therefore gives what is substantially the old view in regard to the Epistle; but it gives this with conspicuous clearness, independence, and impartiality. The author is at least removed from the imputation, which neither Bishop Lightfoot nor I have escaped, of apologetic harmonizing; though, speaking for myself, my conscience is clear of having given to the sacred writers any different measure from that which I should have given them if they had been profane.

I think that I have said enough; and I shall leave it to Prof. Ramsay, if he wishes it, to have the last word.

W. SANDAY.

THE SEPTUAGINT VERSION:

ITS BEARING ON THE TEXT AND INTERPRETATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.[1]

I.

THE Septuagint Version presents a vast field of varied interest to students of the Old Testament, of the New Testament, and of Church History. Much labour has been spent upon it; but much more must be spent before we can hope to solve many of the problems connected with it, and utilise it to the full for the purposes of Biblical criticism and interpretation. The Manual Edition of the Cambridge Press, edited by Dr. Swete with a painstaking care and laborious accuracy which leave nothing to be desired, has at length placed in the hands of students the text of the Vatican MS. so far as it is extant, together with the various readings of all the important uncial MSS.: and the same Press now has in preparation the larger edition, for which the Manual Edition was meant to be preparatory. This edition will reproduce the text printed in the Manual Edition, with as full a critical apparatus as can be con-

[1] A paper read at Sion College, December 17, 1895.

tained in a work of reasonable size. It will include (1) the readings of all extant Greek uncial MSS. and fragments; (2) the readings of a certain number of cursive MSS., selected after careful investigation with the view of representing the different types of text; (3) the evidence of the Versions made from the LXX.—the Old Latin, Egyptian, Syro-hexaplar, and Armenian; (4) the evidence of the quotations in Philo, Josephus, and the more important Christian Fathers.

The Oxford Press, it will be remembered, has contributed a worthy share to the study of the LXX. by its publication of Field's splendid edition of Origen's Hexapla; and by the new edition of Tromm's Concordance commenced under the able superintendence of Dr. Hatch, and carried on under the equally skilful care of Mr. Redpath.

One indispensable work urgently needs to be done, and there is some hope that this too may shortly be undertaken: the preparation of a Lexicon to supersede the works of Biel and Schleusner, which, useful as they are, fall far below the requirements of modern scholarship.

II.

The origin of the LXX. is shrouded in obscurity. We have, indeed, in the famous Letter of Aristeas, a circumstantial account of the origin of the translation of the Pentateuch. This letter, which purports to have been written by Aristeas, an official of high position in the court of King Ptolemy II. (Philadelphus) (B.C. 283–247), to his brother Philocrates, relates that the king was urged by his librarian, Demetrius of Phalerum, to procure a translation of the laws of the Jews, to be deposited in the famous library at Alexandria. Accordingly the king wrote a letter to the High Priest Eleazar, who sent him from Jerusalem a magnificent copy of the law, written in letters of gold, on parchment of marvellous fineness, together with seventy-

two able scholars, six out of each tribe. The work was completed in seventy-two days, and the translators were sent back to Jerusalem loaded with royal bounties.

The details of the story, which received still further embellishment and amplification at the hands of later writers, are undoubtedly fictitious. But the letter of Aristeas is assigned by good authorities to a date not later than B.C. 200,[1] and it may rest on some foundation of fact. It is possible that the translation owed its origin to the literary enthusiasm of Hellenistic culture, though it is equally possible that it was called forth in a natural way by the religious needs of the Jews of the Dispersion.[2] We may, however, safely conclude that the Pentateuch was translated (1) *at Alexandria*, (2) *in the third century* B.C. The Pentateuch, I say, for it is certain from internal evidence that the LXX. is not homogeneous. We have to deal in it with the work of different authors, and of different times. When the prophets and the Hagiographa were translated, we do not know exactly; but they were in existence in B.C. 132, when the grandson of Jesus the son of Sirach came into Egypt. In his prologue to his translation of his grandfather's work he excuses the defects of his translation in the following words:

"Things originally spoken in Hebrew have not the same force in them, when they are translated into another tongue; and not only these, but the law itself, and the prophecies, and the rest of the books, have no small difference, when they are spoken in their original language."

Evidently he was acquainted with a Greek translation of the Prophets and the Hagiographa, and it will be noticed that he already uses the title which came to be the common Hebrew title for the Old Testament in its threefold classification, *Law, Prophets, and Writings*.[3]

[1] Schürer's *History of the Jewish People*, § 33 (E.T., ii. iii. 309), which see for fuller details in regard to the letter.

[2] Schürer, § 33 (E.T., ii. iii. 161).

[3] Cp. Luke xxiv. 44.

Some further evidence as to the date of the translation may be obtained from the use of the LXX. by Hellenistic writers.[1] Demetrius (c. B.C. 200) made use of the Septuagint translation of the Pentateuch. Eupolemus (B.C. 160–150) was acquainted with the translation of Chronicles. Aristeas (not to be confounded with the author of the Letter), who lived at the latest in the first half of the first century B.C., made use of that of Job.

