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On several occasions, I have demonstrated the high quality of the Spanish manuscripts, specifically the manuscript M1 (118-Z-42) of the University of Madrid. As I said, the manuscript M1 is being studied by the Hebrew Bible Team at the Philology Institute in Madrid. We intend to publish its Pentateuch masorah in the next year. This manuscript served as one of the basis texts for the Complutensian Polyglot edited by Ximenez de Cisneros in the 16th century, and has been considered as one of the best for the Polyglot composition. In his *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible* (New York 1966, p. 775), Ginsburg described it as a «magnificent codex», and affirms that it has served as a guide for the compilers of the Polyglot.

But not only the manuscript M1 has a high consideration among Spanish codices. In El Escorial Library, there is another manuscript, the G-II-8, which has been described by J. Llamas ¹. According to his opinion, it was also used for the Complutensian Polyglot text composition. We know that it belonged to Arias Montano’s manuscript collection. He was the first director of the El Escorial Library and editor of the second Polyglot or *Biblia Regia*, published between 1569 and 1572 at the Plantino press in Antwerp, in eight folio volumes. This Bible includes the Hebrew text with Aramaic *targumim*, the Septuagint, the *Peshitta* (each with a Latin translation), as well as the Vulgate, the New Testament in Latin, Greek and Syriac, and three volumes of critical

¹ José LLAMAS, *Catálogo de los manuscritos hebreos de la Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo de El Escorial* (El Escorial 1944).
notes, vocabulary, comments and excursuses, most of which were written by Arias Montano.

The manuscript G-II-8 consists of 386 folios and contains the whole Hebrew Bible, except two folios containing Gen 38,24-42,16. It is written in a Sephardic handwriting, in two columns, with a rich colourful illumination: gold, silver, blue and red. It has geometrical and floral designs, in the text and the masorah. Only the Pentateuch has masora, *parva* and *magna*, but it is particularly rich. In the rest of the books the *sēdarīm* and *parašiyōt* are indicated. It has no colophon and its date of composition and the name of the scribe are unknown, but it has been dated in the 15th century. As we shall see in the following examples, it sometimes preserve some masorahs different from the traditional ones; these are the most usual masorahs contained in the old tiberian manuscripts, such as Leningrad (L), Or 4445, Cairo (C) or Aleppo (A)

In some cases, the masorah of G-II-8 agrees with the masora of M1. In these cases the Spanish manuscripts give information different from that of the tiberian manuscripts or they simply give more specific information. Let us see now some examples.

Spanish manuscripts give sometimes an information different from that of other codices. In Gen 49,22, referring to the word פָּרָשַׁת כְּנַחְלַת, L, Ben Hayyim and BHS write בֵּית הֵיית in MP. M1 says פֶּרֶשֶׂת כְּנַחְלָת בֵּית הֵיית בֵּית הֵיית אֲשֶׁר דִּבְרֵי, ב וּס and G-II-8-8 writes פֶּרֶשֶׂת כְּנַחְלָת אֲשֶׁר דִּבְרֵי, ה וּס. In the *Sefer Hillel*, all cases are with *games*—two in the verse—but in the *Sefer Muggah* and the masorah *magna* they have a *patah* «so that you may obtain a teacher of righteousness» [*Hos 10,12*]. Or 4445 has no masorah.

In this case, the Spanish codices do not refer to the number of cases in which the word פָּרָשַׁת כְּנַחְלַת appears, but to the vocalization of the word: to the *holes* in the first case and to the *games* in the second. They add information about the masorah and model codices, and also say that the vocalization of the Spanish codices agree with one of them, the *Hil-lel*. I have to remark that the style of G-II-8 masorah is not the traditional, laconic and cryptic style. The masorah refers to a biblical passage, *Hos 10,12*, to give an unusual information, which is not the style of the masorah we are accus-

---

2 As we know, L represents codex B19a from the Public Library in Leningrad, C is the Cairo Codex of the Prophets, A is the Aleppo Codex and Or 4445 is the famous Pentateuch of the British Museum.
tomed to. The masorah suggests that the patah vocalization is erroneous.

In another case, Ex 36,15, concerning the words נָכָּה נַעֲקָה, we find ה in MP in most texts (L, BHS and Ben Hayyīm); Or 4445 and G-II-8 have no masorah and in M1 we only read: מ. This masorah explains that the four passages are two pairs of parallels: on one hand Ex 26,8 and 36,5 and on the other hand 1 Kings 7,23 and 2 Chr 4,2.

