

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

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



https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology



https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal

https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php

A Gospel manuscript in the University of Toronto, vellum, twelfth century, is now reported.

Although no attempt was made to list synagogue rolls mention might be made of the one owned by the New York Public Library, because it was formerly the property of the Jews of Kaifong-Fu, China.

The same Library owns a Samaritan manuscript of het Pentateuch written in 1231—1232.

The University of Toronto has a Samaritan Pentateuch, rather late.

Victoria College, Toronto, reports a leather Pentateuch said to be of Yemenite origin about four hundred years old.

In the same library is an Esther roll, rather late.

To the Latin list should be added the Harmony of the Gospels in the University of Chicago Libraries described by Goodspeed in his catalogue, page 18. It is of the fifteenth century.

The Bulletin of the New York Public Library already cited mentions the following Latin manuscripts:

Evangelistarium; illuminated manuscript, gold on a purple ground, ninth century.

Bible and Actorum Sanctorum; illuminated, eleventh century.

Matthew and Mark, written about 1180.

Eleven others are dated in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, some with illuminations. More noteworthy is the Christi Vita ab Evangelistis descripta, a folio on vellum dated about 1535, richly illuminated.

The University of Toronto has a Latin Gospels, vellum, fourteenth century.

HENRY PRESERVED SMITH

תלואים למשובתי Hosea 11 7

Most modern commentators agree that nothing can be done with אמים למשובתי Hos. 11 7, the phrase as well as the rest of the verse defying all attempts at explanation. Cf. Wellhausen, BBD., Nowack. The last-mentioned scholar declares categor-

ically: "The words are in a hopelessly corrupt state, the present text making no sense because מלה means 'to hang' and nothing else." Consequently no attention has been recently paid to the few older attempts to operate with the root in the derived sense 'to fasten', 'to attach'. Cf. Keil, in Keil and Delitzsch Com., vol. III, p. 100. On the other hand, the emendations which have been suggested as an alternative cannot be said to be reasonably convincing. Cf. Marti's לגלום 'they joined themselves' and Oettli's בלאום 'they weary themselves' (so Hal, er).

I wish to call attention to an interesting parallel in Syriac in which #1 is employed beyond any possibility of doubt in the sense of 'depending on', 'adhering to'. In the 'Epistle of Mara the son of Serapion' (Spicilegium Syriacum, ed. Cureton, London, 1855) we find on p. 46 of the Syriac the following statement: نعمه حين مع اسمعا وعنوال معدوه بعدها عصنا For they have gone beyond the limits of truth and transgress all good laws, because thoy depend (hang) upon their own lust.' בו of the Syriac and מלואים of the Hebrew text, both used in contexts surprisingly similar, correspond grammatically in form and even in number. (Both are Ptc. Pass. Qal). As to the meaning, nothing could suit the Hebrew verse better than 'my people is addicted to turning away from me', they habitually leave me in the lurch. The difference in the particles used with the verb in each case can be easily explained by the somewhat different shade of meaning required in the respective contexts. The Syriac text tells us of those who depend on lust for guidance (hence ... > #1.2) whereas the prophet arraigns the professional backsliders, hopelessly addicted to (hence ...) their double-faced methods. The use of the verb in this derived meaning by a writer of the first century (see Cureton's Introduction) whose Syriac is, as far as can be judged, of a healthy, unadulterated kind, leaves little doubt as to the idiomatic nature of the expression under discussion. What was good Semitic idiom in the first century A. D. was most likely so at the time of Hosea. Whatever may be the case with the rest of this unquestionably difficult verse, the present instance is once more illustrative of the truth that many obscurities in the Bible are apparent and not intrinsic. Had there been more occasion for the full use of the Hebrew vocabulary in the Scriptures a goodly number of now almost hopeless cases would have been automatically explained. What may have been household phrases at the time of Hosea or Micah are now responsible for a maze of infelicitous emendations solely because the nature of the Canonical Books did not always leave an unlimited range for the use of the language.

University of Pennsylvania

E. A. SPEIRER