

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_bib-sacra\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php)

## ARTICLE VI.

THE HISTORICAL CRITICISM OF THE  
PENTATEUCH.A REPLY TO DR. ED. KÖENIG.<sup>1</sup>BY HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B., OF LINCOLN'S INN,  
BARRISTER-AT-LAW.

## II.

## THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH.

THE problem of the relationship of the Samaritan Pentateuch to the LXX and the Massoretic text has been discussed by me in the *Expositor* for September, 1911, pages 200-219, and on pages 219-235 of "The Pentateuchal Text: A Reply to Dr. Skinner," which has now been republished at a price which puts it in everybody's reach. Since these were written, the first part of Von Gall's new edition of the Samaritan Pentateuch has been published,<sup>2</sup> and a glance at a few chapters of the apparatus shows how insignificant are the variations of the Samaritan MSS. among themselves and how little any fresh edition can affect the problem. It is only necessary to add that Von Gall's work touches us in two ways. He writes: "Die Rede von dem einen Archetypus, auf den alle Handschriften im Grund zurückgehen, möchte ich weder für den jüdischen noch für den samaritanischen

<sup>1</sup>For the first part of this reply, see *Bibliotheca Sacra*, October, 1914, pp. 593-664.

<sup>2</sup>*Der Hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner* herausgegeben von August Freiherrn Von Gall, Erster Teil, Prolegomena und Genesis. Glessen: A. Töpelmann. 1914.

Text so unbedingt mehr aufrecht erhalten. Die Handschriften beider Synagogen sind erst das Produkt einer Entwicklung, die erst im späten Mittelalter abschloss. Es erklärt sich wohl auch so die Tatsache, dass wir sozusagen keine jüdischen und samaritanischen Handschriften aus dem ersten christlichen Jahrtausend haben" (p. LXVIII). And he tells us (pp. LXI f.) that Petermann's collection of variants is "ganz wertlos," because the Samaritan to whom he gave the task of entering the variants on a Jewish text omitted to note some hundreds of readings. Hence arguments based on Petermann's omission to record variants, e.g., in Genesis vii. 1, lose all force.

After I had written the foregoing paragraph, Skinner's volume on "The Divine Names in Genesis" came into my hands, containing an additional note (pp. 276-281) on my article in the *Expositor* for September, 1911. Of the really important points I had urged he makes no mention, and he has not had an opportunity of answering the section on the subject in my reply to him, which only appeared in America in April, 1914. I had said that my arguments were "partly quantitative and partly qualitative." I attributed the greater weight to the qualitative part of my argument, and of this Skinner says no word. I still think it the more important, and I am confirmed in my opinion by what he himself says in an entirely different connection on page 145: "Their relations must ultimately be determined by characteristic readings whose inherent value can be estimated, and whose lineage can be traced, with some assurance that we are not dealing merely with accidental coincidences." Of tracing the lineage of the readings of our earliest authorities there can of course be no question, and therefore this qualification is inapplicable to the particular matter to which I have applied it.

But the characteristic readings are to be found, and when I point to some of them a writer of Skinner's views ought not to neglect them utterly.

My quantitative argument was less important in itself, and seemed to me to require less emphasis, because I anticipated from my perusal of current commentaries that there would be no serious effort to dispute the fact that the agreement of Sam with M.T. is greater than that of the LXX with either. This has been readily conceded by Skinner himself in a passage reprinted on page 127 of his book.

As it was necessary for me to give some illustration of it, I chose some passages at random, and in view of the probability that the point would be readily conceded, I contented myself with very short passages. It is to these that his additional note relates.

He says that in these — and his criticism is, as already remarked, entirely limited to them — two mistakes vitiate my criticism. If they in fact did, my contention would still be untouched, for they were merely illustrations of the less important branch of my argument, and that has been freely conceded by Skinner himself. But I think he has misunderstood me. The second alleged mistake is the more important. He holds that I have "not recognized the necessity of showing that" the Hebrew of the LXX "is intrinsically superior to that of M.T. and Sam" (p. 277). Here he has confused different things. This part of my argument was devoted to showing not that the Hebrew of the LXX was *better*, but that it was *more different*, and therefore I was not concerned with questions of intrinsic superiority. The particular problem to which my mind was addressed was the mutual relationship of the three texts. Which of the three showed the greatest divergence from the other two? The

question of relative excellence is entirely different.<sup>1</sup> Neutral readings — i.e. readings where there is no decisive superiority apparent on either side — may be important for the determination of this question.

For instance, from most points of view it makes not the slightest difference whether in a given chapter you speak of "the house of Israel" or "the children of Israel." Possibly at some future date it may be shown that one of these phrases was specially characteristic of a particular period or school of thought, and was the more likely to oust the other at a given epoch, and a definite superiority may be established. But till that has been done the readings are for most purposes neutral. When, however, we have to consider the relationship of the three texts, the fact that two have the one reading while the third presents the other, is material to our inquiry, and it is no answer to say that no superiority is shown. On the other hand, this would be a perfectly sound reply to any attempt to *emend* either of the three texts by one

<sup>1</sup> To prevent misapprehension I may say at once that my contention has always been that the Pentateuch ought to be treated like any other ancient book in these matters, and that the best critical text possible ought to be constructed with the assistance of all the available materials. In the preface to my *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, which is dated 29 October, 1909, I wrote: "First, there is the attitude adopted towards textual criticism. In dealing with writings that have for many centuries depended on a MS. text, the first step must be to use all the available material with a view to ascertaining what the authors actually wrote. In the case of the Pentateuch this precaution has hitherto been neglected. The result is that at the present day Pentateuchal studies are conducted on lines to which it would be difficult to find a parallel in any other field of research. . . . The lesson taught by the history of Astruc's clue is driven home by other investigations. A number of further instances where a textual criticism that relies mainly on the extant evidence is able to dispose of century-old difficulties will be found in this volume (see especially pp. 114-138). Since it was written I have conducted some in-

of the other. The determination of the mutual relationship is one thing, the construction of a critical text is quite another, and different considerations apply. But it happens that the former task is one which should properly take precedence of the latter, and accordingly it is in order to approach it and to employ in its discharge all means that are proper to the end.

The other alleged mistake is that I make "too little allowance for the licence natural to the work of translation, and freely employed by the LXX, such as non-literal rendering, substitution of synonyms, accommodation to Greek idiom, adjustment of forms and expressions to the context, explanatory additions, and so on, but tend in all cases to assume a divergent Hebrew" (p. 277). Skinner then endeavors to illustrate this by taking some verses of Isaiah in the Authorized Version, and saying that on my principles they demand a different hypothetical Hebrew in some cases, and proceedings which reaffirm the lesson, and I hope to continue my examination of the critical case in future numbers of the *Bibliotheca Sacra* and elsewhere. So far as I have gone, I have found the evidence ever more favorable to a view that would attribute the narrative difficulties of the Pentateuch not to a variety of sources but to the influences that normally operate on every MS. text that is assiduously copied. The only reasonable basis for scholarly work must be a scientific critical text, and the successful formation of that text will be possible only if the principles of impartiality and economy of conjecture are rigorously applied" (pp. ix-xi). I have never budged from this position, and I am glad to note that Professor N. Schmidt has now adopted it. He writes: "Science is not concerned about the maintenance of any theory. Its most urgent demand upon its votaries in this field at present is that methods of textual criticism, at least as rigorous and exact as those recognized and employed in the elucidation of other Biblical books, shall be applied also to the study of the Pentateuch" (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. xxxiii. [March, 1914] p. 46). The whole of Professor Schmidt's article should be studied by those interested in the subject. He shows the worthlessness of Astruc's clue and Skinner's contentions, though I cannot agree with him in all his points.

ing to reconstruct this. I cannot do better than quote his own comment on this: "Now it is quite true that Wiener allows in words for the occurrence of such divergences between the Hebrew and the LXX; but in practice he does not carry the admission nearly far enough, and I do not think that what I have said is a very seriously exaggerated caricature of his method" (p. 278).

If in Skinner's own view his attempt is a "caricature," I am content to pass on without troubling whether it be "exaggerated" or "seriously exaggerated" or "very seriously exaggerated." As a matter of fact he does not dispute my principles, but claims that I am lax in their application. I think that before he makes such charges he might trouble to read me. The first passage with which I dealt was Genesis xiii., and I noted in verse 9 that for M.T. לֶחֶם LXX had *καὶ ἰδου*. To this Skinner says: "Is Wiener prepared to say that this necessarily presupposes *לֶחֶם* wherever it occurs," etc. (p. 279). But Wiener had, in fact, written on page 209 of the article under discussion "other seeming discrepancies again may be due to the translators, e.g. in 9 לֶחֶם may quite well (though not certainly) have stood in the Hebrew text from which the rendering was made." Then in the same verse we have the omission of *לֶחֶם*. "This," writes Skinner, "is one of the commonest things in the LXX," and he cites passages. "Are we really to suppose," he continues, "that in all these cases the LXX did not find the *לֶחֶם* in their original? And that the omission (here or elsewhere) improves the text?" (p. 279). The question of superiority, as I have already pointed out, was not germane to my inquiry, but I had clearly stated on page 208 that the word was "missing also in a Hebrew MS. of de Rossi," and on page 209 that "de Rossi also quotes the Syriac to the same effect." I have not looked to see what

confirmation there may be of the omission in the other passages cited by Skinner, because it seems to me immaterial. This is a *Hebrew* variant, and that is all that mattered to the question at issue.<sup>1</sup>

It is unnecessary to go through all the points in detail. Thus in Leviticus xvii. 8, where, according to Skinner (p. 280), the LXX "does not necessarily imply" a different Hebrew, its reading is in fact found in 2 Hebrew MSS., the Vulgate, Syriac, and a Targum (Expositor, Sept. 1911, p. 213).<sup>2</sup>

Skinner has, of course, only picked out the instances that suited his purpose, omitting many matters on which I relied; and anybody who trusts to this discussion of his, for an account of my argument, will certainly be misled. In particular

<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, I should say that, in my view, it may quite well be that glossators frequently did insert  $\alpha\iota$ , in order to bring the original directness of speech into accord with the taste of a more polished age.

<sup>2</sup> In Gen. xiii. 3 the LXX has  $\delta\theta\epsilon\upsilon\ \eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\upsilon\ \text{for}\ \gamma\gamma\omega\mu\acute{\iota}$ . Skinner asks, What is the variant Hebrew? It is impossible to answer this with certainty, because the Greek could stand for any one of several Hebrew expressions. The point is that it does *not* represent our existing Hebrew. Nor do the passages cited by Skinner in the least confirm his contention that the LXX are always at a loss when they come to the Hebrew noun used here. Then he says of the same verse where the LXX has "into" for the Hebrew "from" that it is just possible that this represents a Hebrew variant. It is impossible that it should do anything else, for no translators of the caliber of the LXX can reasonably be credited with writing "into" for "from." Then he asks me on Ex. xvii. 3 on "me, my sons, my cattle": "If the 'our' of LXX, Vulg., Pesh, Targum for 'my' of M. T. had been original, how does Wiener explain the change to sing. in M. T.?" Without committing myself to any view as to what was original I think that the system of abbreviations to which I have drawn attention (Oct., pp. 636 ff.) amply explains the variation. Certainly in Deut. xxxi. 16-21, where the LXX has plurals the Vulgate has the singular, — not, as here, the plural. On the other hand, in Num. xix. 7, I appear to have attributed to the LXX by oversight its reading in verse 8.



I should note that the readings in Deuteronomy xx. 6, which he accuses me of having passed over, were duly registered on page 214 of my *Expositor* article. There is one other point to which I must refer. He says (p. 280) that I give "expression to a fallacious assumption which appears often in his writings, that the shorter text is always to be preferred," and he asks (*ibid.*) why the omission of "and he said" in Exodus xvii. 16 is, in my view, "doubtless" the correct text. I have never maintained that the shorter text is *always* to be preferred. I prefer it when the additional words either add nothing to the sense, or water down the vigor of the shorter text, or amplify the text from some other passage, or apparently represent an attempt to explain or annotate the shorter text, or appear to accommodate the terse nervous style of oral narrative to the needs of a writing (and reading) age, or to represent an alternative reading, or any matter that would probably have come in from marginal notes or seem to be due to dittography. I am not sure that even this catalogue is exhaustive; but the points I wish to make are: (*a*) that I do not prefer the shorter text without some stylistic or other reason, and (*b*) that there are instances in which I prefer the longer text for some intrinsic superiority, or because there appears to have been an omission through homoioteleuton. At the same time I think that my frequent preference for the shorter text is in accordance with the facts of Jewish psychology, textual history elsewhere, and the probabilities of the case, and has the support of the bulk of modern textual opinion. I will only cite one writer whose devotion to the documentary theory is above suspicion. "It is probable," writes Dr. G. B. Gray, "that in the great majority of cases the shorter is the *earlier* reading; whether it is also the *better* reading depends on the view taken as to the date at which

the Pentateuch should be regarded as complete" (Numbers, p. xl).<sup>1</sup> It need scarcely be pointed out that, for all critical purposes, the original text is the only true basis, and that a similar remark applies when it is desired to use the Pentateuch for the history of the Mosaic period. On the other hand, later comments may be of great interest for the history of thought, so that the historical student is concerned with these too, though from the point of view of an entirely different period.

Before passing away from this point I would quote a passage from the *Times Literary Supplement* for July 2, 1914, which, while written of the text of the New Testament, appears to me to be extraordinarily applicable to the Old. "It is true that scribes omit, by the *saut du même au même*; it is equally true that they make additions to the text. The later a MS. of the New Testament is, the longer will be the text which it presents. We can see the texts growing, century by century. Is it likely that scribes should have reversed their habits after the fifth century — should have seldom expanded before and seldom omitted after? Then there were motives working with Biblical scribes which were absent in the case of those who copied classical authors. In the Bible every

<sup>1</sup>From his own peculiar standpoint he continues: "It is difficult to draw a sharp line between the latest editors (P<sup>s</sup>), whose remarks might be regarded as part of the original work in its final form, and the early scribes who transmitted the text of the completed work. The amplifications due to these two classes are similar, and the variants of S[am] and G[reek] have been cited freely in the Commentary that the student may the better appreciate to what extent these (for the most part) minor changes were being made as late as the third century B.C., in H[eb] as well, though not so frequently, as in G[reek] and S[am]." Had Dr. Gray included the Vulgate in his survey he could scarcely have maintained this view. I think that the idea of P<sup>s</sup> dividing into three independent lines of glossators—Samaritan, Egyptian, and Palestinian — will cause much innocent amusement.

word was precious and inspired; it was not safe to omit anything; even a reference to the Old Testament, or a parallel passage from another Gospel, or the most trifling marginal gloss, might after all be part of the sacred text (we have seen a lectionary note introduced into the middle of an argument in the Epistle to the Romans), and it would be wiser to retain it as such; this would also lead to expansion."

