
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

persons on the Continent, sometimes respecting Bede and his writings.

Bede passed away on the evening before Ascension Day, which in A.D. 735 would be May 25. In our calendar, therefore, he is celebrated two days too late. He had just dictated the last sentence of the part of the Gospel of St. John, which he had been translating. "After a little while, the youthful scribe to whom he had been dictating, said: 'Now the sentence is finished.' He answered: 'You have spoken the truth; it is indeed finished. Raise my head in your hands, for it pleases me much to recline opposite to that holy place of mine in which I used to pray, so that, while resting there, I may call upon God my Father.' And being placed upon the pavement of his cell, he said: 'Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost,' and as soon as he had named the name of the Holy Spirit, he breathed out his own spirit, and so departed to the Kingdom of Heaven."

It will be a sad day for the Church of England when none of its members draw either instruction or inspiration from the life and death of Bede.

The Study of the Septuagint Version of Amos.

By the Rev. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, D.D.

A BOOK should, whenever possible, be studied in the original language in which it was written. This is especially true of the books of the Bible; but as, unfortunately, so few, comparatively speaking, know Hebrew, the best substitute is, of course, the Septuagint Version. But the Septuagint Version has a very special value of its own, and it will be well to say a word about this first before dealing specifically with the Book of Amos.

I.

The earliest form of the Hebrew text extant belongs to the ninth century A.D.; the oldest *dated* manuscript is the St. Petersburg Codex, A.D. 916; but there is a manuscript in the British Museum (Or. 4445) which "was probably written about A.D. 820-850,"[1] though it does not actually bear any date. The main reason why earlier Hebrew manuscripts of the Biblical books do not exist is because the Jews considered that a well-used, and therefore to some extent damaged, roll was not fit to be used in the service of God. Every synagogue had its *geniza* (literally, "hiding-place"), a kind of lumber-room, to which were consigned those rolls which showed signs of wear and tear. These manuscripts naturally went to decay, and after a time they were either burned, or buried sometimes with some Rabbi who was famous in his day. Now, it is perfectly true that the copying of Hebrew manuscripts was less liable to copyists' errors than was the case with that of other manuscripts, owing to the extraordinary care that was exercised and the minute regulations whereby the copyists were guided; but it must be remembered that the Massoretic text as we now have it dates from about the beginning of the seventh century A.D., and the Massoretes edited the Old Testament Scriptures in accordance with the traditions preserved in the Talmud. Moreover, before the seventh century there were no vowel-points, and everyone who reads Hebrew knows how differently many Hebrew words can be interpreted when unpointed. And, besides this, Talmudic traditions are not always such as to inspire implicit confidence; and even in the text that the Massoretes finally stereotyped there are not wanting examples to show that in some cases it was so obviously corrupt that marginal notes had to be added, even though the text itself was left untouched. There are many passages in the Hebrew Bible as we have it now which are so hopelessly corrupt as to be untranslatable.

[1] Ginsburg, "Introduction to the Hebrew Bible," p. 469.

These considerations lead to the conclusion that in many cases, if one wishes to obtain a correct reading, one must, if possible, get *behind* the Massoretic text to a previously existing form of the Hebrew. And in many cases this is possible when recourse is had to the Septuagint; for the text of the Hebrew Scriptures, which was the basis of the Greek Version in its *original form*, belongs to a date prior to 132 B.C. as regards the prophetical books, and to a considerably earlier date as regards the Pentateuch.[1] As the Hebrew text upon which the Septuagint is based was at least 300 years older than that which became the fixed text (dating from the second century A.D. onwards), one can see that there was ample opportunity for corruption during those intervening centuries. Some words in the Preface to the Revised Version of the Old Testament are appropriate in this connection, and may be quoted here: "The Received, or, as it is commonly called, the Massoretic Text of the Old Testament Scriptures, has come down to us in manuscripts which are of no very great antiquity, and which all belong to the same family or recension. That other recensions were at one time in existence is probable from the variations in the Ancient Versions, the oldest of which, namely the Greek, or Septuagint, was made, at least in part, some two centuries before the Christian Era."

Direct proof of the existence of such "other recensions," mentioned by the Revisers, is now forthcoming, since the discovery of a pre-Massoretic Biblical papyrus;[2] the point of importance, for our present purpose, in this papyrus (which contains the *Shema—i.e.*, Deut. vi. 4 *et seq.*,[3] and the Decalogue) is that "where it agrees with Deuteronomy against Exodus, it has the support of the Septuagint Version of Exodus, and

[1] Swete, "Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek," pp. 10 *et seq.* (1900).

[2] See the article by Mr. S. A. Cook in the Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology, vol. xxv., pp. 34 *et seq.*; and Professor Burkitt's article in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, vol. xv., pp. 392-408.

