

PREFACE

I HAVE great pleasure in thanking the British Academy, and its Secretary, Sir Frederic Kenyon, for having invited me to deliver the Schweich Lectures for 1941. This invitation has been for me a stimulus for resuming and continuing my studies on the text of the Bible.

The subject of these lectures was suggested by my distinguished friend the late Dr. H. Wheeler Robinson, with whom I had discussed many problems concerning the text of the Bible and to whom I am indebted for all sorts of help and encouragement. He was convinced that lectures on the Cairo Geniza might give me the opportunity of making a general survey of former studies on this subject to which I had been devoted for about forty years. He was greatly interested when he saw that in the course of the work new problems arose and new solutions had to be found.

It was not so easy to go on with such studies at a time when I had no access whatever to my own library, highly specialized for dealing with problems of that kind, and the delay in bringing this book to an end is partly due to these circumstances—besides the other work I had to do. I was, however, fortunate enough to do this work in the Bodleian Library in Oxford, for which I worked, as a member of its Extra Staff, by cataloguing Arabic manuscripts. I am very thankful for all the facilities granted to me; I also remember with pleasure the hospitality I found for a number of years in the Radcliffe Science Library, a part of the Bodleian. That I was able to go on with my work in Oxford quietly during the whole war and after, with all the books and manuscripts of this famous library at my disposal, was of the greatest importance to me.

My special thanks are due to Mr. A. Chester Beatty. His generous offer to engage me for a great descriptive catalogue of about 1,300 manuscripts of his wonderful collection of rare Arabic texts was the basis for my whole scientific work here during the last years. I am greatly indebted to him for all he has done to settle myself and my family in this country.

I have to thank Professor W. B. Stevenson in Edinburgh, Professor G. R. Driver in Oxford, Professor H. H. Rowley in Manchester for having read the manuscript of my book and having made some valuable suggestions. I have been able to

discuss several problems of the lectures with two of my former pupils, the Rev. Matthew Black, D.Litt., Ph.D., of Leeds University, and Mr. D. M. Dunlop, M.A., of St. Andrew's University, besides with some learned friends here in Oxford, e.g. the Rev. G. D. Kilpatrick, B.D., now Professor in Nottingham University, Dr. W. Duff McHardy of Oxford University, the Rev. John Bowman, Ph.D., now at Leeds University, the Rev. Bleddyn J. Roberts, Aberystwyth, now in Bangor, Dr. A. F. L. Beeston after his return to the Bodleian from the forces, and Dr. R. Eisler. I had the opportunity of discussing all sorts of problems concerning Judaica with two Jewish scholars who worked for many years in the Bodleian Library, Dr. J. L. Teicher, M.A., who had made his studies in Florence, now Lecturer in Rabbinics at Cambridge University, and with Dr. Naftali Wieder, who had made his studies in Berlin, now in Jews' College, London. Occasionally I discussed similar problems with the late Professor Dr. David Herzog, formerly of Gratz University. With my former pupil Dr. Menachem Zulay, at the Research Institute for Hebrew Poetry in Jerusalem, the chief authority on early Jewish liturgical poetry, I have frequently corresponded on questions concerning this poetry.

Professor H. A. R. Gibb in Oxford has kindly made some valuable suggestions in connexion with the text of al-Farrā', dealt with on pp. 78 f. and 115 f. Sir Harold I. Bell, now at Aberystwyth, has kindly answered questions concerning the letter of Aristaeus and the Septuagint Papyri. Professor Arnaldo D. Momigliano, Hon. M.A. (Oxford), of Turin University, has often informed me on problems of Ancient History. My friend Paul Maas, formerly of Königsberg University, was always ready to help when I had some general questions on textual criticism or problems concerned with Classical or Byzantine authors. With Fritz Schulz, my former colleague in Bonn, later Professor of Berlin University, I have discussed some problems concerning Roman Law.

Two old friends of mine, Miss Claire Swan, M.A. (Oxford), of Bramley near Guildford, and Mr. Ellis Gummer, M.A., in Oxford, have given me some valuable help in improving the English of the Lectures, especially in the early stages of my work.

I have to thank the Oxford University Press for the excellent way in which the lectures were printed and for the great care with which the proofs were read by their readers, and would like to put in a word of special gratitude to the Delegates and their staff who have always been interested in my work.

I dedicate the book to my wife. Her noble action resulted in our leaving our home country and losing everything we possessed. Her special intuition linked with energy enabled us to escape and to settle in this country.

P. KAHLE

24, MUSEUM ROAD, OXFORD

January 1947

CONTENTS

I. GENERAL INTRODUCTION, WITH AN ESSAY ON THE LITURGICAL POETRY OF THE JEWS	I
The Cairo Geniza, 1. Early visitors: Saphir, 2. Firkowitch, 2. Elkan Natan Adler, 5. The fragments of Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson, 6. Schechter's visit, 7. The Taylor-Schechter Collection in Cambridge, 8. Fragments of Ecclesiasticus, 10. Fragments of a 'Zadokite' work, 11. Fragments of Aquila and the Hexapla, 13. The Khazar Document, 14. Necessity of a systematic investigation of the Geniza, 19. Early Paitans: Yose b. Yose, 21. Yannai, 21. Hedwatha, 22. The Jews in the Byzantine Empire and the development of their liturgical poetry, 24. The rhyme in Byzantine and Jewish liturgical poetry, 31. Liturgical poetry of the Samaritans, 32.	
APPENDIX I: Justinian's 'Novella 146'	33
II. THE HEBREW TEXT OF THE BIBLE	36
The Samaritan Targum, 36. The Samaritan Arabic Pentateuch, 38. Biblical manuscripts from Babylonia, 41. Biblical manuscripts with Palestinian punctuation, 49. The Masoretes of Tiberias, 55. Ben Asher Codices, 56. Seligman Baer, 63. Mishael b. 'Uzziel, 67. The Hebrew Bibles published by Bomberg, 69. The Ben Asher text of the 'Biblia Hebraica', 74. Ibn Ezra and the Ben Asher text, 77. The Masoretes and the Arabic Readers of the Koran, 78. al-Farrā' on the influence of Bedouin Arabic on the text of the Koran, 79. The Masoretes and their ideal of classical Hebrew, 85	
1. The pronunciation of the gutturals	86
2. The pronominal suffix of the 2nd pers. sing. masc.	95
3. The pronunciation of the BGDKFT	102
Conclusions	108
APPENDIX II: The Colophons of the Cairo Ben Asher Codex	110
APPENDIX III: al-Farrā' on Reading the Koran	115
III. THE TRANSLATIONS OF THE BIBLE	117
1. THE TARGUMS: Targum Onkelos and Aquila, 117. Fragments of the Palestinian Targum on the Pentateuch, 121. The late introduction of Targum Onkelos into Palestine, 127. Jewish Palestinian Aramaic, the language of Our Lord: Wensinck, Dalman, Wellhausen, 129.	
2. THE SEPTUAGINT: The letter of Aristas and the 'revised' version of the Greek Tora, 132. The Chester Beatty Papyri of the Septuagint, 139. Philo's quotations from the Greek Tora, 141. Greek texts of the Bible used by the Jews, 149. Josephus' quotations from the Bible, 151. The text of Lucian, 155. Lagarde on the Greek versions of Judges, 156. The Greek Bible used by early Christians, 158. Origen and his Hexapla, 160. New Testament quotations from the Greek Bible, 165. Theodotion, 168. Transliterated Hebrew words in the Greek Bible, 171. Lagarde's 'Urtext of the Septuagint', 174. Conclusions, 179.	
3. THE PESHIṬTA: Two forms of the Syriac Pentateuch, 179. Views of a critical edition of the Peshiṭta, 182. The Jewish kingdom of Adiabene	

and the Bible used there, 184. Addai in Adiabene, 189. Beginnings of Christianity in Edessa, 190. Bardaišan, 192. Rabbula, 194. The Abgar legend, 194.

4. TATIAN'S DIATHESSARON, 197. Its connexion with the Old Syriac Gospels, 200. 'Western' readings in St. Luke, 205. The Dura fragment of a Greek Diatessaron, 208.

5. THE ARABIC DIATHESSARON: Its two recensions, 211. The Bodleian manuscript and the texts contained in it, 215. *Ṭiriāḵ al-'uḵūl* and al-Ghazālī's *ar-radd al-jamūl*, 217. The Bodleian manuscript and the second Vatican manuscript (B), 222. Ibn at-Ṭaiyib and the Arabic Diatessaron, 224. Conclusions, 226.

ADDENDA	229
INDEX	235

LECTURE I

GENERAL INTRODUCTION, WITH AN ESSAY ON
THE LITURGICAL POETRY OF THE JEWS

THE Cairo Geniza about which I intend to speak in these lectures belongs to an ancient Synagogue of Old Cairo, which was originally the Christian Church of St. Michael, but was sold to the Jews and converted into a Synagogue in A.D. 882.¹ The Synagogue was rebuilt in 1890, but the Geniza was left unaltered. It is described as situated at the end of the women's gallery, a sort of windowless and doorless room of fair dimen-

¹ We hear that the famous Aḥmed Ibn Ṭulūn, who ruled Egypt from A.D. 868 to 884, had ordered the Coptic Patriarch Michael, the 56th Patriarch (876-901), to pay to the government the sum of 20,000 dinars. In order to raise this sum the Patriarch had to sell some church properties to the Jews: Waḳf lands belonging to churches, a piece of land outside of Fuṣṭāṭ-Miṣr, belonging to the Abyssinians, and a church near the Mu'allaka Church in Ḳaṣr ash-Sham'a. Cf. Maḳrīzī, *Ḳhiṭaṭ*, Cairo, A.H. 1326, vol. iv, p. 397; Abū Ṣāliḥ, *The Churches and Monasteries of Egypt . . .*, ed. B. T. A. Evetts, p. 136 of the translation.

In Ḳaṣr ash-Sham'a, the old Roman fortress near which Fuṣṭāṭ was founded by the Arabs, there were situated six Christian churches: Al-Mu'allaka, Abū Serge, St. George, the Virgin, St. Barbara, and St. Michael. They are marked on the plan of Ḳaṣr ash-Sham'a, facing p. 155 of vol. i of Alfred J. Butler's book *The Ancient Coptic Churches of Egypt* (Oxford, 1884). St. Michael was the last one held by the Melkites when all the other churches throughout the land of Egypt had passed into the hands of the Jacobites. We do not know how long it remained with the Melkites. 'But the violent antipathy of the two factions no doubt gave a cause of quarrel and conquest to the Jacobites, long before the time when . . . it was made over to the Hebrews' (Butler, l.c. i, p. 169). Jacob Mann, in his book *The Jews in Egypt and in Palestine under the Fāṭimid Caliphs*, vol. i (Oxford, 1920), p. 14, speaks erroneously of two churches sold at that time to the Jews, being aware neither that Ḳaṣr ash-Sham'a and Fuṣṭāṭ are used for the same place, nor that the former Church of St. Michael was the very church to which the 'Cairo Geniza' belonged. Butler describes the Synagogue—which does not exist any longer—in the following way: 'The Synagogue is about 65 ft. long and 36 ft. broad, and shows in miniature a Coptic basilica in its simplest and perhaps earliest form. If the eastern end has suffered some alteration, the nave, side-aisles, and returned aisle with triforium above, are unchanged from the old design, though whitewash has long since defaced the splendid colours once blazoned on the walls. In point of detail there is not much of interest remaining, except the fine stucco work about the arch of triumph, the tank or well behind the apse, and the carved doors at the end of the south aisle . . .' (l.c., p. 169 f.).

sions, the entrance being on the west side through a big shapeless hole, reached by a ladder.¹

However, it is not this room which now interests us, but its contents. These contents consisted of a great number of fragments of MSS. and printed books, documents and letters, which had been stored there for many hundreds of years. The Jews were accustomed to put away all sorts of written and printed material which they no longer used into such rooms provided in or near the Synagogues, not that they might be kept there as in archives, but in order that they might stay there undisturbed for a certain time. They feared that such material, on which the name of God might have been written, might be profaned by improper use. So such writings—and later also printed matter—were deposited in Genizas,² and from there they were taken to a consecrated ground to be buried, and thus perished.

It was by mere chance that the Cairo Geniza was forgotten and that its contents so escaped the fate of other Genizas. Very much against the will of those who had stored them there, these old materials escaped burial. When, in the course of the last century, the Cairo Geniza was rediscovered, the chiefs of the Synagogue to which it belonged made the surprising discovery that there were some curious people in the world who were attracted by the old material, who were also willing to pay a considerable amount of money for these scraps of dirty parchment and paper, and that even renowned universities were interested in it.

The Jewish traveller, Jacob Saphir, had heard of the Geniza when he was in Cairo in 1864. He was anxious to visit it and to make some discoveries there. He obtained a permit of the Rabbi to enter the room, but after spending two days there and becoming covered with dust and dirt he gave up the task and took away only a few leaves belonging to different MSS. as a kind of souvenir.³

Soon after him Abraham Firkowitch, on a journey to the East, came to Cairo. This Karaite Jew from the Crimean Peninsula is somewhat ill famed on account of the falsifications he made on dates of gravestones and on Hebrew MSS. in order

¹ Cf. Elkan N. Adler in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, vol. ix, 1897, p. 669 f.; S. Schechter, *Studies in Judaism*, vol. ii, Philadelphia, 1908, p. 5 f.

² The word is derived from גִּזָּא 'to hide, store up'.

³ His experiences are described by him in the report on his journey published under the name *Eben Saphir* in Lück, 1866, p. 21 f.

to show that the Karaites had been settled in the Crimea for a much longer time than was previously accepted, and had had a greater importance than was usually conceded to them.¹ But Firkowitch has the credit of bringing together the largest collection of Hebrew MSS. which exists in the world. These MSS. form the two Firkowitch Collections in the Russian Public Library at Leningrad; the first was sold to the library by Firkowitch himself, the second was acquired by the library in 1876, soon after his death in Tshufutkale on 26 May 1874.

We may form an idea of the extent of these collections when we hear that in the Second Firkowitch Collection the MSS. of the Hebrew Bible and the Masora written on parchment alone number 1,582, those written on paper 725.² To appreciate these numbers rightly we have to remember that in the British Museum Catalogue there are described 161, and in the Bodleian Catalogue 146 Hebrew Biblical MSS., in both cases MSS. written on parchment and paper, and that Kennicott, who tried to use all the Hebrew MSS. available in his time in Europe for his great *Vetus Testamentum Hebraice*,³ was not able to collate even as many as one-third of the number of MSS. which are to-day to be found in this one collection.

The Second Firkowitch Collection is not only extensive but also highly valuable. It is well known that Hebrew Biblical MSS. dated from the tenth and eleventh centuries are of extreme rarity. The so-called Babylonian Codex of the Prophets, dated A.D. 916, belonging to another smaller collection of the Leningrad Library (MS. Heb. B. 3), has been regarded for a long time as the oldest dated MS. of the Hebrew Bible. Ahron ben Moshe ben Asher, the greatest Masoretic authority, who was finally responsible for the exact punctuation and the exact Masora of the Tiberian text which we have in our Bibles, flourished in the first half of the tenth century A.D.⁴ Therefore there cannot exist codices dependent on this authority before that date. The Codex of the Prophets, preserved in the Synagogue of the Karaites in Cairo, written and provided with punctuation and Masora in

¹ Cf. *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. i, 1927, p. 57 f.

² Apart from those mentioned, there belong to this collection 159 scrolls on parchment and leather, 4,933 and 1,243 Hebrew and Arabic MSS., and 344 non-Biblical Hebrew MSS. We have, however, to remember that even a few leaves of a MS. are counted separately.

³ *Vetus Testamentum Hebraice cum variis lectionibus*, ed. Benjamin Kennicott, Oxford, 1776–80.

⁴ Cf. for Ben Asher, *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. i, 1927, pp. 1–15, and the next lecture.

A.D. 895 by Moshe b. Asher, Ahron's father, is the oldest dated Hebrew Biblical MS. of which we know.¹ But I found in Leningrad in the autumn of 1926, chiefly among the MSS. of the Second Firkowitch Collection, not less than fourteen Hebrew Biblical MSS. which can be dated between A.D. 929 and 1121, and all these MSS. contain in the main the text as fixed by Ahron b. Asher.²

But the Biblical MSS. are only a small part of the Firkowitch Collection in Leningrad. No catalogue of this collection exists, there is only a hand-list prepared by Harkavy. Firkowitch was very expert at ransacking old Synagogues and their Genizas. I came across a good example of the way in which he dealt with the people and their treasures in Palestine. In the summer of 1908, when I was in Nāblus for a fortnight, the old Samaritan High-priest Ya'kūb b. Hārūn told me that he well remembered Firkowitch's visit there, about forty years ago. He spoke with great indignation of the man and the way in which he deceived the Samaritan priests and took away great quantities of valuable old Samaritan MSS. paying them practically nothing. Nevertheless, it is due to Firkowitch's activity that the Russian Public Library possesses the greatest Collection of Samaritan MSS. in Europe.³

There can be no doubt that a certain quantity of the MSS. in the Second Firkowitch Collection came from the Cairo Geniza. We hear that Firkowitch did not enter the place himself, but that he acquired bundles of MSS. from it.⁴ And as Firkowitch was a great expert in MSS., he did not gather material at random. He knew how to select important material, and without any doubt some of the most valuable fragments of the Geniza are in the Second Firkowitch Collection in Leningrad. But Firkowitch had an interest in concealing the way in which he used to collect his material, and the places from which it came. So to-day nobody is able to say exactly how far MSS. of his collection are from the Cairo Geniza.

But there is in the Leningrad Library a collection of nearly 1,200 fragments which undoubtedly come from the Cairo

¹ Cf. *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. i, 1927, p. 15 f., and the next lecture.

² These 14 MSS. are described in *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. i, pp. 56-77, and facsimiles from the MSS. are published there.

³ Only the Bible MSS. of this collection are described so far. Cf. A. E. Harkavy's Catalogue: *Описание Рукописей Самаритянского Пятикнижия хранящихся в Императорской Публичной Библиотеке. Санктпетербургъ, 1874.*

⁴ Cf. Norman Bentwich, *Solomon Schechter, a Biography*, Philadelphia, 1940, p. 139.

Geniza, the so-called Antonin Collection.¹ It was brought together by Antonin, a Russian Archimandrite in Jerusalem. I saw each of these fragments in 1926 in Leningrad, and I must say that this Archimandrite had a good understanding of such things and that he has brought together an important collection. I know these Geniza-fragments in Leningrad not only from my short visit of five weeks in 1926. At my request several hundreds of these and other fragments were sent in a most generous way by the library to the Oriental Seminar of Bonn University, where I could study them at leisure together with my pupils.

In 1896 Elkan Natan Adler, the brother of the Chief Rabbi, Dr. Hermann Adler, had an opportunity of entering the Geniza² and of bringing away from it a sackful of fragments, of which a certain amount came later to the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York. Through the kindness of the Librarian, Professor Marx, more than twenty volumes from this collection, containing Biblical texts, were also sent to me at Bonn where I was able to study them for several years.

But after about 1890, when the Synagogue of Old Cairo was rebuilt, the Jews began to make a general trade with the materials of the Geniza, and great quantities of the fragments were sold and brought over to Europe by travellers, especially to the Bodleian Library in Oxford, where A. Neubauer and A. E. Cowley were early interested in this matter and eager to come into possession of material from the Geniza. To-day the Bodleian Library has, next to Cambridge, the largest collection of Geniza fragments from Cairo, and it, and the British Museum, are the only libraries which are in possession of a printed catalogue of their collections. The second volume of the Bodleian *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts* is, for the greater part, devoted to a description of these fragments. Here we find an exact list of all those who acquired in Cairo fragments for the Bodleian Library, and Cowley's catalogue is an excellent piece of work.³ To make such a catalogue is a very difficult task. In the Bodleian Library the fragments were bound together in volumes just after they arrived, and each of these volumes contains a great number of different fragments. Therefore, not only every manuscript men-

¹ Cf. for this collection A. E. Harkavy in *Отчетъ Императорской Публичной Библиотеки за 1899 годъ, С.-Петербургъ, 1903*, pp. 75 ff.

² Adler has described his visit to the Geniza in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, vol. ix, 1897, pp. 669-73.

³ *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, vol. ii, by A. Neubauer and A. E. Cowley, Oxford, 1906.

tioned in the catalogue, but nearly every folio of every MS. had to be investigated and described.

A few fragments found their way to the University Library in Cambridge,¹ others—not the most important—came to the British Museum.² A comparatively large collection came to the Bibliothèque de l'Alliance Israélite in Paris, where Israel Lévi was greatly interested in such things.³ Some fragments came to the Stadt-Bibliothek in Frankfurt-am-Main, famous as possessing the most complete collection of Jewish books on the Continent; here Dr. Freimann, one of the librarians, was interested in this material. Some fragments came also to other libraries, for instance the University Library of Strasbourg, and to private collections, for instance about 4,000 fragments were collected by Jack Mosseri in Cairo.

A new turn was given to the matter when, in 1896, the two learned Scottish ladies, Mrs. Agnes Smith Lewis and Mrs. Margaret Dunlop Gibson, came back to Cambridge from one of their many journeys to the East. They also had bought in Cairo some fragments from the Geniza; these fragments, forming together a respectable collection,⁴ are now in the Library of Westminster College in Cambridge, which was itself founded largely through the efforts of these ladies. In May 1896 they handed over two leaves written with Hebrew characters, one on parchment, the other on paper, to Solomon Schechter, at that time Reader in Talmudic in Cambridge University.⁵ Schechter pointed out that the parchment belonged to a MS. of the Palestinian Talmud,⁶ and in the paper fragments he discovered a piece of the Hebrew text of the book of Jesus ben Sira (Ecclesiasticus), a Jewish text composed in Hebrew shortly after 200 B.C. This text was known to us in the Greek translation contained in the Septuagint and in other translations, but so far nothing was known of the text in the original Hebrew. So we had here a fragment of a book, which was once a part of Hebrew

literature, but had not become part of the Hebrew Canon, and had been lost for about 1,000 years in the original Hebrew text.

This discovery made a great sensation. It was clear that where *one* leaf had been found there might be more, there might be other important material. So it was decided—quite secretly—to send over Schechter to Cairo, so that he might try to bring back to Cambridge whatever he could from the Geniza. Dr. Charles Taylor, the Master of St. John's College in Cambridge, a mathematician, but also greatly interested in Rabbinic studies—he had for instance published a critical edition of the Mishna-tract Pirke Aboth, the 'Sayings of the Jewish Fathers'—gave Schechter the money for his remarkable journey to Cairo, Schechter was provided with a recommendation from Cambridge University, addressed to the President of the Jewish Community of Cairo, saying that he undertook the journey on behalf of the Cambridge University Library. He left Cambridge in December 1896.¹ A letter of introduction from Elkan N. Adler in London to the Chief Rabbi of Cairo, Rafail b. Shim'on, who had helped E. N. Adler to see the Geniza, brought Schechter into contact with this man,² and with his help he got permission to enter the Geniza and to take with him everything he wanted.

To work in the dark and dusty room was certainly no easy task, but with his great energy and enthusiasm he achieved his object within a few weeks.³ Schechter had permission to take with him the whole contents. He decided to select all the *written* fragments and to leave there all the *printed* ones. Schechter was interested in texts still unknown, which could contribute something to Jewish Theology and History, and such material was more likely to be found among MSS. than among printed matter. So we can understand his decision, and only a general selection was possible in the circumstances.⁴ He did not realize the importance of the printed material. To-day we know that this printed matter also had its great importance, since special investigations of printed fragments undertaken recently in the Bodleian Library has revealed very interesting facts about the history of Hebrew printing in the fifteenth and sixteenth cen-

¹ They are preserved in the Cambridge University Library as MS. Or. 1080, consisting of several boxes of fragments.

² Cf. E. N. Adler in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, vol. ix, 1897, p. 672.

³ I had the opportunity of seeing this collection in the summer of 1927.

⁴ Cf. S. Schechter, 'The Lewis-Gibson Collection', in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, vol. ix, 1897, pp. 115 ff.

⁵ Cf. N. Bentwich, l.c., p. 140.

⁶ The Fragments of the Palestinian Talmud are published by Louis Ginzberg, *Yerushalmi Fragments from the Genizah*, vol. i, Text with various readings from the editio princeps, New York, 1909. Ginzberg's *Commentary on Berakhot*, Perek 1-4, was published New York, 1941, in three volumes.

¹ Cf. Schechter, *Studies in Judaism*, vol. ii, Philadelphia, 1908, pp. 3 ff.

² Cf. Adler, l.c., p. 672 f. The letter of introduction was written by Elkan N. Adler, *not* by his brother, the Chief Rabbi Dr. Hermann Adler, as is usually said.

³ Schechter's own report about his journey is to be found in his *Studies in Judaism*, vol. ii, 1908, p. 5 f. Cf. also N. Bentwich, l.c., pp. 126 ff.

⁴ Cf. Schechter, l.c., p. 6 f.

tures.¹ Schechter filled a number of big sacks and large boxes with the fragments.² The British Embassy in Cairo helped to get permits for the removal of the boxes out of Egypt,³ and they arrived safely at the University Library in Cambridge before Schechter himself returned after a trip to Palestine from Cairo.

Under the date 14 June 1898, the Library Syndicate made the following statement concerning the Geniza material:⁴

Dr. Taylor, Master of St. John's College, and Dr. Schechter, the Reader in Talmudic, have offered to the University on certain conditions the valuable collection of MSS. which Dr. Schechter has brought back from the Genizah of Old Cairo with the consent of the heads of the Jewish Community.

Among the more noteworthy treasures which this Collection contains, are fragments of the Book of Ecclesiasticus in Hebrew, and certain Palimpsests of which the underwriting is Greek and which preserve to us unique fragments of the Hexapla and of Aquila's version of the Old Testament. There are, moreover, about twenty large boxes of fragments which contain matter of much interest to Semitic scholars; for example, Biblical fragments in an early Hebrew hand, presenting in some instances the super-linear punctuation, Liturgical fragments and portions of the Talmud and of commentaries thereon; Historical documents (wills, &c.): fragments in Arabic mostly written in Hebrew letters: and a few fragments in Syriac.

The conditions upon which the collection is offered to the University are the following:

1. That the MSS. be kept in the University Library as a separate collection, to be called by some such name as the Taylor-Schechter collection from the Genizah of Old Cairo.
2. That the thanks of the University be given to the heads of the Jewish community at Cairo with whose consent the MSS. were brought to England.
3. That the collection be not used without the consent of the donors for three years from the date of acceptance by the University.
4. That Dr. Schechter have the right to borrow manuscripts of which Facsimiles are not accessible, from the collection, on giving a receipt to the Library for them.
5. That the University undertake to make such provision as is possible by binding, mounting, or otherwise for the preservation of the MSS., and to have them sorted, and a list or Catalogue of them drawn up within ten years from the acceptance of the collection.

¹ Cf. J. L. Teicher, 'Hebrew printed Fragments', *Bodleian Library Record*, vol. i, 1939-41, pp. 234-6.

² 'Thirty bags', Bentwich, l.c., p. 130.

³ Bentwich, *ibid.*

⁴ Cf. *Cambridge University Reporter*, year 1897-8, p. 969.

6. That the fragments of Ecclesiasticus and those with Greek writing remain in the possession of the donors until after they have brought out complete editions of them.

These propositions were accepted and passed in Senate on 10 November 1898.¹ The Cairo Community received from the Senate of Cambridge University an address in Latin, English, and Hebrew, which expressed gratitude 'not only on account of the goodwill with which you received our Reader in Talmudic, but also on account of the conspicuous liberality with which you permitted him to return laden with fragments'.

The Cambridge University has done its best to fulfil the conditions under which the collection was offered. Within ten years the fragments were brought into a certain order, they were cleaned and polished, put into large cardboard boxes, or bound, or mounted between glass, and carefully written lists of the contents enable anyone who has to work among the fragments to find everything he wants in a short time. On the basis of these lists I give here a short survey of the material, which is representative of the material of the Geniza found in other collections.

Fragments contained in boxes (164 boxes):

- A. Biblical text, arranged by Biblical books, in 37 boxes. Fragments with Supralinear punctuation, boxes 38, 39. Colophons, Bible in shorthand, phylacteries, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, boxes 40-5.
- B. Versions of the Bible, Trilingual (Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic), Bible with Targum. Targum alone: 20 boxes.
- C. Midrash: Ibn Ezra, Mechilta, Torat Kohanim, Commentaries on the Bible, &c. 7 boxes.
- D. Masora: 1 box.
- E. Mishna: 4 boxes.
- F. Talmud: Text, Commentaries, pointed Talmud text, Maimonides, Halakhot Gedolot, Aruch, Sheeltot, Alfasi, Minor tractates, Sefer Turim, Talmud Yerushalmi. 17 boxes.
- G. Responsa in general and Responsa of the Geonim. 2 boxes.
- H. Liturgy, originally 18 boxes, now mostly bound up. Of special interest: fragments with Palestinian and Babylonian punctuation.
- J. Documents and letters, Bills and Lists, Historical letters, &c. 3 boxes.
- K. Miscellaneous: Amulets, Calendars, Catalogues, Children's exercises, Children's Readers, Colophons, Dictionaries, Grammar, Illuminated fragments, Indices, Jottings, Kabbala, Maimonides,

¹ *Ibid.*, year 1898, p. 235.

Medicine, Magic and Charms, Names, Pedigrees, Poetry, Polemics, Printed Vellum, Saadyana, Vocabularies, Yosippon. Together 27 boxes.

Besides:

Arabic Fragments: Bible, Calendar, Children's Exercise Books, Documents, Grammar, Lexicography, History, Letters and Bills, Liturgy, Masora, Mathematics, Astronomy, Science, Medicine, Philosophy, Poetry, Polemics against the Karaites, Kabbala and Amulets, Religious tracts, Midrash and Homilies, Talmud and Rabbis, Muhammedan fragments, Jottings and so forth. Together 20 boxes.

Fragments in bound volumes. Fragments consisting of a certain number of leaves are classified according to size and contents, and the contents correspond to the material contained in the boxes. The process of binding material which was first put into boxes is still going on.

Fragments mounted between glass: Single pieces written on parchment and on paper, regarded as of special value. There are not less than 1,800 fragments preserved in that way.

Schechter made an approximate calculation that he brought over to Cambridge from Cairo about 100,000 fragments.¹ If we suppose that the material which came over to other libraries and collections was as extensive, we should have to reckon with a total of about 200,000 fragments. But such calculation is very difficult, and there may be either much more or much less. In any case it is clear that we have an amazing quantity of material.

But it is not only the quantity but also the quality which has to be taken into consideration. Some of the most conspicuous finds are already mentioned in the report of the Cambridge Library Syndicate. First the text of Ecclesiasticus. Since Schechter published the historical fragment of this text belonging to the Scottish ladies in the *Expositor*,² a great number of fragments of that text have been found, and during the next few years one publication followed another. The texts of the Bodleian Library were published by Cowley and Neubauer,³ those of the Cambridge University Library by Schechter and Taylor,⁴ the Paris texts by Israel Lévi.⁵ Further texts were published by Halévy,⁶

¹ *Studies in Judaism*, Second Series, Philadelphia, 1908, p. 9.

² *Expositor*, 6 July 1896.

³ *The Original Hebrew of a Portion of Ecclesiasticus*, Oxford, 1897.

⁴ *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, Cambridge, 1899.

⁵ In *Revue des Études juives*, vol. xi. 1-30.

⁶ In *Revue des Études sémitiques*, vol. vii. 688-702.

G. Margoliouth,¹ Schechter,² Elkan Adler,³ Moses Gaster;⁴ new critical editions of the texts already published were made by Halévy, Israel Lévi, Norbert Peters, and others, and scholars like Theodor Nöldeke, A. A. Bevan, S. R. Driver, D. S. Margoliouth, and many others published critiques with more or less important contributions to the texts or the problems connected with them, until the work was finally edited by Rudolf Smend in a great critical edition.⁵

It is clear that besides the help in understanding the text of Ecclesiasticus offered by these long Hebrew fragments, its contribution to our knowledge of Hebrew is very important. We have always to keep in mind that the selection of the Hebrew texts contained in the Old Testament is very limited, and every old text freshly discovered is to be regarded as a very welcome contribution to Hebrew lexicography and Hebrew grammar.

Of similar importance was another text discovered in the Geniza and published by Schechter under the not very fortunate title 'Fragments of a Zadokite Work'.⁶ The book was composed by an author who left Jerusalem and withdrew to Damascus where he founded a schismatic sect of which previously nothing was known. The book gives in the original Hebrew the sect's own account of its origin, its secession from the Jews in Judaea and migration to the region of Damascus, its organization and the laws under which it lived. The importance of the document is, however, not to be seen in the history of a long forgotten sect, but in the religious and legal matters contained in it. The religious conceptions, the figure of the Messiah and the expected development of history were recently discussed by Rowley.⁷ He tried to bring them into connexion with those in other pre-Christian Jewish sources. The laws and prescriptions in the book, on Sabbath observance, uncleanness and purification, oaths and vows, the lawfulness of certain marriages, and many other things differ largely from those known from Tannaite sources. These differences can hardly be explained if the book was composed shortly before the beginning of the Christian era. Such a date (18-8 B.C.) was proposed by R. H. Charles, who

¹ In *Jewish Quarterly Review*, vol. xii. 1-33.

² *Ibid.* 456-65.

³ *Ibid.* 466-80.

⁴ *Ibid.* 688-702.

⁵ *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach*, 3 vols., Berlin, 1906-7.

⁶ *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, vol. i, Cambridge, 1910.

⁷ H. H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic. A Study of Jewish and Christian Apocalypses from Daniel to the Revelation*, London, 1943, pp. 71-4.

with full justification included the book in his Pseudepigrapha.¹ The book must be considerably older. From the fact that there is no trace in it of the desecration of the Temple, the Maccabean War, or the book of Daniel, Eduard Meyer concluded that the book must be of pre-Maccabean origin.² He may be right. As in the book references are to be found to the Book of Jubilees and the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs, we shall have also to reconsider the dates attributed to these books.³

The two MSS. of which fragments of the 'Damascusschrift' are preserved represent two different recensions of the text and show in an interesting way how much such texts fluctuated. We have similar conditions in many other books, not only in the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs and the book of Enoch, to which E. Meyer draws attention,⁴ but also in the Greek translations of later canonical books of the Old Testament.⁵

Charles had already seen that Schechter's edition of the text of the book was not sufficient.⁶ But when he was occupied with the text, the MSS. were not available. A new edition of the

¹ *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, vol. ii, pp. 785-834; the date is discussed on p. 793 f.

² Eduard Meyer, *Die Gemeinde des Neuen Bundes im Lande Damaskus. Eine jüdische Schrift aus der Seleucidenzeit*. Abhandlungen, Berlin Academy, 1919. Cf. his book: *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, vol. ii, Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1921, p. 47 f.

³ For the book of Jubilees, an early date has recently been proposed by Solomon Zeitlin, in his article 'The Book of Jubilees. Its Character and its Significance', *Jewish Quarterly Review*, vol. xxx, 1939, pp. 1-31. Zeitlin seems to be right in suggesting that the book of Jubilees has nothing to do with Pharisees and Sadducees, parties developed in the Maccabean period, and in drawing attention to the differences which exist between the book and laws and prescriptions in the Pentateuch. These differences can, however, not be explained with Zeitlin by any sort of disagreement of the author with the Tora. The author of the book had certainly the aim of writing a kind of Midrash on the Tora. We know, however, that the text of the Tora used by him differed clearly from the text known to us (see the third lecture, p. 148). The material collected by Zeitlin makes it likely that the differences had a greater extent than we realized before. The comparatively uniform text of the Tora has probably to be regarded as the result of a long development. In the time when the book of Jubilees was composed, several texts of the Tora may have been in circulation. To the question of the calendar much weight is attached by Zeitlin. These matters have been discussed by H. H. Rowley (l.c., p. 82 f.), in connexion with an important article published by J. Morgenstern in *Hebrew Union College Annual*, vol. i, Cincinnati, 1924, pp. 13 ff.

⁴ See Eduard Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge . . .*, vol. ii, p. 47, note 2.

⁵ See the third lecture, p. 173 f.

⁶ l.c. vol. ii, p. 797.

text has been made by Leonhard Rost.¹ He had excellent photographs at his disposal and could make use of all the numerous publications issued in connexion with the text up to 1933.² His edition marks a great advance and is indispensable for the study of the book. It cannot, however, be regarded as definitive. Geniza fragments are always damaged and can never be published on the basis of photographs alone in a satisfactory way. Rost admits that Schechter sometimes saw in the original letters which he could not recognize on the photographs. Further, the fragments show some vowel signs. They were left unnoticed by Schechter, but they are of a certain interest. In the text published by Rost vowel signs are occasionally given. But nothing can be done with these signs before the whole method of vocalization shall have been carefully investigated.

Burkitt's scholarly edition of the fragments of Aquila's translation of the Bible was one of the earliest publications of Geniza fragments.³ For the first time we had here continuous texts of at least some verses of that translation, which we knew before only by quotations of Church Fathers, and Burkitt was able to make several important deductions concerning it. This edition will have its importance even when the much larger fragments of Origen's Hexapla are published, which Giovanni Mercati discovered at nearly the same time in a palimpsest in the Ambrosiana in Milan.⁴ The 35 folios of this palimpsest contain about 150 verses of the Psalms, but not only in Aquila's translation: five columns of the Hexapla are preserved here, with the exception only of the first column, the Hebrew text in Hebrew letters. The reading of this palimpsest is exceedingly difficult. Mercati has deciphered it in an admirable way. The Milan fragments are much younger than the Geniza fragment published by Burkitt; they were written in the tenth or eleventh century, Burkitt's fragment in the fifth, and they were written

¹ *Die Damascusschrift, Neu bearbeitet von Leonhard Rost*, in Lietzmann's 'Kleine Texte . . .', no. 167, Berlin, 1933.

² The bibliography published by Adolph S. Oko, *Solomon Schechter, a Bibliography*, Cambridge, 1938, pp. 61-6, is not complete.

³ *Fragments of the Book of Kings according to the Translation of Aquila*, by F. Crawford Burkitt, Cambridge, 1897. Some fragments of the Hexapla, parts of Psalm 22, were published by Charles Taylor, *Hebrew-Greek Cairo Genizah Palimpsest*, Cambridge, 1900.

⁴ *Atti della Accademia Reale delle Scienze di Torino*, vol. xxxi, Disp. 11 a, 1895-6. A specimen (Ps. 46. 1-4) was published by Ceriani in *Rendiconti del Reale Istituto Lomb. di Scienze e Lettere*, Ser. 2, vol. xxix, 1896. This specimen was republished by E. Klostermann in *ZATW.*, 1896, p. 336 f.

in minuscules, whilst Burkitt's fragment was in uncial letters. Nevertheless, the Milan text is of the greatest importance. Here we have comparatively long texts of five of the six columns of the Hexapla. Up till now only the text of the second column of this fragment had been known, containing the Hebrew text in Greek letters.¹ In this text the Hebrew vowels are written; it is the oldest example of a vocalized Hebrew text which we possess, and gives us essential facts of Hebrew pronunciation during the second century A.D. I shall have to refer to it in my next lecture. Cardinal Mercati is now preparing an edition of the whole text, and we can be sure that the edition will be worthy of the importance of the document.²

Another fragment of wider interest was published by Schechter in 1913 under the title 'An Unknown Khazar Document'.³ The Khazars formed a mighty kingdom to the north of the Caspian and the Black Seas, with a capital on the lower Volga, called Itil. The Arab geographers and historians of the tenth century report many details of their manners and customs, their wars against Arabs, Byzantines, and other neighbours. In Byzantine, Russian, Armenian, and other sources details about them are reported also.⁴ We hear that the king of the Khazars and the

¹ These Hebrew fragments in Greek translation are published by Franz Wutz, *Die Psalmen, Textkritisch untersucht*, München, 1925. He had at his disposal a photograph of Mercati's transcript of the texts. But this edition is very unsatisfactory, and it was made without the consent of Giovanni Mercati. The fragments as deciphered by Mercati had already been used by Henry A. Redpath in Supplement, Fasc. II of the *Concordance to the Septuagint*, Oxford, 1906: 'Additional Words and Occurrences of Words in Hexaplaric fragments', pp. 199-216. See the second lecture, pp. 86 ff.

² In a letter dated 21 April 1942 Giovanni Cardinal Mercati writes to me: 'Credo bene aggiungere che dal 1940 ho represo—dopo un terzo di secolo—con immensa fatica le Esaple, e consacro ad esse il tempo e le poche forze che mi restano: Mi sono dovuto rimettere quasi all' alfabeto! Vado relegando parola per parola il palimsesto medesimo e scrivo note e commentario a causa delle discrepanze della tradizione e per dimostrare che l'ultima colonna non contiene Teodozione come Rahlfs ha continuato a ritenere. Anzi essendo riuscito a ricavare tavole fotografiche del palimsesto, farò un' edizione fototipica con trascrizione di fronte ad ogni tavola e col commento dopo. Ho già steso un terzo del lavoro—lento e fastidioso, ma che spero sarà non inutile, per quanto imperfetto. Mi stimerò beato se potrò cominciare la stampa dentro il 1943.' In a letter dated 16 January 1945 Cardinal Tisserant writes concerning the edition: 'Most of the work is already finished and can be given to the printer, but Card. Mercati prefers to have all his text ready for print.'

³ *Jewish Quarterly Review*, New Series, vol. iii, 1912-13, pp. 181-219.

⁴ Cf. J. Marquart, *Osteuropäische und Ostasiatische Streifzüge*, Leipzig, 1903,

upper classes had turned to Judaism during the Khalifate of Hārūn ar-Rashīd (786-809). The Khazars were defeated by the Russians under Swyatoslaw in the second half of the tenth century. During the following period we hear occasionally about their encounters with their neighbours, but nothing more about their Jewish rulers, and we do not know when their kingdom came to an end.¹

For the Jews the Khazar kingdom is of special interest. It is—besides the Jewish kingdom in Adiabene (חדיב) in the middle of the first century²—the only Jewish kingdom which came into existence after the beginning of our era. In about 1577 a certain Isaak Abraham Akrish published in Constantinople a little pamphlet קול מבושר 'Voice of the Messenger of Good News' intended to encourage the spirit of the Jews by proving that there are known places where Israel possessed kings with strength

pp. 5-27, and W. Barthold's excellent article 'Khazar' in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, vol. ii.

The most important Arabic source, Ibn Faḍlān's report on his experiences during his journey with the Embassy of the Khalif al-Muḩtadir, in A.D. 921 and 922, was up till now only known from excerpts made by Arabic geographers of later times, like Yāḩūt and ḩazwīnī. In 1924 the text of Ibn Faḍlān's report itself was discovered in Meshhed by Professor A. Zeki Validi in the appendix to a MS. containing the second volume of Ibn al-Faḩīh's Kitāb al-Boldān (a text, of which we knew before an extract only, which had been published by M. de Goeje in *Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum*, vol. v, Lugd. Bat., 1885). Zeki Validi recently published Ibn Faḍlān's text with a German translation and a very careful investigation of all problems connected with it: 'Ibn Faḍlān's Reisebericht, herausgegeben, übersetzt und untersucht', in *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Leipzig, 1939.

The reports concerning the Khazars given by the Arabic Geographer al-Balkhī (died A.D. 934) are lost in the original, but most of it is preserved in the books of Istakhri (about A.D. 950) and Ibn Hauḩal (about 975). Istakhri's book is published by M. de Goeje: *Viae regnorum. Descriptio dittonis moslemicae, auctore Abu Ishāḩ al-Fārisī al-Istakhri* (= *Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum*, vol. i, Lugd. Bat., 1870, reprinted 1927). In Mr. Chester Beatty's Library a valuable MS. of the text is to be found, in which some new details concerning the Khazars are contained. Ibn Hauḩal's book was published by de Goeje as vol. ii of the same series (Lugd. Bat., 1873). Since that time important new material has been found which has been used in the new edition of the text: 'Opus Geographicum auctore Ibn Hauḩal (Abū 'l-ḩāsim Ibn Hauḩal al-Naḩībī), secundum textum et imagines codicis Constantinopolitani conservati in Bibliotheca antiqui Palatii, no. 2246, cui titulus est *Liber Imaginis Terrae*, edidit collato textu primae editionis aliisque fontibus adhibitis J. H. Kramers. Lugduni Batavorum, 1939.' The report on the Khazars is here to be found on pp. 386-98.

¹ Cf. Barthold's article, quoted above.

² With this kingdom I will deal in my third lecture: see below, p. 184 ff.

and power, and here he included correspondence between Joseph, the Jewish king of the Khazars, and Chisdai b. Shafrūt, a Jewish physician and high official at the court of the Omaiyad Khalif 'Abdurrahmān an-Nāṣir, who ruled in Cordova in Spain from A.D. 912 to 961.¹ Chisdai had received some news about the Jewish kingdom of the Khazars and addressed to the king a letter in Hebrew in which he told him something of the conditions under which he was living, and asked him some questions about the history and conditions in his kingdom. The letter was introduced by a rhymed poetical epistle composed by the well-known Hebrew grammarian and poet Menachem b. Saruḡ. King Joseph, in the answer, gave at least some of the details for which he had been asked.²

This correspondence has been much disputed, and in critical circles it has generally been regarded as a late falsification, especially as no trace of the documents published by Akrish had been found, except the text in a MS. belonging to Christ Church Library in Oxford, which was not older than the sixteenth century. That this text is really of importance has recently been shown by Kokovtsov.³

Among the MSS. collected by Firkowitch there was an old fragment containing a copy of the letter sent by King Joseph to Chisdai, in general accordance with the letter published by Akrish, and based on the same original text, but much larger, offering sometimes better readings and adding in some instances new material, particularly in the geographical parts. Firkowitch had shown the fragment to Chwolson in 1870. When after Firkowitch's death his collection came to the Russian Public Library in Petersburg, the document was rediscovered by Harkavy.⁴ He published a German translation of the text⁵ and

¹ The correspondence published by Akrish is re-edited by Paul Kokovtsov in his book on the Hebrew-Khazar Correspondence in the tenth century (*Еврейско-Хазарская Переписка в X веке*) published by the Russian Academy in Leningrad, 1932. In this book critical texts and careful investigations of all documents involved are to be found. On plate 1 Kokovtsov has given a facsimile of p. 11b-12 a of Akrish's book.

² An English translation of the correspondence is easily accessible in *Jewish Travellers*, by E. N. Adler ('The Broadway Travellers'), London, 1930, pp. 22-36.

³ MS. no. 1454, described on p. 870 of the *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, vol. i. A facsimile of the MS. is given by Kokovtsov, l.c., plate 2.

⁴ The fragment is now MS. Heb. 157 of the Second Firkowitch Collection in the Russian Public Library in Leningrad.

⁵ 'Ein Briefwechsel zwischen Cordova und Astrachan zur Zeit Swjatoslaws

the Hebrew text somewhat later.¹ It may be that the fragment belonged to the bundles of fragments which Firkowitch had acquired from the Cairo Geniza.² Schechter did not think of this possibility, and Kokovtsov does not doubt that it was found in the Crimean peninsula.

It has been said, for instance, by Joseph Marquart, that this document, as coming from Firkowitch, has to be regarded with critical eyes, as it may be one of his usual falsifications.³ Many others had the same suspicion.⁴ But Harkavy was an expert in Hebrew MSS. and very well versed in Firkowitch's falsifications, and he would certainly not have published the fragment if he had not been sure that it was old. Kokovtsov published a facsimile of the fragment,⁵ and there can be no doubt that it is really old; but Kokovtsov has proved that the text of this longer version is not always preferable to the shorter version, as the first editor supposed, and besides, it is very likely that Firkowitch made a few alterations in it.⁶

Now Schechter found a second Hebrew fragment concerning the Khazars which undoubtedly came from the Cairo Geniza. This fragment is also part of a letter, and the letter claims to have been written by one of the entourage of the Khazar king. Beginning and end are missing. The letter has nothing to do with the documents published by Akrish. It contains reports on the conversion of the Khazars to Judaism and many historical and geographical details. That these reports are given in a somewhat legendary style, and that the letter is not very exact in the details it gives makes no difficulty. We cannot expect a letter of that kind to be more exact. But Kokovtsov has proved that this text is strongly influenced by the book of Josippon, the

(um 960), als Beitrag zur alten Geschichte Süd-Russlands', in *Russische Revue*, vol. vi, 1875, pp. 69-97.

¹ The Hebrew text appeared in מאסף נדחים, an appendix to the Hebrew periodical *Ha-Melish*, no. 8, 1879. A Russian translation of the correspondence was published by Harkavy in the periodical, *Еврейская Библиотека*, tom. vii, 1879, pp. 153-62.

² It is very likely that Akrish got a copy of the correspondence, which he published in about 1577, in Cairo, to which he came during his journey from Constantinople to Egypt, undertaken in 1562. See J. Mann, *Texts and Studies in Jewish History and Literature*, vol. i, Cincinnati, 1931, p. 8.

³ Cf. J. Marquart, l.c. Marquart could not discover the place where Harkavy had published the Hebrew text of the fragment.

⁴ The last was Henry Grégoire, in *Byzantion*, vol. ix, 1934, pp. 484-8.

⁵ l.c., plate 3.

⁶ Cf. the remark of D. A. Chwolson, who had copied the fragment in 1870, reprinted by Kokovtsov, l.c., p. xvii, note 5.

well-known story-book composed somewhere in Italy on the basis of a Latin translation of Josephus's book on the Jewish War and other sources. Although this book seems to be somewhat older than Kokovtsov believed,¹ Kokovtsov seems to be right in stating that the Cambridge document cannot be authentic. But he admits that the document has its value as it has preserved some data from a Byzantine composition otherwise lost to us.

That the correspondence published by Akrish must have existed in the eleventh century is proved by the fact that Jehuda b. Barzillai quotes verbally a part of the letter of the Khazar king in his *Sepher ha-Ittim*, a book on the Holiday Seasons, which was composed about 1100.² There can be no doubt that he had the correspondence before him in a form very similar to that known to us.

What is published about the correspondence is usually dictated by apologetical tendencies. Either the authenticity is accepted for reasons similar to those which led Akrish in 1577 to publish it,³ or it is felt that the ideal picture of Chisdai b. Shafrūt, the man chiefly concerned, does not agree with that of the man who is said to have written the letter to the king of the Khazars, and the genuineness of the correspondence is not thought to be in the Jewish interest. I may quote as an interesting example of this kind of argumentation the following words from A. N. Poliakov's article 'The Khazar Conversion to Judaism':⁴

If, however, Chisdai himself or his secretary wrote the 'letter of Chisdai', we must think of him not as a very clever man, as he is known to us from other sources, but as an ignorant person who in spite of his high position at the court of the Kalif had never heard of the Arabic geographical and historical literature, and so would not have known either the Judaism of the Khazars or their existence, unless he had heard of them from 'the merchant envoys of Khorasan' or 'the envoys of Constantinople'; and not only so, but we must regard all his entourage as not clever, like himself. . . .

Poliakov here goes too far. We need only to read Ibn Faḍlān's

¹ J. Mann has shown that *Sepher Josippon* was already in existence in the time of Chisdai in Spain. Cf. *Texts and Studies*, vol. i, p. 15 f.

² Cf. S. Asaf in the Jewish periodical *Jeshurun*, vol. xi, Berlin, 1924, pp. 113 ff.

³ Cf. for instance S. Dubnov's article 'Last conclusions on the question of the Khazars', in the *Memorial Volume in honour of S. A. Poznanski*, Warsaw, 1927.

⁴ The article of Poliakov is published in Hebrew in the Hebrew periodical *Zion*, published in Jerusalem, April and July 1941, 67 pages. I had at my disposal an English translation, made by D. M. Dunlop of Glasgow University. This translation I have quoted. Mr. Dunlop has made the Khazar question a special subject of his studies and is preparing a monograph on it. I have discussed the problems with him.

report in order to see how little was generally known in the first half of the tenth century concerning the kingdoms situated in the north, and it is very doubtful whether Chisdai had at his disposal the historical and geographical books written by the Arabs, to which we have access to-day. Poliakov tries to suggest some travellers who may have written the reports which might have served as a basis for the supposed inventor of the correspondence. But all his ingenious hypotheses can hardly explain why and by whom this correspondence should have been invented, and how such an invention should have had the consequences which we see in Jehuda b. Barzillai's notice and Jehuda ha-Levi's *Kuzari*. It is certainly of importance that an authority like Paul Kokovtsov (to whom we owe the excellent critical edition of the correspondence and a careful investigation of all the problems connected with it) is convinced that the correspondence is genuine in the main. And we have a good parallel to Chisdai's correspondence with the king of the Khazars in the letters connected with Chisdai published recently from Geniza fragments by J. Mann.¹ In any case it is clear that the Geniza has preserved some old documents containing a great number of historical and geographical details from a time and a country for which our sources are very meagre. These fragments will have to be investigated carefully without reference to the question whether the genuineness of the correspondence is in Jewish interests or not.

So far I have dealt with a number of single fragments of outstanding importance which, when published, attracted great interest and led to fruitful discussions. Not every fragment is of equal importance. But sometimes a fragment may greatly increase in value if published and studied in connexion with other available material of a similar kind, and finally a systematic investigation of the whole material of a special kind may lead to historical discoveries and to important conclusions and may prove of much greater value than the publication of single fragments from the Geniza. I may refer here to the immense mass of material published by Jacob Mann.² What he says concerning

¹ 'Chisdai Ibn Shafrūt and his Diplomatic Intervention on behalf of the Jews in Christian Europe', in Jacob Mann, *Texts and Studies*, vol. i, Cincinnati, 1931, pp. 1-30.

² Jacob Mann, *The Jews in Egypt and in Palestine under the Fāṭimid Caliphs. A Contribution to their political and communal History, based chiefly on Genizah Material hitherto unpublished*, Oxford, vol. i, 1920; vol. ii, 1922. Jacob Mann, *Texts and Studies in Jewish History and Literature*, vol. i, Cincinnati, 1931; vol. ii, Karaitica, Philadelphia, 1935.

this material in the Preface to the first volume of his *Texts and Studies* is certainly true:

All these studies, based as they are on new material, which supplements and illumines the already known, will, it is to be hoped, be appreciated by scholars and students who, like the writer, are averse to fanciful theories spun out as a rule from a minimum of available data. . . . Only by a cautious and laborious inductive method and by adding constantly to our knowledge of the actual realities of the Jewish past . . . can we understand this past fully and truly and ultimately hope to obtain the synthesis that every research worker sets before himself as his ultimate goal. . . . With the widening of the horizon new perspectives are revealed and events, movements, and personalities are placed in a different setting and proportion.

I may illustrate this first by some remarks on the liturgical poetry of the Jews, and will then try to show to what important conclusions we may come through a systematic investigation of the material preserved in the Geniza showing the text of the Bible (second lecture) and the text of the Translations of the Bible: Targum, Septuagint, and Peshitta (third lecture).

How much the material found in the Geniza has increased our knowledge of the medieval liturgical poetry of the Jews I may now illustrate by a few examples. In the Introduction to his grammatical treatise 'Agron',¹ Sa'adya Gaon (who died in A.D. 941), himself a liturgical poet and an authority on this kind of poetry, mentions as the 'five early poets' (*ash-shu'arā al-awwalūn*) Yose b. Yose, Yannai, Ḳalir, Yōshu'a, and Pinḥas.² Of these only Ḳalir was really known to us by his poetry. He was the author of more than 200 poetical compositions preserved in the Maḥzors, the liturgical books of the Jews, and L. Zunz declared him the legislator in this field of poetry.³

Not a single poem composed by either of the two poets mentioned by Sa'adya at the end of his list was known to us until quite recently a few fragments of Yehoshu'a's,⁴ and rather

¹ Edited by Harkavy in *Mkise Nirdanim*, Berlin, 1891, from fragments of the 2nd Firkowitch Collection. It is very likely that these fragments belonged to the material brought over by Firkowitch from the Cairo Geniza.

² *Ib.*, p. 50 f.

³ In his *Literaturgeschichte der synagogalen Poesie*, Berlin, 1865, p. 29. That the name of this poet has to be pronounced more correctly as *Kilir* is known from the acrostics in his poems. But in old Geniza fragments the name is given in the acrostics as *Kilirr* (קילירר) with double *r*, and this shows clearly that the name goes back to the name Cyrillus, with metathesis of *r* and *l*.

⁴ Cf. Menahem Zulay in *Studies of the Research Institute for Hebrew Poetry*, vol. v, 1939, p. 155 f.

more of Pinḥas' poems¹ were discovered in the Geniza. This Pinḥas is of special interest in so far as he seems to be identical with the Tiberian Masorete of that name, who is known to us as 'Rosh ha-Yeshiba', the head of the Rabbinical School in Tiberias, who flourished about A.D. 800.²

To Yose b. Yose only one poem can be ascribed with certainty, an 'Aboda for the day of Atonement (יום כיפור), a great alphabetical hymn starting with the wonders of creation and dealing with the generations since. Here to each letter of the alphabet ten verses are devoted, just as in Psalm 119, where eight verses are devoted to each of these letters. Till then we knew of this poem only through Sa'adya who had incorporated it in his 'Siddur', his great liturgical book.³ In the Geniza, liturgical manuscripts with fragments of the poem are to be found which are independent of Sa'adya, for example one MS. on parchment, containing a large fragment of the poem. This MS. is provided with excellent Palestinian vocalization and is certainly much older than Sa'adya.⁴

Of Yannai a single poetical composition was known from the Maḥzors. Five more were discovered by Israel Davidson on some of the facsimiles of the palimpsests of which the underscript contained the fragments of Aquila and the Hexapla, which had been published by Burkitt and Taylor.⁵ Davidson published them, together with Yannai's composition already known, in his *Maḥzor Yannai, a Liturgical Work of the Seventh Century*, New York, 1919. Since that time many more fragments of Yannai's poetry have been discovered on Geniza fragments here and there, and a systematic investigation of the more than 10,000 photographs of Geniza fragments in the Research Institute for Hebrew Poetry in Jerusalem enabled Menahem Zulay to publish in 1938 a large volume of 438 pages with 177 different compositions or fragments thereof, containing more than 800 poems of Yannai, collected from 175 Geniza fragments.⁶ In his 'Studies of Yannai',

¹ Cf. M. Zulay, *ib.* vol. i, 1933, pp. 150-74; vol. v, pp. 121 ff.

² Cf. my *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. i, 1927, p. 37; Jacob Mann, *The Jews in Egypt and in Palestine under the Fatimide Caliphs*, Oxford, vol. ii, 1922, p. 47 f.; cf. vol. i, 1920, p. 58.

³ Sa'adya's Siddur has been published by I. Davidson, S. Asaf, and B. J. Joel in Jerusalem 1941.

⁴ It is the Oxford MS. Heb. d. 55, fol. 12 ff.

⁵ See above, p. 13.

⁶ *Piyyute Yannai. Liturgical Poems of Yannai*, collected from Geniza Manuscripts and other sources and published by Menahem Zulay, Berlin, 1938.

a monograph in which he investigated all problems connected with this poet,¹ Zulay comes to the conclusion that there can be no doubt that these poems were composed in Palestine, but that they were even earlier than Davidson suggested. They must have been composed during the time of Byzantine rule, that is to say in the sixth or the beginning of the seventh century, as Palestine was conquered by the Arabs in A.D. 636.

But these poems of Yannai are not the only remnants of liturgical poetry which have come down to us from that time. Zulay has established the fact that the Kerobas devoted to the 'Mishmarot' must have been composed at nearly the same time.² Mishmarot (sing. Mishmar) is the term for the classes of priests officiating turn by turn in the Temple of Jerusalem.³ The names of these classes are mentioned in 1 Chron. 24. 7-18. After the destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70 we find these priestly families living in certain villages or towns of Galilee, each class at a special place. Here they kept alive the memory of their former services in the Temple and eagerly hoped for the day when the Temple would be reinstituted and they could begin their services there again. To these twenty-four Mishmarot these Kerobas are devoted, to each Mishmar one Keroba, provided for the services of the very Sabbath day on which the Mishmar would have been in office had the Temple still been in existence. This practice must have been in use at that time in the services of the Synagogues. For us this fact is a surprising novelty, as rites of that kind are nowhere else mentioned.

Of these twenty-four Kerobas nearly one-half are preserved in Geniza fragments. Most of them I have published myself,⁴ some more have been added by Zulay.⁵ All the fragments belonged to the same MS., and no other MS. with any fragment of these poems is known. That these poems were composed by a certain Hedwatha (הדוּתָה) (or Hedutha) has been pointed

out by Dr. Spanier from the acrostic in certain parts of the poems.¹ Nothing is known about this poet otherwise.²

I must acknowledge that it was not my special interest in this kind of poetry which induced me to study these poems for many years, but problems of Hebrew Grammar. Many of these liturgical MSS. in the Geniza are comparatively old and often provided with vowels of the Palestinian system which preceded in Palestine the vocalization developed in Tiberias (see the next lecture). Texts of this kind of vocalization are of importance in so far as they are still more or less independent of the influence of the Tiberian Masoretes who, in the course of the eighth century, began to reorganize the Hebrew language and to bring it into the shape which we know from our Hebrew grammars.³ As early as 1899 A. E. Cowley had already presented me with some photographs of the Oxford MS. Heb. d. 63. They had to wait for many years until I could begin to study them seriously. These poems are composed in an exceedingly difficult Hebrew. They are sometimes packed with alliterations and rich in hints of the Halacha and Haggada. How closely, for instance, the Keroba of Yannai, devoted to the Seder Gen. 35. 9-36. 43, is connected with the Palestinian Targum of the Pentateuch has been shown by Zulay.⁴ These poems are in general more artificial than artistic, and I had to discuss them again and again with my collaborators and pupils in Giessen and in Bonn before I published the texts. Several of my pupils took up similar texts, and some valuable publications were the results of their studies.⁵

¹ In *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*, 1929, p. 68.

² Some poems of a poet with the similar name הדוּתָה are known, one is published by Ismar Elbogen in *ציונים*, a volume in memory of J. N. Simchoni, Berlin, 1929, p. 87, and some others have been found. Zulay has shown that they are of another kind and have nothing to do with our Hedwatha. Cf. *Studies*, vol. v, 1939, p. 112.

³ Cf. as to these problems the next lecture.

⁴ In the Appendix to his Bonn thesis (see next note) Zulay compared Yannai's Keroba, published by me in *Masoreten des Westens*, i, pp. 24-6 of the Hebrew text, 59*-64* of the translation, with the text of the Palestinian Targum published by me in *Masoreten des Westens*, ii, pp. 12-14. It is very interesting to see how closely Yannai is following here the text of the Targum.

⁵ Cf. M. Kober, 'Zum Machzor Jannai' (= *Jahrbuch der jüd. liter. Gesellschaft*), Frankfurt a M., vol. xx, 1929; Menachem Zulay, 'Zur Liturgie der babylonischen Juden. Geniza Texte, herausgegeben, übersetzt und bearbeitet...' (*Bonner Orientalistische Studien II*, Stuttgart, 1933); Rafael Edelmann, 'Zur Frühgeschichte des Machzors' (*Bonner Orient. Studien*, vi, 1934); Gustav Ormann, *Das Sündenbekenntnis des Versöhnungstages*, Frankfurt a M., 1934; Falk Bar, *Liturgische Dichtungen*, 1936; Gabriel Dawidowicz, *Liturgische Dichtungen der Juden*, 1938, (both Diss. Phil.) Bonn, and many other publications.

¹ In the *Studies of the Research Institute for Hebrew Poetry*, vol. ii, Berlin, 1936, pp. 213-372.

² Cf. his 'Contributions to the History of the Liturgical Poetry in Palestine', in *Studies*, vol. v, 1939, p. 111 f.

³ Cf. Emil Schürer, *A History of the Jewish People at the time of Jesus Christ*, Edinburgh, 1885-96, II, i, pp. 207 ff.; Eduard Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, vol. ii, 1921, p. 230.

⁴ In *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. i, 1927, pp. 1-24 of the Hebrew text, 1-59 of the translation. The text is published here from the Oxford MS. Heb. d. 63, fol. 82-9, and the Cambridge MS. T.-S. H. 16, fol. 2-3.

⁵ In *Studies*, vol. v, 1939, pp. 113-20, from the Cambridge MS. T.-S. H. 2, fol. 2, and the Cairo MS. P. 171, 172 of the Moseri Collection.

The great amount of this poetry preserved in the Geniza enables us to understand much better than before the historical background and the conditions under which these poems were composed. There can be no doubt that some of the characteristics of this poetry are due to certain restrictions laid upon the Jews in Palestine at that time, and that these restrictions were the consequences of the Edict *Περὶ Ἑβραίων* issued in the name of Justinian I as Novella 146 in A.D. 553.¹ This Novella regulates the conditions of the Jewish Communities in the whole Byzantine Empire and has to be regarded as a historical document of the first rank, especially as it was issued at a time from which hardly any other authoritative document concerning the history of the Jews is known to us. But the whole context of the Novella must be read. In the Appendix I give an English translation of the whole edict.

Here we learn that the Jews in the Byzantine Empire disagreed among themselves for a long time about the way in which Synagogue services were to be held. A considerable number of Greek-speaking Jews were not satisfied with the practice of reading only the Hebrew text of the Scriptures in these services and they demanded that besides the Hebrew text a Greek translation should also be read. They had further objections to the explanations given in the services by the interpreters, the *ἐξηγηταί*, in accordance with the 'Deuterosis', and had complaints about certain teachings they heard there, the denial of the resurrection, of the last judgement, of angels as beings created by God.² These inter-Jewish controversies were brought before the Byzantine Government, and in Novella 146 the actual document has come down to us in which the Government attempted to settle the quarrels. It was decided that the Greek translation of the Holy Scriptures should be admitted beside the Hebrew text, the Septuagint being recommended in the first instance as the old and most trustworthy translation, but the translation of Aquila being also admitted. Strictly prohibited was the 'Deuterosis' 'because it is neither contained in the Holy Scriptures, nor transmitted from of old (*ἀνωθεν*)³—by the Pro-

¹ *Corpus Juris Civilis*, vol. iii: *Novellae*. Recognovit Rudolphus Schoell . . . Guilelmus Kröll, 3rd edition, Berlin, 1904, pp. 714–18.

² It is of great interest to learn from this official document of these inter-Jewish controversies which were brought before the Byzantine Government in the course of the sixth century. Similar problems led, during the eighth century, to the Karaite movement. See the next lecture.

³ According to Jewish doctrine, the 'Oral Law' was revealed to Moshe on Sinai, when the 'Written Law' was revealed to him. It was transmitted

phets, but was invented by men who had nothing divine in them'. Heavy punishments were inflicted on those who still upheld the teachings in question.

The exact meaning of 'Deuterosis' has been much disputed, it has been interpreted as Targum, as Mishna and Talmud, and as Midrash.¹ There can be scarcely any doubt that 'Deuterosis' is a fairly exact Greek translation of 'Mishna'. But the Byzantine authorities seem to have understood by it all material connected with these sources. In the remnants of *פירקוי בן באבוי* 'Chapters of Ben Baboi', published according to Geniza fragments by Louis Ginzberg,² we have an interesting reference to the changes in Jewish services in Palestine in consequence of the edict. Ben Baboi was a Palestinian Jew by birth and a Babylonian by education. He undertook towards the end of the eighth century to make Palestinian Jewry accept the authority of the Babylonian Talmud and of Gaonic tradition. It was the second attempt of that kind, the first being made about 760 by R. Jehudai Gaon,³ a great Talmudic authority and the teacher of Ben Baboi's teacher, and Ben Baboi refers to his authority. From his 'Chapters' we learn that the Jews in Palestine had been forbidden to say the Shma' and to pray the Tefilla (Shmone Esre), and to occupy themselves with the Tora. No restrictions were imposed on gatherings in the Synagogues on Sabbath mornings, and on reciting and singing the 'Ma'mads'. Now, so continues Ben Baboi, 'as God had destroyed the kingdom of Edom and abolished its restrictions, the Arabs had come and the Jews were again permitted to occupy themselves with the Tora, to say the Shma' and to pray the Tefilla, everything in the services had to be said at its right place, as ordered by the authorities'.⁴

to later generations by the Prophets, up to the time when it was codified in the Mishna.

¹ The quotations of the Church Fathers were collected by Hody in his book *De Bibliorum textibus originalibus*, Oxonii, 1705, pp. 238–40. The most important are also to be found in Schürer, l.c. i. i, p. 119, 103 of the English translation. There can be no doubt, according to these quotations, that the whole sphere of Jewish tradition was included under Deuterosis. Cf. also Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vol. v, 4th edition, Leipzig, 1909, note 7, pp. 410–13.

² *Genizah Studies in Memory of Doctor Solomon Schechter*, ii, *Geonic and Early Karaite Halakah*, by Louis Ginzberg, New York, 1929, pp. 504 ff.

³ Cf. p. xiv of Ginzberg's Introduction.

⁴ I give here the Hebrew text of the passage as published by Ginzberg, p. 551 f. וכן אמר מר יהודאי וְלִשְׁנוֹ שֶׁמֶד עַל בְּנֵי אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל שֶׁלֹא יִקְרְאוּ קְרִית. וְהָיוּ שֶׁמֶד וְהָיוּ מְנַחֵין אוֹתוֹן לִכְנֵס שְׁחָרִית בְּשַׁבָּת לֹמֵר וּלְזֹמֵר מַעֲמֻדוֹת וְהָיוּ אוֹמְרִים בְּשְׁחָרִית מַעֲמֻד וְקָדוֹשׁ וְשֶׁמֶד בְּמוֹסָף וְהָיוּ עוֹשִׂים דְּבָרִים הַלְלוּ בְּאוֹנֶס וְעִשְׂוֹ

That the term 'Ma'mad', occurring here twice in the Hebrew text, has to be understood as liturgical poetry, we see from a notice in Yehuda b. Barzillai's 'Sepher ha-'Ittim':¹

There was a time when the Jews were forbidden by their aggressors to engage in the study of law. The learned men among them, therefore, introduced the custom of mentioning in the course of prayers the laws of the festivals and the laws of the Sabbath and religious observances and exhorting the common people in regard to them by means of hymns, thanksgivings, rhymes, and Piyyutim.

These two texts show the effects of the Novella on the Jewish services in Palestine. When they were forbidden to engage in the study of law, we have to understand this as a prohibition against working on Mishna and Talmud, i.e., the 'Deuterosis' regarded as expressly suspicious by the Novella. To study the Bible was certainly not forbidden to them. When we hear that they were prohibited to pray the Tefilla we have to remember that the Palestinian form of this prayer contained the request:²

May the apostates have no hope! May you speedily, in our days, uproot the kingdom of arrogance! May the Christians (הנצרים) and the Heretics (המינים) perish immediately! May their name be effaced in the Book of Life and not be written together with the righteous ones! Blessed be the Lord who destroys the arrogant ones.

Nobody can blame the Byzantine authorities for suppressing a prayer in which these words were contained as soon as they became aware of it. It is more difficult to explain why the Shma' was forbidden, a kind of creed consisting of Deut. 6. 4-9; 11. 13-21; Num. 15. 37-41, preceded and followed by certain benedictions. Perhaps it was regarded as belonging to the 'Deuterosis', as the rules for saying it were given in the Mishna (Berakot 1. 1-4).

But the Jews did not renounce these elements in their services, and found a compensation for them by introducing the forbidden elements into their liturgical poetry. They had to go to work cautiously. Only hints of these elements could be

שכילה הקבה מלכות אדום וביטל גזרותיה ובאו ישמעלים והניחום לעסוק בתורה ולקרא קרית שמע ולהתפלל [ל] אסור לומר אלא דבר דבור במקומו כתיקון חכ זל ...

Cf. concerning this passage Rafael Edelmann, 'Bestimmung, Heimat und Alter der Synagogalen Poesie', in *Oriens Christianus III*, vol. 7, 1932, pp. 16-31.

¹ The translation given by Davidson in *Mahzor Yannai*, p. xvii, is quoted here. Cf. as to the book above p. 18.

² Published by S. Schechter in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, vol. x, 1898, p. 657, according to two Geniza fragments which show a few various readings. The prayer must have had a similar form already in the second century, cf. Justin's *Dial. c. Tryph.*, 96. 133; Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, p. 300.

introduced into the poetry. That is one of the reasons why this poetry is sometimes so exceedingly difficult. Only experts in Talmud and Midrash were able to understand such hints. Nevertheless, by reciting, or singing and hearing, this poetry in the services they were convinced that they had fulfilled their obligations. We can be quite sure that none of the Byzantine authorities was aware that by these hints the whole 'Deuterosis' was secretly introduced into the services by means of the freely admitted liturgical poetry. And it seems that none of them realized that the polemic against Edom and Duma in these poems was actually directed against Byzantium. To quote but one example: in an old Leningrad MS. with Palestinian punctuation, containing Piuts of Yannai, we read:¹

May the kingdom of Duma be blotted out from the face of the earth!
May Roma fall along with all people!

נחוש נא מאדמה מלכות דומה ותיפול רומה על כל אומה

Under 'all people' we have to understand the four kingdoms mentioned in Daniel, who once ruled over Israel and were later destroyed. The 'kingdom of Duma' is the Byzantine Empire, and 'Roma' is Byzantium. The last word seemed to be too clear a hint at the actual Government. So in the Leningrad MS. the words תפיל רומה were altered into תפיל אומה 'make terror fall (upon all people)'. Polemic of a similar kind is to be found often in the poems of Yannai and Hedwatha.²

It is clear that this kind of poetry must have been developed in Palestine in the period which followed the publication of the edict, Novella 146, in A.D. 553, that is to say, in the second half of the sixth century. This poetry lost its purpose after the Arab conquest of Palestine in 636. So we can fix the date of poets like Yannai and Hedwatha in this period. And that is of great importance for understanding and evaluating their poetry. We see that they had developed this liturgical poetry in every direction. Later poets like Kalir (not before the eighth century)³ and his followers can no longer be regarded with L. Zunz as

¹ MS. Antonin 369. The text has been published with a translation by M. Kober in his Bonn thesis (see above p. 23, note 5), p. 37 (Hebrew text), p. 57 (translation).

² Cf. Rafael Edelmann's article, quoted above, p. 26, note.

³ Hedwatha devotes his Kerobas to the twenty-four Mishmarot when these classes of priests had still some functions in the sixth century. These functions had long ceased when Kalir composed his elegy for the 9th Ab, where the Mishmarot are mentioned. A comparison between these two compositions is very instructive. Cf. Zulay in his article above, p. 22, note 1.

'legislators', they were imitators of the poetry of the sixth century, and hints of Byzantium, which occur sometimes because people were accustomed to it, had lost their actual meaning in later times.

But on the other hand we cannot deal with this Jewish liturgical poetry without referring to the liturgical poetry of other peoples of that time. The Keroba, the most used form of this poetry, containing the poems for the services of one Sabbath or one festival day, has a definite and very complicated structure,¹ and must have had its own history. But remnants from which we could study its development are very scarce. The regular use of acrostics in these poems—mostly alphabetical acrostics, but in certain poems the name of the author being indicated—is not surprising. Alphabetical acrostics are found already in the Old Testament and are regularly used in the liturgical poetry.

The metrical form of this poetry is in general the same as that which we know from the Old Testament. The verse has here a certain number of stresses. It is quite unlike the fixed metre of Arabic poetry. Arabic metre was introduced into Hebrew poetry by Dunash b. Labrat (who died about A.D. 990) and developed by poets of the eleventh and twelfth centuries in Spain, like Ibn Gabirol, Shemuel ha-Nagid, Jehuda ha-Levi, and others. These liturgical poems (the Piuts) have not even verses with a fixed number of syllables, which are characteristic of the Syriac poetry we know. But it has been proved lately that similar metrical forms were used in ancient Syriac poetry before verses with a fixed number of syllables were introduced and became the classical form of Syriac metre under the influence of Ephraem.²

But the surprising characteristic of the poetry is the rhyme, and the regular use of rhyme in this sixth-century poetry is a remarkable fact which has to be explained. Rhyme is not to be found in the 'Aboda of Yose b. Yose and must have been introduced into Jewish poetry after the time of this poet—which we do not know—and before poets like Yannai and Hedwatha. In most of the poems all verses end with the same rhyme, a method known to us from the Arabic *Kaṣida* since the sixth and seventh centuries. But the first poem of the Keroba is composed in virtual stanzas with different rhymes in the single stanzas.