There is always a danger in investigations of this kind that the obvious may be overlooked; and further reflection induced by the variations of the Vulgate in the ritual legislation has convinced me that this has happened in the case of the Samaritan Pentateuch. Accordingly I am now prepared to go a little further than I did in my previous articles, and adduce fresh grounds for my conclusion that the basis which was edited by the Samaritans was a copy belonging to the same recension as the ancestor of the Massoretic text, not to the same recension as the Hebrew of the LXX. Had there been no controversy as to the relationship of the different texts, the obvious course would have been taken of drawing the natural inferences from the narrative of Josephus. The Samaritan schism was led by two men, — Manasseh, the son and brother of Jewish high priests, and his father-in-law, Sanballat the Cuthean. The story is told in Josephus, *Antiquities*, xi. 302–324; and I think that anybody coming to it with a fresh mind and no knowledge of the European controversy would draw the inference that, if Manasseh had anything to do with the Samaritan Pentateuch, he would have worked on a copy of the recension that was in use in the Temple at Jerusalem in his own day, and that especially in all matters of ritual his new edition would have been identical with that which served as the Temple manual except for such changes as might be desirable for making the Samaritan sanctuary

appear legitimate. Here are the extracts from Josephus which lead to this inference, and I ask my readers in perusing them to consider what would have been the natural course for Manasseh to take in the circumstances.

“(S 306) But the elders of Jerusalem being very uneasy that the brother of Jaddua the high priest, though married to a foreigner, should be a partner with him in the high priesthood, quarrelled with him: . . . (308) . . . so they commanded Manasseh to divorce his wife, or not to approach the altar, (309) the high priest himself joining with the people in their indignation against his brother, and driving him away from the altar. Whereupon Manasseh came to his father-in-law, Sanballat, and told him, That ‘although he loved his daughter Nicaso, yet he was not willing to be deprived of his sacerdotal dignity on her account, which was the principal dignity in their nation, and always continued in the same family.’ (310) And then Sanballat promised him not only to preserve to him the honour of his priesthood, but to procure for him the power and dignity of an high priest, and would make him governor of all the places he himself now ruled, if he would keep his daughter for his wife. He also told him farther, that he would build him a temple like to that at Jerusalem, upon Mount Gerizzim, which is the highest of all the mountains that are in Samaria — (311). . . Manasseh was elevated with these promises, and stayed with Sanballat, upon a supposal that he should gain an high priesthood. . . 312 But there was now a great disturbance among the people of Jerusalem, because many of those priests and Levites were entangled in such matches; for they all revolted to Manasseh, and Sanballat afforded them money, and divided among them land for tillage, and habitations also, and all this in order every way to gratify his son-in-law. . . 322 So when Alexander had received him kindly, Sanballat thereupon took courage, and spake to him about his present affair. He told him, That ‘he had a son-in-law, Manasseh, who was brother to the high priest Jaddua: and that there were many others of his own nation, now with him, that were desirous to have a temple in the same places subject to him; (323) that it would be for the King’s advantage to have the strength of the Jews divided into two parts, lest when the nation is of one mind, and united, upon any attempt for innovation, it proves troublesome to kings, as it had formerly proved to the kings of Assyria.’ (324) Whereupon Alexander gave Sanballat leave so to do, who used the utmost diligence, and built the temple, and made Manasseh the priest, and deemed it a great reward, that his daughter’s children should have that dignity” (Whiston’s translation).

On that passage there could be but one natural view, viz. that Manasseh, the son and brother of high priests, who was in the habit of ministering at the altar in Jerusalem, and coveted a high priesthood similar to that which was the greatest dignity in his nation, proceeded, *mutatis mutandis*, to institute a replica of the Temple service, and that he used for this purpose a copy of the Temple recension of the Book of the Law which contained the priests' manual, i.e. the manual regulating the very services that he himself had been in the habit of performing before his apostasy. The object of the schismatics was clearly to institute in the family of Manasseh a high priesthood parallel in all respects to that at Jerusalem. This view is strongly confirmed by a comparison of the Samaritan and Massoretic texts with the Septuagint and Vulgate. In the last section we saw that in the ritual legislation especially, the Vulgate often represented a very much simpler text than Heb-Sam: and that glossators had apparently commented very extensively on the latter. That is natural in the case of the Temple manual, for there would obviously be an overwhelming interest in the elucidation of the ritual which the priesthood were called upon to administer. There would not be the same incentive to comment on and explain these sections outside the Temple, and accordingly the Vulgate and the original LXX often present us with simpler texts. Further, this explains why the ritual legislation is so much more heavily glossed than the jurial laws of Exodus xxi. ff. The latter were naturally of less immediate practical interest to the priesthood of the second temple. It also accounts for the incorporation in Heb-Sam of a number of glosses favorable to the interests of the Jerusalem priesthood that are lacking in Septuagintal authorities. Moreover, "all who have done any textual work on the Pentateuch

know in practice that the text that is most unlike the Massoretic is the Septuagint and that in the great majority of its divergencies the Samaritan supports M.T." (Expositor, Sept. 1911, p. 201). Then there are the recensional differences, enormous in the case of the LXX, very considerable in the case of the Vulgate, in which Sam supports M.T. with great fidelity. All these considerations make it certain that the Samaritan Pentateuch is, in fact, founded on a copy of the recension in use at the Temple at the time of the Samaritan schism.

The resemblances between Sam and LXX (such as they are) may be attributed to five causes: (1) At the time of the schism the minute Massoretic rules for the preservation of the text had not yet come into force, and consequently there would be greater variations in small matters (extending perhaps in some cases to a word or two) between different copies of the same recension than was the case later: (2) some of the divergencies are due to subsequent deterioration of the M.T., e.g. probably Dodanim for Rodanim in Genesis x. 4; (3) the Jewish interpretation and intellectual currents of the day probably affected both the editors of the Samaritan and the translators of the LXX (or the scribes who had copied the Hebrew original and its ancestors), e.g. in substituting "sixth" for "seventh" in Genesis ii. 2; (4) some coincidences would be due to accident, in view of the ease with which certain of the Hebrew letters could be confused, and to the probability of independent glossing or smoothing of difficult passages on the same lines; (5) the mixing of Greek texts due to the existence of a translation of the Samaritan (of which some fragments have lately been recovered) and to the work of Origen and others. On the other hand, the other differences between Sam and M.T.

will be due to the editing of Sam, and to deterioration in the Samaritan text subsequently to the schism, and probably in some cases, as Genesis xlvi. 16 (where M.T. has "angel" and Sam "King" <sup>1</sup>), to scribal alterations in the Jewish texts.

What is there to place against this view? Nothing at all, except a theory constructed by Gesenius by the use of a faulty method which nobody — not even Skinner, who has opposed my contention twice (in his *Expositor* articles and now in the appendix to his "Divine Names") — has ventured to defend. My criticism of this method was quoted from the *Expositor* on pages 222 f. of "The Pentateuchal Text," and need not be repeated here, for Skinner and the other followers of Gesenius are content to let the case go by default.

#### THE CRITICAL VALUE OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

In the foregoing section we have seen that, in Von Gall's opinion, the text of the Synagogue — i.e. the Massoretic text — was not completed till the later Middle Ages, and that this accounts for the late date of all MSS. To this I may add Kennicott's testimony: "Experientia quoque sumus edocti, MStos Hebraicos, quo sunt vetustiores, eo magis a textu Heb. hodierno discrepare." The evidence of the Nash papyrus and the Karaite fragment of Exodus edited by R. Hoerning in his "Karaite MSS. in the British Museum" certainly confirms this, and we have seen that many thousands of letters have been destroyed and inserted even in a single Hebrew MS. of Kennicott's for the purpose of bringing it into line with the Massoretic text. It may also be recalled that in very numerous readings the ancient versions receive support from individual MSS. that have not been brought into complete accord with that text.<sup>2</sup> Consequently, when

<sup>1</sup> See *infra*, p. 131.

<sup>2</sup> *Oct.*, pp. 634-636 *et passim*.

König (*Moderne Pentateuchkritik*, p. 28) objects to the conduct of Dahse and myself in emphasizing the superior antiquity of the LXX to that of any Hebrew MS., he is not making as strong a point as he thinks. A late MS. *may* contain an early form of text, but an early MS. *cannot* contain any corruptions that are later than its own date (except in a form which would betray alteration of its original text). Dr. Swete (*Introduction to the O. T. in Greek* (2d ed.), p. 434) writes: "As the oldest version of the Hebrew Bible, the Septuagint claims especial attention from Old Testament scholars. It represents a text and, to some extent, an interpretation earlier than any which can be obtained from other sources." Now the passage impugned by König runs as follows: "Time after time it happens that perplexing phenomena of the Massoretic text can be explained with supreme ease by the natural processes of textual corruption, and the Versions in very many cases come to the rescue. To this must be added the fact that the translation of the Septuagint is much older than the earliest known Hebrew MS. It is by no means certain that the ultimate judgment of specialists will favor the Massoretic Pentateuch against the Septuagintal. On the contrary, recent investigations lead me to incline to the opinion that in the long run the latter may be shown to have a general superiority. What is certain, both from the Versions and extant Hebrew variants, is that the Massoretic text is merely one recension out of many that were current at one time or another" (*Pentateuchal Studies*, pp. 60 f.). I adhere to every word of that, and need only add that the probable history of the text leads me to think that in the Pentateuch the LXX may hereafter be shown to have a general superiority in some respects, and the Massoretic text in others.



König next points to the fact that, in certain cases, the LXX undoubtedly has an inferior text, e.g. "sixth" day for "seventh" as the time of God's completing his work (Gen. ii. 2), transcendentalization, etc. In all this I heartily concur. Certain currents of thought, theological and other, helped to mold the text of the LXX; and wheresoever they are at work historical textual criticism will of course discount them. On the other hand, I think that the same consideration should be applied when the difference between the LXX and the Massoretic text is such as to show a more transcendental conception of God in the latter than in the former. Take, for example, Exodus xxxiii. 18. The Hebrew has "Shew me, I pray thee, thy glory." But Bah(o)r Sah read "Shew me thyself," which is in far better agreement with verse 20. What inference are we to draw from such a reading? Similarly, in verse 13 the Hebrew has "make me to know, I pray thee, thy ways"; but the LXX again has "thyself." Are we to say in all such cases that the M.T. is to be preferred through thick and thin, or are we to infer that the tendency to transcendentalize has affected sometimes the one text, sometimes the other, and sometimes (as in the case of the alteration of the scribes in Gen. xviii. 22) both equally.<sup>1</sup> In view of what will follow later, I lay stress on one particular instance of the transcendentalizing tendency on which König relies here and elsewhere. "'God' is changed into 'angel' (Ps. viii. 6a. etc.). So the Hellenistic translation shared in the idealisation and transcendentalisation which made themselves felt in Jewish theology with respect to the conception of God" (p. 28; cp. his remarks on p. 22). In Exodus iv. 24, M. T., Symmachus, and Theodotion have the Tetragrammaton, but Aquila reads "God" (*ὁ θεός*), "while the

<sup>1</sup> See *infra*, pp. 148-149, n.

LXX substitutes a transcendentalising *ἄγγελος θεου* and a number of Greek witnesses have gone the length of actually making it only 'an angel' " (p. 46). What are we to say when we meet with similar phenomena in Genesis? If one text gives us an "angel of the Lord" or "God," while another gives us "God" or "Lord," and some Greek witnesses have "angel" only, are we to pin our faith to the text that gives us "angel of God," or shall we suspect a transcendentalizing tendency, even if the "angel of God" text happens to be our Massoretic Genesis<sup>1</sup>?

Lastly, König draws attention to the fact that the LXX sometimes substitutes easier or smoother expressions for the Hebrew. Without stopping to discuss details I may say that I am in general agreement with this view, and consider that this is another factor that must be discounted by textual criticism.

König then (pp. 29-31) proceeds to range over the opinions of a number of writers with regard to various books. None of these refer to the Pentateuch, which is admittedly the oldest and best part of the LXX, so that they could have no relevance if they were all weighty and undisputed. But nothing of the sort can be said. Thus Baudissin is quoted for the statement that the LXX translator of Ezekiel "was influenced by definite principles in the rendering of *gillulim*" (p. 30). Doubtless this is true; but how could that affect the value of the Septuagintal text of Ezekiel—to say nothing of the Pentateuch—as a whole? The opinion quoted from Procksch as to the Greek Joshua is directly contradicted by the most recent investigation—that of S. Holmes in "Joshua: The Hebrew and Greek Texts." And if König wishes to rely on Löhr's Commentary on Samuel

<sup>1</sup> See *infra*, pp. 144 f.

(p. 29). it is pertinent to refer to Professor H. P. Smith's vigorous and successful reply (Samuel, pp. 395 ff.). And innumerable opinions could be quoted on the other side.<sup>1</sup>

On the other hand, the fact that the LXX was the Bible of the Egyptian Jews, and subsequently of the early church, is more important than König allows. It proves that it was a text of good repute and authority in those days, and it answers the sneers of some of König's allies — though of course König himself has never stooped to their methods. Thus Skinner (Divine Names, p. 290) writes: "I tremble to think what the effect on my more conservative friends would be if they were told that the text of the Old Testament is to go into liquidation for an indefinite period, and will not obtain its discharge till it has been rewritten word by word." It is pleasant to be able to allay his tremors by referring him to my discussion of this very point on pages 13-18 of my "Pentateuchal Studies," which Skinner can quite safely put in the hands of his more conservative friends. The fact is that our materials for amending the Bible text, for the most part, resolve themselves into two classes, consisting respectively of (1) our Bible, and (2) the Bibles of former days (some of which, such as the Vulgate and texts of the LXX, are still the Bibles of other people). Conservatives are consequently not at all likely to be alarmed at the probable result.

That, then, is the case that König makes *against* the Septuagint; but though he heads this division of the book, "Investigation of the text-critical authority of the LXX and other forms of the O. T., particularly in respect to the names of God," he really contents himself with enumerating few considerations of any kind, and none of any cogency, in sup-

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, pp. 12 f., 27 f.; *Pentateuchal Studies*, pp. 128-137.

port of the Greek text. We have seen<sup>1</sup> that in his "Einleitung" he divides the textual material into water-tight compartments, never considering the bearing of his criticism of the Massoretic text on the value of the LXX; and this radical fault of method is at the bottom of the discussion in the "Moderne Pentateuchkritik." An investigation of the utility of a version for textual criticism should take account of all the known factors for and against, not merely of a few facts or tendencies.

To the other considerations that make for caution in the use of the LXX must be added the fact — so self-evident that one is always in danger of omitting to mention it — that every translation must necessarily contain some element of paraphrase. This must be discounted in the use of a Version; and there will necessarily be, within certain limits, the impossibility of saying whether it really had a different Hebrew before it; and, if so, what that Hebrew was. But experience and the evidence of Hebrew MSS. and other authorities tend constantly to reduce the margin of uncertainty, though some must always remain.

