ANCIENT CORRECTIONS IN THE TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT (*Tiḳḳun Ṣopherim*).

THE student of the Old Testament is so much accustomed to the story of the scrupulous care with which the Scribes guarded the Sacred Text, counting even its letters, that it comes as a shock to him to be told that, according to Jewish tradition, he has before him in eighteen places of his Hebrew Bible not the original text, but a text altered by the Scribes! In these eighteen passages, if we may believe a statement which has been frequently made, and perhaps never fully disproved, the original reading was altogether displaced from the MSS, as being unbecoming (or, indeed, in some cases, almost blasphemous), and a Scribes' emendation took its place, the memory of the original reading being preserved in tradition only.

The fullest account of the matter in English is to be found in Dr. Ginsburg's *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*[1]; and Mr. T. H. Weir devotes some pages to it in his *Short History of the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament.* Dr. Buhl (*Kanon und Text des A. T.*, 1891) deals with the subject (pp. 103–105), and to some extent[2] accepts the theory (pp. 251 ff.). The 'Scribes' corrections,' in short, still attract considerable attention, and some of them are accepted by serious scholars.

Yet the evidence alleged for the theory is very thin. The early evidence is ambiguous, while what is unambiguous is too late to be of any real value. A Midrashic fancy; an ambiguous phrase; a misinterpretation; such seems to be the history of the growth of the doctrine of Scribes' emendation.

In the present paper I propose to examine the evidence with

[1] In which the theory of emendation is fully accepted.

[2] As far as regards the following passages:—Num. xi 15; 1 Sam. iii 13 (in part); Ezek. viii 17; Hab. i 12; Zech. ii 8 [12]; Job vii 20; Lam. iii 20.

regard to the eighteen passages, in order to discover whether it is sufficient to prove that our present text is indeed an altered text, and that the original readings are really preserved in our 'traditional' sources.

The evidence which is to be the subject of this inquiry is derived from authorities which may be divided into three classes, viz. the Midrashic, the Masoretic, and the Exegetical (commentators).

(A.) MIDRASHIM. (These may be roughly described as homiletic commentaries on books of the Old Testament. They are broadly distinguished from later exegetical works, such as those of Rashi, Aben Ezra, and Ḳimḥi, by their lack of literal and grammatical exegesis and of purely critical matter.) Those useful for the present inquiry are:—

(i) *Siphrē* (ed. Friedmann, Vienna, 1864, p. 22 b), a very early work, revised in the second century of the Christian era, and again in the third [1].

(ii) *Mechilta* (ed. Friedmann, Vienna, 1870, p. 39 a), composed in the second century, and revised perhaps towards the close of the same century [1].

(iii) Midrash *Tanḥuma* (Mantua, anno 323 = 1563 A.D., p. 32 b, col. 2), a late work in which *Mechilta* and an earlier Midrash *Tanḥuma* were used. The earlier *Tanḥuma* [2] (ed. S. Buber, Wilna, 1885) belongs to the fifth or sixth century.

To these some writers would add:—

(iv) *Yalkut Shimeoni* (ed. B. Lorje, Zolkiew, 1859), a compilation by R. Simon of Frankfort (1200–1250 A.D.) from the Midrashim. [Its evidence has not been cited in the important Table VI (below) owing to its secondary character.]

(B.) MASORETIC WORKS. (These deal with the text of the Old Testament, but rather as a fixed thing to be guarded in its integrity, than as subject to correction and improvement.) The chief of these are:—

(i) The printed Masorah found in Rabbinic Bibles (Bomberg's and Buxtorf's). (See the passage at the head of the book of Numbers, repeated in the margin of Ps. cvi 20.) Cited below as '*Masorah* (printed).'

[1] According to Schiller-Szinessy (*Encl. Brit.* MISHNAH) neither *Siphrē* nor *Mechilta* was written down before the sixth century A.D.

[2] According to Eppstein Buber's is the later recension. It does *not* contain the list of *tiḳḳun* passages.

(ii) The *Ochlah w'ochlah* (ed. Frensdorff, Hannover, 1864). There are two MSS of this work, one at Paris, from which Frensdorff printed his edition, containing four hundred articles, and one at Halle[1], containing over a thousand. This second MS, however, does not contain the list of *tiḳḳun ṣopherim* passages, so that there is grave doubt whether the list belongs to the original form of the book *Ochlah*. The book in one form or another is older than Ḳimḥi (1155–1235 A.D.) who quotes it by name.

(iii) The Masorah found in Yemen MSS (B. M. Orient. 1379 of the fifteenth or sixteenth century, and 2349 of the year 1469 A.D., in the margin of Num. xii 12 (cf. Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*, p. 350).

(iv) The Masorah given at the foot of the page containing Zech. ii 12 [8] in the Codex *Petropolitanus Babylonicus* of the year 916 A.D., reproduced in facsimile by Herm. Strack, 1876.

(v) The list published from the Baer MS by S. Baer and H. Strack as an Appendix ('Anhang') to their edition of Ben Asher's Masoretic work *Diḳduḳē ha-ṭᵉamim*. The editors seem to think (p. 44, note) that the list may be the work of Ben Asher himself, who flourished in the first half of the tenth century. It is cited in this paper as Ben Asher.

To the Masoretic lists may be added the isolated marginal notes attached to particular passages in Biblical MSS, asserting in each case that the particular passage is '*tiḳḳun ṣopherim*,' or 'one of the eighteen *tiḳḳun ṣopherim*.' From the mass of MSS I have singled out a few. Each contains Masorah, and is representative of an important or seemingly important class of MSS.

(*a*) Camb. Univ. Add. 465. Sephardic of the twelfth or thirteenth century. Contains the whole Bible. Valuable for its Masorah; cf. Schiller-Szinessy, *Catalogue of Hebrew MSS in Camb. Univ. Library*, pp. 18, 19.

(*b*) Brit. Mus. Orient. 2349. Yemenite of A.D. 1469. Contains the Pentateuch. Sometimes supposed to be valuable on account of its South Arabian origin.

(*c*) Brit. Mus. Orient. 1379 of the fifteenth or sixteenth century. Contains the Pentateuch. Probably also Yemenite.

(*d*) Codex *Babylonicus Petropolitanus* (quoted from Strack's facsimile edition of 1876). Finished in the year 916 A.D. Contains the 'Later Prophets' (i.e. Isaiah to Malachi). Valuable as being pointed[2] on the

[1] Described by H. Hupfeld in *ZDMG* xxi 201–220.

[2] Three or four columns are left unpointed; see Zech. xiv 5; Mal. i 5.

supralinear system and therefore as being probably different in *provenance* from the bulk of Biblical MSS. (The supposition, however, implied in the title 'Babylonicus' that it has any connexion with Babylon, or with some other place situated equally far towards the East, lacks sufficient support to be probable.)

(*e*) Camb. Univ. Taylor-Schechter Collection, Job[a]. A quarto fragment (centim. 37·5 × 38) of six leaves containing the beginning of Job. North African; 'very old' (Dr. Schechter). From the Genizah at Cairo.

(*f*) Camb. Univ. Taylor-Schechter Collection, Job[b]. A quarto (or folio) fragment consisting of the lower part of two leaves (centim. ? × 31). Contains some later verses of Job. Also from the Cairo Genizah[1].

(C.) COMMENTATORS.

(i) Rashi (obiit 1105 A.D.) of Troyes. I have compared the printed text of the Pentateuch as given in the Vienna Pentateuch (5 vols. 4to, 1859) with Camb. Univ. Add. 626, an important MS (fourteenth century) not used by Berliner for his edition (Berlin, 1866); see Schiller-Szinessy, *Catalogue*, p. 50. For the Prophets (Earlier and Later) I have compared the text printed in Bomberg's Bible (Venice, ed. 2) with Brit. Mus. Harley 150 of A.D. 1257, a MS which contains some important variations from the common text.

(ii) Aben Ezra (1090–1168 A.D.) of Toledo. I have compared the printed text in Job and Psalms with Brit. Mus. Add. 24896 (fifteenth century), and in Genesis and Numbers with Brit. Mus. Add. 26880 (A.D. 1401).

