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

broken, a net in which you shall be taken and bound, a trap in which you shall be caught and imprisoned."

The prediction was fulfilled. The fierce Assyrians, when they heard that the Hebrews had allied themselves with Egypt, once more swept through the land. The very men who had lisped their scornful imitations of Isaiah's words, who had affected to think that he used the broken and imperfect dialect which mothers employ to their babes, were destroyed or taken captive by the Assyrian troops, whose language, while it closely resembled that of the Hebrews, had just those differences which made it sound to them like an imperfect and barbarous dialect. So terrible, and so exact, was the retribution that fell on their sin.

> Though the mills of God grind slowly,
>   Yet they grind exceeding small ;
> Though with patience He stands waiting,
>   *With exactness* grinds He all.

S. COX.

THE SEPTUAGINT TRANSLATION.

II.

THE remarks made in the last number of THE EX-POSITOR about the character of the LXX. translation, its value, and the main phenomena which it presents, will readily be illustrated by examining some of the peculiarities of the version in any single book. One of the historical books of the Old Testament will best suit our object, because they furnish us with a good average specimen of the merits and defects of these Jewish translators. I do not indeed propose to sub-

ject any book to the minute examination bestowed by Dr. Frankel upon the Pentateuch, but shall content myself with noting a few of the more salient features. The Books of Moses fell to the share of the ablest and most learned workers, and furnished the Seventy with more scope for the display of their philosophical and exegetical tendencies than any other; but some of their special merits, as well as some of their special weaknesses, are traceable in almost every book of the entire version.

Without entirely limiting to one book the points that I shall adduce for illustration, I may select the first Book of Samuel as a fair type of their handiwork when it is neither at its best nor at its worst. It will furnish us with an average specimen of the difficulties with which they had to deal, and the amount of skill and knowledge which they brought to bear on their deeply-interesting and important task.

1. In the first place it is clear that the LXX. have frequently fallen into error from the circumstance that the text from which they translated was entirely unpunctuated. This has led them in some places to join letters into one word which really belong to two different words, as in Hos. vi. 5, where, instead of "thy judgments (are as) the light;" they read, "*my* judgments shall go forth as the light;" and in Psa. cvi. 7, by joining the two separate words "*al yâm,*" "at the sea," they make one participle, "going in." Except so far as they were guided by distinct and trustworthy traditions, it is obvious that this *scriptio continua*, or series of letters, unbroken into words, must have added immensely to the difficulties of their undertaking. We learn also from errors like this,

as indeed from numerous other errors of every kind, that at this period,—about two and a half centuries before Christ,—the Jewish scheme of interpretation was still to a certain extent vacillating and uncertain-

2. It is almost needless to add that they were without the aid which would have been rendered to them if vowel points had been invented in their time. It is one of the most remarkable characteristics of the Hebrew alphabet that it had originally no signs for vowels, so that the proper pronunciation of many written words depended mainly—in some instances entirely—on the context. The vowel points seem not to have been invented much earlier than the seventh century after Christ, and but for this ingenious method of preserving the true pronunciation of the sacred language, it might have become as uncertain as the pronunciation of the sacred name Jehovah. It is well known that the four letters of this awful name, יהוה — the *Shem Hammephoresh*, or incommunicable name—are pronounced with the vowels of the other and less mysterious name of God, *Eloah;* and it is now a matter of dubious conjecture whether the Tetragrammaton, or four-lettered name, was pronounced *Jahveh* or in some other way. The danger of entirely losing the true method of reading Hebrew was averted by the invention and rapid acceptance of vowel points, which were unknown to St. Jerome and to the writers of the Talmud. These vowel points essentially affect the meaning of the text, and in reality are a kind of running commentary which preserves for us the results of the long labours of the Jewish Masorets. The word *Masorah* means "tradition,"

