

many cases where a proper name appears in one part of the MT with daleth and another part with a resh, and there are cases where parallel passages in the OT° where a divergence is explained by seeing that one passage has taken a word as containing a resh where the other took it as containing a daleth. In cases instances like this, where the Sept° translation can be explained on this basis, it gives strong evidence~~s~~ as to the letter that was in the manuscript from which the Sept° was translated,~~y~~ and thus can in some cases (nth) be strong evidence that this was the letter in the original Heb°. An interesting instance of this is Amos 9 where the MT/^{says}that they shall possess the remnant of Edom. The Sept°~~says~~ Sept° says "the remnant of mankind shall seek ~~the~~ me." ~~(?) Subject (?) the Lord.~~ the Lord." LORD."

The difference can mainly be explained by assuming a resh in the ~~word~~ verb (?) urusu usushe urushu in the MT ~~was~~ ~~was~~ paralleled by a ~~daleth~~ daleth ~~mixte~~ proto-Septuagint text. Since James in Acts 15 quoted this passage as the clinching argument in a determination~~y~~ by the Jeru° council at a meeting at which ~~y~~ there were present many ~~xxx~~ learned men who would have gladly gladly have refuted his argument, if it was had it been untrue to the text, we can feel quite positive that the original Heb° here ~~had~~ at this point was like the Sept° rather than like the Heb°. Where the Sept° differs from the Heb° simply as a difference ~~of~~ of daleth and resh the question may be open opened as to which was the original text. If the NT° quotes it one of the two ways it is a ~~sg~~ strong argument in favor of that interpretation~~/~~, and if, as in this case, a strong NT° argument hangs upon the/quotation it would seem to be ~~convincing~~ conclusive evidence that ~~it~~ in such a case the Sept° has ~~had~~ preserved the correct original ~~text~~ text.