In presenting the case for the value of the LXX, I would first draw attention to a matter that is too apt to be overlooked — I mean the great recensional differences between the Bibles of Jerusalem and Alexandria in the text of the Law and the inferences that are to be drawn from them. I need not now repeat all the instances. It is sufficient to refer to the enormous differences in the concluding chapters of Exodus — differences which are increased if it is assumed, with some, that these chapters were altogether absent from the original of the LXX, and were added later by another Greek translator. In that case we have to deal with three

<sup>1</sup> Oct., pp. 630-642.

main recensions — one which omitted these chapters altogether, a second which presented them in the form of Heb-Sam, and a third which is reflected in our Greek: but for the present purpose I am prepared to limit myself to two main recensions, Heb-Sam and LXX. What explanation can König offer of these? So far as I can see there are three possibilities only. He must claim either (1) that the Egyptian Jews had no copy of the Law at all till the LXX was made (about the first half of the third century B. C.), when they obtained a copy from Palestine; or (2) that they had a law, but abandoned it for the purposes of the Greek translation in favor of a Jerusalem copy; or (3) that they had a law in Hebrew, and made their translation from a copy of it. If he elects either (1) or (2) he must explain (*a*) how it came about that, having obtained a copy of the law that was already canonical in Jerusalem and had been accurately followed by the Samaritans at an earlier date,<sup>1</sup> they proceeded to knock it about mercilessly in these chapters of Exodus, though they generally follow the Hebrew text with scrupulous fidelity; and (*b*) how it is that we find the Nash papyrus exhibiting a text that in Deuteronomy agrees so closely with the LXX, and differs so widely from M. T., circulating in Hebrew some four centuries later. These are merely sample difficulties. They could be increased with ease, but it is best to leave the matter so, in order that the recensional question (which König has altogether ignored) may stand out in bold outline.

Then we must bear in mind the facts reviewed in sections above (Oct., pp. 630 ff.) — the support of the Chronicler, the Samaritan MSS., and versions for Septuagintal readings, the known alteration of the Massoretic text through theological

<sup>1</sup>According to König (and others) in 432 B.C., i.e. about a century and a half earlier; according to Skinner and others *circa* 330 B.C., i.e. about half a century earlier.

and other tendencies, the intrinsic superiority of many of its readings where M. T. (with or without the support of other ancient authorities) presents an unintelligible or inferior text, the known tendency of Hebrew MSS. to abbreviate, with the consequent liability to error, the absence of an adequate vowel system in Hebrew making the further deterioration in the pronunciation of the consonantal text both easy and inevitable. The various forms of Septuagintal text are valuable for the detection of all the normal sources of corruption which operate on MS. texts — glossing, homoioteleuton, haplography, dittography, erroneous vocalization, mistakes due to the system of abbreviations, errors due to misreading or dictation, total or partial obliteration of letters through damage to MSS., bad writing, etc. But the work of the last few years has convinced me that they are also valuable in exposing certain tendencies which have operated on the text. I refer to (1) religious and intellectual tendencies (on which, cp. Oct., pp. 639 f., and *infra*, pp. 108 ff.); (2) glosses importing a system of chronology that was absent from the earliest text (see Pentateuchal Studies, pp. 81 f.) and other chronological and numerical tendencies (*op. cit.*, p. 22: Essays, pp. 155–169); (3) interpretations of the Law in the light of history, which appear to have found their way into the Hebrew text (see especially Pentateuchal Studies, pp. 157–168); (4) interpretations and glosses that are due to the feelings of a more polished and softer age (*op. cit.*, pp. 23–25; *supra*, p. 89); (5) glosses due to the especial interest of the Temple priesthood in the study and practice of the ritual (Oct., pp. 649–661; *infra*, pp. 109 f.).

Before passing away from this, a very difficult passage must claim some attention, for it throws fresh light on the way in which the LXX may be utilized. In Genesis xvi. 13

f., Heb-Sam make Hagar say: "Have I even hither looked after him that seeth me," and call the well Beerlahairoi (cp. xxiv. 62; xxv. 11). It has been conjectured that "hither" הלל is a corruption of אלהים. The LXX and Vulgate also have mutilated texts, but the former is not identical with Heb-Sam, and the interpretation given by the latter tells a curious tale of textual history. The LXX has *καὶ γὰρ* [=הגם?] Lat Eth "because," Eth omitting "because she said"] *ἐνωπιον ἰδον ὄφθεντα μοι*: lit. "a face I saw (him) that was seen by (appeared to) me." In verse 14 she calls the well, according to most texts, *οὐ ἐνωπιον (m+θῦ) ἰδον*, but dp Lat transpose *ἐνωπιον οὐ*: in xxiv. 62; xxv. 11, the well is called *της ὀρασεως* (Eth omits in the former passage). If we turn to the Vulgate we get striking confirmation of the originality of the word "face" in xvi. 13, for it renders "Profecto hic vidi *posteriora* videntis me." That is to say, Jerome read as Heb-Sam, but he understood perfectly that the אחר of the Hebrew meant *posteriora*, as in Exodus xxxiii. 23, not "after." Clearly it has been substituted for "face" under the influence of that verse. Of הלל there is no trace in the LXX, nor of the Hai (living) in the name of the well in any one of the three passages. Has it come in from Exodus xxxiii. 20? Or is it a corruption of face? Then it will be noticed that the LXX has "him that appeared to me" in verse 13, and "whose face I saw" in verse 14. The Greek text of verse 13 is syntactically impossible. I think it clear that the text is mutilated, and that originally the passage told of Hagar's seeing the face of some Baal. To recover the exact original is impossible, but its general sense is clear enough.

Thus in some cases both the LXX and the Massoretic text may be mutilated forms of the original which has suffered through some religious theory, but in such cases the con-

parison of the two may put us on the track of the truth. It will be seen hereafter (*infra*, p. 147, n.) that I believe this to have happened in the case of Exodus xxiv. 10, with the paradoxical result of turning into a striking anthropomorphism a passage that originally avoided any such meaning.

#### SOME INFERIOR READINGS OF THE MASSORETIC TEXT.

Enough has been said in the preceding sections to prove beyond all doubt that the inerrancy of the Massoretic text cannot be sustained, that it can frequently be corrected from other ancient authorities, that it has suffered from all the possible sources of MS. decay, including very heavy glossing and deliberate alteration in the interest of particular theories. In this section I propose to give one or two additional instances of the way in which the versions sometimes assist us to obtain a better text, and to cite a few other readings that seem to me to be of special importance from the point of view of the textual history.

The first word of Numbers xvi. 1 is hopelessly corrupt. It is ויקח. "And (he) took." Thus we get "And Korah took," which makes no sense. If we turn to the versions we get no help, but it should be noted that the LXX expresses וידבר. There is a modern conjecture ויקם "And (he) rose," but this is obviously wrong in view of the beginning of verse 2, "and they arose." But a Hexaplar note tells us that the ancient authority known as "the Hebrew" had καὶ ὑπερηφανεύθη, i.e. he read ויקח. Aquila renders the same Hebrew verb by the same Greek verb in Deuteronomy xvii. 13. Accordingly this reading should be adopted here, and we should translate "And Korah became presumptuous." The meaning of the word is that he "seethed," and it expresses Korah's attitude very graphically. It will be observed that the corruption of



a single letter would give a reading that might be treated as an abbreviation of the Hebrew of the LXX. The sense obtained is admirable and fits the context perfectly: but no modern commentator could possibly have divined the original text from the corruption.

The next instance is better known. In Genesis iv. 8, M. T. has "And Cain said to Abel his brother," without giving his speech. The Samaritan LXX and Syriac add "let us go to the field," undoubtedly rightly. The Vulgate has "Let us go out," and has some support from the Targum of "Jonathan," "come and let us go out." Many MSS. and editions of the Massoretic text have a blank. The passage is important as showing that here the Massoretic text is worse than any of these versions, that the injury must have been late, and that some single MS. must have exercised very great influence on the formation of the text, for it can hardly be supposed that a large number independently underwent damage affecting the same two words.

There is another example of this absolute "said" in the Massoretic text. Exodus xix. 25 reads "and Moses went down to the people and said to them." What he said does not appear, and the narrative immediately continues "And God spake," etc. Corruption is generally admitted, but the solution actually suggested by one of the authorities is not suspected. The Würzburg palimpsest of the Old Latin reads as follows: "Des[c]endit autem Moyses ad populum et edux[it] illū de castris et adplicuit ad montem." In considering this reading we must of course first turn to verse 17. This seems to have run somewhat as follows in the Old Latin: "[et ed]uxit Moyses [populum in ob] viam Deo [ex castris et co]nstererunt [sub monte]. Verse 25 in this version does

not seem to be a mere repetition of 19, but rather an independent rendering from the Greek. That both verses cannot be original is certain. If the Old Latin 25 is correct, the earlier verse must be due to a transposition, and perhaps some of the following verses were misplaced with it. There is so much evidence of transpositions elsewhere that we cannot at once reject the possibility—particularly having regard to the fact that the Massoretic verse 25 cannot stand as it is. We must therefore examine the matter further. Can any plausible ground be suggested for a transposition? I think it can. The scribes who would not tolerate a narrative in which the Lord stood before Abraham would hardly be likely to leave untouched a text in which the Lord descended and waited while the people were brought from the camp; and if there has been a transposition the Latin may represent the last stage in the change of the text. In that case the present position will have been determined by (1) the mention of the people being in the camp (ver. 16), and (2) the desire to place this before verse 20 (God's descent). This too would limit the amount of the narrative transposed, which cannot exceed verses 17-19. If we try the effect of removing these, we find (1) that verse 19 is exceedingly inappropriate in its present position, for "Moses spake and God answered him with a voice" leads to nothing; (2) that in its new position this is the introduction to the Decalogue and makes excellent sense; (3) xx. 18 appears to refer back to these verses, especially if, with the LXX, we read the singular "the voice" for the plural "voices" (R. V. "thunderings").

This leads to the examination of verse 13, "when the trumpet soundeth long they shall come up to the mount." These words absolutely contradict the whole context. If there is

one thing on which the chapter insists, it is that they are *not* to come up to the mount during the theophany, on pain of immediate death, and the preceding part of the verse has laid stress on this, "no hand shall touch him, but he shall surely be stoned, or shot through; whether it be beast or man, it shall not live." Consequently the Massoretic text cannot be sustained. But here the LXX comes to the rescue, and again its reading is instructive. "When [h acx n ptd<sub>2</sub> bw j fi Arm Syr "and when"] the voices [i.e. "thunderings"] and the trumpets and the cloud depart from the mount they shall go upon the mount." Whether all those words should be in is questionable, but it seems quite clear that the crux of the matter lies in the Massoretic text having treated נמש as an abbreviation for נמשך—a natural error when a word for trumpet followed—instead of נמש "on the departure of." Of course some other words may have fallen out of M. T., but that is the substantial cause of the difficulty. It is noteworthy that Theodotion, the Syriac, and Targum read the correct word here, though not the Samaritan, Aquila, and Symmachus. It may be added that a perusal of the notes to this chapter in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* would give the reader no bad opportunity of seeing in brief compass the effect of some of the tendencies that have operated on the various texts—alike Massoretic and versional—for many inferior readings are here quoted from ancient authorities as well as some that assist in correcting M. T.

We have seen that the Biblical text was altered out of religious motives, Ishbaal, for example, being changed into Ishbosheth. There is a passage in the Pentateuch that has fallen under suspicion. In Exodus viii. 22 (26) we read "for we shall sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians to the Lord

our God: lo, shall we sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians before their eyes, and will they not stone us?" The repetition of "we shall sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians" at once suggests that the text is conflate, but it is not to that point primarily that I desire to draw attention. Professor H. P. Smith puts the difficulty in the following words: "The puzzling expression in Ex. viii. 26, 'for we shall sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians,' may show that the author knew of Egyptian worship of bulls and rams, for these were the sacrificial animals of Israel. Did he perhaps write, 'we shall sacrifice the gods of the Egyptians?' This would best suit the context, and a zealous scribe might readily substitute the word that better expressed his own feelings" (*Old Testament History* [1903] p. 59, *n.*). The Vulgate certainly confirms this view, and at the same time appears to go back to an intermediate text, which seems to give a clue to the conflation. It has "abominationes enim Ægyptiorum immolabimus Domino Deo nostro: quodsi mactaverimus *ea quæ colunt Ægypti*, coram eis," etc. Obviously Moses did *not* refer to the objects of Egyptian worship as "abominations" in speaking to Pharaoh: equally he did *not* at one moment call them "abominations" and at the next "*ea quæ colunt.*" The original text probably had "lo, we shall sacrifice that which the Egyptians worship before their eyes." This was first glossed by a commentator with "for we shall sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians." The note made its way into the text and gave us Jerome's reading, which was finally altered into the Massoretic text.

Another class of variants suggests that some of the glosses that have found their way into the Massoretic text directly represent interpretations that found favor with the priesthood

of the Temple. The whole history till the end of the exile shows that, from the death of Moses onwards, the priesthood was Levitical. I have discussed this matter at length in my "Pentateuchal Studies," and cannot now recapitulate the long chapter that deals with "Priests and Levites" (pp. 231-286). But the point to which I desire to draw attention is that in Deuteronomy xviii. 8 "the Levites" is a gloss which was absent from the original text, and is still lacking in some Septuagintal authorities (*op. cit.*, pp. 252 f.). The gloss is erroneous, and the variant which omits it has the support of all history before the return from the Exile. Yet it is easy to see how such a gloss would become part of the Temple text. Similarly in Deuteronomy xii. we have glosses that have entirely obscured the original meaning of the Law. I believe that that chapter was originally very much shorter and clearer than it can be said to be at present, and has grown through interpretation alike in bulk and in difficulty: but at present I wish to draw attention only to some fairly late glosses that are exposed by the LXX. The Law deals quite clearly with vegetable tithes in verses 17 ff., but in verses 6 and 11 "your tithes" is out of place. In verse 6 it is missing from the LXX, being inserted in G (under the asterisk) ckox dpt b<sup>a</sup>? z (marg) and Arm. In verse 11 it is lacking in a<sub>2</sub>, Im Thdt-codd and some other MSS. There is very considerable confusion in the Septuagintal texts of this verse, and this appears to be due to the fact that there was once a shorter text enumerating only "Your burnt offerings and your gifts" (so HP 46) and that this has been more or less brought into accordance with the Massoretic text in different recensions and codices. It may be added that even the Massoretic text by

omitting "and" before "your tithes" shows that the latter phrase is a late gloss.

