

was possible) would be carried out, without removing *πρὸς Λαοδικεῖς* from the epistle as well as *ἐν Λαοδικίᾳ*, and also without substituting some other name in both places, especially in the superscription of the epistle? This substitution, as we are told (p. 705), probably followed the deletion of *ἐν Λαοδικίᾳ* after a very brief interval, i.e. before A.D. 110. But a canonical epistle must have had some title. It might circulate without a place-name in i. 1—from Origen and Basil we know that it did—but it must have had *Πρὸς . . .* in its title, and it appears almost inconceivable that those who were responsible for the drastic treatment of it should have left *Πρὸς Λαοδικεῖς* still in the title or left it with no title at all? Why Ephesus was eventually chosen to supplant Laodicea, Harnack can only explain on the ground that Ephesus was the capital of the province where the Pauline canon was drawn up.¹ Which does not carry us very far.

JAMES MOFFATT.

SAMARITAN SEPTUAGINT MASSORETIC TEXT.

IN the year 1815 Gesenius published a monograph on the Samaritan Pentateuch² which has dominated all subsequent discussion of its relation to the other texts.³

¹ Dr. Souter conjectures that perhaps it was Marcion who was responsible for introducing the harmonising *ἀγάπην* in Ephesians i. 15. If guesses are going, one might as plausibly ask whether the deletion of *ἀγάπην* may not have been due to some reader or editor who found this praise inconsistent with Revelation ii. 6 (*τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῷ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἐκκλησίας γράψον . . . ἔχω κατὰ σοῦ, ὅτι τὴν ἀγάπην σου τὴν πρώτην ἀφήκας*).

² *De Pentateuchi Samaritani Origine Indole et Auctoritate Commentatio philologico-critica.*

³ Dr. Swete, for instance, writes of its occasional agreements with the LXX.: "A careful analysis of the Samaritan text led Gesenius to the conclusion, which is now generally accepted, that the fact of the two Pentateuchs often making common cause against the printed Hebrew Bibles indicates a common origin earlier than the fixing of the Massoretic text, whilst their dissensions show that the text of the Law existed in more than one recension before it had been reduced to a rigid unifor-

Now all who have done any textual work on the Pentateuch know in practice that the text that is most unlike the Massoretic is the Septuagint and that in the great majority of its divergencies the Samaritan supports M.T. These facts are of very great importance in their bearing alike on the textual and on the higher criticism of the Pentateuch. For example, in the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* we are told by Dr. Gray on p. 860 of vol. iii. : "In so far as it is possible to recover the Hebrew text from which the Greek version was made, it is possible to recover a form of the Hebrew text current about 280 B.C. in the case of the Pentateuch. . . . By comparison of the Hebrew MSS. it is not difficult to recover the recension which with few and unimportant variants they have perpetuated, and which may safely be regarded as differing but slightly from the text current and officially established before the end of the 2nd century A.D. By a comparison of these two lines of evidence we can approximate to a text current about 300 B.C. or later ; but for any errors which had entered into the common source of these two forms of the text we possess no documentary means of detection whatsoever." But on p. 856 of the same volume, in the course of the same article "Bible," Mr. Stenning writes : "In point of age the Samaritan Pentateuch furnishes the earliest external witness to the Hebrew text. It is not a version, but merely that text of the Pentateuch which has been preserved by the Samaritan community since the time of Nehemiah (Neh. xiii. 23-31), i.e. about 432 B.C."

It is obvious that if the Samaritan dates from B.C. 432 we can at any rate arrive approximately at a form of the Hebrew text of the Pentateuch at that date. But if the mity." [*Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 2nd edition (1902), p. 438.]

Septuagint exhibits great and startling differences, what conclusions are we to draw? If the Pentateuch was so far canonical as to be taken over by the Samaritans practically intact, how comes it that the Alexandrian Jews did not hesitate to knock it about to a very considerable extent at a later date (as we must suppose if we believe their translation to have been made from MSS. representing the current Palestinian tradition of the day)? How comes it that they often preserve readings that are manifestly superior to the Massoretico-Samaritan? How comes it that some of their readings even suggest that the Massoretico-Samaritan has in some places suffered from tendencies that seem to echo the views and history of ages long subsequent to that mirrored in the originals of the Septuagint?

Such questions naturally lead one to ask whether Gesenius is altogether a trustworthy guide in this matter, and if not, why not? On examining his monograph I found that the explanation was exceedingly simple. Gesenius came after a long controversy as to the relative merits of the Samaritan and Massoretic texts and a minor controversy as to whether the LXX. was translated from the Massoretic or the Samaritan. Hassencamp, for example, wrote a monograph to prove that the LXX. was translated from Sam. Now in this controversy a curious error of method seems to have been made. Instead of comparing the three texts, M.T., Sam. and LXX. with one another, the controversialists appear to have compared M.T. and Sam., and then to have consulted LXX. *only in the places where the other two differed*. But this is quite faulty. If I desire to compare three articles *a*, *b* and *c*, I must compare *c* with *a* and *b* in addition to comparing *a* and *b* with each other. If I only compare *c* with the differences between *a* and *b*, I run the risk of reaching wrong conclusions through ignoring the matters on which the two latter agree against the former. And

this is what has happened to Gesenius. He even quotes Hassencamp in the most unsuspecting manner, never dreaming that this writer might have left out of account the most important part of the evidence. Consequently the whole of the current views as to the history of the text in so far as they rest on this monograph of Gesenius stand in urgent need of revision.

