

## Part II.

### The text itself.

Hitherto I have dwelt upon the outer form of the text into which I have introduced changes in accordance with the Massoretic rules. I shall now describe the condition of the text itself and how far it has been affected by the principles which have guided me in preparing it.

#### Chap. I.

#### Dagesh and Raphe.

In all Massoretic MSS. of all Schools, whether Spanish, Italian, Franco-Italian or German, not only are the aspirated letters (בגדכפת), uniformly denoted by *Raphe*, but the silent *Aleph* (א) in the middle of a word, and the *He* (ה), both in the middle and at the end of words, are duly marked with the horizontal stroke. Thus for instance וַיֹּאמֶר *and he said* (Gen. I 3 &c.), פְּדַחְזֹר פְּדַחְזֹר (Numb. I 10 &c.) פְּאֶכֶה גְּרִרָה *as thou comest to Gerar* (Gen. X 19). The only exceptions are (1) when the aspirate has a superlinear accent, in which case it would be difficult to place both the horizontal stroke and the accent on the top of the letter, and (2) in the ineffable name יְהוָה which never has the *Raphe* on the final *He*. Indeed there are some MSS. which have the *Raphe* even on the consonants with the superlinear accents, though it mars the evenness of the lines.

The editors of the first edition of the Pentateuch (Bologna 1482) conscientiously endeavoured to reproduce these *Raphes* in the first few folios, but owing to typographical difficulties which at that early stage of Hebrew printing the compositors could not overcome, they used it very sparingly after folios 4*b*. The printers of Lisbon, however, who nine years later published the magnificent fourth edition of the Pentateuch in 1491, and who issued from the same printing office the books of Isaiah and Jeremiah, faithfully reproduced the *Raphes* as they are exhibited in all the Massoretically pointed MSS. The less skilful printers, however, could not easily express the aspirates with the horizontal stroke. Hence, they disappeared altogether in the editions subsequent to 1492. But whatever excuse may be made for the early printers on the score of typographical difficulties, there is no justification for modern editors who profess faithfully to reproduce the Massoretic text, for their departure from the uniform practice of all the MSS. I have, therefore, reverted to the correct Lisbon editions of 1491 and 1492 and restored in form the Massoretic text in accordance with the Massoretic MSS., disregarding the enormous labour which it entailed upon me of minutely examining every consonant for the purpose of horizontally marking all the letters which have the *Raphe* in the MSS.

From time immemorial, the custodians of the Hebrew Scriptures have enjoined it most strictly that those who are engaged in public reading are to exercise the greatest care to pronounce very distinctly every letter and to impart to every consonant its proper value. But beyond this injunction they have attached no visible sign to any particular letter, which in their estimation might preclude its being weakened or absorbed by another letter in close conjunction therewith. At a later time, however, one or

two isolated purists resorted to the expedient of putting a *Dagesh* into letters in certain positions to safeguard their distinct pronunciation. Hence, Yekuthiel the Naktan states that in some MSS. the letter *Nun* at the beginning of the name in the phrase **בן-נֹון** *the son of Nun* (Deut. XXXII 4) has a *Dagesh*. Though Yekuthiel himself does not give here the reason for this abnormal position of the *Dagesh*,<sup>1</sup> it is manifest that the purist who inserted it thereby intended to guard this *Nun* at the beginning of the word against being absorbed or weakened in pronunciation by the *Nun* which ends the preceding word.

Heidenheim, who first called attention to Yekuthiel's remark, declares that this practice obtained wherever two of the same letters occurred, one at the end of a word and one at the beginning of the immediately following word. In such a case a *Dagesh* is put in the initial letter to guard it from being absorbed. In the *Haphtara* to *Bereshith*, viz. Isa. XLII 5—XLIII 10, where he gives the reason for putting a *Dagesh* in the *Nun* of **נְשָׁמָה** *breath* (Isa. XLII 5), he also quotes the following: **וּכְלֵל־לְשׁוֹן** *and every tongue* (Isa. LIV 17), **לֹאכֵל־לֶחֶם** *to eat bread* (Gen.

<sup>1</sup> It is remarkable that in the edition of the **עֵיִן הַקּוּרָא** in Heidenheim's Pentateuch, Yekuthiel's words on Deut. XXXII 44 are as follows: **יש אֶסְפְּמִים** *there are Spanish Codices which have Dagesh in the Nun to guard it from being absorbed by its neighbour which is close to it* This indeed makes Yekuthiel himself give the reason, whereas in the two MSS. of Yekuthiel's *Ayin Hakorē* in the British Museum, it is simply **כתבו קר' וכל קר' במס'ה' וכל קר' כתבו** *in the British Museum, it is simply כתבו קר' וכל קר' במס'ה' וכל קר' כתבו* Comp. Add. 19776, fol. 234a, and Or. 853, fol. 67b. Heidenheim's edition also differs materially throughout from these MSS. Heidenheim's own words on Yekuthiel's remark are as follows: **כבר הזכרתי זה בכמה מקומות** *and I have already mentioned this in several places* **ובפרט בהפטרות פ' בראשית שכן מנהגם בכל שתי אותיות דומות זאת בסוף התיבה** *and especially in the Haftarah of the first Parashah, because their custom is in all two similar letters at the end of the word* **וזאת בראש התיבה שאחריה ושתיהן רבוקות כדי להשמר מן ההבלע אלא שלפעמים** *and this at the beginning of the word, after which they are connected, in order to be preserved from being absorbed, except that sometimes* **עשו פסק ביניהם כשיתכן שם פסוק ולפעמים העמידו התיבה הראשונה במתן בסוף** *they put a stop between them when there is a verse, and sometimes they placed the first word in its place at the end of the verse* **כשיגנונו מלעיל.**

XXXI 54), **עַל־לֵב** *to heart* (Mal. II 2), **לָהֶם מִיָּגוֹן** *unto them from sorrow* (Esther IX 22) &c.<sup>1</sup>

We shall now contrast the prototype with the copy by Drs. Baer and Delitzsch which is as follows:

This *Dagesh* is in accordance with the correct MSS. and is in accordance with the rule that when in two words which belong to one another, the same two consonants follow each other, the one at the end of one word and the other at the beginning of the next word, the second of these consonants is furnished with *Dagesh* as a sign that this letter is to be read with special emphasis, so that it may not be absorbed and rendered inaudible by careless and hasty reading in the former identical letter. In the current editions this *Dagesh* is absent, because its import has not been understood.<sup>2</sup>

Delitzsch, moreover, illustrates this use of the *Dagesh* by adducing the following six instances from the Psalms: (1) **בְּכַל־לְבִי** Ps. IX 2; (2) **עַל־לְשׁוֹנוֹ** XV 3; (3) **עַם־מְתִי** XXVI 4; (4) **יֵשׁ מְדַבֵּר לְאָנָם מִים** CV 44; and (5 and 6) **יֵשׁ מְדַבֵּר לְאָנָם מִים** CVII 35, and he assures us that this is to be found in the correct Codices. From the fact, however, that he relies upon Heidenheim's remarks in corroboration of this statement,

Comp. the preceding note in Heidenheim's Pentateuch called **מֵאֵר** *with Yekuthiel's עֵיִן הַקּוּרָא published in five Vols. Rödelheim 1818—21. The *Haphtara* in question is in the Appendix to Vol. I.*

<sup>2</sup> Dieses Dagesch steht nach dem Vorbilde correcter Handschriften und nach der Regel, dass, wenn in zwei zusammengehörigen Wörtern zwei gleiche Consonanten, der eine am Ende des ersten und der andere am Anfange des zweiten Wortes, einander folgen, der zweite dieser Consonanten ein Dagesch erhält, und zwar als Merkzeichen, dass dieser Buchstabe mit besonderem Ausdruck zu lesen ist, damit er nicht bei sorglos eiligem Lesen in den vorigen gleichen Buchstaben verschlungen und unhörbar werde.\* In den gangbaren Druckausgaben fehlt dieses Dagesch. Man hat es vernachlässigt, weil man seinen Zweck nicht kannte. *Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche*, Vol. XXIV, p. 413, Leipzig 1863.

\* Siehe Heidenheim's Besprechung der Sache in seinem Pentateuch-Commentar zu Anfang der Haftarah Bereschith und Desselben Pentateuch-Ausgabe *Meor Enajim* zu Deut. 32, 44.

it is evident that Delitzsch himself did not examine the Codices, nor was he aware that Heidenheim's version of Yekuthiel is contrary to the MSS.

But Yekuthiel, upon whom the whole of this fabric is reared, treats only upon the single phrase **בִּן-נּוֹן** and makes no allusion whatever to the existence of the *Dagesh* in the second of the two identical consonants in any other combination. And even with regard to **בִּן-נּוֹן** itself, he does not say that this is the orthography in correct MSS., but simply remarks "*in some Spanish Codices the Nun has Dagesh*".

What, however, is still more surprising, is the fact that of the twenty-nine instances, in which **בִּן-נּוֹן** occurs in the Hebrew Bible, no fewer than sixteen are to be found in the Pentateuch alone,<sup>1</sup> and that Heidenheim himself, who formulated this rule in connection with this very phrase, has not inserted the *Dagesh* in the second *Nun* in a single passage. And though this absence of the *Dagesh* is in accordance with most of the Codices and with all the editions, yet Dr. Baer has inserted it in all the passages wherever **בִּן-נּוֹן** occurs in the parts of the Hebrew Bible which he has published.

The other instances adduced by Heidenheim and Delitzsch in illustration of this supposed canon require a more detailed examination since some modern Grammarians, who have not had an opportunity to examine the MSS. for themselves, have accepted this orthography as a fact. The following are the five passages adduced by Heidenheim and the six instances quoted by Delitzsch arranged in the order of the books in the Hebrew Bible with the MSS. which testify against their orthography.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Exod. XXXIII 11; Numb. XI 28; XIII 8, 16; XIV 6, 30, 38; XXVI 65; XXVII 18; XXXII 12, 28; XXXIV 17; Deut. I 38; XXXI 23; XXXII 44; XXXIV 9.

(1) Gen. XXXI 54; XXXVII 25.

**לֹאכְלֵ-לֶחֶם** *with* Dagesh, Heidenheim and Baer.

**לֹאכְלֵ-לֶחֶם** *without* Dagesh, Orient. 4445 the oldest MS. extant; Arundel Orient. 2 dated A. D. 1216; Orient. 2201 dated A. D. 1246; Add. 9401—9402 dated A. D. 1286; Harley 5710—11; Add. 21160; Add. 15451; Harley 1528; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 4227; Orient. 2626—28; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; the first edition of the Pentateuch Bologna 1482; the first edition of the entire Bible 1488; the Lisbon edition of the Pentateuch 1491; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491—93; the third edition of the Bible, Brescia 1494; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis, Venice 1517; the second quarto Bible, Bomberg 1521, and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim, Venice 1524—25.

(2) Isaiah XLII 5.

**נָתַן נְשָׁמָה** *with* Dagesh, Heidenheim.

**נָתַן נְשָׁמָה** *without* Dagesh, Babylon Codex dated A. D. 916; Orient. 2201; Harley 5710—11; Arund. Orient. 16; Add. 15451; Harley 1528; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 1478; Orient. 2091; Orient. 4227; Orient. 2626—28; the Lisbon edition of Isaiah 1492 and all the early editions specified under No. 1. Now Orient. 1478 is the remarkable Jerusalem MS. which Dr. Baer has collated<sup>1</sup> and which he quotes in his notes on Ps. III 7, yet he omitted to state that this Codex has not the Dagesh in question. Indeed he himself has violated this eccentric rule by omitting the Dagesh here, though

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, Vol. II, Preface, fol. 3.

Heidenheim adduces this passage in confirmation of this canon.

- (3) Isaiah LIV 17.  
 וּכְל־לְשׁוֹן *with* Dagesh, Baer.  
 וּכְל־לְשׁוֹן *without* Dagesh, Babylon Codex; Orient. 2201; Harley 5710—11; Arund. Orient. 16; Add. 15451; Harley 1528; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 1478; Orient. 2091; Orient. 4227; Orient. 2626—28 and all the early editions.
- (4) Psalm IX 2.  
 בְּכַל־לְבִי *with* Dagesh, Baer.  
 בְּכַל־לְבִי *without* Dagesh, Orient. 2201; Harley 5710—11; Arund. Orient. 16; Add. 15451; Harley 1528; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 2091; Orient. 4227; Orient. 2626—28; the first edition of the Hagiographa, Naples 1486—87, and all the early editions.
- (5) Psalm XV 3.  
 עַל־לְשׁוֹנוֹ *with* Dagesh, Baer.  
 עַל־לְשׁוֹנוֹ *without* Dagesh, Orient. 2201; Harley 5710—11; Arund. Orient. 16; Add. 15451; Harley 1528; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 2091; Orient. 4227; Orient. 2626—28 and all the early editions
- (6) Psalm XXVI 4.  
 עִם מְתִי *with* Dagesh, Baer.  
 עִם מְתִי *without* Dagesh, Orient. 2201; Harley 5710—11; Arund. Or. 16; Add. 15451; Harley 1528; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 2091; Orient. 4227; Orient. 2626—28 and all the early editions.
- (7) Psalm CV 44.  
 וְעַמֵּל לְאֹמִים *with* Dagesh, Baer.  
 וְעַמֵּל לְאֹמִים *without* Dagesh, all the above named MSS. and all the editions without a single exception.

(8, 9) Psalm CVII 35.

יִשָּׁם מְדַבֵּר לְאֹנָם מִים *with* Dagesh, Baer.

יִשָּׁם מְדַבֵּר לְאֹנָם מִים *without* Dagesh, all the MSS. and all the editions without an exception.

(10) Malachi II 2.

עַל־לֵב *with* Dagesh, Baer.

עַל־לֵב *without* Dagesh, all the MSS. and all the editions without exception.

(11) Esther IX 22.

לְהֵם מִיָּגוֹן *with* Dagesh.

לְהֵם מִיָּגוֹן *without* Dagesh, all the MSS. and all the editions without an exception.

It will thus be seen that not a single one of the eleven instances which Heidenheim and Dr. Baer have adduced in illustration of the rule formulated by them, has the slightest support from the MSS. and the editions. The MSS. which I have collated for this purpose are mostly model Codices and represent all Schools, and different countries from the earliest date down to the invention of printing. There may be one or two MSS. in which this eccentric *Dagesh* has been introduced by some purist, but I have not been able to find it in a single one among the numerous Codices which I have collated. To introduce, therefore, such an innovation throughout the Hebrew Bible upon such slender evidence, if indeed it is to be called evidence at all, is a most unjustifiable defacing of the text.

The *Dagesh* is also inserted by Dr. Baer in consonants which follow a guttural with silent *Sheva*. Delitzsch, who defends this innovation, declares that it is to be found in all good MSS. and hence lays down the following rule:

It is designed that the letter which is thus sharpened is to be pronounced emphatically. It begins a new syllable since the preceding guttural is to be read with silent *Sheva*. The *Dagesh* warns us that it is not to be pronounced טַעֲמִי, תַעֲלִים, מְחַסְרֵי, טַעֲמִי, a pronunciation which is in itself admissible

but which in the passages in question is not correct according to tradition. This *Dagesh* too, has been neglected in the current editions. Yet it is attested most emphatically by the Massorah which indicates it mostly by *Dagesh* (דגש) in those places where it ought to be, and by *Raphe* (רפי) where it ought not to be. Thus for instance on וַיֵּאָסֶר the Massorah has the following remark ג' ה' רפ' וּב' דגש'ן it occurs three times, once the *Samech* (ס) has *Dagesh*, i. e. it does not begin a syllable, the syllable begins with the preceding guttural = וַיֵּאָסֶר (Gen. XLII 24) and twice it has *Dagesh*, i. e. it begins a syllable so that the guttural by which it is preceded, has a silent *Sheva* = וַיֵּאָסֶר (Gen. XLVI 29; Exod. XIV 6). To the same effect is the Massorah on מַחֲסֵה which it says ג' רפ'ן וְשֵׁאֵר דגש'ן, i. e. in three passages it is מַחֲסֵה (Joel IV 16; Ps. XLVI 2; LXII 29), but in the other instances it is מַחֲסֵה.<sup>1</sup>

But this statement is based upon a misunderstanding of the expressions *Dagesh* and *Raphe* as used by the

<sup>1</sup> Auch dieses Dagesch findet sich in allen guten Handschriften. Sein Absehen geht darauf, dass der Buchstabe, den es schärft, ausdrucksvoll gesprochen werde; es beginnt ja eine neue Silbe, der vorhergehende Guttural soll mit ruhendem Sch'bâ gelesen werden; das Dagesch warnt, dass man nicht mit ruhendem Sch'bâ gelesen werden; das Dagesch warnt, dass man nicht mit ruhendem Sch'bâ ausgespreche — eine Aussprache, welche an sich statthaft, aber in den betreffenden Stellen nicht die überlieferungsgemäss richtige ist. Auch dieses Dagesch ist in den gangbaren Druckausgaben vernachlässigt. Und doch hat es ausdrückliche Zeugnisse der Masora für sich. Diese zeigt es da, wo es stehen soll, meist mit דגש an, so wie sie da, wo es nicht stehen soll, דגש'ן bemerkt. So macht sie z. B. zu וַיֵּאָסֶר folgende Note: ג' ה' רפ' וּב' דגש'ן, d. h. dreimal kommt וַיֵּאָסֶר vor; einmal ist das *Samech* nicht dagessirt, so dass also nicht mit ihm, sondern mit dem vorhergehenden Guttural die neue Silbe anfängt (וַיֵּאָסֶר Gen. XLII 24), zweimal ist das *Samech* dagessirt, also silben-eröffnend, so dass also der vorstehende Guttural ein einfaches ruhendes Sch'bâ hat (וַיֵּאָסֶר Gen. XLVI 29, Exod. XIV 6). Ebenso bemerkt die Masora: מַחֲסֵה ג' רפ'ן וְשֵׁאֵר דגש'ן, d. h. an drei Stellen ist מַחֲסֵה zu lesen (nämlich Joel IV 16; Ps. XLVI 2; LXII 9), an den drei andern מַחֲסֵה. \* *Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche*, Vol. XXIV, pp. 413, 414, Leipzig 1863.

\* Siehe Heidenheim's *Meor Enajim* zu Gen. X 7 und die *Zeitschrift Kerem Chemed*, Jahrg. IV, S. 119. So wie oben erklärt ist hat man das masoretische דגש und רפי in diesen Fällen zu verstehen; Elias Levita in seinem *Masoreth ha-masoreth* (II 3. g. E.) weiss es nicht befriedigend zu erklären.

Massorah. Elias Levita, who is recognised as the highest Massoretic authority and who was not only a contemporary but a personal friend of Jacob b. Chayim the first compiler and editor of the Massorah, explains it that *Dagesh* in the terminology of the Massorah, denotes *simple Sheva* and that *Raphe* means *Chateph-segol* or *Chateph-pathach*. Accordingly when the Massorah says that וַיֵּאָסֶר has *Dagesh* in two instances, it means that the *Aleph* has *simple Sheva*, i. e. is pointed וַיֵּאָסֶר and that in the one instance where it is *Raphe*, the *Aleph* has *Chateph-segol* or is pointed וַיֵּאָסֶר. The same is the meaning of the Massorah when it says that מַעֲשֵׂר has *Dagesh* in three instances, i. e. the letter *Ayin* has *simple Sheva* or is pointed מַעֲשֵׂר to distinguish it from those places where it is *Raphe* or where the letter *Ayin* has *Chateph-pathach*, i. e. מַעֲשֵׂר. Levita's words are as follows:

I shall now return to my first subject and give you an example of a *Sheva* which the Massorites call *Dagesh*. They make the following remark in the Massorah: 'the expression עלמה to conceal has always *Dagesh*,' that is, it is always with *simple Sheva*, as העלם יעלימו hiding they shall hide (Levit. XX 4) &c. They also say that the word חסיה to trust has always *Dagesh*, as אֶחָסֶה I shall trust (Ps. LVII 2), מַחֲסֵי my shelter (Ps. XCI 2) &c., except in eight instances where it is *Raphe*, that is with *Chateph-pathach* or *Chateph-segol*, as מַחֲסֵה refuge (Joel IV 16), אֶחָסֶה I shall trust (Ps. XVIII 3). They also remark that מַעֲשֵׂר tithe occurs three times with *Dagesh*, as מַעֲשֵׂר the tithe of (Levit. XXVII 30) &c., whilst in all other instances it is *Raphe*, that is with *Chateph-pathach*, as מַעֲשֵׂר the tithe of (Deut. XIV 23) &c.<sup>1</sup>

This definition by the first and foremost expositor of the terminology of the Massorah, it is almost needless to

<sup>1</sup> והנה חוזר על הראשונות ואחן לך משל על השוא שקראו דגש; אמרו במסורת כל לשון העלמה בדגש, ר"ל בשוא פשוט, כמו ואם העלם יעלימו ודומיהן; וכן כל לשון חסיה דגש, כמו בצל כנפוך אָחֶסֶה, אומר ליי"י מַחֲסֵי ודומיהן; חוץ מן ח' רפ'יין. ר"ל בחטף פתח או בחטף סגול, כמו ויי"י מַחֲסֵה לעמו, צורי אָחֶסֶה בו; וכן אמרו מַעֲשֵׂר ג' דגושים, כמו מַעֲשֵׂר הארץ וכולי, וכל שאר רפ'יים, ר"ל בחטף פתח כמי. מַעֲשֵׂר דגש'ן ודיק והמצא עיה. *Comp. Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, pp. 203, 204 ed. Ginsburg.

say, is in perfect harmony with the orthography of the most correct MSS., and with all the early editions. It was Heidenheim who, in his edition of the Pentateuch entitled *Meor Enayim* (Rödelheim 1818—21), maintained that the expression *Dagesh* in these instances denotes the visible dot which is put in the letter following the silent *Sheva*, and that *Raphe* means the absence of this dot in the letter following the *Chateph-pathach* or *Chateph-segol*. "It is the *Mem*," he says on רעמָה in Gen. X 7, "which has the *Dagesh* to show that the *Sheva* which precedes it is simple, i. e. רעמָה and not like נעמָה with *Chateph-pathach* and with *Mem Raphe*."<sup>1</sup>

That Levita's explanation is the correct one and that the sense assigned to these Massoretic expressions by Heidenheim, Delitzsch and Dr. Baer is contrary to the best MSS. will be evident from an examination of the seven examples which these expositors have adduced to prove their theory. To facilitate reference I shall again arrange these passages in the order of the Hebrew Bible.

I. The first passage which Heidenheim quotes and on which, as we have seen, he formulates this rule is רעמָה Gen. X 7. This proper name he points רעמָה. Dr. Baer, who follows Heidenheim and also points it with *Dagesh* in the *Mem*, did not even deem it necessary to make any remark in the Notes, forming the Appendix to Genesis that there is any variation here in the MSS. or in the early editions. As this expression occurs six times, five times as a proper name (Gen. X 7 twice; Ezek. XXVII 22; 1 Chron. I 9 twice), and once denoting *thunder* (Job XXXIX 19), Dr. Baer points it with *Dagesh* in the *Mem*

<sup>1</sup> או"ה דגשות המ"ם להורות על השוא שלפניו שהוא פשוט ואיננו כמו נעמָה בח"פ והמ"ם רפה, וכן מדרך בעל המסרה למסור על כנון אלה דגש ורפה וכמוהו לקמן בפ' ויגש על ויִאָסֵר יוסף מרכבתו נמסר כולהוֹן דגשוֹן במ"א רפה ויִאָסֵר אתִּי לעיניה.

in every instance, and in no case does he mention in the Appendices to the several parts that there exists a difference in the pointing of this word. This, being a test instance, I shall give in detail both the MSS. and the early editions, respecting its orthography.

In the passage before us there are two different orthographies of this expression. The majority of the MSS. and the early editions which I have collated point it רעמָה with *Sheva* under the *Ayin* and without *Dagesh* in the *Mem*. This is the case in Orient. 4445, which is the oldest Codex extant; in Orient. 2201, which is dated A. D. 1246; Add. 9401—9402, dated A. D. 1286; Harley 5710—11; Harley 1528; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2626—28; the first edition of the entire Hebrew Bible, Soncino 1488; the Lisbon edition of the Pentateuch 1491; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491—93; the third edition of the Bible, Brescia 1494; the Complutensian Polyglot; Felix Pratensis' edition of the Rabbinic Bible 1517; and the quarto edition, Venice 1521.

The second way in which this expression is pointed, is רעמָה with *Chateph-pathach* under the *Ayin*. This is the case in Arund. Orient. 2, which is dated A. D. 1216; in Add. 15250; Orient. 4227 and in the first edition of the Pentateuch, Bologna 1482. The only MS. which points it רעמָה with *Dagesh* in the *Mem*, as far as my collation extended, is Add. 15451, but even this MS. points it רעמָה without the *Dagesh* in the second instance of this very verse. It is probably owing to this MS. or to one like it, that Jacob b. Chayim appended in the margin מַם דַּגְּ = *Mem* has *Dagesh* and accordingly pointed it רעמָה. But this is the first and the only one of the early editions which has adopted this orthography. The most remarkable fact, however, in connection with the orthography of this

expression, has still to be stated. Heidenheim in his edition of the *Ayin Ha-Korē* gives ׀רעמָה with *Dagesh* in the *Mem* as the pointing of Yekuthiel, whereas in the two MSS. of this *Nakdan* in the British Museum, one, viz. Orient. 19776, has it ׀רעמָה with *Chateph-pathach* under the *Ayin*, whilst Orient. 856 points it ׀רעמָה without *Dagesh* in the *Mem*, thus exhibiting the two-fold orthography which is to be found in almost all the MSS. and the early editions. And yet this is the very passage in Yekuthiel upon which Heidenheim reared his fabric.

The second instance in which this proper name occurs, is in the latter half of this very verse, viz. Gen. X 7. Here too the MSS. and the early editions exhibit two kinds of orthography. The larger majority of MSS. and editions point it ׀רעמָה with *Sheva* under the *Ayin* and without *Dagesh* in the *Mem*. This is the case in Orient. 4445; Orient. 2201; Add. 9401—9402; Harley 5710—11; Harley 1528; Yekuthiel Orient. 853; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365 and Orient. 2626—28 as well as all the above named early editions. The MSS. which exhibit ׀רעמָה, the second kind of orthography, are Arund. Orient. 2, dated A. D. 1216; Yekuthiel in Orient. 19776; Add. 15250; Orient. 4227 and the first edition of the Pentateuch, Bologna 1482. It is remarkable that Add. 15451, which, as we have seen, is the only MS. representing ׀רעמָה with *Dagesh* in the *Mem*, has here ׀רעמָה without *Dagesh*, so that the first Rabbinic Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim is the solitary early edition which has ׀רעמָה with *Dagesh*.

The third instance in which this proper name occurs, is Ezek. XXVII 22. Here all the MSS. with one exception and all the editions also with one exception have ׀רעמָה without *Dagesh* in the *Mem*. This is the case in Orient. 2201; Harley 5710—11; Arund. Orient. 16; Add. 15451;

Harley 1528; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 2626—28; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491—93; the Latter Prophets, Pesaro 1515; the fourth edition of the Bible, Pesaro 1511—1517; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the Venice quarto edition 1521 and the first edition of Jacob b. Chayim's Rabbinic Bible with the Massorah, Venice 1524—25. The only edition which exhibits ׀רעמָה the second kind of orthography is that of Brescia 1494, whilst there is one solitary MS. in the British Museum which has ׀רעמָה with *Dagesh* in the *Mem*, viz. Orient. 4227. The remarkable fact in connection with this instance is that both, Add. 15451 and the first edition of Jacob b. Chayim's Bible with the Massorah which represent this orthography in Gen. X 7, have in the passage before us ׀רעמָה without *Dagesh* in the *Mem*.

The fourth passage in which this expression occurs, but where it is not a proper name, is Job XXXIX 19. All the MSS. with one exception exhibit the first orthography, viz. ׀רעמָה with *Sheva* under the *Ayin* and *Mem* without *Dagesh*. So Orient. 2201; Harley 5710—11; Arund. Orient. 16; Or. 2091; Harley 1528; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 2212; Orient. 2626—28; the first edition of the Hagiographa, Naples 1486—87; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491—93; the third edition of the Bible, Brescia 1494; the Psalms, Proverbs, Job &c., Salonica 1515; the Complutensian Polyglot; the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the quarto Bible, Venice 1521; and Jacob b. Chayim's first edition of the Bible with the Massorah 1524—25. ׀רעמָה the second orthography with *Chateph-pathach* under the *Ayin* is exhibited in Orient. 4227; in the first edition of the Bible, Soncino 1488; and in the fourth edition, Pesaro 1511—17. From the above analysis it will be seen that not one of the MSS. which I have

collated, nor any of the early editions have רַעְמָה with Dagesh in the *Mem*.

The fifth passage where this expression occurs, but where it is again a proper name, is in 1 Chron. I 9. As is the case in the other instances the MSS. and editions have here the two-fold orthography, but as they also exhibit a variant in the spelling, it will be best to discuss the authorities under the different forms in which it is written.

The first form of this name in the earlier part of the verses is רַעְמָא with *Aleph* at the end, and *Sheva* under the *Ayin* without Dagesh in the *Mem*. This is the case in Orient. 2201; Arund. Orient. 16; Harley 1528; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491—93; the Complutensian Polyglot; and the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25. The same form with *Aleph*, but exhibiting the second orthography, viz. רַעְמָה with *Cateph-pathach* under the *Ayin*, is to be found in Add. 15252; and in Orient. 4227, but in none of the early editions.

The variant or the second form of this name is רַעְמָה with *He* at the end. This also exhibits the two-fold orthography. Thus רַעְמָה with *Sheva* under the *Ayin*, but without the Dagesh in the *Mem*, is the reading in Harley 5710—11; Orient. 2091; Orient. 2212; the first edition of the Hagiographa, Naples 1486—87; the first edition of the Bible, Soncino 1488; the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; and the quarto Bible, Venice 1521, whilst רַעְמָה the second orthography with *Chateph-pathach* under the *Ayin* is the reading of the third and fourth editions of the Bible, Brescia 1494 and Pesaro 1511—17. It will thus be seen that רַעְמָא or רַעְמָה with Dagesh in the *Mem* is not the reading in any of the MSS. or editions.

We now come to the sixth or last instance of this expression which occurs in the latter part of the same verse, i. e. 1 Chron. I 9. As the MSS. and editions also exhibit here a variant in the spelling, I shall separate the two different forms. The form which has the greatest MS. authority, is רַעְמָה with *He* at the end. But like its fellow in the other passages, it has been transmitted in a two-fold orthography. The one best attested is רַעְמָה with *Sheva* under the *Ayin*, *He* at the end and no Dagesh in the *Mem*. This is the reading in Orient. 2201; Harley 5710—11; Arund. Orient. 16; Orient. 2091; Harley 1528; Add. 15252; Add. 15451; Orient. 2212; Orient. 2626—28; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the Venice quarto 1521; and the first Rabbinic Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25. The same spelling, but with *Chateph-pathach* under the *Ayin*, i. e. רַעְמָה is also exhibited in Orient. 4227; the first, third and fourth editions of the Bible, Soncino 1488, Brescia 1494 and Pesaro 1511—17. The variant is רַעְמָא with *Aleph* at the end, but this too has no Dagesh in the *Mem* and is to be found in Add. 15250; Add. 15251; in the first edition of the Hagiographa, Naples 1486—87; and in the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491—93. Here too, therefore, רַעְמָה or רַעְמָא with Dagesh in the *Mem* is not the reading in any of the MSS. or early editions. But what is most remarkable in connection with this orthography, is the fact that the only MS. which points it with Dagesh in the *Mem* in Gen. X 7 and the only early edition which exhibits the same phenomenon, viz. Add. 15451 and the first edition of Jacob b. Chayim's Rabbinic Bible, have it here without Dagesh in the *Mem* in both parts of the verse, though 1 Chron. I 9 is a duplicate of Gen. X 7.

The result, therefore, of the above analysis of the six instances in which this expression occurs, is as follows.



In the first passage only one MS. and one edition have the Dagesh. In the second passage, which is the second clause of the same verse, the same single edition has it, but no MS., not even the one which exhibits it in the first clause. In the third passage only one MS. has it, but not a single edition, whilst in the fourth, fifth and sixth passages it is not to be found in any MS. or early edition.

## II. Gen. XLVI 29.

וַיֵּאָסֶר *with* Dagesh, Add. 9401; Add. 15451; Orient. 4227.

וַיֵּאָסֶר *without* Dagesh, Orient. 4445, which is the oldest MS. extant; Arund. Orient. 2, dated A. D. 1216; Orient. 2201, dated A. D. 1246; Harley 5710—11; Harley 1528; Add. 21160; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626—28; the first edition of the Pentateuch, Bologna 1482; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491—93; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the quarto Bible, Venice 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25. The orthography וַיֵּאָסֶר with *Chateph-segol* under the *Aleph* is exhibited in the first edition of the Bible, Soncino 1488; in the Lisbon Pentateuch 1491; and in the third edition of the Bible, Brescia 1494.

## Exod. XIV 6.

וַיֵּאָסֶר *with* Dagesh, Add. 9401; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15451.

וַיֵּאָסֶר *without* Dagesh, Orient. 4445; Arund. Orient. 2; Orient. 2201; Harley 1528; Add. 21160; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 4227; Orient. 2328; Orient. 2329; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626—28; the first edition of the Pentateuch,

Bologna 1482; the Lisbon edition 1491; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491—93; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the quarto Bible, Venice 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25. וַיֵּאָסֶר with *Chateph-segol* is exhibited in Add. 15250, and in the first and third editions of the Bible, Soncino 1488 and Brescia 1494.

In analysing the different MSS. on this word in the foregoing two passages the following facts are disclosed: (1) Orient. 4227, which has Dagesh in the *Samech* in Gen. XLVI 29, has no Dagesh in Exod. XIV 6; (2) Harley 5710—11, which has no Dagesh in Gen. XLVI 29, but which has Dagesh in the text in Exod. XIV 6, is corrected in the Massorah Parva with the remark "ג' רפי בקרי" i. e. *in three instances it is Raphe in the Bible* which either means that it is one of the three passages where it is וַיֵּאָסֶר with *Chateph-segol* or וַיֵּאָסֶר with *Sheva* under the *Aleph* and without Dagesh in the *Samech*; and (3) Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; and Orient. 2365, which have the following Massorah against it כל לשוי הבישה לא מפיק אלף, show beyond doubt that the Massorah on this word, whether it is דגש or רפי, refers to the *Aleph* and not to the *Samech*.

## III. Levit. XX 4.

העֵלֶם יעֵלִימוֹ *with* Dagesh, Add. 9401, Add. 15451.

העֵלֶם יעֵלִימוֹ *without* Dagesh, Orient. 4445; Orient. 2201; Harley 5710—11; Harley 1528; Add. 21160; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 4227; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626—28; the first edition of the Pentateuch,

Bologna 1482; the first edition of the Bible, Soncino 1488; the Lisbon Pentateuch 1491; the second and third editions of the Bible, Naples 1491—93, Brescia 1494; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the quarto Bible, Venice 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25. **יְעִלִּמוּ הָעֵלָם** with *Chateph-pathach* under the *Ayin* is the reading in Arund. Orient. 2, which is dated A. D. 1216, and Add. 15250.

## IV. Psalm X 1.

**תְּעִלִּים** with Dagesh, Add. 15451; the first and third editions of the Bible, Soncino 1488, Brescia 1494. **תְּעִלִּים** without Dagesh, Orient. 2201; Arund. Orient. 16; Harley 5710—11; Harley 1528; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 2091; Orient. 2626—28; Orient. 2212; the first edition of the Hagiographa, Naples 1486—87; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491—93; the fourth edition, Pesaro 1511—17; the Psalms, Proverbs &c., Salonica 1515; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the quarto Bible, Venice 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25. **תְּעִלִּים** with *Chateph-pathach* under the *Ayin*, is the reading in Orient. 4227.

## V. Psalm XXXIV 1.

**טַעֲמוֹ** with Dagesh, Add. 15451.

**טַעֲמוֹ** without Dagesh, Orient. 2201; Arund. Orient. 16; Harley 5710—11; Harley 1528; Orient. 2091; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 2212; Orient. 2626—28; the first edition of the Hagiographa, Naples 1486—87; the Psalms, Proverbs &c., Salonica 1515; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first edition

of the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the quarto Bible, Venice 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25. **טַעֲמוֹ** with *Chateph-pathach* under the *Ayin* is the reading in Orient. 4227; the first, second, third and fourth editions of the Bible, Soncino 1488, Naples 1491—93, Brescia 1494, and Pesaro 1511—17.

## VI. Psalm LXI 4.

**מַחֲסֶה** with Dagesh, Add. 15451.

**מַחֲסֶה** without Dagesh, Orient. 2201; Harley 5710—11; Harley 1528; Orient. 2091; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 2212; Orient. 2626—28; the first edition of the Hagiographa, Naples 1486—87; the first edition of the Bible, Soncino 1488; the second edition, Naples 1491—93; the third edition, Brescia 1494; the fourth edition, Pesaro 1511—17; the Psalms, Proverbs &c., Salonica 1515; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the quarto Bible, Venice 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25. The reading **מַחֲסֶה** with *Chateph-pathach* under the *Cheth* is that of Arund. Orient. 16 and Orient. 4227. The former has the Massorah against it **ח' רפ"י בליש'** eight times with *Chateph-pathach* in this form. I have, therefore, adopted it in my edition.

## VII. Psalm CV 22.

**לְאָפֶר** with Dagesh, Add. 15451; Orient. 2091.

**לְאָפֶר** without Dagesh, Orient. 2201; Arund. Orient. 16; Harley 5710—11; Harley 1528; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 4227; Orient. 2212; Orient. 2626—28; the first, second, third and fourth editions

of the Bible, Soncino 1488, Naples 1491—93, Brescia 1494, Pesaro 1511—17; the Psalms, Proverbs &c., Salonica 1515; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the quarto Bible, Venice 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25. The reading **לאָסר** with *Chateph-segol* is exhibited in the first edition of the Hagiographa, Naples 1486—87.

VIII. Psalm CIX 29.

**ויעטו** with Dagesh.

**ויעטו** with *Chateph-pathach*, Orient. 2201; Arund. Orient. 16; Harley 5710—11; Harley 1528; Add. 21161; Add. 15451; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 4227; Orient. 2091; Orient. 2212; Orient. 2626—28; the first edition of the Hagiographa, Naples 1486—87; the first, second and third editions of the Bible, Soncino 1488, Naples 1491—93, and Brescia 1494; the Psalms, Proverbs &c., Salonica 1515; the Complutensian Polyglot; the edition of the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the quarto Bible, Venice 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25.

These are the instances adduced by Heidenheim and Delitzsch to establish their rule that the consonant which follows a guttural with *Sheva* is invariably with Dagesh. The passages in which **ויעטו** occurs marked No. I, I have already analysed. Though No. II has the support of three MSS., the most ancient and by far the larger number are against this eccentric Dagesh. Amongst these are Standard Codices of exceptional accuracy. Moreover all the early editions, which Delitzsch himself describes as having the same value as MSS., are against its presence. Equally so is

No. III which is exhibited in two MSS., but which is opposed to the oldest and Standard Codices as well as to all the early editions. No. IV, which is found in only one MS., is supported by two editions, but is against the large majority of Codices and early editions. Nos. V and VI have only one MS. in their favour and no early edition at all. No. VII, which is supported by two MSS., has not only all the Standard Codices against it, but all the early editions, whilst No. VIII is a false reading, since I could not find it in any MS. or early edition.

Levita's explanation, therefore, of the Massoretic use of the terms Dagesh and Raphe is fully borne out by the larger number of MSS., amongst which are the oldest and Standard Codices. Hence, Delitzsch's declaration, that the Dagesh in the consonant after a guttural with *Sheva* is to be found in all the best MSS., is based upon wrong information for which, as the article in question shows, Dr. Baer is responsible. To introduce, therefore, this eccentric Dagesh throughout the Hebrew Bible, as has been done by Dr. Baer, is a most unjustifiable innovation. The only thing which can legitimately be done with the evidence of the MSS. and early editions before us, is to mention the fact that some mediaeval purists have inserted it in several places.

Far less objectionable is the third category of words in behalf of which Delitzsch in the same article pleads for the Dagesh and into which Dr. Baer has actually inserted it throughout the Bible in accordance with the rule laid down by Ben Balaam and Moses the *Nakdan* that when the two labials *Beth Mem* (**במ**) follow each other at the beginning of a word the *Beth*, when it has *Sheva*, has Dagesh though it is preceded by one of the vowel-letters **ויוא**. And though Joseph Kimchi who, in expanding this rule, enforced it by the solemn declaration that whoso reads

בְּמַקְלִי (Gen. XXXII 11) *Raphe*, has not the spirit of the true grammarian in him,<sup>1</sup> yet the grammarian Heidenheim deliberately points it so in his edition of the Pentateuch where he himself first called attention to this rule. Dr. Baer who, as a rule, follows Heidenheim most slavishly, has indeed in this instance departed from his great exemplar, reverted to the statement of Kimchi and accordingly points it בְּמַקְלִי with Dagesh. This, however, is against the celebrated Codex Hilali and against numerous Codices as well as against all the early editions, as will be seen from the following enumeration: Orient. 4445; Orient. 2201; Harley 2201; Add. 15251; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; and Orient. 2626—28. In all these MSS. the *Beth* has the *Raphe* stroke over it (בְּ) so that there can be no mistake about it. It is also *Raphe* in the first edition of the Pentateuch, Bologna 1482; in the first edition of the Bible, Soncino 1488; in the second edition, Naples 1491—93; in the third edition, Brescia 1494; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the quarto Bible, Venice 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25.

The other instances which come under this rule and which Dr. Baer has invariably dageshed are treated in a similar manner in the MSS. and early editions. As I have, however, generally indicated the variations in their proper places, it is not necessary to discuss them here.

<sup>1</sup> אם הראשונה ב"ת ואחריה מ"ם הב"ת רנושה כמו כי בְּמַקְלִי (Gen. XXXII 11) והקורא איתה רפויה אין רוח בעלי הלשון המרקקים נוחה הימנו. שהרי ב"ת רפויה דומה להב"ת ו"ו ולעולם לא תהיה ו"ו שואית לפני איתיות במ"ף אבל נשתנה למלאפום: ספר הזכרון: Comp. Dr. Baer, Appendix to the Psalms, p. 92.

## Chap. II.

### The Orthography.

Without going the full length of those who maintain that the Hebrew Codex, from which the Septuagint was made, had no *matres lectiones* at all,<sup>1</sup> it is now established beyond a doubt that the letters אדו"י commonly called quiescent or feeble letters, have been gradually introduced into the Hebrew text.<sup>2</sup> It is, moreover, perfectly certain that the presence or absence of these letters in our text in many instances is entirely due to the idiosyncrasy of the Scribes.

This is by no means the result of modern philology. Jehudah Chayug, who flourished circa A. D. 1010—1040 and who is described as the founder of Hebrew Grammar, already states that the insertion or omission of the *matres lectiones* has always been left to the discretion of the scribes, and that this practice still obtained in his days.<sup>3</sup>

Still more emphatic is the declaration of Ibn Ezra (1093—1167). He assures us that the choice of plenes and defectives was entirely left to the judgment of individual copyists, that some scribes wrote certain words plene

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Lagarde: *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Uebersetzung der Proverbien*, p. 4, Leipzig 1863.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Chwolson: *Die Quiescentes ו"י in der allhebräischen Orthographie* in the third International Congress of Orientalists, Vol. II, pp. 459, 474 and 478, St. Petersburg 1876.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. Jehudah Chayug's Grammatical works edited by Leopold Dukes in the *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Aeltesten Auslegung und Sprachklärung des Allen Testaments* von Ewald und Dukes, Vol. III, p. 22, Stuttgart 1844.

when in their opinion the text ought to be made a little clearer, and that others wrote the same words defective when they wanted to economise space. His words are as follows:

The sages of the Massorah evolved from their inner consciousness reasons why some words are plene and some defective which, however, only serves to satisfy the ignorant who seek reasons for the plenes and defectives. Behold the scribe could not do otherwise than write plene when he wanted to preclude the word from being mistaken for its homonym as for instance עולם,<sup>1</sup> or defective when he wanted to be shorter.<sup>2</sup>

The following examples will suffice to illustrate this fact.

א. — The Massorah itself has catalogued various Lists of words in which *Aleph* is still wanting. From these Lists, which I have printed in the Massorah<sup>3</sup> I extract a few instances exhibiting words in their original form.

מצאתי “*I have found*” (Numb. XI 11) the only instance of the preterite first person which has survived without *Aleph*. In all the other 39 passages in which it occurs this radical letter has uniformly been inserted.

יצאתי “*I came out*” (Job I 21) which has not only *Aleph* inserted in the only other place where it occurs in this very book (Job III 11), but also in all the other five instances where it is to be found in the Hebrew Bible.<sup>4</sup>

מלאתי “*I am full*” (Job XXXII 18) which has *Aleph* inserted in the other two instances where it occurs (Jerem. VI 11; Micah III 8).

<sup>1</sup> That is עולם is plene and not עלם defective which might be mistaken for עלם, עולם, עולם, or עלם = עולם.

<sup>2</sup> וחכמי המסרה בראו מלבם טעמים למלאי ולחסרי, והם טובים למלא כל חסר לב, כי אחרי שהם מבקשים טעם למלא ולחסר, הנה אין כח בסופר לכתוב רק מלא אם רצה לבאר שלא תחערב המלה כמו עולם, או יכתוב חסר לאחוז דרך קצרה: editio Lippmann, Fürth 1839.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter א, §§ 14–18, Vol. I, pp. 9–12.

<sup>4</sup> Comp. Numb. XXII 32; Jerem. XIV 18; XX 18; Prov. VII 15; Dan. IX 22.

והחזו “*and she laid hold*” (2 Sam. XX 9) in which the *Aleph* has been inserted in the only other passage where this form is to be found (Ruth III 15).

שלחך “*thy petition*” (1 Sam. I 17). Here too the *Aleph* has been introduced in the other three places where this form occurs (Esther V 6; VII 2; IX 12).

Still more striking is the case where the same phrase occurs twice in the same book, once exhibiting the primitive form without *Aleph*, and once with *Aleph* inserted.

Thus for instance Gen. XXV 24 “and behold תומם twins in her womb” without *Aleph*, and Gen. XXXVIII 27 “and behold תאומים twins in her womb” with *Aleph*.

Jeremiah VIII 11 “and they have healed וירפו the hurt” without *Aleph* at the end of the word, and Jeremiah VI 14 “and they have healed וירפאו the hurt” with *Aleph* at the end of the word.

David’s Hymn of Triumph which is recorded in duplicate, once in 2 Sam. XXII and once in Psalm XVIII, affords a striking illustration of this fact. In the former the phrase “for thou hast girded me” ותזרני with strength for the battle” (2 Sam. XXII 40) exhibits the primitive form without *Aleph*, whilst in the latter “for thou hast girded me ותאזרני with strength for the battle” (Ps. XVIII 40) there is already the insertion of the *Aleph*.

In the list of David’s heroes, of which we have also a duplicate, one in 2 Samuel XXIII, and one in Chronicles XI, Nahari the Beerothite is mentioned. In the one place it is הברתי the *Berothite* without *Aleph* (1 Chron. XI 39), whilst in other it is הברתי the *Berothite* (2 Sam. XXIII 37) with *Aleph* already inserted.

The examples of the absence of *Aleph* which are duly noticed by the Massorah are of a still more instructive character when we consider the following instances:

בְּנֵי in Gen. XXX 11 is according to the Massorah בְּ נָד = בָּא נָד *a troop cometh*. It will be seen that not only are the two words written continuously, but that in separating them *Aleph* has to be inserted by the direction of the Massorah.

The same is the case according to the testimony of the Massorites in Jeremiah XVIII 3 where וְהִנֵּהוּ is separated into two words, i. e. וְהִנֵּה הוּא [= וְהִנֵּה הוּא] *and behold he* and where *He* is omitted in the first word, and *Aleph* in the second. The Massorah itself records that whilst the *Aleph* was being inserted by one School of Massorites, another School adhered in some instances to the more primitive orthography.

Thus, for instance in Jerem. XXIX 22 the Western School read וּבְאָחָב = וּבְאָחָב *and like Ahab* retaining the ancient mode of spelling, whilst the Eastern School have this form only in the *Kethiv* and inserted the second *Aleph* in the *Keri*, viz. וּבְאָחָב.

The same is the case in Psalm CXXXIX 20 where the Westerns read יִמְרוֹךְ without *Aleph*, and the Easterns read יִאֲמְרוֹךְ with *Aleph*.

These typical illustrations suffice to show that the primitive forms have not all been superseded by the fuller mode of spelling.

Many other instances of the absence of *Aleph* occur throughout the text which have partially been obscured by the Punctuators, who, by not recognising this fact have so pointed the words in question as to assign them to different roots. By a careful use of the ancient Versions, however, which were made prior to the introduction of the vowel-signs we are not unfrequently able to ascertain the primitive orthography, as will be seen from the following illustrations:

In Gen. IV 15 the text from which the Septuagint was made had לֹא כֵן (without *Aleph*) = לֹא כֵן *"not so"* and this

reading is supported by the context. Cain tells God in the preceding verse that as a fugitive his life was in danger, and that any one who chances to meet him will slay him. Hereupon the Lord assures him in the verse before us that this shall not be the case. Accordingly the correct reading of the verse is: "And the Lord said unto him, it shall not be so (לֹא כֵן) whosoever &c."

In 2 Kings VII 17 we have the primitive form הַמְּלִאָךְ = הַמְּלִיךְ = הַמְּלִיךְ *"the messenger"* without *Aleph* as is attested by the Septuagint and the Syriac. The passage ought accordingly to be translated "when *the messenger* came down to him". This is corroborated by the statement in the preceding chapter, viz. VI 33 Exactly the reverse is the case in 2 Sam. XI 1 where the Massorah itself tells us that the redactors of the text inserted *Aleph* into this very word, converting (הַמְּלָכִים) *"kings"* into (הַמְּלִאָכִים) *"messengers"*.

Ps. XXXIII 7 the Septuagint translates "He gathered the waters of the sea together as in a bottle" כָּנָד = כָּנָד = כָּנָד. This form, which occurs in Ps. CXIX 83 with *Aleph*, was manifestly written here without *Aleph*, but was originally pronounced in the same way, as is also attested by the Chaldee and the Syriac as well as by the parallelism. The Massorites, however, who supposed that there is a reference here to the passage of the *Red Sea* (Exod. XV 8) pointed it כָּנָד and thus obscured its etymology.

According to the testimony of the Septuagint and the Syriac, לְשַׂרְךָ in Proverbs III 8 ought to be pointed לְשַׂרְךָ = לְשַׂרְךָ and the word in question exhibits the primitive form without the *Aleph*. The passage, therefore, ought to be translated:

"It shall be health to thy body  
And marrow to thy bones."

This reading which restores the parallelism is now adopted by most critics.

In the process of supplying the *Aleph*, however, the redactors of the text have not unfrequently inserted it where the Massorites themselves tell us, it is superfluous. Hence the Massorah has preserved different Lists of sundry expressions, in which, by the direction of the Massorites the *Aleph* is to be cancelled.<sup>1</sup>

Thus for instance they state that **תְּסַפֵּן** which occurs twice in Exodus, viz. V 7 and IX 28 has in the first passage a superfluous *Aleph*, and this is corroborated by the fact that in the only other two places where this form occurs (Gen. XLIV 23; Deut. XVII 16) it has no *Aleph*.

The same is the case in 2 Sam. XI 24 **וַיִּרְאוּ הַמִּזְרָאִים** "and the shooters shot" where the *Aleph*, according to the Massorah, has superfluously been inserted in both words, and this is confirmed by a reference to 2 Chronicles XXXV 23, where this phrase occurs again without the *Aleph*.

These again must be taken as simply typical instances. Other examples may easily be gathered from the ancient Versions of which the following is a striking illustration, where *Aleph* has been inserted in **בְּצוּר** *rock* making it **בְּצִוָּאר** *neck* Ps. LXXV 6. The Septuagint exhibits the primitive form without the *Aleph* and the passage ought accordingly to be translated:

"Do not exalt your horn toward heaven  
Nor speak arrogantly of the Rock."

א and ע. — The same vicissitudes to which the feeble *Aleph* was subject, are also traceable in the soft *Ayin*. Very frequently it was not expressed in the primitive forms. This orthography is still exhibited in the name **בַּל** *Bel* = **בַּעַל** *Baal* which has survived in three instances (Isa. XLVI 1; Jerem. L 2; LI 44) apart from compound proper names, and in the particle of entreaty **בִּי** = **בַּעֲי** *I pray, O!* The

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter א, §§ 17, 18, Vol. I, pp. 11, 12.

Massorah itself tells us that **וְנִשְׁקָה** (Amos VIII 8) stands for **וְנִשְׁקָהָ**.

According to the testimony of the ancient Versions **לְמִי**, in Ps. XXVIII 8, is the primitive form of **לְעַמּוֹ**, "to His people". This is attested by the Septuagint, the Syriac and the Vulgate as well as by several MSS., and the parallel passage in Ps. XXIX 11. Accordingly the verse is to be translated:

"Jehovah is strength to His people  
And He is the saving strength to His anointed."

And it is now admitted by the best critics that **בְּנוֹ** in Micah I 10 stands for **בְּנֹו** = **בְּעֵנֹו** the maritime city in the territory of Asher (Comp. Judg. I 31). Accordingly Micah I 10 reads:

"Declare it not at Gath  
Weep not at Accho  
In the house of Aphrah roll thyself in the dust."

This explains the otherwise inexplicable passage in Hosea VII 6. Here **יִשָּׁן** simply exhibits the primitive orthography, **יִשָּׁן** = **יַעֲשָׁן**, and **אִפְהָם** is to be pointed **אִפְהָם** as is attested by the Chaldee and the Syriac. Accordingly the passage is to be translated:

"their anger smoketh all night."<sup>1</sup>

This not only relieves the verse, but agrees with the context and parallelism.

Owing to their similarity in pronunciation and most probably also to the similarity of their form in ancient times<sup>2</sup> the redactors of the text, in supplying these two

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Deut. XXIX 19 and W. Robertson Smith in the *Journal of Philology*. Vol. XVI, p. 72, London and Cambridge 1888.

<sup>2</sup> That the א and ע like the ב and כ the ו and י &c. must have been similar in form in olden times is evident from the following caution given in the Talmud to the Scribes **כִּפֵּן כִּפֵּן כִּתְחַן כִּתְחַן אֶלְפִין**. *שלא יתהיב אלפין עינין עינין אלפין*. *כיתחן כפין כפין כיתחן* Comp. *Sabbath* 103 b.

letters, have not unfrequently interchanged them. Hence we have נָנַעַל to be rejected as polluted with *Ayin* in 2 Sam. I 21, and נָנַאֵל with *Aleph* in Zeph. III 1.

מִתְעַב despised with *Ayin* Isa. XLIX 7, and מִתְאַב with *Aleph* Amos VI 8.

In Ps. LXXVI 8 it is אֵן אִפִּיךָ = עֵן the power of thine anger, and Ps. XC 11 עֵן אִפִּיךָ.

Hosea VII 6 כִּאֲרַבִּים is now regarded by some of the best critics to stand for כָּם בְּעֵר, whilst קָרְעוּ Ps. XXXV 15 is taken for קָרְאוּ "they cry out". Professor Cheyne, who adopts this rendering, did not even deem it necessary to notice the fact that it is with *Ayin* in the Massoretic text, and that without this interchange of letters it denotes to rend asunder. The Massorah has preserved sundry Lists of words in which *Aleph* stands for *Ayin* and vice versa.<sup>1</sup>

ה. — The greatest peculiarities exhibited in the orthography of the Hebrew text are connected with the letter *He*. The Massorah catalogues a number of Lists of words which ought to have *He* at the beginning; and vice versa, of words which have a superfluous *He*, and which, according to the Massorah ought to be cancelled;<sup>2</sup> words which want *He* in the middle, and vice versa, words which have a superfluous *He* in the middle,<sup>3</sup> as well as of words which have a superfluous *He* at the end, and which the Massorites condemn.<sup>4</sup>

Of great orthographical and lexical importance, moreover, are the Lists containing sundry words throughout the Hebrew Scriptures, in which this letter is interchanged

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter א, § 514, Vol. I, p. 57; letter ע, §§ 352, 360 &c.; Vol. II, p. 390.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter ה, § 9, Vol. I, p. 256.

<sup>3</sup> *The Massorah*, letter ה, §§ 26—28, Vol. I, pp. 268, 269.

<sup>4</sup> *The Massorah*, letter ה, §§ 33, 34, Vol. I, pp. 269, 270.

with the letter *Aleph*, and with the letter *Vav*, and vice versa.<sup>1</sup>

These Massoretic Lists, however important as they assuredly are, by no means exhaust all the passages. They simply exhibit typical examples which may easily be multiplied from the ancient Versions. Without attempting to analyse the import of all the passages tabulated by the Massorites, I will point out the influence which the introduction of the *He* into the text has exercised both upon the orthography and the sense by adducing a few illustrations.

I shall quote first a few passages from the parallel records of the same event, narrated both in 2 Samuel V 9, VII 9 and 1 Chronicles XI 7, XVII 8 inasmuch as there can be no room for doubt here about the diversity of orthography in identically the same phrases, recording identically the same occurrence.

In 2 Sam. V 9 it is, "and David dwelt בְּמִצְדָה in the castle and he called her<sup>2</sup> the city of David": whereas in 1 Chron. XI 7 it is, "and David dwelt בְּמִצְדָה in the castle: therefore they called him<sup>3</sup> the city of David." There can, therefore, be no doubt that the primitive form was בְּמִצְדָה = בְּמִצְדָה the feminine. The redactor of Samuel who inserted the *He*, in accordance with the later mode of spelling, pointed it בְּמִצְדָה feminine, whilst the redactor of Chronicles retained the primitive form without the *He*, and hence pointed it בְּמִצְדָה, which is masculine. It will be seen that this diversity of orthography necessitated also a change in the gender of the pronominal suffix, third person singular. This was more easily effected since it required no alteration

<sup>1</sup> *The Massorah*, letter א, §§ 35, 47, 49, Vol. I, pp. 270, 272, 273.

<sup>2</sup> לָהּ i. e. the castle, which is feminine.

<sup>3</sup> Here the castle is in the masculine and hence לוֹ, the masculine suffix.



in the letters, inasmuch as according to the ancient orthography the *He* stood also for the suffix, third person masculine. It was necessary only to pronounce it הָ in the one case, and הֵ in the other.

In 2 Samuel VII 9 it is "and I have *cast off* (וְאַכַרְתָּהּ) all thine enemies", whereas in the parallel passage 1 Chronicles XVII 8, where the same event is recorded, it is "and I have *cut off* (וְאַכַרִית) all thine enemies". This diversity of spelling is manifestly due to the fact that in the primitive text it was simply וְאַכַרְתָּהּ, which the redactor of Samuel resolved into וְאַכַרְתָּהּ by adding *He* at the end, whilst the redactor of Chronicles, demurring to this unique form, resolved it into וְאַכַרִית by inserting *Yod* in the middle, thus making it conformable to the other three instances where this Hiphil future first person singular occurs.<sup>1</sup>

The absence of *He* in the primitive text explains a variation in the present text which affects the translation.

In 2 Sam. XXIV 13 it is "or *will thou flee* (נָסָה) three months before thine enemies?", whereas in 1 Chron. XXI 12 it is "or *will thou be destroyed* (נִסְפָה) three months before thine enemies". Originally the text was in both passages נָסָה, without *He*, which was afterward introduced into Chronicles by the redactor. It was a copyist, who at a later period mistook נ for פ, as is evident from the Septuagint and the Vulgate which still have נָסָה.

In Jeremiah XXIII 5 it is "I will raise unto David (צֶמַח צְדִיק) a *righteous branch*", whereas in the parallel passage in the same book, it is "I will cause to grow up unto David (צֶמַח צְדִיקָה) *the branch of righteousness*" (XXXIII 15). The diversity in identically the same phrase, is however easily explained. The text originally had simply צֶדֶק

in both passages which the redactors of Jeremiah resolved, in one place into צֶדֶק = צְדִיקָה, and in the other into צֶדֶק = צְדִיק. In the one case they appended *He* (ה), in accordance with the later mode of spelling, and in the other they inserted *Yod* (י) in the middle of the word, just as they introduced the same letter into the middle of the word in 1 Chron. XVII 8.

The Massorah registers instances where the *He* is omitted at the end of the word, in the preterite third person feminine. It states, for example, that in Gen. XIX 23, Jerem. XLVIII 45, and Dan. VIII 9 יָצָא stands for יָצְאָה = יָצְאָה.<sup>1</sup> But here again the passages must simply be regarded as typical, since according to the testimony of the ancient Versions other instances still existed where this primitive orthography obtained, which are not recognised by the Massorah. Another instance where יָצָא stands for יָצְאָה = יָצְאָה is 2 Sam. XX 8 which according to the testimony of the Septuagint ought to be read יָצְאָה וְהָיָה "and it (i. e. the sword) came out and fell".

That in Gen. XXIX 34 קָרָא stood for קָרָה = קָרָה "she called" is evident from the Samaritan and the Septuagint.

It is equally certain from the Samaritan, the Septuagint and the Syriac that יָלַד in Gen. XLVI 22 was read יָלְדָה = יָלְדָה "she bore".

The *He* was even omitted at the end when it was suffix third person singular feminine, e. g. אִישָׁה = אִישָׁה "her husband" 2 Sam. III 15 as is attested by the Septuagint, the Chaldee, the Syriac and the Vulgate, and is accepted by the best critics.

I have already adverted to the fact that the suffix third person singular masculine was written with *He* in the primitive text instead of *Vav*, and that the Massorah itself

Comp. 1 Sam. II 33; Nahum I 14; Zech. XIII 2.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter י, § 472, Vol. I, p. 731.

gives a List of words which have not been made conformable to the later orthography. In all these instances the Massorah carefully directs that the words in question are to be read with *Vav* instead of *He*.<sup>1</sup> There was, however, a difference of opinion in some of the Schools whether the *He* in certain words expressed the suffix third person singular feminine or masculine. A notable instance of it we have in *בנצתה* Levit. I 16. The School of Massorites which our recensions exhibit, resolved it into *בנצתה*, whereas the School of textual critics exhibited in the Samaritan and Septuagint read it *בנצתה*.

1. — Far more arbitrary is the presence or absence of the letter *Vav* as a vowel-sign in the middle of the word. Even at the end of a verb the ם, which according to the present orthography is uniformly used in the preterite third person plural and the future third person masculine plural, was not unfrequently absent in the primitive forms. This is attested by the Massorah which gives a List of preterites third person plural, and futures third person masculine plural without *Vav* at the end<sup>2</sup> and has given rise to various readings. When the letter in question was being gradually introduced into the text, a difference of opinion obtained in the ancient Schools, whether certain forms were singular or plural. A striking illustration of this fact is to be seen in the duplicate Psalm, viz. XIV and LIII. In the former the concluding verse is “Oh that from Zion were come (ישועת) *the salvation of Israel*”, whereas in the duplicate it is “Oh that from Zion were come (ישעות) *the salvations of Israel*”. It will be seen that in the one the noun is in the singular, whereas in the other the *Vav* is inserted to make it plural. That this, however,

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter ה, §§ 47, 48, Vol. I, pp. 272, 273.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter ם, § 146, Vol. I, p. 422.

was the opinion of one School, and that another School read it in the singular in both places is evident from many MSS. as well as from the Septuagint and the Syriac.

In David's Hymn of Triumph of which there is a duplicate, viz. 2 Sam. XXII and Ps. XVIII, we have another striking illustration of the difference which obtained in the Schools as to whether the *Vav* is to be inserted or not. This difference which is not observed in the Authorised Version, is exhibited in verse 26. In 2 Sam. XXII 26 it is “with (גבור תמים) the upright *hero*, thou wilt shew thyself upright”, whereas in the parallel passage in Ps. XVIII 26 it is “with (גבר תמים) the upright *man* thou wilt shew thyself upright”. The primitive orthography was in both passages גבר, without the *Vav*, but the redactors of Samuel read it גבר *hero*, and hence inserted the *Vav* to indicate this reading, whilst the redactors of the Psalter read it גבר *man of*, and hence declined to insert the *Vav*.

I shall now give a few typical examples of the absence of the *Vav* at the end, in plural verbs, according to the testimony of the ancient Versions, though not recognised by the Massorah. Both in Gen. XXXV 26 and XLVI 27 ילד stands for ילד = ילדו *were born* the plural. This is the reading of several MSS., the Samaritan and the Septuagint, and in the former passage also of Onkelos, Jonathan, the Syriac and the Authorised Version and is undoubtedly the correct reading.

In Exod. XVIII 16 בא stands for בא = באו *they come*. This is attested by the Septuagint and is adopted in the Authorised Version.

In Numb. XXXIII 7 וישב is וישב = וישבו *and they turned again* as is evident from the Samaritan and the context and is rightly exhibited in the Authorised Version.

Whilst in Deut. XXXII 38 יְהִי is יְהִי = יְהִי *let them be*, as is attested by Onkelos, the Samaritan, the Septuagint, the Syriac, and the Vulgate. This is also exhibited in the Authorised Version.

י. — The same want of uniformity is exhibited in the present text with regard to the presence or absence of the letter *Yod*, as a vowel sign, for *Chirek* and *Tzere* in identically the same forms, thus showing that originally it was absent altogether, and that its insertion was gradual. The Massorah itself testifies to this fact inasmuch as it catalogues Lists of words in which the *Yod* has not been inserted after *Chirek*.<sup>1</sup> Here again the Massorah must be regarded as simply giving typical instances. The parallel passages in the Massoretic text itself furnish far more striking examples.

Thus for instance in Josh. XXI, where the cities of refuge are described, it is in verse 15 וְאֵת חֹלֶן וְאֵת־מְגִרְשָׁה *and Holon with her suburbs*, whereas in 1 Chron. VI 43, where we have identically the same description it is וְאֵת־ חֹלֶן וְאֵת־מְגִרְשָׁה *and Hilan with her suburbs*. It is evident that originally the text had simply חֹלֶן, which was pronounced in some Schools חֹלֶן *Cholon*, and in other Schools חֵלֶן *Chilen*, and to mark this pronunciation, the latter inserted the *Yod*. This very description also furnishes an illustration of the gradual introduction of the *Yod* in plural nouns with the suffix third person singular feminine. With the exception of Josh. XXI 13, 40 מְגִרְשָׁה *her suburbs* is without the *Yod* in all the forty-three times in this chapter; whereas in the parallel description in 1 Chron. VI 40—66 it is without exception מְגִרְשָׁה with *Yod* in all the forty-one instances. This primitive orthography has given rise to differences of opinion with regard to the import of

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter י, §§ 17—19, Vol. I, p. 678.

certain nouns, as is evident from פְּרִיחָה in Numb. VIII 4. The School of Massorites which has been followed by the redactors of our text regarded it as a singular with the suffix third person singular feminine and hence pointed it פְּרִיחָה *her flower*. But the School which is represented by the Samaritan and the Septuagint took it as a plural, i. e. פְּרִיחָה = פְּרִיחָהֶּּ *her flowers*, and this is now accepted as the preferable reading by some of the best critics.

In 1 Kings XXII 35 it is “and the king was (מְעַמֵּד) *stayed up* in his chariot”, whereas in the parallel passage in 2 Chron. XVIII 34 which gives identically the same description, it is “and the king of Israel (מְעַמֵּד) *stayed himself up* in his chariot”. Originally the text in both passages had מַעַמֵּד, which the redactors of Kings pronounced מְעַמֵּד, whilst the redactors of Chronicles pronounced it מְעַמֵּד. To mark this difference in the pronunciation, the latter School of Massorites introduced the *Yod*.

In Jeremiah VI 15 it is “neither could they לֹא הִכְלִים יָדְעוּ *blush*”, whereas in the parallel passage in VIII 12, where the same phrase occurs, it is וְהִכְלִים לֹא יָדְעוּ. Originally both passages read הִכְלִים, which one School pronounced הִכְלִים and the other הִכְלִים, and marked the difference by inserting the *Yod*.

A noticeable instance where the absence of *Yod* in the primitive text has given rise to a difference of interpretation is to be found in Exod. XXXV 21, 22. In both these verses, which begin with וַיָּבֹאוּ, the redactors of the present text regarded it as the *Kal* and hence pointed it וַיָּבֹאוּ “and they came”.

It is, however, evident from the Samaritan and the Septuagint that in the School which these ancient authorities followed, it was regarded as the *Hiphil*, i. e. וַיָּבֹאוּ “and they brought”, a reading which is now accepted by some of the best critics especially as this identical form

without the *Yod* has still survived in no fewer than thirteen instances.<sup>1</sup>

In the plural termination for the masculine gender which is now ים - the *Yod* was originally not expressed. The primitive orthography has still survived in a considerable number of words especially in the Pentateuch. Apart from the forms which occur only once<sup>2</sup> I adduce the following words which have retained the original spelling in one instance and which are to be found in other passages with the *Yod* inserted: ועֲבָדִים *menservants* (Gen. XXIV 35), תּוֹמִים *twins* (XXV 24), שָׁרִינִים *branches* (XL 10), לְפָנִים *lice* (Exod. VIII 12), וְשָׁלִשִׁים *and captains* (XIV 7), בְּאֱלֹהִים *among the gods* (XV 11), הַלְפִידִים *the lightnings* (XX 18), הַזְּמִמִּים *doubled* (XXVI 24), וְהַגִּזְמִיִּים *and the rulers* (XXXV 27), הַנּוֹתָרִים *that were left* (Levit. X 16), לְשַׁעִירִים *unto the he goats or satyrs* (XVII 7), וְהַחֹינִים *and those that pitch* (Numb. II 12), הַיָּמִים *the days* (VI 5), וְלִצְנִינִים *and as thorns* (XXXIII 55).

That these simply exhibit the instances which have escaped the process of uniformity, is evident from the ancient Versions. These Versions not only shew that there were many other passages in which the *Yod* was originally absent, but that a difference of opinion obtained in the Schools as to whether the *Mem* in certain cases denoted the plural, or the suffix third person plural masculine. It is evident that in Jerem. VI 15 it was originally בְּנַפְלִים, which one School read בְּנַפְלִים "among them that fall" and hence, to mark this reading inserted the *Yod*, i. e. בְּנַפְלִיִּים, whilst

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Numbers XXX 12, 54; Judg. XXI 12; 1 Sam. I 25; V 2; VII 1; 2 Sam. IV 8; VI 17; XXIII 16; 1 Kings I 3; VIII 6; IX 28; 1 Chron. I 18. Comp. *The Massorah*, letter כ, § 181, Vol. I, p. 175.

<sup>2</sup> עִירָמִים *naked* (Gen. III 7), אֲשֻׁרִים וְלִטְוִשִׁים *Ashurim and Letushim* (XXV 3), הַיָּמִים *hot springs* (XXXVI 24), מִקְרִיבִים *they offer* (Levit. XXI 6), אֵינֶכֶם מֵאֲמִינִים *ye did not believe* (Deut. I 32) קְשֵׁעִירִים *small rain* (XXXII 2).

another School read it בְּנַפְלִים and rendered it *they shall utterly fall when they do fall*, so the Septuagint. The same is the case in verse 29 of this very chapter. Here the original spelling was ורעם, which one School read ורעם and, therefore, inserted the *Yod*, and another School read it ורעם. Hence the rendering of the Septuagint *πονηρία αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐτάπη* *their wickedness has not melted away or consumed* = ורעם לא נמדך.

In Jer. XVII 25 the primitive text had ובסוסם, which some resolved into ובסוסם *and on horses* and marked their reading by introducing the *Yod*, whilst others, as is evident from the Septuagint, καὶ ἵπποις αὐτῶν, read it ובסוסם *and on their horses*.

So too in Ezek. VII 24, the original spelling was manifestly עזם which some read עזם *the strong*, and afterwards fixed this reading by inserting the *Yod*, while others read it עזים *their strength*. This is followed by the Septuagint which renders it τὸ φφάγμα τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτῶν *the boasting of their strength* = עזים נאון and this is the phrase which is to be found in XXIV 21.

According to the same testimony Ps. LVIII 12 had originally שפטים, which was pronounced שפטים, i. e. *God is judge* by one School, and by another School שפטים *their judge*, Septuagint ὁ θεὸς κρινων αὐτοὺς *God that judgeth them*, which is now accepted by some critics as the correct reading.

The most striking illustration, however, of the absence of the *Yod* plural in the primitive text is to be found in Job XIX 18 where עוֹלִים מאסה בי is rendered by the Septuagint εἰς τὸν αἰῶνά με ἀπεποιήσαντο = עולם מאסו בי *for ever they rejected me*, thus showing that the text from which this version was made, had simply עולם, which one School resolved into עולם *young children* and fixed this pronunciation by the insertion of the two *Yods*, whilst the other School read it עולם *ever*.

The same was the case with the *Yod* at the end of words denoting the plural construct. According to the Eastern School of Massorites **ישב** in Judg. I 21 stands for **ישב = יִשְׁבֵי** *the inhabitants of*, whilst the Westerns read it **ישב** *the inhabitant of* in the singular.

Both the Eastern and Western Schools of Massorites agree that **יד** in 2 Kings XII 12 stands for **יָד = יָדַי** *the hands of*, the plural, whilst the Massorah on 2 Kings XVII 31 remarks that **אלה** stands for **אלהי = אֱלֹהֵי** *the gods of*, and that **ראש** Neh. XII 46 stands for **ראשי = רָאשֵׁי** *chiefs of*.<sup>1</sup>

This fact explains a number of conflicting readings which the present text exhibits in parallel passages. Thus in 2 Sam. V 6 it is **יֹשְׁבֵי הָאָרֶץ** *the Jebusites the inhabitant of the land in the singular*, and in 1 Chron. XI 4 **יֹשְׁבֵי הַיְבוּסִים** *the Jebusites the inhabitants of the land in the plural*. The text had originally **ישב** in both places, one School pronounced it **ישב** and inserted a *Vav*, i. e. **וישב**, whilst the other pronounced it **ישב = יִשְׁבֵי** and inserted a *Yod*.

In the parallel passage, which describes the conduct of Ahaziah, we are told in 2 Kings VIII 27 that he walked **בְּדֶרֶךְ בַּיִת אַחַב** *in the way of the house of Ahab*, the singular and in 2 Chron. XXII 3 that he walked **בְּדֶרֶךְ בַּיִת אַחַב** *in the ways of the house of Ahab in the plural*. Both passages had originally **בדרך**, which one School pronounced **בְּדֶרֶךְ**, and the other **בְּדֶרֶךְ** and appended the *Yod* to mark this pronunciation.

The same is the case in 2 Kings XVIII 28, and Isa. XXXVI 13, where identically the same description is given, yet in the one passage it is **שִׁמְעוּ דְבַר־הַמֶּלֶךְ הַגָּדוֹל** "Hear *the word of the great king*" the singular and in the other **שִׁמְעוּ אֶת־דְּבַר־הַמֶּלֶךְ הַגָּדוֹל** "Hear *the words of the great king*" the plural. The primitive text in both places was

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter ' , § 28, Vol. I, p. 681.

**דבר**, which one School pronounced **דְּבַר**, and the other **דְּבַר** and hence appended the *Yod* to mark this pronunciation.

In some passages the different solutions of the original spelling simply resulted in the difference of orthography without affecting the sense at all. Thus in the description of the solemn covenant which Josiah made with the elders and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, we are told in 2 Kings XXIII 3 that he pledged them **ללכת** *to walk after the Lord*, and in 2 Chron. XXXIV 31 where identically the same description is given, it is **ללכת אַחֲרֵי יְהוָה**, thus showing that the primitive **אחר** was pronounced in the one School **אֶחֶר** and in the other **אָחֶר** = **אָחֶרִי**; and though this is the plural construct it denotes exactly the same thing.

In other places, however, the different solutions of the primitive orthography on the part of the Scribes produced a marked difference in the sense in the parallel passages, and it is sometimes difficult to decide which of the two readings is to be preferred. Thus, in the admonition which Gedaliah gives to the captains of the army and to their people, he tells them, according to 2 Kings XXV 24 **אל־תִּירָאוּ מֵעַבְדֵי הַכַּשְׁדִּים** "Fear not *because of the servants of the Chaldees*", and in Jerem. XL 9, where the same event is recorded, it is **אל־תִּירָאוּ מֵעַבֹד** "fear not *to serve the Chaldeans*". The variation is easily explained. The primitive orthography in both passages was **מעבד**, which was resolved by the redactors of Kings into **מעבד** and they marked this reading by appending the *Yod*, i. e. **מעבדי**, whereas the redactors of Jeremiah resolved it into **מעבד** and fixed this reading by inserting the *Vav*, i. e. **מעבוד**. The latter is more in harmony with the context. The Septuagint, however, shews that in the text which they had before them it was **מעבדי = מעבד** in both places.

The arbitrary treatment to which the orthography was subject, due to the gradual introduction of the quiescent letters, and to the expression of the different manner of reading some words in the vowelless text was not remedied by the rules which obtained in the Talmudic period with regard to the *matres lectiones*. This will be seen from the following canon:

Three mistakes [in each Column] may be corrected, but if there are four the Codex must be buried. It is propounded: If the Codex has one correct column it saves the whole Codex. R. Isaac b. Martha said in the name of Rab if the greater part of the Codex is correct. Said Abayi to R. Joseph if the Codex has three mistakes in one column what is to be done? He replied. It must be given to be corrected and it is right. This [i. e. the duty to correct it] is applicable to defectives only [i. e. when plenes have been written defective], but in the case of plenes [i. e. when plenes have been written instead of defectives] we need not trouble about it.

That is, when this is the case, no duty devolves upon the Scribe to have the Codex corrected. (*Mena-choth 29b.*)<sup>1</sup>

According to this rule, therefore, to write a plene defective, is a serious mistake which may be corrected when only three such mistakes occur in one column, but when there are four, the Codex must be surrendered to the *Geniza*.<sup>2</sup> This canon, however, does not apply to cases of a reverse nature. No serious mistake is committed when defectives have been written plene. The result of this

<sup>1</sup> שלש יתקן, ד' יננו, תנא אם יש בו דף אחת שלימה מצלח על כולה, א"ר יצחק בר שמואל בר מרחא משמיה דרב והוא דכתיב רוביה דספרא שפיר, א"ל אבוי לרב יוסף אי את כההוא דף שלש טעיות מאי, א"ל הואיל ואיתיהיב לאיתקוני מיתקן והני מלי חסירות אבל יתירות לית לן בה: מנחות כ"ט.

<sup>2</sup> Maimonides describes the *Geniza* as follows: *א"ת שבלה או שנפסל a Codex of the Law which is decayed or is rendered ritually illegal is to be put into an earthen vessel and buried by the side of sages, and this constitutes its Geniza.* (Hilchoth Sepher Thorah X 3).

rule was that when the Scribe was in doubt whether a word is to be written plene or defective he naturally wrote it plene since he thereby committed no mistake even if the word in question ought properly to have been written defective.<sup>1</sup> This explains the fact that so many cases of plene have with impunity crept into the MSS. Hence in weighing the evidence, the benefit of the doubt is generally to be given to the defective, though this reading is numerically supported by fewer MSS. and editions.

<sup>1</sup> A very able article on the gradual development of the *matres lectiones* in the Bible and on the Rabbinic law respecting it by Dr. Bardowicz is given in the *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*. Vol. XXXVIII, pp. 117—121; 157—166. Breslau 1894.

Chap. III.

The Division of Words.

From the fact that both in the Inscription of Mesha and of Siloam the words are separated by a point, whilst in the Inscriptions on gems and coins, as well as those in Phoenician, there is generally no such separation, it is fairly concluded that originally the words were not strictly divided and that the process of division like that of the *scriptio plena* was of gradual development. This derives confirmation from the Massorah and the ancient Versions.

The Massorah gives two Lists of words which, according to the School of Massorites whence they emanate, ought to be differently divided. The first List catalogues fifteen instances in which the text exhibits single words whereas they ought each to be divided into two separate words. The second List gives eight passages in which words exhibit examples of a contrary nature. These words have been wrongly divided into two, and the Massorah directs that they should respectively be read as one word.<sup>1</sup> These words are duly noticed as the official *Keris*, or various readings in the margin of the Bible in the places where they occur.

Here, however, as is often the case with other Massoretic Rubrics, the instances are simply to be regarded as typical, or are to be taken as passages recognised by the particular School which formulated the Lists in question. That other Schools of textual critics had different and longer Lists is evident both from the Massorah itself and the ancient Versions. Thus according to the ordinarily received Massoretic text 1 Kings XX 33 וַיַּחַלְטוּ הַמִּמְנוּ is the proper division of these two words, and hence this passage is not

included in the Lists, but we now know from MSS. that the Easterns had divided them into וַיַּחַלְטוּהָ מִמְנוּ.

A careful comparison of the Septuagint with the present Hebrew text undoubtedly shows that in the text which the Greek translators had before them, there were many more passages in which the words were otherwise divided. In the following table I indicate some of the passages in the order of the books in which they occur.

	Original Text	The division in the ancient Versions	Massoretic Division
1 Sam. I 24	בפרמשלש	כפר משלש Septuagint and Syriac.	כפרים שלשה
" XIV 21	סככונם	סככוני נם Septuagint Syriac.	סככיב ונם
2 Sam. XXI 1	ביתדרמים	ביתה דמים Sept.	בית הדמים
Jerem. XXIII 33	אתמהשא	אתם המשא Sept. Vulg. Rashi.	אתמהמשא
Ezek. XLVIII 11	המקדשכני	המקדשים בני Chaldee, Sept. Syriac.	המקדש מבני
Hos. VI 5	ומשפטיכאור	ומשפטי כאור Chaldee, Sept. Syriac.	ומשפטיך אור
" XI 2	מפניהם	מפני הם Sept. Syriac.	מפניהם
Ps. XI 1	הרכם	הר קמ = קמו Chaldee, Sept. Syriac, Vulg.	הרכם
" XVI 3	בארצהמהאדירי	= בארצה מהאדירי ירה Septuagint.	בארץ המה ואדירי
" LV 20	ויענמוישב	ויענמו ישב Sept. Syriac.	ויענם וישב
" LXXI 3	לבואתמידצוית	לבית מצודות Sept. Vulg. Comp. Ps. XXXI 3.	לבוא תמיד צוית
" LXXV 2	וקרובשמך	וקרו = וקרוז בשמך Sept. Syr. Vulg. Comp. Ps. XCIX 6.	וקרוב שמך
" LXXVI 7	נדרמורככוסם	נדרמו רככי סום Sept. Syr. Vulg.	נדרם ורכב וסום
" LXXXV 9	ואלישוובלכסלה	ואלי שובי לבסלה Sept. Vulg.	ואלישוובי לבסלה
Prov. XIV 13	ואחריתהשמחה	ואחרית השמחה Chald. Sept. Syr. Vulg.	ואחריתה שמחה

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter ב, §§ 482, 483, Vol. II, p. 54.

