

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 ¹ he has sought to identify his two recensions, **egj** and **fir** (see below), with those respectively of Hesychius and Lucian; and he still holds to this opinion ² in spite of weighty arguments to the contrary advanced by Hautsch ³ 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 Okeuteuch*, 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 **fr**. The instructive thing, however, is that he regards this as a confirmation of his view that **fr** 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 $\alpha \theta \epsilon \omicron \varsigma$ where the Hebrew had $\kappa \upsilon \rho \iota \omicron \varsigma$ he would obelise $\alpha \theta \epsilon \omicron \varsigma$ and insert $\kappa \upsilon \rho \iota \omicron \varsigma$ with the asterisk, thus: * $\kappa \upsilon \rho \iota \omicron \varsigma$ — $\alpha \theta \epsilon \omicron \varsigma$, 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 * $\kappa \upsilon \rho \iota \omicron \varsigma$ — $\alpha \theta \epsilon \omicron \varsigma$ appears in them as the compound name $\kappa \upsilon \rho \iota \omicron \varsigma \alpha \theta \epsilon \omicron \varsigma$. 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.¹ 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 *κυριος 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 egj.*

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; xxi. 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) *κύριος ο θεός*, (2) *κύριος* and (3) *ο θεός* occur in accordance with this principle of assimilation. (1) *κύριος ο 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.

13, x. 9b, xiii. 4, *perhaps* vi. 22, it seems clearly Hexaplaric), so that from these instances nothing can be inferred as to the *special* tendencies of **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 theos* 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 *κυριος o theos* (iii. 1b, 11) as *characteristic* of it. In Seder 3 (iii. 22-iv. 26) against one case cited (and that *not* distinctive) of *κυριος o theos* (iv. 13) we have *o theos* five times (iv. 1, iv. 4, iv. 10, iv. 16, iv. 25) and *κυριος* 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 theos* never occurs alone in **ej**, but only *κυριος o theos*." Considering that between vi. 12 and vii. 1 the divine name occurs only twice (vi. 13, 22), and that in vi. 22 *κυριος o theos* 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) **ej**, *following the Hexapla*, reads the double name. Again, "a solitary *κυριος* appears in the group only once (iv. 3) in the first ten chapters of Genesis." And how often does the reader imagine that (*o*) *κυριος* occurs alone in these ten chapters in the standard text of the LXX? Just three times (iv. 3, iv. 13, x. 9b),¹ 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 *κυριος o theos*. We are invited further to find illustrations of the tendency (2) in the *κυριος* of xii.

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 κυριος* readings at the close of this article.

17, xix. 29a, b, and (3) in the *o theos* of viii. 20, xv. 4, xx. 18. (2) It is true that in xii. 17 the group changes *o theos* into *κυριος* between two readings of *κυριος* (xii. 8 and xiii. 4) and similarly in xix. 29b; but in xix. 29a the *κυριος* 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 *κυριος* throughout a whole Seder; but apart [from xix. 29b the uniformity exists already in the LXX: in xii. 17 no such consistency results, *o theos* remaining in xiii. 10a, b, 13, 14. (3) On viii. 20, we read (p. 104), "the MT after three times אלהים (viii. 1a, 1b, 15) has in v. 20 יהוה, which our group changes to *o theos*." True, but our group in viii. 15 has *not o theos* but (in common with the entire LXX except one MS.) *κυριος o theos*, which breaks the sequence. In xv. 4 Dahse holds, on the evidence of six cursives and the Old Latin, that no name stood after *φωνη* in the original LXX, that *κυριου* was inserted by the Hexapla (in spite of the fact that *του θεου* is read by two daughter versions of the LXX, the Armenian and Sahidic,¹ of which the former is strongly Hexaplaric), while *egj* with others insert *του θεου*. If we accept his view the name corresponds with the two which follow (*o theos*) and differs from the three which precede (*κυριος*): we see that whichever name was inserted it could not fail to agree with either the one or the other. In xx. 18 *κυριος* is changed to *o theos* 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 *κυριος o theos* 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 *κυριος*." In the very next verse (xi.

¹ Not the Ethiopic, as Dahse says.

