

## A MASORETIC LIST OF BABYLONIAN ORIGIN OF DOTTED WORDS IN THE PENTATEUCH

Yosef Ofer  
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

### 1. Lists of Dotted Words

Many halakhic and masoretic literary sources list fifteen dotted words in the Bible, ten in the Pentateuch, four in the Prophets and a single word in the Hagiographa. These words appear in a Scroll of the Law with dots over some or all their letters. Midrashic literature drew various halakhic or aggadic conclusions from these dots. Scholars generally hold that the dots were added in order to note doubts or disagreements in the Biblical text. This opinion is already implied in Rabbinic sources.<sup>1</sup>

The subject of this paper is an ancient masoretic list in which some forty Pentateuchal verses appear, containing dotted words or let-

---

1. The list appears in *Sifre Bemidbar* 69 (ed. Horovitz, p. 64 ff.); *Avot deRabbi Nathan*, version a, ch. 34; version b, ch. 37 (ed. Schechter, pp. 97-101); *Tractate Soferim* 6, 3 (ed. Higger, pp. 166-169); S. Frensdorff, *Ochlah W'ochlah*, Hannover 1864, p. 96, list 99; and other sources. See: S. Lieberman, *Greek and Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* [Heb.], Jerusalem 1962, p. 182-184 (and note 42 there); C.D. Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible*<sup>2</sup>, New York 1966 (henceforth Ginsburg, *Introduction*), p. 318-333; I. Yeivin, *Introduction to the Tiberian Masorah*<sup>3</sup> [Heb.], Jerusalem 1983, p. 37-38.

ters. The ten dotted words in the common list do not appear in this list, which appears - with minor differences - in two sources. The one is a Tiberian manuscript of the Pentateuch (ms. Leningrad, Firkovitch B10, henceforth: L3), the list appearing in the masoretic inscriptions at the end of the manuscript.<sup>2</sup> The second source is a two-page Geniza fragment containing various masoretic notations<sup>3</sup> (henceforth: 100מס). Before discussing the list, we must note that it was published some thirty years ago by F. Diaz-Esteban,<sup>4</sup> but he overlooked several basic points we shall discuss here.

Here is the full text of the list in both sources:

Ms. 100מס (page 1, recto)	Ms. L3 <sup>5</sup>
אליין מלייה בקרייה דכתיבן לבר מן דפה	אלין מלייא באורייתא דכתיבן לבד מן דפה ׳
ומנקדן מירום מלתה או מירום אתה ואינן זיטימא ומחלוקת ופליגין עליהון	ומנקדין מירום מלתא או מירום אתא ואינן זיטימא ומחלוקת ופליגין עליהון
בראשית	בראשית
Gen 1,16 את המאור הגדול	.1 את המאור הגדל
Gen 2,13 ושם הנר השני	.2 ושם הנר השני גיהון
Gen 2,13 הוא הסובב תינינה	.3 הוא הסובב תיני׳

2. This list was published by C.D. Ginsburg, *The Massorah compiled from Manuscripts*, III, London 1885 [henceforth: Ginsburg, *The Massorah*], p. 278.

3. Ms. Heb. d 62,7 of the Bodleian Library of Oxford. The fragment is numbered 100מס by: I. Yeivin, *The Hebrew Language Tradition as reflected in the Babylonian Vocalization* [Heb.], Jerusalem 1985, p. 206. Other manuscripts mentioned in this article and marked מס are described by Yeivin there.

4. F. Díaz Esteban, "El Fragmento Babilónico Ms. Heb. d. 62 fol. 7 de la Bodleiana de Oxford", *Boletín de la Asociación Española de Orientalistas* 2 (1966), pp. 89-107; 3 (1967), p. 244.