I will now quote the conclusions of Gesenius in his own formulation and then proceed to the examination of the reasoning on which they are based.

“Statuimus enim, versionem Alexandrinam aequè ut textum Samaritanum e codicibus fluxisse judaïcis sibi quæ similibus, Pentateuchi tamen ἔκδοσιν secuti diversam ab eâ, quæ postea publicam auctoritatem obtinuit apud Palaestinos, exemplum autem Samaritanum postea ab librariis semidoctis multifariam correctum esse et interpolatum.” (p. 14).¹

This theory of an Alexandrino-Samaritan edition obviously falls to the ground if the Massoretic and the Samaritan texts are far more alike than either of them is to the Septuagint. Gesenius is of course right in many of his incidental points. The Massoretic text undoubtedly conserves correct readings in a number of passages against a consensus of the other two. In some of these his defences of the Masso-

¹ This is more fully explained in the following passage :—“Pari modo etiam existisse existimamus apud Judæos præter eam, quâ nunc utimur, textus hebræi in Pentateucho recensione, aliam quandam, cujus auctores seu διασκευασταί id inprimis egerant, ut contextum suum planiorem redderent et concinniorem, difficultatibus autem vitis que ejus opinatis ita medicati fuerant, ut glossas emendationesque conjecturales in textum reciperent. Alterius hujus editionis, quam *Alexandrino-Samaritanam* dicere possis, exempla, in multis, quamquam non in omnibus lectionibus sibi constantia (ut fieri solet in recensione quadam nondum satis consummatâ et absolutâ) usu videntur recepta fuisse apud Alexandrinos et Samaritanos; aliis, Judæis potissimum Hierosolymitanis, veterem lectionem non variatam, etsi alicubi difficiliorem et obscuriorem, nec tamen ideo a mendis omnino immunem, religiosus servare studentibus.” (pp. 14-15.)

retic readings may still be read with profit, but his main thesis can easily be shown to be untenable.

The discussion of the evidence for the relationship of the texts is set out on pages 10–11 under five headings. After two headings relating to the similarities between LXX. and Sam. (which will have to be considered in further detail) come two others, the substance of which may be briefly quoted: “(3) *E contrario totidem fere in locis, iisque ejusdem indolis cum iis, quæ primo loco posuimus [i.e. cases of agreement savouring of a conjecture or a gloss], Alexandrini cum textu Hebræo faciunt contra Samaritanum, in emendationibus potissimum audacioribus et valde arbitrariis. . . . Nusquam Samaritanum sequitur Alexandrinus in interpolationibus majoribus, nec in Samaritanismis.*” It is obvious that purely intra-Samaritan readings can rarely affect the particular question discussed in this article. “(4) *Aliquoties in difficultatibus textus removendis ita versatur utrumque exemplar, ut alterum hanc, alterum aliam tibi conjecturam exhibeat . . . in primis autem huc pertinent diversa illa duo systemata de annis vitæ patriarcharum dispendendis, ad quorum normam genealogiæ antediluviana et postdiluviana (Gen. v. et xi.) conformatæ sunt.*”

These instances again do not affect us, and the weight of the discussion falls on the other three heads.

The first and most important of these is as follows:—“*Consentit uterque codex in magnâ parte earum lectionum, quæ glossam sapiunt textui illatam emendationemve conjecturalem locorum paulo difficiliorum, idque ita, ut hunc consensum fortuitum esse, omnino cogitari nequeat.*”¹

¹ In support of this he refers to the following passages: Gen. ii. 2, 24, xiv. 19, xv. 21, xvii. 14, xviii. 19, xxiv. 62, xxv. 8, xxvii. 27, xxix. 1 (? wrong reference: perhaps it should be 8), xxxvi. 6, xli. 16, xlvii. 21, xlix. 3 and 4, 12, 22, 26, Lev. xviii. 21, Num. xvi. 15, xxi. 28, xxxiv. 6, Deut. xxxii. 5, etc.

