

## THE DECALOGUE



# THE DECALOGUE

BEING

THE WARBURTON LECTURES

DELIVERED IN

LINCOLN'S INN AND WESTMINSTER ABBEY

1919-1923

BY

R. H. CHARLES, D.D., D.LITT., LL.D.

ARCHDEACON OF WESTMINSTER

FELLOW OF THE BRITISH ACADEMY

*Wipf & Stock*  
PUBLISHERS  
*Eugene, Oregon*

Wipf and Stock Publishers  
199 W 8th Ave, Suite 3  
Eugene, OR 97401

The Decalogue  
Being the Warburton Lectures Delivered in Lincoln's Inn  
and Westminster Abbey 1919-1923  
By Charles, R.H.  
ISBN: 1-59244-840-2  
Publication date 8/26/2004  
Previously published by T and T Clark, 1923

## P R E F A C E

THE subject of these Warburton Lectures I have treated from three standpoints—the critical, the historical and the practical.

*The Critical.*—In the *Introduction* (pp. vii–lxiv) I have studied the Decalogue critically and have shown that it existed in various forms—at least five—its earliest dating from the close of the fourteenth century B.C., and its latest from the close of the third. The latest is preserved in the Nash Hebrew Papyrus (pp. vii–xxxiii). In its earliest and tersest form, in which each Commandment consisted of one brief crisp command (pp. xlv–xlvi), it comes from the great lawgiver, Moses. In the centuries that followed it received various accretions which were on the whole in keeping with the spirit of the original Commandments, save in the case of the Fourth as it is transmitted in Exodus xx. 11.

In order to represent the results of my research briefly and clearly, I have given on p. lv a genealogical tree, which shows the descent and relations of the successive forms of the Mosaic Decalogue, and on p. lxiii another

which exhibits the relations subsisting between the original Mosaic Decalogue and the two later documents—the Book of the Covenant and the Ritual Decalogue in Exodus xxxiv.

*The Historical.*—In the Lectures I have sought to ascertain the meaning and measure of obedience which were assigned to the Ten Commandments at various stages in the history of Israel and Judah, and particularly to the Second and Fourth. In my study of the Fourth it gradually became clear that a new and Judaistic conception of the Sabbath conflicting with the original one was introduced into Exodus xx. 11 about 500 B.C. or later, and that this later conception henceforward held the field in Judaism.

With the advent of Christianity the Decalogue was reinterpreted for the most part and given a new and spiritual significance. During the first three centuries no difficulties arose within the Church in connection with the Decalogue save that the Sabbath was observed by Jewish Christians as well as the Lord's Day. But in the subsequent centuries difficulties did arise and particularly in the case of the Second and Fourth Commandments. Gradually, though unwittingly, the entire Church abandoned the true conception of the Lord's Day, and substituted in its stead the later conception of the Jewish Sabbath, and clung to this wrong and Judaistic conception to the period of the

Reformation. In the case of the Second Commandment it was otherwise. This Commandment the Church misinterpreted for the most part wittingly, because it condemned absolutely the growing practice of image worship within the Church. From the thirteenth century, if not earlier, it jettisoned the Second Commandment bodily from the Decalogue, and published as authoritative a mutilated Decalogue till the time of the Reformers.

*The Practical.*—But deeply as I have been interested in the critical and historical study of the Decalogue, it has been my main aim to reinterpret the Decalogue on the spiritual and ethical lines already laid down in the N.T., and to apply its lessons to the crying needs of our own day.

For the very full Indexes I am indebted to the efficient services of the Rev. A. Ll. Davies, Vicar of Llanrhos, Llandudno.

R. H. C.

4 LITTLE CLOISTERS,  
WESTMINSTER ABBEY,  
*September 1923.*

# CONTENTS

## INTRODUCTION

	PAGES
ABBREVIATIONS AND BRACKETS USED IN THIS EDITION . . . . .	vi
I. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS ARRIVED AT . . . . .	vii-xii
II. THE NASH PAPYRUS OF THE DECALOGUE . . . . .	xiii-xvi
III. HEBREW TEXT OF THE NASH PAPYRUS ( <i>i.e.</i> N) AND CRITICAL NOTES . . . . .	xvi-xxii
IV. TRANSLATION OF THIS TEXT AND CRITICAL NOTES . . . . .	xxii-xxvii
V. RELATIONS OF N TO DECALOGUE IN Ex 20 AND D 5. N—Egyptian in character—§ 1. Agrees generally with D 5 against Ex 20—§ 2. Agrees occasionally with Ex 20 against D 5—§ 3. Agrees with LXX more than with any other authority—§ 6 . . . . .	xxvii-xxxiii
VI. DATE OF ORIGINAL TEXT OF N—§ 1. Divergences between Ex 20 and D 5 in II. IV. V. IX. X.—§ 2. D 5 secondary to Ex 20 in V. IX. X.—§ 3. Original form of II.—§ 4. Various forms of IV.—§ 5. Comparison of Decalogue (II. III.-V. IX.-X.) in E (8th Cent. B.C.) with Decalogue in D 5 (7th Cent.)—§ 6. Decalogue as it existed about 750 B.C. or earlier—§ 7 . . . . .	xxxiii-xliv
VII. ORIGINAL FORM OF III. IV. X.—§ 1. Decalogue purged of accretions goes back to Moses—§ 2. Objections dealt with—§ 3. Mosaic Decalogue and its subsequent revisions and accre-	



## CONTENTS

v

PAGES

tions down to 200 B.C.—genealogical tree—	
§ 4. Book of Covenant presupposes Mosaic	
Decalogue—§ 5. Decalogue in Ex 34 pre-	
supposes Mosaic Decalogue—§ 6. Influence	
of Ex 34 on later forms of Decalogue in D 5	
and Ex 20—§§ 7-8 . . . . .	xlv-lxiv

## LECTURES

FIRST COMMANDMENT . . . . .	1-13
SECOND COMMANDMENT—	
First Lecture . . . . .	14-35
Second Lecture . . . . .	36-58
Third Lecture . . . . .	59-88
THIRD COMMANDMENT . . . . .	89-109
FOURTH COMMANDMENT—	
First Lecture . . . . .	110-131
Second Lecture . . . . .	132-151
Third Lecture . . . . .	152-172
FIFTH COMMANDMENT . . . . .	173-184
SIXTH COMMANDMENT—	
First Lecture . . . . .	185-198
Second Lecture . . . . .	199-211
SEVENTH COMMANDMENT . . . . .	212-228
EIGHTH COMMANDMENT . . . . .	229-245
NINTH COMMANDMENT . . . . .	246-257
TENTH COMMANDMENT . . . . .	258-272

## INDEX

I. Subjects . . . . .	273-286
II. Passages from the Biblical and other writers dealt	
with in the text . . . . .	287-294

## ABBREVIATIONS AND BRACKETS USED IN THE INTRODUCTION

D	=	Deuteronomy.
E	=	Elohistic source used in the Hexateuch.
Ex.	=	Exodus.
J	=	Jahwistic source used in the Hexateuch.
Jub.	=	Book of Jubilees.
LXX	=	Septuagint.
M	=	Massoretic Text.
N	=	Nash Hebrew Papyrus.
Onk.	=	Targum of Onkelos in Walton's Polyglott.
Ps.-Jon.	=	Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel.
Sam.	=	Samaritan text of the Pentateuch.
Syr.	=	Syriac version of the O.T.
T Sam.	=	Samaritan Targum in Walton's Polyglott.
Vulg.	=	Vulgate.
< >	=	Words so enclosed are restored by the Editor
( )	=	Words so enclosed are supplied by the Editor.
[ ]	=	Words so enclosed are interpolated.

