

The University of Sydney

MEMORANDUM TO

Miss Pamela Green,
Rare Book Librarian,
FISHER LIBRARY.

I am enclosing a copy of the thesis entitled
"The Text of Isaiah I - XXV in the Talmudim and
Midrashim" submitted by Mr. John R. Boyd for the
Honours degree of Master of Arts in the
Department of Semitic Studies.

The candidate has successfully completed the
requirements for the degree.



R.B. Fisher,
Registrar.

Ref. Miss Johns/JD/18125
24th July, 1973.

R. B. Lib.

Boyd, John Roderick
M.A. Jan. 1974

THE TEXT OF ISAIAH I - XXXV
IN THE
TALMUDIM AND MIDRASHIM

A thesis submitted as partial requirement for
the degree of Master of Arts
with Honours in Hebrew
Within
the Department of Semitic Studies
at the
University of Sydney

by JOHN RODERICK BOYD
November, 1972

THE TEXT OF ISAIAH I - XXXV
IN THE
TALMUDIM AND MIDRASHIM

A thesis submitted as partial requirement for
the degree of Master of Arts
with Honours in Hebrew
Within
the Department of Semitic Studies
at the
University of Sydney

by JOHN RODERICK BOYD

November, 1972

Preface

Abbreviations

I. Introduction

1. The Problem

- (a) The Importance of the Problem** 1
- (b) Previous Work** 3
- (c) The Present Treatment of the Problem** 14

2. Divergencies Within the Masoretic Recension

- (a) The Evidence** 22
- (b) Summary of Evidence and Theoretical Discussion** 29

3. The Problem of Genuineness

- (a) Prolegomena and Definition** 36
- (b) Criteria** 38

4. Classification of the Sources

- (a) Tannaitic Texts** 82
- (b) Amoraitic Texts** 83
- (c) Tanhuma and Yalammedem Texts** 86
- (d) Unified Compositions of Indeterminate Age** 87
- (e) Compositions Based on Earlier Sources** 88
- (f) Compilations of Uncertain Date Based on Disparate Sources Partly Unknown** 88
- (g) Texts of Unknown Dates or Origin** 89
- (h) Very Late Texts** 89
- (i) Commentaries Partly Original and Partly Taken from Midrash and Talmud** 89

(j) Anthologies	89
5. Details of Arrangement of the Apparatus	
(a) Purposes of this Section	90
(b) Selection of Readings	90
(c) Method of Recording Readings	90
(d) Recording of Attestation	95
(e) Recording of Information in Exceptional Cases	98
(f) Notes on Recording Readings from Certain Texts	99
6. Details of Arrangement of the Notes to the Apparatus	
(a) Purpose of this Section	117
(b) Texts Used	117
(c) Method of Recording Readings from the Versions and Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts	118
Footnotes to the Introduction	122
II. The Apparatus	
Symbols and Abbreviations	167
Text	172
III. Notes to the Apparatus	216
IV. Surveys of Readings	417
Index	422
Bibliography	443

P R E F A C E

The purpose of this work is explained in the introduction. I wish to comment here on some of its limitations.

Most critical editions of Rabbinic texts were unavailable in Australian libraries when this work was begun. The sixteenth century printed editions were quite unobtainable. Most studies and monographs published before 1950, and many published after that time, were unavailable. Many of these works could be acquired, but there is a limit to the resources of an individual. In any case, it was impossible to acquire out of print works: in general, if a book published before 1950 had not been reprinted, it was impossible to get access to it in any way. No photographs of manuscripts (other than published facsimiles) were available.

The apparatus is as accurate as it could be made. It should be noted that in any complicated article, such as the ones on Is 29:10, the apparatus was checked against the sources themselves after having been written. The apparatus has been checked and revised several times. There are probably still mistakes, but I have not been able to find them. If any reader of this work comes across any such, I will be pleased if he will let me know so that the apparatus can be corrected.

The facsimile of Codex Vatican LX of Bereshit Rabbah was received after this work had been completed. Its variants were incorporated as far as possible, even if this meant re-typing a few pages, but there was no time to incorporate all of them. Readings of this manuscript should not be derived e silentio. The collation of the 'En Ya'aqov is complete only to the end of Mo'ed. There did not seem to be any point in continuing the collation when it became clear that all the edition available had been corrected. No early editions were available.

As against these limitations, it may be pointed out that comparatively few sources have been missed.

A word on style. The pronoun "I" is generally to be avoided in scholarly work because facts are impersonal and arguments should be valid in themselves. Sometimes, however, I have had to use it, for example, to make it clear that I was expressing a personal opinion, or to express concisely a contrast between the method used here and other in other works. The expression "the present writer" that is often seen is no solution. "New presbyter is but old priest writ large".

The words "text" and "source" have often been used to express concisely the concept "a particular passage of the Talmud or a particular midrash".

Hebrew words are too numerous to be underlined. An exception has been made for the words gere, ketiv, and sevir, which are technical terms of the Masorah. Names of ancient sources are not underlined.

This work was typed in its present revised form immediately before my departure for Israel. It has been checked thoroughly, but attention was concentrated on facts and references, and although numerous ordinary mis-typings of words were corrected, some may remain. For this I ask the reader's indulgence in view of the circumstances.

I have attacked some scholars sharply in this work. It is to be understood that such criticisms are not meant personally, and that in most cases I have been enlightened by the same scholar's work.

The division into volumes is planned. It is hoped that the reader will be able to keep the apparatus and the notes to it

both open at once.

I would like to thank Dr. Lionel Singer for the loan of the typewriter used for the first drafts and some of the final draft of this work.

This work would not have been written without the encouragement and advice of Dr. A.D. Crown, my research supervisor, whose encouragement and advice are responsible for the work being completed in a useful form, or even completed at all. Nor would it have been completed without the help and encouragement of my wife, Carmen, who, not only typed the whole work, but helped in too many other ways to mention here.

JOHN BOYD

Abbreviations of Journals and Series

AJSL	American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures
ASTI	Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute
BJRL	Bulletin of the John Rylands Library
BZAW	Beihefte zum Zeitschrift fur die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual
ICC	The International Critical Commentary
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
JJS	Journal of Jewish Studies
JQR	Jewish Quarterly Review
Rev	Qum Revue de Qumran
SVT	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
VT	Vetus Testamentum
ZAW	Zeitschrift fur die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

INTRODUCTION

1. The Problem

(a) The Importance of the Problem

The quotations of the Bible in later literature have been almost completely neglected. Up till the beginning of the twentieth century there was some justification for this in the unreliability of the editions available, but Aptowitzer¹ was able to put together a very reliable collection of material from the editions available before 1906, so that it seems that at least part of the reason for the later neglect of this material has been lack of interest on the part of textual critics. It is worth noticing that the articles written before Aptowitzer's work, unsatisfactory as they were, showed that a few eighteenth and nineteenth century scholars were seriously interested in the problem of divergent quotations, whereas later scholars, who have had access to excellent critical editions, and (by means of photographs) the sixteenth century editions and the manuscripts, have been content to refer to Aptowitzer's work, or even to ignore the whole matter. It is to the credit of the editors and organizers of the Hebrew University Bible Project that they have set up an organization for collecting and assessing the material now available.

These quotations are a very valuable source of evidence for the history of the text of the Bible. Our knowledge of divergent readings in the text between the beginning of the Tannaitic period and the end of the Gaonic period, or even up till the time of the authors of the Tosafot, is very limited. For the Tannaitic period, we have Theodotion, Aquila, and Symmachus (all fragmentary, however) and the Peshitta. For the Amoraic period, we have the Targums and the Vulgate. For the later periods, we have Masoretic notes and lists. This material, impressive as it seems at first sight, is hardly adequate, because the amount of evidence for any given time or place

is limited to a single Version, and for certain times and places, for example Israel in the early Amoraic period, or Israel at the time of Masoretic activity in the eighth century, we have no evidence at all.

Although the recension known as the Masoretic Text has been in use since the beginning of the Tannaitic period or even earlier, the particular form of the text in use has not always agreed in every detail with the present received text, as found in ben Asher and ben Naftali manuscripts, or the modern printed editions. It seems, instead, that a variety of sub-traditions differing in very small details from each other and the received text have been in use. All of the Versions later than the LXX disagree with each other and with the received text in slight details, and in section 2 of this introduction detailed evidence will be given to show that the readings of the received text, though ancient, were not regarded as the only correct readings till the text of the Masoretes of Tiberias was recognized as authoritative, and that even after that time manuscripts diverging in slight details of the consonantal text from each other and from the Tiberian text continued to be used. The Biblical quotations may be used in the same way as the Versions in tracing the divergent readings in the text during this period, and identifying the time when each one was regarded as correct, and the place.

On the basis of such information, we can make a beginning at investigating such problems as the forms of the Masoretic recension in the Tannaitic period, the origin of the readings in Masoretic lists and treatises disagreeing with the received text, and the most intriguing of all, the origin of the readings in the received text disagreeing with the readings accepted by the Amoraim in Israel.

(b) Previous Work

(i) Before Aptowitz

The work before Aptowitz can be divided into lists of variants, mostly very short, some of which were assembled uncritically, but some of which are the result of careful investigation; some very short articles, some uncritical, some very valuable; a few monographs or long articles or series of articles, compiled with an either partial or complete lack of critical insight; and a series of articles by Geiger, and some parts of his Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel (תמקרא ותרגומים). The most useful works are too short to do more than show that variants exist, except for Geiger's Urschrift, which deals with the causes of changes in the text, and mentions variants in quotations in Rabbinic texts only when relevant to its theme; the rest of the longer works are very misleading.²

(ii) Aptowitz's Work

Aptowitz's book, Das Schriftwort in der rabbinischen Literatur, is revolutionary. It covers all of Samuel, Joshua, and Judges, and is the first long work compiled critically that is directly concerned with variant readings in Biblical quotations in later literature.³ Aptowitz read the context of each variant; in most cases the variant did not affect the argument, but in some cases he was able to establish that the argument supported it. He was sometimes able to establish that what seemed at first sight to be support from the context for a variant was in fact rather doubtful.⁴ In most cases the variant did not affect the argument, but even in such cases he was able to estimate the probability of the reading being genuine by considering the number of texts and the number of manuscripts, editions, and quotations in secondary sources supporting the reading.⁵ He classified the various types of inexact quotation and was thus able to avoid including numerous

false variants in his lists. He avoided listing as variants readings that are due to no more than the method of quoting, such as full for defective spelling, or the substitution of the form '7 for '77K.⁶ He collated the readings against the Versions and Hebrew Biblical manuscripts. None of his predecessors had done all of this, and some had not done any of it.

Compared to this, the defects of Aptowitzer's work are minor. Few of his texts were available in critical editions, but he made up for this as much as possible by using first editions and quotations of each work in secondary sources, as well as the extra information available on certain texts, notably the Babylonian Talmud. The lack of critical editions probably harmed his work more by keeping him from being aware of some variants than by allowing false variants to enter his lists. A much more serious defect is that he does not indicate satisfactorily whether, when a variant is found in more than one place in the Talmudim and midrashim, one of the texts draws on one of the others, or whether they are all independent of each other, even though he was aware of the importance of doing so.⁷ So, for instance, for the reading צִרְיָהּ עֲלֶיהָ in I S 4:19⁸ he lists a quotation from Bechorot in the Yalqut Shim'oni, a passage in the Midrash Shemu'el, and a midrash on the Ten Commandments in Jellinek's Bet Hammidrash. He does not tell the reader that Bechorot and the midrash on the Ten Commandments give two very divergent forms of the same baraita, whereas the passage in the Midrash Shemu'el is completely independent. He doubtless took the relationship of the sources into account when selecting the reading to include in his lists, but he should certainly have devised some means of giving the reader this information and saving him the laborious work of checking the references each time. It would have been enough to separate related sources by a comma and unrelated ones by a semi-colon or

full stop. Aptowitzer's work has, however, the merit of always indicating the source of passages in the secondary witnesses, such as the Yalqut Shim'oni, Yalqut Mechiri, Midrash Haggadol, and others. -

(iii) The Hebrew University Bible Project

The work of the Hebrew University Bible Project is organised on very different lines.⁹ Unlike Aptowitzer's work, it is not concerned with just the text of the Biblical quotations in Jewish literature, but rather with all the evidence for the history of the text of the Bible, and unlike Aptowitzer's work, it is intended that eventually it will cover the whole Bible. The edition prints the text according to the Aleppo Codex, and has four apparatuses. The first gives variants of pointing in certain selected manuscripts; the second (which the editors call Apparatus I) gives the evidence of the Versions; the third (Apparatus II) gives variant readings from quotations in Rabbinic literature, and the readings of the Qumran manuscripts; the fourth apparatus (Apparatus III) gives the readings of mediaeval manuscripts. Only the third apparatus concerns us here.

The sources used comprise both Talmuds, according to early editions and manuscripts, the extra-canonical tractates of the Babylonian Talmud, according to the best editions available, and most of the midrashim, according to critical editions if there are any, otherwise according to reliable editions, usually the first edition.¹⁰ How far the editors intend to extend their collations into other types of literature is apparently still undecided. Within the present limits of Talmud and midrash, very few texts have been missed.¹¹

It is a pity that this edition, so far as it can be judged from the Sample Edition, should suffer from several glaring defects which greatly reduce its usefulness.

When a reading is found in more than one source, there is no indication whether the sources are related or not: but support for a reading in several unrelated passages (דאמרי), when it exists, is usually the most conclusive evidence available for the genuineness of a reading.¹²

To make matters worse, the Yalqut Shim'oni, Yalqut Mechiri, and Midrash Haggadol are quoted as independent texts, without indicating their source. The editors justify this by saying that giving the source in such cases would have involved tackling many problems which are outside their province.¹³ This argument is rather hollow. It is quite true that very often the source of a passage in the Midrash Haggadol is uncertain, and that sometimes the source in the Yalqut Shim'oni or Yalqut Mechiri is uncertain. It would, however, be a very simple matter to give the source in each case when it was certain, and simply leave it out in other cases. If this were done, the source of the Midrash Haggadol could be given at least a third of the time, and the source of the Yalqut Shim'oni and Yalqut Mechiri nearly always. Specifically, the source could have been given in all the places where these texts are mentioned in the apparatus of the Sample Edition on chapter 2, 5, and 11 of Isaiah.

To make matters even worse, the editors quote these secondary sources in their own right after quoting a primary source, without telling the reader whether the secondary source quotes that particular primary source or some other source, so that the reader does not know whether the mention of the secondary source is a confusing repetition of the evidence, or a new piece of evidence which the editors do not choose to identify.¹⁴

The Yalqut Shim'oni is sometimes quoted twice, without telling the reader that the variant reading is found in both places in the same context and that the two places in the Yalqut Shim'oni amount

to only one witness.

Let us take an example to show how misleading these principles make the apparatus.

In Is 2:17 the apparatus reads: $\square\Gamma\aleph\eta$] MechShira § 2 (121)
mss $\beth\aleph\aleph$; BerR § 12:10(109)mss $\aleph^2\aleph$ all ed; Yal I § 19; § 242;
II § 794 $\square\Gamma\aleph\downarrow$ III This looks like impressive evidence till one
looks up the passages in the Yalqut Shim'oni and finds that in Part
I par. 19 and Part II par. 794 it quotes Bereshit Rabbah, and is
therefore not a new source but merely a new text-witness (and a single
text-witness at that, not two); and as for the Yalqut Shim'oni Part I
par. 242, this quotes the Mechilta, but the symbol \beth among the list
of Mechilta text-witness signifies the Yalqut Shim'oni, so that the
same text-witness has been counted twice, once as a manuscript of
the Mechilta (as it should be) and once as an independent source!

A digression is in order here. The editors admit that they
sometimes count the Yalqut Shim'oni twice,¹⁵ but the cure for such
a defect is not to mention that it is done, but rather not to do it.
The excuse given is that the Yalqut Shim'oni is accessible to most
readers. True but irrelevant. The reader only needs to look up
a passage -- or should only need to look it up -- when the derash
is related to the variant, and the information is too long or com-
plicated to give in an apparatus, or when he wishes to evaluate
the evidence of the various text-witnesses directly, and assess it
in context, in which case the critical edition of the text will have
to be looked up, not the Yalqut Shim'oni. He does not have to look
up the passage to check that the editor knows how to collate readings;
presumably if the editor says a text reads $\square\Gamma\aleph$, it does.¹⁶ As it
is, the reader must look up the passage because of the editors'
vagueness, only to find that the information is redundant. Anyway,
why is there the inconsistency that the quotation of the Mechilta

in the Yalqut Shim'oni is mentioned twice, once as a manuscript of the Mechilta, and once on its own, whereas the quotation of Bereshit Rabbah in the Yalqut Shim'oni is quoted on its own but not as a manuscript of Bereshit Rabbah? Is the explanation that Bereshit Rabbah and the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el were collated by two different people according to different principles, and that the editors when compiling the apparatus took their information directly from several sets of cards without checking the references?

Last of all, it is a very misleading half-truth to say that the Yalqut Shim'oni is readily accessible. The Yalqut Shim'oni is readily accessible in the Warsaw edition, in which most of the readings disagreeing with the MT have been corrected, and which has been censored besides. The editors of critical editions naturally do not use this edition, but rather the first and second editions and the Oxford manuscript of the Yalqut Shim'oni, and it may be doubted if more than one in a hundred of the readers of the Sample Edition will have these texts to hand: certainly far more will have access to the critical editions of the primary sources. What happens then, when the reader does look up the passage in his copy of the Yalqut Shim'oni according to the Warsaw edition? He finds that in Part I par. 19 and Part I par. 242 it reads $\square\text{TK}\eta$, in agreement with the MT.

We may now note a blunder in the collation. The list of manuscripts of Bereshit Rabbah should include manuscript 7. The editors have probably missed it precisely because it is the manuscript used by Theodor and Albeck as the basis for their edition.

We may now note some omissions of sources. To the sources mentioned should have been added a quotation of Is 2:17 in the Midrash Tehillim on Ps 114 in the printed editions and probably in at least one of Buber's manuscripts (see Buber's edition, p.472,

note 17). The omission of the printed edition of the Midrash Tehillim is justified, as the editors rely entirely on Buber's edition, but the reading could have been got from Buber's footnote. The editors were also justified in omitting the quotation in The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue, part I, p.38, as this book was not collated by them. There should, however, have been added a reference to the quotation of Sanhedrin in the Midrash Haggadol on Genesis, p. 66.

Now let us give the inter-relationship of the sources. The passage in the Mechilta and the one in Bereshit Rabbah are independent. The Midrash Tehillim and the Genizah fragment in The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue both depend on Bereshit Rabbah. The passage in the Midrash Haggadol taken from Sanhedrin is independent of the other two.

It will be seen that the reading $\square\eta\kappa$ is certainly genuine, but the reader would not have been able to tell that it was from the information given without checking all the references himself.

We may now give, very briefly, some further corrections to the apparatus of the Sample Edition, and some comments on certain verses.

Is 2:12 (In Apparatus I, on the Versions). Why is it not mentioned that the omission of $\eta\eta\kappa\eta$ is supported by three manuscripts of the Midrash Haggadol on Exodus, p. 287, quoting one of the Mechiltas?

Is 2:17-18. Reversal of the order of certain phrases. I have not tried to include such readings in the present work, so I am unable to tell whether all such cases are correctly noted. In this case, at least, however, the editors have missed the Pirque deRabbi 'Eli'ezer, chapter 11. It may be noted that the passage in the Yalqut Mechiri on Isaiah referred to is an excerpt from Bemidbar Rabbah, and that the passage in the Yalqut Shim'oni part I par.396 referred to is an excerpt from the Midrash 'Avkir.

Is 2:18. It should have been mentioned that the reading $\text{יְהוָה יִלְפָּטֵנוּ}$, besides being found in IQIs^a , is also found in an excerpt from *Shemot Rabbah* in the *Yalqut Mechiri* on the Minor Prophets, Amos, p.73. There should also have been an arrow pointing down to Apparatus III.

Is 2:21. וַיִּקְרָא . To the *Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el*, add fragment no. II of the *Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai*.¹⁷

The reading וַיִּלְפָּטֵנוּ is not supported by all manuscripts of the *Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai*, as the note implies, but only by manuscript D. Manuscript no. II and D (the *Midrash Haggadol* on Exodus) agree with the MT. The apparent support of the *Midrash Haggadol* for the reading וַיִּלְפָּטֵנוּ is due only to the omission of a note in the apparatus of Epstein and Melamed's edition stating that it disagrees with their basic manuscript D of the *Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai*. See Margulies's edition of the *Midrash Haggadol* on Exodus, p. 303.

It seems that the editors have relied on the defective apparatus to Epstein and Melamed's edition, p. 91, for the reading in manuscript II (given the symbol p by Epstein and Melamed on that page) instead of taking the readings directly from the complete transcription of the fragment at the end of Epstein and Melamed's edition or in Ginze Schechter. See Epstein and Melamed's edition p. 236 or Ginze Schechter, p. 357.

From now on, the apparatus of this thesis will be assumed to be before the reader, so as to keep these notes as short as possible.

Is 2:22. וַיִּקְרָא . A few sources have been missed. See the apparatus of this thesis for the details.

Is 5:8. וְיִלְפָּטֵנוּ . Add the printed edition of *'Echah Rabbah* and the *Midrash 'Aggadah 'al Humash*.

Is 5:9. וְנִגְלָה בְּאָזְנֵי. Add a quotation of Berachot in the Yalqut Mechiri on Psalms, and see my apparatus for the identification of the sources of the Yalqut Shim'oni.

Is 5:12. לֹא הָבִיטוּ. See my apparatus.

Is 5:14. חֲרָה. Not only an 'al-tiore reading, but also assumed in another shiṭṭah on the same page.

Is 5:18. וְכַעֲבוֹתָתָם. It is not quite accurate to say that the reading is found in all text-witnesses of the Sifre, as the note implies. The situation is that the word in question is quoted directly only by the printed editions, in the form וְכַעֲבוֹתָתָם, but that in an allusion almost immediately after manuscript כ reads לְהִיּוֹת כַּעֲבוֹתָתָם הַגְּלָה חֲטָאָה, the printed editions and manuscript ל read הִיּוֹת כַּעֲבוֹתָתָם הַגְּלָה חֲטָאָה, and manuscript ו reads הִיּוֹת עֲבוֹתָתָם הַגְּלָה חֲטָאָה. The variant is accordingly supported directly only by the editions, but indirectly by manuscript ל, and is contradicted by manuscripts טו. See Herovitz's edition, p. 120.

Add the printed editions of Bereshit Rabbah.

Is 5:19. נִרְאָה instead of נִרְאָה. This is inaccurate collating and misleading notation. For manuscript ו of Wayyiqra Rabbah, read ו. If the reading נִרְאָה was mentioned, the substitution of לְמַעַן נִרְאָה for וְנִרְעָה should have been mentioned too. In any case, both substitutions are contradicted by the following וְתִקְרַב וְנִרְעָה (ו) אֵה עֲצַת קְרוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל וְנִרְעָה. Is the incompleteness of this note due to its being taken directly from a card, and not checked against the original?

Is 5:23. יִסְרָר. In spite of appearances, only one midrash has the reading. Both occurrences in the Yalqut Shim'oni and the one in the Yalqut Mechiri are taken from Bereshit Rabbah.

We have here a good example of an invented reading. The Yalqut

Mechiri is mentioned separately as having the reading 'לללל'. Actually it has nothing of the kind; it agrees with the MT. The editors assumed that it read 'לללל' because there is no note in the apparatus of Bereshit Rabbah, as there should be, stating that the Yalqut Mechiri disagrees with the basic manuscript ל. Therefore the editors assumed the Yalqut Mechiri, like manuscript ל, read 'לללל'. So far this is a reasonable mistake, and no fault of the editors. But to quote the Yalqut Mechiri as a separate source while taking its reading (or what was thought to be its reading) from the apparatus to Bereshit Rabbah and not checking it against the Yalqut Mechiri itself is unscientific.

The note bis is not accurate. Some manuscripts have the reading three times.

Is 5:24. 'לללל. The quotation of Is 5:24 in the Yalqut Shim'oni occurs in an excerpt from the Pesiqta deRav Kahana. It is strange that the editors did not have the curiosity to look up the passage in Mandelbaum's critical edition of the Pesiqta deRav Kahana, p. 256, where they would have found that manuscript ל has the same reading.

Is 11:2. לללללל. If the editors had used Aptowitzer's work, they would have seen that the evidence is far more extensive than what they mention. See my apparatus and notes to the apparatus.

Is 17:3. לל (In Apparatus I). There should have been a mention of the quotation of Sanhedrin in the Yalqut Mechiri on Isaiah (to which may be added the Haggadot Hattalmud, not used by the editors).

Is 51:11 (=35:10). לללל'. Add manuscripts לל of the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el.

לללל'. (In Apparatus III). There is excellent evidence for

this reading in quotations, at least some of which should have been known to the editors. See my apparatus.

The reading **נחנח** should be added.

It must be admitted that not all of the omissions of sources just mentioned need necessarily be due to error, as the editors explain that not all sources have yet been collated in full.¹⁸ This qualification does not, however, excuse the omission of manuscript **ז** of Bereshit Rabbah in Is 2:17, the failure to collate manuscript **ח** of the Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai or the Midrash Haggadol properly in Is 2:18, the misleading or wrong information on Is 5:14, 5:18, 5:19, or 5:23, the failure to check the primary source in Is 5:24, or the unfamiliarity with Aptowitzer's work displayed in Is 11:2.

Much more serious, however, are the defects of methodology described before the list of corrections. Listing sources without giving their relationship is on a level with counting manuscripts of the LXX without specifying which are meant and without considering their inter-relationship. Counting the Yalqut Shim'oni, Yalqut Mechiri, and Midrash Haggadol as primary texts, without mentioning their sources, is worse. Counting the Yalqut Shim'oni twice, once as a manuscript of the primary text, and once as a separate primary text, and then only doing it sometimes, so that the reader never knows whether it is meant to be a separate source or not without looking up the passage, and then saying that the Yalqut Shim'oni is mentioned separately for the reader's convenience is so unscientific that a literal description sounds like a parody.

It is with the greatest regret that I make these criticisms, and I only wish it were possible to praise the edition unreservedly. May I urge in the strongest possible terms that the editors of the Hebrew University Bible Project not allow their work to be spoilt by such defects, and that they be corrected before the final edition starts to appear. If this is done, the edition will be of enormous value for textual criticism; if it is not, it will remain unscientific and partly useless.

(c) The Present Treatment of the Problem

(i) Purpose

This work is meant to be a source of reference, listing the variants to Is 1-35 in the Talmudim and midrashim, and a theoretical and practical treatment of the problem of separating genuine variants from scribal errors, both in the case of the variants assembled here and in general.

It is not part of the purpose of this work to apply the results thus obtained to answering the historical questions mentioned at the end of section 1(a) of this introduction; rather, the material assembled and analysed here is meant as part of the basis for future treatment of such questions. A beginning has been made in section 2 of this introduction, where some of the insights that can be derived from this material have been worked into an argument intended to show the position of these variant readings in the history of the transmission of the text. I hope to apply the results obtained here to the whole question of the origins of the Masoretic recension, its transmission, and the origin of the received form of it in future studies.

(ii) Principles

a. The Text

The text examined is Is 1-35. There are two modifications. The first is that readings from Is 2:1-4 have not been included, because a complete collation of these verses and Mi 4:1-3 showed that it was nearly always impossible to tell whether Isaiah or Micah was being quoted, as the quotation generally had some readings characteristic of one and some characteristic of the other. The second modification is that Is 51:11 had to be included because as Is 35:10 and 51:11 are identical, it is impossible to tell whether any given

quotation is meant to be one or the other.

b. The Sources

The sources include both Talmuds, nearly all the midrashim, and certain texts, such as the Tosefta, which although not generally termed midrashim, belong with the rest. The sources used include all known Tannaitic¹⁹ and Amoraic texts, nearly all the available Tanhuma-Yelammedenu texts, and some later works partly dependent on earlier sources. A full classification will be found in section 4 of this introduction.

The extra-canonical tractates of the Babylonian Talmud had to be missed because the critical editions were not available. They do not, however, give very many quotations from Is 1-35. More serious is the omission of manuscripts and early editions of the Babylonian Talmud. These texts had to be left out because they were not available in Australian libraries. Even if they had been available, they probably would have had to be left out because collating them would have taken the resources of a very big committee: it may be noted here that not even the Hebrew University Bible Project collates these texts directly, but receives the collations from a committee working on a critical edition of the Babylonian Talmud.²⁰

The omission is not quite so serious as it might seem. It has been compensated for by collating the Haggadot Hattalmud, (Constantinople 1511), a text not used by the Hebrew University Bible Project, the Diqduqe Soferim on Berachot and Gittin, all the excerpts from the Bavli in the Yalqut Mechiri, Midrash Haggadol and Midrash Leqah Tov (the last two only as far as they were available in reliable editions), and by collating in part or in full certain other texts having excerpts from the Bavli. The details will be found in section 4(b)(ii) of this introduction.

Particular attention has been paid to collating all available Palestinian texts, partly because we have so little know-

ledge of the texts in use in Israel during the Amoraic period and later, partly because it is from such sources that we can hope to learn the nature of the manuscripts available when the present received text was later decided on by the Tiberian Masoretes.

The details of the manuscripts and editions used will be found in the bibliography and section 5(e) of this introduction. A general comment is sufficient here. If a critical edition was available, it was used.²¹ If a critical edition was not available, a reliable edition (such as Buber's) was used, supplemented by other editions if available and if based on different manuscripts. In the case of the Sifra, a reliable manuscript was collated, with a comparison with the Yalqut Shim'oni and other texts. In the case of the Talmud Yerushalmi, the first edition, supplemented by quotations in other texts, was used. In the case of the Talmud Bavli, a reliable early text was used, supplemented by quotations in other texts. All available Genizah fragments were used.

c. Selection of Readings

A dilemma in the arrangement of any critical apparatus is the choice between a full apparatus, which can confuse the reader by its mass of details and confusion of genuine readings with mistakes, and a selective one, which can suppress evidence that may later turn out to be useful. The dilemma is particularly serious in the case of readings taken from quotations in Rabbinic texts. In favour of a full apparatus, it can be argued that there are many readings that would have to be left out of a selective apparatus but might later turn out to be genuine readings when more texts or manuscripts are collated, or that if obvious mistakes are ignored, it becomes impossible to tell which texts or manuscripts were inclined to scribal error in their Biblical quotations, or to tell which types of variant are most commonly due to scribal error. On the other hand, there are so many purely mechanical variants or scribal errors that an uncritical full apparatus would be misleading to most readers.

The problem has been treated by listing all variants, but giving the reader enough information and editorial guidance to distinguish between genuine variants and scribal errors. The details are described in the following paragraphs.²²

d. Annotation and Classification of Readings

i. The Apparatus

Apparent scribal errors, readings apparently induced by the context of the derash, waw-readings at the beginning of a quotation, and omissions of a single word at the end or beginning of a quotation are marked.²³ The inter-relationship of the sources has been given in every case so as to enable the reader to count the number of independent witnesses.²⁴ When the information might be useful, parts of the verse other than the word showing the variants, and sometimes the whole verse, have been quoted.²⁵

ii. The Notes to the Apparatus²⁶

All available information from the Versions and Hebrew Biblical manuscripts is given in the notes to the apparatus. The notes are strictly limited to the individual readings. Value-judgments were not usually given because they are usually helpful only when certain types of reading or certain types of support are considered as a class. This is done in exhaustive detail in other parts of this work and it is assumed that the reader will not draw conclusions from the notes to the apparatus without having read the relevant material on the problem of separating genuine variants from scribal errors, namely the whole of the introduction (and specially section 3) looked at the lists and indexes that follow the apparatus, and looked at the survey of readings that follows the notes to the apparatus. Without these preliminaries, the notes could be very misleading.²⁷

iii. The Introduction and Lists

Aptowitzer intended to write a comprehensive introduction, but was unable to publish more than two sections.²⁸ The present introduction is intended as a treatment of the remaining matters. Particularly important is section 3, which deals with the question of separating genuine variants from scribal errors, and gives an explanation and analysis of the material in the lists.

iv. The Survey of Readings

No matter how clearly and in how much detail principles are set out, and no matter how much background information is given, a reliable estimate of the worth of a particular reading can only be based on long and deep study of the material at first hand. Some of the readers of this work will be in this position, but some of them, at least, may welcome editorial guidance, and even those who are fully capable of evaluating the material may find the lists convenient as an assemblage of readings worthy of consideration.²⁹

(iii) Originality

The following material, analyses, discussions, and conclusions are original.

a. The apparatus is the first one to Is 1-35 based on Biblical quotations in Rabbinic texts.

b. The apparatus is the first one based on Biblical quotations in Rabbinic texts to include all variants. It was thus possible to estimate the incidence of scribal errors in certain texts and certain manuscripts of the texts, and use the information gained in assessing variant readings which were not obviously genuine but were not obviously due to scribal error either. It was also

possible to include readings which in our present state of knowledge are not well enough attested to be included in a selective apparatus, but which may later turn out to be genuine.³⁰

Confusion to the reader due to the inclusion of scribal errors was avoided by means of the editorial techniques described in section 1 (c) (ii) d. of this introduction, and in the following paragraphs.³¹

c. The apparatus is the first to show whether the omission or addition of conjunctive waw occurs at the beginning of a quotation or not. It is also the first to show whether the omission of a single word may be due to its position at the beginning or end of a quotation.³²

d. The apparatus is the first to show whether, when several texts support a variant reading, they are related or unrelated. This information is more important than any other for assessing the genuineness of readings.

e. The apparatus provides a section of text extending beyond the word showing the variant, so that the reader can tell whether certain other words are affected, and so that the reader can tell whether, when one passage of Talmud or midrash has a Biblical quotation with a certain variant, and another passage has a variant on a different word nearby, the reason that the second passage does not exhibit the variant of the first passage is because it agrees with the MT or whether it is because it does not quote the word in question.³⁴

f. The index of texts is of a familiar type, but it is the first such index compiled to illustrate the present problem. The analysis of the reliability of the various texts in section 3(b)(ii) is based on this index. See above, paragraph b, p. 18.³⁵

g. The material in the notes to the apparatus is original. The idea of commenting on the readings, or providing evidence from external sources, is hardly new, but the notes presented here are more comprehensive and systematic than previous ones.

h. Parts of the introduction are original, parts are elaborations of existing knowledge, parts are repetition of existing knowledge.

Wholly original, except where other authors are specifically mentioned is section 3(b) (ii) of the introduction, which is based on the apparatus and lists of this work.

Section 3(b) (v) a. of the introduction, on the mediaeval manuscripts, is wholly original, but would not have been written without the stimulus of certain articles by Goshen-Gottstein.³⁶

Section 3(a) is original in detail, but the idea is taken from Goshen-Gottstein.³⁷

Section 3 (b) (i) is original in detail, but the idea is taken from Aptowitzer.³⁸

The synthesis in section 2 of the introduction is original to some extent in its approach, but most of the material in it is taken from existing knowledge. Some details of the argument are probably original.³⁹ The influence of Rabin, Segal, Orlinsky, and Kahle will be apparent.⁴⁰ The stimulus and basic principles of the argument is taken from some suggestions made by Professor Rabin.

i. The technical details of methodology described in chapters 5 and 6 of the introduction were for the most part devised for this work, but the dependence on established procedure will be apparent.

j. The problem of genuineness has been treated in more detail here than in previous work, not only in the introduction but in all

aspects of the arrangement and analysis, and, as already mentioned, some of the techniques devised are original, but the stimulus to concentrate on the matter came from various articles by Goshen-Gottstein.⁴¹

k. The survey of readings, classified according to their likelihood of being genuine variants, is based on the principles set out in chapter 3 of the introduction, and my own judgment, and is original.

2. Divergencies Within the Masoretic Recension

(a) The Evidence

(1) Divergencies Between the Text in Use in the Tannaitic Period and Later

The text of the Bible now known as the Masoretic Text was in existence and accepted as authoritative by the beginning of the first century A.D., and probably earlier.¹ The exact wording of the text was fixed by the first century A.D., if not earlier,² and even the details of full and defective spelling were fixed at the latest by the beginning of the second century A.D.³ From the time of the early Tannaim the text is treated as absolutely fixed: halachah is based on the most minor details of wording, such as the presence of a conjunctive waw, or even on the spelling itself,⁴ and nowhere do we find anyone objecting to an argument on the grounds that his manuscript reads something different.⁵ From that time on the text was copied with rigorous exactness.⁶

It would be expected that once the text had been fixed it would have been transmitted unchanged till the present time, and that our text as found in Masoretic model codexes (whether ben Asher or ben Naftali or mixed) or twentieth century printed editions based on them would agree absolutely with the text used by the Tannaim. Such is not the case. The Biblical text used by the Tannaim can be re-constructed on the evidence of Theodotion's Version,⁷ Aquila's Version, quotations in Tannaitic literature,⁸ and the Murabba'at texts,⁹ and can be seen to have differed from the modern received text.¹⁰ The divergencies are, in one sense, very minor, but what is surprising is that there should be any divergencies at all: the Tannaim and Amoraim, and the scribes from the time of the Tannaim till the time of the Masoretes, were as attentive to detail as modern textual critics, and for them no divergencies between manuscripts would have been minor.¹¹

Nor is it only the present text that differs from the one used by the Tannaim: the Targums, the Vulgate, and quotations in Amoraic texts and post-Amoraic midrashim¹² show that in the Amoraic and post-Amoraic periods, in both Babylonia and Israel, texts were in use that differed in slight details from the ones used by at least some of the Tannaim, as reconstructed from Theodotion, Aquila, and quotations in Tannaitic sources.

(ii) Divergencies Within the Text in Use in the Tannaitic Period

Several lines of argument lead to the conclusion that the explanation for the divergencies between some forms of the text used by the Tannaim and some forms in use later is that very slightly different sub-traditions of the Masoretic Text were in use in the Tannaitic period, and that some of these alternative readings, perhaps all of them, survived till much later.

a. It seems very unlikely, if not impossible, that variant readings could have arisen (as opposed to being noticed or selected) in the Amoraic period. If this is so, then presumably the readings in Biblical quotations in Palestinian Amoraic texts, and post Amoraic texts such as the Yelammedenu midrashim, were known in the Tannaitic period. The readings of the Vulgate and Palestinian Targums can probably be added to this evidence.¹³ We are faced, then, with at least a two-way alternative, between the variant readings of Palestinian Amoraic and post-Amoraic sources and the readings of the received text, both sets going back to the Tannaitic period or perhaps even further.

b. A similar argument applies to the readings in Tannaitic sources diverging from the received text. In such cases the variant is Tannaitic and the received reading must be assumed to be Tannaitic as well.

c. There are certain very minor divergencies within the

Babylonian text of the Bible as reported in Masoretic notes and lists. Differences are reported between the manuscripts used by the Nehardeans ('Y77777) and Surans ('X7777) and between these two and "the Easterners" ('X7777) in general.¹⁴ Admittedly these notes are later than the close of the Babylonian Talmud, but they probably preserve a much older tradition, since, as already remarked, it is unlikely that the differences in the consonantal text could have arisen after the time of the Amoraim, or even during it. Segal¹⁵ suggests that the explanation of these divergencies is that the readings go back to the time of foundation of each academy.

The academies of Neharde'a and Sura were both founded by scholars who migrated to Babylonia from Israel. The academy of Neharde'a was founded by scholars who fled from Israel at the time of the persecutions which led to the Third Revolt in 132 A.D., i.e. in the time of R. 'Aqiva. The names of most of the founders are not known, but it is known that one of them was Naqai, a scribe with an authoritative knowledge of Masorah. Moreover, we find a traditional pronunciation reported in the name of the scholar Rav Hanuna (not to be confused with either of the Amoraim of this name) of the generation after Naqai which, although rejected by Rabbi, is not a mistake: more on this in a moment. The academy of Sura was founded by Rav, who was a pupil of Rabbi and may be counted as one of the last of the Tannaim or the first Babylonian Amora. Rav was a scribe and transmitted halachot and traditional information relating to the copying of manuscripts and Masorah. Although not a Palestinian, he studied in Israel under Rabbi long enough to acquire the relevant traditions.¹⁶

It will be seen that from the very beginning these academies could rely on their text of the Bible. Probably, then,

as Segal suggests, the readings of the Neharda'e and Sura'e go back to the text brought by the founders from Israel in the second or third generation and fourth generation of Tannaim respectively. If this is so, the disagreements of the Neharda'e and Sura'e with the Ma'arva'e are due to their preservation of an authentic textual tradition corresponding to the one known to their founder when still in Israel, whereas the Ma'arva'e reading, itself authentically Palestinian, is taken from another sub-tradition of the text;¹⁷ similarly the disagreements between the Neharda'e and Sura'e are due to the preservation by the Neharda'e of a textual sub-tradition followed by certain Tannaim of the second generation, and by the Sura'e of a textual sub-tradition followed by certain Tannaim of the fourth generation.

There is some evidence for this theory from a passage in the Yerushalmi, Ta'anit chapter 4 halachah 2, leaf 68 column 1 middle in Bomberg's edition, and partly paralleled in Qohelet Rabbah 7:16 on Ecclesiastes 7:7. The following comments are based on Geiger's analysis of the passage.¹⁸ Rabbi read the word הַמִּלִּת in Ez 7:16 as pointed in the MT, as the plural feminine participle of הִמַּה. R. Haninah bar Hama, in agreement with the pronunciation taught to him by Rav Hammuna in Neharde'a, seems to have read הַמִּלִּת or הַמִּת, or perhaps הַמִּמִּת or הַמִּמִּת; in any case, a hof'al of מִת. Rav Hammuna's reading is not a mistake, but an authentic Palestinian tradition, being supported by the LXX, Peshitta, and Vulgate.¹⁹ Nor is it a mere difference of pronunciation. The text of the Yerushalmi may be slightly corrupt, so that the exact form of Rav Hammuna's reading is not completely certain, but it seems that he pointed out either that the spelling of the word demanded his interpretation, or that it

admitted it.

This passage is important for two reasons. It is a case of an authentic reading rejected by a Tanna, indicating that at different times or in different circles, the Biblical text used by the Tannaim was not absolutely uniform.²⁰ It is also evidence that the origin of the variant readings of the academy of Neharde'a goes back to the time of its foundation, and that their source is a text used by Tannaim in Israel at that time.

d. The Eastern readings as a whole, even when no divergence between sub-traditions is reported, probably go back to a text brought from Israel.²¹ It has already been mentioned that the production of new variants in the Amoraic period is unlikely. Aside from this, it is a remarkable fact that Eastern readings, as found in Masoretic notes and lists, or reconstructed from Targum Yonatan on the Prophets and Targum Onkelos, or from quotations in the Babylonian Talmud, are very often supported by Palestinian sources, namely the rest of the Versions and the quotations in Palestinian midrashim, against the received text.²² This means that the readings are not originally Eastern, but rather of Western origin, the opposite direction of borrowing being inconceivable before the time of the Geonim. The borrowing must have been during or just after the Tannaitic period, as there was not enough contact during the Amoraic period or soon after, and the Babylonians later seems to have regarded their text of the Bible as satisfactory without reference to the Palestinian one, as can be seen from their occupation with the Masora of Targum Onkelos. Once again we are back to Segal's theory that the origin of the Eastern readings is the text brought from Israel by the founders of the academies.

e. There are a few instances of the mention in Tannaitic sources of readings formerly in existence in certain Bibli-

cal manuscripts or even in the received text of the period before the transmitters of the particular tradition.²³ It is possible, of course, that some of these are traditions of the text before its final fixing, but it should be noticed that some of these readings that are expressly rejected are actually to be found in other Tannaitic texts or the Palestinian midrashim.²⁴ Compare also the remarks on Ez 7:16 above.

f. The most conclusive piece of evidence is that the Tannaitic sources themselves do not always agree with each other. The text used by Aquila was not absolutely exactly the same as the one used by Theodotion, and quotations in Tannaitic texts disagreeing very slightly with the received text are not always supported by Theodotion or Aquila, and there are a few cases of readings differing slightly from the received text in one Tannaitic source, and agreeing with the received text in another.²⁵

(iii) Divergencies Within the Text Used by the Amoraim

We have seen that there were very slight divergencies within the Biblical text used by the Tannaim. This situation persisted into the Amoraic period. The divergencies within the Babylonian tradition and between the Babylonian and Palestinian traditions, as reported in Masoretic lists, probably go back to the Amoraic and Tannaitic periods. It may be added that the Palestinian tradition itself was not uniform in the Amoraic period. Palestinian Amoraic texts contain numerous Biblical quotations diverging very slightly from the received text. Yet we must assume that the readings of the received text were known at least somewhere in Israel at that time, as otherwise their origin is inexplicable. The same argument probably applies to the variant read-

ings reflected in the Vulgate and Jerome's commentaries, or the Palestinian Targums, as compared to the received text.

It is a remarkable fact that the Biblical text used by the Amoraim in Tiberias did not agree exactly with the received text.²⁶ The explanation may be that the Masoretes of Tiberias used a text formerly used in another part of the country, and rejected the old text of Tiberias, or it may be that the Masoretes established a mixed consonantal text by comparison of several traditions.

(iv) Divergencies Within the Post-Amoraic Text

The divergencies continued into the period between the end of the Amoraic period and the pointing of the text. Evidence for divergencies within the text in Israel can be found in the Biblical quotations in Tanhuma and Yelammedenu midrashim differing from the received text.²⁷ Evidence for divergencies within the text in Babylonia can be found in the readings reflected in Targum Onqelos and the Targum on the Prophets differing from the received text, and in quotations in Gaonic text.²⁸

(v) Divergencies Within the Text Accepted by the Masoretes

The evidence for divergencies within the text accepted by the Masoretes in Israel consists of the readings found in Masoretic notes and treatises differing from the received text,²⁹ and the contradiction between different sets of Masoretic notes or between the notes and the text.³⁰ To this may be added the evidence of the next section, on divergencies in post-Masoretic sources.

The evidence from Masoretic sources for Babylonian readings disagreeing with the received text, or for divergencies

within the Babylonian text, is well-known and has already been mentioned.

(vi) Divergencies in the Post-Masoretic Text

The divergencies between ben Asher and ben Naftali are almost entirely confined to the cantillation marks and a few minor details of pointing. They seem to have agreed with each other on the consonantal text down to the details of full and defective spelling, with just a few exceptions.³¹ Whether the rest of the Tiberian Masoretes agreed with the consonantal text of ben Asher and ben Naftali is uncertain, but it seems that some Palestinian Masoretes disagreed, because in spite of the consensus of the later Tiberian Masoretes, readings diverging from the ben Asher — ben Naftali text persist till much later. The evidence of the post-Masoretic Biblical manuscripts is discussed in detail in section 3 (b) (v) a. of this introduction, and the arguments need not be repeated here. The conclusions reached there are that the Masoretes were unable to impose their standard text on all manuscripts, possibly because of the size of the task, possibly because some manuscripts were copied against the text of other Masoretes, that genuine readings survive in the later manuscripts and the printed editions based on them, and that these readings can be told from mere scribal errors by the number of manuscripts supporting them, or by the identity of the manuscripts. To this can be added the evidence of divergent readings in post-Masoretic texts, such as Biblical commentaries, the Tosafot, or grammars and dictionaries.³²

(b) Summary of Evidence and Theoretical Discussion

Although the phenomenon of variant readings in the Masoretic recension, as seen in the Versions later than the LXX, or the quotations in the Talmuds and midrashim and other texts, has long been known,

there has been hardly any theoretical consideration of the practical problem of how there can be any variants at all in a text that has been treated as if it were absolutely fixed since the Tannaitic period or earlier and has been copied with scrupulous accuracy, or the psychological problem of how variant readings, no matter how slight, could have been tolerated. So far as I know, only two scholars have shown in their writings that they are fully aware of the importance of the second problem, or the inter-relation of the two.

Segal³⁴ suggests that the readings in Tannaitic and Amoraic sources disagreeing with the received text were probably due to the preservation by different scribal schools of slightly different textual traditions. Segal's suggestion has the merit of explaining how the text can have been absolutely fixed and still show variant readings. Rabin³⁵ suggests that the state of the Biblical text at Qumran seems to have been similar to the text of the Koran, with several alternative traditions, each fixed in itself, and each differing slightly from the others, but all accepted as authoritative and correct, and that the same situation might have applied to orthodox or Rabbinic Judaism. Rabin's suggestion, supplemented by Segal's, explains not only the origin of the readings in Tannaitic and Amoraic sources differing from the received text, and the apparent contradiction of a fixed text with variants, but also the reason that most of the variants only affect a single word and are so minor. It will be seen that the evidence presented in the previous paragraphs supports this theory, and it will become clear as we progress that it is supported by several lines of argument and provides an adequate explanation of diverse phenomena.

We have seen that the scribes of the Tannaitic period inherited a text which the Tannaim were able to treat as absolutely fixed, but in which there were sets of alternative readings. The alternative readings were not unified, perhaps because there was no

reasonable way of deciding on the authoritative reading, or because the scribes did not feel competent or authorized to change the text handed down to them, or because they did not feel the need to level the divergencies between the variants sub-traditions, or for a combination of reasons. The divergencies continued in both Israel and Babylonia up till the time of the pointing of the text. The consonantal text chosen for this by the Tiberian schools of ben Asher and ben Naftali, and quite possibly by the earlier Tiberian Masoretes as well, is almost completely fixed, but even ben Asher and ben Naftali disagree in a few cases. Other Palestinian Masoretes, whether in Tiberias or not is uncertain, seem to have preserved consonantal texts differing very slightly from each other and from the one accepted by ben Asher and ben Naftali. These readings disagreeing slightly with the ben Asher - ben Naftali consonantal text survive in the mediaeval manuscripts, the printed editions, quotations in later literature, and perhaps the Sevir readings.³⁶

The sets of alternative readings seem to have been regarded as having equal authority. This can be seen from the instances of alternate appearance of the received reading, a divergent reading, and then the received reading, perhaps became first one, then the other, then the first again, were treated as authoritative, but more probably because our source for each period reflects the text of a different school. Examples are readings in Aquila disagreeing with both Theodotion before him and the received text after him, readings in the Vulgate disagreeing with Aquila or Theodotion as well as the received text, or readings in quotations in Amoraic and post-Amoraic texts disagreeing with Aquila or Theodotion as well as the received text.³⁷ The alternative readings between ben Asher and ben Naftali in the consonantal text seem to be treated in the lists preserving them as having equal authority. The same seems to apply to the alternatives between the Eastern and Western text, or within the Eastern text.

The readings belonging to the category of קצרה קרן³⁸ may be survivals of readings once accepted as correct, although this matter needs further investigation. It has been suggested that the ketiv and qere readings are the remains of sets of alternative readings, but the age of the qere readings is disputed, so that this argument is in our present state of knowledge inconclusive.³⁹ The most conclusive piece of evidence in favour of the equal authority of the alternatives is the sources from which we know them. It will not be disputed that the readings of the received text must have been taken from reliable sources, and their reliability is confirmed by the support in many cases of Theodotion or Aquila or a Tannaitic or Amoraic derash. Our sources for the variant reading are, however, of equal authority. We have Theodotion's version, almost certainly an officially approved Rabbinic translation,⁴⁰ and Aquila's version, which was certainly officially approved; we have the quotations in Tannaitic and Amoraic texts, and these readings (leaving out false variants due to the mistakes of copyists) must have been taken from manuscripts regarded as authoritative and correct;⁴¹ we have the quotations in Tanhuma-Yelammedenu texts, which are transcriptions of sermons and would have had to be based on a correct Biblical text; we have Masoretic notes, lists, and treatises; we have the divergencies given as such in Masoretic lists;⁴² we have the quotations in post-Masoretic texts, including Biblical commentaries and grammars, by scholars who were well aware of the importance of a correct text.⁴³

Purely as speculation, it might be suggested that the Masoretes did not try to establish a correct consonantal text by deciding between alternative readings, but that each Masorete took as his text reliable manuscripts of the sub-tradition handed down to him, so that the ben Asher or ben Naftali consonantal text was meant simply as a reliable copy of one particular form of the text, and that

the prestige of the ben Asher or ben Naftali pointing (the pointing systems, like the consonantal texts, are so close that for the present purpose they can be considered identical) reflected onto the sub-tradition of the consonantal text that was its vehicle. The faithful recording of the divergences in the consonantal text between different schools seems, as Rabin remarks,⁴⁴ to indicate that there was no wish to level the differences, but only to preserve the sub-tradition of each school.

The attitude towards the text just described, the faithful preservation of a particular sub-tradition of the text, while admitting the validity of other sub-traditions, seems to be confirmed by the halachah.

If there had ever been a formal halachic decision in favour of a particular text-form or Masorah (aside from the present recognition in practice of the ben Asher text) the fact would not have been forgotten, and even if the text or Masorah had been contaminated from outside, there would still be manuscripts purporting to give such a text and Masorah, even if in fact they did not. The authors of the colophons of manuscripts purporting to give the ben Asher text, though they may claim or imply that this text and Masorah is better than others, rely on the prestige of ben Asher as a Masoretic scholar and the internal support of the evident trustworthiness of his text and Masorah, not on the external support of a halachic decision.⁴⁵ The nearest approach to a halachic decision in favour of a particular text in Maimonides's pronouncement in favour of the ben Asher text, apparently as found in the Aleppo Codex, but this pronouncement is much later than the period of Masoretic activity, is not worded as if it were a halachic decision, and is not concerned with the problem of variant readings in the consonantal text, but only the lay-out.⁴⁶ Before Maimonides's time manuscripts written according to ben Asher or ben Naftali were

generally considered to be superior, but the emphasis seems to have been on the superiority of the pointing and lay-out⁴⁷

The traditional method of deciding between alternative readings in Biblical manuscripts is to choose the reading of the majority of carefully-copied and reliable manuscripts. No one manuscript is by itself superior to any other, provided both are carefully copied from unobjectionable originals. Editors of printed editions try to print a ben Asher text, but their reason for doing so is not that this text has more halachic validity than any other, but that it commends itself to them on critical grounds or the grounds of convenience. When two such editions, such as the Biblia Hebraica and the British and Foreign Bible Society edition, disagree, there does not seem to any way of giving halachic preference to one reading over the other. In such cases both readings are so well attested by eminently Masoretic manuscripts that neither could be rejected even if it became known which really was ben Asher's reading. It may be doubted if a reading in such editions has any more validity (as opposed to critical value) than one found in a very large number of accurately written manuscripts and printed editions based on such manuscripts.⁴⁸

The authors of the Tosafot, when they come across a Biblical reading in the Talmud disagreeing with the reading in their manuscripts, remark on the fact, but do not allow the authority of the Amoraim to induce them to reject their own reading. Neither, on the other hand, do they reject the variant reading of the Amoraim or the argument based on it.⁴⁹ In fact, on this matter the halachah is quite definite: the text of Biblical manuscripts must not be emended to agree with the readings of Biblical quotations in the Talmud (of Babylonian origin) or the midrashim (of Palestinian origin); but an argument in the Talmud is not to be rejected merely

because it is based on a reading diverging from ours.⁵⁰ In other words, both readings are correct, but we continue to use the traditional reading of our Biblical manuscripts.

It seems, then, that the state of the halachah, even in its present form, is the result of the attitude to the text postulated by Rabin.

From all the evidence presented here, it seems that Rabin's theory of limited variability, that is, of several very lightly divergent forms of the text, each form being absolutely fixed, and the alternative readings of different text-forms being equally valid, though in practice one particular text may be the only one used by a particular school or in a particular community, is correct.⁵¹ The situation has continued to this day. There are still some pairs of slightly divergent alternative readings, each attested in numerous reliable manuscripts, or supported by a form of the Masorah, although there are usually more manuscripts supporting the consonantal reading of the ben Asher text than the alternative.⁵² If the modern printed editions agree with each other almost entirely in their consonantal text, it is partly due to the gradual ascendancy of the ben Asher — ben Naftali consonantal text in the later manuscripts, so that it is now the text of the majority of manuscripts, but it is also partly due to the custom of always printing the ben Asher text, which, however, seems to be chosen more for its cantillation marks and vowel-pointing than its consonantal readings.

3. The Problem of Genuineness

(a) Prolegomena and Definitions

Before the readings listed in the apparatus can be used for any purpose at all, there must be some means of distinguishing, if not with certainty at least with some probability, between real variant readings and mistakes in quoting or copying. As much information as possible for this purpose on individual readings is given in the apparatus and the notes to it; this section is intended to complement that information by giving some general principles, so that the relevance of it will be understood in each case, and to supplement it by providing, in the process, samples of certain phenomena, so that various categories of variants or various types of support for them can be assessed in groups and the information gained from them applied to individual variants with some insight.

The first step is to establish what is meant by a real variant, or to put it another way, what is meant by a false one.¹

A real or genuine variant in a Biblical quotation in a Rabbinic text is one that has its origin in a group (or at least a certain number) of Biblical manuscripts. In some cases the reading might go back to the author of the passage in which it is found (בעל) (גדאדג, who regarded it as correct; in other cases it might have arisen in the course of oral transmission; in other cases it might have been introduced by the compilers of the text in its oral or written form; in other cases it might have been introduced by a scribe copying the completed text; but at whatever stage it was introduced, it was taken over from Biblical manuscripts with the same reading. A false variant, on the other hand, is one that has entered the quotation in the Rabbinic text through a mistake on the part of the author of the passage, a transmitter, whether of the oral or the written text, a compiler, or a scribe.

There can be no doubt that the apparatus contains many false variants. Nearly all the readings marked <ו"ו> and most of those marked <?ו"ו>² are probably mistakes, and it seems likely that if such readings had arisen in a Biblical manuscript they would have been corrected against another text, if not the MT, at least one that was intelligible.

Most, if not all, of the readings marked with an obelus because they seem to be induced by the matter or wording of their context are probably mistakes.

The handful of cases where the variant reading is contradicted by the derash are certainly due to scribal error or misprint.³

It will be seen from the apparatus that omissions far exceed additions. This is to be expected, as it is much easier to leave a word out by mistake than to insert one.

Some of these omissions are doubtless genuine variants, but most of them must be mistakes: if they were not, they would not exceed the number of additions to such an extent.

It will be noticed that the individual variants in the four categories just mentioned are in nearly every case poorly attested in the Rabbinic texts and poorly supported or not supported by the Versions and Hebrew manuscripts, and that the attestation and support are particularly poor if compared with those for the apparatus as a whole.

There are probably many readings that have arisen in the course of copying under the influence of a phrase from some other verse in the Bible that was in the scribe's mind, but are indistinguishable from genuine variants. See the notes to the apparatus on the reading כל הארץ in Is 24:11. There are some readings explicable as normalizations, e.g. the readings מַפְנֵי in Is 1:12, מַשְׁנֵי in 1:18, מַשְׁכֵּימִים in 5:11, בְּ in 8:6, וְהִרְ in 8:8, קָרִיָה in 29:1.

We may suppose that simply because absolutely perfect copying or memorization is humanly impossible there occasionally appeared in a Rabbinic text a reading that was quite plausible and made good sense, was not induced by the context or a reminiscence of another verse, and was not of a type that is commonly due to scribal error, and that in some cases this happened early enough for the reading to be well-represented in the extant text-witnesses.

In spite of all the foregoing, there can be no doubt that the apparatus does contain quite a few real variants. There are a few variants that can be shown to be genuine because the derash depends on them; many are attested by numerous manuscripts of a particular text; many are attested by several different texts, related or independent; many are well-supported by the Versions and Hebrew manuscripts. In spite of the possibility mentioned in the pre-vious paragraph, it can hardly be supposed that very many variants in the second category are false, particularly if waw-readings are left out of consideration. It might be objected that support of the third and fourth kinds mentioned might be due to coincidence, but such an explanation, though it might apply to some individual cases, will not do for particularly well-attested cases or for the readings as a group.

It being established that the apparatus contains both real and false variants, it remains to set out and apply the criteria for telling them apart.

(b) Criteria

(i) Amount of Attestation

Other things being equal, a reading found in more than one manuscript of a particular Rabbinic text, might be assumed to be more likely to be genuine than one found in a single manuscript of the

text. Mere numbers of text-witnesses are, however, not enough to evaluate the attestation of a particular reading. Two other considerations must be borne in mind: the degree to which the text-witnesses are related, and the number and nature of the text-witnesses that were not available.

If two text-witnesses have a particular reading in their quotation of a Biblical verse, it may be assumed, if the reading is not one that could arise spontaneously several times, such as those marked with an obelus in the apparatus (but sometimes even then⁵) that it goes back to their common ancestor; but there is usually no way of going back any further, and we are left with the possibility that the reading is simply a mistake by the scribe of an early manuscript. The less closely-related the text-witnesses are, the older the reading probably is, and the more likely it is to go back to the original redaction of the midrash or even to the author of the passage in which it occurs; and if it does go back to the redactors of the midrash or the author of the passage it is more likely to be genuine than if it originated with the scribe or corrector of a particular manuscript, no matter how easily it might have been written or how many other manuscripts were copied from it or influenced by it.

Not only the positive evidence of the number of text-witnesses or families of text-witnesses must be considered, but also the number of text-witnesses that were not available and their relation-

ship to each other, and to what extent the text-witnesses available may be unrepresentative. For example, the reading תבואת השרה in Is 30:23 in a quotation of Bereshit Rabbah in the Yalqut Shim'oni on Genesis, although found in only a single text-witness, is not contradicted by any other text-witness because none carries the quotation of the verse as far as the word in question, and the reading תאכלם in Is 33:11 in manuscripts פא² of Bereshit Rabbah is contradicted by only four text-witnesses, דא¹ כ, which are closely related to each other and to א², and ז, the affiliations of which are unknown. The fewer text-witnesses with the reading of the MT are available, and the more closely they are related to each other, the less confidently can it be said that the variant reading is a late development in the textual tradition.

Some further examples of readings found in several manuscripts of a particular text, some of the manuscripts being unrelated (or not closely related) to each other are listed below.

Bereshit Rabbah: Is 2:17 ארם ; 4:4 את ח' ; 29:10 ה' עליהם (or ה' עליכם); 29:16 היאמר ; 30:23 מקנך ; 33:7 אראלים ; 33:16 והוא ; 34:9 והפכתי. Note also the readings ונקרא in Is 9:5 and the readings ארצך and את ח' in Is 30:23. (See Albeck's introduction to Bereshit Rabbah, pp.137-138).

Wayyiqra Rabbah: 1:18 ואם יארימו ; 3:16 וברגליהן ; 14:4 את המשל הזה ; 14:17 ולאסיריו ; 22:15 אל שבוא ; 28:16 ארני ח'. (See Margulies's introduction to his edition, pp. XXXIV-XXXIX).

Pesiqta deRav Kahana: 1:22 היה ח' (but dubious); 1:26 ואחרי מקצה 13:5 עליכם ; 8:7 וברגליהן ; 3:16 (but dubious); 3:16 כן ; 34:11 עליך (apparently); 35:5 תשמענה. (See Mandelbaum's Hebrew introduction to his edition, pp. 17-18).

We must now consider the case of variants found in more than

one text.⁶ It is very important in evaluating such attestation to distinguish clearly, both theoretically and in each individual case, between instances of the same variant reading being found in the same passage in several separate texts, and instances of the same reading being found in different passages in separate texts. If a certain passage is found in more than one text, in each case with the same variant reading in a quotation of a Biblical verse, and the reading is not one that could arise spontaneously several times, the two occurrences of the variant reading must go back to a common source, either the text of the passage as formulated, orally or in writing, by its author (בעל המאמר), or at an early stage in the oral or written transmission of it, so that ultimately the different occurrences must be treated as a single witness, though an ancient one. On the other hand, if a particular variant reading occurs in several unrelated passages, the occurrences must be treated as so many separate witnesses, with their age to be determined. Each of these two kinds of attestation has its own value.

If a reading occurs in a Biblical quotation in the same passage in two different texts, and one of the texts has copied the passage from the other, then the reading must have entered the textual tradition of the earlier text no later than the time of composition of the later one. For instance, the reading על'יך in Is 8:7 in manuscripts P₁^x of the Pesiqta deRav Kahana occurs in a quotation of the Pesiqta deRav Kahana in the Pesiqta Rabbati, which means that at least a part of the textual tradition of the Pesiqta deRav Kahana must have had the reading at the time of compilation of the Pesiqta Rabbati, several centuries before manuscripts P₁^x of the Pesiqta deRav Kahana were copied.

Such evidence for the minimum age of a reading can be very valuable. Even the latest midrashim of the Tanhuma group are older than the earliest manuscripts of Tannaitic and Amoraic texts (except perhaps for some Genizah fragments), so that the support of even a

late manuscript of a Tanhuma midrash or the Midrash Tehillim for a particular reading in an older text is just as valuable as support from an ancient manuscript of the older text, and can be more valuable than support from a late manuscript of the older text, particularly if the possibility of the reading having arisen in the textual tradition of the later midrash some time after the passage had been copied from the older one can be ruled out by the presence of the reading in part of the textual tradition of the older text. An example of such a case is the reading אַדָּא in Is 2:17 in the text-witnesses י' ²אָדָּא of Bereshit Rabbah, and in two separate quotations of the passage from Bereshit Rabbah in later compilations, once in the Midrash Tehillim and once in a Genizah fragment.

There are a few cases of readings found in two occurrences of the same passage in different places in the one text. Presumably such readings, if they do not go back to the author of the passage, at least go back to the compilers of the text in its final form. Some examples from the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el: Is 4:5 על מִכְרוֹן and ה' אֱלֹהִים אַתָּה ; 25:1 כִּי עַל כְּבוֹד.

An example from the Pesiqta deRav Kahana is the reading תְּשַׁמְעוּנָה in Is 35:5. An example from Bereshit Rabbah is the reading ה' עֲלֵיהֶם (or ה' עֲלֵיכֶם) in Is 29:10. An example from Wayyiqra Rabbah is the reading אִם תִּמְאֲנֶךָ in Is 1:20.

Readings found in more than one Palestinian Amoraic text in the same context are probably original to at least one of them, and may well be older than the time of final compilation of either.⁷ Some selected examples: Is 3:11 כְּגֹמֶל; 3:16 וּבְרִגְלֵיהֶן ; 8:18 אֱלֹהִים.

It is difficult to assess the age of a reading found in several Tanhuma texts in the same context, because the relationship of the texts to each other, or even the relationship of different sec-

tions of the one text to each other, is uncertain.⁸ It seems, however, that readings found in more than one such text, such as the reading $\square\aleph$ in Is 2:17, go back to the time of compilation of the later text, and that readings found in more than one place in the same text (but in the same context) such as the reading $\aleph\aleph$ in Is 24:11, are as old as the time of final compilation of the text. The readings may, of course, be older than this.

Although the relationship of the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el and Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yoḥai to each other is uncertain,⁹ it seems that a reading found in the same context in both texts, if it is not older than the time of final compilation of both, must be older than the time of final compilation of whichever is later. Examples are the readings $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ in Is 2:21; $\aleph\aleph$ in Is 24:20; $\aleph\aleph$ in Is 24:21 (but notice the reading $\aleph\aleph$):

It has been mentioned that if a reading is attested in more than one occurrence of the same passage, all the occurrences must be treated as a single witness, though an ancient one, which means that although such testimony is very valuable for confirming the originality of the reading within that passage, and for tracing it back to an early period, it does not give any information as to how well-known or wide-spread the reading was: such information can only be obtained from instances of the same reading being found in different passages. It may be assumed that the more unrelated passages quote a verse with

a particular variant reading, the more widespread was the reading within the textual tradition of manuscripts of Isaiah at an early period. It should be noted that if a reading is found in more than one unrelated passage, this does not necessarily mean that it is original in each, specially if it is found in only a single text-witness; what it does mean is that it is probably original in at least some of them and therefore a genuine variant reading.

(ii) Reliability of Attestation

If a reading is found in several unrelated text-witnesses, or even better, in several different texts, then the cumulative evidence of all the witnesses or all the texts makes it less important to consider each text-witness or each text in detail. It is when a reading is supported by only a single manuscript or closely related group of manuscripts in a single text, or is only found in a single text not available in a critical edition, that this problem becomes important. As each text presents its own problems, it is best to discuss them separately.

Bereshit Rabbah

According to Albeck,¹⁰ the most reliable manuscripts of Bereshit Rabbah are 17; the least reliable, 21, but as this judgment applies only to their reproduction of the text of the midrash, and may not apply to their reproduction of the text of the Biblical quotations, it seems best to re-examine the value of the manuscripts from that viewpoint. The sample of readings available for estimating the relative value of the manuscripts is very limited, so it is probably best to begin with their most salient characteristics, their unique readings.

It will be noticed that the unique readings of manuscripts are decidedly inferior to the unique readings of the other text-witnesses. None of the unique readings of manuscript 7 are supported by

other evidence, and with the possible exception of the reading וְהָיָה in Is 30:29, are inferior in quality to the reading of the MT and seem to be simply scribal errors. The only unique reading of manuscript 1 supported by other evidence is וְהָיָה in Is 29:10, but this does not really count, since manuscripts 31 are the only ones to quote this word, and it seems likely that most of the rest would have given the same reading if they had taken the quotation far enough.

Of the remaining text-witnesses, the most reliable seem to be the Yalqut Shim'oni (9) and manuscript 9, but the sample is very limited and it is impossible to be sure. Manuscript 3 presents a mixture of apparent errors (apparently due to faulty copying of a smudged original, as they seem to be due to misreading of individual letters), along with an equal number of readings that could be genuine, including a few that are well-attested in other texts.

In spite of the uncertainty about the relative value of the text-witnesses, it will be noticed that Bereshit Rabbah gives very few readings that may be called inferior and has a high proportion of readings that are supported by other evidence, and that most of the readings supported by two or more text-witnesses could be genuine. In fact, Bereshit Rabbah stands alone in having a very high proportion of apparently genuine readings supported by several text-witnesses, and relatively few supported by only a single text-witness. This is noticeable even if we make allowance for the large number of text-witnesses of Bereshit Rabbah available. The explanation may be that as the text of Bereshit Rabbah is well-preserved, genuine original readings tend to survive in several text-witnesses, so that most of the unique readings of each text-witness are individual scribal errors, whereas the unique readings of text-witnesses in other texts may tend to be the remnants of original readings corrected according to the MT in almost the whole

textual tradition, and surviving by chance in a single witness.

Wayyiqra Rabbah

This midrash¹¹ has a high proportion of readings that seem to be due to scribal error, and a high proportion of ones well-supported by external evidence and apparently genuine. The inferior readings are confined to a single manuscript or group of manuscripts, but on the other hand several readings that could well be genuine are very weakly attested. The impression is that of a text very rich in genuine variants from the MT, and originally very carefully edited, which has suffered at the hands of scribes and correctors.¹²

Readings found in only a single manuscript or closely-related pair of manuscripts tend to be inferior, but include a certain number that are apparently genuine variants corrected in all the other manuscripts.¹³ The present text of Wayyiqra Rabbah seems to be much less reliable than the text of Bereshit Rabbah in the matter of the preservation of the original text of the Biblical quotations.

The Pesiqta deRav Kahana

All that has been said about Wayyiqra Rabbah as compared to Bereshit Rabbah applies even more to the Pesiqta deRav Kahana.¹⁴ Most of the deviations from the MT in this text seem to be due to scribal error. No manuscript is free from blunders, but surprisingly enough, all of them have variant readings that seem to be genuine. Both the mistakes and the apparently genuine readings may be supported by a single manuscript or by several.

The impression received is of a text in which nearly all original readings have been corrected according to the MT, with a few survivals here and there, producing a large number of unique readings that are apparently genuine, but which has been inaccurately copied, so that each text-witness has a high proportion of scribal errors unique to itself.¹⁵

readings in the Midrash Haggadol seem to be remarkably free of scribal errors, and to contain a higher proportion of apparently genuine variants than most texts, and seem to be very reliable: this applies particularly to readings attested by the majority of text-witnesses.

It is an interesting question, though one that does not admit of a conclusive answer, to what extent variant readings in the Midrash Haggadol are due to its sources, and to what extent they are due to the influence of variant readings in Yemeni Biblical manuscripts. The only readings in the apparatus that seem to be certainly due to the influence of Biblical manuscripts used by the compiler or copyists are לַכֶּם הָעֵרָן הַזֶּה in Is 22:14, and יָנִיץ in Is 6:7.¹⁸

Characteristic of this text is a tendency towards full spelling of the second person masculine singular possessive suffix as יָ- and not י- .¹⁹

There are quite a few instances of readings that seem to be genuine found in only a single manuscript, and there is a possibility that variant readings now found in only a limited number of manuscripts or a single manuscript were once wide-spread and might go back to the original edition of the Midrash Haggadol.²⁰ The Midrash Haggadol extends the Biblical quotations further than do its sources,²¹ and it is possible that the compiler corrected according to the text considered correct by him at the same time as he extended the quotation.

Texts not Available in Critical Editions.

Evaluating the reliability of texts not available in critical editions²² is much more difficult. In most cases all that can be said is that the text seems to contain a small number of scribal errors

a small number of readings that are almost certainly genuine, and a large number of readings that may or may not be genuine, but are at least possible. This comment applies to the Midrash Tanhuma, Midrash Tehillim, Midrash Hādash 'al Hattorah, 'Aggadot Bereshit, 'Aggadot Hattalmud, and Seder Eliyahu.

Special cases are the Pesiqta Rabbati and Shir Hashshirim Zuṭa

The Pesiqta Rabbati

The text of the Pesiqta Rabbati is very corrupt,²³ probably more corrupt than any other extensive text used for the apparatus except Shir Hashshirim Zuṭa. In spite of this, the proportion of readings not apparently due to scribal error and well-supported by external evidence is very high.

Midrash Shir Hashshirim Zuṭa

The text of the Midrash Shir Hashshirim Zuṭa is more corrupt than that of any other text used in this work,²⁴ and the corruption extends to the Biblical quotations. The only readings that seem at all likely to be genuine are לְעַלְמֵי עָלְמַי and לְעַלְמֵי עָלְמַי in Is 31:1 and יְכַוְוֵהוּ in Is 33:5.

Compilations

The Yalqut Shim'oni, Yalqut Mechiri, Midrash Leqaḥ Tov, and Midrash Sechel Tov are compilations, and the same comments on the difficulties of evaluation apply to them as to the Midrash Haggadol.

Other Texts

The rest of the texts used are not quoted enough times in the apparatus to be evaluated.

From all the foregoing a few general principles on evaluating variants in the various texts may be drawn.

The text of Bereshit Rabbah seems to be fairly well-preserved, and as readings supported by external evidence and therefore presumably genuine tend to be attested in more than one manuscript, unique readings should be treated with care, on the principle that if they were genuine they would have survived in more manuscripts. Readings well-attested in Bereshit Rabbah may well be genuine even if they are not supported by external evidence.

The text of the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el and Mechilta de-Rabbi Shim'on ben Yohai seems to be well-preserved, but genuine readings seem often to be found in only a single manuscript. The consensus of more than one text-witness to either midrash is probably genuine; the consensus of part of the textual tradition of one with part of the textual tradition of the other is almost certainly genuine.

The text of the Sifre on Deuteronomy is well-preserved, and the reading of the majority of manuscripts in any given case probably represent a genuine reading. The sample is too limited for unique readings to be evaluated properly, but each one of those listed in the apparatus could be genuine, though probably a proportion are not.

Readings in the Pesiqta deRav Kahana supported by several text-witnesses (there are not many) or by a parallel passage in another text can usually be relied on, but the rest are a mixture of scribal errors and genuine readings, and must be treated with caution.

Readings in the Pesiqta Rabbati that are not of the type that might easily arise through scribal error (such as ׀ל׀ד for ׀ל׀ד in Is 23:4) and present no other difficulties may be genuine, but should be tested against external evidence. If they are supported by another text, or well-supported by the Versions or Biblical

manuscripts, they are probably genuine.

Readings in Shir Hashshirim Zuta should be regarded with suspicion, even if they are plausible, and should not be accepted as genuine without support from external evidence.

Readings supported by all or most of the textual tradition of the Midrash Haggadol are probably genuine. Readings found in only a minor part of the textual evidence may be due to scribal error, or if genuine, perhaps to the influence of Yemeni Bible manuscripts (although this is not certain); nevertheless many apparently genuine variants are found in only a single manuscript of the Midrash Haggadol, or a small proportion of the manuscripts, perhaps because the readings have been corrected in the rest of the manuscripts.

The rest of the texts used are either very ordinary, with a proportion of mistakes, a proportion of almost certainly genuine readings, and a large number of readings that might or might not be genuine, or are not quoted enough times in the apparatus to be evaluated. Any individual reading from such texts can only be assessed on its intrinsic probability and external evidence. If there is no external support, but the reading does not seem to be due to scribal error or induced by the context, and is intrinsically possible, judgment must be suspended.

(iii) Support from the Derash

Support from the derash may be explicit or implicit. Explicit support is the presentation of the variant form as a deliberate contrast to the reading of the MT, which is quoted and assumed to be known to the reader. Implicit support means support for the reading from the context of the argument, without the reader's attention being called to the deviation from the MT and often with the reading of the MT being given instead of the variant.

Explicit support may be of three kinds: the formula אל תהי קררא (אל תקרי) may be used; the reading of the MT and then the

variant may be given one after the other without any technical expression to indicate what is meant by giving an alternative phrasing; or the reading of the MT may be given, followed by the formula $\text{בְּכַךְ וְכַךְ}(\text{כְּתִיב}).^{25}$

The difference between the first two types seems to be only one of formulation. In both cases, the reading of the MT is assumed to be known and is quoted as the standard reading, and then the original reading is changed slightly to one that yields a meaning that fits into the argument of the derash. Most of these readings are probably only exegetical conveniences, but a few may be reminiscences of real variants in Biblical manuscripts.

There is only one case of the third type: the reading הִצִּיחַ in Is 33:7.²⁶ What seems to be meant is that although the traditional pronunciation of the word הִצִּיחַ is with shureq, the defective spelling allows a pronunciation with hireq. The pronunciation with shureq seems to be regarded as standard, and the one with hireq seems to be acknowledged as a deliberate deviation, like the variants of the first two classes mentioned above; but like some of them, this exegetical re-reading seems to be a reminiscence of an old variant reading.

Implicit support may be of two kinds: the variant reading may be required to make the derash intelligible, or at least to make the relationship between the Biblical text and the derash natural and clear; or the reading may be alluded to in the exposition of the verse, without the interpretation depending on the variant reading.

In either case, some text-witnesses may actually quote the verse with the variant reading.

Readings implicitly supported are more likely to be genuine than ones explicitly supported. If the author of the derash or the redactor of it in its present form presents a reading as an alternative to the reading of the MT, then the reading of the MT must have been known, and the alternative reading might have been manufactured for exegetical purposes.²⁷ The readings explicitly attested can be divided into a fairly large number of obvious homiletical devices, a very small number that seem to be genuine variants known to the authors of the passages in which they occur, and a large number that could be either. In the case of readings implicitly attested, there is no sign that the variant reading is regarded by the author of the passage as being anything else than the standard reading.

A serious difficulty in using implicit evidence for a variant reading is that it is sometimes difficult to determine whether the variant really is assumed. In general, it is easier to assess the evidence for the dependence of an argument on a particular reading than the evidence of apparent allusions to the variant in the wording of the derash, and in the second case there is sometimes uncertainty as to whether the variant reading determined the wording of the comment induced the variant reading.²⁸ If it can once be determined, however, that an argument does depend on a certain variant, or that the wording of a comment has been influenced by a variant reading, then that variant is almost certainly genuine.

(iv) Support from the Versions

a. Prolegomena

As the use of the Versions for the detection and evaluation of variant readings in the Hebrew text has been extensively and minutely treated in previous works, and the problems involved are well-known to textual critics, this discussion will be limited mainly to a brief outline of the considerations to be borne in mind, with references to the sources for more detailed information.²⁹ In the case of the LXX, which stands apart from the other Versions, lists of probably genuine variants will be given, but there will not be any attempt to evaluate every single case of apparent support for a variant reading from one Version or the other, because to do so would take a separate book or would treble the size of this work, and in most cases the evidence can be assessed on the principles given here, or is inconclusive; the readings that do require a separate discussion, whether to show that the Version supports or does not support a given reading, or to show that its evidence is not to be trusted, are already discussed in the notes to the apparatus.

There are three main problems in evaluating the readings of the Versions: it is not always easy to go from the wording of the translation back to the reading of the translator's Hebrew text, partly because the grammar and vocabulary of Hebrew and the language of the translation do not always correspond exactly, partly because of the translator's indifference to certain details; the textual witnesses of the Version itself do not always agree; and agreement between the Hebrew text used by the translator and a reading known from a quotation in a Rabbinic text might only be due to coincidence. The most convenient and the clearest way of discussing these problems is to take each Version in turn and show to what extent the first two problems apply, and then treat the third problem separately.

b. The Individual Versions

. The LXX³⁰

The exact relationship of the LXX of Isaiah to the Hebrew text used by the translator is uncertain, because a reconstruction of the Hebrew depends partly on a detailed knowledge of the translator's method of working, and that depends on an exact knowledge of his Hebrew text.³¹ This much, however, is clear, that the translator often deviated from the sense of the Hebrew, sometimes on purpose, sometimes without realising, sometimes because he did not understand what he was translating, sometimes because he was not concerned with giving a word for word translation, or even an exact one.³² The translation is full of omissions, additions, contractions, glosses, changes of inflexional morphemes, substitutions, word-groups syntactically re-analysed, and words read in a way disagreeing with the Masoretic tradition.³³ Some of these translations might correspond to the variant Hebrew readings, some might not, but it is very hard to tell which do and which do not.