[3] The "Shema" consisted originally of Deut. vi. 4 alone: "Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God, the Lord is One," the Jewish confession of faith; but in the Liturgy it includes Deut. vi. 4-9, xi. 13-21; Num. xv. 37-41.

where it has independent readings of its own it is supported, in the first instance, by the Septuagint (and the Old Latin Version)," and, to a less degree, by the other versions.[1] There can be no sort of doubt about the truth of Mr. Cook's words when he says: "A critical and unbiassed study of such earlier and independent writings as the Septuagint, the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Book of Jubilees, etc., forces the conviction that the text has not always been in the fixed state in which it has come down to us, and has led to the commonly accepted opinion that the Massoretic text is but a stage, and that almost the latest one, in the history of the Old Testament text." Of course, as a general rule, the Massoretic text is purer than that of the Septuagint, but the reverse is true in a large number of instances, and it is herein that the main importance of the Septuagint lies.

II.

When we turn to the text of the Septuagint, we are very soon driven to ask the question, "What *is* the text of the Septuagint?" But before indicating how to attempt an answer to this question, it is quite necessary to give a brief outline of the history of the text. We shall do this in the briefest possible manner.

Alexandria was the home of the original Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures. Before the beginning of the Christian era the whole of the Septuagint was in existence. Although absolute proof of this statement is not forthcoming, it is in the highest degree probable.[2] During the Apostolic Age and the succeeding generation the acceptance of the Septuagint by the Hellenistic Jews was universal; but during the second century dissatisfaction on the part of the Jewish religious leaders with a version which differed materially from their official Hebrew text was sufficient reason[3] for some new Greek versions to be

[1] Cook, *ibid.*, p. 45.

[2] Swete, *op. cit.*, pp. 25 *et seq.*; Ryle, "The Canon of the Old Testament," pp. 169 *et seq.*

[3] There was also the fact that the Church used the Septuagint Version in controversy with the Jews, who "not unnaturally began to doubt the accuracy of the Alexandrian Version" (Swete, *op. cit.*, p. 30).

undertaken. These versions are known by the names of their authors, Aquila and Theodotion; a little later another version was made by Symmachus. Three other versions, which were, however, probably not translations of the whole Old Testament, but only of certain books, are known by the names of *Quinta*, *Sexta*, and *Septima*, from their relative positions in Origen's collection of Greek versions. All these versions were gathered together and incorporated by Origen in his monumental "Hexapla," which was completed about the year 240, and preserved at Cæsarea in Palestine in the library of Pamphilus. In 638 Cæsarea was taken by the Saracens, and nothing more is heard of the library. As Dr. Swete says: "Even if not destroyed at the moment, it is probable that every vestige of the collection perished during the vicissitudes through which the town passed between the seventh century and the twelfth.[1]

In the fifth column of his "Hexapla" Origen put a revised version of the Septuagint; Pamphilus and Eusebius published this separately (in the fourth century), but retained in it, more or less exactly, the corrections and additions adopted by Origen, together with the accompanying Hexaplaric signs—that is to say, the obelus (÷), which was prefixed to lines or words which were wanting in the Hebrew, and therefore, from Origen's point of view, of doubtful authority, whilst the asterisk (*) called attention to words or lines wanting in the Septuagint, but present in the Hebrew. The close of the context to which the obelus or asterisk was intended to apply was marked by another sign known as the metobelus (·/.).[2]

Two more important steps in the history of the Septuagint text remain to be noticed: first, the recension of Hesychius, which was a correction of the text used in Egypt; and secondly, the recension of Lucian of Antioch: we shall have more to say about this latter presently. To quote Dr. Swete once more: "The result of these multiplied labours of Christian scholars upon the text of the Septuagint was not altogether satisfactory. Before the time of Jerome much of the original text of the

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 75. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 70.

Alexandrian Bible had disappeared. Men read their Old Testament in the recension of Lucian if they lived in North Syria, Asia Minor, or Greece; in that of Hesychius if they belonged to the Delta or the Valley of the Nile; in Origen's Hexaplaric edition if they were residents at Jerusalem or Cæsarea."[1]

The material, therefore, in which the Greek Version of the Hebrew Scriptures lies embedded, and from which it has got to be extracted if a scientific attempt is made to get at an approximately true text, is as follows:

The original Septuagint.

The versions of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus.

The anonymous versions, Quinta, Sexta, and Septima.

The revised Septuagint of Origen.

The recensions of Hesychius and Lucian.

When it is realized what an enormous mass of material—patristic quotations, manuscripts, and daughter versions—has got to be sifted before any one of these authorities can be approximately got at, it will be seen what an appalling amount of work is called for before it can be said, with reasonable certainty, that such and such is, according to the belief of the best scholarship, the true text of the Septuagint, as far as this is procurable! We may, however, take comfort in the fact that a very great deal has already been done; and when students desire to study any Biblical book in its Greek form, sufficient published material is, generally speaking, at their disposal.

III.