The date of the Septuagint Version of the Prophets and Hagiographa has an important bearing upon some modern theories as to the date of the final redaction of some of the books of the Old Testament. Duhm, for example, holds that the Book of Isaiah received considerable additions in the Maccabæan period. To this period he assigns (1) chap. xxxiii., "a prophetic poem, probably from the year B.C. 162; (2) chaps. xxiv.–xxvii. (exclusive of the later interpolations), an apocalypse, probably from the year 128 B.C.; (3) the lamentation over Moab, chaps. xv. 1–9*a* and xvi. 7–11; (4) the apocalyptic poem upon Edom and upon the future of Zion, chaps. xxxiv., xxxv."; and it was not, he thinks, till the first decades of the first century B.C. that the scribes finally united the various elements of the book in their present form.[2]

Some critics have referred the whole of the last three Books of the Psalter, as well as many Psalms in the earlier books, to the Maccabæan period, and would bring down the completion of the collection to the reign of John Hyrcanus (B.C. 135–107) or Alexander Jannæus (B.C. 105–79).

Now while we cannot dogmatically affirm either (1) that all the Canonical Books of the Old Testament were already included among those of which the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus speaks, or (2) that the books included had already reached their present form, there is at any rate a

[1] Schürer, § 33 (E.T., ii. iii. pp. 162, 163, 200–208).
[2] Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaia*, 1892, pp. xx., xxi.

very strong presumption that both the Book of Isaiah and the Psalter were included, and were included in their present form. For, to quote the late Prof. Robertson Smith's words, "the Greek Psalter, though it adds one apocryphal psalm at the end, is essentially the same as the Hebrew; there is nothing to suggest that the Greek was first translated from a less complete Psalter and afterwards extended to agree with the received Hebrew. It is therefore reasonable to hold that the Hebrew Psalter was completed and recognised as an authoritative collection long enough before 130 B.C., to allow of its passing to the Hellenistic Jews of Alexandria." [1] The same argument applies still more strongly to Isaiah, for in all probability the canon of the Prophets was completed before the canon of the Hagiographa; and even in regard to the Psalter it seems to me that Prof. Sanday is justified in doubting the existence of Maccabæan Psalms on the ground that "the number of steps implied between the Greek version of the Psalter and the original composition of the Hebrew Psalms is so great as to make it difficult to get them all into the interval between its date and even the earliest part of the Maccabæan period. "If there are Maccabæan Psalms, they slipped in as part of a collection which already had a high degree of sanction. As entirely new compositions, they could hardly have done so." [2]

III.

On the character of the Septuagint translation I need

[1] *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, ed. 2, p. 201. Similarly Baethgen, *Die Psalmen* (1892), p. xxx., "I consider it certain that the grandson of the author [of Ecclesiasticus] had the complete Greek translation before him."

[2] *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 257, 270. Prof. Robertson Smith, however (*Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, pp. 210, 211), held that the fifth Book of the Psalter contains Maccabæan Psalms, and that the final redaction of the Psalter may have taken place under Simon (c. 142 B.C.). But would ten years be a sufficient interval to allow for the completion and acceptance of the Greek Psalter?

say but little. It varies greatly in different books. The Pentateuch is the best part of the historical books; the Psalter is a fair translation; Isaiah, the Minor Prophets, and Job have fared ill indeed.[1] Sometimes the translation is free, sometimes slavishly literal. But the Greek is for the most part of the roughest description, bristling with Hebraisms, with uncouth words and strange constructions, which must have sounded hopelessly barbarous to those who were familiar with classical Greek. "Quite a new language," says Schürer justly (p. 163), "swarming with such strong Hebraisms that a Greek could not understand it, is here created. Not to mention the imitation of Hebrew constructions, many Greek words, which correspond to one meaning of a Hebrew word, are without further ceremony made equivalent to the whole extent of the meanings comprised in the Hebrew word, and thus significations are forced upon words which they do not at all possess in Greek (*e.g.* the words δόξα, εἰρήνη, and many others)." The translation often misses the sense of the original. It is often patently absurd. It is very easy to pour ridicule upon it, and to say that it is neither Greek nor Hebrew. It was the work of pioneers, and necessarily had the defects of such work. But it formed an indispensable link of connexion between the Old Testament and the New Testament. It wedded the Greek language to Hebrew thought, and enlisted the noblest and most exact instrument of human utterance in the service of Divine truth. The importance of the study of the LXX. for the interpretation of the New Testament can scarcely be exaggerated.

IV.

But I must not linger any longer upon this topic. The two points to which I desire particularly to call attention

[1] "Nactus est Isaias interpretem sese indignum," observes Zwingli. Buhl, *Kanon und Text des Alten Testaments*, § 41, p. 123.

are (i.) the bearing of the LXX. on the text of the Old Testament; (ii.) the use of the LXX. in the Christian Church; and from these points I shall venture to draw certain inferences in which you may or may not follow me, but which seem to me to have an important bearing upon questions which are perplexing the minds of many at the present time.

(i.) Under the first head there are two points to be noticed: (1) the value of the LXX. for the correction of the Massoretic Text; (2) the evidence which it presents that some at least of the books of the Old Testament were at one time in circulation in what may be called different recensions.

1. I doubt whether in England we have altogether shaken off that superstitious reverence for the Massoretic Text of the Old Testament which reached its climax in the seventeenth century, when the *Formula consensus Ecclesiae Helveticae* (1676) pronounced in favour of the absolute authority, nay, inspiration, of the very vowel-points of the Hebrew text, and condemned the opinion of those who presumed to emend it from the LXX. and other Versions, or even by conjectural alterations.[1] There is still in some quarters a lingering idea that the practical unanimity of Hebrew MSS. is due to the scrupulous care with which they were preserved from the very first.