These are simply typical instances. I adduce them because they are now regarded as exhibiting more faithfully the original text than the Massoretic division, and are adopted by some of the best Biblical critics. And though I fully agree with their opinion I have adopted these readings in the marginal notes only, on account of my principle not to introduce any change in the body of the Massoretic text itself. They are preceded in my notes by the abbreviation צ"ל = צריד להיות *it ought to be so*, i. e. it is the correct reading wherever the ancient Versions confirm such a re-division of the words.

There are, however, other passages where the context suggests a re-division of some of the words, which most accurate and most conscientious critics have not hesitated to adopt, though they are not supported by the ancient Versions. Thus for instance the last word in Gen. XLIX 19 and the first word in verse 20 which are in the Massoretic text עקב: מאשר and which were originally עקבמאשר are re-divided into עקבם: אשר. This not only obviates the harshness of the construction and removes the anomaly of אשר *Asher* alone beginning with the preposition *Mem* when all the other tribes begin without it, but yields an excellent sense

"Gad, a troop shall press upon him,  
But he shall press upon their heels;  
Asher, his bread shall be etc."

The Revisers who have also taken over the *Mem* from the beginning of the next verse have translated it doubly, as the suffix to עקב *hecl* and the proposition of אשר *Asher*.

<sup>1</sup> Kings XIX 21 is translated both in the Authorised Version and in the Revised Version *boiled their flesh*. This is simply an expedient to get over the difficulty in the text which as it now stands means *he boiled them the flesh*.

There is hardly any doubt that the primitive orthography was בשלמהבשר and ought to be divided מהבשר בשל *he boiled some of the flesh*.

In Isa. IX 2, as the text now stands one hemistich contradicts the other, inasmuch as it says:

"Thou hast multiplied the nation,  
Thou hast not increased the joy.  
They joy before Thee according to the joy &c."

The official *Keri*, which substitutes the relative pronoun לו, *to him*, for the negative לא, *not*, and which the Revised Version follows, is evidently due to a desire to remove this contradiction at the sacrifice of the idiom which requires that it should follow and not precede the verb. All difficulty, however, disappears and the rhythm of the passages is restored when we bear in mind that the original orthography was הגילא = הגילה which has been wrongly divided into two words and the *mater lectionis Vav* was introduced to mark this reading. The passage ought, therefore, to be rendered:

"Thou hast multiplied their joy  
Thou hast increased their rejoicing  
They joy before Thee according to the joy in harvest,  
And as men rejoice when they divide the spoil."<sup>1</sup>

Ps. LXVIII 18, which describes Jehovah's march to transfer His throne from Sinai to the Sanctuary, is obscured in the present text. In endeavouring to impart sense to the passage, the Authorised Version renders the second clause:

"The Lord is among them, as in Sinai in the holy place."

<sup>1</sup> It ought to be mentioned that the late Professor Selwyn in his *Horae Hebraicae*, p. 27, Cambridge 1848, has come to the same conclusion.



The difficulty is not removed in the Revised Version which has it:

“The Lord is among them, as in Sinai in the Sanctuary”, with the marginal note “Or Sinai is the Sanctuary”.

The sense is perfectly plain when we resort to the primitive orthography where it was  $\text{במסיני} = \text{מסיני} = \text{ב}$ , i. e.

“The Lord hath come from Sinai into the Sanctuary.”

For an exact parallel, where the *Aleph* is omitted in such cases in the primitive orthography, see Gen. XXX 11; and comp. above p. 140.

For these examples there is no support from the ancient Versions, but they are suggested by the context and sense; and Biblical critics are more or less unanimous in accepting them. I have, therefore, given them in the marginal notes preceded by the abbreviation  $\text{נ"ל} = \text{נראה לי}$  *it appears to me, I am of opinion*, in contradistinction to those which have the support of the Versions and are preceded by  $\text{צ"ל}$  *it ought to be*. They are designed to aid the student, who can either accept or reject them.

#### Chap. IV.

#### The Double or Final letters.

The fact that the Hebrew Scriptures were originally written in the ancient Hebrew or Phoenician characters, and that this alphabet has no final letters, shows beyond doubt that the double letters were gradually developed after the introduction of the present square characters. The Massorah itself has preserved two Lists of variants which presuppose the non-existence of the double letters. These Lists record instances where the text reads one word and the margin reads two words; and *vice versa*, passages in which the text has two words and the margin one word. From these Lists<sup>1</sup> I subjoin the following examples in the order of the books in which they occur:

			Text	Margin
1 Sam.	IX	1	מבן ימין	מבנימין
"	XXIV	9	מן המערה	מהמערה
2 Sam.	XXI	12	שם הפלשתים	שמה פלשתים
Isa.	IX	6	לם רבה	לסרבה
Job	XXXVIII	1	מנהסערה	מן הסערה
"	XL	6	מנסערה	מן סערה
Lament.	I	6	מן בת	מבת
Neh.	II	13	המפרוצים	הם פרוצים
1 Chron.	XXVII	12	לבנימיני	לבן ימיני

These variants could not possibly have obtained if the final letters had existed.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter  $\text{ב}$ , §§ 482, 483, Vol II, p. 54.

It is moreover certain that the translators of the Septuagint had no knowledge of these final letters. This is attested by numerous passages in this Version from which I select the following instances:

	Septuagint	Massoretic Text
Gen. XXVIII 19	<i>Ὀὐλαμλοῦς</i> =	אולמלוּ אילם לוּ
Numb. XXXIV 11	<i>ἀπὸ Σεπραμὰρ Βηλὰ</i> =	משפמר בלה משפם הרבלה
2 Kings II 14	<i>ἀφρώ</i> =	אפוא אף הוא
Jerem. XXXI 8	<i>ἐν ἑορτῇ</i> =	במועד בם עור
Hos. VI 5	<i>καὶ τὸ κρίμα μου ὡς φῶς</i> =	ומשפטי כאור ומשפטיך אור
Nahum I 12	<i>κατάργων ὑδάτων</i> =	משל מים אם שלמים
Zeph. III 19	<i>ἐν σοὶ ἔνεκεν σοῦ</i> =	אתך למעניך את כל מעניך
Zech. XI 7	<i>εἰς τὴν Χαναανῖτιν</i> =	לכנעני לכן עניי
Ps. XLIV 5	<i>ὁ Θεός μου ὁ ἐντελλόμενος</i> =	אלהי מצוה אלהים צוה
" LXIV 7	<i>ἐξερευνῶντες ἐξερευνήσει</i> =	חפשם חפש חפש מחפש
Prov. XII 4		בעץ מוחת בעצמותיו
Neh. VII 34	<i>Ἡλαμάαρ</i> =	עילמאר עילם אחר

The fact, therefore, that the ancient translators frequently read the same consonants as one word which the present text reads as two words, in cases where the last letter of the first word is one of the five final letters, shows conclusively that these final letters did not exist at the time when the Septuagint version was made. With a text before them in which one form of a letter was used at the beginning and in the middle of a word, and another form at the end, these joinings together of two words into one word would have been impossible on the part of the Greek translators. I have deemed it necessary to make this point clear because I have adopted in the notes, some of the re-divisions of words preserved in the ancient Versions, in passages where the final letters of the present text might be thought absolutely to preclude such re-divisions.

## Chap. V.

### Abbreviations.

All post-Biblical Hebrew writings contain copious abbreviations. Students of the Talmud, the Midrashim and the mediaeval religious literature generally know frequently to their discomfort, that there is hardly a page in which these puzzling expressions are not to be found; and how grateful they are for those special Treatises which have been written to aid them in resolving these embarrassing abbreviations, which sometimes represent a whole sentence.

In the Biblical MSS. with the Massorah, it is well known that the latter abounds in abbreviations. In the text itself, however, these abbreviations are as a rule not tolerated. When the line is insufficient to take in the last word, the vacant space is generally filled out with dots or is in unfinished letters. This is the case in Orient. 4445, which is the oldest portion of the Hebrew Bible known at present, and in the St. Petersburg Codex of the Latter Prophets dated A. D. 916. In the St. Petersburg Codex, however, the word which is too large for the end of the line is not unfrequently represented in an abbreviation of one, two or even three letters at the end, but the whole word is also repeated at the beginning of the next line. Thus in Isa. VIII 13 נ stands for מוראכם at the end of the line and the whole word is repeated at the commencement of the next line. In Isa. IX 8 ונ stands for וכנדל at the end, but the whole word is also given at the beginning of the next line. The same is the case in XIV 2 where וה stands for

והתנחלתם; XXIII 3 where **וב** stands for **ובמים**; XXVI 8 where **ול** stands for **ולזכרך**; XXVII 8 where **בסא** stands for **בסאסאה**; XXXVII 10 where **ירש** stands for **ירושלם**, and in many more passages, but in all these instances, the whole word is generally repeated at the beginning of the next line.

There are, however, MSS. which have abbreviations in the text, but in which the abbreviated part of the word is given in the margin. Thus Codex No. 15 in the Imperial and Royal Court Library Vienna, which contains the Pentateuch, the Haphtaroth and the Five Megilloth and which is a Model Codex, exhibits numerous instances of this kind. I extract from it the following examples:

Gen.	X 16	רי	האמ	fol. 9a
"	XVII 20	יד	שמעתי	" 14b
"	" 26	אל	וישמע	" 14b
"	XVIII 21	חה	הכצעק	" 15b
"	XX 15	לך	אבים	" 18a
"	XXII 18	כו	והתקבר	" 20a
"	XXIV 17	תה	לקרא	" 21b
"	XXV 18	ים	מצר	" 23b
"	XXVII 12	תע	כמתע	" 25b
"	XXXII 20	כס	במצא	" 32b
"	XXXVI 18	מה	אדליב	" 36a

The same is the case in No. 5 of this Collection which contains the Prophets, of which the following examples will suffice:

Josh.	VI 12	ם	הכהני	fol. 5b
"	VII 3	ה	שם	" 6b
"	" 4	ו	וינם	" 6b

A very remarkable use of abbreviations with their compliments is exhibited in Codex No. 3 in the Madrid University Library. When a word is too long for the line,

a portion of it is given in the text and the rest is either put perpendicularly in the margin or is placed above the abbreviated word as will be seen from the following example:

Levit.	XV 31	מטמ
"	XVIII 3	וקמע
"	XXII 2	מקד שים
"	" 3	לדרתי כם
"	" 4	וב בקדש ים
"	XXIII 19	ועשית
"	" 36	מקד א
"	XXXVI 25	ושלח תי

In some instances the finishing part of the word is not given in the margin so that the text exhibits a regular abbreviation.

The question which, therefore, naturally arises is — seeing that abbreviations are copiously used in the oldest extra-canonical writings, and that they are not only to be found on the Maccabean coins, but that they occur conjointly with the fully written out word in Biblical MSS. — Were they ever used by themselves in the Hebrew text? As we have no Biblical MSS. of the pre-Talmudic period, we have to appeal for the answer to the ancient Versions which were made from a text written prior to the orthographical laws laid down by the Scribes. Chief among the ancient witnesses, which bear testimony to the use of abbreviations in the Hebrew text, is the Septuagint. From a number of passages it is perfectly evident that the translators had a Hebrew text before them in which half

words and even single letters were used as abbreviations. I subjoin the following passages as typical examples:

In Gen. XLVII 3 אחיו = אחיו was read by the translators of the ancient Versions as an abbreviation for אחי יוסף *the brethren of Joseph*. This is attested by the Samaritan, Jonathan, the Septuagint and the Syriac and is undoubtedly the correct reading. A similar abbreviation occurs in 2 Sam. III 27 where אחיו stands for אחי יואב *the brother of Joab* as it is resolved in the Septuagint.

In Exod. VIII 23 אמר is resolved by the Septuagint into אמר " = יהוה אמר *as Jehovah said* which is preferable to the Massoretic reading.

In Levit. VI 10, according to the testimony of the Samaritan, the Septuagint and the Vulgate, מאשי stands for מאשי יהוה = מאשי *the offerings of Jehovah*. This is not only confirmed by verse 11, but by some MSS.

In Numb. XXIII 10 ומספר is an abbreviation for ומי ספר = ומי ספר *and who can number*. This is the solution of the Septuagint and is the reading of some of the Samaritan MSS. Accordingly the verse ought to be rendered:

"Who can count the dust of Jacob  
And who can number the fourth part of Israel."

It will be seen that this restores the parallelism which is marred by the Massoretic solution.<sup>1</sup>

In Deut. XXXII 35 לי, as is evident from Onkelos, the Samaritan and the Septuagint, is an abbreviation of ליום *for the day*. Accordingly the passage is to be rendered:

"Is not this laid up in store with me,  
Sealed up in my treasuries?"

<sup>1</sup> This solution is also implied in the explanation of this passage given in the Midrash אכלוסין מי יוכל למנות אוכלוסין ומספר את רובע ישראל הרביעית שלהן. מי יוכל למנות אוכלוסין ומספר את רובע ישראל הרביעית שלהן. מי יוכל למנות אוכלוסין ומספר את רובע ישראל הרביעית שלהן. *Comp. Bamidbar Rab.*, § 20.

For the day of vengeance and recompense,  
For the time when their foot shall slip."

It will thus be seen that ליום *for the day* and לעת *for the time* obtain their natural parallelism and that the third line corresponds to the first, and the fourth to the second line in accordance with one of the laws of Hebrew parallelism.

In 2 Sam. V 25 מגבע is an abbreviation of מגבעון *from Gibeon*. This is not only attested by the Septuagint, but is confirmed by the parallel passage in 1 Chron. XIV 16, which records the same event. This removes the discrepancy between the two passages which narrate identically the same occurrence.

In 2 Sam. XVII 11 בקרב is an abbreviation of בקרבם *in the midst of them*, and the passage ought to be rendered:

"and thou thyself shalt go in the midst of them."

This is not only the solution of the abbreviation in the Septuagint and Vulgate, but is most suitable to the context. Besides קרב is never used in Samuel for *battle* or *war* which is invariably מלחמה.

These are simply a few of the abbreviations which are supported by the ancient Versions and which I have adopted in the notes as affording a better solution than those exhibited in the received text.

I have also suggested a few not given in the ancient Versions. Thus for instance:

In 1 Kings XXI 23 בחל is manifestly an abbreviation of בחלק *in the portion of*. This is rendered certain from the parallel passages in 2 Kings IX 10, 36 and is adopted in the margin of the Revised Version.

In 2 Kings VI 27 the words אל-יושעך יהוה which literally denote *let not Jehovah help thee*, are simply per-

plexing. The rendering of the Authorised Version: "If the Lord do not help thee", is contrary to the meaning of אֵל. Nor is the difficulty removed by the marginal rendering in the Revised Version: "Nay, let the Lord help thee", since this is a departure from the normal sense of this negative particle. The sentence is relieved and the construction becomes grammatical if אֵל is taken as the abbreviation of אֵלֹהִים אֵלֵּם which is the proper Hebrew equivalent for

*If the Lord do not help thee.*

In 2 Kings XVIII 2 and 2 Chron. XXIX 1 the same narrative is recorded. In the former the name of the mother of Hezekiah is given as אֲבִי אֲבִי *Abi*, and in the latter as אֲבִיָּה *Abijah*. This discrepancy in identically the same record, is removed by the fact that אֲבִי is the abbreviation of אֲבִיָּה. Such a name as אֲבִי *Abi* does not occur in the Hebrew Bible.

In the abbreviations I have carefully distinguished those which are supported by the ancient Versions from those which I have suggested. The former are preceded by צ"ל = צריך להיות *it should be* and the latter by נ"ל = נראה לי *it appears to me*.

## Chap. VI.

### Homoeoteleuton.

All those who are familiar with transcribing know by experience the omissions which are due to what is technically called homoeoteleuton; that is when the clause ends with the same word as closes a preceding sentence. The transcriber's eye in such a case frequently wanders from one word to the other, and causes him to omit the passage which lies between them. The same effect is produced when two or more sentences begin with the same words. As this fruitful source of error has hitherto been greatly neglected by those who have been engaged in the criticism of the Hebrew text, it necessitates my discoursing upon it at somewhat greater length. In proving the existence of omissions arising from this cause, I shall arrange the instances according to the age of the respective MSS. in which I have found them, and not in the order of the books wherein they occur. My reason for adopting this chronological plan is to show that this cause of error has been in operation in all ages and in all countries from which our Biblical MSS. are derived.

In Oriental 4445 (fol. 107 a), which is the oldest Biblical MS. known at present, the whole of Levit. XXI 24 was originally omitted, because it begins with וַיִּדְבֹר *and he spake* and XXII 1 also begins with וַיִּדְבֹר *and he spake*. The Scribe's eye wandered from one word to the other which is identically the same. The verse has been added by a later hand.

In the St. Petersburg or Babylon Codex, which is dated A. D. 916 (fol. 90 a), Jerem. XXXI 30 is omitted because of the homoeoteleuton תִּקְהֵינָה shall be set on edge . . . תִּקְהֵינָה shall be set on edge. A later Scribe has supplied the omission and disfigured the MS.

In the same MS. (fol. 139 a), the last clause of Ezekiel XVIII 30 and the first clause of verse 31 are omitted, viz. וְלֹא־יְהִיָּה לָכֶם לְמַכְשׁוֹל עֵוֹן: הַשְּׁלִיכוּ מֵעַלְיֶיכֶם אֶת־כָּל־פְּשָׁעֵיכֶם. so iniquity shall not be your ruin: cast away from you your transgressions, because of the homoeoteleuton פְּשָׁעֵיכֶם your transgressions . . . פְּשָׁעֵיכֶם your transgressions. The passage which lies between the same words and which has thus been omitted, is supplied in the margin by a later hand.

In Arundel Oriental 16, a superbly written Franco-German MS. of about A. D. 1250, nearly the whole verse in 2 Chron. XXVI 9 and the first two words of verse 10 are omitted, owing to the homoeoteleuton בִּירוּשָׁלַם עַל־שַׁעַר הַפֶּנֶה towers . . . מִגְדָּלִים towers, viz. וְעַל־שַׁעַר הַנִּיָּא וְעַל־הַמִּקְצוֹעַ וַיְחַזְקֵם: וַיִּבֶן מִגְדָּלִים in Jerusalem at the corner gate, and at the valley gate, and at the turning of the wall, and fortified them. And he built towers (comp. fol. 273 a). The omission, as usual, has been supplied in the margin by a later Scribe. When it is stated that this is a most carefully and sumptuously written MS., furnished with the most copious Massorah, and that it was manifestly a model Codex, it is evident that it required superhuman care to avoid the errors arising from this source.

In Add. 9401—9402 dated A. D. 1286 (fol. 18 a), the whole of Gen. XVIII 32 is omitted, owing to the ending בְּעֶבְרַת הָעֶשְׂרִים for forty's sake . . . בְּעֶבְרַת הָעֶשְׂרִים for ten's sake verses 31 and 32. The omission as usual has been supplied by a later hand.

In the same MS. the second part of Levit. XV 4 is omitted owing to the two clauses ending with יִטְמָא shall

be unclean . . . יִטְמָא shall be unclean. The clause וְכָל־הַכֶּלִי אֲשֶׁר־יֹשֵׁב עָלָיו הֵזָב יִטְמָא and every thing whereon he sitteth shall be unclean is added in the margin by a subsequent reviser (comp. fol. 115 b).

In Oriental 2091 a magnificently written MS. of the German School, circa A. D. 1300, I found no fewer than forty-three omissions due to homoeoteleuta, in the Prophets and Hagiographa which this Codex contains.<sup>1</sup>

These omissions continued uninterapeally even in the MSS. which were written after the invention of printing. Thus in Add. 15251 a choice Spanish Codex, written in 1488, the very year in which the first edition of the entire Hebrew Bible was published, there is the omission of the words וְאֵת שֵׁם אַהֲרֹן תִּכְתֹּב upon his rod; And the name of Aaron thou shalt write Numb. XVII, 17, 18, due to the homoeoteleuton תִּכְתֹּב thou shalt write . . . תִּכְתֹּב thou shalt write (comp. fol. 93 a).

In the same MS. fol. 93 b, the second half of Numb. XXVI 62 is omitted, i. e. כִּי לֹא־נָתַן לָהֶם נַחֲלָה בְּתוֹךְ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל because there was not given them an inheritance among the children of Israel, due to the two clauses ending in יִשְׂרָאֵל Israel . . . יִשְׂרָאֵל Israel.

These examples might be multiplied almost indefinitely. If the omissions in the Hebrew text due to this cause occur not only in the very first or oldest MS., but continue in the succeeding MSS. produced in different centuries and various countries, and also appear in the very latest Codex copied by the human hand, it is perfectly certain that the same source of error was in operation

<sup>1</sup> The following are some of them: Josh. III 17, IV 1 הִירְדָן . . . הִירְדָן, fol. 3 a; Josh. XV 63 בני יהודה . . . בני יהודה, fol. 13 a; Judg. VII 19, 20 בשופרות . . . בשופרות, fol. 26 a; Judg. XVI 3 הלילה . . . הלילה, fol. 33 b; 1 Sam. XIV 40 לעבר אחר . . . לעבר אחר, fol. 46 a; 1 Kings VII 4, 5 שלש פעמים . . . שלש פעמים, fol. 90 a &c. &c.

in the production of the MSS. prior to those which we now possess. In the absence of these MSS., however, the only course left to us is carefully to examine the ancient Versions which were made from a Hebrew recension older by more than a millennium than the oldest MSS. of the present Massoretic text.

A comparison of the present text with the ancient Versions for the purpose of ascertaining whether the Scribes have omitted passages due to homoeoteleuta from the time of the Septuagint down to the date of our oldest MS., just as they have omitted them from the period of the oldest Codex down to the invention of printing, is far more easy and much more certain in result than the utilization of the Version for merely various readings. In the case of retranslating into Hebrew a variant exhibited in the Greek, scholars may differ as to the exact Hebrew equivalent for a single word. But there can be no question in deciding whether the ancient Version has a whole sentence more than is to be found in the present Hebrew text, more especially if the sentence which is found in the Greek, when re-translated into Hebrew, fits in between the two words of similar ending. The certainty in this case is as great as the proper fitting in of the pieces in a dissected puzzle-map. Indeed it carries far more conviction than the testimony of a few Codices in a mass of conflicting MSS., as to the right reading in a given passage.

The first instance which I shall adduce to prove that owing to the cause here stated, passages have been omitted by Scribes in the MSS. produced after the Septuagint and prior to the date of any Codex which we now possess, is from the Book of Kings.

In 1 Kings VIII 16 the text now is

Hebrew  
 ואבחר בירושלם להיות שמי שם ואבחר בדרור להיות עלי עמי ישראל

Septuagint

ואבחר בירושלם להיות שמי שם ואבחר בדרור להיות עלי עמי ישראל

From the simple exhibition of these two passages it will be seen that the Septuagint has preserved the original reading and that the Scribe's eye, in copying the Massoretic text, has wandered from one **ואבחר** and *I have chosen* to the other **ואבחר** and *I have chosen*. Hence the omission of the clause *and I have chosen Jerusalem that my name might be there*. In this case, however, we are not left to the Septuagint alone to establish the fact. In the parallel narrative 2 Chron. VI 6, where the same incident is narrated, the omission is literally given.

ואבחר בירושלם להיות שמי שם ואבחר בדרור להיות עלי עמי ישראל

"And I have chosen *Jerusalem that my name might be there* and I have chosen David &c."

But though this omission is incidentally confirmed by the parallel passage, the other instances, for which there are no duplicate records in the Hebrew Scriptures, are equally conclusive. Some of these I shall now give in the order in which they occur.

Josh. II 1 Heb. . . . . ויבאו בית אשה  
 Sept. ויבאו שני הנערים יריחו ויבאו בית אשה

Here the clause *and the two young men came to Jericho* is omitted because of the similar words *and they came . . . and they came*. They are preserved in the Septuagint.

Josh. IX 27 Heb. . . . . ולמזבח יהוה  
 Sept. ולמזבח אלהים והיו ישביו נקבעו המזבחי עצים ושאיבי מים  
 למזבח אלהים

Here, after the words "and for the altar of God", the following words are omitted: "*And the inhabitants of Gibeon became hewers of wood, and drawers of water for the altar of God*" because of the two similar endings "*the altar of*

*God" . . . . the altar of God.* They are preserved in the Septuagint.

Josh. X 12 Heb. . . . . בני ישראל  
Sept. ישראל כאשר השמידם בגבעון ונשמרו מפני בני ישראל

Here the words "*when they destroyed them in Gibeon, and they were destroyed from before the children of Israel*" are omitted because of the two endings *Israel . . . . Israel.* They are preserved in the Septuagint.

Josh. XIII 7 Heb. . . . . שבט המנשה  
Sept. שבט המנשה מן-הירדן עד-הים הגדול ימה תחננה הים הגדול יהיה הגבול; ולשני השבטים וחצי שבט הנשה

Here the words "*from the Jordan to the great sea westward thou shall give it, the great sea shall be the boundary; and unto the half tribe of Manasseh*" are omitted because of the two similar endings *the half tribe of Manasseh . . . . the half tribe of Manasseh.*

Josh. XXIV 6 Heb. . . . . מצרים  
Sept. מצרים ויהיו שם לגוי גדול ועצום ורב ונעני אהם חמצרים

Here the words "*and they became there a great, populous and mighty people and the Egyptian afflicted them*" are omitted because of the two similar endings in the Hebrew, *Egypt . . . . Egypt.* The Septuagint has preserved them.

Josh. XXIV 17 Heb. . . . . הוא המעלה  
Sept. הוא אלהים הוא מעלה

Here the words *He is God* are omitted because of the two endings *he . . . . he.* The Septuagint has preserved them.

Judg. XVI 13 Heb. . . . . ותחקע ביתר  
Sept. ותחקע ביתר ותליתי ויהי קאתר האדם; ויהי כי ישן ותקח דלילה את-שבע מחלפות ראשו ותאגרום עם-המסכת ותחקע ביתר

Here the clause "*then shall I be weak as another man. And it came to pass when he was asleep that Delilah took the seven locks of his head and wove them with the web and fastened them with a pin*" is omitted because of the two

similar endings *and fastened them with a pin . . . . and fastened them with a pin.* That the Septuagint exhibits the primitive text is moreover confirmed by the fact that the Massoretic text as it now stands says nothing about Samson having gone to sleep though verse 14 alludes to it.

Judg. XVIII 22 Heb. . . . . מבית מיכה  
Sept. מבית מיכה ויהיה מיכה

Here the words "*and behold Micah*" are omitted because of the homoeoteleuton *Micah . . . . Micah.* They are preserved in the Septuagint.

I Sam. III 15 Heb. . . . . עד הבקר  
Sept. עד הבקר וישכב בבקר

Here the words "*and he rose early in the morning*" are omitted because of the homoeoteleuton *the morning . . . . the morning.* They are preserved in the Septuagint.

I Sam. X 1 Heb. . . . . יהוה  
Sept. יהוה לנגיד עלי-עמו עלי-ישראל ואתה תעצור בעם יהוה ואתה תושיעני מיד איביו מסביב וזה לך האות כי-משחד יהוה

Here the clause "*for a ruler over his people over Israel? And thou shalt rule among the people of the Lord, and thou shalt save them out of the hand of their enemies, and this shall be a sign to thee that the Lord has anointed thee*" is omitted. The omission which is due to the homoeoteleuton *the Lord . . . . the Lord* is preserved in the Septuagint.

I Sam. XIII 15 Heb. . . . . מן-הגלגל  
Sept. מן-הגלגל ונלך לדרבנו ונתר העם עלי אחרי שאול לקראת עם המלחמה ויבאו מן-הגלגל

Here the words "*and went his way and the remnant of the people went after Saul to meet the men of war and they came out of Gilgal*" are omitted. The omitted clause which is due to the homoeoteleuton *out of Gilgal . . . . out of Gilgal* is preserved in the Septuagint.



Joshua XXI 36, 37. The omission of these two verses in some MSS. is due to the fact that the following verse begins with the same word, viz. **וּמִמֶּנֶּה** and out of the tribe of. The transcriber's eye, as is often the case, wandered from one **וּמִמֶּנֶּה** verses 36, 37 to the other **וּמִמֶּנֶּה** in verse 38, thus skipping over the two verses in question. I have reserved the examination of this omission for the last, both because it is the most instructive illustration in this category and because it requires a more lengthy discussion. The context itself shows that the two verses have been omitted by a clerical error, since without them the enumeration is incomplete. We are expressly told in verse 7 that the Merarites obtained twelve cities, i. e. four from each of the three tribes, Reuben, Gad and Zebulun. The four cities contributed by Zebulun are enumerated (verse 35), so also are the four cities contributed by Gad (verses 38, 39). Now without Reuben and his four cities there are only eight cities instead of twelve as stated in verse 40. In this instance, however, we are not left to conjecture to supply the omission, nor even to the ancient Versions alone. Unlike the former omissions which are attested only by the ancient Versions, this omission is proved by many of the best MSS. and all the early editions. Not only have the Septuagint and the Vulgate these two verses, but they are found in some of the earliest dated MSS., as will be seen from the following description.

Orient. 2201, which is dated A. D. 1246, has the two verses in the text with the vowel-points and accents and with the following remark in the margin: "*these two verses are not written in the text of the Codex called Hillali*".<sup>1</sup>

The splendid MS. No. 1 in the Madrid University Library, which is dated A. D. 1280, and which is manifestly a Model Codex, has the two verses.

<sup>1</sup> ה'לן תרי פסוקי' אינן כתיבין בספר הנקרא הללי.

Add. 15250 in the British Museum, a beautiful MS. of about the end of the 13th century, has not only the two verses, but has a Massoretic note against **אַת־בְּצֵר** *Bezer* that it occurs (ד =) *four times*. This shows beyond doubt that the School of Massorites from which this note proceeds regarded the two verses as an integral part of the text. For though **בְּצֵר** *Bezer* by itself occurs five times (Deut. IV 43; Josh. XX 8; 1 Chron. VI 63; VII 37 and the passage before us), **אַת־בְּצֵר** with the accusative particle only occurs *four times*, since in 1 Chron. VII 37 it is simply **בְּצֵר** without the **אַת־**.

Besides these Codices, I have to add the following MSS. in the British Museum alone which have the two verses: Arund. Orient. 16;<sup>1</sup> Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add. 15451; Add. 9398; Add. 26897; Harley 1528; Harley 5774; Orient. 1471; Orient. 2369; Orient. 2370; Orient. 2371; Orient. 2415; Orient. 2626—28; Orient. 4227.

Moreover these two verses are given in the text of all the early editions: The first edition of the Prophets, Soncino 1485—86, has them; so also the first edition of the entire Hebrew Bible, Soncino 1488; the second edition, Naples 1491—93; the third edition, Brescia 1494; the Former Prophets, Pesaro 1511; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; and in the three quarto editions of Bomberg, Venice 1517, 1521 and 1525. Jacob b. Chayim was the first who omitted these

<sup>1</sup> In Arund. Orient. 16 the two verses are not pointed and the Punctuator has added the following note in the margin: אין ב' פסוקי' הללו כתוב' בספר סיני ובספר רבי' גרשם והעתקים מספרים אחרים. ואני מתחרט בכך. אך אין זה מקומן כי אם בדי' עיקרם אשר מפורש שם מראש העינין. לבני מררי למשפחתם ממטה ראובן וממטה נד וממטה זבולן בנורל ערים שתיים עשרה נמצא כאילו נאמר בספר יהושע כי לקחו בני מררי יהצה קדמות דימונה רמות מחנים חשבון יעור ולקחו עוד ערים אחרות חומת שתיים עשרה וכו' פירש שמתיהן נמצא כי מ הדין לא כתבום בספר סיני ובספר רבי' גרשם ז"ל.

verses in the *editio princeps* of his Rabbinic Bible with the Massorah 1524—25.

The objections raised against the genuineness of these two verses based upon the Massorah, viz. (1) that they are against the Massoretic Summary which gives the number of verses at the end of this book; (2) that their retention in the text is against the Massoretic statement that Isa. XVII 3 is the middle of the 9294 verses contained in the Prophets and (3) that אֶת־בֶּצֶר *Bezer* and אֶת־קִדְמוֹת *Kedemoth* are not included in the Massoretic List which tabulates all the instances of אֶת in Josh. XXI 11—37 — all prove that the School, from which these Massoretic remarks proceeded, did not recognise these two verses. Hence, these particular Massorites guarded against them by the remarks in question. The MSS., however, which exhibit these two verses in the text proceed from another and more ancient School of Massorites. The Codices upon which they worked were anterior to the clerical blunder which omitted the verses from the text, as is attested by the ancient Versions. Hence, their Massorah is based upon the existence of these two verses in the text. The analysis in the foregoing chapters of the Sections, Verses, Division of words &c. &c. shows beyond doubt the existence of different Massoretic Schools, with different recensions of the Hebrew text. To adduce, therefore, the arguments derived from one Massoretic School only proves that this particular School worked upon a particular text. These few instances which might easily be multiplied must suffice. Some of them I have given in the marginal notes, and I should have given them all, but for the fact that I had not finished my re-translation of the whole Septuagint into Hebrew when this edition of the Hebrew Bible was being printed.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Other instances will be found in 1 Sam. XIV 42; XV 13; XVII 36; 2 Sam. VI 21; XIII 27, 34; XIV 30; XV 18, 20; XIX 11; 1 Kings II 29;

It is to be remarked that not only does the Septuagint exhibit passages which are omitted in the present Hebrew text due to homoeoteleuta, but it shows that sentences are also omitted in the Septuagint itself arising from the same cause. The following instances will prove this fact:

Josh. VI 22 Heb. אֲשֶׁר לָהּ כְּאֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּעְתֶּם לָהּ  
Sept. אֲשֶׁר לָהּ . . . . .

Here the words "*as ye swear unto her*" are omitted in the Septuagint because of the homoeoteleuton *to her . . . . to her.*

Josh. VIII 25, 26 Heb. הָעַיִן וַיְהוֹשֻׁעַ לֹא־הֵשִׁיב יָדוֹ אֲשֶׁר נָטָה בְּיָדוֹן  
עַד אֲשֶׁר הִחְרִים אֶת כָּל־יֹשְׁבֵי הָעַיִן  
Sept. הָעַיִן . . . . .

Here the whole of verse 26: "*For Joshua drew not his hand back, wherewith he stretched out the spear, until he had utterly destroyed all the inhabitants of Ai*", is omitted in the Septuagint because of the homoeoteleuton *Ai . . . . Ai* at the end of verses 25 and 26.

Judg. III 22, 23 Heb. וַיֵּצֵא הַפְּרָשָׁתָהּ: וַיֵּצֵא אֲהוּר  
Sept. וַיֵּצֵא אֲהוּר . . . . .

Here the words *and the dirt went out* are omitted in the Septuagint because of the homoeoteleuton *and he went out . . . . and he went out.*

1 Sam. XX 26, Heb. מִקְרָה הוּא בְּלִתי שְׁהוּר הוּא  
Sept. מִקְרָה הוּא . . . . .

Here the words *he is not clean* are omitted in the Septuagint because of the homoeoteleuton *הוּא . . . . הוּא.*

2 Sam. XXIII 28, 29 Heb. הַנְּטָפְתִּי: חֶלֶב בְּדִבְעָה הַנְּטָפְתִּי  
Sept. הַנְּטָפְתִּי: . . . . .

The first part of verse 29, consisting of the words "*Helcb the son of Baanah a Netophalhtite*", is omitted in the

III 27; VIII 65; XVIII 44; 2 Kings XVII 20, 32; XIX 20; XXII 16; Isa. XXII 22 &c. &c.

Septuagint because of the homoeoteleuton *Netophathite* . . . .  
*Netophathite*.

These instances too might easily be multiplied.<sup>1</sup> Here, however, it is more difficult to decide whether the authors of the Septuagint had a Hebrew text before them in which these passages were omitted; or whether the translators themselves omitted them owing to the homoeoteleuta. All the passages in this category which I have given in the notes are preceded by **בְּחִיעַ נִמְצָא כֹּאן** *the Septuagint has here &c.*

<sup>1</sup> Other instances occur in 1 Kings IV 13; VI 31 VIII 41; XV 6; XVI 11; 2 Kings XVI 11; XIX 10, 15; Isa. XLI 14; LXIII 18 &c. &c.

## Chap. VII.

### The Keri and Kethiv.

In every book of the Massoretic Bible a number of extraordinary forms are exhibited in the text which are exceedingly perplexing to the student of Hebrew. These abnormal forms and unpronounceable words are produced by the vowel-points which are affixed to certain words, but which are most inappropriate to the consonants, as will be seen from the following instances: **וַיֹּאמְרוּ** (Josh. VI 7), **הַיְיִתָּה מוֹצִיא** (2 Sam. V 2), **לִי** (2 Sam. XXI 9) **שְׁלֹשִׁים** (2 Sam. XXIII 13), **הָאֵהָל** (1 Kings VII 45), **אָנֹכִי** (Jerem. XLII 6), **בְּאִשֶׁר** (Ezek. IX 11), **וּמִתְהַתָּה לְשִׁכּוֹת** (Ezek. XLII 9) **יִדְעָתָה** (Job. XXXVIII 12), **בֵּן** (2 Chron. XI 18) etc. etc. In some instances there are actually more vowel-points in the text than consonants, and hence these signs are without a consonant. Thus for instance **עֵשָׂה** (1 Sam. XX 2), **מֶלֶךְ** (1 Kings. XV 18), **וְהָיִי** (Jerem. XVIII 23) &c. &c.

In Hebrew Grammars the student is told that the vowel-signs which produce these abnormal forms and disfigure the text, do not belong to the words in question, but to other words which are exhibited in the margin and which are the authoritative reading. Accordingly the marginal variant or the official reading, called the *Keri* (קרי), is to have the vowel-points, whilst the word written in the text, called technically the *Kethiv* (כתיב), has no vowel-signs at all. The Massorites, therefore, who have decided that the marginal *Keri* is the correct one, have in all these instances

deprived us of the vowel-signs which were originally affixed to the words exhibited in the text.

Without entering into a discussion on the merits or demerits of these official various readings as a whole, it is now admitted by the best textual critics that in many instances the reading exhibited in the text (כתוב) is preferable to the marginal variant (קרי), inasmuch as it sometimes preserves the archaic orthography and sometimes gives the original reading. The *Kethiv* or textual reading moreover is in many instances not only supported by MSS. and early editions, but by the ancient Versions. As according to the testimony of the Massorah itself, the vowel signs do not in these instances belong to the text, but to the marginal reading, and moreover as the original vowel-signs which did belong to the text have been suppressed altogether, I have left the *Kethiv* entirely without the vowel-signs, and have given in the margin both the *Kethiv* and the *Keri* with their respective vowel-signs. This principle I have adopted in fairness to the Biblical student to afford him an opportunity of judging for himself as to which is the preferable reading. Moreover to aid him in his decision I have in most cases given the MSS., the early editions and the ancient Versions, which support the *Kethiv* and those which exhibit the *Keri*. I know that some critics may in sundry cases differ from me as to the proper pointing of the *Kethiv*, but in the absence of all MS. authority I could do it only according to the best of my judgment.

It is to be remarked that this corpus of official various readings has been transmitted to us in three different forms. (1) Originally each of these variations was given in the margin of the text against the word affected by it. The word in the text was furnished with a small circle or asterisk over it, which directed the reader to

the marginal variant. This ancient practice still prevails in all Massoretic MSS of the Bible and is adopted in all the best editions. (2) Later scribes collected these marginal readings and arranged them in separate Lists which they appended to the respective books in Model Codices.<sup>1</sup> These Lists, however, do not always agree in number with those exhibited in the margin and the two classes must frequently be utilized to supplement each other. (3) The third form in which these official variants have been preserved in the Massorah is more artificial, and in some instances more perplexing. The whole corpus of various readings has been classified by the Massorites under different Rubrics. Thus for instance all those which affect the same verb are put together in one Rubric under the same root:<sup>2</sup> those which affect the same particle are collected together in one Rubric:<sup>3</sup> all the instances in which the same letter is affected are grouped together<sup>4</sup> &c. &c.

But all the three classes which supplement and control one another, by no means exhaust all the instances embraced under the *Keri* and *Kethiv* hitherto printed, simply because no single MS. contains them all either in the margins, or in the separate Lists which are prefixed and appended to the different Codices. The reason lies in the fact that the different Schools of Massorites were not agreed among themselves in the critical canons which they respectively followed. Hence that which is exhibited as *Keri* in the margin in a MS. proceeding from one School is no *Keri* in the MSS. which emanated from another School and *vice versa*. In order to exhibit, therefore, all the *Keris* irrespective of the different Schools, it is absolutely

<sup>1</sup> This is the case for instance in Arundel Or. 16.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter נ, § 796, Vol. 1, p. 36, נ § 843, Vol. 1, p. 91.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter נ, §§ 513, 514, Vol. 1, p. 57.

<sup>4</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter ה, §§ 26, 27, Vol. 1, p. 268.

necessary to collate all the existing MSS. which at present is almost an impossible task. I have, however, compared as many MSS. both in the public Libraries of Europe, and in the possession of private owners, as were accessible to me, and have, therefore, been able to give a larger number of *Keris* and *Kethivs* than those which are printed in any other edition of the Hebrew Bible.

## Chap. VIII.

## Sevirin.

The corpus of various readings denoted by the term *Sevirin* (סבירין) as we shall presently show, is of equal importance to the class of variants comprised in the official *Keri* (קרי), though it has hardly been noticed by modern critics. Indeed in some respects it is more important than the alternative readings which have hitherto been so scrupulously given in the margin of our Bibles under the name of *Keri* by modern editors who have either entirely banished the *Sevir* from the margin or have on extremely rare occasions condescended to notice one of the numerous readings introduced by the name *Sevir*. Yet in the MSS. the alternate reading entitled *Sevir* is given in the margin of the text in the same way as the variant described by the term *Keri*.

To establish the fact that *Sevir* is really a kind of *Keri* I have only to mention that the two terms are not unfrequently used interchangeably. The variant which is described in some MSS. as *Keri* is in other MSS. termed *Sevir* and *vice versa*. Thus the oldest Massorah preserved in the St. Petersburg Codex gives us a List of seven passages in which the textual reading or the *Kethiv* is לָא *unto* and the *Keri* על *upon*,<sup>1</sup> one of the seven instances is Ezekiel XIII 2, against which the St. Petersburg Codex duly remarks in the margin of the text the *Keri* is על *upon*.<sup>2</sup> In turning,

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter א, § 514, Vol. I, p. 57.

<sup>2</sup> על קי.

however, to the margin of this passage in the *editio princeps* of Jacob b. Chayim's Massoretic Bible the Massorah remarks against it: "it is one of the five instances in which the *Sevir* is על upon."<sup>1</sup> It will thus be seen that the identical variant which is called *Keri* by one School of Massorites is called *Sevir* by another School.

Isa. XXX 32 affords a still more striking illustration of the interchangeable use of the terms *Sevir* and *Keri*. The Massorah registers three instances in which the textual reading [= *Kethiv*] is בָּהּ with her third person singular feminine and the *Sevir* in each of the three passages exhibits a different reading. In the passage before us the *Sevir* is בָּם with them, the plural masculine. In the Massorah Parva, however, on this very passage this variant is called *Keri* and the St. Petersburg Codex, which has בָּם with her in the text, simply tells us that the Babylonians read בָּהּ with them.<sup>2</sup> The same is the case with the other two instances, viz. Jerem. XVII 24 and Ezek. XIV 4, which are described as *Sevirin* in this Massoretic Rubric, but which are respectively called *Keri* in the Massorah Parva.

I shall only adduce one more Massoretic Rubric to illustrate the treatment which the *Sevir* has been subject to on the part of the School of Massorites who, though bound to give it as an integral portion of the Massorah, have yet passed sentence against it. The Massorah gives a Rubric of two passages where the *Sevir* is לְבָנַי before the children of, and the textual reading is לְפָנַי before the face of, viz. Ps. LXXX 3 and Prov. IV 3.<sup>3</sup> Instead of Ps. LXXX 3, the Massorah preserved by Jacob b. Chayim

<sup>1</sup> ה' סבירי על.

<sup>2</sup> בָּהּ לְבָנַי. The Authorised Version follows the *Kethiv*, the Revised Version the *Sevir* or *Keri*.

<sup>3</sup> לְפָנַי וְקָרַי לְבָנַי וְקָרַי לְפָנַי. Comp. *Massorah*, letter ב' § 145, Vol. II, p. 446.

gives Job XIX 7 as one of the two passages and the compilers of this Rubric do not call the instances *Sevirin* at all, but simply head the Rubric *Two verses are misleading*.<sup>1</sup> That is, the peculiar wording of the text is misleading, but is not to be exchanged for the normal reading which one would naturally expect. The most remarkable part, however, is the fact that whilst Arundel Or. 16, both on Ps. LXXX 3 and Prov. IV 3, describes them respectively as one of the four and one of the two verses where the *Codices* are misleading,<sup>2</sup> the Massorah Parva in the *editio princeps* on Prov. IV 3 describes it as one of the *Sevirin* and the Massorah in Harley 5710—11, which is a model Codex, says it is one of the two passages where the *Keri* is לְבָנַי before the children of. This shows conclusively that whilst one School of Massorites rejected the *Sevir* as misleading, another School not only regarded it in the same light as the *Keri*, but actually called it *Keri*.

From the Lists of variants between the Easterns and Westerns we see that the *Sevir* was not simply an alternative reading, but it was actually the received reading of the Babylonians. Thus לָכֶם in Numb. XI 21, viz. "I will give you flesh", which in the *Sevir* instead of לָהֶם, i. e. "I will give them flesh", is actually the textual reading of the Eastern School. Again in 1 Sam. XVIII 25 instead of the simple פִּי, the *Sevir* is פִּי־אִם which is also the received reading of the Easterns.<sup>3</sup>

But we have still further evidence that the *Sevir* refers to the readings of actual MSS. and that these variants are in many instances supported both by still

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter ב' פס' מטע' § 145, Vol. II, 446.

<sup>2</sup> לְפָנַי ב' פס' מטע' לְפָנַי ד' מטע' בהון ספרי.

<sup>3</sup> This is attested by the official List of differences between the Westerns and Easterns in the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 1009, in Add. 15251 and in the *editio princeps*.

extant Codices and by the early editions as well as by the ancient Versions. I must of necessity confine myself to only a few examples in proof of this statement and leave the student to examine for himself the value of each of the hundreds of *Sevirin* which I have collected from various MSS. and given in the margin of the text against the respective words to which the *Sevir* refers.

In Genesis XLIX 13 the *Sevir* is  $\text{עַל}$  unto, instead of the textual reading  $\text{עָלַי}$  upon. Accordingly the passage ought to be rendered "and his border shall be or extend unto Zidon", instead of "and his border shall be upon Zidon". Now the *Sevir* which gives the intelligible geographical definition of the territory of Zebulun, is actually the textual reading in many of the MSS. collated by Kennicott and de Rossi. It is also the reading of the Samaritan text, Onkelos in the *editio princeps* of the Bologna Pentateuch 1482; the edition in the Ixar Pentateuch 1490, the edition in the Lisbon Pentateuch 1461 &c., the Chaldee of the so-called Jonathan, the Septuagint, the Syriac and the Vulgate. The Authorised Version too, exhibits the *Sevir*, whilst the Revised Version follows the received text.

In Exod. VI 27 the received text has "to bring out the children of Israel from Egypt", whilst the *Sevir* is  $\text{מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם}$  "from the land of Egypt", as it is in the preceding verse, and the *Sevir* is not only the textual reading in a number of MSS.,<sup>1</sup> but is supported by the Samaritan, the Septuagint and the Syriac.

In Exod. XXV 39 the received text is "of a talent of pure gold ( $\text{יַעֲשֶׂה}$ ) shall he make", the third person. The *Sevir* here is  $\text{תַּעֲשֶׂה}$  "shalt thou make". The second person

<sup>1</sup> When MSS. are quoted without specifying the Library in which they are to be found and their number, the reference is to Kennicott's and Rossi's collations published in Parma 1784-88 in 4 Volumes quarto, and the supplement to these volumes also published in Parma in 1798.

is not only demanded by the context, but the *Sevir* is actually the textual reading in several MSS., is exhibited in the Samaritan, in the Chaldee of Onkelos, in the Ixar Pentateuch 1490, in the Septuagint and the Syriac.

The same is the case in Exod. XXVI 31 where the received text has  $\text{יַעֲשֶׂה}$  the third person, i. e. "shall he make". To avoid the incongruity of this isolated appearance of the third person when all the other verbs throughout the context are in the second person the Authorised Version, which the Revised Version follows, converted the active verb into the impersonal, i. e. *shall it be made*. Others again who adhere to the literal meaning "shall he make", refer it to the artificer who has suddenly to be brought on the scene, though he is not mentioned at all in these directions. The *Sevir*, however, is  $\text{תַּעֲשֶׂה}$  "thou shalt make", which not only relieves the context from all unnatural interpretations, but is the textual reading of several MSS., the Samaritan, the Chaldee in the Ixar Pentateuch 1490, the Septuagint, the Syriac and the Vulgate.

In Numb. XXXIII 8 the received text is "and they journeyed ( $\text{מִפְּנֵי}$ ) from before Hahiroth" as the Revised Version correctly renders it. But  $\text{הַחִירוֹת}$  *Hahiroth* by itself does not occur. In the only other three passages where this proper name is to be found, it is the compound  $\text{פִּי הַחִירוֹת}$  *Pi-hahiroth*.<sup>1</sup> It will be seen that one of the three instances is in the very verse which immediately precedes this one, and to which indeed the verse before us refers, by repeating the name of the place from which the Israelites departed after the encampment was broken up. This is the case throughout the description of the journeyings in this chapter where the verse, which gives the departures simply, repeats the identical name of the place of encampment.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Exod. XIV 2, 9; Numb. XXXIII 7.

Now the *Sevir* is מִפִּי הַחִירָהּ from *Pi-hahiroth*. Here too the *Sevir* is the textual reading in many MSS., in the Samaritan, the Chaldee, the Septuagint, the Syriac and the Vulgate. The translators of the Authorised Version who adopted the *Sevir*, also retained the reading of the received text and hence produced the hybrid rendering "and they departed from before *Pi-hahiroth*".

In Joshua I 15 instead of "which the Lord your God giveth (לָהֶם) *them*" the *Sevir* is "which the Lord your God giveth (לָכֶם) *you*", as it is in the second clause. Here again the *Sevir* is the textual reading in many MSS., in the first edition of the Prophets (Soncino 1485), the first edition of the entire Bible (Soncino 1488), the third edition of the entire Bible (Brescia 1494) and in the Chaldee. It is very remarkable that in some MSS. in which the *Sevir* is the textual reading, it is actually the subject of a *Keri*, directing it to be read לָהֶם *to them*.

In 1 Kings I 18 the received text is "and now (וְעַתָּה) my lord the king" for which the *Sevir* has "and *thou* (וְאַתָּה) my lord the king". This *Sevir* is not only the textual reading in numerous MSS., but is in the first edition of the Prophets (Soncino 1485), the first edition of the entire Hebrew Bible (Soncino 1488), the Complutensian Polyglot, the Chaldee, the Septuagint, the Syriac and the Vulgate. It is rather remarkable that the Revisers adopted the *Sevir* as the textual reading, and relegated the received text into the margin. But though this *Sevir* is so strongly supported by MSS. as the primitive reading, by the early editions and the ancient Versions, yet the Massorah adds to it וְמַטְעִים בָּהוֹן *they* (i. e. the MSS. or Scribes) *are misled thereby*, that is in writing אַתָּה *thou* instead of עַתָּה *now*.

In 2 Chron. XXI 2 Jehoshaphat is described as king of *Israel* (מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל), whereas he was king of *Judah* (comp. 1 Kings XXII 41—51). To get over this contra-

diction some have maintained that *Israel* is here used in the sense of *Judah*. But whatever may be the secondary sense in which *Israel* is used, when it is combined with מֶלֶךְ *king*, it always denotes the sovereign of the ten tribes who constituted the kingdom of *Israel* in *opposition to* מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה *the king of Judah*, whose kingdom consisted of *Judah* and *Benjamin*. Here again the *Sevir* solves the difficulty, inasmuch as it is יְהוּדָה *Judah*, and here too the *Sevir* is the textual reading in many MSS., in the first edition of the Hagiographa (Naples 1486—87), the Complutensian Polyglot, the Septuagint, the Syriac and the Vulgate. The same applies to the *Sevir* in 2 Chron. XXVIII 19 which has יְהוּדָה *Judah*, instead of יִשְׂרָאֵל *Israel*, since *Ahaz* was king of *Judah* and not of *Israel*. Here again the *Sevir* is the textual reading in several MSS. and in the *editio princeps* of the Hagiographa. The various readings are due to the fact that originally the text simply was *Yod* (י) and that this abbreviation was resolved into יִשְׂרָאֵל *Israel*, by one School of Massorites and into יְהוּדָה *Judah*, by another School.

Without expanding it into a separate Treatise it is impossible for me to discuss in detail every one of the three hundred and fifty *Sevirin* which I have succeeded in collecting from the margins of various MSS. The few, however, which I have analysed will sufficiently show the correctness of my contention that according to the testimony both of the MSS. and the ancient Versions the *Sevirin* in many instances preserve the primitive textual readings. As I have tried to give in every instance the MSS., the editions and the ancient Versions, which support the *Sevir* on every word where it occurs, the student will henceforth find it an easier task to test the value of this much-neglected class of various readings.

Owing to the fact that the later redactors of the Massorah looked upon the text as finally settled, they



regarded the *Sevir* with disfavour. Hence the various readings preserved under the name *Sevirin*, have never been properly collected. Like the official *Keri*, the extra-official *Sevir* was originally given in the margin of the text against the word for which it exhibits an alternative reading. Later Scribes, however, collected and grouped together these *Sevirin* under different headings or Rubrics. In this form each Rubric comprises the number of instances in which the same verb, noun, particle or proper name has the same *Sevir*, with or without the editorial condemnatory clause that *it is misleading* (מטעי). Jacob b. Chayim was the first who arranged the groups alphabetically in his alphabetical Massorah at the end of the fourth Volume (Venice 1524—25). He, moreover, gives some of the groups in the marginal Massorah on the words which are affected by the *Sevir*. But he only succeeded in collecting altogether about two hundred *Sevirin* which indeed is more than could have been expected even from his untiring industry under the extraordinary difficulties which he had to encounter. Frensdorff<sup>1</sup> has simply brought together and alphabetically arranged under a separate Section the Rubrics which are dispersed throughout Jacob b. Chayim's edition of the Massorah. Although Frensdorff has appended to the *Sevirin* very valuable notes correcting mistakes in the *editio princeps* of the Massorah yet this indefatigable Massoretic scholar has added no new instances. In my edition of the Massorah I have been able to give a much larger number which I collected from different MSS.<sup>2</sup> The continuous collation of new MSS., however, has enabled me to make considerable additions to the *Sevirin* and the number which now appears in the margin of my Massoretico-

<sup>1</sup> Die Massora magna, Vol. I, p. 369—373, Hannover und Leipzig 1876.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter כ, Vol. II, p. 324—329.

critical edition of the Bible amounts to about 350, or nearly more than half as much again as the number given by Jacob b. Chayim. Nor can even this largely increased number be considered exhaustive. Careful students of MSS. of the Hebrew Bible will discover many new ones. The great difficulty in detecting them arises from the fact that later redactors of the Massorah, owing to their hostility to the *Sevir*, have often discarded the word סביר = *Sevir* with the alternative reading, and simply substituted for it 'מטע' ב' מטע, ג' מטע, two or three misleading, without giving the variant. The passage which exhibits this nameless sentence in some MSS. has to be carefully compared with the parallel passage in other MSS., where the nature of the *Sevir* is often given, because the particular Scribe was not possessed by the same degree of hostility to the *Sevirin*.

As to the treatment of this important corpus of various readings by modern editors of the so-called Massoretic Bible, this is best illustrated by an examination of the three editions which are now accepted by scholars. (1) Hahn's edition of which a new issue has just been published Leipzig 1893. (2) Letteri's edition published by the British and Foreign Bible Society and (3) Dr. Baer's edition of which Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy and Kings are still due. Out of 350 *Sevirin* Hahn gives two in the margin of his text, viz. 1 Sam. II 16 and XII 5 and these two, Letteri simply repeats from Hahn's edition. In Dr. Baer's edition not a single one of the *Sevirin* is given in the margin of the text against the words to which the *Sevir* refers, though this is its proper place by the side of the official *Keri* as is the case in many of the Massoretic MSS. Dr. Baer, however, notices many of them in the Latin notes which form Appendices to the different books which he edited. But he does not discuss the value of the respective *Sevirin*, nor does he state

whether they are supported by MSS., the early editions or the ancient Versions. By placing them in the margin of the text, which is a new feature in my edition, I hope to enable the student easily to see the extent and value of this important corpus of various readings.

## Chap. IX.

### The Western and Eastern Recensions.

As early as the third century we are told that there existed differences between the (מִדְּנַחֲאִי =) Westerns or Palestinians and the (מִדְּבַבְיָאִי =) Easterns or Babylonians which affected not only the orthography, but the exegesis of certain words. We know now that many of the deviating renderings of the Septuagint and the Chaldee Version of the Prophets are due to the variations which obtained in these Schools of textual critics.<sup>1</sup>

An instructive incident affecting the difference in the orthography of the text, which obtained in these Schools is mentioned in the Jerusalem Talmud, where it is related that in Jerusalem the Scribes arbitrarily appended or omitted the *He* local. To illustrate this fact it is said that they wrote ירושלמה instead of ירושלם, likewise צפונה instead of צפון and תימנה instead of תימן (*Jerusalem Megilla* I 9).<sup>2</sup> The Samaritans who adhered to the ancient tradition followed the same practice, which elicited the following censure from Simon b. Elasar: "I said to the Samaritan Scribes: What made you commit this error that you have not adopted the principle of R. Nehemiah?" For it is taught in the name of R. Nehemiah that every word which should have *Lamed* at the beginning and has is not, must have

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Geiger in the *Keren Chemed* IX 69: *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, p. 481 etc.

<sup>2</sup> אנשי ירושלים היו כותבין ירושלים ירושלימה ולא היו מקפידין ורבותה צפון צפונה תימן תימנה: מנילה א' מ'.

*He* appended to it at the end, as for instance חוצה for לחוץ, likewise שעיר for לשעיר and סוכות for לסוכות (*Jerusalem Jebamoth* I 6).<sup>1</sup>

It is very remarkable that though the Samaritan Pentateuch still exhibits some of the peculiarities against which R. Simon here raises his voice, the instances adduced to show the arbitrariness of the Jerusalem Scribes do not exist in the present recension of the Hebrew text. Passages of תימנה where it ought to be תימן do not occur now, nor have we ירושלמה which should be ירושלם. The only five instances in which ירושלמה occurs (1 Kings X 2; 2 Kings IX 28; Isa. XXXVI 2; Ezek. VIII 3; 2 Chron. XXXII 9),<sup>2</sup> the *He* local is absolutely wanted, inasmuch as it takes the place of the *Lamed* at the beginning. In this instance, therefore, as is the case with many other features, the process of uniformity has successfully been carried through in so far as the Massoretic text is concerned.

The real nature and extent of the variations between these two Schools of textual critics we must learn from the instances which have been transmitted to us in the official Lists and in the margin of the MSS. against the words on which the variants are recorded. Before entering, however, into an examination of these Schools it is necessary to remark that *Madinchai* (= מדנחאי) the Easterns is the name for the Jews who resided in Babylon because Babylon lies to the east of Palestine in contradistinction to the *Maarbai* (= מערבאי) the Westerns which denotes the inhabitants of Palestine. The term Eastern or *Madinchai*, however, denotes the principal School of Massorites which

<sup>1</sup> נומתי לסופרי כותים מי גרם לכם לשעות דלית אתון דרשין כר' נחמיה דתני בשם ר' נחמיה כל דבר שהוא צריך למיד מתחילתו ולא ניתן לו ניתן לו ה"א בסופו כגון לחוץ חוצה לשעיר שעירה לסוכות סוכותה: יבמות א' ה'.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter ' , § 619 Vol. I, p. 740

was divided into several subordinate Schools; one of these is often quoted by the name *Nehardai* (נהרדאי) and the other *Surai* (סוראי) after the names of the cities where the respective Schools were held. The MSS. as a rule and the printed texts exhibit the *Maarbai* or Western recension.

*The Pentateuch.* — In the examination and analysis of these variations it is necessary to discuss those which occur in each of the three great divisions of the Bible separately, since some of the official Lists extend to one or two of these divisions and all of them omit the Pentateuch altogether. This omission, however, which is entirely due to the first compiler, has given rise to the assertion on the part of Elias Levita that there is not a single difference between the Easterns and the Westerns in the Pentateuch.<sup>1</sup> But this learned expositor of the Massorah, must have overlooked the passage in the *editio princeps* of Jacob b. Chayim's Rabbinic Bible with the Massorah in praise of which he himself composed a Hebrew poem which is appended to the fourth volume. In the Massorah Magna on (Gen. XLVI 20) it is distinctly stated that תובל קין *Tubal-Cain* (Gen. IV 22) constitutes one of the differences between the Easterns and Westerns, the former read it as one word תובלקין *Tubalcain*, and the latter read it in two words תובל קין *Tubal Cain*.<sup>2</sup>

But though the official Lists do not give the differences which existed in these two Schools of textual critics as far as the Pentateuch is concerned, these variants are given in the margin of different MSS. against the respective passages. It is from these scattered marginal remarks as well as from sundry Massoretic Rubrics that I have collected

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, p. 261, ed. Ginsburg, London 1867.

<sup>2</sup> תובל קין למדנחאי מילתא חדא כתיב וקריון, למערבאי חרין מלין כתיב וקריון.

the variants in this division of the Hebrew Scriptures. From these sources we learn that the differences between the Eastern and Western recensions are both far more numerous and far more important than those contained in the official Lists.

A few illustrations will suffice to establish this fact. According to the *Maarbai* (מערבאי) recension which we follow there is no difference in our text between the vowel-points in ממנו *from him*, third person masculine and from us, first person plural. It is in both instances pointed מִמֶּנּוּ. According to the *Madinchai* (מדרנחאי), however, it is מִמֵּנוּ *Raphe* in all the twenty-three passages in which it denotes *from us*, the first person plural.<sup>1</sup> This fact which we have hitherto only known from MSS. is of double importance. It is in the first place a valuable contribution to Hebrew Grammar, and in the second place it shows that the variations between the Westerns and Easterns extended to the Pentateuch, since nine out of the twenty-three instances occur in the Pentateuch.<sup>2</sup>

Of equal importance is the Massorah Parva in Codex No. 13 in the Vienna Imperial and Royal Court Library on Gen. IV 22. We are here told that according to the *Maarbai* בית-אל *Beth-el*, like תובל-קין *Tubal-cain*, חצר-מֶוֶת *Hazer-maveth*, פְּדֵר-לְעֹמֶר *Chedor-laomer*, and גַּל-עַד *Gal-ed*, is in *two words*, whereas according to the *Madinchai* it is ביתֶאל *Bethel* one word.<sup>3</sup> As this name is to be found no fewer than seventy times in the Hebrew Scriptures it will at once be apparent that its correct orthography is essential,

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter ב, §§ 549, 550, Vol. II, page 234.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Gen. III 22; XXIII 6; XXVI 16; Exod. I 9; XIV 12; Numb. XIII 31; XXXI 49; Deut. I 28; II 36

<sup>3</sup> למדרנחאי תובל קין חרא מלה בתי וקי, למערבאי ב' מלין וכן חצר מות. וכן בית אל, וכן כדר לעמר, וכן גל עד.

especially since Dr. Baer has printed it in one word throughout his text.

The first passage in which this name is mentioned is Gen. XII 8 where it occurs twice. Now besides the Massoretic declaration in the Vienna Codex No. 13 the following MSS. in the British Museum and early editions have it בית-אל *Beth-el* in *two words*: Orient. 4445 which is the oldest MS. known at present; Orient. 2201 dated A. D. 1246; Harley 1528; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add. 15282; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; the *editio princeps* of the Pentateuch, Bologna 1482; the Ixar edition 1490; the Lisbon edition 1491; the second edition of the entire Hebrew Bible, Naples 1491—93; the third edition, Brescia 1494; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the quarto Bible, Venice 1521; and the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25. Three out of the ten MSS., viz. Orient. 2201; Harley 1528; and Orient. 2350 have it actually in two lines, i. e. בית- *Beth* at the end of one line and אל *el* at the beginning of the next line. This is also the case in the Complutensian Polyglot. When it is added that Add. 15282 and Orient. 2696 have it לבית אל with the following Massorah ננינה *the accent in לבית* is *Mercha*, and that the third and fourth editions of the Bible (Naples 1491—93; Brescia 1494) have it here with *Mercha*, the evidence of its being in two words in accordance with the *Maarbai* is fully established.

It is, however, to be remarked that in the case of בית-אל *Beth-el* as is the case with other words with respect to which the Western and Eastern recensions differ, some MSS. follow the *Madinchai* reading. Hence ביתֶאל *Bethel* in one word is to be found in Arund. Orient. 2; Add. 9401; Add. 15451; Harley 5710—11; Orient. 4227 and in the first

edition of the Hebrew Bible, Soncino 1488. But as we, including Dr. Baer, profess to follow the *Maarbai*, the deliberate ejection of **בֵּית־אֵל** *Beth-el* from the text, especially when with one exception it is in all the early editions, is to be deprecated.

The treatment of **כְּדֹר־לְעֹמֶר** *Chedor-laomer*, the fourth name in the Rubric which registers the variations between these two Schools of textual critics, is still more remarkable and illustrative of the fact that the *Maarbai* recension is not uniformly followed in all the MSS. or editions. As this name occurs five times and in the same Section, and moreover as it is treated differently by the same MSS. and editions, it will be more convenient to examine each passage separately.

(1) In Gen. XIV 1 where it first occurs, the following MSS. and editions have it **כְּדֹר־לְעֹמֶר** *Chedor-laomer* in two words according to the *Maarbai*: Arund. Orient. 2 dated A. D. 1216; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15451; Orient. 4227; Orient. 2365; the *editio princeps* of the Pentateuch, Bologna 1482; the first edition of the entire Bible, Soncino 1488; the third edition, Brescia 1494; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the Venice quarto 1521, and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25. It is to be remarked that Harley 5710—11 which is one of the most beautiful and accurate MSS. and is evidently a Standard Codex, has it not only in two words, but in two lines, **כְּדֹר** *Chedor* is at the end of one line and **לְעֹמֶר** *laomer* begins the next line.

The following MSS. and editions have it **כְּדֹר־לְעֹמֶר** *Chedorlaomer* in one word according to the *Madinchai*: Orient. 4445 which is the oldest MS. known at present; Orient. 2201 dated A. D. 1246; Add. 9401 dated A. D. 1286; Harley 1528; Add. 15251; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient.

2350; Orient. 2626—28; the Lisbon Pentateuch 1491 and the second edition of the entire Bible, Naples 1491—93. It is also to be added that Add. 15251, which has it in one word has against it in the margin here **מִלָּה קְדָא** = *one word*.

(2) In Gen. XIV 4 the following MSS. and editions have it **כְּדֹר־לְעֹמֶר** *Chedor-laomer* in two words in accordance with the Western recension: Arund. Orient. 2; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15451; Orient. 4227; Orient. 2365; the Bologna Pentateuch 1482; the first and third editions of the Bible, Soncino 1488, Brescia 1494; the Complutensian Polyglot; the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; and the Venice quarto 1521. Moreover Orient. 4227 as also the editions of 1494, 1517 and 1521 have it in two lines, viz. **כְּדֹר** *Chedor* at the end of one line and **לְעֹמֶר** *laomer* at the beginning of the next line.

The following MSS. and editions have it **כְּדֹר־לְעֹמֶר** *Chedorlaomer* in one word in accordance with the Eastern recension: Orient. 4445; Orient. 2201; Add. 9401; Harley 1528; Add. 15251; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; the Lisbon edition of the Pentateuch 1491; the second edition of the Bible 1491—93 and the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25. It is remarkable that Jacob b. Chayim who has it in two words in all the other four passages has it in one word in this solitary instance.

(3) In Gen. XIV 5 the following MSS. and editions have it **כְּדֹר־לְעֹמֶר** *Chedor-laomer* the reading of the *Maarbai*: Arund. Orient. 2; Add. 9401; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15451; Add. 15250; Orient. 4227; Orient. 2365; the Bologna edition of the Pentateuch 1482; the first and third editions of the Bible, Soncino 1488, Brescia 1494; the Complutensian Polyglot; Felix Pratensis Rabbinic Bible 1517; the Venice quarto Bible 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah

by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25. — Add. 9401 and the editions of 1494, 1517 and 1521 have it in two lines. Now on comparing the MSS. quoted under Nos. 1 and 2 it will be seen that Add. 9401, which follows the Eastern recension in these two instances, not only exhibits in the passage before us the Western reading, but has it in two lines, פְּדָר *Chedor* at the end of one line and לְעֶמֶר *laomer* at the beginning of the next line.

The following MSS. and editions exhibit the Eastern recension פְּדָר־לְעֶמֶר *Chedorlaomer* in one word: Orient. 4445; Orient. 2201; Harley 1528; Add. 15251; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2626—28; the Lisbon edition of the Pentateuch 1491; and the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491—93.

(4) In Gen. XIV 9 the same MSS. and editions follow respectively the Western and Eastern recensions as exhibited in No. 3. Here again Add. 9401 not only follows the Western reading, but has it in two separate lines as in No. 3, though in Nos. 1 and 2, the Eastern reading is adopted.

(5) Gen. XIV 17 which is the fifth instance where this name occurs, exhibits no peculiarities, the same six MSS. and the same seven early editions which follow the Western recension in No. 4 follow it here, and the same seven MSS. and two early editions have the Eastern reading.

Delitzsch in his Preface to Dr. Baer's edition of the Five Megilloth, prints a Massorah which reverses the Schools whence this divergent reading emanates. It is the Eastern recension we are here told which reads פְּדָר־לְעֶמֶר *Chedor-laomer* in two words, whilst the Western reads its פְּדָר־לְעֶמֶר *Chedorlaomer* in one word.<sup>1</sup> As this Rubric was

<sup>1</sup> אלן פלונחא, כדרלעמר, שלהבתיה, וביוותיה, בשפרפרא, למדנתא תרתין חמש מגלות חבין, למערבאי מלה חדה חבין; Comp. Preface to the חמש מגלות חבין, p. V, Leipzig 1886.

communicated to Delitzsch by Dr. Baer and no place nor number is given where the MS. is to be found I can not place absolute confidence in Dr. Baer's Massoretic communications from my experience of the manner in which he manipulates Massorahs. If this Rubric, however, is a faithful transcript from a MS. it only shows what I have often contended for, that similar Massorahs are not only based upon distinct recensions of the text, but that the same Rubric or reading is sometimes transmitted to us in the names of opposite Schools of textual critics.

As regards the remaining thirty-one variations which I have given in the notes, they are as follows:

- (1) Gen. X 19 is in Or. 2696, British Museum.
- (2) " XXVIII 3 is in the Madrid Codex No. 1; and in Add. 15251, British Museum.
- (3) " XLIII 29 is in the National Library Paris Codex No. 1—3.
- (4) Exod. XVII 4 is in Norzi's *Minchath Shai* on this passage.
- (5) " " 16 is in the National Library Paris Codex No. 1—3.
- (6) Levit. VII 16 is in the National Library Paris Codex No. 1—3.
- (7) " XII 6 is in the St. Petersburg Codex dated A.D. 916, Jer. XXV 12.
- (8) " XIII 4 is in the National Library Paris Codex No. 1—3.
- (9) " " 7 is in the National Library Paris Codex No. 1—3.
- (10) " XIV 12 is in the National Library Paris Codex No. 1—3.
- (11) " XVI 33 is in Norzi's *Minchath Shai* on this passage.

- (12) Levit. XXVII 24 is in Orient. 2626, British Museum; and in the Codex Leicester, fol. 62 *b*.
- (13) Numb. I 48 is in Orient. 2626.
- (14) " XI 21 is in de Rossi *in loco*.
- (15) " XIII 6 is in the National Library Paris Codex No. 1—3.
- (16) " XXII 37 is in the National Library Paris Codex No. 1—3.
- (17) " XXVI 33 is in the National Library Paris Codex No. 1—3.
- (18) " XXX 13 is in the National Library Paris Codex No. 1—3.
- (19) " XXXII 7 is in Harley 5710—11, British Museum.
- (20) " XXXIV 19 is in the National Library Paris Codex No. 1—3.
- (21) Deut. I 11 is in the National Library Paris Codex No. 1—3.
- (22) " " 28 is in the National Library Paris Codex No. 1—3.
- (23) " XVI 3 is in the National Library Paris Codex No. 1—3.
- (24) " XVII 10 is in the National Library Paris Codex No. 1—3.
- (25) " " 12 is in Orient. 4445, British Museum.
- (26) " XIX 16 is in the National Library Paris Codex No. 1—3.
- (27) " XXXI 27 is in the National Library Paris Codex No. 1—3.
- (28) " XXXII 6 is in de Rossi *in loco*.
- (29) " " 35 is in the National Library Paris Codex No. 1—3.

- (30) Deut. XXXII 39 is in the National Library Paris Codex No. 1—3.
- (31) " XXXIII 5 is in the National Library Paris Codex No. 1—3.

*The Former Prophets.* — For this division of the Hebrew Bible I have collated the following official Lists: (1) The St. Petersburg Codex B 19*a* dated A. D. 1009 which gives the Lists for all the Prophets and the Hagiographa. (2) Codex No. 1 in the Madrid University Library dated A. D. 1280. This MS. gives the List for Kings only; the variations in Joshua, Judges and Samuel are given in the Margin on the respective passages, thus forming part of the Massorah Parva. (3) The beautiful little MS. in 16 volumes 12<sup>mo</sup> dated A. D. 1487 in the Madrid Royal Library which, with the exception of Psalms and Chronicles, gives the Lists for the Prophets and the Hagiographa. (4) The MS. kindly lent me by the late Dr. Merzbacher of Munich which gives the Lists for the Prophets and Hagiographa. (5) Bodley MS. No. 10—11 which also gives the Lists for the Prophets and the Hagiographa. (6) Arund. Orient. 16 British Museum which gives the Lists at the end of each book and (7) Add. 15251 which gives the Lists for the Former Prophets only. These MS. Lists together with the Lists in the *editio princeps* in Jacob b. Chayim's Bible with the Massorah I have carefully collated. Of course there must be other MSS. which have these Lists, but to which I have not had access.

With the exception of more or less clerical errors these Lists are simply copies of one another and add very little to the extensive differences which we know from the MSS. themselves, have existed between the Western and Eastern recensions of the text. The slavishness with which the Scribes copied one another may be seen from the fact that the Scribe of the List dated A. D. 1009 has the instance

from Ezra X 3 out of its proper place, since he put it as the last in the List after Neh. XIII 10 and all the other MSS. and even the *editio princeps* follow suit in this disorder.

*Joshua*. — In Joshua I have obtained four new variations between these two Schools from the MSS., viz. VIII 16; X 1; XXIII 15 and XXIV 15. The first is from Codex No. 1—3 in the National Library Paris, and Add. 15251, British Museum, whilst the remaining three are in the Paris Codex alone. Dr. Baer gives the following six variations:

- |           |                                |
|-----------|--------------------------------|
| (1) III 4 | למדני וביניו כתיב וקרי         |
| (2) IV 18 | למדני בעלות כתיב וקרי          |
| (3) VI 15 | למדני בעלות כתיב, בעלות קרי    |
| (4) VII 1 | למערי בקני ישראל, למדני בישראל |
| (5) XV 22 | למדני ועדיקרה ב' מלין          |
| (6) XV 29 | למדני ואליהקן ב' מלין          |

These I have not adopted because I could not verify them. Those variations which Dr. Baer in his List ascribes to the Easterns and which I could verify, viz. וינים כתיב, וינים קרי. XV 53, belong to the ordinary *Keri* and *Kethiv*. It is so in the Paris Codex No. 1—3 which is dated A. D. 1286; in Harley 5710—11; Arund. Orient. 16; Harley 5720; Add. 15251 and in the *editio princeps*.

Two, viz. בשופרות VI 20 and ואלהולך XV 30; XIX 4 in two words, are simply various readings. The former is in the text in Orient. 2201 which is one of the best MSS. and is dated A. D. 1246; in the *editio princeps*; the first edition of the entire Bible, Soncino 1488; the Former Prophets, Pesaro 1511; the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; and in the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25. The latter is in Harley 5710—11 and in all the early editions.

As to VIII 13 which Dr. Baer says is לעיר of the city, in both parts of the verse according to the Westerns, but

according to the Easterns it is only the *Kethiv* or the textual reading which has it in both clauses, whilst the *Keri* is לעי of the city,<sup>1</sup> no official Lists, MSS., Massorahs, or early editions which I have seen have any variation on this verse. Both the MSS. and the Lists which exhibit any variation at all, not only mark it on לעיר of the city, in verse 12, but vary in their statements as to the nature of the difference and as to the School to which it belongs. This will be seen from the following analysis of the Massorah Parva: (1) Orient. 2201 which is dated A. D. 1246 and Harley 1528 have in the text in VIII 12 לעיר of the city, and in the margin against it לעי ק' the *Keri* is of *Ai*. The same is the case in Harley 5710—11 where the Massorah Parva has against this verse לקר' the *Resh* is to be cancelled = the *Keri* is לעי of *Ai*, thus treating it as an ordinary *Keri* of the Western School. (2) Arund. Orient. 16 and Add. 15451 which are superb MSS., have no *Keri* at all, but simply remark against it in verse 12 דמטע' ד' four times misleading, which is the condemnatory appellation for *Sevirin*.

Equally certain is verse 12 indicated in the official Lists, which tabulate the differences between the Westerns and the Easterns. I must first notice the fact that the two oldest official Lists, viz. the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 1009 and the Madrid Codex No. 1, record no difference whatever either in verse 12 or 13. The Lists, however, which register this difference not only assign it to verse 12, but remark that according to the Westerns it is לעיר of the city, in two verses both in the *Kethiv* and in the *Keri*, whilst according to the Easterns the *Kethiv* in these two verses is לעיר of the city [or עיר city], but the *Keri* is לעי of *Ai* or עי *Ai*, viz. verses 12 and 16.<sup>2</sup> To the

<sup>1</sup> למערי לעיר כתיב וקרי. תרויהוק דפסוק. למדני לעיר כתיב. לעי קרי.

<sup>2</sup> למערי' ב' פסוקין כת' לעיר וכן קרי'. למדני לעיר כת' לעי קרי'.



same effect are the official Lists in Arund. Orient. 16; Add. 15251; Bodley No. 11, the MS. in the Royal Library Madrid; Codex Merzbacher; and in the *editio princeps*. Having altered ב' פסוקין *two verses*, into תריוהון דפסוק *in both clauses of the verse*, Dr. Baer was obliged to palm it on verse 13, since it is the only verse in this Section where לעיר *of the city* occurs twice.

Dr. Baer gives וימיתם Josh. X 26, as the passage which constitutes the difference between the Westerns and Easterns, whereas the official List in the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 1009 gives ואת כל המלכים לכד ויכם as the catchword which is XI 17 and the official Lists in the other MSS. confirm it.

In three instances, viz. VIII 12; XVIII 14 and XXII 18 the Chaldee exhibits the Eastern recension. On VIII 12 my note וכן דמ"י is to be corrected into כ"י ותר'.

*Judges*. — In Judges I have been able to add from Codex No. 1—3 in the National Library Paris the important fact that verses 29 and 30 in chapter VIII are one verse according to the Easterns.

This implies a different accentuation as well as different numbering of the verses in this book. In two instances, viz. I 21 and XX 36 the Chaldee exhibits the Eastern readings. Of the five passages which Dr. Baer includes in his List one (VIII 22) is a *Sevir*, and the other four (VI 25; X 4; XV 5; XX 20) are various readings exhibited in the text of our recensions.

*Samuel*. — In Samuel I have only found one new variation which constitutes a difference between the Westerns and Easterns, viz. 1 Sam. XVIII 25 where the Oriental reading is ערלת *defective*. This is given in the official List in Arund. Orient. 16. As regards the other difference in this verse, the oldest List in the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 1009 distinctly gives it as follows:

למע' כי במאה ערלות פלש'  
למרנ' כי אסי-במאה ערלות

It will thus be seen that the difference between these two Schools is the absence and presence of the particle אִם in the text. This is confirmed by the List in Add. 15251 and in the *editio princeps*. Dr. Baer's statement, therefore, that the Eastern variation is

כי אסי-במאה כתיב, כי במאה קרי

is to be rejected.

Equally wrong is Dr. Baer's manipulation of a supposed difference between these two Schools in 1 Sam. XIX 23 which he formulates as follows:

למע' בְּנִיּוֹת כתיב, וקרי  
למרנ' בְּנִיּוֹת כתיב, בְּנִיּוֹת קרי.

All the best MSS. and early editions give this *Kethiv* and *Keri* as belonging to the Western recension. They have בְּנִיּוֹת in the text and against it in the margin בְּנִיּוֹת ק'. This is the case in Orient. 2201; Harley 5710—11; Arund. Orient 16; Add. 15451; and Add. 15251, all of which are Standard Codices. The second and third editions of the entire Bible (Naples 1491—93; Brescia 1494); the Former Prophets, Pesaro 1511 and the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517, as well as the quarto Bible, Venice 1521 exhibit בְּנִיּוֹת in the text with the vowel points of the *Keri* which is their usual way of indicating the *Keri*, whilst the *editio princeps* of the Rabbinic Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25 has בְּנִיּוֹת in the text and against it in the margin בְּנִיּוֹת ק'.

