

From The Archives of theSamaritanUpdate.com

All Rights Reserved Copyright © 2018

REPRINTED FROM THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW
NEW SERIES
VOLUME XXXIV, NUMBER 1

THE SCHOLIA TO NUMBERS AND
DEUTERONOMY IN THE SAMARITAN-
ARABIC PENTATEUCH

By

DR. A. S. HALKIN

PHILADELPHIA

THE DROPSIE COLLEGE FOR HEBREW AND COGNATE LEARNING

1943

THE SCHOLIA TO NUMBERS AND
DEUTERONOMY IN THE SAMARITAN-
ARABIC PENTATEUCH*

By A. S. HALKIN

Columbia University and Brooklyn College

OF THE Samaritan-Arabic version of the Pentateuch, the books of Genesis, Exodus and Leviticus were published by Abraham Kuenen in 1851, and Deuteronomy 1-11 by Joseph Bloch in 1901. It is unfortunate that almost two books are still not available to students. Pending their uncertain appearance, I am publishing the Scholia (Sch.) to them, which are found in two MSS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale¹ and in one MS. belonging to the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America.² Like the *ḥāshiyas* (marginal notes) to the first three books of the Pentateuch, these are of varied content: linguistic, exegetic, theologic and polemic. They afford a little additional information on the religious and cultural world of the medieval Samaritan, and it would reward a student to give his time to a translation and study of the previously published Sch.

Apart from their intrinsic interest, these Sch. have a bearing on the problem of the authorship of the Arabic

* For technical reasons it was found necessary to transcribe the Arabic into Hebrew characters.

¹ Nos. 5 and 6. In Kuenen's edition [Leyden, 1851] (and in this article) they are called B and C respectively.

² Adler collection No. 1808 (A in this article). I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to the Library of the Seminary and, in particular, to its director, Prof. Alexander Marx, for their generous help and cooperation.

translation of the Samaritan Pentateuch. As the question forms the subject of a study in which I am at present engaged,³ it will be stated here in brief for the purpose of clarifying the pertinence of our material to it.⁴

In prefaces attached to the translation found in the two Paris MSS. which contain the Sch., a claim of authorship is made. But whereas in one of the two MSS. the alleged author is *Abu Sa'īd b. Abu-l-Husain b. Abu Sa'īd*, the alleged author in the other is *Abu Barakāt b. Sa'īd al-Baṣri al-Suryāni*.⁵ This double claim has been variously settled by scholars since the days of Sylvestre de Sacy. The solution which won the approval of Paul Kahle,⁶ the unquestioned specialist in this field, is the one suggested by Joseph Bloch in his doctoral dissertation referred to above.⁷ According to it, Abu-l-Barakāt is a plagiarist whose claim deserves no consideration, and Abu Sa'īd did not translate, but revised a previously existing version and added the Sch. We do not know who the original author is, but it may be the tenth or eleventh-century Samaritan scholar Abu-l-Ḥasan al-Ṣūri to whom the Samaritans wrongly, according to the preface, attribute the work. Since the appearance of Bloch's statement a good deal of additional material has been examined, and one may hope for more positive information on the authorship, originality and date of the older Samaritan-Arabic version.

³ A sketch of the study was presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in December, 1936.

⁴ A good summary of the problem and some solutions is available in Josef Bloch *Die samaritanisch-arabische Pentateuchübersetzung*, Deut. I-XI, 4-12.

⁵ Both prefaces, with Latin translations, will be found in Sylvestre de Sacy, *Mémoire sur les versions arabes des livres de Moïse, à l'usage des Samaritains*, 52-58. Kuenen, *l. c.*, 2-3, contains the Arabic only.

⁶ See his review of Bloch's dissertation in *Zeit. f. hebr. Bibliogr.*, vi (1902), 6-8, and also *Die arabischen Bibelübersetzungen*, p. XI.

⁷ *l. c.*, 12-16.

The Sch. present a difficulty in the way of the proposed solution. In a number of cross-references to Pentateuchal passages which are found in them, the reading does not agree with the Samaritan-Arabic Textus Receptus (TR). In the following list, the column on the left contains the readings which occur in the Sch., and the right column the version of TR. The numbers in parentheses refer to the pages in Kuenen's edition.^{7a}

Gen. 25.23 (13)		
ולמא כאן פי אלגורוב אכד לאה בנחה	פלמא כאן באלעשי אכד לאה בנחה	
Gen. 35.12 (248)		
ואלארץ אלחי נעלת לאברהים	ואלארץ אלחי אעטית לאברהים	
Ex. 10.29 (182)		
לא אעאוד איצא לנטר וגהך	לא אעאוד איצא נטר וגהך	
Ex. 13.21 ⁸		
ואללה סאר בין איריהם	ומלאך אללה סאר בין יריהם	
Ex. 14.12 ⁹		
אנקטע אלאן ענא לנכדם	אנקטע אלאן לנכדם	
Ex. 15.24 ¹⁰		
פשעב אלקום עלי מוסי מא נשרב	פשעב אלקום עלי מוסי קאילין מא נשרב	
Ex. 19.20 (253)		
ונאדי אללה במוסי	ונאדי אללה מוסי	
Ex. 32.14 (23)		
תואעד אן יגעלהא בקומה	תואעד אן יחלהאיי בקומה	
Lev. 14.46 (300)		
ואלדאכל אלי אלבית כל איאם תחגירה	ואלדאכל אלי אלבית כל איאם אעתואלה	
Lev. 18.24 (298)		
לא תתנגסוא בכל הדה	לא תתנגסוא בשיג מן הדה	

^{7a} Passages from Nu. and Dt. are taken from the text of the Sch. published herewith and the TR of MS. A.