5. Bold letters indicate the changes between the two sources. Underlined letters are dotted in the manuscript.

Gen 4,3	ויהי מקץ ימים	.4 ויהי מקץ ימים ויבא
Gen 4,22	את תובל קין	.5 את תובל קין לטש כל
Gen 4,22	ואחות תובל קין	.6 ואחות תובל קין נעמה
Gen 8,17	הוצא אתך	.7 הוצא אתך ושרצו
Gen 24,60	אחתנו את היי	.8 אחתינו את היי לאלפי
Gen 26,32	ויגדו לו על אדות	.9 ויגדו לו על אדות הבאר
Gen 27,3	וצודה לי צידה	.10 וצודה לי צידה
Gen 37,36	לפוטפר סריס	.11 לפוטפר סריס פרעה
Gen 39,1	ויקנהו פוטפר	.12 ויקנהו פוטפר סריס
Gen 39,20	אשר אסורי המ׳	.13 אשר אסורי המלך
Gen 41,45?, 50?;	בת פוטי פרע	.14 בת פוטיפרע כהן
Gen 46,20		
Gen 46,13	תולע ופוח ויוב	.15 תולע ופוח ויוב ושמרון
	ואלה שמות	ואלה שמות
Ex 6,25	לקח לו מבנות פוטיאל	.16 מבנות פוטיאל לו לאשה
Ex 16,2	וילינו כל עדת בני	.17 וילונו כל עדת בני ישראל
Ex 16,6	כי תלונו עלינו	.18 כי תלונו עלינו סוף פסוק
Ex 17,4	עוד מעט וסקלני	.19 עוד מעט וסקלני
Ex 17,6	על כסיה מלחמה	.20 ויאמר כי יד על כסיה
Ex 23,26	לא תהיה משכלה	.21 לא תהיה משכלה ועקרה
Ex 40,22	ויתן את השלחן	.22 —
	ויקרא	ויקרא
Lev 5,14	וידבר דנפש כי תחטא	.23 וידבר דנפש כי תחטא [!]
Lev 14,21	ואם דל הוא ואין ידו משגת	.24 ואם דל הוא ואין ידו משגת
Lev 21,5	לא יקרחה קרחה	.25 לא יקרחה <קר׳> בראשם ופאת
Lev 26,18	ואם עד אלה	.26 ואם עד אלה לא תשמעו
	וידבר	וידבר
Num 1,6	אלה קריאי העדה	.27 אלה קרואי העדה נשיאי
Num 13,32	ויציאו דבת הארץ	.28 ויציאו דבת הארץ
Num 16,11	כי תלונו עלינו	.29 כי תלונו עליו [!]
Num 22,5	הנה כסה	.30 הנה כסה את ע׳
Num 24,23	משמן אל	.31 מי יחיה משמו אל
Num 27,11	לשארן הקרב אליו	.32 לשארן הקרב אליו
Num 29,26	וביום החמישי	.33 וביום החמישי פרים
Num 32,7	ולמה תנאון	.34 ולמה תנאון את לב
	אלה הדברים	אלה הדברים

Deut 2,8	ונפן ונעבר	Dt 3,1 [!]	ונפן ונעבר דרך הבשן	.35
Deut 4,37	ויוצאך בפניו		ויוצאך בפניו בכחו	.36
Deut 4,43	ואת ראמת בגלעד		ואת ראמת בגלעד	.37
Deut 5,9	ולשמרי מצותו		ולשמרי מצותו	.38
Deut 22,20	ואם אמת היה		ואם אמת היה הדבר	.39
Deut 31,7	כי אתה תבוא		כי אתה תבא את העם	.40
Deut 31,9	ויכתב משה		ויכתב משה את הדברים	.41
	אלו הדברים ביני מערביא וביני מדנחיא בתורה			

## 2. The Title of the List and its Conclusion

Let us first examine the title of the list (as it appears in 100M):

אליין מלייה בקרייה דכתיבן לבר מן דפה  
ומנקדן מירום מלתה או מירום אתה  
ואינן זיטימה ומחלוקת ופליגין עליהון

The first line talks about writing outside the page. What does this mean? From the wording of the second source we learn that a sign resembling a final *nun* is inscribed in the margins of the page. Such a sign appears in Tiberian and Babylonian manuscripts to denote cases of *qere* and *kethiv* - and so it would seem that here, too, it denotes some sort of problem in the Biblical text. Yeivin (Yeivin, *Introduction*, p. 44) proposes to view the symbol as an abbreviation of the word זיטימה, (derived from a Greek word meaning "baseness" or "error"), which appears in the third and last line of the title.

