 10 | - 1 | 177 | .. | 14 |  | 206 |
| . | 11 |  | 177 | .. | 12 | - | 206 | . | 18 |  | 208 |
|  | 22 |  | 256 | . | 29 |  | 200 | $\cdots$ | 23 |  | 184 |
| iii. | 6 |  | 196 | xxy. | 7 |  | 208 | xi. | 8 |  | 216 |
|  | 15 |  | 205 |  | 28 |  | 208 | xii. | 4 | - | 208 |
| .. | 30 |  | 119 | xxvi. | 24 | - 1 | 183 | . | 6 |  | 189 |
| $\cdots$ | 34 |  | 109 | xxvii. | 1 | - 1 | 196 | . | 13 | . | 230 |
| iv. | 16 |  | 119 |  | 9 |  | 224 |  |  |  |  |
| v. | 3 |  | 178 |  | 10 |  | 118 | Sone |  | Songs |  |
|  | 20 |  | 165 |  | 14 | 161, | 214 | i | 1 | . | 230 |
| vi. | 3 |  | 240 | .. | 19 |  | 200 |  | 17 |  | 189 |
|  | 13 |  | 183 | . | 24 | 117, | 184 | ii. | 2 |  | 207 |
| vii. | 13 |  | 205 |  | 26 |  | 221 | . | 11. |  | 3, 183 |
| $\therefore$ | 16 |  | 223 | .. | 27 |  | 221 |  | $17{ }^{\circ}$ |  | 164 |
| viii. | 17 |  | 118 | xxviii. | 13 |  | 222 | iii. | 8 |  | 137 |
|  | 26 |  | 223 | . | 17 |  | 231 |  | 11 | - | 177 |
| ix. | 2 |  | 205 |  | 22 |  | 206 | iv. | 2 |  | 190 |
| . | 9 |  | 238 | xxix. | 21 |  | 191 | . | 3 |  | 207 |
| x. | 18 |  | 172 | xxx. | 10 |  | 183 | . | 4 |  | 157 |
| xi. | 3 |  | 187 | .. | 14 |  | 221 | . | 5 |  | 208 |
| .. | 11 |  | 220 | . | 15 |  | 231 | v. | 2 |  | , 222 |
| $\cdots$ | 25 |  | 172 | . | 18 |  | 118 | - | 6 |  | 222 |
|  | 26 |  | 205 | .. | 24 |  | 205 |  | 11 |  | , 207 |
| xiii. | 20 | 117, | 187 | xxxi. | 2 |  | 232 |  | 13 | . | 210 |
| xiv. | 12 |  | 225 | . | 10 |  | 178 | $\cdots$ | 15 | . | 207 |
| $\cdots$ | 21 |  | 102 | . | 16 |  | 118 | ทi. | 5 |  | 240 |
| .. | 22 |  | 213 | *. | 18 |  | 118 | vii. | 4 |  | 208 |
| xp. | 23 |  | 206 | . | 21 |  | 154 | viii. | 9 | . | 232 |
| . | 27 |  | 216 | . | 23 |  | 220 |  | 10 | . | 171 |
|  | 33 | - | 217 | . | 27 | - 1 | 117 | . | 12 |  | 274 |
| xvi. | 19 |  | 109 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 21 |  | 206 |  | clest | rastes. |  |  | $\mathrm{Isata}^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |
| . | 27 |  | 183 | i | 1 | 200, | 236 | i | 7 | . | 155 |
| . | 28 |  | 231 | $\cdots$ | 2 |  | 200 |  | 8 |  | 207 |
|  | 30 |  | 172 |  | 5 |  | 218 | ii. | 12 |  | 236 |
| xvii. | 10 | - | 205 |  | 16 |  | 228 | iii. | 5 | . | 240 |
|  | 13 |  | 118 | ii. | 1 |  | 201 | .. | 15 |  | 193 |
| -• | 14 | - | 217 | . | 18 |  | 200 |  | 16 | - | 119 |
|  | 27 |  | 187 | . | 22 |  | 200 |  | 24 |  | 196 |
| xpiii. | 16 | 2 | 217 | . | 25 | 2 | 251 | iv. | 1 |  | 206 |
|  | 17 | 1 | 186 | $\cdots$ | 26 | 2 | 236 | - | 2 |  | 236 |
| xix. | . 16 |  | 117 | iii. | 16 |  | 205 | . | 4 |  | 208 |
| .. | '17 |  | 196 | iv. | 8 |  | 183 | จ. | 8 | 199 | , 200 |
|  | 19 | 189, | 223 | .. | 14 |  | 170 | .. | 24 |  | 207 |
| xx. | 3 |  | 200 | v. | 8 | 2 | 200 | . | 25 |  | 209 |
| .. | 4 | 1 | 186 | . | 10 | 1 | 118 | . | 28 |  | 209 |
| . | 17 | - | 200 |  | 12 | 2 | 238 | $\because$ | 29 |  | 187 |
| . | 21 | - 1 | 189 | vi. | 3 |  | 216 | vi. | 2 | - | 142 |
| . | 24 |  | 188 | .. | 10 | 1 | 185 |  | 4 |  | 151 |
| . $\cdot$ | 26 | - 2 | 252 |  | 12 |  | 200 | $\because$ | 13 | , | 205 |
| $\cdots$ | 30 | 1 | 118 | vii. | 1 |  | 230 | vii. | 4 |  | 205 |
| xxi. | 4 |  | 164 | $\cdots$ | $\cdot 19$ | 2 | 201 | - | 10 | - | 245 |
| xxii. | ${ }_{11}^{8}$ | 182, | 251 | . | $\stackrel{21}{22}$ |  | $\stackrel{227}{118}$ | . | 15 |  | 201 |
|  | 11 |  | 208 |  | 22 |  | 118 | . | 16 |  | , 206 |




| Chap. | Ver. | Page. | Chap. | Ver. | Page. | Chap. | Ver. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| xaxviii. | 24 | 206 |  | 48 | 255 |  | 7 | 223 |
| . | 28 | 262 | iii. | 11 | 174 | vi. | 9 | 150 |
| . | 52 | 162 |  | 17 | 174 |  | 13 | 236 |
| xxxix. | 7 | - 174 | . | 31 | 250 | vii. | 21 | 117 |
| .. | 11 | 236 | .. | 32 | 184, 199 | viii. | 1 | 152 |
|  | 12 | 110 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 215 |
| . | 13 | 231 |  | menta | ations. |  | 6 | 193 |
| . | 14 | - 231 | i. |  | 193, 206, 238 | ix. | 3 | 215 |
|  | 15 | 218 | . | 6 | 181, 193 | $\cdots$ | 6 | 189 |
|  | 19 | 261 | . | 12 | 163, 231 | . | 6 | - 218 |
| xl. | 1 | 174 |  | 16 | - 152 | $\ldots$ | 8 | 171, 229 |
| . | 3 | 184 | . | 18 | - 184 |  | 11 | . 194 |
| . | 7 | - 174 | i | 19 | 208, 209 | $x$. | 1 | 155 |
| $\cdots$ | 8 | 119 | ii. | 2 | 117, 184 | . | 2 | 155 |
| $\therefore$ | 12 | 233 |  | 4 | - 207 |  | 8 | 155 |
| . | 15 | 177, 206 | . | 6 | - 178 |  | 6 | 155 |
|  | 16 | 118 | . | 8 | - 165 |  | 7 | 155 |
| xli. | 17 | 223 | . | 9 | - 231 | $\cdots$ | 8 | 155 |
| xlii. | 9 | 216 | $\cdots$ | 11 | 206 | . | 10 | 202 |
|  | 20 | 116 | . | 12 | 208, 209 | . | 19 | 215 |
| xliii. | 10 | 119 | . | 14 | 118, 158 |  | 20 | 215 |
|  | 11 | 118 | . | 16 | - 222 | xi. | 12 | 223 |
| xliv. | 6 | 214 |  | 19 | - 118 |  | 13 | 229 |
| .. | 10 | 217 | iii. | 2 | - 150 | .. | 22 | 215 |
|  | 18 | 152 |  | 4 | - 220 |  | 24 | 139 |
| xlv. | 2 | 216 | . | 10 | 118 | xii. | 13 | 274 |
| xivi. | 4 | 237 | .. | 12 | - 172 | xiii. | 14 | 222 |
| . | 8 | 233 |  | 20 | - 118 |  | 16 | 148 |
| $\cdots$ | 12 | 163 |  | 36 | - 281 | xiv. | 1 | 222 |
| .. | 21 | 163 | - | 39 | - 183 |  | 4 | 178 |
| . | 25 | 152 | $\ldots$ | 65 | 232 |  | 8 | 222 |
| - | 28 | 217 | iv. | 3 | - 193 |  | 12 | 205 |
| xlvii. | 7 | 218 |  | 6 | - 184 | . | 22 | 152 |
| xlviii. | 4 | 119 | . | 12 | - 117 | xy. | 5 | 222 |
| .. | 5 | 118 | - | 16 | - 117 | xvi. | 4 | 150 |
| . | 7 | 117 | . | 17 | - 197 | .. | 39 | 160 |
|  |  | - 196 | - | 20 | - 236 |  | 40 | - 150 |
| . | 18 | - 186 | v. | 1 | ${ }^{117} 118$ | . | 44 | - 178 |
| . | 20 | 187 | . | 3 | 117, 184 | . | 56 | - 163 |
| . | 21 | 119 | - | 4 | - 199 | . | 57 | 150, 171 |
| . | 26 | 222 | . |  | 117, 184 |  | 69 | 150 |
| $\ldots$ | 27 | 118 | . | 7 | 117, 184 | . | 60 | 150, 166 |
|  | 40 | 201 | . | 18 | - 185 |  | 62 | . 166 |
| xlix. | 3 | 163, 177 | . | 21 | 118, 236 | xvii. | 12 | - $\quad 174$ |
|  | 16 | $201$ |  |  |  | ... | 17 | -174 150 |
| . | 20 | 163 |  | Ezeri | IEL. 172 | .. | 20 | 174, 222 |
| . | 22 | 201 | i. | 1 | 171, 172, 237 | - | 21 | - 184 |
|  | 30 | 190 | . | 2 | - 238 | xviii. | 6 | : 266 |
| 1. | 1 | 118 | .. | 8 | - 232 |  | 13 | - 216 |
| . | 6 | 118, 179 | . | 10 | - 224 |  | 14 | 196 |
| . | 8 | - 184 |  | 14 | 172 |  | 17 | 241 |
| . | 11 | 187 | ii. | 3 | - 150 |  | 20 | 184 |
| $\cdots$ | 15 | 116 |  | 4 | - 150 |  | 22 | 216 |
| $\cdots$ | 18 | 218 | iii. | 15 | 152, 190, 193 |  | 27 | 216 |
|  | 21 | 147 | . | 16 | 262 | xix. | 14 | 205 |
|  | 25 | 250 |  | 23 | 207 | xx. | 16 | 241 |
|  | 29 | 109, 161 |  | 27 | 150 |  | 20 | 255 |
| li. | 3 | 110, 192 | iv. | 9 | - 152 | - | 24 | 241 |
| . | 9 | - 171 |  | 10 | - 221 | . | 31 | 216 |
| . | 10 | 202 |  | 12 | - 208 |  | 38 | 225 |
| $\ldots$ | 16 | 250 |  | 14 | 213 | xxi. | 16 |  |
| $\cdots$ | 27 | 241 |  | 15 | - 119 |  | 28 |  |
| $\cdots$ | 34 | 232 196 |  | 17 | - 236 <br> $\quad 241$ |  | 14 | - $\begin{array}{r}150 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |
| . | 43 | 196 |  |  | - 241 |  |  |  |




## INDEX II.

## MASSORETIC LISTS QUOTED ENTIRE.

## N

N how many times found in the Bible, 271.
Sixtesn words with silent Alsph, or altogether without Aleph, 170.
Seventesn words which ocenr only once with audible Aleph, 171.
Fifty worde which have only oncs silent Alsph in ths middle, 171, 185.
Twelve worde which have only oncs quisscent Aleph at the snd, 172.
Seventeen words with quiescent Aleph at the end, which have no parallel, $17 \%$.
גבIN, Alphabetical list, according to, 223.
אבוחי thres timss, 251.
ה
N thres times definits, 149.
אוחה twelve times plene, 150.
אוהו twenty-four times pleng, 149, 100.
אותי twanty-saven times plane, 150.
אאוחיוח גדולות, Alphahetical lists of, 230.

, אות masculins, seventsen times plene, 150.

7hiw feminine, seventesn times plene, 150.
Dinthenting times plene, 150.
TKin twenty-fivs timgs, 252.
וֹ three times with Kametz and Pattach, 249.
\$ thirty times construed with other words in an unparallelled manner, 218.

a five times, supposed to be wanting in the text, 226.
ON thres times hafore $3 k, 241$.
הנה 255.

אני יהוד אלהיכם twenty-ons times at the end of a verse, 255.
אמלה Hiphil future aight times, 233.
אארצה כנען eight times, 174.
בטאשר iu four times, supposed to be 226.

אח השמים ואחת הארץ accurs thirtcen times, 139.

אתמש, Alphabetical list of words, accordto, 222.
THN oleven times in an unique construction, 217.

## $\beth$

2 how many times fonnd in the Bible, 272.
Twenty-six words which oecur only once with Beth, and which in all other instances have Kaph, 220.

Eleven wo:ds with Beth in the textual resdiug, and Kalh in the marginal reading, 188 .
Six words with Beth in ths textnal reading, and Mom in the marginal reading, 189.

בבית six times Raphe, 199.
בנבה twenty-nine timss, 174.
ב four times Raphe, 200.
בinftsen times with Tzere, 193.
Cix six timss, 177.
בהרב eight times Raphé, 200.
17ב thres times with Kamstz under the Cheth, 246.
fonr times Raphe and nine times with Dagesh in the Teth, 201.
בנל gsven times with Dagesh in the Kaph, 200.

בכסף fiftosn times Raphe, 200.
בליליה thres times Raphe, 200.
I in four instances, sipposed to be בני, $225,226$.
בעוק thres times, 251.
פרא אלהים three times, 139, 215.
בראשיח beging a verse thres times, 142.
בive times Raphe, 200.

## $】$

I how many timer found in the Bible, 272. גבור three times defective, 148.
בורל four times defective, 149.

## 7

7 how many times found in the Bihle, 272
Two words with Daleth at the snd in the textual reading, and Resh in the marginal reading, 189.
Two words with Daleth in the marginal reading, and with Tav in the tex.tagl reading, 196.
רבריך plural, thirteen times defective, 161.
T textual raading, hint without it in the marginal reading, 183.
דרכיך three times defective, 162.

## ก

i7. how many times it occurs in the Bible, 274.

T in twenty-nine instances, is wanted in the textual reading, hut is sapplied in the marginal reading, 117, 118.
$\rightarrow$ in twenty instances is in the textasl reading, hat not in the marginal reading, 118.
Thirteen words without $\mathrm{He}_{\mathrm{e}}$ at the beginning in the textual reading, hnt with it in the marginal reading, 184.
Seven words with He at the heginning in the textasl resding, hat not in the marginal reading, 184.
Five words with He in the middle in the textakl reading, and without it in the marginal reading, 185.
Twelve words with He second radical, whilst in all other instances it is Cheth, 240 .
Thirty-two words ending in He and Vav, 222.

Fourteen words tarminating with He in the textusl resding, and with Vav in the marginal reading.
Twenty-one worls with He at the end after Ksph, second person singular masculine, 177.
Eleven words which respectively occur twice, once with andible, and ouce with quiescent $\mathrm{He}, 178$.
Eighteen words which khnormally terminate with quiescent $\mathrm{He}, 178$.
Two inctances in which the textaal reading has and anfix, third person plaral masculine, and the marginal resding I snffix, second person plural masculine, 190 .
האהלה eight times, 174.
הביתה eighteen times, 174.
המונה four times, 179.
המשבחה thirty times, 174.
י הקימותי twice entirely plene, eleven times entirely defective, and six times Jod plene, and Vay defective, 166.

* five times with Segol, 197.


## 1

I how many times it occurs in the Bible, 272, 273.
Twenty-three verses which have neither Vav nor Jod, 282.
1 conjunctive in eleven inetances in the Kethiv, but not in the Keri, 117.
1 suffix, not in the Kethiv in eighteen instances, but in the Keri, 117.
1 suffix in eleven instances in the textasl resding, but not in the marginel, 117.
, in seventy-five instances, to he foond in the middle of, or in, the textanl resding for which the marginal reading has Vav.
Ten words heginning with Vav in the marginal resding, and with Joa in the textual reading, 187.
Twenty-five words with $\nabla$ av plene, without parallel, 151, 152.

List of thirty-three words with Vav after Kametz and Chateph-Kametz in the textakl reading, and without Vky in the marginal reading, 182 .
Forty-eight worde terminating in Vav in the textugl reading, and in Jod in the marginal reading, 232.
Twenty-two words heginning and ending with Vav, which occurs twioe, once Milel, and once Milra, 207.
Five pairs of words which respectively occur twice, once with $V$ Vir conjonctive, and once withont, 212.
Sixty-two pairs of worde in which hoth numbers have Yav conjunctive, 218.
Sixteen pairs without Vav conjunctive, 213, 214.
Twenty-seven worde heginning with Vav and Mem, 221.
Thirteen words heginning with Vav, Mem, and Beth, 221.
Twelve words heginning with Vav, Mom, and Gimmel, 221, 222.
Four proper names occurring five times in the esme order, but with the Vav conjunctive differently placed in esch passage, 228.
Six verses heving the same words four times, twice with Vay conjunctive, and twice withont it, 224.
Four verses having respectively the same word four timee, the first with Vav, snd the other three without it, 215.
Forty-eight words in the textual reading with Yav at the and, and in the margin with Jod, 282.
y three times, 202.
forty-five times in an unparsallelled constraction, 218.
a three times at the beginning of a verse, 238, 239.
ศnine times at the heginning of a verse, tion, 239.
אואטא trice with Sheva under the Vap, 201.
Gim nime times with Kametz under the Үav, 202.
ואחה eight times in an unique construc. tion, 218.
ריאמר six times with Sheva ander the Vav 201.

ויאמר אלהים twenty-five times. 215.
ויאמרו nine times with Shevk under the Vav, 254.
Kag ten times, 233.
ויבא in eight instances, supposed to he ,
M with Sheva under the Fav, occurs seven times, 141, 254, 255.
occurs three timee, $139,142$.
וידבר אוֹהים three times, 215.
occurs twelvi times, $139,140$.
ויה oceurs thirty-two times, 141, 202
Maי thirty times, 245.

Mimice Milel， 205.
וצwelve time plene， 250.
Hiphil defective，seven times defec－ tive，239， 240.
וישו twenty－five times， 252 ．
וכל of the verse， 255.
仿 nine times， 217.

yown three times with Pattach under the Vav，and Dagesh in the Mem，255， 256.
וחתרבר twice with Shurek， 202.
וחורד three times， 251.
yneal twice with Sheva under the Var， 201.
$i$
Thow many times found in ihe Bible， 273. ，three times definite， 148.

## $\Pi$

$\pi$ how many times found in the Bible， 273.
Four words with Cheth in the textual reading，and with $H e$ in the marginal reading， 189.
חכרונה five times， 174.
ם seven times definite， 149.
five times definite， 165.
．
הטיה nine times with Chateph－pattach， 203.

## 0

0 how many times fonnd in the Bible， 273. עמולים see صוהורים

## ，

，how many times it occurs in the Bible， 273.

Twenty－two words with Jod at the begin－ ning in the textnal reading，and with Vav in the marginal reading， 186.
Fifty－five words with Jod in the middle in the textual reading，and without Jod in the marginal reading， 188.
Twenty－four words with Jod at the end in the textnal reading，and Vav in the marginal reading， 187.
，in seventy instances in the middle of a word in the textual reading，for which Vav is to be found in its marginal reading．
לאכ＇occurs seventy－three times， 141.
יברכך，＇יחוה four times， 216.
隹 nineteen times， 206.
צ＇וֹ twenty－three times plene， 151.
יהיה eighteen times， 216.
＇היה 216.
םN：I four times plene， 152.
יושבים ten timee plene， 152.
每
אาק twenty－one times， 206.
ירועלימה five times， 174.
ישגלנה four times，altered into ישכבנה， 194.

## 5

S how many times found in the Bible， 274.
Those words heginning with Kaph in the textual reading，and Beth in the mar－ ginal reading， 188.
Twenty－one words beginning with Kaph， which occur twice，once Milel and once Milra．
כה אמר יהוה אלדי ימשראה twenty－five times， 216.

כנשר four times Raphe， 201.
פ
in fifteen instances one word，and the Keri two worde；and in eight in－ etances two worde，and the Keri one word， 198.
כeight instances， $110,192$.

## b

bhow many times found in the Bible， 274.
Fifteen words beginning with two Lamede， $220,221$.
Wh once in four phrases，and once not， 223.
לגר eleven times with Kametz onder the Lamed， 200.
לאהל five times， 216.
לאור oceurs seven times， 140.
לוא thirty－five timee pleme， 163.
בוטל twice Raphe， 200.
wive thirty－two times with Kametz under the Lamed， 200.
אלכא，six times Raphe， 199.
לעולם eighteen times defective， 149.

## D

n how many times found in the Bible， 275. מאאכל four times with Pattrach， 197.
מוקרמיך ומאוחרץץ sixty－two instances of， $116,117,191$.
מוררפין six verses， 219.
מוֹרדפין six words， 219.
Nom occurs three times， 140.
，sixteen worde without parallel， 236.
Y，מל，twenty－one，which respectively occur only once in a particul： 1 book，236， 237.
－${ }^{\prime}$ b，fifty－one，which alwaye occur in a certain form in one book，but which in all other books of the Scriptures occur in a different form，237， 238.
מלעיל thirty－eight words only once Milel， 205.
mintwenty－two words only once so， 205.
צרצ an alphahetical list of words， 208.
，ממנחד in six instances supposed to be 225.

מעשׂר three times with Sheva under the Ajin， 204.
מפני 226.
twenty－eight times， 174.
שקוקחי eight times，24］．

## 3

g how many times found in the Bible, 275. (i) written so twenty-one times in the text, and in the marginal reading inve, 109.
( four times, 157.
נחה twenty-nine times, 175.

## D

o how many times found in the Bible, 275. סמיך thirty-nine instances in which the construction is inverted, 214, 215.

## v

$\$$ how many times foond in the Bible, 276.和 nine times, 216.
y fourteen times defective, 163.踥 eight times in the sense of enemy, 240. ty nine times, enppoeed to he $7,226$.
עtwice in the textal reading, but in the marginal reading, 189 .
צמעורים eleven times defective, 155.
עive times in the Kethiv, and in the Keri 109.
a six times in the Kethiv, and in the Keri טֶהורים, 109, 194.

## $\Xi$

Dow many times fonnd in the Bible, 276. Pattach with Athnach, list of instances, 197.


## Y

\% how many times found in the Bible, 276, 277.

צוּר three times pleme, 151.
$P$
$p$ how many times found in the Bible, 277. קרושט thirteen times defective, 147.
קדוש the constract, three times defective, 147.

קורא ten times plene, 151.
קרי רלא כחיב

## 7

${ }^{\text {EH}}$ Whow many times found in the Bible, 277. , occurs eight times, 139, 141.

## 4

thow many times found in the Bible, 277.
Four words with Resh in the textasl reading, and Daleth in the marginal reading, 189.

שלום eight times defective, 148.
שwelve times construed with 241.

## ก

$n$ how many times found in the Bible, 278. תולעח twice defective, 151.
תנינים three timos withe Jod plural, 157. Пסn three times Milra, 205.