The masorah in Gen 1,9 refers to the word מָכָּה. This is the only case written with conjunctive waw, and there are other two cases written מָכָּה, without the particle. But this is also the only case without dagesh in the מ. L and BHS have מ in MP. Ben Hayyīm notes something more specific: מ. Or 4445 has no masorah in Genesis, and in the case of Leviticus it writes מ in MP. Both Spanish manuscripts give more information about this word. M1 says: מ, and it gives the siman of another passage, Lev 13,57, in which the word is written without the conjunctive מ.

The masorah does not refer to Is 47,3, which is also מָכָּה, because probably mentions only the cases in the Torah. Lastly, G-II-8 notes: מ and inform, not only that the case is מ, but that this case has rafeh in the מ, whereas the other two cases, Is 47,3 and Lev 13,57, have a dagesh in the same letter. The manuscript writes the word plene, with final מ. Once again, in G-II-8 we find more information than in the other codices.

Regarding another case, Gen 18,17, and concerning the word מָכָּה, L and Or 4445 have no masorahs. Ben Hayyīm notes מ in MP, and in BHS Weil explains מ כְּכָל מִלּותהָ בַּמִּסְתָּכוּ וְיִשְׁרֵי (this is one of the two cases of this verbal form, and all references to covering the kidneys involves the same verbal form). The second passage is Ps 147,8. But Ben Hayyīm does not note that in one of the two cases the מ is the interrogative particle and in other one is the definite article. The same masorah appears in Frensdorf 3.

Considering the two Spanish manuscripts, M1 has מָכָּה, with hatef patah instead of Šēwâ', and notes 4 that סְלָל הַשָּׁם אַחַר הָעַרְבָּא ַג הַשָּׁם מֵעַד מִזְמַע מָכָּה in MP. G-II-8 has a different MP, and gives information about model codices: וְיִשְׁרֵי מִלָּהוּ כֵּלָה מָכָּה מֵעַד מִזְמַע מָכָּה. This word

---

4 This passage corresponds to Ex 29,22, and Lev 3,3.9.14.4.8 and 7,3.
appears in this form in the Zanbuki but is with šēwa’ patah in the Hil’lelî’. It is remarkable that the vocalization given by that masorah agrees only with that of M1. However, if we compare the reading for the Hil’lelî with that of the manuscript of the Jewish Theological Seminary known as Codex Hil’lelî (44a), there is no such coincidence, because in the latter the word is vocalized with šēwa’.

Concerning the word בֵּית in Gen 31,26, all manuscripts writeִ בֵּית in MP and so does Ben Hayyîm. M1 says לִבּוּ עַד כְּפַר (the word is once defective of the first waw) and G-II-8 writes the word doubly defective in the text and notes כְּפַר כִּפּ to (other manuscripts plene) in MP.

In Gen 2,19, concerning the word הַנַּעַנְיָה, L writes in MP and Weil 5 notes כְּפַר in BHS. In fact, the word occurs two times, one plene (Gen 2,7) and one defective. Ben Hayyîm gives a different note in MP: הַנַּעַנְיָה רַבִּי פָּסְמָשׁ כְּפַר כְּפַר (Gen 44,12) 'It has têlišâ gêdolâ and the siman of another verse is ...'; he notes the accent of the word and gives the siman of another passage. Referring to the case of Gen 2,7, M1 writes כְּפַר כְּפַר in MP and G-II-8 writes כְּפַר כְּפַר in MP.

The manuscripts sometimes give in its MP an information different from that of the MM. For instance, concerning the word הָעִקּוֹדָה in Zeph 1,1, we find two masorahs: כְּפַר in MM or כְּפַר in MP. Weil explains this masorah in BHS as follows: כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּפַר כְּп̓ęd} in the Aleppô Codex as follows:


6 G. Weil, Massorah Gedolah (Roma 1971). Nevertheless, in his list 3125 he gives Neh 7,21 instead of Neh 10,18 as the third siman of הָעִקּוֹדָה. And he gives the second list, 3983 as if L had MM in the passage of Neh, which is wrong. In this passage L has no MM and writes כְּפַר in MP, corresponding to the word הָעִקּוֹדָה.
In Kings this name occurs 37 times in total. In this book, the longer form occurs 36 times and the shorter form only one time. In this case, the masorah safeguards the solitary exception. L and C only say י in MP, and Ben Hayyîm's edition and M1 give the complete masorah and write the first three simanim as well as the exceptional passage of Kings. Once again, we find that a masorah of one of the Spanish manuscripts clarifies the problem better than those of other codices, although this word is also problematic.