# INTRODUCTION

## I

SUMMARY OF THE CRITICAL INVESTIGATIONS MADE AND  
CONCLUSIONS ARRIVED AT IN THIS INTRODUCTION  
IN REGARD TO THE MOSAIC DECALOGUE, THE  
DECALOGUE IN EX. 34 AND THE BOOK OF THE  
COVENANT

(a) *Hebrew Text of Decalogue about 200 B.C. in Egypt.*—The Nash Papyrus was discovered just over twenty years ago. It was written towards the close of the first century A.D., and was used probably as a Service Book or Catechism. It represents the Hebrew text of the Decalogue that was current in Egypt about 200 B.C., which was based mainly on D.<sup>1</sup> I have given the Hebrew text of the papyrus restored by the help of Ex 20 and D 5,<sup>2</sup> and an English translation,<sup>3</sup> in both cases with critical notes pointing out the affinities of N.

From the above study it follows that N has a definite Egyptian character, that it is mainly descended from D, though in a few passages it is a

<sup>1</sup> See II. §§ 1-3, pp. xiii-xvi; v. § 6, p. xxxii.

<sup>2</sup> See III. pp. xvi-xxii.

<sup>3</sup> IV. pp. xxii-xxvii.

conflate text, and especially so in the fourth Commandment where it follows Ex 20<sup>11</sup>.<sup>1</sup> In two cases where M and Sam. (*i.e.* the older Semitic authorities) fail, N appears to preserve an older text.<sup>2</sup> It is more closely related to the LXX than any other authority.<sup>3</sup>

(b) *Hebrew Text of Decalogue in Egypt (and other localities) about 300 B.C.*—From the text of N we move backwards to the closely related Hebrew text which is presupposed by the LXX of Ex 20 and D 5. The text of these two passages is corrupt in several passages. The LXX of D 5 has reacted on that of Ex 20<sup>12</sup> in v. (*i.e.* 5th Commandment) so that it adds "that it may be well with thee" before "that thy days," etc., exactly as in D 5<sup>16</sup>: in x. the LXX of Ex 20<sup>17</sup> adds "his field" before "nor his manservant," as in D 5<sup>21</sup>. There are other reactions of the LXX of D 5 on that of Ex 20. On the other hand, there is a reaction of the LXX of Ex 20<sup>11</sup> on that of D 5<sup>14</sup> which has led to the insertion in the latter of an entire sentence. Possibly the wrong order of the LXX in VII.—VI.—VIII. in D 5<sup>17-19</sup> may have led to the anomalous order in Ex 20<sup>13-15</sup>.

When a critical text of the LXX of these two chapters is published it will be easy to recover the Hebrew it presupposes.

(c) *Hebrew Text of Decalogue in Ex 20 in the fifth century B.C. and in D 5 about or before 621 B.C.*—We can now put N aside, which is the latest,<sup>4</sup> and con-

<sup>1</sup> See v. §§ 1-3, pp. xxvii-xxxi.

<sup>2</sup> See v. § 6, p. xxxii.

<sup>3</sup> See v. § 4, p. xxxi.

<sup>4</sup> See vi. § 1, p. xxxiii sq.

fine our attention to the two forms of the Decalogue in Ex. and D. These two agree in I. III. VI.—VIII., but diverge from each other in II. IV.—V. IX.—X. Of these five the text of V. IX. X. is secondary in D to that in Ex. and owes its divergencies to the hand of the Deuteronomist.<sup>1</sup>

The real difficulties centre in II. and IV. First, as regards II. In this Commandment both Ex. and D agree. But the Hebrew is impossible. It is ungrammatical, if we attempt to give it an intelligible meaning by translating it thus: "Thou shalt not make unto thee a graven image nor any likeness<sup>2</sup> of that which is in heaven," etc. On the other hand, it is unmeaning, if we translate it as it stands: "nor any likeness that is in heaven." No man makes "a likeness that is in heaven." D 5<sup>8b-10</sup> (Ex 20<sup>4b-6</sup>) can therefore be best explained as originally a marginal gloss in D which was afterwards incorporated in the text in the fifth century B.C. and thence passed into Ex 20. But the phrase "nor any likeness" is differently situated. It is a distinctly Deuteronomic phrase and, like many other Deuteronomic phrases in D 5, is to be attributed to the author of D. Hence II. stood most probably as follows in D in 621 B.C.: "Thou shalt not make thee a graven image nor any likeness."<sup>3</sup> All that follows in the present

<sup>1</sup> See VI. §§ 2-3, p. xxxiv sq.

<sup>2</sup> There is nothing to justify the rendering of the R. V. "nor *the likeness of any form that.*" The R. V., it is true, acknowledges by the italics that it inserts an explanatory phrase.

<sup>3</sup> See VI. § 4, pp. xxxv-xxxix.

Hebrew text of II. is to be regarded as due to the incorporation of a marginal gloss of the fifth century B.C.

In IV. the divergence between Ex 20<sup>8-11</sup> and D 5<sup>12-15</sup> is fundamental. All other variations between the two Decalogues may be regarded as explanatory additions or glosses, which are never contrary to the spirit of the original commandment, but it is otherwise in the case of IV. The interpolation of Ex 20<sup>11</sup> alters essentially the entire character of the original commandment. By virtue of its actual words it was instituted to meet the needs of the Godhead and had no reference originally to man. This interpolation has made the acceptance of the fourth Commandment an impossibility outside a narrow Jewish circle.<sup>1</sup> To this interpolation is most probably due the extrusion of the very ancient clause preserved in D 5<sup>14</sup>, *i.e.*, "that thy manservant and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou." This clause gives the right note. The Sabbath was made for man.

Thus the Decalogue as it stands at present in Ex 20 does not go back farther than the fifth century B.C., whereas that in D 5 goes back to 621 B.C. or earlier, if we remove the gloss in II., *i.e.* 5<sup>8b-10</sup>.

(d) *Hebrew text of the Decalogue in Ex 20 as it stood in the eighth century B.C. or earlier, especially of II. IV. and V. as compared with the Decalogue in D 5 of 621 B.C.*—The text of II. in D, as we have already

<sup>1</sup> See VI. § 5, pp. xxxix-xl.

seen in the preceding paragraph, ran as follows: "Thou shalt not make thee a graven image nor any likeness." But the last phrase "nor any likeness" is a Deuteronomic phrase and comes most probably from the Deuteronomist as do many other phrases in the Decalogue in D. Hence in the eighth century B.C., II. reads as follows: "Thou shalt not make thee a graven image."<sup>1</sup>

The eighth century form of IV. can also be recovered. It read in all probability as follows: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: but <on> the seventh day is a Sabbath unto the Lord thy God: <on it> thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, <nor thine ox nor thine ass>, nor thy cattle, <that thy manservant and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou>."