As to the other eleven instances which Dr. Baer exhibits in his List as constituting variations between these two Schools, five I was unable to verify (1 Sam. XIX 13; XX 33; 2 Sam. XIII 5; XXII 45; XXIII 31) and, therefore, hesitated to accept them. The six instances, however, which

I could test do not belong to this category of variations. They are given on the authority of Codex Reuchlin No. 2 where the Massorah Parva's remark against each of them is as follows:

(1)	1 Sam.	XIX 13	אֱלֹהֵימָטָה עֲלֵי פְלִיג
(2)	"	XXII 6	אָחֹז עִמּוֹ פְלִיג
(3)	"	XXIV 4	עֲלֵי־הַרְרֵךְ אֱלֵי פְלִיג
(4)	"	XXVIII 19	גַּם רֶק פְלִיג
(5)	2 Sam.	III 29	וְאֶל־כָּל וְעַל־ פְלִיג
(6)	"	VII 25	וְעַתָּה וְאֶתָּה פְלִיג

It will thus be seen that Dr. Baer takes פְלִיג or פְלוֹגְתָא as the equivalent for מְדִנְחָאֵי = *Eastern*, which it most assuredly is not. The expression is of frequent occurrence in the Massorah and it simply denotes *there is a difference of opinion here*, or *a variation*, which may either be exhibited in the MSS. or in special Codices revised by known textual critics. Thus on עֹלֹת *burnt offerings* Exod. XXIV 5 the Massorah Parva remarks פְלוֹגְתֵי עֹלֹת *a variation עלות*, which simply means that in some MSS. it is plene. On עֲגָלוֹת *wagons* Numb. VII 3 the Massorah Parva explains this technical expression by adding: "It is three times defective in this Section [Numb. VII 3, 6, 8], but there is a difference of opinion about it since some say it is here עֲגָלוֹת *plene*".<sup>1</sup> It will thus be seen that the Massorah itself explains פְלִיג or פְלוֹגְתָא *by some say*, or *some hold a different opinion*, i. e. certain textual critics say it is plene, or some MSS. exhibit the plene form.

On צִידָה *venison* Gen. XXVII 3 for which the *Keri* is צִידָה the Massorah in Add. 15251 remarks וּפְלִיג בִּיהַ *but there is a variation here*, that is some MSS. or textual critics have no *Keri*. That this is the meaning of פְלִיג is, moreover, evident from the expanded Massorah in the

<sup>1</sup> ג' חס' ופְלוֹגְתֵי עֹלֹתָהּ כִּי אָמְרֵי עֲגָלוֹתָהּ.

*editio princeps* on this very passage which is as follows: "the *He* is superfluous, but it is a variant of R. Nachman",<sup>1</sup> i. e. according to this textual critic the *He* is not redundant, but is as in Josh. IX 11 and Ps. LXXVIII 25. Here we have a clear proof that the simple פְלִיג in one MS. is in another Massorah described as a variation of a particular redactor. Unless, therefore, פְלִיג is followed by the name of the individual or of the School to whom or to which the variation belongs it is most unjustifiable to take it as an equivalent for מְדִנְחָאֵי *the Eastern School*.<sup>2</sup>

The following two readings of the *Madinchai* are exhibited in the text of the Chaldee 1 Sam. IV 15 and 2 Sam. XIII 33. In the variations of these two Schools I have inadvertently omitted 2 Sam. VI 19 where the Westerns read לְמַאֲשֵׁשׁ and the Easterns אֶשׁ without *Lamed*.<sup>3</sup>

*Kings*. — In Kings I have added the following five variations which are not contained in the *editio princeps*. (1) 1 Kings III 12 which is given in the Massorah Parva in Orient. 2626—28. (2) III 26 which is in the List of the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 1009. (3) XVI 19 which is in the List of the same Codex. (4) XX 43 which is in the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 916<sup>4</sup> and (5) 2 Kings X 31 which is in the List of Add. 15251. I can now add a sixth instance, viz. וְעַלְלֵיהֶם *and their children* 2 Kings VIII 12 which according to the Easterns is plene, as will be seen from Massorah Parva in Harley 5710—11 on Ps. XVII 14.

<sup>1</sup> ה' יחירי אבל פְלוֹגְתֵי דְרַב נַחְמָן.

<sup>2</sup> If any other proof were needed I have simply to point out the fact that מ"א in 1 Sam. XXII 6 which is described as פְלִיג is actually given as מ"א in Harley 5710—11, whilst וְעַל־ 2 Sam. III 29 is not only one of the *Sevirin*, but is exhibited in the text of Arund. Orient. 16.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter מ, § 442a, Vol. I, p. 52.

<sup>4</sup> Comp. the St. Petersburg Codex on Ezek. XIII 2, and *The Massorah*, letter מ, § 514, Vol. I, p. 57.

The Massorah here tells us that according to the Easterns עוֹלָלִיהֶם with the suffix third person plural masculine is plene in all the four instances in which it occurs,<sup>1</sup> viz. 2 Kings VIII 12; Isa. XIII 16; Hos. XIV 1; and Ps. XVII 14. In our or Western recension, however, it is only plene in one instance (Ps. XVII 14). Hence we obtain three more passages than we have hitherto known (2 Kings VIII 12; Isa. XIII 16; and Hos. XIV 1) which exhibit differences between the Eastern and Western recensions.

I. From these MS. Lists and the MSS. themselves I have also been able to make the following corrections. Though the official Lists in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009, in the Madrid Codex of the Royal Library, in Bodley No. 11, in the Merzbacher MS., in Add. 15251 British Museum and in the *editio princeps* distinctly state that יִשְׁנָה 1 Kings III 20 is plene according to the Westerns and that according to the Eastern School it is יִשְׁנָה defective, yet some of the best MSS., and all the early editions have the defective form in the text. But as we invariably follow the Western recension I have given the plene in the text and the variant in the margin in accordance with the uniform practice. The MSS. and the editions, however, demonstrate the fact to which I have often had occasion to advert that the Eastern reading and not the Western is not unfrequently exhibited both in the MSS. and editions.

II. The variation which the Massorah Parva in the *editio princeps* places against 1 Kings XVI 1 belongs to verse 12 of the chapter in question. This is not only attested by the official Lists in the MSS., but by the List in the *editio princeps* itself where the proper catchword is given למע' וישמד זמרי = XVI 12.

<sup>1</sup> ועולליהם ד' מל' למרנ'.

III. In 1 Kings XVII 4 the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009 reverses the variation, giving שָׁמָּה there, as the Western recension and שָׁמָּה with the paragogic *He* as the Eastern reading. But as all the other Lists distinctly state the contrary there must be a clerical error in the St. Petersburg List.

In four passages the Chaldee exhibits the text of the Eastern recension, viz. 1 Kings XVI 12; 2 Kings XVIII 37; XIX 9, 20.

*The Latter Prophets.* — With the exception of Add. 15251 which gives the Lists for the Former Prophets only, all the Lists which I have collated for the Former Prophets I also examined for this division of the Bible. I have, moreover, carefully collated the text of the Babylonian or St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 916 which embraces this portion of the Hebrew Scriptures and which is supposed to exhibit the text of the Eastern recension. Whether this claim put forward on the part of Biblical scholars is justified or not will be seen from a comparison of the Eastern variants as transmitted to us in the official Lists and in the Margins of the MSS. with the readings in the text of this Codex.

*Isaiah.* — From the official List in the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 1009 I have been able to add two new instances, viz. III 24 and XIV 26. The first instance shows that חֲגָרָה *girdle* Isa. III 24, which according to the Westerns is defective, ought to be in the text, since we follow the *Maarbai* recension. This reading is actually in the text in some of the best MSS., viz. Orient. 2201 dated A. D. 1246; Harley 5710—11; Harley 1528; Add. 15250; and Orient. 2626—28, as well as in the Complutensian Polyglot. Arund. Orient. 16, however,<sup>1</sup> Add. 15451; Add. 15251; Add. 15252,

<sup>1</sup> This MS. remarks on it in the Massorah Parva 'ב' מל' = twice plene, but as חֲגָרָה is unquestionably defective in the second instance where it occurs,

as well as all the early editions with the exception of the Complutensian Polyglot, have *הַגִּזְרָה* plene in the text which is the Eastern reading. We have here, therefore another proof of the fact, so often adverted to, that the MSS. and the early editions which profess to follow the readings of the *Maarbai* not unfrequently exhibit the *Madinchai* recension.

From the Massorah Parva in Orient. 2201 I have also been able to increase the number by three more instances. On Isa. XXVII 8 this Massorah informs us that the Babylonians = Easterns read *בְּרִיחַ*, that they read *מְלִאךָ* in XXXVII 36 and that they read *מִפְּחָה* in XLVIII 13. I am now able to add a sixth instance, viz. *וְעַלְלִיָּהֶם* Isa. XIII 16 which according to the Easterns is *וְעַלְלִיָּהֶם* plene.<sup>1</sup> Orient. 2201; Harley 5710—11; and Add. 15451, as well as the Lisbon edition of Isaiah 1492 and the Complutensian Polyglot have the plene form in the text, thus affording another illustration of the fact that the Eastern recension is often exhibited in the text of some of the best MSS. and editions which profess to follow the Western recension.

As regards the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 916 which some critics maintain exhibits the text of the Oriental recension, this can best be tested by a comparison of the Eastern readings transmitted to us in the official Lists and in the Massorahs with the readings in this MS. In this examination I shall confine myself more especially to Isaiah since the result of this investigation will equally apply to Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Minor Prophets which constitute the rest of this remarkable Codex.

The official Lists and the MSS. give thirty-one passages in Isaiah in which the Easterns have a different reading

viz. 2 Kings III 21 and, moreover, as it is so written in this very Codex *מִלְּ* is manifestly a mistake.

<sup>1</sup> See above pp. 213, 214.

from the Westerns. Of these the St. Petersburg Codex in question exhibits only fifteen,<sup>1</sup> whereas in the other sixteen instances this Codex follows the Western readings.<sup>2</sup>

From the fact that the St. Petersburg Codex has half the number of the Eastern readings, no valid argument can be adduced that the MS. exhibits the text of the Eastern recension, especially when it is borne in mind that even the acknowledged Western MSS. often exhibit in the text the readings of the Eastern School. All that can be fairly inferred is that at this early period the Massorites and those textual critics who were engaged in the redaction of MSS. did not as yet minutely classify the various readings of the two Schools.

Besides the fifteen variations in the St. Petersburg Codex which happen to agree with the Eastern recension, it has no fewer than two hundred other readings which differ from the Western text in Isaiah alone. As far as I know no critic has as yet been bold enough to assert that these two hundred exhibit the differences between the Eastern recension and the Western text. With such a vast number of variations it would indeed be surpassing strange if a small proportion did not agree with the Eastern School the text of which was only in the process of being separated from the recension of the Western School.

Codex Heidenheim remarks in the Massorah Parva on Isa. XX 2 that it is two verses according to the Easterns,<sup>3</sup> yet the St. Petersburg Codex not only reads it as one verse, but emphatically states in the Massorah that the

<sup>1</sup> Isa. VI 13; XIV 26; XXIII 12, 12; XXVII 6; XXXVII 9; XLIV 27; XLIX 5; LI 7; LIII 4; LIX 4, 9, 11; LXIV 6; LXVI 2.

<sup>2</sup> Isa. III 17, 24; XIII 16; XIV 19; XX 2; XXI 14; XXIII 12; XXXVII 8; XXXVIII 14, 14; XLV 18; XLVI 8; LVI 3, 7; LVII 10; LIX 6.

<sup>3</sup> למדינחאי ב' פסוקין.

textual reading is according to the Westerns who connect the two verses into one.<sup>1</sup>

The St. Petersburg Codex reads **בָּם** *with them*, in the text in Isa. XXX 32 and remarks in the Massorah Parva that according to the Easterns it is **בָּהּ** *with her*, thus showing that it designates its text as exhibiting the Western recension and hence gives the alternative Eastern reading in the margin (**בה לבבלי**).

The conclusion, therefore, which we may legitimately draw from these facts is that this Codex neither exhibits a distinctive Eastern nor a definite Western recension, but that it is a mixture of the two recensions which obtained prior to the time when the texts of the two Schools were more sharply divided. To adduce, therefore, a variant from this Codex alone in order to prove an Eastern reading is to be deprecated, unless indeed the variant is expressly described as such in other MSS., and unless we are prepared to describe all the hundreds of various readings in this MS. as Eastern in contradistinction to the Western recension.

For this reason the following passages which Dr. Baer gives in his Lists and in the Prefaces to the various parts of his editions and some of which I have adopted, as differences between the Westerns and the Easterns, must be taken as simply exhibiting ordinary variants.

In Isa. XVIII 2, 7 the St. Petersburg Codex reads **קִרְקוּ** in two words as it is in the ordinary MSS. and editions. It has, however, against it in the Massorah Parva *the Kethiv is one word and the Keri two words*,<sup>2</sup> in spite of the fact that the *Kethiv* here exhibits two words. This variant which I have not as yet been able to find in any

<sup>1</sup> ליפין מערי.  
<sup>2</sup> קִרְקוּ חֵד כַּת' וּבְחֵרִין קִרְי.

other MS. is not to be taken as exhibiting a difference between the two Schools, but must be regarded as an ancient *Kethiv* and *Keri*. My note on this passage is, therefore, to be corrected into **בְּסֵ"א קִיקוּ חֵד כַּת' קִרְקוּ תְרִין ק'**.

In Isa. XXIII 12 I have adopted the variation given by Dr. Baer **לְמַדְנ' קִימִי כַת' קִימִי ק'** which is to be cancelled, since even the St. Petersburg Codex has simply **קִימִי** in the text without any *Kethiv* and *Keri*. It must, therefore, be regarded as a simple variant.

In Isa. XLVII 10 the St. Petersburg Codex had originally **אִמְרַת** in the text as it is in our MSS. and editions. The Reviser, however, placed a *Yod* over it and remarked in the margin against it **יִלֶּךְ** = *the Yod is to be cancelled*. But this variant is not peculiar to the Eastern School as is evident from Orient. 1478 which has **אִמְרַת** in the text with the following Massorah against it: *In the Mugah it is אמרתִי and the Massorah on it is the Yod is redundant*.<sup>1</sup> Hence the statement of Dr. Baer in the Preface to the Five Megilloth, p. VI, which I have adopted in my notes<sup>2</sup> must be cancelled.

Isa. LIV 9 is given by Dr. Baer in his Preface to Jeremiah, p. XI, as exhibiting one of the differences between the Westerns and the Easterns. He says that the Westerns read **כִּי־מִי** two words and the Easterns **כִּי־מִי** one word.<sup>3</sup> But this is an ordinary variant as is attested by the MSS. Hence Orient. 1478 remarks against it: *It is the subject of a various reading, some write it one word and some two words*.<sup>4</sup> To the same effect is Kimchi whom Dr. Baer wrongly quotes to support the variation as existing between the two Schools and the printed Massorah Parva.<sup>5</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> בְּמוֹנָה אִמְרַתִּי וּמִסִּי עָלֶיהָ יְהִי יוֹד.  
<sup>2</sup> לְמַעַר' אִמְרַתִּי. לְמַדְנ' אִמְרַתִּי כַתִּיב אִמְרַתִּי קִרְי.  
<sup>3</sup> לְמַעַר' כִּי־מִי תְרִין מְלִין, לְמַדְנ' כִּי־מִי מְלָה חֵדָא.  
<sup>4</sup> פְּלִינִי אִית דְּכַת' מְלָה חֵדָא וְאִית דְּכַת' תְּרִין מְלִין.  
<sup>5</sup> מִתְחַלְפִין כִּי־מִי מְלָה חֵדָא.

St. Petersburg Codex, the Chaldee, the Syriac and the Vulgate have it in one word, whilst the Septuagint and most of the MSS. and all the early editions have it in two words. Being an ordinary variant I have not described it as constituting a difference between the Westerns and Easterns.

In the Preface to the Five Megilloth, p. VI, Dr. Baer gives פִּתְחוֹן *plene* Isa. LVIII 1 as one of the differences between these two Schools because it is *plene* in the St. Petersburg Codex, which I have adopted. The Codex had originally פִּתְחוֹן defective and the Reviser placed the *Vav* over it with the remark in the margin against it מִלִּי כֹתֵי = *it is plene*. But this is simply an ordinary variant and is by no means peculiar to the Easterns as is evident from the MSS. some of which have it so in the text. It is *plene* in the *editio princeps* of the Prophets, Soncino 1485—86; in the first edition of the entire Bible, Soncino 1488; in the third edition of the Bible, Brescia 1494; and in the Pesaro edition of the Prophets 1511. The part of my note, viz. לַמְדֵי פִּתְחוֹן מִלֵּא is, therefore, to be cancelled.

Dr. Baer states in his List that Isa. LXIII 6 exhibits a difference between the Westerns and Easterns, that the former read וַאֲשַׁכְּרֶם with *Kaph* and the latter וַאֲשַׁבְּרֶם with *Beth*. Though this is supported by Geiger<sup>1</sup> it is not given in any of the Lists. Orient. 1478 has the following remark against it in the Massorah Parva: *It is written with Kaph and it is derived from Shakar and those who read it with Beth are mistaken.*<sup>2</sup> It is simply a variant which is exhibited in some MSS. and is to be found in the *editio princeps* of the Bible, Soncino 1488 and in the Chaldee. The St. Petersburg Codex had it originally in the text and

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, p. 414.

<sup>2</sup> כֵּן בְּכִיף הוּא מְלֻשׁוֹ שְׂכוּרוֹת וּמֵאֵן דְּקָרִי בְּבִי"ת טַעֲמֵי.

the Reviser altered it into וַאֲשַׁכְּרֶם with *Kaph*. I have, therefore, given it as an ordinary variant.

The following two passages are wrongly given in Dr. Baer's List. Isa. XLV 7 ought to be XLV 18 and LVI 6 ought to be LVI 3 as is attested by all the official Lists.

*Jeremiah*. — To the instances of variants which obtained in the Western and Eastern recensions and which have been transmitted to us in the official Lists in Jeremiah I have been able to add nine new ones, viz. (1) Jerem. II 20 from the Massorah Parva in Add. 15251; (2) VIII 7 from the official List in the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 1009; (3) XII 14 from the Massorah Parva in Add. 15251; (4) XIII 14 from the List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009; (5) XXXIV 2 from the Massorah Parva in Orient. 1474; (6) XXXV 3 from the Massorah Parva in Add. 15251; (7) XXXV 17 from the List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009; (8) XXXVIII 16 and (9) XLVIII 1 both from the Massorah Parva in Add. 15251.

As to the relation of the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 916 which, as we have already pointed out, is supposed to exhibit the Eastern recension, I have to add the following facts to those adduced in the discussion on the condition of the text of Isaiah. In twenty-seven passages this Codex agrees with the Western readings and is against the Eastern recension,<sup>1</sup> whilst in the same number of instances it coincides with the Eastern and is against the Western recension.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Jerem. II 20; IV 30 originally; VI 6, 6; VII 28; VIII 7; X 13 originally; XIII 14, 18; XXV 2; XXVII 5, 12; XXVIII 3, 17; XXXII 12 originally; XXXIV 2, 3; XXXVIII 16; XLII 6; XLIV 18; XLVIII 3, 44 originally; XLIX 12; L 9, 11, 29; LII 2.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Jerem. V 8; IX 23; X 18; XIII 20, 20 second hand; XVII 4; XXVI 8; XXVII 1, 19; XXIX 22 second hand; XXXII 19 second hand; XXXII 34; XXXIV 2; XXXV 17; XXXVI 23; XXXIX 3, 3, 11; XLVI 2; XLVIII 1, 18, 36; XLIX 19, 20; L 6, 20; LII 2.

Out of the large number of variants which occur in this Codex Dr. Baer has selected nineteen and incorporated them in his List as exhibiting differences between the Westerns and Easterns.<sup>1</sup> But the selection is simply arbitrary unless we take it that all the variants in this MS. are Eastern. As in the case of Isaiah (XXX 32) so here the Massorite describes the text as Western. In Jerem. XLVIII 31 the text has the Western reading **יִהְיֶה** *he shall mourn*, third person singular masculine on which the Massorah Parva remarks: *this is the reading of the Westerns, the Babylonians = the Eastern read אֶהְיֶה I shall mourn*, first person singular masculine,<sup>2</sup> thus giving the *Maarbai* as the substantive reading and relegating the Eastern variant into the margin as an alternative.

We have still to note the following variants in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 which add further proof that it does not exhibit the Eastern recension.

In Jerem. XI 11 the *Kethiv* in this MS. is **וְאֵל** and the *Keri* **וְלֵא**, whereas all the official Lists with one exception as well as the *editio princeps* state the very reverse, that **וְאֵל** is the *Kethiv* according to the Easterns and **וְלֵא** is the *Keri*. The MS. No. 1 in the University Library Madrid gives the Eastern *Keri* as **לֵא** so that the variation consists in the absence of the *Vav* conjunctive.

In Jerem. XXVI 24 the St. Petersburg Codex has **בְּןִי** *son of*, in the text which is in accordance with the Western recension, but the Massorite put against it the *textual reading* (כתוב), **בְּנֵי** *sons of*, the plural and the *Keri* is **בְּנִי** *son of*, the singular.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Jerem, IV 20; V 6; VIII 4; IX 21; XIII 25; XV 14, 21; XVIII 17, 21; XIX 3; XXII 14, 16; XXIV 1; XXXVI 23; XXXVII 19; LI 29, 59.

<sup>2</sup> יֵה ק' למען לבבל אהי ק'.

<sup>3</sup> בְּנִי בני כתיב בן ק'.

In Jerem. XXIX 7 this Codex has **הַגְּלִיתִי** in the text which is the Western reading, but the Massorite has against it the *Kethiv* **הַגִּילֵת** and the *Keri* **הַגְּלִיתִי**.<sup>1</sup> It will thus be seen that the textual reading put down by the Massorite is neither in accordance with the Westerns nor with the Easterns.

In Jerem. XXXII 11 the textual reading in this MS. is **וְאֵת־הַמְצֹרָה** which is in accordance with the Western recension. But the Massorite put against it two distinct notes. The first is **אֵת לֹא ק'** = *the particle אֵת is to be cancelled* and the second is **וְהַמְצֹרָה ק'** = *the Keri is וְהַמְצֹרָה*.

In Jerem. XXXIII 3 this MS. has **וּבְצֹרֹת** in the text which is the Western reading, but the Massorite put against it **וּנְצֹרֹת ק'** = *the Keri is וּנְצֹרֹת*, and though this variant makes no difference in the sense, since the one makes it conformable to the phrase in Deut. I 28 and the other to Isa. XLVIII 6, still all the official Lists state that in the Eastern recension **וּבְצֹרֹת** is the textual reading and that **וּנְצֹרֹת** is the *Keri*. This is the very reverse of what is given as the *Kethiv* and the *Keri* in the St. Petersburg Codex.

In Jerem. XLVIII 41 the official List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009, in the Merzbacher MS., in Bodley No. 11 and in the *editio princeps*, emphatically states that **נַתְפְּשׁוּ** *the third person plural*, is the textual reading and that the *Keri* is **נַתְפֶּשֶׁה** *third person singular* according to the Easterns, yet the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 has the very reverse, since **נַתְפֶּשֶׁה** is in the text with the remark **נַתְפְּשׁוּ ק'** = *the Keri is the plural*.

In Jerem. XV 14 **הִיֶּקֶד** *the Kal future*, is given as the *Kethiv* and **הִיֶּקֶד** *the Hiphal future* as the *Keri* according to the Eastern recension in the following official Lists: in the

<sup>1</sup> הגליתי. הגלית כתיב הגלית ק'.

St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009; in the MS. No. 1 in the Madrid Royal Library; the Merzbacher MS.; and in Bodley No. 11. The MS. No. 1 in the University Library Madrid, however, gives the same variant on XVII 14. I have, therefore, given it on both passages.

The following three variations given in Dr. Baer's List are the very reverse of the official Lists. On Jerem. V 17 Dr. Baer says that the Westerns have **בַּטָּח** *defective* and the Easterns read it **בּוֹטָח** *plene*, whereas all the Lists as well as the *editio princeps* state the very reverse. The same is the case in Jerem. X 18 which Dr. Baer tells us the Westerns read **והצרותי** *defective* and the Easterns **והצרותי** *plene*. This I have inadvertently followed. All the official Lists, however, state the very reverse, that the Westerns have it *plene* and the Easterns read it *defective*. So also in Jerem. XXXV 11 where Dr. Baer says that the Westerns read **עַל-הָאָרֶץ** and the Easterns **עַל-הָאָרֶץ** which I have also inadvertently followed. The Rubric in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009 which is the only official List wherein this variation is tabulated, distinctly declares that the Westerns read **עַל-** and the Easterns **-אֵל**. In Jerem. L 9 where both Dr. Baer and I give the difference between the Westerns and the Easterns to be that the former read **עַל-בְּבַל** and the latter **אֵל-בְּבַל**, the only two official Lists which register this variation state the very reverse. Thus the List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009 and in Bodley No. 11 say that the Westerns read **-אֵל** and the Easterns **עַל-**.

*Ezekiel.* — In Ezekiel I have found in the Massorah Parva of the different MSS. nine variations between the Westerns and Easterns which do not appear in the official Lists. (1) Ezek. VI 14 is from the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916; (2) VIII 3 is from Add. 21161 in the British Museum; (3) so is the second variant recorded on this

verse; (4) X 21 is from Add. 15251; (5) XIII 16 is from the St. Petersburg Codex dated 1009; (6) XXIII 17 and (7) XXIII 18 are from Orient. 2201 in the British Museum; (8) XXV 8 is from Add. 15251; and (9) XXXVI 23 is from Orient. 2201.

From a comparison of the text in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 with our Western recension it will be seen that almost identically the same results are yielded in Ezekiel as we have obtained from the analysis of Isaiah and Jeremiah. Thus of the twenty-seven undoubted differences between the Westerns and the Easterns this Codex agrees in fifteen passages with the *Maarbai*, i. e. our recension or the Western School,<sup>1</sup> whilst in twelve instances it exhibits the *Madinchai* or Eastern recension.<sup>2</sup>

We have still to discuss five passages in the official Lists of the differences between the Westerns and the Easterns which show the character of the text in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916.

Ezek. V 11. — All the official Lists state the Westerns read here **אֲנִרַע** *I will diminish*, with *Resh* and that the Easterns have **אֲנִרַע** *I will cut off*, with *Daleth* in the text for which the *Keri* substitutes **אֲנִרַע** with *Resh*.<sup>3</sup> Now the text in this Codex had originally **אֲנִרַע** with *Daleth* which is also the reading in Harley 5710—11; in the second edition

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Ezek. I 13 first hand; VII 7, 10, 22; VIII 3; X 21; XIV 19; XVI 13; XXIII 17, 18; XXV 8; XXXVI 23; XXXVII 24; XLIII 26; XLIV 3.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Ezek. XI 6 second hand; XIII 16; XIV 22; XVII 7; XXI 19; XXV 9; XXVII 31; XXIX 4; XXXI 12; XXXII 4; XLII 8 second hand; XLIII 20.

<sup>3</sup> למע' אנרע, למר' אנרע כח' אנרע ק', so the Lists in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009; in Codex No. 1 in the Madrid University Library; in the MS. of Royal Library Madrid; in the Merzbacher MS.; in Bodley No. 11; in Arund. Orient. 16; and in the *editio princeps*.



of the entire Hebrew Bible, Naples 1491—93; and in the third edition Brescia 1494. The Annotator, however, put against it the following Massorah: "the *Kethiv* is with *Resh* and the *Keri* with *Daleth*",<sup>1</sup> and though this variant is against all the Lists, Dr. Baer exhibits it in this form as one of the differences between the Westerns and the Easterns. It will thus be seen that according to the testimony of the Massorite, the textual reading or the *Kethiv* in this Codex exhibits the Western recension.

Ezek. XIII 17. — This Codex tells us that the Easterns read *על* in the text and that the *Keri* is *אל*, whereas according to the Westerns the reverse is the case, the textual reading is *אל* and the *Keri* is *על*.<sup>2</sup> The oldest official List, however, of A. D. 1009 states that the textual reading according to the Easterns is *על* without any *Keri* and that the Westerns read *אל* also without any *Keri*.<sup>3</sup> And though this difference between the two Schools of textual critics is reversed in the other Lists, inasmuch as they state that the Easterns read *אל* and the Westerns *על*<sup>4</sup> still they all agree that there is no *Kethiv* and *Keri* on this participle here. The Massoretic note, therefore, in the Codex in question is at variance with all the official Lists and can only be regarded as exhibiting the Massorah of one of the several Schools of Massorites which obtained in the East.

Ezek. XXII 4. — This Codex which has *עד* in the text, remarks in the Massorah Parva that the Easterns read *ע* and that the Westerns read *עד*.<sup>5</sup> All the official

<sup>1</sup> אנדע, רע כה, רע ק'.

<sup>2</sup> על-בנות אל ק' לבב, אל-כה' למע' וק' על-.

<sup>3</sup> למע' אל-בנות, למדני על-בנות.

<sup>4</sup> למע' על-בנות, למדני אל-בנות, so the Merzbacher MS.; Bodley No. 11; Arund. Orient. 16; and the *editio princeps*.

<sup>5</sup> עדי-שנותיד בבב' עת ק', ולמע' עד-ק'.

Lists, however, positively state that the textual reading of the Easterns, i. e. the *ע* is *כתב* and that the *Keri* is *עד*.<sup>1</sup>

Ezek. XXIII 19. — On this passage this Codex which has *ותרבה* in the text, states in the Massorah Parva that the Easterns read *ותרב* and that the Westerns read *ותרבה*.<sup>2</sup> All the official Lists, however, most emphatically state that the Eastern textual reading (*כתב*) is *ותרב* and that the *Keri* is *ותרבה*.<sup>3</sup>

Ezek. XLIV 3. — The List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009 states that the Westerns read here *לאכל* defective which is the textual reading in the *editio princeps* of the Bible, Soncino 1488, and that the Easterns read it *לאכול* plene. As this is the only official List which has preserved this record we must accept it as final. The text, therefore, in the Codex in question, i. e. the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 which reads *לאכל* exhibits in this instance also the Western recension.

Dr. Baer has included in his List of the differences between the Westerns and Easterns no fewer than forty-eight variations<sup>4</sup> simply because they occur in the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 916. But it is sufficiently evident from the above analysis that this MS. does not exhibit

<sup>1</sup> למע' עדי-שנותיד, למד' עת כת' עד ק', so the List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009; the Merzbacher MS.; the Madrid MS. in the Royal Library; Bodley No. 11; Arund. Orient. 16; and the *editio princeps*.

<sup>2</sup> ותרבה לבב' ותרב ק', ולמע' ותרבה ק'.

<sup>3</sup> למע' ותרבה, למדני ותרב כת' ותרבה ק', so the List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009; the Merzbacher MS.; the MS. No. 1 in the Royal Library Madrid; Bodley No. 11; Arund. Orient. 16; and the *editio princeps*.

<sup>4</sup> Comp. Ezek. V 12, 13; IX 8; XI 7, 19; XII 14; XIII 2; XIV 17; XVI 4, 29, 46, 48; XVII 7, 14, 15; XVIII 2, 20; XXI 2, 9, 14, 19; XXII 12, 13; XXIII 35, 46; XXVI 17; XXVIII 26; XXX 18; XXXI 4; XXXII 16, 26; XXXIII 33; XXXIV 23; XXXVI 5; XXXIX 28; XL 2, 3, 25; XLIV 3; XLVI 6, 6, 8, 9, 21; XLVII 6, 11; XLVIII 28.

the Eastern recension. Hence no various reading which occurs in it can legitimately be characterised as Eastern.

*The Minor Prophets.* — In the Minor Prophets I have only been able to add one instance to the differences between the Westerns and Easterns, viz. עֲלֵיָהֶם *their children*, Hos. XIV 1 which according to the Western School is defective, whilst according to the Eastern recension it is עֲלֵיָהֶם *plene*.<sup>1</sup>

As to the relation of the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 to the two recensions, it is to be remarked that of the twenty-three passages in which a comparison can definitely be instituted no fewer than thirteen agree with our text or the *Maarbai*;<sup>2</sup> whilst it is only in ten instances that this Codex coincides with the Eastern recension or *Madinchai*.<sup>3</sup>

In two passages this Codex differs both from the Eastern and Western recensions. Thus on Nah. II 6 all the official Lists state that the textual reading (כתיב) according to the Westerns is בְּהִלְכֶתָם with *Vav* and that the *Keri* is בְּהִלְכֶתָם with *Yod*, but that the Easterns have בהליכתם with *Yod* both in the *Kethiv* and *Keri*, whereas this Codex reads בהלכתם with neither *Vav* nor *Yod*. Again on Habak. III 19 the official Lists declare that the Westerns read בְּנִגְיֹנֹתַי without any *Keri* and that the Easterns read בְּנִגְיֹנֹתַי in the text (כתיב) and that the *Keri* is בְּנִגְיֹנֹתַי, whereas this Codex has in the text בְּנִגְיֹנֹתַי with both *Vavs* defective to which

<sup>1</sup> This Massorah is the Margin on Psalm XVII 14 in Harley 5710—11 Vide supra p. 214.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Hos. IV 12; XIV 1, 5 first hand; Amos III 6; VI 8; Micah VI 5 first hand; VII 5, 5; Nahum II 12 first hand; Zeph. III 7; Zech. XII 10; XIV 4; Malachi I 14.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. Hos. VIII 13; IX 6; Joel I 12; IV 7; Micah V 12; Nah. III 8; Hab. II 16; Zech. IX 17; XIII 7; XIV 13.

the later Massorite added a note in the margin to make it conformable to the Eastern *Kethiv*.<sup>1</sup>

That the text in this Codex does not exhibit the Eastern recension, but that a later Annotator tried in several instances to make it conformable to the readings of the *Madinchai* is, moreover, evident from the following passages.

On Hosea IV 12, the official List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009 states that the Westerns read here וּמְקָלוֹ *and his staff*, and that the Easterns read it וּמִקְוֹלוֹ *and from his voice*. Thus Codex of A. D. 916 like our text reads וּמְקָלוֹ, yet the Annotator remarks in the Massorah Parva that *the textual reading is וּמִקְוֹלוֹ* (which is contrary to the text) *and there is a difference of opinion about it*.<sup>2</sup>

Hosea IV 5. — Here the official Lists state that the Westerns read מִמֶּנִּי *from them*, but that the Easterns have מִמֶּנִּי *from me* in the text (כתיב), and that the *Keri* according to some Lists is מִמֶּנִּי. On a close examination of the MS., however, it will be seen that this Codex had originally ממני in the text, which is the Western reading, and that the Annotator altered it into ממני and remarked against it in the margin Read ממנו,<sup>3</sup> which makes it conformable to the Eastern recension. It is, however, to be stated that the official List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009 simply remarks that the Easterns read ממני *from me*, without any alternative or *Keri* and that this is also given in Bodley No 11 and in the *editio princeps*.

On Micah VI 5 the Lists state that the Westerns read מָה *what*, and that the Easterns have מִי *who* in the

<sup>1</sup> On the textual reading בנינותי the Annotator remarks בנינותי which contradicts the text.

<sup>2</sup> וּמְקָלוֹ וּמִקְוֹלוֹ וּמִקְוֹלוֹ וּמִקְוֹלוֹ.

<sup>3</sup> ממנו 1 ממני 2 נו ק.

text (כתיב), but that the *Keri* is מה *what*. The text, however, in this Codex is מַה as it is in the Western recension, but the Annotator put against it in the margin the *Kethiv* is מִי and the *Keri* is מה,<sup>1</sup> thus contradicting the text in order to make it conformable to the Eastern reading.

Nahum II 12. — According to the official Lists the Western reading here is וּמְרַעָה הוּא, whilst the Easterns have הוּא in the text (כתיב) for which the *Keri* is הוּא. Here too this Codex has הוּא the Western reading in the text, but here again the Annotator put against it the contradictory note *the textual reading is with Yod (היא), but the Keri is with Vav (הוא)*.<sup>2</sup>

Zechariah XIV 4 affords the most conclusive proof that this Codex exhibits the Western recension and not the text of the *Madinchai*. The official Lists distinctly state that according to the Western recension this verse reads וְעַמְדוֹי רָגְלוֹי בַיּוֹם הַהוּא עַל־הָרַר *and his feet shall stand in that day upon the mount* &c. and that the Eastern text has it וְעַמְדוֹי רָגְלוֹי עַל־הָרַר *and his feet shall stand upon the mount* &c. leaving out the words בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא *in that day*. This Codex, however, does not leave out the words in question according to the Easterns, but reads the verse exactly as the Western recension has it. The Annotator who states the difference between the two Schools of textual critics in this verse tells us that he found בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא which the text exhibits, to be the Western reading and that the Babylonians do not recognise this phrase as either *Kethiv* or *Keri*.<sup>3</sup> He, therefore, distinctly describes the text in the Codex before us as exhibiting the Western recension.

<sup>1</sup> מִי־עֵץ מִי כֵתִיב מַה קִי.

<sup>2</sup> וּמְרַעָה הוּא יי כִי קִי.

<sup>3</sup> בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא עַל הָרַר, קִרִי מְעַרְי, כִּד אֲשַׁחֵן בְּנִיזוֹ: בְּבִלְאִי לֹא כֵתִיב וְלֹא קִרִי.

Dr. Baer has greatly obscured the issue of the investigation as to which of the two Schools of textual critics this remarkable Codex belongs by unjustifiably incorporating in his Lists of the differences between the Westerns and Easterns many of the variants in this MS. and by exhibiting them as Eastern readings. He has thus increased his List for the Minor Prophets alone by no fewer than twenty-nine passages,<sup>1</sup> simply because they occur in this MS., whereas many of them are also to be found in our acknowledged Western Codices and in the early editions.<sup>2</sup>

The Hagiographa. — For this division of the Hebrew Bible I have collated the following official Lists: (1) The List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009; (2) in the Merzbacher MS.; (3) Bodley No. 11; (4) Bodley No. 93; (5) Orient. 4227 British Museum and (6) in the *editio princeps*. Neither the Madrid Codex No. 1 nor the splendid MS. Arund. Orient. 16 in the British Museum gives the differences between the Westerns and Easterns for the Hagiographa.

*Psalms*. — To the Psalms I have been able to add eight new instances which are not given in the official Lists. They are all from the Massorah Parva in MS. No. 1—3 in the Paris National Library and are as follows: (1) Ps. XXII 5, 6; (2) LII 1, 2; (3) LIII 1, 2; (4) LIV 2; (5) LXXIX 10; (6) XC 1; (7) CI 5 and (8) CXXIX 5, 6. Dr. Baer's statement that the difference between the

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Hosea IX 9, 16; X 11; XIII 9; Joel. I 12; II 7, 22; Amos III 11; V 2, 20; IX 7; Micah IV 3; V 1; VII 16; Nah. II 5; III 11; Hab. II 5; Zeph. II 7; III 9, 11, 18; Zech. I 4; II 12; IV 10; XI 10; XIV 18; Mal. III 11, 14, 22.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. the notes in my edition on Hos. IX 9, 16; Joel I 12; II 7; Amos III 11; Micah IV 3; VII 16; Zeph. III 9, 18; Zech. I 4; XI 10; XIV 18 &c.

Westerns and the Easterns on Ps. CI 1 consists in the former reading *מוזר* *plene* and the latter *מוזר* *defective*<sup>1</sup> is contrary to all the official Lists and to the Massorah. The List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009 emphatically states that according to the Westerns it is *מוזר* *entirely defective*, whilst according to the Easterns it is *מוזר* *plene*.<sup>2</sup> This is also the case in all the other Lists both in the MSS. and in the *editio princeps*. And Add. 15251 has in the Massorah Parva against it that it is the only instance in which *מוזר* is defective according to the Westerns.<sup>3</sup>

*Proverbs*. — In Proverbs I have added one new instance, viz. XXX 6 from the Massorah Parva in MS. No. 1—3 in the National Library Paris. According to the Merzbacher MS. and Bodley No. 11 the difference between the Westerns and Easterns in Prov. XII 18 is that the former read it *בוטה* with *He* at the end, and the latter *בוטא* with *Aleph*, and this difference I give in the Notes on the text of my edition. The List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009, however, distinctly states that the Easterns have as *Kethiv* *ביטה* with *Yod* and as *Keri* *בוטה* with *Vav*. Hence an *Aleph* or *He* at the end is not at all the point at issue, and this is supported by the List in Orient. 4227 in the British Museum and in the List of the *editio princeps*. The List in the St. Petersburg Codex also differs from the other Lists in its statement as to the nature of the variation between the two Schools with regard to Prov. XVIII 20, inasmuch as it declares that both the *Kethiv* and the *Keri* are *תביאת* with *Yod*, according to the Easterns.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> למע' לדוד מוזר מלא, למרנ' לדוד מוזר חסר.

<sup>2</sup> למע' מוזר חס' דחסר, למרנ' מוזר מלא.

<sup>3</sup> מוזר ל' חס' למער'.

<sup>4</sup> למרנ' תביאת כח' וק'.

*Job*. — In Job I have added one new instance, viz. XXXVI 18 from the Massorah Parva in MS. No. 1—3 in the National Library, Paris. It is also to be remarked that the official Lists do not agree among themselves as to the exact nature of the differences between these two Schools with regard to some of the words. Thus for instance in Job II 7 the List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009, the Merzbacher MS. and Bodley No. 11 state that the Easterns have *ועד* and *unto*, with *Vav* conjunctive both as the *Kethiv* and *Keri*,<sup>1</sup> and this in the form in which I have given the variant in the Notes. According to the Lists, however, in Bodley No. 93, in Orient. 4227 British Museum and in the *editio princeps* the textual reading (כתיב) is *ועד* and *unto*, and the *Keri* is *עד* *unto*, without the *Vav* conjunctive which is the very reverse of the Western recension.<sup>2</sup>

In Job XXVI 12 all the Lists agree that the Westerns have *ובתבנתו* both as *Kethiv* and *Keri*, but they differ greatly with regard to the Eastern variant. Thus the List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009 states that the Eastern *Kethiv* is *וכתבנותו*. Bodley No. 11 says it is *ובתובנתו*; Bodley No. 93 and the *editio princeps* give it *ובתבנותו*, thus making it exactly like the *Kethiv* and *Keri* according to the Westerns and doing away with the variant altogether. The Merzbacher MS. and Orient. 4227, however, emphatically state that according to the Easterns the *Kethiv* is *ובתבנתו* and the *Keri* is *ובתבנותו*.<sup>3</sup> This variant probably exhibits the recension of one School of Massorites, whilst the one which I give in the Notes on this passage proceeds from another School who included the word in

<sup>1</sup> למרנ' ועד כתיב וקרי.

<sup>2</sup> According to these Lists the difference is as follows: למער' עד

כתיב ועד קרי, למרנ' ועד כתיב עד קרי.

<sup>3</sup> למע' ובתבנותו, למרנ' ובתבנתו כתיב ובתבנותו קרי.

question in the List of words wherein the letters are transposed.<sup>1</sup>

The Eastern variant which I have given on Job XXXIX 15 is from Add. 465 in the Cambridge University Library. The Massorah Parva in this MS. emphatically declares that these extraordinary points are on both letters *Cheth* and *Yod*;<sup>2</sup> whereas Dr. Baer marks the *Yod* alone. As this passage is not included in the Massoretic List of words which have extraordinary points,<sup>3</sup> it affords another proof of the oft-stated fact that the different Schools of Massorites had different Rubrics, and that the instances which they exhibit are not exhaustive, but are simply to be taken as typical.

*The Five Megilloth.* — In the Megilloth I have added two new instances, viz. Ruth II 7 from Harley 5710—11 and Esther II 3 from Add. 465 in the University Library Cambridge. I have still to examine the following passages which Dr. Baer has incorporated in his List and which I have inadvertently adopted as exhibiting the Eastern readings.

In the note on Canticles II 17 which I give as an Eastern variant, the word למדנחאי according to the Easterns, is to be corrected into ס"א other MSS., another reading is. Though the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009 on Ezek. XIII 2 gives it as one of the seven instances where the *Kethiv* is אל- unto, and the *Keri* על- upon,<sup>4</sup> this by itself, as my analysis of this Codex has shown, does not constitute it a variant of the *Madinchai* unless it is expressly described as such in another MS.

<sup>1</sup> וכתובותיו כתיב, וכתובותיו כתיב; comp. *The Massorah*, letter כ, § 480; Vol. II, pp. 53, 54.

<sup>2</sup> למדנחאי ותחת נקוד על חית ויוד.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter כ, § 521, Vol. II, p. 296.

<sup>4</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter א, § 514, Vol. I, p. 57.

In my note on Ruth III 15 I followed Dr. Baer in describing הָבִי as *Milel* according to the *Madinchai*. Dr. Baer who says that the Westerns read it as the Hiphil from בוא to come, whilst the Easterns read it as the imperative Kal from ירב to give, refers to the printed Massorah Parva on this passage and to the Massorah Magna on Jerem. XXXIX 9 in corroboration of this statement. But the Massorah Parva simply remarks that the verb בוא to come, is in nine passages defective of the radical *Aleph* and that about this instance which is one of the nine, there is a difference of opinion.<sup>1</sup> To the same effect is the Massorah Magna on Jerem. XXXIX 9, which after enumerating the nine passages and giving Ruth III 15 as the last instance, remarks there is a difference of opinion about this last one,<sup>2</sup> i. e. whether it is defective or not. We have, however, seen that the expression פלוגתא = there is a difference of opinion, does not by itself denote Eastern unless it is so specified.

Lamentations I 21. — For the same reason למדנחאי according to the Easterns, on Lament. I 21 where I have followed Dr. Baer, is to be corrected into ס"א = other MSS. have, or another reading is, since it rests upon the same expression פלוג' = a difference of opinion.

Eccl. VIII 2. I have inadvertently followed Dr. Baer and given שְׁמֹר defective, as the Western reading and שְׁמֹר plene, as the Eastern. According to the List in the St. Petersburg Codex the Western recension reads שְׁמֹר plene, and the Easterns have it שְׁמֹר defective. This is corroborated by Harley 5710—11 which not only has שְׁמֹר in the text, but remarks against it in the Massorah Parva plene according to the Westerns.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> ט חס' בליש' ביאה ופלוגתא על דין.

<sup>2</sup> בתרא פלוגתא.

<sup>3</sup> שמור מלי למע'.

Eccl. XII 13. — Here too I have inadvertently followed Dr. Baer giving שָׁמֹר *plene*, as the Western reading and שָׁמַר *defective*, as the Eastern, whereas according to the St. Petersburg Codex which is the only MS. that gives it in the official List the reverse is the case, the Westerns have it defective and the Easterns *plene*.

In the following instances the official Lists differ among themselves as to the exact nature of the variants which obtained between the Westerns and the Easterns with regard to the words in question.

On Ruth I 6 the List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009 states that according to the Easterns both the *Kethiv* and the *Keri* are וְהָקִיִּם.<sup>1</sup>

Ruth II 11. — According to Bodley No. 11; Bodley No. 93 and the Merzbacher MS. the Easterns read here אֶת-כָּל, whilst the Westerns have simply כָּל.<sup>2</sup>

Ruth III 5. — Here too the same difference obtained between these two Schools of textual critics according to the Lists in the Merzbacher MS.; in Bodley No. 93; and in Orient. 4227 in the British Museum.

Eccl. III 13. — According to the List in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009 the Westerns read הָעוֹשֶׂה *plene*, and the Easterns have it הָעֹשֶׂה *defective*,<sup>3</sup> whereas according to the Lists in the other MSS. and in the *editio princeps* the reverse is the case, the Westerns have it defective and the Easterns *plene*.<sup>4</sup>

Eccl. IV 1. — According to the same List in the St. Petersburg Codex הָעֹשֶׂה which occurs twice in this

<sup>1</sup> למרני ותקום כתי וקרי.

<sup>2</sup> למע' כלי-אשר, למרני אתיכל אשר קרי.

<sup>3</sup> למע' העושה מל', למרני העשה.

<sup>4</sup> למע' העושה מל', למרני העושה מל', so the Merzbacher MS.; Bodley No. 11; Bodley No. 93; and Orient. 4227 British Museum.

verse is *plene* in both instances in the Eastern recension,<sup>1</sup> whereas all the other official Lists state that it is *defective* in both instances according to the Easterns.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, all the Lists state that according to the Westerns the second הָעֹשֶׂה alone is *plene*, whereas the first is הָעֹשֶׂה *defective*.<sup>3</sup> But the Massorah Parva in the *editio princeps* emphatically states that it is *plene* in both instances according to the Westerns<sup>4</sup> and in the text follows the Eastern recension, having it *defective* in both clauses.

*Daniel*. — In Daniel I have added no fewer than seven new variations between the Westerns and the Easterns. Six of the instances (Dan. IV 16; VI 5, 19, 27; VII 4; XI 44) are from MS. No. 1—3 in the Paris National Library, and one variant (XI 6) is from the Lists in the Merzbacher MS.; in Bodley No. 93; and in Orient. 4227. One new instance which occurs in the List of the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009 I have omitted. In Dan. XI 44 the Easterns according to this MS. read וְשָׁמַר *defective*.<sup>5</sup>

In one instance the Lists do not agree as to the exact nature of the difference between these two Schools of textual critics. According to the List in the St. Petersburg Codex, the Westerns read וּפְשָׁרָה in Dan. V 8, whilst the Easterns read וּפְשָׁרָא.<sup>6</sup> But according to three other Lists the Westerns have in the text וּפְשָׁרָה with *Aleph*, for which the *Keri* substitutes וּפְשָׁרָה with *He*, whilst the Easterns have וּפְשָׁרָה with *He* both as *Kethiv* and *Keri*.<sup>7</sup> Another

<sup>1</sup> למרני העשוקים ב' מל'.

<sup>2</sup> למת' העשוקים תרויהון חסרים, so the Merzbacher MS.; Bodley No. 11; Bodley No. 93; Orient. 4227; and the *editio princeps*.

<sup>3</sup> למע' העשוקים תנינא מלא.

<sup>4</sup> העשוקים למערבאי תרויהון מל', למרניחאי תרויהון חס'.

<sup>5</sup> למע' ושמתות, למרני ושמתת כתי.

<sup>6</sup> למע' ופשרה, למרני ופשרא כתי וק'.

<sup>7</sup> למע' ופשרא כתי ופשרה ק', למרני ופשרה כתי וק', so the Merzbacher MS.; Bodley No. 11; and Bodley No. 93.

List, however, which agrees with these MSS. as for as the Western reading is concerned, states that the Easterns have **וּפְשָׁרָא** with *Aleph* both in the *Kethiv* and *Keri*<sup>1</sup> and in this respect, therefore, agrees with the List in the St. Petersburg Codex.

*Ezra-Nehemiah.* — In Ezra X 3 the note should be “the Easterns have **בְּעֵצָה** in the counsel of as the textual reading (**כְּתִיב**), and in the *Keri* **בְּעֵצָה** according to the counsel of;” instead of simply “the Easterns read **בְּעֵצָה** according to the counsel”.<sup>2</sup>

In Nehemiah XIII 15 I have followed Dr. Baer and given a variation between the Westerns and Easterns on **וְעַמִּים** and they were lading. But as this simply rests on the expression **וּפְלוּגָתָא** and there is a difference of opinion about it,<sup>3</sup> and as we have already shown that this word by itself does not denote *Madinchai*, my note is to be corrected into **וְעַמִּים** **סִיָּא** other MSS. have or another reading is **וְעַמִּים** with *Sin* as in Neh. IV 11.

*Chronicles.* — In Chronicles I have been able to increase the number of variations between the Westerns and Easterns by the following eleven instances: 1 Chron. IV 15, 20; VI 41; VII 38; XV 24; 2 Chron. II 17; V 12, 13; VII 6; XIII 14; and XVII 8. The following three instances I have adopted from Dr. Baer's List: 1 Chron. V 27; VII 18; and 2 Chron. XXIV 19. These, however, I could not verify. In four passages the official Lists differ among themselves as to the exact nature of the variations

<sup>1</sup> למע' ופשרא כת' ופשרה קרי, למרנ' ופשרא כת' וקרי in Orient. 4227 British Museum. Unless we assume that after **וּפְשָׁרָא כְּתִיב** the words **וּפְשָׁרָא קְרִי** have dropped out of the first line the *editio princeps* differs from all the other Lists.

<sup>2</sup> למרנ' כעצת כת' כעצת ק', so all the Lists instead of **כעצת**.

<sup>3</sup> The MS. Massorah which Dr. Baer adduces in support of the Eastern reading is simply **וּפְלוּגָתָא** **לִית** **וּכְתִיב** **סִיָּא**.

which obtained between these two Schools of textual critics.

1 Chron. VII 28. — According to the List in Arund. Orient. 16; in Bodley No. 93; and in the *editio princeps*, the Westerns read **עַד-עֵיָה** unto *Aiyah*, in two words and the Easterns **עֵדֵיָה** *Adayah* in one word. The latter though the Easterns recension, is exhibited in the fourth edition of the entire Bible, Pesaro 1511 - 17; in the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; and in the Bomberg quarto Bible of 1521. According to the List in the Merzbacher MS, however, in Bodley No. 11 and in Orient. 4227 British Museum, the Westerns read **עַד-עֵדָה** unto *Addah* in two words, whilst the Easterns read it **עֵדֵדָה** *Adaddah* or **עֵדֵדָה** *Adadah* in one word (comp. Josh. XV 22). Dr. Baer indeed quotes Codex No. 18, Tzufutkale which gives a third variant. According to this MS. the Westerns read **עַד עֵיָה** unto *Aiyah*, whilst the Easterns have this as the textual reading (**כְּתִיב**), but substitute for it in the *Keri* **עֵזָה** *Gaza*.<sup>1</sup>

1 Chron. XVII 6. — According to the List in the Merzbacher MS.; Bodley No. 11; Bodley No. 93; Arund. Orient. 16; and the *editio princeps*, the Westerns read here **עַמִּי** *my people*, and the Easterns have **עַמּוֹ** *his people* in the text (**כְּתִיב**), for which they substitute **עַמִּי** *my people* in the *Keri*. But the List in Orient. 4227 emphatically declares that the Westerns have **עַמִּי** as *Kethiv* and *Keri*, and that the Easterns have **עַמּוֹ** *his people*, as *Kethiv* and *Keri*.<sup>2</sup>

1 Chron. XXV 27. — The official Lists greatly differ about the Western and Eastern orthography of the proper name in this verse. They exhibit no fewer than four varieties each of which is claimed as the genuine reading of the respective Schools. (1) According to the List in

<sup>1</sup> למע' עד עיה כת' וכן קרי למרנ' עיה כת' עוה ק'.

<sup>2</sup> למע' עמי כתיב וקרי, למרנ' עמי כתיב וקרי.

the Merzbacher MS. and the Aleppo Codex quoted by Dr. Baer, the Westerns read it לְאֵלִיָּתָהּ to *Eliyathah*, and the Easterns read it לְאֵלִיָּאָתָהּ to *Eliathah*, with an *Aleph* after the *Yod*, thus making it conformable to verse four of this chapter. (2) According to the Lists in Bodley No. 11 and Bodley No. 93 the Westerns spell it לְאֵלִיָּתָהּ with *He* at the end, and the Easterns לְאֵלִיָּאָתָהּ with *Aleph* at the end. (3) According to the Lists in Arund. Orient. 16 and Orient 4227 the Westerns write it לְאֵלִיָּאָתָהּ and the Easterns לְאֵלִיָּאָתָהּ. The two recensions agree in having *Aleph* after the *Yod* and differ about the ending, the former having *He* at the end and the latter *Aleph*. And (4) the List in the *editio princeps* which states that the Westerns have לְאֵלִיָּאָתָהּ with *Aleph* after the *Yod* and *He* at the end, whilst the Easterns read it לְאֵלִיָּתָהּ without *Aleph* after the *Yod*, but with *Aleph* at the end instead of *He*.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Chron. XV 2. — The five Lists which I have collated for this division of the Bible as well as the List in the *editio princeps* distinctly state that the Westerns read here שְׁמַעֲנִי *hear ye me*, defective and that the Easterns read it שְׁמַעֲנִי plene.<sup>2</sup> In my note on this passage I have inadvertently followed Dr. Baer and given the reverse as exhibiting the respective Schools.

In giving the variations of these two Schools of textual critics on each word which is the subject of the variant, I have not only reverted to the practice of the best MSS., but have enabled the student to see at a glance the nature of the various reading. The official Eastern readings now occupy their rightful position by the side of the official *Keri*.

<sup>1</sup> למע' לאליתה כח' וקרי' למד' לאליאתה כתיב וקרי'.

<sup>2</sup> למע' שמעני חס' למד' שמעני מלא No. 11; Bodley No. 93; Arund. Orient. 16; Orient. 4227; and the *editio princeps*.

## Chap. X.

### The Differences between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali.

In the early part of the tenth century Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali, two rival textual critics, were engaged in the redaction of two rival recensions of the Hebrew Bible which they respectively furnished with vowel-points, accents and the Massorah. Without entering into the controversy whether Aaron Ben-Asher who flourished circa A. D. 900—940 was a Karaite or a Rabbinic Jew which is outside the scope of this chapter, it is sufficient to state that he had derived great advantages in his Biblical studies from his father Moses Ben-Asher who had already edited a Codex of the Bible circa A. D. 890—95.

The Codex of Moses Ben-Asher or Ben-Asher the elder as we shall henceforth call him, still exists and is in the possession of the Karaite community at Cairo. It now contains only the Former and Latter Prophets or the second of the three divisions of the Hebrew Bible. According to the Epilogue at the end of the Minor Prophets, which is in the hand writing of Ben-Asher the elder and which Jacob Saphir copied, the writer of this MS. describes himself as Moses Ben-Asher and states that he finished it in Tiberias in the year 827 after the destruction of Jerusalem.<sup>1</sup> This is

<sup>1</sup> אני משה בן אשר כתבתי זה המחזור של מקרא על פי ביד אלהי חשוב עלי באר היטב במדינת מעויה טבריה העיר ההוללה כשהבינו עדת נביאים בחורי ה' קדושי אלהינו המבינים כל נסתרות והמשפירים סוד חכמה אילי הצדק אנשי אמנה לא כחדו דבר ממה שניתן להם ולא הוסיפו מאמ' על מה שנמסר להם והענימו והגדילו המ'ק עשרים וארבעה ספרים וייסודם באמונתם בטעמי שכל בפירוש דבור בחיך מתוך ביזמי Q



according to the Jewish chronology, which according to our reckoning synchronises with A. D. 895. A copy made from this Codex was purchased by Moses Isserles for 100 Ducats in the year 1530 and is now deposited in the Synagogue at Cracow. It is minutely described by M. Weissmann in the Hebrew Weekly called *Magid*.<sup>1</sup>

The Codex of Aaron Ben-Asher or Ben-Asher the younger is in the possession of the Jewish community at Aleppo. This MS. which contains the whole Hebrew Bible, like its predecessor is furnished with vowel-points, accents and both Massorahs Parva and Magna. In the Epilogue we are told that it is not the autograph of Ben-Asher, but that the celebrated Scribe R. Salomon b. Bevieh made this copy and that the original was sacredly consigned by R. Israel of Bozrah to the Karaite community at Jerusalem in trust of the two brothers, the Princes Josiah and Hezekiel who flourished circa A. D. 980, under the following conditions: (1) It is to be produced before the Congregation of the Holy City on the three great Festivals, Passover, Pentecost and Tabernacles for publicly reading therefrom the Lessons. (2) In case the said two Princes leave Jerusalem they are to give the MS. into trust to two other trustworthy and pious men. And (3) any Jew of the Rabbinic persuasion may use it for comparing and correcting by it other MSS., but not for the purpose of study.<sup>2</sup>

מאמר יהי רצון מלפני יוצרנו שיאיר עינינו ויניח לבנו בתורתו ללמד וללמד ולעשות בלב שלם ובנפש חפצה ולכל ישראל אמן. נכתב לקץ שמונה מאות ועשרים ושבע שנים לתורבן הבית השני שיאמר יוצר נשמות וישוב עליו ברחמים ויבנהו באבני אקרה וספיר וכדרכו בנין שלם בנין מקייים שלא ינתש ולא יחרם ולא ינתן לעולם ולעולמי עולמים במהרה בימינו ובימי כל ישראל אמן: אבן ספיר חלק ראשון דף יד עמוד ב.

<sup>1</sup> The description is given in the Supplement (הצופה) Nos. 47, 48, pp. 186, 190, Lyck 1857, where the Epilogue agrees almost literally with the one contained in the *Eben Saphir*, Vol. I, fol. 14b, Lyck 1886.

<sup>2</sup> זה המצחף השלם של עשרים וארבעה ספרים שכתב אותו מרנא ורבנא שלמה הנודע בן בויעא וא' בן ירחם הסופר המהיר רוח ה' תניחנו ונקד ומסר אותו באר

According to a note on page 1, the Codex with the permission of the two said Princes was transferred from Jerusalem to the community in Egypt circa A. D. 1000—1004 for the Jerusalemite Synagogue before the capture of the Holy City to save it from destruction.<sup>1</sup>

In the year 1009, that is three or four years after it was conveyed to the Jerusalem Congregation at Cairo and most probably in the life-time of the first Trustees, a certain Samuel b. Jacob copied this Standard Codex of Ben-Asher for Meborach Ibn Osdad. This very important

הישיב המלמד הנדול החכם הנבון ארון הסופרים ואבי החכמים וראש המלמדים המהיר במעשיו המבין במפעליו היחיד בדורותיו מר רב אהרן בן מר רב אשר תהי נפשו צרורה בצרור החיים עם הנביאים והצדיקים והחסידים. הקדיש אותו השר הנדול האדיר האביר מרנא ורבנא ישראל תפארת כל ישראל החכם והנבון החסיד השר הנדיב ירים ה' דנלו ויצין ציץ נזור ויניבה עוון ממדינת בצרה בן מר רב שמחה בן מר רב סעדיה בן מר רב אפרים רוח ה' תניחם לירושלם עה'ק עם זרע ישראל קהלות יעקב עדת ישורון בעלי המדע סגולת החכמים השוכנים בהר ציון אלקים יכונניה עד עולם סלה קדש לה' לא ימכר ולא ינאל על מנת שלא יצא מתחת ידי שני הנשיאים הנדולים כבוד גדולת קדושת הוד הדר הנשיא יאשיהו והנשיא יחזקיהו בני כבוד קדושת הנשיא דוד בן הנשיא בועתה נפשו צרורה בצרור החיים בניע תחת עץ החיים כדי שיוציאוהו אל הישיבות ואל הקהילות שבעיר הקדש בשלשה רגלים חג המצות וחג השבועות וחג הסוכות לקרות בו ולהתבונן וללמד ממנו כל אשר יחפצו ויבחרו ואם יראו שני הנשיאים הנדולים מר רב יאשיהו ויחזקיהו יחיים צורם בדרך ההצלחה שיפקדו אותו עם שני אנשים צדיקים ונבונים וידועים יראי אלהים אנשי אמת שונאי בצע עשו כחכמתם ובחזקתם ואם יחפון איש מכל זרע ישראל מבעלי הבנה מהרבנים בכל ימות השנה לראות בו דבר יתר או חסר או סתור או סדור או סתום או פתוח או טעם מהמעמים האלו ויציאוהו אליו לראות ולהשכיל ולהבין לא לקרות ולדרוש וישיבוהו למקומו ולא יתבקו בו איש אין בו אמונה וה' אלהי ישראל ישים אותו סימן טוב סימן ברכה עליו ועל זרעו ועל כל ישראל ויתקיים עליו מקרא שכתוב כי אצק מים על צמא וננולים על יבשה אצוק רוחי על זרעך וברכתי על צאצאיך וצמחו בבין חציר כערבים על יבלי מים זה יאמר לה' אני וזה יקרא בשם יעקב וזה יכתוב ידו לה' ובשם ישראל יבנה וכל הברכות האמורות בו יחולו ויבואו ויאחזו ויאגורו עליו ועל זרעו ועל כל הנלוים עליו ועל כל מי ישמע ויאזין ויקשיב ויעשה כדברים האלה ולא יחליפם ולא ימירם לעולם ולעולמי עולמים ברוך ה' לעולם אמן ואמן: אבן ספיר חלק ראשון דף יב וי"ג.

<sup>1</sup> אנתקל בחכם אלאפתכאק מן נהב ירושלם עיר הקודש תבנה ותכונן לקהל מצרים לכניסת ירושלם תבנה ותכונן בחיי ישראל ברוך שומרו וארור גונבו וארור מוכרו וארור ממשכנו לא ימכר ולא ינאל לעולם ועד אבן ספיר חלק ראשון דף יב.

copy is now in the Imperial Public Library at St. Petersburg. The name of the Scribe, the place where the copy was made, the honoured person for whom it was transcribed and the date on which it was finished are all most minutely given in the Epigraph of the MS. They are written in the same hand-writing as the MS. itself.

In the long Epigraph which was published by Pinner who was the first to call attention to this Codex when it was in the possession of "the Odessa Society for History and Antiquities" and which is republished in the Catalogue of the Hebrew MSS. in the Imperial Library in St. Petersburg, the year in which it was finished is given according to five different eras. (1) In 4770 of the creation which synchronises with A. D. 1009—10. (2) In the year 1444 after the exile of King Jehoiachin which is uncertain. (3) In the year 1319 according to the Seleucidien era or the era of Contracts (1319 minus 311) = 1008. (4) In the year 940 after the destruction of the second Temple (940 + 68) = 1008 and (5) in the year 399 of the Muhammedan era = A. D. 1009.<sup>1</sup>

Equally emphatic and distinct is the statement of the Scribe as to the person for whom he made the Codex and the prototype which he followed. "I Samuel b. Jacob," he says on folio 474 a, "have written, vowel-pointed and Massoretically annotated this Codex for the honoured

<sup>1</sup> זה המחזור מקרא שלם נכתב ונגמר בנקודות ובמסורות ומונה יפה במדינת מצרים ונשלם בחדש סיון של שנת ארבעת אלפים ושבע מאות ושבעים שנה לבריאת עולם. והוא שנת אלף וארבע מאות וארבעים וארבעה לנלות המלך יהויכין והוא שנת [אלף] ושלוש מאות ותשע עשרה שנה למלכות יונים שהיא למנין [שמורות] ולפסיקת הנבואה. והוא שנת תשע מאות וארבעים לחרבן בית שני והוא שנת שלוש מאות ותשעים: Comp. Pinner, *Prospectus der Odessaer Gesellschaft für Geschichte und Alterthümer*, p. 81 &c.; Odessa 1845; Harkavy and Strack, *Catalog der Hebräischen Bibelhandschriften der kaiserlichen öffentlichen Bibliothek in St. Petersburg*, p. 265 etc., Leipzig 1875.

Rabbi Meborach the Priest b. Joseph surnamed Ibn Osdad, may the Ever-living one bless him."<sup>1</sup> Again in the Epygraph on folio 479 a it is stated: "Samuel b. Jacob copied, vowel-pointed and Massoretically annotated this Codex of the Sacred Scriptures from the correct MSS. which the teacher Aaron b. Moses Ben-Asher redacted (his rest is in Paradise!) and which constitute an exceedingly accurate Exemplar."<sup>2</sup>

Of Ben-Naphtali nothing is known and no Codex which he redacted has as yet come to light.<sup>3</sup> The passages, therefore, in which he differs from Ben-Asher are only known from the official Lists which have been transmitted to us exhibiting the variations of these two rival scholars. The examples in these Lists may occasionally be supplemented by sundry remarks in the margin of the MSS. and by notices in Massoretico-Grammatical Treatises of mediaeval Grammarians. The latter source, however, cannot always be relied upon, since the Grammarians not unfrequently palm off their super-fine theories on the vowel-points and accents as developments of the respective systems of Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali.

Though the variations between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali refer to the vowel-points Dagesh, Raphe, the Metheg or Gaya and the accents, yet I have found in one MS. four instances in which these two textual critics differ in the consonants and textual readings.

<sup>1</sup> אני שמואל בן יעקב כתבתי ונקדתי ומס' זה המצחף לכבוד רבנא מבורך הכהן בן יוסף הירוע בן אודאד יברכהו חי.  
<sup>2</sup> שמואל בן יעקוב כתב ונקד ומסר את המחזור הזה שלמק' מן הספרים המוגהים המבואר', אשר עשה המלמד אהרן בן משה בן אשר נוחו בנן ערן: והוא מונה: Comp. Pinner, *Prospectus*, pp. 85, 86; Harkavy and Strack, *Catalog*, p. 269.

<sup>3</sup> Like the Ben-Ashers there seem to have been several Ben-Naphtalis. Fragments of a Treatise of one of them I give in the Appendix to this Introduction.

Thus on Numb. XXVI 23 the Massorah Parva in Add. 15251 states that Ben-Naphtali reads *לְפִנָּה* of *Puvah*, which is the textual reading in this MS., but that Ben-Asher reads *לְפִנָּה* of *Punah*.

(2) On Isa. XXX 23 it states that Ben-Asher reads "the rain of (*זֶרְעַךְ*) *thy seed*," which it has in the text, and that Ben-Naphtali reads it "the rain of (*אֲרֵצְךָ*) *thy land*."<sup>1</sup>

(3) On Jerem. XXVII 19 it states that Ben-Asher has "that remain *in* this (*בְּעִיר*) *city*," which is the textual reading, but that Ben-Naphtali has it "that remain *in* this (*בְּאֲרֵץ*) *land*."<sup>2</sup>

And (4) on Ezek. XIV 16 the Massorah Parva in this MS. states that Ben-Asher reads "but the land (*תְּהִיָּה שְׁמָמָה*) *shall be desolation*," and that Ben-Naphtali reads it "but as for the land (*שְׁמָמָה תְּהִיָּה*) *desolation shall it be*,"<sup>3</sup> making it conformable to Ezek. XII 20. I have only noticed the last two variations in the notes of my edition, but I have duly given all the four instances in the Massorah.<sup>4</sup>

Professor Strack has found three other variations between these two redactors which also affect the textual reading of the consonants.

On 1 Kings III 20 Codex Tzufutkale No. 87 states that Ben-Naphtali like the Westerns reads *יְשִׁינָה* *she was asleep* plene, whilst Ben-Asher like the Easterns reads it *יְשָׁנָה* defective.<sup>5</sup>

Trite as this difference may appear it affects two important statements which bear upon the redaction of

<sup>1</sup> בן אשר זרעך, בן נפחלי ארצך.

<sup>2</sup> בן אשר בעיר, בן נפחלי בארץ.

<sup>3</sup> בן נפת' שממה תהיה.

<sup>4</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter ח, §§ 595, 603—605; Vol. I, pp. 576, 581, 582.

<sup>5</sup> למערב' ובן נפחלי ואמתך ישינה מל', בן אשר ומדנחא' ישנה ח': Comp. Strack, *Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche*, Vol. XXXVI, p. 611, note 1, Leipzig 1875.

the current text. Maimonides emphatically declares "that the recension of our MSS. is according to the well-known Codex in Egypt, which contains the twenty-four sacred books, and which had formerly been in Jerusalem for many years in order that other Codices might be corrected by it and that both he and all others followed it because Ben-Asher corrected it and minutely elaborated it for many years and revised it many times, as it has been transmitted to us" and Levita who quotes this passage from Maimonides adds "the Westerns in every land follow Ben-Asher, but the Easterns follow the recension of Ben-Naphtali."<sup>1</sup>

The Massoretic note from the Tzufutkale MS., which is fully confirmed by the unanimous testimony of the official Lists, as far as the difference between the Westerns and Easterns on the passage in question is concerned, discloses two important facts with regard to Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali. It shows in the first place that Ben-Asher and the Easterns have here identically the same reading, which is contrary to the usual statement that our Codices follow Ben-Asher who exhibits the *Western* recension. And in the second place it is apparently against the above cited declaration of Levita that it is the *Easterns* who follow the text of Ben-Naphtali. The real inference from this Massorah, however, is that it yields an additional proof of the fact to which we have often alluded, that our text does not uniformly exhibit the recension of the Westerns and of Ben-Asher. It not un-

<sup>1</sup> וספר שסמכנו עליו בדברים אלו הוא ספר הידוע במצרים שהוא כולל כ"ד ספרים שהיה בירושלם מכמה שנים להגיה ממנו הספרים. ועליו היו הכל סומכין. לפי שהגיהו בן אשר, ודקדק בו שנים הרבה, והגיהו פעמים רבות כמו שהעתיקו. ועליו סמכתי בספר תורה שכתבתי כהלכתו, וכן אנתנו סומכין על קריאתו בכל הארצות: Comp. Levita, *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, p. 114, ed. Ginsburg; and see below p. 267.

frequently follows the Easterns and Ben-Naphtali. Hence it is unsafe to describe any MS. as Western and exhibiting the text Ben-Asher or as Eastern and following the recension of Ben-Naphtali, simply because some of its readings happen to coincide with what are believed to be the redaction of one school or the other.

The second passage on which Professor Strack found a Massorah, also referring to the consonants is Jerem. XI 7. Codex Tzufutkale No. 10 states that Ben-Naphtali reads here "and" or "even unto the city" and that Ben-Asher reads it simply "unto the city."<sup>1</sup> Here too the MSS. and the early editions are divided. For though the majority follow Ben-Asher, still some MSS. and some of the best editions follow the reading of Ben-Naphtali as will be seen from my note on this passage. Yet it is perfectly certain that the MSS. and editions which exhibit here Ben-Naphtali's reading do not as a whole follow his recension. The most interesting and instructive part of this Massorah, however, is the fact which it establishes, viz. that the difference between these two redactions consists in the presence or absence of the *Vav* conjunctive and not in the presence or absence of a *Metheg* under the *Vav* as is stated by Dr. Baer.<sup>2</sup>

Jerem. XXIX 22 is the third instance quoted by Professor Strack where the difference between these two redactors affects the textual reading. Codex Tzufutkale No. 84 states that according to Ben-Naphtali the textual reading here is "and like (וּכְאֶהָב) *Ahab*" and that the *Keri* is "and like (וּכְאֶחָיו) *his brethren*."<sup>3</sup> Here we have an important

<sup>1</sup> לִבְנֵי נַפְתָּלִי עַד, וּבַסֵּף מוֹנֵה וְעַד לִבְנֵי אֲשֵׁר: Comp. Baer and Strack, *Dikdukē Ha-Teamim*, p. XIII note.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Baer and Delitzsch, *Jeremiah*, p. 125, Leipzig 1890.

<sup>3</sup> בֶּן נַפְתָּלִי כַצְרִקְדִּיּוֹ וּכְאֶהָב כְּתִיב וּכְאֶחָיו קְרִי, בֶּן אֲשֵׁר וּכְאֶהָב כְּתִיב וְכֵן קְרִי: Comp. *Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche*, Vol. XXXVI, p. 611, note I, and S. Pinsker, *Einleitung in das Babylonisch-Hebräische Punctationssystem*, p. 126, Vienna 1863.

new *Keri* which is entirely different from the one exhibited in the recension of the *Madinchai* as will be seen from my note on this passage.

There is another record of some of the differences between Ben-Asher and the rival redactors which is not given in the official Lists, but which has an important bearing on the discussion of the nature of these variations. On Gen. XLIX 20 Orient. 4445, fol. 40b, has the following Massorah:

		יש אומרים	מלמד הגדול בן אשר
Gen.	XLIX 20	מְעַנֵּי-מֶלֶךְ	מְעַנֵּי מֶלֶךְ
Deut.	XXXIII 28	יִשְׂרָאֵל	יִשְׂרָאֵל
Judg.	XX 33	מִמְעַרְהָ נָבַע	מִמְעַרְהָ נָבַע
Isa.	XL 18	תִּשְׁרָכֶיךָ לִי	תִּשְׁרָכֶיךָ לִי

The difference, therefore, between Ben-Asher and other redactors of the text is that he has *Mercha* in all the four instances, whilst the others, probably the followers of Ben-Naphtali, connect these two words with *Makeph* and have *Gaya* under the first words. As this MS. is undoubtedly of the early part of the ninth century, and, moreover, as the Massorah in this Codex was added about a century later, there can be no question about the real difference in these passages between Ben-Asher and the other Schools, though we have hitherto had no knowledge of these variations. Indeed from the manner in which the Massorite quotes this distinguished textual critic, viz. "the great teacher Ben-Asher", without the usual benedictory phrase "his rest is in Paradise, which accompanies the mention of the departed," yields additional evidence that

<sup>1</sup> Comp. the Epigraph בֶּן אֲשֵׁר נִחַו בֶּן עֲרֵן in the St Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009.

the Massorah in question was written in the life-time of Ben-Asher.

With these preliminary notices before us we shall be better prepared to enter into an examination of the differences between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali which are recorded in the official Lists. The Massoretico-Grammatical Treatise which is prefixed to the Yemen MSS. of the Pentateuch give the most lucid Summary of these differences not only with regard to certain words which occur in sundry parts of the Bible, but especially in the Pentateuch. With regard to the Pentateuch it describes most minutely the precise nature and the exact number of these variations in each of the fifty-two Pericopes into which it is divided. The differences between these two redactors of the text which affect words occurring throughout the Bible are given in this Treatise under the following six categories.

I. The proper name **יששכר** which with its different prefixes occurs forty-three times in the Bible<sup>1</sup> constitutes the first point of difference. According to Ben-Asher the first **ש** only is pointed and is pronounced *Sin* (**ש**) and the second is entirely passed over being neither pointed nor pronounced, viz. **יששכר** *Isachar*; whilst according to Ben-Naphtali both are pointed and pronounced, viz. **יששכר** *Issachar*.<sup>2</sup> It will be seen that according to this Treatise

<sup>1</sup> Gen. XXX 18; XXXV 23; XLVI 13; XLIX 14; Exod. I 3; Numb. I 8, 28, 29; II 5, 5; VII 18; X 15; XIII 7; XXVI 23, 25; XXXIV 26; Deut. XXVII 12; XXXIII 18; Josh. XVII 10, 11; XIX 17, 23; XXI 6, 28; Judg. V 15, 15; X 1; 1 Kings IV 17; XV 27; Ezek. XLVIII 25, 26, 33; 1 Chron. II 1; VI 47, 57; VII 1, 5; XII 33, 41; XXVI 5; XXVII 18; 2 Chron. XXX 18.

<sup>2</sup> דע כי היה בן אשר ינקוד מלח יששכר השין הראשון ויוציא אותו בסין וישבית השין השני מן הנקוד ולא יוציא אותו בפה כמו ישכר וכולם על זה המנהג; ובן נפתלי יחלפוהו כי הוא ינקוד השנים ויוציאם בסין כמו יששכר. Orient. 2348, fol. 25 a; Orient. 2349, fol. 16 a; Orient. 2350, fol. 23 a—b; Derenbourg, *Manuel de Lecteur*, p. 109, Paris 1871.

the *Sin* which Ben-Asher points has no *Dagesh* and this reading is exhibited in MSS. Nos. 65, 68, 80, 122 &c. of the St. Petersburg Collection.<sup>1</sup> In the *Adath Deborim* where the same fact is recorded, the remark about Ben-Asher is almost identical, but the point of difference on the part of Ben-Naphtali is entirely at variance with the statement here, inasmuch as it says that Ben-Naphtali pronounces the first *Shin* (**ש**) and the second *Sin* (**ש**), viz. **יששכר** *Ishsashar*, and that it is Moses Mochah who points and reads it **יששכר** *Issachar* with two *Sins*.<sup>2</sup> **יששכר** *Ishsachar*, which is here stated to be the orthography of Ben-Naphtali is the reading of MSS. Nos. 49, 54, 57, 59, 70 &c. in the St. Petersburg Collection,<sup>3</sup> whilst **יששכר** *Issachar*, which is here stated to be the orthography of Moses Mochah is the reading of Codex Nr. 110 in the same collection. There is yet another record about Ben-Naphtali's orthography of this name. In the Treatise entitled *Points of Difference between the Karaite and Rabbinic Jews*<sup>4</sup> we are assured that Ben-Naphtali reads it **יששכר** and this is confirmed by the Massorah Parva on Gen. XXX 18 in Orient. 2626—28 in the British Museum. These, however, do not exhaust all the varieties in the orthography of this name as exhibited in the MSS. The St. Petersburg Codex which is dated A. D. 916 reads its **יששכר** without points in the first **ש** in all the passages in Ezekiel (XLVIII

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Harkavy and Strack, *Catalog*, pp. 71, 82, 84, 86, 93 &c.

<sup>2</sup> ובן נפתלי יחליף אותו משום כי ינקוד הב' ויוציא הראשון בשין והשני בסין כמ' יששכר וינהיג הכול [על] זה המנהג, ומשה מוחה היה מנקד הב' ויקראם בב' סינים Comp. Strack, *Codex Babylonicus*, p. 29, St. Petersburg 1876. According to Pinsker, however, Moses b. Mochah reads it **יששכר** Comp. *Lichute Kadmoniot*, p. 98, Vienna 1880, so that here too the statement in the *Adath Deborim* is at variance with other records.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. Harkavy and Strack, *Catalog*, pp. 90, 92, 104, 155 &c.

<sup>4</sup> Comp. לקוטי קדמוניות חלוק הקראים והרבנים in Pinsker's *קדמוניות*, p. 102, Vienna 1860.

25, 26, 33) and this is also the reading in the Pentateuch in Arund. Orient. 2 which is dated A. D. 1216.

We have thus no fewer than six varieties in the orthography of this name exhibited in the MSS. and in the early editions.

- (1) **יששכר** with *Dagesh* in the *Sin* Add. 4445; Add. 15451; Add. 9401; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 4227; the Complutensian Polyglot; the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the Venice quarto Bible 1521 and the *editio princeps* of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25.
- (2) **יששכר** without *Dagesh* in the *Sin*, Ben-Asher, Orient. 2201; Harley 5710—11; Harley 1528; MSS. Nos. 65, 68, 80, 122 &c.; in the St. Petersburg Collection; the first edition of the Pentateuch, Bologna 1482; the first edition of the entire Bible, Soncino 1488; the second edition, Naples 1491—93; and the third edition, Brescia 1494.
- (3) **יששכר** the first *Sin* without vowel points, the Babylon Codex A. D. 916; and Arund. Orient. 2 dated A. D. 1216.
- (4) **יששכר** with vowel points under both *Sins*, Moses b. Mocha and MS. No. 100 in the St. Petersburg Collection.
- (5) **יששכר** Ben-Naphtali.
- (6) **יששכר** also given as Ben-Naphtali, is the orthography in MSS. Nos. 49, 54, 57, 59, 70 &c. in the St. Petersburg Collection.