But when we come to examine the text itself, it is beyond question that, partly by intention, partly by accident, numerous alterations and errors have found their way into it.

(*a*) *Intentional alterations* were sometimes made. It is indeed very doubtful whether the wholesale "overworking" of the text by the *Sōphĕrīm* or Scribes, which some modern

[1] Buhl, §§ 78, 89, pp. 211, 237. Cp. Dorner, *Hist. of Prot. Theology* (E.T. ii. 30.

critics postulate, ever took place;[1] and there is certainly no sufficient ground for the charge brought against the Jews by some of the Fathers, *e.g.* Justin, of wilful depravation of the text in an anti-Christian interest.[2] But examples of intentional change are found in the substitution of *Manasseh* for *Moses* in Judges xviii. 30, to avoid the supposed disgrace reflected upon Moses by the apostasy of his descendant; and in the change of names compounded with *Baal*—Esh-baal to Ish-bosheth, Beeliada to Eliada—to avoid pronouncing the name Baal, or in the deletion of the name altogether, as in 2 Samuel iv. 2.

(*b*) *Accidental errors* due to the carelessness of transcribers are however numerous and serious. The proof of this assertion lies in the following facts:—

(1) There are many passages in which the text as it stands cannot be translated without doing violence to the laws of grammar, or offends against the rules of metre or parallelism or alphabetic structure, or is irreconcilable with the context, or cannot be harmonized with other passages.

(2) The nature of the variations in parallel passages is such as to make it clear that they are largely due to accidental corruption, though in part also to intentional change.

(3) The Ancient Versions, in particular the LXX., represent various readings, which in many cases bear a strong internal stamp of probability, and remove or diminish the difficulties of the Hebrew text.

It is in fact abundantly clear that the same sources of error, which we can see in operation in the MSS. of the New Testament, operated equally, or to an even greater

[1] Cf. Prof. A. B. Davidson's excellent remarks on Duhm's *Isaiah* in the *Critical Review*, vol. iii., p. 15.

[2] Yet Lagarde thought that the chronology of the patriarchal period had been tampered with in the Massoretic Text in order to refute the calculation derived from the LXX. that the Messiah appeared A.M. 5500 (Buhl, § 97, p. 253).

extent, in the transmission of the text of the Old Testament. Similar letters were confused,[1] a fertile source of corruption in an alphabet like the Hebrew alphabet, whether in its older or in its later form; similar groups of letters were omitted or repeated;[2] whole clauses were omitted because the scribe's eye lighted on the wrong catchword, as he looked back from his MS. to the copy before him;[3] words of similar sound were confused; words were wrongly divided;[4] letters were transposed;[5] abbreviations were misunderstood; marginal glosses were incorporated in the text, and omissions which had been supplied in the margin were introduced into the text at the wrong point.[6] Over and above the causes which have operated in the MSS. of the New Testament, are causes of corruption peculiar to the Old Testament, in particular the transition from the archaic to the square characters, and the original absence of vowels and to a great extent even of vowel letters from Hebrew writing.

V.

In view of these facts it is not only a right but a duty to appeal to the Versions, especially the LXX., for the correction of the Massoretic Text. But we must go further. I digress for a moment to express my conviction that *Con-*

[1] Thus Gen. x. 3, 4, *Riphath, Dodanim*; but 1 Chr. i. 6, 7, *Diphath, Rodanim*; D (ד) and R (ר) being almost exactly alike. 2 Sam. xxiii. 27, *Mebunnai* (מבני) is an error for *Sibbechai* (סבכי) of 1 Chr. xi. 29. "Yea, *he was seen* (ויראא) upon the wings of the wind" (2 Sam. xxii. 11) is a mistake for "Yea, *he swooped* (ויידא), as in Ps. xviii. 11.

[2] As in 2 Sam. vi. 3, 4; Hos. iv. 18.

[3] Thus the LXX. inserts a group of eleven cities between *v.* 59 and *v.* 60 of Josh. xv., which has fallen out of the Hebrew text. Doubtless the LXX. preserves the true text, otherwise an important district of Judah, including Bethlehem and Tekoa, would be unrepresented.

[4] See Gex. xlix. 19, 20; Ps. xlii. 6, 7; Jer. xxiii. 33. See below.

[5] Ps. lxxii. 5. See below.

