
PALEOGRAPHY and Criticism are apparently as independent of each other as they are in reality interrelated. The origin, authorship, structure, analysis of a book as well as the recovery of the original form of a corrupt passage are problems intimately connected not only with a particular way of writing, but also with the way in which a book, or what we are accustomed to call a book, was originally produced. Our methods of book-writing and book-making differ immensely from those of the remote ages of the O.T., but very often we unconsciously fail to realize and to appreciate this difference and consequently we think and speak of the composition and transmission of ancient literary works and their various editions in terms of modern usage. Upon this misconception and misrepresentation of paleographical facts theories have been built, solutions proposed that had no other result but that of increasing the intricacy of the literary problems and leading the research worker astray. We must absolutely visualize the whole process of the composition of a book in those remote ages and its successive elaborations or editions, if we want to place in their true perspective the manifold problems of textual and literary criticism to many of which no satisfactory solution has yet been given.

For the sake of clarity I wish to explain the terms of my subject. Paleography is considered here under one of its aspects — book-formation. We have long been accustomed to call a book any number of sheets folded and fastened together at one of their ends and written or printed on one page or on both pages. But there was a time when books were written on long strips of leather and papyrus that were rolled up into a scroll. A work could be written on one or more rolls as a modern work is printed and published in one or more volumes or fascicles. The history of the transmission of ancient texts is, to a great extent, closely connected with their particular form. Naturally, a book written on a number of strips or
rolls was more liable to editorial manipulations. The several component rolls could be easily misplaced, new rolls could be added, others re-written, some could even be lost, and so the final one-scroll edition was, or could be, to some extent, different from the original edition.

In this paper I propose to deal (i) with the form in which the books of the O.T. were originally written; (ii) with some textual and literary problems of the O.T. and the solution thereof in the light of paleographical facts.

The form of a book depends on the material on which it is written. The clay tablets of the Babylonians and the Assyrians were preserved in jars and cases or arranged on a shelf in a consecutive order. But the Accadian scribes ensured that their tablets were read in the correct order by giving the first line of the following tablet as a catch-line at the end of the preceding tablet' (1). But there is no evidence that any of the books of the O.T. was written on clay tablets (2). Nor is it probable that any biblical book was written on potsherds, although such a material was used especially for short communications and records, and possibly for short prophetic utterances, as early as the 6th century B.C. (3).

The writing materials that were more commonly used in Palestine were papyrus and leather. For the use of papyrus we have the evidence of Wen Awon, a royal Egyptian minister under Ramesses XI (c. 1100), who, in the narrative of his voyage to Syria and Palestine, relates that he had to give, among other things, 500 bookrolls, that is, papyrus-rolls, in exchange for wood (4). This seems to suggest that papyrus was used for writing purposes in Syria and Palestine as far back as the 12th century B.C., though for diplomatic corres-

(2) Naville’s theory that the Pentateuch was written on clay tablets in Babylonian script and language is not supported by facts and is now abandoned (*The Text of the Old Testament*, London, 1916, pp. 40).
(3) *The Lachish Letters* discovered in 1935 and published in 1938 (O.U.P.) contain Jewish private correspondence written probably in the year 589 B.C.
(5) The Amarna Letters containing the official correspondence between the Canaanite chieftains and their Egyptian suzerains were written on clay tablets in cuneiform script,
Correspondence clay tablets and cuneiform script were used (5). Papyrus or on leather we have no decisive evidence. The story related in Jer. 36,23 that a roll was cut in pieces with a scribe’s knife and burnt in the fire seems to imply that it was a papyrus roll, because papyrus could be more easily cut with a knife and burn more readily than leather. But it is more likely that it was a leather roll, not only because leather was more durable than papyrus, but also because of the mention of the scribe’s knife which was used to scrape off the writing. Whether the books of the O.T. were originally written on on leather. Papyrus would hardly bear scraping with the knife.