(iii) R. David Ḳimḥi (1155–1235 A.D.) of Narbonne.

Before tabulating and summarizing the evidence of the authorities specified above, I give two of the passages (one Midrashic from *Mechilta*, and one Masoretic from Cod. *Babyl. Petropol.*) in full, in order to illustrate the nature of this evidence.

(*a*) *Mechilta* (ed. Friedmann, 1870, p. 39 a):—

'*And in the greatness of thine excellency thou overthrowest them that rise up against thee* [Ex. xv 7] that is "thou hast greatly magnified thyself against him who rose up against thee." And who are they who rose up against thee? They who rose up against thy sons. "Thou overthrowest them that rise up against *us*" is not written here, but "Thou overthrowest them that rise up against *thee*." It sheweth that every one

[1] Dr. Schechter most kindly called my attention to (*e*), and I am indebted to him and to the Master of St. John's College for permission to examine (*f*).

who riseth up against Israel is as if he rose up against the Holy One (Blessed be He!) . . . And similarly it saith (וכה"א), *And he that toucheth them* (בהם) *is as he that toucheth the apple of his eye* [Zech. ii 8, not M.T.]. Rabbi Jehudah[1] saith, "The apple of an eye" it saith not, but "The apple of his eye" is written; it concerns (if such a thing may be said) the Exalted One, but the Scripture has employed euphemism (אלא שכינה הכתוב). Of the same class (כיוצא בו) is [the passage], *Ye say also, Behold what a weariness is it! and ye have snuffed at it* [Mal. i 13], but the Scripture has employed euphemism. Of the same class is, *For the iniquity which he knew, because his sons did bring a curse upon themselves*[2], &c. [1 Sam. iii 13], but the Scripture has employed euphemism. Of the same class is, *Why hast thou set me as a mark for thee, so that I am a burden to myself* [Job vii 20]: the Scripture has employed euphemism. Of the same class is, *Art not thou my king from everlasting, O Lord God, that we die not*[3] (ולא נמות) [Hab. i 12, not M.T.]: the Scripture has employed euphemism. Of the same class is, *Hath a nation changed their gods which yet are no gods? but my people have changed their glory* [Jer. ii 11]: the Scripture has employed euphemism. Of the same class is, *Thus they changed their glory for the likeness of an ox* [Ps. cvi 20]: the Scripture has employed euphemism. [4]*And let me not see my wretchedness* [Num. xi 15]: the Scripture has employed euphemism. Of the same class is, *We have no portion in David . . . every man to his tents, O Israel* [2 Sam. xx 1]: the Scripture has employed euphemism. *And, lo, they put the branch to their nose* [Ezek. viii 17]: the Scripture has employed euphemism. *When he cometh out of his mother's womb* [Num. xii 12]: (*from our mother's womb* one should have said:) the Scripture has employed euphemism. Also here thou sayest, *He that toucheth him* (בו) *is as he that toucheth the apple of his eye.* The Scripture speaketh (if such a thing may be said) concerning the Exalted One, but the Scripture has employed euphemism.'

(The passage from *Siphrē* reckoned above among the authorities for this paper is closely parallel, but offers a shorter text.)

It may be remarked on the passage from *Mechilta*:

(1) that the *Tiḳḳun* list seems to be ascribed to R. Jehudah

[1] R. Jehudah ben Ilai (first half of second century A. D.).

[2] Quoted from the R.V., which is used as far as possible for the quotations given in this paper.

[3] *Siphrē* (in the parallel place) reads, *that I die not* (ולא אמות), though otherwise it agrees with M.T.

[4] The usual formula seems to have fallen out.

ben Ilai, the pupil of R. Akiva and of R. Tarphon. (Notice the return to Zech. ii. 8 [12] at the close.)

(2) that the isolated emendation given, viz. that on Num. xii 12 is not free from suspicion of interpolation. It is indeed found in *Siphrē*; but here it reads like an addition to the original text. The text of most Midrashim seems to have been in a 'fluid' state during the early centuries.

(*b*) Cod. *Babylonicus Petropolitanus* (in a footnote referring to Zech. ii 8 [12]):—

'Eighteen words are *tiḳḳun ṣopherim: But Abraham* [Gen. xviii 22]: *My wretchedness* [Num. xi 15]: *Out of his mother's womb* [Num. xii 12]: *Did bring a curse* [1 Sam. iii 13]: *The branch* [Ezek. viii 17]: *We shall not die* [Hab. i 12]: *Have changed their glory* [Jer. ii 11]: *Each man*[1] *to your tents, O Israel* [1 Kings xii 16], twice in the verse; and the parallel passage of Chronicles, twice in the verse: *And yet had condemned* [Job xxxii 3]: *So that I am* [Job vii 20]: *Profane*[2] [Mal. i 12]: *And ye have snuffed* [Mal. i 13]: *Thus they changed* [Ps. cvi 20]: *Rob* [Mal. iii 8, 9]: *The apple of his eye* [Zech. ii 8].

This is the oldest Masoretic reference which we can date to *tiḳḳun ṣopherim*. It may be remarked:—

(1) No kind of hint is given as to the nature of the process called *tiḳḳun ṣopherim*.

(2) The list of passages differs from other lists of eighteen.

(3) No alternative reading is given in any passage.

Thus it can be seen that the ancient evidence of *Mechilta* and the Codex *Babylonicus* goes very little way indeed towards supporting the common theory of Scribes' emendation. We have two lists of Biblical passages, one of eleven, which speaks of the employment of euphemism in Scripture, the other of sixteen, which speaks of *tiḳḳun ṣopherim* without giving any explanation of the phrase. The two lists between them suggest *at the most* one possible various reading. Not a promising beginning for those who wish to establish the common theory!

Most of the evidence which remains exists in a form similar to one or other of the two forms already given. For presenting this remainder tabular statements are most convenient, and

[1] The word איש, 'each man,' belongs rightly to 2 Sam. xx 1.

[2] A verb.

accordingly six tables are given here, viz. (I) a table of the number of passages affected by *tiḳḳun ṣopherim*, according to different authorities; (II) the identification of the passages according to Midrashic sources; (III) the same according to Masoretic sources; (IV) the same according to marginal notes in Biblical MSS; (V) the same according to the commentators Rashi and Aben Ezra; (VI) a table of the passages, their supposed 'original readings,' and the authorities for and against.

Table I.

The number of tiḳḳun ṣopherim *according to different authorities.*

Siphrē	7[1]
[Yalkut]	10[2]
[Midrash Haggadol]	10[3]
Mechilta	11
Rashi	11[4]
Masorah (printed)	[16[5]]
Tanḥuma (later form)[6]	18[7]
Masorah of Codex *Petropolitanus*	18[8]
Ochlah (Paris MS)[9]	18
Ḳimḥi	18[10]
Masorah of Yemenite MSS	18[11]
Ben Asher	18

[1] *Seven* instances (*eight* reckoning two in Num. xii 12) are given in Friedmann's edition, and Rashi (according to Brit. Mus. Harley 150, though not according to printed editions) says on Hab. i 12 that *seven* instances of *tiḳḳun* are found in *Siphrē*.

[2] Job vii 20 is omitted, perhaps through homoeoteleuton; otherwise the list is the same as in *Mechilta*.

[3] Num. xi 15 is omitted.

[4] On Mal. i 13 (printed text = B. M. Harley 150).

[5] Seventeen, if two instances are to be counted in Num. xii 12; eighteen according to the heading of the list.

[6] The passage giving a list of *tiḳḳun ṣopherim* is absent from the (probably) earlier recension of *Tanḥuma* published by S. Buber.

[7] Counting two instances in Num. xii 12.

[8] Counting two *tiḳḳun* in Malachi not given in other sources, except that one appears in Ben Asher.

[9] The list of *tiḳḳun ṣopherim* is absent from the Halle MS of *Ochlah*.

[10] On Ezek. viii 17.

[11] The list is the same in contents, but not in arrangement, with that in *Ochlah* (Paris MS).

TABLE II.

Midrashic Lists.

