

# *The Journal of Theological Studies*

JULY, 1915

## NOTES AND STUDIES

### THE TABERNACLE CHAPTERS.

IN the book of Exodus there are two groups of chapters dealing with the construction of the Tabernacle :—

Group I. Cc. xxv–xxxi. The Divine Instructions.

Group II. Cc. xxxv–xl. The carrying out of the Instructions.

From certain peculiarities in these chapters, and in the LXX version of them, three inferences have been drawn :—

(A) that the Greek translators of Group II were not the same as the translators of Group I ;

(B) that the translators of Group II worked from a Hebrew text differing from the Massoretic ;

(C) that cc. xxx, xxxi, and xxxv–xl were later additions to the original text of Exodus.

These conclusions have been put forward with a good deal of confidence, and have been accepted by Biblical students of note. Yet they will bear further examination.

#### (A) DIFFERENT TRANSLATORS.

The inference that the translators of Group II were not the same as the translators of Group I is based solely on the fact that in some cases the translation of certain Hebrew technical terms in Group II differs from that in Group I (see Dr Swete's 'Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek', p. 236 ; Dr Driver's 'Exodus', Cambridge Bible, p. 378 ; and Dr McNeile's 'Exodus', Westminster Commentary, p. 223).

Dr McNeile in his Commentary on Exodus, p. 226, gives a list of seventeen of these variations, and this list is also referred to by Dr Driver.

The instances cited are not very happily selected : several are not technical terms at all but quite ordinary words ; at least two depend on what is the true reading of the Greek text ; in one instance, the only difference is that between the genitive and dative of the same word ; and in another the same verb is used, but compounded with a different preposition.

It would be instructive to examine the whole list in detail, but it will not be necessary here, because even if all the instances were indisputable, the inference would not be justified. For that inference really depends

on an assumption that, as a rule, the LXX translators were fairly consistent in their rendering of Hebrew words. This is not the case.

(i) *In both Groups of chapters, the translators have varied their renderings in the same context.*<sup>1</sup>

A few instances from a list five times the length of Dr McNeile's will shew this.

- Group I. (a) In xxvi 3, the same Hebrew word is rendered by ἐχόμενοι and συνεχόμενοι; in the next verse by συμβολήν; and in the tenth verse by συμβολήν and συναπτούσης.
- (b) In xxvi 36, the 'Screen' is ἐπίσπαστρον; in 37 καταπετάσματι.
- (c) In xxvii 10, 'hooks' are κρίκοι; in 17 κεφαλίδες.
- (d) In xxviii 37, the 'mitre' is μίτρα; in 39 κίδαρις.
- Group II. (a) In xxxviii 27,<sup>2</sup> 'sockets' are κεφαλίδες; in 31 βάσεις.
- (b) In xxxix 34, the 'covering' is διφθέρας in one clause, and καλύμματα in the second.
- (c) In xl 36, 'journeyings' is ἀπαρτία; in 38 ἀναζυγαίς.

This tendency to vary renderings is not peculiar to these chapters, or to Exodus.<sup>3</sup>

In Lev. xxv 39-44, 'servant' appears as οἰκέτον, παῖς, and δούλον; in v. 55 οἰκέται παῖδες; in some other places θεραπείων is found.

In Num. xxii 23-28, 'smote' is rendered by ἐπάταξε, μαστίξαι, ἔτυπτε, and πέπαικας.

In Num. xxxv 2-5, 'suburbs' is rendered by προάστεια, ἀφορίσματα, συγκυροῦντα, and ὄμορα.

Since then the Greek translators frequently vary their translation of a Hebrew word, whether technical or ordinary, in the same passage and even in the same verse, the fact that some of the technical terms in Group I are differently translated in Group II is absolutely without significance.

Nor is this all.

(ii) *In several of the instances adduced as variations, the whole of the evidence has not been considered.*

Again, a few instances will shew what is meant.

(a) xxxi 3 has πνεῦμα θεῖον where the parallel xxxv 31 is said to have πνεῦμα alone.

In the latter passage θεῖον is omitted only by the first hand of B; all the other authorities have it. In the large Cambridge critical edition

<sup>1</sup> This has also been noted by Mr H. St John Thackeray: see 2nd Ed. (1914) of Dr Swete's 'Introduction' p. 236 note 2.

<sup>2</sup> The references to chapter and verse are according to the Hebrew numbering throughout.

<sup>3</sup> See Dr Swete's 'Introduction' pp. 328, 329.

of the LXX πνεῦμα θεῖον is placed in the text, and the omission of θεῖον only recorded in a note. It is nothing but a scribal error.

Similarly, xxxviii 6 has χρυσοῦς where the parallel xxv 18 is said to have χρυσοτορευτά.

But χρυσοτορευτά is scarcely found except in B\* ; B<sup>a</sup>, A, F and other authorities have χρυσᾶ τορευτά, and in *v.* 31, 36 τορευτή is the translation of the word. ('of beaten work') which immediately follows 'gold' in xxv 18. That is to say B\* and a couple of cursives have combined two words which most of the authorities keep separate, and the alleged difference turns upon a very dubious reading.

(b) xxxi 4 has ἐργάζεσθαι where xxxv 32 has ποιεῖν.

But xxxi 6 has ποιήσουσι, and xxxv 10 has ἐργαζέσθω.

Both passages shew the two renderings of the same verb, which rather suggests that the translators were the same.

(c) xxv 17 has ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα ; xxxvii 6 has ἱλαστήριον alone.

Each of the five verses which follow xxv 17 also has ἱλαστήριον alone. Were these verses due to a different translator from that of *v.* 17? If not, why must xxxvii 6 be due to a different translator?

In this connexion ἐπίθεμα does not appear again anywhere. It may be due to a variant rendering which has crept from the margin into the text, but there is another explanation possible.

In some cases, the translators seem to have begun with one rendering which they have immediately abandoned for another. Thus, where casting (of metals) is first mentioned in xxv 12 ἐλάσεις is used, but does not recur again, χωνεύσεις taking its place at xxvi 37. So too at the first mention (xxv 7 and the parallel xxxv 9) the Breastplate is ποδήρη ; at xxviii 4 περιστήθιον ; and afterwards (xxviii 15, xxix 5, xxxix 8) λογιέον. It is therefore possible that when the Mercy-seat is first mentioned the translators thought it advisable to define ἱλαστήριον more closely as a 'covering', and afterwards dropped the explanatory word.

(d) xxviii 11 has γλύμμα ; xxxix 6 has ἐκκόλαμμα.

The word is part of the phrase (in Hebrew two words) which in RV. is rendered 'the engravings of a signet'. The phrase occurs three times in xxviii, and three times in xxxix : the verb alone is found three times in xxviii, and its participle once in xxxix. No two of the Greek renderings agree exactly.

<i>Verb.</i>		<i>Phrase.</i>
xxviii 9 γλύψεις	xxviii 11 γλύμμα σφραγίδος	xxxix 6 ἐκκόλαμμα σφραγίδος
11 διαγλύψεις	21 γλυφαὶ σφραγίδων	14 ἐγγεγλυμμένα εἰς σφραγίδας
36 ἐκτυπώσεις	36 ἐκτύπωμα σφραγίδος	30 ἐκτετυπωμένα σφραγίδος
	G g 2	

In xxxix 6 the participle is doubly translated, *γεγλυμμένους καὶ ἐκκεκολλημένους*, immediately followed by *ἐκκόλαμμα σφραγίδος* as above.

When it is noticed that in six out of the seven cases referring to jewels some form of *γλύφω* is used, and *ἐκτυπώ* in the three referring to the Gold Plate, can it be doubted that this is a deliberate variation to suit the different working of the different materials? The jewels are 'engraved'; the gold is 'stamped in high relief'. But if so, the recurrence of this distinction would again point to the identity of the translators.

At any rate, is it quite fair to single out the one case where a difference between the Groups can be made out, and to ignore the marked resemblances, and the variations in the same Group?

(e) xxviii 22 has *άλυσιδωτόν*; xxxix 15 has *ἐμπλοκίου*.

No mention is made of the fact that for the same phrase xxviii 14 has *ἔργον πλοκῆς*, which differs from the rendering in *v.* 22, and is akin to that of xxxix 15. Moreover, the whole verses should be compared:—

xxviii 22 καὶ ποιήσεις ἐπὶ τὸ λογεῖον κρωσσούς συμπεπλεγμένους ἔργον ἀλυσιδωτὸν ἐκ χρυσίου καθαροῦ.

xxxix 15 καὶ ἐποίησαν ἐπὶ τὸ λογεῖον κρωσσούς συμπεπλεγμένους ἔργον ἐμπλοκίου ἐκ χρυσίου καθαροῦ.

The verses are identical all but one word: ought that to pass unnoticed?

To all these may be added a remarkable instance not included in Dr McNeile's list.

(f) A somewhat peculiar phrase of three Hebrew words in xxxix 6 is rendered

*συμπεπορημένοι καὶ περισσειαλωμένοι χρυσίῳ.*

Seven verses further on (*v.* 13) the very same phrase is rendered

*περικεκλωμένα χρυσίῳ καὶ συνδεδεμένα χρυσίῳ.*

In xxviii 20 (parallel to xxxix 13) the first of the three Hebrew words does not occur, yet the Greek runs

*περικεκαλυμμένα χρυσίῳ· συνδεδεμένα ἐν χρυσίῳ.*

Here the points to be noticed are

(1) in the one passage (xxxix 6-13) two quite different renderings of the same phrase are found;

(2) the parallel passages from the two Groups (xxviii 20 = xxxix 13) have much in common, especially if *περικεκαλυμμένα* (which does not express the meaning of the missing Hebrew word) is but a corruption of *περικεκλωμένα*.<sup>1</sup>

The instances marked (d), (e), (f) are all taken from the one pair of

<sup>1</sup> *περικεκλωμένα* is actually found in one or two MSS. Others read *περικεκλωσμένα*, and there seems to have been some uncertainty about the word.

passages (xxviii = xxxix) about the making of the priestly vestments. They should go far to shew that

(1) difference of translation does not mean difference of translators ;

(2) there are reasons for thinking that the translators were the same throughout.