These variations which have no parallel in any other proper name among the sons of Jacob are due both to the birth of Issachar and to the part he played in the history of the twelve tribes. The original orthography was undoubtedly **יששכר** = **ישא שכר** which denotes *he bringeth*

*reward*, referring to Gen. XXX 18, and he *taketh* or *receiveth hire* (comp. Ps. XXIV 5; Eccl. V 18; Esther II 9 &c.), alluding to Gen. XLIX 14, 15. A similar instance of the double signification of a name, the first referring to the circumstances connected with the birth and the second alluding to events in after-life, we have in the case of the father of Issachar. He is called Jacob (**יעקב**) = Heel-catcher, because at the birth he caught hold of his brother's heel (Gen. XXV 26), and he is afterwards Jacob (**יעקב**) = Trickster, because he deliberately tricked him out of his paternal blessing (Gen. XXVII 36). It is the latter circumstance which underlies all the variations in the orthography. Owing to his love of ease and comfort Issachar we are here told preferred to recognise the supreme power of the original inhabitants of the land and pay tribute rather than engage in the struggle to expel them, as the other tribes were endeavouring to do. For this reason Jacob brands him as a hireling, a burden-bearer to strangers:

Issachar [= the hireling] is the ass of strangers,  
 Crouching down among the folds;  
 When he saw the rest that it was good  
 And the land that it was pleasant  
 He bowed his shoulder to bear the burden  
 And became a servant unto tribute.

In after time when this stigma cast upon Issachar [= the hireling] wounded the national susceptibilities, all sorts of interpretations were resorted to, to conceal or obliterate this censure, as will be seen from the ancient versions and the variations in the vowel-points of the text itself adopted by different redactors.

Hence the variations in the orthography of **יששכר** *Issachar*, have been adopted by the different redactors to preclude the meaning *he taketh hire*, i. e. *hireling*. **חמר גרם**

the ass of strangers, which was the original reading, as is attested both by the Samaritan text and the Samaritan Targum, has been altered in the Septuagint into τὸ καλὸν ἐπεθύμησεν = חָמַד נָרַם he desired that which is good, substituting Daleth (ד) for Resh (ר) in the first word and Samech (ס) for Mem (ם) in the second. What this good represents is manifest from the Jerusalem Targum II, which exhibits the same alteration of letters and which renders it = חָמַד נָרַם חָמַד פְּאֹרֵי־הַתּוֹרָה he desired the Law. The Jerusalem Targum I paraphrases it שְׁבֵטָא תְּקִיף a strong tribe, whilst Onkelos renders it עֲתִיר בְּנִכְסֵין rich in wealth. As for the stigma that he became "a servant unto tribute" the Septuagint makes it into γεωργός a husbandman. The Jerusalem Targum paraphrases it "his brethren shall bring him presents because he bowed his shoulder to master the Law,"<sup>1</sup> whilst Onkelos makes this clause say the very opposite to that which the Hebrew text declares. According to the Chaldee Version it means "he will conquer the provinces of the nations, destroy their inhabitants, and those that remain will serve him and render him tribute."<sup>2</sup> To such expedients have the ancient Versions and the redactors of the Massoretic text resorted in order to obscure and obliterate the otherwise plain meaning of the faithfully transmitted consonants.<sup>3</sup>

In the ten passages where Issachar occurs in Chronicles (1 Chron. II 1; VI 47, 57; VII 1, 5; XII 23, 41; XXVI 5;

<sup>1</sup> ארום בסימא היא בנין כן ארכין כתפי למלעי באורייתא והווי ליה אחוי מסקי דורונין.

<sup>2</sup> ויכבש מחווי עממיא וישיצי יתדיריהון וראשחארון בהון יהון לה פלחן ומסקי מסין.

<sup>3</sup> For a full discussion on the alterations and import of this passage we must refer to Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, 359 etc., Breslau 1857; *Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, XVIII, 658 etc., Leipzig 1864; *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben*, X, 101, Breslau 1872.

XXVII 18; 2 Chron. XXX 18), I have omitted to give in the Notes the usual variant of Ben-Naphtali. The student must, therefore, bear in mind the alternative orthography.

II. The second point of difference between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali is with regard to certain forms of the verb אכל to eat. According to Ben-Asher wherever a form of this verb occurs with a suffix and the Lamed has Segol (ל), the Caph has *Chateph-pathach* (כּ), except in one instance (Eccl. V 10), whereas Ben-Naphtali always points it with simple Sheva (כ).<sup>1</sup> There are only six forms of this verb which are affected in the vowel-points by this variation. But as they respectively occur more than once, amounting altogether to twenty-four instances, and, moreover, as several of the identical forms are treated differently in the same MSS. and early editions, it is necessary to describe each passage separately in the order of the books in which they occur.

It is only by so doing that Ben-Asher's rule can properly be tested. The importance of this minute examination will be seen when it is stated that some textual critics have maintained that the punctuation of these forms constitutes a test whether a given MS. exhibits the Ben-Asher or Ben-Naphtali recension.

In the examination of the passages which exhibit the forms of this verb I am obliged to separate the fifteen instances in the Pentateuch from the nine which occur in the Prophets and in the Hagiographa, since many of the MSS. which I have collated for this purpose only contain the Pentateuch, whilst several have the Prophets and the Hagiographa without the Pentateuch.

<sup>1</sup> וכל לשון אכילה היה בן אשר יפתח הכף על המשפטים שביארנו בסימני Comp. Orient. 2348, fol. 25a; Orient. 2349, fol. 16a; Orient. 2350, fol. 23b; Derenbourg, *Manuel du Lecteur*, p. 109, Paris 1871.

The Pentateuch. — The following ten MSS. have only the Pentateuch: Arund. Orient. 2; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2696; Orient. 4445; Add. 9401; and Add. 15282.

(1) Gen. III 17.

הַאֲבֵלָה Add. 9401 dated A. D. 1286; Add. 15451; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add. 15282; Orient. 2626; the Lisbon edition of the Pentateuch 1491; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491—93; the Complutensian Polyglot; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25.

הַאֲבֵלָה Orient. 4445, the oldest MS. known at present; Orient. 2201 dated A. D. 1246; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 4227; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2629; Harley 5710—11; Harley 1528; the *editio princeps* of the Pentateuch, Bologna 1482; the first edition of the Hebrew Bible, Soncino 1488; the third edition of the Bible, Brescia 1494; the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; and the Venice quarto edition 1521. For the treatment of the same form in Ezek. IV 12 which is the only other instance where it occurs, see below No. 20.

(2) Levit. VI 11.

יֵאבֵלָה Add. 4445; Add. 9401; Add. 15451; and the first edition of the Bible, Soncino 1488.

יֵאבֵלָה Arund. Orient. 2 dated A. D. 1216; Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626; Orient. 2696; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add. 15282; the first edition of the Pentateuch, Bologna 1482; the Lisbon edition of the Pentateuch 1491; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491—93; the third edition, Brescia

1494; the Complutensian Polyglot; the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the Venice quarto 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25.

(3) Levit. VI 19.

יֵאבֵלָה Orient. 4445; Add. 9401; Add. 15282; Add. 15451.

יֵאבֵלָה Arund. Orient. 2; Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626; Orient. 2696; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; the first edition of the Pentateuch, Soncino 1482; the first edition of the Bible 1488; the Lisbon edition of the Pentateuch 1491; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491—93; the third edition, Brescia 1494; the Complutensian Polyglot; the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the Venice quarto Bible 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah 1524—25.

(4) Levit. VII 6.

יֵאבֵלָה Orient. 4445; Add. 9401; Add. 15282; the first edition of the Bible, Soncino 1488; and the third edition, Brescia 1494.

יֵאבֵלָה Arund. Orient. 2; Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626; Orient. 2696; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; the first edition of the Pentateuch, Bologna 1482; the Lisbon edition 1491; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491—93; the Complutensian Polyglot; the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the Venice quarto Bible 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25.



## (5) Numb. XVIII 10.

תַּאֲבָלָנוּ Orient. 4445; Add. 9401; Add. 15451; Orient. 2696.

תַּאֲבָלָנוּ Arund. Orient. 2; Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add. 15282; the *editio princeps* of the Pentateuch, Bologna 1482; the *editio princeps* of the Bible, Soncino 1488; the Lisbon edition of the Pentateuch 1491; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491—93; the third edition, Brescia 1494; the Complutensian Polyglot; the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the Venice quarto Bible 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25.

## (6) Numb. XVIII 13.

יַאֲבָלָנוּ Orient. 4445; Add. 9401; Add. 15451; Orient. 2696.

יַאֲבָלָנוּ Arund. Orient. 2; Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add. 15282; and all the early editions of the Pentateuch and the Bible.

## (7) Deut. XII 15.

יַאֲבָלָנוּ Add. 9401; Add. 15451; Orient. 2696.

יַאֲבָלָנוּ Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add. 15282; and all the early editions of the Pentateuch and the Bible.

## (8) Deut. XII 18.

תַּאֲבָלָנוּ Add. 9401; Add. 15451; Orient. 2696.

תַּאֲבָלָנוּ Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add. 15282; and all the early editions of the Pentateuch and the Bible.

## (9) Deut. XII 22.

תַּאֲבָלָנוּ Add. 9401; Add. 15451; Orient. 2696.

תַּאֲבָלָנוּ Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add. 15282; and all the early editions of the Pentateuch and the Bible.

## (10) Deut. XII 22.

יַאֲבָלָנוּ Add. 9401; Add. 15451; Orient. 2696.

יַאֲבָלָנוּ Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add. 15282; and all the early editions of the Pentateuch and the Bible.

## (11) Deut. XII 24.

תַּאֲבָלָנוּ Add. 9401; Add. 15451; Orient. 2696.

תַּאֲבָלָנוּ Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add. 15282; and all the early editions of the Pentateuch and the Bible.

## (12) Deut. XII 25.

תַּאֲבָלָנוּ Add. 9401; Add. 15451; Orient. 2696.

תַּאֲבָלָנוּ Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add. 15282; and all the early editions of the Pentateuch and the Bible.

## (13) Deut. XV 20.

תאבִּלְנוּ Add. 9401; Add. 15451; Orient. 2696; Orient. 4227.

תאבִּלְנוּ Arund. Orient. 2; Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add. 15282; and all the early editions of the Pentateuch and the Bible.

## (14) Deut. XV 22.

תאבִּלְנוּ Add. 9401; Add. 15451; Add. 15282; Orient. 2696.

תאבִּלְנוּ Arund. Orient. 2; Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; and all the early editions of the Pentateuch and the Bible.

## (15) Deut. XXVIII 39.

תאבִּלְנוּ Add. 9401; Add. 15451.

תאבִּלְנוּ Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626; Orient. 2696; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add. 15282; and all the early editions of the Pentateuch and the Bible. It is to be added that Orient. 4445 and Arund. Orient. 16 point it תאבִּלְנוּ with *Tzere* under the *Lamed*.

*The Prophets and the Hagiographa.* — To the MSS. which contain the whole Bible and which are quoted both for the Pentateuch and these two divisions of the Scriptures, I have here to add the following Codices: the two magnificent model MSS. Arund. Orient. 16 and Orient. 2091 which contain the Prophets and the Hagiographa; Orient. 2210

and Orient. 2370 which contain the Former Prophets; Orient. 1474 which contains the Latter Prophets and Orient. 2212 which contains the Hagiographa.

## (16) 2 Kings VI 28.

ונאבִּלְנוּ Add. 15451.

ונאבִּלְנוּ Orient. 2091; Orient. 2201; Orient. 2310; Orient. 2370; Orient. 2626—28; Orient. 4227; Arund. Orient. 16; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; and all the early editions of the Bible.

## (17) 2 Kings VI 29.

ונאבִּלְנוּ Add. 15451.

ונאבִּלְנוּ Orient. 2091; Orient. 2201; Orient. 2210; Orient. 2370; Orient. 2626—28; Orient. 4227; Arund. Orient. 16; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; and all the early editions of the Bible.

## (18) Isa. XXXI 8.

תאבִּלְנוּ Add. 15251; Add. 15451.

תאבִּלְנוּ Orient. 1474; Orient. 2201; Orient. 2626—28; Orient. 4227; Arund. Orient. 16; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15252; and all the early editions of the Bible.

## (19) Ezek. IV 9.

תאבִּלְנוּ Orient. 2201; Add. 15451; and the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25.

תאבִּלְנוּ Orient. 1474; Orient. 2091; Orient. 2626—28; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; and all the early editions of the Bible with the exception of the *editio princeps* with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim.

(20 and 21) Ezek. IV 10.

הַאֲבָלָנוּ twice Orient. 2201; Add. 15451; the fourth edition of the Bible 1511—17; and Jacob b. Chayim's edition 1524—25.

הַאֲבָלָנוּ Orient. 1474; Orient. 2091; Orient. 2626—28; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; the first edition of the Bible, Soncino 1488; the second edition, Naples 1491—93; the third edition, Brescia 1494; the Complutensian Polyglot; the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; and the Venice quarto Bible 1521.

(22) Ezek. IV 12.

הַאֲבָלָנוּ Orient. 2201; Harley 1528; Add. 15251; Add. 15451; the fourth edition of the Bible, Pesaro 1511—17; the Complutensian Polyglot; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25.

הַאֲבָלָנוּ Orient. 1474; Orient. 2091; Orient. 2626—28; Orient. 4227; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15252; the first edition of the Bible, Soncino 1488; the second edition, Naples 1491—93; the third edition, Brescia 1494; the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; and the Venice quarto 1521.

(23) Ezek. VII 15.

יֵאֲבָלָנוּ Add. 15451.

יֵאֲבָלָנוּ Orient. 1474; Orient. 2091; Orient. 2201; Orient. 2626—28; Orient. 4227; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; and all the early editions of the Bible.

(24) Eccl. VI 2.

יֵאֲבָלָנוּ not a single MS.

יֵאֲבָלָנוּ Orient. 2091; Orient. 2201; Orient. 2212; Orient. 2626—28; Orient. 4227; Arund. Orient. 16; Harley

1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; and all the early editions of the Bible.

The above analysis discloses the startling fact that by far the greater number of our MSS. and the early editions follow the Ben-Naphtali recension and not that of Ben-Asher as has hitherto been supposed. It shows that out of the fifteen instances which occur in the Pentateuch and for which I collated nineteen MSS. and nine early editions, the Ben-Asher reading has some considerable support in No. 1 alone. It has eight MSS. and four editions in its favour. But even here the Ben-Naphtali recension is exhibited in no fewer than eleven MSS. and five editions. In all the other fourteen passages the Ben-Asher reading is exhibited in only two, three or at most in four MSS., whilst the Ben-Naphtali recension is uniformly followed in fourteen or fifteen MSS. and in twelve passages it is the reading of all the early editions without exception.

A similar result is obtained from the analysis of the instances in the Prophets and Hagiographa. Out of the thirteen MSS. which I have collated for these divisions of the Hebrew Bible, the highest number which support Ben-Asher's recension is in the single instance described in No. 22. Here Ben-Asher's reading is exhibited in four MSS. and in four editions. But here too Ben-Naphtali's recension has the greater support, inasmuch as it is exhibited in seven MSS. and five editions. In the other eight passages Ben-Asher's recension is followed by only one MS. or at most by two MSS. In the case of No. 24 not a single MS. or edition follows Ben-Asher, whilst Ben-Naphtali's recension is exhibited in seven to thirteen MSS. and in five out of the nine instances is followed by all the early editions and in No. 19 by all the editions except one.

With this overwhelming evidence before me I did not feel justified in displacing the simple *Sheva* from the text

(כ) in these forms and in substituting for it *Chateph-pathach* (ך). The exception, however, which I have made is in Ezek. IV 10—12. Here as will be seen from the above analysis, this form is not only exhibited in several MSS., but in several of the early editions. In these passages, however, I have given the alternative punctuation in the notes.

III. The third point of difference between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali is with regard to certain forms of the verb *נרש* to drive away. As in the former case so here, wherever the forms of this verb occur with a suffix and the third radical has *Segol* (ש), Ben-Asher points the second radical with *Chateph-pathach* (ך) with one exception, viz. *וינרשהו* and *he drove him away* (Ps. XXXIV 1), where he also points the *Resh* with *Chateph-pathach*, though the *Shin* has *Tzere*; whereas Ben-Naphtali always points the *Resh* with simple *Sheva* (ר).<sup>1</sup> Apart from the exception in Ps. XXXIV 1, there are only three passages which are affected by this difference between these two Massorites. From an examination of these three passages, however, it will be seen that the vowel-points of Ben-Naphtali are the rule both in the MSS. and in the early editions, whereas those of Ben-Asher are the exception.

(1) Exod. XXIII 29.

ואנרשנו Orient 4445; Add. 9401; Add. 15282; Add. 15451.

ואנרשנו Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626—28;

<sup>1</sup> וכל לשון נרושה היה בן אשר יפתח הריש והוא שיהיה תחת השין שלוש נקדות כמו מעט מעט אנרשנו. לא אנרשנו מפניך וזולתם. ואם לא יהיה על השין שלש נקדות לא יפתח הריש כמו וינרלו בני האשה וינרשו. ותנרשני מבית דומי חוץ ממלה אחת כי הוא יפתח אותה ולא יהיה תחת השין שלוש נקדות והיא וינרשהו וילך; ובן נפתלי לא היה פותח ממנה דבר; Comp. Orient. 2348, fol. 25a—b; Orient. 2349, fol. 16a; Orient. 2350, fol. 23b; Derenbourg, *Manuel du Lecteur*, page 109, Paris 1871.

Orient. 2696; Orient. 4227; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; the *editio princeps* of the Pentateuch, Bologna 1482; the first edition of the Bible, Soncino 1488; the Lisbon Pentateuch 1491; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491—93; the third edition, Brescia 1494; the Complutensian Polyglot; the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; the Venice quarto 1521; and the first edition of the Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25.

(2) Exod. XXIII 30.

ואנרשנו Orient. 4445; Add. 9401; Add. 15282; Add. 15451.

ואנרשנו Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626—28; Orient. 2696; Orient. 4227; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; and all the early editions without exception.

(3) Numb. XXII 6.

ואנרשנו Orient. 4445; Add. 9401; Add. 15282; Add. 15451; and the third edition of the Bible, Brescia 1494.

ואנרשנו Orient. 2201; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349; Orient. 2350; Orient. 2365; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626—28; Orient. 2696; Orient. 4227; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; and all the early editions except one, viz. Brescia 1494.

We now come to the exception where we are told that Ben-Asher points it *וינרשהו* with *Chateph-pathach* under the *Resh* (ך) though the *Shin* has *Tzere* (ש). From the following description, however, it will be seen that here too the reading of Ben-Naphtali is the rule in the MSS. and in the early editions, whilst the recension of Ben-Asher is very rarely followed.

## Ps. XXXIV 1.

ויגרִשְׁהוּ Add. 15251; Add. 15451.

ויגרִשְׁהוּ Orient. 2201; Orient. 2212; Orient. 2375; Orient. 2451; Orient. 2626—28; Orient. 4227; Arund. Orient. 16; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15252; and all the early editions without a single exception.

My own Codex No. 1 which is a beautifully written Spanish MS. and which also has ויגרִשְׁהוּ in the text, distinctly states in the official List of variations that the difference consists in Ben-Asher reading it ויגרִשְׁהוּ without *Gaya* and Ben-Naphtali pointing it ויגרִשְׁהוּ with *Gaya*, and this variation I have given in the note on this passage.

IV. The fourth point on which Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali differ is with regard to the Dagesh in the *Tav* in the forms of the word בָּתִּים *houses*, when it has two accents. According to Ben-Asher the word in question occurs only twice with two accents and hence the *Tav* has Dagesh in only two instances, viz. וּבָתִּים and houses Deut. VI 11 and בָּתָיו the houses thereof 1 Chron. XXVIII 11. This is evident from his statement in the Massorah that there are only four words altogether in the Bible which have the two accents and Dagesh in the *Tav* and that the form בָּתִּים *houses*, constitutes two out of the four instances. According to Ben-Naphtali, however, there are more instances where the form בָּתִּים *houses*, has two accents and has the extra *Dagesh* in the *Tav*,<sup>1</sup> viz. Exod. II 7; VIII 7;

<sup>1</sup> וכל לשון בתים אשר יהיה בשני טעמים היה בן נפתלי יחזקם בדגש יותר מוולתם כמו על הבָּתִּים, ומבְּתִיךְ כולם על זה המנהג; וכן אשר יחליפוהו על זה חזק משתי מלות והיא וּבָתִּים מלאים כל טוב, את תבנית האולם ואת בָּתָיו, כי זכר במאסרתה כי ארבע מלות במקרא מרבה הדגשין והן וּבָתִּים מלא, ואת בָּתָיו, במאסרתה; ושימה חל-עולם, ונבריא אלך חל-עולם; Comp. Orient. 2348, fol. 25b; Orient. 2349, fol. 16a; Orient. 2350, fol. 23b; Derenbourg, *Manuel du Lecteur*, p. 110, Paris 1871.

Deut. VI 11; 1 Chron. XXVIII 11; 2 Chron. XXXIV 11. Here too both the MSS. and the early editions follow the recension of Ben-Naphtali, inasmuch as they exhibit the accent and Dagesh in all the five passages.

V. The fifth point of difference between these two Massorites is with regard to the prefixes *Beth* (ב) and *Lamed* (ל) in words which begin with a *Yod* which has a *Chirek* (י). According to Ben-Asher the prefix in question takes *Sheva* and the *Yod* retains the *Chirek*. Thus יִשְׂרָאֵל *Israel* is בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל in *Israel*, and לְיִשְׂרָאֵל to *Israel*; יִזְרְעֵאל *Jezreel* with the prefix *Beth* is בְּיִזְרְעֵאל in *Jezreel*, with *Lamed* it is לְיִזְרְעֵאל to *Jezreel*; יִרְאַה *fear* with the prefix *Beth* is בְּיִרְאַה in *fear*, and with *Lamed* it is לְיִרְאַה to *fear*. According to Ben-Naphtali, however, the *Chirek* in question is taken by the prefix *Beth* or *Lamed* and the *Yod* loses its character as a consonant, יִשְׂרָאֵל with the prefix becomes בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל or לְיִשְׂרָאֵל; so too יִזְרְעֵאל becomes בְּיִזְרְעֵאל or לְיִזְרְעֵאל and יִרְאַה with the prefixes becomes בְּיִרְאַה and לְיִרְאַה.<sup>1</sup> As this pointing which affects hundreds of passages is in accordance with the Syriac, it seems to confirm Levita's statement that Ben-Naphtali belonged to the *Madinchai* or Eastern School of textual critics.<sup>2</sup>

In this category of differences between the two textual critics, the MSS. and the editions with very few exceptions follow the recension of Ben-Asher. We shall only mention two noticeable exceptions, since one of them has given rise to a difference in the interpretation of the text,

<sup>1</sup> וכל בישראל לישראל, ביזרעאל ליזרעאל, ביראה ליראה, ביראת ליראת. היה בן אשר ינקוד היוד באלו המלות ויוציא אותו בפה, וכן נפתלי יחליפוהו ולא ינקוד היוד בן אשר ינקוד היוד באלו המלות ויוציא אותו בפה כמו בישְׂרָאֵל; Comp. Orient. 2348; fol. 25b; Orient. 2349, fol. 16a; Orient. 2350, fol. 23b; Derenbourg, *Manuel du Lecteur*, p. 110, Paris 1871.

<sup>2</sup> Vide supra p. 247; and Levita, *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, p. 114, ed. Ginsburg.

viz. Ps. XLV 10. Though I have adopted in the text **בִּיקְרוֹתֶיךָ** among *thy honourable women*, which is the reading of Ben-Asher, in accordance with some of the best MSS., viz. Harley 5710—11; Arund. Orient. 16; Orient. 2375; Orient. 2451; Orient. 4227; Add. 15251, I must state that the majority of the MSS. which I have collated and the early editions exhibit **בִּיקְרוֹתֶיךָ**, the recension of Ben-Naphtali. This is the case in Orient. 2201; Orient. 2212; Orient. 2626—28; Add. 9401—2; Add. 15250; Add. 15252; Add. 15451; Harley 1528; and all the early editions without a single exception. Hence the mediaeval Jewish interpreters (Saadia, Rashi &c.), who followed this reading, ignored the silent *Yod* and derived the word from **בָּקַר** to *visit, to serve*. They took it as the plural of **בְּקָרָה** (Levit. XIX 20) and translated it *thy female servants*.<sup>1</sup>

The second instance where the Ben-Naphtali recension has prevailed over the Ben-Asher reading is Prov. XXX 17. The reading **לִיקְהָתָה** to *obey*, is exhibited in all the best MSS., in Orient. 2201; Orient. 2212; Orient. 2375; Orient. 2626—28; Orient. 4227; Arund. Orient. 16; Harley 1528; Harley 5710—11; Add. 15250; Add. 15251; Add. 15252; Add. 21161 and in fact in all the Standard Codices which I have collated for this purpose. The same is the case with the editions. All the early editions without exception have this reading. With this overwhelming evidence before me I did not feel justified in displacing it from the text and substituting for it Ben-Asher's recension for which I could not find any authority.

VI. The sixth point of difference between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali affects the presence or absence of the Dagesh in the letters **בְּנִדְכַפְתָּ** under certain conditions. According to Ben-Asher, wherever **וַיְהִי** is followed by

**בְּנִדְכַפְתָּ** and the accent connects it with **וַיְהִי** he has it *Raphe* in accordance with the rule which applies to **אֹיִהּ**. Thus for instance he reads it **וַיְהִי כְשָׁמַע** Gen. XXIX 13; and so in similar cases. Now Ben-Naphtali differs from him in the following seven instances where he puts Dagesh in *Caph* after **וַיְהִי** Gen. XIX 17; XXXIX 15; Deut. II 16; Josh. IX 1; Judg. XI 35; 1 Kings XV 29; and Esther V 2.<sup>1</sup>

We have still to consider the official Lists of the differences between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali which record the variants in each book separately under each of the three great divisions, viz. the Law, the Prophets and the Hagiographa.

*The Pentateuch.* — As is usually the case, the Scribes have taken the greatest care in minutely recording the variations which obtained in the Pentateuch between these two redactors of the text. Hence in some MSS. not only is the precise number of variations given in each Pericope, but the nature of the difference is minutely described. This is notably the case in the splendid Codex No. 1 in the Madrid University Library dated A. D. 1280, folio 81a—82b; in the Massoretico-Grammatical Treatise prefixed to the Yemen MSS. of the Pentateuch: Orient. 1379; Orient. 2348; Orient. 2349 and Orient. 2350 in the British Museum, and in the *Mukaddimat* of Samuel Ha-Rophē.

Samuel Ha-Rophē or Samuel el-Maghrebi was born in Maghrebi circa A. D. 1350 and died circa A. D. 1420. He was *Dayin* or Spiritual head of the Karaite community

<sup>1</sup> וכל ויהי אשר חסמוך עם בְּנִדְכַפְתָּ והטעם מורבק עם ויהי היה בן אשר יקראם ברפי על משפט אֹיִהּ כמו ויהי כשמע ודומי, ובן נפתלי יחליפיהו בשבעה מלות ויהי כראותו אותה ויקרע, ויהי כראות המלך, ויהי כשמעו כי הרימתו, ויהי כאשר חמו, ויהי כהוציאם אתם, ויהי כשמע כל המלכים, ויהי כמלכו, והוץ מאלו ינהיגם על משפט אֹיִהּ כהוציאם אתם, ויהי דוד ודומי: Comp. Orient. 2348, fol. 25b; Orient. 2349, fol. 16a; Orient. 2350, fol. 23b; Derenbourg, *Manuel du Lecteur*, p. 110, Paris 1871.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Ewald and Dukes, *Beiträge*, p. 36 etc.

at Cairo. Amongst other works he wrote circa 1380 the *Mukaddimat* or Introduction to the Pericopes of the Pentateuch.<sup>1</sup> At the end of each *Mukaddima* he not only gives a description in Arabic of the number of *Sedarim* and verses in the Pericope in question, but gives a table in which he registers both the exact number of the variations between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali and the precise nature of each variant. This portion of the *Mukaddimat* is of great importance, inasmuch as its author by virtue of his position and office had the command of the celebrated Ben-Asher Codex which his community at Cairo possessed. It is from the *Mukaddimat* that I printed in my Massorah the portion which sets forth the variations between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali.<sup>2</sup> The Lists of the differences between these two textual critics appended to each of the Pericopes in my edition of the Bible are also from the *Mukaddimat*, collated with the Lists in the Madrid Codex No. 1 and the Massoretico-Grammatical Treatise in the Yemen MSS.

Owing to the special care which the Scribes exercised with regard to the Massoretic materials appertaining to the Pentateuch, some MSS. which contain the whole Hebrew Bible and omit the Lists for the Prophets and Hagiographa, yet carefully record the Lists for the Pentateuch. This is the case in Orient. 2201 which is dated A. D. 1246, fol. 100a—101b; Orient. 4227, fol. 270a—271a; Add. 15251, fol. 3b—5b; in the splendidly illuminated MS. Orient. 2626—28, Vol. I, fol. 180a—184b; and MS. No. 7 dated A. D. 1299 in the National Library, Paris. Besides these MSS. which give the Lists for the Pentateuch alone, I have also collated Harley 1528 in the British Museum; my

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Fürst, *Geschichte des Karäerthums*, Vol. II, p. 283 etc., Leipzig 1865.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, Vol. III, § 290b—298b, p. 6—14.

own MS. No. 1; the Lists in the *editio princeps* of Jacob b. Chayim's Bible with the Massorah, Vol. IV, Venice 1525—26 at the end; and the Lists in Walton's Polyglot, Vol. VI, p. 8—13, London 1657. The List of the variations given in the Summary at the end of each Pericope in my edition of the Bible I printed from the *Mukaddimat* or Liturgical Introduction to the Pericopes by Samuel Ha-Rophē al-Maghridi, Orient. 2482—84; compared<sup>1</sup> with the Massoretico-Grammatical Treatise prefixed to the above-named Yemen MSS. and with the List in the Madrid Codex No. 1.

*Genesis*. — In the Lists of Samuel Ha-Rophē the twelve Pericopes into which Genesis is divided exhibit thirty-nine variations between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali.<sup>2</sup> These I have duly given at the end of each Pericope. They are as follows: (1) 1 + (2) 2 + (3) 1 + (4) 4 + (5) 1 + (6) 7 + (7) 3 + (8) 7 + (9) 2 + (10) 4 + (11) 5 + (12) 2 = 39. In Pericope No. 8 which according to this Treatise has only seven variations,<sup>3</sup> I have added an eighth in Gen. XXXVI 16:

ב"א אלוף קרה. ב"ב אלוף-קרה.

This variation is given in the Massoretico-Grammatical Treatise prefixed to the Yemen MSS. From this Treatise as well as from the splendid Madrid Codex No. 1, I have added in the Summary at the end of the first Pericope the instances in which Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali agree, which are omitted in the Massoretico-Grammatical Treatise.

<sup>1</sup> The Arabic List of variations between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali which I printed in *the Massorah*, Vol. III, p. 6—14, is from this Liturgical Introduction.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, Vol. III, § 590b, p. 6—7. The vowel points attached to the Biblical words throughout this Treatise in my Massorah are those which are given in Samuel Ha-Rophē's MS.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, Vol. III, § 590b, p. 6; with Derenbourg, *Manuel du Lecteur*, p. 111—115.

The importance of this addition may be seen from the fact that in the very first Pericope (Gen. I 1—VI 8) where these MSS. emphatically state that Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali agree in the punctuation of *יהי אור* *let there be light* (Gen. I 4) and *אשר בראתי* *whom I have created* (Gen. VI 7), Dr. Baer gives them in his List of differences between these two rival critics without mentioning that they are expressly excluded in some of the official Lists.<sup>1</sup>

*Exodus.* — The eleven Pericopes into which Exodus is divided exhibit twenty variations. In this number both the List of Samuel Ha-Rophē and the List in the Massoretico-Grammatical Treatise agree.<sup>2</sup> They are as follows: (1) 1 + (2) 5 + (3) 1 + (4) 2 + (6) 2 + (8) 3 + (9) 2 + (10) 1 + (11) 3 = 20. In two Pericopes, viz. No. 5 (*יתרו* = Exod. XVIII 1—XX 26) and No. 7 (*תרומו* = Exod. XXV 1—XXVII 19) there are no differences between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali.

*Leviticus.* — In Leviticus which consists of ten Pericopes, Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali exhibit sixteen points of difference. Here too the number given by Samuel Ha-Rophē and in the Massoretico-Grammatical Treatise in the Yemen MSS. agree.<sup>3</sup> The differences in the separate Pericopes are as follows: (1) 1 + (3) 1 + (4) 2 + (5) 1 + (6) 1 + (7) 1 + (8) 7 + (9) 2 = 16. In two Pericopes, viz. No. 2 (*צו* = Levit. VI 1—VIII 36) and No. 10 (*בהקתי* = Levit. XXVI 3—XXVII 34) these two redactors of the text display no difference.

*Numbers.* — Numbers which is divided into ten Pericopes, exhibits twenty-four variations between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali. They are as follows in the respective heb-

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *Genesis* by Baer and Delitzsch, pp. 81, 82, Leipzig 1869.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, Vol. III, § 592*b*, p. 8—9; with Derenbourg, *Manuel du Lecteur*, p. 115—118.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, Vol. III, § 594*b*, p. 9—10; with Derenbourg, *Manuel du Lecteur*, p. 118—120.

domidal Lessons: (1) 1 + (3) 5 + (4) 7 + (5) 2 + (6) 3 + (7) 3 + (9) 1 + (10) 2 = 24. In two Pericopes, viz. No. 2 (*נשא* = Numb. IV 21—VII 89) and No. 8 (*פינרום* = Numb. XXV 10—XXX 1) there is no variation. The Massoretico-Grammatical Treatise gives only twenty-one differences and even these vary in four Pericopes from those given in the *Mukaddimat*. In Pericope No. 4 (*שלה* = XIII 1—XV 41) the Yemen Treatise gives five differences instead of seven, omitting XV 14 and 24. In No. 5 (*קרוח* = XVI 1—XVIII 32) it gives one difference instead of two, omitting XVI 28. In No. 7 (*בלק* = XXII 2—XXV 9) it has one more, four instead of three, viz. *יִלֶּה* *he shall pour out* XXIV 7 and in No. 10 (*מסעי* = XXXIII 1—XXXVI 13) it has one less, i. e. one instead of two<sup>1</sup> omitting XXXVI 1.

*Deuteronomy.* — In Deuteronomy which is divided into eleven Pericopes there are nineteen differences between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali. They are as follows according to the respective Pericopes: (2) 5 + (3) 4 + (4) 2 + (5) 2 + (6) 2 + (7) 1 + (8 and 9) 1 + (10) 2 = 19. Two Pericopes, viz. No. 1 (*דברים* = Deut. I 1—III 22) and No. 11 (*וזאת הברכה* = Deut. XXXIII 1—XXXIV 12) are without any variation. The Treatise in the Yemen MS. emphatically states that there is also no variation in No. 7 (*כי תבוא* = XXVI 1—XXIX 8) and therefore omits XXVI 19. It will, however, be seen that the *Mukaddimat* declares as emphatically that this Pericope exhibits one difference between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali and that it carefully states in what the difference consists.<sup>2</sup>

Before passing over to the other two divisions of the Hebrew Bible, I exhibit in parallel columns the differences between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali on Leviticus as they

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, Vol. III, § 596*b*, p. 12—13; with Derenbourg, *Manuel du Lecteur*, p. 120—123.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, Vol. III, § 598*b*, p. 14; with Derenbourg, *Manuel du Lecteur*, p. 123—125.





Orient. 4445	Editio princeps	My MS.	Orient. 4227	Add. 15250	Harley 1528	N. L. P. No. 7 A. D. 1299	Or. 2201 A. D. 1246	Yemen MSS.	Mukaddimat	Leviticus
מיתיימות	מֹות־	מֹות־	מֹות־	מֹות־	מֹות־	מֹות־	מֹות־	○	○	כֹּא מֹות־יֹומֹות
כֹּא בִת־	מֹות־	מֹות־	מֹות־	מֹות־	מֹות־	מֹות־	מֹות־	○	○	כֹּא בִת־ מֹות־
הִבְהִינִים	אִי־	אִי־	אִי־	אִי־	אִי־	אִי־	אִי־	אִי־	אִי־	כֹּא אִי־ בִת־
מְקַל־וֹרְעֵכֶם	אִי־	אִי־	אִי־	אִי־	אִי־	אִי־	אִי־	○	○	כֹּא אִי־ בִת־
אֲשֶׁר־תִּקְרָא	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	כֹּא אִי־ בִת־
אֲשֶׁר־תִּקְרָא	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	כֹּא אִי־ בִת־
שְׁתִּים	שְׁתִּים	שְׁתִּים	שְׁתִּים	שְׁתִּים	שְׁתִּים	שְׁתִּים	שְׁתִּים	○	○	כֹּא שְׁתִּים
שְׁבַחֲכֶם	שְׁבַחֲכֶם	שְׁבַחֲכֶם	שְׁבַחֲכֶם	שְׁבַחֲכֶם	שְׁבַחֲכֶם	שְׁבַחֲכֶם	שְׁבַחֲכֶם	○	○	כֹּא שְׁבַחֲכֶם
שְׁבַחֲכֶם	שְׁבַחֲכֶם	שְׁבַחֲכֶם	שְׁבַחֲכֶם	שְׁבַחֲכֶם	שְׁבַחֲכֶם	שְׁבַחֲכֶם	שְׁבַחֲכֶם	○	○	כֹּא שְׁבַחֲכֶם

אֶת־	אֶת־	אֶת־	אֶת־	אֶת־	אֶת־	אֶת־	אֶת־	○	○	כֹּא אֶת־מַעֲדִי
בִּנְקֹוֹ שֵׁם	אֶת־	אֶת־	אֶת־	אֶת־	אֶת־	אֶת־	אֶת־	○	○	כֹּא בִּנְקֹוֹ שֵׁם
וְהִוָּה	וְהִוָּה	וְהִוָּה	וְהִוָּה	וְהִוָּה	וְהִוָּה	וְהִוָּה	וְהִוָּה	○	○	כֹּא וְהִוָּה שַׁבַּת
וְלִבְרַמְתְּךָ	וְלִבְרַמְתְּךָ	וְלִבְרַמְתְּךָ	וְלִבְרַמְתְּךָ	וְלִבְרַמְתְּךָ	וְלִבְרַמְתְּךָ	וְלִבְרַמְתְּךָ	וְלִבְרַמְתְּךָ	○	○	כֹּא וְלִבְרַמְתְּךָ
וְלִבְרַמְתְּךָ	וְלִבְרַמְתְּךָ	וְלִבְרַמְתְּךָ	וְלִבְרַמְתְּךָ	וְלִבְרַמְתְּךָ	וְלִבְרַמְתְּךָ	וְלִבְרַמְתְּךָ	וְלִבְרַמְתְּךָ	○	○	כֹּא וְלִבְרַמְתְּךָ
אֶת־	אֶת־	אֶת־	אֶת־	אֶת־	אֶת־	אֶת־	אֶת־	○	○	כֹּא אֶת־מַכְסַּף
כִּי־	כִּי־	כִּי־	כִּי־	כִּי־	כִּי־	כִּי־	כִּי־	○	○	כֹּא כִּי־עֲבָדִי
וְאִם־	וְאִם־	וְאִם־	וְאִם־	וְאִם־	וְאִם־	וְאִם־	וְאִם־	○	○	כֹּא וְאִם־מַעֲנֵט
מֶלֶךְ	מֶלֶךְ	מֶלֶךְ	מֶלֶךְ	מֶלֶךְ	מֶלֶךְ	מֶלֶךְ	מֶלֶךְ	○	○	כֹּא וְאִם־מֶלֶךְ קִמְוֹן
וְכַל־עֲרֹבֶךָ	וְכַל־	וְכַל־	וְכַל־	וְכַל־	וְכַל־	וְכַל־	וְכַל־	○	○	כֹּא וְכַל־עֲרֹבֶךָ
	וְכַל־	וְכַל־	וְכַל־	וְכַל־	וְכַל־	וְכַל־	וְכַל־	○	○	כֹּא וְכַל־

From the above Table it will be seen that the official Lists often differ among themselves as to the precise nature of the variants even in the Pentateuch, where the greatest care has been taken to transmit the punctuation of Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali. The attempt, therefore, to reduce these variants into a system, to formulate rules from these conflictingly recorded differences and to apply these rules to other passages of the Hebrew Scriptures so as to multiply instances which are not contained in the official registers, is a task far more in harmony with the super-fine ingenuity of some mediaeval grammarians than with sober textual criticism. It is probably due to this fact that the best Codices and even the MSS. which record the official Lists do not follow uniformly the punctuation of either Ben-Asher or Ben-Naphtali. Thus the oldest and most beautifully written Codex of the Pentateuch, viz. Orient. 4445 very rarely employs the *Metheg* or *Gaya* even before *Chateph-pathach*, and yet it is the presence or absence of the *Metheg* or *Gaya* which constitutes fully nine-tenths of the differences between these two redactors of the text.

As regards the separate Treatise called in some MSS. *Dikdukē Ha-Teamim* which has come down to us in several Codices in the name of Ben-Asher, its text in the different MSS. and in the *editio princeps* is as hopelessly irreconcilable as that of the official Lists. The Treatise in question was first published in the *editio princeps* of the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis, Venice 1517, where it is described in the heading as the compilation of Ben-Asher. A second edition of it was published by Leopold Dukes under the title of *Kontres Ha-Massoreth*, Tübingen 1846, from a MS. in the possession of Luzzatto. In this MS., however, no author's name is given to the Treatise. These two editions, moreover, differ essentially in the text, and

the recension published by Dukes barely contains one fourth of the text in the *editio princeps*.

(1) In my Massorah I published five other recensions of this Treatise. The first is under letter  $\beth$ , § 246, Vol. I, p. 654—660. This recension I printed from Add. 15251 British Museum where it forms an appendix with other Massoretic materials to the Hebrew text folio 444*a*—448*a*. It will be seen that the compilation is here ascribed to Ben-Asher. The arrangement and text of this recension approximate more closely to the *editio princeps* though the latter contains about thirty-five more Rubrics.

(2) The second recension which I printed under letter  $\beth$ , § 44—75, in the third Volume of the Massorah, p. 41—43, is from the beautifully illuminated MS. Orient. 2626—28 where it occupies the first and second lines of the ornamental square in Vol. I, folio 1*b*—22*b*. Not only does the text of this recension differ materially from that of the other Treatises, but the Rubrics are fewer and are differently arranged. I could not, therefore, exhibit it in a parallel column with the other recensions.

(3) The third recension which I have given in the third Volume of the Massorah is from Codex Tzufutkale No. 15 for the transcript of which I am indebted to Professor Strack. The Epigraph which according to Strack proceeds from the clever hand of Firkowitsch,<sup>1</sup> ascribes the Massorah to Aaron Ben-Asher. The Massorah itself consists of fifty-nine Rubrics of sundry Massoretic import and constitutes an Appendix to an ancient and valuable fragment of the Pentateuch. Of these only twenty-two correspond to recension No. 1, whilst nine are to be found in the additions in the compilation of Drs. Baer and Strack.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Baer and Strack, *Dikdukē Ha-Teamim*, Einleitung, p. XXXIII, Leipzig 1879; with *The Massorah*, Vol. III, p. 295.

(4) The fourth recension which I also printed in the third Volume of the Massorah<sup>1</sup> is from Codex Tzufutkale No. 17 for a transcript of which I am indebted to Professor Strack. The Codex to which the Massorah in question forms an Appendix, contains an imperfect Pentateuch of 213 folios and is one of the most important fragments of the Hebrew Scriptures.

The Epigraph which assigns the date A. D. 790 to this MS. making it to belong to the grand-father of Aaron b. Moses Ben-Asher, has manifestly been tampered with and the *Shin* (ש = 300) according to the statement of Professor Strack has been made out of the original *Tav* (ת = 400). But though no reliance whatever can be placed on the date, still the MS. is very important.<sup>2</sup> The Rubrics which form the separate Treatise called *Dikdukē Ha-Teamim* are not grouped together in this MS. as a distinct whole. They simply constitute sundry parts of a somewhat extensive Massorah. As will be seen in my reproduction of it, the Massorah itself contains ninety-six Rubrics of diverse Massoretic import. The portions which correspond to the Rubrics in the *Dikdukē Ha-Teamim* No. 1 are only nineteen and eleven correspond to the additions in the compilation of Drs. Baer and Strack.

To exhibit in parallel columns the relationship of the parts in this Massorah which correspond to the Rubrics contained in the *Dikdukē Ha-Teamim* I have numbered them according to the order in which they occur.

(5) The fifth recension which I have given in the third Volume of the Massorah, is the Massorah Finalis in Codex Tzufutkale No. 19 for the transcript of which I am

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, Vol. III, § 1-96, p. 269-294.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Baer and Strack, *Dikdukē Ha-Teamim*, Einleitung, p. XXXIV, Leipzig 1879; with *The Massorah*, Vol. III, p. 294 where the Epigraph is given.

likewise indebted to Professor Strack. The Massorah which is incomplete consists of thirty-six Rubrics.<sup>1</sup> Of these, fifteen correspond to recension No. 1 and four to the additions in the compilation of Drs. Baer and Strack.

Through the kindness of Professor Chwolson I have received a copy of this Treatise made from the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 1009, which I give *in extenso* in the Appendix. This exhibits the oldest homogeneous form of the compilation in question. And as the MS. is a copy of the Ben-Asher Codex made only about three or four years after the Codex itself was conveyed from Jerusalem to Cairo,<sup>2</sup> it must finally decide the form and contents of the Treatise. On comparing the Appendix it will be seen that the Treatise consists of only forty-two Rubrics instead of seventy-six as given in the *Dikdukē Ha-Teamim* of Drs. Baer and Strack and that they follow quite a different order. To give the student a proper idea of the import of this valuable Treatise, I have made it the basis of comparison with the other recensions. It, therefore, occupies the first column in the Table.

Table I.

Tzufut. No. 19	Tzufut. No. 17	Tzufut. No. 15	Orient. 15551	Editio princeps	B. S.	MS. A.D.1009	
o	o	o	o	o	o	§ 1	ברוך יהוה אלהים אלהי ישראל
o	o	§ 21	§ 3	§ 3	§ 3a	§ 2a	סדר המקרא תורה האשמרת
o	o	§ 22	§ 4	§ 4	§ 3b	§ 2b	סדר הנביאים
o	o	§ 23	§ 5	§ 5	§ 3c	§ 2c	סדר הכתובים
o	o	§ 2	o	o	§ 2	§ 3	יהי שם יהוה מברך
o	o	§§ 3, 4	o	o	§ 4	§ 4	עוד בשלשה תורה נמשלה
o	§ 55	§ 5	o	o	§ 9	§ 5	סדר סוד התורה
o	§ 41	§ 17	o	o	§ 10	§ 6	שבע נקודות, למאן כבודות

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Baer and Strack, *Dikdukē Ha-Teamim*, Einleitung, p. XXXV, Leipzig 1879; with *The Massorah*, Vol. III, p. 310-326.

<sup>2</sup> Vide *supra*, pp. 243, 244.

Tzufut. No. 19	Tzufut. No. 17	Tzufut. No. 15	Orient. 15251	Editio princeps	B. S.	MS. A.D. 1009	
°	§ 57	§ 6	§ 2	§ 2	§ 17	§ 7	שער הטעמים שנים עשר רשומים
°	§ 58	§ 8	°	°	§ 5a	§ 8	אילו תולדות האותיות
°	§ 59	§ 8	°	°	§ 5b	§ 9	אילו תולדות האותיות
°	§ 60	°	°	°	§ 15a	§ 10	סדר הנקודות והטעמים
°	§ 61	°	°	°	§ 15b	§ 11	סדר בטוי המקרא
°	§ 62	°	°	°	§ 36a	§ 12	עשר נקודות אומץ המקרא
°	§ 37	°	°	°	§ 36b	§ 13	שער צירוף הרום
§ 27	§ 35	°	°	°	§ 11	§ 14	סדר שוא המשרת לכל האותיות
§ 28	°	§ 19	§ 21	§ 28	§ 55	§ 15	סדר התיבות בדגש ורפי
§ 29	§§ 34, 43	§ 9	§ 26	°	§ 29	§ 16	סימן אֶהָי אשר מראש קנויה
°	°	§ 10	§ 6	§ 6	§ 19	§ 17	סימן שילשלה ומארכה
°	°	§ 11	§ 8	§ 8	§ 20	§ 18	סימן חברה ומארכה
§ 19	§ 33	§ 12	§ 9	§ 9	§ 33	§ 19	סימן שתי אותות אשר בתיבה אחת
°	§ 90	§ 15	§ 13	§ 13	§ 21	§ 20	דרך אולה העולה היא למעלה
§ 20	§ 39	§ 13	°	§ 14	§ 53	§ 21	סימן לשון ברכה
°	°	§ 14	°	°	§ 18	§ 22	שער טעמים שמונה
°	°	°	§ 14	§ 15	§ 24	§ 23	סימן שלשת הספרים
°	°	°	§ 15	§ 16	§ 25	§ 24	סימן סוף הפסוקים
°	°	°	§ 16	§ 17	§ 26	§ 25	סימן לראשי הפסוקים
°	°	°	§ 17	§ 17b	§ 27	§ 26	סימן גרש ופתח בשלשה ספרים
§ 31	§ 36	°	°	°	§ 37	§ 27	סימן סמוך ומוכרת במקרא
§ 32	°	°	°	°	§ 39	§ 28	סימן סמוך ומוכרת בשתי נקודות
§ 35	°	°	§ 10	§ 10	§ 41	§ 29	סימן קָן וכן
§ 34	°	°	§ 11	§ 11	§ 42	§ 30	סימן אָת ואת
§ 33	°	°	°	°	§ 40	§ 31	סימן שלש נקודות ושתי נקודות
°	°	°	°	°	§ 56	§ 32	סימן למה ולמה רפי ודגש
°	°	°	°	°	§ 14	§ 51	כל לשון אבילה
°	°	°	°	°	§ 14	§ 50	כל לשון הליכה
§ 21	§ 51	°	°	°	§ 14	§ 50	כל לשון עשה
°	°	°	°	°	§ 14	§ 35	כל לשון הרבות
°	°	°	°	°	§ 14	§ 45	כל לשון מרכבה
§ 25	°	§ 20	°	°	§ 44	§ 37	סימן כָל וכל
°	°	°	§ 12	§ 12	§ 47	§ 38	דרך הניעיה בכל המקרא
°	°	°	§ 19	§ 19	§ 30	§ 39	סימן ריש אשר יצא בדגש
°	°	°	°	°	§ 7	§ 40	כל ויהיו ויירשו ניעיה ביד
§ 22	§ 88	§ 44	°	°	§ 31	§ 41	כל יוד דסמך ליה שוא
§ 23	§ 89	§ 56	°	°	§ 12	§ 42	

Table II. Additions in the Compilation of Drs. Baer and Strack.

Tzufut. No. 19	Tzufut. No. 17	Tzufut. No. 15	Orient. 15251	Editio princeps	MS. A.D. 1009	B. S.	
°	°	§ I	§ I	§ I	°	§ I	זה ספר מדקדוקי הטעמים
°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 6	דרך אהה'ע ארבע אותיות
°	°	§ 24	°	°	°	§ 8	סדר סוד התיבות אשר במקרא
°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 13	כל תיבה שבמקרא כמו לישראל
°	°	°	§§ 23, 24	§§ 30, 31	°	§ 14	יש סופרים דברי אמת מורים
°	°	§ 40	§§ 16, 18	§ 34	§ 25	°	§ 16 שנים עשר שמות הטעמים
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 22 שני מארכיין לטפחה
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 23 סימן אולה או שופר לפשטה
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 28 ביאור הפסק
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 32 כל לשון יראה נעיה
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 34 כל הקריה המדברים ונ'
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 38 כל מלה סמוכה בפתח ערוכה
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 43 סימן הם והם
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 46 כל צפריא דרניאל
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 48 סימן בכיל על חיית
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 49 סימן פתח בשער פעל
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 52 סימן לשון גרישה
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 54 כל קריה ויאמר דגש
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 57 י"ח מלין כנאיי סופרים
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 58 חמש עשרה נקודות
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 59 אלו אותיות תלויות
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 60 ואלו אותיות מנוורות
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 61a אלו אותיות גדולות
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 61b ואלו אותיות קטנות
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 62a י' מלין דקריין ולא כתיבן
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 62b וחלופיהו ח' מלין דכתבן ולא קריין
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 63 סדר קרי ולא כתיב
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 64 וזה פירוש כתיב ולא קרי
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 65 וזה הוא פירוש סתרי המקרא בחסיר
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	וביתר
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 66 ב"ה שמוי סימן
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 67 הפסקות בתורה
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 68 סכום הפסוקים
§ 18	§ 11	§ 37	°	°	°	°	

Taufut. No. 19	Taufut. No. 17	Taufut. No. 15	Orient. 15251	Editio princeps	MS. A.D.1009	B. S.	
°	°	°	°	§§ 50, 51	°	§ 69	הרא מסורתא דמסר דוסא
§ 36	°	°	°	°	°	°	מספר השנים של הספרים
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	סדר קמעות
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	סימן קמציץ ופתחין בקריה
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	הלץ לית כות' בקריה מלעז
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	וחלופיהון מלרע
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	סימן אל
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	וחלופיהון ... על
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	ממן כל קריאה שבתון ונו'
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	ממן כל קריאה דנן וחירש ונו'
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 76

Table III. From the Editio princeps.

Taufut. No. 19	Taufut. No. 17	Taufut. No. 15	Add. 15251	Editio princeps	MS. A.D.1009	B. S.	
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	א"ב מן כ"ב חד דלת וחד ריש
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	א"ב מן חד חד כת' כ וחד כת' ב
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	תיבה חד וקורין תרין
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	חילוף כת' תרין וקורין חד
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	א"ב מן חד חד כת' יו"ד באמ' תיב' וקי' וא"ו
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	וחלופ' א"ב מן חד חד כת' ו' באמ' תיב' וקי' "
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	סיג מלין מוקדם מאוחר
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	ה' וזנין מן ב' ב' חד כת' ה' בסו' תיב' וחד כת' "
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	י"ב וזנין מן ב' ב' חד כת' א' בסו' תיב' וחד כת' ה'
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	ט"ו דכת' מלה חדא וקי' תרין
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	נ' מלין תיב' קדמ' נסב תניני'
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	וחילופ' ב' מלין תניני' נסב מן קדמ'
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	ט"ו דכת' לא וקריין לו
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	פסקא דספרא אלה הדברים
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	פלונית' בן אשר וכן נפתלי בראשית
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	שמות " " "
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	ויקרא " " "
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 54

Taufut. No. 19	Taufut. No. 17	Taufut. No. 15	Add. 15251	Editio princeps	MS. A.D.1009	B. S.	
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	פלונית' בן אשר וכן נפתלי במדבר
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	רות " " "
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	שיר השירים " " "
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	קהלת " " "
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	קנות " " "
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	מנלה " " "
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	[דברים] " " "
°	°	°	°	°	°	°	§ 61

The above Tables disclose the following facts:

(1) With the exception of the Treatise in the St. Petersburg MS. of A. D. 1009, which occupies the first column, in Add. 15251, which occupies the fourth column and *editio princeps* in the third column, none of the Rubrics exhibited in the other four columns follow any explicable order.

(2) The Rubrics in question are simply so many divers parts of different Massorahs of the *Dikdukē Ha-Teamim* exhibited in column two, which Drs. Baer and Strack have arbitrarily taken out from sundry MSS. and different positions to fall in with their preconceived notions of an independent Treatise.

(3) Even now no two corresponding Rubrics absolutely agree in their wording of the theme discussed therein, and words and whole phrases have often to be taken from one recension and inserted into the other.

(4) The ascription on the part of the editors of the conglomerate Treatise exhibited in the second column to Ben-Asher is unjustifiable.

(5) The Rubrics therein represent portions of the Massorah which have been gradually developed from a period much earlier than Ben-Asher to a time much later than this textual critic.

(6) Many of the Rubrics exhibit various opinions about the vowel-points and accents propounded by different

Massoretic Schools before the vowel-points and accents assumed their present definite forms.

(7) As far as my collation of the numerous MSS. goes I can safely state that I have not found a single MS. which uniformly follows the rules about the vowel-points and accents propounded in the name of Ben-Asher in the Treatise which Drs. Baer and Strack have compiled and have named "*The Dikdukē Ha-Teamim of Ben-Asher*".

(8) If, therefore, Codices which in their Massoretic Appendices exhibit Rubrics ascribed to Ben-Asher, do not follow his rules in the text, it shows that either the rules do not belong to Ben-Asher or that they were not generally accepted and that the opinions of other Massoretic Schools were more popular. And

(9) It is most uncritical to correct the definite statements in the official Lists which tabulate the precise nature of the differences between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali by the uncertain utterances in these highly artificial Rubrics. The reverse process is far more critical. Any views expressed in the conglomerate Treatise which do not harmonise with the official Lists must not be taken as proceeding from Ben-Asher.

## Chap. XI.

### The Massorah; its Rise and Development.

The labours of the Massorites may be regarded as a later development and continuation of the earlier work which was carried on by the *Sopherim* (סופרים, γραμματεῖς) = the doctors and authorised interpreters of the Law soon after the return of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity (comp. Ezra VII 6; Neh. VIII 1 &c.). And though it is now impossible to describe in chronological order the precise work which these custodians of Holy Writ undertook in the new Commonwealth, it may safely be stated that the gradual substitution of the square characters for the so-called Phoenician or archaic Hebrew alphabet was one of the first tasks.

I. *The introduction of the square characters.* That the Old Testament was originally written in the characters which with some slight modifications have been retained by the Samaritans as exhibited on the Nablus Stone<sup>1</sup> is admitted in the Talmud. Nothing can be more plain than the declaration of the highest Talmudic authorities that the present square characters are an innovation and that the Old Testament was originally written in the *Raatz*, *Libonaah* or what is now called the Samaritan alphabet.

Thus the distinguished R. Nathan, who was in the College of R. Jehudah I (A. D. 140—163), and who compiled

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Rosen, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* XIV, 622 &c.. Leipzig 1860.

a collection of Halachoth known by the name of the Mishna or Tosephta of R. Nathan, declares "the Law was originally given in *Ratz* characters" with which his colleague R. Jose agreed.<sup>1</sup> Again Mar Ukba, the celebrated chief judge during the Patriarchate of R. Jehudah II A. D. 220—270 says:

"At first the Thora was given to Israel in Hebrew characters and in the sacred language, but in the time of Ezra they obtained it in the Assyrian [= square] characters and in the Aramaic language. At last the sages chose the Assyrian [= square] characters and the sacred language for the Israelites and left the Hebrew characters and the Aramaic language for the idiots. Now who are the idiots? R. Chasda says the Samaritans. What characters are the Hebrew? R. Chasda says the Libonaah characters."<sup>2</sup>

In accordance with these declarations we are told that the present square characters "are called Assyrian because the Jews brought them with them from Assyria".<sup>3</sup>

To invest it with authority this innovation, like many other changes, was ascribed to Ezra himself.

Thus R. Jose says Ezra was worthy that the Law should be given to Israel through his hand, were it not that Moses preceded him. For of Moses it is said: 'And Moses went up unto God' [Exod. XIX 3] and of Ezra it is said 'this Ezra went up from Babylon' [Ezra VII 6] Now as the expression 'went up' is used in the one case with reference to the giving of the Law, so it is in the other. Of Moses it is said 'and the Lord commanded me at that time, to teach you statutes and judgments' [Deut. IV 14], and of Ezra it is said 'for Ezra had prepared his heart to seek the Law of the Lord and

<sup>1</sup> תניא ר' יוסי אומר ראוי היה עזרא שתינתן תורה על ידו לישראל אילמלא לא

<sup>2</sup> בתחילה ניתנה תורה לישראל בכתב עברי ולשון הקודש חזרה וניתנה להם בימי עזרא בכתב אשורית ולשון ארמי ביררו להן לישראל כתב אשורית ולשון הקודש והניחו להדיוטות כתב עברית ולשון ארמית מאן הדיוטות אמר רב חסדא כותאי, מאן

<sup>3</sup> ולמה נקרא שמו אשורית . . . אמר רבי לוי על שם שעלה בידם מאשור;

*Jerusalem Megilla* I, 9; *Babylon Sanhedrin* 22a.

to do it, and to teach Israel statutes and judgments' [Ezra VII 10]. But though the Law was not given by him the writing was changed by him.<sup>1</sup>

Hence both Origen and St. Jerome who derived their information from their Jewish teachers, record the same thing. The former states: "They say that Ezra used other letters after the exile",<sup>2</sup> whilst the latter declares: "It is certain that Ezra the Scribe and teacher of the Law after Jerusalem was taken and the temple was restored under Zerubbabel, found other letters which we now use; since up to that time the characters of the Samaritans and of the Hebrews were the same".<sup>3</sup>

That the original characters of the Law should have been changed, and that the hated Samaritans should still be in possession of the sacred alphabet was, however, more than some of the patriotic Rabbins could endure. Hence we find R. Eliezer of Modin maintaining that the Law was given to Moses from the first in the Assyrian or the present square characters. He adduces as an argument for his declaration that in the square character alone can the name *Vav* for the sixth letter, denoting *hook* in Exod. XXVI 10 be justified, since it is only in the square character that the import of the name corresponds to the form of the letter, whilst there is no such correspondence in the

<sup>1</sup> תניא ר' יוסי אומר ראוי היה עזרא שתינתן תורה על ידו לישראל אילמלא לא קדמו משה, במשה הוא אומר ומשה עלה אל האלהים, בעזרא הוא אומר הוא עזרא עלה מבבל, מה עלייה האמור כאן תורה, אף עלייה האמור להלן תורה, במשה הוא אומר ואותי צוה יהוה בעת ההיא ללמד אתכם חקים ומשפטים, בעזרא הוא אומר כי עזרא הבין לבבו לדרוש את תורת יהוה אלהיו ולעשות וללמד בישראל חוק ומשפט, *Babylon Sanhedrin* 21 b; ואף על פי שלא ניתנה תורה על ידו, נשתנה על ידו הכתב; with *Jerusalem Megilla* I 9.

<sup>2</sup> φασί γὰρ τὸν Ἐσδραὺν ἑτέροις γράψασθαι μετὰ τὴν ἀλφαινωσίαν Monfaucou, *Hexapla* II 94.

<sup>3</sup> Certumque est Esdram scribam legisque doctorem, post capta Hierosolyima et instaurationem templi sub Zorobabel, alias litteras reperperisse, quibus nunc utimur, cum ad illud usque tempus iidem Samaritanorum et Hebraeorum characteres fuerint. *Prolog. Galeat. ad lib. Regum*.



Samaritan.<sup>1</sup> But as even some of the most zealous sages, who regarded this question from a dogmatical point of view, saw this opinion was contrary to the then ascertained facts they tried to harmonise both statements. Hence R. Jehudah I says: "The Thora was at first given to Israel in square characters, but when they sinned, the characters were changed into *Raatz* [= Samaritan], and when they repented in the days of Ezra the square characters were again restored to them as it is written: turn you to the strong-hold ye prisoners of hope, even to day will I restore to you the forgotten characters of the Mishna = the Law" (Zech. IX 12).<sup>2</sup> In accordance therewith R. Jehudah I and those Rabbins who deny that the square characters are Assyrian take אשורית to be an appellative and make it denote *the happy, the blissful, erect or beautiful characters*.

The fact that the old Hebrew characters were still current B. C. 139—40, that the Mishna and the Talmud find such frequent occasion to forbid their use for ritual writings,<sup>3</sup> that many of the mistakes in the Hebrew text itself, and that some of the variations between it and the Septuagint are distinctly traceable to a confusion of the letters which are similar in shape not only in the square characters, but in the old Hebrew = Phoenician, Palmyrene &c., shows most conclusively that all those alphabets which are simply tachygraphical and caligraphical variations of the same characters were simultaneously used and that the final conquest of the present letters over the rival alphabets was achieved slowly.

<sup>1</sup> תני רבי שמעון בן אלעזר אמר משום רבי אלעזר בן פרטא שאמר משום רבי לעזר המודעי כתב אשורי ניתנה התורה, ומה שעמא ווי העמודים שיהו ווים של תורה: *Jerusalem Megilla* I 9; *Babylon Sanhedrin* 22a.  
<sup>2</sup> רבי אומר אשורית ניתנה התורה וכשחטאו נהפך להן לרעץ וכשזכו בימי עזרא: *Jerusalem Megilla* I 9; *Babylon Sanhedrin* 22a.

<sup>3</sup> *Comp. Megilla* I 8; II 1, 2; *Yadaim* IV 5.

Judging from the mistakes which are to be found in the Hebrew MSS. produced by skilful and professional copyists during the middle ages despite the minute Massoretic directions, it is perfectly certain that the guild of Sopherim who were thus engaged in the delicate task of transcribing the text from the ancient alphabet into the square characters committed similar mistakes, especially when they had before them a script in which some of the letters resembled each other. It is therefore only natural to find that some of the errors in the present Hebrew text are due to the transcription. They may be rectified by going back to the old Hebrew characters where some letters are similar though they are dissimilar in the square alphabet. A few illustrations must suffice to establish this fact.

(1) The similarity of א = נ and א = ת.

That these two letters were not unfrequently mistaken because of their resemblance to each other is evident from the Septuagint transliteration of proper names. Thus the name אצבן *Ezbon* in Gen. XLVI 16, is *Θασοβέν* = תצבן in the Septuagint. There can be no doubt about it since the *Tav* (ת) is expressed in the Septuagint by θ as is evident from this very chapter where קהת *Kehath* in verse 11, is transliterated *Kaðθ*, אסנת *Asenath* in verse 20 is *Ἀσενεθ*, and נפתלי *Naphtali* in verse 23 is *Νεφθαλι*.

1 Sam. XXIV 10. The error here is due to the same cause. The text as it now stands is ותָּחַם עָלַיךְ *and, or but she spared thee*. As this yields no sense, both the Authorised Version and the Revised Version, following the example of the Vulgate, insert *mine eye* in italics. This, however, is contrary to the uniform usage of the verb. Besides the passage in question, חָוַם *to pity, to have compassion*, which is only used in the Kal, occurs twenty-three times. In eight instances it expresses the direct action of the person, viz.

*I, thou or he, spared or pitied*,<sup>1</sup> whilst in fifteen instances it describes *the sparing or pitying of the eye*.<sup>2</sup> Now in the passages where **חַוּם** *to pity*, is the predicate of the eye, *the eye* is invariably expressed. To supply it in this solitary passage is, therefore, contrary to the uniform usage. Hence there can hardly be any doubt that originally the text was **וְאָחַז** *but I spared thee*, and that the present reading is due to an exchange of *Aleph* (א) and *Tav* (ת). When it is borne in mind that the Septuagint, the Chaldee and the Syriac have actually the reading with *Aleph*, the mistake will not be questioned. In accordance with my principle not to introduce any alteration into the Massoretic text, I have retained **וְחָחַז** *but she spared*, in the text and given the ancient reading in the margin.

Jerem. III 8 is another instance of a mistake arising from the same source. The verse now stands in the Authorised Version as follows:

And I saw, when for all the causes whereby backsliding Israel committed adultery I had put her away, and given her a bill of divorce; yet her treacherous sister Judah feared not, but went and played the harlot also.

This is hardly intelligible. The prophet describes and contrasts the conduct of the two sisters Israel and Judah towards God, to whom they were both espoused. Israel had first gone astray and had been divorced for her unfaithfulness. But in spite of her guilt God was willing to forgive her and take her back if she would return. She refused, and as a punishment she was discarded. Now Judah who saw the treacherous conduct and the terrible sufferings of her sister, instead of taking warning thereby, defied all fear and acted in the same incontinent

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Jerem. XIII 14; XXI 7; Ezek. XXIV 14; Joel II 17; Jonah IV 10, 11; Ps. LXXII 13; Neh. XIII 22.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Gen. XLV 20; Deut. VII 16; XIII 9; XIX 13, 21; XXV 12; Isa. XIII 18; Ezek. V 11; VII 4, 9; VIII 18; IX 5, 10; XVI 5; XX 17.

manner. Hence because she saw that the terrible sufferings of her sister were inflicted upon her by her offended God for her wickedness and yet in the face of all this acted in the same faithless and shameless manner, Judah is denounced as worse than her sister Israel, who had gone astray before her, and had, therefore, no such fearful example and warning (comp. Jerem. III 11). Thus it is Judah's *seeing* her sister's conduct and punishment and not taking warning by them, which aggravated her guilt and it is upon *her seeing* all this that the stress is laid. To introduce God, therefore, as a new subject and to make Him say "and I saw" &c. is to mar the whole connection and flow of the passage. All this is obviated by restoring the *Tav* (ת) for the *Aleph* (א). It at once becomes plain that **וְחָרָא** *and she saw*, is the protasis and **וְחָלַךְ** *and she went*, is the apodosis. Accordingly the passage ought to be rendered:

Though she saw that for this very cause that backsliding Israel had committed adultery I had put her away and given her a bill of divorce, and treacherous Judah her sister feared not yet she went and she also played the harlot.

The Vulgate is the only version which exhibits this sense and the Revised Version exhibits it in the margin.

Ezra VI 4 exhibits a reverse instance, inasmuch as the *Aleph* (א) has here been mistaken for *Tav* (ת). According to the present text we are told that Cyrus commanded the Temple to be built

with three rows of great stones and a row of *new* timber

thus implying that otherwise the builders would use *old* timber. To say nothing of the want of dignity implied in such a decree, any one looking at the construction of the two clauses of this passage in the original will see that the *Aleph* has here been mistaken for *Tav* and that the sentence is:

נרבכין די אבן גלל תלהא  
ונרבך די אע חרא

rows of great stones three  
and row of timber one.

The Septuagint has preserved the original reading and the Revised Version exhibits it in the margin.

(2) The similarity of  $\aleph = \text{י}$  and  $\aleph = \text{צ}$  accounts for another class of errors.

Exod. XIV 2, 9. It is owing to this cause that the proper name החירת *Hachiroth*, which occurs three times, is twice rendered in the Septuagint by  $\xi\pi\alpha\nu\lambda\omega$  = החצרת *the village* (Exod. XIV 2, 9), taking the *Yod* for *Tzadi*. This is evident from the fact that  $\xi\pi\alpha\nu\lambda\omega$  not only is the Septuagint equivalent for החצרת in Exod. VIII 9, but is the translation of חצר in no fewer than nineteen passages.<sup>1</sup>

In Isa. XI 15 we have the phrase בעים רוחו which by simple conjecture is usually translated *with his mighty wind*. But the word עים does not occur in the Hebrew or in the cognate languages. It is now generally admitted that as the *Yod* and *Tzadi* are alike in the ancient Hebrew, the text originally had בעצם רוחו.

(3) The similarity of  $\daleth = \text{נ}$  and  $\daleth = \text{פ}$ .

Ezek. XXII 20. In accordance with the present Hebrew text, this passage is rendered both in the Authorised Version and in the Revised Version:

As they gather silver, and brass, and iron, and lead, and tin, into the midst of the furnace, to blow the fire upon it, to melt it: so will I gather you in mine anger and in my fury and I will leave you there, and melt you

It will be seen that in the first part of the verse three verbs are used, viz. *gather*, *blow* and *melt* (קבץ, נפח, נתך), and it is, therefore, only natural to expect, that the same

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Levit. XXV 31; Josh. XIII 23, 28; XV 44, 47; XIX 8, 38, 39; Isa. XLII 11; LXII 9; Neh. XI 25, 30; XII 29; 1 Chron. IV 32, 33; VI 41; IX 22; 25.

three verbs will be repeated in the second part of the comparison. Instead of this only two are repeated, viz. *gather* (קבץ) the first and *melt* (נתך) the third, whilst for the second *to blow* (נפח) we have the tame expression *leave you* or *lay you* as the Revised Version has it, which mars the rhythm and parallelism. It is, therefore, certain that the original *Pe* was mistaken for *Nun* and that יהנחתי *and I will leave*, should be והפחתי *and I will blow*. This is, moreover, corroborated by the next verse, where the statement is repeated and where the three verbs in question are properly given. So glaringly does this mistake disturb the evenness of the passage that Houbigant, without knowing the cause of the error, actually adopts the reading והפחתי *and I will blow*, and Bishop Newcome in his translation of Ezekiel renders it:

So will I gather you in mine anger, and in my fury, and I will blow upon you and melt you.

These few instances must suffice to indicate the great advantages which may accrue to Biblical criticism by a careful re-transcription of some of the difficult passages in the present square characters into the archaic script. Hassencamp and Luzzatto<sup>1</sup> have shown the way in this direction, but as yet few have followed it. The question, however, about the development of the present square characters from the earlier Phoenician and their introduction into the Hebrew Bible, has been most ably discussed by scholars both at home and abroad. The Treatises on this points, which are most accessible to students will be found in the foot-note.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Hassencamp, *Commentatio Philologico-Critica de Pentateucho LXX &c.*, p. 57 &c., Marburg 1765; Luzzatto, in Kirchheim's *Karme Shomron*, p. 106 &c.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Gesenius, *Geschichte der hebräischen Sprache und Schrift*, p. 137 &c., Leipzig 1815; Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Vol. II,

The probable period during which this change was effected may be ascertained from the fact that the Samaritan Pentateuch which the Samaritans received from the Jews *circa* 430 B. C. was still written in Phoenician characters and that these characters were in use when Simon struck the first Jewish coins in 141 B. C. As some of the variations in the Septuagint are undoubtedly due to the similarity of the letters in the Phoenician, and others are traceable to the square characters, the struggle for the victory between these two scripts must have continued for several centuries. It was not till the time of our Lord that the Aramaic characters finally prevailed over the ancient alphabets. This is evident from St. Matth. V 18 where the letter *Yod* (י) is described as the smallest in the alphabet, since this is inapplicable to the old Hebrew.

II. *The division of the consonants into words.* — Having transliterated the text, the next function of the official redactors would naturally be the division of the consonants into separate words in accordance with the sense traditionally assigned to the respective documents. Like the work of transliteration, the process of the word-division was a gradual one and probably extended over several centuries after the Babylonish captivity. From this part of the Sopheric labours we definitely learn that the doctors of the Law who were periodically engaged in this task had different traditions about the meaning of certain passages and hence divided some words differently. This fact is revealed to us in the Massorah itself which has transmitted to us two or four Lists of words divided differently according to the School of Massorites whence

p. 76 &c.; Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden II* 11, p. 400 etc., Leipzig 1876; Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew text of the Books of Samuel*, p. IX &c., Oxford 1890; Neubauer, *The Introduction of the square characters in Biblical MSS.* &c. in the *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, p. 1 &c., Oxford 1891.

they proceed.<sup>1</sup> These Lists, however, contain only typical examples and there is no doubt that there were many more such instances.

Incidentally we learn that 1 Kings XX 33 exhibits another instance about the division of which the different Schools of Massorites held different opinions. In this case we are distinctly told that the Western redactors divided the words in question one way, whilst the Easterns divided them differently. And though the records of other Schools have not come down to us, we know that the redaction of the Hebrew text from which the Septuagint translation was made exhibited a large number of passages in which the words were otherwise divided.<sup>2</sup> This shows that about 200 B. C. the School from which the present word-division proceeds had not as yet established its authority over the rival Schools of textual critics.

III. *The introduction of the Final Letters.* — As a consequence of their anxiety to indicate more definitely the separation of some words and especially biliteral particles<sup>3</sup> which were more liable to be read together with other vocables, the Sopherim introduced the double or five final letters. The gradual development of these letters we learn from a somewhat obscure anecdote in the Jerusalem Talmud which is as follows:

Now as to the double letters in the alphabet the copyist must write the initial letters at the beginning of words and in the middle of words and the finals at the end. If he reverses them the Codex is illegal. It was said in the name of R. Matthew b. Charash מנצפך [= the five final letters] are a law of Moses from Sinai. What is מנצפך? R. Jeremiah said in the name of R. Samuel who said it in the name of R. Isaac, they are what the Seers instituted [מנצפך = מן צפך from thy Seers]. Who are the Seers? It happened

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter כ, §§ 482, 483, Vol. II, p. 54, and *vide supra* p. 158 &c.

<sup>2</sup> *Vide supra* p. 159.

<sup>3</sup> e. g. אָךְ, אַם, אִין מן אָךְ &c.

that in a very rainy day the sages did not assemble in the college and that the disciples did assemble. Whereupon they said let us constitute the college that it should not drop. They then said why is it that the Scriptures have two Mem, two Nun, two Tzadis, two Pes and two Caphs? To indicate that the Law was given by God speaking to Moses, and Moses speaking to Israel [the *ממ* being abbreviations of *מאמר מאמר*], the Faithful One to the faithful one [נאמן נאמן = ננ], by the Righteous One to the righteous [צדיק צדיק = צצ], by the Mouth to the mouth [פה פה = פפ], by the hand of the Holy One, blessed be He, to the hand of Moses [כה כה = ככ]. The sages took notice of these disciples, who afterwards became distinguished men and it is said that R. Eliezer and R. Joshua were of them.<sup>1</sup> (*Jerusalem Megilla* I 9).

The whole of this anecdote shows that these double letters were then still a novelty and that they had not as yet finally established themselves. As R. Eliezer and R. Joshua lived at the end of the first century and at the beginning of the second century of the present era we cannot be wrong in concluding that these sages then determined to enact that the double letter should be adopted uniformly in writing the sacred Scriptures. As to the story in the Babylon Talmud that the *צופים Seers*, are the Prophets, that these did not discover the double letters, but simply resuscitated them, and that they were originally given to Moses on Sinai, but that they had been forgotten in the course of time,<sup>2</sup> this is manifestly designed to impart to the new invention a divine and most ancient authority and is glaringly like the story about the square

כל האותות הכפולים באלף בית כותב הראשונים בתחילת התיבה ובאמצע התיבה ואת האחרונים בסופה, ואם שינה פסל, משם ר' מתיה בן הרש אמרו מנצפך הלכה למשה מסיני, מהו מנצפך ר' ירמיה בשם ר' שמואל ר' יצחק מה שהתקינו לך הצופים, מאן אינון אלין צופין, מעשה ביום סנירר שלא נכנסו חכמים לבית הועד ונכנסו התינוקות, אמרין איתון נעבד בית וועדא דלא יבטל, אמרין מהו דין דכתיב מים מים, נוין נוין, צדי צדי, פיה פיה, כף כף, ממאמר למאמר, מנאמן לנאמן, מצדיק לצדיק, מפה לפה, מכף ידו של הקב"ה לכף ידו של משה, וסיימו אותן חכמים ועמדו כולן בני אדם גדולים אמרו ר' ליעזר ור' יהושע הוון מינהון.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. *Sabbath* 104; *Megilla* 2b—3a.

characters.<sup>1</sup> The explanation, however, of the Jerusalem Talmud which makes the Double Letters the basis of, or rather the mnemonic sign for the giving of the Law on mount Sinai is not the only one which obtained currency among the ancients. The Massorah takes the Five Double Letters as setting forth the deliverance of the Patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the redemption of Israel, the advent of the Messiah the Branch of Righteousness.<sup>2</sup>

IV. *The introduction of the matres lectionis.* — To facilitate still further the study of the unpointed consonants on the part of the laity, the Scribes gradually introduced into the text the *matres lectionis* which also served as vowel-letters.<sup>3</sup> But in this branch of their labours as is the case in the other branches, the different Schools which were the depositories of the traditions as to the import of the text, exhibited considerable diversity of opinion owing to the fact that the traditions themselves were not uniform. So great indeed was this diversity of opinion about the respective traditions and the import of the text of Scripture *circa* 300 B. C. that it gave rise to the division of the people into the two national sects the Pharisees and the Sadducees. These were not only the custodians of the diverse ancestral traditions, but of the Bible. They were the official interpreters and redactors of the text in accordance with the views of which their Schools were the representatives. It is, therefore, most important to ascertain what the condition of the consonantal text was on which these different Schools laboured and into which the Sopherim introduced the above-named changes in order to aid the laity in studying the Scriptures. But here we are faced with the difficulty arising from

<sup>1</sup> *Vide supra* p. 290.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter *ק*, § 228, Vol. I, pp. 36, 37.

<sup>3</sup> *Vide supra* p. 137—157.

the fact that not a single MS. of the Hebrew text has survived which is of a date prior to the Christian era. We are, therefore, deprived of the direct MS. authority to tell us what the actual consonants were which the Sopherim transliterated into the square characters, which they divided into separate words and into which they introduced the Final Letters and the quiescent or vowel-letters, in accordance with the traditions deposited in their respective Schools.

**V. *The consonants of the Hebrew Text and the Septuagint.*** —

In the absence, however, of any MS. of the Apostolic age we have providentially the Greek Version which was made by the Jews *circa* 250—200 B. C. This Version certainly shows what was the *amount*, and approximately also indicates what were the consonants of the Hebrew text which obtained in some of the Schools at that period. But before we accept its testimony it will be necessary to examine into the character which this Version bore and what were the opinions which the Spiritual authorities of the Synagogue who had the custody and the redaction of the Hebrew original expressed about this Version. The story of the origin of this Greek translation is told in the so-called Epistle of Aristeas and is briefly as follows:

Aristeas a Pagan, chief officer of the guards, and friend of Ptolemy Philadelphus (285—247 B. C.) writes to his brother Philocrates that he together with Andreas had been despatched by the king as ambassadors with a letter to Eleazar the high priest of Jerusalem to send to Alexandria seventy-two of the most learned men, six of each tribe, to translate for the Royal Library the Divine Law, out of the Hebrew into Greek. To secure this favour from the high priest, Ptolemy not only liberated 100,000 Jewish slaves, whom his father Ptolemy Lagos carried with him to Egypt, and paid 660 talents to their owners, but sent the following presents to Jerusalem. For the Temple, vessels of silver, value seventy talents; vessels of gold, value fifty talents; precious stones to embellish these vessels, value two hundred and fifty talents of gold. For sacrifices and other uses of the Temple one hundred talents.