[6] In 2 Sam. xix. 10, 11 (Heb. 11, 12), the clause "seeing the word of all Israel is come to the king" is misplaced. The LXX. has it where it is needed, at the end of *v.* 10 (11). So probably Isa. xxxviii. 21, 22, which cannot be translated where it stands without violence to grammar.

iectural Emendation has a legitimate place in the textual criticism of the Old Testament which it has not in that of the New Testament, where the evidence for the text is of a wholly different quality. I grant that very few of the multitude of conjectural emendations carry conviction. The majority of them seem to reflect the critic's ingenuity rather than the original text. But a few reach a very high degree of probability. Thus, for example, in Numbers xxiii. 3, Kuenen's וילך לכשפיו, "and he went to his enchantments," is a brilliant suggestion in place of וילך שפי, "and he went to a bare height." In Psalm xxii. 29 (Heb. 30) אַךְ לוֹ, "Surely Him shall all earth's fat ones worship," for אכלו ו׳ ("eat and"), is commended by the sense and the parallelism. In Psalm lvi. 7 (Heb. 8), על און פלט למו has been the despair of commentators. The change of a single letter gives the reading פלס, "Weigh unto them (*i.e.* requite them) according to their iniquity." In Psalm xciii. 4 the emendation—

מקולות מים רבים
אדיר ממשברי ים
אדיר במרום יהוה

removes a grammatical anomaly, and restores the metrical rhythm (cp. *vv.* 1, 3):

> "Above the thundering of many waters,
> Majestic above the breakers of the sea,
> Majestic on high is Jehovah."

In all these cases we can see how known causes of corruption would have operated; the omission of one of two pairs of the same letters, לכ; the confusion of similar letters, ס and ט; the wrong conjunction of words and omission of one of two identical letters; the wrong division of words prompted by the fact that the phrase מים אדירים occurs elsewhere. In each case an anomalous phrase or construction is removed, or the sense or the rhythm improved.

VI.

But we tread on surer ground when we can appeal to the external evidence of the Versions for the correction of the Massoretic Text. Something may be gleaned from the later Greek versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion; from the Targums; from the Syriac; and from the Vulgate. But the LXX. is our one authority which goes back into the period before the Christian era, and it is from the LXX. that we gain most help. Of course it does not necessarily follow that the LXX. is at once to be preferred to the Massoretic Text when it gives a different reading, even though it is practically certain that it represents a Hebrew text which lay before the translators. The relative value of the two readings must be carefully weighed; and obviously very great caution is needed in the use of a Version for purposes of textual criticism.[1]

(*a*) The general character of the Version must be studied, and in dealing with the LXX. we have to remember, as I have stated already, that the LXX. is not a homogeneous work, but differs very considerably in its character in different books, if not in parts of books. Many variations, which at first sight seem to present genuine various readings, may be due simply to difference of idiom. Greek and English, for example, must supply many words which Hebrew leaves to be understood. A translator is constantly tempted to set the seemingly crooked straight, and to make rough places plain.

Many variations are due to the paraphrastic habit of the translator, who did not think himself bound to produce a mere word-for-word version.

Some variations may be due to the theological tendencies of the time, for Ancient Versions were liable (indeed what Version is not?) to reflect the ideas of the time and

[1] Cp. Driver, *Samuel*, pp. xxxix. ff.

to partake of the nature of a commentary.[1] The LXX., for example, avoids the bold anthropomorphisms and forcible naïvetés of the original text. Thus it substitutes "The Lord breaketh the battles" for "Jehovah is a man of war," in Exodus xv. 3; and "They saw the place where the God of Israel stood," for "They saw the God of Israel," in Exodus xxiv. 10. It introduces, though comparatively seldom, references to recent or contemporary circumstances, as, for example, in Isaiah ix. 11, "He shall scatter His enemies, Syria from the east, and the Greeks from the west." It interprets figurative expressions, putting "great and small," for "palm branch and rush," in Isaiah ix. 13. It removes harshnesses of expression and style.

(*b*) It must be remembered that numerous corruptions have crept into the Greek text. The same sources of error which were operative in the Massoretic Text and in the text of the New Testament have been operative here; and not these only, but others, for a translation is liable to perpetual corrections, made first in the margin and then brought into the text, so that we find in the LXX. multitudes of duplicate renderings. An instance or two of obvious textual corruptions may be given here. In Psalm xlvii. (xlviii.) 10, *ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ λαοῦ σου* is a transcriber's error for *ναοῦ*. In Psalm lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 36, *ἠγάπησαν* is a mistake for *ἠπάτησαν*. In Psalm lxxxvi. (lxxxvii.) 5, the really beautiful reading *Μήτηρ Σειών, ἐρεῖ ἄνθρωπος* ("Mother Sion, shall a man say") is, as the Vulg. *Numquid* shows, merely a graphical error for *μήτι*. So far in fact has the corruption of the Greek MSS. gone that in some cases the true reading has disappeared from all our extant MSS. As Mr. Burkitt has shown (*Tyconius*, p. cxvii.), "there are renderings found in the old Latin representing Greek readings which have

[1] See Buhl, § 41, p. 121; König's *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, § 26, 6; Farrar's *History of Interpretation*, pp. 119 ff.

disappeared from every known Greek MS., but which by comparison with the Hebrew, are shown to preserve the genuine text of the LXX., from which the readings of our present Greek MSS. are corruptions."

One famous reading deserves a passing mention as being beyond doubt a Christian interpolation. The Old Latin Version of Psalm xcv. (xcvi.) 10, reads "Dominus regnavit a ligno," which is quoted by many of the Latin Fathers from Tertullian onwards, as a prophecy of Christ's triumph through death. Justin Martyr, who found the words *ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου* in his text, treats the psalm as a prophecy of Christ's reign after His crucifixion (*Apol.*, i. 41), and in his *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew* (c. 73) he roundly charges the Jews with having falsified the text by erasing the words from the Hebrew. The charge, it need hardly be said, is groundless. The words do not appear in any good Greek MSS.; in fact, they are only found in the Græco-Latin Psalterium Veronense, which has *apo xylu*, and cod. 156, which has the barbarism *ἀπὸ τῷ ξύλῳ*, both of which may have been influenced by the old Latin.

