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QERE AND KETIV IN THE EXEGESIS OF THE KARAITES AND SAADYA GAON

Joseph Habib

1.0. INTRODUCTION

During the approximate period 500–950 CE, the Tiberian Masoretes set out to commit to writing the accepted reading tradition of the Hebrew Bible.¹ In order to facilitate this preservation, they invented a number of graphic symbols to represent the reading tradition as accurately as possible. These symbols were mapped onto the letters of the received consonantal text. The consonantal text adopted by the Tiberian Masoretes was one that, from a very early period, had been transmitted within mainstream Judaism.

¹ See Yeivin (1980, 1–4, 49–80). To be sure, the process of precise transmission of the Biblical Text far predates the Tiberian Masoretes. M. Avot 1.1 states that Moses transmitted (הּוּמְסָרָ) the Torah to Joshua, and Joshua to the elders, etc. Thus, from its very inception, it was necessary to pass on the text, via an oral tradition, accurately. Hence Dotan’s (2007, 606) statement, “The transmission of the Bible is as old as the Bible itself.” In this regard, Lea Himmelfarb (2007) concludes that the first Masoretes were, in fact, the Temple priests, who regularly engaged in the reading, teaching, and copying of the text.
with great care. One important component of the preservation of the text was safeguarding the correct pronunciation of the consonantal text. The Tiberian Masoretes thus invented the vocalisation signs in order to ensure accurate pronunciation of the text. As a general rule, the consonants and the vocalisation signs are

2 The need for an exemplary scroll made itself felt after the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 CE, when an authoritative text could serve as a unifying element to the Jewish community (Contreras and De Los Ríos-Zarzosa 2010, 28). The Babylonian Talmud also reflects an early concern for the transmission of an accurate text. Mo‘ed Qatan 18b prohibits tampering with the “scroll of Ezra” (ספר עזרא) on particular festival days. Ketubot 106a mentions “proof-readers of the scrolls in Jerusalem” (מגיחי ספרי שבירושלים). According to Qiddushin 30a, there was also an awareness among the Babylonian sages that the authoritative text was located in Jerusalem (Khan 2013, 15–16). Qumran also reflects a situation whereby, as early as the Second Temple period, there was already an established (consonantal) text among mainstream Judaism. According to Tov’s latest estimation, 48 percent of Torah texts reflect the Masoretic Text (MT). Of the remaining portions of scripture, 44 percent reflect the MT, while 49 percent form the so-called ‘non-aligned’ group (Tov 2012, 108). Thus, even among the multiplicity of recensions at Qumran—a community not aligned with mainstream Judaism—a text-type that reflects the MT predominated. This strongly suggests that the situation was similar elsewhere in Palestine, although this cannot be verified (cf. Khan 2013, 22–24).

3 The other components of the Tiberian Masoretic tradition are the layout of the text, divisions of paragraphs, the accent signs, the notes of the text written in the margin, and Masoretic treatises, which were sometimes appended to the end of manuscripts (Khan 2013, 3).
in harmony. In a number of places within the Hebrew Bible, however, the consonantal text and the vocalisation signs reflect two different reading traditions of a particular word or phrase.4

During the process of supplying the consonantal text with the vocalisation signs, such differences between the received consonantal text and the orally transmitted reading tradition became apparent. One clear example was the divine name. Since uttering the form of the name reflected by the consonantal text was prohibited, the consonantal text יהוה was read אדוניה. The result was the form יהוה, in which the vocalisation prompted the reading [ʔədɔˈnəj] instead of that reflected by the consonantal text. Another example is the word written with the consonants עפלים 'tumours (?)' (Deut. 28.27; 1 Sam. 5.6, 9, 12). In these places, the reading tradition requires the word 'haemorrhoids' instead, since it was considered less crass. Superimposing the vowels of טחורים on the consonants עפלים was not, however, considered to be sufficient to trigger the memory of the reader to pronounce טחורים, since this conflict between the consonantal text and the

---

4 Yochanan Breuer (1991, 191), also considering the cantillation marks, remarks, Indeed, even though the connection between these three elements is generally tight, and in our version of the Bible they became a unity, we sometimes find that each one of them goes its own separate way’. See also Hornkohl’s contribution to the present volume.
oral reading only occurs four times, compared with the 6,828 occurrences of the divine name. Thus, a different method for maintaining the written tradition while indicating the oral reading tradition was necessary. In the Aleppo Codex, the consonantional form וּבֵעָפְלָם (Deut. 28.27) is pointed with the vowels of ובשִׁים, ובשִׁים [wuvatt‘oхоːriːm] is read’. The oral reading tradition reflected by the vocalisation was known in the Masoretic tradition as qere ‘(what is) read’ and the written tradition of the received consonantal text was known as ketiv ‘(what is) written’.

Modern research on the phenomenon of qere and ketiv has been concerned primarily with tracing the origins and motivation for differences between the qere and ketiv and with classifying these differences according to various criteria (e.g., morphological, syntactic, euphemistic, etc.). I adopt here the view of scholars such as Barr (1981), Breuer (1997), and Ofer (2019, 85–107), according to which the qere and the ketiv represented parallel traditions. The question arises as to whether both traditions were considered equally authoritative or whether the qere was regarded as more authoritative than the ketiv. In the Talmudic period a practice developed of interpreting Scripture on two levels, one according to the consonantal text (ketiv) and one according to the way it was read (qere). This is reflected in the Talmudic dictum יש אם למקרא ושם אם למשורת The reading has authority and

\[\text{\textsuperscript{5} Ofer (2019, 21).}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{6} For a helpful and concise overview of qere/ketiv scholarship, see Ofer (2009, 271ff.); Contreras (2013, 449–53).}\]
the traditional text has authority’ (Naeh 1992; 1993). Some medieval Karaite scholars, e.g., al-Qirqisānī (Khan 1990a), objected to this practice and recognized the authority of only the reading tradition. In the Middle Ages the Karaites also produced Arabic transcriptions of the Bible that represented only the *qere* (Khan 1992). Some medieval Karaite scholars did, however, accept the possibility of interpreting according to the *ketiv* where it conflicted with the *qere*, e.g., the lexicographer al-Fāsi in his *Kitāb Jāmiʿ al-ʿAlfāẓ* (ed. Skoss 1936, vol. 1, 12–13) and Hadassi (Bacher 1895, 113).

In this paper I shall explore whether and to what extent the early medieval Karaite exegetes and Saadya regarded both the *qere* and the *ketiv* as authoritative bases of their interpretation of Scripture.