## INDEX III．

## MASSORETIC TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS EXPLAINED．

| אבצג | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Page. } \\ \\ \hline \quad 223 \end{array}$ | ירושלמי | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Page. } \\ \cdot \quad 260 \end{array}$ | סמילין | Page． <br> －212－214 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| אוֹחיות גדולוח | ．． 230 | ע＂У | － 252 | ロ＂0 | ． 255 |
| צגזיות קטונות | ．． 231 | כל＂ | － 252 | － | －236－239 |
| אטבת | 190， 191 | כ＇ק | － 254 | ספר הללי | ． 260 |
| T＂N $\mathrm{T}^{\prime \prime}$ | 250 | לתיב ולא קרי | 110， 192 | פתח | －195， 196 |
| ת＂ | － 248 | 4 | － 245 | עניכ ． | － 241 |
| $7{ }^{7}$ | 246 | ליח | 245 | $\nabla^{\prime \prime}$ | － 258 |
| אס＂\％ | －． 248 | 7 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ ． | － 254 | פט＂ד． | － 253 |
|  | － 260 | ל＇י\％ | － 252 | פסטוק | － 242 |
| אם＂ | － 246 | ． | 239－241 | פסקא | －209， 210 |
| גת | － 261 | מדינד | ． 261 | פסקא．רספרא | －209，210 |
| ＊＊ | －． 222 | מוקדמין ומואתרין | － 191 | פעינמא | － 262 |
| ¢ | －228， 229 | מוררםין | 218， 219 | פטשטין | － 233 |
| \％ | 250 | מחזורתא | － 259 | פחח רספרא | － 197 |
| ¢＂ュ | － 250 | מטעצין | 227， 228 | קוזיעא | 232， 233 |
| נ＂ | 250 | מיסטן－ | ． 262 | קטיעין | － 230 |
| －במ＂ב | 250 | מלו | 145－148 | קמקי | －195， 196 |
| נ＂ | ．． 250 | מלא דמלא | － 167 | קרדיֶ | －224， 225 |
| ע | ． 250 | מס＂ה | ． 249 | קר | －180，\＆c． |
| דגש | －197， 198 | ロ＂L | － 255 | קריה | 234－238 |
| דנותיד | － 212 | מלעיל | 204，\＆c． | קרי ולא בתוב | －109， 198 |
| רוציץ | 211， 212 | מלרע | 204，\＆c． | ר רתגא | ． 231 |
| וֹאין | 232－234 | － | ． 199 | $1^{\prime \prime \prime}$ | － 258 |
| צונין | － 211 | ص＂ | － 257 | ． | － 256 |
| － | 231 | משטשין | 220－224 | ר＂ | ． 254 |
| דומש ירידי | 259， 260 | Ј＇3 | － 256 | רשד | 197，\＆c． |
| ת\％ | 145－148 | נרזחז | ． 262 | שב＂נ | 248 |
| תסר רדתד | 116 | נסיבין | 219， 220 | שוא | 202，\＆c． |
| יהם＂י | ． 257 | －נפחלי | － 260 | שים | 210， 211 |
| ＂חזדאין | 215－218 | סבירין | 225－227 | ת／ג | 248 |
| יע＂ה | ．． 250 | סיכי | － 259 | ． | ．． 229 |

## INDEX IV.

massoretid lists quoted in this book, which are also FOUND in the ochla ve-ochla.

| OCHLA |  | ocmia |  | ocima |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ve-oonta. | levita. | ve-oomer. | livira. | ve-ochera. | levtra. Page |
| Section. v. . | $\begin{gathered} \text { Page. } \\ 208 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Section. } \\ & \text { cxi. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Page. } \\ 118 \end{gathered}$ | Section. clii. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Page. } \\ 185 \end{gathered}$ |
| $x$ xi. | 207 | cxii. | 118 | cliv. | 189 |
| xv. | 200 | cxiii. | 179 | clxvii. | 189 |
| xviii. | 221, 222 | cexvii. | 117 | clxix. | 1.94 |
| mxvii. | 223 | exviii. | 117 | clxx. | 109 |
| yxxyii. | 222 | oxix. | 117 | clxxxi. | 186 |
| xliii. | 178 | cxx. | 117 | cer. | 240 |
| cliv. | 178 | cxxi. | 189 | carv. | 220 |
| xlv. | 207 | exxii. | 189 | cexxi. | 236, 237 |
| lxxx. | 118 | cxxiii. | 189 | cexxii. | 238 |
| lxaxi. | 119 | cxxviii. | 183 | cexzxiv. | 229 |
| 1zxiii. | 230 | x | 161, 183 | cel. . | 223 |
| lxxxiii. | 230 | cxxxi | 183 | celi. | 212 |
| lxxxiv. | 231 | cxxxiv. | 186 | celii. | 214 |
| lxixy: | 218 | exxxy. | 187 | celiii. | 213 |
| xci. . | 117 | cxxxyi. | 232 | celxi. | 217 |
| zeii. | 177 | cxxxvii. | 188 | celxii. | 218 |
| xevii. | 110 | cxliv. | 109 | celxx. | 236 |
| xcviii. | 110 | cxlv. | 184 | celxxiii. | 214, 215 |
| xcix. | 193 | calvi. | 184 | cclxxviii. . | 241 |
| c. | 193 | cxlviii. | - 171 | colxxxviii. | 228 |
| cii. | 192 | cxlix. | 170, 188 | ceclxxii. | 205 |
| ciii. | 171 | cl. | 188 | ccelxxiii. | 205 |
| civ. . | 172 | cli. | 190 | iv. additions | 205 |

# INDEX V. <br> TOPICS AND NAMES. 

## A

Abbag, alphabet denominated, 223.
Abrafanel, Isaac, 9, 10; his view of the
Keri and Kethiv, 107.
Samuel, 12.
AcHa of Iral, his system of vowel-pointa, 61, 63.
Adrian, Matthew, 66.
ALCALA, Alphonso de, his contribntions to
the Complutensian Polyglott, 9.
Aulemano, Jochanan, 11, 12.
Almanzi, Guespo, 45.
Arama, Isaac, 10.
———Moses, 10.
Athbace, alphabet denominated, 190, 191.
Athbash, alphabet denominated, 222.

## B

Baba Buch, nee Levita.
Bachur, see Levita.
BAEHR, on the Poetical Accents, 65.
Balmes, Abraham de, 10 ; his Hebrem Grammar, 17, 21, 195.
Bardch of Benevent, 12.
Ben-Asher, 45, 65, 113, 114.
Benjamin of Rome, 81.
Ben-Naphtaly, 45, 114.
Bernb, Jacob, 10.
Bible, the, by whom arranged and divided, 120.
Bibles, Rabbinic, 9.
Black, W. H., his opinion about the design of the majnscular letters, 231.
Blayney, 60.
Bomberg, Daniel, his Hebrew publications, 21 ; his connection with Levita, 22.

Boothroyd, Dr., 60.
Broughton, Hugh, his opinion of the vowel-points, 51.
Buber, Life of Levita, 3, 78.
Buxtorf, the father, his defence of the antiquity of the vowel-points, 53,54 , 55-57.

## C

Calvin, 48, 49.
Capito, W. F., his date, contributions to Hebrew literature, \&c., 66.
Cappellus, Lewis, his controversy with the Buxtorfs about the antiquity of the vowel-points, 54-57.

Caro, Isaac b. Joseph, 10.
Chajath, Jehndah b.'Jacob, 12.
Ceajug Jehndah, 20.
Chronology, Jewish, 3.
Clark, Samuel, on the antiquity of the vowel-points, 59.
Compounds, book on the, see Levita.
Conjectural Readings, 225-227.
Cooper, Joseph, on the antiqnity of the vowel-points, 59.
Corbeit, Tsaac de, the anthor of the Compendium of R. Moses' work on the Commandments and Probibitions, 250.
Coronex, 'Paul, his connection with the Complutensian Polyglott, 9.
Couthin, Ferdinand, Bishop of Algarye, bis description of the heart-rending scenes at the compulsory baptisms of Jewish children, 8.
Cretensia, nee Megido.
D
Davidson, A. B., Ontlines of Hebrew Accentuation, 65.
Davilé, 9.
Defectives, 145-148.
Duraen, Isaac, 2.

## E

Eginio, Cardinal; his interview. with Levita, 14, 15 ; instigates Levita to write the Hebrew Grammar, 16 ; his connection with Levita, 96, \&c.
Ephodi, his view of the origin of the Keri and Kethiv, 206; Grammatical work, 107.
Ewald, Jahrbücher, 62.
Ezekiel, the Vision of, 98.

## $F$

FagIos, Panl, his date, 66; connsction with Levita, 67; printing establishment and contribations to Hebrew literature, 68-78.
Farissol, Abraham, his acconnt of the ${ }^{\circ}$ laboars of converted Jews to demonstrate the truth of Christianity from Kabbalistic works, 9 ; his cosmography, 10.
Frensdorff, Dr., 4, 23, 35, 39, 94.
Fucke, William, 51.

Fubet, Dr. Julins, Geschichte des Keräerthums, 62.

## G

Galatines, Petrus, his worl entitlsd On the Mysteries of the Catholic Trath, 15.

Gans, David, his historical work called Seder Olam, 3; his date, and opinion ahont the edition of Levita's Grammatical work, 75.
Geicer, Dr. Urschrift, 62.
Girl, Dr. John, on the antiquity of the vowel-points, 59.
Good Sense, hook of, see Liryita.
Graetz, his critique on Isame Zarphati's Epistle, 7.

## H

Harding, Dr. Thomas, his controversy with Bishop Jswel, 50.
HEBREW, called Sacred, language, 195.
Heidenhein, the Laws of the Accents, 65.
Heilprin, Jechiel, his historical work called Seder Ha-Doroth, 3; opinion ahout the date of Levita's puhlicstions, 75, 76.
Heredia, Paul de, Kebbalist, 9.
Hermes, the worship of, 98.
Hexafemebon, the worl of, 98.
Hilali, Codex, 260.
Hosmes, Dr., his article, Levita, in Kitto's Cyclopædia, 2, 3, 79.
Hutchinson, John, his view of the Hebrew varity and the vowel-points, 60; his school, ibid.

## I

IbN Aknin, 20.
Ibn Al-Tebben, his date, and Grammar, called the Key, 259.
Ibn Baalam, his date, and works, 123; his opinion shont the antiquity of the gccents, 123.
Ibn Danan, Saadia, 10.
Ibn Dand, Ahraham, called Rahad, author of the Chronicle Seder Ha-Kahbalah, 108.

Ibn Ezra, his date, and Grammar, 45, 125.
Ibn Ganach, Jonsh, 20, 131.
Ibn Jachja, David, his contributions to Bihlical literature, 81, 82.
IBN Jachja, Joseph, 10.
Ibn Verga, Jehndeh, 12.
Isaac b. Meier, 2.

## J

$J_{a c o b}$ b. Asheri, called Baal Ha-Turim, his Massoretic commentary, 142, 143.
Jacob h. Chejim, editor of the Messorah, 9,21 ; his date and works, 38 , 39 ; his connection with the Ochla Ve-Ochla, 94 ; his Introdnction to the Rabhinic Bible, 107, 109, 194.

Jacob h. Eleazar, his date, and Recension of the Bible, 258.
Jehovas, the mysteries connected with the name, 219.
Jemonat Ha-Levi, his work entitled Khozari, 126, 133 ; opinion ebont the antiquity of the vowel-points, 126, 127.
Jexutheel Ha-Cohen, his date and Massoretic work, $257,258$.
Jereman the prophet conceals a copy of the Law, 119.
Jelifnek, Dr. Adolph, his contribntions to the History of the Crusades, 7.
Jerome, St., quoted in support of the antiquity of the vowal-points, 52, 53.
Jetzira, the book, 98.
Jerdsalem, Codex, 260.
Jewei, John, Bishop of Salishnry, his controversy with Dr. Harding, 50.
Jewise Converts diffuse Biblical knowledge, 9.
Joss, h. Chalaphta, reputed anthor of the Chronicle Seder Olam, 108.
Jews, parsecnted at Mayence, 6; at Trent, ibid. Eernestly solicited by Isaac Zarphati to quit Germany, and sesk shelter under the Croscent, 6, 7; expelled from Spain, 7; from Portugal, 8; their children forcibly baptised, ibid.
Justiniani, tranalator of the More Nebuchim, 36.

## K

Kabbarah, the, stadied hy Christians, 10, 12, 15, 39.
Katiscen, Dr., his notice of Levita in the Hsbrew Grammar, 3; of Lnther's and Calvin's opinions ahont the antiquity of the vowal-points, 49.
Keri and Kethiv, varions opinions ahont the origin thersof, 103-112; numbers of in the Bibles, 115, 116.
Kfosari, see Jehndah He-Levi.
Kncerr, David, his Grammatiosl and Lexical works, 79, 107, 258; his opinion about the sintiquity of the vowel-points, 121, 122.
Krmeri, Moses, the time he floarished, 13; his Hebrew Grsmmar, 13, 36.

## I

Law, Synagogal Scrolls of the, 124; division of, for hehdomadal lessoùs, 135, 170.
Levita, surnemed Bachar, its siguification, 2; the date of his hirth, ibid; his removel from Germany to Pedue, 7 ; his contribations to the revivel of Hebrew learning, 10; his flight to Rome and intervisw with Cardinal Egidio, 14, 15 ; his journey to Fagins, 66 ; works, in chronological order:-

Commentary on M. Kimchi's Hehrew Grammar, 13, 14, 36, 80-83, 92.
Baba Buch, 14.
Bachur, 16, 73-76, 92.
Tahles of Paradigms, 17.
A Treatise on Compounds, 17, 18, 80, 92 .
Poetical Dibsertations, 18, 19, 80, 92, 145, 199, 202, 219.
Concordence to the Massorah, 20, 23 85, 137.
Arameic Grammar, 20.
Mabsoreth Ha-Massoreth, 40-44.
Treatise on the Accents, called Good Sense, 63-65, 114, 123, 204.
Tishbi, 68.
Methurgeman, 69-72.
NomencIrture, 73.
German translation of the Pentatsuch, Five Megilloth, and Haphtaroth, 78.
German version of the Psaime, 79.
Annotations on Kimchi's Grammatical and Lexicel works, 79.
Landat, 2.
Lurvi, h. Chabib, 10.
Levi, b. Joseph, hie Grammer entitled the Vine-blossom, 122.
Lightroot, Dr., his view of the antiquity and anthority of the vowel-points, 57, 58.
Letters, majnbcular and minuecoIer, alphaheticaI liste of, 230, 231.
Loanz, Jacob h. Jechiel, 10; teachss Reuchlin Hehrew, 12.
Lowte, Bishop, his view ahout the vowelpointe, 59 .
Loluy, Raymond, his connection with the Kabbalah, 11.
Luzzatto, Treatise on the vowel-points in Halichoth Kedem, 62.
Lether, Martin, his sentimente abont the Jewe, 38, 39; his view of the origin and antiquity of the vowel-pointe, 49.
Lyra, Nicolae de, his dete, foreranner of the Reformetion, his opinion abant the vowel-pointe, 16, 17.

## M

Matmonides, his dete and grest philosophical work, 36 ; work on Bihlicel and Traditional Law, called Jed HeChezaka, 114, 182.
Mantino, Jacoh, 10, 36.
Marins, Gregory, his opinion ahout the Hebrew vowil-points, controvergy with William Fulke, 昭o., 51.
Massonar, how treatad by copyiets, 94; signification of the word, 102, 104 ; ite order of the Bihle, 120, 121; magna, and marginalis, 138, 139.
Medigo, Elias del, or Eliss Cratensis, teacher of Mirendola, 11.
Messer, Lion, his workb, 10.
Methurgeman, bee Levita.
Mezuzar, the, 95.

Michaecis, J. D., Anfangs-Grïnde der Hehräiechen Accentuation, 65.
Mirandola, John Pico della, his connection with the Kabbalah, 11.
Morinus, John, his opinion ahont the Hebrew verity end the vowel-points, 50.

Moses, Ha-Darshan, his date, and work on the Commandments and Prohibitions, $249,250$.
Moses, the Punctuator, his dete and works, 123, 124; his opinion abont the antiquity of the accents, ibid.

## N

Nachmanides, Moses, his date, opinion ahout the mystic import of the Law, 124.

Nathan, Ierac, author of the first Hebrew Concordence, 21.
Natian h. JechieI, 2.
Naphtait, see Ben Naphtali.
Natront II., b. Hilai, hie opinion ahont the antiquity and anthority of the Hehrew vowel-points, 44.
NoAI, the seven commandmente of, 99.
Nomenclature, gee Levita.
Numerais, how exprebeed, 135, 136.
0
Ochla Ve-Ochle, described by Levita, 93, 94, 138.
Owes, Dr. John, his controversy with Bishop Welton ahout the antiquity and anthority of the vowel-points, 58, 59.

## P

Pratensis, Felix, editor of the first Rabbinic Bible, $9,21$.
Paester John, 130.
Palestines, the seven productions of, 182.
Pentateuch, the, a copy of deposited by Moses in the Ark of the Covenant, 119.

Perreat, Abate Pietro, 126.
Prefferkonn, his malignity againat the Jews, 12; his dete and works, 37, 38.
Pinsker, Einleitnng in das BabylonischHebräische Punktationesystem, 62.
Pinner, Dr., Prospectus, 62.
Piscator, John, his opinion of the vowelpoints, 51.
Plene, 145-148.
Prophiat Duran, bee Ephodi.
Purity of Language, an anonymous grammatical treetiss, 126.

## R

Rashi, 105.
RAYMOND Martin, his opinion about the Hehrew verity and vowel-points,45, 46.
Ricto, PauI, his Kabbelistic Iebours, 9.
Remembrance, hook of, bee Letita.

Reuchlin, his connection with the Kabbalah, 11, 12.
Rossr, Azsriah de, his date, refatation of Levita's argumenta for the novelty of the vowel-points, \&c., 52, 53; his Meor Ensjim quoted, 122.

## S

Saba, Abrsham, 12.
Sabila, Gaon, 20 ; his date, and philoaophical trastise, 136, 269.
Saccoto, Abraham, 10.
Scribes, their nams and conneetion with the Maseorah, 135.
Seder Ha-Kabbalah, 108.
Seder Olam, the Chroniole, 108.
Semier, J. S., his connection with the German translation of the Massoreth Ha-Massoreth, 42, 44.
Seforno, Obsdiah, 10.
Selve, George de, Bishop of Lavour, his literary connection with Levits, 22; ancourages him to undertake the Msssorstic Concordance, 23-25, 37.
Shraja, Joseph, 12.
Stmon b. Jochai, reputed anthor of the Sohar, 48.
Sxetus IV., patronises the Kabbalah, 11.
Smimshon, the Grammarian, his dste, and treaties on the vowel-points snd sccents, 257.
SoHar, the, its view of the antiquity and authority of the powel-points, 48, 121.
Spira, Meier, 257.

Steinschneider, Dr., 2, 14, 17, 126.
Stern, Lessarge, 65.
Synagogue, the Great, its constitution, 107, 108.

## T

Temple, the Second, five articles wanted in it which wers in the first Tomple, 111.

Transposition of letters, eixty two instances of, 116.

## V

Valencla, Jscob Peraz de, his date, opinion sboat the rowel-points, \&c., 47.

Vowed Points, the, controvergy abont their antiquity and snthority, 44-63; becomes a dogma in Switzerland, 64; superlineary system of, 61; interlineary aystem of, 61, 62; Levits's opinion about their antiquity, 121, \&o.

## W

Walton, Brian, his view of the sntiquity of the vowel-points, 57.
Whiteieln, P., on the sintiquity of the vowel-points, 59.
Whigitc, Dr. William, 100.

## Z

Zasmora, Alphonso de, his contribationa to the Complatensiam Polyglott, 9 ,



[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ In his edition of R. Nathan b. Jechiel's Aramaic Lexicon, called הערוך, vol. i., p. 38. German Introduction. Prague 1819. For an account of the life of R. Nathan and his celebrated Lexicon, we must refer to Kitto's Oyclopcedia of Biblical Literature, Alexander's edition, s. v. Nathan.

    2 Catalogues, Libr. Hebr., in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, col. 934.
    3 Kitto's C.yclopcadia of Biblical Literature, s, v. Elias.
     ולולו סולת .אין בו מסולת, הששנית בעבור היוחו מהובר אל כל בל בתור ללמוד בו בימי בתרותו וישיב לבו באחריחו. השלישיח ,בעבור היוח בנוי משטונה ,ובשם בחור קאכונה. ש לסשואלי ספרי למי אחה, יאמר לאלידוֹו לנוי שמוֹ בחורו.
    
    7 R. Tsaac b. Meier flourished A.d. 1320-1330, at Düren on the Röer, where he was Rabbi of the Jewish commnnity, and whence be derived his surname. His work on the Ceremonial Law be entitled שates, becanse it discasses the laws of legal and illegal meats (הלקוזח (היסור והיחר) in ninety-six gates or sections. It is, however, commonly called (ע) the Gates of or by Duren, which some have erroneonsly translated porta habitationis. It was first pablished at Cracow, 1534. The edition to which Elias Levita wrete the poems is either the second or third. Comp. Fiurst, Bibliotheca Judaica, i., 213; Stcinschneider, Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, col. 1104-8.

[^1]:    ${ }^{9}$ With Elias Levita's own statement before us, the reader will be surprised at the following difference of opinion about the date of our anthor's birth:-

    | Cyclopedia, new ed. s. v. Elias) | A.D. 1470. |
    | :---: | :---: |
    | Fiirst (Bibliotheca Judaica, i., 239) | 471. |
    | Kalisch (Hebrew Grammar, ii., 33) | , 1474. |
    | Gran (Zemaeh David, i., Anno. 277), Jechiel (Seder Ha-Doroth |  |
    | i. 95a, ed. Lemberg 1858), \&c., \&c. | 477. |
    | andau (Nathan's Aruch. i., 38, German Introd. Prague, 1819) |  |

    We are aurprised at Dr. Kalisch's error, since this learned scholar quotes in the foot note on p. 34 of his Hebrew Grammar, the life of Levita, by Buber, in which it is proved to demonstration that Levita was born in 1468, and since Jost, who was also formerly in error npon this subject, has corrected his mistake in his Geschichle des Judenthums, (iii., 119, Leipzig 1859,) four years before the appearance of the Hebrew Grammar. (Longman, 1863). Comp. rlso Graetz, Geschichte der ,Juden, ix., 281, Leipzig 1866.

[^2]:    ${ }^{18}$ In' Frankel's Monatschrift, xiii. p. 99.

[^3]:    14 This interesting Address to the Jews of Germany by Isaac Zarphati, which is to be found in the Imperial Library of Paris, (ancien fonds No. 291), has been pnblished by Dr. Jellinek, in his work entitled קונטורס גזרות תהנ"ו Contribution to the History of the Crusades, p. 14, \&c. Leipzig, 1854. For a thorongh and most masterly critiqne on the Epistle, we must refer to Graetz, (Geschichte der Juden, Fiii., pp. 288 and 446, \&c. Leipzig, 1864,) whose translatien we hare followed.

[^4]:    ${ }^{15}$ Graetz, Geschichte der_Juden, viii., 390, \&cc. Leipzig, 1864.

[^5]:    ${ }^{\text {If }}$ According to a statement by Abraham Farissol, in his MS. work entitled the Shield of Abraham (מבן אברוֹ), twelve distingaished converted Jews formed themselves into a literary society, and conjointly izaned works to prove the trath of Christianity from the Sohar and other Kabbalistic writings. The passage from Farissol's MS. work, giving this account, bas been printed by Graetz, Geschichte der Juden, ix. 195.

[^6]:    ${ }^{17}$ For an account of the import and history of this esoteric doctrine, see The Kabbalah, \&c., by Ginsburg, Longmans, 1865.

[^7]:    ${ }^{18}$ The full Hebrew title of thie concise Grammar is מהזך שבילי הדפת קרבת מליצת ,חכמה, יתרון, the initials of which yield the anthor's name, Sometimes it is eimply called המהר דקדוק or המהל. For an account of the life and writings of Kimchi, we must refer to Kitto's Cyclopadia of Biblical Literature, new ed. s. v. Moses Kinchi.

[^8]:    19 The ahove extract is made from Steinschneider's Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bocleiana, col, 985, where an account is also given of the different editions of the Fiction in question, and the errors of hiographers are corrected,

[^9]:    20 See below, in the Second Introduction, where the whole of the interview is narrated.
    ${ }^{21}$ Geschichte der Juden, ix. 99.

[^10]:    88 אגי אלידו הלוי תברתי הלוח הצה לתח לנצר רעח ברקדוק - ויוסף לקח משני המאמרים . Comp. Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, col. 2012, \&c., and by the same Anthor, Bibliographisches Handbuch, p. 81, No. 1162.

[^11]:    ${ }^{28}$ The above piece of literary history fully illnstrates our remark on page 1 about the ignorance which prevails respecting even the dates of the most distinguished Jewish literati. Even Levita, with all his learning, describes Jehudah Chajug ae the oldest, Jonab Jon Ganach as the next in age, and Saadia as the third in chronological order. Whereas Saadia was born A.n. 892, Ibn Ganach about 995, and Jehudah Chajug about 1020-1040. For notices of the lives and works of these eminent Hebraiste we mast refer to Kitto's Cyelopacdia of Biblical Literature, new ed., and only add here, as anpplementary to the article Jehonaf Chajog in the Cyclopædia, that he also wrote a Commentary on the Song of Songs, which is referred to Ion Aknin, as will be seen under the article Ibn Aknin in the Cyclopadia. He has, moreover, written Commentaries on the Pentateuch (quoted by Ibn Ezra on Gen. xli. 48 ; Exod vii. 5 ; x. 8 ; xxi. 8 ; Numb. x. 36; xxiii. 13 ; Deut. xxix. 29) : on Isaiah (quoted by Jbn Ezra on Is. xiv. 20, xxvi. 20, xlix. 8, lxi. 10) : on Habbakule (quoted by Ibn Ezra on Habak. ii. 19, iii. 2) : on the Psalms (quoted by Ibn Ezra on Ps. lxviii. 14, Ixxxiv. 7, cii. 28, cxxxvii. 2, cl. 6) : on Job (quoted by Ibn Ezra on Job xxxviii. 5) : on Ruth (comp. Ibn Ezra on Ruth i. 20): and on Ecclesiastes (comp. Ibn Ezra on Ecel. ix. 12, xii. 5).

