CANON AND TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON, ... SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED.
DUBLIN, ... GEORGE HERBERT.
NEW YORK, . . . CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

CANON AND TEXT

OF THE

Old Testament.

BY

DR. FRANTS BUHL,
ORDINARY PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AT LEIPZIG.

Translated by

REV. JOHN MACPHERSON, M.A.,
FINDHORN.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
1892.

PREFACE.

THE Author of the following work, after studying in his native city of Copenhagen and also at Leipzig, was appointed ordinary Professor of Theology and Oriental Languages in the University of Copenhagen, and was transferred in 1890, on the death of Dr. Franz Delitzsch, to occupy the place of that distinguished scholar in Leipzig. The Treatise now presented in an English dress is described by its Author as to some extent an enlarged translation of a Danish work, *Den gammeltestamentlige Skriftoverlevering*, which had appeared in 1885. In its original form it aimed at imparting information as to the ascertained results of modern researches with reference to the Canon and Text of the Old Testament. As expanded and recast in the German edition, the Author expresses the hope that it may prove useful to theological students. For the English edition Professor Buhl has supplied some additional references to the most recent literature, and at his request the Translator has called attention to a few of the most important contributions of British scholars which bear directly upon the subject of this work.

THE TRANSLATOR.

FINDHORN, *December* 1891.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

THE HISTORY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT CANON (§§ 1–22)—

General Sketch (§ 1), ... 1

I. *The Old Testament Canon among the Jews* (§§ 2–13), . . 4

A. The Palestinian (Babylonian) Canon (§§ 2–11), . . 4

B. The Collection of Scriptures by the Alexandrine Jews (§§ 12–13), ... 43

II. *The Old Testament Canon in the Christian Church* (§§ 14–22), . 50

THE HISTORY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT TEXT (§§ 23–99)—

Preliminary Remarks (§ 23), ... 79

I. *Aids to the Study of the History of the Text* (§§ 24–73), . . 82

A. *The Immediate Apparatus* (§§ 24–36), . . . 82

1. Printed Editions (§§ 24, 25), ... 82

2. Manuscripts (§§ 26–29), ... 85

3. Collections of Variations (§ 30), ... 90

4. The Jewish Massora (§§ 31–35), ... 94

5. Quotations and Transcriptions (§ 36), . . . 106

B. *The Old Translations* (§§ 37–72), ... 108

1. The Alexandrine Translation (§§ 37–50), . . 108

2. Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus, Quinta, and Sexta (§§ 51–55), ... 149

3. Jerome and the Vulgate (§§ 56–58), . . . 159

4. Jewish Targums (§§ 59–67), ... 167

5. The Syriac Translations of the Bible (§§ 68–72), . 185

C. *Aids from within the Text itself* (§ 73), . . . 194

II. *Results of the History of the Text* (§§ 74–99), . . . 195

A. *The External History of the Text* (§§ 74–87), . . 195

1. Writing Materials (§ 74), ... 195

2. History of the Hebrew Letters (§§ 75–77), . . 198

3. Vocalisation and Accentuation (§§ 78–82), . . 207

4. The Divisions of the Text (§§ 83–87), . . . 219

PAGE

B. The Internal History of the Text (§§ 88–99), . . 228
1. The Linguistic Side of the Text (§ 88), . . . 228
2. The Transmission of the Text according to its Real Contents (§§ 89–99) 232
(*a*) Vocalisation (§§ 90, 91), ... 236
(*b*) The Consonantal Text (§§ 92–99), . . . 239

ABBREVIATIONS.

GGA . . . Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeigen.
JPT . . . Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie.
MGWJ . . Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums.
NGGW . . Nachrichten der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften.
REJ . . . Revue des Études Juives.
TA . . . Alexandrine Text.
TM . . . Massoretic Text.
TSK . . . Theologische Studien und Kritiken.
ZA . . . . Zeitschrift für Assyriologie.
ZAW . . . Zeitschrift der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft.
ZDMG . . Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.
ZKM . . . Zeitschrift für Kunde des Morgenlandes.
ZKWL . . Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft und kirchliches Leben.
ZLT . . . Zeitschrift der gesammten lutherischen Theologie.
ZWT . . . Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie.

THE
HISTORY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT CANON.

INTRODUCTION.

1. The term "canonical books," as designating the writings which constitute the rule of faith and doctrine (*κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τῆς πίστεως*), was first employed by the Greek fathers of the fourth century. But even before this name had been coined, the idea was already current among Christians, and, with reference to the Old Testament, also among Jews. Seeing that it is the canon of the Old Testament with which we have to deal, the conceptions formed by the Jews must, from the very nature of things, be regarded as of normative importance, as may indeed be provisionally assumed, for this reason that the New Testament contains no separate or new doctrine on this point. So then also we see how, in the course of the history of the Christian Church, several eminent, clear-sighted men have directed their attention to what the Jews have taught upon this particular point, and have taken pains to make their fellow-Christians acquainted with the subject. This, too, has oftentimes been done somewhat reluctantly, and, in the first instance, in order to vindicate the Church from the reproachful criticisms of the Jews. Nevertheless, we have, even in this, an acknowledgment of the authority belonging to the Jews on those questions, which, only on account of accidental historical circumstances, was not fully admitted on the part of the Church. Hence the history of the Old Testament Canon has generally been given in the form of an account of the style and manner in which the Jews established the number and extent of the sacred

writings, while a summary sketch of the attitude of the Christian Church upon this question was attached thereto, simply as an appendix of more subordinate significance. It must, however, be now quite evident that the task lying before us consists in tracking out the historical process itself, which, within the limits of Judaism, gave authority to the writings of the Old Testament revelation as canonical, and distinguished from them the writings that did not belong to revelation; whereas the representations of later Judaism, both in their original form and in their imitations among Christians, are not in and for themselves of normative importance, but must eventually give way before the ascertained results of historical investigation.

Reference should be made to "Introductions to the Old Testament," in which also the collection of the Old Testament writings is treated. Surveys of this literature will be found in the following among other treatises: Scholz (Catholic), *Einleitung in die heiligen Schriften des Alten und Neuen Testamentes*, i. 1845, p. 3 ff.; Keil, *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die kanonischen und apokryphischen Schriften des Alten Testamentes*, 3rd ed. 1873, p. 6 ff. [Eng. trans. of 2nd ed. of 1869 by Prof. Douglas, 2 vols., T. & T. Clark, Edin. 1869]; De Wette, *Lehrbuch d. hist.-krit. Einl. in die kanon. und apokr. Bücher des A. T.* 8th ed. by Schrader, 1869, 4 ff. [Eng. trans. of early ed. by Theodore Parker, 2 vols., Boston 1843]; Strack, *Einleitung in A. T. in Zöckler's Handbuch der Theol. Wissenschaften*, i. Also deserving to be named: Belsheim, *Om Bibelen, dens Forvaring, Oversættelse og Udbredelse*, 3rd ed. Christiania; Rosenius, *Indlednings vetenskaben til den heliga skrift*, Lund 1872.

The history of the canon is dealt with in the following: C. F. Schmid, *Historia antiqua et vindic. Canonis*, Leipsic 1775; Semler, *Abhandlungen von freier Untersuchung des Kanons*, Halle 1771–1775; G. L. Bauer, *Canon V. T. ab Esdra non collectus*, 1797; Movers, *Loci quidam historiæ canonis V. T. illustrata*, 1842; Astier, *Étude sur la clôture du canon de l'anc.*

Test. Strassburg 1859; Dillmann in the *Jahrb. für Deutsche Theologie*, iii. 419 ff.; Fürst, *Der Kanon d. A. T. nach den Ueberlieferungen im Talmud und Midrasch*, 1868; S. Davidson, *The Canon of the Bible*, 3rd ed. 1880; Strack in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*, vii. 412–451; Bloch, *Studien zur Geschichte der Sammlung des a. t. Literatur*, 1876; Wildeboer, *Het ontstaan van den kanon des ouden verbonds*, 1889, 2nd ed. 1891. Compare also: Schürer, "Geschichte des jüd. Volkes," *im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, ii. 1886, pp. 248–253 [Eng. trans., *History of Jewish People in the Times of Christ*, Edin., T. & T. Clark, Div. ii. vol. i. 1885, pp. 306–312]; and the works of Grätz and Geiger subsequently referred to.

On the use of the word "canon," see Credner, *Zur Geschichte des Kanons*, 1847.

I.

THE OLD TESTAMENT CANON AMONG THE JEWS.

A.—The Palestinian (Babylonian) Canon.

2. The collection of sacred writings acknowledged by the Palestinian, and subsequently by all the Jews, consists of three parts, which in mediæval times were compared with the three parts of the temple—the holiest of all, the holy place, and the outer court. These three together were designated in brief תנ"ך. They embraced respectively: The five books of the Law (תּוֹרָה; also חֲמִשָּׁה חֻמְשֵׁי הַתּוֹרָה, "the five fifth parts of the Law"); the prophetical writings (נְבִיאִים); and the writings (כְּתוּבִים) or Hagiographa, as we usually call them. The Massoretes divide the prophetical writings into two subdivisions: נְבִיאִים רִאשׁוֹנִים, *Prophetæ Priores* (Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings), and נְבִיאִים אַחֲרוֹנִים, *Prophetæ Posteriores* (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve Minor Prophets), in all, eight books. The Hagiographa are: Chronicles, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ruth, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, Esther, Daniel, and Ezra (Ezra-Nehemiah), embracing eleven books. Of the Hagiographa, from Ruth to Esther are the five so-called festival rolls or Megilloth (חָמֵשׁ מְגִלּוֹת). In one passage in the Babylonian Talmud (*Berachoth* 57*b*), Psalms, Proverbs, Job (the books which, from their initial letters, are frequently called אמ"ת) are grouped together under the designation "the great כתובים"; Canticles, Ecclesiastes, and Lamentations under the designation "the small כתובים." It is, however, to say the least of it, doubtful whether this designation was in such

general use as has been commonly supposed. The entire number of the canonical books is twenty-four, a number which is often mentioned in the older Jewish literature, *e.g.*, *l. Taanith* 8*a*. *Exodus* rb. par. 41, fol. 156; *Koheleth* rb. (on xii. 11), fol. 116*a*, etc. The complete enumeration of the twenty-four books is to be found as early as in a Baraitha (a tradition derived from the age of the Mishna doctors, but not to be met with in the Mishna) *b. Baba Bathra* 14*b*, 15*a*. Compare on this matter § 10.

The whole collection bears the name מִקְרָא (from קרא, "to read") or הַסֵּפֶר or סִפְרָא or כְּתְבֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ, "the sacred writings," or כתבי הקדש, כ"ד סְפָרִים, "the twenty-four writings." By way of contrast to "the Law," the fundamental part, considered as in itself sufficient, the rest of Scripture was sometimes embraced under the name קַבָּלָה, "tradition," or הַנְּבִיא. Compare § 3.

The Jews expressed the idea "canonical" or "non-canonical" in various ways. "Whoever receives more than twenty-four books introduces confusion מהומה into his house," as is said in *B. Koheleth* rb. fol. 116*a*. Only the canonical Scriptures should one save from a conflagration on the Sabbath day; and this applies also to translations of the sacred writings (*M. Sabb.* 16. 1; *b. Sabb.* 115*a*)—and it is only those writings that "defile the hands" (*M. Jadaim* 3. 5, etc.). The latter phrase is an extremely remarkable expression of the notion of sacredness, for, in order to protect the sacred books from careless handling and profanation, those very attributes were ascribed to them which in other cases characterised things which men were forbidden to touch on account of their impurity. From *M. Jadaim* 4. 6, it appears to have been the Pharisees who issued the peculiar ordinance, while the Sadducees vigorously opposed it. On the other hand, the idea that R. Akiba had pronounced all unacknowledged books, even such as the Book of Sirach,

"strange," חִיצוֹנִים, and the reading of them involving exclusion from the future world, is certainly due to a textual error. It is quite evident that in the passage referred to (*M. Sanhedrin* 10. 1, with the Talmuds) the allusion was originally only to particular heretical, and especially to Jewish-Christian, writings; while the Book of Sirach and similar writings were considered secular, but such as might be read. On the other hand, a stricter view undoubtedly was entertained, according to which the reading of such books was declared unallowable (אסיר למקרי, *Sanh.* 100*b*).

On the names of the canon and its several parts, compare Zunz, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden*, p. 44. In connection with this it should be specially remembered that ספרים may signify not only the Prophets and the Hagiographa (*e.g. M. Megilla* 3. 1), but also all the canonical writings; compare especially: Schiffer, *Das Buch Koheleth im Talmud und Midrasch*, 1884, p. 83 f. On the Massoretic expression אֲשֻׁלְּמֻתָּא, "tradition," see Joh. Delitzsch, *De inspiratione scripturæ sacræ*, 1872, p. 7 f. Among the mediæval Jews and the Massoretes מִקְרָא is sometimes used of the sacred writings with the exception of the Law; also here and there of "the Prophets" alone. Among writers of that age we also meet with the word פֻּסּוּק, which in the Talmud means only "verse," applied to the entire collection of Scriptures (see Bacher, *REJ*, xv. p. 113 f., xvi. p. 277 f.). Not quite synonymous with מקרא, although also derived from קרא, is the Arabic Qurʾân, which is correctly rendered by "religious discourse" (*Literaturblatt für orient. Philol.* iii. 104*x*).

That only Canticles, Ecclesiastes, and Lamentations are mentioned in *Berachoth* 57*b* as "short Hagiographa," is to be explained by the fact that Ruth was prefixed to the Psalms as an introduction, while Esther was assigned its place among the historical books (see Fürst, *Kanon* 83, compared with 60).

M. Jadaim 3. 5: "All the sacred writings (not all the

Hagiographa, see § 8) defile the hands מטמאים את־הידים." Compare on this subject: Delitzsch, *Zeitschrift für Lutherische Theologie*, 1854, p. 280; L. Löw, *Graphische Requisiten und Erzeugnisse bei den Juden*, i. 1870, p. 134 f.; Weber, *Lehren des Talmud*, p. 86; and below at § 8. Fürst (*Kanon*, p. 83) translates it quite wrongly: "They declare the hands, without having been previously washed, to be unclean." The correct explanation of this special ordinance, the guarding against any profanation, is pointed out by Johanan ben Sakkai (*Tosephta Jadaim*, ii. 19 f. p. 684, 2), when he says that according to this we would be prevented from using the sacred Scripture rolls as coverings for animals that were ridden. Of small importance is the commonly quoted explanation from *Sabb.* 13*b*, 14*a*, where the subject under discussion is the Torah rolls, regarding which it was forbidden that they should be set down beside consecrated grain, lest the mice should gnaw them (see Schiffer, *Das Buch Koheleth*, pp. 78 ff., 85 ff., 90 f.); this Halacha—one of the eighteen Halachoth included in "The Garret of Chananiah," § 8—is not sufficient to afford an explanation of the whole affair. Still more far-fetched indeed is the explanation given by Geiger (*Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, p. 135; *Jüd. Zeitschrift*, ii. 21 ff.), which is no less untenable than the remarks of the same scholar on the phrase "holy Scripture," on גנז, and on the passage in *Sabb.* 16. 1, where the books שאין קורין בהן are said to be non-canonical, but yet such as may be read (*Nachgelassene Schriften*, iv. 13).

The word גְּנִיזָה (from גנז, "to store up," then "to conceal," with the abstract גְּנִיזָה) which is met with in the earlier Jewish writings, is no mere equivalent of the Greek word "apocryphal." It is not used of the writings that were not received, but of books which were received, the canonicity of which, however, was contested (§ 8), while it was also applied to unauthorised translations of the sacred writings into the Aramaic, Greek, or other languages (*Sabb.* 115*a*). What the exact meaning of גנז is, may be seen from a passage like *Meg.* 26*b*. "A Torah roll that has become rotten must be hidden,

גונזין, in the vault of a scholar." Compare also § 26. Thus originally it implies no judgment on the character of the books, but a particular mode of procedure with existing copies (copies used in the synagogues), and only secondarily does it mean destruction generally. Jerome, therefore, in his *Comm. on Eccles.* xii. 14, correctly translates it by *obliterare.*

Against the correctness of the received text of *M. Sanhedrin* 10. 1, *Sanh.* 100*b*, *jer. Sanh.* 28*a*, Grätz (*MGWJ*, 1886, p. 285 ff.) has produced very cogent arguments. By combination with *Tosephta Jadaim*, ii. 13, p. 683, 10, he constructs the text as follows: R. Akiba said, "Whoever reads in the foreign (חיצונים), *i.e.* Jewish-Christian writings (compare Rabbinovicz, *Dikduke Soph'rim*), has no part in the world to come. Books, on the other hand, like that of Sirach and other such, which were composed after the age of the prophets had been closed (מכאן ואילך, see § 9), may be read just as one reads a letter." In like manner Joel (*Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte*, i. 1880, p. 73 ff.), who meanwhile makes the conjecture: "Whoever reads in foreign writings, like the writings of בן סטדא, *i.e.* Christian writings, etc.; on the other hand, Ben Sirach's book," etc.

3. As the beginning of the construction of the canon properly so called among the Jews, the historical development of which is the subject of our present investigation, we take that particular period when Ezra, at whose side Nehemiah stood during the latter half of the fifth century before Christ, introduced among the Jews "the Book of the Law," ספר תורה, as "canonical" Scripture, and made it the ruling standard for their religious and social life. The solution of the much contested, and as yet by no means solved, questions regarding the existence and enforcement of this law during the pre-exilian period, is a matter to be determined by the special science of Pentateuch criticism. We confine ourselves here to the canonical validity which the written Law had obtained among the Jews, after Ezra had read it before the great assemblage at Jerusalem, and the people had put themselves under

obligation to fulfil all the commands contained in the Law (Neh. viii.–x.), by binding themselves under a written covenant and by the taking of a solemn oath. Of other writings outside of the Book of the Law there is on this occasion no mention, and indeed there could not have been. It is indeed certain enough that the prophetic writings had been eagerly and widely read before, during, and after the exile. One may refer, *e.g.*, to echoes of older prophetical writings in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, to Zechariah i. 4, and to the influence which Isaiah xl.–lxvi. exercised upon the contemporary and the post-exilian literature. But a complete collection of prophetic writings could not exist so long as the prophetic spirit was still active and called forth new writings. Even the acceptance of the Pentateuch alone by the Samaritans (§ 11) points, though indeed this must not be accepted without full proof, to this, that the canon of that day contained as yet nothing more than the Pentateuch. The priority of the Law is seen finally in this, that the entire collection of Scriptures, even in later ages, was often still called "the Law," because the other two parts were regarded as merely supplements to it. See 4 Ezra xiv. 21; John x. 34, xii. 34, xv. 25; 1 Cor. xiv. 21; *Sanh.* 91*b*; *Moed katon* 5*a*, etc.

With regard to the high regard shown to the Law, and its pre-eminence over the Prophets and the Hagiographa, see Sirach xxiv. 22–27; 1 Macc. i. 59 f.; Weber, *Lehren des Talmud*, p. 79; Wildeboer, *Het ontstaan*, 2nd ed. p. 90 ff.

4. That the Jews of the Greek age acknowledged that they were a people without prophets is proved by such witnesses as 1 Macc. iv. 46, ix. 27, xiv. 41; The Song of the Three Children, v. 14 (Ps. lxxiv. 9 ?), with which passages *Sanh.* 11*a* may be compared. And as they became more and more convinced of this fact, after the silencing of the loud voices of the prophets, they must have felt impelled to

bring together in one complete whole the prophetic writings transmitted to them, the historical books, comprising utterances of the old prophets, as well as the properly prophetical books, and to attach this collection, as a second group of sacred and inspired writings, to the Law. From the prologue to the Book of Sirach we see that this collection was generally recognised and circulated in the beginning of the second century before Christ; and from the book itself we further see that this second part had precisely the same contents as it now has, for the author, in the paragraph xliv. 16–xlix. 13, gives an outline of the contents of the first two parts of the canon, in order thereby to set forth a picture of Israel's glorious history and of her mighty heroes, which exactly corresponds with the contents of the prophetical books acknowledged by us. How long it was before the prophetic canon secured general acceptance we know not, and just as little can we tell by whom and in what way the canonisation was carried out. The much discussed story given in 2 Macc. ii. 13 of a temple library founded by Nehemiah contains perhaps a true reminiscence of the historical preparations for the canonisation of the Prophets and the Hagiographa, but is by no means a history of the canonisation itself.

The important passage in the preface to the Greek translation of Ben Sirach runs as follows: *πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων ἡμῖν διὰ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν κατ' αὐτοὺς ἠκολουθηκότων δεδομένων . . . ὁ πάππος μου Ἰησοῦς ἐπὶ πλεῖον ἑαυτὸν δοὺς εἴς τε τὴν τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πατρίων βιβλίων ἀνάγνωσιν, καὶ ἐν τούτοις ἱκανὴν ἕξιν περιποιησαμένος, προήχθη καὶ αὐτὸς συγγράψαι τι τῶν εἰς παιδείαν καὶ σοφίαν ἀνηκόντων, κ.τ.λ.* [Whereas many and great things have been delivered to us by the Law and the Prophets, and by others that have followed their steps, . . . my grandfather Jesus, when he had much given himself to the reading of the Law and the Prophets and other books of our fathers, and had gotten therein good judgment, was drawn

on also himself to write something pertaining to learning and wisdom, etc.].

For the determining of the time during which Ben Sirach lived important data are afforded by his grandson's preface. The editor writes thus of himself: *ἐν τῷ ὀγδόῳ καὶ τριακοστῷ ἔτει ἐπὶ τοῦ Εὐεργέτου βασιλέως παραγενηθεὶς εἰς Αἴγυπτον.* [Coming into Egypt in the eight and thirtieth year, when Euergetes was king.] Seeing that an allusion to his own age when he came to reside in Egypt would have been altogether purposeless, he must mean the thirty-eighth year of the reign of the king. Compare, on the position of the words, the LXX. rendering of Haggai i. 1. Now Euergetes I. reigned B.C. 247–222, and consequently we have to think of Euergetes II. who reigned B.C. 170–116, although his uncontested supremacy began only in B.C. 145. The year in question would then be B.C. 132, and accordingly the grandfather must have flourished about B.C. 170.

For further particulars compare Kuenen, *Historisch-kritisch Onderzoek naar ontstaan en de versameling v. d. Boeken d. Ouden Verbonds*, iii. 426 f.; Wildeboer, *Het ontstaan*, pp. 31, 114; Vitringa, *De defectu prophetiæ post Malachiam* (*Observationes sacræ*, lib. vi. c. 7).

That Ben Sirach knew the full prophetic canon, as known to us, may be regarded as thoroughly established. The non-genuineness of Sirach xlix. 10, where mention is made of the twelve prophets, affirmed in earlier times by Bretschneider, and more recently repeated by Böhme (*ZAW*, vii. 280), has been rightly met by Nöldeke (*ZAW*, viii. 156) by the testimony of the Syrian translation.

It can be easily understood how men felt themselves impelled to collect together the wonderful treasures of the prophetic literature, the inexhaustible springs of the Messianic hopes, and to mark them off as God's words from other writings. The conjecture of Grätz (*Koheleth*, p. 156 f.), that, by the canonisation of the Prophets, a weapon had been sought against the Samaritans, is more characteristic of the ingenuity of its author than of the motives that were operative in that age. That the reception of the historical works, Joshua–

Kings, into the second collection of writings presupposes the decided opinion that these writings had been composed by prophets properly so called, is by no means certain. It is indeed very probable that these books were reckoned among "the Prophets" merely because they contained occasional utterances of the old prophets, such as Samuel, Nathan, Ahijah, etc., by means of which the entire historical narrative was, so to speak, sanctioned. This view is favoured especially by the style and manner in which the author of Chronicles quotes the several historical authorities lying before him. See 1 Chron. xxix. 29; 2 Chron. ix. 29, xii. 15, etc. These passages, since 2 Chron. xxvi. 22 puts the matter quite differently, do not certainly express the idea that that period of the history has been described by a contemporary prophet. For the opposite opinion see Wellhausen, who makes the last-mentioned conjecture (*Prolegomena*, 1883, p. 235). Compare also especially, Kuenen, *Onderzoek*[2], i. 488.

As the date of the canonisation of "the Prophets," Wildeboer (*Het ontstaan*, p. 112) conjectures the period about B.C. 200. But if these writings were not only recognised as canonical by Ben Sirach writing about B.C. 170, but were also circulated in a Greek translation as early as B.C. 140 (§ 38), this date must still be regarded as decidedly too late. In regard to the difference between the views of the grandfather and grandson, see Wildeboer, *Het ontstaan*, p. 29. But how far one will have to go back, it is impossible with the means at our disposal to determine. We might ask whether the allusions of the chronicler, living about B.C. 300, to a prophetico-historical work different from our books of Samuel and Kings (see above), do not imply the assumption, that "the Prophets" were not then as yet regarded as canonical, in which case we would obtain the year B.C. 300 as the *terminus a quo*. But this conclusion is still uncertain, since we are too little acquainted with the circumstances of these times to be able to deduce such consequences.

As to the way in which this canonisation was carried out we possess no information. Undoubtedly it was the *Soph*^{e}*rim* who were the actors in this matter. On the other hand, it

is not altogether impossible that the passage, 2 Macc. ii. 13, contains a faint reminiscence of an earlier fact which prepared the way for the subsequent canonisation of the Prophets and the Hagiographa (§ 5). It is related in a spurious epistle, that Nehemiah, according to his memoirs, founded a library [undoubtedly in the temple], which contained the following books: *τὰ περὶ τῶν βασιλέων καὶ προφητῶν καὶ τὰ τοῦ Δαυὶδ καὶ ἐπιστολὰς βασιλέων περὶ ἀναθεμάτων.* That the *Epistles about Temple Gifts* do not correspond to any Old Testament book, but are probably letters of foreign (Persian) princes, is clear. On the other hand, among others, the Books of Samuel and Kings (perhaps also the Judges), and some sort of collection of Psalms (that mentioned in Ps. lxxii. 20, or those Psalms bearing the superscription לדוד), may possibly have been meant. But this certainly is not all, and even at the best this contribution would be of very slight importance for the history of the canon. Compare on this point the various discussions of Kuenen, *Onderzoek*, iii. 403 ff., 427; Reuss, *Geschichte d. heil. Schriften*, A. T. 1881, p. 717; Strack in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie* [2], vii. 426; and Wildeboer, *Het. ontstaan*, pp. 36 f., 112, 115, 133.

5. The passage quoted in the previous section from the preface to the writing of Ben Sirach mentions, next to the Law and the Prophets, an additional class of writings, which are called "the other writings," or "the other writings of the fathers," where, according to the context, the term "writings" evidently meant writings with religious contents. That this third group corresponds generally with the later so-called כְּתוּבִים (§ 2) is quite plain; but still the question remains as to whether the writings referred to in the prologue were precisely co-extensive with those subsequently known as the Hagiographa. Here we are without the means of answering the question with the same certainty with which we can in reference to "the Prophets," since the Book of Ben Sirach itself expressly refers only to the Books of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and the Psalms (xlvii. 8 ff., xlix. 11). Although

the absence of quotations from the rest of the Hagiographa in and by itself indeed affords no proof against their existence and their recognition in the beginning of the second century before Christ, it must be openly confessed that the history of the canon is thereby prevented from issuing an authoritative veto against the assigning of a later date to one and another of these writings. It belongs exclusively to the particular criticism of the books in question to come to any conclusion upon this point. For the rest it cannot escape a careful observer of the quotation referred to, that not only the indefinite expression "the other writings," but still more the way in which Ben Sirach, who had studied those transmitted writings, determines, according to the preface, also (*καὶ αὐτός*) to make his contribution to the moral improvement of men by composing a treatise, make it evident that this last group had not yet been severed from the religious literature of that present age by the deep gulf of a canonical ordinance. And that this was not only the opinion of the translator, but also that of the author himself, is abundantly proved by the style in which he refers in his treatise (xxiv. 28 ff.) to the inspiring divine wisdom as the source from which he has derived his doctrine. Even if the prophetic spirit were no more operative (§ 4), there still existed the wisdom proceeding "from the mouth of the Most High," making fruitful and inspiring His people, among whom it still always drew to itself all who were hungering after it.

What has been now brought out fully explains why the Hagiographa, in the estimation even of later ages, were regarded as writings of a subordinate rank, as compared with the Law and the Prophets. This is seen conspicuously in the fact, that they were not used, like those others, for the readings of the Sabbath day, and has its origin mainly in the opinions expressed, *e.g.*, in *jer. Sabb.* 16 fol. 15*c*, *Tosephta Sabbath*, 13, p. 128, according to which they were not intended for public

reading, but for Midrashic exposition. Also the designation, "the Law and the Prophets," for the whole canon is thoroughly in accordance with this feeling. Compare § 6 and *Tosephta Baba bathra*, 8. 14, p. 409, 31: "The guardian should purchase for his ward תורה ונביאים"; *jer. Meg.* 3. 1; *Soph^{e}rim*, p. v., passages which are quite correctly explained in the Babylonian Talmud (*Baba bathra* 13*b*), while Grätz (*Koheleth*, p. 150 f.) completely misunderstands their meaning. We naturally find an exception in the case of the Psalms, which were held in high esteem, and were used in the temple service. Even in the LXX. we meet with a superscriptional statement of the Psalms fixed for the several days of the week. See Ps. xxiv., xlviii., xciii., xciv., and compare with Ps. xcii. in the Hebrew. That the five Megilloth were read on the five feasts has been already mentioned in § 2, and in later days it became customary for the High Priest, on the night before the great day of atonement, to read in public from the Books of Chronicles, Job, Ezra, and Daniel.

It might be asked whether the original document used in the Book of Chronicles, the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah, which was in existence as early as B.C. 300, belonged to "the other writings of the Book of Sirach"; but probably this book was even then already supplanted by Chronicles.

6. From the age following that of the Greek translation of Ben Sirach, we find only very slight material for the solution of our problem. In the First Book of Maccabees (vii. 17) a quotation is made from Ps. lxxix. 2, with the solemn formula implying the canonicity of the writing *κατὰ τὸν λόγον, ὃν ἔγραψε*. Similarly, too, Simon ben Shetach, in the first half of the first century before Christ, is said to have quoted Eccles. vii. 12, with a דכתיב (but see further § 8). On the other hand, sources are supplied us abundantly in the generation after Christ. In Philo's work (§ 12) are found citations and references to most of the canonical writings, still with the exception of Ezekiel, Daniel, and the five Megilloth.

This may have been a pure accident, but it is nevertheless of some interest to compare with it the state of matters set forth in § 8. The New Testament thoroughly confirms the results won from Ben Sirach (§§ 4, 5). "Moses of old times hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogue every Sabbath day," Acts xv. 21, and from Luke iv. 17 and Acts xiii. 15 it follows that the same was also true of the prophetical writings. The pre-eminent importance of these two portions of Scripture is seen in this, that the sacred writings were sometimes called simply "the Law and the Prophets" (Matt. v. 17, vii. 12; Luke xvi. 16, xxix. 31; Acts xiii. 15, xxviii. 23; compare § 5), while also the priority of the Law is given expression to in the form of speech referred to above in § 3. As concerns the Hagiographa, quotations are made from a larger number than in the work of Ben Sirach, for (at least if we adopt the prevailing view) references are wanting only to Ezra, Ecclesiastes, The Song, and Esther. Evidence in favour of the threefold division of the canon is afforded by the expression, "the Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms" (Luke xxiv. 44). But the conclusions drawn from this passage in regard to the extent, and particularly the order or arrangement of the Hagiographa, are worthless, for this reason, that the subject dealt with in this passage is the prophetic and symbolic contents of the Old Testament, in which connection the Psalms occupy a pre-eminent position among the Hagiographa. But more important than all this are the names under which the Old Testament is referred to. Designations like *γραφαὶ ἅγιαι, ἱερὰ γράμματα, αἱ γραφαί*, and especially *ἡ γραφή*, and, besides, the well-known solemn formulæ of quotations, put a clear and conscious distinction between holy Scripture and any other sort of literature, and so give ground to the conjecture that the limits, still undetermined in the days of Ben Sirach with reference to the third part of the canon, had meanwhile become more sharply fixed.

On the other hand, it is wrong to seek in the passage, Matt. xxiii. 35, a strict proof for the existence there and then of the canon as we now have it.

The quotation in 1 Macc. vii. 17, seeing that the author wrote after B.C. 105, but before B.C. 70, does not exclude a Maccabean authorship of Ps. lxxix., but, in consequence of the formula used, is not certainly in favour of it.

The above-mentioned quotation of Simon ben Shetach from Ecclesiastes is to be found in *Bereshith* r. c. 91 ; *jer. Berachoth* 7. 2, fol. 11*b* ; *Nazir* 5. 3, fol. 54*b*, and *Koheleth* r. c. 7. 12. To this may be added solemnly introduced quotations from Ecclesiastes from the first half of the first century after Christ, *b. Baba bathra* 4*a* ; *Sabb.* 30*b* ; *Tosephta Berachoth*, ii. 24, p. 5.

On the use of the Old Testament in Philo's writings, see *Observationes ad illustrationem doctrinæ de canone Vet. Test. ex Philone* (Copenhagen 1775), by C. F. Hornemann (scholar of J. D. Michaelis, died as professor in Copenhagen A.D. 1830). In this treatise, however, this fact is overlooked, that Philo once (Mangey i. 525) makes use of a passage from Chronicles (1 Chron. vii. 14). Compare also Siegfried, *Philo als Ausleger d. A. T.* 1875, p. 161. The testimony given in the treatise *De vita contemplativa*, 3, to the tripartite canon may best be left out of account, inasmuch as that work is of doubtful authenticity. See Lucius, *Die Therapeuten*, 1880 ; as also Massebieau, *Le Traité de la vie contemplative et la question des Thérapeutes*, 1888.

It must evidently be regarded as purely accidental that Ezra-Nehemiah, as also the minor prophets, Obadiah, Nahum, and Zephaniah, have not been quoted in the New Testament. On the other hand, one might associate the absence of quotations from the three books of The Song, Ecclesiastes, and Esther with the partly contemporary discussions over those referred to in § 8. Compare Wildeboer, *Het ontstaan*, 44. 128. Nevertheless, this may, on closer examination, be found to be a mere fortuitous coincidence, since Christ and the first Christians, for practical reasons arising from the

circumstances in which they were placed, did not feel themselves called upon to make use of these writings of peculiar contents, whereas the controversies referred to in § 8 were of a purely dogmatic character. When Christ, in Matthew xxiii. 35, speaks of the righteous blood shed from the time of Abel to that of Zacharias (2 Chron. xxiv. 20 f.), a much more than probable conclusion may be drawn from it with regard to the extent and order of the canon of that day. It cannot certainly be treated as a scholarly quotation which must be made accurately to refer to Urija (Jer. xxvi. 23).

7. The result won in the preceding section receives an extremely important confirmation, and the whole question obtains a provisional conclusion by means of two almost contemporary writings at or about the end of the first century after Christ. In the so-called Ezra-Apocalpyse, which, with much probability, has been assigned to the age of the Emperor Domitian, A.D. 81–96, mention is made (xiv. 44–46) of twenty-four writings, viz. 94 — 70, which Ezra wrote out under divine inspiration after they had been utterly lost. Here then we meet with the number twenty-four with which we are familiar from the later Palestinian-Babylonian literature (and, indeed, even from a Baraitha, see §§ 2, 10), as the sum total of the acknowledged writings of the Old Testament. The other witness is the treatise of Flavius Josephus against Apion, in many respects rich in contents and teaching, which must have been written about A.D. 100. In this work (i. 8) it is said that to the sacred and genuine books of the Jews, besides the five books of Moses, there belong also "thirteen prophetical writings" and "four books with hymns and precepts for practical life." This statement of Josephus is remarkable in two ways. In the first place for the number twenty-two (5 + 13 + 4), which, however, in following periods we shall frequently meet with, and then especially for the extremely peculiar threefold division which we do not find

elsewhere, which owing to its indefiniteness has given occasion to various explanations and hypotheses. Thus the Jewish scholar Grätz has sought from this division to draw the conclusion that Josephus did not acknowledge the Books of Ecclesiastes and The Song, since the four books that come last in the list are: Psalms, Lamentations, Proverbs, and Job. But the only right way here is to follow the analogy of the practice prevailing with some, especially Alexandrine writers, and to assume that Josephus treated the Books of Ruth and Lamentations as parts of the Books of Judges and Jeremiah. Among the thirteen prophetical books there had therefore been reckoned the eight books of the prophets (§ 2), Daniel, Job, Chronicles, Ezra, and Esther, while the four books of hymns and practical precepts had embraced Psalms, Proverbs, The Song, and Ecclesiastes. With reference to this it is particularly to be observed how Josephus expresses the idea of canonicity (§ 2): even if the phrase "divine writings" be not genuine, he yet says that only those books can lay claim to our confidence, and that no one has been so bold as either to add anything to them or take anything away from these books transmitted from olden times. And thus, at the end of the first century after Christ, we have undoubted evidence of a clear and conscious conviction of a canonical collection of writings, and unanimity with regard to this canon as it is now known among ourselves.

By way of Appendix, before we pass to the consideration of the contributions made by the Pharisees to the discussions about the canon (§ 8), we may here enumerate some later witnesses to the Jewish Canon, because, although belonging in point of time to the group of authorities referred to in § 8, they afford some supplementary and interesting particulars. We meet in Origen with the number twenty-two as the sum total of the Old Testament writings (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 25), who states expressly that he has taken his list from the Jews.

In it Ruth and Lamentations are introduced only as parts of the Books of Judges and Jeremiah, while the adoption of the Book of Baruch among the canonical books is hardly to be attributed to his Jewish authorities. Similarly, too, Jerome, in his exposition of the Jewish Canon, gives the number of books as twenty-two. In the so-called *Prologus galeatus* (*i.e.* Preface to the Books of Kings the first which he translated) he refers to the genuine Jewish threefold division of the canon into Law, Prophets, and Hagiographa, and, according to this, mentions particularly what books belong to each of these divisions. Of the Book of Judges he says: "Et in eundem compingunt Ruth, quia in diebus judicum facta narratur historia," and similarly he reckons the Lamentations to Jeremiah. But after he has finished this exposition he adds thereto: "Quanquam nonnulli Ruth et Cinoth (Lamentations) inter Hagiographa scriptitent et libros hos in suo putent numero supputandos, ac per hoc esse priscæ legis libros viginti quatuor."

Jerome therefore is acquainted with the Jewish division into twenty-four books, and in the preface to Daniel he keeps expressly to this arrangement, for he says: "Illud admoneo non haberi Danielem apud Hebræos inter prophetas, sed inter eos, qui Hagiographa conscripserunt. In tres siquidem partes omnis Sacra Scriptura ab eis dividitur, in Legem, in Prophetas et in Hagiographa, i. e. in quinque, in octo et undecim libros."

A list of the Old Testament writings which is expressly described as having been borrowed from the Jews, but diverges in important particulars from that list which has been already referred to, is communicated by Melito of Sardis, somewhat after A.D. 150. The writings named by him make altogether twenty-two, but this number he makes up by giving to Ruth an independent place in his enumeration, whereas Esther is altogether wanting. Seeing that Melito does not expressly declare that he is giving the complete number of the writings, it might be supposed that Esther had been

left out in the text before us only in consequence of an error of transcription; but against such an idea it must be remembered that not only was Esther wanting in many of the Church fathers of the following age (§§ 15, 17), but that we knew definitely that an opposition had risen up among the Jews against the canonicity of this book, which held its ground down to the third century (see § 8).

The above quoted passage from the Fourth Book of Ezra is given, *e.g.*, in Hilgenfeld's *Messias Judæorum*, pp. 182, 260, 321, 376, 433. Unfortunately, the Latin text is at this passage uncertain, so that the reference given above rests exclusively on the text of the oriental translations. Nevertheless it is scarcely reasonable to conclude from Epiphanius (*De pond. et mens.* 10) with Bertheau, *Buch d. Richter und Ruth*, 1883, p. 290 ff., that the text had originally read twenty-two instead of twenty-four books.

Josephus, *Contra Apion.* i. 8: *Οὐ γὰρ μυρίαδες βιβλίων εἰσὶ παρ' ἡμῖν, ἀσυμφώνων καὶ μαχομένων· δύο δὲ μόνα πρὸς τοῖς εἴκοσι βιβλία, τοῦ παντὸς ἔχοντα χρόνου τὴν ἀναγραφήν, τὰ δικαίως* [*θεῖα*, unauthentic, according to J. G. Müller] *πεπιστευμένα. Καὶ τούτων πέντε μέν ἐστι τὰ Μωυσέως, ἃ τούς τε νόμους περιέχει . . . . Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς Μωυσέως τελευτῆς μέχρι τῆς Ἀρταξέρξου τοῦ μετὰ Ξέρξην Περσῶν βασιλέως ἀρχῆς οἱ μετὰ Μωυσῆν προφῆται τὰ κατ' αὐτοὺς πραχθέντα συνέγραψαν ἐν τρισὶ καὶ δέκα βιβλίοις· αἱ δὲ λοιπαὶ τέσσαρες ὕμνους εἰς τὸν θεὸν καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὑποθήκας τοῦ βίου περιέχουσιν. Ἀπὸ δὲ Ἀρταξέρξου μέχρι τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνου γέγραπται μὲν ἕκαστα· πίστεως δὲ οὐχ ὁμοίας ἠξίωται τοῖς πρὸ αὐτῶν, διὰ τὸ μὴ γενέσθαι τὴν τῶν προφητῶν ἀκριβῆ διαδοχήν. . . . . τοσούτου γὰρ αἰῶνος ἤδη παρῳχηκότος, οὔτε προσθεῖναί τις οὐδὲν οὔτε ἀφελεῖν αὐτοὺς οὔτε μεταθεῖναι τετόλμηκεν·* Compare, in addition to this, *Antiquities*, x. 2. 2, where it is said: *οὐχ οὗτος μόνος ὁ προφήτης* (Isaiah), *ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλοι δώδεκα τὸν ἀριθμὸν τὸ αὐτὸ ἐποίησαν·* Compare Eichhorn, *Einleitung in d. A. T.*[3] i. 105 ff.; Kuenen, *Onderzoek*, iii. 412 f.; Strack in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*[2], vii. 428; Wildeboer, *Het ontstaan*, p. 42 f.; J. G. Müller, *Des Flavius*

Josephus Schriften gegen den Apion. 1877, p. 99 ff.; Wright, *The Book of Koheleth*, p. 461; Grätz, *Koheleth*, p. 169; *MGWJ*, 1886, p. 83; also Tachauer, *Das Verhältnis von Flavius Josephus zur Bibel und Tradition*, Erlangen 1871.

On Origen, compare his *Opera*, ii. 528, and Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 25: *εἰσὶ δὲ αἱ εἴκοσι δύο βιβλίοι καθ' Ἑβραίους αἵδε*: The five books of Moses (among them *Ἀμμεσφεκωδείμ* for Numbers, *i.e.* חוּמָשׁ פְּקוּדִים, Num. i. 21; *Yoma* vii. 1), Joshua, Judges, and Ruth, *παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐν ἑνὶ Σωφετιμ*, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Isaiah, Jeremiah, *σὺν θρήνοις καὶ τῇ ἐπιστολῇ ἐν ἑνὶ Ἱερεμία*, Daniel, Ezekiel, Job, and Esther. Evidently the omission of the Twelve Minor Prophets is the result of an error of transcription, since otherwise only twenty-one writings would have been enumerated. In Rufinus this book is mentioned after Canticles. On the other hand, the addition of the "Epistle," *i.e.* the Book of Baruch containing the Epistle, is to be explained most simply as an inaccuracy on the part of Origen; for the statement of the *Constitutiones Apostolicæ*, v. 20, that Lamentations and the Book of Baruch were read in public by the Jews on the Day of Atonement, is, when we take into account the silence of the Jewish writings on the subject, too insecure a support on which to build without any other evidence (Wildeboer, *Het ontstaan*, p. 76 f.).

Melito tells in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 26: *ἀνελθὼν οὖν εἰς τὴν ἀνατολὴν, καὶ ἕως τοῦ τόπου γενόμενος ἔνθα ἐκηρύχθη καὶ ἐπράχθη καὶ ἀκριβῶς μαθὼν τὰ τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης βιβλία ὑποτάξας ἐπεμψά σοι.* Then are enumerated the following: five Books of Moses, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, four Books of Kings, Chronicles, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, The Song, Job, Isaiah, Jeremiah (probably along with Lamentations), the Twelve, Daniel, Ezekiel, and Ezra. Compare Wildeboer, *Het ontstaan*, p. 73 f.

The original relation between the numbers twenty-two and twenty-four is still obscure. The latter numbering, indeed, may be regarded as the older, because it can be more easily explained how Ruth was reckoned to Judges and Lamentations (on the presupposition of its authorship by Jeremiah) to

Jeremiah, than how they should have been removed from their original place among the prophets. It is quite uncertain, however, whether in fixing this number they may have been influenced by the idea of making the number of the books equal to the number of the Hebrew letters. Origen and Jerome, indeed, lay stress upon this correspondence, but this may also have been a later play of the imagination, quite after the style of another enumeration referred to by Epiphanius (*De pond. et mens.* 22) and Jerome (*Prologus galeatus*) of twenty-seven books (= the 22 letters of the alphabet and the 5 final letters), in making out which the Alexandrine double reckoning of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, and Ezra was used, while Lamentations was counted as a separate book. Although the combining of Ruth and Lamentations with Judges and Jeremiah in the LXX. and by the Alexandrians was prevalent, yet the number can scarcely have been determined by them, because they generally did not respect the Palestinian Canon (§ 12). Compare Kuenen, *Onderzoek*, iii. 447 f.; Bleek, *Einleitung*, iv. 204. 552; Bertheau, *Richter und Ruth*, 1883, p. 290 ff.; Strack in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie* [2], vii. 434; Wildeboer, *Het ontstaan*, 108. 134 f.

8. The witnesses referred to in the preceding sections indicate in general outline the movement with which we are concerned. A more profound disclosure is made to us by means of a series of very interesting passages in the older Jewish literature, which, however, suffer from the usual absence of historical reminiscences in this literature, from indefiniteness and one-sided incompleteness, and therefore have been used by moderns in various ways and with varied results.

As already stated in § 6, solemnly made quotations of various verses from Ecclesiastes have come down from the last century before Christ and the first century after Christ. But even in the pre-Philonic age the author of the Wisdom of Solomon expresses himself (ii. 1–9) in a way in which one cannot fail to perceive an unconcealed polemic against Ecclesiastes. And shortly after the middle of the first century

after Christ an opposition seems to have arisen in Palestine against the canonicity of that book, an opposition which, however, extended also to other biblical books, and is consequently of greater interest for the history of the canon. Thus it is reported that the followers of Hillel and Shammai differed with respect to the canonicity of the Book of Ecclesiastes, the Hillelites recognising it as canonical, while the strict Shammaites rejected it. Further, we learn that Ezekiel gave offence, so that some wished to pronounce the book apocryphal. However, Hillel and Chananiah, son of Hezekiah, contemporary of the elder Gamaliel, succeeded in setting aside these objections by means of a laborious interpretation, by which the opposition to this prophet was for ever silenced. On the other hand, there was, so far as we can see, no decision arrived at with respect to the Book of Ecclesiastes prior to the fall of Jerusalem, and the same was also the case with respect to some other writings whose canonicity had been attacked, of which we may name Canticles. It was not until about A.D. 90 that the whole question was brought up for discussion before a Synod at Jabne (Jamnia, a city not far from the coast, south of Jaffa), the very one at which Gamaliel II. was deprived of his office of patriarch. At that Synod the canonicity of the whole of the sacred writings was acknowledged. Special emphasis was laid upon the affirmation of the canonicity, not only of Ecclesiastes but also of Canticles, which affords clear evidence of the existence of an opposition against that book. In a similar manner, too, various passages in the Babylonian Talmud show that there must have been ascribed to the Books of Ruth and Esther and (whether in the same way ?) Proverbs, what necessitates the adoption of the same conclusions with reference to these writings. Meanwhile the decree issued for Jabne did not altogether silence the doubts, as we opportunely learn from the procedure of several teachers labouring during the first

half of the second century after Christ. Indeed, the recollection of what was actually determined on at Jamnia was not preserved in an accurate form, so that it gave rise to several diverse statements. A more important effect was produced by the circumstance that the Mishna, collected and edited about A.D. 190, maintained the unrestricted canonicity of all the twenty-four writings, among the rest also Ecclesiastes and The Song, which were specially named. But even after this time the criticism of the canon was not wholly silenced, for we learn from the Babylonian Talmud that a scholar living in the third century denied the canonicity of the Book of Esther.

In the *disjecta membra* here collected together, some now wish to find a historical reminiscence of the final closing of the hitherto open third part of the Old Testament writings, according to which the canonising of the Hagiographa would stand out in the full light of history. A more exact consideration of the fact, however, goes decidedly against this view, and leads us rather to assume that the third part of the canon had been even then already closed, although we know as little about the way in which this closing was accomplished as we do about the closing of the canon of the Prophets (§ 4). Above all, we should take into consideration these Talmudical reports only in connection with the witnesses referred to in sections 6 and 7, especially with the clear passage in the *Apology* of Josephus. Now, indeed, we cannot possibly assume that the representation which Josephus, residing in Rome shortly after the Synod of Jamnia, gives of the contents and idea of the canon must have been influenced by the decisions of the Synod. But seeing that a Synod at Jerusalem in A.D. 65, coming to a decision regarding the canon, is nothing more than an audacious fancy of Grätz, it is highly probable that Josephus in his *Apology* reported simply the teaching of the Pharisees of his times, to whom he attached himself in A.D. 56. Therefore there

existed then the firm, carefully-weighed idea of a concluded canon, and consequently such a canon itself, a result which would be established even although two of the twenty-four Old Testament writings may have been wanting in the Scripture collection of Josephus. See above, p. 18. The statements quoted from the Talmud and Midrash also best agree with this explanation. In the first place, they show negatively that such attacks upon biblical books do not exclude the idea of an earlier established canon, for indeed criticism of the several writings of the Old Testament were never altogether silenced after the Synod of Jamnia, nor even after the decision given in the Mishna. Further, the very attacks referred to, when more exactly considered, presuppose a Scripture canon. There is no dispute about the genuineness or age of the controverted writings, but only about doubts and objections which had been called forth by a definitely developed, dogmatic principle of Scripture, for it was felt that the idea of a "Scripture" precisely defined and marked off from all other literature, involved the postulating of certain requirements of harmonious unity and religious-moral purity in that Scripture. Indeed, Josephus, in the passage referred to, boasts of this, that the sacred literature of the Jews did not consist like that of the other nations of *ἀσύμφωνα καὶ μαχόμενα βιβλία*. And just that objection, which in those times was taken to the writings referred to, and which obliged the vindicator of them to enter into all sorts of minute explanations, which were finally approved by all Jews, is the most striking proof of the fact that it was very strongly felt to be a duty to take up the cause of the books objected to, which can be explained only on the presupposition that has been suggested. It also deserves consideration that the term נגנ is used only of the writings whose canonicity was contested, and not, *e.g.*, of Ben Sirach, although that book was much read, and was quoted by some scholars (§ 12), which could

scarcely be accounted for, if, *e.g.*, Ecclesiastes as well as Ben Sirach had been placed "outside the door." Finally, in spite of all the objections advanced, a bright light is shed upon the whole question by the fact that not only writings from the third part but also a prophetical book from the canon of the Prophets, that had long previously been closed (§ 4), was threatened with exclusion from the canon; for the recent attempts to make out a distinction between the opposition to Ezekiel and the opposition to the Hagiographa have all failed to stand examination. For the rest, Geiger is quite right when he describes all these discussions as scholastic controversies which affected public opinion in a very slight degree. On the other hand, there is no ground for entertaining any doubt as to the credibility of the traditions referred to; there is about them, indeed, too much verisimilitude to admit of their being overthrown by the easily explained attempt of a Rabbi Akiba to deny the whole thing.

The result is therefore this, that even the third part of the Old Testament writings, which in the time of Ben Sirach was as yet without firmly determined limits, had its canon finally closed even before the time of Christ, although we know nothing as to how or by whom this was accomplished; enough that the canon and the clear idea of the canon were there, and formed the basis of a definite dogmatic theory of the sacred writings (compare § 9). But just this dogmatic theory called forth various doubts and objections with reference to particular books, which made a revision of the canon necessary. This revision was made at Jamnia, and was afterwards confirmed in the Mishna. Its result was the establishment of all previously canonised books.

That this revision was carried out somewhere about the end of the first century after Christ is certainly no accidental circumstance, but is closely connected with the completely altered circumstances of Jewish social life. The state of

matters at that time was this: the capital and the temple lay in ruins, and the Rabbinical college upon which the holding together of Judaism depended were obliged to seek refuge outside of the Holy City. Then the "Scripture" and the study of Scripture became even more than formerly the world in which Judaism continued to maintain its life; "the Pharisees, who had lost their material fatherland, fled back into their spiritual fatherland; on it they spent all their care and it brought them comfort amid all their misfortunes" (Derenbourg). There was also added to this the conflict with the powerfully advancing Christianity, which demanded the firm establishment of everything belonging to Scripture, and the setting aside of all hesitation on this point. The Old Testament writings were in an ever-increasing degree the armoury from which was obtained, in the struggle that broke out, weapons of attack and defence, and this demanded, especially in view of the peculiar constitution of the Jewish mind, that the Bible itself should stand forth firm and unassailable. In the closest connection with this, as we shall subsequently see (§ 99), stood also the fact that the Jewish teachers at this very time were labouring to secure a definite standard text for Holy Scripture.

Compare upon these questions: Delitzsch in *ŻLT*, 1854, p. 280 ff.; Kuenen, *Onderzoek*, iii. 415, 421; Bleek, *Einleitung*, iv. 551 f.; Wildeboer, *Het ontstaan*, p. 82 ff.; Cheyne, *Job and Solomon*, p. 280 f.; Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 398 f.; *Jüd. Zeitsch.* 1862, p. 151, 1870, p. 135 ff.; Grätz, *Koheleth*, pp. 159–173; and *MGWJ*, 1871, p. 502 ff., 1882, p. 117, 1886, p. 597.

M. Jadaim 3. 5: "All sacred writings defile the hands (§ 2); even The Song and Ecclesiastes defile them!" [This the decision, now the discussion.] Rabbi Judah [Ben Ilaï, see Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums*, ii. 86] said: "The Song defiles the hands, but this is disputed in regard to Ecclesiastes." R. Jose [Jost, ii. 85] said: "Ecclesiastes does not defile the

hands, and this is disputed with regard to the Song." R. Simeon [Ben Jochai, Jost, ii. 90] said: "The treatment of Ecclesiastes is one of those points in which the school of Shammai was milder than the school of Hillel" [which declared that the book defiled the hands, *i.e.* was canonical]. R. Simeon ben Azai [Jost, ii. 97] said: "I have heard from the seventy-two elders on the day when they gave to R. Eleazar the presidency of the academy [*i.e.* at the Synod of Jabne, see Derenbourg, *Essai sur l'histoire et la géographie de la Palestine*, i. 1867, p. 273; Jost, ii. 28 ff.; Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, iv. 38 ff.], that The Song and Ecclesiastes defile the hands. R. Akiba [Grätz, *MGWJ*, 1870, p. 484, reads R. Jacob instead of Akiba] said: "God forbid that any one in Israel should doubt that The Song defiles the hands; the whole world does not outweigh the day in which Israel received The Song. All the Hagiographa are holy, but The Song is the holiest of all. If they have been contested [!] it was with reference to Ecclesiastes." But R. Johanan ben Jeshua, R. Akiba's brother-in-law, said: "As R. Simeon ben Azai has laid it down, so they disputed and so they decided!" This same tradition is given in *b. Meg.* 7*a*, where, instead of R. Judah ben Ilaï, R. Jose, and instead of R. Jose, R. Meïr are named. To R. Simeon's report about the Hillelites and Shammaites this addition is made: "On the other hand, Ruth, The Song, and Esther defile the hands." Finally, there is then communicated a Baraitha of R. Simeon ben Menasja: "Ecclesiastes does not defile the hands, because it was done in Solomon's own wisdom"; but this affirmation is contradicted by the fact that Solomon, who was the author of other inspired writings, could not in that case have said (Prov. xxx. 6): "Add then not to God's words lest He reprove thee."

On Ecclesiastes compare further *b. Sabb.* 30*ab*; *Koheleth* r. on i. 3 and ii. 8; and Jerome on Eccles. xii. 14: "Ajunt Hebræi, quum inter cetera scripta Salomonis, quæ antiquata sunt nec in memoria duraverunt, et hic liber obliterandus videretur, eo quod vanas assereret Dei creaturas et totum putaret esse pro nihilo, et cibum et potum et delicias transeuntes præferret omnibus, ex hoc uno capitulo meruisse autoritatem, ut in divinorum

voluminum numero poneretur, quod totam disputationem suam et omnem catalogum hae quasi ἀνακεφαλαιώσει coarctaverit et dixerit finem sermonem suorum auditu esse promtissimum nec aliquid in se habere difficile: ut scil. Deum timeamus et ejus præcepta faciamus."

b. Sabb. 30*b*: "Some also wish to remove the Book of Proverbs from the canon (גנז) because it contains contradictory sayings [of which xxvi. 4, 5 is quoted as an example]; but if it were not accomplished, it was because people said: "We have thoroughly examined the Book of Ecclesiastes, and have found a solution for its contradictions, and we shall also examine this book more carefully." Against the attempt of Grätz to prove the incredibility of this tradition, see Schiffer, *Das Buch Koheleth*, p. 95 f.

The Aboth of Rabbi Nathan (a post-Talmudic tract, see Schürer, *Geschichte*, i. 106 f., Eng. trans. Div. i. vol. i. p. 143), c. 1, according to the common recension (the others are given in Schechter, *Aboth of Rabbi Nathan*, Vienna 1887; compare Wright, *The Book of Koheleth in relation to Modern Criticism*, 1883, p. 466): "At first Proverbs, Canticles, and Ecclesiastes were pronounced apocryphal, because they contained symbolical expressions; this lasted until the men of the great synagogue arose (§ 9) and discovered a solution." As examples of offensive passages, Prov. vii. 7–20, Cant. vii. 12 f., and Eccles. xi. 9 are referred to.

b Sabb. 13*b*; *Chag.* 13*a*; *Menachoth* 45*a*: "Hananiah ben Hezekiah [see about this man, living in the time of Hillel and Gamaliel the elder, Grätz, *Geschichte des Juden*, iii. 499] is of blessed memory, for but for him Ezekiel would have been declared apocryphal, because his words contradicted the words of the Law; three hundred jars of lamp oil were brought to him, and he sat in his garret and solved the contradictions." The grounds upon which some would make out the inconsistency of this criticism of the canon with that set forth in other passages are very weak. Grätz (*Koheleth*, p. 161) calls the opposition to Ezekiel simply "casual." The tradition is met with only in the Babylonian Talmud (Bleek, *Einleitung*, iv. 551), but rests upon a Baraitha. And naturally just a little is proved

by the circumstance that the contesters of the canonicity are unnamed (Wildeboer, *Het ontstaan*, p. 66), for this applies also to Proverbs; or by the fact that the canonicity of Ezekiel had been conserved even before the Synod of Jamnia (Wildeboer, p. 60).

Finally, on Esther compare *b. Meg.* 7*a*: "According to R. Judah, Samuel said [Jost, ii. 135 ff.]: Esther does not defile the hands! Could Samuel have meant by this that the Book of Esther was not the work of the Holy Spirit? No; he meant it was produced indeed by the Holy Spirit, but only for reading, not as Holy Scripture." As proof of the inspiration of the book, vi. 6 is quoted: "Haman thought in his heart," which no man without divine revelation could know. That the theory of Samuel did not affect the accepted interpretation (Wildeboer, *Het ontstaan*, p. 64 f.) is a possible, but not a necessary, assumption. Compare further *b. Sanh.* 100*a*, according to which certain teachers declared that wrappings for the Esther rolls were unnecessary. On the other hand, *jer Megilla* 70. 4 is uncertain; see Bertheau-Ryssel, *Esra, Nehemia, and Ester*, p. 368.

The hypothesis of Grätz, above referred to, of two synods at Jerusalem in A.D. 65 and at Jamnia in A.D. 90, at which the canon of the Hagiographa is said to have been settled, rests upon two altogether untenable presuppositions. In the first place, it is false that by the "sacred writings" of *M. Jadaim* 3. 5 are meant only the Hagiographa. See particularly Schiffer, *Das Buch Koheleth*, p. 80 ff. And, in the second place, there is no vestige of proof that the question of the canon had engaged attention just before the overthrow of Jerusalem in "The Garret of Chananiah ben Hezekiah." Only the prohibition against laying the Torah rolls beside the grain devoted and received for the heave-offering (§ 2), belongs to the eighteenth Halachoth sanctioned in "The Garret of Chananiah; all else is pure fancy."

Those modern writers are certainly wrong who seek to maintain that other writings were also the subject of attack. Thus Kohler, in reference to the Book of Chronicles (see Geiger's *Jüd. Zeitschr.* 1870, p. 135 ff.). For when it is said,

for example, in Lev. r. 1 (fol. 165*b*), that the Book of Chronicles was given only to be expounded in Midrashim, this means nothing more than what is true of all the Hagiographa (§ 5). Fürst (*Kanon*, p. 54) regards Num. r. 18, fol. 271*d*, as proving that the Book of Jonah had sometimes been called in question. But evidently it is merely a play upon numbers, when Jonah is here characterised as a "writing by itself" (which his prophecy, moreover, in many respects actually is, compare Wildeboer, *Het ontstaan*, pp. 60–62), in order thereby to bring out the required number eleven. Precisely similar, too, is the position sometimes taken up by the Rabbinists (as, *e.g. b. Sabb.* 116*a*, etc.), where they classify Num. x. 35 f. as a book by itself, and so reckon seven books of the Law.