2.0. **Purpose and Methodology**

I present here my findings with regard to the extent to which the differences between the *qere* and the *ketiv* are reflected in the exegetical works of the medieval Karaites and Saadya Gaon. A search in Accordance Bible Software for every instance of the *qere/ketiv* in the Hebrew Bible yielded 1,384 hits, from among which I chose samples that were relevant for my investigation. In choosing examples of *qere/ketiv* to analyse, it was necessary that some restrictions were in place. First, I chose only examples from biblical books for which the translations and/or commentaries of Saadya and at least one or two medieval Karaite scholars are extant. The main limitation was that the extant commentaries and
translation of Saadya do not include the entire Bible.\textsuperscript{7} Second, I chose only examples of differences between *qere* and *ketiv* that reflected differences in meaning. Consider the following example:

\begin{quote}
(1) 
כִּי יִמַּי אֲשֶׁר יִבְחַר [יְחַבְּר] עַל קָלָה תְּתוֹם יִשׁ בָּתְּתוּם...
\end{quote}

‘For, whoever is joined to life has hope…’ (Eccl. 9.4a)\textsuperscript{8}

In this example, the *qere* is from the Hebrew root חָבַר, which signifies the ‘joining’ of one person or thing to another. The *ketiv*, however, is from the root בָּחַר, which signifies ‘choosing’. In my translation above, as in most English Bibles, I translated the half-verse according to the *qere*. As will be shown below, a translation of this half-verse according to the *ketiv* would also make perfect sense: ‘For, whoever chooses life has hope.’

In considering examples which make a difference in meaning, two additional caveats applied. First, *qere/ketiv* pairs that differ in agreement between subject and verb, as well as in regard to the antecedents of pronominal/object suffixes were excluded.

\textsuperscript{7} The extant portions include the Pentateuch, Isaiah, Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, and Ezekiel (see Zewi 2015, 31 n. 30).

\textsuperscript{8} In this and following examples, the *ketiv* appears unvocalised, and the *qere* appears vocalised in brackets. In my translations that follow each example, I translate according to the *qere*. In Gordis’s (1971, 152) rubric ‘Unclassified KQ (= ketiv/qere)’, this verse appears in the list ‘Q preferable to K’. This verse does not appear in Cohen’s (2007, 7–11) recent work on *qere* and *ketiv*, the corpus of which was limited to the Pentateuch and Former Prophets.
The reason for this is that the rules governing agreement in Arabic and Biblical Hebrew differ sufficiently that it could not be said for certain whether the Arabic translations of Saadya and the Karaites reflected one of the two options. For example:

(2) וְעָנָוּ וְאָמְרוּ וְיָדֵינֶֽלָוּ לֹֹ֤א שפְכָה ‘And they will testify and say, “Our hands did not shed this blood”’ (Deut. 21.7)

Here, the qere indicates that the reading of this verb should be the 3mpl form, whereas the ketiv reflects either a 3fs form, or a remnant of the archaic 3fpl form of the perfect. Regardless, the translation of the phrase ‘X אָמְרַי יָד ֵ֗לָוּ לֹֹ֤א’ (where ‘X’ represents a form of the verb שָׁפְכָה) into Arabic will not reflect which form the translator was translating. Thus, Saadya translates the above phrase

---

9 This 3fpl form would have dropped out at a later stage of the language due to its similarity to the 3fs of the perfect. Some controversy surrounds the construal of perfect verbs ending in נָ with plural subjects (e.g., here, Num. 43.4; Josh. 15.4; 18.12, 14, 19; 2 Kgs 22.24; Jer. 2.15; 22.6; 50.6; Ps. 73.2; Job 16.16). Gordis (1971, 104–5), Kutscher (1982, 39–40), and Cohen (2007, 77–79) maintain the view that this is indeed a remnant of the archaic third person feminine plural form. Bergsträsser (1962, II.15) states that this situation is possible, but not certain, as these cases may simply be “errors or deviations (Fehler oder Abweichungen)” of congruence. Joüon (1947, 100–1), following Nöldeke (1904, 19, n. 3), maintains that these occurrences are simply the 3fs form and that the ketiv was a result of a misspelling due to Aramaic influence, which preserved the form ending in נ.
as נידנה לָם שֵׁפֶךְ (NLRSP\textsuperscript{10} Yevr II C 1, fol. 206v, ln. 1), in which, according to Arabic grammatical norms, he uses the 3fs form. It is not clear whether this reflects the qere or the ketiv. Saadya’s Tafsīr conforms, for the most part, to the norms of Classical Arabic grammar in order to convey to his audience the sense of the biblical text, rather than a wooden literal translation.\textsuperscript{11} Classical Arabic requires a feminine singular verb when the preceding subject is a broken plural.\textsuperscript{12} Yefet translates this verse: בעידנה לא שפכת (BL Or 2480, fol. 31r, lns. 4–5). Yefet’s biblical translations exhibit a word-for-word, even morpheme-for-morpheme, imitation of the Hebrew source text.\textsuperscript{13} It would appear, then, that Yefet’s translation reflects the qere. In his commentary, however, the verse is transcribed for comment as follows: וּלֹֹ֤א שֵׁפֶךְ פָּפַ֨ם קְיוֹלֻהֵ֔ם יִדְּ֖ינוּ לא ‘Now, as for their expression, “לֹֹ֤א שֵׁפֶךְ פָּפַ֨ם יָדְּ֖ינוּ יִדְּ֖֑ינוּ קְיוֹלֻהֵ֔ם לֹֹ֤א שֵׁפֶכֶת’...’ (BL Or 2480, fol. 31r, lns. 8–9), thereby reflecting the ketiv, without an idiomatic translation following.

Second, I excluded euphemistic qere/ketiv pairs, such as the שְׁבַ֤ב (Q) ‘to violate’ pair (Deut. 28.30; Isa. 13.16; Jer 3.2; 10

\textsuperscript{10} Henceforth NLRSP = National Library of Russia, St. Petersburg; BL = The British Library, London; NLF = The National Library of France, Paris; IOM = Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, the Russian Academy of Sciences.


\textsuperscript{12} Wright (1898, 2:296).

\textsuperscript{13} Polliack states that ‘The literalism of Yefet’s translations effects [sic] their Arabic style which often appears slavish and ungrammatical’ (1997, 40). See also Vollandt (2014, 74–77); Sasson (2016, 25–30).
Zech. 14.2), and the טוחורים (Q) ‘tumours/haemorrhoids’ pair (Deut. 28.27; 1 Sam. 5.6, 9, 12), since, in these instances, the qere “suggests the exact same meaning without saying it directly” (Ofer 2019, 99).

With these limitations in place, I analysed 48 verses among Saadya’s works and as many Karaite texts for those verses as was available to me. This yielded a total of 138 items of data. In what follows I offer a brief statistical overview of the extent to which Saadya and the Karaites follow the qere or the ketiv in their translations and commentaries. I then discuss these statistics in greater detail, offering relevant examples. I conclude with some final remarks and observations.