From what is known about the translator's method,³⁴ certain types of apparent deviation from the MT can be judged more likely to represent differences in the translator's Hebrew text than others. The translator does not seem to have cared very much about reproducing each waw or each occurrence of the word ^ל, about using a fixed equivalent for each Hebrew preposition, about preserving the tense, number, gender, or mood of the verbs, or about preserving the grammatical number of the nouns, and seems to have felt free to contract, to add glosses, and to give what he thought on a phrase meant without trying to make any except the keywords of his translation correspond to individual words of the original.³⁵ This does not mean, however, that all such deviations from the MT such be regarded as due to translation-technique. The translator is not consistent with himself,³⁶ and though he translates very freely at times, most of the

translation is fairly literal, and it may be presumed, or at least kept in mind as a possibility, that apparent deviations from the MT in such cases are due to fairly literal translation of a slightly divergent Hebrew text. As far as possible, the reader is warned in the Notes when the LXX's translation must be used with caution because it translates freely, or when its translation diverges so much from the MT or from the literal meaning of the MT that comparison is useless, and if such a warning is not given, it can be assumed that the phrase or sentence in which the variant reading occurs is one that is translated fairly literally. Nevertheless fairly literally does not mean completely literally, and the reader should check any case of apparent support from the LXX mentioned in the Notes and make his own assessment.

The following list gives cases of readings in the LXX that seem to correspond to Hebrew readings attested in other Versions, and that are hard to explain as due to translation-technique.

List A

- 1:18 נא ח'
- 2:21 הצור
- 3:11 כגמול
- 9:4 ברשע
- 9:5 ונקרא
- 14:13 אשים
- 14:19 כנצל
- 17:12 ים
- 22:16 ומה לך
- 24:11 שבת
- 26:16 פקרנוך
- 29:10 עיניהם
- 33:12 שיר ח'

The following list gives some cases of readings in the LXX not supported by other Versions, but that might not be due to translation-technique, as they occur in passages where the translation is fairly literal. This list is not complete, because the dividing line between what is probably a variant reading and what is not is very hard to draw.

List B

4:5 יְנוּא, וְנוּא

5:30 עליהם

8:18 אלהים

9:1 היושבים

The LXX does not distinguish between כִּי and כִּי־אֵל, and translates both as kyrios. It does not translate אֵל.

Besides the original translation, there at least two recensions of a revised text, Origen's³⁷ recension and the Lucianic one.³⁸

The manuscripts containing Origen's text do not contain it in pure form, so that only readings that disagree with the original text of the LXX passages added to the original should be accepted as Origen's; readings that agree with it may be Origen's but may equally well be cases of failure to revise the text thoroughly.³⁹ Origen's revision was done according to the later Greek Versions, and is therefore much more literal than the original translation.⁴⁰ In some cases the Version followed by Origen - usually Theodotion or Aquila - can be identified because the reading of the Version has been preserved separately.⁴¹ In other cases it must be identified by the vocabulary or style, not always an easy matter.⁴² The later Greek Versions are

discussed in detail below.

The Lucianic recension differs from the original more than does Origen's, though this may only be because it is preserved in purer form than Origen's. It is a revision of the original partly according to Origen's recension, partly according to the later Greek Versions, including perhaps some that have otherwise perished, and partly by emendation of the Greek without reference to the Hebrew.⁴³ Though the possibility of Lucianic readings being mere inner-Greek alterations of the original should be kept in mind, and each reading examined individually, it happens that most readings that seem to be due to inner-Greek change are not such as would affect a re-translation into Hebrew.⁴⁴ It can be assumed that additions in the Lucianic recension have been made according to Origen's recension or one of the later Greek Versions⁴⁵ and are fairly reliable.

The Catena recension⁴⁶ agrees partly with the original translation, partly with Origen's recension.

Naturally, readings in Origen's recension, the Lucianic recension, or the Catena recension that agree word for word with one of the later Greek Versions are not to be taken as independent witnesses to the Hebrew, but as text-witnesses of the later Greek Version they are taken from.

Readings found in only a single mixed manuscript, or a closely-related pair of such manuscripts, and to a lesser extent ones found only in S⁴⁷ or only in a very small part of the textual tradition of one of the recensions have been mentioned in the notes because occasionally a correct reading is preserved in only a single manuscript, and there is also the remote possibility of the manuscript having been corrected according to one of the later Greek Versions. Nevertheless, most such readings are probably inner-Greek changes.

No recension of the LXX has any equivalent for JX. Origen's re-

recension translates the article, but the manuscripts in Isaiah do not preserve the text in reliable enough form for the information to be used, even if Origen corrected his text consistently. No other recension translates the article.⁴⁹

ii. Aquila

Aquila's translation⁵⁰ is completely literal, and unless otherwise indicated, any of its readings given in the can confidently be retroverted into Hebrew, and any apparent support for a certain Hebrew reading may be regarded as real support. Aquila's Version can even be relied on for waw-readings (except that the omission of kai at the beginning of a fragment proves nothing) and the omission or addition of NX.

iii. Symmachus

Symmachus's translation is reasonably literal,⁵¹ but probably should not be relied on for waw-readings, and his evidence for morpheme changes should be treated with care. He does not translate NX or the article.

iv. Theodotion

Theodotion⁵² is more literal than Symmachus, but less than Aquila. He does not translate NX.

v. Ho Syros, ho Hebraios

Not enough is preserved of these translations⁵³ in Isaiah to assess them adequately, but they seem to be about as literal as Theodotion.

vi. The Later Greek Versions in General

The readings of these Versions⁵⁴ are not always

accurately transmitted, as can be seen from the cases where two different sources transmit a fragment in two slightly different forms.⁵⁵

The indicators of the name or names of the translation are not always accurate.⁵⁶ In particular, a grouping of two or more names together (e.g. $\alpha' \sigma' \theta'$ or $\alpha' \theta'$) or the indicators $\sigma' \lambda'$ or $\sigma' \gamma'$ or π' do not necessarily mean that all these translations had the reading given: it may only mean that one of them had that reading and the rest had something similar, as opposed to the LXX, which had something rather different.⁵⁷

vii. The Peshitta⁵⁸

The Peshitta of Isaiah is a literal translation, and may be relied on for even the most minor variants except, probably, waw-readings, in which case its evidence must be treated with caution.⁵⁹ It should be noted that the difference in pronunciation of singular and plural nouns in Syriac is mainly a matter of vowel-change, and is not marked in the consonantal text. The value of the evidence of the Peshitta for the difference between singular and plural depends on the reliability of the tradition of the insertion seyame-signs. The Peshitta of Isaiah seems to distinguish between \beth and $\beth\aleph$ and $\beth\gamma$ to the extent that this can be done without violating Syriac grammar. It has no equivalent for $\beth\aleph$, and does not translate the article consistently.

Although the Peshitta is supposed to have been corrected to agree with the LXX, there is not much sign of this in Isaiah.⁶⁰

The text-witnesses GWL=mz are not to be relied on. When they stand alone their evidence may be regarded as worthless, being due to either corruption or deliberate emendation.⁶¹

viii. The Targum

The Targum is literal and explanatory at the same time.⁶² For the most part, the explanatory matter is added to the literal

translation and does not interfere with it. Substitution of an explanatory translation for a literal one usually occurs only to replace a metaphor by a literal statement, or to rephrase an expression that might be misunderstood and be taken in a way that was theologically objectionable. Such changes do not usually interfere with the syntax or form of the sentence.

The evidence of the Targum may be used for waw-readings, the addition and omission of \aleph , and the addition and omission of \beth . The Targum distinguishes between \beth and $\beth\aleph$ and $\beth\gamma$ in the translation to the extent that Aramaic grammar permits. It does not translate the article consistently.

The Targum is the only Version that has been systematically compared with the Hebrew text from the time it was made onward, and it would be expected that deviations from the received text at a particular time or in a particular place, including deviations from the MT in all its details, would have tended to be removed in at least a part of the manuscript tradition. It may be assumed that if some text-witnesses agree with the MT, and others disagree, the ones that disagree preserve the original reading unless there is evidence of inner-Aramaic changes. If the limited number of text-witnesses available and the constant comparison of the Targum with the Hebrew is taken into account, it seems likely that many readings now found in only one or two text-witnesses may be original.⁶³

Unless otherwise indicated, any reading of the unanimous tradition of Targum text-witnesses mentioned in the notes to the apparatus may be regarded as almost certainly representing the literal Hebrew equivalent.

ix. The Vulgate and the Translation in Jerome's Commentary

The Vulgate⁶⁴ is, as it was intended to be,⁶⁵ a literal translation,⁶⁶ with this qualification, that it is sometimes phrases

that are translated and not words.⁶⁷

There is no equivalent in Latin for NK , and no article. The translation does not distinguish between 7 and 7K , but gives the natural Latin form, whatever it might be, and does not seem to distinguish consistently between 7K and 7y . There seems to be a tendency to accommodate waw-readings to what is natural in Latin.⁶⁸

A reading printed in the Stuttgart edition⁶⁹ without any indication of a variant is attested by the pair of primary witnesses manuscripts AC, (and the edition c) may or may not be contradicted by secondary witnesses. The consensus of the pair AC probably represents the original reading of the Vulgate.⁷¹ It should be noted that the apparatus of the Stuttgart edition gives the readings of the secondary witnesses only if they agree with one of the pair AC against the other, but gives all readings of the edition c.⁷²

Readings found only in one of the pair AC may or may not be original, depending on the individual case, but a reading found in only A or C or the secondary witnesses or the edition c that agrees with the LXX is probably due to the influence of the LXX or the Old Latin and not original. Other things being equal, a reading agreeing with the MT is more likely to be original than one disagreeing with it,⁷³ which could be due to the influence of the LXX or the Old Latin, or inner-Latin corruption. A reading agreeing with the translation in Jerome's commentary against the rest of the Vulgate witnesses is probably due to the influence of the commentary.

The translation in Jerome's commentary agrees almost word for word with the Vulgate, but with occasional changes not all of which can be ascribed to chance. Kedar-Kopfstein⁷⁴ suggests that the translation in the commentary is a revision of the Vulgate translation made by Jerome on the basis of manuscripts that he acquired later. Jerome comments twice on chapters 13-23, and the translations

in each place differ very slightly from each other.⁷⁵ Sometimes the first commentary agrees with the Vulgate against the second commentary.

A reading found in only a small part of the textual tradition of the commentary and agreeing with the Vulgate is probably due to its influence, and one that agrees with the LXX is probably due to the influence of the LXX or the Old Latin.

When Jerome quotes a verse in his commentary other than the one he is commenting on, he usually gives the same translation as in the place where the verse quoted is commented on, but sometimes he gives a quotation agreeing with the LXX, and sometimes one that it is impossible to identify. These cases are mentioned in the appropriate places in the Notes.

c. The Relationship between the Hebrew Texts Underlying the Versions and the Quotations in Rabbinic Texts

Even when it is reasonably certain that the translator used a Hebrew text agreeing with one of the readings listed in this apparatus, the support of the Version can only be treated as evidence for the genuineness of the reading if the Hebrew manuscript used by the translator and the one from which the quotation was taken over into the Rabbinic text are genealogically related in some way. If they are not, the support of the Version proves no more than that the same mistake can happen more than once.⁷⁶

Variants of certain forms or of certain origins can reasonably be supposed to occur spontaneously more often than others. In general, the more trivial the variant, the more likely it is to occur more than once, so that waw-readings, the interchange of לָX and לָY, the interchange of ל and לָX, the omission of the word וְיָאָר in the form וְיָאָר, the addition or omission of the word וְ, the addition or omission of the article, and the addition or omission of

DK could occur in both a Biblical quotation in a Rabbinic text and the Hebrew text used by a translator without having a common origin. To this list can be added omissions in general, which seem to occur very easily. Readings that can be explained as accommodations, to standard expressions or as conflations when found in quotations in Rabbinic texts can be explained the same way when found in the Versions.

Nevertheless, these two criteria, the form of the reading and its possible origin, can do no more than create a presumption, and must be used with great care, because such variants could arise just as easily at an early stage of the development of the text as a later one -- in fact would probably arise more easily than -- and be copied from manuscript to manuscript without being noticed because they were too trivial, or seemed so natural.

This difficulty can be relieved, though not solved completely, by approaching the problem from the other side, that is to say, instead of considering which variants are or are not likely to have arisen in genealogically unrelated manuscripts more than once, by considering which Versions can be assumed to have been translated from a Hebrew text genealogically very closely related to the manuscripts from which quotations were taken over into the Rabbinic texts.

The LXX of Isaiah seems to have been translated in the second century B.C. in Alexandria. Nothing definite is known of the translator.⁷⁷ It seems, then, that although the manuscripts used by the translator could have been related to the ones used by the Tannaim and Amoraim, no very close relationship should be assumed.

Not enough is known of Symmachus to give any estimate of the value his translation for this purpose.⁷⁸

If Barthélemy is right in thinking that Theodotion's translation

was made in the first century A.D. (perhaps by Yonatan ben 'Uzziyel) and was intended as an official translation, it must have been based on the manuscripts that were regarded as thoritative by the early Tannaim.⁷⁹

Aquila's translation was made in the early-first century at the direction of R. 'Aqiva (apparently R. 'Eliezer and R. Yehoshua' as well).⁸⁰ The manuscripts used must have agreed with the ones regarded as correct by the early Tannaim.

Origen's revision was based mostly on Theodotion and Aquila,⁸¹ and what was said of these translations can be said of it.

As the Lucianic revision was based to a great extent on Symmachus,⁸² and as some of its sources have not been identified, and it seems to have undergone inner-Greek change, there seems to be no way of identifying the Hebrew manuscripts on which it is ultimately based.

The Peshitta was probably translated during the Tannaitic period, probably on the basis of manuscripts brought from Israel. As the translators seem to have had a good knowledge of the exegesis of the period, as reflected in other sources, they could well have had some direct contact with the Tannaim.⁸³ If Kahle⁸⁴ is right in supposing that the Pentateuch was sponsored by the royal family of Adiabene, and if the argument can be extended to the rest of the Bible as well, it is quite possible that the translation had the direct support of the Tannaim, and was based on manuscripts that they regarded as having a correct text. In any case, manuscripts in use at the time, (specially if the manuscripts were brought from Israel) by apparently orthodox⁸⁵ Jews would probably have had to agree exactly with the text used by the Tannaim.

The Vulgate was translated in Bethlehem about 390 A.D., at the end of the Amoraic period in Israel.⁸⁶ Although there is no

evidence that Jerome was given access to manuscripts considered authoritative, and there is some evidence that at one time he had difficulty in getting hold of any manuscripts,⁸⁷ he knew enough of the importance of using accurate manuscripts to make all efforts to base his translation on them. The manuscripts he used when writing his commentary on Isaiah in 408 seem to have differed slightly from the ones used for the translation of Isaiah, and were probably better ones acquired later.⁸⁸ The differences between the manuscripts used for the translation and the ones used for the commentary seem to have been very slight, and if the ones used for the commentary were chosen because they were considered better, the ones used for the translation must still have been considered pretty accurate. It seems probable, then, that Jerome's manuscripts were of the type used by the Amoraim in Israel.

It is apparent from reading the apparatus that most of the deviations from the MT in the quotations of Isaiah are very minor, and it would in any case be expected on purely theoretical and historical grounds that the Biblical text used in the period of the Tannaim and the Amoraim would differ from the MT in its present form in only very minor points, and that the divergences between Biblical manuscripts used in the period of composition of the elements of the Tanhuma texts (i.e. the period immediately after the end of the Amoraic period in Israel) and the MT would not be much greater than the divergences between different sub-traditions within the MT itself. This means that we can rephrase the question and ask which Versions are known to have been translated from a Hebrew text agreeing very closely with the MT, and of those, which were translated from a Hebrew text almost identical with the MT in the present form. The answer is, of course, that all the Versions except the LXX satisfy the first condition, and that Aquila and to an even greater extent the Vulgate and the Targum satisfy the second.

We may now give some examples of the application of these principles. The following list gives instances of readings of the type which might be expected to occur spontaneously more than once, and for which the evidence of the LXX, and probably the Peshitta or Symmachus alone might be regarded as due to coincidence, but which happen to be supported by the Targum or the Vulgate or the translation in Jerome's commentary, or in some combination of these, and could perhaps be genealogically related to the readings of these Versions.

List C

5:12	לא הביטר	25:1	ואורה
7:18	בקצה ארץ אשור	25:8	ובלע
8:7	לכן	27:4	ושית
11:3	לא	27:9	עון בית יעקב
16:3	עשי	27:13	הארברים מארץ אשור
16:5	כסאר		והנרחים מארץ מצרים
17:12	ים	29:10	עליהם
19:4	ארונים קשים	29:10	ראת הנביאים
19:18	החרס	30:5	אל
22:15	אל שבנא	30:6	מהם ח'
22:16	ומה לך אפוא	33:1	בך
24:6	אבלה	33:6	עתך
		33:15	אזניר
		33:16	מצורת
		34:16	ראשה

(v) Support from Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts

a. Mediaeval Manuscripts

The mediaeval Hebrew manuscripts⁸⁹ have been investigated by Goshen-Gottstein,⁹⁰ who comes to the conclusion that their readings are nearly always to be explained as developments from the reading of the MT, not as survivals of extra-Masoretic readings, and the vast majority of manuscripts have no value for the reconstruction of the original text. An exception might be made for manuscripts Kennicott 30, 93, 96, and 150, but even these need further evaluation.⁹¹

Goshen-Gottstein has undoubtedly proven his case as far as the superiority of manuscripts 30, 93, 96, and 150 is concerned, or the need for treating their readings with extreme caution for the re-construction of an extra-Masoretic text or the original text, and in part as far as the worthlessness of the other manuscripts for these purposes is concerned, but I would suggest, with due respect, that his concentration on exposing the traps scholars have fallen into by using the manuscripts uncritically,⁹² and his awareness of the importance of the problem, have led him to overlook what the real value of these manuscripts is.

The mediaeval Bible manuscripts are useful for finding out the amount of variation within the MT itself during the Masoretic period.⁹³ There is no need to assume that all the deviations from the standard consonantal MT (as we have it in model codices or the modern printed editions) found in the manuscripts are secondary; on the contrary, I hope to show that many of them represent alternative readings within the MT itself.

The MT is not completely uniform. Whatever may be thought of the mediaeval manuscripts, there is still the fact that the Masoretic treatises record many alternative readings in the consonantal text, and quote readings disagreeing with the received text without any

indication that our reading is even an alternative.⁹⁴ If we consider how few early Masoretic treatises survive, and that they would be more susceptible to deliberate alteration than any other kind of text,⁹⁵ and that quite possibly from the time of composition, then it seems almost inevitable that the MT must once have shown much more fluctuation than it does now. The available evidence for the state of the MT before the period of Masoretic activity, namely the quotations in the midrashim, the Talmuds, and the Gaonic literature, and the Hebrew text reflected in the Targum,⁹⁶ shows that the text must have shown much more variation than it does to-day, and the fluctuation would have continued to some extent into the Masoretic period. Even after the production of a standard consonantal text (and the extant Masoretic treatises show that the early Masoretes were unable to do this⁹⁷) it would have been a very long process replacing all the manuscripts in use with copies of it, or correcting them according to it, specially as the differences, although possibly quite numerous, would have been very minor and therefore not easy to detect.⁹⁸ The variants in mediaeval Biblical commentaries may be due to the use of such imperfectly corrected manuscripts.

It has been remarked by Goshen-Gottstein⁹⁹ that there seems to be no way of working out any genealogical relationship between the mediaeval manuscripts, aside from a few isolated cases of direct dependence of one manuscript on another. The explanation for this could be that any relationship there might have been has been obscured by partial and unsystematic normalization of different manuscripts independently of each other, a procedure which will obscure relationships more effectively than anything else.¹⁰⁰ There seems to be some evidence that this is, in fact, the explanation. Let us take the group Kennicott 30, 93, 96, and 150. They each have a high proportion of deviation from the MT, most of which could be genuine

variants,¹⁰¹ and a high proportion of which have the support of the Versions notably the Targum, or of a very large number of other manuscripts,¹⁰² and each of them has a far higher incidence of agreement with well-attested variants in quotations in Rabbinic texts than any other manuscripts have. When a large number of manuscripts have a variant reading, usually at least one of these manuscripts is amongst them.¹⁰³ In spite of all this, there is no discernible relationship between them. In some cases a reading that seems to be genuine is supported by only one of them, but it can be any one. Sometimes it is supported by two or three of them, but it can be any combination of two or three out of the four manuscripts. Only very rarely do all four disagree with the MT.

It is precisely this relationship that ought to occur when different manuscripts, originally in agreement with each other, are imperfectly revised, independently of each other, according to a different textual recension, the same new recension being used for revising each manuscript.

The frequent support of the readings of this group of manuscripts, and the possibility that they are the remnants of a slightly divergent sub-tradition within the MT, means that their readings must be given special value. Since there is no evidence that any of these manuscripts has influenced any other, the agreement of two or more must be regarded as almost certainly being a genuine variant, but even readings found in only one of them must be carefully considered, and are more likely to be genuine than not, for the reasons explained above.

The same persistence of alternative readings can be seen in the rest of the manuscripts as well. The clearest instances are the cases where it is impossible to say which reading would have been regarded by the Massoretes themselves as correct. Examples are the alternation between ך and ך in Is 33:1, or between םלל'וים

and $\square\prime\prime\prime\prime\prime\prime\prime$ in Is 3:23. ¹⁰⁴

Even readings attested by only a minority of manuscripts must be considered real alternatives within the MT, if only the minority is big enough. Nearly all the instances mentioned in the notes to the apparatus are attested by only a very small number of manuscripts, usually less than five, or by a very big number, usually more than twenty-five, sometimes more than thirty-five, sometimes many more. This kind of jump in distribution does not occur by chance: it occurs when two originally distinct groups are mixed. In this case the two groups are readings derived from the received text by scribal error, i.e. secondary readings, and genuine alternative readings. If the readings supported by numerous manuscripts were not alternatives, the distribution of the support of the manuscript would be quite different. Nearly all readings would be supported by one to four manuscripts, a few supported by a few more, hardly a single one (even waw-readings) supported by more than ten, and none at all supported by as many as thirty or forty manuscripts. There would not be a jump from support by only a few manuscripts to support by very many, and there would not be so many readings attested by numerous manuscripts.

As it happens, nearly all readings supported by numerous manuscripts are supported by at least one out of the group Kennicott 30, 93, 96, 150. This agreement is not due to chance: on the one hand the variants in these four manuscripts are not numerous enough for them to have a parallel to even a small proportion of readings from unrelated sources, and on the other hand these four are the only ones that are found among nearly every large grouping of manuscripts supporting variant readings, the distribution of support from the other manuscripts seeming to show hardly any pattern.

Nevertheless, it must not be assumed that just because a large grouping of manuscripts in support of a variant reading does not in-

clude one of these four that the reading is a mistake. If the suggestion put forward above about the unsystematic and independent correction of the ancestors of these four manuscripts is correct, it would be expected that in some cases an original reading happened to be corrected in the ancestor of each one of them. Even if the suggestion is wrong, there is still the fact that many of these readings are supported by only a single member of the group, which can be any one of them, so that we would still expect a few such readings not to be supported by any member of the group. In any case, the jump in distribution between poorly-attested readings and well-attested ones must be taken into account. Aside from these theoretical arguments, it can be shown that each one of the four instances of readings supported by numerous manuscripts not including any one of the group Kennicott 30, 93, 96, 150 is, in fact, genuine.

The four instances are the readings הגלינים in Is 3:23, שם ושאר נין ונכר in Is 14:22, החרס in Is 19:18, and אבלה in Is 24:6.

The evidence given in the notes is sufficient to show that there is so much evidence for the reading הגלינים in Is 3:23, and in such reliable manuscripts and editions, that it must be regarded as a genuine reading, and in fact it could be considered just as correct as the reading הגלינים .¹⁰⁵

The reading שם ושאר נין ונכר in Is 14:22 is not one that would be likely to be derived from the reading שם ושאר ונין ונכר , and could be considered superior to it. Aside from lQIs^a, the evidence of which must be used with care,¹⁰⁶ it has the support of twelve manuscripts, including Kennicott 4 and 23, de Rossi 211, 440, and 737,¹⁰⁷ and Ginsburg 21 and 24, which are very reliable,¹⁰⁸ four editions, all reliable,¹⁰⁹ quotations in Rashi's commentary and Qimhi's commentary, and quotations of the Targum in the 'Aruch and Qimhi's commentary in the Miqra'ot Gedolot. The reading could hardly

have arisen independently in all these witnesses.

The reading וְהָיָה in Is 19:18 is the only one known to the Babylonian Amoraim, as the evidence of the Bavli and the Targum quoted in the notes shows, is the only one known to Jerome, as can be seen from his translation in the Vulgate and his remarks in the commentary, was known to Ibn Ezra, although rejected by him, (but see the commentary, and notice the importance of the Lemma), and is supported by Symmachus and לְוִיִּם ^a. Of all the Versions, only the Peshitta supports the reading וְהָיָה ; the LXX has a different reading altogether (קְרָצָה), and Aquila and Theodotion are inconclusive. The reading וְהָיָה is attested in sixteen or eighteen¹¹⁰ manuscripts and four editions. The only question is, whether it arose in these manuscripts (and the manuscripts on which the editions were based) through scribal error, or whether it is a variant reading surviving only in these manuscripts. It is true, as Goshen-Gottstein¹¹¹ points out, that in about half of the manuscripts¹¹² the reading וְהָיָה has been corrected, but this need not necessarily mean that the scribe has made a mistake, realized it, and corrected the text; it might mean that the scribe copied the manuscript before him, and then saw that the reading וְהָיָה was contradicted by the Masorah, checked the reading against another manuscript, saw that the second manuscript had וְהָיָה , and corrected what he had written the first time. The reading וְהָיָה can hardly be due to scribal error in manuscript Kennicott 320 or three of the printed editions, it is given as an alternative. It may be doubted whether this amount of attestation in Hebrew manuscripts is due to the coincidence of numerous scribes all making the same mistake, or whether the agreement with the text used by the Babylonian Amoraim and Jerome is a coincidence. If it is borne in mind that the reading וְהָיָה was consciously and deliberately rejected in favour of the reading וְהָיָה ,

as the addition of the gloss **למחר** **לעתידא** in the Targum makes clear was done, and that the rejection was before the time of Rashi, and early enough for the addition to be found in all the manuscripts and editions of the Targum, and that it would presumably then have been systematically corrected in the standard codices, and if it is borne in mind as well that the Masorah (and perhaps the Targum) would have helped the removal of the reading **החרי** precisely from the codices that had a claim to be Masoretic and would therefore have been regarded as authoritative, it is remarkable that the reading **החרי** has survived in as many manuscripts as it has.

The reading **אכלה** in Is 24:6 seems to have been regarded as correct by both R. 'Aqiva and the anonymous Tanna quoted in the Sifra, and is supported by Symmachus, the Peshitta, and the Targum. The reading is accordingly attested from the time of R. 'Aqiva or the time of Symmachus's translation, whichever is regarded as earlier, till the time of final redaction of the Targum. It is supported by far too many manuscripts, including reliable ones (and including some early editions), for it to be a scribal error in more than a small proportion of them at the most. With this attestation, it seems that its presence in Hebrew manuscripts and printed editions is not due to spontaneous production.

Readings supported by only a few manuscripts (say ten or less), none of which are from the group Kennicott 30, 93, 96, 150, present special problems. Many of them, particularly those found in only one or two manuscripts, must be mistakes.¹¹³ The criteria for judging a reading to be genuine or not are the number and reliability of manuscripts supporting it, its support from readings, preferably well-attested, in Rabbinic literature, the support of the Targum, and the nature of the reading itself. Let us take each in turn.

If we list the number of readings found in one manuscript, in

two, in three, etc., up to ten, we get the following progression: 38, 14, 9, 4, 3, 1, 2, 1, 0, 0. The best explanation for this distribution is that the great majority of these readings are due to scribal error, and that as the coincidence of many manuscripts is less likely than the coincidence of a few. Readings attested in only a few manuscripts should therefore not be accepted as genuine unless they are supported from external sources or are not such as would arise spontaneously, and even then only with reservation.

The following readings are supported by eight or less manuscripts, (not including Kenn. 30, 93, 96, or 150) but have good or fair support from readings in quotations in Rabbinic texts:

List D

1:18	כשני —	22:14	ארני ח' —
1:20	פי ח'	23:5	לשמע
2:17	אדם	24:21	ועל הארמה
3:10	לצריק —	25:1	את שמך
3:11	ישיב	26:6	רגל ח' —
4:5	על מכון	28:5	צבאות ח'
5:18	וכעבותות	28:7	(גם)
5:23	צדיק	28:16	ארני ח'
6:7	עוניך —	28:16	אבן ח' —
8:7	(לכך)	29:10	עליהם
8:19	הלא עם אלהיו ירוש	29:10	את ח'
13:5	מקצה הארץ	30:18	(לכך)
13:5	(ח')	30:32	(מוסרה)
14:4	את המשל הזה	33:16	(מצורת)
14:12	(הגורים)	34:16	(קבצם)
19:4	ארונים קשים —	35:5	ראוני חרשים תפקחנה —

Readings in brackets are not so well attested in the Rabbinic texts as the others. Readings marked with a horizontal line are ones that are particularly likely to occur independently more than once.

The following readings in eight or less mss., not including Kenn. 30, 93, 96, or 150, are supported by the Targum:

List E

- 3:11 ישיב (Targum יתתב)
 3:18 השביסים (only A $\frac{2}{2}$)
 5:23 צדיק (only c)
 5:24 לשרן ח'
 6:7 ערניך
 8:7 לכן (bogaf N)
 8:20 אשר ח'
 10:32 בנרף
 13:5 מקצה הארץ (bg N)
 17:12 ים
 26:6 רגל ח' (only c)
 30:18 לכן (only N)
 30:20 מורך (very dubious; see the notes to the apparatus)
 33:16 מצורת

The following readings found in eight or less manuscripts, not including Kenn. 30, 93, 96, or 150, in addition to those marked with a horizontal stroke in List E are particularly likely to have occurred independently in both the Rabbinic text and the mediaeval manuscript:

List F

1:11	זבחכם
3:10	יאכל
3:18	השבִּי־סִיִּם
3:22	הַמִּטְפָּחוֹת
8:6	בֵּן
8:20	בִּדְבַר
8:23	בַּעַת
10:14	בְּקֵן
10:26	כִּדְרֵךְ
14:12	מִן שָׁמַיִם
22:21	כֹּתֵנֶיךָ
23:2	סוֹחֵר צִירֹן
23:4	מֵעֶרֶן
26:6	רֵגֶל חֵי
29:23	יִלְדִיֹּם מַעֲשֵׂה יִדְיוֹ
30:5	כִּי אִם
30:20	מִדְּרֵךְ
30:32	וּבְמִלְחָמָה
30:32	וּבְמִלְחָמָה
33:4	בְּמִשְׁקָה
34:16	קִבְצָה
35:5	וְאֶזְנֵי חֲרָשִׁים תִּפְקַחְנָהּ

On the basis of the criteria mentioned, the following readings supported by eight or less mediaeval manuscripts not including Kenn. 30, 93, 96 or 150 can be suggested as probably or possibly being genuine alternative readings in the manuscripts:

List G

- 2:17 ארם
3:11 ישיב, ישוב
4:5 על מכון
5:23 צדיק
7:2 היער
8:19 הלא עם אלהיו יררוש
10:32 בנרף
13:5 מקצה הארץ
17:12 ים
19:4 ארונים קשים
22:14 אדני ח'
24:21 ועל הארמה
28:22 אדני ח'
29:10 עליהם
33:16 מצודת

The readings in List F are probably scribal errors. Nothing can be said of the rest of the readings in Lists D and E except that any one of them might be genuine, but is probably not, and that taken collectively they probably include few, if any, genuine variants.

It may be concluded that although each Masoretic school managed to fix the consonantal text of the Bible in model codices in every tiny detail, down to the addition or omission of every waw, they did not manage to suppress texts that diverged slightly from theirs, per-

haps because they disagreed among themselves,¹¹⁴ perhaps because the job of correcting all the existing manuscripts was too much, and that alternative readings persisted in manuscripts written after the final fixing of the text. Some of these alternative readings survive in the manuscripts used by Kennicott, de Rossi, and Ginsburg, and in the early editions (a very few even survive in twentieth-century editions¹¹⁵). Aside from external evidence from quotations in Rabbinic texts, or the agreement of the Targum, genuine alternative readings, as they may be called, can be detected by their distribution. Readings found in more than ten or fifteen manuscripts, and certainly ones found in more than twenty, can be assumed to be genuine, and so can readings found in two or more of the group Kennicott 30, 93, 96, and 150, or in one of these manuscripts and four or five others, and readings found in one of these four manuscripts are more likely to be genuine than not, though each case must be judged separately. Nearly all other readings must be rejected as scribal errors, as Goshen-Gottstein has shown.

If the arguments put forward above are sound, and we can treat both the group Kennicott 30, 93, 96, 150 on the one hand, and the consensus of a large number of manuscripts on the other, as reflecting an alternative sub-tradition within the Masoretic Text, then it seems that we have a theoretical justification for comparing such readings with ones found in other texts that may be regarded as reflecting a sub-tradition of the MT. This can be done with some confidence in the case of readings in Biblical quotations in Rabbinic texts, or readings reflected in the Targum, Vulgate, and Aquila's Version, and with some caution in the case of readings reflected in the Peshitta, and probably Theodotion and Symmachus as well. Whether it can be done in the case of readings in LQIs^a or ones reflected in the LXX is much more doubtful. In most cases it would be unwise to do so.

b. lQIs^a

This manuscript diverges very often from the MT, but mostly in minor details. It happens that in nearly all the cases of agreement between it and a reading listed in the apparatus the reading is one that could have occurred separately more than once, so that the support of lQIs^a may simply be due to coincidence. The only exceptions to this seem to be the readings שם ושארית (corresponding to שם ושאר ניין ונכר in the apparatus) in Is 14:22, החרס in Is 19:18, and perhaps the reading לכם הערן הזה (for לכם הערן הזה in the apparatus) in Is 22:14.

All other cases of support from lQIs^a must be assessed individually. None are conclusive.

c. lQIs^b

This manuscript agrees almost exactly with the MT in its modern form, and its text may be considered a sub-tradition of the MT. The support of this manuscript for a reading not likely to occur spontaneously would be very valuable, but as it happens the only two readings in the apparatus supported by this manuscript, ארץ in Is 24:19 and ור' in Is 28:16, are such as might very easily occur independently (though surprisingly, these readings are not found in any other manuscript).

d. 4Q162

Not enough of this manuscript is preserved to determine its relationship to the received text. The only two instances of agreement between it and readings in the apparatus, the reading

לא הו'טו in Is 5:12 and the omission of צבאות in Is 5:24, are such as might occur independently more than once.

e. 4Q163

This manuscript agrees very closely with the MT in its received form except for a tendency towards full spelling and the use of pronoun suffixes ending in ם- instead of ך (e.g. ם-).
ם-).

The reading ם' in Is 8:8 is one that might occur independently more than once, under the influence of the following plural. The only other instance of support for a reading in the apparatus, the reading ם' in Is 30:20 (for an assumed reading in the apparatus) is less likely to occur spontaneously and may be genealogically related to the source of the reading in the apparatus.

f. 4Q165

Not enough of this manuscript is preserved to estimate its exact relationship to the received text.

The only reading in the apparatus that is supported by it, the reading ם' קשׁוׁ ם' ם', is not such as would easily arise spontaneously in different texts, and the readings in 4Q165 and the apparatus may perhaps be genealogically related.

4. Classification of the Sources ¹

(a) Tannaitic Texts

The Mishnah (5)

The Sifra (1)

The Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el (3)

The Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai (4)

The Sifre on Numbers (X2)

The Sifre on Deuteronomy (12)

The Midrash Tanna'im (27)

The Seder 'Olam (42)

The Tosefta (26)

The 'Avot deRabbi Natan (34)

Whether the Tannaitic midrashim or the Tosefta were compiled before or after the Amoraic period is disputed, but all of them contain overwhelmingly Tannaitic material, with the possible exception of the Mechiltas on Exodus.² The 'Avot deRabbi Natan has been extensively re-worked and contains some material later than the Tannaitic period.³

Although the halachic sections of the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el are generally taken to be from the school of R. Yishma'el, and the halachic sections of the Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai from the school of R. 'Aqiva, the haggadic material is very similar in each, and much is word for the word the same. The reason for this is uncertain.⁴

Most of the Sifre on Numbers, paragraphs 1-54 and 104-157 of the Sifre on Deuteronomy, and a large part of the Midrash Tanna'im are from the school of R. Yishma'el. Most of the Sifra, and paragraphs 55-103 of the Sifre on Deuteronomy are from the school of R. 'Aqiva.⁵

(b) Amoraic Texts

(i) Palestinian

The Talmud Yerushalmi (25)

Bereshit Rabbah (7)

Wayyiqra Rabbah (9)

'Echah Rabbah (8)

The Pesiqta deRav Kahana (10), including excerpts in the Pesiqta Rabbati (335)

These texts are very closely related, but the historical reason for the relationship is disputed. Most scholars argue for the dependence of some of the texts on the others, in various combinations. For example, Albeck's theory is as follows: The oldest of these is the Talmud Yerushalmi, compiled in 4185 (424/5 A.D.)⁶ Bereshit Rabbah depends on a form of the Yerushalmi differing from the received text, and was compiled some time between 426 and 500 A.D.⁷ Wayyiqra Rabbah depends on the Talmud Yerushalmi in its present form and Bereshit Rabbah, and was compiled at the end of the fifth or beginning of the sixth century.⁸ 'Echah Rabbah depends on Wayyiqra Rabbah and an early form of the Pesiqta deRav Kahana and was compiled at the end of the sixth century.⁹ The Pesiqta deRav Kahana in its present form depends on Wayyiqra Rabbah and 'Echah Rabbah and was completed in the seventh century.¹⁰ Albeck does not discuss the relationship of Bereshit Rabbah to 'Echah Rabbah or the Pesiqta deRav Kahana, or the Talmud Yerushalmi to 'Echah Rabbah or the Pesiqta deRav Kahana, but it follows necessarily from the description just given that the explanation for the passages found in both the Talmud Yerushalmi and 'Echah Rabbah is that the compiler of 'Echah Rabbah took them over from the Talmud Yerushalmi, and similarly that the passages common to the Talmud Yerushalmi and the Pesiqta deRav Kahana were taken over from the Talmud Yerushalmi

by the compiler of the Pesiqta deRav Kahana, and that the passages common to Bereshit Rabbah and 'Echah Rabbah were taken over from Bereshit Rabbah by one of the compilers of 'Echah Rabbah.

Albeck's theory can, then, be concisely stated as follows: The order of compilation of the texts is the Talmud Yerushalmi (425), Bereshit Rabbah (426-500), Wayyiqra Rabbah (end of the fifth or beginning of the sixth century) an early form of the Pesiqta deRav Kahana, 'Echah Rabbah (end of the sixth century), the present form of the Pesiqta deRav Kahana (seventh century); each text borrowed from all those that had been compiled before it.

Other scholars argue for a different series of development. Zunz¹¹ supposes the order to be Talmud Yerushalmi, Bereshit Rabbah, 'Echah Rabbah (aside from later interpolations), Wayyiqra Rabbah, Pesiqta deRav Kahana, with Bereshit Rabbah dependent on the Talmud Yerushalmi, 'Echah Rabbah and Wayyiqra Rabbah dependent on the Talmud Yerushalmi and Bereshit Rabbah, and the Pesiqta deRav Kahana dependent on the Talmud Yerushalmi, its relationship to the other texts being uncertain. He does not consider the relationship of Wayyiqra Rabbah to 'Echah Rabbah. Buber¹² supposes the compiler of 'Echah Rabbah to have used the Talmud Yerushalmi, Bereshit Rabbah, and the Pesiqta deRav Kahana, and the compiler of Wayyiqra Rabbah to have used 'Echah Rabbah. Theodor¹³ argues for the dependence of 'Echah Rabbah and Wayyiqra Rabbah on the Pesiqta deRav Kahana.

Margulies, in the introduction to his edition of Wayyiqra Rabbah,¹⁴ argues against this picture of a series of compilations each later than the other, and specifically against Albeck's version of it. His argument is, briefly, that all the internal evidence, such as language, style, terminology, method of citing Tan-

naim and Amoraim, sources and so on, is identical in each; all of them are earlier than the Tanhuma-Yelammedenu texts and show no influence of their method or terminology; the borrowing between Wayyiqra Rabbah and Bereshit Rabbah seems to have gone on in both directions; there is good evidence (as was first seen by Lerner) for the Yerushalmi itself having drawn on earlier forms of the other texts. Building on Lerner's finding¹⁵ that Bereshit Rabbah and the Yerushalmi drew on common sources, Margulies argues that all of these texts are based on common sources (although of them in their final form could have shown directly on the Talmud Yerushalmi) and were produced at the same time and in the same place, Tiberias, and that the Pesiqta deRav Kahana and Wayyiqra Rabbah could even have been edited by the same person.¹⁶ He dates the final form of Wayyiqra Rabbah (and therefore presumably of the others) as no later than the middle of the fifth century, and an earlier form substantially the same at the end of the fourth century.¹⁷

If Margulies is right -- and his arguments seem to be incontrovertible, at least in substance¹⁸ -- the implications for the assessment of Biblical quotations in these texts are very important. It means that readings found in unrelated passages in more than one of these texts go back at least to the time of final compilation of all of them, and readings found in the same passage in more than one text go back at least to the time when the collections of haggadah had still not reached their final form. In both cases the readings (unless they occur in quotations of Tannaim) can be assumed to have been accepted by the Amoraim in Tiberias.¹⁹

(ii) Babylonian

The only Babylonian Amoraic text available is the Talmud Bavli. The texts used were:

The apparatus in the Diqduqe Soferim to Berachot and Gittin (40)

Haggadot Hattalmud (33)

The 'En Ya'aqov (collated only in part) (20)

Excerpts in the Yalqut Shim'oni (collated only in part),²⁰ Yalqut Mechiri, Midrash Leqah Tov (collated only in part) Midrash Sechel Tov, Midrash Haggadol (not collated for Deuteronomy) and the Menorat Hama'or,²¹ additions by copyists in Bereshit Rabbah,²² and more or less exact quotations in the Midrash 'Aggadah 'al Humash and Midrash Bereshit Rabbati.²³

(c) Tanḥuma and Yelammedenu Texts

These are abstracts of sermons delivered as part of the service in synagogues in Israel from about the fifth or sixth century and continuing for several centuries (the exact dates are very uncertain).²⁴ The extant texts may well be much later than the original compilations.

In their original form, each sermon was made up of an opening taken from a Tannaitic text, or sometimes an Amoraic one, followed by an exposition that might be original or might be taken from an Amoraic source, occasionally from a Tannaitic one. The quotations from Isaiah mentioned in the apparatus of the present work are taken from the exposition, not the opening.

In the exposition the borrowed material is often expanded or re-worked, and the names of the authorities are often left out or the chain of tradition simplified. The reason for the changes was probably the need to adapt the material to the style of a ser-

non.

The extant texts are compilations, and many sections in one are the same as sections in another, but the relationship between the compilations is obscure: there seems to have been a long and complicated process of eclectic borrowing from one compilation to another.

Material from these sermons can be found in the following texts:

- Buber's Tanhuma (6)
- The Printed Tanhuma (11)
- 'Aggadat Bereshit (23)
- Parts of the Pesiqta Rabbati (35)²⁵
- Parts of Midrash Tehillim (12)²⁶
- Additions by copyists in Bereshit Rabbah, Wayyiqra Rabbah, and the Pesiqta deRav Kahana²⁷
- Midrash Devarim Rabbah (13)
- The Tanhuma and Yelammedenu fragments in Bet Hammidrash
- The Genizah fragments published by Mann (51)
- The Midrash Hadash 'al Hattorah (52)
- Excerpts in the Yalquṭ Shim'oni, Yalquṭ Mechiri, Midrash Leqaḥ Tov, Midrash Sechel Tov, Midrash Haggadol, Pirqe deRabbi 'Eli'ezer,²⁸ Midrash 'Aggadah 'al Hūmash and Midrash Bereshit Rabbati, and the Sefer Wehizhir.²⁹

(d) Unified Compositions of Indeterminate Age

Two texts, each highly individual and each showing the marks of having been written as a whole by a single author with a comprehensive plan of organization in mind, are the Pirqe deRabbi 'Eli'ezer and the Seder 'Eliyahu.

The Pirqe deRabbi 'Eli'ezer (15) was written in Israel not

earlier than the eighth century and shows the influence of the Talmud Bavli.³⁰ It has some passages in common with the Tanhuma texts.³¹

The Seder 'Eliyahu or Tanna deVe 'Eliyahu (16) was written before the ninth century, but whether in Israel or Babylonia is uncertain. The author was familiar with the Talmud Bavli.³²

(e) Compositions Based on Earlier Sources

The Midrash 'Aggadah 'al Humash (18) and Midrash Bereshit Rabbati (37) are both derived from a midrash written by R. Mosheh Haddarshan, who lived in Narbonne in the eleventh century. R. Mosheh drew on both Talmuds, all the midrashim, and the Targums, but reworked and expanded the material taken over.³³

R. David Hannagid lived in Egypt in the thirteenth century. The book known as Midrash R. David Hannagid (24) is a collection of his sermons. The material is partly original, and partly taken over from the Talmud Bavli and the midrashim, with some re-wording.³⁴

(f) Compilations of Uncertain Date Based on Disparate Sources
Partly Unknown

Midrash Shemu'el (28)

Midrash Mishle (29)

Midrash Tehillim (12)

Nusah Hadash shel Midrash Tehillim (56)

Pesiqta Rabbati (35)

Pesiqta Hadatta (48)

Midrash Zuta 'al Shir Hashshirim (21)

Midrash Zuta 'al 'Echah (22)

Midrash 'Abba Guriyon (57)

Midrash Panim 'Aherim 'al 'Ester (43)

Midrash Hashkem (55)

(g) Texts of Unknown Dates or Origin

Midrash Wayyosha' (in Oṣar Midrashim) (
Panim 'Aherim shel Midrash Qohelet (in Ginze Schechter)
Midrash Tadshe (in Bet Hammidrash)
Midrash Hallel (in Bet Hammidrash)

(h) Very Late Texts

Midrash Ma'aseh Hanukkah (in Oṣar Midrashim)
Midrash 'Asarah Melachim (in Oṣar Midrashim)
Seder 'Araḳin (in Oṣar Midrashim)
Derashim 'al Ketuvim Hammachḥishim Zeh 'et Zeh (in Ginze Schechter)
'Alfa Beta deRabbi 'Aqiva (in Bet Hammidrash)

(i) Commentaries Partly Original and Partly Taken from
Midrash and Talmud

Midrash Leqaḥ Tov (31, 46, 47, 53)
Midrash Sechel Tov (32)

(j) Anthologies

Yalqut Shim'oni (49, 22, and 5²)
Yalqut Mechiri (17, 39, 45, 30)
Midrash Haggadol (36, 14, 54, 19, 44)
Menorat Hama'or
Sefer Wehizhir

5. Details of Arrangement of the Apparatus

(a) Purpose of this Section

The principles on which the apparatus has been based have already been explained (see above, section 2 (c) (ii) c., pp.16-17). This section is intended merely to explain the application of the principles to the selection and annotation of the readings, and to explain the technical details of setting-out.

(b) Selection of Readings

All variants found in direct quotations are included. A direct quotation is assumed to be one that begins with an introductory word or phrase, such as , שְׁנֵאמַר, וְכֵן הָיָא אַרְמַר, מַה כְּתִיב אַחֲרָיו, or any other standard expression, a lemma before the beginning of the derash, or a lemma before a section of the derash. As well as these, readings apparently or possibly assumed by the derash, 'al-tiqre readings, and cases of deliberate re-wording are included, but marked appropriately.

The following are not included: variants in full and defective spelling, the writing of the Divine Name or אֱלֹהִים as אֱלֹה or אֱלֹהִים or some other substitute, אֱלֹהִים for אֱלֹהִים, qere and ketiv readings, changes in the form of proper nouns, the omission of three or more consecutive words, or relocation of complete phrases.

(c) Method of Recording Readings

No lemmas are given. If it is obvious to which word or phrase in the MT the variant belongs, it is quoted on its own. If there is any possibility of uncertainty on the reader's part, a few of the words before or after are quoted. Only words actually quoted in the Rabbinic text are added for identification. In a few cases when the same word occurs twice in the MT and showing which occurrence was meant by this method would have made the article too long, the

words <]1W87> or <'1W> are written after the word in question.

Variants within an article are put in round brackets. Variants within variants are put in square brackets. See, for example, the last article in the apparatus. To avoid confusion, page, leaf, and chapter numbers in such variants within articles are written in Hebrew letters, not Arabic numbers, to separate them clearly from the number used to indicate sources. In such cases, page numbers are preceded by the word 73 and leaf-numbers by the word 77.

It would have swollen the apparatus to an unmanageable size to give the complete text of each quotation in which a variant occurs, but complete texts are given in a fairly large number of cases that seemed worth making an exception for, the principle being to weigh the length of the quotation against the number and importance of the variants it contained and the need to give the reader as much information as possible.

Very short quotations are usually given in full, even if they contain only a single variant.

If an article has to include most of the quotation to record all the variants, the remaining few words are added.

If there are two variants, one near the beginning of the verse and one near the end, it is often just as economical of space to record the whole quotation, including the words between the two variants, as to divide the variants between two short articles.

In a few cases of quotations particularly rich in variants, the quotation is recorded in full even though this meant adding a fairly long section of text agreeing completely with the MT.

If one text or manuscript has a quotation with a variant on one word, and another text or manuscript has a variant on another word, it may be important to know whether the first text or manuscript quotes both words or only the first, and whether the second text or

manuscript quotes both words or only the second, and in such cases the record of the quotation is extended. In the same way, if the reader might wonder whether certain words similar in form or connected in some way with the word exhibiting the variant are quoted according to the MT or not quoted at all, the record of the quotation is extended to include the other words in question.

A complete recording of a quotation is preceded by a cross, thus: X In such cases, the word 'ללל (sometimes spelt 'לל or 'ללל) is recorded if the quotation has it. If the word 'ללל is not recorded, it may be assumed that the quotation does not have it.

If a quotation is broken up by a part of the derash, this is shown by three dots, whether the interruption is a single word or several lines.

The Divine Name is recorded as 'ן regardless of whether it is written 'ן or some other way in the quotation.

If a word or phrase is quoted more than once, and one or more of the occurrences diverges from the MT and one or more does not, the record of the quotation preceded by a symbol for a fraction, the top half of which represents the number of occurrences of the variant and the bottom half of which represents the total number of occurrences of the word, with or without the variant. If the number of occurrences varies from one text or manuscript to another, a separate fraction is put before the symbol for each text or manuscript. Occasionally a variant reading in a word or phrase quoted only once, or quoted more than once but with the variant each time, is marked with a fraction such as $\frac{1}{1}$ or $\frac{2}{2}$ if other words nearby are quoted partly in variant form and partly according to the MT, and the reader might wonder about the relationship between the number of occurrences of one variant and the number of occurrences of the

other.

In every case where the number of occurrences of a variant reading is not given, it may be assumed to be one out of one (that is to say, the word or phrase in question is quoted only once, and with the reading given), or two out of two.

If a waw-reading occurs at the beginning of a quotation, it is marked with an obelus, thus: †, unless it is recorded after the symbol of three dots indicating that a passage of derash interrupts the quotation, in which case it is not needed. If a waw-reading is not marked with an obelus or three dots, it can be assumed not to occur at the beginning of a quotation.

Variants consisting only partly of a waw-reading that occur at the beginning of a quotation are marked with three dots, because an obelus would be misleading in such cases.

Variants other than waw-readings that may be induced by the context or wording of the derash are marked with an obelus and commented on in the apparatus itself or in the notes to the apparatus.

The omission of a word at the end of a quotation when it would have been expected to have been added to complete a sense-group, or the omission of a word at the beginning of a quotation, are marked with an obelus.

Readings marked with an obelus should be treated with care.

An obelus refers to all the source-symbols following it, as far as the first semi-colon. For example, in the last article on Is 1:18, the obelus refers to both שנת 25 and ב17; in the article on Is 8:7, the obelus before the reading לכן does not refer to the next reading, כן.

Readings probably due to scribal error are marked as טעות סופר, thus: <ט"ו>. Readings that seem to be mistakes, but could perhaps be genuine in individual cases, are marked in the same way, but with

question mark added, thus: <?ו"ו>. If necessary, the reading is commented on in the notes.

The symbols <ו"ו> or <?ו"ו> are usually put at the beginning of the article, but if they are meant to refer to only part of the article, they are put after the word or phrase to which they refer.

Readings apparently assumed by the derash or that seem to be alluded to in the wording of the comment are marked with two asterisks and commented on in the notes. If some texts of a particular derash are recorded in the apparatus as assuming a variant reading, and others as actually quoting it, it may be assumed (unless stated to the contrary in the notes) that the texts quoting the reading assume it as well. It must not be assumed that an unrelated derash assumes the reading, even if some or all texts of it actually quote the variant reading. For instance, in the first article on Is 1:21, the reading פ'י"ל is not assumed by the derash in text 55, even though it is assumed by the derash in all texts mentioned in the next article.

Asterisks refer to all the source-symbols mentioned after them in the same article: so, for instance in the second article on Is 1:21, the asterisks refer to everything that follows, from ON19 6 to (84) 35.

If there is more than usual doubt whether a certain reading is assumed by the derash, the two asterisks are followed by a question mark, thus: <?> ** .

In a very few cases, a reading not demanded by the text of the derash in its present formulation but which seem to have been required by an earlier form of the derash is recorded in the apparatus and marked with three asterisks, and commented on in the Notes.

'Al-tigre readings are marked with an abbreviation for the words

Cases of deliberate or conscious re-wording are recorded as they occur in the text. Usually the verse or phrase is quoted according to the MT and immediately after in slightly altered form. Both quotations are recorded, and the second is divided from the first by a single asterisk.

(d) Recording of Attestation

Each text used has been given a number. At the end of each article the number of each text that supports the reading is given. If the text referred to is available in a critical edition, the symbols for the particular text-witnesses that quote the variant reading are given; if no specific text-witnesses are mentioned, it means that all the text-witnesses available for the section of the text where the quotation is found support the variant reading.

If all the text-witnesses except one or two support a particular reading, the fact is recorded, the information being given in angle brackets, usually with the wording <י"ג כ"ג>. The term י"ג in such cases is to be understood as including printed editions, unless otherwise stated, because the word הנוסח would have been ambiguous.

If a reading occurs more than once in the same text, the number of the text is repeated, each time with the page or leaf or chapter number in round brackets. For example, in Is 1:20, for the reading וַיִּקְרָא בַח, part of the attestation reads (824) א7ב9 = (280) א9 ; this means that the reading is supported by manuscript א of Wayyiqra Rabbah on p. 280 and manuscripts א7ב on p. 824.

If two or more texts quoted have the variant reading in exactly or nearly exactly the same passage of derash so that it is certain that either they drew from a common source or one drew from

the other, the numbers of the texts are connected by an equal sign. For example, the symbols (241) ׀10 = (824) ׀709 = (280) ׀9 in the article just mentioned mean that the passage in Wayyiqra Rabbah p. 280, Wayyiqra Rabbah p. 824, and the Pesiqta deRav Kahana p. 241 are nearly word for word the same. Texts connected by an equal sign are to be regarded as a single witness.

If the passage of derash in one text is quite unrelated to the passage of derash in another, the numbers of the texts are separated by two colons. For example, in the article already quoted, the symbols (241) ׀10 = (824) ׀709 = (280) ׀9 :: ׀709 mean that the passage in the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el is not related to the one in Wayyiqra Rabbah and the Pesiqta deRav Kahana and must be counted as a separate witness. In the fifth article on Is 1:18, the symbols [633 ׀7 9 =] (154) x10 :: [::] (7)₁ ׀9 mean, in part, that the passage of derash on p. 7 of text 9, Wayyiqra Rabbah, is not related to the passage on p. 154 of text 10, the Pesiqta deRav Kahana, and as the latter is identical with the passage on p. 633 of Wayyiqra Rabbah, it follows that the passages on p. 7 and p. 633 of Wayyiqra Rabbah are not related to each other.

If there is some doubt as to whether two similar but not identical passages are related, or if they seem to be related but one of them has been extensively re-worked, the number of each text are separated by an "approximately equal" sign (=). Most such cases should probably be regarded as a single witness, but no definite decision should be made without consulting the texts themselves.

In many cases the relationship between the texts mentioned in different articles on the same verse or on consecutive verses is given. This is done if the same texts are mentioned in more than one article on the same verse, or short series of verses, if the same or similar variants are mentioned in more than one article, or

if there is some advantage in knowing whether certain variants mentioned in separate articles are found together in some texts, or are found in texts related to each other. Indications of inter-relationship are put in square brackets at the end of the appropriate articles. To show that a text mentioned has the same passage of derash as one previously mentioned, the number of the other text is given, preceded by an equal sign. For example, in the sixth article on Is 17:12 the symbols [45 =] (9:17) K12 mean that the passage referred to, text K12, Buber's edition of the Midrash Tehillim, Ps. 17, paragraph 9, has the same text as text 45, the Yalqut Mechiri on Psalms, mentioned in the second article. To show that the passage in the text mentioned is unrelated to all those mentioned before, two colons are put after the number of the text. For example in the third article on Is 29:10, the symbols K35 [::] (157) mean that the derash on leaf 157 of text 35, the Pesiqta Rabbati, is not related to any of the texts mentioned in the previous two articles on that verse. If several texts are mentioned in an article, and one of them is shown as being unrelated to any mentioned in previous articles on the same verse, it may be assumed that all of them are unrelated to any mentioned in previous articles on the same verse, unless there is an explicit statement that some of them are related to texts previously mentioned. For example, in the fifth article on Is 22:14 the symbol [::] after (681) עכ"ל 14 means that not only text 14 (the Midrash Haggadol on Exodus), but the following texts as well, are unrelated to any text mentioned in previous articles, though exceptions must be made for text 34 (the 'Avot deRabbi Natan) which has the same passage of derash as text 26 (the Tosefta) and text 36 (the Midrash Haggadol on Genesis) p. 715, which has the same passage as text 32 (the Midrash Sechel Tov), so that text 36 (the Midrash Haggadol on Genesis) p.637 is left as a text unrelated to any previously mentioned in any article on that verse.

If the same text is mentioned in more than one article on the same verse, or in some cases in different articles on consecutive verses, the second and all the following occurrences are marked with the word \square in square brackets after the text number. If two different places in the same text are referred to, the page or leaf or chapter number is given in each case, and it is noted in the second case whether the passages of derash in the two places are the same or different. For example, in the fifth article on Is 1:18, the symbols [::] (7)₁ 9 mean that the passage on p.7 of Wayyiqra Rabbah is different to any text mentioned in any previous article on that verse, and is therefore different to the passage on p. 633 of Wayyiqra Rabbah mentioned in the third article.

(e) Recording of Information in Exceptional Cases

Occasionally the information was too complex to be expressed by symbols, or there was a need to give information in more detail than usual. In such cases editorial comments are given and put in angle brackets, thus: < >. It should be emphasized that these comments, no matter how long, give the same type of information as would normally be given by symbols, and most of them would not be needed if all the texts were available in completely accurate critical editions. They are not of the same type as the information given in the notes to the apparatus.

A few examples will make the principles clear. In the second article on Is 3:16, the comment on the reading of the two editions of the Pesiqta deRav Kahana was needed because there is at least a possibility that Mandelbaum might have failed to record the reading \square \square \square in the apparatus to his edition, and that the reading \square \square might not be attested by all manuscripts, as the reader would tend to assume if no warning was given.

In the fifth article on Is 30:29, the explanation of the dif-

difficulties of determining the relationship between the derash in text 51 (a Genizah fragment in The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue) and the texts previously mentioned is needed because a simple statement in symbols that the texts were related, were not related, or might be related would be misleading.

In the fourth article on Is 34:9, some comment alerting the reader to the discrepancy between the text as printed and as quoted in Buber's footnote, and an explanation of the possible reason, is needed to prevent misunderstanding.

In the second article on Is 30:6, the comments on the relationship between the various texts are needed because although all the texts agree, it seems that the agreement may in some cases be due to secondary editorial activity, and a simple statement of agreement without any comment would be misleading.

(f) Notes on Recording Readings from Certain Texts

This section gives technical details on the collation and recording of readings from certain texts that require special treatment.

The texts are mentioned according to the order of the numbers assigned to them.

The Sifra (1)

There is no critical edition available. The following were collated: Codex Assemani LXVI (D), the Yalqut Shim'oni on Leviticus (W), Weiss's edition (X), and the Midrash Haggadol on Leviticus.

The Sifre (2)

The symbols K2 refers to the Sifre on Numbers, and the symbol J2 to the Sifre on Deuteronomy. Notice that the K or J is written big, and the following symbols for individual text-witnesses, if

needed, are written small. So, for instance, in the first article on Is 29:10, the symbols ²טגלז mean text-witnesses ט and ²ז of the Sifre on Deuteronomy.

It must be remembered that there are many more text-witnesses available for the Sifre on Deuteronomy than on Numbers, so that even if a reading is attested by only a few text-witnesses in the Sifre on Numbers, they may represent the majority of the witnesses available.

The Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el (3)

Three texts have been used: Ish Shalom's edition, quoted as K3, Horovitz and Rabin's edition, quoted as J3, and Lauterbach's edition, quoted as L3. Lauterbach's edition and Ish Shalom's edition were needed as a check on Horovitz and Rabin's edition, which is not very accurate.

Ish Shalom's edition reproduces the text of the Amsterdam edition (5472 = 1612). Horovitz and Rabin's edition is a critical one, based mainly on the three editions Constantinople 1515 (p), Venice 1545 (r), and Leghorn 1801 (s), quoted collectively as r, with two manuscripts, k and j, excerpts in the Midrash Hachamim (d), and the Yalqut Shim'oni (v). Lauterbach's edition gives selected variants when the editor considers them important.

Horovitz and Rabin confine themselves for the most part to the Yalqut Shim'oni on the Pentateuch, and the symbol v in the apparatus here is to be so understood. I have added a few readings from the second part of the Yalqut Shim'oni. As the collation of the Sefer Wehizhir (r) in Horovitz and Rabin's edition is not completely accurate, I have taken its readings directly from the edition of the Sefer Wehizhir rather than from the apparatus of the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el.

Because giving page references for three different editions

would have been cumbersome, section and chapter references have been given instead. The sections are named as in Ish Shalom's edition.

Only a single case of an excerpt in the Midrash Haggadol from a section of the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el containing a quotation from Isaiah 1 - 35 was found. The readings are given in the article on Is 10:14.

The variant readings of all excerpts from the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el in the Yalqut Mechiri Isaiah (217) and Psalms (45), the Midrash Leqah Tov (31), and the Midrash Sechel Tov (32) are recorded in the apparatus.

The Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yoḥai (4)

The edition by Epstein and Melamed is based on nine sets of Genizah fragments, quotations by R. Avraham of Bethlehem, and quotations in the Midrash Haggadol.

Epstein and Melamed quote Genizah fragments as p (Cambridge) in the apparatus, without specifying which Cambridge fragment is meant. I have substituted the number of that particular set as given in the list of Genizah Fragments by Melamed on pp. 33-34 of his introduction. So, for instance, n means fragment number n.

When sets r, n, or v of fragments have a section of text corresponding to a section in another set, the other set is printed and the readings of r, n, or v given in the apparatus. This is not, however, done completely accurately, and I have checked the readings of these sets of fragments against the transcription of them in full at the end of the book.

Epstein and Melamed use five texts of the Midrash Haggadol, four manuscripts (³_D ²_D *_D ⁰_D) and Hoffmann's edition (¹_D). Manuscripts ³_D ²_D *_D ⁰_D correspond respectively to the manuscripts

used by Margulies for his edition of the Midrash Haggadol on Exodus. Margulies's symbol for Hoffman's edition is 7.

A comparison of the readings of the Midrash Haggadol given by Epstein and Melamed and by Margulies shows a few discrepancies. For this reason both sets of symbols will be found mentioned in the apparatus. As well as these, Margulies uses a few manuscripts not used by Epstein and Melamed.

The Mishnah (5)

Two texts have been collated, Lowe's (x) and the Mishnah in the first edition of the Talmud Yerushalmi (1).

The Midrash Tanhuma (6 and 11)

Because the relationship between Buber's Tanhuma and the editions varies from book to book, it seemed useful to give the name of the seder referred to in each case, so that the reader would be able to tell immediately which book of the Pentateuch was meant. Seder references rather than book references are given because these are often quotations of a given verse in more than one place in the same book, but with the seder reference the reader can, if necessary, look up the passage required straightaway, without having to go through all the passages in a particular book listed as quoting the verse. It would not have been convenient to give page references, because the page-numbering in Buber's edition and the printed edition is not the same, and even if both sets of page numbers had been given, seder or book references would have had to be added. The system of division into sedarim does not suit the arrangement of the Tanhuma, but all editions are divided according to them, and the references in the Torah Hakketuvah Wehammesurah are to them, so that a reference according to the correct divisions of the Midrash Tanhuma would not have been any use.

It is assumed that the reader has access to the Torah Hakketuvah Wehammesurah, and will get the number of the paragraph, or number of the page, within the seder from it.

If a seder reference for Euber's Tanhuma is given, but none for the printed edition, it is to be assumed that the same seder and the same place in the printed edition is meant.

Bereshit Rabbah (7)

Square brackets round a reference to Bereshit Rabbah mean that the quotation is found in a passage that has entered some text-witnesses of Bereshit Rabbah from a Tanhuma text.

The Genizah fragment printed at the end of the indexes to Bereshit Rabbah in Theodor and Albeck's edition, pp. 146-148, the readings of which are not given in the apparatus of Theodor and Albeck's edition, has been given the symbol ²1.

The readings of Codex Vatican LX, not used by Theodor and Albeck, are recorded under the sign 3.

Wayyigra Rabbah (9)

Not all of the Genizah fragments reached Margulies in time for their readings to be recorded fully in the apparatus, and the readings of some of them were not recorded at all. However, all of the important Genizah fragments have been printed in full by Margulies, and I have collated them in full. Readings in a group of Genizah fragments that have already been given a symbol by Margulies are recorded under that symbol in the apparatus of this word, regardless of whether Margulies quotes the reading in the apparatus to his edition or not. The rest of the groups of Genizah fragments have been given the symbol 1 followed by the number Margulies gives the group in his discussion of them, thus:

The symbols I have used for the Genizah fragments are accordingly as follows:

Margulies's group	I	=	פ	(Margulies's symbol)
"	II	=	פ ²	(Margulies's symbol is פ ²)
"	III	=	פ ³	(Not collated by Margulies)
"	IV	=	פ	(Margulies's symbol)
"	IX	=	פ ⁹	(Margulies's symbol is פ ⁹)
"	X	=	פ ¹⁰	(Margulies's symbol is פ ¹⁰)

The Pesiqta deRav Kahana (10)

Because of certain indications that the critical apparatus to Mandelbaum's edition is incomplete, the readings of the Pesiqta deRav Kahana have been checked against Buber's edition and in certain instances against the Yalqut Shim'oni, and the discrepancies recorded in the apparatus.

As Mandelbaum did not use the Yalqut Mechiri for his edition, I have collated it in full.

The Printed Midrash Tanhuma (11)

See on Buber's edition (6).

The Midrash Tehillim (12)

Two texts of the Midrash Tehillim have been used, Buber's, quoted as K12, and the printed edition, quoted as J12.

Because the Midrash Tehillim is a compilation from the most diverse sources, it is best, before using any of its readings for textual criticism, to look up the passage and if possible determine whether the source is a Tannaitic fragment, an Amoraic fragment, or a fragment from later times. Full references for this purpose are

given in the apparatus each case. References to Buber's edition are according to the Psalm, and the paragraph according to Buber's division. For example, in the sixth article on Is 17:12, the symbols (9:17) X12 mean Buber's edition of the Midrash Tehillim, Psalm 17, paragraph 9. Occasionally, if the midrash on a particular Psalm is very brief, only the number of the Psalm is given: see the second article on Is 2:20. References to the printed edition are according to the Psalm and page (e.g. Is 29:9 first article), or, if the midrash on the Psalm is very brief, only to the Psalm. As Buber mentions parallel passages and, if possible, sources, and these are not mentioned in the printed edition, the page reference for the printed edition is followed by the paragraph number in Buber's edition if the same passage occurs there and if the reference to Buber's edition is not given in another article on the same verse. On the other hand, if only Buber's edition has the variant, the reference for the printed edition is not given because it would not help in tracing the source of the passage. For example, in the article on Is 29:12, the symbols (56; 178:119) J12 mean that the passage is found in the printed edition of the Midrash Tehillim on Psalm 119, p. 178, and that the corresponding place in Buber's edition is the same Psalm, paragraph 56. A reference of this type is not to be taken as meaning that Buber's edition quotes the variant reading. On the other hand, the symbols (104; 1:62) J12 X12 in the second article on Is 26:4 mean that both editions support the reading, and that the reference in Buber's edition is Psalm 62, paragraph 1, and the reference in the printed edition is Psalm 62, p. 104.

Buber based his edition on several manuscripts, but it must not be assumed that a reading printed by him is supported by all the manuscripts unless he specifically states this in a footnote. The omission by Buber of any notice that the manuscripts disagree does

not necessarily mean that they agree.

Midrash Devarim Rabbah (13)

The material that is new in Lieberman's edition is quoted as K13; material found in the ordinary text of Devarim Rabbah is quoted as ך13. Material from Buber's edition corresponding to K13 is not given a special symbol but quoted simply as מה' באבוער after the reference to Lieberman's edition.

The Midrash Haggadol on Exodus (14)

See on the Midrash Haggadol on Genesis (36).

The Seder 'Eliyahu (16)

The Seder 'Eliyahu Rabbah is marked as K16, and the Seder 'Eliyahu Zuta as ך16.

The Yalqut Mechiri (17, 39, 45, 30)

The Yalqut Mechiri is what its name says: an anthology, and should not be treated as if it were an independent midrash. In all cases of readings from it given in the apparatus, the name of its source is given. If the source is a passage in a text mentioned in the same article, the number of the text is given immediately before the number of the Yalqut Mechiri, and there is then no need to give the name of the source. For example, in the second article on Is 9:4, the symbols ך"ג ך17 = 45 = ך17 = ןש ך12 K12 mean that the reading is supported by both editions of the Midrash Tehillim in the Psalm and paragraph already referred to, that a quotation of the Midrash Tehillim in the Yalqut Mechiri on Isaiah and another in the Yalqut Mechiri on Psalms support the reading, and that a passage in the Yalqut Mechiri on Isaiah agreeing with the others but taken from Bemildbar Rabbah supports the reading.

Excerpts from the Midrash Tehillim in the Yalqut Mechiri on Psalms are followed by the number of the Psalm and the paragraph in the Yalqut Mechiri, and then, separated from this by a semi-colon, the number of the paragraph in Buber's edition of the Midrash Tehillim. For example, the symbols (7; 10:27) n^o 45 in the article on Is 1:9 mean that the Yalqut Mechiri quotes the Midrash Tehillim, and that the passage is in the Yalqut Mechiri on Ps 27, paragraph 10, and Buber's edition of the Midrash Tehillim, same Psalm, paragraph 7.

The Yalqut Mechiri on Isaiah is quoted as K17 and 117. The symbol K17 refers to the lemmas, which in many cases seem to have been added by the compiler; the symbol 117 refers to the rest of the text. Naturally, in the other volumes of the Yalqut Mechiri the lemmas are not taken from Isaiah and there is no need for a symbol for them. No source-references are given after the symbol K17, because they would be misleading or false.

The Yalqut Mechiri has been collated by Theodor and Albeck for their edition of Bereshit Rabbah, by Margulies for his edition of Wayyiqra Rabbah, and by Finkelstein for his edition of the Sifre on Deuteronomy, and there was no need to mention it in the apparatus of this work in the case of excerpts from these texts.

The Midrash 'Aggadah 'al Humash (18)

See on the Midrash Bereshit Rabbati (37).

The Midrash Haggadol on Numbers (19)

See on the Midrash Haggadol on Genesis (36).

The 'En Ya'agov (20)

See on the Haggadot Hattalmud (33).

The Midrash Shir Hashshirim Zuṭa (21)

The main text-witnesses available are a complete manuscript (referred to in the apparatus as \mathfrak{D}) and a fragment (referred to in the apparatus as \mathfrak{P}). The number 21 without any manuscript symbol means that the reading is supported by both manuscripts. The symbol \mathfrak{D} 21 without any comment means that the reading is found in manuscript \mathfrak{D} , and manuscript \mathfrak{P} agrees with the MT, and the symbol \mathfrak{P} 21 means that the reading is found in manuscript \mathfrak{P} and that manuscript \mathfrak{D} agrees with the MT or is quoted separately in another article. Otherwise, if a variant reading is found in a passage in manuscript \mathfrak{D} that is not preserved in manuscript \mathfrak{P} attention is called to this.

It should be noted that Schechter's edition, not Buber's, has been used. Buber's edition, through no fault of his, is very unreliable.

Midrash 'Echah Zuṭa (22)

Buber prints two divergent recensions, \aleph and \beth . The symbols \aleph 22 and \beth 22 in the apparatus refer to these two recensions.

The symbol \beth 22 in the apparatus refers to the Yalquṭ Shim'onī on Lamentations, which Buber prints after the Midrash 'Echah Zuṭa.

'Aggadat Bereshit (23)

For this text, Buber used two recensions, the one previously printed, and a unique manuscript. I have given the text of the printed editions the symbol \aleph and the manuscript the symbol \beth .

The two recensions \aleph and \beth diverge very much from each other. Buber prints Recension \aleph in full and gives long extracts from the manuscript in the footnotes, but although he seems to have been more systematic than usual in giving the variants, it is often

uncertain whether the omission of any reference to the manuscript means that it agrees with the text printed or that the differences between them are minor. Sometimes, when Recension X quotes a verse from Isaiah with a variant reading, it is not clear from Buber's footnote whether Recension J quotes the verse or not, and if it does, whether it quotes it with the variant reading. Sometimes a verse is quoted in Recension J but not in Recension X but it is only possible to tell this if Buber quotes the reading of Recension J in full, which he does not always do.

Because of all this, a way had to be devised of showing whether a particular verse or part of a verse was quoted in both recensions or only one, or if it is impossible to tell whether a quotation of the verse in Recension J has the variant or not. The symbol J3 means that the reading is found in Recension X and it is uncertain whether the manuscript quotes the verse or not, or if it does, whether it quotes it with the variant reading or not. It does not necessarily mean that Recension J agrees with the MT. The symbol J3X means that Recension J has the reading, and Recension X differs. In this case, if Recension X is not mentioned separately, it may be assumed not to quote that part of the verse. The symbols J3X X3 mean that both recensions have the variant reading.

The Talmud Yerushalmi (25)

References to the Talmud Yerushalmi are always followed by the name of the tractate.

The Tosefta (26)

References to the Tosefta are always followed by the name of the tractate.

It should be remembered that for the first two Orders Liberman's edition was used, and for the other four Zuckerman's.

The Midrash Tanna'im (27)

Readings from sections of the Midrash Tanna'im taken from the Sifre on Deuteronomy are recorded as reading of the Sifre on Deuteronomy. Readings from the rest of the Midrash Tanna'im are recorded separately.

Midrash Shemu'el (28)

Buber's edition is based on the printed editions, with a comparison with a unique manuscript. It is usually impossible to tell whether a variant reading in a quotation printed in the body of the text is confirmed by the manuscript or not.

Midrash Mishle (29)

Buber's edition is based on a Paris manuscript, with a comparison with two other manuscripts and the first edition. It is usually impossible to tell whether a variant reading in a quotation printed in the body of the text is confirmed by the other manuscripts or the first edition or not.

The Yalqut Mechiri on Proverbs (30)

See on the Yalqut Mechiri on Isaiah (17)

The Midrash Leqah Tov (31, 46, 47, 53) and Midrash Sechel Tov (32)

If the source of a passage in one of these texts seems to be fairly certain, the information is given in the apparatus. Otherwise, it may be assumed that the passage is taken from an unknown source, taken from a known source but extensively re-worked, or

original to the compiler.

Buber used three manuscripts for his edition of the Midrash Leqah Tov on Genesis and Exodus, but he does not usually indicate whether a variant reading in a Biblical quotation in the manuscript used by him as the basis for his edition is found in the other manuscripts or not. Similarly, although Buber used two manuscripts for his edition of the Midrash Leqah Tov on Esther, it is usually impossible to tell whether a given variant reading in the manuscript used by him as the basis for his edition is supported by the other manuscripts.

Feinberg prints the text of the Midrash Leqah Tov on Ecclesiastes according to a Munich manuscript, and gives a complete collation with two others, one in Parma and one in Vienna. The symbols 46 in the apparatus may be taken to mean the consensus of the three manuscripts.

Greenup collates three manuscripts in full for his edition of the Midrash Leqah Tov on Lamentations, and the symbol 47 in the apparatus may be taken to mean the consensus of the three of them.

The Midrash Leqah Tov on Genesis has been given the symbol X 31, and on Exodus, J 31. The Midrash Sechel Tov on Genesis has been given the symbol X 32, and on Exodus, J 32.

The Haggadot Hattalmud, Talmud Bavli, and 'En Ya'akov (33, 41, 20)

References to these texts are always followed by the name of the tractate.

The 'Avot deRabbi Natan (34)

Schechter prints two recensions, X and J.

The text of Recension X printed by Schechter is based on the

printed editions, with corrections according to two manuscripts, X and Y. When the text-witnesses disagree with each other Schechter gives the readings in the footnotes, but as he does not concern himself with readings not affecting the sense of the derash, it is often hard to tell whether a given reading in a Biblical quotation is found only in the printed editions or in the manuscripts as well. This does not, however, cause any difficulty, because in the only case of a reading from Recension X in the apparatus, it is the two manuscripts that have the reading, not the editions.

Schechter prints Recension Z according to a single manuscript, with corrections according to quotations in other texts. A reading not commented on by Schechter in the footnotes may or may not be supported by the other texts.

None of Schechter's four appendices confirm or contradict any variant reading in a quotation from Isaiah 1-35, or give any new variants on Isaiah 1-35.

The Pesiqta Rabbati (35)

The various sources of the Pesiqta Rabbati are distinguished as follows: X35 refers to passages taken from Yelammedenu text; Z35 refers to passages taken from the Pesiqta deRav Kahana; 135 refers to the midrash on the Ten Commandments in chapters 20-24; 735 refers to a Tanhuma text with different terminology to X35; 135 refers to passages of uncertain origin; 735 refers to chapter 46, which seems to be an addition.

The Midrash Haggadol (36, 14, 54, 19, 44)

It is very often impossible to tell what the compiler of the Midrash Haggadol's source for a particular passage was, and as

it would have been very misleading to give a doubtful source-reference as certain, and too wasteful of space to give a long series of possibilities, source-references are only given if the editor of the particular volume of the Midrash Haggadol thinks that there is no doubt or hardly any doubt about the matter; instead, all references to the Midrash Haggadol, whether a source is mentioned or not, are followed by the page number of the passage so that the reader immediately open the Midrash Haggadol examine the evidence, and read the editor's suggestions.

Two texts of the Midrash Haggadol on Numbers were used, Fisch's (119) and Rabinowitz's (119). Because both editors' information on the possible sources of the passage is important, references to both editions are given even if only one of them is mentioned in the apparatus as having the variant reading. Fisch's edition is referred to according to the volume and the page; Rabinowitz's, according to the page. If only one edition has the variant reading, then regardless of which one it is, the reference to Fisch's edition comes first and is separated from the reference to the other edition by a semi-colon. For example, in the first article on Is 6:3, the symbols (411 ;173:2) א"ב , א"ק"ר א19 mean that the reading is found in manuscript א of Fisch's edition, in a passage taken over from either Wayyiqra Rabbah or Bereshit Rabbah, and that the passage is in Fisch's edition in volume 2 on p. 173, and in Rabinowitz's edition on p. 411. If both editions have the variant reading, the reference for each edition is put after its symbol. For example, in the article on Is 8:7, the symbols (489) 119 (255 :2) אבא19 mean that manuscripts אבא of Fisch's edition and all manuscripts of Rabinowitz's edition have the reading, and that the passage is in Fisch's edition on p. 255 of volume 2, and Rabinowitz's on p. 489. No source reference is given in this case because there are too many possibilities.

Midrash Bereshit Rabbati and the Midrash 'Aggadah 'al Hūmash
(37 and 18)

Both of these texts are derived from a midrash by R. Mosheh Haddarshan, and are composed of material from older sources extensively re-worked along with some original material. I have mentioned the source for the derash in which a variant reading occurs in the few cases when this could be done with any certainty.

