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RAISE THE STONE: CLEAVE THE WOOD.

A STUDY OF AN OXYRHYNCHUS LOGION.

In his New Light on the New Testament 1 Adolf Deissmann, my friend and former teacher, has a paragraph which for its truth and picturesqueness has haunted my memory. "Leaving the Epistle to the Hebrews out of account," he writes, "we must say, as the result of a comparison of the New Testament with the contemporary non-literary texts, that the New Testament is the people's book. When Luther, therefore, took the New Testament from the learned and gave it to the people, we can only regard him as restoring what was the people's own. And when at some tiny cottage window, behind the fuchsias and geraniums, we see an old dame bending over the open Testament, there the old Book has found a place to which by right of its nature it belongs. Or when a Red Cross sister finds a Japanese Testament in the knapsack of a wounded Japanese, here, too, the surroundings are appropriate. . . . Time has transformed the Book of the People into the Book of Humanity. . . . Because the New Testament came from the unexhausted forces below, and not from the feeble resigned culture of a worn-out upper class—for this reason alone was it able to become the Book of Humanity. Thus from the simple writings on stone, papyrus and clay that unfold to us the nature of the language of the New Testament and at the same time reveal the peculiar characteristic of the Book there streams a flood of light on the fate of the Sacred Volume in the history of the world: the New

1 P. 46 f.
Testament became the Book of the Peoples because it was first the Book of the People."

It is a pleasure to me to quote these haunting sentences not only because of their arresting truth and picturesque-ness, nor yet because they were written by a distinguished friend who combines very remarkably the rigour and precision of the scientist with that intimacy with the life of the toiling masses which is instinctive in a true pastor and native in a true pastor's son. When I first knew him as a professor in the old University of Heidelberg, with a little lecture-room near the sky and a reputation rising rapidly, Adolf Deissmann had been delivering a series of Christian addresses to working men in the neighbour manufacturing town of Mannheim. To ask him about the work, to watch his quiet enthusiasm as he told of it, and to run one's eye over the teeming contents of his Zettelkasten, the box in which workmen were encouraged to place their written questions to the lecturer on points of religious difficulty, was to have a British student's notions of the fundamental bookishness of German scholarship rudely shaken. And in later years, long after those lecture-hours in which he made the Epistles to the Corinthians live again even for students who were sweltering under the heat of a Heidelberg summer afternoon, it was no surprise to me to learn that my old teacher had taken the first opportunity of adding to his equipment as an exegete of the Pauline letters the inestimable privilege of a lengthy journey in the Apostle's footsteps.

I have quoted his words because the principle underlying them, for whose universal recognition among scholars of the New Testament he has done so much, received illustration in an English layman's unpremeditated and unconscious contribution to the solution of a problem which has engaged and perplexed the ablest scholars in Germany,
France, and Britain and America. I feel sure the illustration will appeal to him, and I venture to think the solution will commend itself as adequate and final. If the Bible is a book from the people for the people, if the sayings of our Lord were uttered in the ears of simple men and women in their native language and vocabulary, it need not surprise us that occasionally the secret of their original meaning and force should betray itself to men devoid of academic scholarship. What is hid from the specialist by his very books may be revealed to the “babes and sucklings” of religious insight, the “little ones” of whom, like their Master, it may be said, πῶς οὗτος γράμματα οίδε, μὴ μεμαθηκός;

I vividly recall the day on which the little brochure of Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt, ΛΟΤΙΑ ΙΗΚΟΤ, Sayings of our Lord, published in 1897, first appeared in the Edinburgh bookshops. My father, John Green Curtis, though apart from English etymology he knew no Greek and had missed a University education, was one of its first purchasers. He brought me the copy and I had to read it to him, Greek and all, that very evening. All the Sayings interested him intensely, as everything bearing upon the Bible and its central Figure always did. But at once his quick mind fastened instinctively upon the hardest of them, and I had scarcely finished reading it to him when its explanation rose to his lips. He is no longer with us to demur to my writing about him, or to deprecate my placing him among the doctors, though it would have reassured him to be able to lean on Professor Deissmann’s unconventional arm. Far more than any other mind I have known, his intuitions as an interpreter of Holy Writ have reminded me again and again of the old Alexandrine scholars, whose pages he delighted to read over my shoulder as I sat at work upon them. The natural affinity of his mind to theirs was, I
dare say, a real advantage to him as an amateur diviner of
the sense of those Egyptian Agrapha.

It was the Fifth of the Oxyrhynchus Logia. As it was
first published, with its editors' suggested restorations of
missing letters, it ran as follows.

[Aeyles [Inoots, drjou dav wow [... .]e. . .] . . Oeou
kat |. .joo . e[. .
éotiv povos [. .]tw égô eîmî met' aut[on];
êgei[p]on tòn λîthov kàkeî ευρήσεις με, σχîson tò ξύλov kàgô
ékeî eîmî.

"Jesus saith, Wherever there are . . . and there is one
. . . alone, I am with him. Raise the stone and there thou
shalt find me, cleave the wood and there am I."

In the following year, in 1898, when Messrs. Grenfell and
Hunt republished it in the first volume of their Oxyrhynchus
Papyri, their text had been improved through the eager
discussion which its appearance had evoked among the
most eminent critics in Europe, and their original notes
in explanation had been supplemented by the acumen of
scholars like Harnack, Blass, Sanday and Lock. They
say: 1 "The difficulties of the fifth Saying have not yet
been surmounted. Of the numerous restorations of the
three mutilated lines we on the whole prefer that of Blass,
[Aey|eî [Iησοûs óp]on éâv ðôin [ß, oûk] 'e[ióî]v ãðëov kàî
With regard to the last part of the Saying 'Raise the
stone,' etc., we do not think that the pantheistic meaning
is in itself either probable or relevant to the context, though
it might have been imported into it at a later period when
the original meaning had been lost sight of. We incline
to the view that raising the stone and cleaving the wood are
meant to typify the difficult work of life, see Heinrici (Theol.
Literaturzeitung, Aug. 21, 1897); but we are of opinion
that the reference to Ecclesiastes x. 9 (Whoso heweth out
stones shall be hurt therewith; and he that cleaveth wood is

1 F. 2.
endangered thereby), in which Professors Swete and Harnack find the key to the problem, raises difficulties greater than those it can solve. The objections to it have been excellently stated by Lock ("Two Lectures on the "Sayings of Jesus," by Professors Lock and Sanday, p. 24, Oxf., Clarendon Press, 1897")."

In this later form, as restored by Blass, the Logion reads thus:

"Jesus saith, Wheresoever there are two, they are not without God, and where there is one alone, I say, I am with him. Raise the stone, and there thou shalt find me; cleave the wood, and I am there."

Obviously the one parallel passage in the Gospels is Matthew xviii. 20, οὖς γάρ εἰσὶ δύο ἢ τρεῖς συνήγματι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα, ἐκεῖ εἰμὶ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν, "For where there are two or three gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them." But concerning the precise relation of the two sayings to each other there has been no agreement. Before I discuss that relationship let me suggest one or two notes upon the parallel in Matthew. In the Revised Version it closes a short and difficult paragraph, verses 15-20. 15. And if thy brother sin against thee, go, show him his fault between thee and him alone: if he hear thee thou hast gained thy brother. 16. But if he hear thee not take with thee one or two more, that at the mouth of two witnesses or three every word may be established. 17. And if he refuse to hear them tell it unto the congregation: and if he refuse to hear the congregation also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican. 18. Verily I say unto you, what things soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and what things soever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. 19. Again I say unto you, that if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven. 20. For
where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them. The paragraph may be composite, a compilation in the Matthæan manner of at least two sayings having a topical or verbal connexion. But the function of the congregation in Christian life, the special power and privilege of the two or three met in the Master’s name, is the common theme. The congregation, in a capacity distinct from the individual’s, may effect reconciliation between the estranged, may exercise discipline through excommunication, may unite in prayer with increased assurance, and may count upon the presence of the Lord at their worship. As one thinks of our Lord’s own attitude to Gentiles and publicans one winces a little under the doctrine of excommunication in verse 17, and it is not difficult to realise how grave have been the ecclesiastical abuses which have taken shelter under verse 18. But if verses 16–18 have been thus construed in favour of ecclesiastical abuses, verses 19 and 20 have lent themselves to devotional abuse. They have been construed, in ancient times and now, as if efficacy resided in numbers, as if two persons engaged in prayer commanded a thaumaturgical power denied to the individual. It has long been my impression that whereas in verses 15–18 the two or three stand in contrast with the one, as in the verse of Deuteronomy xix. 15, to which they refer back, One witness shall not rise up against a man for any iniquity . . . : at the mouth of two witnesses, or at the mouth of three witnesses. shall a matter be established, in verses 19–20, on the other hand, that contrast is no longer essential. It is now the congregation as such, however small, that receives a promise. Is the believing prayer granted to the praying many and refused to the praying solitary? Is the Lord present only with the two or three met in His name, and distant from the one whose unaccompanied voice ascends to Him? The Logion would guard
against any such abuse of the utterance, by adding and
where there is one alone, I say, I am with him. One with
Christ at worship is a congregation. None the less the
saying in Matthew xviii. 20 contains a sublime promise
addressed to the Christian congregation, to Christians,
however few, met for worship. The term συνημένων, corre-
sponding as it does to συναγωγή, and the phrase εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν
δύναμα, recalling as it does the language of invocation in the
Psalter, where the name of Jehovah is the object of adora-
tion, define the "two or three" as worshippers. It is the
worship, not the number, that secures the Presence.

Clearly, then, the first part of the Oxyrhynchus Logion
paraphrases and expands the saying in Matthew. Where-
soever there are two, they are not without God, and where there
is one alone, I say, I am with him corresponds intimately to
Where there are two or three gathered together in my name,
there am I in the midst of them. But what of the rest of the
Egyptian Logion, Raise the stone and thou shalt find me,
cleave the wood and I am there?

As my father heard it read to him that evening in 1897
the answer came in a flash. At once he said: "It means,
Raise thine altar, prepare thy faggot for the fire, and I am
with thee." It is just a vivid finish to the earlier clauses.
It says in striking yet familiar metaphor what they affirm
less picturesquely. The altar and the fuel are symbols of
preparation for worship. Erect, push into position (the
true force of ἐγείρω is to raise from a recumbent or fallen
position to an upright, not to lift up from the ground) the
simple undressed stone, cleave the wood in readiness for
the fire,—it is a figure of speech for disposing the heart to
worship, using the barest essentials of the ancient rite of
sacrifice to set forth the elements of the Christian's approach
to his Lord. Erect the stone and thou shalt find me, cleave
the wood and I am there:—there is no suggestion of panthe-
ism in the saying, no thought of Christ’s indwelling in material nature, stock or stone. It is a presence with man, not a lurking in matter, that is proclaimed. Where there are two at worship, God is with them; where there is even only one, Christ is with him: let any man believing set up the altar in his heart and get the fuel ready for his offering of worship, and he will find his Lord at hand, Christ will be there.

It seems to me that this explanation, though something on the way to it has been dismissed by Harnack and by Lock as out of the question, fits exactly into all the requirements of the case. The context and the theme are shown by the Matthew saying to be worship in the name of Christ. Pre-Christian worship in Egypt as in Palestine called up to mind an altar and the wherewithal to make a fire for the consumption of the sacrifice. The New Religion which dismissed the altar and its smoking victim from the Temple kept and enhanced the altar and the fuel in the heart. I submit that the latter portion of the Logion thus interpreted is exactly in the manner of Egyptian Christian language and thought. The interpretation is neither obvious nor far-fetched. Every reader of Clement and Origen whose language and style are closely akin to the Logia, knows that, as Biblical interpreters, at their best they are neither the one nor the other. It keeps the true force of the imperative verbs, instead of weakening them into mere conditionals. And the interpretation is not out of harmony with the character of the other Logia, nor with their relation to the Gospel parallels or prototypes.

Against a crude and literal form of this interpretation Professor Harnack sets just two sentences¹: “It is certainly misleading, but only misleading, that ἐγείρων may also be understood in a ritual sense. But no one can think

¹ *Expositor*, 1897, vol. vi, p. 335.
of the splitting of wood for a sacrifice; we should in that case moreover be dealing with acts of heathen worship."
The very opposite is true. The ritual sense of ἐγέρσων is profoundly natural since worship is the theme. The splitting of wood for sacrificial fire was a familiar and everyday act, and it was as familiar to Jewish as to "heathen" worship, that very fact making it suitable for use in an Egyptian Christian Logion. Jewish and heathen forms of ritual were precisely the proper sources for metaphorical material to illustrate Christian truth. Professor Lock contents himself with saying¹: "But the illustrations of this come from patriarchal times, before the days of the fixed altar in the Temple, and again the plural would be more natural than the singular." For readers of the Old Testament, whether born Jews or proselytes, the patriarchal altar was as familiar as the fixed, and as natural a symbol. In the present context it alone was relevant, since it is the "one alone" whose worship, anywhere, without a congregation, is here assured of the presence of Christ. Dr. E. A. Abbott,² founding on Septuagint usage, objects that ἔδαπνον ought not to have the definite article if it is to mean wood as distinct from tree, but the definite article is as appropriate to it as to λίθων, since it is the wood, the stone, of the sacrifice, that is signified. His objection would be fatal to all interpretations which see in the phrase cleave the wood only a description of a carpenter's common work or the like, as if it ran cleave wood; it lends a strong confirmation to the view which I have urged.

Of the alternative interpretations of this striking Logion which scholarship has advanced the following are the most noteworthy.

¹ Two Lectures on the "Sayings of Jesus," by Professors Lock and Sanday, Oxford, 1897, p. 25.
² Amer. Jrn. Theol., Jan. 1898, p. 15,
(i) Professor Harnack \(^1\) understands *raise the stone* and *cleave the tree* to be simple types of manual labour, quarrying and wood-work, and emphasises the word *alone* in *where there is one alone* as signifying separation from the world.

"It is a profound sentence and a valuable parallel, though differently applied, to the evangelic promises of Christ's presence: 'I am with you always,' 'I will not leave you orphans.'" "The sense is: If only a man is truly alone, that is, separated from the world, then Christ is as surely with him as those objects are to which his daily toil is applied. It is just in his earthly drudgery that a man will find Christ as certainly as he has stone and wood before him." "It is not the union of Christ with wood or stone that is expressed, but the union of Christ with the believer."

"The explanation ... excludes every interpretation which regards the stone-lifting and the wood-hewing as anything else than the rough and solitary labour of the day. Was not the Speaker Himself a carpenter and the son of a carpenter? Is He not here speaking out of His own experience of God's nearness, which He had discerned as a living presence during His own work as carpenter, as real as the objects of His toil? . . . The blessing does not lie in the work itself; and yet the saying is a protest against the idea that the nearness of God is a fact for, and to be discerned by, those only who are engaged in fasting, prayer and meditation. No; God is also present at the daily task, but only then when the disciple is actually μόνος—that is, separated from the world."

But this explanation, attractive as it is in itself, is impossible. It abandons the guiding thought of *worship*, and imports a thought foreign to the context. It gives a forced meaning to μόνος, and a loose meaning to ἐκεῖ. ἐγείρων τῶν λίθων cannot mean "quarry stone," nor can σχίσων τὸ

\(^1\) Expositor, loc. cit,
ξύλον mean "work wood." It would be better to explain the labour as the clearing of ground for a garden or a vineyard, cutting down the trees or stumps, clearing the stones or building retaining walls or surrounding walls: but that is still far from satisfactory. In Ecclesiastes x. 9, ἔξαίρων λίθους διαπονηθήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς, σχίζων ξύλα κινδύνεύσει ἐν αὐτοῖς, the parallel noted by Professor Swete and by Dr. Lisco, and commended by Professor Harnack also, as the clue to the Logion, ἔξαίρω is a very different word from ἔγειρω, and λίθους and ξύλα are, true to Greek idiom, plural. Tempting though it is to link the Logion to that passage, and especially since there it is Wisdom, twin term with Logos, that is set forth as assisting the hewer of stone or wood, "profitable to direct" the workman's hand, and "better than strength," yet the settings of the two sayings are dissimilar, and a knowledge of the earlier could hardly be taken for granted in readers of the later.

(ii) A variant of Professor Harnack's interpretation, suggested by the last sentence, would take raise the stone and cleave the tree, as in Ecclesiastes x. 9, as types of labour, whatever they precisely mean, and would represent the promised presence of Christ as that assistance of the Logos or Divine Wisdom which gives skill and ability, direction, to the hand that wields the tool. But the same objections stand in the way.

(iii) Professor Swete, unlike Professor Harnack, prefers an allegorical meaning for the words. The stone and the wood figure the spiritual building-material of the Church. "The wisdom of God pledges Himself to be with the Christian builder, and never more so than when he builds alone and with labour and peril." But this explanation lies under the same disabilities, and is obscurer still.