In Spanish manuscripts we sometimes find information which is clearly not taken from the traditional sources, as it is the case of Gen 25,6, concerning the word קיפלישׁה. L notes ל rather than קיפלישׁה in MP, which is not totally correct, because there is another plene case in Est 2,14. It probably refers to the only case in the Pentateuch. The second occurrence in Esther has no masorah. Weil has corrected this masorah in BHS and notes ב, not י, but in both instances, in the י and in the ב. Or 4445 has no masorah.

Ben Hayyîm has ל rather than קיפלישׁה in MP, and gives the siman of the second passage, י. He explains that the word must be plene in both instances, in the י and in the ב. Or 4445 has no masorah.

Now we take a look to the Spanish codices. M1 has קיפלישׁה in the text, with the י defective and notes (without circellus) ל in MP. The other case, Est 2,14 is doubly plene and without masorah. In G-II-8 we find a different MP: אַוּצָה פַלְמֹת עֶלָּל בָּטֶרֶם מְדֻרוֹסִי אֲפֶרֶתָה and 'there is a discrepancy in this case: I have found the word written without the last yod in correct codices and it will be not corrected until Eliyahu shall come'. It explains that the M1 text is also correct, even though it

---

7 Vid. Ch. D. Ginsburg, The Massorah, vol. IV, p. 378, § 121. He has found six different lists in the collated manuscripts, some of them agree with the notes found in M1 or A.

8 'Until Eliyahu shall come', it is, for an indefinite space of time. Vid. M. Jastrow, A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature (New York 1967) vol. I, sub voce אָלַיָּה.
always appears *plene* in the other tiberian codices. And it also explains that the variant reading, if we only refer to one of the two *plene/defective* occurrences, is the second one, in the ψ. This specification is not found in any of the other manuscripts.

We also find information in Spanish manuscripts in cases where the other codices have no masorah. For instance, in *Gen* 1,4 and 1,12, concerning the words ψ כ, neither L, Or 4445, BHS, Ben Hayyîm or G-II-8 have masorah. M1 is the only manuscript which says ψ ב with ψ ב in MP and gives the *šîmanîm* in MM as follows:

In the masorah of *Gen* 30,19 regarding the words נוֹרָשֵׁים, we find different information in the manuscripts, although all of them refer to the vocalization of the word נוֹרָשֵׁים, depending on whether it is followed by *maqqef* or not. This noun is normally vocalized with *segôl* in the construct form joined by *maqqef*, except in four instances where it is anomalously joined with *šereh*.

L has no MM and writes נוֹרָשֵׁים in MP. The four occurrences are located in the MM of other manuscripts. These are *Gen* 30,19, *1 Sam* 22,20, *2 Sam* 9,12, and *Ez* 18,10. L has no masorahs in the two cases of Samuel and writes נוֹרָשֵׁים without MM in Ezequiel.

Or 4445 has no masorahs in this passage, but in *Lev* 24,10 we find another masorah referring to נוֹרָשֵׁים:

| MP | נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹরָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים נוֹרָשֵׁים

9 Commentators explain that, depending on whether the second yôd is written or not, they refer to only one of Abraham’s wives (Agar and Qeturah) or to both of them. In *Sefer Beresît Rabbâ* (Vilna 1884) cap. 61, §4, p. 122a it is *defective* and they interpret that it refers to only one of them.
It says י in MP and reads «six times with segol» in MM, gives the six simanim, and specifies the exception of the four cases with shereh.

Ben Hayyîm gives also two peculiar notes in Gen 30,19. He writes י in MP, in MM explains that י with maqef is vocalized with segol except in four cases, and he then gives the simanim. It continues to say that if י has an accent, the nun is vocalized with shereh, except in seven cases, and he also gives the simanim.

The masora seems to be a little confused. The siman is likely to refer to more than one passage (2 Kgs 22,3; Neh 11,7; 11,11; 1 Chr 9,7; 9,11; 9,12), but not to the one which is supposed to do, namely Gen 17,17. We find the same problem in יכсли פתי and in בכסם (Prov 17,25 or 19,13) and in יכсим (I Kgs 5,21; Prov 10,1; 15,20; 13,1; 2 Chr 2,11). It is not clear if the vocalization must be under the bet or under the nun. The masorah omits the case of Gen 17,17, and gives the siman יכسيل פתי. In the Masorah Finalis, Ben Hayyîm gives also another note יכסי פתי יכסי פתי. This masorah can also be found in Gen 17,17.