⁸ See below, p. 53.

⁹ Ib.

¹⁰ Ib.

¹¹ C: יגעלהא

Lev. 20.25 (6)	ותמיווא בין אלבהא'ים אלטאהרה ואלטמ'יה	פלתמ'יווא בין אלבהא'ים אלטאהרה מן אלנגסה
Lev. 20.25 (299)	ולא תרגסוא אנפסכם בבהימ'ה ובטא'יר	ולא תרגסוא אנפסכם בבהימ'ה או בטא'יר
Lev. 23.5 (339)	פי ראבע עשר מן אלשהר	פי ארבע'ה עשר יומא מן אלשהר
Lev. 23.32 (339)	פי אלחאסע מן אלשהר	פי חאסע מן אלשהר
Lev. 25.12 (346)	מן אדחקל חאכלון גלאתהא	מן אלצחרא. חאכלוא גלאתהא
Nu. 14.14 ¹²	ללמבצר ללבצר תגלית אנת יא אללה	אלדי עיאנא תגלית אנת יא אללה
Ex. 23.8 (213)	אן אלרשא יעמי עיון אלבצרא.	אן אדרשא. יעמי בצא'יר אלבצרא.
Dt. 16.19 (213)	אן אלרשא יעמי אבצאר אלחכמא.	אן אלרשא יעמי. בצא'יר אלבצרא.
Dt. 29.3 (194)	קלכא ללעלם ואעינא ללנטר	קלכא ללעלם ועיונא ללנטר
Dt. 32.36 (24)	אן ידין אללה קומה	אד ידין אללה קומה
Dt. 9.26 (247)	לא תהלך שעבך ונחלתך	לא תהלך קומך ונחלתך
Dt. 33.2 ¹³	ואגהר מן גבל פאראן	למע מן גבל פאראן
Dt. 34.7 (255)	לם תכל עינאה ולם תדהב טראותה	ילם כלתא עינאה ולם דהבת טראותה

The differences between the citations in the Sch. and TR compel us to re-examine the accepted conclusion that Abu Sa'id was both scholiast and reviewer. It may possibly be maintained that he prepared the Sch. before revising the text, and that while he was engaged in the

¹² See below, p. 57.

¹³ Ib.

¹⁴ As the passage (the verses in Nu. and Dt. [exc. 1-11] are taken from A, the only MS. at my disposal) occurs on a folio in a much later hand than the body of the MS. it may be a copyist's error.

former he cited passages as he found them in the version which he utilized. This possibility may even seem to be strengthened by the discrepancy between the reading of Sch. and that of TR in Exod. 23.8 and Dt. 16.19, for the comment: *אלמראד באלאעין ואלאבצאר פי אלמכאנין אלבצאיר* is added to the scholion, and it is indeed the word *בצאיר* which is found in TR in both places. But it is very unlikely that after revising the existing translations he neglected to collate his scholia with his new text.^{14a} Moreover, a remark in the Sch. on p. 247 eliminates this possibility. In the discussion of the passage . . . *למה יהוה יחרה אפך בעמך* . . . it is stated: *אנמא אכרתת פי תרגומה למה*: *אלאולי לא לאנהא מבדא אלשפאעה מתל קולה פימא ימאתלהא פי אלשפאעה לא תהלך שעבך וגחלתך ומה בעדה ולהא נטאיר מתל למה לי חיים ותרגמת למה אלהאניה כילא ולהא נטאיר כתירה מן גמלתהא למה נמות לעיניך*.¹⁶ Now TR does render the first *למה* by *lā*, but the second rendered *לילא* (unless the editor of the printed TR misread *כילא* for *לילא* in the Sch.). If, however, my interpretation of the glossator's note is correct, we should expect *lā* in Gen. 27, 46 and *kailā* or *lailā* in Gen. 47, 19. Instead of these particles we find *mā*¹⁷ in the first passage and *lima*¹⁸

^{14a} A curious situation confronts us in Gen. 18.12, where TR has *לדה*. The same reading is found in the Sch. to Dt. 29.3, but in the Sch. to Ex. 14.15 we read *לדה*.

¹⁵ Ex. 32.11, 12.

¹⁶ "I have decided to render the first *למה* *lā* (not), because it is at the beginning of an intercessory prayer, like the statement in a similar prayer 'Destroy not Thy people and Thine inheritance.' We find other parallels for it, such as 'I shall have no life' (Gen. 27.46). I translated the second *למה* *kailā* (lest). It finds many examples, among them 'lest we die before thine eyes' (Gen. 47.19)."

¹⁷ *פמא לי אלחיוה*. Arabic usage certainly requires *mā* in preference to *lā*, and the substitution might therefore be regarded as a concession to good usage. But considering the scholiast's general faithfulness to the original and the fact that he makes special mention of this passage to illustrate his choice of words, it is not likely that he wrote *mā* instead of *lā*.

¹⁸ *פלס נמות במשאהדתך*.

in the second. Taking into consideration the fidelity of the Samaritan-Arabic version to the Hebrew original, the divergence between TR and the indications in the Sch. provides a very strong argument against the suggestion that Abu Sa'id is both scholiast and reviser of TR.