At the receipt of the royal letter and the munificent presents, Eleazar dispatched seventy-two elders, six of each tribe, with a letter to Ptolemy and a present of his own copy of the Law written in letters of gold. After their arrival, and being feasted and toasted for seven days, during which these elders had to answer seventy-two questions, they were conducted by Demetrius to a superb mansion over the Heptastadium, where they executed the Version in exactly seventy-two days, when Demetrius wrote it down from their dictation. Demetrius then read the Version before the whole assembly of the Jews, who declared it to be an exact and faithful translation. Whereupon a copy of it was made in the presence of the seventy-two interpreters for the rulers of the synagogue; and the Jews, by the desire of Demetrius invoked an imprecation upon any one who should at any time make an alteration in the Version. It was then read over to the king, who was profoundly impressed with the sublimity of its contents and enquired why the poets and historians of other nations did not mention it. To which Demetrius replied that they dared not do it, because the Law is divine, and that the historian Theopompus and the poet Theodectes, who attempted to incorporate it in their writings, were afflicted by God, the one with the loss of his senses, and the other with the loss of his eye-sight. When the king heard this he worshipped God, commanded that the Version should be taken care of, gave each of the seventy-two interpreters three changes of the finest garments, two talents of gold, a cup of one talent, the entire furniture of a room, and sent to Eleazar ten tables with silver feet, and the apparatus thereunto, a cup of thirty talents, and ten changes of garments. Thus loaded with presents the seventy-two interpreters went back to Jerusalem.<sup>1</sup>

It is now generally admitted that this Epistle which was written about 80. B. C. is apocryphal. Still it was accepted at the time by the official custodians of the Hebrew Scripture both in Palestine and Babylon as based upon current tradition. Philo not only believed in it,<sup>2</sup> but states that the Jews of Egypt up to his time annually celebrated the day on which the Septuagint was finished, and Josephus almost reproduces the story of Aristeas.<sup>3</sup> The Babylon Talmud, which describes the origin of the

<sup>1</sup> A Critical edition of the Greek text of the Epistle of Aristeas by M. Schmidt appeared in Merx's *Archiv*, I 241 &c., Halle 1870.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. *Vita Mosis*, lib II, § 5—7; ed. Mangey II 138—141.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. *Anliq.* XII 2; *Contra Apion*. II, 4.

Greek Version, distinctly declares that it was composed under divine guidance and that in accordance with divine inspiration the seventy-two translators introduced into it certain variations from the Hebrew original as will be seen from the following:

Our Teachers only allowed the Scriptures to be translated into Greek. R. Jehudah said when the Teachers allowed Greek it was only the Pentateuch, and that because of a certain occurrence with respect to king Ptolemy. For we have propounded: It came to pass that king Ptolemy assembled seventy-two elders and placed them respectively in seventy-two cells and did not disclose to them why he had assembled them. He then went to each one separately and said to him: Translate me the Law of Moses your teacher. Whereupon the Holy One, blessed be He, inspired the heart of each of them so that they all came to the same opinion and made the following alterations: (1) Gen. I 1; (2) Gen. I 26; (3) Gen. II 3; (4) Gen. V 2; (5) Gen. XI 7; (6) Gen. XVIII 12; (7) Gen. XLIX 6; (8) Exod. IV 20; (9) Exod. XII 40; (10) Exod. XXIV 5; (11) Exod. XXIV 11; (12) Numb. XVI 15; (13) Deut. IV 19; (14) Deut. XVII 3; and (15) Levit. XI 6; Deut. XIV 7.<sup>1</sup>

The Version then on which the official custodians of the Sacred original bestowed such high praise exhibits two striking features. It is both slavishly literal in some parts and seriously departs from the present Hebrew in other

רבותינו לא התירו שיכתבו אלא יונית. ותניא אמר ר' יהודה אף כשהתירו רבותינו יונית לא התירו אלא בספר תורה ומשום מעשה דתלמי המלך דתניא מעשה בתלמי המלך שכינס ע"ב זקנים והניסין בעיב בתים ולא גילה להם על מה כינסן ונכנס אצל כל אחד ואחד ואמר להם כתבו לי תורה משה רבכם נתן הקב"ה בלב כל אחד ואחד עצה והסכימו כולן לדעת אחת וכתבו לו אלהים ברא בראשית, אעשה אדם בצלם ובדמות, ויכל ביום הששי וישבות ביום השביעי, זכר ונקבה בראו, ולא כתבו בראם, הבה ארדה ואבלה שם שפתח, ותצחק שרה בקרוביה, כי באפם הרגו שור וברצונם עקרו אבום, ויקח משה את אשתו ואת בניו וירכיבם על נושא בני אדם, ומושב בני ישראל אשר ישבו במצרים ובשאר ארצות שלשים שנה וארבע מאות שנה, וישלח את זמטוי בני ישראל, ואל זמטוי בני ישראל לא שלח ידו, לא חמד אחד מהם נשאתי, אשר חלק ה' אלהיך אותם להאיר לכל העמים, וילך ויעבד אלהים אחרים אשר לא צויתו לעבדם, וכתבו לו את צעירת הרגלים ולא כתבו לו את הארנבת מפני שאשתו של תלמי ארנבת שמה שלא

Comp. *Babylon Megilla* 9a; *Jerusalem Megilla* I 9; *Mechilta*, Exod. XII 40; p. 15b ed. Friedmann. For the import and cause of these alterations see the Appendix to this Introduction.

parts. In some parts it not only follows the Hebrew order, but reproduces the smallest particles and the peculiar idioms, to such an extent that it can easily be retranslated into Hebrew without changing the order of the words. Thus for instance Gen. XXIV 1:

<i>Καὶ Ἀβραὰμ ἦν πρεσβύτερος</i>	ואברהם זקן
<i>προβεβηκώς ἡμερῶν</i>	בא בימים
<i>καὶ Κύριος ἠλόγησε</i>	ויהוה ברך
<i>τὸν Ἀβραὰμ κατὰ πάντα</i>	את אברהם

On the other hand in the midst of literal translations we meet renderings which seriously deviate from the present Hebrew text. A striking illustration of this kind is to be found in Gen. XLI 48. Here the Septuagint translates it:

and he gathered all the food of the seven years, in which was  
the plenty in the land of Egypt

whereas the Hebrew which is properly translated in the Authorised Version is:

and he gathered up all the food of the seven years, which were  
in the land of Egypt.

The most cursory examination of the Hebrew text shows that something has dropped out of it and that the Septuagint has preserved that which is missing. The Greek Version, moreover, is easily retranslated into Hebrew and restores the lacuna, viz.

*τῶν ἐπιτὰ ἐτῶν ἐν οἷς ἦν ἡ εὐθηνία ἐν τῇ γῆ Αἰγύπτου·*  
שבע השנים אשר היה השקבע בארץ מצרים

That the deviation of the Septuagint has here preserved the text which obtained in those days in one School of textual redactors is corroborated by the Samaritan. The Samaritan recension has the very words which the retranslation of the Greek into Hebrew exhibits. We thus see that *circa* 200 B. C. the different Schools had different redactions. Moreover, from the fact that the Septuagint was held in such high estimation it is evident

that the Hebrew recension from which it was made was then recognised as one of these redactions. The authoritative custodians of the traditions had not as yet decided to issue one uniform text.

Several important events, however, in the development of the Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine now called for a uniform standard of the Sacred text. The people were distracted by their rulers who alternately represented the tenets of Pharisaism and Sadduceeism, each claiming to be the representatives and rightful interpreters of Holy Writ. Alexander Janai, a Sadducee, was succeeded by Queen Salome, whose sympathies were with the Pharisees; she again was succeeded by Aristobulus II, a Sadducee; and he again was followed by his brother Hyrkanus II, who favoured the Pharisees. For an exact parallel we have to go to the commencement of the Reformation in England. England was in like manner distracted by the vacillation of Henry VIII, who one day became the defender of the Roman Catholic faith and another day espoused the cause of Protestantism; by the alternate powers of More, Fisher and Gardiner and Cromwell and Cranmer; by Mary, who succeeded to the throne after the good Protestant Edward VI. As it happened in Palestine so it was in England, a standard text or Version was produced in almost every reign, till at last the recognised authorities fixed upon one which met with general acceptance.

Another great event in the Jewish Commonwealth which contributed to bring about the same result was the establishment of public Schools throughout the country. Simon b. Shetach (80 B. C.) introduced Upper Schools or academies in every large provincial town and ordained that all young men from the age of sixteen were to visit them.<sup>1</sup> At the age of five, moreover, every boy had to

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *Jer. Kelhuboth* VIII 11.

learn to read the Bible.<sup>1</sup> As a consequence it was strictly enacted that the greatest care was to be taken that the copies of the sacred books from which the Sopherim imparted instruction should be accurately written.<sup>2</sup> It is to these facts that Josephus refers when he declares "our principal care of all is to educate our children".<sup>3</sup>

The institution of reading the Pentateuch in triennial and annual Pericopes in every Synagogue with the corresponding lessons from the Prophets and the Hagiographa,<sup>4</sup> as well as the extensive use of the Psalter in the Temple service also contributed to the necessity of producing a uniform and standard text. The Sabbath lessons were respectively divided into seven small sections which were read by seven different people who were called up to the rostrum by the congregation or its chief to perform this function.<sup>5</sup> It would, therefore, have occasioned the greatest confusion in mind of the reader and indeed have shaken his faith, if the few verses which he had to read in one Synagogue exhibited one text, whilst the same portion which he should happen to read in another Synagogue disclosed a different recension.

These combined circumstances imposed the responsible task upon the official custodians of the sacred text to undertake a thorough sifting of the various traditions, to collate the different recensions, and to give to the laity an authorised Bible. This redaction is substantially the same which we now possess. It was primarily directed against the MSS. which exhibited the recension from

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *Aboth* V 21.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. *Pesachim* 12a.

<sup>3</sup> Josephus, *Contra Apion.* I 12.

<sup>4</sup> Comp. *Acts* XV 21; Josephus, *Contra Apion.* II 17; *Mishna, Megilla* IV 4.

<sup>5</sup> Comp. *Mishna, Megilla* IV 2.



which the Septuagint Version was made, as well as against the Hebrew text of the Samaritans. The original MSS. which belonged to these Schools and which at that period could not have been many, were readily disposed of by consigning them to the sacred receptacle called the *Geniza*.<sup>1</sup> But the Greek Version itself, like the Samaritan recension, was beyond the control of the Sopherim, and hence could not be destroyed. To meet this emergency it was declared that it was not made by the seventy-two elders representing every tribe of the whole Jewish nation, but by five and that the day on which it was made was as calamitous to Israel as the day on which the golden calf was substituted for the true God, because the Torah cannot adequately be reproduced in a translation.<sup>2</sup> This anathema was afterwards emphasised by describing its accomplishment as a national calamity which was preceded by three days of darkness and by placing the day on which it was finished among the other *dies nefasti* on the eighth of *Tebeth*.<sup>3</sup> It was during the period, therefore, which intervened between the ascription of divine authority to the Septuagint and its being publicly anathematised that the present *textus receptus* was being gradually developed and redacted by the Sopherim or the authorised custodians of the ancestral traditions. The portions of the Hebrew Scriptures which diverged most in the recension used by the translators of the Septuagint from the redaction put forth by the Sopherim are Samuel, Jeremiah, Proverbs, Job, Esther and Daniel. These were probably the primary

<sup>1</sup> *Vide supra* p. 156.

<sup>2</sup> מעשה בחמשה זקנים שכתבו לתלמי המלך את התורה יזנית והיה היום קשה לישראל כיום שנעשה בו העגל שלא היתה התורה יכולה להתרנם כל צרכה: *Massechet Sepher Torah* I; *Sopherim* I 7.

<sup>3</sup> כשמונה בטבת נכתבה התורה יזנית בימי תלמי המלך ובא חושך לעולם נ' ימים  
Comp *Hatachoth Gedoloth Taanith* printed at the end of *Megillath Taanith*.

cause for the activity of the spiritual authorities to issue a uniform and standard text.

The post-canonical authoritative Jewish writings record sundry rules by which the Sopherim were guided in the redaction of the text. Some of these canons are now an integral part of the Massorah, whilst others which are of supreme importance have only been preserved in the Talmud and in the Midrashim. These records reveal to us the reasons why certain letters, words, phrases and whole sections have an abnormal appearance both in the Massoretic MSS. and in the printed text; why some expressions and proper names in parallel passages are apparently at variance with each other. It is, therefore, necessary to remark at the outset that these Sopherim were not simply copyists. They were the authorised revisers of the text. They not only decided which books are canonical, but which of the various readings are to be inserted into the text and which are to be put into the margin, which and in what manner certain of the Divine names are to be guarded against irreverence and which of the names of idols are to be stigmatized, which of the cacophonous expressions are to be changed into euphemisms &c. &c.

One of the classical passages which record the functions of the Sopherim in this respect is to be found in the Babylon Talmud (*Nedarim* 37*b*—38*a*) and is as follows:<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> מקרא סופרים ועיטור סופרים וקריין ולא כתיבן וכתובין ולא קריין הלכה למשה מסיני מקרא סופרים ארץ ארץ שמים מצרים עיטור סופרים אחר תעבורו אחר תלך אחר האסף קדמו שרים אחר נוגנים. צדקתך כהררי אל קריין ולא כתיבן פרת דבלכתו איש דכאשר ישאל איש בדבר האלהים באים דנבנתה לה דפליטה את דהגד הוגד אלי דהגורן אלי דהשעורים הלין קריין ולא כתיבן וכתובין ולא קריין נא דיסלח ואת דהמצוה ידרוך דהרוך חמש דפאת נגב אם דכי נואל הלין כתיבן ולא קריין: Comp. also *Sopherim* VI 8, 9; *The Massorah*, letter ע, § 274; Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel* (whose corrections of the text I follow), p. 251 &c., Breslau 1857.

The pronunciation fixed by the Sopherim, the cancelling [of *Vav*] by the Sopherim, words read which are not written in the text, and *vice versa* words written in the text which are cancelled in reading, are a law of Moses on Sinai [= according to a very ancient tradition]. The pronunciation fixed by the Sopherim are for example אֶרֶץ *land, country*, which is pronounced אָרֶץ when preceded by the article, i. e. הָאָרֶץ *the land*, שָׁמַיִם *heaven*, מִצְרַיִם *Egypt* &c. [which have a dual form without being duals]. The cancelling [of *Vav*] by the Sopherim is to be found four times in the word אַחֲרַי *after*, viz. Gen. XVIII 5; XXIV 55; Numb. XXXI 2; Ps. LXVIII 26; in מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ *thy righteousness* (Ps. XXXVI 7) &c. Words read which are not written in the text are פְּרַת *Euphrates* (2 Sam. VIII 3), אִישׁ *a man* (2 Sam. XVI 23), בָּאִים *they are coming* (Jerem. XXXI 38), לָהּ *to her* (Jerem. L 29), אֵת (Ruth II 11), אֵלַי *to me* (Ruth III 5, 17). These words are read though they are not in the text. The following words on the contrary are written in the text, but are cancelled in reading, נָא *I pray* (2 Kings V 18); וְאֵת *and* (Jerem. XXXII 11); יִרְדֶּךָ *let him bend* (Jerem. LI 3); חֲמִשׁ *five* (Ezek. XLVIII 16); אִם *if* (Ruth III 12). These words are written in the text, but are cancelled in reading.

I. *Mikra Sopherim*. — The first rule which relates to the pronunciation of certain forms is simply grammatical and does not constitute a difference of opinion between the Schools of redactors.

II. *Itur Sopherim* (עֲטוּר סוֹפְרִים). — The second canon, however, which is called *Itur Sopherim* does affect the text inasmuch as it authoritatively declares that the words in question are to be read without the *Vav* conjunctive. The rule is manifestly directed against the recensions of the other Schools and notably against the Septuagint and Samaritan which read these words with the *Vav* conjunctive as may be seen from my notes on these passages. In common with the majority of the Massoretic MSS. and the editions, I have given the reading of the Sopherim in the text and the alternative reading in the margin, where the student will find the textual reading in each case described as being one of the *Itur Sopherim*. It will be seen that the record here does not specify the number of passages

which come within this denomination. We must, therefore, not take it for granted that these are all the instances which exhibit the variations between the different Schools as to the presence or absence of the *Vav* conjunctive. The notes in my edition of the Massoretic text on Gen. XXXI 36; XLVII 11; Exod. XVII 2, 10; XXII 29; XXIII 13, 28; XXIV 20; Levit. XX 18; Numb. VIII 4; Deut. XIV 16 &c. &c., show, beyond doubt, that the differences in the Schools comprised a much larger number and that the instances mentioned under the *Itur Sopherim* are simply typical examples. Later Massorites, however, mistook these typical instances for an exhaustive List and hence added the heading to this Rubric *four words* or *five words* are &c.<sup>1</sup>

III. *Words read which are not written in the text* (קְרִיין וְלֹא כְתִיבֵן). — The third category consists of words which according to the Sopherim have dropped out of the text and which are to be supplied in reading. They are as follows:

(1) 2 Sam. VIII 3. — From the fact that the Sopherim simply direct us to supply the word פְּרַת *Euphrates* in reading, but did not themselves insert it into the text, it is evident that it was absent in the MSS. which obtained in their Schools. The textual reading בְּנֵהָר *the River*, with the article was quite intelligible. There could be no question that it denotes the Euphrates, since it is so used in this very book.<sup>2</sup> Some redactors, however, added פְּרַת *Euphrates*, to make it more explicit and hence this reading was exhibited in some MSS. As this is actually the textual reading in the parallel passage in 1 Chron. XVIII 3 the Sopherim direct that the two passages are to be made

<sup>1</sup> מִלִּין עֲטוּר סוֹפְרִים comp. *The Massorah*, letter ע, § 274, Vol. II, p. 384.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. 2 Sam. X 16; also Gen. XXXI 21; Exod. XXIII 31; Ps. LXXII 8 &c.

uniform. This is the cause why the expression פָּרַת *Euphrates*, has found its way into the text here in some MSS., editions and ancient Versions as will be seen from the note in my edition of the Bible. The Authorised Version has also inserted it into the text, whilst the Revised Version relegates it to the margin.

(2) 2 Sam. XVI 23. — The text as it now stands denotes: "And the counsel of Ahithophel, which he counselled was in those days, as if he inquired at the oracle [or word] of God." According to another recension, however, there was the expression אִישׁ *a man, any one* &c., in the text after the verb יִשְׁאַל *he inquired*, and the passage is, therefore, to be translated: "And the counsel of Ahithophel which he counselled in those days was as if a man [or any one] had inquired at the oracle of God." This reading is exhibited in some MSS., in several of the early editions and in the ancient Versions. The Authorised Version which follows the *Keri* in the former passage without taking any notice of the *Kethiv* [= textual reading], consistently does the same thing here, whereas the Revised Version which on the contrary follows the *Kethiv* [= the textual reading] in the former passages and relegates the *Keri* to the margin, inconsistently inserts the *Keri* here into the text and takes no notice whatever of the *Kethiv* [= the textual reading].

(3) Jerem. XXXI 38. — Here the ancient redactors state that the word בָּאִים *are coming*, has dropped out of the text and direct us to supply it in reading, but they themselves do not insert it into the text though its omission in this common phrase is most glaring. It is, however, in the text of many MSS., several of the early editions and in the ancient Versions as will be seen from the note in my edition of the Bible. The cause of its omission here is very instructive inasmuch as it throws light

on similar omissions elsewhere. On looking at the text it will be seen that the word בָּאִים = בָּאִים *are coming*, and the expression נָאִם *saieth*, are extremely alike. Hence when the Scribe had written one and looked up again at his prototype he naturally thought he had already copied both and proceeded with the text.

(4) Jerem. L 29. — The variation here is simply recensional and does not affect the sense of the passage. According to the *Kethiv* [= the textual reading] the phrase literally means "let there be no escape", i. e. let none escape, whereas according to the *Keri* we are to supply in reading the expression לָהּ *unto her*, which makes it "let there be *unto her* no escape". This variant is manifestly due to the difficulty felt by the later redactors in combining the masculine verb יְהִי with the feminine noun פְּלִיטָה *escape, deliverance*, especially in the face of verse 26 which is undoubtedly the cause of the alternative reading. But it is well known that when the verb precedes the noun it does not always conform to it in gender (comp. Deut. XXXII 38 &c.). It is to be remarked that the Septuagint and Vulgate which follow the *Kethiv* or the older recension read here פְּלִיטָה *her escape*.

(5) Ruth II 11. — Here too the variation does not affect the sense of the passage, but is simply dialectical. According to the *Kethiv* it is simply כֹּל *all*, and the *Keri* directs us to supply the accusative particle אֶת before כֹּל and read אֶת-כֹּל. Though this is here distinctly given as one of the passages in which a word is to be supplied in reading it is not included in the Massoretic Rubric on this subject. The Massorah, however, describes the absence and presence of the particle in question as constituting one of the differences between the Western and Eastern recensions of the text. This is duly recorded in the note on this passage in my edition of the Bible.

(6) Ruth III 5. — The two recensions exhibited here affect the expression אֵלַי *unto me*. According to the *Kethiv* it is simply "all that thou sayest", whilst the *Keri* directs us to insert in reading the word אֵלַי *unto me*, i. e. "all that thou sayest *unto me*". The former recension without the expression *unto me*, is preserved in some MSS., in the Septuagint and in the Vulgate, the latter is exhibited in the text in many MSS., in several of the early editions, in the Chaldee and in the Syriac, though the Sopherim themselves did not venture to insert it into the text. The Authorised Version follows the *Keri*, whilst the Revised Version follows the *Kethiv* and gives the *Keri* in the margin.

(7) Ruth III 17. — The seventh and last instance given in the Talmudic record where we are directed to insert a word in reading which is not in the text affects the same expression אֵלַי *unto me*. As in the preceding passage the *Keri* is exhibited in the text in many MSS., in several of the early editions, in the Chaldee, the Septuagint and the Syriac. Here too the Authorised Version adopts the *Keri*, whilst the Revised Version follows the textual reading and gives the *Keri* in the margin.

It will be seen from the above that this ancient record does not specify the number of the passages where words have been omitted from the text. The instances are, therefore, simply to be taken as typical. That there existed more passages in the recensions of other Schools where words had dropped out of the text is evident from the parallel Rubric in the Massorah which treats on the same subject.<sup>1</sup> Whilst the Massoretic List omits the fifth instance, viz. Ruth II 11 which is probably due to the fact

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter כ, § 487, Vol. II, pp. 54, 55.

that it constitutes one of the differences between the Westerns and Easterns, it adds the following four passages:

(1) Judg. XX 13. — Here the Massorah tells us the word בְּנֵי *sons of*, has dropped out of the text and directs us to supply it in reading. In looking at the text the cause of its omission is perfectly clear. It is due to the fact that the first half of the word בנימין *Benjamin*, by which it is immediately followed is בני and the Scribe naturally thought that he had already written it. This affords an instructive illustration of the source of some clerical mistakes. As the sense of the passage is the same with or without the expression in question, the textual critics of the different Schools were not agreed upon its being an omission. Hence some MSS. and early editions have no *Keri* and they are supported by verse 20 of this very chapter, others have the *Keri* whilst other MSS. again have בְּנֵי *sons of*, in the text which is also exhibited in the Chaldee, the Septuagint and the Syriac, as will be seen in the note in my edition of the Bible. The Authorised Version adopts the *Keri*, whilst the Revised Version follows the textual reading and puts the *Keri* into the margin.

(2) 2 Sam. XVIII 20. — According to the testimony of the Massorah the expression בְּנֵי has here dropped out of the text and we are told in the *Keri* to supply it in reading, so as to make it conformable to the well-known phrase denoting *for, therefore, because*.<sup>1</sup> Here again the omission is due to the same cause which gave rise to the former clerical error. בְּנֵי is immediately followed by בְּנֵי and as the two expressions are very much alike the Scribe omitted one.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. בְּנֵי יִצְחָק Gen. XVIII 5; XIX 8; XXXVIII 26; Jerem. XXIX 27; XXXVIII 4.

(3) 2 Kings XIX 31. — In the redaction of some textual critics the reading here simply was קנאת יהוה *the zeal of Jehovah*, and thus differed from the parallel passage in Isa. XXXVII 32. In the codices, however, which the Massorites took for their standard the two passages were identical. Hence the direction in the *Keri* that צְבָאוֹת *of hosts*, should be supplied here in reading. Still the evidence for the former reading must have been very strong since the Massorites did not insert the word into the text though they believed it to have dropped out of it. Many MSS., early editions and the Versions have the *Keri* in the text as will be seen from the note in my edition of the Bible. The Authorised Version adopts the *Keri*, and the Revised Version translates the textual reading, but puts the *Keri* in the margin.

(4) 2 Kings XIX 37. — The fact that the Massorah directs us to supply the word בְּנֵי *his sons*, in reading, shows, beyond doubt, that according to the recension of some Schools it was absent from the text here. For this reason the Massorites themselves did not insert it into the text, but simply put down the *Keri* against it in the margin. That it was, however, the textual reading in the redaction of other Schools in harmony with the parallel passage in Jerem. XXXVII 38, is attested by many MSS., several of the early editions and the ancient Versions as will be seen from the note in my edition of the Bible. Here too the Authorised Version adopted the *Keri*, whilst the Revised Version translates the textual reading and puts the *Keri* in the margin.

On a comparison of the ancient record in the Talmud with the Rubric in the Massorah it will be seen that the latter not only omits one instance and adds four new passages, but that in the heading to the Rubric it fixes the number of places where a word has dropped out of the

text to ten. But as we have already seen, this number is based upon later redactions and in the earlier recensions there were many more such omissions. The effect, however, of this Rubric on the external appearance of the text in these ten passages is remarkable. In many of the MSS. and editions there is a vacant space left in the text sufficient to contain the missing word and the vowel-signs which belong to the *Keri* in the margin occupy by themselves the lower part of the empty space. This device, however, which imparts to the text such an abnormal appearance cannot be of very ancient date. Two out of the ten passages in question occur in the Latter Prophets, viz. Jerem. XXXI 39; L 29. Now the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 916 which contains this portion of the Hebrew Bible duly notes the *Keri* in the margin, but does not exhibit this phenomenal vacant space in the text. The later development of this vacant space according to my opinion is due to the fact that these missing words were inserted into the text in many MSS. and that the Massoretic Revisers scratched them out except the vowel-signs and put in the margin against each passage the *Keri*. To avoid the process of obliteration and to guard the Scribes against copying these words into the text they left the curious vacant space with vowel-signs below and accents above. On comparing Judg. XX 13; 2 Sam. VIII 3 and XVIII 20 in Oriental 2201 which is dated A. D. 1246 the student will come to the same conclusion. In accordance with my principle, therefore, I have left the *Kethiv* unpointed, given the vowel-signs of both the *Kethiv* and the *Keri* in the notes and have discarded the vacant space.

IV. *Words written in the text, but cancelled in reading.* — According to the same authoritative statement, we are assured that words have erroneously crept into the

text which must be cancelled. As in the former case, so here the ancient redactors did not themselves remove them from the text of their redaction, but marked them in the margin as spurious. They are as follows:

(1) 2 Kings V 18. — From the MSS., the early editions and the ancient Versions it is evident that there existed a great difference of opinion in some recensions with regard to the presence or absence of the particle **נָּ** *now*, *I pray thee*, in the verse before us. In Harley 5710—11 which is one of the most beautiful and accurately written MSS. this particle is in both clauses after the verb **יִסְלַח** and there is a separate Massorah against each of them, remarking that it is to be cancelled. In other MSS. the particle in question is absent in both clauses. This is also the case in the first edition of the Prophets, Soncino 1485—86; the first edition of the entire Bible, Soncino 1488; the second edition, Naples 1491—93; the third edition, Brescia 1494; the Chaldee, the Syriac and the Vulgate. In the majority of MSS., however, the particle **נָּ** only occurs in the second clause and it is here that we are told that it must be cancelled to make it uniform with the first clause. The Septuagint shows that it was in the second clause in the recension from which this Greek Version was made and that it was then not considered spurious.

(2) Jerem. XXXII 11. — There can be no doubt that the ancient recensions differed here with regard to the presence or absence of the particle before **הַמִּצְוָה** *the legal document*. According to the record preserved in the Talmud, the textual reading was originally **וְאֵת־הַמִּצְוָה** and the redactors direct us to cancel **וְאֵת־**. But though the Massoretic Rubric which tabulates the spurious words does not contain the passage before us, the original reading **וְאֵת־הַמִּצְוָה** is still exhibited as the *Kethiv* or textual reading in the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 916 for

which the *Keri* substitutes **וְהַמִּצְוָה**. The latter is the textual reading in the *editio princeps* of the Prophets, Soncino 1485—86, and in the first edition of the entire Bible, Soncino 1488.

(3) Jerem. LI 3. — According to the testimony of this ancient record we have here an instance of dittography where the Scribe has by mistake copied the same word twice. Hence we are authoritatively directed to cancel the second **יִרְךָ** *he shall bend*, in reading. The condemned expression is not exhibited in the text in Add. 21161, in the first edition of the entire Bible, Soncino 1488, nor in the third edition Brescia 1494. This, however, is not the only variation in the verse before us. The particles **אֵל** and **וְאֵל** in the first and second clauses are in Add. 21161, Harley 1528 &c. not pointed **אֵל־** *against*, and **וְאֵל־** *and against*, but **אֵל־** *not*, and **וְאֵל־** *and not*. Accordingly the verse is to be rendered:

Let not the archer bend his bow

Nor let him lift himself up in his coat of mail &c.

This is also the reading in the first edition of the Bible, Soncino 1488; in the third edition Brescia 1494; the Chaldee in the second clause, the Syriac, and the Vulgate; and is adopted in the text of the Revised Version. The Authorised Version follows the *Kethiv*.

(4) Ezek. XLVIII 16. — We have here another instance of dittography, the scribe having by mistake written **הַמֵּשׁ** *five* twice. Hence we are directed to cancel the second **הַמֵּשׁ** in reading. Many MSS. have not got it in the text nor is it exhibited in the *editio princeps* of the Bible, Soncino 1488; the third edition, Brescia 1494; the Chaldee, the Septuagint, the Syriac and the Vulgate.

(5) Ruth III 12. — The direction that the particle **אֵם** here is superfluous after **כִּי** and is to be cancelled, is

due to a dialectical use of it at a later period of the language. Hence some recensions in conformity with the earlier usage dropped it, whilst other redactors retained it. The Massorah has two Rubrics on the presence and absence of this particle.<sup>1</sup>

It will be seen that the record in the Talmud does not fix the number of these superfluous or spurious expressions in the text, but simply leaves us to regard them as typical instances. The oldest separate Rubric in the Massorah on this point is contained in the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 916. This important MS. gives the List twice, once on Jerem. XXXIX 12 and once on Ezek. XLVIII 16, and in both instances fixes the number at eight. The eight passages are made up by the addition of three more examples where the particle **אם** is described as superfluous and is to be cancelled (2 Sam. XIII 33; XV 21; Jerem. XXXIX 12); by the inclusion of Jerem. XXXVIII 16 where it tells us that the particle **אח** before **אשר** is spurious and is to be elided, and by the omission of Jerem. XXXI 11 which is one of the five passages given in the earlier record in the Talmud.

V. *The fifteen Extraordinary points.* — Hitherto we have considered the ancient record with regard to words which have dropped out of the text and which are supplied in the margin of the MSS. and editions, as well as words which have crept into the text and which the marginal notes both in the MSS. and editions direct us to elide. These Massoretic glosses and directions leave no doubt as to their import. We now come to an equally ancient and probably a much older official document which is the cause of the abnormal appearance of no fewer than fifteen words in the Hebrew Bible, but about which the

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter **א**, §§ 742, 743, Vol. I, p. 82.

marginal glosses give no solution. All the information which the puzzled student gets in the margin of the MSS. and the printed text against each of these enigmatic expressions is that the letter or word in question has an extraordinary point. And yet these points are of supreme importance inasmuch as they exhibit the earliest result of textual criticism on the part of the Scribes. The record on this point has been transmitted in several of the post-Biblical writings. The oldest form of it which is in the *Siphri* on Numb. IX 10 is as follows:<sup>1</sup>

(1) Numb. IX 10. The *He* (ה) in *רחקה afar off*, is pointed [to denote] that even he who is on a short journey and is defiled must not offer with them the Passover. So also

(2) Gen. XVI 5. "The Lord judge between me and thee" [is pointed] because she [i. e. Sara] said this to him [i. e. Abraham], only with respect to Hagar. Some, however, are of opinion that it is with respect to those who caused strife between him and her. So also

(3) Gen. XVIII 9. "And they said unto him where is Sara thy wife?" [is pointed] because they knew where she was. So also

או בדרך רחוקה נקוד על ה'א אפי' בדרך קרובה והוא טמא לא היה עושה עמדם את הפסח: כיוצא בו ישפוט ה' בניו וביניך שלא אמרה לו אלא על הנג בלבד, וי'א על המטילי מריבה בינו לבניה: כיוצא בו ויאמרו אליו איה שרה אשתך שהיו יודעים היכן היא: כיוצא בו ולא ידע בשכבה ובקומה נקוד על ובקומה לומר בשכבה לא ידע ובקומה ידע: כיוצא בו וישקרו שלא נשקו בכל לבו. ר"ש בן יוחי אומר הלכה בידוע שעשו שונא ליעקב אלא נהפכו רחמיו באותה שעה ונשקו בכל לבו: כיוצא בו וילכו אחיו לרעות את צאן אביהם נקוד עליו שלא הלכו אלא לרעות את עצמם: כיוצא בהם ונשים עד נופח אשר עד מירבא נקוד עליו שאף מלהלן היה כן: כיוצא בו כל פקודי הלויים אשר פקד משה ואהרן נקוד עליו שלא היה אהרן מן המנין: כיוצא בו עשרון עשרון נקוד עשרון [על] שלא היה אלא עשרון אחר בלבד: כיוצא בו הנסתרות לה' אלהינו והנלות לנו ולבנינו עד עולם נקוד, א"ל עשתם הגלויים אף אני אודיע לכם את הנסתרות, אף כאן אהא אומר בדרך רחוקה נקוד עליו שאפי' היה בדרך קרובה: *Siphra*, fol. 18a, ed. Friedmann, Vienna 1864; Comp. also *Aboth di Rabbi Nathan*, Recension I, cap. XXXIV, p. 100 and Recension II, cap. XXXVII, p. 97, ed. Schechter, London 1887; *Midrash Rabba* Numb. IX 10, *Parasha* III, No. 13, p. 20, ed. Wilna 1878; *Sopherim* cap. VI; *Midrash Mishle* XXXVI 24.

(4) Gen. XIX 33. "And he knew not when she lay down nor when she arose", the point on וּבְקוֹמָהּ *nor when she arose*, denotes that he [i. e. Lot] knew not when she lay down, but that he did know when she arose. So also

(5) Gen. XXXIII 4. "And he kissed him" וַיִּשְׁקְרוּ [is pointed] because he did not kiss him sincerely. R. Simon b. Yochai says Esau was indeed hostile to Jacob, but his bowels had then changed and he did kiss him sincerely. So also

(6) Gen. XXXVII 12. "And his brethren went to feed his father's flock in Shechem" is pointed because they only went to feed themselves. Likewise

(7) Numb. XXI 30. "And we have laid them waste even unto Nopha" is pointed because from thenceforward it was likewise so. So also

(8) Numb. III 39. "All that were numbered of the Levites, which Moses and Aaron numbered" is pointed because Aaron was not of those who numbered.

(9) Numb. XXIX 15. "And a tenth a tenth" the points are on עֲשָׂרִין *tenth*, because there was only one tenth measure in the Sanctuary. So also

(10) Deut. XXIX 28. "The secrets unto the Lord our God and the revealed unto us and to our children for ever", is pointed to denote that when ye shall perform the things which are revealed I will also reveal to you the things which are concealed. So also Numb. IX 10.

Both the Midrash Rabba on Numb. III 39 and the Aboth di Rabbi Nathan supplement the enumeration of the ten instances with the following important statement:

Some say what do these points signify? Now Ezra [who has put them there] declares if Elias should come and say to me why hast thou written them [i. e. these spurious words?], I will answer him I have already furnished them with points. But if he should say thou hast written them correctly, then I will readily erase the points on them.<sup>1</sup>

It will thus be seen that the points were regarded by the ancient authorities as marking the letters and words in question as spurious and that the Prophet Elias, who is to solve all doubts and difficulties, will give his decision

וַיֵּא לָמָּה נִקְוֵד אֵלֶּא כִּךְ אָמַר עוֹרָא אִם יִבָּא אֱלִיהוּ וַיֹּאמֶר לָמָּה כִּתְבַת אוֹתָן  
אֹמַר לוֹ כִּבְר נִקְדְּתִי עֲלֵיהֶם וְאִם יֹאמֶר לִי יֵשׁוּ כִּתְבַת כִּבְר אֲמַחֹק נִקְוֹדוֹתֵיהֶן מֵעֲלֵיהֶן.

on them when he appears. The practice of using dots to stigmatize words as spurious was not restricted to those days. Later scribes continued the example of the ancient Sopherim, as may be seen by the student of Hebrew MSS. As the St. Petersburg Codex dated A. D. 916 is both the oldest dated MS. and is easily accessible to students in Professor Strack's fac-simile, I will restrict my references to this important reproduction. In Isa. LI 4, folio 41 b the word אִים *isles*, is thus stigmatized in the text and עַמִּי *my people*, is substituted in the margin.<sup>1</sup> In Ezek. XIV 11, folio 133 the word מֵעֲלֵי *from me*, is dotted and מֵאֲחֵרֵי *from me*, is given in the margin as the proper reading.<sup>2</sup> Here the superlinear position of the vowel-points precluded the dots from being put on the top of the word and they are, therefore, put inside the letter.<sup>3</sup> Students of Palaeography know that it was also the practice of scribes who copied Greek and Latin MSS., to indicate erasures by placing dots above words and passages.<sup>4</sup>

With these facts before us we shall be better able to examine the fifteen dotted passages in the Hebrew Bible. It will be noticed that the ancient authorities already quoted only tabulate the ten instances in the Pentateuch. The other five passages which occur in the Prophets and in the Hagiographa are minutely described in the Massorah.

<sup>1</sup> Though the combination of אִים *isles*, and אֲמִים *people*, is to be found in Isa. XLI 1; XLIX 1.

<sup>2</sup> The passage, however, in Ezek. XLIV 10 favours the stigmatized reading.

<sup>3</sup> For other examples see Ezek. XIV 13, fol. 133; XX 7, fol. 140a; Hag. I 11, fol. 209b; Hag. II 21, fol. 211a; Zech I 3, fol. 211b.

<sup>4</sup> Comp. Wattenbach, *Schrifttafeln zur griechischen Palaeographie*, plate V, col. 1, line 24 where *KAÏ* is given as an instance from the Codex Sinaiticus; Gardthausen, *Griechische Palaeographie* pp. 278, 279, Leipzig 1879; Thompson, *Handbook of Greek and Latin Palaeography* p. 74, London 1893.



As the Siphri is the oldest document from which all the other Lists are derived, it is essential to examine the import of these instances according to the record in the original source. We shall, therefore, discuss the respective passages in the order in which they are given in the Siphri.

(1) Numb. IX 10 which is the first passage is also given at the end of the List. In the first place it is stated that the *He* in the word רחקה *afar off*, is pointed, whereas at the end of the List after quoting again the phrase בדרך רחקה *in a journey afar off*, we are simply told that it is pointed (נקוד עליו), without specifying which word or letter is thus distinguished. On comparing, however, the wording in Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 10 it will be seen that the latter harmonises with the phrase commonly used in these instances, that it is the original formula and that the specifying of the *He* is due to a later explanation or expansion.

The explanation which follows, stating the reason why the phrase before us is pointed, clearly indicates where the points are to be. We are here told that even he who is on a short journey, if he is defiled must not offer the Passover. This shows beyond doubt that there was in the original text a letter or word which when cancelled yielded the sense required for this legal inference. On comparing this verse with verse 13 we see that the original reading in verse 10 was וּבְדֶרֶךְ. As the *Vav* is ordinarily the conjunctive, the passage may have been taken by some to denote that only he is to offer the second Passover who was at the time of the first Passover both defiled *and* on a journey. Hence the *Vav* in וּבְדֶרֶךְ which is sometimes disjunctive<sup>1</sup> was pointed to indicate that it should be אִם *or*, and it is this אִם which now stands

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Exod. XII 5; XXI 15, 17; 1 Kings XVIII 27 &c.

for the originally pointed *Vav* (ו) in וּבְדֶרֶךְ *or on a journey*.<sup>1</sup> From the uniform reference to the *He* (ה) in all the ancient documents which treat on the extraordinary points, it is evident that the variation in the passage before us also extended to the word רחקה *afar off*, which some MSS. read with *He* and others had it רחק without *He*. As דֶרֶךְ *way, journey*, which is epicene is more frequently construed with a masculine adjective, the *He* was pointed to denote that here too the larger number of MSS. had it without *He* and that it is, therefore, to be elided. Instances where both nouns and verbs read in some MSS. with *He* at the end and in other MSS. without, are also discussed in other parts of the Talmud and whole Lists of them are given in the Massorah.<sup>2</sup> At a later time when the spiritual guides of the nation were anxious to diminish the number of spurious letters and words in the Hebrew Scriptures, the reference to the reading וּבְדֶרֶךְ and אִם בְּדֶרֶךְ was dropped and the variation with regard to the *He* alone was retained. It was then that the legal inference deduced from the reading וּבְדֶרֶךְ = אִם בְּדֶרֶךְ was assigned to the pointed *He* (ה) which has been the cause of all the confusion.

(2) Gen. XVI 5. — It will be seen that here this early record simply quotes the sentence “the Lord judge between me and thee” as pointed, without specifying the letter or word which is spurious. The explanation, however, which follows, clearly shows that the *Yod* and *Kaph* (יך) are to be pointed and, therefore, are to be elided, since it supplies the letter *He* (ה) in their place reading it וּבִינָה

<sup>1</sup> Comp. the able discussion on this point by Blau, *Masoretische Untersuchungen*, p. 25 &c. Strassburg 1891 to which I am greatly indebted. Dr. Blau properly emphasises the fact that the explanation which follows the respective passages indicates the dotted letters and words.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. *Jerusalem Megilla* I 9; IV 10; *Sopherim* VI 4; and *vide supra* p. 144 &c.

and her, i. e. Hagar. Accordingly the passage is to be rendered: "the Lord judge between me and her". This fully agrees with the immediately preceding verse. According to the opinion of others the *Kaph* (ך) is to be pointed and *He* and *Mem* (הם) are to take the place of the elided letter, thus reading it וּבִינֵיהֶם and *them*, and the passage is to be translated: "the Lord judge between me and them", i. e. my traducers, those who stir up strife. The Massoretic note in some MSS. נִקְוֹד עַל יוֹד בְּתָרָא the *second Yod* is pointed, is probably due to a later mistaken solution of the original נִקְוֹד עַל יוֹד בְּתָרָא which was misread נִקְוֹד עַל יוֹד בְּתָרָא.

(3) Gen. XVII 9. — Here too the Siphri simply quotes the sentence "and they said unto him where is thy wife Sarah?" as pointed, without saying which word or letters are stigmatized. The explanation, however, which contains the reason for the extraordinary points indicates the word. It is pointed we are told because "they knew where she is", which plainly declares that the interrogative expression אַיִה *where*, is dotted and is to be elided, and that the sentence exhibits a positive statement. Accordingly the passage is to be rendered: "And they said unto him, As to Sarah thy wife and he [interruptingly] said behold she is in the tent — and he [i. e. the angel resuming] said I will certainly return unto thee according to the time of life and Sarah thy wife shall have a son". This is confirmed by the second recension of *Aboth di Rabbi Nathan* cap. XXXVII, p. 97, and *Sopherim* VI 3, which distinctly say that the dotted expression is the interrogative אַיִה *where*. The reading, however, exhibited in these ancient authorities is not the only variant which obtained in the MSS. The Codices in other Schools indicate that it is the word אֵלָיו *unto him*, which is dotted and hence is to be elided in accordance with some redactions<sup>1</sup> or that the letters *Aleph* and *Yod*

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *Dikdukē Sopherim* on *Baba Metzia* 87a; *Dikdukē Ha-Te'amim* § 46.

(אֵי) in אֵלָיו *unto him*, have the points, thus reading it לוֹ *to him*. It may be that the dots extended also to the *Vav* in וַיֹּאמְרוּ (i. e. וַאֲי) and that the original reading was לוֹ וַיֹּאמְרוּ and *he said to him*. This is confirmed by the Septuagint.

(4) Gen. XIX 33, 35. — The classical passage in the Siphri tells us that in the sentence "and he (Lot) knew not when she lay down nor when she arose", which occurs in verses 33 and 35, the word וּבִקְוֹמָה *nor when she arose*, is pointed (= is to be elided) "because he did know when she arose". The desire on the part of later redactors to reduce as much as possible the number of spurious letters in the Bible gave rise to the opinion transmitted in the Massorah that it is simply the second *Vav* in the first passage where וּבִקְוֹמָה *nor when she arose*, in verse 33 it is plene, which has the dot, distinguishing it from וּבִקְוֹמָה in verse 34 where it is defective, because Lot knew only when the elder daughter arose, but did not know when the younger one arose. The device, however, is too transparent since the presence of the letter *Vav* could not possibly indicate the restoration of consciousness on the part of Lot to know the infamy of the act into which he had been ensnared. Indeed in some MSS. the whole word וּבִקְוֹמָה is dotted.<sup>1</sup>

(5) Gen. XXXIII 4. — Here the word וַיִּשְׁקְחוּ *and he kissed him*, is dotted because it was not in the MSS. of the text. The passage is, therefore, to be rendered: "and he fell on his neck and they wept". This is in accordance with the usage in Genesis of the combined verbs "to fall on the neck and weep" (XLV 14; XLVI 29) without kissing.

(6) Gen. XXXVII 12. — In the primitive record in the Siphri the passage "and his brethren went to feed their

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Rashi on this passage in Berliner's edition 18 6.

father's flock in Shechem" is adduced with the remark that *it has dots*. But though it does not state on which letters the dots are, it is manifest from the reason given for the dots in question, viz. *they only went to feed themselves*, that the words which have the points and which are to be elided are אֶת-צֹאן אֲבוֹתָם *their fathers flock*. This yields the sense required by the reason given for the dots, viz. "and his brethren went to feed in Shechem", and this is in harmony with the phrase in the following verse where it is stated הֲלוֹא אֶחָיִךָ רְעִים בְּשָׂכֶם *are not thy brethren feeding in Shechem?* Owing to the anxiety, however, to diminish as much as possible the indication of spurious words in the Bible, later authorities though retaining the same reason for the dots restrict them to אֶת the simple sign of the accusative, regardless of the incongruity that the absence of this particle is made to yield the sense *they went to eat and to drink and to be merry* (ולהתפתות).<sup>1</sup>

(7) Numb. XXI 30. — It is remarkable that the Siphri which has hitherto plainly indicated the dotted letters or words in the reason assigned for the extraordinary points, fails us in this instance. After quoting the passage וְנָשִׁים עַד נִפְחָ אֵשׁ מִיְדֵבָה *and we have laid waste unto Nopha which is unto Medeba*, this primitive record remarks "it has dots because even from thence forward it was also thus". All we can deduce from this explanation is that by the dotting or cancelling of some letter or word in the passage in question, we obtain a rule which is to guide the conquerors in future how to treat the conquered people or cities. But what the original reading was which yields this sense it is impossible to say. The first recension of the *Aboth di Rabbi Nathan* emphatically states that it is

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *Midrash Rabba* on Numb. IX 10 and *Aboth di Rabbi Nathan* first recension cap. XXXIV, p. 100, ed. Schechter.

the letter *Resh* (ר) in אשר *which*, which has the dot, to teach us that the Israelites destroyed the people, but did not destroy the cities,<sup>1</sup> whereas the Midrash which also says that the *Resh* has the point, on the contrary declares in the name of the minority it is designed to teach us that the conquerors did not destroy the people, but only the cities.<sup>2</sup> No amount of ingenuity, however, can in the present day deduce this sense from the presence or absence of the simple dot on the letter *Resh*.

That the present text is defective and that some dots were originally designed to indicate its imperfection of which the *Resh* in אשר exhibits one of the variants, is demonstrated by the Samaritan and the Septuagint. The recension from which the Septuagint was made was:

וְנִינָם אֲבָר חֶשְׁבוֹן עַד דִּיבּוֹן  
וְנָשִׁים עַד נִפְחָ אֵשׁ עַל-מֹאֵב

And their seed shall perish *from* Heshbon to Dibon  
And the women have yet kindled a fire against Moab.

This Version, therefore, cancels the dotted *Resh*, and with this the Samaritan coincides. It is, moreover, to be remarked that the Talmud not only reads אֵשׁ *fire*, but takes נִפְחָ as a verb denoting *to blow, to fan, to kindle*.<sup>3</sup>

As the Septuagint undoubtedly shows that וְנָשִׁים in the first clause was read in some MSS. וְנָשִׁים *and women*, the plural of אִשָּׁה, it is far more in consonance with the parallelism and the rhythm of the line to point אֵשׁ in the second clause אֵשׁ = אִישׁ *men*. An exactly parallel case where the *Resh* in אשר, according to the Massorah, is superfluous

<sup>1</sup> וְנָשִׁים עַד נִפְחָ אֵשׁ עַד מִיְדֵבָה נִקְוֶה עַל רֵי"שׁ שְׂבָאֲשֶׁר לְמָה מְלַמֵּד שֶׁהָרַחֲבּוּ הָאוֹמוֹת וְלֹא הָרַחֲבּוּ הַמְדִינּוֹת.

<sup>2</sup> וְנָשִׁים עַד נִפְחָ אֵשׁ עַד רֵי"שׁ שְׂבָאֲשֶׁר שָׂאָה מִלְּהַלֵּן הִיָּה כֵן. וְיֵאָ מְלַמֵּד שֶׁלֹּא הָרַחֲבּוּ הָאוֹמוֹת אֲלֵא מְדִינּוֹת.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. the explanation of Numb. XXI 30 in *Baba Bathra* 79a עַד נִפְחָ עַד שְׂבָאֲשֶׁר אֵשׁ שְׂאִינָה צְרִיכָה נִפְחוֹת.

and where **וְאִנִּי** denotes *men*, is to be found in 2 Sam. XXIII 21. Accordingly with only one of the readings exhibited in the Septuagint we obtain the following sense:

We have shot at them,  
Heshbon is destroyed even unto Dibon  
The women also even unto Nopha  
And the men even unto Medeba.

It is probably this reading which underlies the ancient opinion transmitted to us in the *Aboth di Rabbi Nathan* that only the people were destroyed and not the cities since they took Heshbon to denote inhabitants of that city to harmonise with what follows.

(8) Numb. III 39. — After quoting the passage “all that were numbered of the Levites which Moses and Aaron numbered” the Siphri remarks, *it is dotted because Aaron was not of those who numbered*. It will be seen that though the Siphri does not specify the word which is thus stigmatized, the reason assigned for the dots indicates beyond the shadow of a doubt that it is **וְאִהֲרֹן** and Aaron, which has the points. The dotted word which is thus simply, but unmistakably indicated in the classical passage before us, is expressly mentioned in the List of the *Aboth di Rabbi Nathan*. Both in the first and second recensions of this Treatise we are told that it is **וְאִהֲרֹן** Aaron, which has the points. The cause for the existence of the two redactions of the Biblical MSS., one omitting **וְאִהֲרֹן** and Aaron, and the other inserting it, is not far to seek. The command to number the Levites was given to Moses alone (Numb. III 14, 15), and in accordance with this command we are told (verse 16) Moses alone effected the numbering. In Numb. IV 41, 45, 46, however, it is stated that Aaron took part in the numbering, whilst in Numb. I 3, 4 he is expressly mentioned in the command to engage with Moses in the numbering of the other tribes. Hence the

two textual recensions, one based upon Numb. III 14, 15 and the other upon Numb. IV 41, 45, 46. The Samaritan and the Syriac which exhibit the MSS. of the former School, omit the word **וְאִהֲרֹן** in accordance with the dots, whilst the Chaldee and the Septuagint follow the latter School and retain **וְאִהֲרֹן** in the text. We have already referred to the anxiety manifested on the part of some Schools to diminish as much as possible the number of dotted or stigmatized letters. The Midrash in the passage before us affords a striking illustration of this fact. In spite of the explicit statement in the older document the Midrash states that it is simply the *Vav* conjunctive in **וְאִהֲרֹן** which is pointed.

(9) Numb. XXIX 15. — In the passage before us the Siphri distinctly declares that the whole word **עֶשְׂרֹן** tenth deal, is dotted and hence is to be elided, because there was only one tenth deal measure in the Sanctuary. This is also the declaration in the List of the second recension of the *Aboth di Rabbi Nathan*. In the chapter before us the tenth deal measure occurs three times, viz. XXI 4, where it is simply **וְעֶשְׂרֹן** and a tenth deal; in verse 10, where it is **עֶשְׂרֹן עֶשְׂרֹן** reduplicated a several tenth deal, and in the passage here, viz. verse 15, where the MSS. manifestly differed. Some redactions read it here singly in conformity with verse 4, whilst others read it in the reduplicated form in harmony with verse 10. According to the testimony of the Siphri and the *Aboth di Rabbi Nathan* it is to be read here as in verse 4. The conflicting statements in the later authorities that it is only the *Vav* plene in **וְעֶשְׂרֹן** which is pointed does not account for the inference that there was only one tenth deal measure in the Sanctuary and is, moreover, due to the anxiety to diminish as much as possible the number of the stigmatized letters.

(10) Deut. XXIX 28. — The Siphri after quoting this verse says that it has the dots and without specifying where the dots are, remarks that the reason for their being here is to indicate that “when ye shall have performed the things which are revealed I will also disclose to you the things which are concealed”. This plainly shows that the dots here referred to are to be on the words לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ *to the Lord our God*, and that the words in question are to be elided. When these are cancelled we obtain the sense: “The secret things and the revealed things belong to us and to our children for ever if we do all the words of this Law.” That is the secret things or the doctrines which have not as yet been revealed (comp. Deut. XXX 11–14) belong to us and our children or will be disclosed to us if we do all the words of this Law which have been revealed to us. It is remarkable that Rashi already expresses the opinion that the words לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ *to the Lord our God*, ought to have been pointed, but that the reverence for the Divine name prevented its being done.<sup>1</sup> Whether it was the reverence for the Divine name or whether it was due to some other recension, it is certain that a later tradition obtained according to which the four words לָנוּ וְלִבְנֵינוּ עַד-עוֹלָם *to us and to our children for ever*, were pointed, or simply the two words לָנוּ וְלִבְנֵינוּ *to us and to our children*. This is exhibited in the first recension of the *Aboth di Rabbi Nathan*, the *Midrash Rabba* and in the *Massorah*. The remark that the *Ayin* (ע) alone of the particle עַד *unto*, is also pointed is manifestly an error since the solitary *Daleth* (ד) which remains of the third word yields no sense and undoubtedly shows that it is the remains of the redaction in which all the four words were dotted. According to the recension in which the four words are stigmatized, the sense of the

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *Sanhedrin* 13b; Blau, *Masoretische Untersuchungen*, p. 31.

passage is: “The secret and revealed ways of events are in the hands of the Lord our God to accomplish all the statements of this Law”, or according to the redaction which dots the two words: “The secrets and the revealed things are for ever with the Lord our God to fulfil all the words of this Law.” It is, however, to be remarked that these later recensions are utterly at variance with the promise deduced from this verse that the secret things belong to us and to our children or will be revealed to us, which these redactors still retain from the older and classical record in the Siphri.

Though the Talmud and the Midrashim do not discuss the four passages which have the extraordinary points in the Prophets and only refer to the one instance in the Hagiographa, viz. Ps. XXVII 13, the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 which is the oldest dated MSS., gives the list of the fifteen instances no fewer than three times,<sup>1</sup> and all the other MSS. which I have collated coincide with this ancient recension. In discussing, therefore, the remaining five passages I shall follow the Massoretic Rubric and continue the numeration.

(11) 2 Sam. XIX 20. — In the supplication of Shimei to the king recorded in this verse, the suppliant as the text now stands, addresses the monarch in the third person *let him not impute* (אַל-יִחַשְׁבֵּנִי), then suddenly passes over to the second person *and do not thou remember* (אַל-תִּזְכֶּר), and then again as suddenly reverts to the third person *when he went out* (אֲשֶׁר-יָצָא). The dots on this word, therefore, indicate that it is to be cancelled and that יִצָּאָתָּה *thou wentest out*, the second person is to be substituted in accordance with another recension and in harmony with תִּזְכֶּר *thou remember*, which immediately precedes it.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. the *Massorah* in this Codex on Isa. XLIV 9; Ezek. XLI 20; XLVI 22; and my edition of *the Massorah*, letter נ, § 521, Vol. II, p. 296.

(12) Isa. XLIV 9. Here הַמָּה is dotted and is to be cancelled since it is simply dittography of הֵם with which the preceding word וְעֵדֵיהֶם *and their witnesses* ends. Hence also its absence in the Syriac. Accordingly the passage ought to be rendered:

As for their witnesses they [= the idols] see them not nor  
know them.

That there was another recension of the text in which more words were stigmatized and elided is evident from the Septuagint where the whole of this sentence וְעֵדֵיהֶם וְעַבְדֵיהֶם הַמָּה בְּלִי יָרְאוּ וּבְלִי יִדְעוּ is omitted. As the passage is so manifestly defective we may adopt the small alteration suggested by Dr. Blau, viz. to insert the single letter *Beth* (ב) in the word וְעֵדֵיהֶם *and their witnesses*, and we thus obtain וְעַבְדֵיהֶם *and their worshippers*. This yields the appropriate sense:

They that fashion a graven image are all of them vanity  
Their delectable things shall not profit  
As for their worshippers they see them not nor know  
That they [i. e. the worshippers] may be ashamed.

(13) Ezek. XLI 20 where הַהֵיכָל *the temple* at the end of the verse is stigmatized, we have another instance of dittography. The Scribe simply wrote it twice, once at the end of this verse and once at the beginning of the next verse. After its elision the last word of this verse (וְקִיר) is to be construed with the first word of the next verse (הַהֵיכָל) and the passage is to be rendered:

And as for the wall of the temple, the door posts were squared;  
and as for the face of the Sanctuary &c.

This is the alternative rendering given in the margin of the Revised Version.

(14) Ezek. XLVI 22. — It is now admitted by the best textual critics that the hybrid expression מְהִקְצָעוֹת at the

end of this verse which is rendered in the Authorised Version *corners* (margin *cornered*) and in the Revised Version *in the corners*, but which is here stigmatized by the Massorites, is spurious and hence is to be elided. Its absence from the ancient recension is also attested by the Septuagint, the Syriac and the Vulgate. Accordingly the passage is simply to be translated:

these four were of the same measure.

(15) Ps. XXVII 13. — In the Talmud (*Berachoth 4a*) where the points on לֹלֵא are discussed, the following statement is made in the name of R. Jose who flourished in the second century:

It is propounded in the name of R. Jose לֹלֵא has dots to indicate that David spoke before the Holy One, blessed be He, Lord of the universe, I believe in Thee that Thou wilt richly reward the righteous in the world to come, but I do not know whether I shall have my portion among them or not.<sup>1</sup>

From the words, therefore, but *I do not know*, or *I do not believe*, it is evident that he took the dots to cancel the first part of this expression and that he read it לא האמנתי *I do not believe*. In other recensions, however, the word was entirely elided as is attested by some MSS., the Septuagint, the Syriac and the Vulgate. Accordingly the passage ought to be translated:

I believe that I shall see  
The goodness of the Lord in the land of the living.

The italic words *I had fainted*, both in the Authorised Version and in the Revised Version are an exegetical gloss. The words מלמעלה ומלמטה or מן וְאוֹ שְׁלֵא or מלמעלה ומלמטה נקוד אלא מלמטה which are found in some Massoretic Rubrics

<sup>1</sup> ותנא משמיה דרבי יוסי למה נקוד על לולא אמר דוד לפני הק"ב רבוני של עולם מובטח אני כך שאתה משלם שכר טוב לצדיקים לעתיד לבוא אבל אני יודע אם יש לי חלק ביניהם ואם לאו.

are a later addition. They do not occur in the oldest recension of this Rubric which is contained in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916, nor in the best MSS.

These instances, however, must not be regarded as exhausting the List of spurious words. That there were many more expressions which were thus stigmatized, we incidentally learn from the differences which obtained between the Western and the Eastern Schools of textual critics. Thus we are told in Codex Harley 5710—11 British Museum, that whilst the Westerns have the *Kal* תְּנִיאֵן *to hinder, to dissuade*, in the text (= כתיב) in Numb. XXXII 7 and the *Hiphil* תְּנִיאֵן in the margin (= *Keri*), the Easterns have תְּנִיאֵן with the Massoretic note on it that the first *Vav* is dotted.<sup>1</sup> Again on Job XXXIX 15 the Massorah Parva in the Cambridge MS. Add. 465 remarks that the Easterns have dots on the *Cheth* (ח) and *Yod* (י) in תְּנִיתַי *and the beasts of*.<sup>2</sup> How many more such dotted words may still be found when other MSS. come to light, it is at present impossible to say. The important part of this record is the admission by the Sopherim themselves that the dots on the letters and words mark them as spurious, and that this admission is corroborated by the ancient Versions where some of the stigmatized expressions in question are actually not represented.

VI. *The suspended Letters.* — The abnormal appearance of the pendent letters in certain words of the text exhibits another expedient to which the Scribes resorted to record the variations which obtained in the different Schools. Both the Talmud and the Massorah specify four passages in each of which a word has a suspended letter.<sup>3</sup> They are as follows:

1 למערבאי תנואון בתי תניאון קי, למדנחאי תנואון נקוד על ו קרמי ופילג.  
2 וזית למדנחי נקוד על הית וזיר.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter מ, § 230, Vol. I, p. 37

(1) Judg. XVIII 30. — The history of the suspended *Nun* (נ) in the passage before us is both important and instructive inasmuch as it throws light upon one of the principles by which the Sopherim were guided in the redaction of the Hebrew text. We are told that a wandering young Levite who is afterwards incidentally described as Jonathan the grandson of Moses (Judg. XVII 7 with XXIII 30), became the priest of an idolatrous worship at a salary of ten shekels or twenty-five shillings a year in the house of Micah (XVII 8—13). Five spies of the tribe of Dan are sent to spy out the land for their tribe, and when they enter the house of Micah they recognise Jonathan. After saluting him they craftily entice him to enter into conversation with the chiefs of their army at the entrance of the court (XVIII 1—16). Whilst Jonathan is thus busily engaged in talking, these spies clandestinely enter the upper chamber or chapel and steal the ephod, the teraphim and the images both graven and molten (17—18). Whereupon Jonathan not only sanctions the sacrilegious theft, but accompanies the Danite raiders. The Danites who thus become possessed of the stolen essentials of worship as well as of the officiating priest, establish a regular service and appoint the said “Jonathan the son of Gershom, the son of Moses” and his descendants to the priestly functions in the tribe of Dan (19—31).

That this wandering Levite, this young Jonathan was the actual grandson and not a later descendent of Moses is evident from XX 28 where his contemporary Phineas is admittedly the grandson of Aaron. The two second cousins, therefore, lived about the same time. The fact, however, that the grandson of the great lawgiver should be the first priest of idolatry was considered both degrading to the memory of Moses and humiliating to the national susceptibilities. Hence in accordance with one of

their canons to avoid all cacophony the redactors of the text suspended the letter *Nun* (נ) over the name *Moses* (משה), thus making it *Manasseh*. This is admitted by the most distinguished Jewish interpreters. Thus Rashi (1040—1105 A. D.) states: "Because of the honour of Moses was the *Nun* written so as to alter the name. The *Nun*, however, is suspended to tell thee that it is not *Manasseh*, but *Moses*."<sup>1</sup> This was all the more easily effected since we are told that names were not unfrequently transferred from one individual to another, not because they indicate natural consanguinity or identity of person, but metaphorically to denote similarity of character. Jonathan was called the grandson of *Manasseh* because he did the deeds of *Manasseh* the idolatrous king (2 King XXI) and thus belonged to the family of *Manasseh*. In illustration of this principle the Talmud adduces the following passages:

'He shall lay the foundation thereof in his first-born and in his youngest son shall he set up the gates thereof' [Josh VI 26]; so also it is said: 'In his days [i. e. Ahab's] did Hiel, of the house of Eli, build Jericho' (1 Kings XVI 34). Was not Hiel of the house of Josaphat and was not Jericho in the territory of Benjamin? Why then is it put on Ahab? It is to indicate that sin is put upon the sinner. Similarly it is said 'and Jonathan, the son of Gershom, the son of *Manasseh*' [Judg. XVIII 30]. Was he then the son of *Manasseh* and was he not the son of *Moses*? And why then is this matter put on *Manasseh*? It is to indicate that sin is put upon the sinner<sup>2</sup> (*Tosephta Sanhedrin* XIV 7, 8, p. 437, ed. Zuckermann, Trier 1882).

For this reason the name of *Manasseh* has actually been inserted into the text by one School of redactors without mentioning the suspended *Nun*, though in their

<sup>1</sup> בן מנשה. מפני כבודו של משה כתב נון לשנות את השם ונכתבה תלויה לומר שלא היה מנשה אלא משה.

<sup>2</sup> בכבודו ייסדנה וכצעירו יציב דלתיה וכן הוא אומר בימיו בנה חיל בית האלי את יריחו והלא חיל מיהושפט ויריחו משל בנימין ולמה ניתלה באחאב אלא מלמד שתולין חובה בחיוב. כיוצא בו ויהונתן בן גרשם בן מנשה וכי בן מנשה הוא והלא בן משה הוא ולמה ניתלה דבר במנשה אלא מלמד שתולין חובה בחיוב.

explanations they emphatically declare that it stands for *Moses*,<sup>1</sup> whilst another School have *Moses* with the suspended *Nun* over it.<sup>2</sup> It will thus be seen that whether they mention the suspended *Nun* or not, all the ancient authorities agree that *Manasseh* (מנשה) stands here for *Moses* (משה) and that it is so written to spare the reputation of the great lawgiver. This also accounts for the exclusion of Jonathan's name from the family register of *Moses* given in 1 Chron. XXIII 15, 16 and XXVI 24. Indeed the Chaldee paraphrase asserts that *Shebuel* (שבאל), which in the passages in question takes the place of Jonathan, is the name given to Jonathan after his conversion from idolatry and returning to the true God (שבאל = שב אל = *he returned to the true God*). Hence "it is *Shebuel* that is Jonathan the son of Gershom the son of *Moses* returned to the fear of the Lord".<sup>3</sup> The Septuagint, the Chaldee and the Authorised Version represent the redaction which has *Manasseh* (מנשה) in the text, whilst the Vulgate and the Revised Version follow the School which read *Moses* (משה). The early editions are divided. The first edition of the Prophets, Soncino 1485—86; the *editio princeps* of the entire Bible, Soncino 1488; the third edition of the Bible, Brescia 1494; the Complutensian Polyglot, and the Venice quarto 1521 have *Manasseh* (מנשה) without the suspended *Nun*, whilst the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491—93; the Earlier Prophets, Pesaro 1511; the Rabbinic Bible by Felix Pratensis 1517; and the first edition of the Bible

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *Baba Bathra* 109 b; *Aboth di Rabbi Nathan* first recension XXXIV, fol. 50 a, ed. Schechter. London 1887; *Mechillha*, Pericope יתרו XVIII 1, fol. 57 b, ed. Friedmann, Vienna 1870.

<sup>2</sup> *Jerusalem Berachoth* IX, 2; *Jerus. Sanhedrin* XI, 7; *Midrash Rabba* on the Song of Songs II, 5, Wilna 1878; *Aboth di Rabbi Nathan* second recension XXXVII, fol. 49 b, ed. Schechter.

<sup>3</sup> ושביאל היא יתן פר גרשם בר משה שב לדחלאל דיי.



with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim 1524—25 have *מנשה* with the suspended *Nun*.

(2) Ps. LXXX 14. — The almost unanimous explanation of this passage by the ancient authorities as recorded in the Talmud and in the Midrashim supply us with the clue to the condition of the primitive text. In its briefest form the explanation is given in the Midrash Rabba on Levit. XI and is as follows:

The *Ayin* is suspended in *מִיָּעַר* to indicate that when Israel is innocent it will only be assailed by the swine of the River, but when it is guilty it will be destroyed by the boar from the forest. The river animal which comes out of the River is weak, whilst the animal which comes from the forest is strong.<sup>1</sup>

In a more expanded form the same explanation is given in the Midrash on the Psalms and on the Song of Songs III 14 as well as in the Aboth di Rabbi Nathan. In the latter the explanation is as follows:

The textual reading (*כתיב*) is the swine from the River and [the *Keri* is] the swine from the forest. When Israel does not act in accordance with the will of God, the nations, like the swine of the forest, will be upon them. Just as the boar of the forest kills man and tears animals and plagues the children of man, so all the time that Israel does not act in harmony with the will of God, the nations will kill them, damage them and hurt them. But all the time that the Israelites do the will of God, the nations will not domineer over them no more than the swine of the River. Just as the swine of the River does not kill men nor destroy animals, so all the time that Israel performs His will, no nations nor tongue will kill them, damage them or hurt them. For this reason the textual reading is the swine from the River.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> יכרסמנה חויר מיער עין תלויה אם זכותם מן היאור ואם לאו מן היער הדא חיותא כי סלקא מן נהרא היא ממכיא סלקא מן חורשא לית היא ממכיא: *Midrash Rabba* Peniope Parasha XIII, fol. 19a, ed. Wilna 1878.

<sup>2</sup> יכרסמנה חויר מיער כתיב, יכרסמנה חויר מיער [ק]. שבזמן שאין ישראל עושין רצונו של מקום אומות העולם דומות עליהם כחויר מיער מה חויר מיער הורג נפשות ומזיק את הבריות ומלקה בני אדם כך כל זמן שאין ישראל עושים רצונו של מקום אומות העולם הורגין בהם ומזיקין בהם ומלקין אותן, וכל זמן שישראל עושים רצונו של מקום אין אומות העולם מושליו בהן כחויר של יאור מה חויר של יאור אינו הורג

This leaves it beyond the shadow of a doubt that the twofold reading in question is due to the primitive orthography in which, as we have already seen, both the silent or feeble letters *Aleph* (א) and *Ayin* (ע) were frequently not expressed.<sup>1</sup> The word in question was originally written *מִיָּעַר* which one School of textual redactors read *מִיָּעַר* = *מִיָּעַר* from the River, supplying *Aleph* and the other School read it *מִיָּעַר* = *מִיָּעַר* from the forest, supplying *Ayin*. An instance of י standing for יע in Phoenician is given by Schröder from the Tucca Inscription.<sup>2</sup> This reading *מִיָּעַר* from the River, was the more popular one in Palestine as is evident from other parts of the Talmud, where Ps. LXXX 14 is adduced to prove that *חַיִּית קָנָה* the wild beast of the reeds (Ps. LXVIII 31) is identical with the *חַיִּיר מִיָּעַר* the swine of the River.<sup>3</sup> The swine of the River like the beast of the reeds is most probably the hippopotamus and is here used as the symbol of Egypt or the empire of the Nile-valley. The comparative harmlessness which these Hagadic interpretations ascribe to this animal is due to the fact that under the Ptolomaic dynasties the Jews enjoyed many privileges, and many of them occupied positions of high rank. It was under the Roman occupation of Palestine and the Roman oppression of the Jews that the alternative reading *מִיָּעַר חַיִּיר* swine of the forest, became more popular. The Boar was the military sign of the Roman

נפשות ואינו מזיק לבריות כך כל זמן שישראל עושין רצונו אין אומה ולשון הורגין בהו: ומזיקין בהו ולא מלקין אותן לכך נכתב חויר מיער: *Comp. Rabboth di Rabbi Nathan* first recension, cap. XXXIV, fol. 50 b, ed. Schechter, London 1887.

<sup>1</sup> *Vide supra* pp. 138—144.

<sup>2</sup> *Comp. Die Phönizische Sprache* by Dr. Paul Schröder, p. 19, Halle 1869.

<sup>3</sup> *Pesachim* גער חית קנה געור חיה שררה בין הקנים דכתיב יכרסמנה חויר ונ': *Comp. Graetz, Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*. Vol. XXIII, p. 389, Breslau 1874.

legions and though Marius afterwards introduced the Eagle, the Boar still continued as the sign in some legions and especially of the army which was quartered in Palestine. The Romans then became as repulsive to the Jews as the swine and the *חזיר מיער* *the Boar*, the symbol of Rome not only became the more acceptable reading, but was regarded as identical with the iron yoke of Roman tyranny. Hence the Septuagint, the Chaldee and the Vulgate read *the boar out of the wood*. As to its treatment in the early editions, the *editio princeps* of the Hagiographa, Naples 1486—87; the *editio princeps* of the entire Bible, Soncino 1488; the second edition of the Bible, Naples 1491—93; the third edition of the Bible, Brescia 1494; the Complutensian Polyglot and the three quarto Bomberg editions 1518, 1521, 1525 have simply *מיער* and take no notice of the suspended letter *Ayin*. The Salonica edition of the Hagiographa 1515, as far as I can trace it, is the first which exhibits the suspended letter. It is also given in the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim Venice 1524—25. It is remarkable that Felix Pratensis in his Rabbinic Bible 1517 makes the *Ayin* a majuscular letter. This is probably due to the fact that some ancient authorities regarded it as the middle letter of the Psalter.<sup>1</sup>

(3 and 4) Job XXXVIII 13, 15. — In these two verses the expression *רשעים wicked*, occurs and in both instances the letter *Ayin* (ע) is suspended. Here too the explanation given by the ancient authorities indicates the state of the text. The remark on this passage is as follows:

Why is the *Ayin* suspended in the word *רשעים wicked*? To indicate that if one has become chief upon earth, he will be poor in heaven. In such case the *Ayin* should not have been written at all? R. Jochanan said it was

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *Kiddushim* 30a.

written so as not to offend the dignity of David and R. Eleazar said not to offend the dignity of Nehemiah son of Hachaliah<sup>1</sup> (*Sanhedrin* 10, 3b).

Whatever may be our opinion as to the value of this homiletic interpretation of the verse before us, there can be no doubt that according to the emphatic statement of these ancient authorities the *Ayin* (ע) originally formed no constituent part of the word in question and that it was afterwards suspended over the word (*רשעים*) out of respect for the two distinguished personages in the Jewish commonwealth. The passages in question, therefore, afford another illustration of the fact that in the primitive orthography the feeble letters were frequently not expressed. Hence some Schools read it *רשעים* or *ראשים* *poor*, or *chiefs*, whilst in other Schools it was read *רשעים* = *רשעים* *wicked*. The latter is the reading exhibited in all the ancient Versions. As far as I can trace it, Jacob b. Chayim is the first who in the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible with the Massorah, Venice 1524—25, exhibits the suspended *Ayin* in both verses. The *editio princeps* of the Hagiographa, Naples 1486—87; the first, second, third and fourth editions of the entire Bible (Soncino 1488; Naples 1491—93; Brescia 1494; Pesaro 1511—17), the Salonica edition of the Hagiographa 1515, the Complutensian Polyglot, the first edition of the Rabbinic Bible, by Felix Pratensis 1517 and all the three Venice quartos (1518, 1521, 1525) have the ordinary expressions *רשעים* and *מרשעים* without noticing in any way that according to the MSS. and the Massorah the *Ayin* is suspended in both these words.

VII. *The Inverted Nuns*. — Other remarkable phenomena exhibited in the Massoretic text are the Inverted

<sup>1</sup> מה דכתיב וימנע מרשים אורם וזרוע רמה תשבר מפני מה עיין של רשעים חלויה כיון שנעשה אדם רש מלמטה נעשה רש מלמעלה. ולא נכתבה כלל ר' יוחנן ור' אליעזר חד אמר מפני כבודו של דוד וחד אמר משום כבודו של נחמיה בן חכליה.

Nuns (נ) which the student will find in no fewer than nine passages<sup>1</sup> and of which he obtains no solution in the margin except the bewildering remark against it *An inverted Nun* (נון הפוכה) or *A separated Nun* (נון מנוזרת). Yet these inverted letters or their equivalents are also among the earliest signs by which the Sopherim designed to indicate the result of their textual criticism. They are simply intended to take the place of our modern brackets to mark that the passages thus bracketed are transposed.

That this is their original design is attested by the earliest authorities. Thus the Siphra on Numb. X 35 emphatically declares that "these two verses are marked at the beginning and at the end to show that this is not their proper place". Though R. Jehudah the redactor of the Mishna in accordance with the later feelings would not admit that there is any dislocation in the sacred text and hence resorted to the fanciful explanation that the marks in question are designed to show that Numb. X 35, 36 forms a separate book and that the Mosaic Law does not consist of Five, but of Seven Books, yet his father R. Simon b. Gamaliel still maintained the ancient view of dislocation and that the signs denote transposition.<sup>2</sup> In the Talmud (*Sabbath* 115*b*—116*a*) where the same ancient view is recorded as the teaching of the Rabbis that the signs indicate dislocation, and where the later opinion of R. Jehudah is also given, the verse "Wisdom hath builded her house, she hath hewn out her seven pillars" in Prov.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Numb. X 35, 36; Ps. CVII 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 40, and see *The Massorah*, letter נ, § 15, Vol. II, p. 259.

<sup>2</sup> ויהי בנסוע הארץ נקוד עליו מלמעלה ומלמטה מפני שלא היה זה מקומו רבי אומר מפני שהוא ספר בעצמו מכאן אמרו ספר שנמתק ונשתייר בו פ"ה אותיות כפרשת ויהי בנסוע הארץ מטמא את הידים. ר"ש א' נקוד עליו מלמעלה ומלמטה מפני שלא היה זה מקומו: ספרי דבי רב פסקא פד דף כב.

IX 1 is adduced<sup>1</sup> to show that the seven pillars denote the Seven Books of the Law which are obtained by taking Numb. X 35, 36 as constituting a separate book. For this makes the book Numbers into three books, viz.: (1) Numb. I 1—X 34; (2) Numb. X 35, 36; and (3) Numb. XI 1—XXXVI 13. Nothing, however, can be more emphatic than the declaration of R. Simon b. Gamaliel who in accordance with the ancient view adds in the passage before us that "in future this Section, viz. Numb. X 35, 36, will be removed from here and be written in its proper place".<sup>2</sup> Its proper place, according to a later Talmudist, is in the description of the journeys and encampment of the tribes. The two verses belong to the journey of the Levites with the tabernacle and ought to follow immediately after Numb. II 17.<sup>3</sup> That the Inverted Nuns indicate here a dislocation of the text is also attested by the Septuagint. In the recension from which this Version was made, verses 35, 36 preceded verse 34, so that the order of the verses in question is Numb. X 35, 36, 34 and this seems to be the proper place for the two verses.

The other seven *Inverted Nuns* are confined to Ps. CVII. They bracket verses 23—28 and verse 39. But though the best MSS. and the Massorah distinctly mark the verses in question with the sign of dislocation, neither the Talmudic authorities nor the ancient Versions give us any indication as to where the proper place is for the bracketed

<sup>1</sup> תנו רבנן ויהי בנסוע הארץ ויאמר משה פרשה זו עשה לה הק"בה סימניות מלמעלה ומלמטה לומר שאין זה מקומה. רבי אומר לא מן השם הוא זה אלא מפני שספר חשוב הוא מפני עצמו. כמאן אולא דא דאמר ר' שמואל בר נחמן א"ר יונתן הצבא עמודיה שבעה אלו שבעה ספרי תורה: שבת דף טו.  
<sup>2</sup> ר"ש ב"ג אומר עתידה פרשה זו שתיעקר מכאן ותכתב במקומה: עין שבת דף קטו ואבות דרבי נתן נוסחא א פרק ל"ד דף נ.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. *Sopherim* VI, 1; Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben*, Vol. III, p. 80—82, Breslau 1864—65.

sections. The Talmud which notices the fact that this Psalm has the signs, simply explains it homiletically. It says that "verse 23 &c. is furnished with signs like the particles of exception *but* and *only* in the Bible to indicate that the prayer of those who are in danger of shipwreck is only heard before the event is decreed by God, but is not heard after it has been decreed".<sup>1</sup> This is in accordance with the sentiments of the later Rabbins who, as we have often seen, manifested the greatest anxiety to obliterate altogether, or to diminish as much as possible any indication that there are spurious words or letters in the text or that any of the sections are dislocated. Hence they explained away allegorically all the critical signs of the ancient redactors of the text.

But though it is now difficult to say to what part of the Psalm the magnificent description of the sea-voyage belongs, it is comparatively easy to rearrange the passage in which the dislocation is indicated towards the end of the Psalm. As the text now stands the transition from verse 38 to 39 is inexplicable. The verses exhibit no logical sequence and verse 39 is without a subject. If, however, we avail ourselves of the critical indication given us by the ancient redactors that the verse before us is dislocated and put verse 40 before verse 39 we not only obtain a logical order, but have the missing subject for verse 39. We have thus

- Verse 40: He poureth contempt upon princes,  
And causeth them to wander in the pathless waste.  
" 39: And they are diminished and bowed down  
Through oppression trouble and sorrow;  
" 41: But he setteth the needy secure from affliction,  
And maketh like a flock the families [of the afflicted].

<sup>1</sup> יורדי הים באניות ונני עשה להן סימניות כאבין ורקין שבתורה לומר לך צעקי קודם נור דין נענין צעקי לאחר נור דין אינן נענין: ראש השנה ה'.

