

The Princeton Theological Review

JANUARY, 1929

THE PAULINE DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION

First of all we should take note of the close connection between the parousia and the resurrection. It is clearly marked in the structure of 1 Thess. iv. 16: "For the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven . . . and the dead in Christ shall rise first." But this same passage seems further to imply, that the resurrection takes place before Christ in his descent reaches the earth, for it is said that, the dead having been raised, those that are still living, will together with them, be caught up in the clouds, henceforth forever to remain with Him.

With this meeting of Christ with his own in the air the statement of iii. 13, where Jesus is represented as coming with "all his saints" is usually brought in some connection. If "saints" here means believers, it will imply that the Lord in his final descent will be accompanied by all his people in an embodied state. It is not absolutely certain, however, that this combination of the two passages is necessary. Two other possibilities exist. The "saints" might designate the sum total of believers previously having their habitation in heaven and now making with Him the first stage of the journey from there to earth. Or "the saints" might refer to angels. Still, inasmuch as Paul nowhere else follows this latter usage, and, on the other hand, frequently calls Christians by the name "saints," the other view appears the more plausible. If the reference to all the heavenly saints as accompanying Him is adopted, note should be taken of the fact, that, since Jesus comes in visible form, in order to obtain a clear picture of the situation, the saints likewise ought to be conceived in cor-

THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

In an article published recently in this REVIEW I endeavored to show that the books enumerated in the Westminster Confession of Faith are those acknowledged by all the Churches of God always and everywhere and approved by Christ and the apostles as well as by the Jewish Church as "the infallible rule of faith and life." In the present article I am going to advance further in the discussion of the infallibility of the books of the Old Testament by presenting some of the grounds for believing that the Hebrew Scriptures have, as a matter of fact and evidence, been handed down from the time when they were written in a substantially correct form.

After a short Preface, I shall take up in order the Manuscripts, the Parallel Passages, the Versions, and especially the Greek Version of the Seventy, leaving other topics for future consideration.

I. PREFACE

Before entering upon the consideration of the text of the Old Testament, it may be well to remark that there is no doubt that systems of writing were in current use from the Black Sea to Ethiopia and from Susa to the Nile, for many centuries before the time of Moses; and that the Hebrew language was the common one in Palestine and known in Egypt, also, before the time when the books of Moses were written. The literary forms, both of prose and poetry, in which the Pentateuch is written were also used in Egypt, or Babylon, at a time antecedent to the composition of the works attributed to Moses. Further, the grammar of the Hebrew language is shown by the Hebrew words found in the inscriptions of Thothmes III and in the El-Amarna Letters to have been, by and large, the same as that found in the documents of the Pentateuch.

In the second place, it may be remarked that the literary documents of the Egyptians were written ordinarily on stone,

papyrus, leather, linen, wood, gold, silver and copper; and those of the Babylonians on stone, and on clay tablets and cylinders, while those from the ancient Phœnician, Moabites and others that remain are commonly on stone. The Harris MS. is an original document written on papyrus. It is 133 feet long and contains columns usually of twelve or thirteen lines each. The translation of the papyrus into English with the notes occupies 120 pages in Breasted's *Egypt* (large octavo), the contents being about half as great as those of the Pentateuch. The Annals of Thothmes III on the walls of the great temple at Karnak contain 223 lines. They describe the Asiatic campaigns of Thothmes III and show that "at least in this reign [several hundred years before Moses] careful, systematic records were made and preserved in the royal archives." The Cylinder A inscription of Gudea, patesi of Lagash about 3000 B.C., is translated by Thureau-Dangin in 34 pages of 38 lines each. The Gilgamesh legend which contains the Babylonian account of the Deluge consists of about 3000 lines, on twelve clay tablets, making about as long a work as the book of Genesis. The first Babylonian creation story, so called, is about one-fourth as long. The Birth Omens from the time of Hammurabi and Abraham contain books, divided into chapters and with verses numbered, treating of the laws concerning the interpretation of births. The Laws of Hammurabi give a code of civil and criminal law. We have, also, many triumphal, historical, and other inscriptions covering the whole period in which the Old Testament was written, many of them of the length of an Old Testament book.

These various inscriptions and papyri, which have come down to us, show conclusively that the nations around Israel composed numerous literary works of every description. Many of these works have doubtless perished, especially those that were written on papyrus, clay, and other perishable materials. The great question for the scribes of those days was to find out a way by which they could transmit their less ephemeral productions to posterity. This they attempted to do by having treasuries, or libraries, in which contracts and

documents were preserved, and by having regularly organized bodies of scribes and copyists and proof-readers. By means of these, they were able to transmit information for hundreds and even thousands of years without any material change in the copy, except such changes as were deliberately inserted into the original text, either as explanatory notes, or for further information. In later times, or because they were meant for a population speaking two or more languages, the scribes began to write their documents in two or more languages and scripts. Thus, it is clear, that in those ancient times, long works were written and have come down to us.

But, it might be objected to the above paragraph, that the documents on stone and many of those on clay may be original and hence that they afford no real parallel to the Hebrew Scriptures which are all admittedly copies far removed from the original copies. This objection is met, when we observe that the so-called *Book of the Dead* has, as a matter of fact, been preserved for us in numerous copies of an original going back at least to the 4th Dynasty. Five recensions of this book, or parts of it, have been published. These all go back to a common original; but no one of them is a copy from any one of the other four, seeing that each was buried with the mummy around which it was wrapped. Yet, in Chapter XXX. B of this book, some lines are exactly the same, though the first copy dates from the fourth or fifth millennium B.C. and the last from the time of the Ptolemies. Among the Babylonian records, also, we find a copy of a *temen*, a foundation inscription, of Nabunaid which is given in substantially the same form by Assurpanipal, Burnaburiash and Hammurabi, that is, in round numbers at 550, 650, 1500 and 2000 B.C.

