

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

*SINCE WELLHAUSEN.*

SYNOPSIS OF ARTICLE.

Recapitulation. Second line of criticism—MT 'unreliable' (charge of 'unthinking' acceptance, and answer).

Thesis of Article—The substantial accuracy of the MT.

Textual Criticism—Brief statement of its nature.

I. The Massoretic Text.

1. Hebrew MSS.—variants.
2. The Samaritan Pentateuch.
3. The Targums.
4. Aquila.
5. The Peshitta.
6. The Vulgate.

Summing up of Part I.

II. The Septuagint Text.

1. History.
2. Recensions, dependent versions, and quotations.
3. State of text. No critical text. Cambridge LXX.  
Lagarde. Tentative statement as to the Divine Names. Table.

III. Comparison of the two Texts.

1. Four general points.
  - i. MT is in the original Hebrew ; LXX is a Greek translation.
  - ii. The difference between the Divine Names in Hebrew and Greek.
  - iii. Intrinsic evidence largely fails us.
  - iv. Possible variants are limited ; probability therefore of accidental coincidence.  
(*To be continued next month.*)

Article 3. TEXTUAL CRITICISM. THE MASSORETIC TEXT  
AND THE SEPTUAGINT.

PROFESSOR WELCH based his thesis that 'the analysis of the Genesis stories,' based upon 'the differing use of the Divine Names Yahweh and Elohim,' has been 'seriously shaken' upon two lines of criticism (*EXPOSITOR*, May, 1923, p. 346). The first line, viz., that the use of the Divine Names was governed, not by the usage of different writers,

but by the differing value of the two names as used by one and the same writer, has been dealt with in the concluding section of the previous article. We saw ample reason for rejecting this as a quite insufficient explanation of the problem raised by the peculiar use of the Divine Names in Genesis, and in fact Prof. Welch himself evidently does not regard this line of argument as of much value. He rejects Möller's solution of the problem as 'so unconvincing that it has not called for very serious reply' and he speaks of the second line as raising 'a much more serious objection' (p. 347).

To the second line of criticism therefore let us now give our best attention. It is an attack upon the accuracy of the current Hebrew texts in the matter of the Divine Names. To quote Welch, "Dahse \* in Germany and Wiener † in London have pointed out how often the Septuagint text differs from the Hebrew in the precise matter of the divine names and have insisted that in passages where the usage is at present uniform, the uniformity may not be original." It is well known that in other parts of the Hebrew Bible changes have been made in the Divine Names. "An entire Book of the Psalter (Book II, Pss. 42-72) exhibits by preference the name Elohim," and a comparison of Ps. 14 with Ps. 53 and of Ps. 40<sup>ist</sup> with Ps. 70 shows clearly that in, at any rate, some of the Psalms Elohim has been substituted for the original Yahweh. ‡ What assurance then have we, these critics ask, that the present MT § of the Pentateuch represents the original?

\* *Textkritische Materialien zur Hexateuchfrage*, I. (1912); *A Fresh Investigation of the Sources of Genesis* (S.P.C.K., 1914).

† *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism, Pentateuchal Studies, and The Pentateuchal Text*.

‡ For the bearing of this upon the question at issue see Part III 2 vii (end).

§ Here and elsewhere MT is used for the Massoretic (Hebrew) Text (see Part I 1 below).

In fact, may we not say that in a large number of instances the Hebrew text underlying the LXX is clearly the more original ?

Not only has this last question been answered in the affirmative, but Wiener, followed by Welch, charges the scholars who hold 'the regnant hypothesis' with 'unthinkingly' accepting the trustworthiness of the MT. It doesn't seem to have occurred to them that the Dr. Driver (e.g.), who wrote the elaborate note on the chief ancient versions of the Old Testament in his *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel* (Clarendon Press, 1890, pp. xxxvi.-lxxxiv.) and who made such full use of the LXX in the text of that work, was not likely to have neglected the evidence of the versions when he had to deal with the Text of the Pentateuch and that the fact that he and others trusted to the MT rather than to the LXX was due not to want of thought but to exercise of thought on rational lines.

This latter I believe to be the true explanation, and the object of this Article is to show that their trust was not misplaced.