The case is similar with "your peace offerings" in verses 6 and 11. In the first-named verse the word is misplaced by the Old Latin, omitted with much else by B<sup>1</sup> and also by N F\* n b' b\*w u Boh<sup>w</sup>. In verse 11 it is wanting in N and some other MSS.; but, as already remarked, the variations in that verse suggest that the original LXX had a very much shorter text.

#### RIVAL VIEWS OF THE TEXTUAL HISTORY.

We are now in a position to weigh the theories of the history of the text, and see whether they afford any ground for resisting the contentions that have been advanced by textual critics with regard to the Divine appellations in Genesis and the documentary theory. König claims that there were two main periods in the history of the text: (1) that of its composition, during which alterations were made: and (2) that of transmission, during which the text was transmitted unaltered, new matter being incorporated in marginal notes. He

<sup>1</sup>The text of B at first sight looks like the result of homoioteleuton, but further study shows that this is not so. It reads "and ye shall bring thither your burnt offerings and your freewill offerings (?), the firstlings of your cattle and your flocks." The word queried is *ὁμολογίας*, and the fact that the text is original is shown by the use of different words *καὶ τὰς εὐχὰς ὁμῶν καὶ τὰ ἐκουσία ὁμῶν* in all the other MSS.—so that whether the word here means "vows" or "freewill offerings" (as in ver. 17) the text of B has a different origin from that of the other MSS. The support of the Old Latin, which merely inserts *hostias vestras et*, is another proof of the same thing. That B's text is original, and not due to corruption in the individual MS., is clear from the words reappearing at different points of the conflated readings presented in this verse by p sz Lefjkt-va, 71 Arm Boh Eth and w. Note too that B omits "and" before "the firstlings." In this it has the support of yha, Mab, Fl ejsvz fir qu.

holds that in the case of the Pentateuch the first period ended in 444 B.C.<sup>1</sup>

That alterations were not made in the text after 444 B. C. is a thesis that cannot for one instant be sustained in the light of the facts set out in the last five sections. Let me take but one more instance of editorial activity. How comes it, that the patriarchal chronology is to be found in three different versions,—Massoretic, Samaritan, and Septuagintal? Will König really maintain that when these changes were made the

<sup>1</sup>He writes on p. 12: "Aber trotz der zweifellosen Stabilität, die für die Vererbung des hebräischen Textes durch die oben vorgelegten Proben von beweisenden Materialien festgestellt worden ist, könnten doch die Gottesnamen eine Beute der Veränderung geworden sein, wie solche in mehr als einem Stadium der Geschichte des hebräischen Textes nachweislich eingetreten ist. In dieser Geschichte sind betreffs der Veränderlichkeit des alttestamentlichen Wortlauts wesentlich zwei Stadien von einander zu unterscheiden: erstens die Zeit bis zum Abschluss der Entstehung des A.T., also mit Einschluss der zum Teil fraglichen Schlussredaktion, Sammlung und grundlegenden Kanonisierung, zweitens die Zeit der Weitervererbung des entstandenen oder zum Abschluss gekommenen A. T. Auch in der letzteren Hauptperiode wechselte übrigens noch eine doppelte Art des Verhältnisses zum Texte, insofern man zunächst noch am Rande Korrekturen oder Veränderungen des konsonantischen Wortlautes anbrachte und dann die Punktation hinzufügte, während später das Gesetz der Unveränderlichkeit des Textes aufgestellt wurde, wenn es auch praktisch nicht ausnahmslos beim Abschreiben durchgeführt wurde. In jener ersteren Hauptperiode war also die geistige Stellung Israels zum Buchstaben seiner alten Literatur eine viel freiere als im erwähnten zweiten Hauptstadium. Dies ergibt sich ja beispielsweise schon aus dem Faktum, dass Israel sich einstmals nicht scheute, sogar am Grundgesetz des Dekalogs Variationen vorzunehmen, und wie diese verschiedenen Phasen der Textgeschichte weiter in meiner Einleitung, S. 57 ff. und hauptsächlich 78-85 untersucht worden sind." Then on pp. 13 ff. he emphasizes the fact that "die Hauptsache" is that the alteration of the Tetragrammaton into *Elohim* "noch während der Periode der Entstehung und Sammlung des althebräischen Schrifttums geschehen ist, so dass man kein Recht hat, sich auf diesen Vorgang zu berufen, wenn es sich um die Schicksale der Gottesnamen in Schriften han-

portions of Genesis affected must "still have existed as separate documents," and that the Book of Genesis must "still have been in the process of coming into existence" (p. 15). The Samaritans could and did change the text freely, even on König's own view. That of course does not prove that the Jews did. But what of the changes of the scribes and the other alterations enumerated in his *Einleitung*, discussed above (Oct., pp. 632, 639 f.)? And what of the enormous differences of the LXX and the Nash papyrus? Are they due to alteration of the common basis of Heb-Sam or to a recen-

delt, die, wie das Gesetz, seit 444 als religiöse Autorität anerkannt waren, und wenn die Schicksale der Gottesnamen in späteren Zeiten überhaupt in Frage stehen. Dieser Unterschied ist z. B. von de Lagarde übersehen worden, als er den von Dahse (*Textkritische usw.*, S. 46) zitierten Satz schrieb: 'Von 444 bis zu Jesu Tode muss sich der Teil der jüdischen Theologie entwickelt haben, welcher sich mit den Namen Gottes beschäftigte.' Erstens ist dieses 'muss' unbewiesen, soweit nicht oben von mir Beweise dafür aus Chronika, Psalter, Daniel, Qoheleth beigebracht worden sind, und zweitens ist bis auf den Erweis des Gegenteils zu behaupten, dass die an Chronika (um 300 v. Chr.) und den anderen erwähnten Partien des A. T. erwiesene Stellung der Judenschaft zu den Gottesnamen sich nur in bezug auf die noch in Entstehen begriffenen Schriften, also nicht in bezug auf das Gesetzbuch geäußert hat. Ebenso ist jener Unterschied, wie von Eerdmans (vgl. dagegen schon Holzinger in *ZATW* 1911, S. 51), so auch von Dahse schon dadurch übersehen worden, dass er jenen Satz de Lagardes mit Zustimmung wiederholte (*Textkritische usw.*, S. 46) und überhaupt spätere jüdische Hände eine Änderung der Gottesnamen im Texte des Pentateuchs vornehmen lässt (*Textkritische usw.*, S. 48 usw.). On p. 15 he continues: "Denn erstens muss diese Veränderlichkeit des Textes nicht überall sich geltend gemacht haben, und zweitens ist das Gesetzbuch möglicherweise, ja wahrscheinlicher Weise mit konservativerem Geiste behandelt worden, als andere Teile des A.T. (s. o. S. 13). Auf jeden Fall aber haben die, welche meinen, dass in den Abschnitten der Genesis die Gottesnamen später noch im Texte geändert worden seien, folgendes übersehen. Dann müssten diese Teile der Genesis zur Zeit dieser Änderung eben noch als gesonderte Urkunden existiert haben und das Buch der Genesis noch im Entstehen begriffen gewesen sein."



sion that dates from before the Samaritan schism? And what of the Vulgate with its great differences from the Massoretic text? In another place (p. 32) König lays stress on "the judgment of the great authority (des grossen Kenners) Jerome." "He was *not* satisfied with emending the *Vetus Latina* of the Psalter from the *Hexapla* (*Psalterium Romanum* and *Psalterium Gallicanum*). He set himself the ideal aim of also making a translation from the Hebrew text of the O. T." How comes it that his *Hebraica veritas* differs so largely from the Massoretic text and so often for the better? And what of the innumerable passages in which the other younger versions give us better readings than Heb-Sam? How will all this fit in with König's theory? Or how can he explain the fact that in the last eleven chapters of Genesis the Tetragrammaton occurs once only (in xlix. 18) in the Massoretic text, in spite of the fact that large sections of this are assigned to "J"?

If it be asked on what König's judgment of date is based, the answer is that he relies partly on the Samaritan Pentateuch and partly (Einleitung, p. 81) on the contention that the change must have taken place before the time of the replacing of the Tetragrammaton by *Elohim*. This, he thinks, began from the time of the composition of Chronicles, which he fixes at *circa* 300. With the evidence of the Samaritan Pentateuch I have dealt. The other consideration, even if sound, would be too slight to place against the overwhelming mass of readings in almost every chapter of Genesis that tell against his view. But it cannot in fact be supported. For one thing any tendency in that direction may have been neutralized, for some purposes at any rate, when the habit of commonly pronouncing the Tetragrammaton was renounced in favor of *Adonai*. While the sacred Name appears to have been used

to some extent in the Temple services even to the last, for ordinary purposes it had been replaced by *Adonai*. When did that happen? According to Blau in the Jewish Encyclopedia, Jacob (Im Namen Gottes, p. 167) for several reasons assigns the disuse of the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton and the substitution of *Adonai* to the later decades of the Babylonian Exile. One thing is certain. If it can be made probable that the use of the Divine appellations in Heb-Sam has been influenced at any point by any theological or other currents of thought, a presumption will arise that these currents operated before the separation of these two texts.

There is another point which should be pressed in this connection. The last eleven chapters of Genesis present us with the Tetragrammaton in xlix. 18 only. Otherwise its place is throughout taken by *Elohim* in the Massoretic and Samaritan texts. Here then we probably have an instance of the replacing of the Tetragrammaton by *Elohim* before the Samaritan schism. Yet it cannot be said that this change occurred before the supposititious documents were combined.

For myself I think that probably current discussions of the question of the disuse of the Tetragrammaton tend to err through regarding as a single act what was a long-continued process with many stages. From the Babylonian exile to the fall of the Temple is a period extending over half a millennium. It seems to me that there will have been different phases of thought — to some extent different tendencies—during that time. "It may well be," writes Blau (Jewish Encyclopedia, s. v. "Tetragrammaton") of the avoidance of the utterance of the name, "that such a reluctance first arose in a foreign, and hence in an 'unclean' land, very possibly, therefore, in Babylonia." We should probably distinguish various processes which may have become operative at different times :

e.g. (a) avoidance of the utterance of the Tetragrammaton in a foreign land; (b) preference for *Elohim* in new books; (c) substitution of *adonai* for the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton; (d) insertion of the Tetragrammaton in glosses and new texts when the pronunciation *adonai* had become current; (e) refusal to utter the Tetragrammaton except when the people were at worship in the Temple with no strangers present.

If there be anything in this view, and it must be admitted that the change from universal utterance of the Tetragrammaton to entire disuse of its pronunciation cannot have come about suddenly, König's reasoning falls to the ground. We may then see in the concluding chapters of Genesis evidence of the reluctance of the scribes, in days before the pronunciation *adonai* had been adopted in reading the Scriptures, to allow Joseph and the members of his family to utter the Tetragrammaton on Egyptian soil, and account in this way for the textual phenomena<sup>1</sup>: and on the other hand we may attribute glosses that introduce the word into the Egyptian chapters of Exodus to the period when this motive did not operate — either by reason of the view as to the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton abroad not being entertained, or through the adoption of the pronunciation *adonai*, or possibly through a feeling that during the period when Egypt was the scene of great and miraculous assertions of the Divine power the normal view ceased to apply (cf. *infra*, pp. 136 f., where the reading which makes of Ex. viii. 18 (22) an emphatic assertion that Israel's God is the Lord of Egypt is discussed).

<sup>1</sup>This may also be the reason for the frequent preference for *Elohim* in the LXX and Syriac. Scribes outside Palestine removing baal from Hebrew texts would tend to use *Elohim* before the pronunciation *adonai* came into vogue where within Palestine they might tend to the Tetragrammaton.

In his "Divine Names in Genesis," Skinner has put forward a view of the textual history that forms the backbone of his case. An official text has existed since the middle of the second century of the Christian era (p. 24). With perhaps the partial exception of the so-called Targum of Jonathan, all the versions other than the LXX "belong to an age either contemporary with or later than the fixation of the *textus receptus* which we now possess. Hence, as might be expected, their divergence from our present Hebrew is slight; and as a rule it is only where they lend each other mutual support, or agree with LXX or Sam., that any value whatever attaches to their variant readings" (p. 136). At the time when the Vulgate was produced, "the Massoretic recension had been established for 250 years—long enough for many mistakes to have crept into MSS. derived from a single archetype. Hence a divergence of the Vulgate, unless it commends itself by its intrinsic superiority, or is corroborated by textual evidence, can never take us behind the sources of the M. T." (pp. 144 f.). Origen and Lucian knew no other text than M. T. On this Skinner is especially emphatic (pp. 66 n., 244 f.). Traveling backwards, he relies on the agreement with M. T. of Sam, which, on page 132, he derives "from an *unofficial* Hebrew recension" to which the LXX also belongs, while on pages 133 f. it is "derived from the canonical text of Palestinian Judaism." With regard to the LXX, in addition to representing an unofficial Hebrew recension on page 114 and elsewhere, it is on page 131 derived from no "less authentic a source than the official Palestinian text of the time," and on pages 165 f. it "represents at best an Alexandrian recension whose text was certainly not transmitted with the same scrupulous fidelity as that of Palestine."

That Skinner's ideas on the subject are not self-consistent

is obvious. I have dealt with his view of the Samaritan on pages 219–235 of my reply to him, and *supra*, pp. 83–96, and with this theory of the Vulgate, Oct., pp. 642–664. The numerous instances in which readings of one or more versions can be used to correct the Massoretic text, the support given to readings of later versions by Hebrew MSS., the evidence of the Nash papyrus and non-Massoretic Hebrew MSS., are all in irreconcilable conflict with his theory. It remains to test his views of the Hebrew influences that have been operative on the Septuagint since its first translation. Is it or is it not the case that readings can be found which go back to a Hebrew different alike from M. T. and the original of the LXX? Is it or is it not the case that the Hebrew used by Origen, Lucian, and other editors was identical with M. T.? It is obvious that different Hebrew readings may be due either to sporadic correction or systematic editing.

I will first quote Skinner's remarks: "It may be mentioned in passing that Dahse tries to show that the Hebrew used by Origen differed in one or two instances from our Massoretic text. If the difference could be proved in several cases, it would certainly be an important fact; but it would not prove that Origen's Hebrew text was independent of the Massoretic. It might only mean that he relied on a carelessly written MS. of that text. That he followed a *recension* different from the Massoretic, or even a text materially at variance with it, is a position which I do not think any authority on the LXX would maintain.