(iv) The view favoured by Professors Lock and Sanday

and by many others finds in the Logion an assertion of Christ's universal presence in Nature. "Lift yonder stone, and thou shalt find me; cleave yonder piece of wood, and I am there." "In all forms of human life I am present; yea, and under inanimate creation you will find me." The thought is compared with the Prologue to the Gospel according to John, with Ephesians i. 23 (τὸ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρωμένου), and with Psalm cxxxix. 7, 8 (Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? etc.). But it is a descent to pass from Christ's presence with worshipping believers to His presence with inanimate Nature. The immanence of the Divine Logos in nature, His omnipresence on earth, is not a thought foreign to the New Testament, but even the Fourth Gospel does not attribute it to Christ's own lips. It seems much simpler to construe the stone and the wood as symbols of preparation for worship or prayer, and thus link them without anticlimax to the wheresoever of common or individual worship with which the Logion opens. Not in nor under the stock and the stone, but with the believer who handles them, is Christ's presence affirmed. Still less, of course, is there any thought of a pantheistic identification of Christ as God with the wood or stone.

(v) Not a few scholars, and among them the first editors, Dr. James and Professor Harnack, have suggested as a possible explanation that the emphasis rests on the raise and the cleave. One must leave no stone unturned, as we say, to find Christ,—but it is surely pointless and unnatural to add "no stick uncleft." As Dr. Lock says, even if this meaning suited the first part of the Logion, which it does not, it does not suit the word ἐκεῖ and it would require πάντα λίθον rather than λίθον alone. On this view the saying would be parallel to Matthew vii. 7 (Ask and it shall be given you), and "intended to teach the effort required
RAISE THE STONE: CLEAVE THE WOOD

in order to find Christ." But clearly effort is the last thing suitable to the context. The presence of Jesus is promised; to meet in His name, to turn towards Him in worship even when alone, is enough to secure it.

(vi) It is sufficient simply to mention the view of Mr. W. E. Barnes that the saying is from a post-resurrection standpoint, and that the stone is the sepulchre, and the wood the cross. "Wherever you are, together or alone, I am with you; and whatever happens, my burial or crucifixion, I am there. Lift up the stone of the tomb and you will find me alive; pierce through the cross and you will find me there too." Something far simpler is required.

(vii) Dr. Charles Taylor, Master of St. John's College, Cambridge, in an interesting discussion of the Logia gives an explanation which approximates to Professor Harnack's but has features all its own. Raising the stone and cleaving the wood are types of everyday labour. "If the work be taken to be a typical form of manual labour, the sense will be that Jesus is present with the disciple who is, by force of circumstances, cut off from the congregation, and from directly religious occupations and service. Thus the saying would strikingly supplement His assurance of His presence with those engaged in preaching His Gospel or assembled in His name, while giving the closest connexion between the second part of the Logion and the words next before it in the first part."

Ingenious, attractive and valuable these interpretations certainly are; they form in themselves an impressive tribute to the suggestiveness and depth of the Logion. But I venture to urge that, in naturalness, in inherent fitness, in justice to the words ἐγείρων, ἐκεῖ and τὸν άθρον, in close adherence to the thought of the Gospel original in Matthew

1 Harnack, op. cit. p. 334.
xviii. 20, and in maintenance of the consistency and homogeneity of the Logion as a whole, they do not bear comparison with the explanation I have advocated. As I have said, that explanation is not my own, but it laid hold upon me long ago, and it has kept its hold. Nothing that I have read has weakened its appeal to me. If it throws a ray of fresh light upon an ancient saying, the reproach is mine that it has been kept so long under a bushel.

WILLIAM A. CURTIS.

THE DIVINE NAMES IN GENESIS.

III. Recensions of the Septuagint.

In support of his contention that the divine names are a variable element in the textual tradition, Dahse naturally attaches great importance to various recensions of the Greek and Hebrew text which he claims to have discovered, and in which he thinks the names were deliberately altered under the influence of certain recognisable tendencies. Two such recensions we have already had before us: one the assumed Hebrew basis of the LXX, whose existence I have shown to be highly problematical, and the other the Massoretic text itself. To these he now adds two more, which he identifies first of all in the Greek text of two groups of MSS. of the LXX. If he had stopped short at this point it would hardly have been necessary to examine his argument very minutely. But he endeavours to prove that each of these groups “goes back” to a recension of the Hebrew text, which may have an authority equal to or even greater than the Massoretic recension; and that is a position which evidently requires very careful consideration. In order to put the reader abreast of the discussion, I will again commence with some explanatory observations.
1. The word "recension," as used by Dahse, is somewhat ambiguous. In its strict sense it denotes a text established by a systematic revision according to certain critical principles consciously adopted and applied by the editor. Three such recensions of the LXX are known to have been produced in the end of the third and beginning of the fourth century, by Origen, Lucian and Hesychius. Of these the most important and the best understood is that of Origen (the Hexapla). Its character, and the critical lines on which its author proceeded, are sufficiently known from statements of Origen himself, of Jerome and of other patristic writers; and its text is preserved in a number of codices which can be recognised as Hexaplaric by unmistakeable external indications. As to the Lucianic and Hesychian recensions there is no reliable tradition beyond the bare facts that they existed, and that at one time they circulated in specified geographical areas. Their text has been lost sight of in the general stream of MS. transmission, and can only be recovered by investigations which are amongst the most delicate and precarious processes of LXX criticism; while the principles that guided their editors are matter for conjecture based on the characteristics of the text thus provisionally ascertained. It is true that some progress has been made in the identification of a certain type of MS. text as Lucianic for a limited number of Old Testament books; but as regards the Hesychian recension only the most tentative steps have as yet been taken towards the recognition and characterisation of its text. Now the recensions to which Dahse here introduces us stand on an entirely different footing. They are hypothetical recensions, about which we have no historical information, their existence being merely inferred from the typical textual features observed in particular groups of Greek MSS. No exception need be taken to the use of the term "recension" for a
typical text of this kind, provided the problematical character of the revision be clearly kept in view. It must be understood that the discovery of a family likeness in a MS. group does not warrant the inference that we have to do with a recension of the same kind as, say, that of Origen. All that we are entitled to conclude is that the MSS. in question have transmitted the peculiarities of some earlier single codex (called the "archetype" of the group) which may itself have perished. Whether the archetype embodied a deliberate revision of the text, or whether its distinctive readings were merely accidental, is a separate question, which can only be answered, if it can be answered at all, by a demonstration that the text has been treated in accordance with definite canons, implying a conscious purpose of revision. That demonstration, as regards the divine names, Dahse of course attempts to give; but it is clear that he has failed to grasp the significance of the distinction which I have just pointed out. In previous publications he has sought to identify his two recensions, egi and fir (see below), with those respectively of Hesychius and Lucian; and he still holds to this opinion in spite of weighty arguments to the contrary advanced by Hautsch and others. It is an arguable position. But there is a curious argument on p. 153 (cf. p. 113) of the work before us which shows how little he is prepared to realise the wide difference between his recensions and the three great historical recensions of which we have knowledge. It had been urged against his identifications that fir is more likely to represent the Hesychian recension than the Lucianic. To this Dahse replies

1 Zeitschrift für die alttest. Wissenschaft, 1908, pp. 18 ff, 164.
2 Ibid., 1910, p. 281 ff.
3 Mitteilungen des Sept.-Unternehmens. I. Der Lukiantext des Okta-
teuch, p. 4 f. Comp. Moore, American Journal of Sem. Literature, Oct.,
1912, p. 37 ff.
pertinently enough that the Armenian version, which cannot be supposed to have any connexion with Hesychius, has frequent agreements with fir. The instructive thing, however, is that he regards this as a confirmation of his view that fir is Lucianic. He is blind to the possibility that it may be something different from both, and much less important than either. When a scholar like Dahse deals with the affiliation of LXX MSS. his opinion is that of an expert, and it might be presumptuous for me to question it. Nevertheless it is the truth that, while his grouping of the MSS. has been accepted by other workers in the same field, his identifications of the groups with the historical recensions have met with no support. Professor G. F. Moore, of Andover, who speaks on this subject with an authority second to that of no living scholar, says in the article referred to above that Dahse "has attempted a classification of the codices in Genesis on a very slender basis, and the identification of his groups on a still slenderer one."

2. In the second place, it is obvious that the establishment of internal Septuagintal recensions, of however comprehensive a character, does not bring us any nearer a proof of the variability of the divine names in the general transmission of the text. It may prove that certain editors of the LXX manipulated the names with great freedom; but that only tends to weaken confidence in the LXX text as a whole, without affecting the stability of the Hebrew tradition which has hitherto been all but universally accepted by commentators and critics of all schools. It is therefore essential to Dahse's argument to show that behind the Greek recensions postulated by him there lie recensions of the Hebrew text, in which the divine names were handled with the same freedom and on the same principles as are found in the families of Greek MSS. which are supposed to
reflect their characteristics. That step also Dahse takes with full assurance. But it is a step on which a judgment may be formed by any one with a competent knowledge of the textual history of the Old Testament, even if he lack the technical training acquired in the minute comparison of LXX MSS.

These, then, are the two points on which attention must be mainly concentrated in what now follows: (1) We must inquire whether there is sufficient evidence that the hypothetical Greek recensions observe recognisable principles in their treatment of the divine names; and (2) we must examine very carefully the reasons assigned for postulating a Hebrew recension behind the Greek. We approach these questions with an open mind, though perhaps with more circumspection than Dahse thinks called for in the circumstances.

But before coming to that, we must look at a very valuable chapter of the book, in which Dahse discusses the influence on the divine names of Origen's Hexapla—a recension about which, as we have seen, there is nothing hypothetical, but one whose importance for the study of the LXX text can hardly be overrated.

1. The Hexapla of Origen.

The importance of the Hexapla depends mainly on two facts. In the first place, its influence on the current text of the LXX has been very pervasive. All our extant Greek MSS. are of later date than the time of Origen; and there are few of them, if any, that have wholly escaped the impress of his recension. Some of the most important codices are distinctly Hexaplaric, and most others, even when their fundamental text is different from the Hexapla, exhibit traces of its peculiar readings. But secondly, it is
known that the aim and tendency of Origen's critical work was to assimilate the Greek text to the Massoretic. He did not, indeed, wish to lower the authority of the LXX, which was the accepted canon of the Christian Church in his time; but he sought to indicate the "Hebrew verity" in a way that would be intelligible to a student of his recension. Accordingly, where the LXX differed from the Hebrew he did not venture as a rule on a simple alteration of the Greek; but he gained his end by the use of two critical signs: one (the obelus — ) to mark a word or phrase in the LXX which was not in the Hebrew, and the other (the asterisk *) to signify an addition made by Origen to bring it into harmony with the Hebrew. When the LXX differed from the Hebrew, not by a simple plus or minus, but by having a variant text, Origen did not follow any consistent rule, but sometimes he used both asterisk and obelus to show that one phrase was to be deleted and the other substituted for it: that is, if one wished to read according to the Hebrew. Thus, to take a simple illustration from the divine names: if Origen found in the LXX ο θεός where the Hebrew had κυρίος he would obelise ο θεός and insert κυρίος with the asterisk, thus: *κυρίος — ο θεός, showing at a glance what the exact reading of each text was. Now there is a large number of MSS. which Dahse happily designates "crypto-hexaplaric," in which the text of the Hexapla is preserved, but the signs are omitted: hence the reading *κυρίος — ο θεός appears in them as the compound name κυρίος ο θεός. And that is only a particular example of a process of accommodation which has affected the transmission of the LXX text to an indefinite extent; and through the far-spread influence of the Hexapla has introduced into the MSS. a degree of conformity to the Hebrew which has greatly obscured
the original character of that version. There is thus a certain danger that owing to the influence of the Hexapla the ordinary text of the LXX may exhibit, in its use of the divine names, a closer agreement with the MT than the earlier LXX did.

Now on this point I have found a perusal of Dahse's chapter immensely reassuring. He discusses in all about forty-four readings out of some 320 divine names in Genesis. In the great majority of cases the Hexaplaric influence appears in the conflate reading εὐπρεπος ο θεος which is found in different MS. groups. Dahse clearly shows that in several instances this reading arises through copying the Hexapla with omission of the critical signs, in the way illustrated above; and of course in all such cases the presumption is that the name which differs from the MT represents the original LXX. If we may assume that the examination is fairly exhaustive of the traces of Origen's work in the divine names (and I see no reason to suppose otherwise) the influence of the Hexapla has been much more restricted than might have been expected. But we can go much further than this. After all, it is of little interest to us in the present controversy to know that the effect of Origen's work can be traced in this or that MS. or group of MSS., or in this or that secondary version. The real practical question is how far it has affected what may be called the standard text of the LXX, as represented say by the Cambridge

1 It may be mentioned in passing that Dahse tries to show that the Hebrew used by Origen differed in one or two instances from our Massoretic text. If the difference could be proved in several cases, it would certainly be an important fact; but it would not prove that Origen's Hebrew text was independent of the Massoretic. It might only mean that he relied on a carelessly written MS. of that text. That he followed a recension different from the Massoretic, or even a text materially at variance with it, is a position which I do not think any authority on the LXX would maintain.
Septuagint, which always follows the best available uncial. Not, be it observed, because that uncial is necessarily the best witness to the original text of the LXX; but because the edition affords a convenient standard of primary reference in all comparisons of the various types of text. Or, coming nearer home, the question is whether the statistics given in the synopsis in my last article are vitiated by uncertainty as to the extent to which the readings there adopted have been assimilated to the MT through Hexaplaric influence. And here Dahse’s results are still more reassuring. He examines only twenty-four readings¹ in chaps. xii.-l., and in sixteen cases he decides in accordance with the standard LXX. Only in seven or at most eight cases does he prefer another reading: viz. in xiii. 4 (?) xv. 4, xvi. 11, xviii. 1, xviii. 14, xxi. 4, xxiv. 40 (?), xxvii. 20. I am bound to say deliberately that in my opinion the reasons given for the preference are in every instance (except xvi. 11) of negligible value; but even if we accept them all the difference is inappreciable. Moreover the eight passages were all noted in the third line (or in the footnotes) of the tables in the article referred to. It would appear, therefore, that no misgiving need be entertained as to the possible effect of the Hexapla in invalidating the argument already advanced against the pericope-hypothesis. With that satisfactory finding our present interest in the Hexapla of Origen ceases.

2. The Recension egij.

We come now to a group of MSS., bearing evidence of descent from a common archetype, which Dahse identifies with the Hesychian recension. The leading representatives

¹ xii. 17; xiii. 4, 10, 13, 14; xv. 4, 7; xviii. 1, 14; xix. 16b,c; xx. 11; xxxi. 2, 4, 6; xxiv. 40; xxv. 21b; xxvii. 20; xxix. 31, 32, 33; xxx. 30; xxxviii. 7b, 10a.
of the group are three cursives, dating from the tenth to the fourteenth century, whose symbols in the apparatus of the Cambridge LXX are the letters e, g and j. The main stock of the recensions we are told is ej; g frequently parting company with these two. But there is also a considerable number of MSS., more or less closely affiliated with the group, which can be used by an expert critic to ascertain the distinctive readings of the lost archetype. With regard to these, and the general character of the recension, we get no information in the volume before us; but are referred to an earlier paper of Dahse's in the Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft for 1908 (p. 13 ff.). It will be seen how impossible it is for any one who has not minutely worked over the whole ground to control or verify the readings assigned by Dahse to this recension, and I frankly confess my inability to do so. For my present purpose it will be sufficient if I accept provisionally his determination of the text of the recension. Needless to say, however, I am not prepared to extend even a provisional confidence to all the conclusions which he deduces from the data I shall assume him to have established.

1. Let us inquire, then, in the first place, what are the characteristic tendencies of the recension in regard to the use of the divine names. We read (p. 107) that in our recension the tendency is observable "to use only one and the same name for God in one section." Two readings (iv. 5 and vi. 3) are expressly excluded on account of their uncertainty; and then we get lists of cases where (1) κυρίος θεός, (2) κυρίος and (3) θεός occur in accordance with this principle of assimilation. (1) κυρίος θεός is quoted as characteristic of the recension in ten passages: iii. 1b, iii. 11, iv. 13, vi. 13, vi. 22, ix. 17, x. 9a, x. 9b, xiii. 4, xvi. 7. But in iv. 13, vi. 13, vi. 22, x. 9a, b, xvi. 7 the double name is the reading of the general text of the LXX (in iv. 13, vi.
so that from these instances nothing can be inferred as to the special tendencies of \( \text{egj} \). Hence there remain only three clear cases (iii. 1b, iii. 11, ix. 17) to support Dahse's sweeping generalisation. Then what is meant by a "section" (Abschnitt)? It cannot be a Seder, for in Seder 2 (ii. 4–iii. 21) \( o \ \theta e o s \) occurs no fewer than six times in our recension (ii. 4b, ii. ix., ii. 19, ii. 21, iii. 3, iii. 5), while Dahse himself only cites two cases of \( \kappa u r i o s \ o \ \theta e o s \) (iii. 1b, 11) as characteristic of it. In Seder 3 (iii. 22–iv. 26) against one case cited (and that not distinctive) of \( \kappa u r i o s \ o \ \theta e o s \) (iv. 13) we have \( o \ \theta e o s \) five times (iv. 1, iv. 4, iv. 10, iv. 16, iv. 25) and \( \kappa u r i o s \) once (iv. 3). We need proceed no further on that trail. Perhaps Dahse's real meaning is better expressed by the vaguer phrase "in the same context" (p. 107). He says (p. 106) that "between vi. 12 and vii. 1 \( o \ \theta e o s \) never occurs alone in \( \text{ej} \), but only \( \kappa u r i o s \ o \ \theta e o s \)." Considering that between vi. 12 and vii. 1 the divine name occurs only twice (vi. 13, 22), and that in vi. 22 \( \kappa u r i o s \ o \ \theta e o s \) is the common reading of the LXX (as also in vi. 12, vii. 1), it does not seem a very impressive exhibition of consistency that once (vi. 13) \( \text{ej} \), following the Hexapla, reads the double name. Again, "a solitary \( \kappa u r i o s \) appears in the group only once (iv. 3) in the first ten chapters of Genesis." And how often does the reader imagine that \( o \ \kappa u r i o s \) occurs alone in these ten chapters in the standard text of the LXX? Just three times (iv. 3, iv. 13, x. 9b), and in the last two of these the double name is probably Hexaplaric, and is at any rate the most prevalent LXX reading. So much for \( \kappa u r i o s \ o \ \theta e o s \). We are invited further to find illustrations of the tendency (2) in the \( \kappa u r i o s \) of xiii.