¹ This structure is described by Israel Davidson in his *Mahzor Yannai*, pp. xxvi ff.

² Cf. H. H. Schaeder's article 'Bardanes von Edessa' in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, vol. li, 1932, pp. 47 ff.

Rhyme in this changing form is not completely unknown to the liturgical poetry of that time, for a few characteristic examples of it occur in Byzantium. One is found in the Dialogues between Mary and Gabriel, and between Mary and Joseph, inserted into his great panegyric on the Virgin, by Proklos (died A.D. 447). These dialogues have the alphabetical acrostic. In order to show the way in which the rhyme is used here I give the first lines of the beginning of the former dialogue:¹

Mary: Ἀγνοῶ τοῦ ῥήματος τὸ σαφές,
καὶ πῶς γνῶσομαι τοῦ πράγματος τὸ θεοπρεπές;

Gabriel: Ἀπαιτεῖς οὖν τὰ ἀγγελικὰ τάγματα
ἄρρητα Δημοσιεῦειν ῥήματα;

Mary: Βλάβην ἔχει τὰ τῆς ἐπερωτήσεως,
ἐὰν φανερωθῇ τὰ τῆς συλλήψεως;

P. Maas, in discussing this poetry of Proklos, comes to the conclusion that this kind of dialogue must go back to a Syriac prototype, and that we have to find it in the Syriac *Sugitha*, the 'Wechsellied'; he refers to poems of the fifth-century poet Narses.² Maas is quite right in stating that the form of both is almost identical; the difficulty is that these poems of Narses—like all Syriac poems known to us—have a fixed number of syllables in the verse and that they have no rhyme. 'The fixed number of syllables in the Syriac is compensated by the rhyme in the Greek', states Maas. But the rhyme is scarcely of Greek origin, and if Proklos is here really dependent on the Syriac *Sugitha*, he must have known a more ancient type of it, which is now lost to us. That the verse with a fixed number of syllables was preceded by the verse built up in accordance with the older Semitic type of verse we have already seen. The Syriac poetry preserved to us is under the influence of Ephraem. Since he was regarded as the classical Syriac poet, all older forms of Syriac poetry were regarded as imperfect and were destroyed, and practically nothing of it has come down to us. It is very likely that Proklos had before him *Sugithas* with this older type of verse.

It is another question whether we can suppose that rhymes were used in this kind of verse. We do not know of rhymed verses in Syriac. But that at one time the rhyme was used as a rhetorical element in Syriac we know from the few fragments of older

¹ Cf. P. Maas, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, xix, 1910, p. 292, according to Migne, lxxv. 740 B.

² *Syrische Wechsellieder von Narses*. Ein Beitrag zur altchristlichen Syrischen Hymnologie . . . herausgegeben, übersetzt und bearbeitet von Franz Feldmann, Leipzig, 1896.

Syriac literature which have come down to us. I may refer here only to Melito, Bishop of Sardis in the second century, who had certainly connexions with the East. The Greek text of his Homily on the Passion has recently been discovered on a Papyrus of the fourth century and published by Campbell Bonner.¹ Some Syriac fragments of this Homily were published as early as 1855 by William Cureton,² and here groups of rhymed sentences often occur.³ But we find such rhymed sentences in the Greek text also,⁴ and it may be that rhyme was developed after that time in Syriac literature. But it is very difficult to say anything definite here, as nothing of the older type of Syriac poetry is preserved.

The second example we find in the so-called 'Akathistos', a famous Byzantine Kontakion. Kontakion is a kind of poetical sermon consisting on the average of eighteen to twenty-four stanzas, which agree in number of syllables, accent, and syntactic construction. It begins with an allometric stanza, a κουκούλιον. There is besides, within the stanzas, a certain correspondence of cola and periods with one another. Finally, acrostic and refrain are obligatory.⁵ The Akathistos is described by W. Christ as 'Hymnus celeberrimus qui ab eo, quod stantes, non sedentes eum cantabant, ἀκάθιστος dictus est, grata memoria praesidium Mariae matris dei prosequitur, quo adiuti Byzantini anno 630 Persas eorumque regem Chaganum,⁶ urbem Constantinopolin invadere molientes, muris deiecerunt, deiectosque fuderunt fugaruntque'.⁷ The Kontakion itself has no rhyme. But the Akathistos has regularly added to stanzas 1, 3, 5, 7, &c., a number of salutations to the Virgin, and here every two salutations, built in exactly the same way, rhyme. The Akathistos is sometimes attributed to Sergius, who was Patriarch of Constantinople in the time of the siege. But P. Maas has shown

¹ In *Studies and Documents*, edited by Kirsopp Lake and Silva Lake, vol. xii, 1940.

² *Spicilegium Syriacum*, London, 1855, p. 49.

³ Cf. my article 'Was Melito's Homily on the Passion originally written in Syriac?' *JTS.*, vol. xlv, 1943, pp. 52-6.

⁴ Cf. E. J. Wellesz, 'Melito's Homily on the Passion: An investigation into the sources of Byzantine Hymnography', *JTS.*, xlv, 1943, pp. 41-52.

⁵ Cf. P. Maas, 'Das Kontakion', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, vol. xix, 1910, pp. 285 ff.

⁶ P. Wittek remarks that Chagan is not the king of the Persians, but the title of the king of the Avars, who besieged the town from the European side at that time.

⁷ W. Christ in *Anthologia Graeca Carminum Christianorum*, adornaverunt W. Christ et M. Paranikas, Lipsiae, 1871, p. lii.

that it is closely connected with Romanos and must have been composed by him.¹

Romanos is the great Byzantine poet who, if he was not the inventor of the Kontakion, certainly brought it to its highest perfection. The time of his poetical activity is given by the fact that we find in his poems hints of the collapse of the old Hagia Sophia in Constantinople in A.D. 532 and of its rebuilding in 537.² Recently Maas has discovered a fragment of Romanos on a sixth-century papyrus.³ The peak period of the Kontakion was, according to Maas, in A.D. 536-56. So we can fix the date of the Akathistos in the first half of the sixth century.

In order to show the method of this rhyme, I give here the salutations added to the first stanza. The last verse is a refrain repeated at the end of all salutations of this Kontakion.⁴

Χαῖρε, Δι' ἧς ἡ χαρὰ ἐκλάμπει
 χαῖρε, Δι' ἧς ἡ ἀρὰ ἐκλείπει
 Χαῖρε, τοῦ πεσόντος Ἀδάμ ἡ ἀνάκλησις
 Χαῖρε, τῶν λακρύων τῆς Εὐας ἡ λύτρωσις
 Χαῖρε, ὕψος λυσανάβατον ἀνθρωπίνους λογισμοῖς
 χαῖρε, βάθος λυσθεώρητον καὶ ἀγγέλων ὀφθαλμοῖς
 Χαῖρε, ὅτι ὑπάρχεις βασιλέων καθέδρα
 χαῖρε, ὅτι βαστάζεις τὸν βαστάζοντα πάντα
 Χαῖρε, ἀστήρ ἐμφαίνων τὸν ἥλιον
 χαῖρε, γαστήρ ἐνθέου σαρκώσεως
 Χαῖρε, Δι' ἧς νεουργεῖται ἡ κτίσις
 χαῖρε, Δι' ἧς βρεφουργεῖται ὁ κτίστης
 Χαῖρε, νύμφη ἀνύμφευτε

In this connexion it is certainly of importance that the home country of the great Byzantine poet Romanos was Syria, and that he was descended from a Jewish family.⁵ We do not know how far his Jewish education had advanced when he became a

¹ Cf. P. Maas in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, xiv, 1905, p. 645 f.

² P. Maas, 'Die Chronologie der Hymnen des Romanos', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, xv, 1906, pp. 1 ff.

³ It is pap. gr. Vind. 29 430, published in *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien, Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer*, III. Folge, 1939, p. 68; Cf. P. Maas, 'Romanos auf Papyrus', in *Byzantion*, xiv, 1939, p. 381.

⁴ The Akathistos is published by Christ and Paranikas in *Anthologia Graeca Carminum Christianorum*, Lipsiae, 1871, pp. 140-7, and by J. B. Pitra in *Analecta Sacra Spicilegio Solesmensi parata*, tome i, Parisiis, 1876, pp. 250-62. On pp. 263-72 Pitra has published a second Akathistos 'De B. Virginis Transitu'. In it the rhyme is more developed. But this poem—as others similar to it—are simple imitations of the famous Akathistos, and as we do not know when they were composed it is difficult to make use of them.

⁵ Cf. P. Maas, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, vol. xv, 1906, p. 31.

Christian. It is difficult to imagine that a man like Romanos did not know at least something of the liturgical poetry of his former religion. But the poetry which he may have known must have preceded by nearly one century that of the end of the sixth century of which we know. Very little is known to us of Jewish liturgical poetry of that older time, the 'Aboda of Yose b. Yose, of which we have spoken, being nearly the only remnant of it. But a great amount of liturgical poetry composed in the fourth and fifth centuries in Palestine is preserved in the Samaritan Liturgy.¹ Especially the so-called 'Defter', a kind of Common Prayer, which is the oldest part of this Liturgy,² contains a number of interesting liturgical poems of the fourth century poet Marka and his followers.³ They were composed in the Aramaic language which was spoken in Palestine by Jews and by Samaritans, and it may be that the Jews too used the Aramaic language for their liturgical poetry at that time.⁴ Comparatively early, the Jews replaced the Aramaic by the Hebrew language in their liturgical poetry and that may have been a reason why their older liturgical poetry disappeared. The Samaritans retained the Aramaic language for a much longer period, and

¹ *The Samaritan Liturgy*, edited by A. E. Cowley, Oxford, 1909, comprises 879 pages of text and 100 pages of introduction. Some comparatively recent liturgical poems of the Samaritans, not to be found in Cowley's edition, are published by Z. Ben-Hajjim: 'Samaritan Poems for Joyous Occasions', in the Jewish periodical *Tarbiš*, vol. x, Jerusalem, 1939, pp. 190-200, 333-75. He published these poems according to two Jerusalem and one British Museum MS., and did not realize that for such a purpose the best MSS. are to be found in the Samaritan Synagogue in Nāblus, where I saw them in 1908.

² In Cowley's edition, pp. 1-92; for the greatest part of it (pp. 5-81) Cowley could use as chief basis the Vatican MS. Sam. 3, 'the most important of all liturgical MSS.', written in the thirteenth or fourteenth century A.D. The British Museum MS. Or. 5034, described by G. Margoliouth in *ZDMG.*, vol. li, 1896, pp. 499 ff., is written on vellum, mostly in A.D. 1258. It contains parts of the Defter also, and Cowley has given extracts of it in the Appendix, pp. 872-8. I do not remember having seen an old MS. of the Defter in Nāblus. But it may be that there are some old fragments of it in the materials brought over to Russia by Firkowitch and preserved now in the Russian Public Library in Leningrad. This material has so far not been carefully investigated.

³ Cf. my article 'Die zwölf Marka-Hymnen aus dem "Defter" der Samaritanischen Liturgie', in *Oriens Christianus*, iii. 7, 1932, pp. 77-103. Here I have translated and discussed the hymns published by Cowley on pp. 16-27.

⁴ There are still a great number of Aramaic words in the liturgical poetry of the Jews, cf. Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie d. Mittelalters*, 1855, p. 118; and Beilage 5, pp. 372 ff.

the liturgical poems of their great poet Marka have always been an essential part of this Liturgy,¹ up to the present time. These poems have acrostics, but no rhyme. But rhyme was introduced into this poetry too, and plays here a role similar to that which it has in Jewish liturgical poetry since the second half of the sixth century. This older liturgical poetry of the Samaritans will have to be studied seriously by anyone who is engaged in the study of the beginnings of liturgical poetry amongst the Jews in Palestine.

APPENDIX I (see p. 24)

NOVELLA 146²

The same Emperor to Areobindus, most honourable Praefectus Praetorio.

Preamble: The Jews, as they heard Holy Scriptures, ought not to have clung to its mere letter, but should have turned their attention to the prophecies contained in it, by which it foretells the great God and Saviour of the human race, Jesus Christ. But although they have given themselves over to irrational explanation and are astray to this day from the right interpretation, when We learned that they were divided among themselves, We could not leave this difference undecided. For We have learned, from reports made to Us, that some cling to the Hebrew tongue only and wish to use it for the public readings of Holy Scripture, but that others wish to use the help of the Greek language too, and that on this matter they have long been disunited. Informed of this We have found those more praiseworthy who wish to have the assistance of the Greek language, or, indeed, of any which, according to the place, is more suited to and better understood by their audience.

Chapter 1: We therefore decree that the Jews shall have permission if they so desire to read Holy Scripture to the assemblies in their synagogues, in all places where there are Jews, in Greek or in Our mother tongue (that is in this Italic), or, indeed, in other languages, in such a way that both the language and the reading in it shall alter according to the place, so that in consequence what is read shall be comprehensible to those assembled, and they shall live and act according to it. And the interpreters (ἐξηγηταί) in these assemblies shall not be allowed, by using the Hebrew language only, to deform it at will and, as a result of the ignorance of the many, to conceal their own wickedness. But those who read in Greek shall use the translation of the Seventy, which is the most accurate of all, and is preferred to the others especially on

¹ Cf. my article cited above.

² I have to thank Ellis Gummer in Oxford for help in translating this text. I have discussed the text with my colleagues Fritz Schultz and Paul Maas in Oxford.

account of what happened at the time of translation; namely that, although the translators worked only in pairs, and in different places, they nevertheless all produced one and the same composition.

1. Who, moreover, can fail to marvel at this also in these men, that although they lived long before the time of the saving appearance of the great God, our Saviour Jesus Christ, they nevertheless, foreseeing it as taking place in the future, drew up a translation of Holy Scripture as if they were inspired by prophetic grace? All shall now use this translation above others. But so that We shall not seem to deny them the other versions, We give them permission to use that of Aquila also, although he is of foreign race and there is no inconsiderable difference between him and the Seventy.

2. But what is called by them Deuterosis, We entirely forbid, as it is not incorporated in Holy Scripture, nor transmitted of old through the Prophets (ἀνωθεν παραδιδόμενην ἐκ τῶν προφητῶν), but as an invention of men, who spoke merely with earthly wisdom and had nothing divine in them. And they shall read the holy words themselves, opening the books themselves; and not concealing what is said there or adding strange, vain, and worthless phrases which are not in the text and are invented by them for the corruption of the more simple-minded. Since therefore this permission is granted by Us, those who use Greek and other languages shall neither suffer any punishment, nor be hindered by any man. Nor shall those who are called by them Archipherekitae, or elders, or teachers, be permitted to impede this by cunning or by curse, unless they wish to be made wise by corporal punishment and, moreover, by the loss of their property and to submit to Us, who wish and order the better course and the one more pleasing to God.

Chapter 2: But if anyone among them should dare to introduce godless vain-talking denying resurrection or last judgement, or that the angels are the work and creation of God, it is Our wish that he shall be expelled from every place, and shall not emit such blasphemous language lacking all perception of God. The man who dares to say such things We subject to the most extreme penalties, thereby purging the Jewish people of the error so introduced.

Chapter 3: But We wish them while they hear Holy Scripture in one language or the other to guard themselves against the wickedness of the expositors and not to cling to the mere letter, but to penetrate into the matter itself and grasp the truly divine sense, so that they shall come to know what is better, and shall cease once and for all to err and to go astray in respect of the most vital thing of all: hope in God. For this is why We have opened every language to them for the reading of Holy Scripture, so that in future all, one after the other, by acquiring knowledge of it may be made more receptive of what is better. For everyone agrees that a man who has been brought up in Holy Scripture and has little left in him which needs correction is much more fit to distinguish

and to choose what is better than one who knows nothing of the Scripture, cleaves only to the name of divine service, clings to it as to a holy anchor and believes to be divine doctrine what in fact must be termed sheer heresy.

Epilogue: This Our will and what is expressed by the present sacred law will be obeyed not only by Your Highness and by those under Your direction, but by everyone who shall hold the same office; and he shall in no circumstances permit the Jews to undertake anything against it; but shall rather subject those who dare to resist, and to hinder in any way, to corporal punishment, then forcing them into exile and depriving them of their property, that they may not act impertinently against God and the Emperor at the same time. He will also send orders to the provincial prefects, ordering them to obey Our law; so that they also, after they have learned of it, may post it publicly in every town, well knowing that everyone must necessarily observe it in fear of Our displeasure.

Given at Constantinople, 13th February, 26th year of Justinian, 12th of the consulate of Basilius, V. Cl. (= A.D. 553).

LECTURE II

THE HEBREW TEXT OF THE BIBLE

IT was in March 1899 that I came to England for the first time. I had published a thesis on the Samaritan Targum¹ and was anxious to find more material about it in England. I was specially interested in the Arabic translation of the Pentateuch made by the Samaritans. Abraham Kuenen, the great Old Testament scholar in Leiden, had published, a long time before, Genesis, Exodus, and Leviticus in this translation² and I intended to complete the work by editing Numbers and Deuteronomy. I had copied for this purpose the text of the Berlin MS. Pet. 3 and had collated with it, besides the Berlin MS. Or. Fol. 534, the Leiden MS. and two Paris MSS. used by Kuenen for his edition, and I hoped to find more material in the libraries in England. My third purpose was to study Hebrew Biblical MSS. with the supralinear punctuation. G. Margoliouth had published, some time previously, an article in which he had tried to prove that the Yemenite Bible MSS., of which the most important were in the British Museum, although provided with Babylonian vowel signs, had nothing to do with the Babylonian text of the Bible, and that 'Babylonian' was an inadequate term for this kind of punctuation.³ These problems could be solved only by studying the MSS. themselves.

I studied for four weeks the rich material I found in the British Museum, continued these studies in Cambridge, where I stayed for nine weeks, went to Oxford for seven weeks, and was lastly four weeks again in London.

I published in 1901 and 1902 some fragments of the Samaritan Targum I had found in England, together with other fragments which were sent for my use from St. Petersburg to Berlin.⁴ To

¹ *Textkritische und lexikalische Bemerkungen zum samaritanischen Pentateuch-Targum* (Diss. phil. Halle), Leipzig, 1898.

² *Specimen e Literis Orientalibus, exhibens Librum Geneseos secundum Arabicam Pentateuchi Samaritani Versionem ab Abu Sa'ido conscriptum . . . e tribus Codicibus edidit Abrahamus Kuenen.* Lugduni Batavorum 1851. . . *Libri Exodi et Levitici* . . . 1854.

³ G. Margoliouth, 'The superlinear Punctuation, its origin, the different stages of its development and its relation to other Semitic systems of Punctuation', in *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, 7 February 1893.

⁴ *Fragmente des samaritanischen Pentateuchtargums. Herausgegeben und erläutert. = Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete*, vol. xvi, 1901, pp. 78-101; vol. xvii, 1902, pp. 1-22.

publish the whole Targum as I had originally intended proved increasingly impossible the more material I collected for such an edition during the following years, especially in Rome, Nāblus, and St. Petersburg. For nearly every MS. of this Targum has its special text. We have here an excellent example of a Targum in its earlier stage, through which generally translations of the Bible pass before a definite text is created. It is as if only Itala MSS. of the Latin Bible existed and no Vulgate, or only Old Syriac texts of the Gospels and no Peshitta. A definitive redaction comparable with Vulgate and Peshitta was never made by the Samaritans. Once they attempted to create such an official text. In a copy of the Samaritan Targum written in the thirteenth century variant readings are added in great numbers on the margins and between the lines.¹ Most of these variant readings are to be found in the different MSS. of the Targum still preserved.² A special hand has added some variations of Targum Onkelos. This MS. with variant readings was a preliminary work for creating a received text. But in spite of these preparations no such definitive redaction was made. The language spoken in Palestine had become Arabic. In later times the Samaritans had lost all interest in the different versions of their Targum. When in 1868 Heinrich Petermann ordered a copy of the Targum, the Samaritan priests in Nāblus compiled a mixed text from various MSS. in Nāblus taken at random, and Petermann, not aware of that fact, collated afterwards with this mixed-up 'apographon' the different MSS. from which it had been copied and made this Apographon the basis of his new edition of the Targum.³

¹ Of this MS. 97 fols. are known to me. These are: 22 fols. in the Russian Public Library in Leningrad, MS. Sam. 182; 43 fols. in the British Museum in London, MS. Or. 1442; 30 fols. in Trinity College Library, Cambridge, MS. R. 15. 56; 2 fols. I had bought myself in Nāblus. Photostats of all 97 folios are at my disposal.

² That was the result of a careful examination of the MS. made by Lea Goldberg in the Orientalisches Seminar of Bonn University. She pointed out that the Samaritans had at that time, besides the versions of the Targum known to us in the different MSS., one version of the Targum which has not been rediscovered in a MS. so far. Cf. Lea Goldberg, *Das samaritanische Pentateuchtargum. Eine Untersuchung seiner handschriftlichen Quellen.* (Diss. phil. Bonn.) = *Bonner Orientalistische Studien*, Heft 11, Stuttgart, 1935.

³ *Pentateuchus Samaritanus.* Ad fidem Librorum Manuscriptorum apud Nablusianos repertorum edidit et varias Lectiones adscripsit H. Petermann. Berolini. Genesis 1872. Exodus 1882. Leviticus (quem ex recensione Petermanniana typis describendum curavit C. Vollers) 1883. Numeri (ex recensione Caroli Vollers) 1885. Deuteronomium (ex recensione Caroli Vollers)

As for the Samaritan Arabic translation of the Pentateuch: after I had collated nearly thirty MSS. I surveyed the whole history of that text. Here we have a revised version, a *textus receptus*, known to have been made by a certain Abū Saʿīd in the second half of the thirteenth century, at about the same time as the attempt was made to create a revised version of the Targum. The three MSS. used by Kuenen contain the text of Abū Saʿīd, and we know of many more MSS. of it. They are all written in Arabic letters and show only a few variant readings.

But of much greater interest is the text which lies behind this revised version. The Samaritans first used the Arabic version made by Saʿadya Gaon. We have quite a number of MSS. in which we find this very text written in Samaritan letters. A fragment of it had already been described by Silvestre de Sacy.¹ A fragment from St. Petersburg was published by Harkavy.² Other fragments are to be found in Oxford³ and Manchester.⁴ But the most important MS. of this text is a precious Samaritan Triglot of the Pentateuch in Hebrew, Samaritan, and Arabic, written in the twelfth century. I saw it in 1906 and 1908 in Nāblus. Since 1910 it has been in the British Museum.⁵ The Samaritans knew of this origin of their Arabic translation. Abū Saʿīd, in

1891. The Apographon is characterized by Vollers, in the preface to Numbers, as 'neue, um 1868 auf Veranlassung Petermann's von einem Samaritaner besorgte, flüchtige Abschrift einer wertvollen Vorlage'. Cf. my article 'Zu den in Nāblus befindlichen Handschriften des samaritanischen Pentateuchtargums', in *ZDMG.*, vol. lxi, 1908, pp. 909-12.

¹ Cf. his 'Mémoire sur la version arabe des livres de Moïse à l'usage des Samaritains et les Manuscrits de cette version', in *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et des Belles-Lettres*, tome 49, Paris, 1808, p. 118 f.

² Cf. MS. Sam. 179 of the Russian Public Library in Leningrad. The text was published by Harkavy in his *Catalogue of the Samaritan Bible MSS. in Petersburg*, Petersburg 1874.

³ Deut. 11. 2-26. 14 of this text is found in the Bodleian MS. Or. 139, Uss. II, a MS. composed of different fragments. This text was written in the twelfth or thirteenth century.

⁴ Deut. 32-4 in MS. Sam. 2 of John Rylands' Library in Manchester, written A.D. 1328. In 1899, when the manuscript still belonged to the Bibliotheca Lindesiana in Haigh Hall, near Wigan, it was sent, on Cowley's recommendation, to Oxford where I was able to study it. Cf. my notice in *ZDMG.*, vol. xcii, 1938, p. 685.

⁵ MS. Or. 7562. On the upper part of the folios a Samaritan priest in modern times has entered the Arabic text according to later versions. But the old part contains the Arabic version of Saʿadya written in Samaritan letters. This text is often altered by later hands, and it is not always possible to point out the original readings. These are certainly of great importance. One of my pupils tried to decipher them, but with no success.

the scholia which he added to his revised translation, often criticizes Saʿadya. These Samaritan MSS. of Saʿadya's Arabic translation of the Pentateuch are not only older than any MS. preserved by the Jews, they have often preserved the original reading of Saʿadya, where the text in the *textus receptus* of this version has been altered.¹ For a critical edition of Saʿadya's version these old Samaritan MSS. will have to be investigated carefully.²

But the Samaritans soon began to deviate from Saʿadya's version, and we have a great number of MSS. which show in an interesting way how this translation was altered more and more till finally Abū Saʿīd's *textus receptus* resulted. This text, however, is not found in MSS. written in Samaritan letters. These always preserve older forms of the text even to the present day.

When I was in Cambridge I came into contact with Schechter during my first days there. He spoke with enthusiasm to me about the treasures he had brought to Cambridge and told me many details of his journey to Egypt. Often I saw him sitting in the large room of the Old University Library, surrounded

¹ Some of these problems are discussed in my book *Die arabischen Bibelübersetzungen*, Leipzig, 1904. Max Katten, who carefully investigated the material collected by me, has shown that Jewish scholars like Dunash b. Labrat (10th cent.), Yehuda b. Bal'am (11th cent.), Ibn Ezra (12th cent.) used Saʿadya's version in a form which largely differed from that generally known. Cf. his Thesis *Untersuchungen zu Saadja's Pentateuchübersetzung* (Diss. phil.), Giessen, 1924.

² For his edition of Saʿadya's version, Joseph Dérenbourg used, besides the text printed in Constantinople and in the Polyglots, a Yemenite MS. belonging to David Kohen, a Yemenite Jew in Jerusalem. Cf. *Version Arabe du Pentateuch—Œuvres complètes de R. Saadia Ben Josef al-Fayyumi*, publiées sous la direction de J. Dérenbourg, vol. i, Paris, 1893. The same Yemenite MS. was the basis for the text published, besides the Hebrew text and Targum Onkelos, by Yemenite Jews in Jerusalem, 1894-1901 (כתר תורה or תאג). These texts are in the main identical. Dérenbourg was naïve enough to identify this text with that composed by Saʿadya himself. He did not see the problems connected with this text. In fact he had published the *textus receptus* of that version as it was adapted to the needs of the Arabic-speaking Jews in Yemen.

For a critical edition of Saʿadya's version we cannot rely on two printed texts and a Yemenite MS. Besides the material mentioned in the books quoted in the last note remnants of this version preserved in the Cairo Geniza will have to be used. A little Geniza fragment preserved in the Stadtbibliothek in Frankfurt a/M, published by Kurt Levy in his Thesis *Zur Masoretischen Grammatik. Texte und Untersuchungen* (= *Bonner Orientalistische Studien*, Heft 15, Stuttgart, 1936), p. 18 f., has, for instance, a text which is not at all identical with the text published by Dérenbourg.

by boxes filled with the (at that time) dirty and crumbled fragments, trying to make a first order out of them, and telling me of the little discoveries he was making nearly every day.¹ When he saw my interest in Biblical texts vocalized in an unusual way, he gave me some fragments provided with the so-called Palestinian vocalization of which the first traces had been discovered just before in some Geniza fragments. I copied them carefully. In Oxford I found other fragments belonging to the same MS., to which Cowley drew my attention. I published these fragments in 1901.² Besides this I studied in Cambridge and in Oxford some fragments of the text of the Bible and the Mishna with supralinear punctuation, but without having any real understanding of this matter at that time. In Cambridge I also tried to identify some of the Arabic Geniza fragments at the suggestion of Mr. Jenkinson, the Librarian. I made there the acquaintance of Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson who had played such a role in the discovery of the Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus, and of Francis C. Burkitt who had just published the Aquila fragments from the Geniza, and of Norman McLean, who was preparing at that time the great Cambridge edition of the Septuagint, and from then on I was in contact with them and with many others. The material from the Geniza had made a deep impression on me. I felt the importance of it and knew that I should have to come back to it over and over again.

This impression was strengthened by what I saw in Oxford and heard in conversations with Neubauer and Cowley. Cowley was occupied at that time in editing the Samaritan Liturgy. The two big volumes of that work appeared finally in 1909, but he had already some printed proofs of the text which he showed me and which we discussed. I need not say that his great experience in Samaritan matters was very helpful to me. He was also interested in my study of ancient vocalized Hebrew fragments and presented me with some photographs of a fragment of liturgical poetry provided with Palestinian punctuation which—as I have already shown³—became later of importance to me.

Back in Germany I found the things I had learned during my

¹ A characteristic photograph of the room in the Old Library with Schechter examining Geniza fragments faces p. 142 of Norman Bentwich's *Biography of Solomon Schechter*, Philadelphia, 1940.

² Cf. my article 'Beiträge zur Geschichte der hebräischen Punctuation', in *ŽATW.*, vol. xvi, 1901, pp. 273–317; and 'Zur Geschichte der hebräischen Akzente' in *ŽDMG.*, vol. lv, 1901, pp. 167–94.

³ In my first lecture, p. 22 f.

stay in England of great importance for my further studies. On a visit to Berlin, in 1900, I studied in the Royal Library the MSS. with supralinear punctuation. There were some Yemenite Biblical MSS. there, but they could not be compared with the much older and better MSS. I had seen in the British Museum. But even in the London MSS. the Yemenite method of vocalizing Hebrew texts was not very helpful as it was entirely based on the Tiberian method of vocalization. They only render this vocalization in a simplified way by using supralinear signs. What G. Margoliouth had said of the Hebrew text in Yemenite Bible MSS. with supralinear vocalization proved to be quite correct.¹

But there was in Berlin a large fragment of the Kethubim, containing parts of the Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Lamentations, Daniel, Esther, Ezra, and Chronicles, and consisting of ninety-four single leaves of parchment, or fragments thereof, which superficially was vocalized in the Yemenite way, and came really from Yemen. But on closer examination I found that the vocalization had been systematically altered, and that beneath the usual Yemenite vocalization traces of another vocalization, also supralinear, were to be seen which differed in the details from the Yemenite method in a characteristic way. I began to examine the text, a difficult task, and it was nearly two years before I had brought out all the details of the original vocalization and was able to write a sketch of Hebrew grammar in accordance with it, which largely differed from the usual Hebrew grammar based entirely on the Tiberian punctuation.²

The great problem was: where did this kind of vocalization come from? I tried to discuss the matter with Hermann Strack in Berlin who, in his youth, had seen MSS. with supralinear punctuation in Leningrad and had a certain experience with Hebrew Biblical MSS.³ But about the origin of this kind of

¹ Cf. his article quoted above, p. 36, note 3. The Yemenite method of vocalizing the Targum is of much greater importance. Cf. the next lecture.

² Cf. my book *Der masoretische Text des Alten Testaments nach der Überlieferung der babylonischen Juden*, Leipzig, 1902.

³ He had published, together with Harkavy, the *Catalog der hebräischen Bibelhandschriften der Kaiserlichen Öffentlichen Bibliothek in St. Petersburg*, Teil I und II, St. Petersburg, Leipzig, 1875. Besides, Strack had published the photographic reproduction of the famous Codex of the Prophets, dated 916; cf. *Prophetarum Posteriorum Codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus*, St. Petersburg and Leipzig, 1876. In the *Zeitschrift für Lutherische Theologie und Kirche* (year 1875, pp. 585–624) he had published some Bible fragments with supralinear punctuation.

punctuation he had not the slightest idea. Moritz Steinschneider had no interest in Biblical MSS. and all his descriptions of these in the Catalogues composed by him are exceedingly poor. He had no understanding of the importance of the precious Berlin MS.¹ I studied Hebrew grammarians, like Menachem b. Saruk (died 970), Haiyūj (tenth cent.), Ibn Ezra (died 1167), David Kimḥi (died 1235), and others, without result. Only Sa'adya gave some help. He was born in Egypt, lived for a certain time in Palestine, and became in 928 for a few years head of the Rabbinic Academy in Sura in Babylonia. He knew Palestine and Babylonia well. In his Commentary on Sēpher Yešira,² the well-known old cabbalistic book, he deals with the different ways of pronouncing Hebrew in Babylonia and Palestine, and there could be no doubt that his statements on the Babylonian pronunciation of Hebrew corresponded in general with the original vocalization in the Berlin MS.³

This result was confirmed by other facts. The Masora has preserved a list of the differences in the Hebrew consonantal text used by the Eastern (Babylonian) Jews and the Western (Palestinian) Jews. The Berlin MS. always showed the Eastern readings.⁴ It was provided with a Masora which clearly differed from the Masora found in Western MSS., including the Yemenite MSS. and the Babylonian Codex of the Prophets in St. Petersburg, not only in the way in which the Masoretic notes were added to the Biblical words, but in the whole style of the technical terms of the Masora.⁵ So we had for the first time an example of real Babylonian Masora. It is true that a large fragment of a Masoretic Commentary on the Pentateuch had already been published in 1885 by Christian D. Ginsburg according to a copy which had been made, ten years before, by H. L. Strack in Leningrad from a MS. belonging to the Second Firkowitsch Collection and which had come from the Cairo Geniza. But neither Strack nor Ginsburg had recognized it as a piece of the

¹ Steinschneider describes the MS. Or. qu. 680 in the Berlin Catalogue, vol. ii, p. 2 in the following way: 'Pergam. 94 bl., Mittl. Quadrat mit babylonischer Punktation über den Buchstaben, grossenteils abgefaltete Bibelfragmente mit Randmasora, ungeordnet, hauptsächlich Hagiographen (incl. Megillot); Psalmen, Hiob und Sprüche sind strophisch abgeteilt.'

² *Commentaire sur le Séfer Yesira ou Livre de Création, par le Gaon Saadya de Fayyoun, publié et traduit par Mayer-Lambert*, Paris, 1891. Cf. my remarks on the Sēfer Yešira at the end of this lecture, p. 107.

³ Cf. my book *Der masoretische Text des Alten Testaments nach der Überlieferung der babylonischen Juden*, pp. 32 ff.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 18 ff.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 13 ff.

Babylonian Masora, and Ginsburg had interpreted it wrongly and has absolutely overlooked its importance.¹ So it was clear that I had found a specimen of a real Babylonian MS. of the Bible, unique in comparison with all the hundreds and thousands of Hebrew Biblical MSS. so far known. Babylonia had been for centuries the centre of Jewish learning. The Jewish Academies of Sura and Nehardea, later Sura and Pumbeditha, were famous. The final redaction of the Mishna had been made there, the Babylonian Talmud regulating every detail of Jewish life up to the present day in an authoritative way had been developed there. The official Aramaic translations of the Bible, Targum Onkelos on the Tora, Targum Jonathan on the Prophets, had been composed there. The Babylonian Gaons were regarded as the recognized leaders of the Jewish world. So it was of the greatest importance that we had now, for the first time, a large piece of the Bible text which undoubtedly came from Babylonia.

After I had published my book on the Berlin MS.² I suspended my work on these matters for several years. I went to the East where I spent more than five years in Cairo and nearly one year in Palestine; there I was occupied with quite other matters. It was only in 1910, when I was 'Privatdozent' in Halle University, that I was able to resume my studies on the text of the Hebrew Bible.

In the meantime a second genuine Babylonian fragment of the Bible had been discovered and published.³ It belonged to the Second Firkowitsch Collection in Leningrad and contained, on four parchment leaves, the text of Job 2. 11–19. 32. But here the Babylonian punctuation was not corrected by a later Yemenite hand as in the Berlin MS. As the greater part of the text (Job 3. 7–9. 32) was contained in the Berlin MS. also, it was

¹ It is the St. Petersburg Bible MS. Firk. ii, 1549, of which I have given a facsimile, largely reduced in size, in *Masoreten des Ostens*, plate 16 b. The original consists of 18 parchment leaves, 33 by 26 cm. The text is published and interpreted by Ginsburg in his huge book *The Massorah compiled from Manuscripts*, vol. iii, London, 1885, pp. 205–68. How little Ginsburg understood the character of this valuable fragment is to be seen from the fact that in the chapter 'The Massorah, its Rise and Development' (*Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible*, London, 1897, pp. 287–468) he does not mention the text published by him 12 years previously. Cf. on Ginsburg's book 'The Massorah . . .', *Masoreten des Ostens*, pp. xiv ff.

² Cf. p. 41, note 2.

³ Johannes Weerts, 'Ueber die babylonisch punktierte Handschrift No. 1546 der II. Firkowitschen Sammlung (Codex Tschufutkale 3)', Diss. Phil. Halle 1905. = *ZATW.*, vol. xxvi, 1906, pp. 49–87. Cf. *Masoreten des Ostens*, pp. 141 ff.

possible to compare the two texts: they supported each other in the best way. It was clear that this kind of punctuation had once a greater circulation, and it was necessary to find more specimens of it. From what I had seen in 1899 in Cambridge and Oxford it was clear to me that, in the Cairo Geniza collections if anywhere in the world, further specimens could be expected. So in 1911 I came back to England, this time with the professed intention of studying Geniza material.

During the twelve years of my absence things had changed in a most favourable way. In Cambridge the fragments had been carefully cleaned and brought into order, and the lists of the Taylor-Schechter Collection in the University Library proved very helpful. In Oxford the Catalogue had appeared, of which Cowley was good enough to present me with a copy.¹ In this Catalogue, Cowley had described all the MSS. with supralinear punctuation as Yemenite MSS. I was now an expert in these matters and could show him the great difference between Yemenite and Babylonian punctuation. I was glad to find here some very fine specimens of real Babylonian Biblical MSS. in which punctuation and Masora were in good accordance with the original punctuation of the Berlin MS. In Cambridge I also found a great number of fragments of the same kind. In the British Museum in London not a single fragment of the Babylonian text of the Bible could be discovered among all the Geniza fragments which had found their way there.

I came back to Halle with many notes and photographs. At my request several fragments belonging to the Second Firkowitsch Collection were sent from St. Petersburg to the Library of the German Oriental Society in Halle, of which I was at that time the Librarian. Professor Kokovtsov had kindly indicated them to me. Among them I found—besides several Yemenite fragments of no great importance—five fragments with a real Babylonian text, one of them being the text published already by Weerts, which needed a new examination.

I had now a broad foundation for the Babylonian text of the Bible. The fragments at my disposal belonged to about sixty different MSS. I published the results of my investigations in my book *Masoreten des Ostens*,² edited there a great number of

¹ *Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, vol. ii, by A. Neubauer and A. E. Cowley, Oxford, 1906.

² *Masoreten des Ostens. Die ältesten punktierten Handschriften des A.T. und der Targume, herausgegeben und untersucht. Mit 16 Lichtdrucktafeln (= Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom A.T. herausgegeben von Rudolf Kittel, Heft 15, Leipzig, 1913).*

Babylonian texts of Bible and Targum, and added facsimiles of sixteen genuine Babylonian MSS. After the War I continued my search for this material. After 1925, I paid seven separate visits to England; each time I came with new problems, and returned with important material I had found. In 1926 I was for six weeks in Leningrad where, especially in the Antonin Collection of the Russian Public Library,¹ I found many more fragments of these texts. Other specimens I found in the volumes which were sent to me from the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York.² In 1928 I published a list of the material so far known to me.³ A special grant from the Prussian Minister of Education allowed me to add to this list facsimiles of seventy more Babylonian Biblical MSS. An improved list of these fragments I published in the Prolegomena to the new edition of Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*.⁴ Here I was able to report on fragments belonging to more than 120 different Babylonian Biblical MSS.

Of most of these MSS. only one, two or three folios are known. Larger fragments very seldom exceed twenty folios. The Berlin MS. with its ninety-four folios, to which belong seven folios from the Glaser Collection in New York, is a great exception. It was impossible to quote these fragments merely by the shelf-marks of the Libraries to which they now belong. Often folios of the same MS. had come to different Libraries, and nobody could tell which fragments belonged to the same MS. I had therefore to create a special method of quoting them. Some of these fragments exhibit a more simple method of punctuation, others a more complicated method. The first group I designated by the majuscule E (*einfach*), the second by the majuscule K (*kompliziert*). A minuscule a added to the capital letter indicates that the fragment belongs to the Tora, a minuscule b that it belongs to the Prophets, a minuscule c that it belongs to the Kethubim. It is worth noticing that among the more than 100 MSS. to which the fragments belong not a single case is known to me in which a MS. contains parts of more than one of these three sections of the Bible. So I had six groups Ea, Eb, Ec, Ka, Kb, Kc; in each group the MSS. belonging to the same group were counted (Ea 1, Ea 2, Ea 3 . . . Eb 1, Eb 2, &c.).

¹ First lecture, p. 4 f.

² First lecture, p. 5.

³ *Die hebräischen Bibelhandschriften aus Babylonien. Mit Facsimiles von 70 Handschriften, ZATW.*, vol. xlv, Giessen, 1926, pp. 113–37. (100 separate copies were dedicated to the 5th German Orientalist Congress, Bonn, 1928.)

⁴ *Biblia Hebraica* . . ., ed. Rudolf Kittel. *Textum Masoreticum curavit P. Kahle*, Stuttgart, 1937. Prolegomena, pp. xxx–xxxiii.

Two examples may illustrate how fragments of the same MS. came to different Libraries: Of Eb 10, a fine MS. of the Prophets with simple Babylonian punctuation—a facsimile is to be found in *MdO.*, plate 5—twenty-four folios are known of which ten are in Oxford, bound together with other fragments in MSS. Heb. d. 79 and d. 64, four are in Cambridge, in Box A. 39, 9 of the Taylor-Schechter Collection, seven in Leningrad as MSS. Antonin 260, 325, 339, 816, and three are in New York in MS. 2021. Of MS. Eb 22, an interesting MS. of the Prophets, bearing the text of the Targum after each Hebrew verse, provided with simple Babylonian punctuation—a facsimile is to be found in *ZATW.*, 1928, plate 47—thirty-six folios are known, of which twenty-five are in Oxford, bound together with other fragments in MSS. Heb. b. 4, c. 1, d. 26, d. 49, d. 64, four are in Cambridge in Box B. 2, 2 of the Taylor-Schechter Collection, seven are in Leningrad as MSS. Antonin 280, 908, 909, 910. The great number of facsimiles I had published proved very helpful in attributing the single fragments to MSS. of which I already knew specimens.

Sometimes pieces of the same folio are found in different places, as, for instance, a piece of a folio in Cambridge (Box A. 38, 20), of which the rest is in New York (MS. 1229, fol. 1), belonging to MS. Ec 6, which contains parts of Proverbs 26 and 27. By chance I had the pieces of the same leaf from Cambridge and New York at the same time in Bonn and could provide the libraries with photographs of the whole leaf of which they possessed fragments.

These fragments show a great variety of punctuation. Although the basis of the punctuation is the same in most of the specimens, there are scarcely two MSS. in which the punctuation is exactly the same in all details. Some of the fragments have very few vowels and accents; the signs were added in such cases only where the words could easily be read in a wrong way. Later the signs were added with greater regularity. Most of the fragments are provided with signs of the simple system of punctuation. Later it became necessary to indicate more details of the pronunciation and recitation of the Biblical text, and a system resulted which was nearly as complicated as the Tiberian system of punctuation. The last step was that this complicated system was influenced by the Tiberian system in such a way that finally a Biblical text resulted which was in full agreement with the Tiberian text. The best example of this kind of punctuation is the famous Babylonian Codex of the Prophets in Leningrad,

dated A.D. 916. We have already seen that this MS. shows generally the Western readings in the consonantal text and that it is provided with the Western Masora. Now we see that the whole punctuation is Western, only the Eastern signs are retained, and even these are replaced by Tiberian signs on a few pages of the MS.¹

When in 1886 C. H. Cornill published his book on the text of the Prophet Ezekiel,² he had collated carefully the text of the St. Petersburg Codex with the usual Tiberian text. He was surprised by the fact that in all the details of punctuation of such a long and difficult text he was not able to find more than about a dozen slight variations. He concluded from this fact that not only the consonantal text, but also the punctuation of it, was transmitted in Palestine and Babylonia in practically the same way, and that the transmission had to be regarded as very constant. We know now, on the basis of the great number of real Babylonian Biblical MSS., that this conclusion was wrong. The agreement is to be explained simply by the fact that the St. Petersburg Codex was influenced in every detail by the Tiberian text, and the dozen slight variations found by Cornill are to be regarded merely as details which were overlooked by the Masoretes. This harmonizing of both texts is sufficient to explain the survival of the St. Petersburg MS., whilst all the real Babylonian MSS. were lost.

Have we any means of dating real Babylonian Biblical MSS. of which fragments are preserved in the Geniza? We can understand why none of them has a written date. Dates of MSS. are usually to be found at the end, sometimes also at the beginning, and neither ends nor beginnings of MSS. are preserved. But the St. Petersburg Codex of 916 gives us an excellent starting-point for dating these fragments. It shows that about A.D. 900 the influence of the Tiberian Masoretes was already overwhelming, and so strong that Babylonian MSS. had at that time to be adapted in all details to the Tiberian method of punctuation. It is clear that MSS. with complicated punctuation which still show the characteristics of real Babylonian MSS. must be regarded as older, and as much older must be regarded the MSS. provided

¹ These are fols. 1b, 212a, 221a. Cf. *ZATW.*, 1928, p. 117, note 1. Professor Kokovtsov drew my attention to this fact when I discussed the matter with him in Leningrad.

² C. H. Cornill, *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel*, Leipzig, 1886. Cf. P. de Lagarde's famous review of the book in *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1 June 1886 = *Mittheilungen*, vol. ii, 1887, pp. 49-64.

with the simple system of Babylonian punctuation. It seems that the vowel signs used by the Eastern Syrians are of some help.

The simple system of Babylonian punctuation has usually the following vowel signs:

$$\bar{a} = \overset{\cdot}{\bar{a}}, a = \overset{\cdot}{a}, i = \overset{\cdot}{i}, e = \overset{\cdot}{e}, o = \overset{\cdot}{o}, u = \overset{\cdot}{u}.$$

It is clear that some of these vowel signs represent Hebrew letters. $\overset{\cdot}{a} = a$ is a little \aleph , $\overset{\cdot}{u} = u$ is a little κ ; that $\overset{\cdot}{\bar{a}} = \bar{a}$ is an abbreviation of \aleph is to be inferred from the fact that in some of the fragments¹ the full \aleph is still used instead of the abbreviation, and in the same fragments $\overset{\cdot}{\bar{a}}$ is used instead of $\overset{\cdot}{\bar{a}} = i$. The fact that Hebrew letters were used in this system of vowel signs makes it clear that we have here before us a special Hebrew development.

But this system was preceded by another in which only points were used. That is to be found in a MS. of which fragments with parts of Judges 9-13 are preserved in New York (= Eb 4), and fragments with parts of 1 Sam. 13-20 are preserved in Cambridge (= Eb 8). The two groups of fragments belonged originally to the same MS. That this MS. is very old can be seen from the fact that very few vowel signs are added to the Consonantal text. In the facsimile of the MS. published on plate 38 in the *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1928, only six Hebrew words and seven words of the Targum have vowel signs. To the Hebrew text, Tiberian punctuation is added by a later hand. In this MS. the following six vowel signs are used

$$\bar{a} = \overset{\cdot}{\bar{a}}, a = \overset{\cdot}{a}, i = \overset{\cdot}{i}, e = \overset{\cdot}{e}, o = \overset{\cdot}{o}, u = \overset{\cdot}{u}.$$

It is well known that the Eastern Syrians used the following seven vowel signs:

$$\bar{a} = \overset{\cdot}{\bar{a}}, a = \overset{\cdot}{a}, i = \overset{\cdot}{i}, e = \overset{\cdot}{e}, \text{and } \overset{\cdot}{\bar{e}}, o = \overset{\cdot}{o}, u = \overset{\cdot}{u}.$$

The two systems are so similar to each other that we can hardly believe that they have been developed independently. As the Babylonian Jews and the Eastern Syrians were living in the same country, some relationship is very probable. Of the Syriac system we only know that it must have been developed from the diacritical point² which is to be found already in MSS. of the fifth century, and was probably known even to Ephraem in the

¹ Cf. the fragments Ea 23 and 24, and the facsimiles on plates 16 and 17 in *ŽATW.*, vol. xix.

² It was first investigated by H. Ewald in *Abhandlungen zur orientalischen und biblischen Literatur*, Göttingen, 1832, pp. 59-77. Cf. Rubens Duval, *Traité de Grammaire Syriaque*, Paris, 1881, pp. 61-7.

fourth century.¹ The definitive form of the system seems to have existed in the eighth century, perhaps earlier.² On the other hand, this definitive form is developed somewhat further than the Hebrew system, and it is very likely that we have to connect this Hebrew system with an earlier stage of the punctuation of the Eastern Syrians, which must have existed although traces of it are so far not known.

An ancient method of punctuation was used in Palestine also. It preceded here the later Tiberian system. We call it 'Palestinian punctuation' in accordance with a notice in an Aboth Commentary quoted in Maḥzor Vitry³ where, besides the other two systems, 'the punctuation of the land of Israel' (ניקוד ארץ ישראל) is mentioned. That this method really belongs to Palestine is confirmed by the fact that a punctuation quite similar to it was used in Samaritan MSS. where we find it from the twelfth century up to the present day. The Palestinian vowel signs are:⁴

$$\bar{a} = \overset{\cdot}{\bar{a}}, a = \overset{\cdot}{a}, i = \overset{\cdot}{i}, e = \overset{\cdot}{e} (\overset{\cdot}{e} \text{ and } \overset{\cdot}{e}), o, u = \overset{\cdot}{o} (\overset{\cdot}{o} \text{ and } \overset{\cdot}{o} \text{ or } \overset{\cdot}{o}).$$

The vowel signs used in Samaritan MSS. are:⁵

$$\bar{a} = \overset{\cdot}{\bar{a}}, a = \overset{\cdot}{a}, e, i = \overset{\cdot}{e}, e = \overset{\cdot}{e}, o, u = \overset{\cdot}{o} (\overset{\cdot}{o}).$$

The differences are partly to be explained by the fact that we know the Palestinian punctuation from MSS. which may have been written in the seventh to ninth centuries, the Samaritan punctuation from MSS. written from the twelfth century onwards.⁶ We can take it for certain that this kind of punctuation

¹ Duval, l.c., p. 62.

² Duval, l.c., p. 69.

³ A Maḥzor compiled in about 1100 by Simḥa b. Shemuel of Vitry (France). The text of the Maḥzor was published by Hurwitz, Berlin, 1889-93. The note quoted above is found on p. 462 of the edition. It was published by Luzzatto in *Kerem Chemed*, iv (1839), p. 203, long before any fragment with this kind of punctuation was known. Cf. *MdW.* i, p. 24. Luzzatto adds the note: *זה חדוש גדול, הצריך עיון וחפוש הרבה*.

⁴ The specimens added in brackets are later developments.

⁵ Cf. *MdW.* i, p. 32 f., and my article: 'Die Lesezeichen bei den Samaritanern', in *Oriental Studies*, dedicated to Paul Haupt, Baltimore and Leipzig, 1926, pp. 435-36. Cf. Fritz Diening, *Das Hebräische bei den Samaritanern* (Bonn Thesis = Bonner Orientalistische Studien, Heft 24, Stuttgart, 1938). Diening has dealt with this kind of punctuation and all the problems of Hebrew as pronounced by the Samaritans.

⁶ Only a few Samaritan MSS. of the Pentateuch are provided with this kind of punctuation. The following are known to me: (1) MS. Sam. 101 of the Serai Library in Constantinople (12th cent.); (2) MS. Sam. 64 and the small fragment 75 in the Russian Public Library in Leningrad (13th cent.); (3) A Samaritan Pentateuch in Trinity College Library,

was used by the Samaritans in earlier times, perhaps in a form which may have more resembled the Palestinian punctuation, but no earlier MSS. with this kind of punctuation written by the Samaritans are known to us.¹

Biblical MSS. with Palestinian punctuation are comparatively scarce. Whilst it was possible to find fragments of more than 120 different Biblical MSS. provided with real Babylonian

Cambridge, bought 1917, dated A.D. 1332; (4) MS. Or. 6461 of the British Museum in London (14th cent.). Many non-biblical MSS. of the Samaritans are provided with this kind of punctuation.

¹ The oldest MS. in book form of the Samaritan Pentateuch known to me is MS. Add. 1846 of the University Library in Cambridge. It contains a notice that it was sold A.H. 544 (A.D. 1149–50) and may have been written some centuries earlier. It makes the impression that it is much older than the MSS. written since about A.D. 1200, of which we know a great number. This MS. had been very famous amongst the Samaritans and has a long history. In the Prolegomena to his edition *Der Hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner*, Giessen, 1914–18, pp. lxxxiv–lxxxvii, A. von Gall has published all details concerning this MS. on the basis of the material I put at his disposal.

But there exist some older scrolls of the Samaritan Pentateuch. One of these is to be seen, with its cover, on Plate V of Sir Frederic Kenyon's book *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*, London, 1939, facing p. 51. But this scroll has nothing to do with the famous Holy Scroll said to have been written by Abisha', the son of Ahron's grandson, in the thirteenth year after the Israelites had taken possession of Canaan. This scroll is kept as a great treasure in the Synagogue in Nāblus and has for centuries not been used for public reading of the Tora. It was rediscovered at the beginning of the fourteenth century and must have been written many centuries before that time. It has a very interesting history. I have dealt with this old scroll and the different problems connected with it in my article 'Aus der Geschichte der ältesten hebräischen Bibelhandschrift' in *Baudissin Festschrift = Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Beiheft, vol. xxxiii, Giessen, 1918, pp. 247–60. Professor John Garstang got photographs of parts of a Samaritan scroll of the Tora, but not of the Abisha' MS. A photograph containing the cryptogram with the date referred to above—greatly reduced in size and hardly to be read—was published in the *National Geographical Magazine* published by the National Geographic Society, Washington, about 1920. I saw the ancient scroll with the cryptogram in it in 1906. Moses Gaster deals with the scroll in his 'Schweich Lectures 1923' on the Samaritans, London, 1925, pp. 109 ff. He had seen the scroll too. But instead of republishing the photograph of the cryptogram itself, in somewhat larger size, Gaster reproduces a statement of the late High-priest Jacob concerning the old scroll which was in his own possession. I think what the Samaritans themselves have to say concerning the scroll we read better in the Chronicle of the fourteenth-century author Abulfath' who saw the scroll when it just had been rediscovered (cf. *Abulfathi annales Samaritani*, ed. E. Vilmar, Gotha, 1865). What Gaster has to say in the very many books and articles published by him must be accepted with the greatest reserve.

punctuation, I could not discover fragments of more than six Biblical MSS. with this kind of punctuation. They are:

1. A fragment of a scroll with parts of Ezek. 13–16.
2. Four fragments of a scroll with parts of Ps. 27–33, 35–40, 41–6, 55–9.
3. Two folios with the last four chapters of Daniel.
4. One folio with Jer. 1 and 2.
5. Two folios with parts of Ps. 51–5, 69–72.
6. Eight folios with Biblical fragments written in abbreviations (סירוים), containing Prophets, chiefly Isaiah and Jeremiah, and Exod. 28 and 29.

With the exception of no. 2, I have published these fragments in *Masoreten des Westens*, ii, pp. 66–93 and discussed the problems connected with them ib., pp. 16*–35*. There I have published also facsimiles of the different MSS. The scroll of the Psalter is of special interest. The four fragments of it are preserved in Cambridge between glass and have the shelf-marks T.S. 10, nos. 52, 53, 54, 58. Only very few vowel points are used here, and one kind of accent. A close investigation of the original in Cambridge showed that even these few vowel signs were added by two different hands, and that the method of vocalization added by the second hand differed in certain details from that of the first hand. These Biblical MSS. with Palestinian punctuation are for us of the greatest interest as they show what vocalized Hebrew Biblical MSS. looked like when the Masoretes of Tiberias began their work.

Although only a few Biblical fragments with this kind of punctuation are known to us, this system must have been used generally at a certain time in Palestine. Other texts of various kinds have been preserved in the Geniza. It was used for the Targum, not the Targum Onkelos of course, but the old Palestinian Targum of the Pentateuch,¹ for the Mishna,² for the Palestinian Midrash,³ for the

¹ Cf. the third lecture.

² Besides the fragment T.-S. E. 1. 107 with parts of Baba Bathra and Sanhedrin to which I have referred in *MdW.* i, p. 28 f. I have found another fragment containing parts of Sanhedrin and Shebuoth in T.-S. E. 2. 76. These two fragments belonged to different MSS. of the Mishna.

³ Five pieces of a Palimpsest are preserved in the Cambridge fragment T.-S. E. 16. 93. The underscript contains some verses of the Greek New Testament which were published by C. Taylor, *Hebrew Greek Cairo Genizah Palimpsests from the Taylor Schechter Collection*, Cambridge, 1900. The upper script contains fragments of the so-called 'Pesikta de Rab Kahana' which have a number of Palestinian vowel points. The text differs often from that

Masora,¹ and especially for liturgical MSS.² Liturgy is always very conservative, and it seems that it was used here longer than in other texts.

There is a great variety in the punctuation of these MSS., just as in the fragments with Babylonian punctuation. No two of the fragments are punctuated in exactly the same way, and here too it should be possible to write a history of the development of this kind of punctuation. We certainly cannot expect to find a written date in any of these fragments. Nevertheless I think that a method of dating them approximately can be found. To do so we must start from the method of vocalizing Western Syriac MSS.

It is a well-known fact that when, in the course of the eighth century, the Western Syrians introduced Greek vowels as Syriac vowel signs, they used a Greek *o* (omicron) as sign for Zekāfā, a vowel corresponding to Hebrew Kāmeṣ. This shows clearly that at that time this vowel must have been pronounced in Western Syria as *o*. But we know of an earlier system of vocalization introduced in the seventh century by James of Edessa (died A.D. 708). He used for the same vowel an Aleph, and we can conclude from this fact that in his time the vowel was pronounced as *ā*.³ It seems that it became fashionable to pronounce the old *ā* as *o* in Western Syria shortly after 700.

A similar change in the pronunciation of the Hebrew vowel rendered by Kāmeṣ seems to have taken place in Palestine at about the same time. In any case it is clear that when the Tiberian Masoretes began to develop their punctuation at the

published by Salomon Buber, *Pesikta, die älteste Haggada*, redigiert in Palästina von Rab Kahana, Lyck, 1868, and is of great interest.

¹ Besides the Cambridge fragment (T.-S. D 1. 12), which I have published in *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. i, p. 29, I have found some very old fragments of the so-called 'Ochla wo-Ochla' in Leningrad, Second Firkowitch Collection, nos. 1551-4. The last one especially seems to be of great importance. Cf. below, p. 75.

² Some of these I have already mentioned in my first lecture, pp. 20 ff.

³ Rubens Duval, in his *Traité de Grammaire Syriacque* (Paris, 1881), p. 45 f. writes: La coloration de *a* obtus en *o* était un fait accompli, quand les voyelles grecques furent employées pour la notation des voyelles syriaques . . . ; car dans ce système c'est *o* grec (omicron ou oméga) qui est le signe de *a* obtus syriaque. En était-il de même avant l'introduction de ce système, c'est-à-dire avant la seconde moitié du VIII^e siècle? On serait tenté de le nier, en considérant que Jacques d'Edesse dans les types qu'il inventa . . . représentait *ā* par aleph; comme il prenait pour modèle l'écriture grecque . . . on est porté à conclure que *ā* syriaque répondait à *ā* grec qui était écrit par alpha.

end of the eighth century (see below), the pronunciation of Kāmeṣ as *o* must have been regarded as the correct one. Vocalizations like קָדָשִׁים, שְׁרָשִׁים can be understood only on the assumption that these words had to be pronounced as *ḳodoshim*, *shoroshim*. There can be no doubt that the so-called Ashkenazic pronunciation has here preserved the pronunciation intended by the Tiberian Masoretes.

On the other hand we see that in Babylonia the old pronunciation of Kāmeṣ as *ā* was retained. In the same way the Eastern Syrians pronounced their Zekāfā always as *ā*, and never as *o*. The Babylonian Jews wrote קָדָשִׁים (*ḳudāshīm*), שְׁרָשִׁים (*shurāshīm*), קָדְשׁוֹ (*ḳudshō*). This pronunciation was imported from Babylonia into Spain, and here the pronunciation of Kāmeṣ as *ā* had to be reconciled with a Biblical text created under other presuppositions by the Tiberian Masoretes. Under these conditions the Tiberian Kāmeṣ has to be read both as *ā* and as *o* in the Sephardic pronunciation which goes back to the Babylonian pronunciation.

That the vowel corresponding to the later Kāmeṣ was not always pronounced in Palestine as *o*, we can see from the fact that in the second column of Origen's Hexapla and in the transliterations of Jerome it is always transcribed by *a*. Besides, we have to note that the Samaritans have always retained the vowel *a* and have never shared in this change of pronunciation.

The fragments with Palestinian punctuation preserve clear evidence for this change of pronunciation. In the scroll of Ezekiel and in that of the Psalms the vowel sign corresponding to the later Tiberian Kāmeṣ is never used to denote *o*. Here we find regularly written לֹאֲכֹלָה Ezek. 15. 4, אֲזֹנִיךָ 16. 2, בִּפְיֶיךָ 16. 14, 15, 25 and in the Psalm scroll אֲזֹנִים 40. 7, חֲכֹמָה 37. 30, חֲנִי 41. 11, קָדְשׁוֹ 30. 5. In the Jeremiah fragment we find נִכְרִיָּה 2. 4 and בִּאֲזֹנִי Jer. 2. 2. In the fragments of the Psalms we find אֲזֹנֶךָ Ps. 71. 2 and עֲשֹׂרְךָ Ps. 52. 9. And in the Piut of Yannai published by me in *MdW.* i, pp. כו-כו, we find vocalizations like בְּגֹזְרֶךָ, כְּהֹקְרָא, תֹּעֲקֵב, יִנְשֵׁב. But in the Daniel fragment we find written שְׁרָשִׁיהָ 11. 3 *shoroshēh* and וְכִשְׁמַעִי 10. 9 *ukshom'ī*, and in the MS. with abbreviated Bible texts the vowel ֱ, corresponding to Tiberian Kāmeṣ, is used quite in the same way as Tiberian ֿ, I may refer here to the specimens given in *MdW.* ii, p. 33*. The same usage is found in many of the fragments containing liturgical texts.

I think we may conclude from these data that the older fragments provided with Palestinian punctuation reflect the pronunciation of the vowel as *ā*, the later fragments the pronunciation as *o*. If we assume that this change in the pronunciation of Hebrew took place in Palestine at the same time as the change in Syriac in Western Syria, we are able to date the older and the later fragments with Palestinian punctuation in the time before and after A.D. 700 or 750.

That these MSS. with Palestinian and simple Babylonian punctuation must be fairly old we can see from the fact that they differ in many details from Biblical MSS. so far known, not only in the vocalization, but also in the consonantal text. Here we find various readings for which we should look in vain in all the MSS. collated by Kennicott for his great *Vetus Testamentum Hebraice* (1776, 1780).¹ The MSS. used by Kennicott and his collaborators were written centuries later, in a time when all the real various readings of the consonantal text had been for a long time eliminated. In general we can say: The older the MSS. are, the more we may expect to find various readings in them. Compared with the standard of Tiberian MSS. these old MSS. were not at all correct. The general uniformity of Tiberian punctuated MSS. must be regarded as the *result* of the endeavour of the Masoretes. We find it at the *end* of the development, not at the *beginning*.

We have seen that at a certain time the simple system of punctuation in Babylonia was developed into a complicated one. In Palestine the old Palestinian system was replaced by the Tiberian system. The name of this system is derived from the town of Tiberias in Galilee which had been the centre of Palestinian Jewry from the third century up to the Muhammedan conquest. When the Muhammedans opened Jerusalem again to the Jews, Tiberias lost its importance as the leading Jewish community,² but remained important as a centre of Masoretic

¹ I may refer here to the various readings of fragments with Palestinian punctuation given in *Masoreten des Westens*, ii, pp. 16* ff. and to the conclusions drawn from them on pp. 35*-7*. From the scroll of the Psalms I may give here the following specimens: In Ps. 36. 4 we read: דְּבַרְיִי פִיּוֹ אֶחָד אֶחָד [ומרמה]: and after Ps. 43. 4 we read: בִּרְצָה בַּעֲצָמַי [חַרְפוֹנִי צִוְרִי] בִּרְצָה בַּעֲצָמַי חַרְפוֹנִי צִוְרִי. In Ps. 56. 10 we read חֲמוּץ instead of חָרוֹן, &c. Various readings in the Babylonian MSS. are given by me in *Masoreten des Ostens*, pp. 103-53. They are not so striking.

² Cf. Jacob Mann, *The Jews in Egypt and Palestine* . . . , vol. i, p. 166.

studies. Is there any way of dating the activity of these Tiberian Masoretes?

In a treatise on the Shwa, preserved in Geniza fragments in Leningrad, London, Oxford, and Frankfurt a/M, we find an interesting list of Masoretes who worked in Tiberias.¹ This list contains a genealogy of the Ben Asher family in five—or six—generations. It includes Rabbi Asher, 'the great Shaikh', the contemporary of the oldest of these Masoretes, his son Nehemia (his son Moshe), his son Asher, his son Moshe, and his son Ahron, the last of the chain.² The lifetime of Moshe b. Asher is fixed by the fact that he finished, in A.D. 895, a Codex of the Prophets.³ Of Ahron, his son, we know that he was active in the first half of the tenth century.⁴ If we assign to each of these five or six generations of Masoretes a period of 25-30 years, the lifetime of the earliest Asher must have been within the second half of the eighth century. That coincides with the rise of Karaism.

'Anan b. David, the founder of the Karaite movement, was himself an authority in Rabbinic studies. We hear, for instance, that Hai Gaon (A.D. 886-96) and his father translated books of 'Anan, written in the Aramaic language, into Hebrew.⁵ As a direct descendant of the Royal house of King David, 'Anan was a candidate for the post of the Jewish Exilarch in Babylonia in A.D. 761. But he rejected the authority of Talmud and Mishna and exhorted his followers to study the Bible itself. So his succession was opposed by the Gaons of Sura and Pumbeditha, and the Karaite movement began. It is exceedingly difficult to get a real idea of the beginnings and first developments of this movement. The Rabbinical sources are of polemical character: Karaism was sometimes a real danger for Rabbinism. On the other hand, some of the oldest Karaite documents had passed through the hands of Firkowitch and were not left unaltered by him, and their modern editing has not been done with the necessary precautions. An adequate and comprehensive treat-

¹ Cf. about this list *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. i, p. 36 f. Jacob Mann, *The Jews in Egypt and Palestine* . . . , vol. ii, Oxford, 1922, pp. 43-9. The whole treatise has been edited and investigated, according to all sources available, by Kurt Levy, in his Bonn Thesis: *Zur masoretischen Grammatik. Texte und Untersuchungen* (Bonner Orientalistische Studien, Heft 15), Stuttgart, 1936.

² The name added in brackets is mentioned in the Leningrad fragment, cf. *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. i, p. 37, note 8.

³ Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 15-17, and below, pp. 57, 110 ff.

⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 1-15, and below, p. 58.

⁵ Cf. J. Markon, in *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, vol. ii, p. 754.

ment of Karaism is still a desideratum.¹ But for our purposes, the statements made by Jacob Mann in the Preface of his 'Karaitica'² are sufficient. From these I may quote here the following extracts:

It is not feasible to deal here with the origin and the rise of Karaism under Anan b. David about 760 c.e. Suffice it to say that this movement had a leavening influence in the development of Judaism in the Middle Ages, especially in the countries of Islam. Karaism cannot forsooth be regarded as a really liberal movement. . . . And yet, by its very nature as a rebellion against the established form of Rabbinism it allowed a good deal of freedom of thought and investigation. Well known is the saying of the founder Anan: 'Search ye well in the Tora and do not rely on my opinion.' The controversial issues raised by this movement compelled the spokesmen of Rabbinic Judaism to pay more attention to the literal interpretation of the Bible as against the prevalent Halakhic and Aggadic exegesis. The attack on the validity of the Oral Law necessitated a thorough examination of the accumulated Rabbinic dicta and pronouncements. The Karaite writers would hold up to scorn and ridicule many bizarre Agadot depicting the Deity in an anthropomorphic manner. They regarded themselves as the intelligentsia of the time (Maskilim) with the founder of this sect being styled Rosh Hammaskilim. . . . In brief, the sectarian movement of Karaism . . . greatly stimulated the process of clarification of Judaism in the classical period of the Jewish Middle Ages. From the heat of controversy Rabbinic Judaism emerged purified and more acceptable to the educated intelligentsia. . . .

The stimulating influence exercised by the Karaites on Judaism in general is well characterized by Jacob Mann, and we can take it for granted that the intensified study of the Bible led to a special interest in the *text* of the Bible. There can hardly be any doubt that the work of the Tiberian Masoretes—and the parallel work of the Babylonian Masoretes³—have to be regarded as a result of the Karaite movement.

The work accomplished by the Masoretes of Tiberias is clearly to be seen in two Biblical MSS. which are connected with the names of the last two members of the Ben Asher family. One is the Codex of the Former and Later Prophets, written by Moshe b. Asher in Tiberias for Ya'beš b. Shelomo, a Karaite who had

¹ Cf. the Preface of the Volume quoted in the next note.

² *Texts and Studies in Jewish Historical Literature*, by Jacob Mann, vol. ii, *Karaitica*, Philadelphia, 1935. In more than 1,600 pages, Jacob Mann has published and discussed here a great number of Karaite texts from the Geniza, most of them dealing with the later development of Karaism.

³ In so far as they developed, in the same period, the complicated system of punctuation.

himself prepared the parchment for the codex 'by his work and the labour of his hands and the sweat of his face', for the honour of the God of Israel.¹ In the colophon of this codex, written by Moshe b. Asher himself in the year 827 after the destruction of the Second House (A.D. 895), the famous Masorete declares that he has written the codex in the city of Ma'azzia—Ṭabariyya

as it was understood by the congregation of the Prophets, the chosen of the Lord, the Saints of our God, who understood all the hidden things and embellished the secrets of wisdom, the chiefs of righteousness, the men of faith. They have not concealed anything of what was given to them nor added a word to what was transmitted to them, and have made powerful and mighty the Scriptures, the Twenty-four Books, and have established them in their integrity with explanatory accents, with a commentary of pronunciation with sweet palate and beauty of speech.

We see that Moshe b. Asher is very confident of the importance of the work done by the Masoretes of Tiberias. Three notes found in the codex report that it was given by the possessor, Ya'bes b. Shelomo, to the Community of the Karaites in Jerusalem. Another note reports that the codex had been given 'after its redemption' by the great lord David, son of the great lord Yepheth Neker al-Iskanderi to the Community of the Karaites in al-Ḳāhira. 'After its redemption' refers to the release of Biblical codices which had been seized by the Crusaders in A.D. 1099, when they had taken Jerusalem. These codices were released a few years afterwards.² In the Synagogue of the Karaites in Cairo this precious codex has been preserved for more than 800 years, up to the present day.

The other codex is the MS. of the whole Bible preserved in the Synagogue of the Sephardic Jews in Aleppo. It had before been kept in the Jerusalem Synagogue in Old Cairo, and there it had been seen and highly appreciated by Maimonides in the second half of the twelfth century. He tells us that there was a great confusion in Biblical MSS. in his time. But there was a MS. in Old Cairo, containing all the twenty-four books of the Bible, which had been in Jerusalem many years before. This was a model codex, because Ben Asher had corrected it several times and fixed every detail in it, during many years. Therefore it could be relied upon in all problems connected with the text of the Bible. This MS. he had taken as the basis for the Tora

¹ In the Appendix to this lecture, pp. 110–15, all the colophons of this codex are published, with an English translation.

² Cf. below, p. 59 f.

copied by himself.¹ We do not know exactly when and under what conditions the MS. had been brought over from Egypt to Aleppo, but that it was there in the middle of the fifteenth century we learn from a notice in Sa'adya b. David al-'Adeni's Commentary on Maimonides' 'Yad ha-Ḥazaḳa' which was composed between 1478 and 1484. He writes:²

The book to which the Gaon refers is still to-day in the town Ṣoba, i.e. Ḥaleb (Aleppo), and they call it 'the Crown', and it is written on parchment, three columns on a page, and at its end there is written: 'I am Ahron b. Asher, who has corrected it etc.' And I have seen it and read in it.

Jewish authors who saw and described the codex during the nineteenth century do not mention a colophon written by Ben Asher himself.³ But they have published, with more or less exactness, an important notice to be found at the end of the codex which states:⁴ The consonantal text of the codex was written by Shelomo b. Buyā'a. Ahron b. Asher had carefully provided the text with punctuation and Masora. A wealthy Ḳaraite from Baṣra, Israel b. Simḥa b. Sa'adya b. Efraim, had endowed the Codex to the Community of the Ḳaraites in Jerusalem. It was to be kept there under the special care of the two Ḳaraite prince (נשיאים) Yoshiya and Yeḥezḳiya, the sons of the Ḳaraite prince Shelomo b. David b. Bo'az. The suggestion was made that these two princes should appoint two trustworthy men in Jerusalem to take care of the codex. They were to have the duty of bringing it out at the three great Jewish feasts, Passover, Pentecost, Tabernacles, for publicly reading therefrom the lessons. Besides, every serious scholar, whether Rabbanite or Ḳaraite, should be given the opportunity of using it for comparing and correcting by it other MSS., not for the purpose of studying it. The codex should never be seen

¹ Cf. Maimonides, 'Yad ha-Ḥazaḳa, Hilkot Sefer Tora', chapter 8. I have given a translation of the passage in *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. i, p. 11.

² It was Dr. N. Wieder who drew my attention to a notice in this Commentary, a part of which is preserved in the Bodleian MS. Hunt. 372, where we read on fol. 138v: והוא חלב ויסמוה אלתאג ומכתוב עלי רק בכל ורקא תלאת דפאה ומכתוב פי אחרה אני אהרון בן אשר שהגהתי וכו ואני ראיתי וקראתי בו.

³ Cf. Jacob Berlin's report in the Hebrew periodical *הלבנון*, 1863, p. 16. 23; Jacob Saphir in the report on his journey called *אבן ספיר*, vol. i, Lück, 1866, p. 12b; A. E. Harkavy in *חדשים גם ישנים*, No. 6, 1895, p. 7.

⁴ I have published the notice according to the best sources in *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. i, p. 3 f.

by anybody except in the presence of a trustworthy man who was in charge of it.

Shelomo b. Buyā'a was a famous copyist in the first half of the tenth century. A Tora MS. written by him and provided with punctuation and Masora by his brother Efraim was finished A.D. 929.¹ We may suppose that the Aleppo Codex was written at nearly the same time.

The note recording the donation of the codex to the Ḳaraites in Jerusalem gives no date. But we can fix the time approximately by the period of the Ḳaraite princes mentioned in it. David b. Bo'az, the grandfather of the two princes to whom the codex was given, a well-known Ḳaraite author, was Nasi still in A.D. 993, when he wrote a Commentary on Kohelet.² His son Shelomo is mentioned as Ḳaraite Nasi, with his two sons Yoshiya and Yeḥezḳiya, in a colophon dated A.D. 1016.³ The sons themselves are mentioned as Ḳaraite Nasis in A.D. 1042 in Jerusalem, and in 1055 and 1062 in Cairo.⁴ They must have changed their residence between 1042 and 1055. As it was suggested that they should appoint representatives in Jerusalem, it is very likely that they were living already in Cairo when the codex was endowed to the Ḳaraites in Jerusalem, or that they had already decided to move there.

