It is easy but dangerous to let our discussion of Orchard’s hypothesis about Gospel origins close our eyes to other features of his edition of the Gospels. He realizes that the maker of a synopsis is involved in matters of text, and in his Introductory Note to his *Apparatus Criticus* indicates his own views. He agrees with Greeven in not adopting the UBS text for the *Synopsis* and rightly points to the merits in this connection of the Einheitsübersetzung. He is quite right in dissenting from the canon *lectio breuior potior* and his decisions should be attentively pondered.

Dr. Stoldt has provided a useful German version of the essay on Synopses in general and of the Introductory Note to the *Apparatus Criticus*, but is “together with Augustine of Hippo’s conclusion” best rendered by “ebenso wie Augustin mit Hippos Schlußfolgerung”?

The editor has presented us with a stimulating and thought-provoking work which serious students of the Synoptic Problem will want to consult. It is clearly arranged and clearly printed and the headings give ample guidance to the general reader. The printer and publisher have served him well and the whole work makes a pleasing impression.

G. D. Kilpatrick


The foreword, from the two editors, reports that “the book attempts to reflect the historical origins and path of the Septuagint”. It attempts to treat “in some detail the major aspects of Septuagintal research”. Among the contributions several will be relevant to New Testament studies. After the foreword comes a biographical note to which we may add that Wevers’ edition of Leviticus is now completed and that of Exodus is far advanced (p. 71). Genesis, Numbers and Deuteronomy have already appeared. Next we have a list of contributors and a table of contents.

At the end we have a useful bibliography of Wevers’ publications. This is followed by indices, of subject matter, of Biblical and other references and of authors.

The core of the book is the fourteen essays, by the contributors. After an introductory essay by Professor Hanhart we have four papers on the relation of the LXX and the Hebrew text, followed by four on “Linguistic and Translational Aspects of the Septuagint”. Another four papers deal with the transmission of the LXX and three with daughter versions of the LXX.

R. Hanhart, the head of the Septuaginta-Unternehmen at Göttingen, gives a general survey of the present state of research in the LXX. Much of what he has to say about the background and the purport of the LXX is relevant to the New Testament. D. Barthélemy surveys views about the relation of the LXX and the M.T. from the seventeenth century. He alludes to Lagrange’s discussion of Gen. 14:1-17 as a passage where “deux récits parallèles mis bout à bout dans la version grecque (vss 1 à 5a et vss 5b à 7) ont été fondus dans le TM (vss 1 à 7)”. A comparable passage will be found at Gen. 47:1-7. Barthélemy sums up his exposition in some very apposite remarks (38-40).

E. Tov shows conclusively that the LXX did not always understand its Hebrew text and discusses passages which in various categories illustrate this point.

A. Pietersma “Kyrios or Tetragram” (85-101) first sets out to reduce the number of instances of the tetragram in Jewish manuscripts of the Greek version. First he argues that we have to allow for the possibility that the tetragram represents an intrusion from the Hebrew wherever the manuscript concerned
shows any correction from an Hebrew text. Thus Barthélemy’s scroll of the Minor Prophets (8 Hev XII gr) shows corrections from an Hebrew text and so the presence of the tetragram in Hebrew characters may represent a correction from the Hebrew. The same may be argued for P. Fouad 266 (Rahlfs 848).

We may add a footnote here. P.Ox.656, Bodl. Gr. bibl. d.5(P), Rahlfs 905 has some variations where the tetragram is involved. An inspection of the papyrus suggests that 905 was copied from a text that had the tetragram in Hebrew letters. In copying the scribe of 905 left a space for the second scribe to insert the tetragram. Instead of doing this the second scribe inserted the corresponding forms of χύριος. Abbreviated χύριος does not always fit the space left by the first scribe and at least at one place (end of a line?) the second scribe has inserted nothing. If this correctly interprets the evidence of 905, it would support Koenen’s view that the scribe of 848 left spaces in his transcript to be filled in by a second scribe.

We may question Pietersma’s thesis that as far as 848 is concerned “its status, in general, as a typical exemplar of the LXX is not beyond doubt”. This assumes that apart from demonstrable corrections the LXX was transmitted without interference from the Hebrew. We may question this assumption and argue that apart from other variations the LXX was frequently corrected from an Hebrew text whenever opportunity arose. If this is true, we cannot discard texts of the Greek version because they appear to show correction from the Hebrew. If this is so, we shall have to take 848’s evidence seriously.

Let us assume that wherever papyri give the tetragram they are reproducing the LXX and that Origen is right in his evidence about the LXX on this point. We may suggest that apart from the Christian texts the LXX gave the tetragram either in archaic Hebrew or in Aramaic lettering. The occasional use of forms like ΙΑΩ or ΙΙΙΙΙ appear derivative.

Against this we have to set the facts of the Christian tradition. This consistently presents us with χύριος. How are we to explain this? Whatever was written in the manuscripts, we may infer that when the text was read aloud in the synagogue or elsewhere χύριος was used.

We may link this inference with another. In Vigiliae Christianae 36 (1982) 99-106 I reviewed C. H. Roberts, Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt. Apart from other matters touched upon in Roberts’ Schweich Lectures, we have conjectured that the difference between the script of manuscripts of Jewish origin and that of Christian texts may be explained as follows: “Up and down the eastern Mediterranean in the first century A.D. were many Greek-speaking Jewish communities. Each was centred in its synagogue whose congregation often seems to have consisted in a Jewish core and a fringe of interested Gentiles. From this Gentile fringe a number of converts passed into Judaism (Juvenal, Sat.xiv.96-106). When Christianity came upon the scene as in the missionary chapters of Acts it won over Jews and interested Gentiles, but the Jewish authorities controlling the synagogue seem to have remained unconvinced. If we may build on various hints in the Epistles, a minority of Jews and a majority of interested Gentiles seem to have joined the new movement. From this result we can infer that as the Jewish leadership rarely, if ever, became Christian, the resulting Christian community would not as a rule take over the official copies of the Greek Bible in all their calligraphy, but would have a number of private copies in a more or less workmanlike script which derived from the unofficial copies which members of the synagogue possessed.” (100)

We may link this conjecture with another. Official manuscripts of the LXX may have had the tetragram, but unofficial and, subsequently, Christian texts, may have had χύριος. If this is true, Origen’s statement is correct and the use of χύριος will by and large reflect private usage.