---

1 Dahse (p. 38) omits iv. 13, but adds viii. 20. The truth is that both in iv. 13 and viii. 20 the reading is very weakly attested. See the Note on \( o \ \kappa u r i o s \) readings at the close of this article.
17, xix. 29a, b, and (3) in the *o θεός* of viii. 20, xv. 4, xx. 18.

(2) It is true that in xii. 17 the group changes *o θεός* into *κυρίος* between two readings of *κυρίος* (xii. 8 and xiii. 4) and similarly in xix. 29b; but in xix. 29a the *κυρίος* is common to all MSS. of the LXX except 9 (E omits). In this last case the change does bring about a uniform use of *κυρίος* throughout a whole Seder; but apart from xix. 29b the uniformity exists already in the LXX: in xii. 17 no such consistency results, *o θεός* remaining in xiii. 10a, b, 13, 14. (3) On viii. 20, we read (p. 104), "the MT after three times δυο (viii. 1a, 1b, 15) has in v. 20 νομος, which our group changes to *o θεός*." True, but our group in viii. 15 has not *o θεός* but (in common with the entire LXX except one MS.) *κυρίος* *o θεός*, which breaks the sequence. In xv. 4 Dahse holds, on the evidence of six cursives and the Old Latin, that no name stood after φορη in the original LXX, that *κυρίον* was inserted by the Hexapla (in spite of the fact that τον θεον is read by two daughter versions of the LXX, the Armenian and Sahidic, of which the former is strongly Hexaplaric), while *εκτ with others insert τον θεον*. If we accept his view the name corresponds with the two which follow (*o θεός*) and differs from the three which precede (*κυρίος*): we see that whichever name was inserted it could not fail to agree with either the one or the other. In xx. 18 *κυρίος* is changed to *o θεός* in harmony with all the other names of Sed. 17. To the same effect we read (p. 104 f.) that in ix. 17 "members of our group have *κυρίος* *o θεός* following the double name in ix. 12, just as in iii. 11 between iii. 10 and iii. 13, and vi. 13, 22 between vi. 12 and vii. 1." This is true (but on vi. 13, 22 see above); but the next statement is misleading: "in xi. 5 begins in it (the recension) the continuous appearance of the solitary *κυρίος*." In the very next verse (xi.
6) ej have κυριος a θεος; and although with that exception the reading κυριος is continuous to the end of Sed. 8 and throughout Sed. 9, the recension simply follows the main current of the LXX text.¹

Dahse further calls attention to the fact that the group has important readings in v. 29, xx. 4, xxvi. 29, xxviii. 20, xviii. 27, xxxii. 9. In v. 29 its peculiarity is the addition of ημων to the κυριος a θεος of the ordinary LXX, and I do not know in what its importance consists. In xx. 4 for the הַלְוִיה of the MT the recension has κυριε a θεος, which Dahse very arbitrarily holds to imply a double nameלְוִיה הַלְוִי or הַלְוִיה הַלְוִיה in the original. xxvi. 29 should have been mentioned as a glaring exception to the general tendency of the recension, inasmuch as it breaks a long sequence of κυριος by a solitary a θεος: its supposed importance lies in the fact that in the speech of a heathen king, Abimelech, εγι substitute Elohim for Yahwe of the MT and LXX. In xxviii. 20 the group preserves the κυριος (see above pp. 408, 417) which Dahse regards as the reading of the original LXX (MT Elohim; LXX κυριος a θεος). In xviii. 27 it omits in common with the great majority of LXX MSS.) after τον κυριον a μου which is read by the Bohairic and Sahidic versions and eight cursives. Dahse infers that it represents not מִשְׁמֵרוֹ (MT) but מִשְׁמֵרוֹ in the Hebrew. If so, must we not conclude that the main text of the LXX does the same? Finally in xxxii. 9 the recension adds a θεος to the κυριε (MT מִשְׁמֵרוֹ) of the ordinary LXX, to which however the MSS. present variants κυριε a θεος μου, a θεος and others. It should be stated that in xx. 4, xxviii. 20, xviii. 27 (also iii. 1b, vi. 13 (?) xviii. 31, xix. 29) there are variants in Hebrew MSS. which are thought to enhance the significance of our recension. To this subject we shall return presently.

It is difficult to form a clear judgment on these conflict-

¹ xi. 8, 9a, 9b; xii. 1, 4, 7a, 7b, 8a, 8b.
ing phenomena as evidencing a special tendency of the recension \( \text{egj} \). In order to do so we should have first of all to isolate the group from the common text of the LXX, and then to understand how the influence of the Hexapla, which Dahse expressly emphasises, was brought to bear on the recension; and in neither direction is Dahse's work helpful. I will state only two impressions. (1) It seems fair to say that this recension goes a little, but only a little, beyond the ordinary LXX in assimilating a name to those in the immediate context. I can recognise this leaning in at most seven passages (x. 9b, xii. 17, xv. 4, xviii. 27, xix. 29b, xx. 18, xxviii. 20b); but the opposite also occurs (xi. 6, xviii. 20, xxvi. 29). Here the question arises whether these instances are sufficient to prove deliberate purpose on the part of the author of the recension. It seems to me that they are adequately explained as unconscious adaptations to the nearest divine names. One cannot help wondering whether Dahse has ever considered this possibility. (2) The peculiarities of the recension in the use of the divine names are entirely explicable on the supposition that it originated within the sphere of the Greek text. In other words, apart from agreements with Hebrew MSS. (which we have yet to consider), there is nothing whatever to suggest that the changes are determined by reference to a Hebrew original different from that which lay behind the LXX. I do not admit that the addition of \( \mu o \nu \) is a criterion for \( \text{יִלָּה} \) as distinct from \( \text{יִלָּה} \) in the Hebrew (xviii. 27, xviii. 31, xx. 4): it can be naturally accounted for as an inner-Greek insertion suggested by the invariably vocative use of the word.\(^1\)

\(^1\) The ten cases (\( \text{יִלָּה} \) in xviii. 3, 27, 30, 31, 32; xix. 2 (pl.); xix. 18; xx. 4: \( \text{יִלָּה} \) in xv. 2, 8), where \( \text{יִלָּה} \) occurs in MT, are all literally or virtually vocatives; and the \( \mu o \nu \) is never found in the prevalent text of the LXX. But it occurs four times in Boh. and Sah. (xviii. 3, 27, 31; xix. 2); twice in Eth. (xviii. 3; xix. 18); and four times in a few cursives other than \( \text{egj} \) (xviii. 27, 31; xix. 2, 18). Dahse may of course maintain either
2. This brings us to the most important question of the supposed Hebrew basis of the recension egj. As we have seen, the proof of this is sought in agreements of the recension with a group of Hebrew MSS. With the general subject of variants in Hebrew MSS. I shall deal more fully in my next article: here it is only necessary to consider the coincidences between egj and the particular MSS. which are said to support it.

We may start from xx. 4, where nine MSS. of Kennicott (9, 81, 132, 150, 152, 199, 227, 239, 601) and five of De Rossi (419, 455, 507, 766, primo 248) read ייינא instead of MT ייינא. Now it is certainly a most unusual thing to find a nest of Hebrew variants like this to any Massoretic reading of the divine name in Genesis. But it must be observed that it is just in the case of ייינא || יינא that variations in Hebrew MSS. most frequently occur. The reason is not far to seek. ייינא and ייינא were pronounced alike by later Jews (Adonay), and the scribe, whether writing from dictation or (according to a copyists' rule) pronouncing each word before setting it down, very readily confused the two names in writing. But curiously enough in xx. 4 the MSS. cited do not support egj, for ej read κυρίε ὁ θεός, which, according to Dahse, implies an original ייינא ייינא or ייינא ייינא, while g (with all other MSS.) reads κυρίε. That is not a very promising beginning for the theory of a Hebrew basis. But we must inquire further whether these nine MSS. of Kennicott form a true "group," as Dahse says they most assuredly do. The presence of nine men in a tavern on one occasion is scarcely presumptive evidence of a conspiracy, though if they are frequently found in company the suspicions of the law may be aroused.

(a) that the original LXX read ייינא in all these places, or (b) that the μου is original and has dropped out of the current text; but neither view is probable.
Now (1), so far as Dahse’s tables inform us, no two of these nine MSS. are ever found together again leagued against the MT except in xv. 2, where 150, 152 read לְיָיְוָא אֱלֹהִים, for MT לְיָיְוָא אֱלֹהִים, and in xviii. 31 where 227, 239 read לְיָיְוָא; and only in xviii. 31 (and there very doubtfully: see above) does egj support them. (2) Only two of them ever support egj even singly against MT anywhere: viz., 132 in iii. 1b, xviii. 27, and 199 in xix. 29a. (3) Over against these three, or at most four, coincidences of egj with Hebrew MSS. differing from the MT, there are at least twenty-nine cases where egj differ from MT without any support from the group, and except in xxviii. 20b without any Hebrew support at all. If that be sufficient to prove that a recension “goes back” to a Hebrew original, textual criticism ceases to be an exact science.

There are some other matters that require clearing up. What is meant when it is said (p. 107) that the recension “goes back” to a Hebrew original? Dahse cannot possibly mean that it is a fresh translation from the original, though his words might convey that impression to an un instructed reader. All that can be intended is a correction of the Greek text by comparison with the Hebrew recension in question, and we have seen how slight is the evidence

1 Observe again that both these phrases were pronounced alike: Adonay Elohim.

2 I exclude vi. 13 because I do not believe it is a genuine case. K152 there reads פַּעֹלָה מַיִם, and Dahse, following Wiener, takes the first word to be a shortened form of מים: this would agree with the κυριός o θεός of ej. I have not seen the MS., but I have little doubt that the מ is a copyist’s error: the scribe had begun to write מים, but after forming two letters he noticed that the right word was פַּעֹלָה, which accordingly he wrote without removing the traces of his mistake. A similar confusion in K109 (on ch. xviii. 27) will be considered in my next article.

3 iii. 11, iv. 13, v. 29, vi. 13, vi. 22, viii. 20, ix. 17, x. 9a, x. 9b, xi. 5, xi. 6, xii. 4, xv. 4, xvi. 7, xviii. 13, xviii. 20, xvi. 22, xvii. 26, xix. 16a, xix. 29b, xx. 8 [xx. 18], xxi. 1a, xxi. 2, xxi. 4, xxi. 6, xxvi. 14a, xxvi. 29, xxvii. 20b. In xx. 18 ej agree with Sam,
that any such comparison was ever made. But supposing for the sake of argument that it did take place, a single Hebrew MS. would suffice for the purpose, and it is unlikely that the reviser will have used more. We should, therefore, in the assumed case have a parallel to what we have conceded as possible in the case of Origen's Hexapla: viz., the use of a MS. representing the Massoretic recension, but containing variations (such as virtually all MSS. contain) which might be either superior or inferior to our present Massoretic text. There is no occasion to call in the theory of an independent Hebrew recension.

Another point to be noticed is that on p. 107 Dahse puts this recension egj between the original of the LXX and the MT, implying that the hypothetical Hebrew basis of egj is older than the latter. But if it be older than the MT it must represent a distribution of the divine names older than the Samaritan Pentateuch; and the first literary trace of it is in Greek codices of the tenth century. What likelihood is there that an unofficial recension should have retained its characteristic features in a recognisable degree of purity through twelve centuries of transmission in Hebrew and Greek MSS., especially in so variable an element of the text as Dahse supposes the divine names to be?

3. The Recension fir.

These three MSS., assigned respectively to the 15th, the 11th and the 13th century, form the "groundstock" of a recension which, as we have seen, Dahse identifies with that of Lucian. We have also seen that this identification is considered by other scholars to rest on very precarious grounds. In the chapter now before us Dahse seeks to prove that the group represents an "Elohist edition of Genesis" (p. 114); and we have to try and see how far that description is appropriate. The statistics
given below\(^1\) are based on Dahse’s examination, and are at least approximately correct. It will be seen that in about half the passages examined the recension agrees with the common reading of the LXX. Although we must not assume in argument that the prevalent form of the LXX is older than the recension, it is at the same time impossible to investigate the peculiarities of a particular recension otherwise than by comparison with the general characteristics of the LXX; and until these have been finally ascertained we must use some standard of reference, such as the Cambridge edition. Bearing this in mind, we find that though the recension does shew a very decided preference of \(\text{o \, \theta\, \varepsilon\, \oslash}\) to \(\kappa\nu\rho\iota\omicron\sigma\, \text{o \, \theta\, \varepsilon\, \oslash}\), it shews a still greater partiality for \(\kappa\nu\rho\iota\omicron\sigma\, \text{o \, \theta\, \varepsilon\, \oslash}\) over \(\kappa\nu\rho\iota\omicron\sigma\) and even over \(\text{o \, \theta\, \varepsilon\, \oslash}\). Thus while \(\kappa\nu\rho\iota\omicron\sigma\, \text{o \, \theta\, \varepsilon\, \oslash}\) is only three times changed to \(\text{o \, \theta\, \varepsilon\, \oslash}\) and never to \(\kappa\nu\rho\iota\omicron\sigma\), it is twenty-eight times substituted for \(\kappa\nu\rho\iota\omicron\sigma\) and nine times for \(\text{o \, \theta\, \varepsilon\, \oslash}\). Further, though \(\kappa\nu\rho\iota\omicron\sigma\) is nine times changed to \(\text{o \, \theta\, \varepsilon\, \oslash}\) and twenty-eight times to \(\kappa\nu\rho\iota\omicron\sigma\, \text{o \, \theta\, \varepsilon\, \oslash}\), in thirty-five cases it is allowed to stand. These facts are a serious set back to Dahse’s theory of an Elohistic recension. It is of no avail to point out, as Dahse does,

\(^1\) In the cases in which Dahse comes to a definite conclusion the recension reads:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In agreement with LXX.</th>
<th>For (\kappa\nu\rho\iota\omicron\sigma)</th>
<th>For (\text{o , \theta, \varepsilon, \oslash})</th>
<th>For (\kappa\nu\rho\iota\omicron\sigma \text{o , \theta, \varepsilon, \oslash})</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>−</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. (\text{o , \theta, \varepsilon, \oslash})</td>
<td>27 times, viz.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (\kappa\nu\rho\iota\omicron\sigma)</td>
<td>44 &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (\kappa\nu\rho\iota\omicron\sigma \text{o , \theta, \varepsilon, \oslash})</td>
<td>45 &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MSS. of the recension are frequently at variance, and even Dahse has often to confess himself uncertain what name really belongs to it. That he is invariably right when he expresses no hesitation is probably more than he himself would claim.
that in five passages the retention of κυριος is explained by its occurring at the end (xviii. 33, xxvii. 27) or beginning (xxxviii. 7, xlix. 18) of a Seder, or (xxi. 6) at the end of a pericope in an ancient Christian lectionary (!); or again, that in some half-dozen instances it follows "angel" or "name": there are thirty-five to be accounted for. If finally it be alleged that the predominance of κυριος ο θεος is itself evidence of an elohistic tendency (ο θεος being added to an original κυριος), we have to ask why κυριος, though changed to ο θεος in nine cases, is nevertheless retained alone in no fewer than thirty-five, and further how it comes about that κυριος ο θεος appears nine times in place of ο θεος. It seems clear that no principle is consistently followed by the author of the recension in his use of the divine names, or, if there be, that Dahse has not detected it. So far as the interchanges of ο θεος and κυριος are concerned, the facts could be adequately explained by the natural predilection of Greek writers for ο θεος being carried somewhat further in this case than in the main text of the LXX. But it must be admitted that the preference for κυριος ο θεος cannot be satisfactorily accounted for in this way. It might no doubt have come in through conflation at a later stage of the text than the recension fir; and if so, it seems impossible with our present knowledge to determine which component was found in that recension.1