but is confined to that Jewish " tradition " concerning
the text and the significance of their sacred writings
which sprang up during the later centuries of their
history. Among the earliest of the *Baali Ham-
masoreth,* or " Masters of the Masorah," the Jews
reckon Ezra, and even Moses himself; and, since
Jewish learning had almost exclusive reference to
the Scriptures, the term *Masorah,* in its wider sense,
may be said to include all the Jewish schools of
thought down to the famous School of Tiberias,
which continued to flourish for many centuries
after Christ. Now we see from many passages how
much the LXX. would have gained had so clear and
distinct a clue to the true pronunciation been always
in their hands, although in some places (as we shall
shew) it is very probable that their view of the true
pronunciation is more correct than that of the Maso-
rets themselves. Thus in 1 Sam. xiv. 45 they read,
" *the people of God* wrought this day," instead of,
" he hath wrought *with* God," apparently from the
same confusion of *im,* " with," and *am,* " people,"
which has misled them in 1 Chron. xix. 6 ; Psa.
lxxxvii. 4, &c. In Gen. xv. 11 we have an absurd
instance of imperfect knowledge ; for there, simply
by a difference of pronunciation, instead of Abraham
drove the fowls *away,"* we get in the LXX., " *he
sat down with them."* Curious examples of the same
divergence are furnished by the word " *lo,*" which in
Hebrew means " *not,*" or, " *to him,*" according as it
is written, לֹא or לוֹ. Thus in 1 Sam. ii. 16 we find,
" He would answer *him nay,"* where the word is
rendered in *both* its meanings, as also in viii. 19 and
x. 19. In one passage of the English version (Isa.

ix. 3) the acceptance of the "*lo* " in the sense of "not," and the relegation to the margin of the true word "*to him*," make sad and unfortunate nonsense in one of the finest and most important poems of the great Evangelical prophet. Little or no sense is to be derived from the expression, " Thou hast multiplied the nation, and *not* increased the joy," but the true meaning is, "and increased *its* joy." Even in the familiar verse of the one hundredth Psalm, the clause, " It is he that hath made us and *not* we ourselves," should probably be, " And *to him* we belong." But apart from all other instances, the proper names of the LXX. are alone sufficient to prove that they adopted in many words a vocalisation wholly different from that of the Masorets.

3. As it is not my object to be exhaustive, but merely to give a few specimens of recurring peculiarities, I will now proceed to shew how imperfect must have been the text which the Greek translators used. It is quite obvious that they have often been misled by wrong readings, and, above all, by the confusion, in imperfect manuscripts, of letters which resemble each other so closely as the Hebrew ד *d*, ר *r*, and ן, final *n*. Sometimes, indeed, it is all but certain that their reading was right, while that of the received Hebrew text is wrong. A conspicuous instance of this will be found in 1 Sam. xiv. 18, where Saul, immediately before a battle with the Philistines, " said unto Ahiah, Bring hither the *ark of God*, for the ark of God was at that time with the children of Israel." Now the Ark at this time was at Kirjath-jearim (1 Sam. vii. 1, 2), where it remained from its capture by

the Philistines until it was removed by David.
(2 Sam. vi.) But Saul at this time was at Gibeah,
and it is most unlikely that the priests could have
ventured to carry a treasure so sacred as the Ark
for some miles through a disturbed and half-con-
quered country. And, further, the *Ark* would have
been perfectly useless for Saul's object, which was—
though in his hot impatience he did not stop to,
carry it out—to ascertain the will of God. Here,
therefore, the reading of the LXX., which is, " Bring
hither *the ephod*," is almost certainly right, as well
for the reason just given, as because the phrase
" bring hither " is always used of the Ephod and
never of the Ark, and because the only method of
inquiring of God was by the Urim and Thummim,
which formed part of the Ephod. If the two words
be written underneath each other,