9. The actual facts of history to which the unfortunately too rare witnesses made use of in the preceding sections point, have often necessitated the setting aside of conceptions at which men had arrived in a half *a priori* way from accepted theories, the presupposition of which, as a rule, was that the Old Testament canon must have been collected by a single authoritative act, which had most likely taken place at an early period. Those various notions all originated among the Jews, and in part were carried from them to the Christians, by whom they were maintained often with passionate persistency, which certainly was not justified by their origin. We meet with two of these theories even in those writings belonging to the end of the first Christian century, referred to in § 7. In the centre of the Church fathers (*e.g.* in Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* iii. 21. 2; Tertullian, *De cultu feminarum*, i. 3), we often meet with a description of the origin of the Old Testament Canon, which rests upont he passage quoted in § 7 from the Apocalypse of Ezra, according to which Ezra, by means of divine inspiration, wrote out all the Old Testament books after they had been completely lost in the destruction of Jerusalem, and, in consequence, gave authority to the Old Testament Canon. Not quite so devoid of historical basis is the theory

proposed by Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, i. 8. According to him the prophets formed an unbroken series down to the time of the Persian king Artaxerxes, B.C. 464–424. The writings which had their origin before or during that period are genuine, because the prophets have themselves written in them what occurred during their own lives. That is the theory of the origin of the Old Testament historical books, which some have sought wrongly to ascribe to the author of the Book of Chronicles (§ 4), and which has now become current. There are indeed events recorded which occurred after the time of Artaxerxes Longimanus, but *πίστεως οὐχ ὁμοίας ἠξίωται τοῖς πρὸ αὐτῶν, διὰ τὸ μὴ γενέσθαι τὴν τῶν προφητῶν ἀκριβῆ διαδοχήν* [They have not been esteemed of the same authority with the former, because there has not been an exact succession of the prophets since that time]. Naturally all this applies primarily to the thirteen historical books (§ 7), but the four books of hymns and practical precepts Josephus regarded as indisputably still older, and consequently he may probably have considered the closing of the canon as also belonging to that age. Precisely the same thing is also found in the old rabbinical writings, where the period after the cessation of prophecy is indicated by the phrase מכאן ואילך; the writings originating during this period are not canonical, although the reading of them is still partially tolerated (§ 2).

Of greater importance was the third theory which the Christians in the sixteenth century borrowed from the Jews, and which soon lost its hypothetical character, and was set forth by men like Hottinger and Carpzow as incontestable truth. In the ancient Jewish literature there is often mention made of an assembly called כְּנֶסֶת הַגְּדוֹלָה, "the great assembly or synagogue," which is associated with Ezra and Nehemiah. Of the various labours which have been ascribed to this assembly, some refer to the Old Testament writings. Thus, it is said in a well-known passage (*b. Baba bathra* 14*a*), that the men of the

great synagogue "wrote the Book of Ezekiel, the Twelve Minor Prophets, Daniel, and Esther. According to Tanchuma (a Midrashic work on the whole of the Pentateuch) on Exod. xv. 7, the so-called *Tikkune Soph'rim*, § 34, also owe their origin to them. According to *Aboth derabbi Nathan*, c. i., it was they who saved the canonicity of Ecclesiastes and The Song (§ 8), etc. Some hints which are found in the works of rabbis of the Middle Ages, such as David Kimchi, were emphatically given expression to by Elias Levita, who died A.D. 1549, in the third preface to the *Massoreth Hamassoreth* (§ 31), as meaning that the sacred writings, which had not previously been bound up in one whole, were brought together by the men of the great synagogue, and arranged in the three well-known divisions. This hypothesis was taken up with great enthusiasm, and found very general acceptance among Protestant theologians, with whom it retained favour down to the most recent times. It owes its prevalence during so long a period almost wholly to the fact that it was just as difficult to disprove as to prove the significance of the great synagogue for the formation of the Old Testament Canon, so long as the true character of that synagogue and the duration of its activity still remained quite indefinite and indistinct. It was only after the historical data scattered throughout the Talmudical literature had been subjected to careful investigation, and, above all, after the appearance of Kuenen's masterly treatise *On the Men of the Great Synagogue*, that light was at last shed upon this question; but the result of these researches has been once and for all to set aside the idea that that assembly was of any importance for the forming of the Old Testament Canon. "The Great Synagogue," in which even modern Jewish and Christian authors are still seeing a great variety of things, is, according to the convincing evidence led by Kuenen, nothing more than an idealisation of the great popular assembly which Ezra and Nehemiah called together

(Neh. viii.–x.), and which was certainly of great importance in the way of introducing the canon of the Law as the basis of the national life of the Jews (§ 3). The uncommon length of the legislative period which has been assigned to this "synagogue" in the Talmudical writings, namely, from Ezra down to Alexander the Great, is a simple consequence of the fact that this whole period was pressed together in Talmudical reckoning into thirty-four years. Hence it cannot be supposed that the idea was ever entertained of connecting the great synagogue with what is properly regarded as the formation of the prophetical canon (§ 4).

In conclusion, we must briefly call attention to the fact, that what has been the dominant theory down even to recent times, namely, the idea that the canon was formed by a single act effected at one particular period, has carried with it the most artificial and most abstract explanations of the principle of the tripartite division of the Old Testament. Even the mediæval Jews sought to establish various degrees of inspiration, which Christian theologians partly modified and partly blended with other no less unhistorical and unsatisfactory theories. Specially, therefore, because it has carried with it the abolition of all these false theories, the correct account of the way in which the Old Testament collection of Scripture was brought into its present state is to be regarded as a veritable benefit.

Tertullian, *De cultu feminarum*, i. 3: "Quemadmodum et Hierosolymis Babylonia expugnatione deletis omne instrumentum Judaicæ literaturæ per Esdram constat restauratum." Compare Strack in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*[2], vii. 415.

Josephus was led to fix upon the reign of Artaxerxes I. as the limit of the age of the prophets, not by the Book of Malachi (Keil, *Einleitung*, § 154, Eng. trans. ii. 137 ff.), but by the Book of Esther, which he considered the last book of the Bible, and whose אחשורוש he falsely identified with

Artaxerxes Longimanus. With this whole theory the narrative of the prophetic gifts of John Hyrcanus (*Wars of the Jews*, i. 2. 8) is certainly not in accord. In a treatise in *MGWJ*, 1886, p. 281 ff., Grätz has called attention to the closely-related view set forth in *Seder Olam*. It is said there (p. 90 in Meyer's edition of 1706), with reference to the age of Alexander the Great, described prophetically in the Book of Daniel: "Down to this time, עד כאן, the prophets have prophesied by the Holy Spirit; from that time מיכן ואילך have wrought only the wise." With this agrees also *Tosephta Jadaim*, ii. 13, p. 683: "All books, which מכאן ואילך, *i.e.* after the silencing of prophecy, do not defile the hands," and the passage *jer. Sanh.* 28*a*, which has been quoted above at § 2.

Kimchi speaks, in the introduction to his *Commentary on Chronicles* (*Sefer qehilat Mosche*, iv. fol. 377*a*), of the division of the post-exilian prophets in the arrangement of the sacred writings. Elias Levita (compare on him: *Saat auf Hoffnung*, iii., in the first and fourth numbers; *ZDMG*, xliii. p. 206 ff.) says (*The Massoreth Hamassoreth*, ed. Ginsburg, p. 120): "The twenty-four books were even then not gathered together; but Ezra and the men of the great synagogue collected them, and divided them into three parts; and they arranged the Prophets with Hagiographa, but otherwise there are teachers in *b. Baba bathra* 14."

Hottinger, *Thesaurus philol.* i. 2, quæst. 1 (ed. 1696, p. 111): "In concussum hactenus et tam apud Christianos, quibus non pro cerebro fungus est, quam Judæos *ἀναμφίσβητον* fuit principium, simul et semel Canonem V. T. autoritate prorsus divina constitutum esse ab Esdra et viris Synagogæ Magnæ. Similarly Carpzow, *Introductio*, i. c. 2, § 1, and Keil, *Einleitung*, § 154, Eng. trans. ii. 137 ff.

On "the Great Synagogue," see Morinus, *Exercitationes biblicæ*, p. 279 f.; Rau, *Diatribe de synagoge magna*, 1726; and especially Kuenen in *Verslagen en mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wet.* (*Abt. Letterkunde*), 2nd series, 6th part, 1877, p. 207 ff.; Wildeboer, *Het onstaan*, p. 121 ff.; Robertson Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, pp. 156 f., 408 f., against Grätz (*Koheleth*, p. 155 f.), Geiger (*Urschrift*,

p. 124), and Wright (*Kohelcth*, 1883, pp. 6 ff., 475 ff.). Kuenen proves that all the characteristic features which the Talmudical writings attribute to the great synagogue have been drawn from the narrative of Neh. viii.–x. Of special importance in connection with the earlier theory was the passage in *Pirke Aboth*, i. 2, according to which Simon the Just, whom the Talmud makes contemporary with Alexander the Great, but who in reality lived at a yet later period, is said to have been one of the last members of the great synagogue. But this statement overlooked the fact that the period between the rebuilding of the temple and the overthrow of the Persian empire had been compressed, in the Talmudical record of it, into the space of thirty-four years (*b. Aboda zara* 9*a*, *Seder Olam*, p. 91), so that to the Jews it seemed quite a probable thing that one of the famous scribes of Alexander's time should also have been a member of the great assembly of Ezra. How the Jews came to fix upon this period of thirty-four years is not quite clear. Compare the various reckonings in Grätz, *MGWJ*, 1886, p. 293 ff., and Loeb, *REJ*, xix. 202 ff.

The mediæval Jews sought to explain the threefold division of the canon by the hypothesis of three different degrees of inspiration. So, for example, Maimonides, *More Nebuchim*, ii. 45; Kimchi, in the preface to his *Commentary on the Psalms*. But the distinction proposed by them between רוח נבואה and רוח הקדש is one altogether foreign to the Old Testament. Herm Witsius (*Miscel. Sacr.* libri iv. 1736, i. 12), whom Hengstenberg (*Beiträg ezur Einleitung in d. A. T.* i. 23 ff.) follows, distinguishes between *Munus propheticum* and *Donum propheticum*, in order to explain how Daniel came to be placed among the Hagiographa. But this distinction is shattered irretrievably over Amos vii. 14, where Amos repudiates the idea that he is a possessor of the *Munus propheticum*. Compare also the far less clear attempts to mark a distinction in Keil's *Einleitung*, § 155, Eng. trans. ii. 149 f. How completely foreign all such notions are to the spirit of antiquity is strikingly seen from the theory of Josephus above referred to, and from the Talmudical passages, where the authors of the

Hagiographa are spoken of as "prophets." See, for example, *b. Berachoth* 13*a*, and above at § 2.

10. In opposition to the Alexandrines (§ 12) the Palestinians from the beginning held firmly by the tripartite division of the Old Testament writings as a deduction from the history of the origin of the canon. Within the range of these three parts, on the other hand, there was originally no definite order of succession for the several writings, excepting only in the case of the Law and of the *Prophetæ Priores*, where naturally the order of the books has been almost always the same. It was only when the Old Testament writings began to be written out in one roll or in one volume that attention was given to the order in succession of the books. But this first occurred in the times after Christ. From the Talmud (*b. Baba bathra* 13*b*) we learn that even in the first and second centuries there still prevailed a doubt as to whether it were allowable to write several books in one volume, and that this custom came to be generally adopted only after it had obtained rabbinical sanction about A.D. 200. The immediate consequence of the practice of writing each book in a separate volume was that in later times we meet with various arrangements of the several books, especially in the confused and indeterminate collection of the Hagiographa.

In the second part of the canon, as we have already remarked, the order of the historical books was at once fixed. At the most, an alteration was made there only when the Book of Ruth had a place given it after the Book of Judges (§ 7). On the other hand, in the often quoted passage of *Baba bathra* 14, we find Isaiah placed after Ezekiel; and we meet with the same order again in several German and French manuscripts, in the first edition of this Midrashic compilation *Yalkut shimoni*, which is said to have been composed in the thirteenth century, and in the enumeration list of the Massoretic work *Ochla weochla* (§ 32). The motive of this trans-

position is no longer apparent. Although many modern scholars think that they see in it a proof that even then the Tannaites had a correct conception of the partly exilic origin of the prophecies ascribed to Isaiah, this is nevertheless extremely improbable. In view of the passage Ben Sirach xlviii. 24 f., where Isa. xl. ff. is expressly attributed to the old Isaiah, such a view cannot be styled an ancient tradition, especially when we consider, what has already been said, that the prophetic writings were not from the beginning written out in one volume; and to think of an actual historical criticism during the Talmudical period is to make altogether too great an assumption. The most probable thing is, that the many points of contact between Jeremiah and the last chapters of the Books of Kings led to the placing of these writings in juxtaposition, while Isaiah was placed in front of the twelve prophets, because he was contemporary with Hosea (compare Isa. i. with Hosea i.). With Jerome (§ 37), as well as with Origen, Isaiah receives the first place in accordance with the chronological order, and this arrangement was subsequently followed in the Spanish manuscripts, as also in the oldest manuscript known to us, the Codex of the Prophets, described under § 32. It is worthy of remark that the Twelve Minor Prophets, which, even so early as in the first century after Christ, were reckoned as one book, are arranged in the LXX. in an order different from that of the Hebrew Bibles, namely, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi.

The order of the Hagiographa is, according to *b. Baba bathra* 1. 1: Ruth, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, The Song, Lamentations, Daniel, Esther, Ezra, and Chronicles. In this case, also, we cannot accept the idea of some modern scholars who would find in the position of the Book of Chronicles a proof that this book had been received into the canon at a later date than the Book of Ezra. Certainly in this we have

assumptions made that have little to do with criticism. Jerome, on the other hand, certainly on chronological grounds, gives the first place to Job; then follow Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, The Song, Daniel, Chronicles, Ezra, Esther, while Ruth and Lamentations are included among the Prophets. The arrangement given in *Baba bathra*, which, according to a Massoretic work of A.D. 1207 (in the Tchufutkale collection), seems to have been that of the Babylonian Jews, is at least in part adopted in several manuscripts. Compare also the order of succession in *Ochla wochla* Nr. 111, 112, 127. The Massoretic work above referred to gives the following as the Palestinian arrangement: Chronicles, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ruth, The Song, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, Esther, Daniel, Ezra. This order was the prevalent one among the Massoretes, and is therefore to be met with in a variety of Spanish manuscripts and others, even in a Bible of A.D. 1009. In this arrangement the writings of Solomon are no longer placed together, while the five Megilloth are, but not in the order of the parts to which they belong (Passover—The Song; the Feast of the Weeks or Pentecost—Ruth; the Destruction of Jerusalem in the Month Ab—Lamentations; the Feast of Tabernacles—Ecclesiastes; and Purim—Esther). Only the German manuscripts, according to the statements of Elias Levita, allowed their arrangement to be determined by the succession of the parts, for they placed the five Megilloth together in the midst of the Hagiographa, after Psalms, Proverbs, and Job, and before Daniel, Ezra, and Chronicles, and this arrangement has finally became the prevalent one in the printed editions.

Compare the solid and thorough work of Marx (Dalman), *Traditio rabbinorum veterrima de librorum V. T. ordine atque origine*, Leipsic 1844. Elias Levita, *Massoreth hammasoreth*, ed. Ginsburg, p. 120 f., compare Bacher in *ZDMG*, xliii. pp. 208, 236 f.; H. Hody, *De Bibliorum textibus origin-*

alibus 1705, pp. 644–664; Strack in *ZLT*, 1875, p. 604 f., and in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*, vii. 441 f.; Joel Müller, *Massceketh Soph'rim*, p. 44 f. On the Prophets also, Derenbourg in the *Journal Asiat.* 1870, xvi. 443 f. Quite unsupported is the statement of Fürst (*Kanon*, p. 15 ff.), that the original text of *Baba bathra* gives: Isaiah i., Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah ii.

Baba bathra 13*b*: Our teachers declared it permissible to have the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa bound together in one volume. So taught R. Meir (in the second century), whereas R. Judah (ben Ilaï) maintained: the Law by itself, the Prophets by themselves, the Hagiographa by themselves. Some have even given the opinion that each writing should be by itself. R. Judah reported: "Boethus ben Zonia had the eight books of the Prophets in one volume, which Eleazar ben Azariah (in the end of the first century) approved; yet others said that this was wrong." Rabbi (R. Judah, the editor of the Mishna) said: "There was brought us one volume containing the Torah, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa, and we sanctioned it." Compare *jer. Meg.* 3. 1, fol. 73*d*, and *Massceketh Soph'rim*, p. v. Only separate rolls were used for reading in the synagogues. Compare Esther, *b. Meg.* 19*a*. The rolls were wrapped up in cloths and placed in a case (תיקא, *θήκη*), and so were preserved in the book chest of the Synagogue. Compare the remark of Tertullian (*De cultu feminarum*, i. 3) about the book of Enoch, *nec in armarium judaicum admittitur.*

11. The community of the Samaritans, who otherwise imitated the Jews in all matters, had a canon differing from that of the Palestinian Jews. The sacred writings of the Samaritans consisted only of the five books of the Law, wanting all the prophetic writings and all accounts of the fortunes of the Israelites in post-Mosaic times. On the other hand, they possessed outside of the canon an independent reproduction of the Book of Joshua, which formed the beginning of a chronicle which was carried down to the period

of the Roman empire. Evidently it was the often violently denunciatory expressions against the Ephraimites in the historical and prophetical writings that deterred the Samaritans from receiving the two last divisions of the Jewish Canon. But the whole phenomenon is explicable only on the supposition that the Law at the time of its adoption by the Samaritans was, even among the Jews, the only sacred writing, and no mere third part of an indissoluble whole. Had the Jewish Canon, as has been often subsequently maintained, owed its origin to a sudden single act, the authorising on the part of the Samaritans of a single division of it can scarcely be explained, whereas one can easily understand that they did not feel obliged to adopt writings subsequently pronounced canonical and in part anti-Ephraimitic. Unfortunately we possess no tradition of the time at which the Samaritans received the Law. Still it can scarcely be doubted by those who assume no essential recasting of the Pentateuch in the times after Ezra, that this adoption of the Law had already taken place before the institution of the Samaritan community and of the worship on Gerizim. Josephus indeed gives an account of this occurrence (*Antiquities*, xi. 7. 2 ; 8. 2-4), but evidently his chronology is at fault. Partly on internal grounds, partly by a comparison with Neh. xiii. 28, it can be clearly shown that the period fixed upon by him, the age of Alexander the Great, is too late by about a hundred years, for the occurrence referred must have taken place shortly after the time of Nehemiah's activity.

The idea entertained by certain Church fathers, such as Tertullian, Origen, and Jerome, that the Sadducees had to do with the forming of the canon of the Samaritans, certainly rests upon a misunderstanding. The erroneousness of this statement, as well as of that of later writers which substitutes the Karaites for the Sadducees, has been made evident by the clearer information obtained in recent times about the origin

and history of the sect of the Sadducees.—The relation of the Essenes to the canon is not so clear. Notwithstanding their great reverence for the Law, which was read every Sabbath in their assemblies (Philo, *ed.* Mangey, ii. 458), they still had, according to Josephus (*Wars of the Jews*, ii. 8. 7), their own special writings, which they preserved with no little care. All recent attempts to discover these writings among the apocryphal books known to us have, up to the present time, proved unsuccessful.

On the Samaritan Canon compare Kuenen, *Onderzoek*, iii. 430; Wildeboer, *Het ontstaan*, p. 106 f.; *MGWJ*, 1886, p, 294 f. In general: Kautzsch in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*, xiii. 340 ff.

Juynboll, *Chronicon Samaritanum arabice conscriptum*, Leyden 1848 (not to be confounded with the *Abulfathi annales Samaritani* edited by Vilmar, 1865. Compare Heidenheim's *Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift*, ii. 1863, pp. 304 ff., 432 ff.).

On the Sadducees compare Wildeboer, *Het ontstaan*, p. 122 f.; Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 113 f. On the Essenes, especially Schürer, *Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, ii. 467 ff., Eng. trans. Div. ii. vol. ii. 188-218.

B.—The Collection of Scriptures among the Alexandrine Jews.

12. It is not very easy to form a clear conception of the position which the Alexandrine and, along with them, the Hellenistic Jews generally occupied in relation to the question of the canon. It might seem, upon a superficial consideration, as if the few direct witnesses with regard to this matter, which are still at our command, prove that the Alexandrine Jews had the same canon as the Jews in their native land. Philo, indeed, according to Hornemann's investigations, quotes from, and allegorises upon, only the canonical writings (compare § 6), although he betrays acquaintance also with certain apocryphal writings; while Josephus, who, as a Jew writing in Greek

and using the LXX. may be here taken into account, sets forth, in the above quoted passage (§ 7), the complete Palestinian doctrine of the canon. But, nevertheless, it is found, upon more careful examination, that we are here in an entirely different world. Philo's quotations are in almost every instance from the Law, and accordingly afford no certain evidence upon the question of the canon; and yet more decisive is this other fact, that he has a wholly different theory of inspiration from that which lies at the basis of the construction of the Palestinian Canon. According to Philo, inspiration was not confined to any one particular period. In his view, not only the Greek translators of the Law, but, still more, all truly wise and virtuous men, are inspired and capacitated by the Spirit of God for expressing what is hidden from the common gaze (*De Cherub.* § 9, p. 112 D; *De migratione Abrah.* § 7, p. 393 C). This theory, which we meet with also partly in Ben Sirach (§ 5), and which Philo apparently shared with other Alexandrine-Jewish thinkers, must necessarily have contributed to smooth down the sharp boundaries between "canonical" and "non-canonical." With regard to Josephus, his position on this question is not so plain. As a historical writer, he emphasises particularly the "credibility" of the canonical books (see § 7), but this naturally does not prevent him from making use of other sources for the history of post-biblical times, among these an "apocryphal" book, the First Book of Maccabees. It is worthy of remark, on the other hand, that even within the limits of the biblical period he unhesitatingly uses the additions to the Books of Ezra and Esther, which are found only in the LXX. (*Antiquities*, xi. 1–5 and 6). And that the stricter theory of the canon continues to be for him a mere theory is shown by this, that he carries down the Jewish history into the age following that of Artaxerxes I. (see p. 35), without a single word calling attention to the fact that his

narrative now rests upon less credible authorities than before; while at the close of his *Antiquities* (xx. 11. 2), which treats of the ages between the creation and the twelfth year of Nero, he refers only to the ἱεραὶ βίβλοι as his authorities, without indicating the relationship between them and the other authoritative writings. With a genuine Palestinian all this would have been scarcely possible.

Is is only in an indirect way that we reach the conclusive proof of the fact that the Alexandrine Jews did not concern themselves about the strict Palestinian doctrine of the canon. Although we know the Alexandrine translation of the Bible only in the form in which it has been used by Christians, it scarcely admits of doubt that this form was virtually in accordance with that current among the Alexandrine Jews, seeing that the Christians would certainly not have introduced a canon which had been wholly rejected by the Jews who had intercourse with them. Naturally, however, this does not prevent our regarding it as possible that the Christians may occasionally have enlarged the Jewish collection by the adoption of particular books (see further p. 54). The Greek translation of the Bible among the Christians differs in two very important points from the Palestinian Bible. In the first place, the threefold division is given up, so that the distinction between prophetic writings and the Hagiographa is abolished; and secondly, we find among the books regarded, according to the Palestinian rule, as canonical, other books which the Jews, resident in their native land, permitted only as profane literature (§ 2), or distinctly rejected. This is a practice which evidently resulted from the influence of the Alexandrine theory of inspiration, and absolutely prevented the adoption of the principle by which the Palestinian Canon was determined.

From the beginning of the second Christian century, the Palestinian Canon won authority among the Alexandrine Jews.

For proof of this we may point, on the one hand, to the adoption of the translation of Aquila by the Greek Jews; and, on the other hand, to the statements of Origen quoted above in § 7 with regard to the canon of the Jews.

On Philo compare the work of Hornemann referred to in § 6, and W. Pick in the *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, 1884, pp. 126–143.

On Josephus compare Wildeboer, *Het ontstaan*, p. 41 ff.; Bloch, *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus*, 1879, pp. 69–79; Schürer, *Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, ii. 713–715, Eng. trans. Div. ii. vol. iii. 179, 182. On his use of the original text and of the LXX.: Scharfenberg, *De Josephi et versionis Alexandrinæ consensu*, 1870; Bloch, *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus*, pp. 8–22; Siegfried in *ZAW*, iii. 32 f.

How the Palestinians rejected the apocryphal writings, but still permitted the reading of certain post-biblical works, such as the Book of Ben Sirach, is told in § 2. Quotations from Ben Sirach, sometimes of a remarkable kind, are given in the Babylonian Talmud with the solemn introductory formulæ, *e.g.* *Erubin* 65*a* (Rab. c. 165–247 A.D., compare Sirach vii. 10), *Baba Kamma* (Rabba c. 270–330 A.D., compare Sirach xiii. 15, xxvii. 9), and, in addition, *Bereshith* r. c. 91, where Simon ben Shetach (§ 6) quoted a passage from Ben Sirach with כתיב. That in Rabba's time Ben Sirach should actually have been regarded by some as canonical is very improbable, since no controversies on this point are reported. We should rather suppose that here we have simply errors of memory, which might easily have resulted from the Hebrew language and the Old Testament colouring of the book. Compare Strack in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie* [2], vii. 430; Wright, *Ecclesiastes*, p. 47 f.; Wildeboer, *Het ontstaan*, p. 85; and on the other side, Cheyne, *Job and Solomon*, p. 282 f. In the Babylonian Talmud (*Sanh.* 100*b*), on the contrary, R. Joseph plainly forbids the reading of Ben Sirach (אסיר לבוקרי). Jerome, in his preface to his translation of Daniel, shows, in an interesting way, how the Jews of his time abused and criticised the apocryphal works used by the Christians.

On the views entertained with regard to the Apocrypha among the Jews of modern times, compare Geiger, *Nachgelassene Schriften*, ii. 338.

13. The writings which in this way secured an entrance into the Bible of the Alexandrine Jews afford us a glimpse into an extensive and varied literature. It is not easy to determine the limits of this literature, since the Septuagint manuscripts used by the Christians vary greatly in their extent, containing sometimes more, sometimes fewer writings, canonical as well as non-canonical. For example, even the sixth book of Josephus' *Wars of the Jews* is to be found in a Syrian Bible manuscript (see further § 16). We cannot therefore speak of a "canon" of the Alexandrines in the strict sense of the word It may, however, be readily understood that the contents of such writings are religious, and must stand in connection with the history of the Old Covenant. Besides, it was also necessary that their authors, who in many cases wrote under feigned names, should be represented as Israelites or men of the primitive ages of biblical history. Books, therefore, like the Epistle of Aristeas, referred to in § 38, the Jewish Sibyllines, Phocylides, and similar works under heathen masks, were excluded. Further, only writings whose contents were of an original character could be taken into consideration, not poetic or scientific reproductions of biblical history, like the Epic of Philo the Elder, Ezekiel's drama "The Exodus," or the historical works of Demetrius, Eupolemus, Artapanus, and Josephus. Finally, the inclusion among the sacred books of the voluminous productions of a modern author, like Philo, would naturally never be thought of. What remains, after these eliminations have been made, consists partly of Palestinian translations of books written in the Hebrew language, *e.g.* the First Book of Maccabees, Ben Sirach, partly of original Greek works of Hellenistic Jews, *e.g.* the Wisdom of Solomon. Of several writings we now know only

the titles. Of the extant writings some are of a philosophical character: Ben Sirach, the Wisdom of Solomon; others of a poetical character: the Psalms of Solomon; others contain historical tales, especially legends, which, however, are often only the investiture of religious-moral teachings: the three Books of Maccabees, Tobit and Judith, the Jewish sections of the *Ascensio Isaiæ;* others are of a prophetical character: the Book of Enoch, the Assumptio Mosis, the Fourth Book of Ezra, the Book of Baruch, the Letter of Jeremiah, the Apocalypse of Baruch. On account of its special form, a revelation of Moses on Mount Sinai by the Angel of the Presence, the so-called Book of Jubilees (ἡ λεπτὴ Γένεσις), has also been received into this literature, although it is properly only a free Haggadic rendering of Genesis. In addition to these there has to be mentioned finally a series of appendices to various canonical writings, which were read with peculiar enjoyment, and were therefore surrounded with the variegated embellishments of popular legend. The books thus added to were those of Esther and Daniel, while also Chronicles had attached to it the Prayer of Manasseh. Ezra also had such an uncanonical addition joined to it, which, however, we no longer possess by itself, but as part of a very free reproduction of the Book of Ezra translated into Greek.

Sketches of the literature of the writings here referred to are given by Strack, *Einleitung im A. T.* in Zöckler's *Handbuch der Theolog. Wissenschaften,* i.; by Dillmann in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*[2], xii. 341 ff.; and especially in Schürer's *Geschichte des jüd. Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi,* ii. 575–830, Eng. trans. Div. ii. vol. iii. 1–270.

In regard to the additions made to the biblical books, it is most particularly to be observed that there is no ground for supposing that the additions to Ezra, Esther, and Daniel are translations from Hebrew originals; Schürer, *Geschichte des jüd. Volkes,* ii. 713, 715, 717, Eng. trans. Div. ii. vol. iii. 179, 182, 184. This circumstance makes the hypothesis

suggested by Ewald and adopted by Wellhausen (*Prolegomena*, 1883, 237), that the Prayer of Manasseh is derived from the Hebrew "History of the Kings of Israel" (2 Chron. xxxiii. 18 ff.), extremely insecure. A free development of the hint thrown out by the Chronicler was what would very readily occur to writers of a later age.

The Fourth Book of Ezra speaks indeed of seventy writings besides the twenty-four canonical books (§ 7); but among these are included only mystical apocalypses, like that book itself.

II.

THE OLD TESTAMENT CANON IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

14. The use of the Old Testament in the New Testament writings is, when most profoundly considered, a further development of the Scripture proof which Christ Himself pointed out in Luke xxiv. 44: *ὅτι δεῖ πληρωθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωυσέως καὶ προφήταις καὶ ψαλμοῖς περὶ ἐμοῦ.* And just as in this passage the reference is only to the proper Jewish Canon with its three divisions (§ 6), so also the New Testament writers draw all their proofs of the fact that Jesus is the Christ and that the age introduced by Him was the Messianic age of promise, from the writings acknowledged as canonical by the Palestinian Jews. If one considers how little the New Testament otherwise holds itself apart from the intellectual life of the Hellenistic Jews,—of which the free and universal use of the Alexandrine translation in the books of the New Testament is only one single conspicuous example,—he must necessarily attribute a great importance to this restriction of the books used for proof in the New Testament, and ought not to cast it to one side as an insignificant "argumentum e silentio." But this naturally does not at all prevent us from admitting, that there are to be found elsewhere in the New Testament more or less important traces of such non-canonical writings as were in circulation and were used among the Hellenistic Jews, the reading of which was also in part permitted even by the

Palestinians (§ 2). In the first rank among these stands the quotation from the Book of Enoch introduced in the Epistle of Jude (v. 14) with ἐπροφήτευσεν. Alongside of it comes the ninth verse in this same epistle, which is not to be found indeed among the remnants as yet known of the Assumptio Mosis, but is said, upon the distinct testimony of Origen (*De Principiis*, iii. 2. 1), to have formed a part of that work. There is no reason for doubting that Hebrews xi. 35 f. is founded upon the narratives of 2 Maccabees vi. f. On the other hand, we cannot decidedly say whether Hebrews xi. 37 refers to an apocryphal book on the sawing asunder of Isaiah, and 2 Tim. iii. 8 to the writing *Jannes et Jambres liber* mentioned by Origen (*de la Rue*, iii. 916), or whether both passages rest simply upon oral traditions. Of the reminiscences in the New Testament of Ben Sirach and the Wisdom of Solomon, which have been tracked out with great zeal, some are rather striking. Compare, *e.g.*, James i. 19 with Sirach v. 11. But others are of a very doubtful character. No quotations in the proper sense are to be met with here. On the other hand, this would have been the case if the quotation 1 Cor. ii. 9, as Origen (*de la Rue*, iii. 916) affirms, had been derived from an Apocalypse of Elias; but our complete ignorance of this writing prevents us from coming to any definite conclusion. Similarly Epiphanius (Dindorf, ii. 388) reports, and, in a fashion different from him, also Euthalius (Gallandi, *Bibl. Patr.* x. 260), with reference to the passage Eph. v. 14. It still remains doubtful what we are to think of Luke xi. 49; Jas. iv. 5 f.; John vii. 38. On the other hand, those are certainly wrong who, on the ground of a statement of Jerome on Matt. xxvii. 9 ("legi nuper in quodam Hebraico volumine, quod Nazarænæ sectæ mihi Hebræus obtulit, Jeremiæ apocryphum, in quo hæc ad verbum scripta reperi"), conjecture that the evangelist had derived his quotation ascribed to Jeremiah from this Apocalypse.

Without any doubt Matthew intends here as usual to give a canonical quotation, while the Apocalypse referred to may have been of Christian origin.

The actually existing references to non-canonical writings, in connection with the circumstance that we never find in the New Testament a direct prohibition against the use of such books, even for Messianic proofs, in the succeeding age, inevitably resulted in leading many communities where Hellenistic culture prevailed, to follow unreservedly the Alexandrine treatment of Scripture. When the Palestinian principles of the canon had become generally prevalent among the Jews (§ 12), there arose of necessity differences on this point between the Christians and the Jews. In connection with this, even among Christians themselves, divergent customs prevailed, according as they gave a preference to the ecclesiastical or to the Jewish practice, and traces of this divergence are to be found even in the most recent times. How the details were thereby shaped and fashioned will appear from the following brief outline.

Compare among the writings mentioned in § 21, especially Bleek in *TSK*, 1853, p. 325 ff. Also Werner in the *Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1872, p. 265 ff.; Boon, *De Jacobi epistola cum Siracidæ libro convenientia*, 1860; Grimm, *Das Buch der Weisheit*, p. 35 f.; Fritzsche, *Die Weisheit Jesus Sirach's* xxxviii.; Schürer, *Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, ii. 596, 628, 674 f., 636, 676, 685, 690, 741, 758, Eng. trans. Div. ii. vol. iii. 23, 55, 69, 109, 144, 150, 214, 234; Wildeboer, *Het ontstaan* p. 45; Wright, *The Book of Koheleth*, p. 49. On Eph. v. 14 compare also *JPT*, 1880, p. 192.

15. Among the Syrian Christians we find a practical agreement with the canon of the Palestinians, with some very remarkable divergences. The agreement is seen in this, that by both the apocryphal writings are excluded. In the Syrian translation of the Bible they were not to be found in the

earliest times. Aphraates, abbot-bishop of St. Matthew's cloister, near Mosul, about the middle of the fourth century, who quotes passages from all the canonical writings, with the single exception, which seems quite accidental, of The Song, makes no quotation from the Apocrypha, although he knew some of them; and Ephræm, who was likewise acquainted with several apocryphal writings, does not make them the subject of his exposition. On the other hand, the Syrians diverge from the Palestinian Canon by setting aside some of the writings that had been received into it. In the Syrian translation of the Bible the Book of Chronicles was originally wanting, and the Jewish Syrian Targum on that book, which had been subsequently adopted (§ 71), did not by any means receive general acceptance. It is indeed quoted by Aphraates, but Ephræm does not comment upon it. In later times the teachers of the Syrian Church went even further. Theodore of Mopsuestia not only omitted the Book of Chronicles, but also Ezra-Nehemiah, Esther, and Job; and in the canon of the Nestorians, Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, and Esther are wanting, while Job is received. On the other hand, the Nestorians, in a remarkable way, acknowledged Ben Sirach and the apocryphal additions to Daniel as canonical. Several of the Monophysites also adopted this canon, yet, as a rule, with the addition of the Book of Esther. Even Barhebræus, in his grammatical and exegetical works, takes no account of the Book of Chronicles.

In so far as the Book of Esther is wanting in those lists, we are reminded of the criticism which, even among the Jews, had been directed against that book (§ 8). On the other hand, we have, as has been already remarked, no certain proof that the Palestinians had declared themselves against the Book of Chronicles, least of all against Ezra or Job. If, then, this Syrian criticism of the canon, with its recognition of the Book of Ben Sirach and of the additions to Daniel, is

actually an outcome of Jewish influence, that influence is to be sought only among Syrian Jews, who in this particular must have gone their own way; but it is much more probable that they were Syrian Christians, who acted on their own responsibility under the influence of subjective principles, as these indeed appear in other connections in Theodore of Mopsuestia.

Those Syrians who attached themselves to the Greek Church received, as was to be expected, those apocryphal writings into their translations, in the manuscript of which they are to be met with in larger or smaller numbers (§ 16).

Compare v. Lengerke, *De Ephræmi Syri arte hermeneutica*, 1831; Eichhorn, *Einleitung*, iii. p. 255; Nöldeke, *Die Alttestamentliche Litteratur*, p. 263; *G. G. A.* 1868, p. 1826; *ZDMG*, xxxii. p. 587; xxxv. p. 496; Fränkel in *JPT*, 1879, p. 758; Nestle in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie* [2], xv. p. 196. The references to the Apocrypha in Aphraates are found in the Homilies edited by Wright, pp. 66, 252, 438. Compare on other points, Bert, *Aphrahats des persischen Weisen Homilien. Aus dem Syrischen übersetzt*, 1888 (and a review of it in *Theol. Litt. Zeit.* 1889, p. 77 ff.).

16. The Greek Church, and the communities dependent upon it, such as the Ethiopians, the Latins, a part of the Syrians (§ 15), etc., were conspicuously influenced by the practice of the Alexandrine Jews in reference to Scripture. We accordingly meet in Justin, Clement of Rome, Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, etc., not only with frequent allusions to writings which had been excluded from the Palestinian Canon, but also formal and deliberately made quotations from many of the literary works mentioned in § 13. How far these books are to be regarded as all belonging to the Bibles already in use among the Alexandrine Jews is, as we have already remarked in § 12, uncertain. It is

highly probable that the attempt to introduce such books as the Book of Enoch, the Martyrdom of Isaiah, the Apocalypse of Ezra, the Book of Jubilees, etc., into the proper collection of Scripture, was first made by the Christians, although even here the flexibility and indefiniteness of the Jewish Alexandrine method of dealing with Scripture does not allow us to come to any very decided conclusion. At any rate, there arose within the Greek Church an opposition against those books, which in the most emphatic way points to this, that they had not been received by the Jews, and that, in the Christian Churches, they had not obtained such general acceptance as, *e.g.* Jesus Sirach, the Wisdom of Solomon, etc. Since then the Palestinians also considered these books to be non-canonical, such a separation will help us to mark out a certain boundary or outside limit of books in use among the Greek Jews. In this way among the Greeks the writings referred to were banished from Church use, and the result of this has been that for several of them we possess no Greek texts. On the other hand, some of them were preserved among other National Churches dependent on the Greeks, such as the Syrian, and, above all, the Ethiopian, which went furthest in this direction. A picture of this development is afforded by the various Bible manuscripts, which may be here illustrated by two examples. The *Vatican Septuagint Codex* embraces, besides the canonical books: the Greek Ezra, the Book of Wisdom, Ben Sirach, additions to the Book of Esther, Judith, Tobit, Baruch, the Letter of Jeremiah, additions to Daniel. In the Codex Alexandrinus we have all the books here named, and in addition, 1–4 Maccabees and the Prayer of Manasseh; and at the same time, too, the list of contents at the beginning of the manuscript show that it contained originally the Psalms of Solomon, yet only as an appendix affixed to the New Testament. On the other hand, the great Milan Peschito manuscript, of which an account is given in

§ 72 contains, besides the usual Apocrypha (of which, however, the Greek Ezra, Tobit, and the Prayer of Manasseh are wanting): the Apocalypse of Baruch and the Apocalypse of Ezra, and even in addition to these, the sixth book of Josephus' *Wars of the Jews*. Of the old Latin translations of the Apocalypse of Ezra, the Assumptio Mosis, the Martyrdom of Isaiah, and the Book of Jubilees, larger or smaller remnants are still extant, which circumstance proves that these books were read for a long time among the Latins, although officially they were attached to the Greek practice. But it is in a very special degree owing to the complete unsusceptibility of the Ethiopians to any influence of criticism that several of these works are even yet extant. To the Ethiopian translation of the Bible belonged the Apocalypse of Ezra, the Book of Enoch, the Martyrdom of Isaiah, and the Book of Jubilees, from which during the present century the texts have been recovered and edited.

The technical expressions for the books excluded from church use were: ἀπόκρυφος, *secretus, non manifestus*, in opposition to φανερός, κοινός, *manifestus, vulgatus*. Without doubt these expressions were borrowed from the synagogue, where they had been used, however, with a somewhat different application. While among the Jews (§ 2) the term גנז was used of books, properly copies, which had been banished from official (synagogical) use; "apocryphal," among the Greek and Latin fathers, signified such books as were not actually found in the clear daylight of universal ecclesiastical use, and which the particular community therefore could not introduce as ecclesiastical books. Out of this idea there was readily developed the idea of the heretical, the forged and ungenuine, which is often the prominent one when the Apocrypha is spoken of by the fathers.

On the quotations in the fathers from the writings rejected by the Palestinian Jews, compare among others Scholz,

Einleitung in die heiligen Schriften des A. und N. T. i. 232 f.; Schürer, *Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, ii. 582–768, Eng. trans. Div. ii. vol. iii. 9–219. Scholz (p. 220 ff.) gives also a sketch of the relations of the various manuscripts to the Apocrypha.

On the Ethiopians, compare Dillmann, "Der Umfang des Bibelkanons der abyss. Kirche," in Ewald's *Jahrb. der bibl. Wissenschaft*, v. 1853, p. 144 f., and Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*, i. 205. On the range of the biblical canon among the Armenians, Georgians, etc., see Scholz, *Einleitung*, i. 259.

On the use of the word "apocryphal," see especially Zahn, *Geschichte d. Neutestamentlichen Kanons*, i. 126–150, where attention is rightly called to the fact that the ideas heretical, pernicious, false, etc., are in the first instance secondary. Thus it is quite simply explained how Origen, who at one time writes (*Contra Cels.* v. 54): *ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις οὐ πάνυ φέρεται ὡς θεῖα τὰ ἐπιγεγραμμένα τοῦ Ἐνὼχ βιβλία*, and at another time (*de la Rue*, ii. 384), "libelli isti non videntur apud Hebræos in auctoritate haberi," yet also himself quotes the Book of Enoch, *e.g. De Principiis*, iv. 35 (*de la Rue*, i. 153): "sed in libro suo Enoch ita ait," etc.

Various lists of the writings designated apocryphal are given by Credner, *Zur Geschichte des Kanons*, pp. 117 ff., 145; Schürer, *Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, ii. 670 f., Eng. trans. Div ii. vol. iii. 125.

17. After the Palestinian idea of the canon had, during the course of the first Christian century, become the dominant one among all Jews, they were obliged to attack with special rigour the use of non-canonical writings on the part of the Christians, and often a Christian was brought into a dilemma when the Jews in religious controversies simply repudiated all proof passages taken from such writings, although among the Christians they had possessed quite the same validity as the other sacred books. In order to overcome this difficulty, several of the fathers sought to spread among their fellow-

believers more exact information about the extent of the Jewish Canon. Such service was rendered by Melito and Origen, whose important explanations on this point have been mentioned above in § 7. Yet in doing this they had in view a purely practical end, and they had not, indeed the least thought of suggesting that the Christians should submit generally to the Jewish notions about the canon, and give up the use in their churches of those non-canonical writings which had obtained a footing among the Christian communities. Hence Origen himself not only used such books in his works, but expressly vindicates them in his letter to Africanus, for he urges that the practice of the Church in regard to Scripture had been developed under the providence of God, whereas the antipathy of the Jews to these writings had been called forth by their hatred of the Christians and by their fear lest through these books the Christian faith might be strengthened.

The Greek fathers of the fourth century unhesitatingly assume the same standpoint, while at the same time they somewhat more decidedly acknowledge the pre-eminence of the writings that are canonical according to the Jewish practice. Athanasius, in A.D. 365, Gregory Nazianzen, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Amphilochius, without expressly naming the Jews as their authorities, give lists of the canonical writings, which are identical with those acknowledged by the Palestinians, although with this significant difference, that the two first-named fathers omit the Book of Esther, while Amphilochius refers to it as received only by some (compare § 7). On the other hand, in Athanasius and in the 59th Canon of the Synod of Phrygian and Lydian bishops at Laodicea, between A.D. 343 and A.D. 381, we meet with express pronouncements against the use of non-canonical or apocryphal books as injurious to the purity of doctrine. Meanwhile, among those apocrypha the writings authorised by

the practice of the churches were generally not included. They formed an intermediate class between the canonical and the apocryphal writings as books, the use of which for reading in the churches was permitted (*ἀναγινωσκόμενα*). To this class belonged, according to Athanasius, besides the Book of Esther: the Wisdom of Solomon, Jesus Sirach, Judith, Tobit. Hence even among those same fathers who have given us the lists of canonical books referred to, we not rarely meet with quotations from those books allowed to be read; and a consequence of this way of viewing the matter is, that we have those "reading books" in the oldest Greek Bible manuscripts (§ 16).

Compare the Letter of Origen to Africanus in his *Opera*, ed. *de la Rue*, i. 12 ff.

Athanasius, *Epistola festalis* of the year 365 (*Opera*, ed. Cölln. ii. 1686, p. 38 ff.): *Ἐπειδήπερ τινὲς ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι ἑαυτοῖς τὰ λεγόμενα ἀπόκρυφα καὶ ἐπιμίξαι ταῦτα τῇ θεοπνεύστῃ γραφῇ, περὶ ἧς ἐπληροφορήθημεν, καθὼς παρέδοσαν τοῖς πατράσιν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου· ἔδοξε κἀμοὶ προτραπέντι παρὰ γνησίων ἀδελφῶν καὶ μαθόντι ἄνωθεν, ἐξῆς ἐκθέσθαι τὰ κανονιζόμενα καὶ παραδοθέντα, πιστευθέντα τε θεῖα εἶναι βιβλία, ἵνα ἕκαστος, εἰ μὲν ἠπατήθη, καταγνῷ τῶν πλανησάντων, ὁ δὲ καθαρὸς διαμείνας χαίρῃ πάλιν ὑπομιμνησκόμενος . . .* (There follows an enumeration of the twenty-two books, without Esther, but with Ruth separately named.) *Ἀλλ' ἕνεκά γε πλείονος ἀκριβείας προστίθημι καὶ τοῦτο γράφων ἀναγκαίως, ὡς ὅτι ἐστὶ καὶ ἕτερα βιβλία τούτων ἔξωθεν, οὐ κανονιζόμενα μέν, τετυπωμένα δὲ παρὰ τῶν πατέρων ἀναγινώσκεσθαι τοῖς ἄρτι προσερχομένοις καὶ βουλομένοις κατηχεῖσθαι τὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας λόγον· σοφία Σολομῶντος καὶ σοφία Σιρὰχ, καὶ Ἐσθὴρ, καὶ Ἰουδὶθ, καὶ Τοβίας, καὶ διδαχὴ καλουμένη τῶν Ἀποστόλων, καὶ ὁ ποιμήν. Καὶ ὅμως κἀκείνων κανονιζομένων καὶ τούτων ἀναγινωσκομένων οὐδαμῶς τῶν ἀποκρύφων μνήμη, ἀλλὰ αἱρετικῶν ἐστιν ἐπίνοια, γραφόντων μέν, ὅτι θέλουσιν αὐτὰ, χαριζομένων δὲ καὶ προστιθέντων*

αὐτοῖς χρόνους, ἵνα ὡς παλαιὰ προφέροντες πρόφασιν ἔχωσιν ἀπατᾶν ἐκ τούτου τοὺς ἀκεραίους.

Council of Laodicea (Mansi, *Concill. nov. coll.* ii. 574), Canon 59: *ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἰδιωτικοὺς ψαλμοὺς λέγεσθαι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ οὐδὲ ἀκανόνιστα βιβλία, ἀλλὰ μόνα τὰ κανονικὰ τῆς καινῆς καὶ παλαιᾶς διαθήκης.*

Gregory Nazianzen, Carmen xxxiii. *Opera,* ed. Cölln, 1690, ii. 98.

Amphilochius, *Jambi ad Seleucum,* see Schmid, *Historia Canonis,* p. 194.

Cyril of Jerusalem (*Opera,* ed. Benedict. Paris, 1720, p. 57 ff.) names precisely the same books as Origen (§ 7), with the addition of Baruch and the Letter of Jeremiah, and has probably borrowed his list from this predecessor. He makes no mention of an intermediate order between the canonical and the apocryphal books; yet, *e.g.* in his *Catech.* ix. 2, he quotes from Wisdom xiii. 5 as canonical. The 60th Canon of the Council of Laodicea has the same list. Compare, however, on the doubtful genuineness of this canon, Credner, *Geschichte d. Neutestamentlichen Kanons,* p. 217 ff. [Hefele, *History of the Councils of the Church,* vol. ii. Edinburgh 1876, p. 323 f.]

18. The Latin Church took a course somewhat different from that of the Greek Church, a course by which, unfortunately, the results of study won among the Greeks, and used with wise consideration for the customary practice of the Church, were again lost, which is all the more remarkable when we consider that the Latin Church seemed to have been placed, in consequence of Jerome's extraordinary attainments in the knowledge of the Old Testament, in the best position for a happy solution of the whole question. In the *Prologus galeatus,* referred to in § 7, Jerome gives a thoroughly wrought-out description of the genuine Jewish Canon with its twenty-two or twenty-four books; and thereafter he remarks briefly and well: "Quicquid extra hoc est, inter apocrypha ponendum." He thus takes up his position quite at the Palestinian

standpoint, while he still uses the word "apocryphal" with a much wider signification than the Jews did their word גנוז (§ 2). Even those books which the Greek fathers permitted to be read were, according to this mode of representation, included among the *ἀπόκρυφα*. Nevertheless, Jerome was not himself in a position to maintain this standpoint over against the practice of the Church, but repeatedly falls back into the mediating practice of the Greeks. Indeed, he translated from the Apocrypha, and that entirely in consequence of the demands of his fellow-countrymen, only Tobit, Judith, and the additions to Esther and Daniel, these latter writings being distinguished from the canonical by diacritical marks; but in the prologue to the *Libri Salomonis* he gives the non-canonical writings used in the Church the same intermediate place which they held among the Greeks, while he remarks of Jesus Sirach and of the Book of Wisdom: "Hæc duo volumina legit (ecclesia) ad ædificationem plebis, non ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam"; and so he himself not infrequently quotes various apocryphal works, especially Jesus Sirach, — once expressly introducing his quotation (*Comment. on Isaiah*, iii. 12) with a "dicente scriptura sancta." Meanwhile, the Western Church, striving after unequivocal and definite forms, did not regard with favour this somewhat uncertain intermediate position of the books allowed to be read (*libri ecclesiastici*). Instead of now solving the problem by an uncompromising acceptance of the Jewish practice, the attempt was rather made to abolish altogether the distinction between canonical books and books that might simply be read. In the Latin Bible manuscripts prior to Jerome, just as among the Greeks, non-canonical writings are found along with the canonical. Only here the number of the non-canonical writings did not vary so much as among the Greeks, while the manuscripts regularly embraced the writings received by most of the Churches, *i.e.* the Wisdom

of Solomon, Jesus Sirach, Tobit, Judith, 1 and 2 Maccabees, and the additions to Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah. The ecclesiastical *usus* was now regarded as decisive, and all those writings were pronounced canonical, without paying any regard to the Jewish Canon and the opposing remarks of Jerome. It was pre-eminently the African Church which, under the guidance of Augustine, came to this practical, but not historically justifiable, decision, for the first time at the Church Assemblies at Hippo, A.D. 393, and Carthage, A.D. 397, to whose lot it thus fell to give to the Alexandrine Canon that fixity of limits which it had not hitherto.

Concerning Jerome compare, besides the *Prologus galeatus*, his preface to the *Liber Tobiæ:* "Feci satis desiderio vestro non tamen meo studio. Arguunt enim nos Hebræorum studia: et imputant nobis contra suum canonem Latinis auribus ista transferre. Sed melius esse judicans Pharisæorum displicere judicio, et episcoporum jussionibus deservire, institi ut potui." Similarly, too, in the preface to the *Liber Judith:* "Apud Hebræos Judith inter apocrypha legitur: cujus auctoritas ad roboranda illa quæ in contentionem veniunt, minus idonea judicatur. Sed quia hunc librum synodus Nicæna in numero sanctarum scripturarum legitur computasse, acquievi postulationi vestræ, immo exactioni." Further, the *Epistola* 7 *ad Lætam:* "Caveat omnia apocrypha et si quando ea non ad dogmatum veritatem, sed ad signorum reverentiam legere voluerit, sciat non eorum esse, quorum titulis prænotatur, multaque his admixta vitiosa, et grandis esse prudentiæ aurum in luto quærere."

A list of the books in the old Latin Bible translations is given by Cassiodorus, *De institutione divinarium litterarum*, c. 14. Alongside of this we should take notice of a list of the canonical books found by Mommsen at Cheltenham, which belongs to the latter half of the fourth century. Compare with reference to it: Mommsen in *Hermes*, xxi. 142 ff.; Zahn in *ZKWL*, 1886, iii.; Harnack, *Theolog. Litt. Zeitung*, 1886, Nr. 8; and J. Weiss in *ZWT*, xxx. 157 ff. Augustine

treats this question in *De doctrina Christiana*, ii. 8; compare *De prædest. sanct.* i. 11. On the Councils at Hippo and Carthage see Bruns, *Canones apostolorum et conciliorum*, i. 133 and 138. The following tables may help to an understanding of the order of succession of the particular books in these lists. They all have in the same order: the five Books of Moses, only the Cheltenham list puts Numbers before Leviticus (compare on that point Zahn, *Geschichte d. Neutestamentl. Kanons*, i. 63); then follow Joshua, Judges, Ruth, the four Books of Kings, and two Books of Paralipomena. Thereafter the list runs as follows:—

Cassiodorus.	Cheltenham.	Augustine.	Hippo.
Psalms	1 and 2 Maccabees	Job	Job
Proverbs	Job	Tobit	Psalms
Wisdom of Solomon	Tobit	Esther	Five Books of Solomon
Sirach	Esther	Judith	Twelve Prophets
Ecclesiastes	Judith	1 and 2 Maccabees	Isaiah
The Song	Psalms	Ezra-Neh.	Jeremiah
Isaiah	Five Books of Solomon	Psalms	Daniel
Jeremiah	Isaiah	Proverbs	Ezekiel
Ezekiel	Jeremiah	The Song	Tobit
Daniel	Daniel	Ecclesiastes	Judith
Twelve Prophets	Ezekiel	Wisdom of Solomon	Esther
Job	Twelve Prophets	Sirach	Ezra-Neh.
Tobit		Twelve Prophets	1 and 2 Maccabees
Esther		Isaiah	
Judith		Jeremiah	
Ezra-Neh.		Daniel	
1 and 2 Maccabees		Ezekiel	

In the Cheltenham list very remarkably the Book of Ezra-Nehemiah is wanting. The order of succession: Daniel, Ezekiel, is the same in the last three columns. Of the Books the Wisdom of Solomon and Sirach, which in the other lists are simply regarded as writings of Solomon, Augustine says: "De quadam similitudine Salomonis esse dicuntur." In the Hippo list there is apparent an endeavour to gather together at the end of the canon the books regarded by the Jews as non-canonical, while among them is included the Book of Esther, as with Athanasius. Compare further in regard to the repeating of the list of Cassiodorus in the *Codex Amiatinus*: Corssen, *JPT*, ix. 619 ff., and below at § 58. [See also *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, vol. ii. Oxf. 1890, p. 289 ff.,

vol. iii. 1891, pp. 217–325; *The Cheltenham List of the Canonical Books, and of the Writings of Cyprian,* by W. Sanday and C. H. Turner.]

19. The ecclesiastical writers of the Middle Ages vacillated in their representations of the Old Testament Canon between the great authority of Augustine on the one hand, and of Jerome on the other, although even the practice of the Church as a rule followed the good example given by the Africans. Many Latin Bible manuscripts contained, besides the usual "books allowed to be read" (§ 18), also the Apocalypse of Ezra. The whole question was an open one, and the Church used no constraint in regard to the answering of it. But when at a subsequent period Protestantism attached itself decisively to the fundamental position of Jerome, the matter was settled, so far as the Romish Church was concerned, *per viam oppositionis,* and Rome had the courage not only to take under its protection the practice of the Church, but also to proclaim it as a condition of salvation: "Si quis libros integros cum omnibus suis partibus, prout in ecclesia catholica legi consueverunt, et in veteri vulgata Latina editione habentur, pro sacris et canonicis non susceperit, et traditiones prædictas sciens et prudens contemserit, anathema sit" (*Concil. Trident.* iv. c. 1). The non-canonical books referred to, which in this way were declared canonical, were: the additions to the Books of Daniel and Esther, Baruch, with the Letter of Jeremiah, the two First Books of Maccabees, Judith, Tobit, Jesus Sirach, and the Book of Wisdom. On the other hand, the Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees, and the Prayer of Manasseh, were only added as appendices to the New Testament. This solution of the question of the canon, which, especially in view of the repeated and emphatic declarations of Jerome, must be regarded as a rather brutal one, brought several Catholic theologians at a later period into no slight embarrassment, but their attempt to secure acceptance again for the older Greek

practice, by making a distinction between proto-canonical and deutero-canonical books, was too evidently in contradiction to the clear words of the Tridentine Council to be of any real avail.

The Greek Church, too, after various vacillations, and after a passing attempt to adopt the theory proposed by Cyril of Jerusalem and Jerome, decided, at the Synod of Jerusalem in A.D. 1672, to canonise the books which were allowed to be read in the Church.

The literature of the development sketched in the above section will be found in De Wette-Schrader, *Einleitung*, pp. 62–68; see also Bleek, *TSK*, 1853, pp. 271, 274. On the attempted degrading of the books read in the Church to the rank of "deutero-canonical," by Sixtus of Siena (*Biblioth. sancta*, 1566), Bernard Lamy (*Apparat. ad Biblia*, 1687), Jahn (*Einleitung*, i. 141 ff.), etc., compare Welte in the *Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1839, p. 230 ff., and Scholz, *Einleitung*, i. 262 f. On the Greek Church, compare Bleek, *TSK*, 1853, p. 276 ff.; Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*, vii. 445 f.

20. The Reformation, which from the first directed its attention to the Holy Scripture as the means, by the use of which the great reaction in the direction of genuine Christianity could be carried out, was of necessity obliged to come to some decision on the question, as to the canonical worth of the books received into the Bible as books that might be read. The first who treated this question, hitherto left open, in a thoroughgoing manner, was the Hotspur of the Reformation, Andrew Carlstadt, in his little tract, *De canonicis scripturis*, 1520. In this treatise he describes the opinions of Augustine and Jerome, and himself adopts very decidedly the view which Jerome had expressed in his *Prologus galeatus* (§ 18), while, without any reference to the practice of the Church, he styles all writings apocryphal which had not been received by the Palestinians. In the Zürich Bible of 1529

and 1530, the non-canonical writings were not indeed left out, but they were placed, in Leo Judea's German translation, at the end of the whole Bible, with the remark: "These are the books of the Bible, which by the ancients are not numbered among those of the Bible, and also are not found among the Hebrews." Among those there were included, not only the usual books allowed to be read, but also Third and Fourth Books of Ezra and Third Maccabees; on the other hand, it was only at a later period that the Song of the Three Children, the Prayer of Manasseh, and the additions to Esther were received.

Luther also translated the non-canonical writings which were read in the Church. Even in A.D. 1519 he published the Prayer of Manasseh as a supplement to his treatise: *Eine kurze Unterweisung, wie man beichten soll.* In A.D. 1529 appeared the Book of Wisdom, and in A.D. 1533–1534, Judith, Tobit, Jesus Sirach, Baruch, the two Books of Maccabees, and the additions to the Books of Esther and Daniel; while the Third and Fourth Books of Ezra and the Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees were not translated. But, at the same time, we meet in his writings with a remarkable criticism which was directed not merely against these writings but also against particular books of the Hagiographa, and treated not only the practice of the Church, but also the old Jewish decisions regarding the canon, with excessive freedom. Alongside of sharp expressions against several of the non-canonical writings above named, and reminders that they had not been received into the Hebrew Bibles, there are to be found in his writings no less free denunciations of the Books of Esther, Ecclesiastes, and Chronicles. Indeed, he himself employed the expression that, while the Book of Esther ought to have been excluded from the canon, the First Book of Maccabees deserved to have been included in it. It is the old criticism of the several Books of the Hagiographa such as we meet with among the Jews (§ 8, compare § 15), which is

here repeated, not however under the immediate influence of historical facts, but under the impression which these writings made on his religiously sensitive nature, whose task it was not to examine into their historical significance and their consequent right to a place in the canon, but to give expression to the fundamental ideas of revelation in their purity and overmastering power, and to estimate everything according as it contributed to that end. In his translation of the Bible, completed in A.D. 1534, Luther follows the example of Jerome and Carlstadt in denominating the books allowed to be read "apocryphal," and distinguishing them from the canonical books; but he keeps somewhat nearer the mediating practice of the Greek fathers (§ 17, compare even Jerome himself, § 18), when he places them after the canonical Old Testament, with the words of introduction: "These are books not to be held in equal esteem with those of Holy Scripture, but yet good and useful for reading." Through a very natural misconception it thus became general to understand by "apocryphal" just those non-canonical writings received into the ordinary Bibles, in direct contradiction to the *usus loquendi* of the Greek fathers, who called "apocryphal" the books that were excluded from the Bibles of the Church. In later times the term "*Pseudepigraphic*" was introduced to denominate this latter class of books, which, however, is less suitable, inasmuch as Pseudepigraphs are also found among the books admitted to be read by the Church, so that indeed even Jerome, in his preface to the writings of Solomon, named the Book of Wisdom of Solomon a ψευδεπίγραφος.

The treatise: *De canonicis scripturis libellus D. Andreæ Bodenstein-Carlstadt* is reprinted with a historical introduction in Credner's *Zur Geschichte des Kanons* (1847, p. 291 ff.); see especially § 81 (p. 364): "Nunc autem, ut de meo quiddam additiam, constat incertitudinem autoris non facere apocrypha scripta, nec certum autorem reddere canonicas

scripturas, sed quod solus canon libros, quos respuit, apocryphos facit, sive habeant autores et nomina sive non."

On the Zürich Bible and the "Combined Bibles" made up from it, and from Luther's translations, compare Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie* [2], iii. 550, 554 f.