I leave the expression "carelessly written," because Dahse in his Reply (p. 492) makes it the object of sarcastic remarks. It would have been better to say "divergent" (p. 66, *nn.*). "In the first place I have always held that the Greek version of the *Pentateuch* (note the restriction!) originated in a

single translation made once for all (except perhaps Exod. xxxv.—xl.) in the third century B. C., and propagated in Greek MSS. without (so far as we know) systematic revision till the third century A. D. Sporadic emendation in accordance with the Hebrew must have taken place before the latter date; and it is *conceivable* that the Hebrew text employed for this purpose may have differed both from the M. T. and from the Hebrew of the original LXX. Whether any such cases can be proved in the Pentateuch I do not venture to say. But apart from such rare and hypothetical cases, it follows from what I have said that wherever a recension or MS. of the LXX presents an undoubted *Hebrew* variant from MT, that must be accepted as the reading of the Hebrew text on which the LXX as a whole is based. I consider it therefore an error in method, whenever an interesting variant is found in the LXX text, to fly at once to the assumption of a special Hebrew recension without at least exhausting the possibility that — if it be a Hebrew variant at all — it is the Hebrew of the original LXX” (pp. 241 f.). With regard to Dahse’s assumption of separate Hebrew originals he writes: “If he does not mean fresh translation, but only systematic correction after a Hebrew text, I reply that all the data he has hitherto published are insufficient to show the use for that purpose of any Hebrew text except the M. T.” (p. 243). “The second factor which determines my attitude to the LXX problem is the conviction that the Hebrew text employed by Origen and Lucian for the correction of the LXX was the M. T. or an earlier Greek version which followed M. T. As to Origen this, I suppose, has never been questioned save by Dahse. Nor, so far as I am aware, does any other opinion prevail among authoritative scholars in regard to Lucian” (p. 244). “When Dahse can produce a few unambiguous instances in

*the Pentateuch* where a reading of any recension of the LXX goes back to a Hebrew original differing *both* from M. T. and from the basis of the LXX, I shall acknowledge that my views of the LXX are untenable. Meanwhile, I certainly do not stand alone when I say that nothing short of the most searching and comprehensive induction — such as Dahse has not yet attempted — will suffice to establish a dependence of Origen or Lucian on another Hebrew than the M. T.” (p. 245). It is right to add that Skinner probably intends to limit these views to the Pentateuch (see his note on p. 241). Certainly Swete (Introduction to the O. T. in Greek (2d edition), p. 441) represents the views of competent critics when he writes that the textual critic “has before him in many contexts a choice of readings which represent a plurality of Hebrew archetypes.”

I propose to show that Swete’s dictum is true of the Pentateuch, and that there are readings in our Greek MSS. and groups of MSS. which go back to Hebrew originals other than the M. T. or the original of the LXX. Reference may first be made to Num. xv. 11–16 (discussed Oct., pp. 657–661). The text of G and the Syro-hexaplar represents Origen, but bw and m represent *two* divergent Hebrew originals, not one, and if either of them is the original LXX, then the other is something different, while if the original LXX lacked all that is missing in either, we are confronted with three non-Massoretic Hebrew archetypes, only one of which can have been the original of the LXX. Moreover, the readings of c Arm and Eth in verse 14, backed by the Vulgate, show a further discrepancy. Some of these differences may be due to sporadic correcting of the original LXX from the Hebrew, but the general characteristics of bw are such as to exclude the notion of sporadic correction in its case.

The following instances are taken from my "Studies in the Septuagintal Texts of Leviticus," which appeared in the BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, July, 1913 – January, 1914 (the pages are given in parentheses). In considering their bearing we must remember that the MSS. representing Origen's text are well known, so that there is generally no difficulty in determining his reading. When therefore we find him agreeing with the ordinary LXX and some non-Hexaplar group like bw giving us the Massoretic reading, we must infer that Origen's Hebrew agreed with the original of the LXX. Where there are two or three readings we sometimes see more than one non-Massoretic Hebrew archetype. In Exodus xxxii. 3 (July, p. 506) we have three Septuagintal readings—"their ears" (=M. T.), "ears of their wives and of their daughters" (Sahidic, Latin, and some MSS.), "ears of their wives" (several MSS., including some important groups, Arm-ed and Cyril). In verse 7 (*ibid.*) the Massoretic "get thee down" is read by x and Eusebius only, "get thee down thence speedily," with the words in different orders, has the support of the Sahidic Bohairic Latin and Ethiopic and most MSS. It is therefore pre-Hexaplar, but Barnabas and a Greek citation of Origen show that "get thee down speedily," found in bw and fi, is also pre-Hexaplar. Here, therefore, we have two Hebrew non-Massoretic readings. In Leviticus iii. 5 (July, p. 513) to the Hexaplar and Massoretic "the sons of Aaron," the Old Latin adds "the priest," and almost all the MSS. "the priests"—another instance of two non-Massoretic Hebrew readings or perhaps two different ways of reading non-Massoretic Hebrew archetypes. In vii. 13 (LXX 3) (*ibid.*, pp. 515, 520), "with cakes of unleavened bread," Origen lacked "cakes," but it is supplied in ejsvz gn Arm dpt — i. e. probably Lucian. In Leviticus x. 3, 5 (*ibid.*, p. 522) bw



joins M. T. in reading "spake" for the "said" of all other Septuagintal authorities (including the Hexaplar texts). It may of course be that the LXX did not here differ from M. T., but only used the different word; but in any case it is good evidence of revision of bw from a Hebrew text. In vii. 38 (*ibid.*, p. 524) ejsz and M. T. have "Mount" for the "wilderness" of all other Septuagintal texts, including Origen. In viii. 35 (Oct., p. 670) the Armenian and its allies are closer to M. T. than the Hexaplar authorities, but I must content myself with referring to my discussion of that passage in the *BIBLIOTHECA SACRA*, as also to what I have said of the even more important readings in v. 2 on pages 81 f. of the January, 1914, number. In Leviticus xxiv. 7, gn Arm and M. T. give the singular for the plural of all other Septuagintal authorities (Oct., pp. 671, 676). In xxvi. 14, c gn dpt Arm Lat have "all," which is omitted by most Septuagintal authorities, and in verse 21 dpt w and Lagarde's Boh have "and," against the rest of the LXX.

This phenomenon makes its appearance in the Divine appellations in Genesis, for (a) there are passages where *all* the Septuagintal MSS. agree on a reading that is non-Massoretic, and (b) in xviii. 14 a non-Hexaplar group, bw, alone has the Massoretic reading against LXX and Vulgate. Thus in xiii. 10a LXX and probably Pesh have "God" for M. T. "Lord"; in xiii. 13, where M. T. has "Lord," the Old Latin (which is pre-Hexaplar) appears to agree with it, but no Greek authority whatever; in xv. 6, LXX Syr Vulg unanimously read "God" for M. T. "Lord"; in xvi. 5 the LXX is unanimous on "God" against M. T. "Lord," as also in xxx. 27, where the Vulgate and Syriac support it, and xxxi. 49b. In xxxviii. 10a we meet with the curious fact that the pre-Hexaplar Old Latin alone agrees with M. T. in reading

“Lord,” while *dnp* — which are certainly not Origen — have “Lord God,” and all the other Septuagintal authorities read “God.” I cannot see why in such places we should suppose that Origen had before him a Hebrew text that was identical with the Massoretic, though in many passages Jerome and the Syriac translators did not. Accordingly it appears to me that Skinner’s theories of the textual history cannot be supported in this matter either.

Against these views I set the following conception of the history of the text as being in accordance with the known facts. Hebrew and Samaritan alike are descended from the recension that was in use in the second Temple. This represented a text with very numerous comments, ritual and other. But before the Samaritan schism there had already come into existence numerous copies of the Hebrew, which in many cases antedated the Temple comments and alterations. Of these the most important for our purposes were the ancestor or ancestors of the Egyptian texts, the first of which presumably dates from the time of Jeremiah, and the ancestor of Jerome’s text, which belongs to the Babylonian-Palestinian family, but is in many respects purer than M. T., though it contains some corruptions from which the latter is free. At the same time, throughout the earlier period there was a greater tendency for MSS. of the same family to vary, and hence later authorities have often preserved better readings where earlier witnesses had been affected many centuries previously by some corruption that ultimately became widespread. Thus it is that we may see the Vulgate, the “Hebrew,” or any other of the later versions stepping forward from time to time with an original reading that has disappeared from M. T. and LXX.

After the Samaritan schism the Temple text continued to deteriorate. Nevertheless it was the central text of Judaism,

though formed and maintained on non-critical principles, and there was a tendency to bring all other Jewish texts more or less into conformity with it. This operated partly by sporadic changes and partly by systematic attempts, such as the fixing of the text by the school of Aqiba, the elaborate changes of the scribes affecting certain passages, and the fresh renderings into Greek and other languages.

At some period in the history of this text (which was formed on principles of which we are totally ignorant) a single MS. must have acquired a dominant authority — otherwise how explain such a reading as that of our Hebrew in Genesis iv. 8? But the task of bringing all existing copies of the Bible throughout the wide Jewish diaspora into complete accord with a single type of text was impossible of rapid accomplishment when printing was an unknown art. It took centuries, and minor variations were inevitably made in the official text during the process. Fortunately for us there still survive MSS. (of which we must hope to have good modern collations some day) which contain large numbers of variants. Still more fortunately Jerome worked on a Hebrew original which had often escaped the glosses of the standard text with the result that his version is frequently a most valuable guide. Further, as the process of assimilating our witnesses to a single type was necessarily gradual and unequal, it repeatedly happens that in many places one witness will preserve an earlier reading against all others. The last massacre of variants only came with the final triumph of the Massorettes. At no period in the long history of the transmission of the text were the principles applied such as would commend themselves to a scientific textual critic. This outline of the history can be filled in by further research which will be able to trace the stages better by the examination of innumerable agreements

and differences between the various authorities. The natural course of textual transmission was modified from time to time by theological and other theories which swept across Jewry and left their marks on the Biblical texts.

If we could assign a date to the breaking off of the Samaritan Pentateuch it would lend precision to our views, but unfortunately that is impossible. The arguments for *circa* 330 are stated by Skinner (*Divine Names*, pp. 118–121), those for 432 by König (p. 18). The weight of historical documents appears to me to be on König's side, for the Elephantine papyri confirm the approximate date of Sanballat that may be deduced from Nehemiah xiii., but the materials are too conflicting and uncertain for any definite conclusion.

Such, in outline, appears to have been the history of the text from the time when the stream of transmission divided into the ancestors of our present authorities. That the Pentateuch was repeatedly revised in the process by editors who attempted to remedy the trouble appears to me to follow from the various facts to which attention has been drawn — notably the transpositions, the recensional differences between the different texts, the marks of editing in the numbers, and the traces of the activities of the scribes and Massorettes. The men who carried out these revisions were naturally inspired by the ideas of the periods in which they lived, not by the ideas of the Mosaic age. Hence historical criticism is confronted with the twofold task of revising their labors and so working back to the best history of that age which may now be attainable and, on the other hand, tracing the growth of thought during the periods that have molded our text into its present shape and observing the marks which its successive waves have left on the text. I believe that in this matter the Divine appellations form a singularly favorable ground for study.

## THE DIVINE APPELLATIONS IN GENESIS.

Our long study of the textual history has given us the necessary preliminary knowledge for dealing with the Divine appellations in Genesis. It has shown that the agreement of the Massoretic and Samaritan texts is no bar to questioning the soundness of any particular reading, it has put us on our guard against glossing, it has taught us to be on the watch for the effects of abbreviations, and it has shown that theological tendencies of a kind particularly likely to affect the transmission of the Divine appellations have operated on the various Biblical texts. In the light of all this I turn once more to the Divine appellations in the Massoretic Genesis; and I observe, first, that, if we take a sort of bird's-eye view of the book, we shall see many things that would arouse the suspicions of any impartial observer who comes to it with knowledge of the textual history. The beginning and end of the book are Elohistic. In the last eleven chapters the Tetragrammaton occurs only in Genesis xlix. 18. Of this fact the documentary theorists can offer no explanation whatsoever: for, in their view, portions of these chapters belong to J, and I have vainly searched König's "Einleitung" and "Moderne Pentateuchkritik" for any reference to this phenomenon. Yet this reminds us strongly of the Elohistic Psalms and other phenomena, and will do so still more emphatically when we consider the textual evidence. The Tetragrammaton is used in the most extraordinary places. It is scarcely possible that the narratives of the chapters ii. 3-xi. should originally have used the Tetragrammaton frequently, for the traditions they contain antedate its common use, and it must be remembered that every fresh discovery of Babylonian material tends to confirm the general antiquity of their contents. Can it, e.g., be right in x. 9? Or in xi. 9 where Eerdmans thinks that the

word play demands *el?*<sup>1</sup> Then we come upon a considerable passage (chaps. ii. and iii.) where both appellations occur together — Lord God — apparently as the result of conflation of texts. The angel of the Lord or of God, who was due to the tendency to transcendentalize when we found him in the LXX, makes repeated appearances (Gen. xvi. 21, 22, etc.).

There are passages which suggest that the sacred Name was in common use as that of a God recognized throughout Canaan, though we know, from the general tenor of the book, that this was not so. In xiii. 13 we find it said that the men of Sodom were sinners against the Lord (cp. xix.) — but had they ever heard of him by that Name? In xxv. 22 Rebekah goes to inquire of the Lord. Had he then a shrine and a priesthood? Or was he indeed only the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and to a very limited extent of their immediate dependents, who regarded him as “the God of my master Abraham,” rather than as God? In at least one passage we have a duplication of *Elohim* where some other title appears to be plainly demanded, and “angel” is applied very inappropriately to God (Gen. xlviii. 15 f.). The Tetragrammaton again occurs in passages where it is not suitable. Nothing could well be more inappropriate than its use in Genesis xvi. 13, “she called the name of that spake unto her ‘thou art a God.’” The proper name does not fill the blank aptly. What is needed is a substantive with the article: the baal, adon, angel, god, man, or the like.<sup>2</sup> Once more the text appears to be heavily glossed. If therefore we take a general view of the Massoretic text alone, apart from any other evidence or any theory of authorship, and regard it as we should

<sup>1</sup> *Die Komposition der Genesis*, p. 76. But I think Baal or Bel is better, for (a) it explains the second b in Babel, and (b) the motive for its removal is obvious, which is not the case with *el*.

<sup>2</sup> See Eerdmans, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

any other text, our first impression cannot be favorable to its claim to present the original distribution of the Divine appellations in Genesis with substantial accuracy.

Does the documentary theory explain the facts? The answer can only be that it pays not the slightest regard to most of the phenomena mentioned, and in addition presents us with fresh discrepancies and difficulties of its own manufacture. I need only refer to pages 7-9 and 41-44 of my "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism," for neither Skinner nor König has met the points there raised.

If we turn to the textual evidence we find, from a comparison of the figures given by Schlögl and Skinner, that there are at least 189 passages in Genesis in which we have variants in the Divine appellations without counting all the omissions (cp. *Pentateuchal Studies*, pp. 53 f.). The number is impressive, but how far are the variants due to better Hebrew texts?