It is not part of my thesis to maintain the infallible accuracy of the MT in regard to the Divine Names. I question whether any modern scholar has denied that errors have occurred here and there in the course of transcription.\* All that I am concerned to maintain is that the evidence fully justifies belief in the substantial accuracy of the MT, as representing the final canonical form of the Pentateuch.

The attack upon the MT of the Pentateuch and especially of Genesis, with which we are now concerned, has been

\* See, e.g., Notes on Gen. 14<sup>22</sup> by Driver, *Genesis*, p. 166, and Carpenter and Harford, Ed.<sup>1</sup>, Vol. II, p. 22, and on 28<sup>20</sup> by Skinner, *Divine Names*, p. 42.

made in the name of Textual Criticism. Let us remind ourselves what Textual Criticism is. According to Mr. J. P. Postgate (*Enc. Brit.*, vol. 20, p. 708), it is 'the skilled and methodical application of human judgment to the settlement of texts,' the aim being the ascertainment of the 'original form' of any particular document as 'intended by its author.' This is no easy task. No one can hope to attain success in it, unless he be "a scholar who has prepared himself by general training in the analysis of texts and by special study of the facts bearing on particular cases." \* "The best criticism is that which takes account of every class of textual facts and which assigns to each method its proper use and rank." "This conformity to rationally framed or rather discovered rules implies no disparagement of scholarship and insight. It does but impose salutary restraints on the arbitrary and impulsive caprice which has marred the criticism of some of those whose scholarship and insight have deservedly been held in the highest honour." Not all so-called Textual Criticism does observe these "salutary restraints," and I believe that the attempts made in that name to prove that the MT in the matter of the Divine Names in Genesis is untrustworthy recoil upon the heads of those who made them for just this reason. It is necessary to emphasize the words 'in Genesis.' We are not concerned with the text of the Old Testament as a whole, but with the text of the Pentateuch in particular (and indeed with an even narrower issue, viz., the reliability of the MT in the matter of the Divine Names in Genesis and Exodus). This is important, because 'the Law' was recognized as canonical long before the rest of the Old Testament and it received a reverential

\* This and the following quotations are from Dr. Hort's Introduction to *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, pp. 21, 19 and 65. The whole masterly exposition of the methods of Textual Criticism, pp. 19-72, should be consulted.

treatment at the hands of the Jews from the days of Ezra, which was not until much later accorded to their other scriptures. Statements about the condition of the MT and the value of the LXX in regard to later books must not be taken as applicable to the MT and the LXX in Genesis. We will look now, first, at the Massoretic text and, secondly, at the LXX text. The way will then be clear to proceed in Part III to decide which is the best witness to the original text.

### Part I. *The Massoretic Text.*

1. The form in which the Hebrew text of the Old Testament is presented to us in MSS. and printed editions is called the Massoretic text, because it is the work of a guild of trained scholars known as Massorettes, i.e. Masters of the Massora or Tradition. In order to secure the accurate transmission and the proper pronunciation of the consonantal text, they added vowels and accents and compiled an elaborate series of notes upon its minutest peculiarities. The actual compilation of these notes went on from the sixth to the tenth centuries A.D., but it is practically certain that the consonantal text upon which they were based was fixed in the early part of the second century A.D. Several hundreds of MSS. of the Pentateuch were collated by Kennicott and de Rossi. The oldest date from the ninth and tenth centuries. They all exhibit the same text. The writings of Jerome in the fourth and of Origen in the third century show that the Hebrew text of their day was practically identical with the MT.

Evidence from the Targums and from Aquila (see 'Versions' below) carry this text back to the beginning of the second century. The scribes of that day probably chose as their exemplar "an old and well-written copy, possibly one of those which were preserved in the Court of the

Temple" (Robertson Smith, *O.T.J.C.*, p. 69). This copy was not a perfect replica of the original autographs, but whether errors had already actually arisen *in the matter of the Divine Names* is a matter to be determined on strictly scientific principles.

