ARTICLE IX.

CRITICAL NOTES.

FURTHER READINGS FROM THE CODEX HUNTINGTONIANUS.

Our readers will await with great interest the publication of Mr. E. S. Buchanan's edition of the Codex Huntingtonianus discovered by him in the Hispanic Society Museum in New York, of which a partial account was given in the July Bibliotheca Sacra. In the meantime Mr. Buchanan furnishes the following important additions from the readings in the manuscript, confirming in the main the so-called Western Text. Of special interest is the reading of Matt. xvi. 18, coinciding as it does with the Beatus manuscript in omitting Peter and Church. Throughout the manuscript, also, the readings magnify the Holy Spirit, and the higher conceptions of Christ's divinity.

ST. MATTHEW XIII. 36-43.

36 His disciples came unto Jesus, saying, Explain unto us the parable of the wheat and the tares of the field. 37 And He answered and said, He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man; 38 AND THE FIELD IS THE SPIRIT OF MAN; AND THE GOOD SEED, THESE ARE THE DISCIPLES OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. The tares are the wicked men. 39 And the enemy that sowed them is the devil; and the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels of the Holy Spirit. 40 For as men gather tares together, so shall it be in the end of the world. 41 The Son of man shall lead forth the angels of the Holy Spirit, and they shall gather out of His kingdom all things that offend, and the men that cause offenses. 42 [Omitted in MS.] 43 Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in My kingdom. He that hath a spiritual ear, let him hear.

ST. MATTHEW XVI. 13-19.

13 Umet dominus Iesus in partes cesare philippi: et interrogavit discipulos suos dicens. Quem dicunt homines 13 When the Lord Jesus came into the parts of Caesarea Philippi, He asked His disciples, saying, Who do men say that the
esse filium hominis? 14 At illi dixerunt. Alii iohannem bab-
tistam: alii autem heilam: alii uero theremiam: aut unum
ex propheticis. 15 Dicit illis
ihesus: Uos autem quem me
esse dicitis? 16 Respondit sy-
mon petrus et dicit: Tu et
pater tuus et spiritus sanctus
solus deus. 17 Respondens au-
tem ihesus dicit illi. Beatus
et pater meus celestis per spiritum sanctum.
18 Et ego dico tibi: quia super
hanc petram hedificabuntur per
spiritum sanctum discipuli eius.
19 Et quocumque spiritus san-
tus ligauerit super terram: ego
et pater meus ligabimus in celis.
Per spiritum sanctum omnia peccata dimittuntur.

EXODUS xx. 12-17.

Hec dicit dominus deus: Honora
patrem tuum et matrem tuam
ubi sunt longeui super terram:
quam dominus deus tuus dabit
uobis. Non occides: non meca-
beris: non furtum facies: non
suggeres falsa contra proxim-
um tuum: non concupisces
rem proximi tui: non desidera-
abis seruum: non ancillam: non
bouem: non aBinum: nec omnia
que illius sunt.

Son of man is? 14 And they
said, Some say John the Bapt-
ist; some Elias; and others,
Jeremias, or one of the proph-
ets. 15 Jesus saith unto them,
But who say ye that I am?
16 And Simon Peter answered
and said, THOU AND THY FATHER
AND THE HOLY SPIRIT ARE GOD
ALONE. 17 And Jesus answered
and said unto him, Blessed art
thou, Simon; for flesh and blood
hath not revealed it unto thee,
but My heavenly Father by the
Holy Spirit. 18 And I say unto
thee, UPON THIS ROCK SHALL BE
BUILT BY THE HOLY SPIRIT HIS
DISCIPLES. 19 And whatsoever
the Holy Spirit shall bind on
earth, I and My Father will
bind in heaven. And whatso-
ever the Holy Spirit shall loose
on earth, I and My Father will
loose in heaven. By the Holy
Spirit are forgiven all sins.

(1) The Fourth Commandment has no longer a promise
attached to its observance; but is an unconditioned command
to honor the aged and infirm in the midst of newfound prosperity in the land of Canaan.

(2) The Ninth Commandment is raised immeasurably higher. Not even by word or gesture is slander to be suggested, much less spoken. All malice is strangled at birth by this striking new form of text. The Spanish text seems more in keeping with the spiritual teaching of Christ Himself.

(3) The Tenth Commandment has two important changes. First, not only our neighbor's house is forbidden to be coveted, but his material possessions of every kind whatsoever. And, secondly, a man's wife is no longer classed with his house and his slave—after the first and before the second. The mention of the wife in this commandment is not necessary if the Seventh Commandment is observed.

The summary of the Ten Commandments as given by Christ Himself is also found in a new form:

ST. MATTHEW XXII. 37-39.


Our Lord's answer to the Pharisees in the matter of divorce is considerably different in the Spanish text, and warns us to be careful about adopting any ecclesiastical rulings founded on texts of doubtful authenticity, especially when these, as they are found in the Textus Receptus, exhibit a legalistic form somewhat unlike the general teaching of Christ Himself.

ST. MARK X. 2-9.