1 Dahse (p. 114) promises a fuller discussion of the κυριος ο θεος readings in a further volume of his textual studies. Meanwhile he appears to hold to the opinion, based on a doubtful interpretation of a statement of Jacob of Edessa, that it was the practice of Lucian (the supposed author of our recension) to combine the marginal reading of the divine names with that of the text of the MSS. which he followed. In that case there would have been over sixty readings to which he found no margin; and we are left with thirteen absolute substitutions of one name for another which are only explicable by the tendency of Greek scribes spoken of above. There is not the slightest reason to suppose that either text or margin represented a Hebrew original.
The grounds on which Dahse postulates a Hebrew basis for the recension fir in its use of the divine names are as unconvincing as could well be imagined. In the first place, he points to a single agreement with K650 in xlii. 5. It is true that Kennicott cites 650H as reading לְשׁוֹבֵּר בַּיִּשׁ for the Massoretic לְשׁוֹבֵּר; and similarly fir read (with the Sahidic version) ἀγοραζέων στὸν for the bare ἀγοραζέων of the LXX. But לְשׁוֹבֵּר בַּיִּשׁ occurs immediately before in v. 3, and there also the στὸν appears in all LXX codices. It would not have been very wonderful if one Greek and one Hebrew copyist had both supplied the accusative from the preceding context without collusion or interdependence. And even if dependence of the one on the other were probable, would that be sufficient evidence for the existence of a whole Hebrew recension in which the divine names were treated on different principles from the MT? But it is really wasting time to speculate about such probabilities; for the fact is that K650 is not a MS. at all, but a printed edition, and that not of the Pentateuch but of the Talmud! (see Kennicott, Dissertatio generalis, p. 108). The reading has no value whatever; it is simply one of those cases of inexact citation from memory which abound in the Talmud, and for which there is no reason to assume any MS. authority. But in the second place, Dahse asserts that “the Elohistic tendency has had regard to the Sedarim-division, while the author of the recension ignores this.” It is difficult to apprehend so very refined a distinction. It would appear to be Dahse’s view that in fir we have to do with a double recension: first a recension of the Hebrew text, in which some attention was paid to the Sedarim-division, and then a Greek recension in which the Sedarim were ignored. How does he manage to accomplish such an extraordinarily subtle critical operation? (a) As an indication of regard to the Seder-division he has pointed
out the occurrence of a \( \kappa u p i \oslash \) twice at the beginning and twice at the end of a Seder. We have seen already how little importance can be attached to that observation. But even supposing it to be significant, does it prove the existence of a Hebrew original? Were we not given to understand at an earlier stage of the argument that in Dahse’s opinion a regard to the Sedarim was characteristic of the original LXX as a whole? How then can he tell that the text which the “author of the recension” had before him was anything but a Greek MS. of the LXX? (b) How does he know that the “author of the (Greek) recension” disregarded the Seder-division? He says that when the reviser supplies out of his own head a name not found in his original (vi. 14, vii. 23, xviii. 19c, xxiii. 9, xxvi. 25a) he is careless what name he chooses, and thus betrays indifference to the prevalent usage of the section before him. Again, I am unable to perceive in that any ground for believing that his original was in Hebrew. But whether it was Hebrew or Greek, so long as it was a recension independent both of the MT and the original LXX, who is to tell us that in the passages cited the names were not found, but were supplied by the second reviser? We know what names were in the MT and in the current LXX; and in all the five passages here referred to these two texts agree in having no divine name at all. But as to what names were or were not in a speculative Hebrew recension of which not a trace has survived, Dahse can have no knowledge whatsoever. There is no conceivable reason why the alleged recensional additions should not have been made to the Greek text of the LXX; and the whole argument merely shews on how frail a foundation Dahse builds his imposing but unsubstantial theory of Hebrew recensions differing from the Massoretic text. “It is true, in general,”

1 We might add iii. 24, xx. 8, xxviii. 20.
writes Professor Torrey, of Yale, "of the modern use of the Greek Bible for text-critical purposes, that recourse is had far too often to the hypothesis of divergent Hebrew texts, while there is far too little appreciation of the extent to which the Greek texts themselves have been corrupted in transmission." 1 Certainly in Dahse's critical practice we see that tendency carried to most unwarranted extremes. 2

JOHN SKINNER.

1 Ezra Studies, p. 109.
2 Note on the o κυρίως readings.—The name θεόν is ordinarily rendered in LXX by κυρίως without the article. In nearly a score of instances, however, we find o κυρίως; and the question suggests itself whether the distinction has any significance. In regard to three cases (iv. 3, 13; viii. 20) Dahse (p. 38 f.) offers the explanation that o κυρίως is used to signify that "in matters of cultus one addressed oneself not to any Elohim indifferently, but to Yahwe." That is an echo of Eerdmans' theory of a polytheistic phase of the Genesis legends, of which Dahse makes a somewhat unfortunate application. He appears to overlook the fact that the presence or absence of the article is a peculiarly Greek feature which has no expression in Hebrew, and therefore must be traced to the translators or later copyists. But the translators of the LXX were far removed from the stage of thought at which it might have been necessary to guard against a polytheistic sense of Elohim. Dahse does not inquire whether the principle holds good in all or most of the other cases; nevertheless his general idea has some justification in actual usage. The facts are these: (a) o κς is used for θεόν twice (xviii. 27, 31): now in all other instances of θεόν it is represented by a vocative; hence we may say that o κς is the regular equivalent of θεόν wherever the art. is admissible. (b) For θεόν, o κς stands in iv. 3, 13, viii. 20, xii. 8a, xiii. 4, 18, xvi. 2, xvii. 17, 33, xxiv. 16, 48a, 52, xxviii. 13a, xxxix. 23a. Of these iv. 13, xvii. 33 (and perhaps viii. 20) may be set aside as insufficiently attested, but as illustrating a tendency they are here reckoned. Of the fourteen cases no fewer than nine (iv. 3, iv. 13, viii. 20, xii. 8a, xiii. 4, 18, xxiv. 26, 48, 52) refer to acts of worship; and we may add xxii. 9, where a few authorities supply τῷ κυρίῳ after "altar." On the other hand there are many references to worship (e.g. xii. 8b !), where o κς is not used. The result can hardly be set down to chance; although at the same time the element of chance appears in the five cases above, which have nothing to do with worship (xvi. 2, xvii. 17, 33, xxviii. 13, xxxix. 29), as well as in several variants which are not included.—Dahse does not point out that a slight tendency to favour o κς is observable in θεόν. The fact goes to shew that that recension is not based on a Hebrew original.
THE NEW CODEX "W."

When we pass quire 1 at John v. 12, we come back to quite a different recension, agreeing in the main with the character visible in the rest of the work. For, after eliminating "Greek" readings, we pick up e several times, also Coptic, and twice the cursive 28 (in two chapters).

There is again most distinct and unmistakeable Latin retranslation.

Observe the details:—

Jo. v. 15.  + δε b f q r fossat syr (+ ουν D, etc., copt) [non sah].

Ibid.  + και ενεπεν αυτοις. New thus and a conflate, but arising out of the ενεπεν for ανναγγευλε of a e q boh syr and Gl. N CL and few curs.

16.  + τω (ante σαββατω). 237, 251, 264 (copt), is no doubt due to retransl. from Latin.

[The addition of articles is just as much a sign of translation as is their omission.] In hardly any case in the section examined does it come from syr. Sah is II CABBATON.

18. αποκτεναι αι ωυδαιοι. change of order with Greek 107 and Ambrose only

19.  — τι. 245, 511: a d e q Tert.

Ibid. o (pro a). Epiiph Hil Ambr only (cf. sah); oυ 17; ύπερ Didym.

20. δειξη (pro δειξει), 511, 513 q (ostendet); ostendit e; δεικνυον D 28; demonstravit Latt.

21. τους νεκρους εγειρει o πηρ. Change of order for which no Latins vouch nor Greeks. o πατηρ, however, is omitted by a few;
and *Tert* in an exceptionally long quotation; hence perhaps this order change.

24. "οὐκ ἐρχέται εἰς κρίσιν. *Non latt, non syr; probably ex copt.*"

v. 36. "μαρτυροῦσιν (πρὸ μαρτυρεῖ). *No Greeks at all, but q exactly, ‘testificantur’ (copt); a = ‘test. dicunt,’ e, ‘test. sunt,’ b ff, r, etc., *Tert* = ‘test. perhibent,’ all in the plural.*"

37. — "αὐτοῦ sec. *No Greeks, syr, or copt, but b r* and r s of the Latins, *Ath.,* and they alone.*"

vi. 2. "θεωροῦντες. *Chrys. Nonn. (Retransl. from the ‘qu. videbant’ of all Latt.) See 131 and Scholz’ note.*"

16. — "οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. *No support. (See change or order, syr.)*"

28. "αὐτῶ (πρὸ προσ αὐτῶν). *No Greek support. Either ex copt or a clear case of transl. from Latins, who all agree in ad eum.*"

44. "πρὸς με (ante καὶ εἰγω). *So only e boh [not sah], but with Hil, Ambr, Hier, Vigil. Clearly illegitimate.*"

46. "αὐτός (πρὸ αὐτός), 71. *All Latins ‘hic.’ Clearly transl. from Latt (or syr or copt)."

53. — "μη, but this is * and is corrected. Cf. sah (299 τὸς πρὸ μη)."

58. "τὸν ἀρτὸν τοῦτον. *Order supported by the Latins e q only; but b r give the order with the expression ‘carnem meum,’ while a c vg write merely ‘me.’"

*Ibid.* "ξηση (πρὸ ξησεται). *Al. ξησε; vivet a c e ff, q r vg.*"

60. — "ἐστιν. *No support apparently, yet I seem to recollect some one who does this.*"

vii. 3. +και (—ονν). *Syr. Non copt (=OTN), non sah = σε = ουν* (one *sah* MS. 73= δη). But 48 = δη with Latt and *vg* autem.

6. *oudesto* (pro *oupento*). No support. Clear retransl. All Latins *nondum*, but *Z* and *vg* neodium.

17. — *θελη.*

28. — και (ante *λεγον*). Of Greeks 28 only, but *aff* _aur_ with *sah* and eight _boh_ MSS. against Horner’s text.

31. *ek tou ouν orgbou *πολλοι* (pro *πολλοι* δε *ek tou* *οrgbου*). Impossible order, but _ouν_ vouched for by 27, 28, 42, 299, 507, and _order_ of most Latins. (28 joins a small Greek group as 507, 517, 570, with the order.) [See other sympathy with 299, vi. 53.]

39. *ελαμβανον* (pro _emellon_ *lambanein_). So *de* _ψ* *vg Cypr Vigil._ A few Greeks omit _emellon_ with some Latins, but only the above go wholly with Freer.

45. + _av_ (post _eivon_). Cf. copt.

46. + _autous_ (post _apexp_). _Evvan_ 892, _Ewst_ 234 _c_ foss and _syr_ only. (+ *pros touς arx. και φαρ. post νυπρεται, 69)._ But we must pass to the other Gospels.

**St. Matthew.**

In St. Matthew is to be observed the same Coptic or Sahidic influence as in the other Gospels from copying a diglot _copt-gr_. It seems to me a shade more _boh_ than _sah_
here, but not very much. Just about what one would ex-
cept after going over the rest, for I took Matthew after Mark.

But I pick up k distinctly in Matthew more than the other
Latins thus:—

Matt. * ix. 9. Vocabatur k. All other Latins have
nomine, as copt and syr. This is
important for it does away with
what might be an error of homoiotel
in W in another place, viz. :

vi. 20. — oude eilettouwv, for k also omits. So
that the parent of *W and not the
scribe is responsible. Again :

exi. 48. — eion Evan, 440; Evst, 259. c k
Tert bis and boh (2 MSS.) not sah. Truly “Afri-
can,” but very early African, before Cypr. Now
to show that vocabatur comes straight from an
early Latin observe—

ix. 15. aferenq (pro apanqb). W only (28 want-
ing). All the Latins have avferetur, which was
basic. d, however, reads tollatur over against D
1, 25, 71, 273, Evst, 222, aq; Tert alluding,
“ablatus est” twice (copt and sah use different
words).

k ends at xiv. Testing beyond in e I do not find
particular sympathy (as in Mark). Probably k
might show + eltheiv xiv. 30, or fageiv xv. 32
(e q).

r is missing also xiv. 1—xvi. 13, but testing beyond,
I find—

xxii. 18. r2 = nequitas = tas movnas of W against
all Greeks tnv pynpiais, and all the
Latins have the abl. abs. except vy.

* 28 is wanting here, but has kalouwrov for legouwrov in x. 2(alone.)
T. And \( r_2 \) is nearest with *cognoscens* (\( \gammaνος \)) and *nequitias*.

Again:

xxvi. 49. W reads alone \( προσηλθεν και \) for \( ελθων \).
   Only \( r_2 \), \( a \) and syr read thus, *accessit* . .
   et. No other Latins. *Sah* and *copt*
   have "came," but no *και*.

Note also Matthew xii. 48. — τω ενποντι αντω \( \mathrm{X}^\gamma \).

Dimma \( E^{\text{lat}} \) a notable conjunction with \( W^\omega \). (hiat \( r_2 \)).

Testing Luke I find no \( e \) in the unique readings of the first

three chapters, but observe \( b \) \( e \) at i. 65.

It is in St. Mark that \( e \) comes out so very strong, where

available.

In St. Matthew, then, we have more of the \( k-r_2 \) base.

In St. Mark \( e \) is dominant in the first four chapters, fol-

lowed by \( c \) and \( k \), and beyond chap. viii. \( k \) comes in strong.

In St. Luke there is distinct Latin and Coptic running,

as before, upon the surface.

St. Luke must be considered more deeply and throughout

in the light of ii. 7, iii. 7, iii. 24–38. But \( e \) does not seem to

be at all the base here, nor \( c \) particularly, and we must press

on to consider St. Mark.

**St. Mark.**

Here we are face to face with something very strange and

very significant. Mr. Sanders goes so far as to say (p. 139),

"Certainly some one had to send to North Africa for the

beginning of Mark, and the Hesychian recension, which

should have been the favourite one in Egypt at this time,

seems to have been in large part inaccessible." See also

remarks on p. 67.

This is not the way I should put it, for a similar Latin text

like \( e \) (which is that to which he refers) underlies parts of the

Greek MS. \( \mathrm{N} \), and that in Gospels other than that of S. Mark.
It seems more likely that the text of e was in Egypt already for a long while (having come via Carthage), and that for the reason that W does not only show us e, but also c (and c we know is closely and sometimes alone allied to aethiopic readings) and also b (as well as D d), and beyond all this the common base of b c e and sometimes of b c d e. Of these, b never left Italy. How account for it all?

This seems to be the history of it. d represents a Roman base if not the original text, at any rate with b [apart from a few cases of harmonisation] a base as old as we can get, b sometimes controlling later revision in d. The b d base went to Latin Africa very early, and there was modified to e. Adding the glosses of c, we find this b d c e Latin text reappearing in Greek Egypt in Greek dress in the MS. W with and apart from D.

The hardest thing to explain is that after the fifth chapter of St. Mark, W rather drifts away from both e and Dd, while sometimes retaining sympathy with them.

Here is the overlying Coptic influence to begin with:—
Mark i. 6. + ην, (ante ανοσθών ), 514 (v30) and boh. (Mr. Sanders does not notice this.)

Then note—

i. 20. μετὰ τῶν μισθευτῶν εν τῷ πλοιῷ. New order with syr sin, ἐν τῷ πλοιῷ being added. Note that b omits ἐν τῷ πλοιῷ with syr pesh [mut. sah, but boh agrees with the usual order].

(Mr. Sanders gives four other examples of W with syr sin in the first four chapters.

Next we plunge into the Latin base (e only begins at i. 21*).

i. 25. + καὶ εὐτεύ b c e syr [non boh = λεγών, mut. sah].

* At Mark i. 3 we have the long addition by W in Greek, only known in the Latin of c. Probably c had it also.
26. — τὸ ἀπαρτὸν εἰ.
καὶ απηλθὲν (πρὸ ἐξῆλθεν). No Greeks, but so exactly e and f r.
27. εὐανάμαξον (πρὸ εὐαμβῆσαν). So the Latins, and evidently Greek retranslation. Here e conflates with both.

Ibid. Instead of the usual texts (the Greeks vary), W has τις διδαχὴ τῆς κενῆς αὐτῆς ἡ ἐξουσιαστικὴ αὐτοῦ. Cf. e quænam esset doctrina haec inpotentabilis. W e alone together thus.
31. αὐτῷ (πρὸ αὐτοῖς), e and d [contra Dε].
Ibid. καὶ επιλαβομένος (πρὸ κρατησάς). Retransl. for adprehensā, but here e has tenens.
37. — καὶ εὐροντες αὐτόν b c.
— οτι c e.
38. κηρυσσει (πρὸ κηρὺζω) — ina kakei = b c e praeclare (— ut et ibi).
* 42. — καὶ εκαθερισθη. b c e.
* 43. Om. vers. cum b c (e om. καὶ εμβρ. αὐτῷ εὐθύς).
ii. 1. — δὲ ἡμερῶν. No Latins but Eυ, yet omitted by Eυ. 245 and NINE Greek lectionaries.