The form of a book, whether it was written on leather or on papyrus, was that of a scroll. There is not the slightest doubt about this. A very common name for book is megilla which means ‘a scroll’ and is derived from the verb gsd to turn, to revolve’, as the Latin ‘volumen’ is derived from ‘volvere’. In Jer. 36,2 we find the expression megillat sepher the scroll of a book’, i.e. a book in a scroll form. In Is. 34,4 we read: ‘the heavens will be rolled up (‘nagolhu’) as a book’. And still more clearly in Zach. 5, 2 the prophet saw in a vision ‘a volume’ (megilla) flying: the length thereof was 20 cubits, and the breadth thereof 10 cubits’. The codex form came into use in the 2nd century A.D.

A very important point to determine is the size of the roll or the length of the strip on which a book was written. In other words, we must determine whether the longer books of the O.T. were written on a single roll or on more than one. There is absolutely no explicit evidence for the times of the O.T. writings. We are naturally led to suppose that the roll was cut to the length of the book, and that each of the several books was written on a separate roll. This was certainly the practice in the last centuries B.C., as is shown by the indisputable evidence of Mss of that age. Quite recently some Hebrew Mss were discovered near Jerusalem. One of them, containing the book of Isaiah, is a scroll 24 feet long and was written in the 2nd or perhaps the 3rd century B.C. Considering that the book of Isaiah is one of the longest books of the O.T., it is legitimate to infer that at that time each book was written on one scroll.

But we are hardly justified to extend this conclusion to books written many centuries before, especially to those which,
like the prophetical writings, grew up gradually out of the impact of the religious and political conditions of the people. There can be no doubt that even at that early age writers must have found it convenient to divide their works into rolls of moderate size, instead of going on adding indefinitely fresh sheets to the normal roll. If the Greek scribes and writers adopted this method, we have every reason to believe that the Hebrew writers of an earlier age, when the art of book-making was less developed, adopted the same method of dividing their works into a number of rolls of smaller size. The normal length of a Greek roll was from 20 to 30 feet, but the Hebrew roll was presumably much shorter. Books may have been written on a number of separate rolls which were, later, either pasted together or re-written on one roll. According to this hypothesis what we now call, for example, the book of Isaiah was originally a loose collection or a bundle of smaller rolls of a more or less uniform size, unnumbered and therefore liable to disarrangement and preserved in a chest. Direct evidence in favour of this hypothesis is very scanty. The prophet Jeremiah informs us that in the 4th year of king Joakim he was commanded by God to write and to read before the people the prophecies which he had uttered since the beginning of his ministry. This the prophet did, but the roll was cut up and flung into the fire by the incredulous king. We are not concerned with the exact contents of that roll. What is mainly relevant to our purpose is the fact that a part of Jeremiah's prophecies was written on a separate roll. Had that roll not been destroyed, it would have formed part, together with other rolls, written after the 4th year of Joakim, of our book of Jeremiah. Jeremiah was once more commanded by God to write in a book the prophecies that are now contained in chapters 30 and 31. Though the words 'write these words in a book' (30, 2) may be a later editorial addition (6), no editor would have added those words unless those chapters, which together with chapters 32 and 33 form a section by themselves, were actually written on a separate scroll.

For the other prophetic books we have no direct evidence. In the Pentateuch, the narrative of the defeat of the Amalecites

(6) For such they are held by O. Eissfeldt (Einleitung in das A.T., Tübingen, 1934, p. 407).
Paleography of the O.T.

(Ex. 17, 8-16) and the Song of Moses (Deut. 32) were certainly written on separate scrolls and later incorporated in the work of Moses. But there is a considerable amount of indirect evidence of a varying probative force for most of the O.T. books. This evidence, which is provided by textual and literary problems, will be examined later when these problems will be discussed and solved by the theory which may be called 'the roll-theory'. If we can give these problems a satisfactory solution based upon the assumption that books were written on a number of separate rolls, that theory will receive a high degree of probability. The theory, it is true, is tacitly admitted by most critics who, however, do not give it the importance it deserves. They speak of anonymous collections of prophetic writings incorporated in the genuine writings of other prophets; they agree in admitting textual disarrangements, editorial revisions and additions, and sometimes even joint authorship of one and the same book; they try to reconstruct the literary history of the biblical books through all the stages of gradual growth and editorial development; they blame the Green translators and the Jewish scribes for mishandling the text; but they completely ignore the paleographic argument which, at least in some cases, can provide the best solution to these problems.