It must, however, not be supposed that the nine passages tabulated in the Massoretic Rubric as bracketed exhaust all the instances comprised in this category of critical remarks. We incidentally know from the Massorah Parva on Gen. XI 32 in the *editio princeps* of the Rabbinic Bible with the Massorah by Jacob b. Chayim Venice 1524—25 that there is also an *Inverted Nun* at the end of the chapters in question. This indicates that the death of Terah which is recorded in the last verse does not chronologically come before the Lord's command to Abraham to leave Haran with which chapter twelve begins and that it must have taken place after the departure of the patriarch. The verse in question must, therefore, be transposed.<sup>1</sup>

The treatment which these Inverted Nuns has received on the part of some of the later Massorites affords another striking illustration of the anxiety to obliterate all the early traces of critical signs as to the condition of the text. Instead of placing these brackets at the beginning and at the end of the verses which they are designed to indicate as dislocated, in accordance with nearly all the best Codices, some MSS. exhibit the inverted Nun in a word in the text itself which contains this letter in each of the nine passages. This curious device I have given in the Massorah.<sup>2</sup>

VIII. *The Removal of Indelicate Expressions, Anthropomorphisms &c. from the Text.* — Hitherto we have traced the phenomenal signs furnished in the text by the Sopherim themselves as indications of various readings which obtained in the Codices of the different Schools. These abnormal

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben*, Vol. I, p. 120, Breslau 1862.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. *The Massorah* letter נ, § 15a, Vol. II, p. 259.

appearances of the text though plain enough to decipher with the clue which the ancient records supply us, have yet evoked a difference of opinion on the part of some modern critics because later Talmudists allegorised or homiletically explained what was primarily intended as textual criticism. No such difference of opinion, however, can possibly be entertained about the statement made by the redactors of the text with regard to the principles by which they were guided in the work of redaction. The classical passage which sets forth these principles is as follows:

In every passage where the text has an indelicate expression a euphemism is to be substituted for it, as for instance for *ישגלנה* *ravish, violate, outrage* [Deut. XXVIII 30; Isa. XIII 16; Jerem. III 2; Zech. XIV 2] *ישכבנה* *to lie with*, is to be substituted; for *עפלים* *posteriors* [Deut. XXVIII 27; I Sam. V 6; VI 4] read *טחורים* *emerods*; for *חריונים* *dung, excrements* or *חרי יונים* *doves' dung* [2 Kings VI 25] read *דביונים* *decayed leaves*; for *חריהם* or *חריהם* *excrement* [2 Kings XVIII 27; Isa. XXXVI 12] substitute *צואה* *deposits*; for *שיניהם* *urine* [2 Kings XVIII 27; Isa. XXXVI 12] read *ממי רגליהם* *water of the feet*; for *למחראות* *middens, privies* [2 Kings X 27] substitute *למוצאות* *sewers, retreats*.<sup>1</sup> Comp. *Megilla* 25b; *Jerusalem Megilla* IV.

In accordance with this rule not only does the Massorah duly register these stigmatized expressions,<sup>2</sup> but all the MSS. of the Bible with the Massorah and every edition of the Massoretic text give in every instance the authoritative substitute as the official reading in the margin and furnish the consonants of the text itself with the vowel-signs which belong to the marginal reading. These, however, are simply typical examples and we shall see in the sequel that this principle was applied by the authori-

<sup>1</sup> תנו רבנן כל המקראות הכתובין בתורה לנאי קורין אותן לשבח כגון ישגלנה ישכבנה בעפלים בטחורים חריונים דביונים לאכול את חוריהם ולשתות את ממי שיניהם לאכול צואתם ולשתות את ממי רגליהם למחראות למוצאות: מגלה כה.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter ע, § 722, Vol. II, 416; letter ש, § 138, Vol. II, p. 607.

tative redactors of the Sacred Scriptures far more extensively to remove indelicate expressions and antropomorphisms.

IX. *The Emendations of the Sopherim.* — The editorial principle thus laid down that indelicate expressions and anthropomorphisms are to be removed is also illustrated in the examples which the Sopherim have given of the passages altered in harmony with this canon. In the best MSS. there are remarks in the margin against certain readings calling attention to the fact that they exhibit “an emendation of the Sopherim”. Thus in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 which is the oldest dated MS. known at present, the Massorah Parva notices it in four different places. On Ezek. VIII 17 it states that it is “one of the eighteen emendations of the Sopherim”.<sup>1</sup> On Zech. II 12 the remark is somewhat different in form, but the same in purport and is as follows: “one of the eighteen emendations of the Sopherim, the sages, their memory is for good and for a blessing”;<sup>2</sup> whilst on Mal. I 13 and III 8 the Massoretic remark is the same as in the first instance. In two of these four passages the Massorah Magna gives the complete List of these eighteen alterations, viz. Ezek. VIII 17 and Zech. II 12. But though the Massoretic List gives the passages as emended, it does not state what the original text was which the Sopherim altered. Apart from the Massorah we possess no fewer than four separate and independent records which chronicle this important fact, and which illustrate it by adducing the passages wherein the alterations have been made. The variations in the number of the illustrations and the difference in the order in which the instances are adduced

<sup>1</sup> מן י"ח תיקון סופרים.

<sup>2</sup> מן י"ח תיקון סופ' חכמים וזכרני לטובה ולברכה.

show that the records in question are independent of each other and that they are derived from different sources.

The oldest record of these alterations is given in the Mechiltha on Exod. XV 7 and is as follows:

- (1) Zech. II 12 (A. V. v. 8): "For he that toucheth you toucheth the apple of his eye," but the text is altered. So also
- (2) Mal. I 13: "Ye said also, Behold what a weariness *is it!* and ye have snuffed at it," but the text is altered. So also
- (3) I Sam. III 13: "For the iniquity which he knoweth, because his sons made themselves accursed," but the text is altered. So also
- (4) Job. VII 20: "Why hast thou set me as a mark against thee so that I am a burden to myself?" the text is altered. So also
- (5) Habak. I 10: "Art thou not from everlasting O Lord my God, mine Holy One? we shall not die," the text is altered. So also
- (6) Jerem. II 11: "Hath a nation changed *their* gods which yet are no gods? but my people have changed their glory," the text is altered. So also
- (7) Ps. CVI 20: "Thus they have changed their glory into the similitude of an ox," the text is altered.
- (8) Numb. XI 15: "And Let me not see my wretchedness" the text is altered. So also
- (9) 2 Sam. XX 1: "We have no portion in David . . . every man to his tents O Israel?" the text is altered.
- (10) Ezek. VIII 17: "And lo, they put the branch to their nose," the text is altered.
- (11) Numb. XII 12: "When he cometh out of his mother's womb" should be *our mother's*, the text is altered.<sup>1</sup> *Mechiltha* 39a, ed. Friedmann, Vienna 1870.

<sup>1</sup> והנוגע בהם כנוגע בבבת עינו רבי יהודה אומר בבבת עין אינו אומר אלא בבבת עינו כתיב כביכול כלפי מעלה אלא שכינה הכתוב: כיוצא בו ואמרתם הנה מתלאה והפכתם אותו אלא שכינה הכתוב: כיוצא בו בעון אשר ידע כי מקללים להם וגו' אלא שכינה הכתוב: כיוצא בו למה שמחני למפגע לך ואהיה עלי למשא כינה הכתוב: כיוצא בו הלא אתה מלכי מקדם יי' אלהים ולא נמות כינה הכתוב: כיוצא בו ההמיר גוי אלהים והמה לא אלהים ועמי המיר כבודו כינה הכתוב: כיוצא בו וימירו את כבודם בתבנית שור כינה הכתוב: ואל אראה ברעתי כינה הכתוב: כיוצא בו אין לנו חלק ברוד [וגו'] איש לאהליו ישראל כינה הכתוב: והנם שולחים הזמורה אל אפם כינה הכתוב: בצאתו מרחם אמו מרחם אמנו היה לו לומר כינה הכתוב: אף כאן אתה אומר הנוגע בו כנוגע בבבת עינו כביכול כלפי מעלה הכתוב מדבר אלא שכינה הכתוב: ספר מבילתא דף לט.

In the Siphre (fol. 22 *b*; ed. Friedmann, Vienna 1864), where the same fact is recorded, only seven of the instances are adduced, since Nos. 2, 3, 7 and 9 which are given in the Mechiltha List are here omitted. For completeness sake I subjoin the text of the Siphri in the note.<sup>1</sup> It is also important to notice that the order in which the passages are enumerated differs in the two documents.

The third record is contained in the Yalkut Shimeoni on Exod. XV 7, § 247, p. 151, ed. Warsaw 1876. Though the List here given contains ten passages and might thus be almost considered identical with that given in the first record, a close examination of it will show its independence.<sup>2</sup>

It is the fourth record, given in the Midrash Tanchuma also on Exod. XV 7 (p. 83 *a*, ed. Wilna 1833) which is of the utmost importance in the discussion of the alterations of the Sopherim. The List in this document not only contains six more instances, viz. Gen. XVIII 22; 2 Sam. XVI 12; Hos. 10 7; Job. XXXII 3; Lament. III 20;

<sup>1</sup> כל הנוגע בהם כנוגע בבבת עינו בבת עין לא נאמר אלא בבבת עינו של מקום כביכול כלפי מעלה אלא שכינה הכתוב: כיוצא בו למה שמחני למפגע לך ואהיה עלי למשא אלא שכינה הכתוב: כיוצא בו והנה שולחים את הזמורה אל אפם אלא שכינה הכתוב: כיוצא בו הלא אתה מקדם ה' אלהי קדושי ולא אמות אלא שכינה הכתוב: כיוצא בו וימירו את כבודם בתבנית שור אוכל עשב אלא שכינה הכתוב: כיוצא בו ואם ככה את עושה לי הרגני נא הרגו אם מצאתי הן בעיניך ואל אראה ברעתי אלא שכינה הכתוב: כיוצא בו אשר בצאתו מרחם אמו ויאכל חצי בשרו אלא שכינה הכתוב: ספרי דף כב.  
<sup>2</sup> כי הנוגע בהם נוגע בבבת עינו ר' יהודה אומר בבבת עין אינו אומר אלא בבבת עינו כביכול כלפי מעלה הכתוב מדבר אלא שכנה הכתוב: כיוצא בו אתה אומר ואמרתם הנה מתלאה והפכתם אותו אלא שכנה הכתוב: כיוצא בו אתה אומר בעון אשר ידע כי מקללים להם אלא שכנה הכתוב: כיוצא בו אתה אומר הלא אתה הוא מקדם ה' אלהי קדושי לא נמות אלא שכנה הכתוב: כיוצא בו ההמיר גוי אלהים וגו' אלא שכנה הכתוב: כיוצא בו וימירו את כבודם וגו' אלא שכנה הכתוב: כיוצא בו אין לנו חלק ברוד וגו' אלא שכנה הכתוב: כיוצא בו אשר בצאתו מרחם אמו וגו' אלא שכנה הכתוב: כיוצא בו והנה שולחים את הזמורה אל אפם אלא שכינה הכתוב: אף כאן אתה אומר כי (כל) הנוגע בהם וכי: ילקוט שמעוני חלק א פרשת בשלח דף ע"ג § רמו.

2 Chron. X 16, but gives the original text in eleven out of the seventeen passages which it adduces and emphatically declares that the primitive readings were altered by the Members of the Great Synagogue or the Spiritual authorities who fixed the canon of the Hebrew Scriptures.<sup>1</sup>

For the completion of the materials relating to this important branch of textual criticism and before discussing the merits of these alterations we have yet to mention the fact that the Massorah itself gives us a List of these alterations of the Sopherim with the original reading in every passage. The List is preserved in the following three of the Yemen MSS. in the British Museum; Orient. 1379, fol. 268 *b*; Orient. 2349, fol. 108 *a*; and Orient. 2365, fol. 138 *b*. In all the three MSS. the Massorah in question is given on Numb. XII 2. In Orient. 1397 and Orient. 2349 these alterations are not only ascribed to the Sopherim, but it is declared that according to the opinion of some Schools they were made by Ezra himself. As I have printed this

<sup>1</sup> וכן הוא אומר כי הנוגע בכם נוגע בבבת עינו עִינִי היה לו לומר אלא שכנהו הכתוב כלומר כביכול כלפי מעלן וכנהו הכתוב שהוא תיקון סופרים אנשי כנסת הגדולה: כיוצא בו ואמרתם הנה מחלוא והפכתם אֹתָי אלא שכנהו הכתוב: כיוצא בו בעון אשר ידע כי מקללים להם בניו ולא כהה בס אלא שכנהו הכתוב: כיוצא בו למה שמתני למפגע לך ואהיה עֲלֶיךָ למשא אלא שכנהו הכתוב: כיוצא בו הלא אתה מקדם ה' אלהי קדושי לא יִמּוֹת אלא שכנהו הכתוב: כיוצא בו ההמיר גוי אלהים והמה לא אלהים ועמי המיר כְּבֹדִי בלא יועיל אלא שכנהו הכתוב: כיוצא בו וימירו את כְּבֹדִי בתבנית שור אוכל עש אלא שכנהו הכתוב: כיוצא בו כְּבֹדִי בקלון אמיר אלא שכנהו הכתוב: כיוצא בו ובשלשת רעיו חרה אפו על אשר לא מצאו מענה וירשיעו את איוב אלא שכנהו הכתוב: כיוצא בו ואברהם עורנו עומד לפני ה' אלא שכנהו הכתוב: כיוצא בו ואם ככה אתה עושה לי הרגני נא הרוג אם מצאתי חן בעיניך ואל אראה ברעתי: כיוצא בו אל נא תהי כמת אשר בצאתו מרחם אֲמַנּוּ ויאכל חצי בְּשָׂרָנוּ אלא שכנהו הכתוב: כיוצא בו מה לנו חלק ברוד ולא נחלה בבן ישי איש לאהליך ישראל עתה ראה ביתך דוד וילך ישראל לאהליו: וברברי הימים לְאֵלֶיךָ: וזכור תזכור ותשוח עלי נפשי: אולי יראה ה' בְּעֵינָיו אלא שבינו פסוקים אלו אנשי כנסת הגדולה: ולכך נקראו סופרים שהיו סופרים כל אותיות שבתורה ודרשין אותי: וכן והנם שולחים את הומורה אל אֲפִי והם תקנו אל אֲפִים: ואף כאן כי הנוגע בכם נוגע בבבת עִינִי: מדרש תנחומא פירשת בשלח דף פג: ויילא שנת תקצ"ג.

List in the Massorah<sup>1</sup> it is unnecessary to reproduce it here. I must also mention that a List of these Alterations with the original readings has been preserved in Orient. 1425 which contains the MS. of the Hebrew Grammar called *Maase Ephod* by Prophiat Duran. In the heading (fol. 114 *b*) the List is described as exhibiting the alterations made by Ezra and Nehemiah.<sup>2</sup> As it gives only fifteen instances and does not mention any number, it is evident that it emanates from a source prior to the Massoretic recension when the number was already fixed. In the excellent edition of this valuable work published by Friedländer and Kohn, Vienna 1865, the List is not given probably because it was not in the MSS. which these learned editors collated.

It will be seen that in none of the documents in which these alterations are enumerated is any definite order followed in the respective instances adduced. The

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter ת, § 206. Vol. II, p. 710.

### <sup>2</sup> תקון סופרים עזרא ונחמיה

ואברהם עורנו עומד לפני ה'	ויי עומד לפני היה כתוב
ואל אראה ברעתי	ברעתך היה כתוב
מרחם אמו	מרחם אמנו היה כתוב
כי מקללים להם בניו	לו היה כתוב
איש לאהליו ישראל	איש לאלהיו היה כתוב
ועמי המיר כבודו	כבודי היה כתוב
הומורה אל אפם	אל אפי היה כתוב
הנוגע בכם נוגע בבבת עיני	עיני היה כתוב
ואתם מחללים אותי	אותי היה כתוב
והפכתם אותו	אותי היה כתוב
ואהיה עלי למשא	עליך היה כתוב
אולי יראה יי בעיני	בעיניו היה כתוב
ותשוח עלי נפשי	נפשו היה כתוב
ויאכל חצי בשרו	בשרנו היה כתוב
וירשיעו את איוב	שם שמים היה כתוב

חם תקון סופרים.

List in each of the records has a sequence of its own. For the convenience of the student, however, I shall discuss the passages in the order in which they occur in the Hebrew Bible.

(1) Gen. XVIII 22. — "But Abraham stood yet before the Lord." Of the Lists in the four records, the Tanchuma List is the only one which adduces this passage as exhibiting an alteration of the Sopherim. It is also given in both Lists of the oldest Massorah<sup>1</sup> contained in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 and in all the three Massoretic Rubrics in Orient. 1379, Orient. 2349 and Orient. 2365 in each of which it is emphatically stated that it ought to be, or that the original reading was "*but the Lord stood yet before Abraham*" only that the text was altered.<sup>2</sup> To the same effect, but in somewhat simpler language is the declaration in the ancient List preserved in the Maase Ephod that the text was originally *and the Lord still stood before Abraham*, but that it was altered by Ezra and Nehemiah into its present form. With such an emphatic declaration before us, both in the ancient post-Biblical records and in the Massorah itself, it seems almost superfluous to point out that it would be most incomprehensible for the redactors of the text to state that they have here altered the text and also to give the original reading when they had in fact done no such thing. The context, moreover, and the logical continuity of the narrative show beyond doubt that the primitive text was what the Sopherim and the Massorah state it to have been. It was the Lord who *came down* to see and to tell Abraham whether the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah had acted in accordance with the bitter cry which went up to

<sup>1</sup> Comp. the St. Petersburg Codex Ezek. VIII 17 and Zech. II 12.

<sup>2</sup> היה ראוי ויהיה עורנו עמר לפני אברהם אלא שכינה הכתוב.

heaven; it was the Lord, therefore, who stood before Abraham; it was to the Lord's immediate presence that Abraham drew nigh, and it was the Lord who departed from Abraham when the patriarch left off interceding with Him (Gen. XVIII 21, 22, 33). As the phrase to *stand before another* is sometimes used in the Scriptures to denote a state of inferiority and homage<sup>1</sup> it was deemed derogatory to the Deity to say that the Lord stood before Abraham. Hence in accordance with the above rule to remove all indelicate expressions the phrase was altered by the Sopherim.

(2) Numb. XI 15. — All the four ancient records and the Massoretic Lists give this passage as exhibiting an alteration of the Sopherim. The three Yemen MSS. and the Massorah preserved in the *Maase Ephod* state the text originally was "kill me I pray thee out of hand if I have found favour in thy sight that I may not see (ברעתך) *thy evil*", i. e. the evil or punishment wherewith thou wilt visit Israel. As this might be so construed as to ascribe evil to the Lord, the Sopherim altered it into "that I may not see (ברעתי) *my evil*," which the Authorised Version and the Revised Version render "my wretchedness". From the rendering of the Jerusalem Targum "that I may not see the evil of thy people" it is evident that in some Schools the textual reading was ברעת עמך or ברעתם.<sup>2</sup>

(3) Numb. XII 12. — "Let her not, I pray, be as the dead *born child* which when it comes out of its mother's womb, has half its flesh consumed." This we are told by all the ancient authorities is a correction of the Sopherim and that the text originally was: "Let her not, I pray, be as the dead *born child*, which when proceeding from *our*

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Gen. XVIII 8; XLI 16; Deut. I 38; X 8; XVIII 7 &c.

<sup>2</sup> ולא אחמי בבישתהון דעמך.



*mother's* (אִמָּנָה) womb the half of *our flesh* (בְּשָׂרֵנוּ) is consumed." This was regarded as derogatory to the mother of the great lawgiver by depicting her as having given birth to a partially decomposed body. The simile was, therefore, altered from the first person plural into the impersonal.

(4) 1 Sam. III 13. — "Because his sons did bring a curse upon themselves and he restrained them not" or as the Authorised Version has it "because his sons made themselves vile" margin "*accursed*". It is now admitted that this rendering cannot legitimately be obtained from the text as it now stands since the Piel קָלַל does not mean *to bring a curse upon* any one, but *to curse* and is never followed by the dative, but the accusative. All the ancient authorities, however, emphatically declare that this is not the original reading, and that the text exhibits one of the alterations of the Sopherim. According to some authorities, the text originally was לִי מִקְלָלִים *they cursed me*, i. e. God. But though this undoubtedly yields the original sense and supplies the reason for the alteration, it is exposed to the same grammatical difficulty as the present text since קָלַל is never construed with the dative. There can, therefore, be no doubt that the Septuagint has preserved the original reading אֱלֹהִים *God*, viz. "because his sons cursed *God*" (comp. Exod. XXII 27), which is also exhibited in the margin of the Revised Version and is now accepted by the best critics. In their effort to soften the offensive statement that the sons of Eli openly blasphemed God, and that he did not reprimand them the Sopherim were most anxious to alter the text as little as possible. They, therefore, restricted themselves to the simple omission of the two letters *Aleph* (א) and *Yod* (י) and indeed of only the one letter *Aleph* since the *Yod*, as we have seen, was frequently absent in the primitive orthography thus converting אֱלֹהִים *God* into להֶם *them*.

(5) 2 Sam. XVI 12. — Before considering the alteration which the Sopherim introduced into this passage it is necessary to remark that the text here exhibits three different recensions. We have in the first place the textual reading or the *Kethiv* "the Lord will look (בְּעֵינַי) *on mine iniquity*", which is interpreted "the iniquity" or "wrong done unto me" and which is adopted in the Revised Version. Then we have the official *Keri* "the Lord will look (בְּעֵינַי) *on mine eye*", which is explained to stand for "my tears" and which is followed in the margin of the Authorised Version. And then again we have the reading "the Lord will look (בְּעֵינַי) *on my affliction*", which is exhibited in the Septuagint, the Syriac and the Vulgate, and which is followed in the text of the Authorised Version, and is noticed in the margin of the Revised Version. It will be seen that in both the textual reading or *Kethiv* (בְּעֵינַי) *on mine iniquity*, and the official reading or *Keri* (בְּעֵינַי) *on mine eye*, we have to resort to artificial explanations to obtain a tolerable sense. In the first instance we are told that "mine iniquity" stands for *the iniquity* or *wrong done to me* and in the second instance it is stated that "mine eye" stands for *my tears*. The ancient authorities, however, emphatically declare that the passage before us exhibits an alteration of the Sopherim and that the text originally was "the Lord will behold (בְּעֵינָו) *with his eye*". In harmony with the recensional canon that anthropomorphisms are to be removed, the reading that the Lord will see with his own eye was altered by the simple process of substituting the letter *Yod* (י) for *Vav* (ו) at the end of the word thus converting the suffix third person into the first person.

(6, 7 and 8) 2 Sam. XX 1. — "Every man to his tents, O Israel" we are told in the Mechiltha, which contains the earliest record on this subject, that this is not the original

reading, but that it exhibits an alteration of the Sopherim. Originally the text read "every one to his *gods*, O Israel". The rebellion against the house of David was regarded as necessarily involving apostasy from the true God and going over to idolatry. It was looked upon as leaving God and the Sanctuary for the worship of idols in tents. But this impudent challenge of Biehi the man of Belial was regarded as a contemptuous defiance of, and derogatory to the God of Israel which apparently escaped with impunity. Hence the Sopherim transposed the two middle letters of the word and לאלהיו *to his gods*, became לאהלי *to his tents*. For this reason the ancient authorities tell us the expression in question was also altered in the same phrase in 1 Kings XII 16 and 2 Chron. X 16 which record a similar event.

(9) Jerem. II 11. — The ancient records emphatically declare that the original reading here was: "but my people hath changed (פְּבוֹדִי) *my glory*", and that the Sopherim altered it into: "but my people hath changed (פְּבוֹדוֹ) *his glory*". The same reverend motive which underlies the alteration with regard to the name of God in the preceding passage determined the change here. The expression פְּבוֹד *glory*, was considered to denote the visible manifestation of the Deity, i. e. the *Shechinah*. To say, therefore, that the Israelites changed this Supreme Glory for an idol was deemed too bold a statement and derogatory to the Lord. Hence the alteration of the suffix first person to the third person which was easily effected by the substitution of the *Vav* (ו) for the *Yod* (י). And though "*his glory*" may also refer to the Lord yet it leaves room for a divergence of opinion and at all events removes the harshness of the sentence. The ancient Versions exhibit this alteration of the Sopherim which is also followed both in the Authorised Version and in the Revised Version.

(10) Ezek. VIII 17. — "And lo, they put the branch to (אֶפְסוֹ) *their nose*", we are told by all the ancient authorities is a correction of the Sopherim and that it was originally: "and lo, they put the branch to (אֶפְסִי) *my nose*", i. e. face. To understand the alteration here effected it is necessary to examine the context. The Lord here enumerates the great abominations which the house of Judah has committed in His very Sanctuary. He states that they have not only profaned His altar by introducing the idolatrous sun-worship into the Temple of the Lord, "but still further to provoke me to anger they scornfully display the branch which is used as an emblem in this abominable worship into (אֶפְסִי) *my very nostrils*". This bold anthropomorphism was afterwards regarded as derogatory to the supreme Deity and hence in accordance with the prescribed canon was altered by the Sopherim.

(11) Hosea IV 7. — "I will change their glory into shame" exhibits another alteration of the Sopherim. The ancient authorities state that the original reading here was פְּבוֹדִי *my glory*, instead of פְּבוֹדָם *their glory*. But it is evident from the context that this only exhibits partially the alteration which the Sopherim introduced here, since "I will change my glory into shame" is both against the context and against the principle which underlies these alterations. There can, therefore, be no doubt that the alteration also included the verb which as the Mechiltha rightly points out was originally הִמִּיר or הִמִּירוּ Hiphil preterite third person, i. e. *they have changed*, instead of אֶמִּיר future first person singular, i. e. *I will change*. Accordingly the text originally read:

My glory they have changed into shame

which the Sopherim altered into:

Their glory I will change into shame.

This is in perfect harmony with the alteration recorded in No. 9.

(12) Hab. I 12. — “Art thou not from everlasting, O Lord my God, mine Holy One? we shall not die.” All the ancient records emphatically state that this exhibits the corrected text by the Sopherim and that the original reading was:

Art thou not from everlasting?

O Lord my God, mine Holy One, thou diest not.

The parallelism plainly shows that this is the correct reading. The address in both clauses is to the Lord who is described in the first clause as being from everlasting and in the second clause as never dying or enduring for ever. The introduction, therefore, of a new subject in the plural with the predicate “*we shall not die*” thus ascribing immortality to the people is contrary to the scope of the passage. Not only has the Chaldee preserved the original reading by paraphrasing it “thy word endureth for ever”,<sup>1</sup> but Rashi (1040—1105) makes it the basis of his explanation. “The prophet says why art thou silent to all this. Art thou not from everlasting my God, mine Holy One, who diest not.”<sup>2</sup> It is very remarkable that the Revised Version which has not noticed any other of the alterations of the Sopherim has the following note in the margin on this passage: “according to an ancient Jewish tradition *thou diest not*”. The reason for the alteration is not far to seek. It was considered offensive to predicate of the Lord “*thou diest not*”. Hence “*we shall not die*” was substituted.

<sup>1</sup> מימרך קיים לעלמין.

<sup>2</sup> אמר הנביא ואתה למה תחריש לכל זאת הלא אתה מקדם אלהי קדושי אשר לא תמות וזה שכתוב לא נמות אחד מתיקוני סופרים שבמקרא הוא שכינה הכתוב וכן והפחתם אותו וכן הרבה המפורשים בסיפרי ולפי תיקון הסופרים זהו פירושו הלא אתה אלהי מקדם קדושי אל תתני למות בידו.

(13) Zech. II 12 in the Hebrew II 8 in the Authorised Version. — Here the original reading, which was: “he that toucheth you toucheth the apple of (עֵינִי) *my eye*”, has been altered by the Sopherim into: “he that toucheth you toucheth the apple of (עֵינֹו) *his eye*”, i. e. as if one were to touch the apple of *his own eye*. Though “the eye of the Lord” is not unfrequently used in the Bible<sup>1</sup> yet “the apple of my eye” (כַּבֶּת עֵינִי) occurs no where else. It was, therefore, regarded derogatory to the Deity that he himself should ascribe to himself so pronounced an anthropomorphic feature.<sup>2</sup> Hence in accordance with the rule which underlies these alterations the *Yod* (י) was changed into *Vav* (ו) as in the case of the alteration exhibited in No. 9.

(14) Malachi I 13. — All the ancient authorities emphatically declare that the original reading here was: “ye have snuffed (אֹתִי) at *me*”, and that the Sopherim have altered it into: “ye have snuffed (אֹתוֹ) at *it*”, because it was regarded derogatory to the Lord to apply to him such an offensive predicate. That the text had originally אֹתִי at *me* is, moreover, attested by Rashi who plainly says: “this is one of the eighteen alterations of the Sopherim. The textual reading אֹתוֹ at *it*, was originally אֹתִי at *me*, but the passage was altered and they [i. e.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Ps XXXIII 18 with Jerem. XXIV 6; Ezek. V 11; VII 4 &c.

<sup>2</sup> In Deut. XXXII 10 the phrase is not exactly the same since it is here כַּאֲשֶׁן עֵינֵי which is also translated as *the apple of his eye*. There was no necessity for any alteration here because the expression does not necessarily refer to God. The passage may mean God kept Israel as one keeps the apple of his eye. The Septuagint, the Jerusalem Targum and the Syriac omit the article altogether, i. e. he kept Israel as *the eye-apple*, whilst Onkelos, who translates the passage in the plural, renders the suffix also in the plural, i. e. he kept them as the apple of their eye. Comp. Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, p. 324, Breslau 1857.

the Sopherim] substituted for it אֹתוֹ *at it*.<sup>1</sup> St. Jerome must also have known this fact since he thinks that we might read אֹתִי *at me*,<sup>2</sup> and indeed this reading is found in many MSS.

(15) Ps. CVI 20. — “They changed (פְּבוֹדָם) *their* glory.” This we are told exhibits one of the alterations of the Sopherim. The original reading was: “they changed (פְּבוֹדִי) *my* glory”, but it was altered because the statement that the Israelites changed God’s visible Shechinah for the image of an ox was deemed derogatory to the Divine Being. The reason, therefore, which underlies this alteration is exactly the same which induced the changes in the passages marked Nos. 9 and 11. It is to be remarked that both some MSS. of the Septuagint and the Vulgate exhibit the reading פְּבוֹדוֹ *his glory*, in the third person, i. e. God’s glory or Shechinah.

(16) Job. VII 20. — According to the testimony of the ancient records the original reading of this passage was:

Why hast thou set me as a mark for thee  
And why have I become a burden unto thee?

This reading is still preserved in the Septuagint and is demanded by the parallelism and the context. The declaration, however, on the part of Job that he had become a burden to God was considered by the redactors of the text as bordering on blasphemy. Hence the Sopherim altered עָלַי *unto thee*, into עָלִי *unto myself*, by the simple process of omitting the single letter *Caph* (ך). Ibn Ezra (1088—1177) one of the most distinguished Jewish commentators of the middle ages boldly declares that “though

1 זו אחת מִיֵּחַ תִּבְוִי שֶׁל תִּיקוֹן סוֹפְרִי, הַפְּחַתְּם אוֹתוֹ אוֹתִי נִכְתַּב אֵלָא שְׂכִינָה  
הַכְּתוּ וְכַתְּבוּ אוֹתוֹ.

<sup>3</sup> Ut in Hebraeo legi potest, *et exsufflastis me*, haec dicendo, non sacrificio, sed mihi cui sacrificabatis, fecistis injuriam. Comp. the article on the *Tikun Sopherim* by the Rev. Oliver Turnbull Crane in the *Hebraica*, Vol. III, p. 243, 1887.

עָלִי *unto myself* is an alteration of the Sopherim nevertheless in explaining the passage it is best to ignore this alteration”.<sup>1</sup>

(17) Job. XXXII 3. — “And *yet* they had condemned (אִיֹּב) *Job*”, exhibits an alteration of the Sopherim. According to the List of these alterations preserved in the Maase Ephod the text originally was “and because they had condemned (אֱלֹהִים) *God*.” The context shows that the original reading is preferable to the emendation. Job’s three friends came to prove that God’s providential dealings towards the afflicted patriarch were perfectly just, inasmuch as his sufferings were the merited punishment for his sinful life. But instead of vindicating the Divine justice they ceased to answer Job because he was right in their eyes (בְּעֵינֵיהֶם) as the Septuagint rightly has it) and they thereby inculpated the conduct of God. The expression, however, “and they condemned God” was considered blasphemous and hence *Job* was substituted for *God*.

(18) Lamentations III 20. — “And *my* soul (נַפְשִׁי) is humbled in me,” according to the testimony of the ancient authorities and the Massorah is another alteration of the Sopherim. The original reading was: “and (נַפְשְׁךָ) *thy* soul will mourn over me” or “will condescend unto me”. The most cursory examination of the context will disclose the fact that the original reading restores the logical sequence, the true rhythm and the pathetic beauty of the text. We need only read the three verses together which form the stanza to see it:

Verse 19: Remember my misery and my forlorn state  
the wormwood and the gall.  
„ 20: Yea verily thou wilt remember  
and thy soul will mourn over me.  
„ 21: This I recall to my heart,  
therefore, I have hope

1 ואדיה עלי למשא תיקון סופרים אע"פ שבפירושו כאשר הוא בלא תיקון נכון.

The expression, however, “*thy* soul (נַפְשְׁךָ) will mourn” as applied to God, was considered an offensive anthropomorphism and, therefore, the Sopherim in harmony with the rule which underlies all these corrections, altered it into *my* soul (נַפְשִׁי) and thus marred the beauty and pathos of the stanza.

These passages, however, are simply quoted as typical instances and are by no means intended to be exhaustive. Hence none of the above named ancient documents specify the exact number of the Sopheric alterations, but simply adduce sundry examples to illustrate the principle that indecent and anthropomorphic expressions are to be altered by the authoritative redactors of the text. Hence too the different records vary in the number of the examples which they respectively quote. The Siphri adduces seven passages, the Yalkut ten, the Mechiltha eleven and the Tanchuma seventeen passages. That there were other passages in which identically the same or similar phrases occurred in the primitive text and that they too underwent the same process of alteration in accordance with the canon to remove indelicate and improper expressions will be seen from the following considerations.

The oldest Massorah in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916, which registers these alterations of the Sopherim, adds two more examples which are not given in any of the ancient documents. And though the catchwords are simply given without mentioning what the original reading was which the Sopherim altered, there is no difficulty in ascertaining it by the light of the other Sopheric alteration and by bearing in mind the principle which underlies these changes.

The catchword for the first change is מַחֲלִילִים = Malachi I 12. This indicates that originally the text was:

מַחֲלִילִים אוֹתִי “ye have polluted *me*” (comp. Ezek. XIII 19), and that אוֹתִי *me* has been altered into אוֹתוֹ *him*, in accordance with the same alteration which we are told the Sopherim made in verse 13, for though this does not alter the sense it softens it by obviating the direct reference to God. Possibly the alteration may also have included the catchword itself. The original reading may have been יִקְלִלִים אוֹתִי *ye have cursed me*, and the *Koph* (ק) has been changed into *Cheth* (ח).

The catchword for the second change is קִבְעִים which manifestly refers to Malachi III 9. The original reading here was: “with a curse ye *have cursed*” (מִאֲרָרִים), the active participle as is evident from the parallelism:

Ye have cursed with a curse

And ye have robbed me.

As this cursing was pronounced against God which was blasphemy in the highest degree, the active was changed into the passive by the substitution of *Nun* (נ) for *Mem* (מ) which now makes this clause quite detached from the rest of the sentence. The anxiety to mitigate this clause is also seen from the recension which the Greek translators had before them since the Septuagint exhibits בְּמַרְאֵה אַתֶּם רְאִים *in a vision ye have seen*.

X. *Impious expressions towards the Almighty.* — We have now to adduce a few passages into which changes have been introduced by the authorised redactors of the text, but which are not expressly mentioned in the official Lists. Foremost amongst these are instances in which the original reading described blasphemy or cursing God. Such profane phrases were deemed offensive to the ears of the devote worshippers when the Scriptures were read publicly before the congregation. It was the anxiety to mitigate these harsh and impious expressions towards the Almighty which gave rise to the editorial canon in

accordance with which the Sopheric alterations were made.

<sup>2</sup> Sam. XII 14. — “Howbeit, because by this deed thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme.” In looking at the context it will be seen that David is charged by the Prophet with having committed the twofold crime of adultery and murder for each of which the Divine Law imposed the penalty of death (Levit. XX 10; XXIV 17). As an absolute monarch none of his subjects dared to enforce the penalty. Hence it was David himself who by his scandalous violation of God’s Law preeminently blasphemed the Lord though in a secondary sense he also gave occasion for others to follow his example. Such harsh conduct towards God, however, which in ordinary cases offended the feelings of the pious, was in this particular instance more especially intolerable. The direct predicate that the Shepherd King, the sweet Singer of Israel that *he had blasphemed the Lord* was, therefore, mitigated by the insertion of the expression *אֵיבֵי the enemies of*, so that the original reading *thou hast greatly blasphemed the Lord* became “thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme”. That this is an official alteration is attested by Rashi, one of the most illustrious Jewish expositors of the middle ages and the most faithful depository of the ancient traditions. He emphatically declares: “*This is an alteration due to the reverence for the glory of God.*”<sup>1</sup> The alteration is, moreover, indicated by the fact that *נָאֵץ* the *Piel*, which occurs no fewer than thirteen times, never denotes *to cause to blaspheme*, but *to blaspheme*, *to curse*, *to contemn*, *to provoke* &c. and is universally rendered so even in the Authorised Version and in no single instance in the sense

<sup>1</sup> כְּנוֹי הוּא זֶה דֶּרֶךְ כְּבוֹר לְמַעַלָּה.

of the Hiphil.<sup>1</sup> The text, therefore, as it now stands can only mean “because thou hast greatly blasphemed the enemies of the Lord” which is nonsense.

Ps. X 3. — Still more remarkable is the instance before us which exhibits the same phrase. This verse literally translated is as follows:

For the wicked boasteth of his heart’s desire,  
And the robber blesseth blasphemeth the Lord.

It will be seen at once that the expression *בִּרְךָ he blesseth*, is a marginal gloss on the word *נָאֵץ he blasphemeth*, which in accordance with the principle underlying these alterations, is designed to remove the harsh and impious phrase “he blasphemeth the Lord”. The text, therefore, exhibits a blending of the two recensions which obtained in two different Schools, viz. the School which had the primitive reading *נָאֵץ יְהוָה he blasphemeth the Lord*, and the School which substituted for it *בִּרְךָ יְהוָה he blesseth the Lord*.<sup>2</sup> Some idea of the extraordinary expedients to which translators and commentators, by ignoring this fact, have resorted in order to make an intelligible sense from the text as it now stands may be gathered from the Authorised Version and the Revised Version. The Authorised Version renders the verse:

For the wicked boasteth of his heart’s desire  
And blesseth the covetous *whom* the Lord abhorreth  
Margin Or.  
And the covetous blesseth himself he abhorreth the Lord

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Numb. XIV 11, 23; XVI 30; Deut. XXXI 20; 1 Sam. II 17; Isa. I 4; V 24; LX 14; Jerem. XXIII 17; Ps. X 3, 13; LXIV 10, 18.

<sup>2</sup> In verse 13. however, of this very Psalm where the same phrase occurs, there does not seem to have been any euphemistic gloss and hence the redactors left the original reading alone. The same is the case in Isa. I, 4. Like the other editorial principles this canon for reasons which we cannot at present discuss. was not uniformly acted upon.

whilst the Revised Version translates it:

For the wicked boasteth of his heart's desire  
And the covetous renounceth *yea* contemneth the Lord

Margin Or.

And blesseth the covetous, but revileth the Lord.

Still more objectionable and more offensive to the ear was the phrase "*to curse* the Lord". The official redactors of the text have, therefore, substituted in cases where it occurred, the same euphemistic expression בֵּרַךְ *to bless*, for the original reading קָלַל *to curse*, or גָּדַף *to blaspheme*.

1 Kings XXI 10, 13. — We are told here that Jezebel suborned two worthless fellows to testify that Naboth had blasphemed both God and the king for which the Law imposed the penalty of death (Levit. XXIV 16; Deut. XIII 9, 10). But the Hebrew as it now stands, says the very reverse, inasmuch as it literally means: "Thou didst bless (בֵּרַכְתָּ) God and the king". In both the Authorised Version and the Revised Version the principle which underlies this reading in the original is entirely obscured, because the verb in question is rendered *blaspheme*, *renounce*, *curse* &c. The verb בֵּרַךְ *to bless*, has no such antiphrastic and euphemistic sense. The assertion that because it is used as a salutation both in meeting and parting,<sup>1</sup> therefore, it came to denote by a process of evolution *to renounce*, *to blaspheme*, *to curse* &c. is contrary to the very nature of its usage. Both in meeting and parting it expresses the kindest sentiments, wishes for happiness and friendship and not a single instance can be adduced in which it is used even by implication to denote parting for ever in a hostile sense, much less to convey the idea of blaspheming or cursing. Such desperate

<sup>1</sup> Comp. 2 Kings IV 29; Prov. XXVII 14; 1 Chron. XVI 43 &c.

expedients at artificial interpretation would never have been resorted to if the canon adopted by the redactors of the text had been sufficiently attended to. Some of the best modern critics, however, now acknowledge that the original reading here was either בֵּרַכְתָּ as the Chaldee has it or קָלַלְתָּ as it is in the Syriac and these are the two alternative readings which I have given in the notes on this passage in my edition of the text.

The sense of בֵּרַךְ *to bless* being now definitely established and the redactorial principle which underlies its substitution for קָלַל *to curse*, in the text having been duly set forth, it is superfluous to discuss the instances in Job in which the same Sopheric alterations have been introduced. Some of the best critics now admit that the original reading in all the four passages in question was קָלַל,<sup>1</sup> whilst others unhesitatingly exhibit it in the text. In accordance with my principle, however, not to alter the Massoretic text I have given the primitive reading in the notes with the introductory remark נ"ל = *it appears to me, I am of opinion, it ought to be*, because though the reading is perfectly certain there is no MS. authority for it.

XI. *The safeguarding of the Tetragrammaton and other Divine Names.* — Without entering into a discussion on the pronunciation or signification of the Divine Name יְהוָה which is beyond the scope of this section, we have yet to call attention to the fact that the Jews from time immemorial have regarded with the utmost sacredness and reverence this incommunicable Name of the most High God, and that the awe manifested for the Tetragrammaton has played an important part in the redaction of the text. Throughout the Hebrew Bible wherever יְהוָה occurs by itself, it has

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Job. I 5. 11; II 5. 9.

not its own points, but those which belong to אֲדֹנָי *Lord*, only that the *Yod* (י) has the simple *Sheva* instead of the *Sheva Pathach* = Chateph Pathach (יְ) and is pronounced *Adonā* = Κύριος, and when אֲדֹנָי יְהוָה occur together יהוָה is pointed in the Massoretic text יהוָה with the vowel points which belong to אֱלֹהִים *God*.<sup>1</sup> Owing to this extreme reverence for the Ineffable Name the redactors of the text not unfrequently safeguarded it by substituting for it either אֲדֹנָי *Lord*, which is followed throughout the Septuagint and the New Testament, or אֱלֹהִים *God*.

In illustration of this fact I shall restrict myself to a few of the parallel passages which record identically the same events and about which there cannot possibly be any doubt. Both in 2 Sam. V 17—25 and 1 Chron. XIV 8—17 David's encounter with the Philistines is described. In Samuel the Tetragrammaton (יהוָה) is used throughout the description, whereas in Chronicles *God* (אֱלֹהִים) is substituted for it as will be seen from the following:

2 Samuel V	1 Chronicles XIV
V 19 And David enquired of (יהוָה) <i>the Lord</i>	XIV 10 And David enquired of (אֱלֹהִים) <i>God</i>
" 20 <i>the Lord</i> hath broken forth upon mine enemies	" 11 <i>God</i> hath broken in upon mine enemies
" 23 and David enquired of <i>the Lord</i>	" 14 and David enquired again of <i>God</i>
" 24 for then shall <i>the Lord</i> go out before thee	" 15 for <i>God</i> is gone out before thee
" 25 and David did so as <i>the Lord</i> commanded him.	" 16 and David did as <i>God</i> commanded him.

The same is the case in the description of the removal of the ark to the city of David of which we have also a duplicate record, one in 2 Sam. VI and one in 1 Chron. XIII as will be seen from the following:

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter א. § 116. Vol. I. p. 26.

2 Samuel VI	1 Chronicles XIII
VI 9 And David was afraid of (יהוָה) <i>the Lord</i>	XIII 12 and David was afraid of (אֱלֹהִים) <i>God</i>
" 9 the ark of <i>the Lord</i>	" 12 the ark of <i>God</i>
" 11 and the ark of <i>the Lord</i> continued	" 14 and the ark of <i>God</i> continued
" 17 and they brought in the ark of <i>the Lord</i>	XVI 1 and they brought in the ark of <i>God</i>
" 17 and David offered . . . before <i>the Lord</i> .	" 1 and they offered . . . before <i>God</i> .

The duplicate Psalm in the Psalter itself, viz. XIV and LIII illustrates the same fact. In the former the Tetragrammaton is used, whilst in the latter the expression (אֱלֹהִים) *God*, is substituted for it as will be seen from the following comparison:

Psalm XIV	Psalm LIII
XIV 2 <i>The Lord</i> (יהוָה) looked down from heaven	LIII 3 <i>God</i> (אֱלֹהִים) looked down from heaven
" 4 and call not upon <i>the Lord</i>	" 5 they call not upon <i>God</i>
" 7 when <i>the Lord</i> bringeth back the captivity.	" 6 when <i>God</i> bringeth back the captivity.

There are, however, a number of compound names in the Bible into the composition of which three out of the four letters of the Incommunicable Name have entered. Moreover, these letters which begin the names in question are actually pointed יהו *Jeho*, as the Tetragrammaton itself and hence in a pause at the reading of the first part of the name it sounded as if the reader was pronouncing the Ineffable Name. To guard against it an attempt was made by a certain School of redactors of the text to omit the letter *He* (ה) so that the first part of the names in question has been altered from *Jeho* (יהו) into *Jo* (יו). It was, however, only an attempt on the part of a certain School for as we shall see from the following analysis, the alterations were only partially carried out and in most cases the primitive



orthography has survived. In the examination of them I shall give these names according to the order of the Hebrew alphabet and must premise that for the purposes of this investigation no notice can be taken of the fact that two, three or more persons have often the same name in the Bible.

(1) יהוֹאָחָז *Jehoachaz* = *whom Jehovah sustains*, which occurs twenty-four times, has retained the primitive orthography in twenty passages, viz. 2 Kings X 35; XIII 1, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 22, 25, 25; XIV 8, 17; XXIII 30, 31, 34; 2 Chron. XXI 17; XXV 17, 23, 25; XXXVI 1 and it is only in four places that it has been altered into

יוֹאָחָז *Joachaz*, viz. 2 Kings XIV 1; 2 Chron. XXXIV 8; XXXVI 2, 4. With the exception of 2 Kings XIV 1 the marked distinction between the two different spellings which the Hebrew exhibits is obliterated in the Authorised Version.

(2) יהוֹאָשׁ *Jehoash* = *whom Jehovah bestowed*, which occurs sixty-four times, has only retained the original spelling in the following seventeen passages: 2 Kings XII 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 19; XIII 10, 25; XIV 8, 9, 11, 13, 13, 15, 16, 17, whilst no fewer than forty-seven passages

יוֹאָשׁ *Joash* is exhibited in the altered orthography, viz. Judg. VI 11, 29, 30, 31; VII 14; VIII 13, 29, 32, 32; 1 Kings XXII 26; 2 Kings XI 2; XII 20, 21; XIII 1, 9, 10, 12, 13, 13, 14, 25; XIV 1, 1, 3, 17, 23, 23, 27; Hos. I 1; Amos I 1; 1 Chron. III 11; IV 22; XII 3; 2 Chron. XVIII 25; XXII 11; XXIV 1, 2, 4, 22, 24; XXV 17, 18, 21, 23, 23, 25, 25. The altered form, therefore, has prevailed in this name.

(3) יהוֹזָבָד *Jehozabad* = *whom Jehovah bestowed*, which occurs thirteen times, has the primitive spelling in only four instances, viz. 2 Kings XII 22; 1 Chron. XXVI 4; 2 Chron. XVII 18; XXIV 26; whereas

יוֹזָבָד *Jozabad* the altered orthography is exhibited in the following ten passages: Ezra VIII 33; X 22, 23; Neh.

VIII 7; XI 16; 1 Chron. XII 4, 20, 20; 2 Chron. XXXI 13; XXXV 9. Here again the altered spelling prevails.

(4) יהוֹחָנָן *Jehohanan* = *whom Jehovah graciously gave*, which occurs thirty-three times, retained the original orthography in the following nine instances: Ezra X 6, 28; Neh. VI 18; XII 13, 42; 1 Chron. XXVI 3; 2 Chron. XVII 15; XXIII 1; XXVIII 12; whereas the text exhibits the altered spelling

יוֹחָנָן *Johanan* in no fewer than twenty-four passages, viz. 2 Kings XXV 23; Jerem. XL 8, 13, 15, 16; XLI 11, 13, 14, 15, 16; XLII 1, 8; XLIII 2, 4, 5; Ezra VIII 12; Neh. XII 22, 23; 1 Chron. III 15, 24; V 35, 36; XII 4, 12. Here too the altered orthography prevails. In the Authorised Version the original spelling is obliterated.

(5) יהוֹיָדָע *Jehoiada* = *whom Jehovah knoweth*, which occurs forty-seven times, has the primitive orthography in the following forty-two passages: 2 Sam. VIII 18; XX 23; XXIII 20, 22; 1 Kings 1, 8, 26, 32, 36, 38, 44; II 25, 29, 34, 35, 46; IV 4; 2 Kings XI 4, 9, 9, 15, 17; XII 3, 8, 10; Jerem. XXIX 26; 1 Chron. XI 22, 24; XII 27; XVIII 17; XXVII 5, 34; 2 Chron. XXII 11; XXIII 1, 8, 8, 9, 11, 14, 16, 18; XXIV 2, 3, 6, 12, 14, 14, 15, 17, 20, 22, 25, and the abbreviated form

יוֹיָדָע *Joiada* in the following five instances: Neh. III 6; XII 10, 11, 22; XIII 28.

(6) יהוֹיָכִין *Jehoiachin* = *whom Jehovah hath appointed*, which occurs eleven times, retains the original orthography in ten passages, viz. 2 Kings XXIV 6, 8, 12, 15; XXV 27, 27; Jerem. LII 31, 31; 2 Chron. XXXVI 8, 9; and it is in one instance where

יוֹיָכִין *Joiachin* the altered spelling is exhibited, viz. Ezek. I 2. The Authorised Version confounds the different spellings also in this name.

(7) יהוֹיָקִים *Jehoiakim* = *whom Jehovah hath set up*, which occurs forty-one times, has retained the original ortho-

graphy in no fewer than thirty-seven places, viz. 2 Kings XXIII 34, 35, 36; XXIV 1, 5, 6, 19; Jerem. I 3; XXII 18, 24; XXIV 1; XXV 1; XXVI 1, 21, 22, 23; XXVII 1, 20; XXVIII 4; XXXV 1; XXXVI 1, 9, 28, 29, 30, 32; XXXVII 1; XLV 1; XLVI 2; LII 2; Dan. I 1, 2; 1 Chron. III 15, 16; 2 Chron. XXXVI 4, 5, 8; and it is only in four passages where

יֹאֲכִים *Joiakim*, the altered form is to be found in Neh. II 10, 10, 12, 26.

(8) יְהוֹיָרִיב *Jehoiarib* = *whom Jehovah defends*, which occurs seven times, the text exhibits the primitive orthography in only two instances, viz. 1 Chron. IX 10; XXIV 7, whilst in five passages the altered form

יֹאֲרִיב *Joiarib*, is exhibited, viz. Ezra VIII 16; Neh. XI 5, 10; XII 6, 19.

(9) יְהוֹנָדָב *Jehonadab* = *whom Jehovah gave spontaneously*, which occurs fifteen times, has the original spelling in the following eight passages: 2 Sam. XIII 5; 2 Kings X 15, 15, 23; Jerem. XXXV 8, 14, 16, 18, and in seven instances the text exhibits the altered form

יֹנָדָב *Jonadab*, viz. 2 Sam. XIII 3, 3, 32, 35; Jerem. XXXV 6, 10, 19. This difference is obliterated in the Authorised Version.

(10) יְהוֹנָתָן *Jehonathan* = *whom Jehovah gave*, which occurs one-hundred and twenty-one times, has the original spelling in no fewer than seventy-nine passages, viz. Judg. XVIII 30; 1 Sam. XIV 6, 8; XVIII 1, 1, 3, 4; XIX 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 7, 7; XX 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 25, 27, 28, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 37, 38, 38, 39, 40, 42; XXI 1; XXIII 16, 18; XXXI 2; 2 Sam. I, 4, 5, 12, 17, 22, 23, 25, 26; IV 4, 4; IX 1, 3, 6, 7; XV 27, 36; XVII 17, 20; XXI 7, 7, 12, 13, 14, 21; XXIII 32; Jerem. XXXVII 15, 20; XXXVIII 26; Neh. XII 18; 1 Chron. VIII 33, 34; IX 39, 40; XX 7; XXVII 25, 32; 2 Chron. XVII 8, and

in the following forty-two instances the text has it in the abbreviated form

יֹנָתָן *Jonathan* 1 Sam. XIII 2, 3, 16, 22, 22; IV 1, 3, 4, 12, 12, 13, 13, 14, 17, 21, 27, 29, 39, 40, 41, 42, 42, 43, 43, 44, 45, 45, 49; XIX 1; 1 Kings I 42, 43; Jerem. XL 8; Ezra VIII 6; X 15; Neh. XII 11, 11, 14, 35; 1 Chron. II 32, 33; X 2; XI 34. In the Authorised Version this distinction is absolutely obliterated.

(11) יְהוֹסֵפֶה *Jehoseph* only occurs once, viz. Ps. LXXXI 6, and in all the numerous passages where this name is to be found in the Bible it is

יֹסֵפֶה *Joseph*. In the Authorised Version the distinction is obliterated.

(12) יְהוֹזָדָק *Jehozadak* = *Jehovah maketh just*, which occurs thirteen times retains the original orthography in the following eight passages: Hag. I 1, 12, 14; II 2, 4; Zech. VI 11; 1 Chron. V 40, 41, whilst it has the abbreviated form

יֹזָדָק *Jozadak*, in five instances, viz. Ezra III 2, 8; V 2; X 18; Neh. XII 26. The distinction is confounded in the Authorised Version.

(13) יְהוֹרָם *Jehoram* = *whom Jehovah exalted*, which occurs forty-nine times, has the original orthography in the following twenty-nine passages: 1 Kings XXII 51; 2 Kings I 17, 17; III 1, 6; VIII 16, 25, 29; IX 15, 17, 21, 21, 22, 23, 24; XII 19; 2 Chron. XVII 8; XXI 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 16; XXII 1, 5, 6, 6, 7, 11, and the abbreviated form

יֹרָם *Joram*, in the following twenty passages: 2 Sam. VIII 10; 2 Kings VIII 16, 21, 23, 24, 25, 28, 28, 29, 29; IX 14, 14, 16, 16, 29; XI 2; 1 Chron. III 11; XXVI 25; 2 Chron. XXII 5, 7.

(14) יְהוֹשָפָט *Jehoshaphat* = *whom Jehovah judgeth or pleadeth for*, which occurs eighty-five times, has the original orthography in the following eighty-three passages: 2 Sam.

VIII 16; XX 24; 1 Kings IV 3, 17; XV 24; XXII 2, 4, 4, 5, 7, 8, 8, 10, 18, 29, 30, 32, 32, 41, 42, 46, 49, 50, 50, 51, 52; 2 Kings I 17; III 1, 7, 11, 12, 12, 14; VIII 16, 16; IX 2, 14; XII 19; Joel IV 2, 12; 1 Chron. III 10; XVIII 15; 2 Chron. XVII 1, 3, 5, 10, 11, 12; XVIII 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 7, 9, 17, 28, 29, 31, 31; XIX 1, 2, 4, 8; XX 1, 2, 3, 5, 15, 18, 20, 25, 27, 30, 31, 34, 35, 37; XXI 1, 2, 2, 12; XXII 9, whilst it has the abbreviated form

יִשָּׁפָט *Joshaphat*, in only two instances, viz. 1 Chron. XI 43; XV 24.

As far as I can trace it there are only four names which are compounded with *Jeho* (יְהוֹ) and which have entirely retained their primitive orthography: (1) יְהוֹעֲדָה *Jehoadah* = *whom Jehovah adorns*, which occurs twice, 1 Chron. VIII 36, 36. (2) יְהוֹעֲדָן *Jehoaddan*, the feminine of the former name, which also occurs twice, once in 2 Kings XIV 2 in the *Keri* and once in 2 Chron. XXV 1. (3) יְהוֹשֻׁבֵעַ *Jehosheba* = *Jehovah is her oath*, i. e. a worshipper of Jehovah which occurs once in 2 Kings XI 2 and its alternative form יְהוֹשֻׁבַת *Jehoshabat* which occurs twice in 2 Chron. XXII 11 and (4) יְהוֹשֻׁעַ *Jehoshua* = *Jehovah his helper*, which occurs over two-hundred and fifty times. It will thus be seen that with these rare exceptions some of the Schools of textual critics have made efforts to substitute יִ *Jo*, for יְהוֹ *Jeho*, in every name which begins with the Tetragrammaton.

In no fewer than seven names, however, the redactors of the text have completely succeeded in obliterating the initial יְהוֹ *Jeho*, by substituting for it the simple יִ *Jo*. (1) יוֹאָב *Joab* = *Jehovah is his father*, which occurs about one-hundred twenty-seven times. (2) יוֹאָח *Joah* = *Jehovah is his brother*, i. e. confederate, which occurs eleven times: 2 Kings XVIII 18, 26, 37; Isa. XXXVI 3, 11, 22; 1 Chron. VI 6; XXVI 4; 2 Chron. XXIX 12, 12; XXXIV 8.

(3) יוֹעֵד *Joed* = *Jehovah is his witness*, which occurs once in Neh. XI 7. (4) יוֹעֲזֵר *Joezer* = *Jehovah is his helper*, which also occurs once in 1 Chron. XII 6. (5) יוֹעָשׁ *Joash* = *Jehovah hastens*, i. e. to his help, which occurs twice in 1 Chron. VII 8; XXVII 28. (6) יוֹרַי *Jorai* = *Jehovah teacheth him*, which occurs once in 1 Chron. V 13 and (7) יוֹתָם *Jotham* = *Jehovah is upright*, which occurs twenty-four times: Judg. IX 5, 7, 21, 57; 2 Kings XV 5, 7, 30, 32, 36, 38; XVI 1; Isa. I 1; VII 1; Hos. I 1; Micah I 1; 1 Chron. II 47; III 12; V 17; 2 Chron. XXVI 21, 23; XXVII 1, 6, 7, 9. Of these names not a single instance remains in the present Massoretic text in which the original form יְהוֹ *Jeho*, is exhibited.

The great reluctance manifested by the ancient authorities to pronounce the Tetragrammaton was also extended to *Jah* (יָה), which is the half of the Ineffable Name, and though they found it difficult to substitute another expression for this monosyllable as in the case of Incommunicable Name they adopted safeguards against its being carelessly profaned. These means to which the Sopherim resorted account for several of the phenomena in our present Massoretic text.

In discussing the treatment which this monosyllabic Divine name has received from the redactors of the text it is necessary to separate the twenty-two instances in which יָה *Jah*, is unanimously recognised by the ancient Schools to stand for the fuller form יְהוָה *Jehovah*, from those passages about which there is a difference of opinion in these Schools. By so doing we shall be better able to understand certain peculiarities which are visible throughout the Hebrew Scriptures both in the MSS. and in the editions.

The twenty-two passages, in which all the Schools agree that *Jah* (יָה) is the Divine Name, are as follows: Exod. XV 2; Isa. XII 2; XXVI 4; XXXVIII 11, 11; Ps. LXVIII 5, 19; LXXVII 12; LXXXIX 9; XCIV 7, 12;

CII 19; CXV 17, 18; CXVIII 5, 14, 17, 18, 19; CXXII 4; CXXX 3; CL 6. In all these cases the *He* (ה) has *Mappik*, viz. הַיְ which not only indicates its divinity, but is designed to conceal the original pronunciation of this Ineffable Name. With the solitary exception in Ps. LXVIII 5 [4] where it is *Jah*, the Authorised Version translates it *Lord*, being the same expression by which *Jehovah* is rendered without any remark in the margin to call attention to the fact that it is not the usual Tetragrammaton. The Revised Version which follows the Authorised Version in Ps. LXVIII 4 [5] has also *Jah* in Ps. LXXXIX 8 [9]. The Revisers, however, consistently remarks in the margin against every instance "Heb. *Jah*".

The essential difference between the ancient Schools is with regard to יה *Jah*, in the expression הללויה *Hallelujah*. To understand the controversy on this subject it is necessary to refer to some of the canons by which the Scribes had to be guided in copying the Sacred Scriptures. Wherever, the Scribe in transcribing the text, came to one of the divine names he had to pause and mentally to sanctify the sacred name. If he made a mistake in copying a divine name, writing the Lord instead of God &c. he was not allowed to erase it, but he had to enclose it in a square to show that it is cancelled. Moreover he was not allowed to divide a divine name writing one half at the end of the line, and the other half at the beginning of the next line.

As Hallelujah is a typical expression and as the controversy about it affects a whole class of words terminating with *jah* (יה), and moreover, as this is reflected in the MSS. and in the editions, we subjoin the discussion. In the Jerusalem Talmud it is as follows:

About Hallelujah there is a difference of opinion between Rab and Samuel, one says it should be divided into two words, the other says it

should not be divided. According to the one who says it is to be divided יה *jah* must not be erased, whilst according to the other who says it should not be divided יה *jah* may be erased and we do not know which is which. Now from what Rab said I heard from my uncle [R. Chiga] if any one were to give me the Psalter of R. Meier I would erase all the Hallelujahs because he did not sanctify the word in writing it, wrongly regarding יה *jah* as common, it is he [i. e. Rab] who said that Hallelu-jah is in two words. However, the opinion of the teachers is divided for R. Simon says in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi the Psalter uses ten different expressions for praise . . . . . and Hallelujah is the most sublime of them all because the Divine name and praise are both combined therein (*Jerusalem Megilla* I, 9).<sup>1</sup>

In the Babylon Talmud, however, where the same canon about the orthography of Hallelujah is discussed we are told that it is Rab who in accordance with the Codex of his uncle R. Chiga divided it into two words, viz. יה הללו = *praise ye the Lord*, as will be seen from the following statement:

It was asked: How is Hallelujah written according to Rab? It was answered: Because Rab said I have seen the Psalter of my uncle [R. Chiga] in which *Hallelu* was written in one line and *jah* in another line [hence he divided it]. Now in this he differed from R. Joshua b. Levi, for R. Joshua b. Levi said the meaning of Hallelujah is *praise ye exceedingly*. In this, however, R. Joshua is inconsistent with himself because R. Joshua b. Levi had said the Psalter uses ten different expressions for praise . . . . . and Hallelujah is the most sublime of them all for the Divine name and praise are combined herein (*Pesachim* 117a).<sup>2</sup>

1 הללויה רב ושמואל חד אמר הללו יה וחורנה אמר הללויה מ"ד הללו יה נחלק ואינו נמחק מ"ד הללויה נמחק ואינו נחלק ולא ידעין מאן אמר דא ומאן אמר דא מן מה דאמר רב שמעית מן חביבי אם יתן לי אדם ספר תילים של ר"מ מוחק אני את כל הללויה שבו לא נתבון לקדשו הוי דו אמר הללויה מיליהון דרבנן פליגין דא"ר סימון בשם ריב"ל בעשרה לשנות של שבת אמר ספר תילים באישור בניצוח בנינו בשיר במזמור בהשכל ברינה בתורה בתפילה בברכה המאושר שבכולם הללויה שהשם והשבת כלולין בו.

2 איבעיא להו הללויה לרב מאי ת"ש דאמר רב חיינא רבי חביבי דכתיב בהו הללו בחד ניסא ויה בחד ניסא ופליגי דר' יהושע בן לוי דא"ר בן לוי מאי הללויה הללויה בהילולים הרבה ופליגי דר' אריה דא"ר בן לוי בעשרה מאמרות של שבת אמר ספר תילים בניצוח בנינו במשכיון במזמור בשיר באשרי בתהילה בתפילה בהודא בהללויה גיול מכולן הללויה שכולל שם ושבת בבת אחת.

We are not called upon to reconcile the apparent contradiction in the views recorded in the names of these great Talmudic luminaries. That which is of the utmost importance to us, inasmuch as it explains the variants exhibited in the Biblical MSS. and in the Massoretic editions of the text, is the fact that three distinct traditions represented by three different Schools are here set forth. According to the tradition in one School, Hallelujah consists of two separate words and the second word or the monosyllable *jah* is the Divine name. Hence in writing it the Scribe must treat it as such, sanctify it when copying it and in case of an error must not erase it which he is allowed to do with an ordinary mistake. In harmony with this School, therefore, הללו Hallu is the imperative plural, יה *jah* the Divine name is the object, and the phrase must be translated *praise ye Jehovah*. And there can hardly be any doubt that this exhibits the primitive reading which is uniformly followed in the Authorised Version and in the Revised Version.

According to the second School, however, Hallelujah is one inseparable word and the termination *jah* simply denotes *power, might*, i. e. *powerfully, mightily*, just as אל is used to denote *excellence, beauty* &c. in the combination of ארזי אל which the Authorised Version translates *goodly cedars* in Ps. LXXX 10 [11]. Hence in writing it the Scribe need not sanctify it and may erase it in case he wrote it by mistake. It is simply a musical interjection like the now meaningless *Selah*. In accordance with this view the Septuagint and the Vulgate simply transliterate it as if it were a proper name. Most unaccountably the Authorised Version only exhibits this view in the margin in eight instances, viz. Ps. CVI 1; CXI 1; CXII 1; CXIII 1; CXLVI 1; CXLVIII 1; CXLIX 1; CL 1, taking no notice whatever of this alternative view in the other sixteen

passages. The Revised Version, however, consistently exhibits the transliterated form in the margin.

Whilst according to the third School, Hallelujah though undivided still contains the sacred name and is, therefore, divine. R. Joshua who represents this School maintains, therefore, in opposition to Rab and R. Ishmael that the sacredness of the word *jah* is not at all affected by Hallelujah being written as one word. Hence the MSS. and the editions greatly vary in the treatment of Hallelujah. Some have it הללִיָּהּ as one word with Dagesh in the *He*, some have it הלִּלְיָהּ as two words with *Makkeph* and Dagesh in the *He* and some as הלִּיָּהּ as one word without Dagesh in the *He*, thus obliterating the Divine name altogether.

The diversity in the orthography of the term Hallelu-jah, however, is not the only effect traceable to the reluctance on the part of the Sopherim to pronounce the Ineffable Name even in this abbreviated form. Having reduced it to a simple interjection its exact position in the respective Psalms became as great a matter of indifference as the musical expression *Selah*. We have seen that Hallelujah originally denoted *Praise ye Jehovah*. This is incontestably established by the parallelism in Ps. CXXXV 3:

Praise ye Jehovah, for Jehovah is good;

Make melody unto his name, for it is pleasant.

As such the phrase was a summons by the prelector addressed to the worshipping assembly in the Temple or in the Synagogue to join in the responsive praises to the Lord just as is the case in Psalm. XXXIV 4, where the Psalmist calls upon the congregation:

○ magnify Jehovah with me

And let us exalt his name together.

Hallelu-jah had, therefore, a liturgical meaning and as such it naturally stood at the beginning of the respective

Psalms which are antiphonous and in the recital of which the congregation repeated the first verse after each consecutive verse recited by the prelector. This is attested by the Septuagint which never has Hallelu-jah at the end of the Psalms, but invariably begins the Psalm with it as will be seen from the following analysis. Altogether Hallelujah occurs twenty-four times in the Massoretic text.<sup>1</sup> Deducting the one passage where it is in the middle of the text, viz. Ps. CXXXV 3, Hallelujah only begins the Psalm in ten instances,<sup>2</sup> whereas it now ends the Psalm no fewer than thirteen times<sup>3</sup> and as a natural consequence it has entirely lost its primitive liturgical meaning, that is the summons to the congregation to engage in the responses. In the recension of the Hebrew text, however, from which the Septuagint was made, Hallelujah which ends the Psalms in the present Massoretic text, began the next Psalm in seven out of the thirteen instances in question,<sup>4</sup> whilst in the remaining six instances Hallelujah was absent altogether.<sup>5</sup> It is to be added that the Septuagint has in two instances Hallelujah which are not exhibited in the present Massoretic text, viz. Psalms

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Ps. CIV 35; CV 45; CVI 1, 48; CXI 1; CXII 1; CXIII 1, 9; CXV 18; CXVI 19; CXVII 2; CXXXV 1, 3, 21; CXLVI 1, 10; CXLVII 1, 20; CXLVIII 1, 14; CXLIX 1, 9; CL 1, 6.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Ps. CVI 1; CXI 1; CXII 1; CXIII 1; CXXXV 1; CXLVI 1; CXLVII 1; CXLVIII 1; CXLIX 1; CL 1.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. Ps. CIV 35; CV 45; CVI 48; CXIII 9; CXV 18; CXVI 19; CXVII 2; CXXXV 21; CXLVI 10; CXLVII 20; CXLVIII 14; CXLIX 9; CL 6. Comp. *The Massorah*, Vol. III, p. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Comp. (1) Sept. Ps. CV 1 = Heb. CIV 35; (2) Sept. Ps. CVII 1 = Heb. CVI 48; (3) Sept. Ps. CXIV 1 = Heb. CXIII 9; (4) Sept. Ps. CXVI 1 = Heb. XV 18; (5) Sept. Ps. CXVII 1 = Heb. CXVI 19; (6) Sept. Ps. CXVIII 1 = Heb. CXVII 2 and (7) Sept. Ps. CXXXVI 1 = Heb. CXXXV 21.

<sup>5</sup> Comp. Ps. CV 45; CXLVI 10; CXLVII 20; CXLVIII 14; CXLIX 9; CL 6.

CXVI 10 and CXLVII 12, thus showing that in the Hebrew recension from which it was made **הֶאֱמַנְתִּי כִּי אֲדַבֵּר** *I believed, therefore, have I spoken*, and **שִׁבְחֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם אֲתִיְהוֹה** *Praise the Lord, O Jerusalem*, each began a new Psalm and that these two Psalms were originally four Psalms.

The exact position of Hallelujah, however, is not simply a point of difference between the Hebrew recension from which the Septuagint was made and that exhibited in the present Massoretic text. As late as the third century of the present era the controversy still continued between the celebrated doctors of the Law. The head of one School still maintained that Hallelujah must always begin the Psalm as it is in the Septuagint, whilst the chief of another School contended as strongly that it must always end the Psalm of which, however, we have no examples in the MSS. at present known. To reconcile these two opposite traditions the head of a third School declared that he had seen a Psalter in which Hallelujah was always in the middle between two Psalms (*Pesachim* 117a),<sup>1</sup> because it was difficult to decide whether it belonged to the end of the preceding Psalm or to the beginning of the following Psalm. This is exactly its position in some of the best MSS. which have no vacant space between the separate Psalms and it is this which I have endeavoured to exhibit in my edition of the text.<sup>2</sup>

As has already been remarked Hallelujah is simply a typical instance illustrating the anxiety on the part of the redactors of the text to deprive the monosyllable *jah* of its divine import wherever this could feasibly be done.

<sup>1</sup> אמר רב חסדא הללויה סוף פירקא רבה בר רב הונא אמר הללויה ריש פירקא אמר רב חסדא חזינא להו לתילי דבי רב חנין בר רב דכתוב בהו הללויה באמצע פירקא.

<sup>2</sup> A most able article on Hallelujah by the late Professor Graetz appeared in the *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, Vol. XXVIII, p. 193 &c.. Krotoshin 1879.

Hence the ancient authorities have also discussed other groups of words which end in *jah* (יה), and as the different Schools of textual critics could not agree about the orthography of these expressions both the text and the Massorah exhibit variations in the writing of sundry words throughout the Hebrew Bible. Of these differences we can only adduce a few examples.

Exod. XVII 16 exhibits one of the attempts to deprive *jah* (יה) of its primitive sense. The Westerns or the Palestinians we are distinctly told read it כְּסִיָּה as one word with *He Raphe*<sup>1</sup> and the passage is accordingly translated "for the hand is upon the precious throne" as the Chaldee has it, thus obliterating the divinity from the syllable *jah*. As we follow the Western School I have given this reading in the text. The Septuagint which also exhibits the reading of one word takes it as כְּסִיָּה *concealed* from כָּסָה *to hide*, and hence renders it "for with a hidden hand will the Lord war with Amalek". The Easterns or the Babylonian School, however, divide it into two words and retain the primitive reading *jah* = Jehovah. Accordingly the passage is to be rendered "for the hand is upon the throne of Jehovah" which is explained to mean the sign of an oath. This reading, in accordance with the principles of the Massoretic text, I have given in the notes. The difficulty, however, in which it lands us, may be seen from the forced alternative renderings exhibited in the margins of both the Authorised Version and the Revised Version.

Now adhering to the primitive *jah* (יה) = *Jehovah*, which the Sopherim tried to obliterate, it is evident from

<sup>1</sup> Thus the Massorah כְּסִיָּה מְלֵךְ חָדָא וְהוּא חַד מִן חַי מְלִין דְּלֵא מִפְקִין יָהּ in MS. No. 1—3 in the National Library Paris, comp. *The Massorah*, letter ' , § 160, Vol. I. p. 709.

the phrase "Jehovah nissi" (נִסִּי) = Jehovah is my banner, of which יה נִסִּי is the usual explanation following the name, that we ought to read נִסִּי *banner* for נִסִּי, which occurs nowhere else in the Hebrew Bible and the passage is to be translated:

And Moses built an altar and called the name of it Jehovah is my banner for he said surely the hand is on the banner of Jehovah; the war of Jehovah against Amalek is to be from generation to generation.

And though this reading is required by the context and is now accepted by some of the best critics yet as there is no MS. authority for it, I have simply given it in the notes with the introductory remark נִסִּי *the reading appears to me to be &c.*

Josh. XV 28 is another instance in which the obliteration of the monosyllable *jah* in its separate existence for Jehovah has taken place. According to the Westerns which we follow, Bizjothjah (בִּזְיוֹת־יָהּ) the city in the south of Judah has its meaning partly obscured by the reluctance on the part of the redactors to exhibit the Divine name in its unmistakable form in such a combination. The Eastern School of textual critics, however, manifested here also no such awe and hence preserved the orthography בִּזְיוֹת־יָהּ *Bizjothjah* = *the contempt of Jehovah* in two words. The recension, however, from which the Septuagint was made undoubtedly exhibits the original reading וּבְנֵי־הָהָרָה *and towns or villages thereof*. This is not only confirmed by the fact that it is the formula used in this very chapter (comp. verse 45) and is generally employed in the enumeration of the districts especially in the book of Joshua,<sup>1</sup> but from the parallel passages in Neh. XI 27, where this very verse is almost literally given and where it is as follows: וּבְחָצֵר שׁוּעַל וּבְבֵאֵר

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Josh. XV 47, where it occurs twice, and XVII 11, where it is used four times in the same verse.

שָׁבַע וּבְנֵתֶיהָ and at Huzar-shual and at Beer-sheba and the villages thereof. And though there can hardly be any doubt that this is the correct reading as is now acknowledged by some of the best critics, I have only given it in the notes with the usual introductory phrase צ"ל = *the proper reading is*, when it is supported by the ancient Versions.

Jerem. II 31 strikingly illustrates the reluctance on the part of one School of redactors to exhibit the name Jehovah when it could possibly be obviated. According to the Eastern School the passage before us is to be translated as follows:

O generation, see ye the word of Jehovah,  
Have I been a wilderness unto Israel?  
Is the land the darkness of Jehovah?

The Lord expostulates here with his backsliding people by emphatically declaring that whilst they submitted to his guidance the land never failed to yield its rich harvests. The interrogative form as is often the case is used for an emphatic negative, figuratively asserting the very reverse, viz. "I have been a paradise to Israel, the land was brightened by the light of Jehovah."<sup>1</sup> To predicate, however, darkness of Jehovah was regarded by the Eastern School of redactors as unseemely. Hence they closely combined *jah* (יה) with מאפל *darkness* and by this means deprived it of its divinity. It is due to this fact that some interpreters take it simply to be the feminine form of מאפל, i. e. מאפלה *darkness*, which is manifestly the view exhibited in the Authorised Version, whilst others assign to *jah* (יה) the meaning of *intensity* as is done in the text of the Revised Version. The common rendering which as usual

<sup>1</sup> It is hardly necessary to remark in justification of our rendering that אָ — הָ are not unfrequently used together in two consecutive clauses in continuation of the interrogative without being a disjunctive for הָ — הָ. Comp. Gen. XXXVII 8.

is based upon the Western recension, mars the rhythm and is against the parallelism of the passage.

Ps. CXVIII 5. — According to the canon laid down by the Sopherim and the Massorah במרחביה is one word and is simply another form of במרחב (Hos. IV 16; Ps. XXXI 9), denoting literally *in a large place, with room*,<sup>1</sup> and then figuratively *with freedom, with deliverance*, just as צר which means *strait*, is used tropically for *distress, affliction* in the first clause of this very verse and in Ps. IV 2; XLIV 6 &c. This is the reading of the *textus receptus* which follows the Western recension. The verse accordingly is to be translated:

Out of my straits I called on Jehovah  
He answered me with deliverance.

This reading is also exhibited in the recension of the text from which the Septuagint was made. According to the Easterns or Babylonians, however, the reading is במרחב־יה two words and hence the verse in question ought to be rendered:

Out of my straits I called on Jehovah  
He answered me with the deliverance of Jehovah.

That is with a freedom or deliverance which Jehovah only can vouchsafe. It is, therefore, evident that we have here another instance where the Western School of textual critics have tried to safeguard the shorter form of the Ineffable Name by fusing it with the preceding word since the phrase מרחב־יה *the wideness of Jehovah*, in its literal form appeared to them too bold a metaphor. It is remarkable that the Authorised Version and the Revised Version, as well as many modern expositors depart here from the received Massoretic text without even giving the alternative

<sup>1</sup> For similar duplicate forms comp. עֲלִילָה *work* Ps. XIV 1 &c. and עֲלִילָה *work* Jerem. XXXII 19; פְּלִילָה *judging* Job XXXI 28 and פְּלִילָה *judging* Isa. XXVII 7.



reading in the margin. By detaching, moreover, יה from במרהב and by needlessly transferring it from the end to the beginning of the line they are obliged to assume that we have here a *constructio praegnans* and to supply the words "and set me" which mar the parallelism.

Song of Songs VIII 6. — Owing to the same reluctance to exhibit the shorter name of Jehovah, the Western School of textual critics whom we follow in the *textus receptus* read שְׁלֵהֲבַת־יָהּ in one word which is explained to mean *intense flame* or as the Authorised Version renders it "which hath a most vehement flame". In the recension from which the Septuagint was made these consonants were also read as one word and they were pronounced שְׁלֵהֲבַת־יָהּ = *φλόγες αὐτῆς the flames thereof*. According to the Eastern recension, however, which is also the reading of Ben-Naphtali and several early editions it is שְׁלֵהֲבַת־יָהּ *the flame of Jehovah*, and the whole verse is to be rendered:

For love is strong as death  
Affection as inexorable as Hades  
Its flames are flames of fire  
The flames of Jehovah.

That is loving flames kindled in the human heart emanate from Jehovah. The anxiety, however, on the part of the Sopherim not to describe Jehovah as the source of human love, and especially not to exhibit him in parallelism with Hades has caused the Western redactors of the text to obliterate the name of God in the only place where the Divine name occurs in this book. The Revised Version, though contrary to the *textus receptus*, exhibits the true reading in the text and gives the alternative translation in the margin.

We have seen that in the case of proper names which are compounded with the Tetragrammaton and where it begins the name, the *He* (ה) has been elided to preclude the pronunciation of the Divine name. For the same reason

*Jah* (יה) the shorter form of Jehovah has been safeguarded in those proper names into which it has entered into composition and where it constitutes the end of the proper name. To effect this, the redactors of the text have adopted the reverse process. Instead of eliding a letter they have added one and converted the monosyllabic Divine name into a bisyllabic word.