V. read simply thus: "Honour thy father and thy mother." The remaining clauses are from the hand of the Deuteronomist.<sup>2</sup>

For the rest of the commandments as they stood in the eighth century, see VI. § 7.

(e) *The fact that there was a steady, though sporadic, growth of explanatory additions from the eighth century to the second B.C. leads to the hypothesis that such explanatory clauses as still survive in III. IV. X. of the eighth century Decalogue are themselves accretions, and were unknown to the original Decalogue.*—Since I have

<sup>1</sup> See pp. xxxv-xxxix.

<sup>2</sup> See VI. §§ 6-7.

dealt with this question in VII. § 1, in a fashion intelligible to the ordinary reader, it is not necessary to repeat any of the arguments there advanced. I have there concluded that the original form of III. IV. and X. was as follows:

III. "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain."

IV. "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy."

X. "Thou shalt not covet."

Later, in VII. § 5-6, I have sought to prove that the Decalogue, even with certain additions in IV., is older than the Book of the Covenant in E and the Decalogue in Ex 34 (J).

*(f) If the above conclusions are valid, it follows, first, that the Decalogue is presupposed by documents of the tenth century or older; for E and J are merely historians making use of documents such as the Book of the Covenant and the Decalogue in Ex 34: and, in the next place, that, if these things are so, there is no outstanding personality to whom the original Decalogue can be ascribed other than Moses.<sup>1</sup>*

With various objections to this conclusion I have dealt in VII. § 3, and in VII. § 4 (p. lv) I have given a genealogical tree in which I have traced the development of the Decalogue from the time of Moses, 1320-1300 B.C., down to that of the Nash text of 200 B.C.

<sup>1</sup> See VII. § 2.



## II

## THE NASH PAPYRUS OF THE DECALOGUE

§ 1. *Its date and character.*—This papyrus was discovered in Egypt in 1902 by W. L. Nash, the Secretary of the Society of Biblical Archæology, and presented by him to the University Library of Cambridge. It is generally assigned to the close of the first century A.D. (Burkitt) or the beginning of the second (Cook and Lévi), and is thus about 600 to 750 years older than the oldest Hebrew MS of the O.T.<sup>1</sup> Hebrew papyri are very rare. Hence independently of its contents the papyrus before us has an interest of its own.

This papyrus, which I shall forthwith designate with some earlier writers as N, consists of four mutilated fragments, which, when duly put together, measures 5 in. by 2½ in. It contains twenty-five lines, but of the last line only the tops of a few of the letters are decipherable. The papyrus contains neither vowel points, accents, nor diacritical marks. There are no verse divisions. Spaces intervene between the words, but the spacing is very irregular. In line 15 עֲלֶיךָ is written as one word עֲלֶיךָ. Final letters are employed. For an account of the letters I must refer the reader to Cook's article in the

<sup>1</sup> The oldest MS is in the British Museum (*i.e.* Or. 4445). It is undated, but was written, according to Ginsburg, about A.D. 820-850. The oldest dated Hebrew MS (*i.e.* A.D. 916) is in the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg.

*Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* (Jan. 1903, pp. 34–56). This is accompanied by three plates, one of which is a facsimile of the MS, the second of its reproduction fully restored by the editor, and the third of a table of Hebrew alphabets at various periods. To this work I shall frequently refer. In the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, xv. (1903) 392–408, Burkitt deals with this papyrus under the title, “The Hebrew Papyrus of the Ten Commandments,” and returns to it in xvi. (1904) 559–561, “The Nash Papyrus, a New Photograph.” A German study of the papyrus was published by Peters, *Die älteste Abschrift der zehn Gebote der Papyrus Nash* (Freiburg), in 1905.<sup>1</sup> This work is valuable for its collection of materials, but its conclusions are frequently arbitrary.

The average number of letters in a line of N is 32–33 according to Cook, and  $31\frac{1}{2}$  according to Peters. According to my restoration of the text there are 750 (or 749) letters in the first twenty-four lines. Thus the average line contains  $31\frac{1}{4}$  letters. The two longest lines are lines 5 and 10, which consist of 36 letters each. The two shortest are 21 and 23, which consist respectively of 25 and 27 letters. Thus the lines are very irregular in length. At the beginning of each line 2 to 8 letters are lost, except in lines 15–18. The letters are of the square character.

<sup>1</sup> Two other scholars should be mentioned: Israel Lévi, “Un Papyrus Biblique,” in the *Revue des Études Juives*, xlv. (1903) 212–217; von Gall, “Ein neuer hebräischer Text der zehn Gebote und des Schma,” *ZATW* xxiii. 347–351.

§ 2. *N was possibly a Service Book or a Catechism.*—

At an early date the Decalogue and the Shema' (i.e. "Hear, O Israel," etc.) were recited daily in the Temple Service (Tamid, iv. *ad fin.* v. 1).<sup>1</sup> But, because the Minim (the Early Jewish Christians) claimed divine revelation exclusively for the Decalogue and discarded the other Mosaic laws as temporary enactments, the recital of the Decalogue in the daily morning liturgy was abolished (J. T. Ber. 3c, 11a; B. T. Ber. 12a). In the last passage we are told that Rabba b. bar-Ḥana wished to restore at Sura the recital of the Decalogue, and that R. Ashi made the same attempt at Nehardea, but that their efforts failed.

Now it is most probable that N was simply a tiny prayer book consisting of the Decalogue and the Shema', and belonged therefore to the period before the recitation of the Decalogue was forbidden.<sup>2</sup>

§ 3. *N represents a form of the Hebrew text that circulated in Egypt as early as 200 B.C.*—The evidence

<sup>1</sup> ברכו וקראו עשרת הבריות . . . לקרות את שמע = "to recite the Shema" . . . they gave the blessing and recited the ten words." In his commentary on this passage (see Surenhusius, Pars quinta, p. 301) Maimonides' exposition is given. "Decem vero quotidie verba legebant . . . Cæterum jam dictum est quod in Terminis (extra terram Israelis) eas legere volebant, sed quod hoc prohibitum fuerit propter hæreticos; sed Gemara non declarat quænam sit ista hæreticorum controversia, sed in principio tractatus Berachoth in Talmude Jerusalemitano dicitur, fas erat ut decem verba legerentur quotidie, quare autem non leguntur? Ob hæreticos, ne dicant, hæc duntaxat a Mose data sunt in Sinai."

<sup>2</sup> Cook (p. 55) suggests that in N we have a collection of passages of the Mosaic Law.

for this statement is given on pp. xxxii-xxxiii. The Jews in Egypt copied their sacred writings without the accuracy that was due to them. Thus Aristéas<sup>1</sup> (130-70 B.C.) writes: "The books of the law . . . were written in Hebrew characters and language, but they were copied<sup>2</sup> carelessly and not in consonance with the original" (*ἀμελέστερον δὲ καὶ οὐχ ὑπάρχει σεσήμανται*). One of these copies may have been the ancestor of N. N was based mainly on D; see pp. xxix-xxx.