A notice on the first page of the codex says:⁵

It was transferred in accordance with the right granted under release from the booty of Jerusalem, the holy city, to the Community of Old Cairo, the Synagogue of Jerusalem. . . .

'Booty of Jerusalem' refers to those things which were seized by the Crusaders after they took Jerusalem on 15 July 1099. The seized MSS. were released by King Baldwin a few years later. We hear of a thanksgiving service held in the Synagogue of 'Anan, the founder of Ḳaraism, in Jerusalem, on the special

¹ No. 17 in the Second Firkowitch Collection in Leningrad. Cf. *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. i, p. 58 f.

² Cf. S. Poznański, *The Karaite Literary Opponents of Saadia Gaon*, London, 1908, p. 18 f. The same, *Babylonische Geonim im nachgaonäischen Zeitalter*, Berlin, 1914, pp. 127 ff.

³ No. 225 in the Second Firkowitch Collection in Leningrad. Cf. *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. i, p. 67 f., where I have published the colophon.

⁴ Cf. Jacob Mann, *Texts and Studies*, vol. ii, pp. 134 ff.

⁵ Cf. *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. i, p. 9; the chief part of this notice is: אנתקל בחכם אלאפתכאך מן נהב ירושלים עיר הק' . . . לקהל מצרים לכניסת אלאתפכאך Saphir, l.c., p. 17v prints erroneously אלאתפכאך instead of אלאתפכאך which gives no sense, and was taken in the meaning of 'with the consent (of the princes)'. The correct reading is given already in *הלבנון* and by Harkavy (l.c., p. 8).

occasion of the release of the holy books on 13 July 1106.¹ We may suppose that the books which had belonged to the Rabbanites were released at the same time. A great many of these released books were brought to Egypt. We have seen that the Codex of the Prophets written in 895 by Moshe b. Asher was given to the Karaite Community in al-Ḳāhira.² Now we hear that the Aleppo Codex was transferred to the Jerusalem Synagogue in Old Cairo, and it seems that this Synagogue belonged to the Rabbanites.³

Another Biblical codex connected with the name of Ben Asher is the Leningrad Codex B 19a. That this codex was copied in Old Cairo (במדינת מצרים) in A.D. 1008 (or 1009) 'from the corrected clear books prepared by the master Ahron b. Moshe b. Asher',⁴ is expressly stated by the copyist Samuel b. Yacob himself.⁵ For Ginsburg there was no doubt that this codex was a copy of the Aleppo Codex. He writes:⁶

In the year 1009, that is three or four years after it was conveyed to the Jerusalem Congregation at Cairo and most probably in the lifetime of the first Trustees, a certain Samuel b. Jacob copied this Standard Codex of Ben Asher for Meborak Ibn Osdad. This very important copy is now in the Imperial Public Library at St. Petersburg. The name of the scribe, the place where the copy was made, the honoured person for whom it was transcribed and the date on which it was finished are all most minutely given in the Epigraph of the MS. They are written in the same handwriting as the MS. itself.

But we have seen that the Aleppo Codex was given to the Karaite Community in Jerusalem in the middle of the eleventh century, and that it was brought over to Egypt some years after 1100. In 1897, when Ginsburg wrote his Introduction, nothing was known of the time of the Karaite princes mentioned in the

¹ In a notice in a scroll of the Tora, belonging to the Karaites, published by Harkavy in the periodical *הצפירה*, 1875, p. 47 f. Cf. J. Mann, *The Jews in Egypt and Palestine*, vol. i, p. 200, note 2. I have given a translation of the passage in *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. i, p. 10. Mann's doubts of the genuineness of the notice (in *Texts and Studies*, vol. ii, p. 137) are certainly not justified. The exact date given above is pointed out by Herbert Loewe.

² See above, p. 57.

³ There existed at that time in Old Cairo besides the כניסת ירושלים a Synagogue of the Babylonian Jews (כניסת הבבליים), cf. *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. i, p. 10, note 1.

⁴ The Hebrew words are: מן הספרים המוגהים המבואר אשר עשה המלמד אהרן בן משה בן אשר נוח בן עדן.

⁵ Cf. *Catalog der hebräischen Bibelhandschriften* . . ., ed. Harkavy and Strack, 1875, pp. 265 and 269.

⁶ Cf. his *Introduction*, p. 243 f.

colophon, and he misunderstood the notice on the first page of the codex on account of Saphir's mistake in reading it.¹ Ginsburg's reconstruction is therefore wrong, and we have only the following alternatives: *Either* the Aleppo Codex was in Egypt before it was given to the Karaites in Jerusalem, and afterwards was brought back to Egypt in the beginning of the twelfth century. *Or* the Leningrad Codex was copied from another Ben Asher Codex which was in Egypt about A.D. 1000 and which later disappeared.² Ben Asher certainly prepared more than one MS. of the Hebrew Biblical text with punctuation and Masora. If we compare the facsimile of the Aleppo Codex published by Wickes³ (Gen. 26. 34–27. 30) with the Leningrad Codex as printed in the *Biblia Hebraica*, we find in the punctuation only two differences: at Gen. 27. 23 the latter codex reads וַיִּבְרַכְהוּ instead of וַיִּבְרַכְהוּ, which is also the reading of both codices elsewhere (Gen. 26. 12; 27. 27), and at Gen. 27. 1 the Aleppo Codex has clearly מֵרָאָה with Metheg, which is missing in the Leningrad Codex not only here but in all the other places where the word occurs (Isa. 21. 3; 33. 15; 44. 18; Hab. 1. 13; Ps. 69. 24; 119. 37). Besides, in six places Metheg is inserted, where it is missing in the Aleppo Codex, though these may be explained by the fact that Kittel added some Methes which were not found in the MS.⁴ Greater are the differences in the Masoretic notes: Two notes of the Leningrad Codex are missing in the Aleppo Codex, and twenty-four of the Aleppo Codex in the Leningrad Codex. This could hardly be explained if the Aleppo Codex was the original of the Leningrad Codex. We conclude that the original of the Leningrad Codex and the Aleppo Codex were two *different* codices, both prepared by Ahron b. Asher, and as we find on the margins of the Aleppo Codex many more Masoretic notes than in the Leningrad Codex, it is very likely that it was a later development of the text prepared by Ahron b. Asher. Maimonides had heard that Ben Asher had been occupied with the Aleppo Codex during many years and that he had corrected it many times.

¹ See p. 59, note 5.

² If such a MS. becomes incomplete at the end it is difficult to recognize it as a Ben Asher Codex.

³ See next page.

⁴ Cf. Kittel's *Prolegomena to the Biblia Hebraica*, p. iv. In the later books of the *Biblia Hebraica* (i.e. all except Isaiah and Genesis) all Methes added by the editors are printed on the right side of the vowel, the Methes to be found in the MS. on the left side of the vowel.

It is well known that the authenticity of the two Ben Asher Codices has been disputed. William Wickes, who published the facsimile of a page of the Aleppo Codex mentioned above and investigated some other readings of the codex known to him, writes:¹

From these few test-passages we may conclude that the statement assigning this Codex to Ben Asher is a *fabrication*—merely introduced to enhance the value of the same,—and that the whole long epigraph, with the list of Qaraite names (showing it to be of Qaraite origin), &c., is untrustworthy and undeserving of serious notice.

Adolf Neubauer published facsimiles of two pages of the Cairo Ben Asher Codex. It was clear to him that the text of that codex was in general the same as that of the Aleppo Codex, of which Wickes had declared that it had nothing to do with Ben Asher. So he writes:²

But from the mode of accentuation in this MS., Drs. S. Baer and Wickes both concluded that it could not have been pointed by a Masorete of the Ben-Asher school, the accentuation being against the rules laid down by Ben-Asher.

Paul de Lagarde, after having seen the facsimile published by Wickes, writes—I translate the passage:³

According to this [facsimile], the Codex comes from Germany and was written in the fourteenth century, therefore it is worthless for research purposes. I would suggest comparison with the Dresden Codex of the ך'ן which once was made available to me at my house, and plate no. 41 of the Oriental Series of the Palaeographical Society. It should, however, be kept in mind that the facsimile given by Wickes is greatly reduced in size.

To begin with Lagarde: I have not seen the Dresden Codex; Plate 41 to which he refers presents a facsimile of a Cambridge Codex written 1345, but this codex is completely different. Plate 40, however, containing a facsimile of MS. Harl. 5720 of the British Museum, is similar to it. This is described by Gins-

¹ Cf. *A Treatise on the Accentuation of the Twenty-One so-called Prose Books of the Old Testament*, Oxford, 1887, p. ix.

² Cf. his article 'An Account of the Earliest MSS. of the Old Testament', in the third volume of *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, Oxford, 1891, pp. 25-7.

³ 'Danach gehört der Codex nach Deutschland und stammt aus dem vierzehnten Jahrhundert, ist also für die Wissenschaft werthlos. Ich bitte, den Dresdener Codex des ך'ן , den ich einmal im Hause gehabt, und Tafel 41 des Oriental Series des Palaeographical Society zu vergleichen: wobei man allerdings zu bedenken haben wird, dass das Bild des Herrn Wickes sehr stark verkleinert ist.' *Mittheilungen*, vol. iv, Göttingen, 1891, p. 17 f.

burg as one of the oldest Hebrew Biblical MSS. of the British Museum and is dated by him from about 1100 to 1120.¹ Lagarde's condemnation of the Aleppo Codex can be explained only by the assumption that he took the description of one plate for that of the other.

Neubauer had no judgement of his own in the matter and did not dare to say anything against the authority of men like Wickes and Baer. That Wickes depended in his condemnation of the Aleppo Codex on Baer's authority is clear. Already in his former book he had acknowledged his 'obligation to Dr. Baer, as a personal friend'.² In his later book of 1887 he writes in the Preface:

I have once more to express my obligation to my friend Dr. Baer, for the valuable assistance he has willingly rendered me. His familiar acquaintance with the Massora—a department of study in which he ranks *facile princeps*—has been of special service to me.

He was so strongly influenced by Baer that he took over from him even the typical Jewish animosity against the Karaites ! It is therefore Baer with whom I have to deal here.

Seligmann Baer (1825-97) seems to have been in his early youth in contact with Wolf Heidenheim (1757-1832). In any case, he inherited some of his MSS. and continued his work. They both were convinced that all Masora had been written in order to confirm a Hebrew Biblical text similar to that published in 1524-5 by Jacob b. Chaiyim. This text they both took as in general identical with the text of Ben Asher. They really knew a great deal of Masora and were so devoted to its study that we may regard them as a kind of continuators of the work of the Masoretes, as the last Masoretes. Their method was to explain all difficulties and to smooth out the differences into one great unity. I may illustrate the methods adopted by these men by the following two experiences:

1. When I had published my article on the traditional pronunciation of Hebrew and the punctuation of the Masoretes,³ where I had, besides other things, shown that in the fragments with Palestinian punctuation the suffix of the 2nd person masc. sing. is *-āk* instead of *-kā*, I received a letter from Professor D. Simonsen in Copenhagen in which he wrote to me: '... May

¹ Cf. his *Introduction*, p. 435.

² Cf. *A Treatise on the Accentuation of the three so-called Poetical Books of the Old Testament*, Oxford, 1881, Preface.

³ 'Die überlieferte Aussprache des Hebräischen und die Punktation der Masoreten', in *ZATW.*, vol. xxxix, 1921, pp. 230-9.

I draw your attention to the fact that we find a remnant of the pronunciation *-āḱ* instead of *-kā* still preserved frequently in liturgical poems . . . and only W. Heidenheim (1803 ff.) has introduced the pronunciation in accordance with the Masoretes.¹

2. In his book *משפטי הטעמים*, Rödelheim, 1808, Heidenheim had pointed out the rules for setting Metheg in Hebrew Biblical MSS. Baer published a new edition of these rules in his article 'Die Metheg-Setzung nach ihren überlieferten Gesetzen dargestellt'.² Franz Delitzsch, who prepared the article for publication, wrote an introductory notice to it. These rules had been worked out by Heidenheim and Baer from late Hebrew Biblical MSS. which alone were at their disposal. But they were both firmly convinced that they had found the very rules according to which Ben Asher himself had arranged the correct reading of the text. On the authority of men like Franz Delitzsch these rules were generally adopted and faithfully taken over into our Hebrew grammars. Even a critical scholar like G. Bergsträßer accepted these rules into his *Hebrew Grammar*,³ with some specimens, added by himself from the Ben Chaiyim text, in order to illustrate them. On a visit he paid me in Gießen in spring 1923 we discussed this part of his *Grammar*, and I asked Bergsträßer whether he ever had studied a Hebrew Biblical MS. 'No', was the answer. I then showed him some photographs of ancient Hebrew Biblical MSS. in all of which these elaborate rules for the use of Metheg were not observed. He was somewhat perplexed and declared: 'I did not realize that what I have written on the use of Metheg in my grammar was worthless ("Makulatur").'

Baer used to regard all Hebrew Biblical MSS. that did not set Metheg in agreement with the rules laid down by Heidenheim and himself as not belonging to the school of Ben Asher. Hence his condemnation of the Ben Asher Codices.

The methods followed by Baer in dealing with Masoretic material can be illustrated by the way in which he manufactured his editions. Ahron b. Asher had composed a Masoretic treatise 'Dikduke ha-Ṭe'amim' in which he had laid down certain rules for reading and cantillating the text of the Hebrew

¹ Cf. *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. i, p. 46, note 1.

² The article was published in Adalbert Merx' *Archiv für wissenschaftliche Erforschung des Alten Testaments*, vol. i, Halle, 1869, pp. 55-67, 194-207.

³ Some parts of his *Grammar* were published as the 29th edition of Wilhelm Gesenius' *Hebräische Grammatik*. The first fascicle was published in Leipzig, in 1918.

Bible. Baer edited this text together with Strack. But Strack contributed some bibliographical notes only and copies of MSS. he had seen, some years before, in St. Petersburg. All problems of editing the text were left to Baer. Strack was content to share the 'honour' of the edition. Typical is the title of the joint edition:

Die Dikduke ha-Ṭe'amim des Ahron ben Moscheh ben Ascher und andere grammatisch-massoretische Lehrstücke zur Feststellung eines richtigen Textes der hebräischen Bibel, mit Benutzung zahlreicher Handschriften zum ersten Male herausgegeben von S. Baer und H. L. Strack. Leipzig 1879.

Baer did not aim at publishing the treatise composed by Ahron b. Asher critically. He had collected Masoretic material of various kinds, written at different times, in order to make it the basis of a 'correct' text of the Hebrew Bible. The problem how far such divergent materials could really be attributed to Ben Asher did not exist for Baer. The rules composed by Ben Asher certainly refer to the Ben Asher text, and *not* to the Ben Chaiyim text. But Baer supposed the whole material to be a unity, and as the texts collected by him agreed neither with each other nor with the text Baer believed to be the text of Ben Asher, he selected from them what he regarded as 'correct', and what differed he declared to be 'corrupt', 'incomplete', or 'in confusion'.¹ We can hardly agree that with such methods old and difficult Masoretic texts can be edited in a satisfactory way.² But these methods are typical of Baer. Strack was himself more a compiler than a critical scholar; he raised no objection to these methods of his colleague.

But Baer not only *selected* what he regarded as the 'correct' text from the material at his disposal, he also freely *altered* readings of his MSS. when they did not give what he regarded as 'correct'. In Bonn we came across a very drastic example of

¹ In the notes added to the texts edited by him we find therefore remarks like the following:

'In den übrigen Codd. fehlen in einigen diese Sätze ganz, in andern sind bloss Trümmer davon erhalten' (p. 5). 'Von hier an sind in P die Sätze verworren; daher das Folgende nach Cod. Cairo und Man' (p. 7). 'So dieser Satz richtig in K. In den andern Codd. corrumpt' (p. 11). 'So in T 21' (p. 15; the readings of other Codices are not mentioned). 'In den andern Texten fehlt dies alles . . . Überhaupt herrscht in diesem Stücke grosse Verwirrung in den Vorlagen' (p. 17). 'Von hier und weiter die Zurechtstellung nach Man, da in den andern Texten die grösste Confusion' (p. 19).

² Ginsburg advanced objections to Baer's methods in his *Introduction*, pp. 278-86.

this method of Baer. In the Preface of his edition of the *Dikduke ha-Ṭ'amim*, a Masoretical compendium is mentioned, called 'Adat Deborim'.¹ It was composed by a certain Joseph from Constantinople, and the Leningrad MS., dated A.D. 1207, is the only MS. known of that book. The author had incorporated into his compendium a treatise on the differences between Ben Asher and Ben Naftali, composed by Mishael b. 'Uzziel.² The great importance of this text had become clear to me, and so I proposed to one of my pupils, Lazar Lipschütz, to prepare an edition of it. For this purpose we needed, besides the Geniza fragments of the text itself, also the MS. of *Adat Deborim*. On my request the MS. was sent from Leningrad to Bonn.

This book had been used by Baer, in a copy made by Strack, not only for his edition of *Dikduke ha-Ṭ'amim*, but also for the lists of the differences between Ben Asher and Ben Naftali added to the Biblical texts which he edited together with Franz Delitzsch.³ In the lists added to these editions from 1880 onwards,⁴ quotations from *Adat Deborim* occur in great number. A careful examination of these quotations had the result that Lipschütz had to state that hardly any of these quotations was in accordance with the MS. from which they were taken. Baer had altered nearly all of them and had brought them into a form which he regarded as the 'correct' Ben Asher text, without saying a word of this somewhat curious method adopted by him. Franz Delitzsch was so impressed by Baer's great familiarity with Masoretical material that he completely omitted to make a critical examination of the methods adopted by Baer; he did not become aware of his methods, and thus covered Baer's pseudo-editions with his authority.

Under these conditions we need not wonder that William Wickes also was impressed by Baer's acquaintance with the Masora in such a way that he declared the colophons of valuable old Biblical MSS. to be *fabrications*, because the texts of these MSS. did not follow the rules which Baer believed to be those of Ben Asher, and that Neubauer did not dare to say anything against these authorities.

¹ Cf. *Dikduke* . . . , p. xxxii f. The MS. is now 'Hebrew-Arab Paper, 161' of the Second Firkowitch Collection.

² Cf. *Masoreten des Westens*, ii, pp. 60*-2*, and *Biblia Hebraica*, ed. Kittel, Stuttgart, 1937, Prolegomena, p. vii f.

³ Cf. *Liber Psalmorum*, ed. Baer, Delitzsch, Lipsiae, 1880, Praefatio Francisci Delitzschii, p. vi.

⁴ Psalms 1880, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemia 1882, Ezechiel 1884, Megillot 1886, Chronicles 1888, Jeremia 1890, Samuelis 1892, &c.

The book of Mishael b. 'Uzziel on the differences between Ben Asher and Ben Naftali proved to be of great importance. From Geniza fragments preserved in Leningrad and in Paris and from quotations in *Adat Deborim* the whole text of the book could be restored.¹ It could be proved that *Adat Deborim* was composed about A.D. 1060.² Mishael's book, of which a great part had been incorporated in *Adat Deborim*, must have been older. It is very likely that it was composed in the tenth century, not long after the death of the two Masoretes, and Mishael is really very well informed. He knows that Ben Asher—and Ben Naftali—often fixed readings in their earlier time which they altered in their later time. Mishael first enumerates eight general rules for the differences of the two Masoretes,³ then he gives a list of more than 800 instances from all books of the Bible in which all the little details for the readings of Ben Asher and Ben Naftali are given. So the book is an excellent test for Ben Asher MSS. as well as for Ben Naftali MSS.

A careful examination of the Leningrad Bible MS. B 19a on the basis of these test passages had the result that in about 95 per cent. of the cases the MS. had exactly the readings given by Mishael as those of Ahron b. Asher. The statement of the copyist, Samuel b. Jacob, that he had copied a MS. prepared by Ahron b. Asher, was therefore confirmed in an excellent way.

The British Museum MS. Or. 4445, containing the greatest part of the Pentateuch (Gen. 39. 20 to Deut. 1. 33), is connected with the name of Ben Asher in so far as on the margin 'the great master Ben Asher' (מלמד הגדול בן אשר) is mentioned several times.⁴ Ginsburg had seen that the vocalization of the MS. differed from that of Ben Chaïyim and that it was older

¹ The Leningrad fragments were 'Arab.-Hebr. Paper, nos. 147-153' of the Second Firkowitch Collection, the Paris MS. IX A. 3 of the Bibliothèque de l'Alliance Israélite Universelle. The first part of Lazar Lipschütz's book: *Ben Asher—Ben Naftali. Der Bibeltext der tiberischen Masoreten. Eine Abhandlung des Mischael b. Uzziel, veröffentlicht und untersucht*, was published as a Bonn Thesis in 1937. I saw in Bonn some sheets of the continuation of the book, but not the complete text, in print. I had, of course, a written copy of the book at my disposal.

² This was pointed out by Harry Levy, one of my pupils in Bonn who had made a special investigation of *Adat Deborim*. He intended to submit it as a Thesis to the University of Bern (Switzerland). I have not seen anything printed of the book.

³ I have published these eight rules in a German translation in *Masoreten des Westens*, ii, pp. 62*-5*.

⁴ Cf. G. Margoliouth's *Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan MSS. in the British Museum*, vol. i, London, 1899, p. 38.

than it. But as he was convinced that Ben Chaiyim had published the Ben Asher text, Ginsburg suggested that the consonantal text of the codex and the vocalization were written a hundred years before Ben Asher (A.D. 820–50), and that the Masora was added in the time of Ben Asher, as his name is mentioned without the eulogistic formula (A.D. 900–40), and G. Margoliouth, in the British Museum catalogue, adopted this somewhat curious suggestion. Ginsburg pointed out some features in the writing of the consonants to prove that the codex was written so early. But Ginsburg was not acquainted with really old Hebrew Biblical MSS., and so he did not know that the features pointed out by him are found in nearly all the known codices of the tenth and eleventh centuries.¹ A careful examination of the British Museum Codex, of which we had a complete photograph in the Oriental Seminar in Bonn, showed that the codex had the readings given by Mishael b. 'Uzziel as those of Ahron b. Asher in his earlier time.

The third codex examined was the Cairo Codex of the Prophets written by Moshe b. Asher and finished A.D. 895 in Tiberias.² The result showed that this codex never had the readings given by Mishael as characteristic of Ahron b. Asher. It was clear that the little details in the punctuation quoted by Mishael were worked out by the *son*, not by the *father*. The Cairo Ben Asher Codex represents a text from which Ahron b. Asher started. The British Museum MS. is a specimen of the development of the text in the earlier time of Ben Asher's activity; in the text from which the Leningrad Codex was copied we have a type of the Hebrew Biblical text in the later time of Ben Asher's activity. It is very likely that the Aleppo Codex is another type of this text, in which the Masora was further developed.³

The fact that Mishael b. 'Uzziel composed his book on the differences between Ben Asher and Ben Naftali shows that in his time Moshe b. David b. Naftali was a highly esteemed Tiberian Masorete.⁴ In the Geniza I have found quite a number

¹ Cf. the facsimiles of the fourteen Hebrew Biblical MSS. in Leningrad which are dated between 929 and 1121, published by me on Plates 17–30 of *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. i.

² Cf. concerning this MS. above, p. 56 f.

³ Cf. above, p. 57 f. A careful investigation of the whole codex has still to be made.

⁴ How little was known of this Masorete in later times we see from the fact that Elia Levita calls him a 'Babylonian' Masorete (cf. his *Massoreth ha-Massoreth*, ed. Ginsburg, London, 1867, p. 114), and that even Ginsburg shared this error, cf. his *Introduction*, p. 267.

of fragments of his text, and with the help of these fragments a number of MSS. can be identified as containing a text fixed by this authority or later developments of that text. It thus becomes possible to give a survey of the characteristics of this group of MSS.¹ Only a few of these MSS., however, show all these characteristics. We see in general a tendency to assimilate this text to that fixed by Ben Asher.

On the other hand the Ben Asher text did not remain unaltered. It was influenced by the Ben Naftali text. The Masora always tends to bring differences into unity. The result of this development is a kind of *textus receptus* which, although based on the Ben Asher text, must be regarded as a compromise between the two texts. It begins to appear after 1300 and is usually to be found in MSS. written in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Such MSS. were the basis of the text which was printed in the two great Rabbinic Bibles published by Daniel Bomberg in Venice,² the first, edited by Felix Pratensis,³ in 1516–17, the second, edited by Jacob b. Chaiyim, in 1524–5.⁴

¹ Cf. the chapter 'Der Bibeltext des Ben Naftali', in *Masoreten des Westens*, ii, pp. 45–68.

² Daniel Bomberg, son of Cornelius Bomberg in Antwerp (the name had originally been: van Bomberghen), was a wealthy merchant who had settled in Venice. On the suggestion of Felix Pratensis (see next note) he had founded a Hebrew printing office in Venice. The first privilege was granted to him in 1515. Between the years 1516 and 1538 Bomberg published 186 Hebrew texts, many of them of very considerable size. In 1538 he had lost in this undertaking all his money ('four millions in gold'). Cf. A. Freimann, 'Daniel Bomberg und seine hebräische Druckerei in Venedig', in the periodical *Zeitschrift für Hebräische Bibliographie*, vol. x, Frankfurt a/M., 1906, pp. 32–6, 79–88.

³ Felix Pratensis (Fra Felice da Prato) was a very learned Jew who had become a Christian and had entered the order of the Augustine Hermits. In Felix Ossinger's *Bibliotheca Augustiniana*, Ingolstadt, 1718, p. 716, we find the following notice regarding him: 'à Prato, Felix, natione Hebraeus, Alumnus Provinciae Pisanum, Filius Coenobii Pratensis, vixit Saeculo 16. S. Theologiae Magister, ex famoso Hebraeo, Rabbinóque factus Eremita Augustinianus, trium linguarum scientia, ac solida eruditione ornatus, à Reverendissimo P. Generali, Gabriele Veneto, Lector Theologiae constitutus, adeo in hac scientia profecit, ut inter omnes Doctores Theologos similem suo tempore habuerit neminem. Anno 1522, Reverendissimus P. Mag. Generalis praefatus Gabriel Venetiis illum ad Adrianum VI Pontificem Maximum misit, ut negotia nostra tractaret. Multis annis Hebraeorum Concinnator Romae exstitit, è quibus plurimos ad fidem convertit, passim enim Hebraeorum flagellum audiebat. Anno 1523, fit auctoritate Pontificia S. Theologiae Magister. Anno 1526 et 28 suae Congregationis Procuratorem egit. Romae, prope centenarius . . . 5. XI. 1559 finem vitae attigit. . . .'

⁴ See next page.

The MSS. of the Hebrew Bible which were at the disposal of these editors were not very good. In the Latin dedication to Pope Leo X, prefixed to the first Rabbinic Bible, Felix Pratensis describes the MSS. used by him in the following words:

Multi quidem antea manu scripti circumferebantur, sed adeo nitore suo privati, ut par fere mendarum numerus dictiones ipsas consequeretur, nihilque magis ab his desideraretur, quam verus et nativus candor, quem nunc a nobis illis esse restitutum qui legerint cognoscent omnes.

The editor tried to do his best to publish a comparatively good text in spite of the very inadequate MSS. at his disposal.

Jacob b. Chaiyim, the editor of the second Rabbinic Bible, was a Jewish refugee from Tunis who later became a Christian. He was introduced to Daniel Bomberg in 1520 and engaged by him as a corrector in his printing office. We hear that he was engaged in the edition of the great Talmudic Compendium of Rabbi Yishāḳ al-Fāsī, which contained also the first edition of the *Tosefta*¹ (1521), he edited Seder *Ṭohorot* of the Mishna (1523), the Commentary on the Tora composed by Menachem from Recanati (1523), the book on the 613 prescriptions and prohibitions (*ספר ההיגיון*, 1523), and helped in editing the Palestinian Talmud (1522–3), and, together with David Pizzighe-tone b. Eliezer, he edited Maimonides' *Mishne Tora* or *Yad ha-Hazaḳa* (1524). He was greatly interested—perhaps also engaged—in the edition of the Concordance (*מאיר נתיב*) of Isaak Natan b. Kalonymos which was edited 1523 and proved to be of the greatest importance for Jacob's Masoretic studies.² At the same time he prepared the second Rabbinic Bible (edited 1524–5). Many parts of it were simple reprints of what had been edited already by Felix Pratensis in the first Rabbinic Bible. But the Hebrew text of the Bible itself Ben Chaiyim tried to bring into accordance with the Masora. The study of the Masora had been greatly neglected in the time before Jacob b. Chaiyim. After the fixation of the *textus receptus* of the Hebrew Bible of which we have spoken, the Masora had become practically superfluous. Masoretic notes were added to MSS. of the Hebrew Bible, because people were accustomed to see the Biblical text surrounded by such notes. But in most of the MSS. they

¹ Cf. A. Berliner, 'Beiträge zur hebräischen Typographie Daniel Bomberg's', in *Jahrbuch der jüdisch-literarischen Gesellschaft*, vol. iii, Frankfurt a/M., 1905, p. 303.

² Cf. concerning these texts the articles of Freimann and Berliner, quoted above.

had become more and more of a decorative character. They were written in flowers and ligatures and were full of mistakes. The study of the Masora had completely come to a standstill. It was Jacob's merit that he began earnest study of the Masora over again. Firstly he had to look for MSS. Libraries in which valuable MSS. were preserved for the use of scholars did not exist in the beginning of the sixteenth century. Jacob had to work on MSS. which his patron, Daniel Bomberg, acquired for him. He writes in his Introduction.¹

When I explained to Bomberg the advantage of the Massorah, he did all in his power to send into all the countries in order to search out what may be found of the Massorah, and praised be the Lord we obtained as many of the Massoretic books as could possibly be got. He was not backward, and his hand was not closed, nor did he draw back his right hand from producing gold out of his purse to defray the expenses of the books and of the messengers who were engaged to make search for them in the most remote corners and in every place where they might possibly be found.

But the MSS. collected in this way were somewhat disappointing. Jacob himself complains of their incorrectness, and to the Masoretic notes in these MSS. he applies the Biblical text: 'There was not a house in which there was not one dead' (Exod. 12. 30), so many mistakes had he found there. In these MSS. the Masoretic notes were in great disorder. He had to correct them as well as he could. To-day we see that he had quite disparate Masoretic material before him, Palestinian material in the main, but also pieces of Babylonian Masora,² and that he had often to help himself by making his own Masora. According to such a Masora, compiled by him, corrected by him, partly invented by him, he arranged his Biblical text. He was convinced that there was only one correct Masora—the Masora compiled by himself—and that the text arranged by him according to this Masora was the very text which had been established by the great Masoretic authorities of Tiberias, especially by Ahron b. Asher, in the first half of the tenth century. Jacob b. Chaiyim had never seen any old MS. of the

¹ Cf. Jacob b. Chaiyim's *Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, Hebrew and English*, by Christian D. Ginsburg, London, 1865, p. 34. Ginsburg, *Introduction*, p. 956 f.

² In the Masora parva to Lev. 18. 15 we read: *כל סחופי בצרי*; the meaning is that at all places where *סחופי* has the accent *Atnah*, the word has to be pronounced with *Ṣere*. *סחופא* is the usual name for *Atnah* in the Babylonian Masora. Elsewhere in the Palestinian Masora this word is unknown.

Bible, so that he could not be aware of the distinct difference between his text and that of Ben Asher.

It is very curious that the text edited by Jacob b. Chaiyim has generally been regarded as the definitive one. Modern editors of the Hebrew text of the Bible cannot say more in praise of their own edition than that they are exact reprints of the text edited by Ben Chaiyim. When Christian D. Ginsburg published, for the Centenary of the British and Foreign Bible Society, his great edition of the Hebrew Bible for which he had collated more than seventy MSS. and nearly twenty early prints of the Bible, he declares with emphasis that the text published by him is an exact reprint of Ben Chaiyim's text.¹ In his 'Introduction' to an earlier edition of the same text, made for the Trinitarian Bible Society, he declares with regard to Ben Chaiyim's text:² that it is the only Massoretic recension. No textual redactor of modern days who professes to edit the Hebrew text according to the Massorah can deviate from it without giving conclusive justification for so doing. Nobody would be inclined to regard a classical text published in the beginning of the sixteenth century as the best text available. The Greek New Testament edited at that time by Erasmus has to-day historical interest only. How can we think that such a complicated text as that of the Hebrew Bible could be satisfactorily produced on the basis of late and inaccurate MSS., more than 400 years ago, after a preparation of not much more than two years, by a man overwhelmed with other work, printed together with all sorts of Targums and Commentaries, on 952 folios, about 1,900 folio pages, in the astonishingly short time of about fifteen months?³ Yet this has been regarded as the only authoritative text up to the present day.

I was in Leningrad, studying Hebrew Biblical MSS. and

¹ 'The text presented in this book is that of the first edition of Jacob ben Chaiyim's *Massoretic Recension*, printed by Bomberg at Venice in 1524-5. No changes have been made in it beyond the correction of obvious errors as indicated by the MSS. collated' so we read in the 'Advertisement' prefixed to the single parts of the edition. The Pentateuch was published in 1908, the Former and Later Prophets in 1911, the edition was finished after Ginsburg's death, by H. E. Holmes and A. S. Geden, in 1926. Cf. concerning this edition *Masoreten des Ostens*, pp. xiv-xvii, *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. i, p. 18, note 2, and below, pp. 76 ff.

² Cf. Christian D. Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible*, London, 1897, p. 963 f.

³ According to Freimann, l.c., p. 35, the Bible was printed in less than eight months; that is, however, not correct, as L. Goldschmidt informs me. See also Stevenson in *Transactions of Glasgow University Oriental Society*, vol. v, 1930, p. 46.

Geniza fragments in the Russian Public Library, when I received a letter from Rudolf Kittel asking me what text he should publish in the new *Biblia Hebraica* which he was preparing at that time (1926). 'I think we shall have to publish the Ben Chaiyim text again', he wrote. I had just found a number of dated Hebrew Biblical MSS. which had been written between A.D. 900 and 1100.¹ They all showed a text generally in accordance with the Ben Asher text and not with the Ben Chaiyim text. It was clear that this text had been used in wide circles at that period. On the other hand, I could hardly believe that the Masoretes who worked on the text of the Hebrew Bible between A.D. 1000 and 1500 had done anything which was based on really old tradition. For the Ben Asher text a trustworthy source was to be found in the Leningrad MS. B 19a, dated A.D. 1008. So I proposed to Kittel to publish the Ben Asher text, fixed by the greatest Masoretic authority 600 years before Ben Chaiyim.

After my return from Russia, in November 1926, I discussed the matter with Kittel in Leipzig. He was convinced that I was right and invited me to publish the Ben Asher text for the new edition of the *Biblia Hebraica*. I accepted under the condition that the text should be published with the Masora of Ben Asher. It was high time that the Masora compiled by Ben Chaiyim in the way described above should be replaced by a Masora added on the margins of his Biblical text with greatest exactness and care by the most famous Masoretic authority. This was not 'the correct Masora' which Jacob b. Chaiyim and his successors up to Wolf Heidenheim and Seligmann Baer had dreamed of possessing, nor could it be compared with the great mass of Masoretic material which Ginsburg had compiled from MSS. of different kinds;² it was simply the Masora associated with Ben Asher's Bible text and supporting that text. If published this Masora could be taken as a basis for comparing other kinds of Masora, the Masora of Ben Naftali, greatly differing from that of Ben Asher, the Masora of the Babylonian Masoretes, and many others.

Kittel agreed. It was not so easy to persuade the Committee of the Stuttgart Bible Society to publish the Biblical text with the Masora. But Kittel had some influence in these circles, and

¹ Cf. *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. i, pp. 56-77.

² *The Massorah compiled from Manuscripts*, by Christian D. Ginsburg, published by Ginsburg at his own expense in London, vol. i, 1881; vol. ii, 1883; vol. iii (Supplements) 1885; vol. iv, first half (References) 1905. The second part of vol. iv has never been published.

they at last agreed.¹ The Biblia Hebraica could not be printed in a record time of fifteen months like the Second Rabbinic Bible of Ben Chaiyim: We needed more than ten years (1927-37) for printing the text alone²—to say nothing of the work done by the special editors of the single books and by the general editors, Rudolf Kittel, and after his death in 1929, Albrecht Alt and Otto Eissfeldt.

The basis of the text was the Leningrad MS. B 19a, dated 1008. It was sent for several years from Leningrad to Germany. An excellent photograph of the MS. was taken in Leipzig and could be used for the edition. A photograph of the Cairo Ben Asher Codex of the Prophets, dated A.D. 895, was procured with the help of Dr. Max Meyerhof in Cairo. The British Museum Ben Asher Codex of the Pentateuch (Or. 4445) could be used in a photograph procured for the Oriental Seminar of Bonn. For the Kethubim an old MS. with the Ben Asher text was sent from Leningrad to Bonn. So I had for nearly every part of the Bible two Ben Asher MSS. at my disposal, and with their help I tried to publish the text of the Hebrew Bible as fixed by Ahron b. Asher in his later period, with the Masoretic notes added very accurately on the margins of the Ben Asher MS.

I had at Bonn at my disposal the First Rabbinic Bible edited by Felix Pratensis in a copy belonging to the Library of St. Mary's Church in Halle, the Second Rabbinic Bible edited by Jacob b. Chaiyim in a copy belonging to the University Library of Halle to which the copy had come from Wittenberg University. It was of value that I could compare, when editing the Ben Asher text, these two editions of the *textus receptus* prepared by learned men like Felix Pratensis and Jacob b. Chaiyim. But I had no interest in comparing the other seventeen early printed editions of the Hebrew Bible enumerated and used by Ginsburg. These are not much more than reprints of late and inaccurate MSS. rearranged with more or less skill by the different editors or printers.

The Preußische Staatsbibliothek in Berlin sent to Bonn for

¹ A considerable sum for editing the Ben Asher text, and a special sum for publishing the Masora, was contributed by the 'Notgemeinschaft der Deutschen Wissenschaft'. An assistant for the work on the *Biblia Hebraica* was granted to me by the Minister of Education in Berlin from 1927 to 1933, and later by the 'Notgemeinschaft'. My last Jewish assistant, Dr. Falk Bar, a learned Polish Rabbi, worked under me in Bonn until July 1938. The great Masora was nearly ready for publication when I left Germany in March 1939.

² Every sheet of the text had to be read in Bonn five or six times, requiring an average of 80 hours, and there were nearly 100 sheets.

many years MS. Or. fol. 1213, one of the oldest Hebrew Biblical MSS. in Germany. It had been used, as MS. Erfurt 3, by I. H. Michaelis as chief basis for his edition of the Hebrew Bible, published in Halle, 1720. Paul de Lagarde, who describes the codex in his well-known article 'Hebräische Handschriften in Erfurt',¹ dated it at about 1100, and pointed out that it is of special value on account of its Masora, closely related to the 'Ochla we-Ochla', an old collection of Masoretic material which had been edited, according to a Paris MS., by S. Frensdorff,² and of which another MS. in the University Library in Halle had been described by Hupfeld.³ The Halle MS. is of special interest as it had been used by Jacob b. Chaiyim for the Masora Magna added at the end of his Rabbinic Bible, and had later been in the possession of Elia Levita.⁴ In the Berlin Bible MS. we have great parts of the book in a MS. older than the two others. Lagarde makes the following statement on the Codex:⁵

Ich erachte dass alle massorastudien mit diesen drei werken zu beginnen haben, und bitte dringend, diesen codex in höchsten ehren und nicht für jeden ersten besten zur hand zu halten, da seine dinte schon stark ausbleicht, ihn bald herauszugeben: wir haben hier vermutlich den ältesten massoracodex vor uns dessen wir jetzt habhaft werden können. . . .

What Lagarde says here of the Masora contained in the MS. is fully justified. Of the 'Ochla we-Ochla' valuable old fragments from the Geniza are preserved in the Russian Public Library in Leningrad, some of these provided with Palestinian vowel-points.⁶ This fact alone shows that this collection of Masoretic material was known in Palestine before the work of the Tiberian Masoretes began. The MSS. differ greatly and a new critical edition on the basis of all material available would really be of importance.⁷ But the Biblical text in the Berlin MS. could not

¹ In *Symmicta*, vol. i, Goettingen, 1877, pp. 129-64.

² *Das Buch Ochlah W'ochlah (Masora) . . . herausgegeben . . . von S. Frensdorff*, Hannover, 1864. The Paris MS. is MS. anc. fonds hebr. no. 56.

³ Hermann Hupfeld, 'Über eine bisher unbekannt gebliebene Handschrift der Masorah', in *ZDMG.*, vol. xxi, Leipzig, 1867, pp. 201-20.

⁴ Cf. Ginsburg, *Introduction*, p. 464.

⁵ p. 138 in the article mentioned in note 1.

⁶ The most important fragment is no. 1,554, Bible, parchment, of the Second Firkowitch Collection, 18 folios, each with 2 columns, 36-46 lines.

⁷ Ernst Ehrentreu deals with the 'Ochla we-Ochla' in his Königsberg Thesis *Untersuchungen über die Masora, ihre geschichtliche Entwicklung und ihr Geist*, Hannover, 1925; his treatise was published earlier in the Jewish periodical *Jeschurun*, 1921 ff. Ehrentreu does not know the older sources

be used for an edition of the Ben Asher text. To the consonantal text, written by two different hands, the punctuation was added by four hands, following different principles. One shows clearly all characteristics of the Ben Naftali text, two others are connected with it.¹ The Masora added on the two sides of the Biblical text is typically that of Ben Naftali.² The codex belongs to the group of Ben Naftali MSS.³ It was, however, valuable to have a Ben Naftali text and a Ben Naftali Masora available when I was editing the Ben Asher text with the Ben Asher Masora.

It was not necessary to use for more than occasional references the seventy-three Biblical MSS. the little differences of which Ginsburg had added to the *textus receptus* of Ben Chaiyim reprinted by him. I had long discussions with Ginsburg in London, when the two volumes of the Prophets in his new edition had just appeared (1911). I asked him how he could use more than seventy MSS. for an edition without making an attempt to assign these MSS. to different groups. He complained that it was not possible to do so. I agreed that it was really difficult for the *later* MSS., as these merely represent different stages of the Biblical text developed in the time between the Ben Asher and the Ben Chaiyim text. They had influenced each other in different ways, and so it was difficult to classify them. But the *older* MSS. which Ginsburg claims to have used represent quite distinct types of text. These texts, moreover, were centuries older than the *textus receptus* edited by Ginsburg. What connexion, for instance, with the *textus receptus*, which begins to appear in MSS. after 1300, have MSS. like the earlier Ben Asher text of the Pentateuch preserved in the British Museum MSS. Or. 4445 (beginning of the 10th cent.), Ginsburg's codex **8**; or different developments of the Ben Naftali text, as those preserved in the Reuchlin Codex of the Prophets (dated 1105) and in the British Museum MS. Add. 21161 (about 1150), his codices **1** and **7**; or the interesting specimen of a mixed text in the last development of the Babylonian punctuation, strongly influenced of the book. What he has to say on the historical development of the Masora is therefore, to a large extent, construction without foundation, and what he says on the spirit of the Masora is of apologetical character.

¹ Cf. the description of the MS. in *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. ii, p. 54 f., and the facsimile of the Codex published on plate 13.

² The material belonging to the 'Ochla we-Ochla' is usually written on the upper margins of the folios.

³ Such MSS. are enumerated and described in *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. ii, pp. 52 ff.

by the Tiberian Masora, as preserved in the Codex of the later Prophets in Leningrad (dated A.D. 916), his codex **2**; or the oldest Yemenite MSS. of the Pentateuch in the British Museum, MS. Or. 1467 and Or. 2363 (12th cent.), his codices **1** and **7**? To do justice, for instance, to a text like the Codex Reuchlinianus, its text would have had to be printed in a parallel column alongside of the *textus receptus*, as hardly any word in this codex is vocalized exactly as in the *textus receptus*.¹ Nearly the same could be said of the other MSS. mentioned above. Ginsburg certainly knew these circumstances. The value of his edition lies in his collation of *later* Biblical MSS. For the little details in which they differ from each other Ginsburg has carefully collected a great amount of material, and whoever is interested in such details will find them in Ginsburg's edition, although the way in which they are made available by him makes it somewhat difficult to see the value of this material. For an edition of the Ben Asher text, however, these little differences of later MSS. are of no importance.

The difference between the Ben Asher text and that edited by Ben Chaiyim may be illustrated by the following experience. Somebody was working in the Bodleian Library on an old MS. of a grammatical treatise composed by Ibn Ezra (died A.D. 1167). He was puzzled by the fact that the quotations from the Bible never agreed exactly with the text he found in his Hebrew Bible, a reprint of the Ben Chaiyim text. He asked me how this fact could be explained. I said: 'You cannot expect Ibn Ezra to quote a text which was fixed centuries after him; compare the Ben Asher text!' He did so and found Ibn Ezra's quotations in excellent accordance with that text. In the printed editions of Ibn Ezra's treatise the Biblical quotations have been adapted to the *textus receptus*, the Ben Chaiyim text. This naïve method of textual criticism is generally followed by editors up to the present day. Any one having to edit a vocalized Hebrew text is ashamed to publish it with the vocalization found in an old MS. He is convinced that he has the duty of adapting the vocalization to the rules of his Hebrew grammar based exclusively on the Ben Chaiyim text. It is clear that these rules are largely affected by the now published Ben Asher text. When Professor Nyberg, the orientalist of Uppsala University, came to the

¹ In his article 'Bemerkungen über die Vocalisation der Targume', in *Verhandlungen des Fünften Internationalen Orientalisten Congress*, Berlin, 1881, vol. ii, 1, Adalbert Merx deals with the punctuation of the codex and has given some specimens of it, on pp. 181-8.

Congress of Orientalists held in September 1938 in Bonn, he told me that he was preparing a new Hebrew grammar according to the Ben Asher text, as no existing Hebrew grammars could be used for that text.

But other, more important, changes will be necessary, for a really scientific Hebrew grammar. I may begin with a parallel development.

Nearly a century before the Masoretes in Palestine and Babylonia were engaged in establishing the correct reading of the Hebrew Biblical text, their Arabic masters had had similar problems with their holy book, the Koran, the word of God revealed to the Prophet Muhammed (who died A.D. 632). The consonantal text had probably been collected shortly after Muhammed's death, and was brought into its definite form in the time of the third Chalif, 'Othmān (644-55). But now the great problem arose, how this text was to be read and recited correctly. Muhammed was born in Mekka and belonged, like most of his fellow citizens, to the Arab tribe of Ẓuraish. The Arabic spoken by him was that of a citizen of Mekka, and the consonantal text reflects the Arabic spoken there. But the Arabs were accustomed to regard as the model for correct Arabic the language spoken by the Bedouin. In this language the famous pre-Islamic poetry was composed, and every Arab was proud of it. The word of God could not be read in a language inferior to any other. So in the chief centres of Islam at that early time, in Kufa, Basra, Medina, and Mekka, an intensive study of Bedouin poetry began. The students of this Arabic went out to the Bedouin in their neighbourhood and collected there as much as possible of their poetry, and the narratives connected with it, mostly reports of the little battles called 'the Days of the Arabs'. The material collected in that way became the basis of the work done by the Arabic readers. They established the model Arabic in all details, and to it the language of the Koran was adapted. The consonantal text was not altered. But a method of reading the text correctly was developed, and all sorts of signs were added to the consonantal text in order to safeguard a correct reading.¹

The books dealing with reading the Koran do not mention this early activity of the readers.² Books which may have men-

¹ It is very likely that the Arabs began to add vowel signs to the text of the Koran already in the first century A.H. Cf. O. Pretzl in Nöldeke's *Geschichte des Qorans*, 2nd ed., vol. iii, p. 262.

² Not a single treatise of that kind is mentioned by O. Pretzl in his article

tioned it are lost. But recently I discovered in an Arabic MS. dealing with the number of the verses of the Koran, belonging to the Collection of Mr. Chester Beatty,¹ a notice which at least reflects this development. It is a quotation from al-Farrā' (who died A.D. 821), one of the greatest authorities on Arabic grammar and on reading the Koran. Some years ago H. Ritter discovered in Stambul an old MS. (4th cent. A.H.) of al-Farrā's *Commentary on the Koran*, the text of which had been dictated by the author during the years 817-19.² Otto Pretzl, when referring to this MS.,³ says of the author:

Die grammatischen Erklärungen von al-Farrā' werden von den Arabern selbst als das Vollendetste angesehen was auf dem Gebiete der Koranwissenschaft geleistet worden ist.

I give the whole text in an English translation.⁴

Al-Farrā' says:

We have seen that the readers who know the Book (the Koran) and the practice (*sunna*) and are authorities on correct speech, are agreed that it (the Koran) came down in the most correct forms of speech. This was opposed by some of those who investigated the poetry and 'the Days of the Arabs'. They said: 'Those who claimed the excellence of the Koran have merely done so in accordance with what God made obligatory for honoring the Koran. But when we look for correctness of speech, we find it among the Bedouins.'

But in this they disagreed. The people of Kūfa said: 'Correctness is to be found among the Asad', because of their vicinity to them. The people of Basra said: 'Correctness is to be found among the upper Tamīm and the lower Ẓais from 'Ukl and 'Ukail.' The people of Medina said: 'Correctness is to be found among the Ghaṭafān', because they are their neighbours. The people of Mekka said: 'Correctness is to be found among Kināna b. Sa'd b. Bekr and Thaḳīf.'

We answered by referring them through traditions, analogy, and example to the superiority of the speech of the Ẓuraish over all other languages. So we said: 'Do not the Ẓuraish surpass the people in the 'Die Wissenschaft der Koranlesung. Ihre literarischen Quellen und ihre Aussprachegrundlagen', in *Islamica*, vol. vi, Leipzig, 1934, pp. 1-47, 230-46, 290-331.

¹ It is MS. Arab. 705, written A.H. 525 A.D. 1130. I have to express my thanks to Mr. A. Chester Beatty for his permission to make use of the text.

² *Philologica II*, von H. Ritter, in *Der Islam*, vol. xvii, 1928, p. 249. It is MS. Vehbi Ef. Nr. 66. The Oriental Seminar of Bonn University possessed a photograph of this important MS.

³ In the new edition of Theodor Nöldeke's *Geschichte des Qorans*, vol. iii, Leipzig, 1938, p. 247.

⁴ Professor H. A. R. Gibb has kindly revised my translation and made some valuable suggestions in connexion with it. The Arabic text follows below on p. 115 f.

beauty of their statures, in the sagacity of their minds, in the fullness of their bodies?' They said: 'We are the men best informed about this. But sagacity and beauty came to them merely because the Arabs were accustomed to come to the sanctuary (the Ka'ba) for Ḥajj and 'Umra (the two parts of the pilgrimage), both their women and their men. The women made the circuit round the House unveiled and performed the ceremonies with uncovered faces. So they selected them by sight and sought after dignity and beauty. By this they gained superiority besides those qualities by which they were particularly distinguished.'

We said: 'In the same way they were accustomed to hear from the tribes of the Arabs their dialects; so they could choose from every dialect that which was best in it. So their speech became elegant, and nothing of the more vulgar forms of speech was mixed up with it. Do you not see that you will not find in their pronunciation the *'an'ana* of Tamīm¹ nor the roughness in speech² of ẖais, nor the *keskesa*³ of Rabi'a, nor the Kesr (the i-vowel) which you hear from ẖais and Tamīm, like *ti'lamūna*, *ti'lam*, and like *bi'ir*, *shi'ir* with Kesr of *tā*, *bā*, *sīn*, *shīn*.⁴ Correctness came to them from their selection of pronunciation, just as they selected their wives.'

And by this we refuted their arguments and reverted to the arguments of those who knew the Koran better than they.

And besides, we have heard that 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb said: 'O Prophet of God, you came to us with a kind of speech of the Arabs which we do not know, although we are really Arabs.' Then the Prophet of God said: 'My Lord taught me, so I learned, and he corrected me, so I acquired correctness; and the superiority of the Koran to every other speech is as the superiority of God to His creatures.'

'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb heard a man reading *'attā ḥina* in the meaning of *ḥattā ḥina*. He said: 'Who taught you to recite thus?' He said: 'Abdallāh b. Mas'ūd'.⁵ So he wrote to 'Abdallāh b. Mas'ūd: 'The

¹ MS.: *'an'a*; *'an'ana* is substituting 'ain for alif, cf. Lane, s.v.

² *'ajrafīye* means rough, guttural speech, cf. Lane, s.v.

³ According to the Arabic grammarians (see Ibn Ya'ish, p. 1245) the terms *keskese* and *keshkeshe* were used to signify the pronunciation of the suffix *-ki* alternatively as *-kis* or *-si*, and as *-kish* or *-shi*. This is mentioned as a characteristic of the language spoken also by the Rabi'a. Cf. K. Vollers, *Volkssprache und Schriftsprache im alten Arabien*, Strassburg, 1906, p. 11.

⁴ To use *i* in these forms instead of *a* is mentioned as a characteristic of the Tamīm. Cf. the references given by Vollers, l.c., p. 16.

⁵ Ibn Mas'ūd (died about A.D. 652) was one of the earliest companions of the Prophet and knew perhaps more of him than any other Muslim. He was in possession of his own collections of Koranic materials and was regarded as a special authority in matters of Koran and Sunna. The Khalif 'Omar had sent him to Kufa to teach Islam. There, he became the apostle of Islam for Babylonia and the East in general. The Hudhail mentioned here are a tribe of the Bedouins living between Mekka and Medina.

Koran came down in the language of the ẖuraish and it came not down in the language of the Hudhail. So do you teach men to recite it in the language of the ẖuraish and not in language of the Hudhail.'

Abū Bekr said: 'The I'rāb of the Koran¹ is preferable to me rather than keeping some of its letters.'

Abū Huraira² is reported as saying: the Apostle of God said: 'Learn the Koran and hold fast to its strange words.'

Ibn Mas'ūd³ said: 'Keep to the text of the Koran and adorn it with the best of pronunciations and read it with I'rāb (*a'rabūhu*); for it is pure Arabic (*'arabīyun*), and God wishes it to be read with I'rāb (*an yu'raba*).'

'Omar's son⁴ beat his son for pronouncing incorrectly (*'ala-l-laḥn*).

Mujāhid⁵ said: 'Verily I prefer to err in a verse than to make an error of pronunciation (*an alḥana*) in the Book of God.'

And he said:⁶ 'Omar passed by some people who were contending for superiority in shooting. One of them spoke incorrectly (*laḥana*). 'Omar said: "'Incorrectness in speech is worse than badness in shooting.'"

'Abdalmalik b. 'Omair⁷ related that 'Omar b. al-Khaṭṭāb said: 'None shall dictate our copies of the Koran except men of the ẖuraish and Thaḳīf.'

Muḥammed b. Sa'd⁸ says that 'Abdalwahhāb b. 'Atā al-Khaḫāf⁹ reported from Sa'id b. Hishām from 'Āisha from the Prophet . . . : 'The expert in the Koran is with the noble pious angels who register actions. And who recites it whilst upon him there is a difficulty so that he reiterates in it,¹⁰ he gets double reward.'

This is a valuable testimony for the influence of Bedouin

¹ I'rāb are the vocalic endings of the Arabic words according to the laws of the grammar of classical Arabic. The recommendation to read the Koran with these vocalic endings presupposes that they were often not read. In modern Arabic these vocalic endings are usually not read and observed only when it is intended to speak classical Arabic, adapted to Bedouin poetry and to the language of the Koran.

² Abū Huraira died about A.D. 677 in Medina. To him nearly 3,500 traditions are attributed.

³ Cf. p. 80, note 5.

⁴ i.e. the son of the second Chalif, 'Omar b. al-Khaṭṭāb.

⁵ Mujāhid b. Jabr Abū-l-Ḥajjāj, died about A.D. 720; cf. about him Ibn Sa'd's *Biographien*, ed. E. Sachau, vol. v, p. 343.

⁶ The same tradition, with some various readings and with other authorities, is mentioned by Ibn Sa'd, ed. E. Sachau, vol. iii, p. 204, l. 16. Cf. K. Vollers, *Volkssprache und Schriftsprache im alten Arabien*, p. 161.

⁷ Cf. about him Ibn Sa'd, ed. E. Sachau, vol. vi, p. 220.

⁸ The author of the book on *Biographies*, edited by E. Sachau, 9 vols., Leiden, 1904-40. He was a contemporary of al-Farrā' and died A.D. 845.

⁹ Cf. about him Ibn Sa'd, ed. E. Sachau, vol. vii, 2, p. 76.

¹⁰ The Arabic word is explained by 'his tongue sticks fast in doing so'. Cf. Lane, s.v. *ta'ta'a*, according to Tāj al-'arūs.

Arabic on the language of the Koran. Al-Farrā' cannot deny this influence. Correct Arabic is really to be found among the Bedouins. But he cannot admit any alteration in the language of the Holy Book. For a good Muslim it is a matter of faith that the word of God was revealed in the most correct form of Arabic. Conditions have not changed much since the time of al-Farrā'. When K. Vollers—an expert on classical Arabic and a special authority on modern Arabic as spoken in Egypt—¹tried to show the influence of Bedouin poetry on the text of the Koran, at the International Congress of Orientalists in Algiers, 1905, his lecture gave rise to a real revolt among the Muslim members of that Congress.²

Al-Farrā' tries to solve the problem in his own way. He antedates the influence. Long before the Koran had been revealed to the Prophet, the language of the Quraysh had been influenced by Bedouin Arabic. They had heard in Mekka from Arab pilgrims all sorts of Arabic speech, and so had been able to select the best of it, 'just as they had selected their wives'. So the Arabic spoken by the Quraysh had become the most perfect Arabic, and in this model language the Koran had been revealed to the Prophet. Al-Farrā' can show that this language is superior to any Bedouin Arabic. It has neither a wrong pronunciation of gutturals, nor wrong vowels, which both occur in some of the dialects spoken by the Bedouins. This ideal Arabic, in reality the result of the work done by the readers of the Koran, was identified by al-Farrā' with the language spoken by the Quraysh in the time of the Prophet.

Again and again the necessity of correctly reading the holy

¹ Vollers was for years Director of the Khedivial Library in Cairo and had made intensive studies on the Arabic spoken there. Cf. his 'Beiträge zur Kenntnis der lebenden arabischen Sprache in Aegypten', in *ZDMG.*, vols. xli, li, lii (1887, 1896, 1897). His grammar on 'The Modern Egyptian Dialect of Arabic' was translated into English by F. C. Burkitt, Cambridge, 1895. Later Vollers was Professor in Jena University.

² Cf. his book *Volkssprache und Schriftsprache im alten Arabien*, Strassburg, 1906, preface. It must be admitted that Vollers was not very cautious in his deductions. The very title of his book is misleading. Muhammed certainly did not speak a vernacular language (*Volkssprache*) but the language spoken by the prominent Quraysh in Mekka; their language can hardly be opposed to a literary language (*Schriftsprache*). This has clearly been shown by Rudolf Geyer in his review in *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1909, in which he deals in nearly fifty pages (pp. 10–56) with the problems raised by Vollers's book. But Vollers is certainly right in his statement that the language spoken by the Quraysh in Mekka differed widely from the ideal Arabic fixed, in accordance with Bedouin poetry, by the readers of the Koran.

text is emphasized in the quotations of al-Farrā'. It is a well-known fact that in Islamic tradition such quotations are not to be regarded as words really spoken by those to whom they are attributed. But these quotations show the problems which occupied the Muslims at the time when these words were laid before them. For this period these sayings have to be regarded as documents of high value. The sayings quoted by al-Farrā' lead us to the time when the readers established the correct reading of the text of the Koran by adapting it to the ideal of classical Arabic, which they found in Bedouin poetry. For the readings introduced into the text of the Koran in accordance with this poetry the readers needed support. They tried to prove that these readings did not differ from the reading of the Prophet himself, as it was confirmed by his oldest and most trustworthy followers. The necessary proof-sayings were attributed to such prominent Muslims as Abū Bekr and 'Omar, the first two Chalifs, or to such eminent authorities as Ibn Mas'ūd and others.

Of special interest among these sayings are the exhortations to read the Koran with I'rāb and to observe the correct pronunciation of the gutturals. They play an important role in al-Farrā's quotations. This shows that both things belonged to the elements introduced by the readers into the text of the Koran. Vollers remarks:¹

Of the first importance were I'rāb and pronunciation of Hamza; here every kind of haggling was excluded; both were rigorously carried through, without regard to dialect, rhyme, and culture of the author.

Other adaptations were made, according to Vollers, with greater liberality. In the sayings quoted by al-Farrā' we have the best confirmation of these statements of Vollers.

Traditions recommending reading the Koran with I'rāb are still to be found in Suyūṭī's *Itkān*, the well-known Introduction to the Koran. Vollers remarks that Suyūṭī (who died A.D. 1505) could not possibly have understood such traditions, as in his later days it had long been forgotten that the Koran had ever been read without *I'rāb*. These traditions have another significance when they are reported, 700 years before as-Suyūṭī, by an authority like al-Farrā'. Theodor Nöldeke, in his article on the Koran

¹ Cf. Vollers, l.c., p. 181. I am translating the text; the German original is: 'Obenan standen das I'rāb und die Hamza Sprache; hier war jedes Feilschen ausgeschlossen; beide wurden strenge durchgeführt, ohne Rücksicht auf Mundart, Reim und Bildung des Verfassers.'

and the 'Arabiya,'¹ where he strongly criticizes Vollers's theory, says:

If the Prophet and his faithful contemporaries had spoken the Koran without I'rāb, the tradition of it would not have disappeared without any trace.

The tradition missed by Nöldeke is preserved in the quotations of al-Farrā'; we find it here in the only form in which we can expect it in an Islamic source.²

The systematic adaptation of the text of the Koran to Bedouin poetry was victorious and obliterated the older forms of the Holy Book. For more than 1,200 years, since about A.D. 700, this ideal Arabic has been regarded as the original language of the Koran. From this point of view the work of the readers on the text of the Koran can be regarded as that of 'establishing the text in its integrity'.

The Jews were living in Palestine and in Babylonia under Arab rule when, in connexion with the Karaite movement (at the end of the 8th cent.), the problem of correctly reading the Hebrew text of the Bible became of primary interest to them. Like the Arabs they were convinced that the word of God had to be read in the most correct forms of speech. Safeguarding the correct reading of the Biblical text was one of the principal aims of the Masoretes; by adding an increasing number of little signs to the consonantal text they tried to fix every detail of pronunciation and cantillation of the holy text. I may refer here to Moshe ben Asher's description of the work done by the Masoretes;³ for him they are the 'chiefs of righteousness, the men of faith', who have not concealed anything of what was given to them and have not added a word to what was transmitted to them—just as the Arab readers try to show that their reading the Holy Book is confirmed by the oldest and most trustworthy authorities of Islam. Both emphasize that nothing new was introduced into the holy text, both can describe their work as establishing the text in its integrity.

We have seen that the Arab readers adapted the text of the Koran to the ideal of classical Arabic, found in Bedouin poetry.

¹ Cf. his book, *Neue Beiträge zur Semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*, Strassburg, 1910, pp. 1-5. I have translated the text; the German original is: 'Hätten der Prophet und seine gläubigen Zeitgenossen den Koran ohne I'rāb gesprochen, so wäre die Tradition davon nicht spurlos untergegangen.'

² It is interesting to note that on account of the opposition of authorities like Nöldeke, neither Bergsträßer nor Pretzl dared even to refer to Vollers's theory in the new edition of Nöldeke's *Geschichte des Qorans*, vol. iii, Leipzig, 1938.

³ See above, p. 57.

They created a model text which did not exist in this form before. The Masoretes created a model text of the Hebrew Bible. Did they possess an ideal of classical Hebrew to which they could adapt their text? What have we to say of the text created by them?

Before the fragments of old Hebrew Biblical MSS. preserved in the Geniza became known, it was quite impossible to look beyond the Masoretic system of pronunciation. This system stood before us as a 'bolt from the blue'; nobody was able to say how it came into being, nobody how it was developed. It was like a miracle for which only one explanation could be given. The pronunciation of Hebrew as fixed by the Masoretes was handed down by them unanimously and exactly in the form in which it was transmitted to them, and by the long chain of trustworthy transmitters every guarantee was given that they had fixed the text exactly as it was read from time immemorial, in the golden days when the temple was still in existence and services were held there.

The Masoretes did everything in their power to foster this idea. They eliminated all remnants of earlier pronunciation so radically that no pre-Masoretic texts were allowed to be preserved. The first specimens of earlier punctuation to re-emerge were found in the Cairo Geniza, where they had been stored in order to be destroyed. It was *against* the will of the Masoretes that these remnants were preserved there. The Masoretes were interested to ensure that the punctuation finally fixed by them should be the only authoritative one and should alone survive. Thus it became possible to regard the text fixed by them as something to which, in a slightly modified form, the famous words of Vincent of Lérins could be applied: 'Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus traditum erat', as a text which had been transmitted in this very form always, everywhere, by everybody—just as the ideal text of the Koran has been regarded for more than 1,200 years as its really original form.

The material preserved in the Geniza allows us to look beyond the complicated system of punctuation elaborated by the Masoretes. We have a great number of vocalized Biblical texts written before the Masoretes had started their work. By comparing these old fragments with the text definitely fixed by the Masoretes we see how their system was developed. There can be no doubt that a distinct difference can be recognized between the pronunciation of Hebrew before and after the activity of the Masoretes during the ninth century.

For proof of this assertion it is not decisive that these older texts were provided with very simple methods of punctuation. If the Masoretes had no other object than to transmit what was transmitted to them, we have to see as implicit in these simple forms of punctuation all the details of punctuation indicated in the later system, and we have to suppose that all these details were transmitted orally through many hundreds of years when no indication of pronunciation existed at all.

Neither would it be decisive that the older material often shows that certain words or grammatical forms were formerly read differently from the way in which they were read by the Masoretes. We know that Hebrew was not pronounced everywhere in the same way. Nevertheless these various readings are of great interest as showing that the pronunciation of Hebrew was not transmitted so unanimously as we might have expected before the fragments of the Geniza became known.

Of greater importance is the fact that we generally see that the older these fragments are, the more they differ from the later text. But it is really decisive that on the basis now available it can be proved that the Masoretes replaced, in many cases, a pronunciation of Hebrew which they regarded as lax and inaccurate, by a pronunciation which they believed to be more correct, more in accordance with the ideal Hebrew as it might have been spoken in classical times—just as the Arab readers tried to improve the reading of the Koran by adapting it to an ideal Arabic.

I will illustrate this side of the activity of the Masoretes by three examples.

1. *The pronunciation of the gutturals*

The oldest continuous texts of vocalized Hebrew are to be found in the transcriptions of the Hebrew text in Greek letters which Origen incorporated as the second column in his Hexapla. As long as we knew these texts only from occasional quotations of single words or phrases by Church Fathers, not much could be done with them.¹ But conditions have completely changed since Giovanni Mercati discovered continuous texts of these transcriptions in a palimpsest in the Ambrosiana in Milan.² There can be no doubt that these texts were made with great care and accuracy. They were certainly not made by Origen

¹ The last edition of this material was made by F. Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*, 2 volumes, Oxonii, 1875.

² Cf. my first lecture, p. 13 f.

or by his order. Origen knew some Hebrew, but certainly not enough to make such accurate transcriptions.¹ Besides, such difficult work was not done for the use of a few curious Christians who did not understand Hebrew and who might only have been interested in hearing the sound of the Hebrew language. These transcriptions were made by real experts in Hebrew. They were made by Jews for Jews. Jews needed such transcribed texts. Hebrew was not well known by every Jew, and for many of them it was not easy to read a Hebrew text without any indication of vowels. These transcribed texts indicated the vowels and gave help in reading Biblical texts similar to that of the later Hebrew texts provided with vowel signs.

That Hebrew texts in Greek transcription were used by Jews, that they were used by them as a help in reading Biblical texts even in their synagogues, has been proved by Jules Halévy.² He has quoted a number of sayings of Palestinian authorities which deal with these texts and has shown that they were used, for instance, in the Synagogue of Caesarea in Palestine, the very place where Origen had composed the Hexapla. Caesarea was an important town at that time. It was the seat of the Roman governor, a centre of Christian studies—the library founded by Origen and enlarged by Pamphilus was famous—and it was also a centre of Jewish studies—the oldest part of the Palestinian Talmud was compiled there in the fourth century.³ We know that the Jewish community there was strongly hellenized. Origen must have known that these texts existed, and that they had authority in Jewish circles in his time. So he procured himself a copy of the text and got it from the Jews, just as he got from them the Hebrew text, the translation of Aquila, and other texts taken over into the Hexapla. He would hardly have done so if that text had not been highly esteemed at the time. On the basis of these texts we can write a fairly trustworthy grammar of Hebrew

¹ Origen himself did not value very highly his knowledge of Hebrew, 'aiunt ergo qui hebraicas literas legunt in hoc loco "Deus" non sub signo tetragrammatis esse positum: De quo qui potest requirat' . . . ; 'ut aiunt qui hebraica nomina interpretantur' . . . ; 'Socchoth tabernacula intelligi apud Hebraeos tradunt interpretes nominum'. These personal testimonies of Origen are quoted by Franz Wutz in his *Onomastica Sacra*, Leipzig, 1914, vol. i, p. 37.

² Cf. his article 'L'Origine de la Transcription du Texte Hébreu en caractères grecs dans l'Hexaple d'Origène', in *Journal Asiatique*, IX^e série, vol. xvii, 1901, pp. 335-41.

³ Cf. Louis Ginzberg, *A Commentary on the Palestinian Talmud*, vol. i, New York, 1941, p. xxxvii.

as it was pronounced in Palestine in the second century A.D. The following specimen is the text of Psalm 30 according to the Milan Palimpsest:¹

1. μαζμωρ σιρ δυνεχαθ αββαιθ λδανιδ
2. ερωμεμεχ πιτιπι χι δελλιθανη ούλω σεμεθ οϊεββαϊ λι
3. πιτιπι [
4.] εελιθ μεσσωλ (1) νεφσι ιθανι μεϊωρδη βωρ
5. ζωημερου λπιτιπι ασιδαν (1) ουωδου λζεχρ (2) κοδσω (3)
6. χι ρεγε βααφφω αιϊμ βαρσωνω βααρβ ιαλιν βεχι . . .
7. ουανι αμαρθι βσαλουι βαλ εμματ λωλαμ
8. πιτιπι βαρσωναχ εεμεδθ λααρι οζ εσθερθα φαναχ αιθα νεβαλ
9. ηλαχ πιτιπι εκρα ουελ αδωναι εθανναν
10. μεββεσε βδαμι βρεδεθι ελ σααθ αιωδεχχα αφαρ αιεγγιθι εμεθθαχ
11. σμα πιτιπι ουαννηνι πιτιπι αιη ωζηρ λι
12. αφαχθ λμαωλ λι φεθεθα σεκκι ουεθαζερενι σεμα
13. λαμαν ιζαμμερεχ χαβωδ ουλω ιαδομ πιτιπι ελωαι λωλαμ ωδεχ

Whoever compares this transcribed text with the text written in Hebrew characters will come to the conclusion that the men who were responsible for this kind of transcription did not pronounce the gutturals as consonants. This is confirmed by the whole material preserved in the Milan Palimpsest, as may be seen in a few specimens taken from other Psalms preserved in the Milan fragments: *θενηνι-תְּנַחֲנִי* 31. 4; *βαταθι-בָּטַחְתִּי* 31. 7; *ουβσαλη-וְבָצַלְעִי* 35. 15; *θερε-תִּרְאָה* 35. 17; *οραχ-אֶרְךָּךְ* 44. 19; *ιεμου-יְחַמְרוּ* 46. 6; *χεσσω-כָּסָא* 89. 30; *μηρεμ-מִרְחֵם* 110. 3 (Field).

Now it may be said: How was it possible to render Hebrew gutturals with Greek letters? That it was really possible may be seen from the much older methods of transcription which we find in certain strata of the Septuagint. I may refer to transcriptions of proper names like *Αερνων* (*ארנון*) Jer. 31 (48). 20 A; *Αερμων* (*חרמון*) Deut. 3. 8 and often; *Αηλαμ* (*עילם*) 1 Kings 29. 1 A;

¹ This text depends on the photograph of a copy made, about fifty years ago, by the discoverer, G. Mercati. The same photograph was the basis for the text printed by Fr. Wutz in his book *Die Psalmen, textkritisch untersucht*, München, 1925, p. 68 f. The text printed here may be sufficient as a specimen. For a serious study the reader must be referred to the edition which Cardinal Mercati is preparing. He has been able to correct the text in a great many places. The underscript of the palimpsest is written in minuscules. But the text must have been written in capital letters earlier. So some of the misreadings can easily be explained, vs. 4, (1) *μεσσω* (Λ dropped out before Ν); vs. 5 (1) *ασιλαν* (Λ instead of Δ), (2) *αζεχρ* (Α instead of Λ), (3) *κοδεω* (Ε instead of Σ, Ξ).

Αενδωρ (*עֵין דָּאָר*) 1 Chron. 8. 24 A.¹ It is clear that such transcriptions have to be understood as *αερνων*, *αερμων*, *αηλαμ*, *αενδωρ*. The *a* prefixed to the guttural which had to be pronounced with the vowel *e* is the attempt to render in Greek script the Hebrew guttural which still must have been heard when this kind of transliteration was made.

In other cases an *i* or *e* was prefixed to the guttural. I may refer here to transliterations like *λαχειραν* (*אֶחָרִים*) Num. 26. 42 B; *ιαβινεμ* (*אֲבִינֵעַם*) Judges 4. 12 A; *ιασον* (*עֲצָם*) Joshua 19. 3 B; *ιεφραθα* (*עַפְרָה*) Joshua 18. 23 B; *ιακακ* (*חֹקֶק*) 1 Chron. 6. 75 A^a; *Ελεαδ* (*אֶלְעָד*) 1 Chron. 7. 21 A; *Ελεαζαρ* (*אֶלְעָזָר*), often; *Σωβωθ*, instead of *Εωβωθ* (*אֲבֹת*) Num. 33. 43 B. Such transliterations are to be understood as *Ιαχειραν*, *Ιαβινεμ*, *Ιακακ*, *Ιεφραθα*, &c., and we can be sure that at the time when they were made the gutturals were still heard by the transcribers.

Besides, in older times the Hebrew letters *ת* and *ע* must have been differentiated like the corresponding Arabic letters, so that *ת* was pronounced sometimes like Arabic *hā*, sometimes like Arabic *khā*, and *ע* sometimes like Arabic *‘ain*, sometimes like Arabic *ghain*. An *ע* corresponding to *gh* we find, for instance, in words like *Γομορρα* (*עֲמֹרָה*); *Γαζα* (*עֶזְרָה*); *Ραγαν* (*רַעֲוִי*) Gen. 11. 18 f; *Ραγουηλ* (*רַעֲוָאֵל*) Num. 1. 14 and often; *Ραγμα* Ezek. 27. 22 (A.Q. *Ρεγμα*), 1 Chron. 1. 9 (*רַעֲמָה*); *Γαδερ* (*עֲדָר*) Gen. 35. 16 A.D.; *Γοβολια* (*עֲתִלְיָה*) often;—a *ת* corresponding to *kha* in *χορραιος* (*חֲרִי*) Gen. 14. 6 A; *Αχιεζερ* (*אֲחִיעֶזֶר*); *Αχεικαμ* (*אֲחִיקָם*) and similar names.

In the second column of the Hexapla we never find transcriptions of that kind. These older methods of rendering Hebrew gutturals in Greek transcriptions had been completely abandoned in the second century A.D. when the transliteration preserved in the second column of the Hexapla was made; after the gutturals had lost their consonantal value, a new method of transliteration was introduced, and in many MSS. of the Septuagint Hebrew names were adapted to the rules of transliteration used in the second column of the Hexapla. The older methods of transliteration were not understood any more.

