Some cases in the Masorah
of Spanish Manuscripts

M.ª Teresa ORTEGA-MONASTERIO
CSIC, Madrid

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 oppinion, 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 *targumîm*, 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 *sĕdarîm* and *parašiyyôt* 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) [2]. 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 פֹּרָת, L, Ben Hayyîm and BHS write ב or ב בפסוק in MP. M1 says בהלליה ובכליה קמץ ובספר המוגה ובמסו הגדולה אשכהית, and G-II-8 ב וחס "דאינון פת עד יבה ויורה צדק" 'In the *Sefer Hil·lelî*, all cases are with *qameṣ* –two in the verse– but in the *Sefer Muggah* and the masorah *magna* they have a *pataḥ* «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 פֹּרָת appears, but to the vocalization of the word: to the *ḥôlem* in the first case and to the *qameṣ* 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·lelî*. 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 שְׁלֹשִׁים בָּאַמָּה, we find ד in MP in most texts (L, BHS and Ben Hayyîm); Or 4445 and G-II-8 have no masorah and in M1 we only read: ד זוגין מתחלפין. 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 וְתֵרָאֶה. This is the only case written with conjunctive *waw*, and there are other two cases written תֵּרָאֶה, without the particle. But this is also the only case without *dageš* in the ת. L and BHS have ל in MP. Ben Hayyîm notes something more specific: ל רפי. Or 4445 has no masorah in *Genesis*, and in the case of *Leviticus* it writes ב in MP. Both Spanish manuscripts give more information about this word. M1 says: ל וחד תראה עוד, and it gives the *sîman* of another passage, *Lev* 13,57, in which the word is written without the conjunctive ו. The masorah does not refer to *Is* 47,3, which is also תֵּרָאֶה, because probably mentiones only the cases in the Torah. Lastly, G-II-8 notes: ל רפי ומלי and inform, not only that the case is ל, but that this case has *rafeh* in the ת, whereas the other two cases, *Is* 47,3 and *Lev* 13,57, have a *dageš* in the same letter. The manuscript writes the word *plene*, with final ה. 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 הַמְכַסֶּה, L and Or 4445 have no masorahs. Ben Hayyîm notes ב in MP, and in BHS Weil explains ב וכל הכליות דכות (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 Hayyîm does not note that in one of the two cases the ה is the interrogative particle and in other one is the definite article. The same masorah appears in Frensdorff [3].

Considering the two Spanish manuscripts, M1 has הַמְכַסֶּה, with *hatef patah* instead of *šĕwa'*, and notes [4] ל וכל החלב המכסה את הקרב כות in MP. G-II-8 has a different MP, and gives information about model codices: כן בזובוקי ובהללי נקוד הַמְכַסֶּה בשבע פת 'This word

---

[3] S. FRENSDORFF, *The Massorah Magna* (New York 1968) p. 101.

[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 *šĕwa' 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 *šĕwa'*.

Concerning the word כִּשְׂבִיּוֹת, in *Gen* 31,26, all manuscripts write ל וחס in MP and so does Ben Hayyîm. M1 says ל וחס וא קדמא (the word is once defective of the first *waw*) and G-II-8 writes the word doubly defective in the text and notes סא כשביות (other manuscripts *plene*) in MP.

In *Gen* 2,19, concerning the word וַיִּצֶר, L writes ל חס in MP and Weil [5] notes ב חד חס וחד מל 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: קרי' בתלשה גדולה ותר פסק סי' וַיְחַפֵּשׂ בַּגָּדוֹל הֵחֵל וּבָקָטֹן כַּלֵּה (*Gen* 44,12) 'It has *tĕlisâ gĕdolâ* and the *sîman* of another verse is ...'; he notes the accent of the word and gives the *sîman* of another passage. Referring to the case of *Gen* 2,7, M1 writes דין חס in MP and G-II-8 writes ב הדין חס וקדמ מל in MP.

The manuscripts sometimes give in its MP an information different from that of the MM. For instance, concerning the word חזקיה in *Zeph* 1,1, we find two masorahs: ג in MM or יב in MP. Weil explains this masorah in BHS as follows: ג לפי מג וחד מן יב לפי מק 'one of the three occurences according to the masorah *gĕdolâ* and one of the twelve occurrences, according to masorah *qĕtanâ*' [6]. I have found this entry in no one of the manuscripts I have consulted. In these codices we find another formulation: ג, and then they draw attention to the rest of the cases by stating that all of the occurrences of חזקיה from *2 Kgs* 18,1-17 are spelled in the same way, with the exception of one case, *2 Kgs* 18,9, which writes חזקיהו. This masorah is found in the Aleppo Codex as follows:

---

[5] *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.* Ediderunt K. ELLIGER et W. RUDOLPH, Textum Masoreticum curavit H. P. RÜGER, Masoram elaboravit G. E. WEIL (Stuttgart 1977) p. 3.