[^12]:    ${ }^{24}$ The only portions of this gigantic work which have been pnblished are the Dedication and the Introdnction. These the learned Frensdorff printed in Frankel's Monatschrift fur Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, vol. xii., pp. 96-108; Breslan, 1863. Our tranalation is made from the Hebrew text, which, with a few manifest errore, we also reprint below, as the periodical in which they are published is not possessed by every reader who might wish to be acqnainted with Levita's text.
     שעברו החחלחי במלאכה אחח הנראה בעיני היוחה טובה ומעילה מועילה מאד לכל הבאים ללמור תלהנין דרכי לשון הקורש החה אכן החורבן של רומי הבא סמוך אתרי ואח היז סבה שלא השלמהיה
    
    
     וששם בלבבו ללמוד עמי בלשון הקודש הנה ולמדהו ממני בקלוה ובומן קצר מאר, והרי לך שי שם בשלושד, לשין עברי הקדושד, ולשטן יין הרוחד י ולשין לאטםי 'ּו הצחה• כדי שתהיה שלם בכל השלמיות,

[^13]:    זחרי אדוני ביץ החכמים, נמו השמש בין הכוכבים, והנה ידעת אדוני כי יוס אחדר נפל ביגינו הרבור,
     בו יזכרת רב טוכו ותועלתו המניע ממנו לתלמידי הלשין הוה ובקשח ממנו בבל עוז שאקבל עלי השוורח
     פרצו עליך היי בלנה. ובקן החעוררחי וינכנסתי בשורח הנדול ועול הכבר הוה וביום ובלילה לא שכב לבי צד כי וכיתי להשללימו בעורה ה' ובעורח גדבת יד ארוני הטובה עלי. והנה בהיות המנהג הנהוג בארץ שבל מי שיחיחבר סשר חרש להדפיסו וליחםו לשם אחד מהשרים הגדולים אששר בארץ המהו היה
    
     דיית סבה להששלימו ולהקימו על רנליו ועל ירך גוכה כלני במהרה לאורו ולתדפיסוי ו וחמלא כל הארק
     ורורון שלוח לך ממני, כי אס בעבר המשוצעבר לרבו, וצלל מה שקונה עבר קונה רבו, ובקראך בו חלקם קצחת
     שאנכי טרחתי ועמלתי ויותר , והנה לא אוכל לשבח ולהלל ולפאר את מלאכת הספר הוח כראוי לו אך יהללוהו

[^14]:    ${ }^{26}$ The author of the above-named first Hebrew Concordance is R. Isaac Nathan b. Kalonymos. He lived at Avignon, Montpellier, in the time of Peter de Luna, or the anti-pope Benedict XIII. R. Nathan deevoted eight years of his life (1437-1445) to this Concordance, which was first printed hy Bomberg, Venioe, 1523. Comp. Kitto's Cyclopadia of Biblical Literature, new ed. s. v. Nathan.

[^15]:    ${ }^{28}$ A description of this Grammar has already been givsn, vide supra, p. 13.
    29 Maimonides was horn at Cordova, March 30, 1135, and disd Decsmbar 13, 1204. A hiographical sketch of this most distinguishsd Jewish philosopher, as well as an analysis of his remarkable works, will bs found in Kitto's Cyclopacdia of Biblical Litarature. We have only hers to add that Justiniani, who was aided by his teacher, Jacob Mantin, in the translation of The Guide of the Perplexed, sntiroly omittad to acknowledgs the important help hs obtained from this Jewish physician. Comp. Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebreca, iii. 780, \&e.

[^16]:    ${ }^{35}$ Thus the editor distinctly says on the title-page בשנח רצ"ט ללם"ק : והובא עחה שניח לביח הדפום צ"י הנעלה. במהורר קלמן דישבצק
    ${ }^{36}$ From a passage qnoted by Semler, in his Preface to Meyer's German Translation (p. 9), it indeed appears that the celebrated Reformer, Conrad Pellican (1487-1556), translated the whole book into Latin shortly after the publication of the Hebrew. The passage in question, which is quoted from the Life of Pellican, prefixed to the first volnme of his Commentaries, is as follows: "Adhæe tota biblia transtuli e chaldaico in latiunm . . . . et utrumque Targum libri Esther, de quo sibi Jndæi mire placent. Quin et Targam Hierosolymitanum in quinque libroa Mosis. Preter hæc transtuli quædam Talmudica opuscula: librum Massoreth, quem Hebraicum edidit Elias grammaticus." But this Latin version has never been published.
     มีnmerfungen $\mathfrak{D}$. $\mathfrak{J o f}$. Salomo ธemitrz.

[^17]:    ${ }^{43}$ Jacob Perez de Valencia, commonly called Bishop of Christopolitanas, was boru abont 1420 , at Valencia, whence he derived hia name. He became a hermit of the order of Angastin, and died in 1491. He was a voluminous writer, and the above extract which is from his commentary on the Psalms, ia as followa in the original. "Poat convarsionem Constantini M. videntes Rabbinos omnes gentilea cum tanta davotione ad fidem Christi converti per totam orbem, et Eccleaiam tanto favore prosperari et etiam quod infinita mnltitudo Jndmorum videntea manifestam veritatem per experientiam at miracnla, pariter convertabantur, et sic deficiebant quaeatus, et reditna, et tributa Rabbinorum, hac iniquitate commotos magna maltitudine congregatos fuisee apud Babyloniam 曆gyti, qnae dieitur Cayre: ibique quanto magia cante potuerunt, conatoa fuisae falsifàacre et pervertere Scripturas a vero senan e aignificatione. Inde confinxisse aupra 5, vel. 7, puncta loco vocaliam. Quorum punctoram inventoras fuisse Ravina Ravasee, duos Doctores eorum. Addit, istos Rabbinoa confinxise libroa Talmud." Prolog. in Psalmos Tract. vi., Comp. Hody De Bibliorum Textibus Originalibus, lib. iii., p. ii., p. 442. Oxford, 1705.

    44 "Ideo nolla fides adhibenda eat acripturæ a.; sicnt hodie babent (Judæi) aic interpratatam et punctuatam." lbid. Tract. ii., fol. xxiii.

[^18]:    45 For an analysis of the Sohar, see Ginsburg, The Kabbalah, \&c., p. 78, \&c. Longmans, 1865.
    
    
    
    
     לההיאא חיבה מקיומא בגונא אחרא : בוב
    
    
     את ועירא ראורייהא ; זוהר שיר השירם דף ב"ג ב'

[^19]:    ${ }^{48}$ Dr. Kalisch (Hebrew Grammar, Part ii., p. 65, note d. Longman, 1863,) is surely incorrect in his statement, that "the Reformers, as Luther and Calvin, wers of opinion that the vowel-points were at least fixed by Ezra, or the Great Synagogue." Nothing can be more explicit than Lather's remark on Gen. xlvii. 31: "At the time of St. Jerome, the pointe did not es yet exist, and the whole Bible was read withont them. I suhmit that it is the modern Hebrews who affixed them, in order to give a proper sense and mesning to the Hebrew language. However, since they are not friends but enemies of Holy Writ, I often atter words which strongly oppose these points." In his Comment. on Is. ix. 6, he says "that most dangerons people, the Jews, falsify the words of the prophets with the points and distinctions; and thair pointe, which are nothing bnt a modern invention, most assuredly are not to be preferred to the simple, correct, and grammatical sense." And again, in his Treatise entitled Sdiem Gamphoras (1543), he says, mit diefer Wetif fönte man ber Süben $\mathfrak{B e r f t a n d}$ in ber $\mathfrak{B i b e l}$ fein fdimadifen, und ift Das Sortheil Da, Dán Sople und bie Srapheten nidyt haben mit Buncten
     nidt stoth ift biefelben jo jteif zu halten, als bie Juben gerne molten, iondertidif wo fie bem neuen Teftament zumiber gebraudift merben. Eben fo foll man aubl mit bex mquivocatio tno distinctio thun, wo fie miber baĉ neue Teftament bienen. Tit Jüben haben body \&uft, affe ify $\mathfrak{D i n g}$ ztoeifelbaftig und niats geiviffer zu mactien.

    Equally explicit is the remark of Celvin, in his commentary on Zecharish xi. 7. "Scio, quenta industria veteres scribm puncta excogitarint, cum-jam lingum non esset tam communis et femiliaris nsus: qui ergo puncta negligunt, vel prorsus rejiciant, certe carent omni judicio et ratione: sed tamen habendus est aliquis delectus. Si enim legamus hic, proditores, nullns est sensus: si legamns, funiculos, nulla littera mutetur ; interes mutantur duo puncta. Cum argo id necessario postulet res ipsa, miror cur interpretes ita serviliter passi fuerint se regi, ut non spectarent Prophetæ sensum."

[^20]:    ${ }^{49}$ The works of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbary, vol. ii. p. 678. The Parker Society edition.
    ${ }^{\text {bo }}$ Comp. Morinus, Exercitationes Biblicw de Hebraici Græcique textus Sinceritate. Exercitat. iv. cap.ii., s. 8, p. 198. \&c. Paris, 1633.

[^21]:    ${ }^{51}$ A defence of the sincere and true translatians of the Holy Scriptares into the English tangue, against the manifold cavils, frivolous quarrels, and impndent slanders of Gregary Martin, ane of the readers of Papish divinity, in the traitorans seminary of Rheime, by William Fulke, D.D. (1583). Parker Society edition, p. 578, with p. 55.
    ${ }^{5 s}$ Broughton's apinion an the vowel-points is to be found in his Cammentary on Daniel, chap. ix. 26, pnhliehed under the title Daniel: his Chaldee visians and his Hebrew ; hoth translated after the ariginal and exponnded, \&c. London, 1597.

[^22]:    ${ }^{5} 5$ De Rossi, also called among the Jews"Azzariah Min Ha-Adomim, was born at Mantua in 1513, and died in 1577. He was the first and most distinguished Biblical critic among the Jews of the sixteentl century; and his celebrated work, entitled the Light of the Eyes (מאור עינים), which consists of three parts, may almost be designated a Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature. It was first printed at Mantua 1574-5, in square characters; a second edition of it was published at Vienna, 1829, in Rabbinical characters. The ehapter treating on the vowel-points is p. $178 b-181 a$, ed. Mantoa, and, p. $286 b-292 a$, ed. Viemna. For a sketch of De Rossi's life, and an analysis of his works, see Kitto's Cyclopadia of Biblical Literature, new ed., n.r v. Rossr.

[^23]:    ${ }^{55}$ Tiberias sive Commentarius Masorethicus. Brsle, 1620.
    56 The Arcanum punctationis revelatum was first pnblished anonymously at Leyden, 1624, 4to. It was afterwards republished, with the Vindicic Arcani punctationis and Cappellus' other works, by his son ; Amsterdam, 1689, fol. It is to this edition of the collected works that our references are made.

[^24]:    57 "Cum dico a Masorethis Tiberisnsibus excogitata esse puncta et consonis addita, non hoc volo, uti jam monai, ab iis excogitatam, atque de proprio cerebro pro sorum libitu et arbitrio confictam erse lectionean sacri textus, quam punctis illis signarunt, atque expresserunt; sed hoc duntaxat volo, expressam esse ab iis, notulis a se excogitatis, lectionem sacri textus, quae tom ubique inter Judæos obtinebat, quamque ipsi edocti fuerant a suis magistris acholastica institations, atque orali, et $\pi a \tau \rho \circ \pi a \rho a \delta o ́ \tau \omega$ traditione ab iis accepsrant, quam lectionem credebant Judæi antiquæ Mosaicæ et Propbeticæ authentice couformem esse. Cum itaque magistri illi Tiberienses nibil aliad praestiterint, quann ut lectionem quam edocti erant, et a majoribus suis traditione $\pi \alpha \pi \rho o \pi a \rho a \delta o ́ \tau \bar{\omega}$ acceperant, quamque omnes Judæi propterea eandem asse cum antiqua Mosaica et nuthentica Prophetica existimabant, vocalium et accentuum figuris a se excogitatis exprimerent quam poterant accuratissime, nihil est quod quis putet, uon potuisse illam lectionsm omnibue Judæis probari." Arcanum punctationis revelatum, lib. ii., cap. xvii. 5 \& 6, Opp. p. 775, ed. Amsterdam, 1689.

[^25]:    bs Anticritica, sen vindicim veritatis Hebraicm; adversus Ladovici Cappelli Criticam quam vocat sacram. Fasle, 1653.
    ${ }^{59}$ Comp. Prolegom. iii., sect. 38-56, with Walton's Considerator Considered, ed. Todd, p. 210, \&c. London, 1821.

[^26]:    ${ }^{60}$ A Chorographical Century, searching out some more memorahle places of the Holy Land of Israel, chiefly by the light of the Talmnd. Chap. lxxxi., works, vol. ii., p. 73, \&c., ed. 1684.
    ${ }^{61}$ Of the Integrity and Purity of the Hehrew and Greek Text of the Scriptures; with considerations on the Prolegomena and Appendix to the late Biblia Polyglotta. London, 1659, vol. iv., p. 447, \&c., of his collected works, London, 1823, to which the references are made.

[^27]:    62 The Considerator Considered, \&c. London, 1659. Todd has reprinted this rare book in the second volume of his Memoirs of the life and writinge of Bishop Walton. London, 1821.

    68 His Dissertation is entitled Domns Mossicæ Clavis, sive Legis Septimentnm; in quo punctorum Hebraicorum adstruitur antiquitas; eaque omnia, cam accentaalia tum vocalia ipsie, literis fuiebe coøva, argumentis, undiquie petitis demonstratur. Qum vero in contraram ab Lilia Levita primipilo, Ladovico Cappello, D. Doctore Waltono, \&c., adducuntur, multa cum fidelitate examini anbjiciuntur et dilantar, \&c. London, 1673.

    64 An Exercitation concerning the original of the chapters and verses in the Bible; wherein the divine anthority of the points in the Hebrew text is clearly proved by new and intrinsic arguments. London, 1698.

    65 A Discertation on the Hebrew vowel-points, showing that they are an original and essential part of the Language. Liverpool, 1748.
    ${ }^{66}$ A Discertation concerning the antiquity of the Hebrew langaage, letters, vowelpoints, and accents. London, 1767.

    67 Preliminary Diseertation to his translation of Isaiah, new ed., p. xxxviii. London, 1836.

[^28]:    ss The syetem and the plan of the work may be gathered from ite lengthy title; " The Covenant in the Cherubim, so the Hebrew writings perfect. Alterations by Rabbies forged. Shewing the evidence forthe Scriptares ; that Christianity was exhibited to Adam, invisibles by visihles; past and to come by typee; by Cherubim, Urim, Themim, Sacrifice, Clond, \&c.; that the Jews and Gentilee understood them; that tradition was of the things typified. That thongh they nnderstood the tradition even of the covenant before the world, they had perverted the intent of it. That the alterations and stories of the Jews, after they had lost their types and Hebrew, are not traditions, bnt studied evasions to expositione of inspired Christians, \&c., and to sapport their apostacy. That the grammatical formation of the Hebrew, which is descriptive, so gives proper namee, cannot admit vowel-pointing, nor Mr. Masclef's method. By J. H." Collected Works, vol. vi., p. 15̄3. London, 1749.

[^29]:    69 "Codicem Hebr. V. T. tum quoad consonas tum quoad vocalia sive puncta ipsa eive punctorum saltem potestatem $\theta$ Є́orv $\nu \in \nu \sigma \tau \boldsymbol{v}$ esse." Formula Consensus, art. iv., comp. Keil's edition of Hävernick'e Allgemeine Einleitung in das Alte Testament, vol. i., p. 315.

[^30]:    70 For a further account of this system, and of the MSS. which exhibit it, we must refer to Pinner, Prospectus der der Odessaer Gesellschaft für Geschichte und Alterthümer gehörenden ältesten hebräischen und rabbinischen Manuscripten. Odessa, 1845; Luzzatto's treatise in Pollak's Dissertations, entitled, Halichoth Kedem, p. 23-231. Amsterdam, 1846; Ewald, Jahrbücher der bibilichen Wissenschaft, vol. i., p. 160-172, Gottingen, 1849; Geiger, Urschrift und Ueberzetzungen der Bibel, p. 167-170. Breslau, 1857; Fürst, Geschischte des Karäerthums, vol. i., pp. 19, \&c., 134, \&c. Leipzig, 1862 ; Kallisch, Hebrew Grammar; vol. ii., p. 63, \&c. London, 1863; Pinsker, Einleitung in das Babylonüsch-Hebrä̈sche Punltationssystem, Vieuna, 1863 ; Fürst, in the Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, vol. xviii., p. 314-323. Leipzig, 1864.

[^31]:    ${ }^{71}$ The sbove remark does not imply that no enperior Treatise has appeared since the pablication of Levita's Dissertation on the Accents. The learned Heidenheim published an Eesay, entitled The Laws of the Accents, (ספר עטפשי הטעטים) Rödelheim, 1808; chiefly compiled from the anciente, the Massorites, Ben-Asher, Ibn Balaam, Chajug, \&c., which is of anperior excellence, and in which he correcte some of Levita's mistalkes. But Heidenheim's Eseay is very rare; being written in Hebrew, it has therefore little advanced the general knowledge of the accente. Separate Treatisee have also heen published by J. D. Miohrelis, Anfangs-Gründe der Hebrätschen Accentuation, with an Introduction by C. B. Michaelis, 2nd edition, Halle, 1753; Stern, עיץ הקורא Leseauge, illnstrated with 900 examples, Frankfort on the Maine, 1840 ; and recently by A. B. Davidson, Outlines of Hebrew Accentuation, Prose and Poetical, London, 1861; in which the part treating on the prose accents is exceedingly defective, as Mr. Davidson could not evail himself of so able a gaide in this department as he had in Baer'e masterly Treaties on the Poetical Accente, entitled Torath Emeth. Mr. Davidson, moreover, whilst he mentione men who have not written separate Treatises on this enhject, does not even allude to Levita's excellent Dissertation on the Accents.

[^32]:    ${ }^{72}$ For a description of this literary curiosity, see Steinschneider, Bibliographisches Handbuch, p. 2, s. v. Adriands. Leipzig, 1859.

    78 Capito's works on Hebrew literature are, i. Institutiuncula in Hebr. ling. together with the Psalms in Hebrew, and an introduction by Pellican, Basel, 1516; Luther's own copy of this work, with his marginal annotations in MS., from the library of De Rossi, is to be found at Parma. This is exceedingly interesting to the student of the history of the early translations of the Bible, inasmuch as it shows the Manaal which the great Reformer used to acquire his Hebrew knowledge. ii. Institutiones Hebraica, libr. ii., Basel, 1518, 1525; and iii. Enarrationes in Habacuc et Hoseam, 1537.

[^33]:     צידיצתו ורבים שואבים מי תורתו, ורורש טוב לעממו, נאה רורש ונאה מפרש ' ובאמח ראוי הוא שבני עמו יקראו עליו כמו שאנו קוראין על רבינו משה בץ מיימון ממשה ער משה לא קם כמשה, כך יאמרו עליו מפאולוש ער פאולוש לא קם כפאולושי Introduction iii., to the Tiohbi, or the Introduction in prose, as it is called, towards the end.

[^34]:    76 והנה רבים שאלוגי האם אפשר לצשיות רקדוק על התרגומים האלה אמדתי לזי רצתי בי אפשדי רחוק הוא, וחה מפני השתנוח המוסחאוח במלות ובאותיות ועל כלם בנקרוח הם מתחלפוח מארי ו וחה לפּ שבלי סשק המתרגמים כתבו תרגומם בלי מקוד פי לא היו נמצאות, כמו שהוכוכחי היטב בהקרמת ספר מסודת המסורח, ודראהז עור ני הנוסחאוח הישנות מאר בלם בלחי בקורי ני לִא נקרום בעלי המסורח,
     על כן יצא משפטן מעוקל ואיןלהביא מהן ראיה לעשות עלדידם רקרוקי ילולי כן התחשוב שמיום שנצשו החרגומים לא היה איש תכב ובבון ביטדאאל שדיד יורע לעשות עליהם הרקדוק ואומר בילא רי שלא ההד איש שעשה הדקדוק כי אפילו לצשית תבור לפרש המלות לא ה'ה איש חוץ
     ורובם מלות של ין או רומי הנמצאים לרוב בחרגום ידושלמי וכמה מהם הביא ולא בארם והאת היחה. חתונחי עלי בספר מסורת המסורת ואחרי לא קם אישׁ שהתעורי להחויק בו לא ברקרוק ולא בניאור המלות וחשבתי שהסבה בחה לפי שבשנים שעברו רוצה לומר קודם שנמצאה מלאבת הרשוס לא היו במצאים חרנום נביאים וכתובים כי אם אחד במדיגה ושנים באקלים לקן לא היה מי שהשגיח בהם אבל חרנום אונקלוס חמיד נמצא לרוב והד משני שתחיבים אגחנו לקרא בנל שבוע השרשה שנים מקרא ואחר תרגום נמצאים קצח אגשים שהשגיחו בו וכתבו עליי דבר מה ולא מצאחי בהם תיצלח רב גם בעשה עליו מסווחת ולא ראיתים צר הגה אבל צל בביאים ונחובים לא הזה פוצה פה ומצפצך וא׳י דורש ואאין מבקש אלא אמרו Introduction to the Methurgeman.

[^35]:    77 וידעחי בי רגים חמהו על רוב מלות ההרגו' טהבאהי באמרי בהרבה מקומוח חו הלשון לא נמצא
     משלי וחלים וכמו אלה רבום ולא יאמינו לי בנל האוחוח אאשר עשיתי בקרבם, אמנם אם דצו הפוחד

[^36]:    78 Dr. Kalisch (Eebrew Grammar, ii., p. 34, note d.) is snraly mistaken in his remark that Fagins likewise translated this valnable Chaldes Dictionary in 1542 . Fagins translated the Introduction only.

[^37]:    ${ }^{61}$ David Gaur was born in 1541, at Lippstadt, in Westphalia, and died 25th August, 1613, at Prague. He was the first German Jew of his age who was distinguished as a historian, geographer, and astronomer ; he was acquainted with John Müller, Kepler, and Tycho de Brahe, with whom he carried on a literary correspondence ; for the latter he translated into German, extracts from a Hebrew translation of the Tables of Alphonso, composed in 1260. The worke which have immortalised his uame are as follows: i. A Compendium of History, from the Creation to A.d. 1592, in the form of annale, entitled The Sprout of David (צמח רור), first published at Prague, 1592, then with a oontinnation to A.n. 1692, by Reindorf, Frankfort on the Maine and Amsterdam, 1692, Furth 1785, and part iii. improved by Mohr, Lemberg, 1847. This chronicle was translated into Latin by Vorst, Leyden, 1644, the second part being abbreviated; and into Judaio-German, by Hena, Frankfort on the Maine, 1698; and ii. An Introduction to Astronomy, the Calendar, and Mathematical Geography, entitled, A Pleasant and Agreeable Work (ספר בתמר ונעים), in twelve parte, subdivided into three hundred and five sections. It was finished by the author in 1613, aud continued by Joel b. Jekuthiel, Jesnëtz, 1743. The passage in quection, which has been the source of the perpetual error respecting the date of Levita's birth, is as follows in the original : רע : אליהו המרקדק חבר ספר הבחור Anno 277 [=1518]; Elias, the German, composed the Book Bachur, at Rome, in the year 277 [=1518], when he was forty years old; and when he published the second edition, in the year 307 [=1547], he was seventy years of age. Comp. part i., p. 43, b, ed. Frankfort, 1692. In Forst's Latin tramslation of this work, the whole passage is thue erroueously rendered, "Elias Grammaticne composuit librum Bachur Romae anno 277; et ista aetate sua anno 307, erat filius 70 annorum." Comp. p. 151.

    83 Jechiel Heilprin, the author of the chronicle of Jewish history and literati, entitled, The Order of Generations (סרר הרורוח), was Rabbi at Minsk, where he died ahout 1731. His Chronicle was first published at Carlarïhe, 1769 A new and improved edition, edited by H. Sperling and B. Lorje, appeared in Lemberg, 1858. The passage relating to Levita, which the author transferred into thie work from the chronicle of Gans, is erroueously copied. It is here as follows: תסר [חבר read ס' הבחור ברומי רע , He composed the Book Bachur, at Rome, in 277 [ = 1518], when forty years of age, and the Massoreth

[^38]:    ${ }^{4}$ Comp. the article Judenteutsch, in Exsch and Graber's Encyklopädie, sect. ii., vol. xxvii., p. 323, note i.
    ${ }^{85}$ Comp. Ersch and Gruber's Eucyklopädie, article Jüdische Typographie, p. 33.