An important witness for the pronunciation of Hebrew in Palestine is Jerome. He translated the whole Old Testament from Hebrew into Latin, and he knew a good deal of Hebrew. He was in close contact with learned Jews in Palestine and had

¹ These specimens as well as the following ones are to be found in the *Concordance to the Septuagint*, by Hatch and Redpath, Supplement, Fasc. 1, Oxford, 1900.

carefully observed the methods of their pronunciation. Transliterated Hebrew words are to be found in great numbers in his writings. But they cannot be taken as a uniform mass, as has been done, for instance, by Carl Siegfried in his well-known article published in 1884.¹ Jerome quotes the Hebrew words just as he finds them in the source from which he has taken them, only replacing the Greek letters by Latin ones. There is a great difference in these quotations when they are taken from the Septuagint, or from the old Greek Onomasticon of Philo or Pseudo-Philo, or when he quotes later sources as, for instance, the second column of Origen's Hexapla, or when he gives his own transliteration.² Of special interest are the statements given by Jerome about the pronunciation of Hebrew in his time. In his *Liber interpretationis hebraicorum nominum*³ he quotes the word *Gomorrah* which he had found both in the old Greek Onomasticon and in the Septuagint, and he adds:

sciendum quod *g* litteram in hebraico non habet, sed scribitur per uocalem *u*.

We find a similar notice somewhat later when he quotes the word *Segor*⁴ and declares that it is the same as *Seor* which he had explained two lines before, and adds:

sed sciendum quia *g* litteram in medio non habeat, scribiturque per uocalem *ain*.

¹ Cf. Carl Siegfried, 'Die Aussprache des Hebräischen bei Hieronymus', in *ZATW.*, vol. iv, Giessen, 1884, pp. 34–87.

² Cf. Franz Wutz, *Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus*, Stuttgart, 1933, who writes concerning Jerome: 'Die Kenntnis der Onomastik hat sich dabei als recht brauchbar erwiesen; denn schon aus den Onomastica Sacra wusste ich, dass Hieronymus nur mit größter Vorsicht zu benutzen ist, da er ein gewaltiges Sammelsurium von Formen aus allen Jahrhunderten eines Zeitraums von 700–800 Jahren bot. Da Hieronymus trotz aller Gelehrsamkeit der historisch-kritische Blick für die Divergenz seiner Materialien fehlte, häuft er Material auf Material, ohne zu ahnen, um was es ging; ja er nahm Stellung gegen alte Formen, ohne zu wissen, wie sehr sie durch die alte Orthographie berechtigt waren' (p. 3). This is correct on the whole. But as we know now the changes in the transcription of Hebrew words in the different centuries, the material collected by Jerome is, when used with criticism, of great importance. Alexander Sperber, in his treatise 'Hebrew based upon Greek and Latin Transliterations' (*Hebrew Union College Annual*, vols. xii–xiii, Cincinnati, 1937/8) has dealt with Jerome's methods on p. 109 f. His article is based to a considerable extent on Jerome.

³ Published by Paul de Lagarde in *Onomastica Sacra*, 2nd ed., Göttingae, 1887, pp. 26–116; cf. ib., p. 33, and Sperber, l.c., p. 110.

⁴ = Hebrew *צֶרֶר*, Gen. 19. 22 f. Septuagint *Σηγορ*, cf. Lagarde, p. 37.

In mentioning the name *Cham*, Jerome remarks:¹

sed sciendum quod in hebraico *χ* litteram non habeat, scribitur autem per *π* quae duplici adspiratione profertur.

It is clear that in older times Hebrew *π* had in certain cases a pronunciation similar to Greek *χ*, and that in his own time the Hebrew letter, like all the other gutturals, indicated only a vowel. A. Sperber, after a careful investigation of all the evidence concerning the gutturals spoken in Palestine in Jerome's time, comes to the conclusion: 'Gutturals have, therefore, no independent consonantal value, but serve merely to carry the vowel sign.'

We have seen that in the Jewish liturgical poetry of the sixth and seventh centuries² the rhyme—along with the acrostic—is an important characteristic. In these poems there are rhyming words ending in *π* and *η*, and words ending in *π* and *ע*.³ It seems to be clear that the poet Hedwatha who composed, in the second half of the sixth century, the *Kerobas* on the twenty-four classes of priests (*משמרות*), did not pronounce the gutturals. This is confirmed by the way in which Bible fragments with Palestinian punctuation are vocalized. Pontus Leander, in his article 'Bemerkungen zur palästinischen Überlieferung des Hebräischen',⁴ says:

From the Palestinian punctuation we may conclude that the laryngals (i.e. gutturals) were not or not exactly taken into account in the

¹ Lagarde, l.c., p. 30. Cf. *Hieronymi Quaestiones Hebraicae in libro Geneseos*. E recognitione Pauli de Lagarde, Lipsiae, 1868, p. 13. Concerning the *duplex aspiratio* mentioned here by Jerome cf. Sperber, l.c., p. 110 f.

² Cf. my first Lecture, p. 22.

³ Cf. *Masoreten des Westens*, i, p. ב, where the words תְּנַתָּה, תַּפְתָּה, תַּפְתָּה rhyme; p. ד, where תְּנַתָּה, תַּפְתָּה, יִקְרַע, and אֲזִיחָה rhyme; and p. ח, where סֹחַ [סוּחַ], וּפְסִיחַ, and וְנִסְחָה rhyme (the fourth rhyme is not preserved).

⁴ Cf. *ZATW.*, vol. liv, 1936, pp. 91–9. The words quoted above in translation may be given here in the German original: 'Die palästinische Punctuation läßt darauf schließen, daß die Laryngale in der Aussprache nicht, oder wenigstens nicht genau, berücksichtigt wurden. . . . Wörter, die auf *π* ausgehn, reimen mit denen auf *ע*. Und sehr oft wird nur ein Vokal geschrieben, wo die späteren Punctuationen zwei — einen vor der Laryngalis, den andern nach ihr — zeigen. Diese Fälle sind zu zahlreich, um sich restlos durch Unvollständigkeit in der Vokalschreibung erklären zu lassen; die Laryngalis ist also elidiert und die umgebenden Vokale kontrahiert. . . . Es ist kaum anzunehmen daß die Laryngalis in solchen Fällen wirklich gesprochen wurde, denn alles deutet darauf hin, daß die Laryngale zu dieser Zeit völlig verloren gegangen oder wenigstens in der Artikulation irgendwie geschwächt waren' (p. 95 f.).

pronunciation; words ending in ה rhyme with those ending in ע. And very often only one vowel is written where the later punctuation shows two, one before and one after the laryngal. These cases are too numerous to be explained by incompleteness in the writing of vowels. The laryngal is therefore elided and the surrounding vowels are contracted.

From the texts published by me, Leander quotes the following specimens: (with א) הארץ, לארץ, הארץ (mēreš); (with ע) יערָה, לעפָר = לעפָר . . . מבַּעַד (mibbad) = פַּעַלְתָּה; יַעֲרָה; (with ה) אֶהְבֵּתִי, הָהָרִים = הָהָרִים, לָהֶבֶה = לָהֶבֶה; (with ח) נְחֻמָּתָךְ = מְנוּחָתְךָ, נְחֻמָּתָךְ (nēmātak) = מְנוּחָתְךָ; תִּתְנֶמֶ (titnēm) = מְרֻחָק (mērōk) = מְרֻחָק. He adds:

'We can hardly assume that the laryngal was really pronounced in such cases, for everything points to the fact that the laryngal was completely lost at this time or at least weakened in the articulation.'

To these examples I may add a few specimens taken from the scroll of the Psalms with Palestinian punctuation of which the text is not yet published:¹ כְּאוֹרֶחַ (כְּאוֹרֶחַ) 37. 35; שְׁאוֹל (שְׁאוֹל) 30. 11; שְׁאֵלָה (שְׁאֵלָה) 40. 7; יַעֲזֹב (יַעֲזֹב) 37. 28; וַיַּעֲזֹב (וַיַּעֲזֹב) 37. 36; בְּהִגְיִי (בְּהִגְיִי) 38. 4; לְהִמִּיתוֹ (לְהִמִּיתוֹ) 37. 32;² וַיַּחֲרֹשׁ (וַיַּחֲרֹשׁ) 39. 13; וַיַּחֲמֹתְךָ (וַיַּחֲמֹתְךָ) 38. 2; וַיַּחֲמֹתְךָ (וַיַּחֲמֹתְךָ) 39. 4; וַיַּחֲמֹתְךָ (וַיַּחֲמֹתְךָ) 39. 13. It is clear that this method of vocalizing the gutturals confirms the result to which we came on the basis of the other MSS.

This method of not pronouncing the gutturals in reading Hebrew (and Aramaic) has been preserved by the Samaritans up to the present day. The Samaritans know how to pronounce correctly all the gutturals when speaking Arabic. But as soon as they begin to recite the Hebrew text of the Bible or the text of their Targum, or to speak Hebrew or Aramaic, the pronunciation of the gutturals—with the exception of א in certain cases—is completely omitted. In the summer of 1908 I worked for a fortnight daily in the Synagogue of the Samaritans in Nāblus and was during that time always in touch with some of their priests, and I often discussed with them their method of pronouncing Hebrew. They were convinced that they read the holy text exactly as it had been transmitted to them by their forefathers from time immemorial.³

¹ Cf. my reference to these fragments on p. 51 of this lecture.

² In these fragments no vowels are added when the text is written plene.

³ Cf. Heinrich Petermann, 'Versuch einer hebräischen Formenlehre nach der Aussprache der heutigen Samaritaner, nebst einer danach gebildeten

The Masoretes who worked on the Hebrew Biblical text from the end of the eighth to the end of the ninth century have added to the gutturals a great number of new vowels by which they tried to force the readers of the holy text not to overlook any of the gutturals written in the text of the Bible. 'From the whole system of the Chatef vowels—a creation of the Tiberian Masoretes—we can clearly see how little they were accustomed to a correct pronunciation of the gutturals', remarks Pontus Leander.¹ According to his theory the neglect of the gutturals began in the Aramaic vernacular language, especially in Galilee which was long notorious for its lax pronunciation of these sounds.² It spread next in Galilee too into the synagogal reading of the Hebrew Bible. But, according to Leander, the Masoretes found the correct method of pronouncing Hebrew in Judea and introduced it into the reading of the Biblical text by creating vowel signs which they added with great scrupulousness. They failed, however, to establish a correct pronunciation of the gutturals by their methods, and the difficulties they could not master are clearly to be seen in the text created by them. So far Leander.³

I think it quite impossible to differentiate between the pronunciation of Hebrew in Galilee and in Judea at that time. Before the Masoretes of Tiberias began their work, the centre of Judaism in Palestine had been for centuries Galilee, and not Judea. The priestly families, among whom we should expect to find the best tradition for reading the text of the Bible, had been settled in Galilee. They lived in Tiberias and the surrounding places. When after the Muslim conquest Jerusalem was reopened to the Jews, the centre of Jewish learning was transferred from Tiberias to Jerusalem. Where should we find any men who had preserved a correct pronunciation of Hebrew during these centuries in Judea? What we hear of the non-pronunciation of

Transkription der Genesis . . .' (*Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, vol. v. 1), Leipzig, 1868. Petermann's transcriptions are, however, not quite trustworthy as they were not made on the spot but in Germany, according to notes made in Nāblus in the printed text of the Samaritan Pentateuch. Cf. Fritz Diening, *Das Hebräische bei den Samaritanern. Ein Beitrag zur vor-masoretischen Grammatik des Hebräischen* (= Bonner Orientalistische Studien, Heft 24, Stuttgart, 1938).

¹ l.c., p. 95 f.

² Cf. the well-known stories reported in the Talmud concerning the lax pronunciation of the gutturals. They are mentioned, for instance, by Dalman in his *Grammar*, 2nd ed., Leipzig, 1905, p. 57 f.

³ Cf. l.c., p. 96.

the gutturals from Origen and Jerome was transmitted to Origen in Caesarea, and was heard by Jerome from his Jewish teachers in Bethlehem. Both places were situated in Judea. Can we really believe that, besides the faulty pronunciation reported by them, there existed a 'correct' pronunciation of the Hebrew gutturals in Judea of which neither of them has anything to say? And besides, the Babylonian Masoretes introduced a new pronunciation of the gutturals into their text of the Hebrew Bible at the same time as their colleagues in Palestine, although they did not go quite so far as these. Did they also derive their information from the correct pronunciation which may have been preserved in Judea? And did they also depend previously on a wrong pronunciation prevailing in Galilee?

We can take it for granted that neither in Palestine nor in Babylonia did a clear pronunciation of the Hebrew gutturals exist at the time when the Masoretes began to revise the pronunciation of Hebrew by fixing every detail through very complicated systems of punctuation. There need be no doubt that the impetus for revising the reading of the Hebrew text was given to the Masoretes by the Arab readers of the Koran. The Koran was recited everywhere in the great Muslim Empire. In Mesopotamia, Kufa and Basra were the great centres of work on the correct reading of the Koran. The Dome of the Rock, built A.D. 692 by the Chalif 'Abdulmalik (ruled 685-705), directed Muslim pilgrims for many years to Jerusalem instead of to Mekka. In both Babylonia and Palestine the Masoretes had every opportunity of observing the exact methods employed in reading the Koran. We have seen how important the correct reading of the Koran was for every Muslim. The Arab readers of the Koran were the forerunners of the Masoretes in their work on the text of the Hebrew Bible in Palestine and in Mesopotamia.

We see from the orthography of the Koran that consonantal Alif was not read in early times. In accordance with the language of Bedouin poetry the Koranic readers introduced the little sign Hamza with great exactness into the text of the Koran in order to safeguard a pronunciation of this guttural which they regarded as correct. In this Arabic Hamza we must see the model of all the signs introduced by the Masoretes for safeguarding a correct pronunciation of the newly restored Hebrew gutturals, the Ḥaṭefs, and the Pataḥ furtivum introduced by the Tiberian Masoretes, and the auxiliary vowels introduced by the Babylonian Masoretes. The Arabs had to safeguard the pro-

nunciation of only one guttural, that of the consonantal Alif. The other gutturals were not ignored by the Arabs in reading the Koran. The Masoretes had to introduce a newly created method of pronouncing all the gutturals which had generally been omitted in reading the Hebrew text, just as they are omitted by the Samaritans up to the present day. So the signs introduced by them differed from those used by the Arabs. But Leander is completely right when he says that the signs introduced by the Masoretes were not very successful; the fact, for instance, that, in reading the Bible, the Jews generally pronounce an א as Aleph and not as 'Ain, may perhaps remind us of the origin of this innovation made by the Masoretes.

2. *The pronominal suffix of the 2nd person sing. masc.*

In the Masoretic text the regular form of this suffix is תְּ, pausal תְּ, when affixed to a noun in plural תְּ; cf. תְּ, pausal תְּ thy hand, תְּ thy hands. Forms of this kind are not found in the Hebrew known from other sources, as will be shown by the following specimens to which I add always the form of the Masoretic text:

(a) *The Second Column of Origen's Hexapla:*¹

οὐμιναχ תְּ 18. 36; αμμαχ תְּ 28. 9; βαρσωναχ תְּ 30. 8; οζναχ תְּ 31. 3; σεμαχ תְּ 31. 4; βιαδαχ תְּ 31. 6; τουβαχ תְּ 31. 20; σελκαχ תְּ 35. 28; χσελκαχ (MS: χσελκαδ) תְּ 35. 24; οραχ תְּ 44. 19; ηχαλαχ תְּ 44. 10; αβδαχ תְּ 89. 40; μσιαχ תְּ 89. 39, 52; —θελαθαχ תְּ 35. 28; ουανουαθαχ (MS: ουαναναθαχ) תְּ 18. 37; νελαθαχ תְּ 28. 9; εμεθαχ תְּ 30. 10; βσελκαθαχ תְּ 31. 2; εμαθαχ תְּ 89. 47; βαεμουναθαχ תְּ 89. 50. —φαναχ תְּ 30. 8; 31. 21; λιριαχ תְּ 31. 20; ηναχ תְּ 31. 23; ελααχ תְּ 44. 8; εσδαχ תְּ 89. 50; αβδαχ תְּ 89. 51. —ερωμεμεχ תְּ 30. 2; ιζαμμερεχ תְּ 30. 13; ωδεχ תְּ 30. 13; תְּ 35. 18; ουωρεχ תְּ 32. 8; εσχιλεχ תְּ 32. 8; οιβαχ תְּ 89. 52; ιελεδεθεχ תְּ 110. 3 (Field).

I know of two exceptions only: αιωδεχχα תְּ 30. 10, with 'nun energicum' (cf. תְּ Job 40. 14; תְּ Ps. 118. 28). Such forms may have followed special laws. The other form is יסאαχ תְּ 18. 36.

¹ Cf. the material collected by Franz Wutz and by Alexander Sperber in the books quoted above, p. 90, note 2.

(b) *Jerome*

Jerome confirms these forms; he reads *ammach*, *echalach*, *iesacha* as in the second column of the Hexapla. Cf. further *dodach* דֹּדָךְ Jer. 32. 7; *goolathach* גֹּולָתְךָ Ezek. 11. 15; *amaggenach* אִמַּגֶּנֶחַ Hos. 11. 8; *dabarach* דַּבָּרְךָ Hos. 13. 14; *messiach* מְשִׁיחֶךָ Hab. 3. 13; *alichothach* אֲלִיכוֹתְךָ Ps. 68. 25 (Field); *malochothach* מַלְאָכוֹתְךָ Ps. 73. 38 (Field);—**alechchach* אֶלְחַחְךָ Hos. 8. 1 is erroneously written *alechcha*, and **methech* מֵתִיחַ Isa. 26. 19 is erroneously written *metheca*.

(c) *Liturgical MSS. with Palestinian Punctuation*

Here we find always forms of the same kind, cf. אֲבִרְתָּךְ, יִדְךָ, אֲבִרְתָּךְ, בִּבְרִיתְךָ, שִׁירְךָ, בִּצִילְךָ, חֹפְתָךְ; these specimens are to be found in the first four verses of Hedwatha's *Ḳeroba* on *Mishmar Huppa*.¹ Forms of this kind are regularly used in all these texts, and, as we have seen,² they were used in liturgical MSS. and editions provided with Tiberian punctuation also, up to about 1800, when they were 'corrected' by Wolf Heidenheim. It is only since that time that in printed texts of the Piuts forms with the suffix תְּךָ, יְךָ begin to appear.

Even the Biblical text which was before the copyists of these MSS. must have read corresponding forms. Usually in these MSS. only the beginning of a Biblical verse is quoted, or the text quoted from the Bible is left without vowel signs. But in the fragments of Hedwatha's *Ḳerobas* Bible quotations are given with full vocalization, and from these I quote the following specimens:³

מִשְׁנֵאִיךָ (מִשְׁנֵאִיךָ) Exod. 15. 6; מִפְּנֵיךָ (מִפְּנֵיךָ) Num. 10. 35; קִדְשְׁךָ (קִדְשְׁךָ) Deut. 26. 15; מִפְּנֵיךָ (מִפְּנֵיךָ) Deut. 33. 17; וּנְתַתִּיךָ (וּנְתַתִּיךָ) Isa. 49. 6; בְּךָ (בְּךָ) Jer. 51. 20; יִדְךָ (יִדְךָ) Mic. 5. 8; וְעֹנֹתְךָ (וְעֹנֹתְךָ) Ps. 18. 36; שְׁנֵאִיךָ (שְׁנֵאִיךָ) Ps. 21. 9; לִפְנֵיךָ (לִפְנֵיךָ) Ps. 19. 15; כְּבוֹדְךָ (כְּבוֹדְךָ) Ps. 26. 8; עֲבָדֶיךָ (עֲבָדֶיךָ) Ps. 110. 1; אֹיִבְךָ (אֹיִבְךָ) Ps. 102. 13; לְרִגְלֶיךָ (לְרִגְלֶיךָ) Ps. 110. 11; לְהוֹדִיעֶךָ (לְהוֹדִיעֶךָ) Prov. 22. 21.

¹ Cf. *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. i, p. 6 of the Hebrew text.

² Cf. Professor Simonsen's notice quoted above, p. 63 f.

³ These specimens are to be found on pp. 6, 7, 9, 15, 20, 21 in *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. i, Hebrew text, and on p. 115 of Zulay's publication.

(d) *Hebrew as pronounced by the Samaritans*

That the suffix was pronounced and is still pronounced by the Samaritans in the same way, we may see from the following specimens:¹

אֶפֶק (אֶפֶק) Gen. 3. 19; מִיָּדְךָ (מִיָּדְךָ) 4. 11; אֲבִרְתָּךְ (אֲבִרְתָּךְ) 19. 19; לִבְבְּךָ (לִבְבְּךָ) 20. 6; בְּנִיךָ (בְּנִיךָ) 22. 2; יִדְךָ (יִדְךָ) 22. 12; מִתָּךְ (מִתָּךְ) 23. 6; קָלְלִיתָךְ (קָלְלִיתָךְ) 27. 13; בָּבֶרֶךְ (בָּבֶרֶךְ) 35. 1; מִן־לִצִּיךָ (מִן־לִצִּיךָ) 35. 11; רֵאשֶׁךָ (רֵאשֶׁךָ) 40. 13; פִּיךָ (פִּיךָ) 41. 40; יִשׁוּפְךָ (יִשׁוּפְךָ) 3. 15; שׁוּבְךָ (שׁוּבְךָ) 3. 19; נָתַתִּיךָ (נָתַתִּיךָ) 17. 5; שְׁמַעְתִּיךָ (שְׁמַעְתִּיךָ) 17. 20; אֲבִרְתָּךְ (אֲבִרְתָּךְ) 22. 17; וְשִׁבְיֶךָ (וְשִׁבְיֶךָ) 24. 3; וּבִרְכַּתִּיךָ (וּבִרְכַּתִּיךָ) 26. 24; שְׁכַרְתִּיךָ (שְׁכַרְתִּיךָ) 30. 16; וְשִׁבְיֶךָ (וְשִׁבְיֶךָ) 32. 18; וְשִׁבְיֶךָ (וְשִׁבְיֶךָ) 32. 18; וְשִׁבְיֶךָ (וְשִׁבְיֶךָ) 50. 6; גַּמְלוֹךְ (גַּמְלוֹךְ) 50. 17; שָׁמַךְ (שָׁמַךְ) Exod. 2. 14; שְׁלַחְתִּיךָ (שְׁלַחְתִּיךָ) 3. 12.

(e) *Bible MSS. with Palestinian Punctuation*

These are the fragments H, J, K, L, M, published by me in *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. ii, pp. 66–95, and the Psalm scroll, T.-S. 10, nos. 52, 53, 54, 58 of the Cambridge University Library, not yet published.

In MS. H, the scroll with the text of Ezek. 13. 11–16. 31, we find in chapter 16 a great number of specimens with the *feminine* suffix of the 2nd pers. sing., as מְכַרְתִּיךָ (מְכַרְתִּיךָ) 16. 3; אֲתָךְ (אֲתָךְ) 16. 5; &c. But not a single specimen in the whole fragment is to be found where the masculine suffix is vocalized.

In MS. J, two folios with the text of Dan. 9. 24–12. 14, we find clearly written עֲמָךְ (עֲמָךְ) 12. 1, and no specimen is to be found where the suffix is vocalized according to the method of the Tiberian Masoretes. In comparing this fragment we have to be cautious as the signs ֿ and ֿ are also used here for the accents corresponding to Tiberian *Zakef* and *Rebi'a*. In some instances the vowels are not written or the words are not preserved. It is very likely that we have here a Biblical MS. in which the suffix was vocalized in the same way as in the liturgical fragments.

In MS. K, one folio with the text of Jer. 1. 1–2. 29, we find

¹ The specimens are taken from the material collected by Fritz Diening in the book quoted above, p. 92, note 3. Cf. the article 'The Hebrew by the Samaritans' of Foad Hassanain, in *Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, Fouad I University*, vol. vi, Cairo, 1942, pp. 49–64.

invariably forms like אֲצוֹרֶךְ (אֲצוֹרֶךְ); הַקְדַּשְׁתִּיךָ (הַקְדַּשְׁתִּיךָ); 1. 5; יוֹשִׁיעוֹךָ (יֹשִׁיעוֹךָ), אֱלֹהֶיךָ (אֱלֹהֶיךָ) 2. 28. This MS. always gives the vocalization of the suffix in accordance with the Masoretic text.

In MS. L, two folios with fragments of Psalms 51–5, 69–72, we find forms like יִתְצַךְ (יִתְצַךְ), וְשִׁרְשֶׁךְ (וְשִׁרְשֶׁךְ) 52. 7; יִשְׁעֶךְ (יִשְׁעֶךְ) 69. 25; בְּצִדְקָתְךָ (בְּצִדְקָתְךָ) 69. 28; יִשְׁעֶךְ (יִשְׁעֶךְ) 70. 5; אֲזַנְךָ (אֲזַנְךָ) 71. 2; תְּהַלֵּלְךָ (תְּהַלֵּלְךָ), תִּפְאָרְתְּךָ (תִּפְאָרְתְּךָ) 71. 8. The vocalization of the suffix is in accordance with the Masoretic text.

In MS. M, containing Biblical texts written in abbreviations, we find forms like בְּעִשְׂוֹתְךָ (בְּעִשְׂוֹתְךָ) Isa. 64. 2; יִשְׁאֲלֶךְ (יִשְׁאֲלֶךְ) Jer. 23. 3; מִיָּדְךָ (מִיָּדְךָ) 25. 15; עֵךְ (עֵךְ) Isa. 63. 14; בְּכַפְרֶךְ (בְּכַפְרֶךְ) Exod. 29. 36. There is no doubt that the suffix was vocalized here in accordance with the Masoretic text.

In the scroll of the Psalms we have to differentiate between the vocalization added by the first hand, perhaps the copyist of the consonantal text himself, and a later hand. Only a few vowel signs are added by the first hand, and the suffix is never vocalized by this hand. The second hand has added more vowel signs. They are especially found on the fragment T.-S. 20. 54. Here we find forms like the following: וִירוֹמְךָ (וִירוֹמְךָ) 37. 34; חֲצִיךָ (חֲצִיךָ) 38. 3; יָדְךָ (יָדְךָ) 38. 3; נִגְדְךָ (נִגְדְךָ) 39. 6; נִנְעֶךְ (נִנְעֶךְ) 39. 11; צִדְקָתְךָ (צִדְקָתְךָ) 40. 11; וְאִמְתְךָ (וְאִמְתְךָ) 40. 11.

We see that in these Biblical texts new forms of pronominal suffixes begin to appear which we find in full vigour in the MSS. with Tiberian and Babylonian punctuation. What have we to say of this peculiarity of vocalization? In the important chapter viii of his *Studien zur Hebräischen Metrik*,¹ inscribed 'Versbau und Sprachform', Eduard Sievers writes with regard to these pronominal forms (§ 207):

A form such as יָדְךָ *yad'chá* is strange in several ways: (1) orthographically, as it does not indicate the final vowel by a supporting consonant; (2) from the point of view of accent, as it supposes an Early Hebrew oxytone, though otherwise in Early Hebrew the principle of

¹ = *Metrische Studien*, i, in *Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen Classe der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, vol. i. 1, Leipzig, 1901, pp. 288 ff.

penultimate accentuation is the rule; (3) phonologically, as it affirms the preservation of an original final, yet certainly short vowel which otherwise disappears, and in such forms as *lach* (beside *l'chá*) has in fact disappeared; (4) morphologically, as it brings about an incomprehensible difference in the treatment of similarly composed word-forms with masculine and feminine suffix (*yad'chá* as against *yadéch*); (5) finally metrically, as certainly not all, but at least very many forms of this type do not suit the anapaestic rhythm of the verse. If blind chance is excluded, how can all these irregularities have coincided in one and the same category? The probability of this coincidence in any case is quite extraordinarily small. . . .

Somewhat later (§ 229) Sievers states that the forms with feminine suffixes such as pron. *lách*, nom. *yadéch*, *yadách*, &c., have developed for the most part clearly and regularly, but that the forms with the masculine suffix are quite incomprehensible, at least if one seeks in them the direct continuation of any early Semitic or Hebrew original agreeing with rules and facts otherwise established—and that, after all, is what one has to try first. He refers to his previous treatment of these problems and sums them up in the following questions:

If the original threefold case-group *yaduka*, *yadika*, *yadaka* was levelled off in Early Hebrew to **yádaka* (as must be considered likely) why did it not become, with penultimate accentuation, **yadáka* and later **yadách* (as *yadiki* to *yadéch*), why did it become an oxytone, contrary to all rules otherwise applying, and develop into *yad'chá*? And if it became an oxytone, why does it not follow the usual system of vowel treatment in nominal forms, i.e. why is it *yad'chá* and not either *y'dachá* (as, for instance, *d'barí*) or *yadchá*, *yedchá* as in *yedchem*? The mere descriptive grouping under 'light and heavy terminations' does not remove the difficulty, but only describes the facts as they stand. Finally, why is it that in the consonantal text this strange *yad'chá* is normally written only as יָדְךָ as if it had no final vowel, and especially where it would have been advisable for the Masoretes to make a difference in spelling between masculine and feminine forms?

Sievers comes to the final conclusion that all the ךְ- forms of the punctuators are to be regarded as late innovations which had only begun to appear at the time of Origen and Jerome.

There can in fact be no doubt that we must see in these forms a late innovation. But this innovation must be dated much later than Sievers believed. In 1901, when Sievers wrote his *Metrische Studien*, the amount of Hebrew independent of Masoretic punctuation at his disposal was very scanty. He did not know of the texts of the second column of the Hexapla discovered by Mercati, nor of the texts with Palestinian punctuation from the Cairo

Geniza, nor of other material now available. We have seen that suffix forms with a final vowel are practically unknown in earlier texts. They begin to appear in later Biblical MSS. with Palestinian punctuation and were introduced with great regularity by the Masoretes who worked on the text of the Bible in Tiberias and in Babylonia at the end of the eighth and during the ninth century. They have therefore to be regarded as an innovation made in the eighth century.

This innovation was not a genuine development according to the rules of Hebrew grammar. Sievers has clearly shown that it is contrary to all that we should expect. The innovation must therefore have been made under foreign influence. There can hardly be any doubt that we have to consider as the model for this innovation the 'correct Arabic' which had been introduced into the language of the Koran by the readers in accordance with the language of Bedouin poetry. It is very likely that the Prophet, like the people of Mekka, said *baitak* 'thy house', *yadak* 'thy hand', *darabak* 'he struck thee', *lak* 'to thee'. The Bedouin said *baituka*, *yaduka* (nominative), *baitika*, *yadika* (genitive), *baitaka*, *yadaka* (accusative), and they said *darabaka* and *laka*. These forms of Bedouin Arabic were introduced into the Koran by the early readers, and observed with great regularity as the only correct ones. The Masoretes imitated these forms. They certainly could not introduce case-endings into Hebrew. But they were convinced—by the example given by the Arabic readers—that the forms with a final vowel had to be regarded as the more correct. So they were introduced by them with great regularity.

Such final vowels were also introduced by the Masoretes into other kinds of forms where they had not been pronounced before. I may illustrate this by two examples:

In the liturgical texts with Palestinian punctuation the suffix of the 3rd pers. sing. fem. is always written without the final vowel when added to a noun in the plural or to a noun ending with a vowel. In Hedwatha's *Kerobas* on the *Mishmarot* we find the following examples in quotations from the Bible: *אמריה* (אמריה) Prov. 1. 21 (p. 6); *מיקראיה* (מקראיה) Isa. 4. 5 (p. 6); *כרמיה* (כרמיה), *נעוריה* (נעוריה) Hos. 2. 17 (p. 23). In the liturgical poems themselves we find *חומותיה* (p. 8, cf. *חומתיה* Ps. 55. 11); *שעריה* (p. 9, cf. *שעריה* Thr. 1. 4, &c.); *תעלותיה* (p. 14, cf. *תעלותיה* Ezek. 31. 4); *לשומריה* (p. 14); *כפיה* (p. 17,

cf. *כפיה* Prov. 31. 13, &c.); *ביכוריה* (p. 17). To these examples I may add some from the 'Aboda of Jose b. Jose, according to the Oxford MS. Heb. d. 55, foll. 12 ff.: *מתניה* (2. 3; cf. *מתניה* Prov. 31. 12); *מכוניה* (2. 4; cf. *מכוניה* Ps. 104. 5); *פיה* (9. 5; cf. *פיה* Prov. 30. 20, &c.); *אמריה* (10. 1; cf. *אמריה* Prov. 1. 21, &c., see above). Similar forms can be found in all liturgical MSS. with Palestinian punctuation. In the second column of the Hexapla specimens of this kind are generally not preserved. I know of only one example: *עמודיה* (Ps. 75. 4 (Field)). It is clear that the Masoretes have introduced in these forms too a final vowel which was not spoken before, and it is very likely that this vowel was not pronounced at the time when Hebrew was still a spoken language and Old Testament poetry was composed. I may here refer to § 232 of the *Metrische Studien*, where Sievers has shown that all these forms with the final vowel are against the metrical law on which Hebrew poetry was based.

The second example is the 2nd pers. sing. masc. of the perfect. Here also the Masoretes have regularly introduced a final vowel which had not been spoken—or not regularly spoken—previously. In the second column of the Hexapla we find the following specimens:¹ *נתתה* 18. 41; *הפכתה* 30. 12; *פדיה* 31. 1; *ידעתה* 31. 8; *ראית* 31. 8; *שמתה* 31. 23; *נחתה* 89. 39; *פרצתה* 89. 41; *שמתה* 89. 41; *מנחתה* 89. 45.

To these I may add the following forms transcribed by Jerome: *sarith* *שרית* Gen. 32. 29; *carath* *קראת* Jer. 3. 12; *calloth* *קלות* Nahum 1. 14. It is true that these forms without a final vowel are not the only ones found in the second column. We have here also the following transcriptions with the final vowel: *פעתה* 31. 20; *צפתה* 31. 20; *ראיתה* 35. 22; *בראתה* 89. 48. It may be that the different pronunciation of these forms was due to the different Hebrew orthography, in so far that forms written in Hebrew with final ה were pronounced with a final vowel. Under this assumption we have to suppose that the consonantal text, which lay before those who created the transcribed text preserved in the second column of the Hexapla, differed in some instances from the text which we have before us now. The same differentiation is to be found in the liturgical texts with Palestinian

¹ Cf. A. Sperber's article, quoted above, p. 90, note 2.

punctuation. Here these forms were written without the final vowel when the Hebrew text was written without a final ה. In the Kerobas of Hedwatha we find the following examples: (וְאִמְרָתָ) Jer. 25. 30; (הָיִיתָ) Ps. 90. 1; יִדְעָתָ (וְאִמְרָתָ) Ps. 139. 2. But we find also נִתְחַה (נִתְחַה) Deut. 26. 15 and בְּנִתָּה (בְּנִתָּה) Ps. 139. 2 written with ה and a final vowel. In the liturgical poems themselves such forms are always written with a final ה and therefore also provided with a final vowel. It is clear that in this case also the Masoretes have introduced a final vowel which usually was not pronounced in earlier times; I may here again refer to Sievers's *Metrische Studien*, where he has shown in § 227 that the metrical system demands the forms without a final vowel.

3. The Pronunciation of the BGDKPT¹

Discussing the regulations for the correct saying of the Shma', the Jewish creed consisting of the pericopes Deut. 6. 4-9; 11. 13-22; Num. 15. 37-41, which every Jew must in duty recite at least twice a day, Rabbi 'Obadya quotes in the presence of Raba (bar Joseph, died A.D. 352, one of the greatest Talmudic authorities) the Baraita, i.e. a Tannaitic statement not preserved in the Mishna:²

וְלִמְדָתָם 'and ye shall teach' (Deut. 11. 19) means that your teaching should be perfect, that a pause (רְיוּחַ) must be made between the (letters) clinging together (הַדְבָקִים). Raba said after him: That is to say עַל לִבְבְּךָ (Deut. 6. 6); עַל לִבְבְּכֶם (11. 18); בְּכָל לִבְבְּךָ (6. 5); בְּכָל לִבְבְּכֶם (11. 13); עֲשֵׂב בַשָּׂדֶךְ (11. 15); וְאִבְדַתֶּם מִהֶרָה (11. 17); הִכְנֵף פְּתִיל (Num. 15. 38); אֲתֶכֶם מֵאֶרֶץ (15. 41).

Raba enumerates here the eight places where in the Shma' a word begins with that consonant with which the previous word

¹ Cf. my article 'Die Punktation der Masoreten' in *Marti-Festschrift, Vom Alten Testament* (= *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, vol. xli), Giessen, 1925, pp. 167-72.

² Cf. Bab. Talmud, Ber. fol. 16b. The same Tannaitic source is quoted in the Palestinian Talmud, Ber. 2. 4, with the same examples, only בְּכָל לִבְבְּךָ and בְּכָל לִבְבְּכֶם are omitted, and אשר נשבע יהוה Deut. 11. 21 is added. יהוה was read as אדני, an interesting example for the fact that there was no difference in the pronunciation of ע and א at that time in Palestine. But an authority like Raba is not mentioned here. Louis Ginzberg, in his huge *Commentary* (New York, 1941, 3 vols., more than 1,200 pages, for Ber. 1-4), discusses these facts at full length. But he is anxious to write his *Commentary* on very conservative lines, and so he does not dare to draw the consequences.

ends. In order that such words should not cling together, a pause was to be made between them. Six of the examples given by Raba are completely clear. But two examples, עֲשֵׂב בַשָּׂדֶךְ and הִכְנֵף פְּתִיל, are meaningless unless both בַּ and both שֶׁ are pronounced in the same way. If one of these letters had been pronounced as a spirant and the other as a plosive, as the Masora demands, there would have been no danger whatever of their clinging together. It is therefore obvious that Raba had in mind here a pronunciation which differed from that fixed by the Masoretes. What do we know of the earlier pronunciation of these letters?

In the second column of the Hexapla, Hebrew כ, פ, ת are regularly rendered by χ, φ, θ, as may be seen in the following examples:

- (1) for כ: χαβωΔ כְּבוֹד 29. 1; σσχι קִשְׁי 18. 29; θηληχ תִּלְךָ 32. 8; βδερχ בְּדֶרֶךְ 52. 8; ιεχχον יְכוֹן 89. 38.
- (2) for פ: φαρασθ פָּרָצְתָ 89. 41; εφθα אֶפְתָּה 49. 5; ουιφρου וַיִּהְיוּ 35. 26; βαανφη בְּהַנְפִי 35. 16; βααφω בָּאֵפוֹ 30. 6; ιεφφολου יִפְלוֹ 18. 39.
- (3) for ת: ναθαθ נִתְחַה 18. 41; θεθαθθαλ תִּתְּפֶתֶל 18. 27, &c.

In the Septuagint, representing in certain particulars older pronunciations, we find:

Hebrew כ, usually rendered by χ, as for instance χανααν, χαλεβ, Βαρουχ, Αβιμελεχ, Ασχαναζ. But here it is rendered sometimes by κ, so in foreign names as in Κυρος כִּרְשׁ and in Hebrew proper names, especially in certain books, as Κενερωθ כְּנִרוֹת Joshua 11. 2; Κεζειβ אֶכְיִב 15. 44; Κεαφ (read Κσαφ) אֶכְשָׁף 19. 25; Καραφα כָּפַר 18. 24, and besides Ζαχχουρ זָכוֹר we find Ζακχουρ, and we find Ακχω εֲכוֹ Judges 1. 31; Σοκχωθ סְכוֹת besides Σοχωθ.

Hebrew פ, usually rendered by φ, as for instance Φαραν, Φαραω, Φαλεγ, is sometimes rendered by π: Πατροσωνειμ פְּתִרְסִים Gen. 10. 14; Πετρεφης פּוֹטִיפָר, Πειθω פֶּתֶם Exod. 1. 11; Θαλπιωθ Cant. 4. 4 B, besides Θαλφωθ ib. Cod. A (= תִּלְפִּיּוֹת); ΣαλπααΔ זָלְפָנָד Joshua 17. 3 B, besides ΣαλφααΔ A; Σουπ צוּף 1 Kings 1. 1 A; Θαπους (for Θαπουε) תָּפַח 1 Chron. 2. 43 B.

Hebrew ת, usually rendered by θ, as in Θαμνα תְּמִנָּה or תְּמִנֶּע, Θαναχ תְּעִנָּךְ, is sometimes rendered by τ, cf. Ταναχ Joshua 17. 11; Τηναθηλω תְּאֵנֶת שְׁלֵא 16. 6 A; Ταφεθ תִּפְתָּה 4 Kings 23. 10 B, &c.

As to the letters ב, ד, and נ:

Hebrew ב is regularly rendered by β in the second column of

the Hexapla and usually also in the Septuagint, but here we find sometimes φ, cf. Ιακεφ ζηφ זאב יִקָּב Judges 7. 25; זב ζηφ Isa. 49. 4; Δαλαφ (read Ααλαφ) זאב Judges 1. 31.

Hebrew ד is regularly rendered by δ in the second column of the Hexapla and usually also in the Septuagint, but here we find, for instance, ματραειθ מטֶרֶד Gen. 36. 39. This letter was pronounced as a spirant in official Jewish circles in the second century A.D. and later is so presupposed in the Talmud where a Tannaitic saying is quoted:¹ צריך להאריך באחד 'It is necessary to extend in אחד'. This is explained as meaning that when saying the Shma' the ד in the word אחד must be extended. This is possible only when this letter was pronounced as a spirant, i.e. as *dh*.

Hebrew נ is regularly rendered by γ in the second column of the Hexapla and usually also in the Septuagint. But here we find sometimes κ, cf. Δωηκ דואג 1 Kings 22. 9 B (Δωηγ in A); Ναφεκ נִפְגֵּן Exod. 6. 21; Φαλεκ, Φαλκ פֶּלֶג Gen. 10. 25, 11. 16; Σεκελακ (besides Σεκελεγ) צקלג Joshua 15. 31 B, cf. 19. 5.

These few examples show already that the transcriptions of these letters varied in earlier times. A careful investigation of the whole material would be necessary before we could come to definite conclusions. Both the different books and the different MSS. of the Septuagint would have to be examined separately. Very often the method of transcription differs in the same MS. in the different books of the Septuagint. From the different transcriptions of these letters we may infer a different pronunciation. Besides we should have to pay special attention to the problem of how the Greek letters may have been pronounced at the different times when the transcriptions were made.

Such investigations would also be of great value for the Septuagint itself, as the different methods of transliteration would indicate earlier and later strata in the different books and MSS. of the Septuagint.²

Conditions had completely changed by the time the transliterations of the second column of the Hexapla were made. The uniform rendering of the BGDKPT letters in this transcrip-

¹ Cf. Palestinian Talmud, Berakhot 2. 1, Babylonian Talmud, Ber. 13 b.

² This has been shown by Wutz in the first part of his book *Die Transkriptionen* . . ., cf. above, p. 90, note 2. Otto Pretzl refers to these problems in his articles 'Septuagintaprobleme im Buche der Richter' and 'Die griechischen Handschriftengruppen im Buche Josua untersucht, nach ihrer Eigenart und ihrem Verhältnis zu einander', in *Biblica*, vols. vii and ix, Roma, 1926 and 1928.

tion seems to indicate that these letters were pronounced in one way only. For the letter פ this is expressly confirmed by Jerome. In mentioning the Hebrew word אפֿדֿנו Dan. 11. 45, which he transcribes as *apedno*, he says:¹

Notandum autem quod *p* literam Hebraeus sermo non habeat, sed pro ipsa utatur *phe*, cuius vim Graecum φ sonat. In isto tantum loco apud Hebraeos scribatur quidem *phe*, sed legatur *p*.

The word אפֿדֿנו is of foreign origin and corresponds to Accad. *apadana*, and seems to have retained a pronunciation of פ which is not to be found in real Hebrew words in Jerome's time.

We have already seen that Jerome's transcriptions of Hebrew words have to be regarded with precaution.² He usually renders Hebrew words as he found them in his Greek sources. We should not be surprised to find in his works Hebrew words transcribed according to very early methods. When we find in his quotations a Hebrew פ rendered by *p*, we have to see in them quotations from the Septuagint or from the Greek Onomasticon, where such transliterations are often to be found. When we find in his quotations a Hebrew פ rendered by *ph*, we should recognize an influence of the method of transliteration used in the second column of the Hexapla, although sometimes possibly derived from MSS. of the Septuagint, in which the transcription of Hebrew names was brought into accordance with that method. Transcribed Hebrew words in which a Hebrew פ is rendered by *f* are of special interest. In these we must see Jerome's own transcriptions, made in accord with the pronunciation which he heard in Palestine from his Jewish teachers. I may quote here from *Hieronymi Quaestiones Hebraicae in libro Geneseos*³ the following examples: *marahaefeth* מַרְחַפֶּת 1. 2; *afar* עָפָר 3. 14; *nifilim* הַנִּפְלִים 6. 4; *therafim* הַתְּרָפִים 31. 19; *Iafeth* יַפֶּת 9. 18; *Fut* פוֹט 10. 2; *Nefthum* נִפְתְּחִים 10. 13; *Arfaxad* אַרְפַּכְשָׁד 10. 24; *Salef* שָׁלַף 10. 26; *Ofir* אוֹפִיר 10. 29; *Fanuhal* פְּנוּאֵל (MT. פְּנִיאֵל) 32. 31; *Elifaz* אֱלִיפֹז 36. 4; *Efratha* אֶפְרַתָּה 35. 16.

This transcription of Hebrew פ is quite in accordance with Jerome's statement quoted above. There can be no doubt that Jerome (about A.D. 330–420) heard in Palestine the same pronunciation of Hebrew פ which Raba, the Babylonian Amora (A.D. 299–352), presupposes as the correct pronunciation of

¹ Cf. Siegfried, *ZATW.*, vol. iv, 1884, p. 63.

² Cf. above, p. 90.

³ ed. Paul de Lagarde, Lipsiae, 1868.

לְכַנָּף in the Shma', and that this correct pronunciation was *ha-kanaf f^{thil}*, just as the correct pronunciation presupposed by Raba was 'esebh *bh^ssadh^eka* or, according to what we have seen before, 'esebh *bh^ssadhakh*. It is quite certain that the double pronunciation of the BGDKFT fixed as alone 'correct' by the Masoretes in Tiberias and in Babylonia was earlier completely unknown to the most authoritative Jewish circles.

The first indication of a double pronunciation of these letters is to be found in the Sēpher Yešira, the earliest Cabbalistic writing of which we know, a book which has had great influence upon Jewish thought.¹ There is a shorter and a longer text of this book, greatly differing from one another. The shorter text is commented upon by Jewish authors in the second half of the tenth century and often in later times. On the longer text we have the commentary written by Sa'adya in the first half of the tenth century. Both texts must have been in existence at the end of the ninth century. We do not know when the book was composed. It is certain that Sa'adya regarded the book commented on by him as an old text.

In this book we find a double classification of Hebrew letters,² the first on phonetical principles with five groups: (1) אההע, (2) בומפ, (3) גיכק, (4) דטלנת, (5) זסצרש; the second differentiating between (1) 'the mothers', the three letters אמש, corresponding to the three elements air, water, fire, to the three seasons, &c.; (2) the seven letters with a double pronunciation, the letters בגדכפרת, corresponding to the seven planets, the seven heavens, &c.; (3) the other twelve letters with simple pronunciation, corresponding to the twelve signs of the Zodiac, the twelve months, &c.

It is of interest that the letter ר is connected here with the six BGDKFT. Sa'adya reports that he has himself heard the double pronunciation of the letter. According to him the double pronunciation of ר was only *heard* in Babylonia; it was heard and also marked in writing in Tiberias. In spite of this statement we find the double pronunciation of the letter marked in the Babylonian MS. or. qu. 680 of the Berlin Library,³ and no

¹ Cf. G. Scholem's article 'Jezira' in *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, vol. ix, cols. 104-11; Sarton, *History of Science*, ii. 367 f.

² Cf. W. Bacher, 'Die Anfänge der hebräischen Grammatik', in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. xlix, Leipzig, 1895, pp. 20-3.

³ Cf. my book *Der Masoretische Text des Alten Testaments nach der Überlieferung der Babylonischen Juden*, Leipzig, 1902, p. 44. Other older Babylonian Biblical MSS. in which ר is provided with Dagesh and Rafe are mentioned in *Masoreten des Ostens*.

Tiberian MS. is known to me in which the double pronunciation of ר is marked. The Tiberian Masoretes abandoned this double pronunciation, and under their influence the marking of the double pronunciation of the letter was abandoned in later Babylonian MSS. of the Bible also. Later Hebrew grammarians mention the difference in the pronunciation of the letter, but they no longer understand it.¹ We have here an interesting proof of the fact that the Masoretes have altered a pronunciation which, according to Sa'adya, was generally used in his time.

The two pronunciations of the seven letters are called קשה and רך in the Sēpher Yešira. This recalls Syriac ܩܫܝܝܐ and ܪܟܟܝܝܐ, the signs indicating the double pronunciation of the BGDKFT in Syriac. It was the great James of Edessa (A.D. 640-708) who, as far as we know, was the first to observe the double pronunciation of these letters in the Syriac language, and under his influence signs for the different pronunciations were introduced.² The signs indicating the plosive (hard) and the spirant (soft) pronunciation were at first not added regularly to the letters, but only in exceptional cases, and so *two* signs had to be introduced. Later these signs were added regularly to these letters in Syriac MSS.

The fragments of old Hebrew Biblical MSS. preserved in the Geniza show that the same method was adopted by the Jews. Here also the signs were added in exceptional cases only. So the existence of the *two* signs is to be explained in these Hebrew MSS. also. In later MSS. the two signs were added with regularity to all the letters in question. The names of the signs were altered; in the Babylonian Masora they were called Digsha and Kifya, in the Tiberian Masora Dagesh and Raphe.³ But the old names preserved in the Sēpher Yešira are valuable hints indicating the origin of this kind of pronunciation. It is very likely that the double pronunciation of the BGDKFT was introduced into Hebrew in the course of the eighth century A.D. The regular introduction of the signs was accomplished in Syriac and Hebrew Biblical MSS. during the ninth century. It is a curious coincidence that the oldest dated Masoretic Biblical MS. of the Syrians preserved to us, the famous British Museum MS. Add.

¹ I have quoted and discussed these statements in my former book, pp. 38-45.

² Cf. Rubens Duval, *Traité de Grammaire Syriacque*, Paris, 1881, pp. 112 ff.

³ Cf. my contribution to Bauer and Leander, *Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments*, vol. i, Halle, 1922, pp. 117-29.

12138,¹ was written at nearly the same time (A.D. 899) as the oldest dated Masoretic text of the Hebrew Bible preserved to us, the Ben Asher Codex of the Prophets in the Synagogue of the Karaites in Cairo (A.D. 895).

Conclusions

From the three illustrations of the Masoretic treatment of Hebrew phonology discussed above we can draw the following conclusions:

When in consequence of the Karaite movement the Hebrew Masoretes began their work on the text of the Bible, in Babylonia and in Tiberias, in the second half of the eighth century, they were convinced that the word of God should be read in the most perfect language they could imagine—just as were the Arabic readers of the Koran. These Arabic readers had adapted the text of the Koran to the ideal of classical Arabic which they found in the Arabic poetry of the Bedouin. The Masoretes had no model of classical Hebrew to which they could adapt the pronunciation of Hebrew. They were, however, convinced that the pronunciation of Hebrew at the time when they began their work was lax, inconsequent, imperfect. So they tried to create an ideal pronunciation of Hebrew for reading the word of God.

By introducing a number of new vowels for safeguarding the restored pronunciation of the gutturals they followed the example given by the Arabic readers of the Koran, who had introduced the Hamza sign for safeguarding the pronunciation of consonantal Alif which had not been pronounced in the language of the Koran as previously read.

By introducing a number of final vowels which may have existed once in Hebrew but had been lost already during the time when Hebrew was a real spoken language, they followed the example of the readers of the Koran who had introduced the final vowels, especially the I'rāb, according to Bedouin poetry, into the text of the Koran, where they had not previously been pronounced.

By introducing a double pronunciation of the BGDKFT, a pronunciation of which nothing was known to the most authoritative Jewish circles some centuries before, they followed the

¹ Cf. Theodor Weiss, *Zur Ostsyrischen Laut- und Akzentlehre auf Grund der ostsyrischen Massora-Handschrift des British Museum* (= *Bonner Orientalistische Studien*, Heft 5), Stuttgart, 1933. Here the text of Genesis is reproduced according to the British Museum MS. The earlier references to the MS. are mentioned by Weiss.

Syrians who had created special signs to indicate this double pronunciation, which they had observed in their spoken language.

We conclude, therefore, that the Masoretes altered and corrected the pronunciation of the Hebrew Biblical text which they had in their hands in three groups of cases, and that they did so under Arabic and Syriac influences. A consequence of this conclusion is that the whole system of Masoretic punctuation must now be subjected to very careful scrutiny. It has lost much of its former authoritative value.¹

No one will pretend that the pronunciation of Hebrew at the time when the Masoretes began their work was ideal, or was identical with the pronunciation of Hebrew while it was still a true living language. Its pronunciation had changed inevitably in many ways during the period of more than a thousand years, in which Hebrew was only the language of scholars and of religious services. Such changes may be the usual simplifications that arise in course of time. This possibility must be carefully taken into consideration. But corrections by the Masoretes must be considered as *corrections* by modern scientific grammar. Hebrew grammar can no longer be confined as formerly to the discovery of rules framed for it by the Masoretes. It must first of all try to distinguish between what is reconstruction and what is true tradition. Besides the Hebrew in transcription preserved from older times and the Hebrew as pronounced by the Samaritans, the material of the Geniza will have a very important part to play in this new endeavour.

Gotthelf Bergsträßer, in his article 'Ist die tiberiensische

¹ This is the conclusion really to be drawn from the material published by A. Sperber in his article 'Hebrew Grammar. A New Approach' (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. lxii, 1943, pp. 137–262). Sperber is quite right in his statement that Hebrew grammar cannot be based solely on Tiberian vocalization (§ 13); that we must 'first establish what is genuine Hebrew by eliminating the medieval Masoretic schematization' (§ 9) is a very sound principle. But Sperber himself—contrary to this principle—clings to all the little details of Masoretic punctuation. He even goes so far that he tries to make such inconsistencies the basis, not only for details of Hebrew grammar, but for central problems of general Semitic grammar also. It is clear that the problems connected with the Hebrew verb, the Hebrew construct case, the Hebrew prepositions, cannot be solved on the basis of inconsistencies of such a kind, without reference to analogous conditions in other Semitic languages. The evidence collected by Sperber shows that the Masoretes often did not follow the rules according to which they usually vocalized the forms in question. This evidence is valuable in so far as it corroborates the fact mentioned above. But no serious scholar will see with Sperber in irregularities of the Masoretes new revelations for solving problems of general Semitic grammar.

Vokalisation eine Rekonstruktion?"¹ says: 'Is such a daring reform as Kahle supposes² thinkable in these centuries bound by tradition? Hardly, least of all if the vocalization does in fact go back to the Masoretes. For what we know of their activity shows an obstinate clinging to the smallest details of what was transmitted to them.'

What we knew until recently of the activity of the Masoretes was not very reliable as it was impossible to go behind the text created by them. But given now the material found in the Geniza, it should be possible to arrive at a truly historical understanding of their work. There is no doubt that the Jews owe the uniform text of the Bible to the work of the Masoretes. Looking back from this final achievement the verdict of Bergsträßer concerning the character of the Masora is understandable. But it has only the same value as, for instance, the statement that the Law codified in the Mishna is identical with the Oral Law revealed, together with the written Law, to Moses on Sinai. Both are articles of faith to the pious Jew. But science cannot be based on such principles, it must be established on the data of history.

APPENDIX II (see pp. 56 ff.)

THE COLOPHONS OF THE BEN ASHER CODEX OF THE PROPHETS, DATED A.D. 895, PRESERVED IN THE SYNAGOGUE OF THE KARAITES IN CAIRO

(a) *Written by Moshe ben Asher himself*

I (p. 585)

זה הדיפטר מה שזכה יעבץ בן שלמה הבבלי נח נפש ועשה אותו לעצמו להגות בו מעמלו ומיגיע כפיו ומזיעת אפו לכבוד אלהי ישראל שיאמר יוצר נשמות ויזכהו להגות בו ולנצור ולשמור כל דבר שיש בו ויתן לו חלק טוב ולב טוב וגורל נעים בעולם הזה ושכר טוב לעולם הבא ויזכה יעבץ בן שלמה נוח נפש לחזות בנועם יי' ולבקר בהיכלו ויתן לו אלהי ישראל בנים ובני בנים הוגים בתורה ועסוקים במצוות וכל הברכות הכלולות בתורה ובגב ובכתובים יחולו על ראשו ועל זרעו וכל ישראל בכלל ברכה אמן

This is the Parchment which Ya'beš b. Shelomo ha-Babli—may (his) soul find rest—has acquired, and he has prepared it for himself, for

¹ In *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, 1924, no. 26. I have translated the passage.

² Bergsträßer refers here to my article 'Die überlieferte Aussprache des Hebräischen und die Punktation der Masoreten', in *ZATW.*, vol. xxxix, 1921, pp. 230-9.

studying in it, by his work and the labour of his hands and the sweat of his face, for the honour of the God of Israel, who is called Fashioner of souls (cf. Isa. 57. 16). And he has acquired it for studying in it and for observing and keeping every word which is in it; and may He give him a good portion and a good heart and a pleasant lot in this world and a good reward for the world to come! And may it be granted to Ya'beš b. Shelomo—may (his) soul find rest—to see the grace of the Lord and to contemplate in His temple (Ps. 27. 4)! And may the God of Israel give him sons and sons of sons, studying in the Tora and engaged in the commandments! And may all the blessings contained in the Tora, the Prophets, and the Writings come upon his head and upon his offspring, and all Israel is included in the blessing. Amen.

II (p. 586)

אני משה בן אשר כתבתי זה המחזור שלמקרא על פי כיד אלהי הטובה עלי באר היטב במדינת מעוזה טבריה העיר ההוללה כשהבינו עדת נביאים בחורי יי' קדושי אלהינו המבינים כל נסתרות והמשפירים סוד חכמה אילי הצדק אנשי אמנה לא כיחדו דבר ממה שניתן להם ולא הוסיפו מאמר על מה שנימסר להם והעצימו והגדילו המק עשרים וארבעה ספרים וייסודם באמונתם בטעמי שכל בפירוש דיבור בחיך מתוק ביופי מאמר יהי רצון מלפני יוצרנו שיאיר עינינו ויגיה לבנו בתורתו ללמד וללמד ולעשות בלב שלם ובנפש חפצה ולכלל ישראל אמן

נכתב לקץ שמונה מאות שנה ועשרים ושבע שנים לחורבן הבית השני שיאמר יוצר נשמות וישוב עליו ברחמים ויבנהו באבני אקדה וספיר וכדכד בנין שלם בנין מקויים בנין שלא ינתש ולא יהרס ולא ינתץ לעולם ולעולמי עולמים במהרה בימינו ובימי כל ישראל אמן וכל המשנה מן המחזור הזה או מן הגשתון הזה דבר או מוחק ממנו אות או קורע ממנו דף אלא אם כן יבין וידע שיש בו דבר ששגינו בו בכתב או בניקוד או במסרת או בחסר או ביתר אל יהי לו לא מחילה ולא סליחה ואל יחזה בנעם יי' ולא יראה בטוב הצפון ליריאי ויהיה כאשה נדה וכמצורע מוסגר לכתת אבריו ולשבור גאון עזו ולכלות בשרו מראי ולשפות עצמותיו שלא יראו אמן הקורא ישמע והשמע יבין והראה ישכיל שלום

I, Moshe b. Asher, have written this Maḥzor of the Scriptures, according to 'the good hand of my God upon me' (Neh. 2. 8), 'very plainly' (Deut. 27. 8), in the city of Ma'azya-Ṭabariyya, 'the renowned city' (Ezek. 26. 17), as it was understood by the congregation of the Prophets, the chosen of the Lord, the Saints of our God, who understood all the hidden things and embellished the secret of wisdom, the chiefs of righteousness, the men of faith. They have not concealed anything of what was given to them, and they have not added a word to what

was transmitted to them, and they have strengthened and made mighty the Scriptures, the Twenty-Four Books, and they have established them in their integrity, with explanatory accents, with a commentary of pronunciation, with sweet palate and beauty of speech—may it be the will of our creator to enlighten our eyes, and to illuminate our heart in His Tora, to learn and to teach and to act 'with a perfect heart and with a willing mind' (1 Chron. 28. 9)—and for all Israel! Amen.

It was written at the end of the year 827 after the destruction of the Second Temple, about which may the Fashioner of souls ordain, and may he return to it in compassion, and may he build it with rubies and sapphires and carbuncles (Isa. 54. 11, 12) as a perfect building, as a well-established building, a building which shall neither be plucked up, nor demolished, nor destroyed, for ever and for ever and ever, speedily, in our days, and in the days of all Israel. Amen!

Whoever alters a word of this Mahzor or of this writing, or erases from it a letter, or tears off from it a leaf—except that he understands and knows that there is in it a word in which we have erred, in writing, or in punctuation, or in Masora, or in defective or in plene, let him not have pardon or forgiveness, neither let him behold the beauty of the Lord (Ps. 27. 4), nor let him see the good that is reserved for those who fear Him (Jer. 29. 32). He shall be like a woman in impurity, and like a leprous man who has to be locked up, so that his limbs may be crushed, the pride of his power be broken, his flesh be consumed away that it cannot be seen, and his bones that are not seen stick out (Job 33. 21). Amen.

Whoever reads shall hear, whoever hears shall understand, whoever sees shall perceive! Peace!

(b) *Written by other hands*

III (p. 583)

זה הדפתר שמונה נביאים שהקדיש אותו יעבץ בן שלמה בירושלם עיר הקדש אלהים יכונניה עד עולם סלה ללקראין העושים את המועדים על ראות הירח יקראו בו כלם בשבתות ובחדשים ובמועדים לא ימכר ולא יקנה וכל מי שיגוב אותו * או ימכור אותו או יקנה אותו או יעבט אותו ארור הוא לאלהי ישראל וכל מי שישמור אותו ויקים מצות יעבץ בן שלמה בעל הדפתר הזה יהיה ישמרהו ויחייהו ואשר בארץ:

* Addition on the margin:

או יוציא אותו מחצר יעבץ בן שלמה יהי אחריתו להכרית בדור אחד ימח שמם:

This is the Parchment (Codex), the Eight Prophets, which Ya'beš b. Shelomo has consecrated in Jerusalem, the Holy city—may God establish it for ever, Sela!—for the Ḳaraïtes who celebrate the feasts

at seeing the moon.¹ May they all read in it on Sabbath days and at new moons and at the feasts! It shall not be sold or be bought, and whoever steals it* or sells it or buys it or pawns it, cursed be he by the God of Israel! And may God preserve him and give him life and everybody in the land whoever preserves it and keeps the prescription of Ya'beš b. Shelomo, the owner of this Parchment.

* (Added on the margin): or brings it out of the court of Ya'beš b. Shelomo, may his end be—to be cut off. May their names be effaced in one generation!

IV (p. 588)

זה הדפתר אשר הקדיש יעבץ בן שלמה ללקראין בירושלם עיר הקדש לא ימכר ולא יגאל ולא יעבט ולא יוציא אותו מביתו וארורים הם בשם יהוה אלהי ישראל כל מוכריו וכל קוניו וכל מוציאיו מחצר יעבץ בן שלמה בעל הדפתר הזה ולא יאבה יהוה סלוח להם כי אז יעשן אף יהוה וקנאתו בהם ורבצה בהם כל האלה הכתובה בספר הזה ומחה יהוה את שמם מתחת השמים: והבדילים יהוה לרעה מכל שבטי יש וכל הקללות הכתובות בכל ספרי המקרא ידבקו בהם ובזרעם אמן וברוכים הם בשם יהוה כל שומריו והקוראים בו בלב אמת יחיו ויראו ישועת ישראל אמן

This is the Parchment Codex which Ya'beš b. Shelomo has consecrated for the Ḳaraïtes in Jerusalem, the Holy City. May it neither be sold nor bought back nor be pawned! May they not bring it out from his house! And cursed be in the name of the Lord, the God of Israel, all that sell it and all that buy it and all that bring it out from the court of Ya'beš b. Shelomo, the owner of this Parchment, and may the Lord not be willing to pardon them, for then shall the anger of the Lord and His jealousy smoke against them, and all the curse that is written in this book shall lie upon them, and the Lord shall blot out their name from under heaven (Deut. 29. 20)! And the Lord shall separate them for evil from all the tribes of Israel! And may all the curses that are written in all the books of the Bible cling to them and to their descendants! Amen!

And blessed in the name of the Lord be all those who preserve it and who read in it with sincere heart! May they live and see the salvation of Israel! Amen!

V (p. 582)

זה הדפתר הנביאים שהקדיש אותו יעבץ בן שלמה אלכלפי בירושלם עיר הקדש אלהים יכונניה עד עולם ללקראין אשר יעשו

¹ The Jewish festivals were fixed by observation of the moon in older times. Later a final system of calendation was introduced and generally adopted by the Jews. The Ḳaraïtes retained the old system. The authors of this colophon and of colophon V refer to this old Ḳaraïte custom.

את המועדים ביראת הירחים יקראו בו כלם ולא ימנע אחד מהם מלקרות בו במקום אשר הוא מונה בו בשבתות ובחדשים ובמועדים ולא ימכר ולא יקנה וכל מי שיגנוב אותו או ימכור אותו או יקנה אותו או יעבוט אותו ארור הוא לאלהי ישראל וכל מי שישמור אותו ויקרא בו יהיה ישמרהו ויחייהו ואשר בארץ וכל מי אשר יוציא אותו מחצר יעבץ בן שלמה ימחה מספר חיים ועם צדיקים אל ימנה אמן: וברוכים הם בשם יהוה כל שומריהו והקוראים בו באמת אמן

This is the Parchment Codex, the Prophets, which Ya'beš b. Shelomo al-Kalfi has consecrated in Jerusalem, the Holy city—may God establish it for ever—for the Ḳaraite who celebrate the feasts at the sight of the moons—may they all read in it and may none of them be prevented from reading in it, at the place where it is deposited, on the Sabbath days, at the new moons, and at the feasts. And it shall not be sold or bought! And whoever steals it or sells it or buys it or pawns it—cursed be he by the God of Israel. And whoever preserves it and reads in it, may God preserve him and give him life and those who are in the land. And whoever brings it out from the court of Ya'beš b. Shelomo, may he be effaced from the book of life and not be counted with the righteous ones! Amen! And blessed in the name of the Lord be all that preserve it and read in it in sincerity. Amen!

VI (p. 581)

זה הספר הנביאים קדש לי יי אלהים אלהי יש הקדיש אותו אחרי גאולתו השר הגדול דויד בן השר הגדול יפת נצר אלסכנדרי על עדת בני מקרא לקראת בו בימי השבתות והתעניות בכנסת אלקארה תב[נה] ותכ[ונן] ואם הוא או איש מזרעו יושב ישימהו השמש לפניו: ואין רשות לאדם להוציאו מבית הכנסת כי אם חס ושלום לצורך וישיבהו בעת ההשקט וכל המחליף התנאי הזה או הקדושה הזאת ארור הוא לי יי וכל הקללות ידבקו בו וכל השומרו והקורא בו והמשיבו אל מקומו אחר הרוגו ברוך הוא בשם יי וכל הברכות והשכר הטוב והשלומות יחולו על ראשו ועל ראש המקדיש השר דויד וזרעו עד סוף כל הדורות וכל ישראל:

This book, the Prophets, is consecrated to the Lord God, the God of Israel. The great lord David, the son of the great lord Yepheth Neker al-Iskenderi has consecrated it after its redemption for the Community of the Bne Miḳra to read in it on Sabbath days and on fast days, in the Synagogue of al-Ḳāhira—may it be built and established. And when he or somebody of his descendants is sitting, the servant shall set it before him. And it shall not be allowed to anybody to bring it out of the Synagogue except it is done—may God prevent that—by force; And he shall return it in the time of appeasing. Whoever contradicts

¹ The word is altered and cannot be read clearly on the photograph.

this condition and donation, cursed be he by the Lord, and may all the curses cling to him. Whoever keeps it and reads in it and puts it back to its place after the wrath—blessed be he in the name of the Lord and may all the blessings and the good reward and the greetings [rest upon] his head and the head of him who consecrated it, [namely] the lord David and his descendants until the end of all generations and all Israel!

APPENDIX III (cf. pp. 79 ff.)

AL-FARRĀ' (died A.D. 821) ON READING THE KORAN

MS. Arab. 705 of the Chester Beatty Collection, foll. 4-7

قال القراء وقد رأينا أهل القراءة الذين يعرفون الكتاب والسنة من أهل الفصاحة اجتمعوا على أنه نزل بأفصح اللغات فاعترض في ذلك اقوام ممن ينظر في الأشعار وأيام العرب فقالوا إنما فضل القرآن من فضله لما أوجب الله من تعظيم القرآن فإذا صرنا إلى الفصاحة وجدناها في أهل البوادي واختلفوا في ذلك فقال أهل الكوفة الفصاحة في أسد لقريهم جوارهم منهم فقال أهل البصرة الفصاحة في عليا تميم وسفلى قيس من عكل وعقيل وقال أهل المدينة الفصاحة في غطفان لأنهم جيرانهم وقال أهل مكة الفصاحة في كنانة بن سعد بن بكر وثقيف فأجبنا أن نردهم بالاثار والقياس والاعتبار إلى تفضيل لغة قريش على سائر اللغات فقلنا ما بال قريش فضلت الناس في حسن صورها والنبل في رأيها والبسطة في اجسامها قالوا نحن اعلم الناس بهذا إنما اتاهم النبل والجمال أن العرب تأتي البيت الحرام للحج والعمرة نساهم ورجالهم فيطفن النساء بالبيت جواسر ويشهدن المناسك سوافر فيتخيرونهن على العيان فيتبقون الشرف والجمال فمن ذاك اتاهم الفضل معما خصوا به قلنا وكذلك كانوا يسمعون من أحياء العرب اللغات فيختارون من كل لغة أحسنها فصفى كلامهم ولم يخالطه شيء من اللغات الشنعة إلا ترى أنك لا تجد في كلامهم عننة¹ تميم ولا عجرية قيس ولا كسكة ربيعة ولا الكسر الذي تسمعه من قيس وتميم مثل تعلمون تعلم ومثل يعير وشعير بكسر التاء والباء والسين والشين فانتهم الفصاحة من تخييرهم الكلام كما اختاروا المناكح فكان في هذا كسر لقولهم ورجوع إلى قول من هو أعلم بالقرآن منهم

¹ MS. عنه.

قال وقد بلغنا مع ذلك ان عمر بن الخطاب قال يرسل الله انك لتأتينا بكلام من كلام العرب ما نعرفه واتنا لنحن العرب حقاً فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ان ربي علمني فتعلمت وادبني فتادبت فان فضل القرآن على ساير الكلام كفضل الله على خلقه

قال وسمع عمر بن الخطاب رجلاً يقرأ عتي حين يريد حتى حين فقال من أقرأك هذا قال عبد الله بن مسعود قال فكتب الى عبد الله ان القرآن نزل بلغة قريش ولم ينزل بلغة هذيل فأقرئ الناس بلغة قريش ولا تُقرئهم بلغة هذيل وقال ابو بكر الصديق رحمه الله ان إعراب القرآن لأحب الي من حفظ بعض حروفه

وروى ابو هريرة قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم تعلموا القرآن والتمسوا غريبه

وقال ابن مسعود جردوا وزينوه بأحسن الاصوات وأعربوه فإنه عربي والله يحب ان يعرب

وكان بن عمر يضرب ولده على اللحن

وقال مجاهد لان أخطي بالاية أحب الي من ان ألحن في كتاب الله

وقال وممر عمر يقوم يتناضلون فلحن احدهم فقال عمر سوء اللحن اقبح من سوء الرمي

وروى عبد الملك بن عمير قال قال عمر بن الخطاب لا يملين مصاحفنا الا غلمان قريش وثقيف

قال محمد بن سعد ان حدثنا عبد الوهاب بن عطا الخفاف عن سعيد عن قتادة عن زارة بن اوفى عن سعد بن هشام عن عايشة عن النبي ... قال الماهر بالقران مع السفرة الكرام البررة والذي يقرأه وهو عليه شاق يتتبع فيه فله اجران

THIRD LECTURE

THE TRANSLATIONS OF THE BIBLE

TARGUM, SEPTUAGINT, PESHITTA, SYRIAC GOSPELS, DIATESSARON

THE TARGUMS

IF we speak of Targums, we think in the first instance of Targum Onkelos to the Tora and of Targum Jonathan to the Prophets. These are the two official Jewish Targums, and there is no doubt that they were composed in Babylonia. In the Geniza quite a number of fragments of these Targums were found, provided with real Babylonian punctuation, and not the smallest fragment of any other Targum with this kind of punctuation is known to us. It is clear that only these two Targums were used in Babylonia, and that for a long time.

The name Onkelos by which the Targum to the Tora is generally known is nothing else than Aquila. Aquila was the author of the new Greek translation of the Bible which became necessary in the second century A.D. in connexion with the Jewish reorganization which took place after the capture of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple. The old Greek translation, the Septuagint, could not be used any more by the Jews, because it was not in accordance with the text of the Tora newly fixed according to old MSS., which were said to have come from the Temple, nor with its official interpretation according to the oral law which they began to codify in the Mishna at that time, and which became a guide to the new interpretation of the Law. So a new Greek translation had to be provided which fulfilled these requirements, and this was the translation made by Aquila.

The author of the new Greek translation is quoted several times in the Palestinian Talmud and other Palestinian sources. The name is rendered here as עקילס. In the Babylonian Talmud the name is altered to Onkelos (אונקלוס). Of Onkelos several things are narrated, but generally no Bible translation is connected with that name. There is only one place in the Babylonian Talmud where the Targum to the Tora is attributed to 'Onkelos the proselyte' (אונקלוס הגר, Megilla 3a), and in the same place Jonathan ben 'Uzziel is given as author of the Targum to the Prophets. This reference in the Babylonian Talmud is the only evidence for connecting the two Babylonian Targums with these two names.

But the Babylonian Talmud depends here on the Palestinian Talmud, where we find, in Megilla 1. 9, information concerning the Greek version of Aquilas (אֶקִילָס).¹ In Babylonia not much was known of the Greek version of the Bible, and so the name, altered to Onkelos (אֹנְקֵלוֹס), was connected with the Aramaic version of the Tora. Targums are generally not made by single authors and they are mostly anonymous, and no author of the Babylonian Targum is really known.² It is most likely that several persons, or probably special commissions, were engaged in fixing the texts of these authorized versions. But the name Onkelos was quite a suitable designation of the new official Aramaic version of the Tora. This Targum was intended to give to Aramaic-speaking Jews a help for the correct interpretation of the Holy Law such as was given by the Greek version of Aquila to Greek-speaking Jews. And the name Jonathan, connected with the Targum of the Prophets, is, as Luzzatto has already suggested,³ nothing else than a translation of the Greek name Theodotion. Theodotion had revised an old text of the Greek Bible according to the newly fixed Hebrew text and its official interpretation. So his name, in the Hebrew form Jonathan, was connected with the new Babylonian Targum to the Prophets, which was in itself more a revision of older material than a new translation. Later the author of the Targum was connected with Jonathan ben 'Uzziel, a pupil of Hillel. The two Greek versions—Aquila and Theodotion—were well known in Jewish circles of that time and were accepted by Origen in his great Biblical work, the Hexapla.⁴

Nobody would take the Greek of Aquila to be excellent Greek. Burkitt, in his edition of the Geniza fragments of Aquila's version, comes to the conclusion:⁵

As regards the version of Aquila itself, the Cairo MS. shows that it

¹ Cf. Ludwig Blau, in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, vol. ix, 1897, p. 738 f.