Now, among those old Egyptian, Assyrian and Babylonian documents, we find many duplicate copies of the same documents; and these duplicates show the same kinds of variations that we find in the Hebrew manuscripts. Yet, these variations do not invalidate the contracts, nor affect the general trustworthiness of the laws, nor of the historic statements made in the records. Many of these duplicates were written by the

same scribe, or under the direction of the same authority and supervision; and still, they have such variations as did not affect the purpose of the document.

For example, in the three lists of the names of the cities conquered in Palestine and Syria by Thothmes III, there are about 40 variations in the writing of 119 names. In the first of the Lamentations given by Langdon in his *Sumerian and Babylonian Hymns*, there are more than 40 variations in the copies of 3 lines of Sumerian text. In the 14 duplicate contract tablets in Strassmeier's inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar, No. 70 has 18 variations in 16 lines; No. 33, seven in 15 lines. Most of the others agree exactly. In the historical inscriptions of Sennacherib, Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal, there are hundreds of variations and especially many noteworthy additions and omissions in the parallel passages.

From this evidence and from that given above, it is certain; first, that the sources of the Old Testament history may have been written from the time of Abraham down; secondly, that these sources may have been handed down with sufficient accuracy to insure their trustworthy character; thirdly, that additions in the way of notes and explanations may have been inserted in contemporaneous documents or in copies of the same; fourthly, that duplicates may be exactly the same or may vary more or less, without invalidating their testimony or trustworthiness; fifthly, that original documents with contemporaneous versions exist from before Abraham down; sixthly, that versions and duplicates whether contemporaneous or not, have often been enlarged or abridged intentionally and that hence it is frequently impossible to argue from the copy or version as to what exactly the original may have been; and lastly, that all duplicates and versions give substantially the statements and doctrines of the original.

Another and most important piece of evidence is to be gathered from the proper names to be found in the Old Testament text and, also, in the records of the nations surrounding Israel. When we observe that in general the names of countries, nations, rivers, cities, kings, and gods are spelled in the

same way in the contemporary documents of other nations than Israel, as they are spelled in the Biblical records, as they have been handed down to us by the copyists for from 2000 to 3500 years, we cannot but be filled with amazement and a high degree of admiration at the accuracy with which the scribes have performed their arduous work through a succession of scores of generations of erring men. Such accuracy involves the assurance that the scribes did their work honestly, with a high sense of their responsibility to God and with a determination in every case to copy correctly what was set before them.

II. THE MANUSCRIPTS

The most noticeable feature in the Manuscripts is the variation in the writing of vowels fully or defectively, i.e., *ô* and *û* with the use of *w* (*waw*) and *ê* and *î* with the use of *y* (*yodh*). According to Ginsburg, Jehudah Chayug, who flourished in the early part of the eleventh century A.D., and who is known as the founder of Hebrew grammar, states that the use of these vowel letters had been "left to the discretion of the scribes and that this practice still obtained in his days." In fact, this double way of writing the long vowels is to be found in the earliest of the inscriptions written in the Hebrew alphabet; and also, in all the Hebrew manuscripts from the earliest to the latest. Thus in the first chapter of Daniel there are 46 variants from the Textus Receptus in the use of the vowel letters *w* and *y*. These variations occur in from 1 to 16 different MSS. and make all told 288 times in which these 46 variants are found in the 178 MSS. in which they occur. These variants do not affect in the slightest the sound, form or meaning of the words in which they occur any more than the sound, form and meaning of *honor* differs from that of *honour*. It is altogether a matter of spelling.

There are about 1,250,000 letters in the 1390 pages of the Hebrew Bible and about 284,000,000 in the MSS. described in Kennicott. In all of the manuscripts collated by Kennicott and his helpers there are about 900,000 variants,

of which about 750,000 are changes of *w* and *y*. That is, there is about one variant for every 316 letters, and one variant other than that of *w* and *y* for about every 1580 letters. These variants include insertions and omissions, transpositions, changes of consonants and variations of words. It is manifest, therefore, that we can look for little help from the Hebrew manuscripts in changing to a more original form the Hebrew text of the Old Testament; especially in view of the fact that most of these variations are to be found in only one, or at best, a very few of the manuscripts collated in every instance by Kennicott and his colleagues.

The following table based on the variations, others than *w* and *y*, in the first chapter of Amos will give a good illustration of the comparatively slight value of the variations as evidence against the Textus Receptus. These variations are drawn from 337 manuscripts and are 42 in number, occurring all told 54 times. Of the 42 cases, 38 occur in only 1 MS., one in only 2; one in 4, one in 5 and one in 7.

1. Variations of Single Letters.

- כ=ב, vs. 11 in 1 MS. and vs. 14 in 1 MS.
- כ=פ, vs. 8 in 1 MS.
- כ=ט, vs. 3 in 1 MS.
- כ+, vs. 3 in 1 MS.
- ד=ר, vs. 1 in 2 MSS.
- ד+, vs. 9 in 1 MS.
- ר=ד, vs. 14 in 1 MS.
- ה+, vs. 4 in 5 MSS.
- ה=י, vs. 6 in 1 MS.
- י=ה, vs. 9 in 1 MS.
- ה=ח, vs. 13 in 1 MS. and vs. 14 in 1 MS.
- ו—, vs. 9 in 1 MS.
- ו=ט, vs. 11 in 1 MS.
- ש—, vs. 8 in 1 MS.
- ת—, vs. 10 in 1 MS.

