

Testament prophecy, especially the 53rd chapter of Isaiah. Of this chapter HARNACK says, with a cautious circumlocution that is almost amusing, 'If its acceptance was striven against in wide circles, an evasion of it, because of the ruling exegesis, was not easily possible.'

The third source is the reasoning of St. Paul. St. Paul's mind was antithetical. He never rested till he had led everything up to great and moving contrasts, and brought it to a paradoxical form. He had read in the Old Testament, 'Cursed is he that hangs on a tree,' and he learned from the first disciples of Jesus that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures. From this he proved that Jesus, through the very fact that He was accused, had brought salvation to man. The death on the cross was thus the most necessary part of the life of Christ. But St. Paul had also learned from the early disciples that Jesus had risen again from the dead. And so, just as in the death of Christ he discovered the forgiveness of sins, in His resurrection he found a new spirit working

in man and overcoming the desires of the flesh.

The fourth and last source of this second gospel is the mythology of the heathen world. But HARNACK does not honestly think there is much in that. The myth of a God dying and rising from the dead no doubt confronted St. Paul as he journeyed from Syria to Corinth, and may have had some influence on his thinking. But HARNACK believes that that influence was infinitesimal in comparison with the influence which St. Paul's preaching must have had upon those who were prepared for it by their previous belief in that myth. Their preparation was, after all, only a preparation of bondage. St. Paul's preaching was a wonderful and joyful liberation.

Does HARNACK mean, then, that we should accept the first gospel and reject the second? No; he himself accepts both. The first gospel, he says, contains the Truth; the second contains the Way; both together bring Life.

Codex Edinburgensis.

A HITHERTO UNKNOWN MANUSCRIPT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

By PROFESSOR THE REV. A. R. S. KENNEDY, D.D., UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.

II.

THE way is now open for a more technical account of some of the features of the manuscript that are likely to appeal more particularly to the student of the Hebrew text. A MS of the Old Testament, such as the Codex Edinburgensis, may be said to contain three distinct elements, each of which may be, and indeed often is, the work of as many individuals. These are (1) the consonantal text, (2) the vowel-points and accents, and (3) the Masorah (more correctly, it would seem, Masorah, מְסוֹרָה, מְסוֹרָה).

Taking these in their order, we have in the text of our Codex the work of a scribe who belonged, as we have seen, to the German school of copyists

of the sacred text. The heavy and slightly sloping German hand is readily distinguished from the more elegant and upright Sephardic or Spanish hand, which imitated more closely the older Oriental style of writing. In the German manuscript hand of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, several pairs of letters can scarcely be distinguished except by their context, as a glance at the page of Codex Edinburgensis reproduced in the June number will show. Such are ב and כ, ד and ר, ה and ח. ט and final ך; on the other hand, ן can never be mistaken for נ, as is the case in the early Spanish manuscripts. The final letters do not extend, or extend but little, below the line of the other

consonants. Thus ך and final ך, ן and final ן, are almost indistinguishable, while final ן closely resembles ך.

The Sopherim or scribes of the first centuries of our era had already decreed, as the Talmud bears witness, that in Bible manuscripts a word must never be divided between two lines. This explains the unequal length of the lines in the oldest extant MSS.¹ In addition to dots, broken letters, and the first letter or letters of the next word, by the end of the eleventh century the practice was introduced of extending certain letters, the so-called *literae dilatabiles* (ארוּלָהּ),² to bring the last word to the edge of the column. In our MS, however, as in other MSS of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the letters ך (see frontispiece of the June number, col. 2, l. 23), and ן (col. 1, l. 25 col. 2, l. 25) are also used for this purpose, and even ן has its base-line extended (col. 3, l. 1); to economize space, the columns of the page reproduced, containing 2 K. 25^{27b-30} and Jer 1¹⁻², will henceforth be denoted by the letters a, b, c, followed by the number of the line, thus a 25, b 23, 25, c 1).

