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Inks Used to Write the Divine Name in a Thirteenth-Century Ashkenazic Torah Scroll: Erfurt 7 (Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Ms. or. fol. 1216)

Nehemia Gordon, Olivier Bonnerot, and Ira Rabin | Ramat Gan, Berlin, Hamburg

Abstract
The scribe of ‘Erfurt 7’, a thirteenth-century Torah scroll now kept in Berlin, initially left blank spaces for the divine appellations Elohim (אלהים) and YHWH Elohim (יהוה אלהים), which were filled in during a second stage of writing. The appearance of the ink employed to write the appellations was significantly darker than that of the surrounding ink. X-ray fluorescence analysis (XRF) has shown that the light and dark brown inks had similar elemental compositions, but contained different ratios of iron to potassium, which could be explained by the use of different batches of ink. According to some medieval sources, the divine appellations were sometimes filled in during a second stage of writing in the presence of ten men from the Jewish community. In Erfurt 7, the two-stage procedure was only performed in the first 1.5 columns of the original sheets, suggesting it may have been part of a public ceremony inaugurating the writing of the divine names in the scroll. Erfurt 7 emerges from this study not only as a ritual object used for liturgy, but as a rallying point for the Jews of Erfurt to come together as a community to express their reverence for the written form of God’s name. The divine name YHWH (יהוה) was written in a smaller script than the surrounding text on three replacement sheets using the same two-stage procedure. The ink used on the replacement sheets contained zinc, which is characteristic of other Erfurt manuscripts as well. This suggests that Erfurt was the place where the scroll was used, cherished and eventually repaired.

1. Background
Erfurt 7 is one of a cache of fifteen Hebrew manuscripts seized during a massacre of the Jewish community of Erfurt in March 1349. The manuscripts have been in non-Jewish custody ever since, so any Jewish scribal interventions must have pre-dated that event. Fourteen of these manuscripts are currently housed at the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin (Berlin State Library), including four Torah scrolls designated Erfurt 6 (Ms. or. fol. 1215), Erfurt 7 (Ms. or. fol. 1216), Erfurt 8 (Ms. or. fol. 1217) and Erfurt 9 (Ms. or. fol. 1218). Jordan Penkower has dated Erfurt 7 to the thirteenth century and Erfurt 6, Erfurt 8 and Erfurt 9 to the fourteenth century (albeit with some reservations in the case of Erfurt 8).

2. Scribal features of Erfurt 7 (Ms. or. fol. 1216)
Erfurt 7 consists of fifty sheets of parchment with three columns per sheet. Efrem Caspi discovered that it matches the manuscript Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Cod. hebr. 212, which may have served as its tiqqun soferim, the codex from which the scroll was copied. The scroll contains sixty lines per column, while the codex contains thirty lines per page, so each column in the scroll corresponds to two pages in the codex. All but six columns in the scroll begin with a word that starts with the letter vav at the beginning of a verse (see below). Out of the one hundred and forty-four columns in Erfurt 7 (including nine columns from replaced sheets, which are mentioned below), a hundred and thirty-seven begin with the same word as the corresponding verso

---

1 This article is based on a chapter of Nehemia Gordon’s doctoral thesis, the research for which was conducted at the Bible Department at Bar-Ilan University, Israel and carried out under the supervision of Prof. Yosef Ofer. The X-ray fluorescence (XRF) tests, data treatment and statistical analysis described here were carried out by Dr Olivier Bonnerot under the supervision of Prof. Ira Rabin. We would like to express our warmest thanks to the staff of the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, in particular Petra Figeac, Christoph Rauch and Melitta Multani, for their assistance throughout the analysis of the scroll. This research was partly funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG) in conjunction with the Federal Excellence Strategy and the Cluster of Excellence EXC 2176, ‘Understanding Written Artefacts: Material, Interaction and Transmission in Manuscript Cultures’, project no. 390093796. It was partly carried out at the Centre for the Study of Manuscript Cultures (CSMC) at the University of Hamburg.

2 Penkower 2014, 118–119.

3 Caspi 2014, 234–236.
page of Cod. hebr. 212, six columns differ from Cod. hebr. 212 by one verse, and one column differs by four verses. For example, Erfurt 7, sheet 34, col. 2 [col. 98] and Cod. hebr. 212, fol. 98 v both begin with the word וֶדֶבֶר, the first word in Num. 6:32 (see Fig. 1).

The custom of beginning each column of a Torah scroll with the letter וָֽאָמַעְדִּים was commented on by the German legal scholar Rabbi Meʾir bar Jekuthiel ha-Kohen in the late thirteenth century (c.1260–1298):

That which some of the ignoramus scribes have a custom to do – to start each column with a וָֽאָמַעְדִּים, which they call וֹֻֽאָמַעְדִּים – appears to be absolutely forbidden.

The phrase וֹֻֽאָמַעְדִּים is a pun that can mean both ‘[the letters] וָֽאָמַעְדִּים in the columns [in a scroll]’ and ‘hooks of the pillars’. The latter meaning is used to describe an architectural feature of the Tabernacle in the Book of Exodus (27:10, 11; 38:10, 11, 12, 17). The architectural meaning in relation to the Tabernacle was cited in the Babylonian Talmud as an explanation of the name of the letter וָֽאָמַעְדִּים and the reason for its shape. The resemblance of the letter וָֽאָמַעְדִּים to a hook atop a pillar was deemed proof that the Torah was originally written in the so-called Assyrian script (the script used in Talmudic times, the Middle Ages and today) rather than Palaeo-Hebrew script. This Talmudic reference may have led to the custom of writing Torah scrolls with וָֽאָמַעְדִּים at the head of each column as an allusion to the script in which the Torah was supposedly written.

According to a responsa written by Meʾir bar Jekuthiel’s teacher, Rabbi Meʾir of Rothenburg (c.1215–1293), known as Maharam, the scribal practice of וֹֻֽאָמַעְדִּים is not from the Torah or a rabbinical enactment, but rather there was a specific scribe, Rabbi Leontin of Mühlhausen, who

---

4 The numbers in square brackets throughout this study refer to the overall column number from the beginning of the scroll [col. 1] to the end [col. 150].

5 Meʾir bar Jekuthiel ha-Kohen, Haggahot Maimuniyyot, 1524, 56 (Ḥilkhot Tefillin u-Mezuzah ve-Sefer Torah § 7.7). On וֹֻֽאָמַעְדִּים, also see Penkower 2019, 136–138; Penkower 2020, 44.

4 Babylonian Talmud, Sanhedrin 22a.
was showing off his skill. Both Me’ir bar Jekuthiel and Maharam forbade the use of vave ha-ʿamudim because it often required scribes to contract or dilate letters in order to begin a column with a specific word. These rabbis viewed dilation and contraction of letters as distorting the legally mandated shapes of the letter. Scribes would generally dilate or contract letters towards the end of a column when they realised they were going to reach the designated word for the beginning of the next column too early or too late, respectively (Fig. 2).