The above-mentioned prefaces to the translations of the Apocrypha are found in Luther's *Sämtlichen Werken, Erlangen*, lxiii. 91–108. Of the First Book of Maccabees it is said (p. 104): "This book is also one which is not to be met with in the Hebrew Bibles. It is, however, almost equal in its discourses and language to the other books of Holy Scripture, and would not have been unworthy of a place among them, for it certainly is a necessary and useful book for the understanding of the eleventh chapter of Daniel." On the other hand, it is said of the Second Book of Maccabees: "In short, just as we were willing that the First Book should be received into the number of the Sacred Scriptures, so we are willing that the Second Book should be rejected, though there is something good in it." Further, there are the following statements to be compared:—*Erlang. Ausg.* lxii. 131: And when he, the doctor, corrected the Second Book of Maccabees, he said: "I am so opposed to this book and to Esther that I wished they had not been extant, for they Judaise too much and have many heathenish improprieties." *De servo arbitrio:* "Liber Esther quamvis nunc habent in canone, dignior omnibus, me judice, qui extra canonem haberetur." *Erlang. Ausg.* lxii. p. 132: "The Books of Kings go a hundred thousand steps beyond him who has written the Chronicles, for he has only indicated the sum and pointed out the most remarkable points in the history, and has passed over what is bad and small; therefore the Books of Kings are more to be believed than the Books of Chronicles." The same, p. 128: Of the book of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, he says: "This book ought to be more complete, it is too fragmentary, it has neither boot nor spur, it rides only in socks, as I did myself, when I was still in the cloister. I do not believe that Solomon has been damned, but this was written to frighten kings, princes, and lords. So he did not himself

write the Book Ecclesiastes, but it was composed by Sirach in the time of the Maccabees." We must, however, compare with these the divergent statements of vol. lxiii. p. 40, and *Editio Erlang. Latina*, xxi. 1 ff.

The Apocrypha received into the Lutheran translation of the Bible are exactly the same as those canonised by the Romish Church, only that the Prayer of Manasseh has also been adopted. In not a few Protestant Bible translations the Apocalypse of Ezra (*i.e.* the Fourth Book of Ezra) also finds place among the Apocrypha. Compare Gildemeister, *Esdræ liber quartus arabice*, 1877, p. 42.

21. In the Reformed Church also, in the earliest times, the Apocrypha was allowed its intermediate position in the Bible translations, but the stricter principle of Scripture in the Churches influenced by Calvin carried with it the consequence that, on the one hand, their want of canonicity was emphasised in the confessional writings as was not done in the Lutheran confession; and, on the other hand, repeated endeavours were made to have them completely removed from Bible translations. Even at the Synod of Dort, in A.D. 1618–1619, Gomarus, Deodatus, and others, insisted upon having the Apocrypha withdrawn from the Bible, without being able to induce the Synod to sanction this breach with the practice of the Church. At a somewhat later period, the Puritan Confession, *Confessio Westmonasteriensis*, 1648 (the *Westminster Confession*, i. 3), pronounced the apocryphal writings to be of equal value with ordinary human writings, which had, as a natural consequence, the exclusion of these from the Bible. But it was only in the beginning of the present century that the controversy about the position of the Apocrypha assumed more serious dimensions. On the ground of the Puritan Confession, the Edinburgh Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society, on 17th January 1825, protested against the resolution of the Society to allow, especially in Bible translations in foreign languages, the

adoption of the Apocrypha, and emphatically demanded its withdrawal as a condition of their continuing to take part in the work along with the other local committees. The two years' struggle that thus arose ended in the victory of the enemies of the Apocrypha, so that the Bibles published since by the Society contain only the canonical writings. The controversy also broke out in Denmark, where Jens Möller, in a successful pamphlet, vindicated the Apocrypha against Pastor N. Blicher.

At a subsequent period, a prize offered by the Baden Administrative Council of the Inner Mission in the year 1850, for an essay on the significance of the Apocrypha, called forth a series of, in some cases, very solid controversial treatises, which indeed led to no practical results, but afforded admirable contributions to the discussion of the question.

The judgments of the Reformed Confessional writings are to be found in Niemeyer's *Collectio confessionum in ecclesiis reformatis publicatarum*, Leipsic 1840, with an Appendix, Halle 1840; *Confessio fidei Gallicana*, p. 329 f.; *Confessio Scotica*, i. 350; *Confessio Belgica*, p. 362; *Confessio Helvetica poster.* p. 468; *The English XXXIX Articles*, p. 602; *Declaratio Thoruniensis*, p. 670 f.; *Confessio Bohemica*, p. 787. In the *Westminster Confession*, i. 3, it is said: "The books commonly called Apocrypha, not being of divine inspiration, are no part of the canon of the Scripture; and therefore are of no authority to the Church of God, nor to be otherwise approved, or made use of, than any other human writings."

On the Synod of Dort, see *Acta synodi nat. Dordrecti habitæ*, Hanover 1620, p. 30.

[The Edinburgh controversy over the circulation of the Apocrypha by the Bible Society, in which Dr. Andrew Thomson, Dr. Patrick Macfarlane, Robert and Alexander Haldane, Marcus Dods of Belford, Charles Simeon, Henry Venn, and others opposed that circulation, may be studied in detail in a collection of *Pamphlets on the Apocrypha Controversy*, in 4 vols., 1825-1827.]

Niels Blicher, in *Theol. Maanedsskrift*, für Oct. 1827; Jens Möller, in *Nyt theol. Bibliothek*, xv. 1829, p. 1 ff.

Ph. F. Keerl, *Die Apocryphen d. A. T.* 1852 (prize essay); Rud. Stier, *Die Apocryphen*, 1853; Hengstenberg in the *Evang. Kirchenzeitung*, 1853; Bleek in *TSK*, 1853, p. 267–354. Further literature also in Keil, *Einleitung*, p. 665, Eng. trans. vol. ii. 376 ff; and in Bleek, *Einleitung*, p. 281 f.

22. As the above sketch has shown, a pretty considerable difference of opinion has always prevailed within the Christian Church in reference to the value and position of the Apocrypha. The two extremes are represented by the Catholics and by the British and Foreign Bible Society, while the Lutheran Church occupies an intermediate position. It cannot really admit of any doubt, that the Protestant Church has, upon the whole, done right—as the Greek fathers more or less hesitatingly, and Jerome without hesitation, had done—in regarding the Jews as the true authority on the question as to the extent of the Old Testament Canon. The people of Israel, to whom the Old Testament revelation had been entrusted, and whose life task it was to preserve it uncorrupted, are in fact the legitimate and competent judges, when it has to be decided in what writings this revelation appears in purity and free from all foreign and modifying elements. That we are no longer in a position fully to trace out the principles which led the scribes in their determinations regarding the canon, and that those principles which can still be understood are in many cases extremely peculiar, cannot be regarded, as in this connection, of any importance. For it is not with the views of the scribes that we have to do, but only with the favour shown to the Scriptures and their circulation among the people, of which the decrees of the rabbis as to the canon are simply an echo. The spread and recognition which the books had won in the genuinely Jewish community is the material which the scribes had to work up in their own way; but how they succeeded

in this is only of secondary interest, while the firm position of the writings among the members of the community affords the special guarantee that they recognised in them a true reflection of their spiritual life, and that these writings, therefore, must be accepted by us as the canonical means of learning to know that life. Our task consists essentially in pointing out on this basis the significance of the several writings within the history of the Old Covenant, and in thereby proving their canonical authorisation with a more complete apparatus than was at the disposal of the Pharisees. But in order to do this, we must above all firmly maintain that this task cannot be solved, so long as one considers the Old Testament writings under a purely religious aspect, as commonly was the case in earlier times. Such a mode of considering them will, in a strong and independent religious nature, of necessity lead to depreciatory estimates of particular writings, such as we meet with in Luther. The Old Testament writings are not expressive of a religion which in regular and undisturbed progression advances to a conclusive summit, but a preparatory revelation, which after it has reached its culmination begins to sink and to dissolve away in order that it may thereby itself become conscious of its incompleteness, which was destined to give way before the new and perfect. This age of general dissolution, in which some Israelites broke away from the faith of their fathers without being able to transcend it, because the new had not yet appeared, while others, seeking escape for themselves by forgetting the preceding noble development of the prophetic age with its ideal claims and satisfying themselves with a lower standpoint, produced writings in which the community recognised a genuine picture of the moral and spiritual currents by which it was moved. Too much stress cannot be laid upon the fact that such writings, not only were received into the canon, but even maintained their place there in spite of the attacks of later times (§ 8). However

imperfect the method followed by the scribes in their treatment of these writings may have been, they were at least guided by the correct feeling that those books, according to their innermost essence, were true and genuine expressions of the spirit of the Old Testament, which will also be confirmed by every really scientific investigation. It is therefore the distinguishing excellence of the Protestant Church, over against the Romish and Greek Churches, that it has put before its members the canonical books pure and without any admixture. Only these books give us a true picture of the spiritual life of the Old Covenant called forth by revelation and miraculous leading, and they only show the prophecies contained in prophetic words and actions, whose fulfilment and completion is Jesus Christ. And so, too, in the New Testament, Scripture proof is taken only from "the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms" (§ 14). At a greater or less distance from this circle stand, on the other hand, the non-canonical writings. Indeed, in some of them the wonderfully fascinating Old Testament life throbs with no little vigour; yea, it were wrong to deny that we meet with a richer and higher spirit in the Book of Wisdom than in the Book of Esther or the Book of Chronicles, and that perhaps nothing in the Apocrypha gives so much offence in its direct religious application as Ecclesiastes. But, nevertheless, even in regard to them, a thoroughgoing examination will confirm the judgment of the Palestinian community, and lead to the conclusion that these non-canonical books, one and all, must retreat into the background, if we are to obtain a true picture of the Old Testament revelation, with its peculiar course of development and the forms of life thereby called forth. On the other hand, it can be easily understood how the Church, which renounced those forms in order to take up into itself all mankind, might conceive an affection for some of these writings, and esteem the spirit that throbbed in them better than the Palestinians

had done ; and so far one is able to approve of what the older Greek and Lutheran Churches did in respecting the traditional usage, and retaining those writings in their Bible translations.

But however much one may from this standpoint recognise the style and manner in which the Churches named above have solved the question of the canon, there is yet another point in which Luther and those who followed him have not succeeded in disengaging themselves from an inherited incompleteness. In the Alexandrine Bibles the introduction of the Apocrypha led also to this result, that the tripartite division of the canon was abandoned, although it played so important a part among the Palestinian Jews (§ 3–5), and has so essential a significance for the right estimation of the several writings. Now, although Luther and the other Protestant translators of the Bible set the non-canonical writings apart, and gave them a place after the canon proper, they did not reintroduce the tripartite division. And yet it is obvious that we can only be justified in adopting Jewish authority on the question of the canon, if we are prepared fully to appropriate the theory of the Jews with respect to the collection and the mutual relation of the canonical books. Indeed, we find that the New Testament expressly gives prominence to the threefold division as intimately connected with the contents and range of the Old Testament Canon (§§ 7, 14). It is a mistake to confine the knowledge of this division to theological students, and it would undoubtedly mark an important step in advance if the original order and division were again introduced into our Bible translations. If this were done, it would contribute largely to the bringing before the people several of the results of Old Testament research and to the commending of these results as historically justifiable.

The above exposition, which manifestly leaves untouched the incontestably high scientific importance of the Apocrypha, does not exclude the fact that here and there questions about

the boundary line will arise. Thus it has been already told (§ 12) that Ben Sirach had obtained a pretty wide circulation among the Palestinians. In such a case then it was exclusively the scribes who, according to some settled principle, gave the decision as to whether the book was to be received into the collection or not. What sort of principle this was (the lateness of the period during which the author lived ? or the secondary or borrowed character of the Proverbs ?) cannot now be determined with any degree of certainty. The ground on which the First Book of Maccabees was not received is more distinct. It cannot be denied that the description of the happy reign of Simon, c. 14, is given with so many unmistakably Messianic expressions, that the readers must have received the impression that the author had seen in the Maccabean rule the fulfilment of the hope of Israel, which therefore must place the book outside of the Old Testament circle.

Among the Hagiographa pronounced canonical, only "The Song" causes any considerable difficulty. That it was only at a very late period received into the collection is not only not supported by historical evidence (compare § 8), but is in itself a wholly unhistorical statement. More than for any other single writing must we for this very book presuppose an early currency and general favour; otherwise it would certainly never have occurred to any Pharisee to regard it as canonical. That it could maintain its place was undoubtedly owing to the allegorical interpretation, whether suggested by R. Akiba or by some one else. But, on the other side, the attacks upon its canonicity seem plainly to show that this allegorical interpretation was not generally accepted, and so there remains at least the possibility that in earlier times, under a simple understanding of it, it had secured in the community its wide circulation.

THE
HISTORY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT TEXT.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

23. Whoever makes a study of the history of the Old Testament text must put up with very defective information in many directions. Not only are we without the simplest and surest means of discovering the fortunes of the text, namely, the original manuscripts of the Old Testament themselves, but we cannot even in a single case point to a later text in manuscript from which all the various forms of text, as they now lie before us, may have been derived. And so, indeed, the oldest form of the text to which we can get back, and which forms the common source of all texts known to us, must first of all be constructed by means of textual criticism, and that certainly, as regards various passages, with varying degrees of certainty; and between the oldest text attainable by us and the original text itself there now lies a dark space, where all objective means are wanting to us that would enable us to trace the external and internal history of the text. In order to be able to perform its task within the sphere thus indicated, the history of the text must presuppose all along the line the ascertained critical results of specialists. Where such are wanting, or are not satisfactorily established, it also must remain incomplete and fragmentary. On the other hand, the critical labours of specialists will be regulated by the history of the text, and will find even through it a firm and sure method.

A sketch of the means that are at our command for the elucidation of the textual history will form the first and an essential section in the history of the text. Owing to the fact

that in tracing back the Old Testament text the direct witnesses for the text, after a relatively short time, leave us without the benefit of their help, the secondary sources of information, the old translations, play a conspicuous part, so that a quite special attention must be given them. At the same time, with regard to them, it is to be remembered that in the history of the text the translations come into consideration only according to their importance for the text, and that therefore all translations which originated at times when we possess direct witnesses for the text must be left unmentioned. On the other hand, it is necessary to give a somewhat full description of the origination and character of the other translations; for only in this way will the uncritical use of the old versions be prevented, of which the history of exegesis shows so many examples, and which, in a restoration of the original of a somewhat wilful character, or effected by outside influences, discovers immediately a witness for a divergent, and for its very novelty preferred, form of text. So, too, of necessity the peculiar circumstances of the transmission of the text of the translations must be taken into consideration, so that all sorts of readings that may have arisen through later changes may not be allowed to bear false witness with regard to a form of the original text that had never had an existence, and conversely, that no real but later variation corrected according to the original text may be lost to the textual critic.

Compare, in addition to the general works mentioned in § 1, the following writings:—

Morinus, *Exercitationum biblicarum de Hebræi Græcique textus sinceritate libri duo*, Paris 1669; Cappellus, *Critica Sacra*, Paris 1650, new edition, with notes by Vogel and Scharfenberg, Halle 1775–86; Humfredi Hodii *De bibliorum textibus originalibus, versionibus Græcis et latina Vulgata libri* iv. Oxf. 1705; Hupfeld in *TSK*, 1830 and 1837; the second volume of Horne's *Introduction to the Critical Study and*

Knowledge of the Holy Scripture, London 1860, by Dr. Sam. Davidson; Dillmann, "Bibeltext d. A. T." in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*, ii. 381 ff.; Strack, *Prolegomena critica* in *V. T.* 1873; Weissmann, *Kanonisierung und Feststellung des Textes der heiligen Schriften A. T. nach primären Quellen* (*Hebr.*), Vienna 1887; Cornill, *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel*, 1886, pp. 1–175.

I.

MEANS FOR THE STUDY OF THE HISTORY OF THE TEXT.

A.—The Apparatus Proper.

1. *Printed Editions.*

24. The first printed editions of the Old Testament were furnished by Jews. First of all in the year 1477 there appeared a very defective edition of the Psalms with the Commentary of Kimchi; next, in 1488, the whole of the Old Testament at Soncino. The Brescia Bible, edited by R. Gerson ben Moses in 1494, dependent upon the Soncino edition, was the one used by Luther for his translation. The copy used by him is preserved in the Royal Library at Berlin. It was not until A.D. 1514–1517 that the Complutensian Bible referred to below appeared, which contained the first edition of the original Hebrew text issued under the care of Christians. It also forms the real *editio princeps* of the New Testament. The manual edition of Bomberg (Venice 1517, 1521, and often afterwards) was still closely related to the Soncino edition, whereas the manual edition of Buxtorf (Basel 1611) rests partly on the Complutensian text, partly on the second Bomberg Bible spoken of below. The Athias edition of J. Leusden (Amsterdam 1661–67) follows these editions, but with collation of several manuscripts. To this again is attached the edition of E. van der Hooght (Amsterdam 1705), on which rests the widely circulated edition of Hahn and Theile. Of a

more independent character was the edition of the text issued under the charge of J. H. Michaelis (Halle 1720). In more recent times, S. Baer, with the help of Franz Delitzsch, began the editing of a series of very serviceable separate editions of the several books, corrected according to the Massoretic text.

Besides these special editions of the text we also meet with the Hebrew text in the so-called Polyglot Bibles, which, besides the original text, furnish a larger or smaller number of old translations. The most remarkable of these is the Complutensian Bible, edited by Cardinal Francisco Ximenes de Cisnero at Alcala (Complutum), which Conrad Pellican rightly hailed as marking the beginning of a new era in linguistic studies. The revision of the Hebrew text is indeed defective, but rests on good Massoretic manuscripts. The great Antwerp Polyglot contains an improved reproduction of this edition.

Lastly, the original text is also to be found in the so-called Rabbinical Bibles, where it is accompanied by the Targums and various Jewish commentaries. Among these the first place belongs to the second Bomberg Bible (1525–26), the work of Jacob ben Chajim ibn Adonja, because of its text corrected from the Massora and the reproduction of the Massora which it contains. An account of this edition is given below. The edition of the Old Testament published at Mantua 1742–44, resting upon a Toledo Bible of the year 1277, is also deserving of mention, because in it is incorporated the celebrated commentary of Solomon di Norzi (Nurzia), *Minhath Sai* (מנחת שי), which is of special importance for the criticism of the Massoretic text. The same commentary, composed originally in 1626 under the name *Gôdēr peres*, is also to be found in the Vienna Bible, 1813–16.

Compare De Rossi, *Variæ lectiones*, i. p. cxxxix ff.; Le Long, *Bibliotheca sacra*, Paris 1723, a new edition by Masch, Halle 1778–90; De Wette-Schrader, *Einleitung*, p. 217 ff.;

Rosenmüller, *Handbuch der Litt. d. bibl. Kritik und Exegese*, i. 189 ff., iii. 279 ff. Of the Five Megilloth the old Machazor editions ought to be referred to; see upon these: Baer, *Quinque volumina*, p. iv. To the works named in De Wette-Schrader, *Einleitung*, p. 217, on the oldest printed Hebrew editions, should be added: F. Sacchi, *I tipographi Ebrei di Soncino*, Cremona 1877. On Luther's manual edition of the Bible compare Delitzsch in the *Allgem. Luth. Evang. KZ*, 1883, Nr. 51. On the edition of the Psalms of 1477, compare Baer, *Liber psalmorum*, iv. seq. Of Baer's editions there have appeared: Genesis, 1869; Isaiah, 1872; Jeremiah, 1890; Ezekiel, 1884; the Twelve Prophets, 1878; the Psalms, 1880; Proverbs, 1880; Job, 1875; the Five Megilloth, 1886; Daniel, Ezra, and Nehemiah, 1882; Chronicles, 1888; see Euringer, *Der Masoratext des Koheleth*, 1890.

Polyglots: The Complutensian Bible, 1514–1517; The Antwerp Polyglot ("Regia" or "Plantiniana," after the Antwerp printer Christian Plantin, who died in A.D. 1589), 1569-1572. Upon the Antwerp text of the Old Testament, as Delitzsch in the second of the treatises referred to below has shown, is based the Hebrew part of the *Biblia sacra, Hebraice, Græce et Latine ex officina Sanctandreana* 1587 (1599 and 1616 *ex officina Commeliana*). Finally the Parisian Polyglot, 1629–1645, and the London Polyglot, 1654–1657 (1817–1828, 1831).—Franz Delitzsch has dealt with the Complutensian Polyglot in detail in three Leipsic Dissertations: *Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Polygottenbibel des Kardinals Ximenes*, 1871 (in which he gives, p. 19 ff., a biographical sketch of Ximenes, and at p. 24 ff. a sketch of his fellow-workers on the Polyglot); *Complutensische Varianten zum Alttestam. Texte*, 1878 (with investigations about the Hebrew manuscripts by Ximenes); *Fortgesetzte Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der complutensischen Polyglotte*, 1886. See more particulars below at p. 134.

Rabbinical Bibles: The first Bomberg Bible, edited by Felix Pratensis, Vienna 1517–1518; Second Bomberg Bible, edited by Jacob ben Chajim, 1525; Buxtorf's Bible, Basel, 1618–1619; the *Biblia magna* מִשֶּׁה קהלות (rich in materials),

Amsterdam 1724–1727; *Biblia hebraica*, Warsaw 1875–1877.

On Solomon di Norzi's Commentary and the Mantuan edition, see Fürst, *Bibliographisches Handbuch der gesamten jüdischen Litteratur*, iii. 39 f. Of importance in connection with the Massora is the edition of Genesis by Heidenheim, מאור עינים, 1818.

25. The peculiar form of the Pentateuch text used by the Samaritans (§ 11) was printed in the Parisian and London Polyglots, and was published separately by B. Blayney (Oxford 1790) in a quarto edition.

Compare Kautzsch in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*[2], xiii. 353.

2. *Manuscripts.*

26. In comparison with the extreme antiquity of the Old Testament books, the manuscripts of these must be described as remarkably recent. Between the oldest manuscript whose date can with certainty be ascertained and the writing contained in it there lies a period of nearly seventeen hundred years. The reason of this fact, which is all the more remarkable on this account, that we possess manuscripts of several translations of the Old Testament of a much earlier date, is found in this, that the Jews, far from manifesting zeal in the preservation of old Codices of the Bible, were wont rather, when the manuscripts could no longer be used on account of age, and were therefore laid in the lumber room of the synagogue (גְּנִיזָה), to accelerate their destruction, because they feared lest the manuscripts no longer in use might be in any way profaned. Notwithstanding the considerable number of Old Testament manuscripts, we nevertheless possess only a few which can even in a certain sense be called old, and of these generally it is to be remarked, that the age of the manuscripts cannot always with certainty be determined.

The catalogues of the manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible are given in Strack's *Prolegomena*, pp. 29–33, 119–121. To this work we may add further: Steinschneider, *Die hebräischen Handschriften d. königl. Bibliothek zu München*, 1875; Harkavy and Strack, *Katalog d. hebr. Handschriften in St. Petersburg*, 1875; Schiller-Szinessy, *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in Cambridge*, 1876; Steinschneider, *Katalog der hebr. Handschriften in der Stadtbibliothek zu Hamburg*, 1878; *Die Handschriftenverzeichnisse der königl. Bibl. zu Berlin*, ii. 1878; Landauer, *Katalog der Bibliothek in Strassburg. Orient. Handschrifter*, i. 1881; Neubauer, *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, 1886. On the Erfurt manuscripts compare Lagarde, *Symmicta*, 1877, p. 133 ff., and Baer, *Liber XII. Proph.* p. vi. Merx, *Chrestomathia targumica* xv. gives a list of manuscripts with the Babylonian system of points. Compare generally the preface to Baer's editions of the text referred to in § 24, where various manuscripts in the possession of private parties are referred to and described. On the Machazor manuscripts, compare Baer, *Quinque volumina*, iv. seq.

On the Genîzâ see *M. Sab.* ix. 6; *Soph'rim* v. 14, p. xi; Strack, *Prolegomena*, 42, and compare above § 2.

27. The age of manuscripts can be determined accurately only when they have come down with a dated subscription, and even then we must be prepared for the possibility of falsifications and ante-datings, which some editors had recourse to in order to give increased value to the manuscripts. In recent times the Karaite, A. Firkowitzsch, has obtained a particularly unfortunate notoriety for this sort of work. Another, not so decisive mark is afforded by certain formulæ, especially benedictions, which, as can be conclusively proved, were first introduced at particular periods. On the other hand, determinations as to the age of manuscripts which are derived from the form of the letters or other graphical peculiarities, are still more insecure, whereas by these means the manuscripts can be grouped with great certainty according to the place of their origin (German, Spanish, etc.).

Compare Strack, *Prolegomena*, p. 33 ff.; *ZLT*, 1875, p. 601 f.; Zunz, *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur*, 1845, pp. 207, 214–230; Tychsen, *Tentamen de variis codicum Hebraicorum generibus*, Rostock 1872; Idem, *Beurteilung der Jahrzahlen in den hebräisch-biblischen Handschriften*, Rostock 1786; Schnurrer, *De codd. V. T. ætate difficulter determinanda*, Tüb. 1772. On the formulæ of the copyists compare also Bleek, *Einleitung*[4], p. 565; and with regard thereto: *Theolog. Literaturzeitung*, 1878, p. 571.

On the forgeries of Firkowitzsch in general: see Harkavy in *Mémoires de l'Academie de St. Petersbourg*, vii. 24, Nr. 1; Strack, *A. Firkowitzsch und seine Entdeckungen*, 1876; and *ZDGM*, xxxiv. p. 163 ff. On Chwolson's otherwise very learned *Corpus inscriptionum Hebraicarum*, St. Petersburg 1882, wherein an attempt is made partially to vindicate Firkowitzsch, compare Strack in *LCB*, 1883, p. 878. See also § 76.

On some peculiarities of the pointing in the oldest manuscripts ("for *Qames hatuph* and the employment of *Daghesh lene* in all letters") see Baer, *Liber Jeremiæ*, p. viii seq.

A picture of the various types of letters is given in Euting's *Schrifttafel* in Chwolson's *Corpus inscriptionum Hebraicarum*. Compare also the facsimiles referred to in § 28.

28. The oldest manuscripts of the Old Testament whose date can be with certainty ascertained belong to the tenth century. Notwithstanding the many forgeries of Firkowitzsch (§ 27), we owe to his collections of manuscripts from the Crimea the oldest Codex, whose age can be given with certainty, namely, a Babylonian manuscript of the *Prophetæ Posteriores* of the year 916. It has been edited in a photolithographic facsimile by H. L. Strack. To the same century belong some fragments of Karaite Bible manuscripts, which were obtained by Shapira in Hit (on the Euphrates, southwest of Bagdad) and in Cairo. They are written in Arabic letters, but with Hebrew points. The oldest manuscript of the entire Old Testament, on the assumption of the correctness

of the date, is the Codex of the year 1010, which belongs also to the Firkowitzsch collection. On the other hand, there are some manuscripts which claim to be yet more ancient, such as the often referred to *Standard Codex* of Aaron ben Asher (§ 30) in Aleppo, and a Codex in Cambridge alleged to have been written in the year 856, which more exact investigations have shown to be of more recent origin.

Strack, *Prophetarum posteriorum Codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus*, St. Petersburg 1876, of which the Russian Emperor has presented copies to several libraries. Separately: *Hosea et Joel prophetæ. Ad fidem Cod. Babylonici Petropolitani*, ed. H. L. Strack, Leipsic 1875.

Hoerning, *Descriptions and Collations of Six Karaite Manuscripts of portions of the Hebrew Bible in Arabic Characters*, London 1889. Of the whole number of these manuscripts now to be found in the British Museum there are six here described, and one (MSS. Orient. 2540), which comprises Exodus i. i.–viii. 5, is reproduced.

On *Aaron ben Asher's Codex* compare Michaëlis, *Orient. und exegt. Bibliothek*, x. 63; the Jewish traveller Jacob Sappir's *Account of his Travels* אבן ספיר, Lyck, 1866, p. 12 ff.; and especially, W. Wickes, *A Treatise on the Accentuation of the so-called Prose Books of the Old Testament*, 1887, wherein a sheet of manuscript is reproduced in facsimile by photography, and where (pp. vii–ix) the incorrectness of the date is proved. According to Lagarde (*NGGW*, 1890, p. 16) it belongs to the German manuscripts of the fourteenth century.

On the often referred to *Cambridge Codex*, Nr. 12, compare Neubauer in *The Academy*, 1887, p. 321, against Schiller-Szinessy's article in the same paper, p. 304.

Wickes denies the correctness of the date of the Bible of A.D. 1010 or 1009. In his *Treatise on the Accentuation, etc.*, p. ix, he says: "I have myself no doubt, from personal inspection, that *Codex B*, 19*a*, in the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg, dated 1009, is much younger, although the editors of the Catalogue [Harkavy and Strack, pp. 263–274; compare also Baer and Strack, *Dikduke Hateamim*. xxiv. seq.] accept the date."

On other old manuscripts see Strack, *ZLT*, 1875, p. 598 f.; Delitzsch, *Complutensische Varianten*, 1878, p. 4 ff., and especially the prefaces in Baer's editions of the texts. The celebrated *Reuchlin Prophet-Codex* dates from the year 1106. Compare the description of it in Baer, *Liber Jeremiæ*, p. vi sq.

Besides the already-mentioned facsimiles, we also meet with reproductions of the older Old Testament manuscripts in the *Facsimiles of Ancient Manuscripts*, published by the Paleographical Society, Oriental Series iii. sheets 40, 41, iv. sheet 54; also in Neubauer's *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, p. 86. In his *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, p. 32, Stade gives representations of *Reuchlin's Prophet-Codex*, the Erfurt Bible Manuscript No. 3, and the above referred to *St. Petersburg Prophet-Codex*. Further literature in Steinschneider, *Centralblatt für Bibliothekwesen*, iv. 1887, pp. 155–165.

A manuscript fragment of Deuteronomy, alleged to be very old, which caused some excitement in the year 1883, is described by Guthe in *Fragmente einer Lederhandschrift, mitgeteilt und geprüft*, Leipsic 1883.

In the *Memoires de l'Academie imp. de St. Petersbourg*, series vii. tome xxxii. 1884, Nr. 8, Harkavy describes some manuscript fragments from Rhodes with a peculiar alphabet, which, however, are decidedly spurious. Compare Derenbourg in *REJ*, x. 311, and Baer, *Quinque volumina*, vi. sq.

29. To the Hebrew manuscripts of the Law belong also the Samaritan Codices (§§ 11, 25). Since these manuscripts represent a text, which at a very early period separated itself from the Jewish text, it is not to be wondered at that often a great importance has been attached to them, and that it has been thought that by a comparison between them and the received text an important step might be taken in the reconstruction of the text of the Pentateuch. But the Samaritan text has been so disfigured by errors of transcription and by arbitrary treatment, that its critical import-

ance is very much restricted. These manuscripts are of greater interest on account of the letter signs used in them and their want of vowels, whereby in another way they confirm the results obtained with regard to the external history of the text.

Compare Eichhorn, *Einleitung*[3], §§ 378–389; Rosen in the *ZDMG*, xviii. 582 ff.; Strack, *Prolegomena*, p. 56 f.; Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*[2], i. 283, xiii. 349, 334; and Harkavy's *Katalog der samaritan. Pentateuch-Codices*, Petersburg 1874 (in the Russian language). Compare also Heidenheim's *Bibliotheca Samaritana*, i. p. xiv sqq., and in review of it, *ZDMG*, xxxix. p. 167.

3. *Collections of Variations.*

30. By means of the great collections of variations made during last century by Kennicott and John Bern. de Rossi, and by means of the apparatus of the critical editions, we have been placed in a position to make use of manuscripts which are no longer themselves extant. We come into possession of variations from manuscripts no longer extant, which the Jewish traditional text has preserved (§ 31). We may readily set aside what is presented us in the readings of Rabbi Meir and of a Torah Codex, said to have been brought from Rome and preserved in the Severus Synagogue there. On the other hand, the Jewish tradition presents a series of readings which various standard Codices, drawn up by celebrated punctuators, have adopted. Such Codices (sometimes called *Mahzoroth*) are: the *Codex Hilleli* (named after an unknown R. Hillel), *Codex Zanbûkî*, the *Jericho Pentateuch*, *Sepher Sinai*, *Keter Schem Tob*, *Machzora Rabba*, etc. We must also mention readings from various authorities during the period between the eighth and the tenth centuries, like R. Pinchas, R. Moses, R. Chabib, etc., first made known in recent

times by means of the manuscripts of the Crimea; and finally, the divergent readings of the two celebrated masters from the beginning of the tenth century, R. Moses ben David ben Naphtali in Babylon, and R. Aaron ben Moses ben Asher in Tiberias. The latter has become the most distinguished authority in favour of the received text. For the rest, these variations, for the most part varieties of vocalisation, are of more importance for philological than for textual criticism.

Although Ben Naphtali lived in Babylon, and his text sometimes agrees with the traditional Babylonian text, his text cannot be without more ado regarded as representative of the Babylonian text in its opposition to the Palestinian text or the text of Tiberias. On the contrary, a series of variations has long been known which indicate the difference between the Recensions of the Babylonian or Palestinian, or, as they are commonly named in the history of the text, the Eastern (מדינחאי, *mᵉdinhâjē*) and the Western (מערבאי, *maʿarbâjē*) schools. It was, however, only the discoveries of recent times that made it evident how far-reaching this distinction was. As the Babylonians and the Palestinians both had their Talmuds (Babli and Jeruschalmi), their editions of the Targums (§ 61), their arrangement of the biblical books (§ 10), and their system of pointing (§ 80), so, too, they both had their Recensions of the text. The earliest known list of these variations, we owe to Jacob ben Chajim, who, undoubtedly on the basis of old manuscripts, communicated it in his Rabbinical Bible (§ 24). Recent discoveries, however, have not only shown that these lists must have been improved and enlarged, but have also brought into light manuscripts, which contained the *Babylonian Recension* with all its peculiarities (§ 28). The variations extend over all the Old Testament, and refer to the consonants as well as to their vowel pronunciation. Finally, in some few passages there are also reported differences between the readings of the schools of the two Babylonian cities, Nehardea and Sora.

The question as to how far *Q're* and *K'tîb* are to be regarded as actual variations will be discussed in § 33.

Kennicott, *Vetus testamentum hebraicum cum variis lectionibus*, Oxford 1776–1780 (treats only of the consonantal texts); the therein included *Dissertatio generalis* is edited by Bruns, Brunswick 1783; De Rossi, *Variæ lectiones Veteris Testamenti*, Parma, 1784–1788; and *Scholia critica in V. T. Libr. s. supplementa ad varias lectiones sacri textus*, Parma 1798; Delitzsch, *Complutensische Varianten*, 1878. The critical apparatus in Baer's editions (§ 24); Strack in *ZLT*, 1877, p. 17 ff. (on Isaiah). The collations in Hœrning's Karaite manuscripts mentioned in § 28.

The reported readings of R. Meir (see in regard to him, Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums*, ii. 86 ff.) are given: *Bereshith* rb. c. 9 (Gen. i. 31; מוּת instead of מְאֹד); *Idem*, c. 20 (Gen. iii. 21, אוֹר instead of עוֹר); *Idem*, c. 94 (Gen. xlvi. 23, וּבֶן instead of וּבְנֵי); *jer. Taan.* i. 1, fol. 64*a* (Isaiah xxi. 11, דּוּמִי instead of דּוּמָה, indeed his reading rather is רוּמִי [Edom being popularly regarded as equivalent to Rome], compare Jerome on the passage). With these readings agree at least once the readings of a Torah roll catalogued in a manuscript Midrash, *Bereshith rabbati* (now in the library of the Israelite community at Prague), which was brought to Rome, and there "laid up in the בניתא דאסוירוש." This roll is mentioned by Kimchi on Gen. i. 31, who writes "the Synagogue of Severus." Epstein, who in the *MGWJ*, 1885, pp. 337–351, quotes these passages, conjectures that it may have been the roll of the Law brought by Titus to Rome (see Josephus, *Wars of the Jews*, vii. 5. 5). Compare further, Hochmuth in the same journal, 1886, pp. 274–279. For the rest, at least the so-called reading of R. Meir, מוּת for מְאֹד in Gen. i. 31, might be regarded rather as a free playful modification of the common text than as a reading properly so-called.

On the ancient standard Codices, see Strack, *Prolegomena*, 14–29, 112–118, and *ZLT*, 1875, p. 613 f. On the *Codex Hilleli*, see the *Academy*, 1888, p. 321.

On Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali, compare Strack, *Prolego-*

mena, p. 24 ff.; *ZLT*, 1875, p. 616; Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*[2], ix. 390 ff.; Berliner, *Targum Onkelos*, 1884, ii. 139; and especially Baer and Strack, *Die Dikduke hateamim des Ahron b. M. b. Ascher*, 1879, pp. x ff., 78 ff. 84. These various readings are given in a manuscript of the Tschufutkale-Collection, Nr. 13, עֵדַת דִּבּוּרִים (see *Dikduke*, xxxii.; Baer, *Liber psalmorum*, p. vi; *Liber Ezechielis*, p. vi; *Quinque volumina*, p v), and in the חלופי הנקוד of the *Codex de Rossi*, Nr. 940 (see Baer, *Liber Jeremiæ*, p. x sq.). They are mentioned, as well as the following variations, in all the editions of Baer. Of the three passages where the divergences between Ben Naphtali and Ben Asher are said to have referred also to the consonants, Jer. xi. 7, xxix. 22; 1 Kings iii. 20 (see *ZLT*, 1875, p. 611; *Dikduke*, xiii.), the two first are not established by Baer's edition.

On the Eastern and Western schools, compare Strack, *Prolegomena*, 36–41, 121; *ZLT*, 1875, p. 608 ff., 1877, p. 22; Geiger, *Nachgelassene Schriften*, iv. 32 ff. Lists of their divergent readings are to be found in the *Codex ben Asher* (see Baer, *Liber Duodecim*, p. viii), in the Bible of the year 1010, and in the *Codices Tschufutkale*, Nr. 7 and 18*a* (Baer, *Quinque volumina*, p. v; *Liber Jobi*, p. v). It is to be observed that the South Arabian manuscripts with "Babylonian" vocalisation contain the readings of the Western school. See Wickes, *The Accentuation of the Prose Books*, p. 150.

The schools at Nehardea and Sora (compare on these cities, Neubauer, *Géographie du Talmud*, 350 f., 343) diverged from one another in their Halacha as well as in their Targum criticism. An example of their different Bible readings is to be found in Neh. iii. 37, where, according to the *Massora magna*, those of Nehardea read אל, those of Sora ואל. Compare on them, Strack, *Prolegomena*, p. 40; Berliner, *Die Massora zum Targum Onkelos*, ii. 61 ff. According to Berliner the members of the school of Nehardea were emigrant Palestinians, and consequently they followed the western readings.

4. *The Jewish Massora.*

31. The want of old manuscripts of the Old Testament is to some extent supplied by the so-called Massora or text tradition of the Jews, which makes it possible for us to trace back the text to the times earlier than those to which the earliest extant manuscripts belong. The proper task of the Massora was the guarding of the Bible manuscripts against degeneration through carelessness and wilfulness on the part of transcribers, and, in consequence, the most painful and minute supervision was exercised upon them; but just in this way the Massora affords a glimpse into the form of the text transmitted from early times which cannot be too highly valued. Lists of the peculiarities of the text from all points of view were compiled, all singularities were registered, so that they could not easily be obliterated at the hands of transcribers, and in this way a "fence" was built up around Scripture, which has actually resulted in this, that we meet with the text in essentially only one form from the time in which the scribes began to watch over the transmission of the text with this painstaking exactness. There were certainly at the various centres of the Jews various Massoras, the memory of which is preserved by means of the lists of variations of the Massora that had won general acceptance (§ 30), but these differences were trifling, and affected the received form of text very little. The Massoretic material is made up of marginal notes on the Bible manuscripts, and of independent works. The marginal notes (*Massora marginalis*) stand either above or below the text, and are then called *Massora magna*, or alongside the text, and are then called *Massora parva*. The independent Massoretic works are the expansion of the *Massora magna*. They were often added at the end of the Bible text in manuscripts and editions, whence the name *Massora finalis*. The form in

which the Massoretic material was communicated is that of an alphabetical list, or of statements as to how often the forms referred to are met with, or of the gathering together of such expressions as are similar to one another, and might therefore be readily interchanged.

Introductions into the difficult study of the Massora, that may be used still with great advantage, are afforded by Jacob ben Chajim in the preface to his Rabbinical Bible (§ 24), by Elias Levita in his *Massora hamasoreth*, and by the elder Buxtorf.

A style of dealing with the text, which reminds us of that of the Jews, is met with among the Indians; see Max Müller, *Lectures on the Science of Language*, 1861, p. 107. We also meet with something similar among the Persians; see *Sitzungsberichte der königl. bayerischen Akademie d. Wissensch.* 1872, p. 96.

The pronunciation of the word מסורת or מסורה is uncertain, for we find מַסֹּרֶת as well as מָסֹרֶת (מָסֹרָה). Both forms, which occur in Ezekiel xx. 27, are remarkable, since the word is derived from מָסַר, *tradere*. We should have expected מְסֹרָה, like בְּשׂוֹרָה (Barth, *Nominalbildung*, § 42*a*, 2). We prefer the form *Massora*, which may have originated through sharpening the accentuation, compare בַּלָּהָה (Barth, § 93*a* *β*), whereas מָסוֹרָה, since בָּגוֹדָה as an intransitive is not parallel, is more difficult to explain. Also the pronunciation of the corresponding Aramaic מסרתא is doubtful. Compare the divergent hypotheses in Lagarde, *NGGW*, 1882, p. 168; Dalman, *Der Gottesname Adonaj*. 1889, p. 8; and Strack, *Theol. Litteraturblatt*, 1889, p. 291.

Elias Levita's (§ 9) ספר מסורת המסורת was published in Venice in 1536. A German translation was prepared by Semler (Halle 1772); a new edition of the text, with English translation by Ginsburg (The Book of the Massorah, with translation and critical and explanatory notes, ed. C. D. Ginsburg, London 1867). Compare especially Bacher, *ZDMG*, xliii. 231 ff. Ginsburg has edited Jacob ben Chajim's preface in Hebrew and English, 2nd ed., London 1867.

Buxtorf, *Tiberias sive commentarius masoreticus triplex*, Basel, 1620, and often reprinted. A fragment of it as a specimen of the mode of treatment is given by Bleek, *Einleitung*[4], p. 568 f. While Buxtorf here interprets the first chapter of Genesis, the following seven chapters are commented on by J. Hansen, *Interpretatio masoræ magnæ textualis*, Copenhagen 1733–1737.

32. The beginnings of the Jewish Massora can be traced back to a very early period. How far indeed R. Akiba, with his saying that "the מסרת is a fence around the Law" (*Pirke Aboth*, iii. 13), is thinking of the text transmission, is doubtful; but in any case we meet with contributions from the Massoretic material even in the Mishna, and then, considerably increased, in the Gemara and in the old Midrashic works, with the exception, as can readily be understood, of all that refers to the later system of pointing. There is a further increase of material in the post-Talmudic tracts *Masseket sepher torah* and *Masseket sophᵉrim*, which are occupied with the rules for the transcription of the Torah rolls. With the invention of the system of pointing, the work of the Massoretes received a new impetus, because now many delicate points which previously could only be transmitted orally could be fixed in writing. Aaron ben Moses ben Asher of the tenth century, above referred to (§ 30), who belonged to a distinguished family of punctuators in Tiberias, composed a treatise which, besides all sorts of purely grammatical remarks, communicated a series of Massoretic observations and rules. This work was imitated in many similar half-grammatical, half-Massoretic tracts, which, under the name *Horajath ha kore*, gave rules for transcription and pointing. In the following ages, when a purely philological literature had been developed, the grammatical material was separated from these works; and, at the same time, there arose a purely Massoretic literature under the two forms

mentioned above, marginal notes and independent writings, by the latter of which the marginal notes of an almost enigmatical character were often for the first time made intelligible. A standard work of the independent order was the celebrated book *Ochla w^e^ochla*, so called on account of its commencement, which placed together the אכלה of 1 Sam. i. 9 and of Gen. xxvii. 19. That it was already in existence in the latter half of the twelfth century is beyond question, whereas its relation to the Massora of Gerson ben Judah, who lived in the eleventh century, is very doubtful. Its great importance, however, consists in this that it circulated in at least three different editions, of which two are still extant in their original form. The third seems to have been used by Jacob ben Chajim in the *Massora magna*, which he appended to the end of his Rabbinical Bible (§§ 24, 31). Elias Levita also (§ 31), who was almost contemporary with Jacob, used the book *Ochla*, which he praises as "small in size but without equal in the department of the Massora." In the following century the great Buxtorf sought, on the foundation laid in the works named, to make Massoretic studies generally accessible and fruitful (§ 31). At this time also appeared Menahem di Lonzano's *Or tora*, 1618, while Norzi's above-named critical commentary *Gôdēr pereṣ* (§ 24) did not appear till somewhat later. In the eighteenth century Massoretic studies found little favour, either among Christians or among Jews. Only in our own century has new life been imparted to them and essentially furthered by the works of W. Heidenheim (who died at Rödelheim in 1832), L. Dukes, Frensdorff, Baer, Strack, J. Derenbourg, Wickes, and C. D. Ginsburg, many of them very celebrated, and by the manuscripts brought to light by them. The fruits of these minute and unwearied investigations are presented in Baer's edition of the text corrected according to the Massora, and in many monographs of the most recent Hebrew grammarians.

On the history of the Massora compare Geiger in the *Jüd. Zeitschrift*, iii. 78 ff.; Strack in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*[2], ix. 388 ff.; L. Blau, *Massoretische Untersuchungen*, 1891.

The statements regarding the Massora in the earliest Jewish writings are collected in Strack's *Prolegomena*, 73–94, 122 f., where the literature will be found fully given.

Sepher tora is published in Kirchheim's *VII. libri Talmudici parvi Hierosolymitani*, Frankfurt 1851, pp. 1–11. *Masseket soph'rim*, edited by J. Müller, Leipsic 1878. Compare also Adler, *Judæorum codicis sacri rite scribendi leges, a libello Thalmudico* מסכת סופרים *in lat. conversæ et annot. explicatæ*, Hamburg 1779.

On Aaron ben Asher, compare further § 80. Of his massoretico-grammatical lessons a part was printed in the first Rabbinical Bible (§ 24); afterwards L. Dukes gave quotations in his *Kontres hamasoret*, 1846. Finally, Baer and Strack, building with materials supplied by many contributors, have edited the entire collection in a critical text: *Die dikduke ha-teamim des Ahron b. M. b. Ascher*, Leipsic 1879.

A similar treatise, accompanied by valuable notes, has been published by Derenbourg, according to a South Arabian manuscript written in A.D. 1390, under the title "Manuel du Lecteur," in the *Journal Asiatique*, 1870, xvi. 309 ff. The Jews in Yemen called such a compendium which frequently preceded their Bible manuscripts, מחברת התיגאן, "Treatise on the Crown, *i.e.* the Bible." Among the other Jews the commoner name for it was קונטרס.

On the grammatico-massoretic writers quoted by Elias Levita, compare Bacher *ZDMG*, xliii. 208. Especially on the book *Horajath ha-qore*, see Wickes, *Accentuation of the Prose Books*, p. x sq.

Grätz in *MGWJ*, 1887, p. 134, attempts to prove that the book *Ochla* was a work of Gerson ben Judah, who died in A.D. 1028. See, however, the opposing arguments of Neubauer and Bacher in the same journal, pp. 299–309. The one form of the text of the book is to be found in a Halle manuscript, which Hupfield (*ZDMG*, xxi. 202 ff.) describes; the other in a Parisian Codex, which Frensdorff

has edited: *Das Buch Ochla W^{e}ochla*, Hanover 1864. That Jacob ben Chajim used a third form of text of this work as the basis of his *Massora finalis*, has been conjectured by Grätz among others.

Frensdorff has issued in a separate edition: דִּרְכֵי הַנִּקּוּד וְהַפְּנִינוֹת (by Moses the Punctuator), Hanover 1847, and the first volume of a *Massora magna* (*Massoretisches Wörterbuch*), Hanover 1876. Unfortunately this Massoretic Dictionary is not to be continued.

Ginsburg's laborious edition of the Massora (*The Massorah compiled from manuscripts*, alphabetically and lexically arranged, i.–iii. 1880–1885) has been very severely criticised in *The Guardian*, 1886, p. 1049, and by Baer, *ZDMG*, xl. 743 ff., and described as quite an uncritical compilation.

An improved Massoretic text is being prepared by Baer for the great Rabbinical Bible, *Mikra gadol*, which will be published at Wilna.

Compare also the literature given in § 82.

33. While the portions of the Massora which consist in numbers of verses, words, and letters, in lists of rare and remarkable forms or expressions, which might be readily interchanged with one another, are in part made mention of in the following sections, we shall, in so far as it has not already been done in § 30, here concern ourselves with those parts of the Massora which give information about divergent forms of text, and are therefore of special interest for the history of the text. To this class belong the distinctions recorded in the Massora between *K^{e}tîb* and *Q^{e}rê* (usually, but wrongly written *Q^{e}rî*), or between the written and the read text. In a pretty numerous set of passages—1314 according to the Massora—the Jews read a different form of text from that which has been transmitted in writing, for sometimes they pronounce another word, or another form of the word—sometimes they add something to or take something away from the text, or, finally, sometimes they arrange the letters

differently. A trace of this *quid pro quo* can clearly be traced back to the times before Christ, for even then the substitution of יהוה for אֲדֹנָי must have become a very general practice (compare § 76). At a later period we find the practice growing in extent in the Talmud, *Sepher tora, Masseket soph'rim,* and in the Massoretic works. The utterances of the Massoretes, moreover, are not in perfect agreement upon this point, for, in particular, not a few of the varying readings of the Palestinian and Babylonian Jews (§ 30) consist simply in varying statements of the Qarjan. The Qarjan, quoted in the Babylonian Talmud, twice (Ruth ii. 11 and Jer. xxxii. 11) agrees with the Babylonians against the Palestinians.

This somewhat remarkable phenomenon, when we take into consideration the Jewish reverence for the traditional text, is explained very simply from one part of the Qarjan. In the Bible we meet with various expressions which, on various accounts, people could not venture to pronounce in their synagogical readings from the Law and the Prophets, and which they were therefore in the habit of interchanging with other harmless expressions. When the public synagogical reading had been fixed in writing by means of pointing, the vowels of the substituted expression were given to the words in question, while the consonants to which these vowels were originally attached were added in the margin. Thus אֲדֹנָי was read in place of the unpronounceable יהוה (without, however, in the case of this frequently-recurring word, writing the letters אדני in the margin), שׁכב instead of the unlucky word שׁגל, צואה instead of חראים, etc. The same also naturally occurred in the corresponding passages of the Hagiographa, which received a system of pointing moulded upon the mode of the reading followed in the synagogue. Further, it is easily understood how, with regard to the Law and the Prophets, in other cases also there should be a strong tendency to hold fast to the mode of reading that had become crystallised by repeated use

in the synagogues, even where it diverged from the authorised written form of the text. And so, too, the Qarjan of those books of the Hagiographa that were not read in the synagogues proceeded from the old-established use and wont of the teachers who were accustomed to read these books. In so far it may be allowed to be possible, that the Qarjan witnesses to the existence of older forms of text which have been dislodged by the *Textus Receptus;* and upon this hypothesis are really most easily explained such double forms of text as are absolutely equal in value, *e.g.* Isa. xxiii. 12, *K^{e}tîb* כִּתִּיִּים, *Q^{e}re* כִּתִּים; Ps. v. 9, *K^{e}tîb*, הוֹתֵר, *Q^{e}re* הַיָּשָׁר. Of a more doubtful nature are the cases where the distinction has a purely grammatical and logical significance. Possibly, in the traditional mode of reading in the synagogue, free play was given to all sorts of subjective treatment of the text, for the words may have been differently divided according to the conceivable or actual sense, the suffixes may have been changed and the article taken away. It is scarcely possible to come to a definite conclusion with regard to the subjective or objective character of this sort of Qarjan. It must also be admitted to be a possible thing, that this subjective determination of the mode of reading may also have been continued in accordance with the established form of the canonical consonantal text in the principal schools. But, in any case, it soon became finally fixed, since even Ben Asher treats the read text as equally sacred and inspired with the *K^{e}tîb* itself; while the almost contemporary Saadia also regarded all recorded variations of the text as resting upon revelation.

Lists of literature are given by Strack, *Prolegomena*, p. 80 ff., 123, who quotes also the cases of *Q^{e}re* and *K^{e}tîb*, given in the Talmudical writings. Compare the partially-divergent hypothesis of Cappellus, *Critica sacra*, iii. c. 1–16; Morinus, *Exercitat. bibl.* p. 533 ff.; Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 254 ff.; Nöldeke, in *ZWT*, 1873, p. 445; *ZDMG*, xxxii. 591;

Dilmann, in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*, ii. 387; Bleek, *Einleitung*, iv. 618. The records of Ben Asher and Saadias above referred to are given in *Dikduke*, pp. 9 and 82 f.

Frensdorff, *Ochla*, Nr. 97–170, and Baer in his editions of the text, give the lists. Examples:

K^etîb and *Q^ere*: אדני for יהוה, היא for הוא (§ 92), נַעֲרָה for נער; מִלְּשָׁנִי for מלושני, Ps. ci. 5; בָּלּוֹ for בלה, Jer. ii. 21; וְנִשְׁקָעָה for ונישקה, Amos viii. 8.

Q^ere w^elo K^etîb: יָמִים בָּאִים for ימים, Jer. xxxi. 38.

K^etîb w^elo Q^ere: אֶל־יְרֻדָה for ירד ירדך, אל, Jer. li. 3.

A word which is read as two: חֵל בָּאִים for חלכאים, Ps. x. 10; כִּיאֵשׁ תֵּם for כיאשתם, Jer. vi. 29.

Two words which are read as one: בַּיְעָנִים for כי ענים, Lam. iv. 3.

Words whose final letters are connected with the following word: וּמִתַּחַת הַלְיָטְבוֹת for ומתחתה לישבות, Ezek. xlii. 9, 2 Sam. v. 2, Job. xxxviii. 12.

Words whose initial letter is connected with the preceding word: שׁוּרַיָא שְׁכִלְלוּ instead of שׁורי אשכללו, Ezra iv. 12; 2 Sam. xxi. 12.

The omission of an initial letter identical with the final letter of the preceding word: וְאָמְרוּ תִקְעוּ for ואמרו ותקעו, Jer. iv. 5.

For euphemistic readings, compare *b. Meg.* 25*b*; *Tosephta Meg.* iv. p. 228; all expressions written in such a way as to cause shame are euphemistically read.

On אדני for יהוה, see the monograph of Dalman, *Der Gottesname Adonaj*, 1889, pp. 36 ff. and 85 ff. (the Massora on Adonai).

As marginal notes, these Qarjan are sometimes called חיצונים see *Dikduke*, p. 2, line 8; Grätz, *MGWJ*, 1885, p. 108.

On the so-called סביר, compare Buxtorf, *Tiberias*, ii. c. 10; Cappellus, *Critica sacra*, iii. 15. 18; Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 233.

Passages in the older Jewish literature should not be confounded with *Q^ere*, where it is said: "Read not . . . but . . ." By this is meant not other readings but conscious plays upon letters. See Hupfeld, *TSK*, 1830, p. 554 f. (*e.g.* against Morinus, *Exercitat. bibl.* p. 581 ff.).

34. While the Qarjan spoken of in § 33 leaves undisturbed the received consonantal text, the Massora tells of some passages where a euphemistic *Qᵉre* is said to have been adopted into the consonantal text so as to lead to the complete withdrawal of the original reading. These passages are called *Tiqqune sophᵉrim*, the improved readings of the scribes (compare § 9). In the Talmud we do not meet with them, but, on the contrary, they are found in the old Midrash on Exodus, *Mechilta*. In the Massoretic works, whose lists are somewhat divergent from those of the Mechilta, their number is given at eighteen. The later Jews, for reasons that we can readily appreciate, could not understand such liberty being taken with the text, and therefore devised the ingenious theory that by these are meant only passages where the authors had abandoned the purposed expression with a view to the readers, in order to express themselves more perspicuously. The *Sophᵉrim* had then only registered the expression that was really intended. How far the traditional statements with reference to these passages are correct and have recorded all the phenomena belonging thereto, we shall more carefully investigate in a later paragraph (§ 97).

Even in the Talmud (*b. Nedarim* 37*b*) we meet with the so-called *Itture sophᵉrim*, *i.e.* five passages, where the scribes have omitted a ו from the text. Since something similar also occurs in the *Qᵉre* (*e.g.* Jer. iv. 5), and it is not possible to discover a deeper mystery in the five passages referred to, this chapter is of very little interest.

See Mechilta on Ex. xv. 7, p. 39*a* in Friedmann's edition.

Compare the older literature in Strack, *Prolegomena*, p. 86 f. (particularly Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 308 ff.); and also: Nyholm, *De* תקון סופרים *XVIII. vocum Scripturæ sacræ*, Copenhagen 1734; Nöldeke in *GGA*, 1869, p. 2001; Crane in *Hebraica*, iii. 233–248; *Dikduke*, p. 44 f.; Frensdorff, *Das Buch Ochla Wᵉochla*, Nr. 168, 217

The modern Jewish exposition is given among others by Norzi (§ 24) on Zech. ii. 12 (translated in Delitzsch, *Kommentar zu Habakuk*, 1843, p. 206 f.).

The *Tiqqune soph'rim* are according to the Massora: Gen. xviii. 22, originally ויהוה עודנו עמד; Num. xi. 15, originally ברעתך; Num. xii. 12, originally אמינו and בשרינו; 1 Sam. iii. 13, originally לי instead of להם; 2 Sam. xvi. 12, originally בעינו; 2 Sam. xx. 1 (1 Kings xii. 16; 2 Chron. x. 16), originally לאלהיו; Jer. ii. 11, originally כבודי; Ezek. viii. 17, originally אפי; Hos. iv. 7, originally כבודי and חמירו; Hab. i. 12, originally תמות; Zech. ii. 12, originally עיני; Mal. i. 13, originally אותי; Ps. cvi. 20, originally כבודו; Job vii. 20, originally עליך; Job xxxii. 3, originally ויצדיקו; Lam. iii. 20, originally נפשך.

The five *Itture soph'rim* are: Gen. xviii. 5, xxiv. 55; Num. xxxi. 2; Ps. xxxvi. 7, lxviii. 26.

35. Finally, there is still a series of passages to be mentioned, where the Jews seem to have expressed their doubt of the correctness of the text by the use of various diacritical marks, without, however, as in the *Q're*, reading another text than that handed down by tradition. The value of these marks is considerably detracted from by the fact that the critical doubts, at least in most of these cases, seem to rest on no objective foundation, but to have originated in subjective reflections, which have for us a solely historical interest. To this class belong the so-called *puncta extraordinaria* which we meet with upon particular words. We find that already in the Mishna (*Pesachim*, ix. 2), one of these cases is known: Num. ix. 10, and in the Talmud and the Midrashim several are mentioned; but they are interpreted partly in an allegorical mystical fashion. Jerome, too, is acquainted with one such case, Gen. xix. 33, and gives this explanation of it: "Appungunt desuper quasi incredibile et quod rerum natura non capiat coire quemquam nescientem." For the rest it is difficult to decide in particular cases whether the doubts

indicated are of a textual-critical or of a historical-critical character. — The so-called נ *inversum*, (compare a Baraitha *b. Sabb.* 115*b*) seems to be purely textual-critical. It is introduced in Num. x. 35 and 36 and seven times in Ps. cvii., which were originally parentheses, and seem to indicate that the passages referred to were out of their proper places. Compare, *b. Sabb.* 115*a* and above in the notes to § 6. The passages where, according to tradition, an empty space within the verse should have been, פסקא באמצע פסוק, seem to be of somewhat greater interest. Probably it was intended by means of these to indicate that the text there presented was defective; and seeing now that the old versions in some of these passages, *e.g.* in Gen. iv. 8, xxxv. 22, have actually something more than the received text, these statements may possibly rest on more objective foundations than the former; but from this it does not by any means follow that the versions should be unconditionally preferred to the traditional text.

Compare Strack, *Prolegomena*, pp. 88–91; *Dikduke*, p. 45 f. The two words distinguished by *puncta extraordinaria* in Ezek. xli. 20 and xlvi. 22, have not been translated in the Targum (Cornill, *Ezechiel*, p. 127). So too the וישקהו of Gen. xxxiii. 4 is wanting in several manuscripts of the LXX.

On נ *inversum*, compare Delitzsch, *ZKWL*, 1882, p. 231, and on Ps. cvii., *Dikduke*, p. 47.

On "Pisqa in the middle of the verse," compare Buxtorf, *Tiberias*, ii. 11; *Dikduke*, p. 54, and especially Grätz, *MGWJ*, 1878, p. 481 ff.; 1887, p. 193–200.

König in *ZKWL*, 1889, p. 225 ff., 281 ff. has shown the untenableness of the attempt of von Ortenberg (*Ueber die Bedeutung des Paseq für die Quellenscheidung in den Büchern des A. T.* 1887, and in the *ZAW*, 1887, pp. 301–312), to find in Paseq a sign of a collection of various documentary authorities.

5. *Quotations and Transcriptions.*

36. Among the immediate aids for the history of the text are also to be reckoned the occasional introduction of larger or smaller parts of the text into the earlier Jewish and Christian literature, in so far as they reproduce the literal original form of the text. Thus, in the Talmud and in Midrashic works, there is to be found a great number of quotations from the Old Testament writings, which may be of service in affording us a glance into the contemporary condition of the text. Yet, in order that he may not misuse the aid, one should not lose sight of the fact that such passages were often quoted from memory, so that they may not be absolutely identical with the text of that time. Only in cases where the argument turns upon the form of the words in the text, can we conclude that we have a true quotation. Among these are to be reckoned the still extant fragments of the second column in the *Hexapla* of Origen (§ 43), which contains the original Hebrew text transcribed in Greek characters, and from which the fathers sometimes quoted portions, together with the not infrequent transliterations of the original text in Jerome. These transcriptions are specially valuable for this reason that they give us an indication of the pronunciation of the Hebrew then common. The same is true of the tolerably numerous passages where Theodotion in his version has left the Hebrew word untranslated (§ 53). In Josephus and the LXX. the transcriptions are limited for the most part to proper names, but even these are of great importance, especially for the history of the Hebrew language. So too the transliterations of the Hebrew names on the Assyrian and Egyptian inscriptions, imperfect though they are, sometimes cast light upon the ante-Massoretic pronunciation of Hebrew.