Second or third century. *Siphrĕ.*	Second century. *Mechilta*[1] (= *Yalkut*).	Century ? *Tanḥuma* (common recension).
Zech. ii 12 [8]	Zech. ii 12 [8]	Zech. ii 12 [8][2]
Job vii 20	Mal. i 13	Mal. i 13[2]
Ezek. viii 17	1 Sam. iii 13	1 Sam. iii 13
Hab. i 12	[Job vii 20][3]	Job vii 20[2]
Ps. cvi 20	Hab. i 12	Hab. i 12[4]
Num. xi 15	Jer. ii 11	Jer. ii 11[2]
Num. xii 12	Ps. cvi 20	Ps. cvi 20[2]
	Num. xi 15	Hos. iv 7[2]
	2 Sam. xx 1	Job xxxii 3
	Ezek. viii 17[5]	Gen. xviii 22
	Num. xii 12[5]	Num. xi 15
		Num. xii 12[2]
Sixth century. *Breshith Rabba.*		1 Kings xii 16
Gen. xviii 22		2 Chron. x 16
		Lam. iii 20
		2 Sam. xvi 12[2]
		Ezek. viii 17[2]

[1] Rashi (on Mal. i 13) speaks of *eleven* words of ת"ס, but he includes (elsewhere) Gen. xviii 22 and Job xxxii 3, which do not appear among the eleven instances of *Mechilta*. For *Mid. Gad.* see Note II at the end of this article.

[2] Quoted according to the supposed original reading.

[3] Omitted (perhaps through homoeoteleuton) in *Yalkut*.

[4] Quoted with the reading ימות.

[5] Transposed in *Yalkut*.

TABLE III. *Masoretic Lists.*

Sixteenth century. *Masorah interior.* Printed in the Bibles of Bomberg and Buxtorf.	Fifteenth century. *Yemen Masorah.* (B.M. Orient. 1379 and 2349.)	916 A. D. *Masorah.* (Cod. *Petropolitanus Babylonicus.*)	Twelfth century[1] *Ochlah w'ochlah.* (Paris MS[1].)	Century[1] Ben Asher (Baer MS[2].)
Gen. xviii 22	Gen. xviii 22	Gen. xviii 22	Gen. xviii 22	Gen. xviii 22
Num. xi 15	Num. xi 15	Num. xi 15	Num. xi 15	Num. xi 15
Num. xii 12 (*semel*, חצי בשרו)	Num. xii 12 (*bis*)	Num. xii 12 (*semel*, מרחם אמו)	Num. xii 12 (*bis*)	Num. xii 12 (*bis*)
1 Sam. iii 13	1 Sam. iii 13	1 Sam. iii 13	1 Sam. iii 13	1 Sam. iii 13
2 Sam. xvi 12	2 Sam. xvi 12	Ezek. viii 17	2 Sam. xvi 12	2 Sam. xvi 12
2 Sam. xx 1	1 Kings xii 16 (*bis*)	Hab. i 12	1 Kings xii 16 (*semel*)	1 Kings xii 16 (*semel* vid.)
Ezek. viii 17	2 Chron. x 16 (*bis*)	Jer. ii 11	2 Chron. x 16 (*semel*)	2 Chron. x 16 (*semel* vid.)
Hab. i 12	Ezek. viii 17	1 Kings xii 16 (*bis*)	Jer. ii 11	Hab. i 12
Mal. i 13	Mal. i 13	2 Chron. x 16 (*bis*)	Ezek. viii 17	Mal. i 12
Zech. ii 12 [8]	Zech. ii 12 [8]	Job xxxii 3	Hos. iv 7	Mal. i 13
Jer. ii 11	Jer. ii 11	Job vii 20	Hab. i 12	Zech. ii 12 [8]
Job vii 20	Hos. iv 7	Mal. i 12	Zech. ii 12 [8]	Jer. ii 11
Hos. iv 7	Hab. i 12	Mal. i 13	Mal. i 13	Ps. cvi 20
Job xxxii 3	Job vii 20	Ps. cvi 20	Ps. cvi 20	Job vii 20
Lam. iii 20	Job xxxii 3	Mal. iii 8, 9	Job vii 20	Job xxxii 3
Ps. cvi 20	Lam. iii 20	Zech. ii 12 [8]	Job xxxii 3	Lam. iii 20
	Ps. cvi 20		Lam. iii 20	Hos. iv 7

[1] This list is wanting in the Halle MS.

[2] This list is published as an appendix to Baer and Strack's edition (1879) of Ben Asher's *Diḳduḳē ha-ṭ'amim* (tenth century).

TABLE IV.

Passages to which the note ח׳ ס, or the like, is added in specified Biblical MSS.

Num. xi 15 (*a*) (*b*) (*c*)	Mal. i 12 (*d*)
Num. xii 12 (*b*) (*c*)	Mal. i 13 (*d*)
Ezek. viii 17 (*d*)	Job vii 20 (*e*)
Zech. ii 12 [8] (*d*)	Job xxxii 3 (*a*) (*f*)

(*a*) Camb. Univ. Add. 465 (whole Bible). (*b*) Brit. Mus. Orient. 2349 (Pentateuch). (*c*) Brit. Mus. Orient. 1379 (Pentateuch). (*d*) *Babylonicus Petropolitanus* (Later Prophets). (*e*) Camb. Univ. Taylor-Schechter Collection, Job [a]. (*f*) Camb. Univ. T.-S. Collection, Job [b].

*** This Table is intended to illustrate the unsystematic way in which the note ח׳ ס is added in the margin in MSS well furnished with Masorah. The results for (*d*) and still more for (*a*) are striking.

TABLE V.

Passages mentioned by Rashi and Aben Ezra[1] *in reference to* tiḳḳun ṣopherim.

Rashi (asserts *tiḳḳun*).	Aben Ezra[2] (repudiates *tiḳḳun*).
Gen. xviii 22	Gen. xviii 22
Num. xi 15	Num. xi 15
Num. xii 12[3]	Num. xii 12
[1 Sam. iii 13][4]	[Ps. cvi 20[5]]
Hab. i 12	Job vii 20
Mal. i 13	Job xxxii 3
Ps. cvi 20[6]	Hab. i 12[7]
Job xxxii 3[8]	

[1] I have not examined fully the evidence of Ḳimḥi, whose later date makes him of less importance as a witness, but according to the printed text he does not notice *tiḳḳun* in connexion with Jer. ii 11; Hos. iv 7; Zech. ii 12 (*in locis*).

[2] Aben Ezra rejects the ordinary theory of *tiḳḳun ṣopherim* in the *Sepher Çahoth*; and in his Commentaries he nowhere (so far as I can discover) accepts the *tiḳḳun* tradition as yielding trustworthy textual evidence.

[3] Two instances according to the printed text, one only (אמנו for אמי) in C. U. Add. 626.

[4] In the printed text, but omitted in B. M. Harley 150.

[5] Aben Ezra deals with this passage as an instance of כינוי, comparing 2 Sam. xii 14, but he does not use the term ח׳ ס in connexion with it.

[6] Not mentioned *in loco*, but cited on Job xxxii 3, according to the common texts, but not according to the Mendelssohnian Bible (Fürth, anno 565 [1805]).

[7] In the *Sepher Çahoth* p. 74 b.

[8] I have not been able to consult any MS with which to check the printed text, though the passage is an important one.