The one hundred and forty-one proper names in the Hebrew Bible which according to the Massoretic text end with *Jah* = Jehovah are divisible into three classes: (1) The first consists of fifty-nine names, which have in many instances the *Vav* appended to them so that they respectively occur in duplicate form sometimes terminating in *Jah* and sometimes in *Jahu*. They are as follows:

- |   |              |   |
|---|--------------|---|
| } | אֲבִיָּהּ    | <i>Abijah</i> = <i>whose father is Jehovah</i> : 1 Sam. VIII 2; 1 Kings XIV 1; Neh. X 8; XII 4, 17; 1 Chron. II 24; III 10; VI 13; VII 8; XXIV 10; 2 Chron. XI 20, 22; XII 16; XIII 1, 2, 3, 4, 15, 17, 19, 22, 23; XXIX 1.   |
|   | אֲבִיָּהוּ   | <i>Abijahū</i> : 2 Chron. XIII 20, 21.  |
| } | אֲדֹנִיָּהּ  | <i>Adonijah</i> = <i>my Lord is Jehovah</i> : 2 Sam. III 4; 1 Kings I 5, 17, 18; II 28; Neh. X 17; 1 Chron. III 2.  |
|   | אֲדֹנִיָּהוּ | <i>Adonijahū</i> : 1 Kings I 8, 9, 11, 13, 24, 25, 41, 42, 43, 49, 50, 51; II 13, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24; 2 Chron. XVII 8.  |
| } | אֲוִרְיָהּ   | <i>Urijah</i> = <i>my light is Jehovah</i> : 2 Sam. XI 3, 6, 6, 7, 8, 8, 9, 10, 10, 11, 12, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 24, 26, 26; XII 9, 10, 15; XXIII 39; 1 Kings XV 5; 2 Kings XVI 10, 11, 11, 15, 16; Isa. VIII 2; Ezra VIII 33; Neh. III 4, 21; VIII 4; 1 Chron. XI 41. |
|   | אֲוִרְיָהוּ  | <i>Urijahū</i> : Jerem. XXVI 20, 21, 23.  |
| } | אֲחַזְיָהּ   | <i>Ahazjah</i> = <i>upheld of Jehovah</i> : 2 Kings I 2; IX 16, 23, 27, 29; XI 2; 2 Chron. XX 35.   |
|   | אֲחַזְיָהוּ  | <i>Ahazjahū</i> : 1 Kings XXII 40, 50, 52; 2 Kings I 18; VIII 24, 25, 26, 29; IX 21, 23; X 13, 13; XI 1, 2; XII 19; XIII 1; XIV 13; 1 Chron. III 11; 2 Chron. XX 37; XXII 1, 1, 2, 7, 8, 8, 9, 9, 10, 11, 11.   |
| } | אֲחִיָּהּ    | <i>Ahijah</i> = <i>brother of Jehovah</i> : 1 Sam. XIV 3, 18; 1 Kings IV 3; XI 29, 30; XII 15; XIV 2, 4; XV 27, 29, 33; XXI 22; 2 Kings IX 9; Neh. X 27; 1 Chron. II 25; VIII 7; XI 36; XXVI 20; 2 Chron. IX 29.  |
|   | אֲחִיָּהוּ   | <i>Ahijahū</i> : 1 Kings XIV 4, 5, 6, 18; 2 Chron. X 15.  |

- אֵלִיָּהוּ *Elijah = my God is Jehovah*: 2 Kings I 3, 4, 8, 12; Ezek. X 21, 26; Mal. III 23; 1 Chron. VIII 27.
- אֵלִיָּהוּ *Elijahū*: 1 Kings XVII 1, 13, 15, 16, 18, 22, 23, 24; XVIII 1, 2, 7, 8, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 25, 27, 30, 31, 36, 40, 40, 41, 42, 46; XIX 1, 2, 9, 13, 13, 19, 20, 21; XXI 17, 20, 28; 2 Kings I 10, 13, 15, 17; II 1, 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 14, 15; III 11; IX 36; X 10, 17; 2 Chron. XXI 12.
- אֲמַצְיָהוּ *Amazjah = whom Jehovah strengthens*: 2 Kings XII 22; XIII 12; XIV 8; XV 1; Amos VII 10, 12, 14; 1 Chron. IV 34; VI 30.
- אֲמַצְיָהוּ *Amazjahū*: 2 Kings XIV 1, 9, 11, 11, 13, 15, 17, 18, 21, 23; XV 3; 1 Chron. III 12; 2 Chron. XXIV 27; XXV 1, 5, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27; XXVI 1, 4.
- אֲמַרְיָהוּ *Amarjah = whom Jehovah said, i. e. promised q. d. Theophrastus*: Zeph. I 1; Ezra VII 3; X 42; Neh. X 4; XI 4; XII 2, 13; 1 Chron. V 33, 33, 37, 37; VI 37; XXIII 19.
- אֲמַרְיָהוּ *Amarjahū*: 1 Chron. XXIV 23; 2 Chron. XIX 11; XXXI 15.
- בְּנֵיָהוּ *Benajah = Built up of Jehovah*: 2 Sam. XX 23; Ezek. XI 13; Ezra X 25, 30, 35, 43; 1 Chron. IV 36; XI 22, 31; XXVII 14; 2 Chron. XX 14.
- בְּנֵיָהוּ *Benajahū*: 2 Sam. VIII 18; XXIII 20, 22, 30; 1 Kings I 8, 10, 26, 32, 36, 38, 44; II 25, 29, 30, 30, 34, 35, 46; IV 4; Ezek. XI 1; 1 Chron. XI 24; XV 18, 20, 24; XVI 5, 6; XVIII 17; XXVII 5, 6, 34; 2 Chron. XXXI 13.
- בְּרַכְיָהוּ *Berechjah = Blessed of Jehovah*: Zech. I 1; Neh. III 4, 30; VI 18; 1 Chron. III 20; IX 16; XV 23.
- בְּרַכְיָהוּ *Berechjahū*: Zech. I 7; 1 Chron. VI 24; XV 17; 2 Chron. XXVIII 12.
- גְּדַלְיָהוּ *Gedajjah = Magnified of Jehovah*: Jerem. XL 5, 8; XLI 16; Zeph. I 1; Ezra X 18.
- גְּדַלְיָהוּ *Gedajjahū*: 2 Kings XXV 22, 23, 23, 24, 25; Jerem. XXXVIII 1; XXXIX 14; XL 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16; XLI 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 18; XLIII 6; 1 Chron. XXV 3, 9.
- גְּמַרְיָהוּ *Gemarjah = Perfected of Jehovah*: Jerem. XXIX 3.
- גְּמַרְיָהוּ *Gemarjahū*: Jerem. XXXVI 10, 11, 12, 25.
- דְּלַיָּהוּ *Delajah = Freed of Jehovah*: Ezra II 60; Neh. VI 10; VII 62; 1 Chron. III 24.
- דְּלַיָּהוּ *Delajahū*: Jerem. XXXVI 12, 25; 1 Chron. XXIV 18.
- הוֹדַוְיָהוּ *Hodavjah = Praise of Jehovah*: Ezra II 40; 1 Chron. V 24; IX 7.
- הוֹדַוְיָהוּ *Hodavjahū*: 1 Chron. III 24.
- זְבַדְיָהוּ *Zebadjah = Jehovah gave*: Ezra VIII 8; X 20; 1 Chron. VIII 15, 17; XII 7; XXVII 7.
- זְבַדְיָהוּ *Zebadjahū*: 1 Chron. XXVI 2; 2 Chron. XVII 8; XIX 11.

- זְכַרְיָהוּ *Zecharjah = whom Jehovah remembers*: 2 Kings XIV 29; XV 11; XVIII 2; Zech. I 1, 7; VII 1, 8; Ezra V 1; VI 14; VIII 3, 11, 16; X 26; Neh. VIII 4; XI 4, 5, 12; XII 16, 35, 41; 1 Chron. IX 21, 37; XV 20; XVI 5; 2 Chron. XVII 7; XXIV 20; XXXIV 12.
- זְכַרְיָהוּ *Zecharjahū*: 2 Kings XV 8; Isa. VIII 2; 1 Chron. V 7; XV 18, 24; XXIV 25; XXVI 2, 11, 14; XXVII 21; 2 Chron. XX 14; XXI 2; XXVI 5; XXIX 1, 13; XXXV 8.
- הֶזְכִּיָּיָהוּ *Hezekijah = my strength is Jehovah*: 2 Kings XVIII 1, 10, 14, 14, 15, 16, 16; Zeph. I 1; Prov. XXV 1; Neh. VII 21; X 18; 1 Chron. III 23.
- הֶזְכִּיָּיָהוּ *Hezekijahū*: 2 Kings XVI 20; XVIII 9, 13, 17, 19, 22, 29, 30, 31, 32, 37; XIX 1, 3, 5, 9, 10, 14, 14, 15, 20; XX 1, 3, 5, 8, 12, 12, 13, 13, 14, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21; XXI 3; Isa. XXXVI 1, 2, 4, 7, 14, 15, 16, 18, 22; XXXVII 1, 3, 5, 9, 10, 14, 14, 15, 21; XXXVIII 1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 22; XXXIX 1, 2, 2, 3, 3, 4, 5, 8; Jerem. XXVI 18, 19; 1 Chron. III 13; 2 Chron. XXIX 18, 27; XXX 24; XXXII 15.
- חֵילְקִיָּהוּ *Hilkijah = my portion is Jehovah*: 2 Kings XVIII 37; XXII 8, 10, 12; Jerem. XXIX 3; Ezra VII 1; Neh. VIII 4; XI 11; XII 7, 21; 1 Chron. V 39, 39; VI 30; IX 11; 2 Chron. XXXV 8.
- חֵילְקִיָּהוּ *Hilkijahū*: 2 Kings XVIII 18, 26; XXII 4, 8, 14; XXIII 4, 24; Isa. XXII 20; XXXVI 3, 22; Jerem. I 1; 1 Chron. XXVI 11; 2 Chron. XXXIV 9, 14, 15, 15, 18, 20, 22.
- חַנּוּנִיָּהוּ *Hananjah = whom Jehovah has graciously given*: Jerem. XXVIII 1, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 15, 17; XXXVII 13; Dan. I 6, 7, 11, 19; II 17; Ezra X 28; Neh. III 8, 30; VII 2; X 24; XII 12, 41; 1 Chron. III 19, 21; VIII 24; XXV 4.
- חַנּוּנִיָּהוּ *Hananjahū*: Jerem. XXXVI 12; 1 Chron. XXV 23; 2 Chron. XXVI 11.
- חֲשַׁבְיָהוּ *Hashabjah = whom Jehovah regards*: Ezra VIII 19, 24; Neh. III 17; X 12; XI 15, 22; XII 21, 24; 1 Chron. VI 30; IX 14; XXV 19; XXVII 17.
- חֲשַׁבְיָהוּ *Hashabjahū*: 1 Chron. XXV 3; XXVI 30; 2 Chron. XXXV 9.
- טוֹבִיָּהוּ *Tobijah = my good is Jehovah*: Zech. VI 10, 14; Ezra II 60; Neh. II 10, 19; III 35; IV 1; VI 1, 12, 14, 17, 17, 19; VII 62; XIII 4, 7, 8.
- טוֹבִיָּהוּ *Tobijahū*: 2 Chron. XVII 8.
- יָאֲזַנְיָהוּ *Jaazanjah = whom Jehovah hears*: Jerem. XXXV 3; Ezek. XI 1.
- יָאֲזַנְיָהוּ *Jaazanjahū*: 2 Kings XXV 23; Ezek. VIII 11.

- יֹשִׁיָּהּ *Joshijah* = *whom Jehovah heals*: Zech. VI 10.
- יֹשִׁיָּהוּ *Joshijahū*: 1 Kings XIII 2; 2 Kings XXI 24, 26; XXII 1, 3; XXIII 16, 19, 23, 24, 28, 29, 30, 34; Jerem. I 2, 3, 3; III 6; XXII 11, 11, 18; XXV 1, 3; XXVI 1; XXXV 1; XXXVI 1, 2, 9; XXXVII 1; XLV 1; XLVI 2; Zeph. I 1; 1 Chron. III 14, 15; 2 Chron. XXXIII 25; XXXIV 1, 33; XXXV 1, 7, 16, 18, 19, 20, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 25, 26; XXXVI 1.
- יִזְנִיָּהּ *Jezanjah* = *whom Jehovah hears*: Jerem. XLII 1.
- יִזְנִיָּהוּ *Jezanjahū*: Jerem. XL 8.
- יְהִזְקִיָּהּ *Jehizkijah* (*Hezekiah*) = *Jehovah strengthens*: Hos. I 1; Micah I 1; Ezra II 16.
- יְהִזְקִיָּהוּ *Jehizkijahū*: 2 Kings XX 10; Isa. I 1; Jerem. XV 4; 1 Chron. IV 41; 2 Chron. XXVIII 12, 27; XXIX 1, 20, 30, 31, 36; XXX 1, 18, 20, 22; XXXI 2, 8, 9, 11, 13, 20; XXXII 2, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 26, 27, 30, 30, 32, 33; XXXIII 3.
- יְכֹלִיָּהּ *Jecholjah* = *able through Jehovah*: 2 Chron. XXVI 3.
- יְכֹלִיָּהוּ *Jecholjahū*: 2 Kings XV 2.
- יְכֹנִיָּהּ *Jechonjah* = *whom Jehovah has appointed*: Jerem. XXVII 20; XXVIII 4; XXIX 2; Esther II 6; 1 Chron. III 16, 17.
- יְכֹנִיָּהוּ *Jechonjahū*: Jerem. XXIV 1.
- יְרִיָּהּ *Jerijah* = *founded of Jehovah*: 1 Chron. XXVI 31.
- יְרִיָּהוּ *Jerijahū*: 1 Chron. XXIII 19; XXIV 23.
- יְרֵמְיָהּ *Jeremjah* = *whom Jehovah setteth up*: Jerem. XXVII 1; XXXVIII 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 15; XXIX 1; Dan. IX 2; Ezra I 1; Neh. X 3; XII 1, 12, 34; 1 Chron. V 24; XII 4, 10.
- יְרֵמְיָהוּ *Jeremjahū*: 2 Kings XXIII 31; XXIV 18; Jerem. I 1, 11; VII 1; XI 1; XIV 1; XVIII 1, 18; XIX 14; XX 1, 2, 3, 3; XXI 1, 3; XXIV 3; XXV 1, 2, 13; XXVI 7, 8, 9, 12, 20, 24; XXVIII 12; XXIX 27, 29, 30; XXX 1; XXXII 1, 2, 6, 26; XXXIII 1, 19, 23; XXXIV 1, 6, 8, 12; XXXV 1, 3, 12, 18; XXXVI 1, 4, 4, 5, 8, 10, 19, 26, 27, 27, 32, 32; XXXVII 2, 3, 4, 6, 12, 13, 14, 14, 15, 16, 16, 17, 18, 21, 21; XXXVIII 1, 6, 6, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 12, 13, 13, 14, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 24, 27, 28; XXXIX 11, 14, 15; XL 1, 2, 6; XLII 2, 4, 5, 7; XLIII 1, 2, 6, 8; XLIV 1, 15, 20, 24; XLV 1, 1; XLVI 1, 13; XLVII 1; XLIX 34; L 1; LI 59, 60, 61, 64; LII 1; 1 Chron. XII 13; 2 Chron. XXXV 25; XXXVI 12, 21, 22.

- יִשְׁיָהּ *Ishijah* = *whom Jehovah lended*: Ezra X 31; 1 Chron. VII 3; XXIII 20; XXIV 21, 25, 25.
- יִשְׁיָהוּ *Ishijahū*: 1 Chron. XII 6.
- יִשְׁמַעְיָהּ *Ishmajah* = *whom Jehovah heareth*: 1 Chron. XII 4.
- יִשְׁמַעְיָהוּ *Ishmajahū*: 1 Chron. XXVII 19.
- יִשְׁעִיָּהּ *Jeshajah* = *help of Jehovah*: Ezra VIII 7, 19; Neh. XI 7; 1 Chron. III 21.
- יִשְׁעִיָּהוּ *Jeshajahū* (*Isaiah*): 2 Kings XIX 2, 5, 6, 20; XX 1, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 14, 16, 19; Isa. I 1; II 1; VII 3; XIII 1; XX 2, 3; XXXVII 2, 5, 6, 21; XXXVIII 1, 4, 21; XXXIX 3, 5, 8; 1 Chron. XXV 3, 15; XXVI 25; 2 Chron. XXVI 22; XXXII 20, 32.
- כְּנַנְיָהּ *Chenanjah* = *whom Jehovah placed*: 1 Chron. XV 27.
- כְּנַנְיָהוּ *Chenanjahū*: 1 Chron. XV 22; XXVI 29.
- מִיְחַיָּהּ *Michajah* = *who is like Jehovah*: 2 Kings XXII 12; Jerem. XXVI 18; Neh. XII 35, 41.
- מִיְחַיָּהוּ *Michajahū*: 2 Chron. XIII 2; XVII 7.
- מִיְחַיְהוּ *Michajhū*: Judg. XVII 1, 4; 1 Kings XXII 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 24, 25, 26, 28; Jerem. XXXVI 11, 13; 2 Chron. XVIII 7, 8, 12, 13, 23, 24, 25, 27.
- מַלְכִּיָּהּ *Malchijah* = *my king is Jehovah*: Jerem. XXI 1; XXXVIII 1; Ezra X 25, 25, 31; Neh. III 11, 14, 31; VIII 4; X 4; XI 12; XII 42; 1 Chron. VI 25, IX 12; XXIV 9.
- מַלְכִּיָּהוּ *Malchijahū*: Jerem. XXXVIII 6.
- מַעֲזִיָּהּ *Maazjah* = *consolation of Jehovah*: Neh. X 9.
- מַעֲזִיָּהוּ *Maazjahū*: 1 Chron. XXIV 18.
- מַעֲשֵׂיָּהּ *Maasejah* = *work of Jehovah*: Jerem. XXI 1; XXIX 21, 25; XXXVII 3; Ezra X 18, 21, 22, 30; Neh. III 23; VIII 4, 7; X 26; XI 5, 7; XII 41, 42.
- מַעֲשֵׂיָּהוּ *Maasejahū*: Jerem. XXXV 4; 1 Chron. XV 18, 20; 2 Chron. XXIII 1; XXVI 11; XXVIII 7; XXXIV 8.
- מִשְׁלֵמְיָהּ *Meshelemjah* = *whom Jehovah repays*: 1 Chron. IX 21.
- מִשְׁלֵמְיָהוּ *Meshelemjahū*: 1 Chron. XXVI 1, 2, 9.
- מַתְנִיָּהּ *Mattanjah* = *gift of Jehovah*: 2 Kings XXIV 17; Ezra X 26, 27, 30, 37; Neh. XI 17, 22; XII 8, 25, 35; XIII 13; 1 Chron. IX 15; 2 Chron. XX 14.
- מַתְנִיָּהוּ *Mattanjahū*: 1 Chron. XXV 4, 16; 2 Chron. XXIX 13.

- מַתִּיתָהּ *Mattithjah* = *gift of Jehovah*: Ezra X 43; Neh. VIII 4; 1 Chron. IX 31; XVI 5.
- מַתִּיתָהּ *Mattithjahū*: 1 Chron. XV 18, 21; XXV 3, 21.
- נֵרִיָּה *Nerijah* = *my lamp is Jehovah*: Jerem. XXXII 12, 16; XXXVI 4, 8; XLIII 3; XLV 1; LI 59.
- נֵרִיָּה *Nerijahū*: Jerem. XXXVI 14, 32; XLIII 6.
- נֶתְנָהּ *Nethanjah* = *given of Jehovah*: 2 Kings XXV 23, 25; Jerem. XL 14, 15; XLI 1, 2, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18; 1 Chron. XXV 2.
- נֶתְנָהּ *Nethanjahū*: Jerem. XXXVI 14; XL 8; XLI 9; 1 Chron. XXV 12; 2 Chron. XVII 8.
- עֲבָדָהּ *Obadjah* = *servant of Jehovah*: Obad. 1; Ezra VIII 9; Neh. X 6; XII 25; 1 Chron. III 21; VII 3; VIII 38; IX 16, 44; XII 9; 2 Chron. XVII 7.
- עֲבָדָהּ *Obadjahū*: 1 Kings XVIII 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 16; 1 Chron. XXVII 19; 2 Chron. XXXIV 12.
- עֲדָהּ *Adajah* = *ornament of Jehovah*: 2 Kings XXII 1; Ezra X 29, 39; Neh. XI 5, 12; 1 Chron. VI 26; VIII 21; IX 12.
- עֲדָהּ *Adajahu*: 2 Chron. XXIII 1.
- עֲזִיָּה *Uzzijah* = *my strength is Jehovah*: 2 Kings XV 13, 30; Hos. I 1; Amos I 1; Zech. XIV 5; Ezra X 21; Neh. XI 4; 1 Chron. VI 9.
- עֲזִיָּה *Uzzijahū*: 2 Kings XV 32, 34; Isa. I 1; VI 1; VII 1; 1 Chron. XXVII 25; 2 Chron. XXVI 1, 3, 8, 9, 11, 14, 18, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23; XXVII 2.
- עֲזַרְיָה *Azarjah* = *helped of Jehovah*: 2 Kings XIV 21; XV 1, 7, 17, 23, 27; Jerem. XLIII 2; Dan. I 6, 7, 11, 19; II 17; Ezra VII 1, 3; Neh. III 23, 24; VII 7; VIII 7; X 3; XII 33; 1 Chron. II 8, 38, 39; III 12; V 35, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40; VI 21; IX 11; 2 Chron. XXI 2; XXIII 1.
- עֲזַרְיָה *Azarjahū*: 1 Kings IV 2, 5; 2 Kings XV 6, 8; 2 Chron. XV 1; XXI 2; XXII 6; XXIII 1; XXVI 17, 20; XXVIII 12; XXIX 12, 12; XXXI 10, 13.
- עַתְלָהּ *Athaljah* = *afflicted of Jehovah*: 2 Kings XI 1, 3, 13, 14; Ezra VIII 7; 1 Chron. VIII 26; 2 Chron. XXII 12.
- עַתְלָהּ *Athaljahū*: 2 Kings VIII 26; XI 2, 20; 2 Chron. XXII 2, 10, 11; XXIII 12, 13, 21; XXIV 7.
- פְּדָהּ *Pedajah* = *redemption of Jehovah*: 2 Kings XXIII 36; Neh. III 25; VIII 4; XI 7; XIII 13; 1 Chron. III 18, 19.
- פְּדָהּ *Pedajahū*: 1 Chron. XXVII 20.
- פְּלַטָּהּ *Pelatajah* = *deliverance of Jehovah*: Neh. X 23; 1 Chron. III 21; IV 42.
- פְּלַטָּהּ *Pelatajahū*: Ezek. XI 1, 13.

- צִדְקִיָּה *Zidkijah* (Zedekiah) = *my justice is Jehovah*: 1 Kings XXII 11; Jerem. XXVII 12; XXVIII 1; XXIX 3; Neh. X 2; 1 Chron. III 16.
- צִדְקִיָּה *Zidkijahū*: 1 Kings XXII 24; 2 Kings XXIV 17, 18, 20; XXV 2, 7, 7; Jerem. I 3; XXI 1, 3, 7; XXIV 8; XXVII 3; XXIX 21, 22; XXXII 1, 3, 4, 5; XXXIV 2, 4, 6, 8, 21; XXXVI 12; XXXVII 1, 3, 17, 18, 21; XXXVIII 5, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 24; XXXIX 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7; XLIV 30; XLIX 34; LI 59; LII 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, 11; 1 Chron. III 15; 2 Chron. XVIII 10, 23; XXXVI 10, 11.
- צַפְנָהּ *Zephanjah* = *hid or protected of Jehovah*: Jerem. XXI 1; XXIX 25, 29; LII 24; Zeph. I 1; Zech. VI 10, 14; 1 Chron. VI 21.
- צַפְנָהּ *Zephanjahū*: 2 Kings XXV 18; Jerem. XXXVII 3.
- רְחַבְיָה *Rehabjah* = *whom Jehovah enlarges*: 1 Chron. XXIII 17, 17.
- רְחַבְיָה *Rehabjahū*: 1 Chron. XXIV 21, 21; XXVI 25.
- סֵרָיָה *Serajah* = *warrior of Jehovah*: 2 Sam. VIII 17; 2 Kings XXV 18, 23; Jerem. XL 8; LI 59, 59, 61; LII 24; Ezra II 2; VII 1; Neh. X 3; XI 11; XII 1, 12; 1 Chron. IV 13, 14, 35; V 40, 40.
- סֵרָיָה *Serajahū*: Jerem. XXXVI 26.
- שֶׁבַנְיָה *Shebanjah* = *caused to grow up of Jehovah*: Neh. IX 4, 5; X 5, 11, 13; XII 14.
- שֶׁבַנְיָה *Shebanjahū*: 1 Chron. XV 24.
- שֶׁחַנְיָה *Shechanjah* = *habitation of Jehovah*: Ezra VIII 3, 5; X 2; Neh. III 29; VI 18; XII 3; 1 Chron. III 21, 22.
- שֶׁחַנְיָה *Shechanjahū*: 1 Chron. XXIV 11; 2 Chron. XXXI 15.
- שְׁלֵמָיָה *Shelemjah* = *recompensed of Jehovah*: Jerem. XXXVII 3, 13; Ezra X 39; Neh. III 30; XIII 13.
- שְׁלֵמָיָה *Shelemjahū*: Jerem. XXXVI 14, 26; XXXVIII 1; Ezra X 41; 1 Chron. XXVI 14.
- שְׁמַעְיָה *Shemajah* = *heard of Jehovah*: 1 Kings XII 22; Jerem. XXIX 31, 31, 32; Ezra VIII 13, 16; X 21, 31; Neh. III 29; VI 10; X 9; XI 15; XII 6, 18, 34, 35, 36, 42; 1 Chron. III 22, 22; IV 37; V 4; IX 14, 16; XV 8, 11; XXIV 6; XXVI 4, 6, 7; 2 Chron. XII 5, 7, 15; XXIX 14.
- שְׁמַעְיָה *Shemajahū*: Jerem. XXVI 20; XXIX 24; XXXVI 12; 2 Chron. XI 2; XVII 8; XXXI 15; XXXV 9.
- שְׁמַרְיָה *Shemarjah* = *Guarded of Jehovah*: Ezra X 32, 41; 2 Chron. XI 19.
- שְׁמַרְיָה *Shemarjahū*: 1 Chron. XII 5.
- שְׁפַטְיָה *Shephatjah* = *judge of Jehovah*: 2 Sam. III 4; Jerem. XXXVIII 1; Ezra II 4, 57; VIII 8; Neh. VII 9, 59; XI 4; 1 Chron. III 3; IX 8.
- שְׁפַטְיָה *Shephatjahū*: 1 Chron. XII 5; XXVII 16; 2 Chron. XXI 2.

Both in the Authorised Version and in the Revised Version the distinction between these two forms of the same name is entirely obliterated. By ignoring the last syllable and by transliterating both forms alike, the translators have deprived the student of the means to ascertain how far the process of safeguarding the name Jehovah or Jah has been carried out in the different books.

(2) The second class consists of proper names compounded with *Jah* (יָה) which have uniformly been lengthened into *jahu* (יָהוּ). Of these we have the following eleven examples:

אַזְאֲלָהוּ *Azaljahū* = reserved of Jehovah: 2 Kings XXII 3; 2 Chron. XXXIV 8.

בִּקְיָהוּ *Bukkijahū* = emptying of Jehovah: 1 Chron. XXV 4, 13.

יְבִרְכֵהוּ *Jeberechjahu* = he will be blessed of Jehovah: Isa. VIII 2.

יְגַדְלָהוּ *Igdaljahū* = Jehovah will make him great: Jerem. XXXV 4.

יְהַדְּיָהוּ *Jehdejahū* = Jehovah will make him joyful: 1 Chron. XXIV 20; XXVII 30.

כְּנִיָהוּ *Conjahū* = established of Jehovah: Jerem. XXII 24, 28; XXXVII 1.

כְּנַנְיָהוּ *Conanjahū* (the Keri), 2 Chron. XXXI 12, 13; XXXV 9.

מִקְנֵיָהוּ *Miknejahū* = possession of Jehovah: 1 Chron. XV 18, 21.

סִמְכָהוּ *Semachjahū* = sustained of Jehovah: 1 Chron. XXVI 7.

עֲזָזָהוּ *Azazjahū* = strengthened of Jehovah: 1 Chron. XV 21; XXVII 20; 2 Chron. XXXI 13.

רִמְאֲלָהוּ *Remaljahū* = Adorned of Jehovah: 2 Kings XV 25, 27, 30, 32, 37; XVI 1, 5; Isa. VII 1, 4, 5, 9; VIII 6; 2 Chron. XXVIII 6.

It will be seen that with the exception of the last name all the others are of infrequent occurrence. It is probably due to this fact that the process of uniformity has been successfully carried out by the redactors of the text. Here again both the Authorised Version and the Revised Version have taken no notice whatever that these names end in *jahu* (יָהוּ) and have transliterated them as if they terminated in *jah* (יָה).

(3) The third class consists of the names compounded with the Divine name *jah* (יָה) which the redactors of the text have not attempted to safeguard by converting the ending into *jahū* (יָהוּ). There are no fewer than seventy-one such proper names which have retained their primitive orthography and as they have not undergone any change I need not enumerate them.

This, however, is not the only way in which the redactors of the text guarded against the pronunciation of the abbreviated form of the Tetragrammaton. Instead of adding a syllable they often elided the *He* (ה) altogether or substituted another letter for it. Thus

אַבִּיָהוּ *Abijah*, which is sometimes lengthened into אַבִּיָהוּ *Abijahū* has the letter *He* (ה) dropped altogether and is abbreviated into אַבִּי *Abi*. This is evident from a comparison of 1 Chron. XXIX 1 with 2 Kings XVIII 2 where the mother of Hezekiah is called by two apparently contradictory names in these two passages.

יִשְׁמֵרַי *Ishmerai* in 1 Chron. VIII 18 is now acknowledged to stand for יִשְׁמֵרֵיהּ = kept by Jehovah. Not only has the *He* (ה) here been elided which deprives the last syllable of the divine name *Jah* (יָה), but the vowel-points have been adapted to this altered form.

Exactly the same process has been adopted in Ezra X 34 where מַעֲדַי *Maadai* simply exhibits an altered form of מַעֲדָהּ *Maadjah* = ornament of Jehovah, which occurs in Neh. XII 5, and in the name מַתַּנֵּי *Mattenai*. This name which occurs three times (Ezra X 33, 37; Neh. XII 19) is simply an abbreviated form of מַתַּנְיָהּ *Mattanjah* = gift of Jehovah, with the divine name *Jah* obliterated.

עֹבַדְיָהּ *Obadjah* = worshipper of Jehovah, which has in several places been altered into עֹבַדְיָהוּ *Obadjahū*, and which occurs in its original orthography in 1 Chron. IX 16 as the

descendant of the Levites, is spelled עֲבְדָא *Abda* = *servant* in Neh. XI 17 though it describes the identical person.

The same is the case with שְׁמַעְיָה *Shemajah* = *heard of Jehovah*, a son of Galal who is mentioned in the lists of the Levites in 1 Chron. IX 16, whilst in the list in Neh. XI 17 the name of this son of Galal is spelled שְׁמוּעַ *Shammua* = *heard*, with the monosyllable *Jah* = *Jehovah* entirely gone. Such was the anxiety to safeguard the Tetragrammaton.

The extent to which this process of undeifying *jah* (יה) has been carried, and the effect it had upon the redaction of the Hebrew text may be judged from the fact that the ancient authorities went so far as to take it in the sense of the Greek interjection *ὠ*, *ioŭ* and regarded it as an exclamation of sorrow and pain. Thus the Midrash Rabba on Gen. XLIII 14 remarks as follows:

R. Phineas said in the name of R. Hosejah: It is not said here "blessed is the man whom thou chastenest, O Jehovah" [Ps. XCIV 12], but "blessed is the man whom thou chastenest O *Jah*". That is just as one who is sentenced by the judge cries out in his pain and says *ὠ* *ioŭ* enough, enough! so Jacob said He who will say of the sufferings it is enough will also say of my sufferings it is enough! Because it is said God Almighty give you mercy before the man &c.<sup>1</sup>

The ancient redactors of the text have also tried to safeguard the other Divine names, notably *Elohim* (אֱלֹהִים) and *El* (אֵל) *God*, though not to the same extent as they have protected the Tetragrammaton. Without entering minutely into all the results arising from the protection of these names I shall only advert to some of the phenomena in the Hebrew text due to this cause.

<sup>1</sup> רבי פנחס בשם רבי הושעיא אמר אשרי הנבר אשר תיסרנו ה' אין כתיב כאן אלא אשר תיסרנו יה מזה שהוא נדון לפני הדיין צועק ומצטער ואומר יה יה די די, כך אמר יעקב מי שתתיר ליסורים די הוא יאמר ליסורי די, שנאמר ואל שרי יתן לכם: ed. Willna 1878.

The proper name Daniel occurs eighty-one times in the Bible, thirty times in the Hebrew text and fifty-one times in the Chaldee portion of the book of this celebrated prophet of the Babylonish captivity. Both in the Authorised Version and in the Revised Version there is nothing to indicate in the transliteration of this name that the original exhibits a great peculiarity in the orthography. The name denotes *my judge is God*, or *judge of God* and yet it is not pointed and pronounced דַּנְיֵאל *Dani-el*, according to the analogy of such compounds,<sup>1</sup> but is invariably pointed and pronounced דַּנְי־יֵאל *Dani-iel*, which obliterates the Divine name אֵל *El* altogether. This is according to the canon laid down in the Massorah that "the Tzere must be under the letter Yod (י) in accordance with the celebrated Codex in the country of Eden".<sup>2</sup> Hence this remarkable phenomenon in the MSS. and in the printed editions of the text.

In Hosea X 14 a town is mentioned of the name of Beth-Arbel בֵּית-אַרְבֵּאל. Leaving the Septuagint which exhibits here the reading *οἶκον τοῦ Ιερυβοᾶμ* = בֵּית יִרְבֵּעָם *the house of Jeroboam*, and confining ourselves to the received text it is admitted that the name in question as we have it in the Massoretic reading denotes *House of the ambush of God*, i. e. בֵּית-אַרְבֵּאל. It was, however, deemed offensive to ascribe to God the laying of an ambush. Hence it is pointed and pronounced אַרְבֵּאל *Ar-bel* so that the name of God (אֵל) *El*, is entirely disguised.

In the name *Ishmael* יִשְׁמַעֵאל = *whom God heareth*, we have another instance in which the Divine name *El* (אֵל) *God* is disguised. The reason for it is not far to seek. Besides

<sup>1</sup> Comp. אֱלֵיָאֵל 1 Chron. V 24; VI 19; VIII 20 &c.; נְדַיָּאל Numb. XIII 10; חַיָּיָאֵל 1 Chron. XXIII 9; עֲרֵיָאֵל 1 Chron. IV 36; IX 12; XXVII 25.

<sup>2</sup> דַּנְיֵאל הצרי על יוד הונה מן התאג הדויע במדינת עדן comp. Orient. 2350, fol. 27a British Museum.

the five passages in which it is the name of three different persons,<sup>1</sup> Ishmael occurs forty-three times throughout the Hebrew Bible, twenty times it denotes the first born of Abraham by Hagar<sup>2</sup> and in no fewer than twenty-three instances it is the name of the murderer of Gedaliah.<sup>3</sup> Now it was not so much "the wild ass of a man" whose "hand was against every man, and every man's hand against him" (Gen. XVI 12), but Ishmael the son of Nathaniel who is the cause of the obliteration of אֱלֹהִים *God*, in this compound name. The horrible treachery and villainy which are recorded in Jerem. XL 7—XLI 15 have made his name execrable in the annals of Jewish history and the memory of the massacre which he perpetrated is perpetuated by the fact of the seventh month (Zech. VII 5; VIII 19) which the Jews keep to this day on the third of Tishri. This underlies the punctuation יִשְׁמָעֵאלִי instead of יִשְׁמָעֵאל *whom God heareth*. This punctuation has also been uniformly carried through in all the eight passages in which it is the patronymic,<sup>4</sup> viz. יִשְׁמָעֵאֵלִי *the Ishmaelite*, and indeed in one instance the letter *Aleph* (א) in the Divine name has been elided altogether (1 Chron. XVII 30).

The obliteration of *El* (אֱלֹהִים) *God*, in the compound name יִרְעָאֵל *God planteth*, is probably due to the infamous and bloody deeds perpetrated in Jezreel and to the fact that the final overthrow of the kingdom of Israel took

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Ezra X 22 where Ishmael is the name of a priest who had taken a strange wife; in 1 Chron. VIII 38; IX 44 it is the name of the sons of Azel; and in 2 Chron. XIX 11 Ishmael is the name of the father of Zebadiah.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Gen. XVI 11, 15, 16; XVII 18, 20, 23, 25, 46; XXV 9, 15, 13, 13, 16, 17; XXVIII 9, 9; XXXVI 3; 1 Chron. I 28, 29, 31.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. 2 Kings XXV 23, 25; Jerem. XL 8, 14, 15, 16; XLI 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18.

<sup>4</sup> Comp. Gen. XXXVII 25, 27, 28; XXXIX 1; Judg. VIII 24; Ps. LXXXIII 7; 1 Chron. II 17; XXVII 30.

place here.<sup>1</sup> It will be seen that the Divine name is here more effectually disguised than in Ishmael inasmuch as it is always pointed יִרְעָאֵל with *Segol* under the *Ayin* (ע) and it is only the patronymic which has *Tzere* under the *Ayin* (ע). In one instance the Divine name is entirely obliterated by the omission of the letter *Aleph* (א) in the patronymic where the *Keri* directs us to insert it. Comp. 1 Sam. XXX 5.

This reluctance to pronounce the Divine names and the consequent attempts to disguise or to obliterate them have been a fruitful source of various readings. In some Schools of textual critics, the elision of the letter *He* (ה) at the beginning or the addition of the letter *Vav* (ו) at the end of proper names in compounds with *Jah* (יה), i. e. the abbreviated form of *Jehovah* (יהוה), was more extensively carried through than in others. The same was the case with the substitution of *Adonai* (אֲדֹנָי) *Lord*, or *Elohim* (אֱלֹהִים) *God*, for the Tetragrammaton, and with the removal of the vowel-point *Tzere* from the names in compounds with *El* (אֱלֹהִים) *God*. Hence the MSS. frequently exhibit various readings both with regard to the Tetragrammaton and the other names of the God of Israel, as will be seen in the notes to my edition of the Hebrew Bible. This also accounts for the extraordinary phenomenon exhibited in the orthography of the Divine names in the early editions. Thus the *editio princeps* of the entire Hebrew Bible has *Elohim* (אֱלֹהִים) for *Elohim* (אֱלֹהִים) *God*, and *Jehodah* (יהוד) for *Jehovah*, substituting *Daleth* (ד) for *He* (ה) not only in the pronounceable, but in the unpronounceable name to disguise them both alike. The same process of disguise is adopted in the third edition of the Bible printed at Brescia in 1494.

XII. *The attempt to remove the application of the names of false gods to Jehovah.* — We have seen that the safe-

<sup>1</sup> Comp. 1 Kings XXI 1—16; 2 Kings IX 23—37; X 1—11; Hos. I 4

guarding of the Divine names in the proper names of human beings is the cause of a difference in the orthography. Still, as a rule, the identity of the names and persons is easily recognised. In the anxiety, however, on the part of the Sopherim to prevent the application of the names of idols to the true God, changes have been effected in the text which often preclude the identification of the individual and thus produce apparent contradictions in parallel passages.

The most significant changes are those connected with *Baal*. The appellative Baal (בַּעַל) which denotes *Lord*, *Owner*, like the appellatives *Adon* (אֲדֹנָי) *Lord*, *Owner*, and *El* (אֱל) *the Mighty*, was originally one of the names of the God of Israel. This is evident from the fact that names compounded with *Baal* are of frequent occurrence in the families of Saul and David who were zealous defenders of the worship of Jehovah. Thus *Eshbaal* (אֶשְׁבַּעַל) = *the man of Baal or the Lord*, is the name of the fourth son of Saul king of Israel (1 Chron. VIII 33; IX 39), and *Beiliada* (בְּעִלְיָדָע) = *for whom Baal or the Lord careth*, is the name of the son of David born in Jerusalem (1 Chron. XIV 7). As names were given by parents with special reference to God in recognition of mercies vouchsafed, it will hardly be contended that both Saul and David dedicated their children to the false God Baal and not to the true God of Israel. We also find that one of David's heroes who joined his army at Ziklag was called *Bealjah* (בְּעִלְיָה) = *whose Baal or Lord is Jehovah* (1 Chron. XII 5), and that one of David's chief officers was called *Baal-hanan* (בַּעַל-חֲנָן) = *Baal or the Lord of mercy* (1 Chron. XXVII 28).

But Baal was also the name of the supreme deity of the surrounding nations who in conjunction with Asherah was afterwards worshipped with obscene rites.<sup>1</sup> Prior to the

<sup>1</sup> Comp. 1 Kings XVIII 19; 2 Kings XXIII 4.

Babylonish captivity the Jews were frequently seduced by this libidinous form of idolatry and introduced *Kedeshim* and *Kedeshoth* into their worship.<sup>1</sup> During their exile, however, they were completely weaned from going astray after other gods and on their return to the Holy Land under Ezra and Nehemiah every effort was made by the spiritual guides of the people to obliterate if possible the very name of the idols whose worship was associated with licentiousness. Hence Jehovah himself in describing the purified state of religion declares: "It shall come to pass at that day that thou shalt call me Ishi [= my husband] and shalt call me no more Baali [= my Baal or Lord]: for I will take away the names of Baalim out of her mouth and they shall no more be mentioned by their names" (Hosea II 16, 17). It is due to this declaration that the authoritative custodians of the sacred text interpreted the precept "and make no mention of the names of other gods" (Exod. XXIII 13) in a most rigid sense as implying that the very name of Baal should be cancelled even in compound proper names. For this reason names compounded with Baal have been altered either in a good sense or principally by way of ridicule into compounds with *Bosheth* (בוֹשֶׁת) = *shame*. Thus

(1) *Jerubbaal* (יִרְבַּעַל) = *Baal contends*, the name which was given to Gideon by his father Joash when the people wished to kill him, and which occurs fourteen times,<sup>2</sup> is altered in 2 Sam. XI 21 into

*Jerubbesheth* (יִרְבַּשֶׁת) = *with whom shame contends*, i. e. the shameful idol. The fact that the Septuagint, the Syriac and the Vulgate exhibit here יִרְבַּעַל *Jerubbaal*, shows that

<sup>1</sup> Comp. 1 Kings XIV 22-24; XV 12; XXII 47; 2 Kings XXIII 7; Hos. IV 14; with Numb. XXV 1-3; XXXI 16; Josh. XXII 17.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Judg. VI 32; VII 1; VIII 29, 35; IX 1, 2, 5, 16, 19, 24, 28, 57; 1 Sam. XII 11.



they had still a recension before them in which this alteration had not been made, or that the Codex from which these Versions were made belonged to a School which retained the ancient reading.

(2) *Eshbaal* (אֶשְׁבַּעַל) = *the man of Baal*, the name of the fourth son of Saul king of Israel which occurs twice (1 Chron. VIII 33; IX 39), is altered into

*Ish-bosheth* (אִישׁ-בֹּשֶׁת) = *the man of shame*, in all the other twelve passages where it occurs.<sup>1</sup>

(3) *Ashbel* (אֶשְׁבֵּל) = *the man of Baal*, the second or third son of Benjamin which occurs three times, viz. Gen. XLVI 21; Numb. XXVI 38; 1 Chron. VIII 1, is altered into

*Jediael* (יְדִיעָאֵל) = *known of God*, in the other three instances where this name occurs for the son of Benjamin, viz. 1 Chron. VII 6, 10, 11. It will be seen that in the case of this name the alteration is in a good sense.

(4) *Merib-baal* (מְרִיב־בַּעַל) = *my Lord Baal*, the name of Jonathan's lame son and Saul's grandson as he is three times called, viz. 1 Chron. VIII 34, 34; IX 40, but more properly *Meri-baal* (מְרִי-בַּעַל) in 1 Chron. IX 40, is altered into

*Mephibosheth* (מִפְיֹבֶשֶׁת) = *the exterminator of shame*, in all the other fourteen passages where it occurs<sup>2</sup> thus making it denote the very reverse of its original meaning. Mephibosheth also occurs once as the name of a son of Saul by his concubine Rizpah the daughter of Aiah (2 Sam. XXI 8). It is, therefore, to be presumed that it is also an alteration from *Meri-baal*.

(5) *Beeliada* (בְּעֵלִידָע) = *whom Baal or the Lord knows*, i. e. cares for, the name of a son of David which only occurs once in the first List, viz. 1 Chron. XIV 7, is altered into

<sup>1</sup> Comp. 2 Sam. II 8, 10, 12, 15; III 7, 8, 14, 15; IV 5, 8, 8, 12.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. 1 Sam. IV 4; IX 6, 6, 10, 11, 12, 12, 13; XVI 1, 4; XIX 24, 25, 30; XXI 7.

*Eliada* (אֵלִידָע) = *whom God knows*, i. e. cares for, in the other two Lists which repeat the names of David's sons born in Jerusalem contained in 2 Sam. V 14—16 and 1 Chron. III 5—8.

(6) 2 Sam. XXIII 8. — The most remarkable instance of confusion, however, which has been produced in the Massoretic text by this anxiety on the part of the Sopherim "to take away the names of Baalim" (comp. Hos. II 17) is exhibited in 2 Sam. XXIII 8. In the List of David's chief heroes which is repeated three times, viz. (1) 2 Sam. XXIII 8—39; (2) 1 Chron. XI 11—41; and (3) 1 Chron. XXVII 2—15, the name of the first hero who heads this catalogue is given in 2 Sam. XXIII 8 as יֹשֵׁב בְּשֶׁבֶת הַחַמְבִּנִי. This extraordinary name is rendered in the Authorised Version *the Tachmonite that sat in the seat*, with the alternative in the margin "Or, Josheb-bassebet the Tachmonite". This curious marginal rendering is inserted into the text of the Revised Version with the remark against it in the margin "the verse is probably corrupt. See 1 Chron. XI 11". The corruption, however, which is here acknowledged is simply confirmed by the parallel Lists, but cannot be corrected by them. It is the Septuagint which supplies the clue to the correction since it exhibits the reading Ἰεβοσθε = אִישׁ-בֹּשֶׁת = אִישׁ-בֹּשֶׁת *Ishbosheth*, i. e. *the man of shame*, which is also the name of the fourth son of Saul. But as *Ishbosheth* itself, as we have seen, is already an alteration of the original name אֶשְׁבַּעַל or אֶשְׁבַּעַל *Ishbaal*, i. e. *the man of Baal*, there can hardly be any doubt that it was the primitive reading here. This is attested by the Lucian recension of the Septuagint which has Ἰεσβααλ = אֶשְׁבַּעַל *Ishbaal*. With these facts before us we at once see that the name of this first hero in the parallel catalogues must also have been originally אֶשְׁבַּעַל *Ishbaal*, and indeed the Lucian recension of the Septuagint has actually Ἰεσσε-  
AA.

βααλ = יִשְׁבַּע in 1 Chron. XI 11 and B. has Ἰεσαβαδα which is probably an error for Ἰεσεβαλα. In the Hebrew the name was probably written both in 1 Chron. XI 11 and XXVII 2 יִשְׁבַּע which was resolved by one School into יִשְׁבַּעֵל *Ishbaal*, and by another School disguised into יִשְׁבַּעִם *Joshobam*. Whether the Levite יִשְׁבַּעִם, the descendant of Korah whose name is once mentioned in 1 Chron. XII 6, was originally also יִשְׁבַּעֵל, or whether this name has made it easier for the redactors of the text to resolve יִשְׁבַּע [= יִשְׁבַּעֵל] into יִשְׁבַּעִם in 1 Chron. XI 11; XII 2 it is now difficult to ascertain.

**XIII. Safeguarding the unity of the Divine Worship at Jerusalem.** — To understand the anxiety of the spiritual guides of the Jewish Commonwealth to guard against any rival to the central Sanctuary at Jerusalem, and the effect which this solicitude has had upon the redaction of the text it is necessary to advert to the events in the history of the Jews during this period.

During the terrible wars which raged in Palestine between the Jews and the Syrians and the consequent persecutions B. C. 164, Onias IV, the young son of Onias III, the legitimate High Priest, fled to Alexandria accompanied by Dositheus who was likewise of priestly descent.<sup>1</sup> As Onias III had always espoused the cause of the Egyptians against the Syrians, Ptolemy Philometor received his son with great hospitality. Egypt, however, was then distracted by intestine war. The brothers Philometor and Physcon, were arrayed against each other in deadly conflict fighting for the crown. Onias and Dositheus sided with the former and became generals of divisions. Through their high position and influence they were

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Josephus, *Antiq.* XIII 3, 1—3; *Wars* VII 10, 3; *Against Apion* II 5.

followed by the Egyptian Jews into the battle-field and greatly contributed to the success of Philometor over Physcon. As a reward for his services Philometor made Onias prince over the Jewish community in Egypt with the hereditary title of Ethnarch and Alabarch.

As prince over the community, Onias was determined to build a Temple for his numerous Jewish brethren who had settled in Egypt since the Sanctuary at Jerusalem had been profaned, and Alcimus, a usurping High Priest, was politically appointed over the heads of the legitimate priestly family. Being a descendant of that long line of High Priests, whose family dated from the time of David and Solomon, who officiated in the first Temple and who exerted themselves in the building of the Second Temple after the return from the Babylonish captivity, Onias IV was not suspected of schism and hence was greatly encouraged by his brethren in his contemplated design. He, moreover, pointed out a prophecy which foretold that a Temple should be built in Egypt (Isa. XIX 19). When Onias made his design known to Philometor this monarch forthwith gave him a plot of land at Leontopolis, in the Prefecture of Heliopolis for the site of the Temple. He also assigned the revenues of the whole of this province for the permanent maintenance of the divine service. And it thus came to pass that in the vicinity of Goshen, on almost the identical spot where the descendants of Jacob had light when the rest of Egypt was suffering from the plague of darkness, so many centuries before, the Israelites had now a Temple wherein they worshipped the God of Abraham for more than two hundred years (*circa* B. C. 160—A. D. 71), when it was closed by the decree of Vespasian.

The Jerusalem Jews, who during the distracted state of Judea and the profanation of the Sanctuary in the metropolis received the tidings of the building of the

Temple in Egypt with joy, were afterwards extremely jealous of its existence when the Temple at Jerusalem had been purified and when its true worship was restored by the Maccabeans, since the new Sanctuary in Egypt disturbed the central point of unity. The Alexandrian Jews, however, to whom this new Temple had been a great comfort when the metropolitan Sanctuary was profaned, clung to their sacred edifice most tenaciously. Hence the alterations by the redactors of the Hebrew text of any passage which might favour the Egyptian Temple, as will be seen from the following illustration.

Isa. XIX 18. — This verse as it now stands in the *textus receptus* is correctly translated in the Authorised Version:

In that day shall five cities in the land of Egypt speak the language of Canaan, and swear to the Lord of hosts; one shall be called, the city of destruction.

The whole of this Section (XIX 18—25) predicts the glorious future of the five Egyptian cities when they shall use the sacred language in which the worship of God is conducted and when they shall swear fealty to Jehovah. And now we are told that the most distinguished of these cities thus converted and consecrated and dedicated in so special a manner to the worship of Jehovah is to be called *City of Destruction*, which is a perfect contradiction to the whole tenor of the passage in question. The Septuagint, however, solves the difficulty inasmuch as it clearly shows that the Hebrew recension from which it was made read *City of Righteousness* (πόλις ἀσεδέκ = עיר הצדק). From a pious desire not to bring the name of any other place in competition or even in juxtaposition with the sacred city the metropolis of the Holy Land, the Alexandrian translators of the Septuagint, as is often the case, did not venture to translate the word at all, but simply trans-

literated it. The Palestinian redactors, however, who were jealous for the distinction of Jerusalem which bore this name (comp. Isa. I 26) would not consent that this title should be given to any other place, especially out of Palestine.

Hence they substituted for it “the City of the Sun”, which is still to be found in the most ancient traditions,<sup>1</sup> in many MSS., in some of the ancient Versions and in the margins both of the Authorised Version and the Revised Version. But afterward when the Jerusalem Temple was cleansed of its pollutions and the true service of Jehovah was restored, the Onias Temple was not only deemed unnecessary, but schismatic, another School of textual critics altered the name “City of the Sun” or Heliopolis, into the opprobrious name “City of Destruction”. This was done all the more easily since it simply exhibited a kind of alliteration, which is very common in Hebrew, and only required the slightest change in a letter, or the exchange of two letters *Cheth* (ח) and *He* (ה) which are almost identical in form and are frequently mistaken for each other both in the MSS. and in the editions of the Hebrew text.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *Menachoth* 110a, so also Symmachus, the Vulgate and the Chaldee. The latter, however, exhibits both recensions הָרֵם *sun* and הָרֵם *destruction*, inasmuch as it paraphrases it *the City of Beth-shemesh* [= dwelling of the sun, Heliopolis] *which is to be destroyed, shall one of them be called קרחא בית שמש דעתידא למחרב יחאמר היא חדא מנהון.*

<sup>2</sup> How difficult it is to justify this reading which is followed by Aquila, Theodotion and the Syriac may be seen from the expedient to which Kimchi was driven in the interpretation of the passage. *It shall be said to one of them City of Destruction, that is, they will all so cling to the faith of the true God that they will agree together that in case one of the five cities should forsake the worship of God it shall be said to her City of Destruction, i. e. עיר ההרס יאמר לאחת כל עיר יהיו רבקים באמונת האל עד שיסכימו ביניהם שאם תשוב מעבודת האל אחת מהמש ערים יאמר לה עיר ההרס כלומר שיעמירו עליה ויהרסה.*

It will be seen that the formulization of these principles and the redaction of the text in accordance with them, presuppose functions which really belong to revisers rather than editors. But no exception can be taken to the conduct of these divinely appointed depositories of the traditional text. In accepting their transliteration of the text into the present square characters, their division of it into separate words, verses and sections, their orally transmitted pronunciation of the consonants which determines the sense of the Hebrew Scriptures and their finally fixing the canon of the Old Testament, we already concede to these spiritual guides of the Jewish Church a divine authority which almost amounts to co-authorship. Their specific authority, however, as textual revisers ceased about a century before Christ and there can hardly be any doubt that the received text which we now have is substantially the same which was finally settled at that period by these authoritative redactors. Copies of these authorised Scriptures were deposited in the Court of the Temple and these were not only used for public reading, but as Standard Codices whereby other MSS. were corrected. Thus we are told in the Jerusalem Talmud (*Taanith* IV 2):

Three Codices [of the Pentateuch] were in the Court of the Temple, Codex *Meon*, Codex *Zaatute* and Codex *Hi*. In one the reading was מעון *refuge* [Deut. XXXIII 27], and the other two Codices read מעונה [with the final *He*], the reading of the two was accepted and that of the one Codex was rejected. One Codex read ועמוטי [= *ἐπιτηδῆς*] *enquires of* [Exod. XXIV 5] and the other two Codices read נערי *young men of*, the reading of the two Codices was accepted and that of the one Codex was rejected. In one Codex the reading דו"א [with *Yod*] occurred nine times and in the other two Codices it occurred eleven times, the reading of the two Codices was accepted and that of the one Codex was rejected.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> ג' ספרים מצאו בעורה ספר מעוני? [מעון] וספר ועמוטי וספר היא באחד מצאו כתוב מעון אלהי קדם ובשנים כתוב מענה אלהי קדם וקיימו שנים וביטלו אחד. באחד מצאו כתוב וישלה את ועמוטי בני ישראל ובשנים כתוב וישלה את נערי בני

This notice reveals to us the important fact that the Codices in question must have been completed anterior to the introduction of the Five Final Letters when the orthography in Deut. XXXIII 27 was still מעון which one School of textual critics read מעון = מעון, whilst another School read it מעון = מעונה. After the Final Letters were legally established, this variation could not have obtained since the final *Nun* (ן) determines the length of the word.

It, moreover, shows that at this early period the linguistic peculiarities were already counted. In the Pentateuch where the pronoun third person singular הוא with *Vav* occurs about 656 times, and where it is used 457 times for the masculine gender and 199 times for the feminine, we are told that the majority of the Temple Codices read הו"א with *Yod* (י) in eleven passages.

But what is most instructive in this classical record is the fact that we are here told for the first time that the redactors of the text at this period collated MSS. and that they decided in favour of the reading which the majority of Codices exhibited. In selecting, however, the reading which was found in the larger number of Codices they did not destroy the variant of the minority and have thus enabled us to test the merit of the rejected reading. We have already seen that in other instances too, where the official reading is given in the margin, the stigmatized words are not obliterated, but left in the text, though the redactors do not specify the exact process by which they arrived at their conclusions.

The classical record of these Temple Codices, however, by no means implies that there were no other MSS. in the precincts of the Sanctuary or that the instances adduced exhausted the variations. Josephus tells us that Titus

ישראל וקיימו שנים וביטלו אחד, באחד מצאו כתוב תשע היא ובשנים כתיב י"א היא comp. *Jerusalem Taanith* IV 2; *Sopherim* VI 4.

presented him with Codices of the Sacred Scriptures from the spoils of the Temple,<sup>1</sup> and we know that there were others in the possession of distinguished doctors of the Law, which exhibited readings at variance with the present *textus receptus*. In the course of this examination we shall have occasion to refer to the readings in the Codex of R. Meir, the celebrated disciple of R. Akiba which are so often quoted both in the Talmud and in the Midrashim.

In the Midrash attributed to R. Moses Ha-Darshan at Narbonne, which was compiled before A. D. 1280, and the MS. of which is now in the possession of the Jewish community at Prague, a List is given of thirty-two various readings taken from a copy of the Pentateuch which was carried away by the Romans after the capture of Jerusalem. Josephus records that among the trophies which Vespasian brought from the Temple to Rome was the Law of the Jews. This he ordered to be deposited in the royal palace *circa* 70 A. D. About 220 A. D. the emperor Severus who built a synagogue at Rome which was called after his name, handed over this MS. to the Jewish community, and though both the synagogue and the MS. have perished, a List of variations from this ancient Codex has been preserved. This List I printed in my Massorah from the able article by the learned Mr. Epstein.<sup>2</sup> Since then I have found a duplicate of this List in a MS. of the Bible in the Paris National Library No. 31 (folio 399a) where it is appended as a Massoretic Rubric.<sup>3</sup> The List in this

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Josephus, *Life* § 75.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, Vol. XXXIV, p. 337–351, Krotoschin 1885; with *The Massorah*, Vol. III, p. 348.

<sup>3</sup> This List is also printed in the *Monatsschrift*, Vol. XXXVI, p. 508, Krotoschin 1887. Comp. Neubauer, *Studia Biblica*, Vol. III, p. 19 &c., Oxford 1891.

Codex, though consisting of the same number of variations and enumerated almost in the same order, differs materially from the one preserved in the Midrash as will be seen from the following analysis of the two records, exhibits the primitive Rubric. The heading of the Paris List is as follows:<sup>1</sup>

These verses which were written in the Pentateuch Codex found in Rome and carefully preserved and locked up in the Synagogue of Severus, differ as regards letters and words.

(1) Gen. I 31. — Instead of “behold it was *very* good” the text read “behold *death* was good”. That this reading was not confined to the Severus Codex is evident from the record in the Midrash Rabba on this passage where we are told that the Codex of the celebrated R. Meir also read it *death* (מות) instead of *very* (מאד)<sup>2</sup> and Rashi

<sup>1</sup> אֵלֶּיךָ פְּסוּקֵי הַחֵדָּשׁ כְּתוּבִין בְּסֵפֶר אֲרִיחָא דְאִישְׁתַּחַב בְּרוּמֵי וְהָיָא נְנוּחָא וְסֵתוּמָא בְּכִנְשַׁח דְּסִירוּם בְּשֵׁנוּי אֲחִיּוֹת וְחִיבוֹת: וִירָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת כָּל אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה וְהִנֵּה טוֹב מְאֹד, מוֹת הָיָה כְּתוּב: כְּתוּב עוֹד וַיִּלְבַּשׁ, כְּתוּב הָיָה כְּתוּב: הַכְּצַעְקָהּ הִבְאָה אֵלַי עֲשׂו כְּלָה, הַכְּצַעְקָתָם הָיָה כְּתוּב: וַיֹּאמֶר יְיָ אֱלֹהֵי אֲדָנִי אֲבָרְהֶם, וּמֵאֲרַע הָיָה כְּתוּב: וַיִּמְכַּר אֶת בְּכוֹרֹתָיו לְיַעֲקֹב, מִכְרָתוֹ הָיָה כְּתוּב: הִנֵּה נָא זִקְנָתִי, יוֹמֵמֵתִי הָיָה כְּתוּב: רָאָה רִיחַ בְּנֵי כְרִיחַ שׂוּדָה, סֵדָה הָיָה כְּתוּב: יַעֲשֵׂה דְוָאֵהֱלִיכְמָה יִלְדָה, יַעֲשֵׂה הָיָה כְּתוּב: וְכֵן דְּוָאֵלָה הָיוּ בְנֵי יַעֲשֵׂה, יַעֲשֵׂה הָיָה כְּתוּב: וַיִּקְוֶמוּ וַיִּרְדּוּ מִצְרַיִם, מִצְרַיִם הָיָה כְּתוּב: אֵלֵיפוֹ בֶן עֵדָה, בְּנֵעֵדָה הָיָה כְּתוּב: וַיִּשְׁמֵנִי לֶאֱבֹל לְפָרְעָה, פָּרְעָה הָיָה כְּתוּב: וְאֲקַבְרָה שָׁם, שָׁם הָיָה כְּתוּב: וְאֵלָה שְׁמוֹת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הַבָּאִים מִצְרַיִם, מִצְרַיִם הָיָה כְּתוּב: וַיִּסְעוּ בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מִרַעַמְסֵס, מִרַעַמְסֵס הָיָה כְּתוּב: כֹּה תֹאמַר לְבֵית יַעֲקֹב וְתִנְדָּר לְבֵנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, לְבֵית הָיָה כְּתוּב תְּרִיּוֹנוֹ: וְחִמְשָׁה בְּרִיּוֹת לְקִרְשֵׁי, לֹא הָיָה כְּתוּב בְּרִיּוֹת: וְלִקַּח הַכֶּהֵן מִדָּם, מִדָּם הָיָה כְּתוּב: וְכִי יִרַק הוֹב, בָּמִים הָיִים הָיָה כְּתוּב: וְכַבְּשָׁה אֶחָת בַּת שְׁנָה תְּמִימָה, תְּמִימִים הָיָה כְּתוּב: כָּל בָּא לְצִבְאָה דְקֶהֱתָ, הִבָּא הָיָה כְּתוּב: מִרְאשֵׁית עֵרִיסוֹתֵיכֶם לְדִרְתֵיכֶם, לְדִרְתֵיכֶם הָיָה כְּתוּב: נֶקֶם נֶקֶם בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵאֵת הַמִּדְיָנִים אַחַר תֹּאסַף, אֲשֶׁר הָיָה כְּתוּב: וַיִּבְאוּ אֶל מֹשֶׁה וְאֶל כָּל עֵדָה, לֹא הָיָה כְּתוּב בּוֹ כָּל: וַיִּקְרְבוּ רֹאשֵׁי בְנֵי יוֹסֵף, בֶּן יוֹסֵף הָיָה כְּתוּב: וְלֹא אֲבִיחָם לְעֵלּוֹת, אֲבִיחָמוֹ הָיָה כְּתוּב: וַיַּעֲשׂוּ נֹם הֵם, הֵם הָיָה כְּתוּב: לִתַּת אוֹתָנוּ בְּיַד הָאֲמֹרִי, הָאֲמֹרִי הָיָה כְּתוּב: לֹא תִקֶּה הָאֵם עַל הַבְּנִים, הַאֲבִנִים הָיָה כְּתוּב: נִפְרִית וּמִלַח שְׂרָפָה, שְׂרָפָה הָיָה כְּתוּב: כַּמְהַפְכַת אֱלֹהִים אֶת סְרוּם, כַּמְפַכַת הָיָה כְּתוּב: אֲמַרְתִּי אֲפֹאֲדֵהֶם, אִף אֵי הֵם הָיָה כְּתוּב: וַיִּבְא מוֹרָה צֶרֶק בְּמַהֲרָה בִּימֵינוּ, וַיֹּאמֶר לָנוּ.

<sup>2</sup> *Midrash Rabba*, Parasha IX, fol. 24b, ed. Wilna 1878.

(1040—1105), in his gloss on the Midrash so far from taking exception to this reading, adduces Eccl. VII 9 in supporting it. The variant (מות היה כתוב) is inadvertently omitted in the Prague recension of this List. This is also attested by Kimchi in his Commentary on this passage.<sup>1</sup>

(2) Gen. III 21. — According to this List the reading of the Severus Codex in the passage before us was simply “and the Lord God made unto Adam and to his wife coats”, without specifying the material of which the said garments consisted. Here again the Prague List which adduces the same catchword does not give the variant. From the Midrash Rabba on this passage we learn that the Codex of R. Meir exhibited here another variant. Instead of “coats of skin” (עור) this celebrated Codex read “coats of light” (אור), i. e. luminous, bright or precious coats, having *Aleph* (א) instead of *Ayin* (ע)<sup>2</sup> and Onkelos appears to support this reading.<sup>3</sup>

(3) Gen. XVIII 21. — Instead of “according to the cry of it” (הכצעקתה) with the suffix third person singular feminine, the Severus Codex read “according to their cry” (הכצעקתם) with the suffix third person plural masculine. This is manifestly the primitive and better reading as is evident from חטאתם *their sin*, in the preceding verse and as is attested by Onkelos, the Jerusalem Targum and the Septuagint.

(4) Gen. XXIV 7. — In the passage before us the Prague List has preserved the proper catchword and the more

<sup>1</sup> ואני מצאתי כתוב שהוא כתוב באורייתא דאישתביאת לרמי והיא היתה נניוא

: בתורתו של ר"מ מצאו כתוב כהנהגות אור אלו כנדי אדם הראשון שהן דומים

: לפינים רחבים מלמטה וצרין מלמעלה: Comp. *Midrash Rabba*, Parasha XX, folio 47a, ed. Wilna 1878.

<sup>3</sup> כתנור in the List of the Paris National Library is manifestly a clerical error for כתנות.

correct variant exhibited in the Severus Codex. According to this Rubric the Severus Codex had here “who took me from my house and from my country” (מִבֵּיתִי וּמֵאֶרְצִי) in harmony with this phrase in verse 4, instead of the more lengthy phrase “who took me from the house of my father and from the land of my birth” which is the reading of the *textus receptus*. Though the catchword in the List of the Paris National Library is wrong, inasmuch as it refers to Gen. XXIV 12, the expression וּמֵאֶרְצָא = וּמֵאֶרְעָא and from the land exhibits the remains of the right variant contained in the Prague recension.

(5) Gen. XXV 33. — The Severus Codex read here “and he sold his ware” (מכרתו) or price, instead of *his birth-right* (בכרתו).

(6) Gen. XXVII 2. — The reading here in the Severus Codex, though yielding no difference in the sense from that in the *textus receptus*, is of great orthographical interest inasmuch as it exhibits the primitive text prior to the division of the words and to the introduction of the final letters. In the Prague recension of this List these features have been obliterated through a clerical error. For a similar instance which exhibits the same orthographical features see below No. 11.

(7) Gen. XXVII 7. — The value of the variation here consists in the fact that it discloses to us a period in the orthography of the text when in the absence of the diacritical mark which now distinguishes *Shin* (שׁ) from *Sin* (ש) the letter *Samech* (ס) was more frequently used by some Schools of textual critics. In the Prague recension of the List the point in question is obliterated through a clerical error.

(8 and 9) Gen. XXXVI 5, 14. — The variation here affects the orthography of the proper Name *Jeush* (יעוש). This name which occurs nine times in the Bible is spelled

in two different ways. In six passages it is *Jeūsh* (יעוש) with *Vav*,<sup>1</sup> and in three instances the textual reading or the *Kethiv* is *Jeish* (יעיש) with *Yod*,<sup>2</sup> for which the official reading or the *Keri* substitutes יעוש with *Vav* to make it conformable to the six instances. Now according to the Severus Codex the textual reading in both these instances was יעיש with *Yod* and without the official *Keri*. According to the Prague recension, however, the textual reading in both passages was יעוש with *Vav*.

(10) Gen. XLIII 15. — This variation refers to the presence and absence of the local *He* (ה) in the word מצרים *Egypt*. Trite as the difference may seem it discloses to us the orthographical changes which the text underwent in the different Schools of textual critics. The Rubric distinctly tells us that the Severus Codex read it here מצרים *Egypt*, without the local *He* (ה) in contradistinction to the acknowledged MSS. which read it מצרימה with *He*. In our present *textus receptus*, however, the textual reading is now מצרים as it is in the Severus Codex and it is only the *Sevir* according to the Massorah which has מצרימה with *He*.<sup>3</sup> We thus see that according to the testimony of the Severus Codex the present *Sevir* was originally the textual reading. The Prague List gives simply the catchword without specifying the variation. This has misled the learned editor who takes it for Gen. XLVI 6 and hence concluded that the Severus Codex read it here ויקומו וירדו and they rose up and went down, instead of the simple ויבאו and they come. For a similar variation see below No. 14.

(11) Gen. XXXVI 10. — Here again the variation is of great orthographical interest. The Codex Severus we

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Gen. XXXVI 18; 1 Chron. I 35; VII 39; XXIII 10, 11;

<sup>2</sup> Chron. XI 19

<sup>3</sup> Comp. Gen. XXXVI 5, 14; 1 Chron. VII 10.

<sup>4</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter ז, § 700, Vol. II, p. 242.

are told, read בן-עדה *the son of Adah*, as one word, viz. בנעדה which is a survival of the primitive text prior to the division of the words and the introduction of the final letters. For a similar instance see above No. 6. The Prague List simply gives the catchword without specifying the variation which has again misled the erudite editor who takes it to refer to Gen. XXXVI 12 where he thinks that the Severus Codex read בן עדה אליפז *Eliphaz the son of Adah*, instead of בן עשו אליפז *Eliphaz the son of Esau*.

(12) Gen. XLV 8. — The Severus Codex read here "and he made me לאב פֶרעה a father of Pharaoh", instead of a father to Pharaoh לאב לפרעה. This variant makes no difference in the sense and the reading in the Severus Codex is simply according to the construction in Gen. XVII 4. According to the Prague recension, however, the variation consists in the Severus Codex having read וישני and he lent me, from נָשָׂה to lend, instead of וישמני and he made me, from שָׂם to put, to make. This was also the reading of R. Meir's Codex.<sup>1</sup> It is probable that the Prague recension has here adopted the reading of R. Meir's Codex as the compiler of the List was not certain about the real variation in the Severus List.

(13) Gen. XLVIII 7. — Here again the variation exhibits the survival of the primitive orthography inasmuch as it shows that the Severus Codex still retained the

<sup>1</sup> כספרו של ר' מאיר כתוב וישני לאב שנאמר אשר ישה ברעהו דין הוא מן מליא דכתיבן באורחא דנפקת מן ירושלם בשביחא וסלקת לרומי והות נניוא בכנישתא in the Codex of R. Meir the reading was and he lent me as a father, as it is written 'every one who lendeth to his neighbour' [Deut. XV 2]. This is one of the words which were written in the Codex that went from Jerusalem into exile and departed to Rome, and was deposited in the Synagogue of Asverus. Comp. the Prague Midrash Rabba on Gen. XLV 8 and Epstein in the *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, Vol. XXXIV, p. 339, Krotoschin 1885.

spelling שם *there*, with what we now call the medial *Mem* (מ) at the end of the word, instead of the final *Mem* (ם) which obtained at a later period. For a similar instance see below No. 26. The Prague recension of this List simply gives the catchword of the verse in which the variant occurs without stating what it is. This has caused Mr. Epstein to enter into a learned disquisition as to the probable nature of the variant.

(14) Gen. XLVI 8. — The variation here is exactly the same as that exhibited in No. 10 and affords another instance of the absence of the local *He* (ה) in the primitive orthography. Originally it was מצרימ which one School afterwards read מצרימ = מצרימה and the other School read it מצרימ = מצרים. Hence the origin of the Rubric which tabulates the *Sevirin* on the diversity of the orthography of this proper name as well as the Massorah which registers the number of instances where it is spelled מצרימה with the local *He*.<sup>1</sup> The simple catchword in the Prague recension without the variant itself has again called forth a learned and conjectural note from the editor as to the reading in the Severus Codex which is set aside by the explicit statement in the Paris List.

(15) Exod. XII 37. — Nothing can be more clear than the declaration in the Paris List as to the precise nature of the variant here. The Severus Codex we are told had the abbreviation 'מרעמס from *Rames*, instead of the full expression מרעמסס from *Rameses*. This important statement yields an additional proof that abbreviations were originally used in the Hebrew Scriptures.<sup>2</sup> The absence of the variant in the Prague recension has again produced a learned note from the editor which is rendered nugatory by the explicit statement here.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter מ, §§ 700, 703, Vol II, p 242.

<sup>2</sup> *Vide supra*, chap. IV, p. 163—170.

(16) Exod. XIX 3. — Instead of “and tell *the children of* (לבני) Israel” the Severus Codex read it “and tell *the house of* (לבית) Israel”, thus having the same expression in both clauses of the verse. That the phrases בני ישראל *the children of Israel*, and בית ישראל *the house of Israel*, frequently interchanged in the Codices is evident both from the ancient Versions and the Massorah. This is the reason why the Massorites found it necessary to fix the instances in which the respective phrases occurred in the Bible according to the Standard MSS. from which their Lists are compiled.<sup>1</sup> In the Prague recension the expressions לבית and לבני are simply transposed.

(17) Exod. XXVI 27. — In the *textus receptus* the expression bars (פריהם) occurs twice. The Severus Codex, however, had it only once. It omitted it in the second clause and simply read “and five” (וחמש) as it is in the preceding verse. The Prague recension gives the same variation.

(18) Levit. IV 34. — According to our List the Severus Codex read here מרמ. This may either be an abbreviation of מרמה from *its blood*, which would make the variation to consist in the reading of מרמה from *its blood*, instead of מרמ from *the blood of the sin offering*, thus making it conformable to verse 30 where exactly the same phrase is used. Or the variation simply consists in exhibiting the primitive orthography of the so-called medial *Mem* (מ) at the end of the word as is the case in Gen. XLVIII 7 marked here No. 13. The Prague recension favours the former. In either case, however, we have here an important orthographical contribution. According to the former we have another instance where the primitive text exhibited

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter ב, §§ 254—256, 363, Vol. I, pp. 179, 180, 186.



abbreviations, whilst according to the latter the medial letters were still used at the end of words. For a similar instance see below No. 27.

(19) Levit. XV 8. — Instead of “and he shall bathe in water” the Severus Codex read “and he shall bathe in (חיים) *running* water”, as it is in verse 13. The catchword וְכִי יִטְהַר = XV 13 in the Prague recension is manifestly a mistake, since the *textus receptus* has here בַּמַּיִם חַיִּים in *running water* and, therefore, exhibits no variation.

(20) Levit. XIV 10. — The Severus Codex read תְּמִימִם *without blemish*, the plural in both clauses of this verse and not תְּמִימָה the singular in the second clause as it is in the received text.

(21) Numb. IV 3. — The phrase “all that enter into the host” occurs five times in this chapter. In four instances the verb in this combination has the article, viz. הִכָּא (IV 30, 35, 39, 43), whilst in one single instance it is כָּא without the article (IV 3) in the received text. Now the Severus Codex read it also here הִכָּא with the article and there can hardly be any doubt that this is the correct reading.

(22) Numb. XV 21. — The Severus Codex read here לְדֹרֵיכֶם in *your generation*, in the singular instead of לְדֹרֵיכֶם in *your generations*, the plural as it is in the received text. The singular noun with suffix second person plural does not occur in the present Massoretic text.

(23) Numb. XXXI 2. — After quoting the words “avenge the children of Israel of the Midianites” [= Numb. XXXI 2] the Paris List states that the text of the Severus Codex had here אֲשֶׁר הָיָה *which was*. But where this phrase is to be inserted or for which words in the verse it is to be substituted it is difficult to say. The Prague recension does not afford us the slightest assistance. The note of the editor is beside the mark and totally ignores the

expression אֲשֶׁר which follows the catchword and which is not in the received text.

(24) Numb. XXX 12. — Instead of “and unto *all* the congregation”, the Severus Codex had simply “and unto the congregation” without כָּל *all*. This variant is exceedingly interesting inasmuch as it shows that the particle in question was in the then received text from which the reading in the Severus Codex differed. And though it is absent in the present Massoretic text, many MSS. and the ancient Version support the statement in this List as will be seen from the note on this passage in my edition of the Bible. Our present *textus receptus*, therefore, follows the reading of the Severus Codex. The Prague recension simply gives the catchword without the variant which has again misled the erudite editor.

(25) Numb. XXXVI 1. — For “the *sons* of Joseph” the Severus Codex read “the *son* of Josephus”. The Syriac also exhibits the singular which derives support from verse 12.

(26) Deut. I 26. — The variant here exhibits another instance of the survival of the primitive orthography prior to the introduction of the final letters. Whilst the then current text read וְלֹא אָבִיתֶם *and ye would not*, with final Mem (ם), the Severus Codex had it still אָבִיתֶם with what is now called the medial Mem (מ). For a similar instance see above No. 13.

(27) Deut. III 20. — We are expressly told that the Severus Codex read it הֵם *they*, which may either be an abbreviation of הֵמָּה, the same plural pronoun with paragogic He (ה) as it is in Josh. I 15, or it may exhibit another instance of the primitive orthography prior to the introduction of the final letters. In either case we have here an important contribution to the ancient orthography similar in character to the one in No. 18.

(28) Deut. I 27. — According to our List the Severus Codex read here האמור the *Amorite*, the abbreviated form instead of the fully written out האמרי, whilst according to the Prague recension the Severus Codex read it האמורים in the plural which does not occur in the Hebrew Bible.

(29) Deut. XXII 6. — Instead of “thou shall not take the dam with (הבנים) *the young*” the Severus Codex read it “thou shalt not take the dam upon (האבנים) *the laying nest*”, i. e. before she has finished laying her complement of eggs, the same expression which occurs in Exod. I 16.

(30) Deut. XXIX 22. — Instead of שרפה as it is in the received text the Severus Codex read it שרפה which is simply a difference in form and does not affect the sense of the passage. The Prague recension exhibits the same variation.

(31) Deut. XXIX 22. — In the same verse the Severus Codex read כמפכת *like the over throw*, without the He (ה) instead of כמהפכת which is simply an orthographical variation without altering the sense. The Prague recension does not give this instance.

(32) Deut. XXXII 26. — Instead of אפאיהם *I will scatter them afar*, or *I will blow upon them*, the Hiphil future first person singular with the suffix third person plural, from פאה *to breathe, to blow*, the Severus Codex read it in three words אף אי הם *I said in anger where are they?* This division of the single expression into three distinct words is also exhibited in the Chaldee and in the Siphri.<sup>1</sup> The Severus Codex has, therefore, preserved the ancient traditional reading which obtained in one School of textual critics.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Onkelos יהול רוגי עליהן and the Siphri אמרתי כאפי איה הם The Samaritan divides it into two words הם אפי הם *they are mine anger*, i. e. they are the object or cause of mine anger, so also the Syriac which renders it הם אפיהם *where are they?*

It will be seen from the last line of this List that so far from being regarded with indifference, the Massorite expresses the pious hope that the Righteous Teacher, i. e. the Prophet Elias who alone will solve all difficulties, and whose speedy advent is anxiously expected, will decide whether these readings are to be preferred to those in the received text.

We thus see that the registration of anomalous forms began during the period of the second Temple. The words of the text, especially of the Pentateuch were now finally settled, and passed over from the Sopherim or the redactors to the safe keeping of the Massorites.<sup>1</sup> Henceforth the Massorites became the authoritative custodians of the traditionally transmitted text. Their functions were entirely different from those of their predecessors the Sopherim. The Sopherim as we have seen, were the authorised revisers and redactors of the text according to certain principles, the Massorites were precluded from developing the principles and altering the text in harmony with these canons. Their province was to safeguard the text delivered to them by “building a hedge around it”,<sup>2</sup> to protect it against alterations or the adoption of any readings which still survived in MSS. or were exhibited in the ancient Versions. For this reason they marked in the margin of every page in the Codices every unique form, every peculiarity in the orthography, every variation in ordinary phraseologies, every deviation in dittographs &c. &c.

<sup>1</sup> The term מסורה *Massorah* (from מסר *to deliver, to transmit*) denotes tradition and hence technically *the traditional text, the traditionally transmitted text of Holy Writ*. The older form of it used in the Mishna is מסורה *Massoreth* (*Aboth* III 20). The two forms are according to the analogy of the nouns בצרה *Bazzarah* and בצורה *Bazzoreth*, from צר *to cut off*.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. מסורת סייג לתורה *Aboth* III 20.

In the case of the Pentateuch, the Massoretic work was comparatively easy since its text, as we have seen, was as a whole substantially the same during the period of the second Temple as it is now. Being the Divine Law which regulated both the religious and civil life of the Jewish commonwealth, the greatest care was naturally exercised by the spiritual guides and administrators of its precepts and statutes to guard and preserve it according to the ancient traditions. This, however, was not the case with the second and more especially with the third part of the Hebrew Scriptures. These were not so popularly known and the ancient Sopherim were, therefore, not so careful in the redaction of the Prophets and the Hagiographa. This is abundantly demonstrated in the books of Samuel and Kings, in the books of Kings and Chronicles &c. which contain duplicate records of identically the same events. Hence great differences obtained among the sundry Schools as to the precise reading of certain passages, and hence too Standard Codices proceeded from these Schools which more or less reflect other recensions. And although the recension which is now exhibited in the *textus receptus* has finally superseded the other recensions, the Massorah itself frequently records the readings of other Standard Codices. Indeed the Massorites so far from correcting any variations in the duplicate records or any manifest blunder which had crept into the text, have carefully collected them and guarded them most religiously by their wonderful system of annotation, against any attempt at reconciliation or emendation on the part of professional copyists. The present text, therefore, is not what the Massorites have compiled or redacted, but what they themselves have received from their predecessors and conscientiously guarded and transmitted with the marvellous checks and counter checks which they have devised for its safe preservation.

To accomplish this gigantic work in the absence of any Grammar, Lexicon or Concordance, the Massorites commenced their labours by minutely analysing the peculiarities of each book which they divided into Sections for the purpose of registering every expression or phrase in the margin of the respective Codices. These brief and separate remarks in the central margins which are called *Massorah Parva* were afterwards collected and in accordance with their similarity of import, arranged into distinct Lists or Rubrics. The larger Rubrics occupy the upper and lower margins of the same page and are called the *Massorah Magna*. As some of these large Lists are too lengthy, for the margin of the page on which one of the registered peculiarities occurs, the Massorites have both prefixed and appended a considerable number of them to different MSS. They cannot, therefore, be called *Massorah Finalis* as they are partly placed at the beginning and partly at the end of the MSS. and partly also at the end of each of the three great divisions.

To give the student an idea of this stupendous task and the years which it must have taken to carry it out, I give at the end of the chapter a specimen of the Massorah from the two oldest MSS. which have as yet come to light, viz. Orient. 4445 British Museum and the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916. The British Museum Codex which is not later than the middle of the eighth century contains the greater portion of the Pentateuch in its original form extending from Gen. XXXIX 20 to Deut. I 33. The Massorah, however, though by a subsequent annotator, is about a century later, i. e. about the middle of the ninth century. The St. Petersburg Codex contains the Latter Prophets, viz. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Twelve Minor Prophets. Its age is not disputed since it is dated A. D. 916. These two Codices, therefore, contain about half of the

entire Hebrew Bible with the Massorah both *Parva* and *Magna*.

With the specimen of the Massorah Parva and Magna, which I subjoin from Orient. 4445, folio 94b containing Levit. XI 4—21, I exhibit in parallel columns the Massorah on the same verses from nine MSS., as well as from the *editio princeps* so that the student may see how this safeguard has been treated by the different Massorites. In the last or the twelfth column I give the references to my Massorah where the respective Rubrics are given in full with the chapters and verses appended to them. The Massorah Parva as exhibited in the Tables is in each column an exact reproduction of the MSS. Of the Massorah Magna, however, which is in each instance followed by the catchwords of the passages in the MSS. I could naturally only reproduce the headings of the respective Rubrics. The passages adduced in each of the Lists the student will easily find in my Massorah according to the plan which I have adopted in the Tables.

It will be seen that the subjoined four Tables exhibit both the Massorahs Magna and Parva of fourteen MSS. These MSS. belong to various Schools and different countries; they range from *circa* A. D. 850 to 1488, the very year in which the first edition of the entire Hebrew Bible was printed in Soncino. The first column in the four Tables, moreover, discloses the fact that as early as the ninth century of the present era both the Massorah Parva and Magna were already fully developed. The St. Petersburg Codex alone contains no fewer than 574 different Rubrics of the Massorah Magna.<sup>1</sup> As this MS. covers the smaller quarter of the entire Hebrew Bible it may safely be

<sup>1</sup> Alphabetically arranged they are as follows: א 79 + ב 27 + ג 18 + ד 18 + ה 33 + ו 25 + ז 17 + ח 22 + ט 6 + י 71 + כ 27 + ל 27 + מ 47 + נ 33 + ס 4 + ע 34 + פ 6 + צ 11 + ק 14 + ר 22 + ש 43 + ת 10 = 574.

calculated that if we had the whole Bible of this School it would exhibit according to this proportion upwards of 2000 Rubrics.