Let us see now the situation in the Spanish manuscripts. M1 has two masorahs in Gen 30,19. The first one corresponds to the words יכסי פתי יכסי פתי in MP. Once again, the masorah protects the minority reading. The second note corresponds to the word יכסי פתי יכסי פתי and gives the four simanim in MM:

ד cread the fourth masorah in Spanish manuscripts, transl. יכסי פתי יכסי פתי in I Sam 22,20; רמא in 2 Sam 9,12; and רמא in Ez 18,10.

The manuscript G-II-8 has no masorah in its corresponding page, but another very famous Spanish codex, the Or 2626-28 of the British Museum has also two masorahs in Gen 30,19. The first
one, corresponding to the words שים says π in MP, and the second one, corresponding to the word הב, writes the four simanim in MM and adds the seven cases where the הב is vocalized with segol because of the accent as follows:

The Cairo codex has no reference to this case, neither in Samuel, nor in Ezequiel. In the MP of 2 Sam 9,12 Aleppo notes that there are four cases with maqef and sereh, and gives the simanim in MM:

In the other cases it has no masorah.

About these two different informations, Frensdorff \(^{10}\) explains:

"ץ with accent (without maqef) is vocalized with sereh, except in six or seven cases, where it is vocalized with segol. On the contrary, when ź has no accent but maqef, it is vocalized with segol, except in four cases where is vocalized with sereh". Concerning the first masorah, the six or seven cases depend on whether the word has a prefix or not (in case Gen 17,17 is included or not).

We find more information about this issue in Yedidyah Shelomo de Norzi’s Minhah Say. In his comments on Gen 30,7 he writes: The הב with sereh in the correct codices and without maqef, as in this י, which is close to this one (Gen 30,12). In the Miqrah Gedolah it appears with sereh and maqef and says: הב with maqef has always patah (explanation: with segol), except in four instances. The maqef is erroneous and what is here written corresponds to another passage, שים in Gen 30,19, as is written in the masorah».

In his comments on I Sam 22,20 writes: «In all times with sereh and maqef, and its simanim are the הב שים יועבכ (Gen 30,19); I Sam 22,20; (Ez 18,10) and the memphisthot הב of the הרל (Ez 18,10) and the זי of the זי of the אב (2 Sam 9,12)».

Finally, in Ez 18,10 Norzi says: «In a manuscript codex the הב is

\(^{10}\) S. FRENSDORFF, Massorah Magna (New York 1968) p. 35, 36, note 2.
vocalized with ségól but this is not correct, as the masorah of the parasâ הָעֲבוֹן (Gen 30,19) says, because this passage is one of the four cases vocalized with sereh».

In the examples I have analyzed, we notice differences in the information given in the codices on the same cases. In some cases, the notes simply give the same information but written in a different form. In other occasions, the differences can be explained by many reasons. They may come from different traditions, or be taken from different masoretic lists. We also find two different masorahs with two informations concerning different issues.

The Spanish codices seem to have a very coherent method in their masorah, even when they offer notices not found in other manuscripts. In these cases, they are often supported by other masoretic works, such as Minhâj Šay or Ginsburg’s Massorah.

RESUMEN
En el presente artículo se analizan algunas notas masoréticas del Pentateuco en diferentes manuscritos españoles. Algunos de ellos deben su importancia a que fueron utilizados para establecer el texto base de la Bibliia Políglota Complutense de Cisneros. Más adelante, se compara la información de estas notas masoréticas con los manuscritos de Leningrado, Or 4445, Cairo y Alepo y con las ediciones de Ben Hayyim y Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (BHS) con el fin de demostrar la proximidad de los códices españoles con la tradición tiberiense de Ben Ašer.

SUMMARY
The present article analyzes some masoretic notes of the Pentateuch of different Spanish Manuscripts, some of them having been used as basis for the Cisneros’ Complutensian Polyglot. In order to demonstrate the proximity of the Spanish codices with the Ben Asher tradition, I compare the notes of masorah with those of the manuscripts Leningrad, Or 4445 and Aleppo, and with the BHS and Ben Hayyim editions as well.