[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 *sîman* of חזקיה. 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 ב in MP, corresponding to the word לחזקיה.

MP   ג

MM   אטר [*Prov* 25,1] גם אלה משלי שלמה [*Zeph* 1,1] ג דבר יהוה
[*2 Kgs* 18,1] ומן ויהי בשנת שלש להושע [*Neh* 10,18] חזקיה עזור
דכותהון בר מן חד ויהי בשנת הרביעית [*2 Kgs* 18,17] עד תרתן
[*2 Kgs* 18,9] למלך חזקיהו

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 ג in MP, and Ben Hayyîm's edition and M1 give the
complete masorah and write the first three *sîmanîm* 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 [7].

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 הַפִּילַגְשִׁים. L notes ל ומל 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 מל ול בתור, including both
possibilities.

Ben Hayyîm has ב מל דמל שומר in MP, and gives the *sîman* of the
second passage, שומר. He explains that the word must be *plene* in
both instances, in the פי and in the שי. Or 4445 has no masorah.

Now we take a look to the Spanish codices. M1 has הַפִּילַגְשֶׁם in
the text, with the ש defective and notes (without *circellus*) ל חס in
MP. The other case, *Est* 2,14 is doubly *plene* and without masorah.
In G-II-8 we find a different MP: איבא פלוגת עלה בספרים מדוייקי אשכחתי
הפילגשם חס יוד בתר ולא נתקן עד שיבא אליהו [8] 'there is a discrepancy in
this case: I have found the word written without the last *yôd* in
correct codices and it will be not corrected until Eliahu 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* אליהו.

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 ש. This specification is not found in any of the other manuscripts [9].

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 כִּי טוֹב, neither L, Or 4445, BHS, Ben Hayyîm or G-II-8 have masorah. M1 is the only manuscript which says ו בעניינו in MP and gives the *sîmanîm* in MM as follows:

וירא אלהים את האור כי טוב [*Gen* 1,4] ויקרא אלהים ליבשה ארץ ולמקוה
המים קרא מים [*Gen* 1,10] ותוצא הארץ רשא [*Gen* 1,12] ולמשל ביום ובלילה
ולהבדיל בין האור ובין החשך [*Gen* 1,18] ויברא אלהים את התנינם הגדלים
[*Gen* 1,21] ויעש אלהים את חית הארץ למינה ואת הבהמה למינ [*Gen* 1,25]

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

L has no MM and writes ד מקף 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 ד without MM in *Ezequiel*.

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

MP   ו

MM   בתלתה בן וֶ מקפו וקמצ בן הבקר [*Lev* 1,5] בן הישראלית
[*Lev* 24,10] בן ברכיה [*Neh* 6,18] בן יברכיהו [*Is* 8,2] בן משלמיה
[*1 Cr* 9,21] בן יאיר בן שמעי [*Est* 2,5] וכל מבֶן דכותהון וחד הלבן
[*Gen* 17,17] וכל מקפין דכותה בר מן ד

---

[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 ו in MP and reads «six times with *sĕgôl*» in MM, gives the six *sîmanîm*, and specifies the exception of the four cases with *ṣêreh*.

Ben Hayyîm gives also two peculiar notes in *Gen* 30,19. He writes חד מן ד' מקפין וקמץ in MP, in MM explains that בן with *maqqef* is vocalized with *sĕgôl* except in four cases, and he then gives the *sîmanîm*. It continues to say that if בֶן has an accent, the *nûn* is vocalized with *ṣêreh*, except in seven cases, and he also gives the *sîmanîm*.