The Oṣar Midrashim (38)

References to this book are always followed by the name of the individual text from which the reading is taken.

The Yalquṭ Mechiri on the Minor Prophets (39)

See on the Yalquṭ Mechiri on Isaiah (17).

The Talmud Bavli (40)

See on the Haggadot Hattalmud (33).

Ginze Schechter (41)

As this book consists of fragments of the most diverse texts, it was considered essential to give a page reference in any case.

Seder 'Olam Rabbah (42)

Ratner's edition is quoted as X42 and Weinstock's as 242.

'Aggadot 'Ester (44)

See on the Midrash Haggadol on Genesis (36).

The Yalqut Mechiri on Psalms (45)

See on the Yalqut Mechiri on Isaiah (17).

The Midrash Leqah Tov on Ecclesiastes and Lamentations (46 and 47)

See on the Midrash Leqah Tov on Genesis and Exodus (31)

The Pesiqta Hadatta (48)

See on the Bet Hammidrash (50).

The Yalqut Shim'oni (49, פ"י and 122)

The Yalqut Shim'oni on Isaiah was collated in full, and is quoted as 49. The rest of the Yalqut Shim'oni was not collated completely and so is not given a number, but is quoted as פ"י followed by the reference for the part and the paragraph. The method of showing the source is the same as in the case of the Yalqut Mechiri. The number 49 or the abbreviation פ"י (with the part and paragraph reference) is followed by the name of the source, except that if the number 49 or abbreviation פ"י comes immediately after a reference to the source itself, it was considered unnecessary to add the name of the source. In the fourth article on Is 29:10, the symbols יספן רמז פ"י ח"ב = [::] (29) X35 mean that the Yalqut Shim'oni, part II, paragraph 562 quotes the passage found in the Pesiqta Rabbati on leaf 29.

The paragraph numbers are given in Hebrew letters, not in Arabic numbers, as to avoid confusion with source-numbers.

Readings in the Yalqut Shim'oni are not recorded separately if they are given in the apparatus to a critical edition of a text.

The symbols for the Yalqut Shim'oni in the various critical

editions are as follows:

The Sifre: 0

The Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el: 0

Bereshit Rabbah: 7

Wayyiqra Rabbah: 0

The Pesiqta deRav Kahana: 0

Bet Hammidrash (50 and 48)

The number of this book is followed in every case by the name of the particular text referred to.

The Pesiqta Hadatta is quoted separately, as 48.

Genizah Fragments Published by Mann (51)

These fragments are taken from diverse texts, and it was considered essential to give an exact reference in each case so that the reader could consult Mann's notes immediately. References are to the volume and the page.

The Midrash Hādash 'al Hattorah (52)

This midrash is made up of material from diverse sources, and it was considered essential to give an exact reference for the same reasons as in the case of Mann's Genizah fragments. References are to the volume and the page.

The Midrash Leqah Tov on Esther (53)

See on the Midrash Leqah Tov on Genesis and Exodus (31).

The Midrash Haggadol on Leviticus (54)

See on the Midrash Haggadol on Genesis (36)

6. Details of Arrangement of the Notes to the Apparatus

(a) Purpose of this Section

The purpose of the notes to the apparatus and the general principles on which they are based have already been explained (see above, section 2 (c) (ii) d. ii, p.17). This section is intended merely to explain the application of the principles to the selection of material, and the technical details of setting-out.

(b) Texts Used

All the Versions and all the evidence of Hebrew manuscripts that was available have been used.

For the LXX and the later Greek Versions, Ziegler's edition was used. The readings of the Sacra Parallela are only mentioned if none of the text-witnesses used by Ziegler for his edition of the LXX have the reading, or if only very few of them have it. The Arabic Version is referred to only in a few cases, when its readings were of interest. The expression "Arabic Version according to de Rossi" means that I rely on de Rossi for the reading; if his name is not mentioned, it means that the reading has been taken directly from the original. Quotations in the New Testament have been checked against the original.

For the Peshitta, the Urmia edition (U), the Mosul edition (M), and Diettrich's collation were used.

For the Targum, both Sperber's edition and Stenning's edition were used along with van Zijl's corrections to Sperber's edition. The readings of the Targum text of de Rossi's manuscript 737 have been included to the extent that de Rossi mentions them. The Targum text in the Miqra'ot Gedolot was con-

sulted when the pointing of a word made a difference to the meaning, because Sperber does not record the pointing of the printed editions or manuscripts with Tiberian pointing, and Stenning does not use these texts.

There is no really satisfactory edition of the Vulgate on Isaiah. The Stuttgart edition was used, and the readings in the Vulgate text in the Polyglotten Bibel were mentioned if they were not found in the Stuttgart edition. For Jerome's commentary on Isaiah, the Brepols (Turnhout) edition, which is the only satisfactory one, was used. As well as the text of the lemmas to each verse or group of verses, Jerome's comments were consulted. All quotations of Isaiah 1-35 made by Jerome in the course of commenting on other verses were collated.

Of all the Qumran texts of Isaiah, only 1QIs^a, 1QIs^b, 4Q 162, 4Q163, and 4Q145 were found to agree with readings given in the apparatus. The standard editions were used.

For the mediaeval Hebrew texts, the collations by Kennicott, de Rossi, and Ginsburg, the British and Foreign Bible Society edition, the Minḥat Shai, and quotations by Rashi, Qimḥi, and Ibn Ezra were used.

(c) Method of Recording Readings from the Versions and Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts

All cases of apparent support from the Versions are given. In some cases a judgment as to whether the support is real or not has been given, but in most cases no comment has been made because the general discussion and lists in sections 3 (iii) and (iv) of the introduction give the information needed, and giving an assessment in each case would have meant repeating the same arguments over and over or being misleadingly terse. Comments are however, always given in a case not covered by the general principles

mentioned in section 3(iii-iv), and are given in certain cases of particular interest or importance,

The expression "so LXX", "so Peshitta", and so on means that if the words of the Version are translated literally into Hebrew, the result agrees with the lemma at the head of the article. It does not necessarily mean that the translator actually used a Hebrew manuscript with such a reading.

The expression "so apparently LXX", "so apparently Peshitta", and so on, means that if the words of the Versions are translated literally into Hebrew, the result agrees with the lemma, but that more than ordinary caution is needed in evaluating the Version's evidence.

The expression "so probably LXX", "so probably Peshitta", and so on, means the same as the above expression, except that there is even more doubt about the reliability of any translation into Hebrew.

The expression "so perhaps LXX", "so perhaps Peshitta", and so on, means that the translator could have used a Hebrew text with such a reading, but that it is rather more likely that the apparent deviation from the MT is due to translation-technique, or that the evidence of the Version is hard to assess because the translation is not completely literal.

The word "LXX" is to be understood as meaning all text-witnesses of the LXX. If only a certain number of text-witnesses are meant, the word "LXX" is followed by the symbol for the appropriate text-witnesses; for example LXX A means manuscript A of the LXX, and LXX L'' means the group L'' of LXX manuscripts. In the same way, "Peshitta" means all text-witnesses of the Peshitta, "Targum" all text-witnesses of the Targum, and so for "Vulgate" and "Jerome's commentary". If individual text-witnesses are meant, the name of

the Version followed by the symbols for the individual text-witnesses is used, as in the case of the LXX, e.g. Targum bog, Peshitta MU, comm. G, and so on. The symbols used are always the ones used by the editors of the critical editions.

The readings of Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, ho Syros, and ho Hebraios (to Hebraikon) are always mentioned, whether they agree or disagree with the lemma of the article. If one or all of these Versions are not mentioned, it means that they are not extant or that it is impossible to tell whether they support the reading of the lemma or the reading of the MT.

If one or more of the translations LXX, Peshitta, Targum, Vulgate, or Jerome's commentary are not mentioned it means that they probably agree with the MT. If their underlying text is uncertain, some such expression as "the LXX paraphrases" or "the LXX is inconclusive" is used. It is assumed that the reader will be reasonably familiar with the Versions, and will know, for example, that only Aquila and the Targum have an equivalent for אֵל , or that alternative forms of the same Hebrew word, such as אֱלֹהִים and אֱלֹהִי , will not be distinguished in a translation; nevertheless, a reminder has been given in all cases where there was any possibility of the reader being misled, and even in many cases where even a slight acquaintance with the Versions was enough to make it unnecessary.

All cases of agreement between the lemma reading and a Hebrew manuscript are given. It is assumed that this evidence will be treated with caution and that the agreement of a Hebrew manuscript will not be taken as necessarily being support for the genuineness of a reading.

The numbers given to the manuscripts and editions by Kennicott, de Rossi, and Ginsburg are used throughout. The Latin terms used by Kennicott and de Rossi are copied, not translated. Abbreviations

are not expanded, as they are explained by Kennicott and de Rossi and are in any case self-evident. De Rossi sometimes writes the name of an edition in full, sometimes in abbreviated form; I have followed him exactly. Ginsburg uses Hebrew letters for his manuscripts and editions; for the sake of convenience, Arabic numbers have been substituted in the case of manuscripts and Roman ones in the case of editions.

If 1QIs^a agrees with the lemma, the fact is noted. If it agrees with the MT, it is mentioned. If it is illegible in that place, the fact is noted by some such expression as "1QIs^a is illegible" or "1QIs^a is inconclusive." 1QIs^b, 4Q162, 4Q163, and 4Q165 are quoted when they agree with the lemma. If they are not quoted it may mean that they agree with the MT or it may mean that their text is not preserved in that place.

If no support at all for the variant reading is mentioned in the notes, it means that no Hebrew Biblical manuscripts support the reading, either because they agree with the MT or are not extant or are illegible in that place, and no Versions support the reading, either because they agree with the MT, are inconclusive, or are not extant in that place.

FOOTNOTES

INTRODUCTION

Chapter One

1. See section 1 (b) (ii) of this introduction.
2. Aptowitzer surveys all previous work in his introduction, pp. 8-21. His comments, even though cutting, are quite fair.
3. As already mentioned, Geiger's book המקרא ותורתו is not directly concerned with this matter.
4. See his comments on I S 2:22 in part II of his work.
5. Secondary sources are, for example, the Yalqut Shim'oni, Yalqut Mechiri, 'En Ya'aqov, and so on.
6. Introduction, p.10.
7. See his introduction, p.28: "Solche Abweichungen hingegen, die von verschiedenen, von einander unabhängigen Quellen bezeugt sind, sind fast mit derselben Sicherheit für echte Varianten zu halten wie die, welche sich aus dem Inhalte ergeben.
8. In part II of his work.
9. These comments are based on The Hebrew University Bible Project/ The Book of Isaiah/ Sample Edition with Introduction/ by M.H. Goshen-Gottstein. (What seems to be meant is that the introduction is by Goshen-Gottstein). This work is listed in the bibliography under the name of the Hebrew University Bible Project. It will be referred to from now on as the Sample Edition.
10. See pp. 40-42 of the Hebrew introduction to the Sample Edition. For the Tanhuma mss. have been collated.
11. The most important omission is the texts published by Mann in The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue. As well as Buber's edition of the Midrash Tehillim, the early editions, which have a different form of the text, should have been used.

12. See the introduction to the Sample Edition, part IV, paragraph 70, p. 37 of the English text, p. 30 of the Hebrew.
13. Same page, footnote 34. Only the Yalquts are mentioned, but it can be seen from the apparatus to the Sample Edition that the sources of the Midrash Haggadol are not mentioned either.
14. Same page, footnote 33.
15. See my previous note.
16. Goshen-Gottstein warns, in paragraph 68 of the introduction, p. 36 of the English text (the warning seems to be an afterthought, as it is missing in the Hebrew text, p. 30): "All quotations in this apparatus should be checked against the edition or source used by us..." This is quite true, but the reader should still be able to get an approximate idea of the amount of support for the reading directly from the apparatus: otherwise how is he to get a general impression of the textual situation? Anyway, this is not the point. The implication of the last sentence of footnote 33 ("We have, however, made a point of quoting the Yalqutim because of their accessibility to most readers") is that the Yalquts are mentioned separately for the convenience of the reader who does not have access to the critical editions. This is a worthy aim, but the reader is hardly going to derive any convenience from being forced to look up each passage because basic information has been left out of the apparatus.
17. For the symbols used to mark the Genizah fragments of the Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai, see below, p. 101.
18. Sample Edition, p. 35 of the English text, p. 29 of the Hebrew, footnote 18.
19. Some Tannaitic texts, such as the Baraita diMlechet Hammishkan, do not give any quotations of Is 1-35, or, if they do, quote according to the MT. Such texts are not listed in the bibliography.
20. Sample Edition, preface, p. 9 of the English text, p. 8 of the Hebrew.
21. In the case of Bereshit Rabbah, the critical edition has been supplemented by a collation of ms. Vatican LX.

22. See Goshen-Gottstein, introduction to Text and Language, pp. XIII-XIV; Theory and Practice of Textual Criticism, pp. 132-137; Prolegomena to a Critical Edition of the Peshitta, par. 22, and his footnote 172. Note in particular this sentence in Prolegomena: "Because of prevailing attitudes to the contrary, I would like to emphasize in the strongest possible terms that merely printing a collection of variants means leaving half the work undone" (footnote 172).
23. See below, section 5(c), pp. 93-94.
24. See below, section 3 (b) (i), p. 40 bottom and p. 41, and section 5(d), pp. 95-98.
25. See below, section 5(c), pp. 91-92.
26. See section 5.
27. See Goshen-Gottstein, Theory and Practice of Textual Criticism, pp. 130-137.
28. On previous work and the separation of readings due to the manner of quoting from real variants. I have treated these matters, but only the aspects not treated by Aptowitzer. The rest of this introduction is concerned with matters not treated by him.
29. See above, note 22. The end of Goshen-Gottstein's footnote (in Prolegomena) is particularly relevant: "As matters stand, most future users of the proposed edition [of the Peshitta] will certainly appreciate being given an indication of the editor's preferred readings, rather than being left with the often obviously corrupt text of A [the basic manuscript], without any indication of how to get out of the bewildering labyrinth of variants. As long as all the readings are faithfully recorded, this kind of apparatus seems to me the most satisfactory solution from a scholarly as well as from a practical point of view".
- The additions in square brackets are mine.
30. See above, section 1 (c) (ii) c.

31. See above, section 1 (c) (ii) d.
32. See section 5 (c), p. 93.
33. See above, p. 17 and footnote 24.
34. See above, p. 17 and footnote 25.
35. See below, pp.44-51.
36. Introduction to Text and Language, pp. X - XI, Die Jesaiah-Rolle und das Problem der Hebraischen Handschriften, and Biblical Philology and the Concordance. In this case the stimulus led to a certain amount of disagreement.
37. I became aware of the importance of devising some way of separating scribal errors from real variants not so much because of any particular article of his as by the way he keeps on coming back to the problem. See Biblical Philology and the Concordance; Die Jesaiah-Rolle und das Problem der Hebraischen Handschriften, pp. 429-435; Die Jesaia-Rolle im Lichte von Feschitta und Targum, pp. 51-56; the introduction to Text and Language, pp. X-XIV; Biblical Manuscripts in the United States, pp. 41-42; Theory and Practice of Textual Criticism, pp. 132-137.
38. See above, note 7.
39. For instance, the observation of the importance of the fact that the Tiberian Amoraim had a text slightly different to the Tiberian Massorettes' (see p. 28); the observation of the importance of the disagreements between Theodotion and Aquila (see p. 27); the argument, used several times, that the use of a variant reading by the Tannaim or Amoraim does not mean that the reading was later altered to the present one, but that the present reading must have been known in some circles at the same time (see p. 23, p. 26, p.27 bottom); and the arguments from the halachah on pp.33-35.
- Of course, it is possible that these arguments have been put forward before, but that I have not come across them.
40. See below, p.30, including the footnotes.
41. See above, note 37.

INTRODUCTION

Chapter Two

1. See section IV of Gordis's prolegomena to the re-issue of The Biblical Text in the Making (and see below, note 33); Segal, Mevo Hammiora, paragraphs 784-785, or The Promulgation of the Authoritative Text of the Hebrew Bible; Greenberg, The Stabilization of the Text of the Hebrew Bible, p. 159 column 2- p. 160 column 1.
2. If it had not been, Tannaitic exegesis would have been impossible. Even Hillel's seven rules of exegesis depend on a fixed text. Theodotion's translation, probably made in the first generation of Tannaim, is based on a Hebrew text nearly exactly the same as the present one. (On Theodotion's date, see below, pp. 64-65). See the next note.
3. Segal, Mevo Hammigra, paragraph 792, and specially note 79 on p. 877, referring to Sanhedrin 4a; paragraph 793, p. 878b, referring to 'Eruvin 13a, 'Avot 3:13, and Josephus, Against Apion, 1:8:42; Sperber, A Historical Grammar of Biblical Hebrew, pp. 507-508, referring to Yerushalmi Berachot 11c, Bavli Sanhedrin 4a, and Bavli Sanhedrin 4b; Bacher, Terminologie, part I, article and the second half of the article Gordis, op. cit., p. XXXIV, note 68, referring to Bavli Sanhedrin 4b.
4. Bavli Sanhedrin 4b.
5. Gordis, op. cit., p. XXXIV.
6. Segal, Mevo Hammigra, paragraphs 800-801.
7. Theodotion probably made his translation during the first generation of Tannaim. See below, pp. 64-65.
8. Aptowitz, passim; the apparatus to this work, passim, and see below, notes 10 and 25.
9. The Murabba'at texts were not used by scholars, but considering the orthodoxy of bar-Kochva and his soldiers, they can be assumed to have been copied by skilled scribes from manuscripts that would have been considered correct by the Tannaim.

10. In all of the following examples, the reading of the Vulgate, if certain or nearly so, has been given, because the Vulgate is the Version most likely to represent a Hebrew text used by the Amoraim in Israel. This information will be referred to in note 12.

(a) Examples of disagreement between Theodotion and the received text:

Is 10:28 חוֹי לויִּי hoi loipoi (i.e. Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion); חוֹי received text and Vulgate.

Is 10:29 ןוֹרִיִּם Theodotion; ןוֹרִיִּם received text, Aquila, Symmachus, to Hebraikon, the LXX column of the Hexapla, and the Vulgate.

Is 11:3 אֱלֹהִים Theodotion (probably); אֱ received text, Symmachus (probably), Aquila, and Vulgate.

Is 13:9 וְאֵל ןוֹרִיִּם Theodotion, Vulgate, and the printed editions of the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el; וְאֵל ןוֹרִיִּם received text.

Is 14:32 מְלֹאכִי Theodotion and Aquila; מְלֹאכִי received text, Symmachus, and Vulgate.

Is 21:8 אֲרִיִּאֵל Theodotion; אֲרִיִּא received text, Aquila, Symmachus, Vulgate.

Is 30:23 וְקָנָה Theodotion, Aquila, (and perhaps Symmachus), and Bereshit Rabbah; וְקָנָה received text.

Is 33:6 וְחַיִּי Theodotion, Symmachus, Bavli Shabbat, and Shemot Rabbah; וְחַיִּי received text, Aquila, and Vulgate.

Nahum 1:8 וְדָבָר Quinta(= Theodotion; see Barthélemy, Les Devanciers d'Aquila, part III, chapter V) Aquila, and Pseudo-Theodotion (Barthélemy, part III, chapter IX); וְדָבָר received text; see Symmachus and Vulgate.

Habakkuk 3:14 וְיִשְׁפָּטֵנוּ Murabba'at text of the Minor Prophets in Greek (Barthélemy, Les Devanciers d'Aquila, p. 198, line 5), which is to be identified with Theodotion or his school (Barthélemy, pp. 198-202); וְיִשְׁפָּטֵנוּ received text and probably Aquila.

Je 20:11 ןכל (read as ןכא) Theodotion;
 ןכ לז received text.

- (b) There are some examples of the agreement of Theodotion and Aquila against the received text in the first part of this note. Examples of disagreement between Aquila and the received text, with Theodotion's reading not known or Theodotion agreeing with the received text:

Is 8:17 םאלהים Aquila; 'ה received text,
Symmachus, and Vulgate.

Is 27:4 שמיך ושית Aquila (and possibly
Symmachus), some Tanhuma texts, Vulgate; שמיך ושית
received text.

Is 33:20 ןן'יעיד Aquila (and perhaps Symmachus),
Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el and Mechilta deRabbi
Shim'on ben Yoḥai; ןן'יעיד received text and
Vulgate.

Is 37:11 אחך Aquila; אכך received
text.

Je 38 (45): 26 אנכי Aquila; אכי received
text.

Ez 6:3 אנכי Aquila; אכי received text.

Ez 12:11 לכם Aquila; להם received text,
Symmachus, Theodotion, Vulgate.

Ez 16:61 בחקתך Aquila (see Reider, Prolegomena,
chapter IV, paragraph 39); בכתתך received text,
Theodotion, and Vulgate.

Ez 19:7 עריך Aquila and perhaps Vulgate; עריך
received text, Symmachus, Theodotion.

Ez 27:16 אד(ו)ם Aquila; אדם received text,
Symmachus, Theodotion, Vulgate.

Ez 40:2 וַיִּבְנֶה Aquila; וַיִּבְנֶה received text, Symmachus, Theodotion, and Vulgate.

Amos 8:3 וַיִּבְנֶה or וַיִּבְנֶה Aquila (but as this reading is supported by manuscript W of the LXX and the Sahidic, which, as Barthélemy has shown in Les Devanciers d'Aquila, part III, chapters VI and VII, depend on Theodotion (R), we should probably read ε' for α' or add ε' [Quinta = Theodotion]), and Vulgate; וַיִּבְנֶה received text and Symmachus; Pseudo-Theodotion differs.

Joel 4:3 מִי עַל לְעַל מִרְבָּעַת מִרְבָּעַת scroll of the Minor Prophets in Hebrew (DJD, vol. II) and Aquila; מִי עַל לְעַל received text.

Zeph. 3:9 אֵל כָּל הָעַמִּים Aquila and Pseudo-Theodotion; אֵל הָעַמִּים Murabba'at scroll of the Minor Prophets in Hebrew; אֵל עַל received text and probably Symmachus; the Vulgate reads אֵל אֵל הָעַמִּים or אֵל הָעַמִּים אֵל.

More examples are given by Reider, Prolegomena, chapter I, paragraph 17 (specially JQR vol. IV p. 356) and chapter IV, paragraphs 37-41. As Barthélemy has shown that the Greek translation of Ecclesiastes is Aquila's (Les Devanciers d'Aquila, part I, chapter I, paragraph 4) we can add the variant readings given by Gordis in his commentary (Kohleth — The Man and His World, pp. 140-142). Some more examples can be found in Reider and Turner, An Index to Aquila, passim. Ziegler remarks on some of Aquila's deviations from the MT in his editions of the Prophets.

I have taken some of the readings of Aquila listed above from Reider, Reider and Turner, or Ziegler; but have checked all of them. The reading on Amos 8:3 is taken from Barthélemy, Les Devanciers d'Aquila, p. 262.

(c) Instances of disagreement between quotations in Tannaitic texts and the received text can be found in the apparatus to this thesis, passim. The most convincing examples are the readings in mentioned in this note for Is 13:9 and 33:20, and the ones mentioned in note 25. See also note 33, part (g), on Dt 17:3.

(d) The divergencies between the Murabba'at text of the Minor Prophets in Hebrew are given by Milik on pp. 183-184 and p. 205 of vol. II of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert. See above on Joel 4:3 and Zeph 3:9.

11. This point is very important. See below, beginning of section 2(b), p. 29 bottom — 30 top, and note 33.

12. By post-Amoraic texts, I mean the Tanhuma-Yelammedenu sermons. See below, section 4(c).

(a) Examples of disagreement between quotations in Amoraic or post-Amoraic texts, and Theodotion or Aquila or both:

Is 19:4 א'שפ א'י(י)א Tanhuma-Yelammedenu
texts and Vulgate; אשפ א'יא received text,
Aquila, and Theodotion.

Is 24:11 אש Tanhuma; א'ל received text,
Theodotion, and Vulgate.

Is 33:16 א'יא Bereshit Rabbah; א'יא re-
ceived text, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and Vulgate.

Is 34:11 א'ל Pesiqta deRav Kahana and Wayyiqra
Rabbah; א'ל received text and probably Aquila.

Is 35:5 א'א Pesiqta deRav Kahana;
א'א received text, Aquila, Symmachus,
Theodotion, and Vulgate.

(b) Examples of disagreement between quotations in Tannaitic texts and the Vulgate and be found in note 10 on Is 33:20 and note 25 on Is 4:5 and 9:4. Although only these examples of this disagreement between a quotation in a Tannaitic text and the Vulgate could be found, it should be noted that this is due to the rigorous requirements of selection. It not only had to be established that a variant reading in a quotation was genuine, but that it was well-enough attested in a Tannaitic text to be assumed to be the original reading in it; and it is not always possible to tell whether the Vulgate supports a variant reading or not. The only certain instance of agreement between a variant reading in a quotation in a Tannaitic text and the Vulgate is the reading in Is 13:9 mentioned in note 10.

- (c) Examples of disagreement between Theodotion or Aquila and the Vulgate are given in note 10.
13. On the need for care in using the Vulgate, see below, pp.65 bottom -66 top. It should be remembered that the Palestinian Targums contain material from very disparate periods.
 14. Segal, Mevo Hammigra, paragraph 803, and specially note 12.
 15. Op. cit., paragraph 803, p. 895.
 16. All of this paragraph is taken from Segal, op. cit., paragraph 803.
 17. By sub-traditions, I mean traditions of the text differing from each other only in the tiniest details, as opposed to the major differences that mark different recensions.
 18. Hammigra Wetargumaw, beginning of appendix 3, p. 316 of the Hebrew text.
 19. Notice that the LXX is well before Rav Hammuna's time, the Peshitta probably contemporary or slightly later, and the Vulgate much later, On the other hand Theodotion, after the LXX but before Rav Hammuna, had our reading in his text. First one then the other reading is attested in Israel: LXX — variant reading; Theodotion— received reading; Rabbi — variant reading; Vulgate — variant reading; MT of Tiberias— received reading.
 20. Considering the evidence of the previous note, the explanation is probably the use of slightly different texts in different circles. See below, section 2(b).
 21. Segal, op. cit., paragraph 803.
 22. Segal, op. cit., paragraph 807, pp. 900 bottom-901 top, remarks that all the Versions tend to agree with the Babylonian, and gives some examples. More examples are of the agreement of the LXX, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, The Peshitta, and the Vulgate with Eastern and Western readings are given by Gordis, The Biblical Text in the Making, pp. 71-74, who observes that Eastern readings predominate. Numerous examples of the agreement between quotations in Palestinian texts and Targum Yonatan on the Prophets can be found in the notes to the apparatus of this thesis.

23. These are the readings supposed to have been changed by the LXX translators, and the Tiqqune Soferim. See the next note. Readings that were definitely removed from the text are those found in the minority of the three manuscripts of the 'Azarah: see Talmon, The Three Scrolls of the Law That Were Found in the Temple Court.

24. Examples of the readings found in certain manuscripts, but not regarded as correct by the transmitters of the tradition, are the changes supposed to have been made by the translators of the LXX. See the anonymous tradition in the Mechilta de Rabbi Yishma'el, Pisha 14, p. 50 of Horowitz and Rabin's edition; Yerushalmi Megillah chapter 1 halachah 11, leaf 71 col. 4 in Bomberg's edition; Bavli Megillah 9a; Massechet Soferim 1:8; Massechet Sefer Torah 1:9; Printed Tanhuma Shemot paragraph 22 and Buber's Tanhuma Shemot leaf 6. The readings are discussed in detail by Geiger, Hammiqra Wetargumaw, pp. 281 bottom - 287 top. The following information is taken from his work.

If these readings are treated by the author of the passage as deliberate changes in the process of translation, they could not have been regarded by him as the correct or standard reading in the Hebrew text. In spite of this, one of these readings is not only found in another Tannaitic text, but used to derive halachah. In an anonymous passage in the Sifre on Dt. 17:3, paragraph 148, a halachah is based on the presence of the word דַּבַּר at the end of the verse, as in the list of changes in the Mechilta, and against our received text.

Another one of these reading is attested in an Amoraic text, but is treated either as an old, discarded reading or merely as an exegetical explanation. In a comment by Rav Natan on Ex 12:40 in Bereshit Rabbah 63:3 on Gn 25:19, p. 680 of Theodor and Albeck's edition, the addition of the words וְיָרָא(1) (וְיָרָא(1)) וְיָרָא , approximately as in the list in the Mechita and as in the LXX, after the words וְיָרָא(1) , is used to explain a chronological anomaly. There is no reference to the LXX.

The Tiqqune Soferim are changes supposed to have been made in the text for the theological reasons. A full discussion and references are given by Geiger, Hammiqra Wetargumaw, pp. 199-223, and specially pp. 199-203; Barthelemy, Les Tiqquné Sopherim; Segal, Mevo Hammiqra, paragraph 781; Ginsburg,

Introduction to the Massoretico - Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible, pp. 347-363, Bacher, Terminologie, part I, article יָדָו, and Liebermann, Yewanut, pp. 170-177. Lists can be found in the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el, Shirantha 6, p. 135 of Horovitz and Rabin's edition, the Printed Tanhuma, Beshallah 16, and the Sifre on Numbers, paragraph 84, p. 81 of Horovitz's edition, and Keller, Fragments d'un traité d'exégèse massoretique, pp. 79-83. The Mechilta and Sifre give the list in the name of R. Yehudah [ben 'Il'ai]; the Tanhuma and Keller's fragment give it anonymously. Further references are given by Barthélemy p. 286 note 5 and p. 287 note 1, Horovitz and Rabin in the notes to the Mechilta, Ginsburg pp. 350-351, Keller, pp. 81-82, and Liebermann.

The reading that concerns us here, the change of יָדָו to יָדָו in Zech. 2:12, is reported separately in the name of R. Yehudah [ben 'Il'ai] in the Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai on Ex 3:8, p.2 lines 3-4, and in the name of R. Yehoshua' [ben Levi] in Shemot Rabbah 13:2.

Barthélemy, in his article Les Tiqquné Sopherim, pp. 290-291, (see the context as well) shows convincingly that the Kaige Recension (i.e. Theodotion or a translator of the same school) translated tou ophthalmou mou. Barthélemy thinks the translator read יָדָו in the Hebrew and translated as he did because he had a tradition that the original reading was This is possible, but seems unlikely. He admits himself (pp.290-291) "... on le voit cependant soucieux de rendre en grec les particularités du texte hébraïque d'une façon aussi objective que possible ... D'ailleurs notre recenseur vit à une époque où le respect pour la lettre du texte était déjà un principe solidement enraciné". Such a translator would probably not have dared to change the text.

The reading יָדָו is supported by the Vulgate. Barthélemy doubts that Jerome read יָדָו in his Hebrew text, but thinks that he translated as he did under the influence of the Quinta, which in the Minor Prophets is to be identified with Theodotion. This does not seem likely either. Jerome used the Greek Versions as a help in understanding the text, and they do influence his wording, but he did not substitute variant readings from them for what he found in the Hebrew. See Kedar-Kopfstein, The Vulgate as a Translation, pp.59 bottom-62, and the third paragraph of his article Divergent Hebrew

Readings in Jerome's Isaiah. In any case, Jerome is not very much influenced by the Quinta or Theodotion: he refers to Symmachus and Aquila much oftener, and most of the influence on the wording comes from Symmachus. It is quite possible, then, that Jerome did read י'י'י, and if this is so, it is very good support for the presence of the reading in the text used by the translator of the Kaige Recension.

The translator of the Kaige Recension (probably Theodotion) lived in the first century A.D., and probably worked under Tannaim of the first generation. If he did read י'י'י, it means that some Tannaim of the first generation still read י'י'י where R. Yehudah ben 'Il'ai, a Tanna of the fourth generation, read י'י'י. R. Yehudah and R. Yehoshua' ben Levi both attribute the change to the Soferim, so that it must have been made well before the time of the Kaige Recension, and this dating is confined by the LXX, which reads י'י'י. It seems that during the first generation of Tannaim some or most texts read י'י'י, but some still read י'י'י.

25. (a) Examples of disagreement between quotations in Tannaitic texts and Theodotion or Aquila:

Is 4:5 י'י'י Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el, Bereshit Rabbah (in part), and various Tanhuma-Yelammedenu texts; י'י'י received text, to Hebraikon and hoi loipoi panta (i.e. Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion), Vulgate.

Is 24:21 ה'א'ה Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el and various Tanhuma-Yelammedenu texts; ה'א'ה part of the textual witness of both Mechiltas; ה'א'ה received text, Symmachus, Theodotion.

Is 9:4 ו'ו' various Tannaitic texts all depending on a derash by R. Me'ir; ו'ו' received text, Aquila, Symmachus, Vulgate.

Is 5:18 ו'ו' Sifre on Numbers, and the printed editions of Bereshit Rabbah; ו'ו' received text, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion.

The examples are listed in descending order of reliability of attestation.

I have found only two certain instances of agreement between a quotation in a Tannaitic text and Theodotion or Aquila against the received text: see note 10 on Is 13:9 and 33:20.

- (b) Numerous examples of disagreement between Theodotion and Aquila are given in note 10.
- (c) In only three of the instances of disagreement between the Murabba'at manuscript of the Minor Prophets in Hebrew and the received text do we know Aquila's reading. In Joel 4:3 Aquila agrees with the Murabba'at manuscript against the received text (see note 10); in Habakkuk 3:10 Symmachus and hoi loipoi agree with the received text in reading $\text{רַבֵּי אֲמַרְיָהוּ}$ instead of $\text{רַבֵּי אֲמַרְיָהוּ}$; in Zeph 3:9 Aquila agrees with the Murabba'at manuscript against the received text, (see note 10). In no instance of divergence of the Murabba'at manuscript from the received text do we know the reading of the Quinta (= Theodotion).
- (d) Instances of contradiction between Tannaitic midrashim are very hard to establish, because in most cases the reading agreeing with the received text could be due to normalization by later copyists. Only when the received reading is mentioned specifically or used as the basis for an argument can it be assumed to be the reading originally in the text. An instance is the reading אֲמַרְיָהוּ in Dt 17:3 in the Sifre, as opposed to the received reading in the Mechilta. (See above, note 23).
26. This is amply shown by the quotations in Tiberian Amoraic texts (the Talmud Yerushalmi except Neziqin, Bereshit Rabbah, Wayyiqra Rabbah, 'Echah Rabbah, and the Pesiqta deRav Kahana along with part of the Pesiqta Rabbati: see below, section 4 (b) (i)).
27. The Tanhuma-Yelammedenu texts used for this work are listed in part 4 (c) of the introduction.
28. Divergent readings in Gaonic texts can be taken from Aptowitzer's work, passim.
29. Aptowitzer, passim; Diaz Esteban, The Sefer Oklah w'Oklah.
30. Examples are given by Sperber, A Historical Grammar of Biblical Hebrew, pp. 520-555.

31. Ginsburg, Introduction to the Massoretico- Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible, p. 246 and p. 248, gives some differences in the consonantal text. Notice that the ben Naftali reading ךָשֶׁר in Is 30:23 is supported by a quotation in Bereshit Rabbah. It is possible, of course, that the readings given as ben Naftali's in the sources mentioned by Ginsburg are not his, but the readings of certain manuscripts that were assumed to be ben Naftali's because they were not ben Asher's. See Goshen-Gottstein, The Rise of the Tiberian Bible Text, note 121. If this is so, the present argument is not affected, since the readings are still evidence for divergencies between Palestinian Masoretes.
32. Aptowitzer, passim.
33. (a) Kahle, in his article Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Pentateuchtextes suggests (p. 34 top) that when the Masoretic recension was accepted officially, the Masorah was concerned with the major differences between the Masoretic recension and others, so that minor differences within the Masoretic recension were ignored, and (p.32) that the work of pointing the text provided the first opportunity of fixing the text in detail. This may well be true, but it does not answer the problems just mentioned.
- (b) Pfeiffer says (Introduction to the Old Testament, p.79): "It is clear from the variants that still persist in all the ancient versions made after 130, that the official text of Akiba, if we may call it so, did not entirely eliminate other textual recensions circulating at the time, and that copyists of the standard text continued to make some unwitting or deliberate slight changes. Consequently, when the Masoretes undertook to fix the text in all its minute eccentricities, they were confronted with variants which were too well attested to be summarily suppressed". The references given by Pfeiffer include the article by Kahle referred to above, and the criticism made there applies here too. Pfeiffer's view differs slightly from Kahle's. Kahle considers R. 'Aqiva and his school to have produced a recension, but not an absolutely fixed text: "... die Masora zunächst damit zu tun hatte, alle g r ö s s e r e n Differenzen zu beseitigen, und deshalb kleinere bisweilen übersah" (p.34 top). Pfeiffer seems to be of the opinion that R. 'Aqiva's text was fixed in all details. Both date the

recensional activity during the time of R. 'Aqiva. Gordis seems to have proven that the activity must have been well before this time: see the prolegomena to the re-issue of The Biblical Text in the Making, section IV, and The Biblical Text in the Making, pp. 46 - 47. His dating is confirmed by the evidence of Theodotion's version, which we now know to have been made in the early first century (see below, pp. 64-65). His view that this activity extended to absolute fixing of the text must, however, be challenged. This matter will be discussed below.

- (c) Orlinsky, in his prolegomenon to the re-issue of Ginsburg's Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible, pp. XX - XXIII, shows that the consonantal Masoretic Text was not uniform before the time of the Masoretes. Whether he considers the Masoretes themselves to have established a fixed consonantal text is uncertain. On p. XXIII he says: "In fine, any such contention as "But we are editing as 'masoretic' only the Hebrew text of the Masoretes (or, of Ben Asher)" immediately falls to the ground of its own accord. There never was and there can never be "the masoretic text" or "the text of the Masoretes." ". This seems to imply that the consonantal text is not fixed, and this interpretation is confirmed by the position of this statement after a series of examples dealing with variations in the consonantal text. In the same paragraph, however, (p. XXIV top) he goes on to talk about the differences between the Aleppo Codex, Leningrad B 19a, and British Museum Or 2626-27-28 (the basis of the British and Foreign Bible Society's edition) and these manuscripts are practically identical in their consonantal text, even in the matter of full and defective spelling, and differ mostly in tiny details of the pointing and cantillation marks. The continuation of his argument deals with the way of setting out the qere readings. Orlinsky prefaces these examples with the statement: "An excellent justification of this viewpoint may be gained from the manner in which the various just-mentioned editions of the Bible— each of them claiming the last word in masoretic authority — treated the important aspects of masoretic activity which the Kethib-Qere system constitutes.", so that it seems that he is not really concerned with consonantal readings on the first half of p. XXIV. The parts of Orlinsky's

argument are sound, but there does not seem to be any logical connection between pp. XX-JXIII and p. XXIII bottom, or p. XXIII bottom and p. XXIV top.

In his article The Origin of the Kethib-Qere System, he assumes, following Wellhausen, that the stimulus and the opportunity to fix the text completely was provided by the activity of pointing. He argues (pp. 187-192) that the ketiv and qere readings were established by the Masoretes on the basis of three manuscripts. When they disagreed, the majority reading was made the qere and the minority the ketiv. Presumably, when he refers to the Masoretes, he means the Tiberians, as the Babylonian ketiv-qere readings are different. The implication seems to be that a completely fixed consonantal text (aside, perhaps, from details of spelling) was established. Orlinsky has not explained his views on the persistence of variant readings after the close of Masoretic activity in Tiberias. [I have not been able to get hold of a copy of his article Problems of the Kethib-Qere in the JACS, vol. LX, pp. 30-45].

Orlinsky's views may be correct, but like Kahle and Pfeiffer, he has not explained or realized the difficulty of the Tannaim or Amoraim accepting the persistence of variant readings in the text.

- (3) Roberts(The Old Testament Text and Versions, p.29) realizes that the text was not fixed in all details before the period of Masoretic activity in Tiberias, and considers the text to have been finally fixed by "the ben Asher Massorettes". The observation that the text was not absolutely fixed before the activity of the Masoretes of the ben Asher family is correct, although it might be more correct to say that the last generation of Tiberian Masoretes fixed the text and that the sub-tradition known as ben Asher's later became generally accepted. The implication that the Masoretes of the ben Asher family produced a standard consonantal text is rather dubious: from what we know of their activity, their interest was in the pointing. On p. 44 he says that "the aim of the Massorettes was to preserve the text which had by that time, and largely as the result of their own labours, assumed the authority of a standard text." His statement (p. 29 bottom) that the ben Asher text "received official status by the decree of Maimonides" is quite wrong: see below, p. 33 and note 46.

Roberts's view on the persistence of variant readings is that one text-form gradually replaced the rest, and that the standardization began in the time of R. 'Aqiva (p.25, pp. 28 bottom-29 top; summary p. 29 bottom). The picture that he gives of the process of standardization is impossible. He speaks of "a bitter and constant struggle" (p.28), "the final struggle of the various schools" (p.29), the "die-hard traditions" of the Rabbinic academies (p.29). Unlike Christians, who have gone to war over disputes in readings in the NT, Jews have never had bitter and constant struggles over the text. There are no disputes over reading (as opposed to the division of words) anywhere in either Talmud or anywhere in any midrash. Roberts says (p.29 top): "Disunited Judaism, lacking a unifying force in its religion because of sects and creeds, had to be most circumspect in its attempts to remedy one of the main fundamental causes of its dissension, by fixing a standard text-form of the Bible." Why did the Jews have to be "most circumspect", and what are the "sects and creeds" referred to? Hardly the Samaritans, because neither the Jews nor the Samaritans would have let each other's opinion deter them from fixing the text. Hardly the Sadducees, because there is no evidence that the Sadducees and Pharisees disagreed over the text of the Bible, the Sadducees disappeared soon after the fall of the Temple, and their opinion would have been irrelevant to the Pharisees anyway. Hardly the Qaraites, considering that Rabbanites and Qaraites have always been ready to accept each other's text. Anyway as Roberts himself recognizes indirectly (p.29), the only relevant traditions are those of the various Rabbinic academies, and they were hardly divided into sects and creeds. Roberts's view is a travesty of Eissfeldt's.

- (e) Eissfeldt (The Old Testament: An Introduction, pp. 684-685) is of the opinion that the text was gradually standardized as variant forms of it were replaced. This is quite possible, but does not explain the persistence of variant readings after the Masoretic period, or the attitude of the Tannaim and Amoraim to variant readings.
- (f) In the prolegomenon to the re-issue of his book, The Biblical Text in the Making, Gordis has gone into the question of the origin of the Masoretic recension in de-

tail. He repeats the arguments put forward in chapter 4 of The Biblical Text in the Making, and adds important evidence. Unfortunately, the work is very uneven, and some impressive arguments are spoilt by carelessness. It has already been mentioned (this note, part (b)) that Gordis dates the establishment of the Masoretic Text to before the destruction of the Temple, and that the evidence now available on the date of Theodotion confirms his conclusion. Even without the evidence of Theodotion, the outline of his argument appears unassailable. It is Gordis's other point, that the Masoretic Text was fixed in all details from before the destruction of the Temple, that is rather badly argued and is, in fact, open to severe criticism. This note will be concerned with pointing out the inadequacies of the argument. Probably Gordis could put forward a very good case for his view if he chose, and it is to be hoped that he will do so. Section I of Gordis's prolegomenon bears the marks of haste.

He does not seem to know Kahle's view. On p. XII he says, correctly, that Kahle and his school deny the existence of an archetype, but without giving an exact reference to any of Kahle's work. On p. XIII he says: "Not all scholars believed that the variations remained numerous for so long a period as the centuries between Rabbi Akiba and the medieval Masoretes. Some admitted that the consonantal text (vocalization does not enter into consideration here) remained more or less fixed beginning with the second century." Who are the scholars who believe that the variants remained numerous up till the time of the Masoretes? The only possible reference is Kahle and his school, mentioned on the previous page, including Powis Smith, mentioned in note 8. What he does not realize is that Kahle does recognize that the consonantal text "remained more or less fixed beginning with the second century." See the references to Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Pentateuchtextes, at the beginning of this note, and notice the following statement on p. 33: "Seit ungefähr 100 n. Chr. ist in den offiziellen jüdischen Kreisen unser masoretischer Konsonantentext als textus receptus betrachtet worden —, so konnte man vielleicht LAGARDES Hypothese modifizieren." (Italics to the last word are mine).

This interpretation of Gordis's opinion is confirmed by his statements in note 61. He says: "Kahle, who denies the existence of an archetype for the Hebrew original, maintains a similar view with regard to the Septuagint.

Here, too, he denies the existence of an originally basic translation and maintains that many variants of the Greek translation were in use and that the Septuagint, as we know it today, is the result of a long development. Cf. his Cairo Genizah, p.141 ff." Kahle does not maintain that the differences within the Masoretic recension are on the same level as the differences between the Greek translations and recensions the existence of which he assumes. It is one of the central points of the article just referred to that there are differences on that level between the Hebrew original of the LXX, the Samaritan, and the MT, but as we have seen, Kahle recognizes that within the MT itself the divergencies are very slight. Gordis's misconception of Kahle's view seems to be due to a superficial reading of the second paragraph on p. 28 of Roberts's Old Testament Text and Versions. We will see in a moment that a superficial reading of Roberts's work and a dependence on Roberts's statements about the views of other scholars without checking them had led him into other mistakes.

Gordis does not seem to have read all the sources he mentions in part I of his prolegomenon. In note 8 he refers to an article by G.M. (sic) Powis-Smith (sic), Studies in (sic) the Masoretes, JACS (sic), vol. 45 (sic), 1927-1928, pp. 208 ff. (sic). Actually, the author's name is J.M. Powis Smith, the title of the article is Studies of the Masoretes; the journal is the AJSL [American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures]; the volume is 44; the pages are 208 f. Gordis has given the name of the wrong journal because he has copied the reference straight from note 1 on p. 26 of Roberts's The Old Testament Text and Versions. The rest of the mistakes are his own.

Gordis is not aware of what Powis Smith actually says. The relevant passage of Gordis's work is as follows (p. XII): "On the basis of this evidence, Kahle and his school concluded that there never had been an archetype, and that variations in the Biblical text were widespread in Jewish circles until the Middle Ages. One scholar went so far as to argue that there was no accepted text of the Bible until the second edition of the Rabbinic Bible by Jacob ben Hayyim (1521-1525)." A footnote at the end of the second sentence refers to Powis Smith. What he

does not realize is that Powis Smith did not write an original article but a review of Kahle's Masoreten des Westens, and that the view attributed to him is his, but that he is only repeating what Kahle says, and not, as Gordis believes, giving an original and extreme position of his own. Furthermore, Powis Smith is not talking about the consonantal text, but about the pointing. (See the third paragraph of his review).

Gordis's misunderstanding is due to his taking the information about Powis Smith's view direct from Roberts, who seems to misunderstand them himself. Roberts refers to Powis Smith at the bottom of p. 25 and the top of p. 26 in a way that on a superficial reading seems to indicate that he did not believe the consonantal text was fixed before the second Rabbinic Bible. What Roberts is talking about, however, is "variants of orthography" (see line 6 from the bottom on p. 25), presumably full and defective spelling. Roberts himself misunderstands Powis Smith, who, as we have seen, refers to the pointing. Gordis has misunderstood a view that is itself due to misunderstanding. It is no coincidence that in the next footnote he refers to p. 28 of Roberts's book.

Now that we have seen that Gordis has not read Powis Smith's review, we can see why he makes some of the mistakes that he does. To anyone who does not know that it is a review, and that the title is a description of the contents of Kahle's Masoreten des Westens, the title sounds rather strange, but if it is changed to Studies in (sic) the Masoretes, it becomes quite a normal title of an article. The title suggests a long article, so Gordis has substituted 208 ff. for the page-reference instead of 208 f. The rest of the mistakes are merely due to careless copying.

Gordis does not seem to have read Aptowitzer's work either. In note 7 he refers to V. Aptowitzer, Das Schriftwort in der rabbinischen Literatur, Vienna 1906 (sic); reprint edition, New York (sic). It seems that he is not aware that Aptowitzer's work appeared as a series of articles, but thinks that it was a book, and is not aware that it appeared in sections between 1906 and 1915, but thinks that it appeared all at once in 1906. Gordis has copied the reference from Roberts, p. 27 note 5, who has exactly the same wrong information. The re-

ference to the reprint is quite inadequate and probably does not show that he has seen it.

Gordis's knowledge of the contents of Aptowitzer's work is equally faulty. This matter will be discussed below.

On p. XIII Gordis says: "It was the all-powerful influence of Maimonides in the twelfth century that succeeded in giving to the version of Ben Asher its authority as the official text of Rabbinic Judaism". Gordis is not speaking in his own name here, but is giving the view of other scholars. He does not, however, protest at this view, even though as a Rabbi he ought to be familiar enough with the history of the halachah to know that there has never been a formal declaration that any text was authoritative, or that Maimonides has never been "all-powerful" and was certainly not so in the twelfth century. At least he has toned down Roberts's language, and has not said that the ben Asher text "received official status by the decree of Maimonides" (see above). Gordis's note 10, against the last word of the sentence quoted above, says: "This is essentially the view of Kahle accepted by O. Eissfeldt, Einleitung in das AT, p. 306; see Roberts OTTV, p. 28". I have not had access to the German edition of Eissfeldt's book, but there is no reference in paragraphs 115 or 116 of the English translation to such an opinion of Kahle's. Once again, the source of the mistake seems to be Roberts; but the mistake is not due to Roberts, but to Gordis's superficial reading of pp. 28-29 of Roberts's work. Notice that Gordis does not give any direct reference to any of Kahle's works here.

Gordis's explanation (pp. XXI bottom-XXXII top) that the divergencies in quotations in Rabbinic texts are due to the use of popular manuscripts, because some scholars were unable to obtain accurate ones, has been refuted by Loewinger (prolegomenon to the re-issue of Aptowitzer's Schriftwort, pp. XXXIII - XXXIV). As Loewinger says (p. XXXIV), it is no less difficult to copy an inaccurate manuscript than an accurate one. Aside from this argument, if scholars did misquote verses, they would have been picked up on it at least occasionally by their colleagues, yet as Gordis himself says (p. XXXIV), there is no instance of this happening. (The disagreement between Rabbi and R. Haninah bar Hama over a reading in Ez 7:16 is probably

due to the use of slightly different official texts in different academies: see above pp. 25-26).

Gordis's explanation does not agree with what is known of the nature of these variants. If such readings are mistakes, why are they so frequently supported by the Targum? How is it that the derash sometimes depends on a variant reading? How is it that certain variants keep turning up in unrelated sources? How is it that some of these readings turn up much later in Biblical commentaries and grammars, the last place where we would look for popular readings? How is it that some of them are supported by numerous Hebrew Biblical manuscripts? How is it that there are variants reflected in Masoretic lists and treatises? Gordis does not seem to be aware of any of these phenomena, although examples of all of them can be found throughout Aptowitz's work.

It seems improbable that Tannaim or Amoraim would not have been skilled enough to copy a manuscript for their own use. (It used to be expected in Eastern Europe that each well-educated person would copy a Torah scroll once in his lifetime: presumably a Tanna or Amora would have been able to copy a manuscript fit for private study). If a Tanna or Amora did not have his own manuscript, he would probably have used one in the academy or the synagogue. The Yelammedenu or Tanhuma texts, which are abstracts of sermons preached in synagogues, contain numerous variant readings, at least to the Prophets. Presumably the preacher would have been able to consult the synagogue codexes of the Prophets before his sermon.

Gordis's singling out of "the scroll of R. Meir" (p. XXI bottom) as one of these manuscripts scholars "had to be content with" is untenable. Are we to suppose that R.

Me'ir, a professional scribe, was unable to get hold of a manuscript agreeing with the official text? Why was he not able to quote from the master manuscript from which he made copies? If the manuscript was not his, why did he not make a copy of it for his own use as a meritorious act? Gordis does not mention that לשם ר' מיר is the only manuscript referred to in any Tannaitic or Amoraic text as still existing at the time of the transmitter of the tradition and containing variant readings. For his reference to the reading of this

manuscript, Gordis gives Liebermann, Hellenism (Yewanut), chapter I. Liebermann (Yewanut, pp. 167-168) argues that the term ג'קד ג' ז' 1750 refers both to a particular manuscript owned by R. Me'ir and a class of manuscripts agreeing with his text and differing from the standard, and this is apparently the origin of Gordis's view. There are, however, serious objections to Liebermann's view, as we will see.

I do not quite follow Gordis's argument in the last paragraph of p. XXXII (beginning "In the Diaspora") and the first paragraph of p. XXXIII (ending with "a uniform, universally accepted text"). If he means the two paragraphs to be taken together, he seems to be saying that the divergencies in mediaeval Biblical manuscripts and Genizah Biblical manuscripts are due to the limited knowledge of Hebrew of Diaspora Jews. If he means the first paragraph on p. XXXIII to be taken on its own, he seems to be saying that because the Diaspora Jews were not aware of divergencies between their text and the official one, the divergencies in mediaeval Biblical manuscripts and Biblical manuscripts from the Genizah do not disprove the existence of an archetype. Either way the argument is precarious. Many of these are carefully prepared model codexes that are decidedly not the work of copyists with a limited knowledge of Hebrew. There is no reason why such manuscripts, or their ancestors, should not have been copied from the text officially in use in Israel itself.

Neither in part I nor Part IV of the prolegomenon does Gordis discuss the evidence of the post-LXX Versions. This is rather surprising. He was criticized by Pfeiffer (Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 79, note 7) for not considering the evidence of variant readings in the post-LXX Versions and quotations in Rabbinic texts against his theory that the text was absolutely fixed before the destruction of the Temple. He must be aware of Pfeiffer's criticism, since in note 9 he refers to p. 79 of Pfeiffer's work. Although he does not acknowledge Pfeiffer's criticisms directly, the refutation of the evidence of variant readings in Hebrew Biblical manuscripts and quotations in Rabbinic texts may be meant as an indirect answer to them. It would be expected that he would consider the evidence of the post-LXX Versions as well, but he ignores it. In fact, on p. XXXV he uses the argument, which is perfectly valid, that as neither Origen nor Jerome knew

of any redaction of the Hebrew text, it must have been well before their time, but ignoring the fact that the later Greek Versions, as found in the Hexapla, and Jerome's Vulgate, do not agree entirely with the received text. Gordis is well acquainted with the Versions, as can be seen from The Biblical Text in the Making, pp. 71-77, and in any case the references for divergent readings in the post-LXX Versions are given by Pfeiffer in the criticism just mentioned. Ignoring this evidence weakens Gordis's argument seriously.

On p. XXXIX Gordis glosses over the evidence of the Murabba'at texts. He refers to the "essentially Masoretic character of the Biblical texts in the Murabba'at caves" and observes quite correctly that the Masoretic Text must have been in use well before this time. He does not mention that the fact that the Murabba'at texts are only "substantially" in agreement with the received text seriously weakens the evidence for his view that the Masoretic Text was absolutely fixed before the destruction of the Temple.

- (g) Liebermann (Yewanut, pp. 167-168) regards the readings of the manuscript known as ר' של ר' ש' and the ר' ש' ר' י' א' as being typical of the manuscript that R. Me'ir copied for the common people. Loewinger (op. cit., pp. XXXIII-XXXIV) rightly points out that R. Me'ir would not have been willing to distribute such manuscripts, whether or not he used them for private study.

The most important part of Liebermann's evidence for supporting that the term ר' של ר' ש' refers to a class of manuscripts is a statement by R. Hiya in Yerushalmi Sukkah 3:12 (53d bottom) $\text{אם יתן לי אדם ספר תילים של ר' מאיר מוחק אני את כל הללויה שבו שלא נתכוון לקדשן}$ What is meant is that R. Me'ir wrote הללויה , as one word, and R. Hiya maintained that it should be הללו ייה , as two words. We have no reason to suppose, however, that the class of manuscripts referred to here should be identified with the particular manuscript known elsewhere as ר' של ר' ש' (see Loewinger, op. cit., p. XXXII for the complete list). In this passage of the Yerushalmi, it can be seen that scholars were divided over whether to write הללויה as one word or two, and that R. Me'ir's custom of not dividing the word was very widespread, and could even have been more usual than the custom of dividing it. R. Me'ir is followed in this matter by the eminently orthodox ben Naftali. Another part of Liebermann's evi-

dence is the agreement between ר'אב'ר'ל ש'ל ר'דו and ר'דו ר'אב'ר'ל , but the evidence for the agreement is not so strong as Liebermann thinks, being based on a corrupt and interpolated transmission of the readings of ר'דו ר'אב'ר'ל ; see Loewinger, *op.cit.*, part II, specially pp. XXV-XXI *top*. Loewinger (*op. cit.*, p. XXIV *bottom*) is probably correct in distinguishing between the manuscripts copied for distribution by R. Me'ir, as referred to in *Yerushalmi Sukkah*, and the particular manuscript that was his personal property referred to in the other passages.

Liebermann does not seem to know of Aptowitzer's work, but he does refer to paragraph 283 of the Yad Mal'achi and R. 'Aqiva Eger on *Shabbat* 55b. (Yewanut, p.169, *ncte* 50). Liebermann's explanation that the variant readings in quotation in Rabbinic texts are due to the use of variant readings for haggadic purposes is untenable. The examples given in the two references mentioned by him are misleading because some of them are fairly major variants affecting the meaning of the verse to some extent. [I did not have access to the Yad Mal'achi when writing this introduction, and make this statement from memory.] Liebermann does not realize that such variants are not typical, and that the overwhelming majority are trivial variants with no effect on the haggadic interpretation, and that even when the variant reading does affect the meaning of the verse the Tanna or Amora shows no sign of regarding it as anything but the standard reading. Systematically reading a few pages of Aptowitzer's work, or the apparatus of this thesis, and looking up the passages in a few cases of major variants, will show that this is so. Liebermann is wrong in saying that the variant readings are only found in haggadic passages. There are quite a few halachic arguments in Tannaitic and even Amoraic texts based on a reading differing from the received one. See, for example, Geiger, Hammiqra Wetargumaw, pp. 157 *bottom*-158 *top* on Ex 22:24 in *Bava Meši'a* 71a; pp. 162 *bottom*-163 *top* on Ex 23:13 in the *Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el*, *Kaspa* 20, p.332 of Horovitz and Rabin's edition, and *Sanhedrin* 63b; p.309 on Dt 24:17 in the *Sifre* and other texts; see above, note 23, on the reading ר'אב'ר'ל in Dt 17:3; see Sperber, A Historical Grammar of Biblical Hebrew, pp. 507-508 on Lv 4:25, 30, 34 in *Sanhedrin* 4a, and p.508 on Ex 13:16, Dt 6:8 and Dt 11:18 in *Sanhedrin* 4b. See also the explicit references to variant spellings in Ps 95:5 and 68:27 given by Sperber on p. 507.

34. Mevo Hammiqra, paragraph 793, p.879.
35. The Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of the O.T. Text, and specially pp. 180-182. In this article (p.182 top) he puts forward the application of this theory to orthodox Judaism with considerable reservation and in the last paragraph of the article he implies that from the time of R. 'Aqiva onwards the text was completely fixed. It seems that he has since modified his views. In a conversation in Canberra in January, 1971, he put forward the application of the theory to the variants in Tannaitic and Amoraic texts fairly definitely.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank Professor Rabin for his advice and encouragement.

36. Ginsburg, (Introduction, part II, chapter VIII) regards the sevirin as readings formerly found in manuscripts.
37. See above, p. 22 and note 10, and p.23 and note 12.
38. Or קרא רש. See Segal, Mevo Hammiqra, par 782, pp.861 bottom- 862 top. This is the ninth of R. 'Eli'ezer ben Yose Haggelili's thirty-three ways of interpreting the text (דבד). The text of R. 'Eli'ezer's baraita, with a gemara giving examples of each middah, can be found in chapters 1 and 2 of the Mishnat R. 'Eli'ezer, and in another form in the introduction to the Midrash Haggadol (see the Midrash Haggadol on Genesis, pp.22-39). The ninth middah is on pp.20-21 of the Mishnat R. 'Eli'ezer and p.28 of the Midrash Haggadol on Genesis. The editors of the texts give some more examples from Rashi and Qimhi in their notes.

That this middah is different in some way from the others can be seen from the warning attached to it: כאימתי הזכר נידון בזרן קצרה כשיצטרך לו הענין ודאי

This warning is not found against the other middot. Another peculiarity is the extreme rarity of its use. Segal regards the example as ancient readings formerly in the text. The matter needs further investigation.

39. Gordis (prolegomenon to The Biblical Text in the Making, part V; The Biblical Text in the Making, pp.46-48) dates the ktiv-gere readings to before the destruction of the Temple. Orlinsky, The Origin of the Kethib-Qere System (p.187), dates the reading to the period of establishing the pointing.

40. See below, pp.64-65.
41. See above, note 33.
42. The consonantal divergencies between the Westerners and Easterners, Surans and Easterners, Nehardeans and Easterners ben Asher and ben Naftali.
43. Proof of all these assertions is to be found in section 2 (a).
44. The Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of the O.T. Text, p.181 bottom.
45. See the colophon to the Aleppo Codex (quoted by Ben-Zvi on pp.13-14 of his article The Codex of Ben Asher), and see below, note 47. Compare Goshen-Gottstein's remarks on the halachic status of ben Asher's lay-out in par. 8 of The Authenticity of the Aleppo Codex.
46. See Goshen-Gottstein, The Rise of the Tiberian Bible Text, part IX, on the actual nature of Maimonides's pronouncement. [The Yad was not available to me: I rely on the quotation by Goshen-Gottstein in note 1 of his article. The Authenticity of the Aleppo Codex].
- On the acceptance of the ben Asher text before Maimonides, see Goshen-Gottstein, The Rise of the Tiberian Bible Text, par. 47. On the long persistence of reliance on ben Naftali as well, see his note 135.
47. Notice that Mosheh ben Asher, the father of Aharon ben Mosheh ben Asher, in his colophon to the Cairo codex of the Prophets (reproduced by Kahle as plate 17 in Der Hebraische Bibeltext seit Franz Delitzsch) claims the merit of his manuscript to be in its transmission of the pointing and cantillation marks.
 ... באמנות בטעמי שכל כפירוש דיבור בחיך סתוק
 (... בינופי מאטר , and does not
 mention the consonantal text.
48. Such readings would have had halachic validity at the time that the manuscripts were copied or the editions printed.
49. See Sperber, A Historical Grammar of Biblical Hebrew, pp.508-510
50. See Aptowitzer, Schriftwort, introduction pp.35-36 and his notes, specially note 7 p.35 and notes 1 and 2 p.36.

51. As the consonantal text of ben Asher has become the accepted text throughout the world, the text has become standardized by custom, if not by decree.

INTRODUCTION

Chapter Three

1. The distinction is not trivial. If the conditions that would indicate that a reading is scribal error are not present, it does not necessarily mean that it is genuine; and if the conditions that indicate that a reading is genuine are not present, it does not necessarily mean that it is a scribal error.
2. On the use of these symbols, see below, pp. 94-95.
3. See below, p. 94.
4. These are commented on in the apparatus with the words וְנִדְרָשׁ וְנִדְרָשׁ .
5. This applies to the omission or addition — particularly the latter — of waw at the beginning of a quotation. For example, the readings וְאֵלֶיךָ in Is 1:18 or וְאֵלֶיךָ in 33:15 could well be genuine even in the witnesses against which an obelus has been put.
6. See below, section 5 (d), pp. 95-98.
7. See below, section 4 (b) (i), pp. 83-85.
8. See below, section 4 (c), pp. 86-87.
9. See below, p. 82, note 4.
10. The various text-witnesses are discussed in his introduction to Bereshit Rabbah, section 10, pp. 104, bottom -138.
11. Some information on the reliability of the various text-witnesses is given by Margulies in the course of the classification on pp. XXXIV-XXXIX of his introduction, and again on pp. 6-7 of appendix 1, שְׂרִיזֵי וַיִּקְרָא רַבָּה.
12. See Margulies, appendix 1, p. 6, and note the following sentence:
אֲפֶשֶׁר רַק לְהִשְׁתּוֹמֵם עַד כַּמָּה הִרְשׁוּ לְעַצְמָם הַמַּעֲתִיקִים הַקְדֻמוֹנִים
לְשׁוֹת וּלְהַפְּוֹךְ בְּדַבְרֵי הַמִּדְרָשׁ, שֶׁעָשׂוּ בָהֶם כְּאִדָּם הַעוֹשֶׂה בַּתּוֹךְ
לְשׁוֹ. Margulies is speaking of the text of the midrash, but the copyists seem to have exercised the same freedom in correcting what they thought to be mistakes in quoting Biblical verses. Of course, some of the corrections could have been away from the received reading to a divergent reading, regarded by the copyist as correct.

13. The most probable examples are the readings לְיָמָיו in Is 3:11, מִן־הַלַּיְלָה in 8:18, מִן־שָׁמַיִם in 14:13, and $\text{וְיִרְאוּ אֶת־יְהוָה}$ in 35:4.

It should be remembered, however, that an apparently genuine reading may be attested in only one manuscript because that is the only one to quote the word, as in the case of the readings $\text{וְיִרְאוּ אֶת־יְהוָה}$ in Is 1:18, or מִן־הַשָּׁמַיִם in 1:20.

There does not seem to be much correlation between the value of the various manuscripts for transmitting the text of the midrash and their value for transmitting the text of the Biblical quotation. The quotations in manuscript 7, which Margulies uses as the basis for his edition, agree almost entirely with the MT, and the manuscript seems to give hardly any genuine variants: on the other hand, it has hardly any (or no) readings that could be called scribal errors. Manuscript 1, which is described by Margulies on p. XXXV of his introduction as מִן־הַלַּיְלָה , has several readings that appear to be genuine: notice, in particular, the reading מִן־שָׁמַיִם in Is 14:13, found only in this manuscript. Margulies considers the groups of Genizah fragments to be of particular importance, but none of them contained enough quotations from Is 1-35 to be evaluated.

14. See Mandelbaum's Hebrew Introduction to his edition (the whole introduction is relevant) for an estimate of the relative value of the text-witnesses in transmitting the text of the midrash. See also his English introduction, pp. x-xix, and specially pp. xvi-xvii. Mandelbaum (Hebrew introduction pp. 18-19) regards 1K as the most reliable manuscript for the transmission of the text of the midrash, but it does not seem to be any better than the rest in its transmission of the Biblical quotations. Notice the reading $\text{וְיִרְאוּ אֶת־יְהוָה}$ in Is 35:5, which is probably genuine, but compare its transmission of the text of Is 5:24.
15. Notice the large number of readings from this midrash marked in the apparatus to this thesis as probably or possibly due to scribal error.
16. Sometimes it is the Genizah fragments that disagree with the MT, sometimes the Midrash Haggadol.
17. According to Finkelstein (introduction to the first edition) the most reliable manuscript of this midrash is 7, the second 8. [Finkelstein's articles on the relationship

and relative value of the text-witnesses in the Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research, vols. III and V, to which he refers, but without mentioning the titles, were not available to me]. See also the third paragraph of his introduction to the second edition. It seems that the text of א, the Midrash Haggadol, has been re-worked.

There does not seem to be much correlation between the relative value of the various text-witnesses in transmitting the text of the midrash and in transmitting the text of the Biblical quotations. Notice, however, that א stands alone in giving a rather improbable reading in Is 2:7-8, that א stands alone in giving a reading that is probably genuine in Is 22:12, and that א stands alone in giving a reading that is probably genuine in Is 27:9 (in the last instance א was not available).

18. On this matter, see Melamed, introduction to the edition of the Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai, pp. 47 bottom-48; Rabinowitz, introduction to his edition of the Midrash Haggadol on Numbers, p.7 top.
19. See Is 6:7 and 26:19 in the apparatus for examples.
20. It must be remembered that for most parts of the Midrash Haggadol on Genesis and Exodus Margulies only used five manuscripts (sometimes six, sometimes four), so that a reading found in only one of the manuscripts used by him could still be genuine. The reading אהוה אלהים in Is 22:14, although certainly genuine, is only found in a single text-witnesses, א, in the Midrash Haggadol on Genesis, p. 715, and if this passage were considered on its own, the reading would probably be thought to be a scribal error.

Here are some examples of readings found in only one or two manuscripts of the Midrash Haggadol on Genesis, but confirmed by other sources:

- Is 4:4 אה אה, ms. א.
- Is 4:5 אה אה, mss. אה.
- Is 16:5 אה אה, ms. א.
- Is 33:6 אה אה, ms. א.

Notice that the omission of אה in Is 6:2 in Rabinowitz's edition of the Midrash Haggadol on Numbers, although apparently supported by all the manuscripts used by him, is not supported by any of Fisch's manuscripts; or again, the reading אה אה אה אה in Is 24:14, although found in only two

of Fisch's manuscripts, is found in all of Rabinowitz's.

21. See Melamed, introduction to th³ edition of the Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai, pp. 47 bottom-48 top.
22. These are in the majority.
23. See Prijs's introduction to his edition of chapter 26 of the Pesiqta Rabbati, pp. 11-19, and specially pp. 11-12; Zunz, Hadderashot beYishra'el, p. 119; Strack, Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash, p. 213. Aside from these references, the quality of the extant text can be seen by opening Ish Shalom's edition practically anywhere.
24. Schechter refers to the corruption of the text on the first page of his edition and continually throughout the notes. He gives a list of Biblical verses at the beginning of the Addenda (JQR vol. VIII p. 313) with the comment that they are "wrongly quoted" (the list is not complete, at least for Isaiah 1-35).
25. The first type is well known. For an example of the second, see Is 1:21 in the apparatus. Examples of the second type are always marked with a single asterisk: see below, section 5 (c), p. 96.
26. See the notes to the apparatus.
27. This is certainly so in some cases: see, for example, Is 2:22 or 5:19.
28. See Is 22:3.
29. For a discussion of the problems of technique in using the Versions, see Goshen-Gottstein, Theory and Practice of Textual Criticism. Although all the examples are taken from the LXX, the discussion can be applied to other Versions with modifications. See also Rabin, The Ancient Versions and the Indefinite Subject (the implications are wider than the title indicates); Orlinsky, The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament; Goshen-Gottstein, Biblical Philology and the Concordance; Goshen-Gottstein, The History of the Bible Text and Comparative Semitics.
30. The LXX is not a unity. This section deals only with the LXX of Isaiah, which presents unique problems. General works on

the LXX are not mentioned. On the use of the LXX of Isaiah for textual criticism, see Seeligmann, The Septuagint of Isaiah, chapter two, pp. 39-69; Ziegler, Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias, chapter I, pp. 1-31; Fischer, In welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaias den LXX vor?, introduction, pp. 1-17; Ottley, The Book of Isaiah, vol. II, notes.

31. An observation made by Seeligmann, op. cit., p. 58.
32. See Ziegler, Untersuchungen, chapters V, VI, and VIII; Seeligmann, The Septuagint of Isaiah, pp. 54, 56-58; Ziegler, introduction to his edition of the LXX of Isaiah (Septuaginta vol. XIV), pp. 95-99. Explanations of the deviation of the LXX from the MT in individual cases can be found in Ottley, The Book of Isaiah (in the notes); Ziegler's Untersuchungen; Seeligmann's book just mentioned; Geiger, Prijs, Judische Tradition in der Septuaginta.
33. Omissions and contractions: Ziegler, Untersuchungen, chapter III; additions: op cit., chapter IV; glosses: op cit., chapter IV, V, and VIII; and Seeligmann, op. cit., pp. 56-58; changes of inflexional morphemes: Seeligmann, op. cit., p.56; substitutions (mostly due to translation of several Hebrew words by the same Greek word): Ziegler, Isaias (Septuaginta vol. XIV), introduction, pp. 13-21; word-groups syntactially re-analysed: Ziegler, Untersuchungen, chapters V and VII and Seeligmann, op. cit., pp. 56-58; words read in a way disagreeing with the Masoretic tradition: Ziegler, chapter V, and Seeligmann, op. cit., p.57.
34. See note 32. It may be added that the best way to get the feel of the translator's working method is to read through a few long sections of text with the MT open for comparison. Reference to the Targum and the midrash and Talmud (the Yalqut Mechiri and Yalqut Shim'oni on Isaiah are adequate for this purpose), although it will not usually show any tradition certainly held in common by these sources and the LXX, will often serve to bring out the obscurities or exegetical and theological difficulties faced by the translator. Jerome's commentary is often very illuminating, as are the later Greek Versions and Rashi.
35. On the tendency to build up a translation on a few words theologically or otherwise important, see Seeligmann, op. cit., pp. 56-58; Ziegler, Untersuchungen, chapter V.

36. It seems that when the translator understood the Hebrew, there were no theological or exegetical difficulties in the literal meaning of the text, he was not reminded of a scribal passage somewhere else in the Bible, and was not brought up against a concept that was psychologically salient for him (see Seeligmann, pp. 81-90; 105-108), he translated the text accurately, though not necessarily word by word; in fact, in such cases he is as literal as Symmachus. See, for instance, the translation of chapter I, which is an attempt to translate the Hebrew exactly. Notice that even verse 14, although toned down, נָסַח being translated as plesmonen, and $\text{אָמַרְתָּ אֵלֶיךָ וְלֹא אָמַרְתָּ אֵלֶיךָ וְלֹא אָמַרְתָּ אֵלֶיךָ}$ as ouketi aneso tas hamartias hymon, is by no means distorted or made vague, and even in this case it is highly probable that the translator was merely giving what he thought to be the literal meaning of the verse, according to an exegetical tradition. Contrast the Targum. In verse 22, the translation of $\text{וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁכַּח הַיַּיִן מֵעֵינַי וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁכַּח הַיַּיִן מֵעֵינַי}$ as hoi kapeloi sou misgousi ton oinon hydati is probably meant to be literal but explanatory.
37. See Ziegler's introduction to his edition of Isaiah, pp. 36-73, (and the corresponding sections in the other volumes); Soisson-Soininen, Der Charakter der Asterisierten Zusätze in der Septuaginta, and specially his conclusions, pp. 193-197; Johnson, Die Hexaplarische Rezension des 1. Samuelbuches der Septuaginta, pp. 7-15, 123, 142-146; Jellicoe, The Septuagint and Modern Study, pp. 111-113, 134-146; Field, introduction pp. lxx-lxxxiii; Seeligmann, op. cit., pp. 13-16.
38. Ziegler, introduction to his edition of Isaiah, pp. 73-92 (and the corresponding sections in the other volumes); Moore, The Antiochian Recension of the Septuagint; Metzger, The Lucianic Recension of the Greek Bible; Jellicoe, op. cit., pp. 157-171; Seeligmann, op. cit., pp. 16-22; Field, introduction pp. lxxxix-xcii.
39. This can be seen from the frequent disagreement between the sub-groups O, oI, and oII, or the cases where only a part of one sub-group has the reading. Ziegler, in his comments on each of the sub-groups in turn (op. cit., pp. 36-53) discusses the extent to which each one transmits Origen's text. For example of disagreement, see Is 1:7 (om laon Syh); 21:11 end; 34:7 end; 34:12 (+kalesousin V). Cp. Seeligmann (op. cit., p. 13): "... hardly any of the codices remained free from Hexaplaric elements, while, on the other hand, none of them contained the integral text of Origen's Hexapla..."

40. The purpose of Origen's revision was to bring the Greek in line with the Hebrew.
41. In such cases Ziegler marks the reading with an arrow pointing down to the Hexapla-apparatus.
42. Readings taken from Aquila are the easiest to identify because of his rigid translation of a given Hebrew word by a given Greek one, and the extremely literal, word for word, method of translating. Symmachus's translation has a distinctive style, and can be recognised if the addition is long enough. Usually the alteration is slight or the addition is short, and then the source of the reading is often doubtful. It seems, however, that Origen's revision was mostly done according to Theodotion, with Aquila being used for individual words, and Symmachus hardly used at all: see Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 123 and p. 145, and Soisalon-Soininen, *op. cit.*, pp.193-194.
43. See Ziegler, *op. cit.*, pp. 83-90.

The current estimate of the nature of the Lucianic recension has lately been put seriously in doubt by Howard in his article Lucianic Readings in a Greek Twelve Prophets Scroll from the Judaen Desert. Although the article is only concerned with the Minor Prophets, the conclusions may well apply to other books. See in particular his remarks on pp. 58-59: "The Lucianic recension represents a drifting away from MT possibly in favour of another textual tradition, or possibly through accidental scribal errors, or more than likely both, and the readings of Lucian which agree with R are simply remnants of the R-type text left intact". Even if Howard is correct, it will be seen that though the current theory of the origin of the recension will need revising, it will not have to be discarded. That there has been some correction according to the later Greek Versions, whether by way of Origen's recension or directly, can be seen from the numerous cases where the Lucianic text has an addition agreeing with the MT but in the wrong place (Ziegler, *op. cit.*, p.86 top) or where there is a double reading, once according to the original reading of the LXX and once agreeing with one of the late Greek Versions (Ziegler, same page). There is no doubt that the Lucianic recension has numerous readings due to inner-Greek stylistic improvement. Ziegler (*op. cit.*, p.85) says: "Manche dieser Zusätze sind von Lukian aus grammatisch-stilistischen Gründen geändert"; (p.86): "Doch war nicht so sehr M [=MT] massgebend als vielmehr das griechische

Sprachgefühl des Rezensenten"; (p.87) "Die Lukian - Hss. haben eine menge von Änderungen, die meistens rein grammatisch - stilistischen Natur sind und nicht durch M bedingt sind"; see also p.89. Howard's theory that the Lucianic recension is a drifting away from R (The Kaige Recension, probably Theodotion) will explain these phenomena quite well. Cp. Barthélemy's comments (Les Devanciers d'Aquila, p. 127): "C'est essentiellement la Septante ancienne, plus ou moins abâtardie et corrompue. Seulement en certains livres cette forme de la Septante a subi une recension systematique mais éclectique à partir de Symmaque, et parfois d'Aquila et de Théodotion. Jamais, à ma connaissance, il ne s'agit d'une recension de première main faite directement sur l'hébreu". This statement can be reconciled with Howard's theory by substituting "R" for "la Septante ancienne".

Whatever the origin of the Lucianic recension, in its present form it is a mass of material from diverse sources lumped together. Seeligman says (p.21): "Moreover, the occurrence of conflicting corrections is not limited to different places; it may also be observed in the Lucianic version of one and the same passage. To ascribe such places to a single revisor would be to assume a lack of the critical faculty to a degree which, at any rate to the present writer, is hardly imaginable". Cp. Rahlfs's (Lukian's Rezension der Königsbücher, p.293): "Auch aus dem Gesamtcharakter L's lässt sich kein Kriterium gewinnen. Denn der Hauptcharakterzug dieser Rezension ist das Fehlen eines klaren Prinzips".

44. For examples, see Ziegler, op. cit., pp. 87-88.
45. Mostly Symmachus. See the quotation of Barthélemy in note 43; Ziegler, introduction to his edition of the Minor Prophets (Septuaginta vol. XIII), p. 84 and Ezekiel (Septuaginta vol. XVI:1) p. 52.
46. See Ziegler, Isaias (Septuaginta vol. XIV), pp. 92-95.
47. A mixed manuscript is one that has been influenced by the recensions, but inconsistently. See Ziegler, op. cit., in the separate leaflet "Erklärung der Zeichen und Abkürzungen", second page, under "codices mixti". S (the Codex Sinaiticus) tends to stand alone: Ziegler, op. cit., introduction, pp.32-33. See also Ziegler's comments on the Coptic Version, pp.33-34.

48. On original readings preserved in only a single text-witness or very few text-witnesses see Seeligmann, op. cit., pp. 9-11.
49. On Origen's insertion of a translation of the article when the original LXX omits it, see Soisalon-Soincinen, pp.94-95, and notice his comment "... der asterisierte Zusatz des Artikels nur sehr sporadisch vorkommt, die von Origenes gebrauchte Vorlage hat nur selten Veranlassung dazu gegeben".
- Of course, the article is used continually in all forms of the LXX of Isaiah, but only in conformity with Greek usage, not as a translation of the Hebrew article.
50. On Aquila's translation-technique, see Reider, Prolegomena, chapter I; Barthélemy, Les Devanciers d'Aquila, pp.15-18, 81-88; Rahlfs, Septuaginta, introduction, section 4; Field, introduction, pp. xxi-xxiv.
51. Field, pp. xxx- xxxi.
52. On Theodotion, see Barthélemy, Les Devanciers d'Aquila (the whole book is concerned with Theodotion directly or indirectly). Translation-technique is dealt with in part I, chapters II and III, and part II, chapter I, pp. 91-109. See also Field, pp. xxix - xlii.
53. On ho Hebraios, see Field, introduction, pp. lxxv-lxxvii; and on ho syros, see pp. lxxvii-lxxxii.
54. Important notes on the transmission of the readings of these Versions are given by Ziegler in his Textkritische Notizen.
55. See, for example, Ziegler's Hexapla-apparatus for the readings of Aquila and Symmachus in Is 7:13; and see his remarks in the introduction, p.113.
56. See, for example, Ziegler's Hexapla - apparatus to Is 7:13 or 14:10; and see his remarks in the introduction, p.113.
57. Ziegler, introduction to his edition of Isaiah, pp. 114 bottom-115 top.
58. For a survey of the textual tradition of the Peshitta of Isaiah, see Diettrich's introduction to his Apparatus criticus, and Goshen-Gottstein's Prolegomena to a Critical Edition of the Peshitta, pp.11-12, and 39-42. In addition, Goshen-

Gottstein's survey of the amount of variation within the Peshitta as a whole (pp. 8-39) is useful for orientation.