The agreements in the instances cited do not appear to me to be due to a single cause, nor can I refer to conjectural emendation all the differences that Gesenius would attribute to it. But as my arguments are partly quantitative and partly qualitative I would first draw attention to the extremely small number of passages cited. There is no instance from Exodus, one each from Leviticus and Deuteronomy; Numbers is represented by three passages and Genesis by seventeen. And when the passages are examined and the variants are sifted the basis of the argument appears to be very precarious. Omitting all notice of Greek variants which suggest that further deductions might have to be made from the list, it may be observed that a number of the instances consist of a difference of a single letter, e.g. γ for γ ,¹ though sometimes such small differences are combined with others arising from different ways of reading a text which lacked the *matres lectionis*.² Nobody who has had experience of the immense number of variants that have come down to us would lay very much stress on a few coincidences of this kind in so bulky a document as the Pentateuch. In one or two other cases the divergencies appear to be due to genuine early readings. Thus in xlix. 3, 4 for MT פדו the Samaritan has פחזת and LXX. ἐξύβρισας, but the second person of the verb is supported by Theodotion, who has the same rendering as the LXX., and by the renderings of Aquila ἐθάμβευσας, Symmachus ὑπερέξεσας, the "Syrian" ἐπλανήθης, and the Vulgate *effusus es*. In xlvii. 21 Samaritan and LXX. העביר אתו לעבדים appears to me to be correct against M.T. העביר אתו לערים.

¹ Thus Lev. xviii. 21 M.T. להעביר, Sam. להעביר, LXX. λατρεύειν; Num. xvi. 15 M.T. חמור, Sam. חמור, LXX. ἐπιθύμημα; xxi. 28 M.T. ער, Sam. ער, LXX. (Swete) *Es*.

² Thus Gen. xlix. 12 M.T. חבלי, Sam. חבלי, LXX. χαροποι; Num. xxiv. 6 M.T. ים ויהיה, Sam. ימה יהיה, LXX. (BAF. Luo) τῆς θαλάσσης εσται; M.T. תונבול, 2^o Sam. ינבל, LXX. (BAF. Luo) ὄρμι.

Other factors account for a number of the remaining agreements cited by Gesenius. One of these is the current interpretation of the Scriptures which has left its mark on both texts. Thus in Genesis ii. 2 Dr. Swete regards the Greek reading "sixth" for "seventh" as due to the Jewish *Halacha*.¹ Now it is quite clear that the Samaritans did introduce a number of changes into the text for editorial reasons. For instance when in Deuteronomy x. 6 f. they found a number of contradictions to the narrative in Numbers they rewrote the passage so as to bring it into accord with the text of the latter while preserving such touches as the attribution of brooks of water to Jotbathah. Consequently agreement between the two texts in cases where intelligible editorial reasons can be suggested does not in any way prove that a Jewish Hebrew Pentateuch ever existed which presented the Samaritan variant. Other instances again are such that almost any editor would be likely to insert words. In Genesis xv. 21 the Hivites are added to the list of nations by the Samaritan and some of the Greek MSS. including A. Here however the glossing is probably independent, for while the Samaritan puts them after the Girgashites A places them before the latter. And at this point mention may be made of another possible cause of agreement: there was a Greek translation of the Samaritan, and Origen added additions from the Samaritan (perhaps from this Greek translation) under an asterisk, as is proved by extant notes.² This may probably account for some of the other resemblances.³

The second heading of Gesenius's evidence is stated as

¹ Op. cit. p. 327.

² See e.g. Field on Ex. vi. 9, vii. 18, viii. 5 (Heb. viii. 1), xx. 17, 19.

³ The list given by Gesenius under this heading is of course not intended to be exhaustive and could easily be greatly enlarged, but it is fairly representative of the character of the evidence on which he here relies.

follows :—"Accuratissime porro consentiunt plerumque in parvis immo in minimis sæpe momentis, sensum omnino non mutantibus, itemque vocum literarumve transpositione et permutatione arbitrariâ cet. ; qui quidem consensus multo etiam minus cæco casui tribui potest. Sic præfixum ἰducenties in Samaritano additum et centies circiter detractum invenitur, ita quidem, ut LXX paucis exemplis exceptis eum presso pede sequantur." Now this statement as to the ἰ is made on the authority of Hassencamp and takes no account of cases in which the LXX. differs from both the other texts. It is however open to the same replies as the first heading. Some instances of these minor variations will come before us later in this article and the reader can then judge for himself from some typical agreements and disagreements of the various texts in matters of this kind.

The last heading of the discussion clearly shows the inadequacy of the examination of the LXX. "Denique versio alexandrina aliquando a textu hebræo discrepat, Samaritano non suffragante. Quod genus varietatum vel in literarum permutatione et transpositione positum est, vel in eo plerumque cernitur quod loca parallela ex parallelis supplentur." To this there are two footnotes illustrating these two classes of differences. The first refers to Genesis iii. 17, בעבֹרֶךְ, where the LXX. has ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις σου, i.e. בעבֹרֶךְ, of xlix. 14¹; Numbers xxi. 14; Deuteronomy xii. 30, xxxi. 1, xxxiii. 2. He does not discuss these passages at length. The second cites the following passages as instancing alleged Septuagintal glosses Genesis i. 6 (+ and it was so), 8 (+ "and God saw that it was good" after "heavens"), vii. 3 (+ "and of all the winged things that are not clean two by two male and female" after "male

¹ Perhaps Gesenius means to draw attention only to τὸ καλὸν in this verse, where the Hebrew has כָּטוֹר.

and female ”), viii. 17, viii. 1, ix. 1 cet., “scholion frigidum habes xxxv. 22 ” (+ “and it seemed grievous in his sight ” after “of it ”).