It is equally difficult to assume that he did only one of the two things with which he is credited: that he is either the scholiast or the reviser. If we accept his statement in the Preface, there is no reason for regarding one claim as more trustworthy than the other. He specifically mentions his role both as *mutarjim*¹⁹ and as scholiast,²⁰ and speaks of copies which he has revised and of copies which he will write subsequently. He also refers to his work in the passage cited above.

The most plausible conclusion is that although Abu Sa'id performed both tasks, he was not the last person to turn his attention to the Arabic version. While his glosses were adopted, his text underwent further revision.²¹ This will explain the discrepancies between the citations in the Sch. and TR, and will at the same time allow Abu Sa'id due credit for all the work he claims he did.

¹⁹ אקתצת אלמצלחה ענדי אן אתרום הדה אלנסכה ומה תקדמהא ומה קד אכתב בעדהא
²⁰ אלהואשי אלתי עליהא אסתכראני ממה ודי אליהא אנהאדי

²¹ In his review, as well as in the *Übersetzungen*, Kahle states that it is necessary to assume one or more revisions of Abu Sa'id's text. In this my conclusion agrees with his. But the list of variants presented in this paper argues against Kahle and Bloch who regard B as "an essentially faithful copy of the text as revised by Abu Sa'id" and against Kahle's assertion that "die mit samaritan. Buchstaben geschriebenen [HSS.] den alten Text bieten, die mit arabisch geschriebenen den von Abu Sa'id revidierten Text." The three MSS. utilized by Kuenen for his edition and the Adler MS. utilized by me (all written in Arabic characters) show the results of later revision. It is of interest to point out that in the large Samaritan commentary by Meshalma and others, 15th century and later, translations of Biblical verses often diverge from TR. This is further confirmation of the conclusion that the adopted version is comparatively recent.

וקרבו אלרסא קרבאן אלמדבח פי יום מסחה וקרבו אלרסא קרבאנהם
 בחצרה אלמדבח
 קרבאן אלמדבח וידלו עלי צחה הדה אלטרומה קולה וכאן אלמקרב
 קרבאנה פי אליום אלאל וכדלך מא בעדה מן אלאיאם וליס פי אללנה
 אלערביה תעשין

ולכן ובקאי אנא ומא ימלא אלארץ מן גלאל אללה
 אלמראד בקולה ומא ימלא אלארץ מן גלאל אללה אנקיאד אלכלק אלי
 דין אלתוחיד ואלשריעה אלכאמלה ולא בד מן טהור רגל מויד מן אללה עז וגל
 יחצל דלך עלי ידה ואללה אעלם
 ואמא אלעשר אלמתחאנאת פאולהא במצר חין ואנהוא¹ אלרסול עליה
 אלסלאם בקולהם אנקטע אלן ענא לנכדם אלמצריין ותמאמה ותאניהא
 מקאבלתהם לה בדלך בעינה עלי אלבחר ותאלתהא פי מרה חסב קולה פשגבי
 אלקום עלי מוסי מא נשרב וראבעהא פי בריה סין אד קאלוא יא לית מתנא ביד
 אללה פי ארץ מצר ותמאמה וכאמסהא פי רפידים חית שאנרוא ושנבוא בסבב
 עדם אלמא² וסאדסהא פי בריה סיני אלטאמה אלכברי וסאבעהא ותאמנהא פי
 קבור אלשהוה פאלסאבע חסב קולה וכאן אלקום כאלמתענתין שרא ואלתאמן
 קולהם מן יטעמנא לחמא ותמאמה ומא תקדמה איצא ותאסעהא ועאשרהא פי
 בריה פראן פי קדם ענד חצור אלנואסיס פאלתאסע חסב קולה פדמדס בנו
 אסראיל פי מצארבהם ותמאמה ואלעאשר אעלאנהם באלבכא ומא תבעה מן
 אלגרמאת אלפאסדה ואללה אעלם ומא יליק בחאשיה עלי סביל אלתנכית
 אכתר מן הדא אלביאן

פליקרוב אלמקרב קרבאנה ללה הדיה סמידא עשרא מלחותא ברבע אלקסט
 אלקסט אלף וכמס מיה באלרבע אלמתעאמל בה בדמשק אליי אלן
 חקיקתה מן חסאב אלשובך ורבעה יקארב עשר ויבה³ וזנא⁴

פקאל אללה למוסי קדם לך יושע בן נון אלרגל אלדי נבחה פיה ואסנד ירך עליה
 ולתנצבה בחצרה אלעאזר אלך ותגעל מן בהאיך עליה
 אעלם אלהמך אללה אלהדי ועצמך מן אלהוי אנני למא וקפת עלי אכתר
 נסך אלעבארה אלתי באירי אצחאבנא וגדת תרגמה הדה אלסורה תעצבא עלי
 יושע עליה אלסלאם פאללה יקאבל אלפיומי אלדי משוא אצחאבנא עלי
 תרגמתה ואלדי ראיתה פי תרגמה קח קדם נטיר קול יעקוב עליה אלסלאם

¹ C: . missing

² A: + אלסיד.

³ C: ו

⁴ B: ושנבוא פי מרה.

⁵ B and C: כאלמתנבתיין.

⁶ A: באלדרהם.

⁷ Not in A.

^{7a} C: אלוביה (so also de Sacy); A indistinct.

⁸ This note is not found in B.