2. Variation of Words.

Addition of words: the sign of the definite direct object (את) is added in vs. 10 in 7 MSS.; "Jotham" in vs. 1 in 1

MS.; אכלה vs. 7 in 1 MS.; the preposition ל in vs. 11 in 1 MS. Omission of words: in vs. 6 in 1 MS.; vs. 7 in 1 MS.; vs. 8 two words, each in 1 MS.; vss. 11, 13, 15, one each in 1 MS. Transposition: of words, in verse 5 in 1 MS.; of letters, in verses 5 and 13, each in 1 MS. Repetitions, only case in vs. 13 in 1 MS. Change into a synonym vs. 6 in 1 MS., in vs. 13 and vs. 14, in two cases each in 1 MS. Change of suffix one in 1 MS. in vs. 8. Change in written name of God in vs. 8 in 1 MS. Unclassified changes in vs. 4 one in 4 MSS.; in vs. 13 one in 1 MS.; and in vs. 14 one in 1 MS.

Before passing on to the next kind of evidence, it may be well to mention a few of the more remarkable things found in the text of the manuscripts. And first, let us look at the abbreviations. We find in some MSS. (e.g., Kenn. 5, 9, 76) that ישר' is used for Israel; that in No. 9 שמע' occurs for the first person singular of the perfect, the sufformative being omitted; that the sign of the masculine plural of the absolute state is sometimes omitted in Nos. 9, 76 and 155; that in Nos. 9 and 76, the suffix is omitted; and that the last letters are at times absent in Nos. 9, 34, 76, 89 and 155. Also, the Tetragrammaton is denoted at times in Nos. 9, 34, 35, 36, 37 and 76 by two or three *yodhs*; and a frequent substitution of one designation for God for another occurs in the MSS. Thus, for example, in Ps. ii. 4, *Jehovah* is found in 64 MSS. instead of the *Adonai* of the *Textus Receptus*; in Ps. iii. 2, *Elohim* is found for *Jehovah* in No. 2; in Ps. iv. *Jehovah* is found for *Elohay* in No. 40. Further, designations for God are frequently omitted or inserted as in Ps. ii. 9 (5 MSS.), v. 2, 13, vii. 2, 7.

Lastly, transposition of letters, words and clauses average about one for every 52 pages; and additions and omissions, one for every 5 pages.

III. PARALLEL PASSAGES

About one-fifth of the Old Testament is to be found in duplicate or parallel passages. The variations in these parallels are not merely of value in themselves, but also in the light

which they shed upon the history of the text. The most lengthy and important of these parallels consists of the books of Chronicles from Chapter x of the first book on to the end of the second, except most of 11 chapters of Book 1 and 10 of Book 2 and parts of fourteen other chapters.

Before entering upon the discussion of the parallels in Samuel-Kings on the one hand and of Chronicles on the other, let us call attention to the fact that the critics of all schools admit that the sources of Samuel-Kings are substantially reliable. As Cornill says: "As was the case in all civilised states of the ancient East, in Israel also, from the beginning of the monarchy onwards, *official annals* will have been kept, in which the achievements of the kings and personal details about them were described." Besides these annals we have "a collection of Ephraimitic accounts," "a number of detailed Judæan histories," and "a Temple-history." These sources, collections of psalms, proverbs, prophecies, and other works recording the history up to the end of Zedekiah's reign, must have been preserved, as indeed were J and E and D, Hosea, Amos, Isaiah i-xxxix and other works, through the destruction of Jerusalem. The writer of Kings, therefore, must have had in his possession the sources which he used in the composition of his book. There is no reason known why the writer of the books of Chronicles may not, also, have had access not merely to our books of Kings, but even to the sources of these books as well as to many other sources which the author of Kings did not use. In fact, the writer of Chronicles declares that he had access to such sources. Thus, in 1 Chr. xxvii. 24, he speaks of "the numbering in the numbering of the deeds of the days of king David" and in xxiii. 27 of "the last words (or deeds) of David"; in 2 Chr. xvi. 11, xxv. 26, xxviii. 26, we read of "the book of the kings of Judah and Israel" and in xxxii. 32 "of a vision of Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amos in the book of the kings of Judah and Israel." In 2 Chr. xxvii. 7, xxxv. 27 and xxxvi. 8 and 1 Chr. ix. 1 we have mention of "the book of the kings of Israel and Judah," perhaps the same as the last. In the case

of Manasseh (xxxiii. 18) we have reference to a record called the "deeds of the kings of Israel" and in the case of Joash (xxiv. 27) to another called "the Midrash of the book of the kings." Special works by prophets are also cited. Thus, in addition to the prophets mentioned in Kings, we have "the visions of Iddo the seer" (2 Chr. ix. 29), and "the Midrash of the prophet Iddo" (2 Chr. xiii. 22), "the words of Jehu the son of Hanani, who is mentioned in the book of the Kings of Israel" (2 Chr. xx. 34), "the words of Uzziah first and last (which) Isaiah, the son of Amos wrote" (2 Chr. xxvi. 22), "the vision of Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amos" (2 Chr. xxxii. 32), and (probably) "the sayings of the seers" (2 Chr. xxxiii. 19).