That is all. In reply it will probably be best to begin by comparing the differences between the three texts in a number of short passages taken at random, viz. : Genesis xiii., Exodus xvii., Leviticus xvii., Numbers xix. 1-7, Deuteronomy xx. 1-12. I believe that the results in these are merely representative of the experience that is gained by anybody who takes the trouble to collate the texts over a larger area. For the sake of convenience the text of the best MS. of the LXX. is taken as the usual basis of comparison. This is in no way unfavourable to the thesis of Gesenius, since a correct restoration of the original text of the LXX. would involve greater divergencies from M.T. and Samaritan than the text of any individual MS. Differences of spelling in the Samaritan are usually ignored save where they may conceivably have some value, as also is the insertion of את (which would not show in the Greek).

Genesis xiii. Main differences between M.T. and Sam. : 6 M.T. נשא, Sam. נשאה, LXX. ἐχώρει. 7 M.T. ישב, Sam. ישבים, LXX. κατόικουν. 8 M.T. אברם, Sam. אבנם, LXX. Ἀβράμ; M.T. תהי, Sam. תהיה, LXX. ἔστω. 9 M.T. אם השמאלה ואם הימין ואם השמאלה, Sam. אם השמאלה ואם הימין ואם הימין השמאלה, LXX. εἰ σὺ εἰς ἀριστερά, ἐγὼ εἰς δεξιὰ; εἰ δὲ σὺ εἰς δεξιὰ, ἐγὼ εἰς ἀριστερά. 10 M.T. כלה, Sam. כלו. 11 M.T. צער, Sam. צערה, LXX. εἰς Ζόγορα. 18 M.T. ויאהל, Sam. וילך, LXX. ἀποσκηνώσας.

Main differences between LXX. and a consensus of M.T. and Sam. : 3. למסעיו, ὅθεν ἦλθεν; כנגב, εἰς τὴν ἔρημον. 4 בראשנה, τὴν σκηνήν. 5 ואהלים, καὶ κτήνη. 8 ובין רעיך, καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ποιμένων σου καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ποιμένων μου. 9 הלא, καὶ ἰδού; ננ vacat (missing also in a Hebrew MS. of de Rossi) 10 יהוה 1°, τὸν θεόν, 2° τοῦ θεοῦ;

יָרָךְ + *καὶ*. 12 אַבְרָם + *δὲ* (אַבְרָם is read by 2 Hebrew MSS. of de Rossi, and, according to Kennicott, by his MS. 186). 13 סָדָם, οἱ ἐν Σοδόμοις : לִירוּחַ, ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ. 14 וִירוּחַ, ὁ δὲ θεός ; אֲשֶׁר + *νῦν*. 17 end + *καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*. 18 בְּאַלְנֵי, παρὰ τὴν δρῦν.

The variations between M.T. and Sam. here call for no comment : with the possible exception of verse 18, where LXX. supports M.T., none points back to a different consonantal Jewish Hebrew. But when we come to the LXX. the case is different. Some of the divergencies noted may be due to internal corruption : e.g. in verse 5 there is a variant *σκήναι* for *κτήνη*, and such a corruption would not be difficult ; in verse 8 the difference of order is probably due to intra-Greek error : other seeming discrepancies again may be due to the translators, e.g. in 9 אֱלֹהִים may quite well (though not certainly) have stood in the Hebrew text from which the rendering was made. On the other hand two small discrepancies acquire importance in view of the argument of Gesenius stated above, viz., the addition of "and" (*καὶ, δὲ*) in verses 10 and 12 supported in the latter case by Hebrew evidence. If instances where the LXX. and Sam. agree in such additions are to have weight, then equal weight must be assigned to instances in which the LXX. differs from the other two.

When all allowances have been made there are clearly a number of cases in which the LXX. found different consonants. Such are the variants in verses 3 and 4 and the omission of אֵן in verse 9, where de Rossi also quotes the Syriac to the same effect. Such too are the four instances in this chapter where the LXX. has *θεός* for the Massoretic Tetragrammaton. That these divergencies do in fact represent different Hebrew readings I have shown elsewhere.¹ But in the light of recent discussions I have been

¹ *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, pp. 13 ff., 36 f.

