

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.

<p>13 <i>Venit dominus ihesus in partes cesare philippi: et interrogavit discipulos suos dicens. Quem dicunt homines</i></p>	<p>13 When the Lord Jesus came into the parts of Caesarea Philippi, He asked His disciples, saying, Who do men say that the</p>
--	---

esse filium hominis? 14 At illi dixerunt. Alii iohannem baptistam: alii autem heliam: alii uero iheremiam: aut unum ex prophetis. 15 Dicit illis ihesus: Vos autem quem me esse dicitis? 16 Respondit symon petrus et dixit: Tu et pater tuus et spiritus sanctus solus deus. 17 Respondens autem ihesus dixit illi. Beatus es symon quia caro et sanguis non reuelabit tibi: set pater meus celestis per spiritum sanctum. 18 Et ego dico tibi: quia super hanc petram edificabuntur per spiritum sanctum discipuli eius. 19 Et quodcumque spiritus sanctus ligauerit super terram: ego et pater meus ligabimus in celis. Et quodcumque soluerit spiritus sanctus super terram: ego et pater meus soluemus in celis. Per spiritum sanctum omnia peccata dimittuntur.

Son of man is? 14 And they said, Some say John the Baptist; some Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets. 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 whatsoever the Holy Spirit shall loose on earth, I and My Father will loose in heaven. By the Holy Spirit are forgiven all sins.

EXODUS XX. 12-17.

Hec dicit dominus deus: Honora patrem tuum et matrem tuam ubi sunt longevi super terram: quam dominus deus tuus dabit uobis. Non occides: non meaberis: non furtum facies: non suggeres falsa contra proximum tuum: non concupisces rem proximi tui: non desiderabis seruum: non ancillam: non bouem: non asinum: nec omnia que illius sunt.

Thus saith the Lord God: Honor thy father and thy mother when they are old in the land which the Lord thy God shall give you. Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not commit adultery. Thou shalt not steal. THOU SHALT NOT SUGGEST FALSE THINGS AGAINST THY NEIGHBOR. Thou shalt not covet the property of thy neighbor. Thou shalt not desire his servant, nor his handmaid, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is his.

(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.

<i>Diliges dominum deum tuum ex toto corde tuo: et in tota anima tua: et in tota mente tua. Hoc est maximum et primum mandatum. Secundum autem simile est huic: Diliges per spiritum sanctum proximum tuum: sicut ego te ipsum diligo.</i>	Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the greatest and first commandment. The second is like unto it: Thou shalt love by the Holy Spirit thy neighbor even as I love thee.
--	---

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 <i>Et accedentes pharisei interrogabant eum si licet uiro uxorem dimittere temptantes eum.</i>	2 And the Pharisees came and asked Him, Is it lawful for a man to put away a wife? tempting Him.
3 <i>At ille respondens dixit eis.</i>	3. And He answered

Quid uobis precepit moyses?
 4 *Qui dixerunt moyses permisit libellum repudii scribere et dimittere.* 5 *Quidus respondens ihesus ait:* 6 *Ab initio masculum et feminam fecit eos deus.* 7 *Propter hoc relinquet homo patrem suum et matrem: et adheret uxori sue:* 8 *et erunt spiritus duo in carne una. Itaque iam non sunt duo: set unus spiritus.* 9 *Quos ergo deus coniunxit: non separabit 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 היליבי 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 הוליבי. 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 קח 'take.' The latter part of the verse, 'and the woman took' (תקחה) 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 לבי go," the ה 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.

London, England.

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, quæ inferiores sunt, decurrent atque deficient: quæ autem desuper veniunt, in una mole consistent.*" 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 LXX. Following a hint of Dillmann we may conjecture that LXX represents an intermediate stage between the original Hebrew and the M. T. The verse originally ended at יכרתה. A scribe added the first three words

of v. 16 — to judge from the anomalous grammar of *יַעֲמִדוּ* — 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. (*בְּמֵי הַיַּרְדֵּן מִן הַיַּרְדֵּן*). It leaps to the eyes that the second "the waters of the Jordan" *מֵי הַיַּרְדֵּן* is due to dittography. Then the text will have run ". . . in the waters of the Jordan, the waters shall be cut" (*יִכְרַתֵּן הַמַּיִם*). 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 (*תָּמוּ נִכְרַתוּ*). At the same time it was probably before the Greek translators in this passage, and is represented by *ἐλαλείψει* 'shall fail.' The form of the Hebrew verb with the *l* 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 *הַמַּיִם*. 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.

London, England.