So having established the deep and old Latin base above in the first chapter, including very ancient retranslation and reflex action by Latin on Greek, we now see the Greek lectionaries omitting this, which is a pure lectionary omission, and due to nothing else. This not only carries our Greek lectionary use very far back, but shows the lectionaries were Graeco-Latin.†

* Here b c omit with W more than e.
† Observe in Mark i. 27,—τι εστὶν τοῦτο omitted by D, and it (prœter f) is also omitted by W and three Greek lectionaries, not by boh [ḥiṭ sat] nor by others, except aeth syr sin, which here probably replace sat.
Following this in the next verse we have a beautiful illustration of how old our text is, for at
Mark ii. 3. we add ἵδου ἀνδρῶν with Evan 28 2º alone and sah.

Now if this were an omission we could not as safely deduce certain facts. But, being an addition, we see clearly how old a text we have in 28, which I have tried to point out before. So that concurrently with our old Graeco-Coptic-Latin base, and lectionary use, we point to the Graeco-Syriac intertwined with it all. (*Syr* sin is wanting here.)

Note further as regards sah—
Mark v. 40. + εἰδοτες ὀτι ἀπέθανεν (post καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ), fam. 13, and sah only. (*Ex Luc* viii. 53.)

Next consider ii. 3, which is interesting. Instead of καὶ ἐρχονται φερόντες πρὸς αὐτοῦ (οἱ πρὸς αὐτοῦ φερόντες) παραλυτικὸν αἱρομένον ὑπὸ τεσσαρῶν, we have καὶ ἵδου ἀνδρῶν ἐρχονται πρὸς αὐτοῦ μακαριόν ἐν κρεβαττῷ παραλυτικοῖν.

\[ b = \text{et veniunt ad illum ferentes paralyticum in grabatto.} \]
\[ c = \text{Venerunt autem ad eum portantes in lecto paralyticum.} \]
\[ e = \text{et venerunt ad illum portantes in grabatto paralyticum.} \]
\[ f = \text{et venerunt ad eum portantes in grabato paralyticum inter quatuor} \]

(while \(d\) is like the rest: et venerunt ad eum. adferentes paralyticum qui a quattuor portabatur).

Nearest in order to \(W\) are \(e\) and \(c\) (but \(c\) uses lecto); βασταζόντες = clearly portantes of \(c\ e f\) (against \(b\) ferentes), but this word is made to serve for both φερόντες and αἱρομένον ὑπὸ τεσσαρῶν. \(f\) using portantes but once retains alone of the four Latins named inter quatuor (ὑπὸ τεσσαρῶν). We go then with \(c e (b)\) against all else. But we supply ἵδου ἀνδρῶν
with 28 and sah, yet 28 and sah retain the common Greek and Latin longer version of the verse!

All this Mr. Sanders can only hint at in his notes. We must work it out for ourselves.* It shows first that W 28, 2°¢ did not influence the Latin of b e, for where is the ιδου ανδρες? It shows that b e did influence W and chiefly e here.

Mark ii. 3. προσελθείν (προ προσεγγισαι). Cf. accedere
            it, but offerre vg.

            Ibid. ἀπο τον οχλον (προ δια τον οχλον with D (πρει
turba latt).

            8. — εν εαυτοις κ\(\epsilon\) e.

† 11. — σοι λέγω. Ἐνετ 259 (γες) e.

12. θαυμάζειν αυτοὺς (προ εξιστασθαι παντας).
            No Greeks support. Cf. ut admiraren-
tur (— παντας) e; ut adm. turbae c; ut mirantes (— παντας) b.

17. εληλύθει (προ ηλθον). Not e. An old error
            of ηλθεν come back vid. ?

But we must hurry on. The strongest agreement con-
tinues in chapters iii.-iv. between W and e and W and b e. In v. 3 we pick up r₂ poterant with W alone εὐναντο for εὐναντο. But I wish to exhibit one more place in full at iv. 1.‡

Common text

\{ \begin{align*}
\omegaστε \: αυτον \: εις \: \tauο \: \piλοιον \: εμβαντα \\
καθησθαι \: εν \: τη \: \thetaαλασση.
\end{align*}\}

W.

\{ \begin{align*}
\omegaστε \: αυτον \: εις \: το \: \piλοιον \: εμβαντα \\
καθησθαι \: \piαρα \: τον \: \alphaυγιαλον.
\end{align*}\}

* P. 67, Mr. Sanders says : "Does W represent the original Greek from which the N. African translation was made, or is it a retranslation from the N. African Latin or can we find an intermediate explanation?" The explanation seems to be that it is a basic Latin of b e conjoined = Italy and N. Africa, being translated into Greek in Egypt. See iv. 1.

† Mr. Sanders does not chronicle this.

‡ On p. 66 Mr. Sanders exhibits this but partially and the true picture does not appear.
Common text \{ kai pas o ochoi pro tneo xalasean
epi tneo xalasean, \}

W. \{ kai pas o ochoi en tw anigiai nth. \}

This is sheer, clear retranslation from *ad litus* of b e (proxi-
me litus c ff₂, circa litus maris a, super mare q, circa mare d.
and D₄₆ πeπav ths xalaseon); and secondly, *in litore* of b e
e f ff₂ r (circa mare a d l q). And this took place in Greek
Egypt, among Coptic surroundings about A.D. 350, or per-
haps much earlier.

After chapter v. we drift from e and e ceases at vi. 9.
Between chapters vi. and viii. observe—

Mark vi. 13. *exepempot pro exeballo* alone. Translation
of some kind probably influenced by
the Coptic, which has a variety of words
to express *emittere* and *ejicere*.

vi. 29. *kvedvsa pro kai epav*. W and 28 only.

vii. 3. *mutna pro mutna*. W joins S alone of Greek
uncials for this reading. See evidence in
iviii. Here b has *subinde* alone of the
Latins.

6. *agapta (pro tima)*. W with D₄ b c (contra d
honorat). In St. Matthew it is *timan*,
but Clem. Alex., quoting five times,
exhibits *timan* but twice, giving *agapuon*
½ and *philouai* ½.

9. *st theoretai (pro ethepete)*. W with D₄ 1, 28,
2₄ (Cronin) and *itala*.

10. *abeta (pro kakoilogon)*

19. *diap autistic (pro karthian)* \} W alone.

13. *tov logon tne evtolion*. W alone, for *tov*
logon, but *fam 1* substitutes *tolion*.
A curious old conflation of W.
Passing to the eighth chapter, where $k$ is available and $e$ is wanting, notice—

Mark viii. 2.  + autων post ἔχοντων. $D$ and 2nd only (not mentioned by the editor in his selected list of readings).

10. προσ το ορός (pro eis τα μερη) = 28 syr sin (complicated by $N\text{dr} D\text{dr}$), $N$ eis τα ορη, $D$ eis τα ορια.

11. απ' (pro παρ') = copt or lat.

12. ταυτη τη γενεα ((pro τη γεν. ταυτη). Copt order, not lat.

20. — κλασματων. (346) $k$ and 1 boh MS. and Horner's translation, but not his text nor sah (which omits "full" 1 of 4 MSS. only).

23. ευπτυσας (pro πτυσας). Cf. lat.

25. παντα τηλαιγως. syr sin pesh f. [non Goth]. Cf. sah.

34. — autous. $DAX iv$. p.

38. — λογους. $k$ sah and vg.

ix. 6. λαλει. (syr sin).

11. τι ουν (pro οτι). c.

18. ηδυνηθσαν (pro ωσχυσαν). 604 (latt).

24. το πνα (pro o πατηρ). Possible error from copt, or sah rather: πιωτ for Father.


27. — και ανεστη. $k$ and syr pesh (syr sin omits, but substitutes "and he delivered him to his father").

31. λεγει (pro έλεγεν). Cf. $k$ dicens = sah.


x. 8. ουκ (pro ουκετε). Evan 71, Evst 222, $k$ and $d$ (contra D$\text{dr}$) and $ff$, with DL vulgates.
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14. τῶν οὐρανῶν (pro τοὺς θεοὺς). Again from proximity of boh "kingdom" μετουργο- or confusion of sah words for God and Heaven.

26. δύνασται. Cf. k poterit with a b and d (contra D).

32. + αὐτῷ (jam 13). k c f and vulgates G X with sah.

33. — αὐτῷ sec c r₂.

Mark x. 45. λοιπῶν (pro λοιπῶν). Cf. k = prolium (that is: "profluvium" ?) for redemptionem. Absolutely alone of Greeks and Latins.

46. — Βαρτιμαίος. Cf. k, who gives this verse in very condensed form.

49. — αὐτῷ. c k.

xi. 2. — νῦν. N k.

12. εἰς Βηθανίαν. r₂ and boh (6 MSS.) syr pesh (1).


29. ἐπερωτῶ (pro ἐπερωτησώ). Cf. k with a b c f ff₂ i: interrogo and M of vulgates.

Ibid. τινὶ (pro τοια). Clear retransl. [in qua latt; cf. copt].

xii. 3. + καὶ ἀπεκτίναν (post εἰσηραυν). 346 [non 13-69-124]. (Cf. k occiderunt pro ceciderunt.)

6. — εὐτουν 2ον c k.

26. ανεγρωκατε (pro ανεγρώτε). Retransl.

30. — εντολή. 28, 2ον k Eus Mcoll.

31. + ομοιος. Cf. k "secunda similis"; al. "secundum simile vel similem."

33. — τῶν prim. Ex lat.
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34. + οτι (ante ου μακραν). 157, 2ρε = copt.
38. + τας (ante στολαις). Retransl.
44. — παντα σοα ειχεν. Cf. k om. ολον or παντα.

So much for k; now observe other features —

Mark xiii. 8. — γαρ. 246, 247, Εβστ 259, sah, Aug and other Fathers (245 is deeply Latin).

Ibid. — αρχαι ωδινων παντα. c.

12. αναστησονται (pro έπαναστ.). Retransl.
16. τα ματια. 61, 435. Retransl. (syr. 61 indeterminate).

22 + πολλαι. Sah alone (3 out of 5 MSS.
(Again this "overlying" Egyptian influence from error oculi in copying the diglot, probably in third century.)

Mark xiii. 22. πλαναν (pro αποπλαναν). 124 [non 13-69-346], 234,* 299 (which sympathizes elsewhere), while 28 = πλανησαι, and 512 = αποπλανησαι. Thus we trace three Greek lines of transmission. k Cypr = "errorem faciendum" against the others' "seducendos"; and "evertandos," Tert; "seducendum" a c ff₂.

25. —αι sec. Latt.

27. επισωστρεφουσιν (pro επισωναξει) with 28 alone, against all others, and against the parallel in Matthew (επισωναξουσι FLM al decem arm aeth (colligent e, congregabunt Q g₂ for congregabit most and colligit k).
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xiv. 5. — тонто. 8k syr.
6. κοτον. Confused, but cf. k "illic aedium facitis."
10. — ану́и. α c d ff. i k Orig. ΔΧ 28, 91, 299, 2ρε syr sin. Perhaps originally from Lat. commencement of verse 11. "Ad illi." See i d.
14. — και. prim, sah lect. m1 and ff. (Cf. ff. and W in John.)
16. + ετοιμασαι (post εξηλθον). 28, 124, [non 13-69-346], 299 (d) and sah (3 MSS. out of 4).
18. με παραδώσει. Cf. boh [non sah].
22. — ану́и. Ex Latt. Only k; however, suppresses illis, saying "et dum manducant." Cf. syr retaining illi.

Ibid. — εστιν. Syr. (Cf. copt.)
27. σκορ πισθησεται (pro διασκορτ.). Retransl.
41. идон —— και. Matter of order. + τελος Latt: Sah syr, order with lat and pesh (syr sin gives τελος after ορα with q).
47. παρεστωτων. Retransl.
56. — και ... ησαν. 435, 440, 511 (see above with 435 in thirteenth chapter.)
57. — και τινες ... ану́и. 435, 440, 511.
60. — oun apokriny oudev. (Cf. f2 q — oudev), oudev apokriny 28.

Ibid. oti (pro ti). Bex Ψ [non L] (τοι 346), de his k or ad ea some Latt.

61. — o arxierews. c f2.

Ibid. ευλογημενου (pro ευλογητου). 28, 511 and 58, both retranslations, one early and one late. All Latins benedicti.

62. της δυναμεως (pro των νεφελων). Possible copt or sahid confusion or from Greek line above or from Syr.

64. ϕαινεται νυν. Copt; and sah syr order but Δοκει copt for φαινεται, as D 28, Evst 150 δοκει (videtur d).

xv. 1. + autov. copt sah and syrr and Diatess, with 157, 15-69-346-556 [non 124]. This looks basic, but Latt are without it, not even Dex d. (+ autod 511).


Leaf lost between xv. 11-39.

xv. 39. — o sec. } (— o prim. 69*).

παρεστως } Retransl.

41. διηκονουσαν (pro διηκονουν). (28 : διακονησαι autow ministrabant latt, ministrant q. — kai διηκονουν autow 508, Evst 150 sem 222 sem.

46. + ευθεως ηνεγκεν (post συνδονα). Cf. copt syr — ευθεως.
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xvi. 1. εισελθονσαι. (om. ινα ειλθονσαι c d ff.)
5. θεωρουσιν (pro eιδον). Late. Half of a bohairic conflation; see Horner's notes. [mut sah.]
6. τον Ναζ. ζητειτε. c ff2 k syrr.

Ibid. + αυτου εστιν. k syr + illius, c ff2 q + ejus,
+ αυτου D (hiat d).
7. προαγω (pro προαγει). D k (hiat d).
8. + ακουσασαι εξηλθον και syrr sah [non latt]
(pro εξελθουσαι).
15. + αλλα | (following the long addition) + ΔΕ copt.

One word more as to the opening of St. Luke.
Testing at the beginning of St. Luke, we obtain different results, but they are interesting as far as they go.

Luke i. 5. Αβιλ (pro Αβια), perhaps from immediate proximity of εβσλι in copt in line above,
or from εβσλι in sah in line below.
5. αυτη (pro αυτης). 300.
45. και η καρδια (pro και μακαρια) init. vers.
Clearly from sah. Sah ends verse 44 with ΝΖΗΤ or ΖΝ ΖΗΤ, for εν τη κοιλια, as Μευ εν τη καρδια. [Μευ shows relationship to Ev. 28 in Mark.]
68. του λαου, ex lat. genet., but not e.
70. αυτου προφητων. Cf. latt and copt.
77. — του (ante δουναι). All latt have ad dan-
dam including e, but d = dare against "του δουναι." Cf. copt.

ii. 7. — του πρωτοτοκου. This is rather vicious.
Only support Auct de prom.
26. — του. 570 = Lat.; and cf. boh "Christ the Lord," but sah "the Christ of the Lord."

37. + ἡ. Moling gat r with sah and boh. No others. See how with gat υ this proves the Coptic base for this Irish school.

Ibid. νηστίας τε καὶ δεησεσθώς. Cf. copt NEM "with." As at Matt. xxii. 10, πονηρούς τε καὶ αγαθούς the τε καὶ becomes NEM in copt.

49. — μου. syr cu only; not syr sin nor latt nor Greek.

ii. 51. ετηρεῖ (pro διετηρεῖ). 435 (our old friend in Mark). Possibly due to proximity of the word for "all," ΤΗΡΟΤ in copt.

iii. 11. ειπέν (pro λεγεῖ). Latt e goth; elegev BLX fam. 1, fam. 13, 33, 892 latt. c, etc. dicebat. Om. boh.

iv. 4. — μονω. Tertull ½; syr pesh (13) aeth.

5. γῆς (pro οἰκουμενῆς) = terrae W™ and Vigil. του κοσμου D 5 245, f Orig. com. [Copit. sah OIKOTMENH.]

After even this very brief and fragmentary exhibition, I do not think I shall be blamed any more for my tendency to see polyglot influences intruding everywhere. But I hope it will stimulate others to take up W and go through it carefully, not being content with the say-so of any one as to its date or its character.

H. C. Hoskier.
SOME TEXTUAL CONJECTURES IN VERIFIABLE MATERIAL

The layman is apt to imagine that the Classical or Biblical critic exercises the art of textual conjecture in circumstances of pleasing irresponsibility. He can take what liberties he chooses with the text, and there is no one to say him nay. Certainly, he is not likely to be confronted—unless perchance he be a member of the Psychical Research Society—with any absolutely indisputable authority. But the critic himself of course knows only too well that the supposed irresponsibility is illusory. For when he has evolved and elaborated his conjecture, and based it upon argument, and flanked it with analogies, and sent it forth under the escort of a magazine article, or entrenched it in the apparatus of a new edition, then there comes:—

"Cold, edged with dear-bought wisdom,
The judgment of his peers!"

