Lost Hebrew Manuscripts.

BY REV. B. PICK, PH. D.

That Hebrew manuscripts existed at a very early time, may be seen from the following passage in the Mishna Sopherim, vi. 4: "R. Simon ben Lakish says, three codices (of the Pentateuch) were found in the court of the temple, one of which had the reading יִנָּשֶׁה, the other יִנָּשָׁה, and the third differed in the number of passages wherein נָר is read with a Jod. Thus in the one codex it was written יִנָּשֶׁה, dwelling (Deut. xxxiii. 27), whilst the other two codices had יִנָּשָׁה; the reading of the two was therefore declared valid, whereas that of the one was invalid. In the second codex, again, יִנָּשֶׁה was found (Exod. xxiv. 11), whilst the other two codices had יִנָּשָׁה; the reading in which the two codices agreed was declared valid, and that of the one invalid. In the third codex, again, there were only nine passages which had נָר written with a Jod (as it is generally written נָר with a Vau), whereas the other two had eleven passages; the readings of the two were declared valid, and those of the one invalid." The minute prescriptions contained in the Talmud concerning the material, color, letters, writing instruments, etc., for the manuscripts, only prove the fact that such manuscripts existed, otherwise St. Jerome could not have written "veterum librorum fides de Hebraicis voluminibus examinanda est." (Epist. ad Luiniunm). The greatest care was exhibited in writing of MSS., and three mistakes were sufficient to make a copy naught. (Tr. Menathoth, fol. 29, col. 2.)

When the study of the Talmud was no longer attractive amid the disorder and frequent closing of the Babylonian academies, and ulterior development of the traditions became exhausted, attention was
more directed to Scripture. The number of MSS. increased, especially as to them the various systems of vowels and accents of the Massorah, together with the first elements of grammar, were appended. But not all of these MSS. are now extant; some are only known from the quotations made from them by different writers.

The most famous of these lost MSS. is

*The Codex Hillelis.*

As to the name of this codex, there is a difference of opinion. From Jewish history we know that there were two by the name of Hillel; one who lived in the first century before Christ, called Hillel I., the Great, the other who lived in the fourth century after Christ, called Hillel II. Some, as Schikhard (*Jus Regnum Hebraeorum*, ed. Carpzov, Lipsiae 1674, p. 39), Cuneus (*De Republ. Hebr.*, p. 159), attributed this codex to the older Hillel; others, as D. Gans in his *Taemah David*, Buxtorf (*Tractatus de punctorum vocalium*, etc., Basil. 1648, p. 353), attributed it to the younger Hillel. A third opinion is that this codex derives its name from the fact that it was written at Hilla, a town built near the ruins of ancient Babel: so Fürst (*Geschichte des Karäerhums*, p. 22 sq. 138, note 14), and Ginsburg (*Levitas Massoreth ha-Massoreth*, p. 26c, note 40).

But neither of these opinions seems to be correct. Against the the first two we have the express testimony of Abraham ben Samuel Sakkulo', who, in his Book of Genealogies, entitled "Sepher Yuchasin," says that when he saw the remainder of the codex (circa A. D. 1500) it was 900 years old. His words are these: "In the year 4956, on the 28th day of Ab (i. e. in 1196, better 1197), there was a great persecution of the Jews in the kingdom of Leon from the two kingdoms which came to besiege it. It was then that the twenty-four sacred books, which were written long ago, about the year 600, by Rabbi Moses ben Hillel, in an exceedingly correct manner, and after which all copies were corrected, were taken away. I saw the remaining two portions of the same, viz., the earlier Prophets (i. e. Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings), and the later Prophets (i. e. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor Prophets)—written in large and beautiful characters, which were brought to Portugal and sold in Africa, where they still are, having been written 900 years ago. Kimchi, in his Grammar on Numb. xv. 4, says that the Pentateuch of this codex was extant in Toleti." (*Yuchasin*, ed. Filipowski, London 1857, p. 220b). From this statement it may be deduced

---

1 Comp. my art. in McClintock & Strong's *Cyclop.* s. v.
that this codex was written about the seventh century. As to the third opinion, deriving the name from Hilla, a town near Babel, we may dismiss it as very ingenious. A better opinion seems to be that of Strack (Prolegomena, p. 16), who says: "fortasse tamen recte cogitabis eum e numero τῶν εὐφημίων in Hispania fuisse." This is also the opinion of the famous critic Jedidja Norzi (x 1630), who remarks on Genes. 1:5: "He was a very good Masoretic scholar and a scribe in the city of Toletola"

Whatever uncertainty may be about the derivation of its name, certain it is that this codex is very important for the criticism of the Old Testament Hebrew text, as the many quotations which we find in Norzi's critical commentary, entitled מנהת שai (minhat shai), published Mantua 1742-44, Vienna 1813, Warsaw 1860-66, and in Lonzano's critical work, entitled אֵלַיּוּר וְאֵלַיּוּר (or torah).

