

This list in G. 1, as far as it concerns the first 41 Psalms, I have carefully copied for purposes of my own study. There are 56 instances of differences. *In only 16 of these* do the differences as given by Dr Ginsburg agree with those in the list in G. 1, which he says he has “printed”. In the remaining 40 the divergences are often extreme, extending even to *the exact opposite*, what belongs in G. 1’s list to the one authority being assigned in Ginsburg’s list to the other. I hope eventually to publish G. 1’s list *as it stands* for the whole of Psalms.

§ 23. The Colophon of G. 1 is found at the end of Chronicles, vol. 2, fol. 291a (*not* 290, as stated by Dr Ginsburg: what should have been fol. 259 was accidentally left unnumbered by him). It is given in Gi’s *Introd.* p. 741, with two misprints, **אויגיון** and **וברומים**. I give it here in the lines as found in the MS—shewing also the *fill-up* in l. 3 (as often found in the text of G. 1), and the curious mark following the final word in l. 8.

נכתבה זאת המקדשיאה פה אויגיון על יד  
הצעיר אשטרוק ראשקולה והיתה השלמתה  
ביום חמשי לחדש שבט שנת קעט לפרט ז  
האלף הששי השם יוכני להגות בה וברומים  
לה אני וזרעי וזרע זרעי עד סוף כל הדורות  
כדבר שנאמ לא ימוש ספר התורה הזה מפיו  
והגית בו יומם ולילה למען תשמור לעשות  
ככל הכתוב בו כי אז תצליח את דרכך ואז תשכיל

“This sacred book has been written at Avignon by the humble Astruc d’Escola, and it is finished on the fifth day of the month Shebat in the year 5179 [= Jan. 2nd, 1419 A.D.]. May the LORD graciously enable me to meditate in it and in books like unto it, me and my children and my children’s children to the end of all generations—according as it is said, ‘This book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is written therein: for then thou shalt make thy way prosperous, and then thou shalt have good success.’”

INTRODUCTION

xviii

declared war upon his employer), published at Brunswick in 1783, the first few lines of the Colophon of 425 (= *G. 1*), shewing the date, are given, on p. 487, in exceedingly careless fashion.

Before my own second volume appears, I hope to be in a position to give a fuller history of the fortunes of *G. 1*. Along with other Biblical MSS, *G. 1* was bought from Dr Ginsburg by Mr Aldis Wright, Vice-Master of Trinity, and was given by him to the College in 1912. Its class-mark now is *WAW Heb. 11*. It is in two volumes small folio (10 $\frac{3}{8}$  × 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ —size of page as cut down by binder), the contents of the second volume being wrongly bound up by the modern binder, so that the Latter Prophets have been made to follow Chronicles. A description of the MS will be found in Dr Ginsburg's *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible* (1897), pp. 734—743. Readers must, however, be warned that this work contains an extraordinary number of inaccuracies and misstatements. Any one making use of it without carefully checking *all* Dr Ginsburg's citations, lists, tables, and references generally, will find himself landed in *chaos* when confronted with the actual facts. Thus, dealing with *G. 1*, we read on p. 734, "The order of the books is that exhibited in column VI of the Table on page 7"—a statement supported by the listing of *G. 1* in the 'Table of Manuscripts Described' following p. 1028. But the facts of the case are that the order of the Hagiographa is that exhibited in column VIII of the Table on page 7—viz. Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra-Nehemiah, Chronicles. Assuming that Dr Ginsburg's description of the order of the Hagiographa in the other MSS used by him in his *Introduction* is correct, *G. 1* is *alone* among the MSS used by him in having this order. Among the early printed editions the same order is found only in the editions of Felix Pratensis (Venice 1517) and of Ben Chayim (Venice 1524–25), and in Bomberg's first Quarto (1517). The five Megilloth are in the same order among themselves, *but follow the Pentateuch*, in the following editions: Soncino 1488, Naples 1491–93, Brescia 1492–94, Peraro 1511–17, and Bomberg's second and third Quartos, Venice 1521 and 1525. Finally, this is also the order, Megilloth following Pentateuch in the one MS—*Add. 9398*, Gi's (*Introduction*) *No. 11*—which in the Table following p. 1028 is, *wrongly*, given as having the Hagiographa as in 'column VIII on p. 7.' Any one comparing these facts with Dr Ginsburg's Tables on pp. 4, 7, and following p. 1028, in his *Introduction*, will marvel at how much can be done in the way of confusion in Tables of reference!

§ 22. A more serious discrepancy, and one not so easily to be accounted for, must be briefly dealt with. In Dr Ginsburg's account of the various important documents which precede the text in the first volume of *G. 1* we find (*Introd.* p. 742, l. 27 f.):

"(16) complete Lists of the differences between Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali throughout the Bible indicating the precise nature of the variations ׀; [should be ' ; ׀'] §§ 589—617, I 571—591."

The list for Psalms is to be found in Gi's *Massorah*, vol. 1, p. 584, ׀ § 607. See also vol. 4, p. 413, ׀ § 607, "My own MS No. 1, fol. 9b—10b, which I have printed."

