

found elsewhere: to Matt. xxi 9<sup>b</sup> we find added in syr. C 'and many went forth to meet Him, and they were rejoicing and glorifying God for all that they saw', which agrees with an addition found in Φ (Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae): ἀπήντων δὲ αὐτῷ πολλοὶ χαίροντες καὶ δοξάζοντες τὸν θεὸν περὶ πάντων ὧν εἶδον. The Arabic Diatessaron (xxxix 31-35), it should be noted, gives a different combination. I mention these readings here, because I think the single coincidence between Origen and W in Lk. xix 37, striking as it is at first sight, is very likely nothing more than an accidental coincidence in error, and therefore of no great significance.

F. C. BURKITT.

(*To be continued.*)

## TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

### AN INSTANCE (Ps. xcvi 11).

THE Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible may be broadly described as a starveling Science which ekes out its existence on false pretences. Except in the Pentateuch, of which there exists a Hebrew-Samaritan recension, there are (as everybody knows) only a very few various readings of any importance or interest, which are preserved in Hebrew. But this meagre list, too thin to live by itself, has been incorporated by critics in another of imposing dimensions. 'The reading of the LXX' is a phrase in common use, and a goodly number of such 'readings' is found in almost every modern commentary upon almost any book of the Hebrew Bible. In fact the Textual Criticism of the O.T. lives chiefly by one hypothesis, viz., that a vast number of the *renderings* of the LXX can be turned back almost at sight into ancient *readings* of the Hebrew text. Renderings (readings) of other Versions are cited at the heel of the LXX, but chiefly by way of garnishing.

Critics pay lip-homage to Fact when they confess that the LXX was born in ignorance and brought up in a state of continual textual corruption. It was made in Egypt because the Egyptian Jews were fast forgetting their Hebrew, it suffered corruption because it was a popular version, which could be tried by no standard except that of popularity. It was fated both to follow the easier reading and also to fall further and further away from the Hebrew original. When we arrive at codex

'B' in the fourth century A.D. we have moved far both from the Hebrew text and from the original LXX.

And yet, in practice, critics are wont to invoke the LXX almost as an Oracle. They find a Hebrew phrase which does not immediately explain itself represented in the Greek by a smooth and simple term, and they leap to the conclusion that the LXX found the precise Hebrew equivalent of this term in the text from which they made their translation. It is possible, and yet the probability is the other way. The Hebrew-forgetful translators must have made many a slip, and must often have misread a rare or unexpected Hebrew term as a commonplace.

But a slip of the LXX is not infrequently echoed in the Peshitta and to a certain extent in the Latin Vulgate (specially in the Psalter). Thus it often comes to pass that the textual material with which the critic of the O.T. works is beset with uncertainty. In nine cases (perhaps) out of ten this uncertainty ought to be emphasized, and the critic should confess that his work is only tentative, and that it does not at all amount to scientific proof.

It is the usual absence of this confession together with a frequent failure to verify textual statements which justifies the reproach of false pretences against the critics. An instance will shew this.

Psalm xcvi 11 (P-B.V.) reads:—

'There *is sprung up* a light for the righteous'  
(φῶς ἀνέτειλεν τῷ δίκαιῳ, LXX. BAN).

A.V. (= R.V. : no marg.) gives:—

'Light *is sown* for the righteous'  
(אור ירע לעדיק).

The whole verse in the Vulgate runs as follows:—

*Lux orta est iusto  
Et rectis corde laetitia.*

It happens that the rendering of the LXX (ἀνέτειλεν) answers exactly in sense to the Hebrew ורה. Did the Greek translators then find ורה (not ורע) in the copy from which they made their translation? If they found it, is it to be preferred to the reading of the M. T.? These are questions of Textual Criticism which should be carefully considered.