An examination of extant Hebrew MSS., containing Gen. 1<sup>1</sup> to Ex. 6<sup>3</sup>, shows that in them the variations in the Divine Names are very slight indeed. Dr. Skinner (*Divine Names in Genesis*, pp. 264-6) has given a Table, showing a total of 51 variants in Genesis to 37 names. A study of it reveals the following facts. (i) The general accuracy of the MSS. in this respect is remarkable. Kennicott collated nearly 320 MSS. of Genesis in whole or in part, and de Rossi also collated hundreds. Only 46 K. MSS. and 22 de R. MSS., out of all these hundreds, show any variants at all. Of these 68 MSS. 39 have only one variant, 16 have two, 8 have three, 2 have four, 2 have five and 1 has six. (ii) Fifteen of the variants are in the 6 passages (18<sup>3</sup>. 27.<sup>31</sup>, 20<sup>4</sup>; 15<sup>2</sup>.<sup>8</sup>) where Adonai or Adonai-Yahweh occurs. In these only do we find variants supported by more than 3 MSS. The cause of this is obvious. The sacred name YHWH was not pronounced at all. In public reading it was pronounced Adonai (or Elohim). A scribe, writing to dictation or pronouncing the words aloud before writing them down, was very liable to write the name pronounced instead of the name written in his exemplar. Of the remaining 36 variants 1 is impossible (Elohim Yahweh, 35<sup>10</sup>); 12 are omissions (in 10 cases by only one MS. each, 1 by two and 1 by three); 1 is an insertion (15<sup>9</sup>) by two MSS.; the remaining 22 ring changes on Yahweh, Elohim and Yahweh-Elohim (2 only are read by as many as 3 MSS., 5 by 2, and 15 by 1 MS. each). (iii) Moreover we must weigh the MSS. as well as count them. Some swarm with corrections and erasures, some are too late to be of

any independent value. But even if we were to accept them all as of equal value, the wonder would still be, not that there are so many, but that there are so few, variants actually to be found. Those that there are are naturally accounted for as transcriptional errors. So far therefore as Hebrew MSS. go, there is nothing to lead one to doubt the accuracy of the MT.\*

2. By good fortune we have in *the Samaritan Pentateuch* a most valuable witness to the reliability of the MT in the matter of the Divine Names. It is a recension of the Hebrew Pentateuch, possessed and used by the schismatic Samaritan community. Its antiquity is shown by the fact that it is written in a degenerate variety of the old Hebrew writing, which was essentially the same as that found upon the Moabite stone and in the tunnel of the Pool of Siloam. Moreover the hostility which existed between Jews and Samaritans after the schism was set up makes it practically certain that this Samaritan Pentateuch must date back to the time before the schism. When did the schism occur? Opinion is divided between c. 430 B.C. (Neh. 13<sup>s, 23</sup>) and c. 330 B.C., when, according to Josephus, the Temple on Mt. Gerizim was built.† We have then here a witness, which at the latest takes us back to the fourth century B.C. On comparing the Samaritan with the Hebrew Pentateuch we find in the former (a) a series of intentional alterations, due in some passages to a desire to defend the legitimacy of their worship and in many others to a desire to produce a smoother and more intelligible text; (b) a number of lengthy insertions from parallel passages; and, apart from these, (c) a consonantal text very closely resembling the

\* But, it may be said, these variant MSS. do not stand alone. They concur frequently with LXX and other witnesses. This will be dealt with later on (III 1 iv).

† See Skinner, *Divine Names*, pp. 118-121.



MT. Von Gall's edition brings out the remarkable uniformity of the Samaritan MSS. in the matter of the Divine Names. He registers only two variants in Gen. 1<sup>1</sup>-Ex. 3<sup>15</sup> (21<sup>17</sup>, 'God' for 'Angel of God'; 30<sup>23</sup>, 1 MS. omits 'God'). What then has this witness to say as to the Divine Names in this whole section? There are 344 occurrences of Yahweh (146), Elohim (178) and Yahweh Elohim (20). In 334 of these the Samaritan and Hebrew texts are absolutely agreed; in, at most, ten cases is there difference.\*

Copyists' errors are the obvious solution in most, if not all, of these ten cases of divergence. But what of the 334 agreements? The fact that through two independent lines of descent, starting from 430 or 330 B.C., the Divine Names in the passage under review have been transmitted with so microscopic an amount of variation surely proves two things: (1) the care exercised by both Jewish and Samaritan copyists in transcribing the names of God, at least from the date of separation, and (2) the antiquity of the distribution of the names, which is now found in the MT. As regards this later point, the present Hebrew usage is seen to be practically identical with that which obtained in the fourth or fifth century B.C., i.e. either in the days of Ezra or at the latest within a century thereof.