If, however, due caution is observed, the LXX. is a valuable aid for the correction of the Massoretic Text. I take a few instances almost at random.

In 2 Samuel xxiv. 6, ארץ תחתים חדשי is an old puzzle. No "land of Taḥtim Ḥodshi" is known. But Lucian's text of the LXX. gives *εἰς γῆν Χετταιεὶμ Καδής* = ארץ החתים קדשה, "to the land of the Hittites, towards Ḳadesh," the capital of the Hittite empire situated on the Orontes, which lay on the north border of Israel, and would be mentioned as naturally in defining the journey of the enumerators as Tyre and Zidon in *v.* 7. In 2 Kings xv. 10, for the unintelligible קבל עם, "before the people," Lucian's recension gives *ἐν Ἰεβλαάμ* = ביבלעם, "in Ibleam"; cp. 2 Kings ix. 27.

In Psalm xxii. 16 (17) even the A.V. deserts the Masso-

retic Text, which reads, *like a lion my hands and my feet*, in favour of the reading represented by the LXX. (*ὤρυξαν*), and Syr., and to some extent supported by Aquila and Jerome, who attest a verb (*vinxerunt*). The original reading would appear to have been a verb, כָּארוּ, *they pierced*, corrupted into כארי, which came to be read כָּאֲרִי, *like a lion*. In Psalm xxxvii. 28 the Massoretic Text interrupts the alphabetic structure of the psalm. The Vatican and Sinaitic texts of the LXX. are corrupt, but the other MSS. and the Vulg. point to an original עַוְלִים לְעוֹלָם נִשְׁמָדוּ, *the unrighteous are destroyed for ever*. This reading gives the proper acrostic letter, restores the line to its right length, and improves the parallelism; while the couplet then forms the antithesis to *v.* 29. The process of corruption is easily explicable upon well-known principles. עולם (written thus defectively) was omitted on account of its similarity to לעולם. Then the change of נשמדו (*destroyed*) to נשמרו (*preserved*) followed as a matter of course, because the only possible subject to the verb was חסידיו (*his beloved*) in the preceding line.

In Psalm xlii. 5 (6) we have an example of error arising from the wrong division of words, combined with the omission of one of two similar words. The LXX. and Syriac suggest that we should read the refrain as in *v.* 11 (12) and xliii. 5, ישועות פני ואלהי, "who is the help of my countenance and my God"; and at the same time *O my God* should in all probability be retained at the beginning of the next verse. In Psalm xlix. 11 (12) the Massoretic Text reads:

> "Their inward thought (קרבם) [is that] their houses [shall continue] for ever,
> And their dwelling places to all generations;
> They call the lands after their own names."

But the meaning attached to קרבם is very precarious; the LXX. has *οἱ τάφοι αὐτῶν*, evidently representing קברם

(קִבְרָם or קִבְרָם); and as it is supported by the Syr. and Targ., it is doubtless right, and the verse should run somewhat as follows:

> "Graves are their houses for ever,
> The dwelling places for all generations
> Of those who called lands after their own names."

Psalm lxix. 26 (27) gives another example:—

> "For they persecute Him whom Thou hast smitten,
> And talk of the grief of Thy wounded ones."

The expression is a questionable one; and how much more forcible is the reading suggested by the LXX. and Syr.:

> "*They add* to the grief of Thy wounded ones."

It is easy to see how יספרו (*talk*) may have taken the place of the rare form יִסְפָּיוּ, or even of יוֹסִיפוּ. And then how forcible is the cry which follows! "Put (תנה) guilt to their guilt"; deal with them as they have dealt with their victims.

In Psalm lxxii. 5 the case is not so clear, but the variant suggested by the LXX. has a strong claim for consideration. The text reads:

> "They shall fear Thee while the sun endureth."

If God is addressed, the sequence of wishes for the welfare of the king is interrupted; if the king is addressed, it is contrary to the general plan of the psalm, in which he is nowhere else addressed. The LXX., *καὶ συμπαραμενεῖ*, *and he shall endure*, points to a reading ויאריך, which differs from the Massoretic וי(י)ראוך, so far as the consonants are concerned, by little more than a transposition of letters.

In Jeremiah xxiii. 33 the Massoretic text has:

> "When this people . . . shall ask thee, saying, What is the burden of the LORD? then shalt thou say unto them, What burden?" (אֶת־מַה־מַּשָּׂא).

The construction of the last clause is difficult to justify. But the reading implied by the LXX. and supported by the Vulgate at once rectifies the grammar, and gives a far more forcible sense to the prophet's answer:

"Ye are the burden (אַתֶּם הַמַּשָּׂא), and I will fling you off, saith Jehovah."

Yet all the change needed is a different division and punctuation of the Hebrew consonants.

One more example, from Ezekiel xl. 44. The context (*vv.* 45, 46) makes it clear that this verse must be corrected in accordance with the LXX. (see R.V. margin), somewhat thus:

"And without the inner gate were two chambers in the inner court, one at the side of the north gate, and its prospect was toward the south; and one at the side of the south gate, having its prospect toward the north,"

i.e., לְשָׁכוֹת שְׁתַּיִם for לִשְׁכוֹת שָׁרִים. The mention of the singers disappears.