59. The Peshitta tends to add waw.
60. Goshen-Gottstein, Text and Language, introduction, p. XII.
61. Diettrich, op. cit., pp. XIII-XIV.
62. See Stenning, The Targum of Isaiah, introduction, pp. xii-xiv.
63. Examples: Is 1:18 וּמְדַבְּרֵי אֵל ; 5:23 פְּדִי ; 8:7
 '117 ; 30:18]כָּל ; 33:6 אִלְמִי (see the apparatus,
and notes to the apparatus).
64. On Jerome's method of translating, see Kedar-Kopfstein, The Vulgate as a Translation, specially chapter II, pp. 55-74, and chapter V, pp. 274-285.
65. See the quotations of Jerome's own words by Kedar-Kopfstein, pp.55-56, but see also Kedar-Kopfstein's warning on p. 56 against relying too much on Jerome's statements of his principles.
66. Kedar-Kopfstein, op. cit., p.284, classifies the translation of the Psalms and Latter Prophets as rigid and imitative.
67. Kedar-Kopfstein, op. cit., pp. 277-278.
68. Kedar-Kopfstein, op. cit., pp.259-270.
69. Biblia Sacra, Württembergische Bibelenstalt, Stuttgart. See the bibliography for the details.
70. On the meaning of the terms "primary witness" and "secondary witness", see the preface to the Stuttgart edition, p.XXIII.
71. Op. cit., p. XXIII. This is not stated in so many words, but seems to be implied.
72. Biblia Sacra Vulgatae Editionis, Sixti Quinti iussu recognita, Rome, 1592, 1593, 1598.

The inclusion of a full collation of this edition is rather strange, as the editors themselves admit that "as a text,

it left much to be desired" - (preface, p.XX). Its readings could have been omitted with no loss at all, and the energy spent on collating the text of the translation in Jerome's commentary.

73. Compare Roberts's observation (The Old Testament Text and Versions, p. 262) that the text reconstructed on the basis of manuscripts by the Benedictine monks (i.e. Biblia Sacra iuxta Latinam Vulgatam Versionem; see his bibliography, p.311) tends to agree with the MT much more than does the text of the earlier, uncritical editions.
74. Divergent Hebrew Readings in Jerome's Isaiah, pp. 207-210.
75. In the notes to the apparatus I refer to the two commentaries as comm., and comm.₂.
76. Ideas related to those in this section are expressed by Goshen-Gottstein in The History of the Bible Text and Comparative Semitics.
77. See Seeligmann, The Septuagint Version of Isaiah, chapter three.
78. See Jellicoe, The Septuagint and Modern Study, p. 94 bottom-97 top.
79. See Les Devanciers d'Aquila, part I, chapter II.
80. See Silverstone, Aquila and Onkelos, p.23, and compare pp.28-29; or see Yerushalmi Megillah 71c top and Yerushalmi Qiddushin 59a top.
81. See above, p. 57 and note 42.
82. See above, p.58 and note 45.
83. Burkitt, quoted by Kahle, The Cairo Geniza, pp.269 bottom-270 top.
84. Op. cit., pp.270-272. Notice that on p.272, lines 12 and 21, "A.D" should be read for "B.C.": see Jellicoe, The Septuagint and Modern Study, p. 247, note. 4.
85. Of the majority group, the group that included the Tanna'im.
86. Kedar-Kopfstein, The Vulgate as a Translation, p.55.

87. *Op. cit.*, p.50 bottom.
88. Kedar-Kopfstein, Divergent Hebrew Readings in Jerome's Isaiah, section III.
89. As collated by Kennicott, de Rossi, and Ginsburg.
90. Die Jesaiah-Rolle und das Problem der Hebraischen Bibelhandschriften; see also the introduction to Text and Language, pp. X bottom-XI top; Biblical Philology and the Concordance; the introduction The Book of Isaiah, Sample Edition [see bibliography under Hebrew University Bible Project, referred to from now on as the Sample Edition] paragraphs 16-18 and 81.
91. Die Jesaiah - Rolle, p. 434; Text and Language, introduction, p. XI top; to the Sample Edition, paragraph 81.
92. See Die Jesaiah-Rolle, pp.429-433.
93. See above, section 2 (a) (v-vi), pp.28-29.
94. See p. 28.
95. Even including Biblical commentaries.
96. See above, section 2 (a).
97. See note 94.
98. The triviality of most variants within the Masoretic recension, see chapter 2 of this introduction, passim. See p.30, and the examples in notes 10, 12, and 25 to chapter 2.
99. Introduction to the Sample Edition, paragraph 17.
100. Except, of course, perfect correction.
101. Genuine variants, in this case, are the remnants of alternative readings within the Masoretic recension, as opposed to scribal errors. I do not deny that many of the readings found in only one or two of these manuscripts may be scribal errors.
102. The significance of the term "very large number" and the precision that can be given to it are explained on the next page.
103. There are numerous instances of the agreement of three, and even of all four.

104. Compare the Biblia Hebraica and the British and Foreign Bible Society edition, and see Ginsburg's apparatus.
105. This does not necessarily mean that it is a genuine variant in the Yerushalmi or the Midrash Haggadol (see the apparatus).
106. See below, p. 80.
107. The text of these three manuscripts throughout Isaiah would be worth studying.
108. Relatively free of readings that could be called scribal errors.
109. Relatively free of readings that could be called misprints.
110. Depending on whether we count Kern. 115 and 570.
111. Die Jesaiah-Rolle, p. 432, note 6.
112. Not most, as he says.
113. Goshen-Gottstein is quite correct in insisting on this point.
114. See above, section 2 (b).
115. See note 104 on Is 33:1 and 3:23.

INTRODUCTION

Chapter Four

1. This chapter is intended as a convenient survey and classification of the texts used. It has been kept as brief as possible, and there is no attempt to give an introduction to the Talmud and midrash. More information on the individual texts can be found in Zunz and Albeck, Hadderashot beYisra'el, and the introductions to the editions.
2. Albeck argues that the Tosefta was compiled at the end of the Amoraic period. See his סתקרים ובריי'תא ותוספתא, p.137. He also argues that the Amoraim did not know the Tannaitic midrashim as we have them, although he does not give a date for their compilation. See note 2 on p. 64 of his introduction to Bereshit Rabbah. He does not dispute that the contents are almost completely Tannaitic.

The origins of the Mechiltas have been put in doubt by Wacholder in his article The Date of the Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael
3. See Schechter's introduction, chapters 3, 4, and 5, and specially the end of p. XXVI.
4. See Wacholder, op. cit., p. 119, and the references there.
5. See the beginning of the appropriate chapter of Epstein's מנוא למזרשי הלכה in each case.
6. Bereshit Rabbah, introduction, p. 96. He does not give any evidence for this date.
7. Op. cit., p. 71 top, and p. 96.
8. Midrash Wayyiqra Rabbah, pp. 30 bottom-32 (and specially p.32) and p. 42.
9. Hadderashot beYisra'el p.107 top; Midrash Wayyiqra Rabbah, p. 42.
10. Op. cit., p. 107; Midrash Wayyiqra Rabbah, pp.36-39.
11. Hadderashot beYisra'el, pp. 76 bottom-87. The dates are on pp.77 bottom-78 top; p.79; p.80; p.86.
12. 'Echah Rabbah, introduction, chapter 5, paragraphs 6, 7, 8, and chapter 7, paragraph 2.
13. See Strack, Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash, p.211.

14. Wayyiqra Rabbah, introduction, pp. XII-XXII top, and pp. XXXI bottom-XXXIII. Margulies's arguments must be read in full to be appreciated.
15. Page XVII
16. The last suggestion is at the bottom of p. XIII.
17. On the place, see pp. XXVII-XXXI.
18. Wacholder, in note 59 to his prolegomenon to the re-issue of vol. I of Mann's book The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue rejects Margulies's suggestion that Wayyiqra Rabbah and the Pesiqta deRav Kahana were edited by the same person, but otherwise seems to accept his conclusions.
19. Note, however, that Yerushalmi Neziqin is from the school of Caesarea. See Liebermann, Sifre Zuta, p.125.
20. See below, p.116.
21. The Biblical quotations in this seem to have been normalized, with very few exceptions.
22. See Is 3:10.
23. As it happens, none of the variants to Is 1-35 in these last two occur in passages certainly taken from the Bavli.
24. All of this information is taken from Albeck, Hadderashot beYisra'el, pp. 114-116.
25. See below, p. 113.
26. The only way of telling these is by the internal evidence of style and terminology in each case. On the differences in terminology between Amoraic and Tanhuma texts, see p.XV of Margulies's introduction to his edition of Wayyiqra Rabbah.
27. These readings are in square brackets in the index of texts.
28. The only reading in the apparatus taken from a Tanhuma passage in the Pirqe deRabbi 'Eli'ezer is the reading וְתוֹנֵה וְזָרַח in Is 11:2

29. Only one passage is relevant for the present purpose: see the apparatus on the reading נִלְו in Is 24:11.
30. Albeck, Hadderashot beYisra'el, p. 140.
31. See on Is 11:2
32. Albeck, op. cit., p. 57.
33. See Albeck's introduction to his edition of Midrash Bereshit Rabbati, sections 2 and 3.
34. On the style, see Katz's introduction, pp. 18 bottom-19.

A P P A R A T U S

Symbols and Abbreviations Used in the Apparatus

(a) Numbers Assigned to Texts

- .1 ספרא
א. מה' וויס
פ. כ"י וואטיקן 66 מה' פינקלשטיין
ש. מובאות בילקוט שמעוני
- .2א. ספרי במדבר
- .2ב. ספרי דברים
- .3 מכילתא דרבי ישמעאל
א. מה' איש שלום
ב. מה' האראוויטן ורביין
ג. מה' לויטערבאך
- .4 מכילתא דרבי שמעון בן יוחאי
- .5 משנה
- .6 מרש תנחומא מה' באבער
- .7 מרש בראשית רבה
ז. כ"י וואטיקן 60
- .8 מרש איכה רבה
- .9 מרש ויקרא רבה
- .10 פסיקתא דרב כהנא
- .11 מרש תנחומא הנרפס
- .12 מרש תהלים
א. מה' באבער
ב. הנרפס
- .13 מרש דברים רבה
א. מה' שנרפס הפעם הראשונה במה' ליברמן
ב. מה' שנרפס מכבר
- .14 מרש הגדול על שמות
- .15 פרקי רבי אליעזר
- .16 סדר אליהו
א. רבה
ב. זוטא
- .17 ילקוט מכירי על ישעיה
א. הכותרות
ב. המובאות מתלמוד ומרש

18. מרש אגרה על חמשה חומשי תורה
19. מרש הגרול על במדבר
א. מה' פיש
ב. מה' רבינובי
20. עין יעקב
21. אגרת שיר השירים
22. מרש איכה זוטא
- 22ב. מרש איכה זוטא נוסח שני
- 122ג. ילקוט שמעוני על איכה מה' באבער
23. אגרת בראשית
א. נוסח רפוס ראשון
ב. נוסח הכ"י
24. מרש רבי רוד הנגיד
25. תלמוד ירושלמי
תוספתא
27. המאמרים במרש תנאים על רברים שלא נבעו מהספרי
28. מרש שמואל
29. מרש משלי
30. ילקוט מכירי על משלי
31. מרש לקח טוב על בראשית ושמות
32. מרש שכל טוב
33. הגרות התלמוד
34. אבות ררבי נתן
א. נוסח ראשון
ב. נוסח שני
35. פסיקתא רבתי
א. ילמרנד
ב. פסיקתא ררב כהנא
ג. מרש עשרת הרברות
ד. תנחומא
ה. מסופק
ו. הוספה
36. מרש הגרול על בראשית
37. מרש בראשית רבתי
38. אוצר מרשים

39. ילקוט מכירי על תרי עשר
 40. תלמוד בבלי על פי דקרוקי סופרים
 41. גנזי שעכטער
 42. סדר עולם רבה
 א. מה' ראטנער
 ב. מה' וויינשטאק
 43. מרש פנים אחרים על אסתר
 44. אגרת אסתר
 45. ילקוט מכירי על תהלים
 46. מרש לקח טוב על קהלת
 47. מרש לקח טוב על איכה
 48. פסיקתא חרתא
 49. ילקוט שמעוני על ישעיה
 50. בית המרש
 51. קטעי הגניזה הרצאת מאן
 52. מרש חרש על התורה
 53. מרש לקח טוב על אסתר
 54. מרש הגרול על ויקרא
 55. מרש השכם
 56. נוסח חרש של מרש תהלים
 57. מרש אבא גוריון

(b) Abbreviations

איכה רבה	איכ"ר
אסתר רבה	אס"ר
בבא בתרא	ב"ב
במרב רבה	במ"ר
בבא קמא	ב"ק
בראשית רבה	בר"ר

דברים רבה	ד"ר
הגרות התלמוד	הה"ת
ויקרא רבה	ויק"ר
ילקוט מכירי	י"מ
ירושלמי	יר'
ילקוט שמעוני	יש"ש
כתב יד	כ"י
מרש	מר'
מרש משלי	מר"מ
מכילתא דרבי ישמעאל	מרר"י
מכילתא דרבי שמעון בן יוחאי	מרשב"י
מהרורה; מהרורת	מה'
מרש לקח טוב	מל"ט
מרש שכל טוב	מס"ט
משנת רבי אליעזר	מר"א
מרש תהלים	מ"ת
סדר אליהו	ס"א
סנהדרין	סנה'
על ידי	ע"י
על פי	ע"פ
ע"י שם	ע"ש
פרקי דרבי אליעזר	פרר"א
פסיקתא רב כהנא	פרר"כ
פסיקתא רבתי	פ"ר
קהלת רבה	קה"ר
רות רבה	רו"ר
שיר השירים רבה	שהש"ר
שמות רבה	ש"ר
תנחומא	תנ'

Editorial Signs

- < > Enclose editorial comments
- () Enclose variants within the Biblical quotation
- [] Enclose variants within material already enclosed in round brackets
- [6] Buber prints the text of one of his manuscripts other than no.1, but does not specify which one
- [7] The passage in which this reading occurs has probably entered Bereshit Rabbah from a Tanhuma text
- ÷ Marks the omission of a word at the beginning or end of a quotation, the omission or addition of waw at the beginning of a quotation, or a reading probably or possibly induced by the context
- Marks conscious re-wording of the text
- Mark a reading apparently assumed in the derash
- Mark what seems to be a derash not assuming the variant reading, but developed from a derash that did assume it
- :: Indicates that the sources are not related
- = Indicate that the sources are related
- ⋮ Indicates that the sources might be related
- כגדכ [כדמכ] Approximately the same wording
ח [גכ] The word or phrase is missing

6 | + אז ח' 10 א₁ (105) :: 50 תנחומא [= 7] | <ט"ס> ותרון לשרון
אלא 10 א (218) ||

8 | x והיה שם מסלול וררך הקרש (הקורש ד) יקרא לה 14 דה (313) |
x ... ולא יעבור בו טמא 18 [::] ||

1 | x ופרויי ה' ישובר וגו' זבאכ | x ופרויי ה' ישובון (ופרויי

ה' ישובון ח' 35 דף קסד) ובאר לצירון (צירון 10 נספח ו פ)

ברנה (ברינה וגו' 35 דף קלב; ברנה [ברינה 35 מה' פריס;

<ט"ס> + וגו' 35 דף קסד] שמחת [ושמחת 38] עולם על [ט"ס

על ח' 10 נספח ו פ] ראשם [+ ... על ראשם 38] 10 נספח ו פ,

35 דף קסד; 35 מה' פריס, 38, 43 צד פב) 10 נספח ו פ

>מתיבת ובאר עד סוף הפסוק מובא רק בכ"י זה < = 35 (164) [::] ::

35 (132) ומה' פריס צד זה :: 38 סדר ארקין <מוגה ע"פ המקור

בכה' הורוויץ > :: 43 (81) :: 43 (82) ||

הראשונה הוא כלפנינו $\frac{1}{2}$ 35 שם <math>< \text{כן הוא הפעם הראשונה, והפעם}</math>
 השנית הוא כלפנינו $:: 31$ חגיגה (6:1) = 48 \div 50 מדרש
 תדשא ||

12 | x חורי הארץ חוריה ואין שם מלוכה יקראו 46 ||
 15 | נקבצו חיות 14ק (127) ||
 16 | ראשה 14לס שם | כי פי ה' הוא צוה 14ס שם | כי פי ה' צוה
 14 | <math>< \text{והווגה} > \text{שם} | \text{קבצם} 14\text{לסק} < \text{כל כ"י מלבד ד} > \text{שם} ||</math>

פרק לה

2 | <math>< \text{ט"ס?} > \text{פרות תפרח} 39 \text{ במ"ר} ||</math>
 3 | וברכים כורעות 9פ <math>< \text{אכל בדרש נאמר: "ברכים שכשילתן אותן}</math>
 במעשיכם הרעים", וכדמ"ל בשאר הכ"י > ||
 4 | הלב 9כ שם | ואל תיראו 9ופ שם | הנה אליהיכם בחזק יבא 9א
 שם | גמל <math>< \text{גמל?} > 9ו \text{ שם} | + \text{יורשיעכם} 9ט \text{ שם} ||</math>
 5 | + אז ח' 7כ | + אזוני 10ק (105) [::] | <math>< \text{ט"ס} > \text{אז תפקחנה}</math>
 עיני עורים ... אז <math>< \text{תחת ואזוני חרשים} > \text{תפתחנה} 10\text{א} (105) |</math>
 x אז תפקחנה עיני עורים ... ואזוני חרשים תפקחנה 10כ (105)
 = 10כא₁ (218) <math>< \text{עיין במבוא צד} \text{ על גרסת כ"י כ בצד קה} > |</math>
 x אז תפקחנה עיני עורים ... ואזוני חרשים תשמענה 10א₁ (105)
 <math>< \text{עיין במבוא שם} > \text{המאמר נמצא בכ"י אא} 1\text{כק} \text{ בצד קה ובכ"י}</math>
 אא₁ צא₂ כ בצד ריה <math>< ||</math>

<צ"ל רומים> 11 ע"פ יפ"ת ע"פ עץ יוסף וכן בי"ש ח"א רמז קפב; ע"ז [עוברי ע"ז בעץ יוסף; עוברי אליל ע"פ איש שלום בפס"ר] 11 במהדורות המסורסות מתמת צנזורת הנוצרים) עמם 6 בא >התיכות ויררו רומיים עמם לא נדפסו בפנים הספר אבל טובאות הן לנכון בהערות באבער מספר נח שם כאילו הן נמצאות בפנים ולא תובן ההערות מבלעדיהן, ויתכן כי השמיטון המדפיסים מיראת השונאים והשאירון בהערה כי הנבון יבין, או אולי הצנזור מחקן ולא שם דעתו על ההערה > = 11 = י"ש ח"א רמז קפב = 49 = 39 (יואל) ילמדנו = 10א₁ כק שם >המאמר נמצא רק בכ"י א₁א₂ כק > | א ויררו > וכן הוא בפדר"כ כ"י א₂; עיין לעיל > ראימות <ט"ס> * רומיים עמם [10 =] | >נדרש רומיים < 14 (162) = 32 שם >מלת רומיים לא נזכרה במס"ס אבל נראה כי כן הכוונה > ||

9 | והפכו 10 כ שם | והפכתי ללפאג [::] | א ונהפכו נחליה לזפת ועפרה לגפרית והיתה ארץ בוער >אמר מנדלבוים כי הניח המעתיק ריוח פנוי אחרי מלת ארץ כדי תיבה אחת < 10ק שם ||

10 | רירם 50 תנחומא ||

11 | * * וערב, וערוב 6 שם = 11 שם = י"ש ח"א רמז קפב = 39 (זכריה) = 49 שם = 39 (יואל) שם = 10 שם = 14 שם = 35 שם |

+ נטה 9א :: 31 (51:2) תנחומא [6 =] | עליר 9ל שם :: $\frac{1}{2}$

10א₁ שם >כן הוא הפעם הראשונה, והפעם השנית הוא כלפנינו < $\frac{1}{2}$ 10 במה' באבער המיוסדת על כ"י כ >כן הוא הפעם השנית, והפעם

6 | חרב ה' 52 (2:116) | (+) וטבח גרול בארץ ארום ל 7 צד תשכא,
 10אא₁ק צד קח, 35 דף עט, 6, 35 דף סה, 7⁰ל¹, צד תתקצט)
 ... * טבח (וטבח 35 דף עט, 7 פאכ צד תתקצט) גרול בארץ ארום
 (בארום 6) < ** וטבח; עיין בהערות שהעאדאר בב"ר צד תשכא >
 7ל⁰ < עיין בהערות שהעאדאר על גרסת ו⁰ > (721) = 10אא₁ק
 (108) = 35ב(79) $\frac{6}{7}$ חקת < המאמר נמצא רק בכ"י ו > = 10אא₂ק
 (75) = 35א(65) $\frac{7}{8}$ זפואכתי¹ (999) < פירוש ונקוד אלה
 נראים מוזרכים בב"ר צד תשכא פדר"כ צד קח ופס"ר דף עט ע"י
 הקשר העניין ועל זה עמד שהעאדאר בהערותיו בב"ר שם אך בשאר
 הנוסחאות אין צורך לשיטה אע"פ שיש לה שיכות מה אל ענין
 הדרש וכן לדעת שהעאדאר נכפלה השיטה בב"ר צד תתקצט ממה שבצד
 תשכא ולכן יש לשער כי הורכבה בנוסחאות האחרות ע"י המגיהים <
 ** וטבח 31 = 36 (464) [= 7 צד תשכא] | בארום 18 > וכן
 בתנחומא; עיין לעיל < [= 7 צד תשכא] ||
 7 | א והוררתי ראמים לטבח וגר' 32 | וירד 10א₂ [= 32] | [את"א]
 רומיים 10א₂ שם | א ויררו ראמים (ויררו ראמים ח' 10כ) עמם
 (+) וגר' 6; + ופרים וכו' ... 10א₁; + ופרה עם עתורים ...
 10ק; + ... 10כ) * ויררו רומיים (רומים 11 במהדורות
 הראשונות ע"פ באבער בתנחומא שם > וכן הוא נדפס בפדר"כ מה'
 באבער ע"פ כ"י כ אבל השלים באבער מה שחסר בכ"י זה מסברה
 כשתיקה, כי המלים ויררו ראמים שהדפיסין באבער בפנים הספר
 חסרות בכ"י, ולכן אין לסמוך על גרסת מה' באבער כאן; רמ"ם

16 | + והוא 7 לפכ (481) :: 33 ב"ב (90) :: (125) 35 | [9 =] +
הוא ח' 9 כ שם | <ט"ס> מרומם 35 (125) | מצורת 6 שם ::
7 דא² ת (481) :: 14 ב"ב דף י (645) = 33 ב"ב (90) :: 35
(125) | מצורת 7 י (ישעיה) (481) = 36 ב"ר שם ||

17 | עיניו 9 כ שם ||

18 | + ולבך 31 ||

20 | מועד 3 ככ (שירתא ג) | עיניך תחזינה 3 ככ (שירתא ט) <מלים
אלה טובאות רק בכ"י כ בפרק ט ובדפוסים בפרק ג > [= פרק ג] |
כננה (בננה 3) 3 ככ 3 גכ שם <מובא רק בכ"י כ כאן ובדפוסים
בפרק ג > | ואהל בל יצען ובל יסע יתירותיו 3 ככ שם <מובא כאן
רק בכ"י כ ואינו מובא כלל בפרק ג > ||

21 | x וצי אריר בל יעברנו (יעברנהו 6) 6 חקת :: 39 תוספתא סוכה ||

22 | + כי ח' 16 א ||

24 | בה ח' 36 ח (623) ||

פרק לר

2 | + כי ח' 52 (116:2) ||

4 | x רנגולו כספר שמים 12 א (2:92) | + x וכנבולת מתאנה 3 ככ ||

5 | x כי הנה רותה בשמים חרבי ... והנה על ארום תרד 3 א 3 ככ

3 ככ | + הנה ח' 3 ככ שם ||

ישעיה; ח' 8) * חיצה (אמרינן חיצה 35; <ט"ס> חרצה 7אכי
 ישעיה, 8; ח' איכ"ר דפוס ראשון ודפוס ויניציאה, 39) 7
 $(600) = 35 = 8 = \frac{1}{2}$ איכ"ר דפוס ראשון דפוס ויניציאה ודפוס
 קראקא ע"פ טהעאדאר בב"ר שם <לא זייק באבער בהבאת הדפוסים>
 $= \frac{1}{2} 39$ שם | ומלאכי 7ת (719) <חלק זה של הפסוק טובא רק בכ"י
 א¹ת< | + מלאכי שרת 16א ||
 8 | ** <?> הרפר 8 (26) [= 59 צד] = 38 מדרש ויושע שם <עיינן
 בהערות על יחס הנוסחאות זו לזו> ||
 11 | x רוחם אש תאכלם 26א סנה' | x תהרו חשב תלרו קש רוחכם אש
 תאכלם 7פא² = 36 (365) [:::] ||
 12 | והיה עמים 35א (35) | ... יהיר עמים 7מ (ישעיה) <טעה טהעאדאר
 בהבאת גרסת הי"מ> [:::] | והיר העמים 11 במדבר [:::] :: 35א
 (36) | שיר ח' 9כ [:::] | יוצתו 12א (1:45) [:::] ||
 14 | פחדו בציון חטאים ... ואחזו רעה חניפים 32 | אחזה חרדה
 חניפים | 7 (480) [:::] | ** <?> מוקידי
 עולם 7 שם = 36 ב"ר (284) ||
 15 | ערצם 6 שופטים \div + 12ב (47:17) <כל המאמר חסר במה' באבער>
 = 14ל <והווגה> צת <כל כ"י מלבד ס' מכות (775) = 33ב"ב (93) ::
 פוחאגכי (569) :: 9אבוטלפש <רק הדפוסים גורסים כבמסרה> :: 35א
 (2) | עינור 9ט שם | אזנור 14ת שם :: 36 שם בשיטה אחרת
 שהמציאה בעל המדה"ג מב"כ דף טז וב"ב דף נז ושמה המשכה לדרש
 ב"ר; עיינן בהערות סרגליות שם <ומאמר הה"ת ב"ב הנזכר לעיל
 הוא הנמצא בדף נז בדפוסים> ||

פרק לג

1 | ולא בגדר כך 11 ||

2 | אילים ה' 70 | א ה' חנינו כי לך קרינו 2אד [::] ||

4 | במשק 33 סנה' ||

5 | x [] <צ"ל נשוב> ה' לברו השוכן 21פ <טובא רק בכ"י זה
 אבל עיין בהערות על גרסת ההבאה ממאמר זה בי"מ על ישעיה> ||

6 | עתך $20 \frac{2}{2}$ שבת = $33 \frac{1}{1}$ שבת = 36 $\frac{2}{2}$ ד $\frac{1}{2}$ לפס <כל כ"י מלבד ה
 שבת (הקדמה צד 20) $\div \frac{1}{1}$ 45 ש"ר | $\frac{1}{2}$ חכמות 36פ שם | חכמה $\frac{2}{2}$
 20 שם = $33 \frac{2}{2}$ שם = $36 \frac{2}{2}$ שם = $\frac{2}{2}$ מנורת המאור צד תקנד בשם
 שבת $\div \frac{1}{1}$ 45 שם | $\frac{1}{2}$ ויראת 33 שם ||

7 | הן הן 32 (291:1) | אראלים 7לדת <וכן הוא נדרש בכל הכ"י>
 (633) [::] 7ת <וכן הוא נדרש בכל הכ"י> (719) = 32
 (121:1) = 35 = 36 <וכן הוא נדרש בכל הכ"י> (354) :: 8
 (59) <השוה צד 26 = 22א :: 23ב (76) :: ** 7 (600) = [35 =]
 = 15 = 45 = 23ב 23ב (62) = 38 מדרש ויושע :: דפוס איכ"ר
 = 39 = [8 =] 10 = נספח ה = 10 נספח ו = 39 = 39 = 33 חגיגה
 :: 32 (291:1) :: 16א :: 44 = 48 | חיצה 48 שם | <חוצה
 טובא פעם אחת או כמה פעמים בכל הנוסחאות> * חיצה (חיצה
 [ט"ס] <חוצה איכ"ר דפוס ראשון ודפוס ויניציאה, 39] כתיב
 [כתב 35] 7חרר³, 35, איכ"ר דפוס ראשון, דפוס ויניציאה,
 ודפוס קראקא, 39; <ט"ס> <חוצה [7אכ"י ישעיה] 7דתאכ"י

- 3 | + מצרים 35א | וסוס 4מ¹ (56) = 14ד (265) [::] | + כשל
- 4פ (95) [::] | יחרר 4פ שם | ויחר 4מ* שם ||
- 4 | אלי ח' 32 ב"ר <עיינ בהערות> | הארי והכפיר 7א² דת [= 32] |
הכפיר והארי 7י שם | טורפו 7י שם | לא יחת ח' 32 שם <עיינ
בהערות> | לא יחת ולא יענה 7זת שם | יענה ח' 32 שם <עיינ
בהערות> | $\frac{1}{2}$ הרי ציון 21פ [::] | גבע 21פ שם <חלק זה של הפסוק
מובא רק בכ"י זה> ||
- 5 | + צבאות ח' 4ט :: 39 ברכות | $\frac{1}{2}$ כן יגן עליהם ה' צבאות וגו'
40ד ברכות [= 39 בשנויים גדולים] | כן יגן עלינו וגו' <ה'
צבאות ח' ?> 40מ שם | כן יגן עלינו ה' צבאות 40מ שם ||
- 9 | אשר לו אור בציון ותנור לו בירושלם 36ש (365) | x (+) אשר
12א) אור לו בציון ותנור בירושלם (בירושלים 12א) 3בם [::]
= 12א (8:52) :: $\frac{1}{2}$ 39 עירובין ||

פרק לב

- 8 | + נדיב 16א |
- 9 | שאננות ח' 36ל ברכות (347) ||
- 1 | § ובעבורת 21פ <מובא רק בכ"י זה> ||

שם | אשר יניח ה' (+ עליו ש) מלחמות 9אש שם ||

33 | + כי ח' 6 נשא = 39 פזר"א | גם ערוך 45 עירובין [::] |
העמיקה הרחיבה 35 א [::] | <ס"ס?> מרורת האש 45 נדרים
[39 =] | x מרורת אש ועצים 50 א"ב דר' עקיבא נוסחא א
|| [::]

פרק לא

1 | x הוי הירורים (היר יורדים 4פ <והוגה>) מצרימה (למצרים 3;
מצרים 4פ; למצר' 21פ) לעזרה (+ ועל סרסים וגר' 21פ) 3א
3בד 3גז = 4פפ¹ (56) = 14 מדרשב"י, מדר"י () :: 21פ
> מובא רק בכ"י זה < ||

2 | + גם 9ד₁ו | ראת (+ את 9כ) רבריו (רברו 9כ, 25 יבמות;
<ס"ס> רברי 9אב; <ס"ס> רכת' 9ו) לא הסיר (+ * את רברו לא
הסיר 9דכל) <עין בהערות מרגליות בויק"ר שם. דרשו מלשון
מגפת דבר, ואפשר כי קראו רברו < 9 = 25 יבמות = 25 קדושין ||

23 | מטר ארצך [7פחא¹א⁰²זכים (מיכה)] (885) | את ח' ז¹פ שם |
 תזרע את הארץ 7 שם | תבראת השרה 7 שם | מקנך 7לד¹פוחא
 נכתעיצם (תהלים) <כל כ"י מלבד ז²> (1091) = 32 ב"ר [::] ||
 25 | כל <ראשון> ח' 6 וירא | פלגי מים 45 במ"ר ||
 26 | יהיה ח' 10 נספת ו כ <כל כ"י מלבד פ> :: א35 :: 39 ילמדנו ||
 29 | השירה 3בכ *אזכם <אזכם הם שאר הכ"י שם> א3 א3 = 45 =
 י"ש ח"ב רמז כ = 31 מדר"י = 4 = 14 מדרשב"י (285) <עיינ
 גם במקבילות הנרשמות בהערות> | השיר הזה א3 א3 בקו 3גנק שם
 :: 12א (1:113) | התחרש חג 7ל [::] | חג פסח א3גס שם |
 × [ה]שיר יהיה לכם כליל התקורש חג שמחת החג הולך <ס"ס?>
 בחליל לב[וא בהר ה' אל צ]ור ישראל 51 (2:178) <אי אפשר
 לעמוד על יחס מאמר זה אל שאר הנוסחאות הנרשמות לעיל מפני
 קריעת הקטע כי רק ההבאה מהמקרא נשארה מכל המאמר, אבל יש לשער
 כי קרוב היה למאמר המדר"י הנרשם לעיל או למאמר המקביל לו
 בתנחומא כי הוא נמצא בדרשה על יציאת מצרים, וכבר עמד על זה
 מאן בהערותו שם, אולם גם הב"ר ומ"ת הנזכרים לעיל ייחסו מקרא
 זה אל יציאת מצרים או אל הפסח בפרט והכל מוטל בספק> ||
 30 | × אבני ברך 45 ש"ר <אפשר כי כוון אל יהושע י:יא; הסוה גרסת
 הנדפס בהערות באבער שם, שמביא פסוק אחר> ||
 32 | והיה על מעבר 9ד¹ | כל ח' 9פ שם | מוסרה <ברי"ש> 9אד¹ שם |
 מוסרה ח' 9כ שם | אשר יניף ה' 9כ שם | ה' ח' א35 [=9] <ס"ס>
 ובכנורו 9ז <ז"ל ובכנורו?> | בתופים ובנטיף ובמלחמת 9כ
 שם | בתופים במחולות ובמלחמת 35 שם | ** <?> ובמלחמת 9ז

16 || <ס"ס> לא על כי סרס ננרס 36 מר"א, מדרש ל"ב מדות (הקדמה)
|| (36 צד

17 | אלף <ראשון> ח' 41 (169) ||

18 | + לכן יחכה 12ב (10 ; 44:17) = 39 = 35א :: 10 נספח א זכש

<כל כ"י מלבד א₁> | ועל כן יחכה 39 סנה' [::] | + ולכן
<ראשון> ח' 36 ש סנה' (689) [= 39 סנה'] | $\frac{1}{2}$ | ה' ח' 10 נספח

א כ שם | + ולכן <שני> ח' 10 נספח א זש שם | ירחמכם 10ז

שם | המשפט 14ז <והוונה> מדרשב"י (287) [::] | א כי אלהי

משפט אני 12א (3:72) [::] | + ואשרי 31 [::] ||

19 | <ס"ס> כי אם בצירון ישב 18 | ישב ובירושלם 33 סוטה [::] |

ישב ובירושלים 35ד [::] | ישב וירושלם 13ב [::] | ישבו

ירושלם <אפשר כי כוון לכתוב ישבו וירושלם> 45 (5:116)

[::] | זעקיך 12א (1:116) [= 45] | בשמעתו 13ב שם ||

20 | ה' לכם מנורת המאור <סוטה> | + לא יכנף 11 תצא = 10כש = 14זל

פדר"כ (346) | ... לא יכנס 34ב [::] | עוד את מוריך <יכנף

פיעל?> 6 [= 11] = 10ש שם | עוד מורך <נדרש לשון רבים>

36ש (266) | <ס"ס?> ויהי עיניך 33 כריתות [::] ||

21 | תלכו בר 20 שנת ||

22 | צא תאמר לו (+ * צואה [ציאה 10אצ] תאמר לו 10אפצש, 22א, 22ג,

25 שנת <דרשו> צא כשם עצם מלשון צואה או ציאה ומסתבר כי

היו מבטאים צא בחול"ם; עיין בהערות <5 שבת = 5 ע"ז = 26

זבים = 25 שבת = 25 ע"ז > באלה הקודמים יש רמזים גם לפירוש

|| של מלה זו כפועל של צווי; עיין בהערות <:: 10 = 22א = 22ג ||

גורם כבמסרה < : : א35 | x והקרישו את קרוש יש' 41 (227) ||

פרק ל

|| (277) 41 הנס < ט"ס? > | 4

|| (277) 41 הנס < ט"ס? > | 4
| 5 < ט"ס? > כל הרבש על עם 41 שם | כל הנאים אל עם 47 [:::] |

|| שם 41 לבשת שם ||

|| 6 x משא בהמות נגב ב[ארץ צרה וצוקה] וגומ' ואפעה 4 פ | x אפעה

ושרף מעופף מהו שרף מעופף 6 בשלח [= 4] | x משא מרבר (משא

בהמות 3בד, 14ה) נגב בארץ צרה וצוקה (+ וגו' 3בט; + אפעה

י"ש; + לביא 3בכ; + לביא [ולביא 14ה] וליש מהם [מהם ח' 3בט].

אפעה [+ ושרף מעופף 14ה; + שרף מעופף 3בד] 3באדם, 14ה)

3באדסכם < כל כ"י מלבד ז > = י"ש ח"ב רמו רסו = 14ה מדרשב"י

(315) [= 4] | x משא מדבר נגב בארץ ערבה אפעה ושרף מעופף

32 מדר"י [= 3] < בכל נוסחאות אלה דרשו אפעה שרף מעופף כמו

אפעה הסורף כל עוף המעופף עליו ונראה כי קראו שרף בלי וא"ו

ואולי קראו גם ואפעה בוא"ו; עיין בהערות וגם במקבילות

|| המובאות שם < ||

|| 7 x ... מצרים הבל וריק יעזורו לכך < ט"ס > נקראת לזאת רהב הם

|| שבת 47 שם ||

|| 14 ÷ לא 5אב | < ט"ס > לחתות חרש אש מיקוד 5ב שם ||

(439) <כל כ"י מלבד פו, וגם הם יובאו לקמן> = 32 <בהבאה
 מב"ר צד תלס> :: 27ב | א כי נסך עליכם ה' רוח תרומה ויעצם
 עיניהם 2בס¹ שם | א ויעצם את עיניהם 35 (157) [::] | א כי
 (ח' 35) נסך ה' (+ אלהיך 2בא) עליהם (ח' 2באל) רוח (ח' 50)
 תרומה (תרומה 35; תרומ' 17 צד תלג; + וגו' 7 צד קנו;
 + ויעצם את [את ח' 2ב] עיניהם [+ מראות 2בלד] 2ב, 17 צד
 תלג, 35, י"ש, 53) 2באזלם שם :: 7לפי (בראשית) (156) = 7פו
 (439) :: 35א(29) [::] = י"ש ח"ב רמז תקסב :: 50 ילמדנו
 || [27ב]

12 | לא ירע הספר 12ב (119:178; 56) ||

14 | חכמת חכמים 30 מדרש משלי ||

15 | בה' 3א 3ב 3גמקנ | לסתור 26א ב"ק = 45 ב"ק [= 3] | יהיה

במחשך 14ד (160) [::] | ויהי במחשך 6 נח [::] | במחשך

עיניהם 18 [::] | כי יאמרו 14ל ב"ק (494) [= 45] | מי רואהו

3א 3ב 3גמקנ ||

16 | כחומר ביר היוצר 49 ב"ר | היאמר מעשה 7ז¹ פואג [= 49] |

ויצר אומר ליוצרו 7ז שם <חלק זה של הפסוק מובא רק בדפוסים

ובכ"י ג> ||

19 | וירוסיפו 16ב | בה' ח' 46פמ ||

22 | ÷ לכן ח' 6 תולדות ÷ 9ד :: 45 (14:12; 7) | אל בית ישראל

9ד שם ||

23 | ÷ כי ח' 14פ (688) | <ט"ס?> ילרי מעשה ירי 14כ שם | <ט"ס>

ילריו מעשה יריו 12ב (114:163; 5) :: 14הלס שם <רק כ"י ל

אבן (+ וגר' 25; + אבן [ח' 9ד₁פ] בחן [ברוחן 9ט] פנת [פינת
 19] יקרת מוסר מוסר המאמין [ט"ס? ראה ל:לב < יקרת מוסר
 המאמין 9ד₁] לא [יחיש 9ד₁וטלפ] 9אבד₁וטלפ [::] :: 25 יומא
 || 45 =

20 | בהתכנס 9ב :: 10כ :: 33 יומא | להתכנס 9ד שם ||
 22 | ארני ח' 25 ברכות ||
 25 | (+ חיט' שורה ושעורה נסמן וכוסמת גבולתו 25) ושם חטה (חיטה
 25) ... שורה ... שעורה ... נסמן ... וכוסמת 25 חלה = 49 ||
 27 | + כי ח' 36ד מר"א ומדרש ל"ב מדות (הקדמה 34) | לא ח' 32
 [::] | בחרוש 13א [::] | יסב <קל?> 36ל שם ||

פרק כט

1 | x ארי ארי אריאל אריאל 19אב (2:181) | קריה 10א [::] ||
 9 | x שכרו ולא מיין בער ולא שכר 12ב (75:113) | x שגו ולא
 מיין תער ולא משכר 12א (4:75) [= 12ב] ||
 10 | x כי נסך ה' (ה' ח' 2בר, 7ד²ת צד תלט) עליכם רוח תרדמה
 (+ וגר' 7 צד קנו, 7דד¹ צד תלט; + ויעצם את [את ח' 2בט²])
 עיניכם 2ב, 27ב, 32) 2ברט² >ק כ"י קה גורסים כבמסרה; עיין
 לקמן < :: 7דוא¹י (שמואל) (156) >הם כל הכ"י מלבד לכפי
 (בראשית), וגם כ"י לפי (בראשית) יובאו לקמן, אך גרסת כ"י
 כ לא גרשמה בב"ר שם, ונראה כי משובש הוא כאן < = 7דד¹א²גתי

2 | רהיה ביום ההוא 12א 12ב (8:1; 24) = 45 ||
 4 | אין לי חימה 43 | רשית [6] משפטים [::] = 11 = 27ב :: 12ב
 (65) :: 45 ש"ר ||
 5 | <ט"ס?> אז יחזק 9ד | במערוזי ועשה שלום לי 9ו שם ||
 6 | + הבאים ח' 20 שבת | x הבאים ישרש ישראל וגו' 52 (2:91) ||
 8 | הקרים 3בכו ||
 9 | עון בית יעקב 2בא ||
 1 | כיבוש 33 ב"ב ||
 1 | ÷ רהיה ח' 3במ :: 14 ב"ר (81) = 28 :: 32 | ביום ההוא
 נאום ה' 32 שם | בימים ההם 39 ספרי במדבר [::] | + גרול
 ח' 3במ שם | העוברים 26בד סנה' [::] | האוברים מארץ אשור
 והנרחים מארץ מצרים 39 מכות [::] | ובירושלים (ובירושלם
 7א¹) 7א¹ ת [14 =] :: 26 שם | + בירושלם ח' 14ל שם = 36זפש
 (353) ||

פרק כח

5 | צבאות ח' 44 ||
 7 | ÷ גם 6 שמיני = 7זכת ÷ 30 אס"ר :: 20 מגילה = 44 | x גם
 אלה ביין תער ובשכר תער 39 תנחומא באבער נח [::] ||
 1 | שמער נא 16א ||
 1 | x הנני יוסר בצירון אבן יקרי 46 קה"ר | x לכן (<ט"ס> לחן 9פ;
 <ט"ס> + כה אמ' 9ז₁; + כה אמר ה' 9אבטל, 45) הנני יוסר בצירון

- 5 | קריה בצורה נשגבה ישפילנה ישפילנה 33 ראש השנה | ישפילה
 ח' [7ח'] ||
- 6 | רגל ח' 2 בד :: [7י¹ ישעיה שם] ||
- 10 | ובל למד 7 ז | ארץ 7 לז שם | אל ארץ 7 פ שם | <ט"ס?> יעות
 7 ז שם | ולא יראה 7 פ שם | בגאות 7 פז שם ||
- 12 | בנר 24 ||
- 16 | x (+ ה' מזמור 10) בצר פקדונך (+ צקון לחש מוסרך למר מזמור
 12 א (20:1) :: 12 א (63) ||
- 19 | <ט"ס> $\frac{1}{2}$ נבלתי בל יקומון <נדרש כלפנינו> 43 | טליך 23 ::
 25 ברכות :: 36 הלפז <כל כ"י מלבד ח> (479) <מסתבר כי גרסה
 רק ט"ס או שנוי כתיב ושנוי מבטא> ||
- 20 | בחדרך 11 מסעי | בחדרים 38 מדרש מעשה חנוכה [::] | דלתיך
 ח' 6 ויצא [::] | <ט"ס> בערי <צ"ל בערי'> 6 שם ||
- 21 | + כי ח' 16 במבוא

פרק כז

- 1 | + בירום ההוא ח' 11 וארא :: 35 א | והחזקה ח' 36 לפ ב"ב (47)
 [::] | והגרולה והחזקה ח' 11 שם :: 35 שם :: 36 הס שם ::
 || 44

שם < | (+ שמנים ממרחים שמרים [שמרים ח' ד] מזוקקים ...
 (שד) שמנים ממרחים שמנים מזוקקים 2בלזהט³ ש שם ||
 8 | רבלע 2בבש <מובא רק בשני כ"י אלה> שם :: + 3במ :: 10 נספח
 ב צ <חלק זה של הפסוק מובא רק בכ"י זה> :: 28 :: 35ד |
 ארני ח' $\frac{1}{1}$ 23 א $\frac{2}{2}$ 23 :: + $\frac{1}{1}$ 2בבש שם | וחרפת עמו יסור ממנו
 23ב שם | כי פי ה' דבר 5א [::] :: 17א 17ב מדר"י [= 3] ||
 9 | + ואומר (ואומ' כ⁰ס; אומ' כ) 14הכס <כל כ"י מלבד ל> (629)
 א זה אלהינו קרינו לו 8 | וישיענו ח' 6 במדבר [::] ||

פרק כו

1 | א ביום ההוא יושר השיר הזה (הזה ח' החפ) לה' צבאות (+ בארץ
 יהודה ל) 36 <אפשר כי מקור מאמר זה הוא סנה' ונשמט בסנה'
 בספרינו; עיין במש"כ המהדיר בהערה לצד תרפז שורה ח> (685) ||
 2 | פתחו לי 3בט | יבוא 41 (227) [::] | [את"א] אמנים 14 (774)
 [::] :: 33 סנה' ||
 4 | [את"א] צייר 18 = 52 (15:2) | ** צר <כלומר צייר, ברא> 6
 ויקרא = 7 = 11 שרה = 11 ויקרא = 12 א 12ב (104; 1:62) =
 45 = 12 א 12ב (163; 3:114) = 45 = 25 שביעית = 33 מנחות
 = 35 = 36 (11) = 37 = 37 = 51 (37:1) = 52 (209:1) | **
 <?> עולמים כלם שם | עולמו 7ל שם ||

מלכי הארמה בארמה 3באמ 3גאמ שם >חלק זה של הפסוק מובא רק
 בכ"י אכמ < = 17ב שם $\frac{6}{3}$ אדו >הם כל הכ"י שהשתמש בהם באבער
 למאמר זה < בא כג = 11 = י"ש ח"א רמו קפב $\frac{6}{3}$ בא כז $\frac{13}{3}$
 מה' ליברמן ומה' באבער שם = 45 $\frac{28}{3}$ 39 $\frac{39}{3}$ ילמדנו $\frac{3}{3}$ ש"ר
 ע"פ מתנות כהונה :: 24 ||

22 | x ואספה אספה אסיר 32 | + מרוב 3גזס ||

23 | x וחפרה לבנה ובושה החמה 39 מ"ת צב:ב (צפניה 5) | בהר הקרש
 וכירושלם 9ב | + נגר 2א $\frac{2}{2}$ מ $\frac{1}{2}$ ל = $\frac{1}{1}$ 19אב ספרי זוטא (1:236) =
 ספרי זוטא מה' האראוויטץ ע"פ כ"י של מדה"ג >הוא הכ"י המסומן
 ד במה' פיש, ולא יכול פיש להשתמש בו בחלק זה של הספר ||

פרק כה

1 | + ה' ח' 12ב (66) :: 14סא אותיות או א"כ דר' עקיבא (55) |
 ה' אלהים אתה 3א 3בכו (ב א) = 3כו (ב ב) :: 50 א"ב דר'
 עקיבא נוסחא א (14) [::] | אתה ח' 14ק שם | ואודה 3א 3בכו
 (ב א) | את שמך 3א 3בכו (ב א) :: 50 א"ב דר' עקיבא נוסחא
 א (25) [14 =] | כי ח' 14ז שם ||
 4 | מעוז >שני < ח' 14ז (290) ||
 6 | צבאות ח' י"ש ח"ב רמו תתיג ספרי דברים | בהר הזה לכל העמים
 2בם [= י"ש] | לכל העמים בהר ההוא 2בט³ לדש שם >ס³ הוא י"ש

- 9 | אל ישתר 140₂ גיטין ||
- 11 | שבת משוש $\frac{1}{1} 6$ אדו > הם כל הכ"י שהשתמש בהם באבער למאמר זה <
שמיני = $\frac{1}{1} 11 = \frac{2}{2}$ י"ש ח"א רמז תקכח = $\frac{1}{2} 6$ פקודי = $\frac{1}{2}$ י"ש
ח"א רמז תיז = $\frac{1}{2}$ ספר והזהיר סוף פקודי בהבאה מתחומא
באבער פקודי | + כל הארץ $\frac{1}{1} 6$ אדו שמיני שם = $\frac{2}{2} 6$ פקודי שם
= $\frac{2}{2}$ י"ש ח"א רמז תיז = $\frac{2}{2}$ ספר והזהיר שם ||
- 14 | בגאון שם ה' 19 אבד > כנראה השתמש פיש רק בכ"י אבנד בחלק זה
של הספר < (1:60) 19 ב (37) ערכין, במ"ר | ה' ח' 19 אא שם
> מסתבר כי ט"ס הוא, אבל אם לא, נראה צ"ל בגאון < ||
- 17 | < ט"ס > א פחד ערוך יושב הארץ 16 במבוא ||
- 18 | א רירעשו מוסדי תבל 55 מדרש השכם (331) > ושם הביא תה' פב:ה
בגורט מוסדי ארץ, כבמסרה שם, וכן הביא יש' כד: יט-כ בגורט
ארץ, הארץ; עיין לקמן < ||
- 19 | א רועה התרועעה ארץ פור התפוררה ארץ מרט התמוטטה ארץ 55
מדרש השכם שם ||
- 20 | הארץ א 3 אבד = 14 דוג מדרשב"י (438) = 31 יפ מדר"י :: 55 שם ||
- 21 | + והיה ח' 3 במ = 4 פמ = 14 מדרשב"י, מדר"י (289) = 32 מדר"י
(2:202) :: 16 א | ההוא ח' 14 שם | צבא מרום 6 בא כג = 32
[$\frac{3}{3}$] :: 12 א 12 ב (82) = 45 | + במרום ח' 3 במ שם | + על
מלכי הארמה 3 באטכמ 3 גאמ שם = 17 ב = 4 פמ שם $\frac{3}{3}$ 13 א מה'
ליברמן ומה' באבער = 45 $\frac{3}{3}$ י"ש ח"א רמז קפב בשם תנחומא
[= 6 בא כג] | מלכי הארמה ועל הארמה 3 בכ שם = 4 ח שם |

פרק כג

- 2 | <ט"ס> סוחר ציון 2 א ||
- 4 | כי אמרין <ט"ס> מעון הים 35 | לא גולתי בחורים רוממתי
בתולות 14 לוחנ <כל כ"י מלבד ד> פס"ר (408) [= 35] | ולא
גולתי בחורים ולא רוממתי בתולות 14 שם ||
- 5 | יחיל 10 ק ÷ 45 תנחומא בא | לשמע 32 [::] :: 32 ||
- 8 | <ט"ס> אשר על סוחריה 19 אא ויק"ר (296:1) ||
- 11 | הרג ממלכות 32 ||
- 13 | ÷ הן ח' 35 ב(89) | הנה 39 ירושלמי תענית [::] | × זה ארץ
כשרים זה העם לא היה 10 א₁ [::] ||
- 15 | <ט"ס> שנה ח' 39 סנה' ||
- 18 | ÷ ½ כי ח' 36 דחלס (33) | לה' צבאות 6 א תולדות :: 36 שם |

פרק כד

- 6 | על כן אלה אבלה ארץ 11 וישב | × על אלר (על כן אלה פ) אבלה
הארץ (ארץ פ) ויאשמו יושבי (ישבי פ) בה על כן חלר (חרר פ)
יושבי ארץ ונשאר אנוש מזער 1 פש [::] | * על אלה אבלה 1 שם
:: 11 שם ||

- 12 | ארני ח' 6 ויגש | ה' אלהים וגר' <צבאות ח'??> 41 (171) [::] |
- צבאות ח' 2בבטל [::] | ביום ההוא ח' 2באר שם :: 22 (83)
- [::] $\frac{1}{2}$:: 22 (79) :: 33 חגיגה :: 39 קה"ר = 46 קה"ר
- [41 ÷] | צבאות ביום ההוא ח' 2במד שם | x לבכי ומספר 11
- [6 =] | למספר ולבכי 2בד שם | ולחגורת שק 2בא שם ||
- 13 | ÷ הנה 16א = 16ב = 16ב | <ט"ס? או קזור> x הנה ששון רשמחה
- הרוג בקר ושחוט צאן אכול כי מחר נמות 32 תענית [16 =] ||
- 14 | ÷ נגלה 16א שם | + ראם 26בד יומא [::] | x ונגלה באזני
- וגר' אמר ה' אם יכפר וגר' 48 [26 =] | <ט"ס?> עון הזה $\frac{1}{2}$
- 3בז = $\frac{1}{1}$ 33 יומא [26 =] | לכם העון הזה 14הכס <כל כ"י מלבד
- ל> (681) [::] :: 34אאע [26 =] :: 36דש (637) :: 36ד (715)
- [32 =] | לכם ח' 32 שם = + 14ל שם | תמורתו 3בז שם | ארני
- ח' 29 = 34אאע <חלק זה של הפסוק מובא רק בשני כ"י אלה,
- ולא בדפוסים> שם ||
- 15 | לך נא <בא ח'> 9ג⁹ | אל שבנא 9בוטלפ <כל כ"י מלבד או 9> שם ||
- 16 | מה לך פה ומה לך פה 9ג⁹ שם | * מה לך פה ומה לך אפוא 6
- תולדות = 39 [::] | לך שם קבר 9ג⁹ שם ||
- 18 | צפנה ח' 9א שם | ... כל ארץ 9פ שם | שמה מרכבות 9ופ שם |
- ארונוך 9ט שם ||
- 21 | כותנתיך 9ד שם | <ט"ס?> כתנתך במתנתך 9פ שם | <ט"ס> אתן
- בירך 9ד₁ שם ||
- 22 | <ט"ס> x ופתח אין סוגר וסגר ואין פותח 27א ||

- 13 | ביער תלינו 19 או פדר"כ, איכ"ר (2:139) | + ארחות ררכם
 רדנים 19 אה שם ||
- 14 | יושבי בארץ תימא 31 ||
- 15 | מחרב 33 סנה' | מפני חרב נטושה ... מפני קשת ורוכה ...
 ומפני כובר מלחמה 8 [:::] | מפני חרב נטושה מפני קשת ורוכה
 מפני כובר מלחמה 11 יתרו [:::] | המלחמה 24 ||

פרק כב

- 3 | x כל קציניך נררו יחר מקשת אוסרו כל נמצאיך מנאציק אסרו
 יחרו מחוק עמור 47 ||
- 4 | ואמר 37 איכ"ר ||
- 5 | x כי (ח' חבקוק) יום מהומה ומבוסה <ס"ס?> (יום מנוסה
 ומבוכה חבקוק <ס"ס?>) לה' אלהים צבאות (צבאות ח' חבקוק)
 בגי (בגיא חבקוק) תזיון 39 הפטרת שוש אשיש <פדר"כ נספח ו
 (יואל) = 39 הפטרת שוש אשיש (חבקוק) ||
- 8 | x ויקל את מסך יהורה 25 יומא | x ויגל את מסך בית יהורה
 22א [:::] | x ויגל את מטה יהורה 9ד [:::] | x ויגל את מסך
 מטה יהורה ותבט ביום ההוא את נשק היער 10ז [= 22א] <ציון
 גרסת מטה נשמט במה' מנדלבוים, אבל כן גורסים במה' באבער,
 המודפסת ע"פ כ"י ז, והעיר על גרסה זו באבער בהערותיו שם <
 >מתיבת ותבט והלאה מובא רק בכ"י ז < ||

פרק כ

- 2 | x לך ופתחת השק מעל מתניך ונעלך תחלוץ מעל רגלך 17 בב יומא ||
 3 | <ט"ס?> ה' ח' 33 שבת ||
 4 | נערים וזקנים ח' 11 נח ||

פרק כא

- 2 | <ט"ס?> חזרת קשות 23 :: 53 ||
 9 | x נפלה בבל 3א 3באד = 9דפ $\frac{36}{3}$ להלפסד <כל כ"י מלבד ח > פדר"א
 פרק כח <כל המאמר נשמט בדפוס וארשא > (256) :: 22ג איכ"ר |
 x נפלה בבל לא תרסיף קום 9א שם | x נפלה ולא תרסיף קום
 בתולת בת בבל 9ב שם ||
 11 | משא רומי <ז"ל משא רומי ברי"ש > 25 תענית <בהבאה מספרו של
 רבי באיר > | ** אלי <בחיר"ק > 2א = 19 ספרי במדבר, במ"ר
 (94 ; 155:1) $\frac{2}{3}$ 25 תענית = $\frac{1}{2}$ 39 :: 42 | שמר מי מלילה
 שמר מי מליל 19אה שם | שמר מה מלילה שמר מה מלילה 43
 || [::]

פרק יט

- 4 | ארונים קשים 45 במ"ר = ** 6 במדבר = 11 = 117 ב | ** עז, עוז, ערו
 >בחול"ם< 45 שם = 6 שם = 11 שם = 117 שם ||
- 9 | ... יברשו 16 א ||
- 11 | >ט"ס< עצה ח' 30 מדרש משלי | לפרעה 29 [= 30] ||
- 12 | איה 11 מקץ ||
- 13 | >ט"ס< x נואלנו שרי צוען 33 תענית ||
- 17-18 | >ט"ס< x ביום ההוא יהיה ארמת מצרים לחגא וגר' 6 וארא ||
- 18 | עיר החרס <בחי"ת> $40 \frac{2}{2}$ מנחות ע"פ הערוך ערך חרס וכן ע"פ
 דפוסים ישנים שהזכירם יאסטרופ ערך חרס <עיין בהערות> = $\frac{1}{2}$
 117 = ** 33 <חרס מפורש במובן שמש< $\frac{4}{3}$ ** 10 = 117 = 35 ב
 <חרס מפורש במובן כלי חרס, אבל נשרדו רמזים אל הפירוש הקדום;
 עיין בהערות> ||
- 19 | מזבח ה' 3 בכ ||
- 24 | ... יהיה (תהי' 32; והיה 6, 23 א) <ביום ההוא ח' ?> 6 צו =
 11 :: 23 א :: 32 | ... (+ והיה 11; + והי' 23) ביום ההוא
 יהיר (יהיה 11; יהי' 23) 6 בהעלותך [::] = 11 :: 23 ב שם ||

$\frac{1}{2} | 11$ * * רכאב אָנֶגֶשׁ 9 $\frac{2}{3}$ 17ב במ"ר (4:7) | * * רכאב אָנֶלֶשׁ 6 שלח
 = 11 = 19 = (1; 308:210) = במ"ר (12:16) [::] ||
 12 | <ט"ס> א והיה המון עמים רבים וגר' 10צ | <ט"ס> א הרי עמון
 עמים רבים וגר' 21פ [::] | <ט"ס?> א הרי עמים רבים וגר' 45
 [::] | <ט"ס> א הרי המון רבים כהמות ימים יהמיון 18 [::] |
 א הרי עמים גרים רבים כהמון מים יהמיון 21ק שם | + א הרי המון
 מים רבים [כהמות מים יהמיון וגר'] 12א (9:17) [= 45] | א הרי
 המון עמים רבים כהמון ים יהמו 12א (2:83) [::] | + א הרי המון
 עמים רבים כהמות מים יהמון וגר' 35א [= 12א למזמור יז] ||
 $\frac{1}{2} | 14$ | טרם 44 | $\frac{2}{2}$ ואיננו 44 שם ||

פרק יח

3 | <ט"ס> תראו ח' 21פ <טובא רק בכ"י זה> ||
 5 | <ט"ס> הסיר התן 36 (686) ||
 6 | וכל בהמות הארץ עליו תחרף 7פ | וכל חית הארץ עליו תחרף 7י
 שם :: 42א <גרסה זו נמצאת בשלשה כ"י של הסדר עולם וכן בתרגום
 הרוטית אך בפנים הספר כתב ראטנער כבמסרה> | וכל חית (חיות
 7ז) עליו תחרף 7וז שם :: 42ב שם ||
 7 | בעת ההוא 36הח שם | א ירבילו לה' צבאות [7י] [::] | + צבאות
 <ראשון> ח' 36 שם | א עם ממושך וממורט 12ב (5; 181:120) [::]
 <אפשר כי כווננו לפסוק ב> ||

פרק טו

1 | בליל <ראשון> ח' 8 | ער ח' 36 החשד <והושלם ש' > מר"א (325) ||

פרק טז

1 | <ט"ס> x שלחו כר ומושל ארץ 51 (238:2) | הר בית צירון 45
|| סנה' ||

2 | <ט"ס> כערץ 11 תזא ||

3 | x הביאי עצה עשי פלילה רש"י לבר' מח:יא | x עשי פלילה 32
<לאותו פסוק> [= רש"י] ||

4 | המרץ 32 ||

5 | בחסר ח' 45 | כסאר 12 א (4:110) = 30 = 45 שם :: 36 ז (616) ||

14 | שלש שנים 42 ע"פ רבינו תם ע"פ ראטנער, וגם ע"פ רש"י ע"פ
ראטנער, וגם ע"פ בעלי התוספות ||

פרק יז

4 | x משמן בשרם ירזה 32 ||

יורר 14 שם :: 27 כב :: כל נוסח המובא בשלשת הפסוקים
[הקודמים]

17 | ... ראת אסיריו 6 תזריע [= 9 צד תג] | ... ולאסיריו 9 וכ

(403) = 9 כ (437) | אסוריו 32 ב"ר [::] | * בית הכלא 6

שם = 39 = י"ש ח"ב רמז תקטב

18 | כל מלכים 34 כבר > אי אפשר לדעת מהערות שעכסער עד אנה הביא כ"י

זה את הפסוק; ע"ש <קרוב בחלקו אל התנחומא >

19 | * כנצל נתעב > או כנצר נדרש כנצל; עיין בהערות < 6 שם = 11

= 39 שם = י"ש שם = 9 (403) :: 34 כב שם = 42 :: תרגום שני

לאסתר א:א ותרגום אסתר מה' שפובר לאותו פסוק | x ואתה

השלכת כפגור נתעב 39 שם | נתעב ונאלח 34 כב שם

20 | אל תחר אותם 32

22 | נאם ה' אלהים והכרתי 49 מגילה | שם ושאר נין ונכר 43

24 | צבאות ח' 33

25 | x לשבור אשר באפי 3בט

26 | על הארץ 3א 3בד שם | לכל הגרים 3א 3ב שם > חלק זה של הפסוק

טובא רק בדפוסים ואולי גם במדרש חכמים >

27 | + כי ח' 3בא שם | וידו הנטריה מי ישיבנה 3א 3ב שם > חלק זה

של הפסוק טובא רק בדפוסים ואולי גם במדרש חכמים >

פרק יר

- 1 | רנלוח הגר עליהם (עליהם הגר 32; הגר אליהם 17 קדושין מה' שפירא) רנספחו על (אל 17 א 17 קדושין וש"ר מה' גאסטר) בית יעקב (ישראל 39) 17 א 17 קדושין = 32 יבמות = 39 קדושין ::
- 17 <שם> ש"ר ||
- 2 | והם שובים 10 צ ||
- 3 | <ט"ס> העבורה קשה 17 א ||
- 4 | את המשל הזה 6 תוריע $\frac{1}{9}$ 9 ו א ||
- 5 | <ט"ס?> מטת 10 א | רשע 12 א (47) ||
- 12 | מן שמים 33 במפתח | <ט"ס> חולש של גוים 3 בא | הגוים 3 א 3 בו שם ||
- 13 | ÷ אתה 14 ג מדרשב"י, מדר"י לשמות טו: א (289) $\frac{1}{16}$ א :: 45 <צוין מכילתא, והכוונה אל מדר"י שירתא ו על שמות טו: ז, אך המאמר מובא כלשון תנחומא בשלח ונראה כי צ"ל תנחומא תחת מכילתא; עיין בהערות באבער שם > :: 56 |
- ... ותאמר 4×10^2 <ותוקן מ* >; אלו כל כ"י של מ מלבד מ¹ < = 14 הל שם | אל השמים 4 מ שם = 14 הלד <כל כ"י מלבד ג > שם |
- שמים 9 ד₂ (403) [::] | בין כוכבי אל 4 מ שם <חלק זה של הפסוק מובא רק במדה"ג > = 14 הלד שם <כל כ"י מלבד ג > | אשים כסאי 9 שם ||
- 14 | לאל עליון 18 [:: 9, 14, 55] ||
- 15 | תרר 6 ברכה [:: כל נוסח שמוכא בשני הפסוקים הקודמים] |

- 3 | מים ח' 27 א ||
 4 | ראמת 12 א (3:118) ||

פרק יג

- 4 | <ט"ס?> x קול המון בהמון רמות עם רב 21 פ <טובא רק בכ"י זה> ||
 5 | הנה באים 12 א (7:5) | מרחק ח' 17 ב ירושלמי תענית [= 12א] |
 מקצה השמים ח' 12 א (7:86) [= 12א למזמור ה] | מארץ מרחק
 מקצה הארץ 10 א א₂ כזש [= 17ב] | מקצה השמים וכלי <עיינ
 בהערות> זעמר 11 תזריע [= 12א] | את כל הארץ 6 [= 11] ||
 9 | ה' ח' 3 א 3 בוק 3 גז = 32 = 32 :: 16 א | אכזרי ועברה וחרון
 <** נְקָרוֹן > ראף 3 גז שם ||
 10 | בצאתי 3 בא | בצאת 39 הפטרת שוש אשיש [::] | בצאתו ח' 45
 תנחומא בראשית [::] | לא הגיה 4 ח [= 3] | לא יגיה אורה 10
 נספח ו פ [= 39] ||
 11 | כי פקתי 4 מ שם = 14 גדלק <כל כ"י מלבד ה> מדושב"י, מדור"י
 (296) | כי פקר ה' 14 שם ||
 17 | עליכם 17 א 17 ב אס"ר ||
 21 | שעירים 54 חולין (219) | ירקרון 9 דל | שמה 9 ב שם ||

- 3 | לא למראה 17 סנה' = + 33 <בשיטה שחסר ב"מ>
- 4 | <ט"ס> והוציא במישור 24 | x והכה ארץ פיו 17 רו"ר | x והכה
 ארץ בשכט פיו ... וברוחו שפתיו ימית רשע 17 בשם רות רבה
 <השיטה חסרה במה' שלנו> | x וברוח פיו ימית רשע 6 כ"י די
 רוסי מספר רסא מובא במבוא מה' באבער ||
- 6 | <ט"ס> אם כבש 1 בפירוש הראב"ד ||
- 7 | ילריהם 1 אז שם ||
- 10 | לנס העמים [7ח] ||
- 11 | ÷ והיה ח' 36 דהש פר"א (159) :: 32 | יוסיף ירו שנית 17 ס"ת
 (2:6) | יוסיף ה' ירו 18 [::] 45 [= 17ב] ||
- 12 | <ט"ס?> וקבץ 32 | אקבץ 19 או (1:373) 19 בבט (261) [::] |
 <ט"ס> לגוי <צ"ל לגוי'> 10 א | לגויים ח' 10 א₂ שם ||
- 13 | x אפרים לא יקנא את יהודה ויהודה לא יקנא את אפרים 21 פ <מובא
 רק בכ"י זה> ||
- 14 | x עמון ומואב משלוח ירם ובני עמון משמעתם 21 ק ||
- 15 | x והחריב ה' את לשון הים מצרים 12 א (2:92) ||

פרק יב

- 1 | ואמרו 32 | ה' ח' 31 תנחומא באבער שמות ||

- 26 | x ומטהר על הים ונשא כדרך מצר' 21 פ < מובא רק בכ"י זה > ||
- 30 | $\frac{1}{2}$ בת גלים * בת (בית 10 א > = בת; עיין
- בהערות מנדלבוים שם) < גולים (גלים 10 ש) (בת גולים ח' 17 ב) * ברתהון רגלריא (או כדמ"ל; ח' 10 פ) 8 = 17 ב = 10 שם ||
- 32 | בנוף לעמוד 33 במפתח ||
- 34 | בברזל ח' 2 בנה | + הלכנון 4 | x והאריר יפול < והלכנון נוסף בגליון > 40 מ גיטין ||

פרק יא

2 | רוח חכמה רגבורה < והווגה ובינה > רוח עצה רגבורה רוח דעת ויראת ה' 14 פר"א (667) | x ונחה עליו רוח ה' רוח חכמה ובינה רוח עצה ותבונה [7ג] [::] | ** רוח חכמה ובינה רוח עצה ותבונה רוח דעת ויראת ה' 14 שם = 15 = 17 ב = 51 (1:36) = 51 (1:40) = 52 (1:230) = י"ש ח"א רמז תיב בשם תנחומא < כנראה הוא תנחומא לשמות לה:ל; ע"ש > = י"ש ח"ב רמז תתקלה בשם תנחומא < כנראה הוא תנחומא לבר' א:א; ע"ש ובקסעים שהוציא מאן > יש להוסיף לרשימה זו כמה פירושים לספר יצירה שהזכיר אפסוביזר; עיין בהערות < = *** 6 < לשמות לה:ל > = 11 = ש"ר < לשמות לה:ל > = 51 (1:17) < על יחס הנוסחאות זו לזו עיין בהערות > גרסת ותבונה נמצאת גם בכ"י של הבבלי; עיין במה' מפעל המקרא < | ויראת אלה' 14 ל שם ||

5 | ונקרא [לד] | <ט"ס> פלא יועץ זו גבור 35 ||

6 | אותו 20 שבת ||

11 | ארום מקדם ופלישתים מאחור 21 פ ||

16 | ואת יתומיו ואלמנותיו 20 שבת = 30 | בכל פה 10 א | כל פה 10 פ שם ||

19 | [את"א] זרעו 17 שבת = 20 שבת = 33 שבת = 39 ||

פרק י

1 | ארי 9 א | חוקקי <חוקקי> און 9 שם ||

3 | + מה 48 ||

5 | + שבט חרבי 36 ח (559) <ענין חלק זה של הדרש הוא חרב אלהים,

ופסוק זה טובא כמו דוגמה של פעילותיו> | <ט"ס?> ומטהר ביום

21 פ <טובא רק בכ"י זה> ||

10 | ופסיליהם מיהורה ומירוש' 9 פ ||

13 | <ט"ס> עמי <צ"ל עמי', וכן הוא נדרש> 5 א ||

14 | x ותמצא בקן ירי וגר' 45 מדר"י | x ותמצא בהן ירי וגר' 3 בכ

[45 =] | x ותמצא כקן ירי לכל הארץ וכאסוף (וכאסף ג) ביצים

עזובות כל הארץ אני אספתי 14 גול <והווגה ג⁰> מדר"י

(258) [3 =] | x ותמצא כקן ירי לכל ממלכות הארץ י"ש ח"ב רמז

שח בשם מדר"י [3 =] | ... לא יהיה נודד 16 א [::] ||

17 | ... יהיה 21 פ ||

19 | יהיה 33 ||

24 | אדני ח' 17 א ||

8 | ושטף 38 מדוש עשרה מלכים | והיר 6 תזריע >באבער מביאו בהערותו
שם כבמסרה < ||

16 | צור (צר 17 צד סח, 33) > ** צר, במובן נעל < תעורה חתום
> ** חתם < 6 תולדות :: 7 = 9 = 17 = ויק"ר צד נט = 17 צד סח
בלי ציון המקור = 11 שמיני = 36 (475) = אס"ר :: 11 תצוה ::
16 ב :: 21 :: 33 סנה' = 39 ||

18 | + והנה 7 צ | אשר נתן לי (לי ח' 31) אלהים 7 צ שם = 9 מ :: 31 ||

19 | + כי 9 לפ (143) = 9 פ (322) | יאמר 9 נ (322) :: 31 | וכי

יאמרו אליכם בניכם רשו אל האבות ואת הירעונים 18 [= 31] |

+ המהגים 9 פ (144) | הלא עם אלהיר ידרוש 6 אמור $\frac{9}{1}$ שם ||

20 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | אם לא יאמינו ברבר הזה אשר אין לא שחר 9 ט (145) | + ברבר

הזה 9 א שם >ספק אם כוון להביא הפסוק כלשונו או לעבדו למען

פירוש < | $\frac{1}{2}$ + ברבר הזה אין לו שחר 9 ט שם >עיינ בהערה

הקודמת < ||

21 | והיה כאשר ירעב 3 גאם | והתקצף ח' 3 בט שם ||

23 | בעת הראשון 33 סנה' ||

פרק ט

1 | x העם היושבים בחשך ראו אור גדול 44 ||

4 | + כי ח' 12 ב (2 ; 124:81) | ** ברשע 12 א 12 ב שם = 17 ב = 45

17 ב במ"ר = 19 (59 ; 99:1) = 25 סוטה = 26 סוטה = 33 סוטה ||

פרק ח

- 3 | אלי ח' 32 מל"ט | למהר 39 ש"ר ||
- 5 | לרבר אלי 31 ב"ר | עוד ח' 17א | x ויוסף ה' רבר אלי עוד
 ברבר הזה 7א¹ [= 31] ||
- 6 | רשור 10כק | בן 10כ שם = 35ב ||
- 7 | ולכן (+ ח' 12א מזמור טו, 27ב, 12א מזמור צג, 45, י"ש ח"ב
 רמז תתמו; + לכן 19, 35, 35, י"ש ח"ב רמז תרן, י"ש ח"ב רמז
 רלז; רכן 33) הנה ה' (הנני ה' 35 דף פב; הנני <ה' ח' > 12א
 מזמור טו, 27ב, 12א מזמור צג, 45, י"ש ח"ב רמז תתמו) מעלה
 עליכם (עליהם 19, 27ב; עליך 12א מזמור צג, י"ש ח"ב רמז תתמו;
 אתכם 10כ; ח' י"ש ח"ב רמז תרן) את מי <עין בהערות באבער מספר
 יד למ"ת מזמור צג, ששם הוא מביא גרסת הכ"י פעמיים, פעם אחת
 גורס מי ופעם אחת משמיטו, וקשה לעמוד על כוונתו, אם שאר הכ"י
 חלקו על כ"י א, או לא; ואולי שינה הנוסח בהסחת הדעת > הנהר (נהר
 35 דף פב) > בהערותיו למ"ת מזמור צג באבער מביא שתי גרסות, נהר וגם
 הנהר, ובפנים כתב נהר, ונראה כי כן גורס כ"י א לכל הפחות, ואולי
 מסכימים אליו שאר הכ"י; השוה לעיל <את כר' ח' 10כ > 10א₁ כק
 <כל כ"י מלז א > 19א אבהו (2:255) 19ב (489) = 35ב (82) :: 12א
 (4:15) <מובא רק בכ"י או > 27ב ÷ 35א (146) = י"ש ח"ב רמז
 תרן בשם פס"ר :: 12א (4:93) <מובא כמעט כן בכל כ"י > = 45
 = י"ש ח"ב רמז תתמו :: 33 סנה' = י"ש ח"ב רמז רלז > עיין
 בפירוש רש"י < את מי הנהר העצום וגר' 10ק שם ||

- 7 | וסר ערניך 19א (1:249) 19ב (164) :: 36 שבת (62) :: 36 ברכות
 | (631) <נראה כי אינו אלא שנוי מבטא או שנוי כתיב> ||
 8 | ה' ח' 18 פדר"כ, ויק"ר | + $\frac{1}{2}$ את <שני> ח' 10א ||
 10 | בעיניו רבאזנר 45 מגילה ||

פרק ז

- 1 | <ט"ס> אחז בן יאשיהו 11 שמיני ||
 2 | היער 17א 17ב ב"ר ||
 3 | [את"א] כובש 9 ||
 7 | ארני ח' 17א ||
 8 | + בעור 42א ||
 18 | ישרוק לזבוב אשר בקצה יאורי מצרים ולרבורה אשר בקצה ארץ
 | אשר 6 חקת ||
 19 | <ט"ס> וכל הנעצוצים ובכל הנהלולים 33 | x על כל הנעצוצים
 | רעל כל הנהלולים 44 ||
 21 | <ט"ס> עגלה בקר 36ד ב"ר <ע"ש> (298) ||
 23 | <ט"ס?> אלף גפן באלף צאן 17ב סנה' ||
 25 | + כל 1א | <ט"ס> וכל הערים אשר במערה יערוון <נדרש
 | כלפנינו> 1מ שם ||

24 | ÷ לכן ח' 39 במ"ר | $\frac{1}{2}$ לשרון ח' 36 <והושלם בגליון > (474) |
 פרחם כמק יהיה ושרשם כאבק יעלה 6 מזודע | <ס"ס> כאבק יענה
 10א1 | <ס"ס> + וכי 10א1 שם | את ח' $\frac{1}{2}$ 10צ שם = $\frac{1}{1}$ 49
 פסיקתא | + צבאות ח' 11 [= 6] :: $\frac{2}{2}$ 10א1 שם | קודש ישראל
 10צ שם | <ס"ס> ראת אמרת ואת קודש ישראל 10פ שם ||
 30 | x רינהום עליהם כנהמת ים 45 מ"ת (4 ; 33:106) ||

פרק ו

1 | ראיתי 23 = 50 מדרש הלל <בשנויים גדולים> ||
 2 | עמרים ח' 39 ש"ר | לר ח' 10צ (264) :: א35 :: + א7² :: 19ב
 (12 ; 14:1) :: 27א | שש כנפים ושש כנפים 35 שם | + רבשתים
 יכסה פניו 14צ (718) [::] | + בשתים יכסה רגליו 6 אמור = 11
 = 17ב = 45 [::] | x בשתים יעופף 45 ב"ר [::] | (+ בשתים
 יכסה פניו 9א ; + בשתים יכסה פניו רבשתים יכסה רגליו 9זכ)
 רבשתים יעופף (בשתים יעופף 9לוטפ 10 ; ח' 9ז) ... בשתים
 (רבשתים 9ז + ופ 54 ; + רבש' 9ל ; + שתים 9ט) יכסה פניו ...
 רבשתים (+ בשתים 9כ 10) יכסה רגליו 9אדוטכלמפ = 10 (151)
 = 54 (555) [= 6] ||
 3 | ... ויקרא 19אג ויק"ר, ב"ר (411 ; 173:2) | + קדוש ח' 17ב
 תנחומא קדושים | קדוש קדוש ח' 36 חולין (572) [::] | ה'
 צבאות ח' 3ב ||

- 13 | x לכן גלה עמי אין כבוד וגר' 34בר | הרעת 30 אס"ר :: 36החלפ
- || כל כ"י מלבד ד < סנה' (471) ||
- 14 | <ס"ס> x לכן שארל נפשה 33 סוטה | את נפשה 30 תנחומא לך לך |
- פיה ח' 17ב ש"ר | [את"א] חררה 16א | ** חררה 16א שם בשיטה
- אחרת ובמובן אחר <ע"ש> ||
- 16 | + האל 12ב (101:145; 1) ||
- 18 | שרא 17ב ברכות :: 7 = 31 = 32 | וכעבורות 2אד **זל <עיין
- במבוא צד יא < [7] ||
- 19 | יחיש 39 ספרי דברים | ויחיש 2בד [= 39] :: 35א <ס"ס>
- מעשיהם 10צ | למען נראה * למען נראה (למען נראה 9; ולמען
- נראה 54) ** <למען נראה> 9וק = 10צ = 54 (316) [= 35] |
- למען נראה * מהו למען נראה * למען נראה 35כהגהת הז"א <משובש
- קצת בדפוס; ע"ש > שם | ** למען נראה 9 שאר כ"י שם = 10 שאר
- כ"י שם = <?> = 8 <?> = 41 (271) <בשתי הנוסחאות האחרונות האלה
- שינו סדר חלקי המאמר קצת, וספק אם הבינו יחס הפסוק לדרש;
- השוה ויק"ר צד שמג ואיכ"ר שלוש השורות הראשונות של דף עו,
- צד א | <ס"ס> x האומרים ימהר יחיש מעשיהו למען נרע ותקרב
- ותבואה (ותבאה פ) עצת קרוש (+ ישראל פ) למען נראה למען נראה
- (למען נראה ח' פ) ... ותקרב ותבואה (ותבאה פ) עצת קרוש
- ישראל ונרעה 9ופ שם | <ס"ס> ותביאנה 10פ שם ||
- 23 | מצריק רשע 7י (בראשית) | + $\frac{1}{2}$ צרקה צריק 7י (ישעיה) שם |
- יסורו 7 $\frac{3}{3}$ א $\frac{1}{3}$ גזי (בראשית) $\frac{2}{2}$ לדוכתי (ישעיה) $\frac{1}{2}$ ח $\frac{1}{3}$ א $\frac{2}{3}$ > כל
- הנוסחות מלבד פם (ישעיה); עיין במבוא צדי יא-יב < שם ||

רעשן ח' 3 א 33 ב 33 ג <מובא רק בדפוסים> (פסחא יד) | לילה ח'
 17 ב ב"ב + 17א [= 33] | ענן רעשן יומם ראש להבה לילה 35
 שם | + $\frac{1}{2}$ כי ח' 36 ה ב"ב (802) [= 33] | כי על כבוד 33 ג (פסחא יד)
 || <מובא בכל הנוסחאות> = 33 ג (כ פתיחתא) :: [6] צו $\frac{1}{2}$ 35 שם $\frac{1}{2}$ 36 ד (802) ||
 6 | $\frac{1}{2}$ יום 10 נספח ב ש | <ט"ס> לצל יומם מחרב ומחסה ולמסתור
 || 11 תרומה ||

פרק ה

1 | בקרב בן שמן 39 איכ"ר <נדרש כלפנינו> | בבעל בן שמן 26 א
 סוכה [::] ||
 2 | + רגם ח' 17 ב ירושלמי סוכה ||
 3 | יושבי 2 ברלד | נא ח' 2 בנה שם ||
 4 | $\frac{1}{2}$ מה לי לעשות עור 6 בהוספה לפרשת שלח שבכ"י ו ||
 6 | <ט"ס> ואצוה 17 ב קה"ר ||
 7 | א כי כרם ה' ישר' 21 פ <מובא רק בכ"י זה> | ויהודה נסע 9 ד₁
 [::] ||
 8 | מגיע $\frac{2}{3}$ 8 $\frac{1}{3}$ איכ"ר הנדפס = $\frac{1}{1}$ 18 ||
 9 | ונגלה באזני 49 איכ"ר [= 8] :: 45 ברכות = 49 ברכות |
 || ** באזני <בציר"י> 8 שם <מובא רק בכ"י רומי> = איכ"ר הנדפס ||
 11 | משכימים 7 ל ||
 12 | + את 33 שבת דף עה | לא הביטור 17 ב שבת = 32 שבת = 33 שם ::
 || 33 שבת דף קיט ||

|| והקשורים כלפנינו > ||

21 | x ... הטבעות ... ניזמי האף 25 שם <17א 17ב כלפנינו > ||

22 | x ... (+ המחלצות והמעטפות 17א) המחלצות ... המעטפות ...