## III

HEBREW TEXT OF THE PAPYRUS RESTORED BY  
HELP OF EX 20 AND DEUT 5

(For the Abbreviations and Brackets, see p. vi.)

Ex. xx.	Lines in Papyrus.
2	1 <אנכי י-הוה אלהיך אשר >הוצא <חיד מארץ מ >צרים <
3, 4	2 <לוא יהיה ל-ך אלהים אחרים >על-פנ-י לוא תעשה <לך פסל >
	3 <וכל תמונה > אשר בשמים ממעל ואשר בארץ <מתחת >
5	4 <ואשר במי-ם מתחת לארץ לוא תשתחוה להם >ולוא <
	5 <תעבדם כי- > אנכי יהוה אלהיך אל קנא פק <ד ען אבות >
6	6 <על בני-ם על שלשים ועל רבעים לשנאי >ועשה חסד <
7	7 <לאלפים > לאהבי ולשמרי מצותי לוא ת-שא את שם <
	8 <יהוה א-להיך לשוא כי לוא ינקה יהוה >את אשר <
8	9 <ישא את ש- >מה לשוא זכור את יום השבת ל <קדשו >
9, 10	10 <ששת ימים > תעבוד ועשית כל מלאכתך וביום <השביעי >
	11 <שבת ליהוה > אלהיך לוא תעשה בו כל מלאכה <אתה >
	12 <ובנך ובתך > עבדך ואמתך שורך וחמרך וכל בה <מתך >
11	13 <ונרך אשר > בשעריך כי ששת ימים עשה י <הוה >
	14 <את השמי-ם ואת הארץ את הים ואת כל אש >ר במ- <
	15 <וינח >ביום השביעי עלכן ברך יהוה את <יום >

<sup>1</sup> See Charles, *Apoc. and Pseudep.* ii. 98.

<sup>2</sup> Andrews (*op. cit.* ii. 98) renders *σεσήμανται* by "interpreted."

## INTRODUCTION

xvii

	Lines in Papyrus.
Ex. xx.	
12	16 השביעי ויקדשיו כבד את אביו ואת אמ־ך למען־
	17 ייטב לך ולמען יאריכון ימך על האדמה <אשר־
14, 13, 15	18 יהיה אלהיך נתן לך לוא תנאף לוא תרצח לוא
16, 17	19 <תנ־נב לוא תענה ברעך עד שוא לוא תחמוד >את־
	20 <אשת רעך ל־ווא תתאוה את ב־י־ת רעך שד־הו ועבדו־
	21 <ואמתו וש־ורו וחמרו וכל אשר לרעך
Deut. iv. 45	
(vi. 2)	22 <ואלה החק־ים והמשפטים אשר צוא משה את >בני־
„ vi. 4	23 <ישראל־ במדבר בצאתם מארץ מצרים שמע
„ vi. 5	24 <ישראל־ל יהוה אלהינו יהוה אחד הוא ואהבת
	25 <את יהוה א־ל־הי־ך >בכ־ל ל־בבך . . . <

Line 1. N >מבית עבדים, though it is found both in Ex. and D.

l. 3. With כל טמונה (an addition of D; see p. xxxvii sq.) contrast כל תמונת in D 4<sup>16</sup>. 23. 25. On the ungrammatical structure of the words אשר טמונה, see p. xxxvi sqq. I have restored ו before כל as it is found in M. Sam. T Sam. LXX. Syr. Onk. Ps.-Jon. of Ex 20<sup>4</sup> and all these authorities in D 5<sup>8</sup> save M. Onk.

l. 9. For זכור D reads שמור. After לקדשו D adds כאשר צוא יהוה אלהיך.

l. 12. M. Syr. Onk. Ps.-Jon. of D 5<sup>14</sup> read ו before עבדך, but against Sam. LXX. Vulg. In Ex 20<sup>10</sup> many Hebrew MSS with Syr. Ps.-Jon. also insert the ו against all the remaining authorities cited by me. שורך וחמרך. So also D 5<sup>14</sup> (M. Sam. T Sam. LXX. Syr. Onk. Ps.-Jon. Vulg., save that M. Syr. Onk. Ps.-Jon. Vulg. prefix ו). >Ex 20<sup>10</sup> (M. Sam. Syr. Onk. Ps.-Jon. Vulg., but T Sam. LXX. read as in N). וכל. So D 5<sup>14</sup> (M. Sam. T Sam. LXX. Syr. Onk.

Ps.-Jon. Vulg.). Ex 20<sup>10</sup> (M. Syr. Onk.) >כל and Sam. Vulg. >וכל. But T Sam. LXX. Jub 50<sup>7</sup> read כל.

ll. 13–16. ויקרשיו . . . כי is derived from Ex 20<sup>11</sup> (M. Sam. T Sam. LXX. Syr. Onk. Ps.-Jon. Vulg.). This dogmatic reason has displaced the older ethical reason which is preserved in D: למען ינוח עבדך ואמתך כמוך. That the Deuteronomic clause is 200 or 300 years older than the clauses which have displaced it in Ex 20<sup>11</sup> I have shown elsewhere. D adds a further reason—and this an historical one—for the observance of the sabbath in 5<sup>15</sup>, just as Ex. adds a dogmatic one in 20<sup>11</sup>. With the latter compare Ex 31<sup>17</sup>.

l. 16. After אמך D makes the same addition that it has already made after לקרשיו in l. 12.

l. 17. On the addition ויטב לך ולמען, see note 6, p. xxiv.

l. 18. לוא תנאף לוא תרצח. On this Egyptian order of these commandments, see note 1, p. xxv.

ll. 18–20. For לוא, which occurs here five times in N, D 5<sup>18–21</sup> (M. Onk.) reads ולא. But Sam. T Sam. LXX. Syr. of D 5<sup>18–21</sup> >ו.

ll. 18–20. N in omitting ו before לוא (five times) is supported by D 5<sup>18–21</sup> (Sam. T Sam. LXX. Syr.), Ex 20<sup>14–17</sup> (M. LXX. Syr. Onk.). But T Sam. Vulg. of Ex 20<sup>14–17</sup> >ו only the first four times and Sam. the first three. D 5<sup>18–21</sup> (M. Onk.), which inserts ו in all five cases, is secondary.

l. 19. שוא. So D 5<sup>20</sup> (M. Sam. T Sam.). Ex 20<sup>16</sup> (M. Sam. T Sam.) שקר. The latter is an early ex-

planation or rendering of שוא, as Wellhausen observes, and makes a difficult and indefinite phrase clear. Hence D contains the original reading and Ex. is secondary but gives the right sense. T Sam. gives the same Samaritan equivalent for שוא in D 5<sup>19</sup> as it does for this word in Ex 23<sup>1</sup>. The word שוא was a source of difficulty to Jewish scholars. In Ex 23<sup>1</sup>, where it occurs twice, Onk. renders it by two different words. The evidence of the Greek and other versions is not helpful here.