On the quotations from the Old Testament in the Talmud and in the Midrashim, compare Cappellanus, *Mare rabbinicum*

infidum, Paris 1667; Cappellus, *Critica sacra*, v. 12; Strack, *Prolegomena*, pp. 59–72, 94–111, 122; Brüll, *Jahrbücher für jüd. Geschichte und Litteratur*, iv. 166; Geiger, *Jüd. Zeitschrift*, iv. 1886, p. 165; *Nachgelassene Schriften*, iv. 27 ff.; Deutsch, *Sprüche Salomos*, 1885, i. 63–78. The Tosephta quotations are given by B. Pick, *ZAW*, vi. 23–29. The quotations from Mechilta and Sifre in *ZAW*, iv. 101–121. But see the depreciatory remarks of Derenbourg in regard to these collections in *ZAW*, vii. 91–93, where, with good reason, he warns against such a hunt after variations.

On the transcriptions in Jerome compare Siegfried, *ZAW*, 1884, pp. 34–83. On the transcribed Hebrew text in the *Hexapla*, compare Field, *Origenis hexapla*, i. lxxi sqq. On Theodotion compare Field, i. xi sq. He renders the נקדים of Amos i. 1, *e.g.* νωκεδειμ; the דביר of Ps. xxvii 2 by δαβειρ, etc. We sometimes meet with the same sort of thing in the LXX.; see Cornill, *Das Buch des Proph. Ezechiel*, p. 96.

The proper names in Josephus are treated of by Siegfried in *ZAW*, 1883, pp. 38–41. On the names in the LXX. compare Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, p. 90 ff.; Könnecke, *Die Behandlung der hebräischen Namen in der Septuaginta* (Progr.), Stargard 1885; and, as of quite special value, the collections in Lagarde's *Uebersicht über die im Aramäischen, Arabischen und Hebräischen übliche Bildung der Nomina*, 1889. Also the *Onomastica sacra* of Eusebius and Jerome, as edited by Lagarde (2nd ed. 1887), should be taken into account here.

On the Assyrian translations see Schrader, *Keilinschriften und das Altes Testament*, 1883 [Eng. trans. in 2 vols., *The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*, London 1885, 1888]. On the Egyptian and other transcriptions see Merx, *Archiv für wissenschaftl. Forschung d. A. T.* i. 350 ff.; *Bulletin de la société de géographie*, 1879, pp. 209 ff., 327 ff. Compare also Steindorff, *Die keilinschriftliche Wiedergabe ägyptischer Eigennamen* in the *Beiträgen zur Assyriologie*, i. 1889, pp. 330–361, where repeatedly mention is made of Egyptian names occurring in the Old Testament. On the names of places in the letters found in the *Tel-il-Amama*, see Halévy

in *REJ*, xx. 199 ff.; Zimmern, *Zeitschrift d. Deutsch. Palästinavereins*, xiii. 133 ff.

B.—The Old Translations.

1. *The Alexandrine Translation—The Septuagint.*

37. The oldest version of the Old Testament, and generally one of the oldest and most remarkable attempts to translate a writing into another language, is the translation produced by the Alexandrine Jews. What is told of still earlier translations of the Law is devoid of all historical value. It is told, indeed, by a Jewish philosopher that lived under Ptolemy Philometor, B.C. 180–145, that there was a much older rendering (*Diermeneusis*) of the Law from the times of the Persian sovereignty; but even if the fragments ascribed to Aristobulus are genuine, which we have no sufficient ground to doubt, that alleged translation cannot certainly have been anything else than a postulate which seemed to philosophically cultured Jews necessary in order that they might explain the points of contact between Plato or Pythagoras and the Mosaic law from the acquaintance of these philosophers with Mosaism. Still less can a confused story in *Massecet soph^{e}rim* (§ 32) of an earlier translation of the Law by five elders lay any claim to credibility. Indeed, the very uncertainty of the text in this particular passage deprives this story of every vestige of historical worth.

On the Jewish philosopher Aristobulus and the fragments of his work preserved by Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius, compare Hody, *De Bibliorum textibus originalibus*, lib. i. cap. ix. p. 49 ff.; Valckenaer, *Diatribe de Aristobulo*, Leyden 1806, and Schürer, *Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, ii. 764, Eng. trans. Div. ii. vol. iii. 237, where further lists of literature are given.

Among those who contest the genuineness of those fragments is specially to be named Joel, *Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte zu Anfang des 2 christl. Jahrhundert*, i. 1880, p. 79 ff.

In the fragment communicated by Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata*, i. 22, ed. Potter, i. 410) and Eusebius (*Præparatio evangelica*, xiii. 12), Aristobulus writes to King Philometor: *κατηκολούθηκε δὲ καὶ ὁ Πλάτων τῇ καθ' ἡμᾶς νομοθεσίᾳ καὶ φανερός ἐστι περιειργασάμενος ἕκαστα τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ λεγομένων διερμηνεύται γὰρ πρὸ Δημητρίου δι' ἑτέρων, πρὸ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Περσῶν ἐπικρατήσεως, τά τε κατὰ τὴν ἐξαγωγὴν τῶν Ἑβραίων τῶν ἡμετέρων πολιτῶν, καὶ ἡ τῶν γεγονότων ἁπάντων αὐτοῖς ἐπιφάνεια, καὶ κράτησις τῆς χώρας καὶ τῆς ὅλης νομοθεσίας ἐπεξήγησις· ὥστε εὔδηλον εἶναι τὸν προειρημένον φιλόσοφόν εἰληφέναι πολλά· γέγονε γὰρ πολυμαθὴς, καθὼς καὶ Πυθαγόρας, πολλὰ τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν μετενέγκας εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δογματοποιίαν κατεχώρισεν. Ἡ δ' ὅλη ἑρμηνεία τῶν διὰ τοῦ νόμου πάντων ἐπὶ τοῦ προσαγορευθέντος Φιλαδέλφου βασιλέως, σοῦ δὲ προγόνου, προσενεγκαμένου μείζονα φιλοτιμίαν, Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως πραγματευσαμένου τὰ περὶ τούτων.* For the rest a certain acquaintance on the part of Plato with the Jewish religion need not be regarded as absolutely impossible. In some not very clear words ascribed to Demetrius Phalereus by the author of the Epistle of Aristeas (Haverkamp, *Josephus*, ii. 2. 107, compare Josephus, *Antiquities*, xii. 2. 3) there is certainly no reason why we should find a reminiscence of earlier attempts at translation (against Frankel, *Vorstudien*, p. 24).

Masseket soph'rim, i. p. ii: "Five elders wrote for King Ptolemy the Law in Greek, and this day was for the Israelites just as dark as the day on which the golden calf was made, for the Law cannot be translated with impunity. And at a later time the king gathered together seventy elders," etc. In some manuscripts, בחכמיטה זקנים, and the older tract, *Sepher tora* (§ 32), here in the same passage שבעים זקנים. Therefore the use which Joel, *Blicke in die Reglionsgeschichte*, p. 1 ff., makes of the story in the *Masseket soph'rim* is very precarious. Compare also Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 441; *Nachgelassene Schriften*, iv. 71; Berliner, *Targum Onkelos*, ii. 78 f.

38. From the Prologue to the translation of the Book of Ben Sirach (§ 4) it appears that the Law, the Prophets, and part also of the Hagiographa must have existed about B.C. 130 in a Greek translation; and that this translation is in all essential respects identical with the Septuagint as known to us, follows from the use made of it by the somewhat earlier Jewish historical writer, Demetrius, as well as by the Jewish-Hellenistic writers of the last century before Christ. But when this has been said, we have before us really all that is certainly known respecting the origin of the Alexandrine translation. There is indeed no lack of very particular and detailed stories about the way in which the Septuagint came into existence, but unfortunately they are of such a kind that they confuse rather than explain our conception of the origin of this important and influential work.

The oldest writing which speaks of the translation of the Law into the Greek language is the celebrated Epistle of Aristeas, a Jewish-Alexandrine work. This production must at least be older than Josephus and Philo, possibly even than the writings of Aristobulus mentioned at p. 108, as we have internal reason for supposing that it belongs to an age when the Jews had not yet exchanged the Ptolemaic sovereignty for that of the Seleucidean dynasty. Its date must therefore have been earlier than B.C. 198. The little book represents itself as an epistle which Aristeas, an officer of King Ptolemy II. Philadelphus (B.C. 284–247), and therefore a Gentile, had written to his brother Philocrates. In a good literary style it is related how the king's librarian, Demetrius Phalereus, advised his master to have the Law of the Jews translated into Greek, in order that it might have a place given it in the royal library of Alexandria. The king agrees to this proposal, and, besides, emancipates the 100,000 Jews whom his father had carried to Egypt as prisoners of war. He then sent Aristeas and the captain of his bodyguard to Jerusalem with

rich presents and a letter, in which he prays the High Priest Eleazar to supply him with men capable of undertaking this work. There then follows a spirited description of Jerusalem, the temple, the country, and above all of the noble and reasonable laws of the Jews. The high priest is filled with joy at the request of the king, and seventy-two men, six from every tribe, are sent to Alexandria with a copy of the Law written in golden letters. During seven days they have daily audiences of the king, and excite the admiration of all by the wisdom with which they answer the seventy-two questions proposed to them in philosophy, politics, and ethics. Thereafter they are transported to the island of Pharos, where, in a beautiful residence, they engage diligently in the work of translation. Every day they all translate, each one by himself, a portion of the Law, and then, after comparison of the various renderings, they produce a common text. In seventy-two days the work is completed. The Alexandrine Jews express their admiration of the work, and beseech that they may be supplied with a copy of it, while they pronounce a curse upon every one who should presume to change the translation. Finally, the king, who was greatly astonished that this noble law should have been unknown to the Greeks, sends the seventy-two interpreters home laden with rich presents.

This story, though anything but niggardly in its supply of admiration, gifts, and symbolical numbers, was not sufficient for the taste of the following generation, and so it had to be further adorned in various directions. In Philo we meet with an important addition which represents the interpreters as inspired (compare § 12), so that they, for example, had all used in their several translations the very same expressions. In the Church fathers this is still further improved upon by the assertion, that each of the seventy-two interpreters had wrought in his own cell without being able to confer with his colleagues. In this form the story was adopted by the

Talmud, where it forms a rare contrast to the reservation, not to say antipathy, with which the Alexandrine translation is elsewhere referred to (§ 40). Yea, even the Samaritans have appropriated the story with these legendary excrescences. At the same time, in opposition to the express statements of older authorities, this story was made to apply to all the books of the Old Testament, which even Jerome, who views the whole narrative with a rather sceptical eye (§ 51), decidedly rejects.

The Epistle of Aristeas, which has been often published (as, *e.g.* in Havercamp's *Josephus*, ii. 2. pp. 103–132), has recently been issued with a critically improved text by Moritz Schmidt in Merx's *Archiv für Wissensch. Erforschung d. A. T.* i. 241 ff. Compare generally in regard to this subject: Hody, *De Bibliorum textibus originalibus*, lib. i.; Nöldeke, *Alttestamentliche Litteratur*, p. 109 ff.; Grätz, *MGWJ*, 1876, p. 289 ff.; Bleek, *Einleitung*, p. 571 ff.; Papageorgios, *Ueber den Aristeasbrief*, Munich 1880; Lumbroso, *Recherches sur l'Économie politique de l'Égypte sous les Lagides*, Turin 1870, p. 351 ff.; Schürer, *Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, ii. 819–824, Eng. trans. Div. ii. vol. iii. 306–312, where further lists of literature are given.

Philo, ed. Mangey, ii. 139. The passages of the fathers are enumerated by Gallandi, *Bibliotheca veterum patrum*, ii. 805–824, and by Schürer, *Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, ii. 823, Eng. trans. Div. ii. vol. iii. 311. On the chronological statements of the fathers about the year in which the LXX. was translated, see Nestle, *Septuaginta-Studien*, Ulm 1886, p. 12 f.

B. Megilla 9*a*, *Masseket soph*^{e}*rim* i. p. ii. On the other hand, the Mechilta on Ex. xii. 40 (p. 15*b*) about this says only that the Law had been translated "before the time of King Ptolemy." On the Samaritans, see Vilmar, *Annales Samaritanæ*, 1865, p. 95 ff.

Jerome (Vallarsi vi. 456): "Josefus enim scribit et Hebræi tradunt, quinque tantum libros legis Moysi ab eis translatos et Ptolemæo regi traditos.

39. As to the historical character of the account given in the Epistle of Aristeas, there prevails at this day general agreement to this extent, that no one entertains the idea of accepting the story as credible in all its details. As the author himself quite evidently was a Jew writing under a heathen mask, there is also much in his book which is clearly pure invention *in majorem gloriam Judæorum*. On the other hand, among the most distinguished investigators there still prevails a difference of opinion with regard to the question, whether the whole is a purely fictitious romance, or whether a historical core lies hidden under the legendary form. This is a question of great importance in the history of culture, for it is of no small interest to know whether one of the first attempts to translate a literary work into another language (an attempt which had a sort of precursor only in the older polylingual royal decrees) was called forth by the literary craving of the Hellenistic race for knowledge or by the practical need of the Egyptian Jews. Now there are certainly very serious reasons to be alleged against the credibility of this story even when it has been reduced to very much more modest dimensions. On the one hand, attention is called to the jargon, unintelligible to a Greek, in which the translation of the Law has been written. Of expressions like γειώρας (*i.e.* גֵּר, or, as Lagarde shows, rather the Aramaic גִּיּוֹר), ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἀσεβείας, and numerous others of that sort, a Greek could absolutely make nothing, not to speak of יהוה (§ 76) taken over simply in its Hebrew form. And it is certainly not easy to understand why this barbarously rendered translation should not have been subjected to a linguistic revision, if the cultured classes of Alexandrian society had intended to make themselves acquainted by its help with the Jewish Law. Further, it is also in a high degree remarkable that the Alexandrine Jews should have given liturgical rank to a translation of their holy Law carried out at the instance of a

heathen. Had there been indeed no account of the origin of the Septuagint handed down by tradition, then certainly no one would hesitate to account for its existence from the need of the Egyptian Jews, who were growing ever more and more unfamiliar with their Hebrew mother tongue, and all the more so as such a need did certainly very soon make itself felt (compare Nehem. xiii. 24). And in order to satisfy this need just such a translation as the Alexandrine was required, which used the peculiar Jewish-Greek jargon and contributed further to its development. But, notwithstanding all this, we can find no justification for the wholesale rejection of the credibility of the story. If it be really so, as cannot well be denied (compare § 38), that the Epistle of Aristeas was written at the latest about B.C. 200, and therefore scarcely half a century after the death of Ptolemy II., it would have been a bold proceeding on the part of any writer to describe the origin of the translation of the Torah in such a way that its untruth must have been apparent, as well to the Alexandrians as to the Jews. The same is true of the passage from Aristobulus quoted in § 37, whether it be supposed that he knew or did not know the story told by Aristeas. And even if we should feel justified in minimising this witness by adopting the idea that the writings in question were of later origin, still there would remain the circumstance, not easily to be accounted for by us, that the explanation given in the Book of Aristeas of the origin of the Septuagint, considered as a contribution to the history of culture, is of far too original a character to be attributed to a Jewish fabricator. Neither should we overlook the fact that the second of the reasons which have been now given for the rejection of the story is very much weakened by this, that in any case the Jewish author of the Book of Aristeas and the Jews following him, Philo and Josephus, have taken no offence at the thought of the translation having been made at the instance of a heathen prince. Finally, as

to the objection which has been advanced against the historical truth of the story, to the effect that, according to the distinct statement of Hermippus Callimachius, who lived during the reign of Ptolemy III., Demetrius Phalereus had been banished from Alexandria immediately after the death of Ptolemy Lagus, it concerns only a quite separable matter of detail in the story, and cannot therefore be decisive of the main point of the question. If then, after an exact estimate has been made of all reasons, *pro* and *con*, we still hold by the position that the king had a share in the originating of the Septuagint, it is, on the other hand, undeniable that the *rôle* which the translation of the Law is said to have played in the learned circles of Alexandria is wholly undemonstrable; whereas the Greek Torah, in connection with the other books subsequently translated, won among the Alexandrian and all Hellenistic Jews, and through them, among the members of the Christian Church, an importance of which the men who first conceived this bold idea could certainly never have dreamed.

The usual designation in the fathers and in the Talmudical writings, "The Translation of the Seventy," which is applied to the translation of the Law as well as to that of the other books, rests indeed upon the Epistle of Aristeas as its authority, for seventy is simply a round number for seventy-two. But whence the Book of Aristeas has taken that number, which plays so extraordinary a *rôle* in its narrative, and is, therefore, certainly not an invented number, remains still quite obscure.

The question that concerns us here is dealt with in the works of Hody and Valckenaer referred to in § 37, and in many more recent treatises. The following admit partially the credibility of the story told by Aristeas: Valckenaer; Ewald, *Geschichte du Volkes Israel*[3], iv. 322 ff., Eng. trans. v. 244; Wellhausen-Bleek, *Einleitung*, p. 571 ff.; Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte*, v. 490. The whole story is rejected

as a pure fabrication by: Hody, *De Bibliorum Textibus;* Eichhorn, *Repertorium* i. 266 ff.; Reuss, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des A. T.* § 436; Nöldeke, *ZDMG*, xxxii. 588, xxxix. 342; Kuenen, *Godsdienst*, ii. 392; Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, p. 6 ff.; Schuurmans Stekhoven, *De alexandrijnsche Vertaling van het Dodekapropheton*, p. 1 ff.; Oort, *Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1882, p. 287 ff.

The report of Hermippus Callimachius is given in Müller, *Fragmenta hist. Græc.* iii. 47.

In explanation of the name "Septuaginta" various conjectures have been made. Special attention has been called to this that seventy (seventy-one or seventy-two) constituted the normal number of members in a Jewish High Court of Justice. Compare Num. xi. 16, and further Schürer, *Geschichte der jüd. Volkes*, ii. 151, Eng. trans. Div. ii. vol. i. 174 ff. It has therefore been conjectured that the name referred to the authorisation of the translation by a high court of justice. Compare Ewald, *Geschichte der Volkes Israel*, iv. 327, Eng. trans. v. 249; Schuurmans Stekhoven, *De alexandrijnsche Vertaling*, p. 4 f., and the other works above quoted. But nothing of this sort can be proved in connection with Alexandria in the times of the Ptolemies. Still less satisfactory as accounting for the name is the hypothesis that a larger number had actually been engaged in the work (Wellhausen-Bleek, *Einleitung*, p. 576). Compare also the treatise of Steinschneiders on the "Number Seventy" in the *ZDMG*, iv. 145 ff.

40. To the translation of the Pentateuch were soon added translations of the other Old Testament writings. Even the translation of the Torah, as it seems, was not the work of one hand, and this is still more evidently true of the other translations which were executed by various and very variously qualified translators. The most of them are certainly to be regarded as private attempts, to which only circumstances lent authoritative importance. This is seen notably in the case of the Book of Ezra, of which we possess two translations of

varying extent (§ 13). An instructive picture of the way in which such translations originated is given in the preface to the Book of Ben Sirach (§ 4), which at the same time is interesting on account of its remarks about the imperfections of the translations of Old Testament writings that then existed. Besides the definite dating of this preface, the translation of the Book of Esther also contains a statement as to the date of its composition, which, however, is anything but clear.

Notwithstanding this partly private origin, the whole translation soon came to be highly esteemed among the Alexandrian Jews, and was in later times regarded as inspired (§ 12). It was used in the synagogue service wherever Greek was the principal language of the Jews, and was at the same time the means by which the ancient civilised world was subsequently made acquainted with the sacred writings of Israel. The dialect of the Septuagint, so barbarous in a Greek ear, has in several particulars exercised an influence upon the language of the New Testament, and in later days through the fathers, with whom it often completely took the place of the original, and through the translations of following generations, which were all more or less dependent upon it, it has exercised an influence on the religious phraseology of the Christian communities which can be traced even in the most modern languages.

Among the Jews, on the contrary, it only gradually secured its position. We have very incomplete information as to the feelings which prevailed at the first among the Palestinian Jews with reference to this new attempt. No certain conclusion can be drawn from the large use of the Septuagint made by Josephus owing to the peculiar position of that author. The proofs which go to show that the LXX. was used in the Palestinian synagogues are rather weak, and have been vigorously contested by modern Jewish authors. In the Talmud we have the story of the seventy-two inter-

preters, a story which has as its presupposition the inspired character of the LXX., set quietly beside the enumeration of various passages in which its divergences from the genuine text are rejected. On the other hand, the steadily growing struggle with Christianity must naturally have contributed largely to make the Jews, who were always considerably influenced by the state of feeling that prevailed in Palestine, regard with aversion a translation which played so important a *rôle* in the Church. Also, apart from the divergence between the Septuagint and the Palestinian Canon, the often excessive freedom with which the Alexandrine translation treats the Old Testament text could not be satisfactory to the Jews, whose very life and being lay in their adherence to letters and tittles. We possess several witnesses to the existence of this antipathy. Even the writings of Justin Martyr show that the difference between the LXX. and the Hebrew Bible formed a chief point of religious controversy between Jews and Christians. *Sefer Tora*, i. 8, declares that the day on which the Seventy translated the Law was for Israel as doleful as the day on which the golden calf was made (§ 37); and in the later portions of the *Megillath Taanith*, c. xii. it is said: "On 8th Tebét the Law was in the days of King Ptolemy (תלמי) written in the Greek language, and darkness covered the world for three days." The best proof of this feeling among the Jews against the Septuagint, which occasioned so many difficulties to the Church fathers, is to be found in the new Greek translations of the Old Testament which obtained currency among the Jews, and of which a description will be given in a later part of this work (§ 51).

On the question whether several translators had taken part in the Torah translation, compare Frankel, *Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandr. Hermeneutik*, 1851, p. 228 ff.; Egli in the *ZWT*, 1862, p. 76 ff.

In the Prologue to Ben Sirach the translator writes: "Ye

are besought to make allowance where we seem in some words to have failed, although the translation has been made with care, for what has been said in Hebrew and its translation into another language cannot perfectly correspond; also the Law, the Prophecies, and the other books are in their original form not a little different from the translation."

The subscription of the Greek translation of the Book of Esther runs as follows: "In the fourth year of the reign of Ptolemy and Cleopatra, Dositheus, who is said to have been a priest or a Levite, and his son Ptolemy introduced the letter now before us as the φρουραι [Purim], which, according to this statement, had been translated in Jerusalem by Lysimachus, the son of Ptolemy. Compare Fritzsche, *Kurzgefasotes exeget. Handbuch zu die Apokryphen*, i. 72 f.; Nöldeke, *Alttestamentliche Litteratur*, p. 88; Wildeboer, *Het onstaan van den Kanon*, 2nd ed. p. 33.

On the influence which the Septuagint has exercised in philosophy, compare Nöldeke, *Alttestamentliche Literatur*, p. 249.

On the question of the use of the LXX. in the Palestinian synagogues, compare Eichhorn, *Einleitung* [3], i. § 166; Fritzsche in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie* [2], i. 284; Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, p. 56 ff.; Berliner, *Targum Onkelos*, ii. 80. The chief passages are *jer. Meg.* iv. fol. 75*a*: "The foreign-speaking Jews did not observe the custom prevailing amongst us to divide the reading of the Torah among several persons, for one individual reads the whole *Parasha*." Also, *jer. Sota* vii. 1, fol. 21*b*, on the *Sh'ma*; and Justinian, *Novell.* 146.

The passages where the LXX., according to the Jewish statement, diverges from the original Hebrew text, are to be found in *b. Meg.* 9, *jer. Meg.* i. 9; *Mechilta* on Exodus xii. 20, p. 15*b*, and *Massecket soph'rim* i. The best known is Gen. i. 1, where the LXX., according to the Talmudical statement, translate, as though it had been בראשית אלהים ברא; this presupposes that the native Jews themselves interpreted: "In the beginning when God created." Compare Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, p. 25 ff.; Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 439 ff.; *Nachgelassene Schriften*, iv. 50 f.

Justin Martyr (ed. Otto II. p. 232): *τοῖς διδασκάλοις ὑμῶν, οἵτινες τολμῶσι λέγειν τὴν ἐξήγησιν, ἣν ἐξηγήσαντο οἱ ἑβδομήκοντα ὑμῶν πρεσβύτεροι παρὰ Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων βασιλεῖ γενόμενοι, μὴ εἶναι ἔν τισιν ἀληθῆ.* Compare also the same work at p. 240, and Origen, *Ad Africanum* § 5.

41. In judging of the Alexandrine translation we should not for a moment lose sight of the fact that it was a first attempt to perform a difficult task, the translating of a writing out of one language into another, which was found essentially different from the first, and in which expressions were altogether wanting for numerous ideas of the Old Testament. Besides, it ought not to be forgotten that the demands then made of a Bible translation were very different from what would now be made. What was desired was a practically useful translation which would take account of the circumstances of that particular time, which, above all, required that the form in which the sacred writings appeared should be in keeping with the advancing religious consciousness, and should obviate the objections which a more careful and sharper-eared generation might raise against the original form of the writings. The LXX. shows traces throughout of the influence of these factors. It avoids completely the bold anthropomorphisms and the striking *naïveté* of the original text, and shows in this particular an evident relationship with the other old Bible translations of the Jews. And while it is true of every translation that it presupposes a special exegesis of the text in question, this naturally was doubly observable at a time when in a thoroughly naïve manner the then dominant interpretation was treated as the one possible sense of the text. Hence the LXX. in many passages, as well in a Halachic as in a Haggadic direction, assumes the character of a Midrash, which mirrors the contemporary conception of the Bible, and is consequently of decided importance for the history of Old Testament exegesis. That in this way the peculiar circum-

stances and spiritual movements of the Egyptian Jews are allowed to shine through, is what might very naturally be expected. Yet even in this connection the facts have been very much overstated, and the endeavour has been made to find more than the LXX. can afford. That in sections which treat of Egypt it gives evidence of thorough acquaintance with the conditions of that country is natural enough; and so too the well-known rendering of ארנבת by δασύπους instead of λαγώς may have been done out of consideration for the Lagidæ. But all this is not, in any case, of much importance. And specially we shall seek in vain after any real influence of the Greek philosophy on the rendering of the text. At the most this can be proved only in quite isolated expressions, like ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος (Gen. i. 2); but upon the whole the LXX. is a purely Jewish work, whose authors have had only a very superficial connection with the intellectual and spiritual life of Greece.

If we keep in view all the circumstances which have been here mentioned, we shall guard ourselves against making the Alexandrine translation the subject of a sharp criticism. It must rather as a whole call forth our admiration that it should in any sort of way have actually accomplished its task. Only that kind of criticism is justifiable which makes the better sections of the LXX. the standard of comparison for those that have been less successful. There will be found, even within the compass of the whole translation, a remarkable diversity among the several books, which, however, is of interest historically, because it not only proceeds from the very diverse capacities of the translators, but also from the adoption of diverse hermeneutical principles. The first rank unconditionally is held by the translation of the Pentateuch, although even there the various parts are dealt with somewhat variously (compare p. 116). Also the Psalms, of so much importance for the community, are to be regarded as a well-

executed piece of work. So, too, the generally clear contents of the historical Prophets made it possible for the translators to produce a useful translation. On the other hand, several of the Prophets and the Hagiographa are very inadequately, sometimes very badly, translated, so that indeed they run through the whole scale from the freest paraphrases to the most rigid imitation of the very order of word and phrase in the Hebrew. "Nactus est Isaias interpretem sese indignum," remarks Zwingli with good reason, for the translation of that book is in fact of such a kind that one has more cause to admire its readers than its author. One of the most wilfully translated books is the Book of Job, whose translator wished to pose as a *poetarum lector;* while among those that have been rendered with painful literalness are: Ezekiel, Chronicles, The Song, and Ecclesiastes. The two last named remind one strikingly of the method of Aquila (§ 52); yet the exact relation between them and that translator is not quite clear.

Compare on the subject of this section as a whole: Geiger, *Nachgelassene Schriften,* iv. 73 ff.; Frankel, *Vorstudien zur der Septuaginta,* pp. 163–203.

On the Palestinian influence compare Frankel, *Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik,* 1857 (dealing only with the Pentateuch); Geiger, *Jüd. Zeitschrift,* iv. 99 ff.

Examples of the treatment of the text affected by the times, Isaiah ix. 11: *Συρίαν ἀφ' ἡλίαυ ἀνατολῶν καὶ τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἀφ' ἡλίου δυσμῶν*; Num. xxiv. 7: *ἐξελεύσεται ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ κυριεύσει ἐθνῶν πολλῶν· καὶ ὑψωθήσεται ἡ Γωγ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ*; Josh. xiii. 22: "Balaam did they slay בחרב," the LXX. *ἐν τῇ ῥοπῇ*, compare the Jewish Haggada, that Balaam, who by his magical arts had fled into the air, was brought down by Phinehas. On the other hand, the LXX. in Isaiah xix. 18, with their *πόλις ἀσεδεκ*, are not, after all, to be regarded as Egyptising, but rather as preserving the original.

On the influence of Greek philosophy see Frankel, *Ueber den Einfluss*, pp. 34–42; Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2. p. 217; Siegfried, *Philo als Ausleger d. A. T.* 1875, p. 8; and especially Freudenthal, in *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, ii. 1890, pp. 205–222, who, after a thoroughgoing investigation, has arrived at a purely negative result.

It is worthy of being observed that in the three passages where the translators of the LXX. are directly spoken of (the Epistle of Aristeas, the Prologue to the Book of Ben Sirach, and the Postscript to the Book of Esther), the seventy-two interpreters of the Law are brought from Palestine, the translator of the Book of Ben Sirach comes from Palestine to Egypt, and the translator of the Book of Esther lives in Jerusalem. As a matter of fact, in most cases the Palestinians would have understood Greek better than the Jews born in Egypt would know Hebrew, so that certainly the translators would mostly be recruited from the recently immigrant Palestinians.

Luther's judgment of the LXX., in so far as it is regarded as a historical phenomenon, is too severe: "Translating is a special grace and gift of God. The seventy Greek translators have so translated the Hebrew Bible into the Greek language as to show themselves inexperienced in and unacquainted with the Hebrew, their translation is very trifling and absurd, for they have disdained to speak the letters, words, and style" (*Erlangen. Ausgabe*, lxii. 112).

Among the ever-increasing special treatises on the several books of the LXX. the following may be named (in addition to the older literature given by Eichhorn, *Einleitung*[3], i. § 181): Töpler, *De Pentateuchi interpretationis Alex. indole*, 1830; Thiersch, *De Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina libri* iii. 1841; Frankel, *Ueber den Einfluss*, 1851. Hollenberg, *Der Charakter der alexandrinische Uebersetzung des Buches Josua*, 1876. Schulte, *De restitutione atque indole genuinæ versionis græcæ in libro Judicum*, 1889. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 1871. [*Studia Biblica*, 1st series, 1885, *The Light thrown by the Septuagint Version on the Books of Samuel*, by F. H. Woods.] Scholz, *Die alexandrinische Uebersetzung des Buches Jesaias*, 1880. Movers, *De*

utriusque recensionis vaticiniorum Jeremiæ indole et origine, 1834; Wichelhaus, *De Jeremiæ versionis alexandrinæ indole et auctoritate*, 1846; Scholz, *Der masoretische Text und die LXX. Uebersetzung des Buches Jeremias*, 1875; Workman, *The Text of Jeremiah; a Critical Investigation of the Greek and Hebrew, with the Variations in the LXX. retranslated into the Original, and Explained*, 1889. Cornill, *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel*, 1886, pp. 13–103. Vollers, *Das Dodekapropheten der Alexandriner*, 1880 (Nahum–Malachi), and in *ZAW*, 1883, p. 219 ff., 1884, p. 1 ff. (Hosea–Micah); Schuurmans Stekhoven, *De alexandrijnsche Vertaling van het Dodekapropheton*, 1887; Treitch, *Die alexandrinische Uebersetzung des Buches Hosea*, i. 1888; Ryssel, *Untersuchungen über die Textgestalt des Buches Micha*, 1887. Bæthgen, *Der textkritische Werth der alten Uebersetzungen zu den Psalmen*, *JPT*, 1882, p. 407 ff. Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur griech. Uebersetzung der Proverbien*, 1863. Bickell, *De indole ac ratione versionis Alexandrinæ in interpretando libro Jobi*, 1862, and in the *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 1886, p. 557 ff.; Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, Oxford 1889, pp. 215–246, *On Origen's Revision of the LXX. Text of Job*; Dillmann, "Textkritisches zum Buche Job" in *Sitzungsberichte der Königleheuss Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 1890. [Cheyne, "Dillmann on the Text of Job" in *Expositor* for August 1891, pp. 142–145.] Compare also on the traces of the Greek poets in this translation, Egli in the *Rhein. Museum*, xii. 414–448. Jacob, "Das Buch Esther bei den LXX. in *ZAW*, 1890, p. 241 ff. On the Greek translation of Ecclesiastes, compare Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, 1875, p. 65; Grätz, *Koheleth*, p. 175 f.; Renan, *L'Ecclésiaste*, 1882, p. 55 f.; Wright, *The Book of Koheleth*, 1883, p. 50 f.; Klostermann, *TSK*, 1885, p. 153 ff.; Bludau, *De alexandrinæ interpretationis libri Danielis indole*, i. 1891. See also the Prefaces of Jerome to his Commentary, and below at § 52.

42. Besides the historical importance referred to in the preceding sections, the LXX. has the signal distinction of being the oldest complete witness to the text of the Old

Testament. It opens up to us the possibility of being able to work back to the Hebrew text that lay before each individual Greek translator, and in this way to gain acquaintance with a form of text which is some twelve hundred years older than the oldest Hebrew Bible manuscript. The comparison of the text thus constructed, the Alexandrine Text, with the Massoretic Text, introduces us to the most important of all the sections of the history of the text, and converts an entire series of problems from wholly irrelevant variations into completely divergent recensions. Under these circumstances it is in the highest degree deplorable that the use of the LXX. in textual criticism should be so seriously prejudiced by the defective condition of its own text, the restoration of which Stroth called "the squaring of the circle." The degeneration of the Septuagint text began very early, as is shown by the curses, certainly not uttered without occasion, which the Epistle of Aristeas represents the Jews as pronouncing upon every corruption of the translation. A productive cause of this, here as in most cases, was the carelessness and awkwardness of the transcribers, aggravated no doubt by the occasionally meaningless character of the Alexandrine translation; but we learn expressly, even from Justin Martyr, who died about A.D. 163, that many conscious alterations and additions had, even on the part of Christians, been introduced into the text. A well-known example of such additions, in which, moreover, Justin and other fathers considered that they had original elements of the text which had been erased by the Jewish hatred of Christ, are the words *ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου* in Psalm xcvi. 10, which long played a part in patristic literature. Gradually the discrepancies of the various manuscripts assumed so disturbing a character that a remedy for this evil became a necessity. The first who undertook to perform this task was the great Origen, who died A.D. 254. The magnificent conception of

his work in textual criticism continues still to excite an admiration, which is not lessened by the fact that it is not difficult to criticise his methods now, when we are able to glance over their consequences. But it is a fact that his undertaking has contributed to render the use of the LXX. for the purposes of textual criticism yet more difficult. The reason of this was that Origen sought to perform another task of textual criticism, namely, to determine the relation between the Alexandrine translation and the Hebrew text, not only contemporaneously with the establishing of the Septuagint text, but even using that same Septuagint text as an aid in performing that task, whereas that former problem should only have been taken up after he had secured a pure and certain Septuagint text. Although the LXX. in several passages affords the means of improving the received text of the Palestinian Jews, since it points back to an original form of text, the Palestinian Jewish authority, half against the will of Origen, exercised so great an influence that by his labours the LXX. lost not a little of its peculiarities.

Compare *Justin Martyr*, ed. Otto, ii. p. 242 ff.

The position of Origen on this question formed an exact parallel to his treatment of the question of the canon. Also in that connection there were, as he himself expressly remarks, frequent disputations between the Christians and the Jews, which moved him to make his fellow-believers acquainted with the Jewish Bible in order to protect them against the criticism of the Jews (compare *Ad Africanum*, § 5).

43. As then, Origen, notwithstanding the prominence which he gave to the Jewish Canon, would by no means surrender the Apocrypha received by the Church (§ 17), he did not consider the Jewish text *in principio* as the only correct text, to which the Alexandrine translation had to be in all cases conformed. In the passage where he expresses himself most thoroughly with regard to the principles of his

textual criticism (Comm. on Matth. xv. 14), he says, in express opposition to such an idea, that he might not find himself justified (*οὐ τολμήσαντες*) in removing from his Septuagint text the sentences and words to be met with in the LXX., but not in the Hebrew text. But seeing that it was at the same time his aim to call attention to the relation between the Hebrew and the Septuagint text, he indicated such passages distinctly by marking, in accordance with the practice of the grammarians in their treatises on textual criticism, their commencement by means of a prefixed obelus, lemniscus, or hypolemniscus (— or ÷ or ⸗), while a metobelus (⸝) indicated the close of the words referred to. Far more dangerous was his procedure when, in the passages where the original text contained more than the Septuagint, he made additions to the Septuagint text from another Greek translation, most frequently from that of Theodotion (§ 53). For although he indicated also these additions by diacritical marks (placing an asterisk before, ※ or ⁜, a metobelus at the end), the danger here was too great of some later transcriber ignoring the marks, as in course of time to a great extent actually did happen. But the worst of all was that Origen, as he himself declares very distinctly, used the different representatives of the Hebrew *Textus Receptus* to correct the faults of the Greek text and to find his way amid the confusions of the various Septuagint manuscripts, for this must have had a very detrimental effect in the determining of the standpoint of textual criticism with regard to the construction of the Septuagint text. It is at any rate conceivable that the close and firm unity of the Hebrew *Textus Receptus*, as compared with the vacillations of the Septuagint manuscripts, must have made an impression upon Origen like that which in our own days the "unity" of the Roman Catholics has made on some Protestants, but just on this account has he sacrificed much that is characteristic and original in the LXX.

The Septuagint text of Origen, constructed in this way, formed a part of the gigantic work produced by him in the Palestinian seaport town of Cæsarea, the *Hexapla*, the purpose of which was to enable Christian readers, by means of a magnificent apparatus, to take a survey of the relation between the Greek and the Hebrew text. In six columns stand the representatives of the two forms of text alongside of one another. The Jewish *Textus Receptus* was represented by the Hebrew text, a transcription of it in Greek letters (§ 36), and the two very literal translations based on it of Aquila and Symmachus (§§ 52, 54); while the last two columns contained the revised Septuagint text and the translation of Theodotion, which was a sort of revision of the LXX. (§ 53). In some books there were added a fifth and a sixth Greek translation, so that the work sometimes bears also the name *Octapla*. On a seventh translation, compare below at § 55. Moreover, this co-ordination resting upon the Hebrew text was already an injury to the Alexandrine text inasmuch as that text, in passages where the Greek translation had a different succession of portions of the text, had to be corrected according to the Hebrew text.

That such a gigantic work, consisting of somewhere about fifty large volumes, could not be multiplied by transcriptions, must be considered as certain. The cost of such a proceeding would have been too enormous. Either the manuscript itself in Cæsarea must have been used, or students must have been satisfied with the extracts from it. Origen had indeed attempted to make it more easily accessible, for he issued a new edition, with the two first columns left out, and at the same time with some critical alterations; but even this so-called *Tetrapla* seems not to have existed in many copies. On the other hand, at a later date, Eusebius of Cæsarea and his friend Pamphilus caused the column which contained the Septuagint text, with the diacritical marks and the marginal notes of all kinds, to be copied out apart from the other translations, and in

this form the *Hexaplar Recension* found a wide circulation among the Latins. In opposition to this revised text, the pre-Origenistic form of the text was called *κοινή* or *vulgata*. The *Hexapla* itself, which Jerome made use of in Cæsarea (§ 37), was still to be found there in the sixth century, but afterwards, in some unknown way, it disappeared.

Wellhausen is not altogether correct, as also Reckendorf, *ZAW*, 1887, p. 67, has remarked, when he writes (Bleek, *Einleitung*, p. 586): "Proceeding from the belief that the translation must have agreed with the original as he knew it, Origen corrected the LXX., not according to its own standard, but according to the Hebrew truth." In principle Origen, just as in his treatment of the canon, so also in his textual criticism, recognised a double truth.

Origen, *Comm. on Matth.* xv. 14: *τὴν μὲν οὖν ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης διαφωνίαν, θεοῦ διδόντος εὕρομεν ἰάσασθαι, κριτηρίῳ χρησάμενοι ταῖς λοιπαῖς ἐκδόσεσιν . . . καὶ τινὰ μὲν ὠβελίσαμεν ἐν τῷ Ἑβραικῷ μὴ κείμενα οὐ τολμήσαντες αὐτὰ πάντα περιελεῖν, κ.τ.λ.* But once he confesses to have obliterated, with the Obelos, a word that seemed to him meaningless, although it did stand in the Hebrew (compare Cornill, *Ezechiel*, p. 386).

Compare on the *Hexapla* the *Prolegomena* to Field's *Origenis Hexaplorum quæ supersunt*, 1875. Chap. i. deals with the names of the work (besides the names already mentioned, we meet also sometimes with those of *Pentapla* and *Heptapla*); chap. vii. § 2–3, the diacritical signs and their significance; chap. xi., the later fortunes of the *Hexapla*. On the latest form of the *Hexapla*, compare Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen*, p. 107.

On the alterations in the Septuagint text made by Origen without remark, compare Field, *Prolegomena*, chap. vii. § 4. Many a time the collection of the representatives of the Hebrew text helped him to the objectively correct reading, as, *e.g.*, in Jer. xv. 10, where he read *ὠφείλησα* instead of *ὠφέλησα*; but oftener the original was thereby obliterated.

The Book of Job has suffered more than all the rest from

the intrusion of numerous portions of the translation of Theodotion into the Alexandrine text. According to a Scholium of the Codex 161 (*Codex Bibl. Dresdensis*, No. iii.), the book had 1600 *στίχοι*, but with the additions marked by asterisks, 2200 *στίχοι* (Field, *Prolegomena*, lxvi.). But possibly a beginning had been made, even before Origen, of filling up the gaps of the LXX. by means of the renderings of Theodotion. The question is connected with the question of the relation of the *Codex Vaticanus*, in which Job is already very much augmented, to the *Hexaplar* text (compare § 46). That the translation of Theodotion was widely circulated at an early date among Christians, is shown by the fact that even Irenæus used Theodotion for Daniel. See Zahn in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*, vii. p. 131.

That the edition of the text by Eusebius and Pamphilus was furnished with notes from the other translations is declared by the *Syro-Hexaplaris*, compare Field, *Prolegomena*, chap. xi. On the circulation of this recension, compare Jerome (*Præf. in Paralipom.*): "Mediæ inter has (*i.e.* Antioch and Egypt) provinciæ Palestinæ (so Lagarde instead of Palestinos) codices legunt, quos ab Origene elaboratos Eusebius et Pamphilus vulgaverunt." His own preference for this recension, which afforded him admirable help in his contention for "the Hebrew truth," *i.e.* the Hebrew *Textus Receptus*, is given expression to by him in a letter (106) to Sunnias and Fretela: *κοινή* "pro locis et temporibus et pro voluntate scriptorum vetus corrupta editio est, ea autem quæ habetur in *ἑξαπλοῖς* et quam nos vertimus, ipsa est quæ in eruditorum libris incorrupta et immaculata LXX. interpretum translatio reservatur: quicquid ergo ab hac discrepat nulli dubium est, quin ita et ab Hebræorum auctoritate discordet." Compare further the passage quoted in § 44 from the same Epistle; also Epist. 89, *Ad Augustinum;* the *Præfatio in Quatuor Evangg.;* and Lagarde, *Librorum V. T. græce pars prior*, xiii.; Hooykaas, *Jets over de griekse Vertaling van het O. T.* p. 30 f.

44. Some time after Origen, the Septuagint text was subjected to two new revisions. The one was undertaken by

the founder of the Antiochian school, Lucian of Samosata, who died as a martyr in A.D. 311, during the persecution of Maximus. It found acceptance in Antioch, and was from thence introduced into Constantinople, where especially Chrysostom aided its circulation. The second revision was made by Hesychius, who is usually identified with the Egyptian bishop of that name, who also suffered a martyr's death in the year 311. It was circulated in Alexandria and Egypt.

Jerome (*Præfatio in Paralipom.*, compare § 43): "Alexandria et Ægyptus in LXX. suis Hesychium laudant auctorem, Constantinopolis usque Antiochiam Luciani martyris exemplaria probat."

On the *Recension* of Lucian, compare the *Synopsis scripturæ sacræ* ascribed to Athanasius, § 77: *ταῖς προγεγραμμέναις ἐκδύσεσι* (d. h. Aquila, Theodotion and Symmachus) *καὶ τοῖς Ἑβραϊκοῖς ἐντυχὼν καὶ ἐποπτεύσας μετὰ ἀκριβείας τὰ λείποντα ἢ καὶ περιττὰ τῆς ἀληθείας ῥήματα καὶ διορθωσάμενος ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις τῶν γραφῶν τόποις ἐξέδοτο τοῖς χριστιανοῖς ἀδελφοῖς*. In an instructive Scholium of Jacob of Edessa, which Nestle in *ZDMG*, xxxii. p. 481 ff. has communicated, it is said (pp. 489 and 498): "Therefore as the holy martyr Lucian has taken pains about the text of the Sacred Scriptures, and in many places improved, or even changed particular expressions used by the preceding translators, as, *e.g.*, when he saw the word אדוני in the text, and the word 'Lord' on the margin, he connected the two and set them both together, he transmitted them in the Testament which he left behind him, so that we find it written therein in many passages: "Thus saith אדוני the Lord," where we have given both the Hebrew word *adonai* in Greek letters, and then alongside of it also the word Lord [therefore *Ἀδωναι κύριος*]." Compare what is further said below at § 46. Jerome, Epist. 106, *Ad Sunniam et Fretelam:* "Sciatis aliam esse editionem, quam Origenes et Cæsariensis Eusebius, omnesque Græciæ tractatores *κοινὴν*, id est communem, appellant, atque Vulgatam, et a plerisque nunc *Λουκιανὸς* dicitur; aliam LXX. interpretum, quæ in *ἑξαπλοῖς* codicibus reperitur, et a nobis in Latinum

sermonem fideliter versa est, et Jerosolymæ atque Orientis ecclesiis decantatur." Here therefore the *Recension* of Lucian as not belonging to the *Hexapla* is connected with the *κοινήν*. Further, he says in the *Catalogus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum:* "Lucianus, vir disertissimus, Antiochenæ ecclesiæ presbyter, tantum in scripturarum studio elaboravit, ut usque nunc quædam exemplaria Scripturarum Lucianæ nuncupentur." His remarks in the *Preface to the Four Gospels* contrasts strikingly with this: "Prætermitto eos codices quos a Luciano et Hesychio nuncupatur, paucorum hominum asserit perversa contentio; quibus utique, nec in toto veteri instrumento post Septuaginta interpretes emendare quid licuit, nec in novo profuit emendasse: quum multarum gentium linguis Scriptura ante translata doceat falsa esse quæ addita sunt."

The information which we have about the Recension of Hesychius is extremely scanty. Besides the passages quoted in the Prefaces of Jerome to the Chronicles, and to the Four Gospels, he mentions this recension in his Commentary in Isa. lviii. 11: "Quod in Alexandrinis exemplaribus in principio hujus capituli additum est: 'et adhuc in te erit laus mea semper,' et in fine: 'et ossa tua quasi herba orientur, et pinguescent, et heriditate possidebunt in generationem et generationes' in Hebraico non habitur, sed ne in LXX. quidem emendatis et veris exemplaribus." This remark, moreover, is inexact, inasmuch as the words *et ossa tua quasi herba orientur* are to be found in the original text as well as in the LXX.

45. In the course of time not only did each of these several Recensions become corrupted by errors of transcription, but the Septuagint text especially suffered by this, that the manuscripts rarely follow one particular Recension, but attach themselves sometimes to this and sometimes to that authority. A picture of this quite unbounded confusion is presented in the great collections of variations which the Oxford scholars, Robert Holmes and James Parsons, published at the end of last and the beginning of this century. They have, at least, made a survey of the whole material possible,

and so have afforded the starting-point for those who in future would make more thoroughgoing attempts to find their way in this labyrinth by means of grouping the various manuscripts. In so far they have been of use, but at the same time, owing to the errors of their collaborateurs, their untrustworthiness and incompleteness have been brought to light by the continued labours of textual criticism. In the following sketch we shall seek to present a picture of the progress that has been made in the most recent times in this difficult undertaking.

The great editions of the LXX. hitherto had been the four following: The Complutensian Bible, A.D. 1514–1517 (§ 24), the Aldine edition, A.D. 1518, the Roman Sixtine edition, A.D. 1587, and E. Grabe's edition, A.D. 1707–1720. For the Septuagint text of the Complutensian Bible, the editors, as more recent investigations have shown, used especially the *Codex Vaticanus* 330 (in Holmes 108; in Lagarde d) and 346 (in Holmes 248). This text was repeated in the Antwerp Polyglot of A.D. 1569–1572 (§ 24). The Aldine edition was begun by Aldus Manutius, and was completed and published with a preface after his death in A.D. 1515 by his father-in-law, Andreas Asulanus. What manuscripts it followed cannot now be certainly determined. The Roman *Editio Sixtina*, the work of Pope Sixtus V., is based upon the celebrated *Codex Vaticanus Græcus* 1209 (B, in Holmes ii.), the value of which had then been discovered; but from it this Sixtine edition departs in numerous particulars. Another celebrated manuscript, the *Codex Alexandrinus* (A, in Holmes iii.), forms the basis of the edition of E. Grabe; yet it is used with pretty considerable freedom. These two famous uncial manuscripts have now become available through more reliable editions. At the head of them all stands the beautiful English facsimile edition of the *Codex Alexandrinus* (1881–1883), which exactly serves in place of the manuscript itself. Not quite so reliable is the great Roman edition of the *Codex*

Vaticanus by Verzellone and Cozza (1868–1881). To these principal editions are attached a series of editions of particular manuscripts by Tischendorf (especially *Codex Sinaiticus*), Cozza, &c.

A very convenient sketch of the form of text in the *Codex Vaticanus* and *Codex Alexandrinus* is given in the very careful collations of E. Nestle in the last editions of Tischendorf's LXX., which are based upon the Sixtine. Also in these collations the *Codex Sinaiticus* has been compared, while Tischendorf himself had made use of only the first discovered, and separately edited fragments of that manuscript, *Frederico-Augustanus*, and especially also the *Codex Ephræmi*. A very practical edition of the Septuagint with various readings from various principal authorities has been begun by the English scholar Swete. Finally, some separate critical editions, by Fritzsche (Esther, Ruth, Judges) and Lagarde (Genesis and the first Psalms), deserve to be mentioned.

The older literature in De Wette-Schrader, *Einleitung*, p. 100 ff.—*Vet. Testam. cum variis lectionibus, ed. R. Holmes, continuavit J. Parsons*, Oxf. 1798–1827, in 5 vols. Lagarde in his *Librorum V. T. canon*, i. p. xv., characterises the work in the following words: "Qui judicium neque in seligendis laboris sodalibus neque in disponenda scripturarum sibi traditarum farragine probaverunt, religionem in reddendis eis quæ acceperant summam præstiterunt." Compare also the opinions quoted by Hooykaas, *Jets over d. g. vertaling van het O. T.* p. 6.

Sketches of the various manuscripts are given by Stroth in Eichhorn's *Repertorium*, v. viii. and xi.; Tischendorf, *Prolegomena* to his edition of the LXX. § xxiv.; Lagarde, *Genesis græce*, p. 3 ff.; Cornill, *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel*, pp. 13–24.

The Complutensian Bible. On the Greek text of this Polyglot compare Vercellone, *Dissertazioni Accademiche di*

vario argumento, Rome 1864, p. 407 ff.; Delitzsch, *Fortgesetzte Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Complutensischen Polyglotte*, 1886 (compare above, § 24). Besides the two named *Codices Vaticani*, 330 and 346, Delitzsch makes special mention of a copy of a Venetian Codex, the original of which he seeks in the *Codex Marc.* v. (Holmes 68).

The Aldine. *Biblia græce Venet. in ædibus Aldi et Asulani*, 1518. Compare Lagarde, *Genesis græce*, p. 6; *GGA*, 1882, p. 450; *Mittheilungen*, ii. 57; Delitzsch, *Fortgesetzte Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Complutensischen Polyglotte*, pp. 24, 25; Cornill, *Ezechiel*, pp. 24, 79; Schuurmans Stekhoven, *Der Alexandrijnsche Vertaling*, p. 50 ff.

The Sixtine Edition and the *Codex Vaticanus*. *Vet. Testament. juxta LXX. ex auctoritate Sixti V. editum*, Rome 1587. Compare on the history of this edition: Nestle, *Septuagintastudien*, Ulm 1886. After it (1) the London Polyglot 1657; (2) *Vet. Testament. ex vers. LXX. interpr. sec. exemplar. Vatic. Rom. ed. etc. ed.* Lamb. Bos, 1709; (3) *Vet. Testament Gr. juxta LXX. interpr. ex auct. Sixti V. ed.* 1587, *recus. L. van Ess.* 1824, new edition 1887; (4) Tischendorf's editions since 1850 (compare further at p. 136). Vercellone, Cozza, Melander, *Bibliorum sacrorum græcus Codex Vaticanus*, Rome 1868–1881. Compare also Tischendorf, *Prolegomena*, § xix.

Codex Alexandrinus. *Septuaginta interpr. ex antiquiss. manuscripto Codice Alexandrino, ed. Grabe*, Oxford 1707–1720; Fred. Field, *Vetus Testamentum græce*, 1859; Facsimile of the *Codex Alexandrinus Old Testament*, London 1881–1883, in 3 vols.

Other published Manuscripts. In 1846 Tischendorf published a part of the *Codex Sinaiticus* under the name: *Codex Friderico-Augustanus*; the rest of it appeared in 1862 as: *Bibliorum Codex Sinaiticus*, St. Petersburg (the Old Testament forming the 3rd and 4th of the four folio volumes). Afterwards Brugsch discovered some fragments of Leviticus xxii.–xxiii., and published them: *Neue Bruchstücke des Cod. Sinaiticus*, Leipsic 1875. Tischendorf, *Codex Ephræmi Syri rescriptus sive Fragmenta Vet. Testament*, 1845 (passages from Job, Ecclesiastes, Proverbs, and The Song). A series of fragments

and manuscripts, some of them of very great importance, is published in Tischendorf's *Monumenta sacra inedita*, Nova Collectio i.–v. The following deserve specially to be named: *Codex Sarravianus* (Holmes iv. v.), with passages from the *Octateuch* (namely, the fragments preserved in Leyden and St. Petersburg; the Parisian fragments were published by Lagarde in the *Abhandlungen d. Gött. Ges. d. Wissensch.* 1879); *Codex Marchalianus* (or *Claramontanus*, now in Vatican, Holmes xii.) with portions from the Prophets; *Psalterium Turicense; Psalmorum fragm. papyracea Londinensia;* the parts of the *Codex Cottonianus* saved from the fire (Holmes i., containing many fragments from Genesis). *Psalterium Veronense* in Blanchinus, *Psalterium duplex*, 1740. Compare further, Delitzsch, *Die Psalmen*, p. 431 f. *Codex Cryptoferratensis* (fragments from the Prophets), ed. Cozza, Rome 1867–1877; *Prophetarum Codex græcus Vaticanus*, 2125 curante Cozzi-Lugi, Rome 1890. From *Codex Chisianus* R. vii. 45 (Holmes 88) have appeared: Vincenti ide regibus, *Jezeciel sec. LXX. ex. Tetrapl. Orig.*, by Coster, 1840, and Daniel in Cozza's edition of the *Codex Cryptoferratensis*, iii. 1877. This manuscript alone gives the correct Septuagint translation of Daniel, while the others contain Theodotion's translation of that book (compare § 43). Tischendorf published the text, after an earlier edition by Simon de Magistris, Rome 1772, as an appendix to his edition of the LXX. Abbot, *Pars palimpsestorum Dublinensium* (Isa. xxx. 2–xxxi. 7; xxxvi. 17–xxxviii. 1), 1880.

In the two last editions of Tischendorf's *Veteris Testamenti græci juxta LXX. interpretes* (vi. 1880 and vii. 1887) Nestle's collations will be found. They may also be referred to separately: *Veteris testamenti græci codices Vaticanus et Alexandrinus et Sinaiticus cum textu recepto collati.* According to his statement the Sixtine edition differs in more than 4000 passages from the *Codex Vaticanus.* For Daniel he has compared Cozza's edition of the *Chisianus* above referred to.

Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek*, i. and ii. (Gen.–Tobit), Cambridge 1887–1891. [The third volume, completing the work, will contain the Prophets and some of the Apocrypha.]

Besides this manual edition a larger edition is being prepared.

Fritzsche, *Esther, duplicem libri textum emendavit*, Zurich 1848; *Ruth sec. LXX.* 1864; *Liber judicum sec. LXX.* 1867. Lagarde, *Genesis Græce*, 1868; *Novæ psalterii Græci editionis specimen*, 1887 (from the *Gött Abhandlungen*, 1887). Compare also the first chapter of Genesis in his: *Ankündigung einer neuen Ausgabe der griech. Uebersetzung d. A. T.* 1882, pp.5–16.

46. The editions referred to in the preceding section have made us acquainted with a number of manuscripts, among which are the most celebrated uncial manuscripts. The first place among these unquestionably belongs to the *Codex Vaticanus*. So long as one is satisfied with establishing the text of the LXX. by means of some prominent manuscripts, this Codex will certainly maintain its undisputed supremacy, and an edition based on it, with the most important variations noted down, will supply a convenient apparatus for common use. But in this way we do not reach beyond a mere provisional apparatus. In recent times Lagarde has given a specimen, in a laborious but necessarily too irregular way, of the advantage that may be gained even from an unmethodical use of the Alexandrine translation. His demand is, that instead of following the uncial manuscripts which were not domiciled in any ecclesiastical province, we should secure a sure basis for further critical operations by restoring, as far as that can be done, the three recensions of the LXX. signalised by Jerome (§§ 43, 44). We are therefore in this way brought to the question, as to how far it may be possible to authenticate and reproduce those recensions.

So far as the *Hexaplar Recension* is concerned, the text edited by Eusebius and Pamphilus is to be found more or less certainly in various manuscripts and fragments of manuscripts, which in part have been published. The rash conjecture that has been hazarded by Cornill, that the celebrated *Codex*

Vaticanus is an extract prepared with great circumspection and at a relatively very early date from the *Hexapla* of Origen preserved in Cæsarea, has been withdrawn again by this scholar himself. On the other hand, an aid for the revision of the *Hexapla* that cannot be too highly valued is to be found in the Syriac translation of the *Hexaplar* text, the so-called *Syro-Hexaplaris*, of which an account will be given below in § 48. Also the Latin translation of the LXX. in the Commentaries of Jerome, as well as his revisions of the old Latin Bible mentioned in § 37, are of use for the restoration of the *Hexaplar Recension*. Finally, as of special evidential value, there are the quotations of the fathers living in Palestine and the Palestinian liturgies.

The merit of having discovered the *Lucian Recension* belongs to Frederick Field and Paul Lagarde. It is to be found in a group of manuscripts of which the *Codex Vaticanus* 330, the same as was used in the Complutensian Bible, is one of the most important. Of the secondary translations, at least the Gothic attaches itself to it. The biblical quotations of Chrysostom and Theodoret, as well as several marginal notes of the *Syro-Hexaplaris*, furnish decisive proof of this. The edition of the Septuagint begun by Lagarde reproduces this recension, unfortunately without any critical apparatus. It will only be when we have it completely before us, that we shall be able to answer the question about Lucian's relation to the *Hexaplar Recension* and to the later Greek translations, as also about his sometimes affirmed, sometimes denied, acquaintance with Hebrew.

The difficulty in regard to the Recension of Hesychius is incomparably greater, for we have not in fact been able to authenticate it with any degree of certainty. Most scholars point to the quotations in Cyril of Alexandria, which, however, are very inexactly made, and mostly from memory. Lagarde, as indeed also before him the Danish bishop Fr.

Münter, conjectured that the Recension might be found in some one of the Coptic translations (§ 49), while others look for it in the Ethiopic and Arabic version of the LXX.

Compare Lagarde, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, p. 86 ff.; *Ankündigung einer neuen Ausgabe d. griech Uebersetzung d. A. T.* 1882; and the prefaces to the *Librorum Vet. Testament. Canonicorum græce pars prior*, 1883. Lagarde's programme has been acknowledged, among others by Wellhausen (Bleek, *Einleitung*, p. 573) and Cornill (*Ezechiel*, p. 63), while others regard it as too finical and impracticable. Compare *Theolog. Tijdschrift* 1882, p. 285 ff.; 1888, p. 111; Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek*, i. p. x. sq. Certainly this task demands not only many and sure hands and much time, but also that others should busy themselves with the needs of the present. Compare also Hooykaas, *Jets over d. g. Vertaling van het O. T.* p. 8 ff.; Schuurmans Stekhoven, *De Alexandrijnsche Vertaling*, pp. 21–27.