Here I must pause for a moment to note certain misapprehensions that affect König and Skinner. In the first place, the printed Vulgate differs from the Massoretic text more frequently than either of them believes. König (pp. 48 f.) mentions Genesis vi. 5 (*Deus*); vii. 9 (*Dominus*); xv. 6 (*Deus*). Skinner (p. 262) adds iv. 1 with a query, and vi. 5, and queries vii. 9. The queries are due to the facts set out by Pope on pages 386-388 of the *Irish Theological Quarterly* for October, 1913. But the inferences that Skinner (p. 285) draws from Pope's article are unsound. *Pope expressly limits his investigation to the first eleven chapters of Genesis.* There are certainly numerous instances outside these chapters where the Vulgate as printed differs from the Massoretic text, e.g. xviii. 14 (*Deo* with LXX, except bw); xxviii. 4 (omits with Ethiopic); xxx. 22a (*Dominus*); 22b (omits with en Chr K 170, 185); xxx. 27 (*Deus*, with LXX, and perhaps Syriac;

see Skinner, p. 141, *n.*); xxxv. 10 (omits with D n dt f c<sub>2</sub> Sah Eth Chr K 13). This list is not exhaustive, as I think it premature to examine the Vulgate readings carefully until the Benedictine materials are available, but it suffices to show how incomplete the data are. Further, Pope registers twelve omissions in the eleven chapters. Skinner says (p. 285) that they "are not textual, but are incidents of the translation." But have seen (Oct., pp. 647 f.) that there is often Hebrew and other support for Jerome's omissions; and, as a matter of fact, in i. 28 the Vulgate omission is supported by the LXX and Hebrew evidence, in i. 4 by HP 78 Theoph Hipp, in omitting God 2° (rightly in my opinion), in i. 5 by Phil-codd Hip, in i. 17 by dp Eus Ath Thdt, in iii. 22 (omission of Lord God) by HP 108, and in vi. 6 by Phil-codd. The omissions of the Vulgate are in many instances superior to the readings of other authorities. Thus in viii. 21, M. T. has "the Lord smelt the sweet savour and the Lord said," Sah has "the Lord God smelt . . . and God said," the other Septuagintal authorities "the Lord God smelt and the Lord God said," while the Vulgate reads "the Lord smelt . . . and said." There can be no doubt that originally there was no Divine appellation here, and that the Sahidic has preserved an earlier Septuagintal text than the other authorities, though its reading is more remote from that of the original Hebrew than Jerome's.

Another misapprehension runs through König's discussion. He has taken as his basis the conspectus of arguments given by Dahse on pages 51 f. of his "Textkritische Materialien zur Hexateuchfrage, I," not realizing that Dahse is there summarizing the work done on the question before the appearance of his volume and his own further contributions to the subject on pages 13-51. Hence he constantly misunderstands Dahse, and misses the force of remarks which the latter had



made *in reliance on what had gone before* either in the "Text-kritische Materialien" or in some other book or article to which reference is there made. It is therefore only necessary to say that variant readings of the Septuagintal authorities are frequently supported by other versions or Hebrew MSS., and to refer in support of this proposition to what has been set forth in "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism," Skinner's tables in his "Divine Names," and the facts stated above (Oct., pp. 632-664). Hence it is certain that a very large number of the Septuagintal variants really represent divergent Hebrew texts, and we have seen from our studies of the Vulgate that the same holds good there. The variants of the Samaritan Pentateuch and Hebrew MSS. are of course Hebrew and nothing else, and Aquila too is above suspicion. The Syriac is supported in vii. 1 by the Sam K 601, 686, c w Arm-codd, in xiii. 10 a and b by the LXX, in xv. 6 by LXX and Vulg, in xxii. 11 by K 248, 601, in xxix. 32 by the Georgian (and the conflate "Lord God" of i<sup>a</sup>r 1), in xxx. 24 by LXX Aq Symmachus, in xxx. 27 by the Vulgate and LXX. When therefore we find it presenting unsupported readings in xxii. 15 and xxxi. 16b. we need not question the accuracy of the translation.<sup>1</sup>

There are thus a large number of variants which go back to reputable Hebrew archetypes. Are any of these superior to the Massoretic text? When first I dealt with this question, I pointed to the following instances of preferable non-Massoretic readings: Genesis iv. 1; xvi. 11; xxx. 24. 27; xlviii. 15; xiv. 22; xv. 2; xxxi. 42, 53; Exodus iii. 1; Genesis xxviii. 13 (Essays, pp. 17-19, 45 f.), *not* iv. 26 as Skinner (Divine

<sup>1</sup> In iii. 11(?) 24; iv. 10 it has additions which need not be considered, nor need its variant in iii. 13. In xiv. 22 it omits with LXX, and here it is generally recognized that the "Lord" of M.T. and haelohim of Sam are glosses.

Names, p. 107,) apparently believes. I have always held that in that passage the reading of the LXX was palpably inferior to that of the Massoretic text. Of these passages xiv. 22 is generally conceded. There has been a controversy about xvi. 11, but I need only refer to what I have said on pages 259-263 of "The Pentateuchal Text." I now read in Skinner's "Divine Names": "In xxxi. 42, 53, and probably also in xlvi. 15, *God* is used appellatively, and has nothing to do with our problem" (p. 107, *n.*). As this sentence conveys no meaning whatever to my mind, I am unable to say whether Skinner means that I am right about these passages or not. On xxxi. 53, Kittel certainly rejects the phrase "God of their fathers," and Skinner writes: "probably a marginal gloss to 53a" (Genesis, p. 402, Phil. note), and on page 399 he says, "God of Abraham" in xxxi. 42 "may be a gloss." On xlvi. 15 he notes in his commentary (following Gunkel) that in such cases the ancient monotheist names all the names and attributes of the God he knows. Probably therefore his real meaning is that he cannot defend M. T. in any one of these passages. This, on the one hand, and Dahse's reference to the Samaritan, on the other, strengthen the case for reading "Lord" with B in xlvi. 15, and making the three appellations "the *God* before whom my fathers walked, the *Lord* who shepherded me . . . the *King* [so Sam] who redeemed me," the change being due, as Dahse has suggested, to the desire to remove a title (*Melech*) that was used as the name of a heathen deity. The reading "the God" for "the Lord" could be plausibly explained as a wrong resolution of the abbreviation <sup>מ</sup>לך. On iv. 1; xv. 2; xxviii. 13, nobody has attempted to answer me. To these passages we must now add xxviii. 20, where Skinner admits that Dahse is right in claiming that the Tetragrammaton was the original reading, and

xxxii. 10 (9), where dp Eth<sup>c</sup> omit the Tetragrammaton, and Skinner (Divine Names, pp. 155, 232) thinks that Dahse is *perhaps* right. In addition we must remember that Skinner in his commentary rejects the Massoretic reading in xxii. 11 (see Pentateuchal Studies, p. 55). Therefore there are a number of passages in which the Massoretic reading has been successfully challenged, and they include instances in which the Tetragrammaton has wrongly found its way into the Massoretic text, and others in which it has been ousted in favor of *Elohim*. That is to say that both the tendencies — the tendency for *Elohim* and that for the Tetragrammaton — have actually operated on our Hebrew text, and the only question left on the earlier stages of the controversy is how much this has happened. This is important.

Skinner has, however, admitted much more. In a footnote on pages 164 f. he writes: "I now see . . . that I failed to allow for the extraordinary *concentration* of the differences in the earlier chapters (ii.-x.). There can be no manner of doubt that in these chapters the divergences are so numerous that the analysis would be altogether impossible if we held only those readings to be established which are common to LXX and M. T., and if the analysis depended on the names alone. On the other hand, the argument is, of course, all the stronger as regards the later chapters, where the proportion of divergences sinks at times to about one in eleven. There is one curious and inexplicable circumstance which may be mentioned here for what it is worth. The double name *κύριος ὁ θεός* occurs almost exclusively in chaps. ii.-x. Now these readings must have arisen in most cases through conflation, and therefore, are not original;<sup>1</sup> and if we dis-

<sup>1</sup> Skinner is right to draw attention to this point. If Baal or any similar word occurred in the original text of these chapters, independent scribal alterations might give rise to different readings, resulting ultimately in conflation.

count them (i. e. if we suppose the M. T. to have preserved the original names) we find that the proportionate occurrences of LXX variants to M. T. are pretty evenly distributed over the whole book, although still considerably higher in the early chapters than in the later." There are several points in this: (1) he is influenced by a concentration of differences; that is a matter which will have an effect on our further discussion: (2) he admits that "Lord God" must have arisen in most cases through conflation: (3) he assumes that in such cases M. T. is right: and (4) he admits that if it be not, the analysis in so far as it depends on the Names alone would be altogether impossible. I cannot see what justification there is for assuming that M. T. is right in all doubtful cases.<sup>1</sup> I have already pointed to a number of other instances where I think the Vulgate right; but I further think that where Heb-Sam are on one side and Vulg on the other, with conflation in some or all of the Septuagintal authorities, there is really no presumption whatever in favor of M. T. Thus in vi. 3 the great majority of Vulgate MSS. HP 14, 73, 130 Thdt Hil have "Deus," which is clearly Jerome's reading, M. T. has "Lord," and the rest of the Septuagintal authorities have "Lord God," and in vi. 5 Vulg HP 76 K 80 have "God," while the other Septuagintal authorities have "Lord God." It seems to me clear that in both these cases there were two Hebrew readings. Then, if we go a step further, we find that in vi. 1-7, the Tetragrammaton occurs four times in the Massoretic text, but *never in the Vulgate*, and that in verse 6 codices of Philo omit the word altogether with the Vulgate, while the bulk of the Septuagintal authorities

<sup>1</sup> N. Schmidt (Journal of Biblical Literature, vol. xxxiii. pp. 25-47) concludes that it is wrong in twenty passages in chapters ii. and iii. alone!

have "God," and in verse 7 the Bohairic Or-lat  $\frac{1}{2}$  Cyr-ed omit with the Vulgate. Sah omits the whole phrase, and most of the Septuagintal authorities again have "God." I think that in both verses the original text had no Divine appellations at all, and that later glossing is responsible for our present readings.

At this point it is right that I should state the conclusions to which I have been led by the discussions of the last few years and the present investigation. What is wanted is a key that will fit all the wards — historical, psychological, textual — of our lock without forcing. Such a key is to be found in historical textual criticism. We have seen that a great tendency to gloss was continuously at work on Biblical texts, and that disposes of a number of our difficulties. The tendency to transcendentalize accounts for a further large number of readings. And we have learnt that the scribes, in order to safeguard the conception of the unity of God, removed from the text Divine titles — such as Baal — which originally only meant Lord and were freely applied to Israel's God, but could be interpreted in a heathen or polytheistic sense. I believe that this is responsible for a very large number of variants, different scribes having altered the word to which they took objection differently. Then we have to note the tendency to abbreviate and the wrong resolution of abbreviations. Where 'N was used as an abbreviation for *Adon(y)*<sup>1</sup> and *Elohim*, it was easy to substitute the wrong word; and in cases where *Adon(y)* had so been introduced, the scribes would be apt to alter to the Tetragrammaton. Thus "God hath added" might be written "'N hath added," read as "*Adon*

<sup>1</sup>Dahse (*Textkritische Materialien* I., p. 78) calls attention to an interesting example in xx. 4, where m Eth read "Abnēlech" for "Lord" — owing to the misunderstanding of an abbreviation.

hath," etc., and later altered to our Massoretic reading. Lastly, the objection to the utterance of the Tetragrammaton on foreign soil would determine the readings of Heb-Sam in a number of passages in the concluding chapters of Genesis (utterances of Joseph, etc.) and the readings of M. T. in xxxi. This last principle is, however, subject to two or three qualifications. There were passages (e. g. Gen. xxiv.; Ex. v. 1 f.) where the Tetragrammaton could not be avoided or in other words the objection was neutralized by higher considerations. Again, not all foreign lands seem to have been on the same level in this respect. The objection seems to have been felt in the case of Egypt before the separation of Sam, but to have been less regarded in the case of Laban's home, the wrongful identification of which with Mesopotamia may not have taken place until after the Samaritan schism.<sup>1</sup> Syria was too near and closely connected with Palestine to be regarded in the same light as Egypt and Babylonia. At a later date — probably when the Tetragrammaton was pronounced *adonai* — a different view seems to have been taken, and the various texts in Exodus point to the introduction of the Name by glossators in Egyptian narratives.

In working this view out it will be well to begin by considering certain facts about the words *Adon* and *Baal*. *Adon* means "lord." *Adony* may be read as "my lord" or "Adonai," according to the vowel pointing.<sup>2</sup> Whether *Adonai* as a Divine title is ever original in Genesis, it is impossible to say. In reading such passages as xx. 4 it is difficult not to feel that "my *Adon*" would fit in extremely well, and it may

<sup>1</sup> On the question of the position of Aram-naharaim, see *The Origin of the Pentateuch*, pp. 99-102.

<sup>2</sup> *Adonai* appears to be a pointing due to the desire to distinguish the word when used of God from its secular meaning.

well be that the word *Adon* occurred frequently in the original text of Genesis.

We have already considered Genesis xlvi. 15 f. Dahse (*Textkritische Materialien* I., p. 9), in discussing my view,<sup>1</sup> suggested that the reading of B might be "Kodexeigentümlichkeit," as in Exodus viii. 18 (22). A careful examination of that passage will carry us a good deal further. We have the following readings:—

1. M. T.: that I am the Lord in the midst of the land.
2. B Palestinian Aramaic Or-gr; that I am Kurios the Kurios (i.e. Adon or possibly Baal) of all the land.
3. n: that I am Kurios Kurios of all the land.
4. Aya<sub>2</sub> os dpt bw qub<sub>2</sub>: that I am Kurios the God of all the land.
5. M rell Eth Syr: that I am Kurios of all (m Syr omit: kx 'in the midst of') the land.

Further, a Hexaplar note in vz on "Kurios the Kurios" gives the reading *ὁ θες κυριευων*, but with no attribution of the name of the translator.<sup>2</sup>

It seems impossible to doubt that the M. T. is secondary. Compared with the Greek reading, it is feeble and ineffectual. But the Greek reading involves Adon or Baal—probably the former, which seems the more suitable.

*Adon*, used of the God of Israel, has been allowed to stand

<sup>1</sup> See *supra*, p. 131.