[^39]:    ${ }^{86}$ Comp. Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraea, ii., 396, 456 ; iv., 135.
    ${ }^{87}$ Some bibliographsrs question whether Levita is the author of this Jndaio-German version. Stsinschneider (Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, col. 942), pats it among the opera supposititia, whilst Graetz (Geschichte der Juden, ix., 229, Leipzig, 1866), the latest historian of the highest anthority, positively states that Levita made this translation at Constauce, when on his way from Isny to Venice. A spscimen of this curious version, comprising the first chapter of Genesis, is given hy Wolf, Brbliotheca Hebraca, iv., 194-198. Comp. also Buber, Life of Elias Levita, in Hebrew, p. 31, note 49, Leipzig, 1856.

[^40]:    החםד גם האמח מן י
    ואני לא אהיה אלמןי
    

[^41]:    91 It is now established slmost to a certainty, that this Benjamin of Rome, the suthor of the propmdentical treatise prefixed to Levita's commentary on the Journey on the Paths of Knowledge, is Benjamin b. Jehudah, called א"בה, who flourished A.d. 1330, and is the well known author of commentaries on the hooks of Chronicleb, Proverbs, and other portions of the Old Testament; and that Levita hesded his commentary in question by thie treatise, becauee, like his own commentary, it was designed to eimplify the study of Hebrew Gremmer. The meesenger, whose name Levita doee not condescend to give in this poetical description, by putting the name 'R. Benjamin of Rome' at the heed of it, and withholding Levita's name altogether, led people to believe that this Benjamin was the anthor of the commentary iteelf, as well as of the propmedentice. This is the catnse of Levits'e complaint. Comp. Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraea, iii., p. 152, No. ccexciii. ; Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, pp. 790, 1840, 2769 ; by the same author, Jewish Literature, pp. 146, 376, London, 1857; and Bibliographisches Handbuch, p. 21, No. 206. Leipzig, 1859.

    92 "The Language of the Learned," (לשטן לימודים) is an extenvive Hebrew Grammar, to which is appended s trestise on Hebrew Poetry and Metre (מאמר קצר במלאכת השיר), entitled, The Holy Shekel (שקיל הקדש). The author of thie Hebrew Grammar is David Ibn Jachja, of the celebrated ancient family, Jachja, who also wrote a commentary on Proverbe, entitled, Select and Pure (יוק P), which was first printed st Lisbon, 1492; and has aince been incorporated in the Rebbinical Biblee published at Venice, 1516-7, and

[^42]:    ${ }^{1}$ The worde ${ }^{1}$, Information for the Reader, are omitted in the Sulzbach edition.

    2 The word
    ${ }^{8}$ For a deacription of the Book Bachar, -aee above, page 16, \&c.
    4 The word למעלה, above it, is omitted in all the three instancee in the Sulzbech edition.
    ${ }^{5}$ The Snlzbach edition erroneously has the word $\boldsymbol{1}$, string, after I propound new, as well as before something.

[^43]:    ${ }^{6}$ The Sulzbach edition erroneously bas לשמוח, according to the names of, instead of , after the manner of.
    ${ }^{7}$ The Sulzbach edition incorrectly pats המלאים, plene, before החסרים, defective.

[^44]:    日 \& ${ }^{9}$ The word איש, man, as well as the passage beginning with וגם רברי מתגצולתי, and also my defence, and ending with הנובים, worthy, is wanting in the Sulzbach edition.

[^45]:    

[^46]:    -I NOILORGO\&LNI

[^47]:    11 The words מאחרין, the second is the Book Bachur, which animadverts on Grammarians, without which Levita's statement is unintelligible, are omitted in the Sulzbach edition.

[^48]:    learnod annotations, by Frensdorff, Hanover, 1844. The reader will find all Levita's references to the Massorah, contained in the Massoreth Ha-Massoreth, compared witb the etatemente in the Ochla Ve-Ochla.
    14. The above description of the condition of the Massorah, and of the maniner in which it has been treated by the copyitst, is almost literally the same as that given by Jacob b. Chajim, the first editor of the Maesorah. Comp. Jacob b. Chajim's Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, p. 12 in the Hebrew, and 35 in the English translation, ed. Ginsburg, Longmans, 1865.
    ${ }^{15}$ The words והשמורי מחסרים are omitted in the Sulzbach edition.
    ${ }^{16}$ For this celebrated Massorite, and the Bible here alluded to, see above, p. 38. From Levita'e vituperation, it is evident that Jacob b. Chajim was now dead, inasmuch as the phrase, "let bis soul be bound up in a bag of holes," is a spiteful and nuworthy perversion of the beartiful, charitable, and reverential prayer, which the Jews use when spealing of or writing about any one of their brethren who bas departed this life, in allusion to 1 Sam. xxv. 29, becanse he had embraced Christianity.

[^49]:    ${ }_{17}$ Hence it is taken for 7 , chief, and it is deduced that no one is to speak against its chief, i.e., the King or High Priest, comp. Sanhedrin 18, b., and Rsehi on Exod. xxiii. 2.

    18 mun, with the Jews, denotes the piece of parchment whereon are written the passage日 in Deut. vi. 4-9, xi. 13-21, which they regard as containing the injunction to inscribe on the door-posts the words of the Law. The alip of vellum thus written apon is anclossd in a cylindrical tube of lesd, cane, or wood, and to the present day is nailsd to the right door-post of every door. For a detacked description of this institution, we must refer to Kitto's Cyclopredia of Biblical Literature, new ed., s. v., Mexuzah; sud for the lew deduced from the word מוזו , bsing written definitely in Deut. vi. 9, to which Levita alludes, we must refer to Jacob b. Chajim's Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, p. 9 Hebrew, and p. 21 Engliah translation, ed. Ginsburg.

[^50]:    ${ }^{19}$ The Sulzbach edition substitutes כנכרים, strangers, for נויט, Christians.
    ${ }^{20}$ The apparent contradiction between the above statements, that he lived in Egidio's house aboitt ten years, and the remark in the Introduction to the Tishbi, that he had learned from Cardinal Egidio, with whom he was thirteen years (הקרדינאל אשר עמדתי עמו (שלש עטוֹה שנה קבלתי כל אלֹה , is to be accounted for thus: in the Massoreth HaMassoreth, Levita gives the round number, i. e., about ten (וכעשר) years; Graetz (Geschichte der Juden, ix. 224,) explains it, that as Cardinal Egidio was about several years from Rome (comp. Reuchlin's Letters in Friedländer's Beiträge zur. Reformations Geschichte, pp. 89, 99), Levita was ten years in his house at Rome, and three years with him away from the Eternal city.

    21 The words ואממרים לנששי אוי על שלמשרחי תורד ללוי, and they say, Woe to my soul, henmuse $T$ taunht a Christian the Law. are omitted in the Solzbach edition.

[^51]:    ${ }^{22}$ The above quoted eaying is recorded in the Talmud (Taanith $7 a$ ), as having been nttered by R. Chanina, and is literally as followe: הרבה למרחי טרבוחי ופחנרי יותר , much have I learned from my teachers, more from my associates, but most from my disciples. Levita varied it a little to adapt it to his rhyme. In the Midrash Jalkut on Ecclesiastes $\mathrm{\nabla} .7$, where the same eaying is quoted, it is aecribed to R. Berachja. Comp. sect. 973, vol. ii., p. $185 a$, ed. Frankfort on the Maine, 1687.
    ${ }^{28}$ This remark is certainly proleptical, since, at the time when Levita had his first interview with Cardinal Egidio, (circa 1510), he had not as yet pnbliahed any books of hie own, and even his small maiden prodnction, which appeared in 1508, was pnbliehed surreptitionsly, vide supra, pp. 13, 80, \&c.
    ${ }^{24}$ In the Sulabach edition, ננכרים, foreigners, is anbetitnted for 1 , Christians.

[^52]:    ${ }^{25}$ The Sulzbach edition hae suhatitnted במה שאמרו, in what they say, for w w, but what, in consequence of the omission presently to be noticed.
    ${ }_{26}$ From , ולא אמרו, but they did not say, to Sulghach edition, and the editor substituted, from his own cogitations, the following: אלא בומנם, שחהגוים החמה בבורא אינם מאבמנים, אבל בזומנו זהי לא יצטה כזה כי כי אין להם רין גוים , הנוכרים בגמרא, it only refers to their time when the Heathen did not believe in the Creator, but in our time, this is not applicable, since they are not like the Gentiles mentioned in the Talmud, as is evident both from the later legislators, and common sense, and what-. The omission of the lengthy paragraph from the text, as well as the insertion of the concocted pasesge in question, which was dicteted by the oensorship of the prese, hes given rise to the alteration mentioned in the preceding note.

    27 The work of the Hexahemeron is technically called, in the Jewish literature, , מעשד בראשי , becanse the first book of Moses, or more especially the history of the cosmogony, begins with the word תיחwna, (comp. Mishna Taanith iv. 2, Megilla iii. 6 ; Chullin v. 5.) The Vision of Ezekiel, again, is denominated the Chariot (מרכבה), or the Work of the Chariot (מצמשה מרכבה), in conformity to the former phrase, with which it is generally associsted, and comprises Ezeliel, chapters i. and x., which treat on the Divine Throne, reating on wheels, and carried by sacred animals. The Jews, from time immemorisl, have attached great mysteries to these sections of the Hebrew Scriptures, which discourge on the cosmogony and theosophy of the Old Testament, and have invested them with the halo of pecnliar eanctity. Special directions are given to those who study these biblical questions. Thus the Mishna declares that "the work of the Hexahemeron (מצשטה בראשיח) must not be expounded in the presence of two persons, and the Chariot (מרכבה), not even in the presence of one person, unless he is a aage, and nnderstands it already from his own cogitations" (Chagiga iii. 1). It is to this enactment that Levita evidently refers, since he uses almost the very words of the Mishne.

    As to the Book Jetzira (ם), (ם), or the Book of Creation, to which reference is made in the text, it purports to be a monologue of the patriarch Abraham, giving the contemplations which led the father of the Hebrewe to abandon the worship of the atars, and to embrace the faith of the true God. Its design is to exhibit \& system, whereby the universe may he viewed methodically, in connection with the truths given in the Bible, hy means of the donble value of the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet, as well as by the ten digite. For an analysis of this famons document, see Ginsbarg, the Kabbalah, pp. 65-77, Longmans, 1865.
    ${ }^{25}$ Levita alludes to the ancient mode of worehip offered to the heathen deity Hermes,
     being the symbol of Phallng, and thes giving rise to the ithyphalic arrow-form of Hermes. These heaps of atones were more especially collected on the road-sides, and each traveller paid hie homege to the deity hy throwing a stone to the heap as he pessed by, or snointed the heap of stones in which a Hermes was frequently set up, or offered up the firstlingt. Comp. Gen. xxviii. 10-22, xxxi. 45-48; Sanhedrin 61 a-64a; Midrash on Prov. $26 a$, בל , being the lew referred to by Levita. Penly, Real Encyclopädie der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft, s. v. Mercurius.

[^53]:    29 The whole passage from לור מד שאמרו, again what they say, to behold $a m I$ to die, consisting of fifty-four linee in the Hebrew, is entirely omitted in the Sulzbach edition.
    ${ }^{80}$ According to ancient tradition (comp. Sanhedrin, 59 a), God enjoined the following seven commandments on Noah, which both he and all his descendants, that is all mankind, were to obeerve. To abstain, i. from idolatry ; ii. from blaephemy; iii. from murder; iv. from incest; $\nabla$. from plunder; vi. from dieobedience to the powere that be; and vii. from eating flesh cut off from a living beast (אבר מן הרח). These seven commandments were imposed npon every heathen who wished to eettle down among the Jewe in Palestine. The foreigners who accepted and submitted to these conditions were denominated Proselytes of the Gate (נר (נ) Comp. also Sanhedrin, 56 a; Rashi on Aboda Sara, 51 a; Maimonides, Jad Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Melachim ix. 1.

    81 For the canee of this phalanx of Jewish teachers among Christians, as well 88 for the outcry of the orthodox Jews againat Levita, see above, pp. 9, \&c., 38, \&o.
     designedly celected by Levita to form a paronomasia, and though they sound somewhat strangely in the translation, they are very beantiful in the original.

[^54]:    ${ }^{88}$ That Levita did not exactly confine himself to teaching Christians Hebrew, bnt that he also aided them to fathom the mysteries of the Kabbalah, for which there wae such a rage in Europe at that time, is evident, from the fact that he copied the Book Jetzira, and two other theosophic treatises, for Cardinal Egidio (vide supra, p. 15). These three documents, which were formerly in the posse日sion of Almanzi, of Padua, are now in the British Museum, Add. 27,199. Comp. Dr. William Wright; in the Jourinal of Sacred Literature, July, 1866, p. 856, note.

[^55]:    ${ }^{34}$ Levita refers to the instruction in the Greak language, which he received from Cardinal Egidio (vide supra, p. 71, \&c.), and to his knowledge of varions departments of eecular literature, which he acquired with the aid of his Christian pupils.

[^56]:    85 That fan, followed by , is not always rendered in the Chaldee by from I6. xxii. 21. Indeed Levita's whole stricture on Kimehi's explanation is incorrect, inasmuch as in the passage adduced by Kimchi, namely, Deut. ii. 33, וֹ is not followed by 7 , but by isje , and yet the Chaldee paraphrases tranalate it it and רומע, and there is no other instance in the whole Hebrew Scriptures, where \%M, -Kal futare, third person singular masculine, suffix third person singular masculine, with Vav conversive, of which the subject is בירו instance which approaches the one in question, is the phrase 2 Chron. xxviii. 5, where indeed the Targum translates it ומסריה; but here it is suffix third person singular masculine, and not isiok, auffix first person plargit. Beaides, the Chaldee paraphrase of Chronicles was not known till the middle of the eeventeenth century, and was pablished for the first time at Augsburg, 1680-3, more than a hundred and thirty years after the death of Elias Levita.

[^57]:    ${ }^{86}$ The passage quoted by Levita is from the Babylonian Talmud, Nedarim 37 b, Megilla 3 a. It also occurs with the following variations in the Jerusalem Talmud,
     הטעמים ויבינו במקרא וה המסורחי רש אומרחם אילו ההכרעיםי ויש אומרים אילו ראשי השסוקים: " hook, in the Law of God," means the original text; "explaining it," means the Chaldee paraphrase; "and gave the sense," means the division according to the sense; "and cansed them to understand the Scriptare," signifies the Massoreth. Some,

[^58]:    however, say it denotes the pauses, and others heads of verses (Jerusalem Megilla iv. $1,67 b$, ed. Krotoschin). It is necessary to remark, that in all these passages, the expression מטורו, denotes the traditional pronunciation of the text, and that it is not to be confounded with the technical meaning "critical apparatus," which it was made to signify in after times.

    87 The word $7 y$, till, is omitted in the Sulzbach cdition.
    ${ }^{38}$ The Sulzbach edition erroneously repeats ${ }^{\circ}$, to themselves, after , theu made.

[^59]:    ${ }^{39}$ Rashi, ', רבי שלמה 'צחקי, Rabbi , is the acrostic ofomon Isaki or Itzchaki = $\boldsymbol{R}$. Solomon ben Isaac, the renowned Jewish commentator, who was horn A.D. 1040, at Troyes, in Champagne, and died 26th July, 1105. For a sketch of his life, sae Kitto's
    
    
    
     two separate statements, inasmuch as they are pointed with two separate accents, being pointed with the distinctive accent Pashta, and TT, with Jethiv, and having Dagesh. Now if they had been joined together, , רTא would have been pointed with the conjunctive accent Mercha, and 77 with Pashta, and would have been without Dagesh in the Daleth. According to this interpretation, therefore, the verse ought to be translated "these [mountains] are situate on the other side Jordan, far heyond it, towards the way where the snn goeth down."

    40 The word לכ, all, is omitted in the Snlzbsech edition.

[^60]:    ${ }^{41}$ An explanation of all the Massoretic phrases will be found further on, and as we cannot give the pages, not being as yet made up, we must refer to the Index, which will enable the reader easily to find the reqnisite information.

[^61]:    43 The Kimchi, referred to in the text, or Redak (7), as the Hebrew text has it, which is the acroatic of $\overline{\text { I }}$, $R$. David Kimchi, is the younger brother of M, Kimchi, to whose grammatical treatiee, entitled, the Journey on the Paths of Knowledge, Levita wrote the commentary already alluded to, (vide supra, pp. 13, \&cc., 80, \&c.) D. Kimchi, who was born in Narbonne, 1160, and died abont 1235, is the author of the celebrated grammatical and lexical worla, entitled Michlol, which Levita edited with snnotations (vide supra, p. 70, \&c.), ae well as of valusble commentsriee on neerly the whole Hebrew Scriptures. Comp. Kitto, Cyclopadia of Biblical Literature, new ed., s. v. Krmchi. The pescage detsiling his opinion on the origin of the Keri and Kethiv, to which Levita refers, will be found together with sn English translation in Jacob b. Chajim'e Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, p. 5 in the Hebrew, and 7 in the English.

    Ephodi (7פ), is the appellation of R. Ieaac b. Moses He-Levi, the celebrated grammarian and polemical writer, who flourished a.d. 1360-1412. It is a contraction of , thus sayeth, or I Prophiat Duran; and thongh it is the name which he especially assumed sfter 1391, to conceal his real person from the Christians, who, at the peril of his life, compelled him to abjure Judaiem and. join the benighted Christians of that day, he is also known by the name Prophiat Duran. Hie excellent grammatical treatise, entitled the Grammar of Ephod (מעטשח אפד), to which Levita refers, has only recently been published for the first time, Vienna, 1865. The passage in question io to be found in cap. vii., p. 40, and with an English trenslation in Jacob b. Chajim's Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, p. 4, \&o., in the Hebrew, and p. 6, \&c., in the English, ed. Ginsburg. For the life and writings of Ephodi. aee the Introduction to his Grammar, entitled Maase Ephod, pp. 2-49, Vienne, 1865 ; and Kitto, Cyoloperdia of Biblical Literature, new ed., s. v. Prophiat Duran.

    44 Abrsvanel's view, which Levita does not even deign to etate, and which he so cavalierly rejects, is given at length by Jacob h. Chajim, in his Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, pp. 5, \&c., in the Hebrew, and pp. 7-11 in the Engligh. It is to be romarked, that the theory of this celebrated etatesman, philosopher, theologian, and commentator, who was born in Lisbon in 1437, and died at Venice in 1508, hes a greater amount of trath in it than any other hypothesis on thie vexed question. Comp. Kitto's Cyclopredia, s. v. Keri and Kethiv.

    45 The Great Synagogue (כנםח דגרולֹ), to which anch frequent referencee are made iư thie work, denotee the conncil, or synod, firet appointed by Nehemiah, after the retnrn of the Jewe from the Babylonish captivity, to reorgenise the religione life of the people. It consisted originally of one hnndred and twenty members, comprising the represents-

[^62]:    Judg. xx. 13.
    . 2 Sam. viii. 3.
    2 Sam. xvi. 21.
    2 Sam. xviii. 20.
    $?$ Kings xix. 87.

[^63]:    ${ }^{55}$ In the Sulzhach edition, 7 , the secret, is inserted after he delivered.
    ${ }^{6 B}$ According to ancient tradition, the following five thinge, which were in the first Temple, were wanting in the eecond Temple: i. The Ark, with the lid and the cherabim npon it; iii. The fire from Heaven (comp. 2 Chron. vii. 1) ; iii. The Shechinah; iv. The Holy Ghost; and v. The Urim and Thummin. The ahsence of these five, the same ancient tradition declares, was indicated by the absence of the letter in, which namerically represente five, from the word in question. Hence the remark in the Talmud: אמר רוב שמואל בר איכיא מאי רכחיב וארצה בו ואכנד וקרינן ואכבדה מאי שנא רמחופר ה"א אלו חמשדה דבריט
    
     What is meant by the absence of the $\Pi$ ? It is because of the five things which made the difference between the first and second Temple. They are as follows, the Ark, de.

[^64]:    Comp. Ioma, 21 b. In the Midrash Rabba, on the Song of Songs, viii. 8, where the same thing is recorded, the holy oil (שמן המשׂחה), is substitnted for the Shechinah, as one of the five things. Comp. p. $26 a$, ed. Stettin, 1863.

[^65]:    67 Ths words ובשטאר הספרים פמו שקבלו מהנניאים, and in the other books as they received them from the Prophets, which are essential to the argument, are omitted in the Sulzbach adition.
    ${ }^{58}$ From the Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmuds we see that, ss esarly as the third century of the Christisn ers, there existed differences betwaen the Easterns and Westerns, which affected hoth the reading and the exegesis of certsin words (comp. Gaigar, in the Hebraw Esssys and Reviews, entitled, Kerem Chemed, vol. ix., p. 69, Berlin, 1856); and that many of the devisting renderings of the Septnagint and of the so-called Jonsthan Chaldes version of the Prophets arise from their following the more ancient Esstern readings. These two schools prodnced in the middle of the sixth centary the two systems of vocalisstion which we have alresdy described (vide supra p. 61, \&c.), and bequesthed to ns s list of their vsriations (חתוטין), which is given in the Rsbbinic Bibles, hat which is both exceedingly imperfect and incorrect. It is to this list that Levita refers in the text. The indefstigable Pinsker, who crested a new ers in the history of the Karaites, has grestly enriched and smended this list from two Codices, of a.d. 916 and 1010. Comp. Einleitung in das Babylonisch-Hebräische Punktationssystem, pp. 121-132; Vianns, 1863.
    ${ }^{59}$ Aaron b. Moses b. Asher, or simply Ben-Asher, as he is generslly called, flourished circa a.d. 900, at Tiheriss. He was the most accomplished scholsr and representstive of the Tiberisn system of vocslisation and accentngtion, and wrote, in the interests of the Westerns, the following works: i. A Model Codex of the Bible, (מפר בן אשר), furnished with the points and sccents sccording to the Western school, which became the standard text, and which Maimonides described in such eulogistic terms;

[^66]:    62 This rafers to the first edition of the great Rabhinic Bible, in folio, published by Bomherg, 1516-17, and the quarto edition, also published by Bomberg, 1517. Comp. Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraea ii. 367; Masch, Bibliotheca Sacra i. 17; Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, col. 7; Kitta, Oyclopoedia of Biblical Literature, s. v. Rabbinic Bibles.
    ${ }^{88}$ That is to say 848 , which is the numerical value of
    

    64 Levita is surely wrong in saying that there are only aixty-five Keris and Kethivs in the Pentateuch. In again going throngh the Massoretic notes in the Bihle, we have found eighty-two. Thsy are as followe:-Genesis viii. 17; x. 19; xiv. 2, 8; xxiv. 14, 16, 28,

[^67]:    ${ }^{74}$ The Five Megilloth are respectively read every year, on five annnal festivals, as follows:-i. The Song of Songs on Passover; ii. Ruth on Pentecost; iii. Lamentations on the Ninth of $A b$; iv. Ecclesiastes on Tabernacles; and v. Eather on Purim. These festivals occur in the succession in which they are enumerated. Hence the present order of the Five Megilloth.
    ${ }^{76}$ The important passage ונגד הקבלה האמתית שנספר הווחר , or against the genuine Kabbalah of the Sohar, which was firet animadverted npon hy Azzariah de Rossi (Meor Enajim 287, \&c., ed. Vienna, vide supra, p. 52), and of which the Buxtorfs made such terrible nse against Levita (Commentarius Masoreticus, eap. ix., p. 74, ed. Basel 1620), is entirely omitted in the Sulzbach edition. That the Sohar does mention the vowelpoints has already heen shown (vide supra, p. 48), and Levita's aesertion to the contrary is to he accounted for on the supposition advanced by De Rosei, that it aroes from his not having read the Sohar, which had not then been printed.

    76 The Sulzbach edition erroneously has אך בלא רנרי, instead of אחד לא ברברי,

[^68]:    ${ }_{77}$ Kimehi's remark, to which allnsion is made in the text, is to be found on p. $25 b$ of Levita's own edition of the Michlol, Venice, 1545 , and on p. 81 a, ed. Hechim Fiirth, 1793.

    76 This quotation is to be found on p. 18 b , \&c., ed. Venice, 1545 , and on p. 61 a , ed. Fiurth, 1793.

    79 The Sulzbach edition has omitted the word מה, what.
    ${ }^{80}$ Nothing is known of this Grammatical Treatise, entitled Sepher Ha-Semadar (ספר הםמדר) = the Book of the Vine-blossom, or of its author, beyond the fact that it is also quoted by Azzariah de Rossi (Meor Enajim, cap. lix.), who endorses the abovenamed arguments for the antiquity of the vowel-points, and by Samuel Archevolti, in his Grammatical Treatise, entitled Arugath Ha-Bosem (ערוגת הבושם) A Trellis for Aromatic Plants, published at Venice, 1602, and Amsterdam, 1730, who also esponses its sentimente. Comp. Buxtorf, De Punctatorum Antiquitate, p. 42, \&c., Basel, 1648.