The title goes on to mention the dots that the masorah would have marked above the doubtful words or letters, while from the last line we learn that this symbol indicates "disagreement". To explain the meaning of the dots, the masorah adduces three expressions in three different languages: זיטימה in Greek, מחלוקת in Hebrew, and פליגין עליהון in Aramaic.

The last line of the list seems to be its conclusion: אלו הדברים ביני מערביא וביני מדנחיא בתורה. Various scholars have deduced from this

sentence that the list of dotted words is one of disagreements between Palestinian and Babylonian Jews. Yet, there seems to us to be a difficulty in this explanation - for a number of reasons: first of all, the list has been defined at length in its title - and what reason can there be for additional explanation at the end? Secondly, there would seem to be some opposition, or even a contradiction, between the opening and the conclusion. The opening speaks generally of dots and disagreement, whereas the conclusion talks of easterners and westerners. Thirdly, the wording of the conclusion appears in only one of the two sources of the lists (in 100M), but is missing in the other source (L3). In 100M there appears a certain graphic sign, something like two circles joined by an arc, between the list and its conclusion. This symbol would seem to be one denoting separation, showing that the masorah is at this point going on to something new. This is its meaning when it appears a few times on the second page of the fragment. This second page of the Geniza fragment was discovered by Yeivin, who joined it to the first page published earlier by Díaz-Esteban.

All these considerations lead to the conclusion that there is no connection between the last line on the page and the list we are considering here. We shall yet try to demonstrate the validity of this conclusion by a consideration of the material itself.

## 3. Disagreements marked by the dots

What are the disagreements marked by the dots? Out of a comparison with other masoretic sources - especially those of the Babylonian masorah - it is possible to assume with full certainty just what the disagreement implied is. In the appendix I have listed the various kinds of disagreement, and I have adduced evidence in support of my assumption wherever such evidence was available to me.

All the dots denote disagreements in the Biblical text, not in the way the text is to be read. This is why the linguistic differences between the Tiberian and Babylonian language traditions are not reflected in them, for almost all of these differences are connected with the way the words are to be read, rather than the way they are to be written.

Some of the dots denote disagreements in the way the text is to be divided up, a field almost completely overlooked by the Tiberian masorah. Many of these disagreements are to be found in the list of disagreements of the scholars of Nehardea - in Geniza manuscript 5105.

Other topics of disagreement include writing as one word or as two, a case of *qere* and *kethiv*, the use of *waw conjunctiva* and *plene* or *defectiva* spellings. The number of cases in every topic is given in the following table:

Sort of disagreement	number of cases	evidence of disagreement
A. open and closed portions	10	7
B. writing as one word or as two	8	5
C. <i>qere</i> and <i>kethiv</i>	11	7
D. plene or defectiva spellings	7	1
E. <i>waw conjunctiva</i>	2	-
F. doubtful cases and others	3	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>20</b>

#### 4. The Babylonian origin of the list

The summarizing table shows that twenty of the forty disagreements are clearly supported in Babylonian masorah sources. Almost everywhere it can be seen that the disagreement is an internal one, within the Babylonian masorah, and not a disagreement between Babylon and Tiberias. In fact, our claim is a two-fold one: the disagreements indicated by the dots are internal Babylonian disagreements, and furthermore, the very tradition of denoting doubt by means of dots in various places is of Babylonian origin. Let us sum up the evidence as follows:

Firstly, we have seen that in half the cases there is clear evidence of an internal Babylonian disagreement.<sup>6</sup>

6. In some cases, we also find evidence of a disagreement between Palestine and Babylon, but it must be remarked that every internal Babylonian disagreement can also be seen as a disagreement between Palestine and Babylon. Let us assume that there existed a disagreement between two Babylonian schools of thought, such as between Sura and Nehardea, while in Palestine only one of these opinions had

Secondly, we have already seen that one topic of disagreement is the way certain open or closed Pentateuch paragraphs are to be written. The very consideration of these open or closed paragraphs is an integral part of the Babylonian masorah, and the only paragraph lists known to us are of Babylonian origin. On the other hand, the Tiberian masorah does not deal at all with open and closed paragraphs, and the tradition of writing these paragraphs in manuscripts was not uniform. It is thus difficult to assume that this masorah includes a way of marking places of disagreement on this topic.

The third piece of evidence relates to the tradition of using dots to mark these places. In Tiberian manuscripts and in other places in the Tiberian masorah there is no sign of dotted words other than the fifteen known examples. In contrast, the Babylonian masorah indicates a number of dotted words, including two within our list (פּוֹטִיפְרַעַע and תְּנוּאוֹן).<sup>7</sup>

If this is so, then an important question arises: the list we are discussing appears in two manuscripts, one Tiberian (L3) and the other semi-Tiberian (1055).<sup>8</sup> If the origin of the list is Babylonian, how did it come to appear in Tiberian manuscripts? In my opinion, there is

any support: the Palestinian masoretes can say that there is a difference of opinion between the Palestinian version and that of a certain school in Babylon, but - in our opinion - these disagreements originate in Babylon, which is where the custom developed to dot doubtful words.

7. Both words are mentioned in the Babylonian masorah to Gen 16,5 (Ms. יוד דפּוֹטִיפְרַעַע דוּיוֹלֵד נִקּוּד עָלָיו וּפְלִגִּי... תְּנִיאוֹן דַּכְת' תְּנוּאוֹן נִקּוּד עַל וָא קְדַמ': (מספ 97). The dotted word פּוֹטִיפְרַעַע (Gen 46,20) is also mentioned in the masorah parva of Ms. ל"י there (See: M. Breuer, *The Masorah Magna to the Pentateuch by Shemuel ben Ya'aqov* [Ms. ל"י], New York 1992, p. 5). The dotted word תְּנוּאוֹן (Num 32,7) is also mentioned in the Babylonian masorah there (Ms. 1155; Ginsburg, *The Massorah*, III, p. 238).

8. The manuscript has Babylonian vocalization symbols and Tiberian symbols as well. See: Yeivin (above, note 3).

nothing unusual about such a phenomenon. In my doctoral dissertation<sup>9</sup> I have pointed out the existence of a broad process whereby the Babylonian masorah influenced its Tiberian counterpart. It is difficult to find an ancient Tiberian manuscript free of such influence: even the most clearly Tiberian manuscript - the Aleppo Codex - shows signs of Babylonian influence in a number of places. The Tiberian masorah tended naturally to absorb external material, for it had no fixed order, each masorete creating his own masoretic collection which he would then record in the margins of his page.

### 5. An acrostichonic signature in Geniza fragment 10מסמ

Let us now consider an interesting feature further along in Geniza fragment 10מסמ: on the obverse side of the page, there appear many masoretic lists written in smaller letters, most of which are of the accumulative masorah type. In one of these lists there appears a clearly acrostichonic signature: שעיר בן כדרוי חזק

Lam 1,1	-	ל'	שרתי
Lam 3,59	-	ל'	עויתי
Jer 50,24	-	ל'	יקשתי
Deut 9,24	-	ל'	דעתי
Esth 5,8	-	ל'	בקשתי
Ps 139,15	-	ל'	רקמתי
Gen 50,5	-	ל'	כריתי
Ps 142,7 <sup>10</sup>	-	ל' בטע'	דלותי
2 Kgs 2,21	-	[ל']	רפיתי

9. Y. Ofer, *The Babylonian Masorah of the Pentateuch, its Principles and Methods*, Thesis submitted for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy to the Senate of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1995. See especially chapter 14 there.