led to examine two other passages of the Pentateuch to see whether there are similar divergencies between the Greek and Hebrew throughout in this matter. In the M.T. of Leviticus xvii.–xxi. I counted 51 occurrences of the Tetragrammaton. In one place (Lev. xxi. 21) the LXX. has $\tau\hat{\omega}\theta\epsilon\hat{\omega}\sigma\upsilon\nu$ where the addition of the pronoun proves that its Hebrew text read “thy God.” In all the other 50 instances $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ occurs in every MS. of the LXX. with two exceptions. In xviii. 30 a single cursive (f) has $\bar{\theta}\varsigma$ only (for “the Lord your God”), and in xxi. 6 one cursive of Holmes has $\tau\omicron\upsilon\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$.¹ In Leviticus, at any rate, it cannot be contended that the translators shirked using $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ or that Greek scribes were habitually unable to distinguish it from $\theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$. My other passage was Exodus xiv.–xviii. Here I found the Tetragrammaton 69 times in the Hebrew text; and in 10 instances some or all the LXX. MSS. presented the variant $\theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$. In seven places there was enough authority to give some ground for supposing that the LXX. originally had $\theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, viz. xiv. 13, 31 3°, xv. 1 1°, xvi. 7 2°, 8 3°, 9, 33. In three other cases a single MS. [xvi. 7 1° (A), xvii. 1 (y) 15 (73 of Holmes)] has $\theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ for $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$.² These figures show that with experience it is generally easy to detect the differences between genuine variants of the LXX. and intra-Greek corruptions in the matter of the Divine appellations. They also show that the variations in the chapter of Genesis before us are of genuine importance in considering the relations of the three texts.

¹ It should be added that in xix. 37 b k w omit the whole phrase. There are also a number of instances in these chapters where some or all Septuagintal MSS. add “thy, your God” though the M.T. does not present such a phrase; but with the exceptions named there is no example of their reading $\theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ for $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$.

² It should be added that in Ex. xiv. 10 one cursive (m) omits the whole phrase: in xvii. 1 fp supported by the old Latin omit the word on its second occurrence in the LXX (its first in M.T.); and in one or two passages there are additions, especially in xv. 26 2°, where B adds “thy God.”

I pass to the next passage :—

Exodus xvii. Sam. diverges from M.T. in the following cases :—2 M.T. תנו, Sam. (and 21 Hebrew MSS.) תנה, LXX. δὸς; M.T. מזה, Sam. (and 32 Hebrew MSS.) ומזה, LXX. καὶ τί. 3 M.T. ויאמר, Sam. ויאמרו, LXX. λέγοντες; M.T. זה, Sam. and 3 Hebrew MSS. omit, LXX. τοῦτο. 5 M.T. קח 2°, Sam. and 2 MSS. of Kennicott, תקח, LXX. λάβε. 6 M.T. ויצאו, Sam. ויצא, LXX. καὶ ἐξελεύσεται. 10 M.T. אהרן, Sam. and 45 Hebrew MSS. ואהרן, LXX. καὶ Ἀαρὼν; M.T. ראש, 1 MS. of Kennicott, לראש, two others, לע ראש (*sic*), Sam. אל ר', LXX. ἐπὶ κ.τ.λ. 11 M.T. ירו (bis), Sam. ידיו, LXX. τὰς χεῖρας. 12 M.T. ויהי, Sam. and 1 MS. of Kennicott, ויהיו, LXX. καὶ ἐγένοντο. 13 M.T. לפי, Sam. prefixes וכנס, LXX. omits it. 16 M.T. על כסיה, Sam. אל כסא, LXX. ἐν χειρὶ κρυφαία; M.T. דר, Sam. ודר, LXX. εἰς γενεάς.

It will be seen how trivial are the points in which LXX. and Sam. agree *against* M.T.—the addition of a ו, the reading of plural for singular or *vice versa* where the difference might be due to different ways of reading a text that lacked *matres lectionis* and in one instance (verse 10) perhaps, but not certainly, the addition of a preposition which does not alter the meaning.

LXX. diverges from a consensus of M.T. and Sam. in the following cases :—1 לשחת העם, τῷ λαῷ πειν (preferred by Kittel). 3 וילן, LXX. + ἐκεῖ; אתי, ἡμᾶς; בני, τὰ τέκνα ἡμῶν. 5 העם + τούτου; ישראל, τοῦ λαοῦ. 6 לפניך שם, ἐκεῖ πρὸ τοῦ σε; העם, ὁ λαός μου; וקני, τῶν υἱῶν. 7 והמקום, τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου (3 MSS. of Kennicott have וההוא); גסתם, τὸ πειράζειν (Origen added αὐτούς). 9 לנו σεαυτῷ; אנשים + δυνατούς; אנכי, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ. 10 להלחם, καὶ ἐξελθὼν παρετάξατο. 13 עמו, καὶ πάντα [Origen obelised] κ.τ.λ. 15 מובח + κυρίως; נסי, καταφυγή μου. 16 ויאמר vacat, added by Origen under an asterisk.

These variations include differences of a very different type to those of the Samaritan. Some of the additional words may be regarded as glosses that *may* have entered the Greek and not its Hebrew originals; but such readings as "people" for "Israel" (ver. 4), "my people" for "the people," "children of Israel" for "elders of Israel" (ver. 6) cannot be dismissed in this way, nor can the omission of the expression ויִאמֶר (ver. 16) where the LXX. is doubtless the more correct text. Moreover taken numerically Sam. can at best claim the support of LXX. against M.T. in eight cases in this chapter: while M.T. is supported by Sam. against LXX. far more often. But the quality of the instances is more important than the quantity: and the difference here cannot be estimated numerically.