המטפחות (והמטפחות 17ב) ... והחריטין (והחריטים 17ב) 25 שם

= 17ב שם ||

23 | x ... הגליונים ... הסדינים ... הצניפות ... הרדידים ... 25

שם <17א מביא והגליונים והסדינים כלפנינו; 17ב מביא כל

הפסוק כלפנינו, מלבד מלת והגליונים, שנשמטה > | x הגליונים

והסדינים והצניפות והרדידים 14 חל משנת ר' אליעזר (430) [::]

> הפסוקים יח-כב טובאים בשלמותם בכל כ"י כלפנינו > ||

פרק ד

4 | <ט"ס? > כי אם 32 סוטה :: 45 במ"ר = 49 ב"ר > צורת המאמר עובדה

בבמ"ר > | את ח' 6 ויגש = 39 (יואל 36) [::] :: 7 לפו = 36 ד

ב"ר <ע"ש > (298) = 39 ב"ר (מיכה) = 39 קה"ר (יואל 47) = 45 שם |

בת צירון 39 קה"ר שם :: 39 תנחומא שם | בני צירון 6 שם | <ט"ס >

x ואת דמי ידיחור מקרבה 21 פ [::] | מקרבה ח' 14 משנת ר'

אליעזר (451) > חלק זה של הפסוק טובא רק בכ"י זה > [::] ||

5 | יביא ה' 52 (1:269) | על מכון 3א 3ב 3ג (פסחא יד) > מתבא רק בדפוסים >

= 3א 3בד 3גד (ב פתיחתא) :: 6 תרוסה :: 6 ויקהל = 45 :: 52 (1:265) :: 45

ש"ר :: 7 ים (ישעיה) :: 23 :: 35 א :: 36 הש (138) :: 52 (1)

(269) | + ועל מקראה ח' 33 | ועל מקדש 3ב 3ג (פסחא יד) |

- גיטין שם | + $\frac{1}{2}$ וקצין 17ב שם | יריך 17ב שם = 33 שבת = 33
- גיטין = 40 גיטין שם > וכן מביאו רש"י בגיטין שם < ||
- 7 | רבידי אין לחם 49 שם ||
- 8 | x כי כשלה ירושלים ויהודה בלשונם 12א (1:39) ||
- 10 | אמרו כי צדיק 9כ | לצדיק 2ב במה איש שלום $\div 7$ = [9 =] $\div 12$ א
- <מסתבר שרק כ"י א גורס כן; ע"ש> (4:62) :: 7ד > צד קג בהוספה מחגיגה יב < :: 20 יומא | יאכל 10ק [9 =] ||
- 11 | כגמול 43 :: 9פ שם $\div \frac{1}{2}$ 12ב (167:118) = ** 12א (2:118) בשיטה הראשונה שבמאמר) = 17ב = 45 | ישיב לו 10א שם = 12ב שם | ישלם לו 9פ שם ||
- 12 | $\frac{1}{2}$ נשים 17ב אס"ר | ** נשים, ונשים <בחול"ם, מלשון נשה> 17ב שם ||
- 14 | <ט"ס?> זקני ח' 17ב ש"ר | + אתם 14 (57) ||
- 16 | + מסקרות 6 וישלח :: 9פו | וברגליהן 8 = 9דכ שם = 10 > כן במה מנדלבוים; באבער גורס וברגליהם כלפנינו < | \div ברגליהם 20 שבת [9 \div] | וברגלים 17ב איכ"ר = 22ג [8 =] ||
- 17 | את קרקר 8 שם = 10פ שם = 22א = 22ב $\div 6$ תזריע | $\frac{1}{2}$ קרקר ח' 9ד שם (340) | + ה' פתהן 9ד שם ||
- 18 | x העכטים ... השביטים ... הסהרונים (השהרונים 17ב) 25 שבת = 17ב ||
- 19 | x ... הנטיפות ... השרות ... והרעלות 25 שם <17ב גורס כלפנינו> ||
- 20 | x ... הפארים ... הצערות ... הקישורים ... ובתי הנפש ... והלחשים 25 שם <17ב מביא כל הפסוק כלפנינו; 17א מביאו עד

= 40ד (ונוסף בגליון כ"י מ) ברכות :: 57ק | ** במה 57אר שם
 = 53 :: 7 <?> | x חרלך לכם מן הא א נ ב כי במה נחשב הוא
 * כי במה נחשב הוא 7 צ שם ||

פרק ג

1 | + משענה 33 חגיגה = 49 חגיגה ||

2 | (+ גבור ואיש מלחמה וגו' שר חמשים ונשוא פנים ... [גבור
 ואיש מלחמה 17א] 17ב) גבור ... ואיש (איש 17ב) מלחמה (+ שר
 חמשים 33 <עיינ לקמן> ... שופט ... ונביא (נביא 33) ...
 וקוסם (קוסם 17ב, 33) ... זקן (וזקן 17ב) 17ב = 33 שם =
 49 שם ||

3 | (+ שר חמשים ונשוא פנים 17א) שר חמשים (את"א חמשים 49
 <מלשון חמשה חומשי תורה>; ** חמשים 17ב לוכן בהגדות התלמוד
 בפסוק הקודם; ואפשר שקראו חמשים במקראם) ... שר חמשים ...
 ונשוא (נשוא 33) פנים ... ויועץ (יועץ 33) ... חכם <** חכם>
 ... חרשים <מלשון חרש או מחריש, כי כל השומעים נעשו כחרשים>
 ונברן (נברן 33) <** ונברן, נברן> ... לחש <** לחש?> 17ב
 שם = 33 שם = 49 שם ||

5 | העם הזה 17א שם | ונגש איש באחיו ואיש ברעהו 49 שם ||

6 | כי יתפרש איש באחיו ובית אביו לאמר שימלה לך קצין תהיה לנו
 40א₁ ו גיטין <קרוב בחלקו לחגיגה> | ותפס איש באחיו ...

<הנקודות נוספו ע"י מהדיר גיטין, ויתכן כי כוון לומר שכ"י זה
 גורס ובית אביו לאמר כחבריו; ע"ש > שמל לך קצין תהי לנו 40מ

פרק ב

8-7 | x ותמלא ארצם סרסים ותמלא ארצם כסף וזהב ותמלא ארצם

|| אלילים בנה ||

9 | [את"א] ולו אתה תשא להם 35א | ... [את"א] ולו (את, אתה)

תשא להם 10 = 11 תשא = 14 (641) = 17 ב ילמדנו > עיין

בהערות על יחס הנוסחות זו לזו < | + אל 10 כ שם ||

12 | צבאות ח' 14 דהל מדרש"י, מדר"י (287) | על כל נשא ושפל

3א 3בכס (שירתא ב) [= 14] ||

13 | + על כל ארזי הלבנון 3בא שם | לבנון 3בק שם ||

14 | + על כל ההרים 3בא שם | <ס"ס?> ההרים ח' 3בס שם | x <סעות>

x על ההרים הרמים ועל כל הגבעות הנשאות 3א 3בול (נוזיקין

יז) [::] > בעל המאמר כוון לדברים יב:ב והשלימו המדפיסים

בסעות; עיין בהערות מהדירי המכילתא < | x על כל ההרים הרמים

ועל הגבעות הנשאות 3א 3ב סוטה [::] ||

17 | רישח 7ל (109) | אדם 3א 3באזטכ <כל כ"י מלבד מ' 3ג (שירתא

ב שם) :: 7לזפא₂ יז שם = 12א > יתכן כי רק הדפוסים גורסים

כן; עיין בהערות באבער < 12ב (3:114; 163) = 51 (1:38) ::

36 סנה' (66) | <ס"ס> ושפל רוח אנשים 7ז שם | x נשגב לברו

7ו (910) [::] > יתכן כי כווננו לפסוק יא < ||

18 | יחלופו 39 ש"ר ||

20 | ישליכו איש אלילי כספר וגו' 4פ | x ישליך העם אלילי כספר

12א (97) [::] | את אלילי כספר ואלילי זהבו 32 מדר"י שירתא

ח [= 4] ||

21 | בנקרת הצורים 3א 3ב 3ג (שירתא ח) = 4ח | בנקרות הצור 4פ שם ||

22 | בַּמָּה 17ב סוטה | [את"א] בַּמָּה 17ב שם = 33 סוטה :: 33 ברכות

** חרב תאכלו > כלומר מיני מאכל שקשים לגוף כחרבות תאכלו <
 17 קדושין = 19 קדושין (2:332; 556) [::] | חרב תאכלו (או
 כדמ"ל; ח' 9 עם ישעיה צד 280, 9ל צד 824, 10אא₂) * חרובין
 תאכלו (או כדמ"ל; ח' 9 בדפ צד 280, 10א₁א₂פ) > ** חרב תאכלו <
 9 (280) = 9 (824) = 10 שם = 54 ויק"ר, פדר"כ שם | x ואם
 לא תאבו ומריתם חרב תאכלו > צ"ל תאכל ? < אתכם 2 במ [::] > קרוב
 בחלקו לויק"ר צד תתכד > | פי ח' 2 בד שם :: 9 (280) ||
 21 | צריק 55 מ' השכם | צרק ילין בה * צריק ילין בה 9 ג³ = 35 ג(79) =
 י"ש ח"א רמז קצא בשם פסיקתא > כנראה הפדר"כ < [::] |
 ** צריק 6 פנחס = 11 = 10 = 10 = 10 = 17 = 19 א (2:262)
 19 ב (494) = 35 (84) [= 35 דף עט] ||
 22 | היה ח' 10 פ₁¹ א₁ צש | $\frac{1}{2}$ היר 10 ג שם | $\frac{1}{2}$ מים 10 ג שם ||
 23 | <ט"ס> $\frac{1}{2}$ רחבר 10 א₁ שם | + חברי 10 $\frac{1}{1}$ אש $\frac{1}{2}$ צ שם | + רודף
 10 פ שם | $\frac{1}{2}$ ררין אלמנה 10 א₁ שם ||
 24 | $\frac{1}{2}$ מצריר 10 א שם | $\frac{1}{2}$ מאויביר 10 א שם | <ט"ס> $\frac{1}{2}$ מצרי ...
 (+ ראנקמה א₂) ומאויבי 10 צא₂ שם ||
 26 | ÷ ראחרי כן (ראח"כ צ) 10 אפנז שם ||
 27 | <ט"ס> תפרה ח' 30 ש"ר ||
 30 | <ט"ס> + וכאלה 3 בק | <ט"ס> x כתאנה נובלת עליה 32 מדר"י
 || [3 =]

פרק א

- 1 | $\langle \text{ט"ס} \rangle \times \text{בימי חזקיהו ירתם אחז יחזקיהו 9 פ} ||$
- 2 | $\div \text{האזיני 13 ב} = 6 \text{ האזינו} ||$
- 3 | $\div \frac{1}{2} \text{ ועמי 2 בד} ||$
- 4 | $[\text{את"א}] \text{ עיזבור (עוזבור 11) 6 בחקותי} = 11 = 17 \text{ ב} ||$
- 5 | $\div \text{כל לבב 10 צפ} ||$
- 9 | $\div \text{כי לולי ה' צבאר 45 מ"ת (7; 10:27)} ||$
- 10 | $\div \text{סדרם ח' 10 א} ||$
- 11 | $\text{רב ח' 17 א} | \langle \text{ט"ס?} \rangle \text{ זבחכם 40 מ ברכות} :: 50 \text{ מ' תדשא} ||$
- 12 | $\text{מפני 17 חגיגה} ||$
- 15 | $\text{כי יריכם 16 במבוא} | \langle \text{ט"ס?} \rangle \text{ ידיהם 10 א} ||$
- 18 | $\text{נא ח' 36 פדר"כ, ויק"ר} \langle \text{ע"ש} \rangle (762) | \frac{1}{2} \text{ ה' צבאר 33 שבת}$
- 19 | $[::] | \div \text{ואם יהיר 9 כ} (633) [= 36] | ** \text{כשנים 7} = 11 \text{ ויחי}$
- 20 | $[::] | \langle \text{סביר} \rangle \text{כשני 9 ד} (7) [::] :: 10 \text{ א} (154) [= 9 \text{ צד } 633]$
- 21 | $:: 54 \text{ משנה שבת (415)} :: \frac{1}{2} 25 \text{ יומא} \langle \text{נדרש כלפנינו בתלמוד} \rangle | \text{ואם}$
- 22 | $\text{יארומר (ואם רגר' א) 9 אבכ (633)} = 11 \text{ אמור} :: 9 \text{ ד} (7) :: 17 \text{ ב}$
- 23 | $\text{שבת} [= 33] :: \frac{1}{2} 25 \text{ יומא שם} = + 25 \text{ שבת} = 17 \text{ ב} ||$
- 24 | $\frac{1}{2} \text{ רשמעתם ח' 54 ספרי (654)} \langle \text{הספרי קרוב בחלקו לויק"ר צד תתכד} \rangle ||$
- 25 | $\text{אם תמאנו 3 בטכ} :: 9 \text{ פ} (280) = 9 \text{ טלם} (824) = 10 \text{ צ} (241) :: +$
- 26 | $17 \langle \text{הציון אומר סיפרי, וכוון לספרי זברים סוף פיסקא מ,}$
- 27 | $\text{שמשם שאב המדה"ג השיטה שרמזתי אליה במאמר הקודם, אך ההבאה}$
- 28 | $\text{מפסוק כ נמצא כשיטה לקוחה מד"ר ד:ב, וסגנון כל המאמר קרוב}$
- 29 | $\text{ללשון ד"ר, ונראה צריך לציין ד"ר תחת ספרי; השוה הנוסחאות} |$

APPARATUS

195.

195.

NOTES

TO THE APPARATUS

195.

1:2 ׳י׳יִןִן

So Kenn. 195.

1:3 ׳דִּיִּן

So LXX, Peshitta, Targum c, Vulgate Sc, comm. BW on Is 1:3, comm. 2 p. 271 on Is 17:9-10, comm. p. 351 on Is 27:11, 1QIs^a, Kenn. 56, 76, 93, 95, 96, 109, 150, 151, 168, 187, 191, 196, 224, 249, 384; primo 72: de Rossi primo 2, 16, 20, 226, 265, 305, 380, 419, 440, 554, 594, 596; ut videtur 262; munc 230; primo exteri collationis 1, 65: Ginsburg 16, 24, 26, 30, 31, 32: Ibn Ezra. The apparent addition of waw in the LXX may be due to no more than a desire to accommodate the translation to normal Greek expression, and the addition in the Vulgate, Jerome's commentary and the Peshitta may possibly be due to a similar cause. The LXX, Peshitta, Vulgate Sc, and comm. BW on this verse have the equivalent of ׳אִיִּן׳ instead of the reading ׳אִי׳ of the MT just before this, and it seems unlikely that such a reading would be due to anything more than translation-technique. Nevertheless, the readings of ms. c of the Targum, the Hebrew mss. listed above, and the quotation in Ibn Ezra's commentary, taken together give very good evidence that the addition of waw is not due to mechanical error on the part of a copyist, but was taken over, consciously or unconsciously, from Biblical mss. with the same reading. Whether the reading was present in the original text of the Sifre is another matter.

1:5 (גגג) גג

So 1QIs^a.

1:11 דגגג

So Kenn. 258. It would be just possible to take this word as a collective noun, but probably the omission of yod is no more than a mistake in both ms. Kenn. 258 and the midrash.

1:15 (גג'ג') ג

So LXX except 87* 46 Bo Chr, Targum, Vulgate c, comm. p. 61 on Is 4:4, comm. M p. 679 on Is 59:3-4, comm. p. 682 on Is 59:7-8. The translations in these three passages of Jerome's commentary differ from the MT, the LXX, the Vulgate, and each other. The addition in the LXX is probably due to a desire for clearness on the part of the translator, and the requirements of Greek sentence-construction. The reading of edition c of the Vulgate may have a similar cause, or may even be due to the influence of the LXX; in any case, it probably does not go back to Jerome. The origin of the addition in Jerome's commentary is obscure. The reading of the Targum probably reflects a variant reading in the Hebrew.

1:18 גג גג

So LXX except L, Peshitta, Vulgate, comm. The Targum is inconclusive.

Hoi Ereis = MT

1:18 (ר'ה') דא

So LXX and Peshitta.

1:18 ר'ד

This reading is certainly a mistake in Yerushalmi Yoma, where the form ד'ר' is deliberately re-interpreted as being derived from ר'ד, and is probably due to the accidental omission of the sign of abbreviation by the printers. The reading may well be a scribal mistake in Wayyiqra Rabbah and the Pesiqta deRav Kahana under the influence of the numerous other passages of the Bible where this word is used in the singular, as compared to the solitary other passage, Pr 31:21, where it is used in the plural.

The singular form is found in lQIs^a, Kenn. 224, 384: de Rossi primo 262, 721; Isaias Polyglottus Basileae excusus sine anno: Ginsburg 38. The Versions are inconclusive.

1:18 (ר'דא') דא

So LXX, Arabic Version, Symmachus according to Field but not according to Ziegler, Peshitta, Targum c 737, Vulgate, Jerome's commentary, Kenn. 18, 50, 56, 72, 95, 96, 107, 125, 126, 150, 170, 173, 175, 181, 182, 210, 384; primo 114, 128, 154, 172; de Rossi 1 in Apht., 4, 26, 187, 200, 226, 230, 248, 264, 341, 384, 443, 486, 518, 547, 562, 592, 614, 674, 789, 850, 851; primo 1 in textu, 6, 16, 20, 24, 262, 291, 295, 463, 543, 575, 594, 656, 667, 715, 721, 815; nunc 174, 413, 554; Prophetae Soncinenses 1486, Pentateuchus antiquus membr. in 4. in Aphtar.,

Machazor Soncin. 1486, Machazor aliud Soncin. sec. XV; in codicum numero plures hispani: Ginsburg 3, 4, 10, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 24, 33, 49, 52, 58, 62, 69, 70; ed. I.

IQIs^a is uncertain.

1:20 (יִצְחָק) אָח

So Eusebius (not quoted by Ziegler), Vulgate, comm., Kenn. 245.

1:20 יִצְחָק אָח (אָח)

So LXX and Peshitta. Similarly, the LXX further reinforces the parallelism between verse 20 and verse 19 by reading mēde eisakousēte mou, the literal equivalent of (אָח) אָחֵיכֶם שְׁמַעְתֶּם, for וְדַרְשִׁיתֶם, and reinforces the parallelism between verse 18 cd and verse 18ef by removing the chiasm and reading kai ean ōsin hai hamartiai hymōn hōs phoinikoun hōs chiona leukanō, ean de ōsin hōs kokkinon hōs erion leukanō (neglecting minor variants in the manuscripts), which translated literally into Hebrew would be וְאִם יִהְיוּ חַטָּאֵיכֶם כְּשֵׁנִים כַּשֵּׁלֶג וְאִם יִהְיוּ כְּחֹלֶעַץ כְּצִמְרֵי יִלְבִּינּוּ.

The variants in the LXX may be due to translation-technique rather than to actual variants in the Hebrew text used by the translator, and the variant in the Peshitta may be due to the influence of the LXX. On the other hand, even if the variant in the Peshitta is due to the influence of the LXX, it seems unlikely that the same substitution of יִצְחָק אָח for יִצְחָק should have happened independently in both the LXX and the Sifre; and it seems too much of a coincidence that the Peshitta

should have been influenced by a LXX text so rich in variants from the MT only in the one word where such a variant is independently supported by a third source. It is therefore quite possible, although it can not be proven, that at least the substitution of $\text{לֹא תִּיָּאָדָּרְךָ}$ for $\text{לֹא תִּיָּאָדָּרְךָ}$ is due to a variant in the LXX translator's Hebrew text, and that the Peshitta reading is independent support for the existence of such a variant in a Hebrew text.

For $\text{לֹא תִּיָּאָדָּרְךָ}$ the Vulgate and Jerome's commentary have nolueritis. This would normally represent $\text{לֹא תִּיָּאָדָּרְךָ}$, but in this verse it may be meant as a contrast to uolueritis, which translates $\text{לֹא תִּיָּאָדָּרְךָ}$ in the previous verse, and so may be meant to represent $\text{לֹא תִּיָּאָדָּרְךָ}$, in which case the Vulgate must be counted as a fourth witness to the existence of the reading.

Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion = MT.

1:20 $\text{חָרַבְתָּ אֶתְכֶם (צ"ל תִּיָּאָדָּרְךָ) אֶתְכֶם}$

The reading אֶתְכֶם in ms. D is given as such in the apparatus to the Sifre, but the reading $\text{לֹא תִּיָּאָדָּרְךָ}$ is only to be inferred by the lack of any indication of a contrary reading. The word אֶתְכֶם implies that the verb is active and has חָרַבְתָּ as its subject, so that a reading $\text{לֹא תִּיָּאָדָּרְךָ}$ is required. Considering the known deficiencies of the apparatus to the Sifre¹, it seems possible that a note of the reading $\text{לֹא תִּיָּאָדָּרְךָ}$ in this ms. has been omitted.

1:20 פִּי הוּא

So Kenn. 151. The Targum has $\text{אֲרִי בְּמִיָּמָרָא דִּי הוּא}$

for 'ה' ד' ד', which may represent the reading of the MT, but since the Targum freely inserts the word X7D'D, this is by no means certain.

1:21 ק'7צ

The texts of the first group, the Tanhuma and its parallels, all contain the sentence "No-one stayed in Jerusalem overnight with sins unforgiven" (the reason being that the Tamid sacrifice effected atonement) and then quote the phrase הַן י'7' ק'7צ from Is 1:21 as a proof-text for this statement. Although the reading of the MT could be applied here, the reading ק'7צ seems to be much more appropriate. In any case, the explicit testimony of the Pesiqta Rabbati and the quotation of the Pesiqta deRav Kahana in the Yalqut Shim'oni leaves no doubt that the author of the derash either knew of such a reading or deliberately produced it.

The derash in the Midrash Hashkem does not favour either reading against the other

Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion = MT.

1:22 'ה' ה'7

So LXX

Aquila and Symmachus = MT.

1:22 ו'ג

So 1QIs^a.

Aquila and Symmachus = MT

1:22 ו'ד

The LXX, Aquila (Ziegler emends to agree with the MT), Symmachus, Theodotion, Vulgate and Jerome's commentary all translate the word without any preposition, but it is quite likely that all of these Versions, with the exception of Aquila, really represent the same reading as the MT, since it would be natural in Greek and Latin to express the idea of the Hebrew without any preposition. Aquila, however, would certainly have inserted a preposition in his Greek translation if he had had one in his Hebrew text. Ziegler does not seem to have any reason for emending Aquila's reading other than the possibility of influence from the quotations of Symmachus and Theodotion and the evidence of the MT.

The Peshitta is inconclusive.

1:23 חגב

This reading is only possible if חגב is interpreted as חבל, an association, so that חגב חגב would mean "a band of thieves". The derash, however, assumes the reading of the MT, since it glosses the phrase as meaning those who associate with thieves. The reading is probably due to scribal error, perhaps under the influence of the following words חגב and חגב.

1:23 קרינ

So LXX, Vulgate, comm., Kenn. 150, 244, 294, 384.

1:23 קרינ

So Kenn. 384 (קרינ). lQIs^a has קרינ. The LXX reading diokontes may represent קרינ or קרינ. The reading sequuntur in the Vulgate and Jerome's commentary may represent קרינ, קרינ, or קרינ.

1:23 קרי

So Targum K^d. Some mss. of the Sacra Parallela omit kai before krisin, which may indicate a Hebrew reading קרי or קרי, but the omission may be merely an inner-Greek change.

1:23 קרי

So apparently LXX (kai krisin) and Peshitta (קרי).

1:24 קרי...קרי

The MT refers to God's enemies. If these readings are correct, they must refer to Israel's enemies. The derash is intelligible in either case.

lQIs^a reads קרי...קרי.

Aquila reads קרי, and so presumably read קרי... as well.

1:24 קרי

This reading seems to be syntactically impossible. Ms. 3 begins the quotation at this point, so the addition of waw could easily be due to scribal error, but ms. 2^x quotes the verb קרי... as well, and it is puzzling that such a reading should have crept into its text.

1:26] כ ׀ ׀ ׀ ׀ ׀

It is quite likely that this variant has been induced by the method of quotation. The verse is quoted phrase by phrase, each phrase being followed by a comment. The scribe could easily have mistaken these words for an introductory formula for the quotation of the last part of the verse. The use of the standard abbreviation by the scribe of ms. 1 makes it almost certain that he, at least, thought that these words were a technical formula and did not realize that they were part of the Biblical text. Compare the readings 'DIX, 'DIXI, 7DIXI in Is 25:9, which are probably due to the same cause.

The addition of waw is supported by the LXX, the Arabic Version, Peshitta GWLMU = ABDFT² iklmnostovxyz and probably N¹, Targum bogcf N, Kenn. 30, 56, 95, 96, 109, 111, 145, 150, 187, 191, 196, 223, 228, 253, 384; primo 82, 136; nunc 72: de Rossi 16, 230, 262, 419, 554, 715; primo 2, 11, 20, 226, 380, 440, 594, 663, 721; nunc 547, 562: Ginsburg 19, 24, 27, 38, 41.

1:30 ׀ ׀ ׀ ׀ ׀

This reading is syntactically impossible, and could only have arisen because the quotation begins with this word. The Versions, including Aquila according to Eus. and hoi loipoi according to Fr., agree with the MT.

1:30 (׀ ׀ ׀ ׀ ׀) כחאנה

The text quotes] ׀ ׀ ׀ ׀ ׀ from Is 34:4, immediately before, and the reading here is probably due to contamination from the

next phrase in Is 34:4, וְכִנְבַלְתָּ סִתְאֹנָה, which must have been in the author's mind, and might even have been quoted in his text of the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el.

Aquila and Symmachus = MT.

2:7-8 אַרְבָּע

The reading with the plural suffix is supported by the LXX, Peshitta, and Targum, but all of these translations may be influenced by the plurals of v.6.

2:9 לֹא

Targum f reads לֹא or אֵין without waw.

Aquila and Symmachus = MT.

2:9 לֹא אֵין תִּשָּׂא קִהָם, לֹא (לֹא, לֹא) תִּשָּׂא קִהָם

The relevant texts are: the Yalqut Mechiri on Is 2:9, quoting the Yelammedenu; the Printed Tanhuma, Ki Tissa per. 4; the Pesiqta deRav Kahana p. 18; a quotation of the Tanhuma, Yelammedenu, or Pesiqta deRav Kahana in the Midrash Haggadol on Ex 30:12, p. 641; and the Pesiqta Rabbati leaf 37. All of these texts except the Pesiqta Rabbati agree nearly word for word with each other, and probably all quote from the same original. The Pesiqta Rabbati has enough verbal agreement with the other texts to show that it, too, quotes from the same original, but with the addition of other material, and apparently with the preservation of a more original form of the derash than in the other texts.

Mss. (יטעיה) אקש of the Pesiqta deRav Kahana, and the Pesiqta Rabbati give the derash in the name of R. Yonatan (the Pesiqta Rabbati adds: deVet Guvrin); the Printed Tanhuma and the Yelammedenu give it in the name of R. Ya'aqov (the Printed Tanhuma adds: bar Yohai) in the name of R. Yonatan; mss. (תשא) צכש of the Pesiqta deRav Kahana, and the Midrash Haggadol, give it in the name of R. Yohanan; ms. א of the Pesiqta deRav Kahana gives it in the name of R. Yonah. The attribution to R. Yonatan is correct; see Ish Shalom on the Pesiqta Rabbati note 64. The attribution to R. Yohanan or R. Yonah is probably due to wrong expansion of an abbreviation, and in the case of R. Yonah, to the mention of the name in the immediate context. Judging from the evidence of the names, it appears that the Midrash Haggadol probably copies from the Pesiqta deRav Kahana rather than the Tanhuma or Yelammedenu.

The Yelammedenu quotation in the Yalqut Mechiri reads as follows:

ר' יעקב בשם ר' יונתן פתח וישח אדם וישפל איש ואל תשא להם.
 וישח אדם אלו ישראל שני ואתן צאני צאן מרעיתי אדם אתן (יחז'
 לד:לא). וישפל איש זה משה שני והאיש משה עזר מאד (במ' יב:ג)
 אמר משה רבון העולמים יודע אני ששחו ישראל לעגל והושפלתני אני
 ואל תשא להם, א"ל תשא להם, א"ל כי תשא את ראש בני ישראל (סמות
 ל:יב)

Most of the variations in wording in the Tanhuma, Pesiqta deRav Kahana, and Midrash Haggadol are slight and unimportant, except the various forms of the phrase א"ל תשא להם א"ל, which, as will be shown below, are very important. The readings are as follows:

א' לר' אשא להם (+ כדכתיב ז) פדר"כ כ"י אצק
 ח' פדר"כ כ"י אכש
 אלא (אל ה) תשא להם מדה"ג

אמר ליה תשא להם אמר ליה תנחומא
 א"ל תשא להם דה"ד הגהה לתנחומא בעץ יוסף
 א"ל נוסח אחר של התנחומא טובא בעץ יוסף

The Pesiqta Rabbati differs greatly, and will be quoted below.

What is meant here can be clearly seen from the fuller text of the Pesiqta Rabbati. When Israel made the golden calf, Moses's status was diminished because his condition was dependent on theirs; later, when Mosēs was restored to his original status, he asked that Israel, too, should be restored, and God granted his request and gave permission for Moses to rehabilitate Israel in the words of Ex 30:12, where the expression **וְאָרְבָּה נַפְשֵׁי** is interpreted not as "make a census", but in its other meaning of "raise from ignominy, rehabilitate". See the 'Es Yosef on the Printed Tanḥuma for further details.

The Pesiqta Rabbati breaks this derash of R. Yonatan's up into two parts, making it the introduction and conclusion to a composite passage taken from various authorities, partly anonymous. The first half of R. Yonatan's derash is quoted in his name at the top of p. 37a, and then anonymously half-way down the page and then anonymously half-way down p. 37b; the second half is quoted, in the name of R. Yonatan, immediately after the last anonymous quotation of the first half. The Pesiqta Rabbati has the second half of the derash in a much longer form than the other texts. I quote the second half of R. Yonatan's derash as found in the Pesiqta Rabbati p. 37b lines 13-20:

מִיָּד בָּא לּוֹ מִשָּׁה אֲצִל הַקַּב"ה אָמַר לוֹ רַב־שִׁיעַ כְּשֶׁהִשְׁפֵּלַת אֶרְתָּם אֵף אֲנִי
 נִשְׁפֵּלְתִי עִמָּהֶם. שׁוֹאֵמֵר וְיִשְׁחַ אָדָם וְיִשְׁפֵּל אִישׁ זֶה מִשָּׁה. וְעַכְשָׁו שׁוֹקֵפֵת

ראשי אף כך רומם ראשם. אמר לו הקב"ה לך רומם ראשם. א"ר יונתן
 דבית (גבריו) [גוברין] אמר לאו רבוני אלא כשם שזקפת כך אתה
 תלה ראשם של בניך. מניין שנאמר ואל תשא להם אל תהי קורא ואל
 אלא ולו אתה תשא להם את ראשם. אמר לו הקב"ה לאו אלא אני זקפתי
 את ראשך (לו) [כך] אף אני אזקיף את ראשם של בניי כי תשא את ראש
 בני ישראל (שמות ל:יב)

Ish Shalom explains the 'al-tigre reading by saying that the letters
 of ואל are re-arranged as לוּא, and that ואל תשא is then read
 as לוּא תשא. The difficulty with this explanation is that
 such a two-step mechanism seems over-complicated and artificial. Never-
 theless, the text of the Pesiqta Rabbati as it stands does not admit
 any other explanation. Perhaps R. Yonatan read (וּלְא) ואל in his
 Hebrew text, in which case the 'al-tigre reading would be more natural,
 but with the limited textual basis for re-constructing his intention
 this suggestions must remain as more than conjecture. In any case, the
 general intent of the 'al-tigre reading is clear.

This 'al-tigre-reading makes the quotation of ואל תשא להם
 agree very well with the derash in its longer form in the Pesiqta Rabbati.
 There seems to be no reason for doubting that it goes back to R. Yonatan
 himself, and was not invited by the compilers of the Pesiqta Rabbati or
 by the editors of any source it might have quoted from. It will be
 remembered that R. Yonatan's words are used as the introduction and
 conclusion to other material. The only material in the second half of
 R. Yonatan's derash that is not already given in great detail in the
 middle, anonymous section is the 'al-tigre reading, and if R. Yonatan

had not invented it, or if it had not been transmitted by him, there would have been no reason for quoting him at all.

The 'al-tiqre reading may be used to throw light on the text of R. Yonatan's derash in the Yelammednu and its parallels. There is, however, one objection that must be answered before doing so. Ish Shalom finds in the Pesiqta Rabbati a discussion between God and Moses as to which one of them should rehabilitate Israel, and explains the point of the 'al-tiqre reading as being in the world לְפָנָי ; as if Moses should say to God 'Remove thou their ignominy thyself'; if Ish Shalom is correct then the 'al-tiqre reading could not be applied to the other texts, which know nothing of such a discussion. There are three answers to this objection: the first is that such a discussion is rather pointless, since Moses's authority comes from God, and God has chosen to make his will known through the intermediary, Moses; the second is that it would be quite possible to read $\text{לְפָנָי} \text{ (תָּא) תָּא} \text{ לְפָנָי}$ without any stress on the word לְפָנָי or without any implication of a contrast between what God should do and what Moses should do; the third is that the Pesiqta Rabbati probably does not refer to such a discussion at all. To explain what is meant by this last statement, let us consider Ish Shalom's interpretation of the passage: Moses asks God to rehabilitate Israel (line 15); God gives Moses permission to do it himself (lines 15-16); Moses asks God to do it himself (lines 16-18); God changes his declared plan, and says that just as he rehabilitated Moses, so will he rehabilitate Israel (lines 18-19). What Ish Shalom fails to mention is that immediately after all this we find as the conclusion of the passage a quotation of Ex 30:12, where God commands Moses to rehabilitate

Israel. The analysis is accordingly untenable. Moreover, this analysis depends on taking the material in lines 15-16 derived from the anonymous section and the material in lines 16-20 quoted in the name of R. Yonatan as being interdependent, a precarious assumption.

It seems preferable to assume that just as the first half of R. Yonatan's derash is an introduction to the anonymous section and at the same time a parallel version of part of it, the second half of his derash is meant to be a conclusion to it and a parallel version of the rest of the material. The anonymous section ends with Israel's request to God to rehabilitate them, and God's command to Moses to do so. The second half of R. Yonatan's derash is then quoted for the sake of its 'al-tiqre reading to give further information on Moses's request to God and God's answer. According to this analysis, the word לֹא in Moses's speech to God, (line 16) and the same word in God's speech to Moses, (line 18) are not meant to express contradiction of what has been said, but to express rejection of the idea of leaving Israel in their condition at the time: the lines 16-20 (from וְיִתְּנֶנּוּ onwards) must be treated as a repetition of the content of lines 13-16 (from וְיִתְּנֶנּוּ to וְיִתְּנֶנּוּ) quoted solely for the sake of the 'al-tiqre reading and the quotation of Ex 30:12.

The text of R. Yonatan's derash in the Yelammedenu and its parallels differs in two important respects from the text in the Pesiqta Rabbati. The first is the omission of some words after וְיִתְּנֶנּוּ similar in content to the words $\text{אֵלָּא כִּלְמֵם שׁוֹקֶפֶת כִּךְ אַתָּה תִּלְהָרְאֵם שֶׁל בְּנֵיךְ}$. The omission of these words seems to be a mistake, since the argument

becomes very obscure without them.

The second difference is that the Yelammedenu and its parallels have the phrase ל"א ל תשא להם or similar expressions after the quotation of Is 2:9 and before the quotation of Ex 30:12, whereas the Pesiqta Rabbati has a longer and apparently unrelated text instead. The phrase ל"א ל תשא להם or its equivalents seems to be corrupt. The expression ל"א is too abrupt for a Tanhuma or Yelammedenu text, which would normally have ל"א ל הקב"ה (as does the Pesiqta Rabbati), or something similar. The whole phrase is unnecessary, as has been seen by the scribes of mss. פד"א of the Pesiqta deRav Kahana and the Tanhuma mss. mentioned by the 'Es Yosef, who have omitted them. In fact, the phrase looks suspiciously like a repetition of the previous quotation of Is 2:9, with ל"א altered to ל"א and then ל"א ל תשא להם . Notice that ms. א of the Midrash Haggadol reads ל"א and that the reading ל"א ל תשא להם may be derived from it. It seems unlikely that if ל"א had been the original reading, it would have been altered to the more obscure readings of the Midrash Haggadol.

The third difference is the omission of any reference to the 'al-tigre reading. This would seem to be a mistake as well. The 'al-tigre reading is almost certainly original, as we have seen, and seems to be needed for a complete understanding of the derash. Without it,

ל"א ל תשא להם must be taken as a rhetorical question, which is possible, but much less forceful and artistic than the 'al-tigre reading. As the Yelammedenu and its parallels follow the same source as the Pesiqta Rabbati in their quotation of the first half of the derash, and

as their other divergences from the Pesiqta Rabbati in the second half appear to be due to corruption, the omission of the 'al-tiqre reading is likely to be due to corruption too.

The reference to the 'al-tiqre reading seems to have been omitted by mistake in the Yelammedenu and its parallels. It remains to determine the mechanism of the omission. I suggest that the various forms of the phrase $\square \text{ל} \text{תשא} \text{ל} \text{הם}$ are a corrupt remnant of R. Yonatan's 'al-tiqre reading, and that we should substitute ל or $\text{ל} \text{א}$ or $\text{א} \text{ל}$ (with shureq) for $\text{ל} \text{א}$ or $\text{ל} \text{א}$. If the 'al-tiqre reading had been quoted immediately after the quotation Is 2:9 without any introductory formula to show what it was, so that the text read $\text{ל} \text{א} \text{ל} \text{תשא}$ $\square \text{ל} \text{תשא} \text{ל} \text{הם}$ (ל) ל $\square \text{ל}$, later scribes could easily have failed to recognize it and tried to correct it. There are two possible lines of correction. ל or $\text{ל} \text{א}$ could have been read as ל with holem, and corrected to ל 'א, as in mss. $\text{ק} \text{א}$ of the Pesiqta deRav Kahana. This could then have been rewritten as $\text{ל} \text{א}$ and $\text{א} \text{מ} \text{ר} \text{ל} \text{י} \text{ה}$. Alternatively, the scribe could have taken $\square \text{ל} \text{תשא} \text{ל} \text{הם}$ (ל) ל א as a repetition of the quotation of Is 2:9, and corrected $\text{ל} \text{א}$ to $\text{א} \text{ל}$ in agreement with the MT. This would then have become $\text{ל} \text{א}$, ל 'א, and $\text{א} \text{מ} \text{ר} \text{ל} \text{י} \text{ה}$. The presence of the supposed intermediate reading $\text{א} \text{ל}$, and another reading $\text{א} \text{ל} \text{א}$ which seems to be derived from it, in the Midrash Haggadol would indicate that the second explanation is the correct one.

A third explanation, but only applicable to the Midrash Haggadol, is that $\text{א} \text{ל}$ (read with shureq) was directly altered to $\text{א} \text{ל} \text{א}$, but

as the corruption seems to go back to the ancestor of all the texts this last explanation is unlikely.

The difficulty in assuming such an 'al-tiqre reading in the texts other than the Pesiqta Rabbati is that the mechanism of corruption probably depends on an original reading $\square\eta\tau \text{ } \aleph\tau\eta$ ($\aleph\aleph\tau$, $\aleph\tau$) $\tau\tau$, without the addition of $\eta\aleph$. The difficulty is not serious, however, since it would be quite possible to read $(\aleph\tau)$ $\aleph\tau$ with shureq without removing the 'alef, so that the addition of the word $\eta\aleph$ would not be needed.

If R. Yonatan's Hebrew text differed from the MT at all, it was probably only to the extent of reading $(\aleph\tau\tau)$ $\aleph\tau$ for $\tau\aleph\tau$, and even that deviation is uncertain. For this reason, the Versions and mss. do not provide much information, particularly since the difference between $\aleph\tau\eta \text{ } \aleph\tau$ and $\aleph\tau\eta \text{ } \tau\aleph\tau$ interpreted as negative imperatives would not show in any of the Versions except Aquila.

Aquila agrees with the MT in reading $\tau\aleph\tau$. The LXX has kai ou mē anēsō, which would be $\aleph\aleph\aleph \text{ } \aleph\tau$ if literally retroverted, with the verb taken as negative indicative, not negative imperative. It is uncertain whether the Hebrew text obtained by retroversion corresponds to the reading of the Hebrew text used by the translator, or whether the translator is trying to explain the Hebrew by a slight alteration in wording. The other Versions, including Symmachus, translate with negative imperatives, and could have read either $\tau\aleph\tau$ or $\aleph\tau$.

Ms. Kenn. 30 reads $\aleph\tau\eta \text{ } \aleph\tau$ for $\aleph\tau\eta \text{ } \tau\aleph\tau$

The whole phrase is omitted in 1QIs^a

2:12 צבאות ה'

So Peshitta.

2:13 על(כל ארזי)

So Targum K.

2:14 ההרים ח'

The omission is probably due to the similarity of ההרים and הרמים.

2:14

Is 2:14 reads ועל כל ההרים הרמים ועל כל הגבעות הנשאות

Dt 12:2 reads על ההרים הרמים ועל הגבעות. The manuscripts and the first edition read על ההרים הרמים וגו' (וכו' ק)

The later editions read על ההרים הרמים ועל כל הגבעות הנשאות

A quotation of Dt 12:2 is demanded by the context; the completion of the verse as if from Isaiah is a mistake of the editors of the later editions, who did not see the reason for quoting this verse.

2:14 על ההרים הרמים ועל הגבעות הנשאות

LXX C⁻³⁰⁹ and Kenn. 4, 650B omit the first כל; Kenn. 96, 130, 145, 650B omit the second כל. The context demands a verse that

contains both $\aleph\omega$ and $\aleph\eta$, so Is 2:14 is obviously meant, but the deviations from the MT may be caused by conflation with Dt 12:2, so that the support for the omission of $\aleph\delta$ in Kennicott's mss. may only be due to coincidence. See the previous article for another example of confusion between Dt 12:2 and Is 2:14.

2:17 $\aleph\psi\aleph$

So $\aleph\Omega$ Is^a. This reading may be due to the influence of v.9.

The Versions are inconclusive.

2:17 $\aleph\aleph$

So Kenn. 4, 25, 226, 651. This reading may be due to the influence of vv. 9 and 11.

The Versions are inconclusive. $\aleph\Omega$ Is^a is mutilated here.

2:18 $\aleph\aleph\aleph$

So $\aleph\Omega$ Is^a ($\aleph\aleph\aleph$) and Kenn. 224 ($\aleph\aleph\aleph$). The LXX, Peshitta, Targum, Vulgate, and Jerome's commentary translate with plural verbs, but this could be due to the influence of the preceding plural noun. Compare the next article.

2:20 $\aleph\aleph\aleph$

The Peshitta translates $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ ואת אלי לי כספו ואת אלי לי

נשדון אנשא פתכרא דדהבא ודמאמא דעבדו as וזהב

(ו לָהוּן) (דַּעֲבָד) (A few minor variants not affecting the difference between singular and plural are omitted). The Targum translates יִרְחִיקוּן בְּנֵי אֱנֹשָׁא יִתְטַעֲרוּת כְּסַפְהוּן וְיִתְטַעֲרוּת דְּהַבְהוּן

דַּעֲבָדוּ לָהוּן. Both of these translations may depend on a Hebrew reading יִשְׁלִיכוּ הָאֲדָם (not אִיִּשׁ). The translators of the Targum could have translated הָאֲדָם by אֱנֹשָׁא if they had wanted to use a singular verb, and the combination of a plural verb with a singular subject in the Peshitta can most easily be explained as due to the same combination in the translators' Hebrew text. Against this explanation, however, it must be pointed out that the use of a plural verb with אֱנֹשָׁא is very unnatural, that the verb could have become plural in the Peshitta and Targum under the influence of the other plurals in this verse and the previous one, and that the only difference between the written form of אֱנֹשָׁא singular and plural in Syriac is in the pointing.

2:20 וְאֵלֵי לִי זָהָב

So Kenn. 224.

The Targum agrees with the MT. The other Versions are inconclusive.

2:21 בְּנִקְרָא

So Kenn. 1, 23, 30, 72, 96, 115, 155, 168, 175, 182, 210, 227, 242, 245, 246, 247, 252, 258, 260, 264.

Mss. vP of the Targum point the word as a plural. Sperber does not give the pointing of the editions bog, but the Targum text in the

Miqra'ot Gedolot points the word as a singular. Ms. z points it as a plura. Sperber does not give the pointing of the other mss.

2:21 7137

So LXX and Peshitta.

2:22 702

The Vulgate and Jerome's commentary have the reading, but with a favourable connotation: (quia) excelsus (est ipse). Compare Jerome's comments on the possibilities of reading and interpretation here:

'Verbum Hebraicum bama uel hypsōma dicitur, id est excelsum, quod et in Regnorum libris et in Hiezechiele legimus. Vel certe in quo et eisdem litteris scribitur beth, mem, he ac pro locorum qualitate, si uoluerimus legere: in quo dicimus bamma; sin autem: excelsum uel excelsus, legimus, bama. Intellegentes ergo Iudaei prophetiam esse de Christo, uerbum ambiguum in deteriorem partem interpretati sunt, ut uiderentur non laudare Christum, sed nihili pendere'

There is no mention of Jesus in this passage from the Talmud: either Jerome had access to a derash that is no longer extant, or he was misled by his own preconceptions.

LXX V L'' -46-233 C 403' 770 Syh Eus. Chr. Tht. = MT. Other LXX witnesses do not quote the phrase in which this word occurs. Aquila according to Q Hi.^{lat.}, hoi loipoi according to Syh Bas. = MT.

3:2 (דלחמה) שיא

So LXX 106, 87-91 301 407 613. It is possible that the reading of these manuscripts is due to an inner-Greek change. For 7721 these manuscripts, as well as most of the others, have giganta kai ischyonta. It would be natural to make a pause after this phrase, in which case the following kai could easily be omitted.

Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion = MT.

3:2 (ראיש מלחמה) שר חמשים

The wording of the passage as it stands in the Haggadot Hattalmud presupposes this reading, but the wording in the Yalqut Mechiri and the printed editions presupposes the reading of the MT. There is no evidence of textual corruption in any of the texts.

Notice that LXX Tht. Cyr.^(lem) have giganta kai archonta for 7721 and might have read 771 7721.

3:2 קסד

So Targum A (but as a quotation of a single word).

3:3 חכח

Vulgate AC omit et before their translation of this word, but their evidence must be treated with caution, since the Vulgate witnesses are not consistent in their use of et in vv. 2-4; see the apparatus to the Vulgate.

3:3 רחכם

For the treatment of רחכם and חרשים as two separate items, compare Kenn. 30 רחכם וחרש (i.e. presumably רחש וחרש). See the next article, and compare the treatment of נבון and לחש as two separate items.

3:3 נבון

So Peshitta u.

Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion = MT.

3:3 לחש... נבון

With these two words treated as separate items, לחש must refer to a person, not a quality, which indicate that it was read as לחש. For the treatment of these words as separate items, compare the treatment of רחכם חרשים in the same derash.

3:5 (איש) באחיו

This reading may be due to the influence of v. 6.

3:6 (אביו) ובית

So LXX Bo Bas. All other LXX witnesses except ms. 26 have e tou oikeyiou, which might represent the same Hebrew reading.

LXX 26 = MT.

3:6 דַּמְרָא (דְּבַר אֲבִיךָ)

So LXX (οΙ prefixes —), Targum bctgov FN, Vulgate S in the Polyglotten Bibel, Kenn. 30, 182, 650B. The Peshitta has דְּבַר דַּמְרָא, and the Arabic Version has דְּבַר דַּמְרָא. Both of these translations may represent a reading דַּמְרָא

3:6 דְּבַר

So 1QIs^a, Kenn. 1, 4, 30, 89, 96, 112, 126, 141, 150, 158, 175, 182, 224, 245, 249, 250, 252, 253, 258, 260, 286, 650B; primo 17, 82, 130; de Rossi 2, 4, 226, 305, 380, 518, 554, 596, 667, 789; primo 440; nunc 663; exter, collationis 55; nunc 1; Biblia Sconcinensia, Amstelodamensia 1639, Prophetæ Sconcinenses: Ginsburg 5, 10, 11, 15, 24, 26, 69; edd. I, III, X.

The LXX and Targum are inconclusive, the LXX because it translates freely, and the Targum because the Aramaic דְּבַר can be either singular or plural.

3:7 דְּבַר

This variant may be induced by the wording of the derash, since the quotation is followed by the explanation. דְּבַר דַּמְרָא אֲבִיךָ אֲבִיךָ אֲבִיךָ. דְּבַר דַּמְרָא אֲבִיךָ.

3:10 דְּבַר

So 1QIs^a (the 7 is an addition above the line), de Rossi 226. The word is translated by Symmachus, the Peshitta, and the Targum as if it

were ק'גצז, but they may simply have been trying to make sense out of an obscure text. In fact, the variant in the midrash, lQIs^a, and de Rossi 226 may have the same explanatory origin (notice that the 7 in lQIs^a is a later addition). The MT is difficult, but not necessarily corrupt; see Qimhi.

Aquila and Theodotion = MT. The LXX differs.

3:10 זאכז

So Vulgate, Kenn. primo 224. This reading may be induced by the preceding singular noun in the midrash and Kenn. 224, and may be due to no more than translation-technique in the Vulgate, particularly since the translation in Jerome's commentary disagrees with the Vulgate in having a plural verb.

3:11 כגמזק

The relevant passage reads as follows in the Pesiqta de Rav Kahana, p. 147 (Several minor variants of wording that do not affect the sense have been omitted):

ד"א צדקתך כהררי אל (תה' לו:ז), מה הרים הללו נזרעים ועושי' פירות, כך מעשיהם של צדיקים עושי' פירות, אמרו צדיק כי טוב כי פרי מעלליהם יאכלו (יאכל ק). משפטיך תהום רבה (תה' שם), מה התהום לא נזרע ולא עושה פירות, כך מעשיהם של רשעים אינן עושי' פירות (+ אוי לרשע ואוי לשכניו א) אוי לרשע רע כי גמול ידיו יעשה (ישיב א) לו.

The same passage is found in Wayyiqra Rabbah p. 616, Bereshit Rabbah p. 300, Buber's Tanhuma Noah p. 17b, a quotation of the Pesiqta deRav Kahana in the Midrash Haggadol on Genesis p. 144, Buber's Tanhuma 'Emor p. 43a, the Printed Tanhuma 'Emor par. 5, a quotation of the Tanhuma on 'Emor in the Yalqut Mechiri on Psalms, part I, p. 220, and an anonymous midrash in the Yalqut Shim'oni, vol. II, par. 395. There are passages expressing the same idea in different words in the Sifre on Deuteronomy, par. 324, p. 375, line 11 to p. 376, line 3, and the Midrash Tehillim on Ps 62:13 (Notice that the Midrash Tehillim does not quote v. 11).

The text of the parallel passages in Wayyiqra Rabbah, Buber's Tanhuma on Noah, the Midrash Haggadol on Genesis, and the anonymous midrash is nearly word for word identical with the Pesiqta deRav Kahana. Buber's Tanhuma omits the second half of the quotation of v. 10 and v. 11, i.e. **כי גמול יריו יעשה לו** in v. 10 and **כי פרי מעלליהם יאכלו** in v. 11, as do mss. ג of Wayyiqra Rabbah. Bereshit Rabbah gives the passage in a different form. It reads as follows (Minor variants are omitted):

ומה הרים הללו נזרעים ועושים פירות כך מעשיהם שלצדיקים עושין פירות (אמרו צדיק כי טוב כי פרי מעלליהם יאכלו) ומה תהום אין לו חקר כך אין לפורענות הרשעים חקר (+ לעתיד לבא י) (אוי לרשע רע כי גמול יריו יעשה לו) ומה תהום הוה אינו נזרע ולא עושה פירות כך אין מעשי הרשעים עושין פירות שאם היו עושין פירות היו מחריבין את העולם:

The quotations of Is 3:10 and 11 have been bracketed because they are

not found in all mss. The full quotation of Is 3:10 is only found in mss. ¹כ' א' ל'; mss. ²א' ז' quote the first half, and mss. י' ז' do not quote the verse at all. The full quotation of verse 11 is only found in ms. 1; mss. ²א' ז' quote the first half and mss. ¹א' ז' do not quote the verse at all.

Ms. 1 (Codex Vatican LX) of Bereshit Rabbah (page 110 column 1) has the same arrangement of the passage as the Pesiqta deRav Kahana and parallels. The order in this ms. may be the original one in Bereshit Rabbah. The ms. quotes verse 10 in the form א' ז' ל' ו' ח' ג' ד' ה' ו' ז' ח' ט' י' כ' ל' ד', and verse 11 in the form א' ז' ל' ו' ח' ג' ד' ה' ו' ז' ח' ט' י' כ' ל' ד'.

The final phrase of the derash in Bereshit Rabbah "because if they produced fruit they would destroy the world" is found in the Sifre, in slightly different words.

The Midrash Tanhuma on Emor agrees with the Pesiqta deRav Kahana, Wayyiqra Rabbah, and the Tanhuma on Noah, except that extraneous material has been added.

The anonymous midrash agrees with the Pesiqta deRav Kahana and its parallels, except that v.11 is not quoted, although it is pre-supposed, and that the sentence "because if they produced fruit they would destroy

the world" is added, in agreement with Bereshit Rabbah. The context, however, is quite different, being a re-arranged and shortened form of the beginning of the Midrash Tehillim on Ps 118, with this derash taking the place of another, which will be quoted below. It is possible that the derash has been taken over by the compiler of the Yalqut Shim'oni from the Pesiqta deRav Kahana, Bereshit Rabbah, or one of the other parallel texts, and that the indication of the source has been omitted, but it seems simpler to suppose that the derash is taken from a different recension of Midrash Tehillim or from a Tanhuma text.

In all of the texts related to the Pesiqta deRav Kahana, the reason for the quotation of Is 3:10 and 11 is that these verses use the word פרי when speaking of the righteous, but not when speaking of the wicked, from which it may be supposed that although the deeds of the righteous bear fruit, the deeds of the wicked do not.

This point is well brought out by the Midrash Tehillim on Ps 118. Along with two other shittim on these verses, it contains a shittah closely connected in outlook with the derash as found in the Pesiqta deRav Kahana and its parallels. I quoted from the printed edition, with the more important variants from Buber's edition, the Yalqut Mechiri on Psalms and the Yalqut Mechiri on Isaiah added in brackets:

ד"א אמרו צדיק כי טוב כי פרי מעלליהם יאכלו את מוצא את
הברכה עושה פירות והקללה אינה עושה פירות שנאמר אוי לרשע
רע כי גמול ידיו ישיב לו (יעשה לו מ"ת מה' באבער, י"מ על
יש' ועל תה') כפרי (כי פרי י"מ על תה') אינו אומר אלא
כגמול (כי גמול י"מ על יש' ועל תה'); כי גמול ידיו מ"ת מה'

The words [כִּי פָרִי מְעַלְלֵיהֶם יֹאכְלוּ] are put in square brackets by Buber in his edition of the Midrash Tehillim to show that they are not found in his basic manuscript. They are found in the printed edition and Yalqut Mechiri on both Isaiah and Psalms.

It will be seen that both the Pesiqta deRav Kahana and its parallels (aside perhaps from Bereshit Rabbah) and the Midrash Tehillim are concerned with the presence or absence of the word פָּרִי, and that the argument is intelligible whether כִּי גִּמְלוֹל or כִּי גִּמְלוֹל is read. Nevertheless, the wording used by the Midrash Tehillim in discussing these verses makes it clear that at least the redactor of the derash in its present form in the Midrash Tehillim had the reading כִּי גִּמְלוֹל in his text of Isaiah, and so there is a possibility that such a reading might have been known to the author of the derash in its more original form in the Pesiqta deRav Kahana and its parallels. The statement כִּי גִּמְלוֹל in three of the witnesses to the text of the Midrash Tehillim requires the following phrase to be אֵלָּא כִּי גִּמְלוֹל, as in the printed edition, so that אֵלָּא כִּי גִּמְלוֹל is almost certainly an accommodation to the MT. Even the reading כִּי פָּרִי...כִּי גִּמְלוֹל in the Yalqut Mechiri on Psalms is probably an alteration of an original כִּי פָּרִי...כִּי גִּמְלוֹל, since otherwise the natural phrasing would have been כִּי פָּרִי אֵלָּא כִּי גִּמְלוֹל, without mentioning the word כִּי at all in either case. There is unfortunately no way of telling how old this wording is, whether it goes back further than the compilers of the

Midrash Tehillim or not, since the derash is still intelligible if everything from כפרי to the end is omitted.

There is some evidence of the reading כגמול in a derash found in the Tosefta Pe'ah 1:2-3, Yerushalmi Pe'ah 16b top, Bavli Qiddushin 40a, and in slightly different form in the first recension of the Avot deRabbi Natan, p. 60b. I quote from the Tosefta:

על אלו דברים נפרעין מן האדם בעולם הזה והקרן קיימת לו בעולם הבא על עבודה זרה ועל גלוי עריות ועל שפיכות דמים ועל לשון הרע כנגד כולם זכות יש לה קרן ויש לה פירות שני אמרו צדיק כי טוב כי פרי מעלליהם יאכלו: עבירה יש לה קרן ואין לה פירות שני אוי לרצו רע כי גמול ידיו יעשה לו מה אני מקיים ויאכלו מפרי דרכם וממועצותיהם ישבעו (משלי א:::לא) אלא עבירה שעושה פירות יש לה פירות ושאינה עושה פירות אין לה פירות:

The meaning is that the reward of the righteous exceeds their deeds, but that the punishment of the wicked corresponds to their deeds and goes no further, unless the deed is one that led others astray. A reading כגמול ידיו meaning "in proportion to what he has done" would be quite appropriate here, and would bring the point out more clearly than the reading of the MT does. However, the point may not be pressed, since the derash is still intelligible, even if less forceful, in the light of the reading of the MT, and so these texts have not been mentioned in the apparatus.

The derash in the Midrash Panim Aherim on Esther is intelligible whether כגמול or כי גמול is read.

The reading כגמול is supported by the LXX and probably by the Peshitta as well. The LXX translates v. 11 as ouai toi anomoi (+ hoti 106 565) ponera (+ gar 239' Sa; om. 301) kata ta erga autou symbesetai autoi. (I omit some minor variants). The words kata ta erga are a very literal translation of כגמול. It is very unlikely that this is merely a free translation of the MT, since the translator took ער as a noun, which can only be done if כגמול is read. The additions of hoti and gar in some mss. may be an inner-Greek development or may be due to the influence of two of the later Greek Versions. Unfortunately not enough of the later Versions' translation of this verse has been left to tell whether they have influenced the LXX.

The Peshitta translates v. 11 as וי לרשיעא נישא מטל דענד אידוהי מתפרע. The words מטל דענד probably represent a Hebrew reading כגמול; (the choice of the word מתפרע to translate לעשה, and the translation of כי as מטל דנא in v. 10 show that the translation is not meant to be completely literal).

Kenn. 245 reads כי כגמול (sed ' sup. ras.).

3:11 (ל) , ישיב (ל)

These readings could well be due to contamination from other passages. There is only one other case, Jb 9:16, where the verb עשה is used with גמול or גמלות, but there are seven where the verb is some form of שלם and nine where it is some form of השיב or שוב. The reading ישיב, if it is not a mistake for שוב, is particularly likely to be due to

contamination, since the logical subject, which can only be God, is not directly mentioned here, so that a transitive verb sounds much less natural than as intransitive or passive one. On the other hand, there is some support for these readings in the derash from the Tosefta and its parallels quoted in the previous article, which depends on the idea of exact retribution, an idea well expressed by these verbs. There is some support, too, in the reading לַגְּמוֹלָה, which is well attested and fits in with the same idea of exact retribution. Notice that the two readings לַגְּמוֹלָה and אֲשֶׁר are actually found together in ms. 5 of Wayyiqra Rabbah, and that the two readings לַגְּמוֹלָה and אֲשֶׁר are actually found together in the printed Midrash Tehillim.

The reading אֲשֶׁר is supported by the Targum, which translates אֲשֶׁר, and by LQIs^a and Kenn. 182. The LXX and Peshitta are inconclusive.

The translation in the Sacra Parallela has dothesetai instead of symbesetai. If the alteration is due to the influence of a later Greek translation, it could reflect a Hebrew reading אֲשֶׁר or אֲשֶׁר.

It is more likely, however, that it is due to the influence of the LXX of Ps 28:4 (27:4 in the LXX), as Wahl suggests. The complete verse Ps 28:4 reads as follows: dos autois kata ta erga autōn kai kata tēn ponērian tōn epitēdeumatōn autōn kata ta erga tōn cheirōn autōn dos autois apodos to antopodoma autōn autois. (I omit minor variants).

Ms. Kenn. 224 has the reading אֲשֶׁר in the margin.

Aquila = MT.

3:12 (בחוֹלָם) ם'שׁוֹׁ

The word is interpreted as meaning 'creditors'. The same interpretation is found in the LXX, the Arabic Version, Aquila, Theodotion, and the Targum.

Symmachus translates the word as meaning 'women, in agreement with the Masoretic pointing.

3:14 םתא

So Peshitta.

3:16 ם'לגלגל

The LXX translates without any possessive pronoun, but this is probably due to the requirements of Greek style.

3:17 (קדקד) תא

So Kenn. 258; 30 marg. add.

The Targum agrees with the MT. The other Versions are inconclusive.

3:18 ם'שׁוֹׁׁׁ

So Targum A 2/2, Kenn. 182 (ם'שׁוֹׁׁׁ), primo 154, and apparently LXX B 0. In this and the following articles the evidence of the Targum quotations in the 'Aruch and Qimhi's commentary should be treated with caution, since the omission of waw could be due to the position of the

word at the start of the quotation.

3:19 הנטיפות

So Targum A $\frac{1}{2}$.

3:19 הרעלות

So Targum K.

3:20 הקשורים

So Targum A 2/3.

3:22 המצטפות

So Targum bg A 2/2.

3:22 המטפחות

So Kenn. 82, 141.

3:23 הגליונים, הגליונים

So Targum zo, Kenn. and de Rossi in the text, Ginsburg 10, 14, 17, 22, 40, 50, 52, 58, 66, 67, 72; edd. VIII, XII, XIII, XV, XIX, British and Foreign Bible Society edition. See the Minhag Shai.

3:23 הַרְדִּימִים

So Targum K.

4:4 'ירושלם ח'

So LXX S^c A'-Q-26-106-710 B 239' 393 407 410 534 544 770 Bo Syh

Cyr. Eus. o.

Hoi treis = MT.

The LXX manages to preserve the sense of the verse by slightly altering the syntax in translation, but it is hard to see how the word 'ירושלם' can be left out of the Hebrew without changing 'דמ' to ד' or ד'דמ' or ד'דמ'. Probably the omission in the Midrash Shir Hash-shirim Zuta is a mistake (the ms. is very unreliable throughout) and the apparent support of the LXX is due to no more than coincidence.

4:5 (ה') א'ב'א

So de Rossi 663 primo. For א'ב'א ה'ה', the LXX has kai hexei kai estai, which corresponds to a Hebrew reading א'ב'א (א'ב'א) ה'ה'. The interchange of א'ב'א and א'ב'א is graphically very easy.

To Hebraikon kai hoi loipoi panta = MT.

4:5 (כל ח') על סכרן

So Kenn. 4, 72, 112, 182. See the Minhat Shai.

To Hebraikon kai hoi loipoi panta = MT.

This variant may be exegetical in origin. If כְּכֹהֵן is taken to refer to the Temple, the omission of כֹּהֵן becomes almost unavoidable.

4:5 כִּי ה'

The LXX omits this word, but as the translation is rather free here it is possible that the omission is due to the translator and not to a variant in his Hebrew text.

4:5 $(\text{עֲנֵן}) \text{וְעָשָׂן יְוֹמָם וְאֵשׁ (קָהֵבָה לַיְלָה)}$

Targum mss. cvz P omit וְעָנָה , but read וְעָשָׂן יְוֹמָם as in the MT.

Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion = MT.

4:5 $\text{כִּי עַל כְּבוֹד (כָּל ה')}$

So Peshitta GWL = mz, Targum (but paraphrasing), Kenn. 93, 94, 150, 178, 182, 300, 663; de Rossi 174, 782; primo 319, 667, 815; Biblia Veneta 1678 monent ad marg. alios libros omittere כֹּהֵן ; Ven. 1690, 1730, 1739, 1766, alios libros. See Minḥat Shai and de Rossi's note.

4:6 וּמַחֲסֵה

So Vulgate.

5:1 $\text{בְּקִרְבֵּי (בֵּן שְׂמֹן)}$

Perhaps compare Symmachus's translation as quoted by Jerome in

cornu in medio oliuarum, which may translate]DW בקרב]קרב .

However, this may be a free translation, or a translation of]קרב

]DW]'ב . Eusebius gives Symmachus's translation in a form differing from both the MT and the reading of the midrash, but definitely reflecting a Hebrew reading]קרב .

Aquila and Theodotion = MT.

5:1 (]DW]ב) בבעל

This reading may be due to the influence of the Song of Songs 8:11. See the Aggadat Shir Hashshirim lines 1,364- 1,368 for an example of exegetical connection of these two verses.

5:2 <גם ח' > יקב

So LXX, Ode 10, Vulgate, and Jerome's commentary, but reading יקב instead of גם יקב of the MT.

5:3 י'ושבי

So LXX, Ode 10, Peshitta, Targum, Vulgate S^oc, comm., 1QIs^a (י'ושבי), Kenn. 30, 93 (י'ושבי), 153 (י'ושבי).

The Peshitta, Vulgate AOS^oc, and Jerome's commentary seem to read or translate י'ושבי as well.

5:3 נא ח'

Most LXX witnesses do not translate the word. Q^{mg} and V-88 C,

in separate translations, insert an equivalent for it. The word is not translated by the Peshitta or Vulgate, or in Jerome's commentary.

Hoi treis = MT.

5:4 (מה) לי (לעשות עורר)

So perhaps Vulgate, comm. quid est quod debui facere. It is much more likely, however, that Jerome read the MT.

5:9 (באזוני) רנגלה

When evaluating the readings of the Versions it must be kept in mind that a translation of verse 5:9 that seems to support a variant reading רנגלה may have either of two causes: it may be due to a divergent Hebrew text or it may be due to the influence of the translation of verse 22:14, where the form רנגלה occurs, in the same Version. However, if the wording of verse 5:9 and the wording of verse 22:14 differ in any one Version, even though both of them are quite good translations of רנגלה or רנגלה, the word must have been found in the Hebrew text in front of the translator.

The LXX has ekousthe gar, which almost certainly represents the reading of the midrash. That a vague verb such akouein was used, instead of a more literal equivalent of the Hebrew, is no difficulty, since it might have been felt that a literal translation would imply a limit to God's omniscience, as if some external agent had to reveal the information. There is no possibility of any influence from verse 22:14, which has quite a different translation for the word in question.

The Peshitta translates צבאות ה' נאזני (with gere under the mun of the first word) quite literally, and then adds אשחטע. The addition may be a translation of the Hebrew text as found in the midrash, but may just as easily be an attempt to smooth an abrupt and difficult reading out. The Peshitta's translation of verse 22:14 differs.

The Targum translates צבאות ה' נאזני by אמר ובייא באודני. This is exactly the same as the translation of verse 22:14 and so probably represents a reading the same as the MT of verse 22:14. However, the possibility remains that the wording of the Targum in verse 5:9 might have been deliberately harmonized with the Targum of verse 22:14 to such an extent that apparent support is given for a Hebrew reading in verse 5:9 that was, in fact, unknown to the translators of the Targum; certainly there must have been some harmonizing of the two verses in the Targum to produce such a striking identity between them.

The Vulgate translates צבאות ה' נאזני by in auribus meis sunt haec dicit Dominus exercituum. Jerome's commentary has the same translation, except that it omits dicit. It is uncertain whether the presence of dicit in the Vulgate corresponds to a variant reading in the Hebrew or not, but it seems likely that as dicit Dominus exercituum is a standard phrase, the addition is merely an attempt to smooth the text out. The translation in 22:14 agrees with the MT and differs from the translation of 5:9.

5:9 באזני (בצירי) ריש

The relevant section reads as follows: ריש לקיש אמר כזה

שהוא צורח באזני של חברו לא באחת אלא בשתיים, כך באזני ה' צבאות

The reading is supported by the LXX, Peshitta מ (באזני דמריא), de Rossi 4, 596, 789, primo 715, ut et uidetur, 440, Biblia Munsteri 1534, alia ejusdem 1546, Isaias Polygl. Basileensis. According to de Rossi the reading is found in a few ancient and accurate Spanish, Italian, and German mss.

The translation באזני מריא in all Peshitta mss. except מ is ambiguous.

5:12 את (פעל)

So Kenn. 96, 150.

5:12 (לא) הביטו

So Targum, 1QIs^a, 4Q 162, Kenn. 1, 17, 96, 139, 145, 153, 158, 172; primo 155, 173, 187, 250; de Rossi 440: 737; primo 2, 226; munc 380.

5:13 הדעת

So Kenn. 93, 145, 158; forte 130. The Versions are inconclusive.

This reading may be due to conflation with Ho 4:6.

5:14 חררה

So Kenn. 96; forte 99, 158.

Aquila and Symmachus = MT.

5:16 האל

So Targum c.

5:18 וכעבותת

So Kenn. 651.

Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion = MT.

5:19 יחיש

So 1QIs^a. The Versions are inconclusive.

5:19 ריחישא

So Targum bog A (but paraphrasing), Vulgate, comm. The LXX and Peshitta are inconclusive.

5:19 ישראל ח

So LXX A O. The same variant is found in some LXX witnesses, including the Sacra Parallela, in v. 24.

5:23 (עש) קצדיק

This variant, and the one mentioned in the next article, may be induced by the following derash, which applies the word to Isaac as an individual, and takes the following קצדיק to refer back to קצדיק or קצדיקי.

5:23 קצדיק (קצדיקת)

So LXX, Symmachus, Peshitta, Targum c (Targum bvz NP = MT; Targum ogf are inconclusive), Vulgate, Jerome's commentary, Kenn. 258, 260; de Rossi 226 primo; Ginsburg edd. I, III. Ms. de Rossi 4 reads קצדיקת. See the previous article.

Aquila = MT.

5:23 קצדיק

So Kenn. 132; primo 89, 150; forte 17.

There seems to be some connection between this variant and the derash, but what the connection might be is uncertain. As the derash stands, it seems to assume a reading קצדיקת. See Albeck's notes.

Aquila and Symmachus seem to agree with the MT.

5:24 קצדיק

So Targum, Kenn. 154.

Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion = MT.

5:24 צבאות ה'

So 4Q 162, Kenn. 4, 173.

Aquila and Symmachus = MT.

5:30 עליהם

This variant may be induced by the derash, which refers to the destruction of Pharaoh's army at the Exodus and quotes Ex 15:10.

The reading is supported by the LXX and Peshitta.

Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion = MT.

6:2 עמדם ה'

So Targum and Jerome's commentary p. 5 on Is 1:1. The omission in the Targum may be due to theological objections on the part of the translators.

Symmachus = MT.

6:2 ה' ו'

So Symmachus according to Eus. (but Ziegler emends to agree with the MT.)

According to Jerome hoi loipoi and ho Hebraios = MT.

6:2 ו'פ'ים ה' ו'ו'

So 1QIs^a.

6:2 (יערפף) בשתיים

So Sacra Parallela N^L.

6:3 ויקרא

This reading is probably induced by Lv 1:1, which is quoted just before.

6:3 קדוש ח'

So lQIs^a.

6:5 בתוך

So LXX.

Symmachus = MT.

6:7 עונניך

So LXX except Tht., Arabic Version, Targum, Kenn. 2, 109, 111, 125, 168, 264; primo 91: Biblia Brixiensia ac Nisseliana according to de Rossi.

Aquila = MT.

7:2 היער

So lQIs^a, Kenn. 4, 17, 80, 136, 145.

Aquila = MT. The other Versions are inconclusive.

7:7 אדני ח'י

So LXX 407 Bas., Kenn. 1, 101, 252. Other LXX mss. and Kenn. 129 read 'ה' צבאות (אדני ח'י)

7:18 (וידבורה אשר) בקצה ארץ (אשור)

So Targum.

The addition here corresponds to a similar omission in the Targum witnesses ovz A FN. They have מֵאֲרֵעָא וּמְצָרִים, which probably represents מֵאֲרֵעָא וּמְצָרִים, instead of בְּקֵצָה יֵאֲרִי מְצָרִים.

7:25 כל

So Kenn. 72.

8:3 אלי ח'י

So LXX 239 Bo.

8:5 עווד ח'י

So Targum f, Peshitta u.

The other Peshitta mss. have (וואוסף) תווב (מריא למאמר לי), which probably represents the reading of the MT.

8:5 (עווד) בדבר הזה

So Targum c.

8:6 ןב

So Kenn. 93.

8:7 ןכז

So LXX, Peshitta, Targum bogfc N, Vulgate, Jerome's commentary, Kenn. 100.

The Printed Midrash Tehillim on Ps 93 correctly quotes 1K 5:1 instead of Is 8:7. See Buber's note 14 p. 414.

8:7 (׳ה) ׳׳׳׳׳

So Targum o, Kenn. 96. Compare Kenn. 99 ן 2^o sup. ras.

1QIs^a is inconclusive.

8:7 ןכז׳׳

So LXX.

8:8 ףשׁו׳

So Peshitta, Kenn. 72, 89, 96, 113, 126, 224, 249, 286, 650B; primo 115; de Rossi 4, 596, 715; primo 2, 24, 25, 27, 187, 226, 411; nunc 554; Biblia Amstelodamensia 1639: Ginsburg 10, 21, 26, 37, 66.

Aquila and Symmachus = MT.

8:8 וְהִירָא

So 4Q163

8:16 וְצָרָה , וְצָרָה

All of the texts listed in the apparatus take וְצָרָה and וְצָרָה as being in the past tense, as if they were וְצָרָה (meaning 'he wrapped up or tied up'; see Margulies, Wayyiqra Rabbah p.230 note 10) and וְצָרָה. This analysis may depend on a Biblical text with וְצָרָה and וְצָרָה written defectively, and the form וְצָרָה quoted in the Yalqut Mechiri and the Haggadot Hattalmud, if it is not due to the influence of the derash, may be evidence for such a defective spelling.

Ms. Kenn. 226 has וְצָרָה for וְצָרָה.

8:18 לִי הִיא

So Vulgate Al. in the Polyglotten Bibel.

Hoi loipoi according to Eus., hoi treis according to Tht., Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion according to ms. Q = MT.

8:18 אֱלֹהִים

So LXX, Hebrews 2:13, hoi treis according to Tht. but not according to Eus., Kenn. 1, 93, 590.

In v. 17 Aquila seems to read אֱלֹהִים.

8:19 וְאֵת

So comm. B.

8:16 ׁתת ,גצ

All of the texts listed in the apparatus take גצ and ׁתת as being in the past tense, as if they were גצ, (meaning 'he wrapped up or tied up'; see Margulies, Wayyiqra Rabbah p. 230 note 10) and ׁתת. This analysis may depend on a Biblical text with גצ and ׁתת, written defectively, and the form גצ quoted in the Yalqut Mechiri and the Haggadot Hattalmud, if it is not due to the influence of the derash, may be evidence for such a defective spelling.

Ms. Kenn. 226 has גצ for גצ.

8:18 'ת 'ג

So Vulgate Al. in the Polyglotten Bibel.

Hoi loipoi according to Eus., hoi treis according to Tht., Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion according to ms. Q = MT.

8:18 ׁת'גא

So LXX, Hebrews 2:13, hoi treis according to Tht. but not according to Eus., Jerome's commentary p. 118 on Is 8:18 in the comments but not in the lemma in all mss. except B (which combines both readings as Dominus Deus), Kenn. 1, 93, 590.

8:19 גא'ג

So comm. B.

8:19 המהגים

So LXX.

Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion = MT.

8:19 הלא עם אלהיו ידרש (אל ה')

So Kenn. 25, 95. The Peshitta has (הוא ו) לא הרו

אילין ושאלין (Eph. דמריא) עמה דאלהא, which could represent either הלא עם אלהיו ידרש or הלא עם אלהים ידרש; in either case, ׀ is assumed to be in the construct state.

8:20 בדר (הזה)

So Kenn. primo 245.

8:20 אשר ה'

So Peshitta U, Targum, Vulgate, comm., Kenn. 168.

The Mosul edition of the Peshitta agrees with the MT. Diettrich has overlooked the difference between the Urmia edition and the Mosul edition and therefore does not give any readings from the other editions or from any manuscripts.

8:23 בעת

So Kenn. 245, 392; primo 93. Compare Kenn. 428 בעת sup. ras.

The Versions are inconclusive.

9:1 הירשנים (בחשך)

So LXX A' ο II 36^o cI' 301 407 534 Or. IV 83 Cyr. Tert. III 434 and Matthew 4:16 ho kathēmenos, LXX Eus. hoi kathēmenoi.

The variant in the midrash may be due to the influence of the phrase ירשני בארץ צלמות later in the verse, and the variant in Matthew 4:16 may be due to the Greek equivalent of the same phrase. The variant ho kathēmenos or hoi kathēmenoi in the LXX may be due to the influence of the quotation in Matthew; it is certainly not due to the influence of the Greek translation of ירשני in the same verse, since the LXX translates the word in that case by hoi katoikountes.

9:4 ברשע

The phrase כי כל סארן סאן ברשע is taken to mean 'Each

חָקוֹ (of wickedness is measured back (חָקוֹ) to the wicked'.

The LXX has doloi, and the Targum has עָוֹן. These translations probably represent עָוֹן. Kenn. primo 176 reads עָוֹן.

Aquila and Symmachus = MT.

9:5 חָקוֹן

LXX-except A Syp Clem., and Aquila according to QSyh Eus. dem. p. 324 Chr. have kai kaleitai; Symmachus has klethesetai; Peshitta Aph. has חָקוֹן; the Vulgate and Jerome's commentary have et uocabitur. All of these translations represent either חָקוֹן or חָקוֹן. Odo has חָקוֹן (probably a mistake for חָקוֹן according to Fischer), which he translates as et uocabitur. Fisher suggests that he read חָקוֹן.