3.0. General Results across the Works of Saadya and the Karaites

The works of Saadya, out of a total of 48 items of data, yield the following statistics: 35 instances reflect the qere (72.92 percent); nine instances reflect the ketiv (18.75 percent); three instances reflect both the qere and the ketiv (6.25 percent); one instance reflects neither the qere nor the ketiv (2.08 percent). Collectively, the works of the Karaites, presenting a total of ninety items of data, yield the following statistics: 72 instances reflect the qere

---

14 Gen. 30.11; Isa. 9.2; 10.32; 25.10; 30.5; 32.7; 49.5; 52.5; 65.4; Ezek. 42.9, 16; Ps. 9.13, 19; 10.10, 12; 74.11; 100.3; 139.16; Prov. 3.34; 14.21 8.17; 15.14; 16.19; 17.27; 19.7, 19; 20.20, 21; 21.29; 23.26, 31; 26.2; 31.4; Job 6.2, 21; 9.30; 13.15; 21.13; 30.22; 33.19 Song 2.13; Ruth 3.5, 12; 3.17 Eccl. 9.4; 12.6; Dan 9.24; 11.18.
(80 percent); six instances reflect the ketiv (6.67 percent); twelve instances reflect both the qere and the ketiv (13.33 percent).

These data suggest that Saadya and the Karaite exegetes translated and interpreted Scripture according to the tradition of the qere in the majority of instances. They did not, however, feel totally bound to that tradition and occasionally deviated from it, suggesting that they considered both traditions authoritative. Examination of the examples where precedence is given to the ketiv indicates that in almost every case this was due to an attempt to harmonise a reading with a parallel passage in the surrounding context or elsewhere in Scripture. This suggests that the primary concern of both Saadya and the Karaite exegetes was a clear exposition of each verse consistent with its context. Most of the time the meaning of the qere tradition yielded this satisfactory sense. Occasionally, however, this objective could be achieved only if translation and exegesis were based on the ketiv or on both traditions.

Saadya never mentions the phenomenon of qere/ketiv by name. Among the Karaites, I was able to find twelve instances in which they mention the phenomenon explicitly; I will list these instances below in the sections on the relevant scholars.

4.0. SAADYA GAON

Saadya (882–942) was born in Fayyum, Egypt, and was known in Arabic as Saʿīd ben Yūsuf al-Fayyūmī. After spending some
years in Tiberias, in 928 he was appointed the head (Gaon) of the Babylonian yeshiva. One of his most important works is his translation of the Bible into Arabic, known as the *Tafsīr*. Saadya’s *Tafsīr* is not uniform in its shape. For this reason, scholarly mention of the *Tafsīr* usually refers to one (or more) of three things: (1) an exegetical work on a part of the Pentateuch that consists of a translation of biblical verses embedded within a ‘long commentary’—another name by which scholars refer to this body of work; (2) a translation of the Pentateuch without commentary, sometimes called the ‘short Tafsīr’; (3) a translation and commentary on some of the remaining books of the Bible. Based on one of his introductions to the short Tafsīr, scholars accept the fact that he began the work after he left his home town in Egypt. They remain divided, however, as to when exactly he began his translation, and its subsequent development.

---

15 His time in Palestine in general, and Tiberias in particular, is known from two principal sources. The first is a letter he wrote to former students. The scenario is as follows: Saadya and R. David were both in Babylon. R. David received a letter from Saadya’s students, who ask about a calendrical dispute of which Saadya is a part. Puzzled as to why his students did not write to him, Saadya wrote back to them: "כ슨ור איני כי לא כתבתם אליהם ב׳ אחר הלעדי כי המ얽ם כי עד עתה עודני בארץ ישראל" (Brody 2013, 26; see Schechter 1901, 60 leaf 1v lns. 6–8 for the original letter fragment). The second comes from an account by the historian al-Masʿūdī (d. 956) (de Goeje 1894, 112–13; Polliack 1997, 11–12).

16 See Brody (1998, 301).

17 Ben-Shammai (2000).

18 For opinions regarding the beginnings of the *Tafsīr*, see Vollandt (2015, 80, n. 119). For treatments regarding its development, see Brody
group (1) consist of fragments of the commentaries on Genesis (Zucker 1984), Exodus (Ratzaby 1998), and Leviticus (Leeven 1943; Zucker 1955–1956, 1957–1958). The main edition for the work of group (2) is that of Derenbourg (1893), although an updated critical edition is being prepared by Schlossberg (2011). The works of group (3) consist of Isaiah (Derenbourg and Derenbourg 1895; Ratzaby 1993), Psalms (Qafiḥ 1966), Proverbs (Derenbourg 1894; Qafiḥ 1976), Job (Qafiḥ 1973), the Five Scrolls (Qafiḥ 1962), and Daniel (Qafiḥ 1981; Alobadi 2006). Allony (1944) has also published fragments of Saadya’s translation of Ezekiel.

The works of Saadya primarily reflect the qere (72.92 percent), but to a lesser extent than the Karaites collectively (80 percent). In nine instances (18.75 percent), Saadya’s work reflects the ketiv, all which take place within the ketuvim; in three of these instances (Ps. 139.16; Job 6.21; Prov. 19.7), the qere/ketiv pair is וֹלַ to him (Q)/אָל not (K). In one of these instances (Ruth 3.5), the qere reflects the presence of a prepositional phrase תֹּאמְרִֶ֥י א ל י, whereas the ketiv reflects its absence. This instance

---

19 See also Qafiḥ (1984) and Ratzaby (2004) for additional fragments.
21 Ps. 10.10, 12; 139.16; Prov. 14.21; 15.14; 19.7; Job 6.21; Song 2.13; Ruth 3.5.
22 This specific qere/ketiv pair is discussed in detail below, since it receives exceptional treatment by both Saadya and the Karaite exegetes.
may be explained in light of the tendency of Saadya’s translation technique, whereby he omits words that he deems superfluous.\textsuperscript{23} In the remaining four instances (Ps. 10.10, 12; Prov. 14.21; 15.14; Song 2.13), it seems that Saadya’s preference for the \textit{ketiv} is due to an attempt to harmonise the verse with either the immediate context or other verses.\textsuperscript{24} For example:

(3) \textit{ודכה ידכּה יִשְחֹ וְנָפֶל בּעֲצֵוּוּיוּ חָלַ֥אַ֨ים}:

‘He crushes, he crouches down; the host of the fearful fall by his strength’ (Ps. 10.10)

This verse contains two \textit{qere/ketiv} pairs. I will focus here on the second. This is included in the Masoretic treatise ‘\textit{Okhla we-\textit{Okhla} as one of fifteen instances where the \textit{ketiv} is written as one word, but read as two.\textsuperscript{25} The \textit{ketiv} seems to reflect the lexeme חלכה ‘disheartened, unhappy’ (cf. Ps. 10.8, 14) with an orthographic variant of final \textit{alef} rather than \textit{heh}. The \textit{qere} reflects a reading consisting of the word חיל ‘strength’ and a \textit{hapax legomenon} adjectival form from the root ח"א ‘to be disheartened’ (cf. Dan. 11.30). Saadya’s translation (according to Qafih 1966, 68) is as follows:

\begin{flushright}
\textit{He crushes, he crouches down; the host of the fearful fall by his strength}’ (Ps. 10.10)
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textit{ודכה ידכּה יִשְחֹ וְנָפֶל בּעֲצֵוּוּיוּ חָלַ֥אַ֨ים}:

‘He crushes, he crouches down; the host of the fearful fall by his strength’ (Ps. 10.10)
\end{flushright}

\textsuperscript{23} Blau (2014, 447), where he discusses this tendency in Saadya’s translation of the Pentateuch. See also Vollandt (2015, 80–83).