MP   חד מן ד' מקפין וקמץ

MM   וימלט [*Gen* 30,19] ליעקב בן כל בן המוקף פתח במ"ד וסי' בן ששי

ולמפיבושת בן קטן [*1 Sam* 22,20] בן אחד לאהימלך בן אחיטוב

ואם הנגינה בו קמץ בנון [*Ez* 18,10] והוליד בן פריץ [*2 Sam* 9,12]

[*Lev* 1,5] בן חכם בן כסיל ופי" בן שהוא חכם במ"ז ושחט את בן הבקר

בן ישראלית [*Lev* 24,10] בן יברכיהו [*Is* 8,2] בן משלמיה [*1Cr* 9,21]

בן יאיר [*Est* 2,5] בן משלם [many passages] בן ברכיה [*Neh* 6,18]

וכל מבן ומבן הלבן פתח

The masorah seems to be a little confused. The *sîman* בן משלם 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 בן כסיל (*Prov* 17,25 or 19,13) and in בן חכם (*1 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 *bêt* or under the *nûn*. The masorah omits the case of *Gen* 17,17, and gives the *sîman* בן משלם. In the *Masorah Finalis,* Ben Hayyîm gives also another note too: בן ז בטע פתחי וסימ נמסר בפרשת ויצא וע"ש. 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 בֶן ששי and writes דְ צרי במקף in MP. Once again, the masorah protects the minority reading. The second note corresponds to the word בֶן and gives the four *sîmanîm* in MM:

ולמפיבשת בן קטן [*Gen* 30,19] בן ד קמצין במקף וסימנהון ותלד בן ששי ליעקוב

והוליד [*1 Sam* 22,20] וימלט בן אחד ושמו מיכה [*2 Sam* 9,12] ושמו מיכא

[*Ez* 18,10] בן פריץ

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 בֶן שׁשׁי, says ד במק in MP, and the second one, corresponding to the word בֶן, writes the four *sîmanîm* in MM and adds the seven cases where the ב is vocalized with *sĕgôl* because of the accent as follows:

ליעקב דֶ קמ במק וסימנהון ותלד בֶן שׁשׁי [*Gen* 30,19] וימלט בן אחד
[*Ez* 18,10] והוליד בֶן פריץ [*2 Sam* 9,12] ולמפבשת בֶן קטן [*1 Sam* 22,20]
וחלופיהון בֶן במארי ופת ז וסימניון הֵבֶן מאה שׁנה [*Gen* 17,17] ושחט את בֶן
הבקר [*Lev* 1,5] בֶן הישׂראלית [*Lev* 24,10] בֶֽן יברכיהו [*Is* 8,2] בֶן משׁלמיהו
[*1 Chr* 9,21] בֶן יאירבן שמעי [*Est* 2,5] בֶן ברכיה [*Neh* 6,18]

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 *maqqef* and *ṣêreh*, and gives the *sîmanîm* in MM:

ד מקפין בתרתין נקוטין מטעיין בֶן שׁשׁי [*Gen* 30,19] בֶן אחד [*1 Sam* 22,20]
בֶן קטן [*2 Sam* 9,12] בֶן פריץ [*Ez* 18,10]

In the other cases it has no masorah.

About these two different informations, Frensdorff[10] explains: «בֶן with accent (without *maqqef*) is vocalized with *ṣêreh,* except in six or seven cases, where it is vocalized with *sĕgôl.* On the contrary, when בן has no accent but *maqqef*, it is vocalized with *sĕgôl,* except in four cases where is vocalized with *ṣêreh*». 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 Yĕdidyah Shĕlomoh de Norzi's *Minḥaṭ Šay.* In his comments on *Gen* 30,7 he writes: «שׁפחת רחל בן שׁני ליעקב: The *bêṭ* with *ṣêreh* in the correct codices and without *maqqef*, as in בן שׁני ליעקב, which is close to this one (*Gen* 30,12). In the *Miqrah Gĕdôlah* it appears with *ṣêreh* and *maqqef* and says: בן with *maqqef* has always *pataḥ* (explanation: with *sĕgôl*), except in four instances. The *maqqef* is erroneous and what is here written corresponds to another passage, בן שׁשׁי in *Gen* 30,19, as is written in the masorah».

In his comments on *1 Sam* 22,20 writes: «וַיִּמָּלֵט בֶּן־אֶחָד: four times with *ṣêreh* and *maqqef,* and its *sîmanîm* are ותלד בן שׁשׁי ליעקב (*Gen* 30,19); *1 Sam* 22,20; והוליד בן פריץ (*Ez* 18,10) and ולמפיבשת בן קטן (*2 Sam* 9,12)».

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

---

[10] S. FRENSDORFF, *Massorah Magna* (New York 1968) p. 35, בן, note 2.

vocalized with *sĕgôl* but this is not correct, as the masorah of the *parašâ* ויצא (*Gen* 30,19) says, because this passage is one of the four cases vocalized with *ṣêreh*».

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 *Minḥat 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 Biblia 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 Hayyîm 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 Hayyîm editions as well.