Before passing on to the examination of the textual and literary problems I wish to anticipate an objection against the theory of a division of a book into any number of smaller rolls. There are in fact some texts which seem to point out clearly to the practice of writing each book on one roll. Thus the Law-book found in the temple of Jerusalem during repairs in the reign of Josiah is simply called 'sepher' 'book' in the singular. The whole narrative of 2 Kgs 22 and 23 and 2 Par 34 knows of one book only and contains not the slightest reference to rolls. Now supposing that book to have contained at least Deuteronomy, it would follow that in the 7th century B.C., in Josiah's time, each book was entirely written on one roll. Similarly in the book of Nehemiah ch 8 we read that Esdras, the great leader of the Jews after the exile, brought the book of the Law, spread it open before the people and read it during many successive days. Though the book was obviously larger than Deuteronomy, it was only one scroll. The theory of multiplicity of rolls
seems therefore to be definitely excluded.

Apart from the fact that in these two narratives the book of the Law is not the original work of Moses but only a copy or an extract of it, it should be remarked that the word sepher 'book' could be used to denote a whole work consisting of more than one roll just as the Greek teuchos was sometimes employed to denote a literary work in more than one volume. Thus the twelve minor prophets formed certainly one collection as is clearly evinced from Ecclesiasticus 49, 12 where they are collectively referred to as one book. Moreover, in the N.T. references to the minor prophets are introduced by the formula 'it is written in the Book of the Prophets', cf Acts 7, 42. The writings of the minor prophets, therefore, formed one collection, one literary work, but not necessarily one scroll. The different order in which they are arranged in the Hebrew and Greek Bibles is a clear proof that at least in the last centuries B.C. the writings of the minor prophets were still a loose collection of rolls kept together in one chest called 'the Book of the Prophets'.

In the light of these considerations I think we are justified in giving the expression 'the book of the Law' in the Josiah and Esdras narratives the meaning of 'chest containing the rolls forming the Law of Moses'. If this meaning is accepted at least as probable, the objection receives a satisfactory answer.

Having thus established at least the probability that the longer books of the O.T. were originally written on a number of separate rolls, I now pass on to examine some textual and literary problems showing how they can be solved by means of the 'roll theory'.

Let us take the book of Proverbs. Apart from minor textual differences between the MT and the LXX, the order of the collections forming the whole book is different in the two texts. The first Solomonic collections extending over chapters 1-24, 22 stand at the beginning of the book in Hebrew and Greek. The remaining collections are arranged in a different order. In MT the order is: A, B, C, D, E, F, while the Greek order is: C, A, D, E, B, F. How are we to account for this different arrangement? Have the Greek translators, with or without any reason, changed the order which they found in the Hebrew original which they were translating? Or have they simply reproduced the order of the Hebrew original? In this case how
is it that our MT disagrees with the Hebrew text used by the Greek translators? It is generally agreed that at the time of the Greek translation the order of the collections of which the book of Proverbs is made was not yet definitely fixed. The various collections circulated in separate books or scrolls that were later united into one volume. I go a step farther. At the time of the Greek version an edition in one scroll was made in Jerusalem and sent or taken to Egypt in order to be translated into Greek. After being translated that copy remained in the hands of the Alexandrian Jews and no further copies were made. At a later date another one-volume edition was made in Jerusalem by different scribes and with different criteria, and this edition became the basis of our MT. Let us now try to discover the principles of arrangement of the two editions. The several rolls were very probably united into two collections before their final one-scroll edition. This was an intermediate stage in the process of the formation of a book, and both Greek and Latin writers testify to the practice of dividing a book into two equal parts (7). It is therefore legitimate to infer that the component rolls of the book of Proverbs were, at different dates, united into two collections by the Alexandrian and the Palestinian Jews respectively. As there are two Solomonic groups of proverbs, one group was assigned to each part by both the Greek and the Jewish editors. The first Solomonic collection of 10-22,16, being the older, was placed in the first part and preceded by a long introduction extending over the first nine chapters. This formed the first part of the book of Proverbs both in its Alexandrian and its later Masoretic edition. The second collection of Solomonic sayings formed the nucleus of the second part. As an introduction the Palestinian editors prefixed to this collection two groups of sayings by the Wise men, 22,17-24,22 and 24,23-34, and appended three small groups of maxims, and the acrostic poem of the virtuous woman. The Alexandrian editors, however, followed different principles in their arrangement of the second part. The Solomonic collection was shifted to the end immediately before the acrostic poem. The first group of sayings by the Wise men, 22,17-24,22, was placed at the head of the collection serving as a sort of introduction. Then followed