\* The Samaritan text read E for Y in Gen. 7<sup>1</sup>, 14<sup>22</sup> (where the names in both texts are probably late additions, 20<sup>18</sup> and Ex. 3<sup>4</sup>; it reads Y for E in 7<sup>9</sup>, 28<sup>4</sup>, 31<sup>7, 9, 16a</sup> (and Ex. 6<sup>2a</sup>); it adds E in 35<sup>9b</sup>. In 5 of these 10 divergencies the Samaritan stands absolutely alone. In the other 5 it is supported as follows:

	Hebrew MSS.	LXX authorities.	Other versions.
7 <sup>1</sup>	2	cw Arm-codd	Pesh. (except Cod. D= Brit. Mus. Add. 14,445, dated A.D. 464)
7 <sup>9</sup>	1	E.	Vulg.
20 <sup>18</sup>	—	bw ej Boh. Phil-arm	—
31 <sup>9</sup>	1	—	—
35 <sup>9</sup>	—	Practically unanimous	—

This last reading is an *addition* of Elohim, a divergence which makes no difference to the documentary analysis, because chap. 35 regularly uses Elohim (or El, vers. 1, 2, 7, 11), never Yahweh.

3. The Targums are based on the oral 'interpretation' into the vernacular Aramaic, which accompanied the reading of the Law in the Synagogue, when Biblical Hebrew had ceased to be a living tongue. The Babylonian Targum (Onkelos) is of no use to us, because in its written form it employs invariably Yahweh (in an abbreviated written form) as the one Divine Name. The Palestinian Targum (pseudo-Jonathon) is highly paraphrastic and in its present form belongs to the eighth century A.D. Its divergencies from the MT in the matter of the Divine Names are all in one direction, i.e. it usually substitutes Y for E, never E for Y. It gives us no light upon the original Hebrew text.

4. Before the middle of the second century A.D. the LXX had fallen into disrepute with the Rabbis as not sufficiently in accordance with the standard Hebrew text, and a Jewish scholar, named Aquila, produced an extremely literal translation from Hebrew into Greek, which 'reproduced peculiarities of Hebrew construction in conscious defiance of Greek grammar and idiom.' Hence it is a very valuable witness to the standard Hebrew text. Unfortunately only fragments and citations and marginal notes remain. Out of the 344 uses of the names in Gen. 1<sup>1</sup>-Ex. 3<sup>15</sup> as proper names, there are only 32 where the readings of Aquila have been preserved. In 31 of these Aquila and the MT agree. In Gen. 30<sup>24</sup> Aquila agrees with LXX, Symmachus and Peshitta in reading Elohim, while all Hebrew MSS. and Samaritan read Yahweh. The evidence, so far as it goes, indicates that the differences between Aquila and the MT were few and far between.

#### 5. The Syriac Version—the Peshitta.

Nothing is certainly known as to the origin of this version, but it is common ground that it was translated direct from the Hebrew in the second century A.D. and that, at least in some MSS. and in some parts of the Old Testament, it has

been partially revised in accordance with the LXX. Out of the 344 uses of the Divine Names there are only 11 undoubted variants from the MT; in 4 more passages one to four out of five, editions read a text differing from the MT.\*

The agreements with the MT are from 329 to 333. At least the larger proportion of the differences may reasonably be regarded as translator's or copyists' errors. If any of them are due to real differences between the Hebrew MS. (or MSS.) underlying the Peshitta and the official Hebrew text, they are so few in number that we can only conclude that, in that case, the former must have been an offshoot from the latter at a date later than the divergence of the Samaritan from the Hebrew.

6. The Vulgate was translated from the Hebrew by Jerome at the end of the fourth century. In only five cases (4<sup>1</sup>, 6<sup>3,5</sup>, 7<sup>9</sup>, 15<sup>6</sup>) does the Clementine Vulgate read a different name from that in the MT, and in two of these (4<sup>1</sup>, 7<sup>9</sup>) there is strong MS. support for the name which agrees with the MT, so much so that Cardinal Carafa, Editor of the Louvain Bible, adopts the latter reading in both cases. The cases in which the Vulgate omits a Divine Name are, as a rule at any rate, due simply to the character of the Latin idiom and style. †

So far we have found nothing to shake our faith in the substantial trustworthiness of the MT as regards the