קדמהמא אלי לאבארכהמא וקולה רוח בו מענאה נבוה פיה מתל קולה ללרסול
 סלאם אללה עליה ואסתכלץ מן אלנבוה אלתי עליך וקולה והעמדת אתו
 מענאה ולתנצבה פי הדא^{8a} אלמנצב אלגליל אלשריף בחצור גמיע אלאמה ופי
 נמלתהם אלעזר ואיתמר ופינחס עליהם אלסלאם אנמעין וקד ורד פי לפטה
 עמר קולה עז וגל הודא אנא קאים אמאמך ויריד בה אלמאלאך וקד ורד מתל
 דלך פי אלחקדיר אלמחרוץ מן אללפט אלחאבת פי אלמעני כתיר מתל קולה
 ואללה סאר בין אידיהם ותמאמה וכדלך קולה פאן אליום אללה מנגל לכס
 וקולה ותנעל מן בהאיך עליה הו לבאס מן מלאבס אלנור ואללה אעלם¹⁰

ואכדוא כל אלסלב וכל אלפי מן אלנאס ומן אלבהאים
 אלפי משרד גיר מהמוז פצלה אלנהב ואלפי מכפף טל אלשמס וגיראה

ויתחול אלחכם מן עצמונה אלי נהר מצר ויכון כרוגה אלי אלבחר
 נהר מצר הו ואדי אלעריש והו יחד אלשאם מן תלך אלגהה ודוראנהי בעץ
 אלסנה

ואלחביון אלסכאן פי אלארבאץ אלי גוה ואלתפאחיון אלכארגון מן תפאחה
 אסתאצלהם וסכנוא בלאדהם

קיל אנהא עסקלאן ואנהא תערף בתפאחה אלשאם

ולם ינעל אללה לכס קלבא ללעלם ועינוא ללנטר ואדאנא ללסמע אלי אליום
 הדא

הדא סאל אסתבעאד בל אסתחאלה ומתלה קול סארה עליהא אלסלאם
 בעד בלאי תכון לי לדה¹² ומולאי שייך¹³

ידבחון למשידאת לא ללה אלהה לא יערפונהא מחדתה ען קרב אתת ולם
 יתאלההא אבאוכם

אעלם אידך אללה אן סעאדה אלפיומי עאלם אליהוד קאבלה אללה למא
 תרגם הדה אללפטה קאל ידבחון ללשיאטין ומא אערף¹⁴ לה עדרא פי דלך ולא
 מא יסתנד אליה ולו כאן אלאמר עלי מא דכרה כאן דכר פי סור אלכליקה
 לאנה עין פיהא גמיע מא פי אלעאלמין אלעלוי ואלספלי חתי אחסן מא יכון והו
 דביב אלארץ ואלקאילון בהם אלחאמא במקתצי מדהבהם יזעמון אנהם מן
 אלטף אלמכלוקאת חתי אנהם יכרקון אלארץ אלתי הי סכנהם ויצעדון
 ויכרקונהא וינולון ולא יטהר פי אלארץ שי מן אלכרק ועלי הדא אלחכם תכון

^{8a} So A; C: הדה.

⁹ A: אלמחיוף.

¹⁰ This Sch. is not found in B.

^{10a} This Sch. is found only in A.

¹¹ The last three words are missing in C.

¹² MSS: לדה.

¹³ The Sch. is missing in A.

¹⁴ C: ערף.

אכתף מן סאיר אלארציאת עלי מא דכרה ארסטו כביר אלפלאספה חית קאר
אללטאיף סמאוייה ואלכתאיף ארציה פתבת אן לא וגוד לשיאטין שרעא ועקלא
ופלספה ואללה¹⁵ אעלם¹⁶

קלת ארונהם ואעטל מן אלמלאיכה דכרהם
אעלם אידך אללה אן לפטה אנוש ורדת פי אלכתאב אלשריף פי אמאכן
עדידה ומא להא כרוג ען אלמלאיכה וקרית באלואו וכתבת פי אלנסך כדלך
מא עדא רק לאנשים האלה והי פי פצול אלכלאף אלתי בינא ובין אליהוד
ענדנא באלואו וענדהם בניר אלואו ותלך אלפצול חררת תחרירא וקף עליה
מלך חכים כאן חאכמא בינא וביניהם ואהל דלך אלעצר אקרב אלי אלרסול
סלאם אללה עליה מנא בנחו אלף וכמס מיה סנה וקד ברהנת קבאלה לתדכרוא
פי חצרה אללה אלהכס באן אלדכר ענדה עז וגל לא יכון אלא מנהם אד לים
ענדה גל ותעאלי נאטק סואהם עליהם אלסלאם ואללה אעלם

אללה מן סיני אתי ואשרף מן אלשער להם למע מן גבל פאראן ומעה מן רבואת
אלקדם ען ימינה נאר שריעה להם