1. The *Recension* of the *Hexapla*. Of the manuscripts containing this form of text according to the common hypothesis there are partially printed: The *Codex Marchalianus* and the *Chisianus*, R. vii. 45 (compare above, § 45; here also see about the editions of the *Codex Sarravianus*, of which, however, Lagarde, in *Abhandlungen d. Gött. Ges. d. W.* 1879, p. 3, remarks: "Whether the text actually goes back to Origen remains to be investigated"). Further, there also belong to this group the *Codex Barberinus* (Holmes 86, containing the Prophets, with the exception of Daniel), and the *Codex Coislinianus* (Holmes x., with pieces from the *Octateuch*), and some others of which Pitra speaks (*Analecta sacra*, iii. 552 ff.). Compare on these manuscripts generally, Field, i. p. C. sq. ii. 428; Wellhausen-Bleek, *Einleitung*, p. 588 f.; Cornill, *Ezechiel*, 15, 16 ff., 19. Lagarde speaks of a Codex in the possession of a private individual which almost certainly produces the Recension of Palestine, *Mittheilungen*, ii. 56. On the difficulties which beset the restoration of the *Palestinian Recension*, compare Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, ii. 52, 55 f. The conjecture referred to of a relationship between

the *Codex Vaticanus* and the *Hexaplar Recension* had been suggested by Cornill in his *Ezechiel*, pp. 80–95. Rendal Harris (*John Hopkins' University Circulars*, iii. 29, 30, March–April, 1884) had also been led to adopt a similar opinion. This hypothesis was meanwhile refuted by Hort in *The Academy* (1887, ii. 424), and was afterwards abandoned by Cornill himself (*NGGW*, 1888, pp. 194–196), since he was convinced of the fact that in B the Hebraising of proper names, which is characteristic of the *Hexapla Recension* (§ 43), is wanting. It should also be remembered that in Jeremiah, B has not the genuinely Jewish, but the Alexandrine arrangement of the portions of the text. Cornill thinks now, with Hort, that B may rather have been a copy of a manuscript largely and preferentially used by Origen for his Septuagint text. Compare also Lagarde, *Mittheilungen* ii. p. 55. The dependence on the *Hexapla* text spoken of in the *Codex Sinaiticus* in the subscription to the Book of Esther is referred by Tischendorf (*Novum testamentum sinaiticum*, xxxiii.) to later corrections.

2. The *Lucian Recension*. Compare Field, *Prolegomena*, lxxxiv. sqq.; Bickell in the *Zeitschrift für katholischen Theologie*, 1879, p. 407 f.; Lagarde, *Ankündigung*, p. 26 f.; Cornill, *Ezechiel*, p. 65 f.; Reckendorf, *ZAW*, 1887, pp. 63–66; Schuurmans Stekhoven, *De Alexandrijnsche Vertaling*, pp. 28–46. [Westcott, *History of the Canon of the New Testament*, 4th ed. 1875, p. 388.] When Field, *Prolegomena*, lxxxviii., adduces as a criterion of the manuscripts belonging to this Recension the remark of Jacob of Edessa, quoted above in § 44, about the way and form in which Lucian restored the יהוה, he has to be reminded of this that ἀδωναι κύριος is found also in the *Codex Alexandrinus*, in Cyril of Alexandria, and in the Ethiopic translation (Cornill, *Ezechiel*, pp. 73, 76, 172 ff.; König in *ZKWL*, 1887, p. 288 f.). About the manuscripts containing the *Lucian Recension*, moreover, absolute agreement does not prevail. For the historical books, Field points to the *Codices Holmes*, 19, 82, 93, 108 (*i.e.*, *Chisianus*, R. vi. 38; the Parisian *Codex Coislinianus*, iii., *Arundelianus*, or Brit. Mus. i. d. 2, *Vaticanus* 330). To these Lagarde, who

designates them by the signs h, f, m, d, adds the Parisian Codex 6 (Holmes 118, Lagarde p), and some others. For the Prophets, Field names the *Codices Holmes*, 22, 36, 48, 51, 62, 90, 93, 144, 147, 233, 308. Of these, Cornill (and with him Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, ii. 52, agrees) strikes out the numbers 62, 90, 147, 233, while he adds 23 (*Codex Venetus*, i.). Schuurmans Stekhoven names for the Minor Prophets, 22, 36, 42, 51, 62, 86, 95, 147, 153, 185, 238, 240, 231. Yet it may be remarked that (according to the *Theolog. Literaturzeitung*, 1890, 5) in the Book of Ruth Theodoret agrees with the Codices 54 and 75, which often diverge from Codex 108. Lagarde, *Librorum Veteris testamenti canonicorum græce pars prior*, 1883. A critical apparatus is to be found only in the two texts of Esther. We have now the prospect of seeing this long-interrupted work resumed; see *Uebersicht über d. in Aram . . . übliche Nominalbildung*, p. 186. On the quotations of Chrysostom, compare Lagarde, i. p. vii. sq.; on those of the Emperor Julian, compare his *Ankündigung*, p. 27. On Adrian's use of the *Lucian Recension*, compare Goessling, *Adrian's* εισαγωγη, Leipsic 1887. [Scrivener, *Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, Cambridge, 3rd ed. 1883, pp. 315–318.]

3. The *Hesychian Recension*. Fr. Münter, *Specimen versionum Danielis coptiarum*, Rome 1786, p. 20 f.: "Liceat tamen conjecturam exponere cui ipsa S. Hieronymi verba: Alexandria et Ægyptus Hesychium laudant auctorem, favere videntur: recensionem nimirum sacri codicis Hesychianam in una alterave versionum coptiarum nobis superesse." Lagarde, *Ankündigung*, 25, libr. v. test i. p. xv. Cornill (*Ezechiel*, 67 ff.), finds a family likeness between the Coptic, Ethiopic, Arabic, Old Latin translations, and the *Codex Alexandrinus*. With this manuscript are related the *Codices Holmes*, 49, 68, 87, 90, 91, 228, 238, which often agree with the quotations of Cyril. In this group, which may be said almost precisely to correspond with the Aldine edition, Hesychius may therefore be looked for. Reckendorf, however, in *ZAW*, 1887, p. 68, denies that there is any agreement between the Ethiopic translation and the Aldine edition. The

Ethiopic translation, according to him, agrees rather with the *Codices Holmes*, 129, 56. Compare also Schuurmans Stekhoven, *De Alexandrijnsche Vertaling*, pp. 47–56, and especially Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, ii. 60. [Smith's *Dict. of Christian Biography*, vol. iii. 1882, p. 8, Article "Hesychius," by Venables.]

47. The quotations in the fathers form important aids in researches in the textual criticism of the LXX., as has already appeared from the last paragraphs. Yet in the using of them it is necessary to proceed with great caution, since they may easily lead to false conclusions. First of all, in dealing with them, it has to be remembered that the fathers very often quote from memory, and that these quotations therefore are absolutely demonstrative only when they lay special stress upon the form of the passage cited, or when it is certain that they have had the text before them. But if occasional deviations from the common text on the part of the fathers are not therefore always decisive, then also, on the other hand, as Lagarde has made clear, their agreement with the common text is not without further corroboration demonstrative, seeing that the editions of their works, which we now have, sometimes rest upon later revisions which may have in all sorts of ways modified the original.

The translations made from the LXX. into other languages, of which some are very valuable, form another aid to the textual study of the Septuagint. The first place among these daughter versions should be assigned to the Old Latin Bible, if it were not that the results of the investigations regarding it are still so insecure and so much contested. It is even yet quite a matter of controversy whether we can speak of a *Vetus latina*, or whether we have to do with several independent Old Latin translations. The utterances of the later fathers, like Jerome and Augustine, even if they had been clearer and more definite than they are, could not have settled the question, because those fathers evidently

gave expression only to their own opinions and reflections, and did not communicate any old traditions. In particular, one well-known saying of Augustine with regard to the *Itala* (*De doctrina christiana*, ii. 15), not only has not contributed to cast light upon the problem before us, but rather has called forth a new and intricate question. An actual decision will be reached only when we have a complete collection of all the Bible quotations of the Latin fathers, and a collection of the hitherto constantly-accumulating text material. But even now we may regard it as an undoubted result of the investigations that have been carried out, that the circumstances of the case will not be met by the hypothesis of a single translation appearing before us now in several modifications, but that we must assume several independent translations of the Alexandrine text.

The widespread notion that even Tertullian was acquainted with a Latin Bible of North African origin has been confuted with convincing arguments by Theod. Zahn. On the other hand, such a translation certainly did exist in the third century. Generally, indeed, it would be in the provinces that the need of a Latin Bible would be soonest and most keenly felt, especially among the poorer classes of the people, among whom Christianity at first mainly spread, and whose language, "lingua vulgata, rustica, sermo cottidianus, plebeius," is that in which actually the Old Latin Bibles were written.

A first collection of Old Latin Bible texts was edited by Sabatier. In later times, Ranke and Ziegler, among others, have done service in this department.

On the Bible quotations of the fathers, compare Cornill, *Ezechiel*, p. 58 f.; Lagarde, *Psalterium Hieronymi*, viii., *Mittheilungen*, ii. 53 f. From an earlier period, the collections of Stroth in *Eichhorn's Repertorium*, ii. 74 ff., iii. 213 ff., vi. 124 ff., xiii. 158 ff.

For the hypothesis of a single Old Latin Bible translation,

compare Wiseman, *Essays on Various Subjects*, London 1853, i.; Eichhorn, *Einleitung*[3], i. § 321; Wellhausen-Bleek, *Einleitung*, p. 595. On the other hand, for the hypothesis of several translations: Ziegler, *Die altlateinischen Bibelübersetzungen vor Hieron.* 1879; Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, ii. 58 ff. [In *Studia Biblica*, 1st series, Oxf. 1885, in Paper on "Corbey St. James and its relation to other Old Latin Versions," p. 236, Sanday says: "There were originally two main versions, two parent stocks from which all the texts that we now have were derived with different degrees of modification."]

The remarks of Augustine, Jerome, etc., on the Old Latin translations are quoted and commented on by Ziegler, *Die altlat. Bibelübersetz.* p. 4 ff. The passage quoted from Augustine runs as follows: "In ipsis autem interpretationibus Itala ceteris præferatur, nam est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiæ" (*De doctrina christiana*, ii. 15). But when further on he says: "Sed tamen, ut superius dixi, horum quoque interpretum, qui verbis tenacius inhæserunt, collatio non est inutilis ad explanandum sæpe sententiam," it is evident that the openly expressed doubts of the correctness of the text in the former passage are not wholly unfounded, and Bentley's and Corssen's (*JPT*, 1881, p. 507 ff.) emendations *illa* for *Itala* and *quæ* for *nam* are at least worthy of consideration. See, however, Zeigler, *Die altlat. Bibelübersetz.* p. 19 ff.

On the Bible quotations of Tertullian, compare Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, i. p. 51 ff. But on the other side, Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, ii. p. 59.

On the dialectic peculiarities of the Old Latin translations, Rönsch, *Itala und Vulgata*, 1869; Zeigler, *Die altlat. Bibelübersetz.* p. 22 f.; Cornill, *Ezechiel*, p. 25 f.

Sabatarii, *Bibliorum sacrorum Latinæ versionis antiquæ seu vetus Italica*, 1751. A list of later editions is given by Zeigler, p. 102 ff. To these are to be added: Ulysse Robert, *Pentateuchi e codice Lugdunensi versio lat. antiqua*. Paris 1881; Ziegler, *Bruchstücke einer vorhieronymianischen, Uebersetzung d. Pentateuchs*, Munich 1883; Belsheim, *Palimpsestus Vindobonensis*, Christiania 1885; Ranke, *Stutgardiana versionis sacrarum scripturarum latinæ antehieronymianæ*

fragmenta, 1888; Lagarde, *Probe einer neuen Ausgabe der lateinischen Uebersetzungen d. A. T.*, 1885.

48. After a portion of the Syrians had very wrongly begun to abandon their old independent Bible (§ 68) the LXX. was more than once translated into Syriac. Some fragments are still preserved of the rendering of Jacob of Edessa, A.D. 704–705, which sought to steer a middle course between the Peshito and the Alexandrine version; as also perhaps of the translation which Bishop Philoxenus had caused Polycarp to make in A.D. 508, and which embraced at least a part of the Old Testament (after the Recension of Lucian). But more important than all the rest is the Syrian reissue of the *Hexapla* text cited by Eusebius and Pamphilus (§ 43), of which by good fortune not a little has been preserved. It was executed in the years 617–618 in Alexandria by Bishop Paul of Tella, and contained not only the diacritical marks of Origen but also fragments of the other Greek translations, as marginal notes. A manuscript still extant in the sixteenth century, which contained a portion of the historical books, was subsequently lost. On the other hand, the *Ambrosian Codex*, which Ceriani has had reproduced by photo-lithography, comprises the Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, The Song, the Book of Wisdom, Sirach, and the Prophets, with Baruch, the Epistle of Jeremiah, and the additions to Daniel. To these have yet to be added fragments in Paris and London, which have been issued by various editors.

On the translation of Jacob of Edessa, compare De Sacy, *Notices et extraits de MSS. de la bibl. nation.* iv. 648 ff.; Bickell, *Conspectus rei Syrorum liter.* ii. The fragments of Isaiah to be found in British Museum (*addit.* 14,441) have been edited by Ceriani in: *Monumenta sacra et profana*, v. 1 ff. Fragments of the translation of Daniel are to be found in: Bugatus, *Daniel secundum editionem LXX. interpretum desumptum ex Codice Syro-Esthrangelo*, 1788.

On Philoxenus, compare Assemanni, *Bibl. orient.* ii. 83; Bickell, *Conspectus rei Syrorum liter.* p. 9. A fragment in the British Museum (*addit.* 17,106) is ascribed by Ceriani to this translator. Compare, however, Field, *Hexapla*, i. p. xcii. sq. [Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. iv. 1887, p. 392, Article "Philoxenus," by Venables. Scrivener (*Plain Introduction*, p. 328) says: "The characteristic feature of the Philoxenian is its excessive closeness to the original: it is probably the most servile version of Scripture ever made."]

On the *Syro-Hexaplaris*, compare Field, *Hexapla*, i. p. lxvii. sqq. The older editions are given in De Wette-Schrader, *Einleitung*, p. 117. Ceriani's edition of the *Milan Codex* forms the seventh volume of the *Monumenta sacra et profana*, 1874. In the second volume of the same collection are to be found fragments from the British Museum. Further: Skat Rördam, *Libri Judicum et Ruth sec. vers. Syro-Hexapl.* Copenhagen 1859, 1861; Lagarde, *Veteris testamenti ab Origene recensiti fragmenta ap. Syros servata*, v. (Ex. Num. Jos. 1 and 2 Kings) 1880. The best manuscripts, among them the *Codex Ambrosianus*, have, under the influence of Jacob of Edessa, *jhjh* for the older *pipi* = יהוה (§ 76). Compare, *ZDMG*, xxxii. 507 f., 736. In the year 1486 the *Syro-Hexaplar* version was translated into Arabic by Hareth ben Senan. Of this translation there are two manuscripts in the Bodleian library. See Field, *Hexapla*, i. p. lxx. sq.; *ZDMG*, xxxii. p. 468 f.

49. With the old Latin and Syrian daughter versions of the LXX. is connected a series of other translations which are of importance for the establishing of the various Recensions. The Gothic translation of the Bible rests, as has been already said (§ 46), on Lucian's revision of the text. How far the same may be affirmed regarding the Slavic translation is not yet established. The Coptic translation in the three dialects, the Sahidic, the Bohiric, and the Fayumic, will perhaps play an important rôle in the restoration of the text of Hesychius. Besides these we must name: the Ethiopic, the Arabic, the Armenian, and the Georgian translations; and finally, the

interesting fragments of a translation of the LXX. into the Aramaic language spoken by the Christians of Palestine.

Von Gabelentz and Loebe, *Ulfilas V. et N. T. vers. gothica fragmenta*, 1863; Ohrloff, *Die Bruchstücke vom A. T. der Gothischen Bibelübersetzung*, Halle 1876; Lagarde, *Veteris Testam. libri canon.* i. p. xiv; *Mittheilungen*, ii. 52 f.; *NGGW*, 1890, p. 20 f.

On the Slavic translation, compare De Wette-Schrader, *Einleitung*, p. 121. The edition (Moscow 1663) to be seen in the Copenhagen University Library has the following title: "The Bible, *i.e.*, the Books of the Old and the New Testament translated into Slavic according to the translation from Hebrew into Greek, which was undertaken at the command of the Egyptian king Ptolemy Philadelphus in the year 350 before the incarnation of our God and Redeemer," etc. The passages compared by my colleague, Prof. Verner, do not agree with the *Lucian Recension* but rather with the Roman edition.

The Coptic Bible fragments that have been discovered down to 1880 are given in Stern, *Koptische Grammatik*. 1880, pp. 441–446. Besides this, see among others, Lagarde, *Ægyptiaca*, 1883 (Wisdom, Sirach, Ps. cii.); Lemme, *Bruchstücke der sahidischen Bibelübersetzung*, 1885 (Jos. xv. 7–xvii. 1). A. Ciasca *Sacrorum bibliorum fragmenta copto-sahidica musei Borgiani*, Rome 1885–1889. Compare also Bickell, *Zeitschrift für kathol. Theologie*, 1886, p. 558, with reference to the Book of Job; and on the general question, Fritzsche in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*[2], ii. 443; Dillmann, *Textkritisches zum Buche Jjob* (see above at § 41).

On the Ethiopic Bible translation, compare Dillmann in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*[2], i. 203 ff., and *ZAW*, 1887, p. 61 ff; Lagarde, *Materialien zur Kritik und Geschichte d. Pentateuchs*, i. 3 f. (according to which the Ethiopic Bible does not rest exclusively upon the LXX.); *Ankündigung*, p. 28; Cornill, *Ezechiel*, p. 37. Dillmann, *Biblia V. T. Æthiop*, i.–ii. 1853, 1861.

Of the Arabic translations in the Parisian and London Polyglots are derived from the LXX.: the Poetical Books

(with the exception of Job) and the Prophets (Daniel as usual being taken from Theodotion). Compare Gesenius, *Jesaja*, 98–106, and (on Micah) Ryssel *ZAW*, 1885, pp. 102–138. According to Ryssel the translation attaches itself to the *Codex Alexandrinus*, but with the use of the Peshito.

On the Armenian translation, compare De Wette-Schrader, *Einleitung*, p. 120 f.; Fritzsche in Herzog's *Real-Encylopædie* [2], ii. 443 f. On the Georgian translation, De Wette-Schrader, *Einleitung*, p. 121 ; Fritzsche in Herzog's *Real-Encylopædie* [2], ii. 444.

The fragments of the translation used by the Palestinian Christians have been edited by Land from manuscripts of the tenth and eleventh centuries in London (Psalms) and St. Petersburg (parts of Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Job, and Proverbs): *Anecdota syriaca*, iv. 1875, pp. 103 ff., 165 ff., 222 ff. The Greek text which had served as its original was, as might be expected, influenced by the *Hexapla*. Where this community, whose translation of the Gospels had been known even earlier, dwelt, whether in Jerusalem or on the other side of the Jordan, is quite uncertain. Its members spoke the Palestino-Aramaic dialect (§ 59), but employed, at least in later times, the Syriac alphabet.

[A good general account of all these translations, especially with reference to the New Testament, is given in Scrivener, *Plain Introduction*, 3rd ed. 1883, pp. 365–412; Lightfoot contributing the account of the Coptic versions].

50. After we have succeeded in reproducing the Recensions of the LXX., so far as the aids at our disposal reach, with the greatest possible purity (§ 46), our next undertaking must be to work back by means of their help and through the comparison of the non-revised witnesses for the text to the old κοινή. In general what is common to all the Recensions will be accepted as representing the original document. Where differences are met with, any fundamental divergence from the Hebrew *Textus Receptus* will have to be regarded as the original LXX., because the later modifications of the Greek text were

mainly intended to bring it into conformity with the Jewish text. For this construction of the genuine LXX. the genuine quotations of Philo, and partly also those met with in the New Testament, will afford very considerable help.

Finally, in the pursuit of this study, in order that we may not give an overdrawn representation of the facts, it must be remembered that this plan sketched by Lagarde concerns the methodical treatment of the *whole* LXX. In many isolated passages one may even now, by the careful employment of the means at his disposal, make use of the Alexandrine translation in investigations into the history and criticism of the text. In other passages, however, the corruption of the text is so great, that from the very nature of the case it cannot be used.

Compare Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Uebersetzung der Proverbien*, p. 3; *Ankündigung*, p. 29 f.; *Librorum Vet. Testam.* i. 15 f.

On Philo, compare C. F. Hornemann, *Specimen exercitationum criticarum in vers. LXX. interpretum ex Philone*, i.–iii.; Copenhagen, 1774–1778; Siegfried, *Philo und der überlieferte Text d. LXX.* in the *ZWT*, 1873, p. 217 ff., and Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, ii. 52–54.

2. *Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus, Quinta, and Sexta.*

51. The growing dissatisfaction of the Jews with the LXX., in view of the ever-increasing importance of the Greek-speaking Jews, made a new Greek translation necessary (§ 40). In two different ways—the one radical, the other conservatively mediating—the attempt was made to satisfy this demand. Moreover, there had arisen, even before Origen, several other Greek translations of the Old Testament, of which one set proceeded from the Ebionite party, another from Christian circles. Common to all these translations was a closer attach-

ment to the Hebrew text, as that was then received among the Jews. For the knowledge that we have of some general facts about these translations we are indebted above all to Origen, who adopted them into his great Polyglot (§ 43). The *Hexapla* and the *Tetrapla* have indeed perished, but fragments of the amplified translations have happily been saved in the form of marginal notes to the copies of the *Hexapla* text (§§43–48), and in the commentaries of the Church fathers, especially of Jerome. Whether Lucian, whose text often contains interpolations from the later Greek translations, had used this independently, or whether his text had only been wrought over by Origen, has not yet been thoroughly investigated (§ 46). Morinus began to collect the fragments which still remain. The work was continued by others, especially by Montfaucon, and is now provisionally concluded by Field's classical work, in which not only the immediate fragments have been gathered with unwearied industry, but, above all, the statements of the *Syro-Hexaplaris* have been estimated in a way that shows a thorough mastery of the Greek language.

Montfaucon, *Hexaplarorum Origenes quæ supersunt multis partibus auctiora quam a Flaminio Nobilio et J. Drusio edita fuerint*, Paris 1713.

Fr. Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quæ supersunt*, 2 vols., Oxford 1875. Valuable supplements are given by Pitra, *Analecta sacra specilegio Solesmensi parata*, iii. 1883, pp. 555–578. Compare also Cornill, *Ezechiel*, p. 104 ff. 109.

The signs are *'A* for Aquila, *Σ'* for Symmachus, *Θ* for Theodotion, *E'* for Quinta, and S' for Sexta. Compare further, Field, *Prolegomena*, cap. x.

It is, as Nestle has shown, worthy of attention that according to the catalogue of the library of Constantine Barinus at Constantinople (see Verdier, *La Bibliothèque d'Antoine du Verdier*, Lyons 1685, *Supplement*, p. 60), there are said to have been in that collection of books manuscripts with

Symmachus' translation of the Psalms and other books of Scripture. Compare Hody, *De bibl. text. origin.* p. 588.

52. The most peculiar of these new translations, and in many respects an extraordinarily interesting production, is that of Aquila. In thorough touch with the new spiritual movement, which from Palestine had spread out among the Alexandrine Jews, he not only took as his basis the Palestinian Canon and the Palestinian form of the text, but sought perfectly to reproduce the Hebrew text, and to make the Greek translation as suitable for the basis of a discussion as the original, for he reproduced and imitated the original text down to the most minute details. In this way the Greek idiom was indeed boldly violated, and there arose a dialect which to a Greek must have seemed more outrageous than the Jewish-Greek jargon into which the LXX. had been translated. Thus the sign of the accusative את was represented by *συν*, ה *locale* by the enclitic *δε*, לֵאמֹר by *τῷ λέγειν*, and the Hebrew system of roots by etymological creations like *ὀστέοῦν*, and *ὀστέϊνος* for עֶצֶם and עֲצוּם (from עֶצֶם *ὀστέον*), *θυρεοῦν* for גִּנָּן (from גִּנָּן *θυρεόν*), etc. But on the other hand, Aquila—*eruditissimus linguæ græcæ*, as Jerome styles him—displays such skill in his handling of the Greek language, such fidelity in dealing with unusual and poetical expressions, often selecting one of similar sound with the Hebrew word, that those barbarisms are not by any means to be regarded as indications of linguistic deficiencies, but only as the consequence of adopting a principle which it was impossible to carry out. This can be satisfactorily explained only by a consideration of the particular period in which Aquila lived. It is quite certain that he was an old man when the treatise of Irenæus, *Adv. Hæres.*, was composed, between A.D. 175 and A.D. 189, where he is mentioned for the first time. But even what the ancients tell about him is in part deserving of full confidence. Even should the statement of Irenæus, that he

was a proselyte "from Pontus" have to be given up, as arising from a confusion with Acts xviii. 2, and should also the stories of Epiphanius about him be set aside, all the more valuable will be the report of Jerome that Aquila was a scholar of the celebrated R. Akiba about the year 100. With this agrees the statement in the *jer. Talmud* (*Kidd*, i. fol. 59*a*) about a proselyte עקילם, a scholar of R. Akiba, while the passage *jer. Meg.* fol. 71*c*, which makes him a scholar of the contemporary teachers R. Eliezer and R. Joshua, describes him at least as living during that same time. Now it was R. Akiba who, in so pre-eminent a degree, impressed his mental and spiritual character on the Judaism of his day, in this respect as well as in others, that he introduced in his exposition of Scripture a method that dealt with minutiæ, which laid special weight on all sorts of small details, such as the particles גם, את, etc., and therefore just such minutiæ as those which Aquila in his translation wished to fix attention upon by that unrelenting treatment of the Greek language. In this way is explained the preference with which this translation of Aquila, which probably enjoyed full Palestinian authorisation, was used for a long time by the Jews. It had shown, as is said in *jer. Meg.* i. fol. 71*a*, that Greek is the one language into which the Law can be rendered in a complete manner (no doubt only by subjecting it to a very peculiar treatment), and with allusion to the name עקילם and to Japhet, the ancestor of the Greeks, it is told that one praised Aquila (קילסו from *καλως*), and applied to him the language of the 45th Psalm: יפיפית (Thou art fair, or thou art become a Japhet) before the children of men. How widely his translation had spread among the Jews is witnessed to by Origen as well as by Jerome and even by No. 146 of the Novellæ of Justinian. That it was directed polemically against Christianity might evidently be expected from the very nature of things, and is proved from several particulars,

c.g. from Isaiah vii. 14, where it has *νεᾶνις* instead of the *παρθένος* of the LXX., and from its endeavour to render מוֹשִׁיעַ by another term than *χριστός*. With what diligence he wrought appears from the story of Jerome that he produced a second improved edition of his translation. Of the specimens of his translation given in the Talmud some at least agree precisely with the Greek fragments.

Compare R. Anger, *De Onkelo Chaldaico, quem ferunt Pentateuchi paraphraste*, Leipsic 1843; Field, *Hexapla*, i. p. xvi. ff.; Wellhausen-Bleek, *Einleitung*, p. 580 f.; Geiger, *Nachgelassene Schriften*, iv. 83 f.; Schürer, *Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, ii. 704 ff., Eng. trans. Div. ii. vol. iii. 168; Cornill, *Ezechiel*, p. 104 ff.; Ryssel, *Untersuchungen über die Textgestalt des Buches Micha*, 1877, p. 186.

Irenæus, *Adv. Hæres.* iii. 24 (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* v. 8. 10): *οὐχ ὡς ἔνιοί φασι τῶν νῦν μεθερμηνεύειν τολμώντων τὴν γραφήν· ἰδοὺ ἡ νεᾶνις ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν, ὡς Θεοδοτίων ἡρμήνευσεν ὁ Ἐφέσιος καὶ Ἀκύλας ὁ Πόντικος, ἀμφότεροι Ἰουδαῖοι προσήλυτοι, οἷς κατακολουθήσαντες οἱ Ἐβιοναῖοι ἐξ Ἰωσὴφ αὐτὸν γεγενέσθαι φάσκουσι.* Jerome on Isaiah viii. 14: "Scribæ et Pharisæi, quorum scholam suscepit Acibas, quem magistrum Aquilæ proselyti autumant." Further, Epistle 57, *Ad. Pamm.;* Epiphanius, *De mens. et pond.* c. 13–17.

On the hermeneutical methods of R. Akiba, see *Bereshith* r. 1 and *jer. Berachoth*, 9, 7 fol. 14*b*, according to the latter of which passages one of the scholars of Akiba was instructed by his master in the meaning of the words אֵת, גַּם, אַךְ, and רַק. Compare Schürer, *Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, ii. 311, Eng. trans. Div. ii. vol. i. 376.

Origen, *Ad Africanum* (i. 14, De la Rue): *Ἀκύλας . . . φιλοτιμότερον πεπιστευμένος παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις ἡρμηνευκέναι τὴν γραφήν· ᾧ μάλιστα εἰώθασιν οἱ ἀγνοοῦντες τὴν Ἑβραίων διάλεκτον χρῆσθαι ὡς πάντων μᾶλλον ἐπιτετευγμένῳ.* In No. 146 of the *Novellæ* it is said of the public reading of the Scriptures in the Jewish synagogues: "At vero ii, qui græca lingua legunt, LXX. interpretum utentur translationi, quæ

omnium accuratissima et ceteris præstantior judicata est . . . Verum ne illos a reliquis interpretationibus secludere videamur, licentiam concedimus etiam Aquilæ versione utendi, et si ille extraneus sit, et in lectionibus quibusdam inter ipsam et LXX. interpretes non modica sit dissonantia."

Justin Martyr (ed. Otto ii. 240) betrays indeed at least an indirect acquaintance with Aquila's translation of Isaiah vii. 14.

On the relation of Aquila to the Books of Ecclesiastes and The Song in the LXX., compare above, § 41. In reference to this question the statement of Cornill (*Ezechiel*, pp. 64, 104 f.), about an Oxford Codex for Ezekiel (Holmes 62), which has in the highest degree been influenced by Aquila, is of importance. It is also worthy of note that the Syrian translation has the sign of the accusative את only in these two books (elsewhere only in Gen. i. 1 and 1 Chron. iv. 41).

[See article on "Aquila" by Professor Dickson in *Smith's Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. i. 1877, pp. 150, 151; also Article "Versions" in *Dictionary of the Bible*, 1863, vol. iii. 1622.]

53. If Theodotion, as is usually supposed, was younger than Aquila, the appearing of his translation shows that not all Greek-speaking Jews agreed with the bold hermeneutical principles of Aquila, and that many were unwilling wholly to abandon the LXX. with which they had been so long familiar. The work of Theodotion is indeed to be regarded as a sort of comprehensive revision of the LXX., to which it also attaches itself by this, that it retains the apocryphal additions to Daniel and the postscript to Job. It is characteristic of his method that not rarely Theodotion receives into his translation the Hebrew word unchanged.

Regarding his personal circumstances, we are wholly without information. He is, like Aquila, older than the composition of the treatise of Irenæus, *Adv. Hæreseos.* Irenæus himself calls him a proselyte from Ephesus. This, however,

is not in agreement with what is said by Jerome, who repeatedly describes him, in contrast to Aquila, as an Ebionite; but in other passages this Church father names him a Jew, and mentions his Ebionism only as the opinion of others. Origen made use of him, as has been already said, as a companion to his Septuagint column. Among the Jews indeed he seems to have played no important part, which probably is to be accounted for by his mediating method. All the greater, on the other hand, was his success among the Christians, who used him greatly for the emendation of the LXX., partly also in room of that translation. Even Irenæus made use of his translation of Daniel, which afterwards completely supplanted the Alexandrine translation of that prophet. The possibly even older custom of interpolating the LXX. with passages from Theodotion, was carried out systematically by Origen (see, *e.g.* Jer. xxxiii. 14–26), and thereby contributed still more to the mixing up of it with the Alexandrine translation.

Compare Field, *Prolegomena*, cap. iv.; Schürer, *Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, ii. 708 ff., Eng. trans. Div. ii. vol. iii. 172; Ryssel, *Textgestalt des Buches Micha*, p. 187.

Irenæus, *Adv. Hæres.* § 52; Jerome on Habakkuk iii. 11–13: "Theodotion autem vere quasi pauper et Ebionita sed et Symmachus ejusdem dogmatis pauperem sensum secuti Judaice transtulerunt." So, too, in the Preface to the version of Job. On the other hand, *Epistola ad Augustinum* 112 *hominis Judæi atque blasphemi;* Praef. comment. in Daniel: "Illud quoque lectorem admoneo, Danielem non juxta LXX. interpretes sed juxta Theodotionem ecclesias legere, qui utique post adventum Christi incredulus fuit, licet eum quidam dicant Ebionitam, qui altero genere Judæus est." The mediating method pursued by the author is very well characterised by Jerome in his Comment. on John ii. 2.

According to Epiphanius he lived under Commodus, A.D. 180–192, but this author's stories about him (*De mensuris et*

ponderibus, 17–18), like those about the other translators, are quite worthless. The words quoted from Irenæus about the importance of his translation among the Ebionites rather show that it must have been written some considerable time previously. Schürer is therefore inclined to make him older than Aquila. If, however, he is led to the adoption of this theory by the idea that a work like that of Theodotion's would have been superfluous after Aquila's had won acceptance, this is not decisive, since we can without difficulty conceive of the origin of his translation in the way described in the above section. That Irenæus names him before Aquila may simply have its ground in this, that his translation lay nearer Irenæus than that of Aquila, as indeed he actually made use of Theodotion's translation of Daniel (§ 43). The coincidences in the Apocalypse of John are, as Schürer himself remarks, not sufficiently convincing to warrant us in building anything upon them. Of greater importance is the reminiscence in the Shepherd of Hermes (*Vis.* iv. 2. 4), of Theodotion's rendering of Daniel vi. 23 (compare *Theolog. Literaturzeitung*, 1885, 146, 267). But see also *ZWT*, xxviii. 384. Whether Theodotion or Aquila was the elder can finally be decided only by a thoroughgoing examination of their translations. On Theodotion on Isaiah xxv. 8, where some think they find traces of a Christian mode of thought, compare Field on the passage, and Kautzsch, *De vet. Testam. locis a Paulo apost. allegatis*, 1869, p. 104. [See a particularly good and adequate Article, "Theodotion," by Dr. Gwynn of Dublin, in Smith's *Dict. of Chr. Biography*, vol. iv. 1887, pp. 970–979. On the apparent use of Theodotion's Daniel in the Shepherd of Hermes, see Hort in the *Johns Hopkins' University Circulars*, iv. 23, and in opposition to the attempt to bring Hermes down from the beginning to the middle of the second century, see, besides Gwynn, Salmon, *Introd. to the New Testament*, 1885, pp. 654–658.]

54. Symmachus, of whom Irenæus does not speak, was later than Aquila and Theodotion. According to a story of Eusebius, he was an Ebionite, who seems to have made his

translation not long before Origen, and also to have composed other works whose contents were of a Jewish-Christian character. Jerome also calls him an Ebionite. Now if it is thought remarkable to find a Bible translation among the Ebionite Jewish Christians, the astonishment increases when, on a closer inspection of his translation, we find ourselves alongside of one who with equal mastery deals with the Hebrew and with the Greek languages. Together with Jerome, who has made great use of him, he stands among ancient translators nearest to the modern ideal of what a translator should be. Only in his paraphrastic circumlocutions, which we meet with here and there in the case of bold or dogmatically offensive passages, does he show himself a genuine child of his age. According to Jerome on Jer. xxxii. 30 and Nah. iii. 1, he also published a second revised edition of his translation.

Compare Field, *Prolegomena*, cap. iii.; Wellhausen-Bleek, *Einleitung*[4], p. 582 ff.; Cornill, *Ezechiel*, p. 108 f.; Ryssel, *Textgestalt des Buches Micha*, p. 187.

Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vi. 17: *τῶν γε μὴν ἑρμηνευτῶν αὐτῶν δὴ τούτων ἱστέον Ἐβιωναῖον τὸν Σύμμαχον γεγονέναι . . . καὶ ὑπομνήματα δὲ τοῦ Συμμάχου εἰσέτι νῦν φέρεται, ἐν οἷς δοκεῖ, πρὸς τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον ἀποτεινόμενος εὐαγγέλιον, τὴν δεδηλωμένην αἵρεσιν κρατύνειν. ταῦτα δὲ ὁ Ὠριγένης, μετὰ καὶ ἄλλων εἰς τὰς γραφὰς ἑρμηνειῶν τοῦ Συμμάχου, σημαίνει παρὰ Ἰουλιανῆς τινος εἰληφέναι, ἣν καὶ φησι παρ' αὐτοῦ Συμμάχου τὰς βίβλους διαδέξασαι.* Jerome, i. § 53. Whether the story of Epiphanius, that he had been originally a Samaritan, rests on any historical grounds, can scarcely be determined. But Lagarde writes very strikingly (*Mittheilungen*, ii. 51): "In connection with this it should not be forgotten that if Symmachus was a Samaritan, then at least Symmachus does not unconditionally witness for the text of the Jews of his time." Certainly as "a Samaritan" he would have had no text of the Prophets and the Hagiographa. On very weak grounds, Geiger (*Jüd. Zeitschrift*, 1862, pp. 62–64;

Nachgelassene Schriften, p. 88 ff.), sought to attach him to Judaism. A Syrian story about him is communicated by Nestle, *TSK*, 1879, p. 733 f.

Examples of the free paraphrases: Gen. i. 27: *ἐν εἰκόνι διαφόρᾳ, ὄρθιον ὁ θεὸς ἔκτισεν αὐτόν* (which, according to Lagarde, *Psalterium juxta Hebræos Hieronymi*, 165, implies the reading of בצלם ובצלם instead of בצלמו בצלם); Gen. xviii. 25: *ὁ πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἀπαιτῶν δικαιοπραγεῖν, ἀκρίτως μὴ ποιήσῃς τοῦτο*; Ps. xliv. 24: *ἱνατί ὡς ὑπνῶν εἶ*; Richt, 9, 13: *τὴν εὐφροσύνην τῶν ἀνθρώπων.*

55. Of the two anonymous Greek translations, the *Quinta* and the *Sexta*, which Origen, as Eusebius says, drew out of some obscure corner and received into the *Hexapla*, the latter at least, according to the express declaration of Jerome (in Habakk. iii. 13), was of Christian origin. Field's investigations have reached the result that they embraced a larger number of the Old Testament books than was previously supposed to be the case, but otherwise we know nothing precisely about them. Eusebius, and after him Jerome, spoke also of a "seventh translation," and Jerome, on Habakk. ii. 11, speaks of *duas alias editiones*, besides the *Quinta*. But with the exception of perhaps Ps. l. 3 (*Septima, καταιγίσθη*), no trace of this translation has ever been found elsewhere. Whether the *ὁ Ἑβραῖος* cited sometimes by the Church fathers, which often renders the text pretty freely, was a translation in the proper sense, cannot now be definitely determined.

Compare Field, *Prolegomena*, cap. v.

Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vi. 16: *καί τινας ἑτέρας παρὰ τὰς κατημαξευμένας ἑρμηνείας ἐναλλάττουσας, τὴν Ἀκύλου καὶ Συμμάχου καὶ Θεοδοτίωνος, ἐφευρεῖν, ἅς οὐκ οἶδ' ὅδεν ἔκ τινων μυχῶν τὸν πάλαι λανθάνουσας χρόνον εἰς φῶς ἀνιχνεύσας προήγαγεν· ἐφ' ὧν διὰ ἀδηλότητα τίνος ἆρ' εἶεν οὐκ εἰδὼς, αὐτὸ τοῦτο μόνον ἐπεσημήνατο, ὡς ἄρα τὴν μὲν εὕροι ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἀκτίῳ Νικοπόλει, τὴν δὲ ἐν ἑτέρῳ τόπῳ τοιῷδε· ἔν γε μὴν τοῖς ἑξαπλοῖς τῶν ψαλμῶν, μετὰ τὰς ἐπισήμους τέσσαρας*

ἐκδόσεις, οὐ μόνον πέμπτην, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕκτην καὶ ἑβδόμην παραθεὶς ἑρμηνείαν, ἐπὶ μιᾶς αὐθις σεσημείωται, ὡς ἐν Ἱεριχοῖ εὑρημένης ἐν πίθῳ κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους Ἀντωνίνου τοῦ υἱοῦ Σεβήρου [211–217]. According to this then the *Quinta* was found at Nicopolis, on the west coast of Greece, and either the *Sexta* or the *Septima* at Jericho. The passages from Jerome are given by Field, *Prolegomena*, xliii. According to his commentary on Titus iii. 9, the *Quinta*, *Sexta*, and *Septima* were mainly composed of the poetical books (*versu compositi*). Jerome on Hab. iii. 13: "Sexta editio, prodens manifestissime sacramentum, ita vertit ex Hebræo: egressus es, ut salvares populum tuum per Jesum Christum tuum: quod Græce dicitur ἐξῆλθες τοῦ σῶσαι, τὸν λαόν σου διὰ Ἰεσοῦν τὸν Χριστόν σου." The same on Hab. ii. 11: "Reperi, exceptis quinque editionibus, id est, Aquilæ, Symmachi, Septuaginta, Theodotionis et Quinta, in XII. prophetis et duas alias editiones, in quarum una scriptum est: quia lapis, in altera: lapis enim.

On ὁ Ἑβραῖος, compare Field, *Prolegomena*, lxxv. sq.

3. *Jerome and the Vulgate.*

56. Of the translations which were intended to take the place of the LXX., no one has obtained such historical significance as that of Jerome. In the Greek Church indeed the Alexandrine translation maintained its place, and among the Jews circumstances gradually took such a turn that they generally needed no Greek translation of the Old Testament. On the other hand, the Western Church owed it to Jerome that it learnt to know the Old Testament in a form which, upon the whole, was much purer and clearer than the Septuagint or the Latin Bible translations that were dependent upon it (§ 47).

Jerome, born A.D. 346, died A.D. 420, was, if a fair view is taken of the circumstances of his time, well equipped for the

work which he ventured to undertake. And even although the astonishment of his contemporaries which found expression in the declaration of Augustine, *Quod Hieronymus nescivit, nemo mortalium unquam scivit*, may be justifiable only when his knowledge is compared with that of his fellow-Christians, it must yet be acknowledged that he spared no pains to make himself familiar with the Hebrew language, difficult as it was by reason of the *helantia stridentiaque verba*, and with the conditions of life presupposed in the Old Testament. *Non parvis nummis* paid he for his instruction under various Jewish teachers, who sometimes, for fear of their countrymen, came to him secretly by night, "like Nicodemus," among them Baranina, he whom the bitter Rufinus, as a reward for the stores of Bible knowledge which the Church through long ages would have to thank him for, nicknamed by the opprobrious designation of "Barabbas." In addition to this Jerome diligently used the works of the later Greek translators, especially that of Symmachus (§ 54). That the result of his endeavours was nevertheless in many particulars imperfect, is so natural a consequence of the circumstances in which he was placed, that the reproach of a defective scientific method, which *e.g.* Clericus brought against him, is no more justifiable than the Catholic attempts to elevate him into an infallible translator. Compared with the attainments of those around him, his service marks an extraordinary advance; while, on the other hand, his mastery of the Latin tongue, obtained by means of continuous study of the classics, the grave tone of that speech moreover suiting his purpose well, qualified him for his work.

Compare Morinus, *Exercitationes biblicæ*, p. 156; Clericus, *Quæstiones Hieronymianæ*, 1700; L. Engelstoft, *Hieronymus Strid. interpres*, etc., Copenhagen 1797; Zöckler, *Hieronymus, sein Leben und Wirken*, 1865, pp. 342 ff., 465 ff.; De Wette-Schrader, *Einleitung*, p. 136 ff.; Nowack, *Die Bedeutung des*

Hieronymus für die Alttestamentl. Textkritik, 1875, p. 5 ff.; Ryssel, *Textgestalt des Buches Micha*, p. 189 ff.

On the influence of the Jewish exegesis on Jerome, see Rahmer, *Die hebräischen Traditionen in den Werken Hieronymus*, i. 1861, and *MGWJ*, 1865, 1867, 1868; Siegfried, *JPT*, ix. 346 ff.

57. Jerome at the beginning intended only by criticism of the text to establish and correct the *Vetus latina*, which was widely circulated, but had then assumed many divergent forms. After he had, at the call of Damasus, revised the New Testament Scriptures, he improved in A.D. 383 at Rome the translation of the Psalms *licet cursim*, and with constant reference to the old customary form. This Recension Damasus introduced into the Roman liturgy, so that it obtained the name of *Psalterium Romanum*. It was in use in Rome down to the sixteenth century, and is still used in the Church of St. Peter. It was used in Venice in the chapel of the Doge down to A.D. 1808, and is employed to this day in the Ambrosian ritual in Milan. Some time after this Jerome left Rome, in order to prosecute his studies in the East, and to live in the practice of religious exercises. While staying in Cæsarea he came to know of the *Hexapla* of Origen, and thereby became acquainted with one form of the text of the Septuagint, which he subsequently gave the preference to before all others. Dissatisfied with his earlier revision, he began a new rendering of the Psalms according to the *Hexaplar Recension*, which obtained currency in Gaul, and hence bears the name of the *Psalterium Gallicanum*. This *Psalterium* was at a later date adopted into the Roman Breviary and into the Vulgate, and is therefore the authorised translation of the Psalms for Catholics. Other Old Testament writings also he wrought over according to the *Hexaplar* text; but, with the exception of the Book of Job, this work has all been lost. Undoubtedly the fact that Jerome himself,

while carrying on this work, became pledged to a far bolder undertaking, contributed to this result. By means of his laboriously acquired knowledge of Hebrew, he wished as the first among the westerns to translate the Old Testament from the Hebrew text. And even if his designating the Hebrew text of his time (which was essentially the same as the Massoretic text of the present day), "the Hebrew truth" be not absolutely correct, yet this text stood so high above the Alexandrine Bible that the new undertaking marked an important step in advance, while it exposed him to many bitter attacks on the part of his unscientific contemporaries. He himself with his victorious logic pointed out to his opponents that the Church had a long time before without scruple exchanged the Alexandrine translation of Daniel for that of Theodotion, although the inspiration of the Seventy had been a universally admitted dogma (§ 38). On the other hand, the powerful opposition which this man, with noticeable elements of weakness in his character, met with from all sides, succeeded in inducing him to accommodate himself generally, wherever it was at all possible to do so, to the customary translation. He seems to have begun the great and bold work in the year 390. First of all he translated the easiest books, Samuel and Kings; then Job, the Prophets, and the Psalms; and finally, in the years 393–405, the rest of the canonical books, and to please his contemporaries (§ 18), of the Apocrypha: Tobit, Judith, and the additions to Jeremiah, Daniel, and Esther. An epistolary correspondence with Augustine, who in spite of his expressed preference for the old translation, did not wish, without further examination, to pass judgment on the undertaking of Jerome, gave him an opportunity for vindicating his work (Epist. 112, *Ad Augustinum*). The vain man experienced a great triumph when separate portions of his translation were rendered into Greek by Sophronius, a remarkable reversal of

the hitherto prevailing relation between the Greeks and Latins.

L. van Ess, *Pragmatisch-kritische Geschichte der Vulgata*, Tüb. 1824; Kaulen, *Geschichte der Vulgata*, Mainz 1868; Fritzsche in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*[2], viii. 445–459.

On the use of the *Psalterium Romanum*, see Scholz, *Einleitung*, p. 486 f., and *Theol. Litteraturblatt*, 1874, No. 19. In the tenth volume of Vallarsi's *Opera Hieronymi* are to be found the *Psalterium Romanum*, *Psalterium Gallicanum*, and the translation of the Book of Job according to the *Hexaplar* text. Lagarde has published a translation of Job based upon a manuscript in Tours and a *Codex Bodleianus* (2426); *Mittheilungen*, ii. 193–237. Caspari is preparing to edit a third manuscript.

58. After the older Latin translation and that of Jerome had for a long time been used alongside of one another, according to the choice of the Churches or their founder, the translation of Jerome came into general use by the seventh century. In the thirteenth century it became customary to call it the Vulgate (*editio vulgata*), a name, which in earlier times, *e.g.* by Jerome himself, had been used to designate the LXX., especially the κοινή, or its Latin rendering. The Vulgate of the Middle Ages was, however, by no means identical with the genuine translation of Jerome. While the two translations had been in use side by side, the manuscripts of the new translation in their whole extent were subjected to alterations from the *Vetus latina*, especially by means of marginal notes, which by and by were incorporated into the text itself. In addition to this, in the following ages there came in errors of transcription and wilful additions of various kinds. The endeavours of Cassiodorus and Alcuin to restore the text from its corrupt state were unsuccessful, and the so-called *Correctoria*, or Collections of Variations, of which some indeed are of pre-eminent interest from a historical point of view and in connection with the criticism of the text, served, in the hands

of unskilled persons, only to increase the confusion. After the invention of the art of printing—the Vulgate was printed before the Greek New Testament—Catholics and Protestants vied with each other for a long time in the production of critical editions of the Latin translation, until an incident occurred which suddenly cooled the zeal of the Protestants, and led to their judging of the work of the old Church father in quite an unreasonable way. The Tridentine Council, which elevated the recognition of the Apocrypha into a condition of salvation (§ 19), and thereby destroyed what Jerome had with so much energy upheld, yet, on the other hand, ascribed to his translation a quite unmeasured importance, for it authorised the Vulgate *in publicis lectionibus, disputationibus, prædicationibus et expositionibus* (Sess. iv.). Owing to the condition of the text at that time, the Bible authorised in such a manner, had, as Kaulen expresses it, more of an ideal than of a real existence, and the Catholic Church therefore felt itself obliged to establish a form of text which might actually claim to be the Vulgate. The Protestants, for reasons that can well be understood, while these labours were going on, acted the part of critical spectators. The edition of Sixtus V. in A.D. 1590, which, according to the Bull printed in front of it, was approved even for private use *apostolica nobis a domino tradita auctoritate*, and declared to be *vera, legitima, authentica et indubitata*, so that any one who ventured without papal authority to change it, *indignationem omnipotentis Dei ac beatorum Petri et Pauli apostolorum ejus se noverit incursurum*, had not the same fortune as the *Sixtina* of the LXX. Clement VIII. was obliged to take notice of the demands that had become clamant at the papal court, and therefore allowed a new text to be edited, which at last became the authorised text of the Roman Catholic Church. The style and manner, moreover, in which these editions were prepared do not admit of any doubt that, while the

editors might possibly produce a practically useful text, they were not in a position to solve the difficult problem of the restoration of the genuine text of Jerome. And even in recent times, when interest in the translation of the old linguistically skilled Church father has again revived among Protestants, we still find ourselves very far off indeed from this end. Only the unfortunately incomplete Collection of Variations by Vercellone affords a valuable contribution to a future reconstruction of the Vulgate text, especially in this way, that these variations show how many fragments of the old Latin translations, therefore, from the LXX. have been intruded into the Vulgate.

Kaulen, *Geschichte der Vulgata*, pp. 150–494. See also: Berger, *De l'histoire de la Vulgata en France*, 1888; De Wette-Schrader, *Einleitung*, p. 144 f.

On a remarkable *Correctorium*, probably from the thirteenth century, which, besides a rare critical insight, shows acquaintance with the distinction between French and Spanish manuscripts of the Hebrew text, with the Targums, the Rabbinists, etc., compare Vercellone, *Dissertazione accademiche*, Rome 1864, p. 53; Kaulen, *Geschichte der Vulgata*, p. 255 f.

Under Clement VIII. there first appeared: *Biblia Sacra vulgatæ editionis Sixti V. jussu recognita atque edita*, Rome 1592. Since this edition contained more than two hundred errors of the press, a new one was issued in 1593, which "indeed corrected some of the printer's errors, but left a still larger number uncorrected, and added new mistakes of its own" (Kaulen, *Geschichte*, p. 470). Only the third edition of 1598, by reason of the appended *indices correctorii*, can be regarded as conclusive. Although these editions differed from the text of Sixtus V. of 1590 in almost three thousand passages, they still continued to bear the name of that pope on their title-page. How the Protestants judged of these proceedings is shown, *e.g.*, by Th. James, *Bellum papale, sive concordia discors Sixti V. et Clementis VIII. circa Hieronymianam editionem*, London 1600.

The edition of Heyse and Tischendorf, *Biblia sacra latina V.T. Hieronymo interprete*, 1873, is in point of textual criticism very unsatisfactory. Compare *ZWT*, p. 591 ff.; Lagarde, *Psalterium juxta hebræos Hieronymi*, Leipsic 1874. On a manuscript not used by Lagarde, see Bæthgen, *ZAW*, 1881, p. 105 ff.

Among the manuscripts of the Vulgate is the celebrated *Codex Amiatinus*, previously in the Cloister of Mount Amiata, now in Florence. It was supposed by Tischendorf and others to belong to the sixth century. This view was opposed by Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, i. 1885, p. 191 f. He maintained that it was a manuscript of the ninth century, artificially written in an antique style after a cursive manuscript. Such also was the opinion of Cornill, *Ezechiel*, p. 158 f. More recently, however, a series of interesting discussions has appeared in *The Academy* (1887, xxxi. pp. 111, 130, 148 ff., 165 f., 309 f., 414 f.; 1888, xxxiii. pp. 239 f., 307 f.). Light has been shed upon this question especially by Hort's contributions. The name on the first page must be read *Ceolfrid Anglorum*; the Codex was written in Jarrow under the Abbot whose rule extended from A.D. 690 to A.D. 716, after the pattern of older Codices, and was sent from England to Rome as a present to Gregory II. The first sheet, however, with its three lists of the canon and pictorial illustrations (compare Corssen, *JPT*, ix. p. 619 ff.), was borrowed from a Codex of Cassiodorus (of the *Vetus latina*) brought to England. From this manuscript, Lagarde (*Mittheilungen*, i. pp. 241–378) has edited the Wisdom of Solomon and Sirach. [For an admirable and complete account of the *Codex Amiatinus*, see *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, second series, Oxford 1890; (7) "The *Codex Amiatinus* and its Birthplace," by H. J. White. Appendix: "On the Italian Origin of the *Codex Amiatinus* and the Localising of Italian MSS.," by W. Sanday, pp. 273–324.] The *Codex Toletanus*, which is supposed to belong to the eighth century, was collated for the Sixtine edition. This collation is preserved in the Vatican, and was printed in Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, xxix. 879–1096. Other manuscripts are enumerated by De Wette-Schrader, *Einleitung*,

p. 143 f. [See list of MSS. of the Vulgate in Scrivener's *Plain Introduction*, 1883, pp. 348–365.]

Vercellone, *Variæ lectiones Vulgatæ lat. Bibliorum editionis*, Rome 1860–1864 (only the historical books). Compare also: Bukentop, *Lux de luce*, 1710; Thielmann, *Beiträge zur Textkritik d. Vulg., insbesondere des Buches Judith. Programm der Studienanstalt Speier*, 1883.

On the daughter versions of the translation of Jerome, see De Wette-Schrader, *Einleitung*, p. 147.

4. *The Jewish Targums.*

59. The Aramaic language, which even before the exile was the international tongue of the north Semitic peoples, but was not understood by the common Jews (Isa. xxxvi. 11), after the exile gradually took the place of the old Israelitish language, and was, in the times of Christ, the proper vulgar language of the Jews. This remarkable change, of which Dan. ii. 4*b*–vii. 28, and Ezra, iv. 8–vi. 18, vii. 12, 26, are the first witnesses, was one element in a great and sweeping movement. In the Persian age we meet with the Aramaic as the properly universal language of that period, even in the inland parts of Arabia, and as it was adopted by the Jews from their neighbours, so also by the Arabian tribes which had taken up their residence east of that Jordan. Naturally also the Palestinian Christians (§ 49) spoke from the first a dialect of this same "West Aramaic" language. Only in a few villages of the Anti-Lebanon is there now a poor, struggling remnant of this once dominant speech.

Nöldeke, *Die semitischen Sprachen*, pp. 28–34; Kautzsch, *Gramatik des Biblisch-aramäischen*, Leipsic 1884. On the Christian-Palestinian dialect, see Nöldeke, *ZDMG*, xx. 443 ff. On the relation between the Greek and the Aramaic, see Nöldeke, *ZDMG*, xxxix. 313 ff. [*Studia Biblica*, first series,

Oxford 1885, pp. 39–74, Article by Neubauer "On the Dialects spoken in Palestine in the time of Christ."]

60. In the same proportion in which the popular speech of the Jews changed, did the Holy Scriptures become less easily understood by the multitude. Only the scribes kept alive among them the tradition of the pronunciation and the understanding of the text, and to them are we indebted for our ability still to read the Old Testament. The Law, however, played so important a part among the post-exilian Jews that the understanding of it could not remain the peculiar property of the learned class; while the weekly readings from the Law and the Prophets made it necessary that they should be understood by the people. In order to satisfy this need, there arose the custom of the reader in the synagogue having alongside of him an interpreter, מְתוּרְגְּמָן, who rendered the portions read into the language of the people. Such a rendering would very readily assume the character of an expository paraphrase, which sought to bring the read portion nearer to the requirements of the religious sentiments of the age. Negatively this tendency showed itself in the leaving untranslated of some of the passages that were offensive to the taste and feelings of these later times. On account of the circle of readings being regularly repeated, the Aramaic rendering must readily have assumed a fixed crystallised form, which would be transmitted from one generation to another; but upon this basis, wherever there was no manifest antagonism to it, new ideas of all kinds, called forth by the changing circumstances of the times, would be freely deposited. That the Aramaic translations of the Old Testament which are still preserved arose, at least partly, in this way, can be proved to demonstration from this, that in several of them we can distinguish such layers from various periods as prove that the recording of them must have been preceded by a time in which they had been transmitted orally, and were still in a

fluid state. This, however, does not exclude the notion that an earlier attempt may have been made by written Aramaic renderings to make the contents of the Holy Scriptures more generally known. Indeed, it is quite evident that this must have been the case with the Hagiographa, which was not read in public, since there is mention in pretty early times of Aramaic translations of them. Thus there is mention of a written translation of the Book of Job in the time of Christ (*Sabb.* 16); *b Meg.* 3*a* makes evident allusion to various other translations of the Hagiographa, which can only be thought of as written documents. There is also, as it seems, mention in the Mishna (*Jadaim* iv. 5) of Aramaic translations of the Old Testament. Upon the whole, the widely spread notion, that in the earliest times it was forbidden to transcribe the Aramaic translations of the portions read in the synagogue, is not proved. In the passage that has been quoted in support of it (*jer. Meg.* iv. 1) what is really said, when properly understood, is only this, that such written translations must not be used in the synagogue service itself, while the production of a written record is not itself forbidden. On the other hand, it may be fairly concluded, especially from the first-mentioned reference to the subject (*Sabb.* 16), that the scribes of the earlier days regarded with disfavour such written interpretations, especially those of the Hagiographa, which can be easily understood, because such writings were withdrawn from the control of the spiritual guardianship exercised by the Pharisees, and might be the means of spreading all sorts of heretical views among the people.

All these Aramaic translations, whatever their origin may have been, bear the name of *Targums*. What has been already said makes it clear that their significance was essentially in the realm of the history of religion and culture, partly also in the province of exegesis, whereas, owing to their free treatment of the text, they are of importance for textual criticism only

in a limited degree. Yet in not a few passages results can be reached by their help with reference to a text diverging from the *Receptus*. It is very difficult to determine the date of the composition of these works; and even if it were possible to fix with certainty the time of their codification, little would thereby have been gained, since, in respect of their contents, they partly represent much earlier periods, especially the Targums on the Law and the Prophets, whose oldest layers may have originated in the very earliest synagogical readings. And that, especially in the Babylonian Targums, we have to do pre-eminently with ancient materials is shown, as Cornill has appropriately remarked, by the complete absence of all polemic against the Christians in the Messianic passages.

Compare Zunz, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*, 1832, p. 7 ff.; Nöldeke, *Alttestamentliche Litteratur*, p. 255 ff. On the untranslated passages, Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 368; Berliner, *Massora zum Targum Onkelos*, p. 59; *ZDMG*, xxix. 320.

M. Jadaim iv. 5, "עברית, which is written as תרגום," can only refer to Aramaic translations. *Tosephta Sabb.* xvi. 128: "When the elder Gamaliel sat on one of the temple steps one brought him a book with a Targum of the Book of Job; but he ordered a builder working near by to build the book into the wall which he was then building." Compare *b. Sabb.* 115; *jer. Sabb.* 16, fol. 15*c*; *Sophᵉrim*, p. xi. Nevertheless, the grandson of Gamaliel, according to this story, subsequently read in a copy of this same book. The notion of Grätz, *MGWJ*, 1877, p. 87, that this Targum was a Greek translation, is absolutely without foundation. On the other hand, it is not impossible that it was identical with the Συριακὴ βίβλος mentioned in the LXX. at the close of the Book of Job. It is also not impossible that the Old Testament quotations in the New Testament may in some cases have been taken from such a Targum. Compare, *e.g.* on Matt. ii. 5, Delitzsch, *Messianische Weissagungen*, 1890, p. 114, Eng. trans. by Prof. Curtiss, Edinburgh 1891. Compare also Lagarde, *NGGW*, 1890, p. 104.

b. Meg. 3*a*: Jonathan ben Uzziel (§ 63), who had translated the Prophets into Aramaic, wished also to produce a Targum on the Hagiographa; but he told how he had heard a *Bath-qol*, which said: "What thou hast translated is enough." Compare Bacher, *MGWJ*, 1882, p. 120.

Jer. Meg. iv. 1: "R. Haggai said, R. Samuel, son of R. Isaac, visited a synagogue, and found therein a Sopher reading his interpretation from a book; then said he to him, this is not permitted. The oral orally, the written by writing." Compare Berliner, *Targum Onkelos*, ii. p. 88 ff.

On the origin of the word *Targum* very diverse opinions prevail. The Assyriologists (Fred. Delitzsch, *The Hebrew Language*, 1883, p. 50; Haupt in Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften u. d. A. T.*[2] p. 517) [see Eng. trans. vol. ii. 267] refer it to an Assyrian word, *ragâmu*, to shout, to cry out. Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, iii. 110, 153, combines ترجيم, "to conjecture," with some sort of Mantic custom of stone-throwing, and adds: "Perhaps it also has some connection with the Aramaic תרגם." On the other hand, Lagarde (*Armen. Studien*, § 847; *Mittheilungen*, ii. 177 f.) treats תרגמן as an Indo-European loan word, and the verb as denominative. Halévy, finally, according to Devie's Appendix to the Supplementary volume of Littré's *Dictionary*, p. 32, note 8, would derive it from the Greek τριγμός. The Arabic ترجمان is in favour of the secondary nature of the participle מתרגמן, and consequently of the foreign derivation of the word. See Fränkel, *Aramäische Fremdwörter*, p. 280.