The objections of these thirteenth-century German rabbis notwithstanding, vave ha-ʿamudim are found in Erfurt 7 and two other thirteenth-century Ashkenazic Torah scrolls: Washington D.C., Museum of the Bible, SCR.4820 and two other thirteenth-century Ashkenazic Torah scrolls: Washington D.C., Museum of the Bible, SCR.4820 and and another thirteenth-century Ashkenazic Torah scrolls:

Another scrbal custom involved beginning six columns with specific words, the first letters of which form the acronym beyah shemo (‘in Yah, His name’). This custom goes back to at least the eleventh century, with some variation regarding which words were chosen to represent the letters yod, shin and mem. The six letters that form the acronym in Erfurt 7 are the bet of elohim melekh in Gen. 1:1 (sheet 1, col. 1 [col. 1]), the yod of hayamim in Gen. 49:8 (sheet 13, col. 1 [col. 37]), the he of vayoshe in Exod. 14:28 (sheet 17, col. 1 [col. 49]), the shin of shevime in Deut. 16:18 (sheet 46, col. 1 [col. 136]), the mem of vata in Deut. 23:24 (sheet 47, col. 3 [col. 141]) and the vav of vayaasim in Deut. 31:28 (sheet 50, col. 1 [col. 148]). The beginning of these six columns in Erfurt 7 matches the corresponding verso pages in Cod. hebr. 212 (fols 1–3, 9–11, 13–15) and the vav of vayaasim in Deut. 31:28 (sheet 50, col. 1 [col. 148]).

The objections of these thirteenth-century German rabbis notwithstanding, vave ha-ʿamudim are found in Erfurt 7 and two other thirteenth-century Ashkenazic Torah scrolls: Washington D.C., Museum of the Bible, SCR.4820 and Jerusalem, National Library of Israel, 34° 8421. Contrary to Maharam’s claim that the technique was invented by a twelfth- or thirteenth-century scribe in Germany, the scribal custom of vave ha-ʿamudim can already be found in an Oriental Torah scroll from c.1000 designated St. Petersburg, Russian National Library, Parchment Scroll 3. The left-hand margin of each column in Erfurt 7 was justified by dilating and contracting letters near the end of the line, irrespective of any vave ha-ʿamudim (see Fig. 3).

Medieval Torah scrolls were generally written without any punctuation. However, some scribes used spaces to separate verses. According to Rabbi Isaac of Corbeil (d. 1280), “[a scribe must leave] the size of a small word between one verse and the next”. Erfurt 7 usually followed this practice, separating verses with spaces that tended to be larger than those that separated words, as Fig. 3 shows.

Another scribal custom involved beginning six columns with specific words, the first letters of which form the acronym beyah shemo (‘in Yah, His name’). This custom goes back to at least the eleventh century, with some variation regarding which words were chosen to represent the letters yod, shin and mem. The six letters that form the acronym in Erfurt 7 are the bet of elohim melekh in Gen. 1:1 (sheet 1, col. 1 [col. 1]), the yod of hayamim in Gen. 49:8 (sheet 13, col. 1 [col. 37]), the he of vayoshe in Exod. 14:28 (sheet 17, col. 1 [col. 49]), the shin of shevime in Deut. 16:18 (sheet 46, col. 1 [col. 136]), the mem of vata in Deut. 23:24 (sheet 47, col. 3 [col. 141]) and the vav of vayaasim in Deut. 31:28 (sheet 50, col. 1 [col. 148]).

The beginning of these six columns in Erfurt 7 matches the corresponding verso pages in Cod. hebr. 212 (fols 1–3, 9–11, 13–15) and the vav of vayaasim in Deut. 31:28 (sheet 50, col. 1 [col. 148]).

Erfurt 7 contains tagin, that is, decorative or mystical ‘crowns’ on many of the letters. There are two types of crowns in this manuscript. The first type consists of three small strokes added to the tops of the seven letters shin, ayin, tet, nun, zayin, gimel and sade, which form the acronym shaʿatnez gesh. This first type of crown also adorns the letter het. The second type consists of larger lines added

---

7 Maharam’s responsum was published in Me’ir ben Barukh of Rothenburg, Teshuva Pesiqot u-Minhatgim, ed. Kahana 1959/1960, vol. 2, 150 (§ 158). According to Israel Ta-Shema, the responsum was actually written by Maharam’s teacher rather than Maharam himself, see Ta-Shema 1977, 24.

8 Penkower 2019, 137.

9 Isaac of Corbeil, Amude Ha-Golah, 1556, 58a (§ 155); Strauss 2012.

On the scribal practice of beyah shemo, see ’Adat Devorim, ed. Baer and Strack 1879, § 66; Menahem ben Solomon ha-Me’iri, Qiryat Sefer, ed. Hershler 1956, 53 (§ 2.3); Yedidyah Norzi, Minhat Shai, ed. Betzer and Ofar 2005, 59 (Gen. 1:1), 151 (Gen. 49:8), 150 (Exod. 14:28), 251 (Lev. 16:8), 312–313 (Num. 24:5), 352 (Deut. 12:28), 364 (Deut. 23:24), 375 (Deut. 31:28); Caspi 2014, 235; Penkower 2019, 135–138.
Various corrections were made in Erfurt 7 to resolve some common scribal errors, with most erasures carried out by abrasion, that is, scratching the ink off the parchment with a sharp implement. These sorts of corrections were done by both the original scribe and later scribes. For example, in Lev. 23:16 (sheet 29, col. 3 [col. 87]) a second hand abraded over half a line and wrote the correction in a different type of ink than that used by the original scribe (see Fig. 7). Most of the correction is written over the abrasion, with the exception of the last three letters, which were written over an unused section of parchment. Corrections in different hands and different inks are apparent throughout Erfurt 7 (see Fig. 8).

One of the most common types of scribal errors is the confusion of graphically similar words, especially when a rare word is confused with a common one. Such an error occurred in Erfurt 7 in Num. 30:4 (sheet 39, col. 3 [col. 117]), where the scribe initially wrote the common word ‘בָּנָה’ (’with the girl’) instead of the relatively rare word 'בָּנַר'.
While the two words have quite different pronunciations (ban-naʿarah vs. bi-neʿureha), vowel points are not written in a Torah scroll, making these graphically similar words easy to confuse. The original scribe apparently caught the error as he was writing, and stopped before completing the left leg of the he. It seems he then left a blank space and continued writing the next word while he waited for the ink to dry. This is consistent with the instructions of Rabbi Menahem ben Solomon ha-Meʾiri (1249–1315), who said that ‘[a scribe] should not wipe away wet ink because the blackness of the ink is very pronounced and remains [on the sheet], which is not [very] elegant…’.\(^{13}\) Once the ink dried, the scribe of Erfurt 7 resolved the error in Num. 30:4 by first abrading the stunted left leg of the he with a sharp instrument. Next, he added a horizontal stroke to the remnants of the he, turning it into the required resh (technically it looks more like a dalet, but the scribe was satisfied). Finally, the scribe added the missing yod and another he in the blank space he had left earlier.