In the twelfth century this codex was perused by the Jewish grammarian, Jacob ben Eleazar, as David Kimchie testifies in his grammatical work Micshul (ed. Fürth 1793, fol. 78 col. 2, where we read: והב ר ר ר ר ., and rabbi Jacob ben Eleazar writes that in the codex Hillel, which is at Toletola, he found that the daleth in אִירֵיָה was raphe (Deut. xii. 11), and fol. 127 col. 2 in fine, he writes: "R. Jacob ben Eleazar writes, that in the codex Hillel, which is at Toletola, the word אָלֶף is written with a tzere (ורונית הָיְמָה בְּעִיר)."

Lev. vi. 10.

We now subjoin from Lonzano, Norzi and other critics, some readings of the codex Hillel:

Gen. iv. 8.—In some editions of the Old Testament there is a space left between והב and יִרָיְה, and is marked in the margin by שׁבכמ, i.e., space. The LXX. Sam., Syr., Vulg. and Jerus. Targ. add, "let us go into the field." The space we have referred to is found in the editions of Buxtorf, Menasseh ben Israel, Walton, Nissel, Hutter, Clodius, Van der Hoogt. But, says Lonzano, the piska is a mistake of the printer, for in the MSS. which he consulted and in codex Hillel is no space. The addition, "let us go into the field," is not found by Symmachus, Theodotion and Onkelos. Even Origen remarks, διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πεδίον τοῦ 'إسرائيل ὅποι γεγραπται (Tom. II. 30).

Gen. ix. 29.—A great many codd. and edd. read סֵפִּים, but codex Hillel סֵפִּים.

Gen. xix. 16.—here Lonzano remarks that the second mem is written with kames in codd. and in cod. Hillel. In the edition of Baer and Delitzsch the word is thus written herem.

Gen. xix. 20.—לְאִם לְאִם לְאִם. Lonzano says that נ is raphe, but in Hillel it is with a dagesh. In Baer and Delitzsch's Genesis it is written raphe.
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Gen. xxvii. 25.—אֵּלֶּה הָאֲבוֹת, in the cod. Hillel, says Lonzano, the accent darga is in the yod. In our editions it is in, or rather under, the beth. Baer and Delitzsch follow the cod. Hillel.

Gen. xxxix. 6.—עַלְמָה, Norzi remarks that the Hillel codex writes הַלִם with tsere.

Gen. xlii. 16.—אֲבוֹת, in the margin of an old codex, belonging now to Dr. S. Baer, the editor of the new edition of the Old Testament, in connection with Prof. Delitzsh, it is written הַלִּambique i.e., in the cod. Hillel the reading is with segol.

Gen. xlv. 13.—אֲבוֹת, on this word Lonzano remarks that in Hillel and other codd. the vau is raphe, i.e., וַחֲיָהוּ

Exod. x. 9.—בְּכָלֵי חֶדֶשׁ, in Hillel, remarks Lonzano, it is written מִלְּכָלֵי חֶדֶשׁ i.e., plene, בְּכָלֵי חֶדֶשׁ.

Exod. xxxvii. 8.—מִילְלֵיהּ, in Hillel and in some other codd., remarks Lonzano, it is written with a makkeph.

Josh. xxi. 35, 36.—Cod. Kennic. No. 357, reads in the margin נְלֹא מַעְזֵי, אֶלְּאַל חַשֵּׁי סַפּוֹקֵי הַלִּambique, i.e., these two verses are not found in the codex Hillel. Similar is the remark in a manuscript formerly belonging to H. Lotze, of Leipzig.

Prov. viii. 16. A great many codd. editions and ancient versions, as Syriac, Vulgate, Targum, and even the Graecus Venetus, read here שָׁמַשׁ אֶלְּמַעֵי, whilst the Complutensian and other codd. read שָׁמַשׁ אֵלָּמַעֵי, which is also supported by Hillel codex, and is adopted in Baer's ed. of Proverbs.