(iii) *There is evidence that the translators of Group II were acquainted with the translation of Group I.*

(a) The consistent translation of the three colours by *ύάκινθος*, *πορφύρα*, and *κόκκινος* ; of 'Mercy-seat' by *ιλαστήριον* : of 'hangings' by *ιστία* : and of 'bars' by *μοχλοί*, all tend to shew the use of a common vocabulary where differences might easily occur.

(b) It is not very likely that two sets of translators working independently would reproduce the phrase *φαν ἔχον κύκλω τοῦ περιστομίου* (xxviii 32, xxxix 23) word for word, or the phrase *πᾶς ὁ παραπορευόμενος εἰς τὴν ἐπίσκεψιν* (xxx 14, xxxviii 26) with only the omission of *εἰς* in the latter passage.

(c) For 'onyx stones' xxv 7 has *λίθους σαρδίου*, and the same appears in the parallel xxxv 9 : but in xxviii 9 they appear as *λίθους σμαράγδου*, and this variation is reproduced in the parallel xxxix 6 ; and in xxviii 20, xxxix 13 the same word is rendered *βηρύλλιον*.

How could this be possible unless the translators of xxxv 9, xxxix 6, 13 had the renderings of xxv 7, xxviii 9, 20 before them ?

(d) xxv 3-6 is a list of materials to be offered, which is repeated in xxxv 5-9.

## c. xxv

καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶ ἡ ἀπαρχὴ ἣν λήψεσθε  
παρ' αὐτῶν  
χρυσίον καὶ ἀργύριον καὶ χαλκὸν  
καὶ ύάκινθον καὶ πορφύραν καὶ κόκκινον  
διπλοῦν  
καὶ βύσσον κεκλωσμένην καὶ τρίχας  
αἰγείας  
καὶ δέρματα κριῶν ἡρυθροδανωμένα  
καὶ δέρματα ύακίνθινα καὶ ξύλα  
ἄσηπτα  
καὶ λίθους σαρδίου καὶ λίθους εἰς τὴν  
γλυφὴν  
εἰς τὴν ἐπωμίδα καὶ τὸν ποδήρη.

## c. xxxv

(this clause is not in the Hebrew here)  
χρυσίον ἀργύριον χαλκὸν  
ύάκινθον πορφύραν κόκκινον διπλοῦν  
διανησμένοι  
καὶ βύσσον κεκλωσμένην καὶ τρίχας  
αἰγείας  
καὶ δέρματα κριῶν ἡρυθροδανωμένα  
καὶ δέρματα ύακίνθινα καὶ ξύλα  
ἄσηπτα  
καὶ λίθους σαρδίου καὶ λίθους εἰς τὴν  
γλυφὴν  
εἰς τὴν ἐπωμίδα καὶ τὸν ποδήρη.

The only differences are that in the second passage there are a few omissions of *καί*, and the insertion of the one word *διανησμένοι*, clearly a variant rendering for the preceding erroneous *διπλοῦν*.

Otherwise the two are identical : both have the notable *ἡρυθροδανω-*

μένα and ἄσηπτα; both include κεκλωσμένην, which is not in the Hebrew; both have the same four misrenderings (διπλοῦν; δέρματα ὑακίνθυνα; εἰς τὴν γλυφὴν; ποδῆρη).

Can it reasonably be doubted that whoever wrote the latter passage had the other before him?

(e) Another pair of passages is found in xxviii 16-20, xxxix 9-13, the 'Breastplate' and its jewels.

## c. xxviii

Ποίσεις αὐτὸ τετράγωνον· ἔσται διπλοῦν, σπιθαμῆς τὸ μῆκος αὐτοῦ, καὶ σπιθαμῆς τὸ εὖρος. Καὶ καθυφανεῖς ἐν αὐτῷ ὕφασμα κατάλιθον τετράστιχον· στίχος λίθων ἔσται, σάρδιον, τοπάζιον, καὶ σμάραγδος, ὁ στίχος ὁ εἰς. Καὶ ὁ στίχος ὁ δεύτερος, ἄνθραξ, καὶ σάπφειρος, καὶ ἴασπις. Καὶ ὁ στίχος ὁ τρίτος, λιγύριον, ἀχάτης, ἀμέθυστος. Καὶ ὁ στίχος ὁ τέταρτος, χρυσόλιθος, καὶ βηρύλλιον, καὶ ὀνύχιον, περικεκαλυμμένα χρυσίῳ· συνδεδεμένα ἐν χρυσίῳ ἔστωσαν κατὰ στίχων αὐτῶν.

## c. xxxix

τετράγωνον διπλοῦν ἐποίησαν τὸ λογεῖον σπιθαμῆς τὸ μῆκος, καὶ σπιθαμῆς τὸ εὖρος διπλοῦν· καὶ συννφάνθη ἐν αὐτῷ ὕφασμα κατάλιθον τετράστιχον· στίχος λίθων, σάρδιον καὶ τοπάζιον καὶ σμάραγδος, ὁ στίχος ὁ εἰς· καὶ ὁ στίχος ὁ δεύτερος, ἄνθραξ, καὶ σάπφειρος, καὶ ἴασπις· καὶ ὁ στίχος ὁ τρίτος, λιγύριον καὶ ἀχάτης καὶ ἀμέθυστος· καὶ ὁ στίχος ὁ τέταρτος, χρυσόλιθος καὶ βηρύλλιον καὶ ὀνύχιον περικεκυκλωμένα χρυσίῳ, καὶ συνδεδεμένα χρυσίῳ.

Surely independent translators would never have hit on translations so nearly alike. For instance, both have ὕφασμα κατάλιθον, though the corresponding Hebrew is missing from the second passage; and in the same verse (xxviii 17 = xxxix 10) both seem to have transferred λίθων from the first clause to the second. Yet in this very verse Dr McNeile finds one of his differences because one has καθυφανεῖς, and the other συννφάνθη!

Is it conceivable that, if the translations were altogether independent, no one of the twelve jewels should be differently translated?

Further

(iv) *There are indications that the translators were the same throughout.*

The evidence just considered might possibly be consistent with Group II being due to translators who had the translation of Group I before them, and yet were not the same as the former translators. But it is not at all likely that two sets of people would exhibit the same peculiarities and follow the same methods.

(a) In both Groups there is a tendency to make the same kind of careless mistakes.

In xxvii 18 the translators have mistaken the Hebrew word which means 'cubit' for a similar word meaning 'hundred'; in xxxviii 9, 11 (a different part of the parallel passage) the same mistake is made in places where the earlier chapter has the correct rendering.

Similar confusions of words that are somewhat alike are found in xxix 5 ('Breastplate' put for 'Band of Ephod'); in xxvi 34 (the 'Veil' instead of the 'Mercy-seat'); and in xxvi 36 ('board' instead of 'clasp'). In the same way in Group II xxxv 21, 22 have 'brought' instead of 'came'; xxxv 22 has 'seals' instead of 'brooches'; and in xxxviii 18 'the height *in* the breadth' has been turned into 'the height *and* the breadth', which (as the length has been already specified) would give three dimensions to the Screen, making it 5 cubits in thickness!

(b) Certain of the technical terms seem to have been little or not at all understood by the translators, who betray their perplexity by sometimes leaving them untranslated and sometimes giving inconsistent renderings.

In both Groups the same set of words has been misunderstood, e.g. 'board', 'clasp', 'grating' (of the Altar); 'woven band' (of the Ephod); 'finely wrought' (garments); 'lace'. In both Groups *σκηνή* is used sometimes of the Tabernacle and sometimes of the Tent: where the two words occur together, the translators have been puzzled to know what to put for the Tent, and in each case have adopted a different rendering (xxvi 7 *σκέπην*; xxxv 11 *παραρύματα*; xl 19 *αὐλαίας*; in xxvi 11 the Tent, standing alone, is translated *δέρρεις*).

The substitution of 'mingled' for 'salted' in xxx 35, and of 'fasted' for 'served (as a host)' in xxxviii 8, both seem to be attempts to read an easier word for a more difficult one.

In both Groups the translators are puzzled by the same words, and use the same methods to avoid difficulties.

(c) In both Groups there is a tendency to soften down expressions that might suggest a human conception of the Deity. 'Dwell among you' in xxv 8 becomes 'be seen among you', and in xxix 45, 46, 'be called upon among you', while in xl 35 the same verb is translated 'overshadowed'. Possibly a hint of the same tendency is found in the curious inversion in xl 35 by which the phrase 'the Glory of the LORD filled the Tabernacle [the Dwelling]' is turned into 'the Tent was filled with the Glory of the LORD', as though to avoid personifying the Glory.

In xxix 46, 'I am the LORD their God' is changed into 'and to be their God'; in xxxvi 1, 'to whom the LORD gave wisdom' becomes 'to whom was given wisdom'. In both cases the personal Name is avoided.

(d) In both Groups there is a tendency to omit or paraphrase perplexing passages, and occasionally to insert explanatory words or phrases.

(e) The deliberate and frequent use of different Greek words to represent the same Hebrew has already been shewn to run through both Groups, and the opposite tendency to use the same Greek for different Hebrew words is also found in both (e.g. *ἐσχάρα* represents three Hebrew words in the two verses xxvii 4, 5; and *ἀφαίρεμα* stands for three different words in xxxv 21, 22, 29). Had one Group been fairly consistent in its renderings while the other varied them, there might have been reason to suspect a difference of translators. As it is, the same inconsistency is found in both, and in much the same degree.

In short, the translation exhibits the same characteristics throughout.