Sometimes the abraded text is still clearly legible. For example, in Gen. 18:19 (sheet 4, col. 2 [col. 11]) the scribe originally wrote בנותיה (‘with the girl’) instead of the graphically similar בוניה (‘in her youth’), with the girl) instead of the graphically similar בוניה (‘in her youth’).
later corrector erased the word את, although remnants of the letters are still clearly legible (Fig. 10). To remove the empty space left by the erased word, the corrector first erased the descending line of the vav (damage done to the parchment by the abrasion is still visible). Next, he added a horizontal line through the roof of the resh and the remaining top of the vav. Finally, he rewrote the vav following his dilated resh.

Another common type of scribal error is parablepsis, that is, when a scribe’s eye jumps from one section of text to another as he is looking back and forth between his source and the text he is writing. The result is the scribe skipping a section of text. In Erfurt 7, this happened in Num. 22:30 (sheet 37, col. 3 [col. 111]; see Fig. 11) when the scribe’s eye jumped from the word ואת (‘this’) on one line to the Tetragrammaton – a Greek term for the four-letter name of God – יהוה on the next line (Num. 22:31). In Cod. hebr. 212 (fol. 111v) the words אתה and יהוה are graphically similar (Fig. 12). The scribe of Erfurt 7 must have realised his mistake immediately because he copied the correct word אתה following the wrongly placed instance of the Tetragrammaton. Due to rabbinical strictures on erasing the Tetragrammaton, the scribe surrounded the erroneous word with an ink rectangle and later it was excised from the parchment. The scribe initially surrounded the divine name with an ink rectangle, traces of which are still visible. In Gordon 2020.

Fig. 10: The word את (a direct object marker) erased by abrasion is still clearly visible, as is the bottom portion of an erased vav.

Fig. 11: Erfurt 7, sheet 37, col. 3 [col. 111]. a: the scribal error of parablepsis occurred when the scribe finished a line of text (see the yellow box at the far left) and looked back at his source. Instead of reading and copying the word אתה (‘this’; marked by a green box), his eye jumped to the next line where he read the graphically similar Tetragrammaton יהוה (marked by a red box here). This caused him to initially skip an entire line of text. The scribe immediately realised his mistake, however, and copied the correct word אתה following the wrongly placed instance of the Tetragrammaton. Due to rabbinical strictures on erasing the Tetragrammaton, the scribe surrounded the erroneous word with an ink rectangle and later it was excised from the parchment. b: a close-up of the hole left from excising the Tetragrammaton.

Fig. 12: Cod. hebr. 212, fol. 111v, detail showing the graphically similar words אתה (‘this’) in Num. 22:30 and יהוה (God’s name) in Num. 22:31 on the next line.
a later phase, the original scribe or a different one excised the divine name, that is, he cut it out of the parchment using a razor or sharp knife, leaving behind a rectangular hole. In Erfurt 7, excision was used to remove twenty-two erroneous instances of the Tetragrammaton or another divine appellation, leaving a rectangular hole in the parchment in each case.15 In some cases, the original scribe worked around pre-existing holes in the parchment as well as tears in it that were sewn up (Fig. 13).16

In terms of its typology, Erfurt 7 exhibits Ashkenazic characteristics that distinguish it from the standard Tiberian version of the Masoretic Text in numerous ways.17 The Tiberian text was transmitted and standardised in Tiberias over a period of several centuries, culminating in the Aleppo Codex around the year 925. The influence of the Aleppo Codex gradually spread throughout the Jewish world over the course of several centuries, resulting in the ‘correction’, or rather standardisation, of Bible codices and Torah scrolls. One area of this standardisation was matters of plene and defective orthography. The four Hebrew letters alef (א), he (ה), vav (ו) and yod (י) can be used to indicate the presence of a vowel, in which case they are referred to as 'imot qeri'ah, translated by the Latin term matres lectionis (‘mothers of pronunciation’). When a word was written with a mater lectionis (sing.), it was called male, translated by the Latin term plene (‘full’); when it lacked a mater lectionis, it was called ḥaser (‘defective’). Biblical Hebrew did not have uniform orthography when it came to matres lectionis, so the same word could be written in a plene way or a ‘defective’ one without changing the meaning. Take the word sukkoṭ (‘booths’ or ‘name of a town’), for example, which is written סוקט (with a vav) in a plene way and as סכת (without a vav) in a defective way in Gen. 33:17 (Fig. 14).

The Tiberian scribes developed an intricate system to fix the precise orthography of every word in the Bible, including the use of matres lectionis, for every instance of every word. Erfurt 7 contains numerous corrections of plene and defective orthography that bring it in line with the standard Tiberian text. Changing a word from plene to defective spelling usually involved erasing an extraneous vav or yod as

---


16 See cols 36, 65, 90 and 106, for example.

17 Penkower 2015, 124–128.
well as part of an adjacent letter. The partially erased adjacent letter was then dilated to cover up the erased vav or yod. For example, in Deut. 29:39 the scribe originally wrote the plene התולעת contrary to the standard Tiberian text, which has the defective התלעת. The corrector erased the extra vav (traces of which are still visible) as well as part of the adjacent lamed. He then dilated the lamed to cover up the missing vav (Fig. 15a). Changing a word from defective to plene involved the opposite process, that is, erasing part of a letter to make room for a missing vav or yod. The partially erased letter would then be rewritten in a contracted form (as in Fig. 15a). In Num. 23:1, for example, the scribe wrote the defective word אלים (‘rams’) contrary to the standard Tiberian text, which has the plene form אילים. A later corrector, using a different ink than the original scribe’s, erased part of the lamed and then rewrote it in a contracted way. He then added a small yod between the alef and contracted lamed.