TABLE VI. *The* tiḳḳun *passages and their emendations.*

Passage according to M. T.	Alternative 'reading' supposed to be original.	Authorities giving the alternative reading.	Authorities giving no alternative reading, but applying the terms ת'ס or כינה הכ' to the passage.	Authorities silent altogether as to the existence of an alternative.
(1) Gen. xviii 22, 'But Abraham stood yet before the Lord.'	'But the Lord stood yet before Abraham.'	Rashi. Ben Asher. *Ochlah.* *Yemen Masorah.*	*Tanḥuma; Bresh. R.* *Masorah* (of Cod. *Bab. Pet.* and printed). [Aben Ezra, 'No need for ת'ס.']	*Siphrē; Mechilta.* *Mid. Gad.*
(2) Num. xi 15, 'And let me not look upon my wretchedness' ('evil,' ברעתי).	'And let me not look upon thy evil' (ברעתך).	Rashi (on Job xxxii 3). Ben Asher. *Ochlah.* *Yemen Masorah.*	*Siphrē; Mechilta.* *Tanḥuma.* *Masorah* (printed). [Aben Ezra, 'No need for ת'ס.']	(For *Mid. Gad.* see Note II at the end of this article.)
	'And let me not look upon their evil' (ברעתם).	Rashi, *in loco.*		
(3) Num. xii 12, 'Let her not be as one born dead, whose flesh is half consumed when he cometh forth from his mother's womb.'	'Let her not be as one born dead when he cometh out of our mother's womb, so that half of our flesh should be consumed.'	[*Mechilta*[1]]; *Tanḥuma*[2]; *Mid. Gad.*[1] Rashi[2]. Ben Asher[2]. *Ochlah*[2]. *Yemen Masorah*[2].	*Siphrē*[3]. *Masorah* (of Cod. *Bab. Pet.* and printed[3]). [Aben Ezra, 'No need for ת'ס.']	

[1] Single *tiḳḳun* ('Our mother'). [2] Double *tiḳḳun*. [3] Single *tiḳḳun* ('Our flesh').

TABLE VI (*continued*).

Passage according to M. T.	Alternative 'reading' supposed to be original.	Authorities giving the alternative reading.	Authorities giving no alternative reading, but applying the terms כ' הכ' or ת' ס' כימה הכ' to the passage.	Authorities silent altogether as to the existence of an alternative.
(4) 1 Sam. iii 13, 'For the iniquity which he knoweth, because his sons were cursing themselves' (מקללים להם).	'For the iniquity which he knoweth, because his sons were cursing me' (מ' לי).	[Rashi (*in loco* כ' הכ').] *Ochlah.* *Mid. Gad.*	*Mechilta.* *Tanḥuma.* *Masorah* (of Cod. *Bab. Pet.* and printed).	*Siphrē.*
	'. . . were cursing him.'	Ben Asher (*vid.*). *Yemen Masorah.*		
(5) 2 Sam. xvi 12, 'It may be that the Lord will look upon my eye' (בעיני)[1].	'. . . will look with his eyes' (בעיניו).	*Tanḥuma*, Stettin edition, anno 624 [1864].	*Masorah* (printed).	Rashi, *in loco.* *Siphrē.* *Mechilta.* Cod. *Bab. Pet.*
	'. . . will look upon my trouble' (בעניי).	*Masorah* (printed). B. M. Orient. 1379.		
	'. . . will look with his eye' (בעינו).	*Tanḥuma*, Mantua edition, anno 323 [1563]. Ben Asher; *Ochlah.*		
(6) 2 Sam. xx 1, 'Every man to his tents (לאהליו), O Israel.'	[*vide infra.*]		*Mechilta.* *Masorah* (printed).	All other authorities.

[1] So Kri; 'on the wrong done unto me' R.V. following the C'thib, נעשי.

TABLE VI (*continued*).

1 Kings xii 16, 'So Israel departed unto his tents' (לאהליו).	['So Israel departed unto his gods' (לאלהיו)[1].]	Ben Asher, *Ochlah*, *Yemen Masorah*, *Tanḥuma*[2] (all supplying same *tiḳḳun* in Chron.).	Cod. *Bab. Pet.*	*Siphrē*. *Mechilta*. Rashi, *in loco*.
(7) Ezek. viii 17, 'And, lo, they put the branch to their nose' (אל אפם).	'And, lo, they put the branch to my nose' (אל אפי).	*Tanḥuma; Mid. Gad.* *Yemen Masorah*. R. D. Ḳimḥi.	*Siphrē; Mechilta*. *Masorah* (of Cod. *Bab. Pet.* and printed).	Rashi, *in loco*. Ben Asher.
	'. . . his nose' (אל אפו).	*Ochlah*.		
(8) Hab. i 12, 'Art not thou from everlasting, O Lord, my God, my Holy One? we shall not die' (לא נמות).	'. . . my Holy One, [who] diest not' (לא תמות).	Rashi, *in loco*. Ben Asher. *Ochlah*. *Yemen Masorah*. *Mid. Gad*. *Tanḥuma*.	*Siphrē; Mechilta*. *Masorah* (of Cod. *Bab. Pet.* and printed).	
	'. . . my Holy One, he who dieth not' (לא ימות).			
(9) Mal. i 13, 'And ye have snuffed at it' (אתו).	'And ye have snuffed at me' (אתי).	Rashi, *in loco*. *Tanḥuma; Mid. Gad*. Ben Asher. *Ochlah* and *Yemen Masorah*.	*Mechilta*. *Masorah* (of Cod. *Bab. Pet.* and printed).	*Siphrē*.

[1] The *Masorah* (of *Yemen* and of Cod. *Bab. Pet.*) has, it appears, a double *tiḳḳun*, 'To thy gods . . . unto his gods.' *Mid. Gad.* has 'To thy gods' only, and has no mention of Chron.

[2] Bible text influenced by 2 Sam. xx 1.

TABLE VI (*continued*).

Passage according to M.T.	Alternative 'reading' supposed to be original.	Authorities giving the alternative reading.	Authorities giving no alternative reading, but applying the terms ס' ח or הכ' כינה to the passage.	Authorities silent altogether as to the existence of an alternative.
(10) Zech. ii 12 [8], 'Thus saith the Lord of hosts, ... He that toucheth you toucheth the apple of his eye' (עינו).	'... He that toucheth you toucheth the apple of my eye' (עיני).	*Tanḥuma; Mid. Gad.* Ben Asher. *Ochlah.* *Yemen Masorah*[2]. *Shemoth R.* (§ 13).	*Siphrē.* [*Mechilta*[1].] *Masorah* (of Cod. *Bab. Pet.* and printed).	Rashi, *in loco.* R. D. Ḳimḥi, *in loco.*
(11) Jer. ii 11, 'But my people have changed their glory (כבודו) for that which doth not profit.'	'. . . my glory (כבודי) . . .'	*Tanḥuma; Mid. Gad.* Ben Asher. *Ochlah.* *Yemen Masorah.*	*Mechilta.* *Masorah* (of Cod. *Bab. Pet.* and printed).	Rashi. R. D. Ḳimḥi. *Siphrē.*
(12) Job vii 20, 'Why hast thou set me as a mark for thee, so that I am a burden to myself?' (עלי).	'... So that I am a burden to thee' (עליך).	*Tanḥuma; Mid. Gad.* Ben Asher. *Ochlah.* *Yemen Masorah.*	[Aben Ezra[3].] *Siphrē; Mechilta.* *Masorah* (of Cod. *Bab. Pet.* and printed).	Rashi, *in loco.*
(13) Hos. iv 7, 'I will change their glory (כבודם) into shame.'	'. . . my glory (כבודי) . . .'	*Tanḥuma.* Ben Asher. *Ochlah.* *Yemen Masorah.*	*Masorah* (printed).	Rashi; R. D. Ḳimḥi. *Siphrē; Mechilta.* Cod. *Bab. Pet.*
(14) Job xxxii 3, 'And yet they had condemned	'. . . condemned God' (or 'the Lord'	[Rashi, *in loco*[4].]	*Masorah* (printed). *Tanḥuma.*	*Siphrē; Mechilta.* Cod. *Bab. Pet.*

[1] See above, p. 391.

[2] B. M. Orient. 1379 is defective here.

[3] See below, p. 412.

[4] See bel

TABLE VI (*continued*).