אח. <Ex. and D.

l. 20. אשת . . . בית. So N, following D 5<sup>21</sup> (M. LXX. Syr. Onk. Ps.-Jon. Vulg.) and Ex 20<sup>17</sup> LXX. But Ex 20<sup>17</sup> (M. Sam. T Sam. Syr. Onk. Vulg.) and D 5<sup>21</sup> (Sam. T Sam.) preserve the original order אשת . . . בית. As Steuernagel (Holzinger, *Deut.* p. 22) observes: "The Deuteronomist seeks also elsewhere to raise the position of the wife; cf. 21<sup>10899</sup>. 22<sup>13899</sup>. 24<sup>1899</sup>." The wife is no longer subsumed under the conception "house." תחאזה. Here N follows D 5<sup>21</sup> (M. Onk. Ps.-Jon.). Sam. T Sam. Syr. read תחמור; but here the reading of the Samaritan text in Ex 20<sup>17</sup> has reacted on the Samaritan text in D 5<sup>21</sup>, just as the LXX of D has reacted on the LXX of Ex. It is to be observed that איה occurs three times in D but not in Ex. שרהו. N follows D 5<sup>21</sup> (M. Sam. T Sam. LXX. Syr. Onk. Ps.-Jon. Vulg.). >Ex 20<sup>17</sup> (M. Syr. Onk. Vulg.), but Sam. T Sam. LXX of Ex 20<sup>17</sup> support D. Here Sam. of D has reacted on Sam. of Ex., and the LXX of Ex. has been affected

similarly by the LXX of D. In D 5<sup>21</sup> שְׂדֵהוּ appears to be an addition of the Deuteronomist. By his transposition of אֵשֶׁת . . . בֵּית he transformed the meaning of בֵּית, which originally was a comprehensive term for the entire household, and reduced it to the simple meaning of "house" in a material sense. This once done, the addition becomes natural. Ex 20<sup>17</sup> could go back to the nomadic period: D 5<sup>21</sup> could not unless we take it as predictive in character. Hence Ex 20<sup>17</sup> is superior to D 5<sup>21</sup> on every ground.

II. 22–23. But for the LXX text of D 6<sup>4</sup> we should naturally have concluded (as Swete, *Introd. to O.T. in Greek*, p. 332) that these lines were borrowed from D 4<sup>45</sup>, "These are the testimonies and the statutes and the judgments which Moses spake (so LXX. BAL, but F reads ἐνετείλατο) unto the children of Israel when they came forth out of Egypt" (הַחֻקִּים (וְהַמִּשְׁפָּטִים אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר מֹשֶׁה עַל בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּצֵאתָם מִמִּצְרַיִם), influenced by D 6<sup>2</sup>, "All his statutes and his Commandments which I command thee (אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי מַצְוֶה), thou and thy son, and thy son's son." But the Hebrew in our text, II. 22–23, agrees almost *verbatim* with the LXX of 6<sup>4</sup> where it diverges from M (Sam. T Sam. Syr. Onk. Ps.-Jon. Vulg.). The LXX reads: καὶ ταῦτα τὰ δικαιώματα καὶ τὰ κρίματα ὅσα ἐνετείλατο κύριος τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ, ἐξελθόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου. "Ακουε, Ἰσραὴλ· κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κύριος εἷς ἐστίν. The Lyons O. Latin codex also preserves these words, but in agreement with LXX. B\*F reads Moyses for κύριος, and DS tuus DNS unus est for ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν. Cook



(*Pre-Massoretic Biblical Papyrus*, p. 44 sq.) regards these words as genuine and as having originally formed part of the Hebrew text of D 6<sup>4</sup>. It is clear that, as Cook observes (*op. cit.* p. 44), κύριος and ἡμῶν are inconsistent. Cook is of opinion that the subject of the verb commanded was originally unexpressed, and that this introduction to the Shema' (i.e. "Hear, O Israel," etc.) is genuine. He thinks that this introduction was omitted "partly because an introduction was already contained in 4<sup>44</sup> or, better, in 6<sup>1</sup>," and "partly to avoid a break in the continuity." Now this last argument makes against the genuineness; for the introduction in the LXX 6<sup>4</sup> constitutes an awkward break in the context. His next argument is that the Palestinian Targums on this passage ascribe the origin of the Shema' to the sons of Jacob which they uttered when urged by the dying Jacob to shun idolatry. Hence this introduction, which ascribes it to Moses, "was dropped either before or at the formation of the Massoretic text." But the passage in the Targums is brought in artificially. Besides, it is found in the Babylonian Talmud, *Pesach*, 56a, where it is attributed to Simeon ben Lakish of the third century A.D. Furthermore, the evidence of Sam. T Sam. and Syr. is wholly adverse to the genuineness of this passage in the Palestinian form of the Hebrew text. There is also the later evidence of Onk. Ps.-Jon. and the Vulg. Hence, since this introduction appears only in N and the LXX (with the versions derived from it), it seems most

reasonable to conclude that it represents a third or fourth (?) century B.C. intrusion in what afterwards became the Egyptian type of the Hebrew text.

l. 23. במדבר. >LXX in D 6<sup>4</sup>.

l. 24. הוא. Elsewhere only in LXX of D 6<sup>4</sup> (ἐστίν) and Mk 12<sup>29</sup>.

## IV

TRANSLATION OF THE HEBREW TEXT OF THE  
PAPYRUS

Ex. xx.		Lines in Papyrus.
2	<I am the L>ord thy God which <brought> thee out of the land of E<gypt>. <sup>1</sup>	1
3, 4	Thou <shalt have none> other gods <before> me. Thou shalt not make <unto thee a graven image>, <nor any likeness> that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth <be- neath>, 5 <or that is in the water>s under the earth: thou shalt not bow down to them <nor> <serve them: for> I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, vis<iting the iniquity of the fathers>	2 3 4 5

<sup>1</sup> Ex. and D add "out of the house of bondage." Its omission by N is probably due (as E. J. Pilcher suggests) to prudential reasons, as the MS was designed for circulation in Egypt.

Ex. xx. Lines in  
Papyrus.

<upon the child>ren upon<sup>1</sup> the third 6  
and upon the fourth generation of them  
6 that hate me; <and showing mercy>  
<unto thousands of> them that love me 7  
7 and keep my commandments. Thou  
shalt not t<ake the name of  
the Lord thy G>od in vain; for the Lord 8  
will not hold him guiltless <that>  
8 <taketh his na>me in vain. Remember<sup>2</sup> 9  
the sabbath day to <keep it holy>.<sup>3</sup>  
9 <Six days> shalt thou labour, and do 10  
10 all thy work: but *on*<sup>4</sup> the <seventh>  
day is  
<the sabbath unto the Lord> thy God: 11  
*in it*<sup>5</sup> thou shalt not do any work,  
<thou>  
<nor thy son nor thy daughter>, thy<sup>6</sup> 12  
manservant nor thy maidservant, *thine*

<sup>1</sup> So also D 5<sup>9</sup> (LXX. Syr. Onk. Ps.-Jon.) and Ex 20<sup>8</sup> (M. LXX. Syr. Onk.). But D 5<sup>9</sup> (M. Sam. T Sam.) and Ex 20<sup>8</sup> (Sam. T Sam.) read "and upon."