(b) Methegh and Ga'ya apparently also sometimes contained in themselves the implication of a following *accent* in the same word—such accent being therefore not marked. Probable instances of this may be seen in Ps. 2, 3 : 9, 4 : 27, 12 : 29, 5 : 30, 12 : 31, 12, 25 : 33, 18 : 37, 33.

§ 19. But it is in its *accents* that the unique value of G. 1 among Hebrew MSS will be eventually demonstrated. This is not the place for a disquisition on the accents : but a few sentences must be written.

From the first day (July 12th, 1917) upon which I first handled this manuscript, I have been studying its accentual schemes. These, moreover, were partially known to me for more than a year before the date mentioned, as revealed in the course of careful investigation into the accentual notes of Dr Ginsburg's edition of the Psalms (1913). Although there are still some puzzles which I do not pretend to have solved, I should be ready, now, to produce irrefutable evidence that the Poetical Accents of G. 1 throughout Psalms follow definite rules, and that those rules are nearer to the exigencies of the utterance of the voice of reciter (and singer ?) than are the rules of the modern editions, of Ginsburg, Wickes, Baer and other teachers of the last century—even than the rules which governed the eclectic edition of Ben Chayim himself. I am hopeful that, before I have done all which I have it in my mind to do with G. 1 and the Poetical Accents, I shall have been successful in stirring up some younger scholars to embark boldly on the study of these accents, *as found in the MSS*. Such study would result at an early date in the discovery that in the matter of the Poetical Accents the principal surviving MSS fall for the most part into readily defined groups. Analysis of Dr Ginsburg's notes (which, it must be said, are not to be relied on either for their accuracy or for their comprehensiveness) has shewn me that G. 1 is a Prince among an important group of MSS. But it was the independent fashion in which, in certain accentual crises, G. 1 breaks away from its group, to coalesce often with some famous MS from another group, which led me to decide that if ever the way was opened for me to edit a manuscript, G. 1 should be my choice : this decision being arrived at *before* I had seen G. 1.

§ 20. When, through the kind hand stretched out to me by the Managers of the Hort Memorial Fund, I was encouraged to give effect to my plans, a somewhat prolonged search resulted in the discovery of G. 1 in the library of my own college—a piece of scholar's good fortune which is I think worthy of being recorded here.

§ 21. G. 1 was so named by Dr Ginsburg. I have discovered an episode in the history of the MS which was apparently unknown to him. It is identical with *Kenn. 425*. In, or shortly after, the year 1770 it was examined for Kennicott by Paul Jacob Bruns—being then in the possession of D. Bonfils, a Jew, at Leghorn. The examination would appear to have been perfunctory, as in the First Book of Psalms (Kenn.'s vol. 2) 425 is only occasionally cited, and many of its most important variants in the consonantal text (with which alone Kenn. is concerned) have not been noticed. In the edition of Kennicott's *Dissertatio Generalis* with introduction, notes and additions by Bruns (who thereby

INTRODUCTION

xvi

cf. Ex. 21, 19 יִרְפָּא יִרְפָּא : Ps. 40, 2 קִוָּה קִוִּיתִי :  
I K. 19, 10 קָנָא קָנִיתִי : Ps. 118, 18 יִפְרֵי יִפְרֵנִי (Ges-K § 52, o).

(2) Ps. 34, 10 G. 1 יִרְאֵי, Ginsburg יִרְאֵי (Ges-K § 75, oo). G. 1 has the *same* form in Josh. 24, 14 יִרְאֵי (a later hand has added a dot (י)). But note the *position* of the accent), and in I Sam. 12, 24 יִרְאֵי (untouched by corrector). The *Imperative* is undoubtedly intended, the א retaining its consonantal value, as in Jer. 6, 16 וּמִצָּאֵי in the accepted text. I should cite this form of the imperative, יִרְאֵי, as among the many evidences in support of the statement that the vowels of G. 1 are according to a very ancient tradition. For the form יִרְאֵי has every appearance of being of the nature of an artificial device, with the purpose of avoiding confusion with the *impf.* יִרְאֵי = ‘they shall see.’

§ 17. (a) Investigation of what are at first sight the astonishing interchanges in G. 1 between = and ̣, and between ̣ and ̤, leads to the conclusion that here also we are dealing with ancient tradition: that the vowel-points in G. 1 are at an early stage of their history, at a stage when, in close connexion with the accentuation, and following definite rules laid down for the reciter (and singer?), = for ̣, and ̣ for ̤ marked in each case a *quicken*ing (or shortening), while ̣ for =, and ̤ for ̣ marked in each case a *slowing-down* (or lengthening) in the utterance. A MS of the Psalms, of the year 1300, having many of the same peculiarities, is discussed, with lists from some Psalms, by Cyrus Adler, in *Hebraica* 1, pp. 80—95.