Job' (וירשיעו את איוב).	or — euphemistically —'the Judgement').	Ben Asher. [*Yemen Masorah* and *Ochlah*,'condemned the Judgement,' an euphemism.]	[Aben Ezra, *i. l.*]	
(15) Lam. iii 20, 'And my soul (נפשי) is bowed down within me' (עלי).	'And my soul sinketh down upon thee' (עליך). 'And thy soul (נפשך) will mourn over me' (עלי)[1].	Ben Asher. *Ochlah.* *Yemen Masorah.*	*Masorah* (printed). *Tanḥuma.*	*Siphrē; Mechilta.* Rashi; Aben Ezra. Cod. *Bab. Pet.*
(16) Ps. cvi 20, 'Thus they changed their glory (כבודם) for the likeness of an ox.'	'. . . my glory (כבודי) . . .'	Ben Asher. *Ochlah.* *Yemen Masorah.* *Tanḥuma; Mid. Gad.*	*Siphrē; Mechilta.* *Masorah* (of Cod. *Bab. Pet.* and printed).	[Rashi[2].] Aben Ezra[2].
(17) Mal. i 12, 'But ye profane it' (אתו).	'But ye profane me' (אתי).	Ben Asher.	*Masorah* (of Cod. *Bab. Pet.*).	Rashi. *Siphrē; Mechilta.* *Tanḥuma.* *Ochlah.* *Masorah* (*Yemen*, and printed).
(18) Mal. iii 8, 9, 'Ye rob me' (*bis*).	[Not known.]	[No authorities.]	*Masorah* (of Cod. *Bab. Pet.*).	All other authorities.

[1] So Dr. Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*, p. 361; Dr. Buhl, *Kanon des A. T.*, p. 105.

[2] See below, p. 411.

[2] See below, p. 411.

From a study of the contents of the foregoing tables we may draw several deductions:—

(1) The *tiḳḳun* tradition lacks definiteness as to (i) the number of passages affected, (ii) the identity of the passages, (iii) the nature of the change made or supposed to be made in the text.

(2) The tradition (in one form or another) is a favourite element in the Midrashim, including the earliest known.

(3) The tradition has not an undisputed position in the *Masorah*, as the following facts show:—

(*a*) It is doubtful if it had a place in Ben Asher's *Diḳduḳē*.

(*b*) It is not found in the Halle MS of *Ochlah*.

(*c*) It is only casually noted in Biblical MSS which are provided with *Masorah*.

(*d*) The authority of the printed *Masorah* (in which the *tiḳḳun* list is found) is doubtful, for it is not known whether it rests on direct authority of MSS or not.

(4) The two earliest commentators of greatest name either fail to support the tradition in its fullness (Rashi), or treat it as a thing which may be set aside (Aben Ezra).

From the first three of these deductions we may, I think, tentatively draw a fresh conclusion, viz. *The tiḳḳun tradition belongs rather to Midrash than to Masorah*, i.e. its true bearing is on exegesis, not on textual criticism; the *tiḳḳunē ṣopherim* are interpretations not readings. This conclusion can, I believe, be verified (i) by an examination of the terms used in the oldest authorities in rendering the tradition, (ii) by a detailed examination of the evidence alleged for each case of *tiḳḳun*.

(i) The terms used in our authorities with regard to these passages are many; *tiḳḳun ṣopherim* is only one form out of a dozen. Yet a careful scrutiny leaves us with two formulas only which are ancient, from which all the rest appear to be derived; these two formulas are כינה הכתוב ('the Scripture has employed euphemism')[1] and תיקון סופרים ('scribes' correction')[2]. Now the first thing to be noted is that the latter formula is ambiguous, while the former bears an unmistakable meaning.

[1] *Siphrē*; *Mechilta*; *Ochlah*; Ben Asher; [*Yemen Masorah*; *Tanḥuma*].

[2] *Breshith Rabba*; *Masorah* of Cod. *Bab. Pet.* [and of Yemen]; printed *Masorah*; [*Tanḥuma*].

The phrase 'the Scripture[1] has employed euphemism' is irreconcilable with the theory that the text of Scripture has been altered by transcribers. It means not that a euphemism has been introduced into Scripture, but that it was already found there and noted. The second phrase ת׳ ס 'scribes' correction' stands on different ground. It is ambiguous, and *two* views of its meaning seem to have been taken by the Jews themselves.

According to one view *tiḳḳun ṣopherim* was a *viva voce* correction (or modification) of Scriptural language authorized for homiletic purposes by the Scribes. This seems to be the meaning of the phrase adopted in the printed Masorah and in Ben Asher. The printed Masorah heads its list with the title י״ח מלין בקריאה תקון סופרים, 'the eighteen expressions [which] in reading [are] *tiḳḳun ṣopherim*.' Similarly Ben Asher introduces his list with the remark that *They are not written according to their tiḳḳun, but the wise men of Israel read them with tiḳḳun ṣopherim* (קורין אותם כת׳ ס[2]). The scribes interpret a supposed euphemism, and their interpretation is called *tiḳḳun ṣopherim*.

The other sense given to the phrase *tiḳḳun ṣopherim* seems to be that of a 'change' (mental, not written) made by the original writers or redactors of Scripture. 'Our Rabboth' writes Rashi[3] 'turned back in writing thus' (on Gen. xviii 22), i.e. they recoiled from putting into writing a thought which some of their readers might expect them to express. A number of phrases in which the *tiḳḳun* is connected with Ezra and the Great Synagogue arise, it seems, from this view.

Such phrases are :—

(1) '*Tiḳḳun* of Ezra' (margin of Yemenite Masorah).

(2) '*Tiḳḳun* of Ezra and the scribes' (Cod. Taylor-Schechter, Job [b]).

(3) '*Tiḳḳun* of Ezra and Nehemiah and Zechariah and Haggai and Baruch' (Cod. Taylor-Schechter, Job [a]).

(4) '*Tiḳḳun* of the scribes, even of the men of the Great Synagogue' (*Tanhuma*).

(5) '*Tiḳḳun* of the scribes, or as some say *Tiḳḳun* of Ezra' (*Yemen Masorah*).

[1] The Heb. הכתוב corresponds with the Greek τὸ γεγραμμένον or τὸ γραφέν.

[2] Surely not 'call them *tiḳḳun ṣopherim*.'

[3] Or the editor of Rashi's Commentary, see below, p. 405.

To these may be added:—

(6) 'Ezra made a *tiḳḳun*' (תקן עזרא; *Ochlah* in its heading to the passages).

(7) 'The scribes made a *tiḳḳun*' (Rashi on Job xxxii 3)[1].

Probably the *tiḳḳun* tradition is connected with the tradition which ascribes the redaction of several books of Scripture to the Great Synagogue. According to 4 Esdras xiv 19 ff., Ezra, with five companions, re-wrote under inspiration the Law (the whole Old Testament apparently; *omne quod factum est in saeculo ab initio, quae erant in lege tua inscripta*) which had been burnt, presumably by the Chaldeans. This tradition was a favourite one with the Fathers, from Irenaeus downwards (Bensly-James, *Fourth Book of Ezra, Texts and Studies*, vol. iii, no. 2, p. xxxvii), but in origin it is almost certainly Jewish. Certainly those scholars who disbelieve in the existence of the Great Synagogue ought to feel their belief in the ordinary doctrine of *tiḳḳun ṣopherim* shaken.

(ii) It now remains to examine each instance of *tiḳḳun ṣopherim* by itself, in order to decide by a consideration of external evidence, and of internal probability, whether it is likely that our present text is an altered form, and that the original form is preserved in the *tiḳḳun* tradition.

The first passage to be examined is Gen. xviii 22. It is not marked as *tiḳḳun* in the earliest Midrashim, *Siphrē* and *Mechilta*, but the *Breshith Rabba* (sixth century) xlix 7, has the remark, 'R. Simon said, This is *tiḳḳun ṣopherim*, for the Shechinah was tarrying for Abraham.' The fuller form of the same comment is preserved in the *Midrash Shemoth* (not earlier than the tenth century?) xli 4, 'R. Simon said, Come and see what is written, *And the men rose up from thence and looked toward Sodom* (Gen. xviii 16), &c. It was due [for the Scripture] to say (לא היה צריך לומר אלא), *And the Lord stood yet before Abraham*, but it is *tiḳḳun ṣopherim*.' The tradition quoted in the name

[1] The terms in which *tiḳḳun* (or *kinnui*, as the writer prefers to call it) is described in Ben Asher are at first sight mutually contradictory. The list itself begins thus:—'*And Abraham stood yet.* "And the Lord stood yet" it was, but the Scripture has employed euphemism.' The phrase 'it was' (היה) is, however, probably an abbreviation of the phrase used in *Ochlah*, 'One should have said' (הצ"ל). [Cf. the היה לו יומר of *Mechilta* (on Num. xii 12).] The preface to the list denies that the *ṣopherim* 'blotted out and wrote afresh.'

