
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE VIII.

STRAY NOTES ON DEUTERONOMY.

BY HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B., OF LINCOLN'S INN, BARRISTER-AT-LAW.

THE main arguments for the critical dating of the book of Deuteronomy have been answered again and again, and though the critics repeat their parrot cries about assured results not one of them has yet been found to defend the Wellhausen case against the conservative arguments in public controversy.[1] It is, therefore, not my object in this paper to travel once more over the well-worn road along which many a coach and four has been driven through the pet theories of men who have not yet shown either the courage to examine their opponents' case or the intelligence to perceive how fatal their course must be to their own reputations. Rather do I desire to wander along some of the byways to which few students seem to be attracted.

The general condition of the textual witnesses in Deuteronomy is, on the whole, very similar to that in the earlier books. Once more we find the Vulgate acting as an invaluable guide to the tracing of many glosses. Once more we

[1] Since the above was written, Dr. E. König has attempted to reply to Dahse and myself, in Die moderne Pentateuchkritik und ihre neueste Bekämpfung, which I hope to answer shortly. He has, however, not ventured even to mention the great majority of the arguments against the critical case, — far less attempted to meet them. I would refer further to the articles "Pentateuch," "Priests and Levites," and "Sanctuary," in The International Standard Bible Encyclopædia, which will probably be issued early in September by the Howard-Severance Company, of Chicago.

have to deal with groups of Septuagintal MSS. I have examined some of the most interesting features of a few chapters and propose to give here a few results. In view of the interest aroused by the controversy respecting the Divine appellations, it will not be amiss to begin with an examination of what a chapter or two of Deuteronomy has to teach us on this subject. I select the speech of Moses in chapters xxix. and xxx. for this purpose, and in the following table use J and E to represent the Tetragrammaton and *Elohim* respectively. The Washington MS. is denoted by θ. For the most part differences between "your" and "thy," etc., are not noticed.

Certain points stand out clearly from this table. In the first place, there is only one passage in which any considerable body of authority differs on the actual question whether J or E should be read, viz. xxix. 19. All the other instances are examples of omission or insertion. Secondly, there seems to be a considerable tendency to gloss either by assimilating J to J (our, your, thy) E, or else by inserting Divine appellations where they are totally unnecessary. In fact, these chapters of Deuteronomy reinforce the lessons that we have already learnt in other fields, and show the principles that we have seen at work elsewhere operating in a passage where no documentary theory is founded on the peculiarities of the Massoretic text in this matter. They suggest, also, that a tendency was at work on the different texts to introduce phrases found elsewhere in Deuteronomy (e.g. in xxx. 18), thus imparting a peculiar coloring to the text: and this is confirmed by other observations.

It is not only in the matter of the Divine appellations that we have to deal with glossing. A few instances of what may be found in Septuagintal authorities will be interesting.

Reference M. T.	*Authorities Supporting M. T.*	*Variant*	*Authorities for Variant*
xxix 1[1] J	B Ay Gcx r	J E	o
	Arm Lat Syrm Vulg	J our E	Fb b_2 pa? t b′ e Boh
		J your E	M θ p^* vid rell: Ethc
3 J	h gn x Ethf? Thdt ½ Vulg	J E	LXX (except the authorities in col. 3): G and Syrohexaplar obelize E, Arm J your E
4 And I led	x	And J led	θ
		And he led	LXX (except x and θ) Vulg
5 J your E	LXX (with variations that do not affect our question) Vulg		
9 J your E	LXX (except H P 71 some reading "our") Vulg	J	H P 71
11 J thy E 1°	LXX (with immaterial variations) Vulg		
J thy E 2°	LXX (except a_2) Vulg	thy J	a_2
14 J our E	LXX (with variations, except d f, which omit the whole phrase)	vacat	d f Vulg
17 J our E	LXX (mostly with "your") Vulg		
19 J 1°	F Lat Vulg	E	LXX (except authorities in col. 3)
J 2°	LXX (except Arm)	his	Arm Vulg
J 3°	LXX Vulg		
20 J	LXX	vacat	Vulg
21 J	LXX Vulg		

[1] In LXX Vulg EV verse 1 is verse 2, and so on throughout the chapter.

	22 J	LXX (except authorities in col. 5) Vulg	J E	o u z(mg) Boh
	23 J	LXX (except u) Vulg	J E	u
	24 J the E of their fathers	LXX (except authorities in col. 5)	E of their fathers J of their fathers J of their fathers	Arm-ed m bw Vulg H P 16
	26 J	LXX Vulg		
	27 J	LXX	vacat	Vulg
	he (cast them)	LXX (except a) Vulg	J	a_2
	28 J our E	LXX (some "your") Vulg		
xxx	1 J thy E	LXX (except authorities in col. 5) Vulg	J	B θgn r^* Arm Boh Eth Lat
	2 J thy E	LXX	him	Vulg
	3 J thy E 1°	Gckox dpt Syrm Vulg	J	LXX (except authorities in col. 3)
	And will gather thee	LXX (except Eth): Vulg	J	Eth
	J thy E 2°	Ay GMackmoxb$_2$ Fl dpt fir q Boh	vacat J	h bw Eth Vulg Ba_2 θgn ejsvz u Arm Lat
	4 J thy E	LXX Vulg		
	will fetch thee	Ay GMckmoxb$_2$ Fl fir Vulg	J thy E	Ba_2 θgn pt ejsvz qu (h d omit the whole phrase)
	5 J thy E	LXX (except col. 5)	thy E vacat	B a_2 m p bw (also gn d h q which omit more than these) Vulg
	6 J thy E 1°	Gckox Syrm Vulg	J	LXX (except authorities in col. 3)
	J thy E 2°	LXX (except Lat) Vulg	thy J	Lat
	7 J thy E	LXX (except col. 5)	J vacat	Aa u Ethc Vulg
	8 Thou shalt return	LXX (except B)	+ to J	B

