The Dating of their Manuscripts by the Samaritans

RICHARD GOTTHEIL
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

The immediate occasion of this paper was the offer to sell in New York a fine manuscript of the Samaritan Hebrew text of the Pentateuch. The codex, two pages of which are here photographed, is indeed a superb piece of calligraphy, and its parchment generally excellent, though of varying quality and thickness. It contains 265 leaves. Added interest in this manuscript has been aroused by the report that it is the oldest dated Hebrew codex in existence, its date being quite circumstantially given as 116 A.H. (= 734 A.C.). It has been further asserted that the caliph Marwân is mentioned in the cryptogram. By means of photographic reproductions of certain pages, the manuscript has been offered for sale in various places, with a price attached to it quite in keeping with its supposed date. I understand that at one time this had reached the dizzy height of $100,000, but lately it has fallen to $85,000. A speculative trust is said to have been formed in Beirut to hold and eventually to sell the manuscript, which will probably remain a holding trust for some time to come.

Though the age assigned to the manuscript has been declared authentic by a number of scholars — among them Dr. B. Moritz, Keeper of the Khedivial Library in Cairo — the statements made concerning it could hardly contain more errors than they do. Even if the reading of the date were correct, the inference drawn would yet be erroneous: the St. Petersburg codex No. 4 is dated 99 A.H. (= 717 A.C.), and codex Watson II is dated 85 A.H. (= 655 A.C.). But,
in the first place, there is no mention of a caliph Marwân in the cryptogrammic colophon. I can only suppose that the word מַרְוָן (plural of מַרְוָן “law”) has been mistaken for a proper name and connected with that of the caliph. Moreover, the date 734 A.C. would conflict either with the burial day of Marwân I, which was some time in the year 685, or with the birthday of Marwân II, which was some time in the year 744. Furthermore, the date itself has been wrongly construed. I find that one of the photographs came into the hands of Mr. A. Cowley, the learned sub-librarian of the Bodleian; and that he very justly questioned the construction placed upon the ta’rikh. For this ta’rikh is cryptogrammic in its arrangement only, and not at all in its real sense. Upon its face the codex does indeed look old; and from what I have seen of similar synagogue codices in Cairo, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Rome, I should have assigned to it quite a respectable age. This the Samaritans themselves seem to have done; and either in Nablus, or in Gaza, or in Damascus, or in Egypt (wherever it may have tarried), it must have been the object of much veneration. At two places this veneration has spoilt the beauty of the text. Lev. 922 רֹשֵׁם בָּרוֹא אֲדֹנָי and Num. 624 (the בִּינהַת הַבּוֹרְכָם) are much blurred and blotched, as if from an excess of kissing. The manuscript must have been open at these pages, in order that the worshipper might come into physical contact with the promised blessings.

1 Harkavy, Catalog der hebräischen und samaritanischen Handschriften ... in St. Petersburg, II. p. 49) is the Syriac [מַרְוָן] the Talmudic [מַרְוָן] or [מַרְוָן]. The plural occurs in the following forms: מַרְוָן, מַרְוָן, מַרְוָן, מַרְוָן, מַרְוָן, מַרְוָן, מַרְוָן, מַרְוָן (Harkavy, ibid. p. 49; JQR, xiv. 31). In place of this Aramaic form, we sometimes find the Hebrew הַרְוָן or הַרְוָן simply.

2 See JQR, xvi. p. 483; Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement, 1904, p. 390.

3 This is a practice common to Karaites and Rabbanite Jews in the Orient. Nearly every synagogue has, in addition to its scrolls, one or more copies of the Bible or some of its parts in book form (called כִּתְבּ הַתּוֹרָה or קַו) which were, and still are, regarded with superstitious veneration. They are kissed and stroked; but only taken out on the festival of Simkat Torah.
Fig. 1. — A Page containing a Portion of Exodus xx
Whether the efficacy of this act depended upon the age of the parchment and of its writing, I do not know. The manuscript is now no longer in the hands of such as can be benefited by it, and we need have no hesitancy in revealing the fact that it is some 785 years younger than has been supposed.

It must not be forgotten that the Samaritans, having so few connections outside of their own small communities, were even more engulfed in the Arab invasion than were the Jews. The impress of the new culture was seen at a very early time both in their language and in their literature. Samaritan must very soon have become merely a religious and literary tongue—sooner even than Syriac did among the Aramaic-speaking Christians of Palestine and Syria. If it is true that a hundred years of Arab dominion robbed these of their ancient speech, what wonder that the process succeeded even more quickly with the Samaritans. It is, therefore, no argument against the authenticity of Cod. Watson II that the writer dates his work according to the Mohammedan fashion; though Damascus, in which place he lived, had fallen into Arab hands only twenty-three years previously. So far as I am aware, there are no Samaritan manuscripts in which the date is not according to the Mohammedan era. This era is variously expressed לְמַלְאָכָה יִשְׂמָכָא, לְמַלְאָכָה יִשְׂמָכָא; or simply לְמַלְאָכָה בְּנִי חֶרֶב, לְמַלְאָכָה בְּנִי חֶרֶב; and, in a few cases, לְמַלְאָכָה בְּנִי חֶרֶב, לְמַלְאָכָה בְּנִי חֶרֶב, and once, with an addi-

* See *JAOJ*, xx. p. 173.