\textsuperscript{24} For the importance of context in Saadya’s exegesis see Ben-Shammai (1991, 382–83).

\textsuperscript{25} Díaz-Esteban (1975, 134–135 [list 82]).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>תראה</td>
<td>You see him,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>יתבאחרע ויתבאמפ הח יקט</td>
<td>He lowers himself, he sinks down so that the helpless fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>מפי הצל אתעמה</td>
<td>by the might of his strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>וחול דawks ישנה</td>
<td>Now, the phrase דawks ישנה is a description of the actions of the lion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>יחצ פי מפעל אלאמר</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear that Saadya’s translation reflects a single word (חטלאים), and therefore is a rendering of the ketiv (חталאים). All of the Karaites’ translations here, with the exception of Salmon ben Yeruḥam, reflect the qere. The reason Saadya may have preferred to translate the ketiv here is most likely due to the surrounding context. As he says in his commentary, the actions of the verbs עאץ (חסחת) and אפקץ (יתבאמפ) describe that of the lion mentioned one verse earlier (9) as a metaphor for the wicked person. Thus the metaphor extends into this verse (10). Earlier, in verse 8, the wicked person is described as targeting the ‘helpless’ (חoltלכם). This same word is used in verse 14 to describe the victim once again (חoltלכם). The only difference in these two instances (vv. 9, 14) is the orthography, where the word ends in heh instead of ’alef. Considering this context, it appears that

26 Yefet: ‘the army of the broken ones’ (NLF Ms Hebr 290, fol. 67v, ln. 4); Al-Fāsī: ‘the comfort of those perishing’ (Skoss 1936, II.82, ln. 15); Ibn-Nūḥ: ‘The yod has been elided and the form is two words’ (Khan 2000, 223, ln. 16).
Saadya chose to translate the *ketiv* in order to maintain consistency within the chapter.

The qere reflects the so-called dative of interest, whereas the *ketiv* seems to reflect the feminine imperative form of the verb of the *ketiv*. The reason seems to be that, in the Hebrew Bible, whenever

27 For the dative of interest or ‘ethical dative’, see Joüon and Muraoka (2006, 458–59). The *ketiv* may also be analysed as reflecting the old Semitic 2fs -ِ ending (see Joüon and Muraoka 2006, 267). Thanks to Aaron Hornkohl for bringing this to my attention.
the imperative form of the verb קום ‘arise’ is followed by the consonants (ך), the latter is vocalised as the preposition plus a pronominal suffix only once, viz. in Song 2.10 קום לך. By contrast, the consonants (ך) are realised as an imperative form of the verb בך eleven times following an imperative form of the verb קום. Thus, here, Saadya may have preferred a ketiv form since it reflects a more regular construction.

A similar preference for following the more regular construction is seen in his translation of Song 2.10’s קום לך. Here there is no difference between qere and ketiv, but Saadya omits the dative of interest in his translation (according to Qafiḥ 1962, 51):

(5) ענה דודי והאמר לך קומי לך ורבעת יפותך לכי לך:

| Line | My beloved began and said, ‘Arise, O my friend, O my beautiful one and go forth.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>אבתני ודודי ואני קומתי לך ואמתתי ואתנשליקך לך</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Saadya’s translation renders the second dative of interest intact (ך), but not the first one. This is a further example, therefore, of how Saadya translated according to the normal construction with two imperative verbs, even if in this case there is no ketiv reading that reflects the imperative.

On three occasions, Saadya’s works reflect both the qere and the ketiv:

28 Gen. 28.2; Num. 22.20; Deut. 10.11; 1 Sam. 9.3; 2 Sam. 13.15; 1 Kgs 14.12; 17.9; Jer. 13.4, 6; Jon. 1.2; 3.2.
As a bird wandering to and fro, and as a swallow in flight, thus is an empty curse, it will return to him’ (Prov. 26.2)

In this example, the *qere* reflects a translation as I have given above. The *ketiv* reflects the reading ‘it will not come’. Saadya’s translation and commentary (Qafiḥ 1976, 182) are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines (Hebrew)</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ובצעפור ינוד וכדרי</td>
<td>As a small bird sways to and fro, and as a sparrow flies, thus a curse without cause does not strike...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יטיר כדאך לען אלמשכוע</td>
<td>He/it also likens the curse—with which people curse each other—to two things, one of them moves more than the other, because flying is a faster movement than swaying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¦</td>
<td>Thus is the one who curses his neighbour without claim (i.e., for no reason).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>エル אלשארו אסער</td>
<td>Either it turns away from the cursed and does not return to the one who cursed,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Saadya’s translation reflects the ketiv (ln. 2). His commentary, however, depicts the resulting images of both the qere (lns. 19–20) and the ketiv (lns. 16–18). The reason for this does not seem to be the tendency to harmonise with the context or other places in Scripture. Rather, it is due to the exceptional treatment of this particular qere/ketiv pair, which I will treat below.²⁹

In one instance, Saadya’s translation reflects neither the qere nor the ketiv:

²⁹ The other instances in which Saadya’s translation reflects both are Ps. 100.3—for the qere see Qafîḥ (1966, 221, lns. 8–9); for the ketiv see Qafîḥ (1969–1970, 41, lns. 22–24) and Rosenblatt (1948, 47); and Job 9.30—for the qere see Qafîḥ (1973, 59, lns. 2–14); for the ketiv see Qafîḥ (1979–1980, 229, lns. 22–26) and Rosenblatt (1948, 372).
All are put to shame because of a people who does not profit them. They are not for help nor profit, but for shame and reproach’ (Isa. 30.5)

The *qere* reflects ‘to be ashamed’; the *ketiv* seems to reflect ‘to stink, cause to stink’. Saadya’s translation (according to Ratzaby 1993, 61) is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 배אמה敖ענךמלחלאלКОמלא</td>
<td>Considering the fact that they rebelled against me on account of the situation of people who would not benefit them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 אזמה לאלענךלאלנפשבלליביהוואר</td>
<td>because they are not for assistance, not for benefit, instead, they are for failure as well as shame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 איזאה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason for Saadya’s paraphrase is unclear. It seems he translates the portion in question in order to indicate *why* the people (in this case, Israel) would be ashamed (Q)/stink (K), viz. because they rebelled (= עצוני).