Reference *M. T.*	*Authorities Supporting M T.*	*Variant*	*Authorities for Variant*
J		J thy E	LXX Vulg
9 J thy E	LXX (except w) Vulg	thy J	w
J	k Vulg	J thy E	LXX (except k) : G obelizes "thy E."
10 J thy E 1°	LXX Vulg		
J thy E 2°	LXX Vulg		c
16 J thy E 1°	LXX (except c) Vulg	thy E	Ethf Latr
J thy E 2°	LXX (except col. 5 and H P 74*) (thy E.)	J	Vulg
		vacat	most LXXal authorities
18 land	Vulg	+ which J thy E gives thee (with variations)	
20 J thy E	LXX Vulg		
J	LXX (except col. 5) Vulg	J E	k Bohw (+ thy)
		vacat	y

After i. 8 fi Arm Eth add "a land flowing with milk and honey"; in verse 20, after "I said unto you," θgn dpt bw Eth have "at that time saying"; the same words are found in verse 29 after "I said unto you" in c fi Eth Lat (except that Eth Lat omit "saying"); in verse 31 B bw and the Bohairic of Wilkins insert "by the way to the hill country of the Amorites" after "in this wilderness which ye have seen" (so LXX); in ii. 21 BA^{b}ya$_{2}$ Makm 1 dpt bw ejsvz fi qu Boh add "unto this day." These examples may be multiplied at will. Now in some instances such phenomena are due to copyists' errors, but in others the glossing appears to take the form of adding "Deuteronomic" phrases or glosses that are intended to amplify, enhance, or lend precision to the earlier text. Such an instance as that in i. 8 exemplifies the first class. Additions specifying the date ("at that time") and the elaboration of phrases, e.g. prefixing "Mount" to "Gilead" in ii. 36 (LXX), inserting "all" before "his land" in iii. 2, fall under the second heading. If such matters were found, on comparison, to be peculiar to the LXX or the various ramifications of its text, nothing of any great importance to the student of the Hebrew would result. But comparison shows that just as the LXX and its copies contain numerous expressions which are absent from our Hebrew and appear to be mere glosses, so the Hebrew, in its turn, exhibits many phrases which are lacking in some or all of the versional witnesses and only weaken the force of the utterances in which they are at present embedded. If we find the word "all" frequently added in the LXX where the Hebrew (apparently rightly) omits it, and come to the conclusion that its insertion is to be attributed to the desire of some annotator to lend additional emphasis to the text he found before him, what inference are we to draw in a pas-

sage where the Massoretic text gives us a similar occurrence of the word that is not confirmed by all the other witnesses? For instance, in i. 16, 18, the Vulgate omits the words "at that time." In iii. 7 the Vulgate and θgn omit the word "all," in verse 21 the Vulgate omits the same word and also "LORD" on its second occurrence, as also the second occurrence of the same word in verse 26. In that verse the LXX (except kx i) omits the second "to me," and in verse 27 the Sahidic and Vulgate omit "with thine eyes." Now such points, as a rule, make no difference to the sense. The removal of the words omitted from some of our authorities would generally only have the effect of adding to the vigor of the text. But from the critical point of view the importance is very considerable. It must be remembered that long lists of these words and phrases are made; and it is claimed that, with their help, Deuteronomy may on the one hand be discriminated from other books of the Pentateuch, while on the other hand various sources may be distinguished within Deuteronomy itself. That there are certain qualities in the style of Deuteronomy is not denied. That they may be accounted for in a perfectly reasonable manner I have sought to show on pages 195–224 of my "Pentateuchal Studies." Here I am concerned only to lay stress on the bearing of the textual argument on this line of thought. Given the habits of glossators and the facts we find in the textual witnesses, what importance can anybody attach to such lists of words?

Another matter is disposed of by the textual evidence. In this book the second person singular alternates with the second person plural in the addresses to the people. Accordingly some critics, e.g. Steuernagel, have sought to distinguish two collections of ancient sources, called respectively Sg and Pl. The former is supposed to use the singular

throughout, but the latter sometimes incorporates in his collection material that uses the singular number. For this reason it is best to take instances from Sg. In chapter vii., verses 1–4a are assigned to this source; but at the end of verse 2 the preponderance of Septuagintal evidence favors the plural "you." Similarly, in verses 12b–16a, which are also attributed to it, we find the plural "your" at the end of verse 12 in most Septuagintal authorities and "among you," in verse 14 (LXX except Arm-codd). Again, in verse 24 the best Septuagintal authorities favor "your hands," though this also is supposed to belong to Sg. As a matter of fact, nobody who paid any regard to textual criticism could ever have put forward such a theory, for it is well known that the final letters which make the difference between "thou," "thy," and "you," "your," were not written in many ancient MSS.; so that in these matters our present texts, whether Greek or Hebrew, offer us only the idiosyncrasies of copyists without any certainty as to the readings of the original autograph.