In the execution of his laborious task the scribe had to observe the stringent laws and prescriptions binding on those who copied any part of the sacred Scriptures. In our Codex, not only are the three poetical books of Psalms, Proverbs, and Job

¹ Which is the oldest existing manuscript of any considerable part of the Old Testament? The honour of being the oldest, bearing a date which can be accepted as genuine, is usually assigned to the St. Petersburg manuscript of the Latter Prophets dated 1228 of the Seleucid era, i.e. 916 A.D. But Professor Gottheil maintains that 'there is absolutely no reason to doubt the data' in the colophons to a MS of the former Prophets in the Karaite Synagogue at Cairo, according to which it was written in Tiberias by the celebrated Massorete, Moses ben Asher, in 'the year 827 of the destruction of the second temple' (see *Jew. Quart. Rev.* (1905), xvii. pp. 639 ff. with facsimiles). This is the year Oct. 896-7 of our era. Dr. Ginsburg, however, maintains that the Pentateuch MS 'Oriental 4445' of the British Museum, although not dated, was 'probably written about A.D. 820-850,' and is therefore the oldest as yet known. The claims of a Cambridge MS to date from the ninth century, and of another at Aleppo, bearing to have been written by the great master of the Massorah, Aaron ben Asher, the son of the above-mentioned Moses (beginning of tenth century), are now generally disallowed.

² In saying that these letters were unknown in the middle of the twelfth century, Ginsburg (*op. cit.*, 653) has forgotten that they are already found in the famous Codex Reuchlinianus of date 1105 A.D., a page of which is reproduced in vol. iii. of Stadel's *Geschichte d. Volkes Israel*.

written in metrical form (hemistichs), but, as prescribed, certain poems in the prose books are so written. Thus Dt 32, and 2 S 22 are written in hemistichs, while Ex 15 and Jg 5 exhibit the peculiar form reproduced in our printed texts. In the matter of the open and closed sections, especially outside the Pentateuch, the MSS vary considerably. Codex Edinburgensis, also, differs in many places from the standard Massorah (cf. the breaks in Jer 1 with Ginsburg's text). The insertion of the letters פ and ס to indicate an open and a shut section respectively, which characterizes later MSS, is not found, except in two or three cases, in our MS. The 54 Parashahs or Sabbath Lessons of the Pentateuch are carefully denoted by a couple of large פ's under either end of the last line. At the end of the sixth (Gn 28⁰) and eleventh (47²⁷) pericopes, where there is no sectional break, the beginning of the new pericope is indicated by the letters פֿרָשׁ on the margin. In Genesis, but not beyond, the number of verses in each Parashah, with their mnemonic sign, has been entered by the punctuator, but of this in my next paper. The first word of each Parashah is written in large letters and stands alone in its line. Throughout the second volume of the Codex, the first word of each book is also written in large letters (see frontispiece for Jeremiah); the letters of ויהי in Jos 1¹, indeed, are about 2 inches in height and are ornamented with a border of tracery. The Haphtarahs, or lessons from the Prophets, are noted on the margins of vol. ii. (see illustration at Jer 1¹). The Sedarim or triennial lessons from the Pentateuch are not indicated in the text of this MS, although their number is entered in the Massoretic note at the end of each of the books.

The original scribe has been very sparing in his use of the characteristic expressions at the close of the books, limiting himself to the simple חזק, 'be courageous,'¹ at the end of the Torah, of Isaiah (Major Prophets), and of the Hagiographa. The author of the Massorah Magna to the Pentateuch, however, has introduced two personal notes which may be reproduced here. At the end of the Massorah to Leviticus he writes טוב אחה ומטיב, 'good art thou and doing good,'¹ while at the close of the note at the end of vol. i., giving the number

¹ A common formula runs thus: 'Be courageous and let us show courage [from 2 S 10¹²], and may the scribe never be hurt' (חזק ונתקו חסד לך חן).

of verses, etc., in the Torah, he ventures on a gentle rhyme:

חציו נהון
 (אח עבדו יחון)

i.e. 'its half is נהון (Lev 11⁴²—for this see next paper), and may He have pity on his servant.' Again, after the usual summations at the end of Malachi, the same Massorete or another gives utterance to the prayer, חזק ירמם רפוח, 'strengthen the feeble hands.'