In estimating the value of this stupendous work as a safeguard for the preservation of the text which passed over to the keeping of the Massorites it is essential to bear in mind that even after the text was fixed it was by no means absolutely uniform. The different Schools still continued to retain some of their former readings. These they more or less exhibited in their Standard Codices. Some of the Massorites themselves belonged to one or the other of these Schools and framed their Massoretic notes and Rubrics in accordance with the recensions which obtained in their Schools. Hence it happens that Massoretic remarks and Lists not unfrequently contradict one another simply because each faithfully records the readings of the text from which the Massorites in question made the Rubrics. Hence too the Massorites not only record the variants in Codices which were redacted by authoritative Scribes, but adduce readings from renowned MSS. which obtained in certain communities and which are distinguished by certain names. From these sources they not unfrequently supplement the Lists made by their colleagues after certain recensions with other examples calling them either *another Massorah* or *outside this Massorah*.<sup>1</sup>

The Massorah itself has preserved lengthy Lists of various readings from the Eastern recensions which are several hundred in number and extend over the whole Hebrew Scriptures. They not only affect the orthography but the division, insertion and omission of certain words.<sup>2</sup> These variations also extend to the redivision of verses

<sup>1</sup> לבר ממסורתא or מסורתא אחרתא.

<sup>2</sup> Vide supra, cap. IX, p. 197 &c.

which necessarily include a difference in the vowel-points and in the accents,<sup>1</sup> and though I have succeeded in considerably increasing the number in the official Lists, as may be seen from the notes in my edition of the Bible, many of these recensional variations are still dispersed throughout the MSS. and await further investigation.

A striking illustration of conflicting Massorahs due to the fact that the Massorites who compiled the respective Lists worked upon different recensions, may be seen in the Rubric which registers the number of times the exceptional phrase *בַּיָּמִים הָהֵם* in *those days* occurs in contradistinction to the normal form *בַּיָּמִים הָהֵם* without the paragogic *He*. According to our Massorah the heading of the Rubric in question distinctly declares that the abnormal phrase with the paragogic *He* (*הָהֵמָּה*) occurs *eight* times which it duly specifies,<sup>2</sup> whilst in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 where this Massorah occurs three times<sup>3</sup> the heading in each instance as distinctly declares that there are *nine* such passages and duly enumerates them in all the three Rubrics. The note on Jerem. L 20 in my edition of the Massoretic text explains this contradiction, inasmuch as it is shown that the Easterns read here *הָהֵמָּה* with the paragogic *He*. The Massorites, therefore, who give eight instances worked on Western recensions which we follow, whilst the Massorites who register nine passages laboured on the Eastern recensions.

The variations in the Massorah, however, are not confined to the recensions of the Western and Eastern Schools. The Massorahs which proceed from the Westerns and from which our *textus receptus* was compiled also

<sup>1</sup> *Vide supra*, cap. VI, p. 70.

<sup>2</sup> *Viz.* Jerem. III 16, 18; V 18; L4; Joel III 2; IV 1; Zech. VIII 23; Neh. XIII 15. *Comp. The Massorah*, letter ך, § 254, Vol. I, p. 716.

<sup>3</sup> *Comp.* Jerem. III 16; L 4; Joel III 2.

exhibit conflicting registers which undoubtedly show that there were different Schools among the Westerns themselves and that these derived their respective materials from Standard Codices. These conflicting Massorahs not only exhibit orthographical variations, but actual various readings. A few illustrations must suffice to establish this fact which has hitherto been ignored by those who appeal to the Massorah on the supposition that it always exhibits uniform remarks. The Massorahs which I subjoin are from the splendid MS. in the Paris National Library No. 1—3. It is dated A. D. 1286 and is evidently a Standard Codex:

2 Sam.	II 21	ל מל וא חם	שְׁמֹאֵלֶךָ
"	XVIII 20		אֶל־חִבְשֵׁר
"	XXII 35	ל וחם וחד מל	נִחְשָׁה
"	" 48	ד מל	חִנּוּחֵן
"	XXIV 22	ה מל	לְעוֹלָה
I Kings	II 32		בְּרֵאשׁוֹ
"	VI 32	ד ל מל	וּפְטָרִי
2 Kings	IV 6	ל מל וב חם	בְּמִלְאוֹת
"	" 28	זו מל במ	הַלּוֹא
"	X 15	ל דם וכל קר אֶל־הַמַּרְכָּבָה	עַל־הַמַּרְכָּבָה
"	XXII 20	ד ה עַל־הַמְּקוֹם	אֶל־הַמְּקוֹם
Ps.	XV 1		וּמִי־שֶׁבֶן
"	XVII 5	ל חם ו	אֲשֶׁרִי
"	XVIII 34	ג ב מל	בְּמֹתִי
"	XXXV 1	ל וא	וְרִבִּי
"	" 5	ל ומל	הַזֹּחֶה
"	" 14	ל ומל	שְׁחוּתִי
"	XXXVIII 7	ל חם וחד מל	שְׁחוּתִי

It is remarkable that the Massorite cancelled the original readings in all these instances and placed the Massoretic note against the emended text. I could fill pages with

conflicting Massorahs from this Codex alone, but the above instances will suffice to prove my contention that different Massorites worked upon different Standard Codices and hence produced contradictory Rubrics.

But even when the Massorites of one School specify a certain number of instances which constitute a definite List, other Massorites not unfrequently supplement the Lists with more passages of a similar nature which they found in other Codices. Thus for instance the Massorah on Levit. XI 21 in Orient. 4445 which exhibits the oldest form of the List of the passages where the textual reading or the *Kethiv* is לֹא *not*, the negative particle, and the marginal reading or the *Keri* is לוֹ *to him*, preposition with the suffix third person singular masculine, declares that there are fifteen such instances. But at the end of the enumeration of the fifteen passages we find the following remark:<sup>1</sup> *and there are two other passages outside this Massorah, viz. Isa. XLIX 5 and 1 Chron. XI 20.* This positive statement is confirmed by the Massorah Parva on Isa. XLIX 5 in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916. This ancient MS. has the negative particle (לֹא) in the text or the *Kethiv* and against it in the margin the suffix third person singular as the *Keri* (לוֹ ק'). Other Massorites, however, describe these two passages as constituting a difference of opinion between the different Schools of textual critics.<sup>2</sup> This clearly shows that the diverse treatment of this important Massorah cannot possibly proceed from the same Massoretic School.

We have already seen that during the period of the second Temple, Scribes collated their copies with the

<sup>1</sup> ותריין לבר מן מסרחה וישראל לא יאסף ולא שם בשלושה קדמי דברי הימים.

<sup>2</sup> ותרי פלגתה עליהן Comp. *The Massorah*, letter ל, § 77, Vol. II, p. 124.

Codices which were deposited in the Temple Court. The Massorites too, in the redaction of the text and in the compilation of the Massoretic glosses carefully consulted the Standard MSS. which were in the possession of the different communities and which for their excellency were distinguished by special names. Hence they often quote the MSS. in support of a certain reading which they have adopted in the text and as often give an alternative reading in the Massorah with the name of the MS. in which it is to be found.

(1) *The Codex Mugah.* — The earliest Codex quoted by the Massorites, as far as I can trace it, is the *Mugah* (מוגה). On Exod. XXXIX 33—43 where the particle אַת occurs several times in each verse and where it is sometimes with and sometimes without the *Vav* conjunctive the Massorah in Orient. 4445 most minutely indicates its presence and absence and at the end of the Rubric quotes “the Codex Mugah” in support of the order thus indicated. As this Massorah exhibits the peculiar manner in which the Massorites safeguarded the text and, moreover, as it is calculated to give some idea of the plan and difficulties of a Massoretic Rubric, I subjoin it with the necessary explanation in order to supply the student with a key to similar Massorahs:

סימן דויביא את המשכן את אַת ואת. דארון את ואת ואת. דשלחן את אַת ואת. מנרה את אַת ואת ואת. דמוכח הנחשת את ואת כל פסוק. דקלעי החצר את אַת ואת ואת אַת ואת. וחד פסוק סימן להון ואלה יעמדו על הקללה בהר. דבגדי השרד את אַת ואת. ככל אשר צוה את אַת. ורבתררה אַת. ושאר פסוק ואת כוליה פסוק אלין בסיפרא מוגה.

The Sign or Register: by and they brought the tabernacle [= Exod. XXXIX 33] it is twice אַת and the third time וַאֲת; by the ark [= verse 35] it is first אַת and in the second and third instance וַאֲת; by the table [= verse 36] it is אַת in the first instance and וַאֲת the third time; by the candlestick [= verse 37] it is אַת the first and second time and וַאֲת the third and fourth time; by the brasen altar [= verse 39] where this particle occurs six times it alternates אַת and וַאֲת throughout the verse; by the hangings of the court [= verse 40]

where it also occurs six times it is  $\text{וַ$  the first and second time,  $\text{וְ$  the third and fourth time,  $\text{וּ$  the fifth time and  $\text{וֹ$  the sixth time. There is one verse which serves as a mnemonic sign thereto, viz. Deut. XXVII 13 where the names of six tribes occur with exactly the same variation in the presence and absence of the *Vav* conjunctive. By the cloths of service [= verse 41] where it occurs three times it is  $\text{וַ$  in the first and second instances and  $\text{וְ$  in the third instance; by according to all that He commanded [= verse 42] where it occurs twice it is  $\text{וַ$  both times, and in the following verse, where it occurs once it is  $\text{וַ$ , but in the other verses [viz. verse 34 where it occurs three times and verse 38 where it occurs four times] it is  $\text{וְ$  throughout. This is according to the Codex Mugah.

The object of this Massorah and the reason for the appeal to the Mugah Codex will be seen by a reference to the notes in my edition of the Massoretic text. Both the MSS. and the ancient Versions exhibit variations in almost every verse with regard to the use of the conjunctive in this Section and the Rubric in question is manifestly a protest against these variants which obtained in other recensions.

In the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 which exhibits the next oldest Massorah, the authority of the Codex Mugah is appealed to in no fewer than eight instances in support of particular readings.<sup>1</sup> By referring to the notes in my edition of the text it will be seen that though with the exception of one passage (Jerem. LI 46) this MS. adduces the Codex Mugah in support of the readings in the *textus receptus*, there are variants in every instance which are exhibited not only in other Standard Codices, but in the early editions and in the ancient Versions. Here too, therefore, the Mugah is quoted as a protest against the various readings which obtained in other Massoretic Schools.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Jerem. VI 10; LI 46; Hos. I 7; II 21; XI 9; Joel I 12; Amos V 2; Habak. I 5.

The Codex Mugah is henceforth to be found referred to as an authority in almost every MS. of importance either by the full title *Codex Mugah* (בספר מונה) or simply in the *Mugah* (במונה), *Mugah* (מנה). In the splendid MS. in the Cambridge University Library Add. 465 it is quoted several hundred times.<sup>1</sup> Its readings are often contrasted with the readings of rival Codices and in the third Volume of the Massorah I give a List of variations between the Codex Mugah and the celebrated Codex Hilleli which extends over the whole Bible and which I have found in the Munich Codex.<sup>2</sup> The Mugah was copied by the heads of Schools in various communities and in different ages as is evident from the fact that it is quoted by textual critics in districts far apart. Hence the earlier copies of it are not unfrequently referred to in contradistinction to later copies.<sup>3</sup>

(2) *Codex Hilleli* (ספר הללי). The Codex which in importance rivals the Mugah and which is frequently quoted in the Massorah in support of certain readings is the Hilleli. According to Zakkuto this famous Codex was written by R. Hillel circa A. D. 600. In the Chronicle which he compiled about A. D. 1500 Zakkuto tells us as follows:

In the year 4957 A. M. on the 28th of Ab [= Aug. 14, 1197 A. D.] there was a great persecution of the Jews in the Kingdom of Leon from the two Kingdoms that came to besiege it. At that time they removed thence the twenty-four sacred books which were written about 600 years before. They were written by R. Hillel b. Moses b. Hillel and hence are called after his name the Hilleli Codex. It was exceedingly correct and all other Codices were revised by it. I saw the remaining two parts of it containing the Former and Latter Prophets written in large and beautiful characters

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, Vol. III, p. 23—36.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, Vol. III, p. 130—134.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. מונה הקרמון Isa. VIII 8; XXVIII 12 in Orient. 1478 British Museum.

which were brought by the exiles to Portugal and sold at Bugia in Africa where they still are, having been written about 900 years ago. Kimchi in his Grammar on Numb. XV 4 says that the Pentateuch of the Hilleli Codex was extant in Toledo.<sup>1</sup>

And though like the Mugah this famous Codex is now lost, both the Massorites and subsequent Grammarians frequently appeal to it in support of their readings either as *Codex Hilleli* or simply as the *the Hilleli*.<sup>2</sup> In two instances I have found it referred to as *the Hilleli of Leon*.<sup>3</sup> Besides the List of variations between the Mugah Codex and the Hilleli already adverted to, I have given a List from this celebrated Codex setting forth the plenes and defectives throughout the Pentateuch which I have found in the Merzbacher MS. Jacob Saphir has printed a similar List in the second Volume of his work entitled *Eben Saphir*.<sup>4</sup>

(3) Another Standard Codex which is often appealed to in the Massorah Parva is *the Zambuki* (זנבוקי). This name the Codex probably obtained because it belonged to the community in Zambuki on the Tigris. Its readings are frequently adduced side by side with the Hilleli Codex,

<sup>1</sup> בשנת תתקכ"ו [ז' 1] ביום כ"ה לירח אב היה שמר גדול במלכות ליאון משני מלכים שבאו עליהם במבצר אחד ואז הוציאו משם הכ"ד ספרים שהיו כתובים קודם לכן כמו שש מאות שנה שכתב אותם ר' הלל בן משה בן הלל ועל שמו נקרא ההלילי שהיו מדויקות ומהם מניהים כל הספרים ואני ראיתי השני מקראות נביאים ראשונים ואחרונים מכתבת אותיות גדולות ומדויקות שהביאו מנרוש פורטוגאל [ ] בכוניארה באפריקה ושם הם שיש עתה ט' מאות שנה שנכתבו והקמחי בחלק הרקדוק קודם שרבר על הרקדוק למען תוכרו אומי כי החומש מן ההלילי הוח בטוליטלה Comp. *Juchassin*, p. 220 ed. Filipowski, London 1857; and Neubauer in *Studia Biblica*, Vol. III, p. 23, Oxford 1891.

<sup>2</sup> הללי. ספר הללי. Comp. *The Massorah*, Vol. III, p. 23—36.

<sup>3</sup> הללי של ליון Comp. 1 Kings I 18; Jerem. V 6; in Add. 15251, British Museum.

<sup>4</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, Vol. III, p. 106—129; and *Eben Saphir*, Vol. II, p. 192—213, Mainz 1874.

especially in the superb MS. Oriental 2626—28 in the British Museum,<sup>1</sup> as will be seen in the notes to my edition of the Hebrew Bible. Like the other Standard Codices it is known only through the quotations in the Massorah.

(4) Another Standard MS. which is frequently quoted in the Massorah and which has also become a prey to time is the *Jerushalmi* (ירושלמי) or the Jerusalem Codex. This MS. was largely used by the celebrated Grammarian and Lexicographer R. Jonah Abu-Walid as is attested by Kimchi, who states (*Michlol*, p. 184b, ed. Fürth 1793) that he has constantly quoted it as his authority for certain readings and that it was for many years in Saragossa.<sup>2</sup> In the Massorah this Codex is frequently quoted as exhibiting a different orthography to that of the Codex Hilleli.<sup>3</sup>

(5) The *Codex Jericho* (יריחו) which is also often referred to in the Massorah seems to have embraced only the Pentateuch, since in the references to it, it is sometimes called the *Jericho Pentateuch* (חומש יריחו). The List from this Codex which I have printed in my edition of the Massorah,<sup>4</sup> I collected from the Massorah Parva in Oriental 2696 in the British Museum.

(6) The *Codex Sinai* (ספר סיני) or simply (סיני) is another of the Standard MSS., which is referred to in the Massorah, but which has also perished. In the superb MS. Arund. Orient. 16 in the British Museum which is itself a

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Orient 2626—28 on Gen. IV, 17; IX 14; XLII 2, 21; XLIII 10, 21; XLV 10; XLVI 29; XLIX 10; L 11 and especially Exod. XLVI 29; XXXI 27; Numb. XXXIV 4, Comp. *The Massorah*, Vol. III, p. 23—36.

<sup>2</sup> ורבי יונה כתב כי מאזי רשע רפה ולא מצאנוהו אנהנו כן אלא בספר אחד ירושלמי ראיתיו רפה קמץ הווי והוא הספר אשר סמך עליו רבי יונה כי הוא מביא ראיה תמיד ממקרא ירושלמי והווי שהיה בסרקוסטא זה שנים רבות; ספר מכלול דף קפר פיורדא שנת תקנ"ג.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, Vol. III, p. 106 &c.

<sup>4</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, Vol. III, p. 135.



Model Codex, the Sinai Codex is appealed to in the Massorah Parva on six different occasions in confirmation of certain readings. Thus (1) on Josh. XXI 36 it is quoted to justify the omission of the two verses 36 and 37.<sup>1</sup> (2) On 2 Kings VI 25 it is adduced in support of the reading **יונים doves' dung** in two words.<sup>2</sup> (3) On 2 Kings XXIII 31 it is referred to in support of the textual reading of the proper name **חַמוּטַל Hamutal** without a *Keri*.<sup>3</sup> (4) On 2 Kings XXV 11 the Massorah Parva states that the Codex Sinai uniformly reads the proper name **נְבוּזַרְאֲדָן Nebuzaradan** as one word.<sup>4</sup> (5) On Jerem. XXXIX 1 it is quoted as having here no section.<sup>5</sup> And (6) on Amos V 6 the Massorah Parva remarks that *Beth-El* is always in two words in Codex Sinai.<sup>6</sup>

In the printed Massorah Parva too, this Codex is quoted twice, once on Exod. XVIII 1 where it is stated that the word **וַיִּשְׁמַע and he heard**, occurs twice with the accent *Gershain* at the beginning of a verse in the Pentateuch and that it is in Sinai with the accent *Rebia*<sup>7</sup> and once on Exod. XVIII 5 where it is stated that **אֶל-הַמִּדְבָּר into the wilderness**, which has the accent *Sakeph* in the *textus receptus*, is with the accent *Sakeph-gadol* in Codex Sinai.<sup>8</sup> As both these instances occur in the Pentateuch, and moreover, as they both refer to the accents, Elias Levita concluded that the Codex Sinai contained only the Pentateuch and that it treated simply on the variations

<sup>1</sup> אין ב' פסוק' הללו כתוב' בספר סיני ובספר רבי' נרשם.

<sup>2</sup> כן כת' בספר סיני תרי אחין.

<sup>3</sup> אך בסיני כתב חמוטל.

<sup>4</sup> כתב סיני תיבה אחת כוליה.

<sup>5</sup> בסיני אין כאן פסקא לא פתוחה ולא סתומה.

<sup>6</sup> בִּית־אֵל לְבִית־אֵל כולם ב' תיבות בסיני.

<sup>7</sup> וישמע ב' בטע' שני נרשין ריפ' בתור' סיני רביע.

<sup>8</sup> המדבר סיני המדבר' בוקף גדול.

of the accents.<sup>1</sup> The passages, however, which I have adduced from the books of Joshua, Kings, Jeremiah and Hosea show beyond doubt that this Codex contained the whole Hebrew Scriptures.

Jacob b. Isaac of Zousmir, who wrote a little expository Treatise on the Massorah which was first published at Amsterdam in 1649, and a second edition of which appeared at the same place in 1702, maintains that Sinai is the name of one of the redactors who revised the Pentateuch with the same accuracy as if it proceeded from Mount Sinai.<sup>2</sup> Joseph Eshwe, who compiled a Commentary on the Massorah, not only espoused this view, but vouchsafed more definite information on this subject. His statement on Exod. XVIII is as follows:

As to the remark Sinai has *Rebia*, know that the inventors of the vowel-points and the accents were mostly from the spiritual heads and the sages of Tiberias. Now the name of one of these was Sinai, and he differed from the Massorah, which remarks that **וַיִּשְׁמַע and he heard**, in the two passages in question has *Gershaim*, and said that it has the accent *Rebia*.<sup>3</sup>

The authors of these fanciful explanations, however, did not know that in the MSS. the full name **ספר סיני** is given which can denote only *the Codex Sinai*, just as **ספר ירושלמי** denotes *the Jerusalem Codex*, and **ספר יריחו** *the Jericho Codex*.

(7) The *Great Machsor* (**מחזורא רבא**) is the name of another Standard Codex which is frequently quoted in the

<sup>1</sup> סיני שם חומש מדוייק מדבר ממחלוקת הטעמים. כנון וַיִּשְׁמַע יתרו בנרשם. ובסיני הוא ברביע; ועוד שם אל משה אֶל-הַמִּדְבָּר בוקף ובסיני בוקף גדול ולא ידעתי Comp. *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, p. 259, ed. Ginsburg, London 1867.

<sup>2</sup> סיני אחד מן המחברים והניח ספר תורה כאלו היא נתנה מסיני: פירוש על המסורה דף ג' עמוד ב'.

<sup>3</sup> ומה שאמר סיני רביע דע כי בעלי מתקני הניקוד והטעמים רבים היו מנאוני חכמי טבריא. ואחד מהם היה שמו סיני והוא פליג על המסורת דאמר שני מלות וישמע הנו' המה בטעם נרשם, ואמר הוא שהם בטעם רביע: מבין חרות. שמות י"ח א'.

Massorah.<sup>1</sup> Machsortha or Machsor is the common name of the Jewish Ritual which comprises the whole annual cycle of the Daily and Festival Services. The *Cycle*, which is the literal meaning of Machsortha (from *חזר* to go round), was generally written by the most distinguished scholars of the respective Communities in the various parts of the world embodying the local usages and hence obtained the name of the special place where it was written and of the practice which it sets forth. Thus the celebrated Machsor Vitry, which was compiled by R. Simcha circa 1100 A. D., describes the Ritual of the Synagogue of Vitry in France. It is from this Machsor which is in the British Museum (Add. 27200—27201) that I published the *Taagim* or the Crowned Letters in the Pentateuch.<sup>2</sup> These Rituals or Machsorim not only contained the Prayers and Hymns, but frequently gave the text of the whole Bible so that they became the models after which copies were made. It is owing to this fact that the Bible Codex by itself was called Machsor inasmuch as it contained the Annual or Triennial Cycle of lessons which were read on the week days, Sabbaths, feasts and fasts.<sup>3</sup> The "Great Machsor" was manifestly the name of a special Codex to distinguish it from any other Biblical MS., which was simply called Machsor.

From the readings of the Great Machsor, which are adduced in the Massorah Parva, it would appear that this celebrated Codex exhibited the recension of Ben Naphtali. Thus for instance the Massorah Parva in Add. 15251, British Museum, quotes *נשבעתי* *I swear*, with *Kametz* Deut.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Harley 5720 on 2 Kings XIX 25; Add. 15251 on Deut. XXXI 21; 1 Sam. XXII 17; 2 Kings XIX 25; 2 Chron. XXXII 30 &c.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, Vol. II, p. 680—701.

<sup>3</sup> *Vide supra*, Part II, pp. 241, 244 &c.

XXXI 21 as the textual reading in the Great Machsor<sup>1</sup> which is also the reading of Ben Naphtali. The same is the case in 1 Sam. XXII 17 which we are told the Great Machsor reads *לִפְנֵי* to strike, with the Gimel *Raphe* and which is also the reading of Ben Naphtali. Indeed this appears to be the case in the other three instances contained in the Rubric of the Massorah given in my MS.<sup>2</sup>

(8) The *Codex Ezra* (ספר עזרא) is another Standard MS. which is quoted in the Massorah Parva. The only MS. which I have as yet seen, professing to be a copy of the Ezra Codex, is in my possession. A more detailed description of it will be found in chap. XII of this Introduction. In the Massorah Parva of this MS. the Codex Ezra is referred to twice, once on Numb. XXI 14 in support of the reading *אֶת־יְהוָה* in two words<sup>3</sup> and once on Deut. XXXII 6 in confirmation of the division *יְהוָה יְהוָה*.<sup>4</sup>

(9) The *Babylonian Codex* (ספר בבלי). The twelve quotations from this Codex which I have been able to collect are of the utmost importance inasmuch as the Babylon Codex exhibits the Eastern recension. With the exception of 1 Kings XX 33 they have not hitherto been known as Eastern readings. Their importance is still more enhanced by the fact that nine of the readings in question are to be found in the Latter Prophets and thus enable us to test the assertion that the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916, which contains this portion of the Hebrew Scriptures, has the text of the Eastern recension. The eleven instances are as follows:

1 נשבעתי ל' במחזורא רבא.

<sup>2</sup> In my MS. the Massorah Parva on Deut. XXVI 12 has the following Rubric במחזורא רבא קורין לעשר לשבב להשוע לפגע ובמבריא קורין לעשר לשבב להשוע לפגע Comp. *The Massorah* Vol. III, p. 25.

<sup>3</sup> את־יְהוָה שתי תיבות כחוב בספר עזרא.

<sup>4</sup> תר תבות נמצא בספר עזרא הל' תיבה אח' והשם אחרת.

(1) Numb. XXVI 33. — In Codex No. 1—3 in the Paris National Library, which is dated A. D. 1286, the Massorah Parva tells us that the Westerns read here *and Tirzah* with *Vav* conjunctive and that the Babylon Codex = the Easterns, reads it *Tirzah* without the *Vav*. As the Massoretic remark which indicates this variation in the two recensions will give the student some idea of the cryptography of the Massorah and the difficulty in deciphering it, I subjoin it with the necessary explanation

מוחמו סי מערב. מוחמת סי ספר בכל.

That is, according to the Westerns = Palestinians the mnemonic sign here for the order of the five daughters of Zelophehad is

מ [= מחלה], ו [= ונעה], ח [= חגלה], מ [= מלכה], ו [= ותרצה]  
and Tirzah Milcah Hoglah and Noah Mahalah

According to the Babylon Codex it is

מ [= מחלה], ו [= ונעה], ח [= חגלה], מ [= מלכה], ח [= ותרצה]  
Tirzah Milcah Hoglah and Noah Mahalah

(2) 1 Kings XX 33. — The Authorised Version of this verse is simply a loose paraphrase and does not indicate that there is an official various reading here. The real difficulty in the text may be seen in the Revised Version when the rendering in the text is compared with the alternative given in the margin. According to the Babylon Codex which is the Eastern recension, the words are divided *ויחלטה ממנו* and the passage is accordingly to be rendered

Now the men divined and hasted [i. e. quickly divined]  
and they pressed whether it was from him and they said &c.

According to the Western recension, however, or the *textus receptus* it is only in the textual reading or the *Kethiv* that the words in question are divided *ויחלטה ממנו* and the *Keri* or the official reading divides them *ויחלטה ממנו*. Accordingly the passage is to be translated

Now the men divined and hasted [i. e. quickly divined]  
and they pressed it out from him, and they said &c.

The Chaldee Syriac and Rashi follow the word division of the *Keri*. The fact that the *textus receptus* exhibits here the Babylonian or Eastern recension we learn from the Massorah Parva in Orient. 1478, fol. 44*b*, British Museum.<sup>1</sup>

(3) Isa. XXVII 8. — The Massorah Parva on this passage in Orient. 2201 British Museum, which is dated A. D. 1246, distinctly states that the Babylonian Codex reads here *ברוח הקשה* with *a rough spirit*, without the suffix third person masculine.<sup>2</sup> The St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916, however, like our *textus receptus* or the Western recension reads *ברוחו הקשה* with *his rough spirit*.

(4) Isa. LVII 6. — The Massorah Parva in the same MS. remarks on *העלית* *thou hast offered*, that the Babylon Codex points it *העלית* with *Tzere*,<sup>3</sup> whereas the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 has it as our text.

(5) Jerem. XXIII 18. — In the *textus receptus*, the textual reading or the *Kethiv* here is “who hath marked *my* word” (*דְּבָרִי*) for which the official reading or the *Keri* is *his word* (*דְּבָרוֹ*).<sup>4</sup> It is remarkable that the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 originally also had *דְּבָרוֹ his word*, and that the Massorite altered it into *דְּבָרִי my word*, in the text and put the marginal *Keri* *דְּבָרוֹ his word*, thus making it conformable to our Western recension. In my note on this passage *ובס"א* is to be cancelled and the note is to be *בבבלי דברו כת וכן וכן וגו'.*

(6) Jerem. XLIV 25. — In the same MS. the Massorah Parva states on *מלאתם* *ye have fulfilled* or *filled*, the Piel

<sup>1</sup> ויחלטה הממנו כן בספ' בבבלי, ונסח' מערב' ויחלטה הממנו כתי' ויחלטה ממנו ק'. Comp. also Harley 5710—11 on 1 Kings XX 33.

<sup>2</sup> בבבלי ברוח Comp. fol. 196*a*.

<sup>3</sup> בבבלי העלית Comp. fol. 205*b*.

<sup>4</sup> בבבלי דברו Comp. fol. 112*a*.

preterite that the Babylon Codex reads it מְלֹאֲתָם in the Kal,<sup>1</sup> whereas the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 reads it in the Piel as it is in the Western text or in the *textus receptus*.

(7) Ezek. VIII 3. — In Additional 21161 British Museum the Massorah Parva remarks that all the Codices read here יְרוּשָׁלַיִם to Jerusalem, with local He (ה) excepting the Babylonian Codex which has יְרוּשָׁלַם without the local He in the text = *Kethiv*, and יְרוּשָׁלַיִם with the local He as the official reading = *Keri*, in the margin.<sup>2</sup> The St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916, however, like the *textus receptus* or the Western recension has יְרוּשָׁלַיִם in the text without any *Keri*.

(8) Ezek. VIII 3 — The Massorah Parva on the same verse, in the same MS. states that סִמּוּל *likeness*, or *image*, is pointed סִמּוּל with *Segol* under the *Samech* in the Babylon Codex.<sup>3</sup> This certainly implies that the Babylonians used the infralinear punctuation side by side with the superlinear one, since the latter system has no *Segol* [= ם]. The inference would not be so conclusive but for the fact that in all other instances where the variations from the Babylonian recension are given they differ from the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 which is supposed to exhibit the Babylonian text.

(9) Ezek. XXIII 17. — In Orient. 2201 the Massorah Parva remarks on וְתַקַּע נַפְשָׁהּ מֵהֶם and her soul was alienated from them, that the Babylonian Codex reads here בְּהֶם instead of מֵהֶם,<sup>4</sup> whereas the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 like the *textus receptus* or the Western recension reads מֵהֶם.

<sup>1</sup> בככל מְלֹאֲתָם Orient. 2201, fol. 222b.

<sup>2</sup> בככל הַפְּרִים יְרוּשָׁלַיִם בְּת. בככלֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם בְּת. יְרוּשָׁלַיִם ק Comp. Add. 21161, fol. 97a

<sup>3</sup> בככלֵי סִמּוּל פִּלְגוֹ Comp. Add. 21161, fol. 97a.

<sup>4</sup> בככלֵי בְּהֶם Comp. Orient. 2201, fol. 236b.

(10) Ezek. XXIII 18. — The Massorah Parva in the same MS. remarks on וְתַקַּע נַפְשִׁי מֵעֲלִיָּה then my mind was alienated from her, that the Babylon Codex reads then הֶר mind was alienated from her, נַפְשָׁהּ instead of נַפְשִׁי<sup>1</sup> as in the preceding verse, whereas the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 reads here as the *textus receptus*.

(11) Ezek. XXXVI 23. — Instead of “when I shall be sanctified in *you* before *their* eyes”, Orient. 2201 reads “when I shall be sanctified in *them* before *your* eyes”, with the Massoretic remark that the Babylonian Codex reads “in *you* before *their* eyes”<sup>2</sup> which is the reading exhibited in our text. This is the first instance in which the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 has the reading which is ascribed to the Babylonians in Orient. 2201. It is to be remarked that in the passage before us we do not follow the Western reading which is exhibited in the text of Orient. 2201 but contrary to the usual practice we have adopted the Eastern recension.

It will thus be seen that in ten instances out of the eleven the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916 deviates from the readings which the Massorah in the MSS. positively describes as Babylonian or Eastern. They must, therefore, be added to those which we have already adduced in support of our contention that the designation of *Codex Babylonicus* which is given to this MS. is incorrect since the Codex in question does not exhibit the Babylonian recension.<sup>3</sup>

Besides the Babylonian recension the Massorah Parva also refers to other Eastern Standard MSS. which were in the possession of different communities. Add. 15251 in

<sup>1</sup> בככלֵי נַפְשָׁהּ Comp. Orient. 2201, fol. 236b.

<sup>2</sup> בְּהֶם לְעֵינֵיכֶם, בככלֵי כִּם לְעֵינֵיכֶם Comp. Orient. 2201, fol. 242a.

<sup>3</sup> Vide supra, Part II, chap. IX, p. 215—231.

the British Museum appeals to the Codex of Bagdad and the Codex Sharki. Thus for instance —

(1) 2 Kings XVIII 9 where the name Shalmaneser occurs which is pointed in the *textus receptus* שלמנאסר = *Shalman-esser*, the Massorah Parva remarks that in the Bagdad Codex the orthography of this name is שלמנאסר = *Shalma-neser*.<sup>1</sup> This spelling would naturally also apply 2 Kings XVII 3 the only other passage where this name occurs.

(2) In 2 Kings XIX 37 the Massorah Parva in the same MS. remarks on the name אדרמלך *Adrammelech*, that in the Bagdad Codex it is אדרמלך *Adarmelech*.<sup>2</sup> As this name also occurs in 2 Kings XVII 31 and Isa. XXXVII 38 this orthography must have obtained in all the three passages.

(3) On ענבים *grapes*, Isa. V 2 the Massorah Parva states that the Sharki Codex reads it ענוים with a *Nun* instead of *Beth*.<sup>3</sup>

(4) Isa. LI 10. — In the *textus receptus* the reading here is השמה *that hath made*, Kal preterite third person singular feminine from שום *to put, to make*, with the prefix He (ה). For this the Sharki Codex according to the Massorah Parva in the same MS. reads השמה with Dagesh in the *Mem* (מ).<sup>4</sup>

(5) Ezek. IV 16. — On ובדאנה *and with care*, the Massorah Parva in the same MS. tells us that the Sharki Codex reads it ובדאנה with the accent under the *Aleph*.<sup>5</sup>

It will thus be seen that this Model Codex according to the testimony of the Massorah itself exhibited deviations

<sup>1</sup> שלמנאסר פי אל בנרארי Comp. Add. 15251, fol. 211a.

<sup>2</sup> נ"א וְאֶדְרַמְלֶךְ פִּי אֶלְבַּנְדְּרִי Comp. Add. 15251, fol. 212b.

<sup>3</sup> פִּי אֶל שְׂרָקִי עֲנִיִּים Comp. Add. 15251, fol. 217b.

<sup>4</sup> הַשְּׁמָה, הַשְּׁמָה, הַשְּׁמָה פִּי אֶל שְׂרָקִי דָגֵשׁ הֶמֶם Comp. Add. 15251, fol. 234a.

<sup>5</sup> וּבְדֹאֲנָה פִּי אֶל שְׂרָקִי וּבְדֹאֲנָה Comp. Add. 15251, fol. 270a.

from the received text both in the vowel-signs and the accents. The variations in the sundry Standard MSS. are thus adduced in the Massorah as alternative readings without any expression of an adverse opinion against them, though the preference in all these cases is presumeably given to the textual readings. The Massorites, however, who compiled the Rubrics from the sundry Standard Codices necessarily produced Lists which though in harmony with their respective exemplars could not fail to differ from each other.

A striking illustration of this fact is to be found in the Model Codex Harley 5710—11 in the British Museum. In the account of the lives of the patriarchs two phrases are used which, though translated alike, are different in the Hebrew, inasmuch as one is וַיְהִי כָל יְמֵי *and all the days were* (*was* in the Hebrew), where the verb is in the singular, and the other is וַיְהִיוּ כָל יְמֵי, where the verb is in the plural. The Massorah Parva in the MS. in question remarks on Gen. V 23 that the phrase where it is in the singular occurs three times and gives the mnemonic sign for the three passages Enoch, Lamech and Noah,<sup>1</sup> viz. Gen. V 23, 31; IX 1. In the same MS. and on the very same passage the Massorah Magna states that the phrase in the singular only occurs twice, viz. in connection with Enoch and Lamech (Gen. V 23, 31) and that all the Massorites who give the mnemonic sign for the three passages are positively wrong, since in the case of Noah (Gen. IX 1) the verb is in the plural in the correct MSS. till Elias the prophet comes who will clear up all doubts.<sup>2</sup> Now on turning to Gen. IX 1 which is the passage in dispute

<sup>1</sup> וַיְהִי כָל יְמֵי חַלְוֵן סִימָן Comp. Harley 5710—11, fol. 4a.

<sup>2</sup> וַיְהִי כָל יְמֵי בִּז חַלְוֵן סִימָן, חֲנוּךְ לַמֶּךְ וּמִטְעִי כָל הַנְּקֻדָּה וּמוֹסְרֵי חַלְוֵן סִימָן וְשִׁעוֹת הוּא בִּידֵם כִּי חַלְוֵן סִימָן וְעַל נַח הוּא בְּסִפְרֵי מְדוּקָה וַיְהִי כָל יְמֵי עַד שִׁבְאָה אֱלִיהוֹ.

this very MS. not only has וַיְהִי the plural in the text, but has the following Massorah on it:

Here all the Punctuators err for they Massoretically remark the mnemonic sign is חָלֵן = Enoch, Lamech, Noah [i. e. in Gen. V 23, 31; IX 31 it is וַיְהִי in the singular] and this is a mistake on their part for their eyes were closed from looking into the Jericho Pentateuch, and into the Sephardic MSS. where the mnemonic sign is חָלֵל = Enoch, Lamech,<sup>1</sup> viz. Gen. V 23, 31.

Accordingly there are only these two instances where the verb in the phrase in question is in the singular. We have thus two conflicting Massorahs in the same MS. One Rubric proceeds from the School whose recension had וַיְהִי כל ימי in the singular in three passages and וַיְהִי כל ימי the plural in seven passages<sup>2</sup> and the other emanates from the School the Codices of which had the singular in only two instances and the plural in eight passages.

A most important part of this stupendous Corpus is the graphic system of accents and vowel-signs which the Massorites invented and with which they have furnished every expression of the Hebrew Scriptures. With the vowel-signs they most minutely fixed the pronunciation and meaning of each separate word in accordance with the tradition handed down to them from time immemorial, whilst with the accents they indicated the logical and syntactical relation of the words to one another and to the whole clause and verse.

But just as in the case of the consonants, the different Schools redacted the text in accordance with the traditions which obtained amongst them so also was it with the punctuation and accentuation. The Eastern School with its subordinate colleges and the Western School with its

<sup>1</sup> וַיְהִי כל ימי נח כאן משעי כל הנקדנים ומסרין חלן סימן וטעה הוא בידם כי טחו עיניהם מראות בחומש יריחו ובספרדים כי חל סימן.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. *The Massorah*, letter ה, § 204, Vol. I, p. 310.

diverse academies elaborated their respective systems independently of each other, in harmony with the views transmitted to them by their authoritative spiritual guides. Hence the difference in the vowel-points and accents which are exhibited in some of the most ancient and best Codices. Hence too the variations between the ancient Versions and the present Massoretic text in numerous instances which exhibit identically the same consonants but which are entirely due to a difference in the pronunciation and construction of the consonants, thus indicating a difference in the traditions with regard to the vowels and meaning of the words in question.

That the graphic signs are not coeval with the consonants is now generally admitted, though the precise date of their introduction cannot be ascertained. It is certain that they did not exist in the fifth century. This is attested by St. Jerome both in his commentaries on the Hebrew Scriptures and in his numerous other writings. From the sundry remarks of this celebrated Father it is evident that the Hebrew text which he used had no graphic signs for the vowel-points. Fully to appreciate the force of the evidence derived from his writings it is necessary to realise the circumstances under which he wrote.

St. Jerome was frequently obliged to describe most minutely the condition of the Hebrew text in a very elementary manner in order to convey to his Latin contemporaries an idea of the peculiarities of the Semitic original. As his translation differed from the Versions of the Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion and the Quinta, and also from the *Vetus Itala*, with which his readers were familiar; and moreover, as these Versions frequently differed among themselves, St. Jerome was compelled on almost every page not only to justify his

own peculiar renderings, but to explain the cause of the variations in the Versions as well as to expose their errors.

To effect this he discusses the orthographical and linguistical peculiarities of the Hebrew text, and in his explanations he frequently analyses the words. He states how many consonants there are in the word, and names each letter by its Hebrew name. He describes how the same consonants are differently pronounced according to the arbitrariness of the Hebrew reader, or according to the dialect of the Province to which he belongs; how it is that the same word has different meanings and how the same consonants express two or three different ideas. And yet he never mentions the names of our vowel-signs in the numerous exegetical writings nor does he give us the slightest hint that any graphical or diacritical marks were used in the Hebrew Scriptures to indicate the difference in the pronunciation of the same consonants when they are intended to convey a different sense upon which he dwells so much, and which he is so anxious to explain to his readers. A few illustrations from his expositions will demonstrate this fact.

(1) Commenting on Melchizedek he says:

It matters little whether we pronounce it *Salem* or *Salim* because the Hebrew words have very seldom a vowel [-letter = *mater lectionis*] in the middle [= stem, or root] and they are pronounced differently according to the requirements of the context and according to the various pronunciations of the provinces.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Nec refert, utrum *Salem* an *Salim* nominetur, cum vocalibus in medio litteris perraro utantur Hebraei, et pro voluntate lectorum, ac varietate regionum, eadem verba diversis sonis atque accentibus proferantur. Comp. *Epist.* 126 *ad Evagr.* Vol. II, Col. 574, ed. Martinian, Paris 1699. By *vocalibus in medio litteris* is meant the *matres lectionis* ם in the middle of a word in contradistinction to the suffixes at the end. Hupfeld has conclusively shown that *accentus* means pronunciation. Comp. *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 1830, p. 582—586.

It will be seen that if the graphic signs for the  $\bar{o}$  and 7 had existed in his days this learned Father would assuredly have said when the word in question has *Tzere* under the *Lamed* (ל) it is pronounced *Salom* and when it has *Chirek* (כ) it is pronounced *Salim*. Even the diacritical sign which now marks the distinction between *Sin* (שׁ) and *Shin* (שׂ) had not as yet been introduced for he pronounced it *Salem* instead of *Shalem*.

(2) Gen. XXXVI 24. — On the words “this was the Anah that found jamim in the wilderness” he remarks:

Others assign to it the meaning of *sea* because it is written with the same letters which signify both.<sup>1</sup>

With the vowel points affixed to the expression in question it cannot possibly denote both.

Isa II 22. — The last clause of this verse St. Jerome renders *because he was highly thought of*, and remarks:

The Septuagint omits this clause and Origen added it with an asterisk from the edition of Aquila. Where we have it *he was highly thought of*, Aquila renders it *wherein that man was thought of*. The Hebrew word is *Bama* and may either denote *ψωμα* = *high*, as we read it in Kings and Ezekiel, or certainly *wherein*. Both are written with same letters *Beth, Mem, He*, and the sense is according to the context. If we wish to read it *wherein* we pronounce it *Bamma*, and if *high* or *highly* we pronounce it *Bama*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Allii putant *ajamim* maria appellata. Iisdem enim litteris scribuntur *maria*, quibus et nunc hic sermo descriptus est. Et volunt illum dum pascit asinos patris sui in deserto, aquarum congregationes reperisse: quae juxta idioma linguae Hebraicae *maria* nuncupentur: quod scilicet *stagnum* repererit, cujus rei inventio in eremo difficilis est. Nonnulli putant *aquas calidas* juxta Punicae linguae viciniam, quae Hebraeae contermina est, hoc vocabulo signari. *Question. Heb. in Genesim* Vol. II. Col. 539.

<sup>2</sup> Quia excelsus reputatus est ipse. Hoc praetermisere LXX et in Graecis exemplaribus ab Origene sub asteriscis de editione Aquilae additum est; quod in Hebraeo ita legitur: *Hedalu Lachem men Adam Aser Nasama Baaphpho chi Bama nesab hu*. Ubi nos dixemus: *excelsus reputatus est ipse*: Aquila interpretatus est, *in quo reputatus est iste*. Verbum Hebraicum *Bama*, vel *ψωμα* dicitur, id est; *excelsus*; quod et in Regnorum libris et in

Leaving out the exegesis of the passage which this learned Father advances, the statement conclusively shows that the text upon which he commented could not possibly have had the vowel-points, for the graphic signs preclude this double pronunciation.

(4) Jerem. III 1. — “But thou hast played the harlot with many lovers” or says St. Jerome “with many *shepherds*,” because he adds:

The Hebrew word *Reim* which is spelled with the four letters *Res, Ain, Jod, Mem*, denotes both lovers and shepherds. If we pronounce it *Reim*, it means lovers, and if *Roim* it signifies shepherds.<sup>1</sup>

If the Hebrew text before him had the graphic vowel-points he could not have propounded this double pronunciation.

(5) Jerem. IX 21. — On the passage “Speak, Thus saith the Lord” St. Jerome remarks as follows:

The Hebrew word which is written with three letters *Daleth, Beth, Resh*, has no vowel-signs in the middle. It is only the context and the arbitrary opinion of the reader which determines the pronunciation. If it is pronounced *dabar* it denotes a word, if *deber* it is death, if *daber* it is speak. Hence both the Septuagint and Theodotion join it with what precedes and render it “they drove the children out of doors, the young men from the streets of death,” whilst Aquila and Symmachus translate it *speak*.<sup>2</sup>

Ezechiele legimus; vel certe *in quo*; et eisdem litteris scribitur *Beth, Mem, He*; ac pro locorum qualitate, si voluerimus legere, *in quo*, dicimus *Bamma*; sin autem, *excelsus* vel *excelsus*, legimus *Bama*. Vol. III. Col. 30.

<sup>1</sup> *Et tu fornicata es cum amatoribus multis (sive pastoribus)*. Verbum enim *Reim* quod quattuor litteris scribitur *Res, Ain, Jod, Mem*, et *amatores*, et *pastores* utrumque significat. Et si legamus *Reim* *amatores* significat; si *Roim* *pastores*. Comp. Vol. III, Col. 541.

<sup>2</sup> *Loquere, haec dicit Dominus: . . .* Verbum Hebraicum quod tribus litteris scribitur *Daleth, Beth, Res* (vocales enim in medio non habet) pro consequentia et legentis arbitrio si legatur *Dabar*, *sermonem* significat; si *deber*, *mortem*; si *daber*, *loquere*. Unde et LXX et Theodotio junxerunt illud praeterito capitulo, ut dicerent: *Disperdent parvulos de foris; juvenes de plateis morte*. Aquila verò et Symmachus transtulerunt *λάλησον*, id est, *loquere*. Comp. Vol. III, Col. 576.

Accordingly this diversity of rendering, St. Jerome tells us is due to the fact that the three unpointed consonants דבר may be pronounced דְּבַר *word*, דְּבַר *pestilence*, or דְּבַר *speak*. With the vowel-points already affixed to the word in question no such diversity of pronunciation and interpretation could possibly have obtained.

(6) Hosea XIII 3. — On the words “and as the smoke out of the chimney” St. Jerome remarks as follows:

It may be asked why the Septuagint has *locust* for *chimney* which Theodotion renders *καπνοδόχον*? The Hebrews spell *locust* and *chimney* with the same four letters *Aleph, Res, Beth, He*. If it is pronounced *arbe* it denotes *locust* and if *orobba* it means *chimney*, which Aquila renders *καταράκτων* and Symmachus *foramen* an opening made in the wall for the escape of the smoke.<sup>1</sup>

No such diversity of pronunciation and interpretation is possible with the vowel-signs affixed to the four consonants.

The evidence from the Talmudic and Midrashic writings is to the same effect. No mention is made either in the Talmud or the Midrashim of the names of the graphic-signs, though in one notable instance they would most assuredly have been referred to if they had existed in those days. R. Abba b. Cahana and R. Acha who flourished in the fourth century of the present era in their allegorical interpretation of Song of Songs I 11 tell us as follows:

*With studs of silver*. — R. Abba b. Cahana says this denotes the letters. R. Acha says it means the words. Others say “we will make thee borders of gold” denotes the writing, “with studs of silver” means the ruled lines.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Quaerimus autem quare LXX pro *fumarium* quod Theodotio transtulit *καπνοδόχον* *locustas* interpretati sunt? Apud Hebraeos, locusta et fumarium, iisdem scribitur litteris *Aleph, Res, Beth, He*. Quod si legatur *arbe*, *locusta* dicitur; *orobba*, *fumarium*; pro quo Aquila *καταράκτων*, Symmachus *foramen* interpretati sunt. Comp. Vol. III, Col. 1325.

<sup>2</sup> עם נקודת הכסף. רבי אבא בר כהנא אמר אלו האותיות. רבי אחא אמר אלו רבי תורי וזה נעשה לך. זה הכתב. עם נקודת הכסף. זה הסרגל; Comp. *Midrash Rabba* on the Song of Songs I 11, fol. 11b, ed. Wilna 1878.



It will be seen that though these sages in their allegorical exposition propound the verse in question to describe the letters, the words, the writing and the ruled lines of Holy Writ, they make no mention whatever of the vowel-signs. This remarkable omission is all the more striking when it is borne in mind that term נקודות *points*, upon which they comment, is the very name for the graphic signs.

The anecdote in the Talmud, referred to by Elias Levita, is another proof of the fact that the graphic signs did not exist in the Talmudic period. R. Dine, of Nehardea, maintained that he only should be appointed teacher of youths who had a good pronunciation, even if he was not very learned since it is very difficult to unlearn an acquired mistake. To enforce this principle the sage refers to the story which describes Joab's slaying the whole male population in Edom recorded in 1 Kings XI 15, 16 and in connection with which we are told as follows:

When Joab returned to David the latter asked him: What is the reason that thou hast thus acted? [i. e. slain the males only]. To this Joab replied: Because it is written, Thou shalt blot out the males of Amalek [Deut. XXV 19]. He [David] then said to him: We read *Secher* = *the memory*, to which he [Joab] replied, I have been taught to read it *Sachar* = *males*, and went to enquire of his Rabbi, asking him: How didst thou teach me to read it? To which he replied *Secher* = *memory*. Whereupon he [Joab] seized his sword to slay him. He [the Rabbi] asked why? To which he replied: Because it is written, 'Cursed be he that doeth the work of the Lord deceitfully' [Jerem. XLVIII 10]. Upon which he [the Rabbi] said: Away with him who lays hold of a curse. He [Joab] said again: It is written, 'And cursed be he who keepeth back his sword from blood' [Jerem. XLVIII 10]. Some say that he did slay him and some say that he did not slay him.<sup>1</sup> (Comp. *Bable Bathra* 21 a—b).

<sup>1</sup> כי אתא לקמיה דרוד אמר ליה מאי טעמא עברת הכי אמר ליה רכתוב תמחה את זכר עמלק אמר ליה והא אנן זכר קרינן א"ל אנא זכר אקרינן אול שיליה לרביה אמר ליה היאך אקריתן אמר ליה זכר שקל ספסירא למיקטליה אמר ליה אמאי א"ל רכתוב ארור עושה מלאכת ה' רמיה א"ל שבקיה להווא נברא דליקום בארור א"ל

This anecdote conclusively shows that the consonants (זכר) were then without the graphic signs, for with the vowel-points attached to the letters the different readings in question could not have obtained.

The evidence for the non-existence of the vowel-points extends to the sixth or even to the beginning of the seventh century. The Treatise Sopherim which belongs to this period and the first half of which is of Massoretic import makes no mention whatever of the graphic signs though it discusses the crowned letters, the majuscular letters, the verses, the sections, the dittographs &c. A striking instance of the difficulty which the compiler of this Treatise had to encounter in the explanation of certain words, due to the absence of the vowel-points may be seen in chapter IV, §§ 8, 9. Here the Divine names are described and canons are laid down for the scribes of Holy Writ with regard to these sacred appellations. Among these is the monosyllabic word אל which without points may either denote *God* or may be the particle *unto*. The compiler is, therefore, anxious to point out passages where it stands for the Sacred Name and where it is the particle. Among the instances which he adduces is להלך אל אל במשפט Job XXXIV 23 and he states that the first monosyllable is *secular* = the particle and that the second is *sacred*, i. e. the Divine name, *God*.<sup>1</sup> It will at once be seen that, if the graphic signs had existed, there would have been no necessity whatever for this explanation. The different points unmistakably indicate this, since the particle is pointed אל, and the Divine name אל. Moreover, he would not have been driven to use the

כתוב וארור מונע חרבו מרם איכא דאמרי קטליה ואיכא דאמרי לא קטליה: בכא בתרא.  
Comp Elias Levita, *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, p. 128, ed. Ginsburg, London 1867.

<sup>1</sup> להלך אל אל במשפט הראשון חול והשני קדש.  
DD

awkward expressions חול *secular*, and קדש *sacred* to mark the difference, for he would simply have said the first has *Segol* and the second *Tzerē*.<sup>1</sup>

The introduction of the graphic signs, however, must have taken place about a generation after the compilation of the Palaeographical Treatise *Sopherim* or about 650–680. A. D. This is to be inferred from the following facts. (1) Codex 4445 of the British Museum which contains the Pentateuch and which was written about 850 A. D. already exhibits the text with the vowel-points and accents in a highly developed form. (2) In the Massorah of this Codex, which was added about 950 A. D., the vowel-points and the accents are an integral part of this Corpus, and minute regulations are to be found on almost every page as to the points and accents of certain words which are spelled alike. A century at least must have elapsed between the introduction of the graphic signs and their becoming the object of Massoretic glosses. And (3) the same inference is to be drawn from the fact that about the middle of the ninth century the origin of the vowel-points and accents was already shrouded in darkness, and the innovation as usual, was ascribed to the sages and the Men of the Great Synagogue. Several centuries must, therefore, have elapsed before the system could thus be canonised.

As the object of inventing the vowel signs and the accents was to aid the professional teachers of Holy Writ in their function of imparting instruction to the laity in the correct pronunciation and in setting forth the traditional sense of the consonants, the Massorites did not at first confine themselves to elaborate one uniform system of graphic signs. The different Schools of Massorites formulated several systems. Hence, besides the current system according

to which the graphic signs are placed under the consonants and which is called *infralinear*, Massorites of other Schools developed a system which not only consists of different signs, but according to which the vowel-signs and the accents are placed above the consonants and which is, therefore, called *superlinear*.

The existence of the superlinear punctuation was not known till about fifty years ago. The first published notice of it was derived from the epigraph to a MS. of the Pentateuch with the Chaldee Paraphrase in the De Rossi Library No. 12 In this important document we are distinctly told that the superlinear system is that which was current in Babylon as will be seen from the following:

This Targum with its vowel-points was made from a MS. which was brought from Babylon and which had the points above according to the Assyrian system of punctuation. It was changed by R. Nathan b. Machir of Ancona son of R. Samuel b. Machir of Aveyso [in Portugal or of Aveyron in France], son of Solomon who destroyed the power of the blasphemer in Romagna by the aid of the name of the Blessed One, son of Anthos b. Zadok Ha-Nakdan. He corrected it and made it conformable to the punctuation of the Tiberian system.<sup>1</sup>

That the superlinear system was the system which was current in Babylon and was called the Oriental is, moreover, corroborated by the notices of the variations between the Westerns and the Easterns which Professor Strack has collected from the various Tzufutkale MSS. The Massorah on 1 Sam. XXV 3; 2 Sam. XIII 21; Ps. CXXXVII 5 in describing the differences in the words, vowel-points and accents between these two Schools, gives the text of the passages in question according to the

<sup>1</sup> תרגום זה בנקודו נעתיק מספר אשר הובא מארץ בבל והיה מנוקד למעלה בנקוד ארץ אשור והפכו ר' נתן בר מכיר מאנקונא בר שמואל בר מכיר ממדינת אויירי בר שלמה הוא אשר גרע קרן המתלוצץ בארץ רומניא בשם המבורך בר אנתוס בר צדוק הנקדן והגיהו ונסחו לנקוד מברני המקום וכו'; Comp. *Targum Onkelos, herausgegeben und erläutert* von Dr. A. Berliner. Vol II, p. 134, Berlin 1884.

<sup>1</sup> להקד אל אל במשפט הראשון סגול והשני צרי.

infralinear punctuation as that of the Occidentals [i. e. Maarbai, or Westerns] and according to the superlinear punctuation as that of the Orientals [i. e. Madinchai or Easterns or Babylonians].<sup>1</sup>

The Massorah, however, in describing the superlinear system as the Oriental, is not confined to the MSS. derived from the Crimea. In the Model Codex No. 1—3 in the Paris National Library, which has furnished us with so many new readings from the Oriental redaction, I have found two other Massoretic remarks to the same effect. On Levit. VII 16, where the received text or the Westerns read *הַקְרִיבוּ* with *Pathach* under the *He*, the Massorah remarks that the Eastern or Babylonians read it with *Chirek* and accordingly gives the variant with the superlinear punctuation.<sup>2</sup> The same is the case in Levit. XIII 7 on the word *לְמַהֲרָתוֹ* for *his cleansing*, where the Massorah gives the Babylonian variation with the superlinear punctuation.

In the face of this evidence from different ages and separate lands it simply discloses a case of special pleading to argue that the superlinear system is not the product of the Babylonian School of Massorites. Nothing was more natural for the Babylonian authorities who had a distinct recension of the consonantal text than to formulate a system which should exhibit in graphic signs the ancient pronunciation in accordance with the traditions in their possession. The same was to be expected from the Jerusalem or Tiberian School. The two guilds of the two Schools of textual critics who elaborated these systems were not antagonistic to each other, but simply endeavoured in friendly rivalry and according to the best of their

<sup>1</sup> Comp. *A Treatise on the Accentuation* by William Wickes D. D., p. 145, Oxford 1887.

<sup>2</sup> הַקְרִיבוּ לְ, הַקְרִיבוּ קֶרֶן מְרִי.

ability to reproduce by graphic signs the same pronunciation of the consonants which was orally delivered to them from time immemorial. The infralinear and superlinear signs were, therefore, two trial systems to compass the same difficult task, which accounts for the fact that several modifications of the superlinear punctuation are exhibited in some MSS.<sup>1</sup> Hence MSS. produced in countries outside Babylon exhibit both systems by the side of each other. A striking illustration of this fact we have in the oldest dated superlinear system exhibited in the St. Petersburg Codex of A. D. 916. Here the Massorah has frequently in the first part of its Massoretic gloss the first word with the infralinear punctuation and the second word in the second part of the same Massoretic remark with the superlinear punctuation;<sup>2</sup> whilst in other passages the Massorah entirely exhibits the infralinear system.<sup>3</sup> Ultimately, however, the Western system prevailed over its rival, just as the Western recension of the text itself has been adopted as the *textus receptus* and has so completely superseded its Eastern competitor that not a single copy of a purely Eastern, i. e. Babylonian recension has as yet come to light.

This final conquest is no doubt due to a great extent to the more easy and simple nature of the infralinear system. From the primitive single dot and horizontal line, the only two graphic signs which obtained prior to the introduction of the present vowel-points, the Western Massorites ingeniously developed all the vowel-signs in the infralinear system. The one dot under the consonant

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Orient. 1467 and Orient. 2363 in the British Museum with the St. Petersburg Codex of 916 A. D.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Isa. I 25; II 12; VII 16; VIII 1; XXVII 11; XXXIV 5 &c. &c.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. Isa. I 19; III 7; V 2, 8; XIV 2; XVIII 6; XXIII 7 &c. &c.

(ֿ) is *Chirek*. The same dot in the middle (·) is *Shurek* and above the letter (ˆ) is *Cholem*. Two dots in a horizontal position (̄) are *Tzere* and in a perpendicular form (⊥) are *Sheva*. Three dots in a triangular form (⊿) are *Segol* and in a diagonal form inclining to the right (↘) are *Kibbutz*. The simple horizontal line (̄) is *Pathach* and with the dot under it (̇) is *Kametz*. The composite signs *Chateph-Segol*, *Chateph-Pathach* and *Chateph-Kametz* are indicated by the simple addition of the two perpendicular dots to the single vowel-signs, viz. ֿ̄, ֿ̇, ֿ̄̇.

The superlinear or Eastern system is far less simple. The signs for *Kametz* and *Pathach* which we are told are formed of broken letters are sometimes not easy to distinguish and are more difficult to write than the corresponding two signs in the infralinear system. The *Shurek* which consists of the letter *Vav* (ו) occupies a very awkward position. The use of the same horizontal line (̄) to denote *Raphe*, the audible *Sheva* (שׁוּא נֶע), and the quiescent *Sheva* (שׁוּא נָח) is exceedingly inconvenient; and though in the variation of this system, as exhibited in Orient. 1467, this awkwardness is partly avoided by ו̇ representing *Raphe* and ו̄ the audible *Sheva*, still the quiescent *Sheva* is not indicated at all. This system, moreover, does not distinguish between *Pathach* and *Segol* and has no furtive *Pathach* at all. Thus for instance ירִיע he shall cry (Isa. XLII 13) stands for ירִיע̄. By their position the graphic signs also come inconveniently in conflict with the superlinear accents.

The solution of the tangled question as to which of the two systems is the older, or whether the one is a development of the other, or whether both have been developed simultaneously but independently of each other is outside the range of this chapter. So is an analysis of the merits and demerits of the two systems. The attempt

to accomplish this would occupy a Treatise of considerable dimensions. I must, therefore, refer the student to works which discuss these points.<sup>1</sup>

The fact that the graphic signs determine the sense of the consonants in accordance with the traditions of their predecessors the Sopherim, naturally implies that the principles, by which the authoritative custodians of the Hebrew Scriptures were guided in the redaction of the consonantal text, were faithfully followed by the Massorites who invented the vowel-points. This is fully attested by numerous passages in the Massoretic text. From these I shall only adduce a few instances which are now admitted by the best critics and expositors as having the vowel-signs in harmony with the redactorial canons of the Sopherim.

The expression "to see the face of the Lord" was deemed improper, inasmuch as it appeared too anthropomorphic. Besides it was supposed to conflict with the declaration in Exod. XXXIII 20. Hence the Massorites in accordance with the Sopheric canon pointed the verb in the *Niphal* or passive in all these phrases. "To see (יִרְאֶה) the face of the Lord" was converted by the vowel-points into "to be seen" (יִרְאָה) or "to appear before the Lord."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Pinsker, *Einleitung in das Babylonisch-Hebräische Punctations-system*, Vienna 1863; Ewald, *Jahrbücher der Biblischen Wissenschaft* 1844, pp. 160—172; Graetz, *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, Vol. XXX, p. 348—367, 395—405. Krotoschin 1881; Vol. XXXVI, p. 425—451, 473—497. Krotoschin 1887; W. Wickes, *A Treatise on the Accentuation*, p. 144 &c. Oxford 1887; Isidor Harris, in *the Jewish Quarterly Review*, p. 241 &c. London 1889; G. Margoliouth, *The superlinear Punctuation, its origin &c.* in the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, p. 164 &c. London 1893; Bacher, *Die Anfänge der Hebräischen Grammatik* in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Vol. XLIX, pp. 1—62. Leipzig 1895.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, pp. 337—339, Breslau 1857.

But passages like Exod. XXIII 15; XXXIV 20; Isa. I 12, which are most difficult to construe with the accusative, plainly show that the natural vocalization of the verb in all these phrases is the *Kal*. Accordingly the proper punctuation in Exod. XXXIV 23 and Deut. XVI 16 is *יִרְאֶה* shall see, and not *יִרְאֶה* shall appear, and the passages in question are to be translated

Three times a year shall all thy male children see the face of the Lord.

This also shows that in the third passage where this command is repeated (Exod. XXIII 17) the original reading was *אָתָּה* as is attested by the Samaritan recension and not *לָא* as it is in the *textus receptus*.

The same euphemistic pointing is to be found in Exod. XXIII 15 and XXXIV 20 which ought to be translated

and ye shall not see (*יִרְאֶה*) my face empty handed.

This euphemism has also been introduced into Exod. XXXIV 20, and Deut. XXXI 11 where *לִרְאוֹת* to see, the *Kal* infinitive is pointed *לִרְאוֹת* to be seen, to appear, the syncopated infinitive *Niphal*, a form which some of the best Grammarians do not admit. Accordingly the passages in question ought to be translated

to see the face of the Lord thy God.

That the points in *לִרְאוֹת* to appear, in Isa. I 12 are euphemistic and should be *לִרְאוֹת* to see, is now admitted by some of the most distinguished critics. The passage, therefore, ought to be rendered

when ye come to see my face

The same is the case in Ps. XLII 3 where *וַאֲרָאָה* and I shall appear before, ought to be *וַאֲרָאָה* and I shall see, and the verse is to be translated

when shall I come and see the face of God.

In the passage before us we have an instance which testifies to the oft-repeated fact that the different Schools

of textual critics followed different traditions. Thus whilst the present Massoretic text follows the School which laid down the euphemistic canon that it is to be pronounced in the passive (*וַאֲרָאָה*) which is also exhibited in the Septuagint and in St. Jerome, another School of textual critics did not regard the active form or the *Kal* as harsh and hence adhered to the natural pronunciation (*וַאֲרָאָה*). This is attested by some MSS., the Chaldee, the Syriac, and the *editio princeps* of the Hagiographa, Naples 1486—87. This School recognised the fact that the phrase “to see the face of the Lord” simply denotes the Divine presence as manifested in the Sanctuary. Thus when the Psalmist assures the upright that they will enjoy spiritual communion with God, he declares

The upright shall behold his face (Ps. XI 7)

as it is rightly rendered in the Revised Version. The great hope of the Psalmist who worships God without any prospect of material gain is

As for me I will behold thy face in righteousness (Ps. XVII 15).

And Hezekiah when he expected to depart this life expressed his distress

I shall not see the Lord, the Lord in the land of the living (Isa. XXXVIII 11).

The expression *מֹלֵךְ* *Molech*, as it is pointed in the Massoretic text occurs eight times,<sup>1</sup> and with one exception,<sup>2</sup> has always the article, which undoubtedly shows that it is an appellative and denotes *the king, the king-idol*. The appellative signification of the word is confirmed by the Septuagint which translates it *ἄρχων prince, king*, in five out of the eight instances.<sup>3</sup> As this, however, was the

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Levit. XVIII 21; XX 2, 3, 4, 5; 1 Kings XI 7; 2 Kings XXIII 10; Jerem. XXXII 35.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. *וַיִּמְלֵךְ* 1 Kings XI 7 which is probably a mistake in the punctuation and ought to be *וַיִּמְלֵךְ* as it is in the other passages.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. Levit. XVIII 21; XX 2, 3, 4, 5.

title of Jehovah who alone was the true King of Israel,<sup>1</sup> and, moreover, as the Jews had frequently fallen a prey to the worship of this odious king-idol with all its appalling rites of child-sacrifice, the authoritative redactors of the Hebrew text endeavoured to give a different pronunciation to these consonants when they denote this hideous image. Hence the Massorites who invented the graphic signs pointed it מֹלֶךְ *molech*, to assimilate it to the word בִּשְׁתָּה *shameful thing*, the name with which Baal was branded.<sup>2</sup>

The authoritative redactors of the text, however, simply indicated the euphemistic principle, but as in the case of Baal and other cacophonous expressions, they did not attempt to carry it through the whole Hebrew Scriptures. Hence there are passages in which the original appellative *melech* (מֶלֶךְ) is left without any alteration in the points which some of our best critics have taken to stand for *Molech* (מֹלֶךְ). Thus for instance Isa. XXX 33 which is in the Authorised Version "yea for the king it is prepared" is translated by Professors Delitzsch, Cheyne &c.

it is also prepared for Moloch

and Dr. Payne Smith, the late Dean of Canterbury, remarks, "I have little doubt that the right vocalization of Isa. XXX 33; LVII 9 is מֹלֶךְ *Molech*, not מֶלֶךְ *king*."<sup>3</sup>

In accordance with this principle of euphemism the Massorites pointed מִלְכָם *Milcom*, making it a proper name in three passages where this appellative occurs with the suffix third person plural instead of מֹלָכֶם *their king-god*.<sup>4</sup> That the Hebrew text from which the ancient Versions

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Numb. XXIII 21; Deut. XXXIII 5; Jerem. XXXIII 22; Ps. V 3; X 16; XXIX 10 &c.

<sup>2</sup> Vide supra, Part II, chap. XI, pp. 401–404, and Comp. Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzung der Bibel*, pp. 299–308.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. *Bampton Lectures*, p. 323 note, London 1869.

<sup>4</sup> Comp. 1 Kings XI 5, 33; 2 Kings XXIII 13.

were made exhibited variations in these three passages is attested by the Septuagint which has *Molech* [= מֹלֶךְ] in two out of the three passages, viz. 1 Kings XI 5, 35.

But *malcam* [= מִלְכָם *their king*], with the normal points of the suffix third person plural, occurs in at least six passages in the Massoretic text where it is taken to denote the king-idol.<sup>1</sup> The modern critics, however, who admit that the king-idol = Moloch, is here intended, have advocated an alteration of the Massoretic punctuation of the expression in these passages in order to convert the appellative with the suffix into a proper name, viz. *Melcam* or *Malcam*, following the example of some of the ancient Versions. But the passage in Amos V 25 where מִלְכָכֶם *your king*, occurs with the pronominal suffix second person, which is now recognised to mean *your king-idol* i. e. your Moloch, shows conclusively that there is no necessity for departing from the Massoretic punctuation of מִלְכָם *their king-idol*, with the suffix third person. However as מִלְכָכֶם *your king-idol*, and מִלְכָם are undoubtedly forms of מֶלֶךְ *king*, with the second and third persons pronominal suffix, they show that the original expression for this king-idol was מֶלֶךְ *melech*, and that in the passages where it is now מֹלֶךְ *molech*, the Massorites have assimilated the punctuation to בִּשְׁתָּה *shame*, in accordance with the ancient tradition.

Ecclesiastes III 21 exhibits another remarkable punctuation by the Massorites which is due to euphemism. The different Schools of textual critics had a different pronunciation of the *He* (ה) which precedes the two participles עֹלָה *goeth upward*, and יֹרֶדָה *goeth downward*. According to one School it was the interrogative (ה . . . ה) and denotes *whether* it [i. e. the spirit of man] *goeth*

<sup>1</sup> Comp. 2 Sam. XII 30 with the parallel passage in 1 Chron. XX 2; Jerem. XLIX 1, 3; Amos I 15; Zeph. I 5.

*upward . . . whether it* [i. e. the spirit of the beast] *goeth downward*. This School recognised the fact that the verse before us is part of the general argument, and that the proper answer to this question is given at the end of the book. The Chaldee, the Septuagint, the Syriac, the Vulgate, Luther, the Geneva Version and the Revised Version follow this School, and take the *He* (ה) interrogatively. Another School of redactors, however, with a sensitive regard for the devout worshippers who had to listen to the public reading of the passage, were anxious to obviate the appearance of scepticism and hence took the *He* (ה) as the article pronoun and interpreted the clauses in question *that goeth upward . . . that goeth downward*. It is this School which the Massorites followed in their punctuation of the two participles, viz. הָעֹלָה . . . הַיֹּרֶדָה. Coverdale, the Bishops' Bible and the Authorised Version strictly exhibit the present Massoretic punctuation which as we have seen, is due to the principle of euphemism.

With the introduction of the graphic signs and their incorporation into the Massoretic Apparatus, the work of the Massorites ceased circa A. D. 700. From this guild of anonymous, patient, laborious, self-denying and godly toilers at "the hedge" which was designed henceforth to "enclose" and preserve the sacred consonantal text delivered into their keeping by their predecessors the Sopherim, the now pointed and accented text with the stupendous Massoretic corpus passed over into the hands of another guild called the *Nakdanim* (נקדנים) = the *Punctuators* or more properly the Massoretic Annotators.

Unlike the Massorites who had to invent the graphic signs, to fix the pronunciation and the sense of the consonantal text, and formulate the Lists of the correct readings in accordance with the authoritative traditions, the functions of the *Nakdanim* were not to create, but

to strictly conserve the Massoretic labours. They revised the consonantal text produced by professional copyists and furnished it with the Massoretic vowel-signs and accents, as well as with the Massorahs both Parva and Magna as transmitted to them by the Massorites.

To this effect each distinguished *Nakdan* of acknowledged reputation supplied himself with a copy of the Hebrew Scriptures which he generally made himself in accordance with the Massorah and which became a Model Codex. The first *Nakdanim* who have produced such Model Codices and whose date we know are the two Ben-Ashers father and son, and Ben-Naphtali (circa A. D. 890—940).<sup>1</sup> The *Nakdanim* also procured or compiled for themselves independent Collections of Massoretic Rubrics from which they transferred a greater or lesser quantity of these Rubrics into the Codices which they revised proportioned to the honorarium they received from the rich patron or the community for whom a Codex was made. Hence Standard Codices as well as independent Massorahs are constantly referred to by Massoretic Annotators, Jewish Grammarians and expositors from the middle of the tenth century downwards. The separate Massoretic compilations which the *Nakdanim* produced were designed as Manuals. They were exceedingly convenient for selecting from them the portions of the Massorah which the Massoretic Annotator had determined to transfer into the Codex he revised.

The order adopted in these Compendiums generally depended upon the taste of the compiler. As a rule, however, such an independent compilation began with the long alphabetical List of words which respectively occur twice in the Bible once without *Vav* (ו) conjunctive and once with it. As the first pair of words in this List are

<sup>1</sup> *Vide supra*, Part II, chap. X, pp. 241—286.

אכלה *eating* (1 Sam. I 9), and ואכלה *and eat* (Gen. XXVII 19), these Manuals in accordance with the ancient Jewish practice were called *Ochlah Ve-Ochlah* after the words with which they begin.<sup>1</sup> Two such Compendiums in separate books without the regular text of the Bible are still extant in MS. The one in the Paris National Library has been published with learned notes by Frensdorff, Hanover 1864, and the other which is a far larger compilation is still in MS. in the Halle University Library. This MS. is of special interest to the Massoretic student since it belonged to the celebrated Elias Levita according to a partially defaced note on the first page and is the *Ochla Ve-Ochla* which he tells us Jacob b. Chayim largely used in the compilation of the Massorah in the edition of the Rabbinic Bible, Venice 1524—25.<sup>2</sup> By the kind permission of the Halle University authorities I made a fac-simile of this MS. in 1867, and incorporated many new Massoretic Lists in my edition of the Massorah. A separate compilation of the Massorah Parva is also still extant in MS. in the Royal Library of Berlin No. 1219.

These Nakdanim or Massoretic Annotators also wrote Treatises on the vowel-points and accents as well as explanations of the Massorah itself. This independent authorship, however, opened up to the Massoretic Annotators a wide field for ingenious speculations and soon developed fine-spun theories about the vowel-points and accents which may or may not be correct, but which were never contemplated by the Massorah. The results of these theories the Massoretic Annotators frequently introduced into the Massorah itself as a constituent part of this ancient

<sup>1</sup> For this List see *The Massorah*, letter א, §§ 34—53, Vol. I, pp. 391—396.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Massoreth Ha-Massoreth, p. 93 &c., ed. Ginsburg. London 1867

corpus either with the name of the particular authority or without it, so that in many cases it is now difficult to say which Rubric belongs to the old Massorah, and which is the product of later theorists or Grammarians. A few examples will suffice to illustrate this fact.

We have a List transmitted to us in the name of R. Phinehas, the President of the Academy at Tiberias *circa* A. D. 750 registering eighteen expressions in which this Massoretic Annotator substitutes *Chateph-Pathach* for the simple and primitive *Sheva*.<sup>1</sup> Though these instances are adduced without giving any reason for this peculiar punctuation, an analysis of the words in question shows that the following principles underlie this proposed deviation from the Massoretic system.

(1) When a consonant with *Sheva* is followed by the same consonant he changed the simple *Sheva* into *Chateph-Pathach*. This is evident from Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 in the List.

(2) When *Resh* (ר) stands between two *Kametz*s, or between a *Kametz* and *Chirek* or *Shurek* he changed the simple *Sheva* into *Chateph-Pathach*, as is evident from Nos. 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 in the List.

(3) When the copulative *Vav* has *Shurek* (ו) he changed the simple *Sheva* into *Chateph-Pathach*. This is to be seen in the examples Nos. 3, 12, 13, 14 and 16 in the List. And

(4) When nouns from the ל"ה stems have *Yod* (י) at the end, e. g. בכי *weeping* (Deut. XXXIV 8 &c.) the simple *Sheva* under the first consonant is changed into *Chateph-Pathach*. This is implied in No. 15 and in the punctuation

<sup>1</sup> רב פינחס ראש ישיבה קרי סגכיום, המשכריום, וקרוב לבו, שושטן, החמושטן, התפוררה, מקרדים, כי היתה הרוחה, הרביעי, הרבוש, הרשעים, וקנר, ושבה שביך, ושלה לקראתם, אל תפן אל קשי העם הזה, ושבע עשרה דרחבעם, וכתבם, ועל לבם; אכתבנה: Comp. *The Massorah*, letter ט, Vol. I, p. 658, § 24.



of  $\text{קָדַי}$  a *kid* (Exod. XXIII 19), which is one of the instances given in another recension of R. Phinehas's List.<sup>1</sup>

With these facts before us we shall be able to test the value of these principles, whether they have been adopted by other members of the guild of Massoretic Annotators, and how far they have been followed in the best MSS.

As regards the first principle with respect to the double consonant we have a record from another Massoretic Annotator in Orient. 1478, fol. 1*b*, British Museum, which is as follows:

Mnemonic sign: The Earlier ones [i. e. Massoretic Annotators] have ordained that whenever two of the same letters occur together as for instance הללו *praise ye* [Jerem. XX 30 &c.]; סבבים *covering* [Exod. XXV 20]; בהתפללו *when he prayed* [Job XLII 10]; דללו *they are languid* [Isa. XIX 6] and all similar cases, they have Chateph-Pathach. But I have not found it so in the correct Codices.<sup>2</sup>

It will be seen that this Massoretic Annotator emphatically declares that in none of the Model Codices which he investigated was this principle followed: and I can corroborate this fact. The Standard MSS. which I have collated, as a rule have no *Chateph-Pathach* in these cases. Dr. Baer who quotes this identical Rubric in support of the *Chateph-Pathach* theory has entirely suppressed the important words of the Massoretic Annotator, *but I have not found it so in the correct Codices.*<sup>3</sup> It is, moreover, to be remarked that the few Nakdanim who have espoused this

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Baer and Strack, *Dikdukē Ha-Teamim*, § 14, p. 15, Leipzig 1879.

<sup>2</sup> סימן תקנו הקדמונים דכל תרתין אותיות דרמין דא לרא כנן הללו סבבים בכנפיהם. בהתפללו בעד רעהו. דללו. וכל שאר בחטף פת' ולא אשכחית אנא כדון בספרים מוגהים Comp. *The Massorah*, letter כ, § 533, Vol. II, p. 297.

<sup>3</sup> סימן. תקנו הקדמונים דכל תרתין אותיות דרמין דא לרא. כנן הללו. סבבים. בכנפיהם. בהתפללו בעד רעהו. דללו וכל שאר. בחטף פתח. This is what Dr. Baer gives of the Rubric in question in his edition of the Psalms p. 84, Leipzig 1880.

principle consistently also point  $\text{הִנְנִי}$  *behold me*,<sup>1</sup> which Dr. Baer and those who follow him emphatically, though inconsistently reject.

We have also a record with regard to the second principle which affects the punctuation of the letter *Resh* (ר). In the Massoretico-Grammatical Treatise which is prefixed to the Yemen Codices of the Pentateuch it is stated as follows:

Again according to some Scribes when *Resh* (ר) stands between two *Kametz*s, or between *Kametz* and *Chirek* or *Shurek* the *heva* under it is made *Chateph-Pathach*, as for instance  $\text{הַרְכִּישׁ}$  *the goods* [Gen. XIV 21 &c.];  $\text{הַרְחֵחָה}$  *respice* [Exod. VIII 11];  $\text{הַרְפָּאִים}$  *the giants* [Deut. III 11 &c.];  $\text{הַרְשָׁעִים}$  *the wicked* [Exod. IX 27 &c.];  $\text{הַרְדִּירִים}$  *the vails* [Isa. III 23].<sup>2</sup>

It will be seen that in the record before us this is simply described as a practice which obtained among a few Scribes, and is by no means represented as a rule binding upon those who are engaged in the multiplication of MSS.

As for the principle which underlies the instances adduced in the third category it may safely be stated that, with few exceptions, I have not found any Standard Codices which point the consonant with *Chateph-Pathach* after ר copulative. I very much question whether any modern editor of the Hebrew Bible would be bold enough uniformly to introduce this punctuation which the statement of R. Phinehas certainly suggests. The same may be said of the principle implied in the punctuation of the nouns adduced in the fourth category.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Add. 15451 British Museum, Gen. VI 17; IX 9; XLI 17; XLVIII 4 &c. &c.

<sup>2</sup> ועוד למקצת הסופרים כי כל ריש אשר יהיה בין שני קמצין או בין קמץ וחרק או שרק יפחח השוא אשר תחתיו כמו  $\text{הַרְכִּישׁ הַרְחֵחָה הַרְפָּאִים הַרְשָׁעִים הַרְדִּירִים}$  ודומ' וכל זה לפי העיקרים שהקדמוני; Comp. Orient. 2343, fol. 15*a*; Orient. 2349, fol. 10*b*; Derenbourg, *Manuel du Lecteur*, p. 68, Paris 1871.

The conceit of another Nakdan who formulated a rule that whenever two of the same letters occurred one at the end of a word and one at the beginning of the immediately following word the latter is to have Dagesh, has already been discussed.<sup>1</sup> Other Nakdanim are mentioned in Chapter XII in connection with the MSS. which they have produced and Massoretically annotated.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Vide supra*, Part II, chap. I, pp. 115—121.