\* Gen. 3<sup>11</sup> ins. Y, 3<sup>24</sup> ins. YE, 7<sup>1</sup> E, 13<sup>10b</sup> E, 14<sup>22</sup> om. Y, 15<sup>4</sup> E, 22<sup>11</sup> E, 22<sup>15</sup> E, 29<sup>32</sup> E, 30<sup>24</sup> E, 31<sup>10b</sup> Y.] The doubtful readings are 3<sup>13</sup> Y for YE in 1 edition, 30<sup>27</sup> E for Y in 2 editions, 4<sup>10</sup> ins. Y and 13<sup>10a</sup> E, for Y in 4 editions. In 7 (? 9) cases Elohim is read for Yahweh, in 1 Y for E, in 1 (? 2) Y is inserted and in 1 Y is omitted. Support is given to two (? 4) readings by LXX alone, to one by LXX and Vulg., to one by LXX, Aquila and Symmachus, to one by Samaritan (?), 2 Heb. MSS., 2 LXX cursives and Armenian MSS., to one by 2 Heb. MSS. alone, to one by the Georgian version and to one (? two) by one or two minor LXX MSS. Three (? four) have no outside support at all. (See Skinner, *Divine Names*, pp. 140-4.)

† See Skinner, *Divine Names*, pp. 144-5 and 281-8, and next month's continuation of this article, III 2 v.

Divine Names in the Pentateuch and especially in Genesis.

But at this point Dahse and Wiener and others come in with the persistent, one may say the triumphant, cry: But what about the LXX? It is the greatest and the most ancient of our versions and takes us back behind the MT and Samaritan, etc.; and, when we open and read it, we find a wide divergence from the MT-Sam.-Peshitta tradition. Here and not in the MT we find, as a rule, the true text of the Pentateuch. If insistence and confidence would carry the day, this theory would now be generally accepted and the MT discredited. But facts are stubborn things. To them let us go and see if, at the voice of practically one witness, the verdict so far arrived at must be reversed. We will look at the history of the LXX and the state of its text. We will then look at the arguments put forth by a typical exponent of the LXX theory and test their value. Finally we will seek to sum up the discussion and to arrive at a right decision on the point at issue, viz., the reliability or otherwise of the Divine Names as given in the Massoretic text.

### Part II. *The Septuagint.*

1. *The history of the LXX and the present condition of its text.* \*

i. According to 'the letter of Aristeas' the Pentateuch was translated into Greek in Alexandria in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus (285-247 B.C.). Even though this document is not in all respects trustworthy, the date cannot be very far wrong. This translation was clearly intended to supply the needs of the Alexandrian synagogue, the Jews of Egypt being Greek-speaking and no longer conversant with Biblical Hebrew. The Law only at this time was fully canonical and the translation of it would be made

\* See Swete's Introduction, Part I; Driver on text of Samuel, pp. xl-lxxxii.; Robertson Smith, *O.T.J.C.*, Lect. IV and V.

under a strong sense of responsibility. The Greek Pentateuch accordingly "is on the whole a close and serviceable translation." (Other parts of the Old Testament were translated at different times and with different ideals, the process being completed in all probability before the Christian era. But with these we have not to deal in this article.) There are palæographical reasons for thinking that the Pentateuch was translated from a Hebrew text written in archaic characters. (See Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, p. lxxv.)

ii. The original text of the LXX had suffered corruptions before the Christian era. Philo's quotations are sufficient evidence of this (Swete, pp. 372-6). It had deteriorated still further by the time of Origen. Efforts were therefore made to revise it. At Cæsarea Origen, at Antioch Lucian, and in Egypt Hesychius endeavoured to restore the text to its original purity. But this only added to the confusion. Origen sought to correct it by comparison with the Hebrew text of his day. When he found in the LXX words which had no equivalent in the Hebrew, he left them in and marked them with obeli ( - , with or without dots above and below); when words were wanting, he added them (generally from one of the later versions), marking them with asterisks (\*). This recension was often copied without the signs and often mixed with other recensions. Fortunately it is still to be found in a relatively pure form and with the signs in the uncials G, M, in a few cursives and especially in the Syro-hexaplar version (Swete, pp. 59-78).

Lucian (with Dorotheus, who was a Hebrew, as well as a Greek, scholar) revised the LXX, in all probability, on the same principles as governed the Antiochene revision of the New Testament. His main aim seems to have been lucidity and completeness, but he also consulted the Hebrew text current in Syria in the third century A.D., and this

seems to have differed in a number of places from the text which lay before the Alexandrian translators five centuries before (Swete, pp. 80-85).