Instances might be multiplied indefinitely, but it is unnecessary to do so. I have no wish to exaggerate the imperfections of the Hebrew text, or the amount of help to be derived from the LXX. Taken as a whole, the Massoretic Text is far superior to the LXX. or any text that could be recovered from it; but the more I study some of the more difficult parts of the Old Testament, the more I feel compelled to think it probable that much of their difficulty arises from deep-seated corruptions of the text.

2. I can do no more than just call your attention to my second point, namely, the evidence of the LXX. that in the early period of the textual history of the Old Testament some books at least were in circulation in forms so different that they may be called *different recensions.* This was the case with the books of Jeremiah and Proverbs, and, in a less degree, with those of Samuel, Kings, and Job. The char-

acter of the variations is such as to make it improbable that they were all due to the arbitrary will of the translators. I do not say that it was a better recension than the Massoretic Text; I simply point to the fact that the evidence proves that the uniformity of our Hebrew MSS. is a phenomenon of late growth, and that the Old Testament was read by different parts of the Jewish Church, in the pre-Christian period, in forms which differed not a little one from another.

VII.

(ii.) I pass on to my second main topic—the use of the LXX. in the Church.

"It was universally accepted by the Jews of the Dispersion as their text of Scripture. The oldest Hellenists, Demetrius and Eupolemus, in their compilations of Scripture history, rely solely upon the Septuagint. Philo throughout assumes it, Josephus does so for the most part. With Philo, the text of the LXX. is so far a sacred text that he argues from its casual details. Not only was it used in private, it was read as Holy Scripture in the Synagogue. It was then transferred from the hands of the Jews to the Christian Church, and regarded by it as the authentic text of Scripture." [1]

It was, in the main, the Bible of Evangelists and Apostles. According to one calculation, "out of 350 quotations from the Old Testament in the New Testament, not more than 50 differ materially from the LXX.[2] According to another, out of 275 passages quoted from the Old Testament in the New, there are 37 in which the LXX. differs materially from the Hebrew.[3]

The Fathers of the Church were, with rare exceptions, dependent on it. Few of them knew enough Hebrew to

[1] Schürer, ii. iii. 163; ii. ii. 285.
[2] Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, iii. 1209 *a*.
[3] See Turpie, *The Old Testament in the New*, p. 267.

consult the original; probably not one made substantial use of it before Jerome. All the Versions were made from it, except to some extent the later Greek Versions, the Targums, the Syriac, and the Vulgate, and even the Syriac shows traces of having been extensively revised from it.[1] The Old Latin, the Egyptian (Coptic, Memphitic, Sahidic), the Æthiopic, the Arabic, the Armenian, the Georgian, the Gothic, the Slavonic, were all made from it. Until Jerome's translation appeared, the whole of Christendom, except the Syrian Church, was directly or indirectly dependent on it.

The names of many of the books of the Old Testament serve to remind us of its influence. Genesis, Exodus, and so forth, are not Hebrew but Greek titles. We find traces of it in the Prayer-Book Psalter. That Version, taken from the Great Bible, is substantially the work of Coverdale (1535). One of Coverdale's sources was the Vulgate; and it must be remembered that in the Psalter the Vulgate is not Jerome's new translation from the Hebrew, but the Old Latin Version made from the LXX. Coverdale corrected a great many wrong renderings, but he frequently left additions standing. Thus in Psalm xiv. 5–7 he retained the passage which has been interpolated in the LXX. from Romans iii. 10–12. In Psalm vii. 11, "God is a righteous Judge, *strong and patient*," is derived, through the Vulgate *Deus iudex iustus, fortis et patiens*, from the LXX.; *strong* being a rendering of אֵל in the next clause, and *patient* being apparently a gloss.

It may help you to realize what this absolute dependence of the Christian Church on the LXX. for its knowledge of the Old Testament meant, if I endeavour to give you a literal translation from the LXX. of the familiar passage, Isaiah ix. 1–7.

[1] W. Wright, *Syriac Literature*, p. 3.

1. This first drink thou,[1] do quickly, country of Zabulon, land of Nephthaleim; and the rest that are on the sea coast and beyond Jordan, Galilee of the nations.

2. O people that walketh in darkness, see ye a great light; ye that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, light shall shine upon you.

3. The greatest part of the people which Thou broughtest back in Thy rejoicing, they shall even rejoice before Thee as those that rejoice in harvest, and as those who divide spoils.

4. For the yoke that was laid upon them is removed, and the rod that was upon their neck: for the rod of their exactors hath He scattered, as in the day against Midian.

5. For every robe gathered by guile and [every] garment shall they repay with compensation, and they shall delight if they were burned with fire [?].

6. For a Child is born to us, a Son is given to us, upon whose shoulder shall be the rule, and His name is called the Angel of great counsel: for I will bring peace upon the rulers, and health to Him.

7. Great shall be His rule, and of His peace there is no limit, upon the throne of David and his kingdom to establish it and help it, in judgment and in righteousness, from this time forth and for ever: the zeal of the Lord of Hosts will do these things.