61. In Palestine, where the Targums originated, they were never recognised as proper authorities. They continued to occupy a place by themselves, and therefore show, however widely they became known, the above-described peculiarities in their full extent. When they were quoted in the Jerusalem Talmud, this was done only that they might be confuted. So *jer. Berachoth*, 5. 4, fol. 9*c*, where the addition to Lev. xxii. 28, "As I in heaven am merciful, so on earth be ye merciful," to which the Targum known to us as the Jerusalem Targum

contains a parallel, is rejected. It is also significant that Jerome, who lived a long time in Palestine, and was dependent on his Jewish teachers, never made mention of a Jewish Targum. It was otherwise in Babylon. The Babylonian Jews produced no independent Targum, but took over from the Palestinian Jews their Aramaic translations of the Law and the Prophets, which naturally must have made their way to them in a written form. Witness is borne to this by the dialect in the Babylonian Targums, which is the Palestino-Aramaic, with an East Aramaic colouring, which has not essentially changed the linguistic character. But in Babylon these renderings, which were used in the synagogue service, were authorised, and in this way were preserved from further alterations. In consequence of this, the Babylonians had only Targums on the Law and the Prophets, and only one on each of these books (compare *b. Meg.* 3*a*).

On the language of the Targums, compare Nöldeke, *Alttestamentliche Litteratur*, p. 257: *GGA*, 1872, p. 828; *Lit. Centralblatt*, 1877, p. 305. (Otherwise Elias Levita, compare *ZDMG*, xliii. 26.) Geiger, *Jüd. Zeitschrift*, 1871, p. 93, etc.

62. The authorised Torah Targum of the Babylonians, usually, but incorrectly, bears the name *Targum Onkelos*. The denominating of it was based upon *b. Meg.* 3*a*, according to which passage the Aramaic Torah Targum is said to have been "composed by Onkelos (אֻנְקְלוֹס) according to the directions (פִּיפְיֵי) of R. Eliezer and R. Joshua." But this "Onkelos" is only a variation of עקילס (Aquilas), and the parallel passage *jer. Meg.* 1. 9, fol. 71*c*, shows that in the original context the subject spoken of was the Greek translator Aquila (§ 52), out of whom therefore the Babylonian reviewer has made an Aramaic translator. In keeping with this is the fact that the name עקילס occurs also elsewhere in the Babylonian Talmud and in the *Tosephta* in the form אנקלוס (compare, *e.g.*, *jer. Demai*, vi.

10, fol. 25*d*, with *Tosephta Demai*, vi. p. 57, 16). There is now no longer any ground for assuming that any one in Babylon should have wittingly named the redactor of the Torah Targum "Aquila" in order thereby to show off his hermeneutical art, although the Onkelos at least in this connection is an "Aquila" among the Targumists. Undoubtedly we have to do with a simple confusion which was readily enough caused by the word "Targum." From this it follows, in the first place, that that passage is not to be understood as referring to the date of the composition of the Torah Targum, and, further, that the actual redactor of that Targum must have been unknown to the Babylonians, which still further confirm the conclusion to be drawn from the dialectic character of the translation (§ 61). Where the Babylonian Talmud quotes the Targum itself, it names it "our Targum" (*b. Kidd.* 69*a*), or says, "as we translate."

The question therefore arises, whether the Babylonians have so agreed with the Targum which they adopted as they received it, or whether it has been essentially altered by them. It is certain that the Babylonian Targum on the Law, which in comparison with that of the Palestinian is remarkably literal, gives the impression that it originated in a thorough recasting of an older precursor. Also the assertion of Geiger and Bacher that several passages in it are so abbreviated that they are unintelligible without a comparison with the Palestinian Torah Targums, rests for the most part on an exaggeration; yet it is nevertheless evident that it has been formed by a reduction of a document containing a greater abundance of Helachic material, which still in many places shines through, and is nearly related to the material met with in the Palestinian Targums. The assertion of Berliner, that the brief form met with in the Babylonian Targums is the more original, and the paraphrase the later, does not correspond with the facts of the case. This Targum is rather a

learned, and therefore a secondary work; while the Palestinian Targums, which certainly were concluded considerably later, contained many ancient portions which were omitted in the Babylonian Targum. But for the hypothesis that this reduction had been first undertaken by the Babylonians, there is no ground. If these, as the dialectic colouring seems to prove, have also subjected the text to a certain amount of revision, yet, on the other hand, the ignorance of the Babylonians with regard to the origin of their Targum distinctly disproves the idea of it having been essentially a Babylonian work. One would be rather led to assume that the Targum reduction in question was a fruit of the minute treatment of Scripture introduced by R. Akiba, and therefore that it had been undertaken in Palestine. In so far, the naming of the Targum after Onkelos-Aquila has a certain meaning, but scarcely that anticipated by its originator. But the main point is that this work of reduction remained without result in Palestine itself, whereas the Targum originating from it became authorised in Babylon. When this happened we do not know, yet the idea readily suggests itself that the Targum had been first brought to Babylon when the Babylonian school began to flourish, *i.e.* in the third Christian century. For the rest, this question is not of great interest, for in point of contents the Babylonian Torah Targum represents an older, in part certainly a pre-Christian age. In common with all Jewish translations, as also with the LXX., it shows a careful avoiding of all anthropomorphisms. And the peculiar custom of receiving into the text all sorts of Hebrew words untranslated is to be found also in the LXX., and still more in Theodotion.

A properly critical edition of this Targum does not exist. Formerly one had to content himself with the very defective text in respect of vocalisation given in the Polyglots and rabbinical Bibles. Now a step in advance has been taken by

Berliner's publication of the Recension of the excellent *editio Sabbioneta* of the year 1557. Merx has published some fragments from various Babylonian manuscripts in the British Museum. These manuscripts contain the Babylonian system of pointing (§ 80), while Berliner's edition presents a picture of the time during which the Babylonian pointing was being changed for the Palestinian, in which some peculiarities of the former were still preserved. An important aid toward the establishment of the text is afforded by the Massoras on Onkelos, which at the same time show with what care this translation was treated by the Jews.

Compare Luzzato, *Oheb Ger.* 1830; Geiger, *Jüd Zeitschrift*, 1871, pp. 85–104, 1875, p. 290; *Nachgelassene Schriften*, iv. 104, 106 ff.; Bacher, *ZDMG*, xxviii. 59 ff.; Frankel. *Zeitschrift für die relig. Interessen d. Judenthums*, 1846, p. 110 ff.; Wellhausen-Bleek, *Einleitung*, p. 607; Berliner, *Targum Onkelos*, ii. 100 ff., 114–128; Schürer, *Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, i. 117, Eng. trans. Div. i. vol. i. 134. Further literature in Berliner, *Targum Onkelos*, pp. 175–200.

On the beginnings of the Babylonian school, compare Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums*, ii. 134 ff. Yet it is said there, p. 132 f.: "We find even in Babylon, in the time of Akiba, individual Palestinian teachers of the Law, especially descendants of the family *Bethera*."

On the character of the translation, compare Berliner, *Targum Onkelos*, ii. 200–245; Volck in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*[2], xv. 366 ff.; Singer, *Onkelos und das Verhältnis seines Targums zur Halache*, 1881; Maybaum, *Die Anthropomorphien und Anthropopathien bei Onkelos und den späteren Targumim*. 1870. The substitution of "Salamites" for קיני in Gen. xv. 19, and elsewhere, as also in the Targum on the Prophets, is interesting, since that people was contemporary with the Nabateans (Euting, *Nabatäische Urschriften*, p. 28 f.); thus therefore the ancient times distinctly colour the text. Examples of the free treatment of passages: Gen. iii. 22, "Behold, the man is unique in the world, for he out

of his own self can know the good and the evil." Compare Symmachus: ἴδε, ὁ Ἀδὰμ γέγονεν ὁμοῦ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ γινώσκειν καλὸν καὶ πονηρὸν, and R. Akiba. Also *Mechilta* on Exod. xiv. 29 (p. 33*a*). The prohibition against seething a kid in its mother's milk (Ex. xxiii. 19) is in agreement with M. Chullin 8 on the prohibition against eating flesh prepared in milk. The untranslated words are given by Berliner, *Massora zum Targum Onkelos*, p. 57.

First edition: Bologna 1482 (Pentateuch edition). On the following editions, among which those of Lisbon 1491, the Rabbinical Bible 1517, the Antwerp Polyglot (Regia) 1569, and the *Sabbioneta* edition 1557, are deserving of special remark, compare De Wette-Schrader, *Einleitung*, p. 125; Berliner, *Targum Onkelos*, p. 187 ff.—On Berliner, *Targum Onkelos*, Berlin 1884 (I. Text, II. Introduction and Notes), compare Nöldeke's review in *Lit. Centralblatt*, 1884, 39, and especially Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, ii. 163–182, 386. From the Babylonian manuscripts in the British Museum, Merx (*Chrestomathia Targumica*, 1888) has edited after the *Codex de Rossi*, 12, Lev. ix. 1–11, 47; Num. xx. 12–25, 9; Deut. xxvi. 1–10, xix. 27–29, 8, c. 32–34. Gen. c. 1–4, c. 24–25, 6, c. 49. Ex. c. 15, c. 20–24 and Deut. xxxii. 16–26. Compare the favourable remarks of Landauer, *ZA*, iii. 263 ff. On manuscripts see Berliner, ii. 245 ff.; Merx, *Chrestomathia*, p. x. sq., xv. sq.

For exposition: Schefftel, *Biure Onkelos, Scholien zum Targum Onkelos, herausgeg. von Perles*, 1888 (in Hebrew). Compare also: Merx, *Johannes Buxtorf's des Vaters Targumcommentar Babylonia*, *ZWT*, 1887 and 1888.

Berliner, *Massorah zum Targum Onkelos*, 1877; Landauer, *Die Masorâ zum Onkelos nach neuen Quellen, Israelitische Letterbode*, Amsterdam, Jahrg. viii. xi. Compare Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, ii. 167 ff.

63. Of the Babylonian Targum on the Prophets practically the same may be said as of the Targum on the Law. It also usually bears a name which is derived from the same passage of the Babylonian Talmud (*Meg.* 3*a*), but it has just as little

historical value as the name Onkelos. The Aramaic translation of the Prophets is there ascribed to the well-known scholar of Hillel, Jonathan ben Uzziel, and hence the Prophet Targum is commonly cited as the Targum of Jonathan. But where passages are quoted in the Babylonian Talmud from the translation of the Prophets, they are, as a rule, ascribed to R. Joseph ben Chija, who died in A.D. 333, and never to that Jonathan, nor is there ever, in the Palestinian Talmud, any mention made of a translation by Hillel's pupil. But seeing that a Palestinian parallel to the note in the Babylonian Talmud about the Targum on the Prophets is wanting, the unravelling of this point is scarcely possible. The conjecture of Luzzatto is very ingenious, that Jonathan is another name for Theodotion (§ 53), as Onkelos was for Aquila; but this is nothing more than a clever guess. On the other hand, we might perhaps, from the above referred to mode of quotation in the Babylonian Talmud, conclude that the Babylonian Joseph ben Chija, "the blind," had taken part in the redaction of this Targum, which therefore would belong to the fourth century. With this also would agree the limit of time conjectured (§ 62) as marking the final redaction of the Targum on the Law, supposing that actually, as is commonly assumed, the coincidences between the translation of the Prophets and the parallel passages in the Targum on the Law prove the dependence of the former upon the latter. But these similarities may just as well have come down from the oral lectures and the older forms of the Targums, and therefore prove little.

Moreover, the question here also about the date of the redaction is of very slight interest, for, as has been already remarked above, the material of the Targum is undoubtedly very much older. In comparison with the Torah Targum this translation is far freer and more paraphrastic. Compare, *e.g.* the extremely loose rendering of Isa. liii. But this is caused in part by the difference in the contents of the books

translated, as indeed even Onkelos himself in poetical and prophetic passages assumes a less literal and more paraphrastic character than elsewhere. Compared with the Palestinian Targum on the Prophets the Babylonian must always be described as observing the proper mean, while also in a remarkable way a strong adherence to the letter goes side by side with that freedom.

A good help in study is afforded by Lagarde's careful reprint of the text in the *Codex Reuchlin* (§ 28), especially when taken in connection with Cornill's Collations. Some pieces with Babylonian pointing have been published by Merx.

Compare Frankel, *Zum Targum der Propheten*, 1872; Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 164; *Nachgelassene Schriften*, iv. 105; Bacher, *ZDMG*, xxviii. 1 ff., see also xxix. 157 ff., 319 ff.; Berliner, *Targum Onkelos*, p. 124; Volck in Herzog's *Real Encyclopædie*[2], xv. 370; Cornill, *Ezechiel*, p. 110 ff. Especially on Micha: Ryssel, *Untersuchungen über die Textgestalt des Buches Micha*, 1887, pp. 163–169. On the date of composition also Frankel, *JPT*, 1879, p. 756 ff. [On the paraphrastic rendering of the Prophet Targum see Driver and Neubauer, *The Fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah, according to the Jewish Interpreters*, Oxford 1877.]

b. Meg. 3*a*. Jonathan ben Uzziel composed the Targum on the Prophets according to the traditions (מִפִּי) of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi; then trembled the land of Israel in its whole extent (properly 400 parasangs) and a Bath-kol was heard: Who discovers my mysteries to men? But Jonathan remained standing upright, and said, It is I! Thou knowest that I have done it neither for my own glorification nor for my family's but for Thine honour, in order to prevent divisions in Israel (compare further § 60). The expression here is remarkable, "from the mouth of the last prophets." The same מִפִּי appears also in the story about "Onkelos" in the same passage of the Talmud (§ 62). On the other hand, the Palestinian parallel passage has לִפְנֵי instead of מִפִּי "under

their sight." Wellhausen-Bleek (*Einleitung*, p. 608) makes the acute remark that in analogy with "from the mouth of the last prophets," we might conjecture in the Onkelos passage an original "from the mouth of Joshua and Eleasar" (the followers of Moses), which afforded a suggestion of names, out of which were afterwards made the Rabbis Eliezer and Joshua. But in the *Jeruschalmi* (לפני!) the names of the Rabbis at least are genuine, so that one at furthest might assume an original Babylonian reading: N. N. has interpreted the Law from the mouth of Joshua and Eleasar, which may then have been confounded with the passage in the *Jeruschalmi*.

The passages quoted in the Talmud are given by Zunz, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*, p. 63. On Joseph ben Chija, compare Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums*, ii. 184 f.; Bacher, *Aggada der babylonischen Amoräer*, 1878, p. 101 f.

Older editions are named by De Wette-Schrader, *Einleitung*, p. 127. Lagarde, *Prophetæ chaldaice*, 1872, without vowels (compare Nöldeke, *Lit. Centralblatt*, 1872, p. 1157, and especially Klostermann, *TSK*, 1873, pp. 731–767); *Nachträge aus einer Erfurter Handschrift: Symmicta*, i. 139. Variations from the Antwerp Polyglot and the Bomberg-Buxtorf are given by Cornill, *ZAW*, 1887, p. 177 ff.; *Ezechiel*, pp. 113–120. From Babylonian manuscripts, Merx (*Chrestomathia targumica*) has edited: Hab. iii.; Judges v.; 2 Sam. xxii.–xxiii. 7; Isa. lii. 13, liii. 12; Jonah; Micah; and, from the *Codex Reuchlin*, Hab. iii. (vocalised). On the readings of Elias Levita, compare *ZDMG*, xliii. 230.

64. The Palestinian Targums carry us into another sphere (§ 61). Of the Palestinian translation of the Law we have two different forms — one complete, another which consists only of fragments. The correct names for these would have been: for the complete one *Jeruschalmi*, and for the other the *Targum Fragments*, or *Jeruschalmi* i. and ii.; but here also through misunderstandings other designations became current. While by Jeruschalmi is frequently understood the Targum Fragments, the other is called Targum Jonathan

(Pseudo-Jonathan), which originated, however, only through a false interpretation of the abbreviation ת"י (*i.e.* תרגום ירושלמי). Of the complete Targum, which was first printed in Venice in 1591, no manuscripts have up to this time been found. On the other hand, of the Targum Fragments, which had even earlier (in 1518) been published in the Bomberg Bible, two manuscripts are extant.

The relation between the complete Jeruschalmi and the Babylonian Torah Targum has been referred to above (§ 62). It is impossible to determine whether the former should be regarded as older or as younger than the Babylonian, because although it bears a more original, still uncontracted character, yet, on the other side, it secured its present form at a much later period. If, indeed, the translation of Gen. xxi. 21 alludes to the wives of Mohammed, this shows that the present form of the Targum cannot be older than the seventh century; but, on the other hand, in Deut. xxxiii. 11 are found the words, "The enemies of the high priest Johanan shall not survive," which could only have been so formulated in the days of John Hyrcanus. The origin of the work known as the Targum Fragments is much more open to controversy, and even up to this day has by no means been clearly explained. While some see in it fragments of an originally independent Targum, others regard it as a collection of glosses and supplements to some Aramaic translation of the Law. This much in any case is certain, that it is not closely related to the Babylonian but to the Palestinian Targum, and therefore is to be taken into account here. Both are of a free Midrashic character, and so are fundamentally distinguished in their treatment of the text from the Targum Babli.

Seligsohn, *De duabus Hierosolymitanis Pentateuchi paraphrasibus*, 1859; Gronemann, *Die jonathansche Pentateuchübersetzung in ihrem Verhältnisse zur Halacha*, 1875; Seligsohn, and Traub in *MGWJ*, 1857, pp. 96 ff., 138 ff.; Schürer,

Geschichte des jüd. Volkes, ii. 118 f., Eng. trans. Div. ii. vol. i. 135, and the literature referred to under § 62.

Elias Levita himself only knew one Targum Jeruschalmi, but reports that others quoted a Pentateuch Targum of Jonathan (*ZDMG*, xliii. 226). Paul of Burgos (A.D. 1429), Petrus Galatinus, and Azaria de Rossi (who died A.D. 1578) were acquainted with this "Jonathan," whose translation, however, was *rarissima*. See Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, ii. 165 f. Unfortunately the manuscript used for the Venice edition of 1591 has since disappeared. The one manuscript of the Targum Fragments is in *Vatican* 440. Compare Zunz, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*, pp. 70–77; Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, p. 165; Berliner, *Targum Onkelos*, ii. 123. On it is based the Bomberg edition, 1518. Another, the Nuremberg manuscript, is described by Lagarde, *NGGW*, 1888, pp. 1–3.

Both Targums are to be found in the London Polyglot in the fourth volume.

65. Of the Targum or the Targums of the Palestinians on the Prophets there remain only fragments, partly as quotations in the works of the Rabbis of the Middle Ages, partly as marginal glosses in manuscripts, so especially in the Codex of Reuchlin referred to in §§ 28 and 63. They have a similar character to the Palestinian Targums on the Law. Sometimes they contain ideas that might be traced very far back, *e.g.* when a fragment on 2 Sam. xvii. 18 renders ערבתם by "Bill of Dismissal or Divorcement." Compare the notices by R. Joseph in *b. Sabb.* 56*a*.

Zunz, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*, pp. 77–79; Bacher, *ZDMG*, xxviii. 1 ff.; Geiger, *Nachgelassene Schriften*, iv. 109. The glosses of the *Codex Reuchlin* are given by Lagarde, *Prophetæ chaldaice*, vi.–xlii. passim; compare some improvements thereon suggested by Baer, *Liber Jeremiæ*, p. 6. A sheet of a Palestinian Targum on Isaiah was laid by Ginsburg before the members of the Vienna Congress of Orientalists, 1886.

66. The Targums on the Hagiographa are peculiar to the Palestinians. They have also been found among the South Arabian Manuscripts in the British Museum, although these make use of the "Babylonian" pointing. With the exception of the two Old Testament writings in which Aramaic sections are found, Daniel and Ezra, there are Targums on all the other Ketubim, and on the Book of Esther, which was a special favourite, there are three. Official significance they never had, but are to be considered individual works of the same kind as the oldest Targums referred to above in § 60. It only need further be said that they are distinguished from one another by important differences, and follow wholly divergent principles. Whereas some, like the Targums on The Song, Ecclesiastes, and one of those on Esther, are already almost purely Midrashic works, others are of a literalistic character, like the third Targum on Esther, the Targum on Proverbs, and the Targum on the Psalms, which, however, becomes sometimes rather Haggadic, *e.g.* on Ps. xci. The Targum on the Proverbs seems to be a free rendering of a Syriac translation of that book. The date of the composition of these works can only be indicated in a vague, general way. As the Targum on the Psalms presently stands it is later than the ninth century, since in its rendering of Ps. lxxxiii. 7 it mentions the Hungarians. The Targum on Job is much later than the writing referred to in § 60. On the other hand, the material in these Targums is naturally much older, which sometimes can be quite precisely authenticated, *e.g.* when Targum ii. on Esther contains a statement which *Masseket Soph*^{e}*rim*, 13. 6, p. xxii., attributes to R. Joseph (§ 63).

The text of these Targums has been made easily accessible by Lagarde's reprint of the text of the first Venetian Rabbinical Bible of 1517–1518 (§ 24). Instructive monographs on the several Targums are begun, but might be carried out much further.

Lagarde, *Hagiographa chaldaice*, 1873. Among the older editions is specially to be mentioned the Antwerp Polyglot. Compare Merx in the *Verhandlungen des Orient. Kongresses zur Berlin*, 1882, p. 157. In the *Jüd. Literaturblatt*, 1889, J. Riess has published a series of contributions to the textual criticism of the Megilloth according to a Breslau Codex. Compare the same on Esther in *MGWJ*, 1881, p. 473 ff. The dream of Mordecai has been edited by Merx in his *Chrestomathia Targumica*.

About the Targums on Proverbs see Nöldeke in Merx, *Archiv für wiss. Erforschung d. A. T.* ii. 246–249; Geiger, *Nachgelassene Schriften*, iv. 112 f. On Job, Bacher in *MGWJ*, 1871, p. 208 ff. On the Psalms, Bacher, *MGWJ*, 1872, p. 408 ff., and Bæthgen in *JPT*, 1882, pp. 447–455 ff. On Chronicles, Kohler and Rosenberg, *Jüd. Zeitschrift*, 1870, p. 72 ff. Targum ii. on Esther, Riess in *MGWJ*, 1876, p. 161 ff. Munk, *Targum Scheni z. Buch Esther*, 1876; P. Cassel, *Das Buch Esther*, i. 1878, p. 239 ff.; Bertheau-Ryssel, *Esra, Nechemia und Ester*, 1887, p. 366.

On the Jewish Targum on Chronicles, which has been received into the Syriac Bible, compare § 71.

67. The Samaritans also possess an Aramaic Targum, which, as might be expected, embraces only the Pentateuch, and attaches itself to the form of text peculiar to the Samaritans (§§ 11, 29). It is somewhat more literal than the Jewish Targums, but equally with them jealous in guarding against all anthropomorphisms. In regard to its origin and authority we know nothing. The most serious difficulties met with here arise mainly from the wretched condition of the text, which even the more recent editions have not succeeded in remedying.

The Greek fragments which were quoted on the margin of the Septuagint manuscripts by the Church fathers under the title τὸ Σαμαρειτικόν, and which Field has collected, correspond as a rule with this Targum, and are therefore, in some sort of way, related to it. Where the fathers got these frag-

ments is not certain; yet, seeing that the Samaritans even in the times before Christ were in possession of a Greek literature, there is nothing to render it absolutely impossible that they may have had a translation of their Targum into Greek. The Samaritan Targum, as we find it in the Polyglots, shows also a relationship in another direction, namely, with a Samaritan-Arabic translation, which had been composed in the eleventh or twelfth century by Abu-Sa'id. But this correspondence rests, as Kohn and Vollers have shown, on the later revision of the Samaritan text according to an Arabic translation. The manuscripts not infected in this way are divided by Vollers into an Aramaising and a Hebraising group.

Editions: Brüll, *Das samaritanische Targum z. Pentateuch*, 1873–1875; *Varianten zu Genesis des samaritanischen Targum*, 1876; Petermann, *Pentateuchus Samaritanus*, Berlin, i.–ii. 1872, 1882, iii.–iv. (by Vollers), 1883, 1885; Heidenheim, *Bibliotheca Samaritana*, i. 1884 (Genesis), with which should be compared the severe criticism in *ZDMG*, xxxix. 165 ff. Gen. i.–iv., Exod. xx. 7–17 in Petermann's *Brevis linguæ Samaritanæ Grammatica*, 1873. The Oxford Fragments (Lev. xxv., xxvi.; Num. xxxvi. 9) are edited by Nutt, 1874. Moore, "On a Fragment of the Samaritan Pentateuch in the Library of Andover Theological Seminary." *Proceedings of the American Oriental Society*, 1882, xxxv.—A list of manuscripts is given: *Literaturblatt für Orient. Philologie*, ii. 92.

Winer, *De versionis Pentateuchi Samaritanæ indole*, 1817; Kohn, *Samaritanische Studien*, 1868; *Zur Sprache, Lit. und Dogmatik der Samaritaner*, 1876; Nöldeke, *GGA*, 1865, St. 53; *Jüd. Zeitschrift*, 1868, p. 213; *ZDMG*, xxx. 343 ff.; Geiger, *Nachgelassene Schriften*, iv. 121 ff.; Kautzsch in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*[2], xiii. 350.

On the *Samareitikon:* Field, *Hexapla*, i. p. lxxxiii. 329 f.; Grätz, *MGWJ*, 1886, p. 60 ff. On the Samaritan-Greek literature: Schürer, *Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, ii. 750, Eng. trans. Div. ii. vol. iii. 211, 225.

Of Abu Sa'îd's translation Kuenen has published: *Liber Genescos sec. Arab. Pent. vers. ab Abu Said conscriptam*, Leyden 1851; Exodus and Leviticus, 1854. Compare Kohn, *Zur Sprache, Lit. und Dogm. d. Samaritaner*, pp. 134–140. Kautzsch in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*[2], xiii. 350.

5. *The Syriac Translation of the Bible.*

68. The name by which the Syriac translation is usually referred to, ܦܫܝܛܬܐ (pronounced *P^{e}šîṭâ* without *ṭ*; with the English article the *P^{e}šîṭâ*) is to be met with first in manuscripts of the ninth and tenth centuries. The usual explanation, "the simple, literal," or "usual," is scarcely correct. Much more probable is the explanation suggested by Field and Nöldeke, *ἁπλᾶ*, by way of contrast to the Syro-Hexaplar translation, which had obtained a wide circulation among the Syrians (§ 48). The designation was then applied at first only to the Old Testament part of the translation.

The very fact that the translation attached itself to the Hebrew text shows that it owed its existence to Jewish labour, which is further confirmed by the sympathy shown in it for the traditional Scripture exposition of the Jews. From this, however, it does not follow that it was the result of Jewish contrivance. It is indeed quite possible that it had its origin in a Christian undertaking, for the Jewish character might be explained, either from the fact that the Jews had taken part in the work (as in the translation of Jerome, § 56), or, still more probably, by the fact that the translators were Jewish Christians. The possibility must, indeed, generally speaking, be conceded of the Jews residing in the border lands between the Roman and the Parthian empires having come to feel a necessity for a translation of the Old Testament into their own language, like that which had been felt by the Greek Jews. And certainly it is a fact that isolated

portions of the Peshito are purely Jewish productions; such as the translation of Proverbs, which elsewhere had not been received among the Palestinian Targums (§ 66), and that of Chronicles, which had been originally a Jewish Targum. But, on the other side, no Jewish writing speaks of such a Bible translation of the Syrian Jews, whereas they make frequent mention of the LXX. and of Aquila, as well as of the Targums. The Peshito has, on the contrary, always been recognised by the Syrian Christians of the earlier times as their Bible translation. Therefore probability is strongly in favour of the idea that it owed its origin to Christian effort, while, to some extent, fragments of older Jewish translations have been made use of in it, and for the rest, the translation was made by Jewish Christians. For a direct proof of the Christian origin of the translation we might point to the various purely Christian passages which it contains, if only in regard to these we were sure that they had come immediately from the hand of the translator, which, upon the whole, is probable, but cannot be certainly proved.

Compare Perles, *Meletemata Peschitthoniana*, Prague 1859; Geiger, *Nachgelassene Schriften*, iv. 96; Nöldeke, *Alttestamentliche Literatur*, p. 262; Nestle, in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie* [2], xv. 192 ff.

On the relationship with the Jewish tradition: Schönfelder, *Onkelos und Peschittho*. 1865; Berliner, *Targum Onkelos*, ii. 126 f.; Sebök, *Die syrische Uebersetzung der* 12 *kleinen Propheten*, 1887, p. 7; Cornill, *Ezechiel*, p. 154 f. [On the Syriac *Textus Receptus*, see *Studia Biblica*, first series, 1885, p. 151 ff., in article "An Account of a Syriac MS. of the 5th Century," by G. H. Gwilliam.]

Examples of a decidedly Christian colouring: Jer. xxxi. 31 (according to Hebrews viii. 8; as the contrary, Jer. xi. 3); Hosea xiii. 14; Ps. xix. 5, cx. 3.

On the form  see Nöldeke, *Kurzgefasste syrische Grammatik*, § 26 B. On its meaning: Field, *Hexapla*, i.

p. ix.; Nöldeke, *ZDMG*, xxxii. 589. In support of the opposite view, Nestle in Herzog's *Real-Ency.* xv. 192, 199, who translates "usual"; but even this is not = "simple."

69. If we consider the Syriac translation as a whole to be a Christian work, then we shall have to assume the founding of the Christian Church in that region about A.D. 150 as the *terminus a quo* of its origin. The first certain witnesss that we have for its existence is given by Aphraates about two hundred years later (§ 15); but without any doubt, seeing that Greek had not spread in that eastern region, a translation of the Holy Scriptures into the language of the people would, very soon after the founding of the Church in that land, be felt to be a necessity. We should have had a direct proof for the early existence of the Peshito, if the ὁ Σύρος once cited by Melito (§ 7) were identical with it. But what is to be understood by this Σύρος, often quoted by the Church fathers, is still very uncertain. If, as by the arguments of Field has been at least made probable, ὁ Σύρος was a translation of the Old Testament into Greek circulated in Syria, we shall have to look first of all to the West Syrian regions, where in Melito's time we should scarcely expect to hear of a Greek translation of the Peshito. Moreover, the passage quoted by Melito (Gen. xxii. 13, κρεμάμενος ἐν σαβέκ) does not at all agree with the present Peshito text. Should we therefore even assume that the Bible had, as early as in the second century, been translated into Syriac, it is still impossible to produce a proof that that old translation was the Peshito; but this will always be regarded as probable since, at least in reference to the Old Testament, there are no indications pointing to a contrary conclusion. About the composition of the translation, apart from some worthless traditions, we know only this one thing, which is also confirmed by Ephræm and Jacob of Edessa, that it was the work of several translators. That the Apocrypha was originally wanting is a new proof of the Jewish character

of the translation; while, on the other side, the absence of the Book of Chronicles indicates a peculiar attitude on the question of the canon (§ 15). At a later period a large portion of the Syrians, with little reason, abandoned their old independent translation through admiration for the over-estimated LXX., which was several times translated into Syriac (§ 48). The chief leader in this movement was Theodore of Mopsuestia, who repeatedly reproaches those who esteemed more highly an unknown translator (*ἕνα τινὰ ἀφανῆ*) than the seventy-two inspired interpreters. Yet even in the following generations, when the Syrian language had ceased to be spoken, the Peshito was preserved and studied by the Jacobites as well as by the Nestorians, until in modern times, through the labours of missionaries, it has been wakened into a new life.

On the origin of the Syrian Church proper, compare Nöldeke, *GGA*, 1880, p. 873; Zahn, *Geschichte d. Neutestamentl. Kanons*, i. 369.

On *ὁ Σύρος*, see Field, *Hexapla*, i. p. lxxvii. sqq. He calls attention to the note of Diodorus on Gen. xxxix. *ἦν γὰρ ἀνὴρ ἐπιτυγχάνων ἢ κατὰ τὸν Σύρον κατευοδούμενος*; where evidently *ἐπιτυγχάνων* would suit as well as *κατευοδούμενος* to represent the Syriac ܡܨܠܚ, were it only by means of a Greek translation possible to mark this distinction.

On the legends about the origin of the Peshito, compare, *e.g.*, Wiseman, *Horæ syriacæ*, 1828, p. 103.

The statements of Theodore referred to will be found in Mai, *Nov. Patr. bibliotheca*, vii. i. 241, 252 f., 263.

70. Although the Peshito attaches itself to the original text, it still shows here and there, especially in some books, a sort of similarity to the LXX., so that a dependence in this direction must necessarily be assumed. But how far the agreement is capable of explanation by the supposition that the translators during their work may have used the LXX., or that it had been occasioned only by later revisions according to

the Alexandrine translation, has not been as yet determined, and will probably always remain doubtful. The similarity with the LXX. is in all essential respects equally strong in all, even the oldest, manuscripts, and in the quotations of Aphraates, so that such a recasting must in any case have taken place at a very early date. There is not the least probability in favour of the hypothesis of a thoroughgoing revision after the time of Aphraates.

On the quotations of Aphraates, compare § 15. On those of Ephræm: Spohn, *De ratione textus biblici in Ephræmi Syri commentarii obvii*, 1786. Further, as to how the text-words from Jacob of Edessa must be distinguished from the quotations of Ephræm, compare Nöldeke, *ZDMG*, xxxii. 589. [*Studia Biblica*, 1885, p. 168 f., and note by F. H. Wood in same article, p. 173.]

Against the idea of a revision of the older translation, especially of such a revision made on the basis of the original text, in the days after Aphraates and Ephræm, Nöldeke remarks (*ZDMG*, xxxii. 589): "First of all, the text-words in Ephræm have no special relation to the quotations from memory by Aphraates in part very imperfectly remembered, so that we could set the text of these two as a unity over against the later text. Further a revision of the Syrian Bible on the basis of the Hebrew after the time of Ephræm is quite inconceivable. Knowledge of the Hebrew was for ever lost among the Syrians with the complete sundering of the Church of Edessa from Judaism. Even Jacob of Edessa, and men of scientific ardour like Jerome, had only learned a few scraps of Hebrew. And how is it to be explained that the Syrians, split up by civil and confessional divisions, Roman and Persian subjects, Catholics, Monophysites, and Nestorians, should yet all have the same Bible if it had owed its origin to so late a revision? Rahlfs (*ZAW*, ix. 171) has, on the other hand, called attention to a late revision of the translation of the Psalms in some manuscripts undertaken upon the basis of the commentary of Barhebræus.

On the Syriac Bible's dependence upon the LXX., compare Rahlfs in *ZAW*, ix. 161 ff., where the assertion of Gottheil that the Bible manuscript used by Barhebræus had been modified in accordance with the Syrian Hexapla (§ 48) is refuted. Sebök, *Die Syrische Uebersetzung der* 12 *kleinen Propheten*, p. 7; and Cornill, *Ezechiel*, p. 153 f. It is worthy of mention that the translation of the Book of Chronicles (§ 71) is not interpolated on the basis of the LXX. (*JPT*, v. 758).

Some Psalm translations in the Old Syrian manuscripts (*Codex Ambrosianus*, and Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in British Museum*, i. 1870, Nos. 169, 179) are remarkable, according to which the Psalms are said to have been translated "from Palestinian into Hebrew, and from thence into Greek, and finally into Syriac." The light which this passage seems to cast upon the origin of the LXX. is, however, according to Bæthgen's researches, a false light (*JPT*, 1882, p. 422 f.). In particular, Bæthgen has proved that the Palestinian translation referred to in § 49 can have formed no link midway between the LXX. and the Peshito. Very noticeable is the freedom with which the original superscriptions of the Psalms are left out from the Syrian translation, which, however, according to the statements of the Syrians, was first done through the influence of Theodore of Mopsuestia. The superscriptions which we find in the manuscripts and editions are characterised by many variations, and are taken from the commentaries of the Church fathers, especially from those of Theodore. Compare Bæthgen, *ZAW*, 1885, p. 66 ff.; Wright, *Catalogue of Syr. MSS. in Brit. Mus.* i. 116 ff.

71. Considered as a translation, the Peshito, as a whole, takes no mean rank. If it does not reach the elevation of the LXX. in its best parts, it never sinks so low as the Alexandrine translation, which may be convincingly proved if one, *e.g.*, compares the Syriac Isaiah with the Greek. Almost everywhere it conveys an intelligible meaning, even though it be not always that of the original, and oftentimes one meets

with translations which rest upon good tradition or happy divination. Here and there its value is lessened by confusions between the Hebrew and the Aramaic dialect, which is surely excusable considering the relationship of the two languages. Worse, and more dangerous for inexperienced critics of the text, is the freedom with which suffixes and verbal forms are sometimes interchanged. In addition to this, there is another circumstance, already adverted to, whereby the importance of the Peshito for textual criticism is very seriously depreciated, namely, its dependence upon the LXX. Where Syrian and Greek agree against the Massoretic text, we can seldom be sure whether the Syrian witness is only an unimportant reduplication of that of the LXX., or whether the original text on which the Syriac was based had actually so read. While the Peshito is otherwise thoroughly distinguished from the Targums by its literalness and close attachment to the original, an exception in this respect is found in the translation of the Book of Chronicles. In this writing, which originally did not belong to the Peshito (§ 15), a mere Jewish Targum, with all the peculiarities of such a work, is made use of. Fränkel, who has examined it carefully, conjectures that it had been composed by Jews of Edessa in the third century.

Prager, *De veteris Testamenti versione syriaca quæstiones criticæ*, 1871.

On the Pentateuch: Hirzel, *De Pentateuchi versionis Syr. quam Peschito vocant indole commentatio*, 1825. On Isaiah: Gesenius, *Commentar über d. pr. Jesaja*, i. 81 ff. On Ezekiel: Cornill, *Ezechiel*, pp. 136–156. On the Minor Prophets: Credner, *De prophetarum minor. versionis Syr. quam Peschito vocant indole diss.* i. 1827; Sebök, *Die syrische Uebersetzung der 12 kleinen Propheten und ihr Verhältniss zu dem massoret. Texte*, 1887. Specially on Micah: Ryssel, *Untersuchungen über die Textgestalt des Buches Micha*, p. 169 ff. On the Psalms: Bæthgen, *Untersuchungen über die Psalmen nach der*

Peschito (Schriften, der Kieler Universität, xxv.) and *JPT*, 1882, p. 422 ff. On Job: Stenij, *De Syriaca libri Jobi interpretatione*, i., Helsingfors 1887. On Ecclesiastes and Ruth: Janichs, *Animadversiones criticæ in versionem Syr. Peschitthonianam librorum Koheleth et Ruth*, 1871. On Chronicles: Fränkel, *JPT*, 1879, p. 508 ff. Compare also, Nestle in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*[2], xv. 192 ff.

72. Although the critical establishment of the Peshito text is indeed still in its infancy, it is even already clear that no important results are to be expected from any future criticism of the text. The two chief Recensions of the Peshito, the Nestorian and the West Syrian, are represented respectively by the Oromiah Bible of the American missionaries of the year 1852, and by the text of the Parisian Polyglot edited by Gabriel Sionita. The latter, after being collated with other manuscripts, was reissued in the London Polyglot, and repeated in Lee's edition for the British and Foreign Bible Society. The West Syrian group must then, according to Rahlfs, be further divided into three families, the Jacobite, the Melchitian, and the Maronite. One of the most notable of the West Syrian manuscripts is the *Codex Ambrosianus* of the sixth or seventh century, which has been published by Ceriani in photo-lithography. By comparing the West Syrian with the East Syrian group we shall be able to conclude that there had been a common Syriac text in the times before the division of the Syrian Church in A.D. 485, which has then to be compared, partly with the quotations of Aphraates and Ephræm, partly with a manuscript in the British Museum of the year 464, therefore of the period before the division.

A further aid in study is the Monophysite Massora on the text which bears the name of the "Karkaphensian," and proceeded from the cloisters at Chaboras in Mesopotamia. Further also, the daughter versions of the Peshito may be used for the establishment of its text.

The Apocrypha, first received at a later period into the Syriac Bible, has been edited by Lagarde.

The unvocalised edition of the British and Foreign Bible Society by Lee, 1823, is, along with the Oromiah Bible, the most useful help for immediate use. The Psalms, vocalised, were edited by Lee, London 1825. Compare on other editions: Bickell, *Conspectus rei Syrorum literariæ*, 1871, p. 6 ff.; Nestle, *Brevis linguæ Syriacæ grammatica*, 1881, p. 13 ff.

For criticism of the text, compare especially the treatise of Rahlfs in *ZAW*, 1889, pp. 161–210.

On the oldest manuscripts, see Ceriani, *Memoire del R. Instituto Lombardo di Science e Letteratura*, ser. iii. vol. xi. 2; Wright, *Catalogue of Syr. MSS. in Brit. Mus.* i. 3 f. On the *Codex Usshcr*, a copy, as it seems, of an old Maronite manuscript made in the years 1626–1628, now in Oxford, see Rahlfs in *ZAW*, 1889, p. 195 ff. Ceriani, *Translatio syra Pescitto Vet. Testamenti*, Milan 1876-1883. Cornill (*Ezechiel*, p. 140 ff.) would deny all value to this manuscript, which judgment, however, Rahlfs (p. 181 ff.) vigorously contests. [Gwilliam, "Account of a Syriac Biblical MS. of the Fifth Century," in *Studia Biblica*, first series 1885, pp. 151–174.]

On the Syrian Massora, see Wiseman, *Horæ Syriacæ*, p. 119 ff.; Martin, *Tradition Karkaphienne*, Paris 1870; G. Hoffmann, *ZAW*, 1881, p. 159 f., *ZDMG*, xxxii. 745; Weingarten, *Die syrische Massora nach Bar Hebræus. Der Pentateuch*, 1887. [Scrivener, *Plain Introduction*, p. 333 f.; Prof. W. Wright of Cambridge in *Encyclopædia Brittanica*, 1887, vol. xxii. 826.]

On the derivative versions (in the Arabic language), compare De Wette-Schrader, *Einleitung*, 133. In the Polyglots are: Judges, Ruth, Samuel, 1 Kings i.–xi., 2 Kings xii. 17–xxv., Neh. ix. 28–xiii., Job, Chronicles.

Lagarde, *Veteris testamenti apocryphi syriace*, 1861.

C.—Aids from within the Text itself.

73. Since none of the aids mentioned in the foregoing paragraphs go back to the times of the biblical authors, textual criticism, before it can regard its work as brought to a close, must investigate whether means may be found in the text itself which may serve for the regulating of the text. Indeed, as soon as textual criticism began to strike out a path for itself, it was immediately made very evident that the Old Testament writings do in fact at several points supply such aids as would, if they were used with prudence and circumspection, undoubtedly lead to sure results. As an example of the sort of aid thus given, we may mention the parallel sections in the Old Testament, which contain the same text, and where the repetition, if the intentionally changed expressions were left out of account, would have a significance similar to what various manuscripts elsewhere have. *E.g.*, Isa. xxxvi.–xxxix. = 2 Kings xviii. 30–xx. 19; Jer. lii. = 2 Kings xxv.; Ps. xviii. = 2 Sam. xxii.; Ezra ii. = Neh. vii.; also the Book of Chronicles in comparison with the older Historical Books, and the reminiscences of earlier prophets in Jer. xlvi. ff., etc. Further, the forms of Hebrew poetry not seldom afford to the textual critic the means of discriminating: of this order are the generally prevailing parallelism of the clauses, the peculiar rhythm of the Hebrew elegiac poetry, the use here and there of the alphabetic system, the refrains, etc. By means of these forms characteristic of the Old Testament we are led finally to the last criteria of all textual criticism, the universally applicable laws of thought and language, the handling of which, indeed, opens the door to all manner of arbitrariness, but which, nevertheless, above all in writings like those of the Old Testament, must be regarded as indispensable.

Compare Cappellus, *Critica sacra Lib. i. cap.* 3; Eichhorn, *Einleitung*[3], i. § 139.

II.

RESULTS OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM.

A.—The External History of the Text.

1. *Writing Materials.*

74. We know very little about the material and form of the Old Testament autographs. The word סֵפֶר signifies originally The Glazed or Smoothed, and indicates nothing about the material; that it may also mean a book roll is shown by Isa. xxxiv. 4. By חקק we are reminded of the times when writings were engraved or scratched in on a solid substance, but in its secondary meaning it is used of any kind of marking (Isa. xlix. 16). The same is true of the synonymous term חרט; while the root meaning of כתב is uncertain. That in even later times, on particular occasions at least, tablets of a solid substance were used is shown by these passages: Isa. viii. 1, xxx. 8; Hab. ii. 2. Perhaps during the Assyro-Babylonian age brick tablets were known even in Palestine, as Ezekiel refers to them (Ezek. iv. 1, לְבֵנָה). If it was desired to make the engraving of any writing in a very special degree durable, then the stylus or graver (עֵט, Jer. xvii. 1, or חֶרֶט, Isa. viii. 1), with a diamond point (Jer. xvii. 1), was used. But ordinarily lighter materials, such as were undoubtedly used for the writing of letters (2 Kings xix. 14), were also naturally employed in the writing of books. Since Herodotus (v. 58) describes the "Barbarians" as making use of *διφθέραι* as writing material, and as the Persians also

constantly employed material of this sort (compare Ezra vi. 1 f.), the Jews likewise in all probability used the same. This supposition is confirmed by Numb. v. 23, according to which passage what had been written could be washed out with water. But, on the other hand, the report in Jer. xxxvi. 23 does not favour the use of this material, since the burning of a leather roll would have spread a suffocating smoke through the chamber. Perhaps the use of the papyrus (New Hebrew, נְיָר) was even then known, seeing that it grew in some places in Palestine itself, as, *e.g.* at the Merom Lake. On this material writing was made by means of a dark fluid (דְּיוֹ, Jer. xxxvi. 18, compare קֶסֶת, a vessel, a scribe's vessel, an inkstand, Ezek. ix. 2), which was applied by a sharp-pointed (Jer. xxxvi. 23) writer's reed or pen (עֵט, Jer. viii. 8; Ps. xlv. 2). The usual form of the book was a roll, מְגִלָּה (compare Jer. xxxvi. 14; Ezek. ii. 9 f.; Zech. v. 1; Ps. xl. 8; and Jer. xxxii. 14, where a sealed document is preserved in an earthen vessel). The דְּלָתוֹת mentioned in Jer. xxxvi. 23 signify the several columns of the roll.

In later times the Epistle of Aristeas and Josephus (*Antiquities*, xii. 2, 10) mention the διφθέραι, and the Talmud names several kinds of more or less prepared skins of animals. For the copies of the Law only skins of clean beasts were used (*jer. Meg.* i. fol. 71*d*). The roll form was the usual one (compare Luke iv. 17, 20), and is even yet the obligatory form for manuscripts which are to be used for reading in the synagogues. But by and by another form, that of the Codex, came more and more into use. When this book form, now the ordinary one, which some have wrongly supposed to have been found as early as in the Epistle of Aristeas, became usual among the Jews we do not know. With regard to the idea of the canonicity of Scripture this change was of importance, inasmuch as the Codex form made it possible to have all the sacred writings written out in one volume, and thereby

to give outward expression to the fact that the canonical books were in a peculiar manner bound together in such a way as excluded all others. Perhaps in the tradition from *b. Baba bathra*, fol. 13*b* referred to above at § 10, where the permissibility of the collection of several or all of the sacred writings into one manuscript is discussed, and various authorities from the second and from the end of the first century are cited, we have a reminiscence of the change in the practice of writing called forth by the introduction of the Codex form. For the restoring of the synagogue rolls and the correct copying of the text precise rules are prescribed in *Sepher Thora* and *Masseket Soph'rim* (§ 32). The form and material of Bible manuscripts of later times are to be seen in the oldest preserved Codices themselves. They are either synagogue rolls of parchment or leather, or private manuscripts, most frequently in the Codex form, of parchment, leather, or cotton paper. The oldest manuscript, the Babylonian Codex of the Prophets (§ 28), is written on parchment, in Codex form, with two columns on each page.

Wähner, *Antiquitates Ebræorum*, sect. i. cap. 45; L. Löw, *Graphische Requisiten und Erzeugnisse bei den Juden*, Leipsic 1870, 1871; Schlottmann in Riehm's *Handwörterbuch*, pp. 1416–1431; Strack, *ZLT*, 1875, pp. 598–601; Herzog's *Real Encyclopædie*[2], xiii. 689 ff. With reference to similar customs among the Christians, see especially Zahn, *Geschichte des Kanons d. N. T.* i. 61 ff.; *The Academy*, xxxi. 1887, p. 415*b*.

The hypothesis that the Israelites had used papyrus becomes all the more probable when we remember that the Greeks became acquainted with it through their intercourse with the Phœnicians. This is also shown by the very name *βίβλος*, which is connected with the city of Byblus (*Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Academie, philol.-hist. Class.* 1888, cxvi. p. 636). Only at a later date was the name *βίβλος* exchanged for the name *πάπυρος*. On the signification of *πάπυρος*

compare Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, ii. 260 f. Compare generally with regard to papyrus and paper: *Oesterr. Monatsblatt für d. Orient.* 1885, p. 162 ff., 1886, p. 159 ff. On the etymology of διφθέρα compare Lagarde, *Ges. Abhandl.* p. 216, where also דַּיּוֹ is considered as belonging to the same root. Böck, *Pergament, eine culturgesch. Studie; Oesterr. Buchhändler-Correspondenz*, xxvi. 1886, Nos. 3–6 (not accessible to me).

On the Codex form, compare Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen*, pp. 62, 93, 100, 107, 113. Birt is wrong in supposing that in the word τεῦχος, in the Epistle of Aristeas (Merx, *Archiv.* i. p. 67), he finds a proof of the employment of the Codex form; for that τεῦχος is used in that passage of a roll is shown by an earlier passage in the Epistle (p. 44). Compare Zahn, *Geschichte des Kanons d. N. T.* p. 66. According to the last-named passage, the roll of the Law referred to was made of the skins of animals prepared and joined together in a miraculous way. Birt is also wrong when he seeks the reason for the spread of the Codex form in the fact that skins were cheaper than papyrus. Compare Marquardt, *Privatalterthümer d. Römer*, ii. 785; *Theolog. Literatur-zeitung*, 1883, p. 459; Wiedemann, *Ägyptische Geschichte*, p. 29; Zahn, *Geschichte des Kanons d. N. T.* p. 71 f.

Descriptions of the older Old Testament manuscripts have been given above in § 28.

2. *History of the Hebrew Letters.*

75. Were it possible to compare the original manuscripts of the Old Testament with our present texts, the first difference that would attract our attention would be the different forms of the letters. Instead of the square-shaped writing which we have in our present texts, and which is found as the prevalent form even in our oldest manuscripts, we would have seen in these autographs an Old Hebrew style of writing, such as is now known to us through the Siloah inscription of the eighth century before Christ, some seals and weights

found in Nineveh, the coins of the Maccabees and of Bar Cochba, and the Samaritan manuscripts. All these monuments are inscribed with a kind of written characters which belongs to the Phœnician branch of the Semitic alphabet; whereas the square-shaped writing is a development of the Arabic branch, which, just like the Aramaic language (§ 59), obtained a wide currency during and after the period of the Persian dominion.

The Jews named the old Hebrew writing simply כְּתָב עִבְרִי, "Hebrew writing," or sometimes כְּתָב דַּעַץ and לִבּוֹנָאָה כתב, has variously explained expressions, of which, however, the first probably means "inscription on a coin," with reference to the use of the old writing on the coins of the Maccabees. The new writing is called by the later Jews כְּתָב מְרֻבָּע, "square-shaped writing," in respect of the regular form of the letters, and in the Talmud, כְּתָב אַשּׁוּרִי, "Assyrian writing." The latter designation is historically suitable when one remembers that Assyria, even after the overthrow of Nineveh, continued in use as the common name of the districts belonging to the old Assyrian empire, and that it was just in these regions that Aramaic, throughout an ever-increasing radius, became the dominant language.

Compare Buxtorf (the younger), *Dissertat. philol. theol.* iv. Basel 1662; Cappellus, *Diatribe de veris et antiquis Ebræorum literis*, 1645; Dobrowsky, *De antiquis Hebræorum characteribus*, Prague 1783; Kopp, *Bilder und Schriften der Vorzeit*, 1821, ii.; Hupfeld, *TSK*, 1830, p. 289 ff.; De Vogüé, *Mélanges d'archéologie orientale*, Paris 1868; R. N. Cust, *Linguistic and Oriental Essays*, London 1880, xii.–xiii.; Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, 1890, i.–xxix. [*Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, 3rd series, Oxford 1891, Article ii. by Neubauer, "The Introduction of the Square Characters in Biblical MSS., and an Account of the Earliest MSS. of the Bible (with three Facsimiles), pp. 1–36.]

The Phœnician style of writing, from which the European alphabets and the South Arabic-Ethiopic writing are derived, was made use of by the Phœnicians and other Canaanites. The most important memorial of it is the Moabite Stone of Mesha of the ninth century before Christ (Smend and Socin, *Die Inschrift des Königs Mesa von Moab.* 1886). The Aramaic style of writing, of which the oldest representatives are some seals and weights found in Assyria and Babylon, and the old Aramaic Taimain style of writing (*Berichte der Berliner Academie*, 1884, p. 815) are found widely spread among the Palmyrenes and Nabateans, and, during the Persian age, also in Egypt. From this Aramaic writing are derived the Syriac, Cufic, and Arabic alphabets, as well as the Pehlewi alphabet, and also the Avesta writing (Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, ii. 38 ff.). On the Siloah inscription: *ZDMG*, xxxvi. p. 725 ff.; *ZDPV*, iii. 54 f., iv. 102 ff., 250 ff., 260 ff., v. 250 ff.; *Quarterly Statement of Palestine Exploration Fund*, 1881, p. 141 ff.; *Académie des inscr. et des belles lettres*, 1882, p. 199 ff. On fixing the dates, see also *Quarterly Statement of Palestine Exploration Fund*, 1889, p. 35 ff. On the seals and weights with Hebrew writing: Levy, *Siegel und Gemmen*, 1869; Ganneau in *Journal asiatique*, 1883, i. 123 ff., ii. 304 ff. On the coins: De Saulcy, *Recherches sur la numismatique Judaique*, 1854; Madden, *History of Jewish Coinage*, 1864; Schürer, *Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, i. 19, Eng. trans. Div. i. vol. i. 23.

On the Jewish names for the two alphabets, see Löw, *Graphische Requisiten*, ii. 53 ff.; Berliner, *Beiträge zur hebr. Grammatik in Talmud und Midrasch*, 1879, p. 6; and especially by Hoffmann, *ZAW*, 1881, p. 334 ff. Instead of דעץ, the word is often read רעץ, but the correctness of the former reading is proved by the statement of Epiphanius "*deession*, which is interpreted *insculptum*" (*Opera ed. Dindorf*, 1863, iv. 215). The *Somahirenus* writing, there also referred to, is interpreted by Lagarde (*Mittheilungen*, ii. 257) to mean סֹפֵר מָהִיר. *Libbonaa* (*b. Sanh.* 21*b*) is connected by G. Hoffmann with the city לבנה, Judges xxi. 19 (now *El-Leben*), south of Nablus, where probably there was a Samaritan school. Halévy,

Mélanges de Crit. 1883, p. 435, conjectures in place of ניבולאה, the form ניפולאה, *i.e.* "from Neapolis" or Shechem.

On the name Assyria in later times, compare Lam. v. 6; Ezra vi. 22; *Herodotus*, i. 106, 192, iii. 92; *Strabo*, xvi. 1. 1; Josephus, *Antiquities*, xiii. 6. 7; Hupfeld, *TSK*, 1830, p. 289 ff.; *ZAW*, ii. 292 ff., iv. 208.

76. When the Talmud ascribes the introduction of the new style of writing to Ezra, this is in the first instance an example of the Jewish inclination to associate the change with a celebrated name, but there certainly lies in the tradition this element of truth, that the change was brought about not by the people, but by the scribes, who walked in the steps of Ezra. On the other hand, the use of the old style of writing on the coins of the Maccabees was a thoroughly popular and national act, which moreover presupposes that at that time the old alphabet must still have been to some extent in practical use. It was not until the time of Christ that the Aramaic writing became that of the people (Matt. v. 18). We have, on the other hand, in the interesting inscription of the year 176 before Christ, which is found in the tower built by Hyrcanus at *Arak-el-Emir*, east of the Jordan, brief as it is,—it contains only the word טוביה,—a mixed form, in which both styles are combined, which perhaps was typical of the practice of that time. But in the Bible manuscripts of that day the new style of writing had already long been in common use. Unfortunately we are not able to follow out the course of development in detail. That the Samaritans in their Bible manuscripts adhered to the use of the old alphabet, though indeed in a peculiar form, is proved by the fact that the Torah rolls were still being written in the old style when the Law was adopted by the Samaritans (§ 11). On the other hand, the much discussed question as to whether the texts used by the Alexandrine translators were written in the old style of writing or in the

new, must be answered in favour of the latter alternative, since the confounding of letters which occur here and there throughout the translation favours such a supposition. It is also in agreement with this that the name יהוה read at first, as it seems, in the Alexandrine translation unchanged was read *ΠΙΠΙ* by the Greeks and others, which was possible only as the transcription of the word written in the new style, since the name in the old Hebrew writing had a quite different appearance. Probably the fact was this, that the new writing had even by that time been long in use in the Bible manuscripts, while the two styles of writing continued alongside of one another for ordinary purposes. That the synagogue inscriptions, and the inscriptions on the tombs of priests from and after the time of Christ are in the new style of writing is what might be expected.

On the opinions of later Jews regarding the introduction of the square-shaped writing, compare *jer. Meg.* i. 11, fol. 71*bc*; *b. Sanh.* 21*b*; Origen ii. 529[4] (Lagarde, *Novæ Psalterii græci editiones specimen* 9): *ἔστι δέ τι τετραγράμματον ἀνεκφώνητον παρ' αὐτοῖς . . . καὶ λέγεται μὲν τῇ 'Αδωναΐ προσηγορίᾳ, οὐχὶ τούτου γεγραμμένου ἐν τῷ τετραγραμμάτῳ, παρὰ δὲ Ἕλλησι τῇ Κύριος ἐκφωνεῖται· καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀκριβεστέροις δὲ τῶν ἀντιγράφων ἑβραίοις χαρακτῆρσι κεῖται τὸ ὄνομα, ἑβραϊκοῖς δὲ οὐ τοῖς νῦν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀρχαιοτάτοις· φασὶ γὰρ τὸν Ἔσδραν ἐν τῇ αἰχμαλωσίᾳ ἑτέρους αὐτοῖς χαρακτῆρας παρὰ τοὺς προτέρους παραδεδωκέναι.* Jerome, *Epistola* 25 *ad Marcellam:* "Nonum (*nomen dei*) est tetragrammaton, quod ineffabile putaverunt, quod his literis scribitur Jod, E, Vau, E. Quod quidam non intelligentes propter elementorum similitudinem, quam in Græcis libris repererint, Pi Pi legere consueverunt." *Prolog. galeatus:* "Viginti et duas esse litteras apud Hebræos Syrorum quoque et Chaldæorum lingua testatur quæ Hebrææ magna ex parte confinis est, nam et ipsi viginti duo elementa habent eodem sono sed diversis characteribus. Samaritani etiam Pentateuchum Mosi totidem literis scriptitant, figuris tantum

et apicibus discrepantes. Certumque est Ezram scribam legisque doctorem post capta Hierosolyma et instaurationem templi sub Zorobabel alias literas reperisse quibus nunc utimur, cum ad illud usque tempus iidem Samaritanorum et Hebræorum characteres fuerint. . . . Et nomen Domini tetragrammaton in quibusdam græcis voluminibus usque hodie antiquis expressum literis invenimus."

The proper origin of the transcription is even yet a matter of controversy. Epiphanius (in the passage referred to in § 75, see Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, ii. 256 f.) says: "Hesdra ascendens a Babylone, volensque discernere Israel a reliquis gentibus, ut genus Habrahæ non videretur esse permixtum cum habitatoribus terræ [עם הארץ], qui tenent quidem legem, non tamen et prophetas, immutavit pristinam formam relinquens deessenon, propter quod ea forma a Samaritanis præoccupata jam fuerat." But it is less probable that the Samaritans should have transcribed the Law adopted by the Jews in the earlier characters, than that they should have ignored the transcription introduced after their adoption of the Law. If it be therefore improbable that Ezra should have already introduced this change, this makes it all the more likely that the change originated in the school of Scripture expositors imported from Babylon, of whom Ezra was the type (Ezra viii. 16; Neh. viii. 7, 9), and that the members of this school were led to take this step for polemical reasons. Much more hazardous is the conjecture made by G. Hoffmann in *ZAW*, i. 377, after Scheppig, based upon Isa. viii. 1, that the Aramaic writing had been in use among priests and statesmen even before the exile.

On the inscription of Hyrcanus, compare De Vogué, *Temple de Jérusalem*, 1864, pp. 38–42, pl. xxxiv.–xxxv., and especially Nöldeke's *Note*, *ZDMG*, xix. 640, which seems still unknown to the authors of the *Survey of Eastern Palestine*, 1889, pp. 65–87, where the ruins of *Arak-el-Emir* are fully described. The Jewish inscriptions are now collected in Chwolson's *Corpus inscriptionum Hebraicarum*, 1882 (with a large table of different styles of writing by Euting). [See also table of early Semitic alphabets by Professor Brünnow,

as frontispiece to *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, 3rd series, 1891.] Compare also Clermont-Ganneau, *Épitaphes hébraiques et grecques sur les ossuaires juifs*, Paris 1883, and the Palmyrene synagogue inscription in the *Berichte der Berliner Academie*, 1884, p. 933 ff. On the forgeries of Firkowitzsch, compare what is said above in § 27.

On the importance of the Septuagint for the question treated in the above paragraph, compare Böttcher, *Ausführliches Lehrbuch d. hebr. Sprache*, i. 37 f.; Bickell, *ZDMG*, xviii. 379; *De indole ac ratione versionis alex. in interpretando libri Jobi*, p. 8 ff.; Merx, *Hiob.* lxiii. ff.; *JPT*, 1883, p. 70; Vogué, *Mélanges de Crit.* p. 167; and especially Vollers, *ZAW*, 1883, p. 229 ff.