To sum up.

In support of the assertion that the translators of Group II were not the same as the translators of Group I only a comparatively few instances of varied renderings are brought forward, and several of these are decidedly doubtful.

On the contrary, a considerable amount of evidence (yet not nearly all that might be brought) has been adduced to shew that—

(i) differences of rendering in one and the same passage abound, and therefore difference of rendering does not shew difference of translators;

(ii) in a considerable proportion of the instances of difference alleged, the whole evidence has not been considered;

(iii) there is abundant reason for believing that the translators of Group II were acquainted with and made use of the translation of Group I;

(iv) there is fair reason for believing that the translators were the same throughout.

It is surprising that scholars of deservedly high repute (such as those mentioned on p. 449) should put forward as probable the assertion that the translators were different, without a hint of the weight of evidence against it. Can it be that they have reproduced a statement from some less reliable source without themselves verifying the facts?

Why should this question be of any importance? What does it matter whether the translators were the same or not?

If the translators were different, it would be probable that cc. xxxv-xl were not in the text used by the original translators, and were therefore a later addition to the book. If the translators were the same, it would

be evidence that as far back as 250 B.C. the book of Exodus was substantially complete as we now have it.

(B) DIFFERENCE OF TEXT.

The second inference is that the translators of Group II had before them a Hebrew text differing from the present Massoretic text.

It is strange that those who put this forward, together with the assertion that the translators were not the same as those who translated Group I, do not perceive that the two contentions are not altogether consistent. In order to prove that the translators were different, it has to be assumed that they had the same technical terms to translate, and translated them differently. But if the translators of Group II had before them a text different from that which we now possess, how can we be sure that they had the same words to translate? It is scarcely admissible to argue as if these translators had the identical terms before them, and in the next breath to assert that their text was different.

However, it is to be noted that where difference of text is spoken of, something more than mere difference is intended. That might only mean that the text from which the Greek translation was made differed from the present Hebrew in having been altered from it: whereas what it is sought to establish is that the *Hebrew* has been modified by subsequent additions and alterations.

'It is permissible', says Dr Swete ('Introduction' p. 236), 'to suppose that the Hebrew text before the original translators did not contain this section, and that it was supplied afterwards from a longer Hebrew recension of the book in which the last six chapters had not yet reached their final form.'

In other words, the allegation is that the LXX text differed from the Massoretic in being *nearer to the true original*.

The main (if not the sole) argument for this conclusion is drawn from the fact that in the section xxxvi-xxxix the order of the contents in the Greek differs remarkably from that in the Hebrew (see Swete 'Introduction', p. 235; Driver 'Exodus' p. 378).

The difference is very striking, but it does not stand alone. In both Groups (xxv-xxxi and xxxv-xl) the Greek shews a large number of variations from the Hebrew, and all of these should be taken into account. They may be classed under four heads: (a) Greek words or phrases not in the Hebrew; (b) Hebrew words or phrases not in the Greek; (c) difference of substance; (d) difference of order.

VARIATIONS IN GROUP I.

(a) *Greek words or phrases not in the Hebrew.*

i. Sometimes these are words frequently associated with the accom-

panying word, and therefore likely to be inserted inadvertently; e. g. 'fine *twined* linen', xxv 4; 'with *pure* gold', xxv 28; 'Aaron *thy* brother', xxix 5.

2. Sometimes they are manifest errors, such as the insertion of 'the tent' in 'the ark *of the tent* of the testimony', xxx 26; and of τὸ ὕψος in xxvii 14, 15, 16, which would make the height of the hangings inconsistent with that given in *v.* 18.

3. Sometimes phrases that have recently occurred are repeated where evidently they are not needed. Thus the whole phrase 'and in the candlestick four cups made like almond blossoms' which commences xxv 34 is in the Greek unnecessarily repeated at the end of *v.* 35. Similar repetitions are found in xxvii 13, xxix 20, and xxx 21. They are probably scribal errors due to '*similar endings*'.

4. Sometimes the additional words are by way of explanation; e. g. in xxv 34 '*in the one branch*' after 'four cups made like almond blossoms'; in xxviii 33 '*of the robe below*' after 'upon the skirts'; in xxx 19 '*with water*' after 'shall wash their hands and their feet'.

*The character of the words and phrases peculiar to the Greek is such that they may reasonably be considered additions by the translators, and not omissions in the Hebrew.*

(b) *Hebrew words or phrases not in the Greek.*

1. In xxv 33 the Hebrew repeats the phrase 'three cups made like almond blossoms, a knop and a flower' because the branches were in pairs: the Greek has the phrase only once.

In xxviii 34 the Hebrew repeats 'a golden bell and a pomegranate' to convey the idea of repeated alternation: the Greek has the phrase only once.

In xxv 35 the Hebrew has the phrase 'a knop under two branches of one piece with it' three times because there were three pairs of branches, and each pair had a knop below their junction with the stem. The Greek<sup>1</sup> reads 'a knop under the two branches out of it, and a knop under the *four* branches out of it'. It can hardly be doubted that the translators had the triple phrase before them, but combined the second and third clauses into one.

Similar omissions of a repeated phrase, quite in keeping with the Hebrew idiom, are found in other parts of the Pentateuch.

2. xxviii 23-28 in the Hebrew is a lengthy and complicated description of how the Breastplate was to be attached to the Ephod by rings and chains: in the Greek only *vv.* 24, 25 are represented. Yet those two verses are intimately connected with the context, and the whole passage is fully represented in both the Hebrew and Greek of the parallel

<sup>1</sup> In Cod. B. Cod. A omits the second clause.

xxxix 16-21. It is therefore probable that the original text of c. xxviii also had the whole passage, and that the translators have omitted a considerable part of it.

3. In Hebrew xxx 6 reads

‘And thou shalt put it before the Veil  
that is by the Ark of the Testimony  
before the Mercy-seat that is over the Testimony.’

The third clause is not in the Greek. The translators may have passed it over accidentally owing to the similar ending of clause 2 ; but, quite as probably, they may have mistaken *Caporeth* (Mercy-seat) for *Parocheth* (the Veil), and omitted the clause as redundant after clause 1.

*The character of the words and phrases peculiar to the Hebrew is such that in all probability they are part of the original text, and their absence from the Greek is due to omission (accidental or intentional) by the translators.*

(c) *Difference of substance.*

The principal instance of this in Group I is in c. xxviii.

*Massoretic.*

*LXX.*

(23) And thou shalt make upon the breastplate two rings of gold, and shalt put the two rings on the two ends of the breastplate.

(24) And thou shalt put the two wreathen chains of gold on the two rings at the ends of the breastplate.

(25) And the *other* two ends of the two wreathen chains thou shalt put on the two ouches, and put them on the shoulderpieces of the ephod, in the forepart thereof.

Καὶ θήσεις ἐπὶ τὸ λογεῖον τῆς κρίσεως τοὺς κρωσσούς· τὰ ἀλυσιδωτὰ ἐπ’ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν κλιτῶν τοῦ λογεῖου ἐπιθήσεις. Καὶ τὰς δύο ἀσπιδίσκας ἐπιθήσεις ἐπ’ ἀμφοτέροισι τοῖς ὤμοις τῆς ἐπωμίδος κατὰ πρόσωπον.

It will be seen that the Hebrew gives quite clear directions for attaching the Breastplate to the Ephod by means of chains attached to rings on the Breastplate at one end, and to ‘ouches’ on the Ephod at the other. In the Greek (since in v. 22 κρωσσούς . . . ἔργον ἀλυσιδωτόν is the equivalent for ‘chains . . . of wreathen work’) the rings are altogether omitted ; the ‘ouches’ are simply placed upon the shoulderpieces of the Ephod ; and no connexion between the two is even suggested. Clearly the Greek is incomplete, and yet bears sufficient resemblance to the Hebrew to shew that it was derived therefrom.

*There can be little doubt that the Greek is at fault, and not the Hebrew.*

*(d) Difference of order.*

1. In xxix 20, 21 the Hebrew directs that the blood of the ram is to be sprinkled upon the altar round about, and then proceeds (*v.* 21), 'And thou shalt take of the blood that is upon the altar',—the natural sequence. The Greek places the instruction to pour out the blood upon the altar at the *end* of *v.* 21, so that Moses is directed to take of the blood 'that is upon the altar' before there is any intimation that any blood would be there.

2. In the directions to anoint the various parts of the Tabernacle, xxx 26–28, the Hebrew has 'the Table and all the vessels thereof' at the beginning of *v.* 27, between the Ark and the Candlestick, its natural position: the Greek has the Table and its vessels in *v.* 28, between the Altar of Burnt Offering and the Laver, altogether out of place.

Also the Greek text shews signs of perturbation in *v.* 27. The Vatican MS begins the verse with the Candlestick and its vessels, and then, between this and the Altar of Incense, has 'and the Tent of Witness and all the vessels thereof'; an impossible reading, for (1) it is incredible that the Tent should have been mentioned here; (2) it is a repetition of what has been already stated in *v.* 26; (3) the Tent could scarcely be said to have 'vessels'. The other authorities begin the verse with 'and all its vessels' (which cannot refer to the immediately preceding Ark), thereby betraying that something which had 'vessels' ought to stand here.

3. In c. xxviii the Hebrew has the verse (29) directing Aaron to bear the names of the children of Israel upon his heart after the directions for attaching the Breastplate to the Ephod, where it clearly belongs since the Breastplate had the names of the tribes engraved on the twelve jewels: the Greek has this verse after *v.* 22 between the direction to make golden chains, and the direction to place the chains on the Breastplate, as clearly an unsuitable position.

It will be noticed that this one passage (xxviii 23–29) shews three of the classes of difference: (1) a large part of the Hebrew does not appear in the Greek; (2) what does appear differs in substance; and (3) there is a difference of order. Yet in all three it is the Hebrew and not the Greek which is justified.