קולה¹⁷ אללה מן סינא אתי אלמראד בה גלאל אללה אתי באיאת באהראת
לאן אלאתיאן מן צפאת אלגואהר והו תעאלי יכתף בצפאת אלחנזיה אד לים
הו גוהר ולא ערצא ולא כמיה ולא כיפיה ולא זמאן ולא מכאן ולא ינפעל ולא
ימלך ולא יצאף ולא ישבה בשיא סבחאנה ולמתל הדא אללקדיר בעינה נטיר
והו קולה פאן אליום אללה מנגל¹⁸ לכם וחקק אללקדיר קולה ותגלי גלאל אללה
לכל אלקום ונטאירה פי אללקדיר אלמחרוף אכתר מן אן יעד ואלאשארה
בהדא אלאתיאן אלי אלמוקף אלעטם אלדי תלא עז וגל פיה אלעשר
כלמאת ופצלת פיה אלאיאת אלמשרוחה פי אלנף פכאן חצור הדה אלאיאת
קאם מקאם חצורה גל ותעאלי ולהדא נטיר והו קולה ללמבצר ללבצר תגלית
אנת יא אללה והדא אלקול ידכל תחתה הדא אלמוקף וגירה מן אלמענוזאת
אלחאדחה במצר ובאלבחר ובאלבריה וקולה ואשרף מן אלשער להם ואגהר
מן גבל פראן אלמראד בה לזום אלחנה לבני אלעים ובני אסמאעיל אלמנתסבין
אלי אברהים עליה אלסלאם צאחב אלעהד אולא פי אתבאע אלשריעה
אלמקדסה וידל דלך עלי זלאזל חדתת ענדהם פי דלך אליום ובראיך ורואעד¹⁹
ומא יבעד ענדי אן יכונוא סמעוא צות אלבוק איצא והאתאן אלנאחיתאן
קריבתאן מן סינא וליס למא יתעלק בה מן זעם אן גבל פראן אלמשאר אליה
באלחנזא צחה לאן בריה פראן חחד ארץ אלשאם מן אלגנוב ובהא מדינה תסמי
קדם והי פי טרף חכם בני אלעים חסב קולה והו דא נחן פי קדם מדינה פי טרף
תכמך והי פי בריה תערף בבריה צין ואין אלחנזא מן ארץ אלשאם הם אן

¹⁵ This phrase not found in C.

¹⁶ This and the following Sch. are not in A.

¹⁷ The Sch. is missing in C.

¹⁸ MS: מנגלי.

¹⁹ MS: וברפרק ואעוד. The copy of the rest of the Sch. is executed very carelessly in the MS.

אלאלפאט אלוארדה פי הדה אלסורה תדל עלי מא מצי מן אלזמאן ואלדי
 יתעלק בה ארבאב אלשבה ולא צחה לה וידל עלי זעמהם עלי מא סיאתי וכיף
 ינוז פי עקל עאקל אן אלשריעה אלמקדסה תבשר עמן יבטל אחכאמהא ויביח²⁰
 מהרמאתהא ויחרם²¹ אבאחתה אן הדא אלא בהת צראח ואללה אעלם
 ולא אערף מן דהב אלי דלך אלא מן כרג ען אלמדהב תוצילא אלי מן אנתקל
 אליהם ולקד טהר²² בני ובין אלחכים אברהים אבן אלשאער פי מנלס אלצאחב
 בן גריר²³ פי הדא אלמעני ופי קולה במאד מאד ופי לגוי גדול אשיא אחבה פיהא
 באמור שרעיה ודלאיל עקליה בטלאן זעמה ומא יליק בחאשיה עלי סביל
 אלחנכיח אכתר מן הדא אלשרח ואללה אעלם

Nu. 7.10 — And the princes brought the offering of the altar on the day that it was anointed, even the princes brought their offerings before the altar.

That this rendering is correct¹ is proved by the verse "And he that presented his offering the first day," and the similar phrases for the following days. The vocable *Ta'shīn* does not occur in Arabic.

Nu. 14.21 — But by my life and as the earth will be filled with the glory of God.

²⁰ MS: ויבח.

²¹ MS: . . . יאמהא אנ, which I do not understand. Perhaps originally: ויחרם מא אבאחתה.

²² MS: צהר.

²³ The reading is conjectural. MS: ג/ח/כ-רי/כ-ך.

¹ The reference is to the rendering of חנכה by the word offering. While it is essentially correct, the Hebrew term could be rendered more literally, as Saadia does (דשן); according to the medieval commentator *ibn Bal'am*, Saadia used חדשין which the former terms a vulgarism; see Katten, *Untersuchungen zu Saadias arabische Pentateuchübersetzung*, 13). The word תעשין, which the Sch. rejects occurs in three Sam.-Arab. MSS, Katten, *ib.*

Despite Abu Sa'id's objections, we find the seventeenth century commentator Meshalma employing this word. In his comment on הניח (Gen. 4,17; MS. Columbia, 39b) he explains: וסמאהא עלי אסם אבנה אי אנהא נדידה ומעני נדידה משתק מן חנכו אי עשנה ומן חנכה אי עשנהא ומן חנכה אי עשנה.

"He named it after his son, i. e., new The meaning new is derived from *h^anākō*, i. e., 'aššānahu and *h^anākah*, i. e., 'aššānaha and *h^anukkal*, i. e. 'ušūnā."

The purport of this verse is to predict that mankind will adopt the religion which teaches God's unity and the perfect Law. Most certainly a man empowered by God will arise through whom this will be achieved. But God knows best.²

The ten proofs³ are as follows: The first occurred in Egypt, when they confronted the Messenger with the demand: "Let us alone that we may serve the Egyptians."⁴ The second happened when they faced him at the Red Sea with the same demand.⁵ The third was in Marah, as we are told: "And the people murmured against Moses (saying): What shall we drink?"⁶ The fourth took place in the Wilderness of Sin where they said: "Would that we had died by the hand of the Lord in the land of the Egyptians, etc."⁷ The fifth was in Refidim when they complained and quarreled because there was no water.⁸ The sixth was the great evil in the Wilderness of Sinai.⁹

² Jewish commentators (cf. Rashi, ibn Ezra and others *ad loc.*) also interpret וימלא to allude to the future, but they do not see the eschatological implication which our author discovers. The man "empowered by God" is the *Taheb*, the Samaritan Messiah who will restore the era of good-will. See Marx, *Der Messias oder Ta'eb der Samaritaner*, 11-12 and 29-30.