* In other enumerations, e.g. the Masorah (see below), the larger numbers are placed first. In Hebrew and Arabic either method may be followed (Wright, *Arabic Grammar*, 3d ed., i. p. 259, D). In the lithographed copy of Exodus mentioned at the end of this article, the date according to the Exodus is given in the Hebrew manner לְמַלְאָכָה בְּנִי חֶרֶב. שְׁנֵה, כַּעַת. הָעַט. בַּהֲעַט. שְׁנֵה. כַּעַת. הָעַט. בַּהֲעַט. שְׁנֵה. כַּעַת. הָעַט. בַּהֲעַט. שְׁנֵה. כַּעַת. הָעַט. בַּהֲעַט. שְׁנֵה. כַּעַת. הָעַט. בַּהֲעַט. שְׁנֵה. כַּעַת. הָעַט. בַּהֲעַט. שְׁנֵה. כַּעַת. הָעַט. בַּהֲעַט. שְׁנֵה. כַּעַת. הָעַט. בַּהֲעַט. שְׁנֵה. כַּעַת. הָעַט. בַּהֲעַט. שְׁנֵה. כַּעַת. הָעַט. בַּהֲעַט. שְׁנֵה. כַּעַת. הָעַט. בַּהֲעַט. שְׁנֵה. כַּעַת. הָעַט. בַּהֲעַט. שְׁנֵה. כַּעַת. הָעַט. בַּהֲעַט. שְׁנֵה. כַּעַת. הָעַט. בַּהֲעַט. שְׁנֵה. כַּעַת. הָעַט. בַּהֲעַט. שְׁנֵה. כַּעַת. הָעַט. בַּהֲעַט. שְׁנֵה. כַּעַת. הָעַט. בַּהֲעַט. שְׁנֵה. כַּעַת. הָעַט. בַּהֲעַט. שְׁנֵה. כַּעַת. Harkavy, *l.c. p. 73*; De Sacy, *Memoire sur la version Arabe des lieux de Moises a l'usage des Samaritains*, p. 4.


What the word actually means we do not know. The root does not occur in Biblical and Talmudic Hebrew, in Aramaic or in Syriac. If it does not contain some mystic gematria, it may be connected with the Arabic لنس to bore, to throw on the ground, to calumniate, to insult; though it seems almost impossible that the Samaritans would use so openly an “insulting” term in reference to their over-lords. But the Mohammedan era is found even where additional and confirmatory dates are attached, e.g. לְמַשֵּׁב יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּכָנָן, or according to the supposed date of the Exodus or the Creation. The months given are also invariably the Mohammedan ones. Only in most isolated cases is the Jewish Hebrew method used, as in a Passover hymn שָנָה רְמָשְׁבָה אָרָחָא בֵּין חֵלִּית, where the whole date is incomprehensible, or in the jumbled Hebrew of the modern Samaritans in their letter to Professor Kautsch a few years ago: אֱלֹהֵי אָוָד וְעַמְּךָ נַעֲשֶׂה (1)

Usually the formula is as follows:

שָנָה אָוָד וְעַמְּךָ נַעֲשֶׂה (1)

This might also be written:

שָנָה אָוָד וְעַמְּךָ נַעֲשֶׂה (2)

or again:

שָנָה אָוָד וְעַמְּךָ נַעֲשֶׂה (3)

or, lastly, making use of the Hebrew כ for the hundreds:

שָנָה אָוָד וְעַמְּךָ נַעֲשֶׂה (4)

I do not understand this. In Jewish writings Esau = Rome = Christianity. It is quite evident that such cannot be its meaning here.

Harkavy, L.c. p. 18.

Ibid. p. 68; Hebraica, ix. p. 210. In a few ms. from Egypt, the Coptic, Persian, and Alexandrian dates are added (ZDMG, ii. p. 504).

Heidenheim, Vierteljahreschrift, iii. p. 362.