of R. Simon is to the effect that the author of the text quoted wrote one thing, when it was to be expected that he would have written quite another. He employed euphemism. There is nothing here of a transcriber emending the text which lay before him. The comment of Rashi on this place is based upon R. Simon's tradition, but it is somewhat fuller in wording. Its conclusion runs thus, 'This is *tiḳḳun ṣopherim*; [for our Rabboth made a change ("turned back") in writing thus (שהפכו רבותׁ לכתוב כן[1])].' The bracketed words (the genuineness of which is doubtful), though at first sight they seem to favour the common theory of *tiḳḳun ṣopherim*, will nevertheless bear an explanation which yields no support to the theory. 'Our Rabboth' may be identified with the *ṣopherim* just mentioned, and by the *ṣopherim* we may understand, as has been said above, the original writers or redactors of books of Scripture. The statement that these writers or redactors 'made a change' or 'turned back' in writing ver. 22 b is easy of explanation. After writing that '*the* [*three*] *men*' *went towards Sodom*, the natural continuation was to write, *But the Lord stood yet by* (על[2]) *Abraham*. But something checked the pen before it could write the bold words; there was a *change*, and the Scripture ran, *But Abraham stood yet before the Lord*. Thus since the meaning of the clause is ambiguous and its genuineness doubtful, this comment does not justify us in counting Rashi as a witness for the common theory of *tiḳḳun ṣopherim*. It may be added that the versions (Targum, Peshitta, LXX[3], Vulgate) give no hint of the supposed 'original reading.' A′ Σ′ Θ′ in Field's *Hexapla* are silent. Kautzsch and Socin in their German edition of Genesis (1888), in which the 'Quellenschriften' are distinguished typographically, take the 'original reading' into the text. Delitzsch, however, who had more Rabbinical learning than Kautzsch and Socin, rejects it.

The next instance is Num. xi 15. Here *Siphrē* (ed. Friedmann, p. 25 a) gives the paraphrase, 'Let me not look upon the retribution which is to come *upon them*.' Rashi accordingly writes *in loco*, '*Their wretchedness* (or "*their evil*" ברעתם) one should have written, but the Scripture has employed

[1] Quoted from C. U. Add. 626; the clause is omitted in some MSS, cf. Berliner, *in loco*.

[2] So Rashi (according to C. U. Add. 626). [3] Cod. A; Lucian; *hiat* B.

euphemism; and this is one of the *tiḳḳunē ṣopherim*[1] for the euphemizing and correction (תקון) of the language.' The same writer, however (on Job xxxii 3), has a different remark on the text of Num. xi 15. He writes: '*Thy wretchedness* (or "*Thy evil*" ברעתך) one should have written, but the Scripture has employed euphemism.' Thus we have two 'original readings' offered us by one authority in the place of the present Masoretic reading, *My wretchedness*. The inference can hardly be avoided that *Siphrē* and Rashi are not stating facts, but offering suggestions; they are as it were playing with the text in order to point out that Moses' evil was the people's evil, and that a people's evil was their God's evil. This is plainly the view of Aben Ezra (*in loco*) who points out that the reading *My wretchedness* gives good sense, and then adds 'and there is no need for *tiḳḳun ṣopherim*.' This is not the way in which one would speak of a real variant. Again the versions (Targum, Peshitta[2], Vulgate[3]) give no support to the 'original reading.' LXX B has τὴν κάκωσιν *sine add.*, a reading which may be significant, but cod. A and Lucian have μου, and the Lyons Pentateuch (O. L.) *meam*, in agreement with the M.T. A′ Σ′ Θ′ in Field are silent. The common interpretation of the *tiḳḳun* tradition breaks down hopelessly in this instance. The evidence for classing Num. xi 15 among the *tiḳḳun* (or *kinnui*) passages is very early (*Siphrē* and *Mechilta*), but early evidence fails to prove that a genuine various reading of this verse has been preserved by tradition.

Num. xii 12. On this passage *Siphrē* (ed. Friedmann, p. 28 a) comments as follows:—

'*From the womb of his mother.* [It should be,] "From the womb of *our* mother," but the Scripture has employed euphemism in respect to this phrase. *And half of his flesh is consumed.* "Half of *our* flesh" ought to have been said (היה צריך לומר) in the sense in which that expression is used in the passage, *For he is our brother, our flesh.*'

Rashi (*in loco*) has a similar comment, based no doubt on *Siphrē*. But it is important to note that there is no assertion either in Rashi or in the *Siphrē* of an alteration of the text by early transcribers. The *Siphrē* simply points out that a certain

[1] I omit the word בתורה, 'in the Law,' with C. U. Add. 626.

[2] Verified. *Lee* = B. M. Add. 14425 (A.D. 464); Cod. Ambrosianus; edition of Urmi.

[3] *Ne tantis afficiar malis.*

passage would yield good sense, if read differently from the traditional reading. Such remarks on the text are not uncommon in Midrashim and in the Talmud[1]. That the *tiḳḳun* tradition has here preserved a true various reading is a statement wholly devoid of support. No version preserves the supposed 'original reading.' The *wĕlā nehwē*, with which the Peshitta[2] renders אל תהי, comes probably from the *μὴ γένηται* of the LXX (which often influences the present text of the Peshitta), and should not be rendered (as in Walton's Polyglot) by *et non simus*. The *ἐκ μήτρας μητρός sine add.* and the *σαρκῶν αὐτῆς* of the LXX and the paraphrase of the Targum ('Pray now for the dead flesh which is in her') in no way suggest the בשרנו of the *tiḳḳun*, though they show that the אמו and בשרו of the M.T. gave trouble to translators.

1 Sam. iii 13. Here neither the *Mechilta* nor Rashi asserts that the scribes made an alteration in the text. The latter writes, *in loco* :—

'*Because his sons were cursing them* (להם). *Cursing me* (לי) one ought to have said (היה לו לומר), but the Scripture has employed an euphemism.' [The comment is absent from B. M. Harley 150.]

In this instance the versions offer readings which need some consideration. The Peshitta[3], either paraphrasing להם or reading לעם, gives *were reviling the people*. The Greek (Codd. AB and Lucian), however, is more suggestive ; it reads *κακολογοῦντες θεὸν* [*οἱ*] *υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ*. Similarly Lucifer of Cagliari (a valuable authority for the Old Latin), as cited by Sabatier, gives *Quoniam contemnentes Dominum mala locuti sunt filii eius*. Thus we have Rashi, the LXX, and Lucifer agreeing that the object of the verb *were reviling* is not להם. On the other hand the difference between Rashi and the LXX, and again between the LXX and Lucifer, as to the actual word to be supplied, shows us

[1] 'PLAYING' WITH THE TEXT.—Bab. Talm. *Ḥăgigah* (fol. 13 a) on Prov. xxvii 26 (*The lambs are for thy clothing*) :—'Do not read it *lambs* (כבשים), but *hidden things* (כבושים).'

Bab. Talm. *Shabbath* (fol. 55 a) on Ezek. ix 6 (*and begin at my sanctuary*) :—'Do not read it *at my sanctuary* (מסקדשי) but *at my sanctified ones* (מסקודשי).'

In neither case is the 'emendation' put forward as an existing variant, but simply as an occasion for a particular lesson to be enforced.

[2] Verified. *Lee* = B. M. Add. 14425 ; Cod. Ambrosianus ; edition of Urmi.

[3] *Lee* = Cod. Ambrosianus ; C. U. Add. 1964 ; edition of Urmi.

that their agreement is on a matter of interpretation, not of reading. We can read neither לי with Rashi, nor *θεόν* with the LXX; evidence such as this does not carry us behind the reading מקללים להם.

2 Sam. xvi 12. Rashi's comment on this passage is simply, '*The Lord will look upon my eye*, i. e. upon the tears of my eye' (so Targum). Clearly the commentator did not include this passage in his list of *tiḳḳun ṣopherim*. Neither do the versions testify to the supposed original reading of the passage. LXX (codd. A B [Lucian]) gives *ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει μου* (i. e. בעני[1] for בעיני). Field gives no variants from LXX. The Masorah itself, as represented by the Kri and C'thib, reads for the former *upon my eye*, and for the latter *upon my iniquity* (or *upon my punishment*), and altogether ignores such a reading as *with his eye*. Peshitta[2] and Vulgate agree with LXX.