[^69]:    ${ }^{81}$ The Horajoth Ha-Kore (הריית הקורא) = Instruction for the Reader, by Ibn Balaam, (flourished, A.D. 1050-1090), discreses, in twenty-four chspters, the accents and vowelpoints of the Hebrew lenguage. From Dukss' pnblication of the Introduction and Table of Contents, it is evident that esp. i.-xvii, of this Treatise sre devoted to the doctrine: of the prose accents of the twenty-one sacred books; whilst csp. xviii.-xxiv, are taken up with the metricsl sccents of the three remaining hooks, viz., the Pbalms, Proverhs, and Joh. The seventesn chapters which discnss the prose accents wers re-cast by the muthor himsolf, snd designsted טעמי המקרא, A Treatze on the Accents of the Scriptures. It was first published hy the lesrned John Mercier, Paris, 1865, and Hsidenheim inserted twelve chapters of it in his work Rödelheim, 1808. The second part, which assumed the name of חת שעמי אעי A Treatise on the Accents of Job, Proverbs, and the Psalms, was slso published first by John Mercier, Paris, 1556, and recently by G. J. Polak, Amstardam, 1858. Comp. Fúrst, Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, vol. xx., p. 201, Leipzig, 1866; Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, col. 1294, \&c.

    82 The Treatise on the Vowel-points and Accents, hy R. Moses the Punctnator, who lived in London circa A.n. 1230, is alternately designsted Points (vide infra, Part iii., sub דע"; Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraea i. 822) ; שערי חנקור , the Gates to the Vowel-points and Accents (comp. Massorah marginalis on Amos iv. 1; Ps. exxxvi. 3); ;רובי הנצור רזנגינוח, the Method of the Vowel-points and the Accents (Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraea i. 592); snd הוריח הקורא, Instruction to the Reader

[^70]:    ${ }^{85}$ The passage alladed to is to be found on p. $73 a, b$, ed. Lippmann, Fürth, 1827,
    
     חוכור (חבקוק ג' ב' דבק עם אלוה מהמן יבוא (שם ג'ג), וכבר פרשחי שניהם שדם מוכרחים, ובל רד אירע בעבור שמצאא ברברי היחיד שיש פטשד פסוקים במקרא שהיו ראוים להיוחם רבוקים, ואני לפי .רצחי - Both Bnxtorf (De Punctatorum Antiquitate, p. 11, \&c.) and Morin (Lib. ii., Exercit. xii. c. 7) have elaborated npon this passage; the one trying to prove from it that Ibn Eara maintained the antiquity of the vowelpoints, and the other to show that he regarded the Massorites as having lived after the close of the Talmud.

[^71]:    ${ }^{86}$ Wolf (Bibliotheca Hebraea i. 80, 160) conjectarea that the Purity of the Lan-
     entitled Purity (תות), quoted in the preceding note. After carefully perusing, however, Ibn Ezra's work in question, and not being able to find in it Levita'a quotation, we andeavoured to obtain some information on thia subject. And accordingly, in addition to the information in a private communication from Dr. Steinschneider, that tha Zachoth Sephasajim is "atill extent in a MS. of Da Rosei (Cod. 764)," at Parma; ; we have received from the learned librarian, the Abate Pietro Perrean, a description of the codex in question, of which the following is the substance. The MS. ia a folio on parchment, written in Rabbinical characters, and contains four works: i. The Hebraw Lexicon of Solomon Parchon [an account of which will be found in Kitto's Cyclopoedia, s. v. Parchon] ; ii. Several Sections (vin), alao by Parchon, being a supplement to tha Lexicon; jii. The Zach Sephasajim, which only axtends over four folios of the MS., and is complete, as ia evident from the concluaion 0 aren here endeth the Purity of the Languages; and iv. The Instruction to the Reader of the Scriptures (a deecription of which has already heen given. Vide supra, p. 123, note 81].
    ${ }^{87}$ Tha word $n$, and the syllables, is omitted in the Sulzbach edition, whilst , והנרולות, the long, ia wrongly put before short.
    ${ }^{88}$ This aentence ia erroneously tranaposed in the Sulzbach edition.
    a9 The author of the Khosari is R. Jehudah Ha-Levi, a very distinguished Hebraist, Poet, and Moral Philosopher, who was horn in Caetile circa 1086. For the life of this literator, as well as for an analysis of his celebrated work, entitled Khosari, to which Levita refera, see Kitto's Cyclopoedia, s. v. Jehudah Ha-Levi. It is to be remarked
     , והשבר, and Sheber, is omitted, \&c., \&c.

[^72]:    ${ }^{90}$ Even those scholars, who like Levita regard the vowel-points as a post-Talmudic invention, most unhesitatingly affirm, that i, and they put, is the predicate of אנשי כנמח הגרילה, the men of the Great Synagogue; comp. Khosari p. 249, note 3., ed. Cassel, Leipzig, 1853.

[^73]:    98 The Sulzbach editiou erroueoully has בי הששמוח מן השמוח עם הנקודוח

[^74]:    94 Prester [= Priest] John, is celebrated, both among Latin and Oriental writers, as a. Christian sovereign and priest in the far cast of Asia. It is said that the information about him was first brought to Pope Engenins III. in 1145, by two Armenian delegates who visited Rome. And a letter of Pope Alexander III., dated 1177, is still extant, which tbis Pontiff addressed to the said Johannes, Rex Indorum, and in which he is described as a Christian king of Asia, desiring nnion with the Catholic Charch. The story about this romantic monarch was oo eagerly seized by the faithful of the midale ages, because his supposed exietence connteracted the nufavourable impression which the conquests of the Mohammedans and Heathens achieved in Christian conntries. In the fifteenth century, he again appears in the annals of history, as Presbyter Johannes Rex, in Africa, and more especially in ethiopia. Levita's reference is most probahly to Nestorians or Maronites, since he describes Syriac as their ecclesiastical language. For the story abont Prester John, see Ersch and Graber's Allgemeine Encyklopädie, section ii., vol. xxii., pp. 219-21; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche; vol. v., 313 ; vol. vi., 765, \&e.

    95 The Sulzbach edition erroneously substitutes עברי Hebrew, for Arabic. The extract of the above passage in Kitto's Cyclopedia, s. v. Ximenes, having been made from the Sulzbach edition, contains the same blunder, and must therefore be corrected.

[^75]:    ${ }^{96}$ The expression $\mathrm{f}^{\prime \prime}$ ע, thus far their remark, is omitted in the Sulzbach edition.
    ${ }^{97}$ Levita's quotation is to be found on p. 7 a of the Zachoth (צחוח) = Purity, ed. Lippmann, Fiurth, 1127.

[^76]:    98 Both in the Massorah finalis, under letter Vav, and in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section $\mathbf{l v}_{\mathrm{v}}$, where the list in question is given, it is designated ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{K}^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{J}$, twenty-one pairs. The expression מלין, words, in the text of Levita, must therefore he a slip of the pen. It is also to be remarked, that in the Ochla Fe-Ochla the names of the vowels are given (חר מלא פום וחר קמץ פום), which, according to Levita, shows that it is a later addition, and that the title of this rubric in the Massorah finalis is the genuine old designation.

    99 The list of these twenty-seven instances is given in the Massorah finalis, nuder the letter Jad, and in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section cexiv., pp. 45, 127, \&c. Neither the Massorah finalis, however, nor the Ochla Ve-Ochla designates the list in qnestion, , ו"ז מליץ רכחיבין אי expressly entitled רכיביב' ', בחירק, which are written with Jod Chireh, thus giving the very name of the vowel-sign which Levita dispntes; whilst in the latter the rahric in question
     which only occur once with Jod in the midale of the word, and which in all other: passages are written with Vav.

    100 The Sulzbach edition erroneously insert עות
    101 The whole sentence , and they were satisfied with these designations, and did not give them other names, is omitted in the Sulzhach edition.

[^77]:    102 Levita's allusion is to be fonnd in the Khosari ii. 8, p. 191, ed. Cassel.

[^78]:    108 The word
    104 In the Sulzbach edition, the abbreviation $\mathbb{N}^{\wedge}$, eleven, bas erroneonsly heen resolved into דשמומרים is some say, which has no sense; and eubstituted for
    ${ }^{105}$ As the discussion of the authorship of the Chaldee paraphrases is too lengthy to be entered upon here,'we must iefer to Kitto's Cyclopadia, s. v. Jonathan b. Uzziel, Joseph b. Chija, Onkelos, and. Targum, where the necessary information is given at length.
    ${ }^{106}$ Levita did live to see his Chaldee Lexicon published. For a description of it, see above, p. 69, \&c.

[^79]:    109 Saadia's philosophical treatise, to which Levita refers, was originally written in
     sections, and discnsses the following snbjecte :- Section i. The creation of the world and all things therein. ii. The Unity of the Creator. iii. Law and Revelation. iv. Obedience and Rebellion, Divine Justice and Freedom. F. Merit and Demerit. vi. The Soul and Immortality. vii. The Resurrection. viii. Redemption. ix. Reward and Punishment. And x. The Moral Law. The original Arabic, with the exception of a specimen of the Introduction, has not as yet been publiehed. It is in Ibn Tibbon's Hebrew translation of it, made in 1186, and pnblished in Constantinople 1562, Ameterdam 1648, Berlin 1789; and in Füret's German translation, published at Leipzig, 1845, that this treatise is accessible to scholars.

[^80]:    110 The saying that the Massorah, or the traditional pronnnciation of the text, is a fence to the Seripturss, was proponnded by the celebrated R. Aliba, who flonrished circa A.D. 80-120; comp. Aboth iii. 13. The explanation of Song of Songs iii. 8, as referring to the Massorah, to which Levita alludes, is to be found in Rashi's Commentary in loco.

[^81]:    ${ }^{111}$ For the nature and history of this work, see above, p. 28, \&c.
    112 The Snlzbach edition erroneously substitntes שנשמעחי, which I have heard, for :שטמרתי:

    118 This statement of Levita is contradicted by no less an anthority in Massoretic lore than the learned Frensdorff. Frensdorff shows that Jacob b. Chajim, the first editor of the Massorah, which is now printed in the several Rahbinic Bibles, did not derive the greater part of his materials from the Ochla Ve-Ochla. Comp. Introduction to the Ochla Ve-Ochla, p. 10.

[^82]:    119 The Massorah marginalis on Numb. xix. 1, which also mentions twelve passages
     xiii. 1, xiv. 3S, xv. 1; Numb. ii. 1, iv. 1, 17, xiv. 26, xvi. 20, xix. 1.

    120 The three instances in which מחטN occurs, are Gen. xx. 6; 1 Sam. xii. 23 ; Ps. xxxix. 2. They are stated in the Massorah marginalis on Exod. xx. 6. The five instances in which Aleph is wanted, are Gen. xx. 6 ; Nnmb. xi. 11, xv. 24; Dent. xi. 12, xxyiii. 57.

[^83]:    121 For these eight instances, see p. 139, note 117.
    122 The thirty-two instances in which iTh occars with Vav conjanctive, in all other instances being with Vav conversive, are as follows:-Gen. i. 6; ix. 26, 27; Exod. ix. 22; x. 21 ; xviii. 19; Deat. xxxiii. 6; 1 Sam. x. 5; xx. 13; xxviii. 22; 2 Sam. v. 24 ; xviii. 22, 23; 1 Kinge xiii. 33 ; xiv. 5 ; xxi. 2; 2 Kinge ii. 9 ; Jerem. xiii. 10 ; Ho6. xiv. 7; Amos v. 14; Micah i. 2; Malachi iii. 10; Ps. ix. 10; Lxxxi. 16; xc. 17; civ. 20; Rnth iii. 4 ; iv. 12; 1 Chron. xiv. 15; xxii. 16; 2 Chron. xviii. 12; xix. 11. They are enumerated in the Maesorah finalie, nnder the letter He, 23 a, col. 2.
    ${ }^{123}$ The remark in the Basel and Sulzbach editions, that 'אמ", Niphal future, 3rd person singular, "occure seventeen times ( $\mathrm{r}^{\prime \prime}$ )," is surely a migtake, sinee the word in question occars twenty-three times, as follows:-Gen. vi. 2li; Exod. xii. 16, 46; xiii. 3, 7 ; xxi. 28 ; xxix. 34 ; Levit. vii. 6, 15, 16 (twice), 18, 19, xi. 34, 41 ; xvii. 13 ; xix. 6, 7, 23 ; xxii. 30; Numb. xxviii. 17 ; Dent. xii. 22; Ezek. xlv. 21. They are thns given in the Massorah finalis onder the letter Aleph, p. 6 b , col. 2.

    124 The seven instances in which 7 Niph occurs with Sheva under the Vavi, called Raphe in the Massorah, are as follows:-Exod. xiv. 16, 17 ; Dent. x. 11 ; Josh. xviii. 4; Is. xiii. 2; Jerem. iii. 18; Ezek. xxxiii. 31. In all other passages the Vav hae Pattach, which in the langasge of the Massorah is called Dagesh.

[^84]:    was horn in Germany, circa a.d. 1280, and died A.d. 1340. The Commentary to which Levita refers is an exposition of the Pentatench, and interprets the sacred text according to the hermenentical rules called אימטר, redncing every letter of a word to its numerical value, and explaining it hy another word of the eame quantity. The great value of this Commentary consiste in ite explanatione of the Massoretic notes. The portion which treats on the Massorah has been detached from the general Commentary, and puhlished separately in most of the Rabbinic Bibles. Comp. Kitto's Oyclopcedia, s. v. Jacos b. Asheri.

[^85]:    ${ }^{1}$ The Sulzbach edition rightly inserts has dropped out from the ed. Basel, 1539.

[^86]:    2 For a description of this grammatical work, see above, p. 13, \&e.
    3 It will be ssen that in this mnemonical sign, בive good Elijahu, are contained all the five vowels, (viz., $a, 0, i, 0, n$ ) both in the original Hebrew and in its English equivalent. The discnssion of this subject, to which Levita refers, is to be fonnd on p. 36 of the Poetical Dissertation, ed. Prague, 1793.

[^87]:    ${ }^{4}$ The whole of this sentence is transposed in the Sulzhach edition.

[^88]:    ${ }^{5}$ The thirteen instances in which phely, occurs as defective are as follows:Exod. xxix. 31; Levit. vi. 9, 19, 20; xxi. 7, 8; xxiv. 9; Numb: vi. 5, 8; Deat. xxvi. 19 ; Ezek. xlii. 13 ; Nehem. viii. 9, 11. They are enumerated in the Massorah marginalis on Exod. xxix. 31.
    ${ }^{5}$ The three instances in which the construct phen is without Vav are, Ps. xlvi. 5 ; lxv. 5; Isa. xlix. 7. They are mentioned in the Massorah marginalis on Ps. Ixv. 5.

[^89]:    7 The three instances in which גבור is defective are, Gen. x. 8, 9; Dent. x. 17. They are given in the Massorah marginalis on Gen. x. 8.
    s The Basel edition states that there are three instances in which ato is defective; but this is evidently a mistake, for there are eight, as follows:-Gen. xxxvii. 4 ; 1 Sam. xvi. 4 ; 1 Kings ii. 5, 6 ; v. 26 ; Jerem. xv. 5; Ezek. xiii. 16 (twice). They are enumerated in the Massorah marginalis on Gen. xxxvii. 4. The Sulzbach edition omite שום altogether, and substitutes for it

    5 The three passages, in which ${ }^{5}$, 1 is defective are, Exod. xxviii. 12 (twice), 29.
    10 The Sulzbach edition ©rroneously insorts about them, after מהן $I$ shall spcak.

[^90]:    11 The eighteen instances in which abith occurs defective are as follows:-Gen. iii. 22 ; vi. 3 ; Exod. iii. 15 ; xy. 18 ; xxi. 6 ; xxxi. 17 ; xxxii. 13 ; Levit. xxv. 46 ; Dent. v. 26 ; xxxii. 40 ; 1 Kings i. 31; ii. 33 ; ix. 5 ; x. 9 ; Ps. xlv. 18 ; lxxy. 10 ; xcii. 9 . Theugh the word in question is marked in each of these passages as defective, we could not find the entire list anywhere enamerated in the Massorah. On Exod. iii. 15, and Ps. xlv. 18, the Massorah marginalis remarks that a list of the eighteen instances is given in the Massorah on Ps. lxxv. (לעלם י"ח במסר בתהלים סימן ע"ה). On Ps. lxxv., again the Massorah marginalis remarks that the eighteen instances are ennmerated in the Massorah finalis,
     Massorah finalis, to which we are referred again, we find that it simply states $\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{\prime \prime}$
     the passages are given in the Massorah marginalis on Ps. lxxp." Comp. p. 49, col. 2.

    12 The Massorah marginalis on Levit. xvi. 8 gives the fonr instances in which is defcetive, as follows:-Levit. xvi. 8; Nnmb. xxxvi. 3; Judg.i.3; Dan. xii.13; including, as it will be seen, the plural גרלויח.

    18 The seven instances in which דת is defective are as follows:-Gen. xxxviii. 18, 25; Exod. xxviii. 11, 36 ; xxxix. 14; 1 Kings xxi. 8 (twice). They are enumerated in the Massorah marginalis on Exod. xxviii. 11.

    14 The three passages in which 1 №curs defective are, 1 Sam. xviii. 29; Jerem. vi. 25 ; xv. 11. They are given in the Massorah marginalis on 1 Sam. xviii. 29.

    15 Tho twenty-fonr instances in which 1.14, 22; 1 Srm. xii. 24 ; 2 Kings i. 15 (twice) ; iii. $11,12,26$; viii. 8 ; ix. 27 ; x. 16 ;

[^91]:    ${ }^{21}$ The three instañces in which צופר is plene are, Gen. xix. 22, 30 (twice).
    22 The two exceptions in which ${ }^{22}$ is defective are, Exod. xxvi. 1; Deut. xxviii. 39.
    ${ }^{93}$ The whole of this paesage is vitiated in the ed. Besel, 1539.
    ${ }^{24}$ The four passages in which א occurs plene are, Gen. xxxix. 6; Isa. xxix. 8 ; Nahum iii. 12; Ps. xli. 10. They are ennmerated in the Massorah marginalis on Gen. mxix. 6.
    ${ }_{25}$ This is one of the passages which shows how difficult it is to nnderstand the Massoretic language, and how easily one may mistake the meaning of Levita. In resding the above remark, one might be led to suppose that there are only ten instances in the Bible in which ing islene, whereas there are no less than twenty-three. Levita's remark, however, is explained by the Massoretic annotation on 1 Sam. xxvi. 12, where
     xxix. 23: Pe. i. 6; xxxyi. 18; lxxiv. 9; xc. 11: Ruth iii. 11: Esther iy. 14: Nehem. x. 29 ; adding "וכל תריפר ד"ה קהלח ומשלי דכו" "throughout the tweive minor Prophets, Chronicles, Eeclesiastes, and Proverbs, it is likewise plene;" which is omitted by Levita.
    ${ }^{26}$ The ten instancee in which קורא is plene are, Judges xv. 19: Isa. vi. 4; xl. 3; xlv. 3; lxiv. 6; Amoe v. 8; Habak. ii. 2 ; Pe. xlii. 8; 1 Chron. ix. 19; 2 Chron. xxxi.-14. They are given in the Messorah finalis under the letter Kaph, p. $56 a$, cole. 3 and 4.
    ${ }^{27}$ The twenty-four, or rather twenty-five, words written plens, which have no parallel, are as follows:-

[^92]:    ${ }_{30}$ The Sulzbach edition substitutes עליו, on it, for , ever.

[^93]:    S1 This is another instance which shows how difficult it is to moderstand Levita's language withont consulting the Massorah. From his remark the reader would naturally conclude that only occurs thirteen times dcfective in the whole Bible, whereas it is found so nearly thirty times. On referring, however, to the Massorab marginalis on Exod. xxv. 18, we find it remarked 'הכוםבים כלו אוריח' תמחר. ונביא' וכתוב' מלאים במי"ג הסר, "the word כרובים is defective throughout the Pentateuch, whereas it is plene throughout the Prophets and Hagiographa, with the exception of thirteen passages;" which are as follows:-1 Sam. iv. $4: 2$ Sam. vi. 2: 1 Kinge vi. 25, 27 ; viii. 7: 2 Kings xix. 15 : Ezek. x. $1,2,3,6,7,8$ : Ps. lxxx. 2. There can therefore be no doubt that Levita means these thirteen instances of defective.
    s2 The eleven instances in which עמודים is defective are as followe:-Exod. xxvii. 10, 11; xxxviii. 12, 17 : Judges xvi. 26 : 1 Kings vii. 6, 21 : Jerem. xxvii. 19: Ezek. xl. 49: 2 Chron. iii. 16; iv, 12. They are enumerated in the Massorah marginalis on Exod xxxviii. 12.

[^94]:    ${ }^{83}$ Instead of ,שאין אהרחד, for there is not after it.

[^95]:    ${ }^{34}$ That the proper name "David is always defective, except in five instances, in whioh it is plene" is surely a mistake. The Massorah marginalis, both on 1 Kinge xi. 4 and Ezehiel xxxiv. 23, does indeed remark that "David occurs five times plene (דויד ה' מלאים), and ennmerates 1 Kings iii. 14; xi. 4, 36; Ezekiel xxxiv. 23; Song of Songs iv. 4; as the five instances; bnt it adds וכל תריסר ועורא ור'ד דכוו' מלאים, that David is also plene throughout the twelve minor Prophets, Erzra, and Chronicles, which is not to he gathered from Levita's statement.
    ${ }^{35}$ The three instances in which תants the Fav plural are, Gen. i. 21 ; Exod. vii. 12; Dent. xxxii. 33.
    ${ }^{36}$ The single instance in which ציקיקים is plene in the Pentatench is in Exod. xxiii. 8, on which the Massorah parva remarks "ל מל , no parallel, it is entirely plene.
    ${ }^{37}$ The four instances in which נשיאש occurs are, Gen. xvii. 20; xxy. 16; Numb. vii, 10 ; xxvii. 2. They are enomerated in the Massorah marginalis on Gen. xvii. 20.

[^96]:    ${ }^{38}$ Though the Massorah parva on 1 Sam . xix. 20, also remarks that three times plene (') 'ג' מל" ב'י", yet there seem to be four instances; viz., 1 Sam. x. 11, 12; xix. 20; xx viii. 6. The eight instances of plene in Jeremiah to which Levita refers are, Jerem. $\vee$. 13 ; vii. 25 ; viii. 1 ; xxvi. 8 , 11 ; exviii. 8 ; xxix. 1 ; xxxv. 15. They are enumerated in the Massorah marginalis on Jerem. xvi. 2.
    ${ }^{99}$ The two passages in which שצירים plene are, Isa. xiii. 21 ; 2 Cbron. xi. 15.
    ${ }^{40}$ The four instances in which $\begin{gathered}\text { a } \\ \text { is }\end{gathered}$ is entirely plene are, Gen. xxxii. 15; Levit. viii. 2; Numb. xxiii. 1; Deut. xxxii. 14.

    41 The Massorah marginalis on Gen. xxv. 6 distinctly remarks that the word occurs twice entirely plene, that is, with the two Jods after the two Clivelis. The one

[^97]:    instance is in Gen. xxy. 6, and the other in Esther ii. 14. Now Rashi, who, in his commentary on Gen. xxv. 6, follows the traditional exposition of the Midrash, remarks, "The textual reading is $\quad$ defeetive [that is withont the pluxal Jod], because Abraham had only one concubine, namely, Hagar, who was identical with Keturah." But this reading, which is contrary to the Massoretic text, has evidently arisen from a pions desire to lessen the number of concabines of the father of the Hebrew nation. The Bereshith Rabba, from which Rashi's remark is derived, is the part of the Midrash Rabba, or exposition of the Pentatench, which treats on Bereshith $\xlongequal{=}$ Genesis. For an accoant of the Midrash, sse Kitto's Cyclopadia, s.v.
    ${ }^{42}$ For an explanation of Mczuzah ses above, p. 95, note 18. The variations between the Talmud and the Massorah, adduced by Levita, are taken from Jacob b. Chajim's In/roduction to the Rabbinic Bible : comp. p. 19, \&c., where they are fully discussed.

[^98]:    43 Ths thirtesn instsnces in which the plaral רנריך occurs defective are, Gen. xxx. 34; xlvii. 30 : Numb. xiv. 20 : Pe. cxix. 9, 16, 25, 28, $42,65,105,107,169$. The Massorsh marginalis, both on Gen. xxx. 34, and on xlvii. 30 , mentions the thres instancse which occar in the Pentatench as bslonging to the thirteen defectives, and refers to the Msseorah finalis for the whole list. Bnt ws could find no snch list in the Massorsh.

[^99]:    44 The three passages in which ${ }^{T}$ ר is defective are, Exod. xxxiji. 13 ; Josh. i. 8 ; Pa. cxix. 37. They are ennmerated in the Massorah marginalis on Exod. xxxiii. 13.