*Where the order differs, the Hebrew order is natural, and the Greek improbable.*

Altogether, then, Group I furnishes instances of all four classes of variation, yet

(i) So much of these seven chapters (xxv–xxxi) is the same in both versions that it is unlikely that the texts were materially different;

- (ii) Where the two differ, the Greek and not the Hebrew is suspicious ;  
 (iii) No claim is made that the translators had a different text in this Group.

#### VARIATIONS IN GROUP II.

When we turn to Group II, we find the same four classes of variations, only on a larger scale, and therefore more noticeable.

##### (a) *Greek words or phrases not in the Hebrew.*

1. Words commonly associated with the accompanying word :—  
 xxxv 12, 'the ark of the testimony'; xxxix 1, 'Aaron the priest';  
 xxxix 16<sup>b</sup>, 'the two golden rings'.

2. Phrases that have recently occurred repeated :—xxxvii 13, 'two on the one side and two on the second side', of the rings for the staves of the Table (repeated from *v.* 3 of the staves of the Ark); xxxviii 11, 'and the side towards the south, a hundred by a hundred', repeats the immediately preceding phrase, only changing 'north' into 'south' (superfluous here as the south side has already been specified, *v.* 9); xxxviii 20, 'and these were silvered with silver', repeats the last clause of *v.* 19 (inaccurately, for *v.* 20 concerns the pins of the tabernacle which were of bronze and not silvered).

3. Explanations :—xxxvii 6, 'the mercy-seat above the ark'; xxxvii 8, 'at the end of the mercy-seat' (twice); xxxvii 17, 'the Candlestick which giveth light'; xl 17, 'in the second year of their going forth from Egypt'.

Two of the Greek passages not found in the Hebrew are noticeable as suggesting that they were influenced by the parallel passage in Group I.

xxxv 10-19—the list of things to be made—closes with 'the Anointing Oil and the Incense of Composition', not in the Hebrew, and not wanted here as they have already been mentioned in the preceding list: the parallel passage in Group I, xxxi 6-11, has them in this position at the end of the list, and not earlier.

After the making of the Laver (xxxviii 8) the Greek adds, 'in the day when he fixed it: and he made the Laver that in it Moses and Aaron and his sons might wash their hands and their feet when they were entering into the Tent of the Testimony; or whenever they approached the Altar to minister, they used to wash in it, as the LORD commanded Moses'.

Here the inclusion of Moses with the priests, and the closing 'as the LORD commanded Moses', shew that this is really a version of xl 31, 32 (absent from the Greek of *c.* xl). It was probably transferred to this place because the parallel xxx 17-21 has a somewhat similar ending.

Besides all these, at the beginning of xxxviii 1-7, where the Hebrew has 'and he made the Altar of Burnt Offering of acacia wood', the Greek

reads, 'this man made the Brazen Altar out of the brazen censers which belonged to the men who rebelled with the company of Korah'. Not only is this a manifest anachronism, but it does not agree with the account in Numbers, which represents that the censers were beaten into plates to make a *covering* for the Altar, not that the Altar was made of them.

Near the beginning of xxxix 32-43, after the words 'so did they', the Greek has, 'But of the remaining gold they made vessels wherewith to minister before the LORD; and of the remaining blue and purple and scarlet they made ministering garments for Aaron, so that he might minister in the Holy Place'. The whole of this is superfluous, for the making of the gold vessels has already been recorded in xxxvii 16-23, and the making of the vestments in the passage corresponding to xxxix 1-31. Also, it breaks the connexion between the verse recording the completion of the work, and the verses recording the delivery of the finished work to Moses.

Even more clearly than in Group I, *the character of the words and passages peculiar to the Greek points to the conclusion that they have been inserted by the translators, and not omitted by the Hebrew.*

(b) *Words and passages in the Hebrew not found in the Greek.*

Nearly one quarter of the contents of the Hebrew Group II does not appear in the Greek, but this chiefly concerns two chapters, xxxvi, xxxvii. From these, two entire sections (the Framework of the Tabernacle, and the Altar of Incense), and the greater part of a third (the Curtains) are absent from the Greek. These will be noticed later on (see p. 468 and pp. 475, 476).

Of the lesser instances of Hebrew passages not in the Greek, many concern minor details such as the staves of the Altar (xxxv 16, xxxviii 7, xxxix 39), and its horns (xxxviii 2); the cords of the Tabernacle and Court (xxxv 18, xxxix 40); the measurements of the Table (xxxvii 10), of the Mercy-seat (xxxvii 6), and of the Altar (xxxviii 1); and the details about the Cherubim (xxxvii 7-9). As all these are fully given in Group I, it is not unlikely that the translators thought it unnecessary to repeat them here.

In xxxviii 17 the Hebrew reads, 'And he made the Candlestick of pure gold: of beaten work *made he the Candlestick*'; the last four words are not in the Greek: in xxxvii 15 the Greek puts together the making of the staves for the Ark and the staves for the Table, recorded separately in the Hebrew (just as it inserts *καὶ τὰ θυσιαστήρια* at the beginning of xxxi 8, while the Hebrew mentions the two altars separately afterwards): in xxxviii 5-7, after recording the placing of four rings on the grating of the altar, the Greek continues *εὐρέϊς τοῖς μοχλοῖς, ὥστε αἶρειν ἐν αὐτοῖς τὸ*

*θυσιαστήριον*, thus combining 'to be places for the staves' of *v.* 5 with 'to bear it withal' of *v.* 7, and omitting the intervening making and placing of the staves. These three instances have all the appearance of condensing the passages to avoid repetition.

xxxvii 24 (the Candlestick and its vessels made of a talent of gold) and xl 29<sup>b</sup> (sacrifices offered on the Altar of Burnt Offering) are not in the Greek. It is at least as likely that the translators passed over these because not very important as that a Jewish scribe took the trouble to interpolate them.

One matter calls for fuller notice.

In the Hebrew, xxv 6 and xxxv 8 (in the lists of materials to be provided) mention the Oil for the Light, and spices for the Anointing Oil and for the Incense: these verses are not in the Greek, and the Greek has no mention of the Oil for the Light in xxxv 14, 28. Both Hebrew and Greek have instructions about this oil in Group I (xxvii 20, 21), but in Group II neither mentions it among the things that were made, and yet in xxxix 37 both include it among the things delivered to Moses.

The variations seem perplexing enough, especially as the lighting oil is hardly important enough to call for insertion in the Hebrew, or deliberate omission from the Greek. Yet there is a clue.

xxvii 20 has no direction for *making* the Oil for the Light, but only defines it as 'pure olive oil beaten', i. e. clear and of the finest quality (see Driver's 'Exodus', p. 296). Bearing this in mind, the Hebrew is consistent throughout. In xxv 6 the oil is included among the materials to be provided, but it does not appear among the things to be made (xxxii 6-11) because it needed no compounding. The Anointing Oil and the Incense, on the contrary, were composite. Therefore in xxv 6 the requisite *spices* are included among the materials to be provided; in xxv 22-38 full directions for compounding them are given; and in xxxii 6-11 they are named as among the things to be made.

In Group II, the direction to provide oil and spices is repeated (xxxv 8), and they are included among the offerings brought (xxxv 28); no mention is made of making the oil (in xxxv 14 it merely appears along with the lamps as an accessory of the Candlestick); while the making of the Anointing Oil and the Incense is recorded (xxxvii 29), and all three are finally specified in the list of what was delivered to Moses (xxxix 37, 38).

The real harmony of the Hebrew account is so little on the surface that it can hardly be suspected of being artificial. The Greek account, on the other hand, is singularly incomplete. It gives the instruction as to the nature and quality of the lighting oil, and mentions it in the list of things delivered to Moses, but has no direction for providing it, and no mention of it among the offerings. It also gives every mention of

the Anointing Oil and the Incense, excepting only the two verses (xxv 6, xxxv 8) which prescribe the provision of the necessary spices. Where the *offering* of these spices is recorded (xxxv 28) there is a tiny but significant bit of evidence. The Hebrew runs, 'and the spice, *and the oil for the light*, and for the anointing oil, and for the sweet incense': the Greek is *καὶ τὰς συνθέσεις, καὶ εἰς τὸ ἔλαιον τῆς χρίσεως, καὶ τὴν σύνθεσιν τοῦ θυμιάματος*, where the second *καί* breaks the sense. Does not this suggest that the italicized clause, which would complete the sense, has been omitted? If so, then the fact that the same words are missing from the Greek of xxxv 14 would imply that in both places they were deliberately omitted.

On the whole, *the character of the words and phrases peculiar to the Hebrew* (as in Group I) *makes it probable that they belong to the original text, and have been omitted by the translators.*

(c) *Difference of substance.*

1. xxxvi 3 narrates how Bezaleel and his companions received from Moses the offerings which the children of Israel brought for the service of the sanctuary, and then continues, 'And they' [emphatic, referring to the nearer subject, the children of Israel] 'brought yet unto him [Moses] freewill offerings every morning'. The Greek translators, not realizing the force of the emphatic 'they', have thought that it must be the same as the 'they' which commences the verse, viz. : Bezaleel and his companions. Accordingly they have changed 'brought' into 'received'; have omitted 'unto him', and substituted 'from those that brought'.

The Hebrew gives a terse and vigorous picture of the Israelites bringing more and more offerings to Moses morning by morning: the Greek turns this into the feeble statement that Bezaleel and his fellow-workers continued to receive the offerings from those that brought them (not from Moses as in the earlier part of the verse).

2. xxxvii 17-23, the construction of the Candlestick, is the one passage of any length where the substance of the Greek differs seriously from the Hebrew. This, like the similar instance of differing substance in Group I, deals with a rather lengthy and complicated description. The Hebrew, however, though minutely detailed with a good deal of repetition is clear and free from ambiguity: the Greek is confused, hardly intelligible, and has every appearance of having been condensed (not very intelligently) from the longer statement.