Now, it has been the custom of the radical critics of Chronicles for a hundred years or so, to decry these references of the writers of Chronicles, without having any objective ground for their procedure except their desire to show the unhistorical character of the books, even to the extent of assuming that the author manufactured the references and the titles of the documents to which he referred. For notice, there is a universal admission that the sources of many of the books of the Old Testament have come down from David and Solomon and that the sources of others passed safely through the cataclysm of the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. The book of Kings is a book admitted to have been composed from sources, most of which (except the last few verses, which refer to events immediately following the fall of Jerusalem and to the enfranchisement of king Jehoiachim about 560 B.C.) must have been written before the capture of the royal city. Since, then, these sources of Kings existed at 560 B.C., having survived all the vicissitudes of the sack of the city, what reason is there for supposing that they and others like them were not still in existence in the time of Ezra as the book of Chronicles implies? What purpose can the writer have had in appealing to documents which had never been written, or were not known to his readers? For thousands of years writings in both Egypt and Babylon with

well-known titles had been cited and copied. Books such as the books of Jashar and the Book of the Wars of Jehovah and the Laws of Jehovah are cited in the earliest of our present books. What evidence has any one to show that the documents from which the Chronicler's citations were made did not exist?

But, it is said, that about half of our books of Chronicles was evidently taken over bodily from our present books of Samuel and Kings, and that the numerous variations in the text of the former militate against its historicity. Let us, then, next examine into the character and number of these variations to see if the variations cannot be otherwise accounted for.

1. First, then, we find that there is scarcely a verse in Chronicles that is exactly like its parallel verse in Samuel or Kings. If Chronicles were copied from the latter, it is contrary at least to the analogy of other ancient documents to have so few accurate copies.

2. Secondly, many of the variations are simply a difference in the pointing of the consonantal text, such as the frequently cited writing of the name David, i.e., with the *î* written "fully" in Chronicles but "defectively" in Samuel. As we have shown above, this difference is due entirely to the idiosyncrasy of the scribes, or exegetes, and is never to be used as evidence of the original text, or to determine the date of a document. The same is true in general of the employment of vowel letters, especially when final.

3. Thirdly, such variations as are found, for example, in the writing of the pronoun "I" (the using of אָנִי for אֲנִי), while they might be an indication of a later date for Chronicles, are anything but an evidence of the copying of Kings by Chronicles. Why could they not both have come from the same original source? The same question may be asked concerning such variations as "ships going to Tarshish" for "a ship of Tarshish."

4. But the strongest arguments in the text against the copying of Samuel-Kings by the author of Chronicles are to

be found (*a*) in the large number of differences in the verbs and prepositions used in the parallel passages and (*b*) in the kind and length of the insertions and omissions.

a. I have counted 100 verbs in Samuel-Kings for which a different word occurs in Chronicles, making 200 verbs in all. Of these 97 per cent occur in both Samuel-Kings and Chronicles, so that it is not in accordance with the facts to say that the change is due to a change in the language between 550 B.C. (when Kings was written) and the time when Chronicles was composed. Nor will it do to say that the Chronicler wilfully changed so many verbs without any assignable reason. This would be contrary to all analogy among ancient copyists. What, then, will account for it? I can conjecture no reason sufficient to meet the case, except to suppose that the royal records of the Hebrews before the captivity were written in some system of cuneiform. About 180 Hebrew words appear in the Amarna Letters which are written in cuneiform; and documents in cuneiform (but in the Babylonian language) were written in Gezer, twenty miles only from Jerusalem, as late as the middle of the seventh century B.C. If the royal records of the Hebrews were written in cuneiform script, and in the Hebrew language it would, it seems to me, account for all the variations in the verbs; for a single sign might be used not merely for synonyms, but for two, or even more, sets of synonyms.

The use of cuneiform in the writing of the original royal records would account, also, for the scores of differences in the prepositions employed in the parallel passages. For, many cuneiform signs denote two or more prepositions.

b. Additions and omissions of single words and additions of comments or explanations are liable to be found in any ancient copy of a document, whether the copy was made on the same day the original was written, or centuries after. The kind and length of additions made by the Chronicler would point to original sources used by both the author of Kings and the author of Chronicles; and, in the case of Chronicles at least, to some original sources used by one and not by

the other. There is no reason, nor any proof, to show that the additional remarks, the poems, the statistics, the genealogies and the parts concerning the priestly activities would not, or could not, have been made in the fifth century B.C. as well as in the third. For example, the exaggerations in the numbers which are found in Chronicles may have been made by any scribe at any time. And further, in this connection, it is proper to ask why all of the critics mention the exaggerations of numbers found in Chronicles without stating that the diminutions occur about half as many times. These differences, the lowering as well as in the heightening of the numerical statements, seem to indicate that the variations in Chronicles are due to some other cause than malice aforethought, most probably to a difficulty of reading the numerical notations of the original source. The numerous variations in the numbers found in the Babylonian and Aramaic recensions of the Behistun inscriptions are impossible of explanation, although both recensions were certainly written at about the same time and one was certainly a copy of the other, and probably translated by the same person, or persons, that composed the more original of the two. While the variations are glaring, they are non-essential and do not impair the general agreement of the two recensions. They show doubt as to the number of the enemy taken alive or slain in the battles; but not as to who fought the battles, nor as to where they were fought, nor as to who won the victory.