A conjecture which has run the gauntlet of expert criticism, and is finally approved by a consensus of scholarship, acquires, indeed, something not very remote from certainty. Still, it is not to be denied that the discovery of a manuscript, superior in age or pedigree to those previously known, which actually confirmed his conjecture, would give the critic a peculiar thrill of pleasure, and the public, at any rate, a new respect for his skill. Now, a perfectly definite confirmation, so rare in Classical or Biblical matters, is open to any critic who has occasion to exercise the art of conjecture on the works of a living author. It is not often perhaps worth any one's while to seek it. Conjectural emendation is no doubt practised, as the margins of library books bear painful witness, but it is rarely, one fancies, that the critic thinks any confirmation of his superior wisdom
necessary. It so happens, however, that lately, in the course of translating two German books, I have had occasion both to make some conjectures, and to seek confirmation of them. Any interest that belongs to the examples which I am about to give arises from this fact, that they have been put to the test, proved right or wrong. Some of the least certain-seeming were right, some of the most plausible were wrong; that is perhaps not the least instructive feature of the case. There is just one thing more to be said before we come to the examples. As there seems perhaps a certain presumption in assuming the presence of misprints in a scholar’s book, I ought to premise that I knew from the author of one of the books that the final stages of its preparation had taken place under great pressure of other work, and in the case of the other, one or two quite unmistakable printers’ errors—reversal of letters and so forth—showed that the printer, at any rate, was not impeccable. When, therefore, in one of these works, I came on the following statement, I was not prepared to accept it without question as conveying the author’s meaning.

“Reuss lässt die juridischen Gedanken hinter den ethischen ganz zurücktreten; bei Ménégoz kommen die letzteren stärker zur Geltung als die ersteren.”

(Reuss makes the juridical ideas entirely subordinate to the ethical; in Ménégoz the latter are more strongly emphasised than the former.)

Now the statement as it stands is perfectly intelligible. It amounts to this—that the second author’s views coincide in general with those of the first. But if that is the meaning, it is expressed with an extraordinary amount of verbiage; the second part of the sentence is a paraphrase of the first in the style of a penny-a-liner. And our author—such general considerations become of extreme importance in a case of this kind—is a peculiarly trenchant and vigorous
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writer. It is hardly possible that he can have said anything so inept. Moreover the form of the sentence is at variance with its meaning. The semicolon, the paratactic arrangement of the clauses, suggest an antithesis; and the contrast of two directly opposite views would have just the right touch of literary crispness. To restore the antithesis it is only necessary to suppose that ‘former’ and ‘latter’ have changed places—a notoriously easy slip to make. Supposing a study of the facts to show that the antithesis between the two authors' views actually exists, as it does, the case would, I think, be beyond doubt, even in the absence of external verification. The author, as a matter of fact, confirmed.

Our next example, from the other author, is also a case of a “miss-fire” antithesis.

“So ferne man nun nach objektiven Normen und Sicherstellungen gegen die blosse objective Willkür suchte, bot sich als einziges Mittel die Wissenschaft dar.”

(When objective standards and fixed points were sought, to purely objective caprice, science offered itself as the only resource.)

Here “subjective” caprice at once suggests itself as the natural correlative of “objective standards.” Moreover, an “objective caprice” hardly conveys any intelligible meaning. The only thing that gave me pause was that the passage occurred on an early page, of a small book, which had reached a second and revised edition. Was it possible that, if the word was wrong, author and proof-reader could twice have overlooked it? The case was parallel to that where a manuscript bears traces of having been gone through by a diorthotes, and yet where what would seem a very obvious error has been left uncorrected. But if you catch your diorthotes tripping in one simple instance he may do it again, and, as I have said, there were elsewhere in the
book one or two small but quite unmistakable printer's errors. On the whole I thought that, in spite of its having shown such powers of survival, there was very little doubt that "objective" was out of place in its environment; and so it turned out to be on application to the author.

The next instance is of a different character, and the main interest lies in the method of provisional verification adopted. Referring to the cult of Serapis, the author says:

"Seine Anhänger fanden sich hauptsächlich unter Sklaven und Freigeborenen."

(Its adherents were found chiefly among (the) slaves and free-born.) At first sight one is inclined to say that "slaves and free-born" includes the whole population, and that the remark is, therefore, as it stands, quite pointless. This has to be modified to the extent that there was at Rome a third class, that of the freedmen; but that does not make the text any easier, for it is hardly conceivable that this particular form of expression has been deliberately adopted in order to exclude that class. In fact what we expect is precisely "slaves and freedmen"—these were the classes which in such a connexion would be likely to be associated. There was still a possibility, however, which had to be considered before the text was definitely rejected. 'Freigeborene' might conceivably be used in a special technical sense—the sons of freedmen, born after their fathers' enfranchisement. But (1) I could find no trace of such a usage, and (2) it would be very strange that this class should be associated with the slaves, while the intervening class of freedmen was omitted. These probabilities being excluded, we naturally conjecture "freigelassene," freedmen; and it would not be difficult for a printer to make a carelessly written "freigelassene" into the more familiar "freigeboren." But we feel, I think, the need of some further confirmation. Fortunately this was procurable. From certain indications
in the context it appeared probable that the author, who does not pretend to write on these matters from first-hand research, was here following Cumont's *Les Religions Orientales dans le Paganisme Romain*. I turned up the passage about the cult of Serapis in Cumont, and sure enough, I found the statement that its adepts were chiefly to be found among the "foule mêlée d’esclaves et d’affranchis (freedmen)." I said a moment ago that the finding of this confirmation was fortunate; for it happened that in answering my queries the author overlooked this one, and his letter arrived too late to admit of further correspondence. But I felt no conscientious scruples about inserting freedmen in the translation.

We come now to a pair of closely parallel instances, one from each of our two authors.

In each case there is, between text and conjecture, the mere difference of a letter. In each case the text gave quite a good sense, but had some slight "uncomfortableness" about it, while the change seemed, to the present writer at least, a distinct improvement. In the one case, however, the conjecture was right, in the other wrong. Let us take the latter first.

Speaking of St. Paul's relation to the Jewish Hellenistic theology, the author says: "Ihre Probleme, ihre Spekulationen über Logos, Geist und Weisheit, ihre Ethik, interessieren ihn nicht, ihre Lösungen benutzt er nicht."

(Its problems, its speculations regarding Logos, Spirit, Wisdom, its Ethic, do not interest him, its solutions are not used by him.)

It certainly seems a little odd to introduce "solutions" absolutely, like this; one expects a nearer connexion with problems or difficulties. Moreover the statement is logically otiose; if "its problems and speculations" do not interest him, it is hardly likely that he would have any
use for its solutions, for his own problems must have been different.

Now there is another word differing from Lösungen only by what is typographically less than a letter—a mere modification—which would have given a very natural sense here. That is "Losungen," "watchwords," which is freely used by German writers in the metaphorical sense of party cries or catch-words. "Its catch-words were not used by him"—one sees that it would go admirably. Nevertheless this plausible conjecture was wrong. Lösungen, not Losungen was what the author wrote.

Now for our parallel case. This is the passage: "Für den Protestantismus selber aber in allen seinen Lagen ist die ethische Stellung zu den durch Kapitalismus geschaffenen Verhältnissen ein schweres Problem geworden." (For Protestantism itself in all its situations, its ethical attitude towards the conditions created by Capitalism has become a difficult problem.)

Now Lagen (positions, situations) strikes one as a little strange. Still, if you take it in the slightly generalised sense of "local circumstances." "environments," it seems quite possible. On the other hand a distinctly more natural meaning would be given by the insertion of one letter—"in allen seinen Lagern," in all its camps, i.e. sections, parties.

This metaphorical use of Lager being very common, it seemed to me distinctly probable here, so I ventured—though rather tentatively, after my experience with Lösungen—to suggest it, and it turned out to be right. I do not feel competent to draw any lesson—except the general one of caution—from a comparison of these two conjectures and their differing fate. One seems to me a priori as justifiable as the other.

Our last pair of instances is again closely parallel. In both cases the text is difficult—in one paradoxical. In both
cases an easy emendation suggests itself. In neither case is the emendation correct, the difficulty really arising from the fact that the meaning is not quite clearly expressed. Here is the first passage.


(In view of the way in which they understood the Law of Nature (Lex Naturae), they could also regard this Criminal Law as issuing from the Law of Nature, and support it by the Biblical Old Testament examples of the Law of Nature, which is indeed itself (or, also) witnessed to in the Old Testament).

Apart from its context, the whole sentence is rather obscure, and it should perhaps be explained that “Law of Nature”—the reference to jurisprudence is unambiguous in the German—means “the order which, under the Divine providence, issues from reason and the natural course of things.” The appointments of Saul and of David to the kingship were regarded, the author explains later on, as examples of the working of this “Law of Nature.” The present passage means, generally, that punitive justice was regarded as a department of this Law of Nature, and therefore shared the support which Scripture gives to the latter. From the textual point of view what attracts attention is the curious repetition of “Old Testament.” When, in conjunction with this, we take the fact that the words “ja auch,” which the repetition of “Old Testament” forces us to refer to the subject of the clause, would more naturally belong to the predicate, with the meaning “which is indeed also testified to in (something else than the Old Testament), it becomes very tempting to conjecture “which is indeed
also testified to in the New Testament." This would be quite in accordance with the facts; cf. Rom. xiii. 1 f., "The powers that are ordained of God," etc. And yet the conjecture is not correct. The author, with a fine modesty reminiscent of Dr. Johnson's famous answer when challenged about a mistake in his Dictionary, replied to my query, "This is not a Druckfehler (printer's error) but a Stilfehler (fault of style)," and requested me to omit, in translating, the first "Old Testament."

We come now to our final and, I think, most curious example.

"Die Apostelgeschichte . . . weiss nichts von einer Schriftstellerei des Paulus. Sie berichtet auch nichts von den Kämpfen die durch diese Briefe, wenn man ihrem Selbstzeugnis glauben will, hervorgerufen sein sollen."

(The Book of Acts knows nothing of any literary activity on the part of Paul. Nor does it tell us anything of the struggles which were called forth by these letters, if we are to believe their own evidence.)

Here it is internal probability of a general character which is against the text. I am inclined to think that nine out of ten New Testament scholars, reading the above sentence in a translation, would come to the conclusion that some one—probably the translator—had blundered. For, of course the prevailing impression is that it was the struggles which called forth the letters and not vice versa. Think of 1 Corinthians for example. Is it not quite evident that the controversy between the Paul, Apollos, and "Christ" parties was fully alight when Paul wrote? And is not Galatians avowedly written to oppose an attack of the Judaisers?

This being so, what are the textual probabilities of slip or misprint? Is there any simple alteration which would change the meaning? It is at once obvious that there is.
We have only to reverse the words "die durch" into "durch
die" to get the meaning "the struggles by which these
letters, if we are to believe their own evidence, were called
forth." On internal grounds there is, it must be said, just
one objection to the alteration. Grammatically it is un-
exceptionable, but stylistically it is not quite satisfactory;
I believe I am right in saying that cultured Germans give
themselves some trouble to avoid "tautophonies" such as
"durch die diese." Still, even with a careful writer an
accidental awkwardness will occasionally slip through. On
the whole it was with a good deal of confidence that I sub-
mitted the passage to the author as probably in some way
unsound. Nevertheless the text was correct. I was about
to say, the text represents the author's meaning, but that
would not be strictly accurate. In confirming the text, he
wrote me that, according to his view, in the case, for instance,
of the Galatian troubles, it was the letter which "die Kontro-
verse erst recht entfacht hat" (which first set the controversy
fully ablaze). This is no doubt an intelligible view, but
it is not quite what the text says, for "hervorgerufen"
points, just as definitely as the English "called forth,"
and the actual beginning of the matter, whereas the "erst
recht" is a distinct admission that the controversy was
already smouldering.

It would, of course, be absurd to generalise from a pair
of instances. They may, however, perhaps serve as a text
for a general reflection which has been borne in upon my
mind from various quarters. I shall express it tentatively,
thus: Are we not, in all historical criticism, too prone to
rest content with the assumption that the logical thing is
right? As a "methodological assumption" it is no doubt
justified; but one feels that we ought to keep in the back-
ground of our minds a more vivid sense of that subtilitas
naturae which so frequently evades formulated laws. And,
to close with a more particular application, it is probable that the writers of antiquity, like those of modern times, did not always express their meaning with the strictest possible accuracy.

W. Montgomery

LOVE THAT COVERS SINS

We read in i Peter iv. 8, that "Love covereth a multitude of sins." The source whence these words are taken is Prov. x. 12, "Hatred stirreth up strifes, but love covereth all transgressions." The expression "cover a multitude of sins" occurs again as the closing words of the Epistle of James (v. 20), "He which converteth a sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall cover a multitude of sins."

The form in which Peter and James present the saying differs slightly from the original Hebrew and still more markedly from the LXX; and this suggests that we have here not a conscious quotation from the Book of Proverbs, but a saying in common use taken from an independent Greek translation of a text differing slightly from that of the Masora.

We need not spend time in refuting a common misunderstanding of the A.V. rendering in Peter,—"charity shall cover the multitude of sins"—as though it meant that amiability compensates for a great many moral shortcomings; though it is fair to say that the future tense "shall cover" for "covereth," read in the Received Text, which comes from James, rather favours this false exegesis.

Again, it is sufficient to mention, without elaborate refutation, a wrong turn that has been given to the passage just cited from James, "He which converteth a sinner from
the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall cover a multitude of sins." This has been thought by some to mean that the merit gained by the conversion of a sinner will, in the Day of Judgment, outweigh the discredit due for a multitude of sins committed by the converter. We are not now concerned immediately with the passage in James; but a brief consideration of the expression "to cover sins," as there used, will help us to a right understanding of the saying in Peter, "Love covereth a multitude of sins."

The commonest Hebrew word for "to atone for" sin, or "pacify," "or propitiate," means literally "to cover over," kipper (hence kopher, a ransom; kapporeth, propitiatory, mercy seat). The following passages illustrate this use of the verb:—Nehemiah (iv. 5) prays against the enemies of Israel, "Cover not their iniquity, and let not their sin be blotted out from before thee"; the Psalmist says, "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered" (Ps. xxxii. 1); and again, "Thou hast forgiven the iniquity of thy people, thou hast covered all their sin" (Ps. lxxxv. 2). And there are many places in which man is said to "cover over" the sins of others by providing an atonement for them; though the English versions naturally avoid in these cases a literal translation of the Hebrew term. We have, then, in James, the consequence of the conversion of a sinner presented in two aspects, the particular and the general: the soul of the individual sinner is saved, and there is at the same time a demonstration of the working in the moral sphere, through the agency of the converter, of that power which covers over a multitude of sins; and that power is love.

I suggest that we should interpret these passages of the New Testament, especially the text from Peter, in the light of what we know about the operation of love, God's cosmic moral force, which works with most intense power in the
Church of Christ, and which God now uses to check the growth of sin, and which will finally eliminate evil altogether from the universe. It is always best to take large views, to look at things in relation to the whole of which they are a part; and it is allowable, as it is certainly practically helpful, to think of the "multitude of sins," of which the apostles James and Peter speak, not as the sins of any particular person or persons, but as the volume or mass of sin in general, "the sin of the world" which "the Lamb of God taketh away."

But we must, of course, take note in the first place of the working of the force of love in detail. "Love," says the apostle Paul (1 Cor. xiii. 5), "taketh not account of evil." That is to say, a man who puts himself under the control of the love of God acts, when a private personal injury has been done to him, as though nothing had occurred. In this way, by simply ignoring the unkind act or the insulting word, he does not merely conceal from view something that is there all the time, as we put a screen or curtain to hide what we do not wish seen, but he brings the evil thing to an end; it dies and leaves no seed. "Hatred," as the Wise Man says, "stirreth up strifes"; because hatred is like one of those germs familiar to pathologists, which, in a favourable environment, propagate themselves a million-fold in an incredibly short space of time. "Love covereth transgressions," not so much by the act of ignoring them, as by the result of ignoring them, the consequent cutting away from the transgression all that would nourish it, and enable it to live, and be fruitful and multiply; love makes an end of transgression much in the same way as sunshine destroys the germs of disease. Thus evil is overcome by good. The class of sin which is most obviously overcome by love is peculiarly of the self-propagating kind. I may quote in this connexion a suggestive passage from Bishop Butler's sermon
on the Forgiveness of Injuries: "Malice or resentment towards any man hath plainly a tendency to beget the same passion in him who is the object of it; and this again increases it in the other. It is of the very nature of this vice to propagate itself, not only by way of example, which it does in common with other vices, but in a particular way of its own; for resentment itself, as well as what is done in consequence of it, is the object of resentment; hence it comes to pass, that the first offence, even when so slight as presently to be dropped and forgotten, becomes the occasion of entering into a long intercourse of ill offices." He concludes: "Put the case then, that the law of retaliation was universally received, and allowed, as an innocent rule of life, by all... there is no going on to represent this scene of rage and madness; it is manifest there would be no bounds, nor any end."