אָרוֹן, Ark,

אֵפוֹד Ephod,

it will be seen at once how small a change in
what is called the " *ductus literarum* " would
cause the confusion. In this point, as in not a
few others, Josephus agrees with the LXX., for
he makes Saul bid the priest take " the garments
of his high - priesthood," of which garments the
Ephod was the most essential. Another coinci-
dence of tradition in Josephus and the LXX.
may be found in 1 Sam. xx. 30, where Saul, in
his fury, calls Jonathan " a son of perverse re-
bellion," *i.e.*, a perverse, rebellious son (Luther:
Ungehorsamer Bösewicht), but the LXX. renders
it " a son of *maidens who desert*," which may either
imply some alien admixture of race, or " immodest

maidens," as in the Vulgate, "*Fili mulieris virum ultro rapientis.*" Here, too, Josephus seems to indicate the existence of some legend unknown to us, by saying (*Ant.* v. 11. 9) that Jonathan was "born of runagates."

In 1 Sam. ix. 25, we find in the LXX. "they *spread a bed* for Saul upon the housetop," instead of "*he communed with* Saul." The change is caused by a different reading rising from confusions of ר and ד. In xvii. 8, "*servants* of Saul" becomes "*Hebrews* of Saul," from a similar confusion, which, also in the twenty-third chapter, makes them render the word for "*a thick wood*" as though it was the word "*new*," to the utter ruin of the sense. There is no point in which the LXX. are more frequently mistaken than in all that concerns the names of places : not only does their text seem to have been confused, but topographical ignorance, or other causes, lead them often to render names as though they were significant words, and to change ordinary words into proper names. It would take us too long to follow their mistakes under this head, but I may mention two other curious variations from the Received Text, caused by the confusion of two similar letters. In 1 Sam. xxxi. 3, a small alteration of the Hebrew converts "he was *sore* wounded *of the archers*" into "he was wounded on the hypochondries," *i.e.*, under the flank. Again in 1 Sam. xii. 3, Samuel challenges his opponents to name any one from whom he has received a bribe "to blind mine eyes therewith," or, as it is rendered more literally in the margin, "that I should hide mine eyes at him." The LXX., however, read, " A bribe, or *a pair of*

shoes? Answer me." The change required for this sense in the Hebrew is extremely slight, and when we compare such passages as Amos ii. 6, viii. 6,—(" that we may buy the poor for silver, and the needy for a pair of shoes")—it may be doubtful whether here the LXX. are not right. Their reading was also adopted by Jesus the son of Sirach (Ecclus. xlvi. 19), who says of Samuel that "before his long sleep he made protestations in the sight of the Lord and his anointed, I have not taken any man's goods, *so much as a shoe:* and no man did accuse him."

4. It may, perhaps, be asked whether these obvious variations of the Manuscript lead to any·decisive inference as to the date of the present square character in which Hebrew is written? It is certain that the Jews, before their exile, used an alphabet closely resembling the Samaritan, which is still found on the coins of the Maccabees so late as a century and a-half before Christ. It is equally certain that this character had become entirely obsolete in the time of our Lord, who could not otherwise have used the proverbial expression, "one jot or one tittle,"—*i.e.*, the smallest letter or projecting horn of a letter,—since that expression would be meaningless as applied to the old or Samaritan character, in which the sign for "*yod*" (ⅲ) instead of being exceptionally small, is as large as the sign for any other letter. The Jews call the present Hebrew "the square" or the "Assyrian" writing (*ashshûrîts*), and the other "the broken" (*raats*); and if the word *ashshûrîts* means "Assyrian," it would prove an early belief that the square character was adopted during

the Captivity. But it is apparently as probable that the tradition came from the term, as that the term (which has also been interpreted as meaning "blessed" and "supported") is derived from an historic fact. If the LXX. could be used to throw light upon this interesting question, a perplexing literary problem would be set at rest; but when two such scholars as Eichhorn and Gesenius take opposite sides on the question, and so thorough an investigator as Frankel declares the evidence to be indecisive, the controversy must find its decision from other sources.