ZDPV, viiii. p. 150. The same remark applies to their method of dating according to Hebrew style in their letters to Job Ludolf שָנָה שָנָה וּכְלָה יִשְׂרָאֵל שָנָה (Epistolae Samaritanum Sichemitarum, Cizae, 1888, pp. 9, 16), or, according to Arabic fashion, in writing to Huntington: שָנָה אָוָד וְעַמְּךָ נַעֲשֶׂה (Schnurrer, Samaritanischer Briefwechsel, p. 34, etc.). I suspect that Heidenheim, Bibl. Sam. ii. 63, 18, contains a date which I do not understand.
According to scheme No. 4 I have found the following mss.:

Bodleian cod. Pococke No. 5,

\[ \text{Bodleian cod. Pococke No. 5, i.e. } 721 = 1821 \]

Juynboll, *Chron. Samar.*, p. 19,

\[ \text{Juynboll, *Chron. Samar.*, p. 19, i.e. } 751 = 1850 \]

Harkavy, *Cat.*, p. 88,

\[ \text{Harkavy, *Cat.*, p. 88, i.e. } 810 = 1407 \]

*Ibid.* p. 71,

\[ \text{*Ibid.* p. 71, i.e. } 852 = 1448 \]

Barberini Triglott (*Bibl. Sam.* i. p. 95),

\[ \text{Barberini Triglott (*Bibl. Sam.* i. p. 95), } \]

\[ \text{Barberini Triglott (*Bibl. Sam.* i. p. 95), i.e. } 881 = 1476 \]

Cod. Berlin Or. fol. 534,

\[ \text{Cod. Berlin Or. fol. 534, i.e. } 890 = 1485 \]

Paris, cod. Samar, No. 5,

\[ \text{Paris, cod. Samar, No. 5, i.e. } 967 = 1559 \]

Harkavy, *Cat.*, p. 71,

\[ \text{Harkavy, *Cat.*, p. 71, i.e. } 997 = 1589 \]

Many of the Masoretic notes at the end of mss. are also written in this system (see below).

We are now ready to take up the colophon in our manuscript. As is well known, such colophons are rarely to be found at the end of the manuscript; in nearly every case they are woven out of some part of the text of the Biblical books—preferably of the first chapter of Deuteronomy. Our manuscript has them also at this place, and the final letter of each word so selected is characterized by a horizontal stroke underneath it. The colophon thus deciphered reads:

\[ \text{Many of the Masoretic notes at the end of mss. are also written in this system (see below).} \]

\[ \text{We are now ready to take up the colophon in our manuscript. As is well known, such colophons are rarely to be found at the end of the manuscript; in nearly every case they are woven out of some part of the text of the Biblical books—preferably of the first chapter of Deuteronomy. Our manuscript has them also at this place, and the final letter of each word so selected is characterized by a horizontal stroke underneath it. The colophon thus deciphered reads:} \]
and may be translated:

"I, Jacob, son of Joseph, son of Mashlamah,15 son of Joseph of the Priests of the Stone, have written this holy Torah for the aged and honored Reader and Prayer-leader,16 the worthy scribe, the great Appointed One,17 the Archon 18 Joseph, the son of the aged and honored, The Appointed One of the Congregation, the Archon and doer of good, Methohiah, son of the aged and honored Appointed One of the Congregation, the Archon Joseph, son of the aged and honored The Great Appointed One, and Archon Najmah of the Sons of Methohiah. And the aforementioned Metho-

15 The name occurs several times; see the letter of Mashlamah ben Ab bar Heldenheim's Vierteljahrsschrift, i. p. 88; Azimah bar Mashlamah in a Samaritan chronicle of the eleventh century (ibid. p. 380); Abi Hanah Mashlamah of the Ben Sagiana (?) Juynboll, l.c. p. 19, who transcribes it Meshilamah. For the name, cf. JAOS, xx. p. 170; Joseph ben Mashlamah in Heldenheim, Bibl. Sam. i. p. 96.


17 , often or . (Harkavy, l.c. p. 74). Juynboll (l.c. p. 19) translates 'Rabbi.' So does De Sacy (l.c. p. 18); but also 'consecratus' (p. 197). If it is a title, it may stand in some connection with , a designation not used by the younger (Levitic) branch (cf. JAOS, xx. p. 176). It may, however, be nothing more than an honorific appellation, as Watson holds (JAOS, xx. p. 176). 'Stay' or 'Pillar' will then be the equivalent of the Arabic in such names as . An Arabic superscription gives as , as , as (Bloch, l.c. p. 31). G. Margoliouth makes out of this a proper name, "Sadaqa bar Samuka"! (ZDMG, li. p. 604).