Occasionally, a later scribe would add missing letters supralinearly, that is, above the line. For example, in Deut. 26:12 a later scribe using a different ink than the original scribe’s added the letter he to the word ונתתה (‘and you will give’) and the letter vav to וליתום (‘and to the orphan’) (Fig. 16). The he was a mater lectionis, so its addition did not change the meaning. However, the vav in וליתום functioned as a conjunction with the meaning ‘and’. The first of these corrections brings Erfurt 7 in line with the standard Tiberian text, whereas the second is actually contrary to it. This means there was a scribe in thirteenth- or fourteenth-century Germany with a manuscript that he believed to be authoritative and that he used to correct Erfurt 7, but this manuscript did not conform with the standard Tiberian text in every detail. The conjunction vav added by the later scribe is found as a textual variant in several other Ashkenazic manuscripts, which confirms this
was a version known in medieval Germany, even though it is contrary to the standard Tiberian text.¹⁸

Three of the fifty sheets (19, 20 and 26) of Erfurt 7 were replaced in the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century.¹⁹ They are roughly the same size and have the same layout as the original sheets, with three columns and sixty lines per column, and each column beginning with the letter vav at the beginning of a verse. Every column starts with exactly the same words as the corresponding verso page in Cod. hebr. 212, suggesting that they have the same column layout as the sheets they replaced. For example, Erfurt 7, sheet 19, column 2 (col. 56) and Cod. hebr. 212, fol. 56⁰ both begin with the word נראת (‘and the appearance’), the first word in Exod. 24:17 (Fig. 17). The handwriting of the scribe who produced the replacement sheets was horizontally denser than the handwriting of the scribe who wrote the original sheets. This obliged him to dilate letters extensively in order to begin each column with the same word as in the original sheets; two letters alone (tav [ט in מפוך and he [ה in הענן) take up about seventy-five per cent of the last line of sheet 19, col. 1 [col. 55], for example (see Fig. 18a). The script and overall appearance of the replacement sheets closely resemble those of Erfurt 6 and Erfurt 8, which indicates they were produced in the same region and period and perhaps even by the same school of scribes.

3. Procedure for writing divine appellations

A Jewish custom among medieval scribes involved leaving blank spaces for divine appellations, which were filled in during a second stage of writing. This procedure has parallels in the Second Temple period and is still followed today by some scribes. According to certain medieval rabbis such as David ben Solomon ibn Abi Zimra (c.1479–1573), it only applied to the Tetragrammaton YHWH, which was considered the unique name of God. Other rabbis, such as

---

¹⁸ See Kennicott, vol. 1, 417.
¹⁹ Caspi 2014, 234–236.
Joseph Caro (1488–1575), applied it to all divine appellations that are not allowed to be erased according to rabbinical law, such as YHWH, Adonai (‘Lord’) and Elohim (‘God’).  

In the Middle Ages, three reasons were given for following this practice. First, divine appellations had to be written with specific intent, hence a distracted scribe might delay writing them until he could concentrate on them properly. Second, divine appellations could only be written by a scribe following his immersion in a mikveh (ritual bath), and so the scribe might delay writing them until he had done this. Third, there was a custom to write divine appellations in the presence of ten adult Jewish men (or according to one version, ten saintly Jewish men), hence the scribe might delay writing them until he could muster the required audience.  

In Erfurt 7, the scribe left blank spaces for the divine appellations Elohim (אלהים) and YHWH Elohim (יהוה אלהים) throughout Gen. 1:1–3:5, corresponding to the first 1.5 columns of the first sheet. The same scribe then filled them in himself (judging from the script) during a second stage of writing. The inseparable preposition kaf (ָ֝כ) in נָ֣א אלהים (Gen. 3:5) was also written during this second stage. The ink used to write these divine appellations is a darker shade of brown than that of the surrounding text (see Fig. 19).

---


21 Gordon forthcoming.  

22 Elohim and YHWH Elohim are the only divine appellations in this section of the biblical text.
In some instances, the spacing around the divine appellation is awkward, indicating that the scribe wrongly estimated how much space would be required to fill in the name in the second stage of writing: יהוה אלהים in Gen. 2:7 is followed by about 0.5 cm of blank space, for example (Fig. 19, line 2). Similarly, אלהים in Gen. 3:1 is followed by 0.5 cm of blank space and the final mem (ם) has been dilated to about 0.75 cm (Fig. 20). To put this into perspective, the blank space between words in this scroll is usually about 0.1 cm wide, the space between verses is about 0.5 cm wide and the final mem is about 0.5 cm wide.

Further evidence of the two-stage procedure can be found in places where some of the ink used for a divine appellation on one line is superimposed on the ink of a word on the line below it. In sheet 1, col. 1 [col. 1], line 20 (Gen. 1:14), the dark brown ink of the base of the final mem of אלהים (‘God’) is superimposed on the lighter ink of the mast of the second lamed in הלילה (‘the night’) on line 21 (Fig. 21a). This could only have happened if אלהים on line 20 was written after הלילה on line 21. Similarly, in sheet 1, col. 2 [col. 2], line 20 (Gen. 2:19), some of the dark brown ink used for the left leg of the first he of יהוה (YHWH) is superimposed on the lighter ink used for the mast of the lamed of יהוה (‘all’) on line 21 (Fig. 21b). Again, this could only have happened if יהוה on line 20 was written after יהוה on line 21.

The divine appellations, which begin in Gen. 3:8 (sheet 1, col. 2 [col. 2], line 45), were written at the same time as the rest of the text, as is evident from the correction of scribal errors. In Exod. 6:2, for example (sheet 14, col. 2 [col. 122]), the scribe initially made a mistake that needed erasing and a portion of the verse had to be rewritten. It was not permissible to abrade the Tetragrammaton, so the scribe invalidated it by drawing a rectangle around it in ink. In a later phase, the original scribe or a later one excised the Tetragrammaton, leaving a hole in the parchment, although traces of the ink rectangle are still visible (Fig. 22). The correction אני יהוה (‘I am YHWH’) was written by the original scribe directly after the hole on a clean, unabraded section of parchment, following by a space between the verses. Had the scribe skipped writing the divine appellations and only filled them in later, it would not have been possible to write the correction אני יהוה on a clean section of parchment immediately after the erroneous instance of the Tetragrammaton. This space would have been filled with the following words (וארא אל), which the scribe would have needed to erase by abrasion. Such an
erasure would have left obvious marks, though, which is actually the case earlier on the same line of sheet 14, col. 2 [col. 41] where the words אל משה ויאמר אליו are written over an abrasion.24

The reason for only performing the two-stage procedure in the first 1.5 columns (of the original sheets) may have been hinted at by Rabbi Judah ben Samuel he-Hasid of Regensburg (c. 1150–1217):

Some say [the scribe] was required to write [the divine name] in the presence of many people to warn [him] to write it with proper intent.25

Thus it is possible that the scribe of Erfurt 7 performed the second stage of this procedure in the presence of members of the Jewish community of Erfurt as a way of reminding both himself and the community of the profound sanctity of the written form of the divine name. It would have been impractical to maintain a large gathering of community members for the time it took to add all the divine appellations required in a scroll, of course. Hence, the first 1.5 columns may have been chosen as a way of ‘inaugurating’ the writing of the divine name in a public ceremony.