In entering these personal expressions at this point I have digressed from the order of treatment proposed above, which was to deal first of all with the work of the copyist, or copyists, of the consonantal text. The latter, it need hardly be said, is that presented by all known MSS, Eastern and Western, which the majority of modern scholars now believe to have been derived from a single archetype, probably of the second century of our era (see Cornill, *Introduction*, etc., Eng. tr. p. 499 f.). As in the hundreds of MSS collated by Kennicott and his helpers, by Rossi and by later scholars, among whom Christian D. Ginsburg stands pre-eminent, the variants presented by Codex Edinburgensis are of little account compared with those found in early MSS of the New Testament. Much the largest group consists of variations formed by the presence or absence of the vowel-letters, technically *scriptio plena* and *scrip. defectiva*, as will appear from the collation of 2 K 25²⁷⁻³⁰ and of Jer 1¹⁻² with the Massoretic recension as given by Ginsburg and Baer, which must be reserved for a third and final paper. It may, however, be said here by anticipation that this page of our MS contains only two variants of importance, namely, כבלה from the original scribe (a 9), corrected by the punctuator to conform to his version of the Massorah, and טעוה in c 18, where the reading of the *textus receptus* is entered by a later hand on the margin. An extended collation would probably show that the above is typical of the other 1060 pages of this MS.

I come now to the work of the collaborators of the original scribe in the production of our Codex. First of all the vowel-points and accents were supplied by the Nakdan or punctuator, who also, as we shall see, revised the consonantal text. The variations in the form and use of the vowels and other signs presented by Codex Edinburgensis are those characteristic of the school to which it belongs. These have been set forth in great detail by Ginsburg in his description of the German MSS in the British Museum in Part II. of his Introduction

(chap. xii.). A few notes are all that my space will at present allow. The sign of qamets (ֿ), for example, is that of pathach with a dot below, as in the older MSS of all schools. The same sign is used as a rule for qamets-chatuph (e.g. מִלְכָּו, a 4), but occasionally we find instead the sign of chateph-qamets ֿֿ, a practice which has been introduced universally by Baer in his editions of the O.T. text. Occasionally, also, more particularly with ה, this sign and that of chateph-pathach are partly introduced into the body of the letter, thus הֿ. When Cholem precedes the letter Shin, or follows Sin, it does not, as in our printed texts, coalesce with the diacritical point of the consonant; both are written over the ש (see ישבי, c 4 and נחשה, c 22). With the final ך qamets and shewa are placed at the foot of the letter, so that ךֿ is scarcely to be distinguished from ך.

Of the other signs mappiq is not placed within but below ה, as if it were chireq (הֿ), even with the shortened divine name הֿה. The raphe is consistently placed over כנרנפת when these are aspirated, as well as over ה when without mappiq (ישבעה, a 1). The most notable divergence, however, is the very sparing occurrence of metheg, which in later MSS and in our printed editions is so widely used to mark the secondary accent and for other purposes. Thus it is absent from אָנכי, b 12, and even before the ׀ of הַכְּהִנִּים, a 24 (see further Ginsburg, *op. cit.*). Of other peculiarities in this Codex may be noted the pointing of the tetragrammaton. As every one knows, there is a curious inconsistency in the pointing of it in our current texts. When, as in the vast majority of cases, the Massorah intends that it should be pronounced אֲרִי, the pointing is יְהוָה with ׀ for ׀ under the Yod. But when יהוה occurs in conjunction with אֲרִי, the pointing is יְהוָה, with chateph-seghol retained. In our MS the punctuator is more consistent, pointing יְהוָה (without cholem, thus avoiding the irregularity of Waw having two vowels) and יְהוָה respectively.