5. A fair test of the learning and insight of the translators may be found in their treatment of rare and difficult words. The result of our investigation here is not very favourable, since, in not a few instances the LXX. are quite wrong, and in others seem to be wholly perplexed. Thus, in 1 Sam. xv. 32, we find the expression, Agag came unto him *'delicately' (maadannôth).* Now, this Hebrew word only occurs in three other places, and is there rendered "dainties," or "delights" (Gen. xlix. 20; Prov. xxix. 17; Lam. iv. 5). It probably means "cheerfully," but the LXX. render it "trembling,"[1] and the Vulgate, "very fat and trembling."—Again in 1 Sam. xvi. 20 the Hebrew has the very strange expression *"an ass of bread,"* probably by a mere clerical error for "an ass *and* bread." From the LXX. we might, perhaps, conjecture that (by that frequent source of mistake in manuscripts which is called *homœoteleuton, i. e.,* by the eye of the transcriber

[1] The curious various reading "from *Anathoth*" is obvious by a mere mistake of the word for the name of a place.

being caught by a similar word) a sort of play on words had dropped out of the Hebrew; for they render it, "Jesse took an ass (*chamôr*), and put on it a *chomor* (γόμορ, *i. e.*, a *homer*, comp. xxv. 18) of bread."[1]—Once more, in 1 Sam. xvii. 20, xxvi. 5, we find the word *ma'agâl*, which means a circuit of waggons drawn up round a camp for purposes of defence. Here the English version renders it by "trench," and in the margin "*place of the carriage*," and the LXX. very fairly by στρογγύλωσις, a circular defence; but in xxvi. 5, for no obvious reason, they change this rendering to the incorrect ἐν λαπήνη, "in a covered or *royal chariot*."

We constantly find this sort of vacillation in the choice of renderings in the same Book of the LXX., as we do also in the English version. Thus, in 1 Sam. xvii., Goliath is called an *îsh habênîm*, or "man between two (camps)," which our version renders "champion." In verse 4 the LXX. render it vaguely by "powerful," but in verse 23 by ἀμεσσαῖος, which seems to be a corruption of ὁ μεσαῖος, "the one in the midst," and an attempt at more accurate translation. In xxi. 2 the LXX. make most hopeless confusion of the Hebrew expression *pelôni almônî*, "such and such," by the translation, "*in the place called God's Faith, Phellani Maemoni*." The same mistaken supposition guided them in 2 Kings vi. 8, although the word is rendered κρύφιε, "oh, unknown one," in the only other passage where it occurs (Ruth iv. 1). The rare word, which seems

[1] That the sacred writers did not dislike such assonances is proved by the Hebrew text of passages like Judg. xv. 16; Job xxv. 19; Isa. liv. 8. v. 7; Jer. i. 11, 12; Rom. i. 29-31, &c. See the Author's *Chapters on Language*, p. 265.

to mean a *tamarisk*, in 1 Sam. xxii. 6, and xxxi. 13, is rendered ἄρουρα, " field," unless, indeed, there be a corruption of δρῦν, " oak ;" and, lastly, in xxvi. 20, instead of " as one doth hunt *a partridge* upon the mountains," they translate it "*as a night - hawk chaseth* on the mountains."

6. One very curious tendency (which they constantly shew in the rendering of rare or difficult words) is to represent them by some analogous Greek word *of similar sound*, as though there were some affinity between Greek and Hebrew. Thus they render " the stump " (Hebrew, *rak*), or " fishpart," of Dagon, by ῥάχις, chine ; Saul's military robe (*mad*), by μανδύας ; David's scrip (*kelî*), by κάδιον ; and Jonathan's arrow (*chêts*), by σχίζα.

7. Sometimes the words they use throw an important light on the notions of the Jews respecting some subjects on which our information is very imperfect. Thus, in 1 Sam. xxviii. 7, " a woman that hath a familiar spirit," is in the Hebrew, " a woman mistress of *ôbh*," and *ôbh* means properly " a skinbottle." The expression might well perplex us if the LXX. rendering ἐγγαστρίμυθος for " *ventriloquist*" did not indicate the view of the translators that the whole scene was one of imposture. The term seems to have arisen from the fact that ventriloquism requires a kind of inflation, which was attributed by the credulous to the action of a spirit.