5.0. **The Karaites**

The period of medieval Karaism before the twelfth century CE may be divided into two periods. The first period runs roughly
from the middle of the eighth century until the first half of the tenth century. The primary names associated with this period are scholars from Iran and Iraq, such as ʿAnan ben David, Daniel al-Qūmūsī, and Yaʿqūb al-Qirqisānī. The second period is from about 950 until the fall of Jerusalem to the Crusaders in 1099, and is associated with scholars active in Palestine, in particular in the Karaite school (dār al-ʿilm ‘house of knowledge’) in Jerusalem, such as Salmon ben Yeruḥam, Yefet ben ʿEli, David ben Abraham al-Fāsī, David ben Boaz, ʿAbū Yaʿqūb Yūsuf ibn Nūḥ, ʿAbū al-Faraj Hārūn, and Jeshua ben Judah.30

Above (§3.0), I presented the statistical results for the Karaite exegetes collectively. Although useful for comparison to Saadya, this would not be a true representation of the Karaites’ tendencies with regard to qere and ketiv. The data suggest that, even though the Karaites’ works reflect the qere the majority of the time, instances of deviance were not uniform, but differed according to the exegesis of each individual scholar. Thus, in what follows, I will present the data for each Karaite scholar in their rough chronological order.

5.1. Salmon ben Yeraḥam

Salmon, probably born between 910 and 920, was active in Palestine through the middle of the tenth century and is best known for his polemical work against Saadya Gaon, Sefer Milhamot ha-Shem ‘Book of the Wars of the Lord’. His commentaries on Psalms,

Song of Songs, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and a few folios of his commentary on the Pentateuch have been identified.\textsuperscript{31}

In total, I was able to find eighteen items of data for Salmon.\textsuperscript{32} The works of Salmon reflect the \textit{qere} twelve times, or 66.67 percent of the time. This is statistically the lowest incidence among the Karaites for which a significant number (five or more) of instances were found. His works reflect the \textit{ketiv} twice (11.11 percent), and both the \textit{qere} and the \textit{ketiv} four times (22.22 percent). Statistically, his reflection of both is the highest among the Karaites. Both instances in which Salmon reflects the \textit{ketiv} involve the \textit{qere/ketiv} pair עניים/‘poor’/ענויים/‘humble’.\textsuperscript{33} These two terms are usually treated as synonyms due to the fact that in some instances עניים is the \textit{qere} while ענויים is the \textit{ketiv} (e.g., Isa. 32.7; Ps. 9.19), and in others the reverse is the case (e.g., Ps. 9.13; 10.12). In all instances except one (shown below), regardless of which is the \textit{qere} and which is the \textit{ketiv}, Salmon translates ענויים/‘humble’\textsuperscript{34}. The one instance in which he interprets according to

\textsuperscript{31} See Fran\textsuperscript{k} (2004 12–20); Zawanoska (2012, 20–21).

\textsuperscript{32} Ps. 9.13, 19; 10.10, 12; 74.11; 100.3; Prov. 3.34; 8.17; 14.21; 16.19; 17.27; 19.7, 19; 20.21; 26.2; 31.4; Eccl. 9.4; 12.6.

\textsuperscript{33} Ps. 9.19; Prov. 14.21.

\textsuperscript{34} Ps. 9.13: עלאמהואנעני (\textit{qere}; NLRSP Ms. EVR ARAB I 1345, fol. 60v, ln. 13); Ps. 9.19: עלאמהואנעני (\textit{ketiv}; NLRSP Ms. EVR ARAB I 1345, fol. 61v, ln. 15); Ps. 10.12: עלאמהואנעני (\textit{qere}; NLRSP Ms. EVR ARAB I 1345, fol. 65r, ln. 3); Prov. 3.34: עלאמהואנעני (\textit{qere}; NLRSP Ms. EVR ARAB I 1463, fol. 4r, ln. 24); Prov. 16.19: עלאמהואנעני (\textit{qere}; NLRSP Ms. EVR ARAB I 1463, fol. 17r, ln. 2).
The one who despises his neighbour is a sinner, but whoever has compassion on the poor is blessed’ (Prov. 14.21)

Salmon interprets this verse in light of the one preceding (ln. 11). The preceding verse, Prov. 14.20, deals with the poor and the rich. This verse (Prov. 14.21) contrasts the previous one in terms
of normal versus abnormal behaviour. People normally despise the poor (Prov. 14.20); earlier in the commentary, Salmon says that people normally despise the poor not out of hostility, but due to the fact that the poor can exploit others for the sake of their own needs. Despising your neighbour for no reason, however, is abnormal (Prov. 14.21). Salmon says the one who has compassion (חכום) does the opposite of ‘that’ (דוע; ln. 13). ‘That’ could refer to despising either a neighbour (Prov. 14.21) or the poor (Prov. 14:20), or even both. Due to Salmon’s treatment of both verses together, it is most likely he is reading the word ‘poor’ (עניים), in which case he is interpreting the ketiv.

Statistically more than any of the other Karaites—in four instances—Salmon’s works reflect both the qere and the ketiv. In two of these instances the pair is יָתְנָה (Q)/לֹא (K), and in both he explicitly mentions qere/ketiv.35 In the remaining two instances (Eccl. 9.4; 12.6), the qere and ketiv appear to be from separate roots.36

35 See above, n. 22. Ps. 100.3 is written with ’alef and read with waw’ (NLRSP Ms. EVR I 558 fol. 36r, Ins. 2–3); Prov. 26.2 ‘That (form is the) written, and it may be interpreted in both ways’ (NLRSP Ms. EVR ARAB I 1463 fol. 27r, ln. 33).

36 In Gordis’s lists (1971, 152, list 82), these two verses are ‘unclassified’ and appear in the list ‘Q Preferable to K’.
The qere is a pual form from the root ר"ב 'to join', while the ketiv appears to be from the root ר"ב 'to choose'. Salmon’s treatment of this verse (NLRSP Ms. EVR I 559 fols. 144r–145v) is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Whoever is joined, i.e. whoever is added, to all of the living, there is assurance (for him). Surely a living dog is better than a dead lion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Whenever it said ‘And afterwards, to the dead ones’ (Eccl. 9.3), he castigated them when they lived in their rebellion and they ended up in death unpraised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Now, he says that, a case of what is added to something else so that...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
its advantage may be known is the adding of the living to the dead. And, indeed, the living have a great advantage over the dead. It is that the heart of the living is at ease, that they are able to repent and increase in pious works so that God adds to their reward.