On 2 Sam. xx 1 Rashi has no note at all. The Peshitta[3], Targum, LXX, and Vulgate, agree with the M.T. No variation from the ordinary text is cited in Field. In 1 Kings xii 16, and in the passage parallel with it, 2 Chron. x 16, the Peshitta[3], Targum, LXX, and Vulgate, give no hint of any reading 'gods' for 'tents.' Field cites no variant from the later Greek versions. Rashi is silent on 1 Kings xii 16; on 2 Chron. x. 16 he has a note, but no mention of *tiḳḳun ṣopherim*.

On Jer. ii 11 neither Rashi nor Ḳimḥi[4] has any note. The LXX, Peshitta[5], Vulgate, and Aquila *apud* Field, agree with the M.T. Theodotion and Symmachus are not cited. The rendering of the Targum seems to represent the כבודו of the M.T., 'They have forsaken my service for the sake of which I bring upon them glory.'

Ezek. viii 17. Rashi has a long note on this passage, but makes no mention of *tiḳḳun*. Ḳimḥi, however, remarks '*Their nose*: it means (רוצה לומר) *my nose*, but the Scripture has employed

[1] So the printed *Masorah* in quoting this passage among the eighteen, though it does not profess to give the 'original reading' of any passage affected by *tiḳḳun ṣopherim*. B. M. Orient. 1379 also has בעני.

[2] *Lee* = Cod. Ambrosianus; C. U. Add. 1964; edition of Urmi.

[3] *Lee* (1 Kings xii 16) = Cod. Ambrosianus; C. U. Add. 1964; edition of Urmi.

[4] Aben Ezra seems not to have commented on Jeremiah.

[5] The reading of *Lee* (here and in the instances in Ezek., Hos., Hab., Zech., and Mal.) has been verified by comparison with Cod. Ambrosianus; C. U. 'Ll. 2. 4' (Edessa, 1173 A.D.); and C. U. Add. 1965 (Nestorian, fifteenth century).

euphemism, and it is one of the eighteen words which are *tiḳḳun ṣopherim*.' The versions give no support to a reading אפי. The LXX (ὡς μυκτηρίζοντες) is perhaps too free a rendering for absolute certainty, but the three later Greek versions *apud* Field, and the Peshitta[1], Targum, and Vulgate support אפם without doubt.

Hos. iv 7. Neither Rashi nor Ḳimḥi makes any mention of a variation here. The LXX and Vulg. agree with the M.T. No variation from the M.T. is recorded in Field from Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. On the other hand the Targum (with which the Peshitta[2] agrees almost *ad literam*) has what is almost a *tiḳḳun* of its own, יקרהון בקלנא חליפו 'they changed their glory for shame.'

Hab. i 12. Rashi writes:—

'The prophet says, And thou, wherefore dost thou keep silence at all this? *Art not thou from everlasting, my God, my Holy One, who diest not* (אשר לא תמות). And this which is written *We shall not die* (לא נמות) is one of the *tiḳḳunē ṣopherim* which are in Scripture, for the Scripture has employed euphemism; cp. (ובן), *And ye have snuffed at it* [Mal. i 13], and there are seven[3] similar instances which are set forth in *Siphrē*. And according to the *tiḳḳun ṣopherim* the interpretation is this, *Art thou not my God from everlasting? My Holy One, give me not for death into his hand.*'

Again LXX and Vulg. agree with M.T., except that with *Siphrē* and *Mechilta* they read ולא for לא. Field gives no Greek variant, but Symmachus, quoted by Jerome, gives 'ut non moreremur' an idiomatic rendering of the Masoretic text.

The Targum, however, reads מימרך קיים לעלמין, which is a paraphrase of לא תמות. [The Peshitta[4], דלא נמום ('without law!'), is probably a corruption of דלא נמות, which should be taken in agreement with the M.T. as a first person plural.] Lastly, it must be noted that *Siphrē* quotes the passage with ולא אמות for לא נמות. If the text were otherwise settled, we might pass over this fresh reading as due simply to inaccurate quotation, but under the circumstances we are bound to take note of it. We are left, then, with three possible readings

[1] Verified; *cf.* note [5], p. 408.
[2] Verified.
[3] B. M. Harley 150 reads וכן ו המה for the הרבה וכן of the printed text.
[4] Verified.

(1) נמוח M.T., LXX, Vulg. [Pesh.?]; (2) תמוח Targum; (3) אמוח *Siphrē*. To these must perhaps be added (4) ימוח *Tanḥuma*[1]. It must be confessed that the weight of the evidence thus displayed is decidedly in favour of the נמוח of the M.T., and the *tiḳḳun* tradition does not turn the scale in favour of תמוח. The Targum contains a Midrashic element, and its reading here is not improbably a Midrashic play on the original reading, viz. that of the Masoretic Text. It should be mentioned here that the tendency to avoid anthropomorphism is far from universal in Talmudic and Rabbinic literature. Sometimes an exactly opposite tendency makes itself strongly felt. Thus in *Siphrī* (ed. Friedmann, 22 b) it is said that when Israel went into exile to 'Edom,' the Shechinah was with them, and when they return *the Shechinah will return* with them.

Zech. ii 12 [8]. Neither Rashi nor Ḳimḥi mentions *tiḳḳun* in connexion with this passage. LXX and Peshitta read עינו 'his eye,' Targum עיניו 'his eyes.' The Vulgate, however (as printed in Stier and Theile), has 'tangit pupillam oculi mei' (i.e. עיני the alleged 'original reading'), but some MSS (affected, perhaps, by the LXX through the Old Latin) read *eius* or *sui* for *mei*. Field cites nothing here from the later Greek versions. It is not uninteresting that *Siphrē*, *Mechilta*, *Shemoth R.* (§ 13), and the printed *Masorah*, together with five [seven] MSS cited by Kennicott, give כנוגע for נוגע, and that LXX has ὡς ἀπτόμενος, and the Targum כרמושים ידיה למיקרב. One spirit of glossing inspired them all.

Mal. i 12. This instance is without visible means of support from versions and commentators. As an interpretation it is correct: *Ye profane it* means *Ye profane my name*, *Ye profane me*.

Mal. i 13. Rashi[2] writes (*in loco*):—

'*Ye say also, Behold a weariness*, i.e. a lean beast and one driven away (ותהלאה), for we were poor and there was no power in our hands to vow choice offerings; and in this sense Jonathan has interpreted, *Behold we brought our fulness* ("the best that we had"). *And ye have snuffed at it* (והפחתם אותו). This is one of the eleven words of *tiḳḳun*. *At me* they pointed [the word] (נקדו[2]), but the Scripture has employed

[1] In *Tanḥuma* most of the passages are quoted in their 'original' form, so that ימח is strictly speaking a variant of תמח.

[2] Emended from B. M. Harley 150, which varies considerably from Bomberg's text (and edit.).

euphemism, and *at it* is written (וכתו' אותו). *And ye have snuffed* [*at it*], i.e. "and ye have made [it] waste away"; [הפחתם] is in the sense of blowing away with the breath. [*Ye have snuffed*] *at me* and at my table.'

This passage suggests no alteration of the consonantal text at all. It tells us that *punctators* (all or some only?) added a point to suggest the reading of י for ו. The written text, however, is clearly stated to be אותו (*at it*); the אותי (*at me*) is simply an unveiling of a supposed euphemism of Scripture. The versions here give an uncertain sound. The Targum, the Vulgate, and Cod. א and Cod. 311 (according to H. P.) of the LXX as well as the Complutensian edition support the Masoretic Text. On the other hand the Peshitta has *w'nephḥēth b'hōn* (Cod. Ambros.), 'And I rejected them' (the sacrificers), or (C. U. 'Ll. 2. 4'; C. U. Add. 1965) *b'hēn* 'them' (the sacrifices). Similarly LXX (ABQΓ) has ἐξεφύσησα αὐτά.