6) *ej* have *κυριος ο 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 ο θεος* of the ordinary LXX, and I do not know in what its importance consists. In xx. 4 for the אֲדֹנָי of the MT the recension has *κυριε ο θεος*, which Dahse very arbitrarily holds to imply a double name, יְהוָה אֲדֹנָי or אֲדֹנָי יְהוָה 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 *ο θεος*: its supposed importance lies in the fact that in the speech of a heathen king, Abimelech, *egj* 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 ο θεος*). In xviii. 27 it omits in common with the great majority of LXX MSS.) after *τον κυριου α μου* which is read by the Bohairic and Sahidic versions and eight cursives. Dahse infers that it represents not אֲדֹנָי (MT) but יְהוָה 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 *ο θεος* to the *κυριε* (MT יְהוָה) of the ordinary LXX, to which however the MSS. present variants *κυριε ο θεος μου, ο 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 *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 $\mu\omicron\nu$ is a criterion for אֱלֹהִים as distinct from יְהוָה 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 (אֱלֹהִים in xviii. 3, 27, 30, 31, 32; xix. 2 (pl.); xix. 18; xx. 4: אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה in xv. 2, 8), where אֱלֹהִים occurs in MT, are all literally or virtually vocatives; and the $\mu\omicron\nu$ 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 *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 יהוה אדני instead of MT אדני יהוה. 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 יהוה אדני || אדני יהוה that variations in Hebrew MSS. most frequently occur. The reason is not far to seek. אדני and יהוה 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 *κυριε ο θεος*, which, according to Dahse, implies an original יהוה אדני or יהוה אדני, while *g* (with all other MSS.) reads *κυριε*. 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 יהוה in all these places, or (b) that the *μω* 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 יהוה אלהים, for MT ארני יהוה,¹ and in xviii. 31 where 227, 239 read ארני for יהוה; 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.² (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 cases³ where *e(g)j* 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 uninstructed 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 יה אלהים, and Dahse, following Wiener, takes the first word to be a shortened form [of יהוה]: this would agree with the *κυριος ο θεος* of *ej*. I have not seen the MS., but I have little doubt that the יה is a copyist's error: the scribe had begun to write יהוה, but after forming two letters he noticed that the right word was אלהים, 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, xiii. 4, xv. 4, xvi. 7, xviii. 13, xviii. 20, xviii. 22, xviii. 26, xix. 16a, xix. 29b, xx. 8 [xx. 18], xxi. 1a, xxi. 2, xxi. 4, xxi. 6, xxvi. 24a, xxvi. 29, xxviii. 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 "Elohistic edition of Genesis" (p. 114); and we have to try and see how far that description is appropriate. The statistics

given below¹ 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 *ο θεος* to *κυριος*, it shews a still greater partiality for *κυριος ο θεος* over *κυριος* and even over *ο θεος*. Thus while *κυριος ο θεος* is only three times changed to *ο θεος* and never to *κυριος*, it is twenty-eight times substituted for *κυριος* and nine times for *ο θεος*. Further, though *κυριος* is nine times changed to *ο θεος* and twenty-eight times to *κυριος ο θεος*, in thirty-five cases it is allowed to stand. These facts are a serious set back to Dahse's theory of an Elohist 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:—

		In agreement with LXX.	For <i>κυριος</i>	For <i>ο θεος</i>	For <i>κυριος ο θεος</i>	+	—
1.	<i>ο θεος</i> 27 times, viz.	14	9	—	3	1	—
2.	<i>κυριος</i> 44 " "	35	—	1	—	5	3
3.	<i>κυριος ο θεος</i> 45 " "	7	28	9	—	1	—
116		56	37	10	3	7	3

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 **fr** 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 לִשְׁבֵר בַּר for the Massoretic לִשְׁבֵר; and similarly **fr** read (with the Sahidic version) ἀγοραζέειν σιτον for the bare ἀγοραζέειν of the LXX. But לִשְׁבֵר בַּר occurs immediately before in v. 3, and there also the σιτον 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 **fr** 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 *κύριος* 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 to¹ 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 ο κυριος readings*.—The name יהוה is ordinarily rendered in LXX by κυριος without the article. In nearly a score of instances, however, we find ο κυριος; 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 ο κυριος 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) ο κς is used for יהוה twice (xviii. 27, 31): now in all other instances of יהוה it is represented by a vocative; hence we may say that ο κς is the regular equivalent of יהוה wherever the art. is admissible. (b) For יהוה, ο κς stands in iv. 3, 13, viii. 20, xii. 8a, xiii. 4, 18, xvi. 2, xviii. 17, 33, xxiv. 16, 48a, 52, xxviii. 13a, xxxix. 23a. Of these iv. 13, xviii. 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 τω κω after "altar." On the other hand there are many references to worship (e.g. xii. 8b!), where ο 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, xviii. 17, 33, xxviii. 13, xxxix. 23), as well as in several variants which are not included.—Dahse does not point out that a slight tendency to favour ο κς is observable in *sgj*. The fact goes to shew that that recension is not based on a Hebrew original.