On *ΠΙΠΙ* in the LXX. and among the fathers, compare the remarks of Origen and Jerome quoted on p. 202; Lagarde, *Novæ Psalterii græci editiones specimen* 9; Euagrius in Lagarde, *Onomasticon* i. 205 f., and especially *ZDMG*, xxxii. 466 ff. Noteworthy is the remark of Origen that the name of God in the Greek Bibles (for so the passage is certainly to be understood, see *ZDMG*, xxxii. 467) was written in "Old Hebrew" characters. Wellhausen-Bleek (*Einleitung*, p. 629) is certainly wrong in seeking to vindicate this statement by a reference to the inscription of Hyrcanus ("it is therefore certain that the LXX. had found Jahve, not in the characters *ΠΙΠΙ*, for the yod has still an entirely different form on the inscription of Arak-el-Emir"); for the writing in profane literature and that of the Bible manuscripts of the pre-exilian age cannot be assumed without more ado to be parallel. If it be further considered that Origen says nothing of a contrariety between the Septuagint manuscripts in the use of the Old Hebrew and New Hebrew, יהוה, although the latter must still have been the presupposition of *ΠΙΠΙ*, and that Jerome, who expressly speaks of the *ΠΙΠΙ*, simply repeats what Origen had said, it is probable that the remark of Origen rests on a misunderstanding, which perhaps arose from this, that the יהוה had been written after a somewhat old-fashioned pattern. On the other hand, its appearance in Old Hebrew is shown on the Mesha tablet, line 18.

It is interesting also to find that this *Pipi* was adopted by the Hebrew-speaking Jews, see *jer. Nedarim*, fol. 42*c*. The conjecture of Grätz, *MGWJ*, 1886, pp. 60–73, that the form *ΠΙΠΙ* was to be met with in a Septuagint manuscript interpolated with Samaritan additions, is wrong, because conflicting with the words of Origen: τοὶς ἀκριβεστέροις τῶν ἀντιγράφων. Besides, *ΠΙΠΙ* is also met with outside the Pentateuch.

77. Among the Jews the Aramaic alphabet assumes the regular and distinct forms of the square-shaped character, and has continued in this form pretty nearly unchanged down the present day. The variations, of which occasionally mention is made, are very trifling, as *e.g.* that ה in the earliest times looked like ח (*jer. Meg.* i. 9), which, moreover, *ΠΙΠΙ* for יהוה also testifies to (§ 76). In the manuscripts a distinction between the somewhat rectangular "Tam" writing כתב תם of the German and Polish Jews and the rounded "Welsh" writing כתב ועלי of the Spanish and Oriental Jews (compare § 27). Sometimes also manuscripts were written in other styles of writing, *e.g.*, the so-called Rashi writing, a kind of cursive hand. Of a quite singular description are the manuscripts of the Karaites, mentioned above in § 28, from the tenth to the fourteenth century written in Arabic letters.

The so-called "final letters" are often referred to in the Talmud (*e.g. b. Sabb.* 104*a*; *Sanh.* 94*a*, 98*b*; *Meg.* 2*b*, 3*a*; *jer. Meg.* i. 11, fol. 71*c*; compare *Sophᵉrim* ii. p. v.), as also by Jerome (§ 7). From a portion of the numerous instances in which the LXX. divides the words otherwise than is done in the Massoretic Text—*e.g.* B. Nah. i. 12 אם שלמים LXX. מישל מים; Zech. xi. 11 LXX. לענני: Ps. xvi. 3, LXX. בארצה מהאדיר ''; Zeph. iii. 19, LXX. אתך למענך; Jer. xxiii. 33, LXX. המישא אתם,—we might conclude that these letters were foreign to the Hebrew texts used by the Alexandrine translators. Yet this conclusion, although probable, is not absolutely certain, since the divergent division may have originated in

older manuscripts prior to the time of transcription. The last-named examples show besides that *Makkef* is a sign that was only subsequently introduced. The final letters, the existence of which is witnessed to by inscriptions prior to the birth of Christ, were formed only to suit the convenience of writers, since their number (five) is quite arbitrary.

In the days of Jerome the diacritical point over שׁ was not in use, nor was the point Daghesh. Both signs are connected together with the more recently introduced system of points.

With great fidelity the irregularities of form and size in particular letters were preserved in the manuscripts, and subsequently in the editions. To these belong the so-called *literæ majusculæ* (*e.g.* Deut. xviii. 13, xxxii. 6; Ps. lxxx. 16, lxxxiv. 4; Ruth iii. 13). Even in the Talmud some of these are referred to (*b. Kidd.* 66*b*: Num. xxv. 12; *b. Kidd.* 30*a*: Lev. xi. 42; *Meg.* 16*b*: Esther ix. 9), and in the book *Soph'rim* ix. p. xv. we already meet with their technical name. Further, the so-called *literæ suspensæ*, which are mentioned as early as in the Babylonian Talmud (*Kidd.* 30*a*: Ps. lxxx. 14; *Sanh.* 103*b*: Job xxxviii. 13–15), to which also may be added Judg. xviii. 30 (§ 97). An irregular final ק is met with in Exod. xxxii. 25; Num. vii. 2. The so-called נ *inversæ* and *puncta extraordinaria* have been already referred to in § 35. Compare further, § 99.

The ornamental little strokes ("crowns" כתרים, תגין, זיונין) which are to be met with in manuscripts over particular letters, are mentioned even by *b. Menachoth* 29*b*, *Sabb.* 9*a*, 105*a*. In the Crimean Synagogue rolls they were in an unusual way placed over some words, especially over words written too high.

The Talmudical remarks on the form of the letters are collected in Berliner, *Beiträge zur hebr. Gramm. in Talmud*, p. 15 ff. On the later types of writing, compare Hupfeld,

TSK, 1830, p. 278; Levy, *Geschichte der jüd. Münzen*, 1862, p. 145; Zunz, *Zur Geschichte und Literatur*, 1845, p. 206 f.; Eichhorn, *Einleitung*, iii. § 377; Baer, *Liber Jesaiæ*, vii.; Löw, *Graphische Requisiten*, ii. 72 ff.; Euting, *ZDMG*, xlii. 313 ff. and above §§ 27–28.

On the final letters see Hupfeld, *TSK*, 1830, p. 256 ff.; J. Müller, *Masseket Soph'rim*, 40; Wellhausen-Bleek, *Einleitung*, p. 637; Berliner, *Beiträge*, p. 25 ff. and the table of written characters by Euting in Chwolson's *Corpus inscript. hebr.* [or the Table by Professor Brünnow in *Studia Biblica*, 3rd Series, 1891, frontispiece]. On ש compare Jerome on Hab. iii. 4; Amos iv. 13, viii. 12. On Daghesh, Jerome on Gen. xxxvi. 24 (*iamim=maria*).

The *literæ majusculæ* and *minusculæ* are given by Frensdorff, *Ochla W'ochla*, Nos. 82–84 (compare No. 161). Further, Strack, *Prolegomena*, pp. 91–93; Baer and Strack, *Dikduke*, p. 47 f.

On the "crowns," Hupfeld, *TSK*, 1830, p. 276 f.; Bargès, *Sepher tagin*, Paris 1866; *Journal asiatique*, 1867, ix. 242 ff.; *ZLT*, 1875, p. 601; Löw, *Graphische Requisiten*, ii. 68.

3. *Vocalisation and Accentuation.*

78. The signs mentioned in the foregoing paragraphs were composed originally exclusively of consonants, while the vowels, as in the other oldest branches of the Semitic languages, were left wholly without any written visible indication. The vowel signs now commonly used were only introduced at a later date, and so they are even to this day excluded from the rolls that are written out for use in the synagogues (§ 74), while in other manuscripts at least the rule was observed, that the one who added the points, נְקֻדָּן, was another than the transcriber proper, סוֹפֵר.

The recollection of the later origin of the vowel points was never altogether lost sight of. Mar Natronai II., Gaon in Sura 859–869, says expressly, that the pointing was not given

contemporaneously with the Law on Sinai, but had its origin in later times. And in the following century, Menahem ben Sarug and Judah Chajjug express themselves in similar terms. Christian writers also, like Raimund Martin in the thirteenth century and Nicholas von Lyra in the fourteenth century, maintained the historically correct view, which finally found an acute and able vindicator in the learned Jew Elias Levita (compare § 31). From these men the Reformers adopted the correct theory, which found in succeeding ages distinguished representatives in Sebast. Münster, Fagius, Piscator, Scaliger, Drusius, Cappellus, etc. But, meanwhile, another theory had been spreading, first among the Jews (especially among the Karaites), and then subsequently among Christians, according to which the vowel points were equally with the consonants an original element in the Scriptures. In a special manner, too, the purely mechanical development of the Protestant theory of inspiration led many to do battle against a view which made possible a distinction between the original sense of the text and the apprehension of it fixed by the pointing. As the most distinguished Christian representatives of the theory of the originality of the vowel points we may name, Matth. Flacius, Junius, Gomarus, J. Gerhard, and especially the two Buxtorfs. Owing to the dogmatic significance which the question had come to assume, a concussion became absolutely inevitable. An occasion was given by the publication of the treatise of Cappellus, *Arcanum punctationis revelatum*, which Erpenius, without mentioning the author's name, published in 1624. Not till 1648 did the reply appear of the younger Buxtorf, *Tractatus de punctorum et accentuum in libris V. T. hebraicis origine, antiquitate et auctoritate*, in which he sought to vindicate against Cappellus the theory that had been maintained by his father. This theory found also an advocate in Denmark in J. J. Bircherodius, who in 1687 published a treatise *Punctorum*

Ebraicorum authenticæ et biblicæ vindiciæ. The arguments of Cappellus, however, in spite of some flaws, proved so conclusive, that all opposition was vain. Equally unavailing was the acknowledgment on the part of the Swiss in their confessional writings of the authority of the traditional pronunciation. The view maintained by Cappellus prevailed more and more, and had indeed already been long an acquisition acknowledged by all, when new discoveries confirmed it in a surprising manner, and at the same time began to spread light to some extent upon the dark question of the origin of the pointing.

Compare Schnedermann, *Die Controverse des L. Cappellus mit den Buxtorfern*, 1879; Hersmann, *Zur Geschichte des Streites über die Entstehung d. hebr. Punctation.* Progr. d. Realgymn. Ruhrort. 1885 (unknown to me).

The saying of Mar-Natronai's referred to is quoted by Luzzatto, *Kerem chemed*, iii. 200. On other Rabbis, compare *Journal asiatique*, 1870, xvi. 468, and Ginsburg's edition of Elias Levita's *Massoreth ha-massoreth* referred to in § 31. For an opposite statement, we may refer to Aaron ben Asher, see Baer and Strack, *Dikduke*, p. 11.

Raimund Martin (*Pugio fidei*, Leipsic 1687, p. 697) on Hosea ix. 12, *Scribæ punctarunt* בישורי (*i.e. incarnatio mea et derivatur a* בשר *q.e. caro*) *sicut punctatur* בשורי *quod est: in recesso meo.*

Luther on Gen. xlvii. 31 (*Opera lat. Erlang.* xi. 85): "Tempore Hieronymi nondum sane videtur fuisse usus punctorum, sed absque illis tota Biblia lecta sunt. Recentiores vere Hebræos, qui judicium de vero sensu et intellectu linguæ sibi sumunt, qui tamen non amici, sed hostes Scripturæ sunt, non recipio. Ideo sæpe contra puncta pronuntio, nisi congruat prior sententia cum novo testamento." Compare Calvin on Zechariah xi. 7 (*Prælectiones in* 12 *Prophetas*, 1581, p. 676), and Zwingli, *Præfatio in apologiam complanationis Isaiæ* (Opera ed. Schuler and Schultheis, v. 556).

Formula cons. Helvet. Can. ii.: "In specie autem Hebraicus Veteris Test. Codex, quem ex traditione ecclesiæ Judaicæ, cui

olim Oracula Dei commissa sunt, accepimus hodieque retinemus, tum quoad consones, tum quoad vocales, sive puncta ipsa, sive punctorum saltem potestatem, cet."

79. The Hebrew writing was at first, like its Semitic sisters, exclusively a consonantal writing, a sketch with the pen of the speech, familiarity with which as a living language, together with the connection of context, without difficulty contributed the colour, *i.e.* the vowels. It was only when Hebrew became a dead language, in which tradition and study supplied the place of the knowledge that comes from daily use, the need was felt of devising a system of visible vocalisation.

The first means devised consisted in a wider development of the germ already lying in the old system of writing. In those passages where the written indication of the vowel sound seemed specially desirable, letters were added without hesitation, which originally were signs of the consonants connected with the vowels, as direct signs of the corresponding vowels. They were not then in any danger of affixing to the text their own private interpretation. That these letters (הוי, less frequently א), which are often designated by the less correct name *matres lectionis*, were subsequently used to a very much greater extent than they were originally, is clearly proved from a variety of facts. On the Moabite Stone of Mesha (§ 75) they are practically not present at all. On the Siloah inscription they appear only as signs of diphthongs; while the coins of the Maccabees have indeed יהודים, alongside of יהדים, but only הכהן הגדל. The old versions, above all the LXX., translate often in a way which would have been simply impossible had the text already at that time had the *scriptio plena* which it has now; for example, Amos ix. 12, אדום, LXX. אדם: Hosea xii. 12, ישורים, LXX. ישרים: Nah. i. 10, סירים, Trg. Syr. סרים: Ezek. xxxii. 29, אדום, LXX. ארם. In the Babylonian Talmud (*Kidd.* 30*a*) it is expressly said: "We have not more exact information about the *scriptio plena* and

defectiva; and finally, the diversities between the manuscripts in almost all cases arise from the different placing of the half vowels."

How incomplete even these means were is shown from the fact that the short vowels were left wholly without any marking, and the special tone of the long vowels could not be made plain to the eye. Thus ו might be either *û* or *ô*, י might be *î* or *ê*, ה final might be either *ô* or *â* or *e*. Yet Hebrew writing continued to occupy this standpoint for more than five hundred years after Christ. Proof of this is afforded in abundance by the older Jewish and Christian memorials. Fathers of the Church, like Origen and Jerome, knew, indeed, a particular pronunciation of the Hebrew text, but they had only their Jewish teachers to thank for this, and not any system of signs. Whenever any exact statement had to be made about vocalisation, the use of a half vowel was the only graphic means whereby this could be visibly represented. So, too, in the Talmud, which in controversial cases either used the half vowels or left it to the readers to determine the intended pronunciation (*e.g. b Sanh.* 4*a*). Also *Sepher Thora* and *Massekct Soph*ᵉ*rim* prove the same thing by their silence; since they forbid the use of the *Soph pasuk* in the Torah rolls (§ 84), they would have still more determinedly have forbidden the use of the vowel signs, had these then really been in existence. A faithful picture of the state of matters at that time is given in the synagogue rolls, where all later marks of pointing are wanting, while the Samaritan Pentateuch manuscripts (§ 29) are satisfied with indicating the special pronunciation of particular words by means of a diacritical line over the consonants.

Compare Chwolson, *Die Quiescenten* הוי *in der althebräischen Orthographie*, Verhandl. Oriental Congress, ii. 459 – 490; Wellhausen-Bleek, *Einleitung*, p. 634 ff. In the other Semitic languages also half vowels were commonly used as vowel letters, but in various degrees. The Arabic employed

them strictly only for long vowels, while in an increasing measure we find them used for short vowels in the Syriac writings of Palestinian Christians and Jews. This means of vocalisation was finally carried out in a systematic way in the Mandean writing, where, however, ע also in several cases appears as a vowel sign (Nöldeke, *Mandäische Grammatik*, p. 3 ff.). Further, also, of a similar character is the use of עיא in the Jewish transcription of modern languages, and finally, the use of the letters עיהא in the Greek alphabet. Compare Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, ii. 39 ff., who at the same time treats of the Avesta writings in this connection. The Karaites constructed a most peculiar phonetic style of writing in their Bible manuscripts written with Arabic letters. See Hoerning, *Sechs karait. Manuscr.* ix. sqq. The warning of Nöldeke (*ZDMG*, xxxii. 593) against considering the orthography of the Mesha tablet without further examination as Old Hebrew has recently been justified by the Siloah inscription. While the diphthongs on the stone of Mesha are not indicated by signs, the Siloah inscription has עוד, מוצא, etc. On the other hand, it has still איש for איש, קל for קול, צר for צור. Compare *ZDPV*, v. 206. So, too, ראיש in this inscription shows that cases in the Old Testament like תחז for תאחז, יצתי for יצאתי, where an etymological א has been omitted, must be treated as exceptions. Of special importance in connection with textual criticism is the question, whether the final vowels in Hebrew had been originally unmarked. Compare *Gramm.* xxv. p. 33.

The Talmudic אם למקרא *mater lectionis* indicates a proof drawn directly from the traditional reading in opposition to אם למסרת, which is used if the proof is drawn from the abstract possibilities of the text. See Hupfeld, *TSK*, 1830, p. 556; Strack, *Prolegomena*, p. 69; Wellhausen-Bleek, *Einleitung*, p. 616. And on the other side, *e.g.* Levy, *Neuheb. Wörterbuch*, i. 92.

Ewald (*Lehrbuch d. hebr. Sprache*, § 20 f.) is wrong in concluding from the words of Origen (*De la Rue*, iv. 141): *πάλιν τῷ Ιουδᾲ παῤ ἡμῖν μὲν ὁ δεύτερος Ἀννὰν εἶναι λέγεται, παρα δε Ἑβραίοις Ὠνάν ὅ ἐστιν πόνος αὐτῶν*, "that our Massora

then existed essentially in the one form or in the other. The true relationship is seen from the remarks of Jerome. He also frequently points (*e.g.* in Jonah iii. 4) to the proper pronunciation, but this he had from his Jewish teachers, to whom he often refers (*e.g.* in Amos iii. 11; Zeph. iii. 9). That he knew no system of points is evident from many of his remarks (*e.g.* on Hab. iii. 5): "Pro eo quod nos transtulimus mortem in Hebræo tres literæ positæ sunt: Daleth, Beth, Res, absque ulla vocali, quæ si legantur dadar 'verbum' significant, si deber 'pestem';" (on Hosea xiii. 3): "Apud Hebræos locusta et fumarium iisdem scribitur literis Aleph, Res, Beth, He. Quod si legatur arbe 'locusta' dicitur, si aroba, 'fumarium.'" By *vocales* he understands the half vowels referred to, *e.g.* on Isaiah xxxviii. 14: "Media vocalis litera Vau si ponatur inter duas Samach, legitur 'sus' et appellatur equus, si Jod legitur 'sis' et hirundo dicitur." The word *accentus* means with him the pronunciation of the word, *e.g.* Epist. 73, *Ad Euagrium*: "Nec refert utrum Salim aut Salem nominatur, cum vocalibus in medio literis perraro utuntur Hebræi, et pro voluntate lectorum atque varietate regionum eodem verba diversis sonis atque accentibus proferantur." Compare Hupfeld, *TSK*, 1830, p. 571 ff. Nowack, *Die Bedeutung d Hier. für d. Alttestamentl. Textkritik*, p. 43 ff.

In the Talmud נקודה means, either the abnormal points mentioned in § 35, or the angles and corners of the letters, *e.g. jer. Chag.* ii. 2, fol. 77*c*.

80. The insufficiency of the means described in § 79 led the Jews to seek out a new and more certain system, which, as Aaron ben Asher (§ 32) expresses it, might help the reader to avoid confounding נוֹרָא with נֹגְהָא, שׁוֹרָה with סוּרָה, צוֹר with צוּר. In the choosing of a means for the attainment of this end, owing to the view of Scripture then prevailing, all systems were *à priori* excluded which would have involved an alteration of the traditional letters, so that, *e.g.*, there could be no thought of such an invention as the Ethiopic alphabet. What had to be done rather was to discover a system, which

would not make the vowel signs appear of equal importance with the old letters. In this way the present well-known vowel system had its origin. It consists, as we know it, of simple points and strokes, and so for the most part reminds one of the East Syrian pointing. And seeing now that this system of signs can be traced back to the fifth century, it must be always regarded as a possibility that the inventors of the Hebrew system had been influenced by the Syrian.

Although the origin of the Hebrew system of pointing still lies in obscurity, it has yet become possible by means of Firkowitzsch's rich collection of manuscripts to mark within limits to some extent the period of its origin. While indeed, as already remarked, the post-Talmudic treatises *Sepher Thora* and *Massecket Soph'rim* knew of no system of signs, it is proved from statements in these manuscripts that the punctuator Aaron (§§ 30. 32), living in the first half of the tenth century, belonged to a family which occupied itself through five generations with the pointing of the text, whose oldest member, Asher ha-Zakken, must have flourished as early as the eighth century. According to this the origin of the pointing must be assigned to the seventh or eighth century.

The sign for *â* in the usual system might be considered an abbreviated א, as in the system spoken of in § 81. But in many manuscripts (as in the South Arabic, compare *Journal asiatique*, 1870, ii. 363, and in the Karaite facsimiles of Hoerning), Kametz has the form ֶ, which probably was the original.

On the forefathers of Aaron, compare *TSK*, 1875, p. 745; *ZLT*, 1875, p. 612 f.; Baer and Strack, *Dikduke*, x. In opposition to the ordinary view, Grätz seeks with unwearied zeal to prove that Aaron was a Karaite. See *Geschichte der Juden*, v. 533 ff.; *MGWJ*, 1881, p. 366, 1885, p. 102 f.

A Syrian Codex of the year 412, written in Edessa (British Museum 12150), has already the vowels marked by means of points. Compare besides on the Syrian pointing:

Ewald, *Abhandlungen zur orient. und bibl. Literatur*, 1832, p. 53 ff.; *ZKM*, 1837, p. 204 ff., 1839, p. 109 ff.; Martin, *Histoire de la punctation chez les Syriens*, 1875; *Jacobi Epistola de orthographia syriaca*, 1869; *Journal Asiatique*, 1867, i. 447 ff., 1872, i. 305 ff.; Nestle, *ZMDG*, xxx. 525 ff.; Wright, *Catalogue of the Syr. MSS. in British Museum*, iii. 1168 ff.

That the usual system only attained by degrees its present wonderful nicety is proved by various indications. Compare above, §§ 27, 30; Dillmann on Gen. xliii. 26.

81. Besides the system of pointing that is now common, another system, differing from it in some respects, has come to light since the year 1840. This second system, resting as it does on statements in various Bible manuscripts, is usually called the "Babylonian," and is regarded as that which prevailed in the Babylonian schools. The situation, however, is not so simple, as recently Wickes, on good grounds, has pointed out. The divergent system has become known to us from Babylonian and South Arabian manuscripts; but that it was not the only Babylonian system, and that the Babylonians in general did much rather use the ordinary, so-called "Tiberian" or Palestinian, can be proved to demonstration. Not only does Saadia, who from A.D. 928 wrought in Babylon, therefore shortly after the time in which the Codex of the Prophets provided with the divergent system of pointing was written (see § 28), speak as little as the Massoretes and Rabbis of such a system as characteristic of the Babylonians, but the traditional readings of the "Babylonians" (§ 30) are sometimes of a kind that the "Babylonian" system of pointing would have been absolutely incapable of expressing graphically the distinction indicated. The facts of the case, therefore, are more correctly represented by saying that this second system had been made use of in Babylon alongside of the received system, but not to such an extent that it attracted any particular notice from the other Jews. Until future

discoveries lead to further conclusions, we had better denominate the divergent system by the name of the "second," or, in accordance with its peculiar form, the "superlinear" system.

For the more exact determining of the points of difference between the two systems, we are directed to the conclusions to be drawn from their peculiar forms. Now the characteristic of the second system, besides the placing of the vowels above the letters, is, that the signs for *â* (*ŏ*) and *û* consist of a reduced reproduction of the letters א and ו, the sign for *ă*, as it seems, of a small ע. If, then, we should further consider the point by which *î* is indicated a contracted י, and the double point : for *ô* as a bisected ו, we should then have a completed system which reminds us of the West Syrian system of pointing by means of the Greek vowel signs used since A.D. 700, and which may be considered an independent invention alongside of the received system. But this conception of it is not confirmed on closer examination. The superlinear signs for *î* and *ê* (אִ and אֵ) are undeniably the same as in the common system, and since they, as mere points, are not inconsistent in a superlinear system, a dependence of this system upon the received is even by this made probable. This impression is further strengthened by the fact that some manuscripts for *û plene scriptum* use simply the ordinary sign וּ. Since then the recently published Karaite manuscripts (§ 28), which in part had their origin in the neighbourhood of Bagdad, follow upon the whole the common system, but designate the *û* by an Arabic *damma*, *i.e.* a small ו, it is natural to assume that even the above-mentioned peculiarities of the superlinear system should be regarded as an after growth and a further development of the Arabic system of indicating the vowels, in which indeed ו, and partially א, appear as vowel signs. According to this, therefore, the superlinear system would be a secondary modification

of an older system essentially identical with the received. Perhaps also in this way the position of the signs over the letters can be explained, for by this a collision with the older system would be avoided, which would then also enable us to understand how the double point was made the sign of *ô*. That these Greek-Arabic Bible manuscripts which contained the Targum alongside of the text have the superlinear system only in the Targum, while they use the ordinary system in the text, is best explained on this hypothesis. Finally, Wickes also has come to the same result by means of a comparison of the superlinear accentuation with the received.

The older literature on the "Babylonian" pointing (among which especially see: Pinsker, *Einführung in die Babylon Hebr. Punctation*, 1863) is given in Strack's edition of the *Babylonian Prophet-Codex*, p. vii, and Strack-Harkavy's *Katalog. der hebr. Bibelhandschriften zu St. Petersburg*, 1875, p. 223 f. Further, we may mention: *ZLT*, 1875, p. 619 ff., 1877, p. 18 ff.; Derenbourg, *Revue crit.* 1879, p. 453 ff.; M. Schwab, *Act. de la soc. phil.* vii. 165–212; Grätz, *MGWJ*, 1881, p. 348 ff.; Strack in the *Wissensch. Jahresbericht über d. morgenl. Studien in Jahre*, 1879, p. 124; Merx, *Verhandlungen d. Berl. Orient. Congr.* i. 188 ff.; and especially Wickes, *Accentuation of the so-called Prose Books*, 1887, p. 142 ff. The manuscripts with "Babylonian" pointing are given in Strack's edition of the Prophet Codex, in Merx's *Chrestomathia targumica*, p. xv, and in Baer's *Liber Jobi*, p. iv sq.

In an epigraph to a Pentateuch Codex with Targum to be found at Parma, where mention is made of the superlinear system (מנוקד למעלה), it is ascribed to the ארץ אישור. See Zunz, *Zur Geschichte und Literatur*, p. 110; Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, v. 556; Wickes, *Accentuation of so-called Prose Books*, p. 142. So, too, in the Massoretic notes in the Tschufutkale manuscript. Sometimes the superlinear vowel system is designated the "Oriental." See Wickes, *Accentuation*, p. 145*n*. Indeed, the Babylonian Prophet Codex is also a witness to the fact that this system was used in

Babylon. But with perfect right Wickes emphasises the fact that if in Ex. xxiii. 5 וְחָעְנַב is handed down as a "Babylonian" reading in contrast to וְחַעְנֵב the "Western," the superlinear system, which had no proper sign for *Segol*, would not have been able in this case to give expression to the traditional pronunciation. So, too, Saadia knows *Segol* as one of the Hebrew vowels, which is irreconcilable with the Babylonian system.

Although up to this time relatively few manuscripts with the superlinear pointing are known, there are yet to be found in these a considerable diversity in regard to details. In the South Arabian manuscripts the following signs are met with: א̇ *â* and *ŏ*, א̣ *i*, א̈ *e*, א̀ *u*, א̇̇ *o*, א̆ *ă* and א̆̇=א̤ (the horizontal stroke indicates Sheva). In the Job Codex, of which Baer's *Liber Jobi* contains a facsimile, and in the Prophet Codex the system is complicated, for the sign for Sheva is also combined with the other vowels. See Stade, *Lehrbuch der hebr. Grammatik*, § 37. In this way, no doubt, originated a sign for *ĕ* (namely א̈̆); but, as it seems, it was only used if an *ē* lost the tone; otherwise *ă* or *ĕ* stood for *Segol*. While the Prophet Codex represents *û* by ו, the sheet produced by facsimile from Job has sometimes this sign, sometimes the superlinear.

On the Karaite manuscripts, compare Hoerning, *Sechs Karait. Manuscr.* p. 10 f.

82. In all probability, contemporaneously with the introduction of the vowel signs the text was provided with a system of accentuation marks, which played the double rôle of indicating the tone syllable of the words and their logical superordination or subordination in the verse as a whole.

In the Talmud, *Masseket Soph'rim*, the Synagogue rolls and the Samaritan manuscripts, these signs are as completely unknown as are the vowel signs. The superlinear vowel system is, as already indicated in § 81, accompanied by a divergent system of accents, in which the accents are indicated partly by the initial letters of their names. This is found, as it

seems, in all books, whereas the received system of pointing has for the three poetical books, Psalms, Proverbs, and the Book of Job (תמ"א), a separate system.

There are five words mentioned in *b. Joma* 52*a*, the connection of which in the verse were doubtful (namely, שאת, Gen. iv. 7; משקדים, Ex. xxv. 35; מחר, Ex. xvii. 9; ארור, Gen. xlix. 7; וקם, Deut. xxxi. 16), which speaks against the existence of a system of accentuation. Compare Berliner, *Beiträge zur hebr. Grammatik*, 29 f.

On the accents, compare Heidenheim, *Sepher Mischpete hateamim*, 1808; Jhuda b. Bal'ams, *Abhandlung über die poetischen Accente*, ed. Polak, Amsterdam, 1858; Baer, *Thorath Emeth*, 1852; and on the position of Metheg. in Merx, *Archiv für wiss E. d. A. T.* i. 55 ff.; Grätz, *MGWJ*, 1882, p. 385 ff.; Wickes, *A Treatise on the Accentuation of the Three Poetical Books*, London 1881, and *A Treatise on the Accentuation of the Twenty-one so-called Prose Books*, Oxford 1887. Compare Baer and Strack, *Dikduke*, pp. 16–33; and on the Accentuation in *Codex Reuchlin:* Baer, *Liber Jeremiæ*, p. ix. On the Babylonian system: *ZLT*, 1875, p. 606, 1877, p. 31 ff.; Wickes, *Accentuation of the Prose Books*, p. 142 ff.

4 *The Divisions of the Text.*

83. Several Semitic peoples, like the South Arabians, Ethiopians, Samaritans, and in part also the Phœnicians, mark the separation of individual words in a piece of writing by means of a point or stroke inserted between them. The conjecture naturally suggests itself that at one time the Hebrews also had separated the individual words of their sacred text in a similar way, partly because not only the Mesha tablet but also the Siloah inscription (§ 75) has a point between the several words, partly because the double point dividing verses (*Soph pasuk*, § 84) can be most simply conceived of as originating through the doubling of such a

point. But, on the other hand, it is certain that this point in any case has not been regularly used, because we could not then account for the frequent cases in which the LXX. divides the words otherwise than the Massoretic text (compare § 77), and we have seen also in § 33 that the Jewish tradition itself alludes to certain passages in which the division of words was uncertain. In the Babylonian Talmud (*b. Menachoth* 30*a*, compare *Massekct Soph*ᵉ*rim*, ii.) a point for separating words is unknown. It is rather required that between the several words an empty space should be left as large as a letter, while the space left between letter and letter within the word should just be the breadth of a hair. Yet the hypothesis that in earlier times a *scriptio continua* had been in use in the Old Testament texts is unproved. How easily the letters might be falsely divided is shown by the common Bible manuscripts themselves, which yet labour after the observing of the Talmudical prescriptions.

On the divergent systems of dividing words that appear in Jerome, see Nowack, *Die Bedeutung d. Hier. für d. Alttestamentl. Textkritik*, p. 41 f.

On the final letters, compare § 77.

84. The double point, *Soph pasuk*, for marking the division of verses, is made mention of for the first time in *Sepher Thora* and *Masseket Soph*ᵉ*rim*, but the prohibition on the part of these writings against the use of this double point in the synagogue rolls shows at the same time that originally it had been foreign to the text. With this also agree the older witnesses. Even in the Mishna "verses" are spoken of, פָּסוּק *pl.* פְּסוּקִים; but from statements in the Talmud and other ancient writings it is evident that among the Jews much diversity of usage prevailed with regard to the dividing of the several verses, and that among others the Babylonian Jews in this respect observed a different rule from the Palestinians. The same vacillation shows itself when we compare the old translations,

especially the LXX., for these frequently have another system of verse division from that of the Massoretic text. Since those differences affect also the poetical books, the practice of writing in lines or stichoi cannot have been in use in these times, which yet seems so natural a method of writing Hebrew poetry. On the other hand, perhaps about the time of Jerome, this system had found its way into the poetical books, while the colometric style of writing introduced by this father of the Church into his translation of the other books was an imitation of the editions of classical writers.

The division of verses that is now common, which is based on the parallelism prevailing in the poetical books, for in the other writings it divides paragraphs of the size of a poetical double clause, is neither the Babylonian nor the Palestinian, but a third which seems to have been fabricated by the old Massoretes, since it comes to view first of all in the above-mentioned Massoretic work of Aaron ben Asher (§ 32).

Sepher Thora, iii. 4 (ed. Kirchheim, p. 6): A manuscript in which the beginning of the verse is marked by a point could not be used for public reading. *Masseket Soph'rim*, iii. 6. In a remarkable way the synagogue rolls of the Crimea disregard this rule; while, on the contrary, four Crimean private manuscripts have no *Soph pasuk*. See *ZLT*, 1875, p. 601.

In the Mishna (*Meg.* iv. 4) it is said: "The readers should read not less than three *Pesukim* of the Law. Also he should not read more than one *Pasuk* at a time to the interpreter (§ 60). On the other hand, in the Prophets, he should read three *Pesukim* at a time, yet only if the three *Pesukim* are not three *Parashas*. Compare Wähner, *Antiquitates Ebræorum*, i. 97 f.; Strack, *Prolegomena*, p. 78 ff.; Geiger, *Urschrift*, 373; *Jüd. Zeitschrift*, ii. 140, iv. 113, 265, x. 24; *Nachgelassene Schriften*, iv. 24.

On the various systems of verse divisions, compare

especially Grätz, *MGWJ*, 1885, p. 97 ff. It is expressly said in *b. Kidd.* 30*b* that a full understanding of verse division is not to be had. According to this passage, which refers to the Babylonian division of verses, the Law has 5888, the Psalms 5896, and the Chronicles 5880 verses. At the same time it is said that the Palestinians had another division, for they, among other differences, divide Exodus xviii. 9 into three verses. Compare *Masseket Soph^erim*, ix. 3, where we probably meet with the Palestinian division, according to which, not Lev. xiii. 33, but Lev. viii. 23 was the middle verse of the Law. Examples of passages in which the LXX. and other versions divide otherwise than the Massorete text, are the following: Ps. xvii. 3 f., xxiii. 5 f., lxv. 8 f., xc. 2 f., xc. 11 f., xcv. 7; Lam. iii. 5; Hos. iv. 11 f.; Isa. i. 12 f. Compare Cappellus, *Critica sacra*, lib. iv. cap. 3. It may also be mentioned that of the words mentioned in § 82, whose relation is doubtful, one stands quite at the beginning of the verse: Gen. xlix. 7 (compare § 91).

On the Massoretic division of verses compare Baer and Strack, *Dikduke*, p. 55 f.

In the Babylonian Talmud (*Meg.* 16*a*) mention is made of a kind of writing in lines which was used in particular poetical passages; but it cannot have been thoroughly carried out in ancient times on account of what is referred to in the above sections. Compare further, Delitzsch, *Psalmen*, 1883, p. 187; Levy, *Neuhebräischer Wörterbuch*, i. 163; Strack, *Prolegomena*, p. 80. On the colometric style of writing in Origen, compare Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vi. 16; Epiphanius, *De ponderibus et mens.* iv. In the Preface to Isaiah Jerome says: "Nemo cum prophetas versibus viderit esse descriptos, metro eos æstimet apud Hebræos ligari et aliquid simile habere de psalmis et operibus Salomonis; sed quod in Demosthene et in Tullio solet fieri, ut per cola scribantur et commata, qui utique prosa et non versibus conscripserunt, nos quoque utilitati legentium providentes interpretationem novam novo scribendi genere distinximus." Compare Morinus, *Exercitationes biblicæ*, p. 476 ff., and, in general, Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen*, 1882, p. 180. The single lines bear also

in Jerome and Augustine the name *versiculi* or *versus*, which Morinus has misunderstood, p. 481 f.

85. Sections embracing a larger portion of the text, the so-called *Parashas* (פָּרָשָׁה, *pl.* פָּרָשִׁיוֹת) were marked by the Jews by means of intervening spaces, which in the case of a specially complete sundering of the passage, leave all the rest of the line empty, whereas, in the case of the sundering indicated being less thoroughgoing, this ended in the middle of the line. In the former case, the Parashas that ended in that way were called "open," פְּתוּחוֹת, in the latter "closed," סְתוּמוֹת. Subsequently it was customary to indicate by a פ or a ס, to which class the Parasha belonged. In the editions and in most of the manuscripts the use of these signs is confined to the Law, whereas Baer has carried it out in his editions (§ 24) even in the other books. According to the received divsion, the Law contains 298 open and 379 closed Parashas. The Karaite manuscript, written in Arabic letters, edited by Hoerning, diverges in part from this division, as also elsewhere in this direction a certain vacillation prevails.

As concerns the antiquity of this division, mention is made of open and of closed Parashas in both Talmuds. See *bab. Sabb.* 103*b*; *jer Meg.* 71*b*. Also the separate Psalms were sometimes (*b. Berachoth* 9*b*, 10*a*) called Parashas. In the Mishna there is no mention of the two kinds of Parashas, but the Parasha division in general is spoken of, and particular examples are given which, if not always, yet at least for the most part, agree with the later divisions (*Taanith*, 4. 3; *Menachoth* 3, 7, and often). The Mishna knew also of Parashas of the Prophets (*Meg.* 4. 4). Whether these Parashas were outwardly marked as early as the times of the Tannaites, as at any rate they seem to have been in the time of Jerome, cannot be conclusively decided. And that there must have been a time in which the Psalms were not in a single instance distinguished from each other by means of

clear intervals may be concluded from the vacillation in reference to their number and division in the old authorities for the text, and even in later manuscripts.

On the whole, the received Parasha division is to be characterised as proper and fitting. Instances like Ex. vi. 28, Hag. i. 15, where evidently verses that go together are separated, or Isaiah lvi. 9, where the separation rests on an incorrect exegesis, are comparatively rare.

Compare Morinus, *Exercitationes Biblicæ*, p. 491 ff.; Hupfield, *TSK*, 1837, p. 837 ff.; Strack, *Prolegomena*, p. 74 ff.; Geiger, *Jüd. Zeitschrift*, x. 197; *Nachgelassene Schriften*, iv. 22 f.; Grätz, *MGWJ*, 1885, p. 104 f.

Originally *Parasha* only means a section in general, specially one larger than a verse. Compare *b. Berachoth* 63*a*, where "a verse" is called "a small Parasha." The passage from the Mishna (*Meg.* 4. 3), referred to in § 84, proceeds on the assumption that sometimes a Parasha may consist only of one verse, which actually is the case in Isaiah lii. 3 ff.

The *Capitula* of Jerome sometimes correspond exactly with the Parashas, *e.g.*, *Micah* vi. 9, on which passage he expressly remarks: "In Hebraicis alterius hoc capituli exordium est, apud LXX. vero finis superioris." Hence in his text the division was outwardly marked. Compare also on Zeph. iii. 14. But often he used the word quite carelessly in the sense of a passage of the text. Compare Hupfield, *TSK*, 1837, p. 842.

On the division of the Psalms, compare J. Müller, *Masseket Soph'rim*, p. 222 f.; Bæthgen, in the *Schriften d. Universität Kiel*, 1879, p. 9. The division now common, which is met with also in Luther, makes the number of the Psalms 150. This is also the number in the LXX., but it is there reached in another way, namely, by joining Psalms ix. and x., cxiv. and cxv., and by dividing Psalms cxvi. and cxlvii. The Syriac translation, again, joins only Psalms cxiv. and and cxv. and divides only Psalm cxlvii. But elsewhere an entirely different total is given. Thus *jer. Sabb.* 16. 1, fol. 15*c*, gives 147 Psalms, while several old manuscripts have also less than 150, for they frequently join Psalms xlii. and

xliii., and cxiv. and cxv. In olden times, too, Psalm i. was often not counted, or else connected with Psalm ii. (see *b. Berachoth*, 9*b*; Acts xiii. 33; *Justin Martyr*, i. 40), so that the 10th Psalm is once referred to (*b. Meg.* 17*b*) as the 9th.

We must not confound with the Parasha division spoken of in the above section the liturgical division of the Law into Parashas, and of the Prophets into Haphtaras (הפטרה). This system of readings was connected with the practice of the Babylonian Jews, which overtook the reading of the Law in one year (*b. Meg.* 31*b*); whereas in Palestine a three years' course had been introduced (*b. Meg.* 29*b*; compare on this matter § 86). Yet the now authorised fifty-four liturgical Parashas were not made finally valid before the 14th century. They were only externally marked in the Law, and this was done by writing פ or ס three times in the empty space preceding its beginning. With the exception of the one passage (Gen. xlvii. 28), their beginnings always corresponded with the beginning of an open or closed Parasha. Baer, however, in his edition of Genesis, gives them their full title, פרשת לך לך, פרשת נח, etc. Compare Jost, *Geschichte d. Judenthums*, ii. 137; Strack, *Prolegomena*, p. 76 f.; *Journal asiatique*, 1870, p. 531 ff.; and especially *REJ*, iii. 282–285, vi. 122 ff., 250 ff., vii. 146 ff.

86. It has usually been supposed that in the division of the text into *Sedarim* סדרים, as it was made known specially by Jacob ben Chajim's Bible of A.D. 1525, we have an attempt on the part of the Jews to carry out an actual arrangement of the Old Testament in chapters. Recently, however, Theodor has sought to show that this division was originally a liturgical one, for it is said to correspond with the three years' Palestinian cycle of the reading of the Law (§ 85). The Sedarim division of the other writings would then have to be regarded as a later imitation of the Law division. In any case, and to this others have already called attention, this division agrees remarkably with the order of the old Midrashim, which decidedly give the impression of having been homilies

based upon these. Moreover, the Sedarim division varies not a little. The Jerusalem Talmud (*Sabb.* 16. 1, fol. 15*c*, compare *Massekct Soph*^{e}*rim*, 16. 10, xxx.) gives to the Law 175 Sedarim. On the other hand, the division made known by Jacob ben Chajim has 447 Sedarim, of which 154 are in the Law. This numbering is now found to have manuscript authority in a Bible Codex of the year 1294. Finally, the South Arabian Massora manuscript edited by Derenbourg (§ 32) has 167 law Sedarim, with which the Bible of the year 1010 is in substantial agreement.

The division into chapters which now has secured actual recognition in the Hebrew Bible, was borrowed by the Jews from the Christians. After a variety of earlier attempts, the text of the Vulgate was divided into chapters in the thirteenth century, in order that it might be possible to prepare practical Bible concordances. This division, which varies here and there in details, was used first of all by Isaac Nathan in his Hebrew concordance, prepared 1437–1448, and published in 1523, and subsequently it was adopted in the second Bomberg Bible in A.D. 1521. Unfortunately in many passages the work was done just in a haphazard way, and though we must always evidently hold by it, it is yet to be recommended that in editions of the text and translations, the portions of the text should be otherwise grouped, when the blunders are so evident and generally admitted as in Gen. ii. 1 ff.; Isa. ix. 1–6, x. 1–4, lii. 13–15.

The numbering of the verses naturally presupposes the division into chapters. It is met with for the first time in the Sabbioneta edition of the Pentateuch, A.D. 1557 (§ 62), and applied to the whole of the Old Testament first in the Athias Bible of A.D. 1661.

On the Sedarim, compare Müller, *Massekct Sopherim*, p. 220 ff.; *Journal asiatique*, 1870, p. 529 ff.; Geiger, *Jüd. Zeitschrift*, 1872, p. 22; Baer, *Liber Genesis*, p. 92; Theodor,

MGWJ, 1885, p. 351 ff., 1886, p. 212 ff., 1887, p. 35 ff.

On the chapters, compare Morinus, *Exercitationes biblicæ*, pp. 484 f., 487 f. The determining of the date as given we owe to Genebrardus, *Chronographia* (ed. Paris 1660, p. 631). In the following century Nicholas von Lyra (quoted by Merx, *Joel*, p. 320) complains: "Signatio capitulorum in bibliis nostris est frequenter defectiva, quia frequenter non sequitur signationem hebraicam nec etiam Hieronymum, ut præsertim in antiquis bibliis secundum Hieronymum signatur."

87. There was mention originally of a division into "Books" with reference only to certain particular writings of the Old Testament, namely, the Pentateuch, the Book of the Twelve Prophets, the Psalms, and Ezra-Nehemiah. This division, which in the case of the Twelve Prophets was easily enough understood, is also in those other writings very old. Thus the dividing of the Psalms into five books, which again without doubt presupposes the five-fold division of the Law, was indirectly witnessed to as early as by the Chronicles (compare 1 Chron. xvi. 8 ff. with Ps. cvi.). The Talmud (*b. Baba bathra*, 13*b*) requires an empty space of four lines between the Books of the Pentateuch, and of three lines between the Books of the Minor Prophets. At the same time, since it had then become customary to write all or several writings in one volume, four empty lines are required between each of the prophetic writings. In some manuscripts, *e.g.* in the Bible of the year 1010 (§ 28), one empty line is found between Ezra and Nehemiah.

In the printed Bibles it became customary to make a further division of particular works. In Alexandria, the city of literature *par excellence*, the practice began, even in the years before Christ, of substituting short and convenient rolls for the old and often very long ones, and consequently it was found necessary to divide the great literary works into

separate books. Thus it also happened with the Alexandrine translation, for the Book of Samuel, the Book of the Kings, the Book of Chronicles, and the Book of Ezra, were each divided into two books, whereas even the longest prophetic writings were left undivided. Although the occasion of this division was removed when the use of rolls was abandoned in favour of the Codex form (§ 74), it was still retained, and subsequently was adopted from the Vulgate into the Bomberg Bible of 1521 (compare § 86).

Mention is made of the five books of Psalms even in *b. Kidd.* 33*a*. The otherwise so well instructed Jerome strangely enough wished, as the Preface to his translation of the Psalms shows (Lagarde's edition, p. 1 f.), to reject this division as one not genuinely Jewish.

On the Alexandrine practice, compare Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen*, p. 479. Yet it should not be overlooked that mention is made, though indeed more rarely, of several "books" being in one roll, and of one "book" consisting of several rolls (compare Rohde, *GGA*, 1882, p. 1541 f.).

B.—The Internal History of the Text.

1. *The Linguistic side of the Transmission of Scripture.*

88. Since the Massoretic system of pointing was invented only at a comparatively late date, the question arises as to how the pronunciation, that was made visible and clear by this means, is related to the actual pronunciation of the Hebrew as a living language. This question is naturally of fundamental interest in connection with the minute study of the Hebrew tongue, but it will also reward the student of the history of the text, if he will give a glance at it. Here now two facts are firmly established. In the first place, we never elsewhere meet with a system of pronunciation so thoroughly

characterised by inner logical consistency as that which lies before us in the Palestinian system of pointing. And, in the second place, it is certain that this system is not one that first takes form artificially through later reflection, but is, in all essential respects, in accordance with the early tradition. This follows, partly from the incapacity of the oldest Massoretes to understand actually the system of pronunciation, partly from its essential agreement with the transcriptions in Jerome and Origen (§ 36), and, finally, from the testimonies regarding the pronunciation of the allied Phœnician language. Only the pronunciation of *â* as *å*, which is presupposed by the pointing, because it uses the same sign for *ô* and *â*, is to be considered as a novelty which is to be met with in Jerome merely in isolated cases, while even later only the Polish-German Jews so pronounce it, whereas the Spanish Jews have a pure *â*. On the other hand, with regard to the Sheva it is not to be forgotten, that we have it expressly stated by Aaron ben Asher and other rabbis, that this sign represents various vowels or vowel sounds according to the syllable following, sometimes *e*, sometimes *i*, sometimes *ă*, by which means apparent differences between the pointing and the old transcriptions transmitted to us have repeatedly arisen.

But by this it is only proved that the system of pointing gives visibility to what had once actually been the ordinary pronunciation of the Hebrew, and indeed the best now accessible to us, but by no means that the Massoretic pronunciation is absolutely the oldest, let alone that it is the only one that has ever been. In the transcribed proper names in the LXX. (§ 36) we meet with a style of pronunciation considerably different from that of the Massoretes, which no doubt may often have arisen through the awkwardness of the transcribers, and through a certain degeneration of the language on the part of Jews living among foreigners; but nevertheless here and there it does retain the original form. According to

Jerome (Epist. 73, *Ad Evangelum*) it was admitted that in Hebrew *pro varietate regionum eadem verba diversis sonis atque accentibus* were pronounced. To this are to be added further the proofs which the Massoretic pronunciation itself affords in favour of the fact, that it belonged to a later development of the language, for it is intelligible only through the postulating of older forms from which the present had their origin. That in the linguistic investigations in connection with this subject even those Greek transcriptions must have their value is clear, but the systematic and thorough use of these means and apparatus, upon the necessity of which Lagarde has laid special stress, is still in its infancy, and demands, moreover, in its use a very particular measure of circumspection. The same is true in a still higher degree of the transcriptions which are found in the old inscriptions (§ 36), which also here and there can shed light upon an antique stage of the Hebrew language, and especially on the original pronunciation of the proper names.

Compare Schreiner, *Zur Geschichte der Aussprache des Hebräischen*, *ZAW*, vi. 213–259; Kautzsch, *ZDMG*, xxxiv. 388, and the writings referred to in § 36.

On the similarity between the Massoretic pronunciation of the Hebrew and the pronunciation of the Phœnician known through Plautus, compare Schröder, *Die phönizische Sprache*, 1869, p. 120 ff.

In Jerome אָ is pronounced generally as *â*, more rarely as *o*, *e.g. bosor* בָּשָׂר (Isa. xxxiv. 6), *zochor* זָכָר (Isa. xxvi. 14). Moreover, it should not be overlooked that the transcriptions in Jerome are not rarely vacillating, which in many cases must be ascribed to his Jewish teachers, but certainly in many to his own inaccuracy.

The rules with reference to the pronunciation of the *Sheva mobile* at the beginning of the word are given thus by ben Asher (*Dikduke*, ed. Baer and Strack, pp. 12 f., 31 f.): before yod it is *i*, *e.g.* בִּיּוֹם, *bijôm* (compare Jerome on Isa. xvii. 11

biom), but it is *e*, if the yod itself has *i*, *e.g.* לְיִשְׂרָאֵל, *l^ejisrâēl* (in these cases ben Naphtali writes לְיִשְׂרָאֵל, which undoubtedly agrees with the old pronunciation *Israel*, not *Jisrael*; compare Haupt, *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, i. 17, 260; the practice of b. Naphtali, moreover, has made its way into several editions of the *Textus Receptus*: Ps. xlv. 10; Prov. xxx. 17; Jer. xxv. 26; Eccles. ii. 13; when it has *Metheg*, it sounds *a*, *e.g.* בָּבוֹא, *bābô* (compare the frequent *a* instead of *Sheva* in Jerome, *ZA W*, iv. p. 29 f.); or finally, before a guttural it takes the vowel of the guttural, *e.g.* כְּאֹד, *m^ôd*. Elsewhere it sounds *e*. Compare on the somewhat modified rules of other teachers, *ZA W*, vi. 237 f.; Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Grammatik*, xxv. § 10, p. 48.

On the significance of the Greek transcriptions in the *Hexapla* and in the LXX., compare Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, ii. 361 f.: "Uebersicht über die im Aram. . . . übliche Bildung der Nomina," *passim*. If the orthography of the Siloah inscription (in opposition to the tablet of Mesha, § 75) represents the original pronunciation of ו as *au*, then should forms like *Αὐναν* instead of אוֹנָן, *Αυση* instead of הוֹשֵׁעַ (Num. xiii. 8), be regarded as an older pronunciation, all the more as the Assyrians write *auši'a* (*ZA*, ii. 261). But if one should bethink him that the Syrians not rarely resolve *ô* into *au* (*e.g.* *ausar* instead of *ôṣâr*, *mraum* instead of מָרוֹם, compare Stade, *Grammatik*, p. 120), it might still be discussed whether a Greek *au* might not many a time have originated in a similar way. Further, the conclusions drawn by Lagarde from forms like *Σοδομα*, *Σολομων*, etc., in favour of a typal form *qutul*, ingeniously as they are vindicated, are yet somewhat problematical, since here there must be subsumed a pronunciation coloured by the assimilating of the mobile vowel, as the Massoretes admitted was the case before the gutturals (see above). Compare *nifilim*, etc., in Jerome, *ZA W*, iv. 80. Finally, it has also to be kept in mind in this connection that even the most recent translations of Arabic place-names show how difficult it often is in the case of a non-Semitic ear to define precisely a sound that is vibrating between *a*, *e*, *i*, *ö*. Compare what is said in the above § 81 about the Babylonian system of pointing.

On the significance of the names transcribed on the inscriptions, compare Stade, *ZAW*, v. 168 f.; Haupt, *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, i. 169 f. To the examples there named may be added: *Rasunu*, which corresponds to the *Ραασσων* of the LXX. against the רצין of the Massoretic text.

Many niceties of the Massoretic pronunciation can only have been finally established by the introduction of the pointing, among these also various superfine forms. Thus we would certainly not make the old genuine language responsible for a form like יָרֹדּוּ, Ps. vii. 6, or הוֹשֻׁבוֹתִים, Zech. x. 6. The same is true indeed of differentiating forms like אַבִּיר and אָבִיר, בָּתִּים and בָּתִים, כֻּלֹּךְ and כֻּלֶּךָּ, אֲדֹנָי and אֲדֹנָי, which probably rest on artificial forms, although these may have been found already in existence by the Massoretes, as certainly was the case with the sensible pronunciation צַלְמָוֶת (LXX. *σκία θανάτου*). Sometimes errors in the consonantal text have occasioned impossible forms, *e.g.* Neh. ii. 14; Jer. xv. 10.

2. *The Transmission of the Text according to its real Contents.*

89. In the form in which the Old Testament Textual Criticism is presently conducted, it is a young phenomenon. The Reformed theologian Cappellus († 1658), and Morinus († 1659), who went over to Catholicism, had indeed, already in the seventeenth century, sketched the outlines of a criticism of Old Testament Text; but this remained for a long time disregarded, and only now has a beginning been made in earnest to take in hand the necessary preliminary labours. Even among the Jews of the Middle Ages we meet with a conception of Scripture which led them as a matter of principle to exclude all criticism of the text, because it regarded all traditional divergences of the text, *e.g.* the Babylonian and Palestinian reading, as resting on independent revelations. In later times the rigid theory of inspiration in

the older Protestantism contributed to the branding of any attempt to improve the traditional text as a dangerous undertaking. Indeed, the *Formula consensus Helvetici* (§ 78), with scrupulous exactness, expressly rejects all that apparatus for textual criticism which by earlier and later critics of the text has been declared indispensable. And even in modern times have there been several scholars who in practice are disinclined to any thoroughgoing criticism of the text, or who, where it is at all possible, hold out for the traditional form of the text. Now, although this conservative tendency forms a wholesome drag upon the not infrequent recklessly revolutionary "textual emendations" of some critics, and it remains a not-to-be-forgotten truth that the traditional Hebrew text will ever have an advantage over the text that has only indirectly been reached, yet the opinion always more and more gains ground that a methodical criticism of the text is to be regarded, not only as a right, but also as a duty which we owe to the Old Testament writers, and to the noble works which they have left behind. The evil lies, not in the use of the apparatus of textual criticism, but in the circumstance that often that apparatus is insufficient.

It was in particular the result of the great collations of manuscripts undertaken by Kennicott and de Rossi (§ 30) which for a long time afforded confirmation to the notion that the traditional form of the text should be considered without more ado as authentic. The Hebrew manuscripts exhibit indeed so remarkable an agreement, that a strong impression is produced of the care which the Jews had expended on the reproduction of the sacred text. But even although this imposing agreement has been still more evidently supported documentarily by the oldest recently discovered manuscripts, yet a thoroughgoing examination proves that the text preserved with such extraordinary care is, after all, only a *Textus Receptus*, the relation of which to the original text still remains a question

for discussion. And that these two forms of the text are not without further inquiry to be identified, a variety of circumstances incontestably proves. Specially convincing are the texts which in the Old Testament itself lie before us in a double form (§ 73), and which often in details differ in such a way that only the one form can be correct. But even elsewhere passages are met with which in the received form are absolutely impossible and admit only of one explanation, namely, that of an error of the text. Even if the state of matters were such that only a single instance of this sort could be proved, it would be thereby made good, that the text as we have it is not absolutely in harmony with the original, and so there originates the task, which cannot be put aside, of using all means within our reach in order to make clear at all points the relation of the *Textus Receptus* to the oldest text objectively accessible to us; and only when this work has been done, can the question be answered as to whether the task of Old Testament criticism can be hereby solved, or whether we must still call to our aid a well considered conjectural criticism.

In consideration of the peculiar history of the Old Testament text (§ 78), the development of the vowel system and the consonantal text must in the following sketch be treated separately, since they belong to two different periods, and do not come forward with the same authority.

Compare among others, Olshausen's Prefaces to his edition of *Hirzel's Job* and to his own *Commentary on the Psalms*, pp. 17–22; Dillmann in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie* [2], ii. 399 f.; König, *ZKWL*, 1887, pp. 273–297.

Compare the interesting statements of Saadia about the variations in the Old Testament text in Baer and Strack, *Dikduke*, p. 82 f. *Formula consensus Helvetici*, Canon iii.: "Eorum proinde sententiam probare neutiquam possumus, qui lectionem, quam Hebraicus Codex exhibet, humano tantum

arbitrio constitutam esse definiunt, quique lectionem Hebraicam, quam minus commodam judicant, configere, eamque ex LXX. seniorum aliorumque versionibus Græcis, Codice Samaritano, Targumim Chaldaicis, vel aliunde etiam, imo quandoque ex sola ratione emendare religione neutiquam ducunt, neque adeo aliam lectionem authenticam, quam quæ ex collatis inter se editionibus, ipsiusque etiam Hebraici codicis, quem variis modis corruptum esse dictitant, adhibita circa lectiones variantes humani judicii *κρίσει*, erui possit agnoscunt."

Examples of parallel texts, of which only the one can be correct: Gen. x. 4, דודנים, 1 Chron. i. 7, רודנים; Gen. xxxvi. 23, עלן, 1 Chron. i. 40, עלין; Judges vii. 22, צררה, 1 Kings xi. 26, צרדה; 2 Sam. xxiii. 27, מבני, 1 Chron. xi. 29, סבכי; 2 Sam. xxiii. 13, קציר, 1 Chron. xi. 15, הצר; 2 Sam. xxii. 11, וירא, Ps. xviii. 11, וירא, etc.

Examples of passages, which on logical grounds must be incorrect: Josh. xv. 32, 36, xix. 6, 15, xxxviii. 21, 36 f., where the number at the end of the names referred to does not represent the actual sum total; the meaningless expression, 2 Sam. xxiii. 18 f.; Jer. xxvii. 1, where, according to xxvii. 3, and xxxviii. 1, Zedekiah should be read for Jehoiachim. On grammatical grounds we cannot accept the נה of Ezek. xlvii. 13, etc.

Besides the works of Cappellus and Morinus named in § 23, the special treatises on the LXX. mentioned in § 41, and Lagarde's *Specimen* spoken of in § 45, the following may be referred to among the more important modern works as textual criticism: Houbigant, *Notæ criticæ in univ. Vet. Test. libros,* 1777 (in opposition: Kallius, *Prod. examinis criseos Houb. in Cod. Hebr.,* Copenhagen 1763, and *Examen criseos Houb. in Cod. Hebr.* 1764); Kennicott, *Dissertatio generalis* in the second volumn of *V. T. Hebr. cum variis lectionibus;* Spohn, *Jeremias e versione Judæorum Alex. ac reliquorum interpretum græcorum emendatus,* 1794 – 1824; Olshausen, *Emendationen z. A. T.,* Kiel 1826; *Beiträge zur Kritik des überlieferten Textes im Buche Genesis,* 1870; Wellhausen, *Text d. Bücher Samuelis,* 1871; Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text*

of the Books of Samuel, 1890; Taylor, *The Massoretic Text and the Ancient Versions of Micah*, 1891; Bæthgen, *Der Textkritische Werk der Alten Uebersetzungen zu den Psalmen* in *JPT*, 1882, pp. 405 ff., 593 ff.; Merx, *Der Werk der Septuaginta für die Textkritik der Alten Testamentes* in *JPT*, 1883, p. 65 ff.; Cornill, *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel*, 1886; the peculiar works of Krochmal, *Haksaw we hamichtow*, 1875. Also the various commentaries (*e.g.* Lowth's *Isaiah* and Klostermann's *Bücher Samuelis und der Könige*), and innumerable articles referring to matters of detail in reviews and in Lagarde's works.

a. Vocalisation.

90. If we consider the Massoretic system of points, not from the standpoint of the science of language, but simply as a means of discovering the meaning of the text, the differences presented by the manuscripts and the Massoretic collections of variations are of extremely little importance. Such complete divergences as Hosea x. 9, חֲטָאָתָ and חֲטָאת; Judges xx. 48, מְתָם and מְתֹם; Ps. lxxv. 7, מְפוּדָבָר and מְפוּדְבָר; Eccles. ii. 7, מִקְנֶה and מִקְנֵה; Jer. xxvii. 17, חָרְבָּה and חֳרֵבָה, are very rare, and even these are without any essential influence upon the exposition.