So, now, the expression יצר is written יוצר. we have already explained its meaning. As for the ‘inner’ meaning of יוצר it means that people must choose life over death in order to do only good, not to love this world.

In this example, the ketiv is used as a source for the interpretation of the ‘inner’ (בארץ, fol. 145v, ln. 5), i.e., hidden, non-literal,
meaning. This contrasts with the meaning of the qere ‘is combined’ (יולף, fol. 144r, ln. 1), which is glossed as ‘is added’ (אף, fol. 144r, ln. 1). The interpretation is that the advantage the living have over the dead is that they are able to serve God (fol. 144r, lns. 11–14). Salmon states that the word יְחַבֵּר is ‘written’ (כתוב), thereby explicitly referring to the distinction between qere and ketiv. The ‘inner’ meaning is then that people must choose (=וּבֵר) life in order to do good works.

The qere is from the rare root קַח ‘to bind’. The ketiv appears to be from the root קַח ‘to be distant’. The explanation for the two readings seems to be orthographical confusion of the second radical. Salmon’s treatment (NLRSP Ms. EVR I 559 fol. 178r–178v) is as follows:

37 For a discussion of the literal (al-ẓāhir) and the inner (al-bāṭin) meanings of Scripture, see Ben-Shammai (2003, 43). For a discussion of these concepts in the wider Islamic world, see Velji (2016, 14–21).

38 For alternative readings among the Karaites, see Polliack (1993).

39 Barthélemy (2015, 877) explains the reason for this confusion as due to misreading of the phrase לא יִשָּׁר לֹא רָת ק. He contends that לא has a non-negative meaning since the entire phrase is a Hebraicization of the Aramaic לא רָת ‘but’.

(Remember your Creator while you are young) before the silver cord is no longer bound, and the golden basin is crushed, and the pitcher is shattered on the fountain, or the wheel is crushed on the cistern’ (Eccl. 12.6)
Qere and Ketiv in the Exegesis of the Karaites and Saadya

9 Repent towards God before the silver cord is not linked and is far away, and the golden bowl is crushed and the jar is broken upon the spring and the spools are brought to the well. The word ירח המ is derived from ברхотה ויהי ‘the golden chain’ (1 Kgs 6.21), and from ברחות ‘the jar of gold’ from גלגלתו גלגלת קו וארות קבל meaning ‘Repent and return before the silver cord is (not) linked’, refers to the spinal vertebrae. The ancients called it the ‘chain of power’, for that reason he also said

10 קבל אמן לא תסגל ויתבוא עב בל אלפא ובניה
11 גמגמה אלדב ותוכפר אלבר על אלמנבע
12 ירשצר אלבכר אליל אלהים
13 מברחות וחב עשה הרותק פסרה גלת
14 הזחב מגלגלת גלגלת כן עד אשר לא רותק
15 תבל הבסף עיני תוב ואגרע כבל אנ גספלט
16 תבל אלפא ובשה ישיא אליל כרי אליפלד وك אסמדאה
17 אלFontAwesome ששלה Sheila שרה להלבך קאל פית
\begin{tabular}{l|l}
4 & concerning it, ירחק, meaning they would separate one from the other (the vertebrae). \\
5 & For that reason, death lengthens (it) more than when it was alive, because the joints also stretch out. Now, he named the spine a silver cord, because it is the strengthener of the body and a band within it. \\
6 & Both the qere (=יתססל) and the ketiv (=ויתבאעד) are translated (fol. 178r, ln. 9). In order to accommodate both meanings, the ‘silver cord’ is interpreted as a metaphor for the spinal cord (fol. 178v, ln. 2). Signs of ageing include that the vertebrae of the spinal cord are ‘no longer linked’ (ירחק, qere; fol. 178v, ln. 2) and ‘are distancing themselves from each other’ (ירחק, ketiv; fol. 178v, ln. 4) due to the weakening of the joints. Salmon does not introduce the ketiv by stating in any way that it is ‘written’. Rather, he refers to it by קאל ‘it/he said’. \\
7 & 5.2. \\
8 & Yefet ben ʿElī \\

Yefet, known in Arabic as ʿAbū ʿAlī Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī al-Lāwī al- Başrī, most likely immigrated from Baṣra, ʿIrāq, to Jerusalem,
where he was active during the second half of the tenth century.\textsuperscript{40} Few other details of his life are known. Yefet produced a translation and commentary of the whole Bible. This is extant in hundreds of manuscripts, which were copied between the eleventh and nineteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{41} Consequently, Yefet’s treatment of every verse used in this study was available to me.

Out of 48 instances, 38 (79.17 percent) reflect the *qere*; statistically, this is the highest among the Karaites. Two instances (4.17 percent) reflect the *ketiv*; statistically, this is the lowest among the Karaites. Eight instances (16.67 percent) reflect both.

Both instances of Yefet’s reflection of the *ketiv* stem from harmonisation with either the immediate context or other places in Scripture.

Consider Job 6.21:

\begin{equation}
כִּי יִעַתָּה לְּךָ [וֹלֵֽש] 

\text{It is not entirely clear how to translate this verse according to the *qere*: the preposition ל plus the 3ms suffix. The *ketiv* is לא ‘no, not’. This example (as per Hussain’s [1987, 93] edition) is particularly illustrative of Yefet’s tendency to deviate from the *qere* according to the context:}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>So, now you have become nothing. You saw the terror and you became afraid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| פָּאַר אֲלֹא צַרְצָה לָא שֶׁיֵּזֵרַח | 2 |}

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{40} Mann (1935, 20–23); Sasson (2016, 5). Also see Ben-Shammai, (2007).

\textsuperscript{41} Sasson (2016, 5).
\end{footnotesize}
Job said, “You, O my friends, have become nothing.” That is, “There is no one among you who would take sympathy and pity and console my heart. Instead, all of you are against me.” Now the phrase ‘You see my calamity’ means that ‘If you see what has befallen me, you would inevitably be afraid that what happened to me would happen to you, and you would not be able to save yourselves from afflictions of this world. The word תִּרְאֶ֥ו means that תִּרְאֶ֥ו with short vowel (i.e., the hireq).

Yefet’s translation clearly reflects the ketiv (לא شيء; ln. 2). This interpretation is appropriate in the context. ‘Nothing’ refers to the fact that, among Job’s friends, there is no one left to pity him (Ins. 3–4). The reason they leave him is because they see

---

42 Reading taken from NLRSP Ms. EVR ARAB I 247 fol. 75r ln. 11. Hussain’s edition has פָּתכונִי.
(= תִּרְאֶ֥ו) his calamity and do not want the same to befall them (Ins. 4–5).