(7) AULUS GELLIUS, Noctes Atticae 3, 14.
Agur's collection, 30,1-14, and the second group of sayings by the Wise men, 24,23-34. On the whole the Palestinian arrangement is more logical, the Alexandrian is rather mechanical.

The book of Jeremiah raises many important problems. The Greek version is much shorter than the Hebrew text, the difference being estimated at one eighth of the whole book. Moreover the prophecies against the nations, which in LXX are read after 25,13, that is, in the middle of the book, in MT are transposed to the end. Finally, the order of the nations against which the prophecies are directed is different in the MT and LXX.

Many theories have been proposed to explain these differences. The excess matter of MT is explained by A. W. Streane (8) as being due to the tendency to diffuseness, characteristic of later Judaism. Consequently, the LXX represents a purer and a more primitive form of text. This is also the opinion of W. Robertson Smith (9), and H.B. Swete (10), and, more moderately, A. Condamin (11), and G. Ricciotti (12). But we are not so much concerned with the question of the originality of the Hebrew or Greek text as with the paleographic implications of the additions and omissions of the two texts. Looking more closely into these quantitative differences we notice that they generally occur in certain sections or groups of chapters, while they are totally absent in other sections. Thus, in chh 1-7 and 17-22 there are only few and unimportant variations that can indifferently be attributed to the Greek translator or to the Hebrew editor. On the contrary, chh 23-29 present considerable differences, sometimes extending over 5 consecutive verses. This fact, so far unnoticed by critics, is of the greatest paleographical importance because it shows that the book of Jeremiah circulated in separate rolls some of which underwent a more extensive revision than the others. A reviser is supposed to apply his principles uniformly and consistently throughout the whole book; if certain sections are unrevised or only slightly revised, it must be concluded that they were not yet united together.

(9) *The O.T. in the Jewish Church*, London, 1903, p. 103f.
with the others in one volume.

Far more complicated is the problem of the place and order of the prophecies against the nations. As has been said above, in the Hebrew Bible and in our Bibles these prophecies occupy chapters 46 to 51, while in the LXX they are read after 25,13 and are arranged in a different order. Modern critics and interpreters explain these variations by the assumption that the prophecies against the nations circulated in a separate form and were incorporated with the rest of Jeremiah’s prophecies by the Alexandrian and the Palestinian editors in different places and in a different order. This is certainly true, but not the whole truth. Thackeray’s theory gets nearer to the mark. After having thoroughly examined the literary characteristics of the Greek version of Jeremiah Thackeray arrived at the conclusion that the translation has been made by two translators who divided their work somewhere in the latter part of ch 29 of the Greek text (13). The Greek translators, however, did not divide the book into two parts, they simply adopted a division that already existed in their Hebrew exemplars. The prophecies against the nations stood partly at the end of the first division and partly at the beginning of the second division. When, later, the two parts were united into one volume, the Greek editors simply joined one part to the other without introducing any change while the Palestinian editors transposed the prophecies against the nations at the end of the book and arranged them in a different order.