2 Et accedentes pharisei interrogabant eum si licet uxor rem dimittere temptantes eum. 2 And the Pharisees came and asked Him, Is it lawful for a man to put away a wife? tempting Him. 3 At ille respondens dixit eis. 3. And He answered
Quid uobis precepit Moses? 4 Qui dixerunt moyses permisit libellum repudii scribere et dimittere. 5 Quibus respondens Iesus ait: 6 Ab inicio masculum et feminam fecit eos deus. 7 Propter hoc relinquet homo patrem suum et matrem et adherebit uxori sui: 8 et erunt spiritus duo in carne una. Itaque iam non sunt duo: sed unus spiritus. 9 Quos ergo deus conjunctit: non separabat homo.

and said unto them, What did Moses command you? 4 And they said, Moses allowed a bill of divorcement to be written, and a wife to be put away. 5 Jesus answered and said unto them: 6 From the beginning God made them man and woman. 7 Because of this a man will leave his father and mother and cleave to his wife: 8 And they shall be two spirits in one flesh. Therefore they are no more two, but one spirit. 9 Those whom God hath joined together, no man will separate.

The omissions in the text are quite as notable as the changes. Marriages made by God are not dissolved by men.

I CORINTHIANS XI. 4.

Caritas patiens est: non hominum gloriam sed dei gloriam emulatur: non agit perperam: non inflatur.

Love is patient: hath no zeal for the glory of man, but only for the glory of God: wrongeth no man: is not puffed up.

Finally, our Lord's new threefold attestation to the Holy Spirit in St. Mark ix. 23 from its especial interest ought to be made known as soon and as widely as possible:—

ST. MARK IX. 23.

Ihesus autem ait illi: Si potes in spiritu sancto credere: omnia possibilia per spiritum sanctum homini in spiritu sancto credenti.

And Jesus said unto him: If thou canst believe in the Holy Spirit, all things are possible by the Holy Spirit to a man believing in the Holy Spirit.

These extracts are sufficient to show that the new Spanish text is independent in its first copied form of the revisions of Origen or St. Jerome, and therefore of quite extraordinary interest.
ON EXODUS II. 9.

In Ex. ii. 9 the Massoretic text has “And the daughter of Pharaoh said unto her הeliness this boy.” It is generally recognized that there is something wrong with this word, and the commentators accordingly suggest that it is a scribal error for הילן. But the word is unnatural as applied to a babe. I notice, however, that the Vulgate has accipe and the Armenian cape. These point to a text having ‘ני ‘take.’ The latter part of the verse, ‘and the woman took’ (נָּמִּים) appears to support this reading. If it be correct, our Massoretic text will have arisen from the words in verse 8, “And the daughter of Pharaoh said unto her יִרְאֵּה go,” the ꔨ coming in from the final letter of Pharaoh. Such an error would be exceedingly easy in view of the repeated “And the daughter of Pharaoh said unto her” of our present text.

HAROLD M. WIENER.


ON JOSHUA III. 13.

The latter part of this verse is in a very bad state. We read in the Massoretic text: “The waters of the Jordan shall be cut, the waters that come down from above: and they shall stand in one heap.” The best text of the LXX has “the water of the Jordan shall fail, but the water that cometh down shall stand.” That is obviously nonsense. The Vulgate reads “Aqua, quae inferiores sunt, decurrent atque deficient: quae autem desuper veniant, in una mole consistant.” Accordingly we have three different texts. The commentators are not illuminating. Mr. S. Holmes (Joshua: The Hebrew and Greek Texts, p. 23), who is unacquainted with the Vulgate, nevertheless throws some light on the problem. He writes of the Massoretic text: “Of the last six words, three are not represented in L.XX. Following a hint of Dillmann we may conjecture that L.XX represents an intermediate stage between the original Hebrew and the M. T. The verse originally ended at יִרְאֵּה. A scribe added the first three words.
of v. 16 — to judge from the anomalous grammar of — quite mechanically. This text the LXX translator rendered. A later scribe, in order to make the two clauses correspond, introduced the remaining three words from v. 16."

On reading the Hebrew, one thing that has been overlooked appears to me perfectly clear. We have "... in the waters of the Jordan, the waters of the Jordan shall be cut," etc. It leaps to the eyes that the second "the waters of the Jordan" is due to dittography. Then the text will have run "... in the waters of the Jordan, the waters shall be cut". It seems to me that the dittography in the first instance rendered this text unintelligible, and led to the supplementing from verse 16 by glossators. In favor of this view it should be noted: first, that the repetition of the phrase "waters of the Jordan" is intolerably tautologous; and, secondly, that the words may have been unknown to Jerome. He seems, however, to have had two verbs (decurrent atque deficient) and further glossing. His second verb (deficient) apparently comes from verse 16 too. At the same time it was probably before the Greek translators in this passage, and is represented by ἐπελεύσει "shall fail." The form of the Hebrew verb with the ל however, proves its genuineness (see BS, Oct. 1914, pp. 620, 621, and footnote), and I can see no ground for preferring the alternative verb.

Accordingly I differ from Mr. Holmes in rejecting the phrase that appears to me to be due to dittography, and in retaining the word הים. Further, I hold that the accidental repetition of the phrase "waters of the Jordan" was the original cause of all the trouble, and led to various attempts to improve the verse by glossing, giving us our three divergent texts.

Harold M. Wiener.