Of the eight instances in which Yefet’s translation and/or commentary reflect both the qere and the ketiv, four instances involve the pair וֹ/לֹא (Q)/ל (K). Other cases include the following:

ומתוחה לשכון [ומתוחה הלשכון] האלה המבשה [המיבא] מַמְכֵּד (12)

‘Below these chambers, (there shall be) a passage from the east for one’s entering them from the outer courts’ (Ezek. 42.9)

This example contains three pairs of qere/ketiv; the third instance is the one in question. The qere has the hifil participle מַבִּיא ‘to bring’, perhaps nominalised to mean ‘passage’. The ketiv has the noun ‘entrance’ plus the definite article. Yefet’s treatment (BL Or. 5062, fol. 176r–176v) is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>And below these chambers (lies) the entrance for the one who brings in from the east side, whose entrance into them is from the outer court. The term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>מנ אשפל ההד אלחגִיר אלמדכל איל אל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>[מ]จบ מנ גה אלשיך מ_vel רכלה אילוון</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>[על]צעת אילבראני.kokוה המבאה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43 The other instance of Yefet’s translation reflecting the ketiv is Prov. 20.20 באשת (Q)/בּאָשֶׁת (K) (Sasson 2016, 380 ln. 12, 381 lns. 1–2)—most likely a harmonisation with Prov. 7.9, where the ketiv form of 20.20 is the only reading (Sasson 2016, 233, Ins. 10–11).
| תַּהֲלּוֹן | מַהֲכִיֵּים יֵשְׁרָה בַּעַל חֲנוּנִים | • refers to the Levitical priests who are ministers (at) the house (of God) and on behalf of the people
• So, when they bring the sin offerings, the guilt offerings, and offerings of thanksgiving in order to cook them at theseลำשתות, then they should bring them from the east side and should enter it from the תרצוחנה, which is the middle chamber.

Yefet’s translation reflects both the qere (מַהֲכִיֵּים, מַהֲכִיֵּים) and the ketiv (אֲלַמְדַלְדַל; אֲלַמְדַלְדַל). He links the two with the preposition אלויא, which here means ‘for’. There is nothing in the immediate context that provides a definitive answer as to why both words are represented in the translation. Yefet identifies the participle of the qere with the Levitical priests. The context, however, is mostly concerned with the architecture of the temple in Ezekiel’s vision. It is possible that the retention of the ketiv, which represents an architectural feature, allows for continuity in spite of the shift to refer to the activities of the priests.

44 See Blau (2006, 19).
45 The other three instances which are not של (Q)/ל (K) are Gen. 30.11 (NLF Ms. Hebr 278, fol. 87r lns. 10–11, fol. 87v, lns. 6–7), Ps. 10.12
Within the four instances of the וֹ (Q)/ל (K) pair, Yefet explicitly mentions the phenomenon of qere/ketiv. One of the four instances in Yefet’s works (Prov. 26.2) has already been identified by Sasson (2013, 18), in which she also draws attention to the way in which Yefet designates qere/ketiv: “Yefet’s description of kətiv as ‘that which is written inside’ and qǝre as ‘that which is written outside’ testifies to the page arrangement of the codices that were at his disposal.”

The two terms are maktūb dāḥil/yuk-tabu min dāḥil ‘written inside’, and maktūb barran/yuktabu min barra ‘written outside’. Yefet refers to qere/ketiv in this manner in Prov. 19.7 (Sassoon 2016, 360, lns. 1–13), and Job 13.15 (BL Or 2510 fol. 69r, lns. 6–8). But consider Ps. 139.16:

(13) גְּלָּלֵֽךְ | רָאָ ֽיָּ  עַ ֽ יָּ  נָּ  לָ ֽוֹ | מְלָ ֽיָּ  רָ  א  ֽו | וָ  עֵי  נָּ יָ  ו  לָ ֽוּ | סָ  פְּרֻ  ךְ ֽ | כֻּלּּ ֽם | לָ ֽהֲמָ יָ ֽיָ  מָ יָ ֽיָ  כָ  תְּבָ ֽו | מָ יָ ֽיָ  מָ יָ ֽיָ  כָ  תְּבָ ֽו | מָ יָ ֽיָ  מָ יָ ֽיָ  כָ  תְּבָ ֽו | מָ יָ ֽיָ  מָ יָ ֽיָ  כָ  תְּבָ ֽו

‘Your eyes have seen me when I was incomplete, the days formed for me are all written in your book; in it is one of them’ (Ps. 139.16)

In Yefet’s treatment (according to NLF Ms Hebr 291, fol. 147v–148v) he mentions only that which is ‘written’ and does not specify ‘outside’ or ‘inside’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נֶסְמְרִי נֵבְרֶו עֵינֶךְ עַלֶּה דְּרוֹאָמְךָּ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כָּלָּהְמֶךְ יְתָהְבָּ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(NLF Ms. Hebr 290, fol. 68v, lns. 6–13), and Isa. 52.5 (NLRSP Ms. EVR I 596 fol. 221r lns. 8–10, fol. 222v lns. 8–12).

are written which were formed—not any one from them.

Now the phrase ול אחד בם means ‘and to (as for) the creator’—

In all these limbs, He brings about the growth of the limbs (i.e., the translation would be ‘each of them’). Now it is also possible to interpret according to that which is written. In this way, it indicates, ‘not one of these days in which my limbs were formed are hidden from you. Rather, You know what will happen from day to day.

5.3. Yūsuf ibn Nūḥ

Abū Yaʿaqūb Yūsuf ben Nūḥ, a native of Iraq, lived and worked in Palestine in the second half of the tenth century and beginning

Reading taken from IOM Ms. A 215 fol. 75r ln. 8; IOM Ms. A 66 fol. 173v ln. 3. The reading in NLF Ms. Hebr. 291 contains the form אלכתבא.
of the eleventh century. He founded a college in Jerusalem called dār li-l-ʿilm ‘house of learning’ at the beginning of the eleventh century, a compound for biblical study and worship.\footnote{See Margoliouth (1897, 438–439); Khan (2000, 5–7).} Ibn Nūḥ was well known as a grammarian and commentator (see §5.0 above).