<sup>2</sup> D reads "observe."

<sup>3</sup> + "as the Lord thy God commanded thee," D.

<sup>4</sup> >Ex. and D (M. Sam. T Sam. Syr. Onk. Ps.-Jon. in both Decalogues). But LXX and Vulg. (in Ex.) support N: also Ex 23<sup>12</sup> 34<sup>21</sup>). Hence the "on" here appears to be original, though lost early in M and Sam.

<sup>5</sup> >Ex. and D. But N is right, since Sam. T Sam. LXX. Jub. 50<sup>7</sup>, Syr. Onk. Vulg. so read. Cf. Jer 17<sup>24</sup> *ad fin.*

<sup>6</sup> So Ex 20<sup>10</sup> (M. Sam. T Sam. LXX. Onk. Vulg., but Syr. Ps.-Jon. Vulg. read "nor thy") and D 5<sup>14</sup> (Sam. T Sam. LXX, but M. Syr. Onk. Ps.-Jon. Vulg. read "nor thy").

Lines in  
Papyrus.

Ex. xx.  
*ox nor thine ass,*<sup>1</sup> nor *any*<sup>2</sup> of <thy>  
 ca<title>,  
 <nor thy stranger that is> within thy 13  
 11 gates:<sup>3</sup> for in six days the L<ord>  
 made  
 <the heav>en and the earth, the sea and 14  
 all th<at in them is>,  
 and rested the seventh day: wherefore 15  
 the Lord blessed <the day>  
 12 the *seventh*,<sup>4</sup> and hallowed it. Honour thy 16  
 father and <thy> mother<sup>5</sup> <that>  
*it may be well with thee*<sup>6</sup> and that thy 17  
 days may be long upon the land  
 <which>

<sup>1</sup> >Ex 20<sup>10</sup> (M. Sam. Syr. Onk. Ps.-Jon., but TSam. LXX support N). D 5<sup>14</sup> (M. Sam. TSam. LXX. Syr. Onk. Ps.-Jon. Vulg.) supports N save that for "thine ox" M. Syr. Onk. Ps.-Jon. read "nor thine ox."

<sup>2</sup> N follows D 5<sup>14</sup> (M. Sam. TSam. LXX. Syr. Onk. Ps.-Jon.). Ex 20<sup>10</sup> (M. Sam. Syr. Onk. Ps.-Jon.) >"any of." But TSam. LXX of Ex 20<sup>10</sup> herein follow D.

<sup>3</sup> The words "for in six days . . . which the Lord thy God giveth thee" are an interpolation in Ex 20<sup>15</sup> of the sixth or fifth century B.C. See pp. 110-116. N has adopted this late text.

<sup>4</sup> So only LXX. Syr. Hence this correction, due to Gn 2<sup>3</sup>, may have originated in Egypt in the third century B.C. But השביעי may be merely a corruption of השבת.

<sup>5</sup> +as the Lord thy God commanded thee, D.

<sup>6</sup> Ex 20<sup>12</sup> (M. Sam. TSam. LXX. (A) Onk. Ps.-Jon. Vulg.) >underlined words. LXX (B) supports them in their present position. D 5<sup>16</sup> (M. Sam. TSam. Syr. Onk. Vulg.) also adds this clause, but transposes it after the clause "that thy days may be long," etc. Hence since LXX of D 5<sup>16</sup> N insert them before "that thy days may be long," etc., and M. Sam. TSam. Syr. Onk. Vulg. insert them

Ex. xx.	Lines in Papyrus.
14, 13 the Lord thy God giveth thee. <i>Thou</i>	18
<i>shalt not commit adultery. Thou shalt</i>	
<i>do no murder.</i> <sup>1</sup>	
15 Thou shalt not	

after this clause; they appear to have been originally a marginal gloss which was afterwards incorporated in the text—by one scribe in one place, by another scribe in another. It is a favourite expression in D. Cf. 4<sup>40</sup> 5<sup>29</sup>. 33 6<sup>3</sup>. 18 12<sup>25</sup>. 28 19<sup>13</sup> 22<sup>7</sup>. Both clauses, with words coming between, are found in 4<sup>40</sup> 6<sup>2</sup>. 8 22<sup>7</sup>, but with a divergence in order. 6<sup>2</sup>. 8 (with intervening words) supports the order in 5<sup>16</sup>, while 4<sup>40</sup> 22<sup>7</sup> reverse this order as in N.

<sup>1</sup> The order of the Commandments, VII.—VI.—VIII., “Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not steal,” is Egyptian. Ex 20<sup>13-14</sup> (M. Sam. T Sam. LXX (AFL). Syr. Onk. Ps.-Jon. Vulg.) and D 5<sup>17</sup> (M. Sam. T Sam. LXX (AF). Onk. Ps.-Jon. Vulg.) give the Palestinian and original order, *i.e.* VI. VII. VIII., “Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal.” It is found also in Mt 19<sup>18</sup> (5<sup>21</sup>. 27), Mk 10<sup>19</sup>; Josephus (*Ant.* iii. 5. 5); the Didache, ii. 2, iii. 2 sqq.; Tertullian, Clem. Alex., Origen, etc. The order in N is supported in Ex 20<sup>13</sup>. 14 by some Greek cursives and B (in part; for its arrangement is VII.—VIII.—VI.); in D by Greek MSS, B and some cursives, Sahidic, Bohairic, Ethiopic; Luke 18<sup>20</sup>, Ro 13<sup>9</sup>, Ja 2<sup>11</sup>; Philo, Jerome, Augustine, etc. This order seems clearly to have originated in Egypt. If so, the Hebrew text was naturally rearranged as in N for Egyptian Jews. Philo, writing nearly a hundred years before the Hebrew papyrus N was written, says that Moses placed the VII. Commandment before the VI. because he considered the VII. to be the greatest violation of the Law (ἀδικημάτων μέγιστον τοῦτ' εἶναι ὑπολαβών, *De decem Orac.* xxix. *ad fin.*). In the *Jewish Encyc.* iv. 496, an ancient opinion is given that adultery was a breach of seven other Commandments besides the seventh. This is the Jewish view. But Dr. Peters (*Älteste Abschrift d. zehn Gebote*, p. 33), not being acquainted with the attitude of the Jews on this question, thinks that the order VII.—VI.—VIII. is the original one, and that it was changed deliberately into VI.—VII.—VIII. on the theological grounds that murder was a worse sin than adultery. It appears possibly in an ancient Babylonian document. Jeremias<sup>2</sup> (*Das alte Test. in Lichte des alten Orients*, 1906, p. 208) gives the following rendering of it,

Ex. xx.	Lines in Papyrus.
16, 17 <st>eal. Thou shalt not <sup>1</sup> bear	<i>vain</i> <sup>2</sup> 19
witness against thy neighbour. <i>Thou</i>	
<i>shalt not</i> <sup>3</sup> <i>covet</i> <sup>4</sup>	
18 <thy neighbour's wife. <i>Thou shalt n</i> >ot	20
<i>desire</i> <sup>4</sup> <i>thy neighbour's house, &lt;his&gt;</i>	
<i>f</i> < <i>eld</i> , <sup>5</sup> or his manservant>	
<or his maidservant, or his o>x or his	21
ass, or anything that is thy neighbour's.	

which recalls the v.-viii. Commandments, but the order is peculiar and confused. I prefix the number of the Commandment in the Decalogue:

- (v.) Hat er Vater und Mutter verachtet . . .
- (viii.) Falsche Wage gebraucht,  
Falsches Geld genommen . . .
- (vii.) Hat er seines Nächsten Haus betreten  
Seines Nächsten Weib sich genaht  
vi. Seines Nächsten Blut vergossen  
viii. Seines Nächsten Kleid geraubt?