10. It is possible that the masorah refers to Ps 116, 6, which is the single time in the Bible that the word דלותי is stressed on its last syllable.

Ex 23,27	-	ל'	והמתי
Gen 31,51	-	ל'	יריתי
Cant 2,3	-	ל'	חמדתי
Job 32,6	-	ל'	זחלתי
Gen 9,13	-	ל'	קשתי

The list adduces *hapax legomena* ending in -תי. It can be seen that when the masorete reached the letter *daleth* for the second time, he found no suitable *hapax legomenon*, and so he adduced a word appearing only once in its stress pattern (a penultimate or ultimate stressed syllable).

To denote the letter *samekh* in the name סעיר a biblical word beginning in a *sin* is adduced (שרתי). Such a custom can be found in poetic acrostichons (like שמחים בצאתם in the poem אל אדון recited in the morning prayer on Shabbat [Saturday]), as well as in scores of alphabetic lists in the Ochlah W'Ochlah collection.<sup>11</sup>

The name סעיר בן כדרוי is unknown in any other source. The name סעיר became very common after the Arab conquest, but the name כדרוי is unique and is not known from any other source. In the Babylonian Talmud (Yoma 60b) the name כידור is mentioned and is interpreted negatively. The root meaning in Arabic is also linked with ugliness and sadness. The suffix of the name כדרוי is unusual, and seems to denote to some degree the time and place of the owner of the name. The suffix -oy is of Persian origin, and names ending in this suffix were common in the eighth and ninth centuries, especially in Babylon. Amongst the geonim we find in Sura such names as Biboi (served in 776) and Qimoi (824), while in Pumpedita there appear such names as Natroi (752), Shinoi (781), Paltoi (842) and Qimoi (897). Parqoi ben Baboi is the disciple of Rav Yehudai Gaon. The scribe of the yeshiva of Rav Zemah bar Paltoi was named Mishoi. Additional names of this type are Isqoi (= יצחק), Bradoi and Bakhtoi.<sup>12</sup>

11. E.g. Ochlah W'ochlah (above, note 1), lists 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13.

12. See: N. Allony, "An Autograph of Sa'id ben Farjoi of the ninth Century", *Textus* 6 (1968), pp. 109; S. Havlin, "Torat Ha-Ge'onim u-Tqufatam" in: *Toratam Shel Ge'onim*, Jerusalem 1993 [Heb.], pp. 31-42.

It is interesting to note that the name which arises from our acrostichon is very similar to a name mentioned in a biblical manuscript of the Pentateuch (ל, Chufut Kale 36, Leningrad Firkovitch B17). This Ms. was written by Shelomo Halevi bar Boya'a, who wrote also the Aleppo Codex. He signed his name: שלמה הלוי בר בויאעא תלמיד סעיד בן פרגוי (Shelomo HaLevi the son of Boya'a, a pupil of Said ben Pargoi known as Balquq [or Alquq]).<sup>13</sup> This name apparently appears in a fragmented colophon published by Aloni.<sup>14</sup>

Was this acrostichon written by the scribe of ms. 1005? Or perhaps he copied it from another masorah page? We shall try to answer this question on the basis of the nature of the other masorah lists appearing in the manuscript.

The second page of 1005 - identified by Yeivin - is very significant. The masoretic material in this page (on both sides) is far more plentiful than that which was inscribed at the end of the first page, thus enabling us better to appreciate its substance. There appear masoretic notes, most of which are comments of an accumulative masorah made up of *hapax legomena*. The words in each list have the same initial or final letters.