I found a total of six instances from the published portions of ibn Nūḥ’s grammatical commentary known as the Diqduq (ed. Khan 2000). In all instances, his work reflects the qere, even where another scholar’s work may have reflected the ketiv. For example, in Ps. 10.10 Saadya’s translation and commentary indicate the ketiv.\footnote{See example 3.} Ibn Nūḥ’s treatment of this verse (as found in Khan 2000, 222–23) is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines (Arabic)</th>
<th>The meaning of לְחָלָה is ‘for your army’. The yod in it has been elided. Analogous to it is חָלָאִים (Ps. 10.10), in which the yod has been elided and which consists of two words.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>תְפִסֵר לְחָלָה לְנִישֶׁךָ וָקֹד אָכַתַּר</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>פִּי אָלֹוד וּמְתַלֵּה חָלָאִים אָכַתַּר פִּי אָלֹוד וּיְיָ הִי בָּלַמִּין</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ibn Nūḥ refers to the qere of the form in Ps. 10.10, which consists of two words.
5.4. David ben Abraham al-Fāsi

Al-Fāsi was a native of Morroco and lived in Palestine some time during the late tenth and early eleventh centuries. During this time he composed his dictionary the Kitāb Jāmiʿ al-Alfāẓ, which also contains grammatical and exegetical discussions.50

I was able to gather a total of thirteen items of data from al-Fāsi. In twelve instances (92.3 percent), his works reflect the qere. In only one instance (7.7 percent), his work reflects the ketiv:

(14) מְקַלַל אַבְיוֹ וְאָמִיתָ יִדְעֶךְ נַּרְוֶז בַּאָישָׁה [בַּאָישָׁהּ] תַּשְׁדָּךְ

‘He who curses his father and his mother—his lamp will be snuffed out in darkness’ (Prov. 20.20)

The qere is a hapax legomenon, whereas the ketiv appears to be the word for ‘pupil’, used rarely in the Bible (cf. Deut. 32.10; Prov. 7.2, 9; Prov. 17.8). Al-Fāsi (according to Skoss 1936, I:79, lns. 174–75; I:159, lns. 88–89) treats the word as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>בַּכְוֶלַל יִדְעֶךְ נַּרְוֶז בַּאָישָׁה יְֵשֺׁךְ (Prov. 20.20). Now, he called it אִישֶׁךְ because it is literally ‘eyelids of the darkness’, which block the light.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הַשְׁדָּךְ לָאֵנְהֶ גְּפֹן אֵלְסְלָמֶה עַל אָלָחָכִיָּהּ מַאֲנֵה לַלֵּשָׁו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50 See Zawanowska (2012, 24); Skoss (1936, xxxi–lxv).
Al-Fāsi’s reference to the ‘eyelids of darkness’ (גִפון אלט) appears to mean the darkness when one’s eyelids cover their eyes. This mention of a part of the eye appears to refer to the lexeme אישון (=ketiv). In the section of the dictionary where the lexeme אישון would have appeared, al-Fāsi, refers the reader back to the entry for אישון, indicating that he regarded the two words as synonymous. In his interpretation of Prov. 20.20, therefore, al-Fāsi uses the more familiar form of the ketiv as the basis of the interpretation of the hapax legomenon of the qere.

5.5. ʿAlī ibn Sulaymān

ʿAlī ibn Sulaymān lived during the end of the eleventh and beginning of the twelfth centuries and probably lived in Jerusalem for some time.⁵¹ He is best known for his dictionary, which was based on an abridgement of al-Fāsi’s.⁵²

I was able to find only one example for ʿAli which reflects the qere:

⁵¹ Skoss (1928, 30–31).
⁵² Skoss (1928, 31).
Leah said, “Fortune has come!” So, she called his name Gad’ (Gen. 30.11)

The qere reflects two words—a verb plus a noun. The ketiv either reflects the same thing, but with graphic elision of quiescent ʾalef, or, a preposition plus a noun. In his dictionary (edition of Pinsker 1860, 181; translation by Skoss 1928, 60), ʿAli states that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines (Arabic)</th>
<th>And it is said that בבל is constructed of two words: בא בל, similar to בא גד (Gen. 30.11), which are written as one word, but they are two words.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>erekאןבבלמהמלבהכןמהכלמתין</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ʿAli here follows al-Fāsi in recognising that this is two words, and therefore reads according to the qere. He is unlike Yefet, whose translation reflects the qere, but whose commentary reflects both the qere and the ketiv.

6.0. **THE QERE/KETIV PAIR לו/ל"ז**

The qere/ketiv pair ל (Q)/ל"ז (K) often results in deviation from the qere in the works of Saadya and the Karaites. Out of nineteen total relevant instances cited in their works, there are deviations

---

53 Díaz Esteban (1975, 135).
54 For al-Fāsi, see Skoss (1936, I:298, Ins. 14–16).
55 See n. 45.
from the *qere* eleven times (57.9 percent). In some cases—Exod. 21.8; Lev. 11.21; 25.30—the surrounding context made the *ketiv* highly implausible, so I left these out of my investigation. Indeed, Lieberman (1988, 82) argues that, in these three cases, the *qere/ketiv* distinction is actually a false one, and that they constitute “an outgrowth of midrashic inference.” Thus, I limited myself to instances where an obvious exegetical difference was observable.56

The reason for the frequent divergence seems to be related to the long and complicated history of the transmission of the verses containing these alternatives. In his study of this *qere/ketiv* pair Ognibeni (1989, 131–33) concluded, from the textual witnesses of the versions, that the reading tradition of the *qere* (א) is indeed ancient. The Dead Sea scrolls shed new light on the development of the *ketiv*. According to Lieberman (1988, 84), in about 80 percent of the instances of the verses that are attested in Masoretic lists, the *plene* spelling לוע is attested. Within K. A. Matthew’s orthographical typology, the spelling לוע belongs to the Hasmonian type (Freedman and Matthews 1985, 56–57). Ognibeni (1989, 136) concludes that “scribes copying from manuscripts of [the Hasmonean] type but writing according to other orthographic conventions may have occasionally fallen into error in the interpretation of this homograph.” Lieberman (1988, 83–84) has shown that this *qere/ketiv* pair evolved from multiple sources and that all instances have manuscript variants which support either reading. Based on his study of some Genizah fragments of Job 6.21, he states that ‘it becomes quite evident that

---

56 I analysed Isa. 49.5; Job 6.21; Ps. 100.3; 139.16; Prov. 19.7; 26.2.
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until very late... we have a text in a state of flux’ (Lieberman 1988, 84). It is therefore plausible to suppose that, even though some of the Karaites’ comments indicate the typical codicological arrangement of qere/ketiv, the situation described above with this particular pair still rendered both readings authoritative.

7.0. CONCLUSION

In this paper I have tried to determine to what extent the phenomenon of qere/ketiv is reflected in the works of Saadya Gaon and the medieval Karaite exegetes. In order to accomplish this, I analysed 48 instances in which the exegetical effect of the qere/ketiv pair was very apparent. The works of both Saadya and the Karaites generally reflect the qere. Nevertheless, not all of the scholars shared the same conviction as the Karaite al-Qirqisānī, that the qere was to be preferred as exclusively authoritative. Almost every divergence from this tendency may be shown to be due to the desire to harmonise a particular reading with the immediate context or parallel verses. This suggests that consistency of exposition is what propelled exegetical decisions between the qere and the ketiv. The pair וֹ (Q)/לֹא (K) appears to have constituted a special case, since there is evidence that both readings retained authority among the exegetes and so they felt particularly free to base their interpretation on the ketiv when the context allowed for it.
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