Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:

Buy me a coffee — https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

PATREON — https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal — https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

Lost Hebrew Manuscripts.

BY REV. B. PICK, PH. D.

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

When the study of the Talmud was no longer attractive amid the disorder and frequent closing of the Babylonian academies, and ulterior development of the traditions became exhausted, attention was

more directed to Scripture. The number of MSS. increased, espe-
cially as to them the various systems of vowels and accents of the
Massorah, together with the first elements of grammar, were ap-
pended. But not all of these MSS. are now extant; some are only
known from the quotations made from them by different writers.

The most famous of these lost MSS. is

The Codex Hillelis.

As to the name of this codex, there is a difference of opinion.
From Jewish history we know that there were two by the name of
Hillel; one who lived in the first century before Christ, called Hillel
I., the Great, the other who lived in the fourth century after Christ,
called Hillel II. Some, as Schikhard (*Jus Regium Hebraeorum*, ed.
Carpzov, Lipsiae 1674, p. 39), Cuneus (*De Republ. Hebr.*, p. 159),
attributed this codex to the older Hillel; others, as D. Gans in his
Tzemah David, Buxtorf (*Tractatus de punctorum vocalium*, etc., Basil.
1648, p. 353), attributed it to the younger Hillel. A third opinion is
that this codex derives its name from the fact that it was written at
Hilla, a town built near the ruins of ancient Babel: so Fürst (*Ge-
schichte des Karäerthums*, p. 22 sq. 138, note 14), and Ginsburg
(*Levitas Massoreth ha-Massoreth*, p. 260, note 40).

But neither of these opinions seems to be correct. Against the
the first two we have the express testimony of *Abraham ben Samuel
Sakkuto¹*, who, in his *Book of Genealogies*, entitled "Sepher Yuchasin,"
says that when he saw the remainder of the codex (circa A. D. 1500)
it was 900 years old. His words are these: "In the year 4956, on
the 28th day of Ab (*i. e.* in 1196, better 1197), there was a great
persecution of the Jews in the kingdom of Leon from the two king-
doms which came to besiege it. It was then that the twenty-four
sacred books, which were written long ago, about the year 600, by
Rabbi Moses ben Hillel, in an exceedingly correct manner, and after
which all copies were corrected, were taken away. I saw the remain-
ing two portions of the same, viz., the earlier Prophets (*i. e.* Joshua,
Judges, Samuel and Kings), and the later Prophets (*i. e.* Isaiah, Jere-
miah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor Prophets)—written in large and
beautiful characters, which were brought to Portugal and sold in
Africa, where they still are, having been written 900 years ago.
Kimchi, in his Grammar on Numb. xv. 4, says that the Pentateuch
of this codex was extant in Toleti." (*Yuchasin*, ed. Filipowski,
London 1857, p. 220ᵇ). From this statement it may be deduced

---

1 Comp. my art. in McClintock & Strong's *Cyclop.* s. v.

that this codex was written about the seventh century. As to the third opinion, deriving the name from Hilla, a town near Babel, we may dismiss it as very ingenious. A better opinion seems to be that of **Strack** (*Prolegomena*, p. 16), who says: "fortasse tamen recte cogitabis eum e numero סוֹפְרִים *τῶν* in Hispania fuisse." This is also the opinion of the famous critic Jedidja Norzi (x 1630), who remarks on Genes. i. 5: "He was a very good Masoretic scholar and a scribe in the city of Toletola" (הוא היה הכם בעוז המסורת וסופרו היה בעיר טוליטולא)

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

In the twelfth century this codex was perused by the Jewish grammarian, *Jacob ben Eleazar*, as David Kimchie testifies in his grammatical work *Michlul* (ed. Fürth 1793, fol. 78 col. 2, where we read: וכתב
ר' · · יעקב בן אלעזר כי־בספר הללי אשר בטוליטולא מצא וכל־מבחר
מַדְריכם אֲשֶׁר תִּדְרוּ־לה הדלת רפה *i. e.*, and rabbi Jacob ben Eleazar writes that in the codex Hillel, which is at Toletola, he found that the *daleth* in תְּדְרוּ was raphe (Deut. xii. 11), and fol. 127 col. 2 in fine, he writes: "R. Jacob ben Eleazar writes, that in the codex Hillel, which is at Toletola, the word הֵאָפֶה is written with a *tzere* (לֹא הֵאָפֶה חָמֵץ בציר"י) Lev. vi. 10).