IV. VERSIONS

A few years ago, the earliest known version of an ancient document was the Septuagint, made from Hebrew into Greek in the third century B.C., or shortly after. Now, however, we have examples of translations going back long before the time of Hammurabi. Several bilingual interlinear inscriptions from the time of Hammurabi and Samsu-Iluna are known. The original of the fifth Babylonian story of creation, of which we have a copy of a copy of the time of Assurbanipal, may possibly date back to the time of Hammurabi.

All of these Babylonian and Assyrian translations are good word for word renderings of the original. Many Sumerian hymns having a translation into Babylonian have been published. In addition to these we have, from about 520 B.C. on, recensions of the Behistun inscriptions in four languages in Persian, Susian, Babylonian and Aramaic and smaller Persian inscriptions in these languages, some of which are from Egypt and contain Egyptian instead of Susian (?). From Egypt, we have, from the third century B.C., two long trilingual inscriptions,—the Rosetta Stone and the decree of Canopus, both from the third century B.C., occurring in Egyptian and Greek.

These inscriptions teach us that from the earliest historic times, whenever the population of a kingdom was bilingual, or multilingual, the decrees and other important governmental documents were often published in two or more languages. These bilingual documents always contain the same matter in substance; though they sometimes differ considerably in length and in minor details. Thus, to the decree of Canopus the hieroglyphic recension is much longer than the Greek, since the Egyptian scribe has made use of his priestly knowledge to give the particulars of some of the rites, which are mentioned by the Greek writers in only general terms; and he has given to the king his Egyptian complimentary titles, which are not found in the Greek. He shows the various ranks of the priests and priestesses, and the various degrees of holiness of the temples.

So, also, in the four languages of the Behistun inscription, there is a longer recension, written in Persian and Susian, and a shorter in Babylonian and Aramaic. The shorter recension, however, adds frequently a statement of the number of the men killed, or taken alive, in the battles fought.

But, however many and various may be the differences between the recensions of the bilingual, trilingual or quadrilingual inscriptions, there is no doubt as to the general agreement of the documents in all substantial or material statements.

In like manner, also, it can be shown that in all important particulars,—in all matters affecting the general history, the Law, the great predictive passages, the doctrines of revelation and redemption,—all the ancient versions of the Old Testament, secondary as well as primary, are substantially agreed. Since the Hebrew was undoubtedly the original (in all but a few chapters of Daniel and Ezra), the *Textus Receptus* is always to be taken as the starting-point of any investigation of the text of the Old Testament documents. It ought never to be changed when the evidence against it is not conclusive, or merely conjectural. We should always approach the study of any passage with the resolve to find out, if possible, if the apparent variation of the version is a real variation based on a different original; or if it may be due to the ignorance of the translator, or to his desire to improve, or comment upon, the text he is translating. And, further, we ought to consider whether, or not, the variation arises from a corruption in the text of the version itself, as is frequently apparent in the Syriac Peshitto.

V. THE SEPTUAGINT VERSION

We shall now devote ourselves to a cursory consideration of the light thrown by the ancient versions upon the Hebrew text of the Old Testament from which the versions were made. The most important of these versions is one in Greek called the Septuagint, made in the second and third centuries, B.C. It was made by different translators and at different times, probably over a period of more than one hundred years, beginning probably at about 280 B.C. Some of the books were translated with a high degree of accuracy, whereas others are rendered more or less paraphrastically; but all give a tolerably fair view of the doctrines and substance of the original.

1. In discussing this version it will be necessary to observe at the outset that there were no vowel signs in the Hebrew text from which the Septuagint was made, nor were there any accentual signs. Both of these systems of signs used in the Hebrew manuscripts were first introduced into the text by

certain scribes called Massorettes who lived about the year A.D. 500. These signs represented the exegesis of the Rabbis of that time. Whenever, therefore, the Greek translators translate the same consonants as those found in the Hebrew text, but with the use of different vowels from those affixed by the later Hebrew scribes, the Greek translation represents only a different exegesis of the original text. Thus the consonants עו in Prov. xii. 19, Amos i. 11, Mi. vii. 18 and Zeph. iii. 8 are read 'ad (ever) by the Massorettes and 'ēd (witness) by the Greek exegetes; in Gen. xlix. 27 'ad (prey) and 'ōd (again). In Ps. l. 23 the letters זבח are read by the Massorettes as a participle *zôbēah* (sacrificer) and by the Greeks as *zebah* (sacrifice). In Ps. xc. 5 the Massorettes read שנה as *shēnāh* (sleep) and the Greeks *shānāh* (year). In Gen. vi. 5 the Hebrew pronounces יצר as *yēšer* (imagination) and the Greek as *yāšar* (imagines). There are hundreds of such different readings of the original text; but they do not affect that text itself but merely the interpretation of it.

2. What we have just said of the vowel signs is true also of the so-called vowel letters. As we have seen under the treatment of the Manuscripts, these vowel letters always have been inserted or admitted *ad libitum* into the Hebrew manuscripts, whenever there was a suitable long vowel; and whether there was to be such a vowel was determined by the exegesis rather than *vice versa*. Many of the so-called variations of the Greek from the Hebrew text, will be found, therefore, to be nothing but a second interpretation of the same original. For example, in Ps. lxxv. 10, the Hebrew has read *rabbath* (very) but the Greek *ribbitha* (thou didst multiply); in Zech. ix. 12 the Hebrew has read *shûbu* (turn) and the Greek *sh^ebu* (sit)—the original text being the same in both cases.