The dark brown shade of ink used to write the divine appellations in the first 1.5 columns of the first sheet (Gen. 1:1–3:5) has the same colour and appearance as the ink used to write entire sheets elsewhere in the scroll (such as sheets 2, 3 and 38–44; see Fig. 23b). Similarly, the light brown shade of ink used to write the ‘non-sacred’ words (that is, anything other than the divine appellations) in the first 1.5 columns also has the same colour and appearance as the ink used to write whole sheets (like sheets 5, 14, 17 and 21–25; see Fig. 23a). All the inks were probably black when fresh and turned different shades of brown over time; the degradation of the Fe complex into the soluble constituents Fe(II) and gallic acid is known to cause brown discoloration in iron-gall inks.26

The divine name יהוה (YHWH) was inserted into blank spaces in the three replacement sheets (19, 20 and 26), sometimes in a smaller script than the surrounding text. It does not seem that the scribe miscalculated the space needed for the Tetragrammaton as it was sometimes written in a smaller script than the surrounding text even when there was

24 Similarly, in Num. 12:14, the scribe initially neglected to insert an open parashah (a space between sections). To remedy this, he erased the verse by abrading it, with the exception of the Tetragrammaton, which he excised, leaving a rectangular hole. The corrected verse was then written on the following line on a clean, unabraded section of the sheet. In Deut. 4:2, the scribe initially wrote the Tetragrammaton, excised it and then wrote the correction immediately after the rectangular hole on a clean, unabraded section of the parchment. The fact that these corrections were written on clean, unused parts of the respective sheets indicates that the scribe caught the errors as he was writing. This means he must have been writing the Tetragrammaton at the same time as the rest of the words in these sections.

25 Sefer Hasidim, ed. Wistinetzki 1924, 420 (§ 1762).

26 Krekel 1999; Rabin et al. 2012.
ample room (Fig. 24). The appearance of the script suggests the divine name was added by a second scribe. It is possible that the main text was produced by an apprentice whose master filled in the Tetragrammaton. The inseparable preposition lamed (ל) was written in the second stage, often being dilated to fill in the blank space. The two-stage procedure was not followed for other divine appellations such as אלהים (‘God’) that appear in the three replacement sheets. The scribe(s) of the replacement sheets treated the Tetragrammaton with more sanctity than other divine appellations, whereas the original scribe treated all the divine appellations with equal sanctity.

The primary aim of this material analysis was to determine the relationship between the divine appellations (DN) in the first 1.5 columns (Gen. 1:1–3:5) of the original sheets (OS) and the surrounding non-sacred words (NS). Initially, it was hypothesised that the difference in shade between the dark brown (DK) divine appellations (OS.DK.DN) and the surrounding light brown (LT) non-sacred words (OS.LT.NS) occurred because of different elemental compositions and possibly even different types of ink, viz. carbon ink and iron-gall ink. A secondary aim was to compare the divine appellations written in light brown ink (OS.LT.DN) after Gen. 3:8 with the surrounding non-sacred words written in what appears to be the same light brown ink used for non-sacred words in the first 1.5 columns (OS.LT.NS). It was assumed that these two subcategories of ink (OS.LT.DN, OS.LT.NS) would have identical characteristics.

Some sheets used a dark brown ink (OS.DK) of the same colour and appearance as that used for the divine appellations in the first 1.5 columns. Similarly, other whole sheets used a light brown ink (OS.LT) of the same colour and appearance as that used for non-sacred words in the first 1.5 columns. To complete the picture of the original sheets, we proposed exploring the relationships between these two main shades of ink used throughout the scroll (OS.DK, OS.LT), the corrections performed by various hands (OS.CR) and the crowns added to the letters (OS.CW).

What the relationship was between the divine appellations (RS.DN) and the surrounding non-sacred words (RS.NS) was a key question regarding the replacement sheets (RS). Another question concerned the relationship between the inks used for the replacement sheets and the different inks used to write the original sheets (OS.LT, OS.DK, OS.CR, OS CW), along with their connection to other manuscripts in the Erfurt collection, especially scrolls that appear to be similar from a palaeographical perspective, such as Erfurt 6 and Erfurt 8.

4. Experiment

Testing was conducted using ultraviolet-visible-near-infrared (UV-vis-NIR) reflectography followed by X-ray fluorescence analysis (XRF) to determine the relationship between the inks used for the main text written in the first stage and the divine appellations written in the second stage in the original sheets and the three replacements. This two-step procedure, which has now been used successfully by BAM for more than a decade, allows a reliable, non-destructive and non-invasive investigation of inks.27

4.1 UV-vis-NIR reflectography

Carbon-based, plant and iron-gall inks belong to different typological classes of black ink. Soot ink is a fine dispersion of carbon pigments in a water-soluble binding agent, whereas plant-based ink consists of a solution of tannin and gall extracts and a binding agent. Iron-gall ink combines water-soluble components (iron sulphate and tannin extract from gall nuts) with insoluble black material that evolves when the components undergo a chemical reaction. Each ink class has distinct optical properties: the colour of soot ink/carbon ink is independent of the wavelength between 300 and 1700 nm; iron-gall ink gradually loses its opacity towards long wavelengths (that is, 750–1400 nm) and becomes transparent at 1400 nm, whereas plant ink is already transparent at ~750 nm.28 We used a portable microscope (a Dinolite AD4113T-I2V USB) with illumination from the ultraviolet (UV, 395 nm), visible (VIS) and near-infrared (NIR, 940 nm) regions of the electromagnetic spectrum and magnifications of x50 to x200 to determine the ink type and tannin distribution.

4.2 X-ray fluorescence (XRF)

Elemental analysis by X-ray emission techniques relies on the study of characteristic patterns of X-ray emissions from atoms irradiated with high-energy X-rays or electrons: X-ray fluorescence (XRF) and energy-dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDX) respectively. When the external excitation beam interacts with an atom within the sample, an electron is ejected from the atom’s inner shell, creating a vacancy. In the next step, another electron from an outer

---


shell fills the vacancy, emitting X-rays in the process. The energy of the emitted X-ray fluorescence is characteristic of a certain element, whereas the signal intensity (and a number of other factors) is related to the amount of the element in the volume sampled. It is worth noting that each technique has its limits in terms of applicability and different penetration depths. Excitation by electrons (in the case of X-ray spectroscopy, EDX), which is conventionally used in electron microscopy, is limited to the study of surfaces (but capable of detecting lightweight elements), whereas excitation by X-rays (XRF) has greater penetration power. However, conventional portable instruments are limited to detecting elements where $Z > 11$, that is, elements heavier than sodium.

The X-ray fluorescence (XRF) technique is commonly used for analysing the elemental composition of various objects concerned with cultural heritage. More specifically, earlier studies of carbon and iron-gall inks conducted by BAM and the Centre for the Study of Manuscript Cultures resulted in a database of possible metallic contaminants being created. In the case of iron-gall ink, the most common source of iron necessary to form the iron-gallate complex responsible for the black colour of the ink is vitriol, which contains different metallic contaminants (such as manganese, copper and zinc) in different quantities. An analysis of these contaminants allows researchers to compare and discriminate between different inks.