The next passage is Leviticus xvii. :—

Leviticus xvii., chief differences between M.T. and Sam. :—
 verse 4 M.T. הִבִּיאוּ, Sam. + ליהוה + לעשות אתו עלה או שלמים ליהוה + לרצונכם לריח ניהח וישחטו בחוץ ואל פתח אהל מועד לא הביאו
 LXX. + ὥστε ποιῆσαι αὐτὸ εἰς ὄλοκαύτωμα ἢ σωτήριον
 κυρίῳ δεκτὸν εἰς ὄσμην εὐωδίας, καὶ ὃς ἂν σφάξῃ ἔξω καὶ ἐπὶ
 τὴν θύραν τῆς σκῆνης τοῦ μαρτυρίου μὴ ἐνέγκῃ αὐτὸ (obelised
 by Origen); M.T. להקריב, Sam. להקריבו, LXX. προσενέγκαι;
 עמו, Sam. עמיו, LXX. ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτῆς (reading ψυχῇ
 instead of אִישׁ). 6 M.T. פתח, Sam. prefixes אשר which is
 not represented in the LXX. 8 M.T. יעלה, Sam. יעשה,
 LXX. ποιήσῃ. 10 M.T. הִנֵּר, Sam. אשר יִנֹּר; M.T. עתה
 עמה . . . , Sam. אתו . . . עמו, LXX. αὐτὴν . . . αὐτῆς. 13
 M.T. מבני, Sam. nine Hebrew MSS. Targ. מבית, LXX. τῶν
 υἱῶν; M.T. בתוכם, Sam. 1 Hebrew MS. בתוכם, LXX. ἐν
 ὑμῖν. 14 M.T. אכליו, Sam. אכלו, LXX. ὁ ἔσθων αὐτὸ. 15
 M.T. נפש, Sam. הנפש; M.T. וטהר, Sam. vacat, LXX.
 καὶ καθαρὸς ἔσται.

With regard to the extensive variation in verse 4, it is to be observed that the six words לֹא הִבִּיאוּ לְמוֹעֵד אֶהְלֵךְ מוֹעֵד לֹא הִבִּיאוּ

recur in the Samaritan text so that the passage has almost certainly fallen out of M.T. through homoioteleuton. This is one of the cases in which palaeographical probability is decidedly against M.T. In the other instances we only have the usual small variations, the most important being in verse 8 where Sam. and LXX. clearly agree in reading יעשה for M.T. יעלה—a difference of a single letter. Contrast with this the following list of the chief divergencies of LXX. from Sam. and M.T. combined in this chapter.

3 מבית, τῶν υἱῶν (supported by 1 Hebrew MS.); ישראל + ἡ τῶν προσηλύτων ἡ τῶν προσκειμένων ἐν ὑμῖν; אן 3° καὶ.
 4 דם 1° καὶ prefixed; והאיש, ἡ ψυχὴ (supported by 1 Hebrew MS. of de Rossi). 5 על פני, ἐν; והביאם καὶ οἴσουσιν; וזבחי, θυσιάν. 6 מזבח [2 MSS. of Kennicott (המזבח), τὸ θυσιαστήριον κύκλω ἀπέναντι; פתח (1 MS. of Kennicott prefixes אל), παρὰ τὰς θύρας. 7 ואת vacat; להם לדרתם, ὑμῖν εἰς τὰς γενεὰς ὑμῶν. 8 מבית, τῶν υἱῶν (supported by 1 Hebrew MS. of de Rossi); והגר, τῶν υἱῶν τῶν προσηλύτων; בתוכם, ἐν ὑμῖν (so 2 Hebrew MSS. Vulg. Syr. Targ.). 10 מבית, τῶν υἱῶν (and 1 MS. of de Rossi); בתוכם, ἐν ὑμῖν (with almost the same support as in 8). 11 הבשר (1 MS. of Kennicott, כל בשר, πάσης σαρκὸς; בדם, αἷμα αὐτοῦ; והדם הוא, τὸ γὰρ αἷμα αὐτοῦ. 14 בנפש vacat (so too Vulgate and 1 MS. of Kennicott). 16 יכבס + τὰ ἱμάτια; וירחי + ὕδατι.

While none of these variants affect the sense materially, most of them point to a different consonantal Hebrew text.

Numbers xix. 1-7. Principal variations of Sam. from M.T.: 2 M.T. וישר, Sam. וישר, LXX. καὶ ἦ. 3 M.T. וישחט, Sam. וישח, LXX. καὶ σφάξουσιν.

Against this must be set the following variations of LXX. from M.T. and Sam. in agreement:—

3 ונתתם, καὶ δώσεις; והוציא, καὶ ἐξάξουσιν; למחנה + εἰς τόπον καθαρὸν (obelised by Origen). 4 והכחן vacat, added

by Origen under an asterisk; באצבעו vacat, added by Origen under an asterisk. ושררר, και κατακαύσουσιν; את הפרה, αὐτήν; את 2°, και; ערה, δέρμα, Origen added αὐτῆς under an asterisk. 6. והשליך, και ἐμβαλοῦσιν. 7 הכהו 2°, vacat, also missing in 1 Hebrew MS. of Kennicott.