That is a specimen of the Version upon which the Fathers were dependent; perhaps rather an unfair specimen of the Old Testament as a whole, but hardly of the prophetical books. Yet one writer after another argues from it as if it were the authentic and authoritative text of Holy Scripture. There is an interesting article in the Dictionary of Christian Biography (vol. ii., pp. 851 ff.) on *Hebrew Learning among the Fathers*, from which I borrow some of the following illustrations of the dependence of the Fathers upon the LXX., and of the authority which they attributed to it.

Justin Martyr (c. 148 A.D.), though born at Flavia Neapolis, close to Sychem in Samaria, was wholly ignorant of Hebrew, and appears to be unconscious of the disadvantage at which his ignorance placed him in his controversy with the Jews. He was entirely dependent on the LXX., and was indignant with the Jewish teachers

[1] πίε must be a corruption in the Greek for ποίει.

who presumed to doubt its correctness.[1] In c. 49 of the *Dialogue with Trypho*, he quotes the LXX. of Exodus xvii. 16; and, though it differs widely from the Hebrew, and has no claim to be regarded as representing a better text, he bases his argument upon it, applying it to the first coming of Christ in humility. "It is said that the Lord made war with Amalek *with a secret hand* (ἐν χειρὶ κρυφαίᾳ), and that Amalek fell, ye will not deny. But if it is meant that only in the glorious Advent of Christ will Amalek be defeated, what fruit will there be of the saying, For with a secret hand God makes war with Amalek. Ye can understand that the secret power of God belonged to the crucified Christ. . . ."

Tertullian (c. 150–220 A.D.) was naturally dependent on the Old Latin Version; and he too argues from it when it does not represent the Hebrew, and has no claim to be preferred to it. One instance may suffice. In his treatise *Against the Jews*, c. 7, he quotes Isaiah xlv. 1 as a prophecy of Christ: *Sic dicit Dominus Deus Christo meo domino.* It is obvious that for *Κύρῳ* the text upon which the version was based read *κυρίῳ*, an error evidently which had crept into the *Greek* text by a transcriber's mistake (cp. *Adv. Marc.*, iii. 7).

In c. 14 of the same treatise he quotes Jeremiah xvii. 9 as a prophecy of the lowly estate of Christ, unrecognised in His life on earth. *Homo est et quis cognoscet illum?* where the LXX. evidently misread אֱנוֹשׁ for אָנוּשׁ (A.V. *desperately sick*). In another passage (*de Carne Christi*, c. 15) he uses it as a proof-text of the true humanity of Christ. Irenæus, Cyprian, Lactantius, Augustine, make similar use of the passage, "with good intention," as Jerome observes, "but not according to knowledge."

[1] *Dial. cum Tryphone*, c. 68: "Shall I not shame you into disbelieving your teachers, who presume to say that the translation made by your seventy elders who were at the court of Ptolemy, king of the Egyptians, is in some respects not true?" Cp. c. 71.

Origen (A.D. 185–253) stands upon a different level. He "recognised the necessity of learning Hebrew that he might be confident as to the original form of the records of the Old Testament"; yet, though he maintained the significance of every word of Scripture, "he seems to have contented himself with being able to identify the Hebrew corresponding to the Greek texts before him. . . . In his Homilies he constantly follows the Greek text, where it differs widely from the Hebrew, without marking the variation," and "when he marks the variation he gives no paramount authority to the Hebrew text, but keeps faithfully to the LXX."[1] Thus in support of his theory of the triple sense of Scripture he appeals (*Philocalia*, c. i. = *de Princip.*, iv. 11) to the erroneous rendering of Proverbs xxii. 20: *καὶ σὺ δὲ ἀπόγραψαι αὐτὰ τρισσῶς*. "Such," he says, "is that which we believe to be the right method of reading and understanding the Scriptures, as may be deduced from the Oracles themselves. In the writings of Solomon in the Proverbs we find something of this kind enjoined concerning the Divine precepts which have been committed to writing, 'Do thou copy them out for thyself *in threefold wise* in counsel and knowledge, that thou mayest answer words of truth unto the questions that are proposed to thee.' In threefold wise, therefore, must every man copy into his own mind the sense of the holy writings."

The learned scholar and historian, Eusebius of Cæsarea, certainly possessed some knowledge of Hebrew. He quotes the renderings of the other Greek Versions, and compares them and the LXX. with the Hebrew; yet he frequently argues from the LXX., even where he knows that it differs from the Versions which represented the original more exactly. Thus, for example, in *Demonstr. Evang.*, vi. 15, he takes the strange Septuagint rendering of Habakkuk iii. 2, *ἐν μέσῳ δύο ζώων γνωσθήσῃ*, and reading *ζωῶν* (*lives*)

[1] Bp. Westcott, in *Dict. of Christian Biogr.*, iv. 132.

for ζώων (*animals*), he applies the passage to Christ, who "was known in the midst of two lives, divine and human, mortal and immortal." This passage indeed was a favourite one with the Fathers, who propounded the strangest allegorical interpretations of it. Its exegesis furnishes, as Dean Farrar remarks,[1] "a good specimen of fancy, working without restraint and without any guiding principle on the material of pure mistake."

Hilary, adopting the erroneous rendering *in finem* ("unto the end") for למנצח ("For the Precentor"), derived from the LXX. εἰς τέλος, argued from it that the Psalms which bore this title referred to Christ. Similarly, too, Augustine constantly finds mystical meanings in impossible renderings of the titles of the Psalms in the Latin Version, based upon the LXX., which he used.