Due to time and place limitations, the X-ray analysis we performed was done in situ at the Staatsbibliothek using ELIO, a portable micro-XRF spectrometer from Bruker-XGLab with a 4W low-power rhodium tube, a 25 mm$^2$ large-area silicon drift detector (SDD) and an interaction spot of 1 mm. All of our measurements were conducted under the following experimental conditions: a spot analysis of 120 seconds and excitation parameters of 40 kV and 80 µA.

4.3 X-ray fluorescence (XRF) data treatment

After measurement, the spectra were processed with Spectra (ARTAX) software from Bruker to identify the elements and determine their net peak intensities. The contribution of the support was then subtracted. The thickness of ink can vary considerably, depending on the spot analysed, so making a direct comparison of net peak intensities can lead to incorrect interpretations. To compare iron-gall inks...
successfully, we used iron as a standardisation parameter for all the other inorganic components to be quantified, that is, the intensities due to the contaminants were normalised to that of iron, following the semi-quantitative adaptation of the method described by Hahn, Malzer, Kanngießer and Beckhoff (2004; see note 27 above).

Finally, to determine whether the differences observed between several groupings of data were statistically significant, Welch’s t-test was performed (an adaptation of Student’s t-test to compare the means of two independent groups without requiring the variances to be the same).

In Welch’s test, which is similar to Student’s t-test, but not used as often, the null hypothesis that two groups of data have equal means is tested. Unlike Student’s t-test, the two tested groups can have different variance values. A t-value is computed, which depends on the difference between the two means and the standard deviations, and then compared with a table of values depending on the degree of freedom of the dataset. If the computed t-value is bigger than the tabulated critical t-value for a given significance level \( \alpha \), then the null hypothesis can be rejected and the probability that the means are statistically different is \((1 - \alpha/2)\times 100\%\).

The degree of freedom is approximated by the following formula, where \( \sigma_A \) and \( \sigma_B \) are the standard variations of samples in groups A and B respectively and \( n_A \) and \( n_B \) are the number of samples in groups A and B respectively (the result is then rounded up or down to the closest integer):

\[
df = \frac{(\frac{\sigma_A^2}{n_A} + \frac{\sigma_B^2}{n_B})^2}{\frac{\sigma_A^4}{n_A(n_A-1)} + \frac{\sigma_B^4}{n_B(n_B-1)}}.
\]

The t-value is calculated as follows, where \( \mu_A \) and \( \mu_B \) are the mean values of sample groups A and B respectively, \( \sigma_A \) and \( \sigma_B \) are the standard variations of samples in groups A and B respectively and \( n_A \) and \( n_B \) are the number of samples in groups A and B respectively:

\[
t = \frac{|\mu_A - \mu_B|}{\sqrt{\frac{\sigma_A^2}{n_A} + \frac{\sigma_B^2}{n_B}}}
\]

5. Results

All of the inks investigated via reflectography, both the light brown (OS.LT) and dark brown (OS.DK) ones from the original sheets and the inks on the replacement sheets (RS), were found to be of the iron-gall type. When illuminated by near-infrared light, the iron-gall ink faded, remaining slightly visible, as seen in Figure 25 (right). In contrast, carbon ink would have remained unfaded under near-infrared light. No carbon ink was detected anywhere in the scroll.

Following the reflectographic survey, we conducted XRF measurements to determine the elemental composition and relative intensities of the inks. To that end, 35 spots in the ink were examined and 11 spots were analysed on the parchment support so that the contribution of the parchment could be subtracted.

The original aim of the investigation was to compare eight subcategories of inks based on their appearance and function within the text. These subcategories distinguished between the two primary inks used throughout the original sheets (OS), specifically light brown ink (LT) and dark brown ink (DK). They also differentiated between divine appellations (DN), non-sacred words (NS), corrections (CR) and crowns (CW). Additionally, two subcategories were delineated in the replacement sheets (RS), namely divine appellations (DN) and non-sacred words (NS). The result was six subcategories in the original sheets (OS.LT.DN, OS.LT.NS, OS.DK.DN, OS.DK.NS, OS.CR and OS.CW) and two subcategories in the replacement sheets (RS.DN and RS.NS). However, limitations in terms of time, place and equipment prevented us from collecting enough XRF data points to be able to draw any reliable conclusions about all the subcategories.

As a result, the statistical analysis had to employ broader categories based on the visual appearance of the ink (OS.LT, OS.DK, RS) as representative of some of the most important subcategories. The difference between the inks used in the original sheets and replacements was obvious. Although inks from the original sheets did not contain any copper or zinc (or only had traces of them), the inks from the replacement sheets all exhibited traces of copper and high counts for zinc, as Figure 26 shows.

As for the two shades of ink observed in the original sheets, OS.LT and OS.DK, the distinction is less obvious since both shades contain the same elements and the spectra look similar at first glance. Counts for iron, potassium and calcium vary from one spot to another, but cannot be directly correlated with differences in the appearance of the inks. However, the two groups are clearly...
distinguished from the potassium normalised to iron (Fig. 27). Inks with the lighter shade have a lower potassium-to-iron ratio, with an average value of 0.19 (a standard deviation of 0.06), whereas inks with the darker shade have an average K/Fe value of 0.35 (a standard deviation of 0.08). Table 1 below shows the list of ink spots analysed and summarises the XRF results:

To determine whether the difference between the K/Fe mean value of OS.LT and OS.DK data was statistically significant, Welch’s t-test was performed. The t-value is well above the critical threshold of the 0.5 per-cent significance.
level (Table 2). Therefore, the probability that the means are statistically different is 99%. We tentatively attribute the two shades of ink from the original sheets to different writing sessions for which the scribe prepared different batches of ink with different ratios of potassium to iron.

6. Discussion
Iron-gall ink was used throughout the scroll, both on the original sheets and the replacement ones, whereas there was no sign of any carbon ink. This finding is a significant one because there are discussions in rabbinc literature about the permissibility and desirability of adding vitriol (calcanthum) to ink (for example, in the c. third-century minor tractate Sefer Torah 1:5, the c. eighth-century minor tractate Soferim 1:6 and the twelfth-century Mishneh Torah of Maimonides (Tefillin, Mezuzah and the Torah Scroll 1:4)).