LXX Clem. has kai eklethe; the Peshitta except Aph. has חָקוֹן; the Targum has חָקוֹן. All these translations represent חָקוֹן (or חָקוֹן interpreted as past tense).

Aquila according to Eus. comm., and Theodotion have kai ekalēse(n), probably representing חָקוֹן.

A literal retroversion of the Syropalestinian Version into Greek gives kai kalesousin, which would represent חָקוֹן (or חָקוֹן) but it is possible that the Syropalestinian Version's Greek text had, in fact kai kaleitai, since it would be natural for a translator to use a third person plural active verb in Aramaic as the equivalent of a third person singular passive verb in Greek.

LXX A o has kai kalēsei, which represents ויקרא or ויקרא;
the Hebrew column of the Hexapla has ouiekra, i.e. ויקרא. LQIs^a has
ויקרא.

9:5 גבורה ח

It is impossible for this to be a genuine variant, since the
comment depends on the similarity between the phrase גבורה אל and the
name גבורה אל.

Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and the Hebrew column of the
Hexapla = MT.

9:6 ארתו (להכין)

With this reading, the pronoun must refer to ארתו and not to
ממלכתו.

Peshitta u has ונסמכיהו (= ונסמכהו) for ונסמכהו, and
so probably read ארתו להכין.

Theodotion reads ונסמכהו and so probably read ארתו להכין
in agreement with the MT.

9:11 אדום (מקדם)

The derash is found in Schechter's edition of the Aggadat Shir
Hashshirim lines 1,374- 1,385, the fragment F quoted by Schechter in
his notes on the midrash, and the Yalqut Mechiri on Isaiah. All three

texts seems to be corrupt, though the one in the Yalqut Mechiri seems to be better than the other two.

See Schechter's comments on the derash. Aram or Edom are identified with Balaam, and the Philistines with the Amalekites. The identification with Balaam would seem to support the reading אֲרָם, but the reading אֲרָם is still possible. The derash goes to say that the Amalekites paid the sons of Esau, apparently for their services as mercenaries. The sons of Esau can only be the Edomites (and perhaps by implication the Romans: so Schechter). The derash then seems to say that the Balaam tried to curse Israel instead of blessing them because of the bribe given to the Edomites.

Although the point of the derash is obscure, enough is intelligible to make it likely that Balaam is considered to be an Edomite, and that the passage is directed against the Romans, who are identified with the Edomites. Nevertheless, the passage is so obscure that all of this interpretation of the argument could well be wrong.

The reading אֲרָם is supported by the Peshitta.

Compare the variant אֲרָם for אֲרָם in Is 11:14 in fragment F.

9:16 בְּכַל (פֶּה)

So Kenn. 145 and 150.

9:16 כל (פה)

So Kenn. 198.

9:19 זָרְעוּ

So Symmachus tas sarkas tou plēsion autou, Targum (גַּרְר)

(נכסי קריביה (ייבזון) LXX A' -26 407 538 Bo Syp have a double reading: tas sarkas brachionos tou adelphou autou.

10:3 מָה

So Peshitta, Vulgate, comm.

Symmachus = MT.

10:5 וּמִטְהַר

The reading does not make sense, as God is speaking, and it is probably due to the influence of the same word in vv. 24 and 26, where God is spoken of in the third person. Verse 26 is actually quoted by the midrash just before this.

The same reading is found in Kenn. 17, 93, 158, 187, 228; de Rossi 2 (but with the MT's reading in the margin), 380, 663; primo 20.

10:14 כִּקֵּן

So Kenn. 258, primo 89.

Symmachus = MT.

10:14 (רתמצא כקן ירי) לכל הארץ

This reading may be induced by the phrase כל הארץ later in the verse, or by verse 10.

Kenn. 23, 93, 150, 182, 240 (and primo 246 according to de Rossi) and de Rossi 715 read לכל העמים. Symmachus has pasan tēn dynamin tōn laōn, which probably represents

The LXX shortens the verse in translation, and is inconclusive.

10:24 אֵין י' ח

So Kenn. 112.

LXX S^c 90-456 and hoi treis have kyrios (*) kyrios, and LXX S^{*} 36 377 cII 393 403' have kyrios ho theos. Both of these translations probably represent the reading of the MT but go back to two different revisions of the LXX. Hoi treis read kyrios kyrios, in agreement with the MT.

10:26 כדוך

So Kenn. 153.

10:32 (עור היום) בנוף (לעמוד)

The Targum, including a quotation of the Targum Yerushalmi in ms. f and a quotation of the Additional Targum in ms. a, seems to give a double translation. The following table shows the probable correspondence of the Targum's translation to the Hebrew text. The reader is referred to Sperber's edition for the complete text of the Targum. Only the phrases that correspond directly to the Hebrew text are quoted here, and haggadic additions and expansions are omitted, as are a few minor variants of wording.

<u>Targum</u>	<u>Hebrew</u>
<p>ער כען יומא רב וסגי עירן לה למיעל ...</p>	<p>עור היום</p>
<p>אתא וקם בנרב קרית כהניא לקביל שורא רירושלם ...</p>	<p>בנב לעמר</p>

עלה קם מניד ברישיה	בנוף לעמר
מוניל ומיתי ביריה	ינפף ירו
על טור בית מקושא רבצירן	הר בית צירן
ועל עזרתא דבירושלם	גבעת ירושלם

The relationship of the LXX to the Hebrew is very uncertain and no satisfactory explanation has so far been put forward. There seems to be no equivalent in the Greek for $\Gamma\Lambda$ or לל in the Hebrew, and no equivalent in the Hebrew for en hodōi in the Greek. There are five possible explanations for the discrepancy: a different Hebrew text underlying the Greek; misunderstanding of the Hebrew on the part of the translator; free or explanatory translation; paraphrasing; or corruption of the LXX text.

It is unlikely that the discrepancy in this case is due to paraphrasing. Except for the three cases of divergence between the Greek and the Hebrew already mentioned the translator seems to be working on the principle of giving each Hebrew word or phrase a corresponding Greek translation. Admittedly, he has departed from the literal meaning of the Hebrew text, to produce the startling image of hills in Jerusalem waving encouragement to Zion, (whatever that might mean); but he has produced a close correspondence between the Greek and the Hebrew wording in spite of this, a correspondence so close that all that the editors of the Lucianic recension had to do to produce a translation corresponding to the meaning of the MT was to alter the

case-endings of two nouns, so that tēn thygatera became tēs thygatros and hoi bounoi (hoi) became tous bounous (tous).

Corruption in the LXX text is a possibility, but no satisfactory explanation based on this has yet been put forward. There is a telling argument against the theory of corruption in the Greek: if the translator had transliterated the word ⲓⲓ it should be fairly easy to find a corrupt, even heavily disguised, form of it in the extant text; but there is no trace of it.

Misunderstanding of the Hebrew seems equally unlikely. It is true that the gist of the verse as it stands in the MT is obscure, but the meaning of each word or phrase is obvious. Specifically, the translator could hardly have failed to recognize the meaning of the word ⲓⲓ, and could hardly have failed to recognize ⲓⲓ as a place-name after having been alerted to the possibility by the series of place-names in the preceding verses, which give him no trouble.

We are left with two explanations: divergence in the translator's Hebrew text, and free or explanatory translation. The omission of ⲓⲓ could perhaps be due to free translation, if the translator did not consider it important, or if he did not see how the word fitted into the sense of the verse: but it seems unlikely (though of course, it is a possibility) that the translator would have omitted a place-name.

It seems, then, that the possibility of divergence between the

need to translate **בְּנִי** at all, since the verb **הֵעִיזוּ** taken over from the previous verse takes its place, and to translate both **הֵעִיזוּ** and **בְּנִי** would have spoilt the structure of the sentence. The word parakaleite neatly combined the ideas of **בְּנִי** and **הֵעִיזוּ** and may be considered a translation of both words.

If the suggestions that the word **בְּנִי** (for **בְּנִי** or **בְּנִי**) was omitted in translation is correct, it will be seen that en hodōi is an explanatory addition to tou meinai. Compare the full text of the Targum to this verse.

Kenn. 196 reads **בְּנִי**.

11:2 (רוח חכמה ובינה רוח עצה) ותבונה (רוח רעת ויראת ה')

Aptowitzer, in the Introduction to his Schriftwort, pp. 29-30, shows that this reading is assumed in a passage from Sa'adyah's commentary to the Sefer Yeşirah quoted by R. Yehudah ben Barzillai, and a similar passage in R. Ya'aqov ben Nissim's commentary on the Sefer Yeşirah perhaps derived from this; a completely independent passage in Yehudah ben Barzillai's commentary which might be taken from Sa'adyah's commentary; and a passage in the Pirqe deRabbi Eli'ezer which seems to be the basis of the last-

mentioned comment on the Sefer Yeşirah. Of these four texts, only the third quotes the verse with the variant reading and the other three do not take the quotation as far as the word in question.

The passage from the Pirqe deRabbi'Eli'ezer that Aptowitz quotes is the one referred to in the apparatus. Aptowitz quotes the passage in full, explains the point, and relates it to the three comments on the Sefer Yeşirah. There is no need to duplicate his comments here and the reader is referred to his book. This note will be confined to showing the relationship of the passage in the Pirqe deRabbi Eli'ezer to various texts of the Tanhuma or Yelammedenu group, some of which were not available to Aptowitz, and others of which seem to have escaped his attention. In doing so some supporting evidence for his argument will be brought in.

For reasons that will become clear later in the discussion, the passages in the various midrashim may be divided into four groups. The first group comprises two separate fragments on Gn 1:1 published in *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue*, vol.I, p.36

and p. 40, the Pirque deRabbi Eli'ezer, including quotations in the Yalqut Mechiri on Is 11:2 and the Midrash Haggadol on Ex 31:3, and a summary in the Midrash Hadash 'al Hattorah in The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue, vol. I, p. 230. The second group comprises a quotation of the Midrash Tanhuma to Ex 35:30-31 in the Yalqut Shim'oni, vol. I par. 412, and a quotation of the Midrash Tanhuma, probably to Gn 1:1, in the Yalqut Shim'oni vol. II par. 935. The third group comprises Buber's Tanhuma on Ex 35:31, Wayyaqhel par 6 pp. 61b-62a; the Printed Tanhuma to the same verses (in a passage added by the editor of the Mantua edition), Wayyaqhel par. 5, and a slightly condensed form of the same derash in Shemot Rabbah 48:6 on Ex 35:30-31. The fourth group comprises a single fragment on Gn 1:1 in The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue, vol. I, pp. 16-17.

The derash is the same in all the texts mentioned, but only those in the first group give it in its full form. The argument is that the three qualities NYT , N112N , NDDN with which, according to Pr 29:3-4, the world was created, were used, according to Ex 31:3, to build the Tabernacle, and according to 1K 7:14 to build the Temple; and in the future will be used to re-build the Temple, according to Pr 24:3-4, will be given to Israel, according to Pr 2:6, and to the Messiah, according to Is 11:2. All of the texts of the first group agree substantially, except that the mention of the three qualities being given to Israel is only in the Pirque deRabbi Eli'ezer, and that the quotation of the

Pirque deRabbi Eli'ezer in the Midrash Haggadol mentions the Messiah before Israel. The derash in The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue, vol. I, p.40 is defective at the beginning.

The texts of the second group have the derash in shortened form, apparently because of scribal error due to homoioteleuton. Both of them follow the mention of the re-building of the Temple directly with the quotation of Is 11:2, which is quite irrelevant. In both cases a scribe has omitted the quotation of Pr 24:3-4 and then the mention of the Messiah.

The text of the Yalqut Shim'oni vol. I par. 412 finishes at this point, but the text of the Yalqut Shim'oni vol. II par. 935 adds the reference to Israel and the quotation of Pr 2:6.

The texts of the third group do not quote Is 11:2 at all. Mss. 1 and 6 of Buber's Tanhuma mention the re-building of the Temple without any proof-text, and ms. 4 and the margin of ms. 6 of Buber's Tanhuma, the Printed Tanhuma, and Shemot Rabbah add Pr 24:3-4. If only the Printed Tanhuma and Shemot Rabbah were available, it might be concluded that the text had been deliberately cut after the mention of the re-building of the Temple, but the evidence of Buber's Tanhuma shows that this explanation is unsatisfactory. The omission of the quotation of Pr 24:3-4 is very unlikely to be due to editing, since it is required to complete the argument, and there remain the questions of why the quotation is omitted in two of the mss. but not in the third, and why the reference to the Messiah, which makes a fitting conclusion to the derash, is

omitted in all mss.

If we suppose the text of Buber's Tanhuma in this passage to be derived from a text of the type found in the second group, and specifically one similar to the Yalqut Shim'oni vol. I par. 412, the problem is solved. At some stage, perhaps before the Midrash Tanhuma was compiled in its present form, the quotation of Is 11:2 would have been dropped as irrelevant and inexplicable, and at a later stage, after the compilation of the two Tanhumas, certain mss., such as ms. 4 and the margin of ms. 6 of Buber's Tanhuma, the ms. used by the editor of the Mantua edition of the Printed Tanhuma, and the ms. used by the compilers of Shemot Rabbah, would have substituted the correct verse, but without supplying the conclusion of the derash.

It seems, then, that the ancestor of the texts of the third group was probably derived from a text of the second group, which itself was almost certainly derived from a text of the first group.

The only text available of the first group does not mention the Messiah, but there is no sign that the text is in disorder. The exposition goes directly from the mention of the re-building of the Temple, with the quotation of Pr 24:3-4, to the mention of Israel, with the quotation of Pr 2:6. The omission is rather surprising. It might be due to an editor or scribe who did not know of the reading הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ instead of הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵי , and so did not see the point of the quotation of Is 11:2; but it is more likely to be simply a mistake.

It will be seen, then, that all the texts in each group give the

same derash in varying degrees of completeness. It remains to discuss the relationship of this derash to the variant reading הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ for הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ.

Aptowitzer has already demonstrated that the derash depends on this reading, and as a glance at any of the texts of the first group or even the summary of the argument already given will show that he is correct, there is no need to repeat the discussion here. There is, however, one possible objection raised by Aptowitzer himself that needs to be discussed in detail. He says that the word הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ in the MT of Is 11:2 could be taken as the equivalent of הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ, and that the derash could be based on such an interpretation, but rejects such an explanation as forced and artificial. There is actually an argument, not considered by Aptowitzer, that removes any possibility of accepting such an explanation, and seems to make the existence of the variant reading certain. The printed text of the Pirque de Rabbi Eli'ezer (but not the quotations of it in the Yalquf Mechiri or Midrash Haggadol), and the midrash in The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue, vol. I, p. 40 say that the three qualities will be given to the Messiah in double measure, which means, apparently, that the six qualities of Is 11:2 must be treated as three pairs, so that he will have הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ as well as הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ, הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ as well as הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ, and 'הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ' as well as הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ.

The variant is attested implicitly by two passages in ben Barzillai's commentary on the Sefer Yesirah (the first of these being

related to a passage in Ya'akov ben Nissim's commentary) and the Tanhuma texts just mentioned; and explicitly by the second passage of ben Barzillai's commentary, one ms. of Bereshit Rabbah, and a ms. of the Bavli, all of the witnesses being independent. Such strong evidence in favour of a variant is unusual, and it is rather surprising that no Biblical ms. or Version supports the reading.

11:2 וַיִּרְאֵת אֱלֹהִים (וִיראת)

The translations of 'וַיִּרְאֵת ה' in the LXX, the Vulgate, Jerome's commentary on Is 11:2, and p. 60 on Is 4:1, p. 688 on Is 59:19-21, and p. 707 on Is 61:1-3 are inconclusive. The other Versions agree with the MT.

Notice that for 'וַיִּרְאֵת ה' in the same verse, the LXX except C Cypr., the Peshitta, Jerome's commentary ms. B p.60, ms. M p.688, and all mss. p. 707 seems to read וַיִּרְאֵת אֱלֹהִים, and that for 'וַיִּרְאֵת ה' in the next verse, the LXX except oI, and mss. ME of Jerome's commentary p. 688 seem to read וַיִּרְאֵת אֱלֹהִים (Jerome's commentary does not quote v.3 on p.707; the quotation of v. 3 on p.60 agrees with the MT). Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, all according to Chr., read 'וַיִּרְאֵת ה' in v.3, but according to ms. 710, Theodotion reads וַיִּרְאֵת אֱלֹהִים. The translations of the later Greek Versions for 'וַיִּרְאֵת ה' and 'וַיִּרְאֵת אֱלֹהִים are not extant.

11:3 לֹא (למראה)

So LXX, Vulgate, comm., Targum boga, Kenn. 3, 72, 95, 107, 110, 130, 150, 151, 170, 172, 181, 223, 224, 244, 384; primo 294: de Rossi

4, 16, 20, 26, 198, 200, 378, 406, 411, 443, 476, 502, 518, 543, 585, 597; primo 11, 24, 187, 262, 440, 554, 594, 596, 674, 737, 850, 851; nunc 486, 555, 606, 663, 815; Biblia Soncinensia a Kenn. omissa, Prophetas Soncinenses 1486 omissi et ipsi in Kennic. Bibliis, Pentat, antiquus membran. in 4. sine anno et loco: Ginsburg 5, 9, 21, 24, 31, 32, 333, 36, 38, 41, 42, 70; edd. I, III.

Symmachus= MF.

11:4 פ'ר (ח'ח'ח'ח')

This reading is probably a mistake, under the influence of the word פ'ר in the first half of the verse.

11:4 י'מ'ת (ר'ש'ע)

So Targum, 1QIs^a has י'מ'ת.

This reading is confirmed by the wording of the comments following the direct quotation, but the derash does not depend on it.

11:7 י'ד'ה'ם

So apparently Targum, Vulgate, comm.

The LXX, Aquila, and Theodotion are inconclusive.

11:9 ב'ה'ר (ק'ד'ש')

So LXX and 1QIs^a.

Symmachus = MT.

11:15 וְהִחֲרִיב

So apparently LXX, Peshitta except Eph., Targum, Vulgate, comm. (Peshitta Eph. has אַחַח, which according to Diettrich is a harmonization with אַחַחִיָּהּ later in the verse.)

Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion = MT.

12:1 וְאָמַר

LXX 26 87-565 410 Sa Syp read וְאָמַר.

12:4 וְאָמַרְתָּ

So LXX and lQIs^a. Notice that the same word is found in the MT in v. 1.

13:5 (מִקְצֵה) הָאָרֶץ

So Targum bg N, Kenn. 149, 225.

13:5 ה' ה'

The omission of the word ה' with no other variant is probably only a scribal error, as it makes the verse unintelligible. Notice, however, that the derash seems to assume the omission of the word ה' together with the reading כְּלִי for וְכְלִי. God is compared to

a human king who keeps his army in a city far from his palace so that if he calls them to wipe out the inhabitants of the capital, it will take them some time to arrive and he will have time to change his mind.

Kenn. 72, 149, 189 omit 'ה.

Symmachus probably = MT. See the apparatus to Ziegler's edition.

13:9 'ה 'ח

So Jerome's commentary p.224 on Is 13:1, apparently quoting the LXX.

13:9 חררן ואף

So Theodotion, Vulgate, comm. The relationship of the LXX to the Hebrew is uncertain because of the omission of some words, but it seems to represent חררן ואף.

13:17 עליכם

So LXX, Peshitta GWLMU = ABDFNST²aiklmnopstvxz.

13:21 שמה

So Kenn. primo 3.

14:1 ונלרה עליהם הגר

So Peshitta.

The LXX is inconclusive.

14:1 אלהים

So LXX except Eus. Cyr.^{comm.} (pros autous), LXX Eus. Cyr.^{comm.} (autois), Vulgate, comm. (ad eos).

LXX Cyr.^{lem} = MT.

14:1 אל (בית יעקב)

So LXX except A' 62, Vulgate, comm.

LXX A' 0 agrees with the MT. LXX 62 and 1QIs^a are inconclusive.

14:1 על בית ישראל

So LXX 544.

14:4 את (המשל הזה)

So Aquila (but the same text is attributed to Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, and Aquila's reading may be influenced by Symmachus or Theodotion), 1QIs^a, Kenn. 187, 246.

Targum = MT. The other Versions, including Symmachus and Theodotion, are inconclusive.

14:5 ואל

So Peshitta.

14:12 ׀ ׁׁׁ ׁׁ

So Kenn. 23.

14:12 ׁׁׁׁ

So Kenn. forte 154.

The Versions are inconclusive.

14:13 ׁׁׁ

So Peshitta, and so possibly Vulgate and Jerome's commentary, which have qui dicebas.

1QIs^a is uncertain. Symmachus= MT.

14:13 (ׁׁׁׁ) ׁׁ

The LXX and Symmachus have eis ton ouranon; the Peshitta has ׁׁׁׁ; the Targum has ׁׁׁׁ; the Vulgate and Jerome's commentary have in caelum. Although it is possible that these reading represent ׁׁׁׁ, it is much more likely that they represent the reading of the MT, with the preposition added because of the syntactic requirements of the various languages.

14:13 (ׁׁׁׁ) ׁׁׁ

So LXX, Targum, Jerome's commentary p. 35 on Is 1:12, apparently quoting the LXX, and Jerome's commentary p.224 on Is 13.1, apparently quoting Symmachus.

Symmachus according to Eus. = MT.

14:14 ןלרר לאל

So Kenn. 30, 224. Compare Gn 14: 18, 19, 20, 22; Ps 78:35.

Symmachus according to Eus. and the translation on p.224 of Jerome's commentary, which seems to be Symmachus's (see above), agree with the MT.

14:15 תרר

So apparently LXX, Peshitta, and Targum.

Symmachus= MT.

14:17 ןלרר

Ps 69:34 is quoted twice just before the quotation of Is 14:17, once with the reading ןלרר instead of ןלרר of the MT, and once with ןלרר.

14:17 (ןלרר) ראל

The Peshitta and comm.₂ read either ןלרר or ראל ןלרר.

Symmachus= MT.

14:17 ןלרר

The Targum seems to read ןלרר. For the addition of waw see

the previous article.

14:17 (לא פתח) בית הכלא

Although the derash does not depend on this reading, the wording of the passage as found in the Yalqut Shim'oni, Yalqut Mechiri, and Buber's Tanhuma seems to assume it. I quote the passage according to Buber's Tanhuma, with the more important variants of the Yalqut Mechiri added in brackets:

... כל אותו זמן היה אויל מרודך משמש תחתיו, (כוון לומר תחת
נבוכדנאצר) וכיון שחזר חבשו (חבשו אותו י"מ) בבית הכלא וכל
מי שנחבש על ידו אינו יוצא מבית הכלא (אינו יוצא משם י"מ)
עד יום מותו, שנאמר ואת (ואת ח' י"מ) אסיריו לא פתח ביתה

The Yalqut Shim'oni reads as follows:

כל אותו זמן היה אויל מרודך מלך תחתיו כשחזר חבשו בבית כלא,

The Printed Tanhuma and Wayyiqra Rabbah have בית האסורים instead of בית הכלא. For the context of the passage quoted above, the reader is referred to the quotation of Wayyiqra Rabbah in the article כנצל.

It is unlikely that the midrash would have used the expression בית הכלא if it had not been led to do so by its occurrence in the text of Is 14:17 which it quotes. As far as I am aware, the noun כלא is not used in any other passage of the midrashim or in either Talmud: neither Jastrow nor R. Natan ben Yehi'el list it in their dictionaries

(although Jastrow cites one occurrence of the Aramaic כלא, and the same word might have been known to R. Natan: see Jastrow, article כלא). The normal expression in the midrashim and Talmuds is בית האסורים, as in the Printed Tanhuma and Wayyiqra Rabbah.

The reading בית הכלא may be reflected in the translation carcerem in the Vulgate and Jerome's commentary, although this may be merely an explanatory translation of בית.

The word בית is not translated in most mss. of the LXX. Mss. 88 L¹ 46-233 449¹ add (x) eis tas oikias auton (heauton 88 II¹-96¹-46), which may represent בית, but could be a free translation of בית (perhaps read as בית, i.e. בית) under the influence of the preceding plural tous en epagōgei. The Peshitta agrees with the majority of LXX mss. in not translating בית. Symmachus's translation eis oikian probably reflects the reading of the MT. The translation תרעא in the Targum is probably an explanatory translation of בית interpreted as meaning a guard-house at the city gate; compare the translation in the Vulgate and Jerome's commentary. Alternatively, the Targum may simply be translating freely.

14:18 בית (כל)

This reading is probably corrupt. It might be due to the influence of the following words בית.

Symmachus = MT.

The relevant passage reads as follows in the Seder 'Olam:

בעשרים וחמשה מת שטנו נבוכדנצר ונקבר, ובכ"ו הוציאו אויל
מרודך מקברו וגררו, בשביל לבטל גזירותיו, לקיים מה שנאמר
עליו, ואתה השלכת מקבורך כנצר נתעב וגו'

Wayyiqra Rabbah reads as follows: (Minor variants are omitted):

ד"א איום ונורא (חנקוק ז) זה נבוכדנצר, ואתה אמרת בלבבך השמים
אעלה (יש' יד:יג). ממנו משפטו ושאתו יצא (חנקוק שם), זה אויל
מרודך. אמרו כל אותן שבעה עידנין שחלפו על נבוכדנצר נטלו את
אויל מרודך והמליכו תחתיו. וכיון שחזר נטלו וחבשו בבית
האסורים. וכל מי שהיה נכנס בבית האסורים לא היה יוצא משם
לעולם, שני' אסיריו לא פתח ביתה. וכיון שמת חזרו אצל אויל
להמליכו, אמ' להם איני שומע לכם, בראשונה שמעתי לכם נטלני
וחבשני בבית האסורים ועכשיו הרי הוא הורגני, ולא האמין להם
עד שגררוהו והשליכוהו לפניו, הה"ד ואתה השלכת מקבורך כנצר
נתעב

The Targum Sheni to Esther in Sperber's edition reads as follows:

... וכד מית נבוכדנצר מלכא דבבל קם אויל מרודך בריה בתריה ולא
הור צביין אינשי מדינאנא לטיקמא יתיה מלכא עליהון ברם מתיבין
ואמרין ליה נבוכדנצר אבוך לא הוה מדוריה עם בני אנשא והיך
מקימין אנחנא יתך מלכא עלנא ויקטל יתן וכד למע אויל מרודך
ית פתגמא האלין דבני מדינתא אמרין ליה מתיב ואמר נבוכדנצר
אבי מית וטריד מן עלמא ועד כען לא אתון מהימנין מתיבין

ואמרין ליה נבוכדנצר אנוך ארגיש ית ארעא כולה וית מלכיא כולהון
 דעלוהי כתיב מפרש ואמר הזה האיש מרגיז הארץ מרעיש ממלכות (יש
 יד:סז) מה עבר אויל מרווך בהיא שעתא על לבית גנזי מלכיא ונסיב
 מתמן שלשולין דפרזל ורמא בעקברי דנבוכדנצר אבוהי ונגדיה ואפיק
 יתיה מן קבריה ועליה מפרש כתבא ואתה השלכת מקברך וכד חזו אנשי
 מדינתא דעבד אויל מרווך רעות אבוהי די בשמיא קמו כל אנשי מדינתא
 בחדוא רבא ולבישו ית אויל מרווך ארגונא טבא דמלכותא ויהבו ליה
 יקר סגיא ורבו יתירא

There is no need to quote the rest of the sources listed in the
 apparatus, as they do not give any information of importance for
 present purposes that is not contained in one of the sources already
 quoted.

It seems that the sources quoted here, and the others listed in the
 apparatus, either assume a reading כנצל, meaning 'like decomposing
 matter', or attribute the meaning of the word כנצל to the word כנצר
 in the MT. According to the Seder 'Olam this happened the year after
 Nebuchadnezzar's death; according to Wayyiqra Rabbah and the Midrash
 Tanhuma Ewil Merodach did not believe Nebuchadnezzar was dead till he
 saw the כנצר; according to the Targum Sheni to Esther the Babylonians
 did not believe Nebuchadnezzar was dead till they saw the כנצר (The
 text printed by Sperber does not quote the part of the verse containing
 this word but seems to assume the reader will supply it; the text in the
 Miqra'ot Gedolot does supply it). Whether the meaning attributed to
 the word כנצר, or the variant reading כנצל, is based on an old
 tradition or is merely a good guess from the context is impossible to

say. In any case, the usual meaning of 'sprout' is obviously unsuitable here. See further Gray's comments in the ICC.

The interpretation of רצן as decomposing matter, or the reading רצן , is supported by the LXX, which translates רצן נחמך as hōs nekros ebdelygmenos, and by Aquila, who translates it as quasi sanies (ichōr) pollutus according to Jerome. In comm.₂ Jerome transliterates the Hebrew as neser, in agreement with the MT, but translates it as sicut sanies (pollutus), in agreement with Aquila. Similarly, the word דלדל later in the vers is rather surprisingly translated as dysōdes by Aquila according to Eus, and by Aquila and Symmachus according to ms. 710, as ōzekos by Theodotion, and as putridum by Jerome in the Vulgate and the commentary. The other Versions, including Aquila according to Jerome, interpret it as meaning 'trodden on' or 'trampled on'.

Jerome quotes the legend in his commentary in both places.

Symmachus translates רצן as hōs ektroma, and the Targum translates רצן נחמך as $\text{כחט (כיהט פ ; כחט חט)}$ (bog חט ; פ כיהט) כחט. Jerome in comm.₂ gives the reading of the LXX as sicut abortium abominabilis, but this reading is not supported by any manuscript and he has probably quoted Symmachus's translation by mistake. All of these translations assume a reading רצין , 'like a miscarriage', or at least an interpretation of רצן as if it meant רצין .

The Peshitta, the Vulgate, comm.₁, Aquila according to ms. 710, and Theodotion interpret רצן as meaning 'a sprout'.

So Vulgate and Jerome's commentary. The phrase **נתעב רנאלח** occurs in Jb 15:16, where the Vulgate has the same translation as here, so that the text of Is 14:19 in the Vulgate and Jerome's commentary may be influenced by the text of Jb 15:16.

14:20 ארתם

So lQIs^a. The Versions are inconclusive.

14:22 שם ושאר ניין רנכר

So Targum A, a quotation of the Targum by Qimhi, lQIs^a, Kenn. 4, 23, 187, 195, 253; de Rossi 737; primo 23, 211, 440; nunc 210 Biblia Soncimensia, ac Briximensia (sed in Bibliis Soncimensibus custos linea est waw): Ginsburg 21, 24; edd. III, X: Qimhi, Rashi.

The Vulgate and Jerome's commentary translate by et germen et progeniem; ms. G of comm.₂ has progeniem et germen, but the omission of the first et might be due to the reversal of the two nouns.

The LXX differs.

14:24 צבאות ח

So LXX 449'.

Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion = MT.

14:27 כִּי חַי'

So Peshitta and Sacra Parallela.

14:27 (וִירֹד הַנְּטוּרִיָּה) מִי (יִשְׁבְּנָה)

So LXX and Peshitta.

15:1 עַר <רֵאשׁוֹן > חַי'

So LXX.

Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion = MT.

16:3 עֲשֵׂי

So Peshitta, Targum covz PN, Vulgate, Kenn. 24, 30, 67, 72, 91, 93, 94, 96, 99, 101, 102, 113, 139, 144, 153, 160, 171, 175, 176, 195, 198, 224, 225, 226, 227, 249, 250, 252, 253, 258, 260, 264, 270, 271, 279, 288, 300T, 356, 601, 659 Qeri; de Rossi 1, 23, 24, 25, 27, 174, 196, 210, 226, 295, 319, 413, 440, 463, 509, 554, 575, 576, 596, 663, 815, 824; primo 211; nunc 26, 305, 380, 411, 512, 782; Biblia Soncinensia, Brixiensia, Antiqua in fol. sine anno et loco, Complutensia, Veneta bina 1518, Ven. 1521, Veneta 1525-28, Parisiensia Roberti Stephani in 4., Veneta 1613, Veneta 1927, Ven 1647, Veneta 1678, Veneta

1730, Mantuana cum Norzii not. 1742, Liburnensia 1780, Prophetas
Soncinenses 1486, Isaias Ulysseiponensis 1492; Codex Erfurtensis 5 ex
Bibliis Halensibus: Ginsburg 26, 27, 34, 42; edd. I, III, VI, X, XV.

The British and Foreign Bible Society Edition has the plural as
the Qeri reading and the singular as the Ketiv reading. According to
both Qishti and the Minhät Shai, these are the correct readings, and
according to Minhät Shai they are found in the most reliable mss. and
one edition. De Rossi mentions the same alternation in accurate Spanish
masoretic mss. including no. 341. The wording of Rashi's commentary
on this verse implies the same pair of readings.

In Kenn. 659 and Ginsburg's mss. 13, 22, 36, 37, 40, 43, 50, 52,
58, 67, and edd. VIII, XVII, and XVIII, the singular is the Ketiv read-
ing and the plural is the Qeri reading. Mss. Ginsburg 4, 5, 10, 30,
69 have the plural, without any Qeri reading.

All LXX witnesses read poieite, which would represent a plural,
but Ziegler thinks this to be a scribal lapse for poiei te, as two
words, which would represent a singular.

Notice that in Kenn. 245, the second you of 'ת'ו is written over
another letter that has been rubbed out, so that the original reading
was probably a plural, as attested by Targum ed. g; that Kenn. 150 primo
reads 'ללן for 'ללן, and that in verse 4 the LXX esontai probably
represents a reading 'לל instead of 'לל.

It will be seen that the MT and the Versions do not agree with each
other in the distinction between singular and plural in vv. 3-4. The

following table sets out the readings in synoptic form. A stroke means that the reading is inconclusive and a blank space that the reading is not extant. P is plural, S is singular.

ה'ר	בך	תגלי	סתרי	צלך	שיתי	עשו	הביאו	
—	S	S	--	--	--	--	S	LXX
S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	Psh.
S	S	S	S	S	S (P g)	S (P g ^{fb})	S	Tg.
S		S					P	Aquila
		S	S	S	S		P	Theod.
S		S					P	Symm.
S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	Vulg.

16:4 הַמֵּץ

So apparently Peshitta אַחֲרָיִם, Vulgate and Jerome's commentary pulus, and so lQIs^a.

16:5 כִּסְאוֹ

So Targum.

Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion = MT.

16:14 וְלֹא

So Kenn. 96.

17:11 וְכַאֲב

The Midrash refers the word וְכַאֲב to the ninth of Av. The LXX has a similar analysis but takes the word to mean literally 'and like a father' kai hōs pater, and disagrees with the MT in reading וְכַאֲב (with holem) instead of וְכַאֲב (with shureq.)

Aquila and Theodotion = MT.

17:11 אֲנֹשׁ

So LXX, Aquila, Theodotion, Peshitta.

17:12 (הַרִי הַמִּוֶּן) מִיָּמִים (רַבִּים)

This reading may be due to the influence of the numerous other cases of this phrase in the Bible (see, in particular, Je 51:55), or the occurrence of the same word prominently in the derash.

17:12 כַּהֲמוֹן (יָמִים)

So Vulgate, comm., Kenn. 93, 224: de Rossi primo 596; nunc 24; exter. 1.

17:12 יָם (כַּהֲמוֹת)

So LXX, Arabic Version according to de Rossi, Targum, Vulgate, comm., Kenn. 72, 187: de Rossi primo 2.

17:12 מִיָּמִים (כַּהֲמוֹת)

Compare Je 51:55, Ps 46:4.

17:14 וַאֲיִן־נָוֶה

So LXX, Peshitta, Vulgate, comm., lQIs^a, Kenn. 30, 72, 93, 96, (ms. 96 has וַאֲיִן־נָוֶה), 145, 150, 180, 182, 249, 253, 258, 260: de Rossi 4, 20, 554, 715, 737, 789; primo 2, 211, 596, 663; Biblia Sacra Vulgata, Prophetiae Soncineses: Ginsburg 26, 72; edd. I, III: Qimḥi, Ibn Ezra.

Most Targum witnesses have כַּדְלִיתוּהִי (כַּדְלָא אִיתוּהִי) ;f; (ז) דַּכְלִיתוּהִי, in agreement with the MT, but the editions bg have וְהָא כַּדְלִיתוּהִי, which could represent a Hebrew reading וַאֲיִן־נָוֶה or וְהָנָה אִי־נָוֶה, but more likely is a corruption in the Targum text itself under the influence of the word וְהָא at the start of the verse.

18:3 תִּרְאוּ חַיִּים

So LXX.

Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion = MT.

18:5 (הַסִּיר) הַתֵּן

The editor of the Midrash Haggadol does not call attention to this word and it is quite likely a misprint.

Compare Kenn. 96 ; forte ך, Kenn. 91 ; sup. ras.

18:6 (וּכְל) בְּהִטּוֹת

So Vulgate, Jerome's commentary, lQIs^a.

Compare Jb 35:11 אֲרֵץ מִבְּהִטּוֹת, and perhaps Joel 1:20 בְּהִטּוֹת שָׂדֵה

Joel 2:22 בהמות שרי, and Mi 5:7 בהמות יער.

18:6 (וכל) חית הארץ (עליו תחרף)

So Beshitta, and probably LXX ta thēria tēs gēs.

The same or nearly the same expression is found in Gn 1:24, 25; 9:2, 10; 1S 17:46; Ez 29:5; 32:4; 34:28; Ps 79:2; Jb 5:22.

18:6 (וכל) חית השרה (עליו תחרף)

The same or nearly the same expression is found in thirty-one other passages in the Bible.

18:7 (בעת) ההוא

So Kenn. 25, 30, 108, 116, 149, 224, 260, 264; forte 82.

The Versions are inconclusive.

18:7 ירבילר

The Targum has a plural active verb here, but this could well correspond to a singular passive verb in the Hebrew.

18:7 צבאות (ראשון) ח'

So Peshitta F of Eph., Kenn. 72.

18:7 or 2 וממרט

So 1QIs^a and Kenn. 4 (וממרט), Kenn. 96, 150 (וממרט) in verse 7, and so 1QIs^a (וממרט⁷), Kenn. 4, 145, 150 (וממרט) in verse 2.

The Versions are inconclusive.

19:4 אַרְבָּעִים קָשִׁים

The derash in the Tanhuma and Bemidbar Rabbah identifies the אַרְבָּעִים קָשִׁים with the ten plagues brought on the Egyptians, which means that אַרְבָּעִים is to be taken as a real plural, and קָשִׁים must be read to agree with it.

The reading is supported by the LXX (reading or translating ἡ δὲ βασιλῆα as well), hoi loipoi, Peshitta, Vulgate, comm., Kenn. 651. Compare Kenn. 2 קָשָׁה sup. ras.

19:4 עוֹן (נְחוּלִים) עוֹן

The Tanhuma and Bemidbar Rabbah take the עוֹן דָּוִד to be Moses, and identify עוֹן with the Torah on the basis of the phrase ה' עוֹן יְחִן (נְחוּלִים) in Ps 29:11. As the word עוֹן is taken to be a noun it is likely that it was read with holem. The Printed Tanhuma and the text of Bemidbar Rabbah in the Yalqut Mechiri on Psalms spell עוֹן with waw in the quotation from Ps 29:11, and Bemidbar Rabbah spells it in this way in the comment preceding the quotation as well.

19:9 יְבוֹשִׁי

So IQIs^a. The Vulgate has confundentur, which could represent either יְבוֹשִׁי or יְבוֹשִׁי, but Jerome's commentary prefixes et.

19:11 לַפְרָעָה

The Targum seems to support this reading, translating לַפְרָעָה, as

in the Hebrew text. The Targum is the only version that continuously distinguishes between \aleph and η in Isaiah; the others are inconclusive.

19:18 עיר הנחרס

The passage from the Talmud Bavli is made up of two baraitas on the temple in Egypt, a passage of Gemara in Babylonian Aramaic, a quotation from the Targum in the name of Rav Yosef, and a passage of Gemara commenting on the Targum. The first baraita is found in a different form in the Talmud Yerushalmi, Yoma 43d top, and the second is found in a slightly different form in the Seder 'Olam, ch. 23 (pp. 374- 375 of Weinstock's ed.).

There is no quotation from v. 18 in the first baraita, but there is one from v. 19. The form of the baraita in the Yerushalmi ascribes the quotation to R. Meir, attributing to him implicit approval of the temple, and the form in the Bavli ascribes it to R. Yehudah, attributing explicit approval to him. Whichever one of these is the original form of the baraita, it is clear that there was one tradition that approved of the temple in Egypt, which is important for establishing the original reading of v. 18, as will be seen below.

The second baraita attributes the building of the temple to proselytes that settled in Egypt after the destruction of Sennacherib. Both v. 18 and v. 19 are quoted (the phrase עיר הנחרס in v. 18 is not quoted). The altar of v. 19 is not explicitly identified with the city of v. 18, but the wording does not explicitly exclude such an identification either. The Seder 'Olam does not give any specific location; the Talmud Bavli

puts it in Alexandria, but this is probably due to the influence of the previous baraita. This baraita definitely approves of the temple.

The passage of Gemara that follows this is anonymous but clearly distinguishable by its language. It consists of a question as to the meaning of the word חרס, and the reply that it is explained in a Targum transmitted by Rav Yosef, which is then quoted.

The quotation from the Targum has been expanded in the later editions of the Bavli and in the Yalqut Mechiri and Haggadot Hattalmud to agree with the received reading חרס of the MT. The original form is the one found in the 'Aruch under חרס : מאי עיר החרס כדמתרגום (מאי עיר החרס) קרתא דבית שמשא (מאי עיר החרס) קרתא דבית שמשא רב יוסף). Such a translation must represent a reading חרס, as the Gemara recognizes: מאי משמע דהאי חרס לישנא (מאי משמע דהאי חרס לישנא) דשמשא הוא דכתיב האומר לחרס ולא יזרח (איוונ ס: ו) Notice that the word חרס is actually quoted, as well as being assumed by the interpretation. The Gemara must contain a more ancient tradition than the two baraitas since it correctly places the temple at Beth Shemesh (called Heliou Polis in Greek), whereas the baraitas in their present form in the Bavli place it in Alexandria.

After קרתא דבית שמשא, all Bavli text-witnesses mentioned above, except the 'Aruch, add the phrase דעתידה למיחרב; the same phrase has been added in all Targum manuscripts used by Sperber and Stenning, neither of whom have realized that the phrase is a gloss, even though this had already been pointed out by Geiger (p. 53 note).

In the Pesiqta deRav Kahana the tradition has become distorted. The names of the five cities referred to v. 18 are listed, once with

their Biblical names and then again with each Biblical name followed by the contemporary name. The last two items in the first list are עיר ההרס (with ה) and עיר שמש. In the second list, עיר ההרס is glossed as סרקאני or סרקני (corrupt in mss. נ) and עיר שמש as אליופוליס (i.e. Hēliou Polis; the mss. give the name with varying degrees of corruption). The name סרקאני or סרקני, according to Krauss, quoted by Mandelbaum, comes from a Greek name Ostrakane. If this is right, the reading in the Biblical text must have been הרס (with het), interpreted as 'shard' (ostrakon).

These two identifications preserve a reminiscence of the original identification of עיר ההרס with Hēliou Polis in an earlier source. It seems that the word הרס was reinterpreted to mean 'shard' instead of 'son', but that the old interpretation was preserved and referred to another city invented for the occasion. The separation of עיר שמש and עיר ההרס must be due to the Amoraim that compiled the Pesiqta de Rav Kahana and not to their source, since the derash still shows the signs of the alteration. If עיר שמש had been considered distinct from עיר ההרס originally, it would not have been the last item in the list; עיר ההרס would have been. Besides which, the names of the cities given here are all Biblical except עיר שמש, which is not mentioned in the Bible (or anywhere else, as far as I know); the Greek name Hēliou Polis corresponds to בית שמש, not עיר שמש (see, for example, the LXX and MT of Je 43:13). The explanation of the name עיר שמש seems to be that it is a literal translation of Hēliou Polis into Hebrew: that is to say, Hēliou Polis is a gloss on עיר ההרס, and עיר שמש is a gloss on the gloss.

The same passage is found in the Pesiqta Rabbati, but in a slightly shorter form, as follows:

...ואמר ביום ההוא יהיו חמש ערים בארץ מצרים מדברות שפת כנען
ונשנעות לה' צבאות עיר ההרס עיר השמש. (נוון) [נוא] אלכסנדרי.
נוף (מנפוח) [מנפיס]. החפנס חופיינס. ועיר ההרס (סדק אני)
[סרקאני]. ועיר שמש (אילו פילוס) [אליופוליס].

I have quoted the text of the Pesiqta Rabbati without the insertion of עיר ההרס וגו' after the first occurrence of the name עיר ההרס made by Ish Shalom in an attempt to restore the corrupt text. It will be shown below that the correction should be otherwise.

At first sight it looks as if the midrash gives two identifications of עיר ההרס (read עיר ההרס, with het), once with עיר השמש and once with סרקאני. However, it must be remembered that the text of this midrash is very corrupt and any disagreement with parallel passages in other midrashim should be looked at with suspicion. The whole chapter is taken word for word from the Pesiqta deRav Kahana and Buber has proven that the apparent deviation is due to an omission of part of the first list in the Pesiqta Rabbati. See Buber, Pesiqta deRav Kahana, pp. 63b-64a, note 36. In addition to what Buber says, there are three other reasons for regarding the present form of the text of the Pesiqta Rabbati as due to extensive omission from a text originally almost identical with the one found in existing mss. of the Pesiqta deRav Kahana:

1. The end of the quotation from v. 18 at עיר ההרס instead of at עיר השמש is very harsh, and neither the phrase עיר השמש nor the following list follow naturally: Ish Shalom is forced to add to the text to make it make sense.

2. With the text as it stands there are two identifications of עיר ההרס, once with עיר השמש and once with סרקאני. Ish Shalom's explanation of this (see his note 29, p.87a), though ingenious, is forced and unconvincing.

3. The omission can plausibly be explained as due to homoioteleuton, thus:

ואמר ביום ההוא יהיו חמש ערים בארץ מצרים מדברות שפת כנען עיר
ההרס יאמר לאחת ואלו הן חמש ערים נוא נוף תחפנס עיר ההרס עיר
השמש נוא אלכסנדרי נוף מנפס תחפנס חופיינים ועיר ההרס סרקאני
ועיר שמש אליופוליס

The LXX has polis asedek, representing עיר הצדק. According to Geiger, Efrem Syrus glosses the five cities as ה' מדינתא דודיקותא, which would indicate a knowledge of the Hebrew reading עיר הצדק or its Greek or Syriac equivalent. Geiger thinks it reflects a reading עיר הצדק in a Hebrew text but does not give any reasons why it should not be due to a knowledge of the LXX reading, and a realization of what this would be retroverted into Hebrew. Geiger argues convincingly that this must be the original reading, because it is only this reading that explains why one particular city out of the five was named, and the change from a favourable name, עיר הצדק, to a neutral one, עיר ההרס, and then to an unfavourable one, עיר ההרס, is the only one that fits the history of attitudes to the Egyptian temple. For the details and some subsidiary arguments, see Geiger, p. 53, including the footnote; for other opinions, see Gray and Duhm.

Whether any reminiscences of the reading קִיָּץ הַיָּמִים survive in the Rabbinic tradition is very doubtful. The first baraita quoted in the Talmud Bavli, which corresponds partly to the one found in the Yerushalmi, preserves a tradition favourable to the temple; but the approval is supported by v. 19, not v. 18. The second baraita, which partly corresponds to the passage in the Seder 'Olam, supports the approval of the temple with a quotation of v. 19, just as the first one does, but it does quote v. 18 as well. As the text stands, the quotation from v. 18 is used to support the statement that Sennacherib's prisoners (so Seder 'Olam; they are princes in the Bavli) were converted, and apparently, that they settled in Egypt. The quotation of v. 19 is used to support the statement that they built a temple (בְּיָמֵינוּ in the Seder 'Olam; simply בְּיָמֵינוּ in the Bavli) and that the temple was for the worship of God and not for idolatry. It is just possible that a favourable reference to the temple, based on a reading קִיָּץ הַיָּמִים in v. 18, is intended, but as the baraita is easily explicable without such an assumption, I have not included such an assumed reading in the apparatus. The quotation stops short of the end of the verse, so there is no explicit support for any reading.

Symmachus translates civitas (i.e. polis) heliou; Jerome in the Vulgate and in the commentary translates civitas solis. These translations represent a Hebrew reading $\text{סֶרְפִיָּץ הַיָּמִים}$, with het, interpreted as meaning 'Suntown'. The same reading is assumed by the Targum and is found in lQIs^a. The reading is found in numerous Hebrew manuscripts and editions: Kenn. 160, 228, 264

271A, 283A, 288, 300, 320 marg., 396, 423, 453, 569; primo 99, 180, 524, 571; forte 570 (compare Kenn. 115.7 2^o sup. ras.): de Rossi 20; primo 187, 211, 305, 579; Biblia Brixiana, Biblia Munsteri utraque hebraeo-latina 1534, 1546 (sed cum alia lectione ad marg.); Biblia Veneta 1518 ad marg., Basileensia 1536 in append: Ginsburg 66; ed. X. Kenn. ms. 490 has a gloss $\text{W}^{\text{D}}\text{W} \text{N}^{\text{P}}\text{L}$ in the margin. The Arabic Version has $\text{D}^{\text{D}}\text{W} \text{I}^{\text{P}}\text{Y}$, which probably goes back to the Greek reading polis hēliou or hēliou polis; on the other hand, the translation may be due to a local tradition in Egypt. In the LXX, the original reading of Codex Sinaiticus was polis ased hēliou; manuscript 106 adds hēliou in the margin (I quote the reading from Ottley who quotes it from Holmes and Parsons).

Rashi identifies the city mentioned here with the $\text{W}^{\text{D}}\text{W} \text{N}^{\text{P}}\text{L}$ mentioned in Je 43:13 and explains the double reading in the Targum as due to the same verse. It is uncertain whether Rashi's comparison is original to him or not, since no extant Rabbinic text quotes Je 43:13. Notice, however, that the LXX removes the reference to idolatry implied by the word $\text{N}^{\text{P}}\text{L}$ in Je 43:13 by omitting it, which could mean that the translators had the Jewish temple in mind. Actually, the identification of $\text{W}^{\text{D}}\text{W} \text{N}^{\text{P}}\text{L}$ mentioned in Je 43:13 with the town mentioned in Is 19:18 is probably correct, though the identification of the temple mentioned in Jeremiah with the Jewish one is impossible if the verse is read in context. (See, in particular, v. 12 and the second half of v. 13, which refer to the temples of Egyptian gods). As soon as the $\text{W}^{\text{D}}\text{W} \text{N}^{\text{P}}\text{L}$ in Jeremiah were identified with the $\text{N}^{\text{P}}\text{L}$ and $\text{N}^{\text{P}}\text{L}$ in Isaiah the prophecy of destruction in the Jeremiah passage

must have given a welcome scriptural support for the unfavourable attitude towards the Egyptian temple, and a way of ignoring the plainly favourable implications of Is 19:18-19. It is possible that the alteration of $\square\text{החרט}$ with het meaning 'sun' to $\square\text{ההרט}$ with he meaning 'demolition' was suggested by the verb וַשַׁרַר in Jeremiah.

Another alteration, this time to $\square\text{החרם}$, is found in mss. de Rossi 700; primo 6, 575, 737. Ms. 547 has a marginal note giving this as the reading of other mss. De Rossi mentions a form $\square\text{ההרם}$ which is probably a corruption of $\square\text{החרם}$. The existence of the two readings $\square\text{ההרט}$ and $\square\text{החרם}$ is an additional argument for the originality of the reading $\square\text{החרט}$, since $\square\text{החרט}$ could easily change to the other two, but a change of $\square\text{ההרט}$ to $\square\text{החרם}$ is very unlikely.

See Geiger (p. 53 note) on the Masorah.

20:2 רגלך

So Targum: Kennicott, de Rossi, and Ginsburg have this reading in the text.

21:9 נפלה בבל (נפלה ח')

This phrase is found in Je 51:8, but has been listed as a variant to the text of Isaiah because the rest of the mss. of the Midrashim listed in the apparatus, as well as a passage in Bereshit Rabbah, pp. 439-440 on Gn 15:12 parallel to the one in Wayyiqra Rabbah, a quotation of Wayyiqra Rabbah in the Midrash 'Aggadah 'al Hūmah to Gn 15:10-12, a quotation of the Pirque de Rabbi 'Eli'ezer in the Yalqut

Shim'oni, vol. II, par. 76 corresponding to the one in the Midrash Haggadol, and Buber's edition of 'Echah Rabbah, p. 57a, in the passage corresponding to the one in the Yalqut Shim'oni to Lamentations (λ 22) all quote Is 21:9 according to the MT, and it is at least as likely that the quotations listed in the apparatus reflect a variant reading in Is 21:9 as that the scribes of certain mss. chose to substitute a verse from Jeremiah. On the other hand, substitutions of one verse for another do occur, and this argument is not conclusive. For the details of the readings of the mss. and sources not quoted in the apparatus, see the next article.

The omission of one occurrence of נפלה is supported by all LXX witnesses except O' 301 Mus. Hi., and Peshitta v.

Symmachus = MT.

21:9 נפלה בבל לא תוסיף קום, נפלה לא תוסיף קום בתולת בת בבל

These readings might be due to conflation with one of the verses quoted below:

Am 5:2 נפלה לא תוסיף קום בתולת ישראל

Is 24:20 ונפלה ולא תסיף קום

Am 8:14 ונפלו ולא יקומו עוד

Is 47:1 ררי ושבי על עפר בתולת בת בבל

The readings of the mss. and sources not quoted in the apparatus are given here for comparison. 'Echah Rabbah and Wayyiqra Rabbah mss.

ו quote the MT from נפלה נפלה to the end; the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el in Lauterbach's edition and mss. כס of Horovitz and Rabin's edition, mss. ל² of Wayyiqra Rabbah, the Midrash 'Aggadah 'al Humash, and ms. ן of the Midrash Haggadol read simply נפלה נפלה בבל.

21:11 דַּמָּי (KWD)

The wording of the passage makes it clear that דַּמָּי with resh is meant, not דַּמָּי.

The LXX identifies Dumah with Edom, which is the usual equivalent of Rome in the Haggadah. Ms. de Rossi 20 has the word Edom written over Dumah, and ms. de Rossi 380 has Edom in the margin. Peshitta u reads Edom instead of Dumah but this may be due to LXX influence. Jerome mentions the identification of Dumah with Rome and Edom, and might have known of Hebrew mss. with the reading דַּמָּי.

Aquila = MT.

21:11 אֲלֵי (בְּחִירָה) ק

See Ratner's notes in the Seder 'Olam.

Jerome recognizes the possibility of both readings in his second commentary (p.294).

Hoi loipoi according to Eus. and panta according to Jerome = MT.

21:13 (ארחות) דרכם

This word is probably meant to be a gloss on ארחות.

21:14 (יושבי) בארץ (תימא)

So LXX and Targum. The addition in the LXX might only be due to the requirements of Greek style, but the addition in the Targum probably represents an actual variant in the Hebrew.

21:15 (מפני חרב נטרשה) כי

So Vulgate C.

21:15 (קשת דרוכה) מפני

So Vulgate, comm., 4Q165, Kenn. 150, 168, 224.

21:15 (כובר המלחמה) מפני

So Vulgate, comm., Kenn. 150.

22:3 (מרחוק) עמרו

Immediately after the quotation of Is 22:3 comes the comment על שׁעמרו רחוק מן התורה וכן מן המצוות לפיכך אָסרו, which seems to confirm the reading עמרו found in the quotation.

22:4 וּאִמְרָר

So 1QIs^a. Ms. c of the Targum has וּאִבְכִי בְמִרְרָא for
וּאִבְכִי בְמִרְרָא (other Targum witnesses have וּאִמְרָר בְּבִכְיָא).

22:8 נִשְׁקָה הֵיעָר (בֵּית חַי)

So Targum o, but translating freely: וּנְזִי מִקְרָשָׁא (זִינָא).

22:8 (אֵת מִסְךְ) בֵּית (יְהוּדָה)

So Targum and Kenn. 96. The LXX differs.

22:12 צְבֹאוֹת חַי

So Sacra Parallela V^{EAOVMI}H^a.

22:12 בְּיָוִם הַהוּא חַי

So Kenn. 30. Kenn. 150 omits הַהוּא.

22:14 נִגְלָה

So Peshitta. The Targum is inconclusive.

22:14 אִמְרָר הַי (אִם יִכְפֹּר)

The Peshitta translates וּנְזִי מִקְרָשָׁא חַי literally,
and then adds וּאִמְרָר. This reading may perhaps reflect an addition
of אִמְרָר or אִמְרָר הַי in the Hebrew, but may merely be an addition by
the translator for the sake of smoothness. Compare the Peshitta read-
ing to Is 5:9 in the article וּנְזִי מִקְרָשָׁא.

This reading may be due to the expansion of the abbreviation
" 'א, for 'כפך' אא, into ' ' אאך.

22:14 אאך

So LXX L''^a-233-256 Eus. Tht. kai hoti.

22:14 לכם הערון הזה

So LXX except 403' Eus., Peshitta. 1QIs^a has a double reading
לכם הערון הזה לכמה. The reading is found in a Yemeni ms. of
the Talmud: see Talmon, Textus, vol. IV, p.114.

22:14 לכם ח

So Kenn. 30, 112.

22:14 ארני ח

So Theodotion according to the Syrohexapla but not according
to ms. Q, Kenn. 1, 269: de Rossi primo 211, 663; Biblia Pisaurensia
1517, Prophetiae Posteriores Pisaurensia 1516, Pisaur 1520.

Symmachus and Theodotion according to Q = MT.

22:15 אל (שבנא)

So 1QIs^a, Kenn. 30, 150, 249; so probably Targum לל; so per-
haps Peshitta (לל most mss.; ללל mss. oy), Vulgate, Jerome's
comm. on Isaiah 22:15, and Jerome's comm. p.430 on Is 36:1-10 (ad).

22:16 (מה לך פה) ומה (לך פה)

So LXX, Peshitta, Targum; LXX S^c reads מה...ד instead of מה...ומי.

22:16 אפוא (מה לך פה ומה לך)

The relevant passage reads as follows in Buber's Tanhuma:

...כשנכנס עשו נכנס גיהנום עמו, שנאמר ויאמר מי איפא (בר' כו: לג)
ואין איפא אלא גיהנום, שנאמר כי חצבת לך פה קבר וגו';

There is no possibility of this verse having been substituted for another, since there is no other verse that contains the word אפוא and a word that could be interpreted as referring to Gehinnom. This means that the text of the verse must have had אפוא instead of פה in at least one place. At first sight, the wording of the midrash seems to indicate that it was for the third פה that אפוא was read. There are, however, objections to such a reading, since it is very unlikely that both כ' and אפוא could occur in the same clause. It follows then that if the word אפוא must occur somewhere in the verse, and if it is grammatically impossible or nearly impossible for it to occur instead of the third פה, it must have occurred instead of the second one. A reading אפוא instead of the second פה is actually found in the Targum. That only the phrase containing the third פה was quoted is no difficulty since it is common for a midrash to only quote the part of the verse that contains the key-word (in this case קבר), even though the interpretation is based on a longer part of the verse or even several verses.

22:21 כרתנת'ך

So Kenn. 112 and 268. 1QIs^a is partly illegible here. כרתנ' is clearly visible, then what is probably a ך, then what means to be the corner where the two strokes of a ך meet, then the upper stroke and the top and bottom (but not the middle) of the vertical stroke of a ך. The reading is probably כרתנת'ך.

22:21 במתנתך (כתנתך)

1QIs^a has a space of about seven letters between כתנת'ך and ואכנתך. The surface of the leather is damaged and any word that might have been there once is quite obliterated. It is possible that a word was inserted, but if so, it is unlikely that it was במתנתך, because the damaged section would not obliterate all of a final ך: either the top stroke or the bottom of the vertical stroke would show.

23:2 סוחר צ'ון

This reading is a mistake, probably caused by the similarity of סוחר צ'ון and סוחר צ'ון and the greater frequency of סוחר צ'ון.

The same reading is found in Kenn. 89. Notice that LXX S A'-Q-26

B^c 93-46-233 C'' 198 239' 301 393 403' 407 410 534 538 544, the Arabic Version, comm. 2 B, and twenty mss. Kenn. and de Rossi have this reading in v. 12; and that LXX S* O has the reading in v. 4.

23:4 (הים) ןרעו

So Kenn. 72, 116, 269.

23:4 (רוססתי בתולות) ולא

All the Versions except the Targum add a negative: the LXX has oude, most Peshitta witnesses have אלא, Peshitta ABDF ouy have אלא, the Vulgate and comm. 1 have nec, and comm. 2 has neque, but it is unlikely that these additions are due to anything more than the need for a smooth translation.

23:5 לדע

So Kenn. 116. The LXX translates freely and is inconclusive.

23:18 (לה) צבאות

So Kenn. 1, 17, 130, 145, 150, 158, 187, 246; marg. add. 224: de Rossi 2, 211, 663; primo 380; nunc 226.

Aquila = MT.

23:18 כ' ח

So Aquila, but at the start of a quotation.

Symmachus = MT.

The relevant section of the quotation of the Sifra in the Yalqut Shim'oni reads as follows:

וחללת את שם אלהיך (ויקרא י"ט:יב; ועיין כל הפסוק) מלמד שבנועת
שקר חלול השם. ד"א וחללת (ויקרא שם) בעשה אתה חולין על החיה
ועל הבהמה. וכן הוא אומר על אלו אבדה הארץ ויאשמו יושבי בה על
כן חלו יושבי ארץ ונשאר אנוש מזער.

The wording is nearly the same in Codex Assemani LXVI, Weiss's edition, and the Midrash Haggadol on Leviticus, but the extent and form of the quotation from Isaiah differs. Weiss's edition quotes the whole verse according to the MT, and the Midrash Haggadol quotes it as far as **בה** according to the MT. The reading of Codex Assemani is given in the apparatus. The most important variants of wording are **שוא** instead of **שקר** and **על החיה ועל הבהמה** instead of **לחיה ולבהמה** in the other three texts. The section beginning **ד"א** may depend on a deliberate repointing of **וחללת** in Lv 19:12 as a passive, **וחללת**.

The relevant passage of the Midrash Tanhuma reads as follows:

א"ר עקיבא החרם היא השנועה והשנועה היא החרם צא ולמד מיהושע
שהחרים את יריחו ונשרף עכן על שפשט ידו בחרם ולקח את האדרת ואת
לשון הזהב שהיה באותן תרפים של יריחו ושם טומאה חקוק עליו והלך
והטמינם בתוך אהלו. ועל שמעל בחרם נפל מישראל שלשים וששה איש
וקרע יהושע את בגדיו ונפל על פניו ארצה לפני הארון. ויאמר ה'
אל יהושע קום לך וגו' חטא ישראל וגם עברו את בריתי אשר צויתני
אותם וגם לקחו מן החרם וגם גנבו וגם כחשו וגם עמו בכליהם (יהושע

ז:ו, י-יא) למה כתיב כאן גם ה"פ ללמוד שכל העובר על החרם כעובר על חמשה חומשי תורה. וכל עבירות נפרעין ממנו. וחרם נפרעין ממנו ומכל הבריות. שנא' אלה וכחש וגו' על כן תאבל הארץ ואמלל כל יושב בה בחית השדה וגו' (הושע ד:ב-ג): ואומר על כן אלה אבלה ארץ ויאמרו יושבי בה על כן וגו'. וכן את מוצא בעכ"ל נאמר הלא עכ"ל בן זרח מעל בחרם ועל כל עדה יצדאל היה קצף והוא איש אחד לא גוע בעונו (יהושע כב:כ)

It is clear that both the Sifra and the Midrash Tanhuma take אלה to mean a false oath, not a curse; and that the oath is the cause of natural disaster, not the instrument thereof. The Sifra seems to assume a reading על אלה. The reading על כן אלה of the MT can only mean that the sins mentioned in the previous verse are the cause and the אלה in the instrument of punishment; but as the Sifra ignores the sins of the previous verse and definitely makes the אלה the cause of the whole disaster, the word כן must be deleted. The reading על אלו in the Yalqut Shim'onī is probably a corruption of a reading על אלה wrongly read by the scribe as על אלה (and perhaps taken to be part of the text of the midrash and not of the Biblical text); but the scribe could only have made such a mistake if the word כן had already been missing from the quotation in the ms. of the Sifra he was copying from.

The Midrash Tanhuma seems to assume the same reading על אלה as the Sifra does, although it is harder to prove it conclusively. It is true that the text says that breaking the אלה is equivalent to breaking all the commandments in the Torah, and that the sins mentioned in

v. 5 could well be taken to refer to breaking the whole Torah, in which case the phrase לֹא יָדָע in v. 6 would imply that the disasters of v. 6 are the result of the action of v. 5. However, there are several arguments against such an interpretation of the text of the Tanhuma.

A careful reading of the text shows that the hypothetical argument for the retention of the word לֹא יָדָע just mentioned is impossible. There are actually two ideas here. One is that oathbreaking is so serious that it is equivalent to breaking the whole Torah and the punishment for doing so is equal to all the punishment in the Torah together; the other is that the punishment falls on everyone, not just on the one that broke the oath. This means that the general disaster is directly caused by oathbreaking, not by breaking the whole Torah; which in turn means that the punishment of v. 6 are not the result of the sins of v. 5, but of the אֲשֶׁר of v. 6.

A second argument, not quite so conclusive, but still of some value, is that the text seems to imply that the quotations from Ho 4:2-3 and the one from Is 24:6 are to be given the same interpretation, which is only possible if the connection between v. 5 and v. 6 in Isaiah is severed: Ho 4:2 mentions the אֲשֶׁר and similar sins, and v. 3 describes the consequences of the same אֲשֶׁר ; similarly, with the word לֹא יָדָע deleted from Is 24:6, the punishments of the verse become the result of the only sin mentioned in the verse, the אֲשֶׁר .

There is a third argument that seems to be conclusive. If the reading אֲשֶׁר לֹא יָדָע is preserved, and the אֲשֶׁר is taken to be the cause of the disaster, as the midrash makes it clear it must be, the

syntax becomes impossible: the phrase would have to mean 'because of this because of the oath'.

Even if these arguments are rejected, it seems that we must at least suppose that אלה was taken to mean אלה by R. 'Aqiva and the author of the passage in the Sifra: see the Targum and Ibn Ezra, and compare Symmachus's translation dia tautēn tēn aran. The Peshitta has מטל הלין, probably representing על אלה.

24:6 אכלה

This reading seems to be demanded by the comments of both the Sifra and the Midrash Tanhuma. With אלה taken to refer to the reason for the disaster, not the means of it, it becomes impossible to make it the subject אכלה; the only word that can be the subject is then ארץ, but if this word is to be the subject the verb must be intransitive.

The reading אכלה is supported by Symmachus, the Peshitta, the Targum (but see the syntax), Kenn. 1, 4, 24, 115, 158, 160, 245, 253, 258, 260, 288, 300: de Rossi 2, 4, 20, 25, 187, 196, 211, 226, 304, 346, 380, 463, 518, 576,

579, 596, 715, 815, 824; primo 305, 341, 440; videtur 174; primo 411; Biblia Soncinensia, Brixiensia, Veneta utraque 1518 ad marg., Prophetæ Soncinenses; Ginsburg 17, 26, 27, 40, 42, 58, 66, 68; edd. I, III, X, XII, XIII.

De Rossi's ms. no. 305 has a marginal note: Sic legitur in cod. correcto cum כ, quod et Masora definit. The Minhat Shai gives the reading with kaf as the usual and correct one. The statement in the Minhat Shai that Ibn Ezra has the reading with kaf is inexplicable: his comment that אלה is to be taken to mean באלה or perhaps תחת אלה shows that he read אלה, as Friedlander points out (see his note 4, p. 41). Qimhi reads אלה, in agreement with the MT.

24:6 (ויאסור) הארץ

The reading is supported by Kenn. 30, 150. The evidence of the Versions is inconclusive. 1QIs^a omits the word.

Mss. Kenn. 4 and 96 read הארץ for the second occurrence of ארץ. Compare Is 24:4; Je 23:10 and perhaps Je 4:29; 12:4; Ho 4:3.

24:6 (ישבי ארץ) חלו

See the article על כן for the texts of the Sifra. The reading חלו may be induced by the word וחללת in Lv 19:12, and the comment ויעשה אתה חולין.

Jerome translates the word in both the Vulgate and the commentary as insanient, which may correspond to a Hebrew reading חלו, but inter-

preted as if it were ללן , from the root ללן .

Symmachus has ektrychōthēsontai, which probably represents the reading of the MT.

24:11 (שדשד) נכח

Both passages of the Midrash Tanhuma, the one in Pequde and the one in Shemini, discuss Ps 48:3 and relate Is 24:11 to it. The interpretation of Is 24:11 is similar in both passages and it seems that they depend on a common source. The main differences are that Pequde quotes Ps 48:3 at the start of the derash and then proceeds to expand on it with material not found in Shemini, before coming to the quotation of Is 24:11, whereas Shemini has the quotation of Ps 48:3 after the quotation of Is 24:11 and is considerably shorter; and that although both derashim finish with a description of the contrast between this world and the world to come, the details of the contrast are quite different. Because of the considerable differences between the two derashim, they must be analysed separately to determine their support for any variant; but because of their similarities it is probably best to treat them as witnesses to a single tradition after the analysis has been carried out.

The texts available for Pequde are Buber's Tanhuma at the end of Pequde, the Yalqut Shim'oni vol. I, par. 417, and a quotation of the Tanhuma in the Sefer Wehizhir at the end of Pequde (vol. I, p. 261). All three texts quote the verse with the reading ללן in the lemma, but quote it with the reading נכח in the comment following. Probably an

original שנת was changed to גלה in the lemma under the influence of the MT. With such strong evidence for the reading שנת, it seems likely that it goes back at least to the editors of the Tanhuma.

The texts available for Shemini are the Printed Tanhuma to Shemini, par. 5, Buber's Tanhuma Shemini, p. 14a, and the Yalqut Shim'oni, vol. I, par. 528. Only the Yalqut Shim'oni carries the quotation as far the phrase in question in the lemma, and it quotes it with שנת. All three texts (including all three of Buber's mss.), quote the verse with the reading שנת in the comment and then proceed to comment specifically on the significance of the word, so that there is no doubt that such a reading is intended.

The relationship of the LXX to the MT is uncertain. Witnesses S A'-Q-26 B-oI 46-233 490-cII 198 239' 301 393 407 534 538 544 Co Cyr. o have pepautai pasa (om. pasa 26 407 534) euphrosynē (+ pasēs 534) tēs ges (om. tēs ges (B 0)for ערבה כל שמחה גלה משוש הארץ

The possible retranslations of this into Hebrew are (כל) שנתה שנת or משוש הארץ (כל) שנת. It is more likely, though, that the LXX has simply left one of the verbs and one of the nouns out in translating, and that the Hebrew text in front of the translator was about the same length as the MT. There remains the question of the Hebrew equivalent of pepautai. It is the literal equivalent of שנת or שנתה, but it could simply be a free translation of ערבה or גלה. On the other hand, it is unlikely that the translator would have used such a colourless word for ערבה or גלה.

If the LXX translation does represent a verb שנת or שנתה it is more likely that שנתה was read for ערבה than that שנת was read for גלה, since the LXX translator tends to contract phrases and sentences rather than leave out parts from the start or the end.

The Peshitta has בטלת for ערבה. This could be a free translation or perhaps an explanatory translation, but could represent a reading

שנתה. For the same verb the Targum has שלימת, which could be an explanatory translation or could represent a variant reading as in the Peshitta. Although the translations of the LXX, Peshitta, and Targum are not conclusive evidence for a variant reading taken separately, taken together they mutually support each other and make the existence of a reading שנתה כל שנתה very likely. The Targum and Peshitta agree with the MT in reading גלה as the second verb.

For other examples of the root שנת with משוש see Is 24:8; Ho 2:13; La 5:15.

The LXX groups V⁴⁹⁰ and C⁴⁹⁰ in independent translations agree with the MT. Theodotion has a translation supporting the MT that does not depend on either of these two groups.

24:11 (משוש) כל (הארץ)

The word כל has probably been added under the influence of Ps 48:3, which is the key verse for the derash, and is quoted prominently (see the previous article). Notice that the evidence for this variant is

much weaker than for the variant שבת. If the addition of כל were not a mistake, it would be expected to be equally well attested, or even, because of its lesser prominence and susceptibility to correction, better attested.

The original text of the LXX is inconclusive because of reduction in translation: see the previous article. The group V-011 L^{'''}-36-96-456 403' 449' agrees with the MT. Ms. 93, in a translation otherwise agreeing with these mss., reads כל משוש הארץ. The group C⁻⁴⁹⁰, in an independent translation, reads משוש כל הארץ.

The reading of the midrash is supported by Kenn. 30, 114, 149, 182; primo 1; 224 marg.: de Rossi 174, 440; primo 211, 512; nunc 319. The reading could well be due to conflation with Ps 48:3 in these mss. as well.

24:14 בגארן שם ה'

Targum ofovz N have בשמא רי'י, representing בשם ה'. The other witnesses have במימרא רי'י, which probably represents the reading of the MT, but could perhaps represent בשם ה'.

Symmachus = MT. Compare Mi 5:3.

24:19 (רועה התרועעה) ארץ

So 1QIs^b.

24:20 הארץ

So 1QIs^a, Kenn. 96.

The Versions are inconclusive.

24:21 והיה ח

So Peshitta.

LXX C' 403' Eus. read והיה. LXX 88 agrees with the MT. Other LXX witnesses omit the whole phrase. Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion = MT.

24:21 במרום ח

So LXX except L[']-233 449' Tht.

24:21 רעל (הארמה)

So Kenn. 3. Compare Kenn. 130

24:21 בארמה

So Peshitta, Kenn. 96, 149; forte 1: de Rossi 319 marg.

Compare Kenn. 1, 116, 171, 195; de Rossi primo 596, 715, which read (על ח) הארמה, Kenn. 145, which reads על בארמה, and Kenn. 30, which reads בא על הארמה.

Many LXX witnesses omit the phrase על הארמה altogether: see the next article. Symmachus and Theodotion = MT.

24:22 מרוב

So LXX except 538 Sa, Kenn. 3 (מרוב).

Aquila and Symmachus = MT.

25:1 אלהים

So LXX B Sa^P O.

25:1 אתה ח'

So LXX.

25:1 ואודה

So LXX Sa Syp Syh Cyr., Vulgate Mc, Peshitta, Targum fc.

25:1 את (שמך)

So Kenn. 250.

The Targum agrees with the MT. The other Versions are inconclusive.

25:6 שמנים סמוחים שמנים מזוקקים

The following comments are to be read with the Sifre open for reference at par. 324.

The apparatus to the Sifre seems to be defective here. After the
328

lemma $\square^{\prime}7D\mathcal{W}$ (middle of p. 375), no reading is given for $\gamma^{21}\nu$, and after the lemma $\square^{\prime}7D\mathcal{W}$ — $\square^{\prime}1D\mathcal{W}$ no reading is given for γ . After the lemma $\square^{\prime}7D\mathcal{W}$ — $\square^{\prime}1D\mathcal{W}$ there is a reading for γ but none for the other witnesses, although in the Pardes edition $\gamma^3\nu$, i.e. the Yalqut Shim'oni, vol. II, par. 813 reads $\square^{\prime}7D\mathcal{W}$ instead of $\square^{\prime}1D\mathcal{W}$ (of course, the first edition, which I have not seen, might read $\square^{\prime}7D\mathcal{W}$ and the text of the Pardes edition might have been altered).

This defectiveness of the apparatus is unfortunate, because it is not clear what the correct reading in the derash in lines 5-7 should be, and uncertainty as to the exact readings of some text-witnesses makes a definite decision impossible. Nevertheless, the essence of the argument is clear. The verse Is 25:6 is taken to mean: 'The Lord of Hosts will make for all the nations on this hill a banquet of heavy wine, a banquet of lees; rich, heavy wine—filtered (i.e. pure) lees'. The meaning is that the wine, which is of the best quality, will turn to, or turn out to be, pure lees, with all wine filtered off. For the original quality of the wine, see p. 374 line 15 and Midrash Tehillim on Ps 75:9 (printed edition p.57a, tenth line from bottom; Buber's edition p. 170a, first two lines of par. 4). Lines 5-7 of p. 375 of the Sifre mean: 'Perhaps heavy wine that is imperfect (i.e. not of the very best quality) and lees that are perfect (i.e. pure lees, without any wine left)? No, because it says: "Rich, heavy wine — filtered lees": heavy wine in which there is nothing except dregs'.

The text-witnesses to the Sifre have lines 5-7 in various forms, at least some of them corrupt. Mss. ηD agree with the text printed by

Finkelstein. Ms. 7 reads 'Perhaps lees that are imperfect (i.e. with some wine left) or heavy wine that is imperfect? No, etc.'. ²ט reads simply 'Perhaps lees that are imperfect? No, etc.'. ¹ט read 'Perhaps lees that are perfect and heavy wine that is imperfect? No, etc.'. The printed editions read 'Perhaps heavy wine that is imperfect? No, etc.' but we should probably emend to agree with ²ט; see Ish Shalom on this. ³ט reads 'Perhaps lees that are perfect? No, etc.'. This reading does not make sense unless we assume that the scribe thought that 'perfect' or 'without any defect' (שׂאִין בְּהֵן צוֹרֵךְ) meant perfectly good, not perfectly bad. The scribes of mss. 78 might have had the same misconception. Mss. seem to be corrupt. Ms. K has 'Perhaps heavy wine that is imperfect and heavy wine that is perfect? No, etc.'. Ms. V has 'Perhaps lees that are perfect and lees that are imperfect? No, etc.'.

From all this it seems that the derash depends on the contrast between rich wine and filtered lees, and assumes the reading of the MT. It is strange, though, that so many mss. should have a variant reading. Perhaps the variant שְׂמוֹנִים for שְׂמֹרִים was induced by the phrase שְׂמוֹנִים שׂאִין בְּהֵן כְּלוּם אֵלָא פְקֻטִים in lines 6-7, or its equivalent.

The Targum has an interpretation of this verse similar to the Sifre's, but seems to read שְׂמֹרִים מְמַחִים שְׂמֹרִים מְזַקְקִים, as does ms. Kenn. 155 (Compare ms. Kenn. 30 שְׂמֹרִים מְמַחִים שְׂמֹרִים מְמַחִים מְזַקְקִים).

The Peshitta reads שְׂמוֹנִים מְמַחִים שְׂמוֹנִים מְזַקְקִים, and knows nothing of this derash.

Theodotion agrees with the MT. The original text of the LXX does

not quote the phrase in question, but ms. V and the Syropalestinian Version have an addition, probably from Theodotion, agreeing with the MT.

25:6 שְׁמוֹנִים מֵאוֹחִים מְזוֹקְקִים

Compare the reading of ms. Kenn. 30 quoted in the previous article.

25:8 וְנָלַע

So Peshitta, Targum fc, Jerome's commentary all mss. except G, Kenn. 72, 96, 150, 153, 187. Kenn. 4 has וְנָלַע✱.

The form וְנָלַע is found in the previous verse.

25:8 אֲדַנִּי חַ

So LXX Syp kyrios, Kenn. 198.

All other LXX witnesses except S O'' have ho theos. LXX S O'' have kyrios ho theos, representing the reading of the MT.

Symmachus = MT.

25:8 (כִּי) פִּי (הַ דָּבָר)

So LXX.

Symmachus = MT. Compare Mi 4:4.

25:9 'אום, 'אום, ואום

The scribes of the mss. with this reading probably took the word to be the very common introductory formula 'אום. The abbreviation 'אום is very common for this formula.

25:9 זה אלהינו קוינו לו

It is hard to decide whether this is a real variant or a careless combination of two different phrases from the same verse; and if it is a real variant, it is impossible to decide whether it corresponds to זה אלהינו קוינו לו or הנה אלהינו זה קוינו לו of the MT.

For הנו סריא, the Peshitta has הנה אלהינו זה קוינו לו, which could represent הנה אלהינו קוינו לה, but might be a translation of הנה אלהינו זה קוינו לו, with the order of the words changed according to the requirements of Syriac syntax. For הנה אלהינו זה קוינו לו the Peshitta has exactly the same translation (except mss. ns, which omit ונפרקן הנו סריא אלהן דסכין לה, according to Diettrich by homoioteleuton). The addition of אלהן might correspond to an addition in the Hebrew, or might be due to the influence of the first half of the verse.

The LXX seems to read הנה אלהינו זה קוינו לו in the first half of the verse (S 393 538 Co Syp Ir.^{lat} have the equivalent of אלהינו זה קוינו לו instead of אלהינו זה קוינו לו). There is no equivalent in the original LXX text for וישיענו זה ה' קוינו לו, but the groups O' Syp and L''-233

26:4 צר עולמים

The phrase כי ביה ה' צור עולמים is interpreted as meaning 'With yod and he the Lord formed both worlds'. The word צור is read as a verb, and עולמים may be read as a dual. The interpretation of צור as a verb may indicate knowledge of a defective spelling, but this is by no means certain. Mss. Kenn. 4 and 23 have the defective spelling.