How carelessly, and at the same time how positively, eminent German critics can treat the subject is illustrated by the notes of J. Wellhausen and R. Kittel on this verse, the former in the *Polychrome Bible* (1895) edited by P. Haupt, the latter in his well-known *Biblia Hebraica* (1906). Wellhausen's note is as follows:—

(Read) ורע for ורה following ⚡⚡⚡⚡ (ἀνέτειλε, ורה, orta est).

Kittel annotates as follows:—

'l. c. (*i.e.* lege cum) 1 MS ו זרע חיה שרע זרה.'

Neither of these notes is adequate or accurate. In both a very important fact is omitted. They do not tell us that there is a parallel passage in the Psalter which is bound to exercise a disturbing influence on the text of xcvi 11. Yet the parallel is clear enough. In Ps. cxii 4 we read:—

'Unto the upright there hath arisen light in the darkness' (זרה בחשך) זרה לישרים, LXX ἐξανέτειλεν, codd. A; *vacat* B). Under the influence of this passage two of Kennicott's MSS hesitate in xcvi 11 between זרע and זרה, while one of de Rossi's actually reads זרה. No doubt there is an original connexion between xcvi and cxii; the comparatively obscure expression 'light is sown' (xcvi) was (it seems) paraphrased by the more ordinary phrase, 'light hath arisen in the darkness', which is found in cxii. It is moreover to be noted that the very occurrence of the additional clause 'in the darkness' suggests that the later Psalmist found in the earlier Psalm some word like 'sown' (Targum, 'hidden') which he was tempted to paraphrase.

The only solid doubt affecting our Hebrew MSS is whether זרע should not be read with full *shurek*. According to Kennicott 42 MSS have the reading זרוע, while three others had it *prima manu*. Abu'l-Walid (Book of Roots, *s.v.*) has the same. On the other hand the Massorah (ed. Ginsburg) records זרע as the correct reading, and notices that it occurs only once in the Bible. The writer of this note inspected three of the good MSS in the Camb. Univ. Library on Oct. 9 last, and found זרע with defective *shurek* in all. These MSS are:—

Mm. 5. 27 (= Kenn. 89). Sephardic, dated 616 (= 856 A.D.);

Add. 465 (not in Kenn., nor de Rossi). Sephardic, cent. xii-xiii; and

Ee. 5. 9. German Ashkenazic, dated 5107 (= 1347 A.D.). Hagiographa with Targum.

The second fact ignored by Wellhausen and Kittel is the rendering of Aquila and Symmachus as recorded in the Syro-Hexapla (ed. Ceriani), *i.e.* זרוע originally ἐσπαρμένον or (as Field suggests) ἐσπαραι. Thus the testimony of זרוע (passive part.) goes back to certainly the second century A.D. This fact should be borne in mind when the evidence of the Peshitta and of St Jerome is considered.

Besides omissions there are also misstatements in the notes of Wellhausen and Kittel. We may let pass (for the moment) the appeal of the two writers to the LXX, only remarking that Kittel's *lege cum* contains an assumption which may be true, but cannot be verified.

How does Kittel know that the LXX *read* זרה in their Hebrew copy when they wrote ἀνέτειλεν? May they not have had זרע before them, and emended it from Ps. cxii 4? An easy emendation appealed quite as much to ancient translators as to some modern scholars.

Wellhausen and Kittel agree again in citing the Peshitta in favour of the reading זרה. But the Syriac rendering is curious in form and ought to have been cited and discussed. It runs (see my *Peshitta Psalter*, Cambridge, 1904):—

נחור זרע זרע זרע זרע זרע

(in Ps. cxii 4, on the contrary, זרע in the Syriac corresponds to זרה in the Heb.). The same rendering only pointed as a participle was to be expected here. *Why*, then, is the form with ז prefixed used? Indeed may not זרע be a 'primitive corruption' of זרע? Those who have worked at Syriac MSS will recognize how easily such a corruption might arise, alike in Estrangela and Jacobite script.