While fully accepting Thackeray’s conclusions as regards the bisection of Jeremiah’s book, I think we can go further back in the history of the formation of the book. The two-volume edition of Jeremiah’s book represents, as has been already remarked, an intermediate stage in the growth of the book. At an earlier stage Jeremiah’s writings were still a loose collection of rolls intermixed with others written by Baruch, the prophet’s faithful companion. Some of the smaller rolls began to be united into larger ones according to their chronological order or logical connexion. The prophecies against the nations very probably formed one separate collection, or one roll. Other rolls contained Jeremiah’s prophetic utterances, the historical narratives and Baruch’s own writings respectively.

Later on a two-volume or a two-roll edition was made, the line of demarcation falling, according to Thackeray's investigations, in ch 29 of the Greek text. Now considering that the Greek book of Jeremiah together with Baruch ch 1 to 3,8, which shares the same literary characteristics of the second part of Jeremiah, falls into two equal parts at ch 29, we are led to conclude that a copy of the Hebrew text in two rolls of equal length was made in Jerusalem and sent to Egypt in order to be translated into Greek. The first roll contained ch 1 to 25, 13 and a blank space which had to be filled up either with some of the prophecies against the nations, or with some of the historical narratives. The editors chose the former course, but space did not allow them to keep the same order of the Hebrew original. Elam heads the list, perhaps on account of its brevity, as it could easily fill up the last column of ch 25. Then comes Egypt, the first in the Hebrew collection. The prophecy against Babylon was too long to be written in the second roll and was therefore included in the first. The prophecy against the Philistines was also probably written in the first roll. These four prophecies are distinguished from the rest by their long introductory titles 'The word of the Lord that came to Jeremiah concerning Babylon (Egypt, Elam, the Philistines)'. The remaining prophecies were written in the second roll with only small changes of order. This two-roll edition of the Hebrew text, with the prophecies against the nations inserted in the middle of the book, served as a basis for the Greek translation, but no further copies of it were made. Besides this two-roll edition another one-roll edition of the Hebrew text was made in Jerusalem. As the historical sections in chh 26-45 are closely connected with the prophetic utterances in 1-25, the compilers of the book of Jeremiah, unwilling to break this connexion, relegated the prophecies against the heathen nations to the end of the book.

Thus the roll-theory explains in a most satisfactory manner the textual variations existing in the Hebrew and Greek texts of Jeremiah, the different position of the prophecies against the nations and, to a certain extent, the different order of these prophecies.

The writings of the prophet Jeremiah and his companion Baruch present many other literary problems. Let us examine them one by one,
Lamentations. This is a collection of five elegiac poems on the fall of Jerusalem and the calamities that befell the inhabitants after its capture by the Chaldeans. Tradition has always attributed those poems to the prophet Jeremiah. But modern criticism, on the grounds of internal evidence, denies both Jeremiah's authorship and unity of authorship. There are indeed some differences between the second, third, and fourth poem on one side and the first and fifth on the other. But these differences can easily be explained by the supposition that the two groups of poems were not written at one time and on the same roll, and we need not admit that the poems were written by two different poets.

The Epistle of Jeremiah. In LXX it follows Lamentations; in the Latin Vulgate it is the last chapter of the book of Baruch; in Hebrew it is missing. If it is really the work of Jeremiah, its different position in LXX and the Vulgate and its absence from the Hebrew writings of Jeremiah are clear proofs that it circulated in a separate roll. If it is a late composition wrongly attributed to Jeremiah, it obviously was written on a separate roll. At the time of the Alexandrian version it certainly did not form part of the book of Baruch. All that we can confidently say is that this letter was not included in the collection of Jeremiah's writings which passed in our Hebrew and Greek texts. It came into the hands of the Greek translators as an independent roll and was translated by them; but the Hebrew original, owing to its independent existence and small volume, was soon lost.