The primary question in this study was what the relationship was between the ink used for the divine appellations in Gen. 1:1–3:5 (the first 1.5 columns) and what was used for the surrounding text. It was clear from visual observations that the two inks were consistently of different shades, indicating that they were probably employed during two separate writing sessions. Unfortunately, limitations in time, place and equipment prevented us from collecting enough XRF data points in Gen. 1:1–3:5 to be able to arrive at unequivocal conclusions about the inks in this section. However, some tentative conclusions can be reached by regarding the two shades of ink used throughout the original sheets (OS.DK and OS.LT) as representative of the visually similar darker and lighter inks used to write the divine appellations and non-sacred words in Gen. 1:1–3:5 respectively (OS.DK.DN and OS.LT.NS). Based on this approach, it can be cautiously concluded that the two shades of ink have the same basic elemental composition and correspond to different batches of ink with different ratios of potassium to iron. The two inks having the same elemental composition is consistent with the divine appellations having been added by the same scribe who wrote the non-sacred words, which appears to be the case on palaeographical grounds.

Another question we answered concerned the relationship between the three replacement sheets (19, 20 and 26) and the original ones. Although the ink on the original sheets did not contain any copper or zinc (or just traces of the elements), the ink from the replacement sheets is characterised by traces of copper and high zinc counts. Such a high signal for zinc may be characteristic of Erfurt as high zinc counts were already found in previous investigations of Erfurt 1 (Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Or. fol. 1210-1211) and more recently in a number of manuscripts produced or annotated in Erfurt. Finally, it is highly significant that the three replacement sheets in Erfurt 7 not only closely resemble Erfurt 6 from a palaeographical perspective, but also have the same zinc-rich ink. The latter finding strongly supports the attribution of the replacement sheets to the Erfurt area.

7. Conclusions
This survey was conducted with limitations in terms of time, location and equipment. More specifically, the tests were limited to a two-day period at the facility of the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin. The examinations required a small portable XRF spectrometer with an interaction spot of 1 mm. In view of these confines, there was only enough time to analyse forty-six 1 mm spots (thirty-five in ink and eleven in the background parchment). Despite our data set being so limited, some important results were obtained:

1. The two shades of ink used throughout the scroll contain the same chemical composition of iron-gall ink.
2. It was tentatively confirmed that the first 1.5 columns of the scroll were written in two stages.
3. A relationship was shown to exist between the zinc-rich ink used for the replacement sheets and other Hebrew manuscripts and Latin annotations from the Erfurt collection.

These results give us a glimpse into the life of the Jews of Erfurt who gathered as a community to inaugurate the writing of the divine names in the Torah scroll, which would serve them in public liturgy for about a century. It seems that the scroll was also repaired using three replacement sheets in this very same community.

These conclusions notwithstanding, some of the textual and paratextual elements could not be reliably analysed. These included ‘crowns’ and other paratextual features for which the
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13 Hahn et al. 2008.
14 BAM performed an experimental analysis of the inks used in these manuscripts in 2014, followed by a more detailed investigation of inks from Erfurt 2 in 2019. The results of both experiments are discussed in Martini et al. forthcoming a, and in Martini et al. forthcoming b.
Table 1: Ink spots analysed, with the corresponding category/subcategory, sheet (Sh), column (C), line (L), overall column number (#), word, letter and counts for the elements of interest (after subtracting the parchment’s contribution, arbitrary units): sulphur (S), potassium (K), calcium (Ca), manganese (Mn), iron (Fe), copper (Cu) and zinc (Zn). Counts for potassium normalised to iron are also indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sh</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>Ca</th>
<th>Mn</th>
<th>Fe</th>
<th>Cu</th>
<th>Zn</th>
<th>K/Fe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSI.LT.NS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>root of resh</td>
<td>יהוי</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSI.DK.DN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>root of final mem</td>
<td>אלוהים</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSI.LT.NS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>root of second lamed</td>
<td>יהלומ</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSI.LT.NS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>root of bet</td>
<td>בור</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSI.DK.DN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>root of he</td>
<td>אלהים</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSI.LT.NS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>root of tav</td>
<td>את</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSI.LT.NS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>root of lamed</td>
<td>כל</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSI.DK.DN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>root of kaf</td>
<td>אלוהים</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSI.LT.NS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>root of first lamed</td>
<td>יהביאל</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSI.LT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>root of resh</td>
<td>ירא</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSI.LT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>root of lamed</td>
<td>אלוהים</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSI.LT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>oblique line of alef</td>
<td>אל</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSI.LT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>root of resh</td>
<td>יראה</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSI.LT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>root of first he</td>
<td>יהד</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSI.LT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>root of he</td>
<td>האלהים</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSI.CR</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>oblique line of alef</td>
<td>ירא</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1315</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSI.DK</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>root of first he</td>
<td>יהד</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSI.LT</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>top of tav</td>
<td>יאר</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSI.LT</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>base of bet</td>
<td>גבב</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>yod</td>
<td>דָּבָר</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3152</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>yod</td>
<td>יהו</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2863</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 OSI.LT.NS: light ink from original sheets corresponding to non-sacred words.
2 OSI.DK.DN: dark ink from original sheets corresponding to divine appellations.
3 OSI.LT: other light ink from original sheets.
4 OSI.CR: ink of corrections from original sheets.
5 OSI.DK: other dark ink from original sheets.
6 RS: ink from replacement sheets (19, 20, 26).
inked area is smaller than the interaction-spot size of the micro-XRF spectrometer (1 mm). Furthermore, additional tests are warranted with analysis of more samples from each subcategory of ink in the scroll. This could be accomplished by using an XRF imaging spectrometer that has an adjustable interaction spot ranging from 50 to 650 μm and would allow whole columns of the scroll to be imaged. This would provide us with better statistics as well as readily available information from spatial maps of the elements’ distribution. Future tests using this approach would complement the preliminary results presented in this article. The following studies could be performed in this manner:

1. A definitive comparison of the dark brown and light brown inks used to write the divine appellations and the main text respectively in Gen. 1:1–3:5 (the first 1.5 columns) without recourse to a comparison with other sections of the scroll.

2. Investigating the relationship between the divine appellations in the replacement sheets and the surrounding text, which our visual observations indicate were written in two stages.

3. Examining what relationship corrections in the original sheets (written in different scribal hands) have to each other, to the main text of the original sheets and to the text on the replacement sheets.

4. Examining the relationship between the main text and the ‘crowns’; the latter were clearly added to the letters, but it is unclear whether the original scribe or a later one made these additions.