*Where the substance differs, as in Group I, the Hebrew is to be preferred to the Greek.*

(d) *Difference of order.*

1. In xxxv 23 the Greek places the *δέρματα δακίνθια* before the 'rams' skins dyed red', which is not the usual order: in xxxvi 9 the

Greek puts 'the same [measure] was to all [the curtains]' *between* the measurements of the length and of the breadth of the curtains: in xxxix 28 the Greek has the 'head-tires' of the priests before the 'mitre' of the High Priest. These are probably instances of scribal inadvertence, transposing clauses.

2. In xxxv 10-19 the Hebrew has a complete list of the things to be made, arranged in regular order: the Tabernacle and its framework; the Ark, Mercy-seat, and the Veil; the Table, Candlestick, Altar of Incense (with the Anointing Oil and Incense), and the Screen of the Door; the Brazen Altar and Laver; the Hangings and Screen of the Court; the pins and cords; and finally the priestly Vestments.

The Greek list is incomplete and strangely disordered. It begins in the same way with the Tabernacle and its framework, the Ark, Mercy-seat, and Veil. But then follow the Hangings of the Court; the Emerald Stones; the Incense and Anointing Oil; the Table and Candlestick; the Altar; the Vestments; and finally the Anointing Oil and the Incense over again. Can this possibly be the original account?

3. In xxxix 33-41 the Hebrew has a perfectly regular list of the completed articles delivered to Moses in the same natural order as the list of c. xxxv.

The Greek begins with *στολάς*, where the Hebrew 'Tabernacle' is clearly right, being followed by the Tent and framework. Then follow the Ark, the Altar,<sup>1</sup> Anointing Oil and Incense, Candlestick, and Table; the Vestments; the Hangings of the Court; the Screen of the door of the Tent, and of the gate of the Court (bringing together two separate things); all the vessels of the Tabernacle and all its service; the skin and other coverings; the pins; and all the service of the Tabernacle (already mentioned).

The order here not only differs from the Hebrew, but also from the Greek in c. xxxv (notice especially the Vestments at the end of the list in c. xxxv; in the middle of that in c. xxxix).

It may be argued that the imperfect and disordered lists of the Greek may represent an original text which was afterwards systematically rearranged and filled in so as to form the present symmetrical Hebrew. This argument ought hardly to be urged by those who hold that the whole description of the Tabernacle was an 'ideal' plan drawn up by men whose writings are specially characterized by system and order. Anyhow (1) it is unlikely that lists drawn up by the same writers would be so much at variance as these two; (2) it is very unlikely that the original lists would have shewn such utter confusion of the various parts

<sup>1</sup> If this is the Altar of Burnt Offering it is strangely out of place: the association with Ark, Incense, Candlestick, and Table would rather suggest the Altar of Incense.

of the Tabernacle as is found in the Greek ; and (3) original lists would hardly contain the little anomalies (such as repetitions) which the Greek presents.

Unskilful condensation and rearrangement of a fuller original would account for all these peculiarities.

*Where the order differs, the Hebrew is consistent and natural, the Greek confused and contradictory.*

So far it has been shewn that, apart from the difference of order in the contents of xxxvi 8<sup>b</sup>-xxxix 43, the Greek of both Groups shews a large amount of variations from the Hebrew, and that in most (if not all) of these, there is good reason for thinking that the translators used a good deal of liberty in dealing with their text; adding, omitting, altering, and rearranging. The remarkable difference of order in that particular set of chapters is, then, not an isolated phenomenon; and if the other variations are due to the translators, it is not unlikely that this one also may be due to them, and not to a difference of text.

The difference in question will be best shewn in a Comparative Table.<sup>1</sup>

<i>Hebrew.</i>	<i>Greek.</i>
<i>see below.</i>	Vestments (a).
I. { Curtains.	Curtains (fragment).
{ Framework.	—
{ Veil and Screen.	Veil and Screen.
<i>see below.</i>	Court } (b). Summary }
II. { Ark.	Ark.
{ Table.	Table.
{ Candlestick.	Candlestick.
Altar of Incense.	—
—	Metal-work (c).
III. { Anointing Oil and Incense.	Anointing Oil and Incense.
{ Altar of Burnt Offering.	Brazen Altar.
{ Laver.	Laver.
(b) { Court.	<i>see above.</i>
{ Summary.	
IV. Account of Metals.	Account of Metals.
(a) Vestments.	<i>see above.</i>
V. Delivery to Moses.	Delivery to Moses.

<sup>1</sup> The Comparative Table in Dr Swete's 'Introduction' p. 235 is incomplete and obscures some points of resemblance.

From this it is clear that the arrangement of the sections marked I to V is practically the same.

In section III the first two subsections are transposed in the Greek, but that relating to the Anointing Oil and Incense is only a single verse which might easily be displaced, and the Hebrew order is more natural.

The chief differences are with regard to sections (a), (b), and (c).<sup>1</sup>

(a) *The Vestments.*

1. In the Hebrew these come quite at the end after all the details of the Tabernacle, which is intelligible enough, and agrees with the order of things to be made (cc. xxxi and xxxv): in the Greek they come at the very beginning, as though these were the first to be taken in hand. No doubt a great deal of the work would be carried on simultaneously by different sets of workers, but each set of workers would have to receive instructions from Moses, and he would probably first set to work those who had to execute the heavier tasks of the structure and furniture of the Sanctuary.

2. In the Hebrew the section begins with 'And of the blue and purple and scarlet, they made finely wrought garments', following quite naturally on the account of the metals: the Greek begins with *Καὶ ἐποίησε πᾶς σοφὸς ἐν τοῖς ἐργαζομένοις* [= Heb. xxxvi 8<sup>a</sup>] *τὰς στολὰς τῶν ἁγίων, αἷ εἰσιν Ἀαρὼν τῷ ἱερεὶ* [= Heb. xxxix 1<sup>b</sup>]. If the translators had decided (for whatever reason) to place the Vestments first, it is quite easy to see how this combination would be made: it is not easy to see how the Hebrew would be derived from the Greek.

3. The section ends with 'as the LORD commanded Moses', which fits very well with what follows in the Hebrew, 'Thus was finished all the work of the tabernacle of the tent of meeting: and the children of Israel did according to all that the LORD commanded Moses, so did they' (xxxix 32): according to the Greek, it only leads up to 'And they made for the tent ten curtains', the commencement of making the Tabernacle.

4. In the Greek the declaration just quoted, that the children of Israel did as the LORD commanded, is followed by a passage (not in the Hebrew) containing a statement that out of the remaining blue and purple and scarlet they made ministering garments for Aaron, which resembles xxxix 1, the beginning of the Hebrew 'Vestments' section. This looks very much as though the translators were conscious that originally some account of the Vestments belonged hereabouts.

Thus in the Hebrew order the section connects naturally with what precedes and with what follows: in the Greek it fits neither, and there

<sup>1</sup> The absence of the Altar of Incense from the Greek will be considered later on, see pp. 475, 476.

is an indication that there was some statement about the Vestments near the very place where the Hebrew places this section.

(b) *The Court—Summary.*

Following on the account of the making of the Court, both Hebrew and Greek have a short passage (xxxviii 21-23) which begins 'This is the sum of the things for the tabernacle'. In the Hebrew this is quite in place, for it comes at the very end of the things made for the Tabernacle, and is only followed by the account of the quantity of metals and the making of the priestly Vestments: in the Greek it stands before the making of the Ark, Table, Candlestick, great Altar, and Laver; clearly out of place. There could hardly be a plainer indication that this passage and the Court section to which it is attached have been removed from their true place at the end, where the Hebrew has them.

(c) *Metal-work.*

After the account of making the Ark, Table, and Candlestick, but before the Brazen Altar and Laver, the Greek has a passage containing some miscellaneous details of metal work.

Its position is not very appropriate, as one would hardly expect such minor matters as the rings, hooks, bases, and pins to intervene between the furniture of the Tabernacle and the great Altar. Also, at first sight, it seems as if there were no such passage in the Hebrew, but on closer inspection it will be found that there are scattered fragments in other parts of the Hebrew which do correspond.

The passage begins with a fairly close translation of xxxvi 34, and a sentence founded on xxxvi 36; then follows a blending of xxxvi 13 and 18; then a version of xxxviii 17 re-arranged, and finally a version of xxxviii 20.

Now xxxvi 34 is part of the account of the Framework, otherwise wholly absent from the Greek; and xxxvi 13, 18 belong to that larger part of the Curtains section which is not in the Greek. It would seem then that the considerable portion of c. xxxvi which is otherwise absent from the Greek was not wholly unknown to the translators. On the other hand, the verses from c. xxxviii are a repetition in a different rendering of what has already (in the Greek order) appeared in the Court section.

Further, the passage is marked by a curious change. The preceding sections commence with 'And Bezaleel made', or 'and he made', the subsequent details being only joined on by a simple *καί*: here, each fragment commences with *ὄφρα* (with different verbs). The fragmentary nature of the section is clearly indicated.

There can hardly be room for doubt that odd verses relating to the common subject of metal-work have been here grouped together, in

which case the passage exhibits plain traces of omission, re-arrangement, and varied translation, which must have been deliberately done.

Thus each of the three sections in cc. xxxvi-xxxix wherein the Greek order differs from the Hebrew affords indications that in the Greek they are misplaced. Their evidence goes to shew that the Hebrew has preserved the true order of which the Greek is a dislocation.

Dr Swete ('Introduction' p. 235) notices that both the Greek and the Massoretic version of these chapters 'follow a system, i.e. that the sequence is due to a deliberate re-arrangement of the groups', and suggests as a possibility that 'the Alexandrian translator has purposely changed their relative order, giving precedence to the ornaments of the priesthood'. This would account for the Vestments section standing first, but not for the position of sections (*b*) and (*c*).