We can now see that St. James, in the closing words of his epistle, holds out as an incentive to efforts for the conversion of a sinner, that the man who succeeds in effecting this not only saves alive the soul of another, but he also helps forward the accomplishment of the great cosmic purpose of God, by diminishing, ever so little, the sum total of evil. Nay, the experience of the Christian centuries assures us that the conversion of a sinner transmutes, by a divine alchemy, that which is evil, and a source of evil, into a source of good. John Newton, the slave-dealer, becomes John Newton, the evangelist and hymn writer.

The context in Peter is even more plainly favourable to the large, and almost cosmic, reference of the saying which I am seeking to establish. The apostle is urging upon the Christian society the duty of self-preparation—the preparation of the Church by itself—for the Second Coming of Christ:—"But the end of all things is at hand; be ye therefore of sound mind, and be sober unto prayer; above
all things being fervent in your love among yourselves; for love covereth a multitude of sins; using hospitality one to another without murmuring; according as each hath received a gift, ministering it among yourselves." The notion of mutual help is here very emphatically reiterated:—"among yourselves . . . one to another . . . among yourselves." The love here spoken of, like the exercise of hospitality and the generous use of spiritual gifts, affects the common life of the church, her self-education, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, for the fuller life in Christ which will be hers. And so, "the common salvation," as St. Jude terms it, is worked out not merely by the salvation of souls one by one, but by each Christian taking his part, co-operating with Christ in His age-long purpose of "presenting the church to Himself a glorious church, not having a spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but . . . holy and without blemish."

And when we look back over the past, even that short stretch of the past which we can see with any distinctness, we find solid grounds for our belief that the apostle was no vain dreamer when he projected the golden age into a future, distant indeed, but certainly coming. "The vision is yet for the appointed time . . . "though it tarry, wait for it." Pessimism is due to forgetfulness of the past, and it is nourished by a disregard of the past. For when we compare the present with what we know of the past, we must perceive that progress has been made.

Christianity is essentially an optimistic religion; it does not deny the reality of evil, or seek to explain it away; but it does claim to possess in the fullest degree a power, a force, an influence which is a solvent of evil, and which will one day cause evil and sin to cease; and that force is love.

We may state the Christian theory of the relation of love to sin briefly thus:—Sin is a by-product of that free-will
which is an essential quality of human nature; the abuse of free-will brought disorder into the moral order which is God's ideal; "sin is lawlessness" (1 John iii. 4). On the other hand, the divine remedy to restore order, and make disorder cease, is love; "love is the fulfilment of law" (R.V. m.); love, that is, which, in the nature of man, is the emotional personal expression of harmony as opposed to discord. What order is in the world of physical nature that love is in the moral world of human society; a force ever-prevailing in spite of set-backs, increasingly dominant notwithstanding defeats here and there, the only effectual solvent of evil; and in the application of this force to human needs man works with God and God works with man.

This consideration gives dignity and worth inestimable to the feeble efforts of the most insignificant of us to make love the controlling principle in our daily lives. We measure the worth and importance of human actions, not by what the eye sees and the ear hears, but by the worth and importance of the whole transaction in which the men and women are taking part. The eye sees a man writing: it may be a tourist writing his name in a visitors' book, or it may be King John signing the Great Charter of English liberty; the ear hears a man speaking: it may be the empty conventionalities of polite conversation, or it may be the Sermon on the Mount. Is it not stimulating to know that when we "check the hasty word" and "give gentle answers back again," we are not only making peace in our own narrow environment, but we are working out with God the accomplishment of His beneficent plans for the whole creation. The love of God is the supreme example of that love which covereth a multitude of sins; for "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses" (1 Cor. v. 18).

"Our God is marching on... He has sounded forth the
trumpet that shall never call retreat.” But “His banner over us is love.”

It is as in some great funeral march. The notes that tell of hope and triumph are low at first, almost overpowered by sounds of loss and everlasting farewells; yet as the music goes on, we hear joy and victory growing on the ear, ever more and more predominant, until at last sorrow and sighing quite pass away in one triumphal crash of sound.

Even so they to whom “the love of God” and “the love of Christ” are not the empty phrases of an outworn speculative system, but living and active realities, they hear the persistent melody of that love through the confused noise of bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour and railing, and malice; and they go quietly on, in sure and certain hope that these things will pass out of being when God Who is love shall be all in all.

Newport J. D. White.
II.

"THE RIDDLE OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS."

Professor John Dickie, of Dunedin, in the April number of this Magazine raises afresh the "literary riddle of the Epistle to the Hebrews," and invites comments upon his suggestions. May I be allowed to state my large measure of agreement with his conception of the character of the Epistle and its readers, and try to carry the matter a little farther towards a more probable identification of the exact locality of those readers, the authorship of the letter, and its date? I can do this the more briefly that Professor Dickie, and any whom it may concern, can find a fuller exposition of these points elsewhere in print.  

I accept, then, in the main his statement as to the spiritual condition of the readers, "Hebrews" or Jewish Christians, whose immediate danger was drifting "away from all vital religion" (though I believe the writer saw present also the danger of apostasy from Christianity in any distinctive sense); also the view that they formed a "house-church" amid a larger local Christian community (cf. xiii. 24, "Salute all them that have the rule over you, and all the saints"); and that they were a homogeneous group as regards superior social status and that idealistic culture which is known as "Alexandrine" Judaism. But I do not think it probable that they are to be sought in Rome. The Epistle's early use by Clement of Rome does not prove this any more than do the words "they of Italy salute you." This clause may equally well, to say the least, point to the

1 In the article "Hebrews, Epistle to," in the last edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica.
writer's presence in Italy at the time of writing, as I believe to have been the case.

Our best clue seems to be the reference to Timothy (xiii. 23) as having just been set at liberty, and as possibly soon to join the writer himself; in which case he hopes that Timothy will accompany him when he comes, with as little delay as circumstances allow, to advise his readers in person in the critical situation which had suddenly arisen. Now where was Timothy most likely to go after release from imprisonment, in Italy as it seems? Where but to Ephesus? And where, more than in Ephesus, should we be prepared for the exact state of affairs presupposed in the Epistle? When we put it into the background which Acts xix. suggests, it seems to take on new life and actuality. Not only do we find there traces of a non-Pauline type of Jewish Christians, knowing originally only John the Baptist's baptism, like Apollos in the section immediately preceding; but we may infer also from Paul's having to "separate the disciples" from all connexion with the synagogue (xix. 9), owing to the strength of Jewish feeling which he encountered, that there probably continued to exist a rather conservative type of Jewish Christians in Ephesus, such as Apollos had appealed to on his first coming thither (xviii. 25). When Apollos returned from his mission to Corinth, would he not be likely to give his special attention to such, in view of his distinctive gifts? Accordingly, we may well imagine that there was at Ephesus a sort of Apollos group, analogous to the "party" that gloried in him at Corinth, though it continued in communion with the Pauline group in the one local Christian Community, under its one set of "elders" (Acts xx. 17) or "leaders" (Heb. xiii. 7, 24). Yet Paul's address to these elders at Miletus suggests that he saw special dangers ahead (xx. 29 ff.), possibly mainly owing to the persistence of a strongly Judaic type of local
piety. This is what 1 Timothy i. 5 ff. (cf. Titus i. 14 f.) seems to me also to imply. Thus a recrudescence of Judaic tendencies, owing to a faith that was not spiritually vital and morally progressive, would be very likely to occur in some such Ephesian "house-church," especially under the stress of the growing trials and dangers incident to the success of the Jewish attack upon Christianity in the person of Paul in 62 A.D., the very date when it had been able to break out into lawless violence against James and others in Jerusalem itself.

Now this is just the epoch to which the reference to Timothy in Heb. xiii. 23 points, if we infer, as is most natural, that he had become involved in Paul's case on coming to Rome in obedience to 2 Timothy iv. 9. Perhaps "Alexander the coppersmith" (2 Tim. iv. 14 f.), probably the same as the Ephesian Jew of that name (Acts xix. 33 f.), had achieved this, but had been unable to secure the death of a relatively minor "troubler of the peace" in Roman eyes. If this be so, we should date the Epistle (which no doubt works up the substance of many a spoken address on such themes) c. 62, a date which would allow it or its author to influence 1 Peter (e.g. i. 2, "sprinkling of the blood of Christ"), if that be considered probable. Thus, the persecution of some sort implied as having begun before Heb. xiii. 2 was penned, may well be part of the same reflex action of the Jewish successes against leading Christians first referred to, as appears at a somewhat later stage (c. 63–64) in 1 Peter (e.g., i. 6, iv. 1, 12 ff.).

If this line of suggestion be in substance correct, a most probable authorship will already have suggested itself to our minds. If Apollos worked specially among the Jewish Christian wing of the Ephesian Church, who so likely as he to write to a "house-church" of this type in Ephesus, promising to bring with him Timothy, should he reach his side in time
to start from the place in Italy where the writer himself expected to set out, say Brindisi? But is there any trace of Apollos ever having been in Italy? There is, unless a most self-authenticating personal notice in Titus iii. 13 be set aside. If, then, Apollos had been once with Paul in Rome, why should he not have returned after carrying out the mission with which he was no doubt intrusted by the Apostle? Thus we have a situation, soon after Paul’s martyrdom c. 62 A.D., which seems in all respects to clear up the “literary riddle” of this great epistle. I have responded to Professor Dickie’s invitation to continue the discussion he has so usefully opened; and shall be glad if he will return to it with any further comments he has to offer. Vernon Bartlet
THE FORMS OF HEBREW POETRY.

II. PARALLELISM: A RE-STATEMENT.

The literature of the Old Testament is divided into two classes by the presence or absence of what since Lowth has been known as parallelismus membrorum, or parallelism. The occurrence of parallelism characterises the books of Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes (in part), Lamentations, Canticles, the larger part of the prophetical books, and certain songs and snatches that are cited and a few other passages that occur in the historical books. Absence of parallelism characterises the remainder of the Old Testament, i.e. the Pentateuch and the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings and Chronicles (with slight exceptions in all these books as just indicated), Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Ruth, and part of the prophetical books, including most of Ezekiel, the biographical parts of Jeremiah, Jonah (except the Psalm) and some other passages. It had become customary to distinguish these two divisions of Hebrew literature as poetry and prose respectively: parallelism had come to be regarded as a mark of poetry, its absence as a mark of prose; and by the application of the same test the non-canonical literature of the Jews from the second century B.C. to the second century A.D. was likewise coming to be distinguished into its prose and poetical elements.

The validity of parallelism as a test to distinguish between prose and poetry in Hebrew literature might be, and has been, either actually or virtually challenged on two grounds: (1) that parallelism actually occurs in prose; and (2) that parts of the Old Testament from which parallelism is absent are metrical and, therefore, poetical in form.

Parallelism is not a feature peculiar to Hebrew litera-
ture: it is characteristic of parts of Babylonian literature, such as the epics of Creation (the Enuma elīš and others),

Nor even to Semitic literature. Many interesting illustrations from folk-songs and English literature are given by Dr. G. A. Smith in The Early Poetry of Israel, pp. 14–16. Yet in most of these there is more simple repetition without variation of terms than is common in Hebrew, and an even more conspicuous difference is the much less sustained use of parallelism. In view of the great influence of the Old Testament on English literature and the ease with which parallelism can be used in any language (cp. p. 440 above), it is rather surprising that parallelism, and even sustained parallelism, is not more conspicuous in English. But abundant illustrations of this sustained use may be found in the Finnish Epic, The Kalevala, if Mr. Crawford’s translation keeps in this respect at all close to the original, with which I have no acquaintance. Even here there are differences, as for example in the absence of the tendency, so marked in Hebrew, for parallelism to produce distichs. I cite a sufficiently long passage to illustrate what is a frequent, though not a constant, characteristic of the style of The Kalevala:

Listen, bride, to what I tell thee:
In thy home thou wert a jewel,
Wert thy father’s pride and pleasure.
“Moonlight,” did thy father call thee,
And thy mother called thee “Sunshine,”
“Sea-foam” did thy brother call thee,
And thy sister called thee “Flower.”
When thou leavest home and kindred,
Goest to a second mother,
Often she will give thee censure,
Never treat thee as her daughter,
Rarely will she give thee counsel,
Never will she sound thy praises.
“Brush-wood,” will the father call thee,
“Sledge of Rags,” thy husband’s brother,
“Flight of Stairs,” thy stranger brother,
“Scare-crow,” will the sister call thee,
Sister of thy blacksmith husband;
Then wilt think of my good counsels,
Then wilt wish in tears and murmurs,
That as steam thou hadst ascended,
That as smoke thy soul had risen,
That as sparks thy life had vanished.
As a bird thou canst not wander
From thy nest to circle homeward,
Canst not fall and die like leaflets,
As the sparks thou canst not perish,
Like the smoke thou canst not vanish.

J. M. Crawford, The Kalevala, i. 341, 2.
the Gilgamesh epic and the hymns to the gods. It is as apparent in translations from Babylonian as in the English versions of the Psalms or the prophets; as examples from Babylonian literature it may suffice to cite the well-known opening lines of Enuma elīš 2—

When above the heaven was not named,  
And beneath the earth bore no name,  
And the primeval Apsu, the begetter of them,  
And Mumma and Tiāmat, the mother of them all—

And these lines from a hymn to the god Sin. 3

When Thy word in heaven is proclaimed, the Igigi prostrate themselves;  
When Thy word on earth is proclaimed, the Anunaki kiss the ground.  
When Thy word on high travels like a storm-wind, food and drink abound;  
When Thy word on earth settles down, vegetation springs up.  
Thy word makes fat stall and stable, and multiplies living creatures;  
Thy word causes truth and righteousness to arise, that men may speak the truth.

Whether these passages are prose or poetry, and whether if poetry they are such primarily because of the presence of parallelism, turns on the same considerations as the corresponding questions with reference to parallelistic passages in Hebrew: and further discussion of these must be postponed.

But parallelism is characteristic not only of much in Babylonian and Hebrew literature: it is characteristic also of much in Arabic literature. And the use of parallelism in Arabic literature is such as so give some, at least apparent, justification to the claim that parallelism is no true differentia between prose and poetry; for parallel-

---

1 A convenient collection of all of these (transliterated text and translation) will be found in R. W. Rogers, Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament.

2 Cp. Rogers, pp. 3 ff.

3 Cp. Rogers, pp. 144, 145.
ism in Arabic accompanies prose—prose, it is true, of a particular kind, but at all events not poetry, according to the general opinion of Arabic grammarians and prosodists. Not only is parallelism present in much Arabic prose: it is commonly absent from Arabic poetry, i.e. from the rhymed and carefully regulated metrical poetry of the Arabs. In illustration of this, two passages may be cited from the Makāmāt of Ḥarīrī. The translations here given are based on Chenery’s but I have modified them here and there in order to bring out more clearly the regularity of the parallelism in the original: for the same reason I give the translation with line divisions corresponding to the parallel members. The first passage, which consists of part of the opening address of Abu Zayd in the first Makāmāh, is from the prose fabric of Ḥarīrī’s work; the second is one of the many metrical poems which are wrought into the prose fabric. The parallelism of the prose passage, as of innumerable other passages which might equally well have served as examples, is as regular and as sustained as that of any passage in Hebrew or Babylonian literature, and indeed in some respects it is even more monotonously regular: it is complex too, for at times there is a double parallelism—a parallelism between the longer periods, the lines of the translation, and also between the parts of each of these (the half lines of the translation). This prose passage is as follows:

O-thou-reckless in petulance, trailing the garment of vanity!
O-thou-headstrong in follies, turning-aside to idle-tales!

1 T. Chenery, The Assemblies of Al Ḥarīrī, i. 109 f. and 192.
2 In order that parallelism may be better studied I have hyphenated together word groups in English that correspond to a single word (combined in some cases with inseparable particles) in Arabic. But I have generally omitted to hyphen the article, “of” (before a genitive), pronouns and the copulative particle (“and”), though these do not form separate words in Arabic.
How long wilt-thou-persevere in thine error, and eat-sweetly-of the pasture of thy wrong?
And how far wilt-thou-be-extreme in thy pride, and not abstain from thy wantonness?
Thou provokest by-thy-rebellion the Master of thy forelock;
And thou goest-boldly in-the-foulness of thy behaviour against the knower of thy secret;
And thou hidest-thyself from thy neighbour, but thou-art in sight of thy watcher;
And thou concealest-thyself from thy slave, but nothing is-concealed from thy Ruler.

Thinkest thou that thy state will-profit-thee when thy departure draweth-near?
Or-that thy wealth will-deliver-thee, when thy deeds destroy-thee?
Or-that thy repentance will-suffice for thee when thy foot slippeth?
Or-that thy kindred will-lean to thee in-the-day-that thy judgment-place gathereth-thee?
How-is-it thou-hast-walked not in-the-high-road of thy guidance, and hastened the treatment of thy disease?
And blunted the edge of thine iniquity, and restrained thyself —thy worst enemy.
Is-not death thy doom? What-then-is thy preparation?
And is-not-grey-hair thy warning? What-then-is thy excuse?
And is-not-in the grave's-niche thy sleeping-place? What-then-is thy speech?
And is-not-to God thy going? Who-then-is thy defender?