26:5 (קריה) בצורה (נשגבה)

The LXX has poleis ochyras, which probably represents קריה בצורה; the Peshitta has וקריתא עשינתא, which probably represents the same reading, or וקריה בצורה.

26:5 ישפילנה ישפילנה

So Kenn. 94, 99, 145, 150.

The Versions are inconclusive.

26:5 יִשְׁפִּילָהּ ח'

So 1QIs^a. One of the verbs is omitted by the Peshitta and Vulgate C. The LXX omits יִשְׁפִּילָהּ עַד אֲרָץ.

For another case of the elimination of a repetition, see the next article.

26:6 רָגַל ח'

The word רָגַל is omitted by the LXX, 1QIs^a, and Kenn. 72. The word רָגַל is omitted by the Peshitta and Vulgate S, and either רָגַל or רָגַלִּי is omitted by Targum c.

The omission in the LXX may be due to translation-technique. Notice that the LXX omits פָּדַד as well (although some witnesses insert a translation of it under the influence of the later Greek Versions). The omission in ms. S of the Vulgate is probably an inner-Latin corruption of a difficult reading; see the apparatus to the Vulgate for the readings of the other mss.

26:10 אֶל אֲרָץ

The LXX, Ode 5:10, and the Targum seem to read עַל אֲרָץ.

26:16 פִּקְדוֹנֶיךָ

So LXX 88-οII 22^c-51^c-763^{txt}-147-90-93-46 C⁻⁹¹ 239' 301 407 410

534 538 613 Bo Tht. Cyr. ^(lem), Ode 5:16 ms. 55 (other LXX witnesses and ms. A of the Odes seem to read פקרתִיךְ), Targum z, Kenn. 17, 150. Notice that the LXX reads לִל for לִד at the end of the verse.

26:20 בחררך

So LXX 26 V 233 301 407 410 534 Co Or. III 96 Tht. Hippol. I₂ 44 (codd. ER), Sacra Parallela, Ode 5:20 ms. 55, Kenn. 89, 93, 96.

26:21 כִּי חִ

So LXX 377* 239 410.

27:1 רהחזקה חִ

So LXX Hil., Targum K.

27:4 ת'ש'ו

So Aquila, Symmachus, Peshitta, Targum (but paraphrasing), Vulgate, comm., 1QIs^a, Hebrew text transliterated by Jerome in the commentary, Kenn. 93, 96, 145, 150, 153, 198, 226, 253; primo 1, 3; nunc 224: de Rossi 440; primo 1, 2; 20, 187, 226, 575, 596, 663; Biblia Sacra: Ginsburg 24, 26; ed. III.

The reading spinam et uepreu given by Jerome as Aquila's translation is not Aquila's; see Ziegler, Textkritische Notizen. The real origin of the reading remains in doubt, but as it corresponds to the translation of the LXX for the same combination of words in Is 5:6; 7:23, 24, 25, it may be conjectured that the reading is actually Theodotion's.

The phrase ת'ש'ו ו'ש'ו occurs in Is 5:6; 7:24, 25; 9:17. The phrase ת'ש'ו ו'ש'ו occurs only here.

The LXX apparently reads ש'ו ו'ש'ו.

27:5 א'ז (י'חזק)

So Kenn. 651. Compare Kenn. 91 ' א'ז sup. ras.

27:5 ו'עשה (ש'לום לי)

The Peshitta has (ל'ה ש'לום) ו'אעלך, which probably represents (ש'לום לי) ו'עשית. The Vulgate and Jerome's commentary seem to read ו'עשה. The LXX differs.

27:9 (עון) בית (יעקב)

So Targum, Vulgate, comm.

Compare Kenn. primo 109 עון בית ישראל יעקב

27:13 (אשור) מארץ

So Vulgate and Jerome's commentary. This reading, and the reading : מארץ מצרים of the next article, seem to be assumed in Jerome's remarks on this passage: '... de Assyriis et de terra Aegypti dispersus populus congregetur ...'

27:13 (מצרים) מארץ

So Vulgate S in the Polyglotten Bibel, comm. Vict. See the previous article.

27:13 ובירושלם, ובירושלים

So Kenn. 4, 18, 72, 95, 109, 129, 150, 223, 226; primo 136; forte 94.

28:5 צבאות ח'

So Kenn. 111.

28:7 גם (אלה)

So Kenn. 168, 196, and so perhaps LXX houtoi gar and Vulgate

and Jerome's commentary uerum hii.

28:7 (ביין) תער (רנשכר תער)

The Peshitta translates both רנש and תער by טער throughout the verse; however, this may be due to the Peshitta's translation technique. The LXX differs. For a more detailed discussion see the article (ולא מיין) תער (ולא משכר) שור in 29:9.

28:16 ארן ין

See de Waard, pp. 54-60, for a detailed discussion of the evidence of the Qumran texts, the Versions, and the quotations in the New Testament for the text of this verse. This article, and all of the following ones on this verse, are to be read together with de Waard's comments, and in particular with his table of readings on p. 55. See Ziegler, Untersuchungen, p. 67, for the relationship of the LXX to the Hebrew throughout this verse.

The omission of ארן is supported by comm. G, and Kenn. 115, 129, 384. 1QIs^a has the word written as an addition above the line.

28:16 ׳ 707

So 1QIs^b.

28:16 אבן ח

So LXX, Romans 9:33 and 10:11, I Peter 2:6, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, Peshitta Aph., comm. except Vict., Kenn. 474.

28:16 מוסר (ברי"ש)

Kenn. primo 99 has מוסר מוסר for מוסר מוסר.

Theodotion = MT.

28:16 מוסר ח

So perhaps LXX except L³⁶ Syl. Tht., and so Kenn. 1, 17, 107, 111, 249, 431, 471, 603. Both occurrences of this word are omitted in I Peter 2:6 (not mentioned by Ziegler). Romans 9:33 and 10:11 are inconclusive.

< Theodotion > = MT.

28:20 בהתכנס

So 1QIs^a.

The LXX is inconclusive.

28:22 ח' 178

So Peshitta, 1QIs^a, Kenn. 1, 72, 89, 198. Hoi loipoi according

to ms. 86, hoi treis according to Q Syh = MT.

28:27 בחררש

So Kenn. primo 96.

28:27 יסב (לף)

So 1QIs^a (י'סב). Mss. Kenn. 30, 72, 114, 115, 154, 180, 182, 224, 226, 246, 253, 260, 264 have יסב, but it is uncertain whether this represents a qal or a hof'al written defectively. A qal reading may be reflected in the translations periaxei (periagei 566 Cyr.; om. 93) of the LXX, מתחרך of the Peshitta, and circuibit of the Vulgate and Jerome's commentary.

29:9 מ'יין

The Peshitta has מן חמרא, the Targum has מן חמר, and the Vulgate and Jerome's commentary have a uino, all of which may represent a reading מ'יין, but could simply reflect the reading of the MT, with a preposition added in the process of translation. 1QIs^a and Kenn. 250 definitely read מ'יין.

The older text of the LXX omits two of the first four verbs of this verse and for שכרו ולא יין נער ולא שכר it has (kai) kraipalesate ouk apo sikera oude (oud some mss.) apo oinou, which translated literally back into Hebrew would be (ו)שכרו (ו)לא משכר ולא

מ'יין, but whether the translator actually had such a Hebrew text before him, and in particular whether he read משכר and not שכר,

or םיין and not םיין, is uncertain. The Lucianic witnesses L¹-233-456 770 Th. expand the verse to agree with the MT, and among other changes, insert kai methysthēte ouk apo oinou before kai kraipalēsate. The added phrase is an alternative translation of םיין ולא שכר, but there can be no certainty םיין was not read in the Hebrew text.

Symmachus according to Eus. and hoi loipoi panta according to Eus. read aneu oinou which seems to represent םיין ולא, but could well be a free translation of םיין ולא. Theodotion's translation of שכר is extant, but not his translation of םיין. See the next article.

29:9 משכר

So perhaps LXX (see the previous article), and possibly Peshitta םין שכרא, Targum םין עתיק, Vulgate C c ab ebrietate, and barely possibly Vulgate A in ebrietate.

Symmachus and hoi loipoi panta according to Eus have dicha methysmatos, which seems to represent םיין ולא שכר. 1QIs^a has םיין ולא שכר.

Notice that the majority of Vulgate witnesses (but not the early mss. AC), Jerome's commentary, 1QIs^a (or its ancestor), and Kenn. 250 agree with the printed Midrash Tehillim in reading שכר ... םיין and not משכר ... םיין, which is some evidence in favour of the genuineness of the reading םיין.

Theodotion according to Q Syh has kai ou sikera, apparently agreeing with the MT.

29:9 (ולא משכר) תער (ולא מיין)

Buber suggests that this may be a conflation with Is 28:7.

The Peshitta has ןררר for שכר and ןרררר for

The Targum has רר for שכר and רר for רר. It is almost certain that the Peshitta and the Targum read שכר as in the MT, but the identification of the second verb is doubtful.

In 28:7 the Peshitta uses רר to translate both רר and רר, and the Targum uses רר to translate רר, so it is quite likely that they represent רר here. The verb רר is the usual equivalent for רר in the Peshitta and in the Targum. Nevertheless, the possibility remains that both versions might have read רר and translated freely, since there is no one-to-one correspondence of the Aramaic verb with the Hebrew verbs in either Version, either in this verse or in 28:7, as the following table shows:

Is 28:7

Targum	:	Peshitta	:	Hebrew
רר		רר		רר
אסתלעמר		רר		רר
רר		רר		רר
אסתלעמר		אתבלער		נבלער
רר (רר)		רר (רר)		רר
אתפניאר		רר		רר
רר (אסתלעמר רר)		אכלר		פקר

Is 29:9

Targum	:	Peshitta	:	Hebrew
אתרפו		תמהו		התמהכהו
שהו (שחר ס)		ואתרמרו		ותמהו
אשתגישו (איתזמימו מ)		ואתטרפו		השתעשעו
ראשתמימו (אתזמימו ראשתממו בג)		ותורו		ושעו
רוו (רווחן oy Eph.)		דרוין		שכרו
טעו		ורטעין		נעו

29:10 כי ה' ח

So Romans 11:8 (not mentioned by Ziegler). The evidence of the quotation in Romans must be treated with caution; see below on the variant עליהם.

Symmachus = MT.

29:10 ה' עליכם

So Vulgate A, Kenn. 30.

Symmachus = MT.

29:10 (ה') אלהיך

The Syrohexapla reads ה' אלהים; the Speculum and Romans 11:8 read אלהים. The reading of Romans may be due to the influence of kyrios ho theos in the LXX of Dt. 29:3; see the article עליהם.

Symmachus = MT.

29:10 'π 'π

So LXX 93.

Symmachus = MT.

29:10 עליהם

So Peshitta and Kenn. primo 3 and so apparently Jerome's commentary, p. 301 on Is 22:4-5 (eis), in a translation independent of the LXX and Romans 11:8. Compare Kenn. 130 ∩ sup ras.

The Hebrew text underlying the quotation in Romans 11:8 is uncertain. The quotation reads as follows: edōken autois ho theos pneuma katanyxeōs ophthalmous tou mē blepein kai ōta tou mē akouein heōs tēs sēmeron hēmeras. The phrase pneuma katanyxeōs is from Is 29:10; the phrase heōs tēs sēmeron hēmeras is from Dt 29:3 (but not according to the LXX translation, which has heōs tēs hēmeras tautēs); the rest of the quotation seems to be a conflation of both verses. The phrase edōken autois is a possible free translation of עליהם ׀. Alternatively, the original reading in Romans might have been pepotiken autous, with edōken from Dt 29:3 inserted in place of pepotiken, and the case of the pronoun altered to agree with the new verb. Whatever the origin of the phrase in its present form, the pronoun, whether autois or autous, was probably originally third person in the text of Romans. No influence from the MT or LXX of Dt 29:3 is possible, since it has second person forms throughout, and no influence from a variant text of Dt 29:3 with third person form is impossible, since

the context of the verse in Dt. demands the second person (the variant hēmōn for hymōn in LXX mss. b'de in Dt 29:3 is probably no more than a mistake due to the identical pronunciation of the two words in later Greek). The influence of other passages is unlikely.

It may be concluded that the Hebrew text of Is 29:10, or a Greek translation of it, underlying the quotation in Romans probably had עליהם for עליכם of the MT.

29:10 אַתְּ (רֵאשׁוֹן) חָ

So Kenn. 1. The Targum agrees with the MT. The other Versions are inconclusive.

29:10 עֵינֵיהֶם

So LXX except L¹-233-456 Wirc. Tht., and so Peshitta.

Romans 11:8 has simply ophthalmous, but the syntax of the sentence makes it clear that the implied pronoun is autōn, not hymōn, so the underlying Hebrew text probably had עֵינֵיהֶם; see the article on עליהם.

Symmachus= MT.

29:10 אַתְּ (הַנְּבִיאִים)

So LXX, Arabic Version, Symmachus (Ziegler emends to agree with the MT), Peshitta, Targum bogfc N, (but not translating completely literally) Kenn. 1, 17, 32, 72, 91, 149, 150, 154,

158, 172, 198, 210, 224, 225, 226, 228, 258, 260, 264; forte 23, 94;
 אס 3, 82: de Rossi 2, 20, 174, 305, 341, 554, 596; primo 211, 440,
 663; munc 411; Biblia Soncinensia, Brixiensia, Prophetæ Sonc.: Ginsburg
 2, 3, 5, 11, 14, 21, 24, 26, 27, 42; edd. I, III, X.

Romans 11:8 omits this phrase.

29:10 עיניהם (מראות)

This reading may be due to conflation with Dt 29:3. Compare the
 conflate quotation of Is 29:10 and Dt 29:3 in Romans 11:8.

29:14 חכמים (חכמת)

So LXX S A'-Q-26-86 B-oI' 62 -46-233-456 C'' 198 239' 301 393 407
 410 449' 534 538 544 Co Wirc. o.

LXX V 93 Eus read חכמיהם. The rest of the LXX witnesses, i.e.
 L'-147-36-96-86^c-926 403' Tht. agree with the MT. The distribution of
 the readings וננייהם, וננים and ונני' in the LXX witnesses
 is the same, except that ms. 62 agrees with the MT in reading ונני'.

29:15 ריהי (במחשך)

So lQIs^a.

The Versions are inconclusive. See the reading of the Vulgate and
 Jerome's commentary in the next article.

29:15 יהיה (במחשך)

This reading may be supported by the Vulgate and Jerome's commentary, which have quorum sunt in tenebris opera for יהיה במחשך מעשיהם.

29:15 רואהו (ומי)

This reading agrees very well with the derash, which says that the burglar acts as if it were enough not to be seen by people, as if God did not see what he was doing.

29:23 ילרי מעשה ירי

As the context of the Biblical verse refers the children primarily to Jacob (although, of course, they must be God's too) it seems very likely that this reading is due to scribal error of the kind discussed in the next article.

Symmachus = MT.

29:23 ילריר מעשה יריר

The children referred to are Jacob's; the hands are God's. It would be very forced to refer the pronominal suffix of ילריר to Jacob and the pronominal suffix of יריר to God, and the context precludes referring the suffixes of both words to God. It is almost certain that this reading is simply a mistake. The same reading is found in Kenn. 1, 18, 95, 191; primo 116, 128: de Rossi primo 560 hispanus. See the previous

article.

Symmachus = MT.

29:23 'ש' (את קדש)

So Peshitta ns.

This reading may be induced by the quotation of 'עזבו את ה' 'ש' 'ק' 'אמר נאצו...נאצו' (sic) from Is 1:4 immediately before.

Symmachus = MT.

30:5 אל (עם)

So LXX (pros), <Symmachus> and Theodotion (eis), Targum, Peshitta.

30:5 כי אם (לבשת)

So Kenn. 1, 154, 180, 253. The translations of the LXX (alla), the Peshitta (אלא), and the Vulgate and Jerome's commentary (sed), are inconclusive. The Targum's translation 'ך' agrees with the MT. It is likely that the reading 'ך' is a scribal error due to the relative rareness of 'ך' meaning 'but', and the relative commonness of 'ך' with such a meaning.

30:6 (גנ) מרנר (אנד)

This reading may well be due to the influence of the immediately preceding quotation of מ' מרנר אנד from Is 21:1, but against this it must be pointed out that Is 21:1 is only quoted by the printed editions and ms. א of the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el, and is not found in the witnesses נטט to the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el, the Midrash Sechel Tov, the Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai, or the Tanhuma (the anonymous midrash in the Yalqut Shim'oni, the Midrash Leqah Tov, and Midrash Shemot Rabbah are inconclusive because of the extensive abbreviation); which means that the variant to Is 30:6 is found in several texts, namely witnesses נטט to the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el, that do not quote Is 21:1 at all. It is possible, of course, that the ancestors of these texts did contain a quotation of Is 21:1, and that it dropped out under the influence of the similar verse Is 30:6.

The texts of the midrashim are quoted below, in the article after next.

30:6 'ח מהמ

So Targum. 1QIs^a reads מ'מ]א' for מהמ.

30:6 אפעה שרף מערפף (ג)

The relevant texts are the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el pp. 153-154 on Ex 15:22 (including a quotation of the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el in the Yalqut Shim'oni, vol. II, par. 266), Midrash Leqah Tov and Midrash Sechel Tov on the same verse, the Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai, the Printed Tanhuma Beshallah par. 18, Eiber's Tanhuma Beshallah leaf 32, an anonymous midrash quoted in the Yalqut Shim'oni vol. II, par. 418, Shemot Rabbah ch. 24 par 4.

I quote the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el according to the printed editions, with the more important variants of the other witnesses added in brackets:

ויצאו אל מדבר שור (שמות טו:כב) ... כלו מלא נחשים ועקרבים
(+ וצפערונים כ) שני המוליכך במדבר הגדול והנורא נחש שרף ועקרב
וגו' (זכרים ח:סז) וכת' משא מדבר ים (וכת' — ים ח' זטכט) (יש'
כא:א) וכת' משא בהמות נגב (מדבר נגב אטכט) בארץ צרה וצוקה
לביא וליש מהם (מהם ח' ט) אפעה שרף מעופף (נגב וגו' ז; וצוקה וגו'
ט; וליש וכו' ח' כ; שרף וכו' ח' אמ) אין אפעה אלא עכס אמרו שעכס
זה רואה צל עוף (רואה כל עוף זט) שהוא פורח באויר וכשהוא רואה
העוף ומתחבר אל צלו איבריו נושרין (באויר מיד מתחבר [נתחבר ז]
ונושר איברים איברים זא; באויר ומיד מת ונושר איברים ט; באויר
מיד הוא מכרכר ונושר איברים איברים כ; באויר מיד הוא מתחבר
ונושר העוף איברים איברים מ) ... אמר ר' עקיבא (ר' אחא ז; ר'
אבא אטכט) דבר הסיח לי רבינו הקדוש ארם אחד היה בארץ ישראל
והיו קורין אותו מרוטה פעם אחת עלה להר ללקוט עצים וראה את
הנחש ישן והנחש לא ראהו מיד סר (נשר אמ; ונשר [מיד ח' ז; נשרו
טכ) שער ראשו ולא היה (ולא צמח זאטכט) בו שער עד יום מותו והיו
קורין אותו מרוטה:

The Midrash Leqah Tov reads as follows:

ויצאו אל מדבר שור (שמות טו:כב) ... וכולו מלא נחשים ועקרבים,
שנאמר המוליכך במדבר הגדול והנורא נחש שרף ועקרב וצמאון (זכרים
ח:סו), שרף הוא אפעה, כשהוא רואה צל עוף פורח, מיד העוף נושר
אברים איברים ... אמר ר' אבא דבר זה סח לי רבינו הקדוש, ארם אחד
היה בארץ ישראל, פעם אחת עלה להר ללקוט עצים וראה את הנחש ישן,

והוא לא ראהו ומרוב פחדו נשר שער ראשו ועוד לא נצמח זהיר קורין
אותו מרוטה:

The Midrash Sechel Tov reads as follows:

ויצאו אל מדבר שור (שמות טו:כב) ... וכולו מלא נחשים ועקרבים,
ועליו נאמר המוליכך במדבר הגדול והנורא נחש שרף ועקרב (דברים
ח:טו), ואומר משא מדבר נגב בארץ ערבה אפעה ושרף מעופף ואין
אפעה אלא עכס, אמרו עכס זה כל עוף הפורח עליו באויר מיד הוא
משהבר ונושר איבריין איבריין:

There is no need to quote the rest of the texts in full. I will
confine myself to quoting the section of the text of the Mechilta deRabbi
Shim'on ben Yohai, the two Tanhumas, and the anonymous midrash that
corresponds to the text of the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el from the quot-
ation of Dt 8:15 to the words וישרין and omit Shemot Rabbah
altogether, since it does not quote Is 30:6 at all, and has been re-worked.

The Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai reads as follows:

... המוליכך במדבר וגומ' (דברים ח:טו) ואומ' משא בהמות נגב
ב ארץ צרה וצוקה וגומ' ואפעה (משא בהמות נגב בארץ צרה וצוקה
לביא ((ולביא מדה"ג כ"י ה)) וליש מהם אפעה ושרף מעופף מדה"ג
אין אפעה אלא איכעוס אמרו איכעוס זה בשעה שהוא רואה צל עוף
הפורח באויר מחאכל אותו העוף ונושר איבריין איבריין ...

I have omitted a few very minor variants of wording in the Midrash Haggadol.

The Printed Tanhuma reads as follows:

... המוליכך במדבר הגדול והנורא נחש שרף ועקרב (דברים ח:טו) ...

הוי המליכך במדבר הגדול והנורא נחש שרף ועקרב וצמאון אשר אין
מים המוציא לך מים מצור החלמיש (שם) ואומר משא כהמות נגב בארץ
צרה וצוקה לביא וליש מהם אפעה ושרף מעופף אין אפעה אלא עכס אמרו
עכס זה רואה צל עוף פורח באויר מיד נתחבר ונושר אברים אברים ...

Buber's Tanhuma reads as follows:

... הוי המליכך וגו' (זברים ח:טו): ואומר אפעה ושרף מעופף, מהו
שרף מעופף, העוף שהיה פורח עליו מיד היה נשרף ...

The anonymous midrash differs from all the other texts in omitting
(or ויצאו אל מדבר שור ... כלו מלא נחשים ועקרבים (וצפעונים
צפע ופריו שרף מעופף (its equivalent) and substituting a quotation of
from Is 14:29, after which it continues as follows:

ואומר המליכך במדבר הגדול והנורא נחש שרף ועקרב וגו' (זברים
ח:טו), מהו שרף מעופף העוף שהוא פורח עליו מיד היה נשרף ...

Although this midrash does not quote Is 30:4, but quotes Is 14:29 instead,
there is some evidence that it is derived from a text that quoted Is 30:6,
as will be shown below.

The relationship of the texts to each other is fairly clear, and
follows the usual pattern. The Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el and Mechilta
deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai may be regarded as equally close to the original
form of the derash. The Midrash Leqah Tov and the Midrash Sechel Tov
quote the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el, apparently with some editorial
changes. The Printed Tanhuma and Buber's Tanhuma give two different forms
of a re-worked text of the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el. The anonymous

midrash seems to be a form of Buber's Tanhuma or to be derived from it. Midrash Shemot Rabba depends on a Tanhuma midrash, but has been extensively re-worked.

The anonymous midrash is anomalous in quoting Is 14:29 instead of Is 30:6. It is unlikely that the quotation is original, since the derash demands a verse referring to a dangerous saraf found in the desert and dangerous to Israel, as in Dt 8:15; but the saraf of Is 14:29 is a symbol of Hezekiah, according to both the obvious meaning of the Biblical text and the unanimous Rabbinic tradition. Of course, the real saraf used as a symbol in Is 14:29 must be a dangerous snake and is to be identified with the one in Is 30:6, but its symbolic use makes it unsuitable for this derash. Besides, it is unlikely that such a late midrash (at least as late as Buber's Tanhuma), should preserve the original Biblical quotation of the derash when it had been altered in all witnesses to the text of the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el and the Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai.

It is uncertain whether the substitution of Is 14:29 for Is 30:6 is due to an editor of the midrash or to the compiler of the Yalqut Shim'oni. The compiler of the Yalqut Shim'oni would not normally make such a substitution, but on the other hand it seems unlikely that an editor could be so unperceptive as not to see that Is 14:29 does not really fit here. One possible solution can be found by combining both hypotheses. Suppose the midrash originally read אפעא ושרף מעופף מהו שרף מעופף וכו' after the quotation of Dt 8:15, as in Buber's Tanhuma (or perhaps even ושרף אפעא ושרף מעופף אין אפעא וכו'), instead of אפעא ושרף מעופף וכו'.

It would be very easy for the word אפעא to drop out, and if this happened, the phrase שרף מעופף (ו) could be just as well identified with Is 14:29 as with Is 30:6. The only quotation that must be from Is 14:29 and not Is 30:6 is at the start of the derash; but the compiler of the Yalqut Shim'oni usually inserts a lemma in this position if he does not find one in the text he is quoting. What could have happened, then, is that the compiler saw the phrase שרף מעופף (ו), assumed that it was from Is 14:29, and inserted a lemma from Is 14:29 at the start of the passage. The wrong identification would have been made easier by the knowledge that the שרף מעופף used as a symbol in Is 14:29 and the real one in Is 30:6 are identical, and perhaps by knowledge of a tradition preserved by Jerome and to be mentioned below that interpreted שרף מעופף in Is 14:29 in exactly the way it is interpreted in Is 30:6.

In the discussion that follows, the anonymous midrash will be treated as a form of Buber's Tanhuma, and it will be assumed that the reference to Is 14:29 is a mistake. Even if the assumption is wrong, it will not seriously matter, since the arguments based on the wording of the anonymous midrash will still be valid, but will establish the meaning of שרף מעופף in Is 14:29 instead of Is 30:6.

The commentary Keli Paz on the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el (quoted by the 'Es Yosef on the Printed Tanhuma) explains the derash by saying that אפעא שרף המעופף עליך means אפעא ושרף מעופף. This explanation is undoubtedly correct. It fits the implications of the Biblical quotations in the derash and can be shown to be demanded

by the wording of the derash following the Biblical texts.

The evidence of the Biblical texts as used in the derash will be considered first. It is clear that Is 30:6 is quoted to illustrate the terrors of the desert mentioned in Dt 8:15, and in particular the נחש שרף. Now, Dt 8:15 refers back to Nu 21:6-10, and the way נחש and שרף are interchanged in Nu 21:7-10 makes it clear that in Nu 21:6 the phrase נחש שרף refers to one kind of snake, not two, and that שרף is an adjective or a noun in apposition. It follows, then, that the phrase נחש שרף in Dt 8:15 refers to one kind of snake, with שרף describing נחש. The derash identifies the אפעה with the נחש שרף of Dt 8:15, which means that the word שרף (or better, שרף: see the apparatus) in Is 30:6 must be regarded as a qualifier of אפעה. The identification of אפעה and שרף in Is 30:6 can actually be demonstrated fairly conclusively. Notice that the description of the activities of the שרף מערפף is explicitly given by the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el, the Midrash Sechel Tov, the Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai, and the Printed Tanhuma as an explanation of what is meant by אפעה, and that the Midrash Leqah Tov says שרף הוא אפעה. Only Buber's Tanhuma permits a separation of the שרף from the אפעה, and even it does not demand it. As it stands alone in this against the other sources, including the closely related Printed Tanhuma, its divergence is probably due to editorial re-working. If אפעה and שרף in Is 30:6 are regarded as one animal and identified with the נחש שרף

of Dt 8:15 and Nu 21:6, it becomes hard to treat the word מעופף in Is 30:6 as an adjective, since there is no suggestion in the passages quoted from Nu or Dt that the נחש שרף can fly. The only alternative is to make מעופף the object of שרף, which must then be treated as if it were a participle.

An examination of the exact wording of the derash in its various sources shows that such an interpretation is unavoidable. The important section within the quotation from each midrash has been underlined. Horowitz and Rabin regard the correct reading in the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el as מתחבל (ונושר) or perhaps מתאכל (ונושר). They do not justify this statement, but it is easy to do so. The word מתחבר or נתחבר can be shown to be corrupt. The omission of

הערף in the witnesses אנט of the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el, the Midrash Sechel Tov, and the Printed Tanhuma means that the participle מתחבר or its equivalent must have the same subject as ונושר and that this subject is probably the word עוף which occurs just before the underlined section. For this reason the forms נת of the Yalqut Shim'oni (ט) quoting the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el, מכרכר of the Midrash Hachamin (ט) quoting the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el, and משתבר of the Midrash Sechel Tov give better sense and are closer to the original intention of the derash, even though they are not necessarily original. Some word referring to the destruction of the bird is certainly required, and מתחבל is indirectly attested in the corrupt forms מתחבר and נתחבר. Aside from these arguments, the Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai independently has the quite unambiguous reading מתאכל ארתר העוף, and Buber's Tanhuma and the

anonymous midrash, which probably depend on the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el, are just as unambiguous in reading מִיָּד הִיָּה נִשְׂרָף.

(The Midrash Leqah Tov avoids the difficulty by omitting the troublesome word). The story of the men whose hair fell out is further confirmation of this interpretation.

Horovitz and Rabin consider the two forms מִתְחַבֵּל* of the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el and מִתְאָכֵל of the Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai to be equally valid, and explain the divergence between the two midrashim by spontaneous substitution of one synonym for another. In spite of the uncertainty of whether מִתְחַבֵּל or

מִתְאָכֵל is original, the intention of the derash is quite clear, and the interpretation of שָׂרַף מֵעֹרְפָּי as 'bird-burning' is assured.

With the meaning the phrase אֶפְעָה וְשָׂרַף (שָׂרַף*) מֵעֹרְפָּי held for the author of the derash established, it is easy to see why the waw of שָׂרַף is omitted in the printed editions of the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el. The reading of the printed editions is not contradicted by the other direct witnesses (i.e. אֶפְעָה) to the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el or the Genizah fragment (פ) of the Mechilta deRabbi Shi'on ben Yohai, since none of them carry the quotations so far. As for the indirect witnesses to the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el and the Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai, the Midrash Leqah Tov does not quote the verse at all, ^{and} the Midrash Sechel Tov and the Midrash Haggadol may only agree with the MT because the compilers extended the short quotation they found in their mss. according to the MT, as is their

custom. The two Tanhumas agree with the MT, but as they tend to have longer Biblical quotations than the earlier midrashim they depend on, the explanation of the agreement with the MT is probably the same as in the case of the Midrash Sechel Tov and the Midrash Haggadol. The reading in the Geniza fragment (D) of the Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai may be the beginning of a phrase

גאפעה שרף מערפף

The readings of the Versions in Is 14:29 and Is 30:6 will be treated together, partly because there is some chance that the quotation of Is 14:29 in the anonymous midrash might be original to it, and not merely due to the compiler of the Yalqut Shim'oni, and partly because any fabulous qualities of the snake in Is 14:29 are just as valuable as evidence for the age of the derash as the same qualities in Is 30:6.

Jerome translates גרפף שרף as absorbens uolucrum in Is 14:29, and translates the parallel word רפף as regulus, meaning 'basilisk'. It is uncertain whether he knew of an association of the saraf in Is 14:29 with the one in Dt 8:15, but his comments leave no doubt that he took גרפף to be the object of שרף and was aware of the fabulous qualities of the snake. In his first commentary on Is 14:29 he says:

'Pro hoc enim nocentior nascetur Ezechias regulus, quem Graeci uocant basiliscum, qui te suo aspectu interficiat et spiritu oris occidat. Quomodo enim nulla auis reguli aspectum potest illaesa transire; sed quamuis procul fuerit, eius ore sorbetur. Ita et tu a conspectu regis Ezechiae totus peribis. Et pulchre seruaui metaphoram, quia enim

serpentem et regulum nominarat, ore eius et spiritu dicit uolucres deuorari ... Pro eo autem quod nos transtulimus absorbens uolucrem, et in Hebraeo scriptum est saraph mopheth; interpretari potest: serpens uolans, ut sit sensus: de radice colubri nascetur regulus, et fructus illius, id est reguli, serpens uolans, ut draconem intellegas'.

Jerome agrees substantially with the derash but disagrees in giving blowing as an alternative method of killing, and in having the bird actually gobbled up by the snake. The same idea about blowing is probably behind the Vulgate's translation of שרף נחש in Dt 8:15 as serpens flatu adurens, and the anonymous Greek translation of שרף in the same verse as physemat.... On the other hand the choice of adurens as the translation of שרף in Dt 8:15, instead of absorbens as in Is 14:29, may reflect a dependence on the derash under discussion.

In the second commentary, Jerome seems to be in the process of changing his mind about the meaning of שרף מעופף. He has not altered the translation, but in his comments he explains שרף מעופף as meaning either serpentes uolantes or qui absorbeant uolucres. The נחש is still a basilisk, of which he says: 'afflatu suo atque conspectu homines occidere dicitur'. Further down he ^{expands} on the two interpretations of the meaning of שרף מעופף:

'Cumque regnauerint in hominibus aliegenis, qui a Deo alieni sunt, statim egredientur serpentes pennati; ut non sufficiat eis cogitasse, et fecisse quae mala sunt, nisi patrocinium quoque malorum operum quaesierint, et diuersas finxerint haereses. Ego puto serpentes esse pennatos, qui se exaltant et eleuant contra scientiam Dei et ponunt

in caelum os suum. Vel qui absorbeant uolucres, hoc est, qui uenenato ore singulos quosque uolare cupientes et ad excelsa consurgere, suis faucibus deuorant'.

Notice that there is now no mention of a basilisk that kills birds, only of one that kills people.

In Is 30:6, Jerome treats שרפון as an adjective referring to שרף, and translates et regulus uolans. Nevertheless the saraf is still a basilisk, and the fabulous qualities have been extended:

'Ac ne putaremus uere scripturam sanctam de leaena et leone dicere, contra naturam rerum loquitur, quod de leaena et leone nata sit uipera et regulus uolans, siue genimina aspidum uolantia... Ista genimina uiperarum, siue aspidum uolantium, id est princeps populi et omnis impiorum turba ... Leaenam et catulum leonis quidam caelestem Hierusalem et deceptum ex ea populum exposuit, regulumque uolantem, et uiperas, et genimina aspidum, illum de quo supra legimus, colubrum tortuosum; et de quo Saluator in euangelio loquebatur: Videbam satanam, quasi fulgur de caelo cadentem (Luke 10:18). Qui draco appellatus in Apocalypsi, tertiam partem stellarum secum detraxit in terram, quae peruersitate sententiae priores diuitias perdiderunt, deserentes eas in Aegyptum huius saeculi'.

Symmachus translates שרפון שרף (or perhaps שרף) in Is 14:29 as physōn kai eklyōn, 'a blower and breaker-up', i.e. apparently a snake that blows at birds and makes them fall apart. Compare Jerome's first commentary on Is 14:29 and the Vulgate and the anonymous

Greek translation of Dt 8:15. In Is 30:6, Symmachus has kai basiliskos eklyōn, which represents the same tradition as in Is 14:29.

All other Versions (including Aquila and Theodotion in 14:29 and Aquila, Theodotion, and ho Hebraios in 30:6) treat מְעוֹפֵף as an adjective in both verses. There is no trace of any fabulous idea in the translations of Is 30:6, but in Is 14:29 a translation of עַצ as basiliskos is attributed to Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion by ms. 710 and to hoi loipoi by Chrysostom.

For אַפְעָה וְשָׂרָף מְעוֹפֵף In Is 30:6, all LXX witnesses except S* L-96 449' 534 Syh Hi. read אַפְעָה וְשָׂרָף מְעוֹפֵף. The Targum seems to read אַפְעָה שָׂרָף מְעוֹפֵף. Kenn. 30 has אַפְעָה שָׂרָף מְעוֹפֵף. Symmachus and Theodotion's translations of אַפְעָה are not extant, but they agree with the MT in reading אַפְעָה וְשָׂרָף מְעוֹפֵף with waw. The evidence for Aquila and ho Hebraios's waw readings is inconclusive. LXX S* L-96 449' 534 Syh Hi., the Peshitta, and the Vulgate and Jerome's commentary agree with the MT in the distribution of waw.

Of all the extant translations of Is 30:6, only Symmachus's interprets שָׂרָף מְעוֹפֵף as meaning 'bird-burning', but a trace of such an interpretation may be reflected in the omission of the waw in אַפְעָה by the Targum and Kenn. 30. The quotation of Is 30:6 in the printed editions of the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el agrees with Kenn. 30, and the quotation in the Geniza fragment א of the Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai agrees with either the Targum or the LXX.

30:14 לא (ימצא)

So Kenn. 226. Compare Kenn. 182 אשר לא. The LXX has hōste, which is inconclusive. The Peshitta has לא, perhaps under the influence of the LXX.

30:18 לכן

So Peshitta(מטל), Targum RN, Vulgate, Jerome's commentary, Kenn. 130, 168.

30:18 המשפט

So Kenn. 1.

30:18 ואשרי

So Peshitta.

30:19 (ישב) ובירושלם, ובירושלים

So LXX 534, Peshitta, Targum c, 1QIs^a, Kenn. 1, 93, 96, 145, 150. Compare the next article.

Aquila and Symmachus = MT.

30:19 ישב וירושלם, ישבו ירושלם

The LXX except 534 seems to read ישב וירושלם. The reading ישבו ירושלם in the Yalqut Mechiri on Psalms is probably a corruption of the same reading. Compare the previous article.

Aquila and Symmachus = MT.

30:19 זעק'י

So Peshitta MU and Kenn. 4, 93, 158. The Urmia edition has a seyāmē sign and points the word as a plural. The Mosul edition has no seyāmē sign but points the word as a plural. As Diettrich has failed to remark on the difference between the two editions, it is impossible to tell which mss. have seyāmē points and which not, but presumably all of the pointed mss. point the word as a plural.

The Targum is inconclusive. Symmachus = MT.

30:20 ה' לכם

So LXX S A' O' 46 C',⁻⁸⁷ 301 393 449' 538 544 918 Co o, Targum bf K PN, Kenn. 30, 150, 154 (ה' לכם). See van Zijl on the reading of ms. z of the Targum, which both Stenning and Sperber misread. The reading of mss. PN in Stenning's ed. is assumed on the basis of the lack of a notice in the apparatus stating that they diverged from the basic ms. (z), but as the reading of this ms. is given incorrectly, the actual reading of mss. PN becomes very doubtful.

30:20 א'ל

So Kenn. 1, 198, 245.

30:20 (לא) יכנס

The Aramaic verb כנף has the same meaning as the Hebrew כנס. It is quite likely that a scribe took the verb in its Aramaic meaning and unconsciously substituted a synonym. The reading כנפ of the Peshitta, and engisōsi of the LXX are no proof of a reading יכנס in the Hebrew text, since the translators could easily have interpreted כנף in its Aramaic meaning.

30:20 (עור) את (מוריך) (יכנף פיעל)

The derash is intelligible whether יכנף is treated as transitive or intransitive. It would be easy to assume that the reading את מוריך is merely a scribal mistake under the influence of the same phrase at the end of the verse, except that the evidence of the derash is only inconclusive, not negative, and there is external support for reading יכנף as a transitive verb. The Peshitta translates ולא נכנש תוב as ולא יכנף עור מוריך

למטעיני כון 'and he (i.e. God) will not bring those that led you astray any more', taking מוריך in an unfavourable sense. The Vulgate and Jerome's commentary translate: et non faciet auolare a te ultra doctorem tuum 'and he (i.e. God) will not make your (human) teacher fly away any more'. The Targum translates ולא יכנף עור

ולא יסליק עור שכינתיה as מוריך והיו עיניך ראות את מוריך מבית מקדשא ויהויין עינך חזין ית שכינתא (שכינתיה א; שכותי ג) בבית מקדשא. (Only the important variants have been noted).

This would mean 'he (God) will not take his Shechinah away from the Temple any more etc.', with מוריך translated as שכינתיה.

4Q 163 reads $\eta' \eta' \eta'$, presumably as hif'il. 1QIs^a reads $\eta' \eta' \eta'$.
but it is uncertain whether the subject intended is $\eta' \eta' \eta'$ or
whether the verb is an indefinite plural with $\eta' \eta' \eta'$ the object.

30:20 $\eta' \eta' \eta'$

All of the midrashim quoted in the apparatus refer the word to God, except for the Midrash Haggadol on Genesis, which refers it to angels. Probably the form of this word in the MT is only a case of full spelling, and is not intended as a plural. Notice that the only midrash that actually reads $\eta' \eta' \eta'$ without yod is the only one that interprets it as a plural.

Symmachus, Abulwalid (quoted by Field), the Targum, the Vulgate, Jerome's commentary, and Kern. 1, 23, 182 read a singular noun.

30:22 ($\eta' \eta' \eta'$, $\eta' \eta' \eta'$) $\eta' \eta' \eta'$

See Geiger, pp. 263-264, for a discussion of the correct reading in this passage. He shows that the author of this verse probably meant $\eta' \eta' \eta'$ to mean faeces, and that we should probably read $\eta' \eta' \eta'$ (with holem), and gives several other examples of suppression of the word $\eta' \eta' \eta'$ of $\eta' \eta' \eta'$ by means of misleading pointing in the MT. The Gemara seems to take $\eta' \eta' \eta'$ as meaning not faeces, but unpleasant substances in general, and specifically menstrual blood.

As Geiger has already demonstrated the correct reading, and as there is no doubt that one tradition in the Gemara Yerushalmi inter-

preted כץ as a noun, I will confine myself to discussing the origin of the two traditions of interpretation of כץ in the Gemara, and to discussing the evidence of the Versions.

The relevant texts are Mishnah Shabbat 9:1 and 'Avodah Zarah 3:6 (3:8 in the Yerushalmi), Tosefta Zavim 5:6, Gemara Yerushalmi Shabbat 9:1, specially as far as line 36, and 'Avodah Zarah 3:8, specially as far as line 6 of col. 2. The two passages of Mishnah and the passage of Tosefta are very similar; the two passages of Gemara are identical. See Epstein, Diqduqe haYerushalmi, p. 517 on the reading of the Leiden ms. in Shabbat line 23, and see his footnote 3 on the corresponding reading in 'Avodah Zarah.

There are two distinct traditions on the meaning of the word in the Yerushalmi. One tradition takes it to be a noun with the same meaning as חכץ and the other takes it to be the imperative of כץ'. The problem is to date the two traditions on the basis of the conflicting information given.

R. 'Aqiva and the majority of scholars (רבנן , רבנן) agree that only one of the two phrases חכץ תעב תעב and

חכץ תעב in Dt 7:26 can be used to derive the details of the law of impurity from idols. R. 'Aqiva maintains that the details for idols are the same as for menstruous women, basing his argument on

חכץ תעב. The majority maintain that the details for idols are the same as for reptiles, basing their argument on חכץ תעב.

R. 'Aqiva maintains that שקץ תשקצנו is to be interpreted metaphorically as שקציהו נבליהו, and the majority maintain that תעב תתעבנו is to be interpreted metaphorically as אץ'יהו. An explanation of the word אץ is then derived from the phrase אץ תאמר לו in Is 30:22, which is interpreted as meaning 'you shall call it (the idol) muck' i.e. offensive names. The place of this quotation in the argument depends on an analysis of the variant readings in the Gemara text in Shabbat and 'Avodah Zarah and will be discussed below. For the moment, it is enough to say that it supports the majority's argument. An alternative interpretation of the word אץ as 'go out' is attributed to R. 'Aqiva in Shabbat.(line 29), and to the majority in 'Avodah Zarah (line 3 from the bottom of col.1). Seeing that a majority opinion that אץ means אץ'יהו has already been given, it would be expected that a divergent opinion would be R. 'Aqiva's. There are, however, seven difficulties in accepting the interpretation as his.

In the first place, R. 'Aqiva would have no need to interpret אץ any differently to the way the majority do; in fact, interpreting it as a noun would actually support his interpretation of Dt 7:26 just as well as it would support theirs. The only disagreement to be expected on Is 30:22 is on the meaning of the word אץ. It is clear from the Mishnah and Tosefta that R. 'Aqiva took it in its obvious sense of menstrual blood or a menstruating woman; the majority might have given it a less specific interpretation as defiling matter in

general, as does the Targum Yonatan.

In the second place, the form of R. 'Aqiva's quotation of Is 30:22 in the Mishnah and Tosefta seems to indicate that he took KY as a noun. The only fact he is concerned with demonstrating is that the law for idols is the same as for menstruating women, and all he needs to prove his statement is תזרם כמר לרה. As the Mishnah and Tosefta never quote more than the minimum number of words of a Biblical verse needed to prove a point, and often only quote enough of the verse to identify it without quoting the relevant part at all, there must be some special reason for adding יצא תאמר לו. What is needed is an interpretation of the second phrase that will form an expansion, or better, elucidation, of the first, and this can only be had if KY is taken as a noun parallel to לרה.

In the third place, the wording of the Gemara seems to indicate that on the matter of the interpretation of KY R. 'Aqiva and his contemporaries agreed. The majority require a verse to support their interpretation of תעב תתעבנו as יצאיהו נבליהו, and R. 'Aqiva requires a verse to support his interpretation of שקץ תשקצנו as שקציהו נבליהו. The Gemara, before quoting Is 30:22, does not say יצאיהו נבליהו (לרבנו) (מניין) מה הן but simply שקציהו נבליהו (לרבנו) (מניין) מה הן: only the word that R. 'Aqiva and the majority use in common is quoted.

This^{is} actually to be expected. The phrase יצא תאמר לו is not used to prove what is meant by תעב תתעבנו, since that

the doorway, which is only intelligible in the light of the law on entry into a house defiled by leprosy quoted in the last of the heqqeshim. These heqqeshim are no earlier than the second generation of Amora'im, as will be shown below.

In the sixth place, a baraita in the name of R. 'El'azar (R. Ia'zar) says: לא רצה להיקרות עמרה קורין אותה עמירה (Shabbat line 27; 'Avodah Zarah line 5 from bottom), and this statement is only intelligible in its context if R. 'El'azar took אץ as a noun. Now, R. 'El'azar was a pupil of R. 'Aqiva's, and it would be expected that their interpretations would agree.

In the seventh place, Aquila, who translated under R. 'Aqiva's direction, translates אץ as hrypos, meaning any kind of offensive matter. This last argument seems to be conclusive.

It seems likely, then, that the attribution of אץ as an imperative verb to the majority, as in 'Avodah Zarah, is right. There remain two difficulties: the apparent impossibility of two majority opinions, and the origin of the attribution to R. 'Aqiva in Shabbat.

The first problem can be solved by an examination of what exactly is meant by Rabbanan in each case. The term Rabbanan or Rabbanin occurs in four contexts in 'Avodah Zarah, three in Shabbat in the Bomberg edition, and two in Shabbat in the Leiden ms. In the first case, Rabbanan are contrasted to the Hachamin. The Hachamin are R. 'Aqiva's contemporaries, so it would be expected that Rabbanan would be Amora'im, and since the passage under discussion occurs in the Talmud Yerushalmi,

presumably Palestinian ones. This can be shown to be the case. The word Rabbanan occurs in a series of heqqeshim designed to show that idols come partly under the category of reptiles, partly under the category of corpses, and partly under the category of a house defiled by leprosy. An integral and necessary part of this series of heqqeshim is a comment delivered by R. Ze'urah, a Palestinian Amora of the third generation, in the name of R. La'zar, a Palestinian Amora of the second and third generations, in the name of R. Yohanan, a Palestinian Amora of the second generation. As the comment by R. Yohanan is essential to the argument, the argument itself can be no later than the second generation of Amoraim, and the word Rabbanan must refer to Amoraim of about that time and perhaps later as well.

In the second case, Rabbanan are contrasted to R. 'Aqiva and can be seen by the content to be his contemporaries, since R. 'Aqiva refutes their interpretation of Dt 7:26.

The reference in the third case is the same as in the second, though the leiden ms. of Shabbat might be right in leaving the word out in this case.

In the fourth case, where only 'Avodah Zarah reads Rabbanin and Shabbat reads R. 'Aqiva, the term is contained in a passage explaining the meaning of KY according to a series of heqqeshim which, as has been shown above, are no earlier than the second generation of Amoraim. The passage containing the term Rabbanin must be at least as late and the Rabbanin must be Amoraim of the second generation or later.

This means that the first interpretation of the word XY as a noun belongs to the majority of Tannaim at the time of R. 'Aqiva (or, if the word ךךך is deleted, to the consensus of the Tannaim including R. 'Aqiva), and the second interpretation of it as an imperative verb belongs to the consensus of the Amoraim from the second generation onwards.

Both the Palestinian and the Babylonian Amoraim seem to have taken XY as an imperative verb. For the Palestinians, there is evidence from Amoraim of the first generation, R. Hananyah (R. Haninah) and R. Mana, the second generation, R. Yohanan, R. La'zar, and R. Yishaq bar Nahman, the third generation, R. 'Abbahu and R. Ze'urah (R. Ze'irah), the fourth generation, R. Huna, and the fifth generation, R. Yose be Rabbi Bun; and what is more conclusive, there is the consensus of the compilers of the Talmud Yerushalmi. For the Babylonians, there is the evidence of Rav Yosef, an Amora of the third generation, who generally represents the normative Babylonian interpretation of the Biblical text; an unopposed (so presumably generally accepted) statement by Rabbah, a Babylonian Amora of the third generation, in the Talmud Bavli Shabbat 82b contradicting R. 'Aqiva; and a translation as an imperative verb in the Targum Yonatan, the official Targum of the Babylonian Amoraim.

The series of interpretations of Is 30:22 may be summarized as follows: R. 'Aqiva takes ךךך to mean menstrual blood or a menstruating woman, and apparently XY to mean either the same or defiling substances in general; the majority of R. 'Aqiva's contemporaries take XY to mean

defiling substances in general, and probably take הָרַב the same way; the Amoraim take אָל as an imperative verb and presumably take הָרַב as meaning defiling substances in general.

The origin of the wrong reading in Shabbat can be fairly plausibly explained as due to misunderstanding. As the text of Shabbat stands, the gloss $\text{לְרַבֵּי הַמַּדְבָּר לֵאמֹר}$ (line 24) immediately after the first quotation of Is 30:22 seems to refer to the majority, even if the word לְרַבֵּי just before is omitted. If the reader did not realize that the Rabbanin in the fourth case (A.Z. line 3 from bottom; see Shabbat line 29; it is the third case if the word לְרַבֵּי is omitted in Shabbat line 23, A.Z. line 9 from bottom) are Amoraim, it would seem very strange that two contradictory interpretations of Is 30:22 should both be attributed to the Rabbanin, and on a superficial reading it would seem natural to substitute R. 'Aqiva's name in the last case. The same apparent difficulty of an interpretation of אָל as a verb being attributed to the Rabbanin probably led to the substitution of מִיָּד for מִכֵּן in the phrase $\text{מִיָּד שְׂאֵי אֶמְרָ לְאָרֶם}$ 'וכן' in 'Avodah Zarah, line 3 from bottom (see Shabbat line 30). With מִכֵּן in the text, the phrase must refer to the argument of the Rabbanin, which was thought impossible. The word מִיָּד was substituted, removing the connection with the Rabbanin, but leaving a question without an answer.

Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion's translations are transmitted by ms. 86 in a very misleading way. Aquila's translation is given

as homoiōs talaipōrou hrypon. Homoiōs or homoiōs is Aquila's standard translation of יָדָד, talaiporos, of יָדָד or יָדָד, and hrypos, of יָדָד. The translation as it stands joins talaipōros and hrypos into one phrase, which violates the sense of the Hebrew: talaipōrou hrypon could only represent יָדָד (יָדָד) יָדָד, never (יָדָד) יָדָד יָדָד or even (יָדָד) יָדָד יָדָד. The present reading of Aquila's text must, then, be due to inner-Greek corruption. The words written in the margin of the ancestor of ms.86 were probably homoiōs talaipōron hrypon. The three words do not make a single sense-group, but that is no matter, since the purpose of a marginal gloss is to give the translation of interesting individual words as compared to the LXX, not to give whole clauses. Homoiōs talaipōrou and hrypon might even have originally been two separate glosses. The quotation of Theodotion's translation confirms this reconstruction. The quotation reads odyneran deisalian, representing (יָדָד) יָדָד יָדָד. As deisalian is a noun, not an adjective, the two words can not be connected together syntactically, and would not have been intended to be read together. What probably happened to the quotation from Aquila is that a scribe, seeing the apparently meaningless homoiōs talaipōron hrypon, took it to be a single sense-group and made what looked like a very slight and obvious correction by putting talaipōron in the genitive case.

Symmachus's translation is given simply as aphedron, corresponding to יָדָד. It is possible that the reason the gloss does not contain a second noun corresponding to יָדָד is that Symmachus translated

it as a verb, exēlthon or the like, and the glossator, not knowing any Hebrew, did not see that it corresponded to the nouns kopron in the LXX hrypon in Aquila's translation, and deisalian in Theodotion's translation, and omitted it. Nevertheless, the argument should not be pressed, since the transmission of the readings of the later Greek Versions is not always reliable, and a word could have dropped out of the quotation by mistake.

The LXX and Peshitta have a double translation of $\aleph\zeta$, once as a noun and once as an imperative verb. The LXX translates $\aleph\zeta$ as kai (om. 88) hōs kopron (kopria V) ōseis auta 'and like faeces shall you push them away'; the Peshitta translates it as $\aleph\zeta$ $\aleph\aleph$ 'and like garbage shall you throw them out'.

Jerome translates $\aleph\zeta$ as an imperative verb in both the Vulgate and the commentary.

Aquila and Theodotion read a noun where the MT has $\aleph\zeta$, and the LXX and Peshitta recognize the possibility of reading a noun. As the LXX and Peshitta have a double translation, once as a noun and once as a verb, it is more likely that they read $\aleph\zeta$ than $\aleph\aleph$ in their text. Aquila and Theodotion could have read $\aleph\aleph$, but it is more likely that they read $\aleph\zeta$ but took it as a noun.

As the interpretation of the word $\aleph\aleph$ is closely connected with the interpretation of the word $\aleph\zeta$, the translations of it in the Versions will be listed here.

Symmachus's translation of $\eta\eta\eta$ as aphedron probably reflects an interpretation of it as menstrual blood. Aquila's translation as talaipōron or talaipōrou is inconclusive, since he could well have used the same word for $\eta\eta\eta$ no matter how he interpreted it because of his wish to use the same Greek word for the same Hebrew word throughout. Theodotion's translation as odynēran seems to be independent of any of the Rabbinic interpretations and to be based on the root meaning of sickness. Symmachus, Aquila, and Theodotion all seem to take $\eta\eta\eta$ as a substance rather than a person, i.e. not as a menstruating woman but as menstrual blood or some other substance, although it is just possible that Symmachus's aphedron might represent not $\eta\eta\eta$ but $\eta\eta\eta$ מי (reading כמי for כמר), in which case $\eta\eta\eta$ would be a menstruating woman.

The LXX translates $\eta\eta\eta$ כמר as hōs hydōr apokathēmenēs, and all Peshitta witnesses except uv translate it as מיא דיא רכפסניתא . Both of these translations probably represent a reading מי דיא , with $\eta\eta\eta$ taken as meaning a menstruating woman. Peshitta ms. u has מיא על for מיא דיא , and ms. v has מיא דיא . Diettrich suggests that the translation in ms. v is meant to reflect כמר in the MT.

The Vulgate and Jerome's commentary have sicut immunditiam menstruatae, which might represent מי דיא , with $\eta\eta\eta$ taken as meaning a substance, or מי דיא , with $\eta\eta\eta$ taken as

referring to a person.

The Targum translates תורם כמר דרה as תרחקונרן כמא
רמרחקין ית טרמאתא, taking דרה in a general sense as any
impure substance, as would be expected from its translation of צא
and the Yerushalmi text analysed above.

30:23 מטר) ארצך

So Targum vz P (according to Stenning the second hand of ms. z
agrees with the MT), Kenn. 30, 150, 245, 250; sup. ras. 126, 173:
de Rossi primo 20, 575, 789, 815; Ginsburg 72. Compare Kenn. 141
זרע sup. ras. The LXX and Arabic Version have a double reading
מטר זרע ארצך.

There is a similar set of variants in the second half of the
verse. For הארמה all LXX witnesses except 26 C' Eus. have tēs
gēs sou (om. sou 239') which could represent the MT or ארמתך;
ms. 26 has spermatos sou, which apparently represents הורע or
זרעך (witnesses C' Eus. omit tēs gēs). Most Peshitta witnesses
have (u¹ בארעא) וזרעא בארעא, which probably represents
זרע הארמה. Ms. o omits. Only witnesses GW = mz agree with
the MT.

30:23 את ח

So Kenn. 96.

30:23 מקנך

So Aquila, Kenn. 1, 17, 23, 25, 30, 72, 91, 93, 94, 96, 116, 150, 154, 158, 168, 180, 182, 195, 224, 225, 226, 227, 253, 260, 270, 687; de Rossi 2, 4, 20, 23, 25, 174, 226, 295, 411, 518, 554, 560, 579, 663, 667, 715, 815, 824; primo 26, 211, 305, 440, 596, 782; Biblia Soncin., Brixiensia, Complutensia: Ginsburg 3, 11, 15, 21, 24, 26, 42, 49, 58, 68, 69; edd. III, X, XV. Symmachus, Theodotion, the Peshitta, Vulgate, and Jerome's commentary translate the word as a singular.

The LXX and Targum are inconclusive.

30:25 על הר (כל ח')

So Kenn. 72, 91.

Symmachus = MT.

30:26 יהיה ח'

So LXX III-93 87-cI Sa H1., Kenn. 116.

30:29 השירה

The texts referred to in the apparatus are the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el, Shiretha ch. 1, pp. 116-118 on Ex 15:1, with a quotation of the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el in the Yalqut Shim'oni, vol. I beginning of par. 242, another quotation in the Yalqut Shim'oni, vol. II, par. 20, the variants of which are not listed by Horovitz and Rabin,

a quotation in the Yalqut Mechiri on Psalms, part I, p. 103, and a slightly condensed quotation in the Midrash Leqah Tov on Ex 15:1; and the Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai, pp. 71-72 on Ex 15:1, with a quotation in the Midrash Haggadol on Ex 15:1, pp. 285-286.

More or less related passages, apparently from a period when the original derash was no longer understood, are found in the Printed Tanhuma Beshallah, par. 10, a quotation of the Tanhuma in the Yalqut Mechiri on Psalms, part II, pp. 23-24, and a slightly condensed quotation of the Tanhuma in the Sefer Wehizhir, vol. I, pp. 39-40; the Midrash Sechel Tov on Ex 15:1; the Aggadat Shir Hashshirim, lines 195-206, with quotations in the Yalqut Mechiri on Psalms, part II, pp. 111-112 and the Yalqut Mechiri on Is 5:1; Shemot Rabbah 23:11 on Ex 15:1; Shir Hashshirim Rabbah 1:37; and the Targum to the Song of Songs 1:1. These passages will be discussed below.

The Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el and the Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai have almost identical wording throughout the derash. They begin with a quotation of Ex 15:1, mention that there are altogether ten songs, of which this is one, and proceed to list them by mentioning the occasion on which each one was sung and the introductory verse of each. The first song in the list is the one referred to in Is 30:29, which, according to the derash, Israel is supposed to have sung on the first Passover; the second is the Song of the Sea (Ex 15:1-19), of which the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el quotes v. 1 and the Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai v. 2; the third is the one sung by Israel

at the well in the wilderness (Nu 21:17-18), of which v. 17 is quoted; the fourth is the Song of Moses (Dt 31:30-32:43), for which the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el quotes Dt 31:24 and the Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai Dt 31:30, and which the Midrash Leqah Tov refers to simply as $\text{לִשְׁמֹעַן בֶּן יוֹחָי}$, without quoting any verse at all; the fifth is one said to have been sung by Joshua, for which Jo 10:12 is quoted; the sixth is the Song of Deborah (Ju 5), for which v. 1 is quoted; the seventh is David's song of thanksgiving in 2 S 22 and Ps 18, for which 2S 22:1 is quoted; the eighth is Ps 30, which is said to have been sung by Solomon, and of which v. 1 is quoted; the ninth is the one mentioned in 2Chr 20:21-22, which is ascribed to Jehoshaphat himself, and for which v. 21 is quoted; the tenth is one to be sung in the future, for which Is 42:10 and Ps 149:1 are quoted (the printed editions of the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el and the Midrash Leqah Tov do not quote Ps 149:1). It then becomes clear that what the author had in mind was songs of national deliverance or salvation, and that the last one in the list is to be sung at the beginning of the World to Come or Messianic Era, although these specific terms are not used. According to the derash, all songs sung in the past are referred to in the feminine (i.e. as $\text{לִשְׁמֹעַן בֶּן יוֹחָי}$) because in the same way as women bear children, the salvation on each occasion in the past was followed by subjection, but the song to be sung in the future is referred to in the masculine (i.e. as לְיִשְׂרָאֵל) because in the same way as men do not bear children, this salvation will not be followed by subjection.

It is assumed that the first nine songs are introduced with the word הַשִּׁיר in the Biblical text, whereas the tenth is introduced with the word שִׁיר and in fact the second, third, fourth, and seventh are introduced with the word הַשִּׁיר , and both of those in the tenth place are introduced with the word שִׁיר . The difficulty is that not all the songs fit into the scheme. The word הַשִּׁיר is not used in introducing or referring to the first, fifth, sixth, eighth, or ninth; the word שִׁיר is used in referring to the first in Is 30:29, the sixth in Ju 5:12, and the eighth in the first verse of the psalm; and there seems to be no mention of a song at all in Jo 10:12, which is given as the reference for the fifth. Even the fourth song, which is referred to in the MT of Dt 31:19, 21, 22, 30 and 32:44 by the word הַשִּׁיר , presents difficulties, as the reference given by the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el, Dt 31:24, does not refer to the Song of Moses at all in the MT. There is, however, evidence for the existence at one time of Biblical mss. containing the readings required by the derash in each case. Some of the evidence is rather tenuous, but some is quite strong, and the cumulative weight is enough to make the existence of the readings very likely. The evidence will be examined in the order of the songs in the list.

For Is 30:29, which is given as the reference for the first song, there is the evidence of ms. 5 of the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el, which quotes the verse with the reading הַשִּׁיר instead of שִׁיר .

The MT of Dt 31:24, which the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el gives as

the reference for the Song of Moses, does not refer to a song, but to the book of the Torah that Moses had the Levites deposit next to the ark; but the text of the verse quoted in the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el differs from the MT and does refer to the song. The MT reads ויהי ככלות משה לכתב את דברי התורה הזאת על ספר ער תמם, but the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el quotes the verse as follows: (לדבר ד) את (+ כל ד, י"ם) ויהי ככלות משה לכתוב (לדבר ד) את (+ כל ד, י"ם) (את — הזאת ח' ט) . Because of the distinctive beginning of v. 24, there seems little possibility that it could have been substituted by mistake for another verse.

The reading השירה for התורה fits the context of this section of Deuteronomy quite well. Vv. 9-13 of ch. 31 describe how Moses wrote the Torah down in a book and gave it to the priests and elders to keep and read publicly every Sabbatical year. V. 14 begins a new revelation of the Lord to Moses, in which Moses is told how Israel will go astray after his death, and God will turn from them because of their going astray. In vv. 19-21 he is told to write down a certain song, which is to be a witness for God, so that when evil falls upon Israel they will know that it is because they have broken the covenant, and in v. 22 Moses writes the song down, In v. 23 Moses encourages Joshua in his position as leader. In v. 24 Moses finishes writing down the Torah, and in v. 25 he tells the Levites to read it out publicly when evil falls on the people. V.28 returns to the subject of the song, and v. 30 introduces the text of it.

The mention of the book of the Torah in vv. 24-26 is difficult. Except for the command to lay the book next to the ark in v. 26, there is nothing here that is not in vv. 9-10. The verses seem to be out of place, with the subject immediately before and after being the song. It is uncertain whether Moses turns from the subject of the book of the Torah to the song in v. 27 or v. 28, and in either case the shift seems rather abrupt. One explanation of at least the first two of these difficulties, the repetition and the unexpected position of the verses, is that the book of the Torah of vv. 24-26 differs from the one in vv. 9-13 in having the Song of Moses attached to it. Another explanation might be that the book of Torah of vv. 24-26 is simply the text of the Song of Moses.

This second explanation is attested by the Targum Yerushalmi (Fragmentary Targum), which translates הַתּוֹרָה in v. 24 as $\text{אֶת־יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$ (the translation of v. 26 is not extant). The reading הַשִּׁירָה for הַתּוֹרָה could have entered the text of vv. 24 and 26 in some Biblical mss. under the influence of the context and specially vv. 22 and 30, and under the influence of an interpretation similar to the one in the Targum Yerushalmi, and the reading in the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el could have been taken from such mss. There is some evidence, aside from the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el, for the existence of these readings in Biblical mss. Ms. Kenn. 18 and 155 read הַשִּׁירָה in v. 24, and ms. Kenn. 83 has $\text{הַשִּׁירָה הַזֹּאת}$ over an erasure in v. 26. Similarly, ms. 1 of the LXX reads אֶת כָּל

form אִז יִדְבַר יְהוֹשֻׁעַ (+לֵהּ ד) אֶת הַשִּׁירָה הַזֹּאת בַּיּוֹם תַּת ה' מ

אֶת הָאֲמָרִי. The Geniza fragment פ, which is the only other witness to the text of the Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai, reads אִז יִדְבַר יְהוֹשֻׁעַ לֵהּ רְגוּם, and does not take the quotation far enough to show the variant. Of the witnesses to the text of the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el, ms. כ, the Midrash Hachamin, the editions, and the Yalqut Mechiri agree with the MT in omitting the words אֶת

הַשִּׁירָה הַזֹּאת, and ms. א, the Yalqut Shim'on, and the Midrash Leqah Tov do not carry the quotation far enough to show if a variant is intended.

The addition of the words אֶת הַשִּׁירָה הַזֹּאת is supported by a passage in Euber's Tanhuma ms. no. 3, quoted on p. 128 of the introduction to his edition of the Midrash Tanhuma, where Jo 10:12 is quoted in the form אִז יִדְבַר יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶת הַשִּׁירָה. The derash, which I will summarize, depends on the addition of the words (הַזֹּאת) אֶת הַשִּׁירָה. Joshua did not say to the sun 'Stand still (עֲמֹד), but 'Be silent' (דָּמָה), because if the sun stops singing its song of praise to God it must stop moving. When the sun asked 'What about the song?', Joshua replied that he would sing it himself, as it says 'Then Joshua spoke the song'. Notice that this derash is independent of the one in the Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai.

The addition of the words (הַזֹּאת) אֶת הַשִּׁירָה seems to have been unknown to the compilers of the present Tanhuma collections, and a reference to the song has been found by comparison of the wording of the MT of Jo 10:12 with Ex 15:1 or 2S 22:1; see the Printed Tanhuma

'Ahare par. 9, Buber's Tanhuma 'Ahare p. 34b and footnote 158, and the Yalqut Shim'oni, vol. II beginning of par. 22.

The compiler of the Sefer Hayyashar might have known of the addition of the words **את השירה הזאת**. In describing the stopping of the sun and moon, the Sefer Hayyashar quotes Jo 10:12b-14 in a slightly altered form, then quotes Jo 10:12a in the form **אז ירנר יהושע את השירה הזאת ביום תת ה' את האמורי לפני יהושע ולפני בני ישראל** (p.289 bottom to 290 top), and then quotes a song made up of phrases from other Biblical verses. To use the Sefer Hayyashar for textual criticism is, of course, very precarious, and the addition of the words **את השירה הזאת** may, like the addition of the words **לפני יהושע**, be due to the compiler, but there is at least some chance that they were taken from a Biblical ms.

Even if the evidence of the Sefer Hayyashar is ignored as being too unreliable, it does give a further example of a tradition that Joshua sang a song at the time of stopping the sun and moon. The reading **את השירה הזאת** in the quotation of Jo 10:12 in the Midrash Haggadol is amply confirmed by the reading of Buber's Tanhuma ms. no. 3 and the accompanying derash. Qimhi, in his commentary on Jo 10:12, points out that the Targum translates **ירנר** as **שבח**, a verb that normally refers to singing a song of praise; and that the verb does, in fact, have this implication.

The MT of Ju 5:1 has neither the word **שיר** nor the word **שירה**,

and there is no certain evidence of the existence of the word
 The LXX witnesses A E read kai eipen en tēi ōdēi, which could re-
 present either בְּשִׁירָה (ותאמר) or בְּשִׁיר (ותאמר), but the
 reading may be simply an inner-LXX development. Ju 5:12 contains
 the word שִׁיר.

A passage in 'Echah Rabbah seems to imply the presence of the
 word שִׁירָה in 2Chr. 20:22 or 21. The passage is found in Buber's
 edition and the printed edition in par. 30 of the Petihta, and is
 repeated in the printed edition in ch. 4, par. 15. It is quoted in
 the Yalqut Shim'oni, vol. II, beginning of par. 163. The text of
 the derash is almost identical in each case, except that the Yalqut
 Shim'oni omits the word ותהלה in v. 22, and Buber's edition car-
 ries the quotation of the verse further than the other texts. I
 quote from the Yalqut Shim'oni, omitting the beginning and end of
 the passage, which are not relevant here:

... עמר יהושפט ואמר אין בי כח לא להרוג ולא לררוף אלא
 הריני אומר שירה ואתה עושה אמר ליה הקב"ה אני עושה כן שנאמר
 ובעת החלו ברנה נתן ה' מארבים ...

Although the רנה (ותהלה) mentioned must be a kind of song,
 it would be expected that the derash would quote the key-words of the
 Biblical proof-text רנה ותהלה, not the synonym שירה, and
 for this reason it is possible, though by no means certain, that the
 derash depends on a reading שירה instead of רנה or תהלה or
 both. The omission of ותהלה in the Yalqut Shim'oni may be due to
 excision of the word ושירה.

There is, then, fairly good evidence of the existence of the word הָיָה in most of the first nine cases in the list. It is attested by the MT for the second, third, fourth, and seventh songs, by very good evidence from other sources for the fourth and fifth songs, and by some evidence for the first, sixth, and ninth songs. The evidence will be seen to be much stronger if it is borne in mind that although the Versions will show the addition of the word הָיָה or a phrase containing it, they will not show a substitution of the form הָיָה for יָהִי . We may conclude that the word הָיָה was once found in each of the first nine passages of the list, including Is 30:29, and that the derash in the Mechiltas is based on the existence of such reading.

Texts containing the word הָיָה in Is 30:29, Jo 10:12, Ju 5:1, Ps 30:1, and 2Chr 20:21 seem to have been unknown after the time of composition of the Mechiltas, and later midrashim reconcile the derash to the MT by either leaving out most of the first nine songs in the list, altering the list, leaving out the comment on the difference between masculine and feminine songs, separating the mention of the difference between masculine and feminine songs from the list of ten songs, or some combination of these changes. Few examples of the transformation of a derash to agree with the reading of the MT are as well-documented as this one, and for this reason the forms of the derash in later midrashim will be set out here as an example of what could have happened in other cases not so well documented.

The compiler of the Midrash Sechel Tov or his source seems to have found difficulty in applying the distinction between masculine and feminine songs to the ten songs of the list. He quotes Ex 15:1, says that there are nine other songs, then says that this song is referred to in the feminine because all occasions of salvation in the past were followed by subjection, and so all songs already sung are referred to in the feminine, but songs celebrating salvation in the future are referred to in the masculine because they will not be followed by subjection. He then quotes Is 30:29 according to the MT, Ps 96:1 or 98:1, and Is 45:17. As the Midrash Sechel Tov quotes the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el immediately before and after this passage, we may suppose that what the author gives here is taken directly from the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el and not from an intermediate source, but that he has adapted it to agree as well as possible with the MT. The author might have been influenced by the Targum to the Song of Songs (see below) in making Is 30:29 one of the examples of the songs to be sung at the time of future salvation. The failure to specify most of the first nine songs of the list is probably due to exegetical embarrassment at not being able to reconcile the clear requirement that they must all be introduced with the word וְהָיוּ with the readings of the MT.

The Printed T.ahuma quotes the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el, but has the list in altered form and omits the reference to the difference between masculine and feminine songs. The first eight songs are the same as in the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el, but the ninth song is the

Song of Songs (2Chr 20:21 is quoted just before the mention of the ninth song but is not part of the list), and the tenth is Ps 96 or 98, of which v. 1 is quoted. The substitution of the tenth song does not matter, since the word ג'ו in the masculine is found in the substitute and its application to the derash is not affected, but the substitution of the Song of Songs, which is definitely referred to in the masculine in its first verse, makes it impossible to treat the first nine songs as a whole as feminine and makes their application to the derash in its original form impossible. The compilers of the Midrash Tanhuma or this section of it probably no longer understood the relationship of the first nine songs to the derash.

Shemot Rabbah has a derash depending on the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el or perhaps on an otherwise unknown Tanhuma text. After the quotation of Ex 15:1 comes the statement that all songs sung in this world are referred to in the feminine, because in the same way as women keep bearing children one after another, affliction keeps coming upon Israel (examples are given), but in the world to come there will be no more affliction, and a masculine song will be sung. There follows a quotation of Ps 96:1 or 98:1. There is no mention here of any others of the songs listed by the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el or the Midrash Tanhuma, and no mention of what the exact number might be.

Shir Hashshirim Rabbah has a derash delivered by R. Berechyah, an Amora of the fourth generation, in the name of R. Shemu'el bar Nahman, an Amora of the second and third generation, on the dif-

ference between masculine and feminine songs which differs from the others so far mentioned. The question is asked of why Israel is compared to a female, and the answer is given that like the daughter who inherits a tenth of her father's property, Israel inherited the land of seven nations, the seven nations of Canaan (the author of the derash is thinking of the traditional number of the nations of the world as seventy), and this is why they sang a feminine song. Ex 15:1 is then quoted. In the world to come Israel will inherit like the son who inherits all his father's property, and for this reason the song to be sung then is masculine. Ps 96:1 or 98 is then quoted. There is no mention of any songs other than these two.

The 'Aggadat Shir Hashshirim has a list of ten songs apparently based on the Targum to the Song of Songs and the Tanhuma. The first nine are the Song of Adam, the Song of Abraham, the Song of the Sea, the Song of the Well, the Song of Moses, the Song of Joshua, the Song of Deborah, the Song of David, and the Song of Solomon which is the Song of Songs. No direct Biblical reference is given but there is no difficulty in placing most of them. From the Targum to the Song of Songs, it can be seen that the Song of Adam is Ps 92. Songs three to eight correspond to numbers two to seven in the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el, the Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai, and the Tanhuma, and the ninth corresponds to the ninth in the Tanhuma. I do not know what the Song of Abraham can be. Schechter and Buber, in their comments on the 'Aggadat Shir Hashshirim, refer to an article by Epstein on this subject which I have not seen. The tenth song is the Song of the World to Come, for which Ps 96:1 or 98:1 is quoted. The 'Aggadat Shir Hashshirim has

a comment on the difference between feminine and masculine songs agreeing in substance with what is in the Mechiltas, and with a quotation of Ps 96:1 or 98:1 but in a separate shittah marked and in Schechter's text separated from the list by other material, as if the compiler did not see the connection between the first nine songs in the list and the use of the word $\eta\eta'w$: indeed, the connection is effectively destroyed by putting Ps 92 and the Song of Songs, which are introduced in the MT with the word $\eta'w$ in the masculine, among the first nine songs.

The Targum to the Song of Songs begins with a list of ten songs of deliverance culminating in the final deliverance of the return from the exile. The first is Ps 92, which is the song that Adam is supposed to have sung on the Sabbath when his sin was forgiven him. The second to the sixth correspond to the second to the sixth in the Mechiltas, the seventh is the Song of Hannah (1 S 2:1-10), the eighth is the same as the eighth in the Mechiltas, the ninth is the Song of Songs, and the tenth is the one referred to in Is 30:29. In each case, except the ninth, a Targum text (sometimes differing from the Targum Yonatan) of the first verse is quoted. There is no mention of the difference between masculine and feminine songs.

30:29 $\eta\eta'w \eta\eta\eta$

This reading may be induced by the derash, which takes the reference to be a specific song. See the previous article.

30:29 התחודו חג

The derash in this section of Bereshit Rabbah is quite independent of the one in the Mechiltas referred to in the previous two articles, but agrees with it in referring the word חג to the first Passover and the song to one sung at that time. The reading כ"רם התחודו חג may be due to the inter-action of this reference to the first Passover with the plain meaning of the text of Isaiah referring the song to the future; התחודו חג would then mean the renewal of the Passover, presumably at the beginning of the Messianic Era.

30:29 חג פסח

This reading is supported by a quotation of a Targum to this verse, differing from the Targum Yonatan, quoted at the beginning of the Targum to the Song of Songs. The addition in the Targum may, however, be for the purposes of exegesis, and the addition in the Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el may be due to the influence of the derash, which refers this verse to the first Passover. See the article השירה.

30:32 מוסרה (ברי"ש)

So Peshitta, Kenn. 3, 89; forte l.

30:32 'ח 'ה

So perhaps LXX Hi. Other LXX witnesses may perhaps read אֱלֹהִים instead of the Divine Name, and refer it to Assyria.

30:32 רַב־מַלְחָמָה

It is very uncertain whether such a reading is intended. The verse is quoted according to the MT, but the comment following reads: ... רַב־יְמֵי מַלְחָמָה תִּנְרַפֶּה, with מַלְחָמָה in the singular.

The Peshitta and Targum translate this word as a singular. Ms. Kenn. 281 has a defective spelling, which might represent a singular.

The phrase containing this word is missing in all LXX witnesses except V-011 L⁵¹-456 403' 770 Tht., and is asterisked in L⁵¹-96 403. The LXX witnesses that do have the phrase agree with the MT, as does Theodotion.

העמיקה הרחיבה 30:33

These verbs could be read as either העמיקה הרחיבה 'It is deep and wide', העמיקה הרחיבה 'He (i.e. God) has made it deep and wide', or, joining the verbs to מדרתה, 'She has made her dwelling-place (or pyre) deep and wide', העמיקה הרחיבה מדרתה.

The Targum translates גם היא למלך הרכן העמיק הרחב מדרתה as אף היא מלך עלמיה אתקנה לעמקא ולאפתאה מדרתה (מדרתה bog מדרתה). This translation may represent the second interpretation mentioned above, or the reading of the MT.

The Peshitta translates as if מדרתה were the object of the two verbs and makes them transitive: ועמקת ורוחת בית מעמרה. As the translator probably read a feminine pronoun in his Hebrew text (see the previous article), the feminine verbs in the translation probably correspond to feminine verbs in the Hebrew, read according to the third interpretation mentioned above.

Jerome, in the Vulgate and the commentary, translates the verbs as feminine adjectives and refers them to תפתה. This translation could represent either two feminine intransitive verbs according to the first interpretation above, or the consonantal text of the MT with the verbs taken as absolute infinitives.

For העמיק הרחב מררתה Theodotion and an addition in the Lucianic mss. of the LXX have ebathynen eplatynen tēn pyran autēs. As the subject is God, the verbs must be masculine, and as the object is a noun, there can be no pronoun suffix, which means that these translations agree with the MT.

The LXX translates the two verbs as pharanga batheian, apparently nearly an agreement with the consonantal MT, but pointing העמק הרחב.

For (יוכן) הכיני והעמיקי lQIs^a reads העמיק הרחב (הוכן) העמיקי. The verbs are feminine, but imperative.

30:33 מררת האש, מררת אש

Most Targum witnesses translate מררה (מררה bog אשתא) and do not connect the words syntactically. Ms. c has a translation מררת אשתא, This reading destroys the syntax of the verse as translated and is almost certainly not original to the Targum but either an unskilful correction according to the MT or a scribal error.

30:33 ׀

So Kenn. 590. This is the qere in verse 32.

31:1 למצרים ׀

So lQIs^a and Kenn. 150; munc 30. The Versions are inconclusive.

31:1 (ם'סרס) על

So Peshitta, Targum bog, Kenn. and de Rossi in the text, Ginsburg 2, 3, 17, 21, 26, 27, 52, 57, 72; edd. VI, X, XII, XIII, XV, XVII, XVIII, XIX. See the Minhat Shai.

31:2 ררר

The derash assumes this word to be derived from ררר. No Version, and no ms. of which the pointing is known confirms this interpretation, but mss. Kenn. 300 and 651 have a singular suffix, and the LXX's translation ho logos autou may reflect a singular suffix.

31:3 מצרם

So LXX, Vulgate, comm.

Symmachus = MT.

31:3 סרס

The LXX seems to read ס'סרס, but as it changes the syntax of the sentence, its evidence is not very conclusive. The reading סרס for ס'סרס is found in de Rossi 211 primo in v. 1.

Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion = MT.

31:3 ררר

So lQIs^a and Kenn. 150.

Symmachus probably agrees with the MT.

31:4 אֵלַי ח' ; לֹא יַחַת ח' ; יְעֹנֶה ח'

At least the last two omissions must be due to scribal error or a physical defect in the ms., so not too much reliance should be put on the omission of אֵלַי.