³ The rest of the Sch. is an enumeration of the ten proofs mentioned; Nu. 14.22 ("... and they put me to proof these ten times"). A list of 15 tests is given in work called עשר במסות והי במסות אלאמתהאנאח והי במסות עשר מקאלה פי תפסיר אלאמתהאנאח ויהי במסות עשר in de Jong's *Catalogus Codicum Orientalium*, p. 63. Some Jewish commentators, such as ibn Ezra and Rashbam, regard ten as meaning many, but we find numerous lists of the ten proofs in rabbinic literature; cf. Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, vi, 121, note 708 for bibliography (add Mishna of R. Eliezer, ed. Enelow, 175). None of the lists counts two at Paran as our text does.

⁴ Ex. 14.12.

⁵ The proof, if it is different from the first, is not clear to me.

⁶ Ex. 15.24.

⁷ Ex. 16.3.

⁸ Cf. Ex. 17.1-7.

⁹ The story of the Golden Calf, Ex. 32-33. In some Rabbinic sources (e. g., *Sifre ad Deut.* ed. Finkelstein, 6) this act is similarly regarded as the most grievous: אמר להם האי יהרהר לכל מה שעשיתם מעשה עגל קשה עלי מן הכל

The seventh and the eighth both took place in the Graves of Lust; the seventh according to the account beginning "And the people were as murmurers,"¹⁰ and the eighth was their demand "Would that we were given flesh to eat,"¹¹ and all that precedes and follows it. The ninth and tenth occurred in the Wilderness of Paran at Kadesh when the spies returned; the ninth as it is related in the story beginning "And the children of Israel murmured in their tents, etc.,"¹² and the tenth was their loud crying and the severe punishments which followed it.¹³ But God knows best. A more detailed scholion than this is not in place here.

Nu. 15.4 — Then shall he that bringeth his offering present unto the Lord a meal-offering of a tenth part of an ephah of fine flour mingled with the fourth part of a hin.

The *Ḳist*¹⁴ equals 1500 dirhems according to the *rub'* which is in use in Damascus at present. Its true value is established by the manner of reckoning at Shawbak.¹⁵ A quarter of a Kist equals a tenth of a *waiba*¹⁶ in weight.

Nu. 28.18 — And the Lord said unto Moses: Make Joshua son of Nun advance — the man in whom is prophecy, and rest thy hand upon him; and set him before Eleazar the priest And thou shalt put of thy splendor upon him . . .

¹⁰ Nu. 11.1.

¹¹ Nu. 11.4.

¹² Nu. 13.33 acc. to the Samaritan Pentateuch. The passage is based on Deut. 1.27-33.

¹³ Nu. 14.1 ff.

¹⁴ This Sch. is edited and translated in de Sacy, *l. c.*, 146. A similar note on the word *Ḳist* appears ad Lev. 23.13 and is reproduced in de Sacy, 144, and Kuenen, 337.

¹⁵ A fortified town in Transjordan, near Karak. Yaḳūt, iii, 332.

¹⁶ A dry measure equal to 22 or 24 *muddas* or $\frac{1}{8}$ of an *ardeb*, in use in modern Egypt.

Know¹⁷ — may God grant you guidance and preserve you from evil desires — that upon examining most of the copies of the Arabic version which are used by our fellow-Samaritans I found the translation of this verse suggesting that Joshua was taken by force. May God punish al-Fayyūmi¹⁸ whose rendering our coreligionists have followed.¹⁹ The appropriate translation, in my opinion, is “make Joshua to advance,” an expression similar to that of Jacob: “Make them to approach me and I will bless them.”²⁰

The words *רוח בו* signify prophecy, as in God's statement to the Messenger: “And I will take of the prophecy (*רוח*) which is upon thee.”²¹ The phrase *והעמדת אתו* means: You shall set him up in this exalted and glorious office in the presence of the entire community, including Eleazar, Ithamar and Phinehas. The term *עמד* is employed in the clause “Behold I stand before thee;” the reference there is to the angel. Numerous passages have come down which illustrate the metaphorical use of words, as, for example, “and the Lord went before them,”²³ or “for today the Lord appeareth unto you.”²⁴ The expression “and thou shalt put of thy splendor upon him” refers to one of the cloaks of light.²⁵ But God knows best.

¹⁷ This Sch. is edited and translated in de Sacy, *l. c.*, 147.

¹⁸ I take this occasion to correct an assertion made by Katten, *l. c.*, 35, that Abu Sa'id mentions Saadia twice by name, Gen. 37.3 and Ex. 4.24. To these, the mention of Saadia here and ad Deut. 32.17 is to be added.

¹⁹ The Cambridge MS. (Add. 714) translates *נר* like Saadia.

²⁰ Gen. 48.9.

²¹ Nu. 11.17

²² Ex. 17.6. Saadia likewise paraphrases it: *האנא מוקף דלילא*, behold I shall set up a sign.

²³ Ex. 13.21.

²⁴ Lev. 9.4.

²⁵ De Sacy takes this phrase to signify the priestly garments, or garments which indicate sovereignty. It seems to me that the reference is rather to spiritual endowment. This would be more suitable to the

Nu. 31.11 — And they took all the spoil, and all the prey, both of man and of beast.