Many of these variations are of no importance, but the words that are missing in the LXX. are probably glosses. In any case while the agreement of LXX. and Sam. in this passage is limited to a single ו in verse 2, the divergences of LXX. from the other two are incomparably more important.

Deuteronomy xx. 1-12. Principal divergences of Sam. from M.T. 1 M.T. איבך, Sam. and many Hebrew MSS איבך, LXX. τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου; M.T. עם, Sam. ועם, LXX. και λαόν. 3 M.T. תערצו ואל תחפזו, Sam. תערצו אלו תחפזו, LXX. θραύεσθε (Lagarde, θροείσθε) μηδὲ ἐκκλίνητε. 4 M.T. להושיע, Sam. ולהושיע, LXX. διασῶσαι. 8 M.T. ויספו, Sam. ויוסיפו, LXX. και προσθήσουσιν. 10 M.T. לא, Sam. על, LXX. πρὸς.

It is not possible to tell with certainty from the LXX. rendering of 3, which text the translators followed. The Greek agrees with Sam. against M.T. in adding a ו in 1 and with M.T. against Sam. in omitting a ו in 4. Except for an obvious clerical error of Sam. in verse 10 these are the only real differences. On the other hand the principal divergences of LXX. from a consensus of Sam. and M.T. in this passage are as follows:—

1 כִּי, ἐὰν δὲ (so 2 MSS. of Kennicott). 2 כקרבתכם, ὅταν ἐγγίξησ. 6 ולא חללו, και οὐκ εὐφράνθη ἐξ αὐτοῦ [Οἱ λοιποὶ και οὐκ ἐλαίωσεν αὐτόν]; וחללנו, εὐφρανθήσεται ἐξ αὐτοῦ [οἱ λοιποὶ λαικώσει αὐτόν]. 10 עליה, αὐτούς; אליה, αὐτούς. 11 והיה והיה vacat; תענך ופתחה, ἀποκριθῶσίν σοι και ἀνοίξωσιν; והיה, ἔσται. 12 ועשתה . . . ותשלים, ὑπακούσωσιν . . . και ποιῶσιν.

These divergences are far less striking than those in the last passage. The difference between singular and plural, when allowance is made for *matres lectionis*, abbreviations, etc., usually amounts to little or nothing. Yet the difference of tradition as to the way of reading the text together with the actual divergences far outweigh the single γ in which LXX. and Sam. agree against M.T. in this passage.¹ For the constant differences of pronunciation of the same consonantal text between Sam. and M.T. on the one hand and LXX. on the other time must be allowed in any theory of date.

These random instances merely confirm my own experience in working at different parts of the Pentateuch. As already stated I believe that all who examine the text of the Pentateuch for themselves must be led to the same result.

But to estimate the matter properly one has to take into consideration other factors. While the number of variants should have some weight, still more should be attached to their character. Variants that through their intrinsic superiority appear to preserve an original text against later corruption or glossing carry with them a very different amount of conviction from variants that can be explained as being due to editorial causes.² For instance—and I purposely take a case that may appear to some minds rather extreme—in Deuteronomy xvii. 15 few readers suspect that there is anything wrong with the text. A note in the Hexapla relating to a point other than that which I now wish to make led me to examine the whole passage (which I had previously supposed to be in good

¹ On the divergencies between M.T. and LXX. generally cp. Briggs, *Psalms*, vol. i. pp. lii. ff.

² For numerous examples see my *Origin of the Pentateuch* and the literature there cited.

order) and I discovered that in this verse *one* MS. of Holmes omitted the words "shalt thou set king over thee" on their second occurrence, suggesting the possibility that תשים עליך מלך came into the Hebrew the second time by accident. This is an extreme case because the Greek evidence—one cursive—looks so very weak and scanty: but if we consider the *textual* probabilities the matter wears a very different aspect. It leaps to the eyes that the Hebrew looks like dittography: and if we remove the words and read the sentence with this change the immense stylistic superiority of the new text becomes apparent. "Thou shalt in any wise set king¹ over thee him whom the Lord thy God shall choose from among thy brethren: thou mayest not put a foreigner over thee which is not thy brother." Can anybody doubt that this is intrinsically better than "thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee, whom the Lord thy God shall choose: one from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee: thou mayest not, etc?" Yet in this case Sam. supports M.T. and the Greek evidence is very weak.²

Considerable weight, again, must be attached to differences of reading that suggest different views of the history of Israel or of the historical situation of the writer. As reference has been made to the law of the king in Deuteronomy xvii. I may briefly explain that there is considerable reason for supposing that the LXX. did not read king at all. The matter is not one that can be discussed shortly, but I

¹ Assuming for the present purpose that "king" is the right text.