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

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

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

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

Gen. xix. 20.—אִמָּלְטָה נָּא, Lonzano says that נָא is *raphe*, but in Hillel it is with a *dagesh*. In Baer and Delitzsch's Genesis it is written raphe.

Gen. xxvii. 25.—וַיָּבֵא לוֹ, in the cod. Hillel, says Lonzano, the accent *darga* is in the yod. In our editions it is in, or rather under, the *beth*. Baer and Delitzsch follow the cod. Hillel.

Gen. xxxix. 6.—מַרְאֶה, Norzi remarks that the Hillel codex writes מראה with *tzere*.

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

Gen. xlvi. 13.—וּפֻוָּה, on this word Lonzano remarks that in Hillel and other codd. the *vau* is raphe, *i. e.*, וּפֻוָה

Exod. x. 9.—וּבִזְקֵנֵנוּ, in Hillel, remarks Lonzano, it is written מלא ובזקנינו יוד *i. e.*, plene, ובזקנינו

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

Josh. xxi. 35, 36.—Cod. Kennic. No. 357, reads in the margin לא מצינו אלו השני פסוקים בהללי, *i. e.*, these two verses are not found in the codex Hillel. Similar is the remark in a manuscript formerly belonging to H. Lotze, of Leipzig.

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

The Codex Sanbuki.[2]

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

---

[2] See also my art. *Sanbuki Codex* in McClintock & Strong's *Cyclop.*

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

Gen. ix. 14.—כְּעֻנֲנִי where he remarks (fol. 2ᵇ fin. ed. Amstel.):

בהללי הנין בשוא לבד ובונבוקי בשוא הפתח *i. e.*, in the Codex Hillel the *nun* has the *sh'va* (:), but in the Codex Sanbuki the *sh'va* with the *patach*.

Lev. xiii. 20.—שָׁפֵל (fol. 14ᵇ), שפל בונבוקי הפא בפתח *i. e.*, in the Codex Sanbuki the פ in שֶׁפֶל is written with the *patach*.

Lev. xxvi. 36.—וְהֵבֵאתִי (fol. 15ᵇ), ו אך . . . בתי׳א נע ואשבנו " בסס
בהללי ובירושלמיים יבונבוקי לא יש *i. e.*, in the Spanish and German MSS. there is a *gaya* (*i. e.*, a *metheg*) under the ה, but not so in the Codd. Hillel, Jerusalem and Sanbuki.

The Jericho Pentateuch.

Concerning this חֻמַשׁ יְרִיחוֹ Elias Levita writes thus: The Pentateuch of Jericho is doubtless a correct codex of the Pentateuch derived from Jericho. It discusses the *plene* and *defectives* as הַתּוֹעֵבֹת." the abominations" (Lev. xviii. 27), which is in this Pentateuch without the second *vau*. So also יְלִידֵי, which occurs twice in the same chapter (Numb. xiii. 13, 22), of which the first is *plene* (written in the Jericho codex), and the second *defective*.

The Codex Sinai.[3]

This codex, סֵפֶר סִינַי, which contains the Pentateuch, is a correct codex, and treats on the variations of the accents, as וַיִּשְׁמַע, *and he heard* (Exod. xviii. 1) has the accent *Gershaim*, but in Sinai it has *Rebiah;* again, הַמִּדְבָּר, the *desert* (v. s.), has *Zakeph*, while in Sinai it has *Zakeph gadol*. As to the name of the codex, whether it is so called from the author or from the place where it was written, is a matter of dispute. According to Levita, it would be the name of a codex. Fürst (*Geschichte der Karäer*, I. 22, 138) thinks that this codex derives its name from Mount Sinai, while Joseph Eshwe, the expositor of the Massorah, in his *Mebin Chidoth* (מבין הירות, Amst. 1765) on Exod. xviii. 1, remarks: "As to the remark Sinai has *Rebia*, know that the inventors of the vowel-points and accents were mostly from the spiritual heads and the sages of Tiberias. Now the name of one of these

was Sinai, and he differed from the Masorah, which remarks that וישמע
has Gershaim, and said that it has the accent Rebia." From this it will
be seen that this great Massoretic authority does not take סיני as *Codex
Sinaiticus*, but regards it as a proper name of one of the inventors of
the vowel-points and accents. Delitzsch (in his Hebrew translation of
Paul's Epistle to the Romans, p. 41, note) thinks that the name ספר סיני
Sinai Codex, refers rather to the place where it was written or found.

The Codex Ben-Naphtali.

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

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

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

---

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