18 or . (Harkavy, l.c. p. 109) or , and , (ibid. p. 71). Cp. the Syriac and Palestinian . In the Targum , (1 Chron. 112; 2 Chron. 111; 287; Job 3187; 2910); (Prov. 2115; Job 3418); (2 Chron. 345); (2 Chron. 3017). I do not know that this denotes any particular grade in the Samaritan hierarchy. In the Arabic superscription mentioned above, it is translated by , which is chosen not simply because of the similarity in sound, but also because means 'a noble or high person'; cf. (Lane, Arabic-English Lexicon, p. 1149).
FIG. 2.—A PAGE FROM THE BOOK OF DEUTERONOMY SHOWING THE DATE IN THE CHRONOGRAMMIC COLOPHON
hiah had it written 19 at his own cost 20 for his aforementioned son: nor has he any associate in it. This was in the month Jumadah II, in the year 901 (1495/6) of the rule of the Ishmaelites. It is the completion of six Torahs. Praise be to God that He has assisted me in His mercy. I supplicate of Him that He may grant me to teach in (out of) it children and grand-children. Amen! Amen! Amen! Through the intervention of Moses the Faithful One.” 22

Who the persons mentioned in this colophon were we do not know: their names do not appear in other colophons, nor in the three chronicles that have come down to us.

I have punctuated Mashlamah and not Meshalmah, as is it. So I translate 'legis peritus,' which is hardly correct.

21 So I translate his. See Harkavy, i.e. p. 73. De Sacy (l.c. p. 16) translates 'legis peritus,' which is hardly correct.

22 So I translate his. See Harkavy, i.e. p. 73. De Sacy (l.c. p. 16) translates 'legis peritus,' which is hardly correct.
sometimes written; for the name is evidently formed according to the Arabic proper name Maslamah; just as Najmah probably stands for the Arabic al-Najm, which I believe to be the equivalent of some such Hebrew name as Mazal Tob. The scribe, Jacob, refers to himself as one of the בֶּלֶדֶנֶם מָלָם. I have come across the same expression in two Samaritan mss. of the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg, dated respectively 1068 A.H. (=1657) and 1084 A.H. (=1673). To what can this refer? The expression is not used in any account of the Samaritans, old or young, to which I have had access. I have thought that it might possibly have some connection with Gen. 49, where God is spoken of as בֶּלֶדֶנֶם מֶלֶךְ and would then be equivalent to בֶּלֶדֶנֶם מָלָם—an oddity of expression of a kind to which the Samaritans are not altogether strangers. But perhaps it would be simpler to take בֶּלֶדֶנֶם as the equivalent of בָּבָל and to think of the בָּבָל mentioned in Ex. 20. The Samaritan poet Abisha speaks of the בָּבָל as one of the glories of Mount Gerizim. The place of this altar is still shown, as are also the stones brought up from the Jordan (Deut. 27), where "are still celebrated the most sacred rites of the community." 25

The Maecenas belonged to a family which is otherwise known. In the chronicle "Tolidot," one note mentions Shebet, son of Zabo, as the progenitor of the Bene Methohiah; another note gives his name as Methohiah, son of Rewah, son of Zadok, son of Abi Ezer; and I shall not attempt to decide which notice is correct. A Zadaka ben Yeshua ben Methohiah ben Tobiah ben Abraham ben Berakah ha-Levi of the "City of the Priests," who lived in

22 Harkavy in Natt, A Sketch of Samaritan History, p. 167.
24 Heidenheim, Bibl. Sam., iii. p. 87.
25 Cowley in Encycl. Biblica, iv. 4202; Harkavy, i.c. p. 27 (the Russian text of which I am unfortunately not able to read); Geiger in ZDMG, xx. p. 156.
26 Heidenheim's Vierteljahrschrift, iv. p. 370.
28 The Samaritan uses the expression מַלְכָּב (JASOS, xx. p. 175) =
Eagpt, is mentioned several times: in a St. Petersburg ms. of the year 894 A.H., in cod. Bib. Nat. Sam. IV of the year 872 A.H., and in cod. Watson I of the year 868 A.H. He is called של שרת המשה והרשמה וממשה כומרין, an expression which shows that the words של השרים cannot mean simply 'the servant of our master the Law,' but must refer to some office in connection with the famous Abisha scroll or of copies made from it and at one time preserved in Egypt. An Abraham bar Abd YHWH bar Abraham ben Shamash of the Bene Methoiah in the tenth century is also mentioned, and a Methoiah of Shechem in the year 810 A.H. The small evidence we thus have takes us into the fifteenth century, in which the writer of our ms. also seems to have lived.

I have translated the words חלוש 'and it is the completion of six Torahs.' This seems to be the only explanation possible for the expression; yet it seems hard to credit the scribe of cod. Watson I with the seventy-four copies which he prides himself upon having written, though the wording there and elsewhere is quite explicit by the addition of the word השכינה, i.e. והשכינה כותב, המוהה.

There are in our ms., as in all Samaritan books, various

29 Harkavy, l.c. p. 76.
30 Hebraica, l.c. p. 217.
32 De Sacy, l.c. p. 198.
33 ZA, xvi. p. 91. The bill of sale in the lithographed copy of Exodus (see below) mentions a certain נ"י son of Methoiah, 544 A.H. ( = 1149).
34 Harkavy, l.c. p. 138.
35 ibid. p. 122.
36 ibid. p. 73.
37 ibid. p. 144.
38 ibid. p. 148.
39 ibid. p. 207.
40 JQR, xiv. p. 31.
41 ibid. p. 31.

