

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:



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



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

on the authority of his codices M and T. But the late Munich MS μ , together with the tenth-century Oxford MS which Dr Sanday calls O_1 , have *iuxta tractus aquarum*, and this is no doubt the original reading of the *De Montibus* and the true African equivalent for *παρὰ τὸν διεξόδου τῶν ἰδάρων*.

F. C. BURKITT.

PHILO'S INTERPRETATION OF LEVITICUS XVIII 18.

IN Archdeacon O. D. Watkins's learned treatise on Holy Matrimony (London, 1895) it is categorically stated (p. 653 note) that 'Philo had no doubt that the Mosaic Law prohibited marriage of two sisters *even when one was dead or divorced*', and reference is made to Philo: *De Specialibus Legibus* Lib. iii c. 5 p. 304 M (= Cohn v p. 157). This statement seemed so surprising, in face of the ordinary Jewish interpretation that I have re-examined the passage in question, and have come to the conclusion that this interpretation of the passage is wrong, and I have the permission of Archdeacon Watkins to add that he is now convinced that it is wrong.

The particular sentence is indeed ambiguous and probably needs emendation, but the tenor of the whole context is conclusive. The chapter runs thus:—

'Moses does not allow the same man to marry two sisters, either contemporaneously or consecutively, even if he have put away (*ἀπεωσμένος*) the one he married first.' Then follows the sentence on which Archdeacon Watkins relied, which I leave untranslated for the moment:—*ζώσης γὰρ ἔτι τῆς συνοικουσίας, εἴτε καὶ ἀπηλλαγμένης, εἴαν τε χηρεύῃ εἴαν τε καὶ ἑτέρῃ γαμηθῇ, τὴν ἀδελφὴν οὐχ ὄσιον ἰπέλαβεν ἐπὶ τὰ τῆς ἡτυχηκίας παρέρχεσθαι*—'thereby clearly teaching that it is not right to violate the just rights of relationship, or for the new wife to take advantage of the misfortunes of one who is so closely united to her by birth, nor to give herself airs thereon or pride herself on being courted by her sister's enemies and on courting them in return. For from such circumstances spring bitter jealousies and implacable rivalries, bringing in their train countless crops of evils. It is as bad as if the members of the body were to break loose from their natural harmony and interdependence and to rise in war one against the other, the result of which is incurable diseases and death; and sisters, even if they are separate members of a family, are at least linked and united one to another by nature and a common kinship.'

Now it seems clear (i) that the whole context implies that the first wife is still alive, the argument being based upon the danger of quarrels

arising out of jealousy: (ii) that the alternatives *ἐάν τε χηρεὺν ἐάν τε καὶ ἐτέρῃ γαμνηθῆ*, are subordinate to and qualify *ἀπηλλαγμένης*: this makes it impossible to translate *ἀπηλλαγμένης* 'dead' as though it were the antithesis of *ζώσης*, and compels us to interpret it 'separated' as contrasted with *συνουκούσης*; and the *ἀτυχία* in question will not be death but an unfortunate marriage ending in separation. We may then, perhaps, translate 'For while she (*ἦν πρόεγγυμην*) is still alive, whether still living in her husband's house or separated from him, and, if separated, not only if still living in widowhood, but even if married to a second husband; yet even so he did not regard it as seemly that a sister should step into the position held by a wife whose marriage had ended so unhappily'. But it is doubtful whether *τῆς συνουκούσης* can be so translated; Dr Swete suggests *ζώσης γὰρ ἔτι (αὐ)τῆς (εἶτε) συνουκούσης εἶτε καὶ ἀπηλλαγμένης*, which is very clear and would be convincing were it not possible that the whole clause only applies to the alternative of the divorced wife. Mr C. H. Turner suggests *ζώσης γὰρ ἔτι τῆς συνουκούσης, εἰ καὶ ἀπηλλαγμένης*, 'for while his first wife is still alive, even though separated': this applies the whole to the divorced wife and gives in a better form the same meaning as Mangey's longer emendation *ζώσης γὰρ ἔτι τῆς (πρότερον) συνουκούσης, εἶτα καὶ ἀπηλλαγμένης*: but it is doubtful whether *ἡ συνουκούσα* would be used for 'the wife' in the present tense after her separation. Dr Swete's emendation seems the most probable; but, whatever the exact reading may be, the conclusion is clear that Philo's interpretation cannot be quoted as having any bearing on the question of the marriage of a deceased wife's sister.

W. LOCK.

SOME SPANISH MSS OF THE CONSTANTINOPOLITAN CREED.

THE history of the insertion of the words *et Filio* in MSS of the Constantinopolitan Creed still needs investigation. It is generally supposed that the words were added to the Creed by the Third Council of Toledo, A.D. 589, when the Visigothic King Reccared renounced Arianism. But the evidence of the MSS has never been properly sifted.¹ In the following collations I have made a beginning, and am able at

¹ In my *Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 115, I pointed out that two early editions of the Councils—Cologne (1530) and Paris (1535)—omit the words in the text of the Creed quoted by the Council, and D'Aguirre admits that some MSS do not contain them.