The Book of Baruch. The book of Baruch in its Greek form consists of three parts: (i) 1.1-3.8 confession of the people's sins; (ii) 3.9-4.4 a panegyric on Wisdom; (iii) 4.5-5.9 consolation to the exiles. The differences between these parts are such that the book looks more like a varied collection of anonymous writings than the work of one writer. The first part is a liturgical confession in time of national calamity; the second belongs to the Wisdom literature; the third carries us to the end of the exile and to Deutero-Isaiah. That the book is a combination of separate rolls is also borne out by the fact that the first part or 1.1-3.8 has been translated into Greek by the same translator of the second part of the book of Jeremiah. It was therefore a separate roll, and was naturally appended to the book of Jeremiah on account of the relations
existing between Jeremiah and Baruch. The other parts were written on other rolls, and the three rolls were united into one volume by the Greek translators. Very probably the Hebrew rolls were never united into one scroll.

The book of Daniel is one of the most disputed books both among Catholic as well as among non-Catholic critics. The trilingual character of the book, the different position of some of the Greek sections in Theodotion's version and in the LXX, the inconsistencies, repetitions and amplifications in the narratives and visions are all problems which have received the most different solutions. In this case too the roll-theory provides the best explanation. Very probably the Daniel stories circulated in separate fly-leaves or rolls. They were translated, copied out, retouched and some of them expanded. An editor collected these stories into one book or scroll according to that particular form or language that was available to him. So it happened that certain sections have come down to us in Hebrew and others in Aramaic. This edition was later translated into Greek, but the Greek translator incorporated in his translation some narratives that were not accessible to the Hebrew editor. The hypothesis of a collection of separate rolls accounts also for certain rough edges in the narratives and for some additions or amplifications that feature so conspicuously in some sections and are absent in others.

This theory provides also the solution of the literary problem of the book of Zachariah. It is a well known fact that the latter part of this book, or chs 9-14, is entirely different from the rest of the book. In this section we have a different historical situation, a different messianic conception and a different literary form. On the grounds of these differences non-Catholic critics and some Catholic interpreters reject the unity of authorship of the book, separating the composition of the two parts by an interval of three or four centuries. Against the unity of authorship it may be further urged that it is almost inconceivable that a writer, after having worked for several hours at a stretch, should all of a sudden change his style, his conceptions, the historical situation of his predictions and all the literary form of his composition. But we are by no means bound to believe that the book of Zachariah has been written all at one time. Like all the prophetic literature the book has grown up gradually under the influence of different historical
circumstances and different needs of the people. Hence another solution is proposed here. In chapters 1 to 8 Zachariah has given a brief summary of his ministry from the year 520 to 518 B.C. in the form of a diary in which some undated short sermons were inserted. All this formed one roll. At a later date, perhaps some years later, when post-exilic Judaism was passing through a period of revival and reform and concentrating evermore its hopes on the long-expected Messiah, Zachariah collected some fresh material from his teaching in which he expressed his messianic hopes in verse, representing the Messianic king under the figure of a shepherd and his people as a flock. This second composition, independent of the first, was written on a separate roll and bound or placed together with the other one in one case thus forming what is known to-day as the book of Zachariah. The second roll, though in reality independent of the first, was, in the prophet’s mind, the continuation of his teaching, and this explains the absence of the prophet’s name and of any other title at the beginning of the second roll. Thus the book of Zachariah is made up of two smaller books or rolls written by the same author, in different times, in a different literary form and with a different messianic outlook, but forming only one book. This explanation also accounts for the literary affinities between the two parts. Multiplicity of rolls and possible editorial retouches explain the variations between the two parts, and unity of authorship accounts for the literary features common to both parts.