As far as these masoretic comments are concerned, they would seem to be organized in the same order as the Biblical text. The first word in each list (and rarely another word in the list) match this order. On the two pages there appear 31 masoretic lists, and only two of these are unlike the Biblical order.

In light of this data, I should like to make a proposal, concerning the way this collection of masoretic comments came about in this manuscript: some masorete collected up notes from the masorah magna of

13. See: S. Baer und H.L. Strack. *Die Dikduke Ha-Tanin des Ahron ben Moscheh ben Ascher*, Leipzig 1879. pp. xxxvi-xxxvii; P. Kahle, *Masoreten des Westens*, Stuttgart 1927, pp. 58-59; I. Yeivin, *The Aleppo codex of the Bible*, Jerusalem 1968 [henceforth: Yeivin, *The Aleppo Codex*], pp. 366-367

14. N. Allony (above, note 12), pp. 106-117.

some Tiberian masorah manuscript. The masorete generally selected notes of an accumulative masorah, and it may well be that he was looking specifically for a masorah written in a special ornamental fashion, as was customary with accumulative masorah. In this way we can also explain the distribution of the notes - one or two notes per chapter, with entire chapters overlooked.

The acrostichonic list appears within these masoretic lists without any special mark, and it would seem that the person who collected up the masoretic lists is not the one who composed the acrostichonic signature. This would seem to have the creation of the masorete who processed the biblical page from which a scribe copied over the manuscript. The latter copied over the note without noticing its special character.

This is the second time an acrostichonic signature has come up in lists of accumulative masorah, and it joins the signature of the masorete appearing three times in the British Museum manuscript Or. 4445: נִסִּי בֶן דָּנִיֵּאל הַכֹּהֵן יִשְׁמְרֵהוּ אֵל (Nisi son of Daniel the kohen, may God guard him). Lyons and Dotan identified this signature separately.<sup>15</sup> However, whereas in that case there is no doubt that the masorete of the manuscript is the same one who formulated the note and introduced his name into it, in our case it would seem that the manuscript copyist had no idea at all that there was an acrostichonic signature in the material he was copying over.

15. D. Lyons. "An Acrostichonic Signature in the Masorah Lists", *Qiryat Sefer* 61 (1987), pp. 141-145 [Heb.]; A. Dotan, "Reflections Towards a Critical Edition of Pentateuch Codex Or. 4445", *Estudios Masoréticos* (X Congreso de la IOMS), Madrid 1993, pp. 39-51.

## Appendix: Sorting of the Dotted Words according to kinds of disagreements

## A. open and closed portions

2. וְשֵׁם הַנְּהַר הַשְּׁנַי - Gen 2,13  
51ס: The verse is included in a list of closed portions on which the scribes of Neharde'a have another opinion ("פליגין עליהון סיפרי נהרדעאי")
4. וַיְהִי מִקֵּץ יָמִים - Gen 4,3  
51ס: The verse is included in a list of closed portions on which the scribes of Neharde'a have another opinion.
21. לֹא תִהְיֶה מִשְׁכְּלָה - Ex 23,26  
51ס: The verse is included in a list of closed portions on which the scribes of Neharde'a have another opinion; 1ס: ר"פ (no portion); The accepted text [Henceforth: T]: closed portion: Ms. Leningrad B19a [Henceforth: L]: no portion.
22. וַיִּתֵּן אֶת הַשְּׁלַחַן - Ex 40,22
23. יִי דִנְפֵשׁ כִּי תִמְעַל - Lev 5,14
24. וְאִם דָּל הוּא וְאִין - Lev 14,21  
51ס: The verse is included in a list of closed portions on which the scribes of Neharde'a have another opinion.  
A list of portions from the Geniza (Westminster College, Misc. 4,65-66):  
<[= a closed portion, and there is a difference of opinion about that. (In arabic:) no portion in 'the book', and a closed portion in 'the manuscript'].
26. וְאִם עַד אֵלֶּה - Lev 26,18  
T: no portion; 51ס: The verse is not included in the list of closed portions;  
Two lists of portions from the Geniza (Cambridge T-S D1,87, Westminster College, Misc. 4, 65-66) and L: closed portion
35. וַנִּפְּן וְנַעֲבֵר - Deut 2,8  
11ס Deut 2,8: וְאִם ר"פ הוּא
39. וְאִם אִמַּת הִיא - Deut 22,20
41. וַיִּכְתֹּב מֹשֶׁה - Deut 31,9  
51ס: The verse is included in a list of closed portions on which the scribes of Neharde'a have another opinion (The order of the verses there proves that the verse under discussion is verse 9 and not verse 22).