The word אֵלַי is not translated by LXX 88 46 407 538, and is omitted by Kenn. 150.

31:4 הָרִי

LXX 403' has a plural, ta ore, but this is probably due to the influence of the same words almost immediately after.

31:4 גִּבְעַ

All Targum witnesses except ms. c have רִמְתָּה, to be read as רִמְתָּה. The reading רִמְתָּא in ms. c is probably only an inner-Aramaic corruption due to misunderstanding of רִמְתָּה as רִמְתָּה and probably does not represent a variant in the Hebrew.

31:5 צְבָאֵרֶת ח'

So LXX A'-Q^{txt}-26-86 456 C'-566 198 239' 407 410 449' 534 544 918

Co Cyr. o.

כֵּן יִגֹּן עֲלֵיהֶם ה' צְבֹאוֹת וְגו'; כֵּן יִגֹּן עֲלֵינוּ [ה' צְבֹאוֹת; וְגו'] 31:5

These readings might be due to conflation with Zech 9:15.

31:9 אֲשֶׁר לֹא אֹרֵךְ בְּצִירֹן

Compare Kenn. 176 primo אֲשֶׁר לֹא אֹרֵךְ לֹא בְּצִירֹן.

31:9 [אֲשֶׁר] אֹרֵךְ לֹא בְּצִירֹן וְתַנּוּר בִּירוּשָׁלַם

Symmachus according to Eus. Chr. Pr. translate hos echei pyr en sion kai klibanon en hierousalem; Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion according to ms. 86 translate hos (Ziegler emends to read hoi) phos autoi en sion kai klibanos en hierousalem. It is unlikely that Symmachus's apparent divergence from the MT is due to anything more than the desire to write good Greek. The other translation is either Aquila's or Theodotion's and may represent a divergent Hebrew text.

Aquila and Theodotion according to Eus. = MT. LXX L⁴⁶-456 403' 770 Tht. = MT. Other LXX witnesses omit the end of the verse.

32:8 נְרִיב

So Vulgate, comm.

Symmachus = MT.

32:17 וּבַעֲבוּרָתָא

So Kenn. 150.

33:1 כַּךְ

So Targum, Vulgate, comm., Kenn., de Rossi, and Ginsburg in the text, and the British and Foreign Bible Society edition. The LXX witnesses translate hymas or hymim. Literally re-translated, this would be כַּכְּ, but it is quite possible that the translator read כַּךְ but preferred to translate in the plural because of the plural verbs in this verse.

33:2 כִּי (לְ)כִי

So LXX, Peshitta, Vulgate $\text{C}\Sigma$ o, comm.

33:4 בְּמִשְׁקָא

So Kenn. primo 99, 100.

Theodotion = MT.

33:5 בְּשֵׁבֶט הַיְּהוּדִים לְבָרֵךְ הַשְׂרֹכֵן מִרֹּם

The first word is illegible in the ms. The last word is not in the ms. but the derash shows that it must be supplied. In spite of the deviation from the text of the MT, there can be no doubt that Is 33:5 is intended. The derash gives a list of names of Zion, with proof-texts, and this verse is meant to show that one of the names of Zion is מִרְמָה. There are other verses than Is 33:7 where the word מִרְמָה could be taken as referring to Zion, such as Je 17:12 or

Je 25:30, but none of them contains any form of the word]DQ. Moreover, there is support from the Versions for the reading]DQD in Is 33:5, and the text of the 'Aggadat Shir Hashshirim in the Yalqut Mechiri on Isaiah, p. 253 quotes the verse according to the MT, thus removing any doubts about its identification.

The reading]DQD is supported by the LXX, the Peshitta, and the Targum. The addition of LQ is probably induced by the phrase LQD 'H DQD in Is 2:11 and 17, and the phrase D 'DQD LQ in Ps 148:13.

33:6 DQ

So Peshitta, Symmachus, Theodotion, Targum, Kern. 1, 4, 17, 25, 30, 72, 89, 91, 94, 96, 116, 128, 150, 160, 168, 172, 173, 175, 182, 195, 226, 252, 253, 258, 260, 269, 271, 279, 281, 284, 288: de Rossi 1, 4, 20, 174, 210, 295, 380, 554, 715, 815; primo 24, 211, 304, 440, 512, 545, 663, 737, 782, 824; nunc 23; ext. 55; ex Bibliis Halensibus 375; Biblia Sonc. 1488, Pisaur. 1517, Bombergiana Ven. bina 1518, Veneta 1521, Veneta 1525-28, Veneta 1533, Munsteri tria 1534, 1536, 1546, Roberti Stephani in 4., Veneta 1544, Ven. 1551, Veneta 1563, Veneta 1566, Plantiniana 1566, Wittebergensia 1587, vel sub novo Hartmannorum titulo Francofurti ad Oderam 4. 1595, Ven. 1595, Raphel-angii sine punctis 1610, Veneta 1613, Ven. 1615, Ven. 1627, Ven. 12. 1635, Veneta 1639, Ven. 1647, Ven. 1766, Pisana 1781, Prophetæ poster. Soncinenses, Pisauenses 1516, Pisauenses 1520, Isaias Polyglottus

Basilcensis sine anno, Isaias Veronensis 1652: Ginsburg 11, 15, 17, 21, 27, 34, 68, 69, 72; edd. I, III, XII, XIII, XVII, XVIII.

Aquila = MT. The LXX is inconclusive.

33:6 חכמה

So Kenn. 30, 93, 116, 145, 168, 176, 226, 228; forte 113; munc 3.

The Versions are inconclusive.

33:7 אַרְאֵלִים

All texts agree that אַרְאֵלִים or אַרְאֵלִים is a plural noun (perhaps אַרְאֵלִים) meaning 'angels'.

Jerome gives this explanation as an alternative:

'Verbum Hebraicum arellam, pro quo Aquila et Symmachus et Theodotio interpretati sunt: apparebo eis, extremas syllabam diuidentes et legentes: are lahem, Hebraei significare angelos arbitrantur etc.'

The Targum Yerushalmi seems to be familiar with the outline of the derash in both Bereshit Rabbah and its parallel and 'Echah Rabbah, though not necessarily with these texts, and takes אַרְאֵלִים or אַרְאֵלִים to mean angels.

The reading אַרְאֵלִים is supported by Kenn. 96, 145, 150, 182: de Rossi primo 596, 663, 737. Compare de Rossi 715 א sup. ras.

Aquila translates the word as horathēsomai autois, Symmachus and Theodotion as ophthēsomai autois, Qimhi's Targum text as כַּר אַתְּחַזֵּא לְהֵרֶן, and Peshitta ABDF o Eph. as אַתְּחַזֵּא לְהֵרֶן; all texts of the Targum Yonatan except Qimhi's translate כַּר תְּתַגַּלֵּי לְהֵרֶן, Peshitta GWLMU = BCNST U aiklmpstuvxz as בְּתַחֲזֵא לְהֵרֶן, and the Vulgate and Jerome's commentary as uidentes. All of these translations reflect an interpretation similar to the one intended by the Masoretic pointing.

The LXX's translation en tōi phobōi autōn seems to reflect an analysis of the word as if it were some form of the root אָרַא.

33:7 חֲצָה (בְּחִירָה ק)

The interpretation of this word is given by Bereshit Rabbah and 'Echah Rabbah in the name of R. 'Azaryah, and by the Pesiqta Rabbati in the name of R. Berechyah, who probably depends on R. 'Azaryah. The interpretation of the rest of the verse is anonymous. The reader is referred to Theodor's comments in Bereshit Rabbah pp. 600-601, Buber's to 'Echah Rabbah p. 30a, and Ish Shalom's to the Pesiqta Rabbati p. 171a. Theodor and Buber rightly explain that the word חֲצָה or חֲצָה is interpreted to mean 'outrage' or 'atrociousness'. Ish Shalom takes it to mean חֲצָה, which is unlikely, as Abraham was not hold-

ing an arrow, but a knife. Many of the mss. of Bereshit Rabbah, as well as the Pesiqta Rabbati, comment חיצה כתב (חיצה כתב in the Pesiqta Rabbati). As Theodor says, this probably does not mean that R. 'Azaryah found the word spelt with yod in his text of Isaiah, but merely that because of the defective spelling it can be pronounced with hireq instead of shureq. All of the mss. of Bereshit Rabbah that quote the form חיצה, as well as the Pesiqta Rabbati, quote the word as חיצה (i.e. חיצה pronounced with shureq) in the lemma, which probably means that R. 'Azaryah regarded the pronunciation with shureq as correct, and deliberately changed the pronunciation for exegetical purposes.

The Peshitta translates חיצה צעקר חיצה as ניללון קשיאית, which reflects an interpretation similar to the one in the midrashim.

The Targum Yonatan is divided in its translation of חיצה. Witnesses ofvzPN translate it as נסרר, and witnesses bg as נסרר (with final dalet). The first of these translations would agree very well with the exegesis of both Bereshit Rabbah, which refers to the near-sacrifice of Isaac, and 'Echah Rabbah, which refers to the destruction of Jerusalem, and would agree pretty closely, though not exactly, with R. 'Azaryah's interpretation. The second agrees with the information given in Bereshit Rabbah, Pesiqta Rabbati, 'Aggadat Bereshit, and the Pirque deRabbi 'Eli'ezer, that the angels protested at the sacrifice of Isaac, and is on similar lines to R. 'Azaryah's in-

terpretation. It is unlikely that נמלך is a mistake for נמר, since the two witnesses with the form נמר write נמר' instead of נמר in the second half of the verse; if they had had נמר' in the first half of the verse it would probably not have become נמר.

The Targum witnesses o K have a double translation, נמרק(י) א, נמר, agreeing with both the Masoretic pointing and the derash.

Aquila and Theodotion translate נמרק נמרק as eboēsan ektenōs, and Symmachus translates it as ekraxan ektenōs. These emotionally neutral translations are not directly in line with either the context of the derash in Bereshit Rabbah or R. 'Azaryah's interpretation of נמר, but they do belong to a related line of interpretation.

The Vulgate, Jerome's commentary, and the Targum Yerushalmi translate נמר as meaning 'outside', in agreement with the interpretation probably reflected in the Masoretic pointing. The LXX differs.

33:7 נמרלאכי

So Peshitta and Kern. 96. The LXX witnesses S A'-26 oI 46-233 C''-565-566 198 403' 407 534 538 770 Co o have angeloi gar, which may reflect the same reading.

LXX Q-86 O' L'' 239' 410 544 Syh Tht. Cyr.^(lem) omit gar and probably agree with the MT. Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion = MT.

33:8 הרפר

So Vulgate and comm. The LXX has an intransitive verb but phrases.

Symmachus = MT.

33:11 תאכלם

So Kenn. 96, 99, 102, 158, 171, 195, 198, 651; primo 297: de Rossi primo 413, 575, 663; ac Rabboth.

Theodotion agrees with the MT in reading םררר before this.

33:12 רהיה(עמים)

So LXX L¹¹-233 Tht.

Hoi loipoi = MT.

33:12 יהיו(עמים)

Compare lQIs^a ריהיו.

The Versions are inconclusive.

33:12 העמים

Compare Kenn. 250 םהע. The Versions are inconclusive.

33:12 שידח

So LXX. The Targum translates משרפות by יקירת נר and has no equivalent for שיר, but mss. f N insert כיד, which in this case might represent שיר, before אררר, the word translating בא.

33:12 ׳צתר

So probably Targum, and possibly LXX kai katakekaumene (kai katapepatamene Eus.Θ), Targum ׳תוקרן, Vulgate and comm. conburentur. Compare Kenn. 96 ׳צתר.

33:14 ׳תזח

Compare LXX S* @ lēmpsontai.

33:15 ׳תזח

So LXX, Peshitta, Targum of P, Vulgate, Jerome's commentary, 1QIs^a. Targum z has ׳תזח, which is probably a mistake for ׳תזח, representing ׳תזח.

33:15 ׳תזח

So LXX except 403' Tht. Cypr. Hi.

33:15 ׳תזח

So Kenn. 96.

33:16 ׳תזח

So Targum o, Kenn. 93, primo l.

33:16 'ה אהא

So Prokopius (not mentioned by Ziegler).

Symmachus = MT.

33:16 מצדת

So LXX, Peshitta, Targum, Kenn. 154, 283 (מצדת).

Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion = MT.

33:17 עיניך

So Vulgate, comm.

33:18 רלבך

So LXX L¹-233 Tht., Peshitta.

33:20 תחזינה (עיניך)

So Kenn. 30, 72.

The Versions are inconclusive.

33:20 רבל (יסע)

So LXX, Peshitta, Targum.

33:21 (יענרנר) בל

So Kenn. 150 marg., 180, 246, 250, 650B. See verse 20.

Aquila = MT. The other Versions are inconclusive.

34:4 רכנברלת

This form is probably due to conflation with the word כנבל in the same verse.

34:5 רהנה

So Kenn. 150.

34:7 רומיים, רומים

Jerome mentions the identification of Edom with Rome in his commentary. Notice that in v. 9 the Targum translates נחליה as חלי רומי (Qimhi reads נחלה (נחלהא bogfo N דרומי).

34:9 רהפכר

So Targum K.

According to ms. 86, Aquila's equivalent of the LXX's (autēs hai) pharanges (for נחליה) is cheimarroi. If Aquila actually put the noun in the nominative case, he must have read a passive verb, as in the MT; but not too much reliance should be put on this argument,

because even if Aquila had used an active verb and put the noun in the accusative, the glossator could easily have changed the case to the nominative under the influence of the LXX.

34:9 אָרָא

So Targum f N אָרָא, but this may be an inner-Aramaic corruption of אָרָא, as in the rest of the Targum witnesses.

LXX 407 538 have hē gē autōn and 36 has hē gē autois, which may represent אָרָא, a reading found in Kenn. 99, 253 and forte 1, 94.

Symmachus = MT.

34:10 אָרָא

So Kenn. 2, 30; compare Kenn. 82 אָרָא sup.ras.

The Versions are inconclusive.

34:11 אָרָא, אָרָא

There is an analogy made between the word אָרָא in this verse and the אָרָא of Ex 8:18,20. Only the Printed Tanhuma, the Midrash Haggadol, and ms. 1A of the Pesiqta deRav Kahana take the quotation as far as the word in question, and they spell it אָרָא, but the context of the derash makes it clear that אָרָא must be read, or that אָרָא must be interpreted as אָרָא.

34:11 701

So LXX 736.

Eusebius gives Symmachus's translation, and Theodoret gives the translation of hoi alloi, as kai ektathēsetai, in agreement with the MT. Ms. 86 gives Symmachus and Theodotion's translation as ektathēsetai, without kai. This means that there are two contradictory traditions for Symmachus's translation, and probably for Theodotion's as well, since hoi alloi would normally include Theodotion. Either Eusebius inserted kai in his quotation from Symmachus under the influence of the LXX and the kai in the reading attributed to hoi alloi by Theodoret is taken from some other translator, or kai has not been recorded in ms. 86 because it is the start of a quotation. The second explanation seems simpler and likelier.

34:16 7087

So Peshitta, Targum zbog N, Kenn. 30, 96, 228, 602; 277 marg.

See the Minhṭat Shai.

34:16 '7 'D

This reading is supported by Kenn. 1, 30, 206, 337, 576; munc 531. The LXX seems to read simply '7.

For the readings of the other Versions see the next article.

34:16 פ' ה' ה'ר א (צ'ר)

Compare 1QIs^a, which has פ'ה'ר ה'ר. The translation spiritus eius ipse in the Vulgate and Jerome's commentary probably translates א'ר א'ר פ'ה'ר, and the Peshitta's translation ... ה'ר probably depends on either this reading, or a reading ה'ר א'ר פ'ה'ר.

The Targum has ב'מ'מ'ר'ה, probably representing פ'ה'ר.

34:16 ק'צ'ק

So Kenn. 253. The last letter of the word is partly obliterated in 1QIs^a, but enough of the top and bottom strokes has been preserved to show that it is a mem.

The Targum translates ק'צ'ק by an intransitive verb, י'ת'ק'ר'ב'ן. As the verb is feminine, it probably represents ק'צ'ק and not ק'צ'ק. Notice, however, that bogf have a masculine verb just before this.

The Vulgate and Jerome's commentary use a neuter plural pronoun, which could correspond to masculine suffix in the verb ק'צ'ק.

LXX S^o A'-Q-26-86* oII 46 C''-566 198 301 403' 407 410 449' 534 544 Co Tht. Cyr. o have a feminine pronoun, and this is probably the original LXX reading; witnesses S* O' 239' 393 538 have a neuter; witnesses L''-86^c-233 Eus. have a masculine. Hoi treis agree with the majority of LXX witnesses in having a feminine pronoun. The reader is referred to Ziegler's edition for the distribution of masculine, feminine, and neuter forms throughout vv. 16 and 17 in the various

recensions of the LXX and in the later Greek Versions.

The Peshitta has feminine forms throughout vv. 16 and 17.

35:4 ראל

So Peshitta, Targum bogf N, Vulgate c, comm.

Theodotion = MT.

35:5 (ראזני חרשים) תפקחנה

Compare Kenn. 100 ת 2^o sup. ras.

For the reading of the LXX and the Targum, see the next article.

It is impossible to tell whether the other Versions read תפתחנה
or תפקחנה.

35:5 (ראזני חרשים) תשמענה

So LXX and Targum.

Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion = MT.

35:8 וררך ח'

So Peshitta, Vulgate A, 1QIs^a, Kenn. 1, 4, 30, 89, 93, 160,
172, 309, 319, 351, 366, 383, 392, 490, 526, 613: de Rossi primo 26,
380. Kenn. 4 reads לא instead of the second וררך.

For (וררך הקרש יקרא לה) the LXX has

hodos kathara (kai hodos hagia klēthēsetai). It is uncertain whether one of the words לללל or לללל was missing in the translator's Hebrew text, or whether he avoided translating one of them because they were too close in meaning, and substituted an adjective on the principle of slot-translation instead.

35:8 אלה

So LXX S A'-Q-26-86 B C''-566 198 239' 301 393 403' 407 410
534 544 Bo Syp o, Peshitta GWLMU = ABCDFNST iklmnostuvwxyz, Targum f N.

35:8 ואלה

So apparently Peshitta, Targum, Vulgate, and Jerome's commentary, but it is quite likely that the translators read the MT but were induced to translate as they did by the syntactical requirements of the various languages.

35:10 (= 51:11) לללל

This reading is supported in Is 35:10 by Kenn. 4, 96; nunc 30 and in Is 51:11 by Kenn. 30, 172.

The Versions are inconclusive.

35:10 (= 51:11) שמחת (עולם)

This reading is supported in Is 35:10 by Targum f PN and Kenn.

72, 93, 145, and in Is 51:11 by Targum f and Kenn. 2, 72, 82, 93, 150, 158. In Is 35:10 Stenning gives this as the reading of mss. vz, but Sperber gives a reading for mss. vz agreeing with the MT, and is not corrected by van Zijl, and it seems that Stenning has miscopied the mss.

Survey of Readings

This survey is intended as a guide to the reader in separating genuine variants from scribal errors. It is assumed that the lists will be used together with the apparatus and notes to the apparatus of this work. There is room for disagreement on whether certain readings should be included in a particular list or not, and others may differ.

There are many readings in the apparatus that may be genuine but are not yet well enough attested to be evaluated.

1:18 ואם יארימר
2:17 ארם
3:11 כגמול
4:5 על מכון
4:5 כי על כבוד
8:7 הנני
8:7 עליכם
8:18 אלהים
11:2 עצה ותבונה
16:3 עשי
19:4 ארונים קשים
19:18 עיר החרס
21:11 רומי
22:14 לכם העון הזה
22:16 אפוא
24:6 אבלה
24:11 שבת משוש
24:21 מלכי הארמה בארמה
29:10 ה' עליכם
29:10 ה' עליהם
29:10 עיניהם
30:22 צא
30:23 משר ארצך
30:23 מקנך
30:29 השירה
33:1 בך
33:6 עתך
33:7 אראלם
35:10 לציון
35:10 שמחת

1:20	אם תמאנר
2:21	בנקרת
3:6	ידיך
4:4	את ח'
5:12	לא הניסר
5:13	הרעת
5:18	שוא
9:4	ברשע
13:5	מקצה הארץ
13:9	ה' ח'
16:5	כסאר
16:14	שלש
18:6	וכל חית השרה; וכל חית הארץ
20:2	רגלך
23:18	לה' צבאות
24:6	הארץ
24:14	בגאון שם ה'
24:20	הארץ
24:21	בארמה
25:8	ובלע
26:16	פקדונך
27:4	ושית
29:10	ראת הנביאים
30:6	שרף
30:20	ה' לכם
33:11	תאכלם
33:16	מצודות

1:15 כי יריכם

2:21 הצורר

3:16 וברגליהן

3:16 את קרקר

רעשן ח'; ענן רעשן ירמם ראש להבה לילה 4:5

5:9 ונגלה באזני

5:18 וכעבותות

7:18 בקצה ארץ אשר

8:7 לכן

8:8 ושטף

11:3 לא למראה

11:4 ימרת

13:9 וחרון ראף

14:13 אשים כסאי

14:17 בית הכלא

14:22 שם ושאר נין ונכר

16:4 המרץ

17:12 כהמון

17:12 ים

17:14 ואיננו

19:4 עז (בחול"ם)

19:24 והיה ביום ההוא

21:14 יושבי בארץ תימא

21:15 מפני קשת ררוכה מפני כובר

22:8 בית יהודה

22:12 צבאות ח'; ביום ההוא ח'

22:15 אל שבנא

22:16 (מה לך פה) ומה (לך פה)

24:21 על מלכי האדמה ועל הארמה

25:1 ה' ח'
 25:1 אלהים
 25:1 ואורה
 25:1 את עמך
 25:8 ארני ח'
 25:8 כי פי ה' רבר
 27:9 עון בית יעקב
 27:13 האובדים מארץ אשור והנרחים מארץ מצרים
 27:13 ובירושלם, ובירושלים
 29:10 את (ראשון) ח'
 29:16 היאמר
 30:6 ראפעה
 30:6 מהם ח'
 30:19 ובירושלם, ובירושלים, וירושלם
 30:20 עור את מורך
 30:23 את ח'
 31:1 למצרים
 31:1 ועל

 33:5 השוכן
 33:15 אזוניו; עוצם
 33:16 והוא
 33:20 תחזינה
 33:20 ובל
 33:21 בל
 34:11 עליך
 34:16 ראשה
 35:4 ראל תיראר
 35:5 ראזני חרשים תשמענה

1. The Sifra
11:6; 11:7; 24:6

2. The Sifre on Numbers
5:18; 21:11; 23:2; 24:23; 33:2

2. The Sifre on Deuteronomy
1:3; 1:20; 2:7-8; 3:10; 5:3; 5:19; 10:34; 22:12;
22:22; 25:6; 25:8; 26:6; 27:9; 29:10

3. The Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el
1:20; 1:30; 2:12; 2:13; 2:14; 2:17; 2:21; 4:5; 6:3;
8:21; 10:14; 13:9; 13:10; 14:12; 14:25, 26, 27; 19:19;
21:9; 22:14; 24:20; 24:21; 24:22; 25:1; 25:8; 26:2; 27:8;
27:13; 29:15; 30:6; 30:29; 31:1; 31:9; 33:20; 34:4; 34:5;
35:10

4. The Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai
2:20, 21; 10:34; 13:10, 11; 14:13; 24:21; 30:6; 30:29;
31:1; 31:3; 31:5

5. The Mishnah
10:13; 25:8; 30:14; 30:22

6. Buber's Tanhuma
1:2; 1:4; 1:15; 1:21; 3:16; 3:17; 4:4; 4:5; 5:4; 5:24;
6:2; 7:18; 8:8; 8:16; 11:2; 11:4; 13:5; 14:4; 14:15; 14:17;
14:19; 17:11; 19:4; 19:6-17; 19:24; 22:12; 22:16; 23:18;
24:11; 24:17; 25:9; 26:4; 26:20; 26:21; 27:4; 29:15; 29:22;
30:6; 30:20; 30:25; 33:15; 33:16; 33:21; 34:6;
34:7; 34:11

7. Bereshit Rabbah

1:18; 2:17; (3:10); 4:4; 4:5; 5:11; 5:18; 5:23; 6:2;
7:2; 8:5; 8:16; 8:18; [9:5]; [11:2]; [11:10]; 18:6;
[18:7]; 26:4; [26:5, 6]; 26:10; 27:13; 28:7; 29:10;
29:15; 29:16; [30:23]; 30:23; 30:29; 31:4; 33:2; 33:7;
33:11; 33:12; 33:14; 33:16; 34:6; 34:9; [35:5]

8. 'Echah Rabbah

3:16,17; 5:19	(150 - 151)
10:30	(1)
15:1	(74)
21:15	(108-109)
25:9	(95)
33:7	(59)
33:8	(26)

9. Wayyiqra Rabbah

1:1; 1:18; 1:20; 1:21; 3:10, 11; 3:16, 17; 5:7;
5:19; 6:2; 7:3; 8:16; 8:18; 8:19; 8:20; 10:1; 10:10;
13:21; 14:4; 14:13; 14:17; 14:19; 17:11; 21:9; 22:8;
22:14, 16, 18, 21; 24:23; 27:5; 28:16; 28:20; 29:22;
30:32; 31:2; 33:12; 33:15, 16, 17; 34:11; 35:3,4

10. The Pesiqta deRav Kahana

1:5; 1:15; 1:18; 1:20; 1:21; 1:22, 23, 24, 26; 2:9;
3:19, 11; 3:16, 17; [4:6]; 5:19; 5:24; 6:2; 6:8; 8:6, 7;
9:16; 10:30; 11:12; 13:5; [13:10]; 14:2; 14:5; 17:12;
19:18; 22:8; 23:5; 23:13; [25:8]; 28:20; 29:1; [30:18];
30:20; 30:22; [30:26]; [33:7]; 34:6; 34:7, 9, 11; 35:5;
35:6; [35:10]

11. The Printed Tanquma

1:14; 1:18; 2:9; 4:6; 5:24; 6:2; 7:1; 8:16; 11:2;

14:9; 16:2; 17:11; 19:4; 19:12; 19:24; 20:4; 21:15;
22:12; 24:6; 24:11; 26:4; 26:20; 27:1; 27:4; 28:7;
30:20; 30:33; 33:1; 33:12; 34:7; 34:11

12. The Midrash Tehillim

⌘ Buber's Edition

2:17; 2:20; 3:8; 3:10; 3:11; 8:7; 9:4; 11:15;
12:4; 13:5; 14:5; 16:5; 17:12; 24:21; 26:4; 26:16;
27:2; 29:9; 30:18; 30:19; 31:9; 33:12; 34:4

⌚ The Printed Edition

2:17; 3:11; 9:4; 18:7; 24:21; 25:1; 26:4; 27:2;
27:4; 29:9; 29:12; 29:23; 30:18; 33:15

13. Midrash Devarim Rabbah

New Material

24:21 (29)
28:27 (118)

Material Already Known

1:2 (125)
30:19 (36)

14. The Midrash Haggadol on Exodus

2:9 Tanhuma
2:12 Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el (or Mechilta deRabbi
Shim'on ben Yohai)
3:14
3:23 Mishnat R. 'Eli'ezer
4:4 Mishnat R. 'Eli'ezer
6:2

10:14 Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el
 11:2 Pirqe deRabbi 'Eli'ezer
 13:11 Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai
 14:13,13 Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai (or
 Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el)
 22:14
 23:4 Pesiqta Rabbati
 24:20 Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai
 24:21 Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai (or
 Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el)
 25:1 Alfa Beta deRabbi 'Aqiva
 25:4
 25:9
 26:2
 27:13 Bereshit Rabbah
 29:14 Uncertain; Bava Qamma
 29:23 Uncertain; uncertain
 30:6 Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai
 30:18 Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai
 30:20 Pesiqta deRav Kahana
 30:29 Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai
 31:1,3 Mechilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yohai (or
 Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el)
 33:15 Makkot
 33:16 Bava Batra
 34:7,11
 34:15,16
 35:8

15. The Pirqe deRabbi 'Eli'ezer

11:2; 33:7

16. The Seder Eliyahu

X Rabbah

5:14; 10:14; 13:9; 14:13; 19:9; 22:13; 22:14;
28:14; 32:8; 33:7; 33:22

⌈ Zuṭa

8:16; 22:13; 29:19

17. The Yalqut Mechiri on Isaiah

X The Lemra

1:11; 4:5; 7:2; 7:7; 8:5; 10:24; 13:17; 14:1;
14:3; 25;8

⌈ The Derash

1:4 Tanhuma
1:12 Hagigah
1:18 Bavli Shabbat; Yerushalmi Shabbat (11)
1:21 Pesiqta deRab Kahana
2:9 Yelammedenu
2:22 Sotah
3:2,3,5,6 Hagigah
3:11 Midrash Tehillim
3:12 'Ester Rabbah
3:14 Shemot Rabbah
3:16 'Echah Rabbah
3:18,22 Yerushalmi Shabbat
4:5 Bava Batra
5:6 Qohelet Rabbah
5:12 Shabbat
5:14 Shemot Rabbah
5:18 Berachot
6:2 Tanhuma
6:3 Tanhuma

7:23	Sanhedrin
8:16	Wayyiqra Rabbah
9:4	Midrash Tehillim (21); Bemidbar Rabbah
9:19	Shabbat
10:30	'Echah Rabbah
11:2	Pirqa deRabbi 'Eli'ezer
11:3	Sanhedrin
11:4	Apparently Rut Rabbah
11:11	Midrash Tehillim
13:5	Yerushalmi Ta'anit
13:17	'Ester Rabbah
14:1	Qiddushin; Shemot Rabbah (212)
19:4	Tanhuma
19:18	Menahot
20:2	Yoma
24:21	Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el (95)
25:8	Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el (5)

18. The Midrash 'Aggadah 'al Humash

5:8; 6:8 Wayyiqra Rabbah or Pesiqta deRav Kahana;
8:19; 11:11; 14:14; 17:12; 26:4; 29:15; 30:19; 34:6;
35:8

19. The Midrash Haggadol on Numbers

1:20	Qiddushin
1:21	
6:2	
6:3	Wayyiqra Rabbah or Bereshit Rabbah
6:7	
8:7	
9:4	

11:12
 17:11
 21:11 Sifre Bemidbar or Bemidbar Rabbah
 21:13 Pesiqta deRav Kahana or 'Echah Rabbah
 23:8 Wayyiqra Rabbah
 24:14 'Arachin or Bemidbar Rabbah
 24:23 Sifre Zuta
 29:1

20. The 'En Ya'aqov

3:10; 3:16; 9:6; 9:19; 27:6; 28:7; 30:21; 33:6

21. 'Aggadat Shir Hashshirim

4:4	(1,073)
5:7	(103)
8:16	(1,389)
9:11	(1,375)
10:5	(1,327)
10:26	(1,326)
11:13	(1,057)
11:14	(1,112)
13:4	(1,158)
17:12	(1,365)
18:3	(852)
31:1	(1,324)
31:4	(1,183)
32:17	(764 and 768)
33:5	(137)

X 22. Midrash 'Echah Zuta

3:16,17	(63)
22:8	(70)
30:22	(66)

22. Midrash 'Echah Zuta, Second Recension

22:12 (79 and 82-83)

22. The Yalqut Shim'oni on Lamentations, Buber's Edition

21:9 'Echah Rabbah (100)

30:22 'Echah Zuta (88)

23. 'Aggadat Bereshit

4:5 23 (132)

6:1 23

19:24 23 23 (55)

21:2 23 (31)

25:8 23 23 (76)

26:19 23 (89)

33:7 23 (76)

23 23 (62)

24. Midrash R. David Hannagid

11:4 (23)

21:15 (92)

24:21 (401)

26:12 (146)

25. The Talmud Yerushalmi

1:18; 5:2; 7:3; 9:4; 21:11; 22:8; 26:2; 26:4; 26:19;
28:16; 28:25; 30:22; 31:2

26. The Tosefta

5:1; 9:4; 22:14; 27:3; 29:15; 30:22; 33:11

27. Midrash Tanna'im (other than excerpts from the Sifre)
6:2; 12:3; 14:16; 27:4; 29:10
28. Midrash Shemu'el
24:21 (98)
25:8 (122)
27:13 (53)
29. Midrash Mishle
19:11 (101)
22:14 (65)
30. The Yalqut Mechiri on Proverbs
1:27 Shemot Rabbah (82b)
5:13 'Ester Rabbah (43a)
5:14 Tanhuma (99b)
9:16 Shabbat (29b)
16:5 Midrash Tehillim (39a)
19:11 Midrash Mishle (69b)
28:7 'Ester Rabbah (43a)
29:14 Midrash Mishle (69b)
31. The Midrash Leqah Tov on Genesis and Exodus
5:18 (1: 29)
8:5 Bereshit Rabbah (1:115)
8:18 (2: 11)
8:19 Sotah or Shemot Rabbah (2: 10)
12:1 Tanhuma (2: 2)
21:14 (1: 95)
24:20 Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el (2:139)
30:18 (2: 48)

30:29	Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el	(2:91)
33:18		(1:83)
34:6		(1:128)
34:11	Hagigah	(1:6)
34:11	Tanhuḡa	(2:51)

32. The Midrash Sechel Tov

1:30	Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el	(2:331)
2:20	Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el	(2:195)
4:4	Sotah	(2: 15)
5:12	Shabbat	(2:274)
5:18		(1:208)
8:3	Midrash Leqah Tov	(2: 13)
11:11		(2: 3)
11:12		(1:32;)
12:1		(2:)
13:9	Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el or Midrash Leqah Tov	(2: 95) (2:136)
14:1	Yevamot	(1: 19)
14:17	Bereshit Rabbah	(1:135)
14:20		(1:313)
16:3		(1:308)
16:4		(1:296)
17:4		(1:116)
19:24		(2:139)
22:13, 14	Ta'anit	(2: 17)
23:5		(2:197) (2:204)
23:11		(2:37)
24:21	Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el	(2:202) (2: 68)
24:22		(1:242)

27:13		(1: 69)
28:27		(2: 66)
29:10	Bereshit Rabbah	(1: 3)
30:6	Mechilta deRabbi Yishmael	(2:208)
30:23	Bereshit Rabbah	(1:274)
31:4	Bereshit Rabbah	(1:168)
33:7	Bereshit Rabbah	(1: 62)
	Bereshit Rabbah	(1:291)
		(1:121)
33:14		(1: 24)
34:7		(2: 68)

33. Haggadoṯ Hattalmud

1:18	Shabbat	(15c)
2:14	Sotah	(71d)
2:22	Sotah	(71b)
3:1,2,3	Hagigah	(37b)
3:6	Shabbat	(18b)
	Giṭṭin	(64a)
4:5	Bava Batra	(94a)
5:12	Shabbat leaf 75	(14c)
	Shabbat leaf 119	(18a)
5:14	Sotah	(79c)
7:19	Megillah	(24d)
8:7	Sanhedrin	(111a)
8:16	Sanhedrin	(117a)
8:23	Sanhedrin	(111a)
9:4	Sotah	(71d)
9:19	Shabbat	(12a)
10:19	Sanhedrin	(112a)
10:32	in the index	

11:3	Sanhedrin	(110c)
14:12	in the index	
14:24	Sanhedrin	(111b)
19:13	Ta'anit	(50a)
19:18	Menahot	(140a)
20:3	Shabbat	(17a)
21:15	Sanhedrin	(111d)
22:12	Hagigah	(35c)
22:14	Yoma	(46c)
26:2	Sanhedrin	(121d)
26:4	Menahot	(138a)
26:5	Rosh Hashshanah	(42a)
27:11	Bava Batra	(90b)
28:20	Yoma	(42c)
30:19	Sotah	(79a)
30:20	Keritot	(142a)
33:4	Sanhedrin	(111b)
33:6	Shabbat	(111c)
33:7	Hagigah	(35c)
33:15	Bava Batra leaf 57b	(93a)
33:16	Bava Batra leaf 106	(90a)

34. 'Avot deRabbi Natan

⌘ First Recension

22:14

⌚ Second Recension

5:13; 14:18, 19; 30:20

35. The Pesiqta Rabbati

⌘

2:9; 4:5; 5:19; 6:2; 8:7; 17:12; 27:1; 29:10; 29:23;
30:18; 30:26; 30:33; 31:3; 33:7; 33:12; 33:15; 34:6

ג

1:21; 8:6; 8:7; 19:18; 23:13; 30:32; 34:6;

34:7

ד

23:4; 26:4; 33:16

ה

25:8; 30:19; 35:10

ו

35:10

ז

9:5

36. The Midrash Haggadol on Genesis

1:18	Pesiqta deRav Kahana or Wayyiqra Rabbah
2:17	Sanhedrin
4:4	Bereshit Rabbah
4:5	unknown; Bava Batra
5:13	Sanhedrin
5:24	
6:3	Hullin
6:7	Shabbat; Berachot
7:21	Bereshit Rabbah
8:16	
10:5	
11:11	Pirqa deRabbi 'Eli'ezer
15:1	Mishnat Rabbi 'Eli'ezer
16:5	
18:5, 7	
21:9	Pirqa deRabbi 'Eli'ezer
22:14	unknown; unknown
23:18	
26:1	possibly Sanhedrin

26:4
 26:19
 27:1 Bava Batra
 27:13
 28:27 Mishnat R. 'Eli'ezer
 30:16 Mishnat R. 'Eli'ezer
 30:18 Sanhedrin
 30:20
 31:9
 32:9 Berachot
 33:6 Shabbat
 33:7
 33:11
 33:14 Bereshit Rabbah
 33:15
 33:16 Bereshit Rabbah
 33:24
 34:6

37. Midrash Bereshit Rabbati

22:4; 26:4

38. 'Osar Midrashim

8:8 Midrash 'Asarah Melachim
 26:20 Midrash Ma'aseh Hanukkah
 33:7, 8 Midrash Wayyosha'
 35:10 Seder 'Araquin

39. The Yalqut Mechiri on the Minor Prophets

2:18 Shemot Rabbah (Amos p.73)
 4:4 Tanhuma (Joel p.36)

	Qohelet Rabbah	(Joel p.47)
5:1	'Echah Rabbah	(Habakkuk p.34)
5:24	Bemidbar Rabbah	(Zechariah p.53)
6:2	Shemot Rabbah	(Habakkuk p.26)
8:3	Shemot Rabbah	(Obadiah p.20)
8:16	Sanhedrin	(Haggai p.15)
9:19	Shabbat	(Amos p.34)
14:1	Qiddushin	(Malachi p.42)
	Tanhumā	(Habakkuk p.7)
21:11	Yerushalmi Ta'anit	(Zechariah p.87)
22:5	Haftarat Sos 'Asis (Pesiqta deRav Kahana appendix 6)	(Joel p.16 and Habakkuk p.55)
22:12	Qohelet Rabbah	(Zechariah p.66)
22:16	Tanhumā	(Micah p.20)
23:13	Yerushalmi Ta'anit	(Micah p.27)
23:15	Sanhedrin	(Zechariah p.78)
24:21	Yelammedenu	(Malachi p.61)
24:23	Midrash Tehillim	(Zephariah p5)
27:2	Midrash Tehillim	(Joel p.41)
27:13	Sifre Bemidbar	(Zechariah p. 89)
	Makkot	(Amos p.61)
28:7	Tanhumā	(Joel p.49)
30:18	Midrash Tehillim	(Zechariah p.129)
30:26	Yelammedenu	(Hosea p.14)
30:33	Pirqe deRabbi 'Eli'ezer	(Micah p.30)
31:5	Berachot	(Micah p.18)
31:9	'Eruvin	(Jonah p.11)
33:7	Haftarat Sos Asis (Pesiqta deRab Kahana appendix 6)	(Joel p.16 and Habakkuk p.55)

	'Echah Rabbah	(Joel p.42)
33:21	Tosefta Sukkah	(Zechariah p.141)
34:7, 11	Yelammedenu	(Joel p.23)
34:11	Tanpuma	(Zechariah p.147)
35:2	Bemidbar Rabbah	(Malachi p.8)

40. The Talmud Bavli

1:11; 2:22; 10:34; 19:18; 24:9; 31:5

41. Ginze Schechter

5:19	Midrash Leqah Tov
22:12	Midrash Qohelet
26:2	Derashah 'al Ketuvim Hammachhishim Zeh 'et Zeh
29:23	Derashah 'al Ketuvim Hammachhishim Zeh 'et Zeh
30:4, 5	Midrash Leqah Tov
30:17	Midrash Qohelet

42. Seder Olam

7:8; 14:19; 16:14; 18:6; 21:11

43. Midrash Panim 'Aherim 'al 'Ester Nusah Sheni

3:11	(66)
14:22	(61)
21:11	(78)
26:19	(81-82)
27:4	(67)
35:10	(81-82)

44. 'Aggadat 'Ester

7:19	(3)
9:1	(51)
10:17	(
17:14	(58)

27:1 (29)
 28:5 (46)
 33:7 (39)

45. The Yalqut Mechiri on Psalms

1:9	Midrash Tehillim	
3:11	Midrash Tehillim	
4:4	Bemidbar Rabbah	(140:3)
4:5	Shemot Rabbah	(31:31)
	Tanhuma	(97:10)
5:9	Berachot	(125:1)
5:30	Midrash Tehillim	
6:2	Tanhuma	(103:7)
6:10	Megillah	(29:2)
8:7	Midrash Tehillim	
9:4	Midrash Tehillim	
10:14	Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el	(105:27)
11:11	Midrash Tehillim	
13:10	Tanhuma	(139:13)
14:13	Tanhuma	(110:20)
16:1	Sanhedrin	(81:13)
16:5	Midrash Tehillim	
17:12	Midrash Tehillim	
19:4	Tanhuma	(29:40)
	Bemidbar Rabbah	(45:26)
23:5	Tanhuma	(136:29)
24:21	Devarim Rabbah	(149:15)
	Midrash Tehillim	
26:2	Sanhedrin	(22:25)
26:4	Midrash Tehillim	
27:2	Midrash Tehillim	
27:4	Shemot Rabbah	(99:7)

28:16	Yerushalmi Yoma	(50:2)
29:15	Bava Qamma	(94:6)
29:22	Midrash Tehillim	
30:19	Midrash Tehillim	
30:25	Bemidbar Rabbah	(140:3)
30:29	Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el	(18:10)
30:30	Shemot Rabbah	(18:40)
30:33	Nedarim	(72:34)
	'Eruvin	(16:30)
33:6	Shemot Rabbah	(19:47)
33:7	Pirqa deRabbi 'Eli'ezer	(36:5)

46. Midrash Leqah Tov on Ecclesiastes

28:16	Qohelet Rabbah	(18)
29:19		(32)
34:12		(49)

47. Midrash Leqah Tov on Lamentations

22:3		(4)
30: 5, 7		(65)

48. Pesiqta Hadatta

10:3		(66)
22:14		(69)
33:7		(55)
34:11		(59)

49. Yalqut Shim'oni on Isaiah

3:1, 2, 3, 5, 7,	Hagigah	
4:5	Bava Batra	
5:9	'Echah Rabbah; Berachot	

14:22 Megillah
 28:25 Yerushalmi Hallah
 34:7, 11 Tanhuma

50. Bet Hammidrash

1:11	Midrash Tadshe	(3 :175)
6:1	Midrash Hallel	(5:)
25:1	'Alfa Beta deRabbi 'Aqiva (Recension 1)	(3 :14) (3 25)
29:10	Yelammedem	(6 :83)
30:33	'Alfa Beta deRabbi 'Aqiva (Recension 1)	(3 :42)
34:10	Tanhuma	(6 :102)
34:11	Midrash Tadshe	(3:165)

51. Genizah Fragments Published by Mann

2:17; 11:2; 16:1; 26:4; 30:29

52. Midrash Hadash 'al Hattorah

4:5; 11:2; 26:4; 27:6; 34:2; 34:6

53. Midrash Leqah Tov on Esther

2:22	(98)
21:2	(87)

54. The Midrash Haggadol on Leviticus

1:19	Sifre
1:20	Wayyiqra Rabbah, Pesiqta deRav Kahana
5:19	
6:2	Sifra
7:25	
13:21	Hullin

55. Midrash Hashkem
1:21; 24:18, 19, 20

56. Nusah H'adash shel Midrash Tehillim
14:13

57. Midrash 'Abba Guriyon
2:22 (22)

Yalqut Shim'oni

8:7	Pesiqta Rabbati	(2:650)
	Midrash Tehillim	(2:347)
	Sanhedrin	(2:237)
11:2	Tanhuma	(1:412)
	Tanhuma	(2:935)
14:17, 19	Tanhuma	(2:562)
24:11	Tanhuma	(1:528)
	Tanhuma	(1:417)
29:10	Pesiqta Rabbati	(2:567)
30:6	Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el	(2:266)
30:29	Mechilta deRabbi Yishma'el	(2:20)
34:7, 11	Tanhuma	(1:182)

Shemot Rabbah
11:2; 24:21

Sifre Zuṭa
24:23

Targum Sheni
14:19

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

In arranging Hebrew works in alphabetical order, the word midrash in the title, all prefixes, and the word sefer if it is not strictly part of the title, are disregarded.

Part 1: Biblical Texts

(a) Hebrew

Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, ediderunt K. Elliger et W. Rudolph,
Wurtembergische Bibelenstalt, Stuttgart. Liber Jesaiae
praeparavit D. Winton Thomas, 1968

ספר תורה נביאים וכתובים מרויק היטיב על פי המסורה על ידי
Norman Henry Snaith. London, The British and Foreign Bible
Society, 1958

מקראות גדולות רב פנינים (על התורה) . הוצאת ספרים לויין-
אפשטין, ירושלים, תשכ"ז
מקראות גדולות עם ל"ב פירושים (על נביאים וכתובים).
הוצאת בית מסחר ספרים פרזס, תשי"א

Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum Variis Lectionibus, ed. Benjamin
Kennicott, Oxford, 1776-1780

de Rossi, J. B., Variae Lectiones Veteris Testamenti. Parma, 1784-
1788

נביאים אחרנים מרויק היטב על פי המסרה ועל פי רפרסים
ראשונים עם חלופים והגהות מן כתבי יד עתיקים ותרגומים
ישנים מאת כ' ד' וינצבורג. חברת מפיקי כתבי הקדש
בבריטניה ובשאר הארצות, לונדון, תרע"א

The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery: Volume I: The
Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary. Edited for
the Trustees by Millar Burrows with the assistance of
John C. Trever and William H. Brownlee. Published by the

American Schools of Oriental Research, New Haven 1950.

Loewinger, S., The Variants of DSI II, VT 4, 1954, pp.155-163.

Discoveries in the Judaean Desert I-V. The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1955-1968.

(b) The Greek Versions

Brooke, A.E., McLean, N., and Thackeray, H. St. J., The Old Testament in Greek, 9 parts, Cambridge University Press, 1906-1940.

Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Göttingensis editum. Vol. XIII, Duodecim Prophetae, ed. Joseph Ziegler, 1943, 1967. Vol. XIV, Isaias, ed. Joseph Ziegler, 1939, 1967. Vol. XV, Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae, ed. Joseph Ziegler, 1957, Vol. XVI, part 1, Ezechiel, ed. Joseph Ziegler, 1952. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen.

Ottley, R.R. The Book of Isaiah According to the Septuagint (Codex Alexandrinus). Vol. II, Text and Notes. Cambridge University Press, 1906.

Rahlfs, Alfred. Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes. Württembergische Bibelenstalt, Stuttgart, 1935, 1962.

Wahle, Otto. Die Prophetenzitate der Sacra Parallela in ihrem Verhältnis zur Septuaginta-Textüberlieferung. Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, XIII. Kosel-Verlag, Munich, 1965.

(e) The Vulgate

Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem ... recensuit Robertus

Weber OSB. Württembergische Bibelenstalt, Stuttgart, 1969.

Polyglotten-Bibel zum Praktischen Handgebrauch, ed. R. Stier and

K. G. W. Theile, Bielefeld, 1864.

מרש אבא גוריון: ראה ספרי דאזתא על מגלת אסתר
אבות ררבי נתן בשתי נומחאות, מה' ש. ז. שעכטער, [ווינא 1887];
זולם ע"י ש. י. פעלזהיים, ניו יורק, תשכ"ז
מרש אגרה על חמשה חרמשי תורה, מה' ש. באבער, ווילנא, תרמ"ז;
זולם ע"י הוצאת מדע, ניו יורק, תש"ך
אגרת אסתר, מה' ש. באבער, עם הארות והגהות מאת י. בעהאק; זולם
בארץ ישראל בלי ציון התאריכים
אגרת בראשית, מה' ש. באבער, קראקא, תרס"ג; זולם ע"י הוצאת
מוריה, ניו יורק, תשי"ט
[אגרת שיר השירים] Agadath Shir Hashirim, ed. S. Schechter. JQR old
series VI pp. 673-697, VII pp. 145-163, 729-754, VIII pp. 289-320
אוצר מרשמים, מה' י. ד. אייזענשטיין, ניו יורק, 1915; זולם ע"י
בית מסחר והוצאת ספרים של י. א. גראסמאן, ניו יורק, תשס"ז
מרש איכה זוטא: ראה מדרש זוטא
מרש איכה רבה, מה' ש. באבער, ווילנא, תרנ"ט; זולם מאדש בתל
אביב בלי ציון התאריך
משנת רבי אליעזר, או מרש שלשים ושתיים מרות, מה' ה. ג. ענעלאו,
ניו יורק, תרצ"ד; זולם ע"י הוצאת מקור, ירושלים, תש"ל
בית המרש, מה' א. יעללינעק, [ליפזיג 1853-1857, ווינא 1873,
1877]; זולם ע"י ספרי ואהרמן, ירושלים, תשכ"ז
מרש בראשית רבא, מה' י. טהעאדאר וח. אלבעק (בצילום: אלבק),
[ברלין, תרע"ב-תרצ"ו]; זולם ע"י ספרי ואהרמן, ירושלים,
תשכ"ה
מרש בראשית רבה, כתב יד ראטיקן 60, הוצאת מקור, ירושלים,
תשל"ב
מרש בראשית רבתי, נוסר על ספרו של ר' משה הררשן, מה' ח.
אלבעק, מקיצי נרדמים, ירושלים, ת"ש; זולם ע"י מקיצי
נרדמים, ירושלים, תשכ"ז

מרש הגרול על חמשה חומשי תורה, ספר בראשית, מה' מ. מרגליות,
הוצאת מוסד הרב קוק, ירושלים, תש"ז; זולם ע"י מוסד הרב
קוק, תשכ"ז

מרש הגרול על חמשה חומשי תורה, ספר שמות, מה' מ. מרגליות,
מוסד הרב קוק, ירושלים, תשט"ז

מרש הגרול על חמשה חומשי תורה, ספר ויקרא, מה' נ. א.
ראבינאוויץ, [בית המדרש לרבנים שבאמריקה], ניו יורק,
תר"צ

מרש הגרול על חמשה חומשי תורה, ספר במדבר, מה' ש. פיש. כרך
א' יצא לאור בלונדון בשנת תשי"ח ע"י המהדיר, וכרך ב'
יצא לאור בירושלים בשנת תשכ"ג ע"י הוצאת קרית-ספר ודפוס
סיון

מרש הגרול על חמשה חומשי תורה, ספר במדבר, מה' ז. מ.
רבינוביץ, הוצאת מוסד הרב קוק, ירושלים, תשכ"ז
גנזי שעכטער, ספר א': קטעי מרש והגרה מן הגניזה שבמצרים,
מה' ל. גינצבורג, הוצאת בית המדרש לרבנים שבאמריקה,
ניו יורק, תרפ"ח; זולם ע"י הוצאת מקור, ירושלים, תשכ"ט
מרש דברים רבה, יוצא לאור פעם ראשונה ע"פ כת"י אוקספורד
קובץ 147 ע"י ש. ליברמן, ירושלים, [תר"ח]; זולם ע"י
ספרי ואהרמן, ירושלים, תשכ"ה

מרש רבי דוד הנגיד, ספר בראשית, מה' א. י. כץ, הוצאת מוסד
הרב קוק, ירושלים, תשכ"ד
הגרות התלמוד, ליקט חכם ספרדי לא נודע שמו, תצלום הרפוס
היחידי, קושטנטינה ה'רע"א, במברגר את ואהרמן, ירושלים,
תשכ"א

[מרש השכם] Enelow, H.G., Midrash Hashkem Quotations in Alnaqua's
Menorat Ha-Maor. HUCA IV, 1927, pp. 311-343

מרש ויקרא רבה, מה' מ. מרגליות, ירושלים, תשי"ג-תש"ך

מדרש לקח טוב ... יסרו רבינו טוביה ברי אליעזר ז"ל, מה' ש. באבער על בראשית ושמות, [ווילנא, תר"מ]; זולם שנת תש"ך בירושלים

מדרש לקח טוב ... יסרו רבינו טוביה ברי אליעזר ז"ל, מה' א. מ. פאדווא על ויקרא, במדבר, ודברים, [ווילנא, תרס"ד]; זולם שנת תש"ך בירושלים עם מה' באבער מדרש לקח טוב על מגלת קהלת מרבינו טוביהו ב"ר אליעזר זק"ל, מה' ג. א. פיינבערג, ברלין, תרס"ד; זולם שנת תשכ"ז בירושלים

פירוש לקח טוב על מגלת איכה מרבינו טוביהו ב"ר אליעזר זק"ל, מה' א. גראינוף, לונדון, 1908; הזלום כרוך עם מה' פיינבערג

מדרש לקח טוב על אסתר: ראה ספרי דאגדתא על מגלת אסתר לקוטים ממדרש אלה הוברים רבה הנמצאים מפורזים בילקוט גם מדרש אחר על פרשת דברים עפ"י כתב יד שבאצר הספרים במינכען ולקוטי מאמרים שהביא רבנו בחיי ממדרש דברים ואינם נמצאים בנרפס, מה' ש. באבער, ווינא, תרס"ה; זולם ע"י הוצאת מצחף, ירושלים תשכ"ז ספר מכילתא דרבי ישמעאל, מה' מ. איש שלום, ווינא, תר"ל; זולם ע"י הוצאת אום, ניו יורק, תש"ח מכילתא דרבי ישמעאל, מה' ח. ש. האאוויטץ וי. א. רבין, [פראנקפורט שעל נהר מיין, תרצ"א]; זולם ע"י במברגר את ואהרמן, ירושלים, תש"ך

Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael, ed. J. Z. Lauterbach, New York, 1933.

מכילתא דרבי שמעון בן יוחאי, מה' י. נ. הלוי אפשטיין וע. ז. מלמד, מקיצי נרדמים, ירושלים, תשט"ו

מנורת המאור, המיוחס אל ר' יצחק אבוהב, מה' י. פ. הורב,
מושלם ומותקן ע"י מ. ה. קצנלנבוגן, מוסד הרב קוק,
ירושלים, תשכ"א, גדפס מחדש תש"ל
מדרש משלי, מה' ש. באבער, ווילנא, תרנ"ג; צולם שנת תשכ"ה
בירושלים, כרוך עם מדרש שמואל מה' באבער
מתניתא רתלמודא רבני מערבא, מה' Ed. W.H. Lowe, Cambridge, 1883
[נוסח חרש של מדרש תהלים] See below, Mann, Genizah Fragments
סדר אליהו רבה וסדר אליהו זוטא, מה' מ. איש שלום, ווינא,
תרס"ב; נספחים לסדר אליהו, מה' מ. איש שלום, ווינא,
תסר"ז; שניהם צולמו יחד ע"י ספרי ואהרמן, ירושלים, תשכ"ט
סדר ארקיו: ראה כבוד חופה
סדר עולם רבה, מה' ב. ראטנער, ווילנא, תרנ"ז
סדר עולם רבה השלם, מה' מ. י. וויינשטאק, כרך א' יצא לאור
בשנת תשט"ז בירושלים ע"י הוצאת מעין החכמה, וכרך ב'
יצא בלי ציון התאריך בירושלים ע"י המהדיר, וכרך ג'
יצא בשנת תשכ"ב בירושלים ע"י הוצאת מתיבתא תורת חסד
מדרש שכל טוב על ספר בראשית ושמות, חברו רבינו מנחם ב"ר
שלמה ז"ל, מה' ש. באבער, [ברלין, תר"ס-תרס"א]; צולם
בתל אביב בלי ציון התאריכים
ספר והזהיר, מה' י. מ. פרייאמאן, לייפציג, [1873]; || ארשא,
[1880]; צולם בלי ציון במקום או התאריכים
ספרא רבי רב הוא ספר תורת כהנים, מה' אייזק הרש ווייס,
ווינא, תרכ"ב; צולם ע"י הוצאת אום, ניו יורק, תש"ז
תורת כהנים על פי כתב יד רומי מנוקד, מה' א. א. כינקלשטיין,
הוצאת בית המדרש לרבנים שבאמריקה, ניו יורק, תשי"ז
ספרי דאגדתא על מגלת אסתר ... מדרש אבא גוריון ... מדרש
פנים אחרים ... מדרש לקח טוב, מה' ש. באבער, ווילנא,
תרס"ז; צולם בלי ציון התאריך או המקום

ספרי רבי רב, מחברת ראשונה: ספרי על ספר במדבר וספרי זוטא,
מה' ח. ש. האראוויסץ, [לייפציג, תרע"ג]; זולם ע"י
ספרי ואהרמן, ירושלים, תשכ"ו
ספרי על ספר דברים, מה' א. א. פינקלשטיין, בהשתמשות עזבונו
של ח. ש. האראוויסץ, הוצאת האגודה התרבותית היהודית
בגרמניה, ברלין, ת"ש; זולם ע"י בית המדרש לרבנים
שבאמריקה, ניו יורק, תשכ"ט
ספרי דבי רב, מה' מ. איש שלום, ווינא, תרכ"ד; זולם בשנת
תשכ"ח בלי ציון המקום
עין יעקב, אסטטרדאס, [1730]

מדרש פנים אחרים על אסתר: ראה ספרי דאודתא על מגלת אסתר
פסיקתא דרב כהנא, מה' ד. מנדלבוים, הוצאת בית המדרש לרבנים
שבאמריקה, ניו יורק, תשכ"ב
פסיקתא דרב כהנא, מה' ש. באבער, מקיצי נרדמים, [ליק, 1868];
זולם שנת תשכ"ג בירושלים
מדרש פסיקתא רבתי, מה' מ. איש שלום, [ווינא, תר"מ]; זולם
שנת תשכ"ג בתל אביב

See below, Prijs, Pesikta Rabbati [פסיקתא רבתי]

ספר פרקי רבי אליעזר, ווארשא, תרי"ב; זולם ע"י הוצאת אום,
ניו יורק, תש"ו
קטעי מדרשים מכתבי יר הגניזה
מדרש רבה [כנראה אחת מהוצאות ראם בוויילנא]; זולם ע"י הוצאת
ספרים מוריה, תל אביב, תש"כ
מדרש שוחר טוב על תהלים שמואל. משלי. ... עם פירוש מהר"י
כהן; זולם ע"י הוצאת מדרש, ירושלים, תש"ך
מדרש שמואל, מה' ש. באבער, קראקא, תרנ"ג; זולם שנת תשכ"ה
בירושלים, כרוך עם מדרש משלי מה' באבער

מרש זוטא על שיר השירים, רות, איכה וקהלת, על פי כתב יד,
מוצר הספרים, של די ראסטי בפארמא, קובץ 541, עם נוסחא
שניה על מגילת איכה גם כן על פי כתב יד די ראסטי קובץ
261, ואליהם נלוח ילקוט שמעוני על איכה, מה' ש. באבער,
[ברלין תרנ"ד]; זולם בתל אביב בלי ציון התאריכים

מרש חוש על התורה
See below, Mann, The Bible as Read and
Preached in the Old Synagogue

ילקוט המכירי על ישעיהו, מה' י. ז. כהנא שפירא, ברלין,
תרנ"ו; זולם שנת תשכ"ד בירושלים
ספר ילקוט המכירי על משלי מה' א. הלוי גרינהוט, ירושלים,
תרס"ב; הזלום כרוך עם הילקוט מכירי על ישעיה

See also below, Gaster, Texts and Studies

ילקוט המכירי על ספר הושע, מה' א. גראינוף, לונדון, 1909
ילקוט המכירי על ספר זכריה, מה' א. גראינוף, לונדון, 1909
ילקוט המכירי על ספרי עמוס עובריה יונה מיכה נחום וחבקוק,
מה' א. גראינוף, לונדון, 1909
ילקוט המכירי על ספרי יואל צפניה חגי ומלאכי, מה' א. גראינוף,
לונדון, 1913. כל מהדורות גראינוף האלה יצאו יחד בזלום
בשני כרכים בירושלים בשנת תשכ"ז, וכנראה קצת לפני השנה
ההיא במהדורה מוגבלת

ילקוט המכירי כולל אסיפת מאמרי חז"ל על ספר תהלים, מה' ש.
באבער, ברדיטשוב, תר"ס; זולם שנת תשכ"ד בירושלים
ילקוט שמעוני, [מה' ר"י גאלדמאן], ווארשא תשל"ו; זולם ע"י
בית מסחר ספרים פרדס, ניו יורק, בלי ציון התאריך
ילקוט תלמוד תורה
See below, Mann, The Bible as Read etc.

כבוד חופה, מה' ח. מ. הורוויץ הלוי, פראנקפורט שעל נהר
מיין, 1888; זולם ע"י הוצאת מקור, ירושלים, בלי ציון
המהדיר, המקום, או התאריך

מדרש תהלים, מה' ש. באבער, [ווילנא, תרנ"א]; צולם ע"י הוצאת
אום, ניו יורק, תש"ח

מדרש תהלים: ראה מדרש שוחר טוב

תוספתא, זרעים ומועד, מה' ש. ליברמן, הוצאת בית המדרש לרבנים
שבאטריקה, ניו יורק, תשט"ו, תשכ"ב

תוספתא, מה' מ. ש. זוקרמאנדל, [פאזעוואלק, תרמ"א]; צולם ע"י
ספרי ואהרמן, ירושלים, תשכ"ג

תלמוד בבלי, [[הוצאת ראם, ווילנא]; צולם ע"י בית מסחר ספרים
פרדס, ניו יורק, תשי"ד

See below, Diqduq Sopherim

תלמוד בבלי

תלמוד ירושלמי, נרפס בבית רניאל בומבירגי, וויניציאה, [רפ"ג];
צולם בלי ציון המקום או התאריך

מדרש תנאים על ספר דברים, מה' ד. צ. האפפמאנן, ברלין, [תרס"ח]-
תרס"ט; צולם בארץ ישראל בלי ציון המקום או התאריך,
ובהשמטת הפתיחה הגרמנית

מדרש תנחומא, מה' ש. באבער, [ווילנא, תרמ"ה]; צולם שנת תשכ"ד
בירושלים

מדרש תנחומא על חמשה חומשי תורה עם הפירושים המפורסמים עין
יוסף, ענף יוסף, (יתכן כי הוא מה' ווילנא-גרודנו של
שנת 1831); צולם ע"י הוצאת ספרים האחים לוין-אפשטין,
ירושלים, תש"ך

Part 3: Other Ancient Sources

- מרש רבינו בחיי על חמשה חומשי תורה (פירוש התורה ע"י ר'
בחיי בן אשר). מעין החכמה, ירושלים, תשי"ח
ר' נתן בן יחיאל: ראה ערוך
ספר הישר הוא ספר רברי הימים כסדר התורה, Sefer hajaschar,
ed. Iazarus Goldschmidt, ברלין, תרפ"ג
פירוש רבינו אברהם אבן עזרא על ישעיה
פריעדלאנדער, ed. The Commentary of Ibn Ezra on Isaiah,
M. Friedlander, לונדון, 1873; זולם ע"י הוצאת פ
פעלדהיים, ניו יורק, בלי ציון התאריך
פירוש ר' אברהם אבן עזרא על התורה: במקראות גדולות
ארבעה ספרים נפתחים: הערוך, מוסף הערוך, המעריך, הפלאה
שבערכין (ספר הערוך לר' נתן בן יחיאל בן אברהם
פרומי), לובלין, תרל"ד; זולם בלי ציון המקום או
התאריך
פירוש ר' רור קמחי: במקראות גדולות
פירוש רש"י: במקראות גדולות

S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera Pars I, Opera Exegetica: 2,
Commentariorum in Esaiam. Cura et Studio Marci Adriaen.
Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, LXXXIII, LXXXIII A.
Typographii Brepols Editores Pontificii, Turnholti,
[Turnhout], 1963

H Καὶ νη Διαθηκη second edition, The British and Foreign
Bible Society, London, 1958, 1960

Novum Testamentum Graece, second edition, ed. Alexander Souter.
The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1947, 1962

Part 4: Indexes, Dictionaries of Biography, Concordances

Indexes

אהרן בן מרדכי הימאן; ספר תורה הכתובה והמסורה על תורה
נביאים וכתובים. [הותקן ע"י דוד הימן]. הוצאת דביר,
תל אביב, תרצ"ו (תשכ"ה), תרצ"ח, ת"ש
דוד בן אהרן הימן, מקורות ילקוט שמעוני לנביאים וכתובים.
הוצאת מוסד הרב קוק, ירושלים, תשכ"ה

Dictionaries of Biography

אנציקלופדיה לחכמי התלמוד והגאונים, בעריכת ד"ר מרדכי
מרגליות בהשתתפות חכמים ומלומדים. הוצאת יהושע
צ'צ'יק, תל אביב, בסיוע מוסד הרב קוק, 1960
אנציקלופדיה לתולדות גרולי ישראל, בעריכת ד"ר מרדכי
מרגליות בהשתתפות חכמים ומלומדים. הוצאת יהושע
צ'צ'יק, תל אביב, בסיוע מוסד הרב קוק, כרכים
א', ג', ד' בלי ציון התאריך, כרך ב' 1964

Concordances

קונקורדנציה לתנ"ך מאת ד"ר שלמה סאנדעלקערן, ליפסיא,
תרנ"ח. מהדורה שביעית עם מלואים ותקונים פאת פ.
מרגולין ומ. גושן-גוטשטיין, יצא ע"י מ. גושן-
גוטשטיין, הוצאת שוקן, ירושלים ותל אביב, תשכ"ז

Part 5. Dictionaries

A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, ed. Francis Brown, S.R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1907, 1959.

A Dictionary of the Targumim, The Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashit Literature, compiled by Marcus Jastrow [1903]. Reprinted by Pardes Publishing House, New York, 1950.

A Compendious Syriac Dictionary, ed. J. Payne Smith. The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1903, 1957.

A Greek-English Lexicon compiled by Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott. Ninth edition, 1940, 1968, with a supplement 1968. The Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Part 6: Modern Studies

אלבעק, חנוך, מחקרים בברייתא ותוספתא ויחסן [Albeck]
לתלמוד. הוצאת מוסד הרב קוק, ירושלים, תש"ז, תש"ל

אלבעק, חנוך, מרש ויקרא רבה. ספר היוכל לכבוד לוי
גינצבורג, חלק עברי, צד כה-מג. האקדמיה האמריקנית
למדעי היהדות, ניו יורק, תש"ו

Albeck: see Zunz

Aptowitzer, V, Das Schriftwort in der rabbinischen Literatur.

Introduction and Part I, Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Band CLIII: VI, 1906. Part II, same journal, Band 160: 7 (sic, in Arabic numbers), 1908. Parts III and IV, XVIII. Jahresbericht der Israelitisch-Theologischen Lehranstalt in Wien, für das Schuljahr 1910/1911, Vienna 1911. Part V, same journal, XXII. Jahresbericht, Schuljahr 1914/1915, Vienna 1915. Reprinted (without the title-pages to parts III and IV and part V) By Ktav Publishing House, New York, 1970, with a prolegomenon by Samuel Loewinger.

Bacher, Wilhelm, Die Exegetische Terminologie der Jüdischen Traditionsliteratur;, Part I, Die Bibelexegetische Terminologie der Tannaiten, Leipzig 1899; Part II, Die Bibel-und Traditionsexegetische Terminologie der Amoraer, Leipzig 1905. Reprinted in one volume by Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, Hildesheim, 1965.

Barthélemy, D[ominique], Les Tiquuné Sopherim et la critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament, STV IX, 1962, pp.285-304.

Barthélemy, Dominique, Les Devanciers d'Aquila: Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophéton

trouvés dans le desert de Juda, précédée d'une étude sur les traductions et recensions grecques de la Bible réalisées au premier siècle de notre ère sous l'influence du rabbinat palestinien. SVT X, 1963

The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue: see Mann.

Diaz Esteban, Fernando, The Sefer Oklah w'Oklah as a source of not registered Bible textual variants. ZAW, 70, 1958, pp.250-253.

[Diqduqe Soferim]: see Rabbinovicz and Feldblum.

Duhm, Bernhard, Das Buch Jesaia übersetzt und erklärt. 5. Auflage (reprint of the fourth edition, 1922), Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1968.

Eissfeldt, Otto, The Old Testament: An Introduction. Translated by Peter R. Ackroyd. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1966.

אפשטיין, י. נ., מבואות לספרות התנאים. ערוך [Epstein]
ע"י ע.צ. מלמד. הוצאת ספרים ע"ש י"ל מאגנס ירושלים-
חברת דביר תל אביב, תשי"ז

אפשטיין, י. נ., מבואות לספרות האמוראים. ערוך ע"י
ע. צ. מלמד. הוצאת ספרים ע"ש י"ל מאגנס ירושלים-
חברת דביר תל אביב, תשכ"ו

אפשטיין, י. נ., רקדוקי הירושלמי: ראה מבואות לספרות
התנאים. מבוא למרשי הלכה: ראה מבואות לספרות
האמוראים

Esh, Shaul, Variant Readings in Mediaeval Hebrew Commentaries:
R. Samuel Ben Meir (Rashbam). Textus, V, 1966, pp.84-98.

[Feldblum] פלזבלום, מ. ש., דקדוקי סופרים על מסכת גיטין.
הוצאת חורב, ישיבה אוניברסיטה, ניו יורק, תשכ"ו

Fischer, Johann, In Welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaias den
LXX vor?. BZAW, LVI, 1930.

Finkelstein, Louis, The Sources of the Tannaitic Midrashim.
JQR new series, XXXI, 1941, pp.211-243.

Fischer, Johann, Die Hebraischen Bibelzitate des Scholastikers
Odo. Biblica XV, 1934, pp.50-93.

[Geiger] גייגר, אברהם, המקרא ותרגומיו. תרגום י. ל. ברוך.
מבוא מאת י. קלוזנר. הוצאת מוסד ביאליק, ירושלים, תש"ס
[A translation of Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel in
ihrer abh ngigkeit von den innern entwicklung des Judentums,
second edition, 1928

Ginsburg, Christian D. Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical
Edition of the Hebrew Bible, [London, 1897]. Reprinted
(without date and without the original date and place of
publication) with a prolegomenon by Orlinsky (copyright
1966) by Ktav Publishing House, New York.

Gordis, Robert, The Biblical Text in the Making: A Study of the
Kethib-Qere [Dropsie College, Philadelphia, 1937]. Reprinted
with a prolegomenon by the author [=an article קדמתה של
המסורה לאור ספרות חז"ל וגו', תרביץ, כרך כו, תשי"ח]
by Ktav Publishing House, New York, 1971.

Gordis, Robert, Koheleth-The Man and His World. Third edition.
Schocken Books, New York, 1968.

Goshen-Gottstein, M.H. Text and Language in Bible and Qumran.
Orient Publishing House, Jerusalem-Tel Aviv, 1960 [The
chapters originally appeared as separate articles as
follows: Chapter i, The Authenticity of the Aleppo Codex,
= Textus I, 1960, pp.17-58; Chapter ii, Biblical Philology
and the Concordance = JJS, VIII, 1957, 5 f; Chapter iii,
Die Jesaiah-Rolle und das Problem der hebraeischen Bibelhand-
schriften, Biblica XXXV, 1954, 429 f Chapter iv, Die Jesaiah-
Rolle im Lichte von Peschitta und Targum, Biblica XXXV, 1954,
51 f; Chapter , Studies in the Language of the Dead Sea
Scrolls, JJS: IV, 1953, 43 f; Chapter vi, Philologische
Miszellen zu den Qumrantexten, Rev Qum II, 1959, 43 f; Chap-
ter vii, Linguistic Structure and Tradition in the Qumran
Documents, Scripta Hierosolymitana IV, 1958, 101 f; Chapter
viii, Die Qumran-Rollen und die Hebraeische Sprachwissenschaft,
Rev Qum I, 1958, 103 f; Chapter ix, Afterthought and the Syn-
tax of Relative Clauses, JBL, LXVIII, 1949, 35 f; Chapter x,
The History of the Bible Text and Comparative Semitics, VT
VII, 1957, 195 f; Chapter xi, Prolegomena to a critical edi-
tion of the Peshitta, Scripta Hierosolymitana VIII, 1960, 26 f)

Goshen-Gottstein, M.H. Biblical Manuscripts in the United States.
Textus, II, 1962, pp.28-59.

Goshen-Gottstein, M.H. Theory and Practice of Textual Criticism:
The Text-critical Use of the Septuagint. Textus, III, 1963,
pp.130-158.

- Goshen-Gottstein, M.H. The Rise of the Tiberian Bible Text.
Philip W. Lown Institute of Advanced Judaic Studies,
Brandeis University: Studies and Texts: Volume I: Biblical
and Other Studies edited by Alexander Altmann, pp. 79-122.
Harvard University Press, 1963.
- Goshen-Gottstein: see the Hebrew University Bible Project.
- Gray, George Buchanan. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the
Book of Isaiah [as far as chapter XXVII]. The International
Critical Commentary. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1912, 1949.
- Greenberg, Moshe. The Stabilization of the Text of the Hebrew
Bible, Reviewed in the Light of the Biblical Materials from
the Judean Desert. JACS LXXVI, 1956, pp.157-167.
- Howard, George. Lucianic Readings in a Greek Twelve Prophets
Scroll from the Judaeian Desert. JQR LXII, new series, 1971,
pp.51-60.
- The Hebrew University Bible Project, The Book of Isaiah, Sample
Edition with introduction by M.H. Goshen-Gottstein. The
Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1965.
- Jellicoe, Sidney. The Septuagint and Modern Study. Oxford, at
the Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Johnson, Bo. Die Hexaplarische Rezension des 1. Samuelbuches
der Septuaginta. Studia Theologica Lundensia 22. C.W.K.
Gleerup, Lund, 1963.

- Kahle, Paul. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Pentateuchtextes [originally appeared in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, LXXXIII, 1915, pp.399-437]. In Opera Minora, pp.3-37. E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1956.
- Kahle, Paul E. The Cairo Geniza. Second edition, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1959.
- Kahle, Paul. Der Hebraische Bibeltext seit Franz Delitzsch. W. Kohlhammer Verlag, Stuttgart, 1961.
- Katz, P. Septuagintal Studies in the Mid-century: Their Links with the Past and their Present Tendencies. In The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology, ed. W.D. Davies and D. Daube, pp.176-208. Cambridge University Press, 1956.
- Kedar-Kopfstein, Benjamin. Divergent Hebrew Readings in Jerome's Isaiah. *Textus IV*, 1964, pp.176-210.
- Kedar-Kopfstein, Benjamin. The Vulgate as a Translation: Some Semantic and Syntactical Aspects of Jerome's Version of the Hebrew Bible. [Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the Hebrew University, March, 1968.]
- Kedar-Kopfstein, Benjamin. Textual Gleanings from the Vulgate to Jeremiah. *Textus VII*, 1969, pp.36-58.
- Keller, Bernard. Fragment d'un traité d'exégèse massorétique. *Textus V*, 1966, pp.60-83.

[Liebermann] ליברמן, שאול, ירונית וירונות בארץ ישראל.
מוסד ביאליק, ירושלים, תשכ"ג [יצא באנגלית בשנת 1950]

[Liebermann] ליברמן, שאול, ספרי זוטא. הוצאת בית המדרש
לרבנים שבאמריקה, ניו יורק, תשכ"ח

Loewinger: see Aptowitzer.

Mam, Jacob. The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue.
Vol.I, [Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion,
Cincinnati], 1940; reprinted with a prolegomenon by Ben Zion
Wacholder by Ktav Publishing House, New York, 1971. Vol.II,
[partially completed by] I. Sonne, Hebrew Union College-
Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, 1966. [In the
Hebrew section at the back the following texts are printed:
Vol.I, pp.8-148 and Vol.II, pp.167-239, Genizah fragments of
Tanhuma midrashim and various related texts; Vol. I, pp.149-
269 and Vol.II, p.7-129; Midrash Hadash 'al Hattorah; Vol.I
pp.270-346 and Vol.II, pp.130-166, excerpts from the Yelamme-
denu in the Yalqut Talmud Torah].

Moore, George F. The Antiochian Recension of the Septuagint.
AJSL XXIX, 1912-1913, pp.37-62.

Metzger, Bruce M. The Lucianic Recension of the Greek Bible. In
Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism,
pp.1-41. E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1963.

Odo: See Fischer.

Orlinsky, Harry M. On the Present State of Proto-Septuagint
Studies. JACS LXI, 1941, pp.81-91.

Orlinsky, Harry M. The Origin of the Kethib-Qere System: A New Approach. SVT VII, 1960, pp.184-192.

Orlinsky: see Ginsburg.

Pfeiffer, Robert H. Introduction to the Old Testament. Adam and Charles Black, London, 1952, 1963.

Powis Smith, J.M. Studies of the Masoretes [a review of Kahle's Masoreten des Westens]. AJSL XLIV, 1927-1929, pp.208-209.

Prijs, Leo. Judische Tradition in der Septuaginta. E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1948.

Rabin, C[haim]. The Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of the O.T. Text. JTS, VI new series, 1955, pp.174-182.

Rabin, Chaim. The Ancient Versions and the Indefinite Subject. Textus II, 1962, 60-76.

[Rabbinovicz] רבינוביץ, ר. נ. נ., ספר רקרוקי סופרים:
ברכות. מינכען, תרכ"ח

[Rabbinovicz] רבינוביץ, ר. נ. נ., מאמר על הרפסת התלמוד.
מינכען, תרל"ז]. כוסד הרב קוק, ירושלים, תשי"ב

Rahlf, Alfred. Septuaginta-Studien I-III, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965 [Includes on pp.361-658 Lucians Rezension der Konigsbucher, Gottingen. 1911. Also with separate page-numbering].

- Reider, Joseph. Prolegomena to a Greek-Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek Index to Aquila. JQR new series IV, 1913-1914, pp.321-356 and 577-620; VII, 1916-1917, pp.287-366.
- Roberts, Eledyn J. The Divergencies in the Pre-Tiberian Massoretic Text. JJS I, 1949, pp.147-155.
- Roberts, Eledyn J. The Old Testament Text and Versions: The Hebrew Text in Transmission and the History of the Ancient Versions. University of Wales Press, 1951.
- Roberts, Eledyn J. The Second Isaiah Scroll from Qumrân (1QIsb). BJRL XLII, 1959-1960, pp.132-144.
- Seeligmann, I.L. The Septuagint Versions of Isaiah: A Discussion of its Problems. E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1948.
- Segal, M.H. The Promulgation of the Authoritative Text of the Hebrew Bible. JBL LXXII, 1953, pp.35-47.
- [Segal] סול, מ. ז., מברא המקרא. הוצאת קרית ספר, ירושלים, 1967, [1956-1954]
- Silverstone, A.E. Aquila and Onkelos. Manchester University Press, 1931.
- Soisalon-Soininen, Elmeri. Der Charakter der Asterisierten Zusätze in der Septuaginta. Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, series B, Vol. 114. Helsinki, 1959.
- Sonne: see Marn

- Sperber, Alexander. A Historical Grammar of Biblical Hebrew: A Presentation of Problems with Suggestions to their Solution.
E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1966.
- Strack, Hermann L. Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash.
Meridian Books, New York, and the Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, 1931, 1959.
- Talmon, Shmaryahu. The Three Scrolls of the Law that were Found in the Temple Court. Textus II, 1962, pp.14-27.
- de Waard, J. A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament. E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1966.
- Wacholder, Ben Zion. The Date of the Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael.
HUCA XXXIX, 1968, pp.117-144.
- Wacholder: see Mann.
- Ziegler, Joseph. Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias.
Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen XII: 3, Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, Munster, 1934.
- Ziegler, Joseph. Textkritische Notizen zu den jungeren griechischen Übersetzungen des Buches Isaias. Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, new series, vol.I, part 4. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1939.
- Zinger, Zvi. The Bible Quotations in the Pesikta de Rav Kahana.
Textus V, 1966, pp.114-124.

צונץ, יום-טוב ליפמאן, הררשרת בישראל. תרומ [Zunz-Albeck]
ס. א. ז'ק. נערך והושלם על ידי חנוך אלבעק. הוצאת
מוסד ביאליק, ירושלים, תשי"ז

Addendum

Gaster, M., Texts and Studies, London 1925-1928, [In vol. III, pp.53 ff., he prints a fragment of the Yalqut Mechiri in Isaiah and Obadiah]

Mann, Jacob, Some Midrashic Genizah Fragments. HUCA XIV, 1939
Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, 1966

Prijs, Leo, Die Jeremia-Homilie Pesikta Rabbati Kapitel 26.
Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, 1966

UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY LIBRARY



000000601984275