The sentence before the last is rendered in Arabic by: and the last by: وهى كَبْلَةً ثَلَاثِينَ شَرُوعٍ وهى لَى ثَلَاثِينَ نَصْحَةً كَبْتِ.
conceits in the arrangement of the text, which must have made the task of copyist a very difficult one. In Ex. 21 the text is arranged in a circle, so that the letters read upon the circumference make up the sentence מַשֵּׁה אבֵּר אֱלֹהִים מַשֵּׁה 'Moses the great one in the world.' A similar procedure in the arrangement of Numbers 4 brings out the words הֶרֶם הַגֵּרְזִים 'Mount Gerizim'; while a third one in Ex. 31 gives us הֶשְׂכִּלְךָ רָמָשׁ יִשָּׂרָאֵל 'The comprehension of Israel, the barbarous Hebrew of which might perhaps mean, 'He who waits for yesterday does evil to his own head,'—which is none too lucid.

A perpendicular cryptogram in Ex. 12 reads, רַאֲשָׁהָ הַמַּעֲשָׂר 'The commencement of the Commandments'; in Ex. 14 which I venture to translate 'Jehovah is the help of those that are near to Him,' נַעֲלוּ נַעֲלוּ being the Samaritan equivalent of the Arabic ناصراً منصرًا and נַעֲלוּ נַעֲלוּ לַאֲלֹהִים 'The prophet's word shall be the word'; in Lev. 27 אֶלֶף סֵפֶר 'This is the book of the Torahs,' and, finally, in Numbers 6 the following:

‘By (or through) the altar of Abraham, and the statute of Jacob, and the gate of heaven and the altar of Isaac he has written this.’ The ten commandments in Exodus are numbered on the margin—a practice said not to be found in older manuscripts, and having a polemical point against the notation of their Jewish brethren.

I should also like to call attention to some further notes of a little different character, and appended partly in the hand of the original scribe and partly in the hand of a later one. In an article published by Dr. M. Gaster in the Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology for 1900, he

85 Or 'Jehovah help speedily!'
87 JQR, xiv. p. 31. Some Greek codices also have the ten words numbered upon the margins (Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, p. 360).
88 p. 266.
makes the statement, "No trace of such a Masorah has as yet been found in Samaritan mss."; and in all the works upon the Masora of the ordinary Bible no mention is made of a Samaritan Masora. And yet, it has been known that such a Masora exists—at least in its infancy; and it might be of interest to those who indulge in such mathematical subtleties to study its relation to the Syriac and the Jewish Masora. The Samaritan Masora does not seem to have gone beyond the mere counting of sections, words, and letters. Like its Mohammedan counterpart to the Koran, which counts the and the , it adds up the ( Caleb ), or , and the ; the last, however, very often appearing only in a later hand. Our ms. adds also another enumeration which entirely passes my comprehension: it is always introduced by the word "their number." One would imagine that this refers to the numerical value attached to the letters just mentioned, especially as the numbers run up into the millions; but I am too little of a mathematician to work out the different sums. In the Samaritan manuscripts the numbers given in these final Masorases differ sensibly from each other; which difference may be due either to the faults of scribes or to divergencies in the manner of writing individual words by the various writers. This Masora is evidently old. In the copy under consideration, there is a Masoretic cryptogram at Lev. 71 the half of the Torah; though in cod. Watson I it is at Lev. 712; and in a ms. dated 655 A.H. it is at Lev. 715 ( מולא אברה ), which reminds one that the old Samaritan theologian Markah, who is generally supposed to have lived in the fourth century, refers to such a division as common in his days. The Jewish Hebrew text has, as is well known, a similar Masoretic remark at Lev. 1142; 41

40 Rosen in ZDMG, xviii. p. 588. The word is evidently connected with the Arabic and means "division." In a little different sense it is used in the Samaritan liturgy, ( Abend, Des Samaritaners Markah Abhandlung, p. 64.)