## B. writing as one word or as two words

5. אֶת תּוֹבֵל קִין - Gen 4,22
6. וְאַחֲוֹת תּוֹבֵל קִין - Gen 4,22  
masorah magna of *Miqra'ot Gedolot* (Venice 1524), Gen 46,20:  
"תּוֹבֵל קִין לְמַדִּינָחָאֵי מִילְתָּא חָדָא כְּתַב וְקָרִיין לְמַעֲרַבָאֵי תְרִין מַלִּין כְּתִיב וְקָרִיין";  
See also Ms Vienna 13 and Ginsburg Bible, to Gen 46,20; C.D. Ginsburg, *Introduction*, p. 200.
11. לְפוֹטִיפֶר סָרִיס - Gen 37,36
12. וַיִּקְנְהוּ פוֹטִיפֶר - Gen 39,1
14. בַּת פּוֹטִי פֶרַע - Gen 41,45?, 50?; 46,20?  
Ms Gen 16, 5: יוֹד דְּפוֹטִיפֶרַע דְּוִיולֵד נְקוּד עֲלִיו וּפְלִגִי (= Gen 46,20).  
Ms Gen 46,20, masorah parva (Breuer, p. 5): יוֹד דְּפוֹטִיפֶרַע נְקוּד וּפְלִגִי'.  
*Liqqute Qadmoniyot* (ed. Pinsker, Wien 1860, p. 45), on Gen 41, 45): זה מחלפין בו בת פוטיפרע חדא מלתא כתבין וכן מתגקד. וי"א בת פוטי פרע כתבין. See I. Ben David, *Leshonenu* 56 [1991], p. 129; Yeivin, *The Aleppo Codex*, p. 83.  
The first two sources indicate Gen 46,20 as the dotted word, while according to the third source the disagreement is about Gen 41,45.
20. עַל כִּסִּיהַּ מִלְחָמָה - Ex 17, 16  
Ms Ex 17,16: [כסיה] = כסיה  
Ms Ex 17, 16: 'ל' וחד מלה למע':  
Ms (p. 3r): 'כסיה... בסיפרי דסוראי בהד כתי ובסיפרי נהרדעי בתרי כתי'.  
See: Yeivin, *Aleppo codex*, p. 82.
31. מִשְׁמֹן אֵל - Num 24,73  
משמואל - סוראי כתי' בהד נהרדעי כתי' משמו לחוד וקודשא: Ms (p. 3r):  
לחוד.  
?16. לֶקַח לוֹ מִבְּנוֹת פּוֹטִיָּאֵל - Ex 6, 25

## C. Qere and Kethiv

7. הִיצָא הוֹצֵא אֶתְךָ - Gen 8,17  
Ms 11ס: הִיצָא הוֹצֵא כֶּת' וּפְלִגִי'
10. וְצוּדָה לִי צִידָה - Gen 27,3  
Ginsburg, *The Masorah*, list 34; Ochlah W'Ochlah (ed. Frensdorff, 1864), list 112: פְּלוּגְתָּא דְרַב נַחְמָן
13. אֲשֶׁר אֶסְוִרֵי הֵם - Gen 39,20