The particular meaning of *al-fai* with a *teshdīd* and without a *hamza* is booty; *al-fai* without *teshdīd* means shade, etcetera.^{25a}

Nu. 34.5 — And the border shall turn about from Azamona unto the brook of Egypt, and the goings out thereof shall be at the Sea.

The Brook²⁶ of Egypt is Wadi al-'Arīsh, which forms the boundary of Shām on that side.²⁷ It flows only part of the year.

Deut. 2.23 — And the *Ḥabiyūn* that dwelt in villages as far as Gaza, — the Tuffāḥis²⁸ that came forth out of Tuffāḥa, destroyed them and dwelt in their stead.

Some say this is Askalon, for it is known as Tuffāḥat al-Shām.²⁹

Deut. 29.3 — Hath not the Lord given you a heart to know, and eyes to see, and ears to hear, unto this day?

Biblical phrase and would also be in full accord with the high regard in which Joshua is held by the Samaritans. We are told in the Samaritan-Arabic Joshua (ed. Juynboll, 2) that Moses was commanded to "lay his hand upon the head of Joshua, the son of Nun, the spiritual man," in the sense "that he should give him information of the profound secrets, etcetera" (the translation is taken from Crane, *The Samaritan Chronicle*, 15-16).

^{25a} The distinction made here is not recorded in the Dictionaries.

²⁶ The note is found in de Sacy, *l. c.*, 149.

²⁷ This is an almost universally accepted identification; cf. Gray on Numbers (ICC), 456.

²⁸ We have here a literal rendering of the Hebrew כפּתּוּר, as is borne out by a comparison of Ex. 25.31 *passim*.

²⁹ I have not been able to find another source for the identification or for the name. Yaḳūt, s. v. 'Asḳalān, reports the title 'Arūs al-Shām, bride of Syria.

This is a rhetorical question, or rather, one which denies the assumption. A question similar to it is: "After I am waxed old shall I have pleasure, my lord being old also?"³⁰

Deut. 32.17 — They sacrificed unto lofty ones(?), not unto the Lord, gods that they knew not, new gods that came up of late, which your fathers deified not.

Know³¹ — may God strengthen you — that Sa'adya al-Fayyumi, Master of the Jews, may God punish him, rendered this word in his translation "they sacrificed unto demons."³² I do not know of any justification which he can offer for this, nor what he used as his authority. If his interpretation were correct, the demons would be mentioned in the chapters on creation, for everything which exists in both the upper and the lower worlds is listed there in detail, even the minutest creatures possible, that is, the creeping things. Now those who find themselves obliged, by the requirements of their doctrines, to believe in demons, maintain that they are the tiniest creatures, able to penetrate the earth where they dwell and ascend or penetrate it and descend without the slightest visible trace of their penetration.³³ But by this reasoning they should be denser than the other earthly beings, for Aristotle, the greatest philosopher has stated: "The fine beings are celestial, and the dense beings are terrestrial." It is therefore established

³⁰ Gen. 18.12. In his note on *מה חצעק אלי* (Ex. 14.15; Kuenen, 193-4) which he also treats as a rhetorical question, the scholiast cites our passage as well as the one from Genesis.

³¹ The Sch. is edited and translated in de Sacy, *l. c.*, 184.

³² Saadia translates: *ידבחותן ללשיאטין*.
³³ An elaborate and illuminating discussion of the Moslem doctrine regarding demons (it is probably of them that the scholiast thinks here) is found in the modern Persian-Arabic *Dictionary of Technical Terms*, ed. Sprenger, 261-6, esp. 263-4. According to Jewish tradition demons have no bodies, Ginzberg, *l. c.*, I, 83, and V, 107 f.

that the demons cannot be proved to exist either from the Law or from Reason or from Philosophy. But God knows best.

Deut. 32.26 — I thought I would make them weak, and I would make their memory cease from among the angels.

Know³⁴ — may God give you strength — that the word אַנוֹשׁ occurs in numerous places in Holy Scripture,³⁵ and its meaning is undoubtedly angels.³⁶ It is read and also written with *Wāw*. The exception is רַק לְאֲנָשִׁים הָאֵלֹהִים, which is one of the points of difference between us and the Jews; for we retain the *Wāw*, whereas they omit it.³⁷ These differences were listed and submitted for examination to a wise king who acted as judge between us and them. The people of that age were some 1500 years nearer to the Apostle than we.³⁸ I have made clear in connection with

³⁴ The Sch. is edited and translated in de Sacy, *l. c.*, 186.

³⁵ This strange assertion (אַנוֹשׁ as a common noun occurs only once in the Pentateuch) means that the scholiast regarded the form אֲנָשִׁים, when it was taken to mean angels, to be the plural of אַנוֹשׁ. This is confirmed by his statement that such words are spelled אֲנָשִׁים, and by an examination of relevant passages (e. g., Gen. 18.2, 16, 18, 22; 19.5, 10, 16, 19) in von Gall's edition of the Sam. Pentateuch where an impressive number of MSS. is listed which carry the *Wāw*. It seems that the editor should have incorporated this reading in his text, since it is apparently backed by Sam. authorities.