Let us now pass on to the historical books. In 1 Sam 17 we read the story of David’s introduction to Saul. In the Hebrew text and in our Bibles the narrative presents a number of inconsistencies. Thus in 17,12f David is introduced as an unknown person, while a few lines before the writer had already informed us about his parentage, his anointment by Samuel and his appointment as harp-player to Saul. According to 16,21 David was Saul’s armour-bearer, but in v. 23 we hear of him as the king’s harp-player. Moreover after having slain Goliath David is still unknown at court, and the king asks his general Abner: ‘Of what family is this young man descended?’ And Abner replied: ‘O king, I know not’ (17,55). Finally, David was Saul’s armour-bearer; how is it therefore that he has not accompanied him in the campaign against the
Philistines? Critics generally refer these incongruities to different narratives that have been awkwardly pieced up by the Hebrew compiler of Saul’s history. Fortunately the LXX provides the clue for the right solution. Cod. B omits the story of David’s visit to the camp (17,12-31) and David’s interview with Saul (17,55 ff). It must be admitted that in B the narrative runs more smoothly; but how are we to explain these omissions in B? Are they really omissions, or rather interpolations in the Hebrew text? As Robertson Smith has rightly remarked, ‘it is difficult to believe that simple omissions, made without changing a word of what was left, could produce a complete and consecutive narrative’ (14). But it is equally difficult to regard these verses as an interpolation, for, as S.R. Driver has pointed out, ‘an interpolation would not insert anything at variance with the narrative interpolated’ (15).

These textual variations, therefore, cannot be explained either as omissions by the Greek translators or as interpolations by the Hebrew scribes. Both the Hebrew text and the Greek translation have a claim to originality. How are therefore these differences to be explained? This is the solution based on the roll-theory. There existed two separate narratives, representing two different traditions, of David’s introduction to Saul. Both were written on separate rolls and formed part of that collection of rolls which we now call ‘the Books of Samuel’. According to one, which we call A, David was introduced to Saul as a harp-player; he then became his armour-bearer, accompanied him in the campaign against the Philistines, volunteered to fight against Goliath, slew him and won the affection of the people. According to the other, which we call B, David was sent by his father to bring news from his brothers who were serving in Saul’s army against the Philistines. After slaying the giant, he was introduced to Saul who inquired about his parentage and retained him at his court. Of these two rolls the Greek translators made use of A only, either because the two narratives had much in common or because they appeared to be inconsistent with one another. But the Jewish editors combined together the two narratives omitting from B those

parts that were in A.

The book of Job is another illustration of the relations existing between paleography and criticism. The text of this book has suffered at the hands of copyists and translators as badly as the hero of the poem at the hands of Satan. The main textual and literary problems are these: (i) the relation of the LXX to the Hebrew text; the Greek version is much shorter than Hebrew, the omissions amounting, in some sections, to 25% and 35% of the whole Hebrew text; (ii) textual disarrangement in the third cycle of speeches; (iii) the speeches of Elihu (chh 32-37) seem to be from a different hand and added later; (iv) the praises of Wisdom (ch 28) is very loosely connected with the context and seems to be a later addition.

The quantitative differences in the Hebrew and Greek texts are generally considered as omissions by the Greek translator rather than as interpolations by the Jewish copyists and editors. But we are not so much concerned with the origin of these differences as with their significance. Looking more closely into the matter we notice that the omissions in the Greek text are unequally distributed throughout the book. According to the statistics compiled by Prof. G.B. Gray (16), the passages absent from LXX in the first 14 chapters are a negligible quantity. In chh 15-21, that is in the second cycle of speeches, the omissions amount approximately to 16% of the whole book. In the third cycle or chh 22-31 the percentage rises to 25. In Elihu's speeches, chh 32-37, the omissions have increased to 35%. In Yahweh's speeches they have decreased to 16%, and in the epilogue they disappear completely.

How is this different treatment of the text to be explained? How is it that the Greek translators or the Jewish editors have considerably abbreviated or expanded certain sections, leaving others untouched? If the omissions are due, as is commonly assumed, to the translator's ignorance of the meaning of certain obscure passages, to his repugnance to apparently irreverent expressions and to his aesthetic sense of conciseness, one would expect to find the same method applied to the first 14 chapters which have escaped almost unscathed. I should rather say that the Hebrew book of Job consisted of various rolls that were translated by different translators and with different literary

criteria. The speeches of Elihu, with the highest proportion of omissions, formed a separate roll. Yahweh's speeches, with a much lower proportion of omissions, formed another roll; and the three cycles of speeches by Job and his friends formed three separate rolls. The hypothesis of different translators has not as yet been proposed by anyone, but, together with the theory that the book of Job consisted of a bundle of rolls, it provides us with the best solution of the problem of the textual differences between the Hebrew and Greek texts.