There are two words, involving questions of deep interest, the rendering of which by the LXX. is very various. These are the words " *Urim and Thummim*," and " *Teraphim*." To enter into any full explanation of either word would alone involve

a long paper: all that we need here notice is that no one can examine them without giving full weight to the terms used for them in the LXX. Now, in the first Book of Samuel the word δῆλοι is used to render *Urim* in viii. 6, and to render *Thamîm* in xiv. 41, where it is almost certain that they read Thummim. Now, δῆλοι means apparently "bright gems," and it thus becomes clear that the translators of this book, as also of Numb. xxvii. 21, identified the use of the Urim and Thummim in some way with the use of the actual *gems* upon the breastplate; and therefore it becomes probable that they, at any rate, held the now generally abandoned theory that the oracular answers were given by a mystic light gleaming over the letters which were graven upon the gems. Still more important conclusions, analogous to this, may be derived from the words *Δήλωσις κὰ 'Αλήθεια,* "*Manifestation and Truth,*" by which they generally render these two Hebrew words, though, if accurately translated, *Urim* means "Lights" and *Thummim* "Perfections." Into this curious matter we cannot now inquire further, but it is noticeable that the LXX. use the same word δῆλοι to render "*Teraphim*" in the very remarkable passage (Hos. iii. 4, 5), in which it looks at first sight as if Teraphim were acknowledged as legitimate adjuncts to a pure theocratic worship. There are, however, few words in the rendering of which the LXX. vary more widely than the translation of the Hebrew "*Teraphim,*" for, besides δῆλοι, they use to represent it εἴδωλα, idols (Gen. xxxi.); το θεραφεὶν (Judg. xvii.), κενοτάφια, "cenotaphs" (1 Sam. xix.); γλυπτὰ, "sculptured images" (Ezek. xxi. 21); and

ἀποφθέγγομενοι, "utterers" (Zech. x. 2). Each of these words is suggestive, and must be taken into account, but here we are only concerned with the first Book of Samuel.   Now, in 1 Sam. xv. 23, where our English version has "stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry" (literally, "as false gods and teraphim"), they render " Injustice and Teraphim bring pain and troubles," where, as in other places, they evidently regard the Teraphim as forming part of idolatrous worship (comp. 2 Kings xxiii. 24, Gen. xxi. 21, Zech. x. 2).   The word κενοτάφια, in 1 Sam. xix. 13–16, leads to the further conclusion, which I have elsewhere[1] shewn to be highly probable, that the Teraphim were in reality sculptured images of departed ancestors.   The passage is, however, very remarkable on other grounds.   For, instead of saying, "Michal took an image" (literally, "*the* teraphim," for the word is *always* used, like the Latin "*Penates*," in the plural, though here there can only have been one image) "and put it in the bed, and put a pillow of goat's hair for his bolster," they render it, " Michal took the 'cenotaphs' and placed on the bed, and placed at his head a *liver* of goats."[2]   This shews that they read *kâbhêd*, " a liver," instead of *kâbhîr*, " a pillow ; " for Schlensner's conjecture that the Greek ἧπαρ is only a bad attempt to represent *kâbhêr* in Greek letters is inconceivable.   Now, in this very curious reading, Josephus follows them, for he does not even allude to the teraphim, but says (*Ant.* vi. 11. 4) that " Michal, after having let David

[1] See the writer's article in Kitto's Cyclopædia, *Art.* Teraphim (last ed.).