(b) In the same connexion the startling variations from modern rules as to the uses of daghesh remain to be studied. See, for example, the instances of *daghesh lene omitted* though following a strong (‘disjunctive’) accent, in Ps. 6, 2 : 14, 6 : 18, 37 : 21, 7 : 22, 7, 10, 30 : 24, 9 : 26, 11 : 37, 33.

(c) Here too belongs the study of the not infrequent unexpected shiftings of tone (e.g. Ps. 30, 10 הִיוֹדֵךְ : 36, 13 דָּרְחוֹ : 40, 11 וְתִשְׁעֶתְךָ אֲמוֹנֶתְךָ).

(d) I am accumulating much evidence from other MSS of repute on all these matters, but it will be obvious that it is my first duty to publish the whole text of Psalms from G. 1, which may then serve as a centre for a complete investigation.

(e) The whole question, *What is in the MSS?*, with regard to these and kindred matters, calls insistently for reconsideration.

§ 18. (a) Space here can only be afforded for a mere reference to the not uncommon absence of Maḳḳeph following a word with Methegh (or Ga‘ya) alone. This absence of Maḳḳeph occurs also occasionally in the lists of Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali’s differences in vol. 1 of G. 1 : and it also survives, *not* I think as a mere printer’s error, in the text of Ben Chayim’s edition.

INTRODUCTION

Ps.	G. 1	Modern Text	Where corrected in G. 1
19, 10	צדק	צדקו	Text
22, 17	כערי	כארי	Text
27, 7	חנני	וחנני	Text
31, 8	עני	עניי	Text
35, 6	דרנך	דרנם	Text
36, 2	לי	לבי	Margin
12	om.	אל (2°)	Text
37, 1	ואל	אל (2°)	Text
5	על יהוה	עליו	uncorrected
19	צרה	רעה	Margin
39, 8	יהוה אדני	אדני	Text
41, 4	וכל	כל	Text

(b) Readers will be able to study in my printed text the various ways in which the variants have been corrected.

(c) Of great importance is the uncorrected variant in Ps. 37, 5 **על יהוה**. This is supported by the fact that among the 31 instances of **על יהוה**, listed in Ginsburg’s *The Massorah*, vol. 2, p. 399, letter ע—§ 436, **ובטח** is given, while **גול** is *not* given.

(d) Variants in the form of words may be studied in Ps. 1, 4 : 2, 2 : 5, 5, 11 : 6, 4, 8 : 7, 8 : 8, 2, 10 : 9, 2 : 10, 14, 15 : 13, 6 : 15, 3 : 16, 10, 11 : 17, 3, 7 : 18, 6, 7, 43, 46, 47 : 19, 15 : 22, 3, 8 : 23, 4 : 24, 7 : 25, 3, 4, 7, 18, 22 : 26, 2 : 27, 4, 6, 13 : 29, 6 : 30, 2 : 31, 5, 16, 20, 21 : 32, 10 : 33, 11 : 34, 21 : 35, 5, 6 : 36, 12 : 37, 2, 9, 24, 39 : 38, 7, 9 : 40, 3.

(e) It is my intention eventually to publish full lists and analyses of *all* variants.  
(f) When the whole Five Books of Psalms in the Text of G. 1 have been published, but not before, I hope to give full lists shewing support for G. 1’s variants (of all kinds) from MSS and versions.

§ 16. (a) A glance at any page of the text will shew that G. 1’s peculiarities as regards *the vowels* are many and various. It is my intention eventually to publish full lists and analyses.  
(b) Meanwhile, two words of special importance must be recorded here.

(1) Ps. 7, 6 G. 1 **יִרְדֵּף**, Ginsburg (1913) **יִרְדֵּף**. Either form might no doubt be explained, as **יִרְדֵּף** (so given) is explained in Ges-Kautzsch, *second* Engl. Ed. (1910), § 63, n, “as a *forma mixta*, combining the readings **יִרְדֵּךְ** (impf. Qal) and **יִרְדֵּף** (impf. Pi’el).” But perhaps the clue to the original text is given us by G. 1 (alone among the MSS cited by Gi., see his note). May not **יִרְדֵּף** be a conflation of an original **יִרְדֵּף** or even **יִרְדֵּף יִרְדֵּף** ?

INTRODUCTION xiv

§ 13. I have explained my use of *red* at the beginning of § 4. But it is obvious that in many cases, especially those in which single dots, lines, or accents are concerned, critics of the actual text of the MS would differ very widely as to what could rightly be called ‘additions to the original schemes,’ and as to what is the work of later hands. I can only say that in all cases the *red* represents my present opinion as to these things, an opinion arrived at after a good spell of patient work.

And it will, I think, be agreed that there is much to be gained from the appearance of the text of G. I exactly transcribed, but presented in such fashion that students may at once see what are the probabilities as well as the certainties with regard to the doings of the later hands which have meddled with it.