Hesychius about the same time revised the current LXX text for the Egyptian Church. This recension is probably represented fairly well by the text of codex Q (Prophets only), and certain cursives. Ceriani has shown that this text agrees closely with the text underlying the Egyptian versions and that which is reflected in the writings of Cyril of Alexandria.

The result of all this was not satisfactory. In Jerome's time men read their Old Testament in one or other of these three recensions according to their country of residence. As time went on these texts became fused in varying proportions in different manuscripts. Groups of MSS. are recognizable to-day, which seem to answer more or less to this recension or that, but the greater number present mixed texts, which almost defy analysis.\*

iii. When we pass from MSS. to the versions made from the LXX and not direct from the Hebrew, we find valuable guidance towards the recovery of the original Greek Text, but here too the fusion of different types of text greatly complicates the problem. When, e.g., Dr. Swete tries to group the authorities which are generally supposed to represent the three recensions, he has to include the Armenian version as 'in part' belonging to all three! *The Old Latin* is pre-hexaplaric and in general of great value, but in regard to the names of God, its evidence is unreliable, owing to the tendency to confuse the Latin contractions (Dñs and Ds) for Dominus and Deus (see Prof. Burkitt's *The Rules of Tyconius*, p. lix. and very many pages of the text). *The Egyptian versions* probably reflect

\* See article on "The Classification of Greek MSS. of the Hexateuch," by Dr. A. V. Billen (*J.T.S.*, April, 1925).

the Hesychian revision, but "much yet remains to be done before these versions can be securely used in the work of reconstructing the text of the Greek Old Testament" (Swete, p. 108). *The Ethiopic version* again is valuable, but Lagarde maintained that "the printed texts [did not] furnish a secure basis for the employment of this version for the reconstruction of the LXX" (Swete, p. 110). *The Syro-hexaplar* is "an exact reflection in Syriac of the Hexaplaric Greek text, as read at Alexandria at the beginning of the seventh century" (Swete, p. 114). *The Armenian version* "shows a typical hexaplar text in Genesis and Exodus" (McLean in Swete, p. 119). *The Palestinian Aramaic* resembles in its literal character the last two versions.

iv. The last helps to textual reconstruction of the LXX are quotations in Jewish writers (Philo and Josephus), the N.T. and the writings of Christian Fathers of the first four or five centuries, especially, (in Greek) Justin, Origen, Eusebius, Chrysostom and Cyril of Alexandria and (in Latin) Irenæus, Cyprian, Hilary, Lucifer, Tyconius and Latin translations of Origen. The unsatisfactory state of the text of most editions of the Fathers, their habit of quoting inexactly from memory and of weaving together different passages and the influence of familiar quotations in the New Testament make it extremely difficult to be sure of the exact value of particular patristic quotations. A knowledge of the context is often vitally important.

The extent of the internal variant readings revealed by the collation of MSS., versions and quotations may be gauged in some measure by the fact that, if we take the list of variants recorded in the apparatus criticus of the larger Cambridge LXX, we find that out of 1,530 verses in Genesis only 3 have been copied, translated and quoted without variation by these various authorities. These

verses are 1<sup>1</sup>.<sup>19</sup> and 21<sup>24</sup> and contain 10, 8 and 5 words respectively. It is therefore to be expected that this tendency to error should show itself in the transmission, translation and quotation of the Divine Names as well as in the rest of the Greek Text. And as a matter of fact this is very much the case. In the MT the variants for the Names of God in MSS. and versions (apart from the LXX) are extremely rare. "In the Greek Pentateuch perhaps no element of the text is so liable to variation as the names for God." In Gen. 1<sup>1</sup> to Ex. 3<sup>15a</sup> out of 350 uses of the Names (as proper names) in the LXX, separately or in combination, only 90 have no internal variants, while the remaining 260 have from one to three or four variants.