Oft the time hath-awakened-thee, but-thou-hast-set-thyself-to-slumber:
And admonition hath-drawn-thee, but-thou-hast-strained-against-it;
And warnings have-been-manifested to thee, but-thou-hast-made-thyself-blind;
And truth hath-been-established to thee, but-thou-hast-disputed-it;
And death hath-bid-thee-remember, but-thou-hast-sought-to-forget.
And it-hath-been-in-thy-power to impart, and thou-imparted'st not.

The poem I select as an example is translated by Chenery as follows:—

1 Say to him who riddles questions that I am the discloser of the secret which he hides.
Know that the deceased, in whose case the law preferred the brother of his spouse to the son of his father,
Was a man who, of his free consent, gave his son in marriage to his own mother-in-law: nothing strange in it.

Then the son died, but she was already pregnant by him, and gave birth to a son like him:
And he was the son's son without dispute, and brother of the grandfather's spouse without equivocation.

6 But the son of the true-born son is nearer to the grandfather, and takes precedence in the inheritance over the brother;
And therefore when he died, the eighth of the inheritance was adjudged to the wife for her to take possession;
And the grandson, who was really her brother by her mother, took the rest;
And the full brother was left out of the inheritance, and we say thou hast only to bewail him.

This is my decision which every judge who judges will pattern by, every lawyer.

Nothing could be more prosaic than this last passage: and the only approximation in it to parallelism is line 5; nevertheless it is, so far as form goes, a perfect poem in the original: the rhymes are correct, and the well-known metrical form called *khatif* is maintained throughout.

So far, then, as Arabic literature is concerned, it is an unquestionable fact that sustained and regular parallelism is a frequent characteristic of prose, while the absence of parallelism is frequently characteristic of metrical poems. And yet this is not of course the whole truth even in regard to Arabic literature. Most literatures consist of poetry and prose: and what in them is not poetical in form is prose, and *vice versa*. But in Arabic there are three forms of composition: (1) *nathr*; (a) *nazm*, or *šīr*; (3) *sağ*. The usual English equivalents for these three Arabic terms are (1) prose, (2) poetry, (3) rhymed prose; but "rhymed prose" is not, of course, a translation of *sağ*: that word signifies primarily a cooing noise such as is made by a pigeon; and its transferred use of a form of literary composition does not, as the English equivalent suggests, represent this form as a subdivision of prose. We should perhaps do more justice to some Arabic discussions or descrip-
tions of saj by terming it in English "unmetrical poetry"; ¹ and in some respects this "rhymed prose" or "unmetrical poetry" is more sharply marked off from ordinary prose than from the metrical poetry between which and itself the simplest form of metrical verse, termed rejez,² may be regarded as a transitional style.

To the Arabic saj, as rhymed prose, Hebrew literature has certainly little or nothing analogous to show; to saj as unmetrical poetry possibly, and certainly in the opinion of some writers, much. Certainly, if we disregard the rhyme, such passages as that cited above from Hariri have, in respect of parallelism of terms and the structure of the corresponding clauses, much that is similar alike in Hebrew Psalms and Hebrew prophecy. And to some of these we may return.

At this point I raise this question with reference to Hebrew, and a similar question might be raised with reference to Babylonian literature: ought we to recognise three forms of composition as in Arabic, or two only as in most literatures? Since rhyme is so conspicuous in Arabic, and so inconspicuous in Hebrew, this may at first seem a singularly ill-considered question: and yet it is not; for however prominent rhyme may be in Arabic poetry, it is perfectly possible to think the rhyme away without affecting the essential form of Arabic poetry, or of the Hebrew mediæval poetry that was modelled on it. It would have

¹ "The oldest form of poetical speech was the saj'. Even after this stage of poetical form had long been surpassed and the metrical schemes had already been fully developed, the saj' ranked as a kind of poetical expression. Otherwise his opponents would certainly never have called Mohammed ṣā'ir (poet), for he never recited metrical poems, but only spoke sentences of saj'. In a saying attributed to Mohammed in the Tradition, too, it is said: 'This poetry is saj'."—Goldziher, Abhandlungen zur arabischen Philologie, p. 59.

² "Fundamentally rejez is nothing but rhythmically disciplined saj.'" "Many Arabic prosodists do not admit that rejez possesses the character of ṣā'ir."—Goldziher, ib., pp. 76, 78.
been as easy for an Arabic poet, had he wished it, as it was for Milton, to dispense with rhyme: his poetry would have remained sufficiently distinguished from prose by its rigid obedience to metrical laws. So, again, it is possible to think away rhyme from the rhymed prose without reducing that form of composition to plain prose; the parallelism, and a certain balance of the clauses, would still remain; and as a matter of fact much early parallelistic composition existed from which regular rhyme was absent.¹

Had then the ancient Hebrew three forms of composition—metrical poetry and plain prose, and an intermediate type differing from poetry by the absence of metre, and from prose by obedience to certain laws governing the mutual relations between its clauses—a type for which we might as makeshifts employ the terms unmetrical poetry or parallelistic prose?

I am not going to answer that question immediately, nor, perhaps, at all directly. But it seems to me to be one of those worth formulating, even if no certain answer to them can be obtained. They help to keep possibilities before us: and, perhaps, they may help also to prevent a fruitless conflict over terms. In the present instance it is not of the first importance to determine whether it is an abuse of language to apply the term poetry to any part of Hebrew literature that does not follow well-defined metrical laws simply on the ground that it is marked by parallelism; what is of importance is to determine if possible whether any parts of the Old Testament are in the strictest sense of the term metrical, and, alike whether that can be determined or not, to recognise the real distinction between

¹ Goldziher (op. cit., pp. 62 ff.) argues that rhyme first began to be employed in the formal public discourses or sermons (khutba) from the third century of the Hejira onwards. "The rhetorical character of such discourses in old time was concerned only with the parallelism of which use was made" (p. 64).
what is parallelistic and what is not, to determine so far as possible the laws of this parallelism, and to recognise all parts of the ancient Hebrew literature that are distinguished by parallelism as related to one another in respect of form.

It is because I approach the question thus that I treat of parallelism before metre: parallelism is unmistakable, metre in Hebrew literature is obscure: the laws of Hebrew metre have been and are matters of dispute, and at times the very existence of metre in the Old Testament has been questioned. But let us suppose that Sievers, to whose almost overwhelming contributions to this subject we owe so much, whatever our final judgment as to some even of his main conclusions may be, is right in detecting metre not only in what have commonly been regarded as the poetical parts of the Old Testament, but also throughout such books as Samuel and Genesis; even then the importance and value of the question formulated above remains. It is true that some questions may require resetting: if Samuel and Genesis are metrical throughout, if even the genealogies in Genesis v. and xxxvi. are, so far as form goes, no less certainly poems than the very prosaic Arabic poem cited above, it will become less a question whether the Old Testament contains metrical poems than whether it contains any plain prose at all. But the distinction between what is parallelism and what is not will remain as before: we shall still have to distinguish between parallelistic prose and prose that is not parallelistic, or, if the entire Old Testament be metrical, between parallelistic and non-parallelistic poetry.

The general description and the fundamental analysis of parallelism as given by Lowth, and adopted by innumerable subsequent writers, are so well known that they need

not be referred to at length here: nor will it be necessary to give illustrations of the familiar types of parallelism known as synonymous and antithetic. But I may recall Lowth's own general statement in the Preliminary Dissertation (Isaiah, ed. 3, p. xiv.):—"The correspondence of one verse, or line, with another, I call parallelism. When a proposition is delivered, and a second is subjoined to it, or drawn under it, equivalent, or contrasted with it, in sense; or similar to it in the form of grammatical construction; these I call parallel lines, and the words or phrases, answering one to another in the corresponding lines, parallel terms. Parallel lines may be reduced to three sorts: parallels synonymous, parallels antithetic and parallels synthetic."

The vulnerable point in Lowth's exposition of parallelism as the law of Hebrew poetry lies in what he found it necessary to comprehend under the term synthetic parallelism: his examples include, indeed, many couplets to which the term parallelism can with complete propriety be applied; for they really are a subdivision of synonymous or antithetic parallelism and might with more convenience be described as incomplete synonymous parallelism, or incomplete antithetic parallelism, as the case might be. In these cases the second line repeats by means of a synonymous term or terms part of the sense of the first, and is thus in part strictly parallel; but it also adds to the sense of the first line by another term or other terms parallel to nothing in the previous line, and by reason of this addition the second line in its entirety may, if we prefer, be regarded as a synthetic parallel to the first. But there are other examples of what Lowth calls synthetic parallelism in which the second line is pure addition to the first, and not even parallel to that line by the correspondence of similar grammatical terms: in this case the use of the term parallel-
ism surely covers an important difference with a mere semblance of similarity. Two such lines are certainly synthetic, but they are parallel to one another merely in the way that the continuation of the same straight line is parallel to its beginning; whereas synonymous and antithetic parallelisms, even of the incomplete kind, do really correspond to two separate and, strictly speaking, parallel lines. It should be added that Lowth seems himself to have been at least half-conscious of the weakness of this part of his case when he wrote, "The variety in the form of this synthetic parallelism is very great, and the degrees of resemblance almost infinite; so that sometimes the scheme of the parallelism is very subtile and obscure" (Lectures, ii. 52); he very fairly adds in illustration a really test couplet, viz.—

I also have anointed my king on Sion,
The mountain of my sanctity (Psa. ii. 6),

and he perceives, though he does not dwell on the point, that this couplet marks zero among "the degrees of resemblance almost infinite"; he says, "The general form and nature of the Psalm requires that it should be divided into two parts or versicles; as if it were,

'I also have anointed my king;
I have anointed him in Sion, the mountain of my sanctity,'"

where it will be observed that Lowth supplies the only point of resemblance by repeating the words "I have anointed."

Not only did Lowth thus experience some doubt whether parallelism as analysed by himself was the one law of Hebrew poetry, he expressly concludes his discussion of these "subtile and obscure" examples of synthetic parallelism with a suggestion that behind and accompanying parallelism there may be some metrical principle, though he judged that principle undiscovered and probably undiscoverable.
In spite of the general soundness of Lowth's exposition of parallelism, then, there is, perhaps, sufficient reason for a re-statement; and that I shall now attempt.

The extreme simplicity of Hebrew narrative has often been pointed out: the principle of attaching clause to clause by means of the waw conversive construction allows the narrative to flow on often for long periods uninterrupted, and, so to speak, in one continuous straight line. Now and again, and in certain cases more often, the line of successive events is broken to admit of some circumstance being described; but the same single line is quickly resumed. An excellent example of this is found in Genesis i.: with the exception of verse 2, which describes the conditions existing at the time of the creative act mentioned in verse 1, the narrative runs on in a single continuous line down to verse 26; thus,—

1 2 3

The continuity of a single line of narrative is in parts of Genesis ii. nearly as conspicuous: as to other parts of Genesis ii. something will have to be said in a later article. But if we turn to certain other descriptions of creation elsewhere in the Old Testament, we immediately discern a difference. Thus we read in Psalm xxxiii. 6, 7, 9:—

By the word of Yahweh the heavens were made,
And by the breath of his mouth all their host.
He gathered as into a flask the waters of the sea,
He put into treasure-houses the deeps.
For he spake and it came to pass,
He commanded and it stood;

and in Isaiah xliv. 12 the words of Yahweh run as follows:—

I made the earth,
And man upon it I created;
My hands stretched out the heavens,
And all their host I commanded.
And again in Proverbs viii. 24–29 creation is described in a series of subordinate periods:

When there were no depths . . .
When there were no fountains abounding with water;
Before the mountains were settled,
Before the hills . . .
While as yet he had not made the earth, nor the fields,
Nor the beginning of the dust of the world;
When he established the heavens . . .
When he set a circle upon the face of the deep;
When he made firm the skies above,
When the fountains of the deep became strong,
When he gave to the sea its bound,
That the waters should not transgress his commandment,
When he marked out the foundations of the earth.

Now whether, as Sievers maintains, Genesis i. is as strictly metrical as Psalms, Proverbs or Isaiah xl.–lxvi., or whether, as has been commonly assumed, Genesis i. is plain, unadorned and unmetrical prose, between Genesis i. on the one hand and the passages just cited from Psalm xxxiii., Isaiah xlv. and Proverbs viii. there are these differences: (1) whereas Genesis i. is carried along a single line of narrative, the other passages are, in the main at least, carried forward along two lines, parallel to one another in respect of their meaning, and of the terms in which that meaning is expressed; (2) whereas Genesis i. consists in the main of connected clauses so that the whole may be represented by a single line rarely broken, the other passages consist of a number of independent clauses or sentences, so that they must be represented by lines constantly broken, and at fairly regular intervals; thus:

Stated otherwise, as contrasted with the simpler style of Genesis i., these other passages are characterised by the independence of their successive clauses or short sentences, and the repetition of the same thought or statement by means of corresponding terms in successive short clauses.
or sections. Where repetition and what may be termed parallelism in its fullest and strictest sense occur, a constant breaking of the line of narrative or statement is the necessary consequence: a thought is expressed, or a statement made, but the writer, instead of proceeding at once to express the natural sequel to his thought or the next statement, breaks off and harks back to repeat in a different form the thought or statement which he has already expressed, and only after this break and repetition pursues the line of his thought or statement; that is to say, one line is, as it were, forsaken to pursue the parallel line up to a corresponding point, and then after the break the former line is resumed. But the break in the line and the independence of clauses may occur even where there is no repetition of thought or correspondence of terms; just as breaks necessarily occur occasionally in such simple narratives as that of Genesis i. The differences between the two styles here shade off into one another; and everything ultimately depends on the frequency and regularity with which the breaks occur. Where the breaks occur with as much regularity as when the successive clauses are parallel to one another, we may, even though parallelisms of terms or thought between the clauses are absent, term the style parallelistic, as preserving one of the necessary consequences of actual parallelism.

But not only is the question whether a passage belongs to the one style or the other, so far as it depends on the recurrence of breaks and the consequent independence of the clauses, one of degree; the question whether two such independent lines are correspondent or parallel to one another is also at times a question both of degree and of exact interpretation. To return to the passages already cited; when the Psalmist writes—

He gathered as into a flask the waters of the sea,
and then adds—

He put into treasure-houses the deeps,
it is clear that at the end of the first line he breaks the
straight line of continuous statement: the second line adds
nothing to the bare sense, and it carries the writer no further
forward than the first; the two sentences thus correspond
strictly to two equal and parallel lines: where the first
begins the second also begins, and where the first ends there
also the second ends: each line records exactly the same
fact and the same amount of fact by means of different but
synonymous terms. And the same is true of the two lines—

For he spake and it was done,
He commanded and it stood sure.

We can without difficulty and with perfect propriety repre-
sent these two couplets thus:—

But what are we to say of,

I made the earth,
And man upon it I created?

This is certainly not the simplest form of putting the thought
to be expressed: the terms "made" and "created" are
synonymous, and the whole thought could have been fully
expressed in the briefer form, "I made the earth, and man
upon it." But have we, even so, completely delimited sub-
stance and form, the thought to be expressed and the art
used in its expression? Probably not; the writer con-
tinues:—

My hands stretched out the heavens,
And all their host I commanded.

Here we cannot simply drop a term as in the previous lines
and leave the sense unimpaired; but the correspondence
of thought between the two sets of statements may yield
a clue to the essential thought of the whole; as the first
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two lines mean no more than this: I created the earth and its inhabitants; so the second means simply this: I created the heavens and their inhabitants. But have we even yet determined the fundamental thought of the passage? Did the writer really mean to express two distinct thoughts in each set of lines? Was he thinking of the creation of man as something independent of the creation of the earth? Did he mean to refer first to one creative act and then to a second and independent creative act? Or did he regard the creation of man as part of the creation of the earth, so that his lines are really parallel statements, a parallelism, to wit, of the part with the whole, and not successive statements? This seems to me most probable; his thought was: Yahweh created the heavens and the earth; but instead of expressing this in its simplest form by a sentence that would have been represented by a single continuous line, he has artistically expressed it in a form that may once again, though with less complete propriety, perhaps, than in the case of the couplet from Psalm xxxiii., be expressed by two groups of parallel and broken lines:

If the thought of man and the host of heaven had a greater independence than this view recognises, we must still treat the statement (which is not, like Genesis i., the continuous statement of successive acts) not as a continuous line, but as a line broken at very regular intervals—and, if we wished diagrammatically to bring out the similarity in the verbal cast or grammatical build of the clauses rather than the independence of the thought, we might still adopt the form—

Before leaving this diagrammatic description I merely add, without illustrating the statement, that a poem rarely
proceeds far along two parallel lines each broken at the same regular intervals, thus—

Either the two lines are broken at different points, or one is for the time being followed to the neglect of the other, thus—

C. Buchanan Gray.

(To be continued.)
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