The Codex Sanbuki.*

Nothing is known of the author, place and time when this codex was written. According to Richard Simon (Biblioth Critic. I., 367) the name Sanbuki (סאנבוקי) is derived from the owner of the MS., a Hungarian family. According to Hottinger (in Bibliothecario Quadripartito, p. 158, ed. Turic.), the name ought to be read instead of סְנָבְעָקִי, which is equivalent to Zadduki or Sadducee. Dr. Baer, in a private note to Prof. Strack, remarks, "I have not as yet found cited in any codex. It seems to me to be the name of a place like זַדְדָּקִי (perhaps the Italian Subiako?)." Mons. Fourmont, in his Dissertation sur les manuscrits Hébreux ponctués et les anciennes éditions de la Bible (in Mémoires de littérature l. 1. xix. 236) says: "Les Rabbins font mention de plusieurs exemplaires de ces manuscrits authentiques, et placés à

* See also my art. Sanbuki Codex in McClintock & Strong's Cyclop.
desseigne en différents endroits connus; celui d'Hillel par exemple, à Tolède pour l'Espagne; celui de la captivité d'Egypte, au mont Sinai; celui de Ben Ascher, à Jérusalem; et l'exemplaire appelé Drenvouki à la Carthage, dans la contrée nommée Zevigetania. " The codex is quoted in the margin of some MSS., as in Codex Kennic. 415; Cod. Kennic. 8 (Bibl. Bodl. Hunting, 69; comp. Brunsius Ad. Kenn., Diss. Gener. p. 345). Besides this codex is quoted three times by Menachem di Lonzano, in his commentary Or Thora, as on

Gen. ix. 14. —נִנְמָנָה where he remarks (fol. 2b fin. ed. Amstel.):
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was Sinai, and he differed from the Masorah, which remarks that

יושבדתא

has Gershaim, and said that it has the accent Rebia." From this it will
be seen that this great Massoretic authority does not take

emploi ברי

as Codex

Sinaiticus, but regards it as a proper name of one of the inventors of
the vowel-points and accents. Delitzsch (in his Hebrew translation of
Paul's Epistle to the Romans, p. 41, note) thinks that the name

ספיא ברי

Sinai Codex, refers rather to the place where it was written or found.

The Codex Ben-Naphtali.

Moses ben David Naphtali, a cotemporary of Ben-Asher, flourished
about A. D. 900-960. He distinguished himself by his edition of a
revised text of the Hebrew Scriptures in opposition to Ben-Asher, in
which he had no great success, inasmuch as the different readings he
collated and proposed are very insignificant, and are almost entirely
confined to the vowel-points and accents. The codex itself is lost, but
many of its readings are preserved, e. g. by Kimchi in his Grammar and
Lexicon, while a complete list of these different readings is appended
to Bomberg's and Buxtort's Rabbinic, and to Walton's Polyglot
Bible. Fürst, In his Concordance, p. 137 sec. 48, has also given the
variations between these two scholars.

The most important deviation of Ben-Naphtali from Ben-Asher is the
reading of יי יושבדתא, Song of Songs viii. 6, as two words, whilst
Ben-Asher reads it as one word יי יושבדתא, which makes no difference
in the meaning. In a very convenient form these variations are given
by Baer and Delitzsch in their edition of the different parts of the Old
Testament, on Genesis p. 81, Job p. 59, Psalms p. 136, Proverbs p. 55,
Isaiah p. 90, Minor Prophets p. 90, Ezra and Nehemiah, p. 126.

Our printed editions follow for the most part the reading of Ben-
Asher; very seldom, however, that of Ben-Naphtali is followed, with
the exception of such codices as have the Babylonian system of punctu-
ation, and which always follow Ben-Naphtali. The editions in which
the reading יי יושבדתא (i. e., Ben Naphtali's) is found, are: Bomberg's
Rabbinic (1517) and his quarto edition (1518); Stephen's (1543), Müns-
ter's (1546), Hutter (1587), Antwerp Polyglot (1571), Bragadin's
Hebrew Bible (1614), Simoni's (1767-1828), Jahn's (1806), Bagster's
(1839), Basle edition (1827), Hahn-Rosenmüller's (1868).

* See also my art. Sinai Codex Hebrew in McClintock & Strong.