² It may however be remarked in passing that on comparing extant Hexaplar notes with the readings of the various MSS. the latter are seen to divide themselves in the strangest ways. Sometimes all the authorities maintain the original reading of the LXX., at others none, while there are all sorts of intermediate combinations. Hence an eclectic method must be followed, and where there are clear indications of some well-known cause of error it may sometimes be wisest to accept the reading of a single dissentient cursive as the true original of the LXX.

have sent an extended note on the subject to the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for July 1911.

It is impossible to do more than just refer to other classes of evidence. But it must be remembered that where the LXX. diverges most from M.T. Sam. follows the latter with its usual fidelity. In the concluding chapters of Exodus the LXX. differs widely from M.T.¹ In the opinion of Robertson Smith "The variations prove either that the text of this section of the Pentateuch was not yet fixed in the third century before Christ, or that the translator did not feel himself bound to treat it with the same reverence as the rest of the Law."² Yet the Samaritan follows M.T. with its usual closeness except that it places xxx. 1-10 after xxvi. 35. This appears to me of very great importance. For Sam. at any rate this part of the Pentateuch was as canonical and its text as well fixed as any other. Combined with the support given to the LXX. by the discovery of the Nash Papyrus it naturally suggests the question whether the Greek translation was not made from a Hebrew MS. that had diverged at a considerably earlier date from the stream of tradition that is represented by M.T. and Sam. In other cases, too, Sam. agrees with M.T. against the transpositions of LXX.: e.g. Genesis xxxv. 21 (following 15 in LXX.); Exodus xx. 13-15 (LXX. 14, 15, 13); Numbers x. 34-36 (LXX. 35, 36, 34). Of other topics, such as the bearing of our question on the textual use of the book of Jubilees, it is impossible to speak here.

Summing up, it may be said that LXX. provides a text which diverges far more widely from M.T. and Sam.

¹ See Driver, *Introduction*, 8th edition, pp. 40 f.

² *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, 2nd edition, p. 125. If this section was entirely missing in the original LXX. as some think, the case for throwing back the branching off of the Hebrew originals of the LXX. is even stronger.

than do the latter *inter se*, and that this proposition may be established from the number of the variants, from their magnitude and importance, from their utility in correcting errors and removing glosses common to M.T. and Sam. and from their sometimes exhibiting different tendencies. As the actual Greek translation is undoubtedly later than the separation of Sam. from the ancestor of M.T. we are thrown back on the Hebrew originals of the LXX. The legends that we have as to the origin of the Greek translation are of little value: and it seems difficult to suppose that the Palestinian tradition at the time when the Greek version was made did not *in the main* agree with Samaritan and M.T., where, as so often, these make common cause against the Greek.¹ If that be so, we must suppose that the LXX. was translated, not from MSS. newly brought from Jerusalem and representing the current Palestinian tradition of the age, but more probably from the Hebrew text current in Egypt, i.e. from Hebrew MSS. similar to the Nash papyrus. This is supported by the enormous number of cases in which LXX. adopts an entirely different pronunciation of the same consonantal text from that followed by Sam. and M.T.—a phenomenon that suggests a separate scholarly tradition of considerable age. This leads to the question, when did the Egyptian tradition branch off from the ancestor of the Massoretico-Samaritan? Not improbably this question should be brought into relation with a number of others, such as the question of the difference between the Greek and Hebrew editions of Jeremiah. Dr. A. B. Davidson's words on this point should be quoted: "The differences between the Hebrew and Greek might certainly

¹ The agreements of Jubilees with LXX. against M.T. and Sam. are too scanty and slight to set against the overwhelming agreements of M.T. and Sam. against LXX.: but they help to justify the words "in the main."

be easier explained if we could suppose the MS. or MSS. on which LXX. is founded carried early to Egypt." ¹

HAROLD M. WIENER.

CRITICISM AND THE PARABLES.

II.

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE PARABLES.

THE first complete parable in the gospels is followed by the words, "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." We could not be told more plainly that parable is an utterance in which more is meant than meets the ear, a picture which has to be contemplated not only by the outer but the inner eye. Yet in spite of this a great conflict has raged round the question whether the parables need any interpretation whatever. They are illustrations, it has been urged, and to suppose that they need themselves to be explained is as much as to say that they have failed of their purpose. They are meant to throw light upon other things, and to assume that they are dark sayings which need to be themselves illumined by interpretations is worse than absurd. This is so certain to some scholars that on the strength of it they deny the genuineness of the specimen interpretations given in the gospels themselves: it is not Jesus, they say, to whom we owe the interpretations of the Sower and the Tares, but the evangelist or the church; and these interpretations only show that the evangelist or the church had failed completely to under-

¹ *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, ii. p. 575; cp. Briggs' *General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture*, p. 189: "The books of Samuel and Jeremiah differ in the Greek so very greatly from the Hebrew traditional text that we must conclude that they were translated from manuscripts which were at an early date independent of Palestinian manuscripts." It is not credible that any Jewish community had MSS. of Samuel or Jeremiah before it had MSS. of the Law.