3. The differences to be noticed between the Massoretic Hebrew and that from which the Greek Septuagint was translated, in regard to the division of words, clauses, verses, and so forth, are due, not to variations in the original text, but to different interpretations of the same. Thus *kēs-yāh* (throne of Yah) in Ex. xvii. 16 was read by the Seventy as *kasya*

(hidden); *miktam* (Ps. xvi. 1) was read *mak-tam* (tender, perfect); *ôlamôth* (ages) in LXX of Ps. xlvi. 15 was read by the Massoretes as *al-mûth* (concerning the death) and by Luther as *alâmoth* (youth). Again, in Hos. xii. 1, the first clause ends in Hebrew with "Israel," and in Greek, with "Judah," owing to a different exegesis of the verse. So, in Ps. lxviii. 22, the first clause in Hebrew ends with *sê'ar* "hair," but in Greek, with "enemies"; and in vs. 24, with "dogs" and "blood" respectively. In Ps. lxix. 14, the first clause in Hebrew ends with "grace," but in Greek with "God." As to verses, Ps. lxxv. 11 ends in Hebrew with "thou blessest"; but in Greek, vs. 12 begins with it. Ps. x. 9 ends in Hebrew with "his snare" and vs. 10 in Greek begins with it. Moreover, in Ex. xxxvi-xl, Jer. xxv-li, Prov. xxiv-xxxii and 1 Kings iv. 17-vii. 51, many changes in order of sections, chapters and verses are found, "due to a deliberate rearrangement of the groups."

4. The apparent variations, which have arisen from the judgment that certain letters are abbreviations rather than formative elements, or suffixes, may be considered as due to the wrong, or variant, interpretation of the same original text. Thus, the *Lord* in the Greek of Ex. viii. 23 may have arisen from taking the *y* of *yomar* (he will say) as an abbreviation for "Yehovah." So, also, in Lev. vi. 10, the *y* of *'iššay* (my offerings made by fire) may have been read as "Yehovah"; and in Is. ii. 11, the *y* in *'ēnay* (my eyes) is in Greek "the eyes of the Lord." In 2 Chr. xxi. 2 Jehoshaphat is called king of "Israel" in the Hebrew and "Judah" in the LXX; but in 1 Kings xxii. 41-51, he is in both called king of "Judah." In 2 Chr. xxviii. 19, the Hebrew text calls Ahaz the "king of Israel," when the Greek, Latin, Syriac and 10 Heb. MSS. in Kennicott have "king of Judah." In all of these cases, it seems probable that a *yodh* only was written in the original text, this being the first letter of both Judah and Israel.

It is probable that the ancient Hebrews had an abbreviated system of denoting numerals, such as were used by the Egyptians, Babylonians and other nations living near them. Until

this system shall have been discovered, it seems useless to attempt to account for the numerous variations in numbers in the versions from the Hebrew text, and also in the parallel passages of the latter.

5. Another source of what has been falsely called mistakes in the text has arisen from the fact that in the writing of the alphabet at about 400 B.C., a letter was frequently written once but read twice. This way of writing is familiar to all who read Syriac, Arabic, Aramaic and Hebrew, especially in the so-called intensive stems. In the Aramaic indorsements of the Babylonian tablets, however, this double reading and single writing of the letters of the alphabet is confirmed by the writing of the cuneiform. In these inscriptions, the letter to be doubled may belong the first time to the first of two words and the next time to the second.

Now, if we suppose that the Hebrews and Aramaeans in Egypt wrote in the same way as they did in Babylon (or, at least, that they read in the same way), we can account for the numerous cases in which the Greek translators doubled letters in reading the Hebrew text to be translated. Thus, in Hos. vi. 3 the second *n* in *nakon* (is prepared) was doubled by the Greek translators, the second one being read at the head of the next word, making *nimša'u* (we will find); in 2 Chr. xii. 2 the *m* in *melek* (king) was read also at the end of the preceding word, Shishak, making it *Sousakeim*.

6. In many cases, a translation that was thought to have arisen from the LXX having had before them a text different from our present text is found to have been due to the fact that the translators of the second century B.C. were cognizant of meanings of the Hebrew roots which became lost to future ages even among the Jews themselves. Such cases, again, must be referred to a knowledge of the Hebrew language possessed by the Jews of that time and not to any difference of text.

7. Insertions into, or omissions from, a duplicate, copy, or version, of an original do not imply a mistake in that original. This would seem to be the legitimate expectation of

common sense; but, at any rate, it is the clear teaching of analogy, derived from a study of ancient documents. The numerous duplicates, copies and versions found among the Egyptians or Babylonians, Persians and other ancient nations, present analogies to all the varieties of documents which enter into the consideration of the text of the Old Testament.

8. In many cases, where two words are found in the translation, only one is found in the original, the two being merely an attempt to render the sense of the one. Thus in Prov. i. 3, the LXX insert "true" with "righteousness"; in i. 10, "men" with "unholy"; in i. 4, "young" with "lad"; in i. 7, they translate כַּלְיִצָּה by "dark saying"; in i. 9, "golden" with "necklace"; in i. 11, "man" with "innocent"; in ii. 11, "good" with "counsel"; in iii. 9, "just" with "labors"; in iii. 31, "evil" with "man"; in v. 2, "good" with "mind"; in v. 3, "whoring woman" for זֹרָה; and many more in the same book.

9. In like manner, one word in the version translates two in the original. So, in Prov. x. 13 "heartlessness" for "wanting in heart," xi. 22, "evil-minded" for "turning away from advice," vs. 29 "prudent" for "wise of heart"; and many other cases in the book of Proverbs.