41 Blau in JQR, viii. p. 347.
the difference not being as great as one would have imagined.

The Masoretic notes in our ms. run as follows:

1. At the end of the Book of Genesis, in the original hand:

In a later hand, this has been verified and corrected (אָמְרֵי קַשָּׁה):

2. At the end of the Book of Exodus, in the original hand:

In a later hand:

3. At the end of the Book of Leviticus, in the original hand:

In a later hand:

4. At the end of the Book of Numbers, in the original hand:

In a later hand:

5. At the end of the Book of Deuteronomy, in the original hand:
In a later hand:

At the end of Deuteronomy is also the following:

(1) 'עַזֵּקֵן מִן אֶבַּנְתָּן עַל-מֵאֲשׁוֹת תְּשֵׁרֵד מִיָּמֵי עָלָших
(2) אֲרַאְנָה בִּצְיָה שֵׁלְיָה וַיִּקָּחֶנָה וַיִּמְנָהוּ
(3) הָיִה מְרִיץ מְכַסֹּב אָמָס מְלָה לָלֶּה חַדְּמָן
(4) יִבְּרֶה מִן אֵם אָלָבוֹד אַתָּנָה יִשְׂרָאֵל שְׁמוֹת
(5) נְחֵמוֹת וְכְסַפֹּבֵים אֶלֶם כְּשֵׁהוּ
(6) מְלַמְּדֵה הַכֵּסֶף אֶלֶם כְּשֵׁהוּ

In the following table, which gives a résumé of these notes, I have designated the original hand by "A," the second hand by "B":

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>תָּנִית</th>
<th>מִלְּמָה</th>
<th>מִשְׁמֵת</th>
<th>מִסְפָּר</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>A 25048</td>
<td>A 27,25848</td>
<td>B 79,92948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>A 20046</td>
<td>A 17,23047</td>
<td>B 68,86648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td>A 13546</td>
<td>A 10,390</td>
<td>B 45,50150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>A 21841</td>
<td>A 17,120</td>
<td>B 91,12852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>A 16044</td>
<td>A 14,42055</td>
<td>B 56,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Torah</td>
<td>B 96056</td>
<td>A 86,362</td>
<td>B 314,51154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48 I have completed the first two lines from cod. Watson I (Hebraica; ix. p. 223), where only the first half is given. The whole may be translated in this fashion: 'Behold thy portion (Kohn, Zur Sprache... der Samaritaner, p. 178) is in Eden (or 'is pleasant'), drawing life from the Garden of Eden. He (God) will cover him with a great light; from (15) the book he will not be blotted out ('hidden'); if he study in it, God will have compassion upon him. As the sea is full of water, so is the book full of mercy.
I have no doubt that the enumerations are altogether incorrect, especially as the addition of the original numbers does not agree with those put down for the whole Pentateuch. I have given in the notes a comparison with other enumerations that were at my disposal. A closer and a more complete study of the question is only possible with the aid of the mss. themselves. In the Jewish Masora also these numbers vary greatly; by some the letters in the Pentateuch are put at 300,000, by others at 600,000. Blau, however, has shown that the first is probably the more correct; and this would agree in a measure with the Samaritan enumeration. The words in the Hebrew Pentateuch are counted by the Jewish Masora at about 80,000 (79,856 or 79,976), which is also not too far removed from the reckoning of the Samaritan Masora. The Syriac Masora of the Peshitta deserves also some attention; unfortunately nothing has been written on the subject by those who have the

He who clings to the book, will be a good and righteous man, turning neither to the right nor to the left.'
manuscripts at their disposal. The division into נבפ by the Samaritans is paralleled by the division into נבפ by the Syrians.60 Lee's edition gives the enumeration only for Genesis and Exodus; but in the mss. it is given for the other books as well. The following table gives the number of נבפ according to the final Masora in Lee's edition, cod. Brit. Mus. II (13th century), cod. Bodl. I (1627 A.C.), cod. Bodl. III (1195 A.C.),61 and the Ausar 'Rāṣē of Bar 'Ebrāyah:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>34*58</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td>20*44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td></td>
<td>20*65</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will thus be seen that the number of נבפ in the Peshitta varies; but it is interesting to note that the official number of Sedarim in the Pentateuch, according to the Palestinian tradition, is handed down as 154; and it would thus seem that the division as made by the Syrian Church is much nearer that of the Jewish Synagogue than is the

60 נבפ = דִּבְרֵי (קְדָם). See Perles, Melemta Peschithontana, p. 29; König, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, p. 418. There is a difference in the numbering of the נבפ between the Eastern and the Western Syrians (see Dietrich, Die Masorah der östl. und westl. Syrer ... zum Propheten Jesaja, p. xiii); but I believe that the mss. cited in the text are Jacobite.

61 See Wright, Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts, 1.; Payne Smith, Catalogus codicum Syrorum, passim.

62 See the detailed information from a Florence ms. in S. E. Assemani, Bibliothecae Med. Laurentianae Catalogus, p. 66.

63 See B. II. Larsow, Greg. Barhebraei Horreum Mysteriorum, p. 3. There Bar 'Ebrāyah mentions a further division of Genesis into six לואה.