Another textual problem to which no satisfactory solution has as yet been given is the order of chh 25-31 or rather 25-28. It is generally agreed among critics, save for rare exceptions, that the original order of these chapters has been disturbed, and various attempts have been made to restore the original order, but no reason has been given of the cause or causes of the dislocation. Owing to the difficulty of the problem I intend to propose only a tentative solution. The third cycle of speeches, chh 22-31, formed one separate roll or, perhaps two rolls. The disarranged sections occupied the central part of the single roll or the first columns of the second roll. By some accident the part of the roll containing Bildad's and Sophar's speeches and Job's answers to them was torn out. Some fragments may have been lost. What was left was later copied out and distributed among the speakers after the pattern of the other speeches. Lack of proportion in the speeches and inconsistencies with previous speeches were the result of this mutilated and patched up copy of the third cycle of speeches.

The literary problems concerning the poem on Wisdom (28) and the speeches by Elihu (32-38) are easily solved after what we have already said. Their loose connexion with the context may be very well explained by the hypothesis that they did not form part of the book as originally planned by the writer, but were later composed by him on separate rolls and added to the other rolls, to which they were joined. That these sections are later additions made by the same writer is indeed admitted by many critics.

I purposely refrain from dealing with the Pentateuchal problem and with the Deutero-Isaiah question, as I propose to deal with these problems more fully elsewhere. But the first part of the book of Isaiah is undoubtedly a compilation of various collections of prophecies that are easily distinguishable by their
Peculiar character. Chapters 1 to 5 and 7 to 12 form two separate collections in two separate rolls with chapter 6 containing the inaugural vision transposed from the beginning of the first collection to the second on account, perhaps, of the chronological sequence. Chapters 13 to 23 containing the prophecies against the nations formed originally another collection and a separate roll. Chapters 24 to 27 describing the world-judgement formed another unit or roll. Chapters 28 to 33 are a collection of poems which may be called the 'Woe collection' as each poem or discourse commences with the exclamation 'Woe!' The historical appendix 36-39 was certainly added later to the original collection of Isaiah rolls. The first part of the book of Isaiah is, therefore, a collection of rolls united together by an editor who added the historical appendix taken over from 2 Kgs 18-20. The latest editor or former copyists are responsible for some slight changes and additions in some of the rolls. Whether the second part of the book of Isaiah owes its origin to a similar process of combination of separate rolls will be seen on another occasion.

Summing up the results of our inquiry we may say that there is ample evidence that most of the books of the OT were originally written on a number of separate rolls that were not put together before the second or third century B.C. Before being combined into one scroll, the several rolls forming one book were very probably united into two scrolls of a more or less equal length thus forming what was known as dimidiatu liber. The LXX represents the pre-Massoretic Hebrew collection and arrangement of the rolls, but the Hebrew archetypes of the Greek version have not always been preserved; new collections, arranged sometimes in a different order, were made; hence the different arrangements in the Greek version and the Hebrew Massoretic text. Some of the rolls, especially of the prophetic writings, were more widely read and more frequently copied and have, therefore, undergone editorial changes and perhaps some adaptations to the changed conditions of the people. Still more important for literary criticism is the fact that the sacred authors writing on separate rolls and in different times and sometimes on different subjects could employ a different style and a different vocabulary. Hence differences in the literary form between the several parts of a book are not necessarily marks of different authorship.
I conclude by quoting the opening paragraph of Sir F. Kenyon's book *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*: 'The foundation of all study of the Bible, with which the reader must acquaint himself if his study is to be securely based, is the knowledge of its history as a book. ........If the reader wishes to assure himself of the claim which these books have on his consideration, he must know when and in what circumstances they were written, and how they have been handed down through the ages........... He is concerned first with their production and transmission in their original languages.......... and next with their translation into the languages in which they have been made known to him'.

P.P. SAYDON.