10. The large number of transliterations in the LXX shows us that the translators were frequently not certain in their own minds as to what the original text meant. It makes it probable, also, that in many cases they thought they knew the sense of the original, when they did not. In all such cases this misinterpreting of the sense of the Hebrew text should not lead us to suppose that the translators had before them a different text from that which we have in our present Hebrew Bibles. Thus in 2 Kings xi. 4, the LXX transliterate *rašim* (runners; Vulg. *milites*), evidently because they did not understand the meaning of the original; cp. Job. xxxix. 13, *ne'elasa* 1 Chr. xv. 20, *'alamoth*, vs. 21, *amaseneith*, vs. 28, *sofer*, and xvi. 39, *Bama*. In 1 Sam. xxi. 8, the Hebrew נֶעְצָר (A.V., "detained") is first translated by the LXX and then transliterated, as if they were not quite sure of the meaning.

11. It is obvious, that the translation of what the later Rabbis and other exegetes have thought to be proper names comes under the same class. They are due to interpretation and not to a difference of the text. Thus in 1 Chr. viii. 38, ix. 44, we find "his firstborn" for "Bokru"; in Ezra viii. 18 "Sarabia" is rendered by ἀρχὴν ἡλθον; in Ezra viii. 17, "Chasphia" by "silver"; in Ezra x. 37, "Jaasu" (Vulg., Jasi) is rendered by "they made"; in Ezra iv. 7 "Bishlam" by "in peace."

12. It is a question whether most of the changes arising from the different readings of certain consonantal signs should not be classed under the head of interpretations rather than under that of the reading of a different text. Let me explain and illustrate. The most frequent of all the variations in the reading of consonants are those between *w* and *y* and those between *r* and *d*.

As to *w* and *y*, about half of the whole number of the Massoretic notes on the text of the Old Testament Hebrew Bible consist of remarks upon the variations of those two letters; so that it is certain that the manuscripts on which they based these notes must have varied considerably in regard to these two letters. The reason for this is probably the fact that, about the year one, the two letters were written with a sign much like the figure 1. When the text passed into the new alphabet in which the Bible is now written and printed, much confusion must have prevailed at times as to which letter of the older text was meant. This necessitated an interpretation by the scribes and translators.

In the time at which the Greek version was made, however, (i.e. from 100 to 300 B.C.), *w* was written very much like the top of a shepherd's crook, or like the figure 4 with the down stroke lengthened, whereas *y* was like a reversed capital *F* with a stroke at the bottom running to the left, or like a capital *V* turned upside down with a small *v* inserted. Consequently, where a translation in the LXX depends on a reading with *w* instead of *y*, or *y* instead of *w*, the Greek reading is probably often to be preferred to that of the Hebrew Masso-

retic Text. For example in Zech. xiv. 6 the *y* at the beginning of each of the last two *words* was read by the LXX as *w*, making the meaning of the sentence "there shall be no light but cold and frost." So, in Prov. xvii. 27 the *w* of the first word in the second clause is changed in the Kri, LXX and Latin into *y*; in Ps. cxlv. 5 the phrase for "and the words of" is changed into a verb meaning "they shall tell," by reading with the LXX and Syriac a *y* instead of a *w* at the beginning and a *w* for a *y* at the end of the first word in the second clause. Further, in 2 Kings xxiv. 15 the Kri אִילִּי is supported by the LXX and Vulg. and is certainly the better reading; and in Ps. xci. 4 the reading (*shall surround*) of the LXX and Syriac is probably better than the *w* (*and buckler*) of the Hebrew text.

In like manner, also, most of the variations between *r* and *d* which are found between the Hebrew text and its versions are doubtless due to the difficulty of determining whether the dubious sign used in the Hebrew alphabet, in use at the time when the version of the LXX was made, was an *r* or a *d*. This sign in the alphabet used in Egypt was much like the figure 4; but in almost all the old Semitic alphabets, it was hard to be sure which of the two letters was meant. In the Samaritan alphabet and that of the Mesha inscription they are clearly distinguished, but in the old Hebrew coins, gems and inscriptions, it is often impossible to tell which letter was meant by the writer. Consequently, it seems certain, that most of the variations in these letters between the Hebrew Massoretic text and that represented by the Septuagint Greek version are due to a difference of interpretation of this dubious sign. The Greek version stands for an interpretation made by the translators in the second and third centuries B.C.; the Massoretic text, and, in general, the later Greek, the Syriac, the Latin and the Aramaic versions, for an interpretation made by the Rabbis who lived in the second, third and fourth centuries A.D.

Owing to this ambiguity in the sign itself, the burden falls upon us of attempting to find out which letter was meant by

the original writer. This burden is generally not as great as it might seem, at first thought, to be; because the context usually enables us to decide which of the two letters is more probably meant. At the worst, the difficulty is about the same as that which confronts us when we are left to decide how an unpointed consonantal text is to be pointed, or how an imperfect is to be interpreted as to time or mood (i.e., whether as incipient, frequentative, imperative, potential, etc.), or whether a genitive in Greek is subjective or objective.

To illustrate, the verb *'amar* "to say" and its derivatives occur over 5000 times. In all of these cases the sign is always read in the LXX as *r*. *Dôr* (generation) occurs about 120 times and is always read in the same way. On the other hand, we have about 250 instances from about 100 different roots where they have been read in different ways by the Septuagint translation and the Jews who gave us the Massoretic text. Several of the most interesting of these are the following:

In Gen. i. 2, the Hebrew has the verb *rāḥaf* (to brood); while the Greek reads *dāḥaf* (to rush, or blow). Here the Greek agrees with the Samaritan Aramaic, the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan and with Jerome.