Mal. iii 8, 9. Here the expression אתם קבעים 'ye rob' (R.V.) is supposed to be substituted for the original reading, and it has been supposed that the περιπίζετε (=אתם עקבים) 'ye attack in the rear' or 'ye trip up' of the LXX represents this original reading. But the supposition lacks support; one only of our authorities mentions Mal. iii 8, 9, as a *tiḳḳun* passage at all, and even that one does not give us the alleged displaced reading. It seems, in fact, that the LXX guessed, as do the rest of the versions, at the meaning of a rare and obscure word. A′Σ′Θ′ give ἀποστερεῖτε; Vulgate *configitis*; Peshitta *ṭāl'min* 'ye injure'; Targum מרגזין קדמי 'ye provoke me.' From a passage so obscure it is well to keep out the obscure subject of *tiḳḳun*, since there is so little authority for introducing it.

Ps. cvi 20. Here Rashi (*in loco*) gives no hint of any variation[1], but Aben Ezra writes:—

'*Thus they changed their glory.* An euphemism for *the glory of the Name*[2]; cp. [2 Sam. xii 14] *Because thou hast verily despised* [*the enemies of the Lord*]. And there the euphemistic expression is in reference to David the king by way of reproof; and he said not to him, *Because thou hast verily despised the Name.*'

With this note of Aben Ezra agrees the Targum ופרנן ית איקר ריבוניהון, 'and they changed the glory of their Lord,' but the

[1] But see his comment (quoted below) on Job xxxii 3.

[2] i.e. 'the glory of Jehovah.'

agreement need not necessarily be more than an agreement in interpretation. Aben Ezra does not say anything about a change of *reading*. LXX B, Peshitta, and Vulgate support the M.T. The LXX variant τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ (א ᶜ·ᵃ ART) is probably a corruption introduced from the parallel place (Jer. ii 11). Field is silent.

Job vii 20. On this passage Rashi mentions no variant, but Aben Ezra writes:—

'*So that I am a burden to myself* (עלי). A *tikkun sopherim* although the interpretation is certain (נכון) without a *tikkun*.'

The LXX here stands alone among the versions in supporting the alleged original reading; it reads εἰμὶ δὲ ἐπὶ σοὶ (=עליך) φορτίον. (This σοί may, however, be derived from the σοῦ of the previous clause.) Peshitta, Targum, and Vulgate agree with the M.T. Field is silent.

Job xxxii 3. Here Rashi writes:—

'*And yet they had condemned Job.* This is one of the verses in which the scribes have corrected (תקנו סופרים) the language of Scripture; *and they passed by their silence a condemnatory judgement in reference to the Omnipresent* (וירשיעו כלפי המקום) one ought to have written, but the Scripture has employed euphemism (כינה הכתוב). Compare [Ps. cvi 20], *Thus they changed their glory for the likeness of an ox; my glory* one ought to have written, but the Scripture has employed euphemism[1]. Compare also [Num. xi 15], *And let me not look upon my wretchedness* ("my evil"); *on thy evil* one ought to have written, but the Scripture has employed euphemism. Compare also many places [cited] in *Siphrē* and in the Masorah *magna*.'

Aben Ezra on the other hand (*in loco*) writes:—

'And it is written (וכתוב) that it is an instance of *tikkun sopherim*, but they who say so, know that which has been hidden from me.'

Three of the versions (Peshitta, Targum, and Vulgate) reproduce the M.T., while the LXX gives no support to the supposed original reading, for it has καὶ ἔθεντο αὐτὸν εἶναι ἀσεβῆ, with the variant εἰσεβῆ, which is plainly a secondary reading. A′Σ′Θ′ *apud* Field are silent.

Lam. iii 20. Neither Rashi nor Aben Ezra (whose commentary on Lamentations, however, is rather slight) mentions

[1] This whole sentence is omitted in the *Fürth* Bible (anno 565 = 1805 A. D.).

a variant. The versions, Peshitta, Targum, LXX, and Vulgate, support the M.T. There is nothing in Field to support the *tiḳḳun*.

Conclusion.

I have already drawn tentatively (p. 402) the conclusion that the *tiḳḳun* tradition is not Masoretic (i. e. textual), but Midrashic (i. e. exegetical, or, more accurately, homiletic). This conclusion was based on the nature of the documents in which the *data* of the subject are contained; it is supported further by the consideration of each passage in detail. There is no confirmatory evidence in favour of the 'original reading' of Gen. xviii 22. Of Num. xi 15 the utmost which can be said is that the reading of LXX B throws a slight doubt on the M. T. In Num. xii 12 the two 'original readings' are impossible as readings, possible only as flights of homiletic fancy. In 1 Sam. iii 13 the M. T. is probably corrupt, and the tradition of the *ṣopherim* may be said to be no worse than the emendations of the Peshitta and the A. V. The reading restored in 2 Sam. xvi 12 is simply a homiletic fancy. The 'original reading' alleged in the group of passages consisting of 2 Sam. xx 1; 1 Kings xii 16; 2 Chron. x 16 is merely a theological reflexion. A similar remark may be made regarding the group, Jer. ii 11; Hos. iv 7; Ps. cvi 20. In Ezek. viii 17 the obscurity of the heathen rite alluded to has opened the door to the play of fancy. In Hab. i 12 we get a very early and very daring homiletic flight; that is all. In Zech. ii 12 [8] the meaning of the M. T. and of the 'original reading' is the same in substance, only if we read עיני we introduce a change of speaker between שלחני and the end of the verse; no 'reverence' is saved by the עיו of the M. T. As regards Mal. i 12 and 13 and Job xxxii. 3 the *tiḳḳun* tradition is simply theological comment. Mal. iii 8, 9 is an instance too obscure to be discussed further. Job vii 20 is a difficult passage which the 'original reading' makes more difficult still. Lam. iii 20, according to the M. T., yields satisfactory sense, no other reading has any support from the versions.

The whole evidence leads us back to the play of homiletic fancy on Zech. ii 12 [8] (*Siphrē, Mechilta, Tanḥuma*, Cod. *Bab. Pet.*) and to a parallel play of the same fancy on Num. xi 15; xii 12 (printed and Yemen *Masorah*). The homiletic commentators found

parallels for these first three passages, and passage was linked with passage until the chain was long. Next the purpose of the list was misunderstood in some quarters and the list was introduced (but by no means invariably[1]) into Masoretic works, at first as an appendix[2]. Scholars like Abén Ezra, Ben Asher, and Ben Addereth protested against popular notions regarding *tiḳḳun ṣopherim*, but the list when once placed among the traditions of *Masorah* continued to be misunderstood and the effects of the mistake are with us to-day.

W. EMERY BARNES.

[1] *Not* in the Halle MS. of *Ochlah*. [2] Ben Asher.

NOTE I. Dr. Schechter has pointed out to me that the number 'eighteen' appears in *Shemoth Rabba* v 5 as the number of the places which the LXX translators 'changed for Ptolemy the king.' Elsewhere these alterations are reckoned at 'thirteen' or 'fifteen,' and not more than *fifteen* instances are ever specified. From this and many other like facts 'eighteen' would seem to be a merely symbolic number.

NOTE II. Dr. Schechter kindly allows me to make use of a MS in his own possession (*Bamidbar*, paper, 23 lines to a page, 10½ in. × 7¾in., foll. 242) of the *Midrash Haggadol*, of which he is preparing an edition ('*M. H.* edited from Yemen MSS by S. S., Camb. University Press'). It is cited in Table VI as *Mid. Gad.* It agrees in the list (foll. 70 b, 71 a) of *tiḳḳun* passages in contents (but not in order) with *Mechilta*, except that it has 1 Kings xii 16 instead of 2 Sam. xx 1, and that it omits Num. xi 15. This last passage should perhaps be added to the text of *Mid. Gad.* to make up the number *eleven*, for the Midrash *in loco* (fol. 62 a, line 7) seems to base its comment on the reading ברשום. Unlike *Mechilta* the *Midrash Haggadol* adds in its list the 'original reading' of each passage. Like *Yalkut* it cites with the formula, 'Similarly thou sayest' (כיוצא בו אתה אומ').