In Budge's *Books on Egypt and Chaldeans*, vii. 365, quoted by Burney, *JTS*, April 1908, p. 350 sq., there are in the forty-two statements of the Negative Confession parallels to the iii. and vi.-x. Commandments, but in an utterly illogical order.

<sup>1</sup> For "thou shalt not" in Commandments vii.-x. D reads "neither shalt thou"; but see p. xviii, ll. 18-20 for the detailed evidence.

<sup>2</sup> So D (M. Sam. T Sam.). Ex. (M. Sam. T Sam.) reads קר. See note on l. 19, p. xviii sq.

<sup>3</sup> So Ex. (M. LXX (-A). Syr. Onk. Vulg.): D (Sam. T Sam. LXX. Syr. Vulg.), but Ex. (Sam. T Sam.): D (M. Onk.) read "nor shalt thou."

<sup>4</sup> "Covet . . . desire." Here N follows D 5<sup>20</sup>. See note on l. 20, p. xix.

<sup>5</sup> "His field." Here N follows D 5<sup>21</sup> (M. Sam. T Sam.) in this addition. LXX. Syr. Onk. read "nor his field." Sam. of D 5<sup>21</sup> has reacted on Ex 20<sup>17</sup>. Hence Sam. T Sam. of Ex 20<sup>17</sup> insert "his field." See note on l. 20, p. xix sq.

## INTRODUCTION

xxvii

	Lines in Papyrus.
Deut.	
vi. 4 <And these are the statute>s and the	22
judgments which Moses commanded the	
<children of>	
(iv. 45, <Israel> in the wilderness, when they	23
vi. 2) went forth from the land of Egypt. <sup>1</sup>	
4 Hear	
O Is<rael>: the Lord our God is one	24
5 Lord: and thou shalt love	
<the Lord> thy G<od with> a<ll thy	25
hea>rt	

## V

### CONCLUSIONS DRAWN FROM THE ABOVE STUDY AS TO N AND ITS RELATIONS TO EX. AND D IN POINT OF TIME AND TRUSTWORTHINESS

§ 1. *N* has a definite Egyptian character.—(a) *N* was found in Cairo. This fact in itself proves nothing, but when taken in connection with the facts that follow, it possesses some evidential value.

(b) *N* agrees with the LXX, when the LXX has the Massoretic of *D* supported by Sam. T Sam. Syr. Onk. Ps.-Jon. Vulg. against it in 6<sup>4</sup>. (See notes on ll. 22–23, p. xx above.) In other words, the verse

<sup>1</sup> These lines seem to be compounded of D 4<sup>45</sup> 6<sup>2</sup>, and to be an early intrusion in the Hebrew text of the third or fourth (?) cent. which circulated in Egypt. This Egyptian form of the text is supported only by *N* and the LXX (with the versions made from the latter). See note on lines 22–23, p. xx sq.

which is interpolated in the LXX of D 6<sup>4</sup> was unknown in the fourth century B.C. as Sam.<sup>1</sup> (T Sam.) prove, and continued to be unknown in non-Egyptian authorities till the second century A.D. if we assign the Old Latin to that date. This evidence is very strong.

(c) N omits "out of the house of bondage," against Ex. D and their versions. The most reasonable explanation of this omission is that the *Jews in Egypt* refrained from describing Egypt as a house of bondage (see footnote, p. xxii).

(d) N with LXX reads "on the seventh day" (Ex 20<sup>10</sup> D 5<sup>14</sup>), where M. Sam. T Sam. Syr. Onk. Ps.-Jon. both in Ex. and D read "the seventh day."

(e) N reads "blessed the seventh day" in the fourth Commandment (Ex 20<sup>11</sup>), in agreement with LXX and Syr., where M. Sam. T Sam. Onk. Ps.-Jon. Vulg. read "blessed the sabbath day." See footnote 4, p. xxiv.

(f) N reads the Commandments VI.—VII.—VIII. in the order VII.—VI.—VIII. The former order is attested by M. Sam. T Sam. Onk. Ps.-Jon. Vulg. both in Ex 20<sup>13</sup>. <sup>14</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Samaritan Pentateuch "has, presumably, escaped the corruptions which have befallen the purely Jewish line of transmission since the fourth century B.C., whence now and then it agrees with the Septuagint in preserving words and letters which have dropped out of the Massoretic text." Burkitt in *Encyc. Bib.* iv. 5015. It is generally accepted that about the year 333 B.C., Manasseh, the grandson of the high priest Eliashib, carried off to Samaria the Hebrew Book of the Law, when Darius Codomannus gave him permission to build a temple on Mount Gerizim (Neh 13<sup>28-31</sup>; Jos. *Ant.* xi. 7. 8).



and D 5<sup>17</sup>, Josephus (*Ant.* iii. 5. 5), the Didache, etc. The order VII.—VI.—VIII. clearly originated in Egypt, possibly as early as the third century B.C. But N's only supporters are the Greek MSS B and some cursives. Hence the order of N and the LXX (B) may be later than the third century. Philo supports the order in N. This order is purely Egyptian. See footnote 1, p. xxv.

§ 2. *N agrees with D against Ex. and is dependent essentially on D or a descendant of D.*—(a) N adds with D 5<sup>14</sup> “thine ox and thine ass” against Ex 20<sup>10</sup>. D has here the support of M. Sam. T Sam. LXX. Syr. Onk. Ps.-Jon., but M. Syr. Onk. Ps.-Jon. insert “and” before “thine ox.”

(b) N adds “any of” (*i.e.* כל) before “thy cattle,” with D 5<sup>14</sup> against Ex 20<sup>10</sup>.

(c) N and LXX (B) of D 5<sup>16</sup> add “that it may be well with thee.” D 5<sup>16</sup> (*i.e.* M. Sam. T Sam. Syr. Onk. Ps.-Jon. Vulg.) also makes this addition, but after “that thy days may be long.” This addition originated in a marginal gloss in the Hebrew of D. See note 6, p. xxiv.

(d) N following D 5<sup>20</sup> (M. Sam. T Sam.) reads “vain witness” (ער שוא). Here D N preserve the original reading. In Ex 20<sup>16</sup> (M. Sam. T Sam.) שוא is rendered by שקר (= “false”). See note on l. 19, p. xviii sq.