System of a kind, however, is to be found in the Greek arrangement. Supposing that the translator had some reason for placing the priestly Vestments first,<sup>1</sup> he has grouped along with them the Curtains, the Veil and Screen, and the Hangings of the Court. That is to say, all the parts involving the use of textile materials are put together. Then come the parts requiring the use of metals: the Ark, Table, and Candlestick; the metal overlaying and casting; and the Bronze Altar and Laver. In this connexion it is significant that the Greek omits all mention of 'acacia wood' in the construction of the Ark, the Table, and the great Altar, as though these were wholly made of metal. In the same way, it omits the whole section about the Boards and Bars, only preserving in another part, section (*c*), the one verse which speaks of their being overlaid with gold.

This grouping, according to material, may perhaps furnish a clue to the arrangement of the Greek.

If it be asked why this Group of chapters (and indeed Group I also in a lesser degree) should shew an amount of perturbation not found elsewhere in the Pentateuch, the answer is simple.

It is precisely these chapters which contain an unusual amount of repetition, peculiar technical terms, and complicated descriptions, and that in matters which the translators might consider of no great interest to those for whom the translation was being made.

The inference, then, that the translators of cc. xxxv-xl had before them a text differing from the present Hebrew rests only on a portion of the evidence. It is based upon the disorder of one particular set of chapters: it disregards the evidence of all the other variations in both Groups, and the special evidence of the three passages which constitute

<sup>1</sup> Can this have had reference to some Egyptian practice or prejudice?

the chief difference between the Greek and the Hebrew in the disordered chapters.

The evidence taken as a whole rather points to the conclusion that the variations in both Groups are due to the translators; and that in cc. xxxvi-xxxix the Hebrew has preserved the true order, from which the Greek has been derived by a process of re-arrangement.

### (C) LATER ADDITIONS TO THE HEBREW TEXT.

The two inferences already considered (that the translators of Group II were not the translators of Group I; and that their text differed from the Massoretic) are only of any real importance in so far as they would serve to confirm a third and graver inference, viz. that the Massoretic text contains a large amount of matter which does not belong to the original book but was added subsequently.

It is held that there are strong reasons for considering that cc. xxx, xxxi are a later addition to Group I; and that the whole of Group II is a still later addition (see Driver 'Exodus' pp. 328 and 378).

#### I. Cc. xxx, xxxi an 'Appendix' to Group I.

The reasons given for believing that these chapters are a later addition to the Instructions relate to two matters; the Altar of Incense, and the anointing of priests. The latter subject will be considered first.

##### (a) *The anointing of the priests.*

It is held that originally only the High Priest was anointed because (1) the anointing is confined to Aaron in Exod. xxix 7 (and his successors, v. 29) and in Lev. viii 12; (2) in various passages the High Priest is called the *anointed* Priest, which would be no distinction if all the priests were anointed. Therefore it is held that Exod. xxx 30 and other passages which extend the anointing to Aaron's sons must belong to a later period (see Driver 'Exodus' pp. 329 and 337).

Exod. xxix 7 directs that Aaron is to be anointed by the pouring of the anointing oil on his head, and in the verses that follow nothing is said about anointing his sons: Lev. viii 12 records that Aaron was so anointed, and v. 13 does not mention any anointing of his sons. In neither passage is there any express exclusion of the sons: it is not said that *only* Aaron was anointed. That the sons were not anointed is at best only an inference from the silence of these passages.

On the other hand, besides the direction of xxx 30, an earlier passage (xxviii 41) includes the sons in the anointing, and xl 15 is very explicit; 'thou shalt bring his sons . . . and thou shalt anoint them, as thou didst anoint their father . . . and their anointing shall be to them for an everlasting priesthood'. Also the anointing of the sons as well as of Aaron is mentioned in Lev. vii 35, 36, and allusions to it are found in Lev. x 7, Num. iii 3.

It comes to this, then, that because two passages speak of Aaron being anointed without mentioning his sons, the express testimony of six passages to the anointing of the sons is to be discredited as belonging to later interpolations.

This is surely an unusual way of estimating evidence. If two witnesses testify that a famous personage was knighted without saying anything at all about others, while six witnesses testify that others less famous received that honour at the same time, should we be justified in concluding that only one person was knighted, and that the others were only included by an after-invention? One would think that, by the ordinary rules of evidence, the positive statement of the six would far outweigh the merely negative silence of the two.

Is it not possible, and even in accordance with Hebrew tradition, that there was some anointing of the sons (whether the sprinkling with blood and oil specified in Exod. xxix 21, Lev. viii 30, or not) which was not the solemn anointing by pouring the sacred oil on the head (cf. Ps. cxxxiii 2)? If there was this special anointing of the High Priest, and only a subsidiary anointing of the sons, this would at once account for the latter not being mentioned in Exod. xxix 7, Lev. viii 12 (both referring to the pouring on the head), and also for the High Priest being styled 'the anointed priest' *par excellence*.

Whereas, on the later addition theory, we should be required to believe in an interpolator who has been careful to include the sons in Exod. xxviii 41, but failed to mention them in xxix 8, ten verses later; and in the same way has included them in Lev. vii 35, 36, and left viii 13 (fifteen verses further on) without them. He has also inserted precise directions in Exod. xxx 30, xl 15, and allusions in Lev. x 7, Num. iii 3, but left the mentions of 'the anointed priest' untouched. He must have been very careless.

The one view is simple and supported by the weight of evidence: the other involves some considerable improbability. It can hardly be said that this argument for the late origin of cc. xxx, xxxi is very convincing.

(b) *The Altar of Incense.*

The arguments for considering the golden Altar of Incense a later addition, are drawn from (i) the position of the Instruction for making it; (ii) the annual rite of atonement; (iii) the Altar of Burnt Offering called 'the' altar; (iv) the use of censers (see Driver 'Exodus' p. 328).

(i) *The position of the Instruction.*

The Altar of Incense has long been regarded as almost of supreme importance, next indeed to the Ark of the Covenant, and according to Exod. xxx 6 was to be set in the Holy Place with the Table of Shewbread and the golden Candlestick. Yet the Instruction for making

it is not found in c. xxv with the Instructions for making the Table and Candlestick: it is only first mentioned in xxx 1-10, 'when the directions respecting the Tabernacle seem to be complete, and brought to a solemn close by the promise in xxix 43-46 that Jehovah will take up His abode in the sanctuary so constructed': and is not even mentioned in xxvi 34, 35 'where the position of the vessels in the Tabernacle is defined' (Driver 'Exodus' p. 328).

No doubt, if these chapters were (as is alleged) an 'ideal' scheme drawn up by a systematic writer 'as the embodiment of certain spiritual ideas' (Driver 'Exodus' p. 428), it would be very surprising to find this Altar so far removed from the other furniture of the Holy Place. But if these chapters are, as they profess to be, Divine Instructions, then, except so far as they may guide us, we are not qualified to judge what reasons may have determined this particular order, or what was the precise importance of this Altar in the Divine scheme. Now, however important the Altar may have come to be considered in after ages, in these Instructions it appears to be treated rather as an accessory to the golden Candlestick, the burning of incense being directly associated with the preparation and lighting of the lamps (xxx 7, 8).

This view is the more probable because there is a similar instance in this same chapter. The Instruction for making the Bronze Laver is found here, and not along with the Instruction for making the Altar of Burnt Offering in c. xxvii. As regards the Court, there can be no question that the Altar was the main feature, and the Laver subordinate. It is therefore not impossible that, as regards the Holy Place, the Candlestick and Table were the matters of primary importance, and the Altar of Incense only secondary.

Further, between the Incense Altar and the Laver comes the Instruction that every man was to give a half shekel as 'a ransom for his soul'. Why is it placed here? The ransom money was to be applied to 'the service of the tent of meeting' (xxx 16), and in xxxv 24, xxxvi 1 'the service' undoubtedly refers to the construction of the Tabernacle. The obvious conclusion is that the ransom money provided the silver which was needed, and this is distinctly stated in the Account of Metals (xxxviii 24-31) where this provision of silver (placed between the freewill offerings of gold and bronze) is recorded to have been used for the casting of sockets, hooks, and the like. The silver, then, was for the construction and ornamentation of subordinate parts.

If, then, the Altar of Incense was of secondary importance, the whole of c. xxx is occupied with accessories; and the placing of the Ransom money between the Golden Altar and the Bronze Laver (preserving the order 'gold, silver, bronze' of xxv 3, xxxv 5) indicates that the chapter

is a deliberate and orderly arrangement, and not a miscellaneous collection of after-thoughts.

But does not all this follow after the 'solemn close' of xxix 43-46? and does not that shew that these were no part of the original Instructions?

Most of the Instructions in cc. xxv-xxxi end with a passage defining the position or use of the articles which were to be made. C. xxviii gives the instructions for making the priestly vestments: c. xxix continues with the ceremonies to be observed at the investiture of the priests, and the sacrifices to be then offered, leading on naturally to the daily sacrifices (*vv.* 38-42). The chapter, then, is something of a digression from the making of the vestments to the consecration and duties of the priests who were to wear them; and it is this digression, not 'the directions respecting the Tabernacle', which is brought to a close by the promise of *vv.* 43-46.

xxvi 34, 35 defines the position of the Mercy-seat, Candlestick, and Table, for the making of which directions had already been given: it could hardly include the position of that which had not yet been ordered to be made.

(ii) *The annual rite of atonement.*

In xxx 10 an 'annual rite of atonement' is prescribed to be performed upon the Altar of Incense: there is no notice of this in Lev. xvi, 'where the ceremonial of the day of atonement is described in detail'; and in that chapter 'only one altar, the altar of Burnt-offering' is mentioned (Driver 'Exodus' p. 328).