The carelessness (to use no severer a word) of the two critics culminates in their appeal to the Targum in support of the reading זרה. The rendering of the clause is as follows:—

נהור זרע זרע זרע זרע זרע

i. e. 'Light springeth up *and is hidden* (treasured up) for the righteous ones'. Thus, in fact, the Targum gives two renderings, the former presupposing זרה either as part of the text or as an emendation, while the latter is a rendering of זרע. Which of these two renderings is the earlier cannot be determined; their order in the text must not be taken as any indication of their order in time.

When Wellhausen proceeds further to cite the Vulgate, he is equally careless. The Vulgate in this passage from the Psalter agrees with the LXX. What else could it do? The Psalter of the Vulgate is simply an old translation from the LXX corrected by St Jerome, but not freshly translated from the Hebrew. It may be taken as evidence as to the Greek text (of which no one is in doubt); it is worthless as evidence for the Hebrew text of Jerome's time.

Here Kittel is more discreet. He quotes Jerome himself, meaning probably the *Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos*. If we could always trust this Father to follow the Hebrew and disregard on occasion the LXX, we might take the *orta est* of the *iuxta Hebraeos* as important evidence. But has Jerome really followed the Hebrew here? His rendering suggests the opposite conclusion, for the wording of the *iuxta Hebraeos* does not vary from that of the Vulgate. *Lux orta est iusto* is an exact reproduction in Latin of φῶς ἀνέτειλεν τῷ δικαίῳ. Jerome, it is true,

<sup>1</sup> So pointed in C.U. Ee. 5. 9.

avoids the *lumen* of the Old Latin, but he could obtain *lux* from the Greek.

Looking back over the evidence one sees that Wellhausen's textual note is not a piece of textual criticism, but a hasty statement made to justify a foregone conclusion. A brief note written on Wellhausen's lines, but more carefully, would run somewhat as follows :—

זרע (זרוע) *v.* M.T. All Heb. MSS collated (exceptions below).  
Aquila Symmachus. [⌚].

זרח (= Ps. cxii 4) 1 Heb. MS. [1 MS זרע; ע sup. ras.] [1 MS זרערה] Ⓞ<sup>vid</sup> [Ⓢ *q.v.*] [⌚].

But probably Wellhausen did not take his own critical note seriously. He preferred the reading (or rendering) of the LXX on internal grounds and felt secure in his own judgement.

So he has rejected a reading which is thoroughly Hebraic. The metaphor expressed in the words 'Light is sown for the righteous' is just one which would appeal most forcibly to the old Hebrew mind. Israel was an agricultural people, and the processes of farming enriched their language with many vivid (and even startling) images. 'They *sow* the *wind*', cries Hosea, 'and they shall *reap* the *whirlwind*' (Hos. viii 7). 'The plowers', says another Hebrew, '*plowed* upon my *back*; they made long their furrows' (Ps. cxxix 3). '*Judgement*', says Hosea again, '*springeth* up as hemlock *in the furrows* of the field' (Hos. x 4). 'Thou *winnowest* my *path*', cries a Psalmist (Ps. cxxxix 3).

*Light is sown* for the righteous, when the fruition of it is appointed for the future. *Light is sown*, when the night is lit with seeds of light (stars), which are the forerunners of the coming dawn. That which is *sown* is destined to *spring up*, as the Hebrew commentator reminds us (Rashi *in loco*).

The context favours the reading of M.T. Ps. xcvi is one of those Psalms which look forward to the Coming of JEHOVAH to judge the World. The Psalmist realizes to himself the scene as though it were already present, and yet he lets us see that it is still future by the hopes which he expresses. He says that (*v.* 7, Hebrew) 'they *shall be* ashamed that serve graven images', and again (*v.* 10, Hebrew) that 'JEHOVAH will deliver His Saints from the hand of the wicked'. So he proceeds to say (*v.* 11) *not* that 'light has already dawned for the righteous man', but that 'light is *sown*' for a great uprising when the LORD shall manifest Himself in judgement. The Psalm is one of Expectation and Hope.

W. EMERY BARNES.