Instances might be multiplied indefinitely. I have only named a few typical Fathers, and taken a few typical examples from their works. But enough has been said to show the almost absolute dependence of the Christian Church upon the LXX. and the Versions made from the LXX. down to the time of Jerome, and the unhesitating confidence with which its text was quoted as the *ipsissima verba* of Scripture, upon which arguments might legitimately be based.

VIII.

(iii.). In conclusion, what inference is to be drawn from the facts (1) that on the one hand even the Hebrew text of the Old Testament has not been preserved intact and free from error and (2) that on the other hand the Old Testament was only known to and used by the Christian Church for centuries in a form so strikingly divergent from the *Hebraica veritas*? Surely not the inference which Grinfield endeavoured to draw in his *Apology for the Septuagint*, that

[1] *Hist. of Interpretation*, p. 124.

the LXX. was of canonical authority co-ordinate with that of the original text; but rather that the provision of an infallible text of the Bible and the provision of an authoritative and inerrant interpretation of it were not part of God's purpose.

Those matters which lay within the province of man were left to men. Scribes and translators are liable to err, and they erred. They made mistakes, as they did in the case of secular books. No divine Providence preserved them from error, either in transcribing or in translating.

Yet in spite of all the errors of the LXX., in spite of the marvellous methods of interpretation founded upon those errors, the Book, the Library of Books, fulfilled its purpose. The LXX. was truly, as Eusebius calls it (*Praep. Evang.*, viii. 1), *θεόθεν οἰκονομηθεῖσα ἑρμηνεία*, a divinely provided translation of the Old Testament. Here was a voice of God speaking to men as a living oracle, as no other books spoke or could speak; witnessing to the action of the living God in the affairs of men, testifying to His righteousness, His truth, His holiness. The Spirit spoke, though He spoke through the lips of men, as it were in stammering accents and often unintelligible words. On the whole the *regula fidei*, the tradition of Christian doctrine, kept men's minds in the right direction amid all the strange intricacies and vagaries of allegorical interpretation; and much true and noble and elevating spiritual thought is to be found even where it fails as argument because it lacks solid foundation.

I do not know whether you will follow me in finding these considerations reassuring in view of the difficulties which many devout students of the Bible feel are raised by modern criticism of the Old Testament. In the domain of the lower or textual criticism we find that the preservation of an infallible original text, and the provision of an accurate translation, were no part of the Divine purpose.

The things which were within man's power were left to men. Need we be startled if the "Higher Criticism" discloses to us that something analogous was the case in regard to the original composition of the Scriptures? if we are compelled to recognise that the human elements of personality, time, locality, are larger than we once supposed? Holy men of old spake indeed as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; but they spake not only in the language, but according to the modes of thought of their times. Need we be dismayed if modern investigation tells us that they composed their histories according to the methods of Oriental historiography, compiling, combining, altering, modifying, the works of their predecessors? Need we be shocked if we find reason to believe that they employed allegory as the vehicle of teaching because it was the regular mode of instruction, the only mode available for a people to whom abstract thought was unnatural, the only mode capable of lasting for all time and speaking with force to young and old, learned and unlearned alike? Need we be alarmed if we find that works were written in the name of illustrious persons of a bygone age with the intention of expressing their thoughts real or supposed? Need we be troubled if it be proved that the scribes amplified and edited the work of previous generations with a freedom which amazes us?

God speaks through, nay, even in spite of, the imperfections of His human instruments, and His word "effectually worketh in them that believe."

But do not mistake me. It is no part of the Divine purpose that we should rest content with imperfection. It is the duty of each age to strive to go forward in its study and interpretation of Holy Scripture. It is our duty, by the most diligent application of the principles of textual criticism, to labour to recover so far as may be the original words of Scripture; by every aid of grammar and lexicography to

endeavour to understand their meaning; by full use of literary and historical criticism, of archæology, of comparison of other religions, to bring them into due relation to the circumstances under which they were written, the influences by which they were moulded, the needs they were designed to meet; and then by a principle of proportion and analogy to ascertain their message and their meaning for our own age. How God has worked, is working, and purposes to work, in us and through us, in society, in the world, for the accomplishment of that supreme end when He shall be all in all—this is what we need and desire to learn, that we may "grow by the knowledge of God," and bear fruit to His glory.

A. F. KIRKPATRICK.

CHRISTIANS AND SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

(1 PETER II. 11–III. 7.)

IN the earlier part of the second chapter of this Epistle Peter describes the ideal greatness of all Christian people, and their place in the invisible and eternal kingdom of God. God is building for Himself in this world a spiritual temple; Christ is the chief corner stone, and we, one by one, as living stones, are built on Him. God has His earthly home in the life of Christian men of all Churches, of every nation, every creed. Every Christian man is a divine temple; according to Paul, God dwells in him: but Peter describes the whole company of saints—all who have received the eternal life which is the gift of Christ—as one great, majestic, glorious temple of the Eternal. And we are a holy, a consecrated priesthood. We have to offer spiritual sacrifices. We are an elect race, holy, a consecrated nation, a people that God has made His own possession, called out of darkness into God's marvellous light.

In these great conceptions of the dignity, sanctity, and