5. Looking at how crowns that were added later are related to the original crowns and other corrections.

Analysis with an XRF imaging spectrometer of the aforementioned type would give us an unprecedented glimpse of the life of a medieval Ashkenazic Torah scroll and the Jewish community that once produced it, cherished it, maintained it and revised it.
Table 2: Comparison of K/Fe for the two shades of ink observed on the original sheets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>05.LT</th>
<th>05.DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of spots analysed (n)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average K/Fe (μ)</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K/Fe standard deviation (σ)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degree of freedom from Welch’s t-test (df)

\[
df = \frac{\left(\frac{\sigma_{05.LT}^2}{n_{05.LT}} + \frac{\sigma_{05.DK}^2}{n_{05.DK}}\right)^2}{\frac{\sigma_{05.LT}^4}{n_{05.LT}^2(n_{05.LT} - 1)} + \frac{\sigma_{05.DK}^4}{n_{05.DK}^2(n_{05.DK} - 1)}} \approx 22
\]

t-value from Welch’s t-test

\[
t = \frac{|\mu_{05.LT} - \mu_{05.DK}|}{\sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{05.LT}^2}{n_{05.LT}} + \frac{\sigma_{05.DK}^2}{n_{05.DK}}}} = 17.6
\]

Critical t-value for a significance level α of 0.02

2.508
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Written Artefacts as Cultural Heritage

Ed. by Michael Friedrich and Doreen Schröter

Written Artefacts as Cultural Heritage was established in 2020. The series is dedicated to the double role of written artefacts as representations and generators of humankind’s cultural heritage. Its thematic scope embraces aspects of preservation, the identity-defining role of artefacts as well as ethical questions.

The mix of practical guides, colloquium papers and project reports is specifically intended for staff at libraries and archives, curators at museums and art galleries, and scholars working in the fields of manuscript cultures and heritage studies.

Every volume of Written Artefacts as Cultural Heritage has been peer-reviewed and is openly accessible. There is an online and a printed version.

If you wish to receive a copy or to present your research, please contact the editorial office: https://www.csmc.uni-hamburg.de/publications/cultural-heritage.html
CSMC’s academic journal was established as newsletter of the research unit ‘Manuscript Cultures in Asia and Africa’ in 2008 and transformed into a scholarly journal with the appearance of volume 4 in 2011. *manuscript cultures* publishes exhibition catalogues and articles contributing to the study of written artefacts. This field of study embraces disciplines such as art history, codicology, epigraphy, history, material analysis, palaeography and philology, informatics and multispectral imaging.

*manuscript cultures* encourages comparative approaches, without regional, linguistic, temporal or other limitations on the objects studied; it contributes to a larger historical and systematic survey of the role of written artefacts in ancient and modern cultures, and in so doing provides a new foundation for ongoing discussions in cultural studies.

Every volume of *manuscript cultures* has been peer-reviewed and is openly accessible:
https://www.csmc.uni-hamburg.de/publications/mc.html

If you wish to receive a copy or to present your research in our journal, please contact the editorial office: irina.wandrey@uni-hamburg.de
Manuscripts have played a crucial role in the educational practices of virtually all cultures that have a history of using them. As learning and teaching tools, manuscripts become primary witnesses for reconstructing and studying didactic and research activities and methodologies from elementary levels to the most advanced.

The present volume investigates the relation between manuscripts and educational practices focusing on four particular research topics: educational settings; teachers, students and their manuscripts; organising knowledge: syllabi; exegetical practices: annotations; modifying tradition: adaptations.

The volume offers a number of case studies stretching across geophysical boundaries from Western Europe to South-East Asia, with a time span ranging from the second millennium BCE to the twentieth century CE.

---

23 – *Education Materialised: Reconstructing Teaching and Learning Contexts through Manuscripts*, edited by Stefanie Brinkmann, Giovanni Ciotti, Stefano Valente and Eva Maria Wilden

---

22 – *Dunhuang Manuscript Culture: End of the First Millennium*, by Imre Galambos

*Dunhuang Manuscript Culture* explores the world of Chinese manuscripts from ninth–tenth century Dunhuang, an oasis city along the network of pre-modern routes known today collectively as the Silk Roads. The manuscripts have been discovered in 1900 in a sealed-off side-chamber of a Buddhist cave temple, where they had lain undisturbed for for almost nine hundred years. The discovery comprised tens of thousands of texts, written in over twenty different languages and scripts, including Chinese, Tibetan, Old Uighur, Khotanese, Sogdian and Sanskrit. This study centres around four groups of manuscripts from the mid-ninth to the late tenth centuries, a period when the region was an independent kingdom ruled by local families. The central argument is that the manuscripts attest to the unique cultural diversity of the region during this period, exhibiting – alongside obvious Chinese elements – the heavy influence of Central Asian cultures. As a result, it was much less ‘Chinese’ than commonly portrayed in modern scholarship. The book makes a contribution to the study of cultural and linguistic interaction along the Silk Roads.
Studies in Manuscript Cultures (SMC)

Ed. by Michael Friedrich, Harunaga Isaacson, and Jörg B. Quenzer

From volume 4 onwards all volumes are available as open access books on the De Gruyter website:
https://www.degruyter.com/view/serial/43546
https://www.csmc.uni-hamburg.de/

New release

21 – Disiecta Membra Musicae: Studies in Musical Fragmentology, edited by Giovanni Varelli

Although fragments from music manuscripts have occupied a place of considerable importance since the very early days of modern musicology, a collective, up-to-date, and comprehensive discussion of the various techniques and approaches for their study was lacking. On-line resources have also become increasingly crucial for the identification, study, and textual/musical reconstruction of fragmentary sources. Disiecta Membra Musicae. Studies in Musical Fragmentology aims at reviewing the state of the art in the study of medieval music fragments in Europe, the variety of methodologies for studying the repertory and its transmission, musical palaeography, codicology, liturgy, historical and cultural contexts, etc. This collection of essays provides an opportunity to reflect also on broader issues, such as the role of fragments in last century’s musicology, how fragmentary material shaped our conception of the written transmission of early European music, and how new fragments are being discovered in the digital age. Known fragments and new technology, new discoveries and traditional methodology alternate in this collection of essays, whose topics range from plainchant to *ars nova* and fifteenth- to sixteenth-century polyphony.

New release

20 – Fakes and Forgeries of Written Artefacts from Ancient Mesopotamia to Modern China, edited by Cécile Michel and Michael Friedrich

Fakes and forgeries are objects of fascination. This volume contains a series of thirteen articles devoted to fakes and forgeries of written artefacts from the beginnings of writing in Mesopotamia to modern China. The studies emphasise the subtle distinctions conveyed by an established vocabulary relating to the reproduction of ancient artefacts and production of artefacts claiming to be ancient: from copies, replicas and imitations to fakes and forgeries. Fakes are often a response to a demand from the public or scholarly milieu, or even both. The motives behind their production may be economic, political, religious or personal – aspiring to fame or simply playing a joke. Fakes may be revealed by combining the study of their contents, codicological, epigraphic and palaeographic analyses, and scientific investigations. However, certain famous unsolved cases still continue to defy technology today, no matter how advanced it is. Nowadays, one can find fakes in museums and private collections alike; they abound on the antique market, mixed with real artefacts that have often been looted. The scientific community’s attitude to such objects calls for ethical reflection.