64 So, also, Bar 'Ebrāyah; see Kerber, Greg. Abulfaragii . . . scholior in Leviticum, p. 11.

65 So, also, Bar 'Ebrāyah; see Kerber, A Commentary to Deuteronomy in AJSL, xiii. p. 91. This does not agree with the number given in the Florence ms. 1.
Samaritan. The Syriac Masora also counted the letters in the different books—or, rather, the א, which, as will be seen, cannot possibly refer to the letters. The following table gives the number of א in the Masora appended to Lee's edition, compared with that appended to codd. Bodl. I and III:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ED. Lee</th>
<th>Bodl. I</th>
<th>Bodl. III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of course, these numbers fall ridiculously short of the number of words one would expect to find in the Peshitta text. The translation, especially of the Pentateuch, follows the original so closely that the number can hardly be less than that of the Hebrew text; it ought to be more, in view of the additional enclitic words used so frequently in Syriac.

One might imagine that the word א refers to the verses; but here we have the opposite phenomenon. There are too many. According to the Jewish Masora the number of verses in the Pentateuch is as follows: Genesis, 1533; Exodus, 1209 (or 1207); Leviticus, 859; Numbers, 644;

Another division very much like that of the Hebrew פְּרַשָׁיִים, and named according to the subject matter, is found in some codices. Perles, l.c. p. 22, has pointed out the coincidence. Such titles occur in Greek Bible codices: see the lists in Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, p. 364. The Syriac Masora seems, also, to have commenced to count the number of times certain words occur in portions of the Peshitta; in just the manner of the Jewish Masorites. See Bar 'Ebrayi in Lagarde, Patermissorum libri duo, p. 100; in the Psalms 5 739, 733 739, 400 739. In a modern Nestorian ms. (Wright, Catalogue, p. 159) similar notes are found: 739 733, 400 739, 285 739, 24 739, 6 739, 44 739, 5 739. From Bar 'Ebrayi such notes have found their way into Peshitta ms. (Payne Smith, Catalogus, p. 47, ms. No. 9; Rosen and Forshall, Catalogus, No. xii.)
Deuteronomy, 955 (or 958)—making a sum total for the whole Pentateuch of 5845, or 5842, or again 5835. This shows that there are on an average about three Syriac words for one Hebrew verse. The same holds good if we take the Book of Psalms. According to the Jewish Masora this book has 2527 verses; but according to the Syriac it has either 4880 or 4832 words. For some of the other books I have drawn up the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>ED. LHR.</th>
<th>BODL. I</th>
<th>JEWISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>2167</td>
<td>2167</td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>233 (?)</td>
<td>2066</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>3436</td>
<td>3436</td>
<td>1506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>5326</td>
<td>1536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronicles</td>
<td>6003</td>
<td>5603</td>
<td>1765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canticles</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>2553</td>
<td>2553</td>
<td>1075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra and Nehemiah</td>
<td>2361</td>
<td>2361</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67 Blau in *JQR*, ix. p. 479.

68 Besides being divided into five books, as is the Hebrew text, the Syriac Psalter is divided into 29 (cod. Brit. Mus. clxxxvii, ccil; cod. Bodl. xvi; Lagarde, *Prätermissorum*, p. 241, 3), into 20 or 21, and into 67 or 60, according as the so-called and (two songs of Moses and the Song of Isaiah) are added or omitted. These are the designations used by the Eastern and the Western Syrian Church, though the latter have only 15 (see Bodl. codd. ix and xv), each of which they divide again into 4 , making 60 in all. The Easterns divide the Psalms again into sections, of which there are twenty; the Westerns do not seem to use such a division. Sometimes the division is made according to the Greek Church into (καθευδια) and (Wright, *Catalogue*, pp. 128, 131, 134, 136). Finally, the Psalms are arranged in pairs, (Payne Smith, *Catalogus*, p. 60).

The subject has been partly treated by Dietrich, *De Psalterii seu publico et divisione in ecclesia Syriaca*, Marburg, 1882; by Baethgen, *Untersuchungen über die Psalmen nach der Peschita*, p. 9, and especially by Joseph David in his *Psalterium Syriacum*, Mosul, 1878, p. xvi. The number of words in the Psalms is given as 19,834 (Rosen and Forshall, *Catalogus*, No. xil) or 19,934 (Catalogue of the Syriac Ms. in the Cambridge University Library, p. 1081). The Syro-Palestinian naturally uses the Greek Psalms (see Land, *Anecdota Syriaca*, lv. p. 106, and Swete, t.c. p. 859).
It is quite plain therefore that in the Syriac Masora the term ܒܬܐ cannot denote either 'words' or 'verses.' For the one the number given is too high, for the other it is too low. It can therefore have reference only to the ܬܐܒܬܐ, in which the text was written. This can be proved from the Psalms. In the ordinary Syriac text, and at the head of each Psalm, the number of ܡܬܚܡ is given. These numbers represent with fair accuracy the number of divisions in the Psalm according to the interpunctuation by dots and colons. I have no doubt that a comparison of good manuscripts would reveal exact coincidence. Blau seems to have counted these for the whole Book of Psalms—though

69 As translated by Abbé Martin, La Massore chez les Syriens, in JA, 1869, p. 283, and Baethgen, l.c. p. 9, who however adds "von denen in der Regel zwei oder drei einem hebräischen gleich kommen."