2. *A tentative statement of the witness of the LXX as to the use of the Divine Names.*

The perusal of the foregoing very condensed statements of the history and present condition of the LXX and of the materials available for its reconstruction will show to an attentive reader that the task before the Critic, who seeks to ascertain the true Text of the original LXX version of the Pentateuch, is an extremely difficult and delicate one. So difficult is it that no scholar or group of scholars has yet ventured to produce a critically revised text of the original LXX. That great Textual scholar, Lagarde, before his lamented death did produce the first volume (Gen.-Esther) of a provisional text of one recension (Lucian's), but he was careful to disclaim the idea that his work was final and Swete warns us against quoting Lagarde's text as 'Lucian' without reserve. Even if it were satisfactorily 'Lucian,' the final goal would still be far off. As Lagarde wrote in his preface, "the restoration of the text common to any one family must not be regarded as more than a step forward in the right direction, and even a critical text, when reached by these or other means,



will not be free from the element of uncertainty " (see Swete, p. 485). But extremely difficult though it be, the scholar, who would use the LXX as a witness to the Hebrew Text underlying it, is compelled (until such a critically revised text is put forward by men who have given their lives to the study) to come to some tentative conclusions of his own as to what was probably the original text. Here it is only possible to state the results at which the present writer has arrived in the most summary manner. Footnotes giving references will enable the reader to check these results. The evidence upon which they are based is set forth fully in the larger Cambridge Septuagint.

Taking the 344 occurrences of the Divine Names as proper names in the MT of Gen. 1<sup>1</sup>-Ex. 3<sup>15a</sup> we find that in 266 cases the Greek translation agrees with the MT, in 53 it almost certainly differs from it, and in 25 the evidence is so conflicting that, at present, certainty is hardly possible. Moreover in the LXX we find 7 clear, and 2 doubtful, additional occurrences of *ὁ Θεός* and 2 additional of *Κύριος*. Deduct from these the 5 omissions included in the 53 clear differences mentioned above and we arrive at the total of 350 Divine Names in the LXX as compared with 344 in the MT.\*

The Table on p. 180 shows the number of occurrences of each name in the MT and the corresponding readings in the LXX.

Bearing in mind what we have learnt about

I. The Massoretic Text and II. The Septuagintal Text, we must now confront the one with the other and seek to ascertain

\* The total occurrences of the Divine Names in MT and in LXX may be summarized as follows. We find in the MT 178 Elohim, 146 Yahweh and 20 Yahweh Elohim, total 344; in the LXX 193 *ὁ θεός* (including 2 doubtful additions), 1 *θεός* (Gen. 3<sup>5</sup>), 99 *κύριος*, 32 *κύριος ὁ θεός*, 25 doubtful, total 350.

		MT				Not in MT	
Yahweh	146	Elohim	178	Yahweh	Elohim		20
LXX							
<i>κύριος</i>	93		4 *			0	2
<i>ὁ θεός</i>	19 †		160 ‡			5 §	19
<i>θεός</i>			1				
<i>κύριος ὁ θεός</i>	16 ¶		4 **			12	
omitted	1 ††		4 ††			0	
doubtful	17 §§		5			3 ¶¶	
	146		178			20	11

### III. The comparative merits of the two Texts.

Has the LXX in the Pentateuch been translated from a purer text than the MT, or the reverse? Or does it represent essentially the same Hebrew Text, its differences being due in the main to translational or transcriptional errors?

1. There are four points of a general character which deserve preliminary consideration.

(i) In the case of the MT we have a text in the original language, whereas in the case of the LXX we have to deal with a version in another tongue. The MT is written in the later Aramaic script, but evidently in the Pentateuch it was transliterated from the earlier Hebrew script with scrupulous care. In the LXX we have to deal with differences of thought and idiom, and transcriptional probabilities

\* Gen. 19<sup>20a</sup>, 21<sup>2, 6</sup>, Ex. 3<sup>4b</sup>.

† Gen. 4<sup>1, 4, 16</sup>, 6<sup>6, 7</sup>, 13<sup>10a & b, 12</sup>, 15<sup>6, 7</sup>, 16<sup>5</sup>, 18<sup>1, 14</sup>, 25<sup>21b</sup>, 30<sup>24</sup>, 27, 31<sup>49, 38<sup>7b, 10</sup></sup>.

‡ including *θεοσεβασία* for 'fear of God' (20<sup>11</sup>).

§ Gen. 2<sup>5, 7, 9, 19, 21</sup>.

|| Gen. 3<sup>5</sup>.