[^100]:    ${ }_{55}$ Both the Basel and the Sulzbach editione have המרים ' $\lambda$, "the word is alwaye defective, except in Jeremiah, where it is found three times defective." But this is
     times in Jeremiah, viz., xlvi. 12, 21; xlix. 3.
    ${ }^{46}$ The thirty-five instances in which wh is plene are, Gen. xxxi. 35 : Lsvit. v. 1 : 1 Sam. ji. 24 ; xix. 4: 1 Kings xviii. 5 ; xx. 8; xxii. 18 : 2 Kinge v. 17; vi. 12: Iaa. xvi. 14 ; xxviii. 15 : Jerem. ii. 25,31 ; iii. 3,12 ; iv. 11 ; v. $9,10,12$ (thrice), 24 ; vi. 9 ; vii. 28 ; viii. 6,20 ; x. 4 ; xv. 7,11 ; xxix. 23 ; xlviii. 27 ; xlix. 20 : Ezek. xvi 56 ; xxiv. 16 : Lament. i. 12. They are enumerated, in a most confneed manner, in the Massorah marginalis on Levit. v. 1.

    47 The foarteen instances in which עור is defective are, Gen. viii. 22; xix. 12; xl. 13 : 2 Sam. xiv. 32: 1 Kings xii. 5: Jerem. ii. 9 ; xiii. 27 ; xv. 9 ; xxxiii. 13: Hoe. xii. 1, 10 : Micah i. 15 : Zech. viii. 20: Pe. Exxix. 2; xxxix. 2. Comp. Maesorah marginalis on Gen. viii. 22, with Jerem. xv. 9.

[^101]:    4s The words sense, are omitted in the Salabach edition.

[^102]:    49 The five paseagee in which $4 \pi$ is defective are, 2 Sam. xx. 15 ; 1 Kinga xxi. 23 ; Isa. xxvi. 1 ; Obad. 20 ; Lament. ii. 8. They are enumerated in the Massorsh marginalis on 2 Sam. xx. 15.

    50 The reference, both in the Basel and Solzbach editions, to in is a mistake for וימר אל אלו. The note in the Massorah parva on the word in question is
     , לית תסר באילים, no parallel of defective, among the words derived from ancther recencion of the Massorah.

[^103]:    ${ }^{51}$ The other three passages in which קול is defective are, Gen xlv. 16; Exod. xix. 16 ; Jerem. jii. 9. They are ennmerated in the Massorah marginalis on Gen. xxvii. 22.
    ${ }^{62}$ The other two instances in which הקימימי is entirely plene are, 2 Sam. vii. 12; 2 Chron. vii. 18. They are given in the Massorah marginalis on Ezek. xvi. 60, where, however, there is a mistake, inasmuch as it substitntes 1 Chron. xiii. 2 for 2 Chron. vii. 18. In the Maseorah parva, on the last mentioned passage, the remark 'מל entirely plene, will be found, to which Levita refers.
    ${ }^{68}$ The eleven paseages in which ${ }^{\text {ה }}$ is entirely defective, that is, hae neither Jod after the Chirel nor Vav after the Cholem, are, Gen. vi. 18; ix. 11, 17; xvii. 7, 19 ; xxvi. 3; Exod. vi. 4: 1 Kings ix. 5: Jerem. xxiii. 4, 5; xxix. 10: Ezelf. xxxiv. 29. We could not find the entire list either in the Massorah marginalis on the respective passagee, or in the Massorah finalis.
    ${ }^{54}$ The other five passages in which has Jod plene after the Ohirek and Vav defective after the Cholem, are, 1 Sam. xv. 13: 2 Sam. ii. 35; vii. 12: Isa. xxix. 3: Ezek. xvi. 62. In the Massorah marginalis on Levit. xxvi. 9, where the passages are given, 2 Sam. ii. 35 is erroneonsly omitted, and 2 Chron. vii. 18 , which is entirely plene, is substituted for it.

[^104]:    65 In the recensione of the Massorah, printed in the Basel and Amsterdam editions of the Rabbinic Bihles, the remark is that 1 Sam. xv. 13, ie one of the three instances in which it has the tone of the penultima (מלy ' 5 ), and the Massorah marginalis on Gen. ix. 17, gives the three instances ae follows:-Gen. ix. 17; Exod. vi. 4; 1 Sam. xv. 13.

    56 The words 5 להיוח to be plene, are erroneously omitted in the Snlzbach edition.

[^105]:    ${ }^{67}$ There is a great difference of opinion among the Massorites as to the reading of the word in question, in the different passages of the Scriptnres. The Massorah marginalis on Gen. ii. 4, remarks as follows:- חילדוח ב' מלאים רמלאי וסי אלח חולדות השמים והארץ
     תמלדוח, יעקב ושאר אוריחא חולרות כחיב. The word is twice entirely plene, viz., Gen. ii. 4, Ruth. iv. 8; once entirely Defective, viz. Gen. xxy. 12; and thrice it wants the first $\mathrm{VAV}_{\mathrm{AV}}$ viz., Gen. xxxvi. 1, 9; xxxvii. 2; whilst in all other passages throughout the Pentateuch it is written with the first $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{AV}}$, and without the second. Another recension of the Massorah, given in the Massorah finalis under the letter Jod, p. $35 b$, col. 2, is as
     צר סופא דסיפרא תלרוח צתיב בט"ב חלדח בחיב חסר דחסר חלדה עשו הלרח ישמעאל וב' כהיב תולרות מל' דמל' אלה חיולדוח השמים ואלה חולרות פרץ; וג' כתבי חלדות חלדות עשי חוא ארום , ושל אחרו אבי אדוס אלה חלדות יעקב second $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{AV}}$, except in one place, viz., v .1 , where it has the second $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{AV}}$ and not the first; from Gen. xxv. 19, to the end of the book, it is written with the second Vav and without the first, except in two instances, viz., Gen. xxxvi. 1, xxv. 12, where it is entirely defective ; in two passages, viz., Gen. ii. 4, Ruth iv. 18, where it is entirely plene, and three passages, viz. Gen. xxxvi. 1, 9 , xxvi. 19. It will he seen that Gen. xxy. 19 is counted twice.

[^106]:    ${ }^{58}$ In Exod. iii. 13, אבוחריצם is entirely plene, and in Deut. i. 11 it has Vav but wants Jod. Comp. Massorah marginalis on Exod iii. 13.

[^107]:    69 The Massorah only gives sixteen words, which respectively occur in one place with silent Aleph or altogether without Aleph, and have no parallel in other places. They are as follows:-
     finalis, where under the letter Aleph, p. 1, col. 2, they are also mentioned, it is erroneously stated that there are seventeen instances, which has undoubtedly occasioned the error in our text. These instances are also given in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section excix. pp. 43, 123, where one passage, viz. 1 Chron. v. 26, is wanting.

    60 For the division of the Pentateuch into fifty-four Pericopes, for hebdomadal lessons, see above, p. 135, note 138. Vajigash (wirn) is the eleventh section, and comprises Gen. xliv. 18 -vlvii. 27 ; Behaaloscha (בהמתותך) is the thirty-sixth section, and comprises Numb. viii. 1 -xii. 16; Shelach (ש), more fully Shelach Lecha (שלח לך), is the thirtyseventh gection, and comprises Numh. xiii. 1-xy. 41; whilst Eleb (עקy) is the forty-gixth section, and comprises Deut. vii. 12-xi. 25.

[^108]:    ${ }^{65}$ The grammatical rule to which Levita refers is recorded hoth in the Babylonian and the Jerusalem Talmude as having been propounded by $R$. Nehemiah. In the Bahylouian Talmud (Jebamoth, 13 b) it is as follows:-- רי נחמיה אומר לל תימה שיצריכה , h. Nehemiah sayeth: Every word which requires Lamed at the beginning of the Scripture gives He at the end. In the Jernaalem Talmod, however (Jebamoth i. 6, p. 3a, ed. Graetz), it is חני בשם רבי נדמיה
     הוכוכוכוחוח ought to have Lamed at the beginning, and has it not, takes He at the end, as [Deat. xxy. 5] instead of שמיחה ; לחוץ [Judg. iii. 26] instead of סוכוחה ; [Exod. xii. 37] instead of תמכול'. It will he seen that Levita's quotation is from the Babylon Talmud; but since the Jerusalem Talmud, which contains the original rule, as is evident from the whole complexion of the passage, has not the expression madversions are nugatory. Equally feeble is his atricture on the word by, since the instances which are qdduced in the Talmud itself to illustrate this role plainly show that R. Nehemiah did not mean to extend it to every word, hut applied it to those denoting locality. For the use of the local He, see Gesening' Grammar, section xc.

[^109]:    ${ }^{66}$ The twenty-eight instances in which מצרימה occurs with $H e$ at the end are, Gen. xii. $10,11,14$; xxvi. 2 ; xxxvii. 25 , 28 ; xxxix. 1 ; xli. 57 ; xIv. 4 ; xlvi. $3,4,7,8,9,26$, 27; xlviii. 5 ; 1. 14: Exod. i. 1 ; iv. 21; xiii. 17 : Numb. xiv. 3, 4; xx. 15: Deut. x. 22; xvii. 16 ; xxvi. 5 : 2 Chron. xxxi. 4. They are gnumerated in the Massorah marginalis on 2 Chron. xxxvi. 4.
    ${ }^{67}$ The twenty-nine instances in which occurs arb, Isa. xxxix. 6: 2 Kinge xxiv. 15 (twice), 16 ; xxy. 13 : Isa. sliii. 14: Jerem. xx. 4, 5 ; xxvii. 16, 18, 20, 22; xxviii. 4 ; xxix. 1, 3, 4, 15, 20 ; xxxix. 7; x1. 1, 7; lii. 11, 17 : Ezek. xii. 13; xvii. 12, 20: 2 Chron. xxxiii. 11; xxvi. 6, 10. They ars ennmerated in the Massorah finalis, p. $16 a$, cole 3, 4.

    66 The five passages in which ${ }^{6}$ ירושלימשי occars ars, 1 Kinge x. 2; 2 Kings ix. 28; I6e. xxxvi. 2; 2 Chron. xxxii. 9. They are enomerated in the Massorah marginalis on Isa. xxyvi. 2 , with the remark that in four of the passages it-is defective.
    ${ }^{69}$ The five passages in which חhecurs are, Joshua x. $39: 2$ Sam. ii. 1; v. 1, 3; xv. 9: 1 Chron. xi. 1, 3; xii. 23, 38. They are snumerated in the Massorah marginalis on Joshua x. 39.

    70 The eight passages in which האהלה occurs are, Gen. xviii. 6; xxiv. 67: Exod. xviii. 7; xxxiii. 8, 9; Nnmb. xi. 26 : Josh. vii. 22: Jndges iv. 18. They are ennmerated in the Massorah marginalis on Judges iv. 18.

    71 The eighteen instances in which ${ }^{2}$ occurs are, Gsn. xix. 10; xxiv. 32 ; xxxix. 11; xliii. 16, 26 (twice) : Exed. ix. 19: Josh. ii. 18: Judg. xix. 15, 18: 1 Sam. vi. 7: 2 Sam. xiii. 7; xiv. 31; xvi. 20: 1 Kings xiii. 7, 15 ; xvii. $23: 2$ Kings iv. 32; ix. 6. They ars enumerated in the Maseorah marginalis on 1 Kinge xiii. 15.
    ${ }^{72}$ This mast sursly be a mistalks, sinces thers are apwards of thirty instances in which הממובחה occars, viz.-Exod. xxix. 13, 18, 25 : Lsvit. i. 9, 13, 15, 17 ; ii. 2, 9 ; ,iii. 5, 11, 16 ; iv. 19, 26, 31, 35 ; v. 12; vii. 5, 31; viii. 16, 21, 28; ix. 10, 14, 20 ; xiv. 20 ; xvi. 25 : Numb. ₹. 26 : 2 Chron. xxix. 22 (thrice), 24. The Massorah finalis enumerates them under the letter Zajin, p. $30 a$ a col. 1 .
    ${ }^{75}$ The eight passages in which ארצה כנען occur coujointly ars, Gen. xi. 31; xii. 5 (twics) ; xxxi. 18; xlii. 29; xlv. 17; 1. 13: Numb. xxxv. 10. The entire list is nowhers given, though the Maseorahe marginalis on Numbers xxxv. 10, and finalis, p. 11a, coI. 4, refer to each other for it.

[^110]:    74 The twenty-nine instances in which $\begin{aligned} \\ \text { occurs withont } H e, ~ a r e ~ a s ~ f o l l o w s:-G e n . ~ x l . ~\end{aligned}$ 13 ; Exod. xxv. 16, 21, 26, 30 ; xxvi. 34 ; xxviii. 23,30 ; xxix. 3, 6, 17 ; xxx. 16, 18 (twice); xl. 7 (twice), 8 ; Levit. ii. 15; xxiv. 7; 1 Kings viii. 34, 39; Judg. xv. 18; Ps. 1xi. 6; Lan. x. 12; Nehem. ix. 15, 20, 35 (twice). They are ennmerated in the Massorah marginalis on Exodus xxv. 21.

[^111]:    75 The whole sentence בלי אות נח אי נע אחריו ולטיכך באה ה"א אחר כל ת״"ו הדגושה בדגש ,חזק בסףן התיבה, without being followed either by a silent or vocal letter, and hence the He after every Tav which has Dagesh forte, is entirely omitted in the Sulzbach edition.

[^112]:    1 The Prayer Books (סרורי החפלוֹ), to which Levita refers, are the authoxised Lit urgies which the Jews use to the present day.

[^113]:    ${ }^{10}$ This is but one of five instances in which the textual reading has $H e$ in the midale of the word, and the marginal reading has not. The other four words are
     They are enumerated in the Massorah finalis under the letter $\mathrm{He}, \mathrm{p} .22 a$, col. 3.
    ${ }^{11}$ For the forty-eight instances, see above, p. 171, note 62.
     Massorah marginalis on Dan. iv. 4; v. 8 ; and in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section clii. pp. 36, 110.

[^114]:    They are enumerated in the Massorah marginalis on Jerem. i. 1.; Massorah finalis

[^115]:    ${ }^{24}$ Levita must surely be mistaken, since the Rabbins do not say that the Kethiv is , צרפה, but simply try to identify the two words by way of Midrash, which is feequently the case. Comp. Sota, 42 b , and Rashi on 2 Sam. xxi. 18.
    ${ }^{25}$ The other two instances in which the textual reading has Daleth, and the marginal reading Tav, are 2 Sam. xxiii. 3, and Song of Songs iv. 2.
    ${ }^{26}$ The two instances in which the textual reading has D ה, snffix third person plural masculine, and the marginal reading $\square$, suffix second person plural masculine, are also given in the Massorah finalis under the letter He, p. $22 a$, col. 4 , and in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section cli., pp. 36, 110.
    ${ }^{27}$ In the alphabet denominated Atbach (אטבח), the commutation of the letters takes place according to the numerical valne as represented by the respective pairs, which is effected in the following manner. The Hebrew alphabet is divided into three classes, consisting respeclively of four pairs, or eight letters, and representing ten, a hundrcd, and a thousand. The first class, therefore, comprises the letters Aleph, Beth, Gimmel, Daleth, Vav, Zajin, Cheth, and Teth; the second class compri6es Jod, Kaph, Lamed, Mem, Samech, Ajin, Pe and Tzaddi ${ }_{i}$ whilst the third class contains Final Mem, Final Nun, Final Pe, Final Tzaddi, Koph, Resh, Shin, and Tav. When thos divided and paired, according to their numerical value, we obtain the following Table:-

[^116]:    are doubled when required, or they are coupled together among themselves, whereby they also yield 10,100 , and 1000 , as follows : ה ה Accordingly the commutation takes place between every pair, and the name Atbach (אט"ב), by which this anagramic alphabet is designated, is obtained from the first two specimen pairs of the letters which indicate the inter thange. Through the application of this, alpbabet, Prov. xxix. 21 is rendered-" He who satisfies his desire in this world, against him it will testify at the end;" בוצר being taken to denote this world, 172 his servant, his desive, question, makes סטדוֹ witness, the being exchanged with the $\square$, the 3 with the $n$, the $i$ with the 7 , and 3 again with the $ה$. Hence, also, we obtain rib from azh, the a and 1 being interchanged; and hence, too, in from mb , to which Levita refers in tile text. It must be remarked, that interpretation by the aid of this alphabet was rescrted to from time immemorial, and that the exposition of Prov. xxix. 21 by its aid is already given in the Talmud. Comp. Sucea, $52 b$. For other anagramic alphabets, see Ginsburg, the Kabbalah, p. 54, \&c., Longmans, 1865.
    ${ }_{26}$ To anderstand Levita's mnemonical sign, it is to be borne in mind that the numerical value of the word ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{N}$ is sixty-one, viz., $\} 50+, 10+\infty 1=61$; that the expression minus one (Tת), which is erroneonsly omitted in the Sulzbach edition, indicates that one is to be added, thus making the required namber 62; and that there is also a play opon the words in the whole phrase, since it alludes to a well known hermeneutical rale denominated מוקרם ומאודר, according to which whole sentences are transposed. Comp. Kitto's Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature, s. v. Midrase, Rules xxic. a d xyxii.
    ${ }_{29}$ The list in question has already bean given, vide supra, p. 116, note 67 .

[^117]:    50 The words
    31 These instances are also enumerated in the Massorah marginalis on 2 Sam. v. 2 ; Erara iv. 12 ; and in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, sections ci. and cii, pp. 29, 97.
    
    85. Both lists will he fonnd on p. 109 , \&c., note 51. All the three editions of the Massoreth Ha-Massoreth erroneonisly state that there are ten (7' 1 ) words in the textual reading, which are not read in the marginal reading, and eight ('n) viege versa. We have corrected the text, since it is well lmown that the reverse is the case.

[^118]:    ${ }^{94}$ The ffteen instances in which the textual reading has one word, and thé marginal reading two, are as follows:-

    |  | Gen. xxx. 11 | מהם . . Ezek. viii. | מגהסצרה . Job xxxviii. |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    |  | Exod. iv. 2 | מלבם . . Isa. iii. 15 | מנסצרT . Job xi. |
    | צשדת | ent. xxxiii. 2 | ם . . . . Ps. х. 10 | המשרוצים . Nehem. ii. 13 |
    | מאשדם | Jerem vi. 29 | - . . . Ps.lv. 16 | 号 |
    | וה | erem. xviii | [10 |  |

    The eight instances in which the reverse is the case, that is, the text having two words, and the margin one word, are as follows:-
    
     . 1 Sam. xxiv. 9 מן המערה 9 . Lament. i. 6
    The first list is given in the Maseorah marginalis on 1 Chron. xxvii. 12; Tractate Sopherim vii. 3 ; and in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, eection xcix., pp. 29, 96, \&c. The second list is given in the Massorah marginalis on 2 Chron. xxxiv. 6; Tractate Sopherim vii. 3; and in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section c. pp. 29, 97.
    ${ }^{85}$ For the fanciful interpretations and mysterious meanings ascribed to this word, in consequence of its having a final Mem in the middle, see Kitto's Cyclopadia of Biblical Literature, s. v. Keri and Kethiv.

[^119]:    ${ }^{36}$ The four instances in which the Keri snbstitutes the words in question are, Deut. xxyiii. 30 ; Jerem. iii. 2 ; Isa. xiii. 16 ; Zech. xiv. 2. Comp. Massorah marginalis on Is. xiii. 16, and Oehla Ve-Ochla, section clxix., pp. 38, 114.
    ${ }^{37}$ There are six instances in which the alteration in question is made in the margin, vide supra, p. 109, note 49 . The rule of the amges, to which Levita refers, and according to which the alterations in question have been made, is given in the Talmud, Megrlla, 25 b. Comp. also Jacob b. Chajim's Introduction to the Rabbinie Bible, pp. 13, 25, ed. Ginsburg.
    ${ }^{38}$ The words ${ }^{\text {bin }}$, the Hebrew language, are omitted in the Sulzbaeh edition.

[^120]:    89 For De Balmes, see above, pp. 10, 17, 21. The quotation is from section i., p. 3 a, of the Grammar.
    ${ }^{40}$ From Levita'e remark, it would appear that he wrote animadversione on De Balmes' Grammar. We have, however, not heen able to find any trace of this pablication.

[^121]:    41 The complete alphabetical list is given in the Massorah marginalis, on Levit. i. 1. We deviate from our general practice, and do not give this alphabetical list, hoth because it is extremely long, and because it does not contain any material changes in the text.
    ${ }_{42}$ The Massorah gives twenty-five auch instances; they are as follows:-

    | תענה | Exod. xxii. 22 | ותקראו | Jerem. xxxii. 23 | העלה | Habak. i. 15 |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | מרבה | Levit. zi. 42 | תאבדה | Prov. i. 10 | העברה | Josh. vii. 7 |
    | לםרבה | Isa. ix. 6 | מלוד | Prov. xix. 17 | ישר" | Prov. iii. |
    | מקרד | Deut. xxiii. 11 | מתסה | Isa. xxviii. 17 | יל7 | Prov. xxvii. 1 |
    | ועעשה | Jo6h. ix. 24 | מרצד | I6a. xxxii. 14 | לדן | Ezek. xviii. 14 |
    | דוראה | 1 Kinge xviii. 1 | ומצוה | Isa. 1v. 4 | וד | Jerem. xxix. 23 |
    | תהיה | Jerem xvii. 17 | תראה | Dan. i. 13 | תבל | Isa. Ixvi. 7 |
    | מורד | i. 10 | הוה | $\text { Numb. viii. } 7$ | פהת | Pe, cxix. 130 |

    They are enumerated in the Maseorah finalie, under the Koph, p. $56 a$, col. 1.
    15 The fifteen inatances in which occurs with Tzere are as follows:--Gen. xix. 29 ;
    xxx. 26, 37 ; Exod. xxv. 29; xxxvii. 16; Levit. x. 1; Numb. x. 3; Dent. xxviii. 52 ; Jerem. iv. 29 ; li. 43 (twice); xlviii. 9 ; I日a. xxxviii. 16; Ezek. xlii. 14 ; 1 Sam. xxxi. 7. They are enumerated in the Massorah finalis, under the letter $H e, p .24 \mathrm{~b}, \mathrm{col}$. 2. It is in the Massorah parva that the vowel-signs to which Levita refers are given.

[^122]:    44 The four passages in which מאכל occurs, with Pattach under the Kaph, are, Gen. xl. 17; 1 Kinge x. 5; Job xxxiii. 20; 2 Chron. ix. 4. They ere enumerated in the Massorah marginalis on Gen. sl. 17.
    ${ }^{45}$ The five passages in which ${ }^{\boldsymbol{N}}$ occurs, fith Segol under the $H e$, are, Numb. xxiii. 9, 24; Job viii. 19 ; xxxiii. 12 ; xxxi. 35. They are enumerated in the Maseorah mexginalis on Numb. xxiii. 9.
    ${ }^{45}$ The list of the words which have Pattach, with Athnach and Soph-pasuk, is nowhere giver' in the Massorah. From the detached remarks in the Massorah parva, however, we gather the following twelve words, which have Pattach with Athnach :-
    

    ומלנה
    והחה . . Gen. xvi. 4 שבצ . . Gen. xxviii. 10 Gen. xxxiv. 25
    
    To these may be added (Gen. xxi. 15) and (ibid. xiii. 19). As to the seven instances in which the words have Pattach with Soph-pasuk, we could not find any more than those addnced in the text. It must, however, be remarked, that there is a great difference of opinion npon several of the passages given in the list. Comp. the Mebin Chidoth, on Gen. xvii. 17, p. 10 b.

[^123]:    ${ }^{47}$ The section is the last of the four dissertations composing the Poetical Dissertation, and the rule here referred to is on p. 63, ed. Prague, 1793.

    48 The six instances in which בבית occurs Raphe are, Exod. xi'. 46: 1 Kings iii. 17: 2 Sam. vii. 6: 1 Chron. xvii. $5:$ Isa. v. 8: Amos vi. 9. They are enumerated in the Massorah marginalis on 1 Kings iii. 17.
    ${ }^{49}$ The fifteen passages in which בכסף Raphe are, Gen. xxiii. 9: Josh. xxii. 8 : 2 Sam. xxiv. 24, with 1 Chron. xxi. 22, 24 : 1 Kings xxi. 6, 15 : Isa. xlviii. 10; lii. 3 : Jerem. x. 4 : Ezel. xxvii. 12: Micah iii. 11: Ps. cv. 37 : Lament. $\nabla .4$ : Ezra i. 4 : Dan. xi. 38. They are given in the Massorah marginalis on Josh. xxii. 8.

    50 The six instances in which wbjh is Raphe are, Isa. xxii. 23 : Jexem. lii. 32 : Ps. ix. 5 ; cxxxii. 111, 12: Neiem. iii. 7. They are given in the Massorah marginalis on Isa. xxii. 23 : Nehem. iii. 7.

[^124]:    51 The thres passages in which בליליק occurs Raphe are, Gen. xL. 5; xli. 11 : Nehsm. ix. 19. They are snumerated in the Massorah marginalis on Gen. xl. 5.