² It is very doubtful how far we can connect Rab Joseph b. Hama (died 325) with these Targums. Cf. about him A. Geiger, *Urschrift . . .*, 1857, p. 164; L. Zunz, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge . . .*, p. 69.

³ Vgl. S. D. Luzzatto: *Nachträgliches über die Thargumim*, in *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie . . . herausgegeben von Abraham Geiger* vol. v, Grünberg und Leipzig, 1844, pp. 124–36. The way in which Luzzatto here characterizes Hebrew Babylonian Targums is worth studying even to-day. Cf. Abraham Geiger, *Urschrift . . .*, p. 164.

⁴ Instead of Theodotion sometimes other translations are to be found in the Hexapla, so for instance in the palimpsest discovered by Cardinal G. Mercati in the Ambrosian Library in Milan. See below.

⁵ Cf. *Fragments of the Books of Kings according to . . . Aquila*, ed. by F. Crawford Burkitt, Cambridge, 1897, p. 32.

was fully as awkward and pedantic as the scattered notes in the Hexapla would lead us to believe.

As Aramaic is more closely connected with Hebrew than Greek is, we may say that the Aramaic of Onkelos is somewhat better than the Greek of Aquila. It is pedantic too, but perhaps not so awkward. But the language of Onkelos is a special problem. Aramaic had become the universal language in the Persian Empire and had as such been accepted also by the Jews; it continued in use in Babylonia and in Palestine up to the time when it was replaced by Arabic. Books were written in a literary Aramaic which was understood everywhere in Aramaic-speaking countries. We have a specimen of this language in the Aramaic parts of the book of Daniel. A later development of it was the basis of Targum Onkelos. Such a neutral language was intentionally chosen for the purpose in order that the Targum might be understood everywhere in the Aramaic-speaking world. But this literary language was strongly influenced by the pedantic way in which the translators tried to imitate the Hebrew text in every detail. 'It is a learned and artificial imitation of the Hebrew original, in which Aramaic was treated in a similar way to Greek in the translation of Aquila'; so G. Dalman describes the language of Onkelos.¹ He adds 'originating in the same circles', but this is not correct, as I shall show later on.

Further, as Aquila's translation was in accordance with the oral law which the Jews began to codify in the Mishna in Rabbi Akiba's time, so the Targum Onkelos represents—but in a much higher degree—the official Jewish interpretation of the Tora. It is everywhere in accordance with the Halakha, the 'doctrine', as codified in the Mishna and developed later in the Talmud. Such an official text cannot have been definitively fixed before the fifth century A.D.

And it has a fixed text, it is an authorized version. It existed in two editions which show slight variations and were connected respectively with the Jewish Academies of Sura and Nehardea in Babylonia—with these academies were also connected distinctive readings in Babylonian Biblical MSS. But except for these differences, variants in MSS. and printed editions of the Targum are in general confined to instances where the copyists or editors tried to imitate still more closely the Hebrew text in all details, in the order of words, in *plene* and *defective* writing and similar things.

¹ Cf. G. Dalman, *Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch*, 2nd edition, Leipzig, 1905, p. 13.

The various readings of the two editions of the Targum are preserved in a Masora which was added to the Targum in Babylonia. The language of this Masora is in accordance with that of the Masora added to Biblical MSS. in Babylonia of which we have spoken.¹ The Masora of the Targum is used in the edition of the Targum published at Sabbioneta in 1557; it is known to the author of the 'Patshegen', a kind of commentary on the Targum, which was discovered by Luzzatto and published by Nathan Adler in his edition of the Tora, Wilna, 1874. The Masora itself is published, somewhat amateurishly, by Abraham Berliner according to MSS. he had found in Italy,² and again, in alphabetical order and in a more learned way, by S. Landauer.³ But even this edition was made without a real understanding of the problems connected with it. In Tiberian MSS. where these Masoretic notes are mostly preserved, they are often in great confusion, and Landauer did not know how to deal with this heterogeneous material. In the Geniza important material for this Masora has been preserved, sometimes in Babylonian MSS. which were provided with Babylonian vowels, and these notes are very exact and valuable. An edition of this material has been prepared by Mr. A. McIntosh, though it is not yet published. But a new edition of the whole Masora will be necessary. It will have to serve as a basis for a new edition of the Targum. The method by which it will have to be made will differ greatly from the methods adopted by Berliner and by Landauer. I may refer here to my statements in *Masoreten des Ostens*, pp. 207-11.

The Targum to the Prophets is composed in nearly the same language as the Targum Onkelos. But it contains much more Haggadic material (cf. for instance Isa. 10. 32), and it has not the same authority as Targum Onkelos. Also it has no Masora.

Abraham Geiger has shown that these official Targums, which were definitively fixed in Babylonia not before the fifth century A.D., must have been preceded by other Targums, and he suggested that in the so-called Jerushalmi Targums to the Penta-

¹ Cf. my second Lecture, p. 42.

² It was published first in the *Jahresbericht des Rabbinerseminars*, Berlin, 1874/5, later, more completely, in a special book: *Die Massorah zum Targum Onkelos, enthaltend Massorah magna und Massorah parva; nach Handschriften und unter Benutzung von seltenen Ausgaben zum ersten Male ediert und commentiert von A. Berliner*, Leipzig, 1877.

³ 'Die Masorah zum Onkelos, auf Grund neuer Quellen lexikalisch geordnet und kritisch beleuchtet', von S. Landauer, Amsterdam (1896), first published in the periodical *Israelitische Letterbode*, 1896.

teuch there is preserved old material some of which may go back to pre-Christian times.¹ L. Zunz was already convinced that some parts in these Targums must go back to very ancient times.² But these Targums also contained many later passages, and a clear separation was formerly very difficult, as no piece of a MS. of this old Palestinian Targum had been preserved. Now in the Geniza I have found, on fragments of several MSS., remnants of this old Palestinian Targum to the Tora. They are published in *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. ii, pp. 1-65.

Like so many texts preserved in the Geniza, these fragments are scattered among different libraries. Of one splendid MS. called by me C, of which I have given a facsimile on plate 2 of my book, a double leaf is in No. 542 of the Antonin Collection in Leningrad; another double leaf, belonging to the same quire, is in MS. Heb. c. 4, fols. 18/19 in Oxford. Of another similar MS., called by me B, one leaf is in No. 739 of the Antonin Collection in Leningrad. Of another similar MS., called by me D (facsimile plate 3), parts of fourteen leaves are in Box B. 8 of the Taylor-Schechter Collection in Cambridge. These fragments B, C, D are the remnants of three magnificent MSS. written on large folios of parchment. The Hebrew text is followed here verse by verse by the Targum, not by the Targum Onkelos, but by the old Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch. These three MSS. are provided with Tiberian punctuation, added to the Hebrew text as well as to the text of the Targum. If we compare all the details of this punctuation in the Hebrew text with the punctuation of the Ben Asher text of the Bible, we have to recognize that the former must be somewhat older.³ It is most likely that these MSS. were written earlier in the ninth century A.D.

Of another MS., called by me E (facsimile on plate 4), I know of twelve leaves, of which six are in Oxford, bound in three different volumes of Geniza fragments (MS. Heb. d. 49, fols. 47/48; e. 43, fols. 66/67; d. 26, fols. 15/16), two leaves are in Cambridge in Box B. 8 of the Taylor-Schechter Collection, and four are in Leningrad in Nos. 111 and 120 of the Antonin Collection. This MS. was originally without vowel-points; later some parts were provided with Palestinian vowel-points, others with

¹ Cf. *Urschrift* . . ., pp. 451 ff.

² Cf. *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, historisch entwickelt*, 2nd edition, 1892, pp. 70 ff.

³ The little differences in the punctuation of the Hebrew text in these fragments and in the Ben Asher text I have published in *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. ii, p. 2*, note 1.

Tiberian punctuation; others were left without any at all. The consonantal text of this MS. seems to have been written in the seventh century.

Another MS. containing festival pericopes taken from the same Targum, called by me F (facsimile on plate 5), is in Oxford in MS. Heb. e. 43, fols. 57-65. It is written without vowel-points. A few more fragments of this Targum are in New York.¹

But the most important fragment of this Targum is preserved in Cambridge, mounted between glass, as MS. 20. 155 of the Taylor-Schechter Collection. It is a piece of a scroll of parchment of which parts of four columns are preserved. I have called this fragment A and have given a facsimile of it on plate 1 of my book. It is provided with Palestinian punctuation of the older type, and may have been written in the sixth century A.D. A few Tiberian vowels and accents are added by later hands. In this fragment parts of the Palestinian Targum to Exod. 21. 1-22. 27 are preserved, each verse of the Targum being introduced by a few words from the beginning of the verse in Hebrew. The beginning of the 15th Seder of the book of Exodus is marked before Exod. 21. 1 by [יה], the beginning of the 16th Seder before Exod. 22. 24 by [ין].

As this text contains juridical matter which has been the basis for important parts of the oral law as codified in the Mishna, we have here one of the very few cases in which we can make a suggestion about the age of the translation contained in this Targum. The Mishna tractate Baba Kamma begins with the words ארבעה אבות נזיקין השור והבור והמבעה וההבער; here four kinds of damage done to the field of a neighbour are enumerated: the first, השור, refers to Exod. 21. 35 ff., the second, הבור, to Exod. 21. 33, and there is no doubt that המבעה and ההבער refer to Exod. 22. 4 and 5. In the Revised Version these two verses, numbered as vss. 5 and 6, are translated in the following way:

5. If a man shall cause a field or vineyard to be eaten, and shall let his beast loose, and it feed in another man's field; of the best of his own field, and of the best of his own vineyard, shall he make restitution.

6. If fire break out, and catch in thorns, so that the shocks of corn, or the standing corn, or the field, be consumed; he that kindled the fire shall surely make restitution.

This translation is in general accord with the official Jewish interpretation of the text, and is presupposed in Mishna and

¹ An edition of these New York fragments has been prepared by Mr. Alastair McIntosh.

Talmud. The difficulty is that words of the same Hebrew root occurring in the two verses (בער, בעירה, בער in vs. 4; בער, המבער in vs. 5) are understood once as *beast* and *to be eaten*, and once as *fire* and *to be consumed*. In the Palestinian Targum as we have it in the Cambridge fragment the Hebrew words are understood in both verses as *fire* and *to be consumed*, and the difference is that, in one instance, the man visits the field of his neighbour and lights a fire there, in the other instance he makes a fire on his own ground and this fire spreads over to the field of his neighbour. The following is the text of the Targum:

4. ארום יבקר גבר חקל או כרם וישלח ית יקידתה ויוכל בחקלה דאחרן בית שפר חקלה ובית שפר כרמה ישלם: 5. ארום תפוק אש ותשכח קוצנן ותיכול גדישין [או קמ] או חקלה משלמה ישלם מן דמוקד ית יקידתה:

It is interesting to state that in the new American Bible¹ J. Meek has translated the two verses in general accordance with the old Targum:

If a man in burning over a field or vineyard lets the fire spread so that it burns in another man's field, he must make restitution with the very best of his own field or vineyard. If fire breaks out and catches in a thorn-hedge so that the shocks of grain or the standing grain or the field itself is consumed, he who lit the fire must make restitution.

But this interpretation is in clear contrast to all the official Jewish authorities² and can be understood in an old Jewish text only on the assumption that it goes back to very ancient times, before the oral law codified in the Mishna had any validity. That such a translation is preserved in an old scroll of the Palestinian Targum is certainly of importance. It shows that written Targums must have existed in very ancient times. For this fact we have other proofs. We have the well-known notice concerning the Targum of Job, which when shown to Rabbi

¹ *The Bible: An American Translation: The Old Testament*, translated by a group of scholars under the editorship of J. M. Powis Smith; *The New Testament*, translated by Edgar J. Goodspeed, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, 1936.

² It is quite interesting to see how a real Talmudic scholar like J. J. Weinberg cannot admit that a Targum should translate the Hebrew text in such a way contrary to the Mishna. According to him, either the text of the Targum must be regarded as corrupt, or we have to suppose that the first יקידתה is a form newly created on the analogy of the Hebrew text in the meaning of 'cattle'. It is true that usually such texts have been destroyed. He deals with this text in his book *מחקרים בתלמוד*, vol. i, Berlin, 1938, p. 63 f.

Gamaliel was promptly ordered to be immured in the still incomplete temple walls.¹ A. T. Olmstead, who refers to this notice in his article 'Could an Aramaic Gospel be written?'² remarks rightly that this Targum was certainly not composed in the time of Rabbi Gamaliel (c. A.D. 50). It must be much older, and it seems to be quoted already in the Greek translation of Job where we read, 42. 17b in all the important uncial codices: 'This is translated from the Syrian book',³ which can scarcely mean anything else than the Aramaic Targum. Besides, Olmstead is quite right when he states that a Targum to Job must have been preceded by Targums to the Tora and to the Prophets, and he has collected, in collaboration with Samuel I. Feigin, a number of instances in the different Targums which we find in the Rabbinic Bibles which can be understood only on the assumption that we have here before us material of pre-Christian origin. The present fragment of the Targum to Exodus is a very important addition to these instances.

We have seen how urgently the Jews in Palestine needed Aramaic translations of Biblical texts, and it seems likely that the Jewish tradition which connects the origin of the Targum with Ezra⁴ is quite correct. We need not be surprised that these old texts are mostly lost. In the Cambridge fragment we have an interesting specimen of a text which did not agree with the official interpretation of later times. It must be regarded as a special chance that the text has survived. Only when written in *Greek* were Jewish texts of this time preserved, and they were preserved not by Jews but by Christians, who were interested in books like those found in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, in the works of Philo and Josephus and similar texts. But Christians who might have been interested in texts written in *Aramaic* had lost their influence after the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. Edgar J. Goodspeed has *inter alia* completely overlooked the reasons for the disappearance of the Jewish Aramaic literature of that time in his article 'The Possible Aramaic Gospel', his answer to Olmstead's article quoted above.⁵

¹ The notice is to be found in the Palestinian Talmud (Shabbath 15, c), in the Babylonian Talmud (Shabbath 115, a), in the Tosephta (Shabbath 13, 2. 3), and in Maseket Soferim (5, 17).

² In *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, vol. i, Chicago, 1942, pp. 41-75.

³ Cf. Olmstead, pp. 59 ff. The Greek text (in Swete's edition, ii, p. 602) is: Οὗτος ἐρμηνεύεται ἐκ τῆς Συριακῆς βίβλου.

⁴ In b. Megilla 3 a, Neh. 8. 8 is quoted and added: תורת האלהים זה מקרא מפורש זה תרגום

⁵ Cf. Edgar J. Goodspeed in the same journal, i, 1942, pp. 315-40.

It would be a great mistake to think of this old Palestinian Targum of the Tora as analogous to the Targum Onkelos. The Palestinian Targum was no authorized version; it was made for practical purposes and had no fixed text. We see this in the fragments preserved in the Geniza; two sections of the Targum, Gen. 38. 16 ff. and 42. 30 ff., are preserved in the MSS. D and E. A comparison of the texts in these two MSS. shows that the differences are relatively important. In this respect the conditions are similar to those in the Samaritan Targum which—as we have seen—has always remained in the more primitive stage of a Targum where nearly every MS. has its special text.

There is another difference between the two Targums: the Palestinian Targum was not a simple translation of the Hebrew Bible text, but contained in some verses longer or shorter explanations of a midrashic and homiletic character. Sometimes the translation and explanation of a single verse occupies up to half a page in a MS. In the texts I have published quite a number of examples of these longer explanations are to be found. Others of the same kind are found in the so-called 'Targum Yerushalmi', which consists exclusively of midrashic explanations of single verses. The continuous translation has not been preserved. The Targum consists of fragments only, and is therefore called 'Fragmententargum', 'Fragmentary Targum'.¹ From the newly found texts we see now that this Targum is nothing else than a collection of the midrashic explanations of single verses taken from the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch. This material was not to be found in the Targum Onkelos. The continuous translation of the old Targum could be replaced by the Targum Onkelos. And it *has* been replaced by the Targum Onkelos in the so-called Targum Pseudo-Jonathan to the Pentateuch.² This Targum has as basis the

¹ The fragments of this Targum were first published by Felix Pratensis in the Rabbinic Bible, in Venice, 1517/8, and from there reprinted in other Rabbinic Bibles. Supplementary material from MSS. has been published by Moses Ginsburger: *Das Fragmententargum (Thargum Jeruschalmi zum Pentateuch)*, Berlin, 1899. A new edition of the whole material which is at our disposal to-day is necessary. It would have to be based entirely on MSS., and the editor would have to consider also the punctuation to be found in the older MSS.

² *Pseudo-Jonathan (Thargum Jonathan ben Usiel zum Pentateuch)*, Nach der Londoner Handschrift (Brit. Mus. add. 27031) herausgegeben von Dr. M. Ginsburger, Berlin, 1903. The British Museum MS. was written in Italy, probably in the sixteenth century. The text of the Targum was first published by Asher Forins in Venetia 1591, and is reprinted in later Rabbinic Bibles. Only very few and late MSS. of this text are known.

the writings of Tatian.¹ Clement of Alexandria (died about 225) knows of several books composed by Tatian,² and he often criticizes his doctrines.³ But he knows nothing of the Diatessaron, and this fact is of special importance as it is very likely that he was a personal pupil of Tatian.⁴ Irenaeus (died about 202), the first author who mentions Tatian as a heretic,⁵ does not know of the Diatessaron.

Eusebius (died about 340), mentions the Diatessaron in his *Ecclesiastical History* (iv. 29). The Greek text has here:

Tatian, their ['the Encratists'] first head, brought together a combination and junction—I do not know how—of the Gospels, and he called it Diatessaron, and this is said to be still among some people.

The Old Syriac translation has some interesting variants:

This Tatian, their ['the Encratists'] first head, collected and mixed and made an Evangelion and called it Diatessaron, i.e. that of the mixed ones, that which exists among many people up to to-day.

The only natural inference from this much discussed passage is that Eusebius never saw a copy of the text.⁶

Epiphanius (died 403) knows that the Evangelion Diatessaron, called by some people κατὰ Ἐβραϊσμούς, is said to have been composed by Tatian.⁷ Jerome (died 420) in his book *De viris inlustribus* speaks of the endless series of books composed by Tatian, but he does not mention the Diatessaron.⁸

Up to ten years ago not a single line of a Greek Diatessaron was known to exist. This is no longer so, since, on 5 March 1933, during a joint excavation at Dura-Europos on the Euphrates, undertaken by Yale University and the French Academy, a little piece of parchment was discovered with fourteen lines of a Greek Harmony which has undoubtedly a close connexion with Tatian's Diatessaron. The fragment was published by

¹ Harnack, *Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur*, i. 489. It is not very likely that he even knew the title of the book, as Zahn proposes; see *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*, i. 412.

² Harnack, l.c., i. 488; Zahn, *Forschungen*, i, p. 12.

³ Cf. besides the references given in note 2: Einar Molland, *The Conception of the Gospel in the Alexandrian Theology*, Oslo, 1938, p. 21 f.

⁴ Cf. the references given in note 2.

⁵ See Harnack, l.c. i. 486, ii. i, 289.

⁶ See Zahn, *Forschungen*, i. 14-20; Arthur Hjelt, *Die altsyrische Evangelienübersetzung und Tatians Diatessaron* . . ., Leipzig, 1901, p. 23 f.

⁷ See Zahn, *Forschungen*, i, p. 21 f.

⁸ Ibid., p. 6 f.; 'Beachtenswert ist, dass er über das Diatessaron schweigt', Harnack, l.c. 491.

Carl H. Kraeling.¹ It seems to belong to the third century,² and is of great value as it clearly shows that a Gospel Harmony in Greek existed at an early time. It is of special interest as it shows some readings which cannot be found in any MS. of the Gospels so far known. But there can hardly be any doubt that this Greek text is a translation from a Syriac original—although making use of a Greek text of the Gospels.³ Clear evidence of this fact is the name Arimathaea, the place from which Joseph is said to come in Mt. 27. 57. It has here the form Ερινμαθαία, and we must ask how the ν in the name has to be explained. In Syriac letters the name would have the form ܐܪܝܡܬܐܝܐ and this was clearly misread by the translator as ܐܪܝܡܬܐܝܐ, Syriac i and n being very similar; they could easily be confused by somebody who did not know the name. Also the initial ε of the word can easily be explained when we suppose a Syriac original. Dura-Europos was a place where Greek and Syriac influences met. The Diatessaron was read by the Syrian Christians in their churches and the text was translated into Greek for the sake of Greek-speaking Christians there.

Kraeling seems to be right in saying that the Greek fragment is the earliest Diatessaron document in existence. But he admits that the Coptic Manichaean documents recently discovered in Egypt may furnish a witness to the Syriac text only slightly later than that which the Dura fragment bears to the Greek.⁴ That the 'Evangelion' quoted by Mani and his disciples was the Diatessaron was in fact suggested by the first editors.⁵ The texts published since show that there can be no doubt about this fact.⁶ The language used by Mani was Syriac,⁷ and we know

¹ 'A Greek Fragment of Tatian's Diatessaron from Dura', edited by Carl H. Kraeling (*Studies and Documents* . . ., iii), London, 1935.

² Kraeling dates the fragment in accordance with the date of the Christian chapel in the neighbourhood of which it was discovered from about A.D. 222.

³ Cf. A. Baumstark, in *Oriens Christianus*, Series 3, vol. x, Leipzig, 1935, pp. 244-52.

⁴ Cf. Kraeling, l.c., p. 16, note 1.

⁵ See C. Schmidt and H. J. Polotsky, *Ein Mani-Fund in Ägypten*, Sitzungsberichte, Berlin Academy, 1933, pp. 57-9.

⁶ *Manichäische Handschriften der Staatlichen Museen*, Berlin, vol. 1; Kephalaia, ed. Schmidt, Polotsky and Böhlig, Stuttgart, 1935 ff. A quotation from the Diatessaron has been discussed by Baumstark in *Oriens Christianus*, vol. xxxiv, 1937, pp. 169 ff. The Manichaean texts published since then show the use of the Diatessaron in quotations from the Gospels clearly.

⁷ Besides Syriac, Mani knew some Persian too, but he did not know that language very well. W. B. Henning has recently published a report of the last audience granted to Mani by King Bahram I, the Sassanid. The report

Targum Onkelos, and into its frame a great amount of mid-rashic material from the old Palestinian Targum to the Penta-teuch has been inserted. If we withdraw all the words coming from the Targum Onkelos, the material from the old Targum remains. But we have to be cautious. Many of the passages have been altered, and others of very late date have been inserted. The fragments of the old Targum preserved in the Geniza enable us to identify the remnants of the old Palestinian Targum wherever they have been preserved. They enable us also to state in what way this material has been further developed, not only in the two later Targums, but also in the different MSS. of the Targum Yerushalmi at our disposal.

We have seen that the three magnificent parchment codices on which the fragments B, C, and D of the old Palestinian Targum were written cannot be older than the ninth century, and these three MSS. were scarcely the only MSS. of that kind written at this time. We have therefore to recognize that there must have been still a great need in the ninth century for MSS. of the Tora with the old Palestinian Targum in Palestine. This can be understood only on the assumption that the official Babylonian Targum, the Targum Onkelos, had no authoritative value at that time in Palestine. We have spoken of attempts made in the second half of the eighth century to make Palestinian Jewry accept Babylonian authority and Gaonic tradition.¹ Now we see that these attempts had no prompt success. The Jews in Palestine were accustomed to Palestinian institutions. It is very likely that, like the Babylonian Targum, other Babylonian institutions also, for instance the Babylonian Talmud and the annual pericopes of the Tora, the Parashas, had to wait a long time before they were really accepted in Palestine.

Thus the Targum Onkelos became authoritative in Palestine at a time when Aramaic had ceased to be the spoken language in Palestine, when people had already begun to speak Arabic. Therefore it cannot have been introduced into Palestine in order to assist Aramaic-speaking Jews to understand the Holy Law written in Hebrew, a language which they did not understand. For this purpose there had served for centuries the old Palestinian Targum, which was composed in a language really spoken in Palestine. The purpose of Targum Onkelos was quite different. It contained an interpretation of the Law which was in accordance with the Halakha as developed in Babylonia, and its object was to guarantee this official interpretation of the

¹ Cf. my first Lecture, p. 25.

Tora. That is the great importance of this Targum, not only for Babylonia and for Palestine, but for every land, for every time, for everybody. Whoever is anxious to know the official Jewish interpretation of the Tora, he will find it in the Targum Onkelos.

For this purpose a language had to be chosen which was generally understood. Neither the Aramaic spoken in Babylonia nor the Aramaic spoken in Palestine would have been suitable. That this literary Aramaic was strongly influenced by the Hebrew language was perhaps helpful. On the other hand, we can understand that the artificial language of the Targum, created by learned Rabbis in Babylonia, was not favourable for the acceptance of the Targum in Palestine so long as Aramaic was spoken there; they had at their disposal Palestinian Targums composed in a language with which they were acquainted.

The late introduction of Targum Onkelos in Palestine explains another fact. In Babylonia they knew exactly how to pronounce the language of the Targum. Geniza fragments written and vocalized in Babylonia can be taken as a very reliable basis for the grammar of this Targum.¹ It would be excellent if we could make an edition of the Targum according to Babylonian texts. But the fragments preserved are not sufficient for such a task. The Babylonian tradition, however, was handed over, with a few alterations, to the Jews in Yemen. There this tradition was maintained for a long time, and from there we have some reliable MSS. with the Targum Onkelos. The oldest of these MSS., the British Museum MSS. Or. 1467 and 2363, have sometimes preserved the real Babylonian tradition where it was altered in later MSS.² Old Yemenite MSS. can be taken as a basis for a new edition of the Babylonian Targums.³

In the 'West', in Palestine, they knew how to pronounce the Aramaic of the Palestinian Targum. So far as the fragments found in the Geniza are vocalized, they show that the copyists had a fairly good knowledge of the language in which these texts were composed. But no independent vocalization of the Babylonian Targums was developed here. The Babylonian vowels were simply replaced by Tiberian signs.⁴ But the copyists,

¹ Cf. *Masoreten des Ostens*, pp. 219-32.

² *Ibid.*, p. 213.

³ The new editions of the Babylonian Targums prepared by Alexander Sperber have used such Yemenite MSS. as their chief basis.

⁴ That this transformation was really made is stated in a notice in Codex de Rossi 12 of the Royal Library in Parma. This notice was first published by S. D. Luzzatto, and later reprinted several times; cf. *Masoreten des Ostens*, p. 205, note 1.

accustomed to the much more complicated Tiberian vocalization, were not satisfied with the few vowel-signs they found in Babylonian MSS., and so they added to these transformed Babylonian vowels a great number of Tiberian signs created by the Tiberian Masoretes for the Hebrew text. By this practice great confusion was introduced, and as the later copyists had no understanding of the language of the Targum the confusion was increased. The situation was hopeless, and it is well known that Johannes Buxtorf (the elder) in his Rabbinic Bible, published at Basel in 1618–20, tried to end the confusion by using a new method of vocalizing the text of the Targums, viz. by adapting their vocalization to that of the Aramaic texts in the Bible, in Ezra and Daniel.

That the text of the Targum Onkelos which was printed in 1557 at Sabbioneta was much superior to any other text of the Targum so far known was already clear to the editors of that text. They state that they used valuable old MSS. for their text, and that they have edited the text with great care. In his *Philoxenos*¹ S. D. Luzzatto reprinted the statement of the editors, and added his own impression of this printed text. It is the only text known to him which was provided with the Masora to the Targum, but besides that, the text is far more correct than any MS. of the Targum he has seen.² Luzzatto could not realize at that time why it was so. To-day we see that in this text an original Babylonian punctuation, although transformed into Tiberian vowel-points, was comparatively well preserved. But here also, besides the vowel-points adopted from the Babylonian original, a great number of Tiberian signs were added, according to the rules of Hebrew grammar, without understanding of the language of the Targum. This can clearly be seen when the Sabbioneta text is compared with real Babylonian fragments, as for instance with the text preserved in the Babylonian Bible MS. Ea. 12 which I have published in *Masoreten des Ostens*, pp. 12–18, and of which I have given a facsimile on plate 5 in my book. For this reason the Sabbioneta text is also somewhat contaminated.³ But with the help of real Babylonian fragments

¹ Samuel David Luzzatto, *Philoxenos, sive de Onkelosi, chaldaica Pentateuchi versione, Dissertatio hermeneutica-critica* . . . , Viennae, 1830, p. 28. The Hebrew title is: מאמר מחקרי על התרגום אנקלוס הגר ע[ל] ה[תורה] עם ביאור אוהב גר. דרכיו ונתיבותיו בתרגומו . . .

² These are Luzzatto's own words: וזה לבדו תרגום נדפס שמצאתי בו חלק מה ממסורת התרגום והוא מלבד זה מדוקדק מאד בכללו מכל הנסחאות אשר ראיתי.

³ Cf. *Masoreten des Ostens*, p. 215 f.

we can recognize the foolish additions of the copyists, and if they were removed, we should have a real Babylonian text of the Targum, which would have to be regarded as far more trustworthy than any text based on Yemenite MSS.

The Targum text of the Sabbioneta edition is reprinted by Abraham Berliner in his edition of the Targum.¹ Berliner saw neither these nor many other problems connected with this interesting text, and his edition is in no way reliable. For any critical work on this text the original edition will have to be used.

In confirmation of the fact that the Palestinian Targum was composed in a language really spoken in Palestine, I may refer to a conversation I had in June 1938 in Leiden with the late Professor Wensinck, not only a well-known Arabist but an eminent authority also on Aramaic. He was engaged in a very precise investigation of the language spoken in Palestine in the time of our Lord. He had studied carefully all the material available to him, was reading at that time Aramaic parts of the Palestinian Talmud, and showed me the collections he had made for the lexicon and the grammar of that language. Then he asked: 'Do you know which texts I found the most important for my purpose?' I said that I should be interested to know. He said: 'They are the fragments of the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch published by you!' And he mentioned in this connexion the fact that the word παρβουσαι with which Jesus is addressed in Mk. 10. 51 and Jn. 20. 16, and which so far had not been found in any Jewish sources, occurs exactly in the same form in the text I published, for instance in the Targum to Gen. 32. 19, where we read דורון היא משלחא לרבוני לעשו;² cf. לרבוניה Ex. 21. 4 in MS. A. A fact like this shows clearly how closely these texts are connected with the language spoken in Palestine in the time of Jesus. I knew myself the value of the texts I had found, but I was glad to have my impression confirmed by such an authority.

The chief book dealing with Jewish Palestinian Aramaic is the grammar compiled by Gustaf Dalman.³ He takes the Targum Onkelos as the principal source for the language spoken in earlier

¹ *Targum Onkelos*, Herausgegeben und erläutert von Dr. A. Berliner, Berlin, 1884. Cf. Paul de Lagarde's famous critical review of the book in *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, Stück 22, 1. xi, 1886; reprinted in de Lagarde's *Mittheilungen*, vol. ii, Göttingen, 1887, pp. 163–82.

² Cf. *Masoreten des Westens*, vol. ii, p. 10.

³ *Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch*, Leipzig, 1894; 2nd edition, Leipzig, 1905.

times in Judaea (Jerusalem), the chief centre of Jewish Palestinian learning. According to him, the uniformity and independence of the grammatical structure of this language guarantees that the language is correctly preserved.¹ He knows that this Targum was composed in Babylonia, that it was composed in an artificial language² and that it was not finished definitely before the fifth century. He also admits that the Targum Yerushalmi was to be regarded as the best model for the language spoken by our Lord, if it could be proved that parts of it were of great antiquity. But while studying these Palestinian Targums he became more and more convinced that their oldest parts were taken from the Targum Onkelos.

The newly discovered fragments of the old Palestinian Targum, and the conclusions to be drawn from these texts, show clearly that Dalman was wrong, that it was a fatal mistake to take the language of the Targum Onkelos as characteristic of Aramaic as spoken in Palestine at the time of our Lord. It is clear that we cannot reach this goal with the help of a text composed in Babylonia, by learned Rabbis, in an artificial language, after A.D. 400 and introduced into Palestine not before A.D. 900, at a time when the language spoken in Palestine was Arabic, not Aramaic.

It is worth noticing that Julius Wellhausen, from quite different considerations, comes to similar conclusions regarding the way in which Dalman tries to reconstruct the words of Jesus, when he writes:³

Unfortunately we do not know exactly the special Aramaic idiom spoken in Palestine in the time of Jesus. . . . The Jewish literature preserved to us is of a special rabbinic character. This language should not be taken with Dalman as a model for the old vernacular language

¹ Cf. his *Grammar*, p. 12 f.

² Cf. the quotation from Dalman's *Grammar*, p. 13, given above, p. 119.

³ Cf. Julius Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, 2nd edition, 1911, pp. 38–43, where we read: 'Das besondere aramäische Idiom, welches zur Zeit Jesu in Palästina gesprochen wurde, kennen wir leider nicht recht . . . die uns erhaltene jüdisch-aramäische Literatur ist spezifisch rabbinisch. Man darf ihre Sprache nicht, wie Dalman es tut, einfach zum Muster für die alte Volkssprache machen und die Abweichungen davon als griechisch betrachten, als nicht zur Sprache Jesu und der Apostel gehörig. . . . Die Rabbinen wurden erst nach der Zerstörung Jerusalems Alleinherrscher, als das Volk mehr und mehr zu einer Sekte zusammenschumpft. Dalman schlägt den Unterschied des rabbinischen und des volkstümlichen Lexikons zu gering an und zugleich den Unterschied der aramäischen Dialekte zu hoch. . . . Man muss sich nur nicht den Horizont dadurch verengen lassen und darüber selber zum Rabbinen werden.'

and the divergences from it should not be regarded as borrowed from the Greek, as not belonging to the language of Jesus and the apostles. . . . The Rabbis came to absolute domination only after the destruction of Jerusalem, when the people were more and more reduced to a sect. Dalman underestimates the differences of the rabbinic and the vernacular lexicon, and at the same time he overestimates the differences between the Aramaic dialects.

After admitting the fact that Rabbinic literature is generally not sufficiently studied for the exegesis of the New Testament, he continues: 'But this should not lead us to narrow our horizon and to make ourselves into rabbis.'

Dalman's grammar led and leads astray all those who try to reconstruct words or sentences of Jesus in the language in which they were originally spoken. Dalman himself in the first instance was mistaken in the two books he published on this matter,¹ which have both been translated into English.² We have to regard most of the material collected by Dalman on this problem, if not as worthless, yet certainly as misleading.

Dalman paid me a visit in Bonn in 1930, when I was preparing my edition of the texts of the Palestinian Targum. I told him of these texts, showed him the photographs of the MSS., and tried to explain to him some of the problems connected with these texts. I remember well how surprised he was, and how what I told him made a deep impression on him. But it was too late for him to draw the conclusions from it. The second edition of his book *Die Worte Jesu* was already finished at that time; it appeared in 1930, and it was in the main a reproduction of the book published in 1898. Only some additions were made to it, and in a review of the articles published in connexion with the first edition he tried to strengthen his former position.

It is a great pity that serious illness and death prevented Professor Wensinck from completing his work.³ In it we should have had a really solid basis for further investigations in this field.

¹ *Die Worte Jesu*. Mit Berücksichtigung des nachkanonischen jüdischen Schrifttums und der aramäischen Sprache, erörtert von Gustaf Dalman. Band I: Einleitung und wichtige Begriffe. Nebst Anhang: Messianische Texte. Leipzig 1898. . . . Zweite Auflage. Mit Anhang: A. Das Vaterunser. B. Nachträge und Berichtigungen, Leipzig, 1930.—*Jesus-Jeschua*. Studien in den Evangelien. Leipzig, 1921.

² *The Words of Jesus*, Authorized Version, by D. M. Kay, Edinburgh, 1902.—*Jesus-Jeschua*. Studies in the Gospels, Authorized Translation, by Paul P. Levertoff, London, 1929.

³ I was in correspondence with Mrs. Wensinck in the summer of 1939. She had at that time not disposed of the material. We must hope that it may be possible to continue this important work and to bring it to a conclusion.

The history of the development of the Targums supplies important clues to a better understanding of the histories of the Septuagint and Peshitta. It also illuminates problems of the Old Syriac Gospels and of Tatian's Diatessaron.

(a) THE SEPTUAGINT

The Greek translation of the Bible has always been regarded as something unprecedented, as the first attempt to translate a long text into a foreign language. The story told in the letter of Aristeas is well known: The Egyptian king Ptolemy II Philadelphus (ruled 284–247 B.C.) was interested in Jewish Law by the famous Demetrius Phalereus who is said to have been his librarian and to have made him anxious to have a copy of the Jewish Law in Greek in his library. Aristeas, a high official at his court, was sent to Jerusalem. The Jewish High-priest Eleazar selected six elders of each of the twelve tribes of Israel and sent them over to Alexandria in Egypt, together with an accurate copy of the Hebrew Torah, written in golden letters on beautifully prepared parchment. We hear that the king gave seven banquets to these elders, that he put questions to ten, the last two times to eleven, of these elders at every banquet, and stated that these elders were superior to the Greek philosophers. He then put at their disposal a spacious house on the island of Pharos, connected with Alexandria by the Heptastadion. Here they accomplished their great task, and in 72 days these 72 men translated the whole Pentateuch in so admirable a way that in the end they all agreed in every detail of the version.

As long as it was believed that the translation was made by the order of a king, this order could be taken as a sufficient reason for the translation. But for more than 250 years it has been known that the story which reports this fact has to be regarded as a legend.¹ To-day there can be no doubt that the Greek version of the Pentateuch was *not* made at the request of a Ptolemaic king, but that it became a necessity for the Jewish communities in Egypt, owing to the large number of their Greek-speaking members, who no longer understood Hebrew. It is clear that the version was not made by *Palestinian* Jews, but by people acquainted with the language spoken in Egypt. The letter of Aristeas, clearly intended to glorify the Jewish people

¹ Cf. Humphrey Hody, *Contra historiam Aristee de LXX interpretibus dissertatio*, Oxford, 1685. Hody summed up his arguments in his book *De Bibliorum textibus originalibus*, Oxford, 1705.

and the Jewish Law, was not written by a pagan, a high official of a Ptolemaic king, but by a Jew. The author of the letter who speaks of the time of Philadelphus as of a time which was long passed, was *not* living in the first half of the third century B.C., as the letter claims, but much later, although it is certain that he used some older material in composing his book.¹ The letter has to be regarded as a Jewish poetical novel, and must be classified with other similar novels, such as the books of Jonah, Esther, Judith, and Tobit. But whilst these books were taken into the Hebrew or the Greek Bible, the letter of Aristeas was not included; it was nevertheless well known, and is, for instance, largely used by Josephus in the twelfth book of the *Antiquities*, and became later of the greatest importance for the Christian Church.

But the letter deals with a translation, and there can be no doubt that it was written in connexion with a translation, a Greek translation of the Tora. This fact has not been sufficiently stressed in discussions since the letter was recognized not to be genuine. It is not sufficient to enumerate items in the letter which might be regarded as *credible*, as, for instance, H. St. J. Thackeray does;² we have to make the attempt to understand the reasons why the letter was written.

¹ Cf. the excursus 'The Milindapañha and Pseudo-Aristeas' in W. W. Tarn's book *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, Cambridge, 1938, pp. 414–36. Tarn remarks that the questions put by King Ptolemy II before the Jewish sages are in no sense Jewish propaganda. They seem to have belonged to a treatise on kingship, *Περὶ βασιλείας*, written in the third century. Pseudo-Aristeas, though writing propaganda himself, was building his book round an older document which had no propaganda value but which was useful as being probably well known among Hellenistic Jews, and he tried to make propaganda of it by explaining (§ 235) that the Jews could beat the Greek philosophers on their own ground. Tarn has shown some striking parallels in the 'Questions of Milinda' (i.e. Menander—the Greek king in India, who died about 175–150 B.C.). Menander is said to have put the questions before the Indian sage Nāgasena. We know the story from the *Milindapañha*, a Pāli text written by an Indian Buddhist. Among the four persons mentioned in the introduction of the Milinda we find a Demetrius and an Antiochus, the names being adjusted to Devamantiya and Anantakaya in order to make some sort of sense in Pāli. Demetrius is here the chief person. The questions of Menander must have been known shortly after Menander's death. It is quite possible that Demetrius was adopted from this source by Pseudo-Aristeas. He identified him with the famous Demetrius of Phaleron, who was probably dead before King Ptolemy's rule began. For all details refer to Tarn's book.

² Cf. his book *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, London, 1923, p. 11 (Schweich Lectures for 1920).

We read in the letter (§§ 308-11):¹

When the work was completed, Demetrius collected together the Jewish population in the place where the translation had been made, and read it over to all, in the presence of the translators, who met with a great reception also from the people, because of the great benefits which they had conferred upon them. They bestowed warm praise upon Demetrius too, and urged him to have the whole law transcribed and to present a copy to their leaders. After the book had been read, the priests and the elders of the translators and the Jewish community and the leaders of the people stood up and said that since so excellent and sacred and accurate a translation had been made, it was only right that it should remain as it was, and no alteration should be made in it. And when the whole company expressed their approval, they made them pronounce a curse in accordance with their custom upon anyone who should make any alteration either by adding anything or changing in any way whatever any of the words which had been written or making any omission. This was a very wise precaution to ensure that the book might be preserved for all the future time unchanged.

We see that the letter deals with a Greek version of the Tora approved by the Jewish Community of Alexandria, a version regarded as a standard text: no addition, no revision, no omission! Everyone to be cursed who should make any alteration. There cannot be any doubt that the letter was written as propaganda for this standard translation.²

Propaganda is well known to us to-day. Nobody will make propaganda for something that is a hundred years old or older. Propaganda is made for something contemporary, and we can be quite sure that this standard translation was just finished when the letter was written. If we know the date of the letter, we know the time when the translation was made to which it refers.

The letter has been variously dated on the strength of arguments that are mostly subjective and without conclusive value. But we know of some objective arguments pointed out by E. Bickermann.³ He has shown that certain formulas in the documents contained in the letter cannot be expected before 145 nor after 127 B.C. Sir Idris Bell, whom I asked for his opinion on the matter, writes to me that what Bickermann says is in accordance with his own general impression. 'His argu-

ment seems to me most convincing; for, as you will doubtless agree, it is on such minutiae too unimportant to be thought of by the average man, that a forger most often trips up.' But recently W. W. Tarn has shown that Bickermann's dating of the letter before 127 is not decisive and that it is more likely that the letter was written about 100 B.C.¹ But whether the letter was written about 130 or 100 B.C., we can be quite sure that the translation with which it deals was finished at about the time when the letter was written.

Now it is clear that the Jews in Egypt must have had their Law in a Greek translation in much earlier times. So we may hold that the translation for which the letter of Aristeeas was propaganda was not the *first* translation of the Jewish Law; it was a *revised* translation. This letter which purports to antedate the translation by 150 years or more has a certain interest in showing that this same translation was the first made. Nevertheless we still find in the letter some hints of earlier translations. In his memorial (§ 30) Demetrius reports to the king that he has taken great care to collect all sorts of books for the library, and he continues:

The books of the Law of the Jews (with some few others) are absent. They are written in the Hebrew characters and language and have been carelessly interpreted (ἀμελέστερον σεσήμανται) and do not represent the original text (καὶ οὐχ ὡς ὑπάρχει) as I am informed by those who know; for they have never had a king's care to protect them.

The word σεσήμανται 'interpreted' is not quite clear, and οὐχ ὡς ὑπάρχει 'do not represent the original text' is at least not good Greek. But it seems that the author has intentionally chosen somewhat obscure words. 'Carelessly' ἀμελέστερον can only be taken as referring to earlier *translations*, for Demetrius can hardly be supposed to have an interest in any form of the *Hebrew* text of the Pentateuch, nor say that these Hebrew copies were made carelessly.² At the end the letter refers to such earlier

¹ He writes with regard to Bickermann (l.c., p. 425): 'His valuable examination of the formulas in the royal letters puts the work within the limits 145-100 B.C., though strictly speaking the facts he gives p. 289, n. 1 prove a date c. 100. His dating before 127 depends entirely . . . on the implication in a phrase of Pseudo-Aristeeas that Idumea was not part of Palestine, 127 being the date of its annexation to the Maccabee realms. But Bickermann has himself shown that much of Pseudo-Aristeeas' description of Palestine is simply a compound of the Old Testament and of ideas about the ideal state. . . . The independent Idumea is only O.T. Edom. . . .'

² So Elias J. Bickermann tries to understand the text. He writes: 'The passage is misunderstood by translators and commentators who try to find

¹ I quote H. T. Andrews's translation in R. H. Charles's *Pseudepigrapha*, Oxford, 1913, pp. 83-122.

² Cf. my article 'Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Pentateuchtextes', in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, Gotha, 1915, p. 415.

³ Cf. his article 'Zur Datierung des Pseudo-Aristeeas', in *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, vol. xxix, 1930, pp. 280-96.

translations in clearer words. The writer tells us (§§ 314-16) that the Greek historian Theopompus and the Greek tragic poet Philodectos tried to use the Jewish Law in their writings, but were severely punished by God because they quoted 'from the earlier and somewhat unreliable translations of the Law' τινὰ τῶν προηρημευμένων ἐπισφαλέστερον ἐκ τοῦ νόμου. The two authors mentioned were living in the fourth century B.C., somewhat early for Greek translations of the Jewish Law. But the letter must quote such early authorities because its author pretends to write early in the third century.

So we see that the letter itself contains hints of earlier translations, and in relation to these, the translation of about 100 B.C. must be regarded as a *revised* translation, intended to supersede all the other incorrect translations. Several details given in the letter may be true. The translation was certainly made by a commission carefully selected, and it is very likely that it was made on the island of Pharos. Philo gives an interesting report of an annual festival held there in memory of the translation.¹

For this cause there is held to this day every year a festival and assembly on the island of Pharos to which not only Jews, but multitudes of others sail across, to pay reverence to the spot on which the translation first shed its light and to render God thanks for a benefit, ancient yet ever new. After the prayers and thanksgivings some pitch tents on the shore, others recline in the sand, regaling themselves under the open sky with their relatives and friends and regarding the beach on that occasion as more luxurious than a palace.

Such a festival could hardly have been instituted without any justification. But the commission entrusted with the translation was presumably selected by the Community of Alexandria, and consisted probably of a small number of experts who were from Egypt, not sent over from Palestine. The assertion that the

here a hint of a previous Greek version while the author clearly speaks of the original text of the Law.' Cf. his article 'The Colophon of the Greek Book of Esther', in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. lxiii, 1944, p. 343, note 24. The misunderstanding is on the side of Bickermann. σεσήμανται is certainly not 'copied', and the whole letter has the tendency of showing πρόνοια βασιλική bestowed to the *Greek translation*, not to the Hebrew original, which was imported from Palestine. Bickermann's article contains many interesting items, and what he says of the date of the colophon is convincing. But he is certainly wrong in taking λευίτης as a proper name 'Levitas' (εἰσήνεγκεν is singular!) and in taking εἶναι in the meaning 'really exists'. The references quoted by him certainly do not prove this meaning.

¹ *De Vita Mosis*, ii. 41-3, ed. Wendland and Cohn, iv. 209 f. I quote Colson's translation.

translation was made by the order of a king, from a parchment written in golden letters, belongs—like other features—to the embellishments of the letter. It is noteworthy that the new translation was first presented to the Jewish Community, and then to the king who is said to have ordered it.¹ All the embellishments are invented to underline the importance of the translation and to help in the propaganda.

I believe that the problems connected with the origin of the Septuagint can really be solved in the light of the facts concerning the Palestinian Targum of the Pentateuch. As we have seen, the Jews in Palestine had been accustomed to translate their Tora—and other books of their Bible—into Aramaic, the language spoken in their land, since the time of Ezra. So we need not be surprised to find that the Jews in Egypt translated their Hebrew Tora into Greek, the language spoken there. The translation of a long text into a foreign language was therefore not an absolute novelty for these Jews; they only followed a practice used by their brethren in Palestine for a long time. The translation may have been made as soon as it became necessary, in 300 B.C. or earlier. The Jews in Egypt needed a Greek Tora perhaps more than their brethren needed an Aramaic Tora in Palestine, as Hebrew was less understood in Egypt than in Palestine. The first attempts may not have been very perfect. Every beginning is difficult! The epitheton ἀμελέστερον 'somewhat carelessly' in the letter of Aristeas may correctly characterize these older translations, and we can understand that the copyists made alterations in the translation in order to bring it into accordance with the Hebrew text they happened to have.

Such conditions could not be allowed to continue. It was quite natural that official Jewish circles in Alexandria should have wished to have a correct, standard, text of the Jewish Law in Greek, based on a reliable Hebrew text. This standard text was made on the order of the Jewish Community in Alexandria, and was approved by it. It is this *revised* version with which the letter of Aristeas is dealing. If so we can appreciate much better what the letter says about the correct Hebrew text taken as the basis for the translation, the carefully selected commission, the anxiety that this text might be unaltered for all the future. And it is interesting to see how admiration for the version increased with the passage of time. We may remember what Philo of Alexandria says about it, 150 years after the letter of Aristeas:²

¹ This fact has been remarked by Swete, cf. his *Introduction*, p. 20.

² *De Vita Mosis*, ii. 37, 40.

Sitting here (on the island of Pharos) in seclusion . . . they became as it were possessed, and, under inspiration, wrote, not each several scribe something different, but the same word for word, as though dictated to each by an invisible prompter. . . . The clearest proof of this is that, if Chaldeans have learned Greek, or Greeks Chaldean, and read both versions, the Chaldean and the translation, they regard them with awe and reverence as sisters, or rather one and the same, both in matter and words, and speak of the authors not as translators but as prophets and priests of the mysteries, whose sincerity and singleness of thought have enabled them to go hand in hand with the purest of spirits, the spirit of Moses.

We might expect that an authorized version, praised and recommended in such a way, regarded even as inspired by God, should soon have come into general use, should in a short time have supplanted all the other versions and should be found everywhere in quotations. It was not so, and it would have been against all experience in the history of translations of the Bible if it had been so. We know, for instance, that it was at least 400 years before Jerome's Latin translation of the Bible, the Vulgate, approved by the Church of Rome, came into general use in the Church, and it is well known that the Psalter in a pre-Vulgate version is used in the *Breviarium Romanum* up to the present day. We have seen that it was nearly 600 years before the Targum Onkelos, composed by the most competent Jewish circles in Babylonia and regarded as the only authoritative Targum, was definitely accepted in Palestine and superseded the old Palestinian Targum. But we meet the same experience everywhere. We have seen that the authorized Arabic translation of the Pentateuch, made by the Samaritan Abū Sa'īd in the thirteenth century in order to abrogate all the earlier translations, was officially adopted, yet older texts are found in MSS. up to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and later.

So we have to expect that in this case also, along with the Septuagint, the Greek standard text of the Tora, other translations would be still in use during the following centuries. But the problem here becomes very complicated owing to the fact that the Jews lost all interest in this translation from the end of the first century A.D. After the fall of Jerusalem and the great Jewish reorganization which followed it, a new Hebrew text was introduced, in the first instance for the Tora, our Masoretic text. It had been fixed with the help of old MSS. saved from the Temple of Jerusalem. It was invested with the highest authority and served as the basis for the 'Oral Law', the

Mishna, which the Jews began to codify in the beginning of the second century A.D. under the auspices of Rabbi Akiba.¹ As the Hebrew MSS. from which the old Greek translation had been made differed from the newly introduced official Hebrew text, the Jews had to bring the old translation into accordance with it, either by a revision (Theodotion), or by new translations made on different principles (Aquila, Symmachus). The old Greek standard text of the Tora, the 'Septuagint', so highly praised in the letter of Aristeeas and by Josephus, whose translators were regarded by Philo as inspired by God, was declared to be the work of Satan. It is a fact that, except the fragments of a few verses of Deuteronomy on papyrus assigned to the second or first centuries B.C.,² not a single line, neither of the 'Septuagint' nor of any other part of the Greek Bible, written by a Jew, is so far known to be preserved. Even among the Chester Beatty Papyri there is hardly anything written by a Jew.³

¹ See my article 'Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Pentateuchtextes' in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1915, pp. 432-8.

² See C. H. Roberts, *Two Biblical Papyri in the John Rylands Library*, Manchester, 1936; W. G. Waddell, 'The Tetragrammaton in the Septuagint', *J. T. S.*, vol. xlv, 1944, pp. 158-61.

³ Cf. *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri. Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible*, by Frederic Kenyon, fasc. 1-7, London, 1933-7. In the introduction to fasc. 5, containing the text of Numbers and Deuteronomy (2nd cent. A.D.), Sir Frederic Kenyon writes: 'It is true that the manuscript might have been written for a Jewish owner, who need be deterred neither by poverty nor by fear of persecution from obtaining finely written copies of the books of his religion; but for Jews the proper form for the books of the Pentateuch was the roll, and one would not expect to find the codex form coming into early use among them even for non-official copies. A further consideration, which is perhaps decisive, is that a Jew would not be likely to give to the name Ἰησοῦς (= Joshua) the abbreviation normally confined to *nomina sacra*; and since the papyrus was found in Christian company, the presumption is that it was produced for a Christian community', cf. p. ix f.

I have asked Sir Idris Beli for his opinion in the matter. He writes that we have no trustworthy information as to the place of discovery, but that it is very difficult to believe that the whole group was not found together, somewhere in middle Egypt. 'It was then a single library, and the presence in it of N.T. manuscripts and the date of the latest codices make it certain that it was a Christian library. On the other hand the range of dates (2nd-4th cent.) shows that this series of codices was not written at one time for one owner or corporation of owners, so that we must, I presume, conclude that someone, or some monastic body, in building up a Biblical library, acquired manuscripts of earlier date; and there is nothing to rule out the possibility that manuscripts originally written for Jews might be acquired. Yet I doubt this; in the Isaiah (first half of 3rd cent.) there are Coptic

We should expect to find the 'Septuagint', if anywhere, in the quotations of Philo, the Jewish philosopher in Alexandria (died about A.D. 50). We have already seen how highly he esteemed this version. In the still extant works of Philo there are to be found about 2,000 quotations from the Tora, against about 50 quotations from other books of the Old Testament.¹ The Tora was at the centre of his thoughts, and we might think that these numerous quotations would enable us to form a fair idea of the Greek Tora used by Philo—just before the Septuagint was abandoned by the Jews and passed into the hands of the Christians.

Philo's quotations from the Old Testament have been glosses probably not much later, which show that this codex belonged to Coptic Christians; and the fact that the dialect is pure Fayyumic shows that the manuscript comes from that neighbourhood. . . .

'The most decisive argument seems, however, to be the use of the *nomina sacra*. I believe it is generally held that these were a Christian feature, imitated from the tetragrammaton; but even if we may suppose that a Jew writing Greek would not avoid such forms as $\kappa\varsigma$, $\kappa\nu$, $\theta\varsigma$, $\theta\nu$, yet there are compendia in the Beatty papyri which must surely be Christian, such as $\pi\rho$, $\pi\nu\alpha$, $\alpha\nu\sigma$, $\upsilon\varsigma$. For the Deuteronomy manuscript the matter is really settled by the forms $\iota\varsigma$ or $\iota\eta\varsigma$, $\iota\nu$ or $\iota\eta\nu$, $\iota\nu$ for Joshua [in Numbers also, cf. 26. 15; 32. 12; 23. 17 &c.]. I cannot conceive it possible that a Jew would ever employ this specifically Christian compendium for a Hebrew hero. In the Jeremiah I find only $\theta\varsigma$, $\theta\nu$, $\kappa\varsigma$, $\kappa\nu$; $\iota\epsilon\rho\nu\sigma\alpha\lambda\eta\mu$ and $\iota\sigma\rho\alpha\eta\lambda$ are written in full. In the Daniel the only *nomina sacra* are for $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\sigma$ and $\theta\epsilon\circ\varsigma$; $\alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$ and $\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$, as also $\iota\sigma\rho\alpha\eta\lambda$ and $\iota\epsilon\rho\nu\sigma\alpha\lambda\eta\mu$, are not abbreviated. Hence, if the abbreviation of $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\sigma$ and $\theta\epsilon\circ\varsigma$ were not exclusively Christian, there is no impossibility in the supposition that this codex *might* have been written for a Jew.' [Traube really thinks that the forms $\kappa\varsigma$ and $\theta\varsigma$ might be regarded as of Jewish origin, cf. *Nomina Sacra*, München, 1907, p. 31.]

'One argument which might at one time have been adduced for a Jewish origin is no longer available: There were until recently so few signs of Christianity in the Egyptian $\chi\omega\rho\alpha$ in the second century that any Biblical MS. of that period might reasonably be suspected to be of Jewish origin; but the discovery of the St. John in the Rylands Library and our (the British Museum) new Gospel, both probably of the first half of the second century, show that this inference is not justified.' [Bell refers here to the books: *An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library*, edited by C. H. Roberts, Manchester, 1935, and *Fragments of an Unknown Gospel and other Early Christian Papyri*, edited by H. Idris Bell and T. C. Skeat, London, 1935.] Bell concludes: 'On the whole I think it most probable that all these MSS. are of Christian origin; but I would not regard this as proved beyond doubt for some of them.'

¹ Cf. Wilfred L. Knox, 'A Note on Philo's Use of the Old Testament', in *J.T.S.*, vol. xl, 1940, pp. 30-4. Cf. Colson, 'Philo's Quotations from the Old Testament', *ib.*, pp. 237-51.

pared with the text of the Septuagint several times.¹ But these investigations are antiquated. Neither the new critical edition of Philo's works² nor the rich material collected in the new Cambridge Septuagint³ was available for them, and without these editions a real examination of Philo's quotations is impossible. H. B. Swete, who gives in his *Introduction*⁴ some specimens of these quotations in order to show the extent to which Philo departs from the Septuagint, comes to the conclusion that the greater part of his specimens imply a different rendering of the Hebrew, or even in some cases a different Hebrew text from that which is presupposed by the Septuagint. He tries to explain this fact by stating that in spite of his high veneration for the Jewish canon and his respect for the Alexandrian version, Philo does not scruple to quote his text freely, changing words at pleasure, and sometimes mingling interpretation with quotation. But the differences stated by Swete himself, especially those resulting from the different Hebrew texts as basis for the translation, can hardly be explained in this way.

The problems connected with these quotations are still more complicated. The new edition of Philo shows that his quotations sometimes agree more with our Septuagint than we could assume on the basis of the older editions. Paul Wendland, one of the editors, was able to show that, for instance, in Philo's book *De posteritate Caini* some of these quotations agree—curiously enough—with the Septuagint text attributed to Lucian (died A.D. 312), and he concludes from this fact that this text must have existed, as a kind of archetype ('Urlucian'), some centuries earlier than is generally assumed.⁵

On the other hand, we have for a number of Philo's works a group of MSS. consisting chiefly of Cod. U (Vat. graec. 381, 13th/14th cent.) and Cod. F (Laurent. plut. LXXXV, cod. 10, 15th/16th cent.), which differ largely from the other MSS. of Philo's works. In the critical edition the readings of

¹ C. Siegfried, 'Philo und der überlieferte Text der Septuaginta' in *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1873; H. E. Ryle, *Philo and Holy Scripture, or the quotations of Philo from the books of the Old Testament*, London, 1895.

² *Philonis Alexandrini Opera quae supersunt*, ed. Leopoldus Cohn et Paulus Wendland, Berolini, i, 1896; ii, 1897; iii, 1898; iv, 1902; v, 1906; vi, 1915.

³ *The Old Testament in Greek*, ed. A. E. Brooke and Norman M'Lean: Genesis, 1906; Exodus and Leviticus, 1909; Numbers and Deuteronomy, 1911, &c.

⁴ *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, Cambridge, 1902, p. 374.

⁵ Cf. *Philologus*, vol. lvii, 1898, pp. 248 ff., esp. 284 ff.

these MSS. are mostly to be found in the apparatus, and the editors are convinced that the special readings of these codices are mostly due to later emendations, and that the quotations from the Old Testament in these codices are to be ascribed to a later corrector who may have used for this purpose another Greek version of the Old Testament. Cohn writes in the *Prolegomena* to the edition, vol. i, p. lxxxiv:

itaque non paucis locis codicum UF lectionem aspernatus ceterorum codicum memoriam secutus sum. Nam ut ceteroquin manus correctrix in familia UF grassata sit . . . ita et verba biblica corrector ille interdum immutavit, fortasse alia quadam veteris Testamenti versione usus.

Eberhard Nestle already doubted that this evaluation of the deviating readings in these codices was quite correct. He confined himself, however, to a few occasional remarks.¹ A real investigation of the problem has been made by August Schroeder. He carefully examined the Biblical quotations in two of Philo's books preserved in these two MSS.: 'De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini' and 'Quod Deus sit immutabilis',² and came to very interesting results. In the first of these books, where these MSS. are supported by a sixth-century papyrus, the Biblical quotations in the group agree with the other MSS. and are in general accordance with the usual text of the Septuagint. But in the book 'Quod Deus sit immutabilis' the Biblical quotations are so different from those in the other MSS. that in one of the groups of MSS. the quotations must have been altered. There are only two alternatives: either Philo quoted a Greek Tora in general identical with the 'Septuagint', and the Biblical quotations in the archetype of MSS. UF have been altered according to an old Greek Tora otherwise unknown to us, or the quotations from the Tora in this group of MSS.—in Philo's book *Quod Deus sit immutabilis*—correspond to the original quotations of Philo and are altered, according to a form of the 'Septuagint', in the other MSS. of this book and in all MSS. of other books of Philo. Schroeder is convinced that the second alternative alone can be accepted. He writes:

Libri 'Quod Deus sit immutabilis' locis biblicis tantum inter codicum UF et ceterorum codicum textus formam interest, ut quin aut alteri aut alteri a textu postea de industria correcto dependeat dubium non sit. . . . In Philonis enim libro qui 'Q.D.s.i.' inscribitur, me quidem

¹ Cf. *Philologus*, vol. lix, 1900, pp. 271 ff.

² August Schroeder, *De Philonis Alexandrini Vetere Testamento*, Gryphiae, 1907. The book is a Greifswald thesis, suggested by Prof. A. Gehrke, Schroeder's teacher.

iudice codices UF vetustissimum veteris testamenti textum perhibent, ceteri secundum Alexandrinam versionem correcti sunt; vetustior igitur textum nullis codicibus nisi UF servatus est. . . .¹

What Schroeder here says is convincing. We have to remember that Philo's works were preserved by the endeavour of Christian copyists only. It is most likely that they have brought Philo's deviating quotations into accordance with the text of the Greek Tora to which they were accustomed. We know from Jerome that the bishops of Caesarea, Acacius (A.D. 338–65) and Euzoius (A.D. 356–9), had ordered copies to be made on parchment of worn-out books of the Caesarean Library which had been written on papyrus.² A. Gehrke suggested that on this occasion Philo's quotations from the Bible may have been altered. We know that Philo's book belonged to that library.³ We should perhaps, in accordance with the general view, expect that in Caesarea the quotations were brought into accordance with the Caesarean text, not with that of Lucian. This objection need not, however, be considered decisive, and, besides, the quotations may have been altered anywhere else. On the other hand, it is certain that MSS. UF have preserved better readings than the other MSS. not only in quotations from the Bible, but in other places also, where the editors did not recognize it. So in § 59 of 'Quod Deus sit immutabilis' the correct reading of Philo was certainly ἀποπαύεται (so UF and a few other MSS.), whilst Wendland gives ἀποπαύει as the reading of Philo, in accordance with the MSS. he generally follows. In § 174 a whole sentence is preserved in MSS. UF and G only.⁴ We see that not only in quotations from the Bible has this group of MSS. sometimes preserved the better text of Philo.

In these circumstances the books of Philo preserved in these MSS. will have to be investigated carefully. We cannot simply identify the Greek Tora used by him with the Christian 'Septuagint'. The Greek Tora used by him has to be regarded as a problem. We have seen that some of the specimens quoted by Swete presuppose a Hebrew text different from that which was the basis of the Christian 'Septuagint'. I may quote here another example proving this fact.⁵ In Gen. 11. 26 we read that

¹ Schroeder, l.c., pp. 38, 40.

² Jerome's Epistle, 34. 1, quoted by Cohn in the *Prolegomena*, vol. i, p. 111.

³ Schroeder, l.c., p. 46.

⁴ Paul Maas drew my attention to these two instances.

⁵ Cf. my article 'Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Pentateuchtextes', in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1915, pp. 399 ff.

Terah was 70 years old when his son Abraham was born. Terah was 205 years old when he died in Haran, Gen. 11. 32. Abraham was 75 years old when he went out from Haran, Gen. 12. 4. Terah was then 145 years old and must have been alive for a further 60 years after Abraham's emigration. In Philo's book *De migratione Abraami* we read, however,¹ τελευτήσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκείθε καὶ ταύτης μετανίσταται. Here it is clearly presupposed that Abraham went out from Haran after his father's death. Philo must have read in his Greek Tora in Gen. 11. 32 that Terah died in Haran when he was 145 years old. This reading is still preserved, but neither in the Masoretic text nor in any MS. of the Christian 'Septuagint'. It is to be found in the Pentateuch of the Samaritans.

The same text must have been read by Luke in his Greek Tora when he wrote the Acts of the Apostles. We read in Acts 7. 4: κακέiθεν μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ μετόπισεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν γῆν ταύτην. Abraham emigrated from Haran after the death of his father Terah. Not a single MS. of the Christian 'Septuagint' has preserved in Gen. 11. 32 a reading which Philo and Luke read in their Greek Tora in the first Christian century.

New Testament quotations from a Greek Tora based on a Hebrew text now preserved only in the Samaritan Pentateuch are not so uncommon. Exod. 3. 6 is quoted in Acts 7. 32 in the form: ἐγὼ ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων σου. The Masoretic text has here אֲנֹכִי אֱלֹהֵי אֲבִיךָ, and the 'Septuagint' reads in accordance with it . . . τοῦ πατρὸς σου. The Samaritan text has the plural אֲנֹכִי אֱלֹהֵי אֲבִיתִךָ, and the corresponding reading was found by Luke in his Greek Tora. The same text was read by Justin Martyr and by the translators of the Bohairic and Ethiopic Bibles, and is found also in some minuscule MSS. of the Christian 'Septuagint'.²

Of greater importance may be the following example. The extract of the History of Israel given by Stephen in the 7th chapter of Acts closely follows the story related in Genesis and Exodus. Verses 3-16 are dealing with Abraham and Joseph, vss. 17-34 correspond to the story reported in Exod. 1-3; vs. 36 describes the departure from Egypt and the crossing of the Red Sea; vs. 38 deals with the sojourn at Sinai; vss. 40 f. rely on Exod. 32. It is somewhat surprising to find in vs. 37 the quotation from Deut. 18. 15: προφήτην ὑμῖν ἀναστήσει ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῶν

¹ *Philonis Alexandrini Opera* . . ., vol. ii, 1897, p. 202, § 177.

² See the references in the great Cambridge Septuagint.

ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν ὡς ἐμέ. Here it is certainly noteworthy that the Samaritan Pentateuch introduces in Exod. 20. 15-22 several passages from Deuteronomy: After Exod. 20. 17: Deut. 11. 29, 27. 2-7, 11. 30; after Exod. 20. 19: Deut. 5. 24-7; after Exod. 10. 21: Deut. 5. 28, 29; 18. 18-22; 5. 30, 31. In the Samaritan text the first part of Deut. 18. 18 and 18. 15 differ in so far only that in vs. 18 the Lord is speaking in the third person, in vs. 15 in the first. We may suppose that Luke remembered at this place Deut. 18. 15 without any help. But we have to reckon with the possibility that he found in his Greek Tora the passages from Deuteronomy inserted in Exod. 20 which we find to-day in the Samaritan Pentateuch only.

No MS. of the Christian 'Septuagint' has this insertion at this place. In the Syro-Hexaplaris these insertions are quoted as belonging to the Samaritan text.¹ At other places, however, similar insertions from parallel passages which we know from the Samaritan Pentateuch occur in MSS. of the Christian 'Septuagint' also. So after Num. 14. 45, Deut. 1. 44 is inserted; after Num. 21. 8, Deut. 2. 9; after Num. 21. 14, Deut. 2. 17-19; after Num. 28. 1, Deut. 3. 21, 22; after Num. 31. 20 some passages from Numbers. These insertions are to be found in the cursive MSS. s (= 131, Vienna), v (Athos), z (= 85, Rome).—Some verses from the itinerary given in Num. 33. 31-8 are inserted in Deut. 10. 6 before the report of Aaron's death in the Samaritan text. The same insertion is to be found in the cursive MSS. of the 'Septuagint' d (= 44, Zittau), p (= 106, Ferrara), and in Deut. 10. 7 in the cursive MSS. t (= 134, Florence), and in the MSS. 74 (Florence) and 76 (Paris).—In accordance with the Samaritan Pentateuch the words ὅς γὰρ ποιεῖ τοῦτο ὥσῃ ἀσπάλακα θύσει ὅτι μῆνιμά ἐστι τῷ Θεῷ Ἰακώβ, are inserted in Exod. 23. 19 in the cursive MS. k (= 58, Rome). The same words are to be found in Deut. 14. 21 in quite a number of 'Septuagint' MSS., although they are not contained in the Samaritan Pentateuch at this place.

A similar kind of insertion, not to be found in the Samaritan Pentateuch, is preserved in a fragment of the Greek Tora recently published.² Here after Exod. 23. 10-13 the text of

¹ In Field's edition of the Hexapla the insertions quoted in the Syro-Hexaplaris are rendered in Greek by Field. He has adapted the text to the usual Septuagint text, which is certainly not correct. The editors of the Cambridge Septuagint have translated these Syriac quotations into Latin.

² *Berliner Septuagintafragmente*, bearbeitet von Otto Stegmüller (*Berliner Klassikertexte aus den Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin*, Heft VIII), Berlin, 1939. It

Exod. 31. 12–17 is inserted.¹ Both passages contain prescriptions for the Sabbath day. We have therefore to draw the conclusion that MSS. with the insertion of parallel passages were not restricted to the Samaritan Pentateuch but were used also in Jewish circles. But we can draw another interesting conclusion from this text. The editor has not recognized² that the Hebrew text which was the basis of this Greek translation showed several readings of the Samaritan Pentateuch. We see that MSS. of the Hebrew Tora with the insertion of parallel passages and with readings of the Samaritan Pentateuch were in the hands of the Jews. They were used by them up to the time when the authoritative text of the Tora was created and generally accepted.

The MSS. of the Greek Tora which were in the hands of the Greek-speaking Jews in the first Christian century reflected the features of the Hebrew texts from which they had been translated or to which they had been adapted. From the Jews these texts were taken over by the early Christians and were used by them. Such a kind of Greek Tora must have been in the hands of Luke when he composed his 'second' book. In the MSS. of the Greek Tora which became later, as the 'Septuagint', the standard text of the Christian Church, the larger inserted parallel texts have completely disappeared. Some of the smaller insertions, however, are still to be found in quite a number of later cursive MSS. and fragments preserved to us, as we have seen.

It is very likely that the MSS. of the Greek Tora used by early Christians had other characteristics also of the Samaritan Pentateuch. I may illustrate this fact by one example.

The Epistle to the Hebrews presupposes in chapter 9. 3 f. that the golden altar of incense belonged to the Holy of Holies in the Tabernacle and in the Temple. That does not correspond with the facts and can only be explained if the author depended for his knowledge of the Jewish service on written sources, not on experience. This misunderstanding can, however, hardly be explained on the basis of the 'Septuagint' and the Masoretic

is the fragment published as No. 4 (Inv. No. 13994), one folio, parchment, uncial script, fifth/sixth century. The facsimile of one side is to be found on plate 2.

¹ Only the first two of these verses are preserved.

² These connexions can easily be proved. In Exod. 23. 11 ἀμπελουσιν and ελαιουσιν correspond to the plurals לְכַרְמִיךָ and לְזֵיתֶיךָ in the Samaritan Pentateuch; in Exod. 23. 13 the words [οὐκ ἀν]αμνησις οὐδὲ [μη ἀκουσ]θησονται correspond exactly to לֹא תִזְכֵּר וְלֹא יִשְׁמְעוּ in the Samaritan Pentateuch. In Exod. 31. 12 μετα [Μωυσ] and in 31. 13 το σαββα have their correspondences in the Samaritan Targum.

text. In the Samaritan Pentateuch the whole passage has a different order. Here Exod. 26. 35 is immediately followed by Exod. 30. 1–10, and in Exod. 30. 6 the words לְפָנֵי הַפְּרִכֶּת אֲשֶׁר עַל הַעֲדָת (כַּפֹּרֶת) are missing—as also in the Septuagint. The contents are here as follows: the veil should be made, dividing between the Holy and the Holy of Holies (26. 33) . . . 'and thou shouldest put the mercy seat (כַּפֹּרֶת) upon the ark of the testimony in the Holy of Holies (26. 34), and thou shouldest set the table without the veil and the candlestick over against the table on the north side (26. 35). And thou shalt make an altar to burn incense upon it, of acacia wood shalt thou make it' (30. 1)—it is described in vss. 2–5—'and thou shalt put it before the veil that is over the ark of testimony where I shall appear unto thee (30. 6). And Aaron shall burn thereon incense of spices, when he dresseth the lamp he shall burn it (30. 7, 8, 9). And Aaron shall make atonement upon it once in the year; from the blood of the offering of atonement shall he make atonement upon it once in the year for your generations. Most holy is it to the Lord (30. 10). And thou shalt make a screen for the door of the tent . . . (26. 36).'

The passage could be understood in this form also in a way that corresponds to the facts. But there can be no doubt that it could more easily be misunderstood as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews misunderstood it. We have to reckon with the possibility that the Greek Tora which was before the author of the Epistle followed here in Exodus the order of text which we find to-day only in the Pentateuch of the Samaritans.

The actual or possible connexion of a Greek Tora of such a kind and the New Testament has hardly been taken into consideration so far. Such a connexion, if proved, could certainly not be explained in the way in which Heinrich Hammer tried to explain it in a somewhat curious book in which he quoted these and similar examples.¹ He concluded that Jesus and His Apostles—except Paul—were Samaritans. The Samaritan Pentateuch on the whole has no specific Samaritan character. It has some readings adapted to the conceptions of Israelite history that are characteristic of the Samaritans.² But from the fact that this form of text is preserved only with these adaptations we cannot conclude that the text did not exist once among the Jews—although certainly without these adaptations. The

¹ Heinrich Hammer, *Traktat vom Samaritaner Messias*, Bonn, 1912.

² See Abraham Geiger, *Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel*, 1857, pp. 98 ff.; *Nachgelassene Schriften*, vol. iv, 1876, p. 56 f.