To come now to the Book of Amos; it will be best to enumerate first of all what is required in seeking to obtain an approximately satisfactory text. The basis should undoubtedly be Swete's edition of Codex B. In the *Apparatus Criticus* in this edition there are the various readings of Cod. A (Amos is wanting in the Sinaitic, ℵ) and Cod. Marchalianus (Q); where B is wanting in the text, that of Cod. Rescriptus Cryptoferra-

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 85.

tensis (Γ) takes its place. But, from what has been said above, this is clearly insufficient for a scientific study of the text; it is quite necessary, further, that, whenever possible, the versions of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus should be made use of, more especially when the Hebrew text is not being studied, for, to some extent, the version of Aquila supplies this want, as he gives a very literal translation of the Hebrew. In a less degree this is also true of the version of Symmachus. The importance of Theodotion lies rather in the fact that his version is an attempted revision of the Septuagint in its earlier form, though he too used the Hebrew text as a basis for his work; but in each of these cases the available material is small. The anonymous versions mentioned above need not be taken into account as far as Amos is concerned, for the fragments of them that have been recovered are so exceedingly scanty. But another element of great importance for the study of the Greek text must be briefly alluded to—viz., the recensions of Hesychius and Lucian. Before one can deal adequately with the material for forming the true text of the Septuagint, the manuscripts must, as far as possible, be grouped into families. The two groups which for our present purpose are of main importance are those which represent respectively the Hesychian and Lucianic recensions. The former need not now be taken into consideration, for its best representative is Cod. Marchalianus (Q), which is dealt with in Swete's edition; but, in passing, it may be mentioned that the marginal readings of Q are important, for they contain many Hexaplaric notes: these are all enumerated in Swete's edition. Of greater importance is the Lucianic recension. The most notable feature of his text is that of the doublets and conflate readings with which it abounds; these embrace in some cases important variants from manuscripts which embodied a purer Septuagint text than that of the normal text handed down in the great codices. Lucian thus embodies in his mixed recension an ancient and valuable element; and this must obviously be taken into account in studying the Greek text in a scientific manner. In connection with the Lucianic

recension a brief reference must be made to the Old Latin version, for there is a large amount of agreement between the two. Lucian's text embodies ancient readings which have an independent attestation of the Old Latin, so that where the two agree the Old Latin affords a criterion for determining what is ancient in the Lucianic text.

To sum up, then, the requirements for studying the Greek Book of Amos in an approximately pure text:

1. A standard text, such as Swete's, with constant reference to the *Apparatus Criticus*.

2. The available fragments of the later Greek versions.

3. The recensions of Hesychius and Lucian, and, in connection with the latter—

4. The Old Latin Version.

IV.

In conclusion, it may be useful to give a selected bibliography.

For the Greek text of Amos, Dr. Swete's "Old Testament in Greek," published in three volumes by the Cambridge University Press, is without question the best. It is, however, rather expensive for those who have not access to a public library. For the texts of Hesychius and Lucian the writer may perhaps mention his books, *Studies in the Greek and Latin Versions of the Book of Amos* (Cambridge, 1902) and *Codex Taurinensis*,[1] which is the oldest manuscript of the "Dodekapropheton" containing Lucianic elements; in an *Apparatus Criticus*, in the latter volume, the various readings of all the Lucianic manuscripts, twelve in number, are given, as well as those of Codd. BℵAΓQ, the later Greek Versions, the Old Latin, the Syro-Hexaplar, and a few other authorities.[2] A complete collection of the Old Latin texts of the Minor Prophets, as far as these are obtainable from manuscripts and from the writings of pre-Hieronymian Latin ecclesiastical writers, is

[1] *Cf.* Swete, "Introduction," p. 145.

[2] Published by the Clarendon Press (1908).

published by the writer in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1904-1905.

Of commentaries and other books that will be found helpful, the following are recommended:

G. A. Smith, "The Book of the Twelve Prophets" (2 vols., 1896), for the historical setting of the Book of Amos. Vol. i. of this work will be found particularly useful, and the translation given by the author is more faithful to the original Hebrew than either our Authorized or Revised Versions. Pusey's Commentary is invaluable for its patristic references, its Hebrew notes, and, above all, for its deeply spiritual tone.[1] Of a more elementary character than these is Farrar's "Commentary on the Minor Prophets." The most recent work in English is Harper's "Amos and Hosea," in the International Critical Commentary Series (1905). Three other books, each written from a somewhat different standpoint, must also be mentioned, for they are all of great help for the study of Amos in so far as this is dealt with: Robertson Smith's "The Prophets of Israel" (1897)—this is written from the advanced critical point of view; Davidson's "Old Testament Prophecy" (1904), which occupies a somewhat less advanced critical position; and Orr's "The Problem of the Old Testament" (1906), which is thoroughly conservative.

Foreign works, especially German, which are more numerous, are not referred to here; but for a really full study of the subject they are, of course, indispensable. The list given above, however, will be found to offer as much material as most people can find time to deal with.

[1] A new edition has been recently published by Nisbet.