    52 The eight passages in which בחרב is Raphe are, 1 Sam. xvii. 45, 47: 2 Sam. xii. '9: Isa. xxxi. 8: Jerem. 8x. 4: Ezel. xxvii. 23: Hag. ii. 22 : Dan. xi. 33. They are snumerated in the Massorah marginalis on 1 Sam. xxii. 45.
    ${ }^{68}$ As בבהמה only occurs four times Raphe, viz., Levit. vii. 21 ; xx. 15 ; xxvii. 10, 26we have corrected the text, which in the three editions states that the word in question is six ('1) times Raphe. Comp. Massorah marginalis on Levit. vii. 21.

    54 The five passages in which 1 is Raphe are, Numb. xx. 17 ; xxi. 22: Isa. v. 8 : Ruth ii. 8. 22. Comp. the Massorah marginalis on Numb. xx. 17.

    65 The seven passages in which לבנ occurs with Dagesh in the Kaph are, Gen. xvi. 12 ; xxiv. 1: 2 Sam. xxiii. 5: Ps. ciii. 19: Eccles. v. 8: Ezra x. 17: 1 Chron. xxix. 12. They are given in the Massorah finalis under the letter Kaph, p. 39, col. 4.

    56 The two instances in which ${ }^{2}$ Is'Raphe, i. e. Pattach nnder the Lamed, are, Numb. xxxyi. 6, and Eccles. ix. 2. They are given in the Massorah marginalis on Numb, xxxvi. 6.

    57 The eleven places in which has Kametz under the Lamed are, Exod, iv. 11 : Jerem. x. 23: Zeph. i. 17 : Prov. xxvii. 19 : Job xxviii. 28 : Eccles. i. 2; ii. 18, 22 ; vi. 12 (twice); viii. 15. Both the Massorah marginalis on Jersm. x. 23, and the Och7a Ve-Ochla, section xv., pp. 62, 175, describe this rubric as follows:-" "occurs five times with Kametz nnder the Lamed; it is likswise so throughout Ecclesiastes, except in ons place where the Lamed has Sheva, viz., ii. 26."

    55 The thirty-two passages in which wrok occurs with Kametz undsr the Lamed are, Gen. xliii. 6, 11 ; xlv. 22 : Levit. xvii. 4 ; xxv. 27; Numb. y. 8 : Dent. xxii. 16; xxv. 9 : Judg. xvi. $19: 1$ Sam. ii. 15; ix. 7; xvii. 26, 27; xxvi. 23 ; 2 Sam. xii. 4; xviii. 11 : 1 Kings viii. 39 , with 2 Chron. vi. 30 : Jerem. xxvi. 11, $16: 2$ Kings xxii. 15, with 2 Chron. Exxiv. 23 : Malachi ii. 12: Prov. xy. 23 : xx. 3, 17 ; xxiv. 29 : Job ii. 4: Ruth iii. 3: Esther vi. 9, 11. They are enumerated in the Massorah finalis under the letter Aleph, p. 6 a, cols. 2 and 3.

[^125]:    ${ }^{59}$ Tha four instances in which $\overline{\text { limes in }}$ is Raphe are, Levit. xxvii. $10:$ Ps. xxy. 13 : Eccl. ii. 1; vii. 14: and the nine passages in which it is בive with Dagesh in the Teth are, Ggn. xx. 15 : Dent. xxiii. 17 : Isa. vii. 15, 16 : Jerem. xxix. 32: Ps. ciii. 5 : Job xxi. 13; xxxvi. 11:2 Chron. vi. 41. The former ars enumerated in the Massorah marginalis on Lsvit. xxvii. 10 ; and the latter, in ths Massorah marginalis on Iea. vii. 15, and Job xxi . 13 .
    ${ }^{60}$ The foor passagee in which is Raphe, that is has Sheva under the Kaph, are, Deut. xxxii. 11; Hahak. i. 8; Prov. xxiii. 5; Job. ix. 26; and the aeven passages in which the Kaph has Pattach are, Jerem. zlviii. 40 ; slix. 16, 22 : Hos. viii. 1; Ohad. 4; Micah i. 16; Pe. ciii. 5. For the former, see the Massorah maxginalie on Dent. xxxii. 11. The list of the latter we could not find any where in the Massorah.
    ${ }^{51}$ The two instances in which the Vav אואטא, Kal futurs, first person singular mascaline of m , has Sheva are, Pe.lv. 13 ; cxix. 48.
    ${ }^{62}$ The six instances in which the Vav conjanctive is Kal future, third person singular masorline, has Sheva are, 2 Kings ix. 17 : Isa. xliv. 16, 17 ; lviii. 9: Hahak. ii. 6 : Pe. Iviii. 12.
    ${ }^{68}$ This must sursly hs a mistake, since o.ly occure twice with Sheva under the Vav conjunctive, viz., Dsut. xxxii. 1: 2 Chron. xx. 9.

[^126]:     vi. 11.

    66 The thirty-two instances is which $\quad$ occurs with Chirek under $V$ av conjunctive have already heen given. Tide supra, p. 141, note 122.

    66 The two passages in which 10 occurs with Shurel are, Isa. xl. 27 : Ezek. xxiv. 27.
    67 The single instance in which ingocurs, is Jerem. li. 10.
    ss The nine instances in which $\begin{gathered}\text { and } \\ \text { occurs with Kametz under the } V a v a r e, ~ C r e n . ~\end{gathered}$ xxiv. 47 : Dent. x. 5 : 1 Sam. xxviii. 21: 1 Kings viii. 21 : Isa. li. 16 : Jerem. xii. 2 : Malachi i. 3: Joh xxxviii. 10: 2 Chron. vi. 11.
    

[^127]:    ${ }^{70}$ This is curely a mistake, eince the Maseorah marginalie on P6. Ixii. 9, ennmerates nine inetances in which Tra is Raphe, or has Chateph-pattach. They are ae followe:-
    
    
     The Maseorah, moreover, adde that ונמל , the future המחה is likewise Raphe, everywhere except in one instance, viz., $\mathrm{P}_{6}$. lvii. 2. In the Massorah finalis, ander the letter Cheth $32 a$, col. 2, where reference is made to the word in question, it is also distinctly stated that it is nine times Raphe.

[^128]:    71 The three instances in which מעטר occurs, with Dagesh = with Sheva ander the Ajin are, Levit. xxvii. 32: Numb. xpiii. 24: Levit. xxvii. 30. They are given in the Massorah finalis under the letter Ajin, p. $51 b$, col. 2.

    72 The Dissertation on the Accents, to which Levita refere, appeared in 1539 , within twelve months of the pablication of the treatise on the Massorah (vide-supra, p. 63, \&c.) The discussion on the tono accents, or Milel and Milra, is contained in the sixth chapter of the dissertation in question.

[^129]:    . . 2 Kings xxi. 13

    - Isa. xxviii. 17

    מחתלך . . Dent. xxxii. 18
    מת M . Ezek. xxviii. 9
    מאירות . . Isa. xxvii. 11
    מאירח , . . Ps. xix. 9
    , 2 Kings xxiii. 11
    [n] • . . Gen. xxxviii. 9
    ア J . . . Judg. vi. 28
    y נ . . 2 Chron. xxxiii. ${ }^{3}$
    נחם . . Hos. xiii. 14
    1 . 1 Chron. iv. 19
    tes. . . 1 Sam. xxix. 3
    190. . 2 Sam. i. 10

    פ . . . Ps. cxix. 71
    צניתי Ps. xxxy. 13
    תny . . Isa.iv. 4
    TNY . . Ezekiv. 12
    
    קראני . . . . Job iv. 14
    Lamenti. 19
    ירמנ. . 2 Sam. xix. 27
    שכלחי . . Gsn. xliii. 14
    שית ש . . Gen. xliii. 14
    שיששונו . . . Dan.ix. 12
    I . . 1 Sam. viii. 20
    תאומי Song of Songs iv. 5
    תאן Song of Songs vii. 4

[^130]:    ${ }^{88}$ The instances which illustrate all the remarks of Levita, made in this paragraph, are contained in the alphabetical list of Milels and Milras given in note 82 of the preceding page.

[^131]:    ${ }^{81}$ The number of Piskin in each book of the Bible is as follows :-

    | Genesis | 29 | Isaiah |  | Song of Songs | 10 |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | Exodus | 14 | Jeremiah | 31 | Ecclesiastes . | 3 |
    | Leviticus | 8 | Ezekiel | 28 | Lamentations | . . 8 |
    | Numbers | 22 | Minor Prophets. |  | Esther . |  |
    | Deuteronomy |  | 1 and 2 Cbronicles. |  | Daniel |  |
    | Joshun |  | Psalms |  | Ezra-Nehemiah | 13 |
    | Judges |  | Job . |  |  |  |
    | 1 and 2 Samuel | 48 | Proverbs |  |  | 9 |
    | 1 and 2 Kings | 45 | Ruth |  |  |  |

    They are enumerated in the Massorah finalis, p. 53, \&ce.
    ${ }^{85}$ For the anthor of the Aruch, i. e., R. Nathan b. Jechiel, see above, p. 2.
    ${ }^{86}$ The Talmudic discassion on the orthography of the proper name Chedorlaomer, to which Levita refers, is to be found in Chulin, $65 a$.

[^132]:    ${ }^{87}$ The five pairs of words which respectively occur once with the Vav conjunctive, and once without it, are,-

    | החדידה האפטה | Levit. xi. 19 |
    | :---: | :---: |
    | והחסידה והאנפה | Deut. xiv. 18 |
    | צין רמון | Josh. xix. 7 |
    | ועין | Josh. xy. 32 |
    | . | Ezra vii. 17 |
    | ודכרין ואמ | 9 |

    . . . . . . 2 Chron. i. 11
    ועטר יצקבים
    荡 . . . Exod. i. 3
    . . . . . Gen. xxxp. 23

    They are given in the Massorah finalis under the letter Vav, p. 28b, col. 1; and in the Ochla Ye-Ochla, section ccli., p. 138.

[^133]:    forty instances, adding במקך השכים [Prov. xxvii. 14] which otherwise is השכים בבקר. Properly ${ }^{\text {[ }}$ [Job xxrii. 2], as Dr. Frensdorff, the learned editor of the Ochla Ve-Ochla, rightly remarks, whereon the Massorah perve states "not extant" ('h), belonge to this rubric, since in all other pessages it is sh

    91 The three paseages in which occar canjointly are, Gen. viii. 15 : Exod. vi. 2; xx. 1. They are given in the Massorah marginelis on Gen. viii. 15.

    92 The twenty-five persages in which ויאמר אלהים occurs, are Gen. i. 3, 6, 9, 11, 14, 20, $24,26,29$; vi. 13; ix. $8,12,17$; xxi. 12; xvii. 15, 19, 9 ; xlvi. 2; xxxv. 1 : Exod. iii. 14: Numb. xxii. 12: 1 Kings iii. 5, 11: Jonah iv. 9: 2 Chron. i. 11 . They are given in the Massorah finalis under the letter Aleph, p. 8 b, cols. 2 and 3. All the three editions of the Massoreth Ha-Massoreth have twenty-four ( 7 "כ), which we have corrected, as it is a manifest hlunder.
    ${ }^{93}$ For the three peseages in which ברא אלהים oconrs, see sbove, p. 139, note 115.
    94 The twenty-four ( $7^{\prime}$ ) mnst be a mistake for twenty-eight ( $\pi$ ' 5 ), since the Massorsh marginglis on Exod. xxiv. 10 distinctly enumerstes twenty-eight instances in which
     Numb. xvi. 9: 1 Sam. v. 7, 8 (thrice), 11; vi. 5; i. 17; จ. 10; vi. 3: 2 Sam. xxiii. 3 : 1 Kings viii.. 26 : Isa. xxix. 23; xli. 17; xlv. 3, 15 ; xlviii. 2; lii. 12: Ezek. viii. 4 ; ix. 3; x. 19, 20; xi. 22; xliii. 2: 1 Chron. v. 26 : Ps. 1xix. 7: Ezra iii. 2; ix. 4.

[^134]:     iv. 40; xi. 9 ; vi. 2: P6. xxxi. 4: 2 Kings xix. 34: Isa. xxxvii. 35. As these nine instances are distinctly given in the Massorah marginalis on Isa. xxxvii. 35, and as both the Massorah marginalis on the different paseages in qrestion, and the Massorah finalie under the Lamed. p. 43 b , col. 1, emphatically state that there are nine instances, we have corrected the text which had six ('1), and which has evidently arisen from a misprint.

    102 The sixteen passages in which occnrs with Vav conjunctive, withont being preceded by ${ }^{2} \mathrm{~B}$, are, Levit. xvi. 14, 15 ; xix. 14: Nnmb. xxvii. $21: 1$ Kinge vi. 20 : 1sa. xlviii. 7 : Ps. lxxii. 5 : Prov. xv. 33 : Ps. cii. 1: Prov. xvii. 14; xviii. 16: Job viii. 12: Ezek. xlii. 4: Job xy. 7: Jerem. xliv. 10: Nehem. xiii. 4. They are given in the Maseorah marginalie on Nnmb. xxvii. 21.

    108 The eleven words which are preceded by אתה, and which in thie constraction occur only once, are as follows:-
    
     אחתה תרבר They are enumerated in the Massorah finalis, nnder the letter Aleph, p. 9 b 万, cols. 1 and 2, and in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section celxi., p. 142, \&c. As both the Massorah and the Ochla Ve -Ochla leave it beyond the shadow of a doubt that there are eleven such instances, we have corrected the text, which in all the three editions hae ( $\mathrm{r}^{\prime \prime}$ ) eighteen.

[^135]:    107 The "Section on the Different Kinds of Words" constitutes the second of the four sections, composing the work entitled "The Sections of Elias" (comp. p. 54, \&c., ed. Pragne, 1793), a deacription of which has already heen given, ride supra, p. 18, \&c.
    ${ }^{108}$ From the fact that these three verses have respectively seventy-two letters, great mysteries have been ass'gned to them from time immemorial. They have been identified with the Divine name, which consista of seventy-two words, or, according to Ibn Ezra, of
    
     Comp. Rashi on Succa, 45 a; Nachmanides, Introduction to his Commentary on the Pentateuch; Mn Ezra, Commentary on Exodus xiv. 19-21; xxxiii. 21; Ginsburg, the Kabbalah, p. 50, \&ce.

    109 The other three verses which respectively have five biliterals following each other are, Gen. vi. 10: 1 Sam. xx. 29: Nehem. ii. 2. They are noted in the Maerorah parva on each verse, and the whole list is given in the Massorah marginalis on 1 Kinga iji. 26, and Nehem. ii. 2. The text of three editions of the Massoreth Ha-Massoreth states that there are six (') such verses, bnt as this is contradicted by the explicit declarations of the Massorah, we have no donbt that it is a misprint, and have therefore corrected the text.

    110 The other fonr words in which the came letters follow three times are, מממלכה (Ps. cv. 13); ומממלכה (1 Chron. xvi. 20) ; כנכבי (Nehem. ix. 23); הממם (2 Chron. xp. 61. Comp. Ochla Ve-Ochla, section celxvii. pp. 52, 143.

[^136]:    123 The six verses which respectively have the same words four times, twice with Vav conjunctive, and twice withont it, are, -
    

    They are given in the Massorah marginalis on Exod. xviii. 21.
    125 The other passage in which the same word occurs four times, the first three
    

[^137]:    126 The six passages in which the conjectural reading in the Massorah proposes ממבn, third person singular feminine, instead of the textual reading ממנו, third person singular masculine, because of the antecedent to which it refers, and which is feminine, are, Levit. vi. 8; xxvii. 9; Josh. i. 7; Judg. xi. 34; 2 Kings iv. 39 : 1 Kinge xxii. 43. Thay are given in the Massorah marginalis on Levit. vi. 8; in the Massorah marginalis on Judg. xi. 34, where five instances only are given, there must therefore be a mistake.
    ${ }^{187}$ The eight places in which the conjectaral reading is plural, instead of singular, are, Numb. xiii. 22 : Ezek. xiv. 1; xxiii. 44; xxxvi. 20: 2 Sam. iii. 22: Ezek. xx. 38: Isa. xlv. 24: Jerem. li. 48. They are given in the Massorah marginalis on Numb. xiii. 22. It mast be noticed that they are not all the fature with Vav conversive.

[^138]:    120 The instauces in which the conjectural reading substitutes ${ }^{12} \boldsymbol{y}$ for the marginal reading יובי, are not three, as stated in the text of Levita, but four, viz., Gen. xlvi. 22 : Numb. xxvi. 8: 1 Chron. ii. 8: vii. 17. Neither is the statement that there are five instances in which the reverse is the case correct, aince there are six such conjectural readings, viz., 1 Chron. iii. 19, 21, 23 ; iv. 17; vii. 35; viii. 34. They are enumerated in the Massorah marginalis on Gen. xIvi. 22.

    129 The four passage in which the conjectural reading substitntes Jor the textual reading 7 שis, are, Exod. xiv. 13: Levit. vii. 36, 38 : Numb. ip. 49 . They are given in the Massorah marginalis on Levit. vii. 36. The ten instances in which the reverse is the case are, Deut. xvi. 10 ; xxiv. 8 : Josh. ii. 7 ; xiii. 8 ; xiv. 2. Jerem. xxiii. 27 : Isa. li. 13 : Hos. vii. 12: Jonah i. 14: Hag. i. 12. They are given in the Massorah marginalis on Jonah i. 14.
    $1 s 0$ The passages in which the conjectaral reading supplies the particle ak, are, Gen. xxiv. 4: 1 Sam. xpiii. 25: 2 Sam, xix. 8: Jerem. xxii. 12: 2 Chron. vi. 9. They are given in the Massorah marginalis on Gen. xxiv. 4.

    181 The other two passages in which the conjectural reading has tor for the textual reading 'מפנ, are, 2 Sam. xvi. 19: Amos v. 19. They are given in the Massorah marginalis on Numb. xxxiii. 8.

    132 The nine passages in which the conjectural reading has 7 for the textual reading לy, are, Gen. xlix, 13 : Josh. ii. 7; xiii. 16: Judg. vii. 22 : Jerem. xxxi. 39 : Dan. ix. 27: Nehem. xii. 22, 39 (twice). They are given in the Massorah marginalis on Gen. xlix. 13, where, however, the heading, as well as the reference to this rubric made in the Massorah finalis under the letter Ajin, p. 49 b, col. 3, states that there are eleven such instances. though it enumerates only nine, which agrees with the text of Jevita.

[^139]:    183 These three instances are given in the Massorah margiaalis on Dent. xxyiii. 46, and in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section celxviii., pp. 52, 143.

    184 The four verses in which the expression Levites (כלוים) precedes Priests (כהנים) are, Jerem. xxxiii. 21: 2 Chron. xix. 8; xxix. 26 ; xxx. 21. They are given in the Massorah finalis on Jerem. xxxiii. 21: 2 Chron. xxx. 21; and in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section celxxx., p. 151.

[^140]:    135 The meaming of the Massoretic remark which Levita quotes is, that though the four names עממרם יצהר חברון עויאל Amram, Izhar, Hebron, and Uzziel, are exactly the same in all the five passages in which they occur, as far as the words themselves are concerned, yet the letter Vav or the conjunctive is placed differently in each passage, as will be seen from the following enameration of them :-
    

    They are given in the Massorah marginalis on Exod. xvi. 18, where, however, the instance in Numh. iii. 19 is 'omitted, thongh the rubric states that there are five such passages. The Ochla Ve-Ochla, section celxxxviii., pp. 54, 152, \&c., rightly supplies this omission.

[^141]:    ${ }^{186}$ The Massorah differs as to the number of these instances. Thns, on Ysa. i. 1, the Massorah marginalis (as Levita in the text before ns) remarks that there are four anch pairs, and ennmerates them as follows:-

    | , . . . . Dent. vi. 13. |  |
    | :---: | :---: |
    |  | Deut. x. 20. |
    | \% | Dent. xrii. 6. |
    | צ\% עי שלשה ער | - Deut. xix. 15. |
    | אבו טמוף | Isa. xxviii. 12. |
    | אבוי שמוע הול יד | Isa. xxx. 9. |
    |  |  |
    |  |  |

    In the Massorah marginalis on Ezek. xi. 13, however, it is stated that there are seven such instances, and the following two pairs are added :-
    解 . Ps. xxiv. 7, 8
     There can therefore be but little donbt that the remark in the Massorah finalis, under the letter Vav, p. 28b, col. 4, that there are ten (') such instances, has arisen from a corruption of the letter Vav ('1), than which nothing is more easy aud common. In the Och'a Ve-Ochla, section cexxxiv., p. 133, the following two pairs are added, as being fonud (לגד, ממשורהא) apart from those stated in the Massorah :-
    
    
    It is also to be added that the pair which forms the fifth in the rubric given in the Massorah margiualis on Ezelk. xi. 13, is, in the Ochla Ve-Ochla, included in those instrnces to be found " apart from the Massorah."

[^142]:    137 The axiom of the Rabhins, to which Levita refers, has already been discussed, vide supra, p. 173.

    135 The alphabetical list of words in the Hebrew Scriptares, written with majuseular letters, is as follows:-
    

    | שמע | Dent. vi. 4 |
    | :---: | :---: |
    | בשזרברא | . . Dan. vi. 20 |
    | ובהעטיך | Gen. xxx. 42 |
    | צֻו | Isa. lvi. 10 |
    | P1 | Ps. lxxiv. 4 |
    | אחר | Exod. xxxiv. 14 |
    | שֶיר . | Song of Songs i. 1 |
    | . ותכחב | . . Esther ix. 29 |

    This list is given in the Massorah marginalis on Gen. i. 1; in the Massorah marginalis on 1 Chron. i. 1 , however, where the list is repeated, the following alterations are made,
     (Joh ix. 34); both משטפטן (Numb. xxvii. 5), and ובהעשיך (Gen. xxx. 42), are omiitted; and (Deut. xviii. 13) is substituted for ותמבת (Esther ix. 29). In the Ochla VeOchla again, where the list is also given, section lxxxiii., p. 88, $\boldsymbol{y}^{\boldsymbol{j}}$ (Levit. xi. 42) is sabstituted for אn (Esther ix. 9). (Dau. vii. 10), representing final Mem, is addéd ; ובנבה (P9. lxxx. 16) is given instead of (Exod. xxxiv. 7); and ובהעמיך (Gen. xxx. 42) is omitted. The Ochla Ve-Ochla, moreover, (section lxxxii., p. 82), gives another alphabetical list of majuscular letters contained in the Pentateuch alone, which is as follows:-
    

[^143]:    ${ }^{142}$ The eight passages in which ${ }^{\text {ans }}$ is Hiphil futare are, Exol. iii. 17: Jndg. ii. 1: 1 Sam. xxviii. 11: 2 Sam. xxiv. 24: Jerem. xxx. 17; xlvi. 8: Ps. 1xvi. 15; exxxyii. 6. They are enumerated in the Massorah marginalis on Exod. iii. 17.

    148 The ten passages in which 1 וn is Kal are, Exod. iv. 29: Numb. xi. 32 : 1 Sam. v. 8. 11 ; xvii. 1:2 Sam. xxi. $13: 2$ Kings xxiii. 1: 2 Chron. xxix. 15; xxiv. 11: Jerem. xl. 12. They are giveu in the Massorah marginalis on Exod. iv. 29, where, however, they are not designated Pashtin, as is stated by Levita, but (פחחן) Psachin.

[^144]:    144 Thongh the Massorah finalis, under the letter Aleph, p. $3 a$, \&c., only gives one hundred and thirty-four, yet there can he no douht that there are many more than those enumerated onder this ruhric.

    146 The twenty-one words which have He at the end, after Kaph, of the second person singular masculine, have already been given (vide supra, p. 177).

    146 The maxim to which Levita refers was propounded hy R. Tambum h. Hanilai, and is to be found in Aboda Sara, 19 b. In its entirety it is as follows:-א חנחום בר

[^145]:    , R. Tamhum b. Hanilai propounded that man should always divide his time into three parts: one-third he should devote to the study of the Scripturc, one-third to the study of the Mishna, and one-third to the study of the Talmud.

    147 The exegetical rule, that "no Scripture oversteps its simple meaning," to which Levita refers, is to be found in Sabbath $63 a$, and in many other parts of the Talmud.
    ${ }^{148}$ For the description of the manner in which the Massoretic notes were treated, to which Levita refers, see above, p. 94.

[^146]:    ${ }^{149}$ The sixteen words which have no parallel in the whole Scriptares, except in one book only, where they have respectively a parallel, are as follows:-
    . למלאכה . Levit. xiii. 51 בנשים . Numb. xxxi. 18 . 1 Sam. xvii. 18 התפקדו . . 1 Kings xx. 27 וצבא . . . . Joh x. 17
    

    מוֹחת - . . 1 Sam. i. 9
    לצבי . . . . Isa. iv. 2
    ועדחיו . . Deut. vi. 17
    1 Chron. xiii. 10
    Lament. v. 21

[^147]:    $15 s$ The other two inetances in which akioccurs at the beginning of a verse in the minor Prophets are, Amos ix. 3, 4. We could not find them epecified any where in the Maseorah.