Samaritan text is in the main a popular revision of an older text, in which antiquated forms and constructions, not familiar to people of later times, were replaced by forms and constructions easier to be understood, difficulties were removed, parallel passages were inserted.¹

That a popular text of the Tora of that kind was really used in Jewish circles we can see from the fact that in writings of undoubtedly Jewish character we often find readings corresponding to the Tora text preserved by the Samaritans. Such readings are chiefly to be found in texts which were not taken over by the later official Jewish circles, as, for instance, in the book of Jubilees. In his edition of the Ethiopic text of this book R. H. Charles made an exact investigation of the Biblical text presupposed in the book. The quotations from the Bible sometimes agree with the Samaritan text, sometimes with the text which was the basis of the Septuagint, very seldom with the Masoretic text.² Of special interest is the chronological system followed in the book in Gen. 5 and 11. It is well known that the three versions of the Pentateuch have different numbers of years in these chapters. The text which was before the author of the book of Jubilees follows in Gen. 5 the years given in the Samaritan text, in Gen. 11 the years given in the Septuagint. August Dillmann, who carefully investigated these problems,³ comes to the conclusion that—to judge from the book of Jubilees—it must be regarded as doubtful whether the standard numbers for the continuation of the chronological thread, which we find in the Masoretic text, were already established in the time of Christ; they were in any case not generally established in the MSS. of the Hebrew Pentateuch of that time. Dillmann continues:

Curiously enough the other Jewish testimonies for the chronology of the patriarchs preserved to us from pre-Christian times till the end of the first century do not agree with the numbers of the official Hebrew text, but agree almost everywhere with those of the book of Jubilees. Never do we find in the book of Enoch the reckoning of the Hebrew

¹ The whole material is collected and discussed by Wilhelm Gesenius in his book *De Pentateuchi Samaritani origine, indole et auctoritate Commentatio philologico-critica*, Halae, 1815. Gesenius could not see the real problems presented by this text, and the instances collected by him have very often to be explained in a way different from that adopted by Gesenius. Cf. A. Geiger, *Nachgelassene Schriften*, I.c.

² *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, Sem. Series, viii, 1895; Introduction, ch. vii, pp. xx ff.

³ August Dillmann, *Beiträge aus dem Buche der Jubiläen zur Kritik des Pentateuch-textes*, Sitzungsberichte, Berlin Academy, 1883, pp. 337 ff.

text, but sometimes that of the book of Jubilees and the Samaritan text, sometimes that of the Septuagint.

Dillmann further refers to the Assumptio Mosis, and to the fourth book of Ezra, where the conditions are the same, and he shows that the chronology presupposed by Paul in the Epistle to the Galatians (3. 17) follows the reading of the Samaritan text and the Septuagint in Exod. 12. 40, and is in accordance with the reckoning of the book of Jubilees.

Dillmann is chiefly interested in problems of the *Hebrew* text. He has, however, seen that the numbers given in the different MSS. of the Septuagint differ in many respects from each other. But that the differences are far greater than he realized can be seen from the various readings collected in the greater Cambridge Septuagint. The texts discovered in later times increase these readings in many directions, and it is of interest that the Chester Beatty Papyrus 961, dated by Sir Frederic Kenyon in the first half of the fourth century,¹ gives numbers of years which agree with those in the Samaritan text in Gen. 11. 15 and 11. 17, in the first instance supported by the Sahidic version only, in the second instance by quite a number of MSS.² The different theories on which these numbers were based. These theories were not confined to the *Greek Bible*, they existed for the Hebrew text also. Hebrew MSS. with such various readings are not preserved. Those which once existed were brought into agreement with the authoritative Hebrew text by the 'correctors' in the course of time, so that one text only was in the hands of the Jews. For the Pentateuch a second Hebrew text is preserved, the text used up to the present day by the Samaritans. For many centuries the Samaritan Pentateuch also has been a *textus receptus* without various readings. We have seen that a text similar to it must have been used in Jewish circles also, in the time before all the earlier texts were replaced by the authoritative Hebrew text. The traces of different texts of the Greek Tora show that the Hebrew Tora was in earlier times not confined to the two forms of text preserved to us.

For the Greek Tora the Jews in Alexandria had created a standard text in the so-called 'Septuagint'. In spite of this standard text many other forms of the Greek Tora were used

¹ *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri* . . . , fasc. iv, 1934, p. ix.

² Arthur Allgeier, *Die Chester Beatty-Papyri zum Pentateuch. Untersuchungen zur älteren Überlieferungsgeschichte der Septuaginta* (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, vol. xxi. 2), Paderborn, 1938, p. 55 f.

by the Jews and early Christians, as we have seen. What have we to say of the other parts of the Greek Bible for which the Jews—as far as we know—have never made the attempt to create a standard text?

I may begin with a little fragment containing a few verses from Job 33 and 34, written on papyrus in about A.D. 200. After publishing the fragment among the 'Berliner Septuaginta Fragmente',¹ and discussing the different readings, the editor, Otto Stegmüller, comes with regard to the fragment to the following result:

How is this curious text to be assessed? It is so peculiar that it cannot be connected simply with any of the Greek MSS. so far known. It is quite remote from some of them. For instance we do not find in these verses any of the readings peculiar to A. It approximates most closely to B or B*, but besides, we do find a number of special readings which give it a character of its own. The Septuagint and our fragment presuppose the same Hebrew text which is sometimes better, sometimes worse than the actual Masoretic text; but in most cases it is in agreement with it. When special readings and additions are found in the Septuagint, they are generally to be explained as misreadings and glosses. The fragment does not contain a text which was later corrected according to the Masoretic text. It points rather to an independent old translation which represents a Hebrew text of Job in many ways better than any so far known. The great antiquity makes the fragment especially important.

The verses of the Greek Job were taken from a MS. which largely differed from the Job text in our Greek Bible. We can understand that the Christians had no interest in preserving a text differing to such an extent. The Chester Beatty Papyri, being the oldest MSS. of the Greek Bible of which greater parts are preserved, belonged to the library of a Christian Church. Such a library had an interest in having 'correct' MSS. Otherwise the MSS. would probably not have survived. The Church had, besides, an interest in bringing deviating quotations from the Greek Bible into agreement with a text of the Bible used in the Church. We have seen that Philo's quotations from the Pentateuch have systematically been altered by Christian copyists. It seems that the same has been done with certain quotations in the works of Josephus.

Josephus' quotations from the books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles have been carefully examined by H. St. John

¹ = *Berliner Klassikertexte*, Heft viii, Berlin, 1939. The Job fragment is here no. 17.

Thackeray, the co-editor of the Cambridge Septuagint for these books. In an obituary notice of Thackeray, in the Prefatory Note to *Chronicles* (Cambridge, 1932), Brooke and McLean, the chief editors, attest his accuracy in collating and revising Bible MSS., and they add:

Perhaps his most important separate contribution was his investigation of the evidence of Josephus for the text of the Septuagint.

In one of his last books¹ Thackeray gives a general view of the results to which he came with regard to the text of the Bible used by Josephus. Here we find the following remark:

Not only can we confidently state in general terms that Josephus used a Greek Bible. We can go further and identify the particular type of Greek text which lay before him. This text was not one contained in our oldest uncial MSS., the codex Vaticanus or Alexandrinus, on which our modern printed editions of the Septuagint are based. It was a text allied to one preserved only in a small group of MSS. written not in uncial but in cursive script at a much later date, between the 10th and 14th centuries,² and known by the figures assigned to them by the eighteenth-century editors, Holmes and Parsons, as 19, 84, 93, and 103. This type of text . . . was in the nineteenth century identified with a particular recension of the Greek Bible current in Syria and adjacent countries and commonly designated 'Lucianic' after the supposed author, the Christian Lucian of Antioch, who suffered martyrdom under the emperor Maximin in the year 311 or 312. And now that we have in our hands fuller and more accurate editions both of the Septuagint and of Josephus, we discover that this 'Syriac' text in an older form was in existence more than two centuries earlier, and can be carried back from the age of the Christian Lucian to that of the Jewish historian (p. 83).

Thackeray is convinced that the Josephan Biblical text is uniformly of this Lucianic type from 1 Samuel to 1 Maccabees. For this large portion of Scripture Josephus has used—according to Thackeray—one single text, not two or more. In a Prefatory Note on the evidence of Josephus for the Books of Samuel³ he writes:

With the books of Samuel (more strictly 1 Sam. 8 onwards), Josephus becomes a witness of first-rate importance for the text of the Greek

¹ Thackeray: *Josephus, The Man and the Historian*, New York, 1929, pp. 81 ff.

² Thackeray does not refer here to the 'Codex Zuqninensis rescriptus Veteris Testamenti', ed. Eugène Tisserant (*Studi e Testi*, vol. xxiii, Roma, 1911). 127 palimpsest leaves (122 in Rome, 5 in London) are known. They belong to six MSS., and are written in uncial script of the fifth/sixth century. The text preserved here is of clear Lucianic type.

³ *The Old Testament in Greek. I and II Samuel*, Cambridge, 1927, p. ix.

Bible. . . . Throughout the later historical books . . . his main source is a Greek Bible containing a text closely allied to that of the Lucianic group of MSS.

Thackeray is anxious to find out from which part of the world Josephus could have received the 'Lucianic' text in the first Christian century.

For the books of Samuel, Thackeray comes to nearly the same results as Adam Mez who devoted a special investigation to Josephus' quotations from the Bible in some of the books of the *Antiquities*.¹ Mez tried to prove the agreement of Josephus' quotations with the 'Lucianic' text by a great number of instances, proper names, and positive facts reported by Josephus. He referred also to observations made by S. R. Driver, that the old Latin version affords independent evidence of the existence of MSS. containing characteristic readings of Lucian, and that not unfrequently the Peshitta also shows passages which agree with the Lucianic text.² Josephus, *Vetus Latina*, and Peshitta can therefore be regarded as sources for a primitive text of Lucian ('Ur-Lucian') in the first and second Christian centuries.

Thackeray's statement that for the historical books from Samuel onwards Josephus is of first-rate importance for the Lucianic text of the Old Testament is of great interest in so far as it is in complete contrast with the result to which Alfred Rahlfs comes with regard to the text of the Bible used by Josephus for these books.³ Rahlfs's book was suggested by a prize offered in 1907 by the Göttingen Academy:

Das Verhältnis des sogenannten Lucian-textes der Septuaginta zu der ihm zugrunde liegenden Überlieferung soll untersucht werden.

Although Rahlfs had limited his investigation to the books of Kings, and had failed to give adequate attention to the essential problem, he was awarded the prize.⁴ In the printed edition of his book he tried to meet the Academy's criticism.

Rahlfs begins with a sharp criticism of Lagarde's edition of the Lucianic text⁵ for the books of Samuel and Kings. Lagarde had based his edition on MSS. containing the Lucianic text. Ac-

¹ Adam Mez, *Die Bibel des Josephus, untersucht für Buch V-VII der Archaeologie*, Basel, 1895.

² *Notes on the Hebrew text . . . of the Books of Samuel*, 1913, pp. lxxi and lxxvii.

³ *Septuaginta-Studien*, 3: *Lucian's Rezension der Königsbücher*, Göttingen, 1911.

⁴ *Nachrichten von der Kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Ge-schäftliche Mitteilungen*, 1910, pp. 36-40.

⁵ *Librorum Veteris Testamenti canonicorum pars prior graece Pauli de Lagarde studio et sumptibus edita*, Göttingae, 1883.

ording to Rahlfs, these MSS. show two different forms of text, and a relative value only can be attributed to them. Of greater importance are various readings in agreement with quotations of Church Fathers who follow the Lucianic text, and besides, readings which follow Codex B and the Ethiopic version. The text represented by these two sources is for Rahlfs the text nearest to the 'original' Septuagint. He is convinced that the Lucianic text is derived from the 'original' Septuagint. Readings in agreement with Codex B and the Ethiopic version must therefore belong to the oldest parts of the Lucianic text.

On the basis of this reconstructed 'Lucianic' text he re-examines the instances from Samuel quoted by Mez and comes to the conclusion that most of them are no sufficient proof for connecting Josephus' Bible with that kind of text. He must, however, admit that some of the instances given by Mez¹ show nevertheless the 'Lucianic' character of the Bible used by Josephus for these books. Rahlfs himself examined Josephus' quotations from the books of Kings with the result that in three instances only² do these texts agree. He concludes that a few scattered readings of Lucian might be of greater antiquity, not the text of Lucian in general, and he supposes that some of these older 'Lucianic' readings may have been influenced by Josephus.

Rahlfs has the merit of having collected a great amount of material for studying the Septuagint, and his *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments* (Göttingen, 1914) is a very useful piece of work. But his preconceived ideas on the origin of the Septuagint and many other shortcomings prevented him generally from making the right use of this material. In this case we have a very clear example of the methods adopted by him. He reconstructs an older Lucianic text, closely related to Codex B, but one which never existed, and shows that this text has nothing to do with the quotations of Josephus. He severely criticizes Lagarde's edition of the Lucianic text made by that great scholar on the basis of MSS. which actually existed and did not see—what had been seen by Thackeray—that for the text contained in the MSS. published by Lagarde the quotations of Josephus are of first-rate importance. Nobody will be surprised that Rahlfs did not see the doubtful character of his methods. It is, however, somewhat surprising that the responsible men of the Göttingen Academy were so much under

¹ Seven or eight transcriptions of proper names and two positive facts.

² One translation, one addition, and the division of the two books.

the influence of these theories that they did not see the vicious circle in which the whole of Rahlfs' deductions moved.¹

There can be no doubt that the quotations of Josephus from these historical books are in agreement with the text of Lucian. It is, however, another question whether this agreement can be explained in the way proposed by Thackeray and—before him—by Mez. Thackeray and Mez based their investigations on Niese's critical edition of Josephus.² We have to remember that among the MSS. at our disposal there is not a single one which has preserved the original text of Josephus unaltered.

ac primum ne unus quidem (codex) est qui Josephi verba incorrupta tradat. statim enim postquam Josephus maxime a Christianis legi coeptus est, quaedam in eo consulto et de industria mutata sunt, quoniam eum cum libris sacris in linguam graecam olim conversis consentire volebant,

writes Niese.³ From a quotation of Eusebius where the original reading of Josephus is preserved, Niese is able to show that this reading was altered in all codices of Josephus. From this and similar facts he concludes that all the codices preserved must go back to one archetype:⁴

Omnium vere codicum et versionis latinae unum archetypum fuisse etiam alia vitia omnibus communia docent.

Niese tries to date this archetype from a time after Origen and before Eusebius. I am somewhat doubtful whether his arguments for dating the archetype in this way are sufficient proof. Two things, however, are certain: (1) We have no evidence for the text of Josephus before the formation of the archetype. (2) This archetype was not written before the Lucianic text of the Bible was in existence. We have therefore to reckon with the possibility that the striking agreement between Josephus'

¹ In the Academy's report on Rahlfs's book we read: 'Namentlich gibt er (Rahlfs) in allen Fällen, wo eine Gruppe der Lucianhandschriften mit dem griechischen Vulgärtext, eine andere mit B und dem Aethiopen stimmt, der letzteren Gruppe den Vorzug. Dieser Grundsatz, dessen Richtigkeit durch die weitere Untersuchung durchaus bestätigt wird, ist wichtig. Denn es leidet keinen Zweifel, dass der vom Cod. B und dem Aethiopen repräsentierte Texttypus im allgemeinen der ursprünglichen LXX am nächsten kommt' (p. 36).

² *Flavii Josephi Opera*, edidit et apparatu critico instruxit Benedictus Niese, 7 vols., Berolini, 1887-95. The text printed by Thackeray himself and continued by Ralph Marcus as a basis for their English translation in 'The Loeb Classical Library', is derived from the material collected by Niese. Vols. i-vii were published 1926-43, vols. viii and ix are not yet published.

³ Vol. i, Praefatio, p. xxx.

⁴ Ibid., p. xxxii.

quotations from the historical books and the text of Lucian may be due to alterations made by Christian copyists who were anxious—or may have been ordered—to bring Josephus' quotations into agreement with a Greek text of the Bible which was regarded as one of special value at that time. We have seen that similar conditions existed for Philo's quotations from the Greek Pentateuch¹ and the same has been proved in other cases also. Striking agreement of Old Testament quotations with the Lucianic text in the writings of Justin Martyr (died about 165) can be explained only by alterations made by later copyists; all Justin's deductions show that Justin must have quoted a text of the Bible which clearly differed from the text which we now find in the only preserved MS. of his works.²

That the quotations from the historical books in the text of Josephus were brought into agreement with the Lucianic text by later copyists appears very likely in view of two considerations:

1. *Some* agreements in these quotations could easily be explained by pre-Lucianic elements in the Lucianic text. Lucianic readings in the Vetus Latina and in the Peshitta³ are a clear proof that Lucian based the text created by him on a form of the Greek Bible which was in existence some centuries before him. But the *complete* agreement can hardly be explained otherwise than by later alteration of the Josephan text.

2. Josephus' quotations from other books of the Bible are of quite a different character. According to Thackeray, Josephus made little use of the prophetic books, except Daniel, counted by him among the Prophets. For Daniel he appears to have used a Greek text combining peculiarities of the two Greek texts of the book preserved. In the Tora, the use made of the so-called Septuagint is slight. Thackeray thinks that Josephus' main authority must here have been a Hebrew text translated by Josephus himself. In the books of Joshua, Judges, and Ruth, Thackeray finds no evidence for the use of a Greek text; as between Hebrew and Aramaic, he suspects, in Judges at least, dependence on an Aramaic Targum.⁴

That Josephus should have used in the *Antiquities* sometimes (for the Pentateuch) a Hebrew text translated by himself, sometimes (for the historical books from Samuel onwards) a Greek version of exactly Lucianic type, sometimes (for Judges) an

¹ See above, p. 142 f.

² Wilhelm Bousset, *Die Evangelienzitate Justins des Märtyrers in ihrem Wert für die Evangelienkritik*, Göttingen, 1891, pp. 18-32.

³ See above, p. 152.

4. l.c., p. 81.

Aramaic Targum translated into Greek by himself, sometimes (for Daniel) alternatively two Greek translations, is not very likely. Nobody will deny that Josephus knew Hebrew and Aramaic sufficiently well. He declares himself to have written his *Bellum* first in Aramaic, his mother tongue, and he was educated as a priest. More doubtful is his mastery of the Greek language. At least it is very difficult to believe that he should have translated Hebrew and Aramaic Biblical texts into Greek in his later days, when he was living in Rome, under conditions quite different from those under which he wrote his *Bellum*, for a book composed—with the help of his assistants—in the Greek language, for non-Jewish readers. The varying character of his quotations from the Bible must be explained in another way. His Greek Tora may have differed greatly from the text of the Christian 'Septuagint', like the Greek Tora used by Philo. I have already discussed the problem of the Lucianic text in quotations from the later historical books. That the quotations from Daniel sometimes agree with the so-called 'Septuagint', sometimes with the so-called 'Theodotion', seems to show that, besides the two Greek texts preserved to us, other texts of Daniel existed in the first Christian century, and that one of these texts, now lost to us, was the Greek Daniel which was used by Josephus.

The Greek version of the book of Judges is preserved in two different forms. In one of his last publications¹ Paul de Lagarde has dealt with the problem of these two texts. He printed Judges 1–5 according to the two texts side by side, on opposite pages, with the apparatus belonging to each of them, in order to enable the reader to recognize clearly that we have here before us two different translations. He writes:²

Das Vorstehende genügt, um folgende Thesen zu stellen:

1. Die im Codex A . . . stehende Uebersetzung des Buches der Richter stimmt im Grossen und Ganzen sowohl mit dem Texte des Origenes als mit dem Texte des lateinisch redenden Westens.

2. Codex B liefert nicht Varianten zu A, sondern enthält, wie die schwierigeren Stellen zeigen, eine andere Uebersetzung des Buchs der Richter. Aus B in A, oder aus A in B hinüberkorrigieren darf nur der besonders Kundige und Besonnene. . . .

3. Ohne Eingehn in den innern Werth der Codices wird Niemand . . . die griechischen Uebersetzungen benutzen dürfen. Dies Eingehn ist das von mir 1863 . . . gemeinte 'eklektische Verfahren', das für jeden

¹ *Septuaginta-Studien. Abhandlungen der Hist.-Philos. Klasse der Kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Band 37, 1891.

² Cf. *Septuaginta-Studien*, p. 71 f.

Herausgeber der LXX nöthig wird, der den Urtext dieser Uebersetzung finden will. . . .

Lagarde has seen that the text of Judges as contained in Codex A had a wide circulation in the Christian Church. He admits that the codex has not seldom preserved an older translation where Codex B has only an excerpt made from later versions.¹ For the book of Judges he is convinced that Codex B contains a different translation. His own interest is, however, concentrated on finding out the 'Urtext' of this translation. How can we find an 'Urtext' of two different translations!

Whoever is acquainted with conditions prevailing in older Targums at a time before an authoritative text was fixed will recognize in these two Greek texts of Judges typical examples of two forms of an old Targum. The first attempt at translating a difficult Hebrew text into another language had generally no high standard. Revisions were necessary. Such revisions were made with more or less ability, by different men, on different principles. These Targums had no authoritative text. Every copyist could try to improve the text he copied. Sometimes texts of a higher standard were produced, due to a better understanding of the Hebrew original; sometimes we find an adaptation to another Hebrew text; sometimes the Greek of the translation was improved; sometimes we have to see in the new texts mere deteriorations, caused by the 'carelessness and recklessness of the copyists' (Origen).

In this way quite a number of different forms were created and used by Greek-speaking Jews, just as the Samaritans used different forms of their Samaritan Targum and the Jews their different forms of the Palestinian Targum of the Pentateuch.

Except for the Tora, the Jews had no standard text of the Greek Bible. The Christian Church needed a 'canonical' text of the Greek Bible and adopted usually *one* of the different forms used by the Jews. We do not know by what chance for Judges *two* of these forms were taken over by the Church. Lagarde had no experience of the conditions prevailing in older Targums. So he declared the two forms to be 'different translations' and did not recognize that they were the remains of different forms of a Greek Targum which had been used by Greek-speaking Jews. If Thackeray is right in saying that Josephus' quotations do not agree with either of these two forms, we have to conclude that

¹ Lagarde refers here to his *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Uebersetzung der Proverbien*, Leipzig, 1863, where he discusses on p. 3 (in text and annotation) these problems.

he had at his disposal another form of the Greek Targum on Judges now lost to us. It is quite possible that this form contained such midrashic elements as induce Thackeray to believe that Josephus' quotations were translated from an Aramaic Targum.

The Greek Old Testament was the Bible of the Christian Church from the beginning. Its importance can hardly be overestimated. 'Before the Church had any theology, the agreement between the Old Testament and the historical facts on which the new Society was founded was almost the only theme to be considered.'¹ The Christians had taken over from the Jews different forms of the Greek Bible and used these during the first and second centuries. But as evidence of the Scriptures the Church needed more and more a 'canonical' text. So one of the different forms of the Greek Bible became the standard text of the Church, and this standard text was called 'Septuagint', a name derived from the legend contained in the letter of Aristeas. But whilst the letter—and all Jewish authors—restricted that name to a certain revised version of the Tora, it was extended by the Christians to the whole Greek Bible, and all the authority attributed by the letter to a special form of the Greek Tora was conferred by the Christians on that special form of the whole Greek Bible which had become the standard text in the Church. This extension of the term 'Septuagint' took place in the second Christian century. Irenaeus (died A.D. 202) is already convinced of the miraculous origin of the 'Septuagint' meaning thereby the Greek translation of the whole Bible, and what Philo had said of the divine inspiration of the seventy-two translators of the Tora was said by Irenaeus of the seventy-two translators of the whole Greek Bible. It is of great interest to see to what degree the Christian authors made use of the letter of Aristeas in order to enhance the authority of their Greek Bible. I may refer here to the testimonies collected by Paul Wendland in his edition of the letter,² and to his very illuminating article in which he discusses these testimonies.³ The letter helped greatly to prove the 'canonicity' of the Greek Bible which had become the standard text of the Church. I may confine myself to referring to the famous correspondence between Augustine

¹ So Harnack, quoted by Lukyn Williams, *Justin Martyr, the Dialogue with Trypho*, London, 1930, p. xx.

² Leipzig, Teubner, 1900, pp. 87–166.

³ P. Wendland, 'Zur ältesten Geschichte der Bibel in der Kirche', *ZNTW.*, vol. i, 1900, pp. 267–99.

and Jerome in which the views of one of the greatest and most enlightened Christian authorities with regard to the Greek Bible are expressed in a very clear and interesting way.¹

Augustine cannot understand why Jerome intends to use the Hebrew text as a basis for his new Latin translation of the Bible. He is greatly disturbed by this news. He is astonished to hear that a new understanding of any Biblical passage might be gained from the Hebrew text which had escaped all the many translators, to say nothing of the 'Septuagint', of the miraculous origin and the divine inspiration of which Augustine is firmly convinced. He tries to persuade Jerome to use this 'canonical' text as a basis for the new translation, and he is afraid that Jerome's translation, when based on another text, might bring about a rupture between the Greek and Latin Churches. He declares that it is so convenient to be able to appeal in a debate to the Septuagint as the final authority that it would be very hazardous to refer to a Hebrew original, which could be used by nobody but Jerome, and to abandon so many Greek and Latin authorities.

We know that in deciding to use the Hebrew text as a basis for his Latin translation Jerome relied on Origen. He was the great scholar who had a real understanding of the uncertainty of the Greek Bible used in the Church. He calls this Bible 'Septuagint', as all the Christian authors did in his time. But he attributed to it neither the miraculous origin nor the divine inspiration usually connected with that name. He had studied MSS. of the Greek Bible and had seen that these texts did not agree at all with each other. The surviving parts of the 'Septuagint' column in the Hexapla show clearly that he had different texts of the version at his disposal.²

But—more important—there were differences between the Greek translation and the Hebrew original. Through controversies with the Jews he had become aware of these differences. He was convinced that to the original a greater authority must be attributed than to a translation derived from it. He had a certain knowledge of Hebrew, and we hear from Eusebius that he had in his own possession Hebrew Biblical MSS. There can be no doubt that he had been able to procure for himself Hebrew texts which were regarded as authoritative by the Jews of his

¹ Wendland, l.c., pp. 282 ff., based on Augustine's letters, nos. 28, 40, 67, 71.

² Cf. Alexander Sperber, 'New Testament and Septuagint', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. lix, New York, 1940, pp. 210 ff.

time. By comparing the Greek Bible with these Hebrew texts he recognized the differences between the two forms of text. But he was not aware that the Hebrew text also had had its history, and that the text which had been the basis of that translation was often not identical with the text regarded as authoritative by the Jews of his time. He could, therefore, see in all the instances where the Greek Bible differed from that text nothing else than deteriorations caused by the carelessness of the copyists. His aim is to repair the disagreements of the Greek Bible according to the authoritative Hebrew text. As his knowledge of Hebrew was not sufficient for doing this directly from the Hebrew text, he used all sorts of Greek translations of the Bible to which he had access, as a help in this task. He could, however, not speak frankly about these problems. He had to be cautious. The 'Septuagint' was regarded as the canonical text, inspired by God. So we find in his works only occasionally a remark on these problems. The chief reference is to be found in his Commentary on Matthew where we read:¹

Great differences have arisen in the transcripts, from the carelessness of some of the scribes, or from the recklessness of some persons, or from those who neglected the emendation of the text, or also from those who made additions to the text or omissions from it, as they thought fit. With God's help we were able to repair the disagreement in the copies of the Old Testament on the basis of the other versions. We judged what was doubtful in the Septuagint (on account of the disagreement of the codices) according to the rest of the versions, and retained what was in agreement with them. Some passages we have marked with an obelus, as not to be found in the Hebrew text, since we did not dare to suppress them altogether; some we have added using an asterisk, to make clear that we have added from the other versions something not to be found in the Septuagint, in accordance with the Hebrew text. Whoever wishes may accept them; he to whom this gives offence may accept or reject them, as he thinks fit.

Origen refers here to his great work on textual criticism, the Hexapla. The chief report on it is to be found in Eusebius' *Church History* (vi. 16). Eusebius depends here on some notes of Origen's which were published long ago, but had not been recognized in their importance and had been completely forgotten until they were rediscovered and republished by Giovanni Mercati.² These notes are contained in an excerpt

¹ Translated from the critical edition, made for the Berlin Academy by E. Klostermann, vol. xv: *Origenes' Matthäus-Erklärung*, Leipzig, 1935, p. 387.

² Giovanni Mercati, 'D'alcuni frammenti esaplati sulla V^a e VI^a edizione greca della Bibbia'. *Studi e Testi*, vol. v, Roma 1901, pp. 28-46.

dealing with some of the sources used by Origen for his great work. Mercati has shown that the excerpt contains original notes by Origen, which were before Eusebius when he wrote his *Church History*.¹ The passage of Eusebius has been discussed in a short, but important article by Eduard Schwartz.² I quote the passage of Eusebius in the translation of J. E. L. Oulton,³ but correcting it at two essential points in accordance with statements of Mercati and Schwartz which had escaped the attention of Oulton.⁴

And so accurate was the examination that Origen brought to bear upon divine books, that he even made a thorough study of the Hebrew tongue, and got into his own possession the original writings in the actual Hebrew characters, which were extant among the Jews. Thus, too, he traced the editions of the other translators of the sacred writings besides the Seventy and⁵ discovered certain others differing from the beaten track of translation, that of Aquila and Symmachus and Theodotion, which, after lying hidden for a long time, he traced and brought to light, I know not from what recesses. With regard to these, on account of their obscurity (not knowing whose in the world they were) he merely indicated this: that the one he found at Nicopolis near Actium, and the other in such other place. On the other hand,⁶ in the Hexapla of the Psalms, after the four well-known editions, he placed beside them not only a fifth but also a sixth and seventh translation; and in the case of one of these he has indicated again that it was found at Jericho in a jar in the time of Antoninus the son of Severus. All these he brought together, dividing them into clauses and placing them one against the other, together with the actual Hebrew text: and so he has left us the copies of the Hexapla, as it is called. He made a further separate arrangement of the editions of Aquila and Symmachus and Theodotion together with that of the Seventy, in the Tetrapla.

The excerpt as published by Mercati and reprinted by Eduard Schwartz may follow in an English translation:

Concerning the fifth and sixth edition further:

The fifth edition which I found in Nicopolis near Actium. The

¹ Mercati, l.c., pp. 31-6. See also Mercati's article 'Sul testo e sul senso di Eusebio H.E. VI 16', in *Studi e Testi*, v, pp. 47-60.

² Eduard Schwartz, 'Zur Geschichte der Hexapla' (*Nachrichten, Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klasse*, 1903, Heft 6).

³ Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History*, vol. ii (The Loeb Classical Library), London, New York, 1932, pp. 51 and 53.

⁴ Oulton's translation is given in both cases in the notes.

⁵ 'And beside the beaten track of translation, that of Aquila and Symmachus and Theodotion, he discovered certain others, which were used in turn . . .' The incorrectness of this translation was indicated by Mercati, who translated 'differenti dalle . . .', cf. p. 39, and Schwartz, p. 1, note 3.

⁶ 'At any rate'; but here a new sentence begins, Schwartz, p. 3.

marginal notes in it show how far (another similar text) differs from it.

The sixth edition which was found together with other Hebrew and Greek books in a jar near Jericho in the time of the reign of Antoninus (MS. Antonius) the son of Severus.

The translator of the fifth edition, having separated the 10th (Psalm) from the 9th, dividing it into two, goes on with the addition of one until the 69th (Psalm), then, joining the 70th to the 69th, he puts the numbers like those in our MSS., until the 113th (Psalm). From there, by joining some and dividing again others, he concludes with the 148th (Psalm).

In commenting on this text, Schwartz remarks that the last paragraph has to be regarded as a subscription under the seventh column of the Hexapla (containing the *Quinta*). It must have been written there at the end of the Psalms,¹ as we must infer from the contents. In the last but one paragraph we have to see, because of Eusebius' testimony, a subscription at the end of the Psalms under the eighth column (containing the *Sexta*). The subscription under the ninth column (containing the *Septima*) is lost, like nearly all of that edition. We do not know under which book Origen had placed the first note on the *Quinta*.

That the *Sexta*, not the *Septima*, was found near Jericho could be inferred already from Eusebius' report. That is proved with certainty by the original subscription of Origen. It is interesting to see to what extent Eusebius is depending in his description on the original subscriptions in the Hexapla. He preserves the active of εὐρεῖν for the *Quinta* and uses the passive for the *Sexta*, as Origen. It seems that besides these notes very little other material was at the disposal of Eusebius. Schwartz remarks that it is impossible to say at what time and under what conditions Origen was in Nicopolis, and whether he himself or somebody else in his place discovered and acquired the treasure of MSS. hidden in the jar near Jericho.

Mercati and Schwartz have seen that Origen's notice concerning the *Quinta*, as preserved in the excerpt, is incomplete at the end. I have added in brackets the supplement proposed by Schwartz. Origen must have had at his disposal at least *two* copies of the *Quinta*, which differed from each other in some respect. In the column of the *Quinta*, Origen had added to the text of one copy the various readings of the other copy (or copies)

on the margin. Mercati has pointed out that the Milan palimpsest contains in the last column—that following the column with the Septuagint—the text of the *Quinta*, not the text of Theodotion, and that the text of this version is provided on the margin with the various readings added by Origen from the other MS. (or MSS.) of the *Quinta*.¹

We know from Eusebius' report that these anonymous versions (*Quinta*, *Sexta*, *Septima*) occupied special columns in the Psalms of the Hexapla. But a number of readings from these versions belonging to other books of the Bible are reported. Very little is known of the *Septima*. Two readings from the Psalms are reported by Field (p. xlvi). All the rest of this column is lost. Jerome knew more of this version (Field, p. xliii). We know more of the *Quinta* and *Sexta*. 'In Psalmis editiones

¹ Rahlfs, in his edition of the Greek Psalter (*Septuaginta Societatis Scientiarum Göttingensis*, auctoritate edidit A. Rahlfs, x. *Psalmi cum Odis*, Göttingen, 1931) refers to the last column of the Milan palimpsest erroneously as belonging to *Theodotion*, whereas it belongs to the *Quinta*. Mercati had put at his disposal his copy of the complete Milan palimpsest. Rahlfs quotes it very seldom. We can easily control him, as the whole material, on the basis of the same copy of Mercati, was carefully—and correctly—registered in the *Oxford Concordance of the Septuagint*, Supplement II (Oxford, 1906). Rahlfs made also very little use of the Hexaplaric material published by Field—it is especially rich for the Psalter. He did not understand the importance of this material. In the Cambridge Septuagint and in Ziegler's edition of the Greek Isaiah (*Septuaginta*. . . XIV. *Isaias*, Göttingen, 1938), the whole of the Hexaplaric material is carefully registered. Paul de Lagarde, after a long discussion of the importance of this material, declared: 'Eine Ausgabe der Septuaginta ohne vollständige Aufnahme des sogenannten hexaplarischen Materials halte ich für unwissenschaftlich.' See Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, vol. iii, Göttingen, 1889, p. 234.—Rahlfs's chief interest is devoted to the different forms of the Greek Bible used in the different parts of the Christian Church, the so-called 'recensions', indicated already by Jerome. An exact study of them is of great interest for the history of the Greek Bible in the Christian Church, and their importance is emphasized by Paul de Lagarde. With the help of the material at his disposal, Rahlfs could make here some progress. Arthur Allgeier, however, has shown that his work on some of the sources, especially the *Vetus Latina*, is quite unsatisfactory, cf. his valuable reviews of Rahlfs's edition in *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1931, cols. 1635–40, and *Theologische Revue*, vol. xxx, 1931, no. 6. By disregarding the other material at our disposal, which did not interest him, Rahlfs reconstructs, on the basis of the recensions used in the Christian Church, a text which never existed in that form, presents it in the orthography of the third century B.C., and believes that he has pushed back the text 300 years and has arrived at a text closely connected with the 'Urtext' of the translation. Paul de Lagarde saw correctly that we may arrive, with the help of the recensions used in the Christian Church, at a text as old as the beginning of the Christian Church, 'of about the same age as the emperor Tiberius'. See *Mittheilungen*, iii, 234.

¹ See Mercati, 'La numerazione dei Salmi nella V^a edizione', *Studi e Testi*, vol. v, pp. 42–6.

Quinta et Sexta passim laudantur', remarks Field (p. xlv). To the material for the Quinta given by Field nearly 150 verses of the Psalms have to be added from the Milan palimpsest. For these verses the full text of the Quinta with various readings is preserved. Besides the material from the Psalms, Field quotes from the Quinta: four readings from the Pentateuch, many from the fourth book of Kings, one from Job, several from Canticles and from the Minor Prophets, especially Hosea. Of the Sexta, Field quotes—besides the instances from the Psalms—one reading from the Pentateuch, one from the third book of Kings, one from Job, many from Canticles, one from Amos, and three from Habakkuk. This survey shows that Quinta and Sexta must have covered quite a number of Biblical books, although very little of these versions is preserved.

No authors of these versions are known. Origen quotes them by the number of the column which they occupied in the Hexapla. They were of Jewish origin. That the MS. of the Sexta was discovered—according to Origen—together with *Hebrew* MSS. makes this quite certain. But they did not belong to the category of versions made on the basis of the authoritative Hebrew text (Aquila, Symmachus) or brought into accordance with that text (Theodotion). We hear from Eusebius that they had been *hidden for a long time* when they were discovered. That shows that they had been disqualified and become useless for the Jews.

There can hardly be any doubt that these MSS. were discovered by Origen in Jewish Genizas. As a real scholar he was anxious to have the material for his great work on textual criticism as complete as possible. It may be that the Jews themselves indicated to him places where he could find MSS. of the Greek Bible. We may regret that he did not give more details of the MSS. discovered by him or for him. He had to be cautious in all matters concerning textual criticism, as we have seen. That he himself valued highly these old versions of the Bible we may see from the way in which he made use of them. He would not have provided a special column in the Hexapla for each of these versions had they not differed greatly from each other. He would not have marked various readings on the margins of one of these translations of which he had more than one MS., if they had not been of importance for him. According to Eusebius these different columns existed for the Psalms in the Hexapla. We have, however, seen that they were not confined to that book of the Bible.

In these versions, carefully collected by Origen, we have to see different forms of the Greek Bible used by Greek-speaking Jews in pre-Christian times and in the first Christian century.¹ They were later replaced by new Greek translations made in agreement with the authoritative Hebrew text. The more this text became predominant among the Jews, the more older forms of the Greek Bible became obsolete, they were put into Genizas that they might do no harm, that they might disappear in the course of time.

These different forms of the Greek Bible were taken over by the Christians in the apostolic period. They are reflected in the New Testament in quotations from and in allusions to the Greek Old Testament. These quotations in the New Testament were not altered according to the later standard text of the Old Testament, the Septuagint, as quotations in Philo, Josephus, and the Church fathers were. The authors of the writings of the New Testament had their own authority. So these quotations are of great importance for recognizing the forms of the Greek Bible used by the early Christians. We have no interest in proving that these quotations are more or less in accordance with the Christian Septuagint, the only text of the Greek Bible considered so far. That a great number of these quotations agree with the Christian 'Septuagint' is to be explained by the fact that the later standard text of the Church was one of the different forms of the Greek Bible used by early Christians. In other instances there are great differences. These differences generally cannot be explained as 'free quotations' from the Christian 'Septuagint', although nobody will deny that sometimes a difference may be explained in that way. Generally we have to see in these indications hints of other forms of the Greek Bible which were used by early Christians.

An attempt to investigate these differences systematically has been made by Alexander Sperber.² He based his investigations on the readings of Codex B in the Old and New Testaments, but

¹ It is very likely that various readings in the Hexaplaric material introduced by ὁ ἰουδαϊσμός are taken from old Greek translations of Jewish origin. They occur in the Cambridge Septuagint, for instance, in Gen. 40. 9, 43. 11, 47. 31; Exod. 16. 31. The Rev. G. D. Kilpatrick kindly collected these references for me.

² See A. Sperber's article 'The New Testament and the Septuagint', in the Hebrew quarterly *Tarbiz*, vol. vi, Jerusalem, 1934, pp. 1-29. The material collected here is very impressive. Sperber's later article 'New Testament and Septuagint', in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. lix, New York, 1940, pp. 193-293, is not always convincing.

indicated where Codex A and parallels in the Old Testament agree with New Testament quotations. He dealt with about 300 instances in which New Testament quotations differ from the text of the Christian 'Septuagint' and tried to group and classify these different readings according to fifteen criteria: (1) the use of different Greek synonyms; (2) differences in the exegesis of the same basic Hebrew word; (3) differences in the use of the possessive pronoun; (4) *Waw consecutivum* in Greek translation; (5) differences in the use of the personal pronoun; (6) differences in the use of the article; (7) collective nouns treated as singulars or plurals; (8) verb and compound verb; (9) the use of Greek tenses and moods; (10) differences in Greek syntax; (11) addition or omission of Greek particles; (12) Hebrew particles in Greek translation; (13) different interpretation of full sentences; (14) inner Greek corruptions; (15) differences resulting from Hebrew *variae lectiones*.

As an example I may give here the text of Isa. 42. 1-4 as quoted in Mt. 12. 18-20. The first line gives the New Testament quotation, the second line the text of the 'Septuagint'. For the first verse I add in a third line the text ascribed to Theodotion. The numbers added in brackets refer to the 'criteria' as proposed by Sperber.

Mt. Ἰδοὺ⁽¹⁵⁾ ὁ παῖς μου ὃν ἡρέτισα⁽²⁾ ὁ⁽¹⁵⁾ ἀγαπητός⁽²⁾ μου ἐν ᾧ
(ὃν, εἰς ὃν) ἠὺδόκησεν^(1,2)

Isa. Ἰακώβ⁽¹⁵⁾ ὁ παῖς μου ἀντιλήψομαι⁽²⁾ αὐτοῦ Ἰσραήλ⁽¹⁵⁾ ὁ ἐκλεκτός⁽²⁾
μου προσεδέξατο⁽¹⁾

Th. Ἰδοὺ⁽¹⁵⁾ ὁ παῖς μου ἀντιλήψομαι⁽²⁾ αὐτοῦ ὁ⁽¹⁵⁾ ἐκλεκτός⁽²⁾ μου ὃν
ἠὺδόκησεν^(1,2)

Mt. ἡ ψυχὴ μου θήσω^(1,9) τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτὸν καὶ κρίσιν⁽¹⁵⁾

Isa. αὐτὸν ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἔδωκα^(1,9) τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτὸν κρίσιν⁽¹⁵⁾

Th. ἡ ψυχὴ μου

Mt. τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπαγγελεῖ⁽²⁾ οὐκ ἔρισει⁽²⁾ οὐδὲ κραυγάζει⁽¹⁵⁾

Isa. τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἔξοίσει⁽²⁾ οὐ κεκράζεται⁽²⁾ οὐδὲ ἀνήσει⁽¹⁵⁾

Mt. οὐδὲ ἀκούσει τις⁽¹⁵⁾ ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις⁽¹⁾ τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ

Isa. οὐδὲ ἀκουσθήσεται⁽¹⁵⁾ ἔξω⁽¹⁾ ἡ φωνὴ αὐτοῦ

Mt. κάλαμον συντετριμμένον⁽¹⁾ οὐ κατεάξει⁽¹⁾ καὶ λίνον τυφόμενον⁽¹⁾

Isa. κάλαμον τεθλασμένον⁽¹⁾ οὐ συντρίψει⁽¹⁾ καὶ λίνον καπνιζόμενον⁽¹⁾

Mt. οὐ σβέσει ἕως ἂν ἐκβάλῃ⁽¹⁾ εἰς νίκος⁽²⁾ τὴν κρίσιν⁽⁶⁾ καὶ τῷ

Isa. οὐ σβέσει ἀλλὰ εἰς ἀλήθειαν⁽²⁾ ἔξοίσει⁽¹⁾ κρίσιν⁽⁶⁾ . . . καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ

Mt. ὀνόματι⁽¹⁴⁾ αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν.

Isa. ὀνόματι (νόμῳ⁽¹⁴⁾) αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν.

The differences between these two versions of the Greek Isaiah

are so great that no one can seriously attempt to explain the one text as a free quotation from the other. Besides an example for each of Sperber's 'criteria' 6. 9. and 14, we find in these verses seven instances of different Greek synonyms for the same Hebrew word; in five instances the same Hebrew word is understood in a different way; in five instances the Hebrew text which was the basis of one translation differed in some details from the text from which the other translation was made. There can be no doubt that Matthew quoted here a translation of Isaiah which differed from the translation which we find in the Christian 'Septuagint'. Of special interest is the third text added to vs. 1, ascribed to Theodotion. It is sometimes in agreement with the version quoted by Matthew, sometimes with the later standard text in the Christian Church. The three forms of text are an excellent example of the character of a Greek Targum in its earlier time, before a standard text was created. We have to assume that yet other forms of text existed in the MSS. of the Greek Bible which were in the hands of the early Christians.

In the new edition of the Septuagint text of Isaiah, Joseph Ziegler carefully noted in the apparatus the various readings of the text quoted by Matthew. No MS. of the Christian 'Septuagint' supports these readings—except in a few cases where we have to see an influence of the New Testament quotation. It is very remarkable that a Greek translation of Isaiah which must have been well known in the first Christian century and was quoted by Matthew has completely disappeared in the Church. The Church needed a 'canonical' text. Differing texts were not copied any more and have disappeared.—The standard text of Isaiah seems to have been established in the Church comparatively early. In an investigation of the Septuagint text used by Clement of Alexandria,¹ Otto Stählin comes to the conclusion that the quotations of Clement differ often from the readings of Codex B, but are usually in agreement with A, and especially with Q. On the other hand, if we compare the quotations from Isaiah in the first six books of the *Constitutiones Apostolorum* which are based on the Didascalia,² we find that these quotations are made from a text which was in agreement with the text of the Christian 'Septuagint'. Quite different

¹ *Clemens Alexandrinus und die Septuaginta*, Nürnberg, 1901, p. 66.

² *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, ed. Franziscus Xaverius Funk, vol. i, Paderbonae, 1906; *Constitutiones Apostolorum*, P. A. de Lagarde edidit. Lipsiae, Londini, 1862.

are, for example, the quotations from Ezekiel in these books. Stählin has published Ezek. 18. 4-9 according to two different quotations of Clement, side by side, which show clearly that these quotations go back to two different Greek versions of Ezekiel, of which one is similar to the 'Septuagint', the other quite different from it.¹ I have published in *Masoreten des Westens*, ii,² some verses of Ezekiel quoted in the second book of the *Constitutiones Apostolorum* in a form which has nothing to do with the text found in the Christian Septuagint. I have collected since a great number of other quotations. They all differ from the text of the Septuagint, although not always to the same extent. These matters will have to be examined carefully. But it is clear that the standard text of the Greek Isaiah must have been generally accepted in the Church at a much earlier period than the standard text of Ezekiel.

One of the texts of the Greek Bible used by the early Christians was that of Theodotion. Of Theodotion not much is known. A text of the Greek Bible is ascribed to him which he had adapted to the authoritative Hebrew text. Since this Hebrew text had not become a standard text before the second century A.D., it is clear that Theodotion cannot have made his revision before that time. He can, however, not have made it later, as it was known to Irenaeus (died A.D. 202). The best known part of Theodotion's text is the book of Daniel, since his text of this book was adopted by the Church and is to be found in nearly all MSS. of the Greek Bible. Only a MS. in the Chigi Library in Rome and the Chester Beatty Papyrus contain the 'Septuagint' text of that book, for which we have, besides, a witness in a Syro-hexaplaric MS. in Milan. In his edition of the Chester Beatty Papyrus³ Sir Frederic Kenyon writes:

Since 'Theodotonic' readings are found in works earlier than the date of Theodotion (in the New Testament, Barnabas, Clement and

¹ See Stählin, l.c., p. 69.

² I have quoted there, p. 6* f., the text of Ezek. 34. 2-5 as found in *Const. Apost.* ii. 18, and in the Christian Septuagint. Johannes Hempel, in discussing the possibility that the Greek Bible may not go back to one archetype, objects to my reference to such a differing version, see *ZAW.*, vol. xlviii, 1930, p. 198 f. It is, however, essential to recognize that up to the end of the second century A.D., Greek versions of certain books of the Old Testament were quoted by Christian authors, which completely differed from the standard text of the Christian Church. In discussing this matter Hempel is under the influence of Rahlfs's misconceptions.

³ *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri* . . . , fasc. vii, Ezekiel, Daniel, Esther, London, 1937, p. x.

Hermas, to say nothing of Irenaeus and Tertullian, who were his younger contemporaries), it would appear that Theodotion took over, with or without revision, an earlier translation, which has otherwise disappeared except in these few quotations.

In his Commentary on Daniel,¹ James A. Montgomery is anxious to avoid this conclusion. He devotes a special chapter to the problem 'Theodotion' and presents in it the material at our disposal with great care and exactness. After having discussed the early quotations from the 'Theodotonic' text, he proposes a very complicated theory. He tries to explain these quotations by the hypothesis of a Hellenistic oral Targum. Finally, however, he is obliged to admit:

Of course such a theory does not exclude the possibility of literary predecessors of the historical Theodotion.

There can really be no doubt that we have to see in the text revised by Theodotion an 'earlier translation', which was clearly different from the text which became later as 'Septuagint' the standard text of the Christian Church, and which was well known and widely used in earlier times. The quotations from Daniel in writings of the first Christian century show that Theodotion did not alter materially the text of the earlier translation when he adapted it to the authoritative Hebrew text. We can verify with certainty the quotations from Daniel only, as, for the other books of the Greek Bible, we must rely, for 'Theodotonic' readings, on scattered notes from Origen's Hexapla. This old form of the Greek Bible must have been valued highly. In its unrevised form it was largely quoted in the first Christian century; after its revision by Theodotion, the text of Daniel was taken over by the Church (see above).

One of the characteristics of the Theodotonic text is Hebrew words transliterated in Greek letters. Field is able to quote more than a hundred of them, names of animals, plants, garments, all sorts of technical terms.² We depend here on occasional quotations from Origen's Hexapla. The translation contained

¹ *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, Edinburgh, 1927, see especially pp. 46-50 ff. Concerning Theodotion see the rich material collected and discussed by K. A. Credner, *Beiträge zu einer Einleitung in die biblischen Schriften*, vol. ii, Halle, 1838. Cf. further Gwyn, 'Theodotion', in *DCB.*; August Bludau, *Die alexandrinische Uebersetzung des Buches Daniel und ihr Verhältnis zum Masoretischen Text*, Freiburg, 1897, p. 23; Schürer, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* . . . , iii. 439 ff.

² Field, *Prolegomena*, p. lx f.

certainly many more such transliterated words. Thackeray, in discussing 'Hebraisms in Vocabulary', writes:¹

The influence of Hebrew on the vocabulary of the LXX, though considerable, is not so great as might at first sight be supposed. Apart from a small group of words expressing peculiarly Hebrew ideas of institutions (weights, measures, feasts, etc.), the instances where the Hebrew word is merely transliterated in Greek letters are mainly confined to a single group, namely the later historical books (Jd.-2 Chron., 2 Esdras). Now this is a group in which we have frequent reason to suspect, in the text of our uncials, the influence of Theodotion, and at least one book in the group (2 Esdras) has with much probability been considered to be entirely his work. We know that Theodotion was, whether from ignorance of the Hebrew or in some cases from scrupulousness, specially addicted to transliteration, and many of the instances in the later historical books are probably derived from him. . . . Transliteration is rare in the Pentateuch, Isaiah, Jeremiah α, and the Minor Prophets. It is entirely absent from Ezekiel β, the Psalter . . . , Proverbs, Job (excluding the θ portions) and most of 'the writings'.

This view turns the facts upside down. How can we expect that Theodotion, in the second Christian century, should have replaced good Greek translations by transliterated Hebrew words or that such newly made transliterations should have been substituted for Greek words in some parts of the Septuagint! The transliterated Hebrew words were certainly used in translations made for Jews. Greek-speaking Jews were acquainted with such Hebrew terms even if they generally were not able to speak Hebrew. How many Hebrew words are to be found in the Yiddish language and used by Jews who do not understand Hebrew! Such Hebrew terms are understood by them nevertheless. Theodotion made his revision for Jewish circles. He did not replace transliterated Hebrew words by Greek translations, and did not need to fear that the Jews might not understand them.

On the other hand it is clear that in MSS. of the Greek Bible written for the use of Christians—and we have seen that all MSS. of the Septuagint preserved are written by Christian copyists for Christian readers—such transliterated Hebrew words had to be eliminated and replaced by Greek equivalents. From the second century onwards, Christian readers could generally not be expected to understand transliterated Hebrew words. Thackeray's list quoted above shows that this purification has not been made with the same thoroughness in the different

¹ Henry St. John Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*, vol. i, Cambridge, 1909, p. 31.

books of the Greek Bible. They are, nevertheless, to be found in MSS. of the Christian 'Septuagint' in a much greater number than could be expected in accordance with the statements of Thackeray. They are preserved chiefly where they are deformed in a certain way by Greek copyists who did not understand Hebrew, and so 'corrected' them. The result was Greek words, which are completely senseless in the context. A famous example is the word עֶרֶשׁ, a certain kind of couch which was preserved in the old Greek translation in the transliterated form ἐρεσ, showing a very old method of transliterating Hebrew words.¹ The Christian copyist altered this into ἐρεῖς, so that we now read in Amos 3. 12 'priests' instead of 'couch', which is completely senseless at this place. Jerome remarked:²

Quod in principio capituli juxta LXX positum est, *sacerdotes*, in Hebraico non habetur, sed pro hoc verbo *ARES*, quod Aq. interpretatus est *grabatum*; et puto LXX ipsum verbum posuisse Hebraicum, quod quidam non intelligentes pro *ares* legerunt ἐρεῖς.

Jerome transliterates the Hebrew word in a way in which it was pronounced in his time, according to the methods known from the text preserved in the second column of Origen's Hexapla. He was no expert in the methods of transliterating Hebrew words used in different periods. The transliteration ἐρεσ may have been used in the third or second pre-Christian century. But he saw correctly that the transliterated Hebrew word was originally to be found in the 'Septuagint'. Thackeray himself has quoted quite a number of similar cases.³ A special study of such slightly deformed transliterated Hebrew words in the Christian 'Septuagint' has been made by Franz Xaver Wutz.⁴ He found them especially in the Codex Vaticanus (B). The material collected by him must be regarded as very valuable. These transliterated Hebrew words belong to the oldest elements in the Greek Bible. They are certainly no innovation made by Theodotion in the second Christian century.

Quite recently it has been shown that another Hebrew word

¹ See above, the second lecture, p. 88 f.

² Quoted by Field, vol. ii, p. 971.

³ *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*, p. 37 f.

⁴ In his book *Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus*, he first (pp. 10-36) deals with transliterated proper names and then (pp. 36-176) with other traces of transliterations in the Greek Bible. The first fascicle of his book was published Stuttgart, 1925. The conclusions which he tries to draw in the second fascicle (pp. 177-569, Stuttgart, 1933) and the theories which he connects with the material are rather fantastic and can hardly be taken seriously.

was replaced by a Greek equivalent in the Greek Bible used by the Christians. It is well known that the Hebrew Tetragrammaton (יהוה) is usually rendered by κύριος in the Christian 'Septuagint'; nobody doubted that this translation was already found in the Greek Bible used by the Jews and taken over from them by the Christians. In a fragment of the Septuagint written by a Jew for Jews, published by W. D. Waddell,¹ the Tetragrammaton, written in Hebrew letters, is preserved in the Greek text. Papyrus 266 of the Société Royale de Papyrologie du Caire, the remains of a roll containing the second half of the book of Deuteronomy, shows, according to the editor, no example of κύριος, but everywhere the Tetragrammaton is preserved instead. The papyrus is dated by the editor as belonging to the second or first century B.C., is written 'in beautiful, rounded uncials by a Jew who was also a master of the Greek language'—it seems, however, that this Jew was not versed in writing Hebrew letters. At the two places of the facsimile where the name is preserved the copyist has left a lacuna large enough for four big letters. Another hand has entered on the place the word יהוה in very small Hebrew letters which do not really fill the gap. The facsimile contains parts of Deut. 31. 28–32. 7. We read:

Deut. 32. 3 στ[ι] ονομα יהוה[

Deut. 32. 6 τ[αυ]τα יהוה αν[ταποδιδωτε²

This is quite in accordance with the statement of Origen, who knew such MSS. and says that in the most accurate MSS. the Tetragrammaton was written in ancient Hebrew letters,³ and that the word was pronounced by the Greeks as κύριος and by the Jews as αδωναι. No fragment or MS. of the Greek Bible has preserved the Tetragrammaton. In the MSS. written for the use of Christian readers the Hebrew word was replaced by the Greek κύριος.⁴

¹ 'The Tetragrammaton in the LXX', by W. D. Waddell, *JTS.*, vol. xlv, Oxford, 1944, pp. 158–61.

² Waddell reads here αποδιδωτε, but AN[is clearly to be seen on the facsimile.

³ See Burkitt, *Fragments of the Books of Kings according to the Translation of Aquila* . . . , Cambridge, 1897, p. 15, where the words of Origen are quoted. Waddell refers to Burkitt.

⁴ In the other fragment of the Septuagint written by a Jew the name of God does not occur. See C. H. Roberts, *Two Biblical Papyri in the John Rylands Library*, Manchester, 1936. In vocalized Hebrew MSS. this word יהוה was left without vowels in older times. No MS. with Palestinian or genuine Babylonian punctuation has added any vowel sign to it. In Tiberias the word was vocalized יהוה, and so it is to be found in the

Thackeray refers to the fact that another Theodotonic text may be preserved in 2 Esdras of the 'Septuagint'. This theory has been developed with much enthusiasm by Charles C. Torrey.¹ Whether it can really be proved or not, what Torrey has to say with regard to the different Greek texts at our disposal for Chronicles and Ezra is of great interest. He writes:

When we come to the testimony of the Greek versions, we are here confronted with two somewhat widely differing forms of the history. One agrees quite closely with M(asoretic) T(ext), and has the same extent and arrangement, the other—obviously a mere fragment—begins near the end of Chronicles and extends not quite through the story of Ezra. During the part of the history covered by the two in common, the difference between them lies in (1) the words and phrases of the narrative, the difference here (i.e. in the Greek) being very great; (2) the position of extended passages; (3) material of very considerable amount found in one recension, but not in the other. . . . And finally, each one of the two main forms of the narrative, the 'canonical' and the 'apocryphical', has come down to us in a double Greek tradition, the one embodied in Lagarde's edition, and the other contained in most of the existing MSS. . . . That is, for a portion of the Chronicler's history amounting to about thirteen chapters, we have at every point to compare four Greek texts.

This is an interesting testimony to the condition of a part of the Greek Bible in which several texts, differing in the whole arrangement of the material and in the translation, are still preserved. We have here again an excellent example of the character of an old Greek Targum. The different texts preserved here were certainly of Jewish, not of Christian, origin. If Theodotion had really anything to do with the text which we find in 2 Esdras in the 'Septuagint' we have to suppose that he revised an older text, not that he created the version preserved to us. 'Lagarde's edition' quoted by Torrey refers to the Lucianic text edited by him. It is in this case especially clear that we have here an old text of the Greek Bible which was revised by Lucian in the third century, not a text created by him.

In the 'Lucianic' text a form of the Greek Esther is to be

Biblia Hebraica, in accordance with MSS. of the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries. This presupposes the reading שֵׁם, the Aramaic word corresponding to Hebrew הֵשֵׁם, 'the Name', and this pronunciation is preserved by the Samaritans up to the present day. Not before 1100 an *o* was added to the word (יהוה) and this seems to indicate the pronunciation אֱהוֹי.

¹ Cf. Torrey's article 'The Apparatus for the Textual Criticism of Chronicles–Ezra–Nehemiah', in *Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William Rainey Harper*, Chicago, 1908, vol. ii, pp. 55–111, p. 56 f.

found which differs greatly from the text which we usually find in the MSS. of the 'Septuagint'. The editors of the great Cambridge Septuagint write with regard to this text:

This recension differs so much from the B-text that we found it necessary to print it in full as an appendix. . . . We have printed Lagarde's text . . . without alteration. Fresh collations have been made of the MSS. cited by Lagarde.

The Christian martyr Lucian could hardly have had an interest in creating a new text of the Greek Esther differing to such an extent from the form of text usually found in MSS. of the 'Septuagint'. He certainly accepted for his Greek Bible an old Jewish text which he may have revised according to his own principles.

With regard to the text of the book of Tobit, the editors of the great Cambridge Septuagint write:

The presentation of the evidence for the text of Tobit offers special difficulties and we have been obliged to modify our system in several ways. Dr. Swete printed the Sinaitic text 'in extenso beneath the Vatican text, but in smaller type, to denote its secondary character'. He divided the text into verses 'corresponding as nearly as possible with those of the standard text'. We are not prepared to express a definite opinion on the relation of the two Greek texts, certainly not to describe the Sinaitic text as secondary (see p. viii).

These few examples may suffice to show that not only for the Greek Book of Judges, but for several of the later books of the Bible also different forms of text were preserved in MSS. written for Christian readers. These different forms were of Jewish origin and were taken over by the Christians. The Church was more interested in having a canonical text for books like the Pentateuch and Isaiah than for these later books of the Bible.

There can be no doubt that the principles laid down by Paul de Lagarde for the study of the 'Septuagint' mark an important step in the progress of Septuagint textual criticism.¹ Lagarde was right in demanding that methods approved in other branches of philology should be applied to work on the Greek Bible.² But he did not realize the necessary difference between editing an original text and editing a translation. The editor of a dialogue of Plato must try to publish a text as closely connected as possible with the original written by the author himself. Differing forms of text in MSS. or in quotations have to be recognized as alterations or deteriorations of the 'Urtext'.

¹ H. B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, Cambridge, 1914, p. 485.

² See *Mittheilungen*, von Paul de Lagarde, vol. iii, Göttingen, 1889, p. 230.

Lagarde's ultimate aim was to establish the 'Urtext' of the Septuagint. All his work done on the Septuagint was dominated by this idea. Every edition he made of a text connected with the Septuagint, every investigation he made of a Septuagint text, was regarded by him as a step to this goal. He was so absorbed by his aim that he tried to arrive at an 'Urtext' even when he knew and acknowledged that we have different translations in the MSS.¹ Can we ever arrive at such an 'Urtext'?

We may begin with the standard text of the Greek Tora made by the Jews in Alexandria. A special nimbus is conferred upon this text by the letter of Aristeeas. The letter antedates the text by more than a hundred years. Philo declared the translators to be inspired by God. We do not know how far the Jewish standard text agreed with the Greek Tora of the Christian 'Septuagint'. We have found traces of earlier texts used by Jews and early Christians which differed from the Christian 'Septuagint' not only in the translation itself but in the whole arrangement of the text. The Greek Tora used by Philo was clearly different from it.

We may try to edit the Jewish standard text of the Greek Tora. But can we possibly regard such a text as an 'Urtext'—a text from which all existing texts have to be derived? A standard text of a translation is always found at the *end* of the development, never at the *beginning*. The standard text of the Targum of the Pentateuch, the Targum Onkelos, was preceded by different forms of the old Palestinian Targum of the Pentateuch, of which some valuable fragments have been found in the Cairo Geniza. The standard text of the Latin Bible, the Vulgate, was preceded by different forms of the *Vetus Latina*. The standard text of the Syriac Gospels, in the Peshitta, was preceded by different forms of the Old Syriac Gospels, of which at least two forms are still preserved. It is always so, and there can be no doubt that the standard text of the Greek Tora was preceded by divergent forms of earlier translations. In the case of the origin of the Greek Tora, the Jewish 'Septuagint', the letter of Aristeeas has put us on a wrong track.

The Jews had a standard text for no other part of the Greek Bible. It was the Christian Church which needed a 'canonical' text of the whole Bible. This text was preceded by divergent forms of text which had been used by Jews and early Christians. The Church took over one form of the various texts which had been used before. This text was revised and adapted for the

¹ See above, p. 156 f.

use of Christian readers. By copying this text again and again the Church came into possession of a standard text. The name 'Septuagint', given to this Christian standard text of the Bible, transferred to it the nimbus enjoyed some centuries before by the Jewish standard text of the Greek Tora. Texts diverging from this standard text, as far as they were still copied, are preserved in single leaves only. Later they were not copied any more. The Church had an interest in 'correct' texts. All MSS. of the Greek Bible preserved to us were written by Christians for Christians. With the exception of two little bits of papyrus with fragments of a few verses of Deuteronomy, no part of the 'Septuagint' written by a Jew has been preserved.

The divergent forms of earlier texts have, however, not completely disappeared. Traces of them have to be sought mainly in four kinds of sources.

1. In the so-called 'recensions' of the Christian 'Septuagint', indicated by Jerome and recognized as of importance by Paul de Lagarde. The chief value of these 'recensions' is that they give us some material for the history of the Greek Bible in the different provinces of the Church and great help in classifying the MSS. Perhaps the most elaborate work of this kind, done according to the principles laid down by Lagarde, is the Greek Joshua of Max L. Margolis.¹ The material carefully collected and lucidly arranged by him enables us to follow in many details the different forms of the Greek Joshua in the Christian Church, in Egypt, Palestine, Syria, and in Constantinople and Asia Minor. Although most of the MSS. contain 'mixed' texts—some are especially characterized as such by Margolis—we can see in general the development of the standard text of the Church. But we are not led behind this standard text. In a text closely connected with Codex B we may see one of the best representatives of the Christian standard text. But this text was only *one* of those used by Jews and early Christians, not *the* text used by them. We may find remains of other texts in some of the different 'recensions'; we have seen that, for instance, Lucian revised an earlier version which differed from the text generally accepted by the Church.

¹ *The Book of Joshua in Greek*. Parts 1–4 were published in Paris (Geuthner), 1931–8. Cf. Margolis's article 'Specimen of a New Edition of the Greek Joshua', in *Jewish Studies in Memory of Israel Abrahams*, New York, 1927, pp. 307–23. Cf. Harry M. Orlinsky's article, dedicated to the memory of Margolis: 'On the Present State of Proto-Septuagint Studies', in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. lxi, 1941, pp. 81–91, and H. H. Rowley, 'The Proto-Septuagint Question', in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, vol. xxxiii, 1943, pp. 497–9.

2. In quotations from the Greek Old Testament which we find in the New Testament and in other writings of the first centuries, so far as they are not conformed to a form of the Christian standard text.

3. In older translations made from the Greek Bible. I may refer here, as an example, to two Latin quotations from the Bible to which the Rev. Dr. A. C. Lawson in Shrewsbury drew my attention and which we discussed. They were to be found in Isidore's treatise *De fide catholica contra Judaeos*.¹

Isidore, Bishop of Seville, who died A.D. 636, was a remarkable man. His father was of Visigothic royal family, his mother was a daughter of the Emperor Theodoric (who died A.D. 526). It is said that Isidore had been asked by his sister Florentina for arguments wherewith to meet Jewish objections to the faith. He wrote for her the treatise mentioned above, in two books, the first giving the history of Christ according to the Old Testament, the second the prophecies in the Old Testament about rejection of the Jews and the welfare of true believers under the new Covenant.² Here we find, among many others, the quotations in question. The first, Hos. 7. 16, is quoted twice (19. 2 and 47. 2 of the first book) in the form FACTI SUNT MIHI IN SAGITTAM RECIPROCAM. The second, in which A. Lukyn Williams rightly sees an expansion of Jer. 4. 3, is quoted (31. 1 of the first book) in the form: SPINIS PECCATORUM SUORUM CIRCUMDEDIT POPULUS HIC. The same quotation is to be found in Isidore's *Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum. In Genesis*³ (18. 11) and also in Pope Sylvester's *Discussion with the Jews at Rome*, and is presupposed in the Syriac *Letter to the Blessed Sergius*.⁴ The two quotations neither agree with the Hebrew text nor with the Christian 'Septuagint'. They reflect midrashic interpretation of the Hebrew text, and I think that we can find at least hints at these interpretations in Jewish sources.

In Hos. 7. 16 the 'fallacious bow' (קשת רמיה) is explained by Rashi with the words: 'If you shoot an arrow to the north, it will go to the south'. From this explanation *sagitta reciproca* is not very far.

In Jer. 4. 3 the Hebrew 'You must not sow in the thorns' is

¹ Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. lxxxiii, col. 449–538.

² See A. Lukyn Williams, *Adversus Judaeos*, Cambridge, 1935, p. 216 f., and the summary on pp. 282–92.

³ *Patrologia Latina*, vol. lxxxiii, col. 251.

⁴ = MS. Add. 17199 of the British Museum. See the references given by Lukyn Williams, l.c., p. 342, note 2.

rendered in the Targum by 'You must not ask for forgiveness whilst you are in sins'. Rashi combines the two ideas by saying: 'You must not cry unto me whilst you are in sins, but when you are repenting, that you must not be similar to those who are sowing without having weeded the field, otherwise your seed will be turned into thorns.' This is certainly not the quotation of Isidore, but here also sinners and thorns occur which we find in *spinis peccatorum*.

It is therefore very likely that these quotations are ultimately derived from a Jewish source. But the direct source for the Christian authors cannot have been a text written in Hebrew or Aramaic. Isidore, for instance, exhibits a certain naïve curiosity concerning Hebrew, but betrays no trace of Hebrew knowledge save what he derived from Jerome.¹ The same may be said of the other Christian authors who quote such passages. The source must have been a Greek translation of Jewish origin which differed completely from the Christian 'Septuagint', the readings of which were still used by Christian authors in the seventh century and perhaps later. Dr. Lawson writes with regard to such quotations:

It seems clear that Old Testament quotations were used by Christians in a variety of ways from very early times. The number tends to increase. The same texts were used in East and West, in Greek and Latin. Isidore's texts occur partly in S. Cyprian's *Testimonia*, partly in Pseudo-Gregory of Nyssa, and in 'De promissionibus et predictionibus Dei'. So far, in all instances where I have traced them, I have found that he has taken the texts from an author, from a commentary or treatise. . . . These texts are not always used in the same way. . . .

It is necessary to collect and investigate all the traces of such Greek translations of the Bible carefully. They were once used by Jews and Christians, and we may have to see in them remains of one of the anonymous versions included by Origen in the Hexapla, or of a version similar to them.²

¹ See *The Legacy of Israel*, Oxford, 1927, p. 287.

² Lukyn Williams has seen the problem rightly. He writes with regard to the 'Selected Testimonia from the Old Testament against the Jews', attributed to Gregory of Nyssa (*Adversus Iudaeos*, p. 124): 'To most readers perhaps its chief interest lies in the character of the Greek version of the Psalms and Prophets which he uses. For this often differs much from the Vaticanus text'; and he adds the annotation: 'I cannot find that it has been the subject of any special study in this respect. And until the Cambridge Larger Edition of the LXX has reached the Psalms and the Prophets (in several years' time), it is almost impossible for a non-specialist to make any profitable study of the various readings that the *Selections* exhibit.' It is clear

4. In the remains of the Hexapla. This great work of Origen is mostly valued in so far only as it gives an indication of alterations in the text of the Greek Bible in accordance with the authoritative Hebrew text. The different versions collected here have, however, their own importance. We have seen that the version adapted to the authoritative text by Theodotion differed from the version which became, as 'Septuagint', the standard text of the Church. Some earlier material may be preserved also in new translations, such as Aquila and Symmachus. Translations of the Bible were hardly made without reference to already existing texts.

Of greater importance are, however, the anonymous versions which were discovered and registered by Origen. Here we have real Jewish texts, not influenced by the Christian standard text.

It was difficult to value this material rightly on the basis of the scattered remains of the Hexapla. The Milan palimpsest, discovered by Giovanni Mercati, has preserved nearly 150 complete verses of the Psalms in five columns: the Hebrew text written in Greek characters, Aquila, Symmachus, Septuagint, and Quinta. The edition of these valuable fragments, prepared by Cardinal Mercati, will make possible their careful examination. It is certain that a new era of studying the Hexapla will begin with these texts.¹ But the whole problem of the Septuagint will be greatly affected. The task which the Septuagint presents to scholars is not the 'reconstruction' of an imaginary 'Urtext', nor the discovery of it, but a careful collection and investigation of all the remains and traces of earlier versions of the Greek Bible which differed from the Christian standard text.

(b) THE PESHITTA

Another parallel to the history of the Targums may be found in the history of the Syriac versions of the Bible. Nothing definitive is known about the Peshitta, the Syriac version of the Old Testament, and its origin, and already Theodore of Mopsuestia (died 428) did not know by whom or where it was made.² For the Pentateuch we have, besides the text represented by most of the MSS., some of them written as early as the sixth century,

that Rahlfs's edition of the Psalms is completely insufficient and of no value for an investigation of that kind. Ziegler's edition of the *Greek Isaiah* (Göttingen, 1939) is much better and could be used very well for these purposes.

¹ Eduard Schwartz, *Zur Geschichte der Hexapla* (Göttinger Nachrichten, 1903), p. 7.

² The words are quoted for instance in Swete, *Introduction*, p. 112.

another text of which Genesis and Exodus are to be found in the British Museum MS. Add. 14425, dated A.D. 464, the oldest dated Biblical MS. so far known (= D).¹ This text differs in many places from that of the other MSS. and is here generally in agreement with the Hebrew text. In his *Pentateuchus Syriace*, edited for the British and Foreign Bible Society, London, 1914, Professor W. E. Barnes has published the text found in most of the MSS., and he thinks that this recension must be as ancient as that found in MS. D, and that it may be a more faithful copy of the original Peshitta.²

John Pinkerton, one of Professor Barnes's collaborators, in a special study devoted to these two texts comes to somewhat different conclusions.³ According to him the more literal type is to be found not only in MS. D, which is the best example of this text and of which he gives as specimens various readings, but similar features are exhibited by other MSS. for other books of the Pentateuch, for example by the Florentine MS. Laurent, Or. 58 (9th cent.) and the British Museum MS. Add. 14427 (6th cent., Numbers, Deuteronomy, and partly Leviticus). Compared with this text, the other is marked by freedom in translation and by greater fullness and smoothness, and the chief explanation of it he found in the genius of the language, in stylistic reasons, in the development from a literal to a fuller type of translation. From the fact that Aphrahat, who wrote in 337 and 345, used a text which followed the Hebrew more closely than did the text in common use in the sixth century, and that Ephraem (died 373) is more familiar with the text in D than with that of the later MSS., and that the agreements not only outnumber the disagreements but also outweigh them in value and importance, Pinkerton concludes that we have to see in it the *older* text of the Syriac Pentateuch, and that this text cannot be explained as the result of a later revision according to the Hebrew text. A text like the archetype of D has to be regarded as the work of a Jewish translator, made for the use of a Jewish community. This Jewish translation was taken over by the Christian Church. Here it was gradually amplified, improved in style, and a certain form of this ample text, not

¹ Numbers and Deuteronomy in this MS. are written by another hand and have a different type of text. Leviticus is not contained in the MS.

² Cf. his article, 'A New Edition of the Pentateuch in Syriac', in *JTS.*, vol. xv, 1914, pp. 41-4.

³ 'The Origin and Early History of the Syriac Pentateuch', in *JTS.*, vol. xv, 1914, pp. 14-41.

the result of a systematic revision, was accepted as a standard text, and henceforth all codices more or less conformed to this type. This must have happened about the fifth century. The older text was finally ousted by the standard text.

It is at present not possible to control in detail the results of Pinkerton's investigations. The principles of the British and Foreign Bible Society did not allow Professor Barnes to publish the text with a critical apparatus—the new edition was intended for the use of the Syrians of Mardin and its neighbourhood and probably served that purpose well.¹ So until further investigations are made we have to rely for the readings of Codex D and the codices with a similar text on the material published by Pinkerton. But the conclusions drawn by him from this material seem to be convincing.

We may ask whether these features are to be found in the Syriac Pentateuch alone or in other books of the Bible too. C. H. Cornill in his book on Ezekiel² collated carefully the text of Ezekiel in the Ambrosian MS. of the sixth century, published in facsimile by Ceriani (= A), with the printed texts and found that this MS. agrees with the Hebrew text in a great many places, against all the other recensions of the Peshitta—of which he only knows, besides this MS., some printed texts which all depend on the same source—and he concludes that MS. A had been corrected and altered on a large scale according to the Hebrew text, and that among all the accessible texts of the Peshitta A is the worst. A. Rahlfs³ has already shown that Cornill's statement cannot be accepted. According to him MS. A had in many places a text which he—naïvely enough—calls the 'right' text against the printed editions available to Cornill. And W. E. Barnes, who has used manuscripts in addition to the printed texts, comes to this result:⁴

After a careful examination of test passages in eight or ten MSS. (some of the highest importance) I am led to the conclusion that Professor Cornill's judgement on Cod. A cannot be maintained. Cod. A

¹ The latest attempt at publishing the Peshitta Pentateuch (*Peshitta in Hebräischer Schrift, Mit erläuternden Anmerkungen*. Von Ch(aïyim) Heller, Teil i, Genesis, Berlin, 1928; Teil ii, Exodus, Berlin, 1929) cannot be taken seriously. The author is not informed about the real problems; like the other books published by Heller this also is dictated by apologetical tendencies.