Lev. xvi 12-16<sup>a</sup> describes in full detail what Aaron was to do 'within the veil', i. e. in the Holy of Holies: *v.* 16<sup>b</sup> adds 'and so shall he do for the tent of meeting', i. e. the Holy Place, but here no details are given. We have no right to assume that this did not include the rite prescribed in Exod. xxx 10.

'The altar' in *vv.* 18-20 is outside the Tent ('and he shall go out unto the altar', *v.* 18), and there, of course, there was but the one altar. *Vv.* 20 and 33 distinctly mark three stages in the ceremonies: (1) the holy place; (2) the tent of meeting; (3) the altar.

(iii) *'The' Altar.*

In a number of passages (e. g. Exod. xxvii-xxix; Lev. i-iii, v-vi, viii, ix, xvi) 'the altar of Burnt-offering' is referred to as "*the* altar", implying apparently that there was no other' (Driver 'Exodus' p. 328).

Exod. xxvii-xxix comes before the Instruction to make the Altar of Incense, so there was only one altar to refer to: in Lev. i-iii, v-ix the connexion with sacrifice is so close that only the sacrificial altar could be meant: in Lev. xvi the altar is outside: but in Lev. iv 'the altar of sweet incense' is distinguished from 'the altar of burnt offering' (*vv.* 7,

10, 18, 25, 30, 34). Where there is no possibility of mistake, the Bronze Altar is simply styled 'the altar': elsewhere it is distinguished.

More than that, there were reasons for styling the sacrificial Altar pre-eminently '*the* altar': (1) the Hebrew word for 'altar' is derived from the root meaning to kill or slaughter, and therefore intimately connected with animal sacrifice; (2) there is reason for thinking the Incense Altar subordinate, while the Altar of Sacrifice was of primary importance; (3) the Incense Altar was secluded from view and small (cubits 1 × 1 × 2); the Bronze Altar was conspicuous in the open court and of great size (cubits 5 × 5 × 3, more than thirty-five times as large).

The use of the term 'the altar', therefore, no more implies that 'there was no other' than the mention of 'the chair' at a public meeting implies the absence of all other chairs. In a description of St Peter's at Rome, 'the altar' would be readily understood to mean the High Altar without any suggestion that there are no others.

(iv) *The use of 'censers'.*

Lev. x 1, xvi 12, Num. xvi 6, 7 mention 'incense being offered on pans or censers' (Driver 'Exodus' p. 328): hence it is inferred that incense was originally offered in this way, and the incense *altar* was a later development.

Lev. x has to do with the irregular offering of Nadab and Abihu: Lev. xvi directs the High Priest to take the censer into the Holy of Holies, where there was no altar: Num. xvi deals with the test of the claim of Korah and his company which took place 'at the door of the tent of meeting' (v. 18).

All of these are clearly exceptional, and therefore no possible proof that there was not an Altar in the Holy Place for the ordinary daily burning of incense.

None of the four reasons for considering the Altar of Incense a later innovation is really convincing when closely examined, and the most plausible (No. i, the position of the Instruction) may fairly be taken to tell the other way.

We are asked to believe that originally there was no mention of any Altar of Incense, and that the Instruction to make one (Exod. xxx 1-10) was added by some one at a later time. Does it not stand to reason that such an one, if he had any sense, would be careful to put his insertion in the most appropriate place? Why should he put it 'after the directions respecting the Tabernacle seem to be complete and brought to a solemn close'? It would have been just as easy for him to insert it in c. xxv with the directions for the Table and the Candlestick.

It is possible (as shewn above) to see a reason for this Altar occupying a subordinate position in the original Instructions: it is not possible

to imagine any reason for an interpolator inserting this direction anywhere but in the obviously natural place.

Then, again, there are the other contents of the two chapters, xxx, xxxi, to be taken into consideration.

The Instructions about the Altar of Incense and the anointing of priests only occupy 11 verses (xxx 1-10, 30) out of 56. What of the other 45? Were these also part of the later addition?

Dr Driver seems to think so for he marks both chapters P<sub>2</sub>, and summarily dismisses four-fifths of the contents with the remark (p. 329), 'The other subjects treated in chs. xxx-xxxii are such as would naturally find place in an Appendix'.

What are these other subjects? (1) 'The ransom of souls at a census'; (2) the construction of the Laver; (3) the composition and use of the Anointing Oil; (4) the composition of the Incense; (5) the nomination of Bezaleel and Oholiab; (6) the summary of things to be made; (7) injunction to keep the Sabbath.

Was there really nothing of all this in the original Instructions? Was the Laver also an afterthought? The Anointing Oil is referred to in xxix 7, 21: was there no direction about this originally? Incense was 'offered on pans or censers'; was there no hint as to its composition? Did the original account make no mention of the principal workers, and contain no summary of the things to be made?

It is difficult to believe that all these 'other subjects' were absent from the original: it is equally difficult to guess why, if they were absent, an interpolator should have thought it necessary to insert some of them. He might be tempted to bring in an altar for burning the incense, and a laver for the priests' washing mentioned in xxix 4; but why should he invent an imaginary census tax? or imaginary workers? or add a seemingly irrelevant injunction to keep the Sabbath? Yet if there was in the original document an 'Appendix' containing some of these things, the insertion of the Altar of Incense among these instead of in the earlier instructions becomes more unaccountable than ever.

The Septuagint furnishes some further evidence.

It is remarkable that in Group II (the carrying out of the Instructions) the passage which narrates the making of the Altar of Incense, xxxvii 25-28, and the mentions of it in xxxv 15, xxxix 8 are not found in the Greek. So also the notices of the Laver in xxxv 16, xxxix 39, xl 7, 11, 30 are not represented.

At first sight this looks like a confirmation of the view that both Altar and Laver were later additions which had not yet found their way into the text used by the translators of xxxv-xl.

But then, while the Altar is not mentioned anywhere in cc. xxxv-xxxix,

in c. xl there are two passages (*vv.* 5, 6, and 26–28) which recognize both this Altar and the distinctive title of the Altar of sacrifice. Was this one chapter translated at a different time from the preceding five, and after the additions of cc. xxx, xxxi had been introduced into the Hebrew?

Again, while the Greek of c. xl has no mention of the Laver, xxxviii 8, which narrates the making of the Laver, is not only found in the corresponding Greek, but is there actually emphasized by the addition (borrowed from xl 31) about the washing. Are we to suppose that the translators of c. xxxvii had not the passage about the Altar but had the passage about the Laver in c. xxxviii, while the translators of c. xl knew about the Altar, but not about the Laver? If not, then the absence of the Altar from some parts, and of the Laver from others, can only be instances of omission on the part of the translators.

Then, too, all the other subjects in xxx, xxxi—the Census money, Anointing Oil, Incense, chosen workers, summary of things to be made, injunction to keep the Sabbath—are all fully recognized in the Greek of xxxv–xl. If, then, cc. xxx, xxxi are (as marked by Dr Driver) an integral whole, the translators of Group II must have had the whole of these chapters (including the Incense Altar and the Laver) before them, in which case the absence of the Altar section from the Greek is a marked instance of omission.

Yet, as the Altar of Incense is recognized in c. xl, the translators of Group II could hardly have had any reason for *deliberately* omitting the section about its being made. Now, just where this section occurs in the Hebrew, the Greek has the section about Metal-work (see the Comparative Table, p. 466) made up of miscellaneous fragments: and this section is almost exactly the length of the Greek of xxx 1–5, which corresponds to the Hebrew of xxxvii 25–28, which does not appear in the Greek. Can it be that for some reason, such as the mutilation of a page, the text used by the translators was here defective, and that they therefore filled up the gap by stringing together the fragments about the metal-work from other parts?

At any rate, the LXX version of cc. xxxv–xl does not confirm the theory that cc. xxx, xxxi form a later 'Appendix' to the original Instructions. That theory is only founded on a small part of the chapters in question; the reasons drawn from that small part are far from strong; and the theory involves some serious improbabilities as to the action of the supposed interpolator.

## II. *Group II later than cc. xxx, xxxi.*

The theory that cc. xxxv–xl are later than xxx, xxxi depends on the difference in order between the two Groups of chapters, the 'most

noticeable variation' being the difference in the position of the Altar of Incense and the Bronze Laver, which in Group I are relegated to the 'Appendix', and in Group II are 'introduced in accordance with the place' which 'they would naturally hold' (Driver 'Exodus' p. 378).

Of course on any theory cc. xxxv-xl were written after cc. xxv-xxxI, and this rearrangement might have been made even if both Groups were due to the same author.

The two Groups, however, differ in other respects besides the order. Group II is by no means the replica, with trifling changes, of Group I which it is sometimes represented to be, though both Dr Driver ('Exodus' p. 376) and Dr McNeile ('Exodus' p. 223) characterize it as practically a *verbatim* repetition.

But cc. xxxv-xxxix are the record of the work of construction, and therefore verses not enjoining constructive work (e.g. xxv 8, 9; 15, 16; 22; 37<sup>b</sup>; 40; xxvi 9<sup>b</sup>; 12, 13; 30; &c.) are not included in them. So too directions as to the position or use of the furniture or hangings (e.g. xxv 21; xxvi 33-35; xxx 19-21) are transferred to xl 17-33, the setting up of the Tabernacle; and the whole of c. xxix (the Investiture of the Priests) is found in Leviticus, not in this Group.

The omissions in these chapters are not casual but deliberate, to suit the purpose of the account.

In like manner, in Group II there are considerable passages (xxxv 20-29, the offerings that were made; xxxvi 2-7, the delivery of the materials to the workmen; xxxix 33-43, the delivery of the finished work to Moses) narrating what was actually done, which therefore could by no possibility be included in the Instructions.

Lesser instances also are not without significance.

The Instruction about the Oil for the Light (xxvii 20, 21), and that about the Urim and Thummim (xxviii 30), do not appear in Group II. These do not seem to have required any making, and therefore are not included in the work done.