<sup>2</sup> A part of *κυριευων* is used by bw in Deut. x. 17 for *adonim*, and in Ps. xli. (xl.)<sup>5</sup> by "another" for *adon*. Symmachus uses it for the verb *בעל* in Isa. liv. 5 and Aquila in Jer. xxxi. 32. In Job viii. 18 it occurs for *יבלענו* in Theodotion and perhaps Symmachus, pointing to the same verb again (a letter having been transposed). This note therefore does not help us to decide definitely between baal and adon, but it greatly reinforces the evidence for one or the other in Ex. viii. 18. The reading "God" of Ay, etc., will be due to *κ* having been read as *elohē* instead of *adon*.

in Psalm cxiv. 7, the *Adon* in Malachi iii. 1 and the *Adon* followed by the Tetragrammaton in Exodus xxiii. 17, etc. It is therefore impossible to claim of this word that there was any strong religious objection to it for a continuous period of time. Its use of Tammuz or some other deity may possibly have led to its avoidance at some epoch, but the system of abbreviations made it specially liable to confusion with the commoner *elohim*; and, on the other hand, the substitution of the pronunciation *adonai* for the Tetragrammaton would easily lead to confusion between the latter and *adoni*—or, in abbreviated writing, *adon*. Hence it is very probable that the word has often disappeared from the Biblical text. On the other hand, in the case of *Baal* the scribes would have had the choice between retaining the word that they feared might lead to idolatry and had in any case come to regard as blasphemous, and altering the text. It must be remembered that the substitution of “shameful thing” was impossible in such contexts. In any case it is clear that one or the other has dropped out.

I now come to the word *Baal*. It means “lord” or “master,” and was a Divine title frequently applied to the God of Israel after the conquest, as is proved by the proper names. Ishbaal, etc. We have seen that the scribes substituted *bo-sheth*, “shameful thing.” In 1 Chronicles xii. 5 we meet the name Bealiah, “the Lord is Baal.” At some time Hosea ii. 18 f. (16 f.), “Thou shalt no more call me my Baal, for I will remove the names of the Baalim from her mouth, and they shall no longer be remembered by their names (so LXX: M. T. name),” was turned into a textual canon and enforced literally on the text. It is usual to say that this use of *Baal* was connected with or led to religious syncretism after the tribes entered Canaan; but, for my part, I fail to see why



the title should not have been in use—and with similar results—when the patriarchs were in the same country. That Abraham worshiped the Lord is sufficiently clear: if he applied to Him the title Baal it is not clear that this would not lead to syncretism. It is surely improbable that if these phenomena appeared in the period after the conquest, they would be totally absent from the patriarchal period, when the families lacked the powerful religious and historical forces that had been generated by the events in Egypt and the wilderness, and the conquest. Curiously enough Skinner (Genesis, p. 288, on xvi. 13 f.) believes that “by a process of syncretism the original numen of the well had come to be regarded as a particular local manifestation of” the Lord.<sup>1</sup>

There are thus strong historical and psychological probabilities that Baal appeared in the archetype of our present texts of the Pentateuch. To these must be added other considerations. In Genesis xlv. 21; Numbers xxvi. 38; 1 Chronicles viii. 1, we find the name Ashbal. It has been plausibly conjectured that this is a corruption of Ishbaal. In xxxv. 2, “Jacob said unto his household and to all that were with him, Put away the strange gods that are among you . . . and let us go up to Bethel, and I will make there an altar to the *El* [d E Lord = Adon or Baal] who answered me,” etc. So Jacob’s household—or some of them—worshiped strange gods, which was certainly not remarkable in the case of Laban’s daughters and handmaids. Did they then speak only of the God of Israel when they named their children? Skinner has written a book of some 300 pages called “The Divine Names in Genesis,” on page 87 of which he contends “that the divine names are a remarkably stable element of the text,” while on page 106 they have replaced “*El*.” But before he had discovered

<sup>1</sup> On “the original numen of the well,” see *infra*, p. 145, n.

either that the existing names were a remarkably stable element of the text or that they replaced *El*, he wrote a commentary in which he gave expression to a third, and I venture to think a sounder, view. He claims (Genesis, p. 386) that the original name of Leah's first born was Reubel, as in Josephus (and the Syriac), and he writes "The only plausible explanation of the etymology is that it is based on the form רֵאֵוֶבֶל=ראובל and that יהוה is substituted for the divine name בעל." This is also the only plausible explanation of the textual phenomena here and in many other passages, for the Syriac and Georgian have "God," not "Lord," and l i'ar have the conflate "Lord God." In a word, our present texts are the results of two independent scribal substitutions Lord or God — for Baal. Why Skinner, after explaining that Baal had to be replaced in Genesis xxix. 32, goes on to say that "there is therefore not the slightest *internal* ground for questioning the correctness of the Massoretic reading" (Divine Names, p. 109) is beyond me. If the Massoretic text replaces the original, "correct" must mean to Skinner that it faithfully represents the alteration of a scribe, and in that sense it is true. Another scribe made a different alteration, and his text is equally "correct" in Skinner's sense. But it must be obvious that if the earlier text had Baal, we are not dealing with a document that represented God by the Tetragrammaton. Further there was no objection to the word Baal before the scribes put a particular interpretation on the passage of Hosea, and this was certainly not before the age of Hosea, and probably not till long after. Thus Skinner's "correct" text is neither original nor early.

Leah, however, worshiped yet another strange god. In xxx. 11 she says "with Gad." Skinner (*ad loc.*) writes: "Gad is the name of an Aramæan and Phœnician god of

luck. (Τύχη), mentioned in Is lxv. 11 . . . In Leah's exclamation the word is used appellatively *With Luck*. It is probable, however, that at an earlier time it was current in the sense 'With Gad's help' (Genesis, p. 387). Leah was an Aramæan: she says "with Gad": Gad was an Aramæan god: admittedly she worshiped strange gods (xxxv. 2): many centuries after her time Gad was still worshiped, the passage in Isaiah (lxv. 11) speaking of a table being laid for him. The only natural inference is that she regarded Gad as a god, and spoke accordingly. One wonders whether Skinner thinks Isaiah lxv. 11 — where Gad is a god and nothing else, — earlier than the time of Leah the Aramæan.

We are therefore justified in holding that the original text of Genesis contained the expression Baal — applied sometimes to the God of Israel, sometimes to other deities, who, by a later process of syncretism or by scribal alterations, were identified with him — and that wherever the word occurred it was altered by the scribes. In many cases the alteration was differently made in different texts — one man substituting *Elohim* and another the Tetragrammaton — with the result that an enormous mass of variants arose. Perhaps Baal was not the only term so removed, and in any case *Adon* was probably more commonly used in the original text. It will at once be seen that this view explains *uno ictu* the mass of variants in Genesis ii.–x. and other passages, the use of the Tetragrammaton in the earlier chapters, the difficulties about Sodom (including the versional variants and the differences in the M. T. between the *elohim* of Amos iv. 11; Isa. xiii. 19; Jer. l. 40, and the Tetragrammaton of Deut. xxix. 22 (23), Rebecca's oracle and many another passage, particularly in the Balaam narratives.

Before turning to the detailed consideration of the textual variants one other matter must be noticed.

In a passage already cited, Skinner states the effect produced on his mind by the concentration of variants in Genesis ii.-x. I have examined i. 1-ii. 3 for the purpose of seeing whether the Tetragrammaton is introduced there by any textual authorities. The results are very instructive. *Elohim*, if I have counted aright, occurs 35 times in the Massoretic text of that passage. There are, as we have seen, a number of omissions in some of the authorities, which suggest that some of the instances are due to glossators; but what about the introduction of "Lord"? It never occurs in the Samaritan, the Vulgate, or the Syriac, or in any Hebrew, or Greek MS. The only occurrences registered in the larger Cambridge Septuagint are as follows:— i. 24 Boh *prefixes* "Lord." 26 Philo quotes twice, and in *one* of the two quotations "Lord" is *prefixed*, verse 27 is quoted by Eusebius seven times, and in one case out of seven he *substitutes* "Lord" for "God"! In the case of Philo the mistake may have been in the transmission of his work; but, be that as it may, this appears to me to be about the natural proportion of divergences where there is no sufficient cause through alteration of the text, etc. (Compare results in 51 cases of Leviticus, Expositor, Sept. 1911, p. 210, quoted in "The Pentateuchal Text," p. 251.) Similarly in iii. 1b-5, where *Elohim* is clearly right, v. 1, 24, viii. 1, xxiv. and other passages, variants (other than those that suggest glossing) are non-existent, or negligible, or else easily explicable. These facts only throw into clearer relief the phenomena we are now to study.

We have seen that, with the exception of a single verse, the last eleven chapters of Genesis are purely Elohist in M. T. There is, however, one chapter where we have a great con-

centration of variants. In chapter xlv. we meet with the following facts:— verse 5 (“E”) M. T. *Elohim* K 128, 155 Georg Tetragrammaton; verse 7 (“E”) M. T. *Elohim* K 4, 128 Tetragrammaton; verse 8 (“E”) M. T. *ha-Elohim* no variant: 9 (“J”) M. T. *Elohim* D Lord Old Latin *Dominus Deus*. That is a striking collection, and suggests that the chapter has been edited with an Elohist tendency. If anything, there is a gain in substituting the Tetragrammaton in these three places. I think too in xlvi. 9 (“E”) we should restore it with the Old Latin. In all these passages the word is eminently in place. I believe that it was altered in the days when the feeling grew up that the Tetragrammaton should not be uttered on foreign soil, and that consequently we should regard it as original in all four places. It will be seen that this view at once explains the peculiarity of the last eleven chapters of Genesis and the concurrence of Heb-Sam in these passages; it fits in exactly with what we have seen of the textual history, and thoroughly accords with the history of Jewish theological thought. This principle may explain almost all the peculiarities of the use of the Divine appellations in these chapters, and the early date of its application would account for the small number of variants preserved in our extant authorities.<sup>1</sup> Thus “God” occurs in speeches made by Jacob or some member of his family on foreign soil in xli. 51, 52; xlv. 16 (i\* “the Lord”); xlvi. 11, 20, 21; l. 19, 20, 24, 25. In the other instances in xl. and xli. it is clearly right, since Egyptians are involved in the conversation. In xlii. 28 the word appears to be a gloss, being omitted by E and HP 18, 79 Georg and misplaced in F<sup>b</sup>c<sup>x</sup> n dp L Arm Chr, so that apparently the implied subject of the verb was Joseph. We have already seen the reason for the change in xlvi. 15. The

<sup>1</sup> It may also have a bearing on the criticism of the Psalms.

Tetragrammaton will then have escaped alteration in xlix. 18 only — probably because it was hesitated to apply the principle in the blessing of Jacob.

In xxxviii. 7b M. T. has "Lord," LXX (except v) "God," Vulg "ab eo occisus est." Presumably the subject was originally unexpressed, as in verse 10b. In verse 10a M. T. and Lat have "Lord," dp n "Lord God," the other Septuagintal texts "God." It is of course quite possible that the original reading was "baal."

Passing over mere omissions and working backwards, we find that the next passage where we have a group of suspicious looking variants is xxxv. 1b-5 ("E"), In 1b for *El* E Chr have "the Lord" and L Cyr  $\frac{1}{4}$  "Lord," in 3 for *El* d Eus Chr have "the Lord" and E "Lord," in 5 for *Elohim* m n dp Cyr have "Lord." This is certainly strange, especially when we remember the stress that Skinner and his allies lay on the probability of Greek scribes' preferring "God" to "Lord" (though personally I do not hold with this opinion) and on the view that ( $\delta$ ) *κυριος* always deserves attention as a possible indication of a Hebrew variant. It is impossible to arrive at any certain conclusion as to the matter, but it is not improbable that the original text here had *baal*. Here again we may point to the sudden concentration of variants.

In xxxiii. 11, "as one seeth the face of God," K 189 has the Tetragrammaton. Clearly in such a case the scribes would have preferred *Elohim* to the personal name, but this and many other difficulties about seeing the face of a supernatural being would be eliminated if we suppose that originally the text had some such word as "a baal."

Similarly, with xxxii. 30b ("E"), where the Old Latin has "Lord" for "God," but HP 79 has "the face of God" for "God face to face."

A group of angel passages are best treated together. We have seen (*supra*, pp. 98 f.) the tendency to transcendentalize operating on the text of Exodus iv. 24, where M. T. has "Lord," Aquila "God," and LXX "angel of God." Let us examine the textual facts in a number of passages of Genesis.

In xvi. 13 the Massoretic text, supported by Sam Vulg and all the Septuagintal authorities (except Spec-ed Dei), makes Hagar call the name of the Lord who spoke with her. The Tetragrammaton is used beyond the shadow of a doubt. If it is wrong here, there is an end of all documentary theories and much else; but, in fact, the unanimity of our textual authorities seems to show that there was a time when the narrative made the Lord — not an angel — speak with her. How do our authorities stand? The facts may be tabulated as follows:—

- verse 7 Angel of the Lord M. T. Sam Vulg amosvxc, gn dp  
 bw fir Arm Syr Phil Chr Cyr-Cod.  
 Angel of God Bohl<sup>w</sup>.  
 Angel of lord God Ayh D M l t ej qu.
- 8 Vacat M. T. Sam Vulg dp.  
 Angel of the Lord LXX (except dp), Syro-hexaplar prefixes asterisk.
- 9 the Angel of the Lord M. T. Sam Vulg LXX (except as under).  
 vacat HP 107.  
 the angel bw.
- 10 and the angel of the Lord said to her M. T. Sam LXX (except as under).  
 because p.  
 and the angel said &c d.  
 Et rursum Vulg.

11 the angel of the Lord M. T. Sam LXX (except as under).

the angel of God Lat.

vacat HP 107 dp (omitting "said" as well).

Ac deinceps . . . ait Vulg (for the whole phrase, apparently agreeing with HP 107).

The text of xvi. 13 shows that in 7 "Lord" is earlier than "angel of the Lord," and that all our authorities have been affected by the tendency to transcendentalize. In verse 8 we should doubtless follow M. T., while in verses 9, 10, and 11 the "angel of the Lord" is probably an addition.<sup>1</sup>

Another similar passage where the same tendency has been at work is xxi. 17 ("E"), where M. T. Sam Vulg and LXX (except as after) read "angel of God," but Arm-ed has "God," cm bw fr Nov Tract have "angel of the Lord," and q has "angel of the Lord God." Comparison with the rest of the verse and 19 f, shows that the angel is probably no part of the original text. In xxvi. 24a "angel of God" occurs in Eth<sup>p</sup>, and "God" in fir for M. T. "Lord." This again illustrates the tendency.