17. Ex 16,2 - וילינו כל עדת בני  
 Ms Ex 16,2: 'פולג' כת' (a fragmentary remark appears also in ms 208 there).
18. Ex 16,7 - כי תלונו עלינו  
 Ms Ex 16,7: 'פולג' ונחנו מה פולג' [תלינו ב' דק] ונחנו מה פולג'.
19. Ex 17,4 - עוד מעט וסקלני  
 Ms Ex 17,4: 'פולג' וסקלני דק וסקלני כת' 16: מס Ms  
 Meir Abul'afya (רמ"ה), *Masoret Seyag la-Tora*, Firenze 1750, root סקל (p. 47b): 'עוד מעט וסקלני' - חסר וי"ו כתיב יו"ד בתר נו"ן וכן קרי. ולסוראי וסקלנו: כתיב וי"ו בסוף תיבואת וקרי יו"ד. וליתה דכלהי נוסחי דיקי יו"ד כתיב וי"ד קרי. ובמחזורא רבא<sup>17</sup> חד מן אלפא ביתא דכתב' ו: ח: 619 Ginsburg, *The Massorah*, list 619: וקור' יוד. וסקלני ל' מנהון והוא פלוגתא בין סורא לנהרדעי.
25. Lev 21,5 - לא יקרחה קרחה  
 Num 1,16 - אלה קריאי העדה  
 Ms Num 1,16: 'פולג' דק קריאי כת' ופולג' 11: מס Ms
29. Num 16,11 - כי תלונו עליו  
 Num 32,7 - ולמה תנואון  
 Ms Num 32,7: 'פולג' ונקוד על וא קדמ' 11: מס Ms  
 Ms Gen 16,5: 'פולג' ונקוד על וא קדמ' 5: מס Ms  
 See: Ginsburg, *The Masorah*, list 620; Ginsburg, *Introduction*, p. 206.
38. Deut 5, 9 - ולשמרי מצותי

#### D. Plene or Defectiva spellings

1. Gen 1,16 - את המאור הגדול  
 Ms Gen 1,16: 'פולג' דסיר' ... המאור הגדול פולג' דסיר'  
 The masorah magna of ש (Ms. Sasoon 507; now: Jerusalem Heb. 24° 5702) and the masorah magna of 1ש (Ms. Sasoon 1053) to Deut 34,12 say that there is a disagreement between the masorettes of Neharde'a (who write הגדול) and those of Sura (who write הגדל).
3. Gen 2,13 - הוא הסובב תינינה

16. The word 'כת' (instead of 'חס') may hint that according to some opinion there is a case of *Qere* and *Kethiv* here.

17. Read probably רבתיא רבתיא. The masorah refers to *Ochlah W'Ochlah* (ed. Frensdorff, list 136).

8. Gen 24,60 - אחתנו את היי  
 Gen 26,32 - ויגדו לו על אדות  
 Num 13,32 - ויצאו דבת הארץ  
 Deut 4,37 - ויוצאך בפניו  
 Deut 4,43 - ואת ראמת בגלעד \*37

#### E. *Waw conjunctiva*

30. Num 22,5 - הנה כסה  
 MS Ex 32,34: This verse is included in a list of four verses which are written in corrected books ("בסיפ' מוג"). In all three verses a man can read by mistake ונה instead of הנה.  
 Num 29,26<sup>18</sup> - וביום החמישי 33?

#### F. Doubtful cases and others

15. Gen 46,13<sup>19</sup> - תולע ופוח ויוב  
 Num 27,11 - לשארן הקרב אליו  
 Deut 31,7 - כי אתה תבוא

18. Compare Num 29,35 (ביום השמיני, without *waw*). It is also possible that the disagreement is about closed or open portion.

19. The disagreement is probably about *waw conjunctiva* in the word ויוב. See the parallel list in 1 Chron 7,1: "ולבני יששכר תולע ופואה ישיב ושמרון ארבעה".