Of greater importance is the difference, when we compare the Massoretic vocalisation with that of the old translations. So long as we speak of the different vocalisations as totalities, no one will deny that the understanding of the text put before us in the Massoretic pointing by far transcends in value the forms represented by the old versions. None of the old translators, with the exception possibly of the Targumists, whose testimony, however, is weakened by their free treatment of the text, has had so clear an insight into the sense of the text, and has understood it down to its nicest peculiarities in accordance with the traditional reading as it lies before us in the Massoretic system of pointing; and the obligation under

which we lie to the received vocalisation and accentuation for our understanding of the Old Testament text cannot in fact be overestimated. But, nevertheless, it ought not to be overlooked that the apprehension of the text which has been stereotyped by the Massoretes is historically mediated, and is inseparably connected with the history of Jewish exegesis, and hence the possibility that it may reproduce in one passage or another a later conception should never be lost sight of.

As examples of the difference between the vocalisation of the Massoretes and that of the old translations a few well-known instances may serve: Gen. xlvii. 31, מִטָּה; *LXX. Syr.* מַטֶּה; xlix. 10, שִׁלֹה; *LXX. Aq. Sym. Targ. bab. und jer. Syr.* שֶׁלֹה; Isa. vii. 11, שְׁאָלָה; *Aq. Sym. Theod.* Jerome, שְׁאֹלָה; Hos. ix. 12, בְּשׁוּרִי; *LXX. Theod.* בִּישׁוּרִי; Ps. ii. 9, תְּרֹעֵם; *LXX. Syr.* Jerome, תְּרֵעֵם; x. 17, תָּכִין; *LXX. Syr. Sym.* תְּכִין; xi. 3, הַשָּׁתוֹת; *LXX. Syr.* הַשַּׁתְּ; xv. 4, לְהָרַע; *LXX. Syr.* לְהָרֵעַ; Prov. iii. 12, וּכְאָב; LXX. וְכֵאֵב; Isa. ii. 20, לַחְפֹּר פְּרוֹת; *Theod.* *φαρφαρωθ*. A specially interesting example of the variety of meanings which may be given to the consonants is afforded by Ps. ci. 5, אֹתוֹ לֹא אוּכַל, but LXX. אֵתוֹ לֹא אוֹכֵל. Compare Cappellus, *Critica sacra*, lib. iv. cap. 2, lib. v. cap. 2, 4, 8; Cornill, *Ezech.* p. 127; and on the whole question, the remarks of Wellhausen-Bleek, *Einleitung*, 616.

91. The state of matters is most correctly conceived when we continually regard the vocalisation as a *Q^ere* (§ 33), the relation of which to the *K^etîb* has to be more closely considered. Although many expositors as a rule, and not wrongly (see, however, § 92), give the preference to the *K^etîb* over the *Q^ere*, where the Massora expressly states the difference between the two, it should not be overlooked that we may also have to do with an unjustifiable *Q^ere* in passages where the read word presupposes no other consonants than the traditional word. And, in fact, there are cases where the factors operating upon the traditional Qarjan (§ 33) have been

actually at work in producing the usual reading of the text, *e.g.* the nervous dread with which in later times the anthropomorphisms or otherwise offensive expressions were regarded, or the introduction of later ideas and modes of presentation into the text. In other passages where such considerations do not enter, other conceptions than those of the Massoretes may be brought forward as more natural, in regard to which the old translations (§ 90) may here and there afford some help.

The case is similar with the diacritical marks of the Massoretes, *e.g.* with the point over שׁ (§ 77), and with their accentuation and verse division (§ 84), which indeed as a rule disclose a singularly fine insight into the connection, but yet here and there must give way before more simple theories.

Compare Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, 1857, pp. 157 ff., 337 ff.

Examples of a vocalisation probably in favour of preconceived views: Eccles. iii. 21, "Who knoweth the spirit of man, הָעוֹלָה, which ascendeth heavenwards!" instead of the intended, and by the translators presupposed, הַעוֹלָה, "whether it rises upwards?" Jer. xxxiv. 18, לִפְנֵי, *Aq.* לִפְנֵי; Isa. i. 12, Ex. xxxiv. 24, Deut. xxxi. 11, לֵרָאוֹת, instead of לִרְאוֹת (to behold God); Ps. xc. 2, תְּהוֹלֵל, as 3 *fem.* instead of תְּחוֹלֵל (for God could not חוֹלֵל); Isa. vii. 11, שְׁאָלָה, instead of שְׁאוֹלָה (in order to avoid the idea of invoking the dead), etc. Related to these are the traditional forms of some proper names, as Isa. vii. 6, טַבְאֵל; perhaps רצין, instead of רְצִין, § 88; כּוֹלָה after the analogy of בּשֶׁת; עַשְׁתֹּרֶת. Ps. xci. 6, יָשׁוּד (compare שֵׁדִים and the LXX.) is perhaps a popular dogmatic allusion. Harmless passages, which might be improved are: Mal. ii. 3, זֶרַע, better in *LXX. Aq.* Jerome, זְרֹעַ; 1 Sam. xviii. 11, וַיִּטֶל, better וַיֵּט; Isa. xxx. 8, לָעַד, *LXX. Syr. Trg.* Jerome, לְעֵד; Job xvi. 21, בֶּן, better בֵּין=בֵּן. Sometimes vowel letters are misunderstood (§ 79): שְׁאֶפִים, read שָׁאפִים from שׁוף, Amos ii. 7, Ps. lvi. 2, lvii. 4; לָאֵט, read לָאט, 2 Sam. xix. 4.

שׁ is not correctly distinguished: Eccles. iii. 17 (read שָׂם);

Isa. xxxii. 12 (read שׂדים); Ezek. xxxix. 26 (read ונשׂו). Compare Job ix. 17, where Lagarde proposes וישׂפני.

A case in which the accentuation has been certainly determined by the desire to favour a particular view is met with in Isa. i. 9, where כמעט is drawn towards what follows. On Isa. xlv. 1, compare Grätz, *MGWJ*, 1874, p. 45. The view of Delitzsch and others that the accentuation of Isa. ix. 5 was determined by preconceived views of the meaning of the text is denied by Wickes, *Accentuation*, p. 49. A very free rendering, with a play upon the words of the text, is found in *b. Berach.* 4*b.*, according to which in Palestine they read Amos v. 2, as follows: "Fallen is she; further she will not [fall]; raise thee, O daughter of Israel!"

Passages where the verse division might be improved: Ps. xcv. 7, xlii. 6 f., xvii. 3 f., xxii. 31 f.; Gen. xlix. 24 f.; Isa. lix. 15.

b. The Consonantal Text.

92. It has been already remarked above (§ 89) that the Hebrew manuscripts, as also the Massora, represent in reality only one single form of text, for the variations that are met with are of an extremely trifling kind, and are mostly without any influence upon the sense of the text. One of the principal *rôles* among the variations is played by the divergences that arise out of the *scriptio plena* and *defectiva* which are explained in the remarks made in § 79. In addition to these we meet here and there interchanges of letters similar in appearance, like ד and ר, כ and ב, ו and י, etc. Besides, we have interchanges of synonymous expressions, especially under the influence of parallelism, and divergences with respect to the *Q're* and *K'tîb*, which form a frequent difference between the western and the eastern texts. Only one of these latter cases is of any general interest, namely, that the Babylonians have not, like the Palestinians, the well-known *Q're*, הוּא, only in the Pentateuch, but here and there also in the other books.

The *Q're* itself, which, according to § 33, may be regarded in a certain sense as a various reading, has usually only a historically explicable value, but hits sometimes upon the right thing, whether by divination, or in accordance with a genuine old tradition. On the manuscripts of the Samaritans, compare § 94.

Cornill, *Das Buch Ezechiel*, p. 7 ff., rightly styles the result of his comparison of the common text with the *Codex Babylon.* as quite surprising: "In a biblical book of forty-eight, for the most part quite long, chapters, the text of which has been transmitted in a notoriously faulty condition, the oldest of all known manuscripts, compared with the first and best printed editions, yields only sixteen actual variations." It should not on this account be denied that here and there, by means of collations of manuscripts, we may give an emendation of the text, *e.g.* Isa. xxx. 18, where two manuscripts have ירם instead of ירם, Isa. xxvii. 1, חמר, but some manuscripts, חמד; but, for the most part, the variations are quite insignificant, or consist in inaccuracies of particular manuscripts which immediately show themselves to be such. Examples (apart from the innumerable deviations in the use of the vowel letters, the interchange of אֶל and עַל, etc.): Ps. cii. 4, כעשן—בעשן; Isa. ii. 6, כילדי—בילדי; xv. 2, גרועה—גדועה; lxiii. 11, רעי—רעה; Jer. xviii. 4, כחמר—בחמר; Ps. ix. 7, נטשת—נתשת; xviii. 43, אריקם—אדיקם; xcvii. 11, זרע—זרח; Eccles. ii. 25, ממנו—ממני; Hag. ii 10, אל—(*Codex Hilleli*, § 30) בְּיַד; Ps. cii. 13, וכסאך—וזכרך (compare Lam. v. 19); Ps. ci. 24, אשבילה—אשבילה (compare xxxii. 8). Zeph. iii. 18, עליה, *Cod. Bab.* אליך; Zech. xiv. 18, את־כל־העמים *B.* את־הגוים; Zech. xiv. 4 omits in *B.* ביום ההוא; Ezek. vi. 5, גלוליכם—גלוליהם; a different *Q're*, Neh. ii. 6; Zeph. ii. 7, etc.

On the *Q're*, הִוא, compare Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 236. The Massoretic remark that the Babylonians have this reading only in three passages outside of the Pentateuch (1 Kings xvii. 15; Isa. xxx. 33; Job xxxi. 11) is incorrect, as Ezek. i. 13, xi. 7, xiv. 17, xvi. 46–48, xviii. 20, xxi. 19, xxvi. 17, xxx. 13, xxxii. 16; Jer. xxii. 16, xxviii. 17, show. The

idea that הוּא occurs only in the Pentateuch, which has been quoted against the correctness of the theory in the criticism of the Pentateuch which distinguishes a variety of documents, thus falls to the ground.

Examples of passages in which *Q're* is undoubtedly the correct reading are: Amos viii. 8 נשקעה; 1 Sam. xvii. 34, שה; 2 Sam. v. 2, המוציא והמביא.

93. If we compare the form of text obtained by means of the manuscripts and the Massora with older witnesses for the text from the time after Christ, such as the Talmudical quotations, the *Hexaplar* transcriptions, and the post-Christian translations, we shall find indeed variations not much more numerous than in the manuscripts, but the variations found in these exhibit a more characteristic physiognomy. While the variations of the manuscripts, in almost all cases, consist only in an inexact reproduction of the *Textus Receptus* (§ 92), those witnesses now referred to contain not unfrequently valuable readings, the collation of which is of real interest. But, at the same time, there appears a characteristic difference between these witnesses. The quotations in the Talmud correspond for the most part with the text that now lies before us, especially if we keep in view that they are often made from memory. So, too, the texts used by Jerome and the later Greek translators are very nearly the same as our own. In the Aramaic versions, on the other hand, we not unfrequently meet with interesting variations. The Targums especially sometimes afford good readings, which, however, may be explained by what has been stated above in § 60, partly by the extreme antiquity of the Targumic material. On the other hand, according to § 70, it remains often uncertain whether the variations obtained from the Syriac translation represent actually the condition of the text in post-Christian times, or are only repetitions of the pre-Christian (Alexandrine) form of the text.

Compare Cappellus, *Critica sacra*, lib. v. cap. 2, 5, 6, 9–11; Nowack, *Die Bedeutung des Hieron. für d. alttestamentl. Textkritik*, p. 23 ff.; Bæthgen, *Der textkritische Worth. d. alt. Ueberstz. d. Ps.* in *JPT*, 1882, pp. 405 ff., 593 ff.; Cornill, *Ezechiel*, pp. 128 ff., 156. A thoroughgoing comparison of the post-Christian translations with the Massoretic text is a decided desideratum (compare Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, ii. 51).

A couple of examples may at least give a tolerable illustration of the matters referred to in the above sections. Isa. xxvi. 2 ff., פתחו שערים ויבא גוי צדיק שמר אמונים: יצר סמוך תצר שלם שלם כי בך בטוח: בטחו ביהוה עדי עד כי ביה יהוה צור עלמים, the Greek transcription according to Epiphanius (compare Field, *Hexapla*, ii. 473 f.; Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, ii. p. 362): *φθοου σααρειμ ουαβω γωι σαδικ σωμηρ εμμουνειμ. ιεσρο* (יצרה) *σαμωχ θεσαρ σαλωμ σαλωμ χι βακ βατοου* (בטחו). *βετου βααδωναι αδα ωθ χι βαια αδωναι σωδ* (צור) *ωλεμειμ.* Hab. ii. 17, T. M. and Jerome, יחיתן, Targ. Syr. (LXX.), יחיתך; Hos. v. 11, T. M. Jerome, צו, Syr. Targ. (LXX.), שָׁוְא; Zeph. iii. 18, הוי, Targ. (LXX.), הוי; Hos. vi. 5, T. M. Jerome, משפטיך אור, Syr. Targ., משפטי כאור; Jer. xxv. 38, חרון, Targ. (LXX.), חרב; Ezek. xxvii. 11; Gen. i. 26, ובכל־הארץ, Syr. (by correct divination ?), ובכל־חית הארץ. Ps. xi. 1, הרכם, all versions (with the LXX.), הַר כְּמוֹ. Ezek. v. 15, והיתה, Targ. Syr. Jerome (LXX.), והיית. Isa. xxv. 2, מעיר, all versions, עיר.

94. If, finally, we go back to the witnesses for the text in pre-Christian times (to which, as was remarked in § 93, the Targums in part belong), the variations grow in the intensive as well as in the extensive sense. The chief witness here is the Alexandrine translation, in so far as it succeeds in setting forth the text in its original form. It not only affords numerous variations, some of them highly important in regard to details, but sometimes, as in the Book of Jeremiah and in Proverbs, it assumes the character of a different Recension. That these divergences have not arisen through arbitrary treatment on the part of the translators of a text identical with our own, but witness to the actual existence of an

exemplar with a divergent text, is proved partly from the character of the variations themselves, partly from the fact that several of these divergences are also to be found in other witnesses for the text before the time of Christ, as in the text of the Samaritan Pentateuch (§ 29), in the oldest parts of the Targums (§ 64), and in pre-Christian works, such as the Book of Jubilees that had its origin in Palestine (§ 13). Indeed, even in the translations from the times after Christ the forms of the text translated by the LXX. are here and there witnessed to as being then still read (§ 93). It is therefore evident that the relation between the later and the pre-Christian text forms one of the most important chapters in the history of the text of the Old Testament, and that a systematic comparison with the LXX. must be a main task of textual criticism.

Compare the writings referred to in § 41 and § 89.

While in earlier times it was especially the Catholics who gave preference to the LXX., in the modern scientific treatises on the history of the Old Testament text, the Massoretic text has won an ever increasing significance. The utterance of Zwingli is specially deserving of attention: "Infiniti sunt loci, quibus manifeste deprehenditur LXX. et aliter et melius tum legisse, tum distinxisse, quam Rabbini postea vel legerint vel distinxerint" (Opera ed. Schuler et Schultheiss, v. 555–59).

On the remarkable agreement between the LXX. and the Samaritan Pentateuch, compare (besides the literature referred to by De Wette-Schrader, *Einleitung*, p. 205 f.) the London Polyglot, vi. 19; Morinus, *Exercitationes ecclesiasticæ in utrumque Samaritanorum Pentat.*, Paris 1631; Cappellus, *Critica sacra*, lib. iii. cap. 20; Alexius a S. Aquilino, *Pentateuchi Hebr. Sam. præstantia*, 1783; Gesenius, *De Pentateuchi Samaritani origine, indole et auctoritate comment.*, 1815; Geiger, *Urschrift*, pp. 8–19, 99 ff.; *Jüd. Zeitschrift*, iv. 1866, p. 42; *Nachgelassene Schriften*, iv. 54 ff.; Nöldeke, *Alttestamentliche Literatur*, pp. 42, 240; Dillmann in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*, ii. 386; Fritzsche in Herzog, i. 283; Pick, *Biblioth. Sacra*, 1877–78; Heidenheim, *Bibliotheca sama-*

ritana, ii. xxi. sqq. That the Alexandrine translators did not use a Samaritan copy of the Law is clear; but equally improbable is the supposition that the Samaritans may have altered their Hebrew manuscripts in accordance with the LXX. The agreement between the two rather shows that the reading which they have in common was then widely circulated. Moreover, it should not be overlooked that the LXX. in just as many passages agrees with the Massoretic text against the Samaritans.

On the text of the Book of Jubilees, compare Rönsch, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, Leipsic 1874, and especially Dillmann in the *Sitzungsberichten der Berliner Academie*, 1883, p. 324 ff., where about twenty-seven cases are quoted in which the text of the Book of Jubilees agrees with that of the LXX.

95. As certainly as the deviations of the LXX. from the received text consist in great part of deviations in the copy of the Hebrew text used in the work, so certain is it that the Alexandrine readings in not a few passages deserve to be preferred above the Massoretic readings. Especially in some writings, such as the Books of Samuel and Ezekiel, the received text can be variously amended by a thoroughgoing collation with the LXX. We can easily understand how one feels himself shut in at every step by the confused state of the Greek text, but nevertheless its use has already led to all sorts of discoveries, less or more. Naturally in using it the most painstaking care is necessary, and never should the critic of the text lose sight of the fact that the Hebrew text, as the immediate authority on the text, is always to be regarded as worthy of preference to an indirect auxiliary, and that the treatment of the exemplar text on the part of the Greek translators was often one that cannot be determined. But thereby only the demands upon the critic of the text are raised, while the justification of his task is by no means lowered.

On the other side, it is not less certain that the deviations of

the LXX., in spite of the extreme antiquity of this translation, are not throughout always of equal importance for the emendation of the text. Rather in numerous passages the received text is to be unconditionally preferred. The most remarkable feature of the case is that such instances also occur just where the witness of the LXX. is reinforced by the other witnesses from pre-Christian times (§ 94). Thus, it is a generally acknowledged fact that several of the readings which the LXX. and the Samaritan Pentateuch have in common are of less value than the Massoretic readings. It therefore appears also here again very remarkable, that in the criticism of the text the extreme antiquity and the wide circulation of a reading in and by themselves afford no decisive proof of its correctness, but that later witnesses for the text may here and there more correctly transmit the original.

In the following passages, for example, the Alexandrine readings are to be unconditionally preferred: Gen. xli. 56, כל־אשׁר בהם, LXX. המשׁברים (or a similar word for *σιτοβολώνας*); 1 Sam. ix. 25 f., וידבר עם, LXX. וַיְרַבְּדוּ, and וישׁכמו, LXX. וישׁכב; 2 Sam. xxiii. 8, יושׁבשׁבת, LXX. (mediately), יֹשְׁבִי; Isa. xvii. 9, החרשׁ והאמיר, LXX. הָאֱמֹרִי וְהַחִוִּי; Isa. xliv. 12, חרשׁ, LXX. חָדַד הָרַשׁ; Jer. xxiii. 33, את־מה־משׂא, LXX. פְּנֵי וֵאלֹהַי; Ps. xlii. 6 f., אלהי פניו:, LXX. אַתֶּם הַמַּשָּׂא; Ps. lxix. 27, יספרו, LXX. יוֹסִיפוּ; Neh. iii. 14, רכבה, LXX. רֶבְכָּה; Zeph. iii. 17, יחריש, LXX. יחדיש. The LXX. and the Samaritans have good readings in the following passages: Gen. xxxi. 29, אביך, instead of אביכם; Ex. v. 9, יִשְׁעוּ, instead of יעשׂו (so too the Syriac); Ex. xiv. 25, ויאסר, instead of ויסר; Deut. iv. 37, בזרעם אחריהם (=Onk. Syr., Jerome); Deut. xxxii. 43, אדמת, instead of אדמתו. On the other hand, the Massoretic text is to be preferred to their united witness in *e.g.* Ex. xii. 42, xiii. 6; Num. xxiv. 7, xxvi. 12 (compare further the writings referred to in § 94).

To the dangers attending the use of the LXX. in textual criticism belong the corruptions that arose within the Greek itself (*e.g.* Jer. xv. 10; Ps. xvii. 14; *Cod. Vat.*); and above

all, the duplicate translations of the same passage that arose from interpolations, of which Isa. ix. 5 in *Cod. Alex.* affords an interesting example.

96. Although the use of the old translations, especially of the LXX., forms one of the most essential tasks of Old Testament textual criticism, the critic of the text must not suppose that with this his work is ended. Even a very general survey of the field teaches this. The Alexandrine translation carries us back only to the third century before Christ, a time, therefore, which was separated from that of many of the Old Testament writers by a long period. The presence of various errors of the text in the times following compels us to make the fundamental admission of the possibility of such having had an existence even in the texts of those much earlier times. Hence conjectural criticism cannot be excluded from the investigations about the Old Testament text. Here, too, we enter upon a region where only a few select spirits are at home, while just for those who are unfit it has a great fascination. Yet even here, amid the great multitude of arbitrary and useless fancies, we meet with several happy proposals which, in spite of the want of objective evidence, are so striking and simple, that the favour which they have found may lend to them an almost objective character. At the same time, it must here be remembered that the Old Testament itself, as we have already indicated above at § 73, affords at some points a firm basis of operation which lends to the conjectures a greater security. Also the divergent readings of the old witnesses, even if they should be just as little serviceable as those of the Massoretes, sometimes indirectly supply an aid to the correction of the text, because the unknown x can be more easily found by means of two known quantities. And even where ingenuity must simply create the conjectures out of itself, the presupposition lying at the foundation of them, that the ancient authors have expressed themselves clearly and

fittingly, is a presupposition justifiable indeed, but to be used with circumspection.

Several of the proposed alterations of the text are undoubtedly to be regarded as improvements in the writings, and so evidently are they such, that only a blind prejudice can without more ado reject them. Thus. Ps. xxii. 30, אַךְ לוֹ for אכלו; Jer. xv. 10, כלהם קללוני. For our estimate of the character of David, the reading in 2 Sam. xii. 31 of הֶעֱבִיד, instead of העביר, is not unimportant. Also we have improvements in אָהֳלוֹ, instead of אחיו in Gen. xxxi. 25 (Lagarde); לכה עמודה מצפה in Isaiah xxi. 6, etc. The parallel passage 2 Sam. xxii. 5, suggests in Psalm xviii. 4, משברי for חבלי; poetic parallelisms in Ps. x. 6 recommends אֲשֻׁרֵי, and in Job x. 15, רְוֵה עֵנִי; the prevailing rhythm in Psalm xcii. ff. suggests in Psalm xciii. 4, אַדִּיר מִפִּשְׁבְּרֵי or (p. 253) ממשברי אדיר י", instead of אדירים משברי. How a glance at the rhythm of the Lamentations may lead to good emendations of the text has been shown by Budde on Isaiah xiv. The alphabetical form teaches that המה of Psalm ix. 7, with a word that has fallen out of the text, must belong to verse 8. On the contrary, when אוי of Isaiah iii. 11 is attached to verse 10, it leads to the substitution of אַשְׁרֵי for אמרו; the parallelism between Isaiah viii. 12 and 13 suggests קָדֵשׁ, instead of קשר, etc. The genuine LXX. has in 2 Sam. xxiv. 6 a χεττειμ *Καδης*, instead of the senseless תחתים קדשי; but since the Hittite Kadesh was here unsuitable, Ewald ingeniously conjectured חָרְמָנָה, instead of קדשי. [See Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, pp. 217, 221 ff., or Thenius in Commentary.] All the documentary authorities have in Gen. iv. 8, ויאמר, to which, in order to obtain a meaning, Sam. LXX. Syr., etc., supply נלכה השדה; but certainly it was originally וישמר, instead of ויאמר (Olshausen), etc.

97. An essential condition of a methodical criticism of the text is an exact insight into the nature of the textual errors to be met with in the Old Testament. It is specially required that the question be answered as to whether the Old Testament text has been intentionally altered, or

whether we have to do only with purely unintentional errors of transcription.

The assertion that the Jews have on purpose corrupted their text is an old one. The Church fathers, who were dependent on the LXX., must naturally have been led to such a conclusion with regard to the occasional deviations of the Jewish text; and even Jerome, who elsewhere zealously contends for "the Hebrew truth," expresses himself once in a similar way. In the Middle Ages these changes were often repeated, *e.g.* by Raimund Martin, and in later times they were uttered with yet greater violence and bitterness by anti-Protestant critics like Morinus. Yea, even in modern times, Lagarde has expressed the conjecture that the chronological statements of Genesis were falsified by the Jews in the interests of their polemic against the Christians. For the charges thus formulated there have meanwhile never been any actual proofs brought forward. On the other hand, the question about the presence of alterations made on purpose has emerged in recent times in another form, to which a treatise by a Jewish scholar, Abraham Geiger, has given occasion. Geiger, to whom, among others, Dozy and N. Brüll have attached themselves, affirms that in the received text, just as well as in the old translations, numerous alterations are to be found, which had their origin in the religious solicitude and dogmatic views of later times, and had therefore been undertaken in a kind of apologetic interest.

That this latter formulating of the thesis is not altogether unfounded is undeniable. The same religious dread which can be proved in the case of all old translations, and in many Qarjan of the Hebrew text (§§ 33, 91), as also the tendency of modern translations to give expression to their indignation against manifestations of antipathy by means of the word of Scripture, did, as a matter of fact, lead the Jews in ancient times to alter here and there the consonantal text. A

reminiscence of such attempts is preserved in the Jewish tradition itself in the collection of the so-called *Tiqqune Soph'rim*, which was referred to above in § 34. Although some of the cases collected under that name are doubtful, and others evidently wrong, and even although the accounts given of the original sound of the word may not always be correct, yet the fact that such changes had been made is incontestable, and some of the cases reported are perfectly correct, *e.g.* Job vii. 20, where the LXX. had still the original עליך; Zech. ii. 8 (compare Deut. xxxii. 10 and the LXX. rendering of it); Hab. i. 12; Ezek. viii. 17; Lam. iii. 20; Num. xi. 15; while in 1 Sam. iii. 13, not לי but אלהים is to be read (compare LXX.). On the other hand, as often happens in similar cases, the enumeration is not exhaustive, for in other places such *Tiqqunim* may be discovered. The most interesting example is the interchange of *ba'al* with *bösheth* in many proper names. In the older Israelitish times the word בַּעַל was used quite as harmlessly of the God of Israel as the synonymous word אָדוֹן, which is shown by this that many old proper names had this name of God incorporated with them, *e.g. Ish ba'al*, the son of Saul (1 Chron. viii. 33), *Ba'aliada'*, the son of David (1 Chron. xiv. 7), *Meribba'al*, the son of Jonathan (1 Chron. viii. 34). But in later times, when the name Ba'al had become a symbol of Cananitish heathenism, such names gave offence (compare Hos. ii. 18, 20), and people began therefore to change the names, when they occurred in the books used in the synagogues, in various ways; and so, at the same time, the opportunity was taken to give expression to one's sympathy with, or antipathy against, the persons concerned. David's son, *Ba'aliada'* became *Eliada* (2 Sam. v. 16), whereas in the case of those belonging to the race of Saul, in accordance with Hos. ix. 10, *Ba'al* was exchanged for בּוֹשֶׁת, "shame" (compare 1 Kings xviii. 19, 25, LXX.). Thus arose the now well-known names *Ishbosheth* (2 Sam. ii. ff) and *Mephibosheth* (2 Sam. ix. 6).

Besides this change, of which a distinct view is afforded us in the Book of Chronicles, where the names remain unchanged, there are still some *Tiqqunim* which can be proved with an equal certainty. But otherwise Geiger's exposition rests upon an extreme exaggeration and a zeal for discovering intentional changes in the original text bordering on monomania. And as the instances are limited in number, so also must have been the time in which they originated. The Qarjan, with a "*tendency*" character, such as we meet with in the Talmuds, shows this, and therefore belongs at the latest to the fourth century after Christ. At the time when they had their origin, the text had already assumed so immutable a character that it could not be touched even in offensive passages.

Jerome on Gal. iii. 13: "Ex quo mihi videtur aut veteres Hebræorum libros aliter habuisse, quam nunc habent, aut Apostolum sensum scripturarum posuisse, non verba, aut quod magis est æstimandum, post passionem Christi et in Hebræis et in nostris codicibus ab aliquo Dei nomen appositum, ut infamiam nobis inureret, qui in Christum maledictum a Deo credimus" (compare also on v. 10).

Raimund Martin, *Pugio fidei* (ed. 1687), p. 695 ff. [On "Martin" or "Martini," see article by Neubauer in *Expositor*, 3rd ser. 1888, vol. vii. pp. 100 ff. 179 ff.; and article by Schiller-Szinessy in *The Journal of Philology*, xvi. No. 31, p. 130 ff.] Morinus, *Exercitationes biblicæ*, pp. 7–19.

Lagarde, *Materialien zur Kritik und Geschichte des Pentateuchs*, 1867, i. p. xii: "The chronology of the patriarchs before Noah is evidently falsified in the Massoretic text, and indeed falsified for the purpose of opposing, with the help of the LXX., the calculations made by the Christians, according to which the Messiah had appeared in the year of the world 5500. Such falsifications, as the fathers so often charged against the Jews, are only conceivable, if they could be traced back to one copy from which all the other transcriptions of the text had to be taken." Compare, however, against this

view, Kuenen, *Verslagen en Mededelingen der k. Akademie, Letterkunde*, ii. 3, 1873, Amsterdam, p. 296.

Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, 1857.

On *bosheth* for *baʿal*, compare Geiger, *ZDMG*, xvi. 730 ff.; Wellhausen, *Text des Buches Samuel*, pp. xii. and 30 f.; Kuenen, *Verslagen en Mededelingen*, iii. 5, 1888, p. 176. A confirmation is found in the exposition of Num. xxxii. 38, where מוסבת שֵׁם can only be a parenthesis, which recommends that the reading with the word Baal should be changed. On some Arabic parallels, which, however, are divergent in this, that the names are combined with actual names of gods, compare Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, iii. 178. A play upon this change of names occurs in the passages from the LXX. where *Baʿal* has the feminine article (compare Rom. xi. 4), while in reading the word *αἰσχύνη* was used (compare Dillman, *Monatsberichte d. k. Academie d. W. zu Berlin*, 1881).

To the same category belong probably also the name *Jezebel*, which originally indeed can scarcely have been combined with זְבֶל. Compare Hoffmann, *ZAW*, 1883, p. 105. Further, on בָּרַךְ יהוה as a euphemism for קִלֵּל, compare Psalm x. 3; Job i. 11, ii. 9; 1 Kings xxi. 10, with Isaiah viii. 21; 1 Sam. iii. 13. Perhaps also התעו, instead of התעה, Gen. xx. 13. Of another sort is Judges xviii. 30, where Moses was changed into Manasseh (compare *b. Baba bathra*, 109*b*). In this case the added *n* is written higher up than the other letters, and the change therefore was not discovered.

Of purposely made changes that have been alleged to exist in other places, some are of a not very convincing character, because the word said to have been changed is frequently to be found close by: *e.g.* Gen. xxxi. 49, where מִיצְפָּה is said to be a change for מִצְפָּה, whereas this word is itself to be found in verses 45, 51 ff. To this it may be added that, according to Lagarde's happy conjecture, המצפה (verse 21) ought probably to be inserted after the word בהר.

Against Geiger, compare especially the appropriate remarks of Wellhausen in *Text des Buches Samuel*, p. 32.

98. While the changes made in the Old Testament with

deliberate intention are not very numerous, by far the greatest number of errors in the text owe their existence to causes that are met with in all other sorts of writings, namely, the inaccuracies and the misunderstandings of transcribers. Here naturally there is much that cannot be put on record, and much that defies all calculation, but, notwithstanding, we shall find it not unprofitable to cast a glance over the errors that most frequently recur in the Old Testament, in order to be able to estimate in some measure the possibilities of proposed emendations. In doing so, we must always keep in view special characteristics and peculiar fortunes of the Hebrew writings that have been described above.

Moreover, it must not be forgotten that a sketch, like that upon which we have been here engaged, in the very nature of things, must give prominence to the shady side of the text, whereas it has no occasion to refer to passages in which the text is in good order, and so easily a one-sided comfortless representation of the facts may be given. Only the reading of the Old Testament itself can dispel this illusion. This will show that textual criticism can indeed in many cases contribute in an important manner to the greater clearness and beauty of the text, but does not alter the contents from those already known in any essential respect. And even though passages are found of the soundness of which we cannot but entertain a doubt, it is yet, upon the whole, a matter of astonishment that so old a literary work as the Old Testament, written in a character so little practised and so much exposed to serious risks, should still be so readable and so intelligible.

Letters which are very similar in appearance were readily interchanged. Even the ancients were aware of this danger, and *b. Sabb.* 103*b* expressly warns against the confusion of א with ע, of ב with כ, of ג with צ, of ד with ר, of ה with ח, of ו with י, of ז with נ, of ת with פ, of מ with ם. Examples of such interchanges have been occasionally referred to above.

The confusion of ר and ד was particularly common. So, too, the confusion ב and כ. On ח and ה compare above, § 77; and specially on מ and ם, Isaiah xxx. 4, חנם, LXX. חנם. It should further be remembered here, that the forms of the old Hebrew letters have also to be taken into consideration (§ 75), because here other similarities may have led to interchanges. Examples are: Zeph. iii. 13, where the received נגי ממועד might easily originate in the old system of writing from the original (as preserved in the LXX.) כְּיוֹם מוֹעֵד; also Isaiah xix. 18, where הרס might in a similar way originate from צדק; and Isaiah xvii. 9, upon which Lagarde, *Semitica*, i. 31, should be consulted.

Abbreviations were misunderstood. In particular, it cannot be doubted that יהוה even in ancient times had been sometimes written only as י. Then the LXX. presupposes in Jer. xxv. 37, אפי for אף יהוה, and conversely the LXX. had read in Jonah i. 3, עבד יהוה, instead of עברי, and in Ps. xvi. 3, יהוה מהאדיר, instead of מה אדירי[ה]. Compare also Hitzig on Jer. iii. 19 and vi. 11. So, too, it would seem that here and there in the Scriptures transcribers made use of contractions for the grammatical endings, in which cases then the marks of abbreviation might easily have been overlooked. Thus Lowth and Cheyne conjecture in Isaiah v. 1, דודים, instead of דודי, and Derenbourg, in Ps. cxlvii. 17, מים יעמדו, instead of מי יעמד. So, too, in Isaiah li. 4, read עַמִּים for עַמִּי. Compare also Klostermann on 1 Sam. xiv. 34; and in general, J. D. Michaëlis, *Orient. und exeget. Biblioth.* 20. 37; Löw, *Graphische Requisiten*, pp. 44–53; Frankel, *Vorstudien*, p. 215.

Sometimes errors in the text rest upon wrongly supplied vowel letters (§ 79), *e.g.* 2 Sam. xiii. 18, where מְעוֹלָם should be read instead of מעילים. Perhaps also the *Q're* הִוא referred to in § 92 should be so judged, for originally it would be written הא.

The false dividing of words plays a very considerable *rôle*, the possibility of which may be seen from what is said in § 83. Not infrequently is a letter separated from its own word and added to the next. Even the Jewish tradition was aware of some of these cases, as we have already seen (§ 33),

for their corrected readings in such passages as 2 Sam. v. 2, Job xxxviii. 12, Jer. iv. 5, Ezra iv. 12, are quite right. But we meet with this phenomenon very frequently. Thus in the already cited passages, Hos. vi. 5, Jer. xv. 10, xxiii. 33, Ps. xlii. 6 f., and, further, in Neh. i. 12, read עברו ענתך; Ps. lxii. 4, read גדרה דחויה; Ps. xliv. 5, read אלהי מצוה; Gen. xlix. 19 f., read עקבם אשר; Eccles. vii. 27, read אמר הקהלת, etc. Of a somewhat similar kind are the cases where a letter which concludes one word and at the same time begins the second, is through an oversight only written once: *e.g.* 2 Sam. v. 2, read המביא את; Jer. liii. 10, read החליא; Zech. iv. 7, read אתה ההר; Ps. xlii. 2, read כאילת; Ps. civ. 18, read ההרים; Job xxxiii. 17, read ממעשה; Eccles. ii. 24 f., מישיאכל, etc. And such cases as those in which an initial and final letter has been wrongly reduplicated: *e.g.* Jer. vi. 20, read טוב; Neh. ii. 14, read מלאכך; Ps. xxii. 31, read יבא, etc.

Passages where letters have been transposed are found in: Ps. xviii. 46, ויחרגו, on the contrary, 2 Sam. ii. 22, ויחגרו; Ps. lxxii. 5, ויראוך, read ויאריך; Isa. viii. 12, קשר, which probably is to be altered into קדש (with ד for ר). False repetitions are found in Jer. iv. 25, where יום [ים] has arisen out of הנביאים by repeating final sound; Jer. viii. 3, where the second הנשארים, and Isa. xli. 1, where יחליפו כח (compare xl. 31), are to be struck out (compare also Ps. xviii. 14).

A well-known cause of textual errors is the similar beginning of two clauses, of which then the second came to be overlooked. An example is found in Josh. xv. 59, where a whole series of names of places has disappeared from the Massoretic text (compare the LXX.). Not less was the danger attending the adding of omitted passages of the text in the margin, because the signs of correction might easily be misunderstood. In this way are explained passages where the succession of clauses is evidently in confusion, *e.g.* 2 Sam. xix. 12, where the words חמלך . . . ודבר belong to v. 11 (compare the LXX.), and Ps. xxxiv., where v. 16 and v. 17 must be transposed. While in these cases a simple transposition is sufficient, there are other passages to be met with, where various portions foreign to the original text have been

introduced through the incorporation of marginal notes. Thus originated the words standing in a falsified passage, Isa. xxxviii. 21 f., introduced from 2 Kings xx. 7 f. Many passages of this sort are indeed subjects of controversy, but the existence of interpolations, *e.g.* in Isa. vii. 8, ix. 13 f., xxix. 10, has now at last been placed beyond all doubt. In Dan. ii. 4, indeed, ארמית was originally a parenthesis applying to the whole passage ii. 4–vii. 28, the adoption of which into the text brought with it the change of ויאמרו into וידברו. (compare also Ezra iv. 7).

99. It only remains for us now to bind together in one comprehensive description of the historical development of the Old Testament what has been brought out in the preceding sections (§ 92 ff.). It has been shown that the form of the text, as it now lies before us, in all essential respects can be traced back to the first century after Christ, while we have sure witnesses to prove that in the time before Christ a form of text did exist which diverged considerably from the one we now possess. As concerns the Pentateuch, this pre-Christian text had been widely circulated, though indeed in various, and in part divergent, copies, and yet this old text cannot be characterised as one superior to the one that subsequently became the received text. So also in regard to the other book, for which only the LXX. is the oldest witness, sometimes the Alexandrine translation, sometimes the subsequently received text, has preserved the original. Already this distinction of the pre-Christian and post-Christian age suggests the conjecture, that the domination of the received text is to be ascribed to the endeavours of the same men who, shortly after Christ, finally settled the question as to the extent and range of the Old Testament Canon (§ 6). The necessity that everything that concerned Scripture, the peculiar source and centre of Jewish life and activity after the fall of Jerusalem, should be made perfectly certain and immovably steadfast, carried with it also the demand that the text must receive a

fixed form, which was of consequence especially in controversies with the Christians, who were dependent upon the LXX. If, therefore, we were to refer to men such as R. Akiba and his like-minded contemporaries, as those who have on this point also procured for the Jews certainty and unity, it would be in perfect consistency with this view, that we should meet for the first time with this form of the text which has held the sway from that time onwards in Aquila, who was dependent upon R. Akiba or his immediate contemporaries (§ 52). How strongly the Jews felt themselves in subsequent times bound to this authorised text is shown in a striking manner in this, that no one ventured to change it, even in passages where he rightly felt convinced of its incorrectness, whether it be that this insight had been obtained by means of reflection or by the remembrance of other and in part more suitable readings (§ 33).

Of the style and manner in which this authorised text was constructed we unfortunately know nothing definitely. This much only is plain, that the very conception of such an authorised form of text implies the existence of a definite standard manuscript, which was pronounced the only allowable one. In so far, the relatively recent but already widespread theory, that all extant manuscripts point back to one single archetype, is decidedly correct. Such a standard manuscript might secure currency, either by means of direct transcription, or by means of this, that in a greater or less degree the extant manuscripts were corrected in accordance with it (הַגִּיהַ כְּיָן, *e.g. jer., Sanhed.* ii. fol. 20*c*); and so we see also this established text pushing its way in a remarkably short time wherever the Pharisaic influence extended. On the other hand, the equally widespread theory that this primitive Codex obtained this position by mere arbitrary choice, or by the manuscripts of the several books that by chance were at hand being bound together into one standard

Bible, is by no means certain. Even if this may have been the case with particular books,—for example, with the Book of Samuel (§ 95), where surely the manifest errors of the text would scarcely have been allowed to stand if the authorised text had been established by means of the collation of several manuscripts,—it certainly had not been the only principle employed, least of all in the case of the Law. The Jewish tradition, indeed, expressly declares that in the establishing of the Pentateuch text various manuscripts were collated, and that only in this way was an authentic form of the text produced (*jer. Taanith* iv.); and we have absolutely no right to regard the tradition as a fiction. On the other hand, it is quite correct to say that the critical activity in these matters was reduced to a minimum, so that, *e.g.*, the parallel texts of the Old Testament (§ 73) were not brought into harmony, and that in no case was an endeavour made to bring about correspondence between the authorised text and the ancient spoken form of the text, which lay at the foundation of the distinction between the *Qᵉre* and the *Kᵉtîb*. But this fidelity to the objective witnesses for the text is in fact to be considered as a great benefit, since at that time a more subjective criticism, through its dependence upon dogmatic motives and unhistorical principles, would have been productive of incurable mischief. Inadequate as the method of textual criticism certainly was which is indicated in the passages quoted from the Talmud—namely, in the choice of readings, to let the matter be determined by the number of the witnesses—the several passages in the Old Testament that have been intentionally changed show (§ 97) what the result would have been if a subjective criticism had had freer play in the establishing of the authorised text.

By means of the hypothesis of such a primitive exemplar, from which all later manuscripts were transcribed, we may finally explain a part of several abnormal forms which with

pedantic scrupulosity have been preserved down to our own days (§ 77). The irregularly large or small letters, of which mention is to some extent already made in the Babylonian Talmud, may have been occasioned by inequalities or some other defect in the material of that standard manuscript, for later copyists out of reverence for their pattern slavishly imitated them. Also the so-called *litteræ suspensæ* may indeed in part be omitted letters which in that manuscript were added above the other letters.

Rich. Simon (*Histoire Critique du V. T.* liv. i. chap. xviii., ed. Rotterdam 1685, p, 101) points out the importance of the early years of the Christian era for the establishment of this text: "Et ainsi cette grande aversion des Juifs pour la Traduction des Septante, n'a commencé qu'après plusieurs disputes qu'ils eurent avec les Chrétiens; et ce fut principalement dans ce temps-là que les Juifs s'appliquèrent au sens littéral de l'Écriture et à rendre les exemplaires hébreux les plus corrects qu'il leur fut possible."

The derivation of all manuscripts from one Archetype has been maintained by Rosenmüller (*Vorrede zur Stereotypausgabe des A. T.* 1834), Olshausen (*Die Psalmen*, 1853, pp. 17 f., 337 f.), Lagarde (*Anmerkungen zur griech. Uebers. d. Proverbien*, 1863, p. 1 f.; *GGA*, 1870, p. 1549 ff.), Nöldeke (*Alttestament. Literatur*, p. 241), etc. Compare also *ZAW*, ix. 303; and on the other side, *ZWKL*, 1887, p. 278 ff. Lagarde has formulated this theory in a quite peculiar style in the Preface referred to in § 97; but compare Kuenen's reply there also referred to. Against the hypothesis that the standard manuscript consisted of manuscripts arbitrarily put together, compare Dillmann in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*, ii. 388.

Jer. Taanith, iv. fol. 68*b*: "Three Torah Codices were found in the temple Court, Codex מעון, Codex זעטוט, and Codex היא. In one there was מעון (Deut. xxxiii. 27), while the two others had מעונה; one had זעטוטי (Ex. xxiv. 5; compare Levy, *Neuhebräisches Wörterbuch* i. 507), the other two נערי; one

had nine times הוא, the others eleven times היא. In all three cases the two were held to and the one rejected." Compare *Masseket Soph'rim* vi. 4, p. xii. Fürst's *Remarks on an Ezra Codex* (*Kanon d. A. T.* p. 117) rest, as Strack has shown, on a wrong reading, *b. Moed Kat.* 18*b*; compare Rabbinovicz, *Variæ Lectiones in Mischnam*, ii. 61.

The similarity of the post-Christian forms of the text spoken of in the above section is naturally true only upon the whole, and does not exclude, as follows indeed from the facts already set forth in §§ 92–93, all sorts of small divergences. An important question, the exhaustive answer to which, however, requires the performance of the task referred to in § 93, is to determine the exact relation between the Massoretic text and the Archetypal texts of Aquila, Symmachus, and Jerome. In a remarkable way the Hebrew manuscripts, which certainly were derived from the most diverse regions, seem to form a unity over against those translators, because the variations present in these are only extremely seldom repeated in any one manuscript. Evidently the rigid stability of form which resulted from the labours of the Massoretes called into being new standard texts, on which the manuscripts are directly dependent, which, however, were themselves collateral with the manuscripts used by those translators.

MORRISON AND GIBB, PRINTERS, EDINBURGH.

PUBLICATIONS OF

T. & T. CLARK,

38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH.

LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT & CO. LIMITED.

Adam (J., D.D.)—An Exposition of the Epistle of James. 8vo, 9s.

Ahlfeld (Dr.), etc.—The Voice from the Cross. Cr. 8vo, price 5s.

Alcock (Deborah)—The Seven Churches of Asia. 1s.

Alexander (Prof. W. Lindsay)—Biblical Theology. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Alexander (Dr. J. A.)—Commentary on Isaiah. Two vols. 8vo, 17s.

Allen (Prof. A. V. G.)—Life of Jonathan Edwards. Fcap. 8vo, 5s.

Ante-Nicene Christian Library—A Collection of all the Works of the Fathers of the Christian Church prior to the Council of Nicæa. Twenty-four vols. 8vo, Subscription price, £6, 6s.

Augustine's Works—Edited by Marcus Dods, D.D. Fifteen vols. 8vo, Subscription price, £3, 19s. nett.

Bannerman (Prof.)—The Church of Christ. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Bannerman (D. D., D.D.)—The Doctrine of the Church. 8vo, 12s.

Baumgarten (Professor)—Apostolic History. Three vols. 8vo, 27s.

Beck (Dr.)—Outlines of Biblical Psychology. Crown 8vo, 4s.

——— Pastoral Theology in the New Testament. Crown 8vo, 6s.

Bengel—Gnomon of the New Testament. With Original Notes, Explanatory and Illustrative. Five vols. 8vo, Subscription price, 31s. 6d. *Cheaper Edition, the five volumes bound in three*, 24s.

Besser's Christ the Life of the World. Price 6s.

Bible-Class Handbooks. Crown 8vo.

Binnie (Prof.)—The Church, 1s. 6d.

Brown (Principal)—The Epistle to the Romans, 2s.

Candlish (Prof.)—The Christian Sacraments, 1s. 6d.—The Work of the Holy Spirit, 1s. 6d.—Christian Doctrine of God, 1s. 6d.

Davidson (Prof.)—The Epistle to the Hebrews, 2s. 6d.

Dods (Prof.)—Post-Exilian Prophets, 2s. Book of Genesis, 2s.

Douglas (Principal)—Book of Joshua, 1s. 6d. Book of Judges, 1s. 3d. Obadiah to Zephaniah, 1s. 6d.

Hamilton (T., D.D.)—Irish Presbyterian Church History, 2s.

Henderson (Archibald, D.D.)—Palestine, with Maps, 2s. 6d.

Innes (A. Taylor)—Church and State. 3s.

Kilpatrick (T. B., B.D.)—Butler's Three Sermons on Human Nature, 1s. 6d.

Lindsay (Prof.)—St. Mark's Gospel, 2s. 6d.—St. Luke's Gospel, Part I., 2s.; Part II., 1s. 3d.—The Reformation, 2s.—The Acts of the Apostles, two vols., 1s. 6d. each.

Macgregor (Prof.)—The Epistle to the Galatians, 1s. 6d.

——— Book of Exodus. Two vols., 2s. each.

Macpherson (John, M.A.)—Presbyterianism, 1s. 6d. The Westminster Confession of Faith, 2s. The Sum of Saving Knowledge, 1s. 6d.

Murphy (Prof.)—The Books of Chronicles, 1s. 6d.

Reith (Geo., M.A.)—St. John's Gospel. Two vols., 2s. each.

Scrymgeour (Wm.)—Lessons on the Life of Christ, 2s. 6d.

Stalker (James, D.D.)—Life of Christ, 1s. 6d. Life of St. Paul, 1s. 6d.

Smith (George, LL.D.)—A Short History of Missions, 2s. 6d.

Thomson (W. D., M.A.)—Christian Miracles and Conclusions of Science, 2s.

Walker (Norman L., D.D.)—Scottish Church History, 1s. 6d.

Whyte (Alexander, D.D.)—The Shorter Catechism, 2s. 6d.

Bible-Class Primers. Paper covers, 6d. each; free by post, 7d. In cloth, 8d. each; free by post, 9d.

Croskery (Prof.)—Joshua and the Conquest. Given (Prof.)—The Kings of Judah. Gloag (Paton J., D.D.)—Life of Paul. Iverach (James, M.A.)—Life of Moses. Paterson (Prof. J. A.)—Period of the Judges.

Gieseler (Dr. J. C. L.)—ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY. Four vols. 8vo, £2, 2s.

Gifford (Canon)—VOICES OF THE PROPHETS. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Given (Rev. Prof. J. J.)—THE TRUTHS OF SCRIPTURE IN CONNECTION WITH REVELATION, INSPIRATION, AND THE CANON. 8vo, 6s.

Glasgow (Prof.)—APOCALYPSE TRANSLATED AND EXPOUNDED. 8vo, 10/6.

Gloag (Paton J., D.D.)—A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— THE MESSIANIC PROPHECIES. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

——— INTRODUCTION TO THE PAULINE EPISTLES. 8vo, 12s.

——— INTRODUCTION TO THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— EXEGETICAL STUDIES. Crown 8vo, 5s.

Godet (Prof.)—COMMENTARY ON ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— COMMENTARY ON ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.

——— COMMENTARY ON EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— COMMENTARY ON 1ST EPISTLE TO CORINTHIANS. 2 vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— LECTURES IN DEFENCE OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. Cr. 8vo, 6s.

Goebel (Siegfried)—THE PARABLES OF JESUS. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Gotthold's Emblems; or, INVISIBLE THINGS UNDERSTOOD BY THINGS THAT ARE MADE. Crown 8vo, 5s.

Grimm's GREEK-ENGLISH LEXICON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. Translated, Revised, and Enlarged by JOSEPH H. THAYER, D.D. Demy 4to, 36s.

Guyot (Arnold, LL.D.)—CREATION; or, The Biblical Cosmogony in the Light of Modern Science. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 5s. 6d.

Hagenbach (Dr. K. R.)—HISTORY OF DOCTRINES. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.

——— HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Hall (Rev. Newman, LL.B.)—THE LORD'S PRAYER. 2nd Ed., cr. 8vo, 6s.

——— GETHSEMANE; or, Leaves of Healing from the Garden of Grief. Crown 8vo, 5s.

Hamilton (T., D.D.)—BEYOND THE STARS; or, Heaven, its Inhabitants, Occupations, and Life. Second Edition, crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Harless (Dr. C. A.)—SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Harris (Rev. S., D.D.)—THE PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS OF THEISM. 8vo, 12s.

——— THE SELF-REVELATION OF GOD. 8vo, 12s.

Haupt (Erich)—THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. JOHN. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Hävernick (H. A. Ch.)—INTRODUCTION TO OLD TESTAMENT. 10s. 6d.

Heard (Rev. J. B., M.A.)—THE TRIPARTITE NATURE OF MAN—SPIRIT, SOUL, AND BODY. Fifth Edition, crown 8vo, 6s.

——— OLD AND NEW THEOLOGY. A Constructive Critique. Cr. 8vo, 6s.

Hefele (Bishop)—A HISTORY OF THE COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH. Vol. I., to A.D. 325; Vol. II., A.D. 326 to 429. Vol. III., A.D. 431 to the close of the Council of Chalcedon, 451. 8vo, 12s. each.

Hengstenberg (Professor)—COMMENTARY ON PSALMS. 3 vols. 8vo, 33s.

——— COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES, ETC. 8vo, 9s.

——— THE PROPHECIES OF EZEKIEL ELUCIDATED. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— THE GENUINENESS OF DANIEL, etc. 8vo, 12s.

——— HISTORY OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— CHRISTOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. Four vols. 8vo, £2, 2s.

——— ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Herzog—ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF BIBLICAL, HISTORICAL, DOCTRINAL, AND PRACTICAL THEOLOGY. *Based on the Real-Encyklopädie of Herzog, Plitt, and Hauck.* Edited by Prof. SCHAFF, D.D. In three vols., price 24s. each.

——— ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF LIVING DIVINES, ETC., OF ALL DENOMINATIONS IN EUROPE AND AMERICA. (*Supplement to Herzog's Encyclopœdia.*) Imp. 8vo, 8s.

Hutchison (John, D.D.)—COMMENTARY ON THESSALONIANS. 8vo, 9s.

Hutchison (John, D.D.)—COMMENTARY ON PHILIPPIANS. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Janet (Paul)—FINAL CAUSES. By PAUL JANET, Member of the Institute. Translated from the French. Second Edition, demy 8vo, 12s.

——— THE THEORY OF MORALS. Demy 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Johnstone (Prof. R., D.D.)—COMMENTARY ON 1ST PETER. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Jones (E. E. C.)—ELEMENTS OF LOGIC. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Jouffroy—PHILOSOPHICAL ESSAYS. Fcap. 8vo, 5s.

Kant—THE METAPHYSIC OF ETHICS. Crown 8vo, 6s.

——— PHILOSOPHY OF LAW. Trans. by W. HASTIE, B.D. Cr. 8vo, 5s.

——— PRINCIPLES OF POLITICS, etc. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Keil (Prof.)—COMMENTARY ON THE PENTATEUCH, 3 vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.; JOSHUA, JUDGES, AND RUTH, 8vo, 10s. 6d.; BOOKS OF SAMUEL, 8vo, 10s. 6d.; BOOKS OF KINGS, 8vo, 10s. 6d.; CHRONICLES, 8vo, 10s. 6d.; EZRA, NEHEMIAH, ESTHER, 8vo, 10s. 6d.; JEREMIAH, 2 vols. 8vo, 21s.; EZEKIEL, 2 vols. 8vo, 21s.; DANIEL, 8vo, 10s. 6d.; MINOR PROPHETS, 2 vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— MANUAL OF HISTORICO-CRITICAL INTRODUCTION TO THE CANONICAL SCRIPTURES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— HANDBOOK OF BIBLICAL ARCHÆOLOGY. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Keymer (Rev. N., M.A.)—NOTES ON GENESIS. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d.

Killen (Prof.)—THE FRAMEWORK OF THE CHURCH. A Treatise on Church Government. 8vo, 9s.

——— THE OLD CATHOLIC CHURCH; or, The History, Doctrine, Worship, and Polity of the Christians, traced to A.D. 755. 8vo, 9s.

——— THE IGNATIAN EPISTLES ENTIRELY SPURIOUS. Cr. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

König (Dr. F. E.)—THE RELIGIOUS HISTORY OF ISRAEL. Cr. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Krummacher (Dr. F. W.)—THE SUFFERING SAVIOUR; or, Meditations on the Last Days of the Sufferings of Christ. Eighth Edition, crown 8vo, 6s.

——— DAVID, THE KING OF ISRAEL. Second Edition, cr. 8vo, 6s.

——— AUTOBIOGRAPHY. Crown 8vo, 6s.

Kurtz (Prof.)—HANDBOOK OF CHURCH HISTORY. Two vols. 8vo, 15s.

——— HISTORY OF THE OLD COVENANT. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.

Ladd (Prof. G. T.)—THE DOCTRINE OF SACRED SCRIPTURE: A Critical, Historical, and Dogmatic Inquiry into the Origin and Nature of the Old and New Testaments. Two vols. 8vo, 1600 pp., 24s.

Laidlaw (Prof.)—THE BIBLE DOCTRINE OF MAN. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Lane (Laura M.)—LIFE OF ALEXANDER VINET. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Lange (J. P., D.D.)—THE LIFE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. Edited by MARCUS DODS, D.D. 2nd Ed., in 4 vols. 8vo, Subscription price, 28s.

——— COMMENTARIES ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS. Edited by PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D. OLD TESTAMENT, 14 vols.; NEW TESTAMENT, 10 vols.; APOCRYPHA, 1 vol. Subscription price, nett, 15s. each.

——— ON ST. MATTHEW AND ST. MARK. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.

——— ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE. Two vols. 8vo, 18s.

——— ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Lechler (Prof. G. V., D.D.)—THE APOSTOLIC AND POST-APOSTOLIC TIMES. Their Diversity and Unity in Life and Doctrine. 2 vols. cr. 8vo, 16s.

Lehmann (Pastor)—SCENES FROM THE LIFE OF JESUS. Cr. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Lewis (Tayler, LL.D.)—THE SIX DAYS OF CREATION. Cr. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Lichtenberger (F., D.D.)—HISTORY OF GERMAN THEOLOGY IN THE 19TH CENTURY. 8vo, 14s.

Lilley (J. P., M.A.)—THE LORD'S SUPPER: Its Origin, Nature, and Use. Crown 8vo, 5s.

Lisco (F. G.)—PARABLES OF JESUS EXPLAINED. Fcap. 8vo, 5s.

Lotze (Hermann)—MICROCOSMUS: An Essay concerning Man and his relation to the World. Fourth Edition, two vols. 8vo (1450 pages), 36s.

Luthardt, Kahnis, and Brückner—THE CHURCH. Crown 8vo, 5s.

Luthardt (Prof.)—ST. JOHN THE AUTHOR OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL. 7s. 6d.

——— ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL DESCRIBED AND EXPLAINED ACCORDING TO ITS PECULIAR CHARACTER. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.

——— APOLOGETIC LECTURES ON THE FUNDAMENTAL (6 *Ed.*), SAVING (5 *Ed.*), MORAL TRUTHS OF CHRISTIANITY (3 *Ed.*). 3 vols. cr. 8vo, 6s. each.

——— HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS. Vol. I., 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Macdonald—INTRODUCTION TO PENTATEUCH. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— THE CREATION AND FALL. 8vo, 12s.

Mair (A., D.D.)—STUDIES IN THE CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES. Second Edition, crown 8vo, 6s.

Martensen (Bishop)—CHRISTIAN DOGMATICS: A Compendium of the Doctrines of Christianity. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— CHRISTIAN ETHICS. (GENERAL — INDIVIDUAL — SOCIAL.) Three vols. 8vo, 10s. 6d. each.

Matheson (Geo., D.D.)—GROWTH OF THE SPIRIT OF CHRISTIANITY, from the First Century to the Dawn of the Lutheran Era. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— AIDS TO THE STUDY OF GERMAN THEOLOGY. 3rd Edition, 4s. 6d.

Meyer (Dr.) — CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARIES ON THE NEW TESTAMENT. Twenty vols. 8vo. *Subscription Price*, £5, 5s. *nett; Non-Subscription Price*, 10s. 6d. each volume.

ST. MATTHEW'S GOSPEL, two vols.; MARK AND LUKE, two vols.; ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL, two vols.; ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, two vols.; ROMANS, two vols.; CORINTHIANS, two vols.; GALATIANS, one vol.; EPHESIANS AND PHILEMON, one vol.; PHILIPPIANS AND COLOSSIANS, one vol.; THESSALONIANS (*Dr. Lünemann*), one vol.; THE PASTORAL EPISTLES (*Dr. Huther*), one vol.; HEBREWS (*Dr. Lünemann*), one vol.; ST. JAMES AND ST. JOHN'S EPISTLES (*Huther*), one vol.; PETER AND JUDE (*Dr. Huther*), one vol.

Michie (Charles, M.A.)—BIBLE WORDS AND PHRASES. 18mo, 1s.

Monrad (Dr. D. G.)—THE WORLD OF PRAYER. Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d.

Morgan (J., D.D.)—SCRIPTURE TESTIMONY TO THE HOLY SPIRIT. 7s. 6d.

——— EXPOSITION OF THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Müller (Dr. Julius)—THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF SIN. An entirely New Translation from the Fifth German Edition. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Murphy (Professor)—COMMENTARY ON THE PSALMS. 8vo, 12s.

——— A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON EXODUS. 9s.

Naville (Ernest)—THE PROBLEM OF EVIL. Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d.

——— THE CHRIST. Translated by Rev. T. J. DESPRÉS. Cr. 8vo, 4s. 6d.

——— MODERN PHYSICS: Studies Historical and Philosophical. Translated by Rev. HENRY DOWNTON, M.A. Crown 8vo, 5s.

Neander (Dr.)—GENERAL HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION AND CHURCH. Eight vols. 8vo, £2, 2s. *nett.*

Nicoll (W. R., LL.D.)—THE INCARNATE SAVIOUR: A Life of Jesus Christ. Crown 8vo, 6s.

Novalis—HYMNS AND THOUGHTS ON RELIGION. Crown 8vo, 4s.

Oehler (Prof.)—THEOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. 2 vols. 8vo, 21s.

Olshausen (Dr. H.)—BIBLICAL COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPELS AND ACTS. Four vols. 8vo, £2, 2s. *Cheaper Edition*, four vols. crown 8vo, 24s.

——— ROMANS, one vol. 8vo, 10s. 6d.; CORINTHIANS, one vol. 8vo, 9s.; PHILIPPIANS, TITUS, AND FIRST TIMOTHY, one vol. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Oosterzee (Dr. Van)—THE YEAR OF SALVATION. Words of Life for Every Day. A Book of Household Devotion. Two vols. 8vo, 6s. each.

——— MOSES: A Biblical Study. Crown 8vo, 6s.

Orelli—OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECY OF THE CONSUMMATION OF GOD'S KINGDOM. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— COMMENTARY ON ISAIAH. 8vo, 10s. 6d. JEREMIAH. 8vo, 10s. 6d.