An even more interesting passage is xxii. 11-15. I have shown (*Pentateuchal Studies*, pp. 19-21) that in verse 14 we should read "the Lord was seen," with the LXX. In

<sup>1</sup> This chapter will then have passed through at least three stages: (1) Originally it will have had some word like *baal*, (2) then this was eradicated in favor of the Tetragrammaton; (3) lastly the tendency to transcendentalize introduced the angel, and the influence of Ex. xxxiii. caused verses 13 f. to be mutilated (*supra*, p. 104.). Skinner's theory about the numen of the well (*supra*, p. 138) may be dismissed, for nobody has yet met a numen that could speak. Presumably Hagar met a man who delivered to her God's message, and she came home and reported that she had met a supernatural being, using some such term as *baal*. In reading these narratives allowance must be made for the mentality of the actors and narrators.



verse 11 M. T. Sam Vulg LXX (except as under) have "angel of the Lord," Pesh K 248, 601 have "angel of God," Eth has "Lord God of Abraham" (Eth<sup>c</sup> omitting "God") for "angel of the Lord from heaven" j m have "angel" only, Cyril omits "from heaven." It certainly looks as if "from heaven" were an explanatory gloss due to the transcendentalizing theory.<sup>1</sup> Then in verse 15 M. T. Sam Vulg and LXX (except as under) again have "angel of the Lord," Pesh has "angel of God," Boh<sup>lw</sup> have "angel of the Lord God," while dp preserve the earlier reading "Lord" only. HP 16 omits "from heaven." In both verses the Tetragrammaton alone is the reading attested by verse 14, and the alterations are due to the tendency we have so often noted.

In xxxi. 11, for "the angel of God," found in most texts, Eth<sup>f</sup> has *angelus Deus*, Eth<sup>p</sup> *Dominus Deus*, and Eth<sup>c</sup> *Deus*. Here again the tendency to transcendentalize and the comparison with verse 3 make it probable that the Tetragrammaton was original. This view is further supported by the textual evidence as to verse 24, where qu v HP 31 68 121 Slav Ostrog have "angel," and as to xxxi. 7, 9, 16a, b (all E), where the old tendency to remove the Tetragrammaton in cases where it is uttered on foreign soil appears to have been operative. In verse 7 Sam has the Tetragrammaton, in verse 9 Sam K 69, in verse 16a Sam, and in 16b Pesh. It may be added that in 16a Boh<sup>p</sup> omit "which God hath taken away from," reading merely "the riches of our father." Once more I draw attention to the concentration of variants in a single chapter.

<sup>1</sup>A somewhat similar manifestation of the tendency to transcendentalize is to be found in two passages Gen. xx. 3, 6 to which Dahse (*A Fresh Investigation of Sources of Genesis*, pp. 28 f.) has drawn attention. "In a dream" was inserted in the former verse by Origen under the asterisk and is lacking in bw c, Chr, and in the latter it is missing in R 18 jn Vulg e o Ethc. In both cases it is probably a gloss inserted under the influence of Num. xii. 6.

Of the nine variants of Sam at least three (probably more) are due to glosses, xiv. 22 (Pesh omits) xxviii. 4 (Vulg Eth omit) xxxv. 9b (Sam LXX add *Elohim* missing in M. T.).<sup>1</sup> Of the remainder, three occur in this passage (xxxi. 7-16) and are explained by alteration of the ancestors of the M. T. under the influence of the principle we have seen at work before. It seems, however, to have been regularly applied to this chapter at a later date than to the utterances in Egypt, but we have seen a probable reason for this (*supra*, p. 135).

In his "Genesis" (p. 286) Skinner writes on xvi. 7: "In very many instances the Angel is at once identified with God and differentiated from Him. . . The ultimate explanation of the ambiguity is no doubt to be sought in the advance of religious thought to a more spiritual apprehension of the divine nature. The oldest conception of the theophany is a visible personal appearance of the deity (Ch ii. f., Ex xxiv. 10, Nu xii. 6 ff etc). A later, though still early, age took exception to this bold anthropomorphism, and reconciled the original narratives with the belief in the invisibility of God by substituting an 'angel' or 'messenger' . . . as the agent of the theophany, without, however, effacing all traces of the primitive representation."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In vi. 22 "So did he" is a gloss omitted by the Vulgate and Sahidic. Accordingly it is probable that in vii. 1 the varying Divine appellations of M.T. and Sam are due to independent glossing necessitated by the insertion of the words at the end of the preceding verse.

<sup>2</sup> Historical criticism suggests that the difficulty of the anthropomorphisms is greatly exaggerated. (1) The M.T. of Ex. xxiv. 10 "they saw the God of Israel," is directly contradicted by the next verse (11), where the word *רוּחַ* means that they had a vision; cp. Isa. i. 1. "the vision of Isaiah," etc., "which he beheld *רוּחַ*," where I suppose that nobody would claim that he saw his oracle in visible form. I conjecture that in Ex. xxiv. 10 the original text had "saw the face of." etc. This phrase meant "to be in the presence of." It seems

The facts noted above show that Skinner is right in attributing the introduction of the angel into these narratives to a later age. Had he studied the textual evidence, however, he would have known that the change was made at a more recent date than he believed. Similarly the Samaritan introduces an angel into the text of Numbers xxii. 20; xxiii. 5, 16. The textual phenomena of the Balaam passage are of course to be explained by the same kind of considerations as those we have seen at work in Genesis. There too we meet with frequent variants in the Divine appellations and im-  
to have been used in Ex. xxiii. 15, 17; xxxiv. 23; Deut. xvi. 16 (see Kittel *ad loc.*) of appearance at the religious capital. Doubtless it was no more to be taken literally than "Moses stroked the face of" God (Ex. xxxii. 11). Similarly a blind man will speak of "going to see" a friend. The scribes, however, under the influence of Ex. xxxiii. 20-23, abolished the phrase. In xxiv. 10 the word seems to have been omitted in M.T., while the whole phrase was altered in the LXX; in the other passages the verb is pointed with vowels that alter the expression. (2) In Num. xii. 8 the Hebrew is notoriously not in order (see Kittel *ad loc.*) The LXX "and he saw the glory of the Lord" (bw omit) is clearly due to the tendency to transcendentalize. But Jerome's text is probably right "*et palam et non per anigmata et figuras Dominum videt.*" The *palam* (ובמראה) is supported by the מַרְאֵה, which, according to Kittel, is read by 10 MSS. Sam LXX Onk, and the ו has fallen out through haplography after מַרְאֵה. We should then compare Ex. xxxiii. f. and Isa. vi. 1, (3) Ex. xxxiii. is probably better preserved in the LXX and Vulg than in M.T. Jerome reads in verse 13 "ostende faciem tuam ut sciam te" for "shew me, I pray thee, thy ways that I may know thee." LXX has ἐμφανίσον μοι σεαυτον γωστωσ [*ἴνα* in Sah Lat] ἴδω [et noscam et videam Eth] σε. I apprehend that the Septuagintal readings are conflated, and that the original Septuagintal Hebrew had "shew me thy face that I may see thee" the γωστωσ and noscam, being due to our present Hebrew. In verse 18 Bahr Sah again have "shew me σεαυτον," i.e. probably "thy face," and this is met with the refusal of 20. It is clear that Moses here asks for a further visible manifestation to him of the Divine Being than the fiery glory and the voice, and that this was refused, though some manifestation of the Divine presence was

probable uses of the Tetragrammaton. There too the use of Baal — which has actually been allowed to stand in xxii. 41 (Bamoth Baal = high places of baal) was probably responsible for changes (substitutions of the Tetragrammaton or *Elohim* for baal followed by the introduction of an angel to avoid the resulting anthropomorphisms) with the consequent confusions of the text. And the factors that operated in Genesis are probably responsible for numerous variants in Exodus and elsewhere.<sup>1</sup>

In xxx. 6-30 we find no fewer than 8 important variants in 26 verses, the Vulgate differing from M. T. four times,

granted. "To see the face" is here used in a more literal meaning than in the passages considered under (1), but the precise meaning of the whole passage cannot be determined. It may, however, without undue rashness, be suggested that "the face" here probably corresponds better to the English word "presence." Living man cannot see God's presence. We are here before a mystery that cannot be apprehended by human brains, though it is easy enough to frame conjectures. (4) The anthropomorphisms of Genesis vanish before historical criticism, for we have seen reason to suppose that the Divine Name has been substituted by scribes for a word by which the early narrators designated anybody who appeared to them to be supernatural, though in some cases he may have been nothing more than a man sent by God. There is, however, one passage which should be more particularly noticed. Skinner rightly wishes to read "the men" for "the two angels" in Gen. xix. 1 (*ad loc.*), and on xviii. 1 he explains that the three men were "emissaries" of God "who was not visibly present." In point of fact the word "two" is omitted by f Ethp. The word "angels" is doubtless only another instance of the tendency to transcendentalize. In all these narratives historical criticism must discount the mental atmosphere of (a) the original narrator and (b) the scribes.

<sup>1</sup>After I had written this, I saw Waldo S. Pratt's article on the Psalter in 33 JBL [March, 1914] p. 18. He writes of some Psalms, "The present Elohim is superposed upon something that it was thought best to alter." I have not studied the criticism of the Psalter, and can only suggest that those interested in it should consider the matters to which attention has here been directed.

Syr (Pesh) twice, and three Hebrew MSS. once. We have seen that in xxx. 22b *Elohim* should be omitted with Vulg en Chr and K 170, 185. In verse 6 ("J") E and the Vulg have "Lord" and the Sah "Lord God" for the Massoretic *Elohim*, in verse 17 ("E") Old Latin has "Lord" and the Sahidic "Lord God" for M.T. *Elohim*, in xxx. 22a ("P") Vulgate has "and the Lord remembered," in verse 23 ("E") K 69, 80, 157 have the Tetragrammaton for *Elohim*, in verse 24 ("J") LXX Syr Aq Sym have "God" for "Lord," in 27 ("J") LXX Syr Vulg have "God" for "Lord," and 30 ("J") E ir Boh Sah Chr ½ Cyr ½ have "God" for M. T. "Lord," and x Arm have the conflate "Lord God." It should be added that in verses 18, 20, Leah uses *Elohim*, and there are no variants. Again, in xxxi. 49 LXX has "God" for M. T. "Lord" (in Laban's mouth), and verse 53 (when the gloss "the God of their father" is removed) makes it reasonably obvious that Laban did not worship the God of Israel.

Closely connected with xxx. is the passage xxix. 31-35. Here we are at once struck by the fact that in verse 32 the Syriac and Georgian have *Elohim* (i<sup>ar</sup> I present both words), and that in the other three occurrences 31, 33, 35 there are conflate readings (31 LXX except bw acmoxc, Arm Eth Lat Philo Berlin papyrus; 33 fir; 35 E I Sah Eth). Presumably this collection of variants is due to the general causes noted above, the removal of Baal and possibly other words and confusions through abbreviations.

In xxviii. there is an important variant in 20b, where "Lord" (E egj Eth<sup>cp</sup> some MSS. of HP) may be right against the *Elohim* of M. T. and the "Lord God" of most Septuagintal authorities, or may merely represent a substitute for some earlier title, like Baal, which, in the mouths of

Jacob and the original narrator, could only mean Israel's God, but appeared objectionable to later scribes. In verse 4 M.T. and most Septuagintal authorities have *Elohim*, Sam the Tetragrammaton, E f both words, while the Vulgate and Eth omit. This is an instance of glossing. In verse 13b the Tetragrammaton has come in through a scribal error (see Essays, pp. 45 f.). In verse 16 1 Cyr  $\frac{1}{3}$  have "God" for "Lord." This may be a mistake or it may be due to the cause suggested in the case of 20b.

In xxvii. 20 M. T. has "Lord thy God," Vulg f Boh<sup>l</sup> "God," Or-gr "thy God," some quotations from Philo "Lord," while the other Septuagintal authorities are divided between "Lord God" and "Lord thy God." Here there were clearly two readings, perhaps both substitutes for an earlier Divine title. In verse 7 fi<sup>r</sup> has "Lord God" in accordance with a frequent tendency of this group, in verse 27 the Old Latin has "Lord God," and several patristic authorities (but no MSS. or versions) have "God," and in verse 28 m f\* i\* Or-lat and some other patristic authorities have "Lord" and E n (1?) Phil-arm the conflate "Lord God" for M.T. 'haelohim.' In all these cases it seems to me that there are no data for any positive conclusions. The two words might be interchanged through mistakes in reading abbreviations, or they might be due to substitutions for some title to which later scribes objected. The frequent conflate readings of fir and other authorities may be due to the amalgamation of two readings, or to glossing, or to assimilation. It is certain that in very many instances conflate readings are due to two Hebrew variants. It is equally certain that in xxi. 1-6 a lectionary of the Greek Church presents continuous conflate readings, and that there is an extraordinary tendency to favor them on the part of fir and Ethiopic authorities in xxv. 22-

xxvi. 29, though in many of these instances both words are found singly in other authorities. It seems unwarrantable to come to any certain conclusion as to the cause of these phenomena on our present data.

Chapter xxvi. presents some interesting variants that are explicable on the principles we have already noted. In verses 28 f., where the Massoretic text makes the Philistines use the Tetragrammaton, Boh<sup>p</sup> has "God" in the former verse (Eth<sup>ef</sup> "Lord God") and egj with numerous MSS. of HP in the latter (fir s<sup>mg</sup> Eth "Lord God"). I think we may reasonably infer that the Philistines did not use the Tetragrammaton in the original text, and that we have here to do with a substitute. In xxvi. 2 E M I Chr have "God" for "Lord," and this may be due to the tendency to transcendentalize, or to substitution: and in verse 12 SI Chr have "God" and fir Eth<sup>p</sup> "Lord God." It may be that the original was *Adon* or *Baal*, but we have no means of judging. The variant may be due to error. In chapter xxv. the Vulgate twice omits the Tetragrammaton of M. T. In the first instance, verse 21b, all the Septuagintal authorities except Δ<sub>3</sub> f have "God." The word is an obvious gloss. Some Septuagintal authorities omit "Lord" in the earlier part of the verse. In verse 23 the Vulgate again omits "Lord," and once more it seems to be a gloss.

It has been desirable to deal with these chapters in detail, in order to show how the variants may be explained on my hypotheses. Naturally I do not claim that it is in all cases possible to restore the original text. My task is accomplished when I have shown that the phenomena of the Massoretic text and the important versions cannot be explained by the documentary theory, but are such as would naturally have arisen if the narrators and scribes behaved in the way in

which they are known or reasonably conjectured to have behaved on other occasions. It is definitely known that Baal was removed from other early texts; that all Biblical texts were heavily glossed; that a tendency to transcendentalize introduced an angel into sundry Pentateuchal texts (Samaritan, Septuagintal, etc.) where others which appear to be more original read some word for God; that *adon(y)* and the Tetragrammaton were sometimes confused (e. g. Ex. xv. 17 Sam and 86 MSS. Tetragrammaton, M. T. *adonai*); and that abbreviations were common in Hebrew MSS.: and it is reasonably conjectured that there was a time when the reluctance to utter the Tetragrammaton related primarily or especially to foreign soil. The application of these principles to the text of Genesis removes all our difficulties, while the sketch of the textual history which resulted from our previous investigations shows how the causes suggested could have given us our existing texts, and receives confirmation from the peculiarities they present. At the same time the ultimate form of the Massoretic text, and the adoption of certain readings by Heb-Sam, may probably have been influenced by the numerical considerations to which attention was drawn on pages 252-257 of "The Pentateuchal Text."