§ 14. Passing now to a short preliminary survey of some of the peculiarities of the original (completed) text of G. I—Words without accent or methegh are found in Ps. 1, 1\*: 2, 5: 4, 1: 5, 5, 9: 6, 5: 9, 14: 10, 6 (two with makḳeph), 13\*, 14: 11, 1: 14, 6: 17, 3, 9, 10, 11: 18, 3, 10, 13, 29 (two), 47, 51 (two with makḳ.): 20, 3: 21, 7 (two with makḳ.): 22, 12, 18 (two with makḳ.): 27, 11: 28, 1: 32, 4, 5, 6, 10: 33, 16 (two with makḳ.): 34, 19, 20: 35, 6, 13, 15, 23, 26: 36, 1, 2, 7: 37, 4\*, 14 (two with makḳ.), 19, 35 (two): 38, 14 (two), 21: 39, 8\*, 10, 11, 13: 40, 4, 18: 41, 4.

\* unpointed (אשרי Ps. 1, 1 illuminated).

Careful investigation has led me to the belief that in most cases the absence of accent was intended as an expression of doubt as to the word’s correctness. In cases of words without Šilluḳ, however, I have supplied that accent in blue excepting in Ps. 31, 25 (לִיהוָה—see § 18 (b)): 37, 33 (בְּהַשְׁפִּטוּ—see as for last), 35 (בְּאִזְרוֹחַ רֵעֵנִי), as intentionally left without accents).

§ 15. (a) Important variants in Consonantal Text of G. I.

Ps.	G. I	Modern Text	Where corrected in G. I.
5, 8	כרב	ברב	Text
9, 14	חנני	חננני	Text
19	עניים	ענוים	Text
10, 9	om.	עני (2°)	Margin
13	בל	לא	Margin
12, 3	אל	את	uncorrected
14, 6	את יהוה	יהוה	uncorrected
18, 16	מגערת	מגערתך	Text
26	ועם	עם (2°)	Text
27	תתבר	תתברר	Text
	תתפל	תתפתל	Text
19, 7	עד	על	uncorrected

of the accepted text, is eloquent testimony to the good fortune of the MS during the five hundred and one years of its existence.

§ 9. Maḳḳeph is apparently added in Ps. 4, 3 : 8, 2 : 14, 4 : 18, 1 (twice) : 22, 21 : 38, 3.

§ 10. (a) Two accents have been gratuitously, *and* very roughly, added to a word followed by Maḳḳeph in Ps. 27, 4 (a verse in which some late corrector has been busy) : one accent has been similarly added in Ps. 34, 19.

(b) Attempted alterations of accents, without erasure and very clumsily done, are found in

Ps. 5, 11* (Rebhîa into Azla)	Ps. 28, 8 (Azla (?) into Tsinnoreth)
10, 14 (Azla into Pazer)	29, 9 (Munach into Gilgal)
18, 1* (Rebhîa into Azla)	35, 14 (Ṭiphcha into Munach).
21, 10 (Azla into Pazer)	

\* Paṣeḳ has been added.

(c) A double accentuation results from additions in Ps. 4, 3 (?—see § 4 (h)) : 10, 5\* : 11, 3 : 12, 5 (?—see § 4 (h)) : 16, 5 (in two words) : 27, 4, 6 : 28, 4 : 40, 3.

\* Paṣeḳ has been added.

(d) By addition Yoredh alone has become ‘Olehweyoredh in Ps. 27, 3, while in verse 2 ‘Oleh has been added on the same syllable, which originally was accented with Yoredh only.

§ 11. (a) What may be called an accentual Paṣeḳ has, apparently, been added, following a Meḥuppach, in Ps. 24, 4 : 27, 4 : 31, 23 : 41, 7. In all these cases in Gi.’s ‘Psalms’ (1913) the Paṣeḳ appears (in Ps. 41, 7 following an Azla).

(b) A Paṣeḳ has been added, following a Munach, in Ps. 18, 31\*\* : 27, 5\* : 32, 5, 9\*\* : 40, 17\*. In all these, excepting Ps. 32, 5, Gi.’s text has this Paṣeḳ with ‘\*’ Azla or ‘\*\*’ Meḥuppach preceding.

(c) A Paṣeḳ has been added, following a Rebhîa, in Ps. 5, 5\*\* : 8, 3\* : 16, 9\*\*, 10\*\* : 18, 13 : 21, 5\*\* : 22, 25 (Rebhîa Mugrash) : 25, 7\* : 29, 9\* : 31, 3\*, 8, 14\* : 32, 2, 8\*, 10 : 35, 10\* : 38, 12\* : 39, 2, 4\* : 40, 3\*\*, 4\*, 7\*, 10\*.

\* Gi. has Paṣeḳ following Azla.

\*\* „ „ Meḥuppach.

(d) A Paṣeḳ has been added, following an ‘Oleh, in Ps. 2, 12 (see § 4 (b)).

(e) A Paṣeḳ has been added, following a word left without accent in Ps. 32, 4 (§ 4 (a)) : 35, 13, 26 : 36, 1, 7 : 39, 13 : 40, 4, 18.

N.B. I have marked in red *all* Paṣeḳs which come under the categories in (b), (c), (d), and (e) in this §.

§ 12. (a) Mappiḳ is added by a later hand, according to *modern* fashion in the letter, in Ps. 35, 8 (G. 1’s method is מ).