    154 The nine inatances in which $\boldsymbol{F}$ ו begine the verse are, Levit. xxyi. 44: Ezek. xxiii. 40: Habak. ii. 5: Pe. Ixxviii. 31: Joh xix. 4; xxxvi. 16: Ezra v. 10, 14 ; vi. 5. They are given in the Maseorah marginalis on Job xix. 4; xxxvi. 16: Ezra v. 10. In the Maseorah parva, on Ezek. xxiii. 40, and Pe. Ixxviii. 31, where reference is made to this fact, it is erroneously stated that there are eix [ 1 ] snch instancee, whilst on Job xix. 4; xxxvi. 16, the Maesorah parva remarks that there are ten [ ${ }^{\prime}$ "] such paseages: and there can be but little doubt that though this, too, is an error, the former is a corruption of the latter, since we have already seen that nothing is more easy than the
     found in the Maesorah parva on Ezek. xxiii. 40. It has to be added that the
     AND EVEN, ocenrs nine times at the beginning of a verse, and throughout Ezra it is likewise so, including therein the book of Nehemiah; whilst the other two editions omit ['ט] nine, which we have enpplied.
    ${ }^{165}$ The other instances in which the Fiphil is defective of the Jod are, Gen. xix. 16: Levit. xxiv. 12: 2 Sam. xvi. 11: 1 Kings viii. 9 ; xiii. 29. They are given in the

[^148]:    ${ }^{158}$ The twelve pasagges in which the verb are, Gen. xli. 15 : Isa. xxxvii. $9: 2$ Kingexx. 13 : Jerem. iv. 16; vi. 7; xxiii. 16; xxvi. 5 ; xxxv. 18; li. 27: Ezek. xxvi. 30: Amos iii. 9: Nehem. ix. 9. They are given in the Massorah marginalis on 2 Kings xx. 13, and Ezekiel xxvii. 30. In hoth instances the Massorah gives a reference, (i.e. to I6s. xxxiv. 16), which does not contain any snch constrnction, and which mnst therefore have been inserted by mistake. Indeed Buxtorf, in his edition of the Rahbinic Bible, who only gives the Messoretic rubric once, viz., on Ezek. xxvii. 30, has omitted this reference.

    165 The foar instances in which the verb טתט has not nk, the sign of the accusative, are, Levit. vi. 18 (twice) : Isa. Ixvi. $3: 2$ Chron. xxix. 22 . They are given in the Magsorab finalis under the letter Shin, p. $58 b$, col. 4.

    160 This mast be a mistake, since both the Maseorah parva and the Massorab marginalis, on Gen. xliy. 20 and Levit. xix. 3, dietinctly state that there are only three instances in which weprecedes 3 , viz., Gen. xliv. 20 : Levit. xix. 3 ; xxi. ${ }^{2}$. The last two instances are inclnded in the Massoretic list of thirty paseages, in which normal constructions are abnormally inverted, and which we have already given (vide supra, p. 214). Why Gen. xliv. 20 is exclnded from that list we cannot divine.
     struction, are, Levit. xviii. 4; xxi. 43 : Ezek. $\nabla .6$ (twice); xviii. 17; xx. 16, 24 ; xxxvii. 24. The Massorsh also gives Ezel. xliv. 24 as a ninth instance. But since ${ }^{x}$ ה intervenes in this pacsage between the two words in queetion, there can be little donbt that it is an addition by a later hand, and is therefore rightly exclnded from this list in the Ochla Ve-Oolla, section celxxviii., pp. 54, 151.

[^149]:    162 For the division of the Pentatench into hebdomadal lessons, see above, p. 135. Va-Jetze ( $\mathrm{N} \mathbf{Y}^{1}$ ) is the seventh of the fifty-four divisions, and embraces Gen. xxvii. 10 xxxii. 3; and $V a$--Jechi (ויח) is the twelfth Pericope, extending over Gen. xlvii. 28-1. 26.
    ${ }^{163}$ The Pericope Miketz ( $\gamma$ (p) is the tenth of the fifty-four sections or weekly lessons, ,and embraces Gen. xli. 1-xliv. 17.
    ${ }^{164}$ The other three instances in which there is a Pisloa or pause in the middle of a verse in the Pentateuch are, Gen. xxxy. 22: Numb. xxy. 19: Dent. ii. 8.

[^150]:    2 The thres passages in which בדו has Kametz under the Oheth, being in pause, are, Gen. vi. 2: Isa. lxvi. 4: Prov. i. 29. In all other passages it has Chateph-pattach
     , בנביאים, ג

    5 The instances in which ${ }^{2}$ ith is defective havs already been given, vide supra, p. 149. The Massoretic remark to which Levita refers is not to be fonnd in the printed editions of the Massoraih in the Rabbinic Bibles.

    4 The meaning of the passage and the mnemonical sign is as follows:-In the first passage (Gen. xxiv. 3), giving Abraham's own words, the expression בקרבו in the midst thereof is used; whilst in the second passage (ibid. xxiv. 37), which gives Eleazer's repetitions of what his master had said, the word in question is dropped, and in in the land thereof is substituted. To indicate this change in the words, the Massorites selected the passage in Exod. viii. 18 as a mnemouical sign, showing that just as in this sign בקר second, so in the two passages for which it is the mnamonical sign, and whare the two words are interchanged, בקרני occurs first and בארצו second.

[^151]:    5 Here again the mnemonical sign על בשר אדם, which contains both worde, $f l e s h$ and ארם man, shows hy the position of the two words that is used in the first paesage and $\begin{gathered}\text { in the second. }\end{gathered}$
    ${ }^{6}$ That is, since in the word ${ }^{\text {, }}$, we have first ${ }^{4}$, and then ${ }^{2}$; hence the first syllable
     Shurek, which occars second in the Section.

    7 The change of the vowel-pointe in the word $\begin{aligned} & \text {, having in the first place Segol }\end{aligned}$ under the $H e$, and in tho second place Pattach, is shown by the mnemonical exprescion , הקשב, which has twice $H e$,-the first with Segol, corresponding to the Segol under the He in Pattach under the $H e$ in $\boldsymbol{n}$, in the second passage.

[^152]:    ${ }^{8}$ In the printed editions of the Massorah parva, on Gen. xxvi. 26, the remark is not的 not extant, and every prover name is like it, as is stated bv Levita..

[^153]:    hnt simply before $x^{\prime \prime 2}$, which renders the sentence nnintelligible.
    ${ }^{9}$ The thres instances in which ${ }^{2}$ occurs with Kametz and Pattach nnder the first and second radicals are, Exod. xv. 14: 1 Kings i. 51 : Job xxiii. 9. They are given in the Massorah marginalis on 1 Kings i. 51 and Job xxiii. 9, and in both these passagse the Massorstic remark is וכל שום גבר קמץ ומלרע, but wherever it is a proper name it has Kametz [under the second radical], and is Milra, and not as Levita states in the text.
    ${ }^{10}$ The alphabetical list referred to by Levita has already bean given, vide supra, p. 118, \&c.

    11 For the work entitled The Eye of the Reader (y), as well as for its anthor, see below, p. 257, under the initials ${ }^{2}$ "די T Jekuthiel b. Jehudah Cohen.

    12 The anthor of The Major Bool of the Commandments (סמר מצות גרול, called סמ"ג Semag from its initials) is R. Moses, the celehrated Jowish preacher of the middle ages;

[^154]:    marginalis on Numb. xvii. 23. It will be seen that the Massorah gives thirteen instances of defective, inclading Judg. xix. 25, whilst Levita only mentions twelve. If the text does not cont in a clerical error, Levita most probably excludes Jndg. xix. 25, becanse the Tzaddi has Chirek, and not Tzere, as is the case in all the other instances.
    ${ }^{14}$ The three instances in which 1 וning occurs are, Gen. xxiv. 18: 1 Sam. xix. 12 (both defective): Gen. xxiv. 46 (plene). The Massoretic remark to which Levita refers is to be fonnd both in the Massorah parva and the Massorah marginalis on Gen. xxiv. 18. For the instances in which Tpe occurs, see above, p. 147.
    ${ }^{15}$ The three passages in which an is plene, that is, has Vav quiescent with the Cholem, are, Gen. xxxi. 3: Jerom. xxxiv. 5 : Prov. xxii. 28. They are given in the Massorah marginalis on Gen. xxxi. 3.
    ${ }^{18}$ The instances in the Bible where occurs are only three, viz., Gen. vii. 21 ;
     Levit. xx. 25 . On none of these passages, however, could we find in the printed Massorabs the remark to which Levita refers.

    17 For the orthography of המבוחיכם, sce above, p. 168, \&c.

[^155]:    ${ }^{18}$, That is with Tzere under the Cheth, since the Tzere, as has already been explained, is also called Kametz.

    19 The twenty-five instances in which | occurs are, Gen. xiv. 16; xx. 14; x1. 21 : |
    | :--- | Exod. iv. 7; xy. 19 ; xix. 8: Judg. ix. 56; xvii. 3, 4 : 1 Sam. xiv. 27; xxv. 21 : 2 Sam. xv. 29; xxii. 25 : 1 Kings ii. 30 : 2 Kings xiii. 25 ; xvii. 3 ; xx. 11; xxii. $9: 1$ Chron. xxi. 27; 2 Ghron, xxxiv. 16 : Joh xxxiii. 26 ; Ps. xviii. 25 ; xciv. 23 : Prov. xx. 26 : Ezelr. xliv.1. They are given in the Massoral finalis nnder the letter Jod, p. 37 a, col. 1.

    ${ }^{20}$ The twenty-five instances in which אחר occurs are, Gen. xxi. 15 ; xxii. 2 ; xxvi. 10 ; xxxii. 23 ; xlviii. 22 : Levit. xiii. 2 : Numb. xvi. 15: Deut. i. 2 ; xxv. 5 : Judg. xvii. 5 : 1 Sam. ix. 3 ; xxvi. $15: 2$ Sam. vi. 20 ; vii. 7; xvii. 22 : 1 Kings xix. 2; xxii. 13: 2 Kings vi. 12; xviii. 24: 1 Chron. xvii. 6: Isa. xxxvi. 9; lxvi. 17: Ezel. xxxiii. 30 ; xlv. 7 : Dan. x. 13. They are given in the Ma8sorah marginalis on 2 Kings vi. 12.

[^156]:    ${ }^{21}$ As this alphabetical list is by far too long to be given here, we mast refer for it to the Massorah finalis under the letter Aleph, p. 1b, col. 4-p. $2 a$, col. 3 ; and the Ochla Ve-Ochla, section lix., p. 62, \&c. Dr. Frensdorff has made some very important remarks on this rabric, p .17 , \&c.
    ${ }_{23}$ The Sulzbach edition erroneously omits אשר בארהי במאמר ד, which I have explained in Section iv.

[^157]:    ${ }^{28}$ Here the Sulzbach edition inserts the worde "אשר בארחי נמאמר ר, which were omitted from the former part of the paragraph.
    ${ }^{24}$ The Sepher He-Semadar is as yet unlnown (vide supra, p.122); the Stylus of the Seribe will be noticed hereafter under Kimchi.
    ${ }_{25}^{5}$ The nine pascagee in which ie Raphe, that is, has Sheva under the Vav conjunctive, are, Deut. xxxii. 7: Jerem. xvi. 19: Joel ii. 17: Isa, xiv. 10; xliii. 9: Pe. lxa. 5; xxxp. 27: 1 Chron. xiv. 31: Job xxxviii. 35. They are given in the Massorah marginalis on Isa. xvi 10.
    ${ }_{26}^{26}$ The seven paesages in which וריבאו is Raphe, that is, has Sheva nnder the Vav

[^158]:     trestise which discusses the vowel-points and scceuts, aud to which Levita refers, has not ss yet appeared. Excerpts of it, however, have heen published in Abicht's Acrentus Febr. ex antiquissimo usu lectorio vel musico explicati, \&c.; Acced. Porta accentuum Lat. conversa et notis illustr., Leipz. 1713; Delitzsch, in Jesurun, pp. 16, 86, 92, 192, 249, 252. Comp. Wolf, Bibliotheca IFebrcea, vol i. 1152, iii, 1160, iv. 1003; Geiger, Wissenschaftiche Zeitschrift für Jüdische Theologie, vol. v., p.423, \&c., Leipzig, 1844; Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, iii. 16.

    31 All our endeavours to obtain some information sbont this Meier Spirs have proved abortive. Wolf (Bibliotheca Hebrea, i. 756) simply ssys thst Levita quotes him, whilat First, the latest Hebrew bibliogrspher, remsrles (Bibliotheca Judaica, iii. 372) that Spirs wrote these works: i. A Treatise ou Arithmetic; ii. A Commentsry on Immanuel b. Jscob's Astronomical Work; snd iii. A Pentateuch with the Massorsh. Fürst, however, omits his nanal references to some works for particulars about the author.

    32 To understand this pun, which cannot be reproduced in $n$ translation, it is to be remarked, that Levits refers to an incident in $R$. Gamsliel's life, recorded in the Talmud, which is as follows:-R. Gamaliel, whilst iu the house of study, was asked by Jehudsh, a proselyte of Ammonitish descent, whether he might come into the house of study. Gamaliel answered him in the negstive, submitting that the Law [Deut. xxiii. 4] prohibited it. R. Jehoshush was of the contrary opinion, and addnced in support of his yjew the declaration made in Iss. x. 13, that God had abolished the boundaries of all nstions, and thns obliterated the territory of Ammon. He carried his point againstGamaliel, sud the latter went to the honse of his antagonist to be reconciled with him, oince the sltercation had assumed an angry tone. "On entering his house, R. Gsmaliel perceived that the beams were black, and said to R. Jehoshash, מוכרחלי בית ה from the walls of thy house thou art recognised to be a blacksmith," for which incsutious remark he had again to spologise (Berachoth, 28 b ). It will be seen that Levita refers to this remark of Gemaliel, and that the pun consists not only in the fsct thst mear s both house and stanza, but that פחמן blacksmith, with the slight alteration of the $\Pi$ into $\boldsymbol{\pi}$, denotes Bohemian.

[^159]:    ss Jekuthiel b. Jehudah Cohen flourished circa A.d. 1250-1300, at Prague. The work entitled The Eye of the Reader, to which Levita refers, consiste of Maseoretic criticisms on the Pentateuch and the Book of Esther, and has been published hy the learned Heidenheim, Rödelheim, 1818-1825. Jeluthiel has also written a grammatical treatise called The Laws of the Vowel-points (כללי הנקור, רוכי הנקוד), the Introduction and practical part of which were aleo published by Heidenheim, Rödelheim, 1818-1821. Comp. Kitto's Cyclopoedia of Biblical Literature, s. v. Jeruthiel.
     lexicographer, and expositor, who has already been noticed (vide supra, p. 107). His celebrated grammatical and lexical work, entitled Perfection (מכלול), wbich was edited by Levita, has been described on p. 79, \&c. To the article Kimcris, in Kitto'e Cyclop., it is to be added, that Kimchi's Massoretic Treatise, entitled The Stylus of the Scribe (ע) (ע), to which Levita refers, has recently been published for the first time, Lyck, 1864.
    ss There can be hat little doubt that this R. Jacob is the celebrated Hehrew grammarian and poet called Jacob h. Eleazar, who flourished circa a.d. 1130, at Toledo. He was a distinguished writer on the vowel-points (whence he ohtained the name of $H a-N a k d a n)$ and on the etymology of proper names. He moreover formed a correct Recension of the text of the Hebrew Scriptures, after the model of the Codex Hilali, and it is owing to these contributione to Biblical literature that he is 80 often quoted by Shimshon, Kimchi, and other lexicographere and critics. Comp. Kitto's Cyclopcedia of Biblical Literature, s.v. Jacob b. Eleazar.

[^160]:    ${ }^{38}$ Levita's qnotation is not literal. Even in his own edition of Ton Ezra's Balancea, the passage is as follows:--ורבי לוי הנקרא בן אל תבאן ספרדי במרינת סרקסטה חקץ ספר המשה and R. Levi, who is called Ibn Al-Tabben, \&c., vide p. 197 b, od. Levita; Vonice, 1546.

    37 This R. Levi, the Spaniard, or Abulfihm Levi b. Joseph Ibn Al-Tabben, as is his full name, flourished a. D. 1120. He was a friend of R. Johudah Ha-Lavi, the colebrated post and philosopher. Besides composing postry himself, he wroto the Hebrew Grammar callod The Key (מפח), to which Levita refars, but which has not as yot baen pablished. Comp. Graetz, Geschichte der Juden, vol. vi., p. 131 ; Leipzig, 1861.

    Ss Machsortha (מחורחN) is the common uame of the Jewish Ritnal, comprising the whole annual evcle of the Daily and Festival Services. The cycle, as is the literal meauing of Machsortha (from חin to go round), was generally written by the most distinguished scholars of the respective communities in the various parts of the world, embodying the local nsages, and honce obtained the name of the spesisl place whers it was written, and the practice of which it depicted. The cycle, according to the practice of the Synagogue of Vitry, has already been mentioned (vide supra, p. 45), and we have to add hore that these Rituals not only containad Prayers and Hymns, but gava the text of the whole Bible, so that they became models, after which copies wers made. It is owing to this fact that the Bible Codex itsslf was called Machsor (מחורו), as is the cass with the Codex made after Ben-Asher.
    s9 Levita's quotations are not from the Masso:ah marginalis on these passages, but from the outer margin. The Massorotic glosses in qnestion are not reproduced literally by Levita, as will be seen from the following statements:-On Exod. xyiii. 1 , the gloss is
     Gershain at the beginning of a verse in the Pentateuch, Sinai has Rebia; and on Exod. xviii. 5, סים היע המרבר בזקך גדול winai has Sakeph-gadol. Now according to Levita's reading בסיני in Sinai, we are obliged to assume with him that it is the name of a Codex; but, according to the proper reading, we may adopt the opinion of Joseph Eshve, the expositor of the Msssorah, which is onunciated on Exod. xviii. Iומיה שאמר סיני רביצ רע בי בעלי מחקבי הבקוד והטעמים רבים היו מנאוני חנמי טבריא ואחתר מהם
     (the as to themark, Sinai has Rebia, know that the inventors of the vowel-points and accents were nostly from the spiritual heads and the sages of Tiberias. Now the name of one of these was Sinai, and he differed from the Massorah, which remarlos, that yמישׂ in the two passages in question has Gershaim, and said that it has the accent Rebia. From this it will he seen, that this great Massorstic anthority does not take יכ as Codex Sinaiticus, but regards it as a proper name of one of the inventors of the vowel-points and accents.

[^161]:    ${ }^{40}$ It is now generally acknowledged among scholars that the Codex Hilali derives its name from the fact, that it was written at Hilla, a town built near the ruins of ancient Babel. This Codex, which was completed circa A.D. 600, had not only the then newly invented vowel-points and accents, hut was furnighed with Massoretic glosses. It was brought to Toledo about A.D. 1100 , where the grammarian Jacoh b. Eleazar nsed it for his works, and a portion of it was purchased by the Jewish community in Africa, about a.d. 1500 . Comp. Kitto's Cyclopcedia, s. v. Henali Codex.
    ${ }^{41}$ For Ben-Asher, and his celeb ated Codex, vide supra, p. 113, \&c.

[^162]:    ${ }^{42}$ For Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali, ride supra, p. 113, \&c.

[^163]:    ${ }^{45}$ As the above explanation of the mnemonical sign is not very clear, and as it pre-supposes a knowledge of Jewish manners and cnstoms, it requires some further elucidation. It will be seen that the word ${ }^{\boldsymbol{j}}$ ר occurs seven times in the same paragraph (Gen. xxxvi. 20-30), 一three times with Cholem ou the Shin (z.e. \}थ̛̣ Gen. xxxvi. 21,
     as the week has seven days, corresponding to these seven instances, and, moreover, as on three of these days an appointed lesson from the Law is read (ie. Saturday, Monday, and Thnreday), and the other four days (i.e. Sunday; Tueeday, Wednesday, and Friday) are withont sueh lessons, thus corresponding again to the three instances of the Shin with Cholem and the four without it, the seven days are made the symbol of the seven times Tw ; whilst the order of the three daye with and the fonr days withont the lesson from the Law is made to eymbolise tho order in which $\cos$ is read, three times with Cholem and four times without (i.e. with Kametz), beginning with the Sabbath. Accordingly, the first $\boldsymbol{7}$ with Cholem answers to Sabhath, the first day, with a lesson ; the second דישׂ withont Cholem answers to Snnday, which is without a lesson; the third with
     Tuesday, without a lesson; the fifth רישר without a Cholem answers to Wednesday, without a lesson; the sixth $\boldsymbol{j}$ with a Cholem answers to Thursday, with a lesson; whilst the seventh רישץ withont a Cholem answers to Friday, without a lesson,

[^164]:    48 It is to be remarked, that this mnemonical sign is based upon the double meaning of ypp, which denotes both the vowel-sign Kametz and to shut, as well as upon the fact, that when words not eat, shuts his mouth.

[^165]:    49 It will be seen, that the initials of the first line in the Hebrew are the acrostic of אליהו Elias, the anthor's name.

[^166]:    Thus the Song is brought to an end, and the book to its completion.

[^167]:    ${ }^{1}$ Saadia's philo6ophical work, to which Levita refers, has alrsady been describsid (vide supra, p. 136). That Levita most emphatically helieved Saadia to have been the author of this poem, is not only evident from the above remark, bat is placed beyond the shadow of a doubt, by his epilogue to it ívide infra, p. 278). We are, therefore, surprised at the remark of the learned Duken, that "Elias Levita does not say expreesly that R. Saadia was the aathor of it, hat mersly quotes it as a common opinion, with which he agrees" (Berträge zur Geschichte der aeltesten Auslegung und Spracherklärung des Alten Testamentes, vol. ii., p. 101, \&c.; Stuttgart, 1844). It is now, however, almost certain that Saadia b. Joseph Bechor Shor, who flonrished in France towards the end of the twelfth century, was the author of this poem, which was first poblished by Levita in the editio princcps of the Massoreth Ha-Massoreth, Venice, 1538. It is omitted hoth in the Basel (1539) and the Sulzbach (1771) edition6. It wae reprinted in the Theological Decisions of the Gaonim (שאלות ותשובוח הגאונים), Prague, circa 1590; by our countryman Hagh Broaghton, in his worls, antitled, Daniel, his Chaldee Vision, and his Hebrew, \&c., at ths end of chap. ix., London, 1597 ; by Buxtorf, in his Tiberias, cap. xyiii., p. 183, \&c.: Basel, 1620; in the Compilation, entitled, Taalamoth Chochma (חעלומוח תכמה), Bassl, 1629-1631; by Anshel Worme, in his Sejag La-Thora (Dint (Drankfort-on-the-Maine, 1766 ; in Likute Ha-Shas (לקוםי השי), Koretz, 1784; by Jehudah b. Jacob, Dyherenforth, 1821; and by Fiirst, in his Hebrew Concordance, p. 1379, Leipzig, 1840.

[^168]:    17 Final Mem，oocare 24，973 times．The Final Mem is not only indicated by the first，but more especially by the last letter in $\begin{gathered}\text { and the first word in this stanza }\end{gathered}$ which terminates in Final Mem．The initials of the remaining words in the first two lines，viz．，${ }^{2}=24,973$ ，state the number of times the latter occurs in the Bible， which is indicated still more explicitly in the numbers occurring in the two paesages of Scripture adduced under this stanza，viz．，Numb．xxv．9，where we have the number 24，000，and Ezra ii．36，where the nnmber is $973=24,973$ ．

    1s g＇Nun，occurs 32，977－times．The letter itself is indicated by 1 ，the first word in this stanza which begine with $N u n$ ，and the number of times it occurs in the Bible is ehown by tbe initials of the remaining words of the first two lines，viz．，$w=3=32,977$ ． This is also shown by the numbers in the two passages quoted under this etanza，viz．， Numb．i．35，where we have $32,2 \div 0$ ，and Gen．v．31，where we have $777=32,977$ ．

    18 F Final $N u n$ occurs 8,719 times．The letter in question is not only indicated by the first letter in 13 ，the first word in this stanza，bnt more especially by the last， letter of the word，which is Final Nun．The initiale of the remaining words in the first two lines，viz．，win $\boldsymbol{n}=8,714$ ，as nenal indicate the number of times the letter in question occurs in the Bible，which is also shown by the numbers to be found in the two passages of Scripture adduced under this stanza，viz．，Nnmb．iv．48，where the number 8，580 occurs，and Ezra ii．42，where we have $139=8,719$.

    20 Samech，occurs 13,580 times．As nsual，the letter in question is indicated by the first letter in $ס$ ，the first word in this stanza，whilst the initiale of the remaining words in the first two lines，viz．，יגך $=13,580$ ，show the number of times it occurs in the Bible，which is indicated still more plainly by the numbers in the two passages of Scriptare cited onder this stanza，viz．， $\bar{P}_{6} .1 x$ ． 2 ，where we have 12,000 ，and Nehem．vii． 70 ，where we have $1,000+50+530=1580$ ，making in all 13,580 ．