² *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel*, Leipzig, 1886.

³ Cf. his 'Beiträge zur Textkritik der Peschita', in *Zeitschr. f. d. Alttestamentl. Wissenschaft*, vol. ix, 1889, pp. 180-91.

⁴ Cf. his book: *An Apparatus Criticus to Chronicles in the Peshitta Version*, Cambridge, 1897, p. xxii.

in its agreement with the Masoretic text does *not* stand alone to the extent suggested by Cornill's words. The reverse is often the case. . . . The agreement of the Codex Ambrosianus with the Masoretic is no doubt a fact, but the whole truth seems to be that a text formed from the best and oldest MSS. would agree as frequently as Codex A with the Masoretic and would disagree as frequently with the printed text.

The most important MS. for Barnes is here the Florentine Codex Laurent. Or. 58, already mentioned by Pinkerton (= F). About the text presented by it Barnes declares:¹

The text of Cod. F is peculiar. While resembling that of Cod. A in many striking instances, it frequently departs from A (and from all other MSS. which I have examined) in other instances equally striking to agree with the Masoretic text. . . . It seems quite probable that in Chronicles at least its text has been so freely conformed to the Masoretic, that its value to the text of the Peshitta is seriously lessened. Yet where A is silent through loss of text, F should surely be heard, for it seems sometimes to preserve the reading of the lost mutual ancestor of A and F. . . .

And in his book on the Psalter² we find the following statements concerning the same Florentine MS.:

In text this MS. differs not seldom from all other known authorities. The exact coincidences with the Hebrew in places in which the rest of the MSS. of the Peshitta diverge from the original are especially striking. . . . The relation of F to Nestorian authorities raises some important points. . . . In some cases however F has a double coincidence, i.e. with the Masoretic Hebrew on the one side and with the Nestorian authorities on the other; and it is possible that in such cases the reading of F is due to an assimilation which was intentional as regards the Hebrew, but accidental as regards the Nestorian text. . . . It is also possible on the other hand that the agreement of both F and the Nestorian text with the Hebrew points to a reading belonging to the earliest form of the Peshitta; I should be sorry to reject the suggestion on our present evidence, but I should be still more sorry to accept it at the present stage of Peshitta investigation.

Gustav Diettrich in his book *Ein Apparatus criticus zur Pešitto zum Propheten Jesaia*³ has devoted a special study to a group of MSS. to which belong the MSS. A and F already mentioned, and the British Museum MS. Add. 14432, written in the sixth century. According to him these codices have often readings

¹ Cf. *An Apparatus Criticus to Chronicles* . . . , p. xxxii.

² Cf. *The Peshitta Psalter according to the West Syrian Text*, Cambridge, 1904, p. xvii f.

³ = *Beihefte zur ZATW.*, vol. viii, Giessen, 1905, pp. xxvi-xxxii.

which are in agreement with the text of the Peshitta used by Ephraem in his Commentary on Isaiah. Many of these special readings in all three codices agree with the Hebrew text, and just these are often confirmed by the text used by Ephraem.

I may here further quote the conclusions to which S. R. Driver comes concerning the Peshitta of the Books of Samuel:¹

The Hebrew text presupposed by the Peshitto deviates less from the Massoretic text than that which underlies the LXX, though it does not approach it so closely as that on which the Targums are based. It is worth observing that passages not infrequently occur, in which Pesh. agrees with the text of *Lucian*, where both deviate from the Massoretic text. In the translation of the book of Samuel the Jewish element alluded to above is not so strongly marked as in that of the Pent.; but it is nevertheless present, and may be traced in certain characteristic expressions, which would hardly be met with beyond the reach of Jewish influence. . . .

I think we see already from these quotations that the character of the Syriac text in other books of the Old Testament is not completely different from that of the Syriac Pentateuch, and it is clear that we shall have to regard agreements with the Hebrew text in MSS. in general as belonging to the oldest parts of the Peshitta. On the other hand, we shall have to regard cases of the influence of the Septuagint as the result of Christian activity on the text of the Peshitta. This influence is different in the different books of the Old Testament. Professor Barnes, in his article 'On the Influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta',² expresses his conclusions in the following summary:

The influence of the Septuagint is for the most part sporadic, affecting the translation of a word here and of a word there. The Syriac translators must indeed have known that their own knowledge of Hebrew was far in advance of the knowledge possessed by the Septuagint, and yet the stress of Greek fashion had its way now and again. The Syriac transcribers on the contrary were ignorant of Hebrew and ready to introduce readings found in a Greek version or recommended by a Greek father. So the Peshitta in its later text has more of the Septuagint than in its earlier form. It is only in the Psalter (so it seems to me at the present stage of my work) that any general Greek influence bringing in a new characteristic is to be found. That characteristic is a dread of anthropomorphisms from which the Syriac translators of the Pentateuch were free.

In spite of all the valuable work done by Professor Barnes and

¹ *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel*, 2nd ed., Oxford, 1913, p. lxxi.

² Cf. *JTS.*, vol. ii, 1901, pp. 186-97.

his collaborators, by G. Diettrich and others, we have to confess that a really critical edition of the Old Testament Peshitta so far does not exist. But I think we begin now to see the direction in which the critical work on this version will have to be done.¹

That the Syriac translation of the Old Testament is of Jewish origin is in agreement with the conclusions to which other scholars have come. It may be sufficient to quote here what Professor Burkitt says about the version:²

It is clear that the translators had a good knowledge of the general meaning of the text and an excellent acquaintance with Jewish tradition. To such an extent is this the case that it seems impossible to avoid considering the Peshitta as the work of Jewish scholars.

The chief difference is that it is generally assumed—as also by Burkitt—that the translation was made by Jews on the order of Christians, namely the Christian Community in Edessa, since there is no evidence that Jews have ever used this version, whereas according to Pinkerton this version, in the first instance the version of the Pentateuch with which alone Pinkerton is concerned, was made for the Jewish Community. The problem is therefore: can we discover a Jewish Community for the benefit of which the Pentateuch was translated into Syriac? It must have been a community in a Syriac-speaking country which had close connexions with Jerusalem. Joseph Marquardt, forty years ago, had already pointed out that this country might be Adiabene (חדיב), a kingdom situated between the two rivers Zab, to the east of the river Tigris, which formed a part of the great Parthian Empire.³

We read in the twentieth book of Josephus' *Antiquities* that Izates II,⁴ king of Adiabene, son of Monobazos I and his sister Helena, had been won for the Jewish religion when he was still

¹ Leo Haefeli, in his book *Die Peschitta des Alten Testaments mit Rücksicht auf ihre textkritische Bearbeitung und Herausgabe (Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen . . .)*, vol. xi, 1), Münster i. W., 1927, deals with the problems connected with a new edition of the Old Testament Peshitta. He has given a survey of almost everything that has been written on the subject. The result of his book is hardly in proportion to his efforts. From my statements it will be evident that the edition must be made on lines differing greatly from those which he proposed.

² *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, Cambridge, 1904, vol. ii. 201.

³ Cf. his *Osteuropäische und Ostasiatische Streifzüge*, Leipzig, 1903, p. 288 f.

⁴ = *ized*, 'the venerable', a technical term in the Zoroastrian religion. Marquardt finds a special omen in this name; but this view is hardly correct, as the father of Monobazos and Helena had already the name Izates.

in Spasinu Charax,¹ ruled by King Abennerig,² to whom Izates had been sent for reasons of safety. The king had given him his daughter Symmacho³ as wife. To the king's harem a Jewish merchant named Ananias (= Hananyā) had found access, and he had interested in Jewish religion not only some of the ladies but Izates too. When Izates was recalled by his father⁴ he was accompanied by Ananias. At home he found that Queen Helena, his mother, had been won for the Jewish religion too, by another Jew, and that she observed the Jewish rites. After the death of Monobazos, his father, Helena arranged⁵ that Izates became his successor. Izates postponed his official conversion on the special advice of the queen and Ananias—they feared the opposition of the aristocracy of the land, belonging in the majority to the Zoroastrian religion. But under the influence of a Jewish zealot, named Eleazar, who had come from Galilee to Arbela, the capital of Adiabene, the conversion took place about A.D. 40. When Queen Helena saw that there were no serious consequences, she made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem where she remained for many (14?) years. We hear that Izates sent five of his sons to Jerusalem to be educated there. Queen Helena and several other members of the royal family had palaces in Jerusalem, and we hear of valuable presents given by Helena and her son Monobazos II to the temple of Jerusalem.⁶ After Izates' death Monobazos, his elder brother, who succeeded him as King of Adiabene about A.D. 58, sent his remains and those of his mother, who had died shortly after her son Izates, to Jerusalem to be buried there in the 'tomb of the Kings', called by Josephus 'Pyramids', a mausoleum erected by Helena herself for that purpose, which is still to be seen in

¹ On the mouth of the river Tigris, near the present Basra. This may be the same as the kingdom of Mesene; cf. Rostovtzeff, in *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. xi, 1936, p. 113.

² = 'Abd Nerg, 'servant of Nergal' (Mars), cf. Marquardt, *Streifzüge*, p. 289, note 2. On coins he is called Adinerglus or Abinerglus; cf. N. C. Debevoise, *A Political History of Parthia*, Chicago, 1938, p. 165, note 72. Here the original letter *l* in the name is still preserved.

³ So also in MSS. = Syriac ܠܚܠܐ 'recreation'. In Niese's edition xx. 23, Σαρμακος is wrongly printed.

⁴ His father made him Governor of Corduene, bordering Adiabene on the north. καρρων in Josephus has to be read καρδου, cf. Marquardt, l.c., note 4.

⁵ Josephus' report about Helena's arrangements is quite interesting, cf. Rostovtzeff, l.c., p. 114. This happened in about A.D. 36, cf. Debevoise, l.c.

⁶ The palaces are mentioned for instance *Bellum*, v. 6. 1 (252, 253) and vi. 6. 3 (355). The gifts are mentioned in the Mishna, Yoma 3. 10.

Jerusalem.¹ Monobazos II was also converted to the Jewish religion, and many of his relatives and of his entourage followed his example.²

Josephus intended to give further particulars of Monobazos II and the benefits Jerusalem received from these Jewish kings,³ but failed to carry out his plan. We only hear by chance⁴ that two members of the royal family of Adiabene, Monobazos and Kennedaios, fought on the side of the Jews in the war against the Romans. We hear no more of Jewish kings of Adiabene. The sources at our disposal are Roman sources, and these show no interest in such questions. The last king of whom we hear, Mebarsapes, was one of the chief opponents of Trajan in his Eastern campaign in 116. He was defeated and Adiabene became part of the Roman province of Assyria. We do not know whether the dynasty was later restored by Hadrian. Members of the dynasty seem to have played a certain role in Edessa during the end of the first and the beginning of the second century. But the Jewish interests of the dynasty had ceased after A.D. 70.

But what we know about the Jews and their influence in Adiabene in the middle of the first century is sufficient to suggest that these Jews, especially the members of the royal family and the other newly converted Jews, among whom many belonged to the most prominent families in the land, needed a Bible in a language they were able to understand. The language spoken in Adiabene was an Aramaic dialect called 'Syriac', and we can take it for granted that at least parts of a Syriac Old Testament, in the first instance the Pentateuch, were introduced into Adiabene during the time of the Jewish kings there, that is to say in the middle of the first century.

That the Syriac translation of some books of the Old Testa-

¹ Already Ed. Pococke (the elder, died 1691) had rightly identified these tombs with the burial-place of the royal family of Adiabene.

² According to Josephus there was an opposition amongst the leading people of the kingdom against the Jewish interests of the king, and the conflict between Izates and the Parthian king, Vologases, was partly caused by similar reasons. Marquardt (l.c., p. 292) assumes that this is true as Vologases is known as a zealous Zoroastrian, interested in the maintaining of the Avestic literature, the 'Avesta and Zend' (its interpretation). But the passage in the Dēnkart referred to by Marquardt does not necessarily mean that there was a written Zend. And besides—as Henning informs me—it is not quite clear whether Vologases I or Vologases II (148–91) is meant. Rostovtzeff doubts whether these suggested reasons for the conflict can be regarded as historical facts (l.c., p. 112).

³ *Antiquities*, ed. Niese, xx. 53, 96.

⁴ *Bellum*, ed. Niese, ii. 520.

ment, especially that of the Pentateuch, is not much else than a Jewish Targum, has been recognized since 1859, when J. Perles wrote his *Meletemata Peschittoniana*. But it was difficult to show exactly the connexions. The only Targum of the Pentateuch then known was the Targum Onkelos, and this Targum is of much later origin, and besides, it has a specifically halachic character, of which we find nothing in the Syriac Pentateuch. But now there can be no doubt that the closest contact exists between the Syriac Pentateuch and the old Palestinian Targum, of which we have found the first real specimens in the Old Cairo Geniza. We have seen that this Targum already existed in pre-Christian times. So the Jews of Jerusalem had already an Aramaic translation of the Pentateuch at their disposal when the newly converted Jews of Adiabene came to need an Aramaic Bible. This Targum was composed in the Aramaic dialect spoken in Palestine. It was certainly understood by Jews of Adiabene. Josephus sent his first edition of the Jewish Wars, composed in the language of his own country, i.e. in Aramaic, to the 'Upper Barbarians' (τοῖς ἄνω βαρβάροις), and he describes these as 'the Parthians, Babylonians, the remotest Arabians, and those of our nation beyond the Euphrates, with the Adiabeni'.¹ This history was intended certainly in the first instance for the real Jews living in these lands who were able to understand the Aramaic spoken in Palestine. But we have to assume that Biblical texts intended for the newly converted Jews had to be transposed into the Aramaic dialect spoken in Adiabene and to be transcribed into the Syriac alphabet used there. Without any doubt some of the Jews who had come from Palestine and had been settled for years in Adiabene were able to do this task without difficulty.

But there are still some problems. We know that most of the fragments of the Palestinian Targum preserved to us contain special haggadic explanations of some of the verses, and these are in general not to be found in the Syriac Bible. Here we have to remember that this Targum had no fixed text, and nobody can say whether in ancient times there existed MSS. of this Targum without these haggadic elements. In any case, the oldest specimen of this Targum preserved in the Cambridge MS. T-S. 20, 155 (= MS. A), containing parts of Exod. 21 and 22, does not contain any haggadic explanations. On the other hand, we have to state that the Syriac Pentateuch known to us follows in the translation of Exod. 22, vss. 4 and 5, the usual Jewish

¹ *Bellum*, Prooemium, 1, 2; cf. H. St. John Thackeray, *Josephus. The Man and the Historian*, New York, 1929, p. 24.

interpretation and not that in the Cambridge fragment of which we have spoken above. So we have to suppose that this fragment represents an older type of the Targum than that which might have been sent to Adiabene. In any case we shall have to compare carefully the fragments of the Palestinian Targum with the Syriac Pentateuch, especially with the older text of it pointed out by Pinkerton, which is in close connexion with the Hebrew text. We have always to remember that the Palestinian Targum existed in many different forms, and we cannot expect that the fragments of the Targum found in the Geniza, written probably in the period from the sixth to the ninth century A.D., correspond exactly to the text which might have been sent to Adiabene in the first century A.D. On the other hand it is clear that the Syriac Pentateuch, especially the older type of it, has to be regarded as a valuable source for our knowledge of the old Palestinian Targum of which we have otherwise only small fragments.

There can be no doubt that the conversion of the royal family in Adiabene greatly strengthened the power of propaganda of the Jewish religion in the Parthian Empire, and that the Jewish mission amongst the pagan population paved the way for the Christian mission. As early as 1903 J. Marquardt had suggested that the Christian mission in the East did not start amongst the pagan population in Edessa, the later centre of Christianity in the East, as generally assumed, but amongst the Jewish population in Adiabene.¹ This suggestion has been proved to be correct in an excellent way by the Chronicle of Arbela, composed in Syriac by Mshîhâ Zkhâ in the sixth century. This chronicle was discovered by A. Mingana and published by him in the Syriac original with a French translation in 1907.² Eduard Sachau carefully investigated the text and published a German translation with a valuable introduction in 1915.³ The importance of this chronicle can hardly be overestimated. Based on local traditions and reliable sources it describes the history of Christianity

¹ Cf. his *Osteuropäische und Ostasiatische Streifzüge*, p. 298 f.

² *Sources Syriacques*, vol. i: *Mshîhâ Zkhâ* (Text et Traduction) . . . par A. Mingana, Mossoul, Leipzig, 1907.

³ *Die Chronik von Arbela. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis des ältesten Christentums im Orient* (= *Abhandlungen of the Berlin Academy*, 1915). Cf. Allgeier, 'Untersuchungen zur ältesten Kirchengeschichte von Persien', in *Der Katholik*, 1916, 1918. F. Zorell, 'Chronica ecclesiae Arbelensis . . .' in *Orientalia Christiana*, vol. viii, Roma, 1927; P. Peeters, 'Le Passionnaire d'Adiabene', in *Analecta Bollandiana*, vol. xliii, Bruxelles, 1925, pp. 261-304; G. Messina, 'La Cronaca di Arbela', in *Civiltà Cattolica*, vol. lxxxiii, 1932, III. 362-76.

in Adiabene and other countries in the East from the beginnings up to the sixth century, and in spite of some gaps in the chronology it can be regarded as trustworthy in general even in the reports dealing with the oldest times, and A. Harnack is certainly right when he says that we have here a very valuable document for the history of the Christian mission during the second and third centuries which can be rivalled by no other document of the provinces of the Roman Empire.¹

Here we find the apostle Addai as a very active missionary in the mountain villages of Adiabene. A certain Pkîdhâ is baptized by him, and after he had been his disciple for five years he is sent by Addai to Arbela, the capital, where he becomes the first Bishop of the Christians there, for ten years. We are told many details about him and his successors who at first had names from the Old Testament (Samson, Isaac, Abraham, Noah, Abel), while Christian names later prevail. The first leaders of the Christian Church in Arbela seem to have been converted Jews or Christians of Jewish origin. But the chronicle does not mention the Jewish population of Arbela in general. Only once we hear that the parents of the later Bishop Noah, coming from Jerusalem, settled in Arbela 'because there were many Jews there'.² We have to remember that in the sixth century when the chronicle was composed there were no dealings between Jews and Christians. Of special importance is a synchronism which enables us to date the beginnings of Addai's mission in Adiabene some years before A.D. 100. We know that he was active at other places too. So he is mentioned, together with Mari, as the first missionary in Karka, the present Kerkūk,³ and several other places claim to have institutions which go back to the time of this apostle.⁴ Of special interest is the report in the chronicle that in A.D. 224, when the rule of the Sassanid kings began in Persia, there were more than twenty bishoprics in the lands adjacent to the Tigris of which seventeen are described in some detail in the chronicle.⁵

But Christianity must have spread far beyond the frontiers of

¹ A. v. Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums . . .*, 4th edition, 1924, p. 684.

² Sachau, l.c., p. 50.

³ Georg Hoffmann, 'Auszüge aus Syrischen Akten Persischer Märtyrer . . .' (*Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, vol. vii. 3, Leipzig 1880, p. 45).

⁴ G. Hoffmann, l.c., pp. 180, 371.

⁵ Cf. Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung . . .*, p. 689 f.; Sachau, l.c., 17 ff.; Sachau's *Zur Ausbreitung des Christentums in Asien* (*Abhandlungen, Berlin Academy*, 1919) gives important details for the later times.

Mesopotamia at that time. From the newly discovered Manichaean texts we learn that Mani went to India about A.D. 240, before he began his mission in his home country in 241.¹ We can hardly doubt that he went there following St. Thomas, the apostle of the Indians, and that he knew already something of the legendary history of the mission of Thomas as reported in the Acts of Thomas. That 'the whole framework of these tales belongs to the countries washed by the Euphrates and the Tigris', and that the famous 'Hymn of the Soul' which we find in these Acts 'was composed before the overthrow of the Parthian dynasty in 224',² is known as well as the fact that these Acts were originally written in Syriac, the language spoken by Mani, and that they were later very popular amongst the Manichaeans.³ Mani must have expected to find Christians in India, and he found them there. We hear that he 'made a good selection', that is to say that he founded there a community.⁴

Under these circumstances we can hardly believe that Burkitt is right in his thesis that Christianity east of the Roman Empire started in Edessa about A.D. 160-70.⁵ What do we know of these beginnings? Adolf von Harnack makes the following statement about it:⁶

Das Christentum in Edessa, sofern es noch von dem katholischen verschieden war, knüpft (für uns) an drei Personen an, an den 'apostolischen' Missionär Addai um das Jahr 100, der aber einstweilen noch im Dunkeln steht; an Tatian 'den Assyrer', und an Bardesanes (geb. 154).

Harnack dates Addai here in accordance with the Chronicle of Arbela, but admits that in reality nothing is known of his activity in Edessa. Burkitt rejects the evidence of the Chronicle of Arbela. According to him Addai was a contemporary of Tatian. But he too has little to say about the activity of these two men. Since Addai in the legend is connected with the introduction of the Diatessaron into Edessa, of which we otherwise know that Tatian was the author, so, in his last attempt to write the

¹ Cf. Hans Heinrich Schaeder in the periodical *Gnomon*, vol. ix, pp. 348, 350 f.

² F. C. Burkitt, *Early Eastern Christianity*, 1904, pp. 205, 216.

³ W. Bousset, 'Manichäisches in den Thomasakten, in *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, vol. xviii, 1918, pp. 1-39.

⁴ Cf. Schaeder, l.c., p. 348.

⁵ In *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. xii, 1939, p. 492.

⁶ *Die Mission und Ausbreitung . . .*, p. 680 f. Cf. Rubens Duval, *Histoire politique, religieuse et littéraire d'Édesse jusqu'à la première croisade*, Paris, 1892, chapters five and seven.

history of Eastern Christianity,¹ Burkitt tries to prove them identical, supposing that the same man who was called Tatian in the West may have been called Addai in the East. This shows how uncertain everything is in the matter, and we have to ask: Have we really a right to connect the beginnings of Christianity in Edessa with the names of these two men? It is certainly remarkable that in the most reliable source for the history of Christianity there, the Edessene Chronicle,² only the last of the three men quoted by Harnack, Bardesanes, is mentioned. How can we explain why the other two were omitted if they had been of any interest for the town?

There can be no doubt that Bardaisan was of importance for Edessa. I may refer here to the fine characterization of the man given by Burkitt in the fifth of his St. Margaret's Lectures on the Syriac-speaking Church.³ After giving an attractive survey of Bardaisan's dialogue *On Fate*, the only surviving book by him, he characterizes him with the words:

Bardaisan had learned to think for himself. . . . He had read much and thought much and was not content in the end merely to repeat the formulas of a school.

Burkitt shows how great a tragedy it was that the Syriac-speaking Church failed to attract or even tolerate the best scientific intellect of his time. In his 'Introductory Essay' to the important material deciphered by C. W. Mitchell from a palimpsest in the British Museum, published after the author's death, by his

¹ 'Syriac-speaking Christianity', in the *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. xii, p. 493. This identification was already proposed by Burkitt in his article 'Tatian's Diatessaron and the Dutch Harmonies', in *JTS.*, vol. xxv, 1924, pp. 113-30. Cf. especially p. 129 f.

² This chronicle is preserved on excellent ancient parchment in the Vatican Library, No. CLXIII in Assemani's Catalogue, pars I, vol. iii, p. 329. It was published first by J. S. Assemani with a Latin translation in his *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, tom. i, pp. 387-417. A new edition with a German translation and a careful investigation of all questions connected with the text was made by Ludwig Hallier, in his *Untersuchungen über die Edessenische Chronik (Texte und Untersuchungen . . .)*, vol. ix, no. 1, Leipzig, 1892. Hallier thinks that the chronicle was composed in Antioch and that it cannot be the work of an Edessene historian or chronicler and that it contains much less authentic records of the Edessenian archives: 'dafür spricht auch, dass sie spezifisch edessenische Berichte gar nicht hat' (p. 41). But here Hallier is completely wrong. We shall see that the chronicle is very reliable for historical facts, but that it does not contain Edessene legends.

³ 'Bardaisan and his Disciples', in *Early Eastern Christianity. St. Margaret's Lectures 1904 on the Syriac-speaking Church*, by F. Crawford Burkitt, London, 1904, pp. 155-92. Cf. especially p. 187.

teachers, Professors Burkitt and A. A. Bevan, in 1921,¹ Burkitt has devoted a special paragraph to the 'System of Bardaisan'. Under the influence of Ephraem's polemic Burkitt is here much more reserved in his opinion. He doubts whether Bardaisan had a first-hand knowledge of Greek philosophy and whether he really had composed the Hymns attributed to him.

In an instructive article published in 1932,² H. H. Schaeder has made new contributions to a real understanding of the man. He was able to use, besides the material made known by Mitchell, a new translation of Ephraem's 'Hymns' (Madrashe) against the heretics, made on the basis of Syriac texts largely improved from MSS. by Professor A. Rucker.³ Schaeder has characterized Ephraem's method of dealing with Bardaisan in the following way:⁴

The valuation of these passages is made difficult by Ephraem's peculiarities of intellect and authorship. He is neither inclined to deal with the ideas of the opponent he attacks, nor is he able to do so. It is sufficient for him to pick out single disconnected expressions of his opponent and to handle them with an extravagant array of words and of moral pathos. We can clearly see from Ephraem what a condition the Church had reached in his time, when it could not bear a spirit like Bardaisan. What in Bardaisan is intellectual clarity and power of comprehending truth, is to him confinement in a gross and primitive theology which does not illumine truth for him, but conceals it. As Bardaisan and his followers had influenced Christian people by his poetry, Ephraem felt himself compelled in poetry to oppose them. The poetic form in which he clothes his polemics makes them quite unbearable. . . .

In a quotation from Bardaisan preserved by Theodor bar Konai (end of the 8th cent.), Schaeder has recognized a fragment of an original cosmological hymn of Bardaisan.⁵ There can hardly be any doubt that Bardaisan was really a poet, and that he was the author of the hymn-book ascribed to him. This poetry made him popular amongst Syriac-speaking Christians. But the form

¹ *S. Ephraim's Prose Refutations of Mani, Marcion, and Bardaisan*, transcribed from the Palimpsest B.M. Add. 14623, by the late C. W. Mitchell and completed by A. A. Bevan and F. C. Burkitt, vol. ii, London, 1921, pp. cxxii-cxxxi.

² 'Bardanes von Edessa in der Überlieferung der griechischen und der syrischen Kirche', in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, vol. li, 1932, pp. 21-74.

³ 'Des heiligen Ephräms des Syrers Hymnen gegen die Irrlehrer, aus dem Syrischen übersetzt und mit einer Einleitung versehen von A. Rucker, in *Bibliothek der Kirchenväter*, vol. lxi, Kempten, 1928.

⁴ *I.c.*, p. 26. I translate Schaeder's words.

⁵ *I.c.*, pp. 46 ff.

of prosody used by him—which was later followed by Mani—was different from that used by Ephraem. Ephraem's verse with a fixed number of syllables is clearly influenced by the metre of the Greeks, and it seems that this kind of metre was introduced after Bardaisan's time into Syriac poetry, perhaps by Bardaisan's son Harmonios who had studied in Athens. It was accepted by Ephraem and followed by all the later Syriac poets.¹

Schaeder has made every effort to make an impartial examination of all the sources, Greek and Syriac, which mention Bardaisan. He ends his article with the following remarks:²

By examining and comparing information preserved to us more or less at random, in a more or less fragmentary condition, we have had to try to find outlines of the intellectual constitution of the man. Already in the fourth century the positive conception of it had disappeared, as we have seen, in the Syrian Church as well as in the Greek. Everything had been done to obscure his memory and to consign him to oblivion; and Mani, who came after him, was not so much the heir as the destroyer of his thoughts. In Bardaisan Greek civilization and philosophy are still in vigorous and productive tension with the Christian interpretation of life and moral energy. This tension is lost in the dualism and asceticism of the Manichaeans. Bardaisan, in his spiritual freedom and his originality, was in a hopeless position in Edessa at the beginning of the Eastern Church. In the Greek-speaking Church, more fortunate men took up the work he had begun and continued it. The problem of life to which he was devoted, the problem of Christian humanity, is as actual and urgent to-day as it was in his time.

I think there can be no doubt that it was chiefly due to Bardaisan that Edessa became the centre of Eastern Christianity. He was the famous Syriac classic, he was the gifted poet. It cannot have been easy to break the influence of this man whose real importance we only now begin to understand. We know very little of the details of the struggle. We only see what pains a man like Ephraem had to take in order to refute him—and other heretics like Marcion and Mani, who both must have been of a certain importance for Edessa, as both are mentioned in the Edessene Chronicle.³ We also see Ephraem eager to compose hymns in order to supplant Bardaisan's very popular hymns. But in the end it was not Ephraem who definitely made an end

¹ *I.c.*, p. 56 f. Schaeder quotes Sozomen's *Church History*, iii. 16, where the features of Syriac poetry and the differences existing between the poetry of Bardaisan and that of Ephraem are already clearly described.

² *I.c.*, p. 73. I translate Schaeder's words.

³ Cf. the paragraphs 6 and 10 of the chronicle.

of Bardaisan's 'heresy', but Bishop Rabbula of Edessa (died A.D. 435). In the *Vita Rabbulae*,¹ composed shortly after the Bishop's death, we find the following characteristic report about the end of this struggle:

The evil teachings of Bardaisan flourished strongly in Edessa until they were condemned and conquered by him (Rabbula). For before that time this accursed Bardaisan had drawn all the leading men of the town to himself by his cunning and the sweetness of his hymns, in order to protect himself by them as with strong walls. For the fool had hoped that by erring and leading those who were with him to err, he could firmly establish his errors with the weak assistance of his helpers. This saddened him (Rabbula), the man wise in the fields of the heart. He did not only exert himself to root up from that field the choking weeds and to leave behind the many blades of corn—that would have been easy—; but in his wisdom he also exerted himself to turn the weeds into corn—this too was necessary. So instead of the frightful blast of the trumpets of Joshua and his followers who trumpeted at the walls of Jericho till they fell, and instead of the annihilation of men and the seizing of their property for the Lord, this victorious general of Jesus the Messiah, in the power of his God and with conciliatory and gentle voice, was able quietly to destroy their church, to carry away all its treasure and to bring it to his own, so that he made use of its very stones.

We may doubt whether all these endeavours would have succeeded had not another attempt been made to destroy these heresies and to restore the fame of the Edessene Church, somewhat impaired by Bardaisan and the other heretics. The weapon used was a new construction of the history of this Church based on the legendary story of its foundation by a direct disciple of Christ Himself, said to have been sent there in fulfilment of the promise given by Christ in a correspondence with the Edessene king Abgar the fifth, Ukkāmā (died about A.D. 50).

The legend was already known to Eusebius in the beginning of the fourth century. He accepted it in his *Church History* as taken from the Syriac original deposited in the archives of Edessa.² The apostle sent to Edessa is here Thaddaios, one of the Twelve. In the Syriac *Doctrine of Addai*³ he is replaced by Addai, supposed to be one of the larger group of Christ's disciples, said to have been sent there by Thomas, the apostle of the East, whose relics were ceremonially transferred to Edessa

¹ S. Ephraemi Syri, *Rabbulae Episcopi Edesseni, Balaei aliorumque Opera Selecta*, ed. J. Josephus Overbeck, Oxonii, 1865, p. 192.

² Cf. Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*, i. 13.

³ *The Doctrine of Addai, the Apostle . . .*, ed. by George Phillips, London, 1876.

and deposited there in a silver shrine in A.D. 232.¹ In the Syriac text the story is given with many more details and connected with other legends. It is astonishing how many persons are mentioned there by name. The author is anxious to show how well he was acquainted with the conditions of the royal court of Edessa at that time. Most of the men mentioned in the legend are in fact otherwise known to have lived at that time. But they do not belong to the court of King Abgar of Edessa, but to the court of the Parthian kings of the time, of Artabanus III (about 12–38), Gotarses II (about 38–50), and Vardanes (about 39–47). This has been proved by Joseph Marquardt,² and he has drawn from this fact the conclusion that the legend must have been originally composed in a land ruled by these Parthian kings, and that this land was Adiabene.

It seems that when the land had become to a large extent a Christian country the historical fact of King Izates' conversion to Judaism of which we have heard was converted into a Christian legend. We have still traces of this Christian legend of Adiabene. In it King Izates appears under the name of Narsai. In the Edessene 'Doctrine of Addai' he is called *Narsai, malkā d'Athōrāyē*, Narsai, the king of the Assyrians.³ More about this legend is to be found in the Armenian story as reported by Mose of Khorene.⁴

In Edessa, King Izates-Narsai was replaced by his contemporary, King Abgar. Hanan, the keeper of the archives (*ṭabōlārā*),⁵ said to have been sent by the king to Palestine and to have played a prominent role in the conversion of King Abgar, has his prototype in Ananias (= Hananya, Hanan), the Jewish merchant who was responsible for King Izates' conversion to Judaism. Queen Helena of Adiabene, Izates' mother, is made the wife of King Abgar of Edessa in the Armenian text of the story.⁶ Addai, the missionary of Adiabene and the lands adjacent

¹ L.-J. Tixeront, *Les Origines de l'Église d'Édesse et la légende d'Abgar*, Étude critique . . ., Paris, 1888, p. 155.

² *Osteuropäische und Ostasiatische Streifzüge . . .*, Leipzig, 1903, p. 296 f. The years of the Parthian kings are given according to Debevoise, *A Political History of Parthia*, Chicago, 1938, p. 270.

³ Cf. *Doctrine of Addai*, ed. Phillips, p. 37 of the Syriac text, p. 35 of the translation.

⁴ Cf. Tixeront, l.c., p. 71; R. A. Lipsius, *Die Edessensische Abgarsage*, 1880, p. 39.

⁵ This word was read by Eusebius as *tabellārā* and connected with Latin *tabellarius*, and this he translates ταχυδρομος.

⁶ Cf. A. Lipsius, l.c., p. 86 f.

to the Tigris, for whom we have now a certain date in the Chronicle of Arbela, had to be antedated by more than sixty years in order to become a disciple of Christ and missionary of Edessa in King Abgar Ukkāmā's time, and he had to be postdated for more than sixty years in other parts of the legend in order to become the teacher of Bishop Palut in the second half of the second century. So he was twice connected with Edessa which he probably never visited!

It is generally believed that the reason for importing and developing the legend in Edessa was the conversion to the Christian faith of King Abgar IX (ruled A.D. 179–214), with whom Bardaisan is said to have had special connexions. But the only 'Christian' king of whom we really know was the king of the legend, the contemporary of Christ. In the Edessene Chronicle King Abgar IX is mentioned several times in the well-known report of the great inundation of Edessa in A.D. 201, and other details about him are reported in § 9, concerning the year 205–6. But not the slightest allusion is made to a conversion of this king, and it is very likely that this 'conversion' should be regarded as a modern legend without historical foundation.¹

Under these circumstances we must hold that the legend connected with the name of Addai is of no historical value for the beginnings of Christianity in Edessa. As it was adapted in Edessa to the needs of that town, it certainly reflects some of the conditions there at a later time. But it was imported into Edessa in order to be used for an idealistic reconstruction of the past. It gives the official history of a correct development of Christianity in Edessa as it should have been, according to a later point of view.

Burkitt tries to reconstruct the history of Christianity in Edessa with the help of the legend. Addai, said in one part of the legend to have been a contemporary of Christ, was according to other parts of the legend the teacher of Palut, who is said to have been consecrated as a bishop about A.D. 180 by Serapion, who was Bishop of Antioch from 189 or 192 to 209, and Serapion is said to have been connected with Zephyrine, who was Bishop in Rome from 202 to 218.² Through these connexions Palut

¹ On this question cf. Marquardt, l.c., p. 300, note 3, and H. Gomperz's article: 'Hat es jemals in Edessa christliche Könige gegeben?' in *Archaeologisch-Epigraphische Mitteilungen aus Österreich-Ungarn*, vol. xix, Wien, 1896, pp. 154–7.

² These dates do not agree at all with each other. They are given as taken from Burkitt.

becomes the 'catholic' Bishop *par excellence* of the Edessene Church and he is the central figure of Burkitt's hypothetical reconstruction.

On the other hand, Michael the Syrian reports in his chronicle that Bardaisan was converted to the Christian faith by an Edessene Bishop Hystasp who was preceded by Bishop Izani and followed by Bishop Aqai, and Michael puts Palut, of whom he knew from the Doctrine of Addai, into the time of the apostles. Michael's list can hardly be brought into accord with Burkitt's reconstruction. 'I think we shall do best to reject Michael's order altogether,' Burkitt writes.¹ It may be that he is right, but it may be that we have here some remnants of the *real* history which were removed in the idealistic reconstruction. With certainty we can only state two facts:

1. If Bardaisan (born 154) was converted in Edessa to the Christian faith, there must have existed a Christian community there in the second half of the second century.
2. According to the Edessene Chronicle, the sanctuary of the Christian Church was destroyed in the great inundation in 201. This is the earliest reference to a church *building* in Edessa as distinct from worship in private houses. As the 'catholic' Bishop Palut, who must have been bishop of the town at that time, is not mentioned, he cannot have played the important role attributed to him by Burkitt. On the other hand, we fully understand why Addai is not mentioned in the Edessene Chronicle.

(c) TATIAN'S DIATESSARON

Tatian, the second man connected by scholars like Harnack and Burkitt with the beginnings of Christianity in Edessa, calls himself an 'Assyrian', that is to say that he came from Assyria, the land between the Tigris and Media, from the Armenian mountains up to Ctesiphon.² We have already noted that Adiabene, situated east of the Tigris, became a part of the Roman province of Assyria after the war of Trajan (A.D. 116).³ Theodor Zahn may be right in supposing that Adiabene was Tatian's home country,⁴ but we do not know this with certainty.

¹ Cf. *Lectures*, p. 32. For this list cf. the note in Marquardt's *Streifzüge* . . . , p. 298 f.; *Chronique de Michel Le Syrien, Patriarche Jacobite d'Antioche* (1166–99), éditée . . . et traduite . . . par J.-B. Chabot, tome i, Paris, 1899, p. 184 f.

² Cf. Theodor Zahn, *Forschungen*, i. 269. He relies here on Claudius Ptolemaeus, the famous geographer, a contemporary of Tatian.

³ See above, p. 186.

⁴ See Zahn, l.c., pp. 270, 273.

Besides, Tatian calls himself a 'barbarian', that is to say that he was not a Greek. His mother tongue was Syriac, the language spoken in Assyria. He was a very gifted man, a man of importance. He renounced his chance of getting a reputable position at home, and, eager to learn, he went abroad to the West. His *Oratio ad Graecos*, the only book composed by him which has come down to us, shows that he was able to write excellent Greek, and that he was very well acquainted with Greek philosophy and civilization. But he was no real admirer of the Greeks. The whole *Oratio* shows that he was proud of being a 'barbarian'.¹

In Rome he came into close contact with Justin Martyr, and it was probably under his influence that he became a Christian. He must have stayed there after his master's death for some years. We know of several pupils he had during these years—Rhodon from Asia Minor, Narcissus of Jerusalem, perhaps Clement of Alexandria. His differences with the Church are already mentioned by Irenaeus. That he went back to the East we hear only from Epiphanius. It is very likely that he left Rome about A.D. 172. We have no report on his further life. That he came to Edessa is merely conjectured by modern scholars, because they believe Edessa to be the place where Christianity started in the East. He is not mentioned in the Edessene Chronicle² nor do we hear that he came into contact with a man like Bardaisan (born A.D. 154). It is much more likely that he returned to his home country, Assyria, and settled there.

We have seen that a Christian mission had been begun in Assyria before A.D. 100. Tatian may have known something of Christianity before he started on his journey to the West. In Rome he learnt to see that religion with other eyes, and there he became a Christian. When he now returned to Assyria, he must have found in it a great number of Christian communities. The more than twenty bishoprics which existed in A.D. 224 in the lands adjacent to the Tigris³ needed a certain time for their development. Tatian may have been eager to come into contact with these Christians at home. It is for these Christian communities in Assyria that he produced a Syriac text arranged in the order of the Diatessaron.⁴

¹ See Zahn, l.c., pp. 270–2.

² See above, p. 191.

³ See above, p. 189.

⁴ This formulation has been proposed by G. D. Kilpatrick, who remarks: 'If the Diatessaron was primarily an arrangement of the Gospel material, then the whole question whether the Diatessaron was first produced in Greek or Syriac becomes of less importance.'

It is a matter of fact that the Diatessaron is closely connected with the Old Syriac Gospels, of which we know two MSS. One is the Codex Curetonianus, written probably in the fifth century, published by William Cureton.¹ The other is the famous palimpsest in the Convent of Mount Sinai, discovered in 1892 by Agnes Smith Lewis and published in 1894 as a joint edition by Bensly, Rendel Harris, and Burkitt.² The upper script of the palimpsest, containing stories of saints and written by a monk Johannes in a convent in Ma'arrat Mesrën (between Antioch and Aleppo), was finished A.Gr. 1090, A.D. 778. The under script may have been written as early as the fourth century.³

These two MSS. differ from one another sometimes in such a way that it has been said that we have here different translations. But this theory, formulated by Julius Bewer,⁴ under the impression created by the material collected by Albert Bonus,⁵ is certainly not right. We have here a translation of the Bible which had never been officially recognized. This kind of translation has to be regarded as analogous to the old Jewish Targum of which we have spoken. It was exposed to alteration and corrected by copyists who aimed at writing down as perfect a text as possible. They may have adapted the translation to other Greek texts at their disposal. We have here an analogue to the Targum and to the Septuagint which have been occasionally altered according to other Hebrew texts, and a parallel to the Old Latin translation of the Gospels of which we can form now an exact idea from the new edition published by the Berlin Academy from material collected during nearly half a century by Adolf Jülicher.⁶ Here in every line the text regarded by

¹ *Remains of a Very Antient Recension of the Four Gospels in Syriac, hitherto unknown in Europe*; discovered, edited, and translated by William Cureton, London, 1858.

² *The Four Gospels in Syriac*, transcribed from the Sinaitic Palimpsest by the late Robert L. Bensly, J. Rendel Harris, and F. Crawford Burkitt. With an Introduction by Agnes Smith Lewis. Cambridge, 1894.

³ 'Not later than the beginning of the 5th century', Arthur Hjelt, *Sirius Sinaiticus*, 1930, p. 24.

⁴ Julius Bewer, *The History of the New Testament Canon in the Syriac Church*, Chicago, 1900, pp. 3–16.

⁵ *Collatio Codicis Lewisiani rescripti . . . cum Codice Curetoniano, cui adjectae sunt lectiones e Peshitto desumptae*, Oxonii, 1896.

⁶ 'Itala. Das Neue Testament in altlateinischer Überlieferung.' Nach den Handschriften herausgegeben von Adolf Jülicher. Im Auftrage der Kirchenväter-kommission der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zum Druck besorgt von Walter Matzkow, I. Matthäus-Evangelium, Berlin, 1938; II. Marcus-Evangelium, Berlin, 1940.

Jülicher as the oldest is printed in somewhat larger type, and beneath each word the various readings collected from all available sources are given in a somewhat smaller type, so that one can easily recognize the reading of every source. As soon as we come to an *authorized* version, conditions are completely changed. The MSS. of the Latin Vulgate, of the Syriac Peshitta, of the Targum Onkelos, have in the main the same text, with only slight variant readings.

Of the Old Syriac Gospels we have only two MSS. and scarcely any quotation by Syriac Fathers, as these usually quote Tatian's Diatessaron.¹ Burkitt, in his great edition of 1904,² was able to print the text of one of these MSS. and to add the various readings of the other in the notes. The edition was made with great care and is reliable in details. But we must keep in mind that in older times other texts of this version existed, and it is very likely that hardly any two MSS. had exactly the same text. If more of these texts were preserved, we should have to adopt a method of editing the version in a way similar to that used for the Latin Gospels.

Unfortunately Burkitt had been asked to publish a new edition of the Curetonian which was out of print.³ Although he himself was convinced that the Sinai MS. represented a much older form of the text he had to publish the later text, according to his commission, and the readings of the older text he had to give in the notes. Only where the text of the Curetonian was not preserved was he able to print the older text. The text published by him is therefore not consistent. It is mostly the later revised text, though sometimes the older text which was not revised. He publishes these texts as if they represented one and the same recension. Both texts are written—according to Burkitt—in the most idiomatic Syriac. He admits that the text is

¹ There exist, however, some texts in which the separate Gospels are quoted. See Joseph Schäfers, *Eine altsyrische antimarkionitische Erklärung von Parabeln des Herrn und zwei andere altsyrische Abhandlungen zu Texten der Evangelien. Mit Beiträgen zu Tatian's Diatessaron und Markion's Neuem Testament (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen)*, ed. Meinertz, vol. vi, Heft 1-2, Münster, 1917, pp. 226-9.

² *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe. The Curetonian Version of the Four Gospels, with the readings of the Sinai Palimpsest and the early Syriac Patristic evidence*, edited, collected, and arranged by F. Crawford Burkitt, vol. i, Text; vol. ii, Introduction and Notes, Cambridge, 1904.

³ The commission to re-edit the Codex Curetonianus was previously given to Professor Bensly, before the Sinai MS. was known. After Bensly's death in 1894 the commission was handed over to Burkitt, Bensly's collaborator.

full of peculiarities of grammar and spelling which are hardly to be met elsewhere in Syriac literature. But there is no question of dialectical variety or of rustic idiom. On the contrary, every indication shows that the translator used the vernacular Syriac of Edessa with the simplicity and ease which come from literary training.¹

Burkitt underestimates the differences of the two texts and was more impressed by the similarities which they have in common against later translations. The relation between the two texts has recently been discussed by Charles C. Torrey.² He refers to the fact that there are traces of Syro-Palestinian pronunciation and orthography in the Sinai palimpsest. A few of these traces had been previously indicated by Wellhausen in 1905.³ Torrey now publishes a great number of such instances which he has collected from time to time in his own reading of these Gospels from 1895 onwards. He writes with regard to the material which he publishes:

The list makes no claim of completeness, nor on the other hand does it include only such forms and idioms as are not found at all in Edessene Syriac. Any usage which is much more frequent in the 'Western' Aramaic than in classical Syriac may have the right to a place in this investigation.

The material collected by him is convincing on the whole. He is also quite right in assuming that originally such traces were more numerous in the text, and that they were altered in the course of time by copyists accustomed to correct Syriac. Several centuries elapsed between the original date of translation and the copying of the text in the Sinai palimpsest. Torrey comes to the conclusion:

The translators of these Old Syriac Gospels were natives of Palestine, Jews by birth and training, but converted to the Nazarene faith, who for a considerable time had been resident in the region of Antioch; men of learning and masters of the Syriac language who nevertheless spoke and wrote with an admixture of Palestinian Aramaic sufficient to give it something of the character of a patois. In the Curetonian text we have to see a revision of the Sinai text improving its language in the direction of pure Syriac, removing the conspicuously Palestinian elements and conforming the text to a later form of the Greek.

¹ See Burkitt's edition, vol. ii, pp. 39 ff.

² Charles C. Torrey, *Documents of the Primitive Church*, New York, 1942, pp. 249 ff.

³ In his review of Enno Littmann's *Semitic Inscriptions*, in the *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1905, p. 683.

I fully agree with these conclusions of Torrey with only the exception of the words 'in the region of Antioch'. From the fact that the upper script of the palimpsest was written in A.D. 778 in a convent near Antioch we cannot conclude that the under script—the text of the Gospels—must have been written, three or four centuries earlier, at the same place, to say nothing of the place where the translation itself may have been made more than six centuries earlier. On the other hand, it is clear that, if Torrey is right, the translation cannot have been made in Edessa, as Burkitt suggests. It may be that a revision of the text was made there. In the Curetonian we have such a revised text. Here all traces of archaic words and forms are eliminated. But this and other revisions which must have existed, although they are not preserved, may have been made in Edessa and also elsewhere.

Torrey's conclusions imply exactly the conditions prevailing in Adiabene. Here we find a large Jewish population among which a Christian mission had been active since the days of Addai (before A.D. 100). We have seen that this Jewish population had been in the possession of at least parts of a Syriac Old Testament—made by Jews for Jews—since the middle of the first century. Burkitt has rightly remarked that the translation of the Gospels into Syriac must have been preceded by a translation of the Old Testament into that language, because the correct rendering of Hebrew proper names in the Gospels cannot be explained from the Greek text alone.¹ For 'Jews by birth and training, but converted to the Nazarene faith, who for a considerable time had been resident'—in Adiabene—correct rendering of Hebrew proper names would be no difficulty. It is very likely that the translation of the Gospels was made in Adiabene, where the conditions were just such as described by Torrey.

The close connexion which undoubtedly exists between the Diatessaron of Tatian and the Old Syriac Gospels can be explained—and has been explained—in two different ways. We have to suppose *either* that the Diatessaron was made from the text of the Old Syriac Gospels, which in this case must have existed before the Diatessaron was composed; *or* that the Diatessaron was originally composed in Greek and later translated

¹ 'It requires some acquaintance with the Old Testament to know that Νάχωρ in the genealogy given by S. Luke should be written نَحْوَر, but Σαρουχ should be سَارُوح, and Λαμεχ should be لَحْمِش.' *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, ii. 202 f. Burkitt gives several more examples in support of his conclusion.

into Syriac. In this case the Old Syriac Gospels are later than the Diatessaron and must have been translated in close connexion with it.

Theodor Zahn, who wrote his fundamental book on the Diatessaron in 1881,¹ came to the conclusion that Tatian composed the Diatessaron from the Old Syriac Gospels of which Zahn knew at that time only the Curetonian. Friedrich Baethgen, who carefully compared in 1885 the Curetonian with the Diatessaron, pointed out that this text shows a great number of harmonistic readings which can scarcely be explained if we do not realize that they were made under the influence of the Diatessaron. This and other reasons led him to the conclusion that the text of the Curetonian must be later than the Diatessaron and that it cannot be older than the middle of the third century.² Zahn was convinced that Baethgen was right.³

In the Sinai palimpsest traces of great antiquity were discovered. Burkitt, in a long article published in 1894 in the *Guardian*,⁴ deals with these various marks of antiquity and comes to the conclusion:

The arguments for the priority of the Diatessaron which were satisfactory enough against the Curetonianus break down when applied to Syrus vetus represented by the Sinai palimpsest.

But when he published the text ten years later, he had completely changed his mind. After a long investigation of the different problems connected with these questions he comes to the conclusion that the Diatessaron must have been originally composed from Greek texts in Greek and later translated into Syriac. What were the reasons for this change of view?

Burkitt names several. But one is decisive for him: The Diatessaron shows a great number of 'Western' readings which otherwise are unattested except by the Cambridge Codex Bezae (D) and by some Latin texts. Such 'Western' readings cannot be expected in the East, they must have been imported from the West. This importation must have been made via the Diatessaron, composed in Rome from Greek MSS. with 'Western' readings, brought over by Tatian to the East and translated

¹ Theodor Zahn, *Tatian's Diatessaron. Forschungen zur Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altchristlichen Literatur*, i, Erlangen, 1881.

² Friedrich Baethgen, *Evangelienfragmente*, Der griechische Text des Curetonischen Syrsers wiederhergestellt, Leipzig, 1885, pp. 72 ff.

³ Theodor Zahn, *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*, I. i, 1888, p. 405.

⁴ 'The Sinai Palimpsest of the Old Syriac Gospels', *The Guardian*, 31 October 1894.

there into Syriac. A translation of the separate Gospels may have been ordered by Palut, the 'catholic' Bishop of Edessa of whom we have heard. He may have been encouraged in this order by the fact that the Harmony, as composed by a heretic, was not highly valued in the Church of Rome. The translation was made on the basis of a Greek text as read about A.D. 200 in Antioch, and of the Diatessaron to which the Edessenes were accustomed. So the 'Western' readings crept into the new translation. But in spite of the supposed endeavour of the Bishop this new translation did not acquire any influence, for the Diatessaron remained the 'Evangelion' in the Syrian Church during the following centuries.

In the Introduction to his *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe* Burkitt has given this sketch with great caution, as 'a working hypothesis', fully aware of the great difficulties inherent in it.¹ In his lecture *The Bible in Syria*² he speaks with much more confidence, and in his last article 'Syriac-speaking Christianity'³ he has modified somewhat his hypothesis under the influence of the Dutch Harmony discussed by Plooi, but in general he has no doubt of the correctness of the hypothesis, and here, as we have seen, he goes so far as to suppose that Tatian may be the same man as Addai.

The 'Western' readings in the Diatessaron are certainly a problem which has to be explained. But I doubt whether this can be done in the way proposed by Burkitt. I may refer here to two facts which have become known in recent years.

1. The fragments of the Gospels and Acts in the Chester Beatty Papyri, dated by Sir Frederic Kenyon from the first half of the third century,⁴ show these 'Western' readings in great number. After a careful investigation of this MS. in connexion with other ancient texts Sir Frederic Kenyon comes to the following conclusions:

With D and other authorities of the so-called 'Western' type its (i.e. the papyrus') relations are interesting and significant. In all the Gospels there are a considerable number of passages in which it supports readings of this type, including a good many which have exclusively

¹ *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, vol. ii, pp. 206 ff.

² 'St. Margaret's Lectures on the Syriac-speaking Church', no. ii, pp. 39-78. Cf. the summary, p. 76 f.

³ *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. xii, 1939, pp. 492-6. Cf. already Burkitt's review on Plooi, 'A Primitive Text of the Diatessaron, Leiden, 1923', in *JTS.*, vol. xxv, 1924, pp. 113-30.

⁴ *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri* . . ., by Frederic Kenyon, Fasciculus II, The Gospels and Acts, London, 1933, p. x.

'Western' support. But it has none of the more notable variants characteristic of this type, and where D and the Old Latin have peculiar readings, the papyrus is usually against them (p. xiv). The general result to which this evidence points would appear to be that this MS. is a witness to the existence in Egypt in the first half of the third century of a type of text distinct from that found predominantly in B, and with a strong infusion of readings found in the early authorities which are grouped together as 'Western'. . . . Its 'Western' features do not imply any connexion with either Rome or the Syriac Church. It only confirms the conclusion as to the misleading character of the term 'Western'. . . . The readings which do occur in it are not geographically Western or Syrian, but are early readings which did not find a place in B, but which, in varying degrees, are preserved in Western, Syrian, or Caesarean authorities (p. xviii f.).

As we have now a text of the Gospels with 'Western' readings in Egypt in the first half of the third century,¹ we may suppose that much earlier similar texts may have existed in the East in general, not only in Egypt where a favourable climate has preserved them.² A text of that kind must have been the basis of the Old Syriac Gospels.

2. That texts with these so-called 'Western' readings must really be very old is shown in a quite objective way by Professor Wensinck in his investigation of 'The Semitisms of Codex Bezae and their relation to the non-Western text of the Gospel of Saint Luke'.³ By comparing the text of Codex D with that of non-Western MSS. of the Gospels he found a group of variants originating from a more or less faithful rendering of Semitic expressions and Semitic syntax. After disregarding the variants which owe their origin to editorial tendencies, and the variants common to D and non-Western MSS., and those common to D and the parallel texts in the other Gospels, about 270 variants remained. Of these more than 200 belong to Codex D and about 50 instances to non-Western MSS., all of them due to differences of reading or translation of an underlying Aramaic

¹ In connexion with these facts it is of importance to remember that the text used by Clement of Alexandria showed these 'Western' readings in great number. Cf. P. M. Barnard, 'The Biblical Text of Clement of Alexandria in the Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles', London, 1899 (*Texts and Studies*, vol. v, 5).

² Cf. the last discussion of these problems by G. D. Kilpatrick, 'Western Text and Original Text in the Gospels and Acts', in *JTS.*, vol. xlv, 1943, pp. 24-36. In his article 'Western Text and Original Text in the Epistles' (ib., vol. xlv, pp. 60-5) he has shown that similar conditions prevail in other parts of the New Testament.

³ *Bulletin of the Beza Club*, no. xii, Leiden, December, 1937, pp. 11-48.

text. In a number of instances the reading of the non-Western MSS., as well as of Codex D, gives a faulty sense which proved to have an easy explanation in the same way. From these facts Wensinck concludes: D represents the Aramaic background of the Gospel tradition more faithfully than the non-Western MSS., and seems, from this point of view, to have the claim of precedence.¹

The so-called 'Western' readings in the Old Syriac Gospels are in reality *early* readings for which the Diatessaron cannot be made responsible. They were to be found in the Greek text which was the basis of the Syriac translation. This Greek text must have been a very early one. Torrey writes:

The Sinai text occasionally renders a Greek text to which it is the only witness, preserving primitive readings which the developing Christian doctrine could not tolerate and accordingly revised.

He refers to the reading ἰωσήφ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν rendered in Mt. 1. 16, together with the support given to this in vss. 20, 24, 25; to the reading Δαμόνιον ἐστίν rendered in Mt. 14. 26 and Mc. 6. 49, and he comes to the conclusion that the oldest of all Syriac versions of the Gospels must be dated early in the second century. Torrey is certainly right. It is not likely that in the church of Antioch a Greek text with such readings was used in A.D. 200, as Burkitt maintained.

By comparing parallel passages in the Gospels of the Sinai text Arthur Hjelt pointed out that the same Greek word has often been translated in the different Gospels by different Syriac words.² He concluded from this fact that the Syriac translation of the different Gospels was not made by the same man at the same time. Hjelt thinks that he can prove that the Gospel of Matthew was translated first and that the Gospel of Luke was the last translated. I am somewhat doubtful whether we can really go so far. But even Burkitt agrees that a number of the instances collected by Hjelt are sufficiently striking, and he admits that they present a formidable appearance to those who are prepared to regard a text practically identical with that of

the Sinai palimpsest as the earliest version of the Gospels into Syriac.¹

The Syriac text which was before Tatian when he composed the Diatessaron was certainly *not* 'practically identical' with the text in the Sinai palimpsest. It would be a special coincidence if one of the two forms of text preserved to us happened to be the basis for Tatian's work. We have to remember that the Syriac translation had no authoritatively fixed text. The differences which exist between the text of the Diatessaron and that of the Old Syriac Gospels are not to be explained by the fact that Tatian may have used Greek MSS. along with the Syriac Gospels at his disposal. They only show that the Syriac text used by Tatian differed in some respects from the text in the Sinai MS.

On the other hand, the Diatessaron was a great success. In the Syriac-speaking Church the separate Gospels were put into the background by it. It would be quite natural that the Syriac translation of the Gospels should be later influenced by it. In the Curetonian such influences have been pointed out by Baethgen.² The error in Baethgen's deduction was that he concluded from this fact that the translation itself was not made before A.D. 250. He did not reckon with the alterations to which such old translations were exposed. That an authority like Th. Zahn was led astray by these deductions shows that he too was not sufficiently acquainted with the conditions under which such old Biblical translations existed. As the Gospel text in the Sinai palimpsest was copied probably in the fourth century, at a time when the Diatessaron was highly esteemed in the Eastern Churches, it may be that it also was influenced by the Diatessaron.³ But in the main we must see in these Gospel texts descendants of the Syriac text which was before Tatian when he composed the Diatessaron.

The view that the Diatessaron was composed in the East on the basis of an old Syriac translation of the Gospels best explains the fact that we have no real trace of the existence and influence of the Diatessaron in the West. It is certainly remarkable that a scholar like Origen (died 254), so interested in textual criticism, does not once mention it, although he is well informed about

¹ Compare with Wensinck's conclusion Wellhausen's remark in *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, Berlin, 1905, p. 15: 'Im Cantabrigiensis Bezae sind häufig Semitismen stehn geblieben, die im Vaticanus und Sinaiticus beseitigt sind; und dies ist ein Vorzug. Denn es darf als sicher gelten, dass die Semitismen nicht nachträglich eingetragen, sondern ausgemerzt sind.' Cf. *Zweite Ausgabe*, Berlin, 1911, p. 9.

² Arthur Hjelt, *Die altsyrische Evangelienübersetzung und Tatians Diatessaron* . . ., Leipzig, 1901, pp. 96-107.

¹ Cf. *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, vol. ii, pp. 210-12.

² See above, p. 203, note 2.

³ See H. J. Vogels, 'Die altsyrischen Evangelien in ihrem Verhältnis zu Tatians Diatessaron' (*Biblische Studien*, ed. Bardenhewer, vol. xvi, Freiburg, 1911).

the writings of Tatian.¹ Clement of Alexandria (died about 225) knows of several books composed by Tatian,² and he often criticizes his doctrines.³ But he knows nothing of the Diatessaron, and this fact is of special importance as it is very likely that he was a personal pupil of Tatian.⁴ Irenaeus (died about 202), the first author who mentions Tatian as a heretic,⁵ does not know of the Diatessaron.

Eusebius (died about 340), mentions the Diatessaron in his *Ecclesiastical History* (iv. 29). The Greek text has here:

Tatian, their ['the Encratists'] first head, brought together a combination and junction—I do not know how—of the Gospels, and he called it Diatessaron, and this is said to be still among some people.

The Old Syriac translation has some interesting variants:

This Tatian, their ['the Encratists'] first head, collected and mixed and made an Evangelion and called it Diatessaron, i.e. that of the mixed ones, that which exists among many people up to to-day.

The only natural inference from this much discussed passage is that Eusebius never saw a copy of the text.⁶

Epiphanius (died 403) knows that the Evangelion Diatessaron, called by some people *κατὰ Ἐβραϊσμούς*, is said to have been composed by Tatian.⁷ Jerome (died 420) in his book *De viris illustribus* speaks of the endless series of books composed by Tatian, but he does not mention the Diatessaron.⁸

Up to ten years ago not a single line of a Greek Diatessaron was known to exist. This is no longer so, since, on 5 March 1933, during a joint excavation at Dura-Europos on the Euphrates, undertaken by Yale University and the French Academy, a little piece of parchment was discovered with fourteen lines of a Greek Harmony which has undoubtedly a close connexion with Tatian's Diatessaron. The fragment was published by

¹ Harnack, *Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur*, i. 489. It is not very likely that he even knew the title of the book, as Zahn proposes; see *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*, i. 412.

² Harnack, l.c., i. 488; Zahn, *Forschungen*, i, p. 12.

³ Cf. besides the references given in note 2: Einar Molland, *The Conception of the Gospel in the Alexandrian Theology*, Oslo, 1938, p. 21 f.

⁴ Cf. the references given in note 2.

⁵ See Harnack, l.c. i. 486, ii. i, 289.

⁶ See Zahn, *Forschungen*, i. 14–20; Arthur Hjelt, *Die altsyrische Evangelienübersetzung und Tatians Diatessaron* . . ., Leipzig, 1901, p. 23 f.

⁷ See Zahn, *Forschungen*, i, p. 21 f.

⁸ Ibid., p. 6 f.; 'Beachtenswert ist, dass er über das Diatessaron schweigt', Harnack, l.c. 491.

Carl H. Kraeling.¹ It seems to belong to the third century,² and is of great value as it clearly shows that a Gospel Harmony in Greek existed at an early time. It is of special interest as it shows some readings which cannot be found in any MS. of the Gospels so far known. But there can hardly be any doubt that this Greek text is a translation from a Syriac original—although making use of a Greek text of the Gospels.³ Clear evidence of this fact is the name Arimathaea, the place from which Joseph is said to come in Mt. 27. 57. It has here the form *Ερινμαθαια*, and we must ask how the *v* in the name has to be explained. In Syriac letters the name would have the form *ܐܪܝܡܬܐ* and this was clearly misread by the translator as *ܐܪܝܡܬܐ*, Syriac *i* and *n* being very similar; they could easily be confused by somebody who did not know the name. Also the initial *e* of the word can easily be explained when we suppose a Syriac original. Dura-Europos was a place where Greek and Syriac influences met. The Diatessaron was read by the Syrian Christians in their churches and the text was translated into Greek for the sake of Greek-speaking Christians there.

Kraeling seems to be right in saying that the Greek fragment is the earliest Diatessaron document in existence. But he admits that the Coptic Manichaean documents recently discovered in Egypt may furnish a witness to the Syriac text only slightly later than that which the Dura fragment bears to the Greek.⁴ That the 'Evangelion' quoted by Mani and his disciples was the Diatessaron was in fact suggested by the first editors.⁵ The texts published since show that there can be no doubt about this fact.⁶ The language used by Mani was Syriac,⁷ and we know

¹ 'A Greek Fragment of Tatian's Diatessaron from Dura', edited by Carl H. Kraeling (*Studies and Documents* . . ., iii), London, 1935.

² Kraeling dates the fragment in accordance with the date of the Christian chapel in the neighbourhood of which it was discovered from about A.D. 222.

³ Cf. A. Baumstark, in *Oriens Christianus*, Series 3, vol. x, Leipzig, 1935, pp. 244–52.

⁴ Cf. Kraeling, l.c., p. 16, note 1.

⁵ See C. Schmidt and H. J. Polotsky, *Ein Mani-Fund in Ägypten*, Sitzungsberichte, Berlin Academy, 1933, pp. 57–9.

⁶ *Manichäische Handschriften der Staatlichen Museen*, Berlin, vol. 1; Kephalaia, ed. Schmidt, Polotsky and Böhlig, Stuttgart, 1935 ff. A quotation from the Diatessaron has been discussed by Baumstark in *Oriens Christianus*, vol. xxxiv, 1937, pp. 169 ff. The Manichaean texts published since then show the use of the Diatessaron in quotations from the Gospels clearly.

⁷ Besides Syriac, Mani knew some Persian too, but he did not know that language very well. W. B. Henning has recently published a report of the last audience granted to Mani by King Bahram I, the Sassanid. The report

that he began his mission in Mesopotamia in 241.¹ The Syriac Diatessaron was well known and generally used at that time. A Greek text was in existence—that we know from the fragment published by Kraeling. But, as far as we know, it did not play any great role.

The same must be said of the Latin text of the Diatessaron which was the source of the Dutch Harmony, the Liège Diatessaron, to which D. Plooij has drawn the attention of critics. This Dutch text—and similar texts known to us—are derived from an old Latin Harmony with a text older than Jerome's Vulgate, and not identical with the anonymous Latin Harmony found in the sixth century by Victor of Capua, which was brought later into accordance with the Vulgate. Plooij thinks that it was an Old Latin Harmony which had been forgotten for 1,000 years and which the Dutch Harmony may enable us to reconstruct.² He supposes that it was translated directly from the Old Syriac text.³

In the beginning of the fifth century a new text of the New Testament in Syriac was introduced into Edessa. The author was, as Professor Burkitt has made nearly certain, Rabbula, who was bishop in that town from A.D. 411 to 435.⁴ Of his activity against the followers of Bardaisan we have already heard.⁵ In this new translation, the so-called Peshitta, the separate Gospels were to be found. Rabbula ordered that the priests and deacons should take care that in all churches an Evangelion of the separate Gospels should be found and read.⁶ It seems that he succeeded, at least in Edessa. Other bishops of Syriac-speaking

is given by Nuhzadag, who had served Mani as an interpreter on that occasion. Henning remarks: 'Although Mani knew some Persian and even had composed one of his books in, it is true, somewhat halting Persian, he must have felt his knowledge of that language to be insufficient for an audience that was to decide on his life and the future of his community.' Cf. 'Mani's Last Journey', by W. B. Henning, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, vol. x, London, 1942, p. 953.

¹ Cf. H. H. Schaefer, in *Gnomon*, vol. ix, 1933, p. 349.

² D. Plooij, *A Primitive Text of the Diatessaron*, Leiden, 1933.

³ D. Plooij, *Traces of the Syriac Origin of the Old Latin Diatessaron*, Mededeelingen of the Amsterdam Academy, 1927.

⁴ 'Now he translated in the wisdom of God that was in him the New Testament from Greek into Syriac, because of the variations exactly as it was.' *Vita Rabbulae*, ed. Overbeck, p. 172; Burkitt, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, vol. ii, p. 161.

⁵ Cf. above, p. 194 f.

⁶ *Præcepta et Monita ad Sacerdotes et Regulares*, ed. Overbeck, l.c., p. 220, lines 3-5.

communities followed his example. Bishop Theodoret of Cyrus (died A.D. 457) boasts of having collected and destroyed in his diocese more than 200 copies of the Diatessaron and of having forced the churches under his jurisdiction to use the separate Gospels, i.e. the Peshitta.

But the introduction of a revised version of Biblical texts has never been an immediate success. We have seen this in the case of the Targum, the Septuagint, and the Vulgate, and we cannot be surprised to find the same story repeated in the case of the Syriac texts of the Bible. The older text of the Syriac Old Testament is to be found as late as in MSS. of the sixth century and even of the ninth.¹ The Diatessaron remained for centuries highly esteemed in the Eastern Churches in spite of all the efforts made in the fifth century to replace it by the revised text of the separate Gospels, the Peshitta. It may be that the commentary on it written by an authority like Ephraem helped to preserve it. The commentary exists to-day only in an Armenian translation,² but it was quoted in the Syriac original by Syriac authors of the ninth century and later,³ and a copy of the Syriac Diatessaron made in the ninth century is said to have been the basis of the Arabic translation, of which quite a number of MSS. are at our disposal.

THE ARABIC DIATESSARON

The Arabic text of the Diatessaron is known to us in two forms, clearly different in details of translation; they can easily be distinguished by three features: that in one form the Evangelists are quoted by the first two letters of their names, in the other by single letters;⁴ that in one form the genealogies of Christ are to be found in the middle of the text—that of Mt. 1 in chapter 2, that of Lc. 3 in chapter 4 of the Diatessaron—in the other form at the end, as a kind of appendix; and that in one form no author of the Arabic translation is mentioned, in the other the translation is ascribed to Abulfaraj 'Abdallāh b. aṭ-Ṭaiyib.

¹ Cf. above, pp. 180 ff.

² Armenian edition of Ephraem's works, vol. ii, Venetiis, 1836. A Latin translation, made in 1841 by J.-Baptista Aucher and published in 1876 by Georg Moesinger (*Evangelii Concordantis Expositio facta a Sancto Ephraemo Doctore Syro*) was the basis for Zahn's reconstruction of the text in *Forschungen* i.

³ See Rendel Harris, *Fragments of the Commentary of Ephrem Syrus upon the Diatessaron*, London, 1895.

⁴ In the first form the sigla are: Mt. م, Mc. م, Lc. ل, Jn. ي. In the second form: Mt. م, Mc. ر, Lc. ق, Jn. ح.

The first form is to be found:

1. In the Vatican MS. Arab XIV, called A in the published editions of the text,¹ a MS. brought to Rome from the East by Joseph Simon Assemani in 1719, originally 125 folios, but fols. 17 and 118 are missing and fols. 1-7 are not well preserved. The MS. was probably written in the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries;² it begins with the words:

In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, who endows with life, the one God as substance in essence, the threefold as persons in accident. . . .

and ends with the remark:

Finished is with God's help the holy Gospel which Tatian has collected from the four gospels, known as Diatessaron. . . .

A facsimile of fol. 110 of the MS. is published by Marmadji on pl. I.

2. In a Beirut fragment,³ consisting of three folios which contain the narrative of the Lord's Supper and the last sentence of the Diatessaron, followed by an interesting colophon. The text is in agreement with that of Codex A. As the genealogies of our Lord are in this MS. not to be found at the end of the Diatessaron, they must have been given in chapters 2 and 4, as in MS. A. The MS. to which the fragment belonged was finished in July, A.D. 1332. It was connected with a 'very old' MS.⁴ written in the 'town of God' (Antioch)⁵ by three MSS.

¹ *Tatiani Evangeliorum Harmoniae Arabicae*. Nunc primum ex duplici codice edidit et translatione Latina donavit P. Agostinus Ciasca. Roma, 1888. A. S. Marmadji, O.P., *Diatessaron de Tatien*. Texte Arabe, établi, traduit en français. . . . Beyrouth, 1935.

² According to Ciasca, who follows Assemani, the MS. was written in the twelfth century, cf. Ciasca's article 'De Tatiani Diatessaron arabice versione', in Cardinal Pitra's *Analecta Sacra* . . . , tomus iv, Parisiis, 1883, pp. 465-87. That the MS. must in fact be dated later had been seen previously by the Swedish scholar J. D. Åkerblad (died 1819), cf. Zahn, *Forschungen*, i, p. 295.

³ The fragment was discovered and first published by Louis Cheikho, in *Journal Asiatique*, ix. 10 (1897), pp. 301-7, and *Chrestomathia Arabica* . . . auctore P. L. Cheikho, Beryti, 1897, pp. 203-5. A facsimile in *al-Mashrik*, vol. iv, 1901, after p. 104. A new edition of the fragment was made by Georg Graf, in the appendix to the book of Sebastian Euringer, 'Die Überlieferung der Arabischen Übersetzung des Diatessaron' (*Biblische Studien*, vol. xvii, 2), Freiburg i. Br., 1912, pp. 62-71.

⁴ It would be of interest to know the date of this 'very old' MS. Unfortunately the date is not preserved in the fragment.

⁵ 'town of God' (*medīnat Allāh*) is a translation of *Theupolis*, a name given to Antioch by Justinian when he restored the town after it had been destroyed

copied in Egypt the one from the other. The oldest of these three MSS., that which had been copied directly from the 'very old' MS., was written by Anbā' Yūsif b. Muḥabrik, who was a bishop in al-Fūwah (on the Rosetta Nile) in the first half of the thirteenth century A.D.¹ As Codex A was also written in Egypt, at about the same time as the MSS. mentioned in the colophon of the Beirut fragment, and has the same kind of text as the Beirut fragment, we must suppose that it also was a direct or indirect copy of the same 'very old' MS. which had been written in Antioch.

The second form of the text is to be found:

1. In MS. Borg Arab 250 of the Vatican Library, called B in the editions. It was given in 1886 by its owner, Ḥalīm Dōs Ghālī, a prominent Catholic Copt in Cairo, to the Museum Borgianum de Propaganda Fide in Rome. The MS. contains on fols. 1-85 an Introduction to the Gospels, which has not really been investigated so far,² and on fols. 96-353 the Arabic Diatessaron. A facsimile of the beginning of the Diatessaron (fols. 96v/97r) was published by Ciasca, a facsimile of fols. 324v/325r by Marmadji on pl. II of his edition. The MS. in its outer appearance is an imitation of a copy of the Koran. The first two pages of the Diatessaron are written in the same way as Sūra 1 and the beginning of Sūra 2 are usually written in a copy of the Koran. The five lines of the text are short and surrounded by decoration. But from the facsimile published by Marmadji we see that the whole MS. was written like a copy of the Koran. Ciasca proposed as the date of the MS. the fourteenth century A.D., but Korans of a similar type are hardly older than the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries, and the artist who decorated the first pages of the Diatessaron was acquainted with decoration of the Renaissance period, so that the MS. can certainly not be older than the sixteenth century.³ In the preamble of the MS. we read that the Diatessaron collected from the four

by Khusrāu Anūshīrwān, the Sassanid ruler, in A.D. 538. The town belonged from 637 to 969, and again after 1084, to the Arabs. It was held by crusading princes from 1098 to 1268.

¹ Cf. Euringer, l.c., pp. 32-56. In dealing with these fragmentary notes Euringer tries to prove more than is really possible, and he makes some curious mistakes. But his final result seems to be correct.

² But see below, p. 223.

³ That was the opinion of Dr. Hugo Buchthal of the Warburg Institute whom I consulted. It is, however, according to him, impossible to suggest, on the basis of the photograph, at what date after A.D. 1500 these decorations may have been made, since they still occur as late as the nineteenth century.