(b) The Raphe-stroke is added by a later hand in Ps. 16, 10 : 38, 18.

d

INTRODUCTION xii

Good support can be adduced for either of these, but I have not been able to find any support for the omission of **אי**, which seems involved in either alternative.

(d) And in one place, Ps. 22, 17—see Frontispiece—the sponging-out both in the consonantal text and in the marginal note has been so inefficiently done that the original word can be discovered. This word was **כערי** (i.e. **כַּעְרִי**, Inf. Abs. or **כַּעְרִי** partic.). Against this a contemporary hand noted in the margin **ע**, i.e. ‘Dele **ע**’, an instruction to the (? official) corrector. **כערי** was accordingly altered to **כארי**, but the preparatory obliteration had not been complete. Bits of the original **ע** are to be seen as part of the **א**. Notice carefully the right-hand stroke at the top, and the left-hand stroke towards the bottom, of this **א**, and compare the whole letter with normal **א**’s on the same page.

The **ע** of the note was disguised even more clumsily. Apparently no obliteration was done, but strokes were added across the **ע** with a view to its appearing as **ב**, and below it **קָמַ** was added, to make the usual Masoretic note at this place, **קָמַ** = ‘twice with *kamets*.’ But the corrector forgot to substitute the normal **⏟** (in the MS a short *vertical* stroke) for the original ‘Dele’-mark **⸀**, which therefore remains above the manipulated letter.

**כערי ידי ורגלי** = Aquila’s first rendering, *ἡσχυναν χεῖράς μου καὶ πόδας μου*. Cf. also **מה הוא ידי ורגלי אמרו עשו לה**, ed. S. Buber (Krakau, 1897), p. 53 **אגדת אסתר**. **כשפים וכיערו אותה לפני אחשורום**. It will be apparent that the question originally ran **מה הוא כערו ידי ורגלי**. And it would be instructive if we could learn what were the circumstances in which the word **כערו** has disappeared. (See Dr Taylor’s *Cairo Genizah Palimpsests*, p. 41.) A participle of the same verb **כער** is found in Ben Sirach 13, 22

**עשיר מדבר ועזרין רבים ודבריו מכוערין מופין :**

(see Schechter and Taylor, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 1899, p. 49) : and perhaps also 11, 2

**ואל תתעב אדם מכווער במראהו :**

O. G. Tychsen, in his *Tentamen* (Rostock, 1772), says, p. 73—‘Ps. 22, 17 **כארי** sicut Leo *καρι*. LXX *ᾠρυξαν* foderunt **כרו** *καρυ*. Aqu. *ἡσχυναν* **כערו** foedarunt.’

(e) Very visible *erasures* may be seen, marked by me with a red \* in Ps. 3, 7: 9, 14: 10, 15: 25, 16: 27, 13: 31, 21: 35, 6. In all these I believe the erasures to be the work of quite modern hands: *how modern* in the first passage cited, may be proved by the fact that, in altering **שְׁתִּי** to **שְׁתִּי**, the modern form of the accent Munach has been used!

§ 8. Alterations of vowel-points, accompanying obliterations, have been already noted in Ps. 9, 14 (§ 5 (a)): 18, 27 (two words § 5 (c) (2)). Notice also the single stroke drawn through the curious vowel in Ps. 41, 3, **וְאֵלֶּה**. The comparative rarity of such alterations, in view of the great number of divergences in the vowels of G.1 from those

In the last case, while the vowel-point in the place as shewn seems to be original, the first ם certainly is not—no room was left for it.

With these must be included the resultant םִנְנִי (ם added) in Ps. 9, 14 given under (a).  
(2) in the text small (no room being available for a full sized letter), suspended over the text, or, more or less suspended, *at the end of the line* (\* in the list which follows). The more important original readings of G. I are given for reference—Ps. 10, 8\*, 14: 13, 6\*: 14, 6\* אֶת (see my note in *Journal of Theol. Stud.* XIX, p. 277): 18, 16 מְנַעֲרַת, 27 תִּתְבָּר and תִּתְפַּל (as in || 2 Sam. 22, 27)—note the survival in the text, after correction, of the tell-tale daghesh in the second ת in the last word, 46\*, 47: 19, 10: 31, 6, 12\*, 16: 35, 5: 39, 2 (twice\*): 41, 4\* (two letters).

(3) In Ps. 36, 12, written small at the end of the line, and outside its proper limits, the word אֶל has been added, making G. I's וַיֵּרֶשְׁעוּם תִּגְדְּנִי conform to Masoretic requirements.

§ 6. (a) Later hands have added in the margin orthodox substitutes for the un-orthodox words in the text

Ps.	text	margin
10, 13	בָּל	לֹא
36, 2	לִי	לִבִּי
37, 19	צָדִיק	רַעַה
39, 1	לִידִיתוֹן	לִידוֹתוֹן

These two are by a modern hand.

(b) Also in at least one place, Ps. 38, 21, the notice in the margin of a redundant וְאֵן is by a modern hand.