[2] So in both the Alexandrine and Vatican MSS., though there is a various reading, στρογγύλωμα, " a pillow."

escape by a cord out of the window, fitted up a bed
for him as if he were sick, and *put under the bed-
clothes a goat's liver*, and when her father sent to
seize David, shewed the bed covered, and made
them believe by the leaping of the liver, which
caused the bed-clothes to move also, that David
breathed like one that was asthmatic."[1]   It may be
an accidental circumstance that in Ezek. xxi. 21,
teraphim are mentioned in connection with looking
into livers for purposes of divination ; otherwise
we might conclude, as Mr. R. Stuart Poole has
done, that Michal was actually trying to divine the
future by sacrificing to the teraphim, and examining
the entrails of the victim (*extispicium*), when the
messengers of Saul arrived.

7. That the LXX. translators felt themselves at
liberty to deal very freely with the text is clear.
Thus in xxiv. 3, instead of " to cover his feet "
(which means " to perform a natural necessity"),
they use the euphemism παρασκευάσασθαι, " to get
himself ready."   This is a matter of no importance,
but the fact that, according to some manuscripts,
they *entirely omit* xvii. 12–31, and 55–58, because
these passages present a *primâ facie* contradiction to
the other narrative of David's first introduction to
Saul, is far more serious.   It shews a very defective
sense of their responsibility as translators.   The
Books of Samuel are assuredly a compilation, and
the truth of the history can only be discovered by
comparing the differing but not necessarily irrecon-
cilable narratives.   Traces of a certain theological
dishonesty also appear in the rendering of the words,

---

[1] Whiston's Translation.

rûach Elohim, "a spirit of God," and *rûach Jehovah*, "a spirit of Jehovah," simply by "an evil spirit," omitting the names of God, "*Elohim*" and "*Jeho-vah*," in xvi. 23 and xix. 9.

8. It only remains to notice a few of the *Hagadôth*, or legendary Jewish particulars—some of them very minute and frivolous—which every now and then they insert into the text. Thus in i. 14, to save Eli's dignity, they make *his young servant* (παιδάριον) tell Hannah that she is intoxicated. In xv. 12, they desert the Hebrew to accommodate Samuel with a chariot. In xvii. 39, they make David walk up and down once or twice in Saul's armour, and find that it fatigued him. In xvii. 43, they make David tell Goliath that he is not a dog, but " *worse than a dog.*" In xxi. 13, they make him " *run on all fours,*" as one of his ways of simulating madness. In v. 4, 5, they slightly amplify the information that Dagon's wrists were broken off at the vestibule of his temple, and that his priests, in consequence, always step over the threshold. In this and the following chapter they introduce several circum-stances—none of which are of much importance. It is, however, hardly possible to forbear a smile at the circumstance that, in ver. 10, they think it worth while to introduce the ludicrous and superfluous *hagada* that " *the Gittites made themselves seats to sit upon* " when they were afflicted with hæmorrhoids. The Vulgate carries this a little further, and says, " The Gittites took counsel, and made themselves seats of skin !"

Without the slightest attempt to exhaust the sub-ject, I have thus pointed out some of the actual phenomena offered to our notice by the LXX.

Version, especially in a single Book, and have also endeavoured to indicate, without expanding, their main significance. . I have fulfilled my object if I have succeeded in shewing the young theological student how numerous and how interesting are the Biblical questions, in the solution of which we must be guided, in part, by the renderings of those Alexandrian scholars who translated the Old Testament into Greek, for the use of their countrymen, more than two thousand years ago.   F. W. FARRAR.

THE FIRST CHAPTER
OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

VERSES 3 AND 4.

THE inspired writer proceeds as follows, with his delineation of our Saviour :—

Ver. 3. *—who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high ;—*

It is a brilliant picture, and not to be too metaphysically analysed. Yet the pencil that painted it was dipped, reverently, in metaphysics.

Our Lord is *the brightness of ' God's glory*,' that is, *the brightness of the glory of ' the divine Father.'* A distinction of personalities is assumed. And it is further assumed that, in the divine arrangements in reference to creation in general, and human redemption in particular, the Father represents the Godhead, and may therefore be emphatically desig-