70 Perhaps the better word to use would be ܠܡܐ or ܐܠܠܘܡܐ, the designations for sense-divisions; the ܬܐܒܬܐ being used to regulate the pay of the scribe and to facilitate reference; see Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, p. 344. Lagarde (Mitteilungen, iv. p. 200) thinks this is the translation of ܠܝܠ; but that word does not seem to have been ordinarily used for such purposes. It is interesting to compare the lists given above with the stichometric lists both of the LXX and of the Vulgate, as given by Sanday in Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica, iii. p. 200, and Swete, l.c. pp. 347 ff. The coincidences are in some cases remarkable.

71 The division differs in the mss., as will be seen from the following table for the first ten Psalms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have added the ܡܬܚܡ from the Syro-Hexapla, according to the photo-lithographic reproduction of Ceriani and the edition of Bugatus, Liber Psalmorum secundum ed. sept. interpretum, Mediolani, 1708.
he wrongly calls them "verses" — and finds the number to be 4793; and finds the number near enough to that mentioned in the Masoretic notes above. This then must be also the meaning of the 5896 אֲרֵךְ לְעֹלָם mentioned in Talmud Kidd. 30 a, as Blau has correctly seen; and I should imagine that the 15,842 אֲרֵךְ לְעֹלָם mentioned for the Pentateuch in Yalkût, I, 855, refers also to the stichoi, as do the Syriac 16,906. The Vulgate lists give the sum of stichoi for Leviticus as 2300, 2400, or 2600 — a number not far removed from the Syriac 2454. For the Book of Proverbs the Vulgate gives 1840 stichoi, the Peshitta 1863.

I have no means of knowing how old these divisions in the Peshitta are; it is possible that they have been introduced from the Septuagint. The Brit. Mus. cod. Syr. No. xlix, containing the translation of Exodus made from the Greek by Bishop Paul of Tella, has מְרֵךְ לְעֹלָם, which is surprisingly near to the ordinary Peshitta number for that book, 3626.

I have not examined the text of the Samaritan manuscript under discussion, as the variants it might offer can be of use only to the extreme specialist. I have no doubt that it presents the usual ones, and it makes upon me the impression of being a good and faithful copy of the original scroll at Nablus. But I cannot avoid the feeling that the glory is departing from this ancient community, whose members have become too

72 JQR, ix. p. 479.

73 The numbers are by no means certain in the manuscripts. In most cases this is 4832 (codd. Bodl. i. ix.; Brit. Mus. cod. clxvii); but 4830 occurs (cod. Bodl. viii), 4802 (cod. Brit. Mus. clxxix), 4803 (cod. Bodl. xvi — but without the ִּכְנָעַם), and 4833 (cod. Brit. Mus. ccii, late Nestorian; see, also, Rosen and Forshall, Catalogue, No. 12). One of the last two enumerations must be looked for in the defective colophon of cod. Brit. Mus. clxxxvii. 4773. In a Jacobite ms. at Cambridge (England) the number is given as 4832, but the note is added: אֲרֵךְ לְעֹלָם. (Catalogue of the Syriac Mss. in the Cambridge University Library, p. 1028. A similar note is added in a British Museum ms. ; see the Catalogue of Rosen and Forshall, No. x). I do not know what to make of the number 1150 אֲרֵךְ לְעֹלָם for the Psalms in the so-called "Buchanan Bible" (Jacobite ms. in Cambridge, l.c. p. 1037).

74 Wright, Catalogue, i. p. 29.
strongly imbued with the modern commercial spirit. With this modernization the halo which has surrounded their heads must indeed vanish. Only a few of their ancient manuscripts can now remain. The son of their High Priest came running to me from Jerusalem to Jaffa in March, 1905, in a vain attempt to induce me to buy a manuscript Pentateuch. The reproduction of whatever mss. they may still possess has become a flourishing trade. A collection of such reproductions, largely ritualistic, can now be seen in the library of Columbia University. They show, in their outward aspect, how much deterioration there has been since the time when it was the pride of the scribe to do his work well. The modern copies are hastily made, done on poor paper and with poor ink—the very reverse of their forbears. In the year 1864 some one in Jerusalem had taught the Samaritans the process of lithography, and they published a copy of the Book of Exodus in this vicious style. Happily, the undertaking seems not to have prospered. The specimen which we possess certainly does not justify the further use of so miserable a process.

76 Its colophon reads: "The following bill of sale is also copied:

644 A.H. = 1149 A.D. Observe for the usual כותב, כותב is evidently a mistake for כותב, כותב for כותב.