(e) N following D 5<sup>21</sup> (M. LXX. Syr. Onk. Ps.-Jon. Vulg.) reads “wife . . . house.” So also LXX (B) of Ex 20<sup>17</sup>, but wrongly. Ex 20<sup>17</sup> (M. Sam. T Sam.

Syr. Onk. Vulg.) and Sam. T Sam. of D 5<sup>21</sup> preserve the original order "house . . . wife." See note on l. 20, p. xix. Here Sam. of Ex. has reacted on Sam. of D.

(f) N following D 5<sup>21</sup> (M. Onk. Ps.-Jon.) reads "desire" instead of "covet," as in Ex 20<sup>17</sup>. The change is due to the Deuteronomist. Here Sam. of Ex 20<sup>17</sup> has reacted on Sam. of D 5<sup>21</sup> so that Sam. T Sam. agree in both Decalogues. M is right in both Decalogues. See footnote on l. 20, p. xix.

(g) N following D 5<sup>21</sup> (M. Sam. T Sam. LXX. Syr. Onk. Ps.-Jon.) reads "his field." But Ex 20<sup>17</sup> (M. Syr. Onk. Vulg.) omit this expression and rightly, though Sam. T Sam. LXX support D. Here Sam. of D 5<sup>21</sup> has reacted on Sam. Ex. 20<sup>17</sup>. See preceding note for the converse. Here also as in (f) M is right. See note on l. 20, p. xix.

§ 3. *N agrees with Ex. against D.*—(a) N reads "remember" with Ex 20<sup>8</sup> (M. LXX. Syr. Onk. Ps.-Jon. Vulg.), against D 5<sup>12</sup> (M. Sam. T Sam. LXX. Onk. Ps.-Jon. Vulg.) which reads "observe." Here Sam. T Sam. of Ex 20<sup>8</sup> read "observe." The text of Sam. in D 5<sup>12</sup> has here, as in § 2 (g) above, reacted on Sam. of Ex 20<sup>8</sup>.

(b) N follows Ex 20<sup>11</sup> in adding "for in six days . . . and hallowed it." In Ex. this is an interpolation of the late fifth century: see pp. xviii, xxxix sq. But that such an addition to some texts of D was already made in the third century B.C., is proved by the LXX of D which, after "nor thy stranger that is within thy gates," inserts the following clause from Ex 20<sup>11</sup> "for

in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is (*ἐν γὰρ ἕξ ἡμέραις ἐποίησεν κύριος τὸν τε οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς*). Hence the above agreement between N and Ex. does not necessarily prove any direct dependence of N on Ex.

(c) N agrees with LXX. Syr. Onk. of D 5<sup>9</sup> in omitting "and" before "upon the third," but M. Sam. T Sam. read it. N agrees with Ex 20<sup>5</sup> (M. LXX. Syr. Onk.), but again Sam. T Sam. read "and." N therefore agrees with the LXX. Syr. Onk. in both Decalogues; with M in Ex 20<sup>5</sup>, but has M against it in D 5<sup>9</sup> and Sam. T Sam. in both Decalogues. N has, therefore, Semitic texts of the seventh to fourth centuries B.C. against it, *i.e.* M once and Sam. twice. It is allied to the LXX of the third century. It does not appear to be directly dependent on M in Ex 20<sup>5</sup>.

§ 4. *N right against Ex. and D.*—N rightly reads "in it" before "thou shalt not do any work" (Ex 20<sup>10</sup>, D 5<sup>14</sup>), since Sam. T Sam. LXX. Syr. Vulg. in both Ex. and D so read: also Jub 50<sup>7</sup>. Also the "on" before "the seventh day," though lost in M. Sam. T Sam., belongs to an ancient form of the text.

§ 5. *N has readings and forms of its own which do not affect the sense.*—N alone inserts אַח before אִשָּׁה and בֵּית in Ex 20<sup>17</sup>, D 5<sup>21</sup>. N always reads אִלִּים instead of אֱלֹהִים. But both forms are found elsewhere in M, the former thirty-five times. Of the compounds אֱלֹהִים and

סל the Books of Samuel always have the former, while Chronicles always have the latter.

§ 6. *N agrees with the LXX more than with any other authority, and apparently represents a form of the Hebrew text current in Egypt at the close of the third century B.C.*—(a) *N* > “and” before “upon the third,” with LXX. Syr. Onk. Ps.-Jon., against M. Sam. T Sam. of D 5<sup>9</sup>.

(b) *N* represents a later stage of change than the LXX in the fourth Commandment. Thus, whereas the LXX of D 5<sup>14</sup> borrowed only the clause “for in six days the Lord created the heaven and the earth, and all that in them is,” from Ex 20<sup>11</sup> (itself a late fifth-century interpolation?), *N* has borrowed this clause and three others from the same source, Ex 20<sup>11</sup>.

(c) *N* agrees with the LXX against M. Sam. T Sam. Syr. Onk. in giving a different order of the two clauses in the fifth Commandment<sup>1</sup> in D 5<sup>16</sup>, “that thy days may be long, and that it may go well with thee.”

(d) *N* agrees with the LXX of D 5<sup>17-19</sup> against M. Sam. T Sam. Syr. Onk. Ps.-Jon. (see § 1 (*f*) above) in changing the order of the Commandments VI.—VII.—VIII. into VII.—VI.—VIII. Order of LXX in Ex 20<sup>13-15</sup> is VII.—VIII.—VI.

<sup>1</sup> But as we have seen in note 6, p. xxiv, the clause “that it may be well with thee” originated in a marginal gloss in D 5<sup>16</sup>, which was subsequently incorporated by one scribe in an MS (which became the ancestor of M. Sam. T Sam. Syr. Onk. Vulg.) after the clause “that thy days may be long,” and by another scribe before this clause in an MS which was the archetype of the LXX of D and of *N*.

(e) N alone with the LXX interpolates in D 6<sup>4</sup> the following words: "And these are the statutes and the judgments which Moses commanded the children of Israel in the wilderness (>LXX last three words) when they went forth out of the land of Egypt."

## VI

§ 1. *The three forms of the Decalogue in Hebrew, i.e., in Exodus 20, Deuteronomy 5 and the Nash Papyrus, and the date of the archetype of the last of these—not earlier than the close of the third century B.C. or the beginning of the second.*—Owing to the discovery of the Nash Papyrus we now possess the Decalogue in Hebrew in three forms. These in the main agree with each other, and yet they differ essentially from each other in important features as regards both contents and dates. With the Nash Papyrus and its relations to the Decalogues in Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5 we have already dealt. N is very closely related to the LXX of D. See p. xxxii. Further, it is dependent mainly on D: it reproduces the tenth Commandment in dependence on D where D diverges in three respects from Ex. In the ninth Commandment it again follows D against Ex. Also in the fifth it borrows a clause from D, and in the fourth it borrows twice from D, in all three cases against Ex. See v. § 2 (a) (b) (c) (d) (e–g), pp. xxix–xxx. There can be no question as to its dependence on D, and thus to the date of its archetype as subsequent to 600 B.C.