It is generally held that the author of CDC (or the copyist) quoted always by heart or intended to change the verse in order to suit the context. Nevertheless variant readings that fulfill the above-named condition can be found: וְכִי יָדִיעֲךָ הָעָם יִשְׂרָאֵל (CDC I 13-14) does not agree with MT (Hos. iv 16), but it agrees with the Targum (קֹטֶן) and the Peshitta (בָּהֲבְחָמָה). מִי חֲבָשָׁמְךָ דֵּלָה (CDC VI 13) does not agree with MT (Mal. i 10), but it agrees well with the Peshitta (תַּר ʿ<א>).

The variants of the Isaiah scrolls and the Habbakuk scroll are, no doubt, more significant than those of the non-biblical sectarian scrolls. If we desire, however, to erect a firm structure of biblical study, we must not reject even the smallest stone.

Jerusalem

M. H. Gottstein

THE KARAITES AND THE MANUSCRIPTS FROM THE CAVE

The well-known letter of the Nestorian Patriarch Timotheus deals with a great find of Hebrew Manuscripts made shortly before A.D. 800 in a cave not far from Jericho. We hear that the Jews from Jerusalem who had been informed collected the manuscripts and studied them. The Jews chiefly interested in these manuscripts seem to have been Karaites, and we have to assume that the Karaites were considerably influenced by these manuscripts. I tried to show this in a paper which I read at the Pontifical Bible Institute in Rome at the Meeting of the Society for Old Testament Study, on 10th of April 1952. The paper was published in German in ThLZ, July 1952, col. 401-12. An investigation into the relations between the Karaites and the people of the Cave has become necessary and it is very welcome to see a Karaite scholar partaking in it. He had been interested in the matter by some remarks of Albright in the postscript to W. H. Brownlee’s Translation of the Manual of Discipline, New Haven, 1951, p. 58 and 60. See A. Szyszman’s article ‘A Propos du Karaisme et les Textes de la Mer Morte’, VT, vol. II, 1952, 343-8.

Szyszman refers (p. 348) to the fact that it is a custom of the הכותמים הלוים ונוו צדיקים (CDC III 21) agrees partially with the Peshitta (Ez. xliiv 15).

1) Also the quotation הקטןTodd (CDC III 21) agrees partially with the Peshitta (Ez. xliiv 15).
Karaites to bury their dead in their cemeteries in the direction from north to south—the head to the south, and in the same unusual way the corpses are buried in the vast cemetery situated between Khirbet Kumrán and the cave discovered in 1947. This shows a certain relation between the Karaites and the people of the Cave, and it may be possible that the Karaites had been influenced in this by that which they found at the time. DUPONT-SOMMER has referred to the observation of Mr. SZYSZMAN (‘Découvertes nouvelles dans le désert de Juda’, Extrait de la Revue de la Pensee Juive, No. 10, Été 1952, p. 11, note 17) and I was able to refer to the same observation on col. 410 of my article because DUPONT-SOMMER had kindly made available to me the manuscript of his article before it was printed.

I should like to take the opportunity to make a few remarks on the items to which Mr. SZYSZMAN refers.

1. SZYSZMAN remarks that the Cairo Geniza belonged to a Karaite synagogue (kenassa karaite, p. 348). This is certainly not correct, although I have found the same statement already elsewhere. The Cairo Geniza belonged to a synagogue in al-Fustāṭ (Old Cairo) which was a rabbanite synagogue, and the Karaites, once they became a separate body never had a settlement at that place. Their centre in Cairo was always there where it is to-day, in al-Kāhira, the foundation of the Fātimides. From the fact that a considerable amount of Karaite material was found in the Cairo Geniza (JACOB MANN’S Texts and Studies in Jewish Historical Literature, II, ‘Karaitica’, Philadelphia 1935, a volume of more than 1600 pages, is based on Karaite material found chiefly in the Cairo Geniza) we cannot presume that the Geniza belonged to a Karaite synagogue.

2. al-Makrizi, in his Khitat (ed. Bulāk II 475, ed. Cairo IV 366) has preserved an interesting survey on the history of Israel clearly taken from a Karaite author, entitled ‘Report on the Jewish Creed and how it came among them to the change’ (dhikr mu’takad al-yahūd wakaisa wakā’a ‘indahum at-tabdi’il). This report was made available by SILVESTRE DE SACY when he published and translated it in his Chrestomathie Arabe. If we wish to draw from this Karaite survey any conclusions we ought to consider the whole contents of it and should not confine ourselves to a short paragraph published from it for a particular purpose.

3. Older Jewish authors, rabbanite as well as karaite, have tried to connect the beginnings of the Karaite movement with the Sadducees. HARKAVY already collected and discussed a great number of
passages of that kind, for instance in his article ‘Zur Entstehung des Karaismus’, Note 17 to Graetz, Geschichte der Juden, vol. V. The passage from Jehuda Halevi’s book on the Khazars quoted by Szyszman (344 f.) is only one of the many passages discussed by Harkavy.

4. The Karaite prayer for Yom Kippur published by Szyszman (p. 347) is certainly of interest, because in it the Moreh Šedek is mentioned. But in his article ‘The date of the Habakkuk Scroll’ (JQR XLI, 2, 1950) P. R. Weis had already shown that this term is comparatively often found in Karaite texts. He has a special paragraph in his article headed by Moreh Šedek (p. 135-7) in which he pointed out that the term, not found in talmudic midrashic literature, is used by the Karaite Daniel al-Kumisi (end of the 9th century) and by the Karaite Judah Hadassi (middle 12th century). Thus we have exact dates for the use of the term. We are hardly justified in assigning the prayer for Yom Kippur to any particular period of time.

5. I had made the suggestion that the manuscripts of the Geniza from which Schechter had published the Zadokite Document (Damascus Document) were fragments of copies made by Karaites from scrolls which had been discovered in about 800 A.D. in the Cave. As P. de Vaux now informs me, they have discovered in a newly found cave (“Qumran V”) among many other items a fragment of the Damascus Document.

Charlbury/Oxford

P. Kahle

SYNTACTICA II

II. שֶׁהֶב und der nackte Relativsatz

Der Engländer sagt: „The man I saw was the gardener“. Dafür sagt der Deutsche: „Der Mann, den ich sah, war der Gärtner“; und der Zürcher sagt: „Da Maa wo-n-ich gsee ha, ischt de Gärnter gsi“. Der Zürcher setzt die Relativpartikel „wo“, der Deutsche setzt das Relativpronomen „den“, und derEngländer setzt garnichts. „I saw“ ist ein Relativsatz, aber einer ohne Kennzeichen; einen solchen nennen wir einen nacktlen Relativsatz.

Der nackte Relativsatz findet sich auch im Hebräischen. Seine kürzeste Form bietet wohl Gn iii 6: „(Die Frau nahm von seiner