¶ Gen. 4<sup>6, 16a & b, 26</sup>, 5<sup>29</sup>, 6<sup>2, 5, 8</sup>, 7<sup>1, 5, 16b</sup>, 8<sup>21a & b, 10<sup>9a</sup>, 11<sup>9b</sup>, 29<sup>31</sup></sup>.

\*\* Gen. 6<sup>12, 8<sup>15</sup>, 9<sup>12</sup>, 28<sup>20</sup></sup>.

†† Gen. 14<sup>22</sup>.

‡† Gen. 1<sup>28</sup>, 9<sup>16</sup>, 31<sup>50b</sup>, Ex. 2<sup>28b</sup>.

§§ Gen. 4<sup>3, 9, 13</sup>, 8<sup>20</sup>, 10<sup>9b</sup>, 11<sup>8, 9a</sup>, 12<sup>17</sup>, 13<sup>4, 14</sup>, 15<sup>4, 18</sup>, 16<sup>7</sup>, 24<sup>40</sup>, 26<sup>3, 28<sup>13b</sup>, 32<sup>2</sup></sup>.

||| Gen. 6<sup>22</sup>, 7<sup>9, 16a</sup>, 21<sup>4</sup>, Ex. 3<sup>1</sup>.

¶¶ Gen. 4<sup>4b</sup>, 3<sup>13, 22</sup>.

vary in the two languages. This last fact is well exemplified in the case of the two Divine Names.

(ii) In Hebrew the two Divine Names are sharply distinguished, the one being purely a proper name and the other a generic (or common or appellative) name, used as a proper name in particular cases. But, at the time when the LXX translation was made, the sacred name of four letters had ceased to be pronounced and the reader of Scripture habitually substituted the word Adonai (i.e. Lord). (In the rare cases where Adonai preceded Yahweh he substituted Elohim.) Where therefore the Hebrew text was YHWH, the Greek translator as a rule translated by *κύριος* (or sometimes *ὁ κύριος*), and where the Hebrew word was Elohim, he translated by *ὁ θεός*. But *κύριος* and *θεός* (Lord and God) are both common nouns in Greek and therefore, while the Jew who knew Hebrew knew well what *κύριος* stood for, the ordinary Greek-speaking individual did not. He would tend to class them together as synonyms and would not regard it as of great importance whether the one name or the other stood in a particular passage. It is obvious therefore that the possibility of substituting one name for the other would be greater in the case of the Greek copyist than in that of the Hebrew.

(iii) In most cases in which we have to decide between the claims of rival variant readings, the Textual critic is able to call in the help of 'intrinsic probability'; one reading seems to make better sense than its rival or rivals. But in the case of the Divine Names this can rarely, if ever, be done. Taking a sentence in isolation from the context, one name makes as good sense as the other. It is only when one of the speakers is a non-Israelite that there is intrinsic probability in favour of Elohim rather than Yahweh, and in such passages there is no difference between MT and LXX. I exclude for the moment the question of the

accompanying phraseology and of possible different documents in which different Divine Names are used. If these be considered, intrinsic probability has more to say.\*

(iv) The possible variants are strictly limited. If a scribe went astray in copying a Divine Name, he could only substitute Elohim for Yahweh, or *vice versa*, or put the two names together. Out of 344 uses of one or other name, or both names together, in MT it is transcriptionally not improbable that an ordinary copyist would make one or more accidental errors of this kind in a given MS., and it is obvious that, when the range of possible alternatives is so small, if two copyists (say one Hebrew and one Greek, or a Greek Father quoting the passage) did go wrong at the same place, the errors they made would in most cases coincide. As a matter of fact, in a large proportion of cases, both, sometimes all three, alternatives are found in LXX MSS., daughter-versions or quotations, and therefore there is an exceedingly good chance that, when a Hebrew MS. differs from the MT, it will find some kind of support in the LXX. "In all but two (1<sup>28</sup>, 19<sup>206</sup>) of the twenty-two actual instances [in Genesis] of agreement (against the MT) between Hebrew and Greek MSS., the Massoretic reading is also represented in MSS. of the LXX and in the vast majority of cases far more strongly attested than the variant" (Dr. Skinner, *Divine Names*, pp. 103-4). This being so, the argument from the agreement between occasional Hebrew MSS. and LXX MSS. is practically worthless.

J. BATTERSBY HARFORD.

*(This article will be continued in next month's issue.)*

\* See 2 vi below.