In Gen. ii. 2 the Hebrew reads *bārā* (create), whereas the Greek has read *bādā* (to begin).

In Zech. xii. 10, the Hebrew has *dāḥar* (to pierce) and the LXX has probably read *rāḥad* (to insult).

Another series of variations, probably due to different interpretations of the same original text, is to be found in the not infrequent change of person, gender, and number that meets us, here and there, in the present Hebrew text. When the verb is concerned in these changes, they are frequently accompanied by a change of suffix. How explain these variations as interpretations? Very few of them can have been occasioned by the common mistakes arising from misreading of the original. They can be explained, however, if we suppose that the original documents were written with an abbreviated form of the verb called infinitive absolute, to which were later added the preformative and sufformative denoting

person, gender and number. The same would apply also to the suffixes for the objective pronoun. It is certain that both the Egyptians and Babylonians could, and often did, use the sign, or signs, denoting the root idea, without adding the signs for persons, gender, number, or object. So, also, the Hebrew writers frequently used the so-called infinitive absolute without any performative, or sufformative, to denote person, gender, or number. They frequently omitted, also, the objective pronouns after any form of the verb and, especially, after the infinitive absolute. It is obvious that, in such cases, it is left to the reader to supply the person, gender, number and object. Variations in these particulars would arise, therefore, from the different interpretations of the exegetes of the passages in which the variations occur and not necessarily from a difference of text. All mistakes in such passages will be due, also, to the interpretation of the text and must be corrected by going back, when possible, to the original text from which the interpretations were derived. As far as the objective pronouns are concerned, it is possible, also, that the ancient Hebrew had a sign denoting something like "put in your objective pronoun here." Such signs are to be found in Babylonian.

Aside from the common use of the infinitive absolute to strengthen the root of the verb, as in *môth tāmûth* (thou shalt surely die, Gen. ii. 17), it is used about 300 times in the Old Testament *in place of* the finite forms with preformative or sufformative, or in place of the imperative, construct infinitive, or participles. That is, the naked form of the root is used for any person, gender or number of the finite verb whether perfect or imperfect and also instead of the construct infinitive, the participle, or the imperative. The languages of the versions, such as Greek and Latin, render this infinitive absolute by any mood or tense they deem best.

For example, the LXX have the present in Deut. xxvii. 1, Jer. vii. 9, Is. lix. 4, 2 Sam. xxiv. 12 *et al.*; the future in 2 Kings iv. 43, Joel ii. 26, Ezek. xxiii. 47, Num. xxiii. 20; the aorist in 1 Sam. ii. 28, Is. lix. 13, Ps. xxxv. 16, Ex. xxxvi. 7 *et al.*; the imperfect in Ps. cxxvi. 6, 2 Sam. xvi. 13, Jer. iii. 1,

Ezek. i. 14; and even of the Greek perfect, as in Nah. ii. 10. Also, by the first person singular, as in Deut. ix. 21, Jer. xxxii. 33; and by the 1st plural, as in Is. lix. 13, Dan. ix. 5; by the second person singular, as in Lev. xxv. 14, Is. lviii. 6, and plural, as in Jer. vii. 9, Jud. vii. 19; by third person singular, as in Hos. x. 4, Num. xxx. 3 and plural in Ezek. i. 14, Jer. xiii. 16. The giving of further examples would too much enlarge this article. Enough have been given to show that many of the variations of the verbs in the parallel passages of the Old Testament may be due to the fact that in the original text the verb was written, in many more cases than in our present *textus receptus*, in the infinite absolute; and that the later scribes and copyists, and translators, having interpreted these infinitives in different ways, wrote them out in full as they now appear in the manuscripts and printed editions.

Thus, in the parallel passages we have יבוא in 2 Sam. vi. 9 and אביא in 1 Chr. xiii. 12; הנגיד in 2 Sam. vii. 11 and אנגיד in 1 Chr. xvii. 10; הקפתם in 2 Kings xi. 8 and הקיפו in 1 Chr. xviii. 8, *et al.*

This would account, also, for many of the variations of the Massoretic notes such as ואומר (2 Sam. i. 8) for תקרא; ויקרא for יקרא (2 Sam. xii. 24); ועבר for עבר (Is. xxviii. 15). Likewise the variations of the verb in the Septuagint would thus be accounted for. For example, Hos. ii. 4, iv. 5, 15, x. 15, xi. 10, Pss. x. 13, xxviii. 5, xviii. 29, 41. This view is confirmed by the fact that the later versions generally agree with the later Hebrew text as interpreted by the Massorettes. Thus, the Latin version of Jerome nearly always agrees with the Massoretic notes and the Hebrew text, as in the examples from Samuel and Hosea just given above. The Syriac Peshitto and the Targum, also, generally agree with the Massoretic interpretation and were almost certainly made from the same Hebrew text which we now have.

In concluding this section of my discussion, let me say, that I think that I have at least opened up to further research a wide field for those who want to get at the original text of the Old Testament, as it came forth from the pens of those

who wrote the books. I think, also, that I have shown that a large part of the variations in the Old Testament text, which have hitherto been called mistakes, are to be explained as debatable interpretations of that text. Such variations and interpretations do not really affect the historicity and inspiration of the original text; but simply its correct transmission and this only in respect to matters of minor importance.

Princeton.

R. D. WILSON.