If the consonantal text as it left the hand of its copyist had not previously been gone over by a special reviser, this duty fell to the punctuator. Omissions in the text were inserted in the margin. Two illustrations are found in the photograph, b 32 and c 34. A fruitful source of omissions in MSS of all schools and periods is that technically known as

homoioteleuton (see the writer's 'Samuel' in *Century Bible*, p. 27, and index *sub voce*). I have collected dozens of such omissions in Codex Edinburgensis, where they are specially frequent in the Book of Ezra-Nehemiah.¹ The most remarkable instance of homoioteleuton is one which must almost certainly have been present in the original archetype of the Massoretic text above referred to, namely, Jos 21^{96f.} It will probably be a surprise to most of my readers to learn that these two verses form no part of the sacred text according to the official Massorah, although they are required by the context, and are found not only in the LXX and Vulgate, but in a number of Hebrew MSS (see the full discussion in Ginsburg, *op. cit.*, 178 ff., and index under the passage). They are absent from Codex Edinburgensis. It is otherwise, however, with another verse, Neh 7⁶⁸, which is similarly treated by the Massorah. The consonants thereof have been copied by our scribe from his exemplar, but the Massorete has declined to supply the necessary vowels, and has besides added the *circellus Massoreticus* (°) at the beginning and end to show that the verse in question formed no part of the true text according to his school.

¹ It is scarcely necessary to remark that these books, as well as 1-2 S., 1-2 K., and 1-2 Ch. are written as one in our Codex.

In the case of letters, especially י and ו, and words present in the MS copied by the original scribe, but absent from the text preferred by the Massoretic reviser, the latter drew his pen lightly through the offending letter or word (see a ו, the ה of נבלה). But in the case of the tetragrammaton (יהוה), where the text followed by the reviser of Codex Edinburgensis read otherwise, it would have been sacrilege so to treat the divine name, which now appears as יהוה or יהוה.² In two places I find a peculiarly modern method of marking a mistake in the position of two letters or words. In Nu 12⁴ the scribe had inadvertently transposed the second and third letters of פאחם. The reviser makes the correction by placing the letters denoting our 1 and 2 over the transposed letters thus: פאחם. Similarly the transposition of the divine names in Am 6⁸ is indicated thus: נשבע יהוה אדני.

² I regret that considerations of space preclude the discussion of the numerous passages, especially in Is 6-11 and in Am 5-7, where the scribe of Codex Edinburgensis has יהוה instead of the substituted אדני of the *textus receptus*—see Ginsburg's new editions of these books for the divergent readings of the MSS.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF THE PSALMS.

PSALM LXVIII. 18.

Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led thy captivity captive;
Thou hast received gifts among men,
Yea, among the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell with them.

1. THE period of history to which the sixty-eighth Psalm belongs is uncertain; some parts wear the appearance of being ancient, others present features which point with some cogency to a later date. The Old Testament affords many examples of a writer incorporating, and adapting to his own use, phrases, and even entire verses, originally written on an altogether different occasion and by another hand; and it is possible that this is the solution of the phenomena which the Psalm presents.

Certainly, two verses are quoted, nearly word for word, from the Song of Deborah, in the fifth chapter of the Book of Judges; and this being so, it is quite conceivable that other verses may be quoted from some earlier sources extant at the time when the Psalm was composed, but now lost.

The Psalm will in any case not be earlier than the closing years of the Babylonian captivity; and it is a reasonable conjecture that it was written in view of the approaching return of the exiled nation to Palestine, and of God's re-entry into His ancient sanctuary on Zion. The Psalmist views the coming deliverance as a great manifestation of Jehovah's power, and a triumph over Israel's foes; and so he opens in tones of hope and exultation,