Gospels by 'Titianos the Greek' was translated from Syriac into Arabic by Abulfaraj 'Abdallāh b. aṭ-Ṭaiyib. The postscript of the MS. has the following text:¹

Finished is the Evangelion which Tatianos collected and which he called Diatessaron, i.e. the fourfold, collected from the four gospels of the holy apostles, the four excellent evangelists, who are to be blessed. The excellent learned priest Abulfaraj 'Abdallāh b. aṭ-Ṭaiyib—may God be pleased with him—has translated it from Syriac into Arabic from a copy in the handwriting of 'Īsā b. 'Alī, the physician, the pupil of Hunain b. Ishāq—may God have mercy upon both of them. Amen.

2. In MS. 202 of the Library of the Coptic Patriarchate in Cairo, consisting of 114 folios, finished on 27th Bashnes A. Mart. 1511² (22 May, A.D. 1795), MS. E in Marmadji's edition. A facsimile of fol. 25 is published by Marmadji on pl. III of his edition. The MS. is much later than MSS. A and B, and the facsimile shows that it was not written very carefully. Nevertheless, the seventy or so mistakes in the vocalization discovered by Marmadji on every page of the MS. have not to be taken too seriously. The Maronite Marmadji is a protagonist of the 'classical' form of his mother tongue; he is unable to believe that in the vocalization, regarded by him as wrong, there may be found some survivals of the way in which the Copts used to read these Arabic texts. It is, however, somewhat surprising that Marmadji made just this 'incorrect' MS. the basis for his edition. The reason is simple enough: a photograph of the Cairo MS. belongs to the 'École Biblique' in Jerusalem, and Marmadji is a member of its staff. So he had the photograph of the MS. conveniently at his disposal.

The preamble of the MS. is the same as that in MS. B. The postscript has the following text:³

Completed is the Evangelion which Tatianos collected and which he called Diatessaron, i.e. the fourfold, collected from the four gospels of the holy apostles, the four excellent evangelists, may they be blessed. And the accomplishment of this honoured Evangelion was . . . (here follows the date).

¹ The Arabic text is published by Ciasca on p. 210 and by Marmadji on p. 536.

² In the 'Catalogue de Manuscrits Arabes Chrétiens conservés au Caire' (*Studi e Testi*, vol. lxiii, 1934, p. 87) Georg Graf gives as date of the MS. A. Mart. 1512, instead of 1511. That this is wrong was confirmed to me by Professor A. Surial Atiyah in Alexandria.

³ The Arabic text of this postscript is published by Marmadji on p. 536 of his edition.

3. In MS. 1020 of the Library of Père Sbath.¹ This MS. was copied by the deacon (*shammās*) Ibrāhīm Abū Ṭibl b. Sam'ān al-Khawānikī, one of the servants (*khuddām*) of the martyr Merkurios Abū Sifain in Old Cairo,² in A. Mart. 1512 (A.D. 1798). The MS. has the same preamble as MSS. B and E. Of its postscript nothing is known so far.

4. In MS. Arab. e. 163 of the Bodleian Library in Oxford. The MS. contains three Christian texts: (a) an Introduction to the four lifegiving Gospels and the ten Canons (fols. 5-31), (b) a compendium on Christian truth (fols. 41-139), (c) the Arabic Diatessaron (fols. 140-288).

This last MS. with the three texts is called at the beginning and the end *al-muṣḥaf ash-sherīf*, 'the noble volume', a name usually given to a copy of the Koran. The copyist, a certain Anṭūnī Sa'd, who finished the second text in July 1805, the third text in January 1806, declares at the end of the MS. that he, following the orders he had received (see below, p. 222), had copied exactly an original which was finished 13th Rejeb A.H. 500 (15 March A.D. 1107). In the Bodleian MS. the beginnings of the first and the third texts are written just as the first Sūra and the beginning of the second are written in a copy of the Koran. The beginning of the second text has a decorated vertical band on both sides of the text—a kind of decoration found also in copies of the Koran. The name given to the MS. and its outer appearance therefore agree, and there can be no doubt that the original, dated A.D. 1107, contained the same three texts, had the same name, and a similar outer appearance. The whole MS. deserves full consideration.³ The author of the first text, whose name is not mentioned, declares that whoever intends to study a Gospel with profit must do so under the following aspects: He has to regard

- (1) its scope (*gharad*), eternal life for mankind may be won by it (fol. 9v);
- (2) its advantage (*manfa'a*), salvation from captivity of Satan may be won by it (10v);
- (3) its rank (*martaba*), continuous reading and keeping its prescriptions is necessary (19v);

¹ *Bibliothèque de Manuscrits Paul Sbath, Catalogue*, vol. ii (Cairo, 1938), p. 135.

² The church has been described by A. J. Butler, *The Ancient Coptic Churches of Egypt*, Oxford, 1884, vol. i, pp. 75-154.

³ A notice on the MS. was published by A. F. L. Beeston: 'The Arabic Version of Tatian's Diatessaron', in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1939, pp. 608-10.

- (4) its characteristics (*wasīm*), the divine message (20);
- (5) its relation to God (*nisba*), by the Evangelists, who were apostles or pupils of apostles (20);
- (6) its authority (*isnād*), the Gospels report all that Christ has done on earth (20v);
- (7) its divisions (*fuṣūl*), which have to be regarded carefully, as reports on the same things are to be found in the different gospels (21). The author enumerates:
 219 chapters (Mt. 68, Mc. 48, Lc. 83, Jn. 20).
 1,165 canons (Ammonius and Eusebius) (Mt. 355, Mc. 236, Lc. 342, Jn. 232).
 287 Coptic sections (Mt. 101, Mc. 54, Lc. 86, Jn. 46).
 The 'Ten Canons', the harmonizing tables of Ammonius and Eusebius.
 The 'Testimonia', Messianic quotations from the O.T. in the single Gospels (Mt. 95, Mc. 53, Lc. 73, Jn. 39).
 Short prefaces to the Gospels, containing chiefly biographical notes on the Evangelists. (Between fols. 22 and 29 eight folios are to be found in the MS., instead of six.)

Of special interest is the second text which has the title *ṭiriāk al-'uḳūl fī 'ilm al-uṣūl (ad-dīniye)*, 'Antidote of the minds in the matter of the (divine) principles'. In the preamble of the text we are told that the book was written at the request of a Muslim ruler who had asked (a) for a compendium (*mukhtaṣar*) on Christian truth with reference to the different Christian parties (*firaḳ*), (b) for an answer to questions raised by a prominent Muslim (*ba'd as-sādāt al-muslimīn*) concerning the Trinity and the Divinity of Christ. The text complies with the two requests. It contains the compendium dealing in two parts (*jumla*) with Christian dogmatics (24 chapters) and Christian ethics (5 chapters), and in the conclusion (*khātima*) the answer is given to the questions raised by the Muslim authority. Here we find two long quotations from al-Ghazālī's book *ar-radd al-jamīl* (fols. 129 and 133)¹ and constant reference to the problems raised by this book. There is no doubt that it was al-Ghazālī's book to which the Copts had been asked to give an answer.

¹ The quotations from al-Ghazālī's book were published by Paul Sbath in his book *Vingt traités philosophiques et apologetiques d'auteurs arabes chrétiens du IX^e au XIV^e siècle*, Publiés pour la première fois et annotés . . ., Caire, 1929, pp. 176-8. Sbath published these texts according to his own MS. 1580, dated A.H. 715/A.D. 1315. Another MS. of this text, written A.D. 1863, is described under No. 47 of his Catalogue (*Bibliothèque de Manuscrits Paul Sbath*, vol. i, Caire, 1928, p. 38 f.).

The full title of al-Ghazālī's book is *ar-radd al-jamīl li-ilāhīyat 'Isā 'alā ṣarīḥ al-injīl*, 'The pleasant answer to the divinity of Jesus according to the genuine Gospel'. In his article 'Le Christ dans les Évangiles, selon Ghazali',¹ Louis Massignon has drawn our attention to this interesting text. Massignon shows that what Ghazālī, in the earlier period of his life, knew of Christ was exclusively based on material he had found in Islamic tradition, chiefly 'logia' of ascetic character. This material was his only source in his great book on Islamic ethics, the *ihyā 'ulūm ad-dīn*, 'The revival of the sciences of religion', which he wrote after his 'conversion' (1095). In a later period of his life he became desirous of studying the Gospels themselves. The result of these studies we find in his book *ar-radd al-jamīl*. Massignon has shown that it is very likely that Ghazālī wrote this book about 1101 in Alexandria, where he lived some time after Jerusalem was captured by the Crusaders in A.D. 1099.

Al-Ghazālī's book was published by Robert Chidiac.² For the Arabic text he had at his disposal the MS. used by Massignon (Aya Sofia 2246 = B), another Stambul MS. (Aya Sofia 2247 = S), and a Leiden MS. (Catalogue 2084 = G), in which no name of any author is preserved and which had not been recognized previously. The Arabic text is accompanied by an exact and valuable French translation, and in a long introduction to the text the various problems are carefully discussed. Chidiac has shown that there can really be no doubt that the text is rightly ascribed to al-Ghazālī in the two Stambul MSS. A certain difficulty is to be seen in the fact that neither does Ghazālī himself refer to this book in his later works, nor does any other Muslim author do so, and that the only Christian text in which we find a reference to Ghazālī's book is—as far as we know—the compendium on Christian dogmatics and ethics of which the Oxford MS. contains a copy.

Quite a number of copies of this text are known,³ and the book is ascribed to different authors in quite different periods. Now we have an exact date for this text. As it belonged to a MS. which was written in 1107, and as it was an answer to

¹ *Revue des Études Islamiques*, année 1932, pp. 523-36.

² Al-Ghazālī, *Réfutation excellente de la Divinité de Jésus-Christ d'après les Évangiles*, Texte établi, traduit et commenté par Robert Chidiac, S. J. Préface de Louis Massignon (*Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études*, . . . Sciences Religieuses, LIV^e volume, Paris, 1939).

³ Georg Graf, 'Zum Schrifttum des Abū'l-Barakāt und des Abū'l-Hair', in *Oriens Christianus*, iii. 8, 1933, pp. 133-43.

Ghazālī's book composed about 1101, it is clear that the text must have been composed between these two dates. It is very likely that the Muslim ruler to whom the preamble of the book refers was al-Melik al-Afḍal,¹ who under the Fātimid Khalif al-ʿĀmir (1101–30) and his predecessor was the *de facto* ruler of Egypt from 1095 to 1121, in succession to his father, al-Bedr al-Jamālī, the famous Emīr al-Juyūsh, who had been the *de facto* ruler of Egypt from 1073 to 1094. Al-Afḍal may have sent a copy of al-Ghazālī's book to the Copts, with the request for an answer—a certain interest in Christian things amongst Muslims may be expected at a time when Jerusalem was in the hands of the Crusaders. This answer was given by the Copts in the present compendium. The compendium, prefaced by a general introduction to the Gospels and followed by a copy of the Arabic Diatessaron, was handed over to the Muslim authorities by the Copts. It is very likely that the MS. which had been finished in March 1107 was the very text which was handed over by the Copts. So we can understand why the MS. was written in the outer appearance of a copy of a Koran, why it was given a name usually given to a copy of the Koran, and why there should be other similar features in the MS. The Copts may have believed that in this way they would make a greater impression on their Muslim rulers.

The MS. was written by pious members of the Aulād al-ʿAssāl, a prominent Coptic family which flourished in Egypt for several centuries. One member of the family, called simply Ibn al-ʿAssāl, is said to have been the author of the text. The Copts may have commissioned him to write the answer to al-Ghazālī's book. He was the grandson (*sibt*) of the old and venerable Shaikh Buṭrus as-Sadamantī, a well-known Coptic author of the eleventh century.² In the introductory remark to the text Ibn al-ʿAssāl is described as an eminent scholar,³ but the epithets given to him must not be taken too seriously. They were certainly chosen in order to make an impression on the Muslims for whom the treatise had been written.

Three brothers belonging to the Aulād al-ʿAssāl were famous

¹ Cf. concerning him C. H. Becker's article 'al-Afḍal b. Bedr al-Djamālī' in *Encyclopedia of Islam*, vol. i, p. 154.

² See Louis Cheikho, *Catalogue de manuscrits des auteurs arabes chrétiens*, Beirut, 1924, p. 62.

³ The epithets given to him are: *al-ḥabr al-labīb al-fāḍil al-ʿālim al-ʿāmil, kaukab ahl zamānihi az-zāhir al-fāʿid minhu jauhar al-ḥikme min yanbū' bahr ʿilmihi az-zākhīr, kāfi' ḥujaj al-muʿānīdīn bi-aḥsan al-maḳāl*.

as writers in the thirteenth century.¹ One of them was asked in A.H. 650/A.D. 1252 to prepare a new Arabic translation of the Gospels. In the British Museum MS. Or. 3382, described by Rieu under No. 7 of the 'Supplement', his name is given as Abulfaraj Hibetallāh, son of Abulfaḍl Asʿad, son of Abū Ishāḳ Ibrāhīm, son of Abū Sahl Jirjis, son of Abulbishr Yuḥannā, son of Ibn al-ʿAssāl. The six generations mentioned here take us back from the thirteenth to the eleventh century.

The compendium is, however, ascribed in other existing MSS. to other authors. A note of the copyist in the Paris MS. 178 (13th cent. A.D.) reports that the text was composed by a certain Abulkhair, called Ibn al-Ghaib in Homs (Emesa) in A.D. 1052. In MS. Sbath 47 (dated A.D. 1863) Abulkhair b. aṭ-Ṭaiyib is mentioned as author, and Sbath, making him a Jacobite priest in the eleventh century, seems to identify him with the author mentioned in the Paris MS. Professor Massignou rightly remarks that a text referring to a book of Ghazālī cannot have been composed before Ghazālī had written the book. For the same reason Severos b. al-Muḳaffa' (10th cent.) mentioned as author in the Cairo MS. 338 (dated 1746) cannot have composed this text.

In two Bodleian MSS., Hunt. 240 (Uri 38, dated A.D. 1549) and Hunt. 362 (Uri 50, dated A.D. 1476), a certain Abulkhair is mentioned as the author. But the name is to be found only on the title-pages, and these in both MSS. are not genuine. In MS. Hunt. 240 the title-page is added by a very incompetent person who indicated the contents of the book quite wrongly. He calls the author Rashīd Abulkhair. In MS. Hunt. 362 the first 11 folios are missing. The beginning of the text is supplemented on 8 folios by a later hand, and here Abulkhair b. aṭ-Ṭaiyib is mentioned as the author on the first page, just as in MS. Sbath 47 (see above).²

¹ See concerning this family Duncan B. Macdonald's article 'Ibn al-ʿAssāl', in *Encyclopedia of Islam*, based chiefly on some articles written by Alexis Mallon, quoted there. Some new material from MSS. has been collected by Georg Graf; see his article 'Die koptische Gelehrtenfamilie der Aulād al-ʿAssāl und ihr Schrifttum' in the periodical *Orientalia*, vol. i, Neva series, Roma, 1943, pp. 34 f., 129 f., 193 f. Graf is—like Mallon—exclusively interested in members of the family who lived in the thirteenth century. Macdonald rightly suggests that the family must have had a certain importance at an earlier time.

² Moritz Steinschneider, who refers to these two Bodleian MSS. in his book *Polemische und apologetische Literatur in arabischer Sprache* (= *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, vi. 3. Leipzig, 1977, p. 37) does not mention that the title-pages in both MSS. were added later. He is inexact in other directions also. For instance, he quotes MS. Marsh 649 instead of Hunt. 240.

In three Vatican MSS. described by Angelo Mai under nos. 105, 118, 119, all written in the fourteenth century A.D., Abulbarakāt b. Kabar is mentioned as author of a text with a slightly different title *jalā al-'ukūl fī 'ilm al-uṣūl*. According to Graf, these MSS. contain practically the same text. Abulbarakāt is a well-known Coptic author, a great compiler, who died at the age of 90 years in A.D. 1363. The Cairo MS. 711 (17th cent.) is incomplete at the beginning and no author's name is preserved. In the Cairo MS. 391 (18th cent.) Ibn al-'Assāl, the grandson of Buṭrus as-Sadamantī, is mentioned as author, as in the Bodleian MS. Arab. e. 163 and in the original of 1107 from which it was copied.

In these circumstances it is somewhat surprising that Georg Graf declares¹ that the MSS. of the compendium—with a few exceptions—mention as author of the text Abulkhair b. aṭ-Ṭaiyib, whom he, besides, makes the *son of a physician* by confounding *ṭaiyib* and *ṭabīb*, and to whom he gives the name Rashīd, found on a very doubtful title-page of one MS. only.

According to Graf, all MSS. of the text have an appendix (*corollarium*) at the end. But the appendix is missing in two Cairo MSS. described by Graf himself (338 and 391), and in the Bodleian MS. Arab. e. 163, as well as in the original of 1107 from which this MS. was copied.

According to Graf, the appendix added to the text has seven parts:

1. On prayer, with quotations from the Didaskalia.
2. Quotations from Maimonides.
3. Another quotation from the Didaskalia.
4. A quotation from Fakhraddīn ar-Rāzī.
5. The Climates of the Stars.
6. A quotation from 2 Timothy.
7. On the right faith, as preached to the world by the apostles.

Graf depends here on the Vatican MSS. and did not see that they had been enlarged and worked over by Abulbarakāt. In the two Bodleian MSS. Hunt. 240 and 362, the appendix has four parts only:

1. Quotations from the Old Testament (Jer. 7. 16–18; Amos 5. 25, 26).
2. Quotations from Didaskalia chapter 23² and Acts 14. 11 f.

¹ See his article 'Zum Schrifttum des Abū'l-Barakāt und des Abū'l-Ḥair', quoted above, p. 217, note 3.

² In the Oxford MS. of the Arabic Didaskalia, MS. Hunt. 31 (Uri 61) the quotation is to be found in chapter 30 of the Didaskalia, fol. 109.

3. Quotations from Maimonides.
4. A quotation from Fakhraddīn ar-Rāzī.

According to Graf, the appendix was added to the book by the author himself, and the quotations from Maimonides (died A.D. 1204) and Fakhraddīn ar-Rāzī (died A.D. 1209) show that it could not have been composed before the thirteenth century. In the two Bodleian MSS. Hunt. 240 and 362 the appendix is introduced by the notice:

What is to be found at the end of the book from which this MS. was copied—and it is clear that it does not belong to the author (*wa-zāhir al-ḥāl annahu lam yakun lil-muṣannif*)—and what I have copied, is the legal proof that the people of the Seven Climates adored the Seven Planets.

It is very likely that the appendix in the MS. Paris 178 was introduced by the same notice. Slane's description in the Catalogue is not very clear, and Graf completely misunderstood it.

We see clearly now that the compendium *ṭiriāk al-'ukūl* . . . is preserved to us in at least three different forms, attributed to different authors:

1. The text attributed to Ibn al-'Assāl, the answer to al-Ghazālī's book *ar-radd al-jamīl* . . . composed between about 1101 and 1107.
2. The text attributed to Abulkhair b. aṭ-Ṭaiyib, containing several additions to the former text, especially an appendix consisting of four parts as described above. Quotations from Maimonides and Fakhraddīn ar-Rāzī contained in this text show that this form cannot be older than the thirteenth century.
3. The text worked over by Abulbarakāt and published under a slightly altered title in the fourteenth century. We have seen that the appendix was enlarged and altered by him. How far he altered the text in other directions can only be discovered by a careful investigation of the whole text.

It may be that more forms of this text existed. It is, for instance, very likely that Ibn al-'Assāl, when he wrote the answer to the book of al-Ghazālī, used an earlier composition for his book, and that a kernel of truth may be found in the statement that—at least parts of the book—were composed A.D. 1052 or have to be connected with Severus b. al-Mukaffa'. It is interesting to see how the different Christian Arabic authors without scruple put forward older texts, with slight alterations, as

their own compositions. A real history of such a text can only be written after a careful investigation of all the material at our disposal. In any case it is clear that the problems of such texts cannot be solved by the methods adopted by Graf.

The third text in the Bodleian MS. Arab. e. 163 is the Arabic Diatessaron. It has the same preamble as MSS. B, E, and the Sbath MS. Its text agrees with that of MSS. B and E, and probably also with that of the Sbath MS. The postscript has the following text:

Finished is the accomplishment of this fourfold honoured Evangelion which was collected from the four Gospels of the holy Apostles, the four excellent evangelists—may they be blessed. The excellent learned priest Abulfaraj 'Abdallāh b. aṭ-Ṭaiyib—may God be pleased with him—has translated it from Syriac into Arabic, from a copy in the handwriting of 'Īsā b. 'Alī, the physician, the pupil of Ḥunain b. Ishāq—may God the Almighty have mercy on both of them.

And he (the copyist) wrote this in the state wherein it was, not rearranging (anything) in the copy, but observing the orders, on 8th Ṭobah A. Mart. 1522 = 25th Shawwāl A.H. 1220 (i.e. January A.D. 1806).

Comparison of this postscript with that of MS. B shows that in the Bodleian MS. there are slight differences at the beginning, and the note added by the copyist at the end. But in the main part of the postscript the two MSS. agree. They must have been copied from the same original. MS. B may have been copied from the MS. dated 1107 two or three centuries before the Bodleian MS. was copied from it. The fact that MS. B and the Bodleian MS. were both written in a form imitating a copy of the Koran can be best explained on the supposition that the original was already written in the same way.

There is, however, a clear variation between the two MSS. which has to be explained. In the Bodleian MS. the Diatessaron is preceded by *two* texts, as it certainly was in the original MS. of 1107 also. In MS. B only *one* text precedes the Diatessaron. This text, the Introduction, has nearly the same title as the first text in the Bodleian MS., but it cannot have the same contents. In MS. B it occupies 85 folios, in the Bodleian MS. 31 folios only. Now the Bodleian MS. is more closely written, B has 8 lines, the Bodleian MS. 13 lines, on a page. Nevertheless, the Introduction of the Bodleian MS. could occupy 45–50 folios in MS. B, but not 85 folios.

Ciasca gives the following description of the Introduction in MS. B (p. vi):

Folios 1–85 habetur praefatio super Evangelia, in qua anonimus auctor postquam ostendit quibus dotibus liber quilibet ornari debeat ut re vera utilis sit, easque in Evangeliiis reperiri, de divinis attributis disserit in primis vere de unitate ac simplicitate, quae ab Evangeliiis potissimum manifestari demonstrat, loquitur insuper de sapientia Dei in novae Legis promulgatione, qua gentes omnes, idolatria excussa, ad Christum venerunt. Quo in tractatu, eruditionis pleno, cuius ob temporis angustias unum dedi argumentum, auctores plures citantur in antiquitate celebriores, uti Zoroaster, Aristoteles, Hermes, Ammonius, Eusebius Caesarensis, Gregorius Armenus. Ibn at-Tib non semel, alique non pauci.

An Introduction like that of the Bodleian MS. (see above, p. 215) could hardly be described in this way. But the authorities said by Ciasca to be quoted in the Introduction of MS. B throw light on the relationship of the two Introductions. Ammonius and Eusebius are names which occur in the first text of the Bodleian MS., the other authorities are to be found in the second text only, and they all occur together in the third chapter of the first part of the compendium, which is devoted to the problems of the Trinity and the Divinity of Christ. In the Introduction in MS. B we have therefore to see a compilation made from the two texts which precede the Diatessaron in the Bodleian MS.—and in the original of 1107, from which it was copied.

MS. E contains only the Diatessaron, has not the external appearance of a MS. of the Koran, and it does not mention the three Christian Arabic scholars who are connected in MS. B and the Bodleian MS. with the text. But all its other features make it certain that it goes back, directly or indirectly, to the same original, and the same thing may be supposed of MS. Sbath.

Abulfaraj 'Abdallāh b. aṭ-Ṭaiyib (died A.D. 1043) is mentioned in the preamble of all the four MSS. and in the postscript of two of them as translator of the Arabic Diatessaron. Who was this man? What Georg Graf,¹ Sebastian Euringer,² Marmadji³ have to say of him is taken exclusively from Christian sources. But in this connexion it is essential to remember that he had a great reputation among Muslims, and that important reports of him are to be found in Muslim sources. What Christian authors have to say of him depends largely on Muslim sources. Barhebraeus (died A.D. 1286), for instance, whose report is quoted by

¹ Georg Graf, *Die christlich-arabische Literatur bis zur fränkischen Zeit*, 1905, pp. 63 ff.

² *Die Überlieferung der arabischen Übersetzung des Diatessarons* (= *Biblische Studien*, xvii. 2), Freiburg i. Br. 1912, pp. 9 ff.

³ *Diatessaron de Tatien*, Beyrouth, 1935, pp. lxxxv ff.

Euringer and by Marmadji, gives simply what he had found in the *History of Scientists* (*ta'rīkh al-ḥukamā*), composed by Ibn al-Ḳiftī (died A.D. 1248),¹ and Barhebraeus himself refers to this authority. It is somewhat unfortunate that Marmadji should take this passage, in which hardly a word is written by Barhebraeus himself, in order to illustrate the excellent Arabic written by this Christian author, and that Euringer misunderstands the word *al-Ḳiftī*, meaning the man from al-Ḳift, the ancient Koptos, a town in Upper Egypt, as *al-Ḳibṭī*, 'the Copt', thus making this famous Muhammedan kadi a Christian.

But the most important notice of Ibn aṭ-Ṭaiyib is given by Ibn Abī Uṣaibi'a (died A.D. 1270), who devotes to him a long article in his great book on the classes of Arab physicians.² He mentions more than forty learned books composed by him, chiefly commentaries on Aristotle, Hippocrates, Galen, but also other writings, among them a commentary on the Gospels. As Ibn aṭ-Ṭaiyib was a very busy man, he used to dictate his books to his secretaries. But Ibn Abī Uṣaibi'a is very proud of having found a note-book of this eminent scholar in his own handwriting, dated A.H. 406 A.D. 1016, which had served as a basis for some of his famous lectures on medicine delivered in the 'Aḍūdiye hospital in Bagdad. He reports that Ibn Sīnā (Avicenna), his contemporary (died A.H. 418 A.D. 1037), valued highly his works on medicine, but was not convinced that his works on philosophy had the same standard. He tells us an interesting story which he had from his pupil, Muwaffaḳaddīn Ya'ḳūb b. Ishāḳ b. al-Ḳuff an-Naṣrānī (died A.D. 1286), which illustrates well the high esteem in which he was held among the Muslims;³ he gives too a long list of famous physicians in all the

¹ Ibn al-Ḳiftī's *Ta'rīkh al-ḥukamā*. Auf Grund der Vorarbeiten Aug. Müller's herausgegeben von Julius Lippert, Leipzig, 1903, p. 223.

² *Uyūn al-anbā' fī ṭabaḳāt al-aṭibbā*, ed. August Müller, Cairo and Königsberg, 1882 and 1884, vol. i, pp. 239-41.

³ Two young Muslims came from Persia to Bagdad with the intention of studying medicine under the famous Ibn aṭ-Ṭaiyib. At his house they were told that he was in the church. There he was shown to them, an old man, dressed as a priest, the censer in his hand, offering incense. They were wondering to see the famous professor occupied in this way. When they saw him later in his house, they told him the reason of their coming to Bagdad. Ibn aṭ-Ṭaiyib had seen the strangers in the church; he now asked them whether they had made the pilgrimage to Mekka. 'No', was the answer. So he recommended them to go first to Mekka. After their return he would be ready to accept them as pupils. They had to go. When they came back, weary and exhausted, he asked them whether they had accomplished everything, inclusive of throwing stones in the valley of al-Mīna. All had been done

lands of Islam who had been his pupils. He acknowledges that Ibn aṭ-Ṭaiyib was a devoted Christian priest who, as a secretary of the Katholikos (*al-jāthalīḳ*), the Nestorian Patriarch in Bagdad, had great influence among the Christians.

Ḥunain b. Ishāḳ (died A.D. 873), mentioned in the postscript of MS. B and the Bodleian MS., was a Christian, and one of the greatest scholars of the ninth century. By his excellent translations of Greek and Syriac texts into Arabic he more than any other had made Muslims acquainted with the achievements of classical science. He was himself an authority on medicine and physician in ordinary to the 'Abbāsīd Khalīf al-Mutawakkil (died A.D. 861). Ḥunain had founded a whole school of translators who worked according to his methods and whose translations he supervised and corrected.¹ Among his pupils, 'Isā b. 'Alī was one of the most prominent.² He was physician in ordinary to the 'Abbāsīd Khalīf al-Mu'tamid (died A.D. 892) and a scholar of rank. He is well known as author of the first great Syro-Arabic Dictionary ('Bār 'Alī') for which he was able to use material which had been collected already by his master Ḥunain, and which was largely used later by Bār Bahlūl.

Three outstanding Christian Arabic scholars, all well known among Muslims, are accordingly connected by this group of MSS. with the Arabic Diatessaron, in the first instance Abulfaraj b. aṭ-Ṭaiyib. We know that a translation of the Gospels was made by him from Syriac into Arabic. Marmadji has given specimens of this translation and of other writings composed by him, dealing with Christian matters.³ These specimens show that he was an able stylist who knew very well how to write classical Arabic. The language of the Diatessaron is not very correct and certainly not classical. Marmadji with justice concludes from these facts that Ibn aṭ-Ṭaiyib was not the translator of the Arabic Diatessaron. How can we explain his being connected with the translation?

We have seen that the four MSS. of this second group of the Arabic Diatessaron go back to an original which was written in A.D. 1107. The preamble in the four MSS. and the postscript by them. 'So it is right', he said. What is ordered by divine law must be fulfilled to the letter, without reflecting about it. They had seen him doing so in the church. Now they had done themselves what was ordered by their law. They became his pupils and were later famous physicians.

¹ See G. Bergsträßer, *Ḥunain Ibn Ishāḳ und seine Schule*, Leiden, 1913.

² *wahua min ajall talāmīdhīhi*, says Ibn Abī Uṣaibi'a, i. 203.

³ In the Introduction to his edition, pp. xciii-c. See D. S. Margoliouth's review of Marmadji's book, in *JTS*, vol. xxxviii, 1937, p. 76 f.

in two of them were copied from that MS. This MS. was written at the request of a Muslim ruler. To him it had to be handed over. The Aulād al-'Assāl, who prepared that copy, were anxious to bring it into a form which would make a certain impression on the Muslims. They therefore gave the MS. the external appearance of a copy of the Koran and gave it a name used for a copy of the Koran. Ibn al-'Assāl, the author of the second text, was given a number of epithets so that he might be regarded as a great authority. It is very likely that they tried to enhance the authority of the Arabic Diatessaron further by connecting it with the names of three outstanding Christian Arabic scholars, highly respected among the Muslims. Thus Ibn at-Ṭaiyib, the famous professor of medicine, the devoted Christian priest, who was known as author of a commentary on the Gospels, who had translated some of the Gospels from Syriac into Arabic, was made the translator of the Arabic Diatessaron. 'Īsā b. 'Alī, the well-known physician, the great authority on the Syriac language, the eminent pupil of the famous Ḥunain b. Ishāq, was made the copyist of the Syriac text from which the Arabic translation of the Diatessaron had been made. The text handed over to the Muslims had to be supported by the greatest possible authority.

In reality none of these three Christian Arabic scholars had anything to do with the Arabic Diatessaron. This explains why none of them is mentioned in the first group of manuscripts of the Diatessaron.

This discussion of the MSS. of the Arabic Diatessaron leads us to the following conclusions:

1. Ghazālī had based his polemic against certain doctrines of the Christians on an Arabic translation of the Gospels which was used at that time in the Coptic churches. This translation had been made from the Coptic text and R. Chidiac has shown that it is in the main identical with the text published later by Erpenius.¹ When the Copts in A.D. 1107 handed over to the Muslims, together with an answer to Ghazālī's polemic, a copy of the Arabic Diatessaron, they must at that time have been convinced that this text was more reliable than their own Arabic Gospels.

¹ *Novum D. N. Jesu Christi Testamentum Arabice*. Ex Bibliotheca Leidensi Edente Thoma Erpenius, Leidae, 1616. See chapter vii in Chidiac's book: *Les Sources Évangéliques*, pp. 71-7. The investigation must, however, be made on a much broader basis; the biblical quotations in *ṭiryāḳ al-'uḳūl* . . . , must also be carefully investigated.

2. Although the Christian Arab scholars mentioned in the preamble and postscript of the text had in reality nothing to do with the Arabic Diatessaron, there is no doubt that it had been imported into Egypt from Mesopotamia, and that it had been translated from Syriac into Arabic. The text handed over to the Muslims must have been still in existence in Egypt in the beginning of the nineteenth century when the Bodleian MS. was copied from it. It may yet come to light again. Until then the four MSS. of the second form of text known to us must be used as a help for regaining the text of the common original.

3. The two MSS. of the first form depend on a 'very old' MS. which had been imported from Antioch into Egypt before 1200. We know that this text was copied several times in Egypt in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

4. For about 900 years these two forms of text have not influenced each other. They have to be regarded as two of the several different forms of text which existed in the eleventh century. The two forms were imported into Egypt; there they were copied and so saved. All traces of other forms which may have existed are now lost.

5. We cannot derive one of these two forms from the other and cannot reconstruct an 'Urtext' of the Arabic Diatessaron from them. The two forms have to be kept separately. Ciasca's attempt to edit a mixed text from the two forms was a mistake.¹ The attempt of Marmadji to create a 'new' text on the basis of the two forms by improving the Arabic of the translation and adapting it to the text of the Peshitta, supposed by him to be the Syriac original, shows that he had no real understanding of the problems which here exist.²

6. The value of the Arabic Diatessaron consists in the amount of help it gives for finding out readings of the Syriac Diatessaron composed by Tatian. This is limited. The Syriac Diatessaron from which the Arabic translation was made already included alterations made in Tatian's work in order to bring it into conformity with the Peshitta. So far as the Arabic translation agrees with the Peshitta, it is of no particular value. But it is of great importance when it implies a Syriac text differing from the Peshitta. Here we may find traces of the genuine text

¹ This has been seen already by Hope W. Hogg in his translation of the *Arabic Diatessaron* (Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Additional Volume, Edinburgh, 1897, p. 36 f.) and by A. Hjelt, *Die altsyrische Evangelienübersetzung und Tatians Diatessaron*, Leipzig, 1901, p. 61.

² See A. Baumstark, in *Oriens Christianus*, iii. 11, Leipzig, 1936, p. 237 f.

of Tatian. Such passages must be carefully picked out and investigated with the help of the Old Syriac Gospels on the one hand and the Peshitta on the other. They must be discussed in connexion with all the other material of the Diatessaron at our disposal. The task is not easy. It cannot be done on the basis of any translation. The original texts have to be investigated. This demands a solid linguistic equipment and a good grasp of existing problems. Yet there is no doubt that in this way a real service could be rendered to New Testament criticism.¹

¹ An attempt to investigate the Arabic Diatessaron on similar lines has been made by A. J. B. Higgins. He has published a few specimens of his work in his article 'The Arabic Version of Tatian's Diatessaron' (*JTS*, vol. xlv, 1944, pp. 187-99). I discussed some of the problems of the MSS. with him in 1941. Further studies brought me to new results, and some alterations in his Introductory remarks will therefore be necessary. But the examples discussed by him on pp. 196-9 seem to be correctly chosen and properly treated.

ADDENDA

p. 50. I tried to get a photograph of a column in the Abisha' scroll in the Samaritan synagogue at Nāblus with the help of Mr. J. Ben Zevie, the President of the General Council of the Jewish Community of Palestine in Jerusalem. He is in good contact with the Samaritan priests, who still remember very well my staying with them about forty years ago. When he paid me a visit in London he brought me their greetings. I received, however, only a copy of the same photograph which had already served as a basis for the illustration in the *National Geographical Magazine* in Washington, which is so small that nothing can be done with it. It must really be very difficult to take a photograph of the ancient scroll.

The original photograph of a later scroll which was in the possession of Professor John Garstang has been handed over to me together with some other photographs taken from scrolls in Nāblus by Dr. Oliver Robert Gurney, Shillito Reader in Assyriology, of Oxford University. I wish to express my thanks to Professor Garstang and Dr. Gurney for kindly letting me have these photographs.

p. 69. With regard to Felix Pratensis, I may refer to my article, 'Felix Pratensis, der Herausgeber der Ersten Rabbinerbibel, Venedig 1516-17, in the new periodical *Die Welt des Orients, Wissenschaftliche Beiträge zur Kunde des Morgenlandes*, ed. by Ernst Michel (Wuppertal, 1947), first fascicle.

p. 79. With regard to the text of al-Farrā' I may refer here to an article I am preparing for the Ignaz Goldziher Memorial Volume, to be published at Budapest.

pp. 86 ff. I may refer here to an important book of the great Danish linguist Chr. Sarauw, *Über Akzent und Silbenbildung in den älteren Semitischen Sprachen*, which came to my notice only after I had concluded my lectures. It had already been written down to a great extent in 1908, was handed over to the Danish Academy in 1925, shortly before the author's death, and was published in the *Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser*, xxvi. 8, by 'Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab', København, 1939. Sarauw has taken seriously into consideration, with a view to Hebrew grammar, material which is at our disposal apart from the Tiberian punctuation. He has critically investigated problems of Hebrew and general Semitic languages and reconsidered a number of conclusions which had become generally recognized in Hebrew grammars during the last hundred years. He occasionally comes to remarkable statements concerning the questionable value of the Tiberian punctuation, as for instance when he writes (p. 94):

'Daß die Schule zu Tiberias phonetische Gründe gehabt haben wird, das konsequente alte Vokalsystem durch diese Zutat zu

verwirren, brauchen wir nicht zu bezweifeln; es kann sich aber doch nur um eine zarte Abschattung handeln, die entweder in der Aussprache nicht nach festem Gesetze durchgeführt war oder die man in der Schrift nicht konsequent zum Ausdruck zu bringen wagte. Von den Segolaten abgesehen ist die Verwendung so kapriziös, daß man denken könnte, zwei verschiedene Schulen oder verschiedene Generationen hätten sich in den Formenschatz geteilt.'

This quotation is taken from his criticism of the *Lex Philippi* (pp. 71 ff.), which plays a certain role in Hebrew grammar, but to a certain extent explains rather some constructions of the Tiberian Masoretes than problems really existing in the original Hebrew language.

Sarauw knew, however, only a small part of the non-Tiberian material which we have now at our disposal, and could not reach the ultimate consequences. He refers, for instance, to forms with a pronominal suffix ending in *-k*, *-h*, to which I had drawn attention in an article published in *ZAW*. 1921, and cannot believe that the Masoretes should have replaced really existing forms ending in *-ak*, *-ah*, by forms ending in *-ka*, *-ha*. I have dealt with these forms on pp. 95-102 of my lectures and have drawn the conclusions on pp. 108-10. Sarauw is inclined to see here 'pausal' forms which might have existed besides those found in the Tiberian text.

Such 'pausal' forms play a great role in Sarauw's book. Franz Praetorius, in his book *Über den rückweichenden Accent im Hebräischen* (Halle, 1897), had proposed the theory that the Hebrew pausal accent may indicate the original accent in Hebrew, as the accent corresponds to the stress we find in Biblical Aramaic. This theory is for Sarauw the starting-point for fixing the North Semitic accent. He tries to show that pausal forms have been used by the Masoretes to a large extent instead of context forms.

Praetorius himself, however, arrived later at the conclusion that we have to see here in the Hebrew language as fixed by the Masoretes an Aramaic influence or an artificialness (*Künstelei*); see his *Bemerkungen zum Buche Hosea* (Berlin, 1918), p. 98. On the basis of the material we have now at our disposal we cannot doubt that this is right. So the thesis from which Sarauw starts is questionable, and the coincidence in the accent to which he refers has to be otherwise explained. In his criticism of certain proposals of Eduard Sievers (pp. 7-9 of his book) he is certainly mistaken.

Nevertheless, Sarauw's book contains very remarkable observations. Brockelmann, in his article 'Neuere Theorien zur Geschichte des Akzents und des Vokalismus im Hebräischen und Aramäischen' (*ZDMG.*, vol. xciv, Leipzig, 1940, pp. 332-71) needs no less than thirty pages in order to defend against Sarauw's attacks certain theories generally propounded in Hebrew grammars, including his own *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der Semitischen Sprachen*, vol. i (Berlin, 1908). In spite of this defence, Sarauw is right to a great extent.

pp. 86 ff. I have received recently from Dr. med. F. Gumpertz in Jerusalem some articles published in the Hebrew periodical *Tarbis* (vol. xiii, 1942, pp. 107-15; vol. xv, 1944, pp. 143-60; vol. xvi, 1945, pp. 210-30), and in Hanok Yalon's *Konteres 'Aruk* (Jerusalem, 1943, pp. 12-30). Here the author, a specialist on phonetics, tries to solve problems connected with the work of the Masoretes of Tiberias in a new way. The most important of these articles is that published in *Tarbis*, vol. xvi: 'Phonetical Remarks on the Grammar of the Punctuators of Tiberias' (הערות פוניטיות לדקדוק נקדני טבריא), in which the author tries to give an historical valuation of the work of the Masoretes. He shows that these men not only reformed a lax pronunciation of Hebrew which existed at their time, but that they also systematized this pronunciation, that they really created the system which later served as the basis for Hebrew grammar. He tries to explain the differences in the pronunciation of Hebrew at various times by showing that there was a Western tendency in this pronunciation during the first centuries or our era, witnessed by texts in Greek and Latin transliteration, and that this was superseded by the Eastern tendency in the time of Arabic domination, witnessed by the texts created by the Masoretes of Palestine and Babylonia. He shows that one of the aims of these Masoretes was the attempt to reintroduce the pronunciation of the laryngals, completely neglected during the former centuries, and he points out definite inconsequences into which the Masoretes became entangled in this reintroduction. For this he gives interesting specimens. He refers to the great development from the first philological hints we find in Sepher Yešira up to the exact indication of every detail of pronunciation which we find in the texts created by Masoretes like Ben Asher and Ben Naftali in the ninth and tenth centuries.

The starting-point for Gumpertz was the pronunciation of Hebrew in France at an early period, which, being neither Sephardic nor Ashkenazic, had preserved—according to him—several characteristics of pre-Masoretic Palestinian Hebrew. I am somewhat doubtful whether this can be regarded as correct and I find many other items in the articles with which I cannot agree. Nevertheless, I see in these articles on the whole a valuable attempt to solve really existing problems connected with the work of the Masoretes.

pp. 87 ff. A special investigation of the transliterations in the second column of Hexapla has been made by Einar Brønno in his book: *Studien über Hebräische Morphologie und Vokalismus auf Grund der Mercatischen Fragmente der Zweiten Kolumne der Hexapla des Origenes* (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, vol. xxviii, Leipzig, 1943; xvi+489 pages). The author discusses all the forms occurring in the fragments discovered by Giovanni (now Cardinal) Mercati, on the basis of the material published by Redpath and by Wutz, but he was able to use some corrections indicated to him by Cardinal Mercati. His principle of investigating the forms that occur, according to

morphological categories (p. 12), is certainly sound, and there is no doubt that the author deals with the existing forms with great care. There are, however, many considerations against the whole method adopted by him.

1. He confines his investigations to the vowels and completely disregards the consonants. The way, however, in which, for instance, the laryngals are rendered in these texts—described, as we have seen, as vowels by Jerome—is essential for understanding the Greek vowels used here.

2. He fixes the value of the vowels occurring in these texts without any attempt to deal with the problem of how the Greek vowels may have been pronounced at the time when these transliterated texts were made. He could have found the material discussed by E. H. Sturtevant, *The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin* (Chicago, 1920), and certainly in Eduard Schwyzer's *Griechische Grammatik*, of which the first volume was published at München in 1939. For the pronunciation of Latin I may refer here to Stolz and Schmalz, *Lateinische Grammatik*, of which the 5th edition was published by Manu Leumann and J. B. Hofmann (München, 1926 and 1928, and to Roland G. Kent, *The Sounds of Latin. A Descriptive and Historical Phonology* (Baltimore, 1932).

Brønno quite arbitrarily decides not only which of the Greek vowels have to be pronounced as short or long, but also where we have to pronounce them as indefinite vowels (Murmel Vokale), corresponding to Tiberian Shwa!

3. By confining himself to the transliterated texts of the second column he completely disregards the historical development in the various systems. Merely by comparing the different methods of transliteration with each other we find the most valuable help in understanding the transliterated texts of an individual form.

4. Brønno compares the transcribed forms of the second column (2nd cent.) directly with the forms fixed by the Tiberian Masoretes (9th cent.) and completely disregards the valuable material from the time between the two periods, preserved in the Cairo Geniza. Just this material is, however, of the greatest importance for an historical understanding of the work done by the Tiberian Masoretes.

5. Brønno puts forth his own method with great firmness; he sharply criticizes as wrong and erroneous the attitudes followed by all his predecessors, and he assures the reader on nearly every page that he alone is in possession of the only saving method. He represents, however, the material in a very subjective way, and his discussions are of little value for those who do not believe in the infallibility of his method.

6. The conclusions to which he comes may be convenient to those who defend the old method of building the Hebrew Grammar exclusively on the Tiberian Masora, to which method also Brockelmann is inclined, see his article 'Stand und Aufgaben der Semitistik' in *Beiträge zur Arabistik, Semitistik und Islamwissenschaft*, published, under the patro-

nage of Walter Wüst, by Richard Hartmann and Helmuth Scheel (Leipzig, 1944), p. 31. But Brønno's conclusions are nowhere convincing for anybody who is really acquainted with the material now at our disposal.

Brønno has also dealt with transliterations in Septuagint proper names in two articles: (1) 'Some Nominal Types in the Septuagint. Contributions to the pre-Masoretic Hebrew Grammar' (= *Classica et Mediaevalia. Revue Danoise de Philologie et d'Histoire*, vol. iii, Copenhagen, 1940, pp. 180-213); (2) 'Einige Namentypen der Septuaginta. Zur historischen Grammatik des Hebräischen' (= *Acta Orientalia*, vol. xix, Lugduni Batavorum, 1941, pp. 33-64). The methods followed by Brønno here are similar to those adopted in his larger work. But whilst he had there taken into consideration the vocalization of all the forms occurring in the second column, his material used for the Septuagint is very scanty. He confines himself to discussing the vowels in proper names in Codex Vaticanus (B), and professes to follow here Wutz, who had seen that the transcription of proper names in Codex B is in general of an older type than that in Codex Alexandrinus (A). Wutz himself, however, pointed out that the method of transliteration in Codex B is not consistent, and that the conditions are quite different in the different books of the Bible. Besides, the proper names are only a small part of the transliterated forms Wutz had found in Codex B. He discovered there a great and important amount of material quite apart from the proper names.

On the other hand, in 1922 and 1923, when Wutz was doing his essential work on the Septuagint, the greater Cambridge Septuagint had not advanced very far, and the parts which had been published were not available to him in Eichstätt. This may be regarded as a kind of excuse for the methods adopted by him. In his later investigations he was completely absorbed in his special ideas and did not need material of that kind.

But in the meantime conditions have completely changed. Not only all the historical books of the Bible, including Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles, especially rich in proper names, have been published in the Cambridge Septuagint in an excellent way; we have besides at our disposal texts of the Greek Bible which were written down a century or several centuries before the oldest manuscripts so far available. The great lacuna of Codex B in Genesis (1. 1-47. 29) is supplemented by not less than three manuscripts on papyrus of which one is of about the same age as Codex B, the two others about a hundred years older. How can we dare to come to real conclusions concerning the method of transliteration in the Septuagint by investigating only the vocalization in some proper names in Codex B!

Brønno had finished his book on the vocalization of forms in the second column in the Danish original in 1938, and does not seem to have altered much during the following years. He had to deal with

Sperber's long article 'Hebrew based upon Greek and Latin Transliterations', published in 1937-8, in an appendix (pp. 464-87). Sperber has given much more material than Brønno on less than fifty pages (pp. 155-202). He has given this material in a very clear arrangement, and every form needed can be found easily. He has given the material in an objective way, so that it can be used by everybody, even if the reader may not always agree with the way in which he deals in his Introduction (pp. 103-54) not only with the vocalization, but with all the problems concerned. The references given on pp. 203-74 for every form quoted by Sperber are of especial value. We may ask whether it was really necessary to discuss on more than 500 pages in a very subjective way a very small portion of the material available, after the book of Sperber had been published.¹

p. 131: The material collected by Professor Wensinck has been handed over to me by Mrs. Wensinck. I hope to finish the work in co-operation with Dr. M. Black and Dr. J. Bowman, both of Leeds University.

pp. 132 ff. I may refer here to an article on problems and prospects in modern investigation of the Septuagint, published in *Jaarbericht No. 7 van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Gezelschap Ex Oriente Lux* (Leiden, 1940), pp. 359-90e, under the title 'Problemen en perspectieven in het moderne Septuaginta-Onderzoek' by J. L. Seeligmann in Amsterdam. Under the motto taken from the Tosephta, Megilla, iii. 21:

'Rabbi Yehuda says: Whoever translates verbally a verse of the Bible, is a falsifier, whoever adds anything, is a blasphemer.'

the author gives on thirty-six pages in quarto a very good survey of all the problems concerning the Septuagint. After a short introduction (*p.* 359) the following six chapters follow: 1. The Septuagint in Ancient Tradition and Appreciation (*p.* 360); 2. History of the Text of the Septuagint (*p.* 364); 3. A Literary Criticism and the Character of the Septuagint as a Translation (*p.* 372); 4. The Septuagint and the Hebrew text (*p.* 376); 5. The Language of the Septuagint (*p.* 385); 6. Hellenization and Contemporary Value actualizing of the Bible in the Septuagint (*p.* 387). The article can be regarded as an excellent review of all that has been published on problems concerning the Septuagint recently, up to 30 September 1940, the date of the article.

p. 162. Cardinal Mercati, in a letter of 27 August 1947, mentions a conjecture by E. Nestle who reads in the Excerpt ἡ ἐκτῇ, adding the article and making it the subject of ἐναλλατται. In this case the various readings added by Origen to the Quinta must have been taken from the Sexta.

p. 201. Many instances of important Syro-Palestinian readings in the Sinai Palimpsest have been collected by M. Black in his book *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, Oxford, 1946, pp. 216-21.

¹ See concerning Brønno's book the review written by Frank R. Blake, in *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, VI. 3, Chicago, July 1947, pp. 190-2.

INDEX

- 'Abdallāh b. Mas'ūd, reader of the Koran, 80, 81.
'Abdalmalik, Umayyad Khalif in Baghdad, 94.
'Abdarrāhmān an-Nāṣir, Umayyad Khalif in Spain, 16.
Abgar (Edessa), 194, 195, 196.
Abisha', the scroll of, in Nāblus, 50.
Abulfaraj 'Abdallāh b. at-Ṭaiyib, 211 ff., 223, 224.
Abulfath, the Samaritan Chronicler, 50.
Abu Sālih, 1.
Academies, the Jewish, in Babylonia, 42, 43.
Adat Deborim, 66, 67.
Addai, the apostle, 190, 191; his doctrine, 194 f.
Adiabene, 15, 184, 188.
Adler, Elkan N., 2, 5, 6, 7, 11, 16.
— Herman, 5, 7.
— Nathan, 120.
Aḥmad b. Ṭulūn, 1.
Akathistos, Byzantine Kontakion, 30.
Åkerblad, 212.
'Aḳiba, Rabbi, 119.
'Aḳrish, Isaak Abraham, 15-18.
Aleppo Codex, 58-61.
Allgeier, Arthur, 149, 163, 188.
Alt, Albrecht, 74.
Ambrosiana in Milan, 13.
Ammonius, 216.
'Anan b. David, the founder of Karaism, 55, 56.
Ananias (Hananya), 185.
Anbā Yūsif b. Muḥabrik, 213.
Andrews, H. T., 134.
Antiochos-Anantakaya, 133.
Antonin Collection in Leningrad, 5, 45, 46, 121.
Aphrahat, 180.
Aqai, bishop in Edessa, 197.
Aquila, 8, 13, 87, 117, 139, 179.
Arabic readers of the Koran, 94.
Arbela, Chronicle of, 185, 186, 196.
— bishops of, 189.
Aristeas, letter of, 132 ff., 134 f., 158, 175.
Artabanus III, Parthian king, 195.
Asaf, S., 21.
Asher, Ben, 55, 67-9, 73, 77, 121.
— — Ahron, 3, 4, 55, 67, 68, 71.
— — Moshe, 4, 11, 12, 55, 57, 68, 110.
Ashkenazik pronunciation of Hebrew, 53.
'Assāl, aulād al-'Assāl, ibn al-'Assāl, 218 ff.
Assemani, J. S., 191.
Assyria, Roman province of, 186.
Atiya, A. Surial, 214.
Aucher, J.-B., 211.
Augustine, 158 f.
Bābōj, Ben, 25.
Babylonia, 54.
Bacher, Wilhelm, 108.
Baer, Seligman, 62-6, 73.
Baethgen, Friedrich, 203, 207.
Bahrām I, the Sassanid, 209.
Baldwin, king of Jerusalem, 59.
Bar, Falk, 23, 74.
Bār Bahlūl, 225.
Bardaisān, Bardesanes, 191, 193, 195.
Bardenhewer, Otto, 207.
Barhebraeus, 223.
Barnard, P. M., 205.
Barnes, W. E., 180-3.
Barthold, W., 15.
Baumstark, A., 209, 227.
Becker, C. H., 218.
Bedr al-Jamālī, the Amīr al-Juyūsh, 218.
Beeston, A. F. L., 215.
Bell, Sir Harold I., 134, 139 ff.
Ben Chaiyim, Jacob, 73, 77.
Ben Haiyim, Z., 32.
Bensly, R. L., 199, 200.
Bentwich, Norman, 4, 6, 7, 8.
Ben Zevie, J., 229.
Bergsträßer, Gotthelf, 64, 84, 109 f., 225.
Berlin, Jacob, 58.
Berlin Library, 41.
Berliner, Abraham, 70, 120, 129.
Bethlehem, 74.
Bevan, A. A., 11, 191.
Bewer, Julius, 199.
Bezan Club, Codex Bezae, 203, 205.
Bibliotheca Lindesiana, 38.
Bickermann, Elias J., 134, 135.
Black, Matthew, v. 234.
Blake, Frank R., 234.
Blau, Ludwig, 118.
Bludau, August, 169.
Böhlig, 209.
Bomberg, Daniel, 69.
Bonner, Campbell, 30.
Bonus, Albert, 199.
Bousset, Wilhelm, 153, 190.
Bowman, John, vi.
Breviarium Romanum, 138.
British and Foreign Bible Society, 72.
Brockelmann, Carl.
Brønno, Einar, 231-34.
Brooke, A. E., 141, 181.
Buchta, Hugo, 213.
Burkitt, F. C., 13, 14, 21, 40, 82, 118, 172, 184, 187, 190-2, 196 f., 199, 200, 203, 204, 206, 210.

- Butler, A. J., 1, 215.
 Buṭrus as-Sadamanti, 218, 220.
 Buxtorf, Johannes, 125.
- Caesarea, 87, 94.
 Cairo, 43.
 — Ben Asher Codex, 68.
 Ceriani, 13, 181.
 Chabot, J.-B., 197.
 Charles, R. H., 11, 134, 148.
 Cheikho, Louis, 212, 218.
 Chester Beatty, A., v, 15, 79, 168.
 Chidiac, Robert, 217, 226.
 Chisdai b. Shāfrūt, 16, 18.
 Christ, W., 30.
 Chwolson, D., 16, 37.
 Ciasca, Agostinus, 212, 213, 222, 227.
 Clement of Alexandria, 167, 168, 198, 205, 208.
 Cohn, Leopold, 136, 141, 142.
 Colson, F. H., 136, 140.
 Constitutiones Apostolorum, 167, 168.
 Cornill, Carl H., 47, 181.
 Cowley, Sir Ernest (Arthur E.), 5, 10, 23, 32, 38, 40, 44.
 Credner, K. A., 169.
 Crusaders, 59.
 Cureton, William, 30, 199.
- Dalman, Gustav, 26, 93, 119, 129, 130, 131.
 Damascus, secession of Jews to, 11.
 'Damascus Schrift', 12, 13.
 Daniel: Septuagint and Theodotion, 169.
 David b. Neker al-Iskenderi, 57.
 — Pizzigeton b. Eliezer, 70.
 Davidson, Israel, 21, 22, 26, 28.
 Dawidowicz, Gabriel, 23.
 Debevoise, N. C., 185.
 Defter (Samaritan Liturgy), 32.
 Delitzsch, Franz, 64, 66.
 Demetrios Phalereus, 132.
 Demetrius—Devamantiya, 133.
 Dérenbourg, Joseph, 39.
 Deuteriosis, 24-7, 34.
 Diatessaron, 190, 198 ff., 207.
 — the Arabic, 211 ff.
 Diening, Fritz, 49, 93, 97.
 Dietrich, Gustav, 182, 184.
 Diḳduḳē ha-Ṭe'amim, 65.
 Dillmann, August, 148, 149.
 Driver, G. R., v.
 — S. R., 11, 152, 183.
 Dunash b. Labrat, 28, 39.
 Dunlop, D. M., 18.
 Dura-Europos, 208.
 Duval, Rubens, 48, 52, 107, 190.
- Ecclesiasticus, 6, 8, 9, 10 f.
 Edelmann, Rafael, 23, 26, 27.
 Edessa, beginning of Christianity in, 190.
 Edessene Chronicle, 191, 198.

- Efraim b. Buya'a (Masoret), 59.
 Ehrentreu, Ernst, 75.
 Eisler, R., vi.
 Eissfeldt, Otto, 74.
 Elbogen, Ismar, 23.
 Eleazar from Galilee, 185.
 — the High priest, 132.
 Enoch, 12.
 Ephraim, 28, 29, 180, 191, 193.
 Epiphanius, 208.
 Erasmus, 72.
 Erpenius, 226.
 Euringer, Sebastian, 212, 213, 223.
 Eusebius, 160, 164, 194, 208, 216.
 Evetts, B. T. A., 1.
 Ewald, Heinrich, 48.
- Fakhreddin ar-Rāzī, 221.
 al-Farra', 79 ff.
 Feldmann, Franz, 29.
 Felix Pratensis, 69, 74, 125, 229.
 Field, Frederick, 86, 101, 145, 163 f., 169, 171.
 Firkowitsch, Abraham, 2, 3, 16, 17, 32.
 — Collection in Leningrad, 3 ff., 42, 43, 44, 52, 59.
 Freimann, A., 6, 69, 70, 72.
 Frensdorff, S., 75.
 Foad Hassanein, 97.
 Forin, Asher, 125.
 Funk, Franz Xaver, 167 f.
- Gall, August Frh. von, 50.
 Gamaliel, Rabbi, 124.
 Gaonic tradition, 126.
 Gaons, the Babylonian, 43, 55.
 Garstang, John, 50, 229.
 Gaster, Moses, 11, 50.
 Geden, A. S., 72.
 Gehrke, A., 142, 143.
 Geiger, Abraham, 118, 120, 147, 148.
 Gesenius, Wilhelm, 64, 148.
 Geyer, Rudolf, 82.
 al-Ghazālī, 216 ff.
 Gibb, H. A. R., 79.
 Gibson, Margaret Dunlop, 6, 40.
 Ginsberg, Louis, 6, 25, 87, 102.
 Ginsburg Christian D., 42, 43, 60, 61.
 Ginsburger, Moses, 125.
 Glaser Collection (New York), 45.
 de Goeje, M., 15.
 Goldberg, Lea, 37.
 Goldziher, Ignaz, 229.
 Gomperz, H., 196.
 Goodspeed, Edgar J., 123, 124.
 Graetz, H., 25.
 Graf, Georg, 214, 217, 219, 220, 223.
 Grégoire, Henry, 17.
 Gummer, Ellis, vi, 33.
 Gumpertz, J., 231.
 Gurney, Oliver Robert, 229.

- Hadrian, emperor, 188.
 Haeftel, Leo, 184.
 Hai Gaon, 55.
 Haiyūj, 42.
 Halévy, Jules, 87.
 Ḥalim Dōs Ḥālī, 213.
 Halle University, 43, 44.
 Hallier, Ludwig, 191.
 Hammer, Heinrich, 147.
 Harnack, Adolf von, 158, 189, 190, 197, 208.
 Harper, W. R., 173.
 Harris, Rendel, 199, 211.
 Harkavy, A. E., 4, 5, 16, 17, 38, 58, 59, 60.
 Hatch, Edwin, 89.
 Haupt, Paul, 49.
 Hebrews, Epistle to the, 146.
 Hedwatha (Paiṭān), 22, 23, 27, 91, 96, 100, 102.
 Heidenheim, Wolf, 64, 73, 96.
 Helena, queen of Adiabene, 184, 185.
 Heller, Chaiyim, 181.
 Henning, W. B., 186, 209.
 Hexapla, Second column of, 8, 14, 87, 89, 90, 95, 101, 103, 104.
 Higgins, A. J. B., 228.
 Hillel, 118.
 Hjelt, Arthur, 199, 206, 208, 227.
 Hody, Humphrey, 25, 132.
 Hoffman, Georg, 189.
 Hofmann, J. B., 232.
 Hogg, Hope W., 227.
 Holmes, H. E., 72.
 Hunain b. Ishāk, 225.
 Hupfeld, Hermann, 75.
 Hurwitz, 49.
 Hystasp, bishop of Edessa, 197.
- Ibn Abi Uṣaibi'a, 224, 225.
 Ibn Ezra, 39, 42, 77.
 Ibn Faḍlān, 15, 18.
 Ibn al-Faḳīh, 15.
 Ibn Gabirol, 28.
 Ibn Haukal, 15.
 Ibn al-Kiftī, 224.
 Ibn at-Ṭaiyib, *see* Abulfaraj.
 I'rāb, 81-3.
 Irenaeus, 156, 168, 208.
 'Isā b. 'Alī, 225.
 Isaak Nathan b. Kalonymos, 70.
 Isidore of Seville, 177.
 Israel b. Simḥa, 58.
 Istakhri, 15.
 Izates, king of Adiabene, 184, 195.
- Jacob b. Chaiyim, 63, 67, 68-74.
 — b. Hārūn, Samaritan High priest, 50.
 James of Edessa, 107.
 Jehuda b. Barzillai, 18, 19, 25.
 — ha-Levi, 19, 28.
 Jehudai Gaon, 25.

- Jerome, 53, 89, 90, 96, 101, 105, 138, 158 f., 171, 210.
 Jerusalem Synagogue (Old Cairo), 57, 60.
 — booty of, 59.
 Jesus b. Sira, *see* Ecclesiasticus.
 Jewish Theological Seminary, New York, 45.
 Joel, B. J., 21.
 John Rylands Library, 38.
 Jonathan b. 'Uzzi, 118.
 Joseph b. Hama, 118.
 — the king of the Khazars, 16.
 Josephus, Flavius, 18, 151 f., 184-7.
 Josippon, book of, 17.
 Jubilees, book of, 12, 148.
 Judges, Greek version of, 155 ff.
 Jülicher, Adolf, 199.
 Justin Martyr, 26, 198.
 Justinian, the emperor, 24-7, 33-5, 212.
- Ḳalir (Paiṭān), 20, 27.
 Ḳaraites, 55-60.
 Katten, Max, 39.
 Kay, D. M., 131.
 Kennedais, 186.
 Kennicott, Benjamin, 3, 54.
 Kent, Roland, G., 232.
 Kenyon, Sir Frederic, v, 50, 139, 148, 168, 204 f.
 Khazars, the, 14 ff.
 Khusrāu Anūshirwān, 213.
 Kilpatrick, G. D., vi, 165, 173, 198, 205.
 Kimḥi, David, 42.
 Kittel, Rudolf, 44, 45, 61, 73, 74.
 Klostermann, Erich, 13.
 Knox, Wilfred L., 140.
 Kober, M., 23, 27.
 Kohen, David, 39.
 Kokovtsov, Paul, 16, 17, 18, 19, 44, 47.
 Kontakion, Byzantine liturgical poem, 30.
 Kraeling, Carl H., 209, 210.
 Kramers, J. H., 15.
 Kroll, Guilelmus, 24.
 Kuenen, Abraham, 36.
 Ḳuraish, the Arabic spoken by, 78.
 Ḳushshaiya, 107.
- Lagarde, Paul de, 47, 62, 75, 90, 91, 105, 129, 152, 156 f., 163, 167 f., 174 ff., 176.
 Lake, Kirsopp, 30.
 — Silva, 30.
 Landauer, Samuel, 120.
 Lane, E. W., 81.
 Lawson, A. C., 177, 178.
 Leander, Pontus, 91-3.
 Legacy of Israel, 178.
 Leningrad Codex of the Bible, 61, 63.
 Leo X, the Pope, 70.
 Leumann, Mann, 232.
 Levi, Israel, 6, 10, 11.
 Levita, Elias, 68.

Levy, Harry, 67.
 — Kurt, 39, 55.
 Lewis, Agnes Smith, 6, 40, 199.
 Library Syndicate, Cambridge, 8, 10.
 Lietzmann, Hans, 13.
 Lippert, Julius, 224.
 Lipschütz, Lazar, 67.
 Lipsius, R. A., 195.
 Littmann, Enno, 201.
 Loewe, Herbert, 60.
 Lucianic text of the Greek Bible, 141, 143, 152 ff.
 Luzzatto, S. D., 49, 118, 120, 127, 128.

 Maas, Paul, 29, 30, 31, 33, 143.
 Macdonald, Duncan B., 219.
 McHardy, W. Duff, vi.
 McIntosh, Alastair, 120, 122.
 McLean, Norman, 40, 141, 151, 174.
 Mahzor Vitry, 49.
 Mai, Angelo, 220.
 Maimonides, 57, 58, 61, 70, 221.
 Makrizi, 1.
 Mallon, Alexis, 219.
 Ma'mad, 25, 26.
 Mani, 190, 193, 209.
 Mann, Jacob, 1, 17, 18, 19 f., 54, 55, 56, 59, 60 f.
 Marcion, 193.
 Marcus, Ralph, 154.
 Margoliouth, G., 11, 32, 36, 41, 67, 68.
 — D. S., 11.
 Margolis, Max L., 176.
 Marka (the Samaritan), 32.
 Markon, J., 55.
 Marmadji, A. S., 212, 214, 223, 225.
 Marquart, Joseph, 14, 17, 184, 185, 188, 195, 196.
 Masora, Babylonian, 42.
 Masorites of Tiberias and Babylonia, 51.
 Massignon, Louis, 217.
 Matzkow, Walter, 199.
 Mayer Lambert, 42.
 Mebarsapes, king of Arbela, 186.
 Meborak b. Osdad, 60.
 Meek, J., 123.
 Meinertz, M., 200.
 Melito of Sardis, 30.
 Menachem of Recanati, 70.
 — b. Saruk, 16, 42.
 Menander, the Greek king of India, 133.
 Mercati, Giovanni, 13, 14, 86, 88, 99, 118, 160, 162, 179, 234.
 Merx, Adalbert, 64, 77.
 Messina, G., 188.
 Meyer, Eduard, 12, 22.
 Meyerhof, Max, 74.
 Mez, Adam, 152, 154.
 Michaelis, J. H., 75.
 Migne, Patrologia Latina, 177.
 Milan palimpsest, 88.
 Milinda i.e. Menander, 133.

Minister of education, the Prussian, 45, 74.
 Misha'el b. 'Uzziel, 66–8.
 Mishna, Bābā Ḳammā, 122.
 Mitchell, C. W., 191.
 Moesinger, Georg, 211.
 Momigliano, Arnaldo D., vi.
 Monobazos, 184–6.
 Montgomery, James Allan, 169.
 Morgenstern, Julian, 12.
 Mosseri, Jack, 6, 22.
 Müller, August, 224.
 Mu'tamif, the Khalif, 225.
 Mutawakkil, the Khalif, 225.

Naftali, Ben, 66–9.
 Nāgasena (the Indian sage), 133.
 Narcissus of Jerusalem, 198.
 Narsai, malka d'Athoraye, 195.
 Narses, Syr, poet, 29.
 Nehardea, 119.
 Nestle, Eberhard, 142.
 Neubauer, Adolf, 5, 10, 40, 44, 165 f.
 New Testament quotations from the Old Testament, 165 f.
 Niese, Benedict, 154.
 Nöldeke, Theodor, 11, 78, 79, 83, 84.
 Notgemeinschaft der Deutschen Wissenschaft, 74.
 Nyberg, H. S., 77.

Obadya, Rabbi, 102.
 Ochla we-Ochla, 52, 75.
 Oko, Adolph, 5, 13.
 Olmstead, A. T., 124.
 Onomasticon, 90.
 Origen, 53, 86, 87, 94, 118, 159, 160, 169, 179, 207.
 Orlinsky, Harry M., 176.
 Ormann, Gustav, 23.
 Ossinger, Felix, 69.
 'Othmān, the Khalif, 78.
 Oulton, J. E. L., 161.
 Overbeck, J. Josephus, 194, 210.

Palestinian punctuation, 51, 52, 97.
 Palestinian Talmud, 87.
 Palut, Bishop of Edessa, 197, 204.
 Pamphilus, 87.
 Paranikas, M., 30, 31.
 Parthian kings, 186.
 Patshegen, 120.
 Peeters, the Bollandist, 188.
 Perles, J., 187.
 Peshittā, 37, 175, 179 ff.
 Petermann, Heinrich, 37, 38, 92, 93.
 Peters, Norbert, 11.
 Pharos, island of, 132 f.
 Phillips, George, 194.
 Philo, 90, 124, 136, 138–41.
 Philodectes, 136.

Pinhas, 20, 21.
 Pinkerton, John, 180–4, 188.
 Pitra, J.-B., 31.
 Plato, 174.
 Plooi, D., 204, 210.
 Pococke, Ed., 186.
 Poliak, A. N., 18, 19.
 Polotsky, H. J., 209.
 Poznański, S. A., 18, 59.
 Praetorius, Franz, 230.
 Pretzl, Otto, 28, 84, 104.
 Proklos, 21.
 Ptolemäus, Claudius, 197.

Raba b. Joseph, 102, 103, 106.
 Rabbula, Bishop of Edessa, 194.
 Rafail b. Shim'on, chief Rabbi in Cairo, 7.
 Rahlfs, Arthur, 14, 152 ff., 163, 179, 181.
 Redpath, A., 14, 89.
 Reuchlin's Codex of the Prophets, 76, 77.
 Rhodon, 198.
 Ritter, Helmuth, 79.
 Roberts, Bledodyn J., vi.
 Roberts, C. H., 139, 140, 172.
 Robinson, H. Wheeler, v.
 Romanos, 30–2.
 Rost, Leonhard, 13.
 Rostovtzeff, 185, 186.
 Rowley, H. H., 11, 12, 176.
 Rücker, A., 192.
 Rukkāhā, 107.
 Russian Public Library, 73.
 Ryle, H. E., 141.

Sa'adya Gaon, 20, 21, 38, 39, 42, 106.
 — b. David al-'Adenī, 58.
 Sachau, Eduard, 81, 188, 189.
 Samaritan Tora, 144, 145, 146, 147, 149.
 — Arabic translation of the Tora, Abū Sa'id, 36, 38, 39, 138.
 — Liturgy, 32.
 — manuscripts, 50.
 — pronunciation of Hebrew, 92, 97, 173.
 — Targum, 36 ff.
 — vowels, 49.
 Samuel b. Jacob, the copyist of the Leningrad codex, 60, 67.
 Sarauw, Chr., 229–30.
 Sartori, George, 106.
 Sassanid kings, 189.
 Sbath, Paul, 215.
 Schaefer, H. H., 28, 190, 192, 210.
 Schäfers, Joseph, 200.
 Schechter, Salomon, 2, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 17, 26.
 Schmidt, Carl, 209.
 Schoell, Rudolphus, 24.
 Scholem, G., 106.
 Schroeder, August, 142 ff.
 Schulz, Fritz, 33.
 Schürer, Emil, 22, 25, 169.
 Schwartz, Eduard, 161 f., 163, 179.

Schwyzler, Eduard, 232.
 Seligmann, T. L., 234.
 Sephardic pronunciation of Hebrew, 53.
 — Jews in Aleppo, 57.
 Severus b. al-Mukaffā, 221.
 Shelomo b. Buya'a, 58, 59.
 — b. David b. Boaz, 58, 59.
 Shemuel ha-Nāgid, 28.
 Siegfried, Carl, 20, 105, 141.
 Sievers, Eduard, 98 ff., 102.
 Silvestre de Sacy, 38.
 Simonson, D., 63, 96.
 Skeat, T. C., 140.
 Smend, Rudolf, 11.
 Smith, J. M. Pavis, 123.
 Spain, Hebrew poesy in, 53.
 Spanier, P., 23.
 Sperber, Alexander, 90, 91, 95, 101, 109, 159, 165, 234.
 Stählin, Otto, 167 f.
 Stegmüller, Otto, 145 f., 150.
 Steinschneider, Moritz, 42, 219.
 Stevenson, W. B., v, 72.
 Strack, H. L., 41, 42, 60, 65.
 Sturtevant, E. H., 232.
 Sura and Nehardea, 119.
 Suyūṭī, 83.
 Swan, Claire, vi.
 Swete, H. B., 124, 137, 140, 141, 174, 179.
 Symmachus, 139, 179.
 Syriac Gospels, 175, 202 f.
 — Pentateuch, 187 f.
 Syrians, the Eastern, 46, 49, 53.
 — the Western, 52, 54.

Targum, the Palestinian, to the Tora, 23, 117 ff.
 — Onkelos, 43, 117 ff.
 — the Samaritan, 36 f.
 — to the Prophets, 43, 117.
 — Yerushalmi, 125.
 Tarn, W. W., 133.
 Tatian, 190, 197 ff., 208.
 Taylor, Charles, 7, 10, 13, 21, 51.
 Taylor-Schechter Collection in Cambridge, 8.
 Teicher, J. L., vi, 8.
 Testaments, the, of the Twelve Patriarchs, 12.
 Thackeray, H. St. J., 133, 151, 154, 170 f.
 Theodore of Mopsuestia, 179.
 Theopompas, 136.
 Thomas, the Apostle, 190.
 — Acts of, 190, 194.
 Tisserant, Eugène, 14, 151.
 Tixeront, L.-J., 195.
 Torrey, C. C., 173, 201, 202, 206.

Vardanes, the Parthian king, 195.
 Venetus, Gabriel, 69.

Vilmar, E., 50.
 Vincent of Lerins, 88.
 Vogels, H. J., 207.
 Vollers, Carl, 37, 38, 80-3.
 Vulgate, 138, 175.

Waddell, W. G., 139, 172.
 Weerts, Johannes, 43.
 Weinberg, J. J., 123.
 Weiss, Theodor, 108.
 Wellesz, E. J., 30.
 Wellhausen, Julius, 130.
 Wendland, Paul, 136, 141, 158 f.
 Wensinck, A. J., 129, 131.
 Wickes, W., 62, 66.
 Wieder, Naftali, v, 58.
 Williams, Lukyn, 155, 177, 178.
 Witteck, Paul, 30.
 Wutz, Fr. X., 87, 88, 907, 233.

INDEX

Ya'beš b. Shelomo, 57.
 Ya'kūb b. Hārūn, the Samaritan High-priest, 4.
 Yākūt, 15.
 Yannai, 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, 53.
 Yehezkiya, Karaite Nasī, 58, 59.
 Yehūda b. Bal'am, 39.
 Yešira, Sefer, 42, 106, 107.
 Yishāk al-Fāsī, 70.
 Yose b. Yose (Paiṭān), 20, 21, 101.
 Yoshiya, Karaite Nasī, 58, 59.
 Yoshū'a (Paiṭān), 20, 28.

Zadokite work, 11.
 Zahn, Theodor, 197, 203-7.
 Zeitlin, Solomon, 12.
 Ziegler, Joseph, 167, 179.
 Zorell, F., 188.
 Zulay, Menachem, 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 96.
 Zunz, Leopold, 20, 27, 32, 118, 121.