³⁶ The Cambridge MS. (Add. 714) reads אֲלֹנָאִים, but others have מְלֵאִיכָה. The commentary on Genesis by Meshalma, which was completed by Ibrahim b. Ya'kūb, follows TR in translating אֲנָשִׁים in Gen. 18.18 by רַסְל, and in conjunction with that it goes into a lengthy discussion of the problem whether they were men or angels, deciding in favor of the latter.

³⁷ The contention that MT agrees with the Sam. text in the spelling of אֲנָשִׁים save in this case has no basis to my knowledge.

³⁸ De Sacy, *ib.*, believes that the scholiast has in mind the alleged disputation between Samaritans and Jews, as reported by Abu-l-Fatḥ (*Annales*, ed. Vilmar, 95–104 Arab.), which took place before Ptolemy. The incident as told by Abu-l-Fatḥ is a garbled version of the well-known story of the Septuagint. The disagreement discussed here is not related in the chronicle.

the verse "and ye shall be remembered before the Lord your God"³⁹ that remembrance before Him can come only through them (the angels), since no rational being save them stands before Him. But God knows best.

Deut. 33.2 — The Lord came from Sinai, and rose from Seir unto them; He shined forth to them from Mount Paran, and with Him the myriads holy, at His right was a fiery law unto them.

The meaning of the expression "the Lord came from Sinai" is that God's glory wrought wonderful miracles. For coming is an attribute of substances, whereas God is distinguished by His freedom from attributes. He is neither substance nor property; He possesses neither quantity nor quality; He is beyond time and space; He is not acted upon nor claimed in ownership; He does not exist in relation, nor does He resemble anything,⁴⁰ exalted be He. We have an exact parallel to this in the interpretation of the verse "for today the Lord appeareth unto you,"⁴¹ and the interpretation is confirmed by the verse "and the glory of the Lord appeared unto all the people."⁴² Examples of this method of interpreting figuratively are too numerous to be counted.

The coming refers to the Great Assembly before which God proclaimed the Ten Commandments, and the miracles alluded to are related in the Scripture. The manifestation of these miracles represented His manifestation. This is paralleled by the phrase "to him who looks at the sight

³⁹ Nu. 10.9. There is no Sch. to this passage, and the translation does not imply the intercession of angels. The author may be referring to another writing of his.

⁴⁰ These are the ten categories of being as defined by Aristotle. The manner of recording them without any consciousness of their foreign origin deserves notice.

⁴¹ Lev. 9.4.

⁴² Lev. 9.23.

didst thou appear, O Lord,"⁴³ which implies this Assembly and other miracles which occurred in Egypt, by the sea and in the Wilderness.

The verse "and He rose from Seir unto them and He proclaimed from Mount Paran" means that the sons of Esau and the sons of Ishmael, who are descended from Abraham, the first party to the Covenant, were offered such proof as obligates them to adhere to the Holy Writ. The reference is to earthquakes, lightning and thunder which occurred in their land on that day. It is, to my mind, not unlikely that they even heard the sounding of the trumpet, since both these districts are near Sinai.⁴⁴

The arguments advanced by those who maintain that the Mount Paran spoken of here is in Ḥejāz, are worthless.⁴⁵ The Wilderness of Paran forms the southern boundary of al-Shām, and in it is situated the city of Kadesh which is at the uttermost of the border of the sons of Esau. This is made clear by the verse "and behold, we are in Kadesh, a city in the uttermost of thy border." It is in the wilderness known by the name of Sin. How does the Ḥejāz come to the land of al-Shām? Moreover, the words recorded in this verse deal with an event in past time. Now the masters in the art of sophistry argue, without any basis in fact,

⁴³ Nu. 14.14. The translation of the versé is very odd.

⁴⁴ We have here the Samaritan version of the well-known Jewish legend that God offered the Torah to other nations (cf. Ginzberg, *l. c.*, III, 80-82). It is interesting that Abu-l-Ḥasan al-Ṣūri, in his comment on this verse in the *Kitāb al-Ṭabākh*, takes the position that as part of the seed of Abraham, Esau and Ishmael were included in the covenant which God made with the Patriarch, according to which the Israelites would come out of Egypt and become a great people. This covenant obligated them, after the Exodus, to turn to Moses, but they failed to do so.

⁴⁵ See the medieval literature on this point of argument in Steinschneider, *Polemische Literatur*, 317-9. See also Paul Kraus, *Hebräische und syrische Zitate in isma'ilitischen Schriften*, *Islam*, 19 (1931), 243-263, esp. 247-250.

that the passage is concerned with what will happen in the future. But how can any intelligent person believe that the Holy Scripture foretells the appearance of one who will annul its precepts, allow what it forbids and forbid what it allows? This is a flagrant calumny, and God knows best. I am not acquainted with any one who believes this except one who has renounced the true faith and attached himself to him whom they have accepted.

A discussion on this subject took place between me and the physician Ibrahīm ibn al-Shā'ir in the presence of the *ṣāhib* ibn Jarīr.⁴⁶ We also talked about the expressions *במאד מאד* and *לגוי גדול*.⁴⁷ On this occasion I demonstrated the worthlessness of his views by means of religious and rational arguments. But a more detailed statement than this is inappropriate for a marginal note, and God knows best.

⁴⁶ I have not been able to establish the identity of the two people named here.

⁴⁷ For the most recent discussion of these arguments cf. M. Perlmann, *Abd-sl-Haḳḳ al-Islāmi a Jewish Convert* (JQR, xxxi [1940]), 181 f. An admirable refutation will be found in Maimonides' *Epistle to Yemen* (Warsaw ed. 1927), 16-18.