In the account of making the Ephod, xxxix 3 has the addition, 'they did beat the gold into thin plates, and cut it into wires': xxxix 28, 29 has some added details about the priestly robes (the breeches 'of fine twined linen', and the girdle 'of fine twined linen, and blue, and purple, and scarlet'). These are explanations of how the Instructions were actually carried out.

Neither omissions nor additions are accidental or unmeaning: they shew purpose, and are required by the essential character of the two Groups.

What then of the difference in order? Does that shew any traces of plan or purpose?

The differences (by no means confined to the position of the Incense Altar and Laver) will again be best seen in a Comparative Table.

Group I.	Group II.
xxv. <i>see below, (g).</i> Materials to be offered. <i>see below, (f).</i>	xxxv. Observance of Sabbath. Materials to be offered. Summary of things to be made. The offerings and offerers. The workers.
— <i>see below, (e).</i> —	xxxvi. Delivery of materials to workers. Superabundance of offerings.
<i>Furniture:</i> Ark. Mercy-seat. Table. Candlestick.	xxxvii. <i>Furniture:</i> Ark. Mercy-seat. Table. Candlestick.
xxvi. <i>Structure:</i> Curtains. Framework. Veil. Screen.	<i>Structure:</i> Curtains. Framework. Veil. Screen.
<i>see below, (a).</i> <i>see below, (d).</i>	Altar of Incense. Anointing Oil and Incense.
xxvii. <i>Court:</i> Bronze Altar. <i>see below, (c).</i> Hangings, &c.	xxxviii. <i>Court:</i> Bronze Altar. Laver. Hangings, &c.
— — <i>see below, (b).</i> —	Summary. <i>Account of Metals:</i> gold. silver. bronze. —
xxviii. <i>Vestments:</i> Ephod. Breastplate. Urim and Thummim. Robe of Ephod. Gold Plate. Other robes.	xxxix. <i>Vestments:</i> Ephod. Breastplate. — Robe of Ephod. Gold Plate. Other robes.
xxix. Investiture.	—

Group I.	Group II.
xxx. (a) Altar of Incense.	
(b) Census money.	
(c) Laver.	
(d) Anointing Oil and Incense.	<i>see above.</i>
xxxi. (e) Workers.	
(f) Summary of things to be made.	
(g) Observance of Sabbath.	

---

— Delivery of articles completed.

Here it will be noticed that, at the commencement of the work, the Furniture and Structure sections have changed places in Group II. Why?

The Instructions begin at once with the Ark (the most sacred of all), the Table, and the Candlestick, the Structure that was to enshrine them coming after: in the work, the external Structure is first put in hand, and the more elaborate Furniture after. This is just what might be expected; the one arrangement is in order of importance, the other according to the order in which the work would naturally be undertaken.

So in the Vestments section, the Instructions place the Gold Plate before the other robes because of its importance: in the work, the other robes follow the Robe of the Ephod, and the Gold Plate, differing in material and workmanship, follows.

Once more the different character of the two Groups is traceable.

Next, it is to be observed that not only the Altar of Incense and the Laver but *all* the contents of cc. xxx, xxxi are altogether differently placed in Group II. The most remarkable variation of all is that the Instructions of c. xxxi which end Group I are found at the beginning of Group II, and in reverse order:—

End of Group I	Workers: things to be made: Sabbath.
Beginning of Group II	Sabbath: things to be made: Workers.

Why is the injunction to keep the Sabbath inserted at all?

Surely to preclude the possibility of the people supposing that the sanctity and urgency of the work might supersede the law of the Sabbath rest. Not even for so sacred a work might that be broken.

Consider then the order of the Instructions.

A list of the materials needed naturally stands first. Next comes the detailed description of the Sanctuary to be erected, beginning with its most sacred part, the Ark of the Covenant and its Mercy-seat. Then follow the Table and Candlestick of the Holy Place, and then the

Curtains, Framework, Veil and Screen which were to enshrine all these in an awe-inspiring seclusion. After these, the great Altar of the open Court, and the Hangings, pillars, and Screen of the enclosure to guard it. Then the holy Robes in which the priests might enter to minister, and the ceremonies by which they were set apart for their sacred office. After these again come the accessories: the secondary Altar of the Holy Place; the provision of silver; the Laver for purifying ablutions before ministering; the Consecrating Oil, and the Incense.

When the directions for the work to be performed are complete, then the designation of the chief workers, and a short summary of the work they were to do, follow most suitably. Is it not obvious that the command to observe the sacred days of rest makes a most fitting, almost inevitable, conclusion to all that has gone before?

When the whole group of chapters (xxv-xxxi) is regarded as containing the Divine Instructions, an admirable order and unity can be seen to run through them. Could that have been produced by two sets of writers, working independently, and separated by a considerable interval of time?

In the narration of how these Instructions were obeyed, however, clearly some notice is needed of how Moses, who alone had received them, conveyed them to the people. Accordingly c. xxxv begins with Moses assembling the people, and telling them 'what the LORD hath commanded', and now the solemn warning against 'infringing the Sabbath, which so appropriately closed the Instructions, becomes an equally suitable preface to the address to the assembled people. Before they are told of the work, they are cautioned as to its limitation, and to this caution is made the significant addition, 'Ye shall kindle [*lit.* make flame, or burn] no fire throughout your habitations upon the sabbath day'. Not only are they themselves to rest, but the special injunction against the use of fire is added lest they should think it necessary to keep alive the fires for casting and fashioning metals. *All* work is to cease.

This prefatory warning given, the people are next informed what materials are wanted, and the short summary of things to be made is added so that the people may understand to what purposes these materials are to be applied.

Quite simply and inartificially the matters which form the suitable close to the Instructions come as an equally fitting prelude to the performance of the work, and precisely in that reverse order in which they are actually found.

In response to Moses' address the offerings pour in: men and women bring their golden ornaments, the men bringing also the ready-made materials they possessed, as well as silver, bronze, and acacia wood, the

women contributing to the supply of materials by their spinning, and their rulers providing the precious stones, the spice, and the oil. Then the workers are convened, the materials delivered to them, and the work of construction commences.

In this account of the performance of the work, those things which, as being of lesser importance, only appear towards the close of the Instructions, are naturally associated with the parts to which they belong. So we find them: the Incense Altar with (but after) the Furniture of the Holy Place; the Anointing Oil and Incense (coupled because of similar composition) immediately after the Altar on which the Incense was to be offered; the Laver after the Altar of Sacrifice; and the Ransom silver in its appropriate place between the gold and the bronze of the freewill offerings.

Again, a perfect order and unity runs through the arrangement of Group II, and, though the order differs so much from that of Group I, it is the order which exactly harmonizes with the professed character of these chapters, viz. the narration of how the Instructions were obeyed. Is it credible that this harmony, so real and yet so far from obvious, could have been produced by yet a third set of writers, merely re-arranging somewhat slavishly the Instructions of Group I 'in order to dwell on their detailed fulfilment' (M<sup>e</sup>Neile 'Exodus' p. 223)?

The inference that the different order of Group II shews that these chapters belong to a later period than Group I really rests on a small part of the evidence: it disregards the significance of the way in which the contents of cc. xxx, xxxi are re-arranged, and it disregards the fact that the omissions and additions in Group II shew a deliberate purpose agreeing with the different character of the two Groups.

The view that Group II gives a straightforward account of how the Instructions were carried out is consistent with the evidence as a whole, explains all the variations (omissions, additions, differences of order), and is coherent and intelligible throughout.

---

The three inferences to be examined were

(A) that the translators of xxxv-xl were not the translators of xxv-xxx;

(B) that the text used by the translators of xxxv-xl differed from the present Massoretic text;

(C) that cc. xxx, xxxi were a later addition to xxv-xxix,  
and cc. xxxv-xl a still later addition.

It has been the aim of these papers to shew that each of these inferences has been drawn from an imperfect survey of the evidence,

and that a consideration of the whole evidence shews that there is good reason for believing that

- (1) the translators were the same throughout ;
- (2) the differences of the Greek from the Hebrew are due to the translators, and not to a difference of text ;
- (3) cc. xxx, xxxi are an integral portion of the original Instructions, and xxxv-xl a plain narrative of how the Instructions were obeyed.

A. H. FINN.

### THE TEXT OF JEREMIAH vi 27-30, IN THE LIGHT OF EZEKIEL xxii 17-22.

THIS passage comes at the close of the great series of Jeremiah's songs on the Scythian invasion, but it has no direct bearing on that event itself, except in so far as it throws light on the moral and spiritual condition which demanded and received so terrible a punishment. The text, unfortunately, is in a very corrupt state, as is shewn by the various attempts at translation and emendation made by modern editors. Thus, for instance, Dr Driver, who accepts the text practically as it stands, renders as follows: 'I have made thee an assayer among my people; that thou mayest know and assay their way. They are all the most refractory of the refractory, going about with slanders: they are copper and iron; they all of them deal corruptly. The bellows blow fiercely; the lead is consumed by the fire: in vain do they go on refining, for the evil are not separated. Rejected silver shall men call them, because Yahweh hath rejected them.'<sup>1</sup>

Dr Driver adds an explanation referring to the methods by which silver and gold were extricated from various alloys. Certainly some such explanation is necessary, and in the main that given is satisfactory, but it leaves an element of doubt when closely examined alongside of the Hebrew text. In the first place it may be remarked that Dr Driver has rightly omitted the word מִכְּצָר as a gloss from i 18. But v. 28 immediately offers difficulties. The sudden introduction of 'the refractory', while not impossible, breaks awkwardly into the metaphor. It is possibly due to confusion with Isa. i 22, 23. By taking the second מִכְּצָר with the words that follow, the metrical arrangement is seriously

<sup>1</sup> *The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah* pp. 38, 39.