§ 7. (a) The problem of obliteration, whether by sponging-out (? with the help of chemicals) or by erasure, is a very difficult one. In the text of G. I there are a good many places in which appearances point towards something having been rewritten *or* written over something else which had first been obliterated.

(b) When there is no clue to what was there first, it has seemed superfluous to mark the suspected letters by the use of red. I have therefore done so in only one case of this kind, Ps. 22, 12 כִּי צָר *printed in red*, which can be studied in the Frontispiece.

(c) But there is one passage in which the sponging-out has not been quite completed. In Ps. 27, 6 the first line appears as

וְעֵתָה יְרוֹם רֹאשִׁי עַל אֵיבִי

My skeleton ש representing what appears in the MS as a distinct though shadowy letter (*with* its dot). Did G. I's line originally shew

וְעֵתָה הִנֵּה יְרוֹם רֹאשִׁי עַל  
*or* וְעֵתָה יְרוֹם יְהוֹה רֹאשִׁי עַל ?

INTRODUCTION

x

(h) Perhaps another private scholar’s mark may be seen in Ps. 19, 10 מִשְׁפָּטֵי־יְהוָה. But here and in 4, 3 לְכַלְפָּה and 12, 5 לְלִשְׁנֵינוּ (the last two are listed by me in § 10 (c) as cases of double accentuation), the dechi-like mark *may be* an ancient form of Methegh, or euphonic Ga’ya, and as such may be part of the original scheme: note that in each case the vowel — follows.

(i) A curious variant from the usual °, calling attention to the margin, ° (°) occurs twice, Ps. 36, 2: 37, 19. The form of the mark and the ink used betray its late origin.

§ 5. Of much more importance are corrections of the consonantal text.

(a) Letters have been altered:

Ps. 5, 8	כָּרַב	altered to	כָּרַב
9, 14	הִנְנִי	„	הִנְנִי (no accent visible)
19	עֲנִים	„	עֲנִים
22, 17	כַּעֲרִי	„	כַּאֲרִי
26, 2	צָרִיפָה	„	צָרוּפָה
35, 6	דִּרְכָּךְ	„	דִּרְפָּם

This last correction, with the necessary erasure, has been clumsily done by a very late (quite modern) hand. The point over the כ, already noticed in § 4(a), had at an early date called attention to the error (p) of the scribe. כַּאֲרִי, Ps. 22, 17 (see Frontispiece) is dealt with in § 7 (d).

(b) Letters in the text (other than those noted in the margin by official קרי or יתיר) have been marked as redundant:

(1) with a mark, <, affixed to the inside of the letter. So in Ps. 5, 5: 10, 14 (should be shewn as <י): 12, 5: 17, 7: 18, 26\*: 29, 6: 30, 2: 33, 11 (twice): 37, 1\*: 41, 4\*. Of special importance are the three marked \*, where the letter concerned is an initial י, left unpointed by the original hand. A similar mark, but pointing the other way, is found in the centre of each of the three letters in Ps. 37, 19 צָרָה —marking the whole word as wrong.

(2) with two lines drawn through the letter concerned. So in Ps. 6, 4: 27, 13: 35, 6.

(3) with one line through the word, as wrong, in Ps. 36, 2.

(c) Consonants have been added—

(1) in the text full size:

Ps. 27, 7	הִנְנִי	made into	וְהִנְנִי
31, 8	עֲנִי	„	עֲנִי (sic)
37, 9	יִרְשׁוּ	„	יִירְשׁוּ

contemporary, are, as shewn by me : Ps. 2, 6 מִלְכִּי : 7, 1 שִׁנְיֹן : 10, 14 חִלְכָּה (perhaps, but I am doubtful as to the intention, and the date, of the mark here : its shape is not quite regular, and it may have been meant for ם, mark for ‘*Dele hoc*’—or it may have been accidental) : 11, 1 לְרֹד : 27, 11 יְהוָה : 32, 4 כִּי : 35, 6 דְּרַפָּם (this word, when marked over the כ, stood as דְּרַפְּךָ; the erasure and alterations are by a modern hand) : 38, 11 גַּם־הֵם : 39, 10 כִּי. It will be seen that in four instances the word so marked is without accent. In all cases I believe that the mark is intended to throw doubt on the correctness of the marked word.

(b) A much slighter mark above the line occurs Ps. 2, 12 פִּירִיאָנָה : 5, 6 אֶן : 31, 15 (twice in) וְאֲנִי : 35, 15 (with an added stroke) נֶאֱסָפוּ. These are perhaps all by one hand, later than the hand concerned in the marks of the preceding list, but having the same intention. Thus doubt is thrown in the first instance on the correctness of the Paṣeḳ (itself, as I think, not the work of the original hand, see § 11 (d)), and in the other two instances on the correctness of the marked word. Notice that in the last case the word is unaccented.

(c) Another critic of the text has placed a small dot below the word. This may be seen in Ps. 5, 4 : 18, 5, 16 (twice) : 19, 14 : 25, 8 : 31, 14 : 32, 5 : 35, 23 : 37, 19. I believe these dots to have been made by a private scholar, marking words which he considered to be worthy of special attention or scrutiny. They may be described as modest and unobtrusive.

(d) Two strokes above the line, ם, the work of an early hand, occur Ps. 10, 13 בָּל : 19, 2 יָדִי : preceding 26, 1 כֹּ : preceding 37, 3 וְהִתְעַנֵּנּוּ : these two in the centre of vacant lines at foot of columns : 39, 8 יְהוָה.

(e) One stroke above the line occurs in Ps. 2, 5 וּבְחֶרְוֹנוֹ : 10, 14 יָתוֹם (perhaps—but this may be an accent—cf. Ps. 35, 2) : 37, 7 בְּאִישׁ.

(f) One *broken* stroke occurs in Ps. 10, 9 בְּמִשְׁכּוֹ, calling attention to the omission of עָנִי (added in margin). This seems to be the work of the same hand which has placed the broken stroke above the number of each Psalm in the margin. See the marking of Ps. 22 in the Frontispiece.

(g) Also by this same hand seems to be the one instance of ץ (= ‘something missing’ ?) in Ps. 37, 36 וַיַּעֲבֵר יְהוָה. Evidence as to what word was supposed to be missing is supplied, curiously enough, by another MS in Trinity Library, R. 8. 6, = *Kenn.* 97, which has וַיַּעֲבֵר יְהוָה (alone among the MSS, acc. to *Kenn.*).

INTRODUCTION

viii

of (apparently) flagrant error, Ps. 41, 3 וְאֶל־תִּתְּנֶהוּ, וְאֶל for וְאֵל, to which it has been altered by a stroke of a modern pen, as shewn in my text.

The error of a word twice written occurs twice: viz. Ps. 2, 5, וּבְחֶרְוֹנוֹ, the last word of a column, being repeated as the first word of the next column—and Ps. 38, 14, לֵא repeated in similar circumstances. In each case the word as repeated is pointed but not accented.

Unless he was intentionally allowing the omissions of the codex he was copying to remain in his own text, the punctuator seems occasionally to have forgotten to put the necessary ¨ over װ, and to insert the daghesh in letters requiring it. In cases where such dots seem essential, I have added them *in blue*. (In some cases the ink may have perished: I have found instances in this MS where the ink in dots has almost disappeared.) But, as regards daghesh, investigation will shew that the rules for its various uses throughout G. I differed very considerably from the rules laid down in modern grammars.

§ 3. *Blue* I have employed sparingly, to denote only such rectification of errors of omission and errors of commission (e.g. Ps. 2, 5: 35, 19: 33, 14), as Astruc d’Escola would himself agree to, if he could be consulted.

A list of all verses where blue is used follows here: Ps. 1, 1: 2, 5, 9: 4, 1: 5, 9: 6, 5, 11: 7, 16, 18: 9, 7: 10, 6, 12 (twice): 17, 3, 11: 18, 3, 6, 10, 13, 14, 29 (twice), 47, 51: 20, 3: 21, 7 (twice): 22, 18: 23, 6: 24, 4: 25, 2, 13 (twice), 15, 16: 26, 5: 27, 3, 12: 28, 1 (three times): 29, 2, 7, 11 (twice): 31, 1, 2, 8, 11, 12, 23 (twice): 32, 10: 33, 16: 34, 4, 15, 19, 20: 35, 8 (twice), 19, 21, 22 (twice), 23: 36, 2 (twice), 4 (twice): 37, 14 (twice), 38: 38, 7, 9, 14, 21: 39, 3, 7, 10, 11: 40, 10: 41, 7, 9.

§ 4. (a) In the making of G. I as we have it four processes, or *schemes*, were involved—(1) The Consonantal Text. (2) The pointing of that text. (3) The Accents. (4) The Masoretic notes. *Red* I have used to mark *additions to these original schemes* (additions sometimes made by the hand engaged in a *later* scheme), and also for what may be called *one particular additional scheme* in its entirety. This latter I will first explain. It consists in the employment of what are commonly called “the extraordinary points,” the only *accepted* instance of these in the First Book of Psalms being Ps. 27, 13, לִלְלָא, as found in G. I. It is to be remarked that Dr Ginsburg is wrong in citing G. I (the מַבּ of his notes) as supporting the לִלְלָא of his own text (‘Psalms,’ British and Foreign Bible Society, 1913). Note also that he has omitted to mark the accent (Rebhîa) intended by his own note. These extraordinary points were made in the place under notice by the scribe of G. I with the quill held severely upright, as contrasted with the common dots (of daghesh, accent etc.) made with the quill on the slant. Magnified, the extraordinary point appears as ◆, the common dot as ∙. Other extraordinary points in G. I by the hand of the original scribe, or by a hand nearly

INTRODUCTION

§ 1. (a) The text here presented is an exact transcription of the text of G. 1 (Trinity College Library *WAW Heb. 11*): the only qualification of this statement being that certain archaic features of the calligraphy have been replaced by their modern equivalents. Many of these archaic features may be studied in the photographic reproduction of folio 136*a* (Ps. 21, 5—22, 25) in the Frontispiece. They consist in the forms of consonants—notice especially ב, ה, ח, ל, and פ: in the position of the  $\dot{\bar{\text{—}}}$  in ש and ש, and in that of the  $\text{—}$  of the vowel, plene and defect.: in the forms of the accents, pointing as I believe to a high antiquity in the codex which was their parent: and in the *direction* of one accent, Azla, which in G. 1 inclines to the *right*, thus being identical in appearance with Geresh (cf. in the Frontispiece פֶּחֶרֶשׁ (= פֶּחֶרֶשׁ) Ps. 22, 16 with פֶּלֶב (Geresh) v. 21). יְהוָה is written always in G. 1, without the  $\dot{\bar{\text{—}}}$  of the vowel. Where יְהוָה appears, the  $\dot{\bar{\text{—}}}$  is the accent Rebhia: and so in my transcription.

(b) In the arrangement of the lines, and in the relative positions of the first letter of each line and of each Psalm, my text conforms as nearly as possible to the text of G. 1. The normal length of the lines in the MS can be seen in the Frontispiece. Occasional departures from this normality will call for very careful investigation. The most marked of such departures is seen in the first column of fol. 140*a*. This contains Ps. 36, 1—37, 4, וְהִתְעַנֵּג—which word is written as a catch-word in the centre of the last line. The 26 preceding lines of this column contain 488 consonants, while the first 26 lines of fol. 139*a* 1 (normal) contain 516. I hope to analyse my results on this score, when the whole of Psalms has been transcribed by me. That the copyist was faithful to the codex from which he was copying the consonantal text, as regards the lines and their exact contents, can I think be proved. I will only now adduce one piece of evidence—the rule proved by a compelled exception—viz. the abnormal length of the line immediately following the illuminated אֲשֶׁר in Ps. 1, 1. This was due to the fact that in the codex copied the first line contained אֲשֶׁר הָאֵשׁ.

(c) Two distinct codices were the direct parents of the MS G. 1. The consonantal text was copied from a very ancient unpointed codex, while the vowels and accents were added from another codex, of which also high antiquity may I think be demonstrated.

§ 2. The work of Astruc d'Escola, the scribe of G. 1, was careful and accurate. In the whole of the First Book of Psalms there is only one instance of a wrongly placed  $\dot{\bar{\text{—}}}$  over ש, viz. Ps. 35, 19 שְׁנֵאִי (i.e. in modern fashion שְׁנֵאִי) for שְׁנֵאִי (i.e. שְׁנֵאִי of the accepted text). And among the vowel-points there is, I think, only one instance

Cambridge University Press  
978-1-107-43850-7 - The First Book of Psalms: In The Text of G.I  
Transcribed with Frontispiece and Introduction by Henry Winter Sheppard  
Frontmatter  
[More information](#)

Cambridge University Press  
978-1-107-43850-7 - The First Book of Psalms: In The Text of G.I  
Transcribed with Frontispiece and Introduction by Henry Winter Sheppard  
Frontmatter  
[More information](#)

CONTENTS

	PAGE
FRONTISPIECE	
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	vii—xix
TEXT . . . . .	I—49

To the Managers of the Hort Memorial Fund I am exceedingly grateful for the substantial assistance granted by them to me. I must also express my deep obligations for continued help, advice, and encouragement, to Mr Norman McLean of Christ's College, Dr Alexander Nairne of Jesus College, Cambridge, and Professor George Herbert Box of King's College, London.

H. W. S.

TRINITY COLLEGE  
*June 1920*

Cambridge University Press  
978-1-107-43850-7 - The First Book of Psalms: In The Text of G.I  
Transcribed with Frontispiece and Introduction by Henry Winter Sheppard  
Frontmatter  
[More information](#)

Cambridge University Press  
978-1-107-43850-7 - The First Book of Psalms: In The Text of G.I  
Transcribed with Frontispiece and Introduction by Henry Winter Sheppard  
Frontmatter  
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.  
It furthers the University’s mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of  
education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)  
Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9781107438507](http://www.cambridge.org/9781107438507)

© Cambridge University Press 1920

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception  
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,  
no reproduction of any part may take place without the written  
permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1920  
First paperback edition 2014

*A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library*

ISBN 978-1-107-43850-7 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of  
URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication,  
and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate  
or appropriate.

THE FIRST BOOK OF PSALMS  
IN THE TEXT OF G.I

TRANSCRIBED  
WITH FRONTISPIECE AND INTRODUCTION

BY  
HENRY WINTER SHEPPARD, M.A.  
TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

CAMBRIDGE  
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
1920



Cambridge University Press  
978-1-107-43850-7 - The First Book of Psalms: In The Text of G.I  
Transcribed with Frontispiece and Introduction by Henry Winter Sheppard  
Frontmatter  
[More information](#)